UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 100—PART 2

FEBRUARY 8, 1954, TO MARCH 8, 1954
(PAGES 1423 TO 2876)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1954

J
11
.R
v.100
pt.2

UNDEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2-17-55

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1954

Msgr. Béla Varga, president of the Hungarian National Council, offered the following prayer:

O Lord Almighty Father, protector of the weak and ruler of the strong, Thy humble servants lift their prayer to Thee.

In our prayer we join the imploring millions whose silent invocations rise to Thee from the dark dungeons of the Iron Curtain, from the most obscure corners of the slave camps, and from the horror chambers of the secret police. Hear these prayers, O Lord, and deliver them from evil.

O Lord give us strength as Thou hast given strength to Thy servant, Cardinal Mindszenty. He defied the tyrant's wrath until condemned to prison 5 years ago today. On this anniversary help us to dedicate ourselves with renewed firmness and a sure hope to work for Thy peace on earth and for Thy love among men.

On this anniversary, standing in this mighty bastion of freedom's strength, we invoke Thy providence, O Ruler of Nations, that we may justify the confidence of millions of Thy children, who are now bent but unbroken under the scourge of despotism and in the darkness of slavery. Have mercy on them and let us be led by Thy mighty hand that we may strengthen their unquenchable hope to see the end of all tyranny.

We entreat Thee, O Father in Heaven. Lend Thy wisdom in all our deliberations and extend the light of Thy grace when we ponder the fate of centuries to come. Bestow upon us the endowments of Thy divine benevolence that this Chamber, that this Capitol remain the fortress of man's God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, a beacon to dispel the dark forces of death, tyranny, and the very denial of Thy Holy Name.

Almighty Creator who hast made all men in Thine image and likeness free, give us strength to drive out the abominations of tyranny which defile Thy kingdom on earth.

God bless you all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 5, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the remarks by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] raising a question of personal privilege, there be a call of the calendar, as previously announced, for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, to start from the point reached at the last call of the calendar, order of business 857, Senate bill 1647, which appears on page 10 of the calendar. The consideration of measures to which there is no objection will continue to the end of the calendar, and when the last of the bills on which reports are available has been considered, the Senate will return to the first order of business on the calendar, Order No. 19, Senate bill 242, and the call will continue to the point it began today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair designates the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] to read Washington's Farewell Address on February 22, 1954, under authority of the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, 1954

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provisions of Public Law 816, approved June 29, 1948, the Chair appoints as members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy for 1954, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY, 1954

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provisions of Public Law 816, approved June 29, 1948, the Chair appoints as members on the part of the Senate to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy for 1954, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

BOARD OF VISITORS TO MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY, 1954

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provisions of Public Law 301, approved May 11, 1944, the Chair appoints as a member on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for 1954, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY, 1954

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provisions of section 194 of Public Law 207, approved August 4, 1949, the Chair appoints as a member on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for 1954, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to be a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Senator Robert A. Taft.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR-RISK AND CERTAIN OTHER INSURANCE FOR AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF EXCESS NAVAL PROPERTY IN FOREIGN AREAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the disposal of excess naval property in foreign areas, dated January, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a

confidential report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of December, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no exchanges of land were consummated between the States, counties, and municipalities and the Federal Government relating to lands classified chiefly valuable for recreational purposes in exchange for lands of equal value or equal quantity; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATIONS OF PUBLIC LANDS IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, tabulations showing the withdrawals and restorations of public lands in certain cases (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT, GLACIER NATIONAL PARK, MONT.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award to operate a saddle horse concession within Glacier National Park, Mont. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to certain legislation seeking Federal financial aid for flood control and pollution abatement

"Whereas legislation is now pending or will be introduced before the Congress of the United States seeking an appropriation by the said Congress for the purpose of further flood control and pollution abatement in the Connecticut River and its tributaries, said legislation being requested by the Connecticut Valley Water Control Association; and

"Whereas such flood control and pollution abatement can be undertaken only by the Federal Government: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Commonwealth of Massachusetts hereby lends its full and complete support and endorsement to the end that the recommendations and request of the Connecticut Valley Water Control Association be favorably considered by the Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the commonwealth to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States not to pass any legislation granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the Medford (Oreg.) Central Labor Council, protesting against any special exemption on income derived from dividends; to the Committee on Finance.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, and prior to the call of the calendar, there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business under the usual 2-minute limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That will be in order under the rule, because the Senate is meeting after an adjournment.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PNEUMATIC TUBES OF NEW YORK CITY POST OFFICE—QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first of all I desire to thank the majority leader for his cooperation last Friday in agreeing to the arrangement whereby I am permitted to make a statement at this time. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Before I begin my prepared remarks, I should like to say that we are now in the period of the year known as Lincoln week, during which we commemorate the great life, great purposes, and great idealism of the immortal Abraham Lincoln. It is in the spirit of nonpartisanship which characterized Mr. Lincoln that I have compiled a series of Lincoln statements which I believe to be quite appropriate to the discussion I am about to undertake.

It seems to me that the Lincoln statements would certainly set a high standard for political conduct in the United States. I pray that we may rally to that standard and that American politics may be placed on the high level of decency and responsibility, a place which politics in a democracy justly deserves.

I regret that signs of the times indicate that American politics is degrading itself. This can only damage for many years to come the success and strength of free government.

I shall conduct myself now and in the days to come, as I have in the past, as a responsible United States citizen and as a responsible Member of this body.

The great Lincoln had this to say on truth as a vindication against slander:

Truth is generally the best vindication against slander.

That statement was contained in a letter to Secretary Stanton on July 14, 1864. How right the immortal Abraham Lincoln was in that statement.

On the subject of the danger of unjust suspicion of one another, the great Lincoln said:

I believe we need nothing so much as to get rid of unjust suspicion of one another.

That statement was contained in a letter to Charles L. Wilson, on June 1, 1858.

In referring to the need of furnishing proof of any charge, the great Abraham Lincoln said:

A man cannot prove the negative, but he has a right to claim that when one makes an affirmative charge he must offer some proof to show the truth of what he says.

That statement was made during a debate at Ottawa, Ill., on August 21, 1858.

On the subject of falsity of accusation without foundation, the great Lincoln said:

Never add the weight of * * * character to charge against a fellow man, without knowing it to be true. I believe it is an established maxim in morals that he who makes an assertion without knowing whether it is true or false, is guilty of falsehood, and the accidental truth of the assertion does not justify or excuse him. This maxim ought to be particularly held in view when we contemplate an attack upon the reputation of our neighbor.

This was in a letter to the editor of the Illinois Gazette, Springfield, Ill., on August 11, 1846.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me complete this series of quotations, and I shall be delighted to yield.

The great President Lincoln also said:

Persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true is simply malicious slander.

This was from the Cooper Institute address in New York City, N. Y., on February 27, 1860.

It is in this spirit and with these rules of conduct and decency in mind that I approach the subject matter which is weighing so heavily on my heart.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the Senator about to discuss the subject matter of the pneumatic tubes in the New York post office?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the subject to which I am about to address myself.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say that that subject arose at the first meeting of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand so.

Mr. MAYBANK. I happen to be a member of that subcommittee. For-

merly I was chairman of it, as the Senator knows.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. While I do not know as much about the Post Office Department as do members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, nevertheless, in the years gone by, I was chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I believe I told the Senator that the subject had been brought up.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator did.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thought it only fair and just to my colleague to so inform him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for giving me that information.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that nothing was said in that meeting against the Senator. It is my understanding that the charges which were made with respect to losses of money insofar as the tubes were concerned were to be investigated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does not the record show that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what the record shows.

Mr. MAYBANK. I believe the record will further show, in the statement of the present chairman, that in view of the fact that the Appropriations Committee did not have sufficient investigators or sufficient funds to investigate this subject, the Committee on Government Operations would investigate it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was my understanding.

Mr. MAYBANK. Has there been any investigation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not that I know of.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator mean to tell me that after that understanding was reached in the committee nothing has been done? I am certain that all the members of the subcommittee who were present will recall the understanding to which I have referred. I believe the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] was present. I believe there were 4 or 5 Senators present. I was left with the distinct impression that before any charges were made the subject would be investigated by the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was my understanding.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not wish to involve any other Senator, but I believe that the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], introduced the first bill dealing with this subject, at a time when I happened to be chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota merely introduced a bill to continue the activity provided for by his bill, because the cost had increased in the meantime.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am going into this subject in great detail. The Senator's statement is accurate. I shall appreciate it if I may be permitted to develop this point. As I go along I am sure the memory of the Senator from South Carolina, who is a responsible member of the Committee on Appropriations, will be refreshed.

Mr. MAYBANK. When the question arose I did not have before me the records. At that time I understood that the Congress had unanimously passed the bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. There was no dissenting voice in this body on the passage of that bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. So the subcommittee recommended to the full committee that the money be appropriated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to emphasize the fact that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absolutely correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As former chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, it is my recollection that the reason for the increased cost at that time was the change from one kind of current to another in New York. The bill which was introduced was to take care of the additional cost.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for that observation. I am sure that I shall be able to develop this subject to the satisfaction of my colleagues. I have before me information which I have carefully reviewed, as a result of what I consider to be a completely unfounded attack.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In connection with what has been said, the Senator from Alabama happens to be a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I am sure that each year that committee has recommended, and the Senate has approved, appropriations for this purpose. Is not that true?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is absolutely true.

Mr. HILL. That has been true not only under Democratic administrations, but also in the Republican 80th Congress. Each year the Committee on Appropriations has reported an appropriation bill carrying an appropriation for these pneumatic tubes. The Senate has approved such an appropriation, just as the House has done, and the appropriation has been passed upon by both Senate and House Appropriations Committees, and by both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think it should be stated for the information of the public that the bill of the Senator from Minnesota and the bill of the Senator from North Dakota were only enabling acts. After an enabling act is passed, it is necessary to appropriate the money to carry out the purpose of the enabling act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Each year the Committee on Appropriations passes upon the appropriations necessary to carry out the functions of the Post Office Department.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to make one additional observation. I may be in error. If so, I wish to be corrected. I have never heard any voice raised on either side of the aisle against this appropriation during all the years in question. If I am mistaken, I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have examined the record very carefully, and as far as I know, there has never been the slightest whisper of opposition.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The senior Senator from South Carolina is entirely correct. Both the senior Senator from South Carolina and the junior Senator from South Carolina serve on the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I have never heard any opposition to the appropriation during my service as a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will yield once more, and then I should like to develop my case.

Mr. LANGER. I am sure the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] who has just spoken will remember that the subcommittee went to New York and engaged rooms in one of the leading hotels. Witness after witness appeared before us. We went to the post office and discussed the subject with the postmaster. We made the fullest and most complete examination before we reported back to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. That is an accurate statement, which I shall document as I proceed.

Within the past few weeks—yes, even as late as last Sunday—the newspapers of my State have prominently printed in their pages a series of deliberately misleading and politically inspired attacks against my record, my judgment, and my integrity as a Member of the United States Senate and as a citizen of the United States. I hold in my hands various issues of such newspapers. My colleagues can see the nature of the headlines.

These attacks are an outrageous demonstration of irresponsible politics, with no attempt to confirm the facts. They

have been made by a group of Republican national committeemen of my State with the assistance of the United States Postmaster General, Mr. Arthur Summerfield, in connection with the bill I introduced during the 81st Congress, S. 4102, authorizing the Post Office Department to contract for the use of pneumatic tubes in the New York Post Office.

I hold in my hand a newspaper with the headline "HUMPHREY Charges Smear. McCARTHY Will Probe His Role in Postal Contract."

The second headline hints at "Possibility of Graft."

These are words which I do not take gently or without putting up an outright battle and resistance to expose the kind of attack which is being leveled against me.

I wish my colleagues to know that I have before me photostatic copies of various newspapers published in my State. Here is one, the Duluth Herald, of Duluth, Minn., under date of January 6:

Humphrey-sponsored bill may start another Demo scandal.

In one newspaper article after another in the weekly press of my State a deliberate and wholesale attempt is being made to besmirch the character of the junior Senator from Minnesota and, I may say to my colleagues, the character and integrity of the Congress of the United States. Make no mistake about it. The measure which I am about to discuss was passed unanimously by the House and Senate in the 80th Congress; it was passed unanimously by the House and Senate in the 81st Congress.

The measure which I introduced was first submitted to the then Vice President, Honorable Alben Barkley, by the Postmaster General, with the clearance of the Budget Bureau, and was referred by the then chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], to the junior Senator from Minnesota in his responsibility as chairman of the Postal Affairs Subcommittee of the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

It may be a mere coincidence that while the Republican National Committee is meeting in Washington, the Minneapolis newspapers should carry a headline to the effect that the Republican National Committee will level its guns at me. It may be mere coincidence that the Postmaster General and the Minnesota Republican National Committeeman should launch their criticisms of me at about the same time, or that the Senate subcommittee should at this time undertake an investigation of this subject, which has been referred to by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. That, I say, may be a mere coincidence, but I ask the question: Could it be that the Republican National Committee is leveling its barrage in order to attempt to soften up the junior Senator from Minnesota, in the hope that the Minnesota Republican leadership may at long last be able to find a candidate who will run against him? Possibly that is the case.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the present Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, was until a year ago chairman of the Republican National Committee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, that is a fact.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not probable that when the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, who was until quite recently chairman of the Republican National Committee, makes these unsupported and unfounded charges against the junior Senator from Minnesota, he is speaking in his former capacity as chairman of the Republican National Committee, instead of in his capacity as Postmaster General of the United States, a highly important position, in which he should show responsibility, but which he has failed to do in this case?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall give some attention to that observation. However, I want to say to my colleagues that we are not discussing a controversial bill. We are discussing a measure which has been before the Congress since 1898, with the exception of 2 years. We are discussing a measure which was passed unanimously in the 80th Congress, as one very recent example, and was also passed unanimously in the 81st Congress.

Nevertheless, not only has the integrity and the character of the junior Senator from Minnesota been assailed, but, I say to my colleagues, as each of us has the responsibility to examine fully every piece of legislation which comes before this body, and as each of us is held accountable for every piece of legislation which is passed by Congress, when someone undertakes to cry graft or scandal or dereliction of duty in relation to a bill sponsored by the junior Senator from Minnesota, at the request of the executive branch of the Government, at the request of the responsible officer of the Post Office Department, and at the request of the chairman of my committee, then, indeed, politics has come to such a pass that not only is a rifle pointed at the back of an individual Member of this body, but at the Senate as a whole and, indeed, at the House of Representatives, and, indeed, at the President of the United States, who signed the bill, and, indeed, at the Bureau of the Budget, which approved the bill, and at the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Lindsay Warren, who registered no objection to the bill.

If I speak with just indignation, I speak from the heart, Mr. President. I do not intend to have any Member of this body or any leader of any political party brand me with the stigma of scandal or of graft.

We are all of us concerned in this matter, and the time is at hand to call a halt to such tactics, and, as decent and God-fearing and God-respecting men, to stand forthright against them, instead of going down into the gutter in order to win an election.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the releases and newspaper articles to which I have alluded be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Therefore I rise to expose with documented facts this political fraud, and to serve notice upon the Republican Party of my State and upon the Postmaster General of the United States and upon the Republican leadership—I am not referring to the Republicans in my State, because they are decent people—that I will not sit idly by and let the Republican hierarchy introduce into the politics of my State half-truths, innuendoes, and the big lie technique. I am confident that the people of Minnesota will join with me in repudiating this smear attack and its political use and its political currency in a decent community of the United States of America.

I have replied to these attacks through the medium of a letter which I have sent to the editors of newspapers in Minnesota.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a copy of the letter which has been sent to many editors of weekly newspapers in the State of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this attack has been carried on in dozens of weekly newspapers, week after week, in the State of Minnesota, in an attempt to discredit a Member of this body who is trying to do his duty.

The Republican Party leadership and the political irresponsibles in my State are using the word "scandal" and the word "graft" and the words "dereliction of duty" in connection with my sponsorship of the pneumatic tube bill in 1950, and they are basing their charge on an announcement by the Postmaster General canceling the pneumatic tube contract on the ground that the service is obsolete, unnecessary, and excessively expensive.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand, and have available for Members of the Senate to peruse, a copy of a recent statement made by the Postmaster General, as quoted in the Sunday edition of the Minneapolis newspaper to which I have referred. I should like to read a short excerpt from the article. I quote from page 16 of the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Sunday, February 7. I ask my colleagues to listen to this:

It is apparent that the Senator "doth protest too much." I think it is most unfortunate that Senator HUMPHREY should attack us for saving money. I emphatically refute the suggestion that the pneumatic tube contract was canceled for any other reason than to save the taxpayers money.

Note, Mr. President, that he says it was canceled only to save money. But note also that the headline talks about a scandal, and graft, and attaches the name of the junior Senator from Minnesota to that kind of language.

Those are not polite words that are being used, and the Senator from Minnesota indeed does protest.

As a citizen of the United States and as a Senator of the United States I will not, so long as I can stand on the floor of the Senate, allow anyone to accuse me of graft or accuse me of a scandal.

I have served as the mayor of a large city, and my most vicious critics never accused me of corruption. In fact, perhaps, I am a Member of the Senate today because I gave honest service. I do not intend to have the former chairman of the National Republican Committee or the present chairman of the National Republican Committee in Minnesota, directly or indirectly, accuse me of graft, scandal, or dereliction of duty.

Mr. President, the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, went on to say that the Government of the United States can replace the tube service now costing the Government, according to Mr. Summerfield, $1 million a year, "by the addition of two trucks at a yearly cost of about $25,000."

Mr. President, I just checked over the Postmaster General's report for 1952, the most recent available report, and I find that in the year 1952 the cost of the pneumatic-tube service under the Humphrey bill was $351,802. That was at the rate of $14,067 a mile, and there are approximately 27 miles of pneumatic tubes.

Where does the Postmaster General get the figure of $1 million and the figure of two trucks at $25,000 a year? This morning I had my staff check with the New York Post Office and I find that instead of two new trucks, they are buying 70 new trucks. They are not as yet delivered, but they have been ordered. I am not in position to say what make of truck they are.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Minnnesota mentioned 70 trucks. Can he tell us the type of trucks they are? Are they General Motors trucks?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the distinguished Senator that in 1951 the trucks purchased were International trucks. I do not know what trucks are being purchased this year.

I consider the Postmaster General to be an honest man; I consider him to be trying to conduct an honest administration; and I ask him to give other persons the benefit of the same charitable judgment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Postmaster General referred to 2 trucks at a cost of $25,000 each?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was the total cost.

Mr. MANSFIELD. According to the Senator's statement, the Department is purchasing 70 trucks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If we split the number 70 in two the expense involved is far beyond the figure $300,000 and closer to the figure $1 million; so that what the Postmaster General is talking about may apply to his expenditures rather than to the figure which the Senator has given.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not going to try to discuss the Postmaster General's figures, except to state what I have been told by the Post Office Department. I am sure the Postmaster General will give a good accounting for the use of these trucks, but it is ridiculous and ludicrous to say that 6 million pieces of mail could be moved with 2 trucks.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder if the Senator realizes, as I do, that there are many occasions during the course of the year when trucks are almost unusable for several days. I recall a snowstorm in New York 2 or 3 years ago when there was a fall of 22½ inches, and neither mail trucks nor any other vehicles moved freely during that period of time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The mail moved through the pneumatic tubes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Exactly. The trucks did not move.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall go into the question of the full operation of the pneumatic tubes as against the operation of trucks. But the issue here is not even pneumatic tubes versus trucks. I am not an expert, but one thing I do know, namely, that no man living can put the brand of scandal on my brow or my back, and I do not intend to let anyone try to do it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think perhaps the Senator has not emphasized sufficiently what he said with reference to the total cost of the operation of the movement of mail by pneumatic tubes, which I have been informed is approximately $352,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is according to the Postmaster General's report for 1952.

Mr. LEHMAN. And that is an official document. The Postmaster General made the statement that there would be a saving of $1 million in the change which he proposed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A saving of $1 million a year. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. The figure of $352,000 was a yearly figure, and he claims the saving will result in $1 million yearly. He may be a wizard, a miracle man, but I cannot see how there could be any basis for the statement he has made, that he can save $1 million, when the total expenditures up to the present time have been, if I am truthfully informed, $352,000 a year. If that should be completely wiped out he still could not possibly make a saving such as he claims.

I think that is a further demonstration that this is purely a political charge, with the single purpose of injuring the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota in his race for reelection this coming November. I can see no other reason for making such a completely unjustified, and unverified charge as that which has been made by the Postmaster General, who was formerly the chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I have followed the Senator from Minnesota very closely, but do I correctly understand that the Postmaster General said the tube system would cost, in round figures, $1 million a year, and that the mail could be handled with 2 trucks at a total cost of some $25,000 a year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. If I understood the Senator correctly he said his staff had called the New York Post Office this morning and found out that they are going to purchase 70 trucks, or that they have placed an order for 70 trucks. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. What the 70 trucks are going to be used for I do not know.

Mr. MORSE. That is the question I wanted to ask the Senator, because I think the record is a little confused with reference to that.

Did the New York post office indicate to the Senator's staff whether or not the 70 trucks were being purchased to do the job that Summerfield said 2 trucks could do, or are they being purchased to replace trucks used for the entire business section of the city of New York?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not think there is any separation; I understand they are to be used in connection with the general mail which is moved. When the Postmaster General says he can move the pneumatic-tube mail with 2 trucks, and that the 2 trucks would cost no more than $25,000, I am interested in the fact that there is now a purchase of 70 trucks conincidentally with the cancellation of the pneumatic-tube contract.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that at this point in the Senator's argument he is not seeking to leave the inference that it would take 70 trucks to handle the tube business which the Postmaster General said in his release to the Minnesota newspapers could be done by 2 trucks?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I pointed out that it would take many more than that.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator will now proceed with proofs to show that, irrespective of how many trucks the Post Office is ordering for the New York post office, they could not possibly, with two trucks, do the work the tubes are now doing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall show that.

The New York City post office has been serviced by pneumatic tubes for 56 years, since 1898. They have been in existence ever since, with only two exceptions. Congress failed to make the necessary appropriations available in 1901 and in 1918. The appropriations were restored, however, by Republican-controlled Congresses in 1902 and in 1922. The original contract was authorized by a Republican Congress and was twice restored by a Republican Congress and repeatedly renewed by Republican administrations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article summarizing the history of the pneumatic-tube system,

published in the New York Times of January 3, 1954, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in 1948, during the Republican-controlled 80th Congress, the Republican-controlled Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee undertook an investigation of the efficiency of the pneumatic tube mail service system. Two Republican Senators, the distinguished present chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, my warm friend and able associate, the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who was chairman of the subcommittee, and the former junior Senator from Montana, Mr. Zales Ecton, were members of a subcommittee which personally investigated the system by an on-the-spot hearing in New York. This took place before I became a Member of the Senate.

The two distinguished Senators in making the investigation took the testimony of witnesses on every aspect of the entire service, witnesses from the New York City post office, from the company that rendered the service, and from the Post Office Department in Washington, including postal inspectors and experts in the field. Following the investigation, the subcommittee submitted a report.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the hearings on the pneumatic tube mail service before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, dated March 29, 1948, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the hearings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the report represents the findings of the subcommittee and also was the basis for legislation recommended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the 80th Congress. The report was agreed to by Congress without a single dissenting vote.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not object to the interruptions, because if this case should turn out as I believe it will, as I sit and listen to the Senator from Minnesota, I think it highly desirable that during the course of the argument points should be emphasized, so that Senators may observe the proof as the case unfolds.

With the permission of the Senator from Minnesota, I now ask him this question: Am I to understand that the argument which he has just made draws the conclusion that in the Republican-controlled 80th Congress, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in charge of Republicans, conducted hearings on the pneumatic tube system in the city of New York, and that, as a result of the hearings, the committee recommended such a system for the city of New York?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The committee recommended continuation of such a system.

Mr. MORSE. And recommended the appropriation of funds?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The committee recommended an authorization at the rate of $12,000 a mile, which was a fair rate.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct, then, in drawing the conclusion that the able junior Senator from Minnesota subsequently introduced a bill to provide funds for such a tube system to be used in the New York City post office, thus carrying out the recommendation of a Republican-controlled committee in the 80th Congress?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that the bill which has my name attached to it did but one major substantive thing: It increased the rate from $12,000 a mile to a maximum of $15,500 a mile, because of the necessity of changing the electrical system from direct current to alternating current.

I may say to Senators that hundreds of thousands of dollars are being spent in the Senate Office Building itself to convert the electrical system from direct current to alternating current.

It costs money to convert from direct current to alternating current, and since the Government was the sole, exclusive user of the pneumatic tube lines, as I shall develop, the Government worked together with the manufacturing company to effect a conversion for the purpose of maintaining efficient service.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As I understand, in the Senator's mind there are two aspects. One relates to the efficiency of the service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The other is the accusation with respect to graft.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is eminently correct. There are two aspects. One is the accusation and innuendo concerning the junior Senator from Minnesota; the second is the whole matter of the technical nature and efficiency of the service provided by pneumatic tubes as compared with other means of transportation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have read some of the exhibits. As a former businessman, it would be difficult, in my opinion, for the Post Office Department to move 6 million pieces of mail with 2 trucks.

With respect to the second aspect, I note that the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], for whom I am certain I have as high regard as does the junior Senator from Minnesota, was one of the Senators who unanimously recommended, in 1950, exactly what the junior Senator from Minnesota recommended in 1952. Is not that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], was a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in 1948 and also in 1950. He always has been a responsible Member of the Senate, and I say it is to his credit that he voted in 1948 for the Langer bill and in 1950 for the Humphrey bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No Member of the Senate has greater respect for the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota than have I. What I was attempting to say was that any accusation made by any newspaper in the State of Minnesota on this particular subject against the junior Senator from Minnesota would also, in effect, be an accusation against the senior Senator from Minnesota. Am I not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Surely that would seem to me to be the case. Certainly, I do not even wish to bring my senior colleague into this mess. I want to say that there is not a more honest man in my State than the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I asked the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] if the conditions under which both he and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the other members of the committee unanimously agreed to act in previous years and those under which the junior Senator from Minnesota acted in later years were identical, and he has told me they were identical without any reservations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. With the exception of the rate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct; with the exception of the rate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Missouri very much.

Following the unanimous favorable report of the 80th Congress Senate subcommittee, the full Committees of Post Office and Civil Service of both the Senate and House of Representatives in the Republican-controlled 80th Congress voted to continue the pneumatic tube mail-service system. I read to the Senate from Senate Report 1241 of the 80th Congress, 2d session, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which had this to say about the pneumatic tube mail-service system:

> Today when mail matter must move quickly to meet all kinds of timetable deadlines—plane, railroad, and steamers—to insure its early delivery, the underground pneumatic-tube system is invaluable. (P. 3, Rept. No. 1241, 80th Cong., 2d sess.)

It is to this very fact that the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] was referring a while ago.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not correct that the United States Government through the Post Office Department, has been using the pneumatic-tube service since 1922?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The United States Government has been using it since 1898.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There was a break in the use of the service from 1918, when the Democrats were in office, until 1922, when the system was reinstated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, there was. The service was reinstated, I believe the record will reveal, by a unanimous appropriation vote after full hearings and recommendations of the Post Office Department, and it has never been a subject of controversy. I may say that no one ever has raised as much as a

word of doubt until all at once, in the year of our Lord 1954, an election year, the junior Senator from Minnesota is attacked.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There is one other point which I think should be brought out. Are the rates now being paid out of line with the rates which were paid in 1922?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. The rates in the bill sponsored by me provided for $5,000 a mile less than the rates in 1922, according to a letter I received the other day from the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wonder if the junior Senator from Minnesota would not agree that the personal attack which has been made upon him in connection with this matter was not a bit unusual and can only have been politically motivated, since the big item of news was that the Postmaster General had decided to change the mail transportation system in New York City.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Postmaster General could not have failed to have known that the junior Senator from Minnesota would be running for reelection this year; and having been a former chairman of the Republican National Committee, the Postmaster General went out of his way, did he not, to drag in the name of the junior Senator from Minnesota in an effort to discredit him and his service in the United States Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma that I have been told, not once, but a dozen times, in the last month and a half, that the pneumatic tube bill issue was to be wrapped around my neck. This was to be the beginning of a political attack upon HUBERT HUMPHREY. I could see the attack as it developed, as it progressed from one little news story to another. First it related to a simple matter, as to which every Member of the Senate agreed. All at once it built itself into a great public issue, which necessitated front-page headlines in the leading newspaper of my State. I may say it has been a long time since the junior Senator from Minnesota has been on the front page—a long time. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONRONEY. Would it not also be fair to say that if there is responsibility on the junior Senator from Minnesota for the service being continued as it has been operating for some 50 years the responsibility is equally shared by every member of the Committee on Appropriations of both Houses and by every Member of the House and every Member of the Senate, which passed the bill unanimously? Yet, when the news release was made, only one Member of the United States Senate, one who happened to be a candidate for reelection, was considered sufficiently important by a politically minded Postmaster General to try to connect him by innuendo with the idea of graft or scandal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma that there is a strange coincidence here. The Postmaster General gives out a release on pneumatic tubes. Then the Republican national committeeman of the State of Minnesota follows it up. Then newsmen call me on the telephone. Mr. Hayden, the distinguished Washington reporter of the North American Newspaper Alliance, called me on the day I arrived from my State of Minnesota to be with my family for the Christmas holidays and asked about the pneumatic-tube bill. It was one of thousands of bills I handled as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads; and, Mr. President, I gave my time to that committee. I worked diligently on that committee. I think my colleagues in the Senate will testify to the diligence of my service. Then I find all at once that this bill, which has been rolling through the Congress for 56 years, suddenly takes on a new significance. It is interesting, is it not? All at once it becomes a matter of great national importance.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. In the stories on this matter which I read in newspapers of my home State no mention was made of the fact that the pneumatic-tube system had been in use for 50 years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course not.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the Senator from Minnesota think that is a fair way for a department to handle news? Is that not the suppression of a vital, important factor? In the news stories there was no mention of the fact that the use of pneumatic tubes had been approved for 50 years by the Congress, and that they were regarded to be a valuable means of transmitting packages and mail in crowded New York, which has congested traffic arteries. Not one story which I read referred to the historic use of such mail transportation methods. It seems to me that he who would, in a news release, suppress a vital item is guilty of deliberately trying to have read into the story something which is not there.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I cannot read men's motives, and I do not desire to be uncharitable or unkind. All I say is that the emphasis was upon the 10-year contract which was approved, or authorized, by the Humphrey bill, when, in truth, the enabling legislation—the final enabling legislation—was passed in 1922. Ten-year contracts have been authorized ever since that time. The story is just about as new as Ben Franklin's almanac.

Mr. MONRONEY. There has not been anything in the newspaper stories announcing that such a practice had been followed for the period the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to say to the Senator from Oklahoma, who is a former newspaperman, that it is very peculiar that with the cancellation of a contract such as the one involved in this matter, my telephone has been ringing day after day. Reporters have said to me, "We have been tipped off that this is a hot news story. What is your explanation, Senator HUMPHREY?" as if I were a suspected criminal.

Mr. President, such a thing just does not happen of itself. Contracts are being canceled day after day in many areas of the Government. Many defense contracts have been canceled recently. Are we therefore to hold a distinguished Senator who was chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in the 83d Congress accountable for the fact that we may have overappropriated some funds? Are we to hold somebody who was the sponsor of a bill accountable because someone in authority may have gone wrong on mutual security?

Frankly, there is not a bit of evidence that anything has gone wrong with the pneumatic-tube service. The whole question is as printed in the Minneapolis Tribune on February 7, quoting the Postmaster General:

> I emphatically repudiate the suggestion that the pneumatic-tube contract was canceled for any other reason than to save the taxpayers money.

Mr. President, if that is the reason why the contract was canceled, then how did the words "scandal" and "graft" and "dereliction of duty" get into the story?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. If the Postmaster General has said he was canceling the contract in order that he could make a reasonable and realistic saving by eliminating the use of the pneumatic-tube service, it might make sense, but when he makes a statement that he is going to save a million dollars on a contract which amounts to only $352,000——

Mr. HUMPHREY. In 1952.

Mr. LEHMAN. In 1952—then I say he is doing that for the sake of headlines. He would not have received headlines any other way in order to discredit the Senator from Minnesota, who is a candidate for reelection next November.

I desire to ask the Senator from Minnesota if he does not think it is extremely strange that in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, published yesterday, the headline is as the Senator read, "HUMPHREY Charges 'Smear'; MCCARTHY Will Probe His Role in Postal Contract," and on the same day or the day before, Mr. Hall, Chairman of the Republican National Committee, appeared on a television program, or elsewhere, and stated that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] was going to be one of the Republican spearheads in the next campaign. Almost at the same time there was a statement in the press by the Senator from Wisconsin again implying that there was graft and corruption in the introduction and passage of this bill by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Those three statements came out so nearly simultaneously, and are so closely related, that I think the implication

is clear that the action taken was not for the purpose of saving the money of the taxpayer—a purpose of which I am in favor just as strongly as is Mr. Summerfield or anyone else. I believe that the statements were made merely for the purpose of making political capital, and injuring the chances of reelection of the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, who for the past 6 years has given devoted and intelligent service which few other Members of the Senate have ever surpassed.

I think what happened was outrageous, and that it should be brought to the attention of the American people as further evidence of smear tactics, and political guerrilla warfare. The Senator from Minnesota is fully justified in resenting such accusations, and in throwing the lie right back into the teeth of those who have attempted to discredit him. I desire to congratulate the Senator on what he has done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I am certainly sympathetic with the Senator's indignation. If he feels he has been smeared unjustly, I think he should be resentful of that kind of treatment.

I noted what the Senator said about the Postmaster General, that he believed he was an honest man.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I do.

Mr. BUSH. The matter the Senator is discussing is pretty serious, inasmuch as it involves a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The Senator from Minnesota just read the statement of the Postmaster General, wherein the Postmaster General said:

> I emphatically repudiate the suggestion that the pneumatic tube contract was canceled for any other reason than to save the taxpayers money.

Again in the same statement the Postmaster General said:

> We would welcome with open arms a congressional investigation not only of our action in canceling a 10-year contract that has cost us $1 million a year for services which we can duplicate for just $25,000, but also of the motives and circumstances that led to the signing of such a disastrous contract by the former administration in the first place.

The Postmaster General has invited a congressional investigation of the matter. It seems to me it is only fair that such an investigation take place, so that we may see whether the Postmaster General means what he says when he emphatically repudiates the suggestion that the contract was canceled for any reason other than to save the taxpayers money.

I wish to emphasize that I am entirely sympathetic with the indignation of the Senator from Minnesota that his name has been connected with charges of graft or scandal. I find nothing in what he said or nothing in the documents he has been kind enough to circulate among us to indicate that the Postmaster is responsible for having the name of the Senator from Minnesota connected with those charges.

Therefore, I think it only fair to ask the Senator from Minnesota, if he is going to make charges against the Postmaster General, that he be specific about them, and not make them by innuendo. I say that with all due respect to my good friend from Minnesota, having confidence in his integrity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me say that I am not charging the Postmaster General with a single thing. I am simply saying there is a big pass play going on which raises my suspicions. The Postmaster General begins with a release on a bill I introduced—a bill continuing an authorization, by the way, which has been in effect since 1898—then, with a peculiar, timely coincidence, the Republican national committeeman in Minnesota catches the pass; and on the same day my telephone rings repeatedly when I am called by persons who say, "Senator HUMPHREY, what is this bill that you have your name attached to?"

I have been in politics long enough to know what is going on. Sometimes it is not the printed word, but the spoken word, that has the real impact and meaning. To be sure, the releases of the Postmaster General are carefully guarded, except to say he wants to find out the motives which led to the contract.

Mr. President, if he wants to find that he had better find it from William McKinley, who signed the first pneumatic-tube bill in 1898. It would be a rather large assignment to find that from him. Or the Postmaster General could go back to 1922, and find why the Postmaster General at that time signed the authorization for 10-year contracts, which the junior Senator from Minnesota in bipartisan spirit introduced a bill to have continued; that is all. Then let the Postmaster General ask the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, why the contracts have been renewed.

This matter is ridiculous.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I do not blame the Senator from Minnesota for being concerned or puzzled, as he said, about the chain of circumstances.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very puzzled.

Mr. BUSH. However, I think certainly the Senator from Minnesota should be careful not necessarily to jump to the conclusion that the Postmaster General in his official capacity is taking some action which, although he says he is taking it in the interest of the taxpayers, he is actually taking for some other reason—which he has already denied.

Inasmuch as we wish to be entirely fair to the Senator from Minnesota, and I repeat that I myself have the utmost confidence in him—I suggest that we must also be fair to the members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States, and not allow to stand the innuendos which have been made here today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me make the RECORD crystal clear. I am not contesting at this time the honesty or the basic integrity of the Postmaster General. I do contest the figures he has presented to the committee. As one who has been in politics long enough to know how it operates, I wish to make it quite clear that it is very, very much of a puzzling coincidence or, that just as the Postmaster General cancels the contract, which was one of many contracts, I am sure, that he has been canceling—including star-route contracts, and many others—all at once the big guns open up in the State of Minnesota, and suddenly the junior Senator from Minnesota finds that there may be graft or corruption. How does all this tie in? It ties in suspiciously.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should like to say to my distingished colleague that I would feel remiss if I did not tell him that I, also, have full respect for the character and integrity of the Postmaster General. However, men of integrity can make misstatements of fact. I am sure a statement to which I intend to refer later, on the floor of the Senate, with respect to Democrats in Washington, and made by the Postmaster General on January 21, is both false in fact and false in implication.

I simply wish to call that to the attention of the Senate because the Senator from Connecticut may be interested in what I shall say with respect to these comments made by the Postmaster General. They have nothing to do with the efforts on the part of my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota, to protect his own good name. With respect to the question of graft, did the Senator from Minnesota ever discuss with any member of the organization which supplies the pneumatic tube service, the terms or conditions under which the service would be rendered?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can assure the Senator from Missouri that not only did I not discuss it with them, but I do not know who they are, by name; and I never knowingly have seen either their profiles or character sketches.

I accepted the reports of the 80th Congress. I accepted the original basis of the contract, beginning with William McKinley. I figured that if it was good enough for William McKinley, Teddy Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Calvin Coolidge, Harding, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman, it should be good enough for HUBERT HUMPHREY.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In other words, the Senator from Minnesota had no telephone conversation, verbal conversation, or letters, or any other relationship with respect to the persons who benefited by the contract, in any way or form: It that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Never were truer words spoken.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed I do yield to the majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that, as he knows, when he came to me on Friday and said he had a question of personal privilege he wished to submit to the Senate, I immediately cooperated with him to the fullest—even to the extent of laying aside a unanimous-consent agreement—so that he would have an opportunity to make the presentation at the time and under the circumstances he wished.

Frankly, I have not had any information on this matter, other than that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota was to make the speech.

When he began his speech today; and when it became apparent what the subject matter was, I sent for the testimony taken before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill. I have read the testimony as it was given there. I can say to the Senator from Minnesota that I can find no indication that in the testimony of either the Postmaster General or anyone else, any reflection was cast upon the integrity of the Senator from Minnesota.

The only thing I find is that question was raised as to why the former Postmaster General—having had a report, apparently, as I understand, from the Post Office inspectors—had acted contrary to their report, and had signed a 10-year contract.

But in no case do I find the slightest reflection upon the character or integrity of our distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

I should like to ask a question, because in a matter of this kind I think it important that the Senate have the facts: When the former Postmaster General or his assistants had requested the distinguished Senator from Minnesota to introduce the bill—which is a customary practice, regardless of which administration happens to be in power—did they advised the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota that there was a report from the postal inspectors, raising doubts as to whether such a contract should be signed?

I ask that question because it seems to me it goes at least to the heart of this situation, namely, why, beginning in 1896, or whatever the first date was, there was a whole series of renewals; and whether at any time prior to the last time there had been an adverse report from the postal inspectors to the Postmaster General; and that subsequent to an adverse report, proposed legislation on the subject had been introduced.

Perhaps the Senator could give some light to the Senate on that subject. First, does he know whether or not there had ever before been an adverse report from the inspectors? Secondly, in view of the fact that a reading of the testimony apparently shows that there had been an adverse report the last time, did those who spoke to him about introducing the bill have the courtesy at least to inform him that there was such an adverse report?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the majority leader. He is always fair. It is indeed a wonderful tribute to the Senate that we have a man as majority leader who is as fair as is the Senator from California.

First, I am delighted that he has made the statement which he has made. It should dispose once and for all of what I have been reading in the newspapers, namely, the intimation that the junior Senator from Minnesota should in any way be under attack because of the bill to which reference has been made. I think the issue is quite clear.

The next point about the postal inspectors' reports is this: At the time the junior Senator from Minnesota introduced the bill he introduced it at the request of the Postmaster General, with the concurrence of the Bureau of the Budget, and with a letter from the Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren, saying that he had no objection to the measure. That is the language customarily used by the Comptroller General.

A member of my staff discussed this subject with former Postmaster General Donaldson, and I find that he discussed it with the Bureau of the Budget. I find that, while some postal inspectors felt that the pneumatic-tube service could be discontinued, the study which was made was on the basis of the possibility that it would be discontinued, and on the basis of the extra cost which would be involved in that event in the use of trucks and other forms of replacement transportation.

The former Postmaster General has assured my staff that there was no negative report by any full committee of departmental officials or postal inspectors with respect to the pneumatic-tube proposal.

As a Member of the Senate, I accepted the report of the Postmaster General on a strictly technical subject. I wish to make it quite clear that this measure had already been approved in 1948. The Humphrey bill provided only for an increase in the rate of payment, so that there could be conversion from direct current to alternating current.

The basic investigation of the efficiency of the service, the investigation as to the necessity for the pneumatic tubes, had been made in the 80th Congress. At the time our committee considered the bill we had before us the reports made during the 80th Congress, the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, the recommendation of the Postmaster General, and the concurrence or, at least, the letter from the Comptroller General indicating that he had no objection. The bill was unanimously passed. So in 1950 I had no information that anyone was opposed to the bill. The Congress had unanimously approved the pneumatic-tube service.

Let me say to my colleagues that I am not intimately acquainted with the postal service in New York City. I was not actuated by any particular desire to introduce a bill for the benefit of New York City. I introduced the bill on my responsibility as chairman of the subcommittee, as the majority leader has made quite clear. The bill was an administration bill referred through channels until it came to the "low man on the totem pole," the chairman of the subcommittee.

If Mr. Summerfield wishes to have this subject thoroughly investigated, that is exactly my recommendation, as will be apparent as I proceed with my speech.

There are two points involved. The first is the matter of headlines such as this: "Humphrey-Sponsored Postal Bill Starts New Democratic Scandal."

Are such headlines fair and accurate?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Minnesota will not hold the Postmaster General responsible for newspaper headlines in Minnesota or in any of the other States of the Union. I am sure the Postmaster General has enough to do in endeavoring to operate the Post Office Department. He certainly is not calling up newspapers and suggesting headlines. So I think in all fairness the Senator should realize that a headline in a particular newspaper is not necessarily chargeable to the Postmaster General. As the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] has pointed out, in the statement which the Postmaster General released there is nothing which would indicate on the part of the Postmaster General any charge of lack of integrity or character, directed toward the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The junior Senator from Minnesota is talking about a fact which is very obvious to every Member of this body, and that is that Members of this body are not appointed. They are elected.

The Postmaster General refers to a bill of which the junior Senator from Minnesota was the sponsor as though it involved new legislation, as though it involved a new contract, as though an innovation in the postal service were being made. He then makes certain representations as to facts, in connection with savings of $1 million a year, as compared to a cost of $25,000 for trucks.

Subsequently, the attack upon the junior Senator from Minnesota begins with words such as "dereliction of public responsibility," "graft," and "scandal." When events happen in that sequence, something more than mere coincidence is involved. I think that is quite clear.

There are members of the Press Gallery present today who have telephoned my office, and who know that it is quite clear that this is a premeditated, planned offensive against the junior Senator from Minnesota. It must be pretty difficult for some people to find issues if they must use the pneumatic-tube bill in order to start the attack.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, the Senator ought to be aware of the fact that this is only the beginning.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Wait until the campaign really gets under way.

What did the Postmaster General mean when he said that the Senator protested too much? What was the implication behind that statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have been trying to figure that out. I suppose if accusations were to be made against any Member of this body which he felt to be unfounded or untrue, no matter from whence such accusations came, he would feel it his duty to protest, if not on behalf of himself and his colleagues, at least on behalf of his family. I do not intend to have my name dragged down into the mud and attached to something with respect to which the Postmaster General says we ought to inquire so as to ascertain the motives behind this contract.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The reason I ask the question is that in a well-known play by Shakespeare we find the words, "The lady doth protest too much, methinks." The implication is that she is guilty of something.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct. He is not only a good student of Shakespeare, but he is also a factual observer of politics.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield and if so to whom?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon, and then, if I may, I should like to pursue the development of this case, because I told the majority leader that I wished to cooperate today and dispose of this question promptly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is not the fault of the Senator from Minnesota that so much time is being spent on this subject. The time is being spent because a considerable number of Senators on the floor of the Senate feel that the subject is worthy of the attention of the Senate.

I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota 2 or 3 clarifying questions. I am following the presentation very closely, and I wish to be sure that I understand it.

The majority leader pointed out, as I understood, that the transcript of testimony before the appropriate Senate committee showed that a negative report was filed by a post office inspector, recommending against the continuation of the tube system. I listened to the rejoinder of the Senator from Minnesota. I am not quite clear whether, at the time the Senator from Minnesota introduced the bill at the request of the Postmaster General in 1950, he was advised by anyone as to the existence or nonexistence of a negative report on the part of anyone concerning the continuation of the tube system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was never so advised. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I was advised that the whole matter was thoroughly discussed at departmental levels by those who were responsible for policy, had been thoroughly discussed by the Bureau of the Budget, and had been given approval by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I wish to emphasize. At this point in the presentation of his case in chief, it is the statement of the Senator from Minnesota, is it not, that, irrespective of what may be said in the transcript concerning the testimony before any committee in regard to a proposal now to discontinue the tube system, when the Senator was chairman of the subcommittee and introduced a bill for the administration—which is a common practice on the part of a chairman of a committee or subcommittee—it was the Senator's understanding that the recommendations of the parties in interest favored the continuation of the system?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say——

Mr. MORSE. The answer to that question is yes, I assume.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that we have discussed the matter with the former Postmaster General, and I point out furthermore that the members of the subcommittee, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and former Senator Ecton, in the 81st Congress were likewise of the same opinion. A report was made to the 80th Congress on the pneumatic tube service. The report included the result of the investigation made by the Post Office Department's inspectors and top officials and representatives, and by members of the Senate subcomittee. It was on the basis of that report, which was a thorough, completely, and total system report, that the subcommittee, of which the junior Senator from Minnesota was chairman, proceeded. It was on that basis that the whole committee proceeded.

I see the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] on his feet.

Mr. FREAR. I merely wish to confirm what the Senator stated, if he will yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I recall the situation very well, and I am sure the former Senator from Montana, Mr. Ecton, would also recall it if he were present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. We worked hard on that subcommittee, and I believe we processed about as many bills as any subcommittee ought to process.

Mr. FREAR. I believe we did.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report, Report No. 1241, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the result of this investigation and these unanimous recommendations, the Republican-controlled 80th Congress unanimously—and I underscore the word "unanimously"—passed a bill, S. 2510, in 1948 authorizing the Postmaster General to contract pneumatic tube facilities in New York at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per mile.

I ask unanimous consent that Public Law 848, 80th Congress, chapter 761, 2d session, S. 2510, approved June 30, 1948, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 6.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the conference report on this bill, Report No. 2431, 80th Congress, 2d session, dated June 19, 1948, be printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks, as well as a statement of the managers on the part of the House in support of this conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 7.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many of the present Members of the Senate were Members of the Senate of the 80th Congress which unanimously passed S. 2150. These include the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. The same can be said of many Members of the House of Representatives of both political parties, including one of our incumbent Members of Congress, Representative HAROLD HAGEN, of the Minnesota Ninth Congressional District, a Republican, who is the chairman of the House Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service.

I have in my hand a photostatic copy of the rollcall vote in the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, dated April 27, 1948, on S. 2510, the bill authorizing the continuation of the pneumatic tube mail service system.

It was at this time that the full investigation was made. It was at this time that the postal inspectors, the top officialdom, the Postmaster General, the Assistant Postmaster General, the Superintendent of Mails, and the Members of Congress were called upon to investigate the whole system, and as the result of that investigation a report was published, which was adopted by Congress, and the bill was subsequently introduced to continue the system.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. MORSE. I would suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I amend my request accordingly.

There being no objection, the vote was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YEAS: Mr. Flanders, Mr. Thye, Mr. Ecton, Mr. McKellar, Mr. O'Daniel, Mr. Johnston, Mr. O'Conor, chairman.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it will be noted that the vote was unanimous, with eight members present. There are check marks next to the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the then Senator from Montana, Mr. Ecton, the then Senator from Tennessee, Mr. McKellar, the then Senator from Texas, Mr. O'Daniel, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the then Senator from Maryland, Mr. O'Conor, and the chairman, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Thus the pneumatic tube system, which began operating in 1898 received a unanimous vote of Congress by both the Democrats and Republicans in 1948 to continue operating.

In 1949, the Post Office Department was informed that that Consolidated Edison Company of New York which serviced the penumatic tube mail service system with power could no longer serv-

ice the nonstandard current for which this system was equipped.

Mr. President, we were confronted with the same situation in the Capitol. We had to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to convert from direct current to alternating current. As a result walls had to be torn out, and conduit lines had to be taken through walls and under floors. That was the situation which obtained when the Consolidated Edison Co. in New York said to the company which had the pneumatic tube contract, "We are stopping our direct-current service which you have been receiving. You must now change to alternating current." That was 1 year after the contract had been renewed, and 1 year after the full investigation of the system was had.

What happened, Mr. President?

New equipment, therefore, was necessary to install standard alternating current. The cost for the new equipment was estimated at $350,000. It was also deemed desirable to add a number of booster stations to strengthen the system at an additional nominal cost.

The figures were laid before the Bureau of the Budget. As all of us know, the Bureau of the Budget is not exactly a charity institution. The Bureau weighed the figures very carefully. The Postmaster General asked the Bureau of the Budget to accept responsibility with him for the recommendation. As a result of their recommendation and as a result of further investigation, the Postmaster General sent to the Vice President of the United States a letter asking that appropriate legislation be introduced to amend the contract.

The Postmaster General and Budget Bureau came to the Congress in 1950 and asked for an increase in the rate authorization in the contract, so that extra sums necessary could be amortized over a 10-year period.

It should be remembered that the pneumatic-tube system was used exclusively by the United States Post Office Department.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Postmaster General of the United States addressed to the Vice President of the United States, dated August 25, 1950, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 8.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Vice President of the United States referred the letter from the Postmaster General to the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, our colleague and my friend, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. The chairman in turn referred the letter to me as chairman of the Senate subcommittee on Post Office Affairs.

Therefore, if anyone should ask why I introduced the bill, I point out that it was done, at the request of the Post Office Department, the Vice President, and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as part of my responsibility as chairman of the subcommittee.

In connection with my responsibilities as chairman, I introduced S. 4102 on August 28, 1950. This bill substantively altered the law passed by the Republican controlled 80th Congress only to the extent of authorizing the extra expenditure of $3,500 per mile so that the equipment could be amortized over a 10-year period. Our report estimated that the extra expenditure would add no more than $53,000 a year.

In the fantastic figures of the national budget I want this figure to stand out. The Humphrey bill, which is now being so roundly attacked and critically analyzed, calls for the expenditure of $53,000 a year over and above what had been authorized in 1948, and I may say that in between those years there had been a slight inflation in the United States. The actual extra expenditure during the first year of operation was less than $53,000.

Mr. President, I repeat that every year the Postmaster General, in order to get funds to continue the contract, must come before the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate, and if at any time the Appropriations Committees do not provide the funds for carrying out the contract, the contract is null and void.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as far back, at least, as 1937, Congress made annual appropriations to pay for the tube service. I was aware of the investigation which was made of the tube service by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. Congress could at any time have cut off the money. If it did not appropriate for the service, of course, it would have stopped the tube system from operating.

There is one question I should like to ask. If the Post Office Department made an agreement—and, of course, money would have to be appropriated to carry out the agreement—and it was understood in the agreement that the increased cost the company must incur over a period of 10 years would be amortized, would there be any legitimate basis for the company to say that, acting under authorizing legislation and under appropriations year after year, it had expended money which it would have lost if it could not continue the operation?

Would that be a basis of a claim against the United States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that is why the cancellation was referred to the Justice Department. That is the issue which the Postmaster General raised, as to whether the company would have a claim. I think I can quote some interesting material which would be helpful.

The president of the company, at the time the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was holding hearings in New York City on the contract, appeared and stated that the contract was for a number of years, but that if at any time Congress failed to appropriate money, the contract would be null and void. The Congress, by acting through appropriations every year, kept reaffirming the contract.

Mr. HAYDEN. Congress would be justified in not appropriating money upon a showing that a better way of doing the work had been devised.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a question to be passed upon by the Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I came to the Congress in 1949, and in 1948 and 1949, in 1951, 1952, and 1953, Congress appropriated the funds. Apparently, Congress must have thought the tube service was a valuable service.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It is true that Congress appropriated funds not only in 1949, 1950, and 1951, but also in 1947 and 1948. Is not that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and also in the 78th and 79th Congresses, and away back to the 66th Congress.

Mr. HILL. In other words, Congress appropriated money for the tube service for many years. That meant that the appropriations had to be approved by the House Committee on Appropriations, the House itself, and by the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the Senate itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. The funds had to be approved by those four different branches of the Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Alabama. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, dated August 30, 1950, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as well as a letter dated August 25, 1950, addressed to me from the chief clerk of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 9.)

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is making a very good record. I wonder if he desires to have placed in the RECORD Senate bill 4102.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do.

Mr. President, Senate bill 4102 was unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. On that committee were both Democrats and Republicans. They included:

Republicans: William Langer, North Dakota; Ralph E. Flanders, Vermont; Edward J. Thye, Minnesota; Zales N. Ecton, Montana; Henry C. Dworshak, Idaho; Harry Darby, Kansas.

Democrats: Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee; Russell B. Long, Louisiana; Matthew M. Neely, West Virginia; J. Allen Frear, Jr., Delaware; Hubert H. Humphrey, Minnesota; Edward L. Leahy, Rhode Island.

That committee accepted the findings of the thorough investigation by the Republican-controlled Senate committee in 1943.

The bill passed the Senate unanimously, with both the Republican and Democratic leadership giving their approval to it. It was also unanimously passed by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives and became public law.

Mr. President, I digress for a moment to ask, what more could one ask in terms of approval? The bill passed the Senate unanimously, and it was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives and became law. It is clear from these facts that any criticism of the law is a criticism not only of myself but of every Member of the Senate and of the House, Republicans and Democrats alike.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 4102 and the committee report on that bill Senate Report No. 2504, 81st Congress, 2d session, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks, together with House Report No. 3144, 81st Congress, 2d session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 10.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my political opponents are attempting to smear my reputation with their criticism, but to succeed in this absurd effort is in fact to reflect upon the integrity of the Congress which unanimously supported the legislation, and which has supported the pneumatic-tube mail system since 1898. The Minnesota Republican leadership following the lead of Mr. Summerfield, the political boss of the Neanderthal wing of the Republican Party, neglected to confirm the facts.

Mr. President, since this smear attack is leveled against me, I have thoroughly investigated the history, development, and record of the pneumatic-tube mail service system. I wrote letters to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman during the 80th Congress of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], chairman in the 81st Congress of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 26, 1954.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Within the last few weeks as a result of an announcement made by Postmaster General Summerfield canceling a contract under which the New York City Post Office is serviced by pneumatic tube system, a number of statements have been made in the Minnesota press reflecting upon the propriety and the legality of the legislation authorizing that contract. I am enclosing for your information copies of the editorials and newspaper articles to which I refer. You will notice that I am personally being criticized by my political opponents because I sponsored during the 81st Congress a bill, S. 4102, relating to the pneumatic tube contracts which passed the Congress and became Public Law 889 in 1950.

You were a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 81st Congress which unanimously approved the bill, S. 4102. You were, also, chairman, during the 80th Congress, of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. You were likewise chairman of the special subcommittee which held hearings in New York on March 29, 1948, on the pneumatic-tube mail service and you sponsored a bill, S. 2150, during the 80th Congress relating to this pneumatic tube service. Your bill became Public Law 848 in 1948.

In view of the fact that you have very thoroughly and carefully considered the problem of pneumatic-tube mail service in New York and recommended that the Post Office Department sign new contracts to strengthen that system, I would appreciate it very much if you could review for me your views with regard to that contract as well as your experiences and the results of your investigations. You will recall that I was not a Member of the Senate during the 80th Congress, and hence I am not in a position to know the full background and facts with regard to this legislation and investigation.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

JANUARY 26, 1954.

The Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: The enclosed newspaper clippings and editorials will show you that I am under political attack by some leaders of the Republican Party in my State as a result of a bill, S. 4102, which I introduced during the 81st Congress relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tube. You were chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 81st Congress and appointed me chairman of the Subcommittee on Post Office Affairs, which led to my sponsorship of the bill in question.

You were also a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 80th Congress and are thus undoubtedly acquainted with the background of this legislation because of the fact that it was the Republican-controlled 80th Congress that established the pattern which we followed in 1950 with regard to the pneumatic-tube service.

I would appreciate it very much if you would read the attached criticisms and give me your views with regard to them. I would, also, appreciate your views with regard to the decision of Postmaster General Summerfield to cancel the contract authorized by legislation of both the 80th and 81st Congresses, and unanimously approved by both Democrats and Republicans in 1948 and again in 1950.

It was not my intent to trouble you with this request, because I did not take the original criticisms seriously and considered them merely a feeble attempt to distort the facts for political gain. In view of the fact that these distortions have received wide circulation in my State, I am determined to reveal the facts. I am, therefore, anxious to have in my possession whatever information you may have with regard to this issue.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also have in my possession replies which I received from the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from South Carolina. The reply of the letter of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] dated January 30, 1951, contains a splendid description of the hearings held by the Langer subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Senator from North Dakota. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read it.

Much of the report of the Senator from North Dakota is taken from the 80th Congress report, and I have asked that that report be printed in the body of the RECORD, so I see no need to further develop it.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters from Senator LANGER and Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 30, 1954.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUBERT: Your letter of January 26 troubled me a great deal because I recall vividly the study which we undertook in the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 80th Congress when I was chairman of that committee. I have asked my staff to refresh my memory further with the actual official documents which I have carefully examined. The criticism of you and your activities in connection with S. 4102 is totally unfounded.

On March 29, 1948, Senator Ecton of Montana and I held hearings in New York City on the pneumatic-tube service. We made a thorough investigation of this service as a means of transporting the mails in New York. We went into all phases of this question including the cost of the contract, the value of the tube service, and the advisability of continuing that service. Our conclusion was unanimous that the pneumatic-tube mail service was advisable, necessary, and economical as a service in the New York post office. Our conclusion took the form of a bill, S. 2510, which I introduced and which was unanimously approved by our committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, by the United States Senate, Republicans and Democrats alike, and by the House of Representatives, Republicans and Democrats alike. This bill became Public Law 848, 80th Congress, 2d session. The Senate report on that bill, which I submitted to the Senate on May 5, 1948, is report No. 1241, 80th Congress, 2d session. The conference report dated June 19, 1948, is report No. 2431, 80th Congress, 2d session. It is signed by me, Senators Ecton and O'Conor, and by Representatives Rees, St. George, and Murray. I am attaching for your information a copy of the official rollcall of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service dated April 27, 1948, in support of our bill. You will notice upon examining it that it had unanimous, bipartisan support, including the support of your senior colleague, Mr. THYE.

Now, let me give you the background of the pneumatic-tube problem based on the hearings and studies we made during the 80th Congress. The pneumatic-tube system began operation in the New York post office in 1898—56 years ago. When we held our hearings it was 25 miles long, and connected the main post office with 21 branches. We were told by the postal experts that a mail count was kept on March 27, 1947—an average business day—and that on that day 5,871,546 pieces of mail were handled through the pneumatic tubes, which were operating 17 hours a day. (See pp. 8, 33, of our printed hearing—March 29, 1948.)

The pneumatic-tube service has been operating constantly in New York from 1899 until this year with two exceptions. Congress failed to make the necessary appropriations available in 1901 and in 1918. In both cases, however, the appropriation was restored by subsequent Congresses, in 1902 and in 1922.

During the hearings we were told by Mr. Charles H. Carle, assistant superintendent of the New York City post office, that—

"The tubes are important to the service at New York because of traffic density, because

they afford a means of obtaining a steady flow of mail to mail-handling employees at the point where they work it, thereby making the entire operation more flexible, and because they have proven to be dependable and speedy as compared with any method of surface transportation." (Pp. 8 and 9 of the hearings.)

Senator Ecton in commenting on this testimony said at the hearings:

"It not only saves time but isn't it also true that it saves a lot of transportation expenses." (P. 10 of hearings.)

We, also, had an official report from the postmaster of the New York post office recommending the continuance of the pneumatic tube mail service. I quote from his report:

"Today when mail matter must move quickly to meet all kinds of timetable deadlines—plane, railroad, and steamer—to insure its early delivery, the underground pneumatic-tube system is invaluable. Without it the post office would have to operate a larger fleet of trucks to transport the mail." (P. 24 of hearings.)

"Pneumatic-tube service is dependable inasmuch as it is not affected generally by street surface traffic or by weather conditions." (P. 24 of hearings.)

"Experience had with the pneumatic tubes as a medium for the transportation of mail at New York, N. Y., since their establishment, has proven their value as an essential auxiliary to the motor-vehicle service. They have been operated efficiently, thereby affording a reliable and dependable means for a more expeditious dispatch of mails for train connection and interchange of mail for delivery by carrier than could be obtained by the exclusive use of motor-vehicle service. Because of advantages in the time of transit, the fact that they can be used at any time during the period of operation, and the large volume of mail being transported through the pneumatic-tube system, it is advisable that in the interest of good service in New York, N. Y., and Brooklyn, N. Y., that this service be continued." (P. 29 of hearings.)

"The advantage of the pneumatic-tube service for the expeditious dispatch and handling of mail has been heretofore shown. The advantage of this service over motor-vehicle service, other than the speed of transmission, is the fact that it may be used at any time, whereas the motor-vehicle service necessarily is scheduled at regular intervals for trips; in other words, mail destined for transportation by motor-vehicle service must be held from one trip to the next, whereas the use of the tubes is available at any time during the hours of service.

"Its advantage in reducing to a minimum the possibility of missing train connections or a delivery of mail is apparent. The tubes also afford a means for feeding mail to a distribution unit in a continuous stream, rather than forwarding the mass by motor-vehicle service. By using the tubes, special-delivery matter and other matter of this type may be forwarded to the point of distribution for delivery each few minutes. If this service were not available the mail could not be forwarded until the dispatch of the next regularly scheduled motor-vehicle trip, and in consequence there is the possibility that mail which now connects with outgoing airplane or train connection and delivery trip might fail to connect if dispatched by motor-vehicle service." (P. 38 of hearings.)

"The volume of postal business transacted and the vast quantity of first-class mails, out-bound and in-bound, handled daily by the New York post office justifies the use of the best transportation facilities obtainable for the movement of the mails interchanged between the general post office, New York, N. Y., and the stations, and the general post office, Brooklyn, N. Y., in order to insure the most expeditious dispatch and delivery of the mails." (Pp. 44 and 45 of hearings.)

Our subcommittee in addition to investigating this evidence and other similar evidence made a study of the traffic congestion problem in New York. The portion of the City of New York which is being served by the New York post office is built upon a long, narrow island. Practically the entire portion of the Island of Manhattan south of 59th Street has become a business district and is characterized by constant traffic congestion. This problem has been complicated by the replacement of streetcar traffic in almost every section of the city by motorbuses. It was our feeling that the use of pneumatic tubes by the New York post office has proved to be a valuable auxiliary in the handling of the mails by helping to relieve the traffic congestion and by saving a great deal of time lost in traffic.

Our subcommittee, also, carefully explored the cost factor in comparing mail service via the use of pneumatic tubes over and as against the use of motor vehicles. Mr. Carle, speaking for the New York post office, gave our committee the following information in reply to my questions:

"The CHAIRMAN. How does the cost of pneumatic-tube service compare to delivery with trucks?

"Mr. CARLE. The cost at the present rate of rental, according to the latest figures we have, is $57,000 a year less than comparable truck service would cost.

"The CHAIRMAN. Pneumatic-tube service is $57,000 a year less?

"Mr. CARLE. At the present rate of rental; yes, sir." (P. 17 of hearing.)

The Postmaster confirmed this statement and provided our committee with a detailed cost analysis of additional expenditures which would be necessary to substitute a motor-vehicle service for the pneumatic-tube service. The total cost estimate for the use of motor vehicles came to $423,945.90. (See p. 41 of hearings.)

In addition to this estimate of the cost of motor-vehicle service that would be required we were informed that it would, also, be necessary to engage additional personnel to handle the mails and to perform operations connected with pouching, movement from the pouch racks to the trucks, checking into the vehicle, receipt of the mail at destination, removal of the mails, and delivery to workroom points. It was estimated that 90 additional employees would be required to replace the services and the personnel now provided for the pneumatic-tube service (pp. 42 and 43 of hearings). The total cost for this added personnel would be $255,000. In addition to the additional motor-vehicle service and additional personnel needed (totaling $678,945.90) there would be additional items of cost including the purchase of trucks, additional garage facilities, and 19,582 additional pouches.

These figures indicated to us in 1948 that a substitute motor-vehicle service replacing the pneumatic-tube service would cost a minimum of $57,747.14 more than the cost of the existing pneumatic service.

The conclusion of the New York postmaster in his recommendation to us was as follows:

"The surface transportation in the city of New York is seriously interfered with and subject to interruptions and delay because of the acute congestion caused by the vast number of vehicles operating over the city streets, and by the density of population; and the pneumatic-tube system provides a subsurface medium for the prompt exchange of outbound and inbound first-class mails between the general post office and carrier stations and the distribution centers for dispatch to trains or transmission to stations of delivery, free from street congestion or delay caused by traffic or inclement weather.

"The transportation via pneumatic tubes permits of later closings and the use of supplementary dispatches after the final closing time for out-bound mails and the rapid transmission of in-bound and local mails for delivery.

"The availability of the pneumatic-tube service, when used for the transmission of mails at any time during the hours of operation, has a decided service advantage over the motor vehicle, since mail must necessarily accumulate between the schedule time of departure of a motor-vehicle trip and the departure of the subsequent motor-vehicle trip.

"To provide the same motor-vehicle service which was in operation when the tube service was discontinued, it would be necessary to schedule motor vehicles on a half-hourly frequency between the points connected by the pneumatic tubes. Additional employees would be required at all these points to perform the duties incident to the handling of pouches and the loading and unloading of vehicles.

"The estimated annual cost for additional motor vehicles and the additional personnel that would be required as a substitute for pneumatic-tube service would be $678,945.90, which would be $57,747.14 more than the present cost of the pneumatic-tube service, which is $621,198.76." (P. 45 of hearings.)

"Superior service is provided through the medium of the pneumatic-tube service as compared with the motor-vehicle service, on a basis of availability, speed of transmission, and dependability, considering the obstacles prevailing against a more rapid surface transportation, and the freedom of movement of the subsurface medium of transportation." (P. 45 of hearings.)

Our committee shared that conclusion and in our unanimous bipartisan report to the Senate we further added the fact:

"The value of the pneumatic-tube system was dramatically brought into bold relief during Christmas week of 1947 when a 22.8-inch snowfall all but paralyzed New York City but in no way interrupted the orderly distribution of mails through this well-established pneumatic-tube device.

"Today when mail matter must move quickly to meet all kinds of timetable deadlines—planes, railroad, and steamer—to insure its early delivery, the underground pneumatic-tube system is invaluable." (P. 3, Rept. No. 1241, 80th Cong., 2d sess.)

I trust the above information is helpful to you and gives you the background and the facts which transpired before you became a Member of the Senate. You will recall that our hearings were brought to your attention in 1950 and provided the basis for the legislation you introduced, S. 4102, and which I voted for as a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

If I can provide you with any further information, do not hesitate to communicate with me.

With kind regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE
AND CIVIL SERVICE,
February 1, 1954.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUBERT: The partisan political attacks upon you are a reflection upon the integrity of the Congress. The bill, S. 4102, for which you are being criticized, was unanimously approved by our full committee, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on September 1, 1950, during the period when I was chairman of the committee. The other members of our committee who voted for the bill are as follows:

Republicans: William Langer, North Dakota; Ralph E. Flanders, Vermont; Edward J. Thye, Minnesota; Zales N. Ecton, Montana; Henry C. Dworshak, Idaho; Harry Darby, Kansas.

Democrats: Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee; Russell B. Long, Louisiana; Matthew M. Neely, West Virginia; J. Allan Frear, Jr., Delaware; Hubert H. Humphrey, Minnesota; Edward L. Leahy, Rhode Island.

S. 4102 was also unanimously approved on December 5, 1950, by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. You will find that one of your Minnesota colleagues, Congressman HAROLD C. HAGEN, Republican, was a member of that committee which approved the bill. The bill passed the Senate on September 30, 1950, passed the House of Representatives on December 18, 1950, and became Public Law 889 in 1950.

I regret very much that this bill has been made a partisan issue by the announcement of the Postmaster General and by criticisms you have received from the Republican National Committee. They are to be condemned for allowing their partisanship to outweigh their responsibility to the public interest.

During the 81st Congress, a Democratic-controlled Congress, we passed S. 4102 based upon the investigations and hearings conducted by the Republican-controlled 80th Congress. Our action was unanimous and free of partisanship. A partisan examination of the pneumatic-tube issue would demonstrate that it came into being during the Republican-controlled 55th Congress, 1898, and was discontinued in 1918 by the Democratic-controlled 65th Congress. The decision to authorize the pneumatic-tube service once again was made in 1922 by the Republican-controlled 67th Congress.

In 1948, the 80th Congress, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, undertook an investigation of pneumatic tubes in New York. As a result of a unanimous decision made by that Republican-controlled Congress, a contract between the United States Government and the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. was authorized under which an annual rental contract payment rate was established not to exceed $12,000 per mile. Following the passage of that bill, the pneumatic-tube company was faced with an added expense not contemplated for under the original bill. They were informed by the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York that they could not be serviced unless they changed from direct current to alternating current. This required an additional expenditure of $350,000 for the alterations, plus added expenses for a number of new booster stations. After conferences between the company and the Post Office Department the Postmaster General submitted a letter to the Vice President of the United States requesting the passage of legislation which would authorize the Post Office Department to help pay for this added expense by increasing the contract price and amortizing the expense over a 10-year period. I am attaching a copy of the letter for your information. I am also attaching a copy of a letter which I received August 30, 1950, signed by the Comptroller General of the United States with regard to this bill, S. 4102.

At my request the staff director and chief clerk of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service requested you on August 25, 1950, to introduce the legislation sponsored by the Post Office Department, in view of your position as chairman of the Subcommittee on Post Office Affairs.

My records show that you and the members of your subcommittee, Senators FREAR and ECTON, referred the bill to the full committee for approval.

The purpose of the bill, therefore, was to increase the $12,000 per mile rate authorized by the 80th Congress, of which you were not a member, by an additional $3,500 per year for 10 years to cover the extra cost of converting the pneumatic tube from nonstandard direct current to standard alternating current. Your bill did nothing more, therefore, than authorize the expenditure of $53,000 per year for 10 years. This expenditure seemed wise from the point of view of the Congress. It was based on facts and study. As a Member of the Congress during the 81st Congress and as a chairman of the committee which had jurisdiction over the bill, I resent any attempt to cast aspersions upon Members of the Congress, all of whom supported the bill, for the sake of monetary political expediency.

I should like to remind you of one other thing insofar as both of the bills approved by the 80th and 81st Congresses are concerned. They were merely enabling acts. Following passage of these acts, the Senate and House Appropriations Committee considered this matter very thoroughly and approved the expenditure of the necessary funds to allow the Postmaster General to sign the contract.

I am also attaching for your information a copy of the managers' statement prepared by our full committee in 1950 for use on the floor of the Senate in support of Senate bill 4102.

Incidentally, I notice from the editorial criticism against you that you are being attacked for authorizing the signing of a 10-year contract by the Post Office Department for the use of pneumatic tubes. This strikes me as being strange indeed. Our study shows that it was the Republican-controlled Congress which authorized in 1922 the signing of a 10-year contract. This contract expired June 30, 1932.

This 10-year contract entered into by the Republican-controlled Congress, by the way, was for "not exceeding $19,500 per mile," as compared to the bill which our 81st Congress authorized for the amount not to exceed $15,500. The 1922 contract cost our Government $526,500 a year for 10 years, as compared to $351,802 per year for 1952, the first year of operation under the contract which we authorized.

Even though our bill permitted the expenditure up to $15,500 per mile, the first year's contract for 1952 came to $14,067 per mile, and I am informed by Postmaster General Donaldson the cost was decreasing for 1953.

My staff is keeping a file on this case and on other instances of political manipulation by the Post Office Department. You may not have seen a newspaper clipping quoting Mr. Carl F. Dietz, president of the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. I, therefore, want to quote from it. He says: "I never discussed the contract with a Congressman, have never met Senator HUMPHREY, and did not know he introduced the bill."

Also, from a newspaper story interviewing Postmaster General Donaldson which says: "I checked with businessmen, however, and found that particularly in Wall Street, they wanted the tube service because of its comparative speed over trucks. I wouldn't take the responsibility alone so I told the story to both the Budget Bureau and Congress. They both agreed the tubes should stay."

I have further learned some very interesting statistics which affect this question. Under the pneumatic-tube system special-delivery mail, for which extra postage is paid, can be delivered from the train to the consignee in 45 minutes, as compared to 3 to 5 hours if trucks are used. Trucks, of course, also only make their deliveries two or three times a day. The records also show that the pneumatic-tube system carried between 5 and 6 million letters a day. To say that this volume of mail can be effectively and efficiently carried by two trucks, as Postmaster General Summerfield implies, is ridiculous. It would take a fleet of trucks at tremendous expense to serve this need.

I would like to talk to you more about this. I consider the tactic outrageous.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I know the Senator from Minnesota desires to be fair, and he has the right to expect the Senate and the country to be fair with him. But just before completing his remarks, as I recall his statement, he made a charge that these attacks had been made as a result of collusion between the Postmaster General and, presumably, certain party officials in Minnesota. Of course, the Senator from Minnesota is making a serious charge. So far as I know, at least during his remarks today, he has not furnished any evidence which would indicate or support a charge of collusion. At least, I have not heard it. He has said nothing which would, I think, indicate to the average person that those whom he has charged had conspired together and were responsible for the stories.

In glancing over the stories furnished to certain Senators by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, I observed a photostatic copy of the Minneapolis Tribune of Sunday, February 7, 1954. At the bottom of column 2 there appears a statement by a Mr. Etzell, which reads as follows:

> Etzell also denied he had any contact with Summerfield before writing his editorial. He said he obtained his information from newspaper dispatches about the tube contract.

I think that in order to make the RECORD fair both to the junior Senator from Minnesota and to the Postmaster General, if the Senator from Minnesota has any evidence of collusion in the making of the charge, he should present it, because such an accusation goes beyond the general statement the Senator from Minnesota has been making.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My evidence would be that when the Postmaster General says, "The Senator doth protest too much," when the Postmaster General selects a particular item such as this out of all items incident to the reorganization of the Post Office Department, with contract after contract being canceled, with post office after post office being changed, with entire new systems being inaugurated, it is a very peculiar thing that HUBERT HUMPHREY, from the State of Minnesota, should be singled out for this specialized treatment.

There are 96 Members of the Senate. I may say that every Member of the Senate has, at one time or other, voted upon postal legislation. Many Senators have introduced bills pertaining to the postal service. Some of the legislation has now been counteracted or countermanded. Fourth-class post offices are being closed. I am not saying whether it is for good or for bad, but fourth-class post offices are being closed. With all the reorganization of the post office that is now under way, it is indeed peculiar that it ends up with Senator HUMPHREY under political attack.

I shall put it this way: The Postmaster General, by some coincidence, finds himself in cooperation with the Republican national committeeman within the State of Minnesota; or, to put it the other way, the Republican national committeeman

seems to have a sensitive nature, which causes him to find himself in cooperation with the Postmaster General. I say it is rather peculiar and suspicious.

I repeat: Out of all the activities of the Post Office Department, out of all the investigations conducted by the Post Office Department, out of all the reorganization proposed and effected by the Post Office Department, one United States Senator, who performed his duty, in reliance upon reports from his committee and of reports from a trained Postmaster General, a man who came up from the ranks in the postal service, having been a former civil-service employee in the Post Office Department—and in accordance with requests of the Bureau of the Budget, of the Vice President of the United States, of the Postmaster General, of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is singled out to receive this treatment. It seems to me to be a little peculiar and suspicious. I cannot be blamed for my suspicions, knowing, as I do, that the Postmaster General not so long ago wore the cloak of the chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad the junior Senator from Minnesota has at least clarified the situation to that extent, because I think a charge made by a responsible Member of the United States Senate—and each Member of the Senate is a responsible Member, and holds a high position within the gift of the people of the respective States—of collusion between the Postmaster General, who is a member of the Cabinet of the President, and some party official presents an entirely different situation from that of a party official in an individual State who, based on testimony of the Cabinet member before a committee, may have on his own volition picked up and made some use of the charges. I think that is an entirely different thing.

If I may pursue my statement, it seems to me that the Senator from Minnesota, in his original statement charging collusion—and, of course, the Postmaster General himself does not have the privilege of the floor to make a speech in which to answer the Senator from Minnesota—was speaking of something far different than the act of somebody who may have used the testimony of the Postmaster General in which he might properly have expressed concern as to why a contract for 10 years had been entered into by a former Postmaster General, or his assistant, when apparently there had been advice in the Post Office Department that such a contract was unwise. That, as I say, is far different from a charge of collusion, which is a pretty serious charge.

Although I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I am not a member of the Subcommittee on the Treasury and Post Office Department Appropriations, and I have not had a chance to read the complete hearings. But, as I gather, from quickly going over the testimony, this was merely one of a large number of subjects dealing with the Post Office budget.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. At least so far as this hearing was concerned, the Postmaster General did not, apparently, go before the committee merely to open up the subject either of the bill referred to or the tube contract, but the testimony related generally to Treasury and Post Office operations and budgetary problems. I think that in fairness to the Postmaster General that situation should be pointed out.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from California. But, in fairness to the junior Senator from Minnesota, this is the one item that is being referred to the McCarthy subcommittee. In fairness to the junior Senator from Minnesota, it should be said that the chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee, who is sitting now in this Chamber, asked that the matter be referred to the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. It could well have been referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, where it belongs.

I may say that it is very peculiar that this story should have broken in the Detroit newspapers, the home of the Postmaster General. That is where the first news story on this matter appeared.

A reporter came to my office and said, "Senator Humphrey, there is a big news story about you in Washington. All the good Republican folks out here are very anxious to get the information."

Call it "collusion" or call it "friendly cooperation." It has the same effect.

It is amazing to me that out of all the testimony of the Postmaster General with respect to his reformations of the postal service, one Member of the Senate is selected for charges. I might remind my colleagues that, with the elections, the loss of one Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle is significant. This is more than coincidence. The charge is political.

I am not a babe in the woods. I have been in politics long enough to know how it operates; and I am not going to stand idly by and have someone tell me this is not politics. It is politics in its most open manner, and, let me add, in one of its most unsavory manners.

What an issue, Mr. President. It is simply a portrait of things to come. The start is made on a pneumatic-tube bill, a bill that had been approved unanimously. It is a poor start. The Republicans will not succeed in this tactic.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the fact there never was but one meeting of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am aware of that.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the fact that we had one meeting, but never had another meeting?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am.

Mr. MAYBANK. Day after day I called the former chairman of the committee to ascertain when there would be another meeting, but there was never another meeting. That is one of the peculiar aspects of the whole situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There are some very interesting developments and events in connection with the matter. I have no crystal ball; I cannot look into the future; but I can well understand the past. I simply say again: Why is it that a bill which was unanimously approved, had a unanimous report in its favor, and was unanimously passed by both Houses, has suddenly become a political issue? I will tell Senators why. It is because the junior Senator from Minnesota is up for reelection in 1954. It is very obvious why the junior Senator from Minnesota is the target.

I think it is interesting to note that in the State of Minnesota there has been a bit of trouble in getting someone to be a candidate against the junior Senator from Minnesota. Possibly it is desired to plow the soil a little, to loosen it up, to see whether some doubt cannot be cast upon the political scene.

I welcome such attention. Really I did not feel I was so important. I wish the charge had been made with respect to a somewhat more important bill. It is somewhat humiliating to me to be picked on with reference to a little bill like this. I really do not like to be identified with something that happened away back in the McKinley administration, when the first bill pertaining to the pneumatic-tube system was introduced. I do not like to be identified with the Harding administration, when a similar bill reappeared in 1922. But I may say there is some consolation in that the appropriations for the tube service were made in the Roosevelt administrations, the Truman administrations, and in the Eisenhower administration, when the 1st session of the 83d Congress of the United States appropriated funds for the pneumatic-tube system.

Congress and the administration last year found time to reduce the size of the Air Force and found time to discharge some 2,000 persons who were supposedly security risks. But they did not find time in 1953 to determine that the pneumatic-tube contract was not any good. But they found out in 1954. Let me see. The last election was in 1952. Yes; every 2 years we have an election. This is 1954. I do not want to read into the future, because if I could, I would be a great optimist. I have a pretty good idea of what the people of Minnesota are thinking at this time. If we conduct the campaign on the issues of the day, rather than digging down into the bowels of New York, perhaps we will have a sensible campaign.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator think it is a possibility that the same newspapers in the State of Minnesota which carried the charges against the Senator will carry the statement made by the Senator on the floor of the United States Senate today?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope they will. "Hope springs eternal in the human breast." I hope.

We learn that the tube system is 27 miles long and in 1948, when the hearings were held, connected the main post office with 21 branches.

Mr. President, what I am stating comes from a report submitted in the 80th Congress. It is officially estimated that during an average business day nearly 6 million pieces of mail are handled through the pneumatic tubes, operating 17 hours a day. Does Mr. Summerfield expect the Congress and the American people to believe that he can transport this tremendous volume of mail every day by purchasing and using two trucks? I ask any man of sound mind, within reasonable distance of my voice, if he thinks two trucks can distribute 6 million pieces of mail a day. Let me remind the Postmaster General that the pony express would save him more money. The Postmaster General said that his only reason for canceling the contract was to save money. If that was the only reason for it, why does not the Postmaster General cancel the airmail contracts? They cost vast sums of money. But we keep airmail service, because it is good service, and we keep other kinds of equipment because they give good service. That is exactly what the pneumatic-tube system gave—good service.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am at a disadvantage, because I have not had a chance to study the record completely and read the testimony which has been adduced. But is it a fact that the Postmaster General said that all the mail he mentioned could be carried by only two trucks, or did he say that with the purchase of two additional trucks, which would cost approximately $25,000, or whatever the amount was, the mail which is now carried through the pneumatic tube system could be handled by the post office in New York? I do not know the technical operation of the delivery system, but it is quite possible that mail is being sent through the tubes which might otherwise be handled by trucks not now running to capacity in the city of New York, and that if they could obtain two trucks to add to the number they now have, they could handle all the mail by truck.

I think it is important to determine whether the Postmaster General stated that all the mail could be handled by two trucks, or that the addition of two trucks to what the New York post office had would make it possible to handle all the mail.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The distinguished majority leader has made a good point, and I thought of that until I ascertained that the New York City post office is obtaining 70 new trucks. If the New York City post office needs 70 new trucks, it cannot do the work required with two trucks.

Mr. KNOWLAND. New York City is a large city.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am quite well aware of that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is the greatest city in the United States, and I suppose it has the largest post office.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It also has the heaviest traffic in the world.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; probably the heaviest traffic in the world. I suppose any city the size of Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, or any other large city in America, where there is no pneumatic tube system, in the normal course has many trucks in operation. Because of obsolescence, it would be both good business and good judgment to replace trucks no longer capable of being operated economically. Such replacement is taking place all over the country. It takes place under Democratic administrations as well as Republican administrations, because there comes a time when it is no longer economical to operate motor equipment. So I wondered whether or not the statement the Senator referred to had anything to do with the pneumatic system as such, or whether it referred to normal replacement of obsolescent equipment which would normally take place in any great post office in the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to say to the majority leader that I now have the Post Office Department release, and I think I can answer his question.

I quote from the release of the Post Office Department made on December 30, 1953:

> That the tube service is obsolete, unnecessary and excessively expensive is shown by the fact that the mail can be satisfactorily handled by the addition of two trucks at a yearly cost of about $25,000 a year.

Now listen:

> These two trucks will adequately replace the tube service which now costs the Government a total outlay of approximately $1 million a year.

I did not say that; the Postmaster General did. He says these two trucks will adequately replace the tube service, which now costs the Government a total of approximately $1 million a year.

I know there are a lot of fancy public-relations people working for the Government; I am not up to date on their methods; but I submit that anyone reading the release can come to only one conclusion, namely, that the Postmaster General said, "It costs $1 million a year to move the tube mail, and I will move it now for $25,000." We can argue from now to doomsday about it, but the public has been led to believe that two trucks will move the mail which the pneumatic tubes previously moved. One would have had to drink something besides ice-cold water to believe that.

By the way, the Postmaster General frankly tells the Congress of the United States that it did not know what it was doing in 1948, because the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] was a Member of the Congress in 1948 and, whether he remembers it or not, he voted for the bill, based on a report that the system was not obsolete, was not expensive, and was not unnecessary. The report said, in effect, that the system was necessary, that it was efficient, and that it was vital to the mail service.

All of a sudden the Postmaster General says that when the Congress voted for it, the Congress did not know what it was doing. He says that every Member of Congress, 531 in number, was wrong. The presumption is, of course, that we all know what we vote on when we act on the reports of committees but, nevertheless, we were wrong, he says.

In 1950 when the junior Senator from Minnesota introduced the bill, it was the practice of the then minority to have two Senators present at every calendar call in this body, and every single bill was examined. I remember the fine work of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. Every bill was examined. Alongside of those two distinguished Senators sat a competent research man or clerk of the Republican policy committee, and every bill to which there was objection was objected to.

I make note of the fact that the Republican policy committee did not object to the Humphrey bill. I make note of the fact that the bill went through the committee.

I say it is very peculiar that I have been selected for the honor being paid me. The honor is not due me. I want to return it from whence it came. There is no more sense in this attack on me than there is trying to fly to the moon.

Mr. President, I have learned from the records that there is overwhelming expert testimony to the effect that the pneumatic-tube mail service system is vital to efficient service in New York; and that is what the Congress thought, or why did it pass the bill? That is what the Committee on Appropriations thought, or why did it grant the request for appropriations? Are we all going to sit idly by and hear it said that we were all wrong and did not know what we were doing? That is what the Postmaster General says. He has a vision no one else has.

Why is the tube service important? As the report on the bill in 1948 said:

> Because of traffic density, because of its flexibility, its speed, and its dependability regardless of the street surface, traffic, or adverse limitations.

Mr. President, if all the Postmaster General wants to do is to save money, I will tell him how he can do it. I am not advocating this, however. Rural free delivery does not pay its way; rural free delivery is expensive; but it is a vitally needed service. If the only desire of the Postmaster General is to save money, that is one avenue of approach. Cutting down the airmail service is another. We keep airplanes in the skies and pay large airmail subsidies. Airmail service has never paid its way. If the Postmaster General merely wishes to save money, why does he not cancel the airmail contracts? There are many ways by which he can save money, if he wishes to do so.

However, his duty is to provide efficient mail service. That is what the subcommittee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] found the pneumatic tubes were doing.

The report of that subcommittee, as made to the full committee, was eventually made to the Senate itself. Mr. President, if I have to take my choice between the report of a governmental agency or a report of the Congress, I shall choose the report of the Congress. I have been here long enough to have that clubby spirit. [Laughter.] Members of Congress are elected by the people, not appointed.

Let me read some of the items stated by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] regarding the findings of the subcommittee in 1948:

It was our feeling that the use of pneumatic tubes by the New York post office has proved to be a valuable auxiliary in the handling of the mails by helping to relieve the traffic congestion and by saving a great deal of time lost in traffic.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to read from page 39 of the report, on which we find a breakdown regarding regularity of the service. This is the report of the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from North Dakota, in the 80th Congress, 2d session. The subject is dependability of service:

Pneumatic-tube service is dependable in that it is not affected generally by street-surface traffic or weather conditions, and this may be best illustrated by the following comparative statistical statement showing irregularities, including interruptions, delays, and failures of service in the pneumatic-tube and motor-vehicle services from January 1 to December 31, 1946, divided into quarterly periods.

Let us look at it:

The data presented in the statement are taken from the official records of the motor-vehicle service and reports to the Department covering irregularities in tube service.

Comparative table showing service irregularities in the motor-vehicle service and pneumatic-tube service in quarterly periods from January 1 to December 31, 1946.

Here is what the report shows for 1946:

March: Motor-vehicle irregularities or breakdowns, 1,886.

Breakdowns in service by pneumatic tubes, 8.

June: Motor-vehicle irregularities or breakdowns, 1,833.

Breakdowns in the pneumatic tube service, 7.

September: Motor-vehicle irregularities or breakdowns, 2,507.

Breakdowns in the pneumatic tube service, 13.

December: Motor-vehicle irregularities or breakdowns, 10,734.

Breakdowns in the pneumatic tube service, 7.

That is why use of the pneumatic tubes was continued. It was continued because by means of the use of the tubes, the mail went through promptly, and that is generally the purpose of the postal service, even though recent studies show that today the service is poorer than it used to be.

I understand that Colonel McCormick, of the Chicago Tribune, who is not exactly a New Dealer, has made a study of the matter, and finds that in the Chicago area, this year, the mail service is 4 percent worse than it was last year. I understand that will be alluded to later today. That was shown in a recent survey conducted by the Chicago Tribune, because of some of the matters I have mentioned today.

At this time I should like to read from page 41 of the report to which I just referred:

If the pneumatic tube service were not in operation—

By the way, Mr. President, in the 1948 study the entire matter of substitution of service by the pneumatic tubes for service by trucks was gone into intensively by the Post Office Department, by the postal inspectors, by the top officialdom, by the Bureau of the Budget, and by the Senate committee. They went into that matter from top to bottom. This report is the only published official study of cost estimates regarding the pneumatic-tube service, as compared to the cost of truck service. The report was made in 1948. Of course, since that time, the cost of all trucks has increased, whether they be Chevrolet trucks or International trucks.

I read further from the report:

The following estimate of the cost thereof is submitted, with such additional items of cost as would necessarily be involved in this proposition.

In other words, Mr. President, the committee asked the postal inspectors and the New York Post Office Department to submit estimates of what would be needed if use of the pneumatic tubes were discontinued. I point out that it was a committee of the 80th Congress, a Republican Congress.

I now ask unanimous consent to have this portion of the report printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the portion of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pneumatic-tube service is dependable in that it is not affected generally by street surface traffic or weather conditions, and this may be best illustrated by the following comparative statistical statement showing irregularities, including interruptions, delays, and failures of service in the pneumatic-tube and motor-vehicle services from January 1 to December 31, 1946, divided into quarterly periods. The data presented in the statement are taken from the official records of the motor-vehicle service and reports to the Department covering irregularities in tube service.

Comparative table showing service irregularities in the motor-vehicle service and pneumatic-tube service, in quarterly periods from January 1 to December 31, 1946.

Motor-vehicle irregularities include delays and failures. Pneumatic-tube irregularities include all interruptions of the service.

Year and quarter	Motor vehicle	Tube
1946:		
March	1,886	8
June	1,833	7
September	[1] 2,507	13
December	[1] 10,734	7
Total	16,960	35

[1] Abnormal irregularities due to trucking strike, Christmas period, shortage, and the condition of trucks.

The pneumatic-tube service is in operation daily from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m., covering a range of 17 hours. The contract specifies service for a period not to exceed 18 consecutive hours daily, Monday to Friday, inclusive, and 6 consecutive hours on Saturday, provided, however, the Postmaster General may extend the hours of operation for a total of not exceeding 36 additional hours during each and every month of December occurring during the contract period or any extension thereof.

During the period of operation, from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. daily, approximately 61.49 percent of all first-class matter is handled on an average day. The following table showing the quantity by weight, each hourly period, showing disposition under appropriate classification, and also indicating the percentage transmitted by pneumatic-tube service, is submitted for the purpose of illustrating that the present range of pneumatic-tube service is desirable.

	Incoming, originating and transit letter mails transmitted through pneumatic tube	Incoming, originating and transit letter mails transported by motor vehicle service	Incoming and originating letter mails delivered at station of origin or at point of original receipt	Originating and transit letter mails sent direct to trains (tube or motor vehicle not required)	Total incoming, originating and transit letter mails	Percentage transmitted through pneumatic tubes
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	
12:01 to 1 a. m.		26,087	1,879	5,599	33,565	
1 to 2 a. m.		26,602	2,316	4,986	33,904	
2 to 3 a. m.		21,574	1,905	5,459	28,938	
3 to 4 a. m.		12,358	2,670	2,660	17,688	
4 to 5 a. m.		2,794	3,818	2,301	8,913	
5 to 6 a. m.	4,983	2,613	2,743	1,661	12,000	41.53
6 to 7 a. m.	6,159	3,730	2,653	4,191	16,733	36.81
7 to 8 a. m.	5,386	6,757	3,765	2,983	18,891	28.51
8 to 9 a. m.	6,138	2,481	5,322	2,427	16,368	37.05
9 to 10 a. m.	5,507	5,273	3,267	542	14,589	37.75
10 to 11 a. m.	8,557	2,402	3,707	649	15,315	55.87
11 to 12 a. m.	7,100	2,688	3,177	1,414	14,379	49.38
12:01 to 1 p. m.	8,309	3,922	1,617	1,350	15,198	54.67
1 to 2 p. m.	6,166	3,721	807	955	11,649	52.93
2 to 3 p. m.	5,122	4,359	807	2,035	12,323	41.56
3 to 4 p. m.	5,721	5,271	550	1,447	12,989	44.04
4 to 5 p. m.	5,158	6,067	885	2,716	14,826	34.79
5 to 6 p. m.	5,559	6,060	669	2,641	14,919	37.26
6 to 7 p. m.	6,584	12,024	612	4,236	23,456	27.98
7 to 8 p. m.	8,864	17,781	1,042	5,909	33,596	26.38
8 to 9 p. m.	12,050	13,523	870	4,287	30,730	39.21
9 to 10 p. m.	11,765	17,091	1,847	7,548	38,251	30.76
10 to 11 p. m.		25,324	1,735	8,747	35,806	
11 to 12 p. m.		32,325	1,674	8,007	42,006	
Totals	119,098	262,827	50,527	84,750	517,202	
Percentage of mail	23.03	50.82	9.77	16.38	100.00	

The following table, showing the number of trucks assigned to interstation and depot service, and capacity of same as of March 31, 1947:

Make	Capacity (tons)	Depot	Interstation	Prepaid and collection	Active reserve	Reserve for Mondays and emergencies	Service	Total
International	1	3	1	1	6		2	13
International D15	1			36				36
Chevrolet	1			10				10
Ford	1			199	11		1	211
White	2	37	4	4	5			61
International	2	3	37	5	8			53
White	3	64	16		17			97
White Super	3	19	1		4			24
Autocar	3	3	15					18
Mack	5½				12		1	13
Ford Cargo body	1½			5	35			40
Chevrolet Cargo body	1½				8			8
Total		111	103	260	106		4	584

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the report also points out the total increase in cost if trucks were used, rather than if the pneumatic-tube service were used. The report points out that it would cost $57,000 more to give service by truck, rather than to provide service by means of the pneumatic-tube system.

Let me say that I am not the one who made that statement; it is contained in the report of the committee in the 80th Congress, after the committee's study had been made. That Congress was a Republican-controlled Congress. The report is the reason why the pneumatic-tube service was continued. The "Johnny Come Lately" information which has come to us recently did not help us at all in 1950. The report I now have before me is all we had to work on at that time.

The total cost figures are listed on pages 41 to 44 of the report. I now ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If the pneumatic tube service were not in operation, additional motor vehicle service, similar to that which was operated in the former instance, would necessarily have to be provided as a substitute service for the transportation of those mails now transmitted through pneumatic tubes. The following estimate of the cost thereof is submitted, with such additional items of cost as would necessarily be involved in this proposition. The substitute motor vehicle service on which the estimate is based includes the following items:

Additional interstation service:	
Daily:	
312 hours of truck service performed daily by 39 drivers over 39 8-hour runs operating 2-ton White trucks for 253 days or 78,936 hours at $2.16 per hour	$170,501.76
Saturdays:	
18½ hours of truck service for 52 Saturdays performed on 2-ton White trucks at $2.16 per hour or 954 hours	2,060.64
Total	172,562.40
Additional interstation service—Continued	
Daily:	
224 hours of truck service performed daily by 28 drivers on 28 8-hour runs operating 3-ton White trucks for 253 days or 56,672 hours at $2.19 per hour	$124,111.68
Saturdays:	
13 hours of truck service for 52 Saturdays performed on 3-ton White trucks or 676 hours at $2.19 per hour	1,480.44
Total	125,592.12
Daily:	
192 hours of truck service performed daily by 24 drivers on 24 8-hour runs operating 2-ton White trucks for 253 days or 48,576 hours at $2.16 per hour	104,924.16
Saturdays:	
11 hours of truck service for 52 Saturdays performed on 2-ton White trucks or 572 hours at $2.16 per hour	1,235.52
Total	106,159.68
Additional service between Brooklyn and New York, N. Y.:	
Daily:	
46 hours of truck service performed daily by 6 drivers on 6 8-hour runs operating 1-ton Ford trucks for 253 days or 11,638 hours at $1.65 per hour	19,202.70
Saturdays:	
5 hours of truck service performed each Saturday for 52 Saturday's or 260 hours at $1.65 per hour	429.00
Total	19,631.70
Total cost additional motor vehicles service	423,945.90

The present motor-vehicle service generally operates on an hourly frequency between the general post office and the 21 points of the New York, N. Y., post office now connected by pneumatic tubes, and would be supplemented by the establishment of a half-hourly motor-vehicle service between the hours of 5 a. m. and 10 p. m. An express route would be established to operate on a half-hourly frequency between 5 a. m. and 10 p. m. from Church Street Station via Grand Central Station to Station L, to Station J, and return over the same route.

Motor-vehicle service, now operating from Morgan Station to Stations J and L and the stations north of these points, would be routed out of the general post office in addition to the present trips now scheduled from the general post office to Stations J and L and stations north of these points, which would establish a 20-minute frequency motor-vehicle service on trips between the general post office and Station J.

There would also be established two express routes, operating from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m., to transport pouch mails from Church Street Station for train connections at the general post office and Grand Central Station, and interstation connections at these points.

The motor-vehicle service between the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office and points in the New York, N. Y., post office would necessarily have to be increased to provide for adequate transportation service in lieu of the tube service now performed.

In addition to the estimate of the cost of motor-vehicle service that would be required, consideration has been given to the effect that would be had upon the personnel engaged at present in the handling of mails, performing operations connected with the pouching, tubing, receiving, and dispatching operations inside the stations and on the mailing platforms.

It should be understood that mails dispatched and received via the pneumatic-tube service are usually handled within the workrom area adjacent to the apparatus used, and the tube operators are required to open and empty the in-bound tube carriers and to close the out-bound tube carriers and dispatch them. The mail forwarded via motor-vehicle service must be enclosed in pouches and moved from the pouch racks to the tailboard of the truck and must be checked into the vehicle; and, in reverse order, mail received must be checked and removed from the tailboard of the truck and delivered to points in the workroom area where the mails are opened.

Taking the factors relating to the subject under consideration and based upon the quantity and character of this work as performed under the present arrangement it is estimated that 90 additional employees would be required to replace the services and personnel now provided for the pneumatic-tube service.

There is transmitted with this report a number of photographs of the pneumatic-tube equipment at the general post office and the various stations, which photographs have been marked "exhibit K."

The following tabulation is presented to show the work performed and the number of post-office employees required at present; the number of pouches that would have to be made up and handled if the tube service were not available and the number of post-office employees that would be required to perform the work incident thereto:

	Number of pouches now originating on an average day at tube stations or transferred at these points	Number of pouches that are handled in dispatching-receiving sections and mailing platform at tube stations	Number of employees handling pouches in dispatching-receiving sections and mailing platform at tube stations	Number of tube carriers containing mail dispatched	Number of employees engaged in handling mails in tube section (tube operators)	Estimated number of additional pouches that would have to be established if tube service were not available	Estimated number of pouches that would be handled in dispatching and receiving section if tube service were not available	Estimated number of employees required to handle pouches if tube service were not available
General post office	[1] 9,147	18,202	93	5,562	33	2,098	23,864	148
Grand Central	[1] 5,942	10,429	31	6,170	19	6,750	22,000	94
Church Street	[1] 3,175	3,599	25	2,617	19	4,290	10,900	71
A	44	122	2	206	4	418	795	4
Cooper	96	255	2	612	4	210	657	5
Murray Hill	39	233	2	479	3	189	577	4
Radio City	51	358	2	793	4	231	847	6
H	[1] 32	92	1	402	3	418	897	3
J	[1] 717	1,365	9	1,408	5	532	3,931	10
L	[1] 271	504	6	864	3	532	3,071	9
O	51	179	2	460	4	231	624	7
Hell Gate	14	58	1	128	2	342	695	3
Ansonia	40	115	1	261	3	418	922	4
Bowling Green	41	240	2	912	2	210	639	4
Canal Street	88	285	3	399	4	231	2,339	10
Gracie	17	90	1	301	2	342	725	4
Lenox Hill	14	88	1	292	2	342	716	4
Madison Square	449	713	5	1,305	5	750	1,601	11
Morningside	13	42	1	120	2	210	425	3
Planetarium	29	107	1	278	3	418	885	3
Times Square	48	312	2	632	4	210	602	6
Wall Street	67	319	1	394	2	210	609	5
Total	20,384	37,707	194	24,595	132	19,582	77,421	416

[1] Transfer of pouches in transit included.

Total personnel required under existing methods of transportation, pneumatic tube service and motor vehicle service combined (194 plus 132) ---------- 326
Total personnel required if motor vehicle service were used exclusively ---- 416
Total additional employees that would be required ---------- 90

The above tabulation, based on careful estimates, shows that 20,384 pouches made up under existing methods require 37,707 handlings in course of transit between points of origin and destination; and that without the use of the pneumatic tubes, which transmitted 24,595 originating carriers containing mail between the points connected by tubes on an average day, 19,582 additional pouches would have to be made up making a total of 39,966 pouches, for transportation via motor-vehicle service, which would require 77,421 handlings between the points of origin and destination, representing an increase of approximately 105 percent over that required with the combined use of the present motor-vehicle service and pneumatic-tube service.

It is estimated that the additional work involved in a substitution of motor-vehicle service to replace the service now performed by the pneumatic-tube system would require the utilization of the services of 90 additional employees, and that this additional personnel would include 60 clerks and 30 mail handlers. Based on the average rate of pay at the New York post office as of July 1, 1946, the cost is estimated as follows:

60 clerks, at $3,000 per annum	$180,000
30 mail handlers, at $2,500 per annum	75,000
Total cost (90 employees)	255,000

The summary of the items and the estimated annual cost referred to in the foregoing is submitted:

Additional motor-vehicle service	$423,945.90
Additional personnel	255,000.00
Total estimated cost	678,945.90

There would be additional items of cost not included in the above, such as the original investment for six 1-ton trucks for the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office, and forty-six 2-ton trucks for the New York, N. Y., post office, at an approximate cost of $1,250 for the 1-ton trucks and $2,300 each for the 2-ton trucks, making a total of $113,300. The existing garage facilities at New York, N. Y., are inadequate to accommodate the forty-six 2-ton trucks; therefore additional garage facilities would be required.

It has been estimated that 19,582 additional pouches that would be made up daily would have a bearing upon the cost of the substitute for the pneumatic-tube service, since such a large increase in the use of mail equipment to replace the equipment now furnished by the contractor would be an element of considerable expense.

Taking into consideration the principal items, motor-vehicle service and personnel, which would be required, it is estimated that such service would cost $678,945.90 compared with the cost of the pneumatic-tube service of $253,023.15 for the rent of the tube system, plus $320,700 at New York, N. Y., and $8,403.09 at Brooklyn, N. Y., for the salaries of the tube operators now on the Post Office Department's pay roll; plus $37,433.19 at New York, N. Y., and $1,639.33 at Brooklyn, N. Y., for electric current used in connection with the pneumatic-tube service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, making a total of $621,198.70 for tube operation. These figures indicate that a substitute motor-vehicle service, replacing the pneumatic-tube service, would cost $57,747.14 more than the cost of the existing pneumatic-tube service without considering any of the other elements of expense maintained.

Rental of tube system	$253,023.15
Salaries of tube operators at New York, N. Y.	320,700.00
Salaries of tube operators at Brooklyn, N. Y.	8,403.09
Total salaries of tube operators	329,103.09
Electric current at New York, N. Y.	37,433.19
Electric current at Brooklyn, N. Y.	1,639.33
Total electric current	39,072.52
Total for tube operations	621,198.76
Estimated motor-vehicle and personnel cost	$678,945.90
Cost of pneumatic-tube service	621,198.76
Total more than present cost of pneumatic-tube service	57,747.14

On page 45 of the same report we find the following:

To provide the same motor vehicle service which was in operation when the tube service was discontinued, it would be necessary to schedule motor vehicles at half-hourly frequency between the points connected by the pneumatic tubes. Additional employees would be required at all these points to perform the duties incident to the handling of pouches and the loading and unloading of vehicles.

The estimated annual cost for additional motor vehicles and the additional personnel that would be required as a substitute for pneumatic-tube service would be $678,845.90, which would be $57,747.14 more than the present cost of the pneumatic-tube service, which is $621,198.76

Mr. President, there are the facts on which we worked.

I would say Mr. Summerfield does not need to argue with me. Let him argue with the committee of the 80th Congress which made the study, and let him argue with the report of the Post Office Department. Many of the men who served in the Department in 1948 are still there today.

What the New York postmaster pointed out to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] certainly should be controlling in this matter. The New York postmaster said:

Today, when mail matter must move quickly to meet all kinds of time-table deadlines—plane, railroad, and steamer—to ensure its early delivery, the underground pneumatic-tube system is invaluable. (P. 3, Rept. No. 1241, 80th Cong., 2d sess.)

Mr. President, that is what we were told when we passed the bill.

As I have already read from page 45 of the report, it was found at the time that it would cost an additional $57,000 a year to convert the service from the pneumatic tubes to automobile trucks, rather than to continue to use the pneumatic tubes.

The 80th Congress subcommittee shared the conclusion of the New York postmaster to the effect that the pneumatic-tube mail service was necessary, desirable, and economical. In its unanimous bipartisan report the subcommittee commented as follows:

The value of the pneumatic-tube system was dramatically brought into bold relief during Christmas week of 1947 when a 22.8-inch snowfall all but paralyzed New York City but in no way interrupted the orderly distribution of mails through this well-established pneumatic-tube device.

Mr. President, if Mr. Summerfield is able to predict with accuracy that it will not snow, perhaps it will be satisfactory for the New York mail service to rely exclusively on the use of automobile trucks. However, in December 1947, when there was almost 23 inches of snow in New York City, the mail would not have moved very well, if at all, if truck service had been relied upon exclusively. After all, New York City is a metropolis of considerable size, and its postal busi-

ness amounts to more than $200 million annually. So in this instance we are not talking about a small fourth-class post office, but we are talking about the largest movement of mail in the world, in the greatest financial and merchandising center in the world, with the greatest concentration of population in the world. We are talking about a density of traffic the life of which the rest of the world cannot even dream. We are talking about crowded and congested streets which constantly are becoming more crowded and more congested.

Mr. Summerfield says that the answer to the question of better mail service is to put more trucks on the streets. Mr. President, in New York City there is a subway. The subway is a quick means of transportation for the people of New York, but it costs the city of New York many thousands of dollars every year. If New York City merely wishes to save money, it can close the subway. I do not know what would happen to the people, but the subway could be closed.

If it is smart to move people underground in order to get where they want to go, it seems to me that it might be reasonable to try to move a little mail underground in New York City. That is exactly what the Post Office Department was trying to do. If the post office in New York City was busy in 1898 and President McKinley thought the pneumatic-tube system was needed; if the post office in New York was busy in 1922, and if it was busy in 1932, under Mr. Hoover, certainly it was busy enough in 1950 and 1952 for the junior Senator from Minnesota to support the continuation of the pneumatic-tube service, which has worked for 50 years, through all forms of politics. It is tried and true.

Is it not interesting that the only time it becomes a political issue, after 56 years of successful operation, is when the Republican National Committeeman out in Minnesota decides to attack the junior Senator from Minnesota? They cannot find anything else on the basis of which to attack him. They do not dare attack him on the issue of farm price supports. They are unwilling to attack him on the issue of labor-management relations. They are unwilling to attack him on the issue of taxation. So what do they do? They find a little issue involving pneumatic tubes up in New York City, and they ask: "How did Senator HUMPHREY become involved in this thing?" They say: "Cancel the contract. It looks bad."

The newspapers say that the subject was referred to the Department of Justice. What does that indicate in this day and age of fear? It indicates to the popular mind that something is wrong. What the Postmaster General referred to the Department of Justice was the question of whether or not he could cancel the contract.

Now the subject is to go to the McCarthy subcommittee. That looks bad in the newspapers. There must be something wrong, in the implication they foster.

Of course we have a Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the Senate. The newspapers of my State carry certain headlines. Then someone says, "You do not want anybody to think that there is any politics involved in this issue, do you?" If there is no politics in this issue, there are no prayers in the Bible. There is plenty of politics—too much.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I just entered the Chamber. I heard the distinguished Senator say something about the Investigations Subcommittee. Has some charge been filed with that subcommittee, or has any action been taken by the subcommittee with respect to the subject matter which the Senator is discussing?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. I merely have in my hand a statement from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of February 7, which says:

> McCARTHY will probe his role in postal contract.

The Senator from Minnesota is to be probed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has that been announced?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That has been announced.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not believe the subject has come before the subcommittee as a subcommittee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. At least, as a member of the subcommitee I have had no notice of it. Neither have I had any information regarding it. I was surprised when I heard the statement made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was a bit surprised myself.

Let me say that this newspaper has a circulation of between 575,000 and 600,000. I think every Member of this body is sufficiently familiar with politics to know that when he sees headlines like that, they are not intended to promote him for merit badges. It does not make me any happier when I take my boy to the father-and-son banquet of the Boy Scouts tonight, to see the headline, "Hints at Possibility of Graft." I have a 15-year-old daughter and a 12-year-old son. They can read such headlines. There is their daddy's picture. I do not intend to take this from anyone. I will fight it. And I will win and will rewin the support of the people of Minnesota who are decent folks and resent character assassination as a political weapon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has the Senator stated whether any charges have been laid before the Investigations Subcommittee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not that I know of.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not advised of any.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure that I know of no particular charges, except that it was said in the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Post Office and Treasury that this subject might very well be referred to the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee. That is as far as it has gone.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Who made that statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was the record which was read here today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Minnesota. I have not been able to be present during his entire address. I was very much interested when I entered the Chamber just now. The Senator from Minnesota referred to the Investigations Subcommittee, intimating that possibly that subcommittee was taking some action, or had taken action, or was about to take action. I became curious to know what the facts are.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If anyone has the right to be curious on that subject, it is the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who is the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thought I might be entitled to a little information on the subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to give the Senator all the information I have.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the RECORD should show clearly that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Post Office and Treasury Department appropriations is also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Investigations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suppose a member might refer something to himself in a committee hearing if he so desired, if he were the chairman of both subcommittees.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true.

Mr. President, the letter from the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], which I have inserted in the RECORD without reading, reminds us of one additional fact. He reminds us that insofar as both bills approved by the 80th and 81st Congresses were concerned, they were merely enabling acts, or authorization acts. Following passage of such acts, the Senate and House Appropriations Committees very carefully considered the matter of the pneumatic-tube mail system and approved the appropriations of these funds to allow the Postmaster General to sign the contract. The bipartisan composition of the Appropriations Committees and their support for the pneumatic-tube system is further testimonial to the effectiveness of that system and to the desirability of Senate bill 4102, the bill I introduced. Let me bring to the attention of the Senate the distinguished list of both Democrats and Republicans who were members of the Post Office Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. This list was prepared by the staff of the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Post Office Subcommittee:

In the 80th Congress: Senators Maybank, Hayden, Kilgore, McClellan, McKellar, Ellender, Robertson, Cordon, Bridges, Saltonstall, Johnston, Long, and Langer.

In the 81st Congress, 1st session: Senators Kilgore, Maybank, McClellan, McKellar, Robertson, Ecton, Bridges, Saltonstall, Johnston, Neely, and Langer.

In the 82d Congress, 2d session: Kilgore, chairman; Maybank; McClellan; McKellar; Robertson; Zales Ecton; Bridges; Saltonstall.

Ex officio: Olin D. Johnston, Neely, Langer.

In the 83d Congress, 1st session; McCarthy, chairman; Bridges; Saltonstall; Cordon; Margaret Chase Smith; Dirksen; Kilgore; Maybank; McClellan; Robertson; Magnuson.

Ex officio: Frank Carlson, Duff, O. D. Johnston.

The Senators who are on this list are all distinguished men. We trust their judgment. The Appropriations Committee is one of the most respected committees of this body; but up to date it has yet to register any feeling against the pneumatic tube bill.

That subcommittee certainly had an opportunity to go into the pneumatic tube bill. It was necessary for the Department to ask for money. The majority leader is a member of that subcommittee. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who has spoken today, is a member of that subcommittee.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was the ranking member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. That committee knew about the pneumatic tube system. Let us be frank about it. Everyone knew about this system. This is no news flash, like the development of the hydrogen bomb—and it is not going to explode quite so loud, either.

Let me bring additional facts to the attention of the Senate. My irresponsible political opponents in Minnesota are attempting to distort my bill and to capitalize on the fact that it authorized signing of a contract "for terms not exceeding 10 years." This criticism is another example of political irresponsibility. The authorization of a 10-year contract was part of the basic authorization or enabling act passed by the Republican-controlled Congress in 1922. That statute was the law of the land when my bill, Senate bill 4102, was introduced. My bill does not in the slightest change that law. It merely authorized the Postmaster General to continue to enter into contracts not to exceed 10 years. That has been going on since 1922. In fact, in 1922 a Postmaster General signed such a contract which expired on June 30, 1932. He signed a 10-year contract. That 1922 contract, by the way, was for "not exceeding $19,500 per mile," according to the letter from Senator JOHNSTON, as compared to my bill authorizing the amount not to exceed $15,500. We did not have any investigation of pneumatic tubes after Mr. Hoover went out of office. We had other problems confronting us. The tubes were still working, and they carried the mails through Republican days and Democratic days, through rain and snow, and through frost and sleet. The mails went through in keeping with the full meaning of the statement chiseled on the facade of the New York Post Office Building. That statement was made a reality, not merely a hope.

Now let me read one final paragraph of the letter of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]:

> I have further learned some very interesting statistics which affect this question. Under the pneumatic-tube system special delivery mail, for which extra postage is paid, can be delivered from the train to the consignee in 45 minutes, as compared to 3 to 5 hours if trucks are used. Trucks, of course, also only make their deliveries 2 or 3 times a day. The records also show that the pneumatic-tube system carried between 5 and 6 million letters a day.

These are the letters which Mr. Summerfield is going to pile on two trucks.

> To say that this volume of mail can be effectively and efficiently carried by two trucks as Postmaster General Summerfield implies, is ridiculous. It would take a fleet of trucks at tremendous expense to serve this need.

Why does the Senator from South Carolina make that statement? Because the 80th Congress made the investigation, the result of which I put into the RECORD. I did not make the investigation. It was an investigation which was made by prominent officials of the Government, as well as by Members of Congress, and they said it would cost more to use trucks than to use tubes.

Mr. Summerfield, in condemning the pneumatic-tube mail-service system wants to go back to the 19th century. He does not want to go back too far in the 19th century, because at the end of that century the tubes were being used.

He says he can save money by doing so. I suggest that if that is his main interest rather than service he ought to go back to the pony express system of delivering mail. It would be much cheaper. The Post Office could save a great deal of money by eliminating the contracts for shipping airmail overseas. It would be much cheaper to do so. I would hope, however, before any contracts were canceled we would have an opportunity to look into the facts.

Mr. President, the facts are available. They demonstrate the need for a full investigation by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to judge the competency and responsibility of the Postmaster General, and to determine if he is guilty of dereliction of his duties as a public officer. I ask that the committee subpena the postal inspectors and the postal officials who considered the whole pneumatic tube service system. If they are subpenaed, Mr. President, after my private conversations with certain members of the postal inspection service, I am confident it will be found that their testimony will corroborate the testimony taken in the 80th and 81st Congresses. I have not entered into this case lightly. If the investigators will come to me for some names, they will get them.

We need the facts, Mr. President. I want the committee to subpena the postal inspectors who investigated this question in 1948 and 1950, and again this year, to see whether anyone was derelict in his responsibility and to determine whether the subcommittee and the full committee of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service were given any information which would indicate that we ought not to have made the contracts.

The facts are crystal clear. If any member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service had had the slightest doubt as to the wisdom of renewing the contract it would have raised a heated controversy and there would have been debate on the floor of the Senate and in the committee, but the contracts were unanimously approved.

It is clear to me that the announcement of the Postmaster General, followed as it was by the unfair partisan political attack made against me by the Republican national committeeman in Minnesota, was a political maneuver.

Mr. President, I have no more to say, except that I will be back later. I will be back later to make comment pertaining to the postal service to the extent that I feel it necessary to make such comment. I hope, to start with, that we can put this matter where it properly belongs, namely, in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

As I tried to make clear to my colleagues, as the reports indicate, and as the comments of my colleagues have indicated, insofar as the junior Senator from Minnesota is concerned, he did his duty, and there rests upon him no taint whatsoever because of anything that is unusual or anything that could be considered unworthy of a Member of this body.

I am grateful for the sentiments which have been expressed on the floor.

As to whether or not the tube system is the most desirable means of handling mail is a question for policy determination by the Post Office Department and by the Congress. However, I hope that we may keep the high quality service our country is accustomed to and not in any way diminish it.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of February 7, 1954]

HUMPHREY CHARGES SMEAR; MCCARTHY WILL PROBE HIS ROLE IN POSTAL CONTRACT

What was Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S part in the renewal of a New York postal tube contract? The question and the answers shaped Saturday into the first hot debate of the 1954 senatorial campaign in Minnesota.

Involved is whether a contract to send first-class mail between post offices in New York City by pneumatic tube should have been renewed. HUMPHREY sponsored the bill continuing the service in 1950.

Republican Postmaster General Summerfield canceled the pneumatic tube contract as wasteful at the end of 1953. Republican National Committeeman George Etzell of Clarissa, Minn., attacked the postal tube bill saying it looks like another Democratic scandal.

On Friday HUMPHREY reserved an hour for a speech to the Senate on Monday to rip the hide off Summerfield and Etzell.

On Saturday, Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, Republican, Wisconsin, disclosed his Senate committee is investigating. He'll not subpena Senator HUMPHREY, MCCARTHY said, but he thought the Minnesota Senator wants to testify.

Below is what Senator HUMPHREY told Wilbur Elston of the Minneapolis Tribune's Washington bureau about what he plans to say to the Senate Monday. Following that is what Senator MCCARTHY said about his investigation, and what Postmaster General Summerfield says in reply to HUMPHREY. At the end of the article is the text of publisher Etzell's editorial in the Clarissa Independent.

MINNESOTA TO STATE CASE ON MONDAY

(By Wilbur Elston)

WASHINGTON.—Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, Saturday accused Postmaster General Summerfield and George Etzell, Minnesota's Republican national committeeman, of collaborating in a political smear against him.

The Minnesota Senator, up for reelection this year, said he would take the Senate floor Monday to deny the Republicans' charges that a bill he introduced committed the Post Office Department to a 10-year, million-dollar-a-year operation that now can be handled for $25,000 a year or less.

The million-a-year contract has been canceled by the new administration.

HUMPHREY said he also is asking the Senate Postoffice and Civil Service Committee to make a full investigation of the facts, subpena the postal inspectors who investigated the question, and see if Summerfield is guilty of dereliction of his responsibility as a public officeholder.

At issue is the 1950 Humphrey bill that authorized the continuation of the use of a 25-mile-pneumatic-tube system that connects the main post office and 21 stations in New York City for transmission of first-class mail.

Summerfield canceled the contract December 31 after a Department survey showed that almost the entire cost of $1,007,150.24 a year could be saved by discontinuing the service and that two additional trucks costing $22,168.44 could handle all the mail transmitted by the tubes.

After that, Etzell published an editorial in his newpapers, the Clarissa (Minn.) Independent, and later circulated to all papers in the State, saying that HUMPHREY's sponsorship of the postal-tube bill "looks like it might be another Democratic scandal."

HUMPHREY charged that the "decision of the Postmaster General went hand in hand with the unfair partisan political attack made against me by the Republican national committeeman" and was "designed to cause me political embarrassment in an election year."

"Mr. Summerfield has apparently forgotten that when he took the oath of office to become Postmaster General, he assumed a public trust and had left his position as chairman of the Republican National Committee," HUMPHREY declared.

HUMPHREY said Summerfield's estimate of the savings is "patently false" and "directly contradicts" the Republican 80th Congress, which found that to replace the tubes with trucks would cost $57,000 more than the expense of the pneumatic-tube service alone.

The Minnesota Senator explained that as chairman of a Senate Post Office Subcommittee, he had introduced the bill in 1950 at the request of the Department.

The purpose was to increase the payment for tube service by $53,000 a year to amortize the cost of new equipment over a 10-year period.

He said the bill was introduced only after unanimous approval of both my subcommittee and the full Senate committee, including both Democrats and Republicans. One was his Minnesota Republican colleague, Senator THYE, who also had been among the committeemen approving continuation of the service in 1948 before HUMPHREY was elected.

"Our committee accepted the findings of the thorough investigation which had been made by the Republicans in 1949," HUMPHREY said.

"Their judgment was confirmed by the reports and conversations we had with representatives of the Post Office Department, including postal inspectors and technicians."

HUMPHREY pointed out that New York post office has been serviced by pneumatic tubes for 56 years, since 1898, on contracts originally authorized by a Republican Congress, restored by a Republican Congress after being suspended by a Democratic administration and repeatedly renewed by Republican administrations.

He said Republican Senators LANGER, of North Dakota, and ECTON, of Montana (defeated for reelection in 1952), conducted the most recent investigation upholding efficiency of the tube system in 1948 before HUMPHREY entered the Senate.

Full membership of both Houses in the Republican 80th Congress voted unanimously to continue the tube service, and raise the payment for it beyond what the Democratic Postmaster General had recommended after the unanimously favorable recommendation from the committee, he added.

HUMPHREY made public copies of letters of support he had received from both LANGER and Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, who was chairman of the full Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee in 1950 when the Minnesotan offered the controversial bill.

"The criticism of you and your activities in connection with the bill is totally unfounded," LANGER said. "Our conclusion (after the 1948 Langer-Ecton hearings in New York) was unanimous that the pneumatic tube service was advisable, necessary, and economical as a service in the New York post office."

JOHNSTON said the "partisan political attacks upon you (HUMPHREY) are a reflection upon the integrity of the Congress."

He added that he "resents any attempt to cast aspersions upon Members of the Congress, all of whom supported the bill, for the sake of momentary political expediency."

JOHNSTON also said that while the Etzell editorial attacked HUMPHREY for approving a 10-year contract, the contract had been authorized on a 10-year basis for the first time back in 1922 when the Republicans controlled Congress.

In hearings of the House Post Office Committee just released, Summerfield said that the contract had been renewed January 1, 1951, for a 10-year period under the Humphrey bill despite the recommendation of post office inspectors against continuing to use the tubes.

He said a committee made up of post office officials reported on June 6, 1950, that the saving from replacing the tubes with trucks would amount to $449,403.23.

He quoted the committee as saying, "This adds further weight to the committee's recommendation of May 15, 1950, that the pneumatic tube service at New York be discontinued."

Summerfield said he didn't know what actuated the Democratic Postmaster General, Jesse Donaldson, to request renewal of the contract despite this recommendation.

But he added that he had been informed Donaldson felt that the "abandonment of a mechanical means of mail transportation would be considered as being a step backward, and would result in further criticism."

Representative CANFIELD, Republican, New Jersey, said this was an "amazing story," and asked for a complete, up-to-date report on the whole situation that was included in the published proceedings.

This report said the inspectors recommended discontinuance of the tubes because they carried only 32 percent of the letter mail when in operation; they operated only from 6 a. m. until midnight Monday through Friday; 68 percent of the letter mail and all the bulk mail still had to be carried by truck even when the tubes were running, and the capacity of the truck service was not being fully utilized anyway.

"It was estimated that almost the entire sum of $1,007,150.24 could be saved through discontinuance of the tube service and that 2 additional motor vehicles costing $22,168.44 could handle all of the mail then being transported by the tube system," the report said.

MCCARTHY HINTS AT POSSIBILITY OF GRAFT

(By Wilbur Elston)

WASHINGTON.—Senator MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, disclosed Saturday that his Senate committee staff is investigating the New York pneumatic-tube mail transmission contract authorized by a bill by Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, in 1950.

MCCARTHY said his staff will report to him on its preliminary investigations after he returns to Washington in about a week.

The 10-year million-dollar-a-year contract for pneumatic-tube service in New York City that was signed under the Humphrey bill was canceled recently by Postmaster General Summerfield on grounds that 2 trucks could replace the service at a cost of only about $25,000 a year.

"The decision on whether to hold public hearings will be up to the full Senate investigating committee," MCCARTHY said, "but I personally feel very strongly that the situation is so bad that public hearings are justified.

"It seems to me that something worse than stupidity was involved."

MCCARTHY said he thought his committee should make a complete and thorough investigation to see whether there was any possibility of graft or corruption in connection with letting the contract.

He emphasized he didn't know that HUMPHREY played any part in it except to introduce the bill that provides for an increase of payments of about $53,000 a year.

He said he wouldn't subpena HUMPHREY if the hearings were called, but thought the Minnesota Senator would want to testify.

He said the matter first came to the attention of the appropriations subcommittee, but that Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, and other Senators present decided his permanent investigating committee should look into the matter. MCCARTHY said it has a larger staff.

The disclosure from MCCARTHY came after HUMPHREY issued a summary of a speech he'll make on the Senate floor Monday against Republican attacks on the pneumatic tube bill.

In his statement, HUMPHREY bitterly attacked both Summerfield and George Etzell, Minnesota Republican national committeeman, who circulated an editorial criticizing the Democratic Senator for introducing the tube bill.

Asked for comment on HUMPHREY's attack, both Summerfield and Etzell issued statements accusing the Senator of criticizing the Republican administration's efforts to save money.

Summerfield also said he would welcome with open arms a congressional investigation of the cancellation of the contract as well as the motives and circumstances that led to the signing of the contract in the first place.

Summerfield's complete statement to the Minneapolis Tribune follows:

"It is apparent that the Senator doth protest too much.

"I think it most unfortunate that Senator HUMPHREY should attack us for saving money.

"I emphatically repudiate the suggestion that the pneumatic tube contract was canceled for any other reason than to save the taxpayers money without impeding the service.

"Not only does the Senator seem determined to associate his name with the expensive 1950 long-term lease renewal on the antiquated 56-year-old pneumatic tubes in New York City, but he apparently feels that our efforts in saving the taxpayers a million dollars a year in that city alone amount to 'dereliction' of my duty as a public office holder.

"If that is dereliction, then the post office could have used a great deal more of it in the past. If it had, the taxpayer would not be faced with a $3.8-billion deficit which has accumulated in the Post Office Department since the end of World War II.

"We would welcome with open arms a congressional investigation not only of our action in canceling a 10-year contract that has cost us $1 million a year for services which we can duplicate for just $25,000, but also of the motives and circumstances that led to the signing of such a disastrous contract by the former administration in the first place.

"It is our conviction that everything relating to the people's business, and particularly in the Post Office Department, since it touches nearly every citizen in the land, should be made available to the people.

"To that end I have already presented this matter to both the Senate and House Committees on Post Office Appropriations and have supplied the members with detailed information with reference to the pneumatic tube contract.

"We are delighted to let the facts speak for themselves. This is a characteristic of the present administration."

Etzel said in rebuttal that HUMPHREY still hadn't answered the question he had asked him in his editorial after press reports quoted the Senator as saying he "scarcely remembered the bill."

"I asked Senator HUMPHREY then and I ask him now how many millions does any bill have to authorize for expenditure before he feels it is worth remembering," Etzel inquired.

The Minnesota Republican committeeman pointed out that the bill passed by the GOP Congress in 1948 that HUMPHREY cited in his own statement still had been recommended by the Democratic administration running the Post Office Department at that time.

"But Postmaster General Summerfield wasn't talking about that 1948 bill," Etzel commented.

"He was talking instead about the 1950 bill that HUMPHREY himself introduced and that called for an outlay of more than $1 million a year until Summerfield canceled the contract."

"I feel that the Republicans have a responsibility to call this kind of a case to the attention of the American people."

Etzel also denied he had any contact with Summerfield before writing his editorial. He said he obtained his information from newspaper dispatches about the tube contract.

TEXT OF ETZELL ATTACK ON HUMPHREY BILL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—George Etzell, Republican national committeeman for Minnesota, published the following editorial January 7 in his newspaper, the Clarissa Independent, under the heading "Senator HUMPHREY'S $10 Million Lack of Memory.")

Back in 1950, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY as a member of the Democratically controlled Post Office Committee of the Senate, sponsored a bill authorizing the Postmaster General to negotiate and sign a contract for the purpose of transmitting mail in New York City through pneumatic tubes.

The cost to the Post Office Department through a contract with the New York Mail and Newspaper Transportation Co., to handle only one-fourth of the total flow between the 22 offices in New York was $1 million a year.

The contract was signed by former Postmaster General Donaldson for 10 years, at $360,000 a year. But operating bills for personnel, power, and other items raised this amount to $1 million annually.

This contract last Thursday was canceled by Postmaster General Summerfield and instead, two trucks have been put on the job at a cost of $25,000 yer year.

According to the Washington Star, Mr. HUMPHREY, as author of the bill authorizing this excessive contract, said that he "scarcely remembered" the bill.

"I was a member of the Post Office Committee and as such I was asked to submit this purely technical bill for Senate consideration.

"I submitted to the Post Office Committee a letter from Postmaster General Donaldson urging that the measure be passed.

"You have to depend on the experts in those cases, and I did.

"If Mr. Summerfield now finds a cheaper way to do the job and save money, more power to him," Senator HUMPHREY is quoted as saying.

Well, Mr. Summerfield has found a cheaper way—$975,000 cheaper per year and $9,750,000 cheaper in a 10-year period.

There are a number of things that are amazing to us about Mr. HUMPHREY'S sponsorship of the bill:

1. How many millions does any bill have to authorize for expenditure before Senator HUMPHREY feels it is worth remembering?

2. What experts did Senator HUMPHREY ask, if he did ask the opinion of anyone?

We do not know of course, that Senator HUMPHREY did not ask the opinion of the postal inspectors, because the former Postmaster General, Mr. Donaldson, has admitted signing the contract against the advice of the postal inspectors.

Mr. Donaldson said that he did so "in order to maintain an essential and desired service, particularly to the Wall Street district."

That's interesting, too. Never in any campaign speeches in Minnesota has the junior Senator indicated that he was interested in getting mail to Wall Street to the tune of $10 million of the taxpayers' money, when it could be done in that 10-year period for $250,000—that's 2½ percent.

But let's go into the background of this deal as reported by the Washington Star:

Mr. Summerfield learned of the 2 operations after he send 20 top postal inspectors into New York to survey the city's 200-million-a-year postal operation.

Searching for ways to reduce the use of space in the high-rental Manhattan district, the inspectors pointed out to Mr. Summerfield the amount of square footage required for tube openings, containers, and equipment.

His further cross-examination of the inspectors brought out their estimates of the excessive costs of the tube operation.

When he told the story to the House Appropriations Subcommittee last week, Mr. Summerfield was asked why the inspectors had not informed his predecessors of the wasteful operation.

He replied that they had on several occasions—but that the contract had been signed anyway.

Senator HUMPHREY has been diligently campaigning in Minnesota in these last few months. He has also written weekly letters on just about everything—except his sponsorship of the New York City postal tube bill, which looks like it might be another Democratic scandal.

We use the word "scandal" advisedly because the Post Office Department canceled the contract last Thursday, and the whole matter has been turned over to the Department of Justice.

As author of the bill authorizing the contract, Senator HUMPHREY either did or did not bother to learn about what he was proposing.

If he did not bother to investigate, he was derelict in his duty as a United States Senator.

If he did know about it, it is much worse.

In any case, we will be watching for his newsletters with a great deal of interest. He has some explaining to do.

[From the Duluth Herald of January 6, 1954]

HUMPHREY-SPONSORED POSTAL BILL MAY START NEW DEMO SCANDAL

(By Einar Karlstrand)

Minnesota's Republican national committeeman today declared the New York City postal tube bill, sponsored by United States Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, may become "another Democratic scandal."

George F. Etzell, publisher of the Clarissa Independent, in an editorial lashed out against the State's junior Senator and said "he has some explaining to do."

The attack on HUMPHREY marked the start of political fireworks expected to become intense during the 1954 election campaigns.

Etzell referred to a Congressional measure sponsored in 1950 by the Democratic-controlled Senate Post Office Committee of which HUMPHREY was a member. The bill authorized the Postmaster General to negotiate and sign a contract for the purpose of transmitting mail in New York City pneumatic tubes.

The cost to the Post Office Department through a contract with the New York Mail and Newspaper Transportation Co. to handle "only one-fourth of the total flow" between the 22 New York offices was $1 million a year, Etzell said.

Former Postmaster General Donaldson signed the contract for a 10-year period at $360,000 a year. Operating costs for personnel, power, and other items raised this figure to $1 million annually.

The Clarissa weekly newspaper publisher called attention to the fact that the present Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield canceled the contract a week ago and ordered two trucks on the job at a cost of $25,000 a year.

Senator HUMPHREY told a Washington newspaper that he "scarcely remembered" the bill.

He explained:

"I was a member of the Post Office Committee and as such I was asked to submit this purely technical bill for Senate consideration. I submitted to the Post Office Committee a letter from Postmaster General Donaldson urging that the matter be passed. You have to depend on experts in those cases, and I did.

"If Mr. Summerfield now finds a cheaper way to do the job and save money, more power to him."

Etzell replied to the Senator, "Well, Mr. Summerfield has found a cheaper way—$795,000 cheaper per year and $9,750,000 cheaper in a 10-year period."

The GOP national committeeman then said:

"There are a number of things that are amazing to us about Mr. HUMPHREY'S sponsorship of the bill:

"1. How many millions does any bill have to authorize for expenditure before Senator HUMPHREY feels it is worth remembering?

"2. What experts did Senator HUMPHREY rely on if he did ask the opinion of anyone?

"We do know, of course, that Senator HUMPHREY did not ask the opinion of the postal inspectors, because the former Postmaster General, Mr. Donaldson, has admitted signing the contract against the advice of the postal inspectors. Mr. Donaldson said he did so 'in order to maintain an essential and desired service, particularly to the Wall Street districts.'"

Etzell commented that "never in any campaign speeches in Minnesota has the junior

Senator indicated that he was interested in getting mail to Wall Street to the tune of $10 million of taxpayers' money, when it could be done in that 10-year period for $250,000—that's 2½ percent."

The Clarissa publisher said that Summerfield learned of the tube operation after he sent 20 top postal inspectors into New York to survey the city's $200 million a year postal service. The inspectors searched for ways to reduce the use of space in the high-rental Manhattan district.

They found that there was excessive costs involved in tube operation. These facts were reported to authorities but the contract was signed anyway, the newspaperman said.

"Senator HUMPHREY has been diligently campaigning in Minnesota in the last few months," the editorial commented. "He has also written weekly letters on just about everything—except his sponsorship of the New York City postal tube bill, which looks like it might be another Democratic scandal.

"We use the word 'scandal' advisedly because the Post Office Department canceled the contract last Thursday, and the whole matter has been turned over to the Department of Justice.

"As author of the bill authorizing the contract, Senator HUMPHREY either did or did not bother to learn about what he was proposing. If he did not bother to investigate, he was derelict in his duty as a United States Senator. If he did know about it, it is much worse.

"In any case, we will be watching for his newsletters with a great deal of interest. He has some explaining to do."

[From the Dispatch of January 6, 1954]

HUMPHREY HIT BY ETZELL PAPER

George F. Etzell, Republican State chairman, in his newspaper, the Clarissa Independent, today attacks Senator HUMPHREY editorially in connection with the New York mail-tube contract.

The $360,000 contract for 10 years was canceled recently and two trucks now transport the mail at a cost of $25,000, he reported.

HUMPHREY authored the tube bill in 1950 and when asked about it recently said he "scarcely remembered" it as he was requested to introduce it as a member of the Post Office Committee.

Etzell asks editorially "how many millions does any bill have to authorize for expenditure before Senator HUMPHREY feels it is worth remembering?"

Etzell says HUMPHREY has "written weekly letters on just about everything except his sponsorship of the New York City postal tube bill." As author of the bill "Senator HUMPHREY either did or did not bother to learn about what he was proposing," Etzell continues. "If he did not bother to investigate he was derelict in his duty as United States Senator and if he did know about it, it is much worse," the editorial continues. "HUMPHREY has some explaining to do."

[From the Minneapolis Star of January 6, 1954]

SENATOR HUMPHREY RAPPED OVER MAIL CONTRACT

CLARISSA, MINN.—George Etzell, Minnesota GOP national committeeman, suggested today that Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota) was derelict in sponsoring legislation for a contract to transmit New York City mail through pneumatic tubes.

Etzell, publisher of the Clarissa Independent, declared in an editorial that HUMPHREY "has some explaining to do" in connection with the 10-year contract, now canceled.

"The cost to the Post Office Department * * * to handle only one-fourth of the total flow between the 22 offices in New York was a million dollars a year," Etzell wrote.

"This contract last Thursday was canceled by Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield and instead, two trucks have been put on the job at a cost of $25,000 a year."

Etzell quoted press reports that HUMPHREY said he "scarcely remembered the bill."

"How many millions does any bill have to authorize for expenditure before Senator HUMPHREY feels it is worth remembering?" Etzell asked.

"As author of the bill authorizing the contract, Senator HUMPHREY either did or did not bother to learn about what he was proposing. If he did not bother to investigate he was derelict in his duty as a United States Senator.

"If he did know about it, it is much worse."

EXHIBIT 2

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
February 8, 1954.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: Within the last few weeks an editorial published in the Clarissa Independent has been distributed to all newspapers in Minnesota. It is a personal attack upon me and is a reflection upon my integrity and performance as a Member of the United States Senate. It was my original intention to ignore the editorial as a feeble attempt by the national committeeman of the Republican Party in our State to abuse his role as a journalist for partisan political advantage. In view of the wide circulation which the attack has been given I believe it necessary to set the facts straight. It is my hope that you will agree to publish this letter and thus present an accurate picture to your readers.

You will recall that I am being criticized by my political opponents for sponsoring and supporting in 1950, a bill, S. 4102, authorizing the Post Office Department to contract for the use of pneumatic tubes in the New York post office. My opponents have even gone so far as to use the word "scandal" in connection with this bill. This outrageous demonstration of irresponsible politics is being answered on the Senate floor on Monday, February 8, 1954. I am also calling for an immediate investigation of the Post Office Department's decision and the intrusion of the Postmaster General into the Minnesota political picture. In support of my decision, I have gathered the facts and the evidence from both Republicans and Democrats in the Senate. Here are the facts:

1. The New York City post office has been serviced by pneumatic tubes for 56 years—since 1898—authorized by the Congress and contracted for by the Post Office Department.

2. The most recent investigation of the efficiency of this system was made in 1948 by the Republican-controlled 80th Congress. This investigation was made by two able and experienced Republican Senators, WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, and Zales N. Ecton, of Montana, along with high officials of the Post Office Department. I was not a Member of the Congress at that time.

3. The unanimous decision of the Senate subcommittee, the Senate full committee, and both the Senate and the House of Representatives in the 80th Congress was in support of continuing the pneumatic tube service. Report No. 1241 of the Republican-controlled 80th Congress had this to say about the system:

"Today when mail matter must move quickly to meet all kinds of timetable deadlines—plane, railroad, and steamers—to insure its early delivery, the underground pneumatic-tube system is invaluable." (Rept. No. 1241, 80th Cong., 2d sess, p. 3.)

4. As a result of this investigation, the Republican-controlled 80th Congress unanimously passed a bill, S. 2510, in 1948 authorizing the Postmaster General to contract for pneumatic-tube facilities in New York at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per mile.

5. In 1949 the Post Office Department was informed that the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York which provided the pneumatic tube system with power could no longer service the nonstandard direct current for which the system was equipped. It was necessary therefore to install new equipment accepting standard alternating current. Cost of the new equipment would be $350,000.

6. The Postmaster General and the Budget Bureau came to the Congress in 1950 and asked for an increase in the rate authorization to the pneumatic tube company so that the extra expense could be amortized over a 10-year period.

7. The Vice President of the United States referred the letter from the Postmaster General to Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The chairman in turn referred the letter to me as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Post Office Affairs. In connection with my responsibility as subcommittee chairman I introduced a bill, S. 4102, on August 28, 1950. This bill did nothing more than change the existing 80th Congress law by authorizing the extra expenditure of $3,500 per mile, so that the cost of the new equipment could be amortized over a 10-year period.

8. S. 4102 was unanimously approved by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. On that committee were both Democrats and Republicans. Voting for that bill was my distinguished colleague Senator THYE who had also voted for the 80th Congress bill, S. 2510. Our committee accepted the findings of the thorough investigation which had been made by the Congress in 1948. The results of that investigation were confirmed by the reports and conversations we had with representatives of the Post Office Department including postal inspectors and technicians.

9. The bill passed the Senate unanimously with Republican leaders, Senator Taft and Senator WHERRY, giving their approval to the bill. The bill was also unanimously passed by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee of which Republican Congressman HAROLD HAGEN, of Minnesota, was a member. It was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives and became public law.

10. During the 80th, 81st, and 82d Congresses, and all other congressional sessions since 1898, the House and Senate Appropriation Committees provided funds to the Post Office Department to enter into the pneumatic tube contracts. These funds are appropriated only after careful examination.

11. It is clear from these facts that any criticism of S. 4102, is in effect a criticism not only of me but every Member of the Senate and House in both the 80th and 81st Congresses, Republicans and Democrats alike. My political opponents are attempting to smear my reputation with their criticisms, but, in this irresponsible and absured effort, are reflecting upon the integrity of the entire Congress.

12. The Postmaster General's claim of saving nearly a million dollars a year by canceling the pneumatic tube contract is in conflict with the 1948 Report of the Republican controlled 80th Congress. The Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee stated that to replace the pneumatic tube system in New York with trucks would in fact increase the cost by more than $57,000. The Senate committee, also, found the pneumatic tube service more efficient and vitally necessary for adequate postal service in New York City. Postmaster Summerfield's claims thoroughly were refuted by the 80th Congress.

I am attaching with this letter for your information and study copies of correspondence I have had with Senators LANGER and

JOHNSTON thoroughly confirming the facts as I have stated them and completely defending my position. Senator JOHNSTON after providing the background information concluded: "I consider the tactics outrageous."

Senator LANGER writes: "The criticism of you and your activities in connection with S. 4102 is totally unfounded."

It is clear to me that the decision of the Postmaster General went hand in hand with the unfair, partisan political attack made against me by the Republican National Committeeman through his newspaper editorial. This was designed to cause me political embarrassment in an election year. It is a display of political irresponsibility and disregard for the public interest. I am, therefore, asking the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to undertake an investigation of the full facts, to subpena the postal inspectors who investigated this question, and to see if the Postmaster General is guilty of dereliction of his responsibility as a public office holder.

Thank you for your fairness in opening your columns to me.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

P. S.—You will find enclosed for your own background information a brochure of materials with specific facts and photostatic documents.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the New York Times of Jan. 3, 1954]

MAIL TUBE SYSTEM GREW UP WITH CITY—DEVICE POST OFFICE NO LONGER WANTS OPENED IN 1897 WITH SOLEMNITY AND HIGH JINKS

The year was 1897. William McKinley was President, Brooklyn was still electing a mayor of its own, and in New York, where William L. Strong was mayor, crowds were gathering to find out all about a wonderful new device—a pneumatic mail tube, which the fast-growing city decided it needed to keep up to date.

The device, known as the New York Post Office Underground Pneumatic Tube System, is the one that has just fallen victim to an economy ax after serving 56 years as one of the city's most used, but least publicized, gadgets.

It was placed in operation on October 15, 1897, with a mixture of religious solemnity, old-fashioned patriotism and a brash dash of tomfoolery, if the stories handed down by historians are correct.

SOUVENIRS ON OPENING DAY

The tubes were designed to carry sealed containers of mail underground from one postal substation to another. Packed in that first container was a Bible, an American flag, and a copy of the Constitution.

In the second container was an imitation peach in tribute to Senator Chancey M. Depew, apparently a prime mover in the project, who was known affectionately as the "Peach." In the third container, as the story goes, went a black cat that scrambled out at the Custom House Substation and fled to a dark corner.

The pneumatic tube system now said to be more expensive to operate than mail trucks, is 27 miles in length. It is a pair of tubes which carry mail in opposite directions. The system originates at the general post office on 8th Avenue at 32d Street.

The tubes go north as far as the Manhattanville Substation on 125th Street, cut across town to the Triborough Substation, then swing downtown to Bowling Green, where they turn uptown again and terminate at the general post office.

The tubes are 8 inches in diameter and generally are 4 to 6 feet underground. They regularly carried 6 million pieces of mail a day in their "cars," or sealed steel containers.

MAIL SPED AT 30 MILES PER HOUR

The containers fit snugly in the tubes, are 24 inches long and weigh 21 pounds. Each container is addressed at the main post office to a specific substation. The cylinders are forced by air pressure at 30 miles an hour from one substation to the next.

At each station the tubes are examined. If their destination is further along, they are put back in the tube. The containers, which resemble the casings of artillery shells, rarely get stuck, because a lubricating container, perforated and loaded with oil, is sent through the system to keep the interior slick.

Since the Post Office Department canceled the contract of the owners and operators, the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., the question has arisen as to what possible use the tubes could be put to.

But apparently they have no alternative uses. The installations inside the main post office and the substations would have to be removed. What's left in the ground will probably stay there forever.

EXHIBIT 4

PNEUMATIC TUBE MAIL SERVICE

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1948.

The committee met at 10 a. m., in the Pillement Suite, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, Senator WILLIAM LANGER presiding.

Present: Senator LANGER (chairman) and Senator Ecton.

Also present: Mr. George D. Riley, staff director, Post Office and Civil Service Committee; Mr. Constantine D. Chrissos, secretary, Post Office and Civil Service Committee; Mr. John H. Sheehan, general superintendent of mails, New York Post Office; Mr. Charles H. Carle, assistant superintendent, post office quarters; Mr. Carl F. Dietz, president, New York Mail and Newspaper Transportation Co.; Mr. Francis D. Weeks, vice president and treasurer, New York Mail and Newspaper Transportation Co.; Mr. Joseph F. Devaney, superintendent, New York Mail and Newspaper Transportation Co.; Mr. J. Arlington Smith, assistant treasurer, New York Mail and Newspaper Transportation Co.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the record show that Senator O'Conor telephoned and said that he could not be here today but would be able to be here later in the week. Senator JOHNSTON was called to South Carolina and couldn't possibly be here. Senator THYE told me it wouldn't be possible for him to make it either. He told me that on Friday.

Mr. Riley, just what is the subject we are considering here today?

Mr. RILEY. The purpose of this meeting, Mr. Chairman, is to consider the extension of the present provisions, in new or old form, relating to the twenty-and-some-odd miles of pneumatic-tube service used by the Post Office Department and operated by Mr. Dietz and his associates. As you recall, there was legislation that went through last year which called for an extension of the present rates thrcugh the present fiscal year, at which time any new changes would become effective—so that there is a fairly comfortable amount of time here within which to make bids—I understand it takes perhaps 4 weeks or so to advertise for bids.

Mr. DIETZ. Six weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. May I see the advertisement?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir [handing same to chairman].

Mr. RILEY. At some convenient point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have this history [indicating] of the pneumatic tube operations, and the New York system in particular, inserted in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's have the advertisement and the history of the pneumatic tube service inserted in the record at this point and mark them "Exhibits 1 and 2," respectively.

Mr. RILEY. Yes, sir.

(The following statement entitled "Development of Postal Pneumatic Tube Service" was inserted into the record and marked "Exhibit 1" pursuant to the chairman's instructions:)

"DEVELOPMENT OF POSTAL PNEUMATIC TUBE SERVICE

"Following is a résumé of the development of pneumatic tube and automobile mail service 1899–1916, as set forth in Senate committee print 65th Congress, 1st session dated 1917:

" 'Pursuant to authority contained in the act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department approved July 13, 1892 (* * * to examine into the subject of a more rapid dispatch of mail matter between large cities and post-office stations and transportation terminals located in large cities by means of pneumatic tubes or other systems), with a view to ascertaining the cost and advantages of such a system, and advertisement was issued dated July 26, 1892.

" 'Eight proposals were received and a committee appointed by the Postmaster General recommended acceptance of the offer made by the Pneumatic Transit Co. of New Jersey to construct a tube line in Philadelphia between the main post office and the sub-post-office on Chestnut Street below Fourth Street, for test purposes for a period of 1 year without cost or obligation to the United States. This offer was accepted. For a period of about 1 year prior to March 1, 1894, that service was on an experimental basis without cost to the United States. Subsequent to that date, up to July 1, 1896, the service was paid for out of the appropriation for mail messenger service at the rate of $3,450 per annum. The length of the line was .055 of a mile. The appropriation bill for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1897 was the first to make specific mention of the pneumatic tubes. In connection with the allowance for mail-messenger service, it provided that a sum not exceeding $35,000 of that amount could be used for the transportation of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar device.

" 'The appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1898 authorized the expenditure out of the mail-messenger service a sum not to exceed $150,000 for the transportation of mail by pneumatic tubes. Accordingly, four contracts were let in addition to the tube service then in operation at Philadelphia for service in Boston, New York, between Brooklyn and New York and additional service in Philadelphia. The contracts were let as follows:

" 'November 27, 1896, with the Pneumatic Transit Co. for combined pneumatic tube and wagon service in Philadelphia for a term of 4 years from July 1, 1897, at $23,366 per annum, of which amount $16,966 was apportioned to the tube service.

" 'November 27, 1896, with the United States Mail, Package & General Pneumatic Delivery Co. between the general post office, Brooklyn, and general post office, New York, N. Y., for a term of 4 years from August 27, 1897, at $14,000 per annum.

" 'March 27, 1897, with the Tubular Dispatch Co. between the main post office, New York, N. Y., and Station P, also between the main office and Station H, via Station D, Madison Square and P from October 1, 1897, to June 30, 1901, at the rate of $148,500 per annum.

" 'July 1, 1897, with the Boston Pneumatic Transit Co. for combined pneumatic tube and wagon service in Boston, between the main office and the North Union Railroad Station from October 1, 1897, to June 30,

1901, at $18,000 per annum, of which amount $9,000 was apportioned to the tube service.

" 'These contracts stipulated double lines of tubes, each way, in order to permit transmittal of carriers in both directions, all contracts to expire June 30, 1901. On that date all service via pneumatic tubes was discontinued because the Congress failed to make further appropriations.

" 'Pursuant to authority contained in the Appropriation Act approved April 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 114), an advertisement dated June 1, 1902, was issued by the Postmaster General, inviting proposals for carrying the mails by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices at Boston, Brooklyn, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Chicago, and St. Louis.

" 'The contract at Boston contemplated 8.89 miles of double line 8-inch and 10-inch tubes, at an annual rate of $79,852.67; at New York, 24.653 miles at $16,799 per mile, a total of $414,145.74; at Philadelphia 7.642 miles at $17,000 per mile, a total of $129,914; at Chicago, Ill., 8.70 miles at $13,750 per mile, a total of $119,625 and at St. Louis, Mo., 3.16 miles at $15,274.37 per mile, a total of $48,267. The Boston, Mass., New York, N. Y., and Philadelphia, Pa., contracts terminated on June 30, 1906, and the Chicago, Ill., on September 30, 1907, and the St. Louis, Mo., on June 30, 1907.

" 'The annual report of the Postmaster General for the year 1905 shows full service in operation via pneumatic tubes in Boston, Brooklyn, and Chicago.

" 'An advertisement was issued on June 29, 1906, pursuant to law for service by pneumatic tubes in the cities of Boston, Brooklyn, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Kansas City, San Francisco, Chicago, and St. Louis. The term for Chicago and St. Louis was to run from July 1, 1907, to June 30, 1916, and in the other cites from October 1, 1906, to June 30, 1916.

" 'Contracts were awarded at Boston, Brooklyn, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and St. Louis, for an aggregate of 63.275 miles of double-line tubes at $16,869 per mile per annum, a total annual rate of $1,067,411.09. No proposals were received for service via pneumatic tubes from Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Kansas City, and San Francisco.

" 'These contracts were extended for a period of 6 months by the Postmaster General, in accordance with law and later extended by the Congress to June 30, 1918, in accordance with the act of March 4, 1917. All service via pneumatic tubes was discontinued on June 30, 1918, due to the fact that the Congress failed to appropriate moneys for its further operation.

" 'In accordance with authority contained in the act of June 19, 1922, according to 42 Stat. 61, service was resumed at New York, N. Y., effective October 2, 1922, to June 30, 1932, at an annual rate per mile of double line at $17,000. In accordance with the authority contained in the act referred to, the Interstate Commerce Commission increased the rate to $19,500 per mile, per annum, to become effective July 1, 1923, which is the present rate paid at New York, N. Y.

" 'Another contract was entered into at New York, N. Y., effective July 1, 1932, for a term of 2 years at the same rate per mile. The contract contained a provision permitting the Postmaster General to make three 1-year extensions, all of which have been made, the last extension terminating on June 30, 1936.

" 'Under date of April 5, 1937, the route was again advertised, with a view to reletting the contract for a period of 10 years from July 1, 1937, to June 30, 1947. However, as no proposal for service was received under the advertisement, and in order to maintain service subsequent to June 30, 1937, the Department exercised the right contained in the contract to extend the service for a period of 6 months, which will terminate on December 31, 1937. The second advertisement was issued on September 23, 1937, requesting proposals for service on said route for a period of 6 months ending June 30, 1939. Only one proposal was received, which was rejected by the Postmaster General because the proposal was not responsive to the advertisement, nor in accordance with the existing statutes relating to service via pneumatic tubes. The third advertisement, which is now pending and returnable on December 24, 1937, is for the same period—January 1, to June 30, 1938.

" 'After the termination of all contracts on June 30, 1918, the service at Boston, Mass., was not reinstated until August 1, 1926, for a 10-year period ending July 31, 1936. This contract is different from the one in effect at New York, N. Y. It is on a rental basis at the rate of $24,000 per annum, the contractor only being required to furnish the tube system and to maintain it in operating condition during the period of the contract. The United States furnishes all labor and power in connection therewith. Authority for entering into a contract on that basis is contained in the appropriation act for pneumatic-tube service for the fiscal year 1927.

" 'A new contract was consummated at Boston for a new term and under the same provisions as the former contract to run from February 1, 1937, to January 31, 1947. Under date of February 28, 1935, the postmaster at Boston advised that the annual cost of pneumatic-tube service amounted to $52,815, of which amount $24,000 is paid for the rental of the system, and the remainder for labor hire, power costs, etc.'

"The foregoing résumé takes the Boston, Mass., tube up to January 31, 1947. The contract was then extended to June 30, 1947, and again extended to July 31, 1947. An advertisement for a further term of service on this route was issued in April of 1947, but no proposals were received. A temporary contract was, therefore, made for a term of 11 months beginning August 1, 1947, and ending June 30, 1948, under authority granted in (39 U. S. C. 434) at a rate of $24,000 annually. An advertisement is now pending soliciting proposals on a contract rental basis for pneumatic tube service in Boston for a term of 1, 5, or 10 years to begin on July 1, 1948.

"It will be noted that the résumé shows the history of pneumatic tube service at New York and Brooklyn up to December 31, 1937. Thereafter, a temporary contract was made for the period January 1, 1938, to February 28, 1938, and a second temporary contract was made for the period March 2, 1938, to June 30, 1938. The next contract was for the period of July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1940, followed by one for the period July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941, and subsequently extended to June 30, 1942. The next contract period covered July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1947, and the terms of this contract were extended to December 31, 1947, and further extended by mutual agreement to June 30, 1948, at the rate of $9,382 per mile per annum. Advertisement for a term of 1, 5, or 10 years is now pending.

"The following statutes are applicable: Act of April 21, 1902 (32 Stat. 114), act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1211), act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 412), act of June 19, 1922 (42 Stat. 661, 39 U. S. C. 423).

"MARCH 26, 1948."

(The following statement entitled "Proposals for Pneumatic Tube Mail Service" was inserted into the record and marked "Exhibit 2" pursuant to the chairman's instructions:)

"PROPOSALS FOR PNEUMATIC TUBE MAIL SERVICE

"POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
"OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
"Washington, D. C., March 25, 1948.

"Proposals will be received at the office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, Washington, D. C., until 10 a. m., May 6, 1948, for furnishing a pneumatic tube system on route 507011-A, on a lease or rental basis, for use in the transmission of the mails in the Borough of Manhattan and between the New York and Brooklyn post offices, both in the city of New York, N. Y., for a period of 1 year, 5 years, or 10 years, beginning July 1, 1948, in accordance with the conditions specified in the instructions to bidders. Prospective bidders may obtain a copy of the advertisement by making application to the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, Washington 25, D. C.

"JESSE M. DONALDSON,
"Postmaster General."

The CHAIRMAN. Nobody else can bid on this but these people here, isn't that right?

Mr. RILEY. I understand that they have the only system of tubes operating——

The CHAIRMAN. Well, then, there isn't any use advertising it.

Mr. RILEY. No; there isn't much use in advertising it.

Mr. CARLE. No; except that the law requires——

The CHAIRMAN. But as a practical matter, you don't anticipate getting more than but one bid.

Mr. CARLE. Yes, sir; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have this inserted in the record [indicating] and marked "Exhibit 3."

(The following statement entitled "Advertisement Inviting Proposals for Furnishing a Tube System on a Lease or Rental Basis for Use in the Transmission of Mails by Pneumatic Tubes or Other Similar Devices at New York, N. Y., and Between the General Post Office at New York and the General Post Office at Brooklyn, N. Y." was inserted in the record and marked "Exhibit 3" pursuant to the chairman's instructions:)

"ADVERTISEMENT INVITING PROPOSALS FOR FURNISHING A TUBE SYSTEM ON A LEASE OR RENTAL BASIS FOR USE IN THE TRANSMISSION OF MAILS BY PNEUMATIC TUBES OR OTHER SIMILAR DEVICES, AT NEW YORK, N. Y., AND BETWEEN THE GENERAL POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK AND THE GENERAL POST OFFICE AT BROOKLYN, N. Y.

"POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
"Washington, D. C., March 25, 1948.

"Proposals will be received until 10 a. m., May 6, 1948.

"JESSE M. DONALDSON,
"Postmaster General."

"INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS FOR FURNISHING A PNEUMATIC TUBE SYSTEM ON ROUTE 507011-A AT NEW YORK, N. Y., INCLUDING THE GENERAL POST OFFICE AT BROOKLYN, N. Y.

"1. The pneumatic tube system contemplated by these instructions to bidders will be known as route No. 507011-A.

"2. The designation 'tube system,' as used in these instructions, contemplates the tube lines, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, carriers (mail containers), and any machinery, equipment, or device necessary to the efficient use of pneumatic tubes as a facility for the transmission of mail in the cities of New York and Brooklyn, N. Y.

"3. Any contract entered into under this advertisement shall be for a term of 1 year, 5 years, or 10 years from July 1, 1948, unless sooner annulled, or terminated, as provided for elsewhere in these instructions.

"4. The mail-handling points to be embraced on the tube system are as follows: Church Street Annex to Canal Street Station; Canal Street Station to Prince Station (Station A); Prince Station (Station A) to Old Chelsea Station (Station O); Old Chelsea Station (Station O) to General Post Office; General Post Office to Times Square Station; General Post Office to Grand Central Annex; Times Square Station to Radio City Station (Station G); Radio City Station (Station G) to Ansonia Station (Station N); Ansonia Station (Station N) to Planetarium

Station (Station W); Plantetarium Station (Station W) to Cathedral Station (Station H); Cathedral Station (Station H) to Morningside Station (Station I); Morningside Station (Station I) to Manhattanville Station (Station J); Manhattanville Station (Station J) to Triborough Station (Station L); Grand Central Annex to Lenox Hill Station (Station Y); Lenox Hill Station (Station Y) to Gracie Station (Station K); Gracie Station (Station K) to Hell Gate Station (Station U); Hell Gate Station (Station U) to Triborough Station (Station L); Church Street Annex to Cooper Station (Station D); Cooper Station (Station D) to Madison Square Station; Madison Square Station to Murray Hill Station (Station F) to Grand Central Annex; Church Street Annex to Bowling Green Station (Station P) via Wall Street Station; Church Street Annex to General Post Office, Brooklyn, N. Y.

"NOTE.—Points in parentheses are old stations that have been renamed and are now or will be in effect July 1, 1948.

"The points named above shall be connected by the shortest practicable route with double lines of pneumatic tubes not less than 8 inches in diameter, inside measurement, at the expense of the contractor, notwithstanding the designation and/or location of the said stations and annexes may be changed during the contract term; and the carriers (mail containers) shall be of uniform construction and size not less than 6⅞ inches in diameter and 21 inches in length, inside measurement.

"5. The Post Office Department will—

"(a) Allot in the premises under its control, space for the tubes, powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, and other appliances to be installed in the points on the tube system.

"(b) Provide the operators necessary to operate the tube system.

"(c) Furnish electric power necessary in connection wtih the operation of the tube system.

"6. The contractor will—

"(a) Furnish and maintain the tube system and powerplants in a satisfactory operating condition, including the personnel required therefor.

"(b) Provide the necessary powerplants of a type that can be operated by electricity, and capable of transmitting the carriers at an average speed of 30 miles per hour between points.

"(c) Make the tube system available for the transmission of mail 18 consecutive hours daily, Monday to Friday, inclusive, 6 consecutive hours on each Saturday and not exceeding a total of 36 additional hours during each month of December occurring in the contract period or any extension thereof, on a schedule to be prescribed by the Postmaster General.

"(d) Make repairs to the premises connected with the tube system resulting from damage occasioned by the installation of the tubes, powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, and devices.

"(e) Remove the tubes, powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, and devices, from the points connected on the tube system at their own expense at the expiration of the term, or the termination of the contract, if requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

"(f) Upon the discontinuance of tube service at any point connected with the system, the contractor will restore the premises upon which alterations have been made to permit of the installation of the tubes, powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, to the condition in which they were received, ordinary wear and tear expected, if requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

"7. Proposals shall be accompanied by—

"(a) A map showing the location, and as far as practicable, the streets and ways to be followed in the connection of the points to be embraced on the system, together with the distances from point to point.

"(b) A general description of the powerplants to be installed for the operation of tubes.

"(c) Plans, both profile and flat, showing the tubes, powerplants, and receiving and dispatching apparatus, and the proposed location thereof; and the manner of entering the buildings.

"(d) A statement of the distances between the several mail-handling points connected with the tube system, duly verified by a competent engineer. The distance between any two points must be by the shortest practicable route and if a detour is made, the reason therefor must be given.

"Cancellation provisions

"8. The Postmaster General may annul, cancel, terminate, and end any contract that may be entered into under this advertisement—

"(a) For repeated failure of the tube system to operate due to matters within the control of the contractor.

"(b) For repeated failure on the part of the contractor to make necessary repairs to the tube system promptly.

"(c) For failure to have the tube system in a condition for efficient operation on July 1, 1948.

"(d) For violation of the postal laws.

"(e) For refusal to discharge any persons connected with the maintenance and repair of the tube system when requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

"(f) For failure of contractor to change the location of the tube lines and receiving and dispatching apparatus made necessary by reason of the remodeling or rebuilding of the quarters in which the tube terminals are located; or by reason of the failure of the contractor to have all points embraced on the route as outlined in paragraph 4 of this advertisement, connected with the tube system, as more specifically provided for in said paragraph 4.

"(g) For failure of the Congress to appropriate funds for the operation of the system.

"(h) Whenever the contractor shall become a Member of Congress.

"(i) Whenever, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, the public interest may require.

"The contract shall be canceled, without additional compensation to the contractor, in the event of the purchase of the pneumatic tube system by the United States.

"Annulment, cancellation, termination, or ending for any of the causes recited above shall not impair the right of the Postmaster General to claim damages from the contractor or his surety, and such damages may, for the purpose of setoff or counterclaim in the settlement of any claim of said contractor or its surety against the United States, whether arising under this contract or otherwise, be assessed and liquidated by the General Accounting Office of the United States.

"Fines and deductions

"9. The Postmaster General reserves the right to deduct from the pay of the contractor, such sums as he may deem proper as a penalty for the delay, damage, or loss of mail in transit, failure to maintain the tube system in a satisfactory state of repair, or for any other cause within the control of the contractor that may impair the efficiency of the tube system.

"10. Employees of the contractor shall not handle the mails.

"11. Bidders and their sureties shall familiarize themselves with the conditions contained in these instructions before signing proposals and assuming liability thereunder as bidders and sureties.

"12. Two or more individuals or a surety company will be accepted as surety on the bond of a bidder or contractor under this advertisement.

"13. Individual sureties must make oath that they are owners of real estate worth in the aggregate, a sum totaling the amount of the bond, free and above all debts due and owing by them, and all judgments, mortgages, and executions against them, after allowing all exemptions of every character whatsoever. A married woman will not be accepted as a surety either on a bond of a bidder or on the contract.

"14. A surety company, which has complied with the provisions of the acts of August 13, 1894, and March 23, 1910, will be accepted as sole surety on the bond of a bidder or contractor under this advertisement, but the Postmaster General reserves the right to reject any surety company which, as surety on a contract, has previously refused or failed to provide service or furnish equipment as contemplated by the contract.

"15. Proposals will not be considered which are without the bond, oath, or certificate required by the acts of June 23, 1874, and August 11, 1876.

"16. Notice of the withdrawal of a proposal will not be considered unless filed in the office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General at least 24 hours prior to the expiration of the advertisement.

"17. The Postmaster General reserves the right to disregard the proposals of failing contractors and bidders and also to disregard proposals accompanied by bonds on which there appears as surety the name of a person who has been declared a failing contractor or bidder or barred from bidding for any reason whatever.

"18. The accepted bidder under this advertisement will be required to execute a contract prescribed by the Postmaster General within 30 days from the date the award is made, which shall include a stipulation that it is made subject to the Postal Laws and Regulations, Edition of 1940, insofar as they may be applicable thereto, with special reference to section 64, otherwise the bidder will be considered to have failed, and the Postmaster General may proceed to contract for the service with other parties according to law.

"19. The Postmaster General may, in his discretion, continue in force any contract entered into as a result of this advertisement beyond its express terms for a period not to exceed 6 months.

"20. Proposals submitted under this advertisement, as well as any contract entered into thereunder, shall specify the rate per annum for the rental of the entire tube system and shall be accompanied by a bond in double the amount of the annual rental stated in the bid.

"21. Payment for service on the route will commence when the entire tube system shall have been completed and accepted by the Postmaster General, and service performed according to contract.

"22. Proposals shall be enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed 'Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, Washington 25, D. C.' and endorsed 'Proposals for the Rental of Pneumatic Tubes, New York, N. Y.'

"23. The Postmaster General reserves the right to reject any or all bids received under this advertisement.

"JESSE M. DONALDSON,
"Postmaster General."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further from the Post Office Department before we hear from Mr. Dietz?

Mr. CABLE. Not unless you care to ask me any questions. I have a little statement that I have prepared that sort of highlights the thing from an operating standpoint and goes back into the history of it. I will be glad to read it or have it inserted in the RECORD, if you like, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. How long is it?

Mr. CABLE. It is only 3 or 4 pages long.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead and read it into the RECORD.

Mr. CARLE. Yes, sir.

(Mr. Carle then read the following statement into the records:)

"Mr. Chairman, the pneumatic-tube service, so far as the city of New York is concerned, had its inception in the fiscal year 1898, or 50 years ago. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1898, the records show 5.85 miles of tubes in New York City, operated at an annual cost of $168,655 or $28,829 per mile.

"Since then the number of miles of tubes operated has been generally upward, and the operating cost per mile downward.

"The Post Office Department now operates two systems of pneumatic tubes in the United States, 1 in Boston, Mass., where we operate about 1.6 miles of double lines of tubes, and at New York, N. Y., where the system consists of 26.969 miles of double lines of tubes connecting the general post office, 21 large postal stations, and the post office at Brooklyn, N. Y.

"Here in New York the service operates 17 hours a day on weekdays, except Saturdays, and 5 hours on Saturdays. There is no service scheduled on Sundays, and the holiday service is limited.

"The New York City system is rented from the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., a corporation, having executive offices in this city. The company furnishes the complete tube system and keeps it in operating condition. All labor and power necessary for the operation of the tubes and the handling of the mails thereby is provided by the Post Office Department at its expense. The current contract with the owning corporation is at the rate of $9,382 per mile of double line of 8-inch tubes, and expires on June 30, 1948.

"Currently an advertisement is pending, bids being due on May 6, 1948, for furnishing a pneumatic-tube system in the city of New York for a term of 1 year, 5 years, or 10 years, beginning July 1, 1948. Of course, no bids have as yet been received and we do not know definitely what the rate will be subsequent to June 30, 1948, or what other contract conditions may be involved.

"For budgetary purposes the operating expenses at New York, N. Y., and Boston, Mass., are included in one item of appropriation, which for the fiscal year 1948 is $700,000. The 1948 cost breakdown is as follows:

Personnel services, all of which is for the service here in New York	$377,477
Tube system rent, of which $24,000 is for Boston, Mass	277,023
Intercommunicating telephone system, which is for the New York service exclusively	4,500
Electric power, which is also for the New York service exclusively	41,000
Total	700,000

"The estimate of cost for the fiscal year 1949 is $744,700, which includes an estimated increase in personnel cost at New York, and a small increase to $11,000 a mile for tube rental at New York, a slight increase in the cost of power at New York.

"The tube service at New York performs a very important mail-handling function, connecting as it does the main post office with 21 of the larger and more important mail-handling units, and also the main post office at Brooklyn, which has no direct mail connections except with the Long Island Railroad at the Flatbush Avenue Station. Other and very important mail connections must be made at the New York, N. Y., railroad depots; and of course, the city of Brooklyn, with a population of over 3 million and postal receipts for the 1946 calendar year of $15,304,814, is dependent for its incoming mail supply on the New York post office and railroad terminals.

"The pneumatic tubes are used for the transportation of ordinary letter mail, special-delivery matter, airmail, registered mail, daily papers in limited quantities, and miscellaneous letter-sized pieces of other mail when included with the letter mails.

"The New York post office had receipts of $131,369,047 for the calendar year 1947, an increase of $1,436,497 over the previous calendar years, which will give some idea of the magnitude of the business handled.

"In connection with an investigation of the pneumatic-tube service at New York, a mail count was kept on Thursday, March 27, 1947, an average business day. The count was carefully made under the direct supervision of competent servicemen. On that day 5,871,546 pieces of mail were handled through the pneumatic tubes.

"During the period of pneumatic-tube operation 50.71 percent of the ordinary letter mail requiring transportation was transmitted by way of the tubes, and, considering the 24-hour period as a whole, 31.18 percent of the ordinary letter mail requiring transportation was transmitted through the tubes.

"Fifty-one and sixty-one one-hundredths percent, or 2,126,970 pieces of first-class mail for city delivery received from other post offices were transmitted through the tubes.

"Twenty-eight and thirty-eight one-hundredths percent, or 265,410 pieces of ordinary transit first-class mail from other post offices requiring transportation were transmitted through the tubes.

"The tubes are important to the service at New York because of traffic density, because they afford a means of obtaining a steady flow of mail to mail-handling employees at the point where they work it, thereby making the entire operation more flexible, and because they have proven to be dependable and speedy as compared with any method of surface transport.

"The Post Office Department welcomes the survey being undertaken by your committee and will endeavor, with the help of the postmaster at New York, Mr. Goldman, and his staff of supervisory employees, to furnish you with all the detailed information you may desire."

The CHAIRMAN. When did you take over this operation for the first time?

Mr. CARLE. We took over the operation for the first time in March of 1938—March 2, 1938, was when we took over the company employees on a temporary basis, and that became a regular basis on July 1, 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. What does that cost the Government?

Mr. CARLE. The personnel cost is something over $300,000 a year. Mr. Sheehan has the exact figures on that.

Mr. SHEEHAN. The salaries at New York total $320,700. The salaries at Brooklyn, $8,403.09; electric current——

The CHAIRMAN. What other costs have you?

Mr .CARLE. The costs are split into four general headings. In addition to the personnel, of course, we have the tube-system rent, which is at the rate of $9,382 a mile. Then we have to pay for the intercommunicating telephone system, which costs in the neighborhood of $4,500 a year; and the electric power, which costs in the neighborhood of $41,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. Prior to 1938 did the company pay all these costs?

Mr. CARLE. Before 1938 the company paid all the expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the rent per mile, say, in 1937?

Mr. CARLE. The figure for 1937 was—it is worked out on a fiscal-year basis—$19,488 a mile. There possibly were some deductions for fines and penalties. The financial records of the Department show that in 1937 it was operating 26.5732 miles of tubes at a cost of $517,861.93, which, on a mileage-basis rate per mile, figures out to be $19,488.

The CHAIRMAN. Now you pay $9,382 a mile?

Mr. CARLE. Yes, sir.

Senator ECTON. What was the reason that you took over the personnel and the operation of the whole system at that time?

Mr. CARLE. The operating company, as I understand it, was having—more or less—trouble with labor and didn't want any longer to be responsible for the actual operation of the tubes. It then became necessary for the Post Office Department—assuming that the Post Office Department wanted to continue the tube operations—to take over and operate it itself.

Senator ECTON. In other words, it got to the point that if the tube system was to be continued in operation, then the postal department almost had to take it over to continue it in operation.

Mr. CARLE. That's correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the number of personnel you have now?

Mr. CARLE. Approximately 144.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your average pay?

Mr. CARLE. The rates vary from $2,900 to $2,500 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, you don't expect anybody to be able to live on those salaries, do you?

Mr. CARLE. They don't seem to be very high.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are starvation wages. What is the highest salary you pay?

Mr. CARLE. $2,500 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. And your lowest is $2,000?

Mr. CARLE. Yes, sir.

I do have here somewhere a breakdown on personnel expense. [Indicating.] This breakdown I have includes some supervisory employees; and for the fiscal year 1948 the estimate shows 1 at $3,600; 3 at $3,100, 118 at $2,500, 17 at $2,200, and 4 at $2,100.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about this personnel. Are they married people—full time?

Mr. CARLE. It is a full-time operation for them.

The CHAIRMAN. Married folks?

Mr. CARLE. I guess most of them are.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Yes; most of them are married.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have they worked for the Government?

Mr. CARLE. Since 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your turnover?

Mr. CARLE. From the record, Senator, it isn't apparently too large.

Mr. SHEEHAN. It is very small.

Mr. CARLE. We are carrying one vacancy at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Bureau of Labor Statistics found out that it cost $3,347 to live in New York for a man, wife, and two children. If that is the case how can people live on $2,000 or $2,500 a year?

Mr. CARLE. It doesn't seem to be a very high salary.

Senator ECTON. How soon do you think that this tube system will have to be replaced entirely?

Mr. CARLE. Senator, I wouldn't know. We know that parts of the system have been underground for somewhere in the neighborhood of 50 years. This morning over at Grand Central Station we looked at a piece of pipe that had come out of the ground. The gentlemen who are familiar with the system thought the piece of pipe was around 40 years old and there was no noticeable wear. The pipes seem to be very economical to operate. At the beginning of the day there is put through a carrier containing a special lubricant, and it seems that when those carriers go through there isn't a great deal of wear on the pipes.

Senator ECTON. So the system has been definitely proved to be satisfactory?

Mr. CARLE. I don't believe that there can be any doubt of that. We have had very few failures in the system. It certainly saves a lot of time in transit between points as compared with motor vehicles or any other surface means.

Senator ECTON. It not only saves time but isn't it also true that it saves a lot of transportation expense?

Mr. CARLE. I believe that is true; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was your total cost last year?

Mr. CARLE. The total cost of the tube service was $653,758. That included the tube rental, the salaries, the power, and the telephone service.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you just tell us why this figure should be raised, Mr. Dietz?

Mr. DIETZ. May I go into a little historical sketch of this, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Go right ahead, Mr. Dietz, and you can take all the time you want.

Mr. DIETZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just about 10 years ago when the tube system was faced with a CIO union development, among the claims the CIO wanted and made were substantial increases in pay, for which we had no money. We took it up with the Government and the Post Office Department stated that there was no appropriation beyond what we were already being given, and there seemed to be no way in which any larger appropriation could be accomplished in order to make the higher rates of pay available to the men that they demanded.

Originally, the rates of pay per mile rental were based on a 60-hour week. Then the Post Office Department, as generally was the case in all industries everywhere—the 60-hour week became shortened gradually until finally a 40-hour week became, more or less, the established working period, and the boys, of course, wanted a correction in their pay to conform with the 40-hour-week schedule for which we were not being compensated at all. That was batted around for numbers of weeks and we had a trial period in order to try to work out a transfer from a tube operation by our company to a lease operation in order to take care of the question of unionization of the men, with an increase of roughly 30 to operate the tube system on the shortened workweek. So, we had the two things—the higher rates of pay and a substantially larger number of men in order to operate the system. Besides, there was precedent for the Government operating on a lessee basis because of Boston having already been placed on an operating-lease basis several years before then.

We were, secondarily, confronted with the expiration of a 30-year power contract with the New York Edison Co. and we were told that after April 1, 1938—I think it was—our power rates would be increased about two-thirds. Obviously, we couldn't absorb that so it just meant that we would be operating the tube system just for the pleasure of doing so and possibly going into very, very deep red and there was just no reason for our trying to continue on that basis, all of which was recognized by the then Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Purdum.

So we worked out this lease arrangement whereby the Government furnished the power and, as I understand it, the power required by the tube service was wrapped up in a general Treasury Department contract with the New York Edison Co. The details of that contract I am not familiar with.

Under those conditions we arranged an entirely new schedule of lease payments. The new rate contemplated a return to the company of $144,000 a year, which was the average for a 9- or 10-year period immediately preceding these negotiations, exclusive of depreciation and interest charges, because this company standing on its own feet was regularly in the red. When we applied depreciation and interest charges to the amount of free-money flow we had from the operations we were in the red, and it was only because the company was owned by a stronger parent that it was possible for us to get along at all. We couldn't borrow. We had no basis upon which to borrow. We loaned the company the necessary funds. So it was thought that if we had the average over a period, without being saddled with any extraneous expenditures, $144,000 a year to us—before depreciation and interest—was a basis upon which we could negotiate and agree.

That was done—and for the first few years we came around that figure—$140,000, $143,000—somewhere around that figure. However, during the last few years, due to the very sharp rise in costs we are nowhere near the $144,000-a-year figure. I think last year it was $104,000. The year before that it was lower, so that over the period of the last 5 years, actually multiplying $144,000 by 5 for that 5-year period, we have a substantial deficit in relationship to what was expected, and that was one of the reasons why the figure we first put in about 5 or 6 months ago—merely as an expression of opinion of what we should have—was as high as it was because we added into our operating expense—in recalculating the expense—the deficiency which we felt we were entitled to, although there was no contractual obligation on the part of the Government to make that guaranty. However, we felt that we were giving the Post Office Department a very much heavier service than before because the mail tonnage, as you know, did increase hugely during the war. Obviously, the wear and tear was greater and we felt that a reimbursement was not an unfair thing for the Government to consider. However, I think probably Mr. Myers is quite right when he makes the statement that there was no provision in the contract—no obligation—and it probably would be pretty difficult to establish the adjustment on that basis, although I would like to have that considered and I think it is fair.

These systems have been operated with a great measure of efficiency and I don't think we have paid a fine in the past 5 years, although if the system fails and the work stops we are fined on the basis of 30 minutes or over. I think we can well contend that the system has been a pretty good service system.

We are today at the point where we feel that any new price should be reflected at a rate of $144,000 to us per year. In launching into the matter of economics I figure that on a basis of a 60-cent dollar it should be a lot more than that because as we all know the value of the dollar has fallen considerably while our replacement charges are, of course, tremendously higher than they ever were before. Our tube failures fortunately were very little but the costs of replacement are manyfold what the costs were even in the middle thirties on those items. Our carrier costs today are up at least 60 percent over the carrier costs in the late thirties and early forties. Those rings I showed you, Mr. Chairman, are now quoted at double what we paid for them in the last few years. This necessarily means that our operating costs—because of economic conditions—are substantially higher and will be higher than they ever have been before and we feel that that request for proper consideration of those elements is a pretty reasonable one.

Now, on top of that we have this very unfortunate situation of Consolidated Edison having advised the Treasury Department, with whom the contract for power runs, that at the end of daylight saving in 1948 they will no longer be able to furnish us direct current for our 11 powerplants. That, of course, could be disastrous and it is almost unthinkable that that period should arrive.

The contract calls for the Government furnishing power to the station equipment as presently exists and which is a direct-current requirement. Alternating current, in itself, is not desirable. We do have it in Boston but it is not a flexible means of operating that equipment. Direct current is flexible. We can operate up to 20, 24, 26 pounds at will in case any obstruction does occur. We consulted the two major power companies as to what method is the best for doing the job. It is agreed that an attempt to put alternating current motors on our compressors is a terrifically major job because there is nothing standard that will fit into those particular structures. The only practical way is to provide motor generator sets—a motor generator set consisting of a motor receiving alternating current and then converting the alternating current through a generator—on the same shaft with the direct current and hooking right straight into the panel boards presently existing.

Senator ECTON. Could you manage this conversion for all 11 stations by 1 central plant, Mr. Dietz?

Mr. DIETZ. It could be done, sir, but it would require a tremendous amount of special wiring to be run under the streets. In New York you are not permitted to run wires above the surface—and we would have to get franchises and it would be a terrific job. We would have to tear up the streets.

Senator ECTON. The only practical way is to have a unit right at each station?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir.

Senator ECTON. That would be 11 altogether?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir.

(Off-the-record conversation.)

Mr. DIETZ. On top of that the Edison Co. has advised the Treasury Department that before the end of the daylight saving period in 1948 they want to make these changes at the general post office at Vesey Street and also at one of the intermediate stations right up here on the East Side—station K—on 87th Street. It ties up the whole system, crosstown and up the East Side.

They have not made a very detailed study as to price costs but they have thrown out some figures and the cost of that change-over seems to run somewhere in the neighborhood of $200,000 to $275,000.

Senator ECTON. This is a change from d. c. to a. c.?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir; and they give us a delivery time of a year. Now, whether that still prevails I am not too sure, because we haven't discussed this matter with them for at least 3 or 4 months but there may be a little easing off on the time period. Oh, yes, another point was that station changes, of course, would again be at Government expense as it now is provided for in our contract.

Another point that we never have been happy with under the operating contracts was that while we were tied into the service for X years—whatever the contract would call for—it was always provided that at the Government's discretion service could be stopped momentarily and that did happen to us in 1918, and we were down for 4 solid years. We have felt that a contract of that sort should be bilateral and not unilateral.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you have to stop?

Mr. DIETZ. By direction of Mr. Burleson, and for what reason, I don't know. Then the systems in New York and Boston were reinstated in 1922. Philadelphia, St. Louis, and Chicago never were reinstated.

The CHAIRMAN. You must know why Mr. Burleson had the system stopped.

Mr. DIETZ. No, I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean to tell this committee that an order just stopping this system was issued.

Mr. DIETZ. That has been my understanding.

Mr. WEEKS. I think the contract was running out. My recollection is that the contract was running out sometime in 1917 and under that contract it had the usual 6 months and 6 months possible for the Post Office Department to continue operations but then there were some hearings that took place at that time comparing this service with truck service and then we got the word that at the conclusion of the extended period there would be no renewal.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you tell us about that, Mr. Carle?

Mr. CARLE. I am not, as I said, connected with that division and I don't know that back history, but I would be glad to furnish it to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to have that for the record.

Mr. CARLE. We will supply that for you, Mr. Chairman.

(Off-the-record conversation.)

The CHAIRMAN. Have you a chart there showing the cost each year?

Mr. CARLE. Yes, sir [handing same to chairman].

The CHAIRMAN. You haven't got it for 1941, 1942——

Mr. CARLE. That chart carries us up until sometime in 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you the cost for 1939, 1940, 1941, and so on?

Mr. CARLE. There was a contract from January 1, 1938, until February 28, 1938, at $19,000 a mile for 27 miles of tubes at that time. Beginning March 2, 1938, a contract was made running until June 30, 1938, at $8,800 a mile—27 miles of tubes. Then between July 1, 1938, and June 30, 1940, the contract was at the rate of $9,649 a mile, which included $267 a mile for a change in one of the stations. Then from July 1, 1940, until June 30, 1941, then extended to June 30, 1942, the contract rate was the same as at present, $9,382 a mile.

I will get an up-to-date chart for you, Mr. Chairman, and submit it for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Carle, we would really like to have that.

Mr. Dietz, have you a chart showing the amount of money you made or lost each year up to the present time?

Mr. DIETZ. Oh, yes, Mr. Weeks can give us that information.

Mr. WEEKS. During the period from 1938 until 1940—the contract period—our expenses, actual expenses, excluding interest and depreciation charges were approximately $111,300. The contract rate of $9,382 a mile would give us a rental of $253,000, which meant a net return of $141,729.94.

The CHAIRMAN. How big an investment was this?

Mr. DIETZ. The original cost of the system in New York was about $4 million—just under $4 million.

Mr. WEEKS. In the year 1940—that is, before depreciation—in the calendar year 1940 our actual costs were $117,191.26.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you taking care of depreciation each year?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How much depreciation would it amount to?

Mr. WEEKS. We are permitted to depreciate—under agreement with the Board of Tax Appeals—the tube lines were permitted a rate of 2 percent per annum.

The CHAIRMAN. What did they allow depreciation on?

Mr. WEEKS. Underground street construction 2 percent.

Of the original cost in New York, $1,191,806.74 is nondepreciable cost upon which they have never permitted any depreciation.

Senator ECTON. That was left out in this chart that shows your annual cost and your rate per mile up to 1938. That isn't included in these figures, is it? [Indicating.]

Mr. WEEKS. No; these figures are excluding all depreciation charges.

Senator ECTON. Then I wondered if you had the annual cost, the rates per mile since 1938 up to 1948.

Mr. WEEKS. I have those figures here.

Senator ECTON (indicating). This chart shows the annual cost average around 516 or 517 thousand dollars annually, and your rate per mile something over $19,000. Well, the postal system, as I understand it, took over the personnel in 1938. Therefore the last 10 years your operating cost would necessarily be considerably less than the previous years.

Mr. WEEKS. That's correct.

Senator ECTON. And your rate per mile would be less, and I wondered if you had a chart that would show the difference during the last 10 years over the previous years?

Mr. DIETZ. If we haven't those charts, we will prepare them and get them to you.

Senator ECTON. Mr. Chairman, I think we should have them.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you get what Senator Ecton has asked for, Mr. Dietz?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, we will.

Senator ECTON. I think we should have the tabulation for the record.

Mr. DIETZ. We will get it for you, Senator ECTON.

The CHAIRMAN. Who really owns this thing?

Mr. DIETZ. The parent company is the Lamson Corp. of Delaware, which owns the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co.——

The CHAIRMAN. Who are the stockholders in the Lamson Corp.?

Mr. DIETZ. There are 2,400 of them, no one holding more than 10 percent except one holder. The next larger interest is somewhere between 7 and 8 percent and all the rest is scattered all over the Eastern States.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that stock on the curb?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir; and on the Boston Exchange.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the quotations on the——

Mr. DIETZ. On the common around $8 and on the preferred around 41 or 42—that is a $50 stock.

The CHAIRMAN. And now you are in arrears in payment of interest?

Mr. DIETZ. No, sir; we have no loans—no arrearages on the preferred.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to see your last 3 or 4 reports.

Mr. DIETZ. I would be very happy to furnish them.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose the reports are audited by auditors each year.

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What dividends have you paid on the common?

Mr. DIETZ. The common earned $2.06 and we paid a $1 dividend.

The CHAIRMAN. What surplus have you?

Mr. DIETZ. About one million, seven or eight——

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been paying $1 right along each year?

Mr. DIETZ. No, sir; 75 cents the year before, but that did not come out of the tube-system service. That came out of the Lamson operations which run about seven and a half million.

The CHAIRMAN. I am talking about the tube system.

Mr. DIETZ. I would say that the tube system as a service is a losing proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. It is?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir. It is not an attractive part of our business.

The CHAIRMAN. How many States does the Lamson Co. operate in?

Mr. DIETZ. All of them.

(Off-the-record conversation.)

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you to say that this company has lost money right along?

Mr. DIETZ. When all the charges are against us there is no doubt about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Then why do you keep on doing business?

Mr. DIETZ. I have often wondered about that myself.

Mr. WEEKS. Here are the figures for 1932 to 1936 [indicating].

The CHAIRMAN. Does it give you the losses?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; after interest and depreciation costs.

The CHAIRMAN. Even though the Government took over the personnel and paid the labor you haven't made any money?

Mr. WEEKS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You certainly made interest on your money; didn't you?

Mr. WEEKS. Not a proper amount; not a proper rate of interest.

The CHAIRMAN. But you certainly made some money.

Mr. WEEKS. There has been a cash benefit.

Mr. DIETZ. The operations of this company entirely by itself and free from Lamson, with its interest charges on borrowed money, notes and unpaid bonds would always show red.

The CHAIRMAN. If you had no borrowed money—if you actually had it paid off in 1938—you must have made money.

Mr. DIETZ. But it wasn't all paid off.

(Off the record conversation.)

The CHAIRMAN. Assuming you were clear of debt, how much have you made, would you say?

Mr. WEEKS. After interest and depreciation charges there was a net loss of $6,569.23—that is, yielding 3-percent interest on the indebtedness, so that you might say that if the interest rate was slightly under 3 it would be an even break—so we are getting less than 3 percent.

Senator ECTON. That is on the indebtedness and not the investment.

Mr. WEEKS. The indebtedness; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you state how much you would have to get from the Government in order to get 6 percent——

Senator ECTON. I wouldn't say that the entire committee would want to guarantee that. They wouldn't think 6 percent is excessive but this is a business deal and I think the committee would realize that these gentlemen have a system to operate here and that if a new contract is entered into it might be worked out to the benefit of both sides, without unnecessary and undue expenses. I don't want to be bound——

The CHAIRMAN. We are not bound by it.

Senator ECTON. I don't want to be on the record as saying that I think 6-percent interest on this investment is excessive because it certainly is not.

Mr. WEEKS. Postmaster Farley, back in 1935, made a recommendation—and I think there was a bill introduced in Congress at that time, the McCormick bill—that was to consider the purchase of the tube lines at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Consider the purchase——

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; and the company at that time was proposing to the Government that they buy it if they wanted it. We have always considered right from the start that that was the logical thing. I think it was originally put in with the thought of Government purchase. We never contemplated originally operating these tubes. It was an experimental development back in 1900 and the original thought was, and it was the recommendation at that time, that if it proved successful that the Government would purchase them.

The CHAIRMAN. How does the cost of pneumatic-tube service compare to delivery with trucks?

Mr. CARLE. The cost at the present rate of rental, according to the latest figures we have, is $57,000 a year less than comparable truck service would cost.

The CHAIRMAN. Pneumatic-tube service is $57,000 a year less?

Mr. CARLE. At the present rate of rental; yes, sir.

Senator ECTON. Let me ask you this, Mr. Dietz: In explaining the motor down there to me this morning you indicated that it was almost—I don't know if you said it was absolutely impossible—to change the motor in there to use a. c. current instead of d. c. current.

Mr. DIETZ. In the same relative position that the motor is in today.

Senator ECTON. Yes; I got it from you that it was impractical and almost an impossibility.

Mr. DIETZ. That's correct, and we limit the flexibility by so doing. D. c. current has a double range of speeds. A. c. current does

not. If a. c. current went in we would have to have special relays that would control the relative speed from point to point. We wouldn't have the flexibility that we have today. [To Mr. Devaney:] How many of those relays have we in Boston?

Mr. DEVANEY. I think it is three.

Mr. DIETZ. It is not a practical thing.

Mr. DEVANEY. No; it isn't.

Senator ECTON. How would the cost of the two systems compare if it were practical? Do you have an idea?

Mr. DIETZ. I should think it would be more expensive——

Senator ECTON. To change from a. c. than it would be to put in a motor-generator set and transfer the a. c. from the d. c. current and use your present equipment.

Mr. DIETZ. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Ecton, you and I pretty much agree that they should have fair compensation for the work that they are performing.

Senator ECTON. Senator, I think that you and I and the rest of the members of the committee want to at least try to do what is fair and reasonable.

Mr. DIETZ. We appreciate that sentiment very much, indeed.

Of course, you understand that it is our responsibility to provide a high standard of maintenance and operation, with ample inspections, and to be ready at a moment's notice for any emergency and operate at any time according to the requirements of the Post Office Department.

We do throw in at the end of each year, by arrangement with the Post Office Department, an additional service to take care of Christmas mail, for which we get no compensation.

Mr. DEVANEY. That's right; the 2 Saturdays preceding Christmas we operate 12 hours additional and 12 hours the Sunday preceding Christmas—36 hours' extra time each year.

Mr. SHEEHAN. That's correct. That has been the standard practice under these contracts.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you get paid from the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co.?

Mr. DIETZ. My salary comes right from Lamson.

Mr. WEEKS. We make a service charge against that corporation because we run all their books.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the total of that amount?

Mr. WEEKS. $5,900 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean to say that the total amount is $5,900 that this New York Mail & Transportation Co. pays to the Lamson Co.?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes; just $5,900 for the officers. They have some employees of their own. I believe they have 18 employees.

Lamson charges the New York Mail Co. for the responsibility that I have toward New York Mail as president of both companies and it gets its compensation for that service of $5,900 for whatever Mr. Smith, Mr. Weeks, and I do for New York Mail.

Mr. WEEKS. And that includes all the audits, accounting services, payment of all bills and so on. The operating end of the business Mr. Devaney and all the servicemen and maintenance crew are——

The CHAIRMAN. How much does that amount to?

Mr. WEEKS. We have it broken down by operating expenses.

Mr. SMITH. We don't have the salaries listed.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you get us those figures?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DIETZ. And the charge that we make for the services that we render?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DIETZ. We will furnish those figures to you.

The CHAIRMAN. Did I understand you to say, Mr. Carle, that the highest-priced man in the Postal Department in connection with this matter is getting $3,600 a year?

Mr. CARLE. One foreman at $3,600; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is out of a total of 144 men?

Mr. SHEEHAN. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. How can you get any first-class help for $300 a month, I would like to know.

Mr. CARLE. I don't know, sir. I believe those are statutory rates, are they not, Mr. Sheehan?

Mr. SHEEHAN. That's right, Public Laws 134 and 386.

The CHAIRMAN. How can you get men to work that cheap?

Mr. SHEEHAN. They are servicemen. Of course, they can go elsewhere but they feel that they have certain privileges like vacations, sick leave, security retirement——

Mr. CARLE. The real truth of it is that most of us can't do very much else.

Senator ECTON. It is definite employment and definite pay and you consider that that has a value.

Mr. CARLE. Yes.

Senator ECTON. And pensions and vacation benefits, sick-leave benefits, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. CARLE. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. When the President in 1932 put in his Economy Act they did decrease them; did they not?

Mr. SHEEHAN. Yes; we were furloughed for a long time until the present administration came in, when Mr. Farley became Postmaster General.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, times were better than when he came in.

Mr. SHEEHAN. That's right.

Mr. CARLE. After a person has been in the service 30–35 years—I have something around 31 years—I feel that the retirement privilege is worth the little difference I might be able to get if I should go out and work commercially. That's the way I feel about it personally.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I am in 43 years.

The CHAIRMAN. With this high cost of living, you can hardly break even.

Mr. CARLE. It makes it tough scratching sometimes, Senator.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, we would be glad to have any investigators come in and examine thoroughly all of our figures, costs, and everything else, but we think that as far as original costs—investment in the business and in the tube lines and so forth are concerned—it is all a part of Government records. You've got the Bankhead reports where there is a complete survey of all the original costs, not only by the Post Office Department but by the ICC and the Treasury Department and the figures have been gone over.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you submitted an estimate or a bid, Mr. Dietz?

Mr. DIETZ. We have had some very informal discussions with Mr. Myers and we have reduced some of it to writing. We have three alternates in the absence of any advertisement by the Government so there was nothing official by this. Mr. Myers said he can't even consider it because there isn't any appropriation, and all he has today is the same rate that we have had for the last 5 years, and with all these other provisions that have always been irksome to us, that is all the authority he has at the present time, and he said that in his opinion—and I think we agree—it is going to require legislation unless the Post Office Department can reshuffle its own expenditures so that a large portion of the overall appropriation may flow to this service. If that is not possible, then legislation may possibly be required. The last figure we made was close to $11,000 per year per mile—that is an increase from our present $9,382. I am not so sure that since September—when this letter was written—that it isn't going to be necessary to revise these figures somewhat because we have suffered some increases in cost since September.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read part of this contract, if I may——

The CHAIRMAN. Go right ahead, Mr. Dietz.

Mr. DIETZ. Thank you, sir. [Reading:]

"It is mutually understood and agreed that the Postmaster General will—

"First. Allot, in the premises under the control of the Department, space for the installation of the tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus and other appliances necessary in connection with the use of the tube system.

"Second. Provide the man power (operators) necessary to operate the tube system, together with the necessary telephone switchboard and the supervisors.

"Third. Furnish electric power necessary for the operation of the tube system.

"Fourth. Accord access to the post offices for the employees of the contractor for the purpose of maintenance, repair, and inspection of the tube system and equipment."

Then:

"It is further stipulated and agreed that the Postmaster General may annul, cancel, and terminate this contract for—

"(a) Repeated failure of the tube system to operate due to conditions within the control of the contractor.

"(b) Repeated failure on the part of the contractor to make necessary repairs to the tube system promptly.

"(c) For failure to have the tube system in a condition for efficient operation on July 1, 1942, or within a reasonable time thereafter, the contractor having failed to exercise due diligence in constructing the system.

"(d) Violation of the postal laws and the several acts of Congress relating to post offices and post roads and such regulations as are incorporated in the postal laws and regulations, edition of 1940.

"(e) Refusal of contractor to discharge any person employed by the contractor in connection with the maintenance and repair of the tube system, when requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

"(f) For failure of the Congress to appropriate funds for the operation of the system.

"(g) Whenever the contractor shall become a Member of or Delegate to Congress.

"(h) Whenever, in the opinion of the Postmaster General, the public interest requires it."

The CHAIRMAN. What does that last paragraph mean?

Mr. DIETZ. I don't know what it means.

We don't like to enter into a long-term contract with that sort of thing hanging over our heads. Furthermore, the contract provides 5 years—but if at any time Congress fails to appropriate the money the contract is null and void. All the Postmaster General needs to do under the provisions of this contract is to fail to ask for the appropriation and at the end of the fiscal year we are through—our whole organization is thrown right out in the street. So, I see no reason why there shouldn't be a biparty contract entered into which would be agreeable to both parties. I think this whole thing requires a reshuffling to be consummate with the times.

Senator ECTON. Has that general provision always been in there?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir.

Senator ECTON. I wondered whether or not it was in all Government contracts.

Mr. DIETZ. I don't know.

Mr. CARLE. I haven't had a chance to find out whether there is any basic law that requires that provision in the contract and I am unable to say at the present time. That would be a question for legislation if it is a law.

Mr. WEEKS. There is another provision in the contract which we are not in favor of and that is that in the event service ceases at the termination of the contract if the Post Office Department asks us to do so, we will have to tear out all terminal equipment out of the post offices and restore the post offices to the condition they were in prior to the installation of the equipment at our expense.

When the service went out in 1918 all of this terminal equipment machinery, terminals, receiving and dispatching apparatus, everything was, I believe, torn out of the post offices and when it went back in 1922 or 1923 all of that had to be put back in again.

Senator ECTON. You mean to say that you tore all that out and reinstalled it?

Mr. WEEKS. That's right. There was no provision in the contract to reimburse us for that and my recollection is that it cost the company around $350,000 to do that work. Neither Mr. Dietz nor I were with the company then.

We don't say that that isn't a proper provision in the contract, but we feel that if that provision is in there then the rental that is now paid should contemplate paying us something to build up some means of doing it. If we were faced with that situation tomorrow I wouldn't say that it would break this company but the company is insolvent now and it has been for several years. The only way we can get a bond now on our present contract is for the parent company to guarantee the performance——

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever pay in all this money, this $4 million, was that ever paid in or was it financed from the very beginning?

Mr. WEEKS. I can say this, Senator: There was quite an expansion of the mileage here in New York in 1912 and also some extensions in Boston and other cities and the mail tube companies at that time were unable to finance that. They couldn't borrow any money. They had defaulted. The bonds hadn't paid any interest. The only way that they could get the money to do that was for the money to come out of the parent company, Lamson, so that at that time Lamson, or the parent company, which was then American Pneumatic Service Co., sold one and a half million first preferred stock and the whole purpose of that financing at that time was to raise the funds to put in the extension of lines so that the present preferred stock that the parent company now pays dividends on is really money which they raised at that time to expand the lines and then they loaned it to the operating company on notes. The parent company has a 6-percent cumulative stock and it pays its stockholders 6 percent for that money but on the intercompany notes they collect 3 percent on those notes.

On all of these items we would welcome any Government group of any kind to investigate this tube history and all our books and accounts. All we ask is what is considered to be a fair return, but we feel that there are some inequities in the present contract.

(Off-the-record conversation.)

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Ecton, do you have any questions?

Senator ECTON. No, Mr. Chairman; I don't believe I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Riley, do you have any questions you would like to ask?

Mr. RILEY. I have 1 or 2, Mr. Chairman. [To Mr. Dietz.] You do a job for the railroads, I believe, where the tube is somewhat smaller than this, isn't that right, Mr. Dietz?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes; 5½ inches.

Mr. RILEY. What kind of rate do you have on that job?

Mr. DIETZ. It is an outright sale.

Mr. RILEY. On these capital changes, including a changeover to converters or transformers—or even new motors—is that in your bid anywhere?

Mr. DIETZ. I haven't read the specifications. I don't believe it is in the advertisement. It doesn't make any reference to it there.

Mr. RILEY. That would seem to call for a separate appropriation then.

Mr. DIETZ. Undoubtedly.

Mr. RILEY. Do you have a cost figure in mind?

Mr. DIETZ. I think it would run somewhere from two hundred to two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. RILEY. In other words, you are right up against this changeover and even if you didn't get relief here, somebody would have to still pay for the conversion, isn't that right, Mr. Dietz?

Mr. DIETZ. That's right.

Mr. RILEY. So that that would be a companion piece in the legislation no matter what is done in this case?

Mr. DIETZ. That's right.

Mr. RILEY. What is, in your opinion, a fair return on your layout here?

Mr. DIETZ. Eleven thousand dollars per year per mile, and I told Mr. Myers a while ago that some items of increase have come in since September which might require an adjustment of perhaps a few hundred dollars.

(Off-the-record conversation.)

Mr. RILEY. I wonder how the gentlemen would feel about the cost-plus plan?

Mr. DIETZ. I think we would be——

Mr. WEEKS. The only way to approach this would be for the Government and the company to sit down and figure out what is a proper return and from that point the annual rental should be adjusted accordingly. That, I think, would be the proper way to approach this problem.

Mr. RILEY. Where do you get your standby crews to clear up your obstructions in the lines?

Mr. DIETZ. I think Mr. Devaney can answer that question, Mr. Riley.

Mr. DEVANEY. We don't have any standby crews. Repairs are made by our maintenance crew. If we should have repairs in the street of any considerable size, it becomes necessary to hire extra men in order to augment our maintenance force.

Mr. DIETZ. Mr. Chairman, may I ask you for your guidance on this thing? The Post Office Department has put out a bid on which returns must be made before May 6. If we fail to have them, the Post Office Department, under statutes, must again advertise for a period of 6 weeks. If we fail to come to some preliminary understanding, it would be completely devastating in view of this ending of the contract, beyond which the Post Office Department has no money to pay for the tube service. Secondly, we have this terrifically difficult question of power. Now, perhaps, the Treasury Department——

The CHAIRMAN. I think those matters should be taken up with the Post Office Department——

Mr. CARLE. Those matters are certainly ones that I personally would want to talk to Mr. Myers and Mr. Buckley about.

Mr. DIETZ. Well, then, Mr. Chairman, as you suggested, all of these points that we have discussed today will be matters for us to adjust with the Post Office Department, I take it?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, indeed; and then the Post Office Department can come before our committee for any remedial legislation.

Mr. DIETZ. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Dietz.

APPENDIX

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER,
New York, N. Y.

NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDERGROUND POST OFFICE

For almost 50 years the New York Post Office has operated an underground service to speed the delivery of 5 million pieces of mail daily. This pneumatic tube service is the only one of its kind in the United States. Boston has a very short pneumatic tube system between the North and South stations, and there was formerly a short tube in Chicago. However, they do not compare with the New York pneumatic tube system.

The tubes are mammoth replicas of those in department stores and form a network that links virtually all of Manhattan's post office stations. They tunnel 4 to 6 feet below the street surface, going above ground to cross the Brooklyn Bridge.

There are approximately 27 miles of double-track tube lines. Mail is placed in huge projectile-like carriers—steel cylinders whose outside dimensions are 24 inches long and 8 inches in diameter. Inside they measure about 22 inches long and 7 inches in diameter. Weighing approximately 21 pounds, each cylinder has a capacity of 9 pounds and holds some 400 to 500 letters. It is possible to dispatch them at 12-second intervals. These carriers are slightly smaller than the tubes so that they may be shot forward by compressed air from colossal pumps.

The nerve center of the system is at the general post office in Manhattan. Approximately 27 miles of double-track tubes criss-cross Manhattan and link 22 substations together, and with the general post office at Brooklyn, N. Y., there are 23 points connected with the tube service.

From the Battery they shoot over to the main post office in Brooklyn and in Manhattan some of the lines are on the subway roof, others are below it. They go down 12 feet under the Chrysler Building, and about 18 feet under Grand Central. The average speed of the tubes is about 30 miles an hour.

The system is a private invention and is not owned by the Government, but is leased annually. The company keeps it in working order, but the post office supplies the manpower to operate it. The tubes operate from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. every day, except Saturday, when they close down at 10 a. m. They are not in operation on Sundays or legal holidays. On a full day the pneumatic-tube lines carry approximately 95,000 tube carriers. An outside label shows the destination of each carrier and it is not opened until it reaches the proper destination.

A number of test carriers are sent through the tube lines before regular operation starts. Pressure in the lines is from 3 to 8 pounds per inch.

Today when mail matter must move quickly to meet all kinds of timetable deadlines—plane, railroad, and steamer—to ensure its early delivery, the underground pneumatic-tube system is invaluable. Without it the post office would have to operate a larger fleet of trucks to transport the mail.

Pneumatic-tube service is used for the transportation of ordinary letter mail, air mail, special-delivery mail, registered mail, daily newspapers in limited quantities, and miscellaneous letter-size pieces.

Pneumatic-tube service is dependable inasmuch as it is not affected generally by street surface traffic or by weather conditions.

The present pneumatic-tube system has a distinct value as a medium of transportation for first-class mail because of the effectiveness of the system, connecting as it does 23 points including the general post office in Brooklyn, thus establishing a circular system converging at Church Street Station, provision being made for a crosstown service between east and west side lines, from the general post office to Grand Central Station, and from Manhattanville to Triborough Stations.

SEPTEMBER 5, 1947.

Re route No. 507011–A, New York City.

FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
United States Post Office,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with your verbal request for proposals covering pneumatic-mail-tube service over route No. 507011–A

at New York, N. Y., and between the general post office at New York and the general post office at Brooklyn, N. Y., subsequent to December 31, 1947, we desire to submit herewith the following:

PROPOSAL I

For the 6 months' period January 1 to June 30, 1948, inclusive, we suggest that the service be continued under the mutual-agreement provision at the end of paragraph 9, page 6, contained in the existing contract dated June 16, 1942, and hereby notify you of our consent to such extension.

PROPOSAL II

For service subsequent to June 30, 1948, we propose any 1 of the following 3 alternates:

Alternate A

The undersigned will lease to the Post Office Department its system of pneumatic tubes consisting of 26.969 miles of double 8-inch tubes, together with powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, carriers (mail containers) and machinery and equipment necessary for the operation thereof for the transmission of the mails to provide the same service as is now provided under the existing contract, for a period of one (1) year beginning July 1, 1948, at a monthly rental equivalent to an annual rate of $11,000 per year per mile of double tube. The general terms and conditions of the contract to be generally the same as those in the present contract dated June 16, 1942, except more specifically—

(a) There is to be no option to extend the period of the contract beyond June 30, 1949, and

(b) If the service is discontinued by the Post Office Department at the expiration of the contract there shall be no obligation upon the lessor to remove its equipment from the post offices where now located and restore the premises to their former condition, unless it is provided that the lessor shall be fully reimbursed by the Government for the cost of such removal and restoration.

In the event of any interruption in service either during conversion of the equipment from direct to alternating current or due to failure on the part of the Government to provide direct or alternating current, the lessor is to suffer no loss in rental as a result of such interruption in service.

(c) The lessor is to be either completely relieved of or fully reimbursed by the Government for the cost of any changes in the location of tube lines or station equipment which may be required to be made during the life of the contract.

Alternate B

Same as Alternate A except that the term of the contract is to be for a period of ten (10) years, equally binding upon the Government as on the lessor, beginning July 1, 1948, and the annual rental rates to be as follows:

(a) For the first year a monthly rental equivalent to an annual rate of $11,000 per year per mile of double tube.

NOTE.—This rate is based upon estimated operating and maintenance costs aggregating $152,659, plus $144,000 to cover depreciation, interest, and return on investment. While this $144,000 figure was not considered adequate it was, however, a figure agreed upon by the Post Office Department and this corporation in 1938 when the lease contract of June 29, 1938, was negotiated.

(b) For the second and each succeeding year of the contract the rental shall be paid monthly but the total annual rate will be adjusted upward or downward as the total actual operating and maintenance costs of an immediately preceding year vary from $152,659.

Alternate C

If an inspection of the property, a study of the service, and an analysis of possible savings by Government officials indicate that it would be in the best interests of the Government to acquire title to the pneumatic-tube system as at July 1, 1948, or at any time thereafter, New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. will be prepared to enter into negotiations toward that end.

The foregoing is submitted in the expectation that it will meet your present requirements which we understand are largely for budgetary purposes. We have not attempted to outline in full all the details which we expect would have to become part of any formal contract, all of which we believe could be negotiated without difficulty through further discussions with your office.

Very truly yours,

NEW YORK MAIL & NEWSPAPER TRANSPORTATION CO.,
CARL F. DIETZ, *President.*

APRIL 16, 1947.

Hon. E. B. JACKSON,
Chief Clerk and Director of Personnel, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: As directed by you at the meeting held at this office of the committee appointed for the purpose of making an investigation as to the need for the continuation of the pneumatic-tube service for a term of years beginning July 1, 1947, under a new contract, a report is submitted herewith together with the data accumulated and compiled for use in connection with the study being made.

The present contract for pneumatic-tube service on route 57011-A at New York, N. Y., expires June 30, 1947. The contractor is the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. of 101 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. At the present time the cost of the mileage is $9,382 per mile of double 6-inch tubes per annum, on a total mileage of 26.9690 miles. The total cost under the present contract is $253,023.158 per annum.

The service is performed on week days, Monday to Friday, inclusive, from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. (17 hours), and on Saturdays from 5 a. m. to 10 a. m. (5 hours). No service is performed on legal holidays; January 1 (New Year's Day), February 22 (Washington's Birthday), May 30 (Memorial Day), July 4 (Independence Day), first Monday in September (Labor Day), November 11 (Armistice Day), Thanksgiving Day in the latter part of November, and December 25 (Christmas Day). During the present contract the actual operation of the pneumatic-tube service has been performed by post office employees, the operation of the pneumatic tubes having been taken over by the Post Office Department under date of July 1, 1938.

Conforming with the carrier delivery service performed on local legal holidays, namely, February 12 (Lincoln's Birthday), October 12 (Columbus Day), and the Tuesday following the first Monday in November (election day), the pneumatic tubes are operated part of the day, from 5 a. m. to 10 a. m. (5 hours).

The points connected with pneumatic-tube service include the general post office and 21 stations located in the Borough of Manhattan, and the general post office at Brooklyn, N. Y. These 23 points together with the distance between them are as follows:

Lines	*Length (miles)*
Church Street Station to Canal Street Station	0.7485
Canal Street Station to Station A	.4908
Station A to Station O	1.6002
Station O to General Post Office	1.3196
General Post Office to Times Square Station	.8774
General Post Office to Grand Central Station	1.5545
Times Square Station to Radio City Station	1.1794
Radio City Station to Ansonia Station	1.3974
Ansonia Station to Planetarium Station	.8950
Planetarium Station to Station H	1.2570
Station H to Morningside Station	1.1238
Morningside Station to Station J	.7143
Station J to Station L	1.1793
Grand Central Station to Lenox Hill Station	1.5031
Lenox Hill Station to Gracie Station	1.0105
Gracie Station to Hell Gate Station	1.1048
Hell Gate Station to Station L	1.2435
Church Street Station to Cooper Station	2.1714
Cooper Station to Madison Square Station	.8450
Madison Square Station to Murray Hill Station to Grand Central Station	1.6448
Church Street Station to Wall Street Station to Bowling Green Station	1.1500
Church Street Station to General Post Office, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1.9607
Total	26.9690

All of the points connected are served with double tube lines except stations enumerated hereunder, which are supplied by single lines. The length of the single lines is divided by two to determine the basis for payment of double lines.

Lines (single)	*Length (miles)*
Madison Square Station to Grand Central Station	1.3037
Grand Central Station to Murray Hill Station	1.0531
Murray Hill Station to Madison Square Station	.9328
Church Street Station to Wall Street Station	.7173
Wall Street Station to Bowling Green Station	.5103
Bowling Green Station to Church Street Station	1.0724

The chart showing the points connected and the length of lines between each point is submitted as exhibit I.

The points previously named are directly connected with the tube service. All other postal units are indirectly connected through the utilization of certain stations as transfer points for the exchange of mail between points connected with the tube service and stations served by motor vehicle service only. These points are listed below:

Exchange point	*To and from—*
Church Street Station.	Knickerbocker Station.
Cooper Station	Tompkins Square Station.
Station J	College Station, Hamilton Grange Station, Audubon Station, Washington Bridge Station, Inwood Station, Kingsbridge Station, High Bridge Station, Morris Heights Station, Tremont Station, Fordham Station, Williamsbridge Station, City Island Station, and Pelham Station.
Station L	Station X, Hub Station, Morrisania Station, Boulevard Station, Bronx Central Station, West Farm Station, Parkchester Station, Westchester Station, and Wakefield Station.
Station O	Village Station.

The pneumatic-tube service is operated by air pressure developed and maintained through 11 power stations which are located at the general post office, New York, N. Y., and the general post office at Brooklyn, N. Y.; also Church Street Station, Cooper Station, Grand Central Station, Gracie Station, Station L, Station J, Planetarium Station, Times Square Station, and Station O. A uniform speed of 30 miles per hour between the postal points connected is required under the terms of the contract.

The carriers used in the pneumatic-tube service for the transportation of mail are steel cylinder containers, 8 inches in diameter and 24 inches long, outside measurements, and 6⅞ inches in diameter and 22 inches long, inside measurements, and weigh approximately 21 pounds each. Each carrier has an ordinary capacity of about 9 pounds, or 400 letters, and carriers may be dispatched at 12-second intervals. The pneumatic-tube service is used for the transportation of ordinary letter mail, special-delivery matter, air mail, registered mail, daily papers in limited quantities, and miscellaneous letter sized pieces of other mail when included with the letter mails. The mail transported is for outbound destinations, in-bound from other post offices, interchanged between the postal units of the New York, N. Y., post office, and between the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office, and the New York, N. Y., post office.

The space occupied by the pneumatic-tube machinery at each of the points included is shown hereunder:

Station	Space occupied by pneumatic tubes and containers (square feet)			Storage space for containers (square feet)	Operating machinery (square feet)
	First floor	Second floor	Third floor	Pipe gallery floor	Basement
Brooklyn general post office [1]	234				554
New York general post office [1]	582				1,100
Station A	485				
Station H	Room	450			
Station J	462				2,232
Station L	405				1,218
Station O [1]		481			1,881
Ansonia Station	510				
Bowling Green Station [1]	216				
Canal Street Station [1]	Room	549			
Church Street Station [1]			1,496		(sub) 6,118
Cooper Station [1]		357			1,468
Gracie Station	336				1,320
Grand Central Station [1]		768		[2] 1,040	
Hell Gate Station	390				
Lenox Hill Station [1]	Room	468			
Madison Square Station [1]		893			
Morningside Station	360				
Murray Hill Station	288				
Planetarium Station [1]	Room	425			2,345
Radio City Station	510				
Times Square Station	570				1,816
Wall Street Station	236				

[1] Government-owned buildings.
[2] First.

There is shown hereunder the locations of the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office and the New York, N. Y., post office and stations connected with the pneumatic-tube service. The date of expiration of the lease for rented buildings is also shown.

Station	Location	Date lease expires
Brooklyn general post office	Washington and Johnson Sts.	Government-owned.
New York general post office	8th Ave. and 33d St	Do.
Station A	103-105 Prince St	July 15, 1956.
Station H	215-221 West 104th St	Government-owned.
Station J	300-311 West 125th St	Nov. 30, 1951.
Station L	Lexington Ave. and 126th St	Dec. 31, 1954.
Station O	217-229 West 18th St	Government-owned.
Ansonia Station	203-209 West 69th St	Sept. 30, 1954.
Bowling Green Station	Custom House	Government-owned.
Canal Street Station	350 Canal St	Do.
Church Street Station	90 Church St	Do.
Cooper Station	93-99 4th Ave	Government-owned.
Gracie Station	211-215 East 87th St	July 24, 1956.
Grand Central Station	450 Lexington Ave	Government-owned.
Hell Gate Station	226-230 East 106th St	Oct. 14, 1954.
Lenox Hill Station	217-223 East 70th St	Government-owned.
Madison Square Station	149-153 East 23d St	Do.
Morningside Station	232-234 West 116th St	Mar. 31, 1947.
Murray Hill Station	221-229 East 34th St	Nov. 2, 1947.
Planetarium Station	127-135 West 83d St	Government-owned.
Radio City Station	322-332 West 52d St	Dec. 11, 1956.
Times Square Station	221-241 West 38th St	Sept. 30, 1955.
Wall Street Station	165 Pearl St	May 19, 1955.

The present pneumatic tube system has a distinct value as a medium of transportation for first-class mail because of the effectiveness of the system, connecting as it does 23 points, including the General Post Office at Brooklyn, N. Y., thus establishing a circular system converging at Church Street Station, provision being made for cross-town service between the east and west side lines from the General Post Office, New York, N. Y., to Grand Central Station, and from Station J to Station L.

Experience had with the pneumatic tubes as a medium for the transportation of mail at New York, N. Y., since their establishment, has proven their value as an essential auxiliary to the motor vehicle service. They have been operated efficiently, thereby affording a reliable and dependable means for a more expeditious dispatch of mails for train connection and interchange of mail for delivery by carrier than could be obtained by the exclusive use of motor vehicle service. Because of advantages in the time of transit, the fact that they can be used at any time during the period of operation, and the large volume of mail being transported through the pneumatic tube system, it is advisable in the interest of good service in New York, N. Y., and Brooklyn, N. Y., that this service be continued.

Redesignation of lettered stations

Old name	New name	Address	Postal zone	Date of change
Station A	Prince	103 Prince St	12	June 1, 1947
Station B	Knickerbocker	128 East Broadway	2	Oct. 1, 1946
Station C	Village	641 Washington St	14	Feb. 1, 1947
Station D	Cooper	93 4th Ave	3	Apr. 1, 1947
Station F	Murray Hill	221 East 34th St	16	Do.
Station G	Radio City	322 West 52d St	19	Do.
Station H	Cathedral	215 West 104th St	25	June 1, 1947
Station I	Morningside	232 West 116th St	26	Oct. 1, 1946
Station J	Manhattanville	309 West 125th St	27	June 1, 1947
Station K	Gracie	211 East 87th St	28	Oct. 1, 1946
Station L	Triborough	2089 Lexington Ave	35	June 1, 1947
Station M	Audubon	511 West 165th St	32	Apr. 1, 1947
Station N	Ansonia	203 West 69th St	23	Oct. 1, 1946
Station O	Old Chelsea	217 West 18th St	11	June 1, 1947
Station P	Bowling Green	Customhouse	4	Feb. 1, 1947
Station R	Hub	438 Westchester Ave	55	Do.
Station S	Howard	Howard and Lafayette Sts	13	Do.
Station T	Morrisania	442 East 167th St	56	Apr. 1, 1947
Station U	Hell Gate	226 East 106th St	29	Do.
Station W	Planetarium	127 West 83d St	24	Oct. 1, 1946
Station X	Mott Haven	517 East 139th St	54	June 1, 1947
Station Y	Lenox Hill	217 East 70th St	21	Feb. 1, 1947
West 43d St	Bryant	23 West 43d St	18	Do.

The magnitude of the business transacted by the New York, N. Y., post office is indicated by its postal receipts. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, the postal receipts totaled $123,078,829.34, of which $81,571,270.84 represents the postal receipts of the general post office and the 21 stations connected with the transportation facilities for the interchange of mails through the medium of the pneumatic-tube service.

The personnel assigned to the general post office and these postal units includes 7,834 regular clerks, 2,631 regular carriers, 802 regular mail handlers, 82 regular cleaners, a force of 1,490 substitute clerks, 4,865 temporary substitute clerks, 449 substitute carriers, 20 temporary substitute carriers, 169 substitute mail handlers, 494 temporary substitute mail handlers, 2 telephone operators, 132 regular pneumatic-tube operators, and 1,381 custodial employees.

The following table sets forth in detail the postal receipts for the fiscal year 1946 and the employees at present assigned to the various carrier delivery stations connected by the pneumatic-tube service.

Stations	Receipts	Clerks			Carriers			Mail handlers			Cleaners	Telephone operators	Pneumatic tube operators, regular	Custodial
		Regular	Substitute	Temporary substitute	Regular	Substitute	Temporary substitute	Regular	Substitute	Temporary substitute				
General Post Office, incoming, outgoing, and transportation departments	$9,782,962.39	2,325	417	1,576	252	41	3	390	89	363			33	567
Station A	1,095,382.48	74	1	13	43	14		7			7		4	
Station H	718,167.33	78	11	47	87	21	1	4					3	11
Station J	568,118.72	107	17	32	76	18	3	11			5		5	
Station L	449,976.31	52		10	39	7		4			3		3	
Station O	2,627,174.66	149	11	34	104	19		22					4	15
Ansonia Station	817,959.35	88	10	26	70	13	1	4			5		3	
Bowling Green Station	3,273,081.25	102	17	31	60	12	2	3			2		2	
Canal Street Station	3,856,193.58	194	48	38	104	12	1	20				1	4	36
Church Street Station	15,598,224.19	1,570	267	887	247	36		126	30	49			19	464
Cooper Station	2,961,800.08	166	36	45	133	23	3	10					4	15
Gracie Station	842,511.69	89	7	32	83	18		3			6		2	
Grand Central Station	13,727,081.34	1,385	243	1,534	317	36	1	99	50	82			19	195
Hell Gate Station	419,453.82	45	4	18	59	16	2	2			2		2	
Lenox Hill Station	886,060.25	110	36	19	112	11	1	7					2	12
Madison Square Station	7,425,945.72	357	144	116	99	14	1	33				1	5	54
Morningside Station	208,260.39	47	1	7	29	14		2			2		2	
Murray Hill Station	1,940,747.32	170	39	92	153	22		16			10		3	
Planetarium Station	595,590.82	68	9	23	66	12		3					3	12
Radio City Station	2,249,737.52	261	76	153	220	34	1	16			14		4	
Times Square Station	4,366,290.14	247	55	105	197	45		24			20		4	
Wall Street Station	7,160,551.49	150	41	27	81	11		5			6		2	
Total	81,571,270.84	7,834	1,490	4,865	2,631	449	20	802	169	494	82	2	132	1,381

Finance stations not connected by pneumatic tubes, but which are located within territory served by carrier stations that are connected by pneumatic tube service

Stations	Receipts	Clerks			Mail handlers			Cleaners
		Regular	Substitute	Temporary substitute	Regular	Substitute	Temporary substitute	
Clinton	$267,810.11	8						1
Columbia University	374,278.81	10			1			1
Columbus Circle	1,277,192.67	16			1			1
Ellis Island	7,800.68	1						
Empire State	1,614,833.79	12			1			
Gansevoort	581,042.86	13			1			
Governors Island	15,321.42	1						1
Greeley Square	2,561,533.97	39			5		4	3
London Terrace	424,925.75	6			1			
Rockefeller Center	4,038,497.29	42		8	2			1
Howard	1,009,939.64	23		5	2			2
Seamen's Church	29,808.56	9						

Stations	Receipts	Clerks			Mail handlers			Cleaners
		Regular	Substitute	Temporary substitute	Regular	Substitute	Temporary substitute	
Station No. 5	$286,399.77	6						
Station No. 18	98,137.32	4						
Station No. 40	172,376.32	4						
Station No. 82	587,410.14	12			1			
Station No. 102	109,639.88	4						
Station No. 138	384,377.35	10						
Sutton Station	955,856.70	19			2			
Tudor Station	45,027.75	2						
Welfare Island Station	5,434.40	1						
Bryant Station	3,341,091.12	28			1			2
Total	18,188,826.60	270		13	18		4	12

Postal receipts for fiscal year 1946 and personnel at present assigned to nontube carrier delivery stations

Stations	Receipts	Clerks			Carriers			Mail handlers		Telephone operator	Cleaners	Custodial
		Regular	Substitute	Temporary substitute	Regular	Substitute	Temporary substitute	Regular	Substitute			
"X"	$367,633.71	41	1	3	32	8		1				4
Audubon	305,259.71	41	2	15	40	11		1				4
Boulevard	435,608.91	47	2	23	71	17		2				4
Bronx Central	796,372.24	158	140	90	75	20	2	13	1	1		77
City Island	22,389.02	7			4	1					1	
College	180,635.12	56	2	15	43	21		1				5
Fordham	439,844.45	44	3	8	47	13		1			3	
Hamilton Grange	300,413.94	44	2	10	44	19		2			3	
High Bridge	385,787.17	40	3	10	45	16	1	2			2	
Hub	471,902.55	48		9	36	8	1				3	
Inwood	254,477.88	33		9	34	7		2				4
Kings Bridge	189,969.83	39	2	13	58	13	2	2			1	
Morrisania	237,820.96	47	3	8	67	19	1	1				2
Morris Heights	323,800.25	46	2	11	58	17	1	1				4
Parkchester	218,504.09	24		2	20	4		2				
Pelham	103,878.58	15	1		21	2					2	
Tremont	285,926.78	47	2	17	72	14	1	3			1	
Wakefield	181,783.34	42	1	10	45	9		2				6

Postal receipts for fiscal year 1946 and personnel at present assigned to nontube carrier delivery stations—Continued

Stations	Receipts	Clerks			Carriers			Mail handlers		Telephone operator	Cleaners	Custodial
		Regular	Substitute	Temporary substitute	Regular	Substitute	Temporary substitute	Regular	Substitute			
Washington Bridge	$507,600.33	52	1	25	58	9		3				3
Westchester	161,741.27	47		16	77	17	1	2			3	
West Farms	185,607.18	45	4	15	75	18		2				4
Williams Bridge	147,752.46	41	1	20	66	15		1			3	
Total	6,504,710.67	1,004	172	329	1,089	278	10	44	1	1	22	116

The first group of stations listed are located in the Borough of Manhattan, south of 127th Street, embracing a financial and business section that requires the best postal facilities obtainable. Aside from the general post office, Grand Central Station, and Church Street Station, the points named are located at varying distances from the railroad depots, thus requiring facilities for receipt, dispatch, and interchange of mails, and from the standpoint of good postal service it is essential that the best facilities obtainable for the transportation of mail be provided. The second group of stations referred to above are also located in the same area, but are not operated as carrier stations or mail-handling units, but serve the financial needs of their respective localities and develop mail matter which is handled at other units.

Finance stations located within territory served by carrier delivery stations not connected by pneumatic-tube service

Stations	Receipts	Regular clerks	Mail handlers	Cleaners
Allerton	$69,349.11	2		1
Fieldston	20,510.89	1		1
Hillside	29,334.61	2		
Jerome Avenue	224,095.64	9	1	
Mosholu	74,374.78	2		1
Ogden	60,830.85	3		
Parkway	54,626.85	2		
Perry Avenue	76,764.67	3		1
Pilgrim	63,180.09	2		
Riverdale	19,077.85	1		
Soundview	90,594.97	3		1
Throggs Neck	20,704.66	2		
Van Nest	57,917.13	2		
Woodlawn	42,474.28	2		

Finance stations, etc.—Continued

Stations	Receipts	Regular clerks	Mail handlers	Cleaners
Fort Schuyler [1]	$2,793.55			
Naval Training [2]	8,369.00			
Total	915,198.93	36	1	5

[1] Discontinued Aug. 1, 1945.
[2] Discontinued Dec. 15, 1945.

The two groups named above are located in the Borough of Manhattan, north of 127th Street, and in the Borough of the Bronx. Pelham Station is located in Westchester County, outside of the city limits. Mail for these points originating at points connected with pneumatic-tube service is transmitted via tube to either station L or station J where connection is made with motor vehicle service.

Carrier delivery stations in Manhattan served by motor vehicle service only

Station	Receipts	Clerks			Mail handlers			Carriers			Cleaners	Custodial
		Regular	Substitute	Temporary substitute	Regular	Substitute	Temporary substitute	Regular	Substitute	Temporary substitute		
Knickerbocker	$745,911.55	64	6	18	2			76	14			10
Morgan	1,520,803.97	801	181	1,101	240	109	310					413
Thompkins Square	237,532.97	34		1				22	3		2	
Village	744,585.92	53	4	21	2			41	14	1		141
Total	3,248,834.41	952	191	1,141	244	109	310	139	31	1	2	564

To determine the volume of first-class matter handled at New York, N. Y., and Brooklyn, N. Y., and to develop the value of the pneumatic-tube system as a medium for the transportation of mails, certain statistical data was assembled from a computation of mails handled on Thursday, March 27, 1947. Specimens of the forms used for this purpose, and the instructions issued in connection therewith, are submitted as exhibit A. These forms were used in the assembling and compilation of certain statistical data pertaining to mail matter at New York, N. Y., and Brooklyn, N. Y., and they include the following:

No. 1. Record of daily cancellations, weights of originating first-class mails classified as for local delivery, and for other post offices shown in half-hour periods and disposition thereof by one of four methods, namely, dispatch via pneumatic tubes, dispatch via motor-vehicle service, delivery through station, or dispatched directly to trains.

No. 2. Weight of ordinary first-class mails received for delivery in pouches made up by RPO's, or other post offices.

No. 3. Weight of ordinary transit first-class matter for dispatch to other post offices received from RPO's, post offices, or steamships.

No. 4. Number of originating first-class special-delivery letters and packages. Also the number of special-delivery first-class articles received from other post offices.

No. 5. Number of pieces originating airmail, also number of pieces of outgoing airmail received from other post offices and RPO's.

No. 6. Number of pieces of incoming airmail for delivery by New York post office, also for other post offices.

No. 7. Number of pieces of second-class matter (daily newspapers) dispatched via pneumatic tubes.

No. 8. Number of special-delivery and special-handling parcels (other than first-class matter) dispatched via pneumatic tubes.

No. 9. Number of ordinary second-class (other than daily newspapers), 3d- and 4th-class matter (not including special-delivery or special-handling parcels) dispatched via pneumatic tubes.

No. 10. Number of registered articles, all classes, including registered special delivery and registered airmail, dispatched or delivered.

No. 11. Number of pneumatic-tube carriers originating at stations delivered to the tube operators for transmission.

No. 12. Additional supervisors were assigned to each point connected with pneumatic-tube service, who devoted their entire attention to the supervision of the gathering of the data, and the compilation of the data was conducted under the direction of a competent supervisor who had special training and experience in this class of work.

Based upon statistical data, it has been determined that the pneumatic-tube service transported matter of various classes and subclasses in quantities as shown by the following table:

	Total mail	Via tube
Ordinary first-class matter originating New York post office	9,186,600	
Originating matter rehandled	2,133,578	
Originating matter including rehandled	11,320,178	2,637,360
Incoming from other post offices for city delivery	6,012,765	2,126,970
Transit for other post offices	1,744,965	265,410
Total first-class matter	19,077,908	5,029,740
Incoming airmail for city delivery		324,556
Incoming airmail for other post offices (not requiring further transportation by plane)		6,578
Total incoming airmail		331,134
Outbound airmail originating in New York post office		124,909
Outbound airmail from other post offices for dispatch from New York post office		248
Total		125,157

	Total mail	Via tube
Special-delivery letters for city delivery and other post offices mailed at New York Post Office	40,654	18,261
Special-delivery letters for city delivery and other post offices received from other postoffices	48,805	19,796
Total special-delivery letters originating and incoming	89,456	38,057
Special delivery and special handling, city delivery		817
Parcels (other than first-class, outgoing)		808
Total special delivery and special handling parcels		1,625
Originating and incoming registered articles	137,756	6,095
Daily newspapers for city delivery		7,989
Daily newspapers for other post offices		18
Total daily newspapers via tubes		8,007
Second-class other than dailies		889
Third-class other than special delivery and special handling		262,111
Fourth-class other than special delivery and special handling		255
		263,255
Transmitted through tubes from Brooklyn, N. Y., post office		68,476
Total number of pieces transmitted via tube		5,871,546

Based on the weight of ordinary first-class matter requiring transportation at the New York post office daily, it has been developed that there is handled between the hours of 5 a. m. and 10 p. m., when the pneumatic tubes are in operation, 58.30 percent of the originating mail, 68.32 percent of the incoming mail for city delivery, and 72.82 percent of the transit mail for other post offices. Combining originating mail, incoming mail for city delivery, and transit mail for other post offices, 61.49 percent is handled during the same period.

The following table sets forth in detail the weight of first-class mail requiring transportation, showing weight and percentage transmitted through pneumatic tubes and that transported by motor-vehicle service.

	Transmitted through pneumatic tubes			Transported by motor vehicle service		
	Weight of mails	Weight of mails ½ hourly	Percentage	Weight of mails	Weight of mails ½ hourly	Percentage
Originating first class:						
During period 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. when tubes are in operation	*Pounds* 65,934	*Pounds* 1,939	41.95	*Pounds* 91,220	*Pounds* 2,683	58.05
During period 10 p. m. to 5 a. m. when tubes are not in operation	None	None		112,402	8,023	100.00
Total	65,934			203,622		
Incoming for city delivery:						
During period 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. when tubes are in operation	47,266	1,390	75.54	15,308	450	24.46
During period 10 p. m. to 5 a. m. when tubes are not in operation	None	None		29,012	2,072	100.00
Total	47,266			44,320		
Transit for other post offices:						
During period 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. when tubes are in operation	5,898	173	38.97	9,236	272	61.03
During period 10 p. m. to 5 a. m. when tubes are not in operation	None	None		5,649	404	100.00
Total	5,898			14,885		
All ordinary first-class matter:						
During period 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. when tubes are in operation	119,098	3,503	50.71	115,764	3,405	49.29
During period 10 p. m. to 5 a. m. when tubes are not in operation	None	None		147,063	10,505	100.00
Total	119,098			262,827		

Percentage of ordinary 1st-class matter handled during period when tubes are in operation compared to percentage handled when tube service is not available

	Originating mails	Incoming city delivery	Transit for other post offices	Total
From 5 a. m. to 10 p. m.	58.30	68.32	72.82	61.49
From 10 p. m. to 5 a. m.	41.70	31.68	27.18	38.51

The volume of ordinary first-class matter originating at the New York post office was 9,186,600 pieces, of which 91.46 percent, or 8,402,123 pieces were mailed at the general post office and stations connected by pneumatic-tube service, and 784,477 pieces, or 8.54 percent originating at stations having no pneumatic tube connections. The detailed compilation of form 1, showing the volume of pieces of ordinary first-class mail originating in the New York post office is submitted as exhibit B.

In developing the data necessary to determine the volume of originating and other first-class mails transported by the pneumatic-tube service, a weight basis was used, the mails being weighed after preparation for final dispatch, and prior to being placed into containers, either in carriers or pouches.

The final distribution of out-bound and New York City mails is made at the general post office, Grand Central Station, and Church Street Station. Partial final distribution of out-bound and full distribution of New York City mails is made at Madison Square Station. Primary distribution of out-bound mails and full city distribution is made at all other points, excepting stations which do not make distribution of mail received in drops or from collections between 2:30 p. m. and midnight.

Under this system it develops that a certain portion of the mail is transported by pneumatic tubes or motor-vehicle service more than once, and during the process of distribution and preparation for final dispatch, rehandling is necessary. Therefore, the volume of mail handled, expressed by weight or by pieces will be in excess of the cancellations, and credit must be given accordingly for the quantity of mail handled and rehandled.

It has been ascertained that out of a total of 8,976,300 pieces of originating first-class mail, including that which is handled and rehandled, that require transportation, 29.38 percent, or 2,637,360 pieces were transmitted through the tubes.

That ordinary first-class matter for city delivery received from other post offices totaled 4,121,370 pieces, and that 51.61 percent representing 2,126,970 pieces were transmitted through pneumatic tubes.

That ordinary transit first-class mail from other post offices requiring transportation through the New York post office totaled 935,235 pieces, and that 28.38 percent, or 265,410 pieces were transmitted by pneumatic tube.

This data from which these results were developed, including forms 1, 2, and 3, and summaries thereof, are submitted as exhibit C.

The special-delivery articles of the first class handled totaled 89,456, of which 14,886 were delivered direct to trains from the terminals, and 10,237 were delivered to addresses from the station of origin or point of original receipt. Of the remainder of 64,333, 38,057, or 59.16 percent, were transmitted through the pneumatic tubes, and 26,276 or 40.84 percent, were transmitted by motor-vehicle service. This latter included mail received from trains during nontube hours.

In addition to the special-delivery first-class articles transmitted by the pneumatic tubes, 1,625 pieces of special-delivery articles other than first class and special handling parcels were transported via tube. The data from which this statement was developed, forms 4 and 8, are submitted as exhibit E.

Outbound airmail requiring transportation at the New York post office totaled 743,519 pieces, of which 16.83 percent, or 125,157 articles, were transmitted by pneumatic-tube service, and 331,134 pieces of incoming airmail, including that for New York City or for dispatch to other post offices, were transmitted via pneumatic tubes. The data from which this statement was developed, forms 5 and 6, are submitted as exhibit F.

Daily newspapers amounting to 8,007 for local delivery and for dispatch to other post offices, were transported by pneumatic tubes. Two hundred sixty-three thousand two hundred and fifty-five pieces of mail matter of all classes not heretofore recorded were transmitted via pneumatic tubes. The data from which this statement was developed, forms 7 and 9, are submitted as exhibit G.

Registered articles requiring transportation totaled 95,080 pieces, of which 6.41 percent, or 6,059 articles, were transported via pneumatic tubes. The data from which this statement was developed, form 10, is submitted as exhibit H.

Submitted herewith is exhibit R showing the number of pneumatic tube carriers dispatched during the statistical period.

To illustrate as clearly as possible the volume of important letter mails transported by the different mediums of transportation used, namely, the pneumatic-tube system and the motor-vehicle service, two graphic charts have been prepared and are presented herewith. One block graph chart shows the volume of letter mails transported, expressed by weight, and the proportion to the whole that is transported by pneumatic-tube service compared with the proportion transported by the motor-vehicle service. The other block graph shows the volume of special-delivery mail expressed in pieces, and the proportions transported by each of the two mediums utilized to transport the matter.

The foregoing statement relating to the volume of mail transmitted by pneumatic tube and supporting data included in exhibits C, E, F, G, and H relate to the New York post office and do not include Brooklyn, N. Y.

The data relating to the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office is presented separately. The postal receipts of the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, amounted to $14,423,143.02. The Brooklyn, N. Y., general post office receipts were $4,076,772.39 or 28.26 percent of the total receipts of the office. The postal area of Brooklyn, N. Y., includes, in addition to a very large residential population of 2,928,757, because of the fact that it is the most populous borough in the Greater City of New York, important business sections which are located therein, and those interests demand good postal service. In the interest of the general post office at Brooklyn, N. Y., the general post office building being connected with the pneumatic-tube system, are included the borough and county governments, State and Federal courts, office buildings many floors in height, and an important retail shopping district. The Brooklyn post office also serves a portion of Queens Borough, in which section there is located a population of 261,034. (The total population served by the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office is 3,189,791.)

The cancellation and permit mail of the first class handled at the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office totaled 1,296,627 pieces; 35.95 percent of the originating letter mails handled at Brooklyn, N. Y., is for local delivery within the area served by that office. Of the number of pieces of originating incoming letter mails requiring transportation from or to Brooklyn, N. Y., via New York, N. Y., 35.45 percent was transmitted through the pneumatic tubes. The data relating to the mails of the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office are submitted as exhibit D.

The Brooklyn, N. Y., post office having no direct mail connections except with the Long Island Railroad at the Flatbush Avenue station, necessarily must make connection for outbound mails through the New York, N. Y., railroad depots and is dependent for its supply of inbound mails through the New York, N. Y., post office and railroad terminals.

Ninety-seven and ninteen-hundredths percent of all the outbound and 69.06 percent of all the inbound mails for Brooklyn, N. Y., passes through the New York, N. Y., post office and therefore it is extremely important that the most direct and expeditious medium of transportation be established and maintained between the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office and the New York, N. Y., post office.

While the pneumatic service is in operation mail is handled as follows:

Brooklyn, N. Y.

	Percent
Outgoing:	
Via tube	27.68
Via motor-vehicle service	72.32
However, for New York, N. Y., delivery 46.41 percent is transmitted by tube and 53.59 percent is transported by motor-vehicle service.	
Incoming:	
Via tube	38.71
Via motor-vehicle service	61.29
Combined:	
Via tube	35.45
Via motor-vehicle service	64.55
Special delivery, air mail, and registered mail handled as follows:	
Outgoing:	
Special delivery via tube	52.59
Air mail via tube	4.19
Registered mail via tube	48.56
Incoming:	
Special delivery via tube	58.78
Air mail via tube	63.73
Registered mail via tube	13.44

Brooklyn, N. Y.—Continued

Combined:	Percent
Special delivery via tube	56.90
Air mail via tube	40.07
Registered mail via tube	32.11

Approximately 92 percent of the average daily mailing of first-class matter originates within the territory served by the general post office, New York, N. Y., and points connected with the pneumatic-tube service, and the greater portion of the postal activities are conducted at the general post office and stations within the area served by the pneumatic tubes. The postal receipts for this area were 93.3 percent of the total station receipts of the office for the fiscal year 1946. This great volume of business is transacted within the most congested section of the city.

From the foregoing presentation, in addition to the exhibits, it has been reliably established that at New York, N. Y., and the Brooklyn, N. Y., general post office, there is transmitted via pneumatic-tube service a daily average of 5,871,546 pieces of important mail requiring expeditious transmission, warranting the utilization of every available medum of transportation to accelerate its movement through the congested sections to the points of final distribution for delivery within the city, and for dispatch via the several rail terminals to all points throughout the United States and for foreign destination.

Closely correlated to the subject of pneumatic tube transportation in New York City is the question of motor-vehicle transportation. The New York post office employs, under normal conditions, approximately 584 motor vehicles to transport mail in the city of New York, in its interstation service, in its service to rail terminals and depots, and for local delivery service. The experience acquired in this manner concerning traffic congestion is based upon the actual experience of the motor-vehicle service in connection with traffic congestion. Such congestion is enountered in varying degrees in every section of the city, and is by no means confined to any particular period of the day or year, but is due entirely to the fact that the portion of the city of New York which is served by the New York post office is built upon a long, narrow island, and that the main traffic routes are necessarily north and south, with distances varying from 200 feet between such north and south traffic avenues in some cases to almost 900 feet between avenues in other sections.

This, together with the fact that practically the entire portion of the island of Manhattan lying south of 59th Street has become to a great extent a business district, with enormous hotel and amusement areas set in the middle of the business sections, results in a constant traffic congestion in this portion of the Borough of Manhattan.

The greatest congestion, of course, and that presenting the most serious problem, is found in the midtown and downtown sections of Manhattan and along the streets leading to the exits from New York to the main highways in New Jersey, Brooklyn, Queens, and the Bronx. The records of the Motor Vehicle Department of the State of New York for the calendar year 1946 show that there are 785,007 licenses issued in this city, and the number of cars in use has shown a steady increase for many years.

Further complicating this situation has been the replacement of streetcar traffic, in almost every section of the city, by motorbuses. The introduction of the interstate bus for transportation to other points is another factor that has added to the congestion, inasmuch as the bus terminals are without exception located in the midtown section of New York City.

All of these factors add to the situation which has been recognized as presenting a problem of great magnitude, which can only be met by stringent police regulations. Constant study is made by police officials for the purpose of restricting traffic in the various portions of the city affected, and for this reason the pneumatic tubes have been proven to be a valued auxiliary in the handling of the mails.

The route over which the pneumatic tube service is located, with mileage between the points connected (showing the route of the tube system) is transmitted as exhibit I.

The motor vehicle service is efficiently organized and operated and as previously stated, the operation of the pneumatic tube service is efficient. For the purpose of illustrating the advantages of the pneumatic tube service in speed and transportation of the mails, as compared with the transportation of mail by motor vehicle service, there is presented herewith a comparative table built up from current schedules and based on theoretical dispatch from the general post office at New York, N. Y., to each one of the other points connected with the pneumatic tube service.

Comparative time and mileage between tube and motor-vehicle service from the general post office

Station	Via tubes		Via motor vehicle service	
	Mileage	Time	Mileage	Time
		Minutes		Minutes
A	2.9198	8	2.7	28
H	5.6062	15	4.8	53
J	7.4443	20	5.1	30
L	6.4164	19	6.1	85
O	1.3196	5	1.0	11
Ansonia	3.4542	11	2.2	26
Bowling Green	5.3847	17	4.9	60
Canal St	3.4106	10	2.6	42
Church St	4.1571	13	3.1	25
Cooper	4.3854	12	2.3	31
Gracie	4.0681	12	4.5	60
Grand Central	1.5545	4	1.8	25
Hell Gate	5.1729	16	5.6	72
Lenox Hill	3.0576	9	3.7	48
Madison Square	3.5404	10	1.6	15
Morningside	6.7300	18	6.0	68
Murray Hill	2.6076	7	1.2	40
Planetarium	4.3492	13	3.7	40
Radio City	2.0568	8	1.1	11
Times Sq	.8774	3	.5	7
Wall St	4.8744	16	4.3	47
Brooklyn general post office	6.1178	17	4.7	35

A detailed description of the route of travel of vehicles over motor vehicle circuits or routes in New York, N. Y., and between the Brooklyn, N. Y., general post office, and the general post office, New York, N. Y., and stations, is shown in exhibit L.

There is also submitted a complete set of the present motor vehicle schedules, including pneumatic tube service, showing approximate transit time between stations. This is submitted as exhibit M.

Illustration of the advantage in speed of transmission by pneumatic tube over motor vehicle service is presented in the comparative table, exhibit N, which indicates the time of transit via pneumatic tube service, compared with the time of transit via motor vehicle service, based on the present schedules of the motor vehicle service on an hourly basis; also the time of transit if motor vehicle service were operated on a half-hourly basis.

The advantage of the pneumatic tube service for the expeditious dispatch and handling of mail has been heretofore shown. The advantage of this service over motor vehicle service, other than the speed of transmission, is the fact that it may be used at any time, whereas the motor vehicle service necessarily is scheduled at regular intervals for trips; in other words, mail destined for transportation

by motor vehicle service must be held from one trip to the next, whereas the use of the tubes is available at any time during the hours of service.

Its advantage in reducing to a minimum the possibility of missing train connections or a delivery of mail is apparent. The tubes also afford a means for feeding mail to a distribution unit in a continuous stream, rather than forwarding the mass by motor vehicle service. By using the tubes, special delivery matter and other matter of this type may be forwarded to the point of distribution for delivery each few minutes. If this service were not available the mail could not be forwarded until the dispatch of the next regularly scheduled motor vehicle trip, and in consequence there is the possibility that mail which now connects with outgoing airplane or train connection and delivery trip might fail to connect if dispatched by motor vehicle service.

The principal railroad terminals for the receipt and dispatch of mails are connected with Grand Central Station for New York Central and New York, New Haven & Hartford Lines, and connected with the general post office for Pennsylvania Railroad Lines, Long Island Rail Road, Lehigh Valley Railroad, and New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. Connections with trains scheduled to enter and leave the Pennsylvania terminal are also made through Church Street station by using the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad, connecting at Newark, N. J. The terminals for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, the Central Railroad of New Jersey, Erie Railroad, Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad, and the West Shore Railroad are located on the New Jersey shore of the Hudson River.

The three principal distribution units of the New York post office are located at the general post office, the Grand Central Station, and the Church Street Station, all of these being located contiguous to the principal railroad terminals. In view of the close contact of the above-mentioned units to the principal railroad depots, it is possible to dispatch 16.38 percent of first-class mails direct to trains after the distribution is completed. There are a total of 227 trains scheduled to carry out-bound mails and 223 trains scheduled to carry in-bound mails on the railroads leaving and entering New York City. Schedules chonologically arranged showing this service are submitted as exhibit J.

Based upon these schedules and the schedules of the pneumatic-tube service and motor-vehicle service, comparative tables have been prepared and are submitted as exhibit O for out-bound mails and exhibit P for in-bound mails. These tables represent mails dispatched from and received at New York City via certain representative trains. The comparison represented in the tables shows the advantage expressed in time that the pneumatic-tube transportation has over the motor-vehicle service. Eight out-bound and 14 in-bound trains were selected as being representative of the advantages secured in the expeditious movement of the mails, out-bound and in-bound, via pneumatic-tube service.

There is submitted as exhibit Q a list of the scheduled trains for outbound mail, chronologically arranged, which depart during the period of the day the tubes are in operation. They illustrate clearly the advantages gained in time by use of the tubes, which permit of later closing time than would be possible if motor-vehicle service were used exclusively, and the additional advantages of supplementary close-by use of the tube system after final dispatch has been made by motor vehicles. It is shown in the table referred to that the closing time of mails to connect over 45 outbound trains departing from the several depots of the railroads leaving New York between the hours of 5 a. m. and 5:30 p. m. would have to be advanced 1 hour if pneumatic-tube service were not available and in use. It is also shown that mail is distributed after the regular closing time and may be forwarded for supplementary dispatch via tubes for periods varying from 5 to 60 minutes after the regular tie-out and dispatch. The variation in the time depends upon the distance between the points of dispatch and the points at which train connections are made. The supplementary dispatch feature has a particular advantage during the peak mail handling hours, since its use insures dispatch of the greatest number of letters via the earliest trains.

Pneumatic-tube service is dependable in that it is not affected generally by street surface traffic or weather conditions, and this may be best illustrated by the following comparative statistical statement showing irregularities, including interruptions, delays, and failures of service in the pneumatic-tube and motor-vehicle services from January 1 to December 31, 1946, divided into quarterly periods. The data presented in the statement are taken from the official records of the motor-vehicle service and reports to the Department covering irregularities in tube service.

Comparative table showing service irregularities in the motor-vehicle service and pneumatic-tube service, in quarterly periods from January 1 to December 31, 1946.

Motor-vehicle irregularities include delays and failures. Pneumatic-tube irregularities include all interruptions of the service.

Year and quarter	Motor vehicle	Tube
1946:		
March	1,886	8
June	1,833	7
September	[1] 2,507	13
December	[1] 10,734	7
Total	16,960	35

[1] Abnormal irregularities due to trucking strike, Christmas period, shortage, and the condition of trucks.

The pneumatic-tube service is in operation daily from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m., covering a range of 17 hours. The contract specifies service for a period not to exceed 18 consecutive hours daily, Monday to Friday, inclusive, and 6 consecutive hours on Saturday, provided, however, the Postmaster General may extend the hours of operation for a total of not exceeding 36 additional hours during each and every month of December occurring during the contract period or any extension thereof.

During the period of operation, from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. daily, approximately 61.49 percent of all first-class matter is handled on an average day. The following table showing the quantity by weight, each hourly period, showing disposition under appropriate classification, and also indicating the percentage transmitted by pneumatic-tube service, is submitted for the purpose of illustrating that the present range of pneumatic-tube service is desirable.

	Incoming, originating and transit letter mails transmitted through pneumatic tube	Incoming, originating and transit letter mails transported by motor vehicle service	Incoming and originating letter mails delivered at station of origin or at point of original receipt	Originating and transit letter mails sent direct to trains (tube or motor vehicle not required)	Total incoming originating and transit letter mails	Percentage transmitted through pneumatic tubes
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	
12:01 to 1 a. m.		26,087	1,879	5,599	33,565	
1 to 2 a. m.		26,602	2,316	4,986	33,904	
2 to 3 a. m.		21,574	1,905	5,459	28,938	
3 to 4 a. m.		12,358	2,670	2,660	17,688	
4 to 5 a. m.		2,794	3,818	2,301	8,913	
5 to 6 a. m.	4,983	2,613	2,743	1,661	12,000	41.53
6 to 7 a. m.	6,159	3,730	2,653	4,191	16,733	36.81
7 to 8 a. m.	5,386	6,757	3,765	2,983	18,891	28.51
8 to 9 a. m.	6,138	2,481	5,522	2,427	16,568	37.05
9 to 10 a. m.	5,507	5,273	3,267	542	14,589	37.75
10 to 11 a. m.	8,557	2,402	3,707	649	15,315	55.87
11 to 12 a. m.	7,100	2,688	3,177	1,414	14,379	49.38
12:01 to 1 p. m.	8,309	3,922	1,617	1,350	15,198	54.67
1 to 2 p. m.	6,166	3,721	807	955	11,649	52.93
2 to 3 p. m.	5,122	4,359	807	2,035	12,323	41.56
3 to 4 p. m.	5,721	5,271	550	1,447	12,989	44.04
4 to 5 p. m.	5,158	6,067	885	2,716	14,826	34.79
5 to 6 p. m.	5,559	6,060	659	2,641	14,919	37.26
6 to 7 p. m.	6,554	12,024	612	4,236	23,426	27.98
7 to 8 p. m.	8,864	17,781	1,042	5,909	33,596	26.38
8 to 9 p. m.	12,050	13,523	870	4,287	30,730	39.21
9 to 10 p. m.	11,765	17,091	1,847	7,548	38,251	30.76
10 to 11 p. m.		25,324	1,735	8,747	35,806	
11 to 12 p. m.		32,325	1,674	8,007	42,006	
Total	119,098	262,827	50,527	84,750	517,202	
Percentage of mail	23.03	50.82	9.77	16.38	100.00	

The following table, showing the number of trucks assigned to interstation and depot service, and capacity of same as of March 31, 1947:

Make	Capacity (tons)	Depot	Interstation	Prepaid and collection	Active reserve	Reserve for Mondays and emergencies	Service	Total
International	1	3	1	1	6		2	13
International D15	1			36				36
Chevrolet	1			10				10
Ford	1			199	11		1	211
White	2	37	4	4	5			61
International	2	3	37	5	8			53
White	3	64	16		17			97
White Super	3	19	1		4			24
Auto Car	3	3	15					18
Mack	5½				12		1	13
Ford cargo body	1½			5	35			40
Chevrolet cargo body	1½				8			8
Total		111	103	260	106		4	584

The present motor vehicle service between stations connected by pneumatic tubes is generally operated on an hourly frequency and is used principally for the transportation of bulk mail. During the period July 1, 1917, to October 22, 1922, the pneumatic-tube service was not in operation, and the interstation motor vehicle service was operated on a half-hourly frequency to those points formerly connected by pneumatic tubes. In addition there was an express motor vehicle service for the transportation of special delivery and pouch mails, operating on a half-hourly frequency between the hours of 4 a. m. and 11 p. m., during which hours the tubes were previously in operation; said express service being provided between City Hall Station (Church Street Station) via Grand Central Station to Station L, on the east side and between City Hall Station (Church Street Station) via General Post Office to Station J on the west side.

If the pneumatic tube service were not in operation, additional motor vehicle service, similar to that which was operated in the former instance, would necessarily have to be provided as a substitute service for the transportation of those mails now transmitted through pneumatic tubes. The following estimate of the cost thereof is submitted, with such additional items of cost as would necessarily be involved in this proposition. The substitute motor vehicle service on which the estimate is based includes the following items:

Additional interstation service:	
Daily: 312 hours of truck service performed daily by 39 drivers over 39 8-hour runs operating 2-ton White trucks for 253 days or 78,936 hours at $2.16 per hour	$170,501.76
Saturdays: 18½ hours of truck service for 52 Saturdays performed on 2-ton White trucks, or 954 hours, at $2.16 per hour	2,060.64
Total	172,562.40
Daily: 224 hours of truck service performed daily by 28 drivers on 28 8-hour runs operating 3-ton White trucks for 253 days or 56,672 hours at $2.19 per hour	124,111.68
Additional interstation service—Continued	
Saturdays: 13 hours of truck service for 52 Saturdays performed on 3-ton White trucks or 676 hours at $2.19 per hour	$1,480.44
Total	125,592.12
Daily: 192 hours of truck service performed daily by 24 drivers on 24 8-hour runs operating 2-ton White trucks for 253 days or 48,576 hours at $2.16 per hour	104,924.16
Saturdays: 11 hours of truck service for 52 Saturdays performed on 2-ton White trucks or 572 hours at $2.16 per hour	1,235.52
Total	106,159.68
Additional service between Brooklyn and New York, N. Y.:	
Daily: 46 hours of truck service performed daily by 6 drivers on six 8-hour runs operating 1-ton Ford trucks for 253 days or 11,638 hours at $1.65 per hour	19,202.70
Saturdays: 5 hours of truck service performed each Saturday for 52 Saturdays or 260 hours at $1.65 per hour	429.00
Total	19,631.70
Total cost, additional motor-vehicle service	423,945.90

The present motor-vehicle service generally operates on an hourly frequency between the general post office and the 21 points of the New York, N. Y., post office now connected by pneumatic tubes, and would be supplemented by the establishment of a half-hourly motor-vehicle service between the hours of 5 a. m. and 10 p. m. An express route would be established to operate on a half-hourly frequency between 5 a. m. and 10 p. m. from Church Street Station via Grand Central Station to Station L, to Station J, and return over the same route.

Motor-vehicle service, now operating from Morgan Station to Stations J and L and the stations north of these points, would be routed out of the general post office in addition to the present trips now scheduled from the general post office to Stations J and L and stations north of these points, which would establish a 20-minute frequency motor-vehicle service on trips between the general post office and Station J.

There would also be established two express routes, operating from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m., to transport pouch mails from Church Street Station for train connections at the general post office and Grand Central Station, and interstation connections at those points.

The motor-vehicle service between the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office and points in the New York, N. Y., post office would necessarily have to be increased to provide for adequate transportation service in lieu of the tube service now performed.

In addition to the estimate of the cost of motor-vehicle service that would be required, consideration has been given to the effect that would be had upon the personnel engaged at present in the handling of mails, performing operations connected with the pouching, tubing, receiving, and dispatching operations inside the stations and on the mailing platforms.

It should be understood that mails dispatched and received via the pneumatic-tube service are usually handled within the workroom area adjacent to the apparatus used, and the tube operators are required to open and empty the inbound tube carriers and to close the outbound tube carriers and dispatch them. The mail forwarded via motor-vehicle service must be enclosed in pouches and moved from the pouch racks to the tailboard of the truck and must be checked into the vehicle; and, in reverse order, mail received must be checked and removed from the tailboard of the truck and delivered to points in the workroom area where the mails are opened.

Taking the factors relating to the subject under consideration and based upon the quantity and character of this work as performed under the present arrangement it is estimated that 90 additional employees would be required to replace the services and personnel now provided for the pneumatic-tube service.

There is transmitted with this report a number of photographs of the pneumatic-tube equipment at the general post office and the various stations, which photographs have been marked "Exhibit K."

The following tabulation is presented to show the work performed and the number of post-office employees required at present; the number of pouches that would have to be made up and handled if the tube service were not available, and the number of post-office employees that would be required to perform the work incident thereto:

	Number of pouches now originating on an average day at tube stations or transferred at these points	Number of pouches that are handled in dispatching-receiving sections and mailing platform at tube stations	Number of employees handling pouches in dispatching-receiving sections and mailing platform at tube stations	Number of tube carriers containing mail dispatched	Number of employees engaged in handling mails in tube section (tube operators)	Estimated number of additional pouches that would have to be established if tube service were not available	Estimated number of pouches that would be handled in dispatching and receiving section if tube service were not available	Estimated number of employees required to handle pouches if tube service were not available
General post office	[1] 9,147	18,202	93	5,562	33	2,098	23,864	148
Grand Central	[1] 5,942	10,429	31	6,170	19	6,750	22,000	94
Church Street	[1] 3,175	3,599	25	2,617	19	4,290	10,000	71
A	44	122	2	206	4	418	795	4
Cooper	95	255	2	612	4	210	657	5
Murray Hill	39	233	2	479	2	189	577	4
Radio City	51	358	2	793	4	231	847	6
H	[1] 22	92	1	403	3	418	897	3
J	[1] 717	1,365	9	1,408	5	532	3,931	10
L	[1] 271	504	6	864	3	532	3,071	9
O	51	179	2	460	4	231	624	7
Hell Gate	14	58	1	128	2	342	695	3
Ansonia	40	115	1	261	3	418	922	4
Bowling Green	41	240	2	912	2	210	639	4
Canal Street	88	285	3	399	4	231	2,339	10
Gracie	17	90	1	301	2	342	725	4
Lenox Hill	14	88	1	292	2	342	716	4
Madson Square	449	713	5	1,305	5	750	1,601	11
Morningside	13	42	1	120	2	210	425	3
Planetarium	29	107	1	278	3	418	885	3
Times Square	48	312	2	632	4	210	602	6
Wall Street	67	319	1	394	2	210	609	5
Total	20,384	37,707	194	24,595	132	19,582	77,421	416

[1] Transfer of pouches in transit included.

Total personnel required under existing methods of transportation, pneumatic-tube service and motor-vehicle service combined (194 plus 132) 326
Total personnel required if motor-vehicle service were used exclusively 416
Total additional employees that would be required 90

The above tabulation, based on careful estimates, shows that 20,384 pouches made up under existing methods require 37,707 handlings in course of transit between points of origin and destination; and that without the use of the pneumatic tubes, which transmitted 24,595 originating carriers containing mail between the points connected by tubes on an average day, 19,582 additional pouches would have to be made up, making a total of 39,966 pouches, for transportation via motor-vehicle service, which would require 77,421 handlings between the points of origin and destination, representing an increase of approximately 105 percent over that required with the combined use of the present motor-vehicle service and pneumatic-tube service.

It is estimated that the additional work involved in a substitution of motor-vehicle service to replace the service now performed by the pneumatic-tube system would require the utilization of the services of 90 additional employees, and that this additional personnel would include 60 clerks and 30 mail handlers. Based on the average rate of pay at the New York post office as of July 1, 1946, the cost is estimated as follows:

60 clerks, at $3,000 per annum	$180,000
30 mail handlers, at $2,500 per annum	75,000
Total cost (90 employees)	255,000

The summary of the items and the estimated annual cost referred to in the foregoing is submitted:

Additional motor-vehicle service	$423,945.90
Additional personnel	255,000.00
Total estimated cost	678,945.90

There would be additional items of cost not included in the above, such as the original investment for 6 1-ton trucks for the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office, and 46 2-ton trucks for the New York, N. Y., post office, at an approximate cost of $1,250 for the 1-ton trucks and $2,300 each for the 2-ton trucks, making a total of $113,300. The existing garage facilities at New York, N. Y., are inadequate to accommodate the 46 2-ton trucks; therefore additional garage facilities would be required.

It has been estimated that 19,582 additional pouches that would be made up daily would have a bearing upon the cost of the substitute for the pneumatic-tube service, since such a large increase in the use of mail equipment to replace the equipment now furnished by the contractor would be an element of considerable expense.

Taking into consideration the principal items, motor-vehicle service and personnel, which would be required, it is estimated that such service would cost $678,945.90 compared with the cost of the pneumatic-tube service of $253,023.15 for the rent of the tube system, plus $320,700 at New York, N. Y., and $8,403.09 at Brooklyn, N. Y., for the salaries of the tube operators now on the Post Office Department's payroll; plus $37,433.19 at New York, N. Y., and $1,639.33 at Brooklyn, N. Y., for electric current used in connection with pneumatic-tube service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, making a total of $621,198.76 for tube operation. These figures indicate that a substitute motor-vehicle service, replacing the pneumatic-tube service would cost $57,747.14 more than the cost of the existing pneumatic service without considering any of the other elements of expense mentioned.

Rental of tube system		$253,023.15
Salaries of tube operators at New York, N. Y.	320,700.00	
Salaries of tube operators at Brooklyn, N. Y.	8,403.09	
Total salaries of tube operators	329,103.09	
Electric current at New York, N. Y.	$37,433.19	
Electric current at Brooklyn, N. Y.	1,639.33	
Total electric current	39,072.52	
Total for tube operations		621,198.76

Estimated motor-vehicle and personnel cost	678,945.90
Cost of pneumatic-tube service	621,198.76
Total more than present cost of pneumatic-tube service	57,747.14

As a result of a thorough study and careful consideration of the foregoing presentation of the factors related to the question of the transportation of the mails at New York, N. Y., and between Brooklyn, N. Y., and New York, N. Y., the following summary of conclusions and recommendations is submitted.

CONCLUSIONS

The volume of postal business transacted and the vast quantity of first-class mails, outbound and inbound, handled daily by the New York post office justifies the use of the best transportation facilities obtainable for the movement of the mails interchanged between the general post office, New York, N. Y., and the stations, and the general post office, Brooklyn, N. Y., in order to insure the most expeditious dispatch and delivery of the mails.

The principal railroad terminals being located in different sections of the city, and some across the Hudson River in New Jersey, it is necessary that contact between the depots and the general post office and stations be maintained by the use of transportation mediums as will permit the exchange of mails, particularly first-class mails, in the shortest period of time.

Since 93.3 percent of the total postal receipts of the New York post office originate in the territory south of and including stations J and L, logically that is the area wherein the most important first-class mails are handled.

Excepting the general post office, the Grand Central Station, and the Church Street Station, the other 19 stations connected with pneumatic tubes included in the area south of 127th Street are located at various distances from the two principal railway terminals, namely, Grand Central Terminal and Pennsylvania Terminal; and because of their importance to the localities they serve, rapid transportation facilities are required to maintain adequate and satisfactory postal service.

The pneumatic-tube service now in operation is a valuable auxiliary transportation medium supplementing the motor-vehicle service, by which 5,871,546 pieces of mail of all classes are transmitted on an average day between the general post office and the 22 other postal units of the New York post office and the Brooklyn, N. Y., general post office, and the New York, N. Y., general post office.

During the period of pneumatic-tube operation, 50.71 percent of the ordinary letter mail requiring transportation is transmitted via pneumatic tubes, and considering the 24-hour period as a whole, 31.18 percent of the ordinary letter mail requiring transportation is transmitted via the same method.

Of the total mailing of first-class matter, 91.46 percent, or 8,402,123 pieces are mailed at the general post office and stations connected by pneumatic-tube service; 51.61 percent or 2,126,970 pieces of first-class mail for city delivery, received from other post offices, are transmitted through the tubes; 28.38 percent, or 265,410 pieces of ordinary transit first-class mail from other post offices requiring transportation are transmitted through the tubes.

The surface transportation in the city of New York is seriously interfered with and subject to interruptions and delay because of the acute congestion caused by the vast number of vehicles operating over the city streets, and by the density of population; and the pneumatic-tube system provides a subsurface medium for the prompt exchange of outbound and inbound first-class mails

between the general post office and carrier stations and the distribution centers for dispatch to trains or transmission to stations of delivery, free from street congestion or delay caused by traffic or inclement weather.

The transportation via pneumatic tubes permits of later closings and the use of supplementary dispatches after the final closing time for out-bound mails and the rapid transmission of in-bound and local mails for delivery.

The availability of the pneumatic tube service, when used for the transmission of mails at any time during the hours of operation, has a decided service advantage over the motor vehicle, since mail must necessarily accumulate between the schedule time of departure of a motor vehicle trip and the departure of the subsequent motor vehicle trip.

To provide the same motor vehicle service which was in operation when the tube service was discontinued, it would be necessary to schedule motor vehicles on a half-hourly frequency between the points connected by the pneumatic tubes. Additional employees would be required at all these points to perform the duties incident to the handling of pouches and the loading and unloading of vehicles.

The estimated annual cost for additional motor vehicles and the additional personnel that would be required as a substitute for pneumatic tube service would be $678,945.90, which would be $57,747.14 more than the present cost of the pneumatic tube service, which is $621,198.76.

Superior service is provided through the medium of the pneumatic tube service as compared with the motor vehicle service, on a basis of availability, speed of transmission, and dependability, considering the obstacles prevailing against a more rapid surface transportation, and the freedom of movement of the subsurface medium of transportation.

No definite statement can be made as to what quantity of the mail transported via pneumatic tube is expedited, on a basis of comparison between that medium and the motor vehicle service; but it is clearly demonstrated and recognized that the pneumatic tube system transports the mail between the 23 points connected with greater celerity than it is possible with motor vehicle service under the congested traffic conditions existing in the city of New York and as an auxiliary medium of transportation supplementing the motor vehicle service, it has a distinct value that constitutes a necessity for the maintenance of adequate and reasonable postal service at New York, N. Y., and between New York, N. Y., and Brooklyn, N. Y.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following summary of the recommendations referred to heretofore is submitted:

That the present pneumatic tube service, for which the existing contract expires on June 30, 1947, be continued, and that similar service be contracted for, consisting of single and double tube lines connecting the points specified in the following table, with a mileage of 26.9690; all points indicated to be connected with double tube lines except Murray Hill Station, Bowling Green Station, and Wall Street Station, where single lines are provided.

Lines:	*Length (miles)*
Church Street Station to Canal Street Station	0.7465
Canal Street Station to Station A	.4908
Station A to Station O	1.6002
Station O to General Post Office	1.3196
General Post Office to Times Square Station	8.8774
General Post Office to Grand Central Station	1.5545
Lines—Continued	*Length (miles)*
Times Square Station to Radio City Station	1.1794
Radio City Station to Ansonia Station	1.3974
Ansonia Station to Planetarium Station	.8950
Planetarium Station to Station H	1.2570
Station H to Morningside Station	1.1238
Morningside Station to Station J	.7143
Station J to Station L	1.1793
Grand Central Station to Lenox Hill Station	1.5031
Lenox Hill Station to Gracie Station	1.0105
Gracie Station to Hell Gate Station	1.1048
Hell Gate Station to Station L	1.2435
Church Street Station to Cooper Station	2.1714
Cooper Station to Madison Square Station	.8450
Madison Square Station to Murray Hill Station to Grand Central Station	1.6448
Church Street Station to Wall Street Station to Bowling Green Station	1.1500
Church Street Station to General Post Office, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1.9607
Total	26.9690

A total of five copies of this report is being submitted in order that each member of the committee studying the matter may be provided with a copy.

Respectfully submitted.

———— ————, *Postmaster.*

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE FOURTH
ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1948.

Mr. GEORGE D. RILEY,
Senate Commitee on Post Office and Civil Service,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RILEY: Reference is made to the hearings in New York City on March 29, 1948, concerning the general subject of the pneumatic-tube service at New York City.

In accordance with the request of the committee chairman at the hearing, there is transmitted a tabulation showing the tube mileage, the amounts paid to the contractor, the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., and the rates per mile from 1898 to 1948, inclusive. The amount shown for the fiscal year 1948 is for the entire year, upon the expiration of which the contract now in force terminates.

Concerning the chairman's request for advice as to why the tube service was discontinued effective July 1, 1918, I wish to refer you to the printed report of the hearing before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, United States Senate, 64th Congress, 1st session, on H. R. 10484, an act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes and with reference to the pneumatic-tube service. The document is dated March 29, 1916.

Reference is also made to reports of the Postmaster General for the fiscal years 1916, 1917, and 1918. I quote as follows from the report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year 1918:

"The advisability of the discontinuance of the pneumatic-tube service in the cities where it was in operation—New York-Brooklyn, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and St. Louis—was pointed out by the Postmaster General in his annual reports for the past 2 years. As no provision was made for the continuance of this service in the bill making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, it was discontinued at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

"Experience has demonstrated that the contentions of the Department with respect to this tube service were well founded and that equally efficient service can be rendered at much less cost by other means."

In accordance with your telephone request yesterday there is attached a photostatic copy of the existing pneumatic-tube contract between the Government and the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. and also 5 copies of the advertisement inviting proposals for furnishing a tube system on a lease or rental basis for use in the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices at New York, N. Y., and between the general post office at New York and the general post office at Brooklyn, N. Y.

Trusting that this will furnish you with the information desired, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER MYERS,
Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

Pneumatic-tube service, New York, N. Y., 1898–1948

	Miles	Annual cost	Rate per mile
Fiscal year ending June 30—			
1898	8.85	$168,655.00	$28,829
1899	5.85	161,520.50	27,610
1900	5.85	161,520.50	27,610
1901	5.85	161,520.50	27,610
1902	(1)	(2)	(1)
1903	6.853	110,292.65	16,094
1904	6.853	98,986.73	14,444
1905	6.853	105,300.05	15,365
1906	6.853	106,332.21	15,516
1907	7	119,000.00	17,000
1908	9.3998	159,801.00	17,000
1909	20.3987	346,777.90	17,000
1910	21.2763	361,697.10	17,000
1911	25.173	427,941.00	17,000
1912	25.173	427,941.00	17,000
1913	25.781	436,276.80	17,000
1914	26.699	453,883.00	17,000
1915	26.421	449,157.00	17,000
1916	26.429	449,293.00	17,000
1917	26.429	449,293.00	17,000
1918	26.429	449,293.00	17,000
1919	(1)	(1)	
1923	26.8173	496,120.05	18,500
1924	26.4588	515,946.60	19,500
1925	26.4588	515,946.60	19,500
1926	26.4588	515,946.60	19,500
1927	26.4588	515,946.60	19,500
1928	26.4588	515,946.60	19,500
1929	26.4588	515,946.60	19,500
1930	26.4588	515,946.60	19,500
1931	26.4588	515,946.60	19,500
1932	26.4588	515,946.60	19,500
1933	26.4588	515,946.60	19,500
1934	26.4588	515,946.60	19,500
1935	26.4588	515,946.60	19,500
1936	26.5047	516,296.39	19,479
1937	26.5732	517,861.93	19,488
1938 [3]	26.5732	259,058.70	19,500
1938 [4]	27	85,500.00	19,000
1938 [5]	27.1858	79,745.00	[6] 8,800
1939	27.1858	262,315.78	[7] 9,649
1940	26.969	253,023.16	9,382
1941	26.969	253,023.16	9,382
1942	26.969	253,023.16	9,382
1943	26.969	253,023.16	9,382
1944	26.969	253,023.16	9,382
1945	26.969	253,023.16	9,382
1946	26.969	253,023.16	9,382
1947	26.969	253,023.16	9,382
1948	26.969	253,023.16	9,382

[1] All services discontinued beginning July 1, 1918. Resumed at New York City, Oct. 2, 1922, for 10-year period.

[2] No appropriation; all service discontinued.

[3] To Dec. 31, 1937 (6 months).

[4] From Jan. 1, to Feb. 28, 1938 (2 months).

[5] From Mar. 2, to June 30, 1938 (4 months).

[6] Effective Mar. 2, 1938, the Post Office Department began paying for power, telephone service, and salaries of substitute tube operators; the contractor furnishing only tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, lubricants, waste and other supplies required in their operation. Contractor furnished personnel and all services prior to Mar. 2, 1938.

[7] Effective July 1, 1938, Department employed regular and substitute personnel at its expense; contractor continued furnishing same item as in footnote 6.

CONTRACT FOR THE RENTAL OF PNEUMATIC TUBES ON ROUTE 507011–A AT NEW YORK, INCLUDING THE GENERAL POST OFFICE AT BROOKLYN, N. Y.

This article of contract, made this 16th day of June 1942, between the United States of America (acting in this behalf by the Postmaster General) and the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York and having executive offices at New York, N. Y., by Carl F. Dietz, president, and the Lamson Corp. of Delaware, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware and having executive offices at Wilmington, Del., and the Lamson Corp., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York, and having executive offices at Syracuse, N. Y., as its sureties:

Whereas, after proper advertisement dated April 2, 1942, inviting proposals for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes upon a lease or rental basis (route 507011–A), the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. submitted a proposal dated May 26, 1942, which was duly accepted by the Postmaster General by order No. 17831 of June 16, 1942, contemplating the furnishing of a pneumatic-tube system on a lease or rental basis and,

Whereas, pursuant to the foregoing, the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. has been accepted as contractor for furnishing a pneumatic-tube system on route 507011–A, which proposal and acceptance are hereby referred to and constitute the basis of this contract, at the rate of $9,382 per mile per annum, of double lines of 8-inch tubes actually operated, which at the inception of this contract period are 26.9690 miles;

Now, therefore, the said contractor and its sureties do jointly and severally undertake, covenant and agree with the United States of America, and do firmly bind themselves to provide and maintain a pneumatic-tube system connecting the following postal points in the city of Greater New York:

Church Street Annex to Canal Station.
Canal Station to Station A.
Station A to Station O.
Station O to the General Post Office.
General Post Office to Times Square Station.
General Post Office to Grand Central Annex.
Times Square Station to Station G.
Station G to Station N.
Station N to Station W.
Station W to Station H.
Station H to Station I.
Station I to Station J.
Station J to Station L.
Grand Central Annex to Station Y.
Station Y to Station K.
Station K to Station U.
Station U to Station L.
Church Street Annex to Station D.
Station D to Madison Square Station.
Madison Square Station to Station F to Grand Central Annex.
Church Street Annex to Station P via Wall Street Station.
Church Street Annex to General Post Office, Brooklyn.

It is further stipulated and agreed:

That the contractor will place its pneumatic-tube system connecting the points above named at the disposal of the Post Office Department for operation by it, under the following terms and conditions:

1. The contractor will lease to the Post Office Department for a term beginning 12:01 a. m., July 1, 1942, and expiring midnight June 30, 1947, unless sooner annulled or terminated as hereinafter provided, its system of pneumatic tubes and machinery owned by it appurtenant thereto and necessary for the operation thereof as the same shall exist at the commencement of said term.

2. At the expiration of said term, or the prior termination of the contract, the Post Office Department shall vacate, relinquish, and return to the contractor the leased property in the same condition in which it shall be at the commencement of the term, except as changes therein agreed to by the contractor shall have been made during the term and except for ordinary wear and tear and for damages or depreciation not attributable to the negligence or willful or malicious acts of employees of the Post Office Department. At the expiration of the term the contractor will, if requested so to do by the Post Office Department, remove the tubes, powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment and devices located in post offices or on premises of the Post Office Department, from such post offices and premises, except as hereinafter provided.

3. The Post Office Department shall pay to the contractor as rental for the leased property, rental payable monthly, computed at an annual rate of $9,382 per mile, of double 8-inch tubes.

4. The contractor undertakes that, at the commencement of the term the tubes, equipment and machinery appurtenant thereto shall be in good workable condition, satisfactory for the efficient handling of the mails and capable of transmitting the mails in containers through the tubes at an average speed of 30 miles per hour.

5. The contractor will, at its expense, furnish all lubricants, waste, and other supplies required in the operation of the pneumatic tubes and will maintain the pneumatic tubes and equipment and machinery appurtenant thereto, including the powerplants, in a satisfactory working condition during the period of the term, promptly making all necessary repairs therein, except that repairs made necessary by the negligence or willful or malicious acts of employees of the Post Office Department will be made by the contractor, but shall be paid for by the Post Office Department.

6. Except as hereinafter expressly provided, all labor and power necessary for the operation of the tubes and the handling of the mails thereby shall be furnished by the Post Office Department at its expense.

7. During the term of this lease or any extension thereof the contractor shall be under no obligation to change the location, arrangement, or character of any of its tubes, machinery, or equipment as the same may exist at the commencement of the term of this lease, except as hereinafter provided.

8. In the event of interruption of service due to the failure of the contractor to perform its obligations, as herein set forth, or due to any other cause within the control of the contractor, the Postmaster General may withhold from the payments otherwise due the contractor hereunder as a deduction of rental or as a penalty, such amount as he may deem proper with due regard for the extent of such impairment of service as to time and portion of the tube system so affected.

9. It is further stipulated and agreed:

First. That the pneumatic-tube system furnished under this contract is to be operated for not more than 18 consecutive hours daily, Mondays to Fridays, inclusive, and 6 consecutive hours on Saturdays, during the term of the lease, on a schedule to be prescribed by the Postmaster General: *Provided, however,* That the right is reserved by the Postmaster General to extend the hours of operation for a total of not exceeding 36 additional hours during each and every month of December occurring during the contract period or any extension thereof.

Second. That the contractor will furnish powerplants to be operated by electric power and capable of transmitting the carriers at average speed of 30 miles per hour between points connected by tubes, receiving and dispatching apparatus, carriers (mail containers) not less than 6⅞ inches in diameter and 21 inches in length, inside measurement, of uniform construction interchangeable between the several lines, and any other machinery, equipment, or device necessary for the efficient operation of the pneumatic tubes.

Third. That the contractor will repair in an expeditious manner, the tube lines, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, carriers, machinery, equipment and devices, constituting the tube system contemplated by this contract.

Fourth. That the contractor will make repairs to the premises connected with the tube system, resulting from damage occasioned by the installation of the tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, and devices.

Fifth. That the contractor will restore the premises upon which alterations have been made to permit of the installation of the tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, upon discontinuance of tube service at any point connected with the system, to the condition in which they were received, ordinary wear and tear excepted, if requested to do so by the Postmaster General; except as hereinafter provided.

Sixth. That the contractor will discharge any person employed by it in connection with the maintenance and repair of the tube system when requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

Seventh. That the contractor will account for and pay over to the Postmaster General any money belonging to the United States which may come into the possession of the contractor, its sureties or employees.

Eighth. The contractor will make repairs to the premises connected with the tube system resulting from damage occasioned by the installation of the tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, and devices.

Ninth. The contractor will remove the tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, equipment and devices at its expense at the expiration of the term or, except as hereinafter provided, at the termination of the contract or lease if requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

Tenth. The contractor will further, at its expense, upon the discontinuance of the tube service at any point connected with the system, except as hereinafter provided, restore the premises upon which alterations have been made to permit of the installation of the tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus to the condition in which they were received, ordinary wear and tear excepted, if requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

For which service, when properly performed and the evidence thereof shall have been filed in the Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, the said New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., contractor, is to be paid by the United States at the contract rate hereinbefore named; payments to be made monthly and as soon after the close of each month as accounts can be adjusted and settled; said pay to be subject, however, to be reduced or discontinued by the Postmaster General as hereinafter stipulated.

It is mutually understood and agreed that the Postmaster General will—

First. Allot in the premises under the control of the Department space for the installation of the tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, and other appliances necessary in connection with the use of the tube system.

Second. Provide the manpower (operators) necessary to operate the tube system, together with the necessary telephone switchboard and the supervisors.

Third. Furnish electric power necessary for the operation of the tube system.

Fourth. Accord access to the post offices for the employees of the contractor for the purpose of maintenance, repair, and inspection of the tube system and equipment.

It is further stipulated and agreed that the Postmaster General may annul, cancel, and terminate this contract for—

(a) Repeated failure of the tube system to operate due to conditions within the control of the contractor.

(b) Repeated failure on the part of the contractor to make necessary repairs to the tube system promptly.

(c) For failure to have the tube system in a condition for efficient operation on July 1, 1942, or within a reasonable time thereafter—the contractor having failed to exercise due diligence in constructing the system.

(d) Violation of the postal laws and the several acts of Congress relating to post offices and post roads and such regulations as are incorporated in the Postal Laws and Regulations, Edition of 1940.

(e) Refusal of contractor to discharge any person employed by the contractor in connection with the maintenance and repair of the tube system, when requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

(f) For failure of the Congress to appropriate funds for the operation of the system.

(g) Whenever the contractor shall become a Member of or Delegate to Congress.

(h) Whenever, in the opinion of the Postmaster General, the public interest requires it.

It is further stipulated and agreed that—

First. In the event of the purchase of the pneumatic-tube system by the United States within the term of this contract, this contract shall be cancelled, without additional compensation to the contractor.

Second. Annulment, cancellation, or termination for any of the causes recited above in this contract shall not impair the right of the Postmaster General to claim damages from the contractor or its sureties and such damages may, for the purpose of setoff or counterclaim in the settlement of any claim of said contractor or its sureties against the United States, whether arising under this contract or otherwise, be assessed and liquidated by the General Accounting Office of the United States.

Third. The Postmaster General reserves the right to withhold from the pay of the contractor such sums as he may deem proper to impose as fines or deductions for failure to furnish and maintain the tube system in a satisfactory state of repair, or for any other cause within the control of the contractor that impairs the efficiency of the tube system.

Fourth. Employees of the contractor engaged in the maintenance and repair of the tube system shall not handle mail.

Fifth. No Member of or Delegate to Congress shall be admitted to any share in or part of this contract or any benefit to arise therefrom.

Sixth. It is further stipulated that the contractor warrants that he has not employed any person to solicit or secure this contract upon any agreement for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee. Breach of this warranty shall give the Government the right to annul the contract, or, in its discretion, to deduct from the contract price or consideration the amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fees. This warranty shall not apply to commissions payable by contractors upon contracts or sales secured or made through bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the contractor for the purpose of securing business.

Seventh. This contract is further to be subject to all the conditions imposed by law and the several acts of Congress relating to post offices and post roads.

Eighth. The New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. and its sureties hereby further warrant that the tubes, powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, and devices furnished in connection with the tube system shall not infringe any patent of which they are not the owners or assignees, or otherwise lawfully entitled to use, and do hereby covenant with the said party of the first part and its officers or agents that they will at all times well and truly safekeep and bear harmless and fully indemnify the United States and any of its officers or agents, free from all damages or claims for damages, cost of expense in law or equity, that may at any time arise or be set up for any infringement of the patent right of any person or corporation in consequence of the use by the Department of the tubes, powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, or devices furnished by the contractor under this contract for use in connection with the operation of the tube system.

Ninth. The Postmaster General may, in his discretion, continue the contract in force for a period not exceeding 6 months beyond June 30, 1947, the original expiration date of the 5-year term specified herein, provided further, that the contract, if so continued, may be extended by mutual agreement for an additional period not to exceed 6 months.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have hereunto subscribed their names as of the date first above written.

NEW YORK MAIL & NEWSPAPER TRANSPORTATION CO.,
Carl F. Deitz, *Contractor.*
CARL F. DIETZ, *President.*
(L. Mildred Barnes, witness to signature of contractor.)
LAMSON CORPORATION OF DELAWARE,
F. D. Weeks,
F. D. WEEKS, *Treasurer (Surety).*
(L. Mildred Barnes, witness to signature of surety.)
LAMSON CORP.,
F. D. Weeks,
F. D. WEEKS, *Treasurer (Surety).*
(L. Mildred Barnes, witness to signature of surety.)
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
By FRANK O. WALKER,
Postmaster General.
(Witness to signature of Postmaster General.)
DOUGLAS WOLF.
Approved as to form and legality:
VINCENT M. MILES,
Solicitor for the Post Office Department.
Approved as to terms of contract:
WALTER MYER,
Fourth Assistant.

CONTRACT FOR THE RENTAL OF PNEUMATIC TUBES ON ROUTE 504001, BOSTON, MASS.

This article of contract, made this 19th day of September 1947 between the United States of America (acting in this behalf by the Postmaster General), and the Boston Pneumatic Transit Co., a corporation created and existing under the laws of the State of Massachusetts, by Carl F. Dietz, its president; and Maryland Casualty Co., of Baltimore, Md., its surety.

Whereas the contract for rental of pneumatic tubes on route 504001, Boston, Mass., beginning February 1, 1937, terminated by limitation January 31, 1947; extended in accordance with its terms for a term of 5 months beginning February 1, 1947, ending June 30, 1947; further extended in accordance with its terms for a term of 1 month beginning July 1, 1947, ending July 31, 1947.

Whereas no proposal has been received in response to an advertisement issued by the Postmaster General on the 21st day of April, 1947, for continuation of pneumatic-tube service at Boston, Mass., and 39 United States Code 434 provides for the making of a temporary contract without advertising.

Witnesseth, that whereas the Boston Pneumatic Transit Co. has been accepted as contractor for furnishing a pneumatic-tube system for the transmission of mail on pneumatic-tube route 504001 connecting the general post office, North Railroad Station, and South Postal Annex in the city of Boston, Mass., for the performance of all the obligations contemplated by this contract at the rate of $24,000 per annum for the entire tube system constructed, accepted, and maintained in accordance with the terms hereof for a term of 11 months beginning August 1, 1947, and ending June 30, 1948.

Now, therefore, the said contractor and its sureties do jointly and severally undertake, covenant, and agree with the United States of America and do bind themselves to—

First. Provide and maintain a pneumatic-tube system connecting the general post office, north railroad station, and south postal annex, consisting of double lines of tubes not less than 8 inches in diameter, inside measurement.

Second. Furnish a powerplant to be operated by electric power and capable of transmitting the carriers at average speed of 30 miles per hour between points connected by tubes, receiving and dispatching apparatus, carriers (mail containers) not less than 6¾ inches in diameter and 21 inches in length, inside measurement, of uniform construction interchangeable between the several lines, and any other machinery, equipment, or device necessary for the efficient operation of pneumatic tubes.

Third. Have the tube system available for the transmission of mail 20 hours per day on a schedule to be prescribed by the Postmaster General.

Fourth. Repair, in an expeditious manner, the tube lines, powerplant, receiving and dispatching apparatus, carriers, machinery, equipment and devices, constituting the tube system contemplated by this contract.

Fifth. Make repairs to the premises connected with the tube system, resulting from damage occasioned by the installation of the tubes, powerplant, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, and devices.

Sixth. Remove the tubes, powerplant, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, and devices from the points connected by the system, at the expiration of the term of the contract, or the termination of the contract, at the expense of the said contractor, if requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

Seventh. Restore the premises upon which alterations have been made to permit of the installation of the tubes, powerplant, receiving and dispatching apparatus, upon discontinuance of tube service at any point connected with the system, to the condition in which they were received, ordinary wear and tear excepted, if requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

Eighth. Discharge any person employed by the contractor in connection with the maintenance and repair of the tube system when requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

Ninth. Change the location of the tube lines and receiving and dispatching apparatus within the building, when such changes are made necessary by reason of the remodeling or rebuilding of the quarters in which the tube terminals are located.

Tenth. Account for, and pay over to the Postmaster General, any money belonging to the United States, which may come into the possession of the contractor, its sureties or employees.

For which service: When properly performed and the evidence thereof shall have been filed in the Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, the said Boston Pneumatic Transit Co., contractor, is to be paid by the United States at the contract rate hereinbefore named; payments to be made monthly and as soon after the close of each month as accounts can be adjusted and settled; said pay to be subject, however, to be reduced or discontinued by the Postmaster General as hereinafter stipulated.

It is mutually understood and agreed that the Postmaster General will—

First. Allot in the premises under the control of the Department, space for the instal-

tion of the tubes, power plant, receiving and dispatching apparatus, and other appliances necessary in connection with the use of the tube system.

Second. Provide the manpower necessary to operate the tube system.

Third. Furnish electric power necessary for the operation of the tube system.

It is further stipulated and agreed, that the Postmaster General may annul, cancel, and terminate and end this contract for—

(a) Repeated failure of the tube system to operate due to conditions within the control of the contractor.

(b) Repeated failure on the part of the contractor to make necessary repairs to the tube system promptly.

(c) For failure to have the tube system in a condition for efficient operation on August 1, 1947, or within a reasonable time thereafter—the contractor having failed to exercise due diligence in constructing the system.

(d) Violation of the postal laws and the several acts of Congress relating to post offices and post roads and such regulations as are incorporated in the Postal Laws and Regulations, edition of 1940.

(e) Refusal of contractor to discharge any person employed by the contractor in connection with the maintenance and repair of the tube system when requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

(f) Failure of contractor to change the location of the tube lines, and receiving and dispatching apparatus within the building, made necessary by reason of the remodeling or rebuilding of the quarters in which the tube terminals are located.

(g) For failure of the Congress to appropriate funds for the operation of the system.

(h) Whenever the contractor shall become a Member of or Delegate to Congress.

(i) Whenever, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, the public interest so requires.

It is further stipulated and agreed that—

First. In the event of the purchase of the pneumatic tube system by the United States this contract shall be canceled, without additional compensation to the contractor.

Second. Annulment, cancellation, termination or ending for any of the causes recited above in this contract shall not impair the right of the Postmaster General to claim damages from the contractor or its sureties and such damages may, for the purpose of set-off or counterclaim in the settlement of any claim of said contractor or its sureties against the United States, whether arising under this contract or otherwise, be assessed and liquidated by the General Accounting Office of the United States.

Third. The Postmaster General reserves the right to withhold from the pay of the contractor such sums as he may deem proper to impose as fines or deductions for failure to furnish and maintain the tube system in a satisfactory state of repair, or for any other cause within the control of the contractor that impairs the efficiency of the tube system.

Fourth. Employees of the contractor engaged in the maintenance and repair of the tube system shall not handle mail, but will be required to take the oath of office prescribed by Section 30 of the Postal Laws and Regulations, Edition of 1940.

Fifth. No Member of or Delegate to Congress shall be admitted to any share in or part of this contract or any benefit to arise therefrom.

Sixth. It is further stipulated, that the contractor warrants that he has not employed any person to solicit or secure this contract upon any agreement for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee. Breach of this warranty shall give the Government the right to annul the contract, or, in its discretion, to deduct from the contract price or consideration the amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fees. This warranty shall not apply to commissions payable by contractors upon contracts or sales secured or made through bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the contractor for the purpose of securing business.

Seventh. This contract is further to be subjected to all the conditions imposed by law and the several acts of Congress relating to Post Offices and Post Roads.

Eighth. The Boston Pneumatic Transit Co. and its sureties hereby further warrant that the tubes, powerplant, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment and devices, furnished in connection with the tube system shall not infringe any patent of which they are not the owners or assignees, or otherwise lawfully entitled to use, and do hereby covenant with the said party of the first part and its officers or agents that they will at all times well and truly safekeep and bear harmless, and fully indemnify the United States and any of its officers or agents, free from all damages or claims for damages, cost of expense in law or equity, that may at any time arise or be set up for any infringement of the patent right of any person or corporation in consequence of the use by the Department of the tubes, powerplant, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment or devices furnished by the contractor under this contract for use in connection with the operation of the tube system.

In witness whereof, the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, acting for the Postmaster General in accordance with the provisions of 39 United States Code 430, has signed and attested this contract and caused the great seal of the Post Office Department to be affixed thereto on the date and year hereinafter stated.

WALTER MYERS,
Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of Onondaga, ss:

Sworn before the subscriber, postmaster at Syracuse, State of New York, this 19th day of September A. D. 1947; and I also certify that the person above named is not a postmaster, assistant postmaster, or a clerk employed in a postoffice, nor a member of the immediate family of a postmaster, or assistant postmaster, and is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, above the age of 21 years.

MYRON J. PARKINSON,
Acting Postmaster of Syracuse, N. Y.

New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co.—Schedule of salaries and wages paid, calendar year 1947

J. F. Devaney, superintendent	$7,800.00
P. J. Donohue, engineer	5,433.34
Frederick Landen, engineer	4,875.47
Michael Griffin	3,976.01
Arthur Naylor	3,867.33
Charles Nemec	3,639.04
John Schlitt	3,417.98
Charles Shaw	3,301.81
Hugh Gallagher	3,250.29
William Gray	2,866.40
Benjamin Rauschkolb	2,855.51
William Sheridan	2,788.30
Salvatore Albanese	2,607.32
William Ladislaw	2,386.99
Linzor West	2,385.95
Eugene T. Gibbons	2,250.10
Antonio Sabatino	174.83
Sam Sabatino	149.85
Total	58,035.52
In addition there was paid to Lamson Corp. of Delaware for services rendered by officers, executives, and clerical help	6,336.46
Total	64,371.98

EXHIBIT 5

[S. Rept. No. 1241, 80th Cong., 2d sess.]

PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, INCLUDING RETAINMENT OF PNEUMATIC-TUBE SYSTEMS

Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, submitted the following report to accompany S. 2510:

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, having considered the bill (S. 2510) intended to permit adjustment of rates of payment for retainment of pneumatic tube distribution service in New York City, including the Borough of Brooklyn, report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill, without amendment, do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

During the final decade of the 19th century, the Post Office Department began developing the distribution of mail in several of the larger cities by way of pneumatic tubes. Notable installations included New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, and St. Louis.

During the earlier years of operation of pneumatic tube facilities the Post Office Department invited bid proposals in several other cities, including Washington, D. C., Kansas City, Mo., San Francisco, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, and Cincinnati. In certain instances, no proposals were submitted and in others pneumatic tube service was discontinued at the instance of Postmaster General Burleson and later never resumed.

The pneumatic tube operations in New York City, including Brooklyn, and in Boston, have continued down through the years. In New York City, 26.969 miles of double tube are in operation. The owner of the tube system is the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., a subsidiary of the Lamson Corp., of Delaware.

The present tube system services the following post offices and stations in Greater New York: Church Street Annex to Canal Station; Canal Station to Station A; Station A to Station O; Station O to the General Post Office; General Post Office to Times Square Station; General Post Office to Grand Central Annex; Times Square Station to Station G; Station G to Station N; Station N to Station W; Station W to Station H; Station H to Station I; Station I to Station J; Station J to Station L; Grand Central Annex to Station Y; Station Y to Station K; Station K to Station U; Station U to Station L; Church Street Annex to Station D; Station D to Madison Square Station; Madison Square Station to Station F to Grand Central Annex; Church Street Annex to Station P via Wall Street Sation; Church Street Annex to General Post Office, Brooklyn.

Pneumatic mail tubes are reminders of the systems in department stores through which cash and credit transactions are cleared from various points in the store to a central office, except that, in the cases of mail installations, the tubes are much larger. The containers are 2 feet long and 8 inches in diameter, of stainless metal moving through lubricated cylinders to their destinations. Approximately 5 million pieces of mail daily have been distributed for almost 50 years through the Greater New York system. The inside measurement of the cylinders is 22 inches long and 7 inches in diameter. They weigh approximately 21 pounds, each cylinder having a capacity of 9 pounds and holding as many as 400 or 500 letters. The cylinders are dispatched at intervals of 12 seconds and travel at the rate of 30 miles per hour. Air compressors supply the motive power.

The general post office in Manhattan is the nerve center for the entire system. The approximately 27 miles of double-track tube cross and recross Manhattan, linking the 22 substations together and with the general

post office in Brooklyn. From the Battery, these tubes extend to the main post office in Brooklyn and in Manhattan. Some of the lines are on the subway roof while others are below the roof. Upon arriving at the Chrysler Building the tubes go 12 feet below the skyscraper. They are 18 feet below Grand Central Station.

This system is a private invention, leased annually by the Government from the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., which company maintains the system in working order, although the post office supplies the manpower for its operation.

The tubes are in service daily from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. except on Saturday when they cease operation at 10 a. m. The system is not in operation on Sundays or on legal holidays. A full day's operation means that approximately 95,000 tube carriers have traveled all or part of the entire distance of the system. On the outside of each tube carrier there is a label showing the destination of the carrier, which is not opened until it reaches the proper destination. Registered mail, under the usual precautions, is part of the delivery system through the tubes.

Test carriers are sent through the tube lines before daily operations begin. Pressure of from 3 to 8 pounds per inch is maintained.

The value of the pneumatic-tube system was dramatically brought into bold relief during Christmas week of 1947 when a 22.8-inch snowfall all but paralyzed New York City but in no way interrupted the orderly distribution of mails through this well-established pneumatic-tube device.

Today when mail matter must move quickly to meet all kinds of timetable deadlines—plane, railroad, and steamer—to insure its early delivery, the underground pneumatic-tube system is invaluable. Without it the post office would have to operate a larger fleet of trucks to transport the mail.

Pneumatic-tube service is used for the transportation of ordinary letter mail, air-mail, special-delivery mail, registered mail, daily newspapers in limited quantities, and miscellaneous letter-size pieces.

Pneumatic-tube service is dependable inasmuch as it is not affected generally by street surface traffic or by weather conditions.

The present pneumatic-tube system has a distinct value as a medium of transportation for first-class mail because of the effectiveness of the system, connecting as it does 23 points including the General Post Office in Brooklyn, thus establishing a circular system converging at Church Street Station, provision being made for a cross-town service between east- and west-side lines, from the General Post Office to Grand Central Station, and from Manhattanville to Triborough Stations.

The committee fully recognizes the fact that the lessors of the pneumatic-tube system in Greater New York are entitled to a fair return on the expense of maintaining the network; at the same time the committee is mindful of the duty of the Post Office Department to provide the best methods of transmission at the lowest possible cost.

It is appropriate, therefore, that there be a flexibility provided for the convenience of both parties in a day of rising replacement and maintenance costs and rapid depreciations. Therefore, the committee has established a minimum and a maximum rate between which the Post Office Department is left with considerable latitude for receiving bids and bidders are left with the same leeway in preparing and submitting proposals for the supply of the facilities. The amounts of $10,500 as a minimum and $12,000 as a maximum rate, therefore, have been proposed. The present rate is $9,382 per mile.

EXHIBIT 6

[Public Law 848—80th Cong.]
[Chapter 761—2d sess.]
[S. 2510]

An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the acts of April 21, 1902; May 27, 1908; and June 19, 1922 (39 U. S. C. 423), relating to contracts for transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes in New York, N. Y., including the borough of Brooklyn, are hereby amended to provide that the annual rental contract payment rate for the use of the 26.969 miles of double-line pneumatic-tube facilities shall not exceed $12,000 per mile: *Provided, however*, That the rate shall be inclusive of maintenance expenses but shall be exclusive of all operating expenses.

Approved June 30, 1948.

EXHIBIT 7

[H. Rept. 2431, 80th Cong., 2d sess.]

PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, INCLUDING RETAINMENT OF PNEUMATIC-TUBE SYSTEMS

Mr. REES, from the committee of conference, submitted the following conference report to accompany S. 2510:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: $12,000; and the House agree to the same.

EDWARD H. REES,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
TOM MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WILLIAM LANGER,
ZALES N. ECTON,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill amends the provisions of law relating to contracts for transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes in New York, N. Y., including the Borough of Brooklyn, so as to provide that the annual rental contract payment rate for the use of the 26.969 miles of double-line pneumatic-tube facilities shall not exceed $12,000 per mile nor be less than $10,500 per mile.

The amendment of the House provided that the maximum rate should not exceed $11,000 per mile, and eliminated the minimum payment figure contained in the Senate bill.

The conference agreement restores the $12,000 per mile maximum rate as provided by the Senate bill, and eliminates the $10,500 per mile minimum in accordance with the House amendment.

EDWARD H. REES,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
TOM MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EXHIBIT 8

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., August 25, 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am submitting herewith, for consideration by the Congress, legislation relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices.

The legislation is designed to clarify and enact into positive law, the provisions of law relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The present laws on this subject, which would be repealed by the proposed legislation are contained in prior appropriation acts (sec. 423, title 39, United States Code), as amended by the act of June 30, 1948 (Public Law 848, 80th Cong.). The provisions codified in 39 U. S. C. 423 were contained in the act of April 21, 1902 (32 Stat. 114), as amended by the acts of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1211), May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 412), and June 19, 1922 (42 Stat. 661).

Under existing law the amount permitted to be paid the contractor for the use of pneumatic tubes is limited to $17,000 per mile per annum which "shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses," except in the city of New York, including the borough of Brooklyn, where not to exceed $12,000 per mile, inclusive of maintenance expenses, but exclusive of operating expenses, may be paid under authority of the act of June 30, 1948. The limitation of $17,000 was fixed by the act of April 21, 1902, and, with the exception of the increase in amount to be paid per annum in the city of New York, including the borough of Brooklyn, has not been modified.

The act of April 21, 1902, also prohibited contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic-tube service "which will create an aggregate annual rate of expenditure, including necessary power and labor to operate the tubes, and all other expenses of such service in excess of 4 percent of the gross postal revenue" of the city in which such service would be established. This provision of the 1902 act is obsolete.

At the present time contracts are in effect for the transmission of mails by pneumatic-tube service at Boston, Mass., and New York, N. Y. The contracts expire December 31, 1950.

This legislative proposal transmitted herewith would permit the Postmaster General to enter into contracts, for terms of not to exceed 10 years (the terms now authorized by law), for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The maximum per annum rate authorized to be paid for such service at New York would be increased from not to exceed $12,000 per mile to not to exceed $15,500 per mile for a period of 10 years, after which time the annual rate of expenditures per mile shall not exceed $12,000. The per annum rate paid at other cities for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes would be at the most favorable rates obtainable, subject to amounts appropriated therefor by Congress.

It is estimated that the enactment of this legislation will not increase the expenditures of this Department more than $53,000 per annum.

As the existing contracts expire December 31, 1950, it is urged that the proposed legislation be enacted during the present session of Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised this Department that there would be no objection to the presentation of this draft bill for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General.

EXHIBIT 9

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 30, 1950.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter of August 29, 1950, transmitting a copy of a bill—introduced on August 28, 1950, as S. 4102—entitled "A bill relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices," together with a copy of a report of the Postmaster General relative thereto.

As indicated in the report of the Postmaster General, the bill, if enacted, would clarify and enact into positive law the various provisions of existing law relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. However, it is noted that under the bill the limitation contained in existing law limiting the amount permitted to be paid to contractors—other than in the city of New York including the Borough of Manhattan—to $17,000 per mile per annum which "shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses" would be entirely removed. Also, the bill would increase for the next 10 years the amount which, under existing law, may be expended for such services in the city of New York, including the Borough of Manhattan, from $12,000 to $15,500 per mile per annum, inclusive of maintenance expenses but exclusive of operating expenses.

While this office has no information as to the need or desirability of removing or changing the limitations contained in existing law as noted above, the general purposes of the legislation do not appear objectionable.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
August 25, 1950.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Because of the urgency of the legislation covered by the attached suggested draft and explained in the letter from the Postmaster General to the Vice President, I am, at the request of the Department, endeavoring to expedite action on this measure in every possible way.

We should have the Vice President's referral by Monday and since this referral is routine it occurs to me that you may wish to read this over and authorize me to prepare a bill for you to introduce on Monday which might possibly be considered by your subcommittee informally through a discussion by you and Senators FREAR and Ecton so that the bill could be submitted to the full committee on Wednesday, August 30, since this may be the last committee meeting for several weeks.

I realize that this is proceeding much faster than usual but we do not have to worry as to agency reports since we have the approval of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget on the proposed legislation and I think I can clear it with the Comptroller General by Wednesday.

You will note from the first paragraph on page 2 of the Postmaster General's letter that certain pneumatic-tube contracts in New York and Boston will expire on December 31, and it is important that there be congressional action on this matter as early as possible to avoid the danger of the legislation going over to the 82d Congress.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. AUSTIN LATIMER,
Staff Director and Chief Clerk.

EXHIBIT 10

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General may enter into contracts, for terms not exceeding 10 years, for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices.

SEC. 2. Contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices shall be subject to the provisions of laws relating to the letting of mail contracts, except as otherwise provided in this act. Advertisements shall state in general terms only the requirements of the service and shall be in the form best calculated to invite competitive bidding. The Postmaster General may reject any and all bids. No contract shall be awarded except to the lowest responsible bidder tendering full and sufficent guaranties to the satisfaction of the Postmaster General of his ability to perform satisfactory service.

SEC. 3. In the city of New York, including the Borough of Brooklyn, the annual rate of expenditure for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes shall not exceed $15,500 per mile per annum of double line pneumatic-tube facilities for a period of 10 years, after which time the annual rate of expenditures per mile shall not exceed $12,000. This rate shall be inclusive of maintenance expenses but shall be exclusive of all operating expenses.

SEC. 4. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent or in conflict with this act are hereby repealed. This shall include, but is not limited to, the following laws:

(a) The provisions of the acts of April 21, 1902; March 2, 1907; May 27, 1908; and June 19, 1922 (39 U. S. C. 423), relating to contracts for transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes; and

(b) The act entitled "An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1163).

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4102), relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

STATEMENT

This bill is designed to clarify and consolidate the provisions of existing law relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. This legislation is made necessary by reason of the fact that some provisions of existing statutes are obsolete and others need revision.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Postmaster General. This measure would permit the Postmaster General to enter into contracts, for terms of not more than 10 years, for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The maximum per annum rate authorized to be paid for such service at New York would be increased from not to exceed $12,000 per mile to an amount not exceeding $15,500 per mile, for a period of 10 years, after which time the annual rate shall not exceed $12,000 per mile. The bill permits annual rates for pneumatic service in other cities at the most favorable rates obtainable, subject to amounts appropriated therefor by the Congress.

Cost: The Post Office Department estimates that the additional cost from this legislation will not exceed $53,000 per annum.

AGENCY REPORTS

The attached letter from the Postmaster General sets forth the need for this legislation. The Bureau of the Budget interposes no objection to the introduction of this bill. The attached report from the Comptroller General calls to the committee's attention the fact that, except as to New York City, ceilings existing in present law are removed. The committee, however, feels that the language of the bill and the requirement as to competitive bidding are sufficient on this point.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., August 25, 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am submitting herewith, for consideration by the Congress, legislation relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices.

The legislation is designed to clarify and enact into positive law, the provisions of law relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The present laws on this subject, which would be repealed by the proposed legislation, are contained in prior appropriation acts (sec. 423, title 39, U. S. C.), as amended by the act of June 30, 1948 (Public Law 848, 80th Cong.). The provisions codified in 39 United States Code 423 were contained in the act of April 21, 1902 (32 Stat. 114), as amended by the acts of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1211), May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 412), and June 19, 1922 (42 Stat. 661).

Under existing law the amount permitted to be paid the contractor for the use of pneumatic tubes is limited to $17,000 per mile per annum which "shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses," except in the city of New York, including the Borough of Brooklyn, where not to exceed $12,000 per mile, inclusive of maintenance expenses, but exclusive of operating expenses, may be paid under authority of the act of June 30, 1948. The limitation of $17,000 was fixed by the act of April 21, 1902, and, with the exception of the increase in amount to be paid per annum in the city of New York, including the Borough of Brooklyn, has not been modified.

The act of April 21, 1902, also prohibited contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic-tube service "which will create an aggregate annual rate of expenditure, including necessary power and labor to operate the tubes, and all other expenses of such service in excess of 4 percent of the gross postal revenue" of the city in which such service would be established. This provision of the 1902 act is obsolete.

At the present time contracts are in effect for the transmission of mails by pneumatic-tube service at Boston, Mass., and New York, N. Y. The contracts expire December 31, 1950.

The legislative proposal transmitted herewith would permit the Postmaster General to enter into contracts, for terms of not to exceed 10 years (the terms now authorized by law), for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The maximum per annum rate authorized to be paid for such service at New York would be increased from not to exceed $12,000 per mile to not to exceed $15,500 per mile for a period of 10 years, after which time the anual rate of expenditures per mile shall not exceed $12,000. The per annum rate paid at other cities for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes would be at the most favorable rates obtainable, subject to amounts appropriated therefor by Congress.

It is estimated that the enactment of this legislation will not increase the expenditures

of this Department more than $53,000 per annum.

As the existing contracts expire December 31, 1950, it is urged that the proposed legislation be enacted during the present session of Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised this Department that there would be no objection to the presentation of this draft bill for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 30, 1950.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter of August 29, 1950, transmitting a copy of a bill—introduced on August 28, 1950, as S. 4102—entitled "A bill relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices," together with a copy of a report of the Postmaster General relative thereto.

As indicated in the report of the Postmaster General, the bill, if enacted, would clarify and enact into positive law the various provisions of existing law relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. However, it is noted that under the bill the limitation contained in existing law limiting the amount permitted to be paid to contractors—other than in the city of New York including the borough of Manhattan—to $17,000 per mile per annum which "shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses" would be entirely removed. Also, the bill would increase for the next 10 years the amount which, under existing law, may be expended for such services in the city of New York, including the borough of Manhattan, from $12,000 to $15,500 per mile per annum, inclusive of maintenance expenses but exclusive of operating expenses.

While this office has no information as to the need or desirability of removing or changing the limitations contained in existing law as noted above, the general purposes of the legislation do not appear objectionable.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill (S. 4102), as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets).

ACT OF APRIL 21, 1902

"Act of April 21, 1902, making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903 (32 Stat. 114).

"[For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, $500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for a period not exceeding 4 years, after public advertisement once a week for a period of 6 consecutive weeks in not less than 5 newspapers, 1 of which shall be published in each city where the service is to be performed. That the contracts for this service shall be subject to the provisions of the postal laws and regulations relating to the letting of mail contracts, except as herein otherwise provided, and that no advertisement shall issue until after a careful investigation shall have been made as to the needs and practicability of such service and until a favorable report, in writing, shall have been submitted to the Postmaster General by a commission of not less than three expert postal officials, to be named by him; nor shall such advertisement issue until in the judgment of the Postmaster General the needs of the postal service are such as to justify the expenditure involved. Advertisements shall state in general terms only the requirements of the service and in form best calculated to invite competitive bidding.]

"[That the Postmaster General shall have the right to reject any and all bids; that no contract shall be awarded except to the lowest responsible bidder, tendering full and sufficient guaranties, to the satisfaction of the Postmaster General, of his ability to perform satisfactory service, and such guaranties shall include an approval bond in double the amount of the bid.]

"[That no contract shall be entered into in any city for the character of mail service herein provided which will create an aggregate annual rate of expenditure, including necessary power and labor to operate the tubes, and all other expenses of such service in excess of four per centum of the gross postal revenue of said city for the last preceding fiscal year.]

"[That no contract shall be made in any city providing for 3 miles or more of double lines of tube which shall involve an expenditure in excess of $17,000 per mile per annum, and said compensation shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses.]

"[That the Postmaster General shall not, prior to June 30, 1904, enter into contracts under the provisions of this act involving an annual expenditure in the aggregate in excess of $800,000; and thereafter only such contracts shall be made as may from time to time be provided for in the annual appropriation act for the postal service; and all provisions of law contrary to those herein contained are repealed]."

ACT OF MARCH 2, 1907, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1908, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (34 STAT. 1211)

"[For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, $1,250,000, and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to enter into contracts not exceeding, in the aggregate, $1,388,759, under the provisions of the law, for a period not exceeding 10 years: *Provided*, That said service shall not be extended in any cities other than those in which the service is now under contract under authority of Congress, except the Borough of Brooklyn, of the city of New York, and the cities of Baltimore, Md.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Kansas City, Mo.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; and San Francisco, Calif.]"

ACT OF MAY 27, 1908, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1909, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (35 STAT. 412)

"[For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, $1 million; and the Postmasteer-General is hereby authorized to enter into contracts not exceeding, in the aggregate, $1,388,759, under the provisions of the law, for a period not exceeding 10 years.]

"[And the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to investigate and report to Congress not later than January 1, 1909, the feasibility and desirability of the Government purchasing or installing the equipment for pneumatic-tube service, and thereafter operating the same in the cities where such service is now in operation, and also ascertain and report the approximate cost of purchase and likewise of installation and the cost of maintenance and operation]"

ACT OF JUNE 19, 1922, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1923, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (42 STAT. 661)

"[SEC. 5. For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices in the city of New York, including the Borough of Brooklyn of the city of New York, at an annual rate of expenditure not in excess of $18,500 per mile of double line of tubes, including power, labor, and all other operating expenses, $513,911.50: *Provided*, That the provisions not inconsistent herewith of the acts of April 21, 1902, and May 27, 1908, relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, shall be applicable hereto: *Provided further*, That either party to the contract for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices may apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission at any time after October 1, 1922, and before July 1, 1923, for a revision of this rate, its decision to be effective after July 1, 1923, but in no case shall the rate exceed $19,500 per mile.]"

ACT OF JUNE 30, 1948 (62 STAT. 1163) TO PROVIDE FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, INCLUDING RETAINMENT OF PNEUMATIC-TUBE SYSTEMS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

"[That the provisions of the acts of April 21, 1902; May 27, 1908; and June 19, 1922, relating to contracts for transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes in New York, N. Y., including the Borough of Brooklyn, are hereby amended to provide that the annual rental contract payment rate for the use of the 26.969 miles of double-line pneumatic-tube facilities shall not exceed $12,000 per mile: *Provided, however*, That the rate shall be inclusive of maintenance expenses but shall be exclusive of all operating expenses.]"

[H. Rept. No. 3144, 81st Cong., 2d sess.]

CONTRACTS FOR THE TRANSMISSION OF MAIL BY PNEUMATIC TUBES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, submitted the following report to accompany S. 4102:

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4102) relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

STATEMENT

This bill will permit the Postmaster General to enter into contracts for terms of not to exceed 10 years (the terms now authorized by law), for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The maximum per annum rate authorized to be paid for such service at New York would be increased from not to exceed $12,000 per mile to not to exceed $15,500 per mile for a period of 10 years, after which time the annual rate of expenditures per mile shall not exceed $12,000.

The owners of the pneumatic-tube system in New York City must convert the system from nonstandard direct current to standard alternating current. The source of power supply, the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., has requested that it be advised on or before December 31, 1950, whether or not the power machinery operating the pneumatic-tube system will be converted to the use of alternating current. If this concern is notified that the conversion will be made, then it will continue to supply nonstandard direct current for a reasonable length of time in order to permit the work of making the conversion to be completed.

The exact cost of the conversion cannot be determined accurately without detailed field investigation, but it is estimated that the conversion cost will approximate $300,000. The owners of the tube system operating in the city of New York, the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., cannot absorb the expense of making this conversion of the machinery, pay operating and maintenance expenses, and obtain a fair profit on its capital outlay at the existing statutory rate of pay, namely, $12,000 per mile.

The per annum rate paid at other cities for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes will be at the most favorable rates obtainable, subject to amounts appropriated therefor by Congress.

The bill also clarifies existing law with respect to such pneumatic-tube contracts. These contracts expire December 31, 1950, and expeditious action on this legislation is required in order that its terms may be utilized in negotiations for the new contract.

The Post Office Department estimates the enactment of this legislation will not increase expenditures of the Department in excess of $53,000 per annum. The legislation has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and was introduced at the request of the Post Office Department.

The letter sent to the Speaker of the House with regard to this legislation is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., August 25, 1950.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am submitting herewith, for consideration by the Congress, legislation relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices.

The legislation is designed to clarify, and enact into positive law, the provisions of law relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The present laws on this subject, which would be repealed by the proposed legislation, are contained in prior appropriation acts (sec. 423, title 39, U. S. C.), as amended by the act of June 30, 1948 (Public Law 848, 80th Cong.). The provisions codified in 39 United States Code 423 were contained in the act of April 21, 1902 (32 Stat. 114), as amended by the acts of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1211), May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 412), and June 19, 1922 (42 Stat. 661).

Under existing law the amount permitted to be paid the contractor for the use of pneumatic tubes is limited to $17,000 per mile per annum which "shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses," except in the city of New York, including the Borough of Brooklyn, where not to exceed $12,000 per mile, inclusive of maintenance expenses, but exclusive of operating expenses, may be paid under authority of the act of June 30, 1948. The limitation of $17,000 was fixed by the act of April 21, 1902, and, with the exception of the increase in amount to be paid per annum in the city of New York, including the Borough of Brooklyn, has not been modified.

The act of April 21, 1902, also prohibited contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic-tube service "which will create an aggregate annual rate of expenditure, including necessary power and labor to operate the tubes, and all other expenses of such service in excess of 4 percent of the gross postal revenue" of the city in which such service would be established. This provision of the 1902 act is obsolete.

At the present time contracts are in effect for the transmission of mails by pneumatic-tube service at Boston, Mass., and New York, N. Y. The contracts expire December 31, 1950.

This legislative proposal transmitted herewith would permit the Postmaster General to enter into contracts, for terms of not to exceed 10 years (the terms now authorized by law), for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The maximum per annum rate authorized to be paid for such service at New York would be increased from not to exceed $12,000 per mile to not to exceed $15,500 per mile for a period of 10 years, after which time the annual rate of expenditures per mile shall not exceed $12,000. The per annum rate paid at other cities for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes would be at the most favorable rates obtainable, subject to amounts appropriated therefor by Congress.

It is estimated that the enactment of this legislation will not increase the expenditures of this Department more than $53,000 per annum.

As the existing contracts expire December 31, 1950, it is urged that the proposed legislation be enacted during the present session of Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised this Department that there would be no objection to the presentation of this draft bill for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as passed the Senate, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets):

ACT OF APRIL 21, 1902, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1903 (32 STAT. 114)

"[For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, $500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for a period not exceeding 4 years, after public advertisement once a week for a period of 6 consecutive weeks in not less than five newspapers, one of which shall be published in each city where the service is to be performed. That the contracts for this service shall be subject to the provisions of the postal laws and regulations relating to the letting of mail contracts, except as herein otherwise provided, and that no advertisement shall issue until after a careful investigation shall have been made as to the needs and practicability of such service and until a favorable report, in writing, shall have been submitted to the Postmaster General by a commission of not less than three expert postal officials, to be named by him; nor shall such advertisement issue until in the judgment of the Postmaster General the needs of the postal service are such as to justify the expenditure involved. Advertisements shall state in general terms only the requirements of the service and in form best calculated to invite competitive bidding.

"[That the Postmaster-General shall have the right to reject any and all bids; that no contract shall be awarded except to the lowest responsible bidder, tendering full and sufficient guaranties, to the satisfaction of the Postmaster-General, of his ability to perform satisfactory service, and such guaranties shall include an approval bond in double the amount of the bid.

"[That no contract shall be entered into in any city for the character of mail service herein provided which will create an aggregate annual rate of expenditure, including necessary power and labor to operate the tubes, and all other expenses of such service in excess of 4 percent of the gross postal revenue of said city for the last preceding fiscal year.

"[That no contract shall be made in any city providing for 3 miles or more of double lines of tube which shall involve an expenditure in excess of $17,000 per mile per annum, and said compensation shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses.

"[That the Postmaster-General shall not, prior to June 30, 1904, enter into contracts under the provisions of this act involving an annual expenditure in the aggregate in excess of $800,000; and thereafter only such contracts shall be made as may from time to time be provided for in the annual appropriation act for the postal service; and all provisions of law contrary to those herein contained are repealed.]"

ACT OF MARCH 2, 1907, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1908, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (34 STAT. 1211)

"[For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, $1,250,000, and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to enter into contracts not exceeding, in the aggregate, $1,388,759, under the provisions of the law, for a period not exceeding 10 years: *Provided*, That said service shall not be extended in any cities other than those in which the service is now under contract under authority of Congress, except the Borough of Brooklyn, of the city of New York, and the cities of Baltimore, Md.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Kansas City, Mo.; Pittsburgh, Pa., and San Francisco, Calif.]"

ACT OF MAY 27, 1908, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1909, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (35 STAT. 412)

"[For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, $1 million; and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to enter into contracts not exceeding, in the aggregate, $1,388,759, under the provisions of the law, for a period not exceeding 10 years.

"[And the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to investigate and report to Congress not later than January 1, 1909, the feasibility and desirability of the Government purchasing or installing the equipment for pneumatic-tube service, and thereafter operating the same in the cities where such service is now in operation, and also ascertain and report the approximate cost of purchase and likewise of installation and the cost of maintenance and operation.]"

ACT OF JUNE 19, 1922, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1923, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (42 STAT. 661)

"[SEC. 5. For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices in the city of New York, including the Borough of Brooklyn of the city of New York, at an annual rate of expenditure not in excess of $18,500 per mile of double line of tubes, including power, labor, and all other operating expenses, $513,911.50: *Provided*, That the provisions not inconsistent herewith of the acts of April 21, 1902, and May 27, 1908, relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, shall be applicable hereto: *Provided further*, That either party to the contract for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices may apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission at any time after October 1, 1922, and before July 1, 1923, for a revision of this rate, its decision to be effective after July 1, 1923, but in no case shall the rate exceed $19,500 per mile.]"

ACT OF JUNE 30, 1948

"[An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes

"[*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the provisions of the acts of April 21, 1902; May 27, 1908;

and June 19, 1922 (39 U. S. C. 423), relating to contracts for transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes in New York, N. Y., including the Borough of Brooklyn, are hereby amended to provide that the annual rental contract payment rate for the use of the 26.965 miles of doubleline pneumatic-tube facilities shall not exceed $12,000 per mile: *Provided, however,* That the rate shall be inclusive of maintenance expenses but shall be exclusive of all operating expenses.]"

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, after further comments by three Senators, which I understand are to be made at this time, I should like to express the hope that the Senate may proceed to the call of the calendar, which was scheduled for today prior to entering into the unanimous-consent agreement with respect to the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota.

Although I believe the transaction of morning business has been partly concluded, through the yielding for that purpose by the Senator from Minnesota in the course of his remarks, I understand there is further routine business to be transacted and it might be well to have it all appear in the RECORD following my statement. I assume that further routine business will be transacted in each instance by unanimous consent.

It is not my plan to hold the Senate in session beyond 5 o'clock this afternoon, in accordance with my original plan. I hope we can conclude the call of the calendar by that time.

Tomorrow it will be my purpose to have the Senate consider the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, which I understand the House is to consider either today or tomorrow. That will be the order of business.

Either later this afternoon or tomorrow morning I shall get in touch with the minority leadership and furnish to it a list of the bills, some of which have already been announced, which I hope the Senate will be able to consider during the remainder of the week.

There will be no night sessions of the Senate, as such, this week.

ADDITIONAL PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Additional petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolution relative to a study and revision of Taft-Hartley law

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to cause a study to be made of the Taft-Hartley law, so-called, with a view to revising those provisions of said act, if any, which such study may reveal as tending to be detrimental to the legitimate aims and interests of labor; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, January 21, 1954, adopted.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

"Senate, January 27, 1954, adopted, in concurrence.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

"A true copy.

"Attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress bills to grant aid to the Israeli Government; and

"Whereas it is the purpose of these bills to give financial aid in the form of grants to the government of the ancient and traditional democracy now known as the Israeli State; and

"Whereas such assistance to the people of Israel in developing their natural resources, expanding their agricultural and industrial economy will mean a great productive capacity and will further the promotion of the security and general welfare of the United States and of Israel and will strengthen the ties of friendship between the people of the United States and of Israel; and

"Whereas such grants would further the basic objectives of the charter of the United Nations: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Members in the Congress of the United States of America be and they hereby are respectfully requested by the General Court of Massachusetts to give intensive study and consideration to such bills now pending in the Congress of the United States, and to use their best efforts to have this proposed legislation enacted into law; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of state to the presiding officers of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, January 21, 1954, adopted.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"Senate, January 27, 1954, adopted, in concurrence.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"A true copy.

"Attest:

[SEAL] "EDWIN J. CRONIN,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was deeply gratified to receive a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, regarding the victory of St. Lawrence Seaway legislation in the Senate.

I am personally appreciative of the gracious thoughts expressed with regard to myself, but I believe that the congratulations conveyed by the common council are applicable to all those of my colleagues who voted for this sound legislation.

I present the resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas after more than 30 continuous years of effort by advocates of the St. Lawrence Seaway project, the United States Senate has by a decisive vote of 51 to 33, passed enabling legislation to authorize construction of navigation works for the seaway, within United States territory, on a self-liquidating basis; and

"Whereas the legislation which finally gained the approval of the Senate was conceived and sponsored by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, who during present and past congressional sessions has been the recognized leader and advocate of the seaway in the Senate; and

"Whereas the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project has been strongly recommended by the National Security Council, the Cabinet, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President, and other high authorities as necessary to the national economy, the national defense, and the security of this Nation; and the people of this city, this State, and the entire Nation are indebted to Senator WILEY for his courageous and persistent leadership on this great issue, during long and discouraging years of effort: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That we hereby officially commend Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, and his associates in the Senate, for their leadership and their successful and determined effort to carry enabling legislation for the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project to a decisive victory in the Senate of the United States, and thus advancing toward final authorization a project greatly in the national and the international interest of this country, and essential to our prosperity and our national security."

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 4, 1954.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee on January 26, 1954.

STANLEY J. WITKOWSKI,
City Clerk.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN (by request):

S. 2911. A bill to provide for the development of a sound and profitable domestic wool industry under our national policy of expanding world trade; to encourage increased domestic production of wool for our national security; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 2912. A bill for the relief of D. Alston Davis, Jr., and Willard D. Gilbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2913. A bill to establish an effective program for the planning and construction of

needed public works and to create the Office of Public Facilities Administrator; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2914. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2915. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington, in order to improve facilities for navigation;

S. 2916. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Bellingham Harbor in the State of Washington in order to provide for a small-boat basin;

S. 2917. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Quillayute River in the State of Washington in order to improve facilities for navigation;

S. 2918. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Port Angeles Harbor in the State of Washington in order to provide for a mooring basin; and

S. 2919. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Everett Harbor in the State of Washington in order to improve facilities for navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating 1 day each year as National Library Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1954

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a summary and analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, summary, and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2914) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1954."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. Section 3 (j) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "act") is amended to read as follows:

"(j) 'Produced' means produced, manufactured, mined, handled, or in any other manner worked on in any State; and for the purposes of this act an employee shall be deemed to have been engaged in the production of goods if such employee was employed in producing, manufacturing, mining, handling, transporting, or in any other manner working on such goods, or in any process or occupation necessary to the production thereof, in any State."

(b) Section 3 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(p) 'Activity affecting commerce' includes any activity necessary to commerce or competing with any activity in commerce, or where the payment of wages at rates below those prescribed by this act would burden or obstruct or tend to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce.

"(q) 'Hired farm labor' includes the labor of any person employed on a farm, except the labor of the farmer and his immediate family.

"(r) 'Farm enterprise' comprises all tracts of land, whether contiguous or not, under one management, located in a county and immediately adjacent counties on which any of the operations enumerated in section 3 (f) is carried on.

"(s) 'Man-day' means any day on which hired farm labor is performed."

MINIMUM WAGES

SEC. 3. (a) Section 6 (a) (1) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) Every employer shall pay to each of his employees who is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and every employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall pay to each of his employees employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged, wages at the following rates:

"(1) not less than $1.25 an hour;

"(2) in the case of any employee in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, not less than the rate in effect for such employee prior to the enactment of this act plus an amount equal to the sum by which the rate prescribed in paragraph (1) of this subsection exceeds 75 cents an hour: *Provided*, That upon the expiration of 1 year from the date of enactment of this act such rate shall be not less than such rate plus one-third of the difference between such rate and the rate prescribed in paragraph (1), upon the expiration of 2 years not less than such rate plus two-third of the difference between such rate and the rate prescribed in paragraph (1), and upon the expiration of 3 years not less than the rate prescribed in paragraph (1) of this subsection."

(b) Such section 6 (a) is further amended by striking out "(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3)."

(c) Section 6 (c) of such act is hereby repealed.

MAXIMUM HOURS

SEC. 4. (a) Section 7 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, no employer shall employ any of his employees who is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and no employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall employ any of his employees in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged—

"(1) for a workweek longer than 37½ hours during the first 2 years after the effective date of this act;

"(2) for a workweek longer than 35 hours after the expiration of the fourth year from such date,

unless such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of the hours above specified at a rate not less than 1½ times the regular rate at which he is employed."

(b) Section 7 (b) of such act is amended by striking out paragraph (3) thereof.

(c) Section 7 of such act is further amended by striking out subsection (c) and renumbering the succeeding subsections accordingly.

WAGE ORDERS IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

SEC. 5. Section 8 of such act is hereby repealed.

CHILD-LABOR PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. Subsection (c) of section 12 of such act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "and no employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall employ any oppressive child labor in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged."

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 7. Section 13 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. (a) The provisions of sections 6 and 7 shall not apply with respect to (1) any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity (as such terms are defined and delimited by regulations of the Administrator); or (2) any employee employed in any retail or service establishment by an employer having not more than five such establishments and having a total annual volume of sales or services of not more than $500,000; or (3) any employee employed in a hotel or inn having an annual volume of hotel business of not more than $500,000; or (4) any employee employed in agriculture during any calendar quarter, by a farm enterprise which used less than 600 man-days of hired farm labor during each of the preceding four quarters; or (5) any employee to the extent that such employee is exempted by regulations or orders of the Administrator issued under section 14.

"(b) The provisions of section 7 shall not apply with respect to any employee of an employer subject to the provisions of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act.

"(c) The provisions of section 12 relating to child labor shall not apply with respect to any employee 14 years of age or over employed in agriculture outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while he is so employed, or to any child employed as an actor or performer in motion pictures or theatrical productions, or in radio or television productions.

"(d) The provisions of sections 6, 7, and 12 shall not apply to any employee engaged in the delivery of newspapers to consumers at their residences. The provisions of section 12 shall not apply to any employee otherwise engaged in the delivery of newspapers to consumers when such employee is employed outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living and is 16 years of age or over."

LEARNERS, APPRENTICES, AND HANDICAPPED WORKERS

SEC. 8. Section 14 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 14. The Administrator, to the extent necessary in order to prevent curtailment of opportunities for employment, shall by regulations or by orders provide for (1) the employment of learners, of apprentices, except indentured apprentices, and of messengers employed primarily in delivering letters and messages, under special certificates issued pursuant to regulations of the Administrator, as such wages lower than the minimum wage applicable under section 6, but not less than $1 an hour, and subject to such limitations as to time, number, proportion, and length of service as the Administrator shall prescribe, and (2) the employment of individuals whose earning capacity is impaired by age or physical or mental deficiency or injury, under special certificates issued by the Administrator, at such wages lower than the minimum wage applicable under section 6, but not less than $1 an hour, and for such period as shall be fixed in such certificates."

PENALTIES

SEC. 9 (a). The last sentence of section 16 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the word "two-year" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "four-year."

(b) Section 6 (a) of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 is amended by striking out the word "two" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "four."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 10. This act shall take effect upon the expiration of 120 days from the date of its enactment.

The summary and analysis presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO AMEND THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

I. MINIMUM WAGE

Section 3 (a) of the proposed bill would amend section 6 (a) of the act to increase the statutory minimum wage from 75 cents to $1.25 an hour.

The present 75-cent minimum wage was inadequate when the Fair Labor Standards Act was amended in 1949 and is completely outmoded today. The inflationary rise in the cost of living since 1950 when the amended Fair Labor Standards Act took effect has placed a particular hardship on low-wage workers. Moreover, the general wage level has increased considerably during this period.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, after an intensive study, has estimated a city worker's family budget for a family of four for October 1951. This budget is defined as "the total dollars necessary to provide family health, worker efficiency, nurture of children and social participation by all members of the family." It is a minimum budget for adequate family living.

The estimate made by the Bureau of National Affairs, a private research organization, in bringing up-to-date the BLS budget places the average cost of this budget in June 1953 at $4,275. The factory workweek in 1953 averaged 40.5 hours. Assuming the average worker was employed 50 weeks during the year, he would have worked 2,025 hours. To earn $4,275 he would have required an hourly wage of about $2.11, far above the $1.25 minimum wage rate provided for in the proposed bill.

The Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor has compiled the budgets prepared in 12 States and the District of Columbia in connection with the administration of minimum wage laws applying to women workers. These budgets represent the minimum necessary living expenses for a self-supporting woman without dependents. The estimated November 1953 cost of these budgets ranges from $1,693 in Massachusetts to $2,729 in New Jersey. Except for the Massachusetts budget, they are all more than $2,000 and 5 are $2,400 or more. Assuming 2,000 hours of employment, a worker receiving $1.25 an hour would have an annual income of $2,500. Since these budgets are for single women without dependents, it is obvious that the average worker with a family to support would need a much larger income to maintain even the minimum standard of living.

The minimum wage has failed to keep pace with the general increase in wages. Thus from June 1938, when the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted, to December 1953, average hourly earnings of factory workers increased from $0.62 to $1.79, a rise of $1.17. By contrast, the minimum wage has risen by only 50 cents. Enactment of the $1.25 minimum provided for in the proposed bill will still mean that the increase in wages since 1938 of the lowest paid workers employed at the minimum will be considerably less than the increase in the general wage level.

II. MAXIMUM HOURS

Section 4 (a) of the proposed bill would amend section 7 (a) of the act to decrease the maximum workweek from 40 to 37½ hours during the first 2 years after the act takes effect and to 35 hours thereafter.

The gradual reduction of working hours combined with increased real income have contributed greatly to the growth of our national economy. There has been a tremendous increase in the productivity of American industry since World War II. Unless the increased productivity is accompanied by a reduction in the number of hours worked, without reduction in incomes, this technological progress could, instead of enhancing the living standards and welfare of American workers, threaten full employment and continued progress in our economic life. Continuing reduction in the workweek without loss of pay is necessary to assure full employment and an ever-rising standard of living as well as greater opportunities for leisure-time activities for American workers.

Our immediate goal should be the establishment of a standard 35-hour week, which has already been achieved through collective bargaining for large numbers of workers. In order that a transition to the 35-hour week should not be too abrupt, the proposed bill permits a gradual adjustment to the shorter workweek by providing for a 2-year period of transition. During the 2-year transition period, the maximum workweek would be 37½ hours. Thereafter, the maximum workweek would be established at 35 hours.

III. COVERAGE

A. General application of the law

The proposed bill would extend the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act to cover all activities affecting commerce.

At the present time, the FLSA applies only to employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. The coverage of the law is thus far more restrictive than the Nation's other major piece of labor legislation, the Labor-Management Relations Act. There is no reason why the FLSA should not cover the same categories of workers as the labor-management relations law.

B. Large-scale retail and service establishments

Section 7 of the proposed law would extend coverage of the law to employees of large-scale hotels, chain stores, restaurants, and other similar retail and service establishments. This would be accomplished by modifying section 13 (a) (2) of the present law, which gives a complete exemption to all retail and service establishments.

The modern department store, grocery chain, and similar large-scale enterprises, have become part of America's big business. These firms whose business amounts to many millions of dollars annually, are quite capable of meeting the requirements of the Nation's basic labor standards legislation. The proposed bill incorporates the same tests for determining coverage under the law as the proposals made in 1949 and would continue to exempt from coverage the small hotel, the corner grocery store, and similar small business.

C. Industrialized agriculture

Sections 2 and 7 of the proposed bill modify the blanket exemption of the present law for employees employed in agriculture. The exemption would be modified so that only workers on large-scale corporate mechanized farms would be covered by the law.

Workers on these farms are hired just as any factory employee might be. They are paid by the hour or, in some cases, by the week or month, and they are discharged, fired, or laid off just as any machine operator might be. The work of hired farm laborers performing similar repetitive operations such as picking fruit or harvesting crops is strikingly similar to the operations performed on a factory assembly line. There is no reason why these workers should not be covered under the law.

D. Agricultural and seafood processing

The present law contains a maze of partial and complete exemptions for various types of agricultural and seafood processing. These exemptions were written into the law through the influence of the special interest groups who have benefited by them. They should be swept away so that workers in these industries, including the seasonal employees, would be given the protection of the law: 13 (a) (10), agricultural processing industries; 13 (a) (5), seafood and fishing industries; 13 (a) 15), forestry and logging operations; 13 (b) (4), canning of fish; 7 (c), processing of agricultural and seafood products; 7 (b) (3), seasonal exemption.

E. Transportation

There are a number of special exemptions for transportation employees written into the law. These need to be drastically changed so as to give workers in these industries the full protection of the law: 13 (a) (9), electric railway, trolleys, and motor buses; 13 (a) (12), taxicab companies; 13 (a) (14), seamen; 13 (b) (3) air carriers; 13 (b) (1) buses and trucks.

F. Other industries

A number of other exemptions which were written into the law at the request of special interest groups are eliminated from the act by the proposed bill. There is no reason why the benefits of wage and hour legislation should not be extended to these groups of workers: 13 (a) (8), small newspapers; 13 (a) (11), small telephone exchanges; 13 (2) (13), small contract telegraph agencies.

IV. PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Sections 3 (a) and 5 of the proposed bill amend the act to provide for an increase of 50 cents in the minimum-wage rates established by the Administrator under the present industry committee procedure for industries in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. It also provides for a 3-year step-up so that the statutory minimum rate of $1.25 will apply to all industries in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands 3 years after the $1.25 statutory minimum-wage rate takes effect elsewhere in the United States. During the 3-year interim the minimum-wage rate for each industry in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands is to be increased at the end of each year by one-third of the difference between the minimum rate which would take effect with the enactment of the proposed bill and $1.25.

It is essential that the minimum wage in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands be increased to the mainland level as quickly as is feasible in order to raise the standard of living in the population of those territories and to eliminate the competitive advantage of employers in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands over their counterparts on the mainland. As long as workers in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are forced to seek jobs at extremely low wages, employees on the mainland will be continued to be threatened by the ever-present possibility that their employers will move their plants in order to take advantage of the extremely low wages prevailing in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Since these Territories are part of the United States, their industries should be integrated as rapidly as possible with the United States economy and that means rapid elimination of the differential in wage rates. Because such changes cannot be made immediately, the proposed bill provides for a 3-year transitional period to permit Puerto Rican industries to make whatever adjustments are necessary to permit them to pay the statutory minimum wage applicable elsewhere in the United States.

V. LEARNERS, APPRENTICES, AND HANDICAPPED WORKERS

Section 8 of the proposed bill would amend section 14 of the act to provide that subminimum wages established for learners, apprentices (except indentured apprentices) and handicapped workers be set at not less than $1 an hour.

During a transitional period, it may be necessary that under special arrangements employers be permitted to pay certain be-

ginning or marginal workers less than the statutory minimum wage. However, it is most important that a floor be placed under the subminimum wage that may be paid to such workers. The lowest subminimum wage that should be permitted to be paid to such workers should be $1 an hour. It is understood that in some industries the subminimum wage may be set at more than $1 and that from time to time subminimum wages under $1 an hour will be increased to whatever extent is possible without preventing curtailment of opportunities for employment.

VI. CHILD LABOR

Section 7 of the proposed bill amends section 13 (c) and (d) of the act to prohibit employment of children under the age of 14 in agriculture. It also bans employment of children less than 18 in so-called street trades except that children 16 years of age or over may be employed in such occupations outside of school hours.

All available evidence indicates that the employment of children under the age of 14 in agriculture is harmful to their health and proper growth.

The moral hazards involved in employment of young children in so-called street trades are so great that children under the age of 16 should not be permitted to be employed in such occupations under any circumstances and children between the ages of 16 and 18 should be permitted to do such work only after school hours.

VII. ADMINISTRATION

Section 9 of the proposed bill would amend section 6 (a) of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 as well as 16 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, to increase the statute of limitations from 2 to 4 years.

Workers ought not to be limited in their opportunity to recover wages to which they are entitled which have been denied them by unlawful acts of their employer. The present 2-year statute of limitations is too short a time in many cases for all of the necessary preliminary action to be undertaken in order to recover wages which have been unlawfully withheld from employees. The proposed bill would, therefore, increase the statute of limitations from 2 to 4 years in order that workers will not continue to be denied, through no fault of their own, compensation to which they are legally entitled under the requirements of the act.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN GUATEMALA AND ITS EFFECT ON PRICE OF IMPORTED COFFEE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 211), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas it is reported that the Communist movement has gained such economic and political strength within the Republic of Guatemala that it now largely dominates and controls economic and political affairs within that country; and

Whereas it appears that the prices charged by Guatemalan producers for coffee imported into the United States have been drastically increased, and that such increases have been a contributing factor in the establishment of the exorbitant prices now charged consumers for coffee within the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should—

(a) direct the appropriate agencies of the Government to conduct promptly such investigation as may be necessary to ascertain (1) the extent to which the Communist movement now controls economic and political affairs within the Republic of Guatemala, and (2) the extent to which unjustified increases in the price of coffee imported into the United States have been imposed by Guatemalan producers; and

(b) take such action as may be required to exclude from importation into the United States all coffee originating in the Republic of Guatemala until such time as he is satisfied that (1) the economic and political affairs of that country no longer are dominated and controlled by the Communist movement, and (2) the unjustified prices for coffee imposed by producers in that country have been reduced to reasonable levels.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951—AMENDMENT

Mr. FERGUSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6287) to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONVEYANCE TO FORMER OWNERS OF CERTAIN LANDS IN ALBENI FALLS RESERVOIR PROJECT, IDAHO—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 2804) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands in the Albeni Falls Reservoir project, Idaho, to former owners of such lands, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

I have taken the matter up with the Parliamentarian and find that the bill was improperly referred to the Committee on Armed Services, inasmuch as the subject matter of the bill rightly comes under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward William Day, of Rhode Island, to be United States district judge for the district of Rhode Island;

Edwin F. Hunter, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States district judge for the western district of Louisiana; and

Calvin C. McGregor, of Hawaii, to be seventh judge, first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

By Mr. BUSH (for Mr. LANGER), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Carroll C. Hincks, of Connecticut, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit.

By Mr. MUNDT (for Mr. LANGER), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George T. Michelson, of South Dakota, to be United States district judge for the district of South Dakota.

By Mr. IVES (for Mr. LANGER), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice Augustus N. Hand, retired.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Elmer J. Schnackenberg, of Illinois, to be United States circuit judge, seventh circuit.

SIMON E. SOBELOFF TO BE SOLICITOR GENERAL—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on the Judiciary, it is my privilege to report favorably the nomination of my friend Simon E. Sobeloff, Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be received as in executive session, and will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

Statement by him regarding the Atomic Energy Commission's reactor testing station on the Lost River Desert of eastern Idaho.

THE STRENGTH OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a speech delivered by Mr. L. D. Silberstein, chairman of the board of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Co., over facilities of the United States Department of State's Voice of America program, from New York City, on January 28.

Mr. President, this speech by Mr. Silberstein is the type of factual and optimistic propaganda which seems to me to be very effective, and I desire to congratulate the Voice of America on propaganda of this type, and Mr. Silberstein for the service he has rendered his country in delivering, through the facilities of the State Department, this message to the people behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the body of the RECORD, for it is a message of encouragement to the people of the United States, as well as to the people of other countries.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American economy is strong and sound. The future is bright and encouraging.

I have just returned from a 3-week trip through Western Europe. I was astonished to hear the talk about the coming American depression. As an industrialist who is

familiar with European and American business, I can assure people of Western Europe that there will be no serious American recession. I can further assure you that any talk of another 1929 is absurd.

For one thing the American people and the American Government will not stand for an American depression. In the last 20 years the American people have learned that Government can do something to stop a depression. President Eisenhower has pledged that we'll have no boom or bust economy. He will keep the pledge.

I am optimistic about the future. I am optimistic enough so that I am recommending to the companies with which I am associated that they carry out further expansion programs in the near future.

The companies of which I am an officer go into steel, coal, oil, electrical equipment, machinery, and shipping. I see bright futures for all of them.

There is an erroneous belief in Europe that American prosperity is a wartime prosperity. This is not true. American prosperity in this, the second half of the 20th century, is based on the great change that has taken place in American life during the past 2 decades. During that time the savings of the average man have increased gigantically, and the reserves of business have mounted in proportion.

During the month of December alone over 8,000 new businesses and companies were formed in the United States.

Merely to satisfy the normal day-to-day needs of a population of 160 million American people, grown accustomed to living at a comfortable standard, will call for an active rate of employment among American workers. The overseas demand for our products is an additional backlog. Many peacetime projects, private as well as public, were hitherto postponed by reason of war priorities. These will at last get under way.

A further favorable factor that can be counted on in 1954 is the country's strong credit position. With no evidence of inordinate overborrowing on the part of the public, or of strain in the banking situation, we can count on a liberal flow of banking credit, at a low rate, to support whatever activity is undertaken.

But the most important and least known guarantor of our economy is the atomic age. The atom promises to double the United States gross national product in the next 15 years.

During the past 10 years the Government of the United States has poured approximately $13 billion into atomic energy and atomic experimentation. During 1954 the fruits of this effort will begin to be felt by American industry.

I predict that the entire food industry of the United States will soon be revolutionized by atomic developments. Some of the developments already in sight, thanks to the atomic age, include the following:

1. Methods for increasing plant growth and yield per acre which exceed the greatest previous dreams of agricultural scientists.

2. A revolution in food processing and food shipping which will make it possible to preserve food and prevent decay on an increased scale. Atomic radiation of food will soon permit a loaf of bread to stay a year or more without deteriorating, according to the scientists. It will be possible to preserve meats without refrigeration for months and possibly years while improving the taste and quality.

3. We are on the eve in the United States of a revolution in power which will permit lower cost production of metals and a better life for the peoples of the free world.

4. Forthcoming peacetime use of atomic energy will permit a new revolution in chemicals and further developments of such natural resources as coal and oil to provide a whole new range of exciting new products from industry for the service of mankind.

5. Atomic medicine is already fighting effectively against certain types of cancer and blood diseases and opening scores of new secrets of man's health to science, promising an even longer life to mankind.

Thanks to the leadership of President Eisenhower, these peacetime uses of the atomic age will soon be made available on an increased scale to our neighbors and allies of the free world. The opening of this atomic revolutionary age will give America and the western world an economic lift that surpasses the vision of most of mankind. The wonderful part is that some of it is here today. It's not just a dream of tomorrow.

The atomic revolution will cause readjustment in industry, just as atomic weapons are now causing readjustment in the composition of our military forces.

The atom today is a practiced tool of the national economy. It is providing new work and opening new frontiers for utilities, chemical companies, petroleum companies, aircraft companies, shipbuilding companies, drug companies, and food companies.

Armed for the future such as this, America must go forward.

In the brief time available to me, I cannot cover all of the optimistic sides of the economy. But you can bet that free science is America's answer to the depression talk. Our electronics industry has just completed production of the first 20 million black-and-white television sets. After a brief pause for retooling, it is preparing to produce 20 million color TV sets.

The American automobile industry still has vast new frontiers; more than 60 percent of the autos on the road are now more than 3 years old and provide a gigantic replacement market.

Our housing industry still enjoys tremendous pent-up demand. The best insurance for the economic future is the faith of the American people that every tomorrow can and must be a better one.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE—USE OF PNEUMATIC TUBES IN NEW YORK CITY POST OFFICE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Notwithstanding the order of the Senate as to the call of the calendar, is it the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed at this time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief reply to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to Members of the Senate who may be interested that I intend to respond briefly to the observations made by the Senator from Minnesota, speaking to a question of personal privilege. I take judicial notice of 1 or 2 observations which have been made on the floor of the Senate before I respond concretely to the observations of the Senator from Minnesota.

The first was raised by my very felicitous and esteemed friend the Senator from South Carolina, who wondered whether any more hearings were going to be held by the Subcommittee on Post Office Appropriations.

I think the record will bear me out—and I am sure my distinguished friend the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] will bear me out—that he and I were the last two members of the subcommittee to conduct such hearings, and that we started out in a blaze of glory, but that we were forsaken early in the afternoon.

After some hours of taking testimony on the post-office bill, he and I were the only ones left at the hearing. I finished the bill by myself.

So many presumptions have been raised that it might be advisable to have a little truth about these things. It is presumed, of course, when a bill goes through by unanimous consent that every Senator knows all about it and that every Senator is fully informed on the subject with which the bill deals.

Let us take an incident which has been discussed by the Senator from Minnesota. He discussed it on the 13th of September 1950, in connection with a subject which had been before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I was not in the Senate at the time. What I am about to quote will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 11, at page 14665:

> Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota acted only upon information he had from the Post Office Department, and on the urgency of the request. I could not help but feel that since it was a very technical subject, about which I knew very little, the only advice to follow would be that of the Postmaster General, who seems to be doing a job of economizing in the Post Office Department.

Would anyone say that is a presumption to the effect that the Senator from Minnesota knew all about it? I would not dare say to the people of Illinois that I knew all about all things that go on, when I serve on 5 subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, on 7 subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, and on 3 subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations. To do so I would really need roller skates to get from one subcommittee to another, without even then knowing entirely everything about every subject matter which is considered by the various committees.

But that is quite beside the point. I cannot allow such assertions as have been made to go out to the country without making some answer.

I was astonished at the amount of information and material which we received from a statement made on a question of personal privilege. The Senator from Minnesota knows that I bear him the utmost of good will. It has always been that way. I would no more knowingly hurt him, Mr. President, than I would hurt a member of my own family. If I accomplish his defeat in Minnesota, that is another thing. He understands that. He understands that I am the chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee. I shall be glad to find a Republican to sit in the Senator's place in this body if I can, but I shall always be circumspect and shall also be devoted to the truth and show a fidelity to the facts.

So, Mr. President, let us start at the beginning of the matter. This is not casual with me, because it came up on the 26th of January 1954, while we were taking testimony downstairs on the Post Office Department appropriation bill. I

have the advance sheets from the Government Printing Office which have come back for correction. I knew nothing about it until that time. I am beginning to find out a good deal about it. Usually, as is the case with one who has served on the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives, almost the first thing we do is to find out what has been done in the House of Representatives with reference to the Post Office appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1955.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I served on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Department in the House. Hearings were had on the 8th day of December, 1953. The facts are there for all the world to see. I always send for the House hearings and I thumb through them to see what a good job has been done. On page 73 of the hearings is a question regarding the use of pneumatic tubes in New York City. That was the 8th of December. That was 60 days ago. Anyone can read it for himself. When the hearing was about completed, one member of the committee said:

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we request the Postmaster General to make a complete report to this committee as soon as he feels he is in a position to do so.

Who made that request, Mr. President? A Republican? Certainly not. It was Representative GARY, of Virginia, a Democrat, and a good member of that committee. He was a member of the committee when I was in the House, and I served with him.

As I say, Mr. President, that was 60 days ago. I wondered if this matter would come up, and it did. It came up on the 26th of January when we started hearings on the Post Office appropriation bill in the Senate Committee on Appropriations. There was an allusion to it. As a matter of fact, it began with a question from the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. He asked about the pneumatic tubes. It probably came to his attention. The question was asked as to who had introduced the authorizing legislation.

The Postmaster General said that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] had introduced it.

I can find no place, Mr. President, where the Postmaster General spoke in derogation of our friend from Minnesota. I find nothing in the press releases; I find nothing whatsoever in the hearings that can be characterized as a derogatory remark about the Senator from Minnesota.

How did this matter get into the mill, Mr. President? That is very simple. Newspaper reporters have a chance to go through the hearings, and they spot what they think is a story. So, on the 22d or 23d of December, Martin Hayden, who works for the North American Newspaper Alliance, picked up the story. I do not know that I would know him if I saw him, but he sent the story out on the wire, and he did a pretty thoroughgoing job. The story is over his byline, and it appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press and in other newspapers as well.

Was Mr. Summerfield gunning for someone? Certainly not.

It is a fact, Mr. President, that neither I nor Mr. Summerfield nor any other person in Washington has any control with reference to the Republican national committeeman in Minnesota, who is a newspaper publisher. The story came to his newspaper in Clarissa, Minn.

Mr. President, I went to school there and lived there for 5 years. I have affection for the people there, and I am familiar with them. I used to read the St. Paul Pioneer Press every morning when I was a student at the University of Minnesota.

It was in December that Martin Hayden wrote that story, and as I read the story, he probably called the junior Senator from Minnesota with reference to it. That was not Mr. Summerfield. That was not any member of the Republican Party; it was not the chairman of the Senatorial Campaign Committee. It was a newspaper story, and there came telephone calls. It seems to me that our very good friend from Minnesota undertakes to set up a strawman——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senator take note of the fact that the tube contract was canceled on December 1, and that the subcommittee hearing was a closed hearing?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was verified on Saturday by Representative CANFIELD and by——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the story here.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have it, too.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I assume no responsibility for it. I am merely trying to make sure that the record is correct. And, Mr. President, I think a correction of the record is required because of some of the very invidious statements which have been uttered on the floor.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] tried to make it appear that the Postmaster General has not been able to divorce himself from his former job as the chairman of the Republican National Committee. I think it is unfair to make that kind of a statement and to reflect upon him in that fashion. It has been done here a number of times. I do not like to see it go by without some answer, because I think it is my responsibility as a Member of this body and as a member of the Republican Party to be sure that the record is straight in every respect.

I know what happens in these hearings. The records are supposed to be impounded until there is a release date. They are given to the press, oftentimes, so that the members of the press can get their stories written against the day when the hearings will be released, for usually a long period of time intervenes before the release date is placed on the copies of the hearings.

But the fact of the matter is that the hearing was held on the 8th of December, approximately 2 months ago, so that many things could have happened.

Mr. President, I shall not weary the Senate by reciting all the details. I have a copy of the postal inspector's report. We asked to have it placed in the Senate hearings, and it is there where everyone can read it.

The junior Senator from Minnesota is correct in stating that the tube service has been in operation since 1897, and the contract has been renewed from time to time. It is said that in the Republican 80th Congress the contract was renewed. That is correct. It was renewed for a period of 18 months at $11,000 a mile.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For 18 months, Mr. President, the inspectors had been looking into the subject. I was still a Member of the House in the 80th Congress. They had the right to extend the contract for 6 more years. Then it came up in 1950.

There is nothing wrong with making a contract for not to exceed 10 years, but, Mr. President, there was no cancellation clause in the contract and there was no penalty clause so that the Government might be spared a penalty if the contracts were cancelled. Is not that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Illinois realize that the act of 1948 was merely an amendment to the basic act of 1922, and that the language providing for a 10-year contract was in the original authorization act of 1922, and that the act of 1948 was merely an authorization act, and that the same language prevailed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. What about the cancellation clause?

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the Senator from Minnesota read into the RECORD, the company realized the cancellation clause depended on the Committee on Appropriations, and the president of the company so stated. Was the Senator from Illinois absent when the junior senator from Minnesota read that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Illinois never left the floor. He is fully advised.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's attention must have been distracted when I read that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This matter came to the floor of the Senate in September 1950. I procured the inspector's report. I know what I read in the reports—when I get time to read them. I read from page 3 of the inspector's report, as follows:

On May 18, 1950—

Roughly 6 or 7 months before action was taken on the floor of the Senate—

Acting Assistant Postmaster General Cornwell addressed a memorandum to the Postmaster General summarizing the situation and concluding that in the interests of economical administration the use of the tubes should be discontinued at the termination of the then current contract, December 31, 1950.

I did not make that report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When were those reports made available as public records? On February 5 of the past week?

Mr. DIRKSEN. They were made available to the Subcommittee on Appropriations almost as soon as we asked for them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from Illinois kindly answer my question? When were those reports made available as public records?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the record here.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When were they made available?

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is an official hearing of the Subcommittee on Post Office Department Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Are they printed as public records?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The hearings are in process of being stitched now. This material came from the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Was this information available in public form, so that it could have been available to the junior Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DIRKSEN. All I can say to the Senator from Minnesota is that when I first heard about the matter, I said we ought to have the contract and ought to have the record. The Postmaster General sent the record, and there it is. It has been printed, and the Senator from Minnesota can see it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from Illinois yield for a further question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As a result of the investigation to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, did or did not the Postmaster General, the responsible officer of the Post Office Department, recommend the continuation of the use of the pneumatic tubes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us examine the report for a moment and see what it says.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I asked, Did or did not the Postmaster General, who was responsible for the Department, and the Bureau of the Budget recommend continuation of the use of the pneumatic tubes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator from Minnesota mean the former Postmaster General?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that is the person about whom we are talking.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senator from Minnesota speaking of former Postmaster General Donaldson?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am speaking of the former Postmaster General, a trained civil-service man.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Minnesota is speaking of Jesse Donaldson. That brings the situation into focus.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I had been the junior Senator from Minnesota, I do not believe I would have invited this discussion, but I believe it is our responsibility to see why Jesse Donaldson, who came from Shelbyville, Ill., in the first instance, should have signed the contract.

When the matter came before the Senate—and I believe my friend the junior Senator from Minnesota will bear me out in this statement—I think the Senator from Minnesota said on the Senate floor, "This is urgent." Did not the Senator use that language?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed I did.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He said he did not know much about the technical details, but he accepted the word of the Postmaster General.

I am not quarreling about that. But my friend the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota has now nicely left the door open. If I do not do another thing as a member of the Committee on Appropriations or of the Committee on Government Operations, I shall want to see that contract investigated, to find out what its urgency was in 1950.

I say now that that is no reflection upon the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota. I would not for the world reflect upon his integrity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Illinois. That at least clears up one aspect of all these spurious charges which have been made in words such as scandal, graft, and corruption.

Does the distinguished Senator from Illinois feel, as a Member of the Senate, that the report of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the 80th Congress was a valid or an invalid report?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I never saw the report, as a matter of fact.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator, then, indeed was not keeping up with his homework. That was an official report, and it was attached to the bill. The Senator was a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Minnesota would try to quit "kidding" the public and quit "kidding" our constituents. The talk about the presumption that Members of Congress know everything that goes on in the Senate and the House is a lot of nonsense, and everyone knows it. There is not a Senator who can keep up with half of the occurrences in Congress, including, of course, the utterances of my very dear friend, the junior Senator from Minnesota. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. Was the Senator from Illinois a member of the House Committee on Appropriations in 1948?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; in 1948 I was.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Illinois realize that at that time there had been a full-scale investigation as to the amount of money involved in, and the efficiency of the tube system, and that a complete study had been made and published in the form of hearings and an official report of a committee of the United States Senate, which were made available to every committee of Congress? Does the Senator realize that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Illinois realizes it very well. The Senator from Illinois knows that when the House completes its hearings, the volume of hearings is 10 times as big as the hearings on the Senate side. There is a mountain of justification. So I do not pretend now to the people of the United States that within the compass of 24 hours and my physical energy I can go through all that material and keep abreast of everything that goes on. I shall not spoof the people in that way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say that I do not believe there is anyone in the Senate who is more determined to apply himself to his responsibilities, and who is more able, but I wish to remind the Senator from Illinois that this is a special report entitled "Pneumatic Mail Tube Service," only 56 pages long. It was prepared as the result of a desire to investigate the efficiency and the need of the service. It is not a hit-and-miss proposition.

By the way, the report was made available to the House of Representatives and to the United States Senate, as well.

I ask the Senator from Illinois, simply on the basis of information, and of a real investigation, which included an investigation by postal inspectors, members of the Senate committee, and officials of the Department, as well, did the junior Senator from Minnesota have reason to believe that the system had been thoroughly investigated and was worthy of trust?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not know what the junior Senator from Minnesota wishes to believe or had reason to believe. I know I have to hew such things out for myself within the limitations of time, as best I can.

I desire to ask the Senator from Minnesota not to take all of my time, because I wish to make my record.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Illinois believe that the report referred to was an honest report or a dishonest report?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not know, for the very good reason that I have seen thousands of reports. When I have gone into them, I have thrown many of them to one side, on the theory that they were pretty oblique or pretty slanted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I ask how the Senator from Illinois voted on the bill in 1948?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know, as a matter of fact.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The vote was unanimous, I may say to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me comment on that now. That is one of the lovely canards circulated around here. I was not in the Senate in 1950. But while I was a Member of the House of Representatives and since I have been a Member of the Senate I have accepted my responsibilities. Do not think I duck them.

On September 13, 1950, the bill to which the Senator from Minnesota has referred came up on the calendar. There were some questions asked. The distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] raised a question. I think he considered the amount in the bill was too high. This is what the Senator from Minnesota said to the Senate:

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota acted only upon the information we had from the Post Office Department and on the urgency of the request. I could not help but feel that since it was a very technical subject, about which I knew very little, the only ad-

vice to follow would be that of the Postmaster General, who seems to be doing a job of economizing in the Post Office Department. I did not think he would go overboard in his recommendation.

That was the Senator from Minnesota speaking. The only advice to follow, he said, would be that of the Postmaster General. I assume, from the Senator's own words, that he accepted it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not only is that a fair statement, but the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] was a member of the subcommittee, as also was the distinguished former Senator from Montana, Mr. Ecton. As members of the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, they had in their possession, for consideration in connection with their deliberations, not only the recommendations of the Post Office Department and of the Bureau of the Budget, and a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, but also a report submitted in the 80th Congress.

I remind the Senator from Illinois that we are referring to the 81st Congress. I, too, love investigations, but I thought the investigation of the 80th Congress was sufficiently current for the problem so that the Senate possibly could accept the unqualifiedly unanimous report of the committee in the 80th Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not quarrel with my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota. I simply point out that whether it was the 80th Congress or not, a Democratic Postmaster General made the contract.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does that make it bad?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; unless it is bad on its face, or unless investigation shows it to be bad .

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Illinois realize that the bill for which the junior Senator from Minnesota had responsibility was an authorizing or enabling bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly. The language is in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is quite clear that it was not a contract?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly. It was to enable the Postmaster to make a contract.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Therefore, is it quite clear that any statement to the effect that such a bill might involve graft is as fallacious as anything could be?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would be the last person to reflect upon the integrity of the junior Senator from Minnesota, but the Senator rose in the Senate on a question of personal privilege and set up a strawman, and made that a vehicle for what seemed like an attack on the Postmaster General. That sort of thing I will not take without an answer. That is all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. As the Senator from Minnesota should know, the Postmaster General never for a moment reflected upon the Senators' integrity. There is not a word anywhere in the releases or in the statements before the House or the Senate Committee on Appropriations in which the Postmaster General spoke, by innuendo or by indirection, in derogation of the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the testimony the Senator has given about the Postmaster General and his high regard for me, at least to the effect that he has never made any derogatory statements about me. I believe the record is quite clear now that nobody has ever made any derogatory statements about the Senator from Minnesota, except that they are in newspapers all over the country. When the Postmaster General says that he can save a million dollars, and can move the mail now sent by pneumatic tubes with two trucks for $25,000, and says further that the Senator from Minnesota "protesteth too much," I do not have to be hit on the head with a club to know what that means. The Senator from Illinois is one of the most able and adroit politicians, in the best sense of that word——

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator flatters me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have great respect for him in many ways. I want him once more to unfold to his colleagues, in his candor, what the facts are about politics. Since he has told us that of course we do not have time to read all the reports submitted to Congress and that it is time to quit fooling the public about such matter, I should like to have him tell us about the strange coincidence that a little bill, which has been a part of the legislative system for many years, suddenly becomes a political issue, not only in Clarissa, Minn., a lovely little community where the people read the newspapers, but in Detroit, New York, Minneapolis, and St. Paul.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not yield further, because the Senator from Minnesota had nearly 2½ hours to speak today. He started out with reference to Abraham Lincoln and his fidelity to fact and his devotion to truth. But Lincoln said something else. He said that if he responded to every attack made on him, he would not have any time to do any business, and that he might just as well shut up shop.

Who made the attack on the Senator from Minnesota? Was it the Postmaster General? No. It was a newspaperman. Who wrote the article? Was the Postmaster General responsible for it? Was the junior Senator from Minnesota responsible? Certainly not.

Mr. President, I have been around the Congress for 22 years and I have taken it on the chin many times, but if I paid attention to all the criticisms and all the suggestions made, I would not have time for anything else.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am trying to get clear in my mind what the facts are in regard to the alleged urgency for the passage of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know what the urgency was.

Mr. MORSE. That is the question I wish to ask the Senator. Is it the Senator's understanding from the record that Postmaster General Donaldson in 1950 made representations that there was some urgency for the passage of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely, so, because the junior Senator from Minnesota said so on the floor of the Senate; he said it was urgent.

Mr. MORSE. So far as the Postmaster General testified in the hearings——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not seen that. This matter arose all of a sudden. But I took account of it when it was presented to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate on the 26th of January.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the Senator's understanding, as it is mine, however, that the Postmaster General at that time asked for the passage of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator mean in 1950?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think he did.

Mr. MORSE. I mean, did he ask for the authorization?

Mr. DIRKSEN. He made a vigorous request for it, I have no doubt.

Mr. MORSE. Has it been the Senator's observation that when an administration spokesman, whether a Republican or Democratic Postmaster General, proposes a bill, and the chairman of the appropriate committee introduces the bill, it is a common practice for the "people downtown," as we say, to urge the immediate passage of the bill on the ground that they face a great problem which will become greater if the bill is not speedily passed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the Senator that I have been around when they would say that the sun could not set until the bill was on the statute books. I do not labor that point, because it is not a part of what I desire to address myself to, namely, my resentment at any attack on the Postmaster General, because he did not attack anyone, he did not put in circulation any newspaper report. He did his duty by responding to the committees of the House and the Senate, and here is VAUGHAN GARY, a fine Democratic Member of the House, saying, "Mr. Chairman, I think the matter ought to be investigated." That was 60 days ago.

Mr. MORSE. My only reason for asking the question about the matter of the urgency was that in the course of the colloquy with the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Illinois spoke about the Senator from Minnesota's asking for the passage of the bill as being urgent, and left with me the impression, or, may I say most kindly, I think his remarks might be subject to the interpretation of being an inference, that perhaps the Senator from Minnesota was urging the passage of the bill for some motive other than simply to relay to the

Senate the statement of the Postmaster General that it was urgent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I said that the Postmaster General told him it was urgent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator quoted from the report of the House committee hearings about the appropriations for the fiscal year 1955.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator says I quoted?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I did not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator quoted Representative GARY, I believe.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes; from the House hearings.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder if the Senator will let we read from page 73 where Mr. Summerfield said:

> I have just picked up a memorandum that I would like to comment on briefly to your committee. On March 10, 1950, a committee appointed by the Postmaster General under Order No. 42425, comprised of H. B. Montague, post-office inspector; A. R. Gehman, Assistant Superintendent, Division of Vehicle Service; and A. E. Newton, Assistant Director of Division of City Delivery Service, made a report stating that the pneumatic-tube service at New York should be continued, and recommending the issuance of an advertisement for bids.

I mention this because one of the committee is said to be a postal inspector, and, by the way, the Advisory Committee on the Post Office recently made a statement that we cannot rely on the postal inspectors about matters involving mechanical experience. I have that statement in the testimony.

In view of the 1950 recommendation of the Chief of the Inspectors, of the Assistant Superintendent of the Division of Vehicle Service, of the Assistant Director of the Division of City Delivery Service, and the full committee that was assigned to make the report, and which reported that the tube service should be continued, I ask the Senator from Illnois whether there was not evidence for the continuance of the service?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota would not want to stand on that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will take a chance on it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now let us look at the date of that recommendation. That was March 10, was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What did the same committee say on May 15?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The same committee?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They made a report showing a saving then estimated at $280,634.63 per annum by supplanting the pneumatic-tube service with motor-trucks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But there is something else in the postal service besides saving. If all that is desired is saving, let the Department cut out rural free delivery.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope the Senator from Minnesota is not going to start quibbling about this, because the whole idea was to improve the service.

Mr. President, I shall not yield further, because I am going to make the record.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And I will be right here to help the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well. The Senator has been reading from a report of the testimony. He was reading about a report dated March 10. Then comes the same committee on the 15th of May saying the Department should discontinue the tube service because by so doing $280,634.63 could be saved.

Then comes another report. On the 18th of May comes Acting Assistant Postmaster General Cornwell saying that the tubes should be discontinued at the termination of the contract. Then there were still other reports.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not yet, because I desire to make this record.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will not the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; not until I make the record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on May 28, only a little while later, the inspectors then engaged in a comprehensive survey of the postal service at New York issued a report showing that the tubes were operated certain hours during each day, and so forth; and then suggested their discontinuance. That information was here.

When did the bill come to the floor of the Senate? It came here in September. Those recommendations were available.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a correction?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me suggest to the Senator from Illinois that the Postmaster General was asked by Representative CANFIELD whether, when they recommended a renewal of the contract, they recommended discontinuance of the pneumatic tube service. Mr. Summerfield replied, "That is right."

I suggest that when the officers of the Department are subpenaed, it will be found that what Mr. Donaldson asked for was an alternative in case the service had to be discontinued, in case the Government was unwilling to help pay for the amortization of the cost of new equipment.

I suggest that the distinguished Senator from Illinois is getting himself into a situation he will not wish to be in, and I ask him to be careful, because I have checked with the officials and they are willing to be subpenaed; and when they are subpenaed, it will be found that the request made to the committee was not about whether the system should be discontinued; but the request made to the postal committee which made the investigation was, "If we have to discontinue it because the Consolidated Electric has said it will not furnish direct current any longer, how much will it cost to change to trucks, and how much of a saving will there be?"

Following those recommendations, the Postmaster General and the Bureau of the Budget made a decision, based on the surveys, that request should be made for continuation of the tube service and to amortize the cost of the new installations.

I would say Mr. Summerfield is grossly in error; and I trust it is an error which was not premeditated at all, but occurred simply because he had not had time to ascertain the facts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I will stand on what I have said and on what I now say. I am willing to abide by the results of any investigation.

However, there are a few other fallacies to be disposed of. Reference has been made to the time element and the difficulty of carrying 6 million additional letters on 2 additional trucks. That was the crux of the matter.

Let me point out that at this time there are operating in New York City mail trucks which are not entirely loaded and which can carry infinitely more mail. It will require only two additional trucks to stop the duplication and to save money.

In a minute I shall refer to the saving. My friend, the Senator from Minnesota, pointed out the cost to the Post Office Department, and said the Department would buy 70 trucks.

As a matter of fact, the Post Office Department is going to buy 2,500 trucks and will allocate them for all sorts of purposes all over the country. But that does not mean the Department was going to assign 70 trucks in order to supplement the service in New York City.

Mr. President, the Postmaster General said he could do the work in New York City with two additional trucks, because at this time there are on the job in New York City many mail trucks which are rumbling over the cobblestones directly above the pneumatic tubes.

As to the savings, let me make the record here for a moment: The savings are shown in the record, at least. Three hundred and fifty-eight thousand dollars a year will be saved on rental; $63,000 a year will be saved on power; $85,000 a year will be saved on maintenance and personnel; $3,900 a year will be saved on telephone service; $495,000 a year will be saved on workers, for it will be possible to integrate those employees into the postal service of New York, and thus replace the temporary employees who are working there now.

So, Mr. President, when the Postmaster General said he could save $1 million a year, the record establishes it.

At this time, of course, the job the Postmaster General has is to determine how he can cancel the contract, even though it does not contain a cancellation clause.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator from Illinois aware of the 1948 report in which it is estimated that to change from the pneumatic-tube service to service by trucks would cost an additional $57,000?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I am aware of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator from Illinois aware of the fact that in 1950—and, of course, many figures have been referred to in the course of the discussion of this matter——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator from Illinois aware that when Mr. Summerfield says he can save $1,000,000 a year, in 1950 the officials thought they could save $287,000, and the committee headed by Representative CANFIELD suggested that $460,000 could be saved? I point out that somewhere between the estimated saving of $1,000,000 and the $57,000 it would cost to convert the system, and the $287,000 figure of May 15, 1950, and the $460,000 estimated saving, as testified before the committee headed by Representative CANFIELD, perhaps we can obtain some facts.

It appears to me that what the Postmaster General has done is to cancel the contract and then to scurry around in an effort to find some facts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, Mr. President; the Postmaster General is not having any difficulty.

The Senator from Minnesota could have obtained some more facts in 1950, because he then stood on the floor of the Senate and said he was taking the advice of the Postmaster General; and the Senator from Minnesota then said he did not know anything about the matter. That is the effect of the statement the Senator from Minnesota made on the floor of the Senate; I am only repeating what he said.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would not expect the Senator from Illinois to think that I would proclaim myself an expert.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. However, since the bill was unanimously reported by the committee, I would at least like to believe that my 12 colleagues on the committee were much better versed in this matter than I was. As a matter of fact, the 12 other Members of the Senate who were members of the committee were in favor of the bill, and subsequently the Senate itself was in favor of the bill.

As the distinguished Senator from Illinois himself knows, two Republican Senators sat on the floor of the Senate every time there was a calendar call, and had their folders before them, and checked on every bill. That is a matter of procedure and record for which I commend the Republican leadership. The Senator from Illinois also knows that no objection was raised to that particular bill.

Furthermore, I would hope the Senator from Illinois would expect us to accept the testimony. After all, the 80th Congress had a full investigation made. The report of that investigation was a part of our record and a part of the total procedure of the Senate. I think it ill behooves the Senator from Illinois to say that the junior Senator from Minnesota was not informed. The junior Senator from Minnesota said he was not an expert.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I will not yield longer. The junior Senator from Minnesota said so on this floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He said he was not an expert on these matters.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well; he has confessed his case. So let us not discuss it any longer.

Mr. President, when I began my remarks I had no intention of getting into an altercation with the junior Senator from Minnesota. I try to be reasonably constrained.

But the junior Senator from Minnesota saw in all the newspaper publicity—over which we have no control whatever—a "smear" on the part of the Republican high command; that is the language he used on the floor of the Senate. I think it is an outrage for him to make such a statement without having some supporting data. He used my name. He said I was the one who would get the McCarthy subcommittee to investigate this matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I did not say that. I said the Senator from Illinois, who is also chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee, asked in the Senate appropriations, or suggested, that the matter be referred to the permanent subcommittee on investigations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, it has been suggested, but the junior Senator from Illinois did not ask for it, Mr. President.

I simply wish to keep the record straight.

I will help to defeat the junior Senator from Minnesota any old time, but I will never utter a dishonorable word or take advantage of him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I apreciate that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I simply want the record to be kept straight, and I wish to see to it that Cabinet members do not become the victims of an ex parte case when a Member of the Senate sets up a strawman and then attempts to knock him down.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois is now trying to establish Senate rules for debate in regard to Cabinet members——

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I am not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that I have heard Cabinet members literally excoriated in the Senate, without any defense being made here in their behalf, and at a time when Republican Members have participated in that blood bath.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That may be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Furthermore, I have paid tribute to the good character and honesty of the Postmaster General. I simply say that what has happened is quite peculiar. It may simply be a happenstance and sheer coincidence; but in view of all the Senator from Illinois knows about politics——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota knows infinitely more about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from what little I know about politics, I say I think it is quite interesting to see that this measure suddenly receives attention; and all at once articles about it spring into print; and all sort of words, including such words as "scandal," "graft," "public dereliction of duty," and so forth, are used.

Mr. President, these statements did not come from the leader of the Epworth League. They came from the Republican national committeeman, who has been in consultation with high officialdom in Washington in recent days.

Some of these words also came even from Members of the Senate. Members of the Senate are quoted in Mr. Hayden's story.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What does that prove?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It proves that American politics has apparently reached the point where, rather than discuss an issue on its merits, such words as "graft" and "corruption" are used and attached to people's names without one scintilla of evidence.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why does not the Senator talk with Martin Hayden, who wrote the story? Why not talk with the publishers of the St. Paul Pioneer Press? Why not go to Clarissa, Minn., and talk with Mr. Etzell? To be sure, he is the Republican National Committeeman there. Have we any control over him? Indeed not. My friend from Minnesota, I think, finds an amazing significance in something which appears in the press. I hesitate even to suggest it, but perhaps it brought a slight tremor with respect to the outcome in 1954. I will take that remark out of the RECORD, because it is only a pleasantry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want the Senator to leave it there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have seen Charley Etzell only once in my life. I do not think I would recognize him if he walked into the Senate Chamber this afternoon. Have we control over him? Did the Postmaster General set this thing in motion?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did he?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did the Senator find a single derogatory statement about himself in the language of the Postmaster General?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did he?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask the Senator to cite me the language to which he refers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Judging from the product which has emanated, I have more evidence to show that the Postmaster General did set this thing in motion than the Senator from Illinois has to show that he did not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator used 2½ hours to discuss this subject. I am waiting for him to cite the Postmaster General's language.

That is enough. I surrender the floor. I will let the record speak for itself.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will yield for a question. The Senator from New York made the comment that the Postmaster General could not dissociate himself from his former position as national chairman.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That was an unfair and unkind thing to say about Arthur Summerfield, a great businessman, a man of character in his own right. The

Senator from New York would demean him here, where he cannot answer.

Mr. LEHMAN. I certainly made that statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator certainly did, this afternoon.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not apologize for it, and I do not retract that statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Good.

Mr. LEHMAN. It certainly is a very remarkable situation when we see the former chairman of the Republican National Committee, who is now Postmaster General, make the statement which reflects on the Senator from Minnesota that a contract involving a cost of $1,007,000 could be replaced by just 2 additional trucks costing $22,168.44. Of course, that is nonsense.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator——

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator has yielded to me for a comment. If he does not mind, I should like to continue my comment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not going to allow the Senator from New York to make a comment. I yielded for a question. The Senator is not going to take all my time.

I suppose that the former Democratic chairman, Bob Hannegan, and the former chairman, Jim Farley, could, as Postmaster General, dissociate themselves from the fact that they were both former national party chairmen. Does the Senator from New York place them in a little different cubicle? However, if the Senator had heard my remarks a moment ago as to how the saving would be effected, and how much it would be, he would have gotten the whole story.

Mr. LEHMAN. I heard the Senator from Illinois make that statement, but it does not make sense to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, the Senator's capacity for understanding is not within my control.

Mr. LEHMAN. It does not make sense to me that the entire $1,007,000 could be saved, except for a cost of $22,168.44.

The Senator from Illinois referred to trucks rattling over the cobblestones——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to add one further observation. I decline to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds Members of the Senate that the rules of the Senate require that a Senator who wishes another Senator to yield must first address the Chair.

Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What Senators forget about the pneumatic-tube system is that it carries only 32 percent of the first-class mail. It carries no heavy mail in New York City. There are a few trucks, whether they are empty or full, rattling over the cobblestones in downtown Manhattan. So 68 percent of the first-class mail and all the heavy mail must be transported by trucks.

The Postmaster General believes that if the trucks were fully loaded, full efficiency could be obtained through the use of the trucks, in carrying both heavy mail and first-class mail, and that the pneumatic-tube service, which is a sort of two-way, inflexible service, could be done away with, at a saving of $1 million.

The fact of the matter is that in 1948 the pneumatic-tube system could carry 50 percent of the first-class mail. Today it can carry only 32 percent. As the volume of mail goes up the capacity of the tube, percentagewise, goes down, and it becomes a rather inefficient operation. That is the mechanics of the problem. We shall have more to say about it later. I merely wished to be sure that no ex parte record would be left here this afternoon with respect to a very fine Postmaster General.

Mr. President, I surrender the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON obtained the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield for a question.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, provided he does not lose the floor?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield for that purpose under those conditions.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may yield to me in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, provided he does not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEE SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, during recent weeks there has been much intelligent debate on the floor of the Senate as to whether there should be further amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Despite sharp differences of opinion, I am sure we have all been impressed by the dignity and restraint with which this debate has been conducted from both sides of the aisle.

In direct contrast to the statesmanlike atmosphere on the Senate floor, however, have been recent mean and false attacks made outside the Congress by various leaders of the Republican Party.

I have noted these attacks with deep regret.

In this troubled world, they can only affect adversely the security and prosperity of our country.

On January 9, last, in Springfield, Mo., I said in connection with these growing attacks:

> It may be that in this session, as during the last session, President Eisenhower will receive more support from the Democrats than he will from the Republicans.

The President has a growing problem, however. His close friend and political ally, Governor Dewey, recently made a speech which, to the best of my knowledge, is the first time every member of an opposition party has been indicted.

We Democrats will continue to vote for what we believe is best for the country. But I don't see how such a blanket condemnation of all Democrats by anyone as close to the administration as Governor Dewey can help the President in his efforts to obtain bipartisan support.

As our beloved SAM RAYBURN quietly mentioned the other evening, Democratic backs are sore from the mounting criticism from prominent associates of the President.

People who indiscriminately condemn all members of the Democratic Party should remember they are reflecting on the patriotism of such men as the dean of the Senate, that symbol of integrity, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], on Mr. RAYBURN, and on men with such records as that of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], a marine who gave his own blood at Peleliu and Okinawa that America could remain free.

Nevertheless, these attacks continue.

The Republican Party is in numerical minority in the Senate. It barely has a majority in the House.

Therefore the President knows he must depend on Democratic votes for the success of his program, as well as on Republican votes.

When they believe his requests are in the interest of the country's security and prosperity, Democrats will vote with the President, because they are Americans before they are Democrats.

Is it either fair or proper, however, for the President, dependent on the patriotism and support of Democratic Members, to continue to permit not only his party leaders, but even members of his own official family, to smear these same Democrats whose support he knows he must have?

I had hoped that this recent "rat-alley" partisan approach, so contrary to the truth, would cease. But the attacks are expanding. Now they not only include all Democrats who, for any reason, have left office since this new administration came into power, but also all Democrats who still remain in Government service.

In other words, apparently an effort is now being made to place the blot of subversion against thousands of Democrats in the Government who have never been accused of anything; Democrats who resigned of their own free will and accord, and Democrats whose only crime is that they have been transferred from one Government department to another.

Last October the White House announced the separation of 1,456 Government employees, under the Republican Federal employees security program.

In his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower raised this figure to 2,200.

The original Government announcement asserted that of this total of 1,456, 863 had been dismissed, and 593 had resigned.

It also stated that some of those dismissed were actually appointees of the new administration.

As mentioned, some of this number have merely been transferred to other Government jobs. Some have died. Some were automatically eliminated because of "reductions in force" directives.

Those are the facts. Now let us look at the way the facts have been distorted.

In Chicago, on November 6, Attorney General Brownell implied that 1,456 Government employees were being thrown out because they were subversives.

The record shows his implication to be false.

The same day, the President's own counsel, Bernard Shanley, in a speech at Newark, stated that "1,456 subversives have been kicked out of Government jobs since the President assumed office."

This statement by Mr. Shanley was doubly false. A great many of that number were not discharged as subversives; and, as stated, many hundreds of the 1,456 were not "kicked out."

Why did not the administration clear up this part of these false attacks by announcing just how many of these 1,456 were discharged for subversion?

They did not and have not—in fact, the falsity of these implications continued to grow.

Late in November, the Republican National Committee finance chairman, Carlton G. Ketchum, stated "President Eisenhower and his team have gotten rid of nearly 1,500 Communists, fellow travelers, and their ilk, whom the Trumanites had left in office."

President Eisenhower would be the first to agree that this statement is false in fact and false in implication.

In his speech in Hartford last December 16, Governor Dewey implied that most if not all of these 1,456 Government employees were spies and traitors, and that they had all been dismissed.

The record shows that implication was false.

As late as last January 21, Postmaster General Summerfield, a member of the President's Cabinet and former chairman of the Republican National Committee, stated, "Almost 2,200 people who were security risks are no longer using up your tax money. I am here to tell you that we will not hire any new ones. Somehow I do not feel too amicably inclined toward people who make treason a preoccupation."

The able, independent, and fact-finding Washington Evening Star has had something to say about that false blast from a member of the President's Cabinet against many Democrats whose only fault lay in the fact they had resigned of their own free will, or had been transferred, or had been discharged automatically by "reductions in force," or had died.

The Star said:

> The link between "2,200" and "treason" seemed, in the context of the address, to be quite direct. And it was inaccurate to say that none of the 2,200 was "using up your tax money," since some were known to be still on Government payrolls.

Finally, as of only last Saturday, the assistant to the President, Sherman Adams, expressed his idea of how to get Democratic support for the President's program by calling those in Congress who do not always agree with him, political sadists.

On Sunday morning, after reading that statement, I went to my dictionary and looked up the word "sadism." There was one definition for it, and the same definition is contained in the dictionary in the Marble Room of the Senate. It states sadism is "perversion marked by extreme cruelty."

I believe Governor Adams was ignorant of the meaning of the charge he was making against all Democrats who did not agree with him on these economic issues. It is my personal belief he owes an apology to the Democratic Members of the Senate and of the House he criticized. If I may respectfully say so, if he does not make apology, he should not hold his high office.

Are we to accept, as a political necessity of our time, the complete loss of respect to any opposition, and no respect whatever for human decency?

Every American citizen knows that the United States is in danger as the result of the steadily growing military strength of Soviet communism. That is no secret to the people.

Military experts warned last summer that a truce in Korea, although it would contain the blessing of at least temporarily stopping the bullets, might also furnish another successful opportunity for the Communists to regroup and rebuild their strength.

These experts also warned that the Communist military pressure, as mercury in the palm of one's hand, would probably shift to Indochina.

As we have read recently in the news, that is only too true. The situation in Indochina has now deteriorated to the point where it has just been found necessary to send 200 additional Americans as aid to that unfortunate country in its desperate effort to resist the advance of the Kremlin.

Berlin appears to be at stalemate. The political situations in France and Italy vary week to week from crisis to crisis.

Above all, therefore, as I see it, as we face outward, it would appear we need unity at home.

America can lick any problem if it has unity, because unity brings high morale, and that morale furnishes the will to succeed.

Our country faces internally an unbalanced budget, large farm surpluses, and increased unemployment in industry.

At the same time we have these internal problems along with the external dangers, however, some leaders of the Republican Party continue to look backward instead of forward.

For reasons best known to themselves, they sow dissension and discord among the American people, at a time when the United States faces probably the greatest peril in its history.

Is it not time for the President to tell the people his position with respect to the unjust attacks now being carried on by many Republicans, including members of his own White House staff, and his own Cabinet?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that if the President remains silent in the face of these attacks which have come from men who are his very closest advisers and his intimates in determinig the policy of his administration, many persons will feel that he is a silent partner in these attacks and accusations?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama. I have great respect and affection for the President of the United States, but I believe the Senator has expressed well the thinking that is rapidly spreading across our beloved country. In my opinion, if the President does not disown this type and character of smear on those persons he is counting on to help him with his program, it is going to be realized by all the people within a short time.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator share my view that many persons voted for Mr. Eisenhower to be President of the United States because they felt that he had never been in partisan politics, and was free from any of the prejudice, bitterness, and personal feelings which sometimes enter into partisan politics, and therefore, because he had not been in partisan politics and was free of what might be called the things which are sometimes the liabilities of partisan politics, he could go forward as a new leader, lift up the horizon, and stimulate and encourage the people of the Nation, the people of all parties, to a course of action by our country in a way that probably would not be achieved by someone brought up in politics? Is not that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree with my friend from Alabama, I think he is entirely correct in his thinking.

Mr. HILL. If the President by his silence gives his assent to these statements and becomes, as I have said, a silent partner, will he not fail, will he not be in default in the leadership which so many millions of persons hoped and expected he would give the Nation?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Again, I agree with my distinguished colleague from Alabama. At the end of my talk I had expressed the same thought as that advanced by the Senator from Alabama, not so well as he has expressed it, but in the same general way. I would state, with complete respect, that the President is not only the head of the Republican Party, but is also the President of all the people.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that what is happening today is that we are being exposed to what amounts almost to a national panic by the hysterical description of an army of traitors honeycombing our Government and menacing us on every hand, in our schools, in the press, in labor unions, in the theatrical world and even in our churches? Is it not a further fact that leading persons

in public life, seemingly of great responsibility, including the Governor of my own State of New York, and some of the highest officials in the National Government, have stooped to the furtherance of this false impression?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would rather not comment in detail on what the Senator from New York has stated in his able manner. I can only say that the atmosphere of the Government, and the atmosphere inside the Senate Chamber at times this afternoon, distressed me. As Benjamin Franklin said, if we do not all hang together, we will hang separately. It seems there must be some way in which we can have unity behind our President.

I should like to pay my respects to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who for many years has had my affection and deep respect. He has great problems confronting him. There are more Democrats in the Senate than there are Republicans. He works conscientiously and intelligently with the Members on this side of the aisle. Sometimes it seems to me he should receive more support from his own administration with respect to his problems on this floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield further?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact, as the Senator has indicated in his very able address, that the figure of 2,200 which has been used by many persons in high places in the Federal Government and in State governments, including the Governor of my own State, has reference to persons who were dismissed because of reductions in force brought about by budgetary cuts, to some who were transferred from one Government agency to another, to some who were dismissed because of unsatisfactory personal habits, and to some who were dismissed for purely political reasons?

There is indication that some included in the total of 2,200 were dismissed because of real concern regarding their loyalty, not to speak of real proof as to Communist affiliation which is claimed as being slightly involved.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I answer my distinguished colleague from New York by saying that, with the exception of those dismissed for purely political reasons—and, to be honest, I do not know about those—the Senator is correct with respect to those in the other categories. I should like to point out that in all those categories not a single case of disloyalty is involved. Therefore it is grossly false and unfair to many decent Americans to stigmatize them and their families by using such figures as 1,456, 1,500, or 2,200, as being subversives, as Mr. Ketchum has done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief comment and to commend the Senator from Missouri for what I believe to be a very fine, thoughtful, and moderate statement with respect to the problems he has discussed. It is an exceedingly timely statement.

I think we all realize that the American people expect us to act responsibly and to have a high regard for one another in this Chamber, as well as high regard for our Government at the executive level. We have all, at times, been guilty of some excess of language. At times, maybe, we have exaggerated when we should not have done so, but I think we should constantly try to keep in mind what the Senator from Missouri has so well pointed out, that there is nothing to be gained by wide and wholesale accusation and abusive language or invective that cannot be substantiated by facts.

I simply wish to thank the Senator. I really feel he has rendered a great service and has again marked himself as one of our real leaders.

While it is not my privilege frequently to visit the State of Missouri, I wish to say that we are very happy that the State of Missouri has sent its distinguished son, in the person of the junior Senator from Missouri, to work with us in the Senate. I think Missouri is a marvelous State. I congratulate the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Minnesota. One of the reasons I find myself privileged to have the great honor of being junior Senator from Missouri is that the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was kind enough to speak for me as ably in Missouri in 1952 as he has spoken for himself this afternoon in 1954.

Sould the junior Senator from Minnesota desire me to go to Minnesota and tell the people of that State what I think about his character, his industry, his accomplishments, and his contributions to the Government of the United States, I shall look forward with very much pleasure to doing so.

Mr. President, as I was saying, if the President of the United States endorses the attacks now being made by many Republicans, including members of his White House staff and his Cabinet, should he not so tell the American people, and why?

If he does not endorse them, then those of us who believe this growing discord is affecting the security of the United States have the right to ask what he intends to do about it.

If these vicious and untruthful attacks continue, the resulting national disunity can only play directly into the hands of any possible enemy.

At this point, I may say we hear much talk about the dangers of communism. But there is great danger to the American people in internal disunity. A look at a map will disclose that in 10 short years the Communists have increased the number of people under their control from 200 million to 800 million; and it may be noted that invariably this increase in the number of countries succumbing to communistic control can be attributed to the creation of the same type of internal disunity now being developed in the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that those who would divide us, those who would separate us, those who would turn us one against the other, play right into the hands of the Communists?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The senior Senator from Alabama, with an experience vastly greater than mine, knows that what he says is entirely correct.

Mr. President, the decision as to whether or not such a policy shall continue is up to the President. I would ask the President to let us know where he stands in connection with the increasing savage attacks being made on all Democrats, because not only is he the head of the Republican Party, he is also the President of all the people of the United States.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a speech out of order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall not object, of course, to the request of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who had spoken to me earlier. But I wish to say that I shall have to object to any further unanimous-consent requests on the part of Senators to make speeches ahead of the calendar call. Last week it was stated and, I thought, had been thoroughly understood that the calendar would be called this afternoon. I expect to hold the Senate in session tonight until the calendar call has been completed.

I merely wish to say that if any Senators desire to make speeches following the call of the calendar, I shall be glad to have the Senate remain in session to enable them to do so. But under the circumstances, and in view of the unanimous-consent request previously entered into, I shall have to object to further yielding for speeches this afternoon until the calendar shall have been called.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have not the floor; the Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will yield briefly to the Senator from Montana, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from California that some Senators have speeches they desire to make this afternoon. I wonder if we could not make our speeches first, and then proceed with the call of the calendar. We have already listened to 3 or 4 speeches this afternoon; why create discrimination?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from Montana that this is one of the problems the majority leader frequently tries to adjust for the convenience of Senators. I think the distinguished Senator from Montana will at least agree that there has been bipartisan discrimination, if there has been discrimination at all, because the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the distin-

guished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are on the Democratic side of the aisle. The only Senator on this side of the aisle who has had the floor was the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who desired to make a brief response to the junior Senator from Minnesota.

So I think there can be no charge that there has not been a leaning over backward to accomodate unanimous-consent requests on the part of distinguished Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle. But it is necessary to call a stop somewhere.

In fairness to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I may say that there will be no attempt to cut off any Senator who has a speech he wishes to deliver today. I shall hold the Senate in session to permit Senators to make their speeches. But I shall ask for the regular order when the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has concluded his remarks.

POSTAL POLICY CONFUSION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am taking the floor today with some reluctance, because the matter of which I must speak is distasteful to me—as it must be, I think, to any man of good will. Nonetheless, the time has come when it is imperative that someone should challenge the methods, if not the motivations, of our Postmaster General in his efforts to stampede through the Senate and the House of Representatives certain legislation he is anxious to see enacted.

I note that my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has questioned the legality of the Postmaster General's action in authorizing the expenditure of $12,000 of Post Office Department funds to conduct a public-opinion poll which was apparently designed to bring pressure on the Members of Congress. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee that use of postal funds in this way was certainly unethical, if not illegal as well.

But this is only the latest of a series of actions by the Post Office Department which have had the effect, if not the intention, of deceiving the American people.

I should like to list a number of intentional or unintentional misstatements made by the Postmaster General recently in condemning the Citizen's Advisory Council Report recently submitted to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. Summerfield, the Postmaster General, referred to the advisory council, which was established by the United States Senate under Senate Resolution 49, as the Fuller committee. His purpose apparently was to imply that the council was under the domination of Walter Fuller, one of the council members, and that Mr. Fuller's recommendations resulted not from his judgment as to the best interests of the country, but from a selfish and shortsighted loyalty to his own business.

Through oversight—I prefer to look upon it as that, rather than deliberate evasion—the honorable Postmaster General neglected to mention the nine other members of the advisory council, all of whom had a voice and a part in preparing the recommendations contained in the council's report.

I am confident that it was a mental lapse on the Postmaster General's part that he did not tell us that among the other members of the Fuller Committee was Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, first vice president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Now I like to think that Mrs. Chapman did not bow to the wishes of the magazine publishers, or any other special-interest group, in her deliberations and in her efforts and contributions to the report of the advisory council.

Mr. Summerfield, in his anxiety to name Mr. Fuller, completely overlooked another member of the council—William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, and a vice president of the American Federation of Labor. I still am not convinced, despite the implications of Mr. Summerfield, that Mr. Doherty is under the domination of the magazine publishers and willing to put his signature of endorsement on any document placed before him.

Did the Postmaster General forget to tell us, or was it by design that he neglected to mention the name of M. Albert Linton, chairman, board of directors, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Philadelphia and Robert Ramspeck, a distinguished former Member of the House of Representatives, and later Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and now vice president of Eastern Air Lines? Are we to infer that Mr. Ramspeck is also a publisher's pawn?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a full list of the advisory council membership as appointed and approved by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL TO THE SENATE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Walter D. Fuller, chairman of the board, the Curtis Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Eugene C. Pulliam, president, Indianapolis Star and News, Indianapolis, Ind.

M. Albert Linton, chairman of the board, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa.

Ed M. Anderson, editor and publisher, North Carolina weekly newspapers, Forest City, N. C.

Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, first vice president, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Jerseyville, Ill.

William C. Doherty, president, National Association of Letter Carriers, Washington, D. C.

John E. Tillotson, director, Associated Third-Class Mail Users, Kansas City, Mo.

Edward B. Rubin, vice president, Spiegel, Chicago, Ill.

Paul D. Sanders, editor and copublisher, the Southern Planter, Richmond, Va.

Robert Ramspeck, vice president in charge of Federal and State regulatory matters, Eastern Air Lines, Washington, D. C.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have the utmost confidence in the integrity and honesty of these outstanding men and women.

Such aspersion by the Postmaster General is shocking. Let me say with all frankness that I believe Mr. Summerfield owes an apology to Mr. Fuller, to the entire advisory council, and to the Senate of the United States.

To imply that the findings of the council represent simply the views of one man, and that those views reflect simply the short-term interests of magazine and newspaper publishers, is a reflection not only on the members of the advisory council, but on the members of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Only a few days ago were we exposed to the latest instance of the deviations from the truth of the Postmaster General. In an address before the National Industrial Conference Board in New York, Mr. Summerfield again publicly attacked the actions and motivations of the Senate Advisory Council, saying:

> A so-called advisory council whose membership is dominated by representatives of these special interests, released a report with conclusions with which we violently disagree.

Then, apparently remembering his audience, the Postmaster General said:

> I am happy and proud to say that in refreshing contrast to this report (the advisory council's report) is the report of the National Industrial Conference Board entitled, "Economies of Postal Service Business."

The Postmaster General continues on in his praise of the National Industrial Conference Board report, saying:

> These findings offer many helpful suggestions. They are tools we can use. In no sense can they be construed as special pleading for continuance of special privilege.

Mr. President, the National Industrial Conference Board report which Mr. Summerfield so unequivocally praises is a basic part of the Advisory Council's report which Mr. Summerfield is going out of his way to condemn. However, inconsistency seems to be part of the nature of the esteemed head of the postal system of our country, so perhaps we should make allowances accordingly.

I have been recently quoted as withholding approval of the Advisory Council report. I wish to correct this misinterpretation. In its 364 pages the report contains 28 different recommendations. I am sure that no one Senator, myself included, would agree in detail with them all. But I consider the report as a whole to be a magnificent job by dedicated men and women.

The Postmaster General claimed in his press release that "the findings of this 364-page document"—that is, the report of the Advisory Council—"were withheld from us until today." Now, that simply is not so. This body has reason to know that the council report was made available to the Post Office Department some days before the Postmaster General released his prepared statement, a statement in violation of good ethics, as it was released before the release time of the report.

Nor was the council created, as the Postmaster General says, "to assist the Post Office Department." The council was created to assist the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the United States Senate in drawing up sensible postal legislation.

Unfortunately, this type of designed distortion is not new for the present management of the Post Office Department. I have in my hand a statement made by Mr. Summerfield as recently as last October. This is what he said in an appearance on the nationwide television program Facts Forum:

Mr. SUMMERFIELD. The first thing that we did when we took office was to carefully analyze every department of the Post Office and figure out ways and means of reducing the cost at the same time increasing the efficiency.

He said further:

By new efficiencies, reduction in overlaying operations, etc., and then with some additional adjustments in rates * * * I am happy to say to you that now our anticipated deficit for this fiscal year instead of $752 million will be something in excess of $400 million, or a saving to you, ladies and gentlemen, the taxpayers of this country, of more than $1 million every working day.

Now, if my colleagues heard that over the air, would they not have the impression that the Postmaster General has cut expenses in the Post Office Department by a million dollars a day? Of course they would, and that is exactly what he wanted them to think. But has he done that? He has not.

But there must be a saving, one may say, because the Postmaster General tells me the deficit is down to about $440 million, and I am sure the Postmaster General is an honest man.

Mr. President, let us look at the figures. As directed by the 82d Congress, and with the authorization of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the rates on fourth-class mail were raised by $159 million a year, effective October 1, 1953. The Postmaster General has raised international postage rates by $24 million. Increases in the price of stamped envelopes, box rents, and miscellaneous domestic fees amount to $16,400,000. So he has gotten $199,400,000 from higher rates, alone.

But that is not the whole story. By authorization of Congress the Post Office Department has also, and quite properly, transferred the cost of airline subsidies to the Civil Aeronautics Board. That is $80,655,000 off the Post Office books. Other bookkeeping shifts bring the total to about $116 million. That is a grand total of more than $316 million. So it appears that instead of spending less of the taxpayers' money he is actually spending more. Perhaps there are some overall savings, but I should like to see them spelled out.

We have been told repeatedly that the service of the Post Office Department has greatly increased during the last 12 months.

I am not prepared to tell you, Mr. President, with factual background, whether the postal service has been better, or worse, since the new team took over. I do not have access to the popular opinion polls and survey teams for the guidance and analysis available to the Postmaster General.

There is evidence, however, that some advocates for the new regime in Washington are not quite ready to "buy" all that is claimed in the way of better postal service since the new management took over the Department.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a clipping from the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 21, 1954, which, I believe, reveals some worthwhile facts. From the clipping it will be found that publisher McCormick has a few misgivings about Mr. Summerfield's claims of superior postal service. Apparently the Chicago Tribune decided to find out for itself whether Mr. Summerfield or his predecessors did a better job of handling the mails. According to the results, the incumbent still has a little to learn about postal operations. Anyway, he came off second best in Mr. McCormick's survey.

I now read from the article:

TEST REVEALS MAIL SLOWER IN LAST YEAR

A test of the United States mail indicates that service may have slowed about 4½ percent since last year.

The Tribune has repeated an experiment made last year when 384 letters were posted between Chicago and suburbs and 16 major cities. The total elapsed time for delivery of all letters in 1953 was 16,942 hours. The total in 1954 was 17,726 hours.

I willingly admit that 384 letters fall far short of the millions handled daily by the Post Office Department. But let us assume that it is a sufficient number to provide an adequate sampling figure.

Certainly the results are as conclusive as those attained by Mr. Summerfield, who tells us that his poll of 2,000 persons gives unquestionable indication that the American people are anxious to pay a higher rate of postage for their mailing privileges.

By the way, Mr. President, I understand that Mr. Summerfield paid either $10,000 or $12,000 for the poll of the 2,000 persons.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Did I correctly understand the Senator from South Carolina to say that the Postmaster General expended approximately $12,000 of the money of the taxpayers, to poll 2,000 persons?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That was his statement to the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. GORE. Would that amount to approximately $6 per person who was asked the questions?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe that is correct; 6 times 2 is 12.

Mr. GORE. Is the Senator from South Carolina aware of the amount of compensation the census enumerators received when they took the very long and complicated questionnaire to the millions of people of the United States?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not recall the exact cost.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator from South Carolina does not recall the exact cost, I should like to say to him that the enumerators received an average of 10.2 cents per person questioned.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I remember that it was approximately 10 cents.

Mr. GORE. That is a far cry from $6 per person.

Since the Senator previously referred to my having questioned the propriety and legality of the poll, let me say I also question the economy and advisability of it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I, also, question the advisability, and whether it is ethically proper for the Postmaster General to do it, and also whether it is legal. That is my position.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will yield further to me, let me say that in view of his statement that he questions the legality of it, I should like to read a section of the United States Code.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. GORE. I read section 1913, title 18, of the United States Code:

No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; and after notice and hearings by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is a question the Attorney General will have to answer.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the statement by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, I should like to place in the RECORD a letter dated February 4, 1954, addressed to Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, by the Postmaster General, a copy of the contract in question, a copy of the letter stating the legality of the expenditure, by the Acting Solicitor of the Department, a copy of the letter dealing with the so-called Hatch Act relationship to this subject and approving the legal-

ity of the action taken by the Postmaster General, signed by Mr. Walter Yeagley, First Assistant, Criminal Division, Department of Justice, and a copy of a letter addressed to Mr. Charles R. Hook, Jr., by Mr. Stuart A. Rice, Assistant Director for Statistical Standards.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1954.

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

DEAR MR. WARREN: This will acknowledge your letter of January 26, 1954, with which you transmitted a copy of a letter dated January 21, 1954, addressed to you by Senator ALBERT GORE. The subject matter of the Senator's letter was the report on a public-opinion survey entitled "The Public Looks at Postal Rates." You request a factual report in this matter together with such other comments as I may desire to make.

Upon taking over the duties of the Postmaster General I was faced with the prospect of an annual deficit of upward of $700 million unless drastic action was taken to revise the structure, policies, and practices of the postal establishment. One of the apparent needs was a realistic postal-rate policy. Men of experience in the business and professional world were recruited to take over many of the top-level positions in the Post Office Department.

Annually since 1952 the Congress has appropriated funds for the activation of a Division of Postal Rates in the Post Office Department. My predecessor never activated such a Division. I have obeyed this directive of Congress to use appropriated funds for this purpose, and the Division is now a live and active unit operating under the direction of an Assistant Postmaster General. Its function is to make continuing studies of the postal-rate structure and to recommend changes therein when such appear necessary. To do this it cannot operate in a vacuum. It must seek the views of the general public and take into account the possible public reaction to any proposed change. Accordingly it was determined in this Division of Postal Rates to sample public opinion with respect to some of our present policies.

The views of our Solicitor were sought. He advised that it would be lawful to contract for a public-opinion survey under the provisions of 55a, title 5, United States Code, and our appropriations act for 1954.

The views of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget were also requested with respect to this matter. The Federal Reports Act of 1942 recognized that the executive branch of the Government must procure information from the general public. The act directs the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to coordinate the "information collecting services" of all agencies of the Government to the end that the cost of procuring such information would be reduced and that the information obtained be of maximum use to all the Government agencies. It should be noted that under section 3 (d) of the Federal Reports Act of 1942 (5 U. S. C. 139a (d)), the Bureau of the Budget is charged with the duty of determining whether or not the collection of any information by a Federal agency is necessary for the proper performance of the function of such agency, or for any other purpose. The Bureau of the Budget approved the proposed plan. Its approval necessarily carries with it the determination that collecting the information was a proper function of the Post Office Department.

Public opinion sampling is now recognized as a highly specialized field of work allied to, or a subdivision of, the profession of statistics. While such sampling receives its widest publicity in connection with the determination of the probable outcome of elections, it has been widely used by industry as a guide to the conduct of affairs. Business concerns do not normally maintain their own sampling services but rely on the work of such outside firms as Wengel Service Corp. The value of such a survey is dependent, of course, upon the expertness of the organization which conducts it, since objective specifications controlling the quality of the work cannot be written. For these reasons it was administratively determined necessary to the general administration of the Post Office Department to make a contract with Wengel Service Corp.

With respect to the allegation that the information thus obtained, when transmitted to each Member of Congress, constitutes a violation of section 1918 of title 18, United States Code, I believe that you will be interested to note that I have taken this matter up with the Department of Justice. That Department has advised me that under the circumstances it does not believe that the transmission of this information to Members of Congress was a violation of that law.

My letter of January 20, 1954, to the Members of Congress was sent in response to oral requests made to me by several Members that they be furnished copies of the report when it became available. The letters, as you may see by examination of the one submitted to you by Senator GORE, are mere transmittals of the report for the information of the addresses. They do not request the addresses to take any action one way or another on legislative problems. The sole purpose of these letters was to furnish all Congressmen with information in the posession of the Department which a few of them had requested. I did not consider it proper to furnish this information to some Members without making it available to all the Members of Congress.

Since the report was transmitted to Members of the Congress I have received a number of letters in which thanks have been expressed for the receipt of the information.

It is inconceivable that Congress, in enacting the cited law, intended to require a Cabinet officer to withhold from Members of Congress information properly gathered by him in the operation of his department.

For your information I am attaching hereto a copy of the contract entered into with Wengel Service Corp., a copy of the opinion of the Solicitor of this office, a copy of the opinion addressed to me by the Department of Justice and a copy of the opinion of the Bureau of the Budget. If you desire any further information, I will be happy to supply it.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

This contract, entered into this 21st day of December 1953, by and between the United States of America, hereafter called the Government, and Wengel Service Corp., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York, of the city of Princeton in the State of New Jersey, hereinafter called the contractor:

Witnesseth—

Whereas the contractor is an organization of experts in the field of ascertaining public opinion; and

Whereas the Post Office Department desires to obtain the expert services of the contractor in connection with the administration of the Department, pursuant to title 5, United States Code, section 55a and title 2 of the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriations Act, 1954;

Now, therefore, in consideration of the premises and of the mutual covenants and agreements herein contained, and for other good and valuable consideration, the parties hereto agree as follows:

Article 1. Services to be rendered: The contractor shall furnish a report on or before January 15, 1954, to the Post Office Department concerning public opinion on the adequacy of postal service and on the acceptability of changes in postal service and postal rates. Such report shall be based upon a survey conducted in accordance with established principles of sampling on a quota basis and an analysis of such survey. The questionnaire used in such survey shall be approved by the Department.

Article 2. Compensation: The Government will pay the contractor upon submission of the report and on appropriate vouchers the sum of $11,500, provided, however, the compensation shall be increased by the amount of overtime compensation paid by the contractor to its employees at established rates for any overtime work necessary to complete the report on the date fixed in article 1, but such increase shall not exceed $575. The compensation fixed in this article shall be full compensation to the contractor for all work in connection with making a survey, analyzing the responses and preparation and submission of the report as provided in article 1.

Article 3. Nondiscrimination in employment: In connection with the performance of work under this contract, the contractor agrees not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin; and further agrees to insert the foregoing provision in any subcontracts hereunder.

Article 4. Officials not to benefit: No Member of or Delegate to Congress, or Resident Commissioner, shall be admitted to any share or part of this contract, or to any benefit that may arise therefrom; but this provision shall not be construed to extend to this contract if made with a corporation for its general benefit.

Article 5. Covenants against contingent fees: The contractor warrants that no person or selling agency has been employed or retained to solicit or secure this contract upon an agreement or understanding for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee, excepting bona fide employees or bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the contractor for the purpose of securing business. For breach or violation of this warranty the Government shall have the right to annul this contract without liability or in its discretion to deduct from the contract price or consideration the full amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have executed this contract as of the day and year first above written.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
By C. R. HOOK, Jr.,
Acting Postmaster General.

Witnesses:
A. J. ROBERTSON.
MILDRED B. OWENS.

WENGEL SERVICE CORP.,
By ARTHUR R. WENGEL,
President.

Witnesses:
CHARLOTTE S. HOLMES.
GEORGE B. OLSEN.

JANUARY 20, 1954.

To the POSTMASTER GENERAL:

This will confirm the oral opinion given to Assistant Postmaster General Robertson on December 7, 1953, with respect to the legality of the contract which the Department proposed to enter into with Wengel Service Corp. of Princeton, N. J.

The Postmaster General is authorized by section 55a of Title 5 United States Code and by Title 2 of the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriations Act, 1954, to

procure the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants without regard to section 5 of Title 41 United States Code.

It is the opinion of this office that the contract entered into is a lawful contract under the provisions of the sections above cited.

L. J. DOYLE,
Acting Solicitor.

JANUARY 20, 1954.

To the POSTMASTER GENERAL:

Pursuant to the request of the Attorney General, I have read your letter of January 20, 1954, by which you forwarded to each Member of Congress a copy of The Public Looks at Postal Rates. You said in that letter:

"We believe you will find this objective national opinion survey throws much helpful light on the degree of public approval of proposed increases in first-, second-, and third-class postal rates and should be helpful to you in your consideration of the problem."

With the purposes of that letter in mind, consideration has been given to section 1913 of Title 18 of the United States Code. It seems clear from a reading of that law that it was not the intent of Congress to prohibit or even discourage the head of a Government department from furnishing to Members of Congress any information which would be helpful to Members of Congress in considering any legislation then pending before them.

Your letter was in no sense argumentative, but merely forwarded certain data for their assistance in considering a bill presently before them. I do not see that any logical contention could be made that such action has been prohibited by Congress.

J. WALTER YEAGLEY,
First Assistant Criminal Division,
Department of Justice.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C. January 21, 1954.

Mr. CHARLES R. HOOK, Jr.,
Deputy Postmaster General,
Office of the Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOOK: This will confirm the oral approval given by this Office to Mr. Albert J. Robertson, Assistant Postmaster General, on December 7, 1953, covering the public opinion survey plans outlined in your letter of December 4 to Mr. Rowland R. Hughes, Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget.

Our review of the survey, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Reports Act of 1942, was expedited in recognition of the timing requirements presented. We are glad to know that the survey has been satisfactorily completed and the results made available to your office.

Budget Bureau Approval No. 46-5401 has been assigned to this project.

Sincerely yours,

STUART A. RICE,
Assistant Director for Statistical Standards.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a further insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point certain matters following the insertions just made by the distinguished majority leader.

In view of the statement by the distinguished majority leader and the insertions he made in the RECORD, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated January 20, 1954, from the Postmaster General, addressed to me, which letter was likewise addressed to all other Members of Congress.

I ask also to have printed in the RECORD at this point the press release which was attached to the letter just mentioned, and which bears the headline "Public Supports Postal Rate Raises."

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which the junior Senator from Tennessee addressed to the Comptroller General of the United States soliciting his opinion as to the legality of this expenditure, in view of the express statute which I have just read, and in view of the obvious purpose of the law.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Comptroller General's reply, in which he says that he is asking the Postmaster General for a complete explanation before rendering a decision to me.

There being no objection, the letters and other matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1954.

Hon. ALBERT GORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GORE: I am sending with this letter a copy of The Public Looks at Postal Rates—a scientific opinion survey made for the Post Office Department by an independent research organization.

We have been anxious to know how the public felt about the proposed postal rate increases now before Congress.

Did the people understand why these increases were proposed? Did they approve these proposed increases? Were they in favor of operating the postal establishment on a self-supporting basis?

We wanted the answers to these and other questions—given without emotion or colored by special pleading.

We believe you will find this objective national opinion survey throws much helpful light on the degree of public approval of proposed increases in first-, second-, and third-class postal rates, and should be helpful to you in your consideration of this problem.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

PUBLIC SUPPORTS POSTAL RATE RAISES

According to a nationwide public opinion poll, approximately 4 out of 5 Americans think the Post Office Department should be self-supporting.

This statement was announced today by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield in releasing a scientific nationwide opinion survey just completed by the Wengel Service Corp., of Princeton, N. J.

In 200 cities and towns, as well as in rural areas in all 48 States and the District of Columbia, Wengel interviewers asked this question: "Do you think the Post Office Department ought to take in enough money from postage to pay all its costs, or is it all right if it doesn't take in enough to pay all its costs?"

The answers received divided as follows:

	Percent
Ought to take in enough	78
All right if it doesn't	14
Other answers	2
No opinion	6

The opinion that the Post Office Department should take in enough money from postage is held by all major segments of the population. The scientific survey included people of different ages and economic status in different geographical regions and sizes of communities in the same proportion that they occur in the population as a whole.

The public also rejected the principle of the Post Office Department subsidizing certain large users of the mail, casting a 2-to-1 vote in favor of making each class of mail pay its own way.

Their replies in response to this question were: "In your opinion, are there any of these classes of mail where the postage rates ought to be less than the cost of handling the mail?"

	Percent
None of them	67
Yes	18
No opinion	15

Only very small minorities, ranging from 2 percent in the case of third-class to 8 percent for first class, believe that any classes of mail should have rates that do not cover the cost of handling that mail.

After having been informed of current postal deficits, the public favored proposed increases of postage rates on individual classes of mail as follows:

Eighty-three percent approve of a rate increase in third-class mail.

Seventy-four percent approve of a rate increase in second-class mail.

Fifty-six percent approve of a rate increase in first-class mail.

The administration's rate bill now before Congress calls for increased postal rates estimated to yield $240 million annually.

Under these proposals, rates on the first ounce of out-of-town 3-cent letters would be increased 1 penny to yield approximately $150 million new revenue annually.

The increases proposed for second-class mail (magazines and newspapers) would reduce the deficit in that class only from $231 million a year to $211 million.

Postal figures show that magazines are responsible for 68 percent of the deficit in second-class mail. Rates for this class of mail are generally lower today than they were in 1925. In some important instances they are lower than they were in 1879.

Proposed increases in third-class mail (mostly advertising matter, circulars, and small packages) would reduce the deficit in that class from $159 millions to $107 millions a year.

The figures cited above are based on fiscal 1953 computations.

Fifteen million more dollars would be realized by increasing domestic air mail letter rates from 6 cents an ounce to 7 cents an ounce and by increased book rates anticipated to yield $3½ million in additional revenue.

Simultaneously with the release of the Wengel Survey to the press the Post Office Department sent copies to all Members of the Congress.

In a letter accompanying these reports, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield wrote:

"I am sending with this letter a copy of The Public Looks at Postal Rates"—a scientific opinion survey made for the Post Office Department by an independent research organization.

"We have been anxious to know how the public felt about the proposed postal rate increase now before Congress.

"Did the people understand why these increases were proposed? Did they approve these proposed increases? Were they in favor of operating the Postal Establishment on a self-supporting basis?

"We wanted the answers to these and other questions—given without emotion or colored by special pleading.

"We believe you will find this objective national opinion survey throws much helpful light on the degree of public approval of proposed increases in first-, second-, and third-class postal rates and should be help-

ful to you in your consideration of the problem."

JANUARY 21, 1954.

Mr. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WARREN: I enclose herewith a letter from the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, together with enclosures thereto consisting of a press release issued by the Post Office Department on January 20, 1954, and a copy of an opinion survey prepared for the Post Office Department by the Wengel Service Corp., of Princeton, N. J.

I am advised that the Postmaster General authorized the expenditure of approximately $12,000 to cover the cost of preparation of the enclosed survey and that payment therefor was made from the general funds of the Post Office Department. I am further advised that letters similar to that which I received, together with identical enclosures, were delivered to all Members of the Congress yesterday. These materials were circulated on the eve of the date upon which the House Post Office Committee was scheduled to consider legislation which would authorize increases in postage rates as proposed by the Post Office Department. I think it clear that these materials are calculated to influence Members of the Congress in their consideration of legislation the enactment of which is urged by the Postmaster General.

It appears to me that the action of the Postmaster General in authorizing the preparation and distribution of these materials and in authorizing payment therefor out of appropriated funds is in violation of the provisions of section 1913, Title 18, United States Code. I would appreciate your making whatever investigation is deemed necessary and providing me with an opinion as to the legality of the expenditure made in the manner outlined above. I request further that this opinion be provided with the least practicable delay.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT GORE.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, January 26, 1954.

Hon. ALBERT GORE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR GORE: I have your letter of January 21, 1954, concerning an opinion survey entitled "The Public Looks at Postal Rates," obtained by the Post Office Department from the Wengel Service Corp., Princeton, N. J. You request my views concerning the legality of the expenditure involved.

The Postmaster General today is being asked to furnish at the earliest practicable date a complete report in the matter in order that adequate consideration may be given to the request contained in your letter. As soon as the report has been received, the matter will receive prompt consideration and you will be advised further relative thereto.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, Mr. Summerfield tells us that his poll of 2,000 gives unquestionable indication that the American people are anxious to pay higher rates of postage for their mailing privileges.

Mr. President, probably the question comes to your mind—as it has occurred to me—what is the reasoning behind these clearly contradictory statements? What is his objective? What does he hope to achieve? Frankly, I cannot answer those questions.

There have been no attacks on the Postmaster General. Nowhere that I can find has there been raised any question of the management of the Post Office Department. The postal service has been operating on a deficit basis for a number of years. Undoubtedly, some of this deficit could be reduced by better management within the Department. Some of it will continue no matter what the Post Office Department does or does not do.

It would appear to me that we are all attempting to move in the same direction—to give the people of this country the best possible service at the lowest possible cost. It would appear to me that any and all recommendations toward this end would be welcomed by any Postmaster General. Democrat or Republican.

There is glaring evidence here of a move to take not only the ratemaking power but the very policy power away from Congress and to place it in the hands of creatures of the Post Office Department.

Mr. President, the post office was not established as a business. It was established as a service. To be sure, it should be run on a business-like basis, but only so that it can provide the greatest possible service to the people of the United States.

This sad confusion, and the harsh words that have been passed and are being passed between the Post Office Department and Members of this great deliberative body, may yet serve a useful purpose if they impel us to reaffirm that abiding principle. Whether rates should be higher or lower, whether one class or another should carry a greater part of the load, is not at this moment the issue. I deeply trust that from our deliberations may come a statement of principle, so clear as to be unassailable through the generations to come, that the Post Office Department is a Government service to the people of the United States, established in the interests of the general welfare. From that principle all else proceeds. That principle this body must nail down.

Once there has been established in the Post Office Department an adequate and sensible cost determination system and all waste and inefficiency has been, to the most practical extent, eliminated, I will support and encourage all necessary rate increases to eliminate the remaining deficit and to attain a balanced budget.

Toward that end, I am going to insist that we take the time and the trouble to study and appraise the Advisory Council's report and its recommendations for improving the postal service to the people of this country and reducing the Department's perpetual deficit.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is the Senator familiar with the recent report of the Advisory Council on postal rates and postal policy? There has been a recent report. Is the Senator familiar with it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Advisory Council was established during the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, pursuant to a recommendation of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true, but we did not get any appropriation to carry out the recommendation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator realize that in recent days the Advisory Council has made a recommendation in reference to the postal inspection service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It has.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Advisory Council consists of some of the leading business executives of the United States, does it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Some of whom are publishers.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Council consists of persons who are versed in postal matters.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator know that recommendation No. 3 in the recent report of the Advisory Council reads as follows:

> The inspection service has gone far afield from its original role as protector of the integrity of the mails. By evolution, down through the years, it has become almost exclusively responsible for management of the postal establishment. This marriage of law enforcement and management has been a constant and increasing case in incompatibility that has had an ill effect on the efficiency and economy of the postal service. The inspection service, on the one hand, does not command the confidence, cooperation, and participation of the rank and file of postal employees in matters of management; thus, progressive movement is limited. On the other hand, the inspection service, as an entity, is not equipped by training or experience to provide the technical skill required to streamline and modernize the operations of the postal establishment by taking full advantage of recent-day developments in the fields of engineering and management.

Does the Senator recall that observation?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I recall it. That is also in keeping with my views. I made a speech in California last September before the Postmasters' National Convention, and I stressed that point fully at that time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it fair, therefore, to conclude that while the inspection service has a limited function to perform, it does not necessarily, nor should it necessarily, represent the policy determination of the Post Office Department?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think it is a mistake when it enters that field.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, it is the duty of those in management positions, such as Assistant Secretaries, the Under Secretary, the Postmaster General, the Superintendent of Mails, and other top managerial officers, ultimately to arrive at the decision as to policy. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe it should go even further down, to the postmasters.

Mr. HUMPHREY. To the postmasters themselves?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. To the postmasters throughout the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was very much interested in the Senator's observation with regard to the survey reported by the Chicago Tribune. I believe the Senator was in the Chamber when I made my remarks with reference to the service in New York. Is it fairly correct to say that mail may be handled by trucks, or by rail, as a matter of fact, in the mass transportation of mail, but that it is the duty of the Post Office Department to implement the service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And to give good service.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; and to deliver mail as quickly as possible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from South Carolina recall when the former Postmaster General stopped the two-a-day delivery system in the residential areas of the Nation?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator recall the uproar that arose in Congress when the Postmaster curtailed the two-a-day deliveries in the residential areas?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I most certainly do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Why did Representatives and Senators feel that the stopping of the two-a-day delivery in the residential areas was wrong? Was it not because they felt it curtailed service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It curtailed service. If the Senator will recall, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service unanimously disapproved of the plan at the time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from South Carolina recall that President Eisenhower, when he was a candidate in 1952, promised the restoration of two deliveries a day?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I cannot say "yes" or "no"; but I will take the Senator's word for it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that if the Senator will examine some of the speeches made by candidate Eisenhower he will find that that promise was made. The point I am trying to make is that basically policy decisions with reference to the quantity and quality of service rest with two bodies, first, with the Congress of the United States, which determines the basic policy, and, secondly, with the top management officials of the Post Office Department who execute the policy established by the Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is Congress which basically determines what the rates will be, or, at least, should determine what the rates will be, and also the character and the quality of the service. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; and I have a strong feeling with regard to rates. I feel that the determination of rates rests with Congress, and such a question of policy should not be transferred to the Post Office Department, any more than we should transfer to the Department of Agriculture the right to make determinations with reference to parity, and so forth.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I merely wanted to develop that point, because there has been a great deal of loose talk about deficits and business practices in the Post Office Department. I concur in any move that is made for improving the service. I believe Postmaster General Summerfield has taken some steps toward improving it and that those steps will help. But I still want to make it quite clear that there are policy decisions involved which are required to be made by Congress, and Congress ought never to turn those policy decisions over to anyone else to make.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. For the information of the Senator from Minnesota, I will say that we can balance the budget in the Post Office Department if we want the Department to be operated on a purely business basis. But if we were to do that, we would have to cut out all the rural routes and most of the fourth-class post offices. The New York post office would continue to run, and it would continue to have a surplus. It is running now with a surplus of about $30 million a year. Therefore it can be seen that the strong post offices must help the weaker ones, or we will not have a post-office system in the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did I understand the Senator to say—and I should state that the Senator from South Carolina has had many years of service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and is intimately acquainted with those matters—that the New York post office actually produces a surplus in revenue?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is my understanding.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A surplus over expenses?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; of approximately $30 million a year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not correct to say that the people of that great metropolitan area, therefore, are entitled to good service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; they certainly are entitled to good service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And to speedy service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And to speedy service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In rain or shine?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In rain or shine.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In summer or winter?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In winter or summer; in sleet or snow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And in sleet or snow?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I just wanted to be sure about it.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the order previously entered, the Senate will now proceed to the call of the calendar. The Secretary will state the first measure on the calendar.

AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTH OF THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (S. 1647) to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces was announced as first in order.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to use 5 minutes on another subject.

DO WE KNOW WHAT WE ARE DOING?

Recently a Senator, who must remain nameless, came to me on the floor and said that he felt that there was a considerable amount of confusion about the Bricker amendment and what it would do to the Constitution. He also said that he was not quite clear as to the implications of the George amendment. He had some questions as to the effect of the McCarran proposal, and he was not quite sure what the effect would be of the Saltonstall-Ferguson-Knowland amendment. I think he also mentioned the Kefauver amendment and the Case amendment.

Several Senators have remarked to me that they had proposals they thought might add to the confusion.

Mr. President, we now have before us no less than 12 different proposals to amend the Bricker amendment. I suppose we will get some more amendments.

None—not one of these proposals—has had the benefit of careful scrutiny. Most of these proposals have been drafted by one or two men. Most of them have been put before this body during the last few days. They have not been considered by the public.

Mr. President, if we accept any of these amendments, we will be buying a pig in a poke—an act not worthy of the United States Senate.

To buy a pig in a poke means to buy the animal when it is in a sack and cannot be seen or examined.

If we buy any of these amendments we will be buying a pig in a poke on a dark night.

Mr. President, a Constitution such as ours is not one which can be amended by changing one word here and another there. Every word is pregnant with meaning.

We cannot string words together on the floor of this Chamber and expect to come up with anything except something that we all ought to be afraid of.

We must not treat the Constitution like a string of Christmas-tree lights. One bad light bulb, and the whole string may go out.

The Constitution is not to be treated casually, capriciously, or cavalierly. It is an instrument that we revere and cherish. We must be on guard against doing it violence by ill-conceived or ill-considered amendment.

Most of the constitutions of the Western Hemisphere have been patterned upon the American Constitution. These constitutions have stood the Americas in good stead.

Mr. President, it is presumptuous for any Senator to believe that he individually or in consultation with a few of his colleagues can work out a magic formula to amend the Constitution.

The strength of a democracy is found in its people, in the exchange of ideas, in careful and thorough public debate. It is out of public discussion that we get ideas and strength for our Nation. We have had such discussion now for some months of the Bricker amendment.

The President of the United States has stated his unalterable opposition to that amendment in its present form. We have not had careful discussion and consideration of the multitudinous proposals that have blossomed forth here. We cannot on this floor give those proposals the careful study they need and deserve.

There is but one sensible course of action for this Senate at this time. We must reject all proposals that have not been subject to most careful scrutiny, just as we must reject the Bricker amendment which debate here has shown would surely endanger our constitutional system.

THE SENATE FLOOR IS NO PLACE TO DRAFT A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. President, I am appalled at the attempts being made on the floor of the United States Senate to rewrite the Constitution.

Mr. President, the Bricker amendment is dead. But in its place we are asked to support something—almost anything—that would give the people the feeling that the Senate is protecting them from the world in which we live.

Our Constitution has served us exceedingly well for 165 years. Under its provisions we have grown from an infant Nation in swaddling clothes to a great world power.

I very much deplore, therefore, this tendency to rewrite the Constitution on the floor of the United States Senate. We are shooting in the dark and we may make serious mistakes which our children and our grandchildren will live to regret.

Mr. President, it is just as unwise for us to tinker with the Constitution here on the Senate floor as it would be for me to try to repair my watch or to touch up a great portrait.

Our debate on this subject clearly shows, Mr. President, that we are wandering about in a legal no-man's land without a compass to guide us. The State Department has informed us that it should take from 6 to 8 months to make a careful study of the problems involved in the conclusion of executive agreements. Shall we here jump to conclusions regardless of the facts? Shall we put on our blinders and proceed to amend the Constitution without knowing what we are doing?

If we come out of this debate with a hodge-podge of allegedly constitutional language—and that is what it would be—we will forever rue the day.

If we string together on this floor, words which mean one thing to one Senator and something else to another, we will have words without meaning.

If we send meaningless words to the House of Representatives, what will that great body do? Mr. President, if we send a hodge-podge of words to the House we will be asking it to do the job we should do, but of which we have been incapable.

The other day the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said he thinks we have come to this state "because in our desperation to escape the world that we can never escape, we are seeking some advice of magic that would enable us to accomplish that impossible end."

If we must continue to struggle with proposals to amend the treatymaking powers of the Constitution, let us go about it in a statesman-like way. We might return Senate Joint Resolution 1 to the Judiciary Committee, asking it to restudy the matter in the light of the debate on this floor. But, Mr. President, I think that would be a mistake.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that there are several courses of action open to us that would be realistic and statesman-like.

We might, for example, establish a special committee of this Senate, with membership drawn from the Judiciary Committee, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and perhaps from other committees, to make a careful study of the matters we have discussed on this floor. Certainly it has been shown that the problems raised by amending the treatymaking power are broader than those contemplated by the Judiciary Committee.

Or, Mr. President, the President of the United States might take the initiative and create a commission of outstanding jurists and citizens to study this matter.

Of one thing I am certain.

I am certain that the Constitution is too fine an instrument for revision on the floor of this Senate amidst the emotional heat we have here generated.

I have little sympathy with most of the amendments that have been proposed to Senate Joint Resolution 1. But it would be unfair and unjudicious for me to reject them outright. They deserve study because they represent the efforts of honest, hard-working men to deal with what they conceive to be an important problem.

Mr. President, it is my hope and my prayer that we will be guided on this floor today by our heads, not our hearts.

The men who built the Constitution worked long and hard. They made an instrument that has been our foundation for greatness and world leadership.

We must not in a moment of history destroy that instrument.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. May I correctly interpret the Senator's speech as his assurance that I can count upon his support of my motion to recommit the amendment to his committee for further study?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator can be sure that I shall not vote for the amendments as they are, and he can also be sure that if the whole matter is not killed I shall certainly vote to get rid of it in the way the Senator suggests.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I at this time serve notice on the Senate—I have taken it up with the majority leader—that it will be my plan when we take up the Bricker amendment again, and before we vote on the George amendment, to move that the entire matter be recommitted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We shall be glad to meet that issue at that time.

AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTH OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senate has under consideration, Calendar No. 857, Senate bill 1647.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, since S. 1647 was placed on the calendar, H. R. 2326, a similar bill, was passed by the House and is No. 888 on the calendar.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the House bill, H. R. 2326. I shall then ask that the House bill be amended by striking, on line 7, the year "1958" and inserting in lieu thereof "1957." This change will conform to the language of S. 1647.

This bill, with the suggested amendment, extends for 3 years—from July 1, 1954, to July 1, 1957—the existing legislation suspending the ceilings on the authorized active duty strength of the Armed Forces. The several statutes which authorize an overall ceiling of 2,005,882 for the Armed Forces were suspended until July 31, 1954, by the act of August 3, 1950.

If Congress does not pass this bill, the Armed Forces on August 1 will have to reduce their overall strength to the 2,005,822 level. We all know that for the

foreseeable future the strength of the Armed Forces must be in excess of 2,005,882. The President in his budget message stated that as of June 30, 1954, the total military strength of the Armed Forces will number about 3.3 million men, and that as of June 30, 1955, will number slightly above 3 million.

The committee amended the bill by extending the suspension for only 3 years rather than 4 years, which the bill, as introduced, provided. The committee was of the opinion that 3 years was a sufficient period for defense planning purposes since, generally speaking, planning in the Defense Department is based on a 3-year cycle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2326) to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I offer the amendment to which I referred, striking out, on line 7, "1958" and inserting in lieu thereof "1957."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1647 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2772) to provide for the disposal of paid postal savings certificates was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, did the Senator from North Dakota object?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Senator from Tennessee objected.

The bill (H. R. 5379), to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5959) to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government which retired officers may receive, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 848

The resolution (S. Res. 194) to print additional copies of Senate Report No. 848, 83d Congress, on Korean atrocities, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to have printed for its use 50,000 copies of Senate Report No. 848, a report pursuant to Senate Resolution 40, 83d Congress, 1st session, relative to an investigation of Korean war atrocities.

PRINTING OF TASK FORCE REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 202) providing for the printing of the task force reports of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 4, after the word "that," to insert "two thousand," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the task force reports of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, created pursuant to Public Law 220, 83d Congress, be printed together as a Senate document with illustrations, and that 2,000 additional copies shall be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this resolution has reference to the printing of reports.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

INCREASE IN BORROWING POWER OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2714) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee withhold his objection?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 358 relating to a restoration of the impaired capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation, as approved by the Senate, will provide the Corporation sufficient money to operate until the 8th or 10th of March. This bill will have to be taken up and acted upon by that time, or else the Corporation will be out of money again. The Corporation is anticipating approximately $75 million of receipts between now and that time, and loans are being made at the rate of about $100 million a week. I am only making this statement now; I am not asking to have the bill taken up at this time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish the Senator to know that I personally favor the passage of the bill. I hope no one will misunderstand my objection. I am objecting by request of a Senator who was called away on official business and wanted to be present when the bill is considered.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the reason why the Senator is asking that the bill go over. It is too important to be placed on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar, anyway. I only wanted to say that the Corporation will be out of money again in approximately 5 weeks.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to take this occasion to say that I hope the bill will not be passed on a call of the calendar of bills to which there are no objections. I hope it will be scheduled for consideration so that it can be discussed, at least, briefly. The sum of a billion and three quarters dollars is involved, and therefore, it is not a minor matter. I sincerely hope the majority leader will see fit to set this bill for consideration at an early date before a crisis arises in the corporation, at such an hour and at such a time that the issue may be fully discussed on the floor of the Senate. I have no intention or expectation of discussing the bill at length, and I am sure other Senators have not, because, as I recall, the committee unanimously reported it. It is a bill of such magnitude and relates so intimately to the whole question of the price-support structure that I think, by all means, it should have full discussion and be considered not upon the call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, but as a measure worthy of debate and explanation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to answer the suggestion propounded by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

This is a bill of the type which, because of the amount involved, I think should be taken up on motion rather than on the call of the Unanimous-Consent Calendar. I shall plan to schedule it at an early date. I hope that it may be taken up this week.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the colloquy between the Senators prompts me to say that this is the second year I have served on the Calendar Committee. It is a disagreeable task in many respects. Members who are interested in the passage of proposed legislation often do not appreciate an objection being made, and yet we have heard two Senators say that measures of general importance should not be considered on the call of the Consent Calendar. The more I serve in this capacity the more convinced I am that they are correct, and that the calendar

procedure should be reserved for bills of particular and specific subject matter not general in nature.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

JUAN EZCURRA AND FRANCISCO EZCURRA

The bill (S. 54) for the relief of Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, because of the colloquy which just now ensued, I erroneously objected to Senate bill 54. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my objection and that the bill be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 54) for the relief of Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

FAWN S. LOUIE

The bill (S. 60) for the relief of Fawn S. Louie was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Was Calendar 888, H. R. 2326, passed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar 888, H. R. 2326, was substituted for Calendar 857, S. 1647, and was passed, whereupon the Senate bill was indefinitely postponed.

Is there objection to the present consideration of Calendar 892, S. 60?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 60) for the relief of Fawn S. Louie, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fawn S. Louie shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 685) for the relief of Walter Carl Sander was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

KATINA PANAGIOTI FIFFLIS AND THEODORE PANAGIOTOU FIFFLIS

The bill (H. R. 1129) for the relief of Katina Panagioti Fifflis and Theodore Panagiotou Fifflis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. HERMINE LAMB

The bill (H. R. 1496) for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Lamb was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. CLEMTINE DE RYCK

The bill (H. R. 1516) for the relief of Mrs. Clemtine De Ryck was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETSUKO MOTOHARA KIBLER, WIDOW OF ROBERT EUGENE KIBLER

The bill (H. R. 1674) for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARENCE R. SEILER AND OTHER EMPLOYEES OF THE ALASKAN RAILROAD

The bill (H. R. 2021) for the relief of Clarence R. Seiler and other employees of the Alaskan Railroad was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SANTOS SANABRIA ALVAREZ

The bill (H. R. 2618) for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEE SIG CHEU

The bill (H. R. 2633) for the relief of Lee Sig Cheu was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM E. AITCHESON

The bill (H. R. 2813) for the relief of William E. Aitcheson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TAMIKO NAGAE

The bill (H. R. 3027) for the relief of Tamiko Nagae was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. URSULA EICHNER CLAWGES

The bill (H. R. 3228) for the relief of Mrs. Ursula Eichner Clawges was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN JAMES T. BELL

The bill (H. R. 3280) for the relief of John James T. Bell was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EIKO TANAKA

The bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of Eiko Tanaka was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUFIN MANIKOWSKI

The bill (H. R. 3619) for the relief of Rufin Manikowski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. HELEN BONANNO (NEE KOUBEK)

The bill (H. R. 3728) for the relief of Mrs. Helen Bonanno (nee Koubek) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ANNA HOLDER

The bill (H. R. 3733) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, though I have no particular objection except as to the amount provided in the bill, may we have an explanation of the bill? The amount is a little larger than amounts provided in other cases.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill proposes to pay to Mrs. Anna Holder, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for the payment of the proceeds of national life insurance issued to the late Edward J. Burns. The claimant is a stepsister of the deceased, born Edward Dougherty. Edward Dougherty was taken in by the mother and father of the claimant in 1908 and from that time on lived continuously with the Burns family and was considered their child. During his school years he used the name of Edward Burns, although there was never a legal change of name nor an adoption.

He entered the Army at the age of 37 years and took out two national life insurance policies at $5,000 each. The mother of the claimant was the principal beneficiary in one and the claimant was the contingent beneficiary. On the other, the claimant was named by the deceased as the principal beneficiary. The mother of the claimant, who was the principal beneficiary in one of the policies, predeceased the insured on March 27, 1943. Edward Burns died on May 22, 1945. After his death, the claimant, Mrs. Holder, made a formal claim for the payment of the national service life insurance, but the Veterans' Administration determined that she did not come within the permitted class of beneficiaries.

It appears, however, that there never was any objection made to the naming

of these benficiaries by anyone in authority, and had the policies been issued under existing law, this claimant would have been eligible to have received the money. Furthermore, there is no one other than Mrs. Holder who may be eligible to take under any conception of the law.

The committee therefore feels that since the deceased kept his insurance in full force and effect, without objection from any authority, that it is only right and just that the beneficiary he designated be allowed to have the benefits of his insurance. It is therefore recommended that the bill, H. R. 3733, be considered favorably.

I might add that the committee went into the matter very thoroughly, and the report is unanimous on the part of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3733) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANETA POPA

The bill (H. R. 4254) for the relief of Aneta Popa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN ABRAHAM AND ANN ABRAHAM

The bill (H. R. 4439) for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDITH MARIA GORE

The bill (H. R. 4577) for the relief of Edith Maria Gore was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN JEREMIAH BOTELHO

The bill (H. R. 4972) for the relief of John Jeremiah Botelho was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAX KASSNER

The bill (H. R. 5195) for the relief of Max Kassner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. DON ALEXANDER

The bill (H. R. 5945) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADVANCE SEED CO., OF PHOENIX, ARIZ.

The bill (S. 364) for the relief of the Advance Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the proposed legislation, as amended, would award the sum of $4,906.22 to the Advance Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz., for reimbursement for the overassessment for customs duties in connection with the importation of cloverseed.

The collector of customs at Nogales, Ariz., under section 763 of the Federal Seed Act, assessed the shipments of cloverseed imported by the claimant at the rate of 2 cents per pound. However, prior to the entries involved, the rate on cloverseed had been modified to 1 cent per pound in accordance with the provisions of the act. The information as to this modification in rate had not been transmitted to the collector of customs, and consequently he used the old rate.

Under the statute, claimant had 60 days within which to file a protest. He was not advised of this by the collector until after his right to appeal had expired. The Treasury Department and the Department of Justice both recommend favorable consideration of this claim. The committee therefore unanimously recommends favorable consideration of S. 364, as proposed to be amended.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I introduced the bill after conferring with the Treasury Department, which clearly admitted an error in not transmitting the information to the collector at Nogales.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 364) for the relief of the Advance Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Advance Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $4,906.22. Such sum represents reimbursement for overassesament of duties in connection with the importation of clover seed (Melilotus indica) covered by consumption entries Nos. 4224, 21, 76, 108, 126, and 178, dated June 21, 1951, July 6, 1951, July 23, 1951, July 30, 1951, August 6, 1951, and September 4, 1951, respectively: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VILHJALMUR THORLAKSSON BJARNAR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 931) for the relief of Vilhjalmur Thorlaksson Bjarnar which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vilhjalmur Thorlaksson Bjarnar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JEAN JING PEO FENG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 989) for the relief of Jean Peo Feng, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jean Jing Peo Feng, the fiancee of I-Ming Feng, a lawful permanent resident of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Jean Jing Peo Feng is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said I-Ming Feng and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Jean Jing Peo Feng, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Jean Jing Peo Feng, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Jean Jing Peo Feng as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UTAKO KANITZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1137) for the relief of Utako Kanitz which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Utako Kanitz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW D. SUMNER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1208) for the relief of Andrew D. Sumner which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That Andrew D. Sumner, of Brandy, Va. (Army service No. O-364738), be, and he is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any part of the moneys erroneously paid by the United States to his former wife, Mrs. Ila Frances Sumner, as class E allotments, for the period from July 1, 1942, to January 31, 1944, inclusive.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Andrew D. Sumner the sum of $196.09, which represents a like amount refunded by him to the United States on account of the erroneous payments of class E allotments to the said Mrs. Ila Frances Sumner for the period from July 1, 1942, to January 31, 1944, inclusive: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANZ GERICH AND WILLY GERICH, HIS MINOR SON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1231) for the relief of Franz Gerich and Willy Gerich, his minor son, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$250" and insert "$202.38", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Franz Gerich, the sum of $202.38, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for hospital and medical expenses incurred by him; and to Willy Gerich, his minor son, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, pain, and suffering sustained by him as the result of an accident which occurred on May 25, 1945, in the vicinity of Lauderbach, Czechoslovakia, when a United States Army tank collided with a vehicle in which Willy Gerich was riding: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CORNELIO AND LUCIA LEQUILLO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1160) for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Lequillo which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "alien", to insert "minor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LO BIANCO LETIZIA MARIA GENOVEFFA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1112) for the relief of Lo Bianco Letizia Maria Genoveffa which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 5, after the word "child", to strike out "Lo Bianco Letizia Maria Genoveffa" and insert "Letizia Maria Genoveffa Lo Bianco", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Letizia Maria Genoveffa Lo Bianco, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Giuseppe Loverde, a citizen of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Letizia Maria Genoveffa Lo Bianco."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1184) to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminate war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS BY THE HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION

The bill (H. R. 2839) to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the Hawaiian Homes Commission in the Territory of Hawaii to make certain exchanges of lands in order to carry out its functions. The Commission is an agency created by the Federal Government for the purpose of providing homesites for native Hawaiians. I may say that the committee has been advised that the commission owns a large number of noncontiguous tracts of land scattered over a considerable area, and it is asking now for authority to exchange such noncontiguous tracts for other public land tracts, of equal value, so that the commission can consolidate its holdings and provide homes for the natives of Hawaii.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. If the bill is enacted can they make the exchanges without submitting the proposed specific trades for the approval of Congress?

Mr. BARRETT. I think the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of the Territory must approve them.

Mr. MORSE. They will not come back to a committee of the Congress?

Mr. BARRETT. No; they will not.

Mr. MORSE. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, the explanation I have received concerning Order No. 925, House bill 2885, sheds a different light on House bill 2839 than I had in mind when I first raised my objection, and causes me to ask the Senator from Wyoming a few questions.

Is it the Senator's statement that the Federal Government has in fact no property interest in any of the lands which are involved in House bill 2839?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. The only reason why the bill is now before the Senate at all, if I understand correctly, is that the Federal Government is functioning in somewhat of a trustee relationship.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct; the Government is functioning as a trustee for the territory.

Mr. MORSE. It never had a property interest in the land as such?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Then, Mr. President, I withdraw my objection to Calendar No. 924, H. R. 2839.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2839) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF RIGHT OF PURCHASE LEASE TO EDWARD C. SEARLE

The bill (H. R. 2885) authorizing and directing the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to issue a right of purchase lease to Edward C. Searle was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate, and particularly my colleague, the Senator from Oregon, that the public lands of Hawaii are in an entirely different class from the public lands of this country. When Hawaii was annexed to the United States, there was a specific provision that all public lands in the Territory belonged to Hawaii, and that our Government would hold them in trust for Hawaii. The presumption was, and still is, that the lands should be transferred to the new State in the event it is admitted

to the Union. That is the decision of the committee, at least so far as the bill now before the Senate is concerned.

In this case, Mr. Searle applied for 485 acres. The lease was issued to him. After a long time it was determined by the Attorney General that he could have but one tract. The purpose of the bill is to permit Mr. Searle to have the 485 acres of land, and to pay the rental required under the law, in order to enable him to avoid a loss, because the lands were leased to him in the first instance, and he made a considerable investment on the presumption that he could get the lease.

No Federal funds at all are involved. The lands belong to the Territory of Hawaii. The Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Interior, and the Governor of Hawaii, as well as everyone else concerned, approve the bill.

Mr. MORSE. The explanation of the Senator sheds more light on Order No. 924, House bill 2839, than I had in mind when I first raised my objection. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Is it the Senator's statement that the Federal Government has in fact no proprietary interest in any of the lands involved in House bill 2839?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. The only reason the bill has come before the Senate at all, if I understand the Senator correctly, is because the Federal Government is functioning in somewhat of a trustee relationship?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct; it is functioning as a trustee for the Territory.

Mr. MORSE. And it has no property interest in the land as such?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of H. R. 2885?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, referring to House bill 2885, calendar No. 925, is it correct to say that the leasehold interest is subject to appraisal for a determination of the value?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Therefore there is a criterion of the value of the lease which is to be passed on before this transaction is consummated. Is that correct?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2885) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4030) to repeal section 4 of the act of March 2, 1934, creating the Model Housing Board of Puerto Rico, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EXERCISE OF CERTAIN POWERS BY THE PRESIDENT IN RESPECT OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN HAWAII CEDED TO THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2846) authorizing the President to exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii notwithstanding the acts of August 5, 1939, and June 16, 1949, or other acts of Congress, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the bill is in the same category with the two bills which were passed a moment ago. The purpose of the bill is to give the Territory of Hawaii the authority to use certain lands in Hawaii to fulfill an agreement under which the Territory is to construct a retaining wall and certain works in the harbor at Honolulu. While public lands are involved, the title to them in fact remains in the Territory of Hawaii; and the United States is the trustee for the Territory. It is entirely for a public purpose, and I see no objection to legislation of this type.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 3, after the word "of", it is proposed to strike out "August 5, 1939 (53 Stat. 1209, ch. 444), the Act of", and at the top of page 4, to strike out:

2. That land, now part of the Fort Armstrong Military Reservation, which was transferred by the Secretary of Labor to the control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of War (now Secretary of the Army) by letter dated December 16, 1939, pursuant to the Act of August 5, 1939 (53 Stat 1209, ch. 444). Area sixteen one hundredths acre.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the President tc exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii, notwithstanding the act of June 16, 1949, or other acts of Congress."

Mr. MORSE. I simply desire to say for the record that I have raised no objection to these Hawaiian bills on the basis of the representation, which I am satisfied is correct, that the Federal Government has no vested interest whatsoever in the titles to the lands covered by the bills.

MEANING OF THE WORD "COMMODITY" IN THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1386) to amend section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, relating to the meaning of the word "commodity," was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. I was about to propose a one-word amendment. One word was inadvertently left out, either in typing or printing the bill. I am requesting the majority leader to fix a time later this week when the bill will be considered by the Senate. He is not present at this time, but I understand he plans to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee renew his objection?

Mr. GORE. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

RETROCESSION OF JURISDICTION OF CERTAIN HIGHWAYS WITHIN WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO

The bill (S. 2689) to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object, let me say, for the purpose of the RECORD and for future reference, that the bill does not involve an exchange of real estate, but involves only the retroceding to the State of Ohio of current jurisdiction over certain State and county roads within the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, in Ohio. At the last session, Public Laws 38 and 41 were enacted, and they provided similar legislation with respect to Fort Belvoir and Fort Sill.

An investigation of the facts in this case will show that of course there will be joint use by the public generally, including joint use by the Federal Government, in connection with the functions of the forts, camps, and military reservations involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2689) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That there is hereby granted to the State of Ohio a retrocession of jurisdiction over the portions of highways described below within the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base to the extent that all laws of the State and all laws of the United States shall be applicable thereon and the United States and the State shall exercise concurrent jurisdiction thereover:

(A) State Route Numbered 4, beginning at Huberville, approximately three thousand feet northeast of the intersection of Harshmanville Road with State Route Numbered 4, thence northeast to the Greene County and

Montgomery County line, the above section of road being in Montgomery County, Ohio;

(B) All that part of State Route Numbered 4 lying between the Greene County and Montgomery County line and the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis Railroad underpass and being within the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundaries, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(C) Beginning at the point where State Route Numbered 4 passes the extreme south corner of the original Wilbur Wright Field boundary, said point being approximately one thousand seven hundred feet northeast of Huffman Dam, thence northeasterly to the corporate limits of the village of Fairborn, Ohio, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(D) State Route Numbered 235, beginning at a point where State Route Numbered 235 intersects and crosses an easterly boundary line of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, said point being approximately one thousand seven hundred feet north of the intersection of State Route Numbered 235 with State Route Numbered 4, thence westerly to the extreme west line of the reservation, excepting that part of the road lying between Haddix Road and the Osborn Road, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(E) State Route Numbered 69, beginning at the intersection of State Route Numbered 69 and original State Route Numbered 235, thence southwesterly with the east one-half of the road to the extreme southwest corner of the reservation boundary, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(F) Harshmanville Road, beginning at the intersection of Harshmanville Road with Yellow Springs Road in the village of Riverside, thence southerly with the east one-half of the road a distance of approximately one thousand four hundred feet, thence continuing southerly the full width of the road to Airway Road;

(G) Yellow Springs Road, beginning at the intersection of Yellow Springs Road with Harshmanville Road in the village of Riverside, thence easterly with the south one-half of the road to the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary;

(H) Airway Road, beginning at the intersection of Airway Road with Harshmanville Road, thence easterly with the north one-half of the road a distance of approximately two thousand feet, thence continuing easterly with the full width of the road to the Greene County and Montgomery County line;

(I) Spinning Road, beginning at the intersection of Spinning Road with the south right-of-way line of Airway Road, thence southerly with the west one-half of the road one thousand nine hundred and seventy-three feet to a south boundary line of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation;

(J) Glendean Avenue, beginning at the intersection of Glendean Avenue with the north right-of-way of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, thence northerly with the east one-half of Glendean Avenue, a distance of approximately one thousand seven hundred feet;

(K) Airway Road, beginning at the intersection of Airway Road with the Greene County and Montgomery County line, thence easterly to the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary, the point of ending being approximately four hundred and fifty feet east of Skyline Drive;

(L) National Road (Huffman), beginning at a corner in the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary, said corner being in the National Road and approximately two hundred feet north of its intersection with Airway Road, thence, with the west one-half of the road, northerly four thousand four hundred feet, thence continuing northerly with the full width of the road to Old Route Numbered 4;

(M) Zink Road (New Germany Road), beginning at the intersection of the New Germany Road with the south right-of-way line of Old Route Numbered 4, thence southerly with the east one-half of the road, a distance of eight hundred and ninety feet, also beginning in the New Germany Road at a corner in the reservation boundary, the beginning point being approximately one thousand four hundred feet southerly from the south right-of-way line of Old Route Numbered 4, thence continuing southerly with the westerly one-half of the road a distance of one thousand five hundred and eighty-seven feet;

(N) Old Route Numbered 4, beginning at the intersection of Old Route Numbered 4 with the southerly right-of-way of the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis Railroad, thence easterly the full width of the road to the part of the road right-of-way owned by the Commissioners of Greene County, Ohio;

(O) Sand Hill Road, beginning at the intersection of Sand Hill Road with an east boundary line of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation, the same being the west boundary line of the abandoned Cincinnati and Lake Erie Railroad, thence westerly to State Route Numbered 235;

(P) Haddix Road, beginning at the intersection of Haddix Road with State Route Numbered 235, thence northeasterly with the right one-half of the road to the Greene County and Clark County line;

(Q) Elizabeth Road (Johnson Street), beginning at the intersection of Elizabeth Road (in Old Osborn) with State Route Numbered 235, thence northwesterly to Haddix Road;

(R) Osborn Road, beginning at gate Numbered 260 at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary, thence northerly with the west one-half of the road to State Route Numbered 235;

(S) Airway Road, beginning at the intersection of Airway Road with the southerly right-of-way of Old Route Numbered 4, thence southerly with the westerly one-half of the road to the extreme southeast corner of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base-Area "D" reservation boundary;

(T) Old Route Numbered 4, all that part of Old Route Numbered 4 that may be within the boundaries of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Area "D". The location of the highways and the bounded areas are shown and identified by corresponding letter symbols on sheet numbered L of a drawing designated: Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Basic Layout Plan, drawing numbered EWFE 150, dated December 2, 1952, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army. This Act is effective only as to those portions of the highways and areas indicated in this Act over which the United States has heretofore acquired exclusive jurisdiction and shall not affect portions of highways and areas, if any, over which exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction is now vested in the State of Ohio.

SEC. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction provided for in this Act shall take effect upon the acceptance thereof by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 2842) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], who is away on public business, let me say that this bill will authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the Territory of Hawaii title to two parcels of land totaling 9,087 square feet, and also the abutter's rights of vehicle access, in and to certain portions of the Fort DeRussy Military Reservation. The two parcels, which are located on the Fort DeRussy Military Reservation, constitute a narrow strip along the boundary of the military installation.

The Territory of Hawaii has, since 1950, held a perpetual easement on the two parcels described in the bill, and has already utilized the property for street-improvement purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to satisfy a section of the Hawaii laws which provides that all public highways will be owned by the Territory in fee simple. The conveyance to the Territory would have little practical effect on the utilization of the property, since the Territory has a perpetual easement on the parcels, and has been utilizing them for street-improvement purposes under existing authority.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that the reason for the request for transfer of the property is in order that an abutting wall may be built, to help hold back the sea; and therefore the wall will be of benefit to our military installations in that area?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I further understand that the cost of the abutting wall itself will be considerably in excess of the value of the 9,000 square feet which will be needed for location of the wall.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Our committee has no exact knowledge of the cost of the abutting wall, but we understand the statement the Senator from Oregon has just made to be correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have made my own investigation in connection with the bill. I am advised that the improvements which will be placed on the land by the Territory of Hawaii will have a value far in excess of the value of the land involved, and that the improvements will take the form of an abutting wall which is very much needed to hold back the sea at this point, to the great benefit of the United States Government, as well as the Territory of Hawaii.

Therefore, I believe it is certain that the United States Government will obtain value received for the proposed transfer of the 9,000 square feet of land.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2842) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF PORTION OF CAMP BUTNER MILITARY RESERVATION TO THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The bill (H. R. 5632) to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Camp Butner Military Reservation, N. C., to the State of North Carolina, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me point out that the mineral rights are not reserved to the United States, according to the provisions of the bill. I should like to have an explanation as to why the mineral rights should not be reserved to the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I understand it is the position of the Army, in this case, it is not necessary to reserve the mineral rights to the United States. However, certainly the committee has no objection to such a reservation or to an amendment to that effect. So I shall be glad to submit an amendment, as follows:

Subject, however, to reservation to the United States of all mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the land authorized to be conveyed by this act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have a somewhat more detailed amendment which I should like to send to the desk and have read, and then I would ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether he would be willing to accept my amendment as a substitute for the amendment he has just suggested.

I also wish to make a comment on the bill, and also on calendar 933, Senate bill 489.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am glad to have that done. In fact, I shall withdraw the amendment I have proposed, in favor of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon, which has been carefully drawn, I understand.

Mr. MORSE. Then, Mr. President, I submit the amendment to which I have referred, and I send it to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 4, after the word "range", it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a comma, and the words "subject, however, to reservation in the United States of all mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the land authorized to be conveyed by this act."

On page 2, line 9, after the word "purposes," it is proposed to strike out "for a period of 3 successive years."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in support of the amendment I have submitted, I wish to discuss not only House bill 5632, Calendar 931, but also Senate bill 489, Calendar 933. I mention the two bills jointly, since both of them convey land to States, for National Guard purposes, with the right of reversion to the Federal Government if the land ceases to be so used, together with the right of the Federal Government to reoccupy the property in times of emergency.

There are, however, slight differences in the two bills. Senate bill 489, conveying 58 acres to Connecticut, contains a reservation of mineral rights in the Federal Government; whereas House bill 5632, conveying property to North Carolina, does not retain the reservation. The Army advised that they did not insist on the amendment in the House, since there was no reason to believe there were any mineral rights on the property, but they had no basic objection to the inclusion of such an amendment.

As the Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out, the Senate committee did not press the point, since the bill had already passed the House. However, I believe we should follow a uniform practice in these matters. Although there probably is no mineral resource value in the North Carolina land, one might still ask the innocent question, "Who knows for sure?"

Another difference is that Senate bill 489 provides that title shall revert "immediately" if the property ceases to be used for military purposes, whereas House bill 5632, which has been reached at this point in the calendar call, would, if amended in the way I have proposed, provide that if the property is not used for a period of 3 successive years, title will revert.

Mr. President, it seems to me the language of both bills should be identical in this respect. I believe that the differences probably can be explained or accounted for by the fact that the bills were drawn at different sources.

My amendment will simply make the bills uniform in this respect, and therefore I believe the amendment to be a proper one.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the committee has no objection to either of the two amendments submitted by the Senator from Oregon, and I am glad to withdraw the amendment I have suggested, in order that both the amendments may be considered as one, as the Senator from Oregon has suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5632) to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Camp Butner Military Reservation, N. C., to the State of North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

GRANTING OF LICENSE TO LEAHI HOSPITAL TO USE OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES PROPERTY IN HONOLULU, T. H.

The bill (H. R. 6025) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Hospital, a nonprofit institution, to use certain United States property in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I simply wish to say that I should like to have the bill go over for one calendar call, until I may have an opportunity to discuss the bill with its sponsor. I think that discussion may clarify any doubt I have regarding the bill.

It is my present understanding that the bill would authorize the Army to grant a 10-year lease, which the Army could revoke at will, to the Leahi Hospital, a charitable institution, providing for the use of about 4.4 acres to be used as a parking lot. The land is situated on the edge of the Fort Ruger Reservation. I understand the hospital is a public hospital, and a nonmilitary one. I further understand that the annual rental of the property is probably $2,356.

Again we are confronted with the problem of whether this is a de minimis matter. I do not think it is, but I have some questions which I should like to ask in conference in regard to the title to this land, and what the Federal interest really is. If it is simply a cold proposition of taking Federal property and turning it over to a charitable institution for parking-lot purposes, with commercial value, for $2,356 a year, of course, I would insist that 50 percent of the appraised fair market value be paid for the property.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I have concluded.

Mr. GORE. I suggest to the Senator that he note also that the report does not make it plain that any rental is to be charged. There is no reference to rental value in the bill, and the report does not make it clear at all.

Mr. MORSE. I assumed that rental was not to be charged. That is one of the reasons why I wish to talk with the sponsor. If rental is to be charged, then there is the question as to whether or not the rental is fair.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold his objection for a moment, I should like to read into the RECORD at this point a brief explanation. I have no objection to the bill going over for one call of the calendar, if that is the desire of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that technically what I should ask is unanimous consent that the bill go over until the next call of the calendar. That automatically would place it on the next call of the calendar. I should like to have it understood that that is my request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to make a brief statement relative to the

understanding of the committee with regard to this bill.

Mr. President, this bill would authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a lease to the Leahi Hospital, a charitable institution, on a parcel of property totaling approximately 4.4 acres. The lease, which would be given for no consideration, would be for a term of 10 years, and revocable at will by the Department of the Army. The purpose of the lease would be to provide a parking lot for the Leahi Hospital.

The parcel described in the bill is located on the northernmost corner of Fort Ruger, Honolulu, and is an integral part of this installation, which comprises approximately 680 acres.

The Army is not presently utilizing this acreage, but has a requirement for this property in the event of mobilization. The Army does not object to this bill since under the revocable license arrangement the property could be occupied on short notice. For several reasons the bill does not provide that the hospital will pay a fair rental value for leasing the property; first, the revocable nature of the lease makes any occupancy of the property of an indefinite tenure; second, the hospital proposes to spend about $12,000 paving the acreage, in order to make it useful as a parking lot; and third, the fact that the hospital, although supported mainly out of Territorial funds, is a private charitable institution whose primary purpose is to treat patients with tuberculosis.

I may add that the reasons which influenced the committee were the reasons stated in this memorandum, namely, that while this property has a rental value, as stated by the Army, of approximately $2,300 a year, it was felt that the fact that the lease could be revoked at will, the fact that the hospital proposes to spend $12,000 to pave the acreage, and the fact that the hospital is a private charitable institution, whose primary object is to treat patients for tuberculosis, were proper reasons for making this lease for no consideration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before making my request I should like to talk with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee between now and the time of the next calendar call. The figure which was given to me for paving the parking lot was $20,000, and not $12,000, which gives me some concern, because if we encourage or induce this charitable institution to go ahead and spend that amount of money and then reserve the right to take the property at a moment's notice, it seems to me that in fairness and equity we should make some provision for compensation for the loss of the paving cost. At least that is one of the factors which I should like to look into.

As to the out-and-out principle which is concerned here, of making available Federal property for charitable purposes, I am greatly moved by the heart to do so, but I do not know where we are to stop if we adopt that principle. I suppose there is a great deal of Federal property which might be made available to charitable institutions for hospital sites and other purposes. So, in order to make doubly sure that we are staying within a rule which has some checks attached to it, I ask permission to study the bill further. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it go over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN WINDSOR LOCKS, CONN., TO STATE OF CONNECTICUT

The bill (S. 489) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land located in Windsor Locks, Conn., to the State of Connecticut was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 4, line 22, after the word "of", to strike out "National", and on page 5, line 7, after the name "Connecticut" to strike out "in substantially as good condition as it was at the date of entry", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Connecticut all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, in and to the following described land in Windsor Locks, Conn., together with all buildings, improvements thereon, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, such land including approximately fifty-eight and six hundred eighty-five one-thousandths acres and formerly designated as the Post Engineer Area of Bradley Field, as shown on maps on file with the Office of the Chief of Engineers:

PARCEL 1

Beginning at the intersection of the eastern right-of-way line of Connecticut Route Numbered 75 and the northern right-of-way line of the spur track of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad; thence north along the east line of Connecticut Route Numbered 75, north one degree forty-six minutes thirty seconds west, a distance of sixty feet more or less; thence north fifty-three degrees ten minutes east, a distance of five hundred and eighty-eight feet more or less; thence north seventy-two degrees fifteen minutes east, a distance of four hundred seventy-three feet more or less; thence north seventy-eight degrees fifteen minutes east, a distance of three hundred and forty feet more or less; thence south sixty-six degrees twenty-five minutes east, a distance of two hundred and sixty-two feet more or less; thence south seventeen degrees forty-five minutes east, a distance of seventy-seven feet more or less to the northerly boundary of the fifty-foot right-of-way of the spur track of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad; thence along the northern boundary of such railroad spur, south seventy-two degrees fifteen minutes west, a distance of one thousand five hundred and eighty-five feet more or less, to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 2

Beginning at the intersection of the eastern right-of-way line of Connecticut Route Numbered 75 and the southern right-of-way line of the spur track of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad; thence easterly along the southerly right-of-way line of such spur track, north seventy-two degrees fifteen minutes east, a distance of two thousand six hundred and thirty-five feet more or less; thence south seventy-one degrees thirteen minutes east, a distance of one hundred eighty-three and five-tenths feet more or less; thence south eighteen degrees nine minutes west, a distance of one thousand three hundred and ninety-five one-hundredths feet more or less; thence north eighty-three degrees thirty minutes west, a distance of seven hundred and seventy-nine feet more or less; thence south twenty degrees ten minutes west, a distance of five hundred seventy-six and twenty-four one-hundredths feet more or less, to the northerly line of highway Connecticut Route Numbered 76; thence westerly, along the northerly line of Connecticut Route Numbered 76, north eighty-three degrees thirty minutes west, a distance of seven hundred and thirty-six feet more or less; thence north twelve degrees no minutes east; a distance of seven hundred and fifteen feet more or less; thence north eighty-five degrees no minutes west, a distance of seven hundred and five feet more or less to the easterly line of highway Connecticut Route Numbered 75, thence north along the easterly line of Connecticut Route Numbered 75, north one degree forty-six minutes thirty seconds west, a distance of thirty feet more or less to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be reserved to the United States.

SEC. 3. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used primarily for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Connecticut shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and in addition, all improvements made by the State of Connecticut during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shal have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon by the State of Connecticut, for the duration of such state of war or of such emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such emergency plus 6 months such property shall revert to the State of Connecticut.

SEC. 5. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, and 4 of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TO QUIET TITLE AND POSSESSION TO CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1827) to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the State of Washington, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment

on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

That the United States hereby releases, remises, and quitclaims to the persons who are the successors in interest of the city of Seattle, Wash., and King County, Wash., with respect to the tracts of land hereinafter described all right, title, interest, claim, or demand of the United States in or to such tracts of land. Such tracts of land are described as follows:

And insert:

That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to disclaim any and all right, title, lien, or interest of the United States in and to certain property located in the city of Seattle, Wash., King County, Wash., hereafter described as follows:

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to disclaim any and all right, title, lien, or interest of the United States in and to certain property located in the city of Seattle, Wash., King County, Wash., hereafter described as follows:

A portion of West Canal Street and Burns Avenue Northwest, described as follows: Beginning at the southeast corner of lot 16, block 3, Ross addition; thence on the south line of said lot south eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds west seven and forty one-hundredths feet to the true place of beginning; thence south thirty-nine degrees thirty-one minutes west ninety feet to a point on the north line of the Lake Washington Canal; thence following the said north line to the most southerly corner of lot 8, block 1, Seattle tide lands; thence along the easterly and northeasterly lines of said lot 8 to an intersection with the southeasterly line of that portion of Burns Avenue Northwest as vacated by ordinance numbered 76354; thence following said southeasterly line northeasterly to an intersection with the northeasterly line of Burns Avenue Northwest; thence following the northeasterly line of Burns Avenue Northwest and West Canal Street southeasterly to the true place of beginning; Also,

A portion of West Canal Street (formerly Ewing Street), together with a portion of West Bowdoin Place, formerly West Fortieth Street: Beginning at the southeast corner of block 6, Ross addition to the city of Seattle; thence south thirty-nine degrees six minutes no seconds west one hundred thirty and eighteen one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of the Lake Washington Canal right-of-way; thence on the said northerly line, northwesterly four hundred forty-eight and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet; thence north thirty-nine degrees thirty-one minutes east sixty-nine and sixty-six one-hundredths feet to a point on the north line of said block 6, Ross addition; thence on said north line north eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds east thirty-one and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of West Canal Street; thence on said line southeasterly three hundred seventy-five and twenty one-hundredths feet to a point on the south line of said block; thence on said line north eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds east sixty-three and twelve one-hundredths feet to the place of beginning; also,

A portion of West Canal Street (formerly Ewing Street), together with a portion of Sixth Avenue Northwest: Beginning at the northwest corner of block 8, Ross addition to the city of Seattle; thence on the west line thereof south no degrees twenty-one minutes twenty-eight seconds east twenty-six and two one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of West Canal Street; thence on said line southeasterly three hundred forty and fifty-one one-hundredths feet to a point on the south line of said block 8; thence south thirty-eight degrees sixteen minutes no seconds west ninety feet to a point on the northerly line of the Lake Washington Canal right-of-way; thence on said line northwesterly three hundred fifty-eight feet, more or less, to a point that bears south thirty-eight degrees fifty-six minutes no seconds west from the place of beginning; thence north thirty-eight degrees fifty-six minutes no seconds east to the place of beginning; Also,

A portion of West Canal Street (formerly Ewing Street): Beginning at the northwest corner of lot 4, block 9, Ross addition to the city of Seattle; thence on the north line of said block north eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds east forty-five and twenty-two one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of West Canal Street, as established by ordinance numbered 14267; thence on said line southeasterly two hundred seventy-eight and thirty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point on the east line of said block 9, which said point is south no degrees twenty-one minutes twenty-eight seconds east twenty-two and sixty-four one-hundredths feet from the northeast corner of lot 11 of said block; thence on the east line of said block and the same extended south no degrees twenty-one minutes twenty-eight seconds east one hundred and forty-eight feet, more or less, to a point on the northerly line of the Lake Washington Canal right-of-way; thence on said line northwesterly to a point that bears south thirty-eight degrees six minutes no seconds west from the place of beginning; thence north thirty-eight degrees six minutes no seconds east to the place of beginning.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the purpose of the RECORD for future reference, my understanding of this bill is that it would authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a disclaimer on property adjacent to the Lake Washington Canal, Seattle.

This bill came about as the result of the question of whether under the State statute of Washington, the Federal Government acquired an interest in land next to the canal. The Washington Code provides that if a city abandons a street, the property shall belong to the abutting owners. A Washington lower court has held, however, that the statute applied only to those abutting owners who contributed to the dedication. The Federal Government did not so contribute. The title companies in Washington are apparently still not sure. The Army is of the opinion that it has no interest, and is willing to grant a disclaimer.

I have gone into the legal point involved. I am satisfied that the lawyers for the Department of the Army are correct. As a matter of law, we have no legal interest in this property, but in order to clear up any question as to the title, the bill is necessary. I make that statement for future reference, and raise no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to disclaim any interest of the United States in and to certain property located in the State of Washington."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the call of this portion of the calendar.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that under the order heretofore entered the Senate is now to proceed to the beginning of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

BILLS AND SENATE RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 242) to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo., was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 56) for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 59) for the relief of Felix Kortschok was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 101) for the relief of Phed Vosniacos was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 57) to amend rule XIII of the standing rules relative to motions to reconsider was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER—NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BILLS

The bill (S. 389) for the relief of Dr. Alexandre Demetrio Moruzi was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with Calendar Nos. 48, 49, 58, and 90, being, respectively, Senate bill 56, Senate bill 59, Senate bill 101, and Senate bill 389, which have been on the calendar for some time, I give notice that I shall ask that they be considered by the Senate at the first opportunity. Although the majority leader is not present I hope he will be able to arrange for their consideration either tomorrow or the next day. They are measures which have been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, and the members of the committee are very anxious to dispose of the bills. Therefore, I give notice now that I shall ask that the bills be called up at the very first opportunity, and I hope it will be tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of

Calendar No. 90, Senate bill 389, for the relief of Dr. Alexandre Demetrio Moruzi?

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will go over.

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 978) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to expedite and facilitate the termination of railroad reorganization proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act and to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1063) to authorize and request the President to promote certain naval officers, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1663) to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of the United States courts, and United States attorneys, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE and Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

The resolution (S. Res. 20) amending the cloture rule with respect to the number required for adoption of a cloture motion was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. HOLLAND. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over.

The bill (S. 1857) to amend certain statutes providing expeditious judicial proceedings for the condemnation of lands for public purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1461) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, concerning requests of common carriers for increased transportation rates.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AUTHORIZATION FOR POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO. TO CONSTRUCT CERTAIN RAILROAD TRACKS—BILL PASSED TO NEXT CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The bill (S. 1691) to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain and operate in the District of Columbia and to cross Kenilworth Avenue NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee withhold his objection for a statement on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. GORE. I withhold my objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is necessarily absent, has sent me a message asking me in his behalf to ask unanimous consent that order No. 373, S. 1691, may be considered on the next call of the calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection to that course being followed if it is at the request of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I did not understand the Senator's statement.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry. I was talking to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the request being made on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I am making the request on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. The advice he has sent me is that he believes the possibilities are very strong that a satisfactory solution of the differences involved can be consummated by the time of the next call of the calendar. Therefore he asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed to the next call of the calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection. I have the same information with respect to the situation. I believe the differences have been adjusted and we are awaiting merely a working out of the wording. I join in the request that the bill be passed to the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1396) to authorize the adoption of certain rules with respect to the broadcasting or telecasting of professional baseball exhibitions in interstate commerce, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1806) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 848) to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2314) to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate commerce by communication facilities was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4557) to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to permits for construction of radio stations, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4558) to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4559) to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 281) to amend sec. 1 (17) (a), sec. 13 (3) and sec. 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1026) to amend the Public Health Service Act, with respect to the provisions of certain medical and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service and for dependents and widows of officers and employees of such Service, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3704) to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2351) for the relief of Sam Rosenblat was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2413) to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, for the District of Columbia,

and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2457) to authorize the Administrator of General Services and the Postmaster General to enter into building purchase contracts; to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease space for post office purposes, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2038) to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2231) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1243) to amend the War Contractors' Relief Act with respect to the definition of a request for relief, to authorize consideration and settlement of certain claims of subcontractors, to provide reasonable compensation for the services of partners and proprietors, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF RENEGOTIATION ACT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6287) to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 was announced as next in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. I submit some amendments to the bill which I propose to offer, and I ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. GORE and Mr. MANSFIELD asked that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1688) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard; the bill will go over.

The bill (S. 796) to permit the charging of tolls on certain highways constructed with Federal aid was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 666) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and right-of-way in the State of Wyoming, to the town of Jackson, Wyo., was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION OF FIREWORKS—BILL RECOMMITTED

The bill (H. R. 116) to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the transportation of fireworks into any State in which the sale or use of such fireworks is prohibited was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with this bill, pursuant to a motion passed by the Committee on the Judiciary this morning, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that H. R. 116, Calendar No. 784, which prohibits the transportation of fireworks into any State in which the sale or use of such fireworks is prohibited, be recommitted to the committee for further consideration.

The reason for this request is that since H. R. 116 was reported to the Senate on July 30, 1953, hearings have been held on companion legislation, S. 1722 and S. 2245, and it is desired to review the matter and submit a further report thereon.

I may add that the request is made also on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is the chairman of the subcommittee involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 395) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1918) to amend section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5976) to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6648) to amend section 205 of the Small Business Act of 1953 was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2313) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1990) to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE and Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1381) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, was announced as next in order.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I call attention to Calendar No. 837, Senate bill 1381, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949. The reason I call attention to the bill at this time is that all over the United States the Commodity Credit Corporation apparently has small lots of commodities, so small that it is difficult to get rid of them without going to considerable additional expense. This bill would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell such small lots at prevailing rates in the various communities—mostly in farm communities—and then to offset such sales to purchase at not to exceed the loan rate, similiar quantities of such commodities elsewhere.

I call attention to the bill at this time because I have asked the majority leader to set a time within the next few days for the consideration of the bill. It has previously been objected to.

As things now stand, the only way the Commodity Credit Corporation can get rid of these small lots is either to wait until they start to spoil or else consolidate several of them in one place so as to have a quantity sufficient to attract a buyer. Even then, the Commodity Credit Corporation is not sure of getting rid of them. I believe that this bill would save some money. The bill was not objected to in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or by anyone who appeared before the committee.

Mr. GORE. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) to authorize and direct the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy-Utah power project and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5861) to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing case relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

That concludes the call of the calendar.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. In a moment I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. However, for the information of the Senate, it will be my purpose to ask that only nominations under new reports be taken up and that the Senate not proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Mr. Beeson at this time.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on nominations under the heading "New Reports."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair. If there be no reports of committees the nominations under the heading "New Reports" will be stated.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Glen A. Lloyd, to be Deputy to the Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from California if it is not a fact that all the nominations now being considered were reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct; except with respect to the nomination in the Foreign Operations Administration, which was reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The respective committees approved the nominations unanimously?

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as I know, that is correct.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Neil H. Jacoby to be a member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter W. Stewart to be a member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wendell B. Barnes to be Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the President will be notified forthwith of the nominations confirmed this day.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

INDOCHINA CRISIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are now in the third week of debate on the Bricker amendment, a week during which the resolution will be discussed but not voted on. We will continue into another week and, perhaps, still another. I recognize that the question is one of great importance and I do not in any way mean to deprecate the Senate's concern in this matter. But I cannot believe that it is of such urgency that we ought to neglect other vital issues which are pressing in on the Nation. After all, the treatymaking power in its present form has served the United States for one-hundred-and sixty-odd years. I trust, therefore that the Senate will bear with me in a brief discussion of another vital issue.

I would not do so unless I felt that the matter which I am about to discuss requires the urgent attention of the Senate. Last September, I traveled several thousand miles in the three states of Indochina. The war that is going on there was then in a relatively quiet phase. The towns and cities appeared peaceful and there was a note of optimism, a hope that perhaps the French and the Associated States of Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam were going to win out over the Communists and hold this vital territory in the camp of free nations.

Now the situation has suddenly changed. The news of the change is on the inside pages of the press but, in many respects, it overshadows in importance to the Nation the headlines which will soon be forgotten. Brief notes, a few paragraphs here and there, tell of the swiftly developing crisis in Indochina. If not closely observed, this crisis might easily resolve itself into a Communist victory or the entanglement of the United States in another Korean situation.

The Communist-led Viet Minh forces have opened up a new offensive into northern Laos and are moving rapidly in the direction of the royal capital of Luang Prabang. The Viet Minh command has thrown at least a division and possibly more into northern Laos and has 2 additional divisions on the Vietnam-Laos border. The seriousness of the situation is shown by the news blackout imposed on February 3 by the French high command on information from northern Laos.

Of grave concern is the effect of these victories of Ho Chi Minh's forces on Paris. The French mood parallels that of some Americans in the grim winter of 1950 when our forces were withdrawing from north Korea. Many wish to abandon Indochina. And if the French quit the struggle the gateway of South Asia is open to the onward march of Communist imperialism.

Deserting Vietnam troops have cost additional vital outposts in southern Vietnam as the Communist invaders of northern Laos sweep onward and Red forces harass positions elsewhere in Indochina. Approximately 40 military posts in Cochin-China have been seized by Communist-led rebels during the last 2 weeks. At least half fell through treason or desertion. Vietnamese troops have gone over to the Viet Minh, evidently without a struggle and of their own volition. This may indicate the success which Communist-leader Ho Chi Minh has had in personifying himself as a leader of anticolonial and antiwestern nationalism instead of what he actually is—the leader of the Communist forces against France and the Associated States.

In my report on Indochina to the Committee on Foreign Relations on October 27, 1953, I pointed out that one of the most important elements in a successful termination of hostilities lies in the mobilization of the local people against the Communists. At the same time I stated that a substantial part of the population, at present indifferent, would, if success is to be achieved, have to enter into active participation on the non-Communist side. Failure to utilize the power latent in nationalism serves merely to increase the cost to ourselves and to France of preventing the Communists from seizing Indochina. This has been emphasized by the statement of President Eisenhower at a news conference on Wednesday, February 3, in which he stated that—

> Everyone knows that the heart and soul of the population usually becomes the biggest factor of success or failure in a situation such as Indochina.

The President further observed that if Vietnamese wanted to be free; if they believed that through this kind of war they will be free, there probably will be a success in that area.

The only way to insure success in the struggle against communism in Indochina is for the people of the Associated States to put their shoulders to the wheel. They must stop the squabbling which has been going on between the numerous religious and political groups in the area and recognize the fact that whether or not they will achieve the independence promised them by the French is a matter of their own choosing and in large part their own responsibility.

The situation has already deteriorated during the past few weeks, so much so that the French Government has asked the American Government to send additional American technicians and planes to the Indochina theater. While considering and acceding to these requests we should look at the military situation in Indochina.

The French have in excess of 400,000 troops of various kinds in this theater of war. They are led by extremely capable officers in the persons of Generals Navarre, Bodet, and Cogny. The French have also put one of their ablest diplomatic officials, Maurice de Jean, into the office of High Commissioner for the Associated States. The Communist forces, led by Ho Chi Minh, are estimated to number approximately 300,000 men.

In addition to the numerical superiority of the French and the Associated States, these forces have in general sufficient military supplies, with which to

carry on the war. I was told that repeatedly by both American and French officials during my study mission to Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, and recent information substantiates this fact.

The only items which are cited by French authorities in the area as being in short supply are helicopters and small naval craft for use in the delta areas. These shortages are being filled by additional shipments from the United States. A request of 25 C–47 transports was sent to Indochina in December of last year. The French have been receiving a steady flow of American aid, and in January the 400th ship carrying American assistance to Indochina arrived at Haiphong, an additional 50 shipments since August 1953. These shipments have included ammunition, transport and combat vehicles, military aircraft, navy vessels, communication equipment, small arms and automatic weapons, artillery, ammunition, hospital supplies, engineering and other technical equipment.

In my report to the Foreign Relations Committee I stated:

> Without a vast increase in striking power the Viet Minh will not be defeated. This increase, primarily a question of manpower, cannot come from France, already hard-pressed to meet commitments elsewhere. It certainly cannot come from this country. It can come only from the three Indochinese States.
>
> And it is right that it should come from them. Their hope for freedom and national existence is at stake. If they have the will to sustain themselves as independent nations, the French have pledged themselves to continue to support them until the Communists are defeated. As for the material needed to insure the resistance, we have not stinted in our assistance in the past, and we are not likely to do so in the future.

And the state which can make the greatest contribution by far, if it will forget its internal squabbling and shoulder the responsibilities it must if it is to become and remain independent, is the State of Vietnam. The Laotians had in October, 1953, 1 battalion, today they have 13. The Cambodians had approximately 10 battalions. The Vietnamese had something like 80 battalions in being and with plans calling for a force within a few years on the order of 200 battalions. It was the hope of the French command that as an area became pacified it could be turned over, militarily and administratively to the Vietnamese troops and the Vietnam Government. Some degree of success has been achieved in this policy but one wonders how long it will take if desertions like those which occurred in south Vietnam continue. The pacification of hostile areas in Cambodia and Laos has not been—and is not yet—a serious problem because the Viet Minh forces have been operating largely in Vietnam.

It is my understanding that President Eisenhower has appointed a committee to report to the National Security Council on the problem of Indochina. It is my further understanding that the President has authorized an additional shipment of B–26 bombers for the Indochina theater. According to press reports France has asked for 400 United States technicians to help service these and other planes and to train French and Vietnamese technicians. Over the weekend the press has carried stories to the effect that 200 Air Force ground technicians have been sent to Indochina. I might say that on the basis of my knowledge of the situation in Indochina the question of maintenance of aircraft by American personnel has been one of the projects of the military advisory assistance group over the past several months. This addition, therefore, is a logical extension of a practice already underway.

The situation in Indochina is ever-increasingly a world problem and answers must be found for the questions arising out of this southeastern Asia crisis. Before we commit ourselves more deeply in this area, the Senate and the American people are entitled to know these answers.

If we are about to be drawn more deeply into the military situation on the Asia mainland, as some persons seem to fear and as some press reports hint at, has the administration undertaken at this point to replace our conventional forces and place reliance on atomic weapons? One need not be a military strategist to know that the kinds of wars being fought in Asia are largely rifle wars, not atomic wars.

Does the sending of technicians to Indochina mean that additional American military personnel will be sent to that area?

Does it mean that if the French and the Associated States forces become harder pressed we will send in naval and air support?

Does it mean that if the situation warrants it, American combat troops will be sent to Indochina?

Does it mean that action has been taken or will be taken without notifying the proper committees of Congress as to just what kind of policy we intend to pursue in that area?

We cannot afford to permit the situation in Indochina to drift any longer. A few months ago I said on my return from that area that the issue there could be met successfully by a three-pronged effort of the Indochinese, the French, and the United States. I reported then that each had a part to play: Ours, to supply the essential equipment and material—which we have; the Associated States, primarily the Vietnamese and Cambodians, to develop the will to freedom among the people and the determination to fight for it—which is open to serious question; the French, to assist in the achievement of that freedom by a combined military and political effort in keeping with their finest traditions—which they have done up to this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have been interested in the remarks of the Senator from Montana. I know he was in that area of the world, because we met each other in the Far East. He was going in one direction, and I was on my way in the other direction.

I wish to ask the Senator if he does not believe it is highly important that the French in Indochina be sent trained mechanics. There are native mechanics who have been trained over the years adequately to service ground vehicles, but as to some of the planes which are being sent to Indochina, the natives have not yet been adequately trained to take care of American equipment. Does not the Senator from Montana think that in the absence of an adequate training program, whereby replacements could be furnished for the mechanics who are being sent there, at least half the equipment, perhaps a great deal more, might be on the dead line, and none of it serviceable?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that I am in accord with his views. I fully approve the sending of additional B–26 bombers. I am glad that 25 C–47's were sent last December. I see nothing wrong in sending 200 technicians to assist the 125 technicians who have been there, working under the military assistance advisory group, caring for the planes of different types, while at the same time teaching the French and Vietnamese technicians. I think that is good, sound policy. Up to that point, I am in full accord with what the administration has done.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that I think the action does not indicate, either directly or indirectly, any desire or intention on the part of the Government of the United States to send any ground forces to that area of the world. To the contrary, I think that supplying planes and seeing to it that the planes can be kept flying, instead of being kept on the dead line, will do more than anything else to insure that no demands for ground forces will be made upon us; and if they were, I do not believe the United States Government would, in any event, send ground forces to that area.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The words of the distinguished majority leader are, of course, very reassuring. I know how busy the distinguished Senator from California is, but if he had time to read the article by Constantine Brown in the Washington Star of last Saturday, he may recall that Mr. Brown indicated that there had been rumors to the effect that the two divisions being withdrawn from Korea might find their way to Indochina. One of them is the California division.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think I can give categorical assurance to the junior Senator from Montana that there is no intention to send those two divisions, or any other two divisions, of land forces to Indochina.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that his statement is reassuring enough for me and, I am sure, for the Senate and for the American people.

The majority leader mentioned the fact that he had spent some time in Indochina. I know he did, and I know he worked hard, and really got to know the problem in that area better than I did.

The Senator from California realizes, of course, that so far as leadership in the struggle of the Viet Minh against the

French and the Associated States is concerned, Ho Chi Minh is playing a very cagey game. He is not picturing himself as a Communist, but he is trying to carry out the idea, which he has done for some years, of being the leader against colonialism and of fostering a policy of anti-westernism.

Because of that it has been quite difficult, it appears to me, to get sufficient support on the nationalist side in Vietnam to overcome the picture which Ho Chi Minh has been able to create in the minds of a great many people in that region.

I had hoped that by this time we might have heard that Vietnam had been able to develop a leader of comparable stature, but so far it appears there are too many leaders in Vietnam who are not of sufficient stature to act as a counterpoise to Ho Chi Minh.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that I think everyone recognizes the importance of not allowing Indochina to pass into Communist hands, because to do so would, of course, place Communist forces up against the borders of Thailand, Burma, and Malaya, and such forces would then be just one jump away from India and Pakistan. The loss of all Indochina to the Communists, of whatever nationality, would, I think, be an unfortunate development in that area of the world, to say the least. I think, however, that up to the moment there has been no indication of any major Chinese invasion of Indochina.

Undoubtedly, the forces of Ho Chi Minh are being supplied and re-equipped, and perhaps are being trained, on the Yunan side of the Chinese-Indochina frontier. But I believe that, so far as we know, no substantial volunteer forces have shown up, such as have shown up in North Korea.

I believe this Government has made it perfectly clear to the Chinese Communists that we could not be unconcerned if there were any such invasion from across the Chinese frontier. I do not believe that either the United States or the rest of the free world could be unconcerned about such an event.

I wish to say also to the distinguished Senator from Montana that I fully agree with him that up to the moment, at least, the French have not been able to get the same wholehearted support for the war effort on the part of the Vietnamese that the Republic of Korea had on the part of the people of Korea in resisting Communist aggression.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from California is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senator from Montana has quite correctly put his finger on the point when he says that Ho Chi Minh, from a propaganda point of view, has had some advantage, because he has posed as the leader in freeing that area from colonialism, whereas Korea, of course, had been an independent country which was attacked from the outside.

Actually, I do not believe there are many Vietnamese who would be happy if the French announced overnight that they were going to withdraw from Indochina, because I think that actually they know, as well as the Communists know, and as we must know, that the Vietnamese, in their present state of training and with present equipment, could not successfully resist the well-trained forces of Ho Chi Minh.

It has seemed to me, however, that it would be highly advantageous if the French were able to go beyond the point which they reached last July. I think the French made great progress in pointing out that they want Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to be free and independent states. But difficulty arose because the French wanted them to remain inside the French union and not have the choice as to whether or not they should so remain.

Personally, I think that if the French were in a position to give assurances to the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia that, as of a certain day in the future those people would have their independence we would see a remarkable change in that area of the world. Such a date might be 5 or 10 years in the future. The United States had a similar arrangement with the Philippines under the so-called Tydings Act and other legislation passed by Congress.

I have been told by responsible people who have been connected with the Philippine Government and by persons who had been in business in the Philippines that there was a great deal of agitation in the Philippines prior to the passage of the basic act by the American Congress. In practically every election the issue was the desire of the Filipinos to gain their independence, and some contended that perhaps the Americans had no intention of ever giving them their independence.

However, once Congress passed the basic act, which provided that on a certain date in the future the Philippines were to have complete independence, the picture in the Philippines changed overnight, and everyone went to work and wanted to be properly trained to assist the new Government in taking over.

It seems to me that there would be a great many advantages if the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia had the same kind of association with France which India, Canada, Pakistan, Australia, and New Zealand have with Great Britain in the British Commonwealth. Each one of those nations, if it so desires, has the right not to be a part of the British Commonwealth. If that kind of assurance could be given to the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, very likely, in their own economic and defense interests, in the interest of their cultural ties, and for other reasons, they might elect to belong to what might be called a French Commonwealth. But until they have the assurance that such a choice will be theirs, I think it would be very difficult to get the support of the rank and file of the people in the same manner the Government of Korea had the support of the rank and file of their people in resisting Communist aggression from the north.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that there is a great deal of merit in what he says. I should like to see something done along the line he suggests, but I believe the Senator stretches the termination period too far ahead. It is my belief that, so far as granting independence to Associated States in the French Union is concerned, the French would be willing to postpone the date to any the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia would desire.

Of course, the French would like to remain and see the new states get on their feet economically. I think likewise the new states would need French help. When we consider the difficulties which the French have had and the lack of support in the villages and at the grassroots level, one can appreciate such a desire. Despite the agitation for a negotiated peace, I hope there will not be a negotiated peace such as the French hope for. I am becoming concerned about the 16th parallel, because it brings up thoughts of the 38th parallel. I should like to see a clear-cut victory, and then the states given complete independence, so that they would not lose their independence as soon as they had achieved it, under such circumstances as the Koreans did.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Unless we keep in mind some period of time, it is a little difficult for the people of France, and for the French Government itself, to carry the very heavy burdens which they have been bearing. There should be some time for adjustment such as the period we had in our relations with the Philippines. I do not think it necessary to fix on a precise number of years; but in view of the heavy burdens which the French have borne and the contributions they have made in that area of the world, I do believe there could be some adjustment, and that the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia should be able to feel that on a day certain, which day could be determined upon between them in the future, they would have their complete independence, just as the Philippine Republic gained its complete independence.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Perhaps that is the eventual answer. Certainly it is an alternative worth study by both the French on one side and the people of the Associated States on the other.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The discussions which have been going on for a negotiated settlement would probably end up in Indochina being Communist, because Ho Chi Minh and the Communists will do only what Communists have done the world over. They will enter a government only for the purpose of destroying it. If they can once get a so-called coalition government, which is one of the things they have been talking about and aiming for, it will have the same tragic results coalition governments had in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and elsewhere in the world where they have been tried. It would not be to the advantage of the people of Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia, or of the French, or of the free world, or of the rest of the people of Asia, to have that kind of settlement, which could only result in the ultimate annexation by the Communists of Indochina.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct, and I desire to thank him for his sage words and the statements which he has made this afternoon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator asked some questions a few minutes ago about 200 men. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the majority leader and the Senator from Montana have said. I agree with practically everything that has been stated by them. I should like to go back a little and try to answer some of the Senator's questions, because I was as disturbed as he was when I read that 200 uniformed mechanics of our Air Force were to be sent to Indochina.

As a result of inquiries, the Committee on Armed Services had information given to it last Friday by Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I think I can assure the Senator from Montana that at present there is certainly no intention of sending members of our Armed Forces into Indochina except for two purposes. One is to help train the technical and military assistants of MAAG; and that number of men is a good deal smaller than it has been at some other times. The second group comprise the so-called technicians who maintain our airplanes. The B–26 is an airplane about which the Indochinese have no knowledge. French mechanics and Indochinese are being trained to maintain those planes. But for certain purposes, more planes than originally contemplated were sent to Indochina. Consequently, if the planes were not to fall apart—and, of course, the Senator from Montana agrees that they should not be permitted to fall apart—we had to send additional personnel there. The French requested 400. We have sent 200.

This afternoon, in response to an inquiry of mine, I have received, over the telephone, assurances from the Secretary of Defense that the 200 mechanics will be out of Indochina by June 12. If the French and Indochinese are not capable by that time of maintaining the planes, then perhaps some civilian volunteers will be sent to do it. But we hope that will not be necessary.

However, I know I can assure the Senator from Montana that it is the intention of the Department of Defense, and their firm determination, to have those 200 trained mechanics out of Indochina by June 12.

Between now and then, those men are to be in places far removed from any combat area, and are to be there solely for the purpose of maintaining the planes which are sent there, work on which cannot now be done by local mechanics. Thus we shall have in Indochina a training force.

I do not think there is any objection to sending the training group, because in that way our material and equipment will be made of value.

In the second place, the special technicians, who are to be kept in places far removed from any combat area or combat zone, are to be out of Indochina—on the assurance to me, this afternoon, of the Secretary of Defense—by June 12 of this year.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I know that with the weight of his word behind it, his statement will receive due consideration.

Of course he understands that I am not opposed to the sending of the Flying Boxcars, the B–26 bombers, and the technicians; I think it must be done. In my opinion, the French will not lose the war in Indochina, although, of course, the operations there are scattered, and matters cannot be clarified until conditions have settled a little.

However, I appreciate the explanation which has been given. In that connection let me say, to use a phrase used several years ago by the majority leader, that in Indochina and elsewhere the Democrats at this time, I hope, will be "in" on the "take-off," as well as on the "crash landing"—although of course we hope there will not be a "crash landing."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say that I am sure the Senator from Montana is fully informed of the fact that both last year and this year the President of the United States has consulted with the members of both parties on the general, worldwide situation. Last year there were numerous meetings of the leadership of both the Democrats and Republicans of the House and the Senate, in going over the very delicate developments at that time in Korea. I am sure the President has made it very clear that in the field of foreign affairs and in the field of defense, he believes that both parties should be fully consulted in advance, and not merely notified after an event has occurred.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted to hear that. I hope that spirit of cooperation in both fields will continue and will grow, and that both parties will receive full consideration in connection with the discussion and study of any new policy which may be advanced and which may affect those fields.

Insofar as the area of foreign affairs is concerned, I certainly hope politics will be kept to a minimum, and an effort will be made to present a united front to the rest of the world.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if there is no further business, and if there are no other remarks to be made at this time by Members of the Senate, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 9, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 8, 1954:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Billy Elza Carlisle, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Georgia, vice Edward B. Doyle, retired.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of sections 504 and 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Gen. Otto Paul Weyland, 63A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander, Tactical Air Command, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Earle Everard Partridge, 33A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander, Far East Air Forces, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Orval Ray Cook, 36A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be deputy commander in chief, United States European Command, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Edwin William Rawlings, 95A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander, Air Materiel Command, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Bryant LeMaire Boatner, 362A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, and to be lieutenant general in the United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Truman Hempel Landon, 93A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be the Inspector General, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, and to be lieutenant general in the United States Air Force.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 8, 1954:

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

Glen A. Lloyd, of Illinois, to be Deputy to the Director, Foreign Operations Administration.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The following-named persons to be members of the Council of Economic Advisers:

Neil H. Jacoby, of California.

Walter W. Stewart, of New Jersey.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Wendell B. Barnes, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of majesty and mercy, grant that nothing during this day may undermine or eclipse our faith in Thy greatness and goodness, Thy presence and power.

May our sense of Thy divine sovereignty and sympathy transcend and supplant those feelings of anxiety and doubt which so often consume our strength and mar our peace.

Deliver us from all thought and tendencies which are alien to the mind and spirit of our blessed Lord as we seek to solve the problems of international relationships.

Show us how we may strengthen the ties of brotherhood and bring the members of the human family into a closer fellowship.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 4, 1954, was read and approved.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN submitted a conference report and statement on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I regret that my absence on Thursday last to attend a funeral prevented my voting on the bill authorizing help to control the level of Lake Michigan.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the conference report that has just been filed has to do with the replenishing of the depleted capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In this instance the papers have been held on the other side. My information is that the Senate expects to act on the conference report first thing tomorrow, in which event we would expect to act on it immediately after that time.

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH VETERANS' DAY AS A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to change the name of Armistice Day to Veterans' Day.

Armistice Day was declared a legal public holiday by the Congress in 1938, to be observed on the 11th day of November of each year. The date, November 11, was, of course, chosen to commemorate the close of World War I. The holiday was dedicated to the cause of world peace, and to the veterans of that First World War.

Since 1938, the United States has been involved in two great military efforts, and each has added millions of veterans.

This legislation does not establish a new legal holiday. Rather, it expands an existing holiday in order that a grateful Nation may pay proper homage to all its veterans who have contributed so much to the cause of world peace and the preservation of our way of life. It is altogether fitting that the United States should honor its veterans on a day when they themselves pause to pay tribute to their comrades who gave their lives on foreign soil.

It is my hope that the observance of Veterans' Day will become universal in the United States to the end that the great sacrifices of the American veteran shall not be forgotten.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to explain to the House my absence on Thursday, February 4, and to explain that my vote on the authorization to help control the level of Lake Michigan, that is, on rollcall votes No. 10 and No. 11 would have been "yes" in both cases. I was absent in New York testifying before Governor Dewey's special legislative committee on integrity and ethical standards in govcrnment at the Governor's request.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the 1953 annual report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been printed and released to the public. As a result of the report of the most active year in the committee's history, demands from all corners of the United States are coming in for additional copies of the report. It is the finest and most objective report that has ever been issued.

This morning I have thrown in the hopper a request for the printing of additional copies of this report as a House document. I am certain that the additional copies, which I understand will be approximately 4,000, will fail to meet the requests already pouring in; however, the committee will distribute them as long as they last to the persons who request them.

The committee, however, following its usual policy, will fill requests from Members of Congress. I expect in the near future to introduce a resolution asking for the printing of this report in such numbers as will meet the requests of the general public.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I have today written to Mr. Wilson, Secretary of the Department of Defense, asking if it is not possible to change the name of the officials in the Navy who are called petty officers. I assume this word "petty" has been bequeathed to our Navy because of British tradition. I am certainly not an Anglophobe, but I think we can find great improvement on this name.

When we read in the dictionary we note that the word "petty" is defined as "Small in nature, trifling, mean or ungenerous, inferior," and so forth. I am sure these names have no part in the magnificent work that the petty officers in our Navy perform. The title of petty officer roughly corresponds in rank to an Army noncommissioned officer, and I am especially thinking in terms of the sergeant in the Army. All of us who have had the high honor of serving in the Army realize that the sergeant is the backbone of the Army. His title is one that is borne proudly and he has to make no apology for the name. I have talked with petty officers in the Navy and they do not like the name "petty." Why not change the name to enlisted officer and correct this problem that may seem small, and yet one that, if solved, would improve the already high morale in our great Navy.

I am delighted to speak this word for the petty officers in the Navy and for their wives and loved ones. Surely we can think of a better word than "petty" to give to the backbone of the Navy.

NEW HAVEN RAILROAD

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am calling today for immediate congressional action to prevent seizure of the New Haven Railroad by a group of profit-hungry individuals. I shall seek legislation, if necessary, to keep control of a railroad which is a New England public utility and a strategic element in our national defense from being run and plundered by citizens of a foreign country.

I intend to seek bipartisan support of the entire New England congressional delegation for a prompt investigation by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Canadian interests, working through a Mr. Patrick B. McGinnis, a New York financial venturer whose mismanagement of the Norfolk & Southern Railroad is already the subject of ICC inquiries, intends to seize control of the New Haven Railroad at the annual meeting of the stockholders on April 14, 1954.

It will be a disastrous day in New England when the New Haven Railroad is operated by absentee investors in Hamilton, Ontario. The only possible interest these men and their financial agent have in New England is to see how much money they can take out of our State and the public be damned. The present management of the New Haven Railroad, under Mr. Frederick C. Dumaine, Jr., has been repeatedly hailed in the press of New England and New York for constantly improving equipment and service. Massachusetts in particular remembers only too well the situation which existed just a few years ago when the New Haven Railroad planned to abandon some 88 stations, close down its Old Colony Line, and leave thousands of commuters with no convenient means of transportation. There were predictions at the time that grass would grow on the Old Colony tracks. The present management, in a move which astounded even the most optimistic New England boosters, not only saved the Old Colony but turned it into a healthy, well-equipped line through the installation of new rail, new roadbeds, rebuilt and refurnished installations of all sorts, and a complete new single system offering a better service than it ever had in its history. Besides reducing overhead costs and opening new and enormous sources of revenue such as the great wholesale market terminal in Boston and warehouse in New York, the New Haven's management has been building the recent bankrupt company into one of the strongest and healthiest businesses in northeastern United States.

But most important, the present management has recognized that the sound long-range interests of New Haven stockholders are inseparable from those of the general public. It has resulted in an inspiring demonstration of public responsibility and service.

Now, Mr. McGinnis, who has been hostile to the present management ever since it refused his demand that he be hired as some kind of a consultant at an enormous salary, is attempting to spearhead a drive by a few big stockholders who are hungry for a fast dollar.

I have absolutely no interest in the New Haven Railroad except as a Congressman representing my district in Massachusetts and as a resident of New England and as an American keenly interested in the defense of this Nation. In these capacities, I am deeply disturbed and even alarmed by the plans made public by Mr. McGinnis in the press during the last few days. If a small group of alien profiteers is allowed to run the New Haven Railroad, I have not the slightest doubt they will do exactly what Mr. McGinnis said they intend to do—make profits. Since this group obviously is not satisfied with the present sound and reasonable improvement of their investment, it must follow that they desire a much faster rate, and this is possible only at the expense of equipment, service, and the public.

This, understandably, does not disturb anyone in Hamilton, Ontario. However, the people of New England cannot and will not allow their principal transportation utility to degenerate, once again, to the status of a milk cow serving a few men with insatiable appetites.

The Canadian profiteers must be made to realize that the New Haven Railroad belongs, first and foremost, to the people of New England and they will not stand by while this utility is picked to the bone for the profit of the few at the expense of the many.

It must be remembered also that a modern, efficient, and well-run New Haven Railroad is an integral link in the Nation's defense pattern. It is every bit as important in this respect as bombers, radar installations, and munitions. As a matter of principle and plain commonsense we simply cannot allow a public utility of such strategic importance to be run by citizens of a foreign country, friendly or otherwise, any more than we can allow it to become a financial plaything for greedy profiteers.

NATIONAL DAIRY PRODUCERS CONFERENCE BACKS PARITY LEVEL SUPPORTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, more than 1,000 dairy farmers from every type of dairy producing area, and from 25 States, met 2 days recently in Madison, Wis., the capital city of my home State. The butter brokers, the large milk trusts, and dairy-processing companies were not represented at the meeting, just the grassroots farm people who work every day milking cows and the representatives of their own cooperative creameries, cheese factories, and marketing associations. The farmers who attended were both Democrats and Republicans; many said they were independent voters. Members of all the major farmer organizations took part in the conference.

These dairy farmers held a working conference to discuss among themselves their production and income problems. They called in many of the Nation's top dairy and economics experts from the land-grant colleges and universities.

After learning everything they could from these specialists, the 1,000 dairy farmers went to work to develop a united program of action that would develop commonsense and practical solutions to the problems of dairy farming in this country. The program they adopted is a fine statesmanlike document. I am impressed by the wide scope and hardheaded realism of the recommendations they made. I commend this statement to the Members of the Congress for our careful consideration. The conference manifestly realized the importance to farmers of general economic policies as well as specific farm programs.

I am gratified that the conference recommended enactment of 100 percent of parity mandatory price supports for dairy products such as is provided in H. R. 7166, which I have introduced. I include with my remarks, the recommendations of the National Dairy Producers Conference to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Members of Congress:

ACTION PROGRAM STATEMENT ADOPTED BY NATIONAL DAIRY PRODUCERS CONFERENCE, MADISON, WIS., JANUARY 22–23, 1954

A continuing increased production of milk and the food products manufactured from it must be maintained each year if the increasing population of the United States is to have a nutritionally adequate diet. Dairy farmers are willing and capable of producing a continuing abundance of milk and its products at reasonable prices for American consumers; provided educational research and other services, and income from production and sale of milk and butterfat, are sufficient to enable them to stay in business and earn farm family incomes equivalent to those earned by other segments of the population.

We dairy farmers assembled at the National Dairy Producers Conference at Madison, Wis., on January 22 and 23, 1954, do hereby adopt the following program statement:

1. We urge enactment by Congress of an amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949 that will direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the prices of milk, butterfat, and its products at 100 percent of parity and that will authorize the Secretary to utilize parity production payments to farmers, in combination with other approved methods of support.

2. We urge the Secretary of Agriculture to announce now his official and definite decision to extend the present dairy price support program at a minimum of 90 percent of parity.

3. We urge the United States Department of Agriculture to revise the procedures currently utilized in the administration of the dairy price support progam so that the announced level of supports will be actually reflected to dairy farmers in all sections of the country rather than the less than 85 percent supports now received in many areas.

4. We urge that a parity formula be adopted such that the calculated parity price for milk producers in different areas will reflect an economic balance with the rest of the economy.

5. We are opposed to enactment of sliding scale, variable, or flexible price support levels for any farm commodity. We urge all dairy farmers to join forces with farmers who produce other commodities in the interest of enactment of a sound, fully adequate price support program.

6. We favor the enactment of an expanded Agricultural Conservation Practices program with sufficient funds to make payments to wheat, corn, cotton, and other producers who put their diverted acres into soil-building annual crops, developing a national soil fertility security reserve rather than using such land for commercial production.

7. We recognize that American consumers cannot maintain and increase their purchases of milk and its products unless they have adequate incomes. Therefore, we urge adoption by business, industry, and Government of economic policies that will promote and encourage national economic expansion at a rate sufficient to maintain prosperous full employment with increased productivity per man, and increased consumption at a rate sufficient to balance expanding production.

8. We urge adoption of special means and programs to enable low-income consumers and relief recipients to increase their purchases of milk and its products through regular channels of trade up to a desirable nutritional standard. Additionally, we urge increased use of milk and its products by the United States Armed Forces, in public welfare institutions, and in the school lunch program.

9. We urge the establishment of a security stockpile of milk products under provisions of the Critical and Strategic Materials Stockpile Act, such commodities to be purchased in the market, or from Commodity Credit Corporation, at prices provided for disposition of Government-held commodities in section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, including provisions for adequate civil defense needs.

10. We urge the adoption of import and export policies under negotiated international agreements, so that imports of milk and its products will not reduce returns to American dairy farmers below 100 percent of the parity price, and that export markets for United States milk products will be expanded. To the extent that our Government believes that it is in the national interest to promote two-way trade by accepting imports of agricultural commodities that compete with commodities produced on American farms, farmers should not be required to bear the cost; rather this cost should be borne by the entire Nation.

11. Other suggestions recommended for increasing the consumption of milk and its products are:

A. A strengthened educational program to inform consumers of the dietary merits of dairy products, to be carried on through producer and industry-financed advertising programs, educational courses in the public schools, improved grading procedures to make high quality more readily recognizable by consumers, and legal protection against false or misleading labeling or advertising of competitive and imitation products.

B. Inasmuch as it is clearly demonstrated that increasing the purchasing power of lower-income families results in their increased consumption of dairy products, while equal increases in incomes of higher-income groups do not, we recommend: That any tax reduction made by Federal or State governments should be tailored to benefit low-income families, preferably by raising the personal exemption; that the legal minimum wage should be raised and extended to additional workers, including agricultural workers; that benefits should be increased, and coverage extended to additional workers, including agricultural workers, of unemployment insurance and workmen's disability programs; that social-security benefits be increased and extended to additional workers, including agricultural workers and family-farm operators.

C. Intensified research on marketing and transportation procedures to develop more attractive and appealing products, lower-cost distribution methods, and more effective sales programs to move a greater volume of dairy products at fair prices.

D. Encouragement of action by consumers to achieve more efficient and lower-cost distribution of dairy products at prices fair both to farmers and to consumers through the development of consumer cooperatives able to join with producer cooperatives in establishing a nonprofit yardstick for the handling of milk and its products all the way from the producer to the consumer.

E. A broad public appeal to industry, business, and trade unions, to raise wages out of profits without increasing prices, so as to keep purchasing power rising fast enough to balance increasing productivity per man.

12. We urge adoption of Federal legislation to authorize accelerated depreciation for tax purposes and a capital credit program to enable dairy producers' cooperatives and other privately owned dairy processing plants to replace obsolescent plant facilities with modern flexible multiple-purpose dairy plants.

13. We urge enactment by Congress of a loan and service agency and program similar to the cooperative rural electrification program of REA, to assist in the establishment of a nationwide system of dairy marketing and processing cooperatives.

14. We urge dairy farmers to explore the possibilities of setting up national or regional dairy marketing organizations.

15. We urge increased appropriations for research in dairy merchandising.

16. We urge the Congress to increase appropriations for the school lunch program in order to increase the use of dairy products, and we recommend that purchases be made from local sources to insure better quality.

17. We urge that milk marketing orders be continued, and since milk distribution is now regional instead of local, that Federal orders should be reexamined for their effect on the transfer of milk from one local market to another, and their effect on the locations of production.

18. We urge that costs of distributing dairy products be investigated and appropriate legislation be enacted to insure producers of receiving a fair share of the consumers' dollar.

19. We recommend the establishment of a national grading system for butter and cheese, and that such products be grade labeled in terms understandable to consumers.

20. We ask Congress to enact legislation directing the Armed Forces to use butter and milk products; that farmers and processors make every possible effort to see that such butter and other products are of high quality; and we urge that the Armed Forces use sufficient care in transportation and handling of such products that their high quality is preserved up to the point of consumption.

21. To facilitate product-quality improvement, we recommend (a) better coordination of State standards of sanitation and quality inspection across State lines, and that the United States Department of Agriculture engage in activities to bring about this coordination; (b) that the Federal Government assume a greater responsibility in setting standards and promoting the eradication of Bang's disease and tuberculosis; (c) that the Federal appropriation required to support the $25 and $50 indemnity be restored; and (d) that the grade of milk be determined on the basis of flavor, sediment, and bacterial count in addition to the physical surroundings.

22. We recommend appropriation of greater funds for public and private, including cooperatives, research and educational activities designed to discover and encourage the adoption of improved dairy farm management techniques that will reduce the costs of milk production and improve the quality of milk when it leaves the farm. We urge every dairy farmer to avail himself fully of every such service and to adopt such of the improved practices as are adapted to his farm and within his financial resources.

23. In connection with use of parity production payments as a method of supporting the returns from the sale of milk, butterfat, and other perishables, we favor placing a maximum limitation upon the amount of such payments that can be earned by an individual farmer in a single year at the following level:

An individual farmer would be authorized to earn a production payment only upon each unit of the commodity he produces and sells up to a volume of sales such that the total received from sales plus payments would be not more than $25,000 for farms with average farm-cost-gross income ratios, or its net income equivalent for types of farms where the ratio of farm costs to farm gross income is greater than under average farm conditions.

24. We wish to express our appreciation to the National Farmers Union for sponsoring this conference which has given dairy farmers from all over the Nation an opportunity to meet together, discuss mutual problems, and to develop this statement of a practical and commonsense program of action in order to approach a solution for these problems.

25. We express our appreciation to the Governor of Wisconsin and to the officials and citizens of Wisconsin and Madison for the fine hospitality they have shown us.

26. We express our appreciation to the University of Wisconsin, University of Nebraska, and North Dakota State College whose cooperation in supplying information and the services of technical specialists has contributed to the success of this conference.

27. We express our appreciation for the fine services of the press and radio representatives who have covered this conference.

28. We direct that copies of this statement be forwarded to all Members of Congress, to the President of the United States, and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

"MY RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE BILL OF RIGHTS"

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Real Estate Boards last year conducted a nationwide essay contest on the subject, My Responsibilities Under the Bill of Rights. Some 20,000 high-school students from every section of our country submitted essays on this subject. The judges who selected the prize-winning essay from the 80 local winners were Senator John W. Bricker, of Ohio; Representative Ralph W. Gwinn, of New York; and United States District Judge Edward M. Curran, of Washington, D. C.

The winner of the first prize was Miss Helena M. Carter, of Atlanta, Ga., a senior in Christ the King High School.

The National Association of Real Estate Boards held its annual banquet dinner in Washington last Wednesday night. Many of you attended this dinner and heard Miss Carter read her essay which won for her the first prize in the contest, that prize being a 5-day visit to the Nation's Capital, with all expenses paid for Miss Carter and her chaperone.

Many of you who are here today have asked me to express to Miss Carter your appreciation for her splendid document. It was one of the finest articles on the Bill of Rights ever to come to my attention. It is heartening and inspiring to

know that our young people are concerning themselves so earnestly with the fundamental principles upon which our Government is founded, and that they can think with such clarity and come to such logical and sound conclusions as those expressed in this essay.

I think this essay deserves wide distribution. I believe that every person who reads it will benefit by it, and I insert it here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks:

MY RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE BILL OF RIGHTS

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution * * * are reserved to the States * * * or to the people."

These lines of the 10th amendment to our Constitution epitomize the spirit of American life. Into these lines has been transcribed all of our American heritage, our freedoms, and our rights, and consequently our corresponding duties.

Our responsibilities under the Bill of Rights are many. Into our hands, the hands of the people, have been placed the most precious gifts our Founding Fathers could give—gifts which we must protect, cherish, and in turn, transmit to our children.

I, a student, share equally in these responsibilities and obligations. I must realize that a nation's wealth is not found in its stores of gold or silver, but in its people who are willing to make sacrifices for its welfare. I must realize that our Government under the Bill of Rights, government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," is not a luxury on which some men may grow indolent and selfish, but an instrument which demands and requires all of the participation, services, and energies of the people whom it benefits.

If I begin to take our Government for granted, if I begin to regard its privileges as something it owes to me, then I shall someday awaken to the fact that, because of me and others like me, my Nation has been consumed by the lethargy of its own people.

I must realize that our Government, under the Bill of Rights, offers a sterner challenge than any other government in the world. It scoffs at the ideas of totalitarianism and only asks the generosity, the loyalty, and the cooperation of its people.

It is not possible for men to be impressed or disciplined into devotion to the rights and privileges which self-government offers them. Instead, they must be alerted from youth, the youth of which I, as a student, am a part, to respect and cherish the ideals which democracy upholds. They must be made aware of the great privileges which our Government, under the Bill of Rights, grants them, and must be taught to safeguard these privileges.

It is a sample of gross immorality for me to claim freedom to vote, if I am not ready to allow my fellow Americans that privilege. It is ungodly for me to claim religious freedom, if I am unwilling to tolerate beliefs which differ from mine. It is deceitful to declare freedom of the press, if I intend to deny that freedom to others, and it is hypocrisy for me to declare freedom of opinion, if I will not grant equal freedom to those who oppose me.

Today we are faced with the problem of rectitude of the individual versus rectitude of the State. It is a contest which may, understandably, last until the end of our lives. Basically, the odds are with me, as a responsible member of American society. A democracy such as the one which our Government offers cannot be defeated in this contest; it can only lose by default. It can only lose, if, through indifference, I neglect my personal responsibilities for its safety and growth.

TRICKLE, TRICKLE LITTLE TAX RELIEF

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, if you do not have a son or daughter in college; if you do not have a foster child; if you are not a widow or widower with a son or daughter under 10 years of age, who works and also hires a baby sitter; if you are not living on a pension; if you are not so unfortunate as to spend more than 3 percent of your adjusted gross income for medical expenses; if you are not a shareholder in a corporation, the action so far approved by the Ways and Means Committee of the House will not give you 1 cent of relief from taxation in its so-called technical revision of the revenue laws.

In other words, practically all the wage earners and small merchants are being completely ignored.

PUBLIC-WORKS PROGRAM

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, today the distinguished Member of the other body, the Honorable PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and I introduced companion bills to provide for more effective planning, coordination, and programing of public works.

We are dissatisfied with the Eisenhower administration's slowness of action in developing an adequate reservoir of public-works projects for use in the event the present economic situation worsens. However, we feel our bill represents a necessary step in the public-works field regardless of whether the present recession deepens or full employment quickly returns.

The Douglas-Bolling bill, entitled the "Public Facilities Act of 1954," first, enables Congress to carry out its responsibilities to the people by planning ahead and preparing programs to assure continued economic stability and growth; second, provides machinery for the advanced planning of public-works programs which would be available immediately for implementation; third, centralizes responsibility for such planning and action in the President and authorizes the establishment of a special office for his assistance; fourth, stimulates Federal public works and community development through cooperation of the Federal, State, and local governments. Today, no such unified approach or integrated public-works program exists; advanced planning is not conducted on a comprehensive basis nor is responsibility for such leadership centralized in any agency.

The bill establishes a Public Facilities Administrator, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. He is to be aided by an advisory committee consisting of representatives of Federal agencies concerned with public works and with assisting State and local government programs.

The Douglas-Bolling bill directs the President, with the assistance of the Administrator, to devise programs for submission to the Congress to aid in the construction of needed public facilities by the Federal, State, and local governments and authorities set up under the jurisdiction of State and local governments. The President is authorized, after determining that such need exists, to accelerate Federal public-works programs. The President is directed to include in his Annual Economic Report to the Congress: First, specific information on the reservoir of public facilities needed and planned by all levels of government; second, the policy of the Federal Government with regards thereto; third, recommendations for legislation to implement that policy.

PROPHETS OF GLOOM

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, those of us who bring to the attention of the administration figures on unemployment in our respective areas are termed prophets of gloom.

It seems to me rather remarkable that for bringing these subjects to their attention we are chastised for certain things that are true. Those here who do not want to take the responsibility and do not want to take cognizance of the fact I believe are the prophets of doom to themselves, because, as all of us know, back in the thirties when there was mass unemployment there were a hundred thousand Communists in this country; today, 20 years after, there are less than 20,000.

We had better start doing something now.

These are the most up-to-date facts about unemployment in the Detroit area:

Chrysler Corp.—excluding the automotive body division, formerly Briggs—has reduced employment more than 40,000 from a total of 138,000 in April 1953.

At the present time more than 28,000 seniority workers—exclusive of those in the automotive body division—are among those laid off by Chrysler Corp., the hardest hit plants being Dodge and Plymouth.

At the Dodge plant, where production has been cut from the 1953 peak of 1,630 cars a day to 550 per day, 13,200 seniority workers are laid off. Moreover, at times they are given only 4 days' work a week, as was the case last week.

At Plymouth, where cars were being assembled at the rate of 2,160 per day during the peak period of July 1953, production was cut starting last January 25 to 760 cars per day. This cutback resulted in the layoff of approximately 5,000 seniority workers.

The recent cutbacks in Plymouth production have resulted in the layoff of 10,000 workers in the Chrysler automotive body division—formerly Briggs.

Among the so-called independent producers, Hudson employment has been cut from more than 15,000 to 7,500.

Packard employment has fallen from 17,900 to 10,000.

Studebaker employment has been reduced from 20,000 to 13,500 and the work schedule has been cut to 4 days a week.

On January 9, 1954, the Michigan Employment Security Commission reported that 107,000 workers, more than 7 percent of the work force, were unemployed in the Detroit area and 167,000 unemployed in the State of Michigan. The commission then projected a further decline in employment. This projection is being borne out.

On February 5, 1954, the Detroit Free Press reported that 3,800 workers at the Packard plant face a 1-week layoff.

The Free Press also reported that Chevrolet workers, of whom there are 9,000 in Detroit, have had their work cut to 4 days for the second consecutive week and that Chevrolet officials indicate that the 4-day week may continue temporarily.

At the Great Lakes Steel Plant, in addition to 1,800 workers laid off 2 weeks ago, it is expected that another 2,000 or more will be laid off this week or in the near future. Those working now I understand are on a 3-day-a-week schedule.

The service-connected employment has been cut throughout the city. There were some 500 brewery employees released. This is typical of other fields of employment.

Attached hereto is a recent telegram sent to Leonard W. Hall by UAW-CIO President Walter Reuther:

I note from the newspapers that you are still engaged in your name-calling campaign. It is my unpleasant duty to inform you that I have been unable to find a single laid-off worker who has been put back to work by your epithets. In fact, since you initiated your name-calling campaign, there have been further layoffs in Detroit and other industrial centers. I suggest that instead of playing politics with unemployment, you could use your influence as national chairman of your party to persuade the Republicans in the various State legislatures to proceed without delay to implement President Eisenhower's recommendations to increase unemployment compensation benefits and duration. While this alone will not eliminate unemployment, it will at least provide some immediate relief for the hardship and distress now facing the families of the more than 2 million workers now drawing miserably inadequate benefits, and to the businesses dependent on their patronage.

At the same time, you can urge the leadership of your party in the executive and legislative branches of the Government to get to work to dispel the gloom to which you refer by taking vigorous action to restore full employment. We have enough faith in the basic soundness of the American economy to believe that full employment can be restored. All that is required is the will to do it on the part of those who have the responsibility for doing it. Name-calling will not do it. Neither will optimistic incantations prove any more effective now than "prosperity is just around the corner" during the 1930's. It is not enough to be long on confidence so long as millions of American families are short on purchasing power.

Your party, which has the responsibility for administering the economic as well as the political affairs of the Nation, cannot deal with the problems of the American people by brushing them under the rug. Nor can it conceal those problems by covering with bushel-loads of abuse those who refuse to join you in denying that any problem exists.

Unemployment must not be made a political football by either party. The way to keep unemployment out of politics is to put the unemployed back to work. We suggest you direct your activities toward that end.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 when Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey appeared before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report the newspapers quoted him as saying that if consumers keep buying at the rate they are now, the present slow decline in the economy will level off and we will be on our way again.

On February 3 the Anaconda Copper Mining Co. announced the closing of two of its mines in Butte, Mont. Also announced was the curtailing of output of copper from the Butte mines by about 10 percent and a reduction of workweek from 6 days to 5 in the mines and at the smelters in Anaconda and Great Falls.

Secretary Humphrey's statement, so closely followed by the action in Butte, prompted one of the Butte miners to wire me as follows:

FEBRUARY 5, 1954.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Secretary Humphrey says keep buying. Butte miners cut from 6 to 5-day week. Means loss of $100 per month to every miner affected. Ask Secretary Humphrey how miners can continue buying at present rate with this reduced income.

KENNETH P. SHEEHAN.

This is the real question of the week.

CONFIDENCE IN MR. DULLES AT BERLIN CONFERENCE

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when the Secretary of State appeared before our Baltic committee last November in Washington he stated among other things that if we go to the conference table we go there not to sacrifice principles but to make our principles prevail. I think the history of the Berlin conference thus far indicates that we are taking a real leadership at that conference. We are not sacrificing or negotiating principles but we are there commencing to make our principles prevail.

Along this line I should like to point out to the House the effect of our strong position with regard to free elections in Germany. We are with regard to free elections in Germany standing on principle and we see an unmistakable response among the East German people on the other side of the Iron Curtain, in the yearning of men for freedom. We see those people rallying to the principle of freedom when it is expressed. With that firm leadership that is being shown by Mr. Dulles, particularly with respect to faith in human freedom, we are also gaining firmer support from France and England.

Sometimes it is difficult to take a firm stand on belief in the right when the currents of indecision and neutrality are running strong against us. But Mr. Dulles is proving that he acts from moral courage and gains the strength to take his stand against the Communist semantics of deceit and fear from a deep faith in human freedom. All men of good will on both sides of the Iron Curtain will respond to this deep faith.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CLARDY (at the request of Mr. VELDE), from Monday to Thursday, on account of official business with the Un-American Activities Committee.

NORTH PACIFIC FISHERIES TREATY A TRIBUTE TO MILLER FREEMAN

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the thought that we should send flowers to the living, I desire to pay tribute to a great citizen of the Pacific Northwest who resides in my congressional district.

Activation in Washington this month of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission crowns the career of Miller Freeman, Seattle industrial publisher, and his half-century campaign for the conservation of the world's fishery resources through the means of international agreements applying scientific research and intelligent management to the end of "use without destruction."

The North Pacific Fisheries Treaty, under which the United States, Canada, and Japan are undertaking the development of that ocean's fisheries on the basis of sustained yield is the third such treaty which has come into effect in large degree through the vision, faith, and efforts of Miller Freeman. All have grown in

the pattern of the first, through which the United States and Canada in 1924 agreed to joint management of the Pacific halibut resource. Largely conceived and carried through negotiation to actuality by Mr. Freeman, the halibut treaty and the research and conservation achieved under it have stood for 30 years as the world's best example of achievement in the field of international fisheries conservation.

Some 20 years ago, the United States and Canada, again under the leadership and stimulus of this man, united their efforts to solve scientifically the perplexing riddle of the once fantastically abundant Sockeye salmon of the Fraser River. From virtual extinction, this run today is rebuilding into one of the rich natural resources of North America. What was virtually lost to men, now promises to yield food and wealth to Canadians and Americans forever, through this treaty which Miller Freeman shepherded into being.

With the end of war in the Pacific, Miller Freeman undertook to stimulate thinking throughout the Pacific States to the end that a means might be evolved to prevent destruction of the fishery resources of the North Pacific through reckless international competition. Out of his suggestions grew the Pacific Fisheries Conference, an exceedingly interesting agency in which all elements of the fisheries—unions and owners, workers and operators, crewmen and scientists—unite their efforts to solve fishery problems of common concern. From its inception early in 1946, Mr. Freeman has been the modest chairman of this conference, out of which has come the International North Pacific Fisheries Treaty.

This treaty raises a new concept of conservation. In it the three nations agree to pool their scientific research through the tripartite commission, studying the fisheries which they develop to the end that the crop can be harvested without impairing the future, and that the yield may be sustained at maximum levels. It goes even further in that the nations agree that: Where a fishery resource has been under development, is utilized to its full capacity, is under scientific study and management directed at its conservation, nations not previously engaged in the fishery should abstain from entering it.

Here is a breadth of common concept which has never appeared before in the field of international fisheries. It is a concept and an achievement which has grown out of the thinking and working of Miller Freeman for 50 years in the field of fishery conservation, in the sense which counts wise use as the very essence of conservation.

This man is a publisher, not a scientist, not a fisheries expert. He is the founder and builder of one of the leading industrial publishing houses of this country. His earliest memory is that of traveling through the mountains of Montana with a knock-down print shop carried in two covered wagons which served as well to bear and shelter the Freeman family.

His father was a Confederate soldier from Culpeper Court House, Va., who after the War Between the States chose the way of the West, where he published a unique newspaper—the Frontier Index—which moved with the frontier, west and west.

Miller Freeman was born in Ogden, Utah, 79 years ago. As I have said, his first memory recalls the journey as the wagons moved on to Butte. Then to Yakima, in my State of Washington.

As a very young man, Miller Freeman launched forth as an editor and publisher on his own on Puget Sound. In 1903 at Seattle he founded Pacific Fisherman, the first of his numerous industrial journals, most of them devoted to the natural resource industries. Some of them deal primarily with the Pacific region. Others, like Pulp and Paper, The Lumberman, Mining World, and The Log, are national in scope; and all are international in reputation and respect.

A naval captain in World War I, Mr. Freeman has served my State for many years in many ways—and particularly in enterprises which required forward vision, faith, courage, and energy abounding. America's first, and still only, great floating bridge would never have come into being if he had not fought through to fulfillment the enterprise which the engineers conceived, but could not of themselves achieve.

Miller Freeman has made his mark and served his country well in widely varied ways. In this new treaty, with its wider concepts, he serves all mankind; for the Pacific—whose productivity the treaty protects—is one of Earth's richest reserves, with resources that, wisely used, can furnish man with food and wealth forever.

THE RELEASE OF BUTTER FOR IMMEDIATE PUBLIC CONSUMPTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that on tomorrow we will consider the question of the restoration of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I also heard our friend speak a moment ago of the desire for a fixed parity of 100 percent for dairy products, including butter.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that some of the butter producers are recommending to the Secretary of Agriculture that he call back into consumption some of the butter that is in store, amounting as of June 30, 1953, 231 million pounds. As I see it, the dairy farmers are facing as big a scandal in butter with irreparable damage to them as the potato farmers themselves realized in potatoes.

I urge upon them to support this return to consumption of some of the store of butter to bring the butter price down to a 60- or 70-cents-a-pound level. I feel that will restore consumption of butter which has fallen off 50 percent in the last 10 years. If the dairymen insist on seeking 100-percent parity, consumption of butter will decline still further and they will inevitably and finally incur the full wrath of all American consumers. No business group should do that with its eyes open.

OLD ORDER AMISH MENNONITE PEOPLE

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed a petition presented to me from the Old Order Amish Mennonite people, who reside in and near my district. I am quoting below from the heading of the petition:

We, the undersigned (Old Order Amish Mennonite), are conscientiously opposed to take insurance of any form, as we provide for our poor and disabled through our churches. So we are praying and asking to be exempted from social security.

Following this heading, Mr. Speaker, there are 94 signatures.

To our Worthy State Representative of Ohio:

We, the undersigned (Old Order Amish Mennonite), are conscientiously opposed to take insurance of any form, as we provide for our poor and disabled through our churches. So we are praying and asking to be exempted from social security.

Susanna M. Troyer, Maryann J. Yoder, Esther H. Miller, Susie R. Swartzentruber, Sarah E. Troyer, Katie Lehman, Sadie Troyer, Lizzie Keim, Erma Miller, Saloma Miller, Susanna Yoder, Elizabeth Troyer, Mary Weaver, Emma Troyer, Elizabeth D. Troyer, Rebecca L. Troyer, Amanda M. Troyer, Lydia Ann E. Weaver, Bishop Henry J. Miller, Sol. L. Weaver, Levi M. Troyer, Levi Swartzentruber, Jonas L. Yoder, Melvin J. Yoder, Henry J. Yoder, Jonas E. Schlabach, Eli D. Yoder, Eli M. Keim, Eli M. Troyer, Raymond Swartzentruber, Joni A. Yoder, Benj D. Troyer, David M. Miller, John E. Yoder, Elmer D. Miller, Abe J. Weaver, Moses M. Troyer, Andrew M. Troyer, Ervin L. Weaver, Alfred J. Yoder, Eli E. Gingerich, John C. Yoder, Mose P. Troyer, Emanuel M. Troyer, Andrew J. Weaver, Emanuel E. Miller, Abe C. Yoder, Andrew D. Troyer, Aden Troyer, Melvin J. D. Yoder, Mrs. Martha Yoder, Ben J. P. Weaver, Dan J. Hershberger, Emanuel A. Miller, Ben J. E. Weaver, John P. Weaver, Abe M. Troyer, Joseph M. Keim, Mose P. Miller, Moses J. Keim, William J. Keim, Abner P. Miller, Nelson A. Troyer, Moses E. Miller, Ben Kauffman, Fredericksburg, Ohio, route 2; Isaac Miller, Apple Creek, Ohio, route 2; David K. Troyer, Andy E. Hershberger, Andy E. Gingerich, Amos D. Yoder, Andy G. Yoder, Mary E. Troyer, Anna B. Weaver, Clara J. Troyer, Laura J. Keim, Fanny E. Hershberger, Ella A. Weaver, Clara J. Nisley, Clara J. Keim, Mattie B. Kauffman, Lydia J. Weaver, Amanda E. Gingerich, Martha M. Keim, Elizabeth A. Hershberger, Mary S. Troyer, Mary J. Nisley, Susie M. Miller, Olen J. Schlabach, Ella Schlabach, Anna A. Weaver, Fredericksburg, Ohio, route 2; Bishop Jacob J. Stutzman (age 82 years); Preacher Elam Swartzentruber, Preacher Eli B. Yoder, Deacon John J. Stutzman, Millersburg, Ohio, route 4.

Our church consists of 46 members.

DISMISSALS FOR SECURITY REASONS

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am, today, introducing resolutions calling on the President, the Attorney General, and the Civil Service Commission for information with respect to Federal officers and employees who have been separated from the service for security reasons under Executive order during the past year.

The dismissal of some 2,200 Federal employees is a matter which has inspired wide public interest. It has caused hundreds of editorials to be written on the subject. People are looking for the facts. I am sure that the American people are mature enough to be told the truth. Congress is entitled to know, and I hope that all Members will join with me in requesting this information.

I have asked that we be told how many officers and employees have been dismissed in each category according to the specific ground or reason for their separation. How many, if any, were removed for acts of espionage, sabotage, or treason. How many, if any, were removed for present membership in the Communist Party. How many were notified in writing of charges against them. How many of these people are now employed by the Government. How many were separated under the Executive order, and how many resigned. Let us have the facts. We need not fear the truth. The people are entitled to the truth.

EMPLOYEES' SALARY INCREASE BILLS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, originally the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee had planned to schedule the beginning of hearings on employees' salary-increase bills today, Monday, February 8. However, because of the schedule of the House, it was decided by the committee to postpone the beginning of the hearings until Tuesday, February 16, 10 a. m.

The committee had planned to hear Members of Congress today and tomorrow. Because of the postponement of the hearings, we will set another time for hearing Members of Congress. On Tuesday, February 16, we will begin the hearings by testimony from the Postmaster General.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Tuesday and Thursday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

IS HONEYMOON OVER?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the very grievous wounds inflicted upon me by my own committee when they refused to let me go on with the investigation of racketeering and extortion, and then, in addition, the committee hid behind the so-called iron curtain of an executive session—I refused to have these individual votes made public—those wounds had only begun to heal when just this morning I was amazed, shocked, and really began to suffer in earnest when I learned that after last session—remember, last session, our colleagues on this side promised so often and so faithfully to go along with President Eisenhower—when here this morning, from the well of the House there, six Democrats got up—I kept count of them on my fingers of one hand and two on the other hand—six of them, I think it was, got up and criticized our President and told him what to do. They expressed their displeasure. Now, I wonder what caused that change of heart. Certainly they meant it last session? I am sure they did? And, he has not done anything since that was harmful to them. What is the matter with the gentleman? Please tell us what is politically biting you.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY AND RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN IRON CURTAIN COUNTRIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in May of 1947 the Communists successfully overthrew the legally established government in Hungary. By the middle of 1948 practically all effective political opposition to Communist leadership was ruthlessly crushed. There followed the elimination of other forces which were the uncompromising enemies of atheistic communism.

In the foreground of such forces, and the most formidable one, was the church. Communist leaders of Hungary knew this well; they realized that it was more difficult to combat spiritual and ideological forces than physical ones, and were fully prepared for the occasion. They were firmly determined to subdue, to subjugate, to enslave and destroy all religious forces which were obstacles in the attainment of their goal—the establishment of a Communist dictatorship.

On September 26, 1949, the newly established Ministry of People's Enlightenment announced that "an organized struggle will begin on the ideological plane for the eradication of capitalism." This meant open warfare against the church and the clergy. In that struggle, the Communists were prepared to use police, prisons, guns, and gallows. Already some churchmen were in trouble, and now many others were forcibly banished from their parishes and thrown into prisons where they languished with great suffering.

Cardinal Mindszenty, the Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, protested vigorously against all these inhumanities. Of course, he also protested, with all possible energy, against the suppression of the religious press, against the outlawing of youth organizations, against the Communist design of seizing church schools, against the exclusive teaching of Marxist materialism in schools under government control, and against elimination of the Christian spirit from Hungarian culture.

In this struggle against the forces of darkness and destruction in a Communist-dominated country, the brave cardinal had the solid but, in the circumstances, ineffective support of all believers; he also had the moral support of churches in all free countries; neither of these, however, could assist him in standing against the physical forces of tyranny. On December 26, 1948, when 16 secret-service officers surrounded the cardinal's residence and arrested him, he was physically alone against that circle of brute force, well beyond the ready sympathetic human assistance.

From the time of his arrest until his trial in the following February, this prince of the church was subjected to a series of agonizing physical treatments—a type of torture inflicted upon innocent victims by their inhuman masters. It has been repeatedly and reliably reported that the cardinal was drugged in order to have him confess. His trial began on February 3, 1949, and the public prosecutor accused him of espionage, treason, and black marketing. In the course of the trial it was announced that the cardinal admitted the charges and confessed his guilt. Five days later, on February 8, he was found guilty of treason, of espionage, and of black-market activities, and was sentenced to life imprisonment.

Since that day the sad event is remembered by all believers in freedom of conscience. On this, the anniversary of the fifth year of his life imprisonment, we are all reminded of the sufferings of this prince of the church in some dark dungeon in Hungary. While he is thus rendered incapable of waging struggle against the forces of Communist dictatorship, his faithful followers are being persecuted, spied upon, arrested, imprisoned, exiled, and even shot by the hundreds, sometimes without a trial.

In Hungary, as well as in all countries where Communists have established their so-called people's democracies, there is no freedom of conscience. Religious leaders are not allowed to perform their duties. If these leaders show any unwillingness to take orders from the civil authorities they are arrested on some pretext, are accused of some anti-state activity, in a prearranged trial they are found guilty, and then sent to prison

or liquidated. Cardinal Stepinac's arrest and imprisonment in Yugoslavia in 1946 was the first of such celebrated cases, and Cardinal Wyszinski's arrest last September in Poland may not be the last of such arrests, but in all Iron Curtain countries the struggle for the suppression of the church, for the elimination of the clergy as a force against the spread of un-Christian Communist doctrine, for the destruction of hallowed and sacred institutions, is still raging. In this holy war churches in all these countries are involved in a life-and-death struggle against the dark forces of tyranny and evil. Let us pay our tribute to Cardinal Mindszenty on this day for his long and courageous fight against ungodly civil authorities. Let us also hope that the final victory in this struggle will be on the side of righteousness and freedom.

UNTRUE STATEMENTS ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, this is not in reply to what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] said but it is in reply to the general situation that we meet.

I said a while ago that the backs of some of us are getting pretty sore. We are being called on to cooperate, yet we have people high in the administration and people high in the Republican Party indicating that everybody connected with the Democratic Party is at least tinged with communism. Then the man who is closest to the President of the United States on last Saturday night indicated we were all sadists.

Of course, those statements are mean, they are untrue, they are dastardly. They should be stopped by somebody, and there is one man in the United States who can stop that kind of talk.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and privileged to have this opportunity to address my colleagues of the House today on this, the fifth, anniversary of the sentencing of Cardinal Mindszenty to life imprisonment by the Communists of Hungary. At this point I should like to read into the RECORD the text of a letter which was sent to all Members by the Hungarian National Council, 125 East 72d Street, New York 21, N. Y., under date of January 25, 1954:

HUNGARIAN NATIONAL COUNCIL,
New York, N. Y., January 25, 1954.

Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENTLEY: The month of February marks the fifth anniversary of the trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, prince primate of Hungary, staged by the Communist regime of Hungary. News of the cardinal's arrest, on the second day of Christmas in 1948, was received with deep consternation by the entire free world. The world immediately realized that the Mindszenty case was not merely a concern of the Roman Catholic Church and the Hungarian Nation, but that it affected the entire free world and every thinking man and woman. The circumstances of the cardinal's arrest, the utterly false accusations brought against him, the mock trial, filled the free world with alarm.

America, the land of freedom, instinctively sensed that Mindszenty stood for the principles of human liberty on which this great country was founded. No one in the United States had any doubt that Mindszenty had done the right thing. He did so because he foresaw the real goal of the Bolsheviks: the destruction of the subjugated peoples of Central Europe. The arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty in 1948 marked the beginning of a new era in the fight between bolshevism and the Hungarian as well as the other Central European nations.

Since the silenced and oppressed Hungarian people is unable to express its opinion and feelings today, we who represent their interests on the free soil of the United States and in the countries of the free world, must speak for them in thanking you for your generous contribution to their fight for liberty and for your firm stand in the case of Cardinal Mindszenty. The moral support received from the United States greatly encouraged the Hungarian Nation's resistance to bolshevism, and was largely responsible for the fact that the Hungarian people did not lose faith and hope. On the contrary, their faith in ultimate liberation is today stronger than ever before, and their passive resistance has already shaken the Bolshevik regime to its foundations.

On the fifth anniversary of the arrest and trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, we appeal again to the conscience of all freemen to keep the fate of the heroic cardinal and the cause of the suffering Hungarian Nation before the forums of the free world, so that liberty and justice may eventually emerge victorious from this great human and national tragedy.

Sincerely yours,

MSGR. BELA VARGA,
Former Speaker of the Hungarian Parliament, President of the Hungarian National Council.

I must add at this point I received a telephone call from Monsignor Varga last Tuesday evening requesting me to make some appropriate remarks on the floor of the House today on the occasion of this tragic anniversary. As I have already explained to my colleagues, the specific request was made of me because I knew Cardinal Mindszenty personally and because I was in Hungary, attached to the United States Legation at Budapest, at the time the cardinal was arrested, tried, and sentenced. Needless to say, I am more than happy to accede to this request.

Cardinal Mindszenty was born Joseph Pehm on March 29, 1892, in the country village of Csehimindszent in southwestern Hungary. After finishing common school, he attended a Catholic boarding school at Szombathely, where he studied for the priesthood at the local seminary. He was ordained on June 12, 1915, at the age of 23.

Mindszenty had his first contact with communism in 1919 when he was arrested by the Communist regime which controlled Hungary at that time. His first imprisonment, however, was brief since the Communists were overthrown after a brief rule of 4 months.

His next totalitarian foe, however, was not Communist but Nazi in origin. As far back as 1935, a Hungarian Nazi Party had been formed and continued to grow and increase in strength. Mindszenty fought these Nazis as strenuously and vigorously as he had opposed the Communists. He went to particular lengths to save Hungarian Jews, who had been blamed for the early Communist governments of Bela Kun. There is a remark attributed to him at this time which is worth repeating.

You have heard of collective responsibility—

He said—

collective crime, and collective punishment. This is Communist teaching. See that you do not fall into its error yourselves. There is no such thing as collective crime or collective punishment. Everyone must answer before God and his judges on earth only for the crimes he has himself committed. I hear voices which I do not like, voices uttering collective condemnation just as the Communists do, voices threatening to take justice out of the hands of the law and to administer it privately and wrongly. No one has the right to take justice into his own hands. The Jews are not responsible for the crimes of Bela Kun, simply because he was a Jew, any more than they may all be given distinction because of the courage and righteous patriotism of those Jews who were imprisoned with me. Are you as Catholics willing to be punished for the crimes of other Catholics? Will you condemn all Protestants because some Protestants are wicked men?

Incidentally, I should mention that this quotation is from the book Cardinal Mindszenty, by the noted Hungarian author, Bela Fabian, who is himself of the Jewish faith.

In 1944 Mindszenty was appointed bishop of Veszprem. During the remainder of that year, when the Germans were in military control of Hungary, Mindszenty continuously worked to save the Hungarian Jews from Nazi persecution, even hiding many of them in his own house. For refusing to permit the Nazis to search the episcopal palace for these poor people, Mindszenty himself was arrested on November 27, 1944. At this time, he walked the entire distance from his palace to prison, surrounded by his priests, all of whom were also arrested. The Nazis charged him with treason and many other crimes, just as the Communists did 4 years later. However, he was released from prison in April of 1945 when the Russians captured Hungary and set up a Communist coalition government. In the fall of 1945, he received news as to his appointment as cardinal or prince primate of Hungary.

Cardinal Mindszenty early became "enemy No. 1" for the Russian and Hungarian Communists. He fought them over the issue of agricultural collectivization, over Communist control of the schools, at every step of their progress toward complete Sovietization of his country. Time and again he spoke out, mostly by pastoral letters, to encourage the spirit of resistance among his people. He was everywhere regarded as the out-

standing symbol of anti-Communist resistance throughout the land.

I remember 6 years ago when I attended a high mass which he conducted in Budapest, in the Cathedral of St. Stephen, the patron saint of Hungary. Of course, the church was jammed and the streets outside crowded for blocks around, but we had reserved seats and managed to get in. That was 8 months before his arrest, but it was the last time I saw him.

He was a stern, uncompromising man, of the highest moral principles and integrity. He absolutely had a will and a determination like a rod of iron—he was afraid of nothing on earth, and he would not deviate one iota from what he believed the right course of action. There were many persons who tried to persuade him to steer a middle course with the Communists but he fought them as outspokenly as he knew how. The Communists tried to get him to leave the country, offering him a safe conduct, and then they tried to get him to come to an understanding with them but he would not give in an inch.

You may have heard that when Mindszenty was in Rome in 1946 for his investiture as a cardinal and when the Holy Father placed the red hat on his head, the ancient formula was pronounced:

> Receive this red hat, the sign of the unequaled dignity of the cardinalate, by which it is declared that thou shouldst show thyself intrepid even to death by the shedding of thy blood, for the exaltation of the blessed faith.

At this time the Pope then said to Mindszenty, "And you, my son, may be the first to suffer."

You also may remember when he visited Cardinal Spellman in New York in 1947, and his host warned him of the danger of returning to Communist-dominated Hungary, that Mindszenty replied, "My enemies can take from me no more than my life, and that has already been given to God."

I remember that black day of December 26, 1948, when Mindszenty was taken by the Communist police and disappeared from the world for nearly 2 months. But we were able to find out a little of what went on during that time. We knew that first he was interrogated continuously by police officers working in shifts, questioned for 82 hours without being allowed to leave the room or even sit down until he finally fainted. We found out that when he was revived, his former secretary, Father Andrew Zacher, who had also been arrested, was brought into the same room. Father Andrew had been beaten so brutally that he could not walk; he had to be carried into the cardinal's presence. When he saw what had happened to his secretary, Mindszenty collapsed a second time.

From that time on, no one is exactly certain just what they did to the cardinal. I did, however, contact a Hungarian doctor who told me that one of his colleagues had told him how he had been called into the prison to administer a drug to Mindszenty. Some people call this drug actedron and some say it is more like scopolamine. My friend who only knew it by its Hungarian name said the Russians had used it in criminal proceedings for a great many years and he had read about it in Russian medical journals before 1932 at which time an account of its use could no longer be published. He did say the drug was made from a plant which he described as something like the mescal cactus which grows in Mexico. Whether the drug was given to Mindszenty as a truth drug or a stimulant or for some other reason, we just don't know.

When the cardinal was brought to trial in February of 1949 all American and British diplomats were barred from attendance. One American newspaperman, representing the United Press, was permitted to attend. Another got in through an error on the part of the Hungarians. There were other foreign correspondents, all of them pretty well picked. There was an American Communist whom I knew, Peter Furst, representing Reuters News Service. I later took his passport away from him. I also remember an Englishman, Wilfred Burchett, representing some English paper at the trial—today he is covering the war in Korea from the Communist side of the lines. Most of the American wire services were represented by Hungarian citizens who of course had to write just what they were told.

As I said, all we diplomats were barred. Previously, however, I had gone to some contacts of mine and, through them, had arranged to get a couple of tickets which I actually had with me. But I made the mistake of telling my chief, the American Minister, about it. He said, "We can't get tickets in that way. We will have to request them through the Hungarian Foreign Office." I told him that if we asked for them officially we would be refused but he insisted upon it. So I had to return the tickets. We went to the Communist Foreign Office, through the proper channels, and were, of course, turned down cold, just as I knew we would be.

I heard the radio broadcast of the entire trial, however, except those parts which they cut out when something did not suit them. I remember sitting beside my radio with two interpreters taking down every word that came through. And I will never forget one time when the presiding judge—in Hungarian courts the chief judge of the five-man court interrogates the prisoners, not the prosecutor—when the judge asked Mindszenty a question. The cardinal answered it and then went right ahead and replied to another question which had not even been asked him. The judge, who, incidentally, used to be one of the biggest Nazis in Hungary, actually said, "Wait a moment; I haven't asked you that yet." Whether he had been hypnotized in some way or not, Mindszenty had obviously been forced to memorize his entire confession, which I believe lasted nearly 4 hours. I do know that there was no comparison between the way I heard him speak before and the way he talked at the trial. His voice, before so strong and sure of itself, was weak and trembling, and he definitely gave the impression of repeating words that were not his own, words that someone else had written for him and taught him to say. We also found out, for example, that various letters that were supposed to have been written by him during his imprisonment had been forged by handwriting experts.

To show you what his own mental state was during the trial, after it was all over and he had received his sentence to life imprisonment, his old mother was permitted to visit him for an hour or two. When he saw her, about 2 weeks after the trial was over, the cardinal said to her, "Mother, when will my trial begin? I have so much I have to say." We got that story right from his mother herself.

Another thing which you may not have heard about the trial: Before it started the Hungarians had made up their minds that they were going to hang him. Rakosi, the Communist boss in Hungary, advised Moscow of this decision, and the Russians wired back forbidding them to do it, as it would create too great an uproar. That was the only thing which saved Mindszenty's life.

Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty was a real martyr. The Communists broke his body and they broke his mind. You probably know that, since his trial, he has completely lost his mind. Now, actually, the Communists have taken pretty good care of him. When his heart gave him trouble, they flew in a specialist from Russia. When his lungs got bad, they moved him up to a prison in the Tatra Mountains, on the Slovak border. As a matter of fact, they continually move him from one prison to another, for obvious reasons. You know there are still attempts under way to free him, either by bribery or by other methods. But, as I say, although they now take good care of his physical needs, they can never undo what they did to his mind. That part of the man is gone forever.

The only part of the old Cardinal Mindszenty that is still with us today is his unquenchable spirit and that will live always. Maybe some people will say that Mindszenty lost his fight against the Communists. You remember that before his arrest he warned everyone not to believe any so-called confession, which, as he said, would only be due to human frailty. When he was forced to stand up in the Communist kangaroo court and repudiate this warning, some people claimed that he was finally defeated. They were wrong. Mindszenty's body and his mind may have been overcome but his spirit emerged triumphant. The Hungarian people will never forget him, the whole world will never forget him. And the example he provided stirred the people, the great mass of the people who live behind the curtain today and who are perhaps 95 percent anti-Communist; it stirred those people to a degree of passive resistance to their Communist rulers that could never have happened otherwise. I even remember the Communist policeman on my block who lost his job because he said that Mindszenty was a good man.

A few months after the Mindszenty trial I went to Easter services in Budapest, which was shortly before my departure. This time I did not have a reserved seat. On that Easter morning I not only could not get into the church; I could not even get near it. It was the same with every church in the city, Catholic and Protestant alike. People 50 and 60 years old who had lived in Budapest all their lives told me that they could not remember anything like it. It was the only form of protest that these people had left; it was the only way that they could demonstrate that, in suffering for his faith in God and his belief in the inherent freedom of man, the Cardinal had won their hearts and their spiritual allegiance.

You have seen what the Communists can do to those in their power, even so great and determined a man as was Cardinal Mindszenty. The millions of people who live back there behind the Iron Curtain can call neither their bodies nor their minds their own—the only freedom left them is that of spirit. And so I ask you today, my friends, to unite with those people back there in spirit, whether they be Poles or Czechs or Slovaks or Hungarians or any other of the oppressed. There is so little that we can do for them in their hour of need, so little help that we can give, at least we can support them in spirit. Do not be sleeping while they are waiting out their Gethsemane.

I am not of the Catholic faith, but I have the most tremendous respect and admiration for any organization which has sons as ready to fight and die for it as was Joseph Mindszenty. However, Mindszenty was not defending the principles of the Catholic Church alone. He was the champion of freemen everywhere who believe in their right to worship the Lord in their own way and according to the dictates of their own conscience. And, my friends, as long as we have men of the caliber of the Cardinal who are prepared to sacrifice everything for that belief, no Communist dictatorship can ever defeat us. The Christian religion has been persecuted before but the blood of the early martyrs gave it new life and strength in its darkest hour and the Roman Emperors found that when one convert was given to the lions, two appeared to take his place.

The martyrs of the 20th century, among whom Mindszenty is first only because of his religious rank, the martyrs behind the Iron Curtain today are also giving of their blood to ensure that the Christian religion will never die. This is something which transcends denominational lines. And while we cannot relieve their physical and their mental sufferings, we can be with them in our hearts. And in the hearts of all of us, they will live forever.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we here in free America today, on the fifth anniversary of the sentencing of Mindszenty to life imprisonment in a Communist jail, take note of this man who, with many thousands of other heroes behind the Iron Curtain, showed the world how to live and, if necessary, how to die. The spirit of freedom burns strong in the human heart and, by encouraging that spirit everywhere, by helping to keep it alive and glowing in his own native Hungary, Mindszenty did not suffer in vain. No totalitarian rule can ever triumph so long as men such as Cardinal Mindszenty have the faith in God and in the freedoms which are God-given, the faith which will move mountains. Let us hope that the example of Cardinal Mindszenty will keep that faith alive forever. And let us hope that the spirit of resistance to communism inspired by Mindszenty—that that spirit will continue to grow behind the Iron Curtain. Let us hope that that faith and that spirit will become so great that one day we will see liberation and freedom and independence again in that part of the world. It was in this cause that Mindszenty was martyred.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the gentleman that Members of the House join him in the views which he has expressed with respect to Cardinal Mindszenty as typifying the slavery in which the countries of Eastern Europe are held and the suppression of religious freedom and, indeed, religious opportunity of any kind as we understand it, and to hope that the gentleman on our Committee on Foreign Affairs may give the matter further consideration at this session of the Congress, as it has before.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

I must say at this point that I received a telephone call from Monsignor Varga last Tuesday evening requesting me to make some appropriate remarks on the floor of the House today on the occasion of this tragic anniversary. As I have already explained to my colleagues, this specific request is made of me because I knew Cardinal Mindszenty personally, and because I was in Hungary attached to the United States Legation in Budapest at the time the cardinal was arrested, tried, and sentenced, and needless to say I was more than happy to accede to this request.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I shall be glad to.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I wish to compliment the gentleman for the very fine speech he is giving us here today reminding us of the fifth anniversary of the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty; and I want to compliment the gentleman for taking this occasion to give this speech, which I believe is an historic one, because as he has indicated we know that he was there during this period and was living behind the Iron Curtain for a period of two or more years experiencing what it really means to live under the Communists, and particularly the facts pertaining to the fiendish preparation for the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. We in the free world can hardly believe some of the things that happen in Communist courts; we find it hard to believe because we do not appreciate the extent to which the Communists have gone to prepare defendants for trial, the tortures that are inflicted upon defenseless people.

The gentleman is associated with me in the hearings in the Baltic committee in which similar tortures and religious persecutions have been related. But more important is the fact that we in the United States do not fully realize that the Soviets have instituted a systematic plan for the destruction of religion. It is only when one begins to realize the extent to which these fiends in the Kremlin will go, that we can begin to understand how defendants such as Cardinal Mindszenty can be brought to the state where he would be forced to plead guilty to almost any charge.

The apprehension that the gentleman indicated at the outset of his talk that this was perhaps the beginning, and that there would be other persecutions of a similar nature, certainly proved to be true. We have had similar situations in Czechoslovakia; Archbishop Jozaf Beran was removed from his position, and most recently we have had the persecution in Poland of Cardinal Stefan Wyszuski, and also the persecution of Protestant and of Jewish clergyman, in all of the Iron Curtain countries. I am sure the gentleman is very familiar with those cases because, as the gentleman will agree with me, I am sure, the Communists know that having invaded the field of the spirit, they will find a real resistance in the things of the spirit they knew that they must destroy this resistance in Christianity or in Judaism in order to maintain their power.

I think the gentleman is doing a wonderful thing in bringing this matter to the memory of this House, to keep alive the martyrdom that Cardinal Mindszenty has suffered.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to join my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] in commending the gentleman in bringing to the attention of the Congress and the country the deplorable experience that Cardinal Mindszenty endured as a prisoner of the Soviets. I, along with him and with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] and members of the Baltic Committee, have learned a great deal through the testimony offered last December at our various hearings in New York, Chicago, Detroit, and Washington, of the intense and bitter barbarism that exists in the minds of the Soviet leadership, especially against religions of all kinds.

I was chairman of the Katyn Massacre Investigating Committee, of which the gentleman who is occupying the chair at this time [Mr. O'KONSKI] was a member. Through our hearings in this country and also in England and in Europe we had testimony which brought out just what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] is talking about. Those Katyn hearings revealed the barbarism and the uncivilized state

of mind that exists among the leaders in the Kremlin in their mad rush for world domination. The Communist tyrants are trying to rule the world through fear, mass murder, massacre, and slave prison camps. Cardinal Mindszenty is one of the real heroes and martyrs which future world history will record as the real fighters in our future victory over the Communist menace.

I want again to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] for bringing this to the attention of the House.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I gladly yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to compliment the gentleman on his fine statement. I want to say that I think Cardinal Mindszenty, realizing that he was a prince of the church, was cognizant of the words of the Master when He said about the church, "Behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world." And, the gentleman has told that in his own way this morning. The fine expression that he has given this case deserves the commendation of the House.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. I, too, desire to compliment and congratulate the gentleman on the very stirring address in which he has given his own personal observations about a great man.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I, too, would like to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his timely and forceful comments on the imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty. The free world as a whole owes Cardinal Mindszenty, and men like him, an eternal debt. It is a very timely reminder which the gentleman from Michigan has given the House and I congratulate him for his presentation.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the fifth anniversary of the infamous trial and conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary by the leaders of communism. Cardinal Mindszenty still languishes in a dismal Communist prison—the protoype for the true Communist attitude toward religion. Since his imprisonment many thousands have joined the ranks of those victimized for this cause.

The most recent case that ranks with that of Cardinal Mindszenty is that of Cardinal Wyszysnki, of Poland. In many respects the two cardinals have parallel positions. Both were spiritual heads of the Catholic churches in their countries. Both were courageously outspoken in their devotion to the principles of their faith, and both were looked upon as sources of inspiration to their people in resisting the atheistic doctrines of communism.

The world has not forgotten Cardinal Mindszenty—nor have we forgotten the millions of others who suffer under the yoke of Communist tyranny. Perhaps this anniversary of the Cardinal's fake trial will serve to remind everyone of their great desire for freedom.

ATTACKS ON OUR GOVERNMENT AND OUR CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, our Government and our Constitution are being subjected to many attacks. Some are made openly, some by stealth.

Those which are made openly can be recognized and resisted promptly and effectively. Undercover attempts to break down our form of government with its three separate and independent departments, under which our system of checks and balances is preserved, are more dangerous than direct and open attacks. Efforts to break down our system through disguised and stealthy attacks may remain undetected and unsuspected until irreparable harm has been done.

Our form of government with its three separate departments was the result of the wisdom and foresight of our country's founders. They knew that with the legislative powers vested in an independent Congress, neither the executive nor the judicial departments of the Government would ever be able to override the will of the people of this land. They knew that with the principles of our Government proclaimed in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and with that instrument itself providing that it can be amended only by a two-thirds vote of the House and Senate and a ratification of the amendment by the legislatures or conventions of three-fourths of the States in the Union, that the Constitution could only be legally amended when amendment was wanted by two-thirds of the Members of both Houses of Congress and by the people in three-fourths of the State of this Union. They knew that no pressure group or combination of pressure groups would be able to foist upon the people an unwanted amendment, and that when the organic law of the land was legally changed, it would truly express the will of the people.

The Constitution itself requires that United States Senators and Representatives, all members of the State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and the State governments, shall take an oath to support our Federal Constitution.

Throughout the years and the generations since 1776, we have been fortunate in having public officials who respected and observed their oath to support the Constitution of the United States. Throughout these years and generations our Government has stood firm, and our system of checks and balances has operated to prevent either department of Government, or a combination of any two of them, from usurping functions which do not properly belong to them.

Yet, in this present generation, there has developed an insidious movement to destroy this system of checks and balances.

I refer to a scheme which has been devised by the radicals and leftwingers of this country, both in the Government and out of it, spearheaded by such organizations as the Americans for Democratic Action, to ignore the provisions of the Constitution, to completely bypass Congress, to thwart the will of the people, who have made no move to set into motion the machinery for changing our Constitution. This scheme which these radicals and minority pressure groups have devised is one to amend the Constitution and change the laws by judicial legislation. Such a scheme can only be put into operation through bypassing Congress and through a usurpation of legislative functions by the judicial department.

I have previously called attention to this practice in speeches both on the floor of this House and elsewhere. On August 15, 1949, I pointed out that the Supreme Court was engaging in this practice. On June 18, 1953, I again called attention to this practice.

Not only has the judicial department of our Government, represented by the Supreme Court of the United States, engaged in this judicial legislation by usurpation of legislative functions, but the judicial department has now been joined by the executive department. The executive department began its collaboration with the judicial department in bypassing Congress when the Solicitor General of the United States, either as the express direction or through the connivance of the President, filed a brief as a "Friend of the Court" in the case of Henderson against Southern Railway Co., pending in the Supreme Court. This was a case in which Henderson sought a decision to change the existing law which was and had been for years to the effect that a railway company was not legally required to feed whites and blacks at the same table in a dining car. To effect this change in the law, which was a legislative function, and not a judicial one, required a construction of the Constitution which amounted to a constitutional amendment, inasmuch as the law, both constitutional and statutory, had been settled for years that no such requirement existed.

This approval of the executive department lent enough respectability to the radical groups who were joining Henderson in his far-fetched and absurd claim to give the Supreme Court all the impetus they needed to amend the Constitution and change the laws in that particular case. They had previously lifted themselves over the fence by their own bootstraps and engaged in judicial legislation in cases involving white Democratic Party primaries, admission of Negroes to white universities, and outlawing restrictive covenants in warranty deeds.

So in the Henderson case, a trial balloon was sent up by the executive and judicial departments to see how the people of the country would respond to this usurpation of legislative functions by a combination of the executive and judicial departments of our Government. Although this action was resented greatly, many people felt that this action possibly would end the usurpation of legislative powers, and because of an ingrained and deep-seated respect for the processes of Government and a strong disinclination to repudiate those who have been placed in official positions of authority, Congress and the people have permitted this usurpation of legislative functions up to this point.

Encouraged by these results, the radical groups and the executive department have spread themselves much further now, and we now find not the lowly Solicitor General, the smallest officer in the Justice Department, filing briefs as a "Friend of the Court" in behalf of these attempts to secure judicial legislation. We find in the cases now pending in the Supreme Court affecting the rights of States to operate their own public-school systems, the Attorney General himself, together with the Assistant Attorney General, a special assistant to the Attorney General, and six other attorneys in the Justice Department signing the briefs, and a note stating that two other attorneys in the Department of Justice also assisted in the historical research. We therefore find 11 lawyers in the Justice Department purporting to represent the people of the United States, in a 188-page printed brief, urging the Supreme Court to enact more judicial legislation and to further amend the Constitution by handing down a decision to the effect that the sovereign States of this Nation cannot, in the operation of their school systems, send white children to one school and Negro children to another, even though the facilities of each are equal.

It is an astounding thing that the Attorney General's office can assign 11 of its attorneys to any such task as this when in the same year that this was being done, Mr. Warren E. Burger, Assistant Attorney General, representing the Attorney General's office before the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, was emphasizing their shortage of lawyers in the Department, and what it was costing the taxpayers of the country in dollars and cents because they were more than 5 years behind with their work. I quote the following testimony of Mr. Burger on March 2, 1953, when he was testifying before the Subcommittee on Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, on page 47 of that subcommittee's hearings:

> I am startled, if I may use a strong word, to find that there is a minimum of $475 million worth of caseload, business of this Department, more than 5 years old. How much more I do not know because I did not anticipate asking for a breakdown by years of more than 5 years. * * *
>
> We are, in round figures, I do not want to try to be exact, about 5 years behind in the work of that division, with the result that interest is running on a very, very large part of the claims against the Government in that section.
>
> I have had several people try to give me estimates as to how much interest the Government is losing. I will not present it as an estimate but as a reasonably informed guess that it is costing the Government upward or downward of $1 million in that one section of the civil division because of the lag in the workload. I think it is more than $1 million. That is my own judgment on it.

But, being more than 5 years behind in their work, having so many cases unattended to that it is costing the taxpayers in the opinion of Mr. Burger, more than $1 million a year because of this nonattention to business by the lawyers of that Department, the Attorney General nevertheless has enough lawyers to put 11 of them at work preparing and filing a 188-page brief in the Supreme Court in an unauthorized effort to speak for the people of the United States in an attempt to procure that Court to again bypass Congress, the States, and the people, and hand down another judicial legislation and Constitution-amending decision.

I am pressed for time, and this adds to my load of work, but I do not intend to sit silently by and see our Constitution ignored and our system of checks and balances destroyed through any such action without protesting such action as vigorously as I can.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. The gentleman has a most enviable record in the State of Georgia, as one of the outstanding jurists that our State has produced. I want to congratulate the gentleman upon the logic of his discussion and upon his ability to correctly interpret the law. If the gentleman has time, I would like to pursue another matter with him at this time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORRESTER. I want to ask the gentleman if he read the decision of the United States Supreme Court to the effect that a grantor in a deed to real property has no right of action for damages or court relief arising by reason of the grantee's conveying that property to persons of other races, although the property was deeded with a covenant that grantee would not deed said property to persons of certain races? Did the gentleman read that decision?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have not read it in full; I have read reports on it, and I have asked that the reference be furnished to me at my office so I may read it in full.

Mr. FORRESTER. The reasoning of the court in that case, I may say to the gentleman, was that such restrictions might injure some unidentified person at some time in the distant future. I want to ask the gentleman: Does not that theory and that reasoning violate every rule of law?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman in the conclusion which he has reached about that provision.

Mr. FORRESTER. Does not that decision in effect amount to confiscation of the grantor's property? For instance, the grantor might own 10 city lots. By observance of that covenant the value of the property would remain high and maybe advance, but willful violation of the covenant by the grantee, which was part of the consideration of the deed, destroyed the value of the balance of the property owned by the grantor.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is certainly the effect of it.

Mr. FORRESTER. Has not the gentleman seen that in action right here in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would say to the gentleman that I have seen here in the District of Columbia many blocks of property formerly occupied by white people exclusively that when submitted to what is referred to as the blockbusting technique, that is, one Negro family would move into a block, immediately all the other residents of the block began a pell-mell effort to sell out and move and go to some other section where they are not subjected to that practice. That means that the property owners here in the District of Columbia and elsewhere have to sacrifice property values and lose dollars and cents rightfully theirs because of this very Supreme Court decision.

Mr. FORRESTER. In other words, it is nothing less than a deliberate confiscation of property.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Certainly it is; and I want to say to the gentleman also in that connection that I saw an article in the Washington papers 2 or 3 days ago to the effect that a statement has been issued by the authority in charge of public housing here in the District of Columbia that they had tried out a system of integration in certain public-housing projects and had found that it worked all right, that no incidents resulted from it. Let me say in this connection that in the first place these unfortunate people are low-income people who must by reason of necessity live in these housing projects. They represent only a small percentage of the people of the District of Columbia. They are there because they have to be through force of circumstances.

They know that if they create an incident, they will be put out; they, therefore, do not dare to protest any action of those in authority, whatever it may be. The mere fact that they have moved some Negro families into those low-income housing projects and the white occupants have not moved out, is in no sense of the word indicative of what the attitude of the people generally in the District of Columbia is with reference to moving Negroes into white sections. If you want to find what the real sentiment is among people who are at liberty to act for themselves, look at some of these blocks where the property owners live in the houses. What happens to them when some Negro family moves in—a blockbuster? They sell out and move.

Mr. FORRESTER. I would like to ask the gentleman another question, pursu-

ing this decision I was talking about a little further. Has the gentleman in all of his life, either as a lawyer or a judge, ever read of any decision prior to the decision of the United States Supreme Court which held that a grantor in a deed could not recover damages from the particular grantee although the grantee might be allowed to convey that property and that the person buying from that grantee would not be liable? In other words, this is a complete confiscation of property and a property owner is entitled to have his property protected.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have read, and the gentleman has, too, of cases where a contract was entered into for illegal purposes, such as to operate a bawdy house, or the owner of a bawdy house had purchased furniture and the seller could not recover the price of it because it was to be used in a criminal enterprise; but so far as a contract that was entered into, not violative of any criminal provision of the laws of the land, I recall no such decision at the moment as the gentleman has referred to.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the gentleman has had to say. In my opinion his speech was merely an expression or a restatement of what I consider to be basic fundamental American philosophy. In another week or so we will observe our annual custom of having Washington's Farewell Address read to us herein the House of Representatives. If we listen close enough we will find that George Washington in his Farewell Address recognized the fact that at some time in the future the Constitution would be under an indirect attack when he admonished the people that if the Constitution be wrong in any respect, he said let it be corrected in the manner provided in the Constitution.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is the only way it legally can be corrected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In the form of an amendment and letting the people pass upon it. There are those, I am sure, who will argue that because of changing times there should be changes in the interpretation of the Constitution. With that I entirely disagree because I agree with Washington that if we are to change the Constitution let us not change the Constitution, nor should we change the law, by judicial interpretation or judicial legislation, as the gentleman has pointed out. What the gentleman has said will be but a voice crying in the wilderness, but I want to repeat, it is basic, it is fundamental, even though it may be drowned amid the clamor of highly organized and heavily financed pressure groups who have no regard whatsoever for our triparty system of Government or for the Constitution upon which it is based.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution. Whenever the time comes, and from actions recently in evidence it appears to be very close by, that our Constitution can be changed in any manner other than that which the Constitution itself provides, then our Government, which has been strong and which has been a bulwark of freedom, liberty, and opportunity through the ages and generations, will very likely fall down around our ears. Of course, the radical groups and the minority pressure groups and their followers are responsible now for these attempts to bypass Congress; but any illegal change in the organic law of the land is dangerous not only to those against whose interest it takes place at the time but to every person in this country.

While now those who favor these policies and principles on which these usurpations of legislative functions are based, there may come a time when the court will be packed with persons of a different philosophy and then those who promote and welcome and embrace these things now will find that they have done so to their own great injury.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. When the integrity of any one of our branches of Government is destroyed, our Government will fall down amid the rubble. What the Justice Department is asking the Supreme Court to do—and incidentally, it is the same thing they asked them to do in the Henderson case—they are asking the Supreme Court to rule not on the law as the law is written but on the law as they think it should have been written.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In my opinion that is very dangerous, and if the law is not right, let us change the law in the legal manner.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is the only safe thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to make more speeches spotlighting these activities, and I shall continue to point out that amendment of the laws is a function which belongs to the legislative department, and that amendment of the Constitution is a function which belongs to the Congress, the States, and the people.

POLITICAL BLUNDER AGAINST CIVIL SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlemen from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield last week expanded the Republican politicians' policy of sabotaging civil-service protection to Federal employees when he ordered the dismissal of Postmaster James Neugebauer, of Gary, Ind. This, to my knowledge, is the first official notice that Indiana postmasters are to be the next victims of the Republican program to circumvent and nullify the Federal law extending protection and security to Federal employees.

Political leaders in the new Republican administration have been laying the groundwork for almost a year with disgruntled employees in various post offices to undermine incumbent postmasters so the appointment of postmasters throughout the United States be relegated into the maelstrom of partisan politics. Had the vast majority of postmasters throughout the country realized that the new Republican administration in the Post Office Department would be a party to circumvent the civil-service law, they would have resigned January 20, 1953, and be content with the knowledge that the postmasterships were once again under the club of the political spoils system. Had the Postmaster General informed all incumbent postmasters of this fact, the sabotage and brainwashing which a great number of incumbent postmasters have submitted to in the last 8 months could have been avoided. This campaign of harassment against postmasters by certain employees in the Inspection Department has been a well-organized political conspiracy to force incumbent postmasters to resign. If the postmaster fails to resign, a foundation would then be laid for the filing of phony charges in order to create a vacancy for Republican politicians.

I hold no brief for the few who have been discharged by reason of malicious misfeasance and malfeasance in office. Officials of this type have been dismissed under both Republican and Democratic national administrations and these dismissals have been accomplished in conformity with civil-service regulations.

The case of the discharging of Postmaster Neugebauer, at Gary, Ind., is a malicious, intentional and unlawful circumvention of the civil-service law as set out by Public Law 720, passed in the 75th Congress. James Neugebauer was appointed postmaster October 1, 1950, from the ranks of the postal service. He started in as substitute carrier in 1935 and, through diligence and application, made an outstanding record as a postal employee for almost 20 years, with the exception of the time he served in the Armed Forces during World War II. At the time of his appointment, he received the endorsement of dozens of prominent businessmen and postal patrons in the city of Gary. He also received the endorsement of veterans and labor organizations. Since being postmaster, he has received the following ratings from the Inspection Service of the Post Office Department: In 1950, his rating was 94.5. There was no inspection rating given out in 1951. In March 1952 he received a rating of 91.5, and in 1953 he received a rating of 94.5. In the year 1949, before Mr. Neugebauer became postmaster, the office showed a loss of $100,633.69. In 1953, the Gary post office showed a gain of $89,511.00. Today the postal patrons of the city of Gary, including big business, small business, groups, individuals, Republicans and Democrats generally, comment with high praise on the outstanding postal service which Postmaster Neugebauer has installed. The Chicago Tribune, of Friday, February 5, 1954, on page 5, in commenting on Neugebauer's ouster, stated the following:

It was reported in Gary that Neugebauer instituted many reforms and improvements in mail service, and incurred the dislike of some employees because of crackdowns on loafing and excessive sick leaves. Last

month Neugebauer received a congratulatory telegram from Postmaster General Summerfield which said delivery of mail last Christmas in Gary had been better than in years.

All the above improvements of service have been accomplished by Neugebauer in spite of the fact that three or four politically minded, disgruntled employees in the Gary post office have been harassing and attempting to undermine the postal service in order to hinder progress and discredit the postmaster.

I am confident that it will be proven to the satisfaction of the Civil Service Commission that this small group has been working in conjunction with Republican politicians in an effort to oust Neugebauer. Postmaster Neugebauer informs me that if the Civil Service Commission fails to uphold him on his appeal, he will take advantage of his veterans preference rights given under Public Law 720 and ask that the Federal courts not only protect him but also decide whether the veterans' civil-service law can be nullified and circumvented by patronage-seeking politicians.

Congressman HALLECK, our distinguished majority leader, was quoted in the newspapers and over the air yesterday, in a speech which he delivered before the Republican National Committee on Saturday, as follows, and I quote from the February 7, 1954, edition of the Washington Post:

He called for congressional legislation firing all present postmasters, most of whom he said, were appointed under civil service by the preceding Democratic administrations. "I'll vote for a bill to throw them all out," HALLECK said, adding: "They were blanketed in. It's a phony civil service."

I wish to commend my good friend and colleague from Indiana for being frank and advocating the repeal of the civil-service law as the only legitimate and legal way to secure Republican postmaster appointments throughout the Nation. If the majority leader would file his repeal bill and follow through, it would save incumbent postmasters the humiliation and disgrace of the brainwashing and harassment that they have been subjected to during the last year. If Congressman HALLECK's repeal of civil service would be enacted into law, every incumbent postmaster in the country no doubt would resign in 24 hours.

I find that this brutal purging of postmasters for political advantage is not an occurrence peculiar to Gary. Two Democratic Senators—SPARKMAN and MONRONEY—have reported publicly that this same pattern is followed elsewhere—a pattern of postal inspectors sent in to hunt for pretexts for bringing charges against Democrats.

As an example: The Department's Inspection Office located in Chattanooga, Tenn., was requested to investigate the postmaster at Sylacauga, Ala. An inspector of Republican faith was sent to Sylacauga to conduct this investigation. After weeks of inspection, this inspector finally recommended that the incumbent postmaster at Sylacauga be commended for doing such a splendid job. When this report was received in Washington, a letter was immediately fired back to the Inspection Office at Chattanooga that a reinvestigation be started immediately because "this postmaster owns one-half interest in the local newspaper and during the presidential campaign of 1952 this newspaper wrote an editorial mildly in the support of the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket." The Inspection Office was told specifically to choose an inspector for this second inspection whose ideas coincided with those of the new Washington team.

In the little town of Elkhart, Ind., the Republicans fired the postmaster for suggesting publicly that Mr. Summerfield's background as automobile dealer and political boss of the GOP were not ideal qualifications for this new post. This, incidentally, is not the only case of thought control by the new Post Office administration. Recently they impounded the mail of a poor old Oklahoma cowboy who was sending out postcards which intimated that Secretary Benson's farm program was not bringing perfect results to cattle raisers.

We hear of other peculiar things in the Post Office Department. An inspector tells a postmaster "We're going to file charges against you. We don't know what they are now, but we will before we leave." A postal inspector charges a postmaster with hiring a secretary in violation of civil-service rules. The secretary is the needy widow of a postal inspector and the inspector who filed the charges is the same one who asked the postmaster to hire the widow.

The evidence of fake charges, cheap political trickery, to obtain Republican patronage in the Post Office Department is widespread, but I believe it is the duty of Democrats to rise above politics on this issue and do all we can to save the Republicans from their own greed for patronage. If we can keep the efficient people in the Post Office Department and keep politics out, it will be unnecessary to pass Postmaster General Summerfield's bill to increase letter postage to 4 cents. Having great faith in the Civil Service Commission and our Federal court system, I am confident that the postal patrons of Gary, Ind., will enjoy the present, efficient postal service under the executive leadership of Postmaster James Neugebauer for a long time in the future.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. I do not know whether the gentleman from Indiana realizes it or not, but the Post Office Department has already made ready the guillotine by either dismissing or the bringing up of charges and suspending 152 postmasters or postmistresses throughout the country up to this date. We have had two interesting experiences in New England. One of them is the postmistress in the town of Agawam, a Mrs. Brady, who is a widow. Her husband had been a veteran. She is also a gold-star mother, and had a daughter in the service.

They have brought up these trumped-up, phony charges about which the gentleman has been talking against Mrs. Brady. The people of the town, which is a strongly Republican town, all came to her help. As a matter of fact, they had a mass meeting. Last Thursday night the leaders of the town organized and had a banquet in her honor, and over 300 people attended the banquet.

Those who live by the sword will die by the sword. This administration fired the postmaster of the city of New Haven, Conn., and for the first time in many, many years a Democrat was elected mayor of the city of New Haven. This retribution will show in the end. The people just will not stand for it. I do not want the gentleman from Gary, Ind., to think he is alone in this problem. This is a nationwide problem.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. JENKINS in two instances.

Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. SADLAK).

Mr. HOPE.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR).

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 9, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1241. A letter from the Assistant to the Chairman, Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, transmitting a minority report submitted by Representatives DANIEL A. REED and RICHARD M. SIMPSON, pursuant to Public Law 215, 83d Congress, approved August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 472) (H. Doc. No. 290, pt. 11); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1242. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of December 1953, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1243. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the Sixth Annual Report of the District of Columbia Armory Board, pursuant to section 10, Public Law No. 605, an act of June 4, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1244. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the Department of the Navy's fifth annual report on the disposal of Navy excess property in foreign areas, pursuant to section 404 (d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, (40 U. S. C. 514 (d)); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1245. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on withdrawals and restorations of public lands in certain cases, pursuant to an act approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847, 16 U. S. C., sec.

471, 43 U. S. C., sec. 141, et seq.); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1246. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. E. G. Wellman which will, when approved by the regional director, region 2, National Park Service, authorize him to operate a saddle horse concession within Glacier National Park, Mont., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1247. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed list of the lands exchanged for the patenting to States, counties, and municipalities of lands classified chiefly valuable for recreational purposes in exchange for lands of equal value or equal quantity, pursuant to the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741, 43 U. S. C. sec. 869); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1248. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 19th Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 23 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, approved June 6, 1934, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1249. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the report of the activities of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public for the period as of December 31, 1953, pursuant to section 1211 of Public Law 763, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1250. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 14, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on the Illinois and Mississippi Canal, Ill., and also to review prior reports on the Rock River, Ill., and Wis., particularly as regards the advisability of improvements in the interest of navigation above Sterling, Ill., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 24, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1251. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 8, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Wilmette Harbor, Ill., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Committee of conference. House Joint Resolution 358. Joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation (Rept. No. 1184). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GROSS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 7554. A bill to provide for compensation of certain employees on days when departments or establishments of the Government are closed by administrative order; with amendment (Rept. No. 1185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4984. A bill to remove certain limitations upon the purposes for which the city of Miles City, Mont., may use certain land heretofore conveyed to it by the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5620. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to correct an incomplete and faulty survey in township 8 north, range 53 west, of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado, and to issue patents describing any new areas included in lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 in sections 1 through 6, township 8 north, range 53 west of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado; with amendment (Rept. No. 1188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6251. A bill to authorize the abolishment of the Shoshone Cavern National Monument and the transfer of the land therein to the city of Cody, Wyo., for public recreational use, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VAN ZANDT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4231. A bill to authorize appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of certain individuals who were killed in action or who died or shall die as a result of active service in World War I, World War II, or between the period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending on a date proclaimed by the President or the Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 1190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 459. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1191). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VELDE: Committee on Un-American Activities. Annual report of the Committee on Un-American Activities pursuant to House Resolution 5, 83d Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 6290. A bill to discontinue certain reports now required by law; with amendment (Rept. No. 1193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. House Joint Resolution 300. Joint resolution to provide for the conveyance to the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation of certain surplus land situated in Kerr County, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 7371. A bill to provide for the disposal of paid postal-savings certificates; with amendment (Rept. No. 1195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 962. A bill for the relief of Gabrielle Staub; with amendments (Rept. No. 1179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2441. A bill for the relief of Husnu Ataullah Berker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3961. A bill for the relief of Margherita Di Meo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4738. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Hittrich; without amendment (Rept. No. 1182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Teherepnin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1705. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jesse Bell; with amendment (Rept. No. 1186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 7763. A bill to amend certain sections of chapter 21 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7764. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 7765. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the requirement that a widow once entitled to a current insurance annuity must have a child of the deceased employee who is under the age of 18 in order to remain entitled to such annuity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 7766. A bill to establish an effective program for the planning and construction of needed public works and to create the Office of Public Facilities Administrator; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7767. A bill to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment program; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 7768. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to include in the definition of "agriculture" the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained and operated for farming purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 7769. A bill to provide for apprentice or other training on the job in agricultural occupations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7770. A bill to provide institutional on-farm training for the veteran who performs part of his course as the employee of another; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7771. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to reduce from 3 years to 6 months the period of limitation upon the

assessment of estate taxes and upon proceedings in court for the collection of such taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 7772. A bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 7773. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country without payment of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 7774. A bill to establish a uniform system for the granting of incentive awards to officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 7775. A bill to provide for the development of a sound and profitable domestic wool industry under our national policy of expanding world trade; to encourage increased domestic production of wool for our national security; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 7776. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 7777. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the income-tax exemptions allowed for a taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents, and the additional exemptions allowed for old age and blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 7778. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7779. A bill to amend section 422 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7780. A bill to include all types of compensation paid to officers and employees of the Federal Government by the Federal Government within the scope of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7781. A bill to grant longevity pay-step increases to Federal employees on an equal basis upon the completion by them of 10, 13, and 16 years of service, respectively; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 7782. A bill to provide for payments by the Federal Government to States or local taxing units adversely affected by Federal acquisition, ownership, or use of defense production facilities, to provide for the taxation of certain Federal properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 7783. A bill to provide equal pension or compensation benefits to all veterans disabled in the military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7784. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican Border Service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 7785. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to make permament the increases in regular annuities provided by the act of July 16, 1952, and to extend such increases to additional annuities purchased by voluntary contributions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7786. A bill to honor veterans on the 11th day of November of each year, a day dedicated to world peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7787. A bill to provide for the payment of annuities to certain former employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 7788. A bill to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets at the United States Military Academy or as midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve or as cadets at the United States Coast Guard Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 7789. A bill providing for the development of a highway and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 7790. A bill to provide for the establishment of a policy of placing certain contracts in States having the lowest per capita income; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H. R. 7791. A bill to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 7792. A bill to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 7793. A bill to authorize the improvement of Anacortes Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7794. A bill to authorize the improvement of Neah Bay Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLVERTON (by request):

H. R. 7795. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OAKMAN:

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution amending the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, with respect to the pledge of allegiance to the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 434. Resolution requesting the President of the United States to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to the discharge of Federal officers and employees for security reasons during the past year; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. Res. 435. Resolution directing the chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to the discharge of Federal officers and employees for security reasons during the past year; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. Res. 436. Resolution directing the Attorney General of the United States to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to the discharge of Federal officers and employees for security reasons during the past year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolutions of the Massachusetts Legislature urging the Congress of the United States to investigate fully the unjust annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, and the atrocities committed therein by the Communist leaders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Massachusetts Legislature relative to a study and revision of the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, resolutions of the Massachusetts Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to certain legislation seeking Federal financial aid for flood control and pollution abatement; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to remove that part of the social-security law limiting the earnings of a recipient of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relative to a study and revision of Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to certain legislation seeking Federal financial aid for flood control and pollution abatement; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to deed the title to all the area of Fort Logan, except that area now used as a national cemetery, to the State of Colorado, together with all appurtenances thereto; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to continue to maintain and operate locks on the Kentucky River; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 7796. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 7797. A bill for the relief of Hans Horn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 7798. A bill for the relief of Vera Maria Luise Bitterlich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 7799. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Norman Rowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 7800. A bill for the relief of Adrian Van Leeuwen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7801. A bill for the relief of Adrian Van Leeuwen; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 7802. A bill for the relief of Hanna Werner and her child, Hanna Elizabeth Werner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 7803. A bill for the relief of Hector Mokhtarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7804. A bill for the relief of Renee Hamwee, Charles Hamwee, Sheila Hamwee, and Lillian Hamwee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7805. A bill for the relief of Esther Tawil, Isaac Tawil, Jaqueline Tawil, Kathy Tawil, Solomon Tawil, and Sarina Goldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 7806. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Bider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 7807. A bill for the relief of Heinz Gerhard Rolappe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 7808. A bill for the relief of Claudio Rodriguez (Puente); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 7809. A bill for the relief of Julian S. Lizardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

499. By the SPEAKER: Petition of President Consejo Puertoriqueno de Partidarios de la Paz, San Juan, P. R., protesting the dispatch of United States troops to countries near and bordering on Guatemala, which likewise constitutes a grave threat to the peace of the continent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

500. Also, petition of the secretary, Scioto County Democratic Central-Executive Committee, Portsmouth, Ohio, requesting enactment of legislation for an increase in the compensation of postal employees commensurate with the cost-of-living level; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

501. Also, petition of the clerk, Board of Supervisors of the County of Delaware, N. Y., opposing the proposed flood-control dam, Charlotte River, town of Davenport, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

502. Also, petition of the secretary, Medford Central Labor Council, Medford, Oreg., requesting that they be placed on record as in favor of personal income taxes being levied on income, regardless of source, and being opposed to any special exemption on income derived from dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Late Ernest Harold Cluett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1954

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the House will be saddened to learn of the death of Ernest Harold Cluett, late a Representative of Congress from New York.

Mr. Cluett was born in Troy, N. Y., on July 13, 1874. He was elected to the 75th, 76th, and 77th Congresses.

There are Members who are present today who served with him during those terms, and I am sure that they will remember him as a man of high principles and an able servant to those whom he represented in the Congress.

Mr. Cluett's life was a full one. He was a graduate of Williams College and later studied at Oxford University in England. Early in his career he became treasurer of Cluett, Peabody & Co. and in later years became chairman of the board of directors of that company.

During World War I he became head of the employment division of the Government arsenal at Watervliet, N. Y., and in 1918 he served on a special mission to France for the YMCA.

The Republican Party of New York State nominated him as its candidate for the United States Senate in 1934.

At the end of his term in the 77th Congress he retired from public life.

The people of my community will remember Mr. Cluett as one who devoted himself unsparingly to the welfare of the community.

It was my good fortune to have known Mr. Cluett intimately, and my respect and esteem for him was boundless.

I extend to the members of his family my deep and sincere sympathy in the great loss they have sustained and in their hour of bereavement. I hope they will find some comfort in the knowledge that his passing is mourned by a host of friends.

Anniversary of Cardinal Mindszenty Sentencing Reminds Us That All Freedoms Are in Jeopardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1954

Mrs. FRANCIS P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we in America must remind ourselves constantly of the pattern of aggression taken by the Communist conspiracy all over the world. Just as individual Communists are guided by a tight formula of behavior toward the end of dominating the world, so are individual acts of international communism not separate moves but part of an overall pattern to stamp out all opposition.

The menace of communism was emphasized by the brutality of its attacks on the Roman Catholic Church. But it was not just freedom of religion in Communist nations that perished. With it went freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of petition and freedom of speech. Only last week the Red-dominated government of Guatemala gave us a graphic example of that pattern. Besides expelling two American newsmen, it ousted a Franciscan missionary, the Reverend Sebastian Buccellato.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, today, the fifth anniversary of the life imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty, the Primate of the Roman Catholic Church in Hungary, we shall do well to review the pattern of events and remember that with the advance of the Red tide, all human freedoms are in jeopardy.

In 1948 when the Communists of Hungary had consolidated their position, and had virtually eliminated all political, economic and social groups opposed to them, they moved into another arena—the ideological and spiritual sphere. They hoped that their success in this arena would crown their firm hold over the populace of Hungary. In this phase of their struggle for supremacy, godless Communists were face to face with a devout people. And the Catholic people, always guided in the ways of God by their devoted and dauntless leaders, were no easy prey to Communist blandishments and brutalities. The clergy as well as the people were subjected to all sorts of cruelties; their freedom of movement was restricted; their activities were brought under surveillance and rigidly circumscribed; the religious press was muzzled, and freedom of speech became a thing of the past. Parochial schools were taken over by the Government and their properties were confiscated. Religious publications were banned, and many courageous clergymen were imprisoned or liquidated.

During all this time the Primate of the Roman Catholic Church in Hungary was displaying indomitable courage in condemning all these moves made by civil authorities. In his sermons he was exposing the villainy and brutality of the secret police. His was a defiant voice, and the Government sought ways of silencing him. Finally, on the night of December 26, 1948, 16 secret agents of the Government surrounded his official residence, arrested him on charges of antistate activity, and led him to prison. A few days later when the news of this startling event was revealed to the outside world, peoples in western democracies were stunned. Protest meetings were held in many countries condemning this arbitrary act of the Hungarian Government; our Acting Secretary of State Robert Lovett branded this act as a "sickening sham." These protests and condemnations, however, did not save the cardinal from prison. On February 3 of the following year he was tried and accused of espionage, treason, and black-market activities. It was reported officially that the cardinal admitted the charges and confessed his guilt.

On February 4, 1949, Great Britain and the United States officially protested to the Hungarian Government because representatives from their Governments

were not allowed to be present at the trial proceedings.

The appearance of the cardinal at various stages of the trial indicated quite conclusively that he had been "brainwashed." The result was a confession by the cardinal.

On February 8, 1949—5 years ago today—Cardinal Mindszenty was found guilty of treason, espionage, and currency offenses and he was sentenced to life imprisonment.

Since that fateful day, this humble servant of the church, this stanch champion of human freedom, has carried on his fight against tyranny and brute force from his prison in some unknown corner in Hungary. On this day, marking the fifth year of his life imprisonment, we pay tribute to him for his courageous defiance of evil forces and for his championing supreme ideals.

Last week President Eisenhower, in a letter to the United Catholic Organization for the Freeing of Cardinal Mindszenty, stated:

> We in the free world have not forgotten this is the fifth anniversary of Cardinal Mindszenty's trial and imprisonment. * * * The unjust nature of the proceedings against Cardinal Mindszenty is, of course, well known to the American people. They regarded the attack upon him as a blow against religious freedom in Hungary and an unprincipled attempt to destroy spiritual and moral influences in that country.

Development of Atomic Energy for Public and Commercial Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the development of information concerning atomic energy has been one of the most interesting epochs of modern times. Until a few months ago we looked upon atomic energy only as something that might be used in war with great destructibility. But we are now coming to realize the great possibilities of atomic energy in the field of domestic usefulness.

Probably no part of the United States has come to appreciate these great atomic energy developments any more than that part of the country that I have the honor to repreesnt in the Congress of the United States. Several months ago the Atomic Energy Commission, which by Federal law is directly under the control of the Congress of the United States, entered upon a tremendous atomic energy construction program in southern Ohio. This program is now well on its way, and is considered as one of the most wonderful programs of our time. The initial building program will cost the Government about $1,200,000,000. There will be several kindred programs that will operate with the main project, and these will also cost many millions, most of which will be furnished by private capital.

Fifteen power-producing companies have joined their finances together and are building two of the largest electric power plants in the country. The total production of these two plants is to be consumed by the atomic-energy plant to which I have referred.

Now that the Government has proved that atomic energy can be produced, the Congress and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am a member, are looking forward to the time when atomic energy will be produced and used for domestic purposes. Automobiles no doubt will be operated by atomic energy. Homes no doubt will be heated by atomic energy. In order that this phase of atomic energy might have a fair chance to develop the Atomic Energy Commission and the Congress are planning to encourage private industry to enter the field of production and distribution. The Commission has invited those private industries that are equipped to enter this field to present the Commission with plans as to what they are able and willing to do toward the furthering of this great program to make atomic energy useful. It is understood that already several of these groups are prepared to submit their plans and the Commission will soon be ready to consider them.

It is the belief that as soon as these plans are approved a plant will be constructed somewhere in close proximity to the present atomic-energy plants. The people of southern Ohio have been advancing the advantages offered by our own section. We feel that the wonderful showing made in the construction of the mammoth atomic-energy plant, and the two great electric power plants in southern Ohio will convince the Atomic Energy Commission that southern Ohio will be the ideal place for this new plant that will make atomic energy useful for domestic purposes. There are a number of desirable locations that can be secured in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Federal Communications Commission Requests Amendment of Communications Act With Regard to Protest Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing. Enactment of this legislation has been requested by the Federal Communications Commission. The reasons for the Commission's request are set forth in a letter which the Commission addressed on January 22, 1954, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In order to give the Members of the House of Representatives and all other interested persons an opportunity to study the Commission's arguments in favor of the proposed amendment, the letter of the Commission is set forth here in full:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commission wishes to recommend for the consideration of the Congress a proposed amendment to section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. A proposed bill is attached as an appendix to this letter. The objective of the proposed legislation is to clarify the so-called protest rule contained in section 309 (c) which was incorporated into the Communications Act by the Communications Act Amendments, 1952 (66 Stat. 711), so as to obviate the use of the new procedure as a device for delaying radio station grants which are in the public interest while at the same time retaining the rule's primary objective of providing interested parties with a means by which they may bring to the Commission's attention bona fide questions concerning grants made without hearing.

Section 309 (c) provides that all authorizations granted without a hearing shall remain subject to protest by any party in interest for a 30-day period. The protest must show that the protestant is a party in interest and must specify with particularity the facts relied on to sustain the protest. Within 15 days from the date of filing of a protest, the Commission must determine whether the protest meets these requirements. If the Commission so finds, the application involved must be set for hearing on the issues specified in the protest as well as such additional issues as the Commission may prescribe. The protestant has the burden of proof and the burden of proceeding with the evidence on issues set forth in his protest and not specifically adopted by the Commission. The Commission is directed to expedite protest hearing cases, and the effective date of the Commission's action protested is to be postponed until the Commission's decision after hearing, unless the particular authorization is necessary to the maintenance or conduct of an existing service. It should be noted that a bill extending the time in which the Commission may act on a protest to 30 days, H. R. 4558, has passed the House of Representatives and an identical bill, S. 1627, has been introduced in the Senate.

The protest rule has resulted in substantial delays in the construction and operation of new television or radio stations authorized by the Commission without hearing. For any party in interest may file a protest and it seems clear, under relevant court decisions, that the term "party in interest" includes not only existing stations in the same service as the grantee who might be adversely affected economically by the grant, but also stations in other broadcast services who might similarly suffer economic injury as a result of competition afforded by the new stations. Furthermore, if the protestant shows himself to be a party in interest and details his objections to the grant, the Commission is required to designate the application involved for hearing; it may not dispose of the protest on the pleadings, even though it would be otherwise possible to do so. And finally, since with respect to the authorization of new stations there is no existing service to be maintained, the Commission is required to postpone the effectiveness of the authorization pending any such hearing and the decision by the Commission. The result has been to make pos-

sible delaying tactics on the part of existing licensees or permittees attempting to forestall competition. And such hearings not only delay the effectiveness of the particular authorization involved but also occupy the time and efforts of members of the Commission's limited staff who could otherwise be utilized in connection with other proceedings, including necessary hearings involving competitive television applications.

In order to obviate these difficulties the enclosed proposal would amend section 309 (c) to make clear that while any party in interest could protest a grant of a permit made without hearing, such protest would not automatically result in staying the effectiveness of the grant or require a hearing regardless of the merits of the claims advanced by the protestant. Instead, the proposed new language would provide merely that within 30 days of the filing of such a protest the Commission, upon consideration of the protest and any reply thereto, would issue a decision either affirming its previous grant or suspending its effectiveness and designating the application for hearing. The proposed revision would also provide that the filing of a protest would not operate to stay the effective date of the grant unless the Commission expressly so ordered. It is believed that the revised language would achieve the apparent objective of the protest rule in affording interested parties an opportunity to bring to the attention of the Commission questions about grants made without hearing and to obtain a determination thereon. At the same time, it would avoid the utilization of the protest rule as a device for delay on the part of potential competitors.

The Commission, therefore, recommends that section 309 (c) should be amended as set forth in the attached proposed bill. The submission of this proposal to the Congress has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. If there is any further information concerning this matter which the Commission can furnish you with, please do not hesitate to let us know.

By direction of the Commission:

ROSEL H. HYDE,
Chairman.

The Ohio Valley Is Fast Becoming a Great Industrial Section

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, soon after the close of the Revoluntionary War, there began a movement of people toward the settlement of the West. The Ordinance of 1787 set up what was then known as the Northwest Territory, and soon thereafter the hardy pioneers proceeded to migrate to the great West. The first settlements were made in southern Ohio. Marietta, Chillicothe, and Gallipolis were, in that order, the first settlements. Marietta was founded in 1788—Chillicothe in 1789—and Gallipolis in 1790.

The great river in that section had for many years been named Ohio by the Indians. The name Ohio in the Indian language means "beautiful river."

The pioneers moved into Ohio with great hopes and in great numbers. In 15 years there were 40,000 pioneers living in Ohio. Ohio was admitted into the Union in 1803.

The Ohio River and the Ohio Valley have offered many encouragements to people and to industry. A few years ago one of the great industries of the country caused a survey to be made so as to ascertain where, east of the Mississippi River, electric power could be produced and distributed most economically and most advantageously. This survey indicated that there was no doubt but that this distinction should go to the Ohio Valley.

In response to this survey there has been a tremendous development in the manufacture of electric power in southern Ohio in the past 4 or 5 years. These developments are continuing, and as a result the Government is building an atomic energy plant in that section. Many other smaller industries are coming into that section.

For a few years I and a number of other men and organizations have been promoting the location of an airfield in that section. The city of Portsmouth, near which the Government's great atomic plant is located, has been pressing, vigorously, for Federal aid in the construction of an airport. We have shown the great increase in big Government business and other businesses in our section. We have also shown that the people of the city of Portsmouth, believing that the Government would extend some aid to this airport program, issued bonds in the sum of $400,000. This would be an ample contribution on the part of the people. The city of Portsmouth felt that this would be proof of their faith in this project.

Other people of that section of the State, not only the people of Portsmouth, have done their best to convince the proper Government officials and congressional committees of the necessity for this airport, still the money raised by the city of Portsmouth from this bond issue is reposing in the Portsmouth banks, and the bonds are drawing interest in the hands of those who own them.

This airport should be built. I hope the proper Government officials and the proper congressional officials willl do what should be done under the conditions. At present there is no airport within about 100 miles, and there are many Government officials interested in the millions of dollars the Government is spending in that section of the country. The airplane is an accepted method of travel, and while this airport will be to the advantage of the people of that section it will be of great and immediate advantage to the hundreds of Government officials, engineers, and employees who will be coming and going into that section.

I hope the people of southern Ohio will keep up their fight for this airport—they deserve consideration. I shall continue my efforts in this just cause.

Will the Government officials and the Congress tell the people of Portsmouth that the $400,000 which they have on deposit in the banks will avail them nothing, and that these fine people must go on paying interest on the bonds which were sold on the market several months ago?

Inspection of Cuban Agriculture and Sugar Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1954

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1938, as amended and extended, the producing areas which provide our sugar are allotted quotas. In 1953 the respective areas supplied approximately the following proportions of our total sugar consumption: Domestic beet 21 percent; domestic cane, 6¼ percent; Hawaii, 13 percent; Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands, 14 percent; Cuba, 33 percent; Philippines, 11 percent; other foreign countries, 1⅓ percent.

The Sugar Act, which has been under the jurisdiction of this committee since its inception, was last extended in 1951. The present extension of the law continues to December 31, 1956.

In carrying out its responsibilities with regard to this legislation, the Committee on Agriculture is undertaking, during this period when extension and revision of the act is not immediately before the committee, to familiarize itself with the conditions and problems incident to production in the various areas.

At the invitation of the Government of Cuba and as the guests of that Government, the committee was able to make an inspection of the Cuban sugar industry and other phases of Cuban agriculture in the period January 23–30, 1954.

Presented herewith for use of the Committee on Agriculture and for the information of other Members of the House is a brief report of that study:

INSPECTION OF CUBAN AGRICULTURE AND SUGAR INDUSTRY

The Sugar Act of 1937, regulating production of sugar for the American market, has been one of our most successful agricultural programs. It has provided American consumers, even during the war years, with an ample supply of sugar at a reasonable and stabilized price level, at times even below world market prices.

At the same time, the act has contributed materially to national security by making possible production of significant quantities of sugar within continental United States. Economically, the stability which operation of the act has brought to our own offshore areas (Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands) and to our neighboring nation of Cuba has been a most important factor in the greatly improved economy of the whole Caribbean area.

Financially, the program has operated consistently at a profit. In the 16 years of its operation it has returned a net profit to the Treasury, over and above all expenses including administration, of approximately $269 million.

The law has been amended and extended from time to time but has continued the basic concept of providing for production of part of our sugar supply in continental

United States and dividing the total consumption of this country between our domestic producing areas and our other historical sources of supply. The legislation has been consistently under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture.

The latest extension of the act was in 1951, at which time it was extended with minor changes through 1956. It is unlikely, therefore, that there will be any sugar legislation before Congress this year. In the course of the hearings on the 1951 extension of the act, the committee indicated the hope that it would be able to visit each of the major sugar-producing areas before the act came up for reconsideration again and familiarize itself more thoroughly with production in the various areas.

In conformity with that intention, a subcommittee visited Hawaii in the fall of 1952 and spent several days inspecting the Hawaii sugar-production industry. In the spring of 1953 a majority of the members of the committee visited Puerto Rico at the invitation and as guests of the Puerto Rican Government and obtained much valuable firsthand information on the place of sugar in that island's economy and some of the problems connected with its industry.

During the last week in January 1954 the committee carried out the third step of its intention to familiarize itself with the sugar-producing areas with an inspection of the Cuban sugar-producing industry. The committee's visit to Cuba was possible only because of the invitation of the Government of Cuba, since the committee obviously is not in a position to invite itself to make a detailed inspection of the industry of another sovereign nation.

The invitation of the Cuban Government was extended to the committee by the Cuban Ambassador to Washington on July 13, 1953, and was officially accepted by the committee in executive session on July 17. A subcommittee was appointed to work with the Cuban Ambassador in perfecting arrangements for the trip. All expenses of the trip were paid by the Government of Cuba.

As is customary in the case of field hearings and trips of the Committee on Agriculture, representatives of the press were invited to accompany the committee, and the meetings and inspection trips in Cuba were fully covered by reporters both from the United States and Habana.

The sugar harvest in Cuba starts about January 15 and is normally completed in 3 to 4 months. It was impossible, therefore, for the committee to make its visit during the recess of Congress and see the sugar mills in operations. The date of the inspection trip was set, therefore, at a time when it was anticipated that the mills would be in operation and that the legislative situation would permit members to be away from Washington for a few days.

The following brief summary of the committee's visit to the Republic of Cuba will give some idea of the scope of the studies conducted by the committee:

On its arrival in Habana Saturday, January 23, the committee was met by Chester Davis, the sugar economist of the American Embassy in Habana; John Johnston, the chief of our point 4 program in Cuba; and the director of experiment stations of the Cuban Department of Agriculture. The Ambassador assigned Mr. Davis and Mr. Johnston to the committee for the duration of its stay and they were a valuable source of information and interpretations.

The committee was also fortunate in having in its membership Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, who acted frequently as interpreter when members of the committee were interviewing farmers and others who did not speak English readily.

At noon Saturday the committee attended a luncheon meeting as guests of the Secretary of Agriculture of Cuba. In addition to the formal statements presented at the luncheon, the committee members discussed various aspects of Cuban agriculture personally with the large number of officials of the Cuban Department of Agriculture who were present. Later Saturday, members attended a reception at one of Habana's oldest newspapers El Diario de la Marina, at which committee members were able to discuss general Cuban business conditions with many of the outstanding Cuban and American businessmen of Habana.

Monday, January 25, the committee, accompanied by American Ambassador Gardner, went first to the Cuban Department of State for an official call on the Minister of State. Most of the rest of this day was spent at the Cuban Sugar Stabilization Institute in a meeting with the members of the institute and with the Association of Hacendados, the association of the sugar-mill operators.

Monday evening members of the committee were the guests of Gen. Fulgencio Batista at a reception and buffet supper at the President's palace. Committee members had an unparalleled opportunity during the informal 3 hours spent at the presidential palace for personal discussions with the President of the Republic.

Early Tuesday morning the committee left by auto for a Cuban agricultural experiment station at Santiago de las Vegas, a few miles outside of Habana. This experiment station is the headquarters of our point 4 agricultural program in Cuba and about 1 hour of the visit at the experiment station was devoted to a conference with those in charge of our point 4 program. The committee then inspected the operations connected with the growing and production of kenaf fiber, which is one of the major objectives of our point 4 program in Cuba. Kenaf is a rough fiber produced from an annual plant which can apparently be adapted with considerable success for growth in Cuba. It is a fiber which can be used readily instead of jute for the manufacture of burlap, bagging, and similar rough cloth.

Kenaf seems to hold particular promise for production in Cuba for two reasons: (1) Cuba is a large user of burlap and similar jute cloth for sugar bags and tobacco baling. Virtually all of this material is now imported. (2) Kenaf is normally harvested during the time of year when sugar is not being harvested and when there is little or no work in the fields for the large number of laborers who must be maintained to harvest the sugar crop. Development of the kenaf crop would give employment to many of these laborers during the off season of sugar production.

On its return to Habana, the committee inspected the modern central bank maintained by the Associacion de Colonos, the Association of Sugar Growers. The bank is operated on a cooperative basis and is similar to regional banks for cooperatives and production credit associations serving our own farmers. It serves as a central source of credit for the growers of sugarcane.

In the large auditorium on the top floor of the modern bank building, the committee then attended a mass meeting of several hundred sugar growers and farmers. The statements presented by these Cuban farmers were similar to the many statements the committee has heard from American farmers during the course of its recent hearings throughout the United States.

Like any American farmers, Cuban sugar farmers are faced this year with a sharp reduction in their quotas. Cuban sugar quotas have been reduced by about 1,500,000 acres this year, or about 17 percent of the total acreage planted. Like American farmers, Cuban producers of sugarcane are also caught between lower prices for their crops and rising or stationary costs of labor and other production expenses.

Wednesday morning the committee left by bus for a 2-day trip into the interior of the island southeast of Habana. It was accompanied on the trip by officials of the Cuban Department of Agriculture, by the agricultural and commercial experts of the American Embassy in Habana, and by the directors of our point 4 program in Cuba.

The committee spent all day Wednesday visiting sugar plantations, a raw-sugar mill or "central," and a sugar refinery.

Although some modern machinery is used in handling the cane and transporting it to the mills, two-wheeled carts drawn by ox teams were still much in evidence in almost every field and the actual cutting of the cane is still entirely a hand operation. The cane cutting requires a labor force of from 500,000 to 700,000 workers during the 3 to 5 months of the cane harvest. The finding of some profitable employment for this army of sugar workers during the months when they are not employed in the cane fields, thus relieving the sugar industry of the entire burden of their support, is one of the obvious economic problems confronting the island nation.

The sugar mill visited by the committee, Central Cuba, is one of the more modern on the island. There are 161 such mills or "centrals" scattered throughout the sugar-producing areas of Cuba. These mills crush the juice from the cane and reduce it to crystalline raw sugar. Much of it is exported in that form but some is refined into granulated white sugar and other products in Cuba. Late on Wednesday the committee visited and inspected one of the large Cuban sugar refineries.

Thursday morning the committee went by airplane from Veradero, where it had spent the night, southeast across the island to Topes de Collantes, Trinidad, and Las Villas, in the Province of Santa Clara on the south-central coast of Cuba. This is one of the major coffee-producing areas of the island and the committee inspected one of the larger plantations. Here the committee also visited a new rural electric-generating plant and the Cuban forest-experiment station. A new tuberculosis hospital was also inspected at the special invitation of President Batista. The group returned to Habana by plane late Thursday.

Friday the committee went by bus almost to the western tip of the island to inspect the area which produces the famous Cuban tobacco. Stops were made at a number of tobacco farms en route. An informal luncheon meeting with tobacco farmers was held at the Cuban agricultural experiment station at San Juan y Martínes. The committee returned to Habana late that evening.

Saturday forenoon the committee visited the capitol building and afterward placed a wreath on the impressive memorial to José Marti, considered the father of Cuban freedom. Cuba is just completing celebration of the 100th anniversary of Marti's birth.

Before leaving Cuba, committee members made another visit to the American Embassy for a final session with its sugar expert, Chester Davis, and for general orientation on the information the committee had obtained.

In its inspection of the Cuban sugar industry and agriculture, the committee traveled about 650 miles by bus and automobile and about 350 miles by airplane. It participated in six formal meetings with agricultural groups and in at least twice that many informal discussions with groups encountered in the course of its travels. At least equally as valuable to the committee members as the group meetings, however, was the excellent opportunity throughout the committee's stay in Cuba, and particularly during the bus and auto trips into the rural areas, to discuss with individual Cubans the many aspects of Cuban agricultural and economic life which presented themselves.

The great importance of sugar in the relationships and trade between the United States and Cuba is easily summed up: Under the provisions of our Sugar Act, Cuba pro-

vides about 34 percent of the sugar consumed in the United States. This sugar normally comprises 80 to 85 percent of Cuba's total of all exports to the United States.

The dollars provided by our purchases of Cuban sugar comprise the funds for Cuban purchases in the United States so extensive as to make that nation our sixth best foreign customer and to give it a per capita consumption of American goods beyond that of any other foreign country except Canada. In 1952 American exports to Cuba amounted to about $1.18 for each dollar of our imports from that country.

The committee is deeply appreciative of the many courtesies and the great assistance extended to it throughout its visit by the Government of the Republic of Cuba and by the many citizens of the island who assisted materially in its quest for information. The committee desires particularly to express its thanks to President Batista for the generous manner in which he placed every facility and every office of the Cuban Government at the disposal of the committee during its visit to the Republic.

The committee also desires to express its appreciation to Dr. Aurelio F. Concheso, the Ambassador of Cuba to Washington, for his great assistance in making the arrangements for the trip, and to Dr. Mario Nuñez de Villavicencio, first Secretary of the Cuban Embassy, who accompanied the committee from Washington and throughout its entire trip, and who handled arrangements for transportation and accommodations in most exemplary fashion.

The committee is also grateful to Dr. Alfredo Jacomino López, Minister of Agriculture of Cuba, for placing the informed personnel and the facilities of his department at the service of the committee and for personally accompanying the committee on much of its inspection of the island's agriculture. Also to Dr. Miguel Angel Campa, Minister of State of Cuba, who assisted the committee in many ways, including the assignment of Dr. Charles A. Mendiola and Sr. Pedro Diaz, of the Cuban State Department, who were of great assistance to the committee throughout the entire period of their visit to Cuba.

The committee also desires to express its appreciation to Mr. Arthur Gardner, American Ambassador to Cuba, whose personal assistance and cooperation, and that of his able staff, added much to the information obtained by the committee during its visit.

Statement by Hon. Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho, Regarding Atomic Energy Commission's Reactor Testing Station on the Lost River Desert of Eastern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 8, 1954

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement which I made regarding the Atomic Energy Commission's reactor testing station established on the Lost River Desert of eastern Idaho some 4 years ago.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I address myself to a matter which I hope will not be construed as emanating purely from State or local pride, because I sincerely believe it is one which should evoke national admiration.

My reference is to the magnificent manner in which the Atomic Energy Commission's reactor testing station, established on the Lost River Desert of eastern Idaho some 4 years ago, has been integrated into the area community, both economically and socially. The results of this integration are so outstanding that they should provide the pattern for AEC operations elsewhere. They demonstrate that an instrumentality of the Federal Government can be made to function as a cohesive part of a community without overpowering it. And they establish that local communities, with a desire to progress without the frothing, transitory impetus of a boom, can rise to meet the challenge thrust upon them by suddenly increased population loads.

Mr. President, my purpose in these remarks is intended for more than mere boasting. It is to call attention to the ideal conditions, the unusually fine community atmosphere and the vast potentials of the area for further expansion of AEC operations there. As a matter of fact, I feel it would be the ideal location for the headquarters of the international atomic pool when it is created. It is at the east Idaho reactor station where theory is being converted into the practical. If for no other reason, that is why the area would be the ideal and sensible location for the headquarters of the pool.

Further, the area is superbly suited for the construction of the atomic reactor powerplant which the AEC intends to serve as the pilot facility for the production of electric power through atomic energy. The east Idaho project already has available the brains and the trained personnel to perfect such a powerplant—the men who developed the propulsion mechanism for the *Nautilus*, America's first atom-driven submarine. It would also be desirable to develop the prototype reactor powerplant there because the power could be used to good advantage at the reactor station.

It is my hope that the Atomic Energy Commission will not overlook Idaho during consideration of these matters.

When the AEC picked the eastern Idaho area from a list of 74 prospective sites for its reactor testing project, I know that there was great concern among the people of my State that the AEC would follow the pattern established elsewhere and construct a Government town.

Idaho Falls, Arco, Blackfoot, Pocatello, and other communities of eastern Idaho opposed construction of a Government town because they had learned of the endless difficulties which beset areas where such projects were established.

They said: "Let us meet the challenge of housing and community facilities. We can absorb the impact, we can save the Government millions of dollars and we can avoid the frictions of living as neighbors to an artificial, Government-run community."

Happily, the decision was made to integrate. The result has been the savings of millions of dollars of taxpayers money and orderly growth. I would like to quote from the December issue of Engineering News-Record, which discussed the National Reactor Testing Station in east Idaho:

"The nature of the work at NRTS has led to marked differences in the development program there from other AEC installations. These factors stand out:

"There is no Government town.

"There have been no labor troubles.

"Major work has been divided among several design firms and several construction firms rather than lumped into one big job."

I would like to quote from an article written by Herman Edwards, a staff writer for the Portland Oregonian, who visited the NRTS in east Idaho:

"NRTS employees have found housing facilities sufficient for their needs. Most find two or more choices of residence, and rentals and other costs apparently have not been boosted. The visitor gains the impression these new people have been accepted into the Idaho communities in an hospitable spirit as new neighbors rather than as new and transient sources of revenues."

Mr. President, the potential of Idaho and especially in the atomic area in the eastern part of the State has been tapped to only a small degree. Opportunities are unlimited. The AEC would do well to recognize this.

Morale in the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1954

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a great deal about morale in the postal service. Numerous studies are being conducted by both Houses of Congress, by Departments and agencies, to determine a proper program to bring about improved morale.

It seems to me that the answer to the problem is very simple indeed. There are two ills that have plagued the postal service. I do not believe it is necessary for the Congress or any committee of Congress to conduct any lengthy involved study to determine what these ills are and what is the proper remedy to correct these ills.

We simply have to pass legislation repealing the restrictions placed upon the postal service by the Whitten amendment, and pass legislation providing the postal employees with a decent American wage.

According to the last published report of the Postmaster General, there were 168,000 part-time employees, compared to 355,000 full-time employees. Obviously, this condition requires correction, and correction cannot be had until the restrictions of the Whitten amendment are repealed.

The Post Office Department is having a great deal of difficulty convincing men to accept employment. What chance do you have to convince a prospective employee to come to work for Uncle Sam when he can walk down the street and secure a position paying 20 or 25 cents more per hour? This is particularly true when the employing officer in the postal service cannot offer the man a permanent job and is compelled to offer him an entrance salary far below what he can secure in most industries.

In 1951, when we last adjusted postal salaries, the entrance pay in the post office was 2 cents above the average hourly earnings in factories. Today, the average hourly earnings in factories is 18 cents above postal pay. In the large cities, postmasters are finding it extremely difficult to recruit personnel. Hundreds of people take an examination for entrance in the postal service, which is evidence of the fact that they have the desire to work for Uncle Sam, but when they are called to report for duty, it has been the experience in many large cities that well over 50 percent of these men refused to accept the position. They are offered a starting salary of

$62.88 a week. In 1953, the take-home pay out of this salary of a man with three dependents was only $54.52. Effective January 1, 1954, there was a reduction in withholding tax, which added the munificent sum of 50 cents to the take-home pay of this employee, so now in this period of extremely high prices, the postal employee with three dependents is expected to maintain an American standard of living with weekly income of $55.02. It simply cannot be done.

In talking with many of my friends in the postal service in Rhode Island, I find that a good number of them have been forced to take outside jobs in order to make ends meet. Others tell me that their wives have had to seek work outside the home in order to supplement the family's income.

Can we in the Congress permit such conditions to continue? Can we say that we are meeting our responsibility to Federal employees when we take no action to remedy the injustice with which they are presently faced? In my opinion, neither further study nor further talk constitutes a remedy. What the situation demands is a substantial pay increase now—not months in the future.

I am happy to learn that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has scheduled hearings on this important legislation commencing February 8. I wish to urge my colleagues on that committee to speed up these hearings so that we can pass legislation in the House of Representatives during the month of February and so that the postal employees will be given the increase that they so sorely need promptly in this session. In my opinion, this is an emergency situation and we should waste no time in correcting it.

His Excellency the Cardinal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure for me to be offered the opportunity to express the sentiments of the great people of the district I am honored to represent—the 13th District of New Jersey—especially when those sentiments recoil against the cruelties of man, recoil against cruelties as those imposed on Cardinal Mindszenty.

The letter sent to me recently by Msgr. Bela Varga, former speaker of the Hungarian Parliament, citing the gallant stand of his excellency the cardinal against the real goal of the Bolsheviks—submission of man to confiscation, torture, and death—reminds one how precious liberty is—worth life itself.

What is the lesson for Americans in this? For the people of Hungary and all the world? As each of us is strong, so do we strengthen each other. While a bundle of fagots cannot easily be broken, it can be, if the sticks are broken one by one. Thus do we in America address ourselves to the dignity of man and his inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, here and for the hereafter.

Socrates gave Europe its concept of soul. Christ showed man the beatitude of its salvation. Both were killed.

What of the upward road? The road from here to the hereafter: Lighted by men like his excellency the cardinal—saintly soul, glimpsed in his life are these lines:

I would be true, for there are those who trust me.
I would be pure, for there are those who care;
I would be strong, for there is much to suffer;
I would be brave, for there is much to dare.
I would be friend of all, the foe, the friendless;
I would be giving, and forget the gift;
I would be humble, for I know my weakness;
I would look up, and laugh, and love, and lift.

Thank you Msgr. Bela Varga, for calling to our attention the heroic epic of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty. We have not forgotten. The world will gain by his faith and example.

A Bill To Curb Illegal Gambling Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1954

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a bill which I am today introducing would substantially broaden the Lottery Act of 1895 so as to reach other gambling enterprises and gambling devices. Such a revision of the Lottery Act has been specifically endorsed by the American Bar Association.

The Lottery Act was the very first blow aimed by Congress at organized crime in interstate commerce. It quickly put an end to the national lottery racket which has outgrown the powers of any State, 60 years ago. So this is a tried and true approach. Expanding it to include other kinds of gambling is a most logical way to deal with today's overlords of crime who are still fattening themselves on nationwide gambling operations in all the other categories except lotteries. It is no accident that lotteries are not the problem now. It is virtually certain that other illegal gambling activities—most notably illegal bookmaking—will respond just as readily to this same approach.

H. R. 7311, introduced on January 18, 1954, is designed to control the interstate transmission of gambling information upon which illegal bookmaking largely depends. This so-called wire service bill, coupled with the instant measure, would effectively blanket the gambling activities of notorious crime syndicates.

Under leave granted, there follows a copy of the bill to amend chapter 61 of title 18 of the United States Code:

A bill to prohibit certain acts and transactions with respect to gambling materials

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 61 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 61—LOTTERY AND GAMBLING ENTERPRISES

"Sec.
1301. Importing, transporting, or mailing gambling or lottery materials.
1302. Postmaster or employee as gambling or lottery agent.
1303. Broadcasting gambling or lottery information.
1304. Fishing contests; track racing events; foreign publications.

"SEC. 1301. Importing, transporting, or mailing gambling or lottery materials.

"(a) Whoever knowingly brings into the United States for the purpose of disposing of the same; or whoever knowingly deposits with any express company or any other carrier for compensation or carries in interstate or foreign commerce; or whoever knowingly deposits in the mail, or sends or delivers by mail—

"Any letter, package, postal card, or circular concerning any gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme of any kind offering money or other prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance;

"Any gambling or lottery ticket or part thereof, or paper, certificate, or instrument purporting to be or to represent a ticket, chance, share, or interest in or dependent upon the event of any gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme of any kind offering money or other prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance;

"Any punchboard or pushcard;

"Any check, draft, bill, money, postal note, or money order, for the purchase of any ticket or part thereof, or of any share or chance in any such gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme, or for the purchase of, or in payment of any chance taken on, any punchboard or pushcard, or in payment of any bet or wager in connection with any gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme of any kind offering money or other prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance; or

"Any newspaper, circular, pamphlet, or publication of any kind containing any advertisement of, or soliciting any business in connection with, any gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme of any kind, offering money or other prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance, or containing any list of the prizes to be drawn or awarded by means of any such gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme, whether such list contains any part or all of such prizes, or containing any advertisement of any punchboard or pushcard

shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both; and for any subsequent offense under this section shall be imprisoned not more than 5 years.

"(b) Whoever knowingly takes or receives any paper, certificate, or instrument purporting to be or to represent a ticket, chance, share, or interest in or dependent upon the event of a lottery, gift enterprise, or similar scheme, offering prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance, or any advertisement of, or list of, the prizes to be drawn or awarded by means of any such lottery, gift enterprise, or similar scheme, which have been brought into the United States or deposited with any express company or any other carrier for compensation, or carried in interstate or foreign commerce, shall be fined

not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"(c) All matter, the mailing of which is forbidden by subsection (a) hereof, is hereby declared to be nonmailable and shall not be conveyed in the mails nor delivered from any post office, nor by any letter carrier, but shall be withdrawn from the mails under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe.

"(d) For the purposes of this section the phrase 'punchboard or pushcard' shall include such boards, cards, or similar devices designed and manufactured primarily for use in connection with gambling, but shall not include devices numerically keyed to an answer sheet or containing no numerical identification of individual plays and designed and manufactured primarily for amusement purposes.

"SEC. 1302. Postmaster or employee as gambling or lottery agent.

"Whoever, being a postmaster or other person employed in the postal service, acts as agent for any gambling or lottery office, or, under color of purchase or otherwise, sends gambling or lottery tickets, or knowingly sends by mail or delivers any letter, package, postal card, circular, or pamphlet advertising any gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme of any kind offering money or prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance, or any ticket, certificate, or instrument representing any chance, share, or interest in or dependent upon the event of any such gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme, or any list of the prizes to be drawn or awarded by means of any such gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme, whether such list contains any part or all of such prizes, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 1303. Broadcasting gambling or lottery information.

"Whoever broadcasts by means of any radio station for which a license is required by any law of the United States, or whoever, operating any such station, knowingly permits the broadcasting of, any advertisement of or information concerning any gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme of any kind offering money or prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance, or any list of the prizes to be drawn or awarded by means of any such gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme, whether such list contains any part or all of such prizes, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"Each day's broadcasting shall constitute a separate offense.

"SEC. 1304. Fishing contests; track racing events; foreign publications.

"The provisions of this chapter shall not apply with respect to—

"The sponsorship, management, or advertisement of any fishing contest not conducted for profit wherein prizes are awarded for the specie, size, weight, or quality of fish caught by contestants in any bona fide fishing or recreational event;

"The sponsorship, management, or advertisement of any track-racing event to which the general public is admitted and upon which betting is legal under applicable State laws; or

"The importation and distribution of any foreign newspaper, pamphlet, or other publication distributed as a bona fide medium for news, information, or opinions in any foreign country."

Count Albert Apponyi, of Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD a sketch I had prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress of the life and ideals of Count Albert Apponyi, of Hungary. In my opinion it is a good thing to refresh our memories from time to time of the careers of men who have led inspirational lives so that their example might further inspire present generations to meet the problems that still beset us boldly, objectively, and with foresight.

The sketch follows:

February 8 marks the anniversary of the death in 1933 of one of Europe's most respected elder statesmen, Count Albert Apponyi, of Hungary. He was long a leader in Hungarian public affairs. A man whose authority was moral more than political he was respected even more for his own personal integrity rather than for his public positions. Throughout his extensive career he was a man who stood above politics and in all things remained true to his own principles and ideals.

Although he was a member of one of Hungary's oldest aristocratic families, Count Apponyi was devoted to the precepts of democracy and to progressive social reform. He believed in "social equality in everything which is fundamental to human dignity and to the requirements of human happiness."

Following the death of the great patriot, Louis Kossuth, Count Apponyi succeeded to the leadership of the Hungarian Independence Party. As its head he was an advocate of universal suffrage and a strong supporter of Hungarian independence. His long and distinguished career in his country's service included many prominent posts—speaker of the house of representatives, minister of education, minister of worship and privy councilor.

Count Apponyi, however, is best known for his distinguished career in the field of international relations. Although he was an ardent supporter of Hungarian nationalism and a great patriot, he saw beyond the divisions of geographic and ethnic boundaries. Even before the creation of the League of Nations he devoted himself to the cause of world peace. In this respect, his work as a member of the Interparliamentary Union was especially outstanding.

After World War I he pleaded Hungary's cause at the peace conference with such dignity and nobility that he won the respect even of his enemies. He was indefatigable in his efforts to build up the League of Nations. His great gift of oratory enabled him to plead with conviction on behalf of international cooperation. He had faith that the "spirit and letter of cooperation will replace our old struggle for supremacy." Therein lay the only path of progress for the postwar world.

Count Apponyi himself was an example of the ability of patriotism and internationalism to reach a compromise. His belief that "no nation can enrich itself by destroying another" led him to the belief that international cooperation did not lead to the subjection of national sovereignty, but was in the national interest as well as in the interest of humankind. His career was itself patriotism and internationalism, each used for the highest good, separately and together.

Count Apponyi early recognized the increasing importance of the United States in world affairs. He had been an enthusiastic visitor of this country three times—first, as a delegate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference, and later as a highly successful guest lecturer. He was received with the same warmth which he himself felt for America. At a time when this country was being sharply criticized abroad, he praised it for "its youthful freshness, compared to which old Europe appears to be worn out." Europe had achieved her best, and in her ripeness there were already the first signs of decay. The world depended on American optimism and enthusiasm as well as on its rich idealism. Gradually this country was beginning to emerge from her traditional policy of no entanglements. But although Europe had reached and passed her zenith, her rich heritage could offer invaluable experience to a country entering the European scene as a relative novice. Europe's background and America's new vigor were in the eyes of Count Apponyi the strongest combination for the perpetuation of international peace and cooperation.

Fittingly enough, Count Apponyi died fighting to attain world peace while serving as his country's delegate to the International Disarmament Conference. Mankind has not yet reached its ultimate goal. More than ever it is important to realize, as Count Apponyi did, that its attainment is only possible through the effective cooperation of all nations.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Thou only art the fountain of our being, the light of all our seeing; our helper Thou amid the flood of mortal ills prevailing. Our puny mortal strength is unequal to the tests and tasks of these terrific times which are upon us; the arm of flesh fails us, we dare not trust our own devices and counsels. At this altar of Thy grace may our hearts be steadied and stilled, purged of self, emptied of strain and stress, filled with peace and poise, satisfied with each new morning just to wake and find Thee there: For Thine is the kingdom to which the future belongs, the power and the glory for ever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 8, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that today, February 9, 1954, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 373) to extend the time for filing claims for the return of property under the Trading With the Enemy Act.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints, from the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, established by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941, to fill existing vacancies.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARMORY BOARD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, together with a financial statement, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPERTY OF GERMAN NATIONALS HELD BY THE ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN — RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, there has been pending for some time in the Senate a bill providing for the return to German nationals of property confiscated during the war.

I call attention to a resolution on the subject adopted by the American Legion at its annual convention, held in St. Louis, Mo., on September 2, 1953. It is one of 35 resolutions adopted by the American Legion at its convention. The resolution reads:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE 35TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, ST. LOUIS, MO., SEPTEMBER 2, 1953

We urge that Congress by proper legislation return to German nationals, as has already been returned to Italian nationals, their properties seized and now in the hands of the custodian of alien property.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL TAXATION ON INTEREST FROM CERTAIN BONDS—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., on January 29, opposing Federal taxation on interest from bonds issued by any governmental subdivision, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING FEDERAL TAXATION ON INTEREST FROM BONDS ISSUED BY ANY GOVERNMENTAL SUBDIVISION

Whereas we are advised that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of Congress has, without a public hearing, voted to recommend a tax on the interest of certain State and municipal bonds; and

Whereas although the recommendation included only municipal housing authority bonds and bonds issued by States or municipalities for industrial development purposes, the inclusion of such items in any tax bill would provide an entering wedge for the taxation of the interest on all municipal obligations; and

Whereas the city council has consistently opposed any such taxation; and

Whereas on May 29, 1953, the council adopted a resolution opposing a proposal then under consideration by United States Treasury Department officials to require that municipal bonds be made subject to Federal income taxes; and

Whereas the taxation of interest from municipal bonds and bonds of governmental subdivision would increase the rate of interest required to be paid on such bond issues, resulting in additional local taxes to meet such increase; and

Whereas the burden of property taxes in Minneapolis is already among the highest of any large city; and

Whereas this city is faced with dangerously critical problems of raising sufficient local taxes to meet rising costs and new requirements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That we oppose any proposal which would permit Federal taxation of interest received from future issues of municipal housing authority bonds, bonds issued by States or municipalities for industrial development purposes, or bonds issued by municipalities or governmental subdivision for any purposes whatsoever; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to each Member of the House and Senate delegation in the United States Congress from Minnesota, and to the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

Passed January 29, 1954.

EUGENE E. STOKOWSKI,
Vice President of the Council and President pro tempore.

Approved February 1, 1954.

ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor.

Attest:

ARLENE R. PINKLE,
City Clerk.

CARE OF VETERANS—LETTER FROM SERVICE OFFICER, CHISHOLM, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a letter dated February 1, 1954, addressed to me by Clarence M. Carney, Service Officers, Veterans' Service Office, Chisholm, Minn., relating to care of veterans.

I believe his suggestions deserve consideration of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS SERVICE OFFICE,
Chisholm, Minn., February 1, 1954.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Due to the inability of certain disabled veterans to pass a physical examination for practically any type of employment in the field of industry, I am submitting for your consideration a Senate amendment to a bill, H. R. 7300, that where for 20 years or more, the Veterans' Administration has rated a service-connected disability of a veteran with over 25 percent, should at age 60 and upon application for rerating, be raised to 50 percent, and at age 65 to 70 percent, and that all other ratings of more than 70 percent or less than 25 percent be made permanent after 20 years.

It is logical to assume that this would remove thousands of patients from domiciliary care or soldiers' home care; also prevent many others from going to Veterans' Administration hospitals as they would be able to remain at home on outpatient treatment, thereby saving millions of dollars for the Veterans' Administration institutions.

I have arrived at this conclusion from personal contact with other veterans who have made application for domiciliary care and soldiers' home care and also hospitalization, and find that the majority would much prefer to remain at home if they were financially able to do so.

Yours very truly,

CLARENCE M. CARNEY,
Service Officer.

INCREASED DEPENDENT DEDUCTION—RESOLUTION OF HECTOR (MINN.) FARMERS UNION LOCAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Hector Farmers Union Local, Hector, Minn., in favor of increasing the dependent deduction for income taxes to $1,000, and urging the continuation of the present price-support program of 90 percent through 1956, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the cost of rearing and educating dependents has increased beyond the $600 a year, which the present income tax allows: Be it

Resolved, That the Hector Farmers Union meeting January 18, 1954, goes on record urging our Federal Government to increase this dependent deduction to $1,000.

Whereas the present price-support program for dairy products will expire April 1, 1954: Be it

Resolved, That the Hector Farmers Union local meeting January 18, 1954, goes on

record urging Congress to continue the present support program of 90 percent through 1956: Be it further

Resolved, That we favor a long-range program of production payment system. Let dairy products find their own price in open market and have Federal Government make an income payment to the farmer in such amount as market price may be below parity.

POSTAL SALARIES—LETTER FROM LOCAL 125, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Local No. 125, Minneapolis, Minn., concerning postal salaries, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS, LOCAL NO. 125,
Minneapolis, Minn., January 30, 1954.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Numerous measures were introduced in the 1st session of the 83d Congress by legislators who were cognizant of the immediate need for revision of the now inadequate salary structure of postal employees, and the early consideration of measures which will, by their enactment, improve the working conditions of postal workers.

I have taken the liberty of inclosing copies of those measures felt to be of the most urgent importance, foremost of which is the salary increase bill, S. 1685, introduced by Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota.

I'm sure I need not remind you of the ever-increasing high cost of living. Since the last salary increase in July 1951, the cost of living has risen to 116.6, an increase of over 14 percent. This is reflected in the decreased purchasing power for the basic necessities of life, leaving far too little for other vital services. The salary of postal workers has lagged too far behind the added costs of sustaining a family. This inability to meet living expenses and to buy the manufactured goods surely will reflect in the overall economy of our country, and gives added fuel to the depressing talk of a recession. If the Nation is to avoid such a calamity it must set the pace by encouraging the maintenance of a substantial living standard and a healthy purchasing ability.

Second in importance is the enactment of a personnel-management bill, such as found embodied in the measure S. 501, also introduced by Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota. The purpose of this measure is to extend to representatives of employee organizations the right to meet with department or agency heads and discuss policies which affect the morale and welfare of the represented employees. This is accepted as good-management practices in private industry. Why is it not accepted in Government? We don't ask the right to strike, but we do request a voice in policymaking where it affects the welfare and working conditions of employees. A happy worker means increased production and high morale, two important factors in business today.

The next measure requiring early consideration, and by no means of insignificant importance, is the repeal of the Whitten rider. This can be accomplished by passage of H. R. 4148, introduced by the Honorable JOEL T. BROYHILL, of Virginia. The Whitten amendment was attached to the Supplemental Appropriation Acts of the 82d Congress, with the intent of curtailing the appointment, promotions, etc., by agency or department heads. This has proven very detrimental, not only in the Post Office Department, but in other Government agencies as well. The President, too, has recognized this blight in the laws and has asked Congress to repeal the Whitten rider as soon as possible.

You and your office have been very cooperative in past years and have recognized the plight of Government workers and have helped to give them relief. I am sure you will again give every support to enactment of measures to correct the inadequate salary structure, and to improve the morale and welfare of postal employees with passage of this much needed legislation.

Thank you very much. With sincerest wishes for a healthy and successful year, I am

Respectfully yours,
LAWRENCE W. CHILDERS,
Cochairman, Legislative Committee,
Local 125, N. F. P. O. C.

POSTAL SALARIES—LETTER FROM CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES JOINT COUNCIL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the Civil Service Employees Joint Council of Minneapolis, Minn., concerning postal salaries, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES JOINT COUNCIL,
Minneapolis, Minn., January 25, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senator from Minnesota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: It is anticipated that hearings will begin soon by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on S. 1685, and other bills vitally affecting the living standards of postal employees.

As I recall it was in 1951 that a minor increase was granted in the basic pay of these workers. Based on present cost of living indexes and compared to the pay increases and fringe benefits negotiated by workers in private industry, postal employees are again in the untenable position of engaging high prices with insufficient income.

S. 1685 is a just and equitable bill, but will require real missionary work by its friends in the Senate to assure passage, assuming that it will be reported out of committee.

The joint council appreciates greatly your interest in and support of measures which have as their objective the raising of living standards for the entire group of Federal workers.

Your continued endeavor and leadership has been of great benefit to all civil service groups and has earned their commendation.

Sincerely,
DAVID FINNE, Sr.,
Secretary-Treasurer.

INCREASED FEDERAL SALARIES—LETTER FROM AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, LOCAL 390, ST. CLOUD, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the American Federation of Government Employees, Local No. 390, St. Cloud, Minn., concerning the need for an increase in Federal salaries, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES,
St. Cloud, Minn., January 30, 1954.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: During the last session of Congress we did what we could to try to impart the urgency of our request showing the necessity for an early and adequate pay increase.

We continue to support the passage of salary adjustments in accordance with H. R. 4556 and H. R. 4555.

Our requests for an adequate salary adjustment are based upon the following assumptions:

1. Last summer when we made our concerted effort to stimulate necessary interest in getting a pay raise during the last session of Congress, we were doing so from absolute necessity.

2. When it becomes necessary for most of our employees to secure additional part-time employment in order to supplement their regular Federal salary so that they may merely meet their current obligations, then there can be little doubt that the present Federal salaries are wholly inadequate.

3. When it further becomes necessary for mothers to work to supplement the income of the family because the father is unable to provide the family necessities from his inadequate Federal salary, it is essential that a pay adjustment be made.

4. The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor reports that in mid-September factory workers earned an average of $1.78 an hour. In contrast to this hourly rate, the following hourly rates are being paid at present for the following grades which represent most of our employees at the VA Hospital, St. Cloud, Minn.:

GS-1: $1.20 to $1.43 hourly.
GS-2: $1.32 to $1.55 hourly.
GS-3: $1.42 to $1.65 hourly.
GS-4: $1.53 to $1.76 hourly.
GS-5: $1.64 to $2.00 hourly.
CPC-1: $.87 to $1.04 hourly.
CPC-2: $1.16 to $1.37 hourly.
CPC-3: $1.23 to $1.46 hourly.
CPC-4: $1.32 to $1.55 hourly.
CPC-5: $1.43 to $1.66 hourly.
CPC-6: $1.54 to $1.77 hourly.

In making a further comparison between present annual income and the adjustments requested in H. R. 4556, we submit the following:

Grade	Present annual salary	Proposed annual salary
GS-1	$2,500–$2,980	[1] $2,900–$3,660
GS-2	2,750–3,230	[1] 3,410–4,170
GS-3	2,950–3,430	[1] 3,640–4,400
GS-4	3,175–3,655	[1] 3,915–4,685
GS-5	3,410–4,190	[1] 4,195–5,095
CPC-1	1,810–2,170	[2] 2,210–2,810
CPC-2	2,420–2,840	[2] 2,960–3,640
CPC-3	2,552–3,032	[2] 3,150–3,830
CPC-4	2,750–3,230	[2] 3,400–4,120
CPC-5	2,974–3,454	[2] 3,675–4,395
CPC-6	3,200–3,680	[2] 3,950–4,580

[1] For 9 years' service.
[2] For 7 years' service.

You'll notice that the salary increases are as follows:

GS 1: $400 to $490.[1]
GS 2: $660 to $750.
GS 3: $690 to $780.
GS 4: $740 to $920.
GS 5: $785 to $935.
CPC 1: $400 to $490.
CPC 2: $540 to $630.
CPC 3: $598 to $628.
CPC 4: $650 to $710.
CPC 5: $701 to $761.
CPC 6: $750 to $900.

In comparing our requested increases to those already received by the average factory worker in mid-September, we find that even after such adjustments as requested in H. R. 4556 would be made, the average salary for GS 1 and GS 2, and CPC 1, CPC 2, CPC 3, and CPC 4 would not exceed an annual salary of $3,709, which is about the annual salary equivalent of the average factory worker rate of $1.78 an hour.

Also taken into consideration is the fact that most of the turnover of Federal employees is amongst employees in the lowest salary brackets rather than in the upper brackets.

Also to be considered is the fact that the majority of employees are in the lower CPC and GS ratings. Therefore, since turnover is highest at this point and since the majority of employees are at this wage level represented by the lowest 4 CPC and lowest 4 GS levels, we feel that we can expect Congress to authorize raises which would at least raise the compensation to the levels requested by H. R. 4556. Most employees in these lowest grades would not have reached their maximum annual increases at this time, due to an excessive rate of turnover.

We take into account other factors, too, in requesting early action on this pay raise.

No salary adjustment has been made since 1951. The cost of living has continued to rise. We have not shared the benefits of salary adjustments which have been granted to others in industry and in the Government.

The one characteristic of Federal salary increases has been always too little and too late. Should this be the case for those Federal employees who are expected to do their job and do it right?

Any raise granted classified Federal employees will result in the return of at least 18 percent of such raise back to the Government in the form of income taxes. This does not even take into account the increased payment of State income taxes, which in turn would strengthen the stability of the Federal Government.

We have not even mentioned the fact that a substantial adjustment in Federal classified salaries is vital to the upward adjustment of the salaries of a large segment of the working population, thereby bringing salary income of this group of employees into line with other salaries throughout industry. Such action is vital in preventing the type of conditions which tend to create a depression in the economy.

In its executive council meeting at Miami in February 1953, the American Federation of Labor called upon its affiliated unions to press for higher wages in 1953 to prevent a major depression in 1954 or 1955.

The A. F. of L. council pointed out that an ominous disparity has developed between how much workers are able to produce and how much they are able to buy. When this gap is closed, it said, a substantial increase in the purchasing power of American workers will result and the national economy will be sustained as defense spending tapers off.

A. F. of L. President George Meany said this lag in purchasing power must be corrected if the Nation's industries are to continue to expand. If wages fail to keep pace with productivity, workers will not have enough to buy the goods, markets will collapse, factories will be closed, mass unemployment will follow, and a depression will result. If the present disparity continues for another year or more, we will produce more than we can consume. We will be back to where we were in 1929 when the collapse came.

Other labor leaders have expressed the same idea. Walter Reuther, in his address at the Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minn., expressed this same viewpoint when he spoke last fall.

It would seem to us that at this stage of economic recession, the Federal Government would at least consider the factor that an adequate salary increase for Federal employees at this time would contribute toward stimulating the economy to prevent or slow down further recession.

Any increase necessitated by the current cost of living applies to all Federal employees alike.

We urgently request that you take any action necessary to get the earliest possible action in securing an early adequate salary increase for all Federal employees.

We extend our thanks for action which you may be able to take to get early action on a salary increase.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH P. HACKERT,
Secretary, AFGE, No. 390.

[1] This represents the seventh step increase since annual increases at present do not exceed seven annual steps.

PER CAPITA PAYMENT TO INDIANS—RESOLUTION OF GENERAL COUNCIL, RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the General Council of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, on January 17, requesting the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Congress to approve the $50 per capita payment bill, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

"RESOLUTION 9—SERIAL NO. 800

"Whereas under date of February 15, 1953, a request was made by the General Council that a $50 payment be made to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, Resolution No. 1, Serial No. 716; and

"Whereas bills were introduced in the last session of Congress by Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN for the payment of $50 to each member of the Red Lake Band; and

"Whereas the chiefs believe they are entitled to be granted any request pertaining to their own funds on deposit with the Treasurer of the United States for the welfare of the Red Lake Band: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Council requests the Honorable Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and the Congress of the United States to approve the $50 per capita distribution of the timber fund belonging to the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians for the relief and benefit of the individual members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians as follows:

"1. The majority of the Red Lake workers are woods workers, and it will be impossible for them to work through the spring breakup which usually lasts for a period of 30 to 60 days.

"2. Funds are needed to buy seed, prepare for the planting season and for purchase of commercial fishing equipment.

"3. Tribal relief funds will be saved if said period of critical unemployment can be alleviated by this payment.

"4. The snow is deep in the woods, and this causes extra hardship among the Indians; it is further

"*Resolved*, That the general council requests enactment of the per capita payment bill in order to relieve unnecessary distress among the Indians."

Unanimously requested.

We, the undersigned, do hereby certify this to be an exact copy of resolution 9, in council proceedings, dated January 17, 1954.

JOSEPH GRAVES,
Chairman.

Redlake, Minn., January 25, 1954.

[SEAL] PETER GRAVES,
Secretary.

Action of superintendent:

FRELL M. OWL,
Superintendent.

PRICE SUPPORTS—LETTER FROM PRESIDENT OF CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think working men and women of America as well as farmers resent any efforts to drive a wedge between them.

Perhaps soundest evidence of that attitude was contained recently in a letter from Walter P. Reuther, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, to Chairman GEORGE D. AIKEN of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1954.

The Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: We denounce Secretary of Agriculture Benson's attempt to incite city workers against farmers and farmers against city workers by falsely stating that city workers are opposed to price supports for farm products.

Having pursued a virtually do-nothing policy for the past year when farm surpluses, so-called, were piling up to $5½ billion while millions of people have gone hungry in this and other countries, Secretary Benson now puts a question to the Senate Agriculture Committee that reeks with irresponsibility and lack of courage:

"At what point will the 140 million Americans who do not live on farms rise up—as they did in the potato fiasco of a few years ago—and demand not revision but outright elimination of all direct aid to agriculture?"

We do not believe the 140 million Americans who do not live on farms are now or are likely to become opposed to all direct aid to agriculture.

They are aware, as specifically pointed out in the Eisenhower administration's budget

sent to Congress January 20, that the direct Federal money aids to business exceed direct aids to agriculture, including net costs of price supports. The business aids do not include billions in additional subsidy given business apart from direct appropriation.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations has appeared at House Agriculture Committee hearings across the country in support of farm programs that will meet the standards proposed by House Agriculture Committee Chairman CLIFFORD R. HOPE (Republican, Kansas):

"1. Productivity must be maintained at a level to insure at all times (a) a supply of food sufficient to meet the needs of an expanding population at home and (b) whatever obligations this Nation may assume abroad; and

"2. Agricultural prices must be stabilized at levels that will afford farmers a fair share of the national income."

CIO members know that the American people are now being sucked into a spiraling recession that is farm led and farm fed and that can only be checked and reversed by bold action.

Creeping unemployment that began in the farm implement plants early in 1953 has now increased to more than 50 percent, and overall employment in the communities where these plants are located is now more than the 11 percent reported.

Notably, in the quad cities of Moline, East Moline, Rock Island, Ill. and Davenport, Iowa, where normally 55,000 men and women are employed, today more than 1 out of every 5 are out of work. In the 14 farm-equipment plants in these 4 cities, more than 17,000 production and maintenance workers are normally employed. Today only half are on the payroll, many downgraded to jobs paying 40 cents an hour less than they were making a year ago.

We know that the 16 percent drop in prices paid to farmers in the past 2 years and the $2.1 billion drop in net farm income, amounting to 14 percent, while the consumer price index rose from 112 to 114, have not only depressed the market for farm implements, automobiles, and trucks, but likewise have shrunk the markets for other products all across the industrial map. And this shrinkage has, in turn, resulted in cutbacks, shutdowns, layoffs and short time that further shrink purchasing power for both manufactured goods and farm products. We know that uncertainty and fear about future farm programs are making farmers postpone buying, even when they have funds, as proved by a transfer, during 1953, of $500 million from farmers' checking to savings accounts or bonds.

We want the members of the Senate and House Agricultural Committees and every Member of both Houses to know that we shall not be split away from and put in opposition to the working farm families of America.

As set forth in Resolution 30 adopted at the CIO's 1953 convention, we shall support the development of farm programs that will insure continued abundant production and, at the same time, put adequate floors under the incomes received by these families for producing that abundance.

We suggest that, instead of trying to set American citizens at each other's throats, as Secretary Benson is attempting to do, the Eisenhower administration quickly address itself to this simple proposition:

That food is grown to be eaten and fibers are grown to be worn and used;

That those who produce the foods and fibers should not be penalized for abundant production, but must be assured adequate incomes;

That consumption should be increased by bringing about, through investigation, exposure and, if necessary, antitrust prosecutions, reduction in exorbitant markups of food prices from the time they leave the farm gate to the time they arrive at the retail counter;

That so-called surplus foods and fibers should be moved into consumption and use within this country and abroad by methods that will strengthen, not weaken, our own and our allies' economies.

Bushels of wheat, gallons of milk, sides of meat, and bales of cotton are the cheapest and most effective munitions that can be used here at home and in the worldwide fight to strengthen freedom against the open and concealed attempts at totalitarian infiltration, subversion and aggression.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER P. REUTHER,
President.

INTERIM SURVEY REPORT FOR FLOOD PROTECTION OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER, WINONA, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution which I have received from the city of Winona, Minn., together with a letter accompanying it, and signed by the city recorder. The letter is addressed to me, in reference to the interim survey report for flood protection of the Mississippi River at and in the vicinity of Winona.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF WINONA, MINN.,
February 2, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Enclosed is a certified copy of a resolution passed by our council at last night's regular meeting, which is self-explanatory.

Our information is that the project has been approved in St. Louis and that it is now under consideration in Washington by the Corps of Engineers. We understand further that the next proper step is to get the project authorized either by inclusion in the ombnibus bill or by special legislation.

You know how important this project is to all of the citizens of Winona and the surrounding area, and we urge you to take whatever action may be necessary to get the project going.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Yours truly,

ROY G. WILDGRUBE,
City Recorder, City of Winona, Minn.

Whereas the plans for a flood-control project at the city of Winona, Minn., prepared by the district engineer, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, formally designated as "Interim survey report for flood protection on the Mississippi River at and in the vicinity of Winona, Minn.," have progressed to the point where the project is under consideration by the Corps of Engineers in Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas this council is extremely desirous of taking all necessary steps to assure prompt action thereon by the proper governmental authorities in Washington, D. C.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Winona, Minn., That the city recorder write to the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY, the Honorable EDWARD J. THYE, and the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, our representatives in the Congress of the United States, urging them to exert their greatest efforts to insure that the Winona Flood Control project is authorized and approved and appropriations therefor made at the present session of the Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the above-named Members of the Congress and to the Honorable C. Elmer Anderson, Governor of the State of Minnesota, with the request that he help in any way that he can to get the project authorized.

Passed at Winona, Minn., February 1, 1954.

WILLIAM P. THEURER,
President of the City Council.

Attest:

ROY G. WILDGRUBE,
City Recorder.

Approved this 1st day of February 1954.

LOYDE E. PFEIFFER,
Mayor.

RECLASSIFICATION OF EMPLOYEES BY RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—TELEGRAM FROM THE BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram which I received from W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen be printed in the body of the RECORD.

I would also like to have the telegram referred to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Mr. Kennedy states that the Railroad Retirement Board is attempting to displace experienced civil servants by reclassifying them in schedule C. We must put a stop to the constant raids on the civil service for the sake of pure political patronage.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Chairman Railroad Retirement Board attempting to displace Board's experienced department heads by reclassifying them in schedule C. Section 205, Public Law 162, 75th Congress, was intended to protect Board's employees against such actions. Your efforts to prevent such unjustified action will be appreciated.

W. P. KENNEDY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

INCREASED SALARIES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE JUDICIARY—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Committee on Judges' Selection, Tenure, and Compensation, adopted by the officers and board of governors of the Minnesota State Bar Association at St. Paul, January 23, 1954, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON JUDGES' SELECTION, TENURE, AND COMPENSATION ADOPTED AND APPROVED BY THE OFFICERS AND BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE MINNESOTA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION AT ST. PAUL, JANUARY 23, 1954

Resolved, That the officers and board of governors of the Minnesota State Bar

Association hereby approves United States Senate bill 1663, introduced by Senator McCARRAN, of Nevada, to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of the United States courts, and United States attorneys.

ADEQUATE PERSONNEL FOR FARGO VETERANS HOSPITAL—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., urging adequate medical personnel for the Fargo Veterans Hospital, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas the veterans of the Ninth District of Minnesota are served by the Fargo Veterans Hospital; and

"Whereas the Fargo Veterans Hospital has a capacity of 400 beds, but due to lack of sufficient doctors and other medical personnel, it has been necessary to limit the patient load to 120, which has deprived many veterans of badly needed medical care, and has resulted in a waiting list of from 100 to 200 applicants: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, in convention assembled at Minneapolis on August 3, 4, 5, 1953*, That the Administrator of Veterans Affairs be strongly urged to secure adequate medical personnel for the Fargo Hospital as soon as possible; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D. C., to the Representative in Congress of the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota, and to the two United States Senators representing Minnesota in Congress."

I certify that the above resolution was unanimously adopted by the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, in convention assembled at Minneapolis, Minn., on August 5, 1953.

CARL GRANNING,
Adjutant, the American Legion, Department of Minnesota.

ENFORCEMENT OF ANTITRUST LAWS — LETTER FROM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U. S. A.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 7, I placed in the RECORD a statement by a group of small-business organizations calling for a stricter enforcement of our antitrust laws. I have since learned that the Cooperative League of the U. S. A. has been working closely with the small business organizations and has associated itself with that statement. I ask unanimous consent that their name be added and that the enclosed letter by former Congressman Jerry Voorhis, executive director of the league, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 14, 1953.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWNELL: You are recently in receipt of a letter submitting the views of a number of organizations concerned with the welfare of small business in the United States for submission to your committee which is now studying the antitrust laws. The letter gave particular attention to the Robinson-Patman Act and urged both in the letter and in the accompanying memorandum addressed to the committee that nothing be done to weaken that act, but on the contrary, steps be taken to strengthen and clarify its provisions.

Had a time factor not intervened, the Cooperative League would have joined in the signing of these communications, but they were mailed before we had opportunity to secure clearance on the matter. Consequently, I am writing this separate letter. The position of the Cooperative League on this question can be described as follows: This organization is concerned first for the protection of the opportunity of cooperative organizations of every sort freely to grow and to develop in the United States, but secondly, we are concerned with the protection and the interest of the people as consumers. In this respect it is our conviction that the long-range interest of the people as consumers in the United States is best served by the maintenance of vigorous competition and particularly by the presence of a large number of small businesses in every field where they can possibly survive in the face of the ever-increasing concentration of economic control which is taking place in our country.

We presume it may be true that certain favored groups of consumers in certain favored areas might derive temporary benefit from lowered prices offered by very large distributors of nationally integrated organizations in case the Robinson-Patman Act were weakened or some of its provisions relaxed. But we are convinced that such action would be, at best, temporary and we are further convinced that it would be bought at a price of the elimination of many of the smaller competitive units in different lines of business so that the end result would be a further increase of economic power on the part of the large-scale distributing organizations and ultimately higher prices all along the line.

This organization therefore has constantly done what it could to protect the interest of genuine small-scale business in the United States whether or not that business was cooperative in its form of organization. We desire to take this same position in the instant case and are therefore writing this letter to join with the other organizations which communicated with you in defense of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY VOORHIS,
Executive Director.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 2920. A bill to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Cougar Dam and Reservoir on the South Fork McKenzie River, Oreg., with participation for power by the city of Eugene, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CORDON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2921. A bill for the relief of Ervin Fuchs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 2922. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Borromeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 2923. A bill to increase the compensation of certain members of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 2924. A bill for the incorporation of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2925. A bill for the relief of Evantiyi Yorgiadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2926. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to provide for the imposition of nominal charges or fees by the Commission for inspections, certifications, registrations, licenses, permits, or applications issued or provided by the Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATERPOWER RESOURCES

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, presently I shall ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill.

Prior thereto, I desire to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate to discuss the matters involved in the bill, because I believe the proposed legislation may well mark a milestone in the future development of the public resources of the United States.

In his budget message of January 21, of this year, the President of the United States again emphasized the views of the present administration with respect to the construction of public works in the United States, with particular reference to the doing of such work in partnership with both private industry, where possible, or in partnership with the States or with divisions of the States.

I now quote from the President's message, on page M81:

Standards for the justification of proposed water resources projects are currently being reviewed by the executive branch. Special attention is being given to requirements for the sharing of costs among private beneficiaries, State and local groups, and the Federal Government.

Again quoting:

This administration has also taken, and will continue to take, steps to encourage non-Federal interests to formulate plans and undertake development of water resources, including hydroelectric power, which are consonant with the best use of the natural resources of the area.

I quote further:

Federal activities in projects or plans will not imply any exclusive reservation of such projects to Federal construction or financing, or preclude local participation in them.

I quote further from the message, on page M83:

The power policy of this administration recognizes the willingness of State and local groups to participate in providing additional power facilities.

Mr. President, I have heard many of my colleagues from time to time discuss the overall problem of development of the natural resources of the United States, and advocate that the Government go into the public works field only when local interests or private interests cannot or will not do the job.

I am particularly struck by the soundness of the program enunciated by the

President in the message just referred to, when he advocates partnership between the Government and private industry or the States or political subdivisions of the States, in the same field of development of natural resources or safeguarding of natural resources by the construction of public works. The President particularly referred to the portion of public works that develops additional power.

Mr. President, the people of my State have gone into the matter sincerely. They have felt that the plan advanced was a sound one. They have felt there was an obligation upon local interests to step into this field and become partners with the Federal Government, wherever that was possible.

In western Oregon, approximately 125 miles south of the metropolis of Portland, is the city of Eugene, which now has a population of approximately 36,000, with a suburban area having a total population of approximately 75,000. That city has long maintained its own municipal water and electric system. It has made an outstanding record in the United States of efficiency, economy, and vision in the construction and operation of its electric-power facilities. Those facilities, Mr. President, are of a hydroelectric nature. The city is blessed in that it is near mountain streams which have a high potential for development as electric-power-producing streams.

The city has a water and electric board, set up for the purpose of constructing and operating these municipal utilities. That board has done a magnificent job in the matter of a thorough engineering examination into the potentialities of the area for additional hydroelectric generation, which it has now become essential for the city to acquire in order to meet the heavy demands for additional power, resulting from the rapid increase in population of the city, the suburbs, and the surrounding area.

Harkening to the President's words, the city of Eugene has made a complete engineering study of one of the proposed and presently authorized flood-control multiple purpose projects which is a part of the comprehensive flood-control system of the Willamette River Basin. The project in question is known as the Cougar Dam and reservoir project. It is located on the South Fork of the McKenzie River east of Eugene, Oreg., and is a flood-control project authorized by the act of Congress of June 28, 1938, with further recommendations in House Document 531, 81st Congress, 2d session.

It is now proposed by the Eugene Water and Electric Board that this authorization be amended to include power facilities at Cougar Dam which may be provided by the board—I emphasize the words "which may be provided by the board"—under a partnership agreement with the Corps of Engineers. The Federal Power Commission would be asked to issue a license to the Eugene Water and Electric Board for these power facilities.

The Corps of Engineers has proposed a revision in the design of Cougar Dam, recommending a rock-fill type dam to be constructed, with a saving of about 30 percent, as compared with the earth-and-gravel-fill dam proposed in House Document 531.

The Eugene Water and Electric Board employed engineering consultants to review the Corps of Engineers' plan and study the operational aspect of the joint use of Cougar Dam in the generation of power for the city of Eugene's system. These studies have shown that only slight modifications of the Corps of Engineers' proposed plan would be necessary in order to adapt the power output to that required by the Eugene system. The principal modification planned would increase the installed capacity from the 25,000 kilowatts proposed by the Corps of Engineers to approximately 35,000 kilowatts. This would permit its operation, on a semipeaking basis, at an annual load factor of 45 percent.

The modification would require construction of a regulating dam downstream from the Cougar powerhouse. An acceptable site has been tentatively selected at a point 2 miles below the dam.

The proposed modification would in no way detract from the conservation uses of the main dam and would permit the addition of extra generation capacity at the re-regulating site.

The fundamental purpose of the re-regulating structure would be to minimize fluctuations in the river level below the dam site. With the re-regulating structure added to the project, the maximum power output from the project and maximum use of the river for recreation can both be assured.

The project carries a cost-versus-benefit ratio of 2.4 to 1. That is an exceptionally high ratio in favor of benefit achieved as compared with cost incurred.

The total cost of the project, as amended and proposed to be further modified, would be in the neighborhood of $34 million. Of that amount, the power aspects would represent, overall, approximately $10,500,000, or 30 percent of the total. The proposal of the city of Eugene is that that city take over the cost of constructing the complete power facilities in that dam, including the re-regulating dam, to pay its fair proportionate share of the total cost of the dam and to take over the operation, for its own benefit, of the power facilities, construct the necessary transmission lines, and so forth, all at its own expense, and to pay annually its proportionate share of the operation and maintenance of the entire structure.

It proposes to do this through legislation authorizing an agreement between the Eugene Water and Electric Board and the Corps of Engineers, under which the corps would do the complete construction job, but the city would pay to the corps, as required, 30 percent of the overall cost. The city would, of course, have to make its case before the Federal Power Commission, as would any other applicant for a power license. It must comply with the requirements of the Commission.

The allocation of costs between the city, on the one hand, and the Government, through the Corps of Engineers, on the other, would be a matter which would be taken care of by joint action of the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. President, we have before us an opportunity to do exactly what the President of the United States has suggested as a sound basis for public improvement in the United States, where the Government undertakes to supply the money for that portion of the improvement which is of national interest and local interests are prepared to put up every dollar of the cost where they, and they alone, can use the resulting benefit. To me that is sound statesmanship. I congratulate the people of Eugene and their water and electric board on the sound program which they have advanced, and I am hopeful that this legislation will receive early and favorable consideration at the hands of the Congress.

I now introduce a bill to effectuate that purpose, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2920) to provide for the construction, operation and maintenance of the Cougar Dam and Reservoir on the South Fork of the McKenzie River, Oreg., with participation for power by the city of Eugene, Oreg., introduced by Mr. CORDON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the comprehensive plan of improvement for the Willamette River Basin, Oregon, as authorized by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1215), as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress, is hereby modified to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Cougar Dam and Reservoir project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers substantially in accordance with the plans contained in House Document No. 531, 81st Congress, 2d session, and is hereby further modified to include power facilities at Cougar Dam which may be provided by the city of Eugene, Oreg., in accordance with the terms of the Federal Power Act and in accordance with this act.

SEC. 2. The Cougar Dam and Reservoir shall be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Department of the Army as a unit of the comprehensive plan for the Willamette River Basin for the control and utilization of the water resources for flood control, navigation, power, conservation, and other beneficial purposes, and the appropriation of funds therefor is authorized.

SEC. 3. Power-generating facilities and appurtenances therefor may be constructed by the city of Eugene, or such facilities and appurtenances may be constructed by the Corps of Engineers as agent for the city of Eugene with funds advanced therefor by the city. Such construction shall be in accordance with provisions of a license by the Federal Power Commission, and with the provisions of this act. The city of Eugene shall own all such facilities and appurtenances and shall operate and maintain such facilities and appurtenances at its own cost and expense.

SEC. 4. The dam and reservoir shall remain the property of the Federal Government. The city of Eugene shall pay to the Department of the Army such proportionate share of the cost of construction, operation, and maintenance of the dam and reservoir as

may be appropriately allocated to power development, such allocation to be made by the Chief of Engineers, under direction of the Secretary of the Army, in collaboration with the Federal Power Commission in accordance with the "Separable-cost-remaining benefits" method of cost allocation as recommended by the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Subcommittee on Benefits and Costs in its report dated May 1950, or by such other method as may be mutually agreed upon by the city of Eugene and the Secretary of the Army and approved by the Federal Power Commission.

SEC. 5. The Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, shall enter into an agreement with the city of Eugene, acting by and through its Eugene Water and Electric Board, for the operation of the dam and reservoir insofar as such operation affects the development of power, for contribution of funds by the city in accordance with this act, and for other matters necessary for the joint construction, operation, and maintenance of the Cougar Dam and Reservoir project in accordance with this act. Such agreement shall be for a period consistent with the period of the license issued by the Federal Power Commission and may be amended from time to time by mutual agreement.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point two letters and a telegram which I have received bearing on the subject of the bill.

There being no objection, the letters and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION,
Salem, Oreg., February 5, 1954.

Senator GUY CORDON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GUY: On behalf of Gov. Paul L. Patterson, the Willamette River Basin Commission and the Willamette Basin Project Commission, we want to urge you to do all possible to get planning money for Cougar Dam in order to alleviate damaging floods on the McKenzie River.

There is a very rich delta of land between the McKenzie River and the Willamette that should be protected at all costs.

We have now three dams above Eugene that lower the water in the Willamette River at Eugene at flood stage about 8 feet. The bed of the Willamette at Eugene is several feet lower than the McKenzie just east of Eugene. Thus you can see that if we have an overtopping flood on the McKenzie, it will have this increased velocity due to the lowering of the Willamette some 8 feet. The increased velocity will cut great holes in this area if the McKenzie should overtop.

This delta is some of the richest land in the Willamette Valley and is populated by a large number of people who make their living in the city of Eugene and have their home there. This is in addition to the very fine farms.

This urgent need for control of the McKenzie, as you know, is nothing new with us. We have been asking for planning funds on Cougar for the last 6 or 7 years because we could see this contingency arriving whenever the Willamette was controlled.

The McKenzie the last 2 years has done many hundreds of thousands worth of damage along its area from McKenzie Bridge clear to the mouth. Due to the cutting of timber up above and the possible carelessness of some of the loggers, a large volume of debris is coming down each year that cuts into the places very materially.

It also creates another hazard in that the same volume of water that comes down now due to the cutting of timber makes a flash flood that is, by actual measurement, at least 9 inches higher than it was before.

The control of the McKenzie is sorely needed at this time, and anything you can do to secure planning funds will be appreciated by the before-mentioned people as well as the residents who live along the McKenzie River. There is no difference of opinion in regard to this by any of the people in that area.

Sincerely,

IVAN E. OAKES,
Executive Secretary.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
Portland, Oreg., February 8, 1954.

Hon. GUY CORDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CORDON: Reference is made to your inquiry concerning the flood-control value of the Cougar dam and reservoir project which is planned for construction on the South Fork, McKenzie River. I am glad to furnish you, in this letter, a summary of the situation regarding the project, information as to the need for it, and the basis for the high flood-control value which is assigned to it.

Cougar Dam is the major unit of an alternative three-dam plan selected prior to 1948 in place of the originally authorized Quartz Creek Dam on the McKenzie River. After Quartz Creek Dam had been authorized, commercial fishery interests and proponents of recreational use of the McKenzie strongly opposed the main-stream dam.

Cougar Dam was first described and recommended in the 1948 Corps of Engineers' report published as House Document 531, 81st Congress, 2d session. On the basis of subsequent action by the Bureau of the Budget and the joint House-Senate conferees, preliminary to adoption of the 1950 Flood Control Act, Cougar project is considered to be authorized for all multiple-purpose functions as originally authorized for Quartz Creek and as described in House Document 531, except that the power authorization is limited to minimum provisions for future installation of generating facilities.

As in 1948 when Cougar was proposed, flood-control benefits attributable to the project provide the major part of the project justification at this time.

House Document 531 shows that, of the total estimated project benefits, those from flood control, including major drainage, amounted to about 60 percent; those from power generation at the site and downstream amounted to about 24 percent; and the remainder, from irrigation, navigation, domestic water supply, pollution abatement, etc., amounted to about 16 percent.

At present the estimated distribution of benefits is as follows: Flood control, about 65 percent; power, about 23 percent; and all other functions, about 12 percent. The increase in percentage of flood-control benefits is principally attributable to the rapid increase in economic development since 1948 in the areas to be protected.

On the basis of the current estimate, the benefit-to-cost ratio for that portion of the multiple-purpose project cost which can be allocated to flood control would be about 2.4 to 1. By comparison, the benefit-to-cost ratio for power, based on that portion of the project cost which can be allocated to power, would be about 1.3 to 1.

The overall project benefit-to-cost ratio now is about 1.9 to 1, and the flood-control benefits alone would more than justify the entire project cost.

Thus, it is apparent that the Cougar Dam Reservoir project is basically a flood-control project which, by virtue of economies achieved by multiple-purpose development, can serve other purposes, including power, irrigation, navigation, etc. About 75 percent of the project benefits are from sources other than power.

A comparison of the amount of flood-control benefit originally credited with the amount now credited shows that the present concept of the project's principal function is the same as at the time it was proposed in 1948.

From a physical standpoint, the flood-control value of Cougar is readily apparent. As in almost any basin, the logical point for early construction of major dams in the Willamette River Basin is upstream from the largest practicable portion of the area which is in need of protection.

The principal damage areas in the Willamette Basin lie along the main stream downstream from the Eugene-Springfield area in the approximate 85-mile length of valley extending to the vicinity of Newberg and along the McKenzie, Santiam, and South Santiam Rivers.

Of the five major dams constructed or under construction to date, all but one are in the area near or upstream from Eugene where their effect will be felt throughout the entire valley.

The result has been a maximum of flood-damage reduction in an area which, without any flood control, would suffer an average annual flood damage of almost $13 million on the basis of present price levels and economic development.

Cougar Dam will be so located as to provide the maximum supplement to the existing flood-control system and create flood-control benefits averaging almost $2 million annually along almost the entire length of the Willamette River, as well as along more than 50 miles of the main McKenzie River.

In addition to the high degree of economic feasibility, the extensive area which will be benefited by Cougar, and the fact that it is a logical next step from the standpoint of location with respect to areas to be protected, a further consideration is the strong local desire for early construction of Cougar Dam to make Willamette Basin project benefits available to residents along the McKenzie River.

At the present time the McKenzie and South Santiam River Basins are the only major flood-damage areas in the Willamette Valley which have not been benefited by storage for flood control and other purposes.

Because of its location with respect to the major damage areas between Springfield and Albany, Cougar Dam should be constructed at the earliest practicable date.

Also as a result of the control already effected on Willamette River tributaries above Eugene an interim unbalanced stage condition now exists at the mouth of the McKenzie River during floods. Consequently velocities in the stream and overbank along the lower McKenzie River and on the rich delta between the McKenzie and Willamette Rivers are temporarily increased, tending to offset some of the benefits created by the existing reservoirs.

This is not an unforeseen condition, but rather one which, it has been realized, would exist until floods on the McKenzie River were controlled. Construction of Cougar Dam will provide more than one-half the flood-control storage proposed for the McKenzie River and will substantially eliminate that condition.

Thus the Cougar project will not only create the flood-control benefits attributed to it but it will also insure full realization of benefits credited to the projects now existing or under construction.

In summary, I consider the Cougar Dam and Reservoir project to be one which is urgently needed and worthy of early construction on the basis of its flood-control effect alone. Whether it is constructed with complete power facilities as recommended or with minimum provisions for future power as now authorized would have no effect on the flood-control and conservation use of Cougar, as those functions would be served to the same extent under either plan.

I might add that this office has, since proposing Cougar in 1948, always been of the opinion that it should be constructed at the earliest practicable date.

I am glad to have been of any service to you in this matter. Should you desire additional data at any time, please feel free to call on me at your convenience.

Very truly yours,

T. H. LIPSCOMB,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer.

EUGENE, OREG., *February 6, 1954.*

Hon. Senator GUY CORDON,
United States Senate Building:

The Lane County Board of Commissioners would appreciate any help that you could put forth toward the advancement of the Cougar Dam of the McKenzie River. Since the building of the dam is on the Willamette a cross drainage on the lower McKenzie has become very expensive.

ROBERT MCCLAY.
KENNETH NEILSON.
RALPH PETERSEN.

ADDITIONAL UNITED STATES JUDGESHIPS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on February 5, 1954, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] introduced the bill (S. 2910) providing for the creation of certain United States judgeships, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill and explanatory statement of the bill by the Senator from Nevada be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill and explanatory statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2910

A bill providing for the creation of certain United States judgeships, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional circuit judge for the ninth circuit. In order that the table contained in section 44 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this section in the number of circuit judges for the ninth circuit, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such circuit:

"Circuits	*Number of judges*
• • • • •	
Ninth	10
• • • • •	

SEC. 2. (a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 1 additional district judge for the district of Arizona, 1 additional district judge for the northern district of California, 2 additional district judges for the District of Columbia, 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Florida, 1 additional district judge for the nothern and southern districts of Iowa, 1 additional district judge for the district of Kansas, 1 additional district judge for the district of Maine, 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi, 1 additional district judge for the district of New Hampshire, 1 additional district judge for the southern district of New York, 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio, 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, 1 additional district judge for the district of Puerto Rico, 1 additional district judge for the district of Rhode Island, 1 additional district judge for the district of Vermont, 1 additional district judge for the western district of Washington, and 1 additional district judge for the district of Wyoming.

(b) In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this section in the number of permanent judgeships for certain districts, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said districts:

"Districts	*Judges*
• • • • •	
Arizona	3
• • • • •	
California:	
• • • • •	
Northern	8
• • • • •	
District of Columbia	17
Florida:	
• • • • •	
Southern	5
• • • • •	
Iowa:	
• • • • •	
Northern and southern	1
Kansas	3
• • • • •	
Maine	2
• • • • •	
Mississippi:	
• • • • •	
Southern	2
• • • • •	
New Hampshire	2
• • • • •	
New York:	
• • • • •	
Southern	19
• • • • •	
Ohio:	
Northern	6
• • • • •	
Pennsylvania:	
Eastern	9
• • • • •	
Puerto Rico	2
Rhode Island	2
• • • • •	
Vermont	2
• • • • •	
Washington:	
• • • • •	
Western	3
• • • • •	
Wyoming	2"

SEC. 3. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional district judges for the southern district of New York. The first two vacancies occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

SEC. 4. The last sentence of section 128 (b) (2) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "Court for the southern division shall be held at Tacoma and at one other place in such division to be designated by the district judges for the western district of Washington."

SEC. 5. The first paragraph of section 4 of the act approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; title 48, U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"There is established a district court for the District of Alaska with the jurisdiction of district courts of the United States and with general jurisdiction in civil, criminal, equity, and admiralty causes; and five district judges shall be appointed for the district, each at an annual salary of $15,000. The court shall consist of four divisions, which shall also be recording divisions. Two of the judges of the court shall be assigned by the President to the third division and one each shall be assigned by the President to the first, second, and fourth divisions. During the terms of office these judges shall reside in the divisions of their district to which they may be respectively assigned."

SEC. 6. (a) Section 371 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(c) Whenever any circuit or district judge eligible to resign or retire under this section does neither, and the President finds that such judge is unable to discharge efficiently all the duties of his office by reason of permanent mental or physical disability and that the appointment of an additional judge is necessary for the efficient dispatch of business, the President may make such appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. If such additional judge is appointed, the vacancy subsequently caused by the death, resignation, or retirement of the disabled judge shall not be filled.

"Any circuit or district judge whose disability causes the appointment of an additional judge, shall, for purposes of precedence, service as chief judge, or temporary performance of the duties of that office, be treated as junior in commission to the other judges of the circuit or district."

(b) The analysis of chapter 17 of title 28 of the United States Code, immediately preceding section 371 of such title, is amended by striking out the items "371. Resignation or retirement for age." and "372. Retirement for disability; substitute judge on failure to retire.", and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"371. Resignation or retirement for age; substitute judge on failure to retire.

"372. Retirement for disability."

(c) The section heading at the beginning of section 371 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 371. Resignation or retirement for age; substitute judge on failure to retire."

(d) The section heading at the beginning of section 372 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 372. Retirement for disability."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN RELATING TO HIS BILL (S. 2910) INTRODUCED FEBRUARY 5, 1954

MORE FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS NEEDED

I have introduced a bill (S. 2910), which provides for additional judgeships throughout the Federal judicial system. As the Senate knows, we recently passed S. 15, which created a number of new judgeships, and that bill has gone to the President for his signature. Since the introduction and passage of S. 15 in the House and the Senate last session, other recommendations for additional judgeships have been made by the Judicial Conference of the United States as a result of its meeting of September 1953.

The bill S. 2910 includes all of the recommendations of the Judicial Conference, as well as other proposed additional judgeships. Aside from those recommended by the Judicial Conference, there are included in the bill all of the judgeships which were approved by the Senate when it originally passed S. 15, but which failed of passage in the House and were not agreed upon by the conference on S. 15. In addition to the foregoing, it will be noted that the bill provides that each State in the Union now having only one United States district judge shall be given another judge, so as to make a total of two for the State. Also included in the bill is a provision for two additional district judgeships for the District of Columbia.

Another feature of my new bill arises from the fact that in S. 15 there was an attempt made to amend sections 371 and 372 of title 28 of the United States Code, which would have provided for the appointment of an additional district judge when such judge became incapacitated for the performance of his duties. That provision was not passed by the Senate and not restored by the House,

and so, unfortunately, enactment of S. 15 will result in repeal of existing law which provides that when a judge becomes 70 years of age and eligible to retire, if he does not do so, the President may appoint an additional judge if he finds that the judge eligible to retire is physically incapacitated and therefore not able to perform the duties of his office. My new bill would restore this provision of the law, which it never was the intention or desire of either House of the Congress to repeal.

What I have stated covers in essence the provisions of S. 2910 as I have introduced it. Even though the enactment of S. 15 will provide much-needed additional judge power for the Federal judicial system, I am greatly concerned with the welfare of the judiciary as it exists today. I have attended hearings on numerous occasions on the subject of the judge power throughout the Federal judicial system, and I believe my concern in this regard should be shared by all. There is no question but what even more additional judgeships, beyond those which will be provided through enactment of S. 15, are needed in order to alleviate a situation which may become so distressing as to endanger the entire judicial structure. My basic purpose in introducing new legislation in this field is to further relieve this situation. I hope that hearings may be speedily held so that the picture may become entirely clear to all concerned.

As I have pointed out earlier in this statement, every State in which, after enactment of Senate bill 15, there will be only 1 Federal district judge has, in my new bill, been slated for 2 such judges. This provision, it seems to me, has multiple meritorious purposes. In the first place, I do not believe any one judge should have complete control of all the Federal judicial business in any State. That is a bad situation, involving too much concentration of power. Furthermore, all of the States involved have on their borders other States and districts in which caseloads are prodigious. If there is a lone judge in such a State, and he goes to another district in order to help with these loads, this leaves the district for which he is a judge completely without any judicial power whatsoever during that period of time. A concomitant of this is the fact that if there are 2 judges in any such State, and 1 of them is not needed full time in that State, he can be utilized very effectively in some nearby district. The Administrative Office of the United States Courts has full power to assign judges out of their districts in this way. It seems to me that the judicial business of the United States has so grown and so changed, over the last few years, as to require at least two judges in every State. And as I have pointed out, by giving each State a minimum of 2 Federal district judges, to the extent that any of those States does not have at any given time enough business to require the full-time services of 2 judges, we will have created a pool of judge power that can be used efficiently and effectively wherever the need may arise. I do not contend that this is complete solution for the entire judicial manpower problem, but certainly it is a step in the right direction.

With regard to the two additional district judges proposed for the District of Columbia, I might say that there have been movements to establish within this district a court dealing solely with domestic relations. This, of course, would mean the establishment of another judicial level in a district which already has a multiplicity of courts. This to my mind is not particularly desirable, as it means more personnel, more clerks, more court attachés, and more of all other forms of judicial panoply, without any corresponding increase in judicial efficiency. If two more additional district judges are provided for the District of Columbia, they will, of course, carry on with minimum increases in present court facilities and personnel, and will enable the court not only to alleviate whatever situation may have arisen as regards the load of domestic-relations cases, but also to handle more efficiently all the rest of the very heavy workload of this court. It does not seem to me wise, in such a growing district, to create new judges whose services will be confined to domestic-relations cases only, when we can just as well handle the situation with additional manpower for the present court, and help all the other work of the court at the same time.

I have made this statement and introduced the bill (S. 2910) because, as I have stated before, the situation which confronts the Federal judiciary of the United States is to me alarming and we must keep ever vigilant to prevent situations which will break down the quality of judicial service to the people of this country. We have had many hearings in the past on this subject, and I think I can safely say that every Senator involved in these hearings will share my concern. Not only must we aid the districts in the Federal judiciary that are at the present time in trouble, but we must guard those which are "on the line" from getting into trouble; and this can be done only by recognizing the gravity of the situation and taking necessary preventive steps as early as the need can be clearly seen.

Again I say I intend to press for early hearings on this matter so that the entire field may be explored, and that a bill will come out of committee which may give us reason to feel that the judiciary and the people whom it serves have been dealt with fairly and adequately.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON KALAMAZOO RIVER, MICH. (S. DOC. NO. 98)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated November 15, 1951, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of a report on the Kalamazoo River, Mich., requested previously by the Committee on Public Works. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF STUDY OF CONGRESSIONAL POWER OF INVESTIGATION (S. DOC. NO. 99)

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed as a Senate document a study prepared at my request by the Legislative Reference Service entitled "Congressional Power of Investigation." This is a revision of a study prepared at the direction of Senator WILEY in the 80th Congress by the Service for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary. The earlier study, published as a committee print, was entitled "Proceedings Involving Contempt of Congress and Its Committees." The copies of this print were soon exhausted because of current public interest. Numerous requests that the study be revised and republished thereafter were received by the Service. However, the requested work could not be done because of limitations placed on appropriations with respect to publishing Service studies.

Following the adjournment of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, I requested that the subject be reexamined and the study revised. Thereafter similar requests were received from Senators HENDRICKSON, FERGUSON, WILEY, and JENNER.

The revision, as completed, contains the original preface of Senator WILEY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS—PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a very brief statement, which will not require more than 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on February 2 the Senate considered a resolution authorizing an appropriation of $214,000 for the Committee on Government Operations, of which the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is chairman. On the rollcall I voted in favor of the appropriation. I thought the reasons justifying my vote were so obvious that I did not need to explain it at the time.

In the past few days, however, I have received a considerable number of communications from my constituents and others and many personal inquiries regarding my vote. People have asked me why I, who have so strongly and consistently for the past 3 years opposed the methods and techniques of the Senator from Wisconsin and so frequently attacked the brooding spirit of fear and inquisition which has been called McCarthyism, voted in favor of an appropriation for the committee headed by the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Throughout the 3-year period during which I have consistently and repeatedly criticized and attacked the methods and the sinister effect of the activities of the Senator from Wisconsin I have constantly maintained a very clear distinction between the methods and tactics of the man and the general objective of investigating matters properly coming before the Congress.

The Committee on Government Operations is a duly constituted standing committee of the Senate. Its functions are provided for in the law of the land. Its jurisdiction is laid down in the Congressional Reorganization Act. Its membership is bipartisan, with a minority of Democrats. I have a high regard for some members of the committee. Very recently they forced from the chairman some important concessions in regard to committee procedure. I hope they will eventually be able to eliminate more of the evil practices of the past.

The functions of that committee are not confined, indeed, they are not even primarily intended to be confined, to the investigation of communism. There are many other functions of the committee.

I shall continue to work with all my strength for a proper mandatory code of procedure for that committee, and for all other committees of the Senate and of the Congress. But I would not wish to confuse my attitude toward methods and procedures of a committee and its chairman with my attitude toward the general investigatory powers of congressional committees. I believe in those powers and their legitimate exercise. I do not believe that the proper cure for the disease in this case or in any other case is the paralysis of all the functions of the committee by cutting off appropriations. To withhold all funds from a legally constituted committee of the Senate would furnish grounds for a plausible claim that the exercise of its proper functions had been sabotaged. In this case, nothing would more conveniently play into the hands of its chairman, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. I would not, by my vote, refuse all appropriations to a legally constituted congressional committee. I will, however, continue in every way open to me to fight for a fair set of rules and procedures which will prevent the perversion of congressional investigation into congressional inquisition.

I will, of course, continue to do my utmost to arouse the Nation to the dangers of what has become known as McCarthyism.

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, February 16, 1954, marks the 36th anniversary of the independence of the small but proud and courageous Baltic State of Lithuania. This republic which, during her brief 20-year span of independence, made such remarkable progress in self-government and in other fields of endeavor, is now suffering the consequences of ruthless Soviet aggression. Once again, as on many a February 16th in the past, throughout the world, persons of Lithuanian ancestry, many of whom live in my State, are dedicating this day, not to celebration of freedom, but to a protest against subjugation.

It is fitting at this time to emphasize President Eisenhower's policy of liberation which should keep hope alive in the people of Lithuania. The President, in his message to the Baltic Freedom Committee Congress, held in New York in June 1953, stated that the seizure of the Baltic States was in violation of solemn treaty agreements, and that we maintained our steadfast policy of continuing to recognize the diplomatic representatives of the independent Baltic Republics.

This policy was reinforced by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, when he testified at the first public hearings, last November 30, of the select committee of the House to investigate incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the U. S. S. R. Mr. Dulles stated:

Some say that it is unrealistic and impractical not to recognize the enforced incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union. We believe, however, that a despotism of the present Soviet type cannot indefinitely perpetuate its rule over hundreds of millions of people who love God, who love their country, and who have a sense of personal dignity. * * * The captive people should know that they are not forgotten, that we are not reconciled to their fate, and, above all, that we are not prepared to seek illusory safety for ourselves by a bargain with their masters which could confirm their captivity.

These principles were restated by Secretary Dulles in his impressive speech before the Council on Foreign Relations in New York in December when he said:

The fundamental, on our side, is the richness—spiritual, intellectual, and material—that freedom can produce and the irresistible attraction it then sets up. That is why we do not plan ourselves to shackle freedom to preserve freedom. * * * If we rely on freedom, then it follows that we must abstain from diplomatic moves which would seem to endorse captivity. That would, in effect, be a conspiracy against freedom. I can assure you that we shall never seek illusory security for ourselves by such a deal.

There are increasing evidences behind the Iron Curtain that the totalitarian forces of communism are unable to stifle the unyielding spirit of freedom which is so indelibly instilled in the people of Lithuania. We shall continue to join forces with freedom-loving people everywhere in the reaffirmation of this country's belief in the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they live.

AGRICULTURAL POLICIES ADOPTED BY THE STATE FARM BUREAU

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement adopted on February 6, 1954, by the Vermont State Farm Bureau entitled "Agricultural Policies."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

A major objective of Farm Bureau policy is to create conditions which will make it possible for farmers to earn and get a high per family real income.

The problem of maintaining prosperity in agriculture is exceedingly broad and complex and involves many different lines of action, not only in agriculture but also in other fields.

We appreciate the untiring efforts of the Vermont congressional delegation in carrying out these objectives. We feel particularly fortunate in having as our elected representatives men who have worked so closely with our organization. Following are general statements covering our stand on major issues with which we expect Congress to deal in 1954.

INTERNATIONAL

The most satisfactory solution to the current farm problem is to expand domestic and foreign markets until they balance agricultural production. We, in Farm Bureau, urge Congress and the executive branch of Government to develop a clear-cut long-range policy on foreign economic relations and international trade and an effective program to implement it—a sound trade relationship can make a great contribution to world peace.

Such a policy should be designed (a) to balance trade between the United States and other free nations at a high level, on a mutually advantageous basis, by means of sound trade relationships rather than continued dependence upon foreign aid; (b) to encourage, rather than strangle, foreign trade and investments; (c) to maintain consistency between our foreign policy objectives and domestic price support programs; (d) to include exporting the maximum quantities of agricultural commodities and other products and reducing trade barriers to facilitate the expansion of needed imports to help bring about an expansion of exports.

Many of these recommendations will require legislation. Others will require administrative action. Still others require cooperation, understanding and action by agricultural and business groups in the United States and cooperating countries.

NATURAL RESOURCES

It is a responsibility of each generation to make wise use of our natural resources for themselves and future generations.

It is our conviction that this can best be accomplished by emphasis upon individual activity and responsibility; upon participation of local instruments of self-government, including watershed, irrigation, soil conservation, and fire-prevention districts; and upon active participation of local units of government in resource development. State and Federal agencies should provide technical assistance and service on a cooperative basis.

Appropriated funds for ACP should be allocated on the basis of conservation needs, and should be administered at local level.

We support the watershed protection program as set forth by the President in his State of the Union Message to Congress on January 7, 1954. The Farm Bureau recommends the following clarifications of the language in the proposal.

1. That not less than 50 percent of the original cost be borne by the local agency.

2. That local interests shall be responsible for construction and operation and shall retain the title to any land or easements acquired.

3. That State governments will not be bypassed but that it be provided that where any State government has established an agency to promote shall work with, and through, such State agency.

The 1954 AFBF resolution on natural resources provides for support of a St. Lawrence Seaway project on a self-amortizing basis and therefore we support the enactment of the Wiley bill.

The propoals contained in H. R. 6767 and S. 2548 (identical bills) relating to the use of Federal grazing land by private users. Farm Bureau will support the enactment of this bill.

FARM PROGRAM

The American Farm Bureau believes the best solution to agriculture's problems lies in a variable price support system. A high fixed price support will result in the Government piling up surpluses at taxpayers' expense but will not result in a solution to a problem of overproduction. Vermont Farm Bureau specifically favors a flexible price support, depending on demand and supply conditions.

The modernized parity formula should be extended to basic crops which are still using the old formula when temporary legislation expires December 31, 1955, so parity price should not be reduced more than 5 percent in any one year resulting from the change.

By stockpiling fertility in the soil we will build a soil bank as a reserve against national emergencies resulting in fertilizer shortages. Proper authority should require that producers devote a portion of their crop land to their soil building practices as a condition of eligibility for conservation payments.

Increases in acreage devoted to soil building crops should be subject to the limitations comparable to those that may be

imposed on acreages diverted from scrop under marketing quotas.

To dispose of its stocks the Commodity Credit Corporation must enlist the initiative of private traders throughout the world. Financial losses of the CCC should be reduced by proper rotation of stocks to prevent spoilage. We should encourage use of private resources to stimulate disposal of stocks through private channels.

Adequate stores of food are an important part of civilian defense. These stores should not be in city warehouses as is not often the case, and a study should be made, perhaps using commodity credit stocks for research of the effects of H-bombs and A-bombs on stored foods.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY

Legislation directed toward the stabilization of the general price level is one of the most important projects that face agriculture and, in fact, all of the people. The Constitution provides that "the Congress shall have the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof." No one can say that the Congress has neglected the first mandate but they certainly have failed on the second, largely because they, the Congress, have never made a substantial appropriation for a continued study of a most necessary but baffling subject.

During the lifetime of this Nation we have experienced prosperity during major wars and for a few years afterward but deflation has invariably followed inflation and, while deflation continues, we see bankruptcies and unemployment generally.

The only time that different parts of society are in fair price relationship is after deflation has run its course. Today the several groups are out of a fair price relationship. Farmers are one of this group because in any period of price decline farm prices fall first.

Nearly everyone interested in the general welfare today is aware of this and asks the question, "What is the right price level?" A reasonable answer to this is that it is that level to which we are now fairly adjusted.

It is most important to follow the amendment by the voting delegates at the last meeting of the American Farm Bureau, which was as follows: "We direct the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation to employ competent personnel for research in this important problem." We urge them to keep Congress informed as to results of study.

We urge that (1) expenditures be brought within tax revenues as soon as possible; (2) no segment of our economy, including agriculture, be spared participation in efforts to achieve a balanced budget.

As a long-range tax policy we favor (1) long-range plans for reduction on national debt, handled in such a way as to promote a stable price level and a stable economy; (2) a tax policy to contribute to stable price level, tax revenues should rise relative to Government expenditures in inflation and fall in depression; (3) the personal income tax should be a major source of revenue for Federal Government with the base kept as broad as possible through retention of low exemptions; (4) taxes levied to increase revenues in an emergency should be terminated when emergency has passed.

EXTENSION AND RESEARCH

Research to improve efficiency and lower the cost of producing, marketing, and distributing food and fiber benefits the public as well as farmers. It provides adequate food and fiber at reasonable prices and the opportunity for farmers to achieve a high standard of living. Inasmuch as States and local appropriations have increased greatly in recent years while there has been little increase in Federal funds, we favor increase in Federal appropriations for the purpose of expanding the research and educational program in agriculture.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT

The farm folk of Vermont have always believed in development of a better understanding between labor and agriculture to the extent that each understand the other's problems. Inasmuch as the tools farmers need to carry on their operations must necessarily carry a large labor charge, it is important that labor not engage in some of the practices which contribute to this change such as featherbedding, closed shops, strikes, and high unrealistic minimum-wage standards.

Farmers necessarily depend on labor for a market and thus are interested in high employment of available workers plus a high earning power for each which develops the markets for food and clothing.

We are firmly opposed to industrywide bargaining which results in monopolistic tendencies; closed shops which denies the right of people to work and industrywide bargaining that goes beyond the realm of collective bargaining. We firmly believe that high production per man is a factor in economic welfare of farmers and that the power to strike should be limited.

We reaffirm our belief that labor should certainly have the right to organize and to strive for conditions for their own betterment but must have regard for the economic welfare of the rest of the citizens of our economy.

We believe the Taft-Hartley law, in general, to be a good law, but should not infringe on States rights where it seems States might well legislate to the end result of decentralization of Federal power in labor-management relations.

TRANSPORTATION

We oppose liberalization of ratemaking standards of Interstate Commerce Act. Railroad freight rates have already reached levels where further increases are self-defeating due to resulting loss of traffic.

Reduction or elimination of transportation taxes should have a priority in any tax reduction program. Transportation taxes are hidden taxes which add to the cost of farm productions.

Highway and road costs should be financed primarily by motor fuel and vehicle taxes. Such revenues should not be diverted to other purposes.

The Federal Government should continue to have a responsibility for the development of an integrated highway system but we recommend substantial reductions in Federal finance and regulation of highway construction.

CIVILIAN MILITARY TRAINING

Since world peace is our national objective we are in favor of an aggressive program to promote international friendship and to reduce armaments by all nations.

To protect ourselves in the meantime, we urge the expansion of a civilian military training program and a reduction in the number of professional soldiers, as conditions permit. To this end we would recommend:

1. The expansion of our National Guard and Reserve units.

2. The expansion of the military training in our colleges and universities where it can be accomplished without undue interference with the education of our youth.

3. The continued use of the selective service for the induction of such men as are essential to the maintenance of adequate Armed Forces, with special emphasis and care being placed upon the selective character of the system to safeguard against the induction of essential workers who should be indefinitely deferred, except in the case of active war, because of the much greater contribution which they can make to our economy as a whole through the use of their specialized skills in agriculture and other fields.

4. Since it is evident that all present Selective Service Boards do not carry out their methods of selection in the same way, we recommend a greater care in the selection of citizens for the Boards and a rigid universal system set up.

Since we feel that the present administration of the selective service program is, in effect, universal military training, we are opposed to it.

TREATIES

We favor an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, or other legislation, to provide that no treaty or other agreement shall ever take precedence over the Constitution. We urge the termination of any treaty heretofore ratified where there is the possibility of infringement of the constitutional rights or privileges of citizens of the United States.

THE INDOCHINA CRISIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the serious situation developing in Indochina, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a commentary on the situation there by Bill Costello, CBS commentator. Mr. Costello has had wide experience in the Far East, and has spent considerable time in Indochina in recent years. His remarks are worthy of our most serious consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President's decision to send 400 aircraft maintenance men to Indochina is the administration's way of recognizing two recent developments which threaten us with the greatest reversal since the loss of China.

The first of these is a new wave of defeatism in France. The French are understandably weary—after 8 years of fighting and losses which have exceeded ours in Korea—and there is reliable evidence in Paris that a single serious French defeat at this point could arouse an irresistible demand for withdrawal. One of the favorite argument now, one which disregards the fact that the United States now pays 60 percent of the war costs in Indochina, is that America called off the war in Korea and France is entitled to the same relief.

The second major development is the recent defection of some Vietnamese troops in southern Indochina—an area which had been considered largely pacified. The garrisons at some 40 small outposts simply deserted to the enemy, and there is a tendency among both French and American observers to look askance at the entire native army. This is a matter of dire concern. For the last 5 years, American advisers have insisted communism could never be defeated in Indochina without powerful support from the native population; for the last 2 years the French have agreed. Barely 3 months ago, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD reported to the Senate foreign relations committee, after a personal tour of investigation, that the Communists will not be defeated "without a vast increase in present striking power," and he added that the necessary manpower "can come only from the three Indochinese states." If then, as now appears possible, native armies are to be recruited, armed, and trained, only to join the Communist side in the end, the only possible hope of victory is destroyed. In China, between 1946 and 1949, we saw the folly of arming turncoats who would use our own weapons against us. If France lacks manpower to reinforce its troops in Indochina, and if the Vietnamese cannot be trusted to reinforce them, and, finally, if a vast increase in manpower is needed, who

is going to provide the marginal strength necessary to achieve a military victory?

In the view of many experts, the choice is now simple: We must have a military victory or else resign ourselves to the eventual loss of all southeast Asia. If there is a negotiated peace which leaves Communist armies in existence, then the Reds will ultimately take over by a process of infiltration and subversion. A Senator said privately this week that the only reassuring feature in the present situation is the knowledge that the National Security Council is deeply concerned, and is actively considering every possible solution of the crisis.

In the decision to send 400 technicians to Indochina, the Council has now come to grips with the fundamental problem of manpower. It still has to answer another and even bigger question: What would we do if the French suddenly walked off on 30 days' notice, as the British did 7 years ago in Greece? Could we afford to let Indochina go Communist by default?

Recently, a foreign spokesman gave State Department officials a warning. He said that, if today's policy decisions cause the loss of Indochina, or India, or any other non-Communist territory, those Republicans who are now in power will some day face the same recriminations and perhaps investigations that have made life miserable for those Democrats who are blamed for the loss of China. The hour of decision is not so very far away.

This is Bill Costello in Washington.

CURTAILMENT OF OPERATIONS AT TWIN CITIES ARSENAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, some time ago on the floor of the Senate I spoke of the threatened layoff of a substantial number of workers in our defense plants. That layoff has already taken place, and others are in the offing. At least it has been so indicated.

The subject is of great concern to us in Minnesota. I have written to the Secretary of Defense about it, urging that he reconsider offshore procurement contracts in the light of the layoffs of American workers in our own domestic arsenals and defense plants.

I refer particularly to the Twin Cities Arsenal in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, which is a Government-owned installation and one of the lowest cost producers in the United States.

Mr. President, 1,900 men and women have been laid off and the work shift has been reduced, and additional hundreds—yes, thousands—will be laid off in the days to come.

I hold in my hand a telegram which was sent to me by William Paul Bitzke, chairman, District Lodge 77, International Association of Machinists. It reads as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *February 7, 1954.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building:

In behalf of our organization and all of its members, we wish to commend the Senator on his open stand against the curtailment of operations at Twin Cities Arsenal and the proposed opening of like arsenals in foreign countries. We need defense preparation and we believe those necessary expenditures can best be used here in the successful operation as is at the Twin Cities arsenal for the employment of our people.

WILLIAM PAUL BITZKE,
Chairman, District Lodge 77, International Association of Machinists.

The telegram is supported by the signatures of hundreds of people who have signed a petition addressed to the Minnesota congressional delegation, a copy of which has been brought to my attention. The petition reads:

P. S.—Had time and working hours permitted, this list would include many more signatures. But due to the fore-mentioned reasons, it was not able to reach all employees. All employees were not only willing but anxious to sign their names to this list. We wish to congratulate you in your fight to back our rights and let you know that all at the Twin City Arsenal plant are 100 percent behind you.

EARL VIERLING,
ST. PAUL, MINN.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter accompanying the petition printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
February 4, 1954.
Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We have noted in our daily newspapers of your investigation on arms contracts being made to foreign countries and our own arsenals being shut down due to curtailment of small arms cutbacks.

We appreciate your interest in this matter and are expressing our opinions and are backing our Senator 100 percent.

Our feelings are shared areawide here at the Twin Cities Arsenal and also statewide.

Cordially yours.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have two substantiating telegrams, or perhaps I should say telegrams that follow in line with the layoffs at the Twin Cities Arsenal. There is a small machine-tool industry there, and from its owner I have received this telegram:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *February 7, 1954.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.:

Have been threatened with cancellation of contract with Federal Cartridge Corp. Having purchased machinery for these contracts, cancellation will mean bankruptcy of small business which has taken 10 years to build and unemployment for 18 people; also loss of regular manufacturing business. Appreciate your help.

R. W. MURRAY,
Owner, Accurate Tool & Gage Co.

I am not going to ask that the names of all the petitioners be printed.

Mr. President, I desire now to turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

HEARINGS BY HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON REVENUE REVISION BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a telegram from the mayor of the city of Rochester, Minn., Mr. Claude H. McQuillan. Rochester is the fourth largest city in my State. The telegram reads as follows:

ROCHESTER, MINN., *February 3, 1954.*
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building:

Rochester City Council directs me officially protest closed-door action House Ways and Means Committee on revenue revision bill, 1954; also request you express sentiments city of Rochester to your colleagues and press reconsideration and fair hearing before presentation on floor.

Mayor CLAUDE H. MCQUILLAN.

I have fulfilled the mayor's request. I have presented the matter to my colleagues, and I thoroughly agree with the sentiments expressed by the mayor.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have discussed with the minority leader the nominations on the Executive Calendar, under the heading "New Reports," and he has advised me that there is no objection. So I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations, I give notice that certain nominations for promotions in the Foreign Service, received from the President today, appearing at the end of the Senate proceedings under the head of "Nominations," will be considered by the committee after 6 days have expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar, under the heading "New Reports."

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Simon E. Sobeloff, of Maryland, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Elmer J. Schnackenberg, of Illinois, to be United States circuit judge for the seventh circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be United States circuit judge for the second circuit.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I think this is a very fine appointment. Mr. Harlan has had a very distinguished career; he comes from an unusually distinguished family in my State, and I am very happy to vote to confirm his nomination.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say to my distinguished friend from New York that all the nominees for judgeships are outstanding men. A full investigation was made with reference to these nominations and, with one single exception, Senators on both sides of the aisle endorsed them. The one exception was in the case of the nomination of a gentleman from Louisiana. A Senator, who had not endorsed him, said he thought he would make a very fine judge.

I want the Senate to know that exceptional care has been taken in going into the qualifications of these men, and I am satisfied they will make excellent judges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of John Marshall Harlan is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carroll C. Hincks, of Connecticut, to be United States circuit judge for the second circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edwin F. Hunter, Jr., of Louisiana, to be district judge for the western district of Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward William Day, of Rhode Island, to be United States district judge for the district of Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George T. Mickelson, of South Dakota, to be United States district judge for the district of South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Calvin C. McGregor, of Hawaii, to be seventh judge of the first circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed today.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators, on page 3, line 5, of the amendment proposed to be inserted by the committee.

REPORT ON RECENT TRIP TO THE FAR EAST

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to address the Senate for a few minutes concerning my recent trip to the Far East, and I ask that the formal report of that trip, which I have prepared with the able assistance of Dr. Francis O. Wilcox, chief of staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, be incorporated in full in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee I deem it to be appropriate for me to report to all my colleagues in the Senate, as well as to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

On this trip I was accompanied by Mrs. Smith, Miss Elizabeth Wherry, my secretary, and Dr. Wilcox. We visited a large area in the Far East, and especially southern Asia, touching on Hawaii, Japan, Formosa, Korea, Hong Kong, the Associated States of Indochina, Thailand, Burma, India, and Pakistan. We came back by way of Beirut and Paris, which enabled us to check up in Paris on our experiences in Indochina with the leadership of the French Government.

I had been in the Far East in 1949 and again in 1951, so that this was my third trip. By these periodic trips it has been possible to keep in touch with the rapid changes taking place in this critically important area. In all the places we visited we had the privilege of conferring with the chiefs of state, which included such well-known personages as Premier Yoshida in Japan, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa, Dr. Syngman Rhee in Korea, Emperor Bao Dai in Indochina—we also met the kings of the other Associated States, Laos and Cambodia—Mr. Nehru in India, and Mohammed Ali in Pakistan. It will be remembered that he was the ambassador from Pakistan to the United States before he was recalled to become premier of that important country.

The years since World War II, however gloomy, have not been without hope for those who have faith in the ultimate freedom of Asia. Formosa has remained free despite the curses and threats of Peking. Japan has moved steadily toward democracy. The capacity of free men to stand together in resistance to aggression has been tested in the Korean conflict. Indochina still holds against the onslaughts of the Communists in southeast Asia. Of course all of us know of the grave danger which exists there today and I pray that country will continue to hold firm. Elsewhere, in new countries like Burma, India, and Pakistan, the people are moving toward freedom and national responsibility.

Despite the events of the past few years, I do not despair of the cause of liberty in Asia. No country in that area of the world, not even China which is now totally dominated by Moscow, is forever lost to liberty.

I have learned one important truth in my several visits to the changeless east. Nothing in it is changeless except a fundamentally moral and religious approach to life that is practically continentwide in application.

I might say parenthetically that I have been deeply interested in studying the impact of some of the religions in those far-off lands. They are very strong and very deeply rooted. Because this is so, because there is this bedrock upon which to build, I know that in the long run, the surface of the east will change. It must change. The tide of totalitarianism will recede, for that moral-religious substructure which is fundamentally opposed to totalitarian communism will reassert itself to shape the societies of the new Asia.

It may be that even now this change has begun. However, in view of the mighty forces involved and the many cross-currents, it would at this time be rash to do more than speculate on this possibility, for the discouraging aspects of the situation in Asia, as I found on my recent visit, are still numerous and vivid. Communist totalitarianism still controls more than half the land mass and two-fifths of the population of Asia. The military strength of communism has expanded greatly and constitutes a powerful force for intimidation, coercion, or invasion. Large groups of Asians still cling to the illusion that communism is a movement of liberation from foreign domination. These people do not realize it is Moscow-directed imperialism aimed

at world domination. Others believe that they must steer a course of neutralism between the Soviet world and the free world, not yet understanding, apparently, that the preservation of their freedom depends on cooperation as equals with other free nations. Population pressures, poverty, and illiteracy continue to keep the continent fertile for totalitarian ideologies. Quarrels among the free nations of Asia, such as the most lamentable disputes between India and Pakistan, open cracks into which the Communists can pry with their divide-and-conquer techniques. Finally, the Communists have achieved some success with propaganda branding the United States as an unfriendly, arrogant, and imperialistic nation.

If the situation in Asia were characterized exclusively by the factors I have mentioned, the outlook would indeed be grim. That, however, is not the case. There are more positive factors which I observed in the Far East and which are noted in our report to the Foreign Relations Committee a few days ago. These factors constitute the encouraging aspects of the situation in Asia. If they continue to accumulate, they may turn the tide in the not too distant future.

There is, first of all, the fact that the shooting war in Korea has been brought to an end. Bloodshed has been halted, so that countless lives have been spared. The truce was accomplished, moreover, without surrendering the basic objectives of the United Nations action in a futile gesture of appeasement.

The frontal advance of communism has been halted in Korea. Elsewhere in Asia, there are signs that a greater degree of stability is settling over several countries of southern and southeast Asia. These new nations are tackling their internal economic and social problems with energy and determination. Another encouraging aspect of the situation is the outstanding caliber of our present ambassadors and military commanders in the Far East. They understand the problems of the area and are dealing with them as effectively as possible.

I wish to emphasize that point and to say that I was deeply impressed, as were the other members of my party, with the character and caliber of the persons representing the United States in those various countries.

I said earlier in my remarks that I did not believe any part of Asia was forever lost to freedom. I should like to reiterate that belief. But I also wish to point out that to win back those people who have temporarily slipped behind the Iron Curtain, and to preserve the independence of those who cling tenuously to freedom, is a monumental challenge, particularly to us in the United States.

The policies which we pursue with respect to Asia are of the utmost importance. In fact, they may determine whether or not the peoples of Asia shall have an opportunity to work out their destiny in freedom. If our policies are wise, decent, human policies, as befits this great Nation, they will benefit not only the Asians, but ourselves as well, for generations to come. If they are not, if instead they are impatient, expedient, or short-sighted policies, we, as well as our friends in Asia, will suffer the consequences.

In my report to the Committee on Foreign Relations a few days ago, I listed a number of recommendations which, I believe, will be helpful in developing and maintaining a sound policy toward the Far East. I do not claim perfection for these recommendations. It would be presumptuous to assume that they supply all the answers. I do feel, however, that they are relevant to the complex problem of our relations with the East and I should like to summarize them now:

First, we should do everything we can to understand the oriental way of life and the philosophy back of the foreign policy of our neighbors in the East.

Second. We should continue to help the anti-Communist nations in Asia to develop and maintain a posture of strength. I believe that if weakness is shown there, those countries cannot hold out; they will become the prey of the Communist movement.

Third. We must continue our program of encouraging the training of native Asian troops, particularly in Korea, Formosa, and Indochina. This was impressed on me, not only on this trip, but also on previous trips I have taken. We must give all the aid we can to train the native Asians who are opposed to communism in the skills to defend their homelands. They can defend their native soil much more effectively than can any foreign troops. I am convinced of that, particularly as the result of this trip. I have talked to our commanders about it, and they say the natives do wonderfully well and make excellent troops.

Fourth. We should do what we can to encourage the idea of collective security in the Far East. Weak nations standing alone are easy prey for Communist imperialism. That point is covered more fully in my report, which I am having made a part of this statement.

Fifth. In spite of pressures in the opposite direction, we should resist any move to appease the Communist aggressors.

Sixth. The United States must not recognize Red China or consent to its admission to the United Nations while it remains a satellite taking orders from Moscow. This is an important point, so I shall read the whole recommendation that was made concerning it:

(6) In this connection I want to emphasize that on this trip I had my previous convictions fully confirmed, namely, that the United States must not recognize Red China nor consent to its admission to the United Nations while it remains a satellite taking orders from Moscow.

Such a move might well be the death blow to the aspirations of the struggling nations of Asia to be free and independent. It would put the appeasing stamp of American approval on the exploitation by Moscow of the sufferings of the people of Asia.

Furthermore, no outlaw regime, like that in Peiping, should ever be allowed to blast its way with guns and tanks and instruments of war into a peace organization like the United Nations.

That is exactly what the Peking regime has attempted, as is illustrated in Korea.

Seventh, the time has come when our Government should declare that we will react to aggression wherever it occurs in the world, taking whatever action our national interests require. This is in line with the recently announced policy of the Secretary of State in his very well organized and presented speeches on the subject.

Eighth, we should exert every effort to bring about a unity of purpose and direction among the free nations and a common policy with respect to the Far East. In that connection, I may observe that one of our handicaps is that we do not have a fully united, common policy in that area. This is one of the most important things to which we must address ourselves and which we must try to bring about.

Ninth, continued technical assistance, and in some countries modest amounts of aid for economic development purposes, must remain an indispensable part of our program in that area.

Tenth, the United States—both our people and our Government—should, in dealing with its friends in Asia, do its utmost to demonstrate the positive values of the democratic way of life.

Eleventh, we should lose no time in stepping up certain aspects of our information service in the far eastern area. This is a very important subject. I have been talking about it to Mr. Streibert, who is in charge of the Information Agency. I believe it is worthy of special emphasis. I shall read at this point from our report on this subject:

I am inclined to feel we have overemphasized the importance of the military and economic aspects of our program and neglected the ideological. And I believe that in an ideological approach we would do well to highlight the teachings and traditional moralities of the countries concerned which bring out and illustrate those deep values of individual freedom for which peoples throughout the world are yearning. It is far more effective in India, for example, to extol the spiritual greatness of Gandhi and to relate his teachings to freedom and world peace, than to boast of America's material accomplishments and military might.

Our whole experience emphasizes the importance of appointing United States representatives in these areas who are humanly sympathetic with the problems of the people, and who are able to interpret the good will and sincere desire of the American people to help. We must not seek to dominate or dictate. We must not try to rebuild these countries in the image of America. We must help them in their keen eagerness to work out their own future.

Mr. President, these are simple propositions, but I feel that to state them and restate them may well help to set our relations with Asia on a more solid foundation. And there is no time to lose in doing so. A great continent teeming with able, energetic, and God-conscious people is in the throes of being born again in our times. The challenge to us, as well as to them, is to learn quickly to bridge the gulf of ignorance of one another's true worth which for centuries

has separated East from West. I pray that with God's guidance we shall find the way to bridge that gulf in peace.

Mr. President, as I previously requested, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the end of my remarks, the full text of the report.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

JANUARY 25, 1954.

To the Chairman and Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate:

I am submitting herewith for the consideration of the Foreign Relations Committee and for all of the Members of the Senate a report on the trip to Asia which I took during November and early December 1953.

I was accompanied on this trip by Mrs. Smith, Dr. Francis O. Wilcox, chief of staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Miss Elizabeth Wherry, my secretary.

Everywhere we went our accommodations were efficiently handled and every consideration and assistance was shown to us. With my companions I want to take this opportunity to express our deep appreciation to the officials of our own Government abroad and to the officials of the countries we visited for their friendly hospitality and for their many courtesies.

Those who have studied this area of the world, and especially those who have traveled in it, know that the problems which the United States faces are exceedingly difficult and complex. We certainly do not claim to have all the answers.

Our mission was to study the impact of our foreign policy upon the Far East, to inquire into the issues involved and to explore possible changes that might be made in that policy. We were particularly interested in the situation in Indochina and the progress that is being made there in liquidating the 7-year-old war.

We visited Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, Korea, Hong Kong, Indochina (Vietnam and Cambodia), Thailand, Burma, India, and Pakistan. We also stopped on our way back to the United States to consult with French leaders in Paris with regard to the French attitude toward the war in Indochina.

We conferred with many people, including officers of our high military command, our Ambassadors and their staffs, the leading officials of foreign governments, members of parliaments, newspaper correspondents, and other informed individuals. Through Mrs. Smith and Miss Wherry we made contacts of first importance with many of the women in these countries, and in the East as elsewhere, women are an increasingly important factor in the great urge for freedom.

In this report, in which Dr. Wilcox and I collaborated, I have endeavored to outline our overall impressions of the situation in the Far East and Asia generally, to give some background facts on each of the countries visited, to comment briefly on certain current issues, and finally, to make a number of recommendations with regard to our far-eastern policy.

I desire to pay special tribute to the career men and the members of the staffs of our Foreign Service. In many of these places they are working under extreme difficulties and great personal sacrifice. They deserve the confidence and support of the people of the United States.

It is my hope that the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and also all those Members of the Senate who are interested in foreign affairs will have the time and the opportunity to study this report.

Always cordially yours,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senator, New Jersey.

REPORT ON THE FAR EAST AND SOUTHEAST ASIA BY SENATOR ALEXANDER SMITH OF NEW JERSEY, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FAR EAST

I. INTRODUCTION

Overall comments

We came back from the Far East convinced that the Communists have had three main objectives in their attempt to dominate that part of the world.

First, they wanted to gain control of the almost unlimited reservoir of manpower in China. This they have now done. China has been drawn behind the Iron Curtain and the huge Chinese Army has been made a factor of first importance in Asia.

Second, they want to win over to their side the great industrial capacity of Japan. Their first major attempt to achieve this objective failed when their aggression in Korea was stopped at the 38th parallel.

Finally, they have their sights set upon the vast quantities of rice and the rich raw materials which are available in Southeast Asia. That is why they are so intent upon winning the struggle in Indochina. For if that country falls into the clutches of the Kremlin then the other nations of Southeast Asia would find it increasingly difficult to withstand Communist pressure.

These, I think, are the prime objectives of the Communists in the East as a part of their overall strategy to dominate the world. If they can win these, they believe, the rest will inevitably follow.

There can be no question about the tremendous importance of Asia to Communist leaders in Moscow. This is not because they have lost interest in the great industrial complex of Western Europe. But they have been held at bay there by the successes of the European Recovery Program and the North Atlantic Treaty. I am convinced that Communist strategists now place primary priority upon vigorous action in the East. This explains why Asia is currently the hot battleground of the global conflict in which we are engaged.

There is an interesting paradox that becomes more apparent when one visits the Far East. Everywhere there is a deep resentment against colonialism and imperialism in any form. People in the area feel strongly that they should be free from external controls, that they should be allowed to work out their own destiny in their own way. This leads to the propaganda of hatred toward foreigners which, of course, the Communists have agitated in every conceivable way.

What we have, then, is the curious spectacle of communism being on the side of the angels. They talk about liberation. They denounce imperialism. They condemn colonialism. And with their tongues in their cheeks, they wave the banner of national independence.

But what many people in the Far East still fail to realize is that the Soviet Union has been engaged in an ambitious and diabolical effort to conquer and colonize the entire world. This they are now doing in Asia with all the cunning and vigor at their command. Kremlin-supported forces launched the aggression against Korea. And Kremlin-supported forces are today engaged in Communist military operations in Indochina, Burma, Malay, and the Philippines. It is obvious that, while they are shouting about western colonialism, their brand of colonialism is endangering the freedom and the future not only of all Asia but of the entire free world.

Discouraging aspects of the situation

When one looks at the march of events in Asia there are, of course, a number of discouraging factors. On this side of the ledger I would include the following points:

(1) There can be no doubt that the impressive territorial gains made by the Communists in Asia have given them added influence and power. They now control all of China, Manchuria, Siberia, North Korea, and parts of Indochina. These areas comprise over half the land mass of Asia with some two-fifths of its population. This rising tide of Red success, even though it has not advanced for 3 years, remains a formidable fact of threatening proportions.

(2) Nor should we overlook the fact that the Communists have exerted every effort in the past 3 years to build their military strength. They now possess by far the largest ground forces in the Far East, and both Communist China and North Korea, with assistance from Moscow, have developed air forces of their own. For purposes of intimidation and coercion this expansion of military might is a very useful device for the Communists; power is generally a very persuasive argument.

(3) In addition to the territorial and military factors, the Communist movement in Asia has two very significant psychological advantages. Rightly or wrongly, it is not identified with colonialism or imperialism in these States. Even more important, it works through its own Communist parties which function in the individual countries as indigenous, seemingly patriotic groups. In Asia these advantages, which the Communists are exploiting to the fullest, are extremely difficult to overcome.

(4) Then there is the spirit of neutralism in parts of Asia which, in my judgment, works to the detriment of the free world. It is prompted in part by the fact that certain Asian countries have only recently ceased to be pawns in the power politics of others. In fear of being returned to this status, they attempt to steer a middle course between the Soviet bloc and the nations of the West. The advance of international communism, however, may consign to them the very fate which they dread unless they recognize in time that the preservation of freedom depends on cooperation as equals with other free nations.

(5) The rapid population growth still exceeds the increase in food production in several countries—particularly India and Japan. We sometimes forget that more than half the world's total population live in Asia. With too little food to keep their people alive and healthy, they are confronted with the terrible dilemma that their natural increase in population continues to outstrip their increase in the production of food.

(6) Population pressure, poverty, illiteracy, and an intense feeling of anti-imperialism make the people a relatively easy target for Communist propaganda. The average life expectancy in the area is about 25 years. The average annual income is about $50. Throughout much of Asia this pathetically low standard of living is attributed to the handicaps which have confronted these countries in the colonial system. Under these conditions, the promises of the Communists for independence and higher living standards often fall on fertile soil.

(7) Numerous areas of tension exist which tend to accentuate differences between the free countries of Asia and thus help the Communist cause. Take, for example, the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan. Or the dispute over the so-called Rhee line between Korea and Japan. Or the bitter differences between Burma and Formosa. The Communists, who like to divide and conquer, take advantage of these disputes and stir up animosity wherever they can.

(8) Communists are doing their utmost to discredit the United States all over Asia. We are pictured as a capitalist and imperialist nation of arrogant and conceited people who are bent on bringing about war rather than peace. Minor instances of racial prejudice and of cooperation with so-called colonial powers like Britain and France are

widely broadcast and exaggerated far beyond their intrinsic importance.

(9) Finally, there is still a general disinclination throughout the area to recognize the serious nature of the Communist threat, particularly in its external aspects. Countries like India and Burma, for example, will take vigorous measures to suppress the illegal acts of their indigenous Communist parties but will go out of their way to conciliate Moscow and Peking. In part, this inconsistency undoubtedly originates in the spirit of neutralism previously mentioned. It may also be due, however, to a lack of understanding of the dangerous challenge of international communism to all independent states.

Encouraging aspects of the situation

On the positive side of the ledger I suggest the following:

(1) The truce in Korea—uneasy though it may be—has done much to ease tensions in the Far East. While there are many problems yet to be resolved it is our impression that the Communists do not want to resume hostilities. Moreover, I do not think President Rhee will take unilateral action unless something unforeseen should develop.

(2) The main march of communism has been held at least temporarily in check at the borders of China. Two years ago when I was in the Far East there were dire predictions that Korea, all of southeast Asia, and perhaps even Japan might be under Communist rule by this time.

(3) There are also encouraging signs of a greater degree of stability in several countries of southern and southeast Asia—particularly Burma, India, Pakistan, and Malaya. To be sure a great deal remains to be done. But as these countries develop in strength and national stature they will be more and more able to resist the virus of international communism.

(4) We were impressed by the energy and the hope with which most countries in the area are tackling their problems of economic development. With help from the United Nations, the Colombo plan, and our own technical assistance program, they are moving ahead, slowly but surely, to improve their standards of living.

(5) I believe, too, that there are some signs of a growing awareness of the mortal danger of communism in Asia. While there is a general disinclination among many Asians to face up to this reality, as I pointed out above, nevertheless we are beginning to make some progress. In this connection the United Nations has been a most useful device, for a good many of Asia's leaders have learned there just how false the propaganda of Russia and her satellite states really is.

(6) On the whole, I think the lesson of Korea has been most helpful. Many of the officials to whom I talked expressed the conviction that our vigorous leadership in defending South Korea from aggression not only saved the free world from disaster but gave the people of Asia new hope and determination for the future.

(7) In spite of vicious Communist propaganda there is, among the people of Asia, an encouraging reservoir of good will for America. Fundamentally they believe in the same basic principles that we as free Americans believe in and, on the whole, I think they are grateful for the aid we have given them.

(8) Still another favorable factor is the striking change that is taking place in the attitude of the overseas Chinese. These important Chinese elements in Burma, Thailand, Hong Kong, and the other countries of South Asia—some 12 million of them—have heretofore maintained a wait-and-see attitude in the conflict between Chiang Kai-shek and Mao Tse-tung. Now, at long last, there are some encouraging signs that they may be moving away from communism.

(9) Finally, we should point out that we were very favorably impressed by the quality of our leadership in Asia. Our ambassadors, on the whole, are oustanding as are our military leaders in Tokyo, Seoul, and SHAPE headquarters in Paris. It is gratifying to meet such extremely able people in the field who are devoted to the best interests of the United States.

II. COUNTRY ANALYSES

A. The Far East

1. Japan

Background: During the period of allied occupation the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP) attempted to establish in Japan a foundation for democratic government. Premier Shigeru Yoshida, leader of the Liberal Party, in power through most of the occupation and since, has sought to carry out the occupation reforms. He has pursued a policy of close cooperation with the United States and strict control over both communism and elements of resurgent ultra-nationalism in Japan. In pursuing this middle course the Liberal Party leadership is challenged by both the right and left wing Socialist parties and to a lesser extent by the prewar militarist interests.

Since the peace treaty went into effect there has been some retrogression from reforms initiated by the military occupation, noticeably in the return of prewar Japanese military personnel to public office and in the modifications of original plans for breaking up the Zaibatsu. Though a recent tendency for the two conservative parties (called Liberal and Progressive) to aline in opposition to the leftist parties indicates the possible emergence of a two-party system, there is still considerable political instability in Japan.

Japan's recovery since the end of the war has been great, but fundamental economic difficulties remain. They have been camouflaged somewhat by the built-in "tourist industry" of American military personnel and the special procurement orders of the United Nations Command for the Korean war. Notwithstanding these quasi-subsidies, the current overall balance-of-payments deficit approximates $250 million annually.

Japan's economic position has changed drastically from that of the prewar period. Access to raw materials and markets on the mainland is now restricted. The merchant marine is no longer a major source of earnings of foreign exchange. The former Japanese-occupied countries of southeast Asia in varying degrees are reluctant to resume trade with Japan; some are still negotiating for reparations. Many countries of the Americas and Europe, recalling former Japanese dumping and other unfair trade practices, share this reluctance. The Japanese silk industry suffers from the worldwide slump resulting from development of rayon and nylon. Japan is dependent upon increased imports, particularly of raw materials, from dollar areas. Moreover, Japanese technology has lagged behind that of the western nations.

There is mounting pressure within Japan for resumed trade with the Chinese mainland. If this pressure is to be resisted, then there is a need for developing alternative trade outlets for Japan. A solution to this problem may be found in part in integrating Japanese industrial skills with development programs in south Asia, the Philippines, Formosa, and in the reconstruction of Korea.

Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution renounces war and prohibits the maintenance of land, sea, and air forces. In view of postwar developments, however, this provision runs counter to the responsibility of a sovereign state for its self-defense. Consequently, the United States has urged a modest rearmament for purpose of defense. Although deeply concerned over the possibility of a resurgent militarism, the Japanese are also aware of the immediate danger of Communist aggression. By recent agreement therefore between the two conservative parties the present National Safety Force will be redesignated "National Defense Force" with an authorized strength of 250,000 men.

Comments on current issues: Japan

Japan's economy is operating on borrowed time. Short-run palliatives such as the war orders growing out of the situation in Korea and expenditures by United Nations forces in Japan provide a most unstable economic base for Japanese democracy. A sounder answer must be found quickly to the dilemma of a rapidly growing population confined in islands of very limited natural resources. Unless one is found, we may be faced with an unending dependence of Japan on United States aid or an expansion of Japan's trade with Communist China. Both of these are clearly repugnant to our own interests.

A much happier solution lies in a great expansion of Japan's trade and other economic relations with the rest of the world, particularly with other Asian nations. The Japanese are a skilled people with one of the most advanced technologies in Asia. They could make a great contribution to the economic development of their free neighbors. We should encourage them to do so.

We should also continue to urge the Japanese to assume a larger share of their own defense. There is real danger, however, in going too far too soon. The buildup of the national security force ought to be a gradual one, in harmony both with Japan's economic capabilities and the developing realization among the Japanese people of the dangers which confront them.

We, of course, are anxious to bring our troops home from Japan at the earliest possible time. As the Japanese strengthen their defense forces we should be able to begin a planned and gradual withdrawal of our own forces. According to the best estimates available in the Far East, however, we probably should not plan on entering the final stages of withdrawal until a period of 4 or 5 years has elapsed. Even so, I believe there might be some advantage in setting a target date now for that eventuality. Such a target date might accelerate action by Japan.

Japan needs very much to improve her relations with Korea. One can understand why a certain amount of antagonism exists between the two countries as a result of Japan's relationship to Korea between 1910 and 1945. Nevertheless, it is discouraging to see two free world nations, who have much the same general objectives, consume their energy in quarreling with each other. I hope very much that both the Koreans and the Japanese will realize that they have much to gain by cooperation, and begin to work together toward our common goal.

2. Formosa

Background: Chinese Nationalist forces occupied Formosa in September 1945. As the Chinese Communist forces advanced on the mainland, the Executive Yuan of the Nationalist Government was evacuated to Formosa at the end of 1948. Taipei, Formosa, was proclaimed the national capital of China in December 1949 and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek resumed the presidency on the island in March 1950.

Under the American-educated provincial Governor Dr. K. C. Wu, and since April 1953 under O. K. Yui, both former mayors of Shanghai, progress has been made in both economic development and governmental reform. Local Taiwanese have increasingly been placed in responsible positions at all levels of government. A policy for development of popular self-government has been supported by a program of school expansion. Under a land reform program rent has been reduced from 55 to 33.5 percent of the main crop while public land representing 17 percent of all rental land has been sold to tenant farmers.

The National Government with United States assistance has engaged in an economic development program aimed at improving rural conditions, increasing agriculture production, developing power and transportation facilities, expanding industrial production, and adopting sound fiscal and management policies.

Since 1951 the United States Military Assistance Advisory Group under Maj. Gen. William C. Chase has assisted the Chinese in reorganizing, training, and revitalizing the Chinese Nationalist Army.

In addition to the improvement in the ground forces, approximately 2,000 pilots have been trained while a small navy has become proficient in amphibious operations. Both General Chase and Generalissimo Chiang have lauded the morale and combat effectiveness of these forces.

Of the great powers, the United States and France continue to recognize the Nationalist Government while the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom recognize the Communist regime as the government of all of China. On June 27, 1950, former President Truman neutralized Formosa by ordering the 7th Fleet to prevent attacks across the Formosa Straits in either direction. On February 2, 1953, President Eisenhower deneutralized Formosa, thus posing a potential threat to Communist control of the mainland. It is clear, however, that the Nationalist forces would not be able to launch any large-scale attack against the mainland without naval, air, and logistic support from outside sources.

Comments on current issues: Formosa

As compared to the situation 2 years ago, we found a marked improvement in political stability and in economic conditions on Formosa. If this progress continues, the Nationalist Government will become an increasingly important factor in encouraging disaffection for the Mao Tse-tung government among the Chinese on the mainland. Formosa can serve as a rallying point for their discontent as well as a powerful psychological base for a counteroffensive of Chinese democracy.

There is encouraging evidence that this idea of developing Formosa as a kind of showplace for democracy in the East is already bearing fruit. Certainly the feeling of hostility in China against the Communist government is graphically illustrated by the large number of Chinese prisoners of war in Korea who do not want to be repatriated to Red China but who prefer to go to Formosa instead.

Now let me add a few words about the Nationalist troops on Formosa. While they are growing in strength I think it would be unrealistic for even the most ardent supporters of the Chiang government to expect any successful all-out attack upon the mainland, at least in the near future. Meanwhile the Nationalist forces, the second largest non-Communist army in Asia, perform an invaluable service in helping to keep Formosa a free and independent country. They also serve to tie down a relatively large number of Chinese Communist troops on the mainland across the Formosan straits. Moreover, in the event Peking should precipitate a new crisis in Korea, Indochina, or elsewhere along the Chinese border, Chiang's forces could be a military factor of very great importance to the free world.

3. Korea

Background: Since the United States first signed a treaty with Korea in 1882 that country has been in the vortex of great power struggles in Asia. Traditionally a tribute state of China, battleground in the Russo-Japanese War of 1905, a colony of Japan from 1910, Korea emerged after World War II divided at the 38th parallel. A testing ground in the early stages of the cold war, Korea became a proving area for the United Nations and the concept of collective security with the invasion of the Republic by the Communist forces in June 1950. Entry of Communist China into the conflict at the end of 1950 made Korea once again the stage of great power conflict in northeast Asia. The signing of an armistice brought at least a temporary cessation to hostilities.

Since the armistice the United States as head of the United Nations Unified Command has sought to bring about the political conference provided by the armistice agreement to consider the removal of foreign troops, the unification of Korea, and other questions involved in a Korean settlement. The General Assembly in September determined upon a conference in which the U. N. would be represented by those members having contributed armed forces in Korea plus the Soviet Union as a member of the Communist delegation. The Communists have insisted that the conference be on a roundtable pattern with India and other States of Asia represented and with the Soviet Union thereby seated as a neutral. The American position has been that Russia may be included but only as a belligerent on the Communist side. As negotiations over this issue have continued at Panmunjom, the United States representative, Arthur H. Dean, has upheld the position that the conference be restricted to the immediate issues involved in a Korean settlement and that a later conference with wide representation consider other outstanding problems in the Far East.

Concurrently the efforts of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission (which includes India, Switzerland, Sweden, Czechoslovakia, and Poland) to continue the explanation sessions to prisoners unwilling to be repatriated have been beset by demonstrations, strikes and riots, accusations of partiality against the Commission, threats of a revival of the conflict, and walkouts by members of the Commission. Further controversy surrounds the United Nations position that prisoners who have not been repatriated and whose fate has not been determined by a political conference be released upon expiration of the explanation period, that is, January 22, 1954.

Complex issues and Communist intransigence offer little optimism for an early achievement of a peaceful unified Korea. During the immediate postwar period efforts of the Joint Commission created at the Moscow conference in December 1945 to solve the issue met with Soviet obstruction. Following a General Assembly resolution of August 1947, a temporary commission sought to hold elections throughout Korea. Soviet occupation forces prohibited entry of the commission into North Korea. After the establishment of the Republic of Korea through elections in the south in August 1948 the General Assembly established a permanent commission to seek the unification of Korea. These efforts were brought to a halt by the North Korean invasion of June 1950. To this earlier background of Soviet and North Korean obstructionism is now added the basic interest of Communist China in this strategic area. Recently the Governments of Communist China and North Korea signed a 20-year treaty of friendship and mutual assistance.

The United States has signed a Mutual Security Treaty with the Republic of Korea, now awaiting Senate approval. In signing this treaty, the United States has attempted to make clear to the Government of President Syngman Rhee that it is for the defense of South Korea against further aggression but that the United States opposes independent action by President Rhee to unify Korea by force.

The prospect for solution has to some extent been furthered by the recent agreement of President Syngman Rhee to accept the mandate of new elections if held throughout Korea. This reverses an earlier stand for elections only in North Korea. The North Koreans, however, have opposed nationwide elections except on their own terms.

While the political questions blocking a Korean settlement remain in abeyance, reconstruction has begun on both sides of the armistice line. Under the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954, the United States made $200 million available for this purpose with the proviso that the funds be used only in areas not under Communist control. Questions relating to jurisdiction as between United States and United Nations agencies in reconstruction are presently under discussion.

Comments on current issues: Korea

The prospects in Korea are for a tenuous truce of uncertain, but probably long, duration. From all the information that came to us the Communists do not want to resume the fighting. They prefer instead to have an uneasy truce during which time their tactics of obstructionism and delay can be effectively used in the war of nerves. We must keep up our guard, however, and remain on the alert against the possibility of renewed aggression. The growth of Communist air forces in Manchuria creates the ever-present danger of another Pearl Harbor unless we maintain constant vigilance.

There is also danger that the South Korean troops might resume the fighting. I do not believe, however, that President Rhee would take unilateral action in violation of the truce without at least consulting with the United Nations Command. We all sympathize, of course, with President Rhee's deep-felt desire for the unity and freedom of his country. We can hardly asquiesce, however, in unilateral action by South Korea. That would destroy all grounds for hope that a peaceful solution of the Korean situation might eventually be worked out.

There is before the Senate now the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of Korea. That treaty demonstrates completely the good faith of the United States. While it pledges American assistance against further aggression it does not, of course, extend to any unilateral violation of the truce terms by South Korea.

Now that the fighting has stopped, the United Nations should move rapidly to aid in the rehabilitation of the Republic of Korea. Through no fault of their own, the Korean people have suffered untold hardships in the collective effort to stop Communist aggression. The other free nations have a great moral responsibility to assist in alleviating their suffering.

4. Hong Kong

Background: The British Crown Colony of Hong Kong lying on the southeast coast of China at the mouth of the Pearl River was acquired by Great Britain in 1841. The Kowloon territory on the mainland opposite Hong Kong was leased by China to Great Britain in 1898 for 99 years. Under British administration since 1841, except during the Japanese occupation from 1941 to 1945, the colony is politically an outpost of the west on the doorstep of China while economically a great crossroads for the international trade of the Far East. The colony symbolizes both an earlier era of treaty ports, concessions, extraterritoriality and other manifestations of western commercial interest in China and a later era in which Hong Kong was a point of entry not only for western merchandise but for missionaries, educators, doctors, hospital administrators, and technicians in many fields.

Hong Kong has long been a haven for Chinese revolutionaries, political exiles, and refugees. Since the Communist regime came into power on the mainland late in 1949 there has been a great influx of persecutees from China. Although political organizations are strictly controlled by the government, the area is now a center of intelligence operations of both the Chinese

Communists and the Nationalists. Among the many Chinese political organizations found in Hong Kong, one of the strongest in terms of numbers is that which disavows both Communist and Kuomintang extremism and favor what is termed the "new force" or the "third force" reform program.

Economically dependent upon China's world trade, Hong Kong has been adversely affected by the policy of restricted trade with the Communist bloc. The trade of the colony has also suffered from the disruption of the Chinese internal economy, from the expansion of Chinese overland trade with the Soviet Union and from restrictions on imports in parts of southeast Asia as a result of foreign exchange shortages.

Comments on current issues: Hong Kong

From information that came to us in Hong Kong apparently the ban on the shipment of strategic materials to Communist China is being enforced. We were told that all the non-Communist nations except Ceylon—which is not a member of the United Nations—are endeavoring to observe the embargo voted 3 years ago by the General Assembly. While free-world trade with Communist China showed a moderate increase in 1953 over 1952, the control machinery was tightened during the year and relatively little smuggling took place.

It is true that accurate statistics on trade with Communist China are very difficult to obtain. It is true, too, that honest individuals may differ over their definitions of what constitutes strategic materials. But from all that we could learn in Hong Kong our allies are giving us their cooperation in enforcing the economic sanctions which the United Nations recommended against the Peiping Government.

As for Hong Kong, that colony, by reason of its location, its dense Chinese population, and its limited resources, is in a very vulnerable position. Nevertheless, the Hong Kong authorities appear willing to cooperate in enforcing the ban against China. Trade continues between the colony and the mainland, but to the extent that it enters into legitimate channels this trade is limited and seems to be confined to nonstrategic items.

There is good reason to believe that the limited exchange of nonstrategic commodities between the Chinese mainland and Hong Kong is at least as beneficial to the non-Communist countries as it is to the Communists. The alternative to this trade might be a new program of economic and military aid to Hong Kong or the abandonment of this important outpost of the free world.

B. Southeast Asia

5. Indochina

Background: As World War II drew to an end, Emperor Bao Dai, of Annam, proclaimed an independent state of Vietnam. In August 1945, with the Japanese surrender, Bao Dai relinquished power to a government headed by Moscow-trained Ho Chi Minh. Under an agreement of March 6, 1946, France recognized this government within the French Union. Negotiations with Ho on the details of implementing the arrangement, however, broke down with the Communist leader demanding a greater degree of sovereignty than France was willing to grant at that time.

In December 1946 the war commenced and has continued to the present time. In September 1947 France opened discussions with Bao Dai. Basic agreements were signed in Paris March 8, 1949, under which Cochin-China was added to Annam and Tonkin to form, under the former Emperor, the independent state of Vietnam within the French Union. France retained the right to maintain military forces in Vietnam and a measure of control over the Vietnamese military forces. Foreign policy was to be coordinated through the High Council of the French Union. In July 1949 a similar treaty was concluded with King Sisavang Vong of Laos and in November with King Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia. Sovereignty was formally transferred to Vietnam February 2, 1950. In conferences at Paris during the latter part of 1950 the agreements between France and the Associated States were further clarified. In response to an increasing pressure for complete independence, particularly in Vietnam and Cambodia, France in July 1953 agreed to negotiate with the Associated States with a view to relinquishing some powers still retained by France, and new agreements have been reached.

Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia were recognized by the United States and Great Britain in February 1950 and have subsequently been recognized by 30 other powers. Their admission to the United Nations, however, has been vetoed by the Soviet Union. The Associated States were signatory to the Japanese Peace Treaty and have participated in various international conferences.

The war in Indochina has been a struggle to win the loyalty of the people no less than a bitter contest to gain and hold strategic areas. In the battle of ideologies France has had the responsibility of demonstrating an intent to grant full freedom concurrently with the presence of French forces in Indochina. Ho Chi Minh appeals to Indochinese nationalism largely by raising the issue of antiforeignism, an issue not without attraction to a politically unsophisticated people. Vietminh political cadres are highly trained, subtle, and found in many parts of Vietnam. The vast majority of the people, not being able to foresee the eventual outcome, can hardly afford to risk ultimate retribution at the hands of the Vietminh. These factors have produced a popular neutralism which stands as a blockade against effective military gain by the French-Vietnam forces.

Military operations in Vietnam have been at a stalemate since 1951, with the French Union forces holding the Red and Mekong River Deltas and the Viet Minh, based in the north along the China border, holding the hinterland and a short coastal strip in central Vietnam. On May 8, 1953, Gen. Henri Eugene Navarre was appointed commander in chief of French Union forces. The "Navarre plan" for bringing the war to an end by 1955 called for: (1) Expanded forces; (2) increased supplies; (3) development of commando-type offensive units; (4) more intensive use of land- and carrier-based tactical aircraft; (5) adoption of a continuing and vigorous offensive strategy; (6) increased emphasis upon psychological warfare; and (7) political measures to gain popular support for the national governments.

The United States signed a pact of economic cooperation with Vietnam in September 1951 and subsequently with Laos and Cambodia. The Special Technical and Economic Mission (STEM) has introduced programs in the fields of rural development, public health, agriculture, communications, and light industry.

A United States Military Defense Assistance Advisory Group, headed by Maj. Gen. T. V. Trapnell, provides instruction in the use of military equipment made available under the military aid agreements of December 1950. Since 1950 the United States has borne approximately 40 percent of the cost of the war and at the present time is carrying approximately 63 percent of the total cost.

In the interest of retaining this strategic gateway of southwest Asia within the ranks of the free world, the United States announced on September 30, 1953, that it would make available to the French Government prior to December 1954, additional financial assistance not to exceed $385 million.

The future developments in Indochina are closely associated with internal political instability in France. There is strong opposition to continuation of the war. In addition to a popular weariness with the long conflict, some left-wing factions sympathize with the Ho Chi Minh cause while right-wing elements link the withdrawal of forces from Indochina with the pending European Defense Treaty and the question of German rearmament. Moreover, many French ask why they should be called upon to defend these states when they have been granted virtual independence.

Comments on current issues: Indochina

The avenues of conquest in southern Asia lead through Indochina not only to the raw materials and food of southeast Asia but across the sea to Indonesia, the Philippines, and beyond. It is well to remember that the attack on the United States in World War II was not launched until after the enemy had secure control of Indochina. That is why continued resistance to the Communist advance is so essential to us as well as to other free nations.

I believe communism can be checked in this region as it has been in Korea. It will be extremely difficult but it can be done. The keys to victory on the Indochinese front of the struggle with international communism are the continued effort of the French in support of the nationalist governments of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia; a great rallying of the indigenous peoples to defend their developing independence; and continued United States assistance in both the economic and military fields.

Most important, it seems to me, is the necessity for building a greater will to fight among the people of Vietnam. The crying need at the moment is for additional native divisions capable of taking over from the French a greater share of responsibility on the fighting front. This means that the people of Vietnam (1) must understand more clearly than they do the nature of the Communist threat that surrounds them; and (2) they must be assured of their independence. The problem at this stage is more a psychological one than a material one.

Until recent months the Communists have had the advantage in their propaganda war with the French, for they have posed as the great liberators whose efforts alone can free the Vietnamese from the yoke of colonial imperialism. But the French have now made clear their intention to grant independence to Vietnam. If the French position is thoroughly understood in Vietnam, it should do much to unite the anti-Communist forces in the country and create the spirit that is necessary to win the war.

While we were in Indochina we studied at some length the Navarre plan. I am convinced that it is based on sound principles and holds considerable promise for the termination of hostilities in Indochina. French and Vienamese leaders have agreed to go on the offensive, and to prosecute the war more vigorously than they have in the past. If they carry out their present plans I believe the Communists can be defeated.

6. Thailand

Background: In all southeast Asia Thailand remains the one country which at the moment is free of Communist guerrilla operations. Thailand is an area of relative stability and prosperity surrounded by turbulence and unrest. It is threatened on the east by the Vietminh forces in Indochina and on the north by the avowed ambitions of Communist China to create a Greater Thai State. The stability of Thailand is an important factor in forestalling a further Communist advance in southeast Asia.

A bloodless revolution in Thailand in November 1947 was followed by the adoption of a new constitution and establishment of a government controlled by the military group who had engineered the coup d'etat. Phibun Songgram, a leader of the group, was named premier. There is a lack of any substantial opposition in Parliament and considerable reliance upon government by decree. Under the administration of Phibun

Songgram, Thailand has enjoyed a high degree of prosperity by Asian standards. Attempts to insinuate a Communist fifth column among the Chinese residents have been vigorously suppressed and a friendly working relationship has been maintained with the United States. Notwithstanding any deficiencies of democratic government by western standards, there is little evidence that the regime is unpopular with the people.

Thailand has assumed her responsibilities as a member of the United Nations and has voted with the west. Having voted in favor of the United Nations action against the North Korean invaders, Thailand was the first country to offer ground troops and naval units to the United Nations command. Regional offices of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Rice Commission and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East are located in Bangkok.

Thailand has recognized the government of Bao Dai in Vietnam and has maintained close relations with Laos and Cambodia. Though Thailand has been involved in the dispute surrounding the Chinese Nationalist forces in northern Burma, cordial diplomatic relations have been maintained with Burma. Thailand has not recognized the Mao Tse-tung Communist government in China, but at the same time relations with the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa have been minimized. The immigration of Chinese into Thailand has been restricted to 200 persons a year while recent efforts have been made further to assimilate the more than 3 million Chinese now living in Thailand. British influence which was predominant in Thailand before World War II has continued, particularly in commercial matters, and an extensive trade exists between Thailand and the Commonwealth. Britain has assisted in equipping Thai military units in the southern provinces which are engaged in preventing Communist infiltrations from and into Malaya.

Since 1950 the United States has been actively engaged in aiding Thailand. An educational exchange agreement concluded in July 1950 has received considerable support and increasing numbers of Thais are receiving a higher education in the United States. Since 1950 technical assistance and military defense assistance programs have been maintained in Thailand.

Under the present leadership of Ambassador William Donovan, the United States is accelerating these programs of assisting the Thais in a further strengthening of both their economy and defense forces. In this recognition is given to the strategic economic and geographical position of Thailand, as well as to the demonstrated aversion of the Thai people to communism.

Comments on current issues: Thailand

It is encouraging to visit a country in south Asia that is relatively free from internal strife. There are no Communist guerrilla activities in Thailand and the government is not seriously troubled by discontented political minorities. The economy seems to be stable and the people happy and relatively prosperous.

Personally, I admire the courageous and vigorous action the Thai leaders have taken in the conduct of their foreign policy in spite of their proximity to Communist China. In their prompt response to help meet the challenge of aggression in Korea, and in their refusal to recognize Mao Tse-tung's regime in China, they have demonstrated that they clearly recognize the nature of the Communist menace in Asia.

Meanwhile, the Thai Government must continue its vigilance with respect to Communist minorities within its borders. The Communists among the 3 million Chinese in Thailand are a disturbing element, and the newly organized Thai State located in southwest China constitutes a potential threat. I am confident, however, that with our continued military assistance Thailand can keep the situation under control.

7. Burma

Background: Of those former British colonial areas which have gained independence since the end of World War II, Burma alone chose at the outset to remain outside the British Commonwealth of Nations. Burmese independence was achieved on January 4, 1948, in the midst of a civil war which has continued to date. The efforts of the new republic to maintain a workable government and to rehabilitate the economy have been hampered by the insurrection of two distinct Communist groups and by demands of the Karen and Mon minorities for autonomy. In consequence, the Government has been in a state of almost continuous instability and the production of rice and other exportable commodities has fallen considerably below prewar levels.

The government of Premier U Nu has attempted to follow a neutral foreign policy. While vigorously prosecuting campaigns to subdue the Communist guerrillas, the administration has sought to pursue a course which would not alienate factions not openly in revolt against the Government. Many of these are vehemently antiwestern. In this precarious situation, the Government in March 1953 requested discontinuance of the services of the Technical Cooperation Administration.

In pursuing a neutral foreign policy the Government frequently has followed action which might be interpreted as alinement with the West accompanied by conciliatory gestures toward Moscow and Peking. Burma was the first country outside the Communist bloc to recognize the Chinese Communist regime. While supporting the United Nations resolution of June 1950 for repelling aggression in Korea, Burma opposed the resolution declaring Communist China to be an aggressor. Burma has supported Chinese Communist representation in the United Nations.

Since 1950 remnants of Chinese Nationalist forces of General Li Mi estimated at upward of 12,000 troops plus dependents have remained in the northern Shan States of Burma. Fearing that Communist China would use the presence of Kuomintang troops as pretext for invasion, and pointing out that they were a disruptive force in the country, Burma has long pressed the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa to arrange for withdrawal of the forces while the latter has disclaimed effective control over these irregulars. In March 1953 Burma charged Nationalist China before the U. N. with aggression committed by Chinese guerrillas against Burmese territory. On April 27, 1953, the General Assembly condemned the presence of Chinese Nationalist troops in Burma and called upon the troops either to leave the country or submit to internment. Subsequent negotiations led to the repatriation of 2,000 Chinese to Formosa in October.

Comments on current issues: Burma

On the whole our relations with Burma have been friendly. At the moment, however, the presence of Chinese Nationalist troops on Burmese soil constitutes a discouraging irritant. Unfortunately, in some quarters in Burma the United States is blamed for this condition. There seems to be a mistaken impression that all we need to do is to request Chiang Kai-shek to order the troops to be removed and a general exodus will take place.

There are, of course, two fallacies to this reasoning. In the first place, we are certainly not in a position to tell the Generalissimo what to do. In the second place, so far as I am able to ascertain, Chiang's control over the Nationalist forces in Burma is tenuous at best.

Personally, I am completely sympathetic with the desire of the Burmese Government to get these dissident elements out of their country. No established government can tolerate within its borders groups of people who wantonly violate the law.

I hope very much, therefore, that our Government will continue to use its influence, both in the United Nations and with the Nationalist government, to bring this controversy to a satisfactory conclusion. Certainly the Burmese government, which is busily engaged in fighting Communist uprisings within its borders, should not have to dissipate its resources and its energy chasing troops and trouble makers who claim to be on the side of the free world.

C. The India-Pakistan area

8. India

Background: Since attaining independence from Great Britain in 1947 India has grappled with the problems involved in a rapid transition to full self-government. This has been complicated by the complexities of dividing the subcontinent between India and Pakistan. Under the leadership of President Rajendra Prasad and Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru steady though modest gains have been made toward strengthening political democracy and in raising the living standards of India's 360 million inhabitants. The Congress Party and Prime Minister Nehru in particular, have denounced both internal communism and Hindu extremism and the Government has kept a strict control over the illegal activities of Communists within India. Under the present 5-year plan, construction is in progress on some 135 separate river valley projects. A rural development program was commenced early in 1953 which will improve conditions in 120,000 villages and be felt by one-quarter of the population.

India has increasingly assumed a position of leadership among those countries of south Asia which maintain a position of neutrality between the Communist bloc and the western democracies. The India plan for settlement of the Korean prisoner-of-war deadlock was adopted by the U. N. General Assembly in December 1952 and elements of the plan were included in the final armistice agreement. As chairman of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission in Korea, India has been subject to pressures from both sides.

India's policies have at times incurred opposition from both the Soviet Union and the United States. The primary source of difference with the United States has concerned policy toward Communist China. The Indians have pressed for the seating of the Mao Tse-tung regime in the United Nations. They have opposed prolonged continuation of restrictions on trade with Communist China. They have supported the view that stability in the Far East can best be achieved by the resumption of normal relations with China. Premier Nehru objected to the deneutralization of Formosa through removal of the United States 7th Fleet as a threat of general war and not conducive to a peaceful solution of Far Eastern tensions. Notwithstanding these areas of opposition, the United States has given technical, financial, and other assistance in support of India's efforts to grapple with a vast complex of internal economic problems.

Comments on current issues: India

In India we encountered a neutralist sentiment with respect to the cold war. The Government, as it has clearly demonstrated, remains vigorously opposed to communism as a political force within the country. But we differ with most Indian leaders as to how communism should be dealt with as an external or world threat.

India's policy of neutralism, or nonalinement, is based upon a number of factors, including the relative military weakness of India and her proximity to Red China and Soviet Russia. It no doubt stems in part

from Ghandi's philosophy of nonviolence. But it also stems from India's urgent desire to develop its backward economy which her leaders feel they can best do if they remain relatively uncommitted to either the East or the West. Moreover, we must not forget that the Indian distrust of western imperialism tends to loom larger in the minds of many Indians than does their suspicion and distrust of the far more aggressive Communist imperialism. At the present time, they do not feel that India is endangered by any threat of external aggression.

Personally I do not agree with the Indian position. It is difficult for me to believe that neutralism can ever be a real antidote for the poisonous and aggressive tactics of international communism. Only the collective determination of the free nations can meet that threat.

India is a great nation and is destined to play an increasingly significant role in world politics. It is highly important that India remain a free and independent country. Many people in the United States may not agree with her views. But one who has been to India cannot fail to appreciate the sincerity and the logic with which they are advanced.

It appears to me, however, that the concept of neutralism is based upon an erroneous understanding of the great issue of our time. In the so-called neutral group of countries many people seem to believe that two hostile blocs—Soviet Russia and her satelitte states, and the Western World—are engaged in a selfish, imperialistic struggle for world domination. They fail to realize that the big issue is the struggle between human freedom and independence on the one hand, and slavery under an atheistic, imperialistic totalitarianism on the other.

It is my belief that neutralism will be defeated when and if the free nations convince Asia of this truth. For Asia above everything is seeking freedom and independence and the opportunity for her people to work out their own destiny in their own way.

9. Pakistan

Background: The creation of the independent Islamic state of Pakistan came with the withdrawal of Great Britain from India in 1947. A constituent assembly meeting in Karachi in October 1953 determined upon a republican form of government with a two-house parliament and cabinet directly responsible to the legislature.

The separation of East and West Pakistan by 1,000 miles of Indian territory has created serious internal administrative problems. Though the eastern part of the divided country is only one-sixth the size of West Pakistan the population of East Pakistan is 42 million as compared to 33.8 million in the West. Some dissatisfaction has been in evidence in East Pakistan with what has been considered to be a disproportionate concentration of political power in the West.

The world's fifth largest state in terms of population, Pakistan ranks with Turkey as the most powerful of the Muslim States. While linked to the Arab countries and to Indonesia by strong religious ties, Pakistan is also a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. A sharp contrast exists between Muslim beliefs and the Communist doctrines emanating from Soviet Asia which reaches to within 18 miles of the West Pakistan border.

During the period immediately following independence, riots and bloodshed marked the two-way mass migration of Hindus and Muslims across the India-Pakistan borders. Many Indian leaders took the view that Pakistan could not long survive economically and that reunion with India would be but a matter of time. Pakistanis charged India with a conscious policy of attempting to destroy Pakistan by economic strangulation. As Pakistan has developed her political system, strengthened her armed forces and tackled a myriad of economic problems, the early bitterness with India has tended to subside. Certain fundamental differences, however, continue to hamper relations between the two countries. Among these are the misunderstandings which exist between the Hindu and Muslim religions.

Both India and Pakistan for example, have laid claim to Kashmir which borders both states in the north. Under the terms of independence Kashmir was one of 560 princely states whose rules were left free to join either India or Pakistan. The case for Pakistan has been based upon the fact that the Kashmir population is predominantly Muslim; prior to partition Kashmir was linked economically with what is now West Pakistan; the headwaters of three of the rivers upon which Pakistan's agriculture depends are in Kashmir; Kashmir's principal roads and only railroad leads into Pakistan. Notwithstanding these facts, the Maharajah of Kashmir, a Hindu, called upon India to furnish troops to quell rioting following partition. At that time Lord Louis Mountbatten, governor general of India, declared that after law and order were restored the final status of Kashmir would be determined by the people. In May 1948, Pakistan sent armed forces into Kashmir. A U. N. Security Council Commission mediating the dispute succeeded in obtaining a cease-fire agreement in January 1949. In August 1953, Prime Ministers Nehru, of India, and Mohammed Ali, of Pakistan, reached agreement for a plebiscite to be conducted by a neutral administrator to be selected by April 1954.

The appointment of Mohammed Ali, former Ambassador to Washington, as Prime Minister in April 1953, prefaced the development of closer relations with the United States and a renewed effort to solve outstanding differences with India. Exploratory discussions relating to the possible extension of United States military assistance to Pakistan, however, have met with strong resistance from India.

Comments on current issues: Pakistan

While we were in India and Pakistan a great debate was raging over the current press reports that the United States might extend military assistance to Pakistan. In India the reaction was particularly heated. I came away with the feeling that there should be a careful and cool analysis of all the issues involved.

In many ways the case for Pakistan is a very logical one. Pakistan is a sovereign state and has been a firm friend of the free-world alliance. A strong Pakistan, teamed up with a strong Turkey, would do much to anchor the whole defense structure of the Middle East and make the Middle East defense pact a real possibility. "If we want military assistance for defense purposes," say the Pakistanis, in effect, "why should India interpose such strong objections?"

Indian leaders seem to feel that they, too, have a good case. They argue that a further buildup of western military power on continental Asia might eventually lead to a third world war; that the entry of the United States into the area would bring the cold war to the borders of India; that it would rekindle the feeling against imperialism in Asia; that it would jeopardize India's policy of nonalinement; and that the existence of increased military power in Pakistan would not only be a potential threat to India but would incite Communist retaliation from which India could not escape.

If our Government should decide to extend military assistance to Pakistan, then I suggest that we might offer a comparable amount of aid to India. While the Indian Government might reject the offer, it would certainly make clear that the United States is playing no favorites as between the two countries but is interested rather in the broad principle of helping to build the collective defensive strength of the area against the dangers of Communist aggression and subversion.

I assume that the Pakistan Government would also be willing to agree that any arms received in the way of military assistance from the United States would not be used in any aggressive action against India. A public declaration of this sort might do much to relieve the tension in the area by demonstrating the good faith of the principal parties concerned.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the fundamental importance of Asia to American foreign policy and to world peace generally, it seems to me that we should thoroughly reexamine our policy objectives there from time to time in order to make sure that we are on the right track. What we want, of course, is a free, peaceful, friendly, and stable Asia. In working toward that goal we ought to keep in mind certain general principles.

Let me stress my conviction that peace in the Far East can only be assured by the ultimate solution of the problem of freedom and independence for all these nations. This seems to me to be fundamental. There can be no more imperialism, no more colonialism, no more totalitarian dictatorships. And at the very center of this problem is ultimately a free and independent China.

Having in mind this fundamental approach, I submit the following recommendations:

(1) We should do everything we can to understand the oriental mind and the philosophy back of the foreign policies of our far-eastern neighbors. By the same token we must help the people of the East to understand us and the ideals that underlie our western way of life. Admittedly this is not an easy task. Differences in religions, languages, customs, and traditions often create gulfs of misunderstanding between nations which are difficult to bridge.

In many instances they may not think as we do. They may not move with the same tempo. They may emerge with different solutions to problems that confront them. But this does not necessarily mean they are wrong. We must do our best to understand their point of view and to appreciate it.

(2) We should continue to help the anti-Communist nations in Asia to develop and maintain a posture of strength so that they can defend themselves against Communist aggression. Weak nations invite attack and increase the chances of war. It is imperative, therefore, that the free nations of Asia strengthen their armed forces and their economies in order to be able to prevent subversive activities from within their borders and deter aggression from without. Also, additional armed strength and general stability in this area will put the anti-Communist world in a much better position to negotiate effectively in the event a peace conference is convened.

(3) In this connection we must continue our program of encouraging the training of native Asian troops—particularly in Korea, Formosa, and Indochina. Everywhere people should be and, I am convinced, are willing and able to fight for the defense of their homelands. Such a program not only tends to increase the defensive posture of the countries in question; it speeds the day when American and other free-world troops can be withdrawn from foreign soil.

(4) We should continue to encourage the idea of collective security in the Far East. Weak countries cannot stand alone and expect to remain free and independent. Personally, I should like to see a regional security pact developed for the Far East—under the leadership of the far-eastern nations themselves—in the nature perhaps of a multilateral Monroe Doctrine, comparable to the Rio Treaty in the Western Hemisphere.

I realize, of course, that some of the states in the area are not yet ready to assume the far-reaching obligations that go with such a program of collective security. Nevertheless, I believe the matter should be the subject of constant exploration.

(5) We should continue to resist any move to appease the Communist aggressors. Appeasement has much the same effect on the Communists as throwing a piece of raw meat to a hungry tiger; it only whets his appetite for more. Our policies should be pursued with firmness and patience. We should indeed be the first to arrive at the conference table and the last to leave. But we must insist in our negotiations upon settlements that are just and honorable.

(6) In this connection I want to emphasize that on this trip I had my previous convictions fully confirmed, namely, that the United States must not recognize Red China nor consent to its admission to the United Nations while it remains a satellite taking orders from Moscow.

Such a move might well be the death blow to the aspirations of the struggling nations of Asia to be free and independent. It would put the appeasing stamp of American approval on the exploitation by Moscow of the sufferings of the people of Asia.

Furthermore, no outlaw regime, like that in Peiping, should ever be allowed to blast its way with guns and tanks and instruments of war into a peace organization like the United Nations.

(7) I believe the time has come when our Government should declare that we will react to aggression wherever it ocurs in the world, taking whatever action our national interests require. The two great wars of this century might never have occurred if the free nations had made clear in advance their determination to oppose aggression. From what we heard in Asia, Secretary Dulles' warning to the Communist Chinese that they must not resume hostilities in Korea or move into Indochina, has had a tremendously helpful impact. I believe that these important warnings should be expanded to emphasize our concern, in line with our obligations under the United Nations Charter, about any aggression against any free-world country.

(8) I believe, too, that we should exert every effort to bring about a unity of purpose and direction among the free nations and a common policy with respect to the Far East to meet the dangers that confront us there. The Communist strategy is to divide and conquer—to sow the seeds of suspicion and distrust among the freedom-loving nations. We can counter this only if we join hands and formulate a program of action upon which we and our allies can agree. Too often in the past we have pulled apart and the cause of the free world has suffered accordingly. If the anti-Communist nations are to meet the Communist threat effectively the keynote for the future must be unity and teamwork.

(9) Continued technical assistance, and in some countries modest amounts of aid for economic-development purposes, must remain an indispensable part of our program. With living standards abysmally low and population pressure increasing, governments in these countries are extremely anxious to push ahead in improving the productivity of their soil, their transportation facilities, their public-health techniques, their educational systems, and their industrial production. To be sure, our assistance in all these countries must be a relatively small amount. But in most cases it represents a leavening factor which is extremely important. We must, I think, continue to underline in this practical way to the people of Asia our interest in the progress they are making in trying to build a better tomorrow.

(10) In this same connection, we in the United States should do our utmost in our dealings with our friends in Asia to demonstrate the positive values of the democratic way of life. It is not enough to condemn communism; we must convince the people of Asia that their future and their destiny lies on the side of freedom. When they understand that communism means slavery and the loss of those basic liberties that man has struggled over the centuries to attain, I am confident they will freely choose to stay with the free nations.

(11) Finally, I am convinced that we should lose no time in stepping up our information service in this far eastern area. I am inclined to feel we have overemphasized the importance of the military and economic aspects of our program and neglected the ideological. And I believe that in an ideological approach we would do well to highlight the teachings and traditional moralities of the countries concerned which bring out and illustrate those deep values of individual freedom for which peoples throughout the world are yearning. It is far more effective in India, for example, to extol the spiritual greatness of Gandhi and to relate his teachings to freedom and world peace, than to boast of America's material accomplishments and military might.

Our whole experience emphasizes the importance of appointing United States representatives in these areas who are humanly sympathetic with the problems of the people, and who are able to interpret the good will and sincere desire of the American people to help. We must not seek to dominate or dictate. We must not try to rebuild these countries in the image of America. We must help them in their keen eagerness to work out their own future.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In making these recommendations I am not unaware of the difficulties involved. Today it may look to some people as though the freedom of these countries could only be won by force of arms. I am in full agreement that this must be avoided, if it can be avoided, without appeasement or the slavery of human souls. Wars in this atomic age are terrible to contemplate but human slavery is worse. Lincoln said that a nation half slave, half free cannot survive. Today we know that a world half slave and half free is threatened with destruction.

But physical war and atomic destruction need not be inevitable. We are dealing with a new and different kind of struggle. Final and lasting victory can be won by winning the critical war of ideas—by convincing the minds of men of the eternal values of freedom under the guiding hand of God. If and when this is done, shooting wars will be over.

May we pray and strive that our United States will be a beacon of light guiding these suffering, groping people of Asia to join the Great Crusade; that governments of freemen, by freemen and for freemen may win the world to lasting peace.

INDOCHINA CRISIS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I did not have the advantage yesterday afternoon of hearing the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], which were joined in by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], with reference to the recent decision to send mechanics into Indochina to maintain bombers and other airplanes in the present Indochinese war. I think, however, that some very material and very pertinent and very timely points were raised in that discussion. I appreciate the very fine sentiments on the subject which each of the Senators made.

Mr. President, in my peculiar responsibility as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I consider I am duty bound to give a few facts and a few reasons why I feel the way I do about the matter.

A week or more ago I wrote the Secretary of Defense that I had understood that some of our mechanics or members of our Armed Forces were being sent to Indochina to take some part in the activities there and that I felt compelled to object.

We have heretofore launched on a policy of sending money and other material aid into this area and into the conflict. I am in accord with that policy, and I stand behind it. I know that we have had a very small group of military personnel in that area on a special training mission for some time, but it has been a very small group. I understand the number involved has been less than 100. Now we are sending to that area B–26 bombers, and we were recently called on to send maintenance crews into Indochina. The press releases call them "technical men," which would include chemists or technicians of that kind. However, they are members of the United States Air Force and of the fighting crews of the bombers to the extent that they keep them going and in the air.

I do not know whether or not those men wear American uniforms; but I always thought that a man had to properly and correctly identify himself if he was connected with a war; otherwise, he would be called a spy. Anyway, they are directly from the Air Force, and they are being sent to Indochina. It is not as if they were volunteer mechanics, who work for high wages and take their chances. So we are actually participating in a war to that extent.

I understood that 400 such men were wanted, and that we sent only 200. As I understand, those men were sent to that area under the orders of the Commander in Chief. Such a step could not be taken otherwise, according to my view of the situation.

As I understand a radio announcement this morning, it was stated that the French were asking that, in order to operate a particular kind of airplane, we send our own pilots. That is a very reasonable request from the standpoint of the French; but it proves my contention that, step by step, we are moving into this war in Indochina, and I am afraid we will move to a point from which there will be no return.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Is the distinguished Senator from Mississippi saying that those so-called technicians are actually members of the United States Air Force military personnel?

Mr. STENNIS. That is my information; yes. I do not think there is any contention about that. They are mechanic crews, or what we sometimes call ground crews, in the Air Force, specially trained as mechanics to repair the type of motor or plane we are sending there.

As I was saying, according to the radio announcement this morning, there had been or there is a request for pilots,

which surely is another step, and another logical step, in the direction which I mentioned. If we are going to send men to Indochina for the purpose of keeping airplanes on the firing line, it is only natural that we send along the pilots and the trigger men. It is the logical next step.

I desire to say a few words about the selection of these mechanics. As I understand, there are a number of nationals of the Philippines who are qualified mechanics for such work. There are a number of highly qualified Korean mechanics able to do such work. There are a number of highly qualified Japanese nationals in Japan who are able to do such work, and also a number of nationals of other countries in Asia. I understand that the use of some of these mechanics was considered, but that, for one reason or another, the idea was rejected and the plan to use United States Air Force mechanics was adopted.

I have no criticism now of France as to her conduct of the present war. I know she has been bled tremendously. I am not one to criticize her conduct of the war, especially since I have been to France and have become aware of the problems France confronts. However, I think it is a fact that while we are sending great amounts of money and other material aid, France has mechanics of her own who are qualified to do such work. With my own eyes I saw French mechanics last fall in Chateauroux who were doing very effective work at our air bases in the repair of our jet engines and our jet planes. That is what they were trained for, and that is what they were doing. They were repairing jet planes and jet engines after the planes had been flown a certain number of hours. I think such mechanics are available now within France. This fact shows that it certainly was not necessary that men be sent from our own Air Forces. If men were necessary, it seems clear to me that advanced and determined planning would have found a way to have recruited such mechanics from Asiatic countries, or in France. I believe civilian mechanics could have been recruited here; but this would also have been a mistake in my opinion.

It is a part of the day's work for our Air Force mechanics in Indochina who are maintaining airplanes there to be out on the field. Suppose a plane is shot down; suppose a base where they work is bombed; suppose they are attacked. They will have to fight back, of course. If our men are attacked, we will have to go to their aid. We could not stand back. Then we will have been already committed. What concerns me is that it is just another step toward a committal from which we will not be able to retrace our steps. I think the logical move of retaliation on the part of Red China is for her to send her planes and her men to Indochina. If she wants to intervene, this is her excuse for so doing. Here is her chance to counteract what we are doing. This action on our part is just another illustration of having one thing lead to another. First we send them planes, and then we send them men.

I know the general argument is that we must stop communism in Asia. I wish that were as simple and as easy of accomplishment as it sounds.

However, Mr. President, we are not yet out of Korea. Our soldiers are still there. There is no peace there, but only an uncertain and an armed truce. We have had to commit ourselves, in the wisdom of our Government, to a mutual-security pact guaranteeing the political and territorial integrity of South Korea. We do not know when fighting may reopen there. But one of the most certain ways to bring about a renewal of the fighting there is for us to become committed in Indochina and have to send our troops there on a large scale. An easy way to bring about a reopening of the Korean war is to have our Armed Forces committed in Indochina.

Mr. President, let me point out that our present commitments of our land forces throughout the world are, in my opinion, far beyond what we have in being or what we are planning. Let me say that I am not "talking through my hat" on that point; I have very respectable authority for the statement that the ground troops we now have in our Army are not sufficient in number to enable us to carry out our present commitments. Certainly we should not be involving ourselves in the very delicate situation in Indochina—one of the trigger situations, I suppose it might be called—for, should we get into war in Indochina, it could result in involving us further on an enormous and, I believe, an endless scale.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Mississippi is saying, I assume, that we are overextended; that we have made commitments which we are unable to live up to; and that we are committing ourselves in this additional way at the same time when we are reducing the size of our Army, as I understand, according to the figures in the budget, by approximately 20 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Montana is correct in his estimate of the reduction. I think a great part of the "new military look" is sound, but I do not like the idea of a reduction of the Army at the very time when we are carrying on such activities. In fact, I think it is unsound for us to reduce the size of the Army if we extend our commitment. The logical sequence of the steps we are taking could quickly lead us into another commitment far larger than any we now contemplate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Could the distinguished Senator from Mississippi tell me just what the "new military look" is?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, that is a short question, but it involves a very long answer. I was referring to the general proposition of greater emphasis on the Air Force and greater emphasis on airpower in the Navy. Personally, I think it is sound and all right to bring back the two divisions from Korea.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to the Senator from Mississippi that I understand the possibilities are that the reduction in Korea will amount to more than two divisions, and that the Navy will have to put 50 of its vessels into mothballs. Furthermore, so far as the "new look" based on "massive retaliatory power" is concerned, there is nothing new about it, because ever since we have had a Strategic Air Command, under the leadership of General LeMay, its policy has been that of massive retaliatory power. That was so even during the Truman administration.

On the other hand, the "new look" means 137 air groups, I believe, instead of 143. It means 54 air groups for General LeMay's Strategic Air Command, I believe, instead of 58. It means a reduction in the size of the Navy to the extent of 50 vessels, and it means a reduction of the Marine Corps, plus a reduction of the Army to the extent of at least two divisions.

Yet we have these commitments all over the world. How can we obtain more defense for less money on the basis of cutting the size of our Armed Forces and on the basis of propagandizing the "new look," which I do not believe many of the American people at the present time really understand.

Mr. STENNIS. As I havt said, Mr. President, I do not care to discuss at this time the entire aspects of what is called "the new military look." I appreciate the comments the Senator from Montana has made, and I appreciate his feeling about this matter.

My point is that we are reducing our Army at a time when we have commitments which are already in what we might call the active stage—at least they involve the possibility of our being called upon—and which are beyond our power to carry out. And now, in addition to those commitments, we are flirting with the most serious situation which I think there is on the present horizon, unless it be the situation in Korea, where some of our forces are still assigned. We are far from a peace in Korea. We have binding, unconditional commitments to keep our forces there; and I do not advocate that we remove them from Korea.

However, the Indochina situation to which I have referred is fraught with the most terrible consequences, and it is something for which we are not preparing. On the contrary, we are looking in the other direction.

So I say now, Mr. President, that, in my opinion, those who feel safe in such a course should consider the possibilities involved. They should advocate a larger Army, the increased taxes which will be necessary to maintain it, increased appropriations, and a call for more men each month under the Selective Service Act. We will have to have more of our men trained, in order to have the power, if this situation should break against us; to follow through on a dangerous policy on which I believe we are embarking. We are going to war, inch by inch.

Mr. President, I cannot speak for any other member of the Armed Services

Committee, and, of course, I do not attempt to do so. On the other hand, I know the reaction of at least some members of the committee. When it was learned that men from the Regular Air Force were not merely being considered for duty in Indochina, but had already been sent there, and that the original proposal was to send 400 men, instead of 200—there was grave concern. Although the other members of the committee can speak for themselves, I do not believe the great majority will approve of the sending of those men to Indochina. I know I do not. I heard the rumor some 10 days ago, and I wrote to the Secretary of Defense, as a member of the Security Council, stating that I strenuously objected.

Mr. President, I feel that we are riding hard along what can be a road to direct intervention with armed manpower in the Indochinese War, and for that we are not prepared. If the American people want to go in, all right; if they want to stay out, all right. But I do not want to see them committed step by step, so that eventually they will have no choice, but will be compelled to go in. I think that is the big decision we must make.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi is making a number of observations which I think are very important. Does he not believe that the statement made by the distinguished majority leader yesterday evening, to the effect that we do not contemplate sending any combat troops, should suffice; or is the Senator from Mississippi afraid that perhaps through some back-door approach, some of his fears may be realized, and, as a result, the country will have to pay the price?

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate very much the sentiments expressed by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I noted with great interest and very carefully what he had to say yesterday afternoon. I take his statement, so far as he can control the situation, at full faith, of course. I know that he is very sincere. However, I feel that this policy was decided upon and action was taken under it, and men were sent to Indochina without any knowledge whatsoever on the part of any member of the Armed Services Committee, so far as I know. I consider it to be very definitely a part of a new policy which ought to be brought up and discussed. The sentiment of more Senators and more people should be determined. Even though I trust the majority leader implicitly, I cannot be content merely on the assurance of only one Member of the Senate, the Senator from California, who stated that there was no present intention to go any further.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I missed the implication of the word "present." It is my understanding that the majority leader stated that no combat troops would be sent to Indochina. I raised the question with respect to rumors that the two divisions being withdrawn from Korea were being sent to Indochina. He stated that those two would not be sent there; nor would any other divisions.

I take it that what the Senator from Mississippi has in mind is that before action is taken the appropriate committees of the Congress should be informed. In other words, to use a phrase which was in high esteem during the period of the previous administration, when the Republicans were in the minority, we today, like them at that time, would like to be in on the takeoff as well as the crash landing, if there is to be a crash landing.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator has stated the situation correctly. I do not believe there is any probability of shipping the two divisions now in Korea to Indochina. I do not think there is present any plan to do so.

My point is that, step by step, we are leading to a situation in which we may have no choice except to go in there with ground forces. We are committing ourselves step by step and item by item, until that may be the only course left for us to take.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true, according to the press reports this morning, that the French Government has requested of this Government Air Force pilots?

Mr. STENNIS. I did not see that in the press, but I heard on the radio that such a request had been made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How long could we go along with supplying Air Force pilots before we might be called upon to supply ships, and perhaps combat troops?

Mr. STENNIS. It would be only a question of a short time. That is my point. One step leads to another.

Mr. President, I have one additional point to make. I am satisfied in my own mind that the need for the mechanics in question could be supplied from other sources. They could be supplied from the nationals of several countries in Asia. It might require a little time. They could be supplied from France, or even from civilians in the United States, although I would object to that method.

I notice that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee stated that he has been assured by the Secretary of Defense that these mechanics would be brought back not later than June 12, which is approximately 4 months away. That indicates a retreat from the plan, policy, or whatever it may be called.

I insist that another plan be put into effect, a plan to provide substitute mechanics for that area from some other source, and get our men away from there at the earliest possible date prior to June 12, because I think the fact that there is an agreement to bring them back is an admission that the situation is fraught with the gravest possibilities of danger.

I feel that these mechanics can be supplied from other sources. Under the circumstances, I believe that they should be supplied from other sources. I hope that will be the policy of the administration, and that that policy will guide its thinking and planning. The situation is grave. We must either go in or stay out.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not see what we could gain by sending combat troops into Indochina. According to the information I have, the French and Associated States have approximately 400,000 men under arms. The Communists, the Viet-Minh under Ho Chi Minh, have approximately 300,000 men. The Lactians have 13 battalions, the Cambodians about 10, and the Vietnamese about 80, with an eventual buildup to about 200. What good would it do to send any more men from outside, when this buildup is in progress, when there is a superiority not only in manpower but in equipment as well? In a war in which there is no front, in a war which a great many people would like to forget, I will admit, I do not see that there is much that could be done by our country sending combat troops into that area.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is better qualified to speak as to the general conditions in Indochina than I am. However, as I have tried to point out, one step leads to another. Such a situation might lead to the intervention of Red China, perhaps on a small scale at first, and, through one step leading to another, we could very well become involved in the entire area, and not merely on the present battlefronts of the Indochinese war. I do not believe that we ought to go in; but if we are committing ourselves to a policy which may lead us there, we had better be prepared.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT TO INCLUDE WOOL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the information of the Senate we are awaiting a message from the House with reference to the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

In the meantime I desire to take up a number of bills which I previously discussed with the minority leadership. They are as follows:

Calendar No. 835, S. 2313, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act; Calendar No. 836, S. 1990, to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act; Calendar No. 837, S. 1381, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; Calendar No. 877, S. 2722, to provide for the disposal of paid postal savings certificates; Calendar No. 878, H. R. 5379, to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of

publication; Calendar No. 879, H. R. 5959, to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government which retired officers may receive; and Calendar No. 617, S. 2038, to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2313), Calendar No. 835.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2313) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments were agreed to on January 22, 1954.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senate should have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at the time wool tops were included in the list of commodities to be regulated under the Commodity Exchange Act, there was no trading at all in wool in grease as such. Producers and users of wool and manufacturers have requested that wool, as well as tops, be included in the list of commodities regulated by the Commodity Exchange Act.

That is the sole purpose of the bill. Two clarifying amendments have been agreed to by the Senate. Section 2 has been added in order to give certain interested parties an opportunity to put themselves in a position to comply with the act.

There was no objection to the bill in the committee, and it was reported unanimously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS OF THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1990) to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1990) to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, on page 2, after line 7, to strike out:

SEC. 13. Whenever it shall appear to the Secretary of Agriculture that any person has engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice constituting a violation of any provision of this act, or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, he may in his discretion bring an action in the proper district court of the United States, or the proper United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to enjoin such act or practice and to enforce compliance with this act, or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder. Upon a showing that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such act or practice, a permanent or temporary injunction or decree or restraining order shall be granted without a bond.

And insert:

SEC. 13. Whenever it shall appear to the Secretary of Agriculture that any person (other than a contract market) has engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice constituting a violation of any provision of this act, or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, and whenever it shall appear to the commission that a contract market has engaged or is about to engage in any such act or practice, the Secretary or the commission, as the case may be, in his or its discretion, may bring an action in the proper district court of the United States or the proper United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to enjoin such act or practice and to enforce compliance with this act, or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder. Upon a showing that such person or such contract market has engaged or is about to engage in any such act or practice, a permanent or temporary injunction or decree or restraining order shall be granted without a bond.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third sentence of section 6 (b) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U. S. C. 15) is amended to read as follows: "For the purpose of securing effective enforcement of the provisions of this act, and for the purpose of any investigation or proceeding under this act, the provisions, including penalties, of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended and supplemented (49 U. S. C. 12, 46, 47, 48), relating to the attendance and testimony of witnesses, the production of documentary evidence, and the immunity of witnesses, are made applicable to the power, jurisdiction, and authority of the Secretary of Agriculture (or any person designated by him), the commission, and any referee designated pursuant to the provisions of this act, and to any person subject thereto."

SEC. 2. The Commodity Exchange Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 13. Whenever it shall appear to the Secretary of Agriculture that any person (other than a contract market) has engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice constituting a violation of any provision of this act, or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, and whenever it shall appear to the commission that a contract market has engaged or is about to engage in any such act or practice, the Secretary or the commission, as the case may be, in his or its discretion, may bring an action in the proper district court of the United States or the proper United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to enjoin such act or practice and to enforce compliance with this act, or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder. Upon a showing that such person or such contract market has engaged or is about to engage in any such act or practice, a permanent or temporary injunction or decree or restraining order shall be granted without a bond."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the bill would give to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Exchange Commission the same rights to issue subpenas for investigational purposes and to seek injunctions as are now employed by other regulatory commissions of the Government.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 25 of the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out the word "and" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "or."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1949

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1381) Calendar No. 837.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1381) to amend the Agriculture Act of 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished Senator from Vermont state the purpose of the bill before permission is granted for its consideration?

Mr. AIKEN. This bill would permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to rotate its stocks of basic and storable commodities to prevent them from going out of condition, to consolidate odd lots, and to discontinue maintaining stocks at out-of-position locations.

The first committee amendment makes it clear that the question of storability must be one arising after the commodity is put in store in order to warrant application of this provision.

The second committee amendment would relieve the corporation of the necessity of purchasing inventory replacements at more than the support price.

The Commodity Credit Corporation owns very small lots of commodities all over the country. Under the law as it now reads the Corporation cannot dispose of these commodities except when they are beginning to spoil or, in many cases, by consolidating small lots so as to make up a carload or a quantity which will attract buyers. Even then the Corporation cannot sell the commodities below the support price plus 5 percent.

This bill would permit them to dispose of a hundred bushels of corn at the going price in the community, and then purchase elsewhere whatever amount would be necessary to offset the effect of the sale of that corn on the support program.

If Senators will read the bill, they will see that it specifies small quantities.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have a copy of the bill at hand, and I should like to ask if the Senator would consider 10,000 bushels a small amount?

Mr. AIKEN. Personally, I would not. I am looking at the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who has had experience in handling tremendous quantities of commodities, and I should prefer to have him answer the Senator's question as to what would constitute a small quantity. Where I come from 200 bushels would be a small quantity.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think it would depend considerably upon the type of commodity. If it were 10,000 bushels of wheat, it might be regarded as a small quantity compared with the 600 million or 700 million bushels stored all over the country. On the other hand, 10,000 bushels might be a rather large quantity with which to deal.

Mr. AIKEN. I am advised by the counsel that the bill would be expected to apply primarily to less-than-carload lots. I believe that is the position taken by the Department.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have no objection, if that is the case.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for one question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is language in the bill which is designed to cover the situation which the Senator mentioned. Does the Senator think this language would cover as well all the Commodity Credit stock of butter and cheese?

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, no.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am also sure it does not. It is only for the small odds and ends which the Department may have around the country which they wish to dispose of.

Mr. AIKEN. If it owned 5,000 pounds of cheese in one place and 100 pounds in another, the language would permit a sale at the going price in the particular community involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1381) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 1, line 9, after the word "questionable", to insert "continued"; and on page 2, line 1, after the word "substantially", strike out "depressing market prices or impairing any price-support program" and insert "impairing any price-support program, but in no event shall the purchase price exceed the then current support price for such commodities", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following "Nor shall the foregoing restrictions apply to sales of commodities the disposition of which is desirable in the interest of the effective and efficient conduct of the Corporation's operations because of the small quantities involved, or because of age, location, or questionable continued storability, but such sales shall be offset by such purchases of commodities as the Corporation determines are necessary to prevent such sales from substantially impairing any price-support program, but in no event shall the purchase price exceed the then current support price for such commodities."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISPOSITION OF PAID POSTAL SAVINGS CERTIFICATES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 877, Senate bill 2772.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2772) to provide for the disposal of paid postal savings certificates.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the main objective of this bill, which was reported without amendment from the committee, is to authorize the Postmaster General to dispose of approximately 250 million paid postal savings certificates or other evidences of deposit 6 years after the date of such are shown by the official records of the Department to have been paid.

It provides a statute of limitations of future claims thereon of 6 years from the date of shown payment. It provides that the final determination of whether such payment has been properly made on these postal savings certificates shall be based on the official records of the Post Office Department and that, as a protection to the persons having such claims, the effective date of the act shall be the first day of the sixth calendar month following the date of its enactment.

It is believed that this will enable the Post Office Department to make great savings inasmuch as they will gain the storage space and funds will be received from the sale of the 600 tons of this material.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2772) to provide for the disposal of paid postal savings certificates was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) all claims for payment of any postal savings certificate, or other evidence of deposit in the postal savings depository system, including duplicates, which certificate or evidence of deposit, including duplicates, are shown by the records of the Post Office Department to have been duly paid, shall be barred if not presented to the Postmaster General within 6 years from the date on which such records show that they were paid.

(b) Final determination as to whether payment properly has been made on postal savings certificates or other evidences of deposit in the postal savings depository system, including duplicates, shall be based upon the official records of the Post Office Department.

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, destroy, or otherwise dispose of, all postal savings certificates, or other evidences of deposit in the postal savings depository system, including duplicates, after the expiration of 6 years from the date payment thereon has been made as shown by the records of the Post Office Department.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of the sixth calendar month following the date of its enactment.

PRINTING AND MAILING OF PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS OF CERTAIN SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 878, House bill 5379.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5379) to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, H. R. 5379 was reported by the committee without amendment.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to allow certain societies and institutions which publish periodicals to print those periodicals and enter them in the mails at places other than that of their declared publication. Under the existing law in order for these societies or institutions to qualify for second-class postage rates, their periodicals must be printed and entered in the mails at the office of publication designated by such association or body.

In our modern day economy, this has placed an unrealistic burden upon these societies inasmuch as they were limited in their negotiations for printing to those printing plants at the place of their stated publication. This bill, by removing such burden and allowing the publications to be entered in the mails and printed at places other than the designated place of publication, will provide the desired flexibility to these small publishers.

The bill will not involve any additional cost to the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5379) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN RETIRED COMMISSIONED OFFICERS FROM A LIMITATION PRESCRIBED BY LAW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 879, House bill 5959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5959) to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government, which retired officers may receive.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the purpose of H. R. 5959, which has been reported by the committee without amendment, is to amend the dual compensation statute which restricts the amount of combined income received as a civilian employee of the Government and military retired pay of disabled commissioned officers.

Under the present law retired commissioned officers who were disabled as a result of combat with the enemy or an explosion of an instrumentality of war are excepted from this limitation.

The purpose of this amendment is to strike out the word "explosion" so that any person hereunder disabled by an instrumentality of war would be excepted from the statute irrespective of whether the instrumentality of war exploded or not. The strict interpretation placed under the statute at preesnt prohibits, for example, a pilot who crashes and survives the airplane crash from being excepted from the dual compensation limitation unless his plane exploded.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wonder if the Senator will indicate his definition of "instrumentality of war"?

Mr. CARLSON. An instrumentality of war may be an aircraft. A pilot may be injured, but if the plane does not explode when it crashes, he does not receive the same compensation as would be received if the plane had exploded. That is the reason we are trying to correct the statute.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has presented an extreme case, it seems to me. What other machines might be regarded as instrumentalities of war? Would a truck, an automobile, a jeep, or a calculating machine at the headquarters be so considered?

Mr. CARLSON. I can only state the basis for this proposed legislation. It passed the House, and the committee heard testimony, and we are trying to correct the condition which existed because of an airplane crash which had resulted in permanent injury, but because the plane did not explode, the particular persons involved received different compensation from that which would have been received if it had exploded.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator think that in order to correct the situation which obviously works an injustice, judging from the Senator's description, we may be going far afield and opening the Government to wide claims under the interpretation of "instrumentalities of war," unless there is a definition of what is meant by the term?

Mr. CARLSON. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that, so far as our committee was concerned, I think I can definitely state that the bill affects only this particular or one type of instrumentality of war. The bill has the approval of the Comptroller General, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Department of the Army. I believe they have encountered some problems in connection with the matter and are trying to correct a situation which I think should be corrected.

I can readily see the point raised by the Senator from Tennessee, but I do not believe it would be valid in this case.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CARLSON. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the Senator from Kansas seeing the point I have raised, but I do not know why he should say it is not valid in this case. At this time we are considering a bill which comes with a report which does not shed any light upon the interpretation of the language used in the bill. Neither does the Senator give an interpretation. It seems to me we are leaping in the dark. Therefore, I think the point is valid.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit me to do so, I shall read from the report.

This legislation will remove from the existing law the need for the instrumentality of war to have exploded before such disabled officer would be exempt from the statute, thus making it compatible with the exemption provided by another dual-compensation statute, the act of July 31, 1894 (5 U. S. C. 62). This 1894 statute prohibits the holding of more than one office where the annual compensation of any such office amounts to $2,500 or more. Officers of the uniformed services retired for injuries received in battle or for injury or incapacity incurred in the line of duty are exempted from this dual-compensation limitation.

So the bill is an attempt to correct an error in the law.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have read the language which the Senator has quoted. I submit that the language he has read from the report delineates what, in the opinion of the committee, the bill would do, but it does not shed light upon the extent to which an instrumentality of war may be interpreted as a source of a claim for compensation.

Mr. CARLSON. Does not the Senator from Tennessee believe that officers of the uniformed services, retired for injuries received in battle, or for injury or incapacity incurred in the line of duty, ought to be exempted from this dual compensation limitation, and that that takes care of the point raised by the Senator? The provision of this bill does only one thing: It simply corrects a situation that should have been corrected earlier.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill, because the distinguished majority leader has cleared it for consideration with the minority leader. I shall not object, but I shall vote against passage of the bill until there is further information concerning it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5959) to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government which retired officers may receive, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I observe that the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is present. There is a bill, S. 2038, Calendar 617, which we discussed some time ago and temporarily held up, because the Senator from Delaware, I believe, expressed some interest in the bill. If the Senator desires to send to his office for any material, I can proceed with other bills which have been cleared. However, I should be glad to take up the bill in which he is interestd, if it would suit the convenience of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. President, I shall ask that the consideration of Calendar 617, S. 2038, be deferred and that the Senate proceed with the consideration of other bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). The Senator from California has the floor.

CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF BUREAU OF PRISONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 785, H. R. 395, a bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 395) to confer jurisdiction

upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the bill simply confers jurisdiction on the United States Court of Claims to hear and render judgment on the claims of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons for compensation for the time they were required to work, in violation of the Saturday half-holiday law, during the period beginning March 3, 1931, and ending May 1, 1943, in excess of 4 hours on Saturday without being allowed compensatory leave on some other workday.

The bill further provides that nothing contained therein shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States. Each employee would be required to prove the amount of compensation to which he may be entitled as a result of the suit. The only defense available to the Government which is waived in the bill is that of the statute of limitations.

I might say that a great many prison employees received their pay, but for some reason or other a small group, not being aware of their rights, did not secure their pay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As I read the bill and the report, no effort is made here to prejudge or prejudice a case in any way; the bill merely confers jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Tennessee is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICERS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 923 (S. 1184) to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminate war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1184) to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminate war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 20, after the word "act", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That the authority granted under this act shall expire not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies, in process of liquidation by the Department of State at the time of the enactment of this act, for the amounts of suspensions and disallowances, which have been, or may be, raised by the General Accounting Office on account of payments made in accordance with vouchers certified by such certifying officers: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State or his authorized representative shall certify that in his opinion there is no evidence of fraud or collusion on the part of the certifying officers in connection with the payments.

SEC. 2. "Authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in process of liquidation by the Department of State" as used in this act means certifying officers employed by terminated war agencies tranaferred to the Department of State for liquidation and certifying officers under the Department of State who certified payments for the activities of such terminated war agencies, or any terminated wartime activity of the Department of State from funds allocated to or made available to the Department of State by working funds or reimbursements pursuant to the provisions of section 686, title 31, United States Code, or other authority of law: *Provided, however*, That no certifying officer of the Department of State shall be released hereunder as to payments made from funds appropriated directly to the Department of State or as to payments made after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That the authority granted under this act shall expire not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to authorize and direct the Comptroller General to allow credit in the accounts of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in process of liquidation by the Department of State, under certain conditions. According to a letter received from the Department of State, there are 5 additional officers involved, and the aggregate sum of $1,297.72. Most of the exceptions are those due to the inexperience of the certifying officers in the early part of the war. Before relief is granted, the Secretary of State must certify that there is no evidence of fraud or collusion on the part of the officer being relieved—nor does the bill in any way relieve from liability the recipients of the erroneous payments. The committee has amended the bill so as to cause the authority granted to expire 2 years from the date of enactment of the act.

I might add that the committee went into the subject matter of the bill very carefully, and finally, after much discussion, agreed to it by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, yesterday I stated to the distinguished majority leader that there had been pending on the calendar for some time certain bills, and that I would move to have them brought before the Senate for consideration. I appreciate the great dispatch of the business of the Senate on the part of the distinguished majority leader. He is doing an excellent job, for which I compliment him.

I wonder if there would be some way to have a time set for the consideration of the following bills, which I read according to their order number on the calendar:

Calendar 48, S. 56; Calendar 49, S. 59; Calendar No. 58, S. 101; Calendar 90, S. 389; Calendar 293, S. 1857; Calendar 563, H. R. 2351; and Calendar 893, H. R. 685.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota had previously mentioned these bills to me, and I brought his request to the attention of the majority policy committee and also of the minority leadership, stating that it was desired to have these bills taken up at a very early time. It was pointed out that Senators who had objected on the minority side, and I think there was one Senator who had objected on the majority side, happened to be away this week. Under those circumstances, it was preferred not to have the bills taken up during this week. But at the earliest opportunity, when there is a lull in the business of the Senate, I assure the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that I shall again bring the bills to the attention of the majority and minority leadership, in order to expedite action for the benefit of the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from California.

RELIEF FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order of business 617, Senate bill 2038, to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amenndment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That section 1 of the act entitled "An act authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Panama Canal not coming within the provisions of the Canal Zone Retirement Act," approved July 8, 1937 (50 Stat. 478), is amended by striking out the proviso therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That such cash relief shall not exceed $1.50 per month for each year of service of the employee so furnished relief, with a maximum of $45 per month, nor be granted to any employee having less than ten years' service with the Canal Zone Government and its predecessor agencies, including

any service with the Panama Canal Company, and its predecessor agencies, on the Isthmus of Panama."

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall take effect the first day of the month in which it is enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Senate bill 2038, introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. On July 2, 1953, the Senator from Massachusetts reported S. 2038 favorably to the Senate, accompanied by Report No. 494. On July 8, 1953, the bill was re-referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee, after discussion of the bill in executive session on July 21, 1953, voted to hold open hearings on the bill on Thursday, July 23, 1953. After due consideration was given to the testimony of various witnesses on that day, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to accept Report No. 494 by the Armed Services Committee, and directed the chairman to report S. 2038 to the Senate with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The Armed Services Committee had amended the bill by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the wording from lines 9 through 23 inclusive. Neither the substance nor the intent of S. 2038 is altered by the Armed Services Committee amendment.

The purpose of the bill is to permit an increase in the cash relief now being extended to certain employees of the Canal Zone Government. Under existing law, payments are limited to $1 a month for each year of service, with a maximum of $25 a month. Such employees, in order to be eligible, must have completed ten years of service.

S. 2038 would increase this amount by permitting payments of $1.50 a month for each year of service, with a maximum of $45 a month.

The act of July 8, 1937, by excluding those coming within the provisions of the Canal Zone Retirement Act, applied only to non-United States citizen employees. The 1937 act was passed in order that these alien employees, most of whom are Panamanian citizens, might not become public charges when disabled by age or disease.

The Canal Zone Retirement Act was repealed by the act of July 21, 1949 (63 Stat. 475). This brought the United States citizen employees who were formerly under the Canal Zone Retirement Act under the coverage of the United States Civil Service Retirement Act. The non-citizen employees of the Panama Canal Company are not expressly covered under either the 1937 act or S. 2038. The Panama Canal Company, however, has extended the system established by the 1937 act to its own employees and also, we understand, will extend the increases provided for in S. 2038.

According to reports at hand, the pending bill would not result in expense to the United States Treasury. The relief costs under S. 2038 would be financed in the same manner as those under the 1937 act. The costs payable by the Canal Zone Government, while initially financed from appropriations, would be repaid annually to the Treasury out of the operating revenues of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company. The costs payable by the Panama Canal Company to its employees would be financed from corporate revenues and not from appropriations.

S. 2038 as introduced was requested by the Secretary of the Army. The Bureau of the Budget interposed no objection to its enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, my attention has been called by the Parliamentarian to the situation apropos Senate bill 2038, Calendar No. 617, to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government, which the Senate passed a few minutes ago. The Parliamentarian has pointed out that there is on the calendar a House bill, Calendar No. 856, House bill 5861, to the same effect.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate in passing Senate bill 2038 be reconsidered; that in lieu of considering that Senate bill, the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5861, to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone government; that House bill 5861 be ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed; and that Senate bill 2038 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISCHARGE OF INDEBTEDNESS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there is at the desk the conference report on House Joint Resolution 358, which is privileged, and I ask that the Senate now proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

(For conference report, see p. 1591 of the House proceedings of February 9, 1954.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, approximately 2 weeks ago the House passed House Joint Resolution 358, which would restore anticipated losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the amount of $741,548,788. In acting on that measure, the Senate voted to reduce the amount to $245,900,917. The Senate voted to allow the Commodity Credit Corporation the actual impairment of the year before, namely, for actual losses, $114,283,062; and also for $129,553,795, representing the loss incident to the International Wheat Agreement; and for $2,064,060, the cost of the foot-and-mouth-disease operation, largely in Mexico. As the joint resolution was passed by the Senate, it provided for a total of $245,900,917.

When the Senate conferees met with the House conferees, the latter were adamant in their position, and insisted that the full amount be approved. They claimed that was strictly according to law, and that the entire amount was justified.

Finally the Senate conferees compromised with the House conferees, and allowed the amount voted by the House of Representatives, except the sum representing losses in connection with the dried milk program and the tobacco program. In short, the conferees agreed on an amount of $681,769,703.

Mr. President, the House has already acted on the conference report, I understand. At this time the question before the Senate is either to approve or to disapprove the conference report, which was approved unanimously by the House of Representatives, in the amount of $681,769,703.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. YOUNG. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I correctly understand that the conferees struck out the two items pertaining to tobacco and milk?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Upon what basis did they strike out those items, and leave the others in the conference report?

Mr. YOUNG. Those two items seemed to provoke greater dispute on the floor of the Senate than any of the others; and it was thought best to postpone consideration of those items to a future date, which would allow time for further hearings by the Senate subcommittee and the House subcommittee on agricultural appropriations, and would permit those items to be handled in the next agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield further to me?

Mr. YOUNG. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think the objection to those two items was any greater than was the objection to any of the other items, except I know that on the day the bill was considered by the Senate the committee apparently was willing to accept the amendment which then was pending, and therefore debate ended, and the differences on the other items did not come up. However, in connection with this measure there are many items which I do not think have been adequately explained. Perhaps the Senator from North Dakota can give us the answers.

For instance, I notice that $73,650 is provided to meet the loss on white potatoes. Under the law, we have not had price supports on white potatoes since 1951. I wonder whether the Senator from North Dakota can explain that item.

Mr. YOUNG. As I understand, the amount stated was the actual, realized loss in the liquidation of the potato price-support program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But that item is for the fiscal year 1953, whereas we have not supported white potatoes since 1951.

Having had a little experience with white potatoes, I know it would have been physically impossible to have had any white potatoes carried over from 1951 to the fiscal year 1953. The books of the Commodity Credit Corporation itself showed it did not have any white potato inventory at the beginning of the year. Under the law, the Commodity Credit Corporation was not allowed to buy any white potatoes during the year. So how could it have a price-support loss on this commodity in the fiscal year 1953?

Mr. YOUNG. As I understand, the loss was under the price-support program. It could have been on white-potato flour or on accounts which had not been settled as of that date.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But, if the Senator will yield further, I point out that there were no such items in the Commodity Credit Corporation's inventory at the beginning of the year; and under the law the Corporation could not have bought any white potatoes during the year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. YOUNG. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not likely that this is an item which should have been charged off in a previous year?

Mr. YOUNG. It is very likely.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That could well be; but in this case we are writing off this particular item, and no one knows what it is for. I do not think we have a right to say, "It could be for this" or "It could be for that." I agree that it could be for many things, but I think the Congress and the country are entitled to know what these items actually represent.

Mr. YOUNG. Of course the accounts could not be completely closed in 1951. For example, in the case of the Pakistan wheat program, we have been shipping wheat to Pakistan for nearly a year. It may be 2 or 3 years before we receive all the accounts for freight, and so forth, to the extent that the Commodity Credit Corporation can be completely reimbursed for the expenses of the program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield further to me at this point?

Mr. YOUNG. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask about another item, which perhaps the Senator from North Dakota can explain. I refer now to the item relating to cottonseed products. In the report which accompanied the request, in schedule 8, as it appears in the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation, on page 24, I notice that the Corporation says that in the fiscal year 1951 it made a profit of $5,500,000 on this program. For 1952 the Corporation reports a profit of $2,686,612 on the same program. For the fiscal year 1953, the year with which we are now dealing, the Corporation tells the American people it made a profit of $7,701,799 on the program. The Corporation also says in the same report that the overall, lifetime result in the case of this particular program is that it has made a profit of $15,297,314. In other words, the Corporation is claiming a profit throughout their operations in connection with cottonseed products.

On the other hand, in the same report I notice that the Congress is being asked to reimburse the Corporation for a loss of $38,479,026, on this same commodity. According to the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation, published on the same day, the Corporation made an overall profit. Now who are we to believe? Who is right? I wonder how that is explained.

Mr. YOUNG. That is understandable, I think, when the situation is analyzed. Until last year there had been the profit which the Commodity Credit Corporation reported. However, the expected loss is estimated by the Treasury Department at approximately $38 million.

I will say to the Senator from Delaware that I anticipate some rather sizeable losses in the operation of almost all the price support programs during the next year. In fact, the Commodity Credit Corporation was never organized in the first place to make a profit. It would be fine if it could. However, the purpose is to maintain some stability for agricultural prices.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not have before me the chart to which the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from North Dakota have referred. Is the loss in connection with cottonseed used for drought relief listed separately, or is this $38 million in addition to that?

Mr. YOUNG. I do not have the exact figure, but I do not believe that the impairment as a result of feed being furnished to livestock producers shows up in this report. Nothing of that nature shows up in this report. That is true also of the losses on the Pakistan wheat, for example. Those losses will show up next year.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, practically all the cottonseed meal on hand last year was disposed of, a good share of it in the late summer, under the drought relief program. It had to be disposed of before fall, because it does not keep as well as do some other items.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That loss will show up in connection with another appropriation bill, and is not included in the figures we have before us.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the answer to my question. I asked if, by any chance, the low price charged for cottonseed showed up in this report. We all know that last spring the Commodity Credit Corporation had hundreds of thousands of tons of cottonseed meal on hand, which it was having trouble getting rid of. It cut the price down to something like $55 a ton in order to move it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I fully agree that the cost of these programs will be tremendous. That is the point I am trying to bring out. I wish to get that point across to the people, and make those who are sponsoring the programs admit the cost. That objective is not achieved however under the proposed plan to cancel these notes in advance.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I have been talking about the profits which the Commodity Credit Corporation has made on certain price support operations in connection with basic commodities. However, I admit that there will be some sizeable losses. But I think the program is well worth while. If we could stabilize the agricultural economy of the nation at a cost of $1 billion a year, in my opinion it would be well worth the price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. However, the point is that we should bring the price tag out into the open. Every transaction should be open and aboveboard, which has not been the case in years past. We are not doing it today. In the report which is before us we are telling the American people——

Mr. YOUNG. I will say to the Senator from Delaware that the Commodity Credit Corporation has been following the law since 1938. The Department officials have not done anything under cover. They are doing exactly what they are supposed to do under the law. If the Senator from Delaware wishes to change the law, that is another matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from North Dakota that they are doing today exactly what they have been doing since 1938. I have been protesting this procedure for the last 6 years since I have been in the Senate. I thought that as a result of the last election we were going to change the situation. However, in connection with this program, 7 of the 9 directors are men who held those positions during the preceding administration. In view of this fact, it is understandable why the necessary changes are not being made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to

me if the Senator from Delaware has concluded?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I share the sentiments of the Senator from Delaware with regard to the change in personnel; but that question is not involved at the moment. What we have been forgetting in this entire story is that the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Treasury Department are charged with measuring a diminution in the value of the assets which they have. They have set up a very careful appraisal program. They appraise what they have in their inventory. The $495 million on this sheet is actually an inventory loss.

When the Commodity Credit Corporation buys butter at 66 cents a pound, and the market price is 38 cents a pound, the Commodity Credit Corporation is charged, on an appraisal of its assets, with reflecting that loss when it seeks to repair the capital structure of the Corporation. When it has bought milk at 17 cents a pound, and it now has a value of a little less than 3 cents a pound, that represents a loss. Under the law the Corporation must appraise the value of its assets and make a report thereon. That is the mandate in the law.

There are some items which might be a little difficult to explain, but they are minor items. The Senator from Delaware referred to an item of $78,000 in connection with potatoes. That is doubtless an administrative charge which goes back several years, even though the inventory shows neither potatoes nor potato flour.

There is a charge of $5,000 for liquidation of the honey program. That is a "honey," in any man's language. Why we should be in the honey business is more than I know, but that is a minor item. The large items represent nothing more than a determination of what the asset is worth as of the time the sheet is made up, compared with the cost of the commodity. A report must be made to the Treasury and to the Congress. That is what is reflected on the sheet before us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield in order that I may ask the Senator from Illinois a question or two? He seems to understand the program pretty thoroughly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator flatters me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator from Illinois tell the Senator from Delaware, for the RECORD, the manner in which he thinks this determination is made?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The price determination?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a very involved appraisal method. The Corporation is mandated, of course, to make the appraisal on the basis of the law. I will tell my friend the appropriate provisions of the act of March 8, 1938.

There must be an appraisal of all assets and liabilities of the Corporation for the purpose of determining the net worth of the Corporation. In order to do so the Corporation makes an appraisal of the cost of such assets to the Corporation, or, insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal.

My friend from Delaware may remember that when we first created the Corporation it was necessary for the Corporation to make a report in March. Because of the volume of its operations, it was discovered that it could not do so. We amended the law so that it could be done by June 30th, the end of the fiscal year.

What the Corporation does is simply to make the best appraisal it knows how to make, consonant with certain Supreme Court decisions. So the large item here is an inventory loss. A business concern would do precisely the same thing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that these appraisals are made at cost or on the basis of the market price as of June 30th, whichever is lower. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. First of all, the Corporation takes into consideration the cost, and then the market value. I can best illustrate the method to my friend from Delaware by the report which is before us. For example, butter was purchased at a little more than 66 cents a pound. Then the price of butter went down to a figure representing whatever the market value was at the time the appraisal was made. The appraisal was made as of June 30, 1953. So whatever the difference was, that figure represents the inventory loss.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Speaking of butter, what was the average cost of the butter to the Corporation, and what was the average market price as of June 30, 1953?

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I understand, the average cost was 66.86 cents a pound, and the average market value under the appraisal was a little more than 38 cents, so it is easy to express the final impairment in the inventory.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Where did the Corporation get the figure of 38 cents a pound, when the United States Government is buying all the butter that is offered for sale in the United States at approximately 67 cents a pound? That is the market price, and that has been the market price ever since.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What my friend forgets is this——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I recognize that the Corporation is not going to get its money out of the operation, and we shall have to take a loss. I think we made a mistake when we started buying it, and I think we should revise our program today. We were buying it when the market was 67 cents. The market price is now 67 cents. Those are the facts.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I should like to make an explanation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well. I think the Senator from North Dakota is entitled to some of his own time.

Mr. YOUNG. The Commodity Credit Corporation had commercial sales during the past 6 months of 3,694,000 pounds, at a little more than 66 cents a pound. It sold 15,034,000 pounds to the Army at 15 cents a pound. Under the operation, in connection with section 32 funds, it disposed of 70,790,000 pounds at 66.8 cents a pound, or about the cost to CCC. There were also donations of 28,354,000 pounds. The average price the Corporation received for the past 6 months amounted to 38.78 cents. That includes the price of sales to the Army, and gifts and donations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is an average price.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That price includes sales of all kinds, and includes donations and deterioration in butter stocks. That is the average price obtained by the Corporation.

Mr. YOUNG. Or what it expects to get.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not believe the law is too clear on that point. I am not trying to say that there is not the possibility that it might be so construed; but the law does not mention average price. The law provides:

> The value of assets shall be determined on the basis of the cost of such assets to the Commodity Credit Corporation, or insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower.

They must use the cost unless they can obtain a market value. If they can ascertain the market value, and it is lower than the cost, that must be used.

In this instance they did exactly what has been described, namely, they gave away large quantities of butter. The giving away of it should not enter into the market price; nor should the sale to the Army at 15 cents a pound enter into the market price. I do not know why they would sell butter to the Army at a price lower than the price paid for oleomargarine.

Mr. YOUNG. They probably did it in order to get rid of it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know why the Army should pay 15 cents a pound for butter when it must pay 25 to 26 cents a pound for oleomargarine.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, at this point I should like to have read at the desk a letter written to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations by the general counsel of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read the letter.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> THE GENERAL COUNSEL
> OF THE TREASURY,
> *Washington, February 4, 1954.*
>
> Mr. JARLATH M. SLATTERY,
> *Director, Professional Staff, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*
>
> MY DEAR MR. SLATTERY: It appears that in connection with the consideration by the Senate Committee on Appropriations of House Joint Resolution 358, "to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation," a question has arisen concerning the basis used by the Treasury in its June 30, 1953, appraisal of the assets and liabilities of

the Commodity Credit Corporation for determining the value of certain dairy products held by the Corporation on that date.

The governing statutory provision (15 U. S. C. 713a–1) provides in pertinent part that "The value of assets shall be determined on the basis of the cost of such assets to the Commodity Credit Corporation, or insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower, * * *."

It is understood that during the month of June 1953 there existed generally a wholesale price for butter in the neighborhood of 66 cents per pound. However, the Treasury appraisers did not deem that they would be justified in adopting this as average market price for butter during the period in question, since such rate was largely determined by the buying price for butter of the Commodity Credit Corporation (i. e., approximate cost of butter to the Commodity Credit Corporation) and since the Corporation was unable to dispose of butter at this price in any significant quantities. Accordingly, the market price used for the purposes of the appraisal was a composite price of 38.78 cents per pound, based upon the actual experience of the Commodity Credit Corporation in disposing of butter. For the reasons outlined above, a similar method of arriving at the "average market price" for dried milk was used.

The question of whether the basis for the appraisal of the foregoing dairy products was proper from a legal standpoint resolves itself into the question of the meaning of "average market price" as set forth in the foregoing statutory provision. It was held in the case of *McGarry* v. *Superior Portland Cement Company* (Wash. 1917, 163 P. 928), that "The words 'market price' have no hard and fast meaning. There is no magic in the term. When it becomes the subject of legal controversy it will be given that meaning which will best serve the purpose and intent of those who use it in their contracts." In connection with the language it may be stated that, while the present situation does not involve the construction of a contract, the legislative history of the applicable statutory language does not indicate an intention by the Congress that the average market price should be arrived at by one particular method.

Accordingly, it would seem quite appropriate to apply the following definition of "market price" contained in the case of *Blydenburgh* v. *Welsh* (3 Fed. Cas. 771–775):

"Now, what is the price of a thing, particularly the market price? We consider it to be the value—the rate at which the thing is sold. To make a market there must be buying and selling, purchase and sale. If the owner of an article holds it at a price which nobody will give for it, can that be said to be its market value? * * * The law does not intend this."

In the light of the quoted definition and the particular circumstances prevailing in respect to the dairy products held by the Commodity Credit Corporation as of June 30, 1953, it is our opinion that the basis upon which they were appraised was not objectionable from a legal standpoint.

Very truly yours,

ELBERT P. TUTTLE,
General Counsel.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, at this point I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota that, as I am sure he realizes, those of us who raise this question are not trying to keep the Commodity Credit Corporation from getting some money. I have an interpretation of what I believe the law to be. I have before me an interpretation of the law as written on the 4th of February 1954, which is a very recent date. I believe that for years the Department has been proceeding under another theory. Perhaps that is not correct. At any rate, what the question raised by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] suggests to me is that soon, at least, and probably as quickly as the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry can do so, it ought to establish three bases upon which the Treasury Department might appraise these assets: One, the cost; two, the market value; and then, where there is no market and no possibility of sale, the Treasury Department might fix some sort of average price which would take care of the donations, and so forth.

I read from the case of Blydenburgh against Welsh:

To make a market there must be buying and selling, purchase and sale. If the owner of an article holds it at a price which nobody will give for it, can that be said to be its market value? * * * The law does not intend this.

Mr. President, 75 percent of all the butter produced does move at the market value, which is 67 cents a pound. It does not seem to me that the appraisal comes under the scope of this definition at all. I am trying to say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] that there can be a difference of opinion about how the appraisal should be determined without there being any question as to whether the Commodity Credit Corporation may need some more money. I hope that it may be clarified either by this discussion or by the enactment of subsequent legislation.

Mr. YOUNG. The point of the Senator from New Mexico is well taken. There is room for improvement with respect to the appraisal procedure, and I believe we ought to go into the subject further.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In response to the Senator from New Mexico, of course Congress might have written a more specific provision into the act of 1938, although at that time it did not appear to be necessary.

At this time certain guidelines and certain formulas might be written into the law, so as to avoid guesswork and the necessity of going to the Supreme Court for a decision. Let us make it specific, and let the act of 1938 be amended to provide what Congress intends to provide, and then, of course, the question probably will never arise again.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is what I am trying to suggest. I shall wish to say something further on the subject, and I hope we may have further discussion of it. I believe, however, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] ought to be allowed to complete his statement. I shall be happy to wait until he has concluded his remarks.

Mr. YOUNG. I do not have much more to say. At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the Committee on Appropriations from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, approving the procedure followed in making the appraisals.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 9, 1954.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Committe on Appropriations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: I understand that your committee desires certain information relating to the appraisal of the Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with the pending cancellation of notes in lieu of an appropriation under the act of March 8, 1938, as amended.

The committee appointed by me to make the appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of June 30, 1953, has observed the same standards and procedures since the law was amended in 1945 to include the present provisions.

The General Counsel of the Treasury Department has advised me that he is satisfied that the principles followed in making the appraisal of June 30, 1953, are in compliance with the act of 1938, as amended, which provides for the valuation of assets on the basis of cost of such assets to the Commodity Credit Corporation, or insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is lower. I am also informed that the practice followed by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the establishment of reserves for losses was referred to outstanding representatives of the public accounting profession who have commended the Corporation for the accounting practice employed, and advised that the practice appeared to be generally in accordance with acceptable accounting principles. It may be of interest to note that the appraisal committee has been more conservative than the Commodity Credit Corporation in the allowance of reserves for losses for appraisal purposes. In arriving at the preliminary appraisal which was submitted to the Congress by the Commodity Credit Corporation, the staff which assembles the data for the appraisal committee reduced the estimated impairment from $641,329,000 as shown on the Corporation's books to $609,931,000; this is $31,398,000 less than the impairment shown by the Corporation's records.

This appraisal data compiled by the committee's staff is now being given formal review by the appraisal committee. On the basis of the information available it appears that it would require approximately $609 million to restore the capital of the Corporation to the amount provided by law. Therefore, the sum of $550 million agreed to by the conferees is well below the capital impairment of the Corporation as of June 30, 1953.

As I understand it, the intention of the Congress as indicated in the law of March 8, 1938, as amended, was to place the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation on an accrued loss basis rather than on a cash payment basis. This results in allocating losses to the proper fiscal period, and is a practice generally used by large business concerns.

Very truly yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Mr. True D. Morse, acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 9, 1954.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: It is my understanding that your committee desires my comment on the appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of June 30, 1953.

The responsibility for making an appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of determining the amount of capital to be restored is placed by the act of March 8, 1938, as amended, on the Secretary of the Treasury. From our observation of the methods used in making the appraisal, it appears to us that a careful and painstaking effort is being made to perform the appraisal as accurately as possible within the requirements of the law.

If I can be of further assistance, I shall be glad to do so.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I realize the existence of some of the objections which have been made on the floor of the Senate with regard to the method of estimating losses, but I believe it to be about as broad as it is long. If losses on wheat are estimated as a result of a very weak cash price as of July 1 last year, and the Commodity Credit Corporation actually sells wheat, the wheat is accumulated for more than the Treasury anticipated it would be sold, the Treasury is repaid for it, and there is no loss incurred.

As of last June 15, the average price of wheat was $1.88 a bushel, or 78 percent of parity. On June 30, when the Treasury made its appraisal of wheat, it appraised it at about that value. Since that time the price of wheat has risen from 78 percent of parity to 82 percent of parity as of January 15.

On the basis of that computation, and barring further unfavorable conditions with respect to the wheat program, the Department may realize more money than it anticipated at that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that to the extent that the Treasury appraised the price of wheat, perhaps it was correct, and I made that statement in committee, because the domestic price was lower as of the day it made the appraisal. However, that is not the case with respect to butter. The Treasury wrote off the anticipated loss as it would be if certain factors entered into the situation, but they are factors which we know do not enter into it. If we allow them to follow this procedure in reference to butter, what will prevent them from adopting the same procedure next year on wheat, corn, or other commodities. To accept this philosophy places the power in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury to wreck the program on any commodity he wishes. The Government is committed, under the announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture, to support the price of butter until the first day of April at 67 cents. If they are going to drop the price after the first day of April, certainly the domestic price of butter will be lower. I do not know what they are going to do, and the Senator from North Dakota does not know. I do not think the Department could intelligently write off the loss on butter for the next 12 months. If we support butter at 80 percent of parity, which I personally think would be too high, it means that the price of domestic butter would be from 60 to 62 cents. In the absence of knowledge of what the Department plans to do we cannot estimate the loss here today. That is not the intent of the law as I understand it. It will accomplish nothing except to confuse the overall cost of the program.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, there is a great deal of merit to appraising ahead of time what the losses may be on commodities. The Treasury Department thought it probably would not be able to sell the butter for more than 38 cents a pound. It may well be that there will be more of a loss than that. If it had to be dumped on the market at this time it would not bring more than from 38 to 40 cents a pound. The world market price is about 4 cents a pound higher than that figure. By the time it is packaged and shipped to Europe it would cost about 44 cents, or the world price as of last June.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing the total capital impairment and operations by years.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Analysis of surplus, U. S. Treasury appraisals, and payments to or from U. S. Treasury

A. SURPLUS AS OF JUNE 30, 1953

Item	Cumulative to June 30, 1952	Fiscal year 1953	Cumulative to June 30, 1953
Net operating gain or loss * exclusive of cost of wartime consumer subsidy program	* $1,050,927,622.82	* $626,778,849.07	* [1] $1,686,706,471.89
Adjustments for recovery of price support losses:			
Charge to the reserve for postwar price support	500,000,000.00		500,000,000.00
Recovery from Secretary of Treasury, Public Laws 389 and 393, 80th Cong	56,239,432.11		56,239,432.11
Net total	* 593,688,190.71	* 626,778,849.07	* 1,130,467,039.78
Cost of wartime consumer subsidy program	* 2,102,061,818.55	74,622.70	* 4,101,987,195.85
Net restoration of capital from U. S. Treasury (see pt. B)	2,385,528,507.78	109,391,154.00	2,494,919,661.78
Net surplus (or deficit*)	* 220,221,501.48	* 517,313,072.37	* 737,534,573.85

[1] Includes $636,711,746 of reserve for losses reflected in schedule 7a and $732,327,908 net realized program loss reflected in schedule 8.

NOTE.—Asterisks indicate loss or deficit.

B. U. S. TREASURY APPRAISALS AND PAYMENTS TO OR FROM U. S. TREASURY, MAR. 31, 1938, THROUGH JULY 31, 1952

Appraisal as of—	Cumulative operating loss	Appraisal losses and adjustments	Total capital impairment	Payments to or from U. S. Treasury		
				Amount	Date	Manner
Mar. 31, 1938	$23,184,618.19	$71,100,786.54	$94,285,404.73	$94,285,404.73	June 1938	Appropriation.
Mar. 31, 1939	19,465,444.77	194,419,878.01	213,885,322.78	119,599,918.05	August 1939	Do.
Mar. 31, 1940	31,713,504.73	138,415,087.04	170,128,591.77	*43,756,731.01	June 1940	Payment to U. S. Treasury.
Mar. 31, 1941	60,161,512.71	111,604,524.57	171,766,037.28	1,637,445.51	September 1941.	Appropriation.
Mar. 31, 1942	21,125,668.56	122,824,855.04	143,950,523.60	*27,815,513.68	June–September 1942.[1]	Payment to U. S. Treasury.
Mar. 31, 1943	67,312,510.87	116,074,897.66	183,387,408.53	[2]		
Mar. 31, 1944	363,846,418.04	36,868,986.60	400,715,404.64	256,764,881.04	May 1945	Appropriation.
June 30, 1945	1,319,454,710.71	2,717,255.03	1,322,171,965.74	921,456,561.00	July 1946	Note cancellation.
June 30, 1946	2,149,835,521.63	185,831,475.35	1,964,004,046.28	641,832,080.64	May 1947	Do.
June 30, 1947	1,946,108,502.74	202,051,40	1,946,310,554.14	*17,693,492.14	April 1948	Payment to U.S.Treasury.
June 30, 1948	1,898,603,546.76	1,236,092.98	1,897,367,543.78	*48,943,010.36	June 1949	Do.
June 30, 1949	2,067,882,674.69	103,816,673.57	1,964,066,001.12	66,098,457.01	September 1950.	Note cancellation.
June 30, 1950	2,695,604,694.11	310,075,396.33	2,385,528,507.78	421,462,507.00	September 1951.	Do.
June 30, 1951	2,539,693,277.51	44,773,615.73	2,494,919,661.78	109,391,154.00	July 1952	Appropriation.
Net restoration of capital from U. S. Treasury.				2,494,919,661.78		

[1] $18,000,000 partial payment made in June 1942 and balance paid in September 1942.
[2] The impairment of $39,436,884.93 as of Mar. 31, 1943, is included in the May 1945 appropriation.

NOTE.—Asterisks indicate loss or deficit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, my opposition to the conference report is based on the fact that we are acting in an arbitrary fashion in removing the inventory reduction on dried milk and leaving in cuts on the value of butter and cheese.

I want to make clear again, as I tried to do when the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was discussing the question a few days ago, that I do not question the wisdom of the valuation placed upon commodities by the Treasury Department. I am not trying to show that prices finally received will not be as low as those established by the Treasury Department. I am merely contending that I do not think the law as presently written should be interpreted to give authority to bring prices down in accordance with what the Government thinks might result if all the butter were dumped on the market.

The amount set aside for wheat, I quite agree with the Senator from North Dakota, is probably proper, because the price did drop for a period of time during June. It is up again, somewhat. It is not going to go too high, because of the large carryover and the lack of storage space. Nevertheless, there will be a loss; but the figure on wheat is all right. The figures may be right as to a great many commodities. The thing which disturbs me most is what has happened in the butter situation. As the matter now stands, by the adoption of the conference report we shall have to restore full value to nonfat dry milk solids, a difficult product to sell, but we will drop the calculated price of butter to approximately 38 cents a pound.

The figures which the Treasury Department used in making its calculation represent an average or blended price. I hate to see that sort of a price used, because I think it is a bad tendency with reference to agricultural commodities which the Government is engaged in trying to support in the marketplace. We are supporting butter at a price of 66 cents, and yet a sale is made to the Army at 15 cents a pound. I do not know by what token the military should say to the Department of Agriculture, "We have requirements for butter, and if you cut the price to 15 cents a pound we will buy it."

The American farmer has been told repeatedly that he produces a very fine butter, and he does. For the Army to establish a price of 15 cents a pound I think is wrong. I think it is particularly wrong when butter is moving into the marketplace, and being supported at 66 or 67 cents a pound, that it is proposed we write the butter price down to 38 cents.

If the Secretary of Agriculture found he was unable for any reason to continue supporting the price of butter, can we imagine what that surplus would do to the butter price in this country?

Mr. President, the law under which the Secretary of Agriculture is operating has a special provision for butterfat and milk products. It is in a group of commodities that can be supported between 75 and 90 percent of parity. The stipulation is that the price of whole milk shall be supported at a level not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 75 percent as the Secretary shall determine to be necessary in order to insure an adequate supply.

The present level is 90 percent of parity. Surely, Mr. President, if we are getting so much butter that we have to reduce the price to 38 cents a pound, almost down to 50 percent of what the Government has paid for it, then we are supporting it at a level higher than the requirement of the law should be. The Secretary will be in difficulty when he tries to support butter again in the coming year.

Some years ago there was in this country a very large supply of dried eggs. We tried to figure out what we would do with them. We now have on hand 265 million pounds of butter. The average load of butter in a refrigerator car is 30,000 pounds. The number of cars necessary to take our butter supply across the country would be 8,833. If we placed 60 cars of butter in each train, we would have to have 147 special trains to carry the amount which the Commodity Credit Corporation now owns.

With reference to cheese, there are 260 million pounds. There, again, approximately 30,000 pounds would fill a refrigerator car, and it would require 8,660 of those refrigerated cars to move the cheese supply. It would require 144 trains of 60 cars each to transport it.

When it comes to dried milk, there are 424 million pounds on hand and it would take approximately 9,422 refrigerator cars to handle it. That would take 157 more trains of 60 cars each.

Mr. President, the supplies of these commodities are getting completely and absolutely out of line. So far as I am concerned, I should like to take some of the dried skimmed milk powder, which is a good and nutritious food, and move it into areas of the world where it is needed for food.

There is a great deal of dry skim milk powder used by the commercial trade. Bakers use it; many industries use it. It is a good product, produced from good nutritious milk. If we cannot convert all milk into butter and cheese, or dry skim milk solids, I would suggest using the stamp plan which the Senator from Vermont has advocated, to make possible increased consumption of fluid milk in this country. We do not have too much fluid milk to take care of the people who need to drink milk in the United States. The trouble is we are not able to supply it to the great number of people who ought to have it.

I think if they were going to reappraise our CCC stocks, it might have been done to provide for dry skim milk powder, which is very cheaply disposed of, and butter prices might have been left at a little higher figure.

This is not criticism of the Department of Agriculture. These figures are primarily worked up by the Treasury Department. I am sure the individuals in the Treasury Department must feel that they are trying to carry out the provisions of the law. I do not believe that was the purpose of the law. I believe the purpose of the law was to say that the estimate of value placed on it should be the cost at which the commodity was acquired, or it should be the market price, if that market price was lower. Today, to sell it at market would cause the Commodity Credit Corporation to sustain a loss. I do not think it was intended to put in the law an element of judgment, an element of guesswork and estimate.

If, however, that is the purpose, then I think the provision ought to be changed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which should consider it or provide some further legislative rider that might come into play when the next impairment of capital comes along.

I think these commodities have a way of surprising us every once in awhile. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] read some instances in which commodities have been written down, and then gains came back from them. There were many people who thought the price of cotton was supported at too low a level, when we were only supporting it at a low level, and we acquired endless stocks of cotton that had to be stored all over America. Some of it was placed in a ball park in one State, because it was the only large area close to the railroad tracks where it could be stored.

People said, "That whole mountain of cotton is a waste. It should never have been bought or its price supported."

Now we can go back and point to a gain of $180 million, $190 million, or $200 million on that cotton. That cotton returned to the Federal Treasury much more than it cost.

I think some of the other commodities would do the same thing. I believe some of the butter, which is a very fine, nutritious food, needed by countries short of fats, could be moved into some of those areas and be a whole lot more appropriate for us than some of the other things we might be doing around the world.

I regret that I cannot support the conference report. I do not ask other Senators to do what I shall do. I shall vote against the report merely because I do not feel the conferees should have attributed such a heavy loss to butter and various other commodities, and take a commodity like dry skim milk and handle it as they did, not showing any loss.

If we were going into the whole project, I think we would have been justified in taking a new approach and correcting the situation with a view to that factor. I do not believe this completely corrects the situation. The Commodity Credit Corporation needs money. I said to the distinguished majority leader the other day that if we had trouble agreeing to this, certainly I would not oppose bringing up a bill to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation by $1,750,000,000, and I would vote for it. This is not a question of trying to cramp them in their operation. I believe those who determine the value of Commodity Credit Corporation stockpiles will need additional assistance from

Congress. I hope they may shortly get it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it is a statement of fact, is it not, that ever since the first appraisal committee was created, under the act of 1938, this practice has substantially been followed, and it has had the approval of the general counsel of the Treasury, since the Treasury, the RFC, and the Department of Agriculture all have had membership in the Commodity Credit Corporation and all have had an interest in it.

In a general way—I will not say they did it in specific detail—I think this pattern has been followed right along.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the last statement of the Senator from Illinois is correct. This pattern may have been followed right along. I do not believe it ever came before the General Counsel for attention. I have asked representatives of the Treasury, while the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], was present, if they had any previous written opinions on it, and they said they could not find any. The Department of Agriculture has said it could not find a written opinion. But I have, tucked somewhere in the back of my mind, a feeling that I was advised that the other point was the truth, that we should do it on a sustained-loss basis, and that way only. But I say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I found in the year 1950 that they did charge off $28 million for butter in that particular year, just as is being suggested here.

In a subsequent year, they found out what their sustained loss was—$44 million—and they put into that second year a sustained loss of $44 million on butter, and put back a gain of $28 million they had taken out the year before. Actually, the net loss was $44 million. Probably it should have been $28 million the first year and $16 million the next year, if it is to be done that way. I would have preferred to put $44 million in the year the loss was sustained, but I wish to say in fairness that this is not a sudden discovery, not a new practice. It was done that year. I regret that it was done that way. I think it would have been better to have taken the whole $44 million in the year the loss was sustained.

Sometimes some good comes from these discussions. Through the kindness of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I was given an opportunity to attend a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations this morning while some of this discussion was under way. I found that in a single year it was charged that the amount necessary to restore capital to the Commodity Credit Corporation was $801 million.

I suppose that sometime someone will get up and say the farm program cost the Treasury of the United States that year $801 million, but against that $801 million, $845 million was for consumer subsidies, and the farm program actually made a profit. But when books are kept so that they do not reflect what goes on, such things can easily happen.

I am not being critical of any individual when I speak of "books being kept in that way." This has long been the practice. Apparently it goes on that way. I think it is wrong to charge farm programs with subsidies. I also think it is wrong to charge the loss in one year, and then estimate for the next year what is expected to be done, without specific legislative authority.

I am only hoping that it will be possible to obtain specific legislative authority in the future, so that this problem can be clearly understood, so that we can take cost or market value when the commodity is being traded in the market place; but if there is no market, the Treasury shall set the price that shall be realized by a forced selling of the commodity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to reaffirm what the Senator from New Mexico has said. This is not the only opportunity or means of approach we shall have to afford the Commodity Credit Corporation in order to enable them to carry out the law. No one is suggesting that we refuse them proper funds to carry out the law. I think the manner of approach should be by way of a bill, brought before the Senate in the normal manner. By passing a bill in the manner in which we are now doing, I do not think we are getting across to the American people or to Congress a true picture of what these particular programs cost. The Treasury Department this afternoon, in conference with the Committee on Appropriations, admitted this has the effect of writing off, for instance, $71 million as a prospective loss on butter and has the indirect effect of making the program look less expensive than it really is. If, for instance, a war should break out, or if some other unforeseeable circumstance should develop, whereby the butter could be disposed of without loss, then the next year they would come in and report an imaginary $71 million profit.

We are being told by the Department of Agriculture that the loss on butter as of June 30, 1953, was only $456,452. Yet, as of the same date, they are asking us to write off $71,497,512 on the basis of anticipated loss. Then, when the loss is actually sustained, the American people will have forgotten our action here today and the loss will not be publicized. That is the sole purpose of adopting this procedure.

From the standpoint of the taxpayer, I grant there is no difference in whether a loss is anticipated and written off this year or later, but I think we get a much clearer picture if we write it off after the losses are sustained. The only possible objection that I can see is that those sponsoring this procedure are ashamed of the true cost.

Mr. YOUNG. The figures the Senator read a few minutes ago were as of July 1, 1953, and they covered the previous year. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. There was not a loss at that time; but we are now running into a problem in connection with dairy products.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think we are running into a problem for which I have yet to hear anyone offer a proper solution. As the Senator from North Dakota knows, the representatives of the Department of Agriculture appeared before the committee recently and discussed a plan whereby they would write the price of butter down to about 30 cents a pound and perhaps start selling it on the free market. The Senator knows, as I do, that the Congress, and the country as well, I think, have overwhelmingly repudiated that plan, which was identical to the one proposed by Secretary Brannan.

As one Member of the Congress who denounced the Brannan plan at that time, I may say that it does not look any better to me, now that certain members of the present administration propose it. The Department of Agriculture has the responsibility of coming before the Congress before it extends the price support on butter another 12 months, and telling us how they plan to dispose of it. The Government cannot continue to accumulate butter and store it in the warehouses. I do not question that the loss will be $71 million. Indeed, I do not believe that amount will even touch the actual loss. However, I do object to the Department of Agriculture first claiming a profit or insignificant loss and then on the next day telling us their losses are staggering. Let us get our stories together and at least tell the same one today that we told yesterday.

I refer now to cottonseed products. During the last 3 years the Department of Agriculture has reported a profit. So far as the American people are concerned, they are being told that the Department of Agriculture has made a profit on cottonseed products in each of the past 3 years. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, the report before the Senate today for consideration, and the books of the Department of Agriculture, show a profit of $7,701,796. The financial statement of the CCC dated June 30, 1953, claims that they have never sustained a loss on this program. On the other hand, the Treasury Department on the same date is saying that we should write off $38,479,026 as a loss on the same product. The Department of Agriculture tells us they have always made a profit and the Treasury says they are losing money. Who is right?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The figures applied up to July 1 of last year. The Treasury Department estimated there would be a loss in the present fiscal year. There is a vast difference again in the two periods. The Department at that time was operating at a profit. Now they anticipate that they will be operating at a loss. There may be a change, and the loss may turn into a profit. It is good procedure to anticipate a loss, so that one can correct conditions before they become too bad.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I point out to the Senator, however, that the Department

of Agriculture is the agency primarily charged with the responsibility of administering the program. Now it is sending representatives to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and is saying to the American people that the program as a whole is not so expensive that it does not cost very much. Yet at the same time the Treasury Department says it is costing a great deal of money and that $700 million is needed immediately to write off the loss.

I think we should get the parties together, and if the program is going to cost $600 or $700 million, we should pin it down. If it is going to cost only $20 million a year, let us get that figure.

We are not getting the true picture today. In the past few weeks I have heard Senators representing different agricultural areas state on the floor of the Senate that, as a whole, the Government has made money on the programs affecting the particular crops produced in the areas for which they were speaking. Yet, at the same time, when the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is asked how much money the agency in question has made, he states it has lost more than $5 billion. I say that if the Government continues to make money on the products in question as it has made it in the past, it will go broke.

I recognize that it was never intended that the Commodity Credit Corporation should make a profit. It was created to carry the expenses of the agricultural program. However, let us not be ashamed of telling the taxpayers the true costs. As a political party we promised that we would adopt sound business procedures in the agencies of the Government. Under the former administration many of us criticized the former Secretary, Mr. Brannan, for these same policies. They are just as unsound today.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. This program is an old defense program. The Government has a stockpile of strategic war materials, and it has billions of dollars invested in such materials. Agricultural products, particularly wheat, cotton, and corn, are very important in time of war. The Government has carried the necessary surpluses and necessary stockpiles of those products in time of war or during a period of emergency, under operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, all chargeable to the price support program. I think the Senator will admit that his statement is not exactly fair.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not questioning the merits or demerits of carrying reserves. That is not the question before us today. But I submit that the charge for carrying such surpluses should be accounted for in the same manner that is used in the case of other strategic materials. I voted against the rigid 90 percent parity price supports, as the Senator may know. However, I would help in appropriating the money to carry out the program, so long as the law is on the books. However, I shall insist that it be done on an accurate accounting basis.

The point I am making is that we should not appropriate money in advance of the actual need for it. The agency plainly states that their losses for the last year were around $116 million. Yet we are asked on the same day to write off $609 million for capital impairment. Those two figures cannot be reconciled.

Mr YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Department is anticipating that the loss will be as large as the figure it has stated. It may very well be that large. Let us hope not; but, as I pointed out a while ago, wheat prices have increased from 78 percent to 82 percent of parity. There has been a considerable improvement over the prices of last July.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; but I will read the law upon which their figures are based:

1. The appraisal shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury.

2. The appraisal shall be as of June 30 each year and shall be completed as soon as possible thereafter and the results reported to the President.

3. The value of Commodity Credit Corporation assets shall be determined on the basis of cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation or, insofar as practicable, the average market price in the month of June, whichever is the lower.

Now, the cost of butter to the Commodity Credit Corporation was around 67 cents a pound. The average price for the month of June 1953 was 67 cents a pound. I have said on many occasions that it might be an unrealistic market; but, nevertheless, the market price in June, July, and August, and as of today, is 67 cents a pound. The fact that the Department sold butter to the Army for 15 cents a pound does not establish a domestic market price. From the taxpayer's standpoint, it makes no difference whether they sell it at 15 cents a pound to the Army, give it to them, or sell it to them for a dollar a pound. Suppose they sold it for a dollar a pound. The Army would tell us they made a profit of three or four hundred million dollars on butter inventories. The Senator will have to admit that that is unrealistic.

On May 7, 1953, the Department of Agriculture was reporting to the American people that they were actually making money on butter; but I know they have not made a dime from the day they started the program, and the Senator from North Dakota knows it. Let us tell the truth even though it hurts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The important thing to remember in connection with the law is that the whole purpose of the mandate to the Treasury Department and to the Department of Agriculture is to keep intact the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is incorporated for $100 million, and the law is specific in stating that when its capital structure is impaired, the impairment must be reported. One has to start from the capital structure to begin with. I wonder if the Senator can tell me how one can get by without thinking in terms of one's capital structure when one has x dollars' worth of commodities in one's inventory and one discovers, on the 30th of June, that the value of those commodities is $435 million less than what they cost. If that is not an impairment of capital structure, I have never seen one. I think the Commodity Credit Corporation would be derelict in its duty if it did not make known to the Treasury Department and to the Congress what the impairment in its inventory was, because no private corporation could keep alive under such circumstances. Creditors would come forward and put it out of business.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I might say to the Senator from Illinois that every private corporation in the United States is doing exactly what I say the Commodity Credit Corporation should do today. Under the Treasury's own rule no business institution, not even a farmer, can write off a loss until the loss has been sustained. All I am asking is that we apply the same sound business principles to this Government Corporation as are demanded of our private corporations. Before the 1952 election we were all for that procedure.

Today the Treasury Department is asking us to write off an imaginary loss in 1 or 2 cases on products which had not even been purchased on June 30, 1953.

Mr. President, not another corporation in the United States would be allowed to file its tax returns based on such a method of operation. The Senator from Illinois knows full well that is true. The Treasury Department's own rule is that a loss cannot be taken until the sale has actually been completed. Let them abide by their own rules.

In regard to butter, a commodity which seems to be discussed the most—and I imagine we shall discuss it much more before we arrive at a solution—every wholesaler in the United States who took his inventory as of June 30, or during the period in question, must figure the price of butter at the prevailing wholesale price, or 67 cents. Certainly the Senator from Illinois is not telling us that every dealer who had butter in his inventory at the close of his fiscal year can write the price down to 30 cents a pound, thereby reducing his taxes, even though he has not sold the commodity.

I should like to have either the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] explain that if they understand the law differently.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I will answer it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Under the statute the Treasury Department has to determine the net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation; that is the law. The net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation, or its capital structure, is $100

million. The Senator from Delaware tells me that there can be an inventory writedown—not a loss, because the law says nothing about a loss. If there is a writedown of inventory, the capital structure has been impaired by whatever is the difference between the cost of the commodity and the price of the commodity at the time when the inventory is made. That is what the law says must be done.

On one side of its books, the Commodity Credit Corporation carries losses. On the other side of its books, the Corporation carries the impairment of its capital structure.

What my friend, the Senator from Deleware, has shown in the last column is the losses. Then, of course, the impairment in inventory is shown. The losses were $114 million, I agree.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois still has not answered my question; namely, Would you apply the same rules to all business organizations?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I have not answered it, I certain would not know what an answer is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Delaware respects the right of the Commodity Credit Corporation to be allowed its actual losses, but I am opposed to its taking an anticipated loss of 30 cents a pound and at the same time boasting how much money it is making. Does the Senator from Illinois say it would be permissible for any other corporation in the United States to follow the same procedure?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I say that under the law which Congress enacted in 1938, and which has been amended almost constantly since then, the Commodity Credit Corporation is simply following the mandate set forth in the law. If at the end of any fiscal year the Corporation should happen to have to liquidate its assets, obviously its capital structure could not be impaired, under the laws; the Corporation would have to wind up with $100 million. However, how could that be done if the Corporation had at that time to sell the commodities in its inventory at the then market price?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Sure, the Corporation could write down the inventory either to the cost price or to the prevailing market price. The cost of the item we are discussing was approximately 66 cents a pound, the market price is the same and it will remain the same until you and some others join some of us in rewriting the law. That is the key to the whole problem and it is one that thus far Congress hesitates to tackle.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us see what Congress did; let us see what the law on this subject is. Congress passed the law. I was a Member of the other branch of Congress in 1938, when the law was passed. It provides that in the event any such appraisal shall show that the net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation is less than $100 million, the Secretary of the Treasury, on behalf of the United States, shall restore the amount.

That is what the law provides, and it is as clear as crystal.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the rest of the law says that in establishing the appraisal, two factors shall be used: One, the cost; the other, the prevailing market price.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am not quarreling about the method. I am stating what the law is, what Congress told the Corporation and the Treasury to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But in this instance they did not follow the law, because they did not follow either the cost factor or the prevailing market price factor. Instead, they followed a factor based on a loss which they said they might have to take if certain circumstances were to develop.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I could not let that statement go unchallenged, because I do not think that is the fact, as developed here this afternoon.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the Senator from Illinois will admit that the prevailing market price of butter was not 38 cents a pound in the markets of the United States at the time of this report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not admitting anything of the kind. I say they ascertained the loss, insofar as practicable; they tried to ascertain the average loss.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the point the Senator from Delaware has been trying to make is that in dealing with a private corporation the Treasury Department will not allow appraisals and determinations of the values of stocks or inventories to be made in the same manner as that in which the Commodity Credit Corporation makes its inventories and appraisals, or in the same way the Treasury Department does, insofar as the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation are concerned.

However, let me point out that the difference occurs only because of the statute. The statute provides that as of the 30th of June of each year and as soon as possible thereafter, beginning with the 30th of June 1945, an appraisal of all the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the purpose of determining the net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation, shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The statute further provides that the value of the assets shall be determined on the basis of the cost of such assets to the Commodity Credit Corporation, or, insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower.

The difficulty is that the law requires the Treasury Department to perform a function which I think is almost impossible to perform.

Let us consider the situation in the case of butter: The Secretary of the Treasury has to appraise the value of the butter held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Senator from Delaware says that, according to the law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is compelled to buy every pound of butter on the market which has not been purchased by private consumers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just a moment, Mr. President; the Senator from Michigan and other Senators said the Commodity Credit Corporation should do that. I objected to such a procedure when it was started, and I am objecting to it today. The Corporation is buying butter under a directive to the Secretary of the Treasury which apparently was supported by a majority of the Members of the Senate, but not by the Senator from Delaware. I said then, and I repeat it here again today, the high support price for dairy products is destroying the farmers' market for both butter and milk. Ten years ago the per capita consumption of butter was about 18 pounds per person. Today that has declined to about 9 pounds, and oleomargarine has picked up the difference. Butter is stored in Government warehouses while the American people eat a substitute. Then the Department and some Members of Congress have the audacity to claim a profit under such practices.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well; I shall not include the Senator from Delaware. However, I am stating what the law is.

The law requires the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase the butter, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Senator from Delaware says the Secretary of Agriculture should appraise all the butter in storage—millions of pounds of it—at the same price. I think the Senator from Delaware and I know that it simply is not possible to appraise that butter at 66 or 67 cents a pound, for if it were placed on the market, and if Congress were to repeal the law requiring the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy the butter at the average price, which now is 66 cents a pound, I doubt that even 40 cents a pound or 30 cents a pound could be obtained for the butter which now is in storage. In fact, I think the Senator from Delaware will have to agree——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, let me say at this point, since I have the floor, that the Senator from Michigan is predicating his remarks upon a big "if." I agree with him that "if" the Congress were to repeal the law, in the case of butter, and "if" the butter were to be thrown on the market, perhaps it would sell for 30 cents a pound. However, if we are to go right down the line with the word "if" in the case of every other agricultural commodity, it would be found necessary to write off losses, not of millions, but billions.

That is why I am objecting at this time, because the allowance of such wide discretionary power permits 3 or 4 men to write off, according to their imagination, losses based on an anticipated price, although it is impossible for anyone to determine the formula they might use.

Of course, it is true that if the price-support law were to be repealed in the case of wheat, and if all the wheat now held in storage were to be dumped on the market today, the market price would fall, but that is not going to happen.

Mr. FERGUSON. But is not the Senator from Delaware making on this floor

to the Senate and to the public a statement that the amount that now is being charged off is not an absolute amount, but that it is one based upon an appraisal? Sometime later, the exact date of which is unknown, there will be an absolute loss. What the Senator from Delaware would like to do is to postpone the time so that the absolute loss can be pointed out to the public, rather than what he calls a fictitious or hypothetical loss.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What I am trying to make plain is this: When we write off the loss, so far as the taxpayers are concerned, we should be able to say, "This is the loss."

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We should be able to say, This is the loss; however, we are telling them that the loss is only $116 million on the entire program when every Member of the Senate knows that the figure tells only a part of the story. I think we should bring out the true cost figures as they come.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad the Senator from Delaware is pointing out that we cannot determine the sustained losses by trying to figure out what would happen if all the commodities were dumped on the market. No one has fought more courageously for the wheat farmer than has the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. He knows what would happen if the 600 million or 700 million bushels of surplus wheat which will be carried over at the end of this season were suddenly dumped on the market. The wheat market is bad enough now. Let us not try to say that wheat prices are going to be wiped out by dumping all the surplus wheat on the market. If we hold on to the wheat and take good care of it, I do not believe that the Commodity Credit Corporation's losses are going to be large.

I remember a time when the Commodity Credit Corporation was very glad that the farmers had some wheat in their bins. It saved us from paying $6 a bushel for wheat. We paid only $3. Let us not feel too bad when it goes down to $2. If the market is down to 76 percent of parity, and it goes up to 82 percent of parity, I do not think the Government will lose very much on wheat. I do not believe it will lose very much on corn. I think it will take a pretty stiff loss on butter, but I believe it will take a bigger loss on dry skimmilk solids. That loss is not being written off at all, but the loss on butter is being written off to a very substantial extent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree with what the Senator from New Mexico says. A moment ago the Senator from Delaware said, "Do it once and for all, and that will be the end of it." I want my friend from New Mexico to hear this. This is not going to be the end of this matter. If we have written down the inventory as of June 30, 1953, and the average price set under the appraisal for butter, cheese, honey, tung oil, sorghum, or linseed oil continues to drop, next year we shall have to write down again whatever inventory loss results. This is not going to be the end of it so long as any of these commodities are in the inventory. That point should be made clear.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois is correct, in that this may not be the end of the matter though some may wish it was. Certainly we cannot anticipate the end. But when we write off the prospective loss, and then the loss proves to be less than that which is written off today, someone will be boasting that we have made money, because they are turning it back to the Treasury. That is what we have been doing in the past; however, if we continue to make money in this same manner we shall go broke.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois knows, and I know, that no man in business could continue to operate as this Government agency has been operating.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is the fault of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; but everytime we approach the subject Congress does what apparently it is going to do today. Year after year it criticizes the program and talks about it, but does nothing. I believe that the proper thing to do here is to reject the conference report, send it back to conference, and strike out all amounts for anticipated losses. In the meantime we can act on the bill which will increase the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation. We should amend the law at the same time to clear up the confusion, and settle the question once and for all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What would the Senator do about the mandate which both branches of Congress wrote into the law, not only to lend money on corn and wheat in order to support prices, but to buy perishables in the market in order to support prices?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no mandate so far as buying perishables is concerned. That is done solely at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. So far as the other aspects are concerned, I say that if Congress wishes to change the law, it should change the law. I think we should. This question before us today, however, has nothing to do with whether we approve or disapprove of the agricultural program. We are not legislating today on the agricultural program. Whether we are for flexible supports, 90 percent supports, or some other program has nothing to do with our vote today. It is not even a factor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, Mr. President, but it is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I repeat. It is not a factor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the general survey the Corporation must include all the money which has been committed on cotton loans, wheat loans, corn loans, and all other loans. If the Corporation runs out of credit, how is it going ahead to fulfill the mandate placed upon it by Congress without violating another law?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In a few days the Senator from Illinois will be standing on this floor asking for another billion or $2 billion for the same agency. Some day the American people will demand an accounting.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly the Senator from Illinois will be here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The agency will be back after more money, time after time, until we change the law. Thus far there appears a great reluctance to do that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just a moment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated March 3, 1953, to be followed by a letter dated March 16, 1953, from the Director of the Budget, in which he outlines the losses sustained under the Commodity Credit Corporation since its inception in 1933, together with my letter making the inquiry. I think that will explode the theory that this agency has made money. On the contrary, the losses have been over $5½ billion.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 12, 1953.

Mr. FREDERICK J. LAWTON,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LAWTON: Will you please advise me from the standpoint of the American taxpayers the total profit or loss which has been sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation through its operations since its inception until January 1, 1953.

With this information, please break down the manner in which the Corporation received its funds; that is—

1. What is the paid-in capitalization of this Corporation?

2. What was the net worth of the Corporation as of January 1, 1953?

3. List all appropriations which have been made to this Corporation since its inception.

4. List all repayments to the Treasury which have been made by this Corporation.

5. List all note cancellations, along with dates and amounts.

6. List the total amount of section 32 funds which have accrued to this Corporation since its inception.

7. List any other moneys which have accrued to this Corporation through any other sources.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1953.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reply to your letter dated January 12, 1953, requesting information regarding losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the manner in which the Corporation receives its funds.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is capitalized for $100 million in capital stock owned by the United States and as of December 31, 1952, there was a deficit of $179,959,760.89. A brief statement of the losses

and appropriations, note cancellations, and repayments to the Treasury follows:

Net operating loss exclusive of wartime consumer subsidy	$1,128,999,783.32
Wartime consumer subsidy	2,102,119,071.46
Total operating losses	3,231,118,854.78
Less:	
Net restoration of capital from U. S. Treasury	2,494,919,661.78
Recovery from Secretary of Treasury—Public Laws 389 and 393, 80th Cong.	56,239,432.11
Reserve for postwar price support of agriculture	500,000,000.00
Total recoveries	3,051,159,093.89
Net deficit Dec. 31, 1952	179,959,760.89

The net operating loss of $1,128,999,783, excluding the wartime consumer subsidy, reflects a net realized program loss of $737,319,500, a net amount of $158,813,865 in reserves for losses, and a net amount of $232,866,418 for administrative expenses, interest, etc.

The following item-by-item reply to your specific questions will show the manner in which the Corporation has been reimbursed by the United States Treasury for such losses, as well as other funds which have been paid to the Corporation pursuant to specific legislation:

1. The paid-in capitalization of the Corporation is $100,000,000 held by the United States.

2. As of December 31, 1952, the Corporation's books showed a deficit of $179,959,760.39

3. Appropriations have been made to the Corporation as follows:

(a) For restoration of capital impairment pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938:

Appraisal of	Appropriation Act	Amount
Mar. 31, 1938	June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1114, 1148)	$94,285,404.73
Mar. 31, 1939	Aug. 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1301, 1326)	119,599,918.05
Mar. 31, 1941	July 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 451, 563)	1,637,445.51
Mar. 31, 1943	Apr. 12, 1945 (59 Stat. 77, 90)	256,764,881.04
Mar. 31, 1944		
June 30, 1951	July 5, 1952 (66 Stat. 335, 354)	109,391,154.00
	Total appropriations for restoration of capital impairment	581,678,803.33

(b) Pursuant to the act of February 18, 1946 (Public Law 301, 79th Cong.), $500 million was paid to the Corporation as a reserve for postwar price support of agriculture. Price-support losses during fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1949 were charged against this reserve, thereby reducing the amounts required for restoration of capital impairment during those years.

4. Payments of surplus were made to the United States Treasury pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938, as follows:

Appraisal of	Date of payment	Amount
Mar. 31, 1940	June 1940	$43,756,731.01
Mar. 31, 1942	June and September 1942	27,815,513.68
June 30, 1947	April 1948	17,693,492.14
June 30, 1948	June 1949	48,943,010.36
	Total payments of surplus to U. S. Treasury	138,208,747.19

5. Notes of the Corporation have been canceled by the United States Treasury as follows:

(a) For restoration of capital impairment pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938:

Appraisal of	Appropriation act	Amount
June 30, 1945	July 20, 1946 (60 Stat. 566, 593)	$921,456,561.00
June 30, 1946	May 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 106)	641,832,080.64
June 30, 1949	Sept. 6, 1950 (64 Stat. 595, 677)	66,698,457.00
June 30, 1950	Aug. 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 225, 245)	421,462,507.00
	Total notes canceled by U. S. Treasury for restoration of capital impairment	2,051,449,605.64

(b) Pursuant to Public Laws 389 and 393, 80th Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to cancel notes of the Corporation in an amount not to exceed $57,500,000 for costs of commodities furnished by the Corporation for foreign relief and assistance. During fiscal years 1948 and 1949, a total of $56,239,432.11 of the Corporation's notes were canceled by the United States Treasury, thereby reducing the amounts required for restoration of capital impairment during those years.

Summary of recoveries of losses through June 30, 1951

Appropriations:	
Capital impairment	$581,678,803.33
Reserve for postwar price support	500,000,000.00
Total appropriations	1,081,678,803.33
Deduct: payments to Treasury	−138,208,747.19
Note cancellations:	
Capital impairment	2,051,449,605.64
Foreign aid	56,239,432.11
Total note cancellations	2,107,689,037.74
Total recoveries of losses from U. S. Treasury through June 30, 1951	3,051,159,093.89

6. Section 32 funds are made available to the Department for the removal from the market of commodities in surplus supply. These funds do not accrue to the Corporation except to the extent that they are in payment for commodities purchased by section 32 from the Corporation. These purchases by section 32 are reflected as sales by the Corporation, and the funds go into the general funds of the Corporation together with funds derived from sales to all other private or governmental entities. The amount of sales to section 32 cannot be readily summarized as all sales to domestic purchasers are reported to Washington as a consolidated item. This information is obtainable from the field offices and can be secured if necessary, but this would involve a considerable expenditure of time and money.

7. Other funds which have accrued to the Corporation are as follows:

(a) Pursuant to the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949; the United States has agreed to supply wheat or wheat products to participating nations at a specified price. The Corporation is utilized for this activity and is authorized to use its general borrowing authority to pay current obligations and to be repaid therefor from appropriations made specifically to cover the costs of the agreement. Following is a list of reimbursements to the Corporation and manner of reimbursement:

Program year	Appropriation act	Amount
1950	Public Law 135, 82d Cong., Aug. 31, 1951 (appropriation to the Secretary)	$76,808,000
1951	Public Law 451, 82d Cong., July 5, 1952 (note cancellation)	182,162,250
	Total reimbursements for International Wheat Agreement	258,970,250

(b) Pursuant to Public Law 271, 80th Congress, approved July 30, 1947, and subsequent Department of Agriculture appropriation acts, funds of the Corporation have been transferred to the appropriation "Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals and poultry." Following is a list of the reimbursements made to the Corporation and the manner of reimbursement:

Appropriation act:	*Amount*
Public Law 785, 81st Cong., June 25, 1948 (appropriation to the Secretary)	$25,400,000
Public Law 343, 81st Cong., Oct. 10, 1949 (appropriation to the Secretary)	34,000,000
Public Law 135, 82d Cong., Aug. 31, 1951 (note cancellation)	32,700,000
Public Law 451, 82d Cong., July 5, 1952 (note cancellation)	11,240,532
Total reimbursements for transfers to eradication of foot-and-mouth disease	103,340,532

The reimbursements shown under this item are not included in the realized losses of the Corporation, as the intent of the respective legislation was that the Corporation would be reimbursed for any unrecovered costs under these activities.

(c) Section 391 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, required the Corporation to lend to the Secretary of Agriculture during each fiscal year, such sums, not to exceed $50 million to make advances for the purchase of conservation materials from January 1 to June 30 of each year. Repayment to the Corporation is usually made during the succeeding fiscal year from funds appropriated to the Secretary for the conservation program. These loans and repayments are handled on the books of the Corporation through its usual loan accounts.

In addition to the foregoing, the Corporation has authority to borrow up to $6,750 million from the Treasury and/or from private lending agencies. At December 31, 1952, $2,800,778,475 of this borrowing authority was committed, leaving $3,949,221,525 yet available.

The figures contained in this reply to your letter have been furnished by the Department of Agriculture.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. DODGE,
Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1953.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This has reference to your letter of March 5, 1953, regarding the funds available for section 32

programs and the expenditures of such funds. The answers to your questions are as follows:

1. "How much money has been made available to the Department of Agriculture during the past 20 years (broken down by years) under section 32?"

The surplus removal program, commonly known as section 32, was not authorized until August 24, 1935. For the fiscal years 1936 through 1953, however, a total of $2,573,671,819 has been made available by (1) the permanent appropriation of an amount equal to 30 percent of customs receipts, and (2) various supplemental appropriations. In years prior to 1948, various portions of the annual appropriations remained unobligated at the end of the fiscal year for which they were originally available, and several of these unobligated balances, amounting to $117,617,178, have been reappropriated.

An analysis of sources of funds, obligations, and disposition of balances for fiscal years 1936–54 is attached as schedule I.

2. "How much of these funds has been spent by the Department of Agriculture either through the Commodity Credit Corporation or by direct purchases during this same interval?"

For the fiscal years 1936 through 1952, a total of $2,057,618,939 was obligated, and total expenditures would be approximately the same amount. Of this total, $610,693,914 represents purchases of surplus commodities for direct distribution, $104,627,120 for diversion of surplus commodities to new uses, $260,131,250 for encouraging exports of surplus commodities, $285,972,494 for the financing of various stamp plans, $136,694,622 for the school-lunch and milk programs, $57,224,648 for administrative expenses, $41,239,560 for allotments and transfers to cooperating agencies, and $561,035,331 for transfers to other uses authorized by legislative action. In addition to the foregoing, obligations for the fiscal year 1953 through January 31, 1953, have amounted to $44,437,655, and expenditures for the same period were $46,265,965.

An analysis showing obligations by projects, allotments and transfers, unobligated balances, and total funds available for fiscal years 1936–54 is attached as schedule II.

In regard to your question concerning assurance that section 32 funds are being spent in accordance with the law, before any section 32 programs are authorized, the proposal is thoroughly considered by the Department, the legality of the program is reviewed by the Office of the Solicitor, and a formal docket is prepared to authorize the program. Funds are then obligated under the standard obligation procedures, and the vouchers which authorize the actual expenditures of funds are, of course, audited by the General Accounting Office.

I regret that the information furnished in response to your previous letter did not meet your needs.

Sincerely yours,

JOS. M. DODGE,
Director.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not what the Senator would like to do, to suspend the operation of the law?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly not. I am not asking to suspend the operation of the law and you know it. I am only asking the Senator from Michigan and other Senators not to appropriate $400 million for this agency when we do not know what the money is for. I am willing to appropriate the amount of money which the Senator from Michigan and other Members of the Senate can say represents so much loss on this or that item. But neither the Senator from Michigan nor any else defending this bill can tell us what the $400 million will be used for except it is proposed to write off an anticipated loss on commodities which in some instances have not even been purchased.

A few days ago a representative of the Department of Agriculture appearing before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry insisted that the Department is going to get back all the money it loaned on corn. I do not believe it, but he insisted that it would. If it is expected that the Department will get back the money it loaned on corn, why are we writing off an anticipated loss of $126 million? I say let us wait until the loss has been sustained, make them own the loss, and then write it off. Let us keep only one set of books. I do not like the dual bookkeeping system of the Department of Agriculture, which tells the American people that this program is costing but very little, and then aks us to write off losses of $700 million in 1 year. Let us put a price tag on the program. If we are ashamed of it, let us vote accordingly on legislation to correct these losses.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we do not replace this loss, which is determined under the statute, we then suspend the operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We do not do anything of the kind. Let us keep the record straight. This is the first time in 7 years that the Senate has been asked to consider the question in the month of January or February. It has always been done in July, August, or September. This is definitely not a question of closing the agency.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Corporation has never depleted its capital before during January or February.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If it has depleted its capital, then let us bring up in an orderly manner the bill providing increased borrowing authority.

There is not one statement in the law which says that this procedure should be taken to increase the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Let us get that straight.

So far as the threat to close down the agency is concerned, I remember that a week ago last Friday Senators came to the floor of the Senate and quoted Department officials to the effect that if we did not pass the bill before 6 o'clock on Friday, the whole country would collapse—commodity exchanges would be closed. Yes; they said that Monday morning there would be a panic on the commodity exchanges. The Department threatened to send out telegrams suspending the entire program. Everything was going to fall around our ears if we did not pass the bill before sundown Friday, January 29.

Well, we did not pass it. The Department did not send out the telegrams, and the grain market is higher today than when we first started debating. Fortunately Congress did not click its heels merely because some former assistant to Charlie Brannan told us that we must do his bidding within 24 hours or else.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that the Senator knew that this question was coming up yesterday, and the Senator wished to have it postponed until today?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I knew it was to come up yesterday. I believe the Senator from Michigan had something to do with having it go over until today.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wanted to give the Senator from Delaware an opportunity to be here and to get his arguments in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I told the Senator from Michigan on Friday that I would be here yesterday if the bill came up. I would have canceled my engagements.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is not until tomorrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is the day on which the conference report on the bill is being considered, and I am here. I thought the Senator from Michigan arranged for the conference report to be taken up today, however, we are here now, so let us make our decision.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that to be so. However, what we are trying to do today is to pass legislation so that telegrams and notifications will not be sent out. The matter is being held in abeyance until we have an opportunity to vote the conference report up or down on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am perfectly willing to vote on the conference report today. Let us get that point straight for the record.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that to be so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I told the Senator from Michigan that I was willing to vote on it, not yesterday, but last Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday. Nobody tried to bring it up during last week. Nobody got into any hurry about it until last Saturday.

Mr. President, we are not voting on the question of whether we should shut down the program, and I resent such implications. I will vote against the conference report. I will say further that if the conference report should be defeated and the Department in retaliation should send out the telegrams which have been referred to, I assure them that such action will be further discussed. To make such a threat merely because some of us want an accurate accounting of the money they spend is absurd. There is no more reason why they should hold that threat over us today than there was a week ago last Friday. I will repeat what I said then. If the telegrams are sent out, I want the persons who send them out to put their names on the telegrams so that the individuals responsible can be easily identified.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad the Senator from Delaware has made that statement. I also agree that it is not necessary to send out any such telegrams. There was approximately $4,173,000,000 actually borrowed from the Treasury as of November 30. The amount had dropped to $4,070,000,000 as of January 22. They had about a $2½ billion leeway. To be sure, addi-

tional notes will come in and additional notes will go out, as is the case in any other financial institution. People borrow money and pay it back.

I do not believe that they would have to shut down the program and I do not believe we should get into any such discussion. The discussion should revolve around the question of whether we should go ahead and take care of the losses in the way now proposed, or whether we should send the report back to conference and say that losses should not be anticipated, because that is not a part of the law. Certainly there is room for argument on both sides of that question, but I do not believe anyone needs to send out any telegrams, and nobody should.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico. I repeat there is another bill on the calendar providing for an increase in the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I am perfectly willing to have the bill brought up for consideration immediately after we have disposed of the conference report if the majority leader so desires.

I am not trying to handicap the agency by depriving it of money with which to perform its functions as laid down in the law. However, we have no right to appropriate nearly $500 million for which no accounting is rendered. That is my opinion. The Senator from Michigan may differ with me. I believe that by following the course suggested by me a clearer picture of the situation will be presented to the American people. I will not support, today or at any other time, any such irresponsible bookkeeping procedure as that which we are asked to approve in this conference report.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to tell the Senator from Delaware that the policy committee today has determined that the bill to increase the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation has been set down as one of the bills which the majority leader will bring before the Senate at a very early date.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wanted to keep the record straight. It is not the Senator from Delaware who wants the bill to be delayed. So far as I am concerned, it could have been considered 2 or 3 weeks ago.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I do not want the record to stand as it is. I believe the Commodity Credit Corporation officials are honest men. They are out of money. I would have preferred to have followed the procedure of increasing the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation; but the fact is that we are up against a difficult situation, because the bill to increase the borrowing authority cannot be enacted for some time. The House committee has not yet scheduled hearings on it. If we fail to adopt the conference report the Corporation will be in very bad shape.

It will be remembered that in 1931 the stocks of the Farm Board were ordered liquidated, and those stocks were dumped on an already overburdened market. It created serious, chaotic conditions. Similar conditions would be created if such a procedure were followed now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no question that if the Commodity Credit Corporation were to dump its inventories on the market the market would be demoralized. No one has proposed that that be done. In the first place, the Corporation could not do it even if it wanted to; the law provides that the commodities must be supported and that certain procedures be followed. Conceivably, Congress could repeal the law. But in order to do it a bill would have to be introduced, and it would have to go to committee, be reported by the committee, and then it would have to be voted on and passed by both Houses.

Mr. YOUNG. What would happen to the commodity market if the CCC could not meet its commitments?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The same thing that would happen if the United States Government could not meet its commitments. The market would break, of course. But let us not put any imaginary "ifs" into a situation that cannot possibly happen as a result of any vote today. Let us consider the bill in an orderly fashion. The Senator from North Dakota was on the floor of the Senate last Friday a week ago when the alarmists came to the Hill and told us what would happen if we did not pass the bill by sundown. Well, we did not pass the bill at that time, the sun rose at the scheduled time the following morning, the tides on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts kept their routine schedules, and the commodity markets were actually higher throughout the week.

Mr. YOUNG. We must remember that there was the problem of getting a conference with the House, which has now been done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The world has kept moving along while we were waiting for the conference to meet, and the world will continue to move along regardless of what we do this afternoon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I see on the floor the chairman of the legislative Committee on Agriculture. I hope the discussion on the floor will not be lost. I recall distinctly when the Commodity Credit Corporation was created. Every year thereafter we had a good deal of controversy on the floor of the House of Representatives when it came time to repair the capital structure. I can say that as a fact because I was a participant. I suppose I scolded about it as much as anyone.

When I came to the Senate in 1951, I believe one of the first discussions I encountered was on the question of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The same thing occurred in 1952, and again in 1953; and now in 1954 we are considering the question again. The law of 1938 goes merrily along.

It occurs to me that, since my good friend from Delaware is on the Committee on Agriculture, and since the chairman of the committee is present today, if we are going to avoid this kind of discussion and this kind of difficulty in the next fiscal year, it would be well for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to give serious attention to a modification of the language of the 1938 act, in order to make it specific. Then if anyone wishes to introduce new methods of bookkeeping, it is perfectly all right with me. I shall certainly give my support to the conference report today.

Mr. AIKEN rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, regardless of whether the law of 1938 requires the writing off of anticipated losses in this manner, and regardless of whether the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation have been complying fully with the law for the past 15 years, the fact remains that to conduct a farm price-support program of the magnitude of that which we now have money is required, and the Commodity Credit Corporation does not have the money to go on any longer. It is true that it continued after it was practically out of funds a week ago, but it is also true that the debate on the Senate floor pretty nearly instructed them to do so. How long they can continue remains to be seen.

If we approve the conference report they will then have money enough to carry them through the first week in March. Before that time we shall have to take up the bill to increase their borrowing authority on which they have requested action. That would give them $1,750,000,000 more. We do not know how long that will carry them. They are making loans at the rate of approximately $100 million a week at the present time. I think their income is approximately about $15 million a week. I fully expect that the representatives of the Commodity Credit Corporation will have to come before the Congress before the first of July to request additional funds. But the fact remains that they need money at this time. Whether this is the proper way to give it to them is something we can debate indefinitely, but they have to have some money. The law requires them to make loans, but I do not think they can continue to make them without money. Unless money is provided they will be in the unhappy position of violating the law. I do not think we should ask Government agencies to do that.

As to the entire cost of the program, it has been said that we will lose two or three billion dollars this year. We shall probably have to write off at least $3 billion if we set aside commodities as requested by the President. I think it is better to write off the losses now than to go on with losses of $1 billion or $2 billion a year indefinitely.

I hope the Congress will look favorably upon the program set forth by President Eisenhower, because I think it points a way out of our dilemma. In fact, if it is once put into effect, I anticipate the cost of maintaining a prosperous agriculture in the United States will not exceed $500 million a year, which would be a very cheap price to pay for the maintenance of a prosperous agriculture and a prosperous national economy, which agriculture helps to sustain.

I hope the Senate will approve the conference report. In my opinion, there is an emergency, and failure to approve the report could create lack of confidence in Government and in the Congress. The people on the farms who raise the wheat, the milk, the butter, the cotton, are not responsible for their situation. We cannot let them down.

Whether we think the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation have been right or wrong over the years, it is true they would suffer somewhat, but the 2 or 3 million persons who have put their commodities in loans or who expect to put them in loans in order that prices may be maintained, would suffer the most.

Mr. President, I think we must retain the confidence of the people of the country, and develop a program which will not get us into this situation again, if it is humanly possible to do so and if we can get the necessary funds. I think we can, because I believe we have got to do it.

Let us permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to have some money to go on with. It will last them only 5 weeks. We must do something before that time has expired. Even though the Senate passes the bill providing for an increase in borrowing authority, there is little likelihood that it will get through the House before the first of March. The House Committee on Banking and Currency insists that they are going to hold hearings on it. Therefore, we cannot expect it to be passed overnight.

Whether this is the right or wrong way, Mr. President—and I agree with a great deal of what has been said by my colleagues from Delaware and New Mexico—we cannot lose the confidence of all the people who are doing business with the Commodity Credit Corporation and let them think Congress is not going to honor its commitments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to the reasons why I think it would be unwise for the Senate to approve this conference report at this time. I fully agree with the theme of the able address which has just been made by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. AIKEN], to the effect that the major value which should be in mind at this time is the retention of confidence in the Commodity Credit Corporation by all the people of the country. I am keenly anxious to retain the confidence of the people though I sense the fact that it has already been greatly impaired.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] will not leave the Chamber, because I am going to address myself, in a moment or two, to an argument which he made and which I think is unsound.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if we are going to try to retain the confidence of the general public in the Commodity Credit Corporation—which, after all, is only an agency created for the purpose of carrying out laws which Congress has passed—and in the entire price support program, we must be very careful about doing things, such as I believe this conference report will do, which will not commend themselves to the reasonable business judgment of citizens throughout the country and to the good judgment of men and women in the agricultural industries which are so vitally affected.

First, Mr. President, I wish to dwell a moment on the point ably made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan and the distinguished Senator from Illinois to the effect that they believe the methods followed in writing down the inventory on milk products are sound. I do not concur in their conclusion.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. In a moment.

Despite the faith I have in not only the integrity but in the professional skill of those two able Senators, I do not agree with them, and I desire to state briefly, if I may, why I do not agree. I shall then be very glad to yield for questions.

The statute under which this annual inventory is made was enacted in 1938. It has been correctly quoted by both the distinguished Senators whom I have mentioned, and I quote from it again briefly:

> The value of assets shall be determined on the basis of the cost of such assets to the Commodity Credit Corporation, or, insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lowest.

Mr. President, it is obvious that the value of the investment which the Nation has in this huge surplus would not be a reasonable basis upon which to value the inventory at the end of 1953, because already it seemed as though we had amassed all the surplus we could possibly take care of. Since that time, as Senators know, the surplus has greatly increased in volume and in value of investment. So the whole situation has become somewhat of a national scandal and somewhat of a source of trouble and concern to every person who is vitally interested in the price-support structure.

It is clear that the Treasury and the Commodity Credit Corporation were given a choice between two values: That is, either the basis of the investment made, or the basis of the average market price of the assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal. It is the fact that the various elements which were put into the average market price of the commodity during the month of June 1953, were figured by methods which I think make it depart clearly from any reasonable rule or any reasonable theory upon which either the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] or the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would, for a moment, hazard their professional skill if they were advising a private client or if they were handling their own money. I know perfectly well that they would want to be just as careful and just as keenly professional, and even more so, in their consideration of the facts with respect to this matter, as if they were advising a private client or were handling their own money. I think they will clearly remember, since they put into the record the basis which the appraisal on butter was made, that the methods followed do not commend themselves to any reasonable person as being fair, but that, to the contrary, those very methods, if continued and approved by Congress, can be used in any June, in any last month of any fiscal year, in such a way as to juggle the inventory values between very high levels and very low levels, whichever seems at that time to be the appropriate level in the judgment of the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation or of the Treasury Department.

Mr. President, I ask that I may have printed in the RECORD at this point a chart prepared by the Treasury Department, showing the basis upon which butter was valued, and its inventory.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Development of unit prices for appraisal of dairy products, June 30, 1953

I. BUTTER

	Quantities	Average unit price	Amount
	Thousands of pounds	*Per pound*	*Thousands*
1. Sales used as guide to unit prices:			
Commercial sales	3,694	$0.6686	$2,470
United States Army sales	15,034	.15	2,255
Sec. 32 sales	70,790	.6686	47,336
Donations	28,354		
Total	117,872	.4417	52,061
Less: Sales through June 30, 1953 [1]	23,637	.6566	15,521
Sales June 30 through Dec. 11, 1953	94,235	[2] .3878	36,540
2. Application of average unit price to inventory of June 30, 1953:			
Inventory	231,034	.3878	89,595
Contracts to purchase	15,213	.3878	9,066
Total	246,247	.3878	98,661
3. Effect on appropriation (or cancellation of notes) estimates:			
Cost of inventory of butter			169,702
Less: Appraised value			98,661
Reduction in inventory value			71,041
Add losses on sales during 1953			456
Total appraisal and operating loss			71,497

[1] The appraisal committee has not yet made a determination that this item should be excluded from the computation of the average price.

[2] The only June price for foreign butter exported (Denmark) was 42 cents per pound. After considering the cost of packaging and transportation from the United States to the European markets, the selling price in the United States would be about 37 cents.

1952 cash receipts from commodities on which direct price support programs were in effect in 1953

	Cash receipts 1952 (million dollars)
BASIC COMMODITIES	
1. Cotton lint	2,609
2. Wheat	2,147
3. Corn	1,136
4. Tobacco	1,086
5. Rice	301
6. Peanuts	144
Subtotal	7,423
DESIGNATED NONBASIC COMMODITIES	
7. Dairy products [1]	4,554
8. Wool	118
9. Mohair	12
10. Tung nuts	10
11. Honey	[2]
Subtotal	4,694
OTHER NONBASIC COMMODITIES	
12. Soybeans	778
13. Cottonseed	389
14. Oats	243
15. Barley	180
16. Dry edible beans	128
17. Flaxseed	118
18. Sorghum grain	97
19. Rye	20
20. Hairy vetch seed	7
21. Common rye grass seed	6
22. Crimson cloverseed	4
23. Wild winter peas	1
24. Naval stores	[2]
Subtotal	1,971
Total	14,088
Cash receipts from all farm marketings	32,373
Cash receipts of supported commodities as percent of cash receipts for all commodities	43.5

[1] Support extended directly to milk for manufacturing only.

[2] While the price of this commodity is supported, no data are available on cash receipts.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that there are included two elements which I believe no attorney could justify. I believe no Member of the Senate or of the House would want to approve of their being available in any June of any year, and making possible such great manipulation as to afford a greatly changed inventory value of any perishable commodity at the end of June, which is the end of the fiscal year.

The first of the typical items, Mr. President, is an item for United States Army sales, which is unexplained, so far as a reading of the two records of the hearings is concerned, or a reading of any of the papers which have been submitted to the Senator from Florida is concerned. I have asked the staff of the Committee on Appropriations—and it is an able staff—to get the information, and I am certain they have endeavored to comply with my request in every way.

In the information furnished, the first of the questionable items is the sale, presumably during June 1953, of surplus butter to the Army in the amount of 15,034,000 pounds, at an average price of 15 cents a pound. It is not clear, and it is not stated, whether that kind of sale is made in each of the 11 months of the fiscal year. It is not clear, and it is not stated, whether it is an average of the sales prices of butter to the Army during the entire fiscal year. It is simply stated that in the computation of the average price per pound of butter, which would apply to the inventory butter on hand at the end of June, there was to be figured, along with the sales at the full price of 67 cents, or nearly that, the delivery or sale of 15,034,000 pounds of butter to the United States Army at 15 cents a pound.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], before yielding to any other Senator. I hope the Senator from Vermont will allow me to complete my second remark, to show the type of unsound accounting items contained in the report, in order that he may understand why I am so brash as to differ with the distinguished Senator from Michigan in the expression of his legal judgment.

The second item which is figured in the report is an outright donation of 28,354,000 pounds of butter, presumably made in the month of June, for which no value whatever was received.

Can it truthfully be said that the average sales price of butter prevailing in the month of June 1953 can be arrived at by a process whereby, with total net sales of 94 million pounds, more than 43 million pounds were of the type I have mentioned, namely, in excess of 15 million pounds to the Army at 15 cents a pound, and a large quantity in donations? It is not stated to whom it was donated, but presumably to school-lunch programs or, perhaps, to penal institutions. If the average market price of this important commodity can be figured properly by including two such items as these, then I say the sky is the limit, because any large delivery to the Army could easily be postponed until June. I am not making any charge whatsoever that that was done in this case. Likewise any large deliveries of surplus to the various donees who are approved by the law could be delayed until the last month of the fiscal year, so as to run down to absurdly low figures—and I think that is what the result is in this case, whether so meant or not—the inventory prices which are arrived at for butter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. What the Senator from Michigan was saying was that he felt that the law required the appraisal, and when the Treasury made the appraisal, they had to try to ascertain all the factors of distribution. I think what was done naturally could not be allowed, so far as private corporations are concerned, for tax purposes. Nevertheless the statute required an appraisal of the butter.

It is true that two sales were made to the military at 15 cents a pound. I think the butter that was given away with no price charged at all went to eleemosynary institutions or to the school lunch programs, as the case may have been, as provided by statute.

As I see it, the difficulty is that the Commodity Credit Corporation was faced with a very difficult problem. It had all the butter in storage. It was compelled by law, or permitted by law, whichever side of the coin the Senator wishes to choose, to purchase butter. Some persons say that was discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture and not mandatory. Others feel that, under the circumstances, it was mandatory. But to try to arrive at the value of that butter during that month was very difficult.

So far as losses to the Government are concerned, I do not think anyone will be able to determine actual losses until every pound of butter shall have been disposed of in some way or other. Therefore, the determination of the loss for the month indicated was believed to make a basis for the loss which might be sustained in the future. But should the loss not be so great, and should it be proved next June that the butter is worth more than the amount paid for it, the Government will lose no money by the operation, but, the Corporation will have been permitted to use some of the money to buy additional commodities. I can see some objections to permitting the Commodity Credit Corporation, by virtue of appraising the commodities at a low figure, to have more money with which to purchase butter and other commodities.

As I have said, I can see some objections to a method of permitting the Commodity Credit Corporation, by virtue of appraising commodities at a lower figure, to have more money with which to purchase butter and other products.

If objection is made on that basis, I can see the validity of such an objection. But, in the same breath, we are asked, in a bill which has been reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation by $1¾ billion. Therefore, the amount by which they will benefit by this bill will be small as compared to the overall amount which they are asking to be permitted to borrow again and to use.

I heard an explanation from a representative of the Treasury Department as to how the figure was arrived at. I merely wish to say at this point that I think what was done was legal, but I hope the practice will never be extended to the operations of any private corporation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for conceding, by implication at least, that the method followed in this case is not a method which would be countenanced for a moment in private accounting or in legal accounting, from the standpoint of meeting tax obligations or from any other standpoint except the particular one used in this case, in which the Senator from Michigan feels it is appropriate, though he concedes it is of a highly questionable nature.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to say that is what we must bear in mind when we come to vote in this particular case.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, right there is where I differ with the distinguished Senator from Michigan, because it seems to me that by voting our approval of this type of accounting—and, so far as we know, it is the first time when this precise type of accounting has been used—we not only give it validity, and say we approve that type of accounting in the management of Federal affairs, but we say in so many words it is too unreasonable to be used or approved for private purposes, or for tax purposes, or for any other purposes. We encourage the use of that procedure for the future, and then, what is of the greatest importance, we do it without knowing whether or not the sales to the United States Army and the donations referred to were allowed to pile up so as to be used in the month of June in order to accomplish the particular objective sought to be accomplished. I have heard nobody give us any explanation regarding that matter.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I shall be glad to answer his question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not asked the Senator from North Dakota a question, but I am glad to yield to him in order to hear the answer.

Mr. YOUNG. The sale of the butter to the Army was based on the price being paid for oleomargarine. It was a negotiated sale. The Army was buying oleomargarine at a price of 15 cents a pound.

If the Senator from Florida will permit me, I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point the names of the officials of the Review Committee of the Treasury Department, who determine the figures or estimates. The members are the same persons who have been on the committee for many years. Exactly the same procedure has always been followed. I do not understand why the question should be raised at this time as to the legality or propriety of the procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following is the Review Committee at the Treasury Department which determines CCC losses. It has been the same since 1946:

Nathaniel Royal, auditor at the RFC.

J. C. Cooper, Office of Budget and Finance at Agriculture.

Edward Bartelt, Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Department.

Robert Maxwell, Commissioner of Accounts at the Treasury Department.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from North Dakota mean to have the Senate understand that the purchase of butter by the Army in the method described by the Senator applied not only in the month of June 1953, but to each of the other 11 months of the year?

Mr. YOUNG. It was a negotiated sale. As I understand, it was one sale which took place over a period of months.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator is saying that just one sale of that kind was made in the course of the year, then I think he is giving validity to my point that it was not a typical month at all, but a month completely not typical, whereby butter was sold at a price much lower than normal, a price of 15 cents as compared with 67 cents a pound, which is less than one-fourth, or about two-ninths, of the normal price. Yet such a sale is allowed to be considered as a sale in June in the overall figures, without our having any information to the effect that such sales regularly are made during the year. By adopting this report we would be giving our approval to allowing the Army's needs to pile up and to be met in 1 month of the fiscal year in such a way as to very greatly cut down the average price to be given to the commodity affected, in this case butter, at the very time when the inventory was being taken, with the purpose not only of establishing what the fiscal situation of the Commodity Credit Corporation was, but for the additional purpose of asking the Congress of the United States to cancel obligations and to restore enough financial ability as to allow the Commodity Credit Corporation to handle their loans.

If I am the only Senator who will vote against the report, I intend to do so, because I do not think we should give that kind of approval, and that kind of encouragement, to a method which even the able Senator from Michigan admits, by implication, could not be approved for any other purposes or for any other type of business except this.

I desire to bring out one more point, because I should like to get the idea of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota on it. In passing I wish to say for the RECORD that the Senator from North Dakota has been as diligent in fighting for agriculture as has any other Member of the Senate. I certainly respect his position.

I ask the Senator if he realized that by permitting the sale of butter to the Army at 15 cents a pound, and allowing butter to be given away for nothing, to the amount of over 28 million pounds in the 1 month of June, we are charging that expense to the agricultural program instead of to the General Treasury or to the general coffers of the Nation. It is going to be charged off. It is one of the things which has been written off. There is no value to come back from more than 28 million pounds donated to someone. Will it be sound bookkeeping to say later that such value was restored? It puts the part of agriculture in the Nation which is covered by the price-support program in the position of having made, out of its price-support funds, a huge donation, which, if justified at all, should be a donation made by the Nation as a whole. I do not see how any Senator could come to any other conclusion than that.

If we are justified in making donations—and I say we are—and I have voted for donations to eleemosynary institutions and for the school-lunch programs, we should make them a charge against all the people of the Nation, and not allow them to be added as an item to reduce the inventory of the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Such an item should be charged so as to appear, as a cost against the whole Nation, and not as a cost against that part of agriculture which has the benefit of the price-support program. I do not think it is right and I do not think it is to the interest of agriculture to have that done.

When the distinguished Senator from North Dakota addresses his next question to me, for which I shall be glad to yield to him, I hope he will give consideration to that particular aspect of the matter. It seems to me that this kind of bookkeeping does a disservice to agriculture, and enters against agriculture a cost for the price-support program which should not be entered, because it is not the butter or the dairy producers who make the grant; it is the Congress of the United States, speaking for all the people of the Nation. Yet, under this form of bookkeeping, it would be entered as a charge against the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation, just as would a loss due to spoilage, just as would other reductions in inventories due to diminished prices.

So far as I am concerned, I do not believe it is either fair or in the interest of agriculture to approve a kind of bookkeeping which would allow that sort of result.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I would agree with the Senator from Florida—who, let me say also, has been a very good friend of agriculture, in my opinion.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. We happen to hold different views on some matters; but the Senator from Florida is as entitled to his views as I am entitled to mine.

I prefer not to see these losses charged to the price-support program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then the Senator from North Dakota agrees with me that the loss is charged to the price-support program, does he?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes. But that is according to the law.

I think the appraisal by the Corporation of the value of the butter may be somewhere near correct. Last June the world price of butter was apparently approximately 42 cents a pound. It would cost perhaps 3 or 4 cents a pound to package and ship butter abroad. So their average price of 38 cents a pound for butter in the United States was approximately the world price.

Perhaps more than that amount will be realized for the butter; but if that occurs, the Commodity Credit Corporation will be given credit for it next year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from North Dakota mean there is to be any "tomorrow" in the case of the 28,354,000 pounds of butter which have been delivered, from the surplus supplies which have been built up through the operations of the price-support program, to the various donees in the United States or elsewhere? Is not that butter gone; and is it proper to charge it to the price-support program, as is done in this instance?

Mr. YOUNG. So far as the Treasury Department is concerned, it cannot do any differently; it has to charge it to the impairment of the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. HOLLAND. But Congress can adopt a different attitude, one more

friendly and one fairer to agriculture. Of course, the Treasury Department is a banker and a bookkeeper, and it is trying to keep correctly portrayed the items of the transaction of the business of this agency of the Government, namely, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and its program.

However, Congress created the Corporation and its program. Is Congress going to admit that when it prescribed that one of the two methods which should be followed was to fix the average market price of the assets during the last month of the fiscal year, Congress intended that great quantities of the commodity could be delivered for nothing to donees, and then that volume could enter into the total amount sold, so as to bring down the average price; or that great quantities could be sold to the Army—which, incidentally, has paid, many times, full value for butter, to the Commodity Credit Corporation, as I am informed and believe. Is it the right thing for us in Congress, after Congress set up the program, now to take a position which would indicate to all who read from now on that we intended from the very beginning that this very foolish and irresponsible thing could be done?

Any other Member of the Senate who desires to vote for the conference report may do so; but I do not think Congress ever intended that to be done—either now or heretofore; and I do not think that this kind of transaction or program has ever been rushed through before. On the contrary, it has come to us as a feature of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, with ample time for us to study it.

I repeat what one of my colleagues said on Friday a week ago, I believe, namely, that we were told that if we did not pass the bill "as was," at that particular time, 3,000 telegrams would be sent all over the United States, to break down the confidence of the agricultural producers in every agricultural county, in their Congress, and in the solvency of their price-support structure. Mr. President, that has not been done. It was not necessary to be done. It is not necessary to be done now.

As a matter of fact, the committee of conference brought back some value from the conference, because even in conference it was agreed that there were several commodities which were so loosely handled in the entire accounting that they could not be included; and they were excluded, as I understand.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield at this point? The statement he has just made is not a fair one.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield to my friend, the Senator from North Dakota, if I do not correctly understand the situation. However, as I understand, approximately $100 million worth of the commodities which were written off in the inventory were kept written off in the conference.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield at this point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The only reason why action was postponed in writing off the losses in the case of dried milk and tobacco was to give our good friends, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and other Senators, 2 or 3 months more to study the figures and to ascertain what, if anything, was wrong with them. In other words, we simply postponed the consideration of that part of the transaction.

The Commodity Credit Corporation arrives at its figures, each month, for the value of the commodities; but the Treasury arrives at such figures once a year.

Probably it would be far worse if the Treasury Department estimated the value of the butter at 50 cents a pound, and if next year we found that the Corporation was able to salvage only 5 or 10 cents a pound from the butter. In that event I think the Corporation would be subject to far more valid criticism, rather than if a realistic value had been arrived at in appraising the value of the butter, as has been done.

Mr. HOLLAND. They may have reached a realistic value, but they have followed steps which I cannot approve, because two or three of those steps cannot appeal to the reason of any citizen, in my opinion. It is not a sale at the marketplace, a sale which would help fix the market price for that month, when our Government delivers to another branch of the Government an immense amount of butter at 15 cents a pound, which is approximately two-ninths of the purchase price. That is not a sale in the marketplace. The other branch of the Government did not buy it, nor did the Commodity Credit Corporation find a purchaser. The butter was simply moved from one Government warehouse to another, and a bookkeeping operation was engaged in.

I say it is not proper to penalize, by such an operation, the agricultural industries of the Nation; and I do not believe it was intended by Congress to be done in that way. I do not think we should, by an approving vote now, indicate that we thought Congress intended to have the matter handled in that way.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder whether the attention of the Senator from Florida has been called to the report of the appraisal committee, as of June 30, 1953, on dairy products. I call his attention to the following:

> The Corporation's selling experience in marketing surplus supplies of dairy products indicates that the appraisal of inventories at market quotations would result in a considerable overstatement of the asset values. To reflect values believed more nearly realizable than market price, the inventories were appraised as follows: after marketing allowances for donation commitments, allocations to the school lunch program, and the Defense Department sales contracts, the remaining quantities in inventory were valued at the average price realized by the Corporation for stocks disposed of through December 11, 1953.

The law is very plain. The Senator from Florida has been quoting it. It calls for the values as of June 30, 1953, and there is not a line of authority to permit the Treasury Department to begin making use of the values of supplies of the commodity "disposed of through December 11, 1953."

I am glad the Senator from Florida is bringing out this point. I think the dairy farmers are geeting an awful stab in connection with this matter.

I say very clearly that I do not believe that in rushing to get the money for the Commodity Credit Corporation, we should do this damage to the dairy farmers. On the contrary, we should realize that the very language of the report of the appraisal committee reads, in part:

> To reflect values believed more nearly realizable than market price.

The law says the appraisal of inventory shall be made at either the cost or the market price. On the other hand, here we have a report which states that they did not use either the cost or the market price. However, under the law, nothing else can be done; the representative of the Treasury Department who sits with the representative of the Commodity Credit Corporation is required by law to do 1 of 2 things: He must use either the cost price or the market price.

However, in the face of that requirement, we have their own statement that "to reflect values believed more nearly realizable than market price," something else was done.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, if anything further were needed to make it clear that the methods followed in this case are not only unfair and unreasonable, but also are, in fact, not in accord with the law, it is the statement of the Treasury Department's officials or, at least, of the members of the Treasury's committee, who admit that in fixing this value, they were attempting to fix a value nearer what in their opinion they believed would be a fair price, instead of following either of the two criteria prescribed by law, namely, either the purchase price or the market price in the last month of the fiscal year 1953.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understood the Senator, a little earlier he was raising the point that in the disposition of some of these commodities, either to the Army or to other agencies, a charge was made against the agricultural funds. I ask the distinguished Senator from Florida this question: If the butter should turn rancid and no longer be fit for human consumption, to whom would the loss be charged?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator has raised that question, because the same point occurred to the Senator from Florida, and he requested the clerk of the Appropriations Committee to obtain from the Commodity Credit Corporation information as to how important a place in this entire picture was played by spoilage, that is, by physical deterioration. The Senator from Florida has a prepared statement supplied to him by the clerk of the Appropriations Committee, coming from the Commodity Credit Corporation, which he asks to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of his remarks, together with a

table, following which the Senator from Florida hopes to make some observations upon the subject.

There being no objection, the statement and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOSSES DUE TO SPOILAGE OR DETERIORATION

The CCC accounting records reflect losses sustained in connection with commodity inventories when the commodities are sold or otherwise removed from CCC inventory. Such losses are classified as (1) losses on sales or (2) inventory adjustments.

The estimated amount of additional losses which will be sustained upon ultimate disposition of commodities remaining in inventory is reflected in CCC financial statements by establishing reserves for inventory losses. Although the age of commodities in inventory and their general condition are factors which are considered in estimating the ultimate sales value for the purpose of establishing reserves, the amounts of the reserves to a larger degree reflect the excess of support price plus carrying charges over the estimated ultimate sales value of sound commodities. It is the policy of CCC to dispose of commodities which are spoiled or deteriorated as soon as their condition becomes known; therefore, it is unlikely that a large quantity of spoiled or deteriorated commodities remains in inventory at any particular time. The reserve for losses on corn established at June 30, 1953, included $3,111,614.22, representing estimated shrinkage of corn stored in CCC binds, computed at the rate of 1 percent.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, sales of commodities were classified as (1) export, (2) domestic, and (3) domestic-salvage. The classification "domestic-salvage" was intended to cover commodities which had been damaged in storage or had spoiled or deteriorated to a degree that they had only nominal value. Sales of commodities which had suffered reductions in grade while in storage were generally classified as "domestic" sales, together with sales of commodities which had suffered no grade reduction. The quantities reported as "domestic-salvage" sales were not large. The information so reported was deemed to have questionable value and was not tabulated currently; however, it can be obtained from reports available in Washington.

Inventory adjustments were recorded during 1953 to reflect shrinkage of inventories in CCC-owned bins as follows:

	Total quantity stored in the sites	Shrinkage
Corn.....bushels..	34,467,736.40	664,251.42
Wheat.....do....	1,588,415.30	4,476.00
Soybeans.....do....	537.58	13.33
Oats.....do....	28,904.05	20.72
Rye.....do....	3,097.46	128.41
Barley.....do....	735,002.46	6,373.15
Grain sorghum hundredweight..	367,989.88	3,970.08
Flaxseed.....bushels..	3,032.07	47.71
Clover (hay and pasture seed).....pounds..	658,350.00	550.00
Grasses (hay and pasture seed).....pounds..	2,184.00	1,464.00

The above information represents shrinkage in CCC storage sites from which all the commodity was removed during 1953. The shrinkage occurred over a period of 3 or 4 years in most cases. Additional shrinkage in sites which have not been emptied was estimated and included in the inventory reserve at June 30, as explained above. Other inventory adjustments during 1953 resulted mainly from transit losses.

Because of the interest in inventory losses indicated by members of congressional committees during 1952, the reporting procedures were revised at July 1, 1953, to require separate accounting and reporting for sales of deteriorated commodities and for inventory adjustments due to shrinkage or spoilage. The results have been tabulated for the months of July through November 1953 and are presented in a separate statement. It should be noted that the amount of loss reflected in the statement represents the average inventory cost of the commodities, less any proceeds of sales. Average inventory cost is computed, insofar as practicable, on the basis of accumulated costs for the commodity acquired from a particular crop, generally without regard to grade or quality. No attempt is made to obtain a precise measurement of the actual gain or loss on individual transactions, but rather the objective is to obtain reasonably accurate measurement of the total gain or loss on inventory operations with respect to each commodity.

Commodity Stabilization Service, Commodity Credit Corporation—Losses resulting from sales of deteriorated commodities and inventory losses due to shrinkage and spoilage, fiscal year 1954 through Nov. 30, 1953

Commodity	Unit	Deteriorated				Shrinkage and spoilage		Total loss
		Quantity	Cost	Proceeds	Loss	Quantity	Loss (cost)	
Corn	Bushels	8,477,654	$15,526,022.82	$11,193,329.80	$4,332,693.02	343,947	$608,404.77	$4,941,097.79
Rice, rough	Hundredweight					33	190.04	190.04
Wheat	Bushels	254,935	519,879.15	450,040.27	69,838.88	18,623	84,973.60	154,812.48
Wool	Pounds					146,592		
Barley	Bushels	286	356.66	248.85	107.81	1,534	1,920.46	2,028.27
Beans, dry edible	Hundredweight	596	5,529.91	426.65	5,103.26	2,996	26,005.44	31,108.70
Cottonseed oil, refined	Pounds					3,702	683.16	683.16
Cotton linters	do	5,162	505.64	264.71	240.93	[1]300	[1]26.98	213.95
Flaxseed	Bushels					10,323	40,496.77	40,496.77
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	[1]822	[1]1,994.43	[1]3,182.07	1,187.64		.26	1,187.90
Oats	Bushels	31,323	27,358.04	20,376.61	6,981.43	1,549	1,208.71	8,190.14
Alfalfa (hay and pasture)	Pounds					2	.56	.56
Clover (hay and pasture)	do					451	132.77	132.77
Grasses (hay and pasture)	do					12	2.49	2.49
Vetches (winter cover crop)	do					19,754	2,091.67	2,091.67
Soybeans	Bushels	22,440	60,745.76	53,045.05	7,700.71	1	4.38	7,705.09
Corn (emergency feed program)	do					555	819.36	819.36
Total			16,138,403.55	11,714,549.87	4,423,853.68		766,907.37	5,190,761.05

[1] Adjustment of prior fiscal year transaction.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will further yield, I should like to say that in a number of discussions at the White House relative to the entire agricultural program, President Eisenhower has made it very clear that he would consider it nothing short of criminal if this great country of ours, with its huge productive capacity, had to start destroying food. He would be absolutely opposed to the destruction of food while there are people here and elsewhere without adequate supplies of it. Certainly he would not support any program which would entail the burning or dumping of foodstuffs, or making them unusable for human consumption.

The distinguished Senator from Florida is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He has a deep understanding of agricultural problems. I believe he will agree with me that one of the great problems affecting agriculture today is the problem of the tremendous overhanging surpluses and stores of foodstuffs which the Commodity Credit Corporation now has. So long as they are hanging over the market, they are bound to have quite a substantial effect upon the price in the market place; and if there were any major liquidation of such stocks in the market place, probably even the market price would not be a very realistic one. So there is some advantage to the general price structure if the disposals can be made to the Army or to other agencies which will put the commodities to beneficial use, and at the same time gradually cut down the huge stocks which we have.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from California that neither the Congress nor the country wishes to have good food spoil. It was with that policy in view that the Senator from Florida requested the statement and the table which have now gone into the RECORD, the Senator from Florida holding the belief that perhaps a large portion of the entire amount charged off—which I believe was some $609 million—might have been the result of spoilage. The statement shows quite clearly that such is not the case. I read the following key sentence from the statement prepared by the Commodity Credit Corporation:

It is the policy of CCC to dispose of commodities which are spoiled or deteriorated as soon as their condition becomes known. Therefore it is unlikely that a large quantity of spoiled or deteriorated commodities remain in inventory at any particular time.

The statement goes on to say that since interest was expressed in this particular subject in 1952, the Department

undertook, at the end of the fiscal year 1953, that is, in July 1953, to keep a monthly statement as to losses due to spoilage and shrinkage. That is the way they are shown.

The total losses shown for 5 months—the only period, so I am advised, that is covered by this particular type of breakdown of information—that is, the months from July through November, ending November 30, 1953, were $5,190,761.05.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Might it not be quite possible, however, that some of those supplies which were finally made available to the Army and other agencies would, if they had been kept for a period of months, or a year or so longer, have been subject to greater spoilage? I do not know just how long certain of these commodities can be kept. Certainly the Corporation would attempt to move those which had been in stock for the longest time. I assume that would be the normal inventory-control method of handling such commodities. But it is quite possible that, had there not been certain disposals to the Army and other agencies, there might have been more spoilage than the distinguished Senator has pointed out in the report, which I am glad he has filed for the RECORD.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, there is some merit in the position suggested by the distinguished Senator from California. At the same time, the spoilage in the first 5 months of the fiscal year 1954, according to the report shown by the Commodity Credit Corporation, is just about $1 million a month, and no more.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. The statement further shows that it has been the fixed policy of the Commodity Credit Corporation to keep its business in such shape that spoilage will never be large at any particular time. There is no showing here of any departure from that situation at the time the inventory was taken, in July 1953.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, even granted that that amount of spoilage is not large when compared to the overall supplies, nevertheless, it seems to me very unfortunate that there must be even that much spoilage, because $1 million a month, if I correctly understood the Senator's figure, is still quite a bit of money, even in these days of billion-dollar budgets.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I still have not quite become adjusted to thinking of $1 million a month as being chicken feed. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that under these circumstances, whenever we have that type of spoilage, obviously the entire amount is charged to the agricultural funds. Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. It would appear in a different place in the inventory. The Senator will note that there is another figure, something over $100 million, which is represented as a charge for sales in 1953. That, as the Senator from Florida understands, covers losses upon all sales, handlings, or dispositions during that year. However, I will say to the Senator from California—and I have much sympathy with his position—that I wish he would carry his thinking a little further. If he did, he would find that this loss of $1 million a month, which he very properly states is not to be sneered at, is just twice as much as the daily loss which the Nation is now sustaining because of payment for warehousing, refrigeration, and storage costs. In other words, the costs of this program due to the operation of the 90 percent rigid, fixed support—and that is the principal reason for this huge surplus, in the opinion of the Senator from Florida—are mounting until they are simply tremendous.

When we talk about a loss of $500,000 each day due to the payment of warehousing and refrigeration costs, the Senator can understand that even a million dollar loss a month due to spoilage becomes insubstantial as compared with other costs in connection with this program.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will ask the distinguished Senator from Florida whether that does not make even more important the fact that if they have been able to make certain disposals to the Army and to other agencies, to that extent at least they have cut down the warehousing program?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not advised as to whether there was a transfer from one warehouse to another, as might have been the case. It may be that the Army took the commodity over right at the warehouse where it had been stored. The Army did not use all of it at once. Regardless of that point, however, I insist that there is no justification for writing into this computation of the average market price during the month of June what was nothing in the world but a salvage sale of this immense quantity of butter to the Army, and what was nothing more than an outright gift of more than 28,000,000 pounds of butter, which was given away free in the same month of June.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to point out to the Senate that we are actually making progress in getting an estimate of the losses due to spoilage. For the first 5 months of fiscal 1954 we have accomplished something we had been trying to do in vain for the 3 previous years. The Senator from Florida may well recall that when we were holding hearings on the thefts of Government commodities we tried to get an estimate from the Commodity Credit Corporation as to the losses due to spoilage, and we never could get anything from them. They said their books were not set up in that way. I believe they were telling the truth when they said that; but, their books should have been set up that way.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Vermont for making that contribution by saying that there is some little rift in the clouds through which we can see a bit of blue sky. The Senator from Florida has been, and is now, as he stands upon the Senate floor, alarmed at the way these surpluses are piling up, and in that way destroying the very confidence of the people for which the Senator from Vermont expressed so much concern a few minutes ago.

The Senator from Florida believes that so long as Congress continues with a rigid, high support-price program, which was a war measure pure and simple, and the only war measure that he believes is being continued, as an invitation to create—and that is what it is—these huge surpluses, we are not going to get anywhere through some little minor improvement, which may enable us to have a little clearer picture of the situation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida permit me to make an observation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to make an observation which is not quite so encouraging. The Senator from Florida has pointed out that the price of butter to the armed services was very low. I understand that the armed services would not pay any more. They were not interested in it anyway. However, they would take it at 12½ or 15 cents a pound.

In financing the armed services out of agricultural appropriations, we have completely reversed the situation. Formerly, when the Commodity Credit Corporation would get into trouble, it would unload its troubles onto the armed services.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Vermont has verified what I have been trying in my feeble way to state on the floor of the Senate, namely, that the farmers have been imposed upon. It is not Congress that is being imposed upon, but it is the farming industry that is being imposed upon.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is an imposition upon the price-support program.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me that although the Senator from Florida and I disagree on the question of approval of the conference report, tremendous good can come from the discussion on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, if we do nothing more than put the provisions of the law in such language that we will never have to go through this again.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to say to the Senator from Florida and other Senators that I am more worried about the situation because of what it could mean to other programs. That is my main concern today. Just above the item of dairy products there is the item of cotton. The report states that the value of cotton is based upon the average price of 15/16-inch Middling cotton on the 10 designated spot markets as published by

the Department of Agriculture in the Cotton Price Statistics for the month of June. That is what the law provides. That is what they should have done. That is what they did do.

However, they did not do it in the case of dairy products. How do we know, Mr. President, that they will not say, "The law says we should do it on cotton, but we will not do it on cotton. We have 10 million bales of cotton, and we will dump the cotton." What would happen then?

Mr. President, we should not talk that way. They will not dump the cotton. There will be no unloading of 10 million bales of cotton.

However, if they can do it in the case of dairy products, why can they not also do it in the case of cotton or peanuts or any of the other products?

They have made sales to the Army and have averaged them in at 15 cents a pound in order to cut down their inventory. I say that is not fair to the dairy farmers. I sold my dairy herd, numbering 400 animals. However, I feel just as keenly about it, because there are other dairy farmers who are holding their herds, and they will not be pleased.

I do not know how any Senator who has dairy farmers in his State can appreciate what has been done with respect to these products.

I do not believe what the Corporation did with respect to wheat and on corn and on other commodities was very much out of line. I believe the reduction in the case of wheat ran to $120 million or $150 million. It was the outstanding reduction in the marketplace which took place in the month of June, and it has since corrected itself.

However, if the Commodity Credit Corporation is to live up to the law, it is necessary for them to take the price in the month of June, even though we know wheat is as good as people say it is, as the expression goes, "It is just like wheat in the bin." But they did evaluate it and did mark it down. I do not believe that in the case of dairy products they had a right to use a figure different from that of the market price.

If they can do it with dairy products, they can do it with everything else, including cotton, peanuts, and rice. Congress did not give them that authority. They must stay within the law.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I fully approve of all he has said.

I shall conclude my remarks in a few minutes; but I wish to substantiate, at least in some measure, my own statement that the 90 percent support price is a large contributing factor to the debacle in which we find ourselves.

The statement as prepared by the Commodity Credit Corporation shows the following facts with reference to wheat and corn, which are two of the large items in making up this table. This is supposed to be turned back to the Commodity Credit Corporation as new money by the action of the Senate in approving the conference report.

As to wheat, it was written down as $212.8 million. That is the figure according to the statement I have seen furnished by the committee, and I take it to be the correct amount.

As to corn, it is $106.2 million.

With respect to milk products, the Senator from Florida knows the price is not a rigid 90-percent support price, but is the support price which has been operative at 90 percent, and which has been inducing overproduction of milk products and overproduction in the three dairy products which are supported as to their prices, namely, butter, cheese, and dried milk. As to the total of those three products, the writedown is about $150 million.

Mr. President, it seems clear to the Senator from Florida that what we are doing here, if we do it, is to strike at the very people whom we are trying to help, through an accounting system which we never had any intention of setting up, and by writing this whole expense down as an expense of the agricultural price-support program, when much of it should not be so reflected at all. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he does not propose to do it.

I have one more point to make. I asked the Secretary of Agriculture what percentage of the total of our agricultural production was supported by various support-price programs, whether mandatory or designated. He furnished me with a list showing that the total value in 1952 of cash receipts from the sale of commodities which were in support-price programs was $14,088,000,000, out of cash receipts from all marketings of $32,373,000,000.

Perhaps this will be a surprise to some Senators from industrial areas, since we find in these figures that, instead of this being a general price-support program, it applies to much less than half of the cash receipts of the agricultural producing public of the nation, 43½ percent, in all. I am happy to say that 56½ percent is not under price-support programs. Many have asked to be left out of price-support programs, as in the case of the cattle industry and in the case of the potato farmers. The potato program would still have been operating if the potato farmers had not come before the Congress and said, "This thing is destroying the confidence of all our people in the price-support program. It shows a loss to our Nation of half a billion dollars in just a few years. We do not want it; we will not have it."

What we are talking about, therefore, Mr. President, is that the support-price structure affects 43½ percent of the production of the agricultural industries of the Nation. Much less than that figure is under the 90-percent figure in the industries which are making a bad record in producing commodities for Uncle Sam to buy and to store in warehouses, refrigerators, and all kinds of storage places all over the Nation, to such a degree, according to the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture the day before yesterday, that it is costing us $500,000 every day to pay the warehouse rentals.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that not all farmers at the present time produce commodities which require a flexible program?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. Of the three principal offenders, milk products are the only ones not under the mandatory 90-percent program, though they are under the actual 90-percent program. They should have been, in my judgment, reduced well below that a long time ago.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that the Commodity Credit Corporation has the right to refuse a loan?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. I was present at a meeting of the committee at which the Secretary of Agriculture sought the advice of the committee, and the Senator from South Carolina will recall that I felt very strongly that the 90-percent program should have been cut off last year. If it had been cut down much nearer the 75-percent minimum, we would not have had anything like the tremendous production of butter, cheese, and dried milk and these terrible losses to write off.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator remember the position of the Senator from South Carolina and the question he asked at that time?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not recall that, but, knowing the soundness of the views of the Senator from South Carolina, I hope that his position was like that of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Did I not say to the Secretary that I feared, from the reports being circulated throughout the Nation, the public would feel that the program was causing a great loss to the people?

Mr. HOLLAND. I remember some such comment on the part of my friend, the Senator from South Carolina. I am sorry I cannot remember exactly what he said, but I remember his position was along the line he has stated.

I want to be fair to the Secretary of Agriculture. I think he has a hard job administering a law which he did not pass, but which was approved by a Republican Congress and a substantially similar measure was approved in the next Congress, when not quite a majority was willing to provide an effective date for its termination.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Republican Congress was not responsible for the Korean war. It was under an emergency provision that the program was established. A year ago, in March, we were in a shooting war, and I felt that it would not do to let down. I think the Secretary of Agriculture probably felt the same way.

Mr. HOLLAND. I felt that it was unrealistic at that time. There was already enough butter to cover up the whole Korean front if it could be used in that way. The situation is getting worse and worse.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no question about that.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will permit me to paraphrase some lines of the Ancient Mariner, we now have a situation where most of our people of modest incomes have reached the point where

they can say, "Butter, butter everywhere, but not a bite to eat."

The Senator will agree with me, will he not?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I receive letters every day from persons who say they cannot get butter to eat. But I should like to point out that the price of butter is not out of line with what it was 25 years ago. The trouble really started when the price was raised to $1 a pound, and it was aggravated by the better quality of oleomargarine.

Mr. HOLLAND. Since we see so exactly alike in the coffee situation, I hope the Senator from Vermont will also see the butter situation in the same light. I think the dairy industry is being menaced and that if the situation continues, the support of their product will menace the whole price-support program. People are becoming completely disgusted with it.

Mr. AIKEN. I was pointing out that in March 1953 we had a shooting war. Now the Secretary of Agriculture is asked by certain groups to maintain a price of 90 percent of parity for the coming year. In my opinion, he would now be definitely violating the law if that is done. We have now obtained an armistice. We do not know how long it will last, but if we do not get into a new war the situation should improve.

I should like to read the provision of the law which is in title II of the act of 1949, section 201:

(c) The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at such level not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 75 percent of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines necessary in order to assure an adequate supply.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator think we have an adequate supply?

Mr. AIKEN. Absolutely.

Such price support shall be provided through loans on, or purchases of, the products of milk and butterfat.

I agree that the effort to over-produce has done immeasurable harm to the dairy farmers. There has been talk of purchase and resale programs for butter to be sold at wholesale at 30 cents a pound, so that the consumer will be able to purchase it at 46 or 47 cents a pound.

The cost of this type program from April 1, 1954, to April 1, 1955, is estimated to be approximately $640 million, in the case of butter alone, not including the cost of carrying out the powdered-milk and cheese program. That represents trouble in a big way.

Mr. HOLLAND. I presume the Senator from Vermont means if the 90-percent-support program is continued; does he not?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. If the 90-percent-support program is continued, there will be a cost of $640 million under the program, which the department seems to lean to more than any other.

The butter could be sold to Russia, the Balkan States, and to North Africa for the going world market price, and the United States could dispose of it by taking a $200 million loss. I do not want to face the American public if we take butter away from them and send it all to Russia and her allies. That would not do at all.

There is another solution; namely, the practice which was followed in the 1930's. If dairy products are supported at 90 percent of parity, it will be necessary to restrict the amount which can be marketed. Farmers will not like that. It will necessitate a heavy culling of the herds. The dairy farmers probably could be paid for killing about 2 million head of dairy cows, in order to bring supply into line with demand for a time, at least. That might have to be done later. But I do not believe the public would stand for it.

I wish to point out, however, that there are in the United States 6 million families who do not have enough to eat. They are the widows of veterans, crippled persons, and old-age pensioners and others, who are retired on fixed incomes. If they could receive each day 1 quart of milk, or its equivalent, that would take care of the entire dairy surplus, and it would not cost, if it were given to them outright, more than $175 million a year. If they were charged half price, the cost would not be that much. In my opinion, that would be a simple solution. But I agree with the Senator from Florida that we shall be faced with almost insurmountable trouble in the field of dairy products if we do not find a solution of the problem, and find it quickly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his rejoinder in which, in the main, he takes the position which I have taken.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that I should also hope to see the 6 million low-income families to whom I have referred receive plenty of meat, eggs, and orange juice.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I am happy to say that while citrus producers have no magic formula, they have increased their production vastly more than have the producers of dairy products. Yet they do not have a support price program, and have not asked for one. They have used their own money to develop such programs as canning, production of citrus concentrates, better distribution, and the like. They are never so highly prosperous as they would wish to be.

The Senator from Vermont knows that he has not heard the citrus industry ask Congress for a price support program, and he is not going to hear it ask for one, because the citrus industry maintains a fair level of prosperity. We simply ask Uncle Sam, in the matter of price support structures, to let us alone.

I have understood that the apple industry, so ably represented by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], has taken a similar position, as have other industries, including the fruit and livestock industries, which, in the main, make up 56½ percent of the agricultural production of the Nation which is not under price-support programs, and most of which does not wish to be.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the conference report, and will direct the committee to let stand such matters as the wheat inventory, the corn inventory, and other items, which are supportable, and on which there is a real market price for June 1953, upon which to base a finding, but to cut out of the program such an unrealistic item as the dairy-support price, which would put Congress in the position of approving a method of operation which simply points the way to cutting the heart out of the whole price-support program by means of manipulation in June of every year.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to take only 2 or 3 minutes in which to reply to what I consider to have been an unwarranted attack upon the 90-percent price-support program for basic commodities.

First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table contained in the House Appropriations Committee hearings on the Commodity Credit Corporation.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of CCC price-support costs with subsidies and emergency investment

1. Losses under CCC price-support program:	
Basics	$53, 299, 009
Nonbasics	1, 141, 540, 014
Total	[1] 1, 194, 839, 023
2. Federal expenditures for—	
Consumer subsidies (losses):	
CCC	[2] 2, 102, 067, 121
DSC and RFC	[3] 2, 143, 281, 385
Subtotal	4, 245, 348, 506
Business reconversion payments (including tax amortization)	40, 787, 864, 000
Subsidies to maritime organizations	[4] 327, 500, 000
Subsidies to airlines	[5] 302, 123, 000
Total	45, 662, 835, 506
3. Federal investment in—	
Military materiel	[6] 129, 000, 000, 000
Food and fiber (CCC inventories)	[7] 2, 687, 103, 365
National stockpile of materiel	5, 700, 000, 000

[1] From beginning of program in 1933 through November 30, 1953.

[2] From July 1941 through November 30, 1953. The last CCC subsidy program was ended on October 31, 1947, although claims, refunds, and adjustments continued to be processed after that date.

[3] From July 1, 1943, through June 30, 1949. All DSC and RFC subsidy programs were ended by October 14, 1946, but claims, refunds, and adjustments continued to be processed after that date.

[4] Estimated operating subsidies payable through calendar year 1954.

[5] Airmail subsidies through fiscal year 1954.

[6] Deliveries since Korea total $50 million; balance in pipelines.

[7] As of November 30, 1953. Includes price support, supply and foreign purchase, and emergency feed programs.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the table indicates, among other things, business reconversion payments, including tax amortization, at a cost to the Federal Government of a little more than $40 billion. That was part of the cost of helping business recover as a result of the war.

As late as 1950 cotton and wheat farmers had voted for quotas, because they desired to reduce production and hold down surpluses. But when the Korean war began, quotas were canceled. Instead, the Department of Agriculture asked farmers to increase their production drastically.

Let us consider the present situation. In June 1950 Korea became a battleground. The Secretary of Agriculture at that time, with a history of the past war before him, issued, in the form of press releases, urgent appeals to farmers to produce more and more, so that this country would be adequately prepared for any eventuality. This was the conservative and proper course to pursue.

That policy was not followed with respect to citrus and other fruits or commodities of that kind.

On February 2, 1951, the Secretary of Agriculture said:

> Full production from American farms is essential in the defense effort.

A goal of 90 million acres of corn was established for 1951.

On July 20, 1951, the Secretary of Agriculture said:

> The announced 1952 crop goals are designed to fill all known requirements and to maintain or build stocks as safeguards in the defense emergency.

On November 29, 1951, the goals for 1952 were announced with the following statement by the Secretary of Agriculture:

> The need for agricultural production in 1952, especially feed grains, is the greatest we have ever faced. The goals we have set will challenge our productive capacity.

In 1952, the support price levels were 90 percent of parity. The corn production requested was 3,375,000,000 bushels. On March 20, 1952, the Secretary of Agriculture stated:

> Unless more corn and other feed grains are planted by farmers this year than is indicated in yesterday's report on farmers' intentions, we will face a serious situation in our feed grain supplies.

On December 23, 1952, a goal of 3,350,000,000 bushels of corn was requested for 1953.

Last year the Department of Agriculture asked corn producers to increase their production. The farmers complied as well as they could, but they did not have a written order, so those who had to sell received much less than they had a right to expect. They did not have a written order when they prepared similarly for World War II.

The same Government ordered tanks, planes, and other equipment for war, and the producers of those implements were guaranteed the cost of production plus a profit. Should we condemn producers of basic commodities for surpluses thus created?

Many persons seem to have the opinion that the farmers have received an exorbitant price for the butter which the Government is holding. Actually, by Government standards, the farmers have received only 90 percent of a fair price.

It is true that the program may be unworkable, but let us not allow the impression to go forth to the American people that they have received too much as wages for producing butter or any other farm product.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	Martin
Anderson	Hayden	Maybank
Barrett	Hendrickson	McClellan
Beall	Hennings	Monroney
Burke	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Payne
Byrd	Humphrey	Purtell
Carlson	Hunt	Robertson
Case	Jackson	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kennedy	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kilgore	Stennis
Ellender	Knowland	Symington
Ferguson	Langer	Welker
Frear	Lehman	Williams
George	Long	Young
Gillette	Mansfield	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—49

Aiken	Hendrickson	Monroney
Barrett	Hennings	Murray
Beall	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bush	Hill	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Purtell
Carlson	Hunt	Robertson
Case	Jackson	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Langer	Sparkman
Ellender	Lehman	Stennis
Ferguson	Long	Symington
George	Mansfield	Welker
Gillette	Martin	Young
Gore	Maybank	
Hayden	McClellan	

NAYS—10

Anderson	Frear	Kilgore
Burke	Holland	Williams
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	
Clements	Kennedy	

NOT VOTING—37

Bennett	Green	Millikin
Bricker	Griswold	Morse
Bridges	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Ives	Pastore
Capehart	Jenner	Potter
Chavez	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cooper	Kerr	Smathers
Douglas	Kuchel	Thye
Duff	Lennon	Upton
Eastland	Magnuson	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	McCarran	
Goldwater	McCarthy	

So the report was agreed to.

PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, I am about to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, but I shall be glad to yield to Senators who have material to place in the RECORD, or remarks to make.

Tomorrow we hope to take up Order of Business No. 928, which is Senate bill 1336, otherwise known as the coffee bill. I have discussed this bill with the minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Also it is hoped that we may consider Order of Business No. 854 which is Senate Joint Resolution 12.

I hope some other measures will be ready tomorrow. I shall give advance notice to the minority if it is proposed to consider other measures.

I am very hopeful that we can dispose of a great deal of our work so that the Senate can take a recess on Thursday

evening until Monday, in order to enable Senators to clear up some of the work which has been accumulating in their offices.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency held a community hearing in Boston, Mass., on January 28, 29, and 30.

In our judgment, the results of these public hearings have already stimulated a good deal of action at the local level and this, we are all agreed, is a most healthy condition.

Our subcommittee received a maximum amount of assistance from the local authorities, and the entire proceedings demonstrated to me anew that the Federal Government, through this subcommittee, can achieve a real public good by providing leadership at the local level without superimposing a huge new Federal program upon the States and localities.

Mr. President, I offer for insertion in the RECORD various editorials that appeared in the Boston press.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald of February 2, 1954]

THE "TERRIBLE INDICTMENT"

Laws are no better than the men and women who administer them.

The fact stands out as we examine the painful testimony of Police Commissioner Thomas F. Sullivan and License Board Chairman Mary Driscoll. Under the words of both there was a frightening undertone of apathy and discouragement. There was no evidence of vigorous, new ideas; no sense of hope that conditions could be improved.

But the police department and the Boston Licensing Board operate with great authority and with little restraining responsibility to anyone. City agencies, they derive their power from long-term appointments from the Governor. This situation demands reexamination.

There are laws which should be studied. It may be wise to make it illegal for unaccompanied minors to go into an establishment where liquor is served. We may need better laws on evidence. Our whole liquor law should be gone over. Improvements in procedures would be wise, especially in the licensing board which does not swear witnesses. Investigating procedures are often shocking or nonexistent.

But no change in law, organization, or administrating method will get at the heart of the trouble revealed before the Senate subcommittee.

Listen to a few of the remarks by two of the city's chief law-enforcement officials:

Commissioner Sullivan on teen-age girls in cafes, "There's nothing can be done about that, because the teen-agers have a right to be there under the law." He makes no mention of the fact that he has an unwritten responsibility to ask for the laws he needs.

The police commissioner didn't inspect the records of the armed services law enforcement agencies, because "they are dealing with matters the Police Department has nothing to do with. It is not our job to police restaurants. That's a job for the health department. It is not our responsibility to inspect their toilets." Here is the constant buck passing, technically correct, ethically reprehensible.

Missing the whole point of having trained personnel in a special police juvenile bureau, the commissioner declared, "I would like to have somebody show me that putting a name on a wall at headquarters and calling it a juvenile bureau is going to help." Of course it won't, unless we have a police commissioner who attracts, encourages, and keeps properly trained personnel and who has the vision to see what they could do.

Again Commissioner Sullivan says, in excuse of shocking conditions, "The problem is to get evidence against them." Of course, it is the problem of the police to get evidence. That is the problem in every case, from pickpocketing to murder. It is never an excuse for police paralysis.

Miss Driscoll also seems to miss the point. She stopped taking sworn testimony because that resulted in perjury. She said, "Some years ago we decided they were telling such awful falsehoods that we thought they'd only be adding another lie if they took an oath." So instead of lying under threat of penalty, they now lie with immunity.

She declared that the police didn't give her evidence but stated she did not want her own investigators since the police are doing such a fine job. Confusing?

In the face of shocking revelations before the committee, Miss Driscoll could say complacently, "I think our system here works out very well."

When telling of girls who give false papers she says, "what can you do about that?"

This attitude of defeat is more at fault than our laws. No good law can be created unless the people close to the situation have the vision to see what is needed and the courage to fight for it. No good law will result in improved conditions unless our law enforcement officials have the vigor and the dedication to carry it out.

The community should take action to see that the present situation, called a terrible indictment by Senator HENDRICKSON, is corrected.

[From the Boston Traveler of February 1, 1954]

COMMUNITY DELINQUENCY

The city of Boston is apparently unwilling, or unable, to control its drinking establishments.

This shocking failure to enforce the law was brought out during hearings held here last week by the Senate subcommittee investigating juvenile delinquency.

The problem of controlling teen-age drinking is admittedly a tough one, but that's no reason why our law-enforcement agencies should be almost helpless to do so.

The picture brought out at the hearings was one of an appalling inability of these two agencies to work together effectively to get convictions and keep teen-agers out of barrooms run by persons willing to shade the law.

All this came on the heels of a farcial fuss over the scheduled appearance here of Christine Jorgensen, a "he-she" exhibitionist whose appeal is mostly to the morbidly curious and who certainly should not be allowed to appear in Boston.

Our liquor laws, licensing procedure, and the responsibility and methods of the police and licensing board need reexamination and revision.

The licensing board and the police cannot be excused of responsibility just because their problems are difficult. If the laws and the system need changing, let's change them.

[From the Boston Post of January 30, 1954]

RIGHT ON THE RECORD

While it is too early to weigh the implications of facts produced at the Senate subcommittee studying juvenile delinquency here in Boston, certain things have been established which should create a general public demand for sensible remedial measures.

Senator HENDRICKSON and other members of the committee have performed a great public service for the people of Greater Boston, for certain incontestable facts are on the record for the first time. One of the facts is that there is a juvenile delinquency problem, one which cannot be explained away, ducked, or dodged. This is the first time that all the agencies and all the people who have authority over, and have looked into the problem of, delinquency have been brought together at a public proceeding to tell what they know about juvenile delinquency.

There have been police conferences, conferences of social workers, conferences of correctional workers, studies by any number of well-meaning groups—but they have never had to publicly pool their information. Indeed, those who have been saying all along that there is no problem of juvenile delinquency in this area are going to have to swallow their views.

And those who seek to shirk the responsibility are going to have to put it right in the record. What have they done to combat delinquency? Are they doing enough? Are they doing the wrong thing?

Serious charges have been made about teen-age drinking and a failure to take punitive action against those responsible. That subject—both sides of it—will go into the official record.

The bitter truth is that, in the past, trying to grapple with an overall solution for the juvenile-delinquency problem has been like trying to gather up a ton of feathers. The principal objective of all agencies concerned seemed to be to prove that the fault belonged elsewhere.

This is no abstract problem. It is immediate and urgent. It deals with a generation which has known nothing but war, depression, boom, swiftly changing standards, and vast social changes. It is no longer a question of who is going to be left holding the baby.

Even if the Senate subcommittee finds the problem on a national scale too complex, too massive, to make a rigid set of recommendations, they have done us a service here in Boston and New England—for they have put it on the record—as much of it as anyone knows who is not a juvenile.

What the juveniles think about it is still an unknown quantity, partly because they seem to be talking a different language. Are the Senate subcommittee and its witnesses a pack of squares, or are they cool; do they dig or make it? We don't know. They have not said.

[From the Boston Daily Globe of February 1, 1954]

FOR THE THOUGHTFUL

To television audiences, the juvenile-delinquency hearings lacked the local interest of some inquiries that have appeared on local screens.

What was under scrutiny was how to meet a perennial problem; neither the loyalty nor the conscientiousness of any witness was questioned.

But thousands must have watched, if only for a short time, and have felt encouraged to fill out their knowledge from newspaper accounts. The hearings have inevitably made many aware of the problem's nature; and have contributed greatly toward a balanced public understanding of conditions, and toward all citizens' ability to assess proposed remedies.

From what has been discovered here, and what may be learned in other cities, there should result greatly improved methods of dealing with youth. Perhaps even more important has been the demonstration that television has the power to attract the interest of the thoughtful. The hope is that it may come to enlist their participation as well.

[From the Boston Daily Globe of January 28, 1954]

HEARINGS ON DELINQUENCY

Beginning this morning, a subcommittee of the United States Senate will hold 3 days of televised hearings in Boston as part of a national study of juvenile delinquency.

The inquiry is evidently to be conducted in a spirit of realism, for one of the committee's investigators, who has already looked the ground over, has said that the situation here seems to compare favorably with that in the rest of the Nation.

Such an attitude is all to the good, for the question of juvenile delinquency has been so magnified and sensationalized throughout the Nation in recent years that it is often difficult to view the problem in its true proportions.

There is general agreement here that the number of juvenile cases in the State is smaller than in the early 1930's, despite the increase in the population. Court records make it clear that fewer young people came before judges in the 5 years ending December 31 last than in the preceding similar period. Regarding the Federal question of youthful narcotic addicts, which interested Senator KEFAUVER, a member of the subcommittee, when he was here last summer, it seems accepted on all sides that this constitutes no present problem in Massachusetts.

But the hearing will inevitably produce sharp disagreement between two equally earnest schools of thought. One favors Governor Herter's proposal to extend throughout the State tribunals based on the principles of the Boston juvenile court, whose presiding judge is a trained social worker. The other supports the system in the 72 district courts of Massachusetts, where the regular justices also conduct the juvenile sessions.

Those who favor the Governor's proposal believe that special training is needed in the handling of young people. They think it a full-time job, which calls for more emphasis on human understanding and less on the legal aspects of cases.

Members of the other school of thought emphasize the protection of the community, but they do not concede that a district court judge lacks understanding. Living for years in a community, he is more likely, they say, to know its families and understand their individual problems than would be a juvenile judge who moved from community to community within a given area.

That juvenile delinquency is a serious problem, both sides agree, but they differ as to its urgency. Those who favor the Governor's proposal believe that new measures are now needed to keep the situation in hand. They point to an increase in the number of juvenile cases in the last 2 years, but their opponents retort that this has been sharpest in the jurisdiction of the Boston juvenile court.

And there is complete disagreement between the two schools of thought on the question whether youngsters have recently been committing more serious crimes than in the past.

The Senate committee can do valuable service by studying conditions throughout the country, by comparing methods of meeting the juvenile delinquency problem, and by assembling data and ideas, which can be of advantage to the authorities everywhere.

But the next 3 days of televised hearings will inevitably open the argument over the Governor's proposal for a juvenile court system throughout the State. The testimony of witnesses should furnish much that is constructive. But there is still some danger that sensational material, true enough in itself but unrepresentative of the problem as a whole, may distort the picture in the public mind.

The problem before the legislature and the people is to form a policy which can assess prospects and estimate costs, both human and financial, and thus find the best way to meet a problem which is always with us and always serious.

Such an approach is more likely to be discovered in a mood of calm sympathy for all who are young than in an atmosphere made intense either by sentimentality or horror.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

COST OF PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared on the subject of our price-support operations, the authorization for the Commodity Credit Corporation program, and the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

PRICE SUPPORTS ONLY COST 35 CENTS PER CAPITA

I feel compelled to further protest against the current barrage of misleading propaganda and deliberate distortions against farm-price supports. I think it is high time more of this propaganda against American agriculture was exposed for what it's worth, and the American people given a chance to know some of the true facts instead.

Day after day we are having dinned into us over the air and through the press about the terrible cost of Government handouts to agriculture. Millions and billions are tossed around quite recklessly in these propaganda stories, with very little evidence of any desire to put things properly in context, as long as it adds fuel to the fire of efforts to place American agriculture in a bad light. The purpose, apparently, is an eager attempt to carry out Secretary Benson's suggestion that a consumer revolt might be stirred up against Government farm programs.

Knowingly or unknowingly, Secretary Benson has done a disservice to the Nation by touching off such an attempt to turn one segment of the American people against another segment, when the fate of each group is closely interrelated.

I recognize that honest differences of opinion exist in and out of the Congress over methods of price support. But I think this body has the wisdom to resolve those differences for the good of the country with calm and deliberative judgment, and without need for stirring up an atmosphere of confusion, misunderstanding, distrust, and disgust to cloud the issue and attempt by sheer pressure of a mass howl to tip the scales of the body's judgment one way or another. It is an insult to us, as well as to farmers of the country. I am sure that many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle from agricultural States—and many others from a standpoint of fair play alone—join me in regretting and deploring the sudden outburst of misleading attacks on American agriculture. Whether we are for high supports or flexible supports, it is time for us to unite in calling a halt to the widespread impression being created that America's farmers are getting all kinds of special privileges at tremendous cost to everybody else.

If the press insists on headlines about subsidies, here are a few I would suggest for them to consider:

1. Farm price support programs have cost the American people an average of only 35 cents annually per person.

2. Government subsidies to business this year alone will virtually equal the entire realized loss on price supports for the past 20 years.

3. Government subsidies to newspapers and magazines alone through loss in handling second-class mail for the past 20 years has been nearly 2½ times the entire loss on farm price supports.

4. Agriculture, made up of around 15 percent of the country's population, gets less than 3½ percent of the Government's total outlay for subsidies in the form of expenses for aids and special services.

5. Total losses on Government price support operations over the past 20 years amount to only one-half of 1 percent of the increased net agricultural income to which they greatly contributed over that same period.

The figures to back up these assertions are all a matter of record. Will the press convey them to the American people with as much enthusiasm as they have conveyed misleading figures about the farm program costing $16 billion since 1932?

It is to the credit of the Senate's Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that Secretary Benson's reckless use of the deliberately misleading figure of $16,921,000,000 as the total cost of farm programs since 1932 has been thoroughly discredited, exposed by Democrats and Republicans alike as a complete fraud insofar as it is relevant to costs of the farm price-support program.

My own estimate of the price-support losses being less than 35 cents per capita, on the annual average, is based on Secretary Benson's own budget officer's testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee, January 19, that the grand total net realized loss on price-support programs since their inception was $1,073,115,955.

Over a 20-year span, that means about $50,000,000 per year, or only 35 cents per person for our 150 million population.

Over the period of 1932–52 the actual net income from agriculture totaled $247 billion dollars, or $184 billion greater than the total would have been had net income from agriculture remained at the 1932 rate.

Cost of price supports contributing so much to that tremendous gain was just about one-half of 1 percent. I consider that a mighty good investment that has paid off solid dividends to our entire economy, including increased tax revenue for the Government far greater than the original cost.

But as sound an investment as that has been, in terms of benefit to our entire economy, I submit that it's hardly fair to American agriculture to raise a hue and cry over even that legitimate figure without making some comparisons to place it on the right perspective of Government benefits to other segments of our economy.

That is why I have called attention to some comparisons by which they may be rightly judged.

According to a report from the Library of Congress inserted in the RECORD January 26 by the capable Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], Government subsidies to business for 1954 alone are estimated at $1,063,000,000.

My other comparisons are equally documented. The Republican Postmaster General testified before Congress during the last session that the loss in handling second-class mail for newspapers and magazines since 1933 was $2,400,000,000.

The Library of Congress report estimates total current expenses for aids and special services for 1954 at $15,194,000,000, of which less than 3½ percent—$520 million—is for agriculture, not only for price-support programs but also including the school-lunch program, the International Wheat Agreement, the Sugar Act, and other expenses of all aid programs to farmers.

Some of the most vicious and unfounded attacks against subsidies to agriculture have come from Life magazine. I think it only fair for the public to know that, according to the Postmaster General's testimony, the

Government loss on mail handling of Life magazine for the fourth quarter of 1952—just 3 months, mind you, not 20 years—was $2,151,000.

Hereafter when the press cares to tell its readers all about how much the Government provides for agriculture, I suggest that it include these comparisons so that the public may judge for itself whether agriculture is getting any special privileges.

Hereafter when the press cares to deliberately develop inflammatory stories about how much it costs each hour to store surplus farm products, I suggest that it go a step farther and include how much it costs taxpayers each hour to make up for the losses on tax writeoffs to business and industry for accelerated amortization, oil-depreciation tax loopholes, and the many other "gimmicks" by which even more direct subsidies are hidden.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to cite two or three observations from this statement. Speaking of the matter of subsidies to agriculture, I think these points should be noted:

1. Farm price-support programs have cost the American people an average of only 35 cents annually per person.

2. Government subsidies to business this year alone will virtually equal the entire realized loss on price supports for the past 20 years.

3. Government subsidies to newspapers and magazines alone through loss in handling second-class mail for the past 20 years has been nearly 2½ times the entire loss on farm price supports.

4. Agriculture, made up of around 15 percent of the country's population, gets less than 3½ percent of the Government's total outlay for subsidies in the form of expenses for aids and special services.

5. Total losses on Government price-support operations over the past 20 years amount to only one-half of 1 percent of the increases net agricultural income to which they greatly contributed over that same period.

The figures to back up these assertions are all a matter of record. Will the press convey them to the American people with as much enthusiasm as they have conveyed misleading figures about farm program costing $16 billion since 1932?

It is to the credit of the Senate's Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that Secretary Benson's reckless use of the deliberately misleading figure of $16,921,000,000 as the total cost of farm programs since 1932 has been thoroughly discredited, exposed by Democrats and Republicans alike, as a complete fraud insofar as it is relevant to costs of the farm price-support program.

My own estimate of the price-support losses being less than 35 cents per capita, on the annual average, is based on Secretary Benson's own budget officer's testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee, January 19, that the grand total net realized loss on price-support programs since their inception was $1,073,115,955.

Over a 20-year span, that means about $50 million per year—or only 35 cents per person for our 150 million population.

Over the period of 1932–52 the actual net income from agriculture totaled $247 billion, or $184 billion greater than the total would have been had net income from agriculture remained at the 1932 rate.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if there be no further business at this time, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 10, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received February 9 (legislative day of February 8), 1954:

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Edward T. Wailes, of New York, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 1 to Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:

George M. Abbott, of Ohio.
Garret G. Ackerson, Jr., of New Jersey.
Max Waldo Bishop, of Iowa.
Howard Rex Cottam, of Utah.
Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama.
Avery F. Peterson, of Idaho.
James B. Pilcher, of Georgia.
Harold M. Randall, of Iowa.
Horace H. Smith, of Ohio.
Henry E. Stebbins, of Massachusetts.
Carl W. Strom, of Minnesota.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
Robert M. Carr, of California.
Harlan B. Clark, of Ohio.
Leon L. Cowles, of Utah.
H. Francis Cunningham, Jr., of Nebraska.
Donald D. Edgar, of New Jersey.
James W. Gantenbein, of Oregon.
William M. Gibson, of New York.
Theodore J. Hohenthal, of California.
John P. Hoover, of California.
Richard A. Johnson, of Illinois.
Edward P. Maffitt, of Missouri.
Roy M. Melbourne, of Virginia.
David A. Thomasson, of Kentucky.
Rolland Welch, of Texas.
Thomas K. Wright, of Rhode Island.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

Kenneth A. Byrns, of Colorado.
John A. Calhoun, of California.
William H. Christensen, of Ohio.
Adrian B. Colquitt, of Georgia.
William N. Dale, of New York.
Donald A. Dumont, of New York.
Clifton P. English, of Tennessee.
Joseph N. Greene, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Henry A. Hoyt, of California.
Charles E. Hulick, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Spencer M. King, of Maine.
LaRue R. Lutkins, of New York.
George E. Miller, of New Jersey.
David G. Nes, of Maryland.
Herbert V. Olds, of Virginia.
James L. O'Sullivan, of Connecticut.
Richard I. Phillips, of California.
Ernest V. Siracusa, of California.
Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., of California.
S. Roger Tyler, Jr., of West Virginia.
Livingston D. Watrous, of New York.
Harvey R. Wellman, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

Philip E. Haring, of Pennsylvania.
Hendrik van Oss, of New Jersey.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Alfred L. Atherton, Jr., of Massachusetts.
James J. Blake, of New York.
Frank E. Cash, Jr., of Minnesota.
Thomas J. Corcoran, of New York.
Samuel D. Eaton, of New York.
Richard T. Ewing, of Maryland.
Richard G. Johnson, of New York.
Bruce M. Lancaster, of Mississippi.
Roye L. Lowry, of Washington.
Frank E. Maestrone, of Connecticut.
Eugene V. McAuliffe, of Massachusetts.
Richard M. McCarthy, of Iowa.
Sandy MacGregor Pringle, of New York.
Herbert F. Propps, of Wisconsin.
Ernest E. Ramsaur, Jr., of California.
Thomas M. Recknagel, of New York.
William Perry Stedman, Jr., of Maryland.
Galen L. Stone, of Massachusetts.
William H. Sullivan, of Rhode Island.
Charles R. Tanguy, of Maryland.
John M. Thompson, Jr., of Florida.
William H. Witt, of South Carolina.
Robert L. Yost, of California.
Robert W. Zimmermann, of Minnesota.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

John A. Baker, Jr., of Connecticut.
Harry G. Barnes, Jr., of Minnesota.
John W. Black, of Washington.
Samuel C. Brown, of Rhode Island.
William A. Buell, Jr., of Rhode Island.
Pratt Byrd, of Kentucky.
Christian G. Chapman, of New York.
Elwyn P. Chase, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
George T. Churchill, of Colorado.
W. Kennedy Cromwell, 3d, of Maryland.
Frank J. Curtis, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Arthur R. Day, of New Jersey.
William L. Eagleton, Jr., of Illinois.
Theodore L. Eliot, Jr., of California.
James B. Engle, of Iowa.
Raymond E. González, of California.
Herbert I. Goodman, of Pennsylvania.
Harry W. Heikenen, of Minnesota.
Gordon G. Heiner, 3d, of Maryland.
Henry L. Heymann, of Pennsylvania.
Max E. Hodge, of New York.
Lewis Hoffacker, of Arizona.
Robert B. Houston, Jr., of Missouri.
Wharton Drexel Hubbard, of New York.
Heyward Isham, of New York.
James R. Johnston, of Ohio.
Walter M. McClelland, of Oklahoma.
John A. McVickar, of New York.
William B. Miller, of Ohio.
Grant E. Mouser, 3d, of Ohio.
Paul M. Popple, of Illinois.
Clifford J. Quinlan, of Minnesota.
Frederick H. Sacksteder, Jr., of New York.
David T. Schneider, of Massachusetts.
Peter A. Seip, of Iowa.
Roland C. Shaw, of Massachusetts.
Herman T. Skofield, of New Hampshire.
Paul A. Smith, Jr., of Virginia.
Richard E. Snyder, of New Jersey.
William F. Spengler, of Wisconsin.
Daniel Sprecher, of New York.
Jack A. Sulser, of Illinois.
David R. Thomson, of the District of Columbia.
Theodore A. Tremblay, of California.
William N. Turpin, of Georgia.
J. Robert Wilson, of Pennsylvania.
Orme Wilson, Jr., of New York.
Arthur I. Wortzel, of New Jersey.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 9 (legislative day of February 8), 1954:

Department of Justice

Simon E. Sobeloff, of Maryland, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

United States Circuit Judges

Elmer J. Schnackenberg, of Illinois, to be United States circuit judge, seventh circuit.

John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit.

Carroll C. Hincks, of Connecticut, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit.

United States District Judges

Edwin F. Hunter, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States district judge for the western district of Louisiana.

Edward William Day, of Rhode Island, to be United States district judge for the district of Rhode Island.

George T. Mickelson, of South Dakota, to be United States district judge for the district of South Dakota.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Calvin C. McGregor, of Hawaii, to be seventh judge, first circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are again turning our thoughts toward Thee in praise and adoration for Thou art always blessing us according to our needs.

Grant that we may go forth into the hours of this day with a new accent of faith in Thee, a clearer vision of divine truth, and a larger measure of brotherly love.

Give us a vivid and vital sense of the place of religion in our personal and national life and may we accept not only its consolations but its challenge, its discipline as well as its delight.

Inspire us to make a more daring trial of its moral and spiritual values as we seek to lead humanity out of the bondage of darkness into the glorious liberty of the sons of God.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1129. An act for the relief of Katina Panagioti Fiffis and Theodore Panagiotou Fiffis;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Lamb;

H. R. 1516. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clemtine De Ryck;

H. R. 1674. An act for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler;

H. R. 2021. An act for the relief of Clarence R. Seiler and other employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 2618. An act for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez;

H. R. 2633. An act for the relief of Lee Sig Cheu;

H. R. 2813. An act for the relief of William E. Aitcheson;

H. R. 2839. An act to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands;

H. R. 2842. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 2885. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii to issue a right of purchase lease to Edward C. Searle;

H. R. 3027. An act for the relief of Tamiko Nagae;

H. R. 3228. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ursula Eichner Clawges;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of John James T. Bell;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of Eiko Tanaka;

H. R. 3619. An act for the relief of Rufin Manikowski;

H. R. 3728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Bonanno (nee Koubek);

H. R. 3733. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder;

H. R. 4254. An act for the relief of Aneta Popa;

H. R. 4439. An act for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham;

H. R. 4577. An act for the relief of Edith Maria Gore;

H. R. 4972. An act for the relief of John Jeremiah Botelho;

H. R. 5195. An act for the relief of Max Kassner; and

H. R. 5945. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Tequillo;

H. R. 2326. An act to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces;

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing the President to exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii, notwithstanding the acts of August 5, 1939, and June 16, 1949, or other acts of Congress; and

H. R. 5632. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Camp Butner Military Reservation, N. C., to the State of North Carolina.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following tiles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 54. An act for the relief of Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra;

S. 60. An act for the relief of Fawn S. Louie;

S. 364. An act for the relief of the Advance Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz.;

S. 489. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land located in Windsor Locks, Conn., to the State of Connecticut;

S. 931. An act for the relief of Vilhjalmur Thorlaksson Bjarnar;

S. 989. An act for the relief of Jean Jing Peo Feng;

S. 1112. An act for the relief of Letizia Maria Genoveffa Lo Bianco;

S. 1137. An act for the relief of Utako Kanitz;

S. 1208. An act for the relief of Andrew D. Sumner;

S. 1231. An act for the relief of Franz Gerich and Willy Gerich, his minor son;

S. 1827. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to disclaim any interest of the United States in and to certain property located in the State of Washington; and

S. 2689. An act to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following appointments:

The Vice President appointed on the part of the Senate the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BUSH, as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for 1954.

The Vice President appointed on the part of the Senate the Senator from New York, Mr. IVES, as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for 1954.

The Vice President appointed on the part of the Senate the Senator from Idaho, Mr. DWORSHAK; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL; and the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. ELLENDER, as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy for 1954.

The Vice President appointed on the part of the Senate the Senator from Michigan, Mr. FERGUSON; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL; and the Senator from Virgina, Mr. ROBERTSON, as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy for 1954.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that there are many places in our country, especially in the great Pacific Northwest, where the Government will build river-dam and reservoir projects to provide flood control, reclamation, and other benefits.

An important function of any such project is the generation of hydroelectric power. When such projects are small in character and located within the service area of a locally owned utility, it seems reasonable that such utility should be allowed to relieve the Government of the power generating and distribution cost of the project on a partnership basis.

This plan in fact has been endorsed by the Eisenhower administration.

I have today introduced a bill which I believe represents an ideal partnership arrangement of this sort. A flood-control dam is to be built on the McKenzie River in Oregon. It is authorized. Its estimated cost for flood control is $25,500,000.

The bill I have introduced proposes that in addition to paying some $10 million for all the costs of construction allocated to power, the Eugene Water and Electric Board, of Eugene, Oreg., plans to contribute toward the flood control and other benefits of the project approximately $1,500,000, thus reducing the Government's estimated cost from $25,500,000 to $24,000,000 and relieving the Government of the additional investment in power facilities and transmission lines.

The Eugene Water and Electric Board has been established since 1906; the

utility is owned and operated by the city of Eugene, Oreg.; the additional power to be provided is needed by the city. If this partnership plan is not approved it will be necessary for the city to build its own dam in the same general area. It seems to me this partnership proposal is an ideal one and should be promptly approved by Congress.

THE MECHANICS OF COMMUNISM

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Baltic Committee, which I truly believe to have proven itself bipartisan throughout hearings in Washington, New York, Detroit, and Chicago has seriously, and successfully, endeavored to document what happens to a nation—in this case three nations—when the Soviets move in.

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were the first to suffer from Communist aggression. In all 3 countries there were only 6 million people—but we found, in addition to the exiles who had lost their land, their home, and their families, that there were many great Americans deeply concerned with the fundamental freedom of people.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was our first witness. His historic statement on the principles for which our Government stands at the international conference table has—as I stated on the floor yesterday—produced notable and outstanding success at the current Berlin Conference.

Our committee must finish its documentation of the illegal seizure of the Baltic nations. Many important witnesses are unable to come to the United States. It might be necessary for our small group to go to them.

But even more important is the very basic fact, brought out by testimony before our committee, that the seizure of the Baltic nations and their incorporation into the Soviet Union was but the first in a well-planned series of aggression which has now brought nearly a billion people under the domination of the small clique in the Kremlin.

The same pattern of merciless, inhumane treatment that was used in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in 1940 and 1941 was later used in Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the other captive nations.

A map, for example, placed before our committee as evidence and attested to by former President Herbert Hoover and General Rastikis, chief of staff of the Lithuanian Army, conclusively proves that the Nazi-Soviet Friendship Pact of 1939 sold out not only the Baltic nations but gave half of Poland to Stalin. This means that Soviet aggression in the Baltics and in Poland went hand in hand—even though Hitler never dreamed that after his death Stalin would steal Poland through "phony" elections first perfected in the Baltics.

We have conclusively proven, by testimony, films and documents that Soviet Ambassador to the United Nations, Andrei Vishinsky, was the mastermind who subjugated the Baltic States. We ask permission to show the role he played in the ruin of Rumania.

We ask, too, that we be given the opportunity to document the names of Premier Georgi Malenkov on reestablishing the Cominform in Poland in 1947, which resulted in the bondage the Polish people now endure.

Think of it: In 7 years the most modest estimate of Poles deported from their homeland is well over a million.

Our committee hopes that, through being granted the privilege of more latitude in our investigation, we can, before this session of Congress closes, bring before you conclusive proof of a great international conspiracy through which the many are enslaved by the few. Our investigations thus far show that the story is the same, the pattern is the same, only the magnitude of the crime changes as we go from the Baltics to the Ukraine, to Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, as each new chapter of aggression prepared by the Kremlin unfolds, the same pattern that was first imposed on the Russian people by the Communists again appears.

We ask for time. We ask for funds to fully expose it.

I should report to you that your Baltic Committee is probably the only one established by the House in recent years to win 14 attacks in 3 weeks by the big guns of the Moscow propaganda machine. We even have a new name. Pravda, Radio Moscow, and the entire Communist press have called us KERSTEN'S Wandering Circus.

But from behind the Iron Curtain—through Stockholm, Sweden, comes word that brings assurance that this investigation is worth while. It may give you some measure of the concern our hearings have caused in the Kremlin.

After Pravda, the entire press of Soviet Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania reprinted the attack (on KERSTEN'S Wandering Circus), and those Balts who cannot hear the Kersten committee in Baltic broadcasts could read in their daily papers that the Soviet crimes against their countries are being inquired into and that their case is not entirely forgotten in the democratic West.

We cannot forget the Poles, the Czechs, the Slovaks, the Hungarians, the Rumanians, the Albanians, Ukrainians, or Russians, or other peoples enslaved by communism any more than we can afford to forget the Balts, through blood or friendship.

The day is not far off when we will have a free world of free nations and free people. And I believe that our committee should conclude its work in such form and in such manner that the red mark which the Reds have made on human history will become a matter of record that will live forever and plague the criminals responsible for it.

Through this amendment, we can achieve two objectives: We can show the Communist conspiracy for what it is. We can keep the faith, the hope, and the spirit of captive millions alive. And through thousands of tomorrows, we can help to show those who follow us what it means to lose freedom and how it can be lost through a carefully planned and well-executed conspiracy.

OUTLAWING THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I am this day introducing a bill which will outlaw completely the Communist Party by making it unlawful for any person to become or be or to affiliate with any organization, society, group or assembly of persons who teach, advise, or advocate communism. The definition of "communism" which I am using in the bill is the same definition as that contained in a bill which I introduced in 1932, and which the House of Representatives passed to deport and exclude Communists from this country. It is in line with the recommendation of the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1941, at which time we said unanimously that as long as the Communist movement had a legal status in the United States no agency of the Government could cope with it.

Many people do not know that from 1919 to 1924 communism was unlawful in the United States. During that period the Communist Party did not enjoy a legal status and was unable to make any headway. I believe if the measure I am introducing passes it will once and for all end the issue of communism in the United States by making it a crime and by leaving all action in reference to it to the police and law-enforcement authorities of this country. I hope the appropriate committee will grant immediate hearings on it and that we can get favorable action. If not, I intend to place a discharge petition on the desk and will ask my colleagues, particularly my Democratic friends who are now under fire, to sign that petition unanimously and finally end this issue.

We have been investigating communism for 18 years. The time has come now to do something very definite and conclusive about it. The present laws are inadequate, as shown by the fact that under these laws we have only prosecuted a handful of Communists. Under my measure, I promise you, if my experience of 7 years as head of this committee means anything, that it will once and for all end the issue so far as the United States is concerned.

HONORING ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I am flying to Montana this weekend, to join with several hundred other Montana people at Billings in the observance of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. Friday, February 12, is the 145th anniversary of his birth.

We remember and honor Lincoln as one of the founders of the Republican Party, and the first Republican to win the office of President of the United States. But beyond that, all Americans honor Lincoln as one of the truly great men of our country, and an example for all times to the best in our country's traditions.

Other American leaders are remembered and honored, but there are few if any for whom these feelings are so warm and affectionate as they are for Abe Lincoln. Most of the virtues we associate with our ideal of the American citizen were found in Lincoln. He was an honest man. He was industrious, worked hard all of his life. He was thrifty. He was a great leader. He had faith in our country. He was a religious man. But the things that especially endear him to us, years afterward, are his compassion for other people, his warm and affectionate nature that shows through his feelings for his family and in his letters and messages to those who suffered losses in the War Between the States. He had a great love for humanity. This, and his tragic death, have given him a place in the American heart that is not usually accorded to our leaders.

FAITH IN INDIVIDUAL MEN

As Lincoln said of himself, he was a living witness to the fact that any American child might aspire to occupy the White House, as President of the United States. No one could spring from more humble surroundings. None could have a more difficult struggle to establish his place in the society of his day. This personal experience became the foundation of his whole political philosophy. Throughout his career, in all of his speeches, you will find expressions of his faith in the individual, under our form of Government, to advance the welfare of himself and his family. Along with this he developed the determination to preserve in America the freedom of opportunity that permitted every individual to grow according to his capabilities. Time and again he said:

I want every man to have a chance. An open field and a fair chance is our birthright.

Lincoln's attitude toward government, taxation, labor, even the war, is related to this basic creed.

He believed in a limited central government, as established by our Constitution.

In all that people can individually do as well for themselves, he said, government ought not to interfere.

The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities.

He endorsed the words of Jefferson, when he said:

Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread. When all government, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will become venal and oppressive.

Lincoln believed that the cost of government, like its size, should be held to the necessary minimum, so as to avoid unnecessary burdens on the people.

In this connection he said he believed that "each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruits of his labor, so far as it in nowise interferes with any other man's rights."

This belief in limited government did not prevent Lincoln from acting when he found that Federal aid or Federal services were in the public interest. Thus in his first term of office, despite the heavy pressures of war, he secured the approval by Congress of a law to establish the Department of Agriculture, to provide services for farmers. He gave opportunity to individuals and promoted the development of the West by sponsoring the original Homestead Act. He suggested legislation, which was enacted, to donate land for new agricultural and mechanical arts colleges, which we now know as the land-grant colleges. He suggested that Congress establish the national banking system, and he supported Federal aid in the construction of the transcontinental railroad.

IN LINCOLN'S PATH

I like to believe that the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln is reflected and developed in the programs we are undertaking today.

We are engaged right now in a program to restore to the States and individuals those things they can do for themselves as well as or better than the Federal Government. The Hoover Commission and the Manion Commission are reviewing the whole Federal structure, and the basic principle of their work is close to Lincoln's belief—let the people's business remain in their own hands and we cannot be wrong.

As Mr. Eisenhower said in his state of the Union address, we are almost the single exception to the worldwide trend toward greater centralization of power and corresponding reduction in personal liberty. We are reversing that trend.

We recognize, however, as did Lincoln, that there are projects of great importance to the growth of the Nation in which, because of their size or complexity, the Federal Government must cooperate with individuals and their local governments if we are to enjoy the benefits of full development. This is the partnership we propose in developing our natural resources and in other fields where problems are too difficult for individuals or States to handle alone.

Another comparison with Lincoln arises in the field of taxation. The aim of our present tax-reduction program, as stated by President Eisenhower, is to return to the people the control of their own earnings, so that they can do their own spending or saving, rather than have the Government try to do it for them. Unnecessary taxation deprives men of the fruits of their labor.

Excessive taxation is one of the surest roads to loss of our individual liberties. As a people are overtaxed, they are forced to rely on government, and their self-reliance and freedom vanish. This is something that grows more and more pronounced as it is permitted to continue. Big government and big taxes go hand in hand. In reversing the trend in America, we are doing something more than making a money saving for taxpayers. We are serving the cause of individual liberty.

As a nation, our problems differ with each generation. In Lincoln's time the issue was slavery, and the peril was civil war and division of the new nation. In our time the threat is worldwide communism and the Socialist philosophies that seek to enslave men, not to other men as in the days of Lincoln, but to the State itself.

Reviewing the years, I think it is evident that as long as the American people have met their problems with solutions based upon our historic faith in individual freedom, we have met them successfully. When we have attempted solutions that ignored human freedom, and departed from the basic principles of our Republic, we have failed.

It is for this reason that it is important for us all to take occasion, such as Lincoln's birthday, to review the lives and philosophies of the great men who have made the history of our country. Insofar as these occasions serve to renew our faith in the vision of our forefathers, they contribute to the well-being of our country.

I have unlimited faith in the future spiritual, social, and economic growth of this country, just as long as we maintain those principles of freedom exemplified in Lincoln's life, and in its dedication to the preservation of human liberty, human dignity, and a unified nation.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts of America are celebrating their 44th anniversary. This great organization, chartered by Congress, continues to render an outstanding service to the Nation. Notable meetings honoring distinguished Scouts are being conducted in Washington this week, and appropriate recognition is being given their executives and volunteer workers. I am sure that every Member of Congress is happy to pay tribute to this group of young Americans. The Scout badge which I am glad to wear was placed in my lapel yesterday by Cub Scout Stanford Pritchard, representing the Washington, D. C., area.

President Eisenhower has sent his greetings to the 3,300,000 Boy Scouts, and under leave to extend my remarks I include his splendid statement:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

To the Boy Scouts of America:

My warmest greetings go to all of you as you celebrate the 44th anniversary of your movement. Those of you today active as Boy Scouts and Boy Scout leaders, and those

who represent the 21 million others who have taken the Boy Scout pledge in the years since its founding in 1910, may be justly proud of the contribution of this organization to the moral strength of our Nation.

It is because of this contribution that the Boy Scouts of America are respected and beloved by the Nation. America is also grateful for the work of those volunteer leaders who, giving freely of their time, transmit to our youth values basic to good citizenship. I am delighted, therefore, that during this anniversary the unit leaders of the movement are to be singled out for special recognition.

To all the 3,300,000 Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, Explorers, and leaders, I extend cordial birthday greetings. You have my best wishes for the continued success of your current program—"Forward on Liberty's team."

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

UNEARNED INCOME TO BE TAX FREE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, customary procedure when tax measures are considered on the floor is to do so under a closed rule. This makes it very difficult for Members to have an even fair knowledge of many important provisions contained in a bill.

I would plead with Members to try to get an understanding beforehand on the so-called technical revision of the code.

Under this so-called technical revision to come to the floor, an entirely new concept of taxation will be presented for your decision. This new concept is that income received which is not earned will not be taxed. On the other hand, if you work for your income it will be taxed.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the entire free world paid tribute yesterday to the great religious leader, Cardinal Mindszenty, the Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, whose fifth anniversary of imprisonment at the hands of the Communists was observed in the hearts and prayers of millions of people.

Recognizing the strength of religion in combating the godless ideology of communism, the evil leaders in Hungary attempted to subdue resistance to their Red regime by persecution of the prelate. Although Cardinal Mindszenty remains captive within their prison walls, his great heroism provides a spiritual leadership that inspires millions behind the Iron Curtain to continue to withstand communistic pressure.

The arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty did more than any one single thing to awake the world to the true menace of communism. It spread an alarm which opened a new era in the fight between communism and the free world. The world quickly realized that the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty was not merely the concern of the Roman Catholic Church and the Hungarian nation, but that it was the concern of freemen everywhere.

The cardinal stood for the principles of human dignity which are so anathema to Communist leaders. Mistakingly, the Communists believed their false accusations at a mock trial would remove the cardinal as a threat to their evil regime. But from his capivity Cardinal Mindszenty radiates encouragement and spiritual support to the Hungarian nation's resistance to communism and increases the will of the Hungarian people to hold fast to the faith and hope that one day the Red yoke will be lifted from their beloved land.

Today, 5 years following the cardinal's imprisonment, the faith of his people in ultimate liberation is stronger than ever before, and their passive resistance shakes the Communist regime to its foundation.

Cardinal Mindszenty has not made his sacrifice in vain. His captivity holds high the torch of liberty and justice. This great sacrific binds freemen throughout the world in a common cause and from it eventually will come victory of right and human dignity over the communistic forces of oppression and evil.

POLITICAL APPRAISAL

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor of February 8, 1954, page 1, is adorned with a photograph of the Honorable Sherman Adams at the microphone. Behind the Honorable Sherman Adams is some cheap and shoddy circus billboarding. Then without mentioning the name of the Honorable Sherman Adams the Christian Science Monitor goes on to remark:

> The same calm, nonpolitical appraisal of the current situation gives a similar bipartisan view that the Eisenhower administration does face an awkward situation. * * * The question is whether the administration will make its transition (a) with a gentle, gradual descent; (b) with a bumpy, tumultuous drop; or (c) with a crash landing.
>
> In a national predicament like this it does not aid the pilots to hear political battle cries thrown at them by extremists from either side: On one hand panicking passengers by shouting "fire"; on the other, denying any hazard at all by attributing all such talk to political fearmongers.

Mr. Speaker, may I join with my colleagues in congratulating the Christian Science Monitor in doing a needed job in a thoroughly gentlemanly and artistic manner. I wonder if the Honorable Sherman Adams knows he has been taken to the woodshed.

DETROIT UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I brought to the attention of the House certain ominous signs on the economic horizon for the State of Michigan.

I was promptly thereafter included among the prophets of doom and gloom by certain of my colleagues for this warning. An article in the Journal of Commerce of February 5, which labels itself as the world's foremost business newspaper, and an announcement yesterday by the Department of Labor would indicate that a prophet is not without honor except in his own country.

The Journal of Commerce reported that unemployment compensation claims jumped nearly 16 percent that week in Michigan. The increase in Detroit alone was 26.1 percent with a total of 150,823 claims reported.

The Johnny-Come-Lately Department of Labor yesterday delivered itself of the long overdue announcement that Detroit is an area of substantial unemployment with 107,000 jobless workers as of mid-January, the exact figure I used in my remarks of January 27.

Detroit is now eligible for Government aid in the procurement of defense contracts. What help this will be is questionable in view of current and prospective cutbacks of defense orders, but it certainly should be tried, and should have been tried at least a month ago.

Certain optimistic, well-chosen passages from the President's economic report were used in reply to my warning. Mr. Speaker, might I suggest that the administration make available about 150,000 copies of the report to Detroit's jobless workers. They can present it to the groceryman, the landlord, and the finance company in lieu of money.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Friday next.

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and, of course, I shall not object, may I ask the gentleman what the program will be on Friday and the early part of next week?

Mr. HALLECK. I should be glad to answer the gentleman.

First of all, as of today, the other body has the papers on the Commodity Credit Corporation conference report. I discussed the matter of the conference report action over there with the majority leader just a few minutes ago and suggested to him that we would appreciate it if they could act on that as promptly as possible so that we in turn could act on it, because, as we all realize, it is a matter of some urgency.

It is our expectation, so far as I can see now, to adjourn from next Friday until the following Tuesday. On Friday

I hope to obtain unanimous consent that both the Private and Consent Calendars be called on Tuesday.

There is a rule outstanding on the bill H. R. 4646, which has to do with timber exchange. Consideration of that was postponed by reason of various interests here with respect to it, but we shall hope to call that bill up after the call of the calendars on Tuesday, the 16th.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has indicated that he hopes to be able to file the committee's report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill on the 16th. I am quite certain that is the one to which he referred. We would anticipate taking it up just as shortly thereafter as we could, either under the rules or by unanimous consent, and to dispose of it during the week.

As to what further program we might have, I have understood that possibly the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce might have one or more health bills ready, and also that the Committee on Education and Labor might have one or more education bills ready, but I am not prepared at this time, I may say to the gentleman from Texas, to say definitely what might be forthcoming later.

Mr. RAYBURN. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think I would heartily agree with the majority leader that the bill H. R. 4646 is nothing more than an exchange. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is there any way by which, while the Thursday-to-Tuesday fellows are away and the more eloquent Members of the House are out making Lincoln Day speeches, some of us who want to make Lincoln Day speeches here can do that?

Mr. HALLECK. I am quite certain the gentleman can get a special order for Friday.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, but what about in between now and then?

Mr. HALLECK. That is Lincoln's birthday. As the gentleman knows, many of us will be out on that occasion. I expect to be in Lafayette, Ind., in my district, on that evening. Of course, some Members will be here. I do not know of any reason why any Member could not make a speech on Friday if he wants to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What about Wednesday and Thursday? I do not want to interfere with the trips of any of the Members. I do not want to ask Members to come here, but two or three Members of the House have said that they would like to speak on those days, even if no one was here.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, I always like to have the Members afforded every opportunity to make speeches. A number of Members have special orders for today, and there can be all the special orders anyone wants on Friday. I do not know how much enlightenment anyone would get from speeches on Wednesday or Thursday, but if the gentleman feels that we ought to meet on Wednesday and Thursday, of course, he can object to this request.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not like to do that.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman, I trust he will not object. He knows this arrangement has been traditional on both sides of the aisle. If there were some bills that committees had reported out, which were ready for the House to work on, it would be a different story. But, I assure him as far as I can discover, there is no such situation. However, as has been indicated, the appropriation bills, as well as other legislation, will start to come regularly after the 16th of the month.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, I do not want to interfere with any desire of the leadership on either side, but I did think that perhaps people would get just as much enlightenment from speeches made here as they would from those made on the outside. Mr. Speaker, I will not object.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire whether the Commodity Credit Corporation report will come in this afternoon, and if it does not come in, is it likely to come up on Friday?

Mr. HALLECK. I have every reason to believe that the report will be here this afternoon. If it does not get here this afternoon, then we shall have to make some determination as to when it might be taken up. As far as I know, there will be no serious opposition to the conference report. I may be in error about that. As I remember, a record vote was had on the measure.

Mr. NICHOLSON. A record vote was asked for, but it was not obtained on this measure.

Mr. HALLECK. I think there was a record vote on it. I think there were 27 votes against it, if my memory serves me correctly, and three-hundred-and-some-odd in favor of it. The amount provided in the bill is less than was carried in the House bill and so, as I say, I had not anticipated that the matter would be controversial as far as the conference report is concerned, because Members who wanted to be recorded in opposition to it had that opportunity when the measure was first before us.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, that in view of some of the nasty things that have already been said in the name of Lincoln, such as calling all Democrats traitors; things that Lincoln would never have said or approved, probably it would be just as well if the House did not meet on Wednesday and Thursday, and so there would be that much more left unsaid.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may I say in reply to what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] just said that I never heard anybody anywhere at any time, ever say a word against the life and character of Abraham Lincoln. I do not think that any Member of this House, either Republican or Democrat, has ever said anything about Lincoln that they are ashamed of or that they would want to retract. Verily he was "of the people and for the people."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. NEAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

SURPLUS BUTTER AND THE CONSUMER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, following is a statement issued by the National Milk Producers Federation. It shows what I have always contended, that many farm producers realize the dangers to them of the surpluses piled up under the high fixed farm price parity program. Consumption of butter has fallen 50 percent in a decade. It is gratifying to see that this organization of producers at least recognizes how consumers may be induced to reverse this trend. The statement follows:

To aid in the disposal of Government-held surpluses of dairy products and to give American consumers the benefit of lower-priced butter, the National Milk Producers Federation recommends that the Department of Agriculture take immediate steps to offer its stocks of surplus butter to commercial butter packagers at prices below the support level.

This would permit an averaging of the price of butter now sold commercially with the price set on the Government stocks. The result would be that Commodity Credit Corporation would obtain the best possible price on Government-held butter, and consumers would be able to buy butter at this average price—which would be substantially lower than present retail prices.

The exact reduction in consumer butter price would be determined by the figure at which Commodity Credit Corporation would price its butter. In the interests of stimulating consumption of butter, this program would make possible the determining of the price at which substantially increased volumes of butter would readily sell.

This plan is the only presently proposed program under which Government-held surpluses can legally be disposed of in domestic markets at lower prices to consumers.

The National Milk Producers Federation does not favor waiting for any legislation to be passed, as it feels action should be taken immediately to move stocks of CCC-owned butter into commercial consumer channels.

We understand Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, has proposed a stamp plan to make stocks of CCC-owned food available to the aged and needy. We would certainly endorse such a program and encourage its being put into action immediately or as soon as possible. However, we feel such a program would not use all butter stocks of CCC, and our disposal suggestion also would have to be put into effect.

SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, a measure, which is designed to provide equal status under the law for social-security beneficiaries who continue to receive income from any source after becoming eligible for benefits. The measure will remove some of the prevailing inequalities and discriminations in the present law, which are indefensible.

The bill envisions a new formula for determination of the annual income, which an individual may receive without loss of benefits, that sum being an amount equal to the maximum payable to any beneficiary under the law, plus $1,000, annually. A further provision would make this ceiling applicable to so-called unearned income from rents, investments, and so forth, as well as to income from wages, salaries, or self-employment.

Under present law, an individual may receive any amount of income from investments, and so forth, without losing his social-security benefits; but the elderly individual who is obliged to continue at work to keep a roof over his head loses his benefits if he earns more than $75 a month or $900 a year. This ceiling on earnings now applies regardless of whether the individual is receiving the maximum social-security benefit of $85 per month, or a minimum benefit of $30 a month, or a benefit in between.

My bill is so worded as to be applicable if benefits are raised to a proposed maximum of $108 a month, or $1,296 a year. At present, under its terms, an individual could have an income, from all sources, of $2,020 per year, before becoming liable for loss of social-security benefits. At the same time, his wife, if otherwise eligible for social security, could have an income up to $1,510 per year before losing her benefits.

If the pending program of expanded benefits is approved, a retired worker could have an income up to $2,296 a year, and his wife, if 65 or over, could have an income up to $1,648 per year without loss of benefits. These sums, in all cases, are inclusive of social-security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would be a potential aid to several million persons whose only crime is that they desire or are obliged to continue in productive work after reaching 65. We now penalize them for such enterprise, and what is worse, we penalize the elderly individual who is receiving minimum benefits from social security more than we penalize the man who is receiving maximum aid.

The average benefit under social security today is $49 per month, or only slightly more than the maximum permissible under present law. Thus for the average beneficiary, my bill would lift the income ceiling from $1,458 per year to $2,020, provided the individual concerned had the health, the initiative, and the opportunity to go out and earn the difference. The record shows that most eligible old folks do not even apply for social-security benefits until they are 68 or 69 years old. Many would undoubtedly apply earlier, were it not for the wage ceiling in the present law. At present they are obliged to contribute to the system but receive no benefits from it, even though they may otherwise qualify.

Mr. Speaker, in introducing this measure, I do not wish to suggest that I believe in a wage ceiling in the Social Security Act. I am opposed to any ceiling, and have sponsored a bill to remove the present provision.

Thus far, however, the Social Security Administration has opposed the removal of the ceiling on the ground that it would be too costly. But I am by no means convinced that it has adequately taken into account the administrative savings which would result, or the taxes that would accrue to the Government if old people were encouraged to remain at productive work.

Spokesmen for the Social Security Administration have pointed out that the Nation is losing $4 billion a year by not making use of its able old people. We know that the 3 million workers 65 or older who are still in the labor force contribute some $12 billion a year to the Nation's economy. Yet, so far from encouraging the employment of elderly people, we pursue policies which discourage marginal elderly workers altogether, and which penalize the self-reliant old folks who insist on paying their own way.

We should at least not compound the indignity by imposing on minimum beneficiaries under the program the same earnings ceilings which we impose on maximum beneficiaries, while waiving the ceiling entirely for those who are not obliged to work at all after 65 because they can rely on so-called unearned income.

LINCOLN DAY SPEECHES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, if speeches of Republican leaders given in the last week or two are a preview of what is going to be said at Lincoln Day observances this week, I can conclude only that Republicans have either forgotten or are ignoring the words and example of the man whom they claim as the greatest leader of their party. In a letter to Charles L. Wilson, in June 1, 1858, Abraham Lincoln wrote these words:

> I believe we need nothing so much as to get rid of unjust suspicion of one another.

This is quite a different thing from the policy announced by an active participant in one Republican campaign committee, of expanding doubt where doubt could be found. Such action is little different from creating doubt where none exists, or of contracting truth if possible.

Certainly it has no place in the philosophy or in the code of conduct of Abraham Lincoln, who stated his position many times, but perhaps never more clearly or appropriately than in a letter to the editor of the Illinois Gazette, of Springfield, Ill., on August 11, 1846. Lincoln wrote:

> I believe it is an established maxim in morals that he who makes an assertion without knowing whether it is true or false, is guilty of falsehood and the accidental truth of the assertion does not justify or excuse him. This maxim ought to be particularly held in view when we contemplate an attack upon the reputation of our neighbor.

I sincerely hope that the Republican leaders or their speech writers who are now preparing speeches for Lincoln's Day will approach their work with the same rules of conduct and decency in mind that were standards for political action sustained by Abraham Lincoln.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DOYLE asked and was granted permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Friday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE FOR TODAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state that pending the arrival of the papers on the conference report from the other body, he will go along with the special orders heretofore entered into. If they should be concluded before the papers arrive, there will be a unanimous-consent request for a recess.

PRICE SUPPORT FOR FARM PRODUCTS

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for speaking out of order for the reason that the subject I shall discuss gets into the homes of every constituent of every Member of this House three times every day of the year. I am speaking of the critical problem of farm surpluses.

Recently here on the floor of the House we have heard a lot about the so-called parity and price support for farm products. The subject is being seriously discussed all over the country. January 21, the Christian Science Monitor, one of the most reliable and usually one of the best-informed publications in America, published a cartoon picturing price support for agriculture as an overgrown swine consuming United States dollars and labeling it "Surplus producing farm policy." This was followed a few days later by a cartoon showing the American consumer under great strain as he wheeled a heavy taxload produced from losses incurred from farm surpluses.

Now I want to correct what seems to me a lot of misinformation about these farm surpluses. They are nothing new. Except in occasional years of nation-wide drought, we have always had them. With our vast areas of new and rich agricultural land, we were bound to produce surpluses, and those surpluses always produced distress to agriculture. The difference is in the way in which they recently have been handled. Formerly, and up until the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, nothing was done by the Government to relieve the distress arising out of the production of surplus farm commodities. Prices were left to seek their own level on the markets of the world. To be sure we had a protective tariff on meat and grain and various other farm products, but, since we produced a surplus to be sold abroad, the protective tariff didn't protect. The net selling price of the surplus determined the price of the entire product. The American farmer got for his products just what they would bring on the market of Liverpool, England, or Hamburg, Germany, less the cost of putting it there. The price of wheat in Chicago was determined by the price in Liverpool, England, and the price in Chicago determined the price to every farmer in the United States. In other words, through the years, the farmers of this Nation, even when they were in the majority in numbers, bought their necessities on a highly protected market, and sold on the open markets of the world. It was not fair, it was not just, and it nearly broke our backs, but we endured it, partly through patience and partly through ignorance. But in the early thirties the time came when we could endure no longer, patience was at the breaking point, and the farmers of this Nation were on the verge of revolt.

It was out of this situation that, for the first time in the history of this Nation, an effective, good-faith effort was made to right the wrongs of agriculture, to give to the farmers and their families, who had always been the hardest working, poorest paid people in America, an even break with other segments of society. Out of this situation arose the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and later the price support legislation which seeks to give parity of reward to the farmers of the Nation.

I do not like the word "parity" for the reason that it is not generally understood, and I am going to digress enough here to pay my respects to the person who was responsible for its use. It simply means equality, and it would have been much better to have used the term that we all understand. Could you imagine Thomas Jefferson writing in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created free and on a parity"?

But back to the merits of the case. I hear a lot of talk about a sliding scale of price support. Sliding from where to where—sliding from parity to below parity? From equality to inequality? From justice to injustice? What is the purpose of this proposed sliding scale? Plainly the purpose is to penalize the farmer for having raised too much and to force him to produce less. Because he produced too much wheat we will compel him to sell at a loss and presumably he will not produce so much. Simple is it not? Looks as if it should work. But it will not, and I will tell you why. It is returning in part to the conditions when there was no price support and this is the way that worked out. The cheaper the product the more the farmer had to produce. The farmer's production cost is fixed. There is the tax on his land, the interest on his investment evidenced in notes at the bank and often a mortgage on his land, the cost of his help, and the depreciation on his equipment. These are items that do not vary and which he must arrange to meet.

What happened when corn went down? The farmer broke up more grass land and planted it to corn. Then corn went lower. What happened when wheat went down? He broke up pasture and planted more wheat. Then wheat went lower still. Why did he do it? Because he could not help it. The cheaper the product the more he had to raise to meet his operating and living expense. He could not help it because there was no provision for concerted action, and you cannot get concerted action among millions of farmers without governmental assistance.

Mr. Speaker, our economy is all tied together. We are in the same situation with regard to this farm legislation that the Colonies were when Benjamin Franklin said:

> We must hang together or we surely shall hang separately.

And I am not talking in figures of speech. Mr. Speaker, I do not often rise to speak on the floor of the House, but I am a good listener. Let me relate a conversation I heard while sitting at a table with a half-dozen other Members in the House restaurant. This was in the latter days of the last session, and the farm program was under discussion. A Member from New York asked, "How long do you think we people of the East will pay subsidies to you farmers?" In a flash, a Member from Georgia replied, "As long as we pay you a protective tariff and a minimum wage." There you have it in a nut shell. My friends of the cities, you cannot raise one valid objection to a support price at parity. It is based on simple justice. You can object to mismanagement of the surplus products. We all do that. Mr. Speaker, I submit that proper management of our surplus is our only problem with regard to agriculture.

And now I come to the gist of the problem, which is, "What shall we do about the surpluses?" Plainly where there are price supports there must be controls of production, and we farmers are perfectly willing to agree to whatever may prove to be necessary. We have shown that on every occasion. Having established controls, we must also see to it that the American people have opportunity to earn enough money to buy all the food and clothing that they need. That will go a long way toward consuming the present surpluses and preventing others. There is plenty of work that needs to be done in this country—roads, dams, soil conservation, a thousand things. Coming from the farm, I speak in farm terms. You people in the city need houses, sewers, schools, playgrounds. This Nation needs a national conservation program. Conservation of human values and conservation of material resources.

We will never know the size of our surpluses until every man, woman, and child in this Nation has an opportunity to do the best that is in him to earn the good things of life. That, at this critical time, when unemployment is increasing, should be the first concern of government. A part of our surplus arises out of underconsumption.

I come now to the question of subsidies, and that, too, concerns everyone in the Nation. The farmers have paid subsidies ever since the First Congress put a protective tariff on iron for the benefit of some ironworkers in the State of Pennsylvania more than 150 years ago. I am told that the first subsidy paid by the American people was embodied in that law.

The shrewd business people of Pennsylvania were out to get theirs even then, and they still are asking for subsidies. And the people of New York and New England are going along with them. I don't blame anybody. We farmers are still going along with you in every practical way. We built your railroads, your ships, your wharves. We dredged your rivers and harbors, subsidized your industries. That is, we did our part. How did we do it? We furnished you food and clothing at ruinous prices. You needed help. You asked for it—you even begged for it. How the manufacturers did wail about cheap products from abroad. How they cried for a protective tariff. And we gave it, willingly, gladly. And we have no regrets. We only want you to understand that we know all about what took place. We want you to understand that while we were making it possible for you to build your cities and to have the high standard of living that you demanded, and often bragged about, we farmers were selling our products in the markets of the world and a lot of the time we were out at the knees. The truth is that only in times of drought and short crops did we receive a decent recompense for our labor. We paid subsidies on everything we wore from the caps on our heads to the shoes on our feet. There was a time—and I am a little ashamed of this—when we did not know any better, when we actually thought that we were getting the benefit of a protective tariff; but when the time came that the price of our products fell below the paper tariff that was written in the statute books here in Washington, we woke up. And we are awake now, and we are going to stay awake. You say you want to get away from controls. Let me suggest that if this Congress enacts a sliding support price, and farm prices slide down with it, as they are bound to do, not only the farmers, but a lot of others will be in distress. Now to controls: Why all this turmoil about controls, as if they were something new under the sun?

What is protective tariff but control? What is a minimum wage but control?

What are established railroad rates but control? The very bus tickets and taxi fares that brought some of us to this meeting are controls. Your stop lights are controls. At this very time we are controlling the production of oil, and if you can control oil you can control anything. We are subject to controls from the time the nurse gave us our first spank until the requiem is sung over our bier, and it is all right. It is necessary and as it should be. Controls are an essential part of modern civilization. But I must return to the farm question. We hear it suggested how fine it would be if the farmer would just go back to the law of supply and demand where he used to be when he bought the necessities on an artificial, protected market, and sold the products of his labor on a world-competitive market. I have heard that preposterous idea broached on the floor of the House. That is what we had during the 150 years before we had a farm program. Those were fine times indeed. Maybe some of you can remember when we farmers sold good cattle at 2 cents per pound. I remember it well. Many a time, when I was a boy of 12, I helped to drive cattle 7 miles over country roads to a market and weigh them up at 2 cents per pound. They were not old cows. They were fat, sleek yearling heifers. That was fine for you city people, was it not? when you could buy steak at 10 cents and a dozen eggs for a dime. We sometimes hear that period spoken of as the Gay Nineties. It may have been gay for some, but not for the farmer. Let me remind you that was the period of the uprising of the Farmers' Alliance and the Populist Party, and those Nation-shaking movements did not arise out of any conditions of gayety. Reform movements never do. But we do not need to go back to the last century. Only a little more than 20 years ago, I hauled to market as fine hogs as any Member of this House ever saw at $1.75 per hundred pounds. Think of it, a 400-pound hog for $7. I have seen No. 1 corn sell for 8 cents per bushel at public sale and wheat as low as 28 cents.

I have heard a lot of talk about the farmer being soft and coddled and spoiled. Did you know that other segments of society have collected $40 in subsidy to $1 that has been paid to agriculture? That is an established fact. They do not seem to be afraid of being spoiled. They do not mind being coddled. The farmer is a laboring man engaged in business and his wage is determined by the price of his product. On the farm everyone works—the wives, the husband, and the children—and they work long hours. What was the result of these conditions when there was no price support? It broke nearly every farmer in the land. That is not all. It closed the factories; it closed the mines; it crippled the merchant; it put the professional man on short rations; and, if it had not been stopped by governmental action—by controls, if you please—it would have broken every bank in the land. No one profited but the lawyer who was expert in bankruptcy proceedings. Do we want a repetition of this condition? No; we do not, and it will not happen. It will not happen because the American people will not let it happen. For 150 years the farmer of this country worked 16 hours a day to feed and clothe the Nation while he and his family ate the cheapest food and often his children went in rags. There was no farm program then. There were no price controls to worry Congress then. But in the past 20 years the farmer has demanded and has received for the first time an equal status with the rest of the American people and he will never again consent to less. He will never go back. Never again will he consent to be a second-class citizen—never. This Nation may need a new farm program, but it must be a program based on justice.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not quite sure I understood the gentleman but I thought he said that the lower the price the more the farmer planted. Is that right?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. That is true; it is necessarily true, because the lower the price the more he must produce to meet his overhead.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But if the price is so low he could not make a profit how can he afford to produce more instead of less? That is the idea I had.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. He cannot afford to do it. He is compelled to do it to meet a fixed overhead. He is forced to produce at a loss.

THE BUY AMERICAN ACT AND THE CONTRACT FOR EQUIPMENT AT THE DALLES, OREG., DAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of those having special orders, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] may address the House now for 10 minutes and revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 20 I protested to the House against consideration of bids submitted by foreign firms to supply equipment to our Government in competition with American suppliers. The Members of the House will recall that I made specific reference to Corps of Engineers awards of contracts on equipment for power and flood-control projects under construction by them.

On January 23 the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, the Randall Commission, submitted its report and recommendations on United States foreign trade policy. Among other things the Commission urged repeal of the so-called Buy American Act. The situation I dealt with in my January 20 remarks provides a timely illustration of what can happen even with the Buy American Act in effect. Without the protection it affords to American industry the door would be left open for Government purchasing and contracting agencies to range far and wide in their purchases of materials for public use.

Since my earlier remarks I have received a number of protests against the policy now being followed by the Corps of Engineers with regard to acceptance or consideration of bids by foreign firms to supply materials for use on Government projects within the United States. May I say right here and now that I do not blame the Corps of Engineers for this policy. I believe they are doing a fine job within the limits of the broad policy laid down by this administration which forces the administrative agencies to use a straight dollars and cents yardstick in contracting, without regard for any long-range considerations of vital importance to the national welfare. The arguments I have heard, while addressed to specific cases, are equally valid when applied to the whole question of whether or not this Government should be permitted to purchase materials, supplies, or services abroad when the items are to be used in the United States. I should like to point out some of these arguments now.

My correspondents emphasize particularly the difference between wage scales for workers in the metal trades in foreign countries and those paid in the United States. Mentioning Japan and Italy specifically, since firms from those 2 countries have submitted bids on a contract currently under consideration by the Corps of Engineers, it is pointed out that the metal worker in those countries is paid almost $2 less per hour than our craftsmen receive. It must be remembered that domestic bidders on Government contracts are required by law to comply with the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act and with our wage-and-hour laws. Any foreign supplier cannot be put under such restraints. Thus, in direct competitive bidding with such foreign firms our American companies are under an almost insurmountable handicap. It was with this knowledge that Congress enacted the Buy American Act back in the 72d Congress. It is not only presumptuous for this administration to direct the Corps of Engineers to evade the intent of the act by using their own interpretation of the "unreasonable cost" clause of the act to award contracts foreign; it is a direct threat to American labor and its high standards of pay and working conditions, and to American industry, whose prosperity is built on those high standards and the correspondingly high rate of consumption they permit.

And now, Mr. Speaker, we find a responsible group set up to advise the President and the Congress on matters of high policy coming in with a report which threatens to multiply the threat and to break down the thin wall of protection provided by the present law. In my judgment, congressional action on foreign trade matters should not be aimed at driving standards we have set for our workingmen down to the level prevailing in substandard areas abroad. It should, rather, be taken with the intent of raising them up to our level, thus creating new markets abroad for our products.

My own background in the labor movement naturally inclines me to fight

for the protection of the hard-won rights and benefits enjoyed by the American laboring man. That inclination is doubly strong when, as in this case, the threat is aimed at both industry and the men whom industry employs. It is triply strong when the threat, as in this case again, is so obviously a violation of good commonsense and enlightened self-interest.

Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported the reciprocal-trade program as a means of promoting two-way trade between ourselves and other nations and as a means of striking down some of the barriers which arouse suspicion and distrust among friendly allies. However, I firmly believe that our foreign-trade program should be a real two-way proposition confined to commercial operations and not a one-way street with the United States Government on the wrong end. Our Government is not a commercial venture, although some of our agencies, particularly the military, would like to have it so. In its necessary commercial-type operations it cannot be governed by the same rules which apply to industry. It must, to some extent at least, overlook the dollars and cents aspect of its transactions and give overriding consideration to the economic and social well-being of our people. Repeal of the Buy America Act, as urged by the Randall Commission, or evasion of it as practiced by the Corps of Engineers on a number of recent contracts and which they threaten again on a contract pending for The Dalles, Oreg., power project, might in some cases save a few dollars initially. In the long run, however, the American workingman, American industry, and the Government itself will pay dearly for this administration's apparent policy of supporting such action.

Aside from the undermining of American working conditions which will result from wholesale United States Government purchases abroad, my correspondents have referred to the loss of man-hours of work and business to various vendors which result when our Government awards contracts to foreign firms. They cite specifically the case of the pending contract at The Dalles. But the argument is no less true when applied to the general problem of whether the United States should buy from foreign sources when the need can be supplied at home. In my remarks of January 20 I called attention to the present rising unemployment as a powerful reason for keeping The Dalles contract in the United States. One hundred thousand man-hours has been mentioned as the loss of employment to an American company if that contract goes to a foreign supplier. Multiply those 100,000 man-hours, plus the man-hours lost to the employees of subcontractors and vendors, by the number of such contracts which might be let abroad if the Randall Commission's recommendation is followed and the Buy America Act is repealed, and any one can plainly see what a blow might be struck at our economy at this critical time.

In due time Congress will act on the recommendations of the Randall Commission. At that time I sincerely trust that we will have the good sense to reject repeal of the Buy America Act if it is not knocked out in committee. In the meantime, however, it seems to me that the appropriate committee of the House, presumably the Committee on Government Operations, should begin an investigation of the manner in which Government agencies have administered the Buy America Act. I urge this action so that if any agency prepares to let such a contract abroad—as has been done for equipment on projects such as the Chief Joseph Dam, the McNary Dam, and numerous others, and as is now being considered for The Dalles power plant—we will be prepared to step in and tell them quite flatly "No." To that end, Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate committee consideration of the matter. I shall be happy to cooperate with the committee by supplying such information as I have and in any other way possible.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BONIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday next, February 16, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, on Lithuanian Independence Day.

FARM PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, instead of talking upon the matter I had in mind, moved by the logic, the sincerity, and the earnestness of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER], I should like, for the purpose of information only and not in a critical way, to discuss the question he did and ask a few questions.

The gentleman made a very earnest and a very logical plea for farm subsidies. As one who lived during the days to which he referred, when good heifers were sold for 2 cents a pound, I might add that I bought some at 10 dollars a head. I do not know how that compared to the 2 cents a pound. I am not farmer enough to know about that.

I also had some of that 10-cent steak, and in those days you got round or sirloin or porterhouse at the same price. I bought the round because there was less bone in it. Eggs, as the gentleman says, were 10 cents. If you were a farmer you took them to the market and you got 6 cents in trade. I know about these things. I have also known of this tariff which protected industrialists and the workers of New England, the cost of which was paid in part at least by the farmers as the purchasers of the things that were affected by the tariff. Now we have on hand all of these surpluses. The Republicans were very, very critical of the opposition when they were buying potatoes, peanuts, tobacco, and, oh I do not know how many things were on that list. We were very critical. Now while we are still paying these subsidies, these surpluses are piling up. If I understand the gentleman, and again I am asking not critically but for information, as I understood his argument it was that the workers should have wages high enough to enable them to purchase the farm surpluses. That sounds all right. Maybe that is the way to solve it—I do not know. We have a minimum wage law, of which the farmers in my community at some times have complained and which they have cited as justification for their demands that they have a minimum price for the things that they grow, which, of course, in turn will give them a minimum wage for the work of the farmers. Again that is logical. This is my question. If the Government is to pay a subsidy for farm products, and we get these large surpluses all the time, apparently we all concede we will if we get the subsidy large enough or a little too large, and the only way we can dispose of them is to raise wages or to give the surpluses away—as I say the only way we can dispose of the surpluses is to raise the wages of the workers of the city people and increase their income so that they can buy them, then as I get the gentleman's statement that makes for controls, am I right?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I think we do have controls over almost everything, do we not—controls of one kind or another?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now the gentleman is asking me a question. My question is being asked in absolute good faith, and it is this. Is not the effect of the gentleman's argument that if we have subsidies on farm products, of necessity we must have controls on production acreage?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Absolutely.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, all right—that is my theory. What is bothering me is if we are to have controls, then to what extent and how far are they to go, and if the farmers are to be told how many acres of this, that, and the other thing, that they are to harvest, then is it illogical to say to the workers if they are to receive a minimum wage, they should be told what work they should engage in? And if we follow through even on the controls as to the farmers, do we not get ourselves into a situation where the Government will be controlling all of our activities? And to stretch it a little beyond the limit, would not the Government tell us—tell you and me what we should eat and how much we should eat so as to dispose of these surpluses?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I think perhaps it is not generally understood that the farmers' operations are not completely under controls.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is to a certain extent.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. But they are under controls in a very limited way. You are not forced to raise any one thing or to raise any particular quantity of it. There is simply a maximum that you are not permitted to exceed, and in case you do, you just simply do not benefit by the price supports because you have not contributed to the thing that you are supposed to contribute to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. As I understand it, that is, you do not get the subsidy unless you submit

to the controls. Would it not be equally logical to say that you shall not have the minimum wage unless you follow an administrative order as to where and when you should work and what you should work at?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I do not think the analogy would go that far.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. To me, the issue comes down to this. If we are to have a system of subsidies, of necessity, to make it work you must have control of what you grow, what you produce, the number of acres planted, and so forth.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Yes, within limitations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If you do that, then you are getting into the danger of having the Government control all of your activities. That is the only point I was trying to make. We must make our choice as between the dollars and our freedom.

That is about the way the farmers in my district have indicated is their thinking. They say, "We admit that the subsidies are piling up surpluses which we cannot handle, and all we are asking—"

I have sat in on some of those meetings. I recall one that lasted for 4 hours and, believe it or not, I did not ask a question or make a remark. But the substance of their conclusions was, "We do not want subsidies as an overall policy, but do not take them away from us too fast."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. YOUNGER asked and was granted permission to address the House for 5 minutes on Friday, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BAILEY asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday next, after the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

RECESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 1:15 p. m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock p. m.) the House stood in recess until 1:15 p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1184)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$550,151,848"; and the Senate agree to the same.

H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
OAKLEY HUNTER,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
JOHN TABER,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRED MARSHALL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STYLES BRIDGES,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 1: Authorizes restoration of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the amount of $550,151,848, instead of $609,930,933 as proposed by the House and $114,283,062 as proposed by the Senate.

The amount agreed upon in this amendment, together with the other two items provided in the joint resolution, provides a total capital restoration of $681,769,703, instead of $741,548,788 as proposed by the House and $245,900,917 as proposed by the Senate.

H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
OAKLEY HUNTER,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
JOHN TABER,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRED MARSHALL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 358 provides for the restoration of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation, due to, first, losses on price-support operations; second, cost of the International Wheat Agreement; and, third, cost of the foot-and-mouth disease eradication program in Mexico.

As the bill passed the House late in January, it provided $741,548,788 in note cancellation for this purpose, as follows:

CCC capital impairment	$609,930,933
International Wheat Agreement	129,553,795
Eradication of foot-and-mouth disease	2,064,060
Total	741,548,788

As it passed the Senate, the resolution provided a total of $245,900,917, as follows:

CCC capital impairment	$114,283,062
International Wheat Agreement	129,553,795
Eradication of foot-and-mouth disease	2,064,060
Total	245,900,917

The conferees have agreed upon a total of $681,769,703, consisting of the following:

CCC capital impairment	$550,151,848
International Wheat Agreement	129,553,795
Eradication of foot-and-mouth disease	2,064,060
Total	681,769,703

The only point of difference between the two Houses had to do with the figure for losses under the price-support program. The House conferees took the position that the House action was based on the latest appraisal made by the Treasury Department under the law and should be adopted, particularly in view of the present tight fiscal position of CCC. The Senate action was based on the fact that the audit report carried some estimated losses in inventory values in addition to actual losses incurred from sales and disposals accomplished.

The matter was finally agreed to as a result of some compromise on the part of the conferees on both sides. It is estimated that the amount agreed to will carry CCC for the next 7 or 8 weeks—at which time it is hoped that the bill providing for an increase in the limit of borrowing authority from $6.75 billion to $8.5 billion will have passed the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that last week this body adopted the House version by a vote of 12 to 1. In conference the House receded to the extent of approximately $60 million, and it is my opinion that this report should be adopted without much discussion, because it certainly meets the objections in part of those who were opposed to it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] such time as he may require.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out by the chairman of our subcommittee, this conference report extended the lending authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation. As we pointed out last week, the borrowing authority of the Corporation is practically exhausted and the law makes it compulsory to carry on certain operations through the Corporation. On the other side of the Capitol, the question was raised as to just what the actual losses may be. We feel this is a separate matter. However, in view of the feelings of

some Members of the other body we have agreed to reduce our original resolution by the amount of two items. These two items amount to some $60 million or more. We believe the figure here will enable the Corporation to operate until legislation can be passed through the Congress to enlarge the size of the Corporation's operations. I trust in the present emergency, there will be no opposition to the conference report. The conference report itself is less than that which the House passed by an overwhelming majority a short time ago.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, this question was fully debated when the issue was in the House on the resolution and a rollcall vote was taken on which I voted "nay." Reference is made to the debate in the other body on the same resolution at pages 1051 to 1058 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 1, 1954. The bill now comes back to us cut $65 million as a result of action in the other body and in conference.

The bill represents a cancellation of losses on the high fixed farm price supports to the extent of $550 million as against $61 million of actually realized losses in the fiscal year 1953 in such operations. This should dispose once and for all of the allegations of small actual loss suffered in the program as the $550 million represents a realistic appraisal of the diminution in value of the over $4 billion of farm products held by the Government as of June 30, 1953. These losses are accelerating rapidly and all that this bill has done is to give the Commodity Credit Corporation another over half-billion dollars to stave off the day when it must ask Congress for more credit authority.

The bill to raise this credit authority to $8,500,000,000, it is said, will come before us shortly. It is vital that all who speak for consumers—and this applies especially to those of us who represent big city areas—should oppose this constant drain of money and resources attributable to a high-fixed-farm-price-parity program inimical alike to the interests of the consumer, the farmer and the national economy.

No one wants to embarrass our Government. Hence, the record once having been made on the original rollcall no fight is being made on the conference report. But the expansion of credit which the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to make available to support this program is a matter of policy and it is there that the interests of the consumer and the farmers who see their own best interests should be decisively manifested.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, we are being asked by the present administration to maintain our high spirits and an attitude of confidence during the so-called transition from a wartime to peacetime economy. Incidentally, this transition is not to be confused with the words "recession" or "depression" which have suddenly become unethical or almost un-American in reference to the present widespread decline in business generally. The Administration's leaders tell us that we are going through "an orderly and healthy readjustment." These phrases are very reminiscent of expressions made during the Hoover Administration. But the prosperity "around the corner" which the country was promised at that time also was not reached until the Democratic administration came along and helped lead the way to it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the 3 million people who are unemployed today are finding it easy to maintain their high spirits, nor do they consider their present situation a very healthy one. When almost a million workers lose their jobs in a period of 3 months because of a falling-off in demand for goods, unemployment compensation may keep them from going hungry, but they and their families have nevertheless taken a jolting economic blow which sends a shock all through the rest of the economy. And with this going on throughout the country, I personally find it difficult to maintain an attitude of confidence.

Nor do I find this readjustment as orderly as the Administration claims it to be. Of a total employment labor force of 1,717,000 in the Philadelphia labor market area, 5 percent—or approximately 86,000 persons—are now unemployed. A year ago the unemployment was at 3 percent. At this rate, Philadelphia will soon be in the distressed-area category. It is not necessary to go into the fine points of what types of jobs are included in these figures or to give excuses as to why these particular trades are on the unemployed list. Each person included in this 5-percent figure is an individual and is entitled to the opportunity to earn a living as provided in the Full Employment Act of 1946. According to this legislation—passed by the Democratic administration—the Government is responsible for promoting maximum employment. It is required to mobilize all its resources to promote conditions which afford useful employment opportunities for those able, willing, and seeking to work.

Our Government is not fulfilling its obligation under the Employment Act of 1946 when it eliminates Federal projects without properly arranging for transition to private industry. It is not offering the opportunity to maintain the prosperity of the Nation when it retains the taxes which were originally imposed for the purpose of building up the defense of our country. Expenditures for defense have been drastically curtailed, but taxes on so-called luxury items—electrical appliances, automobiles, gasoline, travel, entertainment, telephones, and so forth—have not been reduced. It seems that the only thing going down these days—besides excess-profits tax for business—is the employment rate.

I think it is time that the Administration wake up to the fact that we are rapidly sliding into a recession and do something about it. Continued high corporate profits seem to have blinded the Administration to the fact that pay envelopes are shrinking, job opportunities are narrowing, unemployment is rising, and small business is getting scared.

I am sure that even those people in my Congressional District who were never employed at one of the several large Government installations in South Philadelphia will be interested in the large number of layoffs taking place. The United States Army Quartermaster Depot in Philadelphia has 3,200 civilian employees now as compared to 5,750 in 1952; the Marine Corps Depot, 3,460 now as compared to 4,503 in 1952; the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard has been reduced from 14,868 employees in August 1952 to 12,000. In Government installations in South Philadelphia alone, approximately 5,000 individuals have lost their jobs in the past year. Most of these are persons of special skills whose know-how was of tremendous value in the recent emergencies of our country. On the basis of an average American family of 5 persons, this means that 30,000 persons are suffering the effects of what we are not supposed to refer to as a recession or depression, but merely a transition from Government to private enterprise. These former Federal employees who lost their jobs will no longer be able to buy the products or pay for the services of those businesses fortunate enough to still be intact.

In the past 2 months the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad reduced its 55,000-person work force by 11,000—20 percent. During the same period, the Pennsylvania Railroad issued layoff notices to approximately 75,000 of its 135,000 workers. The Reading Railroad has laid off 1,820 since the first of the year. On January 6 the Jersey Central put 400 workers on indefinite furlough, and the Lehigh Valley has also cut its work force drastically. But according to the big business administrators, this is not recession either. In the words of the workingman who can no longer look forward to a weekly paycheck, this is plain unemployment and no dramatic phrases or technical excuses can hide that fact.

The 3 million people who are unemployed today are having their depression today, and as of now there is no brighter hope for tomorrow. Nor will the situation change until the workingman is given a higher rate of pay so that he can purchase the essentials of living, the manufacture of which will provide employment for other individuals.

This cannot be accomplished unless we have wage increases sufficient to spur consumer spending to a pace equal to production capacity and to provide an increasing standard of living—even if it is at a cost of reducing profits from fat levels to merely fair levels. What will become of the millions of dollars each big business concern will save as a result of the recent elimination of the excess profits tax? Has big business offered any additional benefits to the workingman who actually earned those excess profits for him? Shall we wait patiently for them to volunteer to share these millions with their employees? It does not take a dynamic program to realize that we cannot maintain the past economy of the country by giving more to big business and continuing to take away from the workingman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, if there is no desire on the part of anyone to further discuss the conference report, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight to file its Sixth Intermediate Report on Military Surplus Property—Part I, and its Seventh Intermediate Report on Government in Business, General—Part I.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE AND AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Friday next the clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

WHOSE OX IS BEING GORED?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, took occasion yesterday to indict the Republican administration for attempting to remove the postmaster at Gary, Ind.

His anguished cry that such an effort is an uncalled for and unjustified conspiracy to destroy the Federal civil-service system was apparently timed to engender resentment of Government employees against the Eisenhower administration. I say this because his statement follows closely the request of a Senator from Oklahoma for an investigation of the removal of postmasters because of slight or minor irregularities.

If this seeming loyalty to individuals employed in Government service were a sincere desire to help the individual, and if it were a consistent Democrat practice, we might accept his gesture as sincere.

A bit of research on the gentleman's part, while it may prove embarrassing, certainly will establish the inconsistency in his statements and others acting on the part of the members of his party. Has memory become so impaired as to destroy all recollection of arbitrary behavior on the part of the early New Deal administration when it assumed the reins of Government in the early thirties?

Let me read from two letters which I have in my possession.

This letter is signed by the First Assistant Postmaster General, W. W. Howes, and it is addressed to the postmaster at Reedy, W. Va. It is dated February 8, 1935:

> The Reedy office was relegated to the fourth class on July 1, 1934, and it has been decided to appoint your successor.
>
> This opportunity is accordingly afforded you to tender your resignation, which should be received, so that the change may be made, effective February 15.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> W. W. HOWES,
> *First Assistant Postmaster General.*

The postmaster replied to this letter, but evidently that reply was not accepted by the Postmaster General; so a second letter followed it, exactly 6 days after the first letter, February 14, and it was addressed to the postmaster:

> Receipt is acknowledged of your reply to the Department's letter of February 8, advising you that it had been decided to appoint your successor and affording you an opportunity to tender your resignation.
>
> As you have not tendered your resignation and it has been definitely decided to appoint your successor, your removal is being ordered.
>
> A bond for execution as acting postmaster has been sent in and you are directed to transfer the office immediately, including all official funds, supplies, and other Government property for which Mr. Carpenter should give you a receipt. You will be released from further responsibility in connection with the conduct of the office subsequent to the date the acting postmaster assumes charge.
>
> Respectfully yours,
>
> W. W. HOWES,
> *First Assistant Postmaster General.*

These letters were sent to me with the statement:

> I was under civil service and there were no charges sent in against me.

I should like to mention another closely related matter. I wonder what my Democratic colleagues would say if President Eisenhower were to serve notice on every person having a Government lease to furnish facilities for housing post offices, substantions, and so forth, that they must immediately agree to reduce their rental rate by 20 percent or run the risk of cancellation of their contract? That is what the Roosevelt administration did in the early days of the New Deal. Regarding this, I do not speak as an outsider. I was there when it happened. I had a contract with the Government to furnish housing for a substation at a rental of $75 per month, and I was required to furnish all equipment and utilities. I was told that I would have to reduce my rent or my contract would be canceled. I reduced the rent, but when the lease expired a new lease was given to a member of the Democratic Party.

A new building was erected by a party follower, leased to the Government for 10 years at a monthly rental of $125, and the Government furnished not only all of the fixtures but also all of the utilities.

The people voted for a change last November and that is what we are trying to give them just as fast as practical.

I can tell this House that the shifts we have made in Federal personnel have the wholehearted support of the true career employees of the Government, and they have the support of the American people.

I am proud to say that no such violation of civil service such as mentioned here has occurred under the Eisenhower administration, and nothing of that sort will happen.

The Eisenhower administration has done more for civil service than did both previous administrations combined. This has been accomplished by restoring to civil service its true purpose, which is to protect the loyal, hard-working career public servant. Civil service was never intended to be what our predecessors made it—a cloak to hide and shield the loafer, the incompetent employee as well as to make places for political favorites.

President Eisenhower is the best friend the true civil servant has ever had.

Our duty is to strive constantly to improve and strengthen the Federal personnel. That is exactly what we are doing, so the American people will have the kind of Government they want and deserve.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 440) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That CLIFTON YOUNG, of Nevada, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Education and Labor.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL).

Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

Mr. NORRELL and to include a resolution.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. BONNER.

Mr. JAVITS in the body of the RECORD before the motion for the previous question on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill conference report and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SADLAK (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN), for the rest of the week, on account of illness in family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's

table, and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 54. An act for the relief of Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Escurra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 60. An act for the relief of Fawn S. Louie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 364. An act for the relief of the Advance Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 489. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land located in Windsor Locks, Conn., to the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 931. An act for the relief of Vilhjalmur Thorlaksson Bjarnar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 969. An act for the relief of Jean Jing Peo Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1112. An act for the relief of Letizia Maria Genoveffa Lo Bianco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1137. An act for the relief of Utako Kanitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1208. An act for the relief of Andrew D. Sumner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1231. An act for the relief of Franz Gerich and Willy Gerich, his minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1827. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to disclaim any interest of the United States in and to certain property located in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2689. An act to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Friday, February 12, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1252. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to increase the compensation of certain members of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1253. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. R. E. Baygent, doing business as Baygent Coaches, which will, when approved by the regional director, region 3, National Park Service, authorize Mr. Baygent to provide passenger motor-bus transportation to Big Bend National Park, Tex., from outside points, for a period of 3 years from January 1, 1952, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1254. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter to Mr. Erwin H. Flother which will, when approved by the regional director, region 3, National Park Service, renew for 1 year from January 1, 1954, concession permit No. I-4np-94 under which Mr. Flother is authorized to provide accommodations, services, and facilities for the public at Willow Beach in Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev., pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1255. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Lee Roy and Alice Wiles, which will, when approved by the regional director, region 2, National Park Service, authorize them to offer rowboats and outboard motors for hire at Lake McDonald in Glacier National Park, Mont., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1256. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1257. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. Sixth intermediate report pertaining to surplus military property; without amendment (Rept. No. 1196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. Seventh intermediate report pertaining to Government in business; without amendment (Rept. No. 1197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 7810. A bill to enable the mothers and widows of deceased members of the Armed Forces now interred in cemeteries outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska to make a pilgrimage to such cemeteries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 7811. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 7812. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 7813. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to adjust or cancel certain charges on the Milk River project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 7814. A bill to make affiliation with the Communist Party unlawful; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 7815. A bill to provide for the construction, operation and maintenance of the Cougar Dam and Reservoir on the South Fork McKenzie River, Oreg., with participation for power by the city of Eugene, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 7816. A bill to repeal certain laws authorizing the Postmaster General, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to revise parcel-post rates, size limits, zones, and other conditions of mailability; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 7817. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the filling of oral prescriptions for certain narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committe on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 7818. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 7819. A bill to provide for the orderly settlement of certain claims arising out of acts or omissions of civilian employees and military personnel of the United States in foreign countries and of civilian employees and military personnel of foreign countries in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 7820. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide an additional social-security tax on certain income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 7821. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that members of Reserve components of the Armed Forces may deduct from gross income expenses paid or incurred for transportation in connection with inactive-duty training; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 7822. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax certain automobiles furnished without charge to schools for use in driver-training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 7823. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to make permanent the increases in regular annuities provided by the act of July 16, 1952, and to extend such increases to additional annuities purchased by voluntary contributions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 7824. A bill to provide for greater safety of life and property at sea by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe rules for the loading, stowage, and securing of grain and other similar bulk cargoes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 7825. A bill to require that merchant seamen be able to understand orders given in the English language, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 7826. A bill to amend section 4462 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 7827. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to make soybeans a basic commodity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 372. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 9 as Leif Erickson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. Res. 437. Resolution relating to the issuance of a special air-mail postage stamp

bearing the phrase "Liberty and Justice for All"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 438. Resolution to amend House Resolution 346 so as to provide for an investigation and study of the subversion and destruction of free institutions and human liberties in certain areas controlled, directly or indirectly, by world communism, including the treatment of the peoples in such areas; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. Res. 439. Resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various candidates for the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANE: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts relative to study and revision of the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to certain legislation seeking Federal financial aid for flood control and pollution abatement; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 7828. A bill for the relief of Mariana George Loizos Kellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 7829. A bill for the relief of Shimasoi Michiko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 7830. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosario Cecere Santoianni and Luigi Santoianni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 7831. A bill for the relief of Armenouhi Assadour Artinian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 7832. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cornelia Juliana Long; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 7833. A bill for the relief of Olga Anna Drenckova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7834. A bill for the relief of Erika Schneider Buonasera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 7835. A bill for the relief of S. Sgt. Frank C. Maxwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 7836. A bill for the relief of William E. Nash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 7837. A bill for the relief of Hon Cheun Kwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 7838. A bill for the relief of Kazumi Aoki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since their rise to power in 1947 in Hungary, Communists have committed many outrageous crimes in that outpost of western civilization. They have arrested, imprisoned, and shot innocent people by the thousands; they have suppressed all forms of freedom; they have instituted widespread terrorism and have thereby succeeded in keeping down all outward signs of resistance; they have organized and perfected a secret police system that is as ruthless as it is efficient; they have crushed all actual and potential opponents to communism, and have consolidated their dictatorship; they have confiscated and nationalized all church property, and have taken over all private and parochial schools; they have also nationalized all industries, and have introduced the Soviet system of collective farms. They have, in addition, imposed a severe set of controls over the movements of all Hungarians so that none is allowed to leave the country and peoples of the free world are definitely barred from Hungary. In these outrageous acts the Communist regime of Hungary has been guilty of violating the most elementary human rights. Peoples of the free world have shown their indignation by protesting against these injustices and crimes, but perhaps none of these touched the freedom-loving peoples of the west so intensely as did the case of His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty; his arrest, trial, and conviction on false and trumped-up charges.

When the godless Communist regime launched its ideological campaign against the church and the clergy, many devout and stouthearted leaders of the church voiced their opposition. These dauntless souls, refusing to be subdued and silenced by the fury and/or blandishments of civil authorities, wholeheartedly disapproved and condemned all outrages committed by governmental agents. Most outspoken of the clergy was the Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty. Through his utterances and sermons he challenged the authority of the Government in spiritual matters. His popularity as well as his uncompromising stand on principles which he had defended against all usurpers and oppressors was most embarrassing and disturbing to civil authorities. The Government was not going to allow such antistate talks and agitations. It meant to silence him and, once and for all, eliminate him as a force opposed to the Communist regime. This was done. On December 26, 1948, secret agents of the Government surrounded Cardinal Mindszenty's residence, arrested him and led him to prison.

This despicable move by the Government was revealed a few days later to the peoples of the free world. Protest meetings were immediately held by large groups in many lands. The opinion of this country was well expressed by a congressional resolution unequivocally condemning this act. I need hardly say that I was in the forefront of those in Congress who denounced this unspeakable act of Hungary's Communist tyrants. Nor have I relaxed in my efforts to relieve the suffering of this Prince of the Church. When he was tried and found guilty of treason, espionage, and foreign currency abuses, we all were shocked. Even more shocking was the news that the Cardinal was drugged before his trial in order to have him confess to the charges brought against him. On hearing of this we all shuddered in revulsion at such inhumanity and travesty of justice. It has been alleged that the former Hungarian Minister in Washington, Dr. Emil Weil, himself had done the drugging. On February 8, 1949, it was announced in Budapest that the Cardinal admitted all the charges, and confessed his guilt. Thereupon he was sentenced to life imprisonment.

Since then we do not even know the exact whereabouts of Cardinal Mindszenty. On December 27 of last year it was stated that he is still in prison in Hungary. Even though we are in the dark as to his fate, yet we are deeply concerned about him. Last week President Eisenhower, speaking for the whole people of this country, stated that "We in the free world have not forgotten that this is the fifth anniversary of Cardinal Mindszenty's trial and imprisonment." And as Secretary of State Dulles declared on December 28:

> The case of Cardinal Mindszenty, a defender of the faith and of human freedom against both of the great tyrannies of our time, is not closed. It is actively before the conscience of his countrymen and that of the free peoples throughout the world.

I ardently hope that through our prayers and good intentions we may be able to relieve the agonizing suffering of this noble churchman.

The Late Maj. Gen. Earl T. Ricks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1954

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

PILOT CLUB,
Hot Springs, Ark.

"Whereas there is under construction an Air Force base at Jacksonville, Ark.; and

"Whereas Earl T. Ricks was Arkansas' most illustrious man in the field of aviation, and the recent national commander of the Air National Guard of the United States of America, and the aviator who piloted the plane bearing Japan's emissaries to the official surrender ceremony of that nation to our Nation, and Hot Springs' distinguished and beloved citizen; and

"Whereas the said Earl T. Ricks passed away on January 4, 1954, while in the service of his country: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the Pilot Club of Hot Springs, respectfully petition that this flying field in his native State of Arkansas be named in his memory and honor, The Ricks Field."

Dated this 26th day of January 1954 at Hot Springs, Garland County, Ark.

THE PILOT CLUB OF HOT SPRINGS,
By DOROTHY LEE EMBREE, *President*,
LAURA ALICE WILSON, *Secretary*.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to have known the late Maj. Gen. Earl T. Ricks for many years prior to his passing on January 4, 1954. He was a constituent for whom I had highest regard, and a personal friend. An outstanding citizen of Arkansas, he had a distinguished military record the details of which have been furnished me, upon request, by the Department of Defense, as follows:

MAJ. GEN. EARL T. RICKS, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Earl T. Ricks was born in West Point, Miss., in 1908. He enlisted as a private in the 154th Observation Squadron of the Arkansas National Guard, March 13, 1940. He was commissioned a second lieutenant April 7, 1940, and entered Federal active duty as a pilot on September 16, 1940, with the 154th Observation Squadron.

In August 1941 General Ricks was transferred to the 17th Bomb Group. Later he served as commanding officer of the Air Transport Command at Miama (Fla.) Air Base, prior to a tour of duty as the commanding officer of Payne Field at Cairo, Egypt.

In June 1944 General Ricks became deputy commander of the Southwest Pacific Wing of Air Transport Command. While serving in the Pacific theater, he piloted the plane that carried the Japanese surrender party from the island of Ie Shima to Manila to receive the surrender terms.

Following his discharge from the military service in October 1945, General Ricks became mayor of Hot Springs, Ark. He was appointed adjutant general of the State of Arkansas in January 1949, and received his Federal recognition as a brigadier general on February 28, 1949. In October 1950 he was named deputy chief of the National Guard Bureau and chief of the Air Force Division, National Guard Bureau. He was federally recognized as a major general with date of rank from March 7, 1951.

Among the decorations which General Ricks has been awarded are the Legion of Merit, Air Medal, Commendation Ribbon, American Defense Ribbon, Pacific Theater Ribbon with seven battle stars, European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Ribbon with two battle stars, South Philippine Campaign Ribbon and Luzon Campaign Ribbon.

General Ricks has been a flier for 26 years and received his first transport pilot's license in 1929. He is a rated pilot for jet planes, single-engine fighters, and 2- and 4-engine bombers.

PROMOTIONS

He was promoted to first lieutenant February 4, 1941; to captain April 6, 1942; to major July 20, 1942; to lieutenant colonel April 8, 1943; to colonel April 26, 1944. He was appointed a brigadier general in the Air National Guard February 28, 1949, and was promoted to major general on April 11, 1951, with date of rank from March 7, 1951.

In view of his military record I take pride in submitting that, in the judgment of many of us in Arkansas, it would be appropriate that the air base under construction at Jacksonville, Ark., be named in the memory and honor of Maj. Gen. Earl T. Ricks.

Col. Phyllis D. S. Gray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1954

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Air Force recently appointed Col. Phyllis D. S. Gray as Director of Women in the Air Force.

News dispatches carried the word that Colonel Gray was formerly the WAF Staff Director in Europe. It was indicated that she was chosen for her new post by a board of Air Force colonels from among 38 Air Force women colonels on active duty.

The attention of the House should be directed to the selection of this new director. Newspaper comment was all too brief in outlining the caliber of the new director. This is understandable in the desire for more startling and dramatic recording of everyday events.

During the latter part of the 82d Congress, a subcommitee of which I had the honor to be chairman concluded a worldwide survey of military supply-management activities by a study of Air Force installations in Europe. During our hearings at the Air Force headquarters in Wiesbaden, Germany, the subcommittee membership was briefed on WAF European activities by Colonel Gray.

Colonel Gray presented to the subcommittee a graphic word picture of WAF activities in Europe. She demonstrated a keen grasp of her responsibilities and was able in a straightforward manner to answer the inquiries of the subcommittee.

The hearing held by the subcommittee at the Weisbaden installation was highlighted by an able Air Force presentation on supply management. Although we chose to disagree with its approach in our report, the personnel presenting the Air Force position did so with clarity and conviction. Colonel Gray's contribution to this hearing demonstrated the thoroughness with which the Air Force had prepared the summary of all phases of their activities for our evaluation. Her report was complete in itself and formed an invaluable supplement to the résumé of Air Force programs in Europe.

The Department of the Air Force is to be congratulated on their selection of the new Director. The women of the Air Force can look forward to an efficient administration balanced by a recognition of their problems.

Colonel Gray will, it is predicted, justify the confidence of her superiors which led to her selection over such a wide field of candidates.

Oscar "Battling" Nelson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the city of Chicago this week they will be burying Oscar "Battling" Nelson. When the business of the day in this House is finished, I shall fly to Chicago in the hope that I shall arrive in time to pay the last respect of friendship to a great guy. He was in my corner every time I had a political fight. I was always in his corner.

Our friendship started in the old Hearst Building on the south side of Madison Street in Chicago in the block-long editorial room we affectionately called the madhouse. I was 21, sports editor, and the writer of a syndicated fight column. Battling Nelson was 21, not much of a fighter as yet, but game. No one could make him quit.

At that time Benny Yanger and Tommy Mowatt were the prides of Chicago. Benny on the North and West Sides, Tommy in the Back o' the Yards. John Hertz—later taxi magnate, now partner of a distinguished member of the other body in a great financial house in New York—was managing Yanger, who was well on his way to matches with Jimmy Britt and eventually for the title.

The late Jack Robinson, than whom there never was a greater as manager, took on "Battling" Nelson. I had dinner with them in King's Restaurant on Fifth Avenue, now Wells Street, in Chicago just before they started their famous trek westward. They had a total capital of $10, or what was left after Robinson had insisted on picking up the meal check at King's. It was one victory after another. Overnight "Battling" Nel-

son became the sporting sensation of the country. He left Chicago unknown and unsung; he returned the fistic hero of the nation.

Nelson's rise to fame was so sudden that the only photograph of him in a Chicago newspaper morgue was one posed as an unidentified sparring partner of the famous Syracuse Tommy Ryan. We were a bit chesty that we were the only paper in town to come out with a Nelson photograph. This time it was Mr. Ryan who got painted out and Mr. Nelson got the big identification.

In a very real sense it is fitting and proper that the Congress of the United States should note the passing of Battling Nelson and give tribute to his memory.

A great and popular athlete has a mighty influence in molding the character of the youth of his generation.

Battling Nelson has left us a tradition of courageous gameness that cannot fail to have lasting and wholesome repercussions. He never had a bad habit. His was an example to follow.

He never knew how to quit. Nor did he know how to complain. I think he always understood that the man who complains is the man who is looking for an excuse to quit. The last thing in the world that Battling Nelson wanted was an excuse to quit.

Even when the walls were closing about him he did not complain. He had put his earnings into the real estate of his beloved Hegewisch. The depression came, and he was washed clean. I saw him often those days. He had faith, courage, the gameness to see the night through, the certainty that the day would dawn.

Poverty came, and illness and grief. His body that once was of iron wasted to a mere 40 pounds. But he did not know how to quit. He did not know how to complain. The good souls and kind hearts of the Veteran Boxers Association sought him out and when they got him to a hospital the doctors found that he had carried on almost to the last hour with cancer of the lungs.

What a man was Oscar "Battling" Nelson. I am enriched that he was my lifelong friend. He has given to the blood of the Danes and the tradition of these United States an imperishable glory.

Navy Procurement Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1954

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to note that the Subcommittee on Defense Activities of the House Armed Services Committee, of which Congressman WILLIAM E. HESS, of Ohio, is chairman, has requested Navy Secretary Robert B. Anderson to explain the award of a contract for three destroyers to a manufacturer whose bid was more than $6½ million in excess of the lowest price obtainable. The contract was awarded to the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., Quincy, Mass., for the sum of $53,022,000, whereas the bid of the Bath Iron Works in Maine was $46,476,960.

The manufacturer who received this award was higher than 2 of the 4 bidders. The bid of the Newport News, Va., Shipyard was $50,400,000, or $3,923,040 less than that of the company receiving the award.

Congressman HESS stated:

I cannot understand why bids were asked for at all if they were to be disregarded; and I must have more than just a plausible explanation of why a $6½ million premium is being paid. I have read some versions of the Secretary's statement, but they do not satisfy me. In my mind the biggest distress area right now is in the taxpayer's pocketbook; and I don't believe we ought to be tossing around $6½ million bonuses when we have good competitive bids. The taxpayers are putting up every dollar that is required for defense; but they ought not to be pitched into other businesses without knowing why. We are very much interested in what the Secretary will have to say.

Mr. Speaker, I have previously stated on the floor that the American people expect and are entitled to receive the maximum in defense for the funds expended by the military services. The taxpayers will not be convinced that economy is being practiced when a large company is given a $6½ million subsidy while a company in the same region is being deprived of the business on which they were the low bidder.

On January 6, 1954, I introduced a bill, H. R. 6864, in an effort to return to competitive bidding and to avoid the unfavorable results of the past under Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 and the interpretations which have been placed on the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 by the defense agencies. H. R. 6864 would modify section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act, and it is under this section I am advised that the above $6½ million subsidy was paid.

The award of this contract with the payment of a $6½ million subsidy appears to be in conflict with the language contained in a ruling of the Comptroller General dated January 14, 1952, which was set forth in a letter to the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. The Comptroller General stated as follows:

On the other hand, section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 authorizes the negotiation of contracts, without advertising, when determined by the agency head to be necessary in the public interest during the period of a national emergency declared by the President. Such a national emergency was proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950. Despite such authority, it would not normally appear to be in the public interest for the military departments to make awards of contracts to a firm or group of firms when it is known at the time that the services or supplies are obtainable elsewhere at a lower price.

In this instance it was known at the time the contract was awarded that the destroyers were obtainable elsewhere at a lower price. The public announcements which have come to my attention have not given any indication that this contract was submitted to the Comptroller General for review.

I would also like to call to the attention of the Department of the Navy the following language in the 1954 defense appropriations bill:

Provided further, That no funds herein appropriated shall be used for the payment of a price differential on contracts hereafter made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations.

I believe it is time to return to free competitive bidding on the vast majority of Government contracts, and that negotiation be used only when necessary rather than when convenient. I hope that serious consideration will be given to the bill which I have introduced, H. R. 6864, and that legislation will be passed which will curb the recent abuses in Government procurement contracts.

Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on this fifth anniversary of the trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, prince primate of Hungary, I join with many of my colleagues in a message of assurance that we have not forgotten. The circumstances of the cardinal's arrest, the infamy of his trial and his sentencing to life imprisonment continue to move us to deep indignation.

I can, of course, speak only for myself. But from what has been said on the floor of this House, and what I have heard on all sides in conversations with my colleagues, I feel perfectly safe in saying that the sentiment of the Congress of the United States demands with complete unanimity the immediate release of Cardinal Mindszenty and condemns as unworthy of reception in decent society those responsible for his torture and confinement.

In the district in Illinois which I have the honor to represent are many fine men and women of Hungarian blood. For them and for myself I join in this message to the silenced and oppressed people of Hungary: We will not rest in our prayers and in our efforts until Cardinal Mindszenty is free and to all the people of Hungary have been restored the blessings of liberty, the dignity of man and the right to worship God.

Cardinal Mindszenty we hold to be one of the great Christian martyrs of our times. The story of his heroism under the torture of martyrdom will never die.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art from everlasting to everlasting, in the brief day committed to us may our hands, clean and undefiled, be Thy instruments to help weave the finer fabric of the Nation's life. The generations come and go, returning to dust; but Thy laws abide, and above and around us Thy love is not moved.

We are grateful for the fundamental fact of the universe, which in myriad ways showeth Thy handiwork, that while all is law all is love. Amid all the chance and change of our ebbing days we have been attended by an ever-present help wiser than our own; our hurts have been healed and our burdens made light by a strength kinder than we know.

O Thou who art nearer than breathing, live within us yet more vividly, that the dross of our natures may be consumed by the fire of Thy blessed indwelling. May new days bring new visions of truth, new surprises of Thy love, and an ampler service to our fellow men. May our homes be more hallowed, our work more sacramental, and our faith more firmly fixed in Thee, that life may unveil to us its worth and wonder. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 9, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITION

A petition was presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolution respectfully requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to call to the attention of their associates in Congress the recent action of the house of representatives in creating a special committee of said house to investigate the high cost of coffee in Rhode Island, in tangible protest at public hearing against such prevailing high cost of coffee

"Whereas by authority of house bill 594, introduced by Representative Orist D. Chaharyn, of Woonsocket, R. I., January 21, 1954, being a house resolution creating a special committee of the house of representatives to investigate the high cost of coffee in this State, a public hearing was promptly held in tangible protest against such prevailing high cost of coffee: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this general assembly respectfully requests the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to bring to the attention of their associates in said Congress the fact that such a house resolution has passed in Rhode Island and that such an investigation of the high cost of coffee to cooperate in bringing down this extraordinary high price; directing the Secretary of State to transmit to said Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF MARYLAND HOUSE OF DELEGATES

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I would like to have it noted that the first resolution adopted by the Maryland House of Delegates during its 1954 session was a resolution opposing construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. Copies of this resolution will be sent to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, ordered to lie on the table, and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Resolution 1

House resolution opposing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway

Whereas the Congress of the United States is again considering the proposal for the construction and development of the St. Lawrence seaway project; and

Whereas it is apparent for many reasons this project is of dubious value; and

Whereas it would require the expenditure of hundreds of millions and perhaps a billion dollars or more at a time when the full resources and energies of the Federal Government are needed for the continuing fight to guarantee the American way of life against communism; and

Whereas it is probable that this seaway would be closed because of ice conditions for at least 5 months out of every calendar year, thus reducing sharply any potential benefits which might be expected from this project; and

Whereas the completion of such a project would divert much ocean-going traffic from the port of Baltimore and would be a serious threat to the economy of the Baltimore area and of the entire State of Maryland; and

Whereas it is a matter of doubtful statesmanship to expend untold sums of money on a project of doubtful value, while at the same time perhaps injuring irreparably the industries and the economies of the great seaports and industrial cities along the eastern seaboard: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That this body expresses its firm opposition to the projected St. Lawrence seaway and particularly to any cooperation in this venture on the part of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Members of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

By the house of delegates, February 3, 1954.

Rules suspended and adopted.

JOHN C. LUBER,
Speaker of the House of Delegates.
CLEMENT R. DEWALD,
Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates.

OVERSEAS INFORMATION PROGRAMS (S. REPT. NO. 936)

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in accordance with the permission granted by the Senate on January 29, 1954, from the Committee on Foreign Relations I submit, pursuant to Senate Resolution 74, 82d Congress, 2d session, as extended by Senate Resolution 44, 83d Congress, 1st session, and Senate Resolution 117, 83d Congress, 1st session, a final report on the overseas information programs. Because it is a short report, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was received, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OVERSEAS INFORMATION PROGRAMS OF THE UNITED STATES

A. LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Senate Resolution 74 (82d Cong.), agreed to on June 30, 1952, established a special subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee consisting of 6 members of that committee and 2 additional members appointed by the President of the Senate. The subcommittee was directed to make a full and complete study of all aspects of overseas information with a view to improving the effectiveness of the overseas information program of the United States. The subcommittee was continued by Senate Resolution 44 (83d Cong.), agreed to on February 20, 1953, and again by Senate Resolution 117 (83d Cong.), agreed to on June 11, 1953.

The subcommittee was provided with a total of $75,000 from the contingent fund of the Senate to defray the cost of the investigation. Economies in staffing and other costs make it possible to return an unused portion of this total, amounting to $21,748.80.

B. SUMMARY OF THE WORK OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

The subcommittee spent 18 months in an intensive study of all aspects of the overseas information program. During that time, staff studies were prepared and issued on numerous aspects of the problem. Extensive

hearings were held in Washington and New York to take testimony from both official and private witnesses. Members of the subcommittee made on-the-spot examinations of the operation of the program in almost every part of the world.

C. THE FINDINGS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

Analysis of the evidence collected during the investigation was set forth in the subcommittee's principal report (S. Rept. No. 406, 83d Cong., 1st sess.), issued on June 15, 1953. That report discussed both the strengths and the weaknesses of the information program. The major defects in the information program were listed as follows:

1. Ineffective coordination of psychological strategy.
2. Duplication and competition in informational activities of United States agencies operating abroad.
3. Lack of budgetary stability and continuity of administrative direction.
4. Ineffective administration of the program by the Department of State.
5. Inadequate personnel and faulty personnel practices.
6. Failure to utilize fully widespread public interest in this country to further program.
7. Unsatisfactory evaluation methods.
8. Lack of a common understanding of the objective of the information program on the part of the administration, Congress, and American people.

In addition to pointing out these shortcomings, the report also summarized the strengths and weaknesses of the various media employed in the program, the information centers (overseas libraries), exchange of persons, motion pictures, press and publications, and the Voice of America and other forms of telecommunications.

The subcommittee proposed a number of positive measures for improving the overseas information program. Among these recommendations were the following:

1. Strengthen coordination of psychological strategy.
2. Consolidate nonmilitary overseas information programs; coordinate all exchange-of-persons programs.
3. Give the International Information Administration greater autonomy within the Department of State for a trial period of 1 year; or establish it as a separate agency, except that the exchange of persons should remain in the Department.
4. Establish independent personnel system suited to the special needs of the overseas information program.
5. Consider establishing regional coordinators in all areas of the world.
6. Explore possibilities of increased cooperation and coordination with friendly foreign governments and groups.
7. Encourage greater participation of nonofficial groups, organizations, and individuals in the program.
8. Consolidate all evaluation functions of the IIA in an independent evaluation and inspection corps responsible directly to the Administrator, with records of the corps accessible to appropriate congressional committees and the advisory commissions.
9. Strengthen overseas libraries and exchange-of-persons programs.
10. Continue motion-picture program.
11. Reappraise the press and publications service.
12. Reappraise the structure of the Voice of America; and explore the possibilities of more effective use of telecommunications, including television, in the program.
13. Avoid drastic cuts in appropriations for the information program.
14. Adhere to the terms of Public Law 402 (80th Cong.) and maintain a tone in the program worthy of the United States and its citizens.

Major changes have occurred during the last 8 months in the conduct of the information program of the United States. These have resulted from the President's Reorganization Plan No. 8 separating the program from the Department of State, the work of various investigations and studies, as well as from the subcommittee's own findings.

The subcommittee has devoted its efforts during the past 6 months largely to a study of these changes in order to determine the degree to which they have followed the recommendations contained in its report of June 15, 1953, and their effect on the operations of the information program. Several members of the subcommittee and other members of the Foreign Relations Committee observed and reported on the program in foreign countries, especially in Latin America. During December 1953 the United States Information Agency and the Department of State were requested to submit written responses to a list of questions designed to elicit information on the manner in which the subcommittee's recommendations were being carried out.[1] A hearing was held on January 15, 1954, with Mr. Theodore Streibert, Director of United States Information Agency, and Mr. Russell Riley, Director of International Educational Exchange Service, to obtain a final summarization of the status of the program.

The 6 months that have elapsed since the filing of the subcommittee's principal report do not afford sufficient opportunity to evaluate fully the changes which have taken place in the information program. Observations and studies during this period, however, suggest that a determined effort is being made to follow the general course which was outlined by the subcommittee's recommendations. They also indicate that progress is being made in developing an efficient and effective program that carries out the intent of Public Law 402 (80th Cong.). Certain aspects of the program warrant close observation on the part of those who have executive responsibility, if this progress is to continue.

1. Coordination of psychological strategy: Some improvement in coordination appears to have been made. Nevertheless, the executive branch might profitably study the role which informational considerations should play in forming psychological policy with a view to possible inclusion of the Director of the Information Agency in the Operations Coordinating Board.

2. Consolidation of nonmilitary overseas information programs: The ambiguous and wasteful situation of having various agencies overseas engage in information activity appears to have been almost completely eliminated. Care must be exercised, however, to prevent its reappearance.

3. Coordination of policy between the Department of State and the United States Information Agency: Elaborate administrative machinery has been set up to insure that the Department and the Agency will speak with the same voice on foreign policy. As of this date, there are no serious complaints on the effectiveness of this procedure either in Washington or at the posts in the field.

The task of maintaining cooperation over a period of years, however, is considerably more difficult than that of devising blueprints for cooperation. The subcommittee believes that the present system of separate jurisdictions as between the United States Information Agency and the Department of State should be kept under close scrutiny for signs of schisms. The possibility of administrative duplication is ever present in the present arrangement and, even more serious, the danger of the development of dual voices in the realm of foreign policy.

4. Regional coordination: In recommending that the possibilities of regional coordination be explored, the subcommittee did not have in mind the establishment of elaborate satrapies in the field at the intermediate level of administration. While the subcommittee does not criticize the establishment of regional assistant directorships, it is essential that these offices do not clog the lines of communication from Washington to the field with needless bureaucratic trappings and that they do not smother the initiative of the officers at the post.

5. Personnel procedures: Considerable improvement appears to have been made in the personnel practices of the Information Agency since separation from the Department of State. Policies have been established in this field which could result eventually in staffing the Agency with the specialized personnel that is required for the special tasks it is performing. The Agency has assured the subcommittee that it is dealing effectively with problems of security and of separating incompetent or inappropriate personnel. Because of legislative limitations, it has been unable, however, to rectify the present unrealistic representation allowances which work a hardship on officers in the field.

The Agency should look closely into the possibilities of using lower-salaried personnel at some of the smaller posts as a means of effecting further economies.

6. Voice of America and other forms of telecommunications: The shortwave broadcasting of the Voice of America has been sharply curtailed. Shortwave transmissions continue to be made to Iron Curtain countries and, on reduced schedules, to the Middle and Near East and the Far East.

As far as the subcommittee could determine, the elimination of a segment of the shortwave broadcasting, notably to Latin America, has not seriously affected the overall effectiveness of the information program. These curtailments have enabled the Agency to absorb substantial reductions in appropriations without reducing unduly the more effective media.

Now that the decision has been made to relocate the principal programing installations of the Voice of America in Washington, the subcommittee hopes that there will not be a prolonged delay in moving from New York. The move, moreover, should be of a kind as to insure against regrowth of the establishment in New York and consequent duplication of offices.

The subcommittee's recommendation that a commission be established to explore the possibilities of an expanded use of television and other forms of telecommunications in the program resulted in the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 96 during the last session of Congress. Senate Joint Resolution 96 passed the Senate on July 23, 1953, but is still pending in the House.

7. The information centers (the overseas libraries): The relative proportion of the appropriation for the Information Agency allocated to the information centers has been increased substantially. The subcommittee hopes that ways will be found to strengthen this aspect of the program, particularly the book translation program and the binational centers. The latter have proved to be unusually effective in Latin America despite the relatively low cost of their operation and the idea should be spread wherever practicable.

The Agency should reexamine the present localities of the two-hundred-odd information centers scattered throughout the world. It is entirely possible that economies can be effected without weakening the program by eliminating some of the smaller posts in remote areas or by turning their management over to the United States consulates on a reimbursable arrangement with the Department of State.

8. Coordination of exchange-of-persons programs: The necessary steps to insure effective coordination of all exchange-of-persons programs have not yet been taken.

[1] The questions together with the responses are included in the record of the proceedings of the subcommittee.

While arrangements between the Information Agency and the Department of State in this field appear to be working satisfactorily, exchanges involving other agencies are still left dangling. The subcommittee recommended that all exchanges of persons be cleared through the Department of State to encourage a reasonable degree of uniformity in standards and procedures, to maintain a balance in the total program and to prevent duplication. If this cannot be accomplished by executive action alone, then it may be necessary to prepare legislation designed to bring about effective coordination.

The subcommittee notes that the exchange-of-persons program has not been released from the operation of the Rabaut amendment, requiring the appropriation of counterpart funds, as was recommended in its report of June 15, 1953.

E. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

There has been improvement in the operation of the information program during the past 6 months. Many shortcomings remain, and there is, as there always will be, room for improvement. It does appear, however, that a solid foundation for further progress has been laid. Many new policies have been initiated during the past 6 months, and these should bear fruit as they take firmer hold and permeate the entire organization.

The authority of the subcommittee expires on February 1, 1954, and an extension will not be sought. The subcommittee believes that it has carried out the intent of Senate Resolution 74 (82d Cong.), as amended. Little would be gained by prolonging the intensive study which has been pursued over the past 18 months.

What is most needed during the next 3 or 4 years is a period of stability and continuity in the direction of the information program in which the policies now being developed can be applied and tested. The experience thus gained should lead to further adjustments and improvements. It may be that after such a period, another examination by the legislative branch will be in order.

The termination of the work of the subcommittee does not mean that its members or the members of the full Foreign Relations Committee will lose interest in or become indifferent to the information program. Overseas information has become an integral part of the machinery of the foreign relations of the United States. As such its development and progress will continue to be of deep concern not only to the Foreign Relations Committee but to the Congress and the American people.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAYBANK (for himself and Mr. MARTIN):

S. 2927. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Secretary of Defense for all Reserve affairs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAYBANK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2928. A bill for the relief of the late Henry Barncastle Fitch; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 2929. A bill to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act to increase Federal financial participation in State programs for old-age assistance, aid for dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently disabled, in order that the States may make appropriate adjustments in their payments to beneficiaries under such programs to provide for the increased cost of living; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution amending the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, with respect to the pledge of allegiance to the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. FERGUSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR RESERVES AND NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill proposing to create the office of Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Reserves and National Guard. The present law gives such authority, but such an office has never been created; and day by day the situation in the Reserves and in the National Guard becomes more acute, and it is more necessary that such an Assistant Secretary be appointed. For instance, in today's newspapers it is announced that four divisions are to be returned to the National Guard.

Mr. President, in time of war the United States depends upon the National Guard and the Reserves, and I think there should be a civilian Assistant Secretary of Defense who will always be in direct contact with them.

The bill (S. 2927) to provide for an additional Assistant Secretary of Defense for all Reserve affairs, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK (for himself and Mr. MARTIN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase Federal financial participation in State programs for old-age assistance, aid for dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently disabled. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill which I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2929) to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act to increase Federal financial participation in State programs for old-age assistance, aid for dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently disabled, in order that the States may make appropriate adjustments in their payments to beneficiaries under such programs to provide for the increased cost of living, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement by Mr. LONG is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG

The bill I have just introduced provides for an increase in the amount paid by the Federal Government to the States in connection with the public-assistance program. The programs affected are those providing old-age assistance, aid for dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently disabled.

As the cost of living has soared, the beneficiaries of these programs have suffered greatly as a result of the failure of payments under these programs to keep pace with the rising cost of living.

A slight increase in the amounts payable under these programs was authorized in 1952, but this increase was in no way equal to the increase in living expenses. At present those participating in the old-age assistance program, aid to the blind program, and aid to the permanently disabled program, receive a maximum of $55 per month. The bill I have introduced provides for a $10 per month increase in these payments and for a $6 per month increase in the payment being made to dependent children.

Under the present law, the Federal Government contributes four-fifths of the first $25 paid to the recipients of aid under these programs (except under the aid to dependent children program) and one-half of the balance up to a maximum of $55. My bill would require the Federal Government to pay four-fifths of the first $25 and five-eighths of the balance up to a maximum of $65.

In the case of the aid to dependent children program, the present law provides that the Federal Government will pay four-fifths of the first $15 and one-half of the balance up to a total of $30. My bill would require the Federal Government to pay four-fifths of the first $18 and five-eighths of the balance up to a maximum of $36.

In addition, my bill contains no provisions for automatic termination of the increase as did the bill which provided for the increase in 1952. That bill provided that the increase would no longer be effective after September 30, 1954.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the pledge of allegiance to the flag, by inserting the words "under God" in that pledge.

If my proposal is adopted, the pledge of allegiance to the flag will read:

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation indivisible, under God, with liberty and justice for all.

I believe this modification of the pledge is important because it highlights one of the real fundamental differences between the free world and the Communist world, namely, belief in God.

Our Nation is founded on a fundamental belief in God, and the first and most important reason for the existence of our Government is to protect the God-given rights of our citizens.

Communism, on the contrary, rejects the very existence of God.

Spiritual values are every bit as important to the defense and safety of our Nation as are military and economic values. America must be defended by the spiritual values which exist in the hearts and souls of the American people. Our country cannot be defended by ships, planes, and guns alone.

In fact, we have an infinite lead over the Communists, in terms of our spiritual and moral values because of our

firm belief in God, and because of the spiritual bankruptcy of the Communists.

Indeed, Mr. President, over one of the doorways to this very Chamber inscribed in the marble are the words "In God we trust." Unless those words amount to more than a carving in stone, our country will never be able to defend itself. Those words must have a very real meaning in the heart of every American.

Mr. President, the joint resolution I have introduced will give additional meaning to the spiritual defense of our Nation.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 126) amending the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, with respect to the pledge of allegiance to the flag, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL AGENCY FOR PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED—REPRINTING OF BILL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on August 1, 1953, for myself and nine other Members of the Senate, I introduced the bill (S. 2570) to establish a Federal agency for the physically handicapped.

Since then, several other Senators have indicated a desire to join in cosponsoring this worthwhile bill.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2570) be reprinted and that the names of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] be added as cosponsors of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ANETA POPA—RECONSIDERATION OF BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate on Monday last passed the bill (H. R. 4254) for the relief of Aneta Popa.

I make a further motion that the House of Representatives be requested to return the engrossed bill to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the latter motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, ATTORNEYS, AND MARSHALS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 19, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

Walter H. Hodge, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2, district of Alaska, vice Joseph W. Kehoe, resigned.

Clarence Edwin Luckey, of Oregon, to be United States attorney for the district of Oregon, vice Henry L. Hess, resigned.

Maurice Paul Bois, of New Hampshire, to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire, vice John J. Sheehan, resigned.

Fred Elledge, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee.

Frank Quarles, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Tennessee.

John Overall Anderson, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee.

Dewey Howard Perry, of Vermont, to be United States marshal for the district of Vermont, vice Edward L. Burke, whose term expires February 10, 1954.

Edward John Petitbon, of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana, vice Louis F. Knop, Jr., term expired.

Billy Elza Carlisle, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Georgia, vice Edward B. Doyle, retired.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEY AND MARSHALS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 18, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Malcolm R. Wilkey, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Texas, vice Brian S. Odem, resigned.

Louis O. Aleksich, of Montana, to be United States marshal for the district of Montana.

George M. Glasser, of New York, to be United States marshal for the western district of New York, vice Raymond A. Morgan, whose term has expired.

Vernon Woods, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Carl J. Werner, resigned.

Tom Kimball, of Colorado, to be United States marshal for the district of Colorado, vice Maurice T. Smith, removed.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there are scheduled for consideration today Calendar No. 928, S. 1386; Calendar No. 854, Senate Joint Resolution 12; Calendar No. 932, H. R. 6025; and Calendar No. 709, S. 666. There is a possibility of an additional bill being considered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have discussed with some Members of the minority the possibility that Calendar No. 210, S. 1063, be brought up for consideration, if that is agreeable.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, it is agreeable. I was withholding a statement concerning that bill until I could hear from the minority leader.

Mr. President, I include also Calendar No. 210, S. 1063.

The first of the measures scheduled for consideration is the so-called coffee bill. Following the consideration of the bills scheduled for today, and after any speeches or other business to be transacted today, I expect to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

I hope Senators who wish to speak on the Bricker amendment will be prepared to do so either today or tomorrow.

On tomorrow, at the time of taking the recess, I shall propose that the recess be until Monday noon, in order to give Senators an opportunity on Friday to clear up some of their office work.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I did not hear the first part of the remarks of the Senator from California. Will he repeat the list of measures to be taken up?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; they are Senate bill 1386, Calendar 928, amending the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, relating to the meaning of the word "commodity"; Senate Joint Resolution 12, Calendar 854, regarding a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project; House bill 6025, Calendar 932, authorizing the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Hospital to use certain United States property in

Honolulu; Senate bill 666, Calendar 709, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and right-of-way in the State of Wyoming, to the town of Jackson, Wyo.; and Senate bill 1063, Calendar 210, authorizing and requesting the President to promote certain naval officers.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from California.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res.1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

IMPRISONMENT OF JOSEPH CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, 5 years ago this month Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty was placed on trial by the Communist puppets of Hungary. His arrest, his trial, and his subsequent imprisonment shocked the conscience of freemen everywhere. Cardinal Mindszenty, still imprisoned, is today a symbol of resistance to atheistic bolshevism, for the suffering peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following these remarks, the text of a message I transmitted recently to a meeting held in observance of the fifth anniversary of the imprisonment of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE OF UNITED STATES SENATOR IRVING M. IVES ON THE OCCASION OF THE OBSERVANCE OF THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE IMPRISONMENT OF JOSEPH CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

This noteworthy gathering in observance of the fifth anniversay of Cardinal Mindszenty's imprisonment is of paramount significance in the all-embracing struggle against tyranny and despotism. I feel deeply privileged to be afforded this opportunity to greet all who are present, and at the same time convey my sincere feelings to my fellow citizens of Hungarian descent everywhere.

The inhuman treatment suffered by Cardinal Mindszenty at the hands of his godless oppressors is etched on the conscience of the free world. His resistance to those who know no god but force has given to the gallant people of Hungary and to all subjugated peoples behind the Iron Curtain renewed courage to sustain them until their ultimate liberation is secured from the Russian invaders.

I am proud that my position enables me to sponsor in the Senate of the United States resolutions condemning the treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty and other religious leaders in the satellite nations. I join with you today in fervent prayer that the coming year may bring peace and freedom to the brave people of Hungary and to all who have fallen victims to Soviet brutality.

GREETINGS FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as the honorary president of the Boy Scouts of America, President Eisenhower, on February 6, sent a message to the Boy Scouts throughout the country, who are this week celebrating the 44th anniversary of the Boy Scout movement.

I ask unanimous consent that the message in commemoration of the 44th anniversary of the Boy Scouts be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 6, 1954.

To the Boy Scouts of America:

My warmest greetings go to all of you as you celebrate the 44th anniversary of your movement. Those of you today active as Boy Scouts and Boy Scout leaders, and those who represent the 21 million others who have taken the Boy Scout pledge in the years since its founding in 1910, may be justly proud of the contribution of this organization to the moral strength of our Nation.

It is because of this contribution that the Boy Scouts of America are respected and beloved by the Nation. America is also grateful for the work of those volunteer leaders who, giving freely of their time, transmit to our youth values basic to good citizenship. I am delighted, therefore, that during this anniversary the unit leaders of the movement are to be singled out for special recognition.

To all the 3,300,000 Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, Explorers, and leaders I extend cordial birthday greetings. You have my best wishes for the continued success of your current program: "Forward on Liberty's Team."

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

SELECTION OF SENATOR NEELY AS MEMBER OF THE COLLEGE OF ELECTORS OF THE HALL OF FAME FOR GREAT AMERICANS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a signal honor which has come to my distinguished colleague from West Virginia, MATTHEW M. NEELY.

It has just been announced in the press of the Nation that for the third successive time Senator NEELY has been unanimously chosen as a member of the college of electors of the Hall of Fame for great Americans.

Senator NEELY will accordingly serve as one of those who will choose from among the great Americans of past generations, the ones whose names will be added to the Hall of Fame at the next quinquennial election in 1955.

No living man or woman is eligible for election to the Hall of Fame. No man or woman who has lived within the preceding quarter of a century is eligible. Only those Americans whose fame has stood the test of years are eligible.

Similarly, only living Americans of the very greatest distinction are chosen to the college of electors to make the selections each 5 years. Senator NEELY was first chosen to the college of electors in 1944. He was chosen again in 1949. Now he has been chosen for a third successive time.

All West Virginians can take just pride in this national honor which has again been conferred upon a West Virginian who has long served his State and Nation with such ability and distinction.

I may add that, by a peculiar coincidence, the only other West Virginian ever elected for that honor was John W. Davis, who preceded the junior Senator from West Virginia in the House of Representatives of the United States. My colleague [Mr. NEELY] succeeded John W. Davis when John W. Davis was appointed Solicitor General.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 928, Senate bill 1386, a bill to amend section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1386) to amend section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, relating to the meaning of the word "commodity."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, Senate bill 1386 would simply add coffee to the list of commodities covered by the Commodity Exchange Act. The principal effect of the bill would be to require registration of exchanges, commission merchants, and floor brokers dealing in coffee futures, and to provide for regulation of coffee futures trading, so as to prevent such undesirable practices as price manipulations and corners.

The bill was given a hearing by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, without material opposition in the hearing, was then reported unanimously by the committee.

However, in copying the bill, in some way or other one word in the original text of the old law was omitted. So I offer an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "and" to insert "all." This would merely restore the language which has been in the law for years, and which was inadvertently omitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third sentence of section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, is amended to read

as follows: "The word 'commodity' shall mean wheat, cotton, rice, corn, oats, barley, rye, flaxseed, grain, sorghums, mill feeds, butter, eggs, Solanum tuberosum (Irish potatoes), wool tops, fats and oils (including lard, tallow, cottonseed oil, peanut oil, soybean oil, and all other fats and oils), cottonseed meal, cottonseed, peanuts, coffee, soybeans, and soybean meal."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE TOWN OF JACKSON, WYO.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 709, Senate bill 666.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 666) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and rights-of-way in the State of Wyoming, to the town of Jackson, Wyo.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, the bill was introduced by me on January 27 last year. It provides for the reconveyance to the town of Jackson, Wyo., of a small tract of land, consisting of approximately 10 acres, together with certain rights-of-way across the land, comprising approximately 3½ acres.

The land was given to the Federal Government in 1937 by the Lions Club of Jackson, Wyo., without cost to the Federal Government. The use intended to be made of the land by the Federal Government was by the Fish and Wildlife Service, to erect certain facilities for the propagation of fish.

This, however, proved to be unprofitable. The Fish and Wildlife Service has no further use for the land, and has not used it since 1947.

The Department of the Interior does not object to the bill. The Bureau of the Budget approves the bill. It was reported unanimously by the committee. The bill would merely return to the town of Jackson an unused piece of land which the town now wishes to put to use as a camp for Boy Scouts.

Since the acreage is so small, and since the land cost the Government nothing in the first place, and in view of the fact that the bill would merely reconvey to the town of Jackson a gift which was given to the Federal Government, I am very hopeful that the Senate will not object to passing the bill, and that it may become law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make an argument against the bill. The Senate has heard me make this argument many times in the past. I started making this argument in 1946. I thought the principle of the Morse formula was sound then. I still think it is sound. It is a very simple principle, allegiance to which, on my part, has saved the taxpayers of the country a great many hundreds of millions of dollars since 1946.

Some difficulty has arisen in applying the principle to so-called small-value cases, cases which some call de minimis. But, for the life of me, I have never been able to see how a Senator could protect a principle if he started making exceptions to it and discriminating either for or against his colleagues in the Senate who may be authors or sponsors of bills such as the bill which my good friend from Wyoming has introduced in this instance.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As a member of the Calendar Committee of the minority, I wish to congratulate the able junior Senator from Oregon for the service he has rendered. Many times I have seen evidence of the fine service which the distinguished Senator has rendered in this particular regard, as well as others.

However, it seems to the junior Senator from Tennessee that this case might justifiably be made an exception, because the Federal Government came into possession of the property without consideration. The fact is that this particular piece of property was donated to the Federal Government. Now the Federal Government does not desire to use it. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming is asking only that it be returned on the same basis.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very glad to discuss that argument, because I completely disagree with my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee, in the conclusion he reaches by way of attempting to justify this bill as an exception to the Morse formula. I disagree for these reasons:

This property was donated by the Lions Club, which now wants it back. Not a single reservation was attached to the donation. If the Lions Club had wished to attach reservations to the donation, it could have done so, but it did not. In the donation of the property to the Federal Government there was no reservation as to the use to be made of the property. It was not stipulated that the property should be used solely for one specific purpose and no other, and that if the Federal Government did not use it for that purpose it would automatically revert to the Lions Club. The Lions Club made a donation, a grant. It authorized a conveyance.

When that conveyance was consummated the property belonged to all the taxpayers of the United States, from coast to coast. We cannot escape that legal proposition. Because the taxpayers of the United States own that property I cannot sit in the Senate and undertake to discriminate between and among my colleagues as to the disposal of Federal property in their respective States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am not suggesting that the Senator from Oregon distinguish or discriminate between or among his colleagues, but it does appear to the junior Senator from Tennessee that a principle or some equities are involved—at least equities, whether principle or not—in that when the Lions Club dispossessed itself of this property and vested it in the Federal Government, it must have had in mind that the Federal Government would use the particular piece of property.

Now that it has not been used and the Federal Government does not desire to use it, the Senator from Wyoming is asking only that it be returned on the same basis. The Federal Government will not suffer any loss. Indeed, if we require payment in this case the community will have suffered a loss without making any gain.

Mr. MORSE. I shall discuss that argument in a moment. Let me first take up the interesting observation of my friend from Tennessee, that I would not be discriminating between or among my colleagues in the Senate.

It is not quite so easy as the Senator from Tennessee puts it. If he sat at this desk and applied, as rigidly as I have, the Morse formula, he would understand the position I would be in if I listened to my colleagues, and then undertook to make an exception of any bill, even in an alleged de minimis case. I have not done so, and I do not intend to start with this bill.

The Morse formula simply provides that when a bill provides for the transfer of Federal property to some State or local governmental body or local institution for a public use the Federal Government shall receive 50 percent of the appraised fair-market value. When the property is sought for a private use or a private charity the Federal Government shall receive 100 percent of its appraised fair-market value. It would be unfair of me to apply the formula to some bills but not to others. This bill is a clear violation of the basic principle and purposes of the formula. It is asking the taxpayers of the United States to donate this property to the Lions Club so that the Lions Club in turn can donate it to the Boy Scouts. The objective is sound but I think the Lions Club should pay for the property.

Let me discuss the question of equities, which the Senator from Tennessee mentions. The Lions Club in Jackson, Wyo., knew full well what it was doing when it gave away the property. It was making a donation of property—let us be frank about it— for a certain purpose. For what purpose?

Mr. HUNT. For fish culture.

Mr. MORSE. For fish culture, and more. It knew full well that the establishment of a Federal project in that area was not going to be to the economic disadvantage of that particular area in Wyoming. Every Senator knows how

delighted he is if he can get the Federal Government to come into a community in his State and proceed with a project, whether it be a fish hatchery or a great defense plant. It brings some economic gain to the community—in some instances less than in others.

I would never discourage the establishment of a Federal fish hatchery in Oregon, because the establishment of such a project in Oregon would provide at least one job, if only that of the superintendent of the hatchery. Of course we know other jobs would be provided also. Such projects help a community economically.

The facts are that the Lions Club gave this property as an outright donation to the Federal Government, without any reservations attached. I believe it had in mind a great many equities when it did so, but they were equities accruing to the benefit of the community in which the fish hatchery was to be located.

What did the Federal Government do? It transferred some buildings to the property. The committee report so states. The committee report says that at the present time they are not of very much value, probably not more than $500. Nevertheless, it is $500. It is $500 that belongs to all the taxpayers of the country. I believe the Federal Government ought to get something for the buildings and for the land. The Byrd-Saltonstall-Morse formula of 1946 is a formula that protects the public interest. It calls for the payment of 50 percent of the appraised fair-market value of the property in such a case as this one. It is a formula which protects the financial interest of the American people in their property. It helps prevent Members of Congress from turning surplus Federal property into a giveaway political grab bag.

Mr. President, I have attended a great many Lions Club meetings. I do not believe the Lions Club in Wyoming is any different than the Lions Club in Oregon, or in any of the other States. I have seen the members pass the tin cup for some good public cause, and in that way collect several hundred dollars at a noon meeting.

It is beyond my comprehension that the Jackson Lions Club could not pass the tin cup and collect 50 percent of the appraised fair market value of the property in question. If the property is worth very little, they do not have to put very much in the tin cup; but they should be willing to pay one-half of whatever it is worth.

Mr. President, let us not sacrifice a principle which has saved the taxpayers millions of dollars in the past few years. I do not take credit for the formula alone. The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] were comembers of the subcommittee which brought forth the formula in the first place. I have only insisted that it be equitably and fairly and uniformly applied to the disposal of all Federal property. There are good lawyers in Wyoming and I am sure there are good lawyers in the Jackson, Wyo., Lions Club. I shall take judicial notice of that fact. They know how to prepare a deed of conveyance. If they wanted to put any reservations in the deed they could have done so. A reservation would have been a simple thing to add. They did not do it, though. They made the conveyance an out-and-out grant to the Federal Government.

I cannot escape the legal effect of that grant. It vested property rights in the Government of the United States, and through the Government of the United States in all the people of the United States. It is only fair and proper that we hold the Jackson Lions Club to the same principle that we apply in all other cases.

Let me tell the Senate what will be said if we let the bill pass as written. I am now speaking of a hypothetical case and of an argument which will be made in the future. The argument will be made: "You did it in the case of Jackson, Wyo. It is true that bill did not involve much money; but the particular bill for which we are pleading does not involve much more money than was involved in the Jackson, Wyo., bill. Oh, perhaps it is $10,000 more, but that is not much more, when we think of the billions of dollars we are giving away to Europe." Senators are familiar with that argument. Indeed, the argument even now can be made, "Can we not give to the people of Jackson, Wyo., this little piece of property, when we give billions of dollars away?" Of course it is a non-sequitur argument.

I submit that the question today is, Was this an out-and-out grant, without any strings attached? The answer is, Unquestionably it was.

Let us look at the language contained in the committee report. Some of the language is a pretty good example of an effort to skirt around the principle for which I have fought so long in the Senate. I read from the report:

> The bill provides that the conveyance shall be without consideration. In this connection, it should be pointed out that the Congress rather consistently has required, with respect to transfers of the nature proposed here, that the United States be reimbursed for at least one-half of the value of the property. An exception to this general requirement would appear to be justified in this instance, however, since the land was acquired by donation and the value of the improvements remaining thereon is relatively insignificant.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit it does not make any difference how the land was acquired, if there were no reservations attached to the conveyance.

The second argument, that the value is rather insignificant, raises the question: Where are we to draw the line?

On the floor of the Senate I have insisted that an amendment, in the form of the Morse formula, be added to a bill proposing to transfer one-fifth of an acre of land which was cut off the corner of a piece of Federal property in Albany, Oreg., in order to straighten a road. It was stated that it did not amount to very much. I said, "I do not care whether it is worth only a dollar. If it is worth only a dollar the people in Oregon who want the property should pay 50 cents to the Federal Government under the Morse formula."

I was very much pleased when I was out in Oregon some weeks later and I was being joshed about the objection to the bill which I had raised on the floor of the Senate. Mr. President, do you know what the men in the chamber of commerce said? Incidentally, I was speaking to the chamber of commerce at one of their noon meetings. I was told, "WAYNE, we wanted that property, and we would have been willing to pay 100 cents on the dollar to get it. We did not want it for nothing; but we did want the right to get that property in order to straighten out the road. We think your position was very fair and right."

I cannot speak for the Lions Club of Jackson, Wyo., but I have a hunch that if we laid it on the line to the Lions Club they would have the officer whom, as I remember, they call their tailtwister get out the tin cup and pass it around, and I am sure they would raise 50 percent of the appraised market value. In that way they would protect the principle the Senator from Oregon has been fighting for on the floor of the Senate.

That is what I believe they would do. I do not believe the people in Wyoming are any different than the people in Oregon or Tennessee, or anywhere else in this country, when it comes to a zealous desire to protect the property interests of all the people of the United States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I concur in the distinguished Senator's conviction that the people of Wyoming are not essentially different from the people of Tennessee, or of Oregon, or of other States, but I submit to the Senator that there are equities involved. The property came to the Federal Government without cost. A local club is asking only that it be returned on the same basis.

The Senator from Oregon has promulgated a good rule, but it seems to me that an occasional exception is necessary to prove the virtue of the rule.

The Senator has also made an intriguing suggestion that the cup be passed. Lest we send the distinguished and able Senator from Wyoming home to pass the cup, let me remind the Senator from Oregon that this is an election year, and the passing of the cup may not be in order.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator, but I imagine the people would welcome the Senator from Wyoming if he should walk in and pay the Lions Club a visit. I think they would be delighted to pass the cup. I know how popular is the Senator from Wyoming in his State. He does not have to worry about reelection. He cannot be defeated. Although I am opposed to him with regard to this bill, I would be happy to do anything I could in Wyoming to help his reelection. But I shall not vote for his bill. I think he ought to withdraw it. I think he should pass the cup.

The Senator from Tennessee has made another argument to which I should like to reply. He says there are equities involved. Saying there is an equity does

not create one. All the Senator from Tennessee has said is that there is an equity. I am still looking for that equity. When an out-and-out donation is made to the Federal Government, no equitable interest is created. I am sure this Lions Club is not an Indian giver.

I care not how much Senators may argue; they cannot erase the fact that all the people of the country have legal title to this property. They could not get a clearer conveyance than was made in this case. I think all the people of the country ought to receive 50 percent of the appraised fair market value of the property. There are buildings on the property for which all the taxpayers paid. They are worth at least $500 and the taxpayers should be paid for them.

I wear a Boy Scout button in my lapel this week, and I am proud to wear it. But I do not think we should start the practice of giving away Federal property even to a Lions Club for a Boy Scout camp. There are many charitable institutions and character training programs on a national scale which I am willing to help as a private citizen, but I would not donate public property to them. If we start doing that then how can we ever draw a line between and among the requests of all the denominations of churches, youth movements, charitable institutions, private schools, and an almost endless list of worthwhile religious and human welfare institutions?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I submit to the Senator from Oregon that he is correct in stating that the property was conveyed without reservation. But that does not tell the whole story, nor do I believe it would tell the whole story with respect to a community in my State or in the State which the Senator from Oregon, in part, so ably represents. The community hoped to see the development of a fish hatchery or some other project which would bring economic betterment to the community.

Mr. MORSE. They had it for a period of years.

Mr. GORE. That property is no longer used or desired by the Federal Government. The Federal Government has suffered no loss. It has had the use of the property through the years without payment of rent or acquisition cost.

Mr. MORSE. What about the value of the buildings?

Mr. GORE. What the few buildings are worth I am not advised.

Mr. MORSE. The report states that they are worth $500.

Mr. GORE. They might be considered as compensation for the use of the property.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator think we should start paying for the use of our own property?

Mr. GORE. I do not think we should start paying for the use of our property, but I believe we should start giving some consideration to the claims of individual communities rather than having the Federal Government drive such a hard bargain. The property came to the Government without consideration.

Mr. MORSE. A hard bargain? We helped the economic life of the community.

Mr. GORE. May I ask the Senator one further question?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. A few moments ago the Senator suggested that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] return to the Lions Club at Jackson, Wyo., with a cup, and the junior Senator from Oregon stated that the Senator from Wyoming would be welcomed by that club. I agree. The Senator from Oregon went on to say that he would be welcome to explain this principle. I think I agree with that. I know of no club that would not appreciate a visit from the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. MORSE. To that I agree.

Mr. GORE. But I am not worried about the preservation of the principle. I referred to the passing of the cup.

Mr. MORSE. I think the people of Jackson would be delighted to fill it. I think the club would tell the Senator what the Albany Chamber of Commerce in my State told me when they wanted property for highway purposes.

Mr. HUNT rose.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Wyoming want to ask me a question or does he want the floor?

Mr. HUNT. I want the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I have finished my argument.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I think only a word is necessary. In the original conveyance of the property to the Government there is one specific purpose involved, and that is the operation of a fish hatchery. It was found that the site was not suitable for that purpose, so all the buildings were removed with the exception of an old icehouse, which is of no value.

The city of Jackson requests that the land be returned for one purpose—that of making a campground for Boy Scouts. I am sure that, while the Morse formula may be very apropos under some conditions, the Senator from Oregon would not care about the Morse formula being put ahead of the giving to the Boy Scouts a place where they may make a campground.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BARRETT. As I understand the situation, the Fish and Wildlife Service abandoned this property approximately 7 years ago.

Mr. HUNT. It was abandoned in 1947.

Mr. BARRETT. They have no further use for the property at all.

Mr. HUNT. They have so stated and they have not utilized the property in any way since that date.

Mr. BARRETT. If it would suit the purpose of the junior Senator from Oregon, I assume there would be no objection to letting the Fish and Wildlife Service take the old icehouse, if they want to.

Mr. HUNT. It would be satisfactory to the city of Jackson if they make the ground available to the Boy Scouts.

Mr. BARRETT. The property is suitable only for camping purposes or park purposes in connection with the town of Jackson.

Mr. HUNT. It has apparently no other value. The acreage is so small that it has no great value.

Mr. BARRETT. I assume that grants of this character have been made to the State of Oregon in years gone by, have they not?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield? I shall be glad to answer that question.

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Such grants have not been made in Oregon since 1946, since the Morse formula went into effect, and I continue to issue a challenge to anyone to produce a single instance of my knowingly having permitted the transfer of Federal property to the State of Oregon to which I did not apply the Morse formula. Certainly, I have no knowledge of such an instance.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will my colleague yield further?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to inquire if the reason why there has been no instance of that character is that neither the Lions Club nor the people of Oregon have donated anything to the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. A few moments ago I referred to the Albany, Oreg., case. In that case the people of Albany wanted to get some land from the United States without paying for it, and I did not permit that to be done. I think that is the test. In addition, let me say that the people of Oregon, through many institutions and organizations, have donated property of great value to the Federal Government. They can be counted upon to continue to do so. However, that does not justify my trying to secure the passage of legislation through the Senate that seeks to give to the people of Oregon property that belongs to all of the people of the United States.

Mr. HUNT. In the hope of bringing the debate to a close, I may say that in many instances I have thoroughly agreed with the Morse formula, but not in the case of a penny-ante matter, such as this, when a failure to return the property would prevent the Boy Scouts from having a place for a camping ground.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have one more remark to make, because in this good-natured debate the Senator from Wyoming has just raised a very fundamental principle. I am willing to discuss the Boy Scouts issue in relation to Federal grants. I do not yield to anyone in the Senate in my support and admiration of the Boy Scouts. However, I shall never agree to a proposal, in the United States Senate, that would give without consideration, Federal property to the Boy Scouts organization, or to any similar organization. If ever that practice should be started, there would be no end to it or to the application of such a principle.

I stood on the floor of the Senate some years ago and opposed the giving of Federal property to a church. I did so on the basis of the sound, historic doctrine

of the separation of church and state. Once Congress starts giving away Federal property to promulgate the program of some great institution, such as the Boy Scouts, it will have great difficulty in distinguishing, by way of principle, between a grant to such an organization and a grant to a very desirable youth movement within some great denominational church institution of the United States.

I shall donate to the Boy Scouts out of my pocket, but I do not think Congress can justify having the Federal Government give the taxpayers' property to private charitable institutions, or to great public service and character building organizations, such as the Boy Scouts, Salvation Army, and a host of other very much worthwhile organizations that are not governmental in their functions.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Mansfield
Anderson	Hennings	Maybank
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bush	Hill	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Neely
Case	Hunt	Payne
Cordon	Jackson	Robertson
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Kilgore	Stennis
George	Knowland	Symington
Gore	Langer	Thye
Griswold	Lehman	

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on official committee business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms is instructed to execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. FREAR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WELKER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. BEALL, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LENNON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BURKE, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. IVES, and Mr. LONG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 666) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey without consideration by quitclaim deed to the town of Jackson, Wyoming, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described tract of land, in Teton County, Wyoming:

Beginning at a point on north line of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 13, township 40 north, range 117 west, sixth principal meridian, Wyoming, which is four hundred and eighty-one feet west and thirteen hundred and twenty feet south of the north quarter corner of said section 13, township 40 north, range 117 west; thence proceeding west two hundred feet; thence proceeding south three hundred and forty-four feet; thence proceeding east thirteen hundred and twenty feet; thence north eight degrees thirty minutes west three hundred and forty-six feet in the channel of Spring Creek; thence west one thousand and sixty-two feet to place of beginning and containing ten acres as bounded and surveyed. All in section 13, township 40 north, range 117 west, Teton County, Wyoming.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized and directed to convey without consideration by quitclaim deed to the town of Jackson, Wyoming, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described easements and rights-of-way with respect to lands situated in Teton County, Wyoming:

(a) Beginning at a point which lies due west sixty feet and due north one hundred and forty feet from the northeast corner of lot 4, section 12, township 40 north, range 117 west, sixth principal meridian; thence south eighty-eight degrees ten minutes west two hundred and four feet; thence south sixty-nine degrees no minutes west two hundred and one feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees no minutes west one thousand one hundred and nine feet; thence north fifty-nine degrees fifty minutes west two hundred and sixty feet; thence north seventy-seven degrees thirty minutes west three hundred and sixty-six feet; thence south sixty-nine degrees ten minutes west seven hundred and twenty feet (being a right-of-way forty feet in width); thence north seven degrees fourteen minutes west two thousand two hundred feet (being a right-of-way twenty feet in width), the entire strip of land containing approximately three and sixty-three one-hundredths acres.

(b) Beginning at a point on the south line of the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 13, township 40 north, range 117 west, sixth principal meridian, bearing south ten degrees west, one thousand three hundred and thirty-one feet from the north quarter corner of said section 13; thence north seven degrees twelve minutes west two thousand and sixty-one feet; thence north eight degrees ten minutes east five hundred and seventy-five feet to the north line of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 12, township 40 north, range 117 west (being a right-of-way forty feet in width and being five feet west and thirty-five feet east of the above-described line), the entire strip of land containing approximately two and forty-three one-hundredths acres.

SURVEY OF PROPOSED PASSAMAQUODDY TIDAL POWER PROJECT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 854, Senate Joint Resolution 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) to authorize and direct the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian Boundary Waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) to authorize and direct the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian Boundary Waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "treaty", to strike out "is authorized and directed" and insert "be requested"; on page 2, line 9, after the word "dated", to strike out "March 15, 1950" and insert "October 20, 1950"; and in line 24, after the words "to the", to strike out "Congress of the

United States and to the Government of the Dominion of Canada" and insert "Governments of the United States and of Canada respectively", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the International Joint Commission created by the treaty between the United States and Great Britain relating to boundary waters between the United States and Canada, signed at Washington on January 11, 1909, under the provisions of such treaty be requested to make a survey to determine the cost of construction of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project at Passamaquoddy Bay in the State of Maine, United States of America, and the Province of New Brunswick, Dominion of Canada, and to determine whether or not such cost would allow hydroelectric power to be produced at a price that is economically feasible, and also to determine what contribution such project would make to the national economy and the national defense.

SEC. 2. The survey provided for in the first section shall be consistent with the report (dated October 20, 1950) made by the International Joint Commission, and with the supplemental report (dated May 1952) on details of estimate of cost of comprehensive investigation of Passamaquoddy tidal power project by Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army, the Federal Power Commission, and other officers and agencies of the Government of the United States are authorized to assist the International Joint Commission in the making of such survey, and shall be compensated for any work performed pursuant to this section out of such funds as may hereafter be appropriated for use by the International Joint Commission in carrying out this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. The International Joint Commission shall report the results of such survey to the Governments of the United States and of Canada respectively.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $3 million to carry out this joint resolution, and any sum appropriated pursuant to this section shall be included in any determination of the proportionate share of the cost of construction of the Passamaquoddy tidal power project to be borne by the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations which had charge of the matter, I should like to say that the joint resolution would request the International Joint Commission, established under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, to make a complete survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project in Maine and New Brunswick, with a view to determining once and for all whether the project is economically feasible.

The proposal involved is one to use the tides in Passamaquoddy Bay for the generation of hydroelectric power. These tides average 18 feet, and it has already been determined that the project is feasible from an engineering point of view.

A number of different plans have been developed during the past 35 years, and at one time in the 1930's construction of an all-American project was actually undertaken but was halted for lack of funds. I desire to make it clear, however, that the survey authorized by the pending resolution would have to do with an entirely different proposal, namely one for an international project in cooperation with Canada.

The object of the survey is to determine:

First. The cost of construction.

Second. Whether or not such cost would allow hydroelectric power to be produced at a price that is economically feasible.

Third. What contribution the project would make to the national economy and the national defense.

The resolution authorizes an appropriation of $3,000,000 to conduct the survey, which is expected to take 2 years.

I desire to emphasize that the resolution has nothing whatever to do with construction. The very purpose of the resolution is to determine whether or not construction would be feasible. Passage of this resolution in no way commits the Congress as to its future action in regard to the project in any respect. Indeed, the Congress could not even intelligently consider any further action until it has the results of this survey.

In Passamaquoddy Bay, the people of the United States and Canada have a natural resource of great potentialities. All that is here proposed is a determination of the extent of those potentialities and of whether or not they can be economically developed at this time.

In 1941, the Federal Power Commission pointed out that although the Passamaquoddy project was not justified under conditions then prevailing, it would become economically feasible and desirable at some time in the future as the costs of fuel and the demand for power increased.

In the intervening years, New England has developed a chronic power shortage, which has come to the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who has been doing magnificent work on this subject. In fact, she was one of the outstanding witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee.

It may or may not be feasible to alleviate the power shortage in New England by the development of Passamaquoddy. That is what we want to find out through the survey authorized by this joint resolution.

The procedure is comparable to that followed in connection with public-works projects lying wholly within the United States. The International Joint Commission is involved in this case because the project lies partly in the United States and partly in Canada.

The survey will reveal a great deal of information which will be extremely useful even if the tidal power project itself should be found to be unjustified, or if its construction should not be authorized for some other reason.

Mr. President, the present demands on the American economy are such that we should not overlook any possibility for continued economic development.

It is for that reason that the subcommittee went into the matter fully, at the request of both Senators from Maine, particularly the author of the joint resolution, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. We do not know whether such a project will be feasible; but we believe the joint resolution is one of the best measures ever introduced so far as getting power for the New England States is concerned. I urge approval of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to request the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes."

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement on the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

The purpose of this resolution is to obtain authorization for a final overall survey to determine the potential of what could be one of the greatest developments in the field of the generation of electric power—the generation of such power by harnessing the tides.

Thus far we have known waterpower as that generated by rivers. But rivers have been known to run low or even dry up and cause a power shortage. That never happens with the tides. For time and tides never change. They keep going at the same rate. Tides can be predicted with pinpoint certainty. And electric power generated by the harnessing of the tides would be the surest source of waterpower known to man.

The physical feasibility of this proposed tidal power project has already been determined by a preliminary survey and study made by the Army engineers. Four years ago in March 1950, the Army engineers made an official finding that the proposed project was physically feasible.

The remaining questions now are (1) the economic feasibility of the proposed tidal power project and (2) the estimated cost of the project. The overall survey that is sought in this resolution would provide the answers to these questions. And it is important to our national defense to have the answers to these questions so that we may determine once and for all whether we are to have this project.

The tremendous potential value of the proposed project to our national defense must not be underestimated.

So that there may be no misunderstanding, let me observe that this resolution proposes authorization of a survey and not appropriation for construction of the project. It calls for the authorization of a survey to determine the economic feasibility and cost of the proposed project.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. It is my intention to take up two

bills at that time, and perhaps some others also, in which case the minority leadership will be given advance notice. However, if there is any further routine business to be transacted, I shall withhold making the motion.

Mr. President, there are a number of bills which we had contemplated taking up this week, but which, at the request of Senators on one or the other side of the aisle, and because of absences from the Senate this week, we did not take up. I do not know at what time next week we will be able to reach them, but, so that the Senate may be on notice relative to some of the bills, let me say that it is not contemplated they will be taken up this week, but in the following week we should like the Members of the Senate to go over them so that they will be familiar with them.

The bills to which I refer are Calendar No. 48, S. 56, for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert; Calendar No. 49, S. 59, for the relief of Felix Kortschok; Calendar No. 58, S. 101, for the relief of Phed Vosniacos; Calendar No. 90, S. 389, for the relief of Dr. Alexandre Demetrio Moruzi; Calendar No. 210, S. 1063, to authorize and request the President to promote certain naval officers, and for other purposes; Calendar No. 293, S. 1857, to amend certain statutes providing expeditious judicial proceedings for the condemnation of lands for public purposes; Calendar No. 320, S. 1461, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, concerning requests of common carriers for increased transportation rates; Calendar No. 373, S. 1691, to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia and to cross Kenilworth Avenue NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes; Calendar No. 516, H. R. 3704, to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; Calendar No. 563, H. R. 2351, for the relief of Sam Rosenblat; Calendar No. 620, S. 2231, to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims; Calendar No. 703, S. 796, to permit the charging of tolls on certain highways constructed with Federal aid; Calendar No. 821, H. R. 5976, to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act; Calendar No. 840, S. 2404, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers; Calendar No. 893, H. R. 685, for the relief of Walter Carl Sander; and Calendar No. 932, H. R. 6025, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Hospital, a nonprofit institution, to use certain United States property in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H.

We should like to be in position, in the first lull in the program of major legislation, to be able to consider any of those bills. I wanted the Senate to be advised as far in advance as might be possible.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—NOTICE CONCERNING MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] came to me earlier in the day and said he understood that I was going to bring up my motion to recommit the Bricker amendment and the George amendment and other amendments to the Bricker proposal on next Monday. I explained to the Senator from Virginia that if that was an understanding prevalent in the Senate, it was a misunderstanding. I intended to make clear last Friday that I would call up my motion to recommit prior to the vote on the George amendment. That does not necessarily mean next Monday. It means that whenever the George amendment is about to go to a vote I shall make my motion, because I think it is only fair to the Senator from Georgia that he should have ample and adequate time to debate his amendment.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 11, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received February 10 (legislative day of February 8), 1954:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT, EFFECTIVE DATE OF ACCEPTANCE

To be senior surgeon

Robert F. Martin

To be senior assistant surgeons

Virgil B. Polley	John H. Wuest, Jr.
William B. Barr	T. Phillip Waalkes
William M. Smith	Andrew W. Koch
John T. West	Alexander Matthews
Gilbert R. Christenson	William E. Newby
Leon Rosen	Stuart M. Wallace
Harold Y. Yanamura	Edward A. Rogers

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

John E. Frank
Donald M. Phillips
Stanley Lotzkar

To be assistant dental surgeons

Dale E. Smith	Theodore J. Le Blanc, Jr.
John C. Greene	Joseph S. Locantro
Warren E. Maley	Jerome J. Fahrenbach
James R. Lambrecht	

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

William H. Davis, Jr.

II. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS APPOINTMENT

To be senior assistant surgeons, effective October 9, 1953

William H. Stewart	William B. Kannel
Ronald A. Welsh	Charles N. Austin
John D. Ainslie	C. F. Sparger
Charles A. Robbins, Jr.	Burton S. Eggertsen, Jr.
Chester J. Semel	David B. Hurlbut
Karl R. Sohlberg	Goffredo S. Accetta

To be assistant surgeons, effective December 15, 1953

Charles C. Elliott	Robert W. Jones
Charles A. Davis	Cuvier D. McClure
Gerald D. Klee	William B. Gaynor
Joshua L. Weisbrod	William S. Lainhart

To be assistant sanitary engineers, effective date indicated

Melvin W. Carter, December 15, 1953.
Lawrence C. Gray, December 15, 1953.
Herbert H. Rogers, December 15, 1953.
Jerrold M. Michael, December 21, 1953.

To be senior assistant nurse officers, effective date indicated

Ruth E. Simonson, November 3, 1953.
Grace E. Mattis, November 3, 1953.
Marjorie E. Jantho, November 16, 1953.
Elizabeth C. Kuhlman, November 27, 1953.
Jay C. Wertman, November 27, 1953.

III. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To senior assistant surgeon

Laurens P. White

To sanitary engineer

Richard P. Lonergan

To senior assistant sanitary engineer

David E. Barry

To nurse officer

Adele L. Henderson

IV. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS PERMANENT PROMOTION

To medical directors, effective November 16, 1953

Abraham Wikler	Richard H. Smith
Richard F. Boyd	Paul W. Kabler
Clarence A. Smith	James G. Telfer

To senior assistant surgeons, effective date indicated

John L. Eicholz, Jr., July 1, 1952.
Hugh A. Storrow, July 1, 1952.
Donald L. Toker, July 1, 1953.

To dental director, effective November 16, 1953

George E. Jones	Norman F. Gerrie
William P. Kroschel	Robert M. Stephan
Henry F. Canby	

To sanitary engineer director, effective November 16, 1953

Walter N. Dashiell

To sanitary engineer, effective date indicated

Gerald Dyksterhouse, February 2, 1952.
Lloyd W. Gebhard, June 4, 1953.

To assistant pharmacist, effective July 1, 1953

Albert B. Ripley	Joseph N. Salvino
John W. Toole	Bertram J. Baughman
Mario C. Baratta	

To nurse director, effective November 16, 1953

Rosalie I. Peterson

To nurse officer, effective November 16, 1953

Tabitha W. Rossetter
Gladys M. Ray

To dietitian, effective November 16, 1953

Frances M. Croker

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the third calendar quarter of 1953.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1953:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

	QUARTER			
P	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" and answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D".—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what the percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors? Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following headings: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates*	*Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11:	Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshblanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15:	Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL	

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Strategic minerals, including manganese.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally any legislation which will affect the aircraft industry.
D. (6) $5,066.48.
E. (2) $3,750; (4) $825.70; (7) $490.78; (9) $5,066.48; (10) $9,654.14; (11) $14,720.62.

A. W. L. Allen, 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International (AFL), 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See attached sheet containing answers to items 1, 2, and 3.)[1]

A. Allied Wool Industry Committee, 327 North Van Ness, Fresno, Calif., and 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) H. R. 1427, S. 1538, H. R. 4294, H. R. 5495, H. R. 5894, H. R. 5496, H. R. 5106, H. R. 5638, H. R. 5700, S. 2164.
D. (6) $2,083.
E. (2) $4,000; (7) $4,000; (9) $8,000; (10) $11,885.69; (11) $19,885.69.

A. W. R. Allstetter, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $100.

A. Thomas H. Alphin, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills relating to health and welfare. (3) (AMA Washington Letter).
D. (6) $570.
E. (7) $71.13; (9) $71.13; (10) $327.10; (11) $398.23.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, A. F. L., 1214 Griswold Street, Detroit, Mich.
E. (2) $4,142.65; (9) $4,142.65; (10) $340.19; (11) $4,482.84.

A. Mr. Joseph Amann, 341 East Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, 341 East Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers and other members of affiliated units, including, but not confined to, Taft-Hartley Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Defense Production Act, and similar legislation related to rights of employees, working conditions, and so forth.
E. (See page 3).[1]

A. American Association of University Women, 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (2) $675; (6) $31.61; (9) $706.61; (10) $3,770.25; (11) $4,476.86.

A. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City.
C. (2) Appropriations for Public Health.
E. (1) $4,999.96; (7) $1,323.88; (9) $6,323.84; (10) $12,801.42; (11) $19,125.26.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the cotton textile industry, including tariffs, corporate taxes, price and production controls.
D. (6) $2,031.05.
E. (2) $1,890.95; (5) $67.34; (6) $10.31; (7) $62.45; (9) $2,031.05; (10) $6,790.63; (11) $8,821.68.

A. American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Edificio Bearn, Plaza Santos Degollado, Mexico, D. F. (2) A. E. Brooks, 408 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
C. (2) I. R. C., section 116 (a): To exempt from United States income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.
E. (2) $339.03; (9) $339.03; (11) $339.03.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, General office: 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. Washington office: 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See Schedule "2".)[1]
D. (6) $9,524.
E. (2) $18,984; (4) $4,052; (5) $1,833; (6) $1,439; (7) $351; (9) $26,659; (10) $48,558; (11) $75,217.

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working people. (3) American Federationist.
E. (1) $7,170.15; (2) $18,034.44; (4) $4,018.33; (5) $981; (9) $30,203.92; (10) $62,270.58; (11) $92,474.50.

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
E. (2) $1,500; (4) $1,077.84; (5) $200; (6) $125; (7) $75; (8) $315; (9) $3,292.84; (10) $3,648.77; (11) $6,941.61.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation which may affect hospitals. (See exhibit.)[1]
D. (6) $12,972.69.
E. (2) $7,849.99; (4) $1,010.91; (5) $902.14; (6) $842.49; (7) $555.01; (8) $512.15; (9) $11,672.69; (10) $22,182.67; (11) $33,855.36.

A. American Hotel Association, a trade association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $131,753.12.

A. The American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (See statement attached.)[1]
D. (6) $1,566.81.
E. (2) $13,302.64; (4) $2,335.56; (5) $2,190.92; (6) $734.08; (7) $2,117.84; (9) $20,681.06; (10) $44,523.38; (11) $65,204.44.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All prospective and existing legislation which may affect the life insurance business.
D. (6) $5,452.72.
E. (2) $4,623.33; (5) $553.16; (6) $131.77; (7) $139.46; (9) $5,452.72; (10) $13,107.29; (11) $18,560.01.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. American Medical Association, a corporation, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The specific legislative interest of the American Medical Association at the present time is in the items referred to on pages 3 through 9 of this report.[1]
E. (2) $6,163.21; (4) $718.42; (5) $892.40; (6) $330.05; (7) $298.10; (8) $1,079.44; (9) $9,476.62; (10) $88,765.74; (11) $98,242.36.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 3850 and H. R. 4447.
D. (6) $57,368.60.
E. (2) $1,200; (5) $559.43; (6) $36.28; (7) $284.88; (9) $2,130.59; (10) $4,699.42; (11) $6,830.01.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.
D. (6) $452.82.
E. (2) $375; (5) $69; (6) $8.82; (9) $452.82; (10) $1,134.70; (11) $1,587.52.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulp and paper industry, its operations, practices, and properties.
D. (6) $1,005.
E. (2) $700; (6) $140; (7) $165; (9) $1,005; (10) $1,280; (11) $2,285.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $9,292.
E. (2) $5,906; (5) $3,000; (6) $253; (6a) $1,088; (9) $10,247; (10) $21,422; (11) $31,669 (see statement).[1]

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulpwood industry, its operations, practices, and properties.

A. American Retail Federation, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See p. 3).[1]
D. (6) $17,076.45.
E. (2) $4,750; (4) $101.41; (5) $773.33; (6) $573.07; (7) $203.79; (9) $10,401.60; (10) $22,025.54; (11) $32,427.14, (see pp. 6 and 7).[1]

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See p. 140 Proceedings, attached).[1]
D. (6) $1,326.53.
E. (2) $525; (4) $205.02; (5) $216.20; (6) $21.25; (7) $309.52; (8) $49.54; (9) $1,326.53; (10) $4,605.06; (11) $5,931.61.

A. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All bills, hearings, and studies relating to tariffs and foreign trade. (3) How Low Are United United States Tariffs?
D. (6) $7,775.
E. (2) $9,000; (4) $2,299.02; (5) $1,192; (6) $349.77; (7) $257.81; (8) $481.45; (9) $13,580.05; (10) $28,285.64; (11) $41,865.69.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The association is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.
D. (6) $6,175.
E. (2) $2,062.50; (3) $1,068.69; (4) $88.35; (5) $374.61; (6) $297.49; (7) $291.04; (8) $341.72; (9) $4,524.40; (10) $8,992.34; (11) $13,516.74.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., room 424, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 5894.
D. (6) $3,180.
E. (2) $3,185; (8) $4; (9) $3,189; (10) $3,453.04; (11) $9,642.04, (see p. 4).[1]

A. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al., Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) Generally legislation affecting Texas railroads.
E. (2) $4,791.65; (8) $2,068.59; (9) $6,860.24; (10) $11,829.79; (11) $18,690.03.

A. Mr. Richard H. Anthony, 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All bills, hearings, and studies relating to tariffs and foreign trade.
D. (6) $3,125.
E. (7) $67.67; (9) $67.67; (10) $390.47; (11) $458.14.

A. John R. Arant, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $104.45; (9) $104.45; (10) $99.30; (11) $203.75.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) St. Lawrence Seaway—internal revenue bill (excess profits tax) (general tax question)—extension of the reciprocal trade agreements—amendment of labor laws—Housing Act matters—certain phases of appropriations.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (8) $727.65; (9) $727.65; (10) $1,701.94; (11) $2,429.59.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1115 Doyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class one railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
C. (2) Legislation affecting Arkansas railroads.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $1,693.37; (9) $1,693.37; (10) $3,406.58; (11) $5,099.95.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York City.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $900; (7) $238.31; (9) $1,138.31; (10) $2,229.25; (11) $3,367.56.

A. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See statement attached).[1]

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, Room 502—1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation relating to postal laws and regulations—rate increase bills.
D. (6) $4,790.
E. (2) $5,225; (4) $1,000.36; (5) $384.70; (6) $348.36; (7) $1,567.30; (8) $38; (9) $8,563.72; (11) $8,563.72.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The association concerns itself with only proposed legislation affecting physicians and surgeons in the practice of their profession. (3) News letter and bulletin.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (4) $1,500; (9) $1,500; (11) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. (See rider D–14 for list of full member roads, A. A. R.) [1]
C. (2) (See rider C–2).[1]
D. (6) $41,549.92.
E. (2) $20,861.79; (3) $10,000; (4) $777.11; (5) $3,691.08; (6) $460.40; (7) $1,262.23; (8) $4,503.31; (9) $41,549.92; (10) $119,338.43; (11) $160,888.35.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (See page 3 attached hereto).[1]

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. (See attached list of member companies).[1]
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies; (3) Casualty and Surety Journal.
D. (6) $1,865.69.
E. (2) $1,403.06; (4) $65.56; (5) $102.64; (6) $33.86; (7) $78.64; (8) $179.93; (9) $1,863.69; (10) $4,234.31; (11) $6,098.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) This association is interested in any and all Federal legislative proposals which do or may affect the western railroads.
D. (6) $341.05.
E. (2) $171.65 (7) $169.40 (9) $341.05; (10) $1,223.39; (11) $1,564.44.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding labor laws and revenue act.
E. (2) $125, (11) $125.

A. Awalt, Clark & Sparks, 822 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, page 4).[1]
D. (6) $6,250.
E. (6) $3.26; (7) $43.16; (9) $46.42; (10) $283.68; (11) $330.10.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 4, Box 73, Vienna, Va.
B. Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3025 North Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Control of immigration; improvement of free public schools; suppression of communism.
D. (6) $849.99.
E. (5) $54; (6) $1.50; (7) $44.75; (8) $2.50; (9) $102.75; (10) $332.78; (11) $435.53.

A. John A. Baker.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1417 California, Denver, Colo. (home office); 1404 New York Ave., NW., Washington 5, D. C. (legislative office).
C. (See employer's report).

A. H. M. Baldridge, 1001 Connecticut Ave., NW., Washington, D. C.
B. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Ave NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 1713 K St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) The registrant's employment terminated September 15, 1953, and this is his final report.
D. (See page 3).[1]

A. J. H. Ballew, Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free-enterprise system, and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.

A. Hartman Barber, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor.
D. (6) $1,904.19.
E. (6) $103.77; (7) $141.98; (8) $344.25; (9) $590; (10) $1,847.93; (11) $2,437.93.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, pages 5 and 6.)[1]
D. (6) $4,950.
E. (6) $8.50; (7) $330.07; (8) $40.93; (9) $379.50; (10) $662.89; (11) $1,042.39.

A. Irvin L. Barney, Room 412, Railway Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $2,425.

A. A. K. Barta, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Proprietary Association, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting the proprietary medicines industry.
E. (7) $125; (9) $125; (10) $250; (11) $375.

A. J. A. Beirne, CWA–CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America–CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians.
E. (2) $1,451.25; (4) $111.92; (5) $35.71; (6) $36.30; (7) $22.55; (8) $7.50; (9) $1,665.23; (10) $3,680.34; (11) $5,345.57.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance-of-Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) All legislation affecting railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $4,500.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Mrs. Louella Miller Berg, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
(C) (2) (See AAUW National Legislative Program for 1953–55, attached.)[1]
D. (6) $675.

A. Preston B. Bergin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See p. 3.)[1]
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $21.25; (9) $21.25; (10) $24.30; (11) $45.55.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.
D. (6) $943.39.
E. (2) $641.64; (6) $3.08; (7) $293.42; (8) $5.25; (9) $943.39; (11) $943.39.

A. Joe Betts, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,365.
E. (7) $34.95; (9) $34.95; (10) $106.55; (11) $141.50.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,600.
E. (6) $26.70; (7) $193.50; (8) $85.80; (9) $306; (10) $531; (11) $837.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York 38, N. Y., and 932 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Institute of Marine Underwriters, the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.
C. (2) General questions affecting the insurance of ships and their cargoes against marine risks; reparations; subrogation.
E. (5) $75.60; (6) $20; (7) $40; (9) $135.60; (10) $221.20; (11) $356.50.

A. Norman E. Biorn, 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Federal and State taxation and governmental expenditures.
E. (2) $150; (5) $1.62; (9) $151.62; (10) $339.10; (11) $490.72.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
E. (See attached statement.)[1]

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (10) $1,000; (11) $1,500.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, postoffice box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized.
E. (10) $201.19; (11) $201.19.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, CWA–CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America–CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,434.19.
E. (2) $1,959.98; (7) $178.50; (8) $255.71; (9) $2,434.19; (10) $5,366.06; (11) $7,800.25.

A. Chester F. Bletch, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc.

A. Blumberg, Miller, Singer & Heppen, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Morton Bodfish, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and those institutions.
D. (6) $625.

A. John N. Bohannon, 75 Macon Avenue, Asheville, N. C., and 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. Sanford H. Bolz, 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Congress, 15 East 84th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.
D. (6) $187.50.
E. (7) $1; (9) $1; (10) 65 cents; (11) $1.65.

A. Sanford H. Bolz, attorney, 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cigarette Lighter Manufacturers Association, Inc., 303 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Revision of method of collection of manufacturers excise tax on cigarette lighters.
E. (7) $5.25; (9) $5.25; (10) $3.70; (11) $8.95.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Robert T. Borth, General Electric Co., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Labor relations, wage and hour matters, and controls over wages and salaries.
D. (6) $375.
E. (4) $30; (5) $130; (6) $5; (9) $165; (11) $165.

A. R. B. Bowden, 600 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C., and 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Bills affecting the grain and/or feed trade.
D. (5) Estimated $5; (6) estimated $5; (12) estimated $5.
E. (Estimated $5 value of time spent inquiring about legislation above.)

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) The Reserve Officer.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation involving or in the direction of national prohibition taxation of alcoholic beverages, etc. (3) The Brewery Worker.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting transportation matters.

A. Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 1850, a bill for the relief of Dr. John D. MacLennan. We are attorneys for Dr. MacLennan.

A. James M. Brewbaker, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Dawes F. Brisbine, 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation dealing with Federal grants-in-aid to States for highways, or repeal, modification, or extension of Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles, gasoline, oil, tires, or auto parts.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation related specifically to food processing and farming.
D. (6) $500.
E. (6) $25; (7) $100; (9) $125; (10) $940; (11) $1,065.

A. A. E. Brooks, 408 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
B. American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico Edificio Boarn, Plaza Santos Degollado, Mexico, D. F.
C. (2) I. R. C. Sec. 116 (a) (To exempt from U. S. income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident U. S. citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.)
E. (4) $23.12; (6) $29.50; (7) $276.41; (8) $10; (9) $339.03; (11) $339.03.

A. C. R. Brown, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) 18 bills repealing dual-benefits provision of Railroad Retirement Act. Also bills affecting railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $975.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Bldg., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NABC.
D. (6) $8,499.99.
E. (2) $7,824.99; (5) $375; (6) $17.79; (8) $34; (9) $8,251.78; (10) $16,160.78; (11) $24,412.56 (see attached sheet).[1]

A. P. W. Brown, Dept. 731, Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Postal legislation.
D. (6) $534.69.
E. (6) $8.75; (7) $347.03; (9) $355.78; (10) $495.45; (11) $851.23.

A. Thad H. Brown, Jr., NARTB, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation, local, State or Federal, which relates to the television broadcasting industry.

A. John M. Brumm, Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation regarding National Health Insurance. (3) (See attachment B).[1]
D. (6) $2,374.98.
E. (7) $100.13; (9) $100.13; (10) $75.29; (11) $175.42; (14) $100.13.

A. Henry H. Buckman, consulting engineer, 4805 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C. (2) All legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $1,350.
E. (6) $23.15; (8) $22.25; (9) $45.50; (10) $154.36; (11) $199.76.

A. Henry N. Buckman, consulting engineer, 4805 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. George Bugbee, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,562.51.
E. (7) $135.33; (9) $135.33; (10) $215.62; (11) $350.95.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, page 5).[1]
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (7) $261.70; (8) $51.55; (9) $313.25; (10) $788.45; (11) $1,101.70.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Thomas H. Burke, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit 14, Mich.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,495.
E. (7) $962; (9) $962; (10) $1,924; (11) $2,886.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
E. (2) $3,140.76; (5) $361.20; (6) $136.16; (7) $1,049.12; (8) $587.79; (9) $5,275.03; (10) $8,707.26; (11) $13,982.29.

A. F. Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, 1625½ Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2150, House Joint Resolution 104.
D. (6) $1,980.

A. Robert M. Burr, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation affecting imports of products into the United States.
D. (6) $309.17.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation dealing with the electrical workers in particular and labor in general, such as annual and sick leave; Federal retirement; unemployment insurance and severance pay; and other liberal benefits for the workers.
D. (6) $2,874.99.

A. Eugene J. Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.
D. (6) $2,625.
E. (7) $36.92; (9) $36.92; (10) $57.45; (11) $94.37.

A. Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Seeking reduction in the rate of Federal excise tax on distilled spirits. Revenue Act of 1952.
D. (See attached.)[1]
E. (2) $135; (4) $85; (6) $15; (7) $55; (8) $175; (9) $465; (10) $980; (11) $1,445.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2) S. 91, Cotton Products Identification Act of 1953. Tax legislation. Revenue revision. H. R. 3470, controlling inflation.
D. (6) $760.20.
E. (6) $3; (7) $10; (8) $10; (9) $23; (10) $86; (11) $109.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Patent Equity Association, Inc., 5 Tudor City Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Patent extension legislation.
D. (6) $888.64.

A. Wallace J. Campbell, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cooperative League of the U. S. A., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Julian W. Caplan, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation that affects retail trades.
D. (6) $200.
E. (10) $200; (11) $200.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting certified public accountants.
D. (6) $82.50.
E. (6) $25; (9) $25; (10) $92.92; (11) $117.92.

A. James K. Carr, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Matters pertaining to Central Valley project (California) which affect the interest of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District.
D. (6) $593.01.
E. (4) $21; (7) $32.22; (8) $39.20; (9) $92.42; (10) $69.60; (11) $162.02.

A. T. C. Carroll, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to railroad employees.

A. Henderson H. Carson, George Washington Inn, Washington, D. C., and 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to natural gas industry.
D. (6) $3,897.78.
E. (1) $54.35; (2) $220.90; (4) $45; (5) $53.06; (6) $67.97; (7) $392.10; (8) $64.40; (9) $897.78; (10) $1,027.70; (11) $1,925.48.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $634.86; (6) $39.25; (7) $597.25; (9) $1,271.36; (10) $2,086.82; (11) $3,358.18; (12) $1,271.36; (14) $1,033.96.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) Enactment of 30-year, half-pay railroad retirement legislation maximum annuity $200 per month. (3) Pension Conference Bulletins.
E. (5) $82.87; (6) $7.46; (9) $90.33; (10) $140.79; (11) $231.12.

A. D. E. Casey, 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Statutes or bills which affect the interests of milk dealers.

A. Larry Cates, Air Line Pilots Association, 861 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. C. N. Sayen, president, Air Line Pilots Association, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Aviation legislation—Railway Labor Act.
D. (6) $1,622.14.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
C. (2) S. 75, H. R. 1500, and H. R. 1501. (3) "The Case for Water in Central Arizona"; "Work for Water"; "California's Stake in Arizona's Share of Colorado River"; "What the Central Arizona Project Means to You"; "Truth"; "Settling Up Time"; "Facts You Should Know Respecting the Central Arizona Project"; "National Tax Benefits from the Central Arizona Project".
D. (6) $1,593.91.
E. (2) $5,277; (4) $217.80; (5) $962.60; (6) $178.06; (7) $498.22; (8) $49.81; (9) $7,183.49; (10) $16,774.90; (11) $23,958.39.

A. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2).
E. (2) $400; (9) $400; (11) $400.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See attachment.)[1]
D. (6) $726,485.72 (see attachment).[1]
E. (9) $23,730.49; (10) $67,257.56; (11) $90,988.05 (see attachment).[1]

A. Walter Chamblin, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Promoting Senate Joint Resolution 87 and House Joint Resolution 289, a proposed Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (3) The Christian Patriot.
D. (6) $2,958.08.
E. (2) $1,744.50; (4) $549.60; (5) $118.25; (6) $22.84; (7) $330.32; (9) $2,765.51; (10) $9,528.10; (11) $12,293.61.

A. Abiah A. Church, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (See attachment.)[1]

A. Mr. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Pending and prospective legislation affecting the interest of the railway company.
D. (6) $5,025.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) CCBS is opposed to any proposed legislation (such as S. 491 and H. R. 4004, 81st Cong.) calling for the duplication of class I–A clear channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I–A standard broadcast stations. CCBS opposes ratification of the so-called NARBA agreement signed November 15, 1950.
D. (See page 3.)[1]
E. (7) $26.40; (9) $26.40; (10) $36.75; (11) $63.15; (15).[1]

A. Marcus Cohn, 1625 I Street NW., Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Genocide. President's civil rights program. Bricker resolutions, Senate Resolutions 70 and 71. Citizenship rights for aliens. Immigration. Reece resolution.
D. (6) $125.

A. Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $100.

A. Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 335 Symes Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) General legislative interests: The taxing of competitive business on the same basis without regard to exemptions under section 101 of the present Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $1,090.
E. (2) $250; (4) $47.09; (5) $27.75; (7) $36.90; (8) $690.39; (9) $1,052.13; (10) $426.71; (11) $1,478.84; (15).[1]

A. The Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
E. (2) $400; (7) $326.92; (9) $726.92; (10) $1,097; (11) $1,823.92.

A. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (See page 3 attached.)[1]
E. (2) $2,250; (4) $70.82; (5) $372.66; (6) $294.95; (7) $1,575; (9) $4,563.43; (10) $41,996.25; (11) $46,559.68.

A. Committee on National Affairs, 100 East 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (10) $25.21; (11) $25.21.

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation regarding national health insurance and the following bills: H. R. 1817; S. 1052; S. 1153; H. R. 3582; H. R. 3586; H. R. 4128; S. 461; H. R. 3850; S. 994; H. R. 8; H. R. 390. (3) (See attachment B.)[1]
D. (6) $10,775.19.
E. (2) $6,384.86; (4) $869.82; (5) $2,220.02; (7) $198.62; (7) $99.25; (8) $118.32; (9) $9,890.89; (10) $22,715.14; (11) $32,606.03, (see attachment D).[1]

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 710 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives. (3) Legis-Letter.
D. (6) $10,061.62.
E. (2) $4,343.10; (3) $2,300; (4) $992.89; (5) $925; (6) $900; (7) $311.21; (8) $289.42; (9) $10,061.62; (10) $18,340.03; (11) $28,401.65.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General counsel for Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., successor to Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Salt Producers Association, 726 La Salle-Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $21.27; (7) $52.20; (9) $73.47; (10) $173.86; (11) $247.33.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Nationwide Trailer Rental System, 512 South Market Street, Wichita, Kans.
C. (2) Excise tax on utility trailers.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and those affecting the coal industry.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See p. 3 attached.)[1]
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (6) $8.91; (7) $378.93; (9) $387.89; (10) $394.60; (11) $782.49.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. J. G. Cor na, Suite 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company in addition to my administrative duties at the company's Capitol offices.
E. (7) $45.50; (9) $45.50; (10) $100; (11) $145.50.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1722 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Federal taxation, Federal expenditures, social security, and labor relations; (3) (see attached sheet).[1]
D. (6) $17,661.31.
E. (1) $2,000; (2) $12,033.35; (4) $3,495.74; (5) $936.22; (6) $702.04; (7) $3,800.70; (8) $421.93; (9) $23,389.98; (10) $47,054.19; (11) $70,444.17.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. W. W. Coxe, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk and Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

A. M. F. Crass, Jr., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) On behalf of the association, I have a general interest in any legislation affecting the chemical industry.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) $21,642.56.
E. (2) $475; (7) $2; (9) $477; (10) $927.92; (11) $1,404.92.

A. Robert A. Crichton, American Life Convention, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All prospective and existing legislation which may affect the life-insurance business.
D. (6) $1,663.33.
E. (7) $76.01; (9) $76.01; (10) $199.57; (11) $275.58; (15).[1]

A. Edward B. Crosland, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 1108, H. R. 5, H. R. 1034, H. R. 1271, H. R. 2524, H. R. 6436, H. R. 408, H. R. 477, H. R. 3552, H. R. 1524, S. 753, S. 1081, S. 2314.
D. (6) $5,583.21.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 540 Equita' le Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) All legislation both general and special that affects the above-named [1] railroads.
D. (6) $726.92.
E. (2) $400; (7) $326.92; (9) $726.92; (10) $1,097; (11) $1,823.92.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 944 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting tavern and restaurant industry.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (4) $38.15; (6) $23.65; (7) $217.29; (8) $.80; (9) $279.89; (10) $468.44; (11) $748.33; (12) $18.02; (14) $276.36.

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., room 738, Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, Esq., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., room 738, Washington, D. C.

A. Richard Ammi Cutter, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on, and opposing, legislation imposing increased duties or quotas on importation of petroleum or petroleum products. (3) A Present Threat to New England's Industrial Fuel Supply.
E. (6) $28.25; (7) $9.95; (8) $17.41; (9) $55.62; (10) $363.67; (11) $419.29.

A. Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the dairy industry.
D. (6) $4,050.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. N. R. Danielian, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2150; H. J. Res. 104.
D. (6) $6,384.66.

A. T. C. Davis, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 978 and any other legislation affecting Missouri Pacific Railroad Co.
E. (10) $160.

A. Henry F. DeBardeleben, Sipsey, Ala.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Robert N. Denham, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Continental Baking Co., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
C. (2) Labor relations and general industrial regulatory legislation.
D. (6) $1,268.33.
E. (6) $18.33; (9) $18.33; (10) $16.27; (11) $34.60.

A. Casimir de Rham, Jr., lawyer, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on, and opposing, legislation imposing increased duties or quotas on importation of petroleum or petroleum products.

A. B. B. Derrick, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc.

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) The DAV is interested in legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans.
E. (2) $5,066.60; (7) $186; (9) $5,252.60; (10) $10,266.46; (11) $15,519.06.

A. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting disabled veterans and their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans.
E. (2) $2,750; (9) $2,750; (10) $5,500; (11) $8,250.

A. Walter L. Disbrow, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $1,262.38.
E. (7) $107.50; (9) $107.50; (10) $192.50; (11) $300.

A. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry in the District of Columbia.
D. (6) $435.75.
E. (2) $300; (7) $135.75; (9) $435.75; (10) $585.02; (11) $1,020.77.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Room 303, Medical Science Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Supporting or opposing as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $13,752.31.
E. (2) $7,778.44; (4) $200; (5) $2,023.23; (6) $334.43; (7) $1,455.61; (8) $2,033.01; (9) $13,824.72; (10) $22,777.02; (11) $36,601.74; (15).[1]

A. Division 241, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employes of America, A. F. of L., 1608 West Van Buren Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislative interests include laws, proposed laws, and proposed amendments to laws affecting the interests of its members and their families.
E. (10) $343.25; (11) $343.25.

A. Division 589, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employes of America, A. F. of L., 100 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (10) $100; (11) $100.

A. Doherty, Humble, & Butler, B-1006 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.
E. (6) $3; (7) $134.17; (9) $137.17; (10) $444.12; (11) $581.29.

A. W. J. Donald, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation with respect to amendment of the Labor Management Relations Act.
D. (6) $136.70.

A. James L. Donnelly, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (formerly at 120 South La Salle Street).
C. (2) All legislation of general interest to manufacturers. (3) Industrial Review.
E. (7) $249.16; (9) $249.16; (10) $255.36; (11) $504.52.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation, amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.
D. (6) $900.

A. James J. Donohue, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interest in all legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries. (3) Qualified Contractor.
D. and E. (see reference A).[1]

A. Thomas J. Donovan, Tax Council of the Alcoholic Beverage Industries, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting excise tax on alcoholic beverages.
E. (4) $1,841.66; (9) $1,841.66; (11) $1,841.66; (15).[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $99.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $1,174.02.
E. (7) $38.75; (9) $38.75; (10) $73.50; (11) $112.25.

A. John E. Dougherty, 211 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (See attached statement).[1]

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interest of the lumber manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $2,200.
E. (7) $65; (9) $65; (10) $203; (11) $268.

A. Mrs. Francis P. Douglas, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $4.50; (9) $4.50; (10) $39.75; (11) $44.25.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Fayette B. Dow, Attorney, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Tulsa, Okla.
D. and E. (see attachment).[1]

A. M. J. Dowd, El Centro, Calif.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

A. Adin M. Downer, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy. (3) Foreign Service.
D. (6) $1,750.
E. (7) $49.38; (9) $49.38; (10) $61.70; (11) $111.08.

A. Richard S. Doyle, 404 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Fletcher Trust Co. and Jessie Reed Willis, executors of estate of Fred Willis, deceased, Indianapolis, Ind.
C.[1]

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. (3) P. R. Notes.
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (4) $225; (9) $225; (10) $450; (11) $675.

A. Dudley, Algire, Jones & Ostmann, 602 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Match Co., Wadsworth, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (6) $15.39; (8) $25.79; (9) $41.18; (11) $41.18.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
E. (10) $46.96; (11) $46.96.

A. William M. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $66.85; (9) $66.85; (10) $79.65; (11) $146.50.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $3,150.
E. (7) $516.02; (10) $1,139.31; (11) $1,655.33.

A. Herman Edelsberg, Washington Regional Office of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Registrant supports legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans, and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any Americans; more specifically, the program of the President's Committee on Civil Rights.
D. (6) $140.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (10) $30; (11) $45.

A. Joseph H. Ehlers, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West 39th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting engineering profession. (3) Civil Engineering.
E. (5) $30; (9) $30; (10) $28.50; (11) $58.50.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association & Council of Business Schools, 418 Homer Building, 13th and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests on all bills relating to the education and training of World War II veterans and Korean veterans and all other legislation affecting proprietary schools.
D. (6) $1,050.
E. (6) $44.97; (8) $63.10; (9) $108.07; (10) $352.67; (11) $460.74.

A. Oscar Elder, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C., a national trade association.
C. Interested in any legislation, local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Advancement toward enactment of H. R. 2446, generally known as the Townsend plan.
D. (6) $910.
E. (7) $85; (9) $85; (10) $38.70; (11) $123.70.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the rural electrification program provided for under the REA act of 1936 as amended including REA administrative and loan funds for rural electrification and for rural telephones and legislation furthering the construction of multipurpose dams, transmission and related facilities to provide Federal hydro power to rural electric load centers; proposed legislation providing for surveys and development of water resources. (3) Rural Electrification Magazine.
D. (6) $5,036.39.

A. Newell W. Ellison, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Theodore Roosevelt Association, 28 East 20th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General interest is to protect the rights of the Theodore Roosevelt Association under the act of May 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 163). Specific interest is to prevent any action being taken under H. R. 5471 which is in violation of the act of May 21, 1932.

A. John H. Elso, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retail lumber dealers, including housing, etc.
D. (6) $3,050.
E. (7) $363; (9) $363; (10) $763.50; (11) $1,126.50.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting public power projects generally.
D. (6) $1,673.40.
E. (6) $8.38; (7) $134.89; (8) $29.63; (9) $173.40; (11) $173.40.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the city's rights in the Colorado River and related

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

matters, and legislation affecting public power projects.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 16th Street, Oakland, Calif.
C. (2) Interior Department appropriation bill, 1954, and legislation affecting social-security coverage for municipal employees.
D. (6) $2,149.81.
E. (6) $16.80; (8) $33.01; (9) $49.81; (10) $73.82; (11) $123.63.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the district's rights in the Colorado River and related matters.
D. (6) $2,404.84.
E. (6) $22.94; (7) $267.30; (8) $14.60; (9) $304.84; (10) $165.09; (11) $469.93.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's interest in the Colorado River.
D. (6) $6,539.81.
E. (6) $41.79; (8) $8.02; (9) $49.81; (10) $137.15; (11) $186.96.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sun Pacific, Inc., 520 Ash Street, San Diego, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting Sun-Pacific's interests.
E. (10) $890.84; (11) $890.84.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the Central Valley project and Federal reclamation and power policies generally.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Robert B. Ely, III, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Interested in having the present Congress pass an appropriation act providing for payment of claims arising from French spoliations where claims have heretofore been reported to Congress by the Court of Claims.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Army Civil Functions Appropriations bill, 1954, and legislation affecting flood control projects generally.
D. (6) $500.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to small business, either directly or indirectly. (3) Pulling Together.
D. (6) $2,475.
E. (7) $322.45; (9) $322.45; (10) $801.15; (11) $1,123.60; (14) $322.45.

A. Engineers and Scientists of America, 341 East Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers and other members of affiliated units, including, but not confined to, Taft-Hartley Act, Walsh-Healy Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Defense Production Act, and similar legislation related to rights of employees, working conditions, etc.
D. and E. (See page 3.)[1]

A. Joseph P. Fahey, 100 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Division 589, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL, an unincorporated labor union, 100 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (10) $100; (11) $100.

A. Herman Fakler, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) (See page 3.)[1]
D. (6) $625.
E. (7) $7.75; (9) $7.75; (10) $11.30; (11) $19.05.

A. Edward Falck & Ruth Falck, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Southern California Gas Co., 810 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to the natural gas industry.
D. (6) $8,640.
E. (2) $3,210; (4) $130.66; (5) $1,050; (6) $529.44; (7) $973.53; (9) $5,893.63; (11) $5,893.63.

A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1417 California, Denver, Colo. (home office), and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of farmers.
D. and E. (See attached.)[1]

A. Charles J. Farrington, National Automobile Dealers Association, Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,730.78.
E. (7) $1,390.30; (9) $1,390.30; (10) $2,807.85; (11) $4,198.15.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1209 Whitehall Building, 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.
B. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project (opposed).
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $737.25; (9) $737.25; (10) $1,010.34; (11) $1,747.59.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.; American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.

A. James Finucane, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as: Mutual assistance program, appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation including universal military training and service, tariffs, economic assistance (point 4), disarmament, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange, immigration, prisoners-of-war, a peace treaty with all Germany, treatymaking powers of the Executive, de facto recognition of nations, and revision of the U. N. Charter.
D. (6) $1,225.
E. (8) $108.09; (9) $108.09; (10) $40.50; (11) $148.59.

A. Adrian S. Fisher, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Theodore Roosevelt Association, 28 East 20th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General interest is to protect the rights of the Theodore Roosevelt Association under the act of May 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 163).
E. (2) $43.94; (4) $12.60; (6) $27.19; (8) $5.25; (9) $88.98; (11) $88.98.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the N. A. E. C.
D. (6) $675.

A. Stephen Fitzgerald & Co., a partnership of Stephen E. Fitzgerald, Raymond C. Baker, and Paul E. Morgan, 502 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $18,000.
E. (4) $452.42; (6) $269.57; (7) $1,165.62; (8) $132.44; (9) $2,020.05; (10) $7,264.29; (11) $9,284.34.

A. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, Construction and Civic Development Department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Particularly interested in legislation in the general field of public works, urban redevelopment, city planning, and housing.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting funds for research on plant disease control and crop improvement. Items in Agricultural Department budget affecting research and control work on black stem rust through plant breeding and barberry eradication.
D. (6) $2,025.
E. (2) $270; (5) $256.69; (6) $138.37; (7) $279.23; (9) $944.29; (10) $1,782.82; (11) $2,727.11.

A. Fletcher Trust Co. and Jessie Reed Millis, Executors Estate of Fred Millis, deceased, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual.
C. (2) Any legislation that affects the citrus industry.
D. (6) $250.
E. (2) $2,499.99; (4) $11.45; (5) $110.50; (6) $7.28; (8) $2,630.18; (9) $4,435.39; (10) $7,065.57.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood

control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.
E. (2) $1,350; (8) $45.40; (9) $1,395.40; (10) $2,854.36; (11) $4,249.76; (15)[1]

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. (See "B" attached.)[1]
C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association set forth under B.
D. (6) $2,512.50.
E. (3) $1,320; (6) $2.62; (7) $133.30; (9) $1,455.92; (10) $2,640; (11) $4,095.92.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, Suite 1002–3, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, Suite 1002–3, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting livestock and meat packing industry, supporting or opposing such legislation as it affects the interests of the industry. Opposed socialization of industry and agriculture and undue Government intervention.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) For H. R. 2446–2447. A bill—pay as you go, Federal Social Security for all. To provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal social security payments, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys. (3) Townsend National Weekly.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
C. (2) Legislation on forestry matters. (3) The Forest Farmer.
E. (10) $977.44; (11) $977.44.

A. J. Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (See rider C–2.)[1]
D. (6) $4,798.75.
E. (7) $100.56; (9) $100.56; (10) $304.53; (11) $405.09; (15).[1]

A. Charles E. Foster, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation affecting war veterans and their dependents and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV.
D. (6) $2,160.

A. National Tax Relief Coalition, Box 401, Greensboro, N. C.
C. (2) Tax limitation.
D. (6) $275.
E. (2) $375; (7) $275; (9) $650; (10) $2,790; (11) $3,440; (12) $375.

A. Robert Franklin, 327 North Van Ness, Fresno, Calif.
B. Allied Wool Industry Committee, 327 North Van Ness, Fresno, Calif., and 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C.[1]
D. (6) $4,000.
E. (7) $4,000; (9) $4,000; (10) $6,885.69; (11) $10,885.69.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. NARD.
C. (2) To oppose legislation detrimental to independent retail druggists and to further legislation favorable to the profession. (3) NARD Journal.
D. (6) $2,800.
E. (2) $675; (5) $399; (6) $100; (9) $1,179; (10) $2,396; (11) $3,575.

A. Walter Freedman, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Metal Dealers Division and Secondary Metal Institute, National Association of Waste Material Dealers, 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. This is final report. (2) All legislation dealing with duty or tax on imported metal scrap.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (6) $54.28; (7) $37.21; (8) $14.50; (9) $105.99; (11) $105.99.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (See p. 3 attached.)[1]
D. (6) $13,503.73.
E. (2) $8,384.95; (3) $5; (4) $924.67; (5) $1,717.04; (6) $369.96; (7) $924.22; (8) $1,010.41; (9) $13,336.25; (10) $31,584.83; (11) $44,921.08; (15).[1]

A. George M. Fuller, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry, American industry, and free enterprise.
D. (6) $4,299.98.
E. (7) $1,171.12; (9) $1,171.12; (10) $2,661.04; (11) $3,832.16.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
D. (6) $625.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C., vice president and director of the Washington office of Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation applicable to or affecting the radio and/or television industry.
E. (10) $119; (11) $119.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., 143 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y.; agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; and other holders of awards of Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, World War I.
C. (2) Legislation relating to World War I awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, such as H. R. 6074, 81st Congress, H. R. 4702 and H. R. 5802, 82d Congress.
E. (10) $197.77; (11) $197.77.

A. Gwynn Garnett, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Mutual Security Program (foreign aid); farm-credit legislation.
D. (6) $1,062.48.
E. (7) $33.70; (9) $33.70; (10) $44.33; (11) $78.03.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops, The Alert, Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $2,588.09.
E. (7) $144.89; (8) $5.70; (9) $150.59; (10) $90.23; (11) $240.82.

A. Gas Appliance Manufactures Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc.

A. Mrs. Paul Gebhard,[1] 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

A. Gus F. Geissler.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1417 California, Denver Colo. (home office); 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (legislative office).
C. (2) Legislation on matters of interest to the National Farmers Union.

A. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (2) $720; (4) $27,967.88; (9) $28,687.88; (10) $21,230.54; (11) $49,918.42 (see schedule A attached for explanation of above).[1]

A. Leo E. George, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Union Postal Clerk.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $905.
E. (7) $16.02; (9) $16.02; (10) $323.44; (11) $339.46.

A. Leif Gilstad, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation on transportation.

A. Dr. H. T. Gordon, postoffice box No. 2214, Washington, D. C.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) A pay-as-you-go Federal social security for all.
D. (6) $811.75.
E. (7) $370.50.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., suite 603, Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, American Federation of Labor, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 509, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that affects Government employees.
D. (6) $5,350.11.
E. (2) $3,472.54; (4) $361.18; (5) $604.04; (6) $134.86; (8) $281.35; (9) $4,853.97; (10) $10,163.30; (11) $15,017.27; (15).[2]

A. S. Stewart Graff, 41 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, 41 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the organic chemical industry particularly in the field of foreign trade, tariff, and customs matters.
D. (6) $120.

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relative to interests of grain and feed trade.
E. (9) $10; (11) $10.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318/418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) To promote general interests of locomotive firemen and enginemen.
D. (6) $647.50.
E. (2) $4,009.63; (5) $1,272.21; (6) $84.97; (7) $1,384.58; (8) $67.85; (9) $6,819.24; (10) $11,031.89; (11) $17,851.13; (15).[2]

A. Cassius B. Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters. (3) The Postmasters Advocate.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Proponents of St. Lawrence Seaway.
D. (6) $17,449.75.
E. (1) $3,229.22; (2) $11,908.92; (4) $421.57; (5) $1,811.13; (6) $764,080; (7) $1,815.45; (9) $19,950.37; (10) $41,929.29; (11) $61,-880.16; (12) $10,000; (15)[1].

A. Ernest W. Greene, 731 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Post Office Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 544 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects the coal industry.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Agriculture and the processing and transportation of the products thereof; tax legislation; legislation pertaining to imports and exports.
D. (6) $14,874.96.
E. (10) $21.50; (11) $21.50.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation covered by convention adopted platform of organization. A copy of platform has been sent to each Member of Congress and is on file with the Secretary of Senate and Clerk of the House. (3) ADA World.
D. (6) $1,462.50.
E. (7) $243.48; (9) $243.48; (10) $591.29; (11) $834.77.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,592.50.
E. (7) $212.58; (9) $212.58; (10) $363.33; (11) $585.91.

A. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For allowance of percentage depletion on gypsum.
E. (6) $113.31; (7) $1,300.78; (9) $1,414.09; (10) $9,676.86; (11) $11,090.95.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building.
C. (2) All Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.
D. (6) $171.65.
E. (7) $169.40; (9) $169.40; (10) $605.45; (11) $774.85.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support legislation in the interest of seamen; oppose legislation detrimental to them.
D. (6) $312.
E. (7) $45.60; (9) $45.60; (10) $174.40; (11) $220.

A. Hugh P. Hall, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Taxation; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA; meat inspection funds appropriation; appropriation, Agricultural Extension Service; Department of Agriculture reorganization; appropriations for defense.
D. (6) $950.02.
E. (7) $14.10; (9) $14.10; (10) $100.25; (11) $114.35.

A. Radford Hall, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (10) $1,961.36; (11) $1,961.36.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Federation News Service Bulletin.
D. (6) $2,874.96.
E. (7) $106.4[illegible]; (9) $106.41; (10) $400.52; (11) $514.93.

A. Jess Halsted, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For allowance of percentage depletion on gypsum.
E. (4) $40.15; (6) $22.58; (7) $841.88; (8) 42 cents; (9) $905.03; (10) $1,052.38; (11) $1,957.41.

A. Harry O. Hamlet, 1616 I Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits and pensions. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $750.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $1,616.70.
E. (6) $22.22; (7) $469.48; (9) $491.70; (10) $991.55; (11) $1,483.25.

A. Ralph M. Hanneman, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $1,151.75.
E. (7) 50 cents; (8) $1.25; (9) $1.75; (10) $10.52; (11) $12.27.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
C., D., and E.[1]

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 3203, S. 925, Trip-Leasing—for. S. 1461, Time-Lag—against. H. R. 5052, Time-Lag—for some parts, against others. (3) Washington situation.
D. (6) $2,749.98.
E. (7) $99.07; (9) $99.07; (10) $225.15; (11) $324.22.

A. Dudley Harmon, 505 Statler Building, Boston, Mass., and 53 State Street, Room 735, Boston, Mass.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Bell, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Opposing, legislation imposing increased duties or quotas on importation of petroleum or petroleum products. Opposition to oil import quota provisions of H. R. 4294 and H. R. 5496.
D. (6) $250.
E. (6) $16.35; (8) $1.75; (9) $18.10; (10) $51.76; (11) $69.86.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association.
D. and E.[1]

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilder Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Maritime matters.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $37.68; (9) $37.68; (10) $266.09; (11) $303.77; (13) $1,000; (14) $1,000.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Interested in general livestock tax matters including specifically proposed amendments to the Internal Revenue Code concerning capital gains on sale of breeding livestock and deduction of soil conservation, brush control, and other ranching expenditures and livestock accounting methods.

A. Dow W. Harter, 412–14 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all tax bills which have been introduced or may be offered in the 2d session of the 83d Congress.
D. (6) $2,125.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See page 3).[1]
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (7) $36.45; (9) $36.45; (10) $150.96; (11) $187.41.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Testified at hearing before subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in opposition to ratification of the proposed North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement. (3) Washington Situation.
D. (6) $2,475.
E. (7) $75.49; (9) $75.49; (11) $75.49.

A. Joseph H. Hays, business address 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in any and all Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.

A. John C. Hazen, Suite 808, Sheraton Building, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (See attachment).[1]
E. (7) $65.07; (8) $1.25; (9) $66.32; (10) $229.85; (11) $296.17.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Felix Hebert, 500 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
B. Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurpanies, 1500 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
C. (2) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code, section 207.
E. (10) $508.08; (11) $508.08.

A. K. W. Heberton, Room 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company.
E. (7) $103.25; (9) $103.25; (10) $208.10; (11) $311.25.

A. Robert B. Heiney, National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Long-range plans for agriculture and other legislation directly affecting the food canning industry.
D. (6) $2,427.99.
E. (7) $180.51; (9) $180.51; (10) $356.07; (11) $536.58.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y., and 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects directly or indirectly the interests of local property insurance agents. (3) The American Agency Bulletin.
D. (6) $142.75.
E. (7) $142.75; (9) $142.75; (10) $190.29; (11) $333.04.

A. Ewart A. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all proposed legislation affecting the brewing industry; the wool trade industry, and the hothouse vegetable industry.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which may affect the ice cream industry.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $1,347.32.
E. (6) $4.31; (7) $93.01; (9) $97.32; (10) $251.99; (11) $349.31.

A. John L. Heen, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc., 40 Central Street, Boston, Mass.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the American Merchant Marine.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Room 316, Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and general welfare. Oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $4,000.
E. (7) $3,200; (9) $3,200; (10) $6,400; (11) $9,600.

A. Robert L. Hogg, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All prospective and existing legislation which may affect the life insurance business.
D. (6) $2,916.67.
E. (7) $63.45; (9) $63.45; (10) $1,336.29; (11) $1,399.74; (15).[1]

A. Charles M. Holloway, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education.
E. (10) $3.50; (11) $3.50.

A. Fuller Holloway, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
C. (See attached.)[1]
D. (6) $3,416.

A. Home Rule Headquarters, 1608 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 999, District of Columbia Charter Act.
D. (6) $930.83.
E. (2) $754.98; (5) $167.39; (6) $98.52; (8) $216.84; (9) $1,237.73; (10) $4,451.12; (11) $5,688.85; (15).[1]

A. Richard C. Holmquist, General Electric Co., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Labor legislation.
D. (6) $180.

A. Charles W. Holman, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops; The Alert; Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $4,127.
E. (8) $2; (9) $2; (10) $12.10; (11) $14.10.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general.

A. Harold K. Howe, Suite C, 2480 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof.
D. (6) $2,649.99.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $1,154; (7) $170.01; (9) $1,324.01; (11) $1,324.01.

A. Harold K. Howe, 205 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 205 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters of interest to the lawn mower industry.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (4) $18; (9) $18; (11) $18.

A. Hudson, Creyke, Lipscomb & Gray, 400 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To obtain relief for applicants for leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Federal Government to assert title to submerged lands.
E. (10) $305.85; (11) $305.85.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $225.

A. John M. Hurley, 515 Hoge Building, Washington Railroad Association, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $745.26.
E. (7) $496.18; (9) $496.18; (10) $1,270.59; (11) $1,766.77.

A. William C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $3,220.
E. (6) $18.75; (7) $246; (8) $71.25; (9) $336; (10) $672; (11) $1,008.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
E. (2) $825; (9) $825; (10) $1,650; (11) $2,475.

A. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Indiana Tax Equality Committee, second floor, Board of Trade Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Bills affecting equality of taxation—examples, revenue bills, the Mason bill (H. R. 1559) in the current Congress (for).
D. (6) $355.
E. (3) $4,337.53; (9) $4,357.53; (10) $202.95; (11) $4,540.48.

A. Ingoldsby & Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Committee for the Promotion of Tramp Shipping (now incorporated under the name of American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc.), 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades, and in other legislative matters affecting American-flag shipping.
E. (6) $32.35; (7) $45.65; (9) $78; (10) $1,158.44; (11) $1,236.44.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 5969, section 622.
D. (6) $300.

A. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Archer Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Petitioner is interested in having the present Congress pass an appropriation act providing for payment of claims arising from French spoliations where claims have heretofore been reported to Congress by the Court of Claims.

A. Iowa Associated Businessmen, Inc., 463 Westwood Drive, Ames, Iowa.
C. (2) Such bills as H. R. 1559, H. R. 1986, and H. R. 1177, introduced in present session of the 1953 Congress favoring equality of income taxes applicable to all types of competitive businesses.
D. (6) $987.50.
E. (2) $886.50; (5) $41.23; (6) $7.11; (7) $27; (8) $961.84; (9) $2,160.87; (10) $3,122.71.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $1,725.
E. (2) $1,500; (6) $42.93; (7) $741.43; (9) $2,284.36; (10) $23,121.22; (11) $25,405.58; (15).[1]

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2) S. 91, Cotton Products Identification Act of 1953. H. R. 3470, controlling inflation. Tax legislation, revenue revision.
D. (6) $737.50.
E. (7) $39.45; (9) $39.45; (10) $256.78; (11) $296.23.

A. Seward H. Jacobi.
B. Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) All legislation affecting business and industry.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. C. Clinton James, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Building and Loan League, No. 1 Thomas Circle, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Nominal interest in Federal legislation affecting savings and loan business.
D. (6) $349.98.
E. (5) $125; (8) $125; (9) $125; (10) $250; (11) $375.

A. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States and Hawaii.
D. (6) $1,628.95.
E. (2) $600; (9) $600; (10) $1,200; (11) $1,800.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.
C. (2) We are interested in retaining our present percentage depletion allowance for ball and sagger clays as shown by title 26, section 114, Internal Revenue Code.

A. William T. Jobe, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General interest in matters affecting ice industry.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., Mountain Pine, Ark.
B. Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Flood Control Act of 1945—Millwood Dam. Legislation affecting lumber industry.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) St. Lawrence Seaway—internal revenue bill (excess-profits tax) (general tax question)—extension of the reciprocal trade agreements—amendment of labor laws—Housing Act matters—certain phases of appropriations.
E. (2) $1,250; (8) $727.65; (9) $1,977.65; (10) $4,201.94; (11) $6,179.59.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping.
D. (6) $2,916.
E. (10) $33.21; (11) $33.21.

A. Vernon A. Johnson, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.
C. (2) All legislation affecting aviation.
D. (6) $4,320.
E. (7) $338.40; (9) $338.40; (10) $1,702.43; (11) $2,040.83.

A. W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors, O. R. C. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
C. (2) St. Lawrence seaway project and all legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally and employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act in particular.

A. Walter R. Johnson, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.
D. (6) $5,400.
E. (7) $623.58; (9) $623.58; (10) $1,352.45; (11) $1,976.03.

A. Bascom P. Jones, Tennessee Railroad Association, 930 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $630.
E. (7) $171.50; (9) $171.50; (10) $151.14; (11) $322.64.

A. Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, 1759 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio and 1135 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The M. A. Hanna Co., Leader Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) S. 589 and House Joint Resolution 104, to authorize the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.
E. (4) $8.57; (6) $20.31; (7) $88.04; (9) $96.92; (10) $452.10; (11) $549.02.

A. J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific Natl. Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C.[1]
D. (6) $2,499.99.
E. (6) $61; (7) $980.68; (8) $244.19; (9) $1,285.87; (10) $4,197.37; (11) $5,483.24.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect the petroleum industry.
E. (8) $18.55; (9) $18.55; (10) $54.97; (11) $73.52.

A. Mr. Lyle W. Jones, 1112 Barr Building, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the pottery industry.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (5) $262.15; (6) $41.84; (8) $174.86; (9) $478.85; (10) $905.67; (11) $1,384.52.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See page 3).[2]
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $146.09; (9) $146.09; (10) $563.52; (11) $709.61.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.
D. (6) $2,456.25.
E. (7) $436.95; (9) $436.95; (10) $1,007.36; (11) $1,444.31.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry in the District of Columbia.
D. (6) $300.
E. (7) $135.75; (9) $135.75; (10) $375.77; (11) $511.52.

A. The Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans.
C. (2) Tax equality and other legislation affecting independent business.
D. (6) $185.
E. (5) $221.48; (7) $35; (9) $256.48; (10) $373.49; (11) $629.97.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. City and County of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including civil functions appropriations, civil defense, ship construction, payments in lieu of taxes, airports and aviation, merchant marine development, national defense appropriations, slum clearance, housing and urban development, taxation and southern crossing.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $950; (6) $442.37; (7) $1,428.40; (8) $172; (9) $2,992.77; (10) $8,597.75; (11) $11,590.55.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation involving the interests and welfare of the American merchant marine.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Metal Co., 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interest is the mining, smelting, and fabricating of metals.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. (Miss) Elizabeth A. Kendall, 23 West Irving, Chevy Chase, Md.
C. (2) Any legislation related directly or indirectly to the development of the Antarctic Continent, such as that regarding geopolitical decisions, inventions, transportation, communications, equipment, long-range planning, exploitation of natural resources, and so forth, in the interests of all United States taxpayers and world peace and prosperity.
E. (6) $10; (9) $10; (10) $17; (11) $27.

A. Isaiah Leo Kenen, 3636 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Zionist Council, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) For American assistance to the Near East. H. R. 5710, mutual security program.
D. (6) $1,166.66.
E. (2) $375; (4) $750.68; (5) $228; (6) $257.19; (7) $490; (9) $2,100.87; (10) $5,300.73; (11) $7,401.60.

A. Mr. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
C. (2) Generally interested in all legislative matters that would affect the oil and gas industry.
D. (6) $500.
E. (2) $125; (5) $75; (6) $25; (7) $25; (8) $25; (9) $275; (10) $640; (11) $915.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (See statement attached.)[1]
D. (6) $3,100.
E. (7) $29.45; (9) $29.45; (10) $104.95; (11) $134.40.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,050.
E. (2) $3,050; (9) $3,050; (10) $6,100; (11) $9,150.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration. (3) VFW magazine.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $256; (9) $256; (10) $517.85; (11) $773.85.

[2] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Jeff Kibre, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.; National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) General interest in legislation affecting unions and their members and the maritime industry as well.
D. (6) $214.63.
E. (2) $303.33; (4) $2.62; (5) $102.60; (6) $47.12; (8) $40.57; (9) $496.24; (10) $1,100.46; (11) $1,596.70; (15).[1]

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Clara Kennett, c/o Taylor Weir, Helena, Mont.
C. (2) Public Law 287, 83d Congress, 1st session.
E. (6) $21.73; (8) $24.42; (9) $46.15; (11) $46.15.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $330.
E. (7) $63.97; (9) $63.97; (10) $78.74; (11) $142.71.

A. C. W. Kitchen, United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly. (3) The Packer and Produce News.
E. (7) $326.37; (9) $326.37; (10) $185; (11) $511.37.

A. Allan B. Kline, American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation.
C. (2) Matters affecting directly American agriculture.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Palmer-Bee Co., Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Appearing before congressional committees relative to private bills for relief of Palmer-Bee Co., to reimburse company for loss of $725,285.60 in manufacture of radar equipment for Navy.
E. (6) $17.12; (7) $110.50; (8) $0.50; (9) $128.12; (10) $234.05; (11) $362.17.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Alfred U. Krebs, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. The National Federation of American Shipping will be dissolved on September 30, 1953, and legislative interests will not be continued subsequent to that date.
B. (6) $500.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Oscar R. Kreutz, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings & Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation adverse to savings and loan associations. Opposing S. 975 and H. R. 1559. Supporting in the main H. R. 316. Suporting H. R. 1280.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting water and power projects, flood control, and reclamation.
D. (6) $3,492.
E. (7) $1,954.90; (8) $228.21; (9) $2,183.11; (10) $7,617.70; (11) $9,800.81.

A. Lake Carrier's Association,[1] 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Director of Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., successor to Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Salt Producers Association, 726 La Salle Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. State Tax Association, Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex.
C.[1]

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $975.

A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Taft-Hartley law. H. R. 6292.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $2,506.41; (7) $37.47; (8) None; (9) $2,543.88; (10) $5,503.56; (11) $8,047.44.

A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Taft-Hartley law. H. R. 6292.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (5) $2,506.41; (6) $34.27; (7) $93.99; (9) $2,634.67; (10) $5,537.04; (11) $8,171.71.

A. William V. Lavelle, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and general welfare. Oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $2,625.
E. (7) $1,775; (9) $1,775; (10) $3,712; (11) $5,487.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See report of American Trucking Associations, Inc.).[1]
D. (6) $7,083.32.
E. (7) $57.10; (9) $57.10; (10) $17.80; (11) $74.90.

A. John G. Laylin, Wallace G. Dempsey, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The undersigned advised the Danish Ambassador in connection with the final lump-sum settlement of the unsatisfied claims arising from the requisitioning of 40 Danish vessels by the United States Government in 1941. This settlement requires congressional approval which is provided for in S. 2237.
E. (2) $48.68; (4) $221.55; (6) $89.01; (7) $704.28; (9) $1,063.52; (11) $1,063.52.

A. John G. Laylin, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are relating to mining, smelting and refining and to foreign or international investment, trade or commerce.
D.[1]

A. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See program attached).[1] (3) Report From the Hill, Working Together for International Cooperation, Tips on Reaching the Public, Significant Rollcalls, How To Get and Keep Members, The National Voter.
D. (6) $1,823.71.
E. (2) $600; (4) $1,053.79; (6) $9.50; (9) $1,663.29; (10) $4,770.44; (11) $6,433.73.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General—legislation affecting the United States merchant marine. Merchant Marine Act of 1936. (3) (See attached sheet).[1]
D. (6) $6,693.60.
E. (4) $3,498.17; (6) $31.86; (7) $39; (8) $124.57; (9) $3,693.60; (10) $2,737.44; (11) $6,431.04; (15).[1]

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General—Legislation affecting the importation by the United States of sugar produced in Cuba. Sugar Act of 1948 and Public Law 140, 82d Congress, amending the Sugar Act of 1948. Trade Agreements Act. Tariff Acts. (3) (See attached sheet).[1]
D. (6) $1,793.22.
E. (4) $134.88; (6) $14.38; (8) $143.96; (9) $293.22; (10) $2,082.07; (11) $2,375.29; (15).[1]

A. James R. Lee, 604 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association.

A. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States (J. L. McCaskill, director), 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education.
E. (2) $2,209.16; (4) $916.91; (5) $220.85; (6) $904.08; (7) $2,964.36; (9) $7,215.36; (10) $13,305.62; (11) $20,520.98; (15).[1]

A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. G. E. Leighty, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to railway employees.

A. Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 341 Sharon Street, Providence, R. I.
C. (2) The general legislative interests, measures which affect the welfare of children and youth in the field of education; social and economic well-being; child labor and environmental situations; Federal research agencies in education, health, juvenile protection, and homemaking; world understanding and peace among nations. (3) National Parent-Teacher.

A. Dr. William N. Leonard, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation.
D. (6) $225.
E. (4) $80; (6) $2.92; (7) $115.24; (9) $198.16; (10) $52.70; (11) $250.86; (14) $198.16.

A. Wilbur R. Lester, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests relate to mining, smelting, and refining and to foreign or international investment, trade, or commerce.
D. (6) (See p. 3.)[1]

A. Stephen Levitsky, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare.
D. (6) $2,325.
E. (7) $900; (9) $900; (10) $1,800; (11) $2,700.

A. The Liaison Committee of the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The committee has a continuing interest in all legislation affecting the mechanical specialty contracting industries.
D. (6) $5,533.37.
E. (2) $4,400; (4) $1,133.37; (9) $5,533.37; (10) $16,126.06; (11) $21,659.43.

A. Frederick J. Libby, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as: Mutual assistance program, appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation including uni-

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

versal military training and service, tariffs, economic assistance (point 4), disarmament, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange, immigration, prisoners of war, a peace treaty with all Germany, treatymaking powers of the Executive, de facto recognition of nations, and revision of the U. N. Charter.
D. (6) $1,299.71.
E. (7) $74.72; (9) $74.72; (10) $331.74; (11) $406.46.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (Washington address: 1000 Vermont Avenue).
C. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants. (See p. 3.) [1]
D. (6) $5,317.59.
E. (2) $4,015.11; (5) $1,146.91; (6) $105.44; (7) $50.13; (9) $5,317.59; (10) $9,913.25; (11) $15,230.84.

A. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In support of House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 23, proposing a constitutional amendment relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances and gifts.
D. (6) $2,796.80.
E. (2) $1,431.77; (4) $865.71; (5) $1,006.67; (6) $132.86; (7) $637.62; (9) $4,074.63; (10) $14,145.48; (11) $18,220.11.

A. Leo F. Lightner, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, 341 East Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers and other members of affiliated units, including, but not confined to, Taft-Hartley Act, Walsh-Healy Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Defense Production Act, and similar legislation related to rights of employees, working conditions, etc.
D. (6) (See p. 3).[1]

A. Miss Esther Lipsen, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation: S. 281, authorizes ICC to discontinue certain intrastate railroad services. For. S. 978, S. 1360, S.1461, H. R. 91, H. R. 3203.
D. (6) $825.03.
E. (6) $140; (7) $125; (9) $265; (11) 265; (14) $265.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Mr. E. F. Forbes, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,500.02.
E. (7) $18.77; (9) $18.77; (10) $232.16; (11) $250.93.

A. John W. Lindsey, National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
D. (6) $375.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., suite 510, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5).
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (6) $35.79; (7) $406.42; (8) $99.60; (9) $541.81; (10) $1,537.34; (11) $2,079.15; (15.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Walter J. Little, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. Major Steam Railroads of California (see schedule attached).[1]
C. (2) In opposition to: St. Lawrence seaway; trip-leasing bill, H. R. 3203. In support of: Time-lag bill, S. 1461.
D. (6) $2,933.32.
E. (6) $52.60; (7) $1,380.15; (9), $1,432.75; (11) $1,432.75; (15).[1]

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, 15th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products, and specifically H. R. 1417; also, technical changes covering method of payment for excise taxes on tobacco products.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 643 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation favorable to the pipeline industry. The committee is interested in S. 1461, H. R. 5052, H. R. 6733, H. R. 6734, H. R. 6735, H. R. 6736, H. R. 6737, H. R. 6738, H. R. 6739, and H. R. 6740. All bills provide for amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General interest in legislation for payroll deductions, war damage, economic controls, and hospital and health matters.
D. (6) $3,250.
E. (6) $27.85; (7) $65.34; (8) $522.70; (9) $615.89; (10) $642.15; (11) $1,258.04; (15).[1]

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. S. A. Healy Co., 61 Westchester Avenue, White Plains, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 1762.

A. Otto Lowe, 820 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting canning of food products.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (10) $1,000; (11) $1,500.

A. James C. Lucas, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (see p. 3).[1]
D. (6) $750.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Federal tax matters affecting life insurance companies.
D. (6) $750.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation which may deal with credit controls.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Adolph Von Zedlitz, 100 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 155 and H. R. 3594, to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

A. Wendell Lund, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Detroit Edison Co., Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) S. 1442 enacted.
E. (6) $166.51; (7) $173.80; (8) $43.60; (9) $383.91; (11) $383.91.

A. Dr. Carl E. Lunn, Post Office Box 689, St. Petersburg, Fla. (Formerly Phoenix, Ariz.)
B. Townsend Plan for National Insurance, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Townsend plan, as per H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447.
D. (6) $154.47.
E. (5) $20; (7) $60.10; (9) $80.10; (10) $24.20.

A. Gerald J. Lynch, Ford Motor Co., Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
E. (10) $295.36; (11) $295.36.

A. John C. Flynn, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C.[1]
D. (6) $2,203.14.
E. (7) $31.65; (9) $31.65; (10) $188.79; (11) $220.44.

A. A. E. Lyon, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting labor—especially railroad labor.
D. (6) $750.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc.
C. (2) Legislation affecting aviation, the steel industry, and other industries which may be clients of Hill & Knowlton.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is protection and fostering of the interest of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities. Specific interest: S. 925 and H. R. 3203—leasing of motor vehicles; H. R. 2524—a bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, Room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia government employees.
D. (6) $1,750.
E. (7) $6.30; (9) $6.30; (10) $27.40; (11) $33.70.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 211 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) (See attached statement.)[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of legislation and Federal relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $233.12.
E. (7) $61.65; (9) $61.65; (10) $30; (11) $91.65.

A. McClure & Updike, 626 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code. H. R. 604; H. R. 2691. In favor of bills.
E. (4) $304.98; (6) $45.38; (7) $148.24; (9) $498.50; (10) $1,843.66; (11) $2,342.16.

A. Warren C. McClure, Mississippi Valley Association, box 207, Camden, Ark.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $850.

A. Angus McDonald.
B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1437 California, Denver, Colo. (home office), and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (Legislation Office).
C. (2) Legislation on matters of interest to the National Farmers Union.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement.
C. (2) The Christian amendment resolution was introduced into both Houses of Congress during June and July. It is seeking to amend the Constitution by placing in our supreme law an acknowledgment of the Supreme Being.
D. (6) $810.
E. (7) $350; (9) $350; (10) $550; (11) $900.

A. Ernest W. McFarland, La Salle Building, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cable & Radio Corp., New York City; RCA Communications, Inc., New York City; Western Union Telegraph Co., New York City.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Taxpayers, U. S. A., 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $180; (7) $360; (8) $540.
E. (2) $180; (9) $180; (10) $360; (11) $540.

A. M. C. McKercher, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, O. R. T. Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.

A. Joseph V. McLaughlin, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation in connection with parcel post.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (7) $870.87; (9) $870.87; (10) $2,705.48; (11) $3,576.35.

A. W. H. McMains, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the domestic distilling industry, such as H. R. 5407.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants (see p. 3).[1]
D. (6) $337.50.

A. Daniel J. McNamara, 1608 West Van Buren Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Division 241, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL, 1608 West Van Buren Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Division 241's legislative interests include laws, proposed laws, and proposed amendments to laws affecting the interests of its members and their families.
E. (10) $343.25; (11) $343.25.

A. Mackoff, Kellogg, Muggli & Kirby, Dickinson, N. Dak.
B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John Hanson, trustees, operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak. Trustees in behalf of former owners of lands sold to United States. Seeking recovery of mineral rights.
C. (2) Interested in S. 134 and in H. R. 100 seeking the right to repurchase or reacquire minerals in land heretofore sold to the United States.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. This organization being dissolved as of September 30, 1953.
D. (6) $1,050.
E. (7) $28.41; (9) $28.41; (10) $57.99; (11) $86.40.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above-named trade association.
D. (6) $600.
E. (6) $49.10; (7) $19.37; (9) $140.47; (10) $359.84; (11) $500.31.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above-named trade association.
D. (6) $2,600.
E. (6) $49.10; (7) $91.37; (9) $140.47; (10) $359.84; (11) $500.31.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The Association has a general interest in any legislation affecting the chemical industry.
E. (10) $4,750; (11) $4,750.

A. Leslie T. Manurin, 5001 Battery Lane, Bethesda, Md.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $56.60.
E. (10) $1.95; (11) $1.95.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Olya Margolin (Mrs.), 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, 1 West 47th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,632.
E. (8) $34.60; (9) $34.60; (10) $108.78; (11) $143.38.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Ford Motor Co., Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $46.
E. (5) $160; (6) $35; (9) $195; (11) $195.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See attached page for answer to items 1-3).[1]
D. (6) $62.44.
E. (7) $5.75; (9) $5.75; (10) $12.75; (11) $18.50.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112-16 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Washington Railway Co., Roosevelt Avenue and F Street, Seat Pleasant, Md.
C. (2) Interested in preventing the removal of the single-track railroad now located and operated adjacent to Kenilworth Avenue by the Capital Transit Co. Legislation introduced with respect to this purpose through H. R. 7341, S. 1691, and H. R. 4830.
E. (7) $10.50; (8) $5; (9) $15.50; (11) $15.50.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Second National Bank Building, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) Legislation to conserve the natural resources of the subsoil of the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States.
E. (2) $3; (6) $17.35; (7) $11; (8) $15; (9) $46.35; (10) $156.63; (11) $202.98.

A. Robert F. Martin, 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers' Association, Inc., 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States and Hawaii.
D. (6) $600.
E. (8) $4.50; (9) $4.50.

A. Will Maslow, 15 East 84th Street, New York City.
B. American Jewish Congress, Inc., 15 East 84th Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its form and in connection therewith to defend incidental civil rights.
D. (6) $112.50.
E. (10) $150; (11) $150.

A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $2,600.
E. (6) $29.25; (7) $189.60; (8) $66.15; (9) $235; (10) $601.50; (11) $886.50.

A. P. H. Mathews, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See rider C-2.)[1]
D. (6) $4,749.99.
E. (7) $525.77; (9) $525.77; (10) $1,217.57; (11) $1,743.34; (15).[1]

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $575.
E. (7) $38.05; (9) $38.05; (10) $424.98; (11) $463.03.

A. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action.
D. (6) $142.50.
E. (2) $1,650; (4) $225; (9) $1,875; (10) $3,750; (11) $5,625.

A. E. A. Meeks, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Retired effective August 31, 1953. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters. (3) The Postmasters Advocate.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. William R. Merriam, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation.
D. (6) $750.
E. (6) $25; (7) $81.56; (9) $106.56; (11) $106.56; (14) $106.56.

A. James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla., an association composed of Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Southern Railway System, Florida East Coast Railway Co., Atlanta & St. Andrews Bay Railway Co., Live Oak, Perry & Gulf Railroad Co., and St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co.
C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association set forth under B.
D. (6) $1,320.

A. Ross A. Messer, Box 1611, Washington, D. C. (Room 512 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.)
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, P. O. Box 1611, Washington, D. C. (Room 512 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.)
C. (2) All beneficial legislation affecting custodial employees of the Post Office and GSA. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $11.95; (8) $7.82; (9) $19.77; (10) $78.94; (11) $98.71.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See attachment "A").[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $484.86.
E. (6) $15.51; (7) $64.72; (9) $80.23; (10) $234.90; (11) $315.13.

A. Harold M. Miles, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co.
C. (2) S. 925 and H. R. 3203.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See attached statement, p. 3.)[1]
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (3) $1,500; (9) $1,500; (10) $3,040.29; (11) $4,540.29; (15).[1]

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
C. (2) General legislation affecting Dallas and Texas, such as appropriations and revenue bills; H. R. 5376.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $225; (5) $8.03; (6) $54.72; (7) $561.13; (8) $51.12; (9) $900; (10) $1,800; (11) $2,700.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Second National Bank Building, Houston.
C. (2) For adequate river and harbor authorizations and appropriations; H. R. 5376.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (5) $15.41; (6) $30.29; (7) $48.60; (8) $11.05; (9) $105.35; (10) $466.68; (11) $572.03.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislation affecting sulphur industry; H. R. 5134.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $1,009.52; (6) $277.08; (7) $643.71; (8) $8.50; (9) $1,938.81; (10) $3,183.31; (11) $5,122.12.

A. Justin Miller, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (2) $625; (7) $7.75; (9) $632.75; (10) $324.65; (11) $957.40.

A. Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Federal and State income taxation and governmental expenditures.
D. (6) $520.
E. (3) $311.86; (5) $151.62; (9) $463.50; (10) $838.68; (11) $1,302.18; (15).[1]

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (6) $0.40; (7) $32.86; (9) $33.26; (10) $71.41; (11) $104.67.

A. Justus R. Moll, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. David O. Zimring, 11 S. La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. F. E. Mollin, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Reciprocal trade, support prices, livestock credits, and other matters affecting livestock industry.
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (6) $5.34; (7) $722.18; (9) $727.52; (10) $1,195.32; (11) $1,922.84.

A. George W. Morgan, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. and E.[1]

A. The Morris Plan Corporation of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Bank holding company bills and similar legislation—against.
E. (4) $1,699.50; (9) $1,699.50; (11) $1,699.50.

A. Giles Morrow, 1220 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting freight forwarders.
D. (6) $4,354.99.
E. (5) $27.91; (6) $3.19; (7) $13.63; (9) $44.73; (10) $148.07; (11) $192.80.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation of interest to the aircraft manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $512.53; (8) $48.90; (9) $561.43; (10) $1,727.16; (11) $2,288.59.

A. William J. Mougey, General Motors Corp., 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250.
E. (6) $10; (7) $15; (9) $25; (10) $80; (11) $105.

A. Allen P. Mullinnix, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors. (3) "The Retired Officer."
D. (6) $400.

A. Howard E. Munro; Room 607, A. F. of L. Building, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of the Panama Canal Zone, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone.
C. (2) All legislation affecting A. F. of L. Union members employed on the Canal Zone.
D. (6) $940.
E. (3) $177.59; (5) $50.62; (6) $117.39; (7) $481.30; (9) $826.90; (10) $2,504.81; (11) $3,331.71.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Ins. Co., Webster City, Iowa.
C. (2) Insurance coverage of employer is restricted to chiropractors. Legislative interest of employer is to promote the welfare

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

of its policyholders and prevent discrimination against the chiropractic profession. H. R. 54; Senate Joint Resolution 41.
D. (6) $300.
E. (8) $300; (9) $300; (10) $600; (11) $600.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $99.

A. Francis J. Myers, Esq., 2026 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. National Foundation for Consumer Credit, Inc., 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2)[1]
E. (10) $389.53; (11) $389.53.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
C. (2) Legislation introduced on forestry matters.
E. (10) $977.44; (11) $977.44.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 5894 (trade agreements bill). H. R. 5877 (customs simplification bill).
D. (6) $500.
E. (2) $2,490.40; (4) $241.04; (5) $18.38; (6) $542.41; (7) $266.01; (9) $3,558.24; (10) $4,154.79; (11) $7,713.03; (15).[1]

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) NAB is generally interested in laws affecting businessmen, particularly with relation to taxation of business, social security and tax-privileged corporations in business. Specifically: H. R. 1559. (3) Washington report.
E. (2) $3,157.48; (4) $14.23; (5) $539.68; (6) $142.01; (8) $422.24; (9) $4,275.64; (10) $8,597.85; (11) $12,873.49.

A. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (a) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (2) $5,753.25; (4) $11.01; (5) $418.50; (6) $92.45; (7) $623.58; (8) $321.45; (9) $7,220.24; (10) $18,586.41; (11) $25,806.65; (15).[1]

A. National Association & Council of Business Schools, 418–419 Homer Building, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation concerning education of all kinds, particularly bills relative to GI education for Korean veterans, Public Law 550. (3) Business School News.
D. (6) $2,213.23.
E. (2) $1,050; (4) $83; (6) $44.97; (8) $63.10; (9) $1,241.07; (10) $10,204.81; (11) $11,445.88.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, pp. 5, 6.)[1]
D. (6) $14,517.06.
E. (1) $20,007.21; (2) $78,392.58; (4) $5,209.13; (5) $4,984.18; (6) $1,961.59; (7) $2,945.62; (8) $3,636.93; (9) $117,137.24; (10) $268,937.03; (11) $386,074.27; (15).[1]

A. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The association has a "general legislative interest" in statutes or bills which will affect the interests of independent tire dealers.
D. (6) $185.42.
E. (2) $62.44; (4) $117.23; (7) $5.75; (9) $185.42; (10) $275.86; (11) $461.28; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects, directly or indirectly, local property insurance agents.
D. (6) $2,894.75.
E. (2) $3,941.56; (5) $430; (6) $346.09; (7) $142.75; (9) $4,860.40; (10) $8,553.19; (11) $13,413.59.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation that may relate to margarine.
D. (6) $12.65.
E. (7) $12.65; (9) $12.65; (10) $147.68; (11) $160.33.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C., Room 512 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Beneficial legislation affecting postal employees and General Services employees, and post office custodial employees and GSA in PBS employees in particular. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.
D. (6) $11,128.27.
E. (2) $666.24; (4) $183.63; (5) $155; (6) $48.70; (7) $11.95; (9) $1,065.52; (10) $2,277.24; (11) $3,342.76; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.; 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.
D. (6) $19,105.36.
E. (1) $303.51; (2) $18,558.05; (4) $2,008.56; (5) $2,406.44; (6) $469.65; (7) $4,443.28; (8) $884.90; (9) $29,074.39; (10) $59,823.61; (11) $88,898; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Storekeeper-Gaugers, 1538 Ingleside Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) All legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and that in particular which would affect our position—United States storekeeper-gaugers.
D. (6) $605.80.
E. (2) $500; (9) $500; (10) $1,000; (11) $1,500.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,906.
E. (2) $333.99; (4) $18.50; (5) $78; (6) $12; (9) $442.49; (10) $884.98; (11) $1,327.47.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Long-range plans for agriculture and other legislation directly affecting the food-canning industry.
D. (6) $312,377.71.
E. (2) $3,927.99; (4) $126.57; (5) $67.79; (7) $180.51; (8) $1.19; (9) $4,304.05; (10) $11,845.11; (11) $16,149.16; (15).[1]

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All measures affecting bituminous coal industry.

A. National Committee for Strengthening Congress, 1135 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests include any and all legislation dealing with the organization of Congress.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 600 South Michigan Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of the National Congress are concerned with measures which affect the welfare of children and youth in the field of education; social and economic well-being; child labor and environmental situations; Federal research agencies in education, health, juvenile protection, and homemaking; world understanding and peace among nations. (3) National Parent-Teacher.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $81.45.
E. (2) $71.50; (5) $9.95; (9) $81.45; (10) $162.90; (11) $244.35.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $5,061.79.
E. (2) $2,815.55; (4) $867.99; (5) $199.80; (6) $113.40; (7) $1,065.05; (9) $5,061.79; (10) $5,941.68; (11) $11,003.47; (15).[1]

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation relating to the Postal Service, particularly H. R. 6502, 6515, 6544.
D. (6) $1,415.04.
E. (1) $900; (5) $11.17; (7) $368.56; (8) $135.31; (9) $1,415.04; (10) $5,989.26; (11) $7,040.30; (15).[1]

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 3203, S. 925—trip leasing—for. S. 1461, time lag—against. H. R. 5052—time lag—for some parts, against others. (3) Washington situation.
D. (6) $3,122.
E. (2) $1,652; ((4) $3.70; (5) $162; (6) $66.40; (7) $194.36; (8) $130.54; (9) $2,209.08; (10) $14,309.60; (11) $16,518.68; (15).[1]

A. National Council Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) S. 2585, S. 2550, S. 2545, S. J. Res. 1.
E. (2) $249.99; (4) $43.78; (9) $293.77; (10) $1,533.59; (11) $1,827.36.

A. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as mutual-assistance program; appropriations,

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas; manpower legislation, including universal military training and service; tariffs; economic assistance (point 4); disarmament; expellees and displaced persons; educational exchange; immigration; prisoners of war; a peace treaty with all Germany; treatymaking powers of the Executive; de facto recognition of nations, and revision of the U. N. Charter. (3) Peace action.

D. (6) $4,622.67.

E. (2) $4,525.74; (4) $183.46; (5) $1,170.77; (6) $55.85; (7) $317.31; (8) $1,088.71; (9) $7,341.84; (10) $19,036.90; (11) $26,378.74; (15).[1]

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

C. (See attached sheet).[1]

D. (6) $30,306.98.

E. (2) $16,478.95; (4) $5,831.72; (5) $5,348.89; (6) $805.13; (7) $3,136.69; (8) $553.12; (9) $32,154.50; (10) $51,865.20; (11) $84,019.70; (15).[1]

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C.[1]

D. and E.[1]

A. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.; American Merchant Marine Institute, 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and Committee of American Shipping Lines Serving Essential Foreign Trade Routes, 1809 G Street, Washington, D. C.

C. and D.[1]

E. (1) $752.81; (2) $2,018.75; (5) $1,350; (6) $339.82; (7) $54.67; (9) $4,516.05; (10) $10,852.25; (11) $15,368.30.

A. The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Club, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (See attached statement).[1]

D. (6) $303,627.50.

E. (2) $916.64; (5) $220; (6) $37.48; (8) $22.12; (9) $1,196.24; (10) $3,037.61; (11) $4,233.85.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Suite 502, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) The Union Postal Clerk; Federation News Service Bulletin.

D. (6) $152,991.73.

E. (2) $7,091.12; (4) $15,742.27; (5) $380; (6) $20.75; (8) $3,972.02; (9) $27,206.16; (10) $34,557.33; (11) $61,763.49; (15).[1]

A. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See attached sheet.[1])

D. (6) $4,347.48.

E. (2) $4,006; (4) $264.98; (5) $30; (7) $46.50; (9) $4,347.48; (10) $5,012.15; (11) $9,359.63; (15).[1]

A. National Housing Conference, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. All housing legislation.

D. (6) $10,764.23.

E. (2) $6,563.48; (4) $310.89; (5) $1,030.34; (6) $525.42; (7) $1,165.61; (8) $3,170.37; (9) $12,786.11; (10) $35,189.22; (11) $47,975.33; (15).[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Taft-Hartley law; tax on coconut oil; and matters affecting meatpackers.

D. (6) $95.56.

E. (2) $106.37; (3) $.50; (4) $22.26; (5) $15.78; (6) $1.79; (7) $8.88; (8) $13.51; (9) $169.09; (10) $513.13; (11) $682.22; (15).[1]

A. National Institute of Diaper Services, 67 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests to secure deduction for income-tax purposes for amounts paid for antiseptic diaper service used to cure or prevent skin infection, in accordance with H. R. 5502.

D. (6) $2,824.06.

E. (2) $1,374.99; (4) $1,352.76; (6) $16.31; (8) $80; (9) $2,824.06; (10) $1,005.88; (11) $3,829.89.

A. The National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Room 424, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H. R. 5894 (trade agreements bill), H. R. 5877 (customs simplification bill).

D. (6) $3,218.61.

E. (2) $2,685.99; (4) $147.89; (5) $760.93; (6) $78.46; (7) $472.68; (8) $1,507.47; (9) $5,653.42; (10) $8,754.18; (11) $14,407.60; (15).[1]

A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (See page 3 attached.[1])

D. (6) $5,173.24.

E. (See p. 3 attached.[1])

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of the lumber-manufacturing industry.

D. (6) $15,779.65.

E. (1) $1,610.50; (2) $3,787.47; (4) $332.04; (6) $128.86; (7) $1,410.89; (8) $1,989.08; (9) $9,258.84; (10) $22,136.42; (11) $31,395.26.

A. National Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops; the Alert.

D. (6) $79,815.66.

E. (1) $11,613.54; (2) $27,828.67; (3) $5,000; (5) $8,943.70; (6) $723.96; (7) $6,046.63; (8) $1,867.01; (9) $62,022.40; (10) $90,402.09; (11) $52,424.49; (15).[1]

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.

C. (2) Appropriations for public health.

E. (1) $600; (7) $158.87; (9) $758.87; (10) $1,486.18; (11) $2,245.05.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (See page 3).[1]

D. (6) $4,125.

E. (2) $3,375; (4) $3,050.29; (5) $517.60; (7) $65.07; (8) $2.50; (9) $7,010.46; (10) $13,617.01; (11) $20,627.47; (15).[1]

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation that affects retail trades.

E. (10) $600; (11) $600.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation/reclamation, soil-and-water conservation, and related subjects.

D. (6) $805.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $1,720.50; (6) $32.48; (7) $325.73; (8) $1,016.54; (9) $3,095.25; (10) $8,565.42; (11) $11,660.67; (15).[1]

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the rural electrification program provided for under the REA Act of 1936 as amended, including REA administrative and loan funds for rural electrification and for rural telephones and legislation furthering the construction of multipurpose dams, transmission, and related facilities to provide Federal hydropower to rural electric load centers; proposed legislation providing for surveys and development of water resources. (3) Rural Electrification magazine.

E. (8) $5,956.37; (9) $5,956.37; (10) $18,311.71; (11) $24,268.08.

A. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project (opposed).

D. (6) $11,000.

E. (2) $7,456.25; (4) $789.59; (5) $295.65; (6) $165.44; (7) $1,510.65; (8) $260.63; (9) $10,478.21; (10) $25,328.34; (11) $35,806.55; (15).[1]

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Member associations of the league.

C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation adverse to savings and loan associations. Opposing S. 975 and H. R. 1559. Supporting in the main H. R. 316. Supporting H. R. 1280.

D. (6) $2,339.63.

E. (2) $2,000; (4) $72.48; (9) $2,072.48; (10) $5,774.05; (11) $7,846.53; (15).[1]

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) $5,000.

E. (2) $4,597.92; (5) $1,352.33; (6) $110.29; (9) $6,060.54; (10) $12,179.64; (11) $18,240.18; (15).[1]

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers, including: Taft-Hartley Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Davis-Bacon Act, UMT, selective service, Armed Forces Reserve legislation, Defense Production Act, Hoover Commission bills, income retirement legislation.

D. (6) $24,773.21.

E. (2) $1,183; (4) $391.06; (9) $1,574.06; (10) $3,654.43; (11) $5,228.49; (15).[1]

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) General legislative interests relate to corporate income-tax legislation.

D. (6) $6,714.88.

E. (1) $1,420.40; (2) $1,997.01; (4) $996.20; (5) $286.50; (6) $755.05; (7) $1,091.80; (9) $6,546.96; (10) $29,211.32; (11) $35,758.28; (15).[1]

A. National Water Conservation Conference, 341 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization, and conservation of natural resources.

D. (6) $460.

E. (5) $800.60; (8) $13.68; (9) $814.28; (10) $1,804.19; (11) $2,618.47; (15).[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
B. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, with headquarters at 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $968.14.
E. (2) $1,162.50; (5) $457.59; (6) $16; (9) $1,636.09; (10) $3,595.47; (11) $5,231.56.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $3,197.
E. (2) $2,499.99; (6) $61; (7) $980.68; (8) $244.19; (9) $3,785.86; (10) $9,197.40; (11) $12,983.26.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C and D.[1]

A. Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr.
C. (2) Legislative interests: all legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.
D. (6) $895.
E. (8) $444.12; (9) $444.12; (10) $125.98; (11) $570.10; (15).[1]

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the mortgage banking industry.
D. (6) $6,138.50.
E. (2) $325.16; (4) $138.20; (5) $1,266.63; (6) $383.69; (7) $274.85; (9) $2,388.53; (10) $4,882.65; (11) $7,271.18.

A. Herbert U. Nelson, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (2) $224.09; (6) $32; (7) $1,491.13; (8) $124.83; (9) $1,872.05; (10) $4,173.71; (11) $6,045.76; (15)[1].

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members. (3) Double taxation of dividends; capital gains tax.
E. (2) $3,000; (4) $69.60; (7) $444; (8) $28; (9) $3,541.60; (10) $6,700.32; (11) $10,241.92; (15).[1]

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5).[1]
D. (6) $4,750.02.
E. (7) $171.56; (8) $15; (9) $186.56; (10) $1,035.09; (11) $1,221.65; (15).[1]

A. Harry E. Northam, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (See attached.)[1]

A. Northern Hemlock & Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the timber industries of Wisconsin and Michigan, taxation, forestry, and labor-management relations.
E. (8) $10; (9) $10; (10) $25; (11) $35.

A. Charles E. Noyes, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting certified public accountants.
D. (6) $937.50.
E. (6) $40; (7) $193.86; (9) $233.86; (10) $619.82; (11) $853.68.

A. Donald W. Nyrop, 710 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Conference of Local Airlines, 710 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support legislation which is in the interest of a sound national air transportation policy.
D. (6) $511.68.
E. (2) $500; (4) $1.68; (7) $10; (9) $511.68; (10) $647.28; (11) $1,158.96.

A. John Lord O'Brian, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Theodore Roosevelt Association, 28 East 20th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General interest is to protect the rights of the Theodore Roosevelt Association under the act of May 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 163).

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills proposing to amend the Social Security Act.
D. (6) $6,870.50.

A. W. Raymond Ogg, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Immigration legislation; mutual-security program (foreign aid); Customs Simplification Act; Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; Reorganization of Foreign Agricultural Service; Section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1953 and related legislation.
D. (6) $1,187.49.
E. (7) $27.25; (9) $27.25; (10) $23.85; (11) $51.10.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.
E. (7) $304.37; (9) $304.37; (11) $304.37; (15).[1]

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation which the mutual savings banks have an interest in opposing or supporting.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) (See attached statement.)[1]
D. (6) $1,929.24.
E. (7) $246.04; (9) $246.04; (10) $685.09; (11) $931.13; (15).[1]

A. Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal rates and postal legislation.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $103.07; (8) $60; (9) $163.07; (10) $328.75; (11) $491.82.

A. Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Power Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to public power.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (7) $100; (8) $60; (9) $160; (10) $320; (11) $480.

A. Order of Railway Conductors of America, O. R. C. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (2) $2,125; (5) $1,257.14; (6) $74.97; (9) $3,274.50; (10) $6,530.13; (11) $9,804.63.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C. (Please refer to p. 3 for nature of organization[1]).
C. (2) Public officers and employees, retirements, and income-tax exemptions.
D. (6) $17.86.
E. (2) $68.71; (4) $195.89; (9) $264.60; (10) $188.51; (11) $453.11; (15).[1]

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee. (Explained in registration.)
C. (2) S. 1461, H. R. 3203.
D. (6) $197.28.
E. (7) $326.53; (9) $326.53; (10) $715.90; (11) $1,042.43.

A. Thomas R. Owens, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare.
D. (6) $1,430.
E. (8) $543.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 20 East 93d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 20 East 93d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (10) $89.52.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation, amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.
D. (6) $200.
E. (2) $900; (9) $900; (10) $1,800; (11) $2,700.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 611 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, National Council of Coal Lessors, and Television Broadcasters Tax Committee; all of Washington, D. C., and Iron Ore Lessors Association, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Tax legislation affecting the bituminous-coal industry, the iron-ore industry, and the television-broadcasting industry.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. James G. Patton.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1417 California, Denver, Colo. (home office); 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fidelity & Casualty Co., Insurance Building, Richmond, Va.
C. (2) In favor of H. R. 6402, a bill to provide for abatement of jeopardy assessments under section 273 of the Internal Revenue Code when jeopardy does not exist.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) Amendment to the partnership provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a partnership's fiscal year does not terminate upon the death of a partner.

A. Albert A. Payne, Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry. Legislation affecting the real-estate industry, because of its complex character, does not lend itself to any ready classification on the basis of support or opposition.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $2; (7) $82.83; (8) $51.35; (9) $136.18; (10) $431.40; (11) $567.58; (15).[1]

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 2097, Dixieland Station, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual (legislative fund), Lakeland, Fla.
C. (2) In any legislation that affects the citrus industry.
D. (6) $2,499.99.
E. (4) $11.45; (5) $110.50; (6) $7.28; (8) $0.96; (9) $130.19; (10) $404.40; (11) $534.59.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 2097, Dixieland Station, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Government of Guam, an unincorporated Territory of the United States.
C. (2) Legislation affecting Guam. For omnibus bill making certain legislation applicable to Guam. Against legislation that would adversely affect Guam and for legislation that would be of assistance to Guam. For an act making National Guard Act applicable to Guam.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (8) $1.40; (9) $1.40; (10) $172.38; (11) $172.38.

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., Henry H. Glassie, and Thomas M. Cooley II, attorneys, doing business as Weaver & Glassie.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) All legislation which might affect the New Haven Railroad and its subsidiaries (the Connecticut Co., New England Transportation Co.)
D. (6) $2,300.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $55.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Basic Vegetable Products, Inc., Vacaville, Calif.; Gentry, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.; Pucinelli Packing Co., Turlock, Calif.; and J. R. Simplot Dehydrating Co., Caldwell, Idaho.
C. (2) Tariff and customs legislation, appropriations for Tariff Commission.
D. (6) $900.
E. (8) $1.92; (9) $1.92; (10) $27.25; (11) $29.17.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Mushroom Growers Cooperative Association and Cultivated Mushroom Institute of America, both of Kennett Square, Pa.
C. (2) Tariff, customs, and foreign trade legislation generally. Defense production legislation. Tariff Commission appropriations.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Parker Pen Co., Janesville, Wis., W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa, and Fountain Pen and Mechanical Pencil Mfrs. Assn., New York City.
C. (2) Tax legislation.
D. (6) $600.
E. (4) $178.55; (6) $3.50; (9) $182.05; (11) $182.05.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pin, Clip & Fastener Association, 74 Trinity Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Tariff, customs, and foreign trade legislation generally. Defense production legislation. Tariff Commission appropriations.
D. (6) $1,150.
E. (4) $5.45; (6) $99.26; (7) $39.75; (8) $0.84; (9) $145.30; (10) $509.85; (11) $655.15.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sunkist Growers, Inc., and California Walnut Growers Association, Los Angeles, Calif.; Northwest Nut Growers, Portland, Oreg.; and Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Agricultural and farmer cooperative matters. Tariffs, customs, and foreign trade legislation generally. Defense production legislation. Agriculture and Tariff Commission appropriations.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (4) $80.26; (6) $208.48; (7) $89.35; (8) $6.83; (9) $384.92; (10) $864.49; (11) $1,249.41; (15).[1]

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) (See explanatory statement).[1]

A. Stanley I. Posner and Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Institute of Diaper Services, 67 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests to secure deduction for income-tax purposes for amounts paid for antiseptic diaper service, H. R. 5502.
D. (6) $1,374.99.
E. (4) $16; (6) $16.31; (8) $80; (9) $112.31; (10) $318.34; (11) $430.65.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $1,125.
E. (10) $6.20.

A. John H. Pratt, 905 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of S. 589 and House Joint Resolution 104 and related legislation.
D. (6) $730.

A. William H. Press, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia, of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Charles M. Price, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For allowance of percentage depletion on gypsum.
E. (7) $374.43; (9) $374.43; (10) $686.53; (11) $1,060.96.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York City.

A. The Proprietary Association, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting the proprietary medicines industry.
E. (8) $125; (9) $125; (10) $386.80; (11) $511.80.

A. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) General legislative interests of client are those affecting foreign commerce of the United States, including tax and tariff legislation.
E. (6) $1.83; (8) $3.80; (9) $5.63; (10) $7.23; (11) $12.86.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street, Washington, D. C.
C. Legislation as may affect the development of an adequate American Merchant Marine.
D. (6) $468.75.
E. (7) $54.67; (9) $54.67; (10) $166.17; (11) $220.84.

A. Edmund R. Purves, American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating to architectural profession.
D. (6) $200.
E. (10) $337.48; (11) $337.48.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) General legislative interest in matters affecting railroads.
E. (7) $202.88; (9) $202.88; (10) $286.01; (11) $488.89.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., Room 607, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City; United Cerebral Palsy Association, 50 West 57th Street, New York City; Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York City, and National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.
C. (2) Public health. The specific interest is to present the need for adequate appropriations by the Federal Legislature for research in the fields of diseases which kill and disable people.
D. (6) $7,499.97.
E. (2) $844.98; (5) $1,690.67; (6) $372.39; (7) $2,093.70; (8) $570; (9) $5,571.74; (10) $8,948.87; (11) $14,520.61.

A. F. Miles Radison, 1200 18th Street NW. (510), Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, pp. 5 and 6.)[1]
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (7) $41.80; (8) $19; (9) $60.80; (10) $236.65; (11) $297.45.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Any legislation affecting the generation, transmission, and distribution of electrical energy by local publicly owned electric systems, and the management and operation of such systems.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry. Specific legislative interests are: Excise taxes, excess-profits taxes, Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and opposition to S. 24. (3) RETMA Industry Report.
E. (2) $2,130; (8) $405.57; (9) $2,535.57; (10) $9,096.12; (11) $11,631.69; (15).[1]

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. Enactment of 30-year, half-pay railroad retirement legislation.
D. (6) $90.40.
E. (4) $69.56; (5) $160.90; (6) $7.46; (8) $4.61; (9) $242.53; (10) $675.20; (11) $918.23.

A. Railway Business Association, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C.[1]
E. (4) $38.90; (6) $207.15; (9) $246.05; (10) $20.33; (11) $266.38.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting railroad labor.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetables Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the aviation industry. No specific bills at this time.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation involving silver; H. R. 2518, to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; S. 2555, to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.
D. (6) $4,249.98.
E. (7) $746.39; (9) $746.39; (10) $1,687; (11) $2,433.39.

A. Stanley Rector, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The overall field of social security. (3) The Advisor.
D. (6) $4,999.98.

A. Otie M. Reed, Wyatt Building, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers and dairy products manufacturing firms.
D. (6) $1,687.50.
E. (2) $1,687.50; (5) $150; (9) $1,837.50.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is protection and fostering of the interest of Federally regulated motor common carrier of general commodities.
E. (10) $6,101.95; (11) $6,101.95.

A. Mr. John C. Reid, Mr. Robert J. Bird, Ivins, Phillips & Barker, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of O. F. Woodward, 103 East Main Street, Rochester, N. Y.
C. (See attached statement.)[1]

A. Mr. John C. Reid, Mr. Robert J. Bird, Ivins, Phillips & Barker, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of O. F. Woodward, 103 East Main Street, Rochester, N. Y.
C. (See attached statement.)[1]

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) $475.
E. (7) $2; (9) $2; (10) $11.25; (11) $13.25.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) "The Reserve Officer."

A. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, regular and reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits and pensions. (3) "The Retired Officer."
D. (6) $29,474.55.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $9,001.
E. (2) $3,027.26; (4) $229.93; (5) $614.28; (6) $29.13; (7) $146.25; (8) $2,012.25; (9) $6,119.10; (10) $11,614.44; (11) $17,733.54; (15).[1]

A. Roland Rice, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference, of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest of registrant is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.

A. William M. Rice, 631 Tower Building, 14th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Engaged to advocate, before appropriate members and committees of the Congress and administrative agencies, amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2).
D. (6) $400.

A. Charles R. Richey, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (7) $164.44; (9) $164.44; (10) $433.53; (11) $597.97.

A. Siert F. Riepma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation which may relate to margarine.
E. (7) $12.65; (9) $12.65; (10) $25.60; (11) $38.25.

A. George D. Riley, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,600.
E. (6) $27.60; (7) $168; (8) $89.40; (9) $285; (10) $679; (11) $964.

A. H. J. Ripp, 10 Independence Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railway labor in particular and labor generally.
D. (6) $660.
E. (6) $3.65; (7) $380.60; (8) $45.62; (9) $429.87; (10) $126.29; (11) $556.16.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Water Conservation Conference.
C. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization, and conservation of natural resources, including bills to authorize

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

projects and appropriations for construction of projects.
E. (2) $428.81; (4) $94.54; (5) $150; (6) $25.06; (9) $696.41; (10) $1,488.43; (11) $2,186.84; (15).[1]

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers Association, postoffice box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
C. (2) Legislation that may affect or limit the right of American farmer to grow and market sugar beets.
D. (6) $190.
E. (2) $79.92; (4) $60.22; (5) $75; (7) $204.84; (8) $3.15; (9) $423.13; (10) $655.07; (11) $1,078.20; (15).[1]

A. Paul H. Robbins, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers, including UMT, Taft-Hartley Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Davis-Bacon Act, selective service, Armed Forces Reserve legislation, Defense Production Act, Hoover Commission bills, income-retirement legislation.
D. (6) $230.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry. (See attached sheets for specific bill numbers.)[1]
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (7) $16.50; (9) $16.50; (10) $67.25; (11) $83.75.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 911 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Federal legislation affecting the petroleum industry in Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, and Nevada.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See attached sheet.)[1]
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George B. Roscoe, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C., D., and E.[1]

A. Carlton H. Rose, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are confined to legislation affecting the operation of National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

A. Roland H. Rowe, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (See p. 3 attached.)[1]
D. (6) $36.30.
E. (10) $3.25; (11) $3.25.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $1,320.
E. (7) $327.52; (9) $327.52; (10) $77.50; (11) $405.02.

A. Francis M. Russell, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (7) $63.25; (9) $63.25; (10) $624.25; (11) $687.50.

A. Horace Russell, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the savings and loan business.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (10) $215.23; (11) $215.23.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $284.81; (9) $284.81; (10) $637.55; (11) $922.36.

A. William Henry Ryan, room 303, Medical Science Building, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District No. 44, I. A. of M., room 303, Medical Science Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $1,499.94.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (10) $30; (11) $45.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee (formerly Emergency Committee on Small and Medium-Size Magazine Publishers), 305 East 46th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in matters affecting second-class postal rates.
D. (6) $1,250.01.
E. (2) $58.75; (4) $117.36; (6) $147.51; (7) $224.37; (9) $547.99; (10) $474.54; (11) $1,022.53; (15).[1]

A. Charles E. Sands, 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Hotel & Restaurant Employees & Bartenders International Union, AFL., 525 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Labor and social legislation.
D. (7) $1,800.
E. (5) $111.25; (9) $11.25; (10) $204; (11) $315.25.

A. L. R. Sanford, Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Harrison Sasscer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of legislation and Federal relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $234.
E. (7) $37.60; (9) $37.60; (10) $30.80; (11) $68.40.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests are in legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health. (3) The American Journal of Nursing.
D. (6) $3,500.
E. (10) $557.99; (11) $557.99.

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
E. (10) $123.25; (11) $123.25.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting labor, in particular railway labor as well as labor generally.
D. (6) $640.
E. (7) $396.88; (9) $396.88; (10) $262.47; (11) $659.35.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Railroad retirement and unemployment insurance matters.
E. (10) $24.56; (11) $24.56.

A. John W. Scott, 317 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Harvey B. Jacobson, Clarence A. O'Brien, and Harvey B. Jacobson, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters before Congress which may affect the right of practitioners before the Patent Office to use advertising in the solicitation of patent and trade-mark business.
D. (6) $700.

A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. To establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $25; (9) $25; (10) $30; (11) $55.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) CCBS is opposed to any proposed legislation (such as S. 491 and H. R. 4004, 81st Cong.) calling for the duplication of class I–A clear channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I–A standard broadcast stations. CCBS opposes ratification of the so-called NARBA agreement signed November 15, 1950.
D. (6) (See p. 3.)[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (7) $26.40; (9) $26.40; (10) $36.75; (11) $63.15; (15).[1]

A. James D. Secrest, 777 14th St. NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry. Specific legislative interests are: Excise taxes; excess-profits taxes; Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; and opposition to S. 24. (3) RETMA.

A. Mr. Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating favorable labor legislation and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.
E. (7) $12; (9) $12; (10) $251.67; (11) $263.67.

A. A. Manning Shaw, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.
D. (6) $5,419.98.

A. A. Manning Shaw, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Detroit Edison Co., Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) S. 1442 enacted.

A. Mark R. Shaw, 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Favor economic aid to Europe and Asia, point 4, etc.; favor plans for universal disarmament, Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, etc.; favor full cooperation with U. N. for economic and social welfare, UNICEF; favor modification of the McCarran-Walter immigration law; favor extension of reciprocal trade; favor study of U. N. Charter revision; oppose UMT, UMS, military-aid program; oppose rearming Germany and Japan; other measures related to peace and war. (3) Peace action.
E. (7) $134.50; (9) $134.50; (10) $116.20; (11) $250.70.

A. Leander I. Smelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. The Port of New York Authority, New York, N. Y. (bistate agency); American Association of Port Authorities, Washington, D. C. (port association); Airport Operators Council, Washington, D. C. (airport association).
C.[1]
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (8) $1.38; (7) $270.74; (9) $272.12; (10) $362.57; (11) $634.69; (15).[1]

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $117.50.

A. Earl C. Shively, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.
D. (6) $304.37.
E. (7) $304.37; (9) $304.37; (11) $304.37.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Silver Users Association.
C. (2) Legislation regarding silver, S. 2555; to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.
D. (6) $35.
E. (2) $8,134.98; (5) $1,108.56; (6) $664.76; (7) $746.39; (8) $469.26; (9) $11,123.95; (10) $24,541.72; (11) $35,665.67; (12) $35,665.67.

A. Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's interest in the Colorado River, including S. 1438, Bridge Canyon bill; H. R. 4443, H. R. 4449, H. R. 4463, and S. 1555, Colorado River storage project; S. 964 and H. R. 236, Fryingpan-Arkansas project; and legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies.
D. (6) $7,800.
E. (2) $4,055; (8) $49.81; (9) $4,104.81; (10) $10,683.88; (11) $14,788.69; (15).[1]

A. Stephen Slipher, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See attached page).[1]
D. (6) $1,300.
E. (7) $15.10; (9) $15.10; (10) $44.15; (11) $59.25.

A. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, room 301, 305 East 46th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Postal legislation.
E. (2) $1,250.01; (4) $384.38; (5) $73.48; (6) $170.95; (7) $233.77; (8) $130.59; (9) $2,243.18; (10) $3,844.29; (11) $6,087.47.

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, 138 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation dealing with alcohol, narcotics, international relations, women and children.
D. (6) $601.02.
E. (5) $133.66; (6) $29.46; (9) $163.12; (10) $410.21; (11) $573.33.

A. Anthony W. Smith, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General: forestry, regional development, resource conservation, labor. Specific: Hope mining claims bill, Ellsworth timberlands exchange bill.
D. (6) $18.

A. George C. Smith, Jr., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests including Federal and private finance, and Government reorganization.
D. (6) $1,562.50.
E. (6) $3.46; (7) $149.59; (9) $153.05; (10) $923.44; (11) $1,076.49.

A. Harold O. Smith, Jr., 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, regulation of domestic transportation.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (10) $450.13; (11) $450.13.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting directly or indirectly the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. and the Great Northern Railway Co.
D. (6) $3,500.

A. Purcell L. Smith, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, pp. 5 and 6.[1]
D. (6) $16,250.01.
E. (6) $43.20; (7) $268.56; (8) $61.60; (9) $373.36; (10) $1,483.03; (11) $1,856.39; (15).[1]

A. Robert E. Smith, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General education concerning the effect of inflation on the purchasing value of life-insurance proceeds, as it relates to Federal policies or measures which are deemed to be inflationary, or inflationary-retarding, in character. (3).[1]
E. (7) $729.95; (9) $729.95; (10) $2,119.45; (11) $2,849.40; (12) $9,852.65; (13) $1,500; (14) $160.14; (15).[1]

A. Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
B. Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.

A. Calvin K. Snyder, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $3,437.50.
E. (6) $1.87; (7) $449.65; (9) $451.52; (10) $1,524.57; (11) $1,976.09.

A. J. D. Snyder, 1040 La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
D. (6) $825.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free-enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system. (3) Southern States Industrial Council Bulletin.
D. (6) $19,619.50.
E. (2) $16,608.70; (4) $5,754.31; (5) $1,940.78; (6) $156.94; (7) $308.16; (8) $378; (9) $25,146.89; (10) $51,371.59; (11) $76,516.48; (15).[1]

A. Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 20 East 93d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (4) $9; (5) $3.65; (6) $14.66; (9) $27.31; (10) $353.58; (11) $380.89.

A. A. L. Spradling, 1214 Griswold Street, Detroit, Mich.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL, 1214 Griswold Street, Detroit, Mich.
E. (10) $340.19; (11) $340.19.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 356, H. R. 5097, H. R. 5269, S. 1776, S. 1911, and all bills pending in Congress relative to increasing the benefits for the rank and file railroad employees, covered by the Railroad Retirement Act. (3) "Rail Pension News."
D. (6) $1,320.
E. (1) $214.50; (2) $1,320; (4) $1,400; (6) $73; (7) $318.53; (9) $3,326.03; (10) $6,719; (11) $10,045.03.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $150.
E. (7) $7.50; (9) $7.50; (10) $18.25; (11) $25.75.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart (Annalee), 1734 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1734 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See attached priorities program).[1] (3) Four Lights.
D. (6) $6,217.92.
E. (2) $4,594.57; (4) $157.05; (5) $2,156.26; (6) $183.32; (7) $173.77; (9) $7,264.97; (10) $21,716.21; (11) $28,981.18.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.
D. (6) $3,622.90.
E. (7) $105.25; (8) $17.65; (9) $122.90; (10) $645.60; (11) $768.50.

A. Erskine Stewart, Suite 808, Sheraton Building, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
C.[1]
D. (5) $375.
E. (8) $1.25; (9) $1.25; (10) $2.50; (11) $3.75.

A Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $2,536.50.
E. (7) $2.75; (8) $33.75; (9) $36.50; (10) $102.56; (11) $139.06; (15).[1]

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the American Merchant Marine and transportation generally.
D. (6) $1,000.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $50; (9) $50; (10) $90; (11) $140.

A. O. R. Strackbein, America's Wage Earner's Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., room 424, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 5894 (Trade Agreements bill).
D. (6) $6,000.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4317 (amendment of section 308 of the Tariff Act of 1930). H. R. 397 (amendment to Copyright Law).
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 5894 (Trade Agreements bill). H. R. 5877 (Customs Simplification bill).
D. (6) $3,000.

A. O. R. Strackbein, the National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, 815 15th Street, room 424, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 5894 (Trade Agreements bill). H. R. 5877 (Customs Simplification bill).
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Arthur D. Strong, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) All legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits.
D. (6) $1,224.30.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See p. 8.)[1]
D. (6) $625.
E. (10) $7.75; (11) $7.75.

A. Francis M. Sullivan, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1423 E. McMillan St., Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans.
D. (6) $2,906.60.

A. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States, 41 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The association is concerned with any legislation affecting the organic chemical industry, particularly in the field of foreign trade, tariff, and customs matters.
D. (6) $690.
E. (2) $589.62; (4) $96.31; (5) $110.20; (6) $18.47; (7) $44.22; (9) $858.82; (10) $295.05; (11) $1,153.87.

A. Barrett Godwin Tawresey, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Petitioner is interested in having the present Congress pass an appropriation act providing for payment of claims arising from French Spoliations where claims have heretofore been reported to Congress by the Court of Claims.

A. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 310 Commerce Building, Louisville, Ky.
C. (2) Advocating revision of section 101, IRC.
D. (6) $1,360.
E. (1) $1,250; (2) $146.25; (5) $135; (8) $5.04; (9) $1,536.29; (10) $2,023.21; (11) $3,559.50.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General interest in Federal excise tax legislation; specifically, excise tax on business and store machines.

A. Margaret K. Taylor, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.
D. (6) $2,447.80.
E. (8) $10.30; (9) $10.30; (10) $13.85; (11) $24.15.

A. Randolph S. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.
C. (2) All legislation which might affect tobacco growers, dealers, and warehousemen.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (7) $552.69; (8) $13.20; (9) $565.89; (10) $461.83; (11) $1,027.72.

A. Tyre Taylor, 1112 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.
D. (6) $2,462.37.
E. (5) $474.17; (6) $69.22; (9) $543.39; (10) $1,232.89; (11) $1,776.28; (15).[1]

A. Marjorie L. Temple, 1917 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (See attached statement.[1])

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev. The Union Pacific Railroad Co., the Western Pacific Railroad Co., Southern Pacific Co.
C. (2) All Senate and House bills and resolutions affecting the interests of Nevada railroads. St. Lawrence Waterway, H. R. 2685, H. R. 3203, S. 925, S. 1401, and S. 539.
D. (6) $675.
E. (7) $536.95; (9) $536.95; (10) $573.57; (11) $1,110.52; (15).[1]

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters affecting barge and towing-vessel industry and water transportation.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $6,166.66.
E. (7) $244.45; (9) $244.45; (10) $406.80; (11) $651.25.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 3850, Federal grants-in-aid to nursing education; legislation in area of social-security support; income-tax deductions for household help; revision of National Labor Relations Act; bills relating to various health programs are under study.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants. Specific (see p. 3).[1]
D. (6) $1,962.25.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislation pertaining to the pay of military personnel.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (10) $107.50; (11) $107.50.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (2) $500; (6) $100; (7) $150; (9) $750; (11) $750.

A. William H. Tinney, 211 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) (See attached statement.)[1]

A. S. G. Tipton, general counsel, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry in the public interests. (See p. 3 attached for specific legislative interests).[1]
D. (6) $1,983.17.
E. (7) $132.33; (9) $132.33; (10) $564.80; (11) $697.13.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.
D. (6) $2,253.91.
E. (7) $6.25; (8) $18.90; (9) $25.15; (10) $87.35; (11) $112.50; (15).[1]

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Any matters affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.
D. (6) $62.50.
E. (10) $34; (11) $34.

A. Wallace Townsend, 306 Commercial National Bank Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La.
C. (2) My only interest has been in the size of the appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration.
D. (6) $600.
E. (10) $270.56; (11) $270.56.

A. Matt Triggs, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Mexican farm labor importation; transportation legislation; grazing land; St. Lawrence seaway; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; flood control, Hells Canyon conservation program legislation; reclamation program legislation.
D. (6) $1,818.78.
E. (7) $32.05; (9) $32.05; (10) $227.22; (11) $259.27.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Plant Food Council, Inc., 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally interested in legislation affecting the fertilizer industry.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
C. (2) All bills which directly affect railroads of Oregon.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 50 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $999.99; (7) $264.77; (9) $1,264.76; (10) $2,476.93; (11) $3,741.69.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See appended statement.)[1]
D. (6) $56,252.79.
E. (1) $1,794.85; (9) $1,794.85; (10) $22,810.80; (11) $24,605.65; (15).[1]

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) (Schedule attached.)[1]
E. (2) $4,676.51; (4) $3,383.33; (5) $851.54; (6) $5.38; (7) $15.10; (8) $495.55; (9) $9,427.41; (10) $25,778.01; (11) $35,205.42; (15).[1]

A. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. John E. Walker, 631 Tower Building, 14th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2).

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.)[1]
D. (6) $7,000.02.
E. (7) $361.06; (8) $110.70; (9) $471.76; (10) $1,297.01; (11) $1,768.77; (15).[1]

A. Thomas G. Walters, Government Employees' Council, A. F. of L., room 509, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employees' Council, A. F. of L., room 509, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Milo J. Warner, 904 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio.
B. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) Attention to legislation which may affect the interests of the mutual policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.
D. (7) $5,000.
E. (6) $25.38; (7) $578.50; (9) $603.88; (10) $1,365.82; (11) $1,969.70.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia, of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.
D and E.[1]

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, 616-623 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 999, District of Columbia Charter Act.
D. (6) $381.75.
E. (1) $350; (2) $417.57; (3) $925.83; (4) $898.66; (5) $1,237.85; (6) $194.49; (7) $245.48; (8) $793.01; (9) $5,062.89; (10) $4,069.88; (11) $9,132.77; (15).[1]

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. J. R. Watson, room 1, C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads in Mississippi.
E. (10) $130.23; (11) $130.23.

A. Newton Patrick Weathersby, room 303, Medical Science Building, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Medical Science Building, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $1,999.98.
E. (7) $25; (9) $25; (10) $50; (11) $75.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., Henry H. Glassie, and Thomas M. Cooley II, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, a committee comprised of executives of the National Association of Master Plumbers, National Electric Contractors Association, Inc., and the Heating, Piping, Air Conditioning Contractors National Association, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation respecting mechanical specialty contracting industries, and in any legislation dealing with contracting or subcontracting by the Government, Government construction contracts, public works and building. In particular they are interested in legislation forbidding unqualified and inexperienced contractors from under-

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

taking mechanical specialty work on a cost-plus basis and forbidding bid-shopping after award of fixed-price contracts unless the net saving therefrom accrues to the Government.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (4) $28.55; (6) $111.66; (7) $94.11; (8) $71.28; (9) $305.60; (10) $1,125.01; (11) $1,430.61.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., Henry H. Glassie, and Thomas M. Cooley II, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $1,696.60.
E. (5) $1; (7) $86.69; (8) $255.50; (9) $343.19; (10) $930.96; (11) $1,274.15; (12) $10; (15).[1]

A. E. E. Webster, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Eighteen bills repealing dual-benefits provision of Railroad Retirement Act. All bills affecting railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $993.41.

A. Wayne M. Weishaar, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Wayne M. Weishaar, Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (3) $2; (4) $32.18; (9) $34.18; (10) $55.83; (11) $90.01.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 3147 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 50 West 77th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) (See attached sheet).[1]
D. (6) $2,083.30.
E. (5) $42.21; (6) $16.13; (7) $383.48; (8) $18.61; (9) $460.43; (10) $788.12; (11) $1,248.55.

A. Western Cotton Growers Association of California, 2201 F Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
C. (2) Securing equitable cotton acreage allotment for California. Agricultural Adjustment Act, 1938.
E. (2) $1,500; (6) $541.12; (7) $2,303.69; (8) $564.63; (9) $4,909.44; (10) $3,154.28; (11) $8,063.72; (15).[1]

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, suite 1002-1003, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting livestock and meat-packing industry, supporting or opposing such legislation as it affects the interests of the industry. Opposed socialization of industry and agriculture and undue Government intervention.
D. (6) $10,695.09.
E. (7) $18.77; (9) $18.77; (10) $232.16; (11) $250.93.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. George Y. Wheeler, II, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (10) $25; (11) $25.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (7) $40; (8) $20; (9) $60; (10) $155.02; (11) $215.02.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry directly.

A. Albert V. Whitehall, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,937.49.
E. (7) $419.68; (9) $419.68; (10) $841.79; (11) $1,261.47.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all legislation particularly affecting the interests of manufacturers of gas appliances and equipment.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All measures affecting taxation of mutual fire and casualty insurance.
D. (6) $2,121.88.
E. (2) $1,500; (5) $427.85; (6) $15.62; (7) $178.41; (9) $2,121.88; (10) $5,270.45; (11) $7,392.33; (15).[1]

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees, and principally the Committees on Armed Services, the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities, and obligations of the personnel involved. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Williams, Myers & Quiggle, 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Opposition to legislation tending to destroy the effectiveness of the antitrust laws to the detriment of free competition. Opposition to H. R. 635, H. R. 3501, H. R. 4170, R. H. 4931, S. 540, S. 1377. Support of legislation which would strengthen the effectiveness of the antitrust laws. Support of S. 1357 and H. R. 5848. (All of the above bills to amend the Robinson-Patman Act.)
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $6; (9) $6; (11) $6.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, Inc.
C.[1]
D. (6) $43.78.
E. (4) $43.78; (9) $43.78; (10) $1,033.61; (11) $1,077.39.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (See page 3 attached).[1]
D. (6) $1,812.50.
E. (6) $16.58; (7) $77.03; (9) $93.61; (10) $259.79; (11) $353.40.

A. Frank E. Wilson, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $800.
E. (7) $279.75; (9) $279.75; (10) $1,841.33; (11) $2,121.08.

A. Everett T. Winter, Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American Merchant Marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $164.94; (9) $164.94; (10) $1,156.59; (11) $1,321.53.

A. Walter F. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., et al., Keltys, Tex.
C. (2) Generally legislation affecting Texas railroads.
D. (6) $6,757.22.
E. (6) $106.43; (7) $1,539.21; (9) $1,645.64; (10) $3,750.86; (11) $5,396.50; (15).[1]

A. Edward W. Wootton, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) General—Legislation affecting California wine and brandy industry.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See attachment A.)[1]
D. (6) $646.74.
E. (6) $8.76; (9) $8.76; (10) $144.24; (11) $153.

A. J. Banks Young, 1632 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

A. O. David Zimring, 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 3, Ill., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B and C.[1]
E. (10) $2,173.49; (11) $2,173.49.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1953:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy, questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____ ←

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report. ←

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1 ←

A. Arthur A. Allen, Jr., 312 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. (See statement attached).[1]
C. (2) To support measures deemed to be in the interest of the railroads, members of the association, and in the interest of a sound national transportation policy, and to oppose measures deemed to be contrary to those interests.

A. Gibbs L. Baker, 1044 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Mastercraft Linen Fabrics Corp., 1071 6th Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Frederick J. Fawcett, Inc., 129 South Street, Boston, Mass.; and Hughes-Fawcett, Inc., 115 Franklin Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Introduction and enactment of tariff legislation.

A. Helen Berthelot, CWA-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.

A. Hyman H. Bookbinder, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation concerned with the general welfare, international peace, security, democracy and economic well-being of the Nation; oppose all legislation deemed detrimental to these objectives.

A. Robert T. Borth, General Electric Co., Wyatt Building, 777 14th Street, Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (See Rider "A".)[1]

A. Lawrence V. Byrnes, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting labor and transportation.

A. William E. Chace, 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Group Attitudes Corp., 500 5th Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To promote the O'Hara bill (H. R. 2739).

A. Hyman J. Cohen, Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturer's Agents National Association, 1008 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting manufacturer's agents in Washington.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Salt Producers Association, 726 La Salle Street, Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Generally all matters affecting the salt industry. Specifically current hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee on taxation, especially as it relates to depletion.

A. Robert M. Creaghead, 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Group Attitudes Corp., 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To promote the O'Hara bill (H. R. 2739). (4) $100 per month compensation.

A. Wesley E. Disney, 501 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Thomas J. Green and Edward Simone, 70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In favor of proposed repeal of tax on preferred stock of banks which have made loans or issued preferred stock to Reconstruction Finance Corporation. (4) Retainer of $2,500 received from Edward R. Simone. Additional fee undetermined.

A. John F. Gale, The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy. (4) Of salary received by me during the quarter, $20 may be allocable to legislative interests.

A. Gordon A. Grant, 709 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Protestant Church-Owned Publishers' Association, 709 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) My general legislative interest will be in reporting on matters affecting the welfare of nonprofit religious publishers.

A. Group Attitudes Corp., 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To promote the O'Hara bill (H. R. 2739). (4) $500 per month expenses; $4,000 per month compensation.

A. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For H. R. 3897, percentage depletion on gypsum rock. (3) The Gypsum Industry's Case for Percentage Depletion. (4) Estimated at $20,000 for mimeographing, telephone calls, traveling expenses and fees of law firm which is our general counsel and of which employees named above are partners.

A. Jess Halsted, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For H. R. 3897, percentage depletion on gypsum rock. (3) The Gypsum Industry's Case for Percentage Depletion. (4) Estimated $5,000 to reimburse for traveling expenses and pay fee at regular per diem rate of $150–$200 per day as lawyer.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 5969, section 622. (4) Edwin C. Barringer, salary quarterly $200, nominal expenditures; Benjamin Z. Katz, salary quarterly $100, nominal expenditures.

A. Raymond Kay, 206 First Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Mail-Users Association of America, Inc., 206 First Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 6052, S. Res. 49, and other similar bills affecting postage rates, rules and regulations, etc. Also, any and all bills affecting printing, publishing, and related matters, including taxation and tariffs covering the same.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Harry C. Trexler (a charitable trust), 1227 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
C. (2) Seeking amendment to section 421 (c), Internal Revenue Code, to alleviate hardships of tax on income of charities.

A. John T. Koehler, 1039 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation authorizing final settlement of claims arising from the requisitioning of 40 Danish vessels by the United States in 1941. (a) To provide for the payment of the balance of the compensation promised in connection with the requisition in 1941 of 40 Danish vessels. (b) S. 2237. (d) For. (4) Anticipated expenses—nominal, not estimated to be in excess of $50—local transportation, etc. Rate of compensation—$350 per day.

A. Louis Kranitz, Krug Building, St. Joseph, Mo.
B. Claimants listed in H. R. 6749.
C. (2) H. R. 6749—A bill for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered property damage or other loss as a result of the flood of the Missouri River, in the vicinity of Kickapoo Bend, south of St. Joseph, Mo., in January–March 1949.

A. A. M. Lampley, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen in particular, and railroad workers in general. H. R. 359 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act. (4) $11,000 per year salary.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Salt Producers Association, 726 LaSalle Street, Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Generally all matters affecting the salt industry. Specifically current hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee on taxation, especially as it relates to depletion.

A. Charles G. Lavin, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Hillcrest Hospital, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Tax amortization and other legislation favorable to proprietary hospitals. (4) a. Anticipated expenses; Secretarial services, telephone, supplies, etc.—not to exceed $500. b. Anticipated compensation: $50 a day—not to exceed 100 days.

A. Alva F. Lindsay, Kirkpatrick Building, St. Joseph, Mo.
B. Claimants listed in H. R. 6749.
C. (2) H. R. 6749—A bill for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered property damage or other loss as a result of the flood of the Missouri River, in the vicinity of Kickapoo Bend, south of St. Joseph, Mo., in January–March 1949.

A. Richard K. Lyon, 700 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Claimants listed in H. R. 6749.
C. (2) H. R. 6749—A bill for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered property damage or other loss as a result of the flood of the Missouri River, in the vicinity of Kickapoo Bend, south of St. Joseph, Mo., in January–March 1949.

A. Mail Users Association of America, Inc., 206 First Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 6052, Senate Resolution 49 and other similar bills affecting postage rates, rules and regulations, etc. Also, any and all bills affecting printing, publishing, and related matters including taxation and tariffs covering the same.

A. John G. Mapes, 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. and 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Group Attitudes Corporation, 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) To promote the O'Hara bill (H. R. 2739). (4) $100 per month compensation.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Ford Motor Co., 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
C. (See attached statement).[1]

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Nellie Buckingham, care of Northern Trust Co., Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The estate favors amending section 208 of H. R. 6426. (4) Ordinary out-of-pocket expenses of lawyers, not to exceed $100. Compensation will be paid for this representation; amount to be agreed upon.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Demarest Lloyd, care of Harry Olins, 31 State Street, Boston, Mass.
C. (2) The estate favors the passage of H. R. 6440. (4) Ordinary out-of-pocket expenses of lawyers, not to exceed $100. Compensation will be paid for this representation; amount to be agreed upon.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fidelity & Casualty Co., Insurance Building, Richmond, Va.
C. (2) Amendment to section 273 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury may abate a jeopardy assessment when, in fact, no jeopardy exists.

A. Charles M. Price, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For H. R. 3897, percentage depletion on gypsum rock. (3) The Gypsum Industry's Case for Percentage Depletion. (4) $5,000 (in addition to expended amounts shown on p. 2 hereof) estimated to reimburse for traveling expenses and for fee at regular per diem of $200–$250 as a lawyer.

A. Harry N. Rosenfield, 3600 38th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Safety Council, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) A bill to incorporate the National Safety Council, S. 1105, H. R. 1985.

A. Delbert L. Rucker, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy. (4) Of salary received by me during the quarter, $20 may be allocable to legislative interests.

A. James D. Secrest, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry. Specific legislative interests are: Excise taxes, excess profits taxes, Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and opposition to S. 24. (3) RETMA Industry Report. (4) No specific expenses anticipated; monthly rate of compensation is $1,666.67.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Jane Stewart, 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Group Attitudes Corp., 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To promote the O'Hara bill (H. R. 2739). (4) $100 per month compensation.

A. Bernard H. Topkis, 1316 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Hickory Handle Association, care of B. Holthouse, Waynesboro, Tenn.
C. (2) Reciprocal trade legislation.

A. Qualfe M. Ward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (4) Annual rate of compensation, $4,000; anticipated annual expenses, $200 (travel).

A. Richard H. Wels, Moss & Wels, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting in any way the bowling industry.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, whose word is hidden in the framework of the world, shines in the mind of man, and is made flesh in that holy One who unveils Thy heart: We can know Thee only in part, but we know what goodness is, and we believe that Thou art good; we know what justice is, and we believe that Thou art just; we know what love is, and we believe that Thou art love. Thou hast made all things dependent upon Thee for their existence and Thou hast made our hearts so that they are restless until they rest in Thee. Yet we confess that we have so often not made it our chief concern to establish a life of communion with Thee; we have been slack in prayer and careless in living; we have not hungered and thirsted after righteousness. Yet Thou art the love that will not let us go. Help us to yield our flickering torch to Thee, to give Thee back the life we owe, that in Thine ocean depths its flow may richer, fuller be. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARRETT thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 10, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 395. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice;

H. R. 1129. An act for the relief of Katina Panagioti Fifflis and Theodore Panagiotou Fifflis;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Lamb;

H. R. 1516. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clemtine De Ryck;

H. R. 1674. An act for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler;

H. R. 2021. An act for the relief of Clarence R. Seiler and other employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 2618. An act for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez;

H. R. 2633. An act for the relief of Lee Sig Cheu;

H. R. 2813. An act for the relief of William E. Aitcheson;

H. R. 2839. An act to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands;

H. R. 2842. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 2885. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii to issue a right of purchase lease to Edward C. Searle;

H. R. 3027. An act for the relief of Tamiko Nagae;

H. R. 3228. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ursula Eichner Clawges;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of John James T. Bell;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of Eiko Tanaka;

H. R. 3619. An act for the relief of Rufin Manikowski;

H. R. 3728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Bonanno (nee Koubek);

H. R. 3733. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder;

H. R. 4439. An act for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham;

H. R. 4577. An act for the relief of Edith Maria Gore;

H. R. 4972. An act for the relief of John Jeremiah Botelho;

H. R. 5195. An act for the relief of Max Kassner;

H. R. 5379. An act to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication;

H. R. 5861. An act to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government;

H. R. 5945. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States;

H. R. 5959. An act to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government which retired officers may receive; and

H. J. Res. 356. Joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its work today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REIMBURSEMENT OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR HANDLING FRANKED MAIL

A letter from the Postmaster General, requesting that the amount of $1,169,700 be substituted for $1,890,905, recommended by him in his letter of December 2, 1953 (laid before the Senate on January 7, 1954), as the amount the Post Office Department should be reimbursed for handling franked mail for the year 1954; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of several aliens from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, heretofore transmitted to the Senate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED RENEWAL OF CONCESSION PERMIT, WILLOW BEACH, LAKE MEAD NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, NEVADA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed renewal of a concession permit at Willow Beach, in Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nevada (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AWARDS OF CONCESSION PERMITS, LAKE MCDONALD, GLACIER NATIONAL PARK, MONT., AND BIG BEND NATIONAL PARK, TEX.

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed awards of concession permits at Lake McDonald, in Glacier National Park, Mont., and the Big Bend National Park, Tex. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ABOLITION OF OLD KASAAN NATIONAL MONUMENT, ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MR. WILLIAM HENRY DIMENT, MRS. MARY ELLEN DIMENT, AND MRS. GLADYS EVERINGHAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Mr. William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TAXATION OF INTEREST FROM CERTAIN STATE AND MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS — RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, OWATONNA, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Owatonna, Minn., on February 2, opposing taxation of interest from certain State and municipal obligations, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution opposing proposition for the taxation of interest from certain State and municipal obligations

Whereas it has been made to appear to the city council of the city of Owatonna, Minn., that the United States House Ways and Means Committee has provisionally voted for a general revenue revision bill of 1954 which will contain provisions providing for (1) Federal income taxation of interest received from future issues of municipal housing authority bonds; and (2) Federal income taxation of interest received from revenue bonds issued by States or municipalities for industrial development purposes; and

Whereas it appears that such provisions would tend to destroy the constitutional tax immunity of State and municipal bonds; and

Whereas it has been made to appear to said council that if such proposed revision were in effect, such municipal obligation interest rate costs would increase between 1 and 1½ percent, which would result in an added cost to municipal taxpayers of millions of dollars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Owatonna, Minn. (*five aldermen being present*), That said city object to and oppose any such revision in Federal legislation, and that certified copies of this resolution be sent to the United States Representative and Senator of the people of the city of Owatonna in voicing its objection.

Passed and adopted this 2d day of February 1954.

Approved and signed this 3d day of February 1954.

T. E. CARROLL,
Mayor.

Attest:

LAWRENCE R. HABERMAN,
City Clerk.

TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF MUNICIPAL BONDS—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, BRAINERD, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Brainerd, Minn., on February 1, 1954, opposing any attempt to repeal the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the city of Brainerd is vitally interested in its ability to finance itself in its various governmental activities through the sale of municipal bonds; and

Whereas the burden imposed upon the city and village units of government has grown substantially more and more heavy due to the increased demand for service by the public at the municipal level; and

Whereas this burden has been further increased by the taking away by the State and Federal governments of more and more traditional sources long used by municipalities to finance their activities; and

Whereas any further increase in this burden will further jeopardize the ability of the municipal unit of government to function and perform the services required of it; and

Whereas the removal of the tax exemption from municipal bonds will substantially increase the cost of financing needed municipal improvements; and

Whereas a tax of any type imposed upon public power systems will likewise further burden the many operations of this type conducted by municipalities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Brainerd, That the city of Brainerd opposes any attempt to repeal the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds; be it further

Resolved, That the city of Brainerd opposes any attempt or proposal to tax municipal operated power systems.

Adopted this 1st day of February 1954.

GEO. W. KRUEGER,
President of the Council.

Approved this 2d day of February 1954.

LEVI JOHNSON,
Mayor.

Attest:

WALTER FALL,
City Clerk.

TAX ON MUNICIPAL BONDS—TELEGRAM FROM MAYOR OF ST. CLOUD, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram which I have received from Mayor George Byers of the city of St. Cloud, Minn., protesting any attempt of the Federal Government to tax municipal bonds, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. CLOUD, MINN., *February 6, 1954.*

Senator HUMPHREY,
United States Senate:

City of St. Cloud vigorously protests any attempt of Federal Government to tax municipal bonds. Tax immunity of the State is right guaranteed under our Constitution. We insist that right be protected. No hearing has been held on this matter. We request your assistance in obtaining a hearing on the issue. A motion for reconsideration of these matters should be made before the bill is presented on the floor. Please contact House Ways and Means Committee expressing our views.

We respectfully request that you exert efforts on behalf of St. Cloud and other cities on segment 5, route 86, of Northwest Airlines to have CAB hearing on airlines attempt to withdraw from all cities on segment 5 held in Twin City area.

Mayor GEORGE BYERS.

SOCIAL-SECURITY PLAN FOR ALL VILLAGE AND GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES—LETTER FROM VILLAGE CLERK, HIBBING, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from Roy E. Mickelson, village clerk of Hibbing, Minn., favoring a general social-security plan for all village and governmental employees, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VILLAGE OF HIBBING,
Hibbing, Minn., February 6, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is to advise that the Hibbing Village Council at a meeting held February 4, 1954, took action to the effect that the council go on record as favoring a general social-security plan for all village and governmental employees, with the choice of those now belonging to other pension plans to retain same if they desire, unless such persons desire to avail themselves of social-security benefits.

I have been instructed to advise you of this action of the village council. On behalf of the council I desire to take this opportunity of soliciting your full support and cooperation in furthering the proposed measure which will provide social-security benefits for village employees. I know of my own knowledge that all of our employees decidedly favor social security, with the exception, of course, of those employed in the police and fire departments, they having had a pension plan of their own for a great number of years.

I would appreciate also receiving a copy of the proposed bill for the files in this office.

Thanking you for any assistance you may render in connection with this matter, and assuring you it will be appreciated and remembered, not only by the members of the council but our employees as well, who are very much interested, I am

Very truly yours,

ROY E. MICKELSON,
Village Clerk.

INCLUSION OF MINISTERS UNDER SOCIAL-SECURITY LAW—LETTER FROM NORTHEAST MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the Northeast Ministerial Association, Minneapolis, Minn., requesting that ministers be granted the privilege of participating in the social-security program, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHEAST MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 4, 1954.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: As Christian citizens of our country, we, as members of the Northeast Ministerial Association of Minneapolis would like to have the privilege of participating in the social-security program of the United States of America.

Whatever you may be able to do to make this desire a reality will be much appreciated.

We are praying that you will be given the wisdom of Christ the Lord for all your deliberations.

Respectfully yours,

Rev. HAROLD MCCLURE,
Vice President.

TAX EXEMPTION OF $125 PER MONTH FROM RETIREMENT INCOME—LETTER FROM MINNESOTA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the Minnesota Education Association, St. Paul, Minn., in support of the so-called Mason bill (H. R. 5180) to amend section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide that $125 per month of retirement income shall be nontaxable, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
St. Paul, Minn., February 4, 1954.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to call to your attention that the Minnesota Education Association, speaking for the more than 20,000 teachers of Minnesota, did unanimously urge favorable consideration of H. R. 5180, otherwise known as the Mason bill.

It is unnecessary to point out that teacher annuitants must under current exemption provisions pay up to and beyond $100 in Federal income taxes in many instances. When one considers that the retirement annuity is often the only means of subsistence the annuitant has, it becomes readily clear that relief by the Federal Government would be an act of public interest in that it would increase the ability of annuitants to maintain their independence.

There is, further, discrimination among annuitant groups in that teachers do not enjoy the same degree of exemption as that allowed for some other bodies of workers. H. R. 5180 would to an extent remove these discrepancies.

We are currently, throughout the Nation, seeking to interest young people to enter teaching and to reduce the shortage due to the ever-increasing number of children in our schools. The future of our country depends on the proper education of these children. An improved retirement situation would be an inducement of no small moment in attracting young men and women to teaching as a career and to holding them throughout a long period of service.

We respectfully bespeak your influence in securing favorable action on H. R. 5180.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER E. ENGLUND,
Executive Secretary.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, SOUTH ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of South St. Paul, on February 1, 1954, in regard to the Natural Gas Act, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That the City Council of the City of South St. Paul go on record as approving the passage of "a bill for an act to amend section 4 (e) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U. S. C. 717c)"; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of the resolution be forwarded to HUBERT E. HUMPHREY, United States Senator in Congress; JOSEPH O'HARA, United States Representative in Congress; and EDWARD J. THYE, United States Senator in Congress.

Adopted by the city council February 1, 1954.

Approved February 3, 1954.

FRANK J. PETRICH, *Mayor.*

FARM PRICE PROGRAM—LETTER FROM LANCASTER (MINN.) BUSINESSMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the Lancaster Businessmen's Association, Lancaster, Minn., in support of a strong farm price program, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LANCASTER BUSINESSMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Lancaster, Minn., January 19, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At our regular January meeting it was moved, seconded, and unanimously carried, that the Lancaster Businessmen's

Association go on record and support a strong farm price program.

We urge you to do your utmost in support of this farm price program.

Yours very truly,

SIMON ELLEFSON,
Secretary.

PRICE SUPPORTS FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS—TELEGRAM FROM CAMBRIDGE (MINN.) BUSINESS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram which I have received from the Cambridge Business Association, Cambridge, Minn., urging continuation of price support for dairy products at the present level, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMBRIDGE, MINN., *February 7, 1954.*

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully request you support legislation continuing price support for dairy products at present level. While Government subsidy is not permanent solution dairy industry must have price support until it can adjust itself to inroads made by butter substitutes. If price support is lowered now dairy farmers cannot survive.

CAMBRIDGE BUSINESS ASSOCIATION,
A. G. ENGBERG, *Secretary.*

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. IVES, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2930. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 2931. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy at Great Falls, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 2932. A bill to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Fort Peck Tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 2933. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act so as to provide for assistance under such act in the restoration of pasture land which has been damaged by drought or insects and the placing of protective vegetative cover on croplands which are not to be tilled for an extended period; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 2934. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, relating to emergency feed and seed assistance to farmers, ranchers, and stockmen in connection with major disasters; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2935. A bill for the relief of Chew Shee Woo; and

S. 2936. A bill for the relief of Elisa Palumbo Castaldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2937. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing without meeting the requirements of section 15 (8) (b) (ii) of that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and myself, and such other Members of the Senate as may care to join us, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is jointly sponsored by all standard railway labor organizations to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

The bill which I have introduced liberalizes the railroad retirement system and makes certain adjustments in regard to benefits.

The changes which it proposes can be summarized, as follows:

First. Widows' benefits at age 60: Under present law aged widows are not eligible for survivor benefits until age 65. The bill reduces the eligibility age to 60.

Second. Disability work clause: Under present law, a disability annuitant is deemed recovered if he earns more than $75 in each of 6 consecutive months. The bill provides for withholding the annuity in any month in which more than $100 is earned. This will remove hardships on the one hand, and eliminate abuses on the other.

Third. Survivor's benefits for disabled children and widowed mothers: Under present law, a widowed mother and her child cease getting survivor's benefits when the child reaches age 18 even though the child may be completely disabled for any employment. The bill provides that if the child is permanently and totally disabled, the survivor's benefits to the widowed mother and child will continue beyond age 18.

Fourth. Maximum creditable and taxable compensation: Under present law, the maximum compensation that is taxable and creditable for both railroad retirement and unemployment insurance purposes is $300 per month. The bill increases this maximum to $350 both for tax purposes and for credit toward benefits under both the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance systems. In connection with establishing the new benefit rates for crediting this additional compensation under the Unemployment Insurance Act, it is also provided that the daily benefit rate shall not be less than one-half the last daily rate of pay at which he worked in railroad employment, but with a maximum of $8.

Fifth. Crediting of compensation earned after age 65: Under present law, compensation earned after retirement age is used in computing the annuity even though through lower earnings in later years this operates to reduce the annuity. The bill provides for disregarding such compensation (though crediting the service) if using such compensation would reduce the annuity.

Sixth. Receipt of both survivor annuity and retirement annuity: Under present law, a widow who has had railroad employment and is eligible for a retirement annuity in her own right and who would also be eligible for a survivor annuity by reason of her husband's employment has the latter offset against the former and cannot receive both; the bill provides for both to be paid.

Seventh. Delegates to conventions: Under present law, service as a delegate to a labor organization convention is covered employment. These conventions frequently include delegates from units outside the railroad industry or outside the country who have no other covered employment. The accumulation of these trifling credits is of no substantial value compared with the nuisance of recording it and collecting the taxes on it. The bill excludes such service from coverage where the individual has no other covered employment.

Mr. President, I request that, by unanimous consent, there be printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks a letter which I have received from the railroad brotherhoods requesting that this proposed legislation be introduced.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 11, 1954.*

Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to advise that all the standard railroad-labor unions, including the four train and engine service brotherhoods and all the organizations identified with the Railway Labor Executives' Association, are in full agreement and in support of the draft bill which has been delivered to your office by Messrs. Johnson and Kolanda, which would amend the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance systems. For your ready reference, these recognized standard railroad-labor organizations are listed below:

Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; Order of Railroad Conductors; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; Switchmen's Union of North America; the Order of Railroad Telegraphers; American Train Dispatchers' Association; Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L.; International Association of Machinists; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America; Sheet Metal Workers National Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and

Station Employes; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America; National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; International Longshoremen's Association; Hotel and Restaurant Employes and Bartenders International Union; Railroad Yardmasters of America; Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

The above organizations represent substantially all the railroad workers in the United States. We will be very grateful to you if you will introduce this bill and do all you consistently can to expedite its prompt consideration.

Respectfully yours,

LAWRENCE V. BYRNES,
Assistant Grand Chief Engineer and National Legislative Representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

A. M. LAMPLEY,
Vice President, National Legislative Representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

W. D. JOHNSON,
Vice President and National Legislative Representative, Order of Railroad Conductors.

HARRY SEE,
National Legislative Representative, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. E. LYON,
Executive Secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association.

The bill (S. 2930) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. IVES, and Mr. KENNEDY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED AIR FORCE ACADEMY, GREAT FALLS, MONT.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy at Great Falls, Mont., and for other purposes. On January 30, 1954, I wrote a letter to Hon. Harold E. Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force. I ask unanimous consent to have my letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 30, 1954.

HON. HAROLD E. TALBOTT,
Secretary of the Air Force,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of the fact that the House has passed a bill approving the establishment of an Air Academy and in view of the possibility that this bill will be before the Senate shortly, I should like to call to your attention the possibility of your giving every consideration to the designation of Great Falls, Mont., as the designated site for this new installation.

In my opinion the Great Falls Airbase is the most important air installation in the United States and, as you will recall, during World War II we shipped over 7,000 combat planes of all types from that base to Alaska for eventual shipment to Siberia and the western front. This is an important factor to consider because in case of an all-out war what once was a one-way street may in fact become a two-way avenue of approach. As we all know, the shortest distance and perhaps the most effective way to carry out an aerial attack against this country would be from over the polar regions.

It may be of interest to note that in recent years the Soviet Union has made a definite shift in its offensive power to northeast Siberia, from which area that power could form a direct threat to the American Continent. Preparations for this drastic change of strategy, I am informed, began in 1950 when the Soviets began building air bases with 2,500-yard runways at various bases on the north Siberian coast. In addition to that it is my understanding that they have put many thousands of their slave laborers to work on a new railroad track connecting Chita in mid-Siberia on the trans-Siberian line with Chukotsk naval base on the Bering Straits. Until January 1953, all of this area was under the command of Marshal R. J. Malinovski. After Stalin's death, however, Malenkov separated northeast Siberia from Malinovski's command and turned it into a military district of its own. Headquarters for this new district have been established in Anadyr, and the man supposedly designated to head this new district is Lt. Gen. Sergi M. Shtemenko. According to my information, Shtemenko is today in charge of at least nine Red army divisions including four paratroop brigades. He has under his command somewhere between 5,000 to 6,000 aircraft composed of C–47's, B–29's, MIG–15 jet fighters, and TU–4 bombers. This information indicates just how serious the Soviet Union considers northeastern Siberia, and it should certainly make us realize how important our Alaskan Air Command is and how in conjunction with that command the airbase at Great Falls becomes. Recently, the Great Falls Airbase became one of the operating fields for the Strategic Air Command. Everyone knows of course what the primary mission of the Strategic Air Command is, and the movement to Great Falls only adds up to a renewed significance of that particular base.

In addition to its strategic position Great Falls has ideal weather conditions the year round with as many full and partial flying days as any of the southern areas where the bulk of Air Force training is now carried out. If the proposed Air Academy were placed in Great Falls, cadets and trainees would have the advantage of flying and maintenance training under all weather conditions.

I urge, therefore, that when the bill for the proposed Air Academy passes the Senate, as I am confident it will, that you give every possible consideration to the establishment of this Academy at Great Falls, Mont. I can assure you that the local people would be most happy to have this installation, and I am certain that in view of the statements I have made, you and your staff will give this matter your most earnest and serious consideration.

Must close now, but with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

The bill (S. 2931) to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy at Great Falls, Mont., and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ASSISTANCE IN RESTORATION OF PASTURE LAND

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act so as to provide for assistance under such act in the restoration of pasture land which has been damaged by drought or insects and the placing of protective vegetative cover on croplands which are not to be tilled for an extended period. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2933) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act so as to provide for assistance under such act in the restoration of pasture land which has been damaged by drought or insects and the placing of protective vegetative cover on croplands which are not to be tilled for an extended period, introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. CLEMENTS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLEMENTS

The last 2 years have seen the greater part of Kentucky suffer one of the worst droughts in its recorded history. Cropland and pastures have been ravaged by sun, heat, and wind that have left thousands of acres of once-fine productive farmland momentarily useless and open to destruction by erosion. Since the inception of the drought assistance program carried out by the Department of Agriculture, 77 counties in the State have been designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as eligible for Federal drought aid, with many more counties in such condition that they should be designated without further delay. Hay and other forage crops have been completely consumed many months ago, and beef cattle and dairy herds maintained by the farmers of the State are rapidly being decimated for lack of food supplies.

In the preparation of the 1954 Agricultural Conservation Programs Handbook, several of the county committees in Kentucky strongly recommended that practices be included in the 1954 program that would hasten the restoration of pasture and croplands that were severely damaged by drought and insects. Such practices are authorized under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, but have been disapproved by the Secretary as being emergency measures outside the concept of the ACP program. Being well acquainted by now with the philosophy of the present Secretary of Agriculture of waiting until disaster has taken its toll before offering aid to the farmers, I am introducing this morning a bill to make it mandatory that practices designed to restore our soil's fertility be included in the ACP program for this year, a program that has long since proven itself to be one of the most successful and beneficial to the country as a whole that has ever been carried out by the Federal Government.

EMERGENCY FEED AND SEED ASSISTANCE IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, for myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, relating to emergency feed and seed assistance to farmers, ranchers, and stockmen in connection with major disasters.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2934) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, relating to emergency feed and seed assistance to farmers, ranchers, and stockmen in connection with major disasters, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement by Mr. HENNINGS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

Many farmers in my State are now without pastures or meadows due to last year's drought. A serious emergency exists. The Missouri Agricultural Mobilization Committee submitted an appraisal with urgent recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture on January 7.

The purpose of this bill is to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to give emergency seed and fertilizer assistance for restoring pastures and meadows in disaster areas. Federal funds heretofore appropriated for disaster demands are made available for use as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary.

The drought has been disastrous for vast segments of the farm economy. Its consequences are far reaching. Realizing the severity of the emergency, the Missouri Legislature in special session appropriated $6,500,000 to pay transportation costs on hay to drought-disaster areas. Railroads moved the hay at one-half their customary rates. The Federal Government committed $1 million to assist the State in paying the freight charges.

The Missouri commissioner of agriculture reports that through January 7, 1954, his office paid freight charges on 20,195 cars of hay, totaling 280,154 tons. This hay has cost Missouri farmers approximately $5,600,000 or an average of about $20 a ton.

The freight charges paid on those shipments amounts to $2,876,085 or an average of approximately $10.27 a ton. The railroad contribution, through reduced freight rates, has been approximately equal to the State-Federal aid. It is estimated that 30,000 cars of hay have been shipped into Missouri by this time. Unless the pastures and meadows are reseeded soon, vast shipments on this scale must be continued.

Many Missouri farmers have exhausted their credit and their resources. Maintaining farming operations in this area is essential not only to the farmers directly involved but to the entire agricultural economy of the Midwest.

An example of the severe effects of the drought is seen today in Dunklin County, Mo., where surplus commodity food is to be made available to some 5,000 residents who have appealed for emergency aid. The people, who are not transients, are destitute because the drought reduced the need for farmworkers. Most farm jobs will not be available until May. The demand for farm labor will be considerably below that of 1953 because of reduced crop quotas.

Members of the Missouri congressional delegation of both political parties have been unanimous in repeatedly urging Secretary of Agriculture Benson to assist farmers in restoring their drought-seared pastures and meadows. It was recommended that the seeds and fertilizers for the program be obtained through regular commercial channels. The Department of Agriculture has promised surveys.

With other members of the Missouri delegation, I offered to introduce legislation to provide any necessary additional authority to carry out an adequate drought aid program. To remove any doubt that may exist in the Secretary's mind, I am introducing this bill.

Certain aspects of the farm problem are becoming more acute. Depressed farm markets have caught vast numbers of American farmers in an economic squeeze between ever-rising prices on the cost-of-living items the farmer buys and the prices he receives for the things he sells. This condition is affecting nonfarm people. The farm implement business is among those that have been badly affected by falling farm prices. This trend, if not checked, will spread to other industries which supply the farmer with items he utilizes in producing food and fiber for our economy.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF JOHN M. CABOT TO BE AMBASSADOR TO SWEDEN

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I give notice that the committee will consider a nomination received from the White House today, at the expiration of 6 days. The nomination is that of John M. Cabot, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador of the United States to Sweden.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTER IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

Article entitled "Florida's Sunshine at Last Gets Tax Deductible Rating."

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE PLAN

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to address the Senate for not exceeding 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, yesterday I was honored by being permitted to be a sponsor, with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], of a bill (S. 2927) to provide for an additional Assistant Secretary of Defense for all Reserve affairs.

American defensive power will be seriously weakened if the National Guard and Reserve plan is ever replaced by any system that fails to recognize the outstanding merit of the citizen soldier.

Even when we are able to teach every young man the fundamentals of military service, the National Guard and the Reserve will continue to be the best and most effective agencies for peacetime training of good soldiers.

Since the beginning of our Republic, the citizen-soldier has kept alive the spirit of national service. The wars of the United States have always been fought by its citizens. George Washington contended that a republic could not survive unless it was defended in war by the people themselves.

The defense of the United States is the most serious problem confronting our Nation at the present time. It calls for patriotic sacrifice on the part of our finest young manhood. It calls for the expenditure of vast sums of money, representing almost two-thirds of our national budget.

I am sure everyone who knows the terrible waste and destruction of war will stand behind President Eisenhower in his determined efforts to get more defense for fewer dollars.

In World War I, the German high command made a very careful analysis of the units opposing them. Some months after the armistice a war correspondent asked Major Von Rundstedt, who became Field Marshal Von Rundstedt in World War II, what their records revealed as to the efficiency of the American divisions.

The war correspondent told of the incident as follows:

I asked the major what the high command had noted as regards the most efficient American divisions. While an aide went to get the proper books, the major said he could recall offhand four divisions which the Germans considered among the best.

He said, "The division which you call Rainbow-in-the-Sky."

"Forty-second," I said. "Yes, Forty-second," he replied.

"And that division, half of which is made up of Marines." "Second," I told him. Yes, the Second," he said. "Also the Twenty-eighth and the First."

The lieutenant had brought back the record and the major found other divisions which the Germans considered were excellent. These were the 32d, the 26th, the 33d, and the 37th.

Mr. President, 6 of those 8 divisions which were considered by the enemy to be the most efficient were National Guard or civilian divisions.

THOMAS ALVA EDISON

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, today marks the 107th anniversary of the birth of one of New Jersey's most distinguished sons, Thomas Alva Edison. In calling him a son of New Jersey, I realize that he was born in Ohio, and was reared in Michigan. But shortly after he reached the age of choice, at 23, he established himself in Newark, and thereafter maintained his principal home and laboratories in the Garden State. His first wife, Mary Stilwell, was from Newark; and his son—and my warm, personal friend—Charles Edison, was elected by the people of his father's adopted State to be their Governor in 1940.

Fortunately for the future of America, even in this day of emphasis upon machines, rather than men; and upon inevitability, rather than inspiration, the story of Thomas Edison's life and achievements is still taught in our elementary schools. I shall not repeat here in detail the facts all of us remember: The former newsboy and "candy butcher" printing at the age of 15 a newspaper on the train running between Port Huron and Detroit; the experiments in telegraphy, at the age of 16, after learning the skill from a grateful father whose son's life was saved by Edison; his arrival in New York City in debt and out of work. At 23 he received his first money from an invention, and invested it in a manufacturing shop in Newark. Then began his fabulous life of productivity and prosperity.

Four major contributions to modern life spring from Edison's genius. They are the phonograph, the electric light and power system, the motion picture, and discovery of the so-called Edison effect, upon which principle is based the whole science of electronics. However, the wide range of Edison's interest is attested by the fact that he was awarded 1,097 patents, the greatest number awarded an individual to this day. When Thomas Edison was past 80, he embarked on experiments to produce rubber from sources indigenous to the United States. Before his death, at 84, on October 18, 1931, he had the satisfaction of seeing a small piece of rubber vulcanized from goldenrod which he himself had grown.

Mr. President, probably the closest competitor among Edison's contemporaries for the honor of being most responsible for the wondrous age in which we live was Henry Ford, the master of mass production. But Mr. Ford took himself out of the running by saying of Edison:

> It has sometimes been said that we live in an industrial age. It might better be said that we live in an age of Edison. Edison did more to abolish poverty than any other person or group of persons since the beginning of the world.

Mr. President, New Jersey is proud of Thomas Alva Edison. But its pride is not selfish; and the manner of the man is such that we are pleased to share his memory with the people of all the States, indeed, all the world.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on this 11th day of February, the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison, the great American inventor and great American, I wish to join in paying tribute to him.

It is fitting and proper that the State of Michigan take a leading role in this tribute. Edison belongs to the ages—to all men everywhere; but the State of Michigan has a unique claim on this great man.

It was in the wholesome atmosphere of Michigan that the boy, Thomas Alva Edison, did his first experimenting. His father had moved to Fort Huron, Mich., when young Thomas was 7. That was in 1854, just 100 years ago. When Thomas was 11, he set up his first laboratory in the cellar of his home in Port Huron.

Michigan contributed its wholesomeness to the formative years in the life of Thomas Edison, who was destined to give the world the electric light, the phonograph, and many other blessings and comforts. Michigan is justly proud of its part in his life.

To make money to buy equipment for his cellar laboratory, young Edison sold papers on a Grand Trunk railway train between Port Huron and Detroit. At the end of his run, his spare time was spent in the Detroit Public Library.

Edison's venture in the publishing field was in Michigan. He composed, printed, and sold a newspaper on the train. He called it the Weekly Herald. It contained market reports and Michigan news. Edison was only 15 then. The world is familiar with the story of the baggage-car fire which suddenly halted the young publisher's career—as a publisher.

A Michigan man, J. U. McKenzie, station agent at Mount Clemens, taught Edison telegraphy; and that opened up a great new field in the inventive mind of Thomas Edison.

When the telegraph cable across the river between Sarnia, Ontario, and Port Huron, Mich., broke, young Edison, then only 16, used a locomotive whistle to send messages across.

Edison lived and worked in several States, but he considered Michigan his home. When, at the age of 21, he conceived the plan of duplex telegraphy, he arranged to demonstrate his device before railway officials in his home town of Port Huron.

Yes, the great State of Michigan is a little greater for having had a part in the early life of Thomas A. Edison, inventor, benefactor of mankind.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, Pennsylvania is very proud of the work of Thomas A. Edison. The first electric-light plant in the world was established by Edison at Sunbury, Pa. He spent much time in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the time he spent in our great State was most helpful to us.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey desires to commend his distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] for their fine tributes to Thomas A. Edison. I join them, and associate myself with their remarks, and pay my personal tribute to a very great American.

"BE KIND TO DEMOCRATS" WEEK

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I was pleased to note yesterday that the President was sponsoring a movement to be kind to Democrats. With that policy I am in accord. I have many fine Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle, and, of course, over the Nation as a whole. I would not desire to see them unduly criticized or castigated.

However, I noticed that when former President Truman accused the Republicans of sponsoring a "rich man's tax relief," and when he said that the President had a program of weakening the national security for the sake of false economy, it received rather liberal applause in many Democratic quarters.

I noticed, too, that when Adlai Stevenson declared that the 4 freedoms had been replaced in this Nation by 4 fears, among them being the fear of depression, his statement was received with approval by Democrats in many places.

I sincerely hope that our good Democratic friends will not criticize us if we talk about some of the extravagances, favoritism, and crookedness which was apparent in the Truman administration. I hope we will not be criticized even if we go to the extent of mentioning the fact that efforts to expose Communists in the Government were resisted.

I do not object to participating in political debate. I have been through it for many years. I know that our good Democratic brethren can take it. So can we Republicans. I do not believe they should be crying "foul" at this time.

REPORT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD ON STUDY OF ASSOCIATED STATES OF INDOCHINA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report which I made on October 27, 1953, to the Committee on Foreign Relations as a result of a study mission to the Associated States of Indochina, namely Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks:

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDOCHINA

(Foreword)

Communist power in the Far East thrusts outward from the heart of the Asian mainland in two principal directions. One drive extends into the Korean Peninsula, where it has recently been blocked by a combination of United Nations military action and diplomacy. The second probes into Indochina, from whence, if unchecked, it might turn west toward India or south and east toward Indonesia and the Philippines.

World peace hangs in balance along both these avenues of Communist expansion. Hence, the security of the United States and of other free nations is no less involved in Indochina than in Korea. Indochina is the key to control of southeast Asia, rich in the raw materials of war. This is an area of rice surplus—on which the armies of Asia march—and of petroleum, tin, and rubber. To deny these sinews of power to the Communists is to limit their capacity to engage in further aggressive adventures.

Although the responsibilities of the United States in Korea have been more direct than in Indochina, our policies since 1950 have recognized the essential indivisibility of these two situations. It will be recalled that in taking action in Korea in June of that year, we also made provision for direct military assistance to Indochina. This aid program has continued through the past 3 years.

In view of the interrelationship of the two situations, it seemed to me that the halting, at least temporarily, of hostilities in Korea called for a firsthand study of the situation in Indochina. My objective in making this study has been to obtain information of possible interest to the Committee on For-

eign Relations, particularly along the following lines:

1. Current military situation in Indochina.

2. Political developments in the relationship between France and the three Associated States of Indochina and within the associated states relevant to the conflict with international communism.

3. The role of American aid in the defense of Indochina against international communism.

4. Prospects for a successful termination of her conflict in Indochina.

The report that follows is based primarily on discussions with officials and nonofficial observers and on personal observations in Vietnam, the Kingdom of Cambodia, and the Kingdom of Laos during the latter half of September. In order to obtain additional information and to cross-check findings, officials and nonofficial observers were also interviewed in Paris at the beginning and end of the study.

I should like to express my appreciation for the courtesies extended to me in Indochina by Ambassador Donald Heath and Gen. T. J. Trapnell of our mission at Saigon; by Commissioner Maurice Dejean and Gen. Henri-Eugene Navarre; by Prime Minister Nguyen Van Tam and Gov. Nguyen hun Tri of Vietnam; by Prime Ministers Penn Nouth of Cambodia and H. H. Souvanna Phouma of Laos; and by their staffs. The assistance and cooperation of these officials, their staffs, and many other persons in the three States greatly facilitated the carrying out of the study mission.

I should also like to note the indispensable assistance of Mr. Francis R. Valeo, Chief of the Foreign Affairs Division of the Legislative Reference Service, on detail to the Foreign Relations Committee staff, who accompanied me on the study mission.

MIKE MANSFIELD.

OCTOBER 27, 1953.

A. MILITARY SITUATION IN INDOCHINA

The Indochinese war is a grim one. It is a strange and elusive struggle, a shadowy war without battle lines. It is a war of sudden raids in the night, of parachute drops on scattered supply dumps, of interminable patrol actions, of ambush, terrorism, and sabotage.

It is fought in dense jungle, in remote mountain passes, and in the great river deltas. These are now vast green seas of rice, shoulder deep in monsoon rain. This kind of terrain favors an enemy whose tactics are hit-and-run, plunder, and retreat. To a considerable extent it neutralizes the mechanized equipment which the French possess. For years now it has been a stalemate. The casualties mount; but positions remain relatively the same. Except for an abortive advance of the Viet Minh into the Kingdom of Laos last spring and occasional sallies by the French and Associated States forces against Viet Minh supply centers, there have been few major actions and no significant positional changes in many months.

The French and Associated States forces continue to dominate the large cities, the principal rice-producing areas, the rubber plantations, the coal mines, and port facilities. The Viet Minh hold the rural areas, the jungles, the mountains, and, at night, parts of the rice-producing deltas which are under nominal control of the French and the Associated States by day.

There are indications that the stalemate in Indochina may be coming to an end. The months ahead could witness the beginning of a series of significant military engagements. On the one hand, the Viet Minh have been concentrating in divisional strength in the northern delta region. On the other hand, the new French commander, Gen. Henri-Eugene Navarre, has made clear that he thinks in terms of ending the defensive mentality which has characterized the French and Associated States operations since the death of Gen. de Lattre de Tassigny in January 1952. To this end, tactical concepts are being revised; France is dispatching 9 additional battalions from Korea and Germany to the Indochinese theater; and the indigenous forces of the 3 Associated States are being expanded as rapidly as the French believe possible.

The Viet Minh forces under Ho Chi Minh consist of approximately 300,000 men. It is an army built around disciplined and devoted Communist cadres and is generally regarded in the area as well organized and well led. While a portion of the manpower is grouped in small, scattered guerrilla bands, the Viet Minh are capable of deploying in divisional strength. The bulk of the army is concentrated in and around the Red River Delta in northern Vietnam. There are, in addition, Viet Minh forces in central Vietnam, in the Mekong River Delta of south Vietnam, in northern Laos, and on the borders of Cambodia.

The Viet Ninh are equipped with an assortment of locally produced and foreign-made weapons, which includes those of American and of recent Soviet manufacture. They have neither aircraft nor naval vessels.

Their principal source of outside supply is Communist China. Equipment flows over the border at the rate of 3,000 to 5,000 tons per month and military reports indicate that there has been some slight increase in the total since the Korean truce. The Chinese also supply technical advisers and training facilities. There is no evidence of Soviet Russian personnel within Indochina but there are reports of such personnel operating across the border in southern China.

The military position of the Communists in south Vietnam appears to have weakened over the years in the Mekong Delta area. It is unchanged or perhaps more powerful, however, in the northern Red River region, which from the outset has been the citadel of Viet Minh strength. The Communists also continue to pose a threat in northern Laos.

Opposing the Viet Minh are some 400,000 French, French Union, and Associated States forces, equipped with air and naval units. The core of these forces consists of French and French Union troops. However, the armies of Vietnam and, to a lesser extent, those of Cambodia and Laos are expanding.

The casualties suffered by the French Union forces and the 3 Associated States, while lower than those of the Viet Minh by perhaps a 5-to-1 ratio, have been greater than those of the United States in Korea. Casualties among French officers have been particularly heavy.

The non-Communist forces have been supported largely by France, whose current annual outlay for the conflict in Indochina amounts to approximately $1.2 billion, and by the United States at the rate of some $500 million a year. French expenditures in Indochina over the years has more than equaled the grants which France has received under our foreign-aid programs.

Like ourselves in Korea, the French are participating in an extremely difficult military undertaking. It involves fighting at the end of supply lines that stretch halfway round the world.

B. THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN INDOCHINA

The French are trying to halt communism in an area where nationalism is giving a new birth of freedom to peoples who have not known it for a long time. The French have found that in these circumstances military problems are deeply enmeshed in political problems. This creates a situation not readily amenable to simple, get-out-cheap formulas.

The current of nationalism runs strong throughout Indochina. It is not, perhaps, of equal fervor in each of the three States but in all of them it is the basic political reality. It gives rise to a desire for independence from foreign control that is deep-seated and widespread. To a great extent, it explains the continued acceptance of Ho Chi Minh in many parts of the region. He has been publicized not as an exponent of communism but as the figurehead of anticolonial, anti-western nationalism.

The problem for France and, in an indirect sense, for ourselves, is to treat with this political reality in a manner which will insure that full independence, once achieved, will not immediately be nullified in the onrush of international communism. It is a problem that has both moral and practical aspects. This country is committed by belief, tradition, and practice to policies of supporting the right to self-government of peoples able and willing to assume the responsibilities of self-government. Moral aspects apart, failure to utilize the indigenous power latent in nationalism merely serves to increase immeasurably the cost to ourselves and to France of preventing the Communists from seizing Indochina and it could even throw the entire issue into doubt.

It is the general consensus of opinion of French, indigenous, and American observers in Indochina that one of the most important elements in a successful termination of hostilities lies in the mobilization of the local peoples against the Communists. This involves the winning over of the non-Communist support which, as a form of misdirected nationalism, is now enjoyed by Ho Chi Minh. At the same time it requires the stimulation of a substantial part of the population, presently indifferent, into active participation in the conflict on the non-Communist side.

French leaders, both in Paris and in Indochina, give evidence of recognizing this reality. As previously pointed out, they are moving rapidly to expand the military forces of the Associated States while shifting political power to the three local governments. Preparations are now being made and preliminary discussions are already under way to give effect to the July 3 declaration which paves the way for full independence. At issue are such matters as control of foreign exchange, customs, justice, the sureté, the participation of indigenous military in the high command of the armed forces and arrangements which link the three Associated States such as a common currency and a common customs.

Given mutual confidence and patience on the part of the negotiating political leaders, it is possible that most of the remaining limitations on full national sovereignty can be removed during the coming months.

Impetuous actions, however, such as recently manifested in Cambodia,[1] could be seriously disruptive, as could a failure of rapport between French officials in Paris and Saigon or unwarranted pressure by ourselves or other outside parties.

If there is to be a meaningful transfer of full sovereignty to the Associated States, one which will not immediately jeopardize the resistance to the Communists, it must be a transfer which is worked out by the French and the nationalist leaders in a manner satisfactory to both. Once such an arrangement has been achieved, the last remaining political block to the full mobilization of Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian national sentiment against the Communist advance in the area will have been removed.

The political problems of the Associated States, however, will not end with the achievement of full independence. The leaders of these countries are already confronted with a multitude of internal difficulties and these are more likely to increase rather than decrease in the future. The basic problem

[1] See appendix 1, subsection on Cambodia.

which confronts all three governments, and particularly that of Vietnam, is to put down firm roots in their respective populations. They will be able to do so only if they evolve in accord with popular sentiment and if they deal competently with such basic problems as illiteracy, public health, excessive population in the deltas, inequities in labor and land tenure, and village and agricultural improvement. Finally, it is essential that there be a constant raising of the ethical standards of government and a determination to use the armies, now in the process of formation strictly for national rather than private purposes. Failure in these fundamental responsibilities of self-government will result in the achievement of the shadow rather than the substance of independence. It could also mean the rapid reduction of the three nations to chaos and the subsequent intrusion of some new form of foreign domination from close at hand.

C. UNITED STATES AID TO INDOCHINA

Direct United States assistance to Indochina began in August 1950. At that time, France's domestic economy had reached a point where it was no longer able to sustain the burden of the conflict in Indochina. Simultaneously, Ho Chi Minh's forces were everywhere preparing to push the French into the sea. This blow, however, did not fall. France did not withdraw. Throughout Indochina this is attributed largely to our intercession which provided the margin of material support and of hope that enabled the French to pursue the struggle.

Under military-aid agreements signed in December 1950, some 350 ships bearing arms have reached Indochinese ports. These shipments have included small-arms ammunition, transport vehicles, combat vehicles, military aircraft, naval vessels and small craft, communications equipment, small arms and automatic weapons, artillery ammunition, hospital supplies, and engineering and other technical equipment. There is a United States Military Defense Assistance Advisory Group in Indochina under Brig. Gen. T. J. Trapnell which provides instruction in the use of this equipment.

A pact of economic cooperation was signed between the United States and Vietnam on September 7, 1951. Subsequently, similar pacts came into effect with Laos and Cambodia. Under the STEM (Special Technical and Economic Mission) program of the Foreign Operations Administration some $96 million has been authorized as technical and economic aid during the fiscal years 1951–54. It is used to finance projects in village rehabilitation, sanitation, small business, irrigation, and public works. An additional $30 million annually in military-support assistance has been allocated in 1953 and 1954.

In all, the United States has been assuming about 40 percent of the total cost of the war in Indochina. In March 1953 the United States assured France of a willingness to increase its aid program if France produced an adequate plan for concluding the war. Such a plan, based on the views of General Navarre, was presented to the United States by the Mayer cabinet and later by the Laniel cabinet. The United States and France announced in a joint communique September 30, 1953, that "in support of plans of the French Government for the intensified prosecution of the war against Viet Minh, the United States will make available to the French Government prior to December 31, 1954, additional financial resources not to exceed $385 million." This assistance was additional to aid to Indochina in the Mutual Security appropriation early in 1953. The new allocation will raise the United States share of the cost of the war to an estimated 60 percent of the total.

In general, military supplies appear to be entirely adequate to meet current needs in Indochina. The only items which are cited by French authorities in the area as being in short supply are C–47 transports, helicopters, and small naval craft for use in the delta areas. These shortages will probably be relieved in the near future.

Economic assistance from the United States is channeled through the indigenous governments of the three states. Military aid, however, is made available to the French military authorities who, in turn, allocate it to the various forces engaged in the conflict. There is considerable pressure emanating from the governments of the associated states to participate more directly in American military aid. Any change in the present distribution system, however, prior to a clarification of relationships between the various parties under the July 3 declaration could prove disruptive of present military operations. Furthermore, a service of supply, now nonexistent, must be developed in the national armies of the three states before aid can be effectively handled by them.

D. SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

The military prospects of the non-Communist forces in Indochina are improving

Three principal factors account for the improvement in the military position of the non-Communist forces which 3 years ago was at the point of utter dissolution. In the first place, there has been an expansion of the national forces of the associated states. Much remains to be done before these forces acquire the skills, morale, and leadership that will be necessary if they are to assume the primary burden for the defense of their countries. A start has been made, however, and the announced policy of the French is to push this process as rapidly as possible.

A second factor in the improved situation is the flow of American aid. This assistance makes possible the equipping and activating of indigenous forces on a large scale. It also provides the margin without which the French would probably be unable to continue to sustain their commitments in Indochina. American aid, however, does not and should not involve the commitment of combat forces. Sacrifices for the defense of freedom must be equitably shared and we have borne our full burden in blood in Korea.

The third factor is the new approach to the conduct of the campaign against the Viet Minh, which has been introduced by General Navarre. It is basically, as has been pointed out previously, the psychology of the offensive. While it is still too early to evaluate its effectiveness, the general consensus is that it has already provided a lift to morale and may provide in time the striking edge necessary to end the long stalemate.

The non-Communist forces in Indochina are still, however, a long way from the threshold of victory. Without a vast increase in present striking power, the Viet Minh will not be defeated. This increase, primarily a question of manpower, cannot come from France, already hard-pressed to meet commitments elsewhere. It certainly cannot come from this country. It can come only from the three Indochinese states.

And it is right that it should come from them. Their hope for freedom and national existence is at stake. If they have the will to sustain themselves as independent nations, the French have pledged themselves to continue to support them until the Communists are defeated. As for the material needed to insure the resistance, we have not stinted in our assistance in the past and we are not likely to do so in the future.

Transfer of full sovereignty to the indigenous governments of the Associated States in the near future is possible

Responsible French officials in both Paris and Saigon are unanimous in their views that France must withdraw from political authority in the Associated States. This view is generally shared by nonofficial observers. The French Government is on record as pledging the transfer. Indigenous leaders, in varying degrees, are anxious to assume full political responsibility. The issues that remain to be resolved before the transfer can be made do not appear to be excessively complex.

In these circumstances, then, the principal problem would appear to be one of timing, especially insofar as the transfer affects military opefations. Full independence can be a reality only within the context of security against Communist aggression.

Apart from the question of timing, a successful transfer depends on the closest liaison between Paris and French officials in Indochina so that political decisions arrived at between France and the Associated States will be carried out promptly and accurately in the field. It also requires that the indigenous leaders of the three States recognize that full national independence carries with it full responsibilities for maintaining internal order and effective government.

Essential to the negotiation of the transfer are good faith and the utmost patience on both sides. It is not the kind of settlement that either side can be clubbed into making by well-intentioned friends. It is the kind of settlement that can be negotiated only by the two parties themselves. And it must satisfy both.

Continuing American assistance is justified and essential

As previously pointed out, American aid has provided the margin of material assistance necessary for continuing resistance to the Communist advance in southeast Asia. In making available this assistance we recognized that Indochina is of great importance to the security of the non-Communist world and to our own national security. Just as the conflict in Korea is being fought in part to avoid war on our own frontiers in the future, so, too, is the war in Indochina.

In these circumstances continued aid to the French and Associated States is justified and essential. Neither the French, who are already making heavy sacrifices in Indochina and who must support commitments to the common defense in Western Europe and other parts of the non-Communist world, nor the newly created Associated States can carry this burden alone. In the interests of our own security, therefore, it is necessary that American aid be continued.

American assistance in this area, however, as elsewhere, must be carefully administered to insure its most economical and effective use. It may be desirable, therefore, to review in detail both the military and economic aspects of the aid program in Indochina. Some informed observers in the area believe that present procedures and undertakings are unduly wasteful.

A solution to the war in Indochina satisfactory to the non-Communist world is possible

It is to the advantage of international communism to continue this highly indecisive struggle in Indochina, not to our side. It drains the strength of France into distant battlefields and impairs the consolidation of the defense of Western Europe. It churns into turmoil and chaos an area which should have peace and stability. Finally, it places a heavy financial load on the people of the United States at little cost to Moscow or Peking.

This situation can be reversed provided the position of the non-Communist world in Indochina is steadily strengthened over the next 2 or 3 years. If progress is made in the military and political fields along the lines previously mentioned, and if American aid continues, the Communist threat in southeast Asia can be dissolved.

Only an outright invasion by the Chinese Communists would be likely to rescue the Viet Minh from defeat in time, at the hands of the expanding non-Communist power in

the Associated States. If such an invasion were to occur, however, it would create an entirely new situation of international aggression. On September 2, 1953, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, in a speech before the American Legion convention in St. Louis, warned that such an aggression "could not occur without grave consequences which might not be confined to Indochina."

While present plans of the French and the Associated States must necessarily envision essentially a military solution to the problem of the Communist advance, a negotiated settlement based on the Korean precedent is by no means ruled out by France. A truce in Indochina, however, as anywhere in dealing with the Communists, depends on strength, not weakness. On September 15, 1953, the Chinese Communist regime proposed a Korean-like peace conference on Indochina. The French have repeatedly indicated their willingness to enter into negotiations to this end and the desire for peace is strong in the Associated States. The Viet Minh under Ho Chi Minh, however, so far have spurned all overtures which might lead to a termination of hostilities, probably because they still believe that they can win.

In these circumstances, continuance of the present three-pronged effort in Indochina is of the utmost importance. The Communists may become more receptive to a cessation of hostilities once they are faced with the certainty of ultimate defeat. That is why they must be convinced that the French mean to pursue a course leading to the establishment and preservation of the independence of the three States. They must be convinced that the three States, in turn, have the will and popular support necessary to fight for their national freedom. They must be convinced, finally, that we are prepared to stay with the struggle until the liberty of this area is assured.

And the need to stay with it is clear because the issue for us is not Indochina alone. Nor is it just Asia. The issue in this war so many people would like to forget is the continued freedom of the non-Communist world, the containment of Communist aggression, and the welfare and security of our country.

Appendix 1

Background Information on Indochina

The Indochina Peninsula forms the southeasternmost extremity of continental Asia. To the north is China. Burma and Thailand border on the west. The Gulf of Tonkin and the China Sea lie to the east, while the Gulf of Siam is to the south. Indochina is comprised of three separate States: Vietnam on the east, extending from the China border to the extreme south; Laos, in the northwest hinterland; and Cambodia, in the southwest. The State of Vietnam includes the areas previously known as Tonkin in the north, Annam in the center, and Cochin China in the south. Hanoi is the principal city in the Tonkin Delta and Saigon, the capital of Vietnam, the principal city in the Mekong Delta. Pnom Penh is the capital of Cambodia and Luang Prabang the capital of Laos.

The population of Vietnam is 23 million, Cambodia 3½ million, and Laos 1½ million. Three-fourths of the Indochinese live on the coastal plains on one-tenth of the total land surface. Ninety percent of the population is rural. The total area of Indochina, 285,640 square miles, is about twice the size of the State of Montana.

Rice production predominates in the Indochinese economy. About five-sixths of the cultivated land produces rice. Prior to World War II Indochina was the world's third largest rice-exporting country with Cochin China the principal exporting region. Rubber production has developed rapidly in Cochin China and Cambodia since 1911, with some 69,000 tons exported in 1939. Other agricultural products include sugar, cotton, corn, tea, coffee, silk, lac, and spices. The high mountain ranges of the north produce hardwoods, bamboo, herbs, and vegetable oils. Laos is a primary source of teakwood. High-grade anthracite coal, iron, manganese, zinc, and wolfram are mined in Tonkin. Laos produces tin.

Indochinese industries are largely of the conversion type and inslude rice mills, distilleries, sugar refineries, spinning and textile mills, tobacco-manufacturing, lime and cement works, paper mills, and chemical plants. Although heavier industry had begun to develop between the two World Wars, the war and unrest which followed has stopped any significant industrial expansion.

When the French returned to Indochina in 1945 rice exports had dropped to one-tenth of the prewar level. They have not yet regained their former position. Rubber production in 1952 had almost returned to the prewar level. The transportation system built by the French has deteriorated during 12 years of war and rebellion. Shortages of technical personnel and investment capital retard industrial development. Problems related to a high population density in the Tonkin delta, absentee landlordism in south Vietnam, and high interest rates on agricultural loans persist. While some gains have been made since World War II, significant economic recovery has been retarded by continuing internal hostilities.

The French colony of Cochin China and the protectorates of Annam, Tonkin, Laos, and Cambodia were federated in 1887 to form the Union of Indochina. Under French rule the colony enjoyed certain benefits of western education, sanitation, and material progress. Railroads were built, canals and harbors dredged, mines developed, rubber plantations established, and rice culture expanded. French medical services gained wide recognition. French cultural institutions were intermingled with the indigneous. French became a second language of the educated classes.

As nationalism and anticolonialism spread throughout Asia it found support in Indochina. During the 1920's various national movements challenged the French authority. French prestige was crippled by the Japanese occupation during World War II, and the Indochinese desire for independence was nurtured by the postwar attainment of independence by the Philippines, Indonesia, Burma, India, and Pakistan.

In March 1945 Japan proclaimed the end of Indochina's colonial status, removed the Vichy administration from office, and recognized indigenous regimes. In Annam the Emperior Bao Dai proclaimed an independent State of Vietnam. With the surrender of Japan in August 1945, Bao Dai transferred his authority to a government headed by Ho Chi Minh and became an adviser in that government. France quickly regained control in Laos and Cambodia and, by an agreement of March 6, 1946, with the Ho Chi Minh government, recognized the Republic of Vietnam as a free state having its own government, parliament, army, and finances, and forming a part of the Indochinese Federation and the French Union. The entry of Cochin China into the Republic of Vietnam was to be determined by a plebiscite. Discussions with the Ho government eventually broke down and Ho Chi Minh's forces commenced an armed insurrection against the French. During a temporary truce Ho demanded a greater degree of sovereignty than France was willing to concede. In December 1946 full-scale war commenced which has continued to date.

In September 1947, France opened discussions with Bao Dai, who had in the meantime broken his connections with Ho Chi Minh, for the establishment of an indigenous government. Basic agreements were signed in Paris March 8, 1949. France agreed that Cochin China would become part of an independent and self-governing State of Vietnam within the framework of the French Union. Under the agreement France retained a measure of control over the Vietnamese Army and the right to maintain military forces in Vietnam. Vietnamese foreign policy was to be coordinated with that of France through the High Council of the French Union. Vietnam's currency was linked with the franc and the French retained certain administrative controls.

Bao Dai assumed office June 23, 1949, and sovereignty was formally transferred February 2, 1950. In July 1949, a similar treaty was signed with the Kingdom of Laos and in November with the Kingdom of Cambodia. In conferences at Pau, France, ending in November 1950, clarifying agreements were reached.

The association of the 3 states within the framework of the French Union provided the basis of their title, "Associated States of Indochina." The 3 states were recognized by the United States and Britain in February 1950. Subsequently recognition was extended by some 30 other powers. Their applications for membership in the United Nations were vetoed by the Soviet Union. However, the states are members of several U. N. subsidiary agencies. In October 1950, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia took part in the London meeting of the Consultative Committee on the Colombo Plan and, in September 1951, delegates of these states signed the Japanese Peace Treaty in San Francisco.

On July 3, 1953, France agreed to negotiate with Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia with a view to transferring to the 3 states some of the functions and powers which had been retained by France under the earlier agreements.

The most pressing problem in Indochina is the military conflict with the Communist-led Viet Minh. The Viet Minh League for Independence was founded in China in 1941, as a coalition of Indochinese nationalist movements under Communist domination. During the immediate postwar period its propaganda made little or no mention of communism and popular support was sought by stressing the theme of national independence. The Viet Minh leader, Ho Chi Minh, a Communist organizer with experience in France, the Soviet Union, China, and Thailand, had organized the Indochinese Communist Farty in 1930. When the Japanese withdraw from Indochina in 1945 they left behind large quantities of arms and ammunition which fell into the hands of Ho Chi Minh. With this material, the Viet Minh forces were able to launch a surprise attack on the French garrison in Hanoi in December 1946.

Appendix 2

Notes on Political Developments Within the Associated States

VIETNAM

Bao Dai, upon assuming power as the Chief of State, declared that the people of Vietnam would have the right to choose their own form of government at some future date; that, in the meantime, government would be by ordinance and decree. The government is directed by a Premier who is President of a nominated Provisional National Council. Nguyen Van Tam, the present Premier, was appointed in June 1952.

The first nationwide election under the Bao Dai regime was held in January 1953. The election was on a local basis for municipal and village councils and was limited to non-Viet Minh areas. At the time of the election it was announced that newly elected municipal councils would later choose Provincial Councils, which in turn would nominate members of three regional assemblies. The regional bodies would select representatives to a national assembly.

The government of Nguyen Van Tam has energetically approached the administrative problems involved in the transition from a colonial to a national civil service. Defense appropriations have been doubled. Premier Tam has given publicity to French and American aid programs while pressing for the allocation of American aid directly to Vietnamese authorities rather than through France.

Political opposition to Premier Nguyen Van Tam has centered in certain nationalist groups which have always opposed the Viet Minh or have defected from it. These groups, which include such powerful politico-religious sects as the Cao Dai and Hoa Hao, favor complete independence for Vietnam and oppose the more conciliatory position of Bao Dai and Premier Van Tam toward France.

Following the announcement of France in July 1953, of a willingness to negotiate a modification of the pacts with the associated states, Bao Dai moved to gain the increased support of the nationalists. Upon departing in September for preliminary discussions with the French Government in Paris he announced that he was spokesman for all segments of the Vietnamese population and would press for complete independence of Vietnam as well as for a free association with France in a union grouping sovereign and friendly peoples.

CAMBODIA

King Norodom Sihanouk, at the close of of World War II, affirmed his loyalty to France and, on March 7, 1946, signed a provisional agreement providing for French direction of Cambodia's foreign policy and matters affecting the Indochinese Federation. At the same time the king set in motion the transformation of the absolute monarchy into a constitutional monarchy and the creation of a unicameral legislative assembly elected by universal adult male suffrage. An electoral law was promulgated in May 1946, and members of the legislative assembly were elected in September 1946. Three political parties emerged: the Democrats favoring a maximum of autonomy; the Progressives desiring gradual political evolution; and the Liberals urging French control. In the election the Democrats gained 50 of the 57 seats. A constitution was promulgated on May 6, 1947.

During the immediate postwar period Cambodian political affairs have also been affected by the Issarak or Free Cambodia movement. This militant organization of Cambodians in Thailand and Vietnam affiliated with the Viet Minh in 1948. King Norodom responded to the threat of armed rebellion to gain complete independence from France by assuming for himself the position of leadership in the nationalist movement. While in New York City, in April 1953, King Norodom publicized Cambodia's grievances against France. Upon returning to Cambodia he dramatized Cambodia's desire for complete independence by going into temporary exile in Thailand. Cambodia has expressed dissatisfaction with the present pacts governing economic relations among the Associated States and has attempted to break the hold of Saigon on the Cambodian economy by modernizing the port of Pnom-Penh and by orienting her trade toward Thailand.

In September 1953, Cambodian Premier Penn Nouth made a public statement to the effect that Cambodia would remain neutral toward Viet Minh forces in Vietnam so long as they left Cambodia in peace. The Foreign Minister, Strit Matak, however, sought quickly to allay adverse reactions in the United States and France by issuing a statement repudiating the neutralist stand and affirming Cambodia's loyalty to the free world.

LAOS

King Sisavang Vong is the head of the state. The aging monarch entrusts the affairs of state to his son, Crown Prince Savang Vathana. The basic agreement defining the relationship of Laos to France and the French Union is similar to the agreement of France with Cambodia. A constitution guaranteeing democratic freedoms to the Laotian peoples was promulgated May 11, 1947. Legislative power is exercised by a national assembly elected by direct universal suffrage.

APPENDIX 3

TEXT OF THE DECLARATION OF JULY 3, 1953, ON INDOCHINA BY THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT

The Government of the French Republic, meeting in Council of Ministers, has examined the relations of France with the Associated States of Indochina.

It considers that the time has come to adapt the agreements made by them with France to the position which they have acquired, with her full support, in the community of free peoples.

Respectful of national traditions and human freedoms, France has led Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam to the full flowering of their personality, and has maintained their national unity in the course of cooperation over nearly a century.

By the agreements of 1949, she recognized their independence and they agreed to associate themselves with her in the French Union.

The Government of the Republic wishes today to make a solemn declaration.

During the period of 4 years which has elapsed since the signature of the agreements, the brotherhood of arms between the armies of the French Union and the national armies of the Associated States has been further strengthened thanks to the development of the latter, which are taking daily a more important part in the fight against the common enemy.

In the same period, the civil institutions of the three nations have put themselves in a position to assume the whole powers incumbent on modern states, while the voice of their governments has been heard by the majority of countries composing the United Nations organization.

In these conditions, France considers that there are grounds to complete the independence and sovereignty of the Associated States of Indochina in assuring, with the agreement of each of the three interested governments, the transfer of the functions that France has still retained in the interests of the states themselves, because of the perilous circumstances resulting from the state of war.

The French Government has decided to invite each of the three governments to come to an agreement with it on the settlement of questions which each of them may deem it necessary to raise in the economic, financial, judicial, military, and political fields, in respect of and safeguardng the legitimate interests of each of the contracting parties.

The Government of the Republic expresses the wish that agreement on these various points may strengthen the friendship which unites France and the Associated States within the French Union.

USE OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES IN CONSTRUCTION OF OVERSEAS MILITARY BASES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, both as an individual Senator and as chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction, I have been trying to find ways to use Government-owned surplus commodities in the construction of overseas military bases.

Following a recent hearing of our committee on the matter, I wrote a letter to the President indicating our hope that the Departments of State, Defense, and Agriculture might get together on practical steps to achieve this objective. I now have a reply from President Eisenhower which will be of general interest.

The letter from the President follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 4, 1954.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: I appreciate your letter about exchanging our surplus agricultural commodities for certain construction materials and services that we need overseas.

Some time ago I asked certain Cabinet officers to make a careful study of this and other possible uses for some of our surpluses. My deep interest in the matter is undiminished, and I am glad to have your suggestion on the problems of implementations of the program. I intend to see that the executive branch continues actively to explore the possibilities of this kind of action. I agree completely with you that we must move as promptly as possible to take advantage of these possibilities as they are developed.

With kind regard,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 1.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], on behalf of himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment on page 3, line 5.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to modify my amendment, so as to make it read:

On page 3, line 5, after the word "treaty", strike out the words "which conflicts with" and insert "or other international agreement which conflicts with, or is not in pursuance of."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan modifies his amendment accordingly.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, this morning I should like to discuss the substitute amendment which has been proposed by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], which has been incorporated as a part of the most recent substitute proposed by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. In essence, this substitute provides that no executive agreement can be effective as internal law until it has been implemented by act of Congress. No distinction is made regarding the various types of executive agreements or the constitutional powers under which such agreements are concluded.

Before I begin my discussion, I should like to state that it is only with great reluctance and with a sense of my own limitations that I find myself in disagree-

ment with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] on a question of constitutional law. As the Senator from Georgia knows, I hold him in the highest possible esteem both as a friend and a fellow lawyer.

Let me say at the outset that I hope to keep what I have to say on as factual a plane as possible, and not descend to hypothesis, recrimination, the questioning of motives, or emotionalism.

So that I may not in any way misconstrue the basic premise which underlies the substitute amendment of the Senator from Georgia, I prefer to use his own clear and concise words rather than a paraphrase of my own. On last Friday, February 5, in an exchange with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Georgia said:

> When it comes to a limitation upon the right and power of the President to make executive agreements, the only concern I have grows out of cases like the Pink case, which I agree is not very good law, but which happens to be the decision of the Supreme Court. It grows out of the feeling I have that the Court has been moving in that direction for some time, and it looks as if the Court, in the case, went overboard.

The three points which I would like the Senate to consider, before finally voting on the George substitute, are the following:

First. That the Pink case, which more or less stands alone, is neither a precedent of a dangerous character nor one which would warrant amending the Constitution of the United States.

Second. Under our present system of separation of powers, there are sufficient checks and balances to prevent an abuse of the President's power to conclude executive agreements.

Third. The proposed substitute amendment is open to an interpretation which would destroy one of our greatest bulwarks of States' rights against Federal encroachment upon them.

The factual situation underlying the Pink case, decided by the Supreme Court on December 2, 1942, is quite complex. The Pink case perhaps has been used as a gambit, somewhat in the manner used by lawyers who have at times quickly silenced other lawyers and laymen by saying, "It is evident from what you say that you never read the decision in the Schultz case." That argument usually silences his opponent, who has not read the Schultz case. In fact, there generally has never been a Schultz case. One of the easiest ways in which to destroy the opposition in the course of an argument is to ask one's opponent whether he has ever read such and such a case, although he knows full well the case does not exist.

It is a standing joke that sometimes that terminology is used in argument.

The aversion to the so-called Pink case throughout the course of the debate had interested me to such a point that I undertook to reread the approximately 50 pages of the opinion and tried to study it so that within the limitations of my own understanding I could discuss it in lawyerlike fashion. With the indulgence of the Senate, I shall try to do that today. The facts are quite complex and I think it might aid everyone's understanding of the issues of the case if I review this factual situation as briefly as I can at this point.

Although the Soviet Government came into power in 1917, it was not until 16 years later, in 1933, that the United States formally recognized the new Russian Government. One of the most difficult problems which caused this delay was the inability of United States citizens to collect debts due them from the Russian Government or from Russian citizens. Their inability resulted in large measure from the Soviet expropriation of a large part of the Russian economy. The Supreme Court stated the difficulty very concisely in the Pink case when it said:

> The existence of unpaid claims against Russia and its nationals * * * had long been one impediment to resumption of friendly relations between these two great powers (315 U. S. 203, 225).

I believe it is quite clear that the question of the recognition of the Soviet government differed radically from the usual recognition of a foreign government because of the many difficult collateral questions that had to be ironed out simultaneously with recognition. After much discussion and bargaining, the U. S. S. R. agreed to assign to the United States Government all claims which it or its citizens had against the United States or its citizens. There was an understanding that the United States would proceed to collect the assigned claims and apply the proceeds against the claims which United States citizens had against Russia or its citizens.

The Pink case itself arose out of the impact of this assignment—known as the Litvinov Assignment because Litvinov was the negotiator for the Russians at that time—upon certain assets which were being distributed by the New York courts. These assets had been deposited with the New York Superintendent of Insurance by the First Russian Insurance Co., involved in the Pink case.

This company was a Russian insurance company which had established a branch in New York in 1907. Under New York law, it had been required to pledge with the New York Superintendent of Insurance certain assets to guarantee payment of claims arising out of transactions in New York. Before we can fully understand the case, it is necessary to consider the different types of creditors of the New York branch of this Russian insurance company. There were many creditors whose claims arose out of transactions concluded by the branch in New York. Generally speaking, these creditors were United States citizens who had taken out insurance policies in this country with the New York branch. There were also, of course, foreign creditors. In general, these were the shareholders who had put up the money to organize the company and who might be described as the persons who owned an equity in the company itself.

Many were living in Paris and London; many of them were so-called white Russians, doubtless living within the orbit of the Soviet Government. In any case, generally speaking, these foreign creditors were Russian citizens.

In 1918 and 1919 the Soviet Government nationalized all Russian insurance companies, and all property, wherever situated, of all such Russian insurance companies. They also canceled the rights of the shareholders in such property, including the rights of the shareholders in the First Russian Insurance Co. In a word, the Soviet Government confiscated the equitable holdings of the company without compensation.

The New York branch of the company continued to do business until 1925, when the New York courts ordered liquidation of the company's assets. Pursuant to the court order, Mr. Pink, who was superintendent of insurance in New York, paid all claims arising out of transactions of the New York branch in this country. In other words, all domestic creditors, including all policyholders—and they were Americans, of course—were paid in full. There remained a surplus of more than $1 million. In 1931 the New York courts ordered that the surplus should be distributed to various foreign creditors, including the foreign stockholders, of course, whose equity interests had been expropriated by the Soviet nationalization decrees. The claims of a few foreign creditors were paid, but a stay was granted pending presentation of the claim of the United States Government arising out of the Litvinov assignment.

As I said before, the Soviet Government assigned to the United States Government, among other things, the equity interest of the New York branch of the First Russian Insurance Co. Under Russian law, the Soviet Government could assign such interest because of its nationalization decree. The basic question which was presented to the New York courts in a very complicated series of legal proceedings was whether or not it should honor the assignment to the United States or should disregard the assignment as worthless and pay the equity assets over to the original Russian shareholders.

The New York courts held that the nationalization decrees were contrary to New York "public policy," and therefore the courts would not recognize them. They concluded that the Soviet Government had nothing to assign to the United States Government, and therefore the assignment was worthless. The court held as not controlling the fact that by our recognition it became the policy of the United States to recognize retroactively all acts of the then Soviet Government.

The case was appealed by the United States Government to the United States Supreme Court. In a 5-to-2 decision, that Court overruled the decision of the New York Court of Appeals. That is the decision in the famous Pink case, as I understand it to have been then interpreted, and as the Court, I believe, said. It held that the public policy of the United States was paramount to the public policy of New York—there is nothing remarkable, shocking, or unusual about that—and further, that the public policy of the United States was expressed in the Litvinov assignment, the

executive agreement between the President and Litvinov, which was an integral part of our diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Government. The Court demonstrated how a contrary decision would have frustrated our recognition of the Soviet Government and would have frustrated the payment of claims of the United States citizens against other nationalized firms in Russia.

The exact holding in the case was as follows:

We hold that the right to the funds or property in question became vested in the Soviet Government as the successor to the First Russian Insurance Co.; that this right has passed to the United States under the Litvinov assignment; and that the United States is entitled to the property as against the corporation and the foreign creditors (315 U. S. 203, 234).

Mr. President, that, in brief, in substance and in effect, is the Pink case. That holding and that holding alone, in the minds of some persons is supposed to furnish a predicate or a support to warrant a change in our Constitution. I wish to point out a number of aspects of the case which lead me to the conclusion that the case represents no threat whatever to our liberties.

First. I think it is necessary to keep in mind that the assignment was an integral part of the act of recognition itself. Without the assignment, no recognition could have taken place, because the settlement of claims had been an obstacle to the recognition for years. The Court touches upon this point in the following passages:

Recognition is not always absolute; it is sometimes conditional. (1 Moore, International Law Digest (1906), pp. 73–74; 1 Hackworth, Digest of International Law (1940), pp. 192–195.) Power to remove such obstacles to full recognition as settlement of claims of our nationals (Levitan, Executive Agreements, 35 Ill. L. Rev. 365, 382–385) certainly is a modest implied power of the President who is the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations. (*United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corp., supra*, p. 320.) Effectiveness in handling the delicate problems of foreign relations requires no less. Unless such a power exists, the power of recognition might be thwarted or seriously diluted. No such obstacle can be placed in the way of rehabilitation of relations between this country and another nation, unless the historic conception of the powers and responsibilities of the President in the conduct of foreign affairs (see Moore, Treaties and Executive Agreements, 20 Pol. Sc. Q. 385, 403–417) is to be drastically revised. It was the judgment of the political department that full recognition of the Soviet Government required the settlement of all outstanding problems including the claims of our nationals. Recognition and the Litvinov assignment were interdependent. We would usurp the executive function if we held that that decision was not final and conclusive in the courts.

I continue to read from the decision in the case:

The action of New York in this case amounts in substance to a rejection of a part of the policy underlying recognition by this Nation of Soviet Russia. Such power is not accorded a State in our constitutional system. To permit it would be to sanction a dangerous invasion of Federal authority. For it would "imperil the amicable relations between governments and vex the peace of nations." (*Oetjen* v. *Central Leather Co., supra*, p. 304.) It would tend to disturb that equilibrium in our foreign relations which the political departments of our National Government had diligently endeavored to establish.

Does anyone really seriously believe that New York or any other one of the 48 States should be permitted to block the recognition by the United States of a foreign government or a foreign state? This is what would have resulted if the Supreme Court had affirmed the decision of the New York Court of Appeals.

Second. The executive agreement which formalized our recognition of the Soviet Government and which included as an integral part the Litvinov assignment was an executive agreement made in pursuance of a specific power of the President under the Constitution. It is the exercise of just this type of power that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has said he does not wish to limit. For example, on February 5, he said:

I would be perfectly willing, if it was sound principle of law, which I could justify, to say that my amendment should not be construed to affect the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy or his powers as provided in the Constitution to receive Ambassadors and Ministers of foreign governments. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1404.)

On the same day the distinguished Senator also said that his substitute "could certainly not affect his"—the President's—"power, as an illustration, to invite and receive Ambassadors and Ministers of foreign countries. Those powers are expressly guaranteed in the Constitution, and under international law as well. International law is a part of the law which our courts must accept and enforce."

What the Senator from Georgia says may be very true in regard to some recognitions. I fail to see how it could apply to the recognition of the Soviet Government in 1933. There is certainly no principle of international law which would cover the Litvinov assignment, which was an integral part of the recognition. If recognition were to be accomplished, it was necessary to conclude an executive agreement containing specific provisions falling completely outside the principles of international law.

What is difficult to understand is the fact that the Litvinov assignment, which forms the base of the Pink case, is an executive agreement which was made by the President within his power as provided in the Constitution to receive Ambassadors and Ministers of foreign governments. It is just this power which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] says he does not wish to limit, and still he disagrees with the decision in the Pink case.

Third. It is frequently said, although erroneously, that the Pink case stands for the proposition that international agreements are not subject to the provisions of the Constitution, and in particular, that they are not subject to the fifth amendment. For example, on page 1405 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we find the following statement by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]:

Certainly it is the President's right to recognize foreign governments. But the question of abolishing one of the rights of the people under the fifth amendment has nothing to do with the recognition of a foreign government.

So said the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, nothing could be more misleading than this. The Court makes it perfectly clear that it is ready and willing to examine all international agreements to see if they contravene any of the provisions of the Constitution. In this instance, the Court examined the Litvinov assignment very closely and specifically dealt with arguments that it contravened the fifth amendment. The Court concluded, and I believe rightly, as do other lawyers, that there was no violation of the fifth amendment or any other provision of the Constitution. I should like to read several passages from the Court's opinion on this point.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Missouri has made a very important point with regard to the meaning and the effect of the Pink case. The Pink case does not stand for the proposition that the Court will not look into executive agreements entered into by a President which may contravene the Constitution. To the contrary, the Pink case is authority holding that the check provided under our constitutional system will be exercised by the Supreme Court of the United States, and which was exercised by the Supreme Court in terms in passing on the Litvinov agreement.

I do not believe we can emphasize too strongly that the Pink case does not support the holding that executive agreements made by a President supersede the Constitution; but, to the contrary, the Supreme Court found that the particular executive agreement in question did not violate the Constitution, carrying out the check which the Supreme Court had upon the exercise of executive power.

As I suggested in my speech last Friday on the Pink case, I am at a loss to find the language in the Court's decision which has caused all the excitement about the Pink case being an example of how the President of the United States can violate the constitutional rights of the American people. The Supreme Court said such an opinion is not valid.

That leads to the next question which I think needs to be emphasized: Are we, the Congress, to take the position that, because we do not like the effect of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, we ought to go along with a constitutional amendment which would have the legal effect of destroying the separation-of-powers doctrine, under which each branch of the Government is coordinate and equal, and under which system the Supreme Court of the United States is set up as the final judge of what is or is not constitutional? I suggest that in the last analysis we get down to the question whether or not the Congress

is going along with a proposal to amend the Constitution by an amendment which in effect puts the Congress over the President and the Supreme Court.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my distinguished colleague for his contribution. He is a fine lawyer and a scholar, and a teacher of the law in his own right. It is perfectly evident to me that there must be a gross misunderstanding upon the part of some of our colleagues and other proponents of the several amendments proposed, of what is actually stated in the Pink case. As to many of these amendments, the attempt is to write them on the floor of the Senate, or at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, or goodness knows where. We are asked to come in and, so to speak, off the cuff, amend the Constitution of the United States upon the basis of the Pink case, which does not at all state what many have undertaken to tell the Senate it does state and what impact it in fact has. When one takes the decision in the Pink case, and spends a little time studying it and reading the Court's opinion, it is really incredible and unbelievable to understand how some arrive at such an opinion. I hope that Members of the Senate, when we come to the consideration of the amendments, will not undertake to accept the word of even distinguished constitutional lawyers and others that the Pink case is an enormity, or a denial of justice to American citizens, or that it transgressed or trespassed upon the fifth amendment or any other section of the Bill of Rights or the Constitution of the United States.

It is the easiest thing in the world to lead people astray by saying, "This is the decision," and when they rely upon it without having read or fully comprehended the decision, driving them into something on which they need enlightenment when they may not fully comprehend or understand the decision.

I say that with no reflection upon the intelligence or capacity of any Member of this body; but we all know that many Senators do not have the time to study questions adequately. They are engaged in many other matters, on their own committees, and with their other obligations. To read and analyze a 50-page opinion is an undertaking from which many of us would quite naturally shrink. However, I do most respectfully adjure my colleagues to read the opinion, if they are not willing to accept what has been said in derogation of the effect of the so-called Pink case. I am sure that after doing so they will be compelled to a full realization that the Pink case is really not the bogey under the bed which it has been described to be by many of my learned colleagues.

The Court's opinion in the Pink case, which also involved the question of the fifth amendment, contained this statement:

> The Belmont case forecloses any relief to the Russian corporation. For this Court held in that case (301 U. S. at p. 332): "Our Constitution, laws, and policies have no extraterritorial operation, unless in respect of our own citizens. * * * What another country has done in the way of taking over property of its nationals, and especially of its corporations, is not a matter for judicial consideration here. Such nationals must look to their own government for any redress to which they may be entitled."

But it is urged that different considerations apply in case of the foreign creditors to whom the New York Court of Appeals (255 N. Y. 415, 175 N. E. 114) ordered distribution of these funds.

Of course, the reference is to the distribution of funds referred to in the Pink case.

I read further:

> The Court added the following footnote: In view of the disposition which we make of this case, we express no view on whether these creditors would be barred from asserting their claims here by virtue of the ruling in *Canada Southern Ry. Co.* v. *Gebhard* (109 U. S. 527, 538).

The Canada Southern Railway Co. case was an old case, decided in 1883, long before the decision in the Pink case, and long before the Pink case was raised as a grim specter which was "going to destroy our rights and take away our liberties and freedoms and make it possible for a Hitler to march to power." That argument has been used; it has been said that if we do not amend the Constitution in the way now proposed, we shall find a Hitler marching to power—all because of the Pink case, I gather.

Mr. President, I repeat a little of the last quotation:

> The Court added the following footnote: "In view of the disposition which we make of this case, we express no view on whether these creditors would be barred from asserting their claims here by virtue of the ruling in *Canada Southern Railway Company* v. *Gebhard* (109 U. S. 527, 538), that 'anything done at the legal home'—
>
> Which in that case meant Canada—
>
> of the corporation, under the authority of such laws, which discharges it from liability there, discharges it everywhere."

Mr. President, in that Canadian railway case, decided away back in 1883, the Canadian Parliament had made an arrangement for new securities in place of the ones then held by some American bondholders among others, thereby depleting considerably the value of the securities held by the Americans.

But to go back to the Pink case, the argument is that their rights in these funds had vested by virtue of the New York decree; that to deprive them of the property would violate the fifth amendment, which extends its protection to aliens, as well as to citizens; and that the Litvinov assignment cannot deprive New York of its power to administer the balance of the fund in accordance with its laws for the benefit of these creditors.

The Court said:

> At the outset, it should be noted that, so far as appears, all creditors whose claims arose out of dealings with the New York branch have been paid.

Mr. President, the creditors there referred to are the American creditors.

I read further from what the Court said:

> If the President had the power to determine the policy which was to govern the question of recognition, then the fifth amendment does not stand in the way of giving full force and effect to the Litvinov assignment. To be sure, aliens as well as citizens are entitled to the protection of the fifth amendment. (*Russian Volunteer Fleet* v. *United States* (282 U. S. 481).) A State is not precluded, however, by the 14th amendment from according priority to local creditors as against creditors who are nationals of foreign countries and whose claims arose abroad. (*Disconto Gesellschaft* v. *Umbreit* (208 U. S. 570).) By the same token, the Federal Government is not barred by the fifth amendment from securing for itself and our nationals priority against such creditors. And it matters not that the procedure adopted by the Federal Government is globular and involves a regrouping of assets. There is no constitutional reason why this Government need act as the collection agent for nationals of other countries when it takes steps to protect itself or its own nationals on external debts. There is no reason why it may not, through such devices as the Litvinov assignment, make itself and its nationals whole from assets here before it permits such assets to go abroad in satisfaction of claims of aliens made elsewhere and not incurred in connection with business conducted in this country. The fact that New York has marshaled the claims of the foreign creditors here involved and authorized their payment does not give them immunity from that general rule.

In essence, Mr. President, what the Court is saying is that since all American creditors of the Russian Insurance Co. have been paid in full, the Litvinov assignment does not contravene the fifth amendment. Creditors whose claims arise out of foreign transactions are not covered by the fifth amendment; and, furthermore, "the Federal Government is not barred by the fifth amendment from securing for itself and our nationals priority against such creditors." Mr. President, in my view, it is clearly wrong to say that the Pink case violated the rights of anyone under the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Fourth. There has been a great deal said about "secret agreements" and the necessity to control them. I should simply like to point out that the substitute amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] would have no bearing whatsoever on secret agreements. Perhaps I fail to get the point, but it seems perfectly obvious to me that an Executive agreement cannot possibly have any effect as internal law until it is made public. In other words, all the talk about secret agreements seems to me to be irrelevant.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Missouri has just used the phrase "internal law," in referring to the identical phrase used in the George amendment.

I have been "running the cases," as we lawyers say; and I cannot find in constitutional law any decision of the United States Supreme Court which interprets the phrase "internal law."

If my premise in that respect is a correct one, as I believe it to be, based upon the research I have made up to today, then let me say that if there is a case in which the Supreme Court discussed the

meaning of the phrase "internal law," I have not been able to find it.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sure the Senator from Oregon is correct, and that he will not be able to find such a case. I do not think one exists.

Mr. MORSE. Assuming that it is a new concept in United States constitutional law, does the Senator from Missouri agree with me that therefore it follows that if there is a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States on the floor of the Senate, and to do so before we have had the advantage of the learning of outstanding constitutional law authorities in the United States as to the meaning of the phrase "internal law," and as to its effect upon our legal system, what we are really doing is using a term which up to this hour is without constitutional-law meaning?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Oregon is precisely correct. The Senate would be proposing to amend the Constitution, and to add to it the word "internal," in compliance with, and following, the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, but without there being in existence in any case I have been able to find, or in any definition I have been able to discover, in its constitutional sense, a statement of the meaning of "internal law."

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit me to say one more word, which relates to the point he has just made, I believe it would be most unfortunate for the Senate to proceed to recommend to the American people the adoption of the George amendment, with an entirely new constitutional law concept in it, until we have at least first taken, our soundings, so to speak, in a hearing before the Judiciary Committee, as to what the legal consequences may be of adopting a constitutional amendment containing a legal term which has yet to be defined by the United States Supreme Court or, for that matter, used in any legal sense. I think that would be very dangerous, because, as I indicated yesterday, I do not know what internal law is, and I do not know what is meant when it is said that the proposed amendment would protect the American people from any executive agreement having internal law effect.

A few days ago I asked whether our truce agreement in Korea had any internal legal effect. Some GI's might think so, in connection with some claims which they might conceivably have in the future. I am speaking hypothetically. Therefore, I think it would be a great mistake, distinguished as is the Senator from Georgia, for us to accept the interpretation of the meaning of the phrase "internal law" advanced on the floor of the Senate by the Senator, until we have the benefit of scholarly hearings on the subject before the Judiciary Committee, so that we may know exactly what the legal effects are to be when we write a new concept into the Constitution of the United States by way of a legal term.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator for his contribution. I am in complete agreement that it would be a great mistake, without availing ourselves of the usual processes of committee consideration with regard to the full impact, significance, and interpretation of such an amendment, to undertake, on the floor of the Senate, to write an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Another point which I undertook to raise in my remarks last week was the question: Who is to decide which of the so-called executive agreements affecting internal law are to come to the Senate? Would not a President be well advised to send all such agreements to the Senate, on the theory that they might have some effect upon internal law? What effect would that have on the processes and the machinery of legislation in the Congress, or action in the Senate? Where do we start? Where do we stop? What is it that affects internal law? If such an amendment would not affect internal law, why not? What is our definition of the internal law about which we are now speaking? Where does it all lead us?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Speaking hypothetically again, the limitations which I now understand the Senator from Georgia proposes by way of clarification of his amendment, as first offered, also stimulate legal imagination. As I understand, he now wishes to make clear that he is excluding any agreement which involves the President carrying out his duty as Commander in Chief.

What are the limitations of the President's duty as Commander in Chief? Speaking hypothetically, is he exercising a duty as Commander in Chief if he enters into an executive agreement with the French Republic in connection with policies which the United States will follow in the prosecution of the war in Indochina?

Is he exercising his functions as Commander in Chief if—still speaking hypothetically—he enters into an executive agreement with the French Republic to supply a thousand airplane mechanics to work on airplanes of American design, owned by the French, and used in the Indochina war?

Is he exercising his duties as Commander in Chief if those thousand mechanics work on the planes out of the war zone, or only if they work on the planes within the war zones?

Is he exercising his powers as Commander in Chief if he enters into an agreement with the French Republic that we will supply, under the name of a military mission, 500 American Air Force officers only to brief French pilots on airfields within the war zone?

Or is he, in such an agreement—again speaking hypothetically—exercising his civil powers as President; and would such an agreement have to come to the Senate? Would any of the three hypothetical agreements which I have suggested have to come to the Senate, or would they all be examples of exercise by the President of his powers as Commander in Chief? The mechanics might think differently. The thousand mechanics might think, under my hypothetical example, that because of the effect of the executive agreement upon them, perhaps the Senate ought to take a look at the agreement, under the George amendment.

I cite these examples at random, to point out that a myriad such hypothetical questions ought to be submitted to the Judiciary Committee. We should have the benefit of testimony by constitutional experts; and, with the benefit of the hearings, we might be able, as Senators, to pass judgment upon the meaning of the George amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. The distinguished Senator is eminently correct. He has stated exactly the position of some of us, not only as to the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], but the proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute known as the George amendment.

The Senator raises many intricate questions. Of course, if such an amendment should become a part of our Constitution, those questions and many more would be persistently raised, and I fear to the embarrassment of all of us who would have taken part in an ill-considered action, with no emergency existing, amending the Constitution at this time, accepting an ill-considered substitute by way of compromise—or for whatever other purposes it might be devised. I want it very clearly understood that in making that statement I question the motives of no Senator.

I think the proposal to amend the Constitution is very dangerous. It is something which we would live to regret when the effects of it confronted us in after years.

Another aspect of the case which has either been ignored or minimized is that the Congress gave specific endorsement to the Litvinov assignment after its conclusion. The Court points this out very clearly on pages 227–228 of its opinion, as follows:

> Acting in anticipation of the realization of funds under the Litvinov assignment (H. Rept. 865, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), it authorized the appointment of a Commissioner to determine the claims of American nationals against the Soviet Government. Joint resolution of August 4, 1939, 53 Stat. 1199.

If the Congress had desired, it could have annulled the internal effects of the Litvinov assignment by a simple act of Congress. Far from doing this, it set up a Commission to adjudge the claims to be paid by the funds realized from the assignment.

Congress had not sought to annul the Litvinov agreement as it had abundant power to do. Congress had taken steps to implement the Litvinov agreement. The Court, in the Pink case, only sought to give effect to an agreement which the Congress itself had taken steps to implement.

Sixth. An argument can be made that in the case of the recognition of the Soviet Government in 1933, the President should have used a treaty instead of an executive agreement, since the recognition involved an assignment which could override State laws. This is a plausible argument but, in my view, an invalid one. To force the President to use a treaty in such circumstances would constitute a

change in our system of separation of powers. Under our present Constitution, the President alone has the power of recognition without the advice and consent of the Senate. He recognizes foreign governments on the best terms possible, his recognition often being conditional. If the conditions are to be subjected to senatorial approval, the President will no longer have the exclusive power of recognition. We must realize that such a situation would work a change in our Constitution as we have known it for 165 years.

Seventh. There is some broad and unessential language in the opinion which has caused a certain amount of apprehension. In my view, this language is dicta because it is not essential to the decision of the court. The language which I have in mind is on pages 230 and 231 of the Court's opinion. I will read it now:

> It is, of course, true that even treaties with foreign nations will be carefully construed so as not to derogate from the authority and jurisdiction of the States of this Nation unless clearly necessary to effectuate the national policy. (*Guaranty Trust Co.* v. *United States, supra*, p. 143, and cases cited.) For example, in *Todok* v. *Union State Bank* (281 U. S. 499), this Court took pains in its construction of a treaty, relating to the power of an alien to dispose of property in this country, not to invalidate the provisions of State law governing such dispositions. Frequently the obligation of a treaty will be dependent on State law. (*Prevost* v. *Greneaux* (19 How. 1).) But State law must yield when it is inconsistent with, or impairs the policy or provisions of, a treaty or of an international compact or agreement. (See *Nielsen* v. *Johnson* (279 U. S. 47).) Then, the power of a State to refuse enforcement of rights based on foreign law which runs counter to the public policy of the forum (*Griffin* v. *McCoach* (313 U. S. 498, 506)) must give way before the superior Federal policy evidenced by a treaty or international compact or agreement. *Santovincenzo* v. *Egan, supra* (284 U. S. 30); *United States* v. *Belmont, supra*.

That is the language which seems to give some Senators and other persons difficulty.

In the first place, the Court speaks of treaties when no treaty is involved. And in the second place, the language is very general and rather vague. In contradistinction, the decision of the Court is very narrow. I have no reason to believe that the Court would apply its broad dicta to an executive agreement which was not a valid exercise of a specific constitutional power and which has been made under circumstances where either a treaty or a congressionally sanctioned executive agreement should have been employed.

Eighth. I might make this further point, in passing, that it was not New York law, in the sense of a statute, that was in question in the Pink case, but only a determination of the New York courts as to what constituted New York "public policy," as distinguished from law.

The Legislature of New York has never decided that in regard to Russian shareholders in a Russian insurance company a nationalization or expropriation by the Russian Government would not be recognized in New York. It was the New York courts that had decided that Russian creditors of this expropriated insurance company should take precedence over American creditors of other expropriated Russian companies. In my view, the Pink case should have been decided the same way even if it had involved an act of the New York Legislature, but I merely wanted to point out that no such act was involved. It was simply a question of the "public policy" of the United States prevailing over the judicially declared "public policy" of the State of New York.

Ninth. I think that it should be made clear that in the Litvinov assignment the United States Government was in no way endorsing the Soviet expropriations. Quite to the contrary, it was trying to alleviate the hardships caused by such expropriations on all United States creditors whose property had been expropriated. There was no question of paying the claims of American creditors of the First Russian Insurance Co.; they had been paid in full. The question was one of priority between the Russian creditors of this company and American creditors of other expropriated Russian companies. It was the objective of the Litvinov assignment to give priority to such American creditors. The Supreme Court of the United States seemed to feel that this was a perfectly legitimate objective. I have difficulty in seeing how anyone can honestly disagree with it. Personally, I would feel that the President of the United States would have been lax in his duties if at the time he recognized the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics he had failed to obtain any available assignment, such as the Litvinov assignment.

In making the Litvinov agreement, President Roosevelt acted to protect American creditors. His policy was to take care of Americans in preference to foreigners. I am surprised that the senior Senator from Ohio apparently disagrees with this policy. In the Pink case, the Supreme Court merely said that the President was within his constitutional powers in acting so as to protect Americans first. That Senators are critical of President Roosevelt's action and of the Court's rule in this case is indeed amazing.

Mr. President, let me review the aspects of the Pink case which have led me to the conclusions that the decision was correct and that, even if it were incorrect, it is no cause for alarm, and certainly no cause for constitutional amendment.

The Litvinov assignment was an integral part of the act of recognition, and one of the 48 States should not be permitted to block national recognition of a foreign state or government.

The executive agreement, including the Litvinov assignment, was concluded under a specific power granted to the President in the Constitution.

There is no violation of any provision in the Constitution.

Congress showed its approval of the assignment by appointing a commission to administer the funds to be obtained under it; Congress certainly did not disapprove of the conclusion of the assignment, since it took no action whatever to overcome its domestic effect; it could simply have directed the President not to prosecute the interests derived under the assignment; and this would have constituted no breach of an international agreement, because it would have been a pure right and no obligation of the United States Government that would have been nullified.

Under the Constitution as we have known it for 165 years, the President has had the sole authority to recognize foreign government; and to force him to get the consent of the Senate in all cases where recognition is conditional would be a change in our traditional system of separation of powers.

There is some broad dictum in the case, but like all dictum it is of very limited effect. It alone should certainly not cause us to make changes in our Constitution.

There was no New York statute that was overruled in the decision.

I believe that the results of the case were good. It seems to me that the effects of Russian expropriation should be borne by Russian citizens and American citizens should not be forced to suffer losses. After all, it is the Russian Government that did the expropriating, not the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I hope I have demonstrated that the Pink case is not a judicial monster, but a very sensible case that has been misconstrued and exaggerated. I know that some Senators may disagree with some of the points I have made, but I hope I have called to their attention some points which may not have occurred to them.

Even if some of my distinguished colleagues are not convinced of all I have said, I would hope to convince them of my second major point: Regardless of the merits of the Pink case, under our present system of separation of powers, there are sufficient checks and balances to prevent an abuse of the power to make executive agreements.

In connection with the discussion of the various substitutes dealing with executive agreements there has been some rather extreme talk about "one-man rule," constitutions under which a Hitler could come to power in America, and so forth. The only justifications for such extreme theories seem to be the cases that arose out of the Litvinov assignment, and principally the Pink case. Even if they are given the most frightening interpretation possible, in my view, they do not present any real threat because of the various checks and balances which we have in our form of government.

Let us very quickly review these checks and balances.

Congress, by a simple act, can override the domestic effect of any treaty and any executive agreement. That is an exceedingly important point. I am perfectly aware that we do not want to make a habit of breaking our international commitments, but in an emergency—when the man on horseback is on the horizon—I feel sure that the Congress would never hesitate to take appropriate action as

sanctioned by the Constitution. I realize, also, that the man on horseback who might be sitting in the White House might veto the legislation. However, in a real emergency I am sure that a two-thirds majority of both Houses of Congress would be easy to obtain to override the veto.

A second very potent check and balance is the Supreme Court of the United States. Although in the Pink case the Court decided that a particular executive agreement, which had been made under a specific constitutional power of the President, could override State law, there is no indication that they will decide the executive agreements in general can override State law, regardless of the circumstances under which it was made, and regardless of the Presidential power being employed.

A great deal has been made of the fact that the present Attorney General has appealed the *Capps* case (204 F. 2d 655 (April 15, 1953)) to the Supreme Court It is said that if the Supreme Court decides in favor of the Government, all the fears growing out of the Pink case will have materialized. I am unable to agree with that conclusion.

The Capps case arose out of an executive agreement made with Canada in 1948 to prevent a flood of potatoes that would have wrecked our potato price-support program. There was an alternative method available under the provisions of the Agriculture Act of 1948, but it was felt that its application would take so long that it would not have been effective. Also its application would have caused hard feelings, and possibly retaliation, on the part of Canada, which preferred to prohibit export of potatoes rather than have us prohibit import of Canadian potatoes. The whole object of the executive agreement was to carry out the intent of Congress as expressed in the potato support program, and at the same time not to injure or impair our relations with Canada.

The Capps Corp. imported potatoes in violation of the executive agreement. The United States Government brought suit against Capps as a third-party beneficiary to the contract made between Capps and the Canadian exporter providing that the executive agreement, which had been implemented by the Canadian Government, would not be violated. Both the district court and the court of appeals found for the defendant. We do not know, of course, how the Supreme Court will decide the case. The question which is presented to them is whether the Congress intended to limit the President in carrying out the potato program solely to the use of the provisions of the Agriculture Act to discourage imports which would have the effect of wrecking the program, or whether they intended it to be merely one way with discretion in the President to supplement it with more effective methods wherever necessary. The Court will also have to decide whether the President did not have some independent discretion in the matter because of the foreign relations aspects of the case, growing out of the strong Canadian desire to work out an executive agreement rather than have the Agriculture Act applied.

Once the case is understood, it loses, as did the Pink case, most of its frightening aspects. Even if the Supreme Court decides in favor of the Government, no great danger to our liberties is presented. I feel quite certain myself that the court will decide this case very narrowly and avoid the type of dicta that was used in the Pink case.

In any event, I believe it will be beneficial for the Supreme Court to pass upon the issues involved, and I do not see why the Attorney General is being criticized for asking for certiorari in the case.

Aside from the Congress and the courts, we have additional checks and balances such as the power of impeachment and the power of public opinion. Although the power of impeachment is an extreme one, the power of public opinion can be relied upon in most instances to prevent an abuse of the power to make executive agreements. After all, there are elections every 4 years.

To me, all of these checks and balances, taken together, appear sufficient to protect us from abuse of the executive power.

The third point I would like to bring to the Senate's attention is the question of States' rights. I am utterly convinced that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] does not intend by his amendment to strike a blow at States' rights.

However, I am equally convinced that despite his intent, the wording of his proposed substitute would have just that effect. It would result in giving up the protection against Federal encroachment that is offered by the constitutional protection of two-thirds of the Senate.

I am not sure exactly how the Senator from Georgia does interpret his words so that they do not have this effect. At present, the supremacy clause is so worded that only treaties can have the effect of overriding State laws and State constitutions. Under the Senator's proposal, the supremacy clause would, in effect, be amended so that executive agreements, implemented by a majority of both Houses of Congress, would override State laws and State constitutions. I do not see how any other construction is possible under the wording of the substitute.

Executive agreements are given constitutional status, which they have never had, and which they do not have now. By specific constitutional sanction, they will be made superior to State laws when implemented by Congress. Is not this an invitation to the President to submit all controversial agreements in the form of executive agreements, rather than in the form of treaties? Will not the line between executive agreements and treaties, which has worked so well in practice, be completely broken down? Will there not be a great temptation upon the President to present such things as the Genocide Convention, the Human Rights Covenants, and similar documents, in the form of executive agreements, in the hope of getting approval of a majority of both Houses?

In my view, this is rather fatal medicine for a hypothetical disease. The only justification for taking the medicine seems to me to be some dictum in a single Supreme Court case.

This is a question which certainly my southern and my western friends, and certainly I, as a Senator from a State so classified, should think about. We should hesitate, even, to vote for the George substitute or any similar substitute or, for that matter, any substitute written on the floor of the Senate.

Should the small States be asked to give up their greatest protection on the theory that some bad result might come from the dictum in the Pink case, which really did not influence the decision? To that, the answer would seem to me to be an unequivocal "No."

Mr. President, there has been little time for the Senate to consider the George proposal. We have not had the benefit of the mature thinking of constitutional lawyers and students of international affairs on the proposal, as the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon has pointed out.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. In support of the comment the Senator from Missouri has just made, we will not have had the benefit of the testimony of the Secretary of State and persons in the State Department so responsible in their obligations to the President for devising foreign policy, and we will not have had the benefit of the testimony of the Attorney General of the United States, legal counsel to the President of the United States.

Does not the Senator from Missouri agree with me that as a matter of parliamentary courtesy, we owe an opportunity to the executive branch of the Government, with its obligations and responsibilities under the Constitution, to have its representatives come forward and to present their testimony on the effects of such an amendment as the George substitute?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Oregon certainly is correct. In all matters relating to the several departments of the Government, it is almost invariably the practice to call before the committees the Cabinet officers and other persons, including those charged with the defense of the country, as in the case of military matters, involving or affecting the armed services. We know that in this case the Attorney General of the United States and the Secretary of State never have been interrogated with respect to any of the possible effects, or as to the long-term or short-term effects, of the so-called George substitute.

A superficial study of the proposal has convinced me that it would have effects far beyond those contemplated by the learned Senator from Georgia. None of us in the Senate can be sure that further study would not disclose even more serious difficulties than those which I have undertaken to discuss in my speech today and that which I delivered last week. Even the most learned among us should avoid snap and hasty judgments when we consider amendments to the Constitution.

Let us remember that it is the Constitution, the fundamental law of the land, the charter of our liberties, with which we are dealing. We are not considering amendments to a code of court procedure which can be altered at will by future Congresses. We are considering amendments to the Constitution which once accepted cannot be altered by simple congressional enactment. If we err and deprive the Executive of the power to protect the security of the people in a grave and pressing emergency, no future Congress will have power in time to rectify whatever mistake may now be made.

We cannot preserve the Constitution and the liberties it guarantees to us by adding or subtracting a few words here and there. The genius of our Constitution resides not in the inflexible rules which it may impose, but in the general distribution of powers among the three great branches of government. The great principles governing the distribution of power between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches derive from the Constitution as a whole, and cannot be reduced or continued in any simple formula of words. We must rely on the spirit of the Constitution and the devotion of our people to the spirit of the Constitution to maintain a fair and workable balance of power among the three branches of government. At times in our history, the judiciary has tended to encroach on the functions of the other two branches of government; at other times, it has been the President or the Congress. But each time the balance has been restored, not by a new formula of words, but by the eternal vigilance of our people and their devotion to the great principles of the Constitution. Let us be careful that the vitality of these great principles is not lost by any vain attempt on our part to degrade them into a few inflexible rules or glib, easily arrived at, compromised verbal formulas.

We live in the atomic age and are threatened by dangers which cannot be erased by adding to our Constitution any formula of words. A few weeks ago, the Secretary of State made an important address in which he indicated a basic decision had been taken by the National Security Council to depend primarily for our defense upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our own choosing. I have many doubts and reservations about the policies announced in this respect by the Secretary of State in that speech. But there can be no doubt that we are living in a world in which the President of the United States may have to make instant decisions which may involve us in instant war without time for consultation or discussion with or in the Congress. The spirit of the Constitution would require that the President take the Congress into his confidence to the fullest extent possible before the necessity to act arises. But that cannot be achieved by adding any formula of words to the Constitution. Neither the Bricker amendment or any of its substitutes would help us to create smoother and more workable relations between the President and the Congress in meeting a genuine crisis. The Bricker amendment and its substitutes would simply make it harder or more difficult for the President in a grave emergency to take action which might be immediately necessary to safeguard the lives of our people.

We cannot save our people from the scourge of total war by tying the hands of the President or of future Congresses. This is no time to tinker with our Constitution. This is no time to deprive the President of powers under the Constitution which he may need to save the Republic.

I now yield the floor.

LICENSING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN HONOLULU TO LEAHI HOSPITAL

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 932, House bill 6025.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 932, House bill 6025.

The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6025) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Hospital, a nonprofit institution, to use certain United States property in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I had been a Member of the House of Representatives from the newly admitted State of Arizona for not quite a year when, on February 7, 1913, I listened to a lengthy speech delivered by Frank W. Mondell, of Wyoming, one of the senior Members who afterward became the majority floor leader. Mr. Mondell began by saying:

> Mr. Chairman, we live in the midst of revolution—revolution proposed and revolution threatened. It is true there are few open avowals of revolutionary intent; no armed forces hostile to our form of government and to our institutions thunder at our gates or threaten our liberties. On the contrary, the forces of revolution, though they have among their leaders many supremely selfish and inordinately ambitious and some thoroughly irresponsible and conscienceless men, are in the main composed of entirely well-meaning people, who, carried away by their enthusiasm or by the claims and sophistries of others, fail utterly to realize that they are the advocates and supporters of a revolutionary cause.
>
> This is a Government we are sworn to uphold. The portion of the sovereignty of the people which they have surrendered, or, rather, agreed to exercise jointly under a National Government, is set out in the Constitution in language reasonably clear and explicit; and that is the instrument we are sworn to uphold and defend against all enemies, foreign and domestic, which includes well-meaning enemies as well as willfully wicked ones.

Mr. Mondell then proceeded to state just why he was convinced that a revolutionary assault upon the Constitution was being attempted:

> What I have said is not intended as the opening of a Fourth of July oration or of a dissertation on American Government. It is preliminary to some observations which I shall make with respect to what, I regret to say, seems to be a very live issue. On May 9 last Mr. Lee, of Georgia, reported from the Committee on Agriculture a bill entitled "A bill for the protection of migratory and insectivorous game birds of the United States." A short time before that, namely, on April 26, 1912, Senator McLean reported from the Senate Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game a bill entitled "a bill to protect migratory game and insectivorous birds in the United States." On January 22, 1913, the said bill passed the Senate without any real debate and practically by unanimous consent. This bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, was ordered reported, and is, I believe, now on the calendar.
>
> It is 18 years since the beginning of my service here. In all that time there has been no legislation reported that has approached this in its revolutionary character.
>
> I shall not at length discuss the constitutionality of this legislation. I will leave that for the lawyers. I could not do it without expressing an opinion of the views of gentlemen who favor it from a constitutional standpoint, which I think no Member should express in regard to a colleague. Some of them claim that a bird is interstate commerce. I have never heard of the consignee or the consignor of the blackbird or the crow or the brant that wings its flight across the blue vault of heaven.
>
> The fact is that the most ingenious torturing of the Federal Constitution cannot develop the shadow of an excuse for such legislation as is proposed. The birds referred to are game. The Supreme Court has declared the sovereign power of the State over them, and no flight can change their character.

Mr. President, it is my purpose to present a number of historical facts, of some of which I had personal knowledge when they occurred, to show that the issues in the case of the State of Missouri against Ray P. Holland, a United States game warden, were thoroughly understood and debated in the Congress before the enactment of the migratory bird law upon the constitutionality of which the Supreme Court passed judgment in 1920.

The need for legislation to give adequate protection to migratory birds had been recognized throughout the United States for more than two decades before the Supreme Court decided the case. In 1910, Senator George P. McLean, a Senator from Connecticut and a former

Republican governor of that State, introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution which provided that "Congress shall have power to protect migratory birds and prohibit and regulate the killing thereof." The Senator later became convinced that a constitutional amendment was not necessary and therefore sponsored a bill which passed the Senate on January 22, 1913. In reporting the bill to the Senate, Senator McLean said:

For many years the necessity and importance of effective protection for the bird life of this and other nations has been apparent to ornithologists and all others who have interested themselves in the subject.

The several States of the Union have enacted many laws prohibiting and regulating the killing of birds, but the strong temptation pressing upon every State to secure its full share of edible game birds during the spring and fall migrations has rendered harmonious and effective State supervision impossible.

Game commissioners and other officials representing 43 of the 48 States of the Union, together with some of the leading ornithologists of the country, appeared before your committee, and their testimony, based upon years of experience and practical observation, was conclusive to the fact that State control of migratory birds must, from the very nature of the surrounding temptations and conditions, end in failure.

Conceding the necessity of Federal regulation and the willingness of Congress to exert its power to prevent the extermination of the useful migratory birds, the question of the extent and nature of that power was at once raised and very carefully considered by your committee.

The fact that several States of the Union have, up to date, exercised the right to regulate the taking of both migratory and nonmigratory birds where no discrimination or distinction has been suggested or desired does not preclude the Nation from asserting its right to protect migratory birds whenever conditions make such protection necessary. A dormant and unused power in a nation may be asserted at any time.

The power of the Federal Government to regulate by treaty the taking of migratory seals and fish cannot be questioned, and your committee can see no distinction between the right to regulate by law and treaty the taking of seals and fish that today may be in the waters of one State or Nation and tomorrow in the waters of another State or Nation, and that the right to regulate the taking of wild birds whose habitat changes from one State or Nation to another with the changing seasons.

A House bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture by Representative Gordon Lee, of Georgia, was accompanied by a 12-page report which gave detailed reasons why migratory birds required protection by the Federal Government. The bill was not brought to a vote, but later, as stated by Mr. Mondell, the McLean measure came over from the Senate and was favorably reported to the House by Hon. John Lamb, of Virginia, a Confederate veteran, who served for 16 years in the House. The following extracts are taken from his report:

It appears that most of the States have laws more or less effective in the protection of game and other birds resident and breeding within their borders, and by special reservation in this act none of its provisions are to be deemed to affect or to interfere with these laws as to such birds, or to prevent the States from enacting laws and regulations in aid of the regulations of the Department of Agriculture provided for in this act.

Through these local laws, however, it appears that because of their nomadic habits little or no real protection is afforded waterfowl or other migratory game and insectivorous birds, and therefore, to secure for them adequate protection, particularly in the spring, when they are on their way to their nesting grounds, they should be placed under the control of the general Government.

It has been conclusively shown that some of the most valuable species of these nomadic birds will soon become extinct unless immediate congressional protection is afforded.

The game birds yield a considerable and important amount of highly valued food, and the insectivorous migratory birds destroy annually thousands of tons of noxious weed seeds and billions of harmful insects, and it may be stated that they are the deadliest foe yet found for the cotton boll weevil, the gypsy and brown-tail moths, and other like pests.

Forty-four of the States of the Union were represented before your committee at the hearings on this proposed legislation, either in person or by letters and briefs, and the legislatures of the States of Massachusetts, New York, and Oklahoma have adopted and presented to Congress resolutions urging this legislation.

Owing to the opposition of Mr. Mondell, no action was taken by the House on the Senate bill, so Senator McLean offered the text of it as an amendment to the annual agricultural appropriation bill, to which objection was made by Senator Nathan P. Bryan, of Florida. The following statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1913, show the action taken, which resulted in what became known as the Migratory Bird Act of March 4, 1913:

Mr. GRONNA of North Dakota. Mr. President, I hope that the Senator from Florida will withdraw his point of order on the amendment that has been submitted by the Senator from Connecticut. The Senator from Florida well knows that a similar bill passed the Senate unanimously, and the only way that this bill can become a law at the present session is to put it upon some appropriation bill. The bill which the Senator from Connecticut introduced passed the Senate unanimously, and it would seem to me that having formerly passed the Senate it is not really subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Inasmuch as the bill has passed the Senate without objection the Chair will submit the question to the Senate: Is the amendment in order on the pending bill?

Mr. BURNHAM (of New Hampshire who was in charge of the appropriation bill). In view of the action of the Senate, the Senate having passed the bill, and its present standing in the House, as I understand it, I wish to say that I have no objection to the amendment, and I accept it, so far as I have any authority to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators who are of the opinion that the amendment is in order on the pending bill will say "aye." [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

At a Senate committee hearing on the protection of migratory birds, held on March 6, 1912, attended by Milo C. Perkins of California, Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, Miles Poindexter of Washington, Lee S. Overman of North Carolina, and Gilbert M. Hitchcock of Nebraska, and presided over by Senator McLean as chairman, it was urged by numerous witnesses representing game-protective associations that wild game belongs to all the people in their united sovereignty, and that consequently the Government of the United States had authority to legislate for the protection of this property. Supreme Court decisions were cited to show that in the absence of legislation by Congress the reserve power of the States is plenary within their jurisdictions, but when Congress exercises a dormant power State laws must give way. It was this line of reasoning which persuaded Senator McLean to sponsor the legislation which became the Migratory Bird Act of 1913.

However, it is evident that the Senator from Connecticut did not fail to take notice of a paragraph in a brief filed by George H. Shiras 3d, a former Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, urging direct action by Congress, which stated:

THE RIGHT OF THE GOVERNMENT BY TREATY TO PROTECT THE MIGRATORY BIRDS AND MIGRATORY FISH OF THE UNITED STATES

While in one respect it may not be germane to consider now another and wholly different jurisdiction for the protection of beneficial migrants, were it not that future development may make it important in the present connection.

In the case of wild fowl, excepting possibly the wood duck, and in the case of most of our shore birds or snipe, it can be easily shown that as a class all these migrants during their vernal and autumnal movements either breed in or pass over the adjoining territory of several nations. And just as we are now about to put into effect a treaty with Great Britain regulating the taking of fish in the Great Lakes and within the territorial waters of such boundary States, just so we have the future right to make a series of treaties with Canada, under British sanction, and with Mexico and other southern republics interested in the protection of birds habitually migrating from one country to another.

Under a similar treaty with several foreign powers we have been able to prohibit pelagic sealing, and Congress, while having no original jurisdiction over such a subject, now possesses an implied right to pass such laws as may be necessary to put such treaty regulations into operation.

Should Congress now decline, by a direct act, to protect the migratory birds and the migratory fish of the United States, it may be worth while then to resort to a treaty for this purpose.

This precautionary suggestion probably had influence when Senator McLean introduced his resolution requesting the President to negotiate migratory bird treaties with other nations. This he did on April 7, only a little over a month after the enactment into law of the text of his bill on March 4, 1913.

There can be no doubt that, being convinced that the constitutional question would be raised, Elihu Root, then a Senator from New York, a former Secretary of State, felt fully justified in submitting on April 12, 1913, a favorable report from the Committee on Foreign Relations on a resolution introduced by Senator McLean, which provided:

That the President be requested to propose to the governments of other countries the negotiation of a convention for the protection and preservation of migratory birds.

In fact, Senator Root introduced a resolution of his own which read:

Resolved, That the President be requested to propose to the governments of other North American countries the negotiation of a convention for the mutual preservation of migratory birds.

Then Senator Root gave way to Senator McLean, whose resolution was agreed to in the Senate on July 7, 1913, and promptly transmitted to President Wilson.

It is impossible to believe that Elihu Root, a great lawyer, after serving for over 4 years as the head of the Department of State, would look with favor upon any proposal whereby the treaty-making power might be utilized to impair the Constitution of the United States. Yet the American people have been told over and over again during the past 3 years that the Migratory Bird Treaty with Great Britain, negotiated in response to the resolution reported by Senator Root, created a great loophole in the Constitution which, if not plugged by the Bricker amendment, leaves an opening by which the American people can lose all the liberties guaranteed to them by the Bill of Rights.

In course of time the Migratory Bird Act of 1913 was compelled to travel over a rough legal road. It was declared to be unconstitutional by a number of United States district courts, the opinions in three of which are available in printed reports. Consequently it became evident that use of the treaty-making power was the only remaining way to proceed.

On August 21, 1916, a little over 3 years after the Senate made its request, President Wilson sent a message to the Senate transmitting a convention between the United States and Great Britain for the protection of migratory birds in the United States and Canada, which stated that the convention was negotiated pursuant to the Senate resolution adopted on July 7, 1913.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the President's message and the accompanying statement by Robert Lansing, the Secretary of State. I also include in my request that I may have permission to insert in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, other documents and extracts from records to which I shall make reference as I proceed with this discussion.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate:

In pursuance of the resolution adopted by the Senate on July 7, 1913, requesting the President to propose to the governments of other countries the negotiation of a convention for the protection and preservation of birds, negotiations were by my direction initiated with the Government of Great Britain through the British Ambassador for the conclusion of a convention that would insure protection to migratory and insectivorous birds in the United States and Canada.

These negotiations have resulted in the signature, on August 16, 1916, of a convention for this purpose between the United States and Great Britain, which I transmit herewith to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification.

The attention of the Senate is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State and to the views of the Department of Agriculture therein presented.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 21, 1916.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 17, 1916.

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate, if his judgment approve thereof, to receive the advice and consent of that body to its ratification, a convention between the United States and Great Britain for the protection of migratory birds in the United States and Canada, signed at Washington on August 16, 1916.

This convention is the result of negotiations initiated with the British Ambassador at Washington in pursuance of the resolution adopted by the Senate on July 7, 1913, "That the President be requested to propose to the governments of other countries the negotiation of a convention for the protection and preservation of birds."

The Department of Agriculture has taken keen interest in the negotiations and has been of great help in their final conclusion. The views of that Department regarding the negotiation of this treaty were expressed in a communication recently addressed to this Department, as follows:

"Not very many years ago vast numbers of waterfowl and shore birds nested within the limits of the United States, especially in the Far West, but the extension of agriculture, and particularly the drainage on a large scale of swamps and meadows, together with improved firearms and a vast increase in the number of sportsmen, have so altered conditions that comparatively few migratory game birds nest within our limits. The greater part of the supply still remaining, the value of which must be estimated at many millions of dollars, breed largely in the Canadian Provinces and consist of birds that winter within or to the south of the United States and journey back and forth in autumn and spring across our territory.

"That a very great number of people in the United States are personally interested in the protection of our migratory wild birds is evidenced by the fact that there are about 5 million sportsmen in this country and their number is steadily increasing. These men are all dependent upon the continuance of our supply of wild fowl for their sport, and a very large number of them are in consequence taking an active interest in the present treaty. In addition the value of the proper protection of our migratory insectivorous birds is of the deepest interest to farmers for the practical assistance they give in destroying insects injurious to crops. Furthermore, millions of people in the United States are deeply interested in the conservation and increase of our bird life from an esthetic viewpoint, as well as on account of their practical utility. As a result the number of persons who approve and are deeply interested in the conclusion and enforcement of the present treaty includes many millions. There is no question but that the Federal migratory bird law and the present treaty for the protection of migratory wild fowl now being negotiated between the United States and Canada are conservation measures of prime importance."

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT LANSING.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, article VIII of the convention provided that—

The high contracting powers agree themselves to take, or propose to their respective appropriate lawmaking bodies, the necessary measures for insuring the execution of the present convention.

The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in his address on February 1 in support of the Bricker amendment, made the following statement:

John Pollock was Federal district judge in Missouri in 1915. He laid down a very solid and a very well-reasoned opinion, in which he said there was no power in Congress to authorize a warden to go into Missouri and to apprehend one of its citizens for shooting a wild mallard out of season.

The case went to the Supreme Court of the United States when, I believe, Edward Douglass White was the Chief Justice, who, as I recall, came from Louisiana. The vote in the Supreme Court on that issue was 3 to 3. * * *

So no effort was made to disturb the decision which was rendered in the Missouri case, involving the shooting of a wild mallard and the apprehension of the hunter under Federal law. The decision meant, of course, that Congress did not have the power under the Constitution as it then obtained to pass a law providing for arrests in such cases. So the conviction could not stand.

Then something happened. Very quickly President Wilson submitted a treaty to Great Britain and to the Dominion of Canada. It did not take long to contrive that treaty to deal with wildfowl.

Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from Illinois did not intend it that way, but from his saying "Then something happened. Very quickly President Wilson submitted a treaty to Great Britain and Canada," it might be inferred that the then President acted in an artful way without letting everyone know the object to be accomplished by the ratification of such a treaty.

The message from President Wilson transmitting the migratory bird convention to the Senate shows that it was negotiated pursuant to a request made by the Senate more than 3 years before. I am sure that no one who knew him will believe that Mr. Wilson was duped into negotiating and submitting a treaty which violated any part of the Constitution. A man who had built up a national reputation for his knowledge of the nature of the powers possessed by the Federal Government must be assumed to have known just what he was doing when he asked the Senate to approve that treaty. The author of Congressional Government was a stanch defender of every right guaranteed to the American people by the Constitution.

The minutes of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations show that on August 25, 1916, on motion by Senator James A. O'Gorman, of New York, seconded by Senator John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, a favorable report was ordered to be made on the Migratory Bird Treaty. The minutes of the executive session of the Senate for August 29, 1916, have not been located, but the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date shows that Senator O'Gorman, in open session, reported its ratification.

The next step to be taken was the introduction of a bill to implement the treaty, which was done by Marcus A. Smith, a Senator from Arizona and a member of the Committee on Foreign

Relations. His bill was favorably reported with the following justification:

The Committee on Foreign Relations, having had under consideration Senate bill 1553, "to give effect to the convention between the United States and Great Britain for the protection of migratory birds, concluded at Washington August 16, 1916, and for other purposes," reports it back and recommends that the bill be passed.

Your committee desires to call attention to the fact that the aforesaid treaty was ratified at the earnest solicitation of the United States and that the demands of international courtesy call for the passage of this act at an early date.

Your committee would further call attention to the fact that the Senate, in 1913, adopted a resolution requesting the President to negotiate treaties with foreign nations for the protection of migratory birds, and that the treaty with Great Britain was secured in direct response to this resolution.

In view of these circumstances, your committee is confident that the Senate will recognize the necessity for immediate and favorable action upon the pending measure.

The effective protection of the useful migratory birds has been desired by the American people for many years.

It is advocated by State authorities, as well as by many associations and individuals who have appeared before congressional committees to urge the economic value of the insectivorous birds as a protection to agriculture and the vital necessity of conserving the birdlife of the country by Federal laws and regulations.

The Senator from Arizona had difficulty in obtaining consideration for his bill, which was under discussion on 5 different days between June 27 and July 30, 1917, when the Senate passed it without a record vote. The principal opposition came from Senator James A. Reed, of Missouri, who, after his motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations had failed by a vote of 7 yeas to 43 nays, among other arguments advanced the following:

Mr. President, I am perfectly aware that my opposition to this bill and this class of legislation has been regarded as somewhat stubborn, and I am going to say now for the relief of the Senator in charge of the bill that I am going to give him a vote before 2 o'clock, because I shall have done my full duty, and I only want time enough to make my position perfectly clear.

The fact is, there are two classes of men opposed to this legislation. One of them is that class of sportsmen who believe that when you undertake to turn over to the Agriculture Department of this country the right to make rules and regulations prescribing when and how and where game can be killed, you have put the job into the hands of incompetents who do not know how to administer it. The demonstrations up to this day are to the effect that the Agriculture Department do not know how to administer this law, a fact which they confess by going outside of the departments of the Government and outside of any authority of law and organising what they please to term an advisory council.

But there is another class who have opposed this legislation, and in that class I include myself. It is that class of men who hold that there are certain fundamental rights and privileges and duties which belong to the several States of the Union, and that those rights and duties under the Constitution of the United States cannot be taken away, and that when Congress undertakes to take them away Congress violates the Constitution that it ought sacredly to uphold.

I say it now, in all pleasantness, and by way of parenthesis, the day is going to come, and come soon, when men who do not stand by the Constitution of the United States will find other men occupying their seats in Congress, for, just as certain as the old sun will lift its head in the east and disappear at eventide in the west, just as certain will the day come when the people of the United States will discover that this much-maligned Constitution is their Constitution; that it is their charter of rights; that it is their harbinger of safety; and that those who strike it down or lay unholy hands upon it are worse than anarchists, because the anarchist parades his infamy in the open, while those who undermine the Constitution do it under the pretense of performing a public service; but whoever undermines the Constitution will someday find that the people will rise and say: "This was our Constitution; we wrote it in blood and in tears; we inscribed it as the charter of our rights; and we demand that obloquy and disgrace shall be visited upon every man who has assisted in debasing the Constitution." Make no mistake. We shall be held to a strict accountability.

In the vast majority of cases the liberties of the peoples of various countries who have had liberty and have lost it by men who permitted the rights of the people to be impinged, and who at the time thought they were doing a good service; but, sir, they made a precedent that lived to become the instrument in the hands of others to bring about evil for their country. And so I still have the temerity to stand here, although I stand alone, with nothing back of me except the unbroken decisions of half a century of the courts of the United States and the courts of the several States, with nothing back of me but the decisions of at least two Federal courts rendered recently with reference to a law like the one now before us—I have the temerity to stand alone and protest against this legislation.

The Smith bill was favorably reported from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs by Hon. Charles M. Stedman, of North Carolina, a three times wounded veteran of the Confederate Army, who came out of the Civil War with the rank of major. His report, submitted on April 20, 1918, reads, in part, as follows:

The power to make treaties extends to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and that of other nations.

One of the provisions of the migratory-bird treaty is that the two nations shall enact whatever legislation may be necessary to carry into effect its terms.

As this agreement is contained in the treaty, Congress must execute the contract by legislation to make it effective and enforceable by the courts. (*Foster* v. *Neilson* (2 Peters 253–314).)

The treaty is valid. It was negotiated and concluded by the authorities having undisputed power to do so. It has been ratified by both governments.

The bill as reported has all essential requisites to enforce the treaty.

Its passage is demanded by a sense of patriotic duty to our entire country. By preventing the indiscriminate slaughter of birds which destroy insects which feed upon our crops and damage them to the extent of many millions of dollars, it will thus contribute immensely to enlarging and making more secure the crops so necessary to the support and maintenance of the brave men sent to the battlefield by this Republic, to preserve the honor of its flag, and to protect the lives of its citizens wherever engaged in lawful pursuits.

This bill, or one like unto it in all essential features, is demanded by practically all the farmers in our land, through their different organizations, State and national.

There are approximately 5 million sportsmen in this country, who urge prompt action to protect the migratory birds.

Not alone the utility of this measure appeals to many others than farmers and sportsmen, but thousands upon thousands of people—men, women, and children—who have happy memories of their homes made brighter and more attractive by the annual visitation of the robin, the catbird, and other insectivorous birds embraced within the treaty, earnestly request the passage of the bill.

The sentiment of approval is practically universal.

My recollection that the principal opposition to the bill to carry into effect the Migratory Bird Treaty was based upon the fear of Federal bureaucracy rather than upon a violation of the Constitution, is borne out by the proceedings in the House as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A sample of what was repeatedly said can be found in a speech by Hon. Thaddeus H. Caraway, a Representative from Arkansas, who became a Member of the Senate in 1921, and served in this body until his death 10 years later, when he was succeeded by his estimable wife.

In denouncing the bill Mr. Caraway said:

It gives to the Secretary of Agriculture the right to name a horde of officers, many of them without known character, without standing, certainly not known in the community that is to suffer from their activity. These will pin the bottom of an oyster can upon their coats and invade the homes of free citizens * * *. If you have had any experience with a departmental agent, one of these who parts his hair in the middle and puts on a nose glass and looks wise and knows nothing, you know this is true—that he has the idea that his efficiency—whatever that may mean—depends upon the number of people he harasses and the amount of discontent and disturbance he creates.

The author of this measure seeks power for the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint a thousand of those fellows and turn them loose to protect the tomtits and harass the white people of this country. They will go out from Washington and will come back with statements something like this: "I arrested Bill Jones because I saw a duck feather sticking out of his hat, and I threw the widow Smith out of her house because I had a suspicion there was half of a bird's egg under her table. I left anger and resentment wherever I went, and I will do as well the next time."

Mr. Mondell, of Wyoming, expressed his continued opposition by saying:

Whenever we encroach upon those principles thus laid down and established we undermine the very foundations of our Government. It is curious the frame of mind gentlemen bring themselves to in a matter of this kind. Men who have so profound a regard for local rights—we call them States' rights because our Commonwealths are States, but I mean local rights. Men who have such regard for local rights of self-government that they would not tolerate for a moment a proposition to invoke the Federal authority in the protection of human life and against outrage to the individual will blithely support a proposition to establish Federal police jurisdiction the country over for the alleged protection of the plover and peedee. Such is the inconsistency of the attitude of these gentlemen.

Major Stedman, an experienced lawyer, who had served as president of the North Carolina Bar Association,

made an able defense of the bill, and clearly set forth what would be accomplished by its enactment. His line of reasoning is indicated by the following extracts from his remarks made on June 4, 1918:

The treaty is valid. It violates no fundamental principle of our Government. It was negotiated and concluded by the authorities having undisputed power to do so. It has been ratified by both governments. The power to make treaties extends to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and that of other nations.

One of the provisions of the migratory-bird treaty is that the two nations shall enact whatever legislation may be necessary to carry into effect its terms.

As this agreement is contained in the treaty, Congress must execute the contract by legislation to make it effective and enforceable by the courts.

The bill as reported has all essential requisites to enforce the treaty. * * *

The present migratory-bird law has been declared unconstitutional by five courts, three Federal courts and two State supreme courts, Maine and Kansas, whilst it has been sustained by 15 courts. One of the cases decided by a Federal court was from the eastern district of Arkansas, Shauvers case. That case was removed to the Supreme Court of the United States and was argued in 1915. That court took it under advisement. When the case was called the Attorney General moved that the case be passed subject to be called up by an agreement of counsel. Is it not a fair and legitimate presumption that this action was so taken to give Congress the opportunity to enact a bill to carry out the treaty between the United States and Great Britain?

The bill deals with an international question. There is a marked distinction between the right of Congress to legislate for the protection of birds in the different States, in the absence of any treaty with another nation with reference to the same subject and affecting the interests of that other nation, and the right to so legislate after a treaty is made to carry it into effect.

The cases relied upon as bearing upon the present migratory-bird law and intended to show its violation of the Const'tution, in that it interferes with the inherent right of the several States to regulate and control game laws, do not apply to this bill.

The full power of the United States to make treaties, with stipulations affecting matters within State control, and also to enforce said treaties by appropriate legislation, is recognized by many eminent authorities, both Federal and State.

It could not be otherwise, as the States are deprived of all power to make treaties by express constitutional limitations. It is only through the intervention of the Federal Government, exercised in their behalf, that the rights of the citizens of each State with foreign nations can be protected.

At the very commencement of the operation of constitutional power a conflict arose between State sovereignty and the right of the Federal Government to modify State laws under the treatymaking power.

Over 100 years ago this question was before the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Ware* v. *Hylton*, reported in Third Dallas, page 199. This case has been the leading authority from that date, that a treaty made by the constituted authorities of the United States with regard to any matters, whether exclusively within the control of the States or not, was paramount to any State legislation. The point involved was whether the treaty of peace with Great Britain would override State statutes in regard to the collection and confiscation of antebellum debts owed by Americans to citizens of Great Britain.

The doctrine announced in *Ware* v. *Hylton* was reiterated in *Fairfax* v. *Hunter* (U. S. Supreme Court, 7 Cranch 603); also in *Hopkirk* v. *Bell* (U. S. Supreme Court, 3 Cranch); in *Hunter* v. *Martin* (U. S. Supreme Court, 4 Wheat.); in *Haunstine* v. *Lynham* (100 U. S. Supreme Court); in *Chirac* v. *Chirac* (U. S. Supreme Court, 2 Wheat.); in *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. Supreme Court); in *Carneal* v. *Banks* (U. S. Supreme Court, 10 Wheat. 189); in *Hughes* v. *Edwards* (U. S. Supreme Court, 9 Wheat. 489); and in other cases decided by the Supreme Court of the United States which might be cited.

In *Ware* v. *Hylton* it was held that the treaty of peace nullified all State laws by its own operation when in conflict with them.

In *Hopkins* v. *Bell* the treaty was held to repeal the Virginia statute of limitations.

In *Hunter* v. *Martin* it was held that in a case where the treaty was ratified after the rendition of a judgment in the circuit court, which was impeachable on no other ground than the effect of a treaty, the judgment was revoked on that ground.

To the same effect have been the decisions of the highest courts in many of the States. * * *

These decisions are sustained by the support and concurrence of the illustrious names of John Marshall, Joseph Story, and other eminent jurists, including Justices Jay, Field, Bradley, Miller, Harlan, Gray, and Fuller.

It has also been urged that the United States could not exercise its treatymaking power in regard to matters wholly within State jurisdiction to any greater extent than Congress could exercise its legislative powers.

It is sufficient to say in answer thereto that the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly held that the treatymaking power could regulate the descent of property as well as other matters under State jurisdiction and that in so doing it can supersede all conflicting State laws which Congress, in the absence of treaty stipulation, could not possibly do by ordinary legislation.

When the importance of this bill is considered as affecting the interests of our entire country, one cannot fail to pause and reflect upon the memorable words of Joseph Story:

"That had the framers of the Constitution done nothing else than to securely vest the treatymaking power in the Central Government, they would be entitled to immortality and the unending gratitude of the American people."

Hon. William H. Temple, of Pennsylvania, who served in the House for over 10 years from that State, and who prior thereto had been for 8 years a professor of history and political science at Washington and Jefferson College, clearly demonstrated that the bill in no way violated the Constitution. I quote from his speech:

The question has been raised as to whether the bill now under discussion, or even the treaty itself, is constitutional. I should like to read a single sentence from Charles Henry Butler's great work on the treatymaking power of the United States. Mr. Butler says:

"The power to legislate in regard to all matters affected by treaty stipulations and regulations is coextensive with the treatymaking power, and acts of Congress enforcing such stipulations, which in the absence of treaty regulations would be unconstitutional as infringing upon the powers reserved to the States, are constitutional and can be enforced, even though they may conflict with State laws and provisions of State constitutions."

If the power to legislate in regard to all matters affected by treaty stipulations is, as Mr. Butler says, coextensive with the treatymaking power, then a law to make the treaty operative cannot be unconstitutional unless the treaty itself is unconstitutional. There are doubtless limits to the treatymaking power, but no case has yet arisen in which a treaty has been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

It has been said that the police power is a right reserved by the States and has not been delegated to the General Government; that in its lawful exercise the States are absolutely sovereign, and that such exercise cannot be disturbed by any treaty stipulations. It is argued that as the laws for the protection of game birds are such an exercise of the police power, the enactment of such laws by the National Government would be unconstitutional, and even treaty stipulations could not bring them within the jurisdiction of Congress.

On the contrary, the Supreme Court has held that the United States, in the exercise of its treatymaking power, may in certain circumstances enforce laws prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in territory which, but for the treaty, would be in this matter subject only to the police power of a State.

I refer to the case of the *United States* v. *Forty-three Gallons of Whisky*, reported in 93d United States Reports, page 188.

The whisky had been seized in Crookston, Polk County, Minn., under the act of Congress, 1864, which prohibited the possession of spirituous liquors in Indian country. The place where the liquor was seized was not Indian country, and had not been Indian country in 1864, when the act was passed. It was situated in the district which had been ceded to the United States in the treaty of October 3, 1863, between the United States and the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians. Article 7 of the treaty is as follows:

"The laws of the United States now in force, or that may hereafter be enacted, prohibiting the introduction and sale of spirituous liquors in the Indian country, shall be in full force and effect throughout the country hereby ceded until otherwise directed by Congress or the President of the United States."

The district court of the United States declined jurisdiction, and the question of jurisdiction was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States.

It was then contended that the treaty which made the law applicable to this territory was invalid so far as it attempted to extend to an organized county of Minnesota certain United States laws applicable only to Indian territory. This contention was based on the ground that a treaty which provides regulations which the Federal Government cannot constitutionally impose is to that extent without validity or binding force.

The Supreme Court decided otherwise and held that it is competent for the United States, in the exercise of its treatymaking power, to stipulate in a treaty with an Indian tribe that within the territory ceded by the treaty laws of the United States prohibiting the introduction and sale of spirituous liquors in the Indian country shall be in full force and effect in spite of the fact that the said territory has ceased to be Indian country and has become a part of an organized county of a State.

This applies not only to laws in force at the time the treaty was signed but also to laws that might afterward be enacted. They, too, would be in full force and effect within the limits of the district covered by the treaty, though in that district, but for the treaty, the laws of the United States for the control of Indian country would not be operative.

The case that was referred to by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood], *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S., p. 258), is also in point, as showing the wide scope of the treatymaking power. The Court said:

"The treatymaking power extends to all proper subjects of negotiation between our

Government and that of other nations. It, as expressed in the Constitution, is in terms unlimited, except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the Government or all of its departments and those arising from the nature of the Government itself and that of the States."

In reply to Mr. Temple, Hon. Horace M. Towner, of Iowa, an able lawyer, who opposed the bill, gave his opinion on the issue of constitutionality by stating:

Mr. Chairman, I agree with those who have said that the constitutional powers conferred upon the President and the Senate in the negotiation of treaties would reach to any question such as here is to be considered. I agree entirely with the proposition that insofar as it is proper to carry out the terms of a treaty all the necessary powers are given to Congress to carry them out. I agree entirely with the statement that it is necessary for the House of Representatives in instances such as this to join in legislation that shall carry into effect the terms of the treaty. However, I differ from the gentlemen who say that because now we have made a treaty that therefore Congress can pass any law that they may deem necessary for the purpose of carrying out any of the provisions regarding the migration of birds, for instance, as in this bill.

The Supreme Court of the United States has clearly indicated the limit of the action of Congress with regard to the enforcement of treaties. It extends to all of those things that do not raise a constitutional question, that do not affect the rights of the Federal Government or the rights of the States. This rule was expressly laid down in the decision that was quoted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Temple]. It does not extend to those questions affecting the relations of the States to the General Government. It cannot take from the States the powers that are theirs under the Constitution. That being true, then we have not removed and will not remove by the passage of this act the constitutional difficulty, because the constitutional difficulty regarding the present law, and which will remain in this law if it is passed, is the question as to whether the General Government has any right to legislate whatever regarding migratory birds or fishes.

The power to legislate concerning game has been from the first exercised by the States and has been confirmed by the courts down to the present day. This bill if passed will take that power away from the States and confer it upon an official of the General Government. Therefore if we commit to the General Government a question that belongs to the jurisdiction of the States, it is an interference with the constitutional rights of the States. We are, therefore, not going to get rid of this constitutional question by this legislation. It will still remain. I do not know what the Supreme Court of the United States will say eventually regarding this proposition, but it is not removed by any means. It remains, and if the Supreme Court shall follow out the almost unbroken line of authorities, that the control of the wild game, of the birds and the fishes, lies with the States, then this law will be declared unconstitutional, just the same as the United States courts up to the present time have declared the present law unconstitutional.

Hon. John H. Small, who served 22 years as a Representative from North Carolina, made the following statement:

I flatter myself that when it comes to the preservation of the essential rights of the States, I have a record perhaps as good as that of any Member of this honorable body. But we are not violating any essential rights. In fact we are trying to provide a law the purpose of which may not be effected by the law of any State of the Union. The fact that we are adopting the only method for carrying into effect a solemn treaty made between the United States and the Kingdom of Great Britain is of itself an argument of the impotency of the States to effectuate the purpose which this law is intended to carry out.

How can you take away an essential right of the State when the purpose to be accomplished by the exercise of the so-called State rights will be nugatory and accomplish nothing? The gentlemen are straining at a gnat. There are some essential rights in the States—rights which involve local self-government—which involve absolute sovereignty, which preserve the integrity of the States, and for such rights gentlemen of this body and the citizens of the country ought to stand; but we disparage the essential rights of the States when we cite such a law as this as one which violates them.

To demonstrate the old saying that there is nothing new under the sun, I now quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what was said by Hon. Oscar E. Bland, of Indiana, who presented the 1918 version of what is now known as the "which" clause in the Bricker amendment. His amendment read:

SEC. 13. That this act shall not become effective until the provisions of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain covering the question of migratory birds shall have been ratified or approved by the legislatures of all the States of the Union, which fact shall be determined by proclamation issued by the President of the United States.

He then stated that—

The people should have something to say about their rights to hunt, and if my amendment carries, the legislatures of the various States will have to approve, not ratify, this legislation. You understand that I am against the bill, and in its present form I intend to vote against it, so my amendment says, "All the States of the Union." I am frank about it. I want this requirement so that no State shall be denied this natural right without its consent. I want to call the attention of the gentleman in charge of the bill to the fact that it is not necessary to ratify the treaty to make the treaty good, but it is necessary for you to get the approval of the States of that treaty before the people of the States will be satisfied with such usurpation of their natural rights; before they concede the right by this bill to make their game laws by the delegation of legislative authority to the Department of Agriculture.

Opposition to the Bland amendment, which finally resulted in its defeat, was first expressed by Hon. Henry A. Cooper, of Wisconsin, who said:

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the Constitution of the United States provides that treaties negotiated and ratified and laws enacted in accordance with the Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land, and inasmuch as the Constitution confers upon the Senate of the United States the sole power to ratify treaties, and inasmuch as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bland] would make it necessary to have all of the 48 States separately ratify this treaty with Great Britain, I feel that I shall be constrained to vote against the amendment.

Uncle Joe Cannon, the former Speaker, interrupted Mr. Cooper, and the following colloquy occurred:

Mr. CANNON. The treaty having been ratified, as I understand, by Great Britain, I do not know that its ratification is necessary, but it was ratified by the Senate of the United States and it stands as a law.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The supreme law of the land.

Mr. CANNON. Then what is the necessity for this legislation? If I recollect aright, I think there have been several treaties that have practically failed because after they had been ratified by the treatymaking powers the House of Representatives refused to enact legislation that would put them into force.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What the gentleman from Illinois says is entirely in accord with the facts; but as I heard the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana read, it proposes to require that all of the States shall ratify the provisions of this treaty, and that it shall not be effective until all the States have ratified and approved it.

Mr. CANNON. I am inclined to think that the amendment was in order, and if it should be agreed to and this bill should become an act of Congress, I think its operation would be postponed until all the States had approved it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is very true, because an act of Congress passed in accordance with the Constitution, if passed subsequent to the ratification of a treaty, repeals that treaty entirely or pro tanto, as it may happen to run counter to the provisions of the treaty; but I said only that I shall vote against the amendment because it proposes in effect, that all of the States must ratify this treaty.

A question almost identical with one I heard proposed only a few days ago was asked and properly answered with one word by Mr. Temple in the following colloquy:

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Suppose Canada and the United States, through the proper officers, made a treaty providing that no person should vote at any municipal, State or county election unless he had $10,000.

Mr. TEMPLE. If the gentleman will permit me to read the remainder of the paragraph—

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Suppose such a treaty was negotiated, would it be good? In other words, it must be a proper and legitimate matter of negotiation between the Governments.

Mr. TEMPLE. Certainly.

The vote on the final passage of the bill was 236 yeas to 49 nays.

It appears to be most difficult for some people to understand that one sure way to completely destroy the effectiveness of any treaty which requires implementation is for Congress to refuse to make the necessary appropriations. If Thomas U. Sisson, of Mississippi, could have had his way about it, that is exactly what would have happened to the Migratory Bird Treaty. When the agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1918 was under consideration in the House Mr. Sisson objected to an item providing for the necessary expenses for the enforcing of the provisions of the Migratory Bird Act by saying:

The only way in which an individual ever gets title to birds or animals, ferae naturae, is either by reducing them to captivity or by bringing them to the ground. The court having repeatedly decided that all such animals and game belong to the people of the States. The Federal Government in creating this law said that the title in this property should be vested in the Federal Government, thereby divesting the people who have always owned that property, and taking away from the people of the States that which they own, as has been repeatedly decided by the Supreme Court of the United States. Therefore, when the Supreme Court

of the United States passes upon this question I do not believe a majority of that Court will go to the extent of saying that Congress by its act can take away from the people their property and vest the title in the Government of the United States, and that is exactly what that law attempted to do when it was passed. I have never voted for this appropriation in this bill. I opposed the passage of the law when it was proposed by Mr. Weeks, of Massachusetts, now a member of the Senate. * * *

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SISSON. I will if I have the time.

Mr. MANN. Admitting for the sake of the argument the gentleman's position, does he think that the treaty just proclaimed between the United States and Great Britain, controlling the migration of birds between this country and Canada, would be invalid?

Mr. SISSON. I do.

Mr. MANN. Under the treatymaking power?

Mr. SISSON. I do. The first time that matter was called in question was when Washington was President, and a young Representative from the State of Pennsylvania called the matter in question. The language of the Constitution, saying that a treaty shall be the supreme law of the land, has never been construed by the Supreme Court, or by any subordinate court, to mean that it can supersede the Constitution, and the treatymaking power is limited in the instrument to the specific grant of power to the Federal Government over which it has jurisdiction.

If Mr. Sisson had been successful there would have been no Federal control over the taking of migratory birds. Every Senator now knows that if Congress should refuse to appropriate money for the rearmament of the free nations of Europe the North Atlantic Treaty would be just as dead as if Congress had passed a joint resolution to abrogate it.

It is therefore not strange or extraordinary that every argument relative to the treatymaking power which has been made during the past few years was completely duplicated 30 years ago. As a final result of the present agitation this generation of Americans will no doubt be benefited by having a better understanding of the powers granted and the limitations imposed by the Constitution. But they will learn nothing the last generation did not know.

Mr. President, it has been my purpose to present a series of pertinent facts as disclosed by the record made at the time of the negotiation and ratification of the Migratory Bird Treaty with Great Britain and Canada, and in the enactment of legislation to give it force and effect to show that the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives acted with their eyes wide open, and that there was no concealment of any facts essential to a proper determination of what was the wise and proper action to be taken.

I do not hesitate to say that when the treaty and the law to make it effective were under consideration, the constitutional questions involved received the attention of able lawyers in both the Senate and the House of Representatives who probably had devoted more time to a study of the Constitution than the present membership of the Congress. They knew what the Constitution meant and what could and what could not be done in conformity with it.

I can add that the Nation 30 years ago also had its alarmists who were terrified at what might happen if their ideas were not adopted. But, strange to say, the revolution so fervently predicted by Representative Mondell has not occurred, and the certain defeat of all Senators who disagreed with him as predicted by Senator Reed did not happen. The executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government continued to function within the respective spheres of activity assigned to them by the Constitution. The American people lost none of their liberties and continued to enjoy their freedom.

It would not be appropriate to bring these remarks to a close without some comment on the activity and efficiency that has been displayed by one man in magnifying the importance of the Supreme Court decision in the case of Missouri against Holland. For example, he has succeeded in frightening most of the physicians and surgeons in the Nation into the belief that there is a real danger that a President will negotiate and a two-thirds majority in the Senate will approve for ratification a treaty which would impose socialized medicine on the American people. Furthermore, the doctors have been urged to believe that the precedent established by Missouri against Holland will compel the Supreme Court to decide that a socialized-medicine treaty is entirely within the scope of the treatymaking power as set forth in the Constitution.

I am in entire accord with the statement of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that between 1920, when the Supreme Court decision was handed down in the case of Missouri against Holland, and the year 1950, the American people lived for a full 30 years in serenity and equanimity and likewise in sweetness and tranquillity so far as that very sensible decision was concerned. But about 4 years ago Frank E. Holman, an ex-president of the American Bar Association, made the amazing discovery that what Justice Holmes said in announcing that decision of the Supreme Court made a great loophole in the Constitution, and from then on he has devoted most of his time to crying havoc, sounding the tocsin, and making clarion calls.

From some unaccountable cause, Mr. Holman has persistently and completely ignored what should be obvious to any thinking person, that birds which nest in one country and then fly each year to another country are a proper subject for the exercise of the treatymaking power which the Constitution grants to the Federal Government, and consequently the Migratory Bird Treaty of 1916 in no way whatsoever violated the Constitution. He has done everything he possibly could to make the American people believe that in deciding Missouri against Holland the Supreme Court deprived them of rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution. What right was lost to any American citizen except possibly the right to kill the only surviving migratory duck?

Having assumed that the Migratory Bird Treaty took away rights previously enjoyed by all Americans, Mr. Holman established a basis for the assertion made by advocates of the Bricker amendment that other rights safeguarded by the Constitution, even all of those specifically set forth in the Bill of Rights, might also be forever lost by what he calls treaty law.

By insisting that the decision in Missouri against Holland gave Congress a power unwarranted by the Constitution, the loophole is created, Mr. Holman has acted as if he were entitled to a patent on that assertion by right of original discovery. With that for a base of operations, for nearly a year, he has proclaimed to the Nation that the Bricker amendment, pure and unadulterated, is the only plug the insertion of which will completely and adequately fill that gaping loophole. And we may all be assured that until that eminent lawyer from Seattle has had his way about it there will be neither serenity and equanimity nor sweetness and tranquillity anywhere in these United States.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Due to the hour that has been reached this afternoon, I have suggested to the Senator from New Jersey that rather than take up the pending bill now, we should be prepared to have it considered when the Senate convenes on Monday. Because the Senate is preparing to recess over the weekend, I thought, in the absence of a number of Senators, that it would be preferable to have House bill 6025 considered on Monday. As I understand, it has been made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). It is now the pending business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am prepared to suggest that the Senate now recess, but before doing so I shall be glad to yield to any Senator who may desire the floor.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks in order to make my own position clear with respect to the so-called Bricker amendment, that is to say, Senate Joint Resolution 1, which was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

I have listened with great interest to the historic background given by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in connection with the "duck" case, as it has been called, in which the Supreme Court held that it had been given authority to sustain an act of Congress by putting into effect a treaty made between the United States and Great Britain on behalf of Canada.

I have never been able to believe that treatymaking was endangered by the case of Missouri against Holland. I have never taken that position, and I shall not take that position. I cannot see any great danger in permitting the making of treaties which have had the scrutiny of the Senate, and which must be concurred in by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present; and a quorum must be

present. I see in such a procedure no very great danger to the liberties of individuals or of the States.

My position from the beginning has been that nothing should be done to the Constitution except to reiterate what I think is implicit in the Constitution, and what almost all the Justices in the earlier days have said—namely, that a treaty could not rise above the Constitution; that is, a treaty could not conflict with the Constitution and still remain valid; though perhaps many times they may have gone beyond the necessities of the instant case. Most of those declarations were obiter dicta, but that makes very little difference, because the principle was so well recognized by the Justices who sat on the Supreme Court in the early days of the Republic that everyone took it for granted.

However, I think there would be no particular harm in declaring, as the so-called Bricker amendment would declare, as the majority leader has proposed, and as I propose in the first section of my amendment in the nature of a substitute, that no provision of a treaty—not a whole treaty, but no provision of a treaty—shall be valid which is in conflict with the Constitution. Or, as the amendment states, no provision of a treaty which conflicts with the Constitution shall have any force or effect. That is almost the equivalent of what I have said.

I have always taken the position, and I take it now, that I could not go all the way with the Bricker amendment. I do not believe we should confuse the fundamental, basic relations between the Federal Government and the States in the field of treatymaking. I say this as one who believes basically in the rights of the States; that is, in the rights of local government as against the rights of the general government. At the same time, I believe it is not amiss at this time in our history to say that no provision of a treaty which conflicts with the Constitution shall have any force or effect, because many loose statements have been made in decisions of the Supreme Court during recent times. Almost any lawyer who has kept abreast of the decisions can find some intimation or other that ought never to have been put into such decisions.

I thought, however, that there should be a clear declaration that no provision of a treaty, and particularly no provision of any other international agreement, which conflicted with the Constitution, should have any force or effect. Why? A treaty is made by the President, or, at least, the President is authorized to make a treaty when two-thirds of the Senate present and voting consent to it; and the act of the President in actually making a treaty is but confirmatory of what the Senate is giving him the power to do. But an executive agreement is made by no one but the President, by his Secretary of State, or by such other legal advisers as the President may wish to have make it. Therefore, there is a fundamental reason for saying that an executive agreement, or any international agreement other than a treaty, should not become effective as domestic law, or should not be valid, so far as that goes, if it conflicted with the Constitution.

Mr. President, if that position is not reasonable, then I am not a reasonable man. I believe the American people will recognize that position as being reasonable. They could not do otherwise.

Let me make myself clearly understood. I am not speaking of the President who is now in charge of the affairs of this Nation. So far as I know or have any reason to believe, no executive agreement made by President Eisenhower is a matter of concern to any right-thinking American. I cannot make my statement any stronger than that. Therefore, it is not any act of his that concerns me.

I go back to the Constitution. I use the language of the Constitution, which repeatedly says that the President of the United States shall have power to do so and so, or which places a limitation upon the power of the President.

So the amendment offered by the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], would bring the first section of the so-called Bricker amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 1, which was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, exactly into line with what I have in mind. I believe the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] offered an additional amendment earlier in the day which I have not seen; therefore, I do not know exactly the meaning of it. But so far as the original amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from California is concerned, it brings the first section of Senate Joint Resolution 1 exactly into line with what I have suggested.

In the second section of the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I have offered, I have used the words "other than a treaty," leaving treaties to stand as they stand at present under our Constitution, namely, as the supreme law of the land.

My amendment in the nature of a substitute then provides that an executive agreement or an international agreement, other than a treaty, which has not been submitted to the Senate, which neither the Senate nor the Congress as a whole has had an opportunity to consider, which the Senate knows nothing whatever about, and not even the Committee on Foreign Relations ever hears of one out of a thousand, shall not become effective as domestic law or as internal law in the United States until it shall have been approved by an act of Congress.

Again, I have not brought the States into the picture, because I do not wish to disturb the fundamental, historic, basic reasons for the separation of the powers of the Federal Government from the local governments in the field of treatymaking, or the fundamental relationship between the executive branch of the Government and Congress in that field.

I am aware of the fact that certain objections have been made to my proposal. The objections are to the effect that my amendment in the nature of a substitute might interfere with the power of the President acting as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. Last week on the floor of the Senate I stated specifically that I would not have the slightest objection to excepting the orders or even the executive agreements which it might be found necessary to make in order to carry out an order issued by the President of the United States acting as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of this Nation.

I will say—and I repeat—that I have no objection to saying that my amendment does not touch the power of the President to receive ambassadors and ministers of foreign states; and when they are received, under international law, they have immunity in this country, as if they were on their own home soil. That is a principle which our courts have always respected and recognized.

Mr. President, those are the two objections which have been mainly urged. I have made that declaration, because, under article II, clause 2, of the Constitution, the President is made the Commander in Chief of the Army and of the Navy of the United States. Nothing in my proposed substitute touches his power as such. Under article II, clause 3, of the Constitution as written, the President is given the express power to receive ambassadors and ministers of foreign states; and nothing in the proposed substitute which I have suggested can touch that power. It is not designed to touch it.

If it is desired to allay the fears of those who think we may be encroaching upon the power of the President as Commander in Chief, or the power of the President to receive ambassadors—that is, to recognize foreign states and to receive ministers of foreign states—I would be perfectly willing to make that situation clear, explicit, and definite. I change nothing in my amendment. There is not a word changed in it. Nothing is intended to affect such power, and nothing does affect it.

If it is desired to allay the fears of those who think that perhaps in some way the President could see fit and find it necessary to make an international agreement in case of an invasion from the north through Canadian territory, then I wish to add two express statements: First, that nothing in my amendment should be construed to affect those constitutional powers of the President; and, second, the further safeguarding clause that nothing in the enumeration of powers excepted should be construed to deny or impair other powers given to the President under the Constitution itself.

Mr. President, that is the whole of my amendment. It is simple. The American people can understand it. In my opinion, no amount of camouflage can prevent the American people from understanding it. I have heard the argument that I was proposing to confer upon the States a power which they do not have, that of ratifying a treaty.

Mr. President, that is not the purpose. The purpose of my substitute is to let the Congress say whether such secret agreements—they would be necessarily secret in most cases—shall become domestic law in this country unless approved by an act of the Congress. That is simply to say that it is better for the

protection of the American people, for the liberties of the American people, for the rights of individuals, and for the rights of States to have the whole Congress pass judgment upon such an issue rather than to have a President and a Secretary of State pass upon that issue. So no one need be worried for fear that I am trying to weaken the powers of the States under the Constitution. Not at all. The point is that now an executive agreement is approved by no one but "a President."

I should say that at least in order to avoid disturbing fundamentally the relations between the Federal Government and the States in the field of treaty-making, there must be an act of Congress carrying into effect those provisions of a secret agreement which override otherwise valid State laws. That is all I propose.

Mr. President, this is Lincoln week. I remind my friends on both sides of the aisle that "you can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time."

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Do I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from Georgia to suggest that the Pink case, to which the Senator has frequently adverted, overruled any State law?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes, Mr. President, I shall discuss the Pink case next week.

Mr. HENNINGS. I discussed that question earlier in the day in the hope that the Senator would be present. I wished him to hear my interpretation of it.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall discuss that case a little later.

I assert now, as a basic premise, that the whole tendency of the decisions of the courts in construing the effect of executive agreements—forget treaties—has been to assimilate them into the category of treaties. I assert now, whoever takes the contrary view, that the whole philosophy and doctrine of the Pink case are based on the definite, final conclusion of that court, which handed down the decision by a vote of 5 to 2, that an executive agreement or understanding which is assimilated into the category of a treaty becomes the supreme law of the land, and, if necessary, overrides the laws of the States.

Mr. President, I do not care if courts sometimes overspeak their cases. I know what the Court meant by that decision. I assert that if the Pink case becomes the established doctrine of the Supreme Court of the United States, the people of America will demand a definite, positive constitutional amendment which will declare that executive agreements must conform to the Constitution and may not become the internal or domestic law of the country unless they have been acted upon by at least the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. In the light of the Pink case and the facts relating to the Litvinov agreement, does the Senator suggest that the Congress did nothing to implement the Litvinov agreement?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have already assured my friend that I would try to discuss that case; but I am discussing it on the basis that the doctrine of the Pink case—do not read merely the holding of the Court—is to elevate an executive agreement to the category of a treaty. Otherwise the Pink case has no basis. Otherwise there is nothing in it. I think the Court made a fundamental mistake; but that is not the point here involved.

Referring to what the Supreme Court said in the Pink case, be it said to the eternal credit of Chief Justice Stone and Mr. Justice Roberts, who associated himself with the opinion of the Chief Justice, that they stated sound law, namely, that the decrees of the Russian Government had no extraterritorial force and effect over property in the hands of an officer of the State of New York.

That is the British rule, from which nearly all our jurisprudence has come. Yet five justices gave it extraterritorial effect and force, and carried it out.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia be kind enough to enlighten me on one matter? I may have been grievously in error earlier today when I said that the Pink case, first, did not deprive any United States citizen of any right under any article of the Constitution or under the first 10 amendments thereto——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Missouri to wait a minute, please. I am not complaining whether the Pink case deprives a United States citizen or a foreigner of his rights. If today, a foreign citizen can be deprived of his rights, tomorrow a United States citizen can be deprived of his rights, under the same theory or the same doctrine. I would never discuss this point upon so narrow a principle as that.

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me ask a question regarding that point, please. Does the Senator from Georgia tell us that Congress did not implement the terms of the Litvinov agreement?

Mr. GEORGE. I have no knowledge that the Congress ever acted upon those assignments.

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me suggest to the Senator from Georgia that I have read the 50 pages of the Pink case; and according to my understanding of it, Congress did implement the Litvinov assignments, although Congress at that time had—just as Congress today has—the power to negate the terms of those assignments and that agreement.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not wish to enter upon a discussion of the Pink case today, but I am perfectly willing to say that I have no knowledge that Congress ever ratified the Pink case or the Litvinov assignments. The President executed that agreement.

Mr. HENNINGS. I said "implement."

Mr. GEORGE. Implement? Oh, that may have been. We went to war, and Russia was our ally; and I suppose that implemented everything. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENNINGS. Congress did not complain, let me suggest to the distinguished Senator from Georgia. On the other hand, Congress implemented the Litvinov assignments; and Congress had the power to negate and vitiate the terms of that agreement.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; Congress did not know anything about it until it got into the courts. Not even the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I have been a member since 1927, ever heard of it until it got into the courts. So how did Congress have a chance to negate it?

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to interrogate the Senator from Georgia upon the premise he has just suggested and upon the further suggestion that internal law contained in executive agreements—or, to put the matter in another way, executive agreements which have an effect upon internal law—should be acted upon by the Congress, meaning the Senate and the House, in concurrence, and by a simple majority thereof.

How would the Senator from Georgia suggest we would go about the matter of dealing with all the executive agreements negotiated and entered into by the President of the United States—as a matter of congressional procedure? Would the President send to Congress all executive agreements, or would he send only those which in his judgment have an effect upon internal law? Or would the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, determine which ones have an effect or impact upon internal law? How would Congress manipulate the cumbersome machinery incident to considering every executive agreement entered into by the President of the United States?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have not suggested that that be done, and I refuse to argue about anything I have not suggested.

Mr. HENNINGS. I did not say the distinguished Senator from Georgia suggested it; I say the amendment contemplates it.

Mr. GEORGE. No, no; it does not contemplate any such thing, if I may be permitted to contradict my colleague.

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Georgia state what the amendment does contemplate.

Mr. GEORGE. It contemplates that before any provision of an executive agreement shall become internal or domestic law, the Congress shall have a right to act upon it.

I may say to the Senator from Missouri that perhaps 10,000 executive agreements have been made since World War I.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes, at least that many.

Mr. GEORGE. And perhaps since World War II. I dare say that only a fractional, infinitestimal number of those agreements affect in anywise internal law or have any direct effect on any State statutes.

Mr. HENNINGS. As to that, we do not know until such an agreement gets into court. At least, that is frequently the case; is it not?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, we do not know. That is why I mean to say that the President should submit, as a treaty, to

the Senate every executive agreement having the effect of internal law. He should submit it to the Senate. If the Senate by two-thirds vote approved the treaty, then I have no doubt at all that it would become a coextensive part of the law of the United States.

That is where we are now, so far as treaties are concerned. I am only concerned with executive agreements which never have been acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. HENNINGS. By whom would the determination as to which executive agreements affect internal law be made, before the President sent them to us?

Mr. GEORGE. By the President himself.

Mr. HENNINGS. So if the President thought they did not affect internal law, he would not send them here; is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; in that event he need not send them to the Senate.

Mr. HENNINGS. If the President thought they did affect internal law, he would send them to the Senate; is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; presumably.

Mr. HENNINGS. So, Mr. President, under the thesis of the Senator from Georgia, the President still would have complete discretion in the matter of deciding which executive agreements would be submitted to Congress, for congressional approval, and which ones would not be submitted to Congress; is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; I do not think any President acts without proper restraints under the Constitution.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is my point, of course.

Mr. GEORGE. I have said that not a single executive agreement of President Eisenhower, so far as I know or have been informed, has given anyone concern.

On the contrary, I am speaking of what a President of the United States may do.

Presumably the President of the United States reads his Executive orders. That task has been held to be an intolerable burden upon the President. But if he is going to make the orders, he certainly must read them; and presumably he has someone to advise him about them. The President is under a constitutional restraint not to send to Congress an Executive order or not to issue one that will be in conflict with the Constitution. I have no idea that the President would do such a thing.

I desire to congratulate the President of the United States upon his decision not to send to this body the so-called genocide treaty. It violates article I, article II, and article III of the Constitution; it violates all of them.

The President also decided—and wisely so, I think, and I congratulate him—not to send here the so-called human rights or universal human rights treaty. It never did get into the form of a treaty, entirely; but it was being kicked around and talked about. The President said he would not send it here, and I congratulate him on that decision, because such a treaty would violate the legislative power given to the Congress and the judicial power vested in the Supreme Court of the United States; and I am glad the President did not send such a treaty here.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, to permit me to ask a question——

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Would it be possible, on the question of whether such an agreement violated domestic law, for the courts of the United States later to hand down a decision that the executive agreement did violate or did conflict with domestic law, and therefore should have been referred to the Congress?

Mr. GEORGE. That is right.

Mr. GRISWOLD. So that question would not entirely be left to the discretion of the President, I assume.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, although it would in the first instance.

Consequently, if an Executive order or agreement were asserted against the right of a citizen of the United States, that citizen then could go into court and could say to the court that, with respect to the executive agreement, "It does not have congressional approval, and is not binding as part of the domestic law of the Nation or the State, and therefore is not binding against me; and therefore I plead against it." That is true; the Senator is quite right.

I rose this afternoon merely to make my position clear, and to state what I hope my amendment in the nature of a substitute might accomplish. I wish to pay my respects to some of the other suggestions which have been made.

It has been suggested that we now have ample power. What power have we to even know about an executive agreement? I am not speaking of treaties. I have taken them out of this discussion, so far as I am concerned. What power have we even to learn about executive agreements? How can we overcome them? How can we do anything about them? Presumably we might find out about them in some way, and a bill might be introduced disapproving certain provisions of an Executive order which in our judgment clearly cut across the rights of a citizen of a State under a law of his State which would otherwise be valid.

Then what would happen? We would have to obtain a vote of two-thirds in this body. We would have to obtain a two-thirds majority in the House, and then submit the bill to the President who made the executive agreement. What sort of protection would that be to American citizens?

The only other so-called right or power which is more ridiculous is the right of impeachment of a President or the right of impeachment of a Senator who might vote for such an agreement. What sort of protection would that be? That suggestion goes beyond the ridiculous. When we examine such suggestions, we find that none of them affords any rights whatsoever to the American citizen.

How is a President impeached? He is not impeached in this body. We try him here, if the House impeaches him; and when he is tried here, the Chief Justice comes over and presides. Then it is necessary to have a vote of two-thirds of the Senate to sustain the impeachment of the President or anyone else. How could we obtain such a vote in the face of an honest difference of opinion as to whether or not the President should have made an executive agreement, or whether, in the first instance, he should have submitted the executive agreement to Congress for its approval or disapproval? I have cited only two examples, but they are all of equal dignity in the realm of the ridiculous.

There is no possible safeguard for the American people against an executive agreement made by a President which cuts across the laws of the State and invalidates what would otherwise be a good law in the State, unless we say that at least we will not leave that question to the uncontrolled discretion of the President, but will ask him to send the agreement to the Congress and let the Congress vote upon it. If the majority of Congress votes upon it, that is infinitely better than having the President himself decide the question.

Mr. President, I rose this afternoon merely to make plain my position. I do not believe that the President is without restraint under the Constitution in the making of a treaty. I concede that he is under restraint. He is under similar restraint in making executive agreements; but so far as the treaty is concerned, it must come to the Senate. The Senate is itself at least a part of the treatymaking power. In fact, the Senate gives the treaty life and validity; and the final act of the President putting it into force and effect is but a recognition of that fact. It is merely confirmatory of what the Senate has done.

But with respect to executive agreements, no one knows what is in them. No one can know the full effect of them. It is true that the President is under similar constitutional restraint with respect to executive agreements as with respect to treaties, because, thank God, the Supreme Court has not said that the executive agreement is even higher than a treaty. The Court has lifted executive agreements into the category of treaties and has given them effect as treaties, but no one has said that they are higher than treaties. Therefore, in the field of executive agreements or other international arrangements and understandings, other than treaties, why should not the President be willing to submit to the Congress the question of whether or not they shall go into effect internally, within the United States, as a part of the law of the United States?

I am satisfied that no President would act without due restraints in treatymaking or in the making of executive agreements; and I am also satisfied that some executive agreements have been made which could be dangerous and which would not have had the approval of the American people if they had fully understood such executive agreements. I have said, and I repeat, that my statement does not refer to any decisions made by the present President of the United States.

I cannot believe that the American people do not want us to do at least as

much as I have suggested. I know that there are some Members of this body, for whom I have great respect, who do not believe it is advisable to touch the Constitution. I know that there are some who will say that the Pink case is perhaps not the firmly established law of the Supreme Court of the United States, and may never become such. I grant that. But, Mr. President, enough has happened to indicate the direction in which the Supreme Court is traveling to put us on notice that we ought to do something about it. I think we should face the issue clearly and squarely.

I think we should do so for another reason. I believe that this discussion necessarily involves a divisive issue. The people ought not to be divided. My whole purpose in offering my substitute is that, as a result of submitting a straightforward amendment to the Constitution, the question may be taken back to the States themselves to say whether or not they want such constitutional amendment. I expect to offer my amendment if I have the opportunity to do so, because I firmly believe that the great masses of the American people will approve it when they understand it.

Mr. LONG and Mr. HENNINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana. I do not wish to occupy any more of the time of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has made a very fine speech today. The junior Senator from Louisiana is torn between various versions and proposals which have been discussed. His question with regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia is whether it goes far enough. One thing which has concerned the junior Senator from Louisiana with respect to executive agreements is that Congress is unable to find out what they are.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true.

Mr. LONG. For example, even though the Senator may say that he would not lay any blame upon the present administration for any executive agreements it has made, some of us would like to know the terms of the agreement with Spain, for example. We have been asked to build airbases in Spain, to build great radar establishments, to send troops to Spain, and to make preparations to receive them. Yet we cannot find out whether we would even be able to use such bases in the event of war.

I do not care to rehash the issue of Yalta, Potsdam, Teheran, and all the other meetings which were held with Russian leaders. Yet at that time Congress could not find out what was in those agreements. I wonder if the Senator would agree that we should have some way at least to require the Executive to inform us what these international agreements are, when there is no compelling reason why they should be secret.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe the Senator is quite right. My amendment does not go that far; it is not intended to. I believe there is much merit in the Senator's suggestion. I am not at all sure that the whole question should not be approached in this way, that a treaty or executive agreement, in order to become the supreme law of the land, must be assented to by two-thirds majority of the Senate. I say that because there seems to be an attempt to make an impossible distinction as between treaties and executive agreements. In many instances there is no clear line of demarcation.

I concede to the very able Senator from Louisiana that my amendment does not go as far as many people would like to see it go. Of course, my amendment does not include treaties; nor does it call for congressional action to put treaty terms in effect as domestic law. A great many Senators would like to have it go that far, and many persons throughout the country would like to have it go that far. At the same time, I do not feel it is wise to disturb the fundamental and historic relation between the Federal Government and the State governments with regard to the question of treatymaking. Therefore, I do not wish to disturb the making of treaties.

I do not care to have Congress given the opportunity of passing upon all executive agreements. To do so might impede the progress with which those agreements must be made. My amendment could not, however, impede the progress of an executive agreement, so far as creating a relationship and an obligation between our country and any other sovereign country is concerned. It could refer only to provisions which might have the effect of domestic law.

Mr. LONG. It is true, however, that even though executive agreements relating to bases overseas, many of which are secret agreements, might not affect persons within this country, could they not involve the rights of Americans who would be stationed at those bases overseas?

Mr. GEORGE. That might be possible.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I did not quite understand the distinguished Senator's statement to the effect that he expected to offer his substitute if he had an opportunity to offer it. I can say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia, insofar as the majority leader is concerned, that he will certainly oppose any parliamentary device which would prevent the Senate from having an opportunity to vote on the distinguished Senator's amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only thing I can conceive of which might prevent it would be the success of a motion to recommit the joint resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. That might prevent a vote, it is true. Such a motion, of course, would be in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall oppose such a motion, and I shall seek every support possible to prevent a motion to recommit from being successful.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The Chair will advise Senators that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is not before the Senate in a formal manner. The Senator from Georgia has offered his amendment. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered to the amendment that had been offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], on behalf of himself and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and other Senators. When that amendment has been disposed of, the next order of business will be the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. The Presiding Officer is entirely correct. I thought perhaps a motion to recommit might be made. I was hopeful that the Senate would have an opportunity to consider my amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield; but I hope the Senator from Missouri will bear in mind that I do not want to go into a full discussion of the Pink case at this time.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understand. My only reason for undertaking a discussion of the Pink case this morning was that in the course of the discussion the other afternoon the Senator from Georgia frequently adverted to the Pink case. Therefore I got busy and tried, to the limit of my ability, to analyze the Pink case, as I am sure the Senator from Georgia has analyzed it. It will be recalled that in House Report No. 865, 76th Congress, 1st session, it is stated that the appointment of a commissioner to determine the claims of American nationals against the Soviet Government was authorized.

If Congress had desired, it could have annulled the internal effects of the Litvinov assignment by a simple act of Congress. Far from doing this, it set up a commission to adjudge the claims and to adjudge the rights of American citizens; and certainly no American citizen was deprived of any rights under the fifth amendment or any other rights.

Mr. GEORGE. I must say to the Senator from Missouri that I did not have an opportunity to hear all of his argument this morning, because I had an engagement and had to leave the Chamber, but I have no doubt that the Senator has learned very much more about the Pink case than I have. However, I do know the philosophy of the case.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I would suggest that I did not learn more about the Pink case than my distinguished colleague from Georgia may have learned. The question is purely one of interpretation.

Mr. GEORGE. I am sure the Senator has learned more.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is a matter of interpretation, and I got into the subject because upon the Pink case there seems to rest so much of the discussion and the apparent reason for the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio and the amendment

offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I confess that that is true so far as executive agreements are concerned, because had not the Pink case gone as far as I believe it has, keeping in line with the general trend of some of the decisions that have tended to interpret executive agreements as being very closely akin to treaties, I would not have offered my substitute.

Mr. HENNINGS. There is one point which bothers me, and as to which I should appreciate enlightenment by the Senator from Georgia. Does the Senator have in mind a definition of internal law as it might be contemplated by the Constitution; and, further, if the President is to determine which executive agreements affect internal law, as in the instance cited by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], if the Executive is to determine which of those agreements are to come to Congress for congressional action and which executive agreements are not to come to Congress, does it not still leave the Chief Executive with vast discretion?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, certainly it does.

Mr. HENNINGS. In terms of those agreements, I mean.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I would not take them all away from the Chief Executive.

Mr. HENNINGS. Can we, by writing into the Constitution an amendment such as the distinguished Senator from Georgia has suggested, really inhibit the Executive, and should we inhibit him, in terms of some agreements and other things which are necessary for the preservation and the welfare and the security of our country?

Mr. GEORGE. No; indeed not.

Mr. HENNINGS. To what extent should we inhibit his powers as our representative and constitutional actor in any international affair?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not propose to do so. All I propose to provide is that, insofar as any provision of agreements, other than treaties, do affect internal law, that is, become domestic law in the United States, such agreements shall be approved by Congress. However, so far as the President's exercise of political powers is concerned, to negotiate with any foreign country any agreement which he believes advisable to make, so far as his authority to carry those things out, so far as his power to issue orders as Commander in Chief, and so far as his powers—just to enumerate these few instances—to receive ambassadors and recognize a foreign country are concerned, those are matters that lie wholly within his political power, and we would not regulate or restrict those powers. I do not want to restrict them.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I say to the Senator that the very gravamen, the heart, of the Pink case related to the recognition of a foreign government and the receiving of foreign ambassadors, and, as a condition precedent, negotiations involving the Russian insurance companies. So that the President entered into these negotiations and recognized the Soviet Government.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me make myself plain. I do not want a President of the United States to conclude an executive agreement which will make it unlawful for me to kill a cat in the back alley of my lot at night, and I do not want a President of the United States to make a treaty with India which will preclude me from butchering a cow in my own pasture.

Mr. HENNINGS. To take it one step further, if the Senator wants to butcher his cow and the President does want to enter into an executive agreement with Turkey, for example, what process would be followed, if, in the judgment of the President, the executive agreement is not going to prevent the Senator from Georgia from butchering his cow? Are we going to decide whether it does or does not affect internal law, or are we going to leave it solely to someone's discretion?

Mr. GEORGE. When I kill the cat or butcher the cow, and someone prosecutes me——

Mr. HENNINGS. Then the Senator would know.

Mr. GEORGE. No. I would have the right to go into court and say, "This was not approved by the Congress, and it affects internal law."

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator would then get a judicial determination.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. But is the President of the United States to make a judicial determination? And if he does not, who is to do so?

Mr. GEORGE. He does, in the first instance, make his decision, and, as I have said, it puts upon him no great burden. I dare say the President does read every agreement he signs, and if it be an agreement which invades an otherwise valid right under a State law, the President would say so.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then in the opinion of the President it might invalidate a State law, but in the opinion of the court it might not.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair in order to clarify what otherwise I am afraid may be a misunderstanding, or perhaps the majority leader misunderstood the observations of the Chair a short time ago.

As I understand, there is now pending an amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators, which is the amendment now before the Senate, so far as Senate Joint Resolution 1 is concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, in addition to that amendment which is pending, except as it has been temporarily displaced by proposed legislation under consideration today, there are several other perfecting amendments which have been offered by the Senator from Michigan for himself and other Senators. I believe one perfecting amendment has been offered by the Senator from Ohio, and conceivably there may be other perfecting amendments offered during the course of the next few days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The perfecting amendments have been offered and printed, and are now lying on the table.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My parliamentary inquiry is that it is my understanding that prior to action by the Senate on the so-called George substitute, or any subsequent substitute that may be offered, the Senate will first act on the perfecting amendments. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote on a substitute is not cast until all perfecting amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is what the Chair was endeavoring to clarify, that there was pending an amendment which had been offered to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan in behalf of the majority leader and other Senators, and that a later perfecting amendment had been offered which will be the first order of business, and then the Senate will return to the substitute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In other words, it is now clear that any perfecting amendment will be acted upon by the Senate prior to a vote on a substitute, whether it be the so-called George substitute or any substitute subsequently offered, having in mind, however, that at any time in that procedure a motion to recommit might be made or a motion to table an amendment might be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is correct. The motion to recommit, however, would precede any other motion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I intend to discuss Calendar 932, House bill 6025, which has been laid over until Monday, but before I discuss that case and certain other points as part of my weekly report of the Independent Party, I desire to make a few comments on the remarks of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

THE PINK CASE

I shall await with great interest the Senator's analysis of the Pink case next week. If his analysis follows the line of the major thesis he laid down today, I shall respectfully argue next week that his interpretation of the case is counter to what the Pink case holds. In my judgment, there is no holding in the Pink case, as a matter of law, that justifies any conclusion that the Supreme Court in that case equated treaties and executive agreements. There is some broad dictum in the Pink case, but I certainly do not share the viewpoint of the Senator from Georgia that we should be frightened into passing a constitutional amendment because of dicta in Supreme Court cases.

When there is a problem before the Court which would call upon the Court for the first time to decide if it should adopt that dictum as a matter of law, the Court is heard to say frequently that it does not follow the language of the case cited by counsel because as dictum it is not applicable to the facts of the later case.

Mr. President, I am not going to be frightened into voting for a constitutional amendment on the basis of any fear argument that because some judge

or group of judges in a Supreme Court decision talked in terms of dictum we should protect the people from the Supreme Court. I merely say to the American people, "Where is the ruling, as a matter of law, by the United States Supreme Court showing that the Court has ever equated treaties and executive agreements?" The answer is that it has not, and it did not do so in the Pink case.

CONSTITUTIONAL CHECKS UPON ARBITRARY POWER

Mr. President, I am a little surprised to hear on the floor of the Senate the argument made that the basic checks in the Constitution of the United States against the exercise of arbitrary power on the part of any branch of government fall into the category of being ridiculous. I am one who believes that the impeachment section of the Constitution of the United States is a living check upon any President of the United States sitting in the White House. I do not see how we can say that Presidents of the United States have not paid attention to the impeachment section of the Constitution of the United States. It stands there, Mr. President, as a living check upon him.

I think, if we had a crystal ball which would permit us to look into the thinking of the Presidents in the history of the United States, we would find how far from sound it is to argue on the floor of the Senate that the impeachment section of the Constitution is really ridiculous when it comes to being an effective check on the President of the United States.

The fact that impeachment proceedings have not been used extensively during our history does not support an argument that the impeachment check is not effective. Nor does it support an argument that it is ridiculous for those of us opposed to the George amendment to refer to the impeachment power as one of the effective checks upon a President under our check and balance system.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator believe that these so-called secret agreements entered into by the Executive have any effect upon internal law?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know. Who does?

Mr. HENNINGS. Who does? Does the Senator suggest, under the terms of the George amendment, what procedure might be followed by an executive in determining what would or would not be internal law?

WHAT DOES INTERNAL LAW MEAN?

Mr. MORSE. At least, we ought to be helpful enough to the Executive to give him some definition of what is ment by internal law. We ought to use language that already has been interpreted by the courts. As I said earlier this afternoon, my rundown of cases thus far—and I have not completed the research—does not disclose a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States which has defined the meaning of the phrase "internal law." I do not know whether it means "the law of the land" which the Supreme Court has interpreted in a series of cases, or whether it means "domestic law," or what it means. But the George amendment, in the nature of a substitute, would inject into the Constitution a legal phrase that has yet to be interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

I believe that before the Senate votes upon an amendment that uses an entirely new legal concept, at least the amendment should be sent to committee, in order to have some of the constitutional experts in this country testify as to what they believe the effects on constitutional law of such a phrase in the George amendment would be.

I have listened this afternoon to the Senator from Georgia make what I thought was the soundest, most unanswerable argument that could be made for recommitting the entire matter to the Committee on the Judiciary, in order to obtain expert testimony. The brilliant argument of the Senator from Georgia—and it was a brilliant argument, but a highly fallacious one—was an argument that, in my opinion, justified recommitting the entire matter to the Committee on the Judiciary, for the purpose of taking the testimony of the Secretary of State, the Attorney General of the United States, and the outstanding constitutional law experts of the country.

I wish to continue with the comment I was making about the great living checks that exist in the Constitution to prevent arbitrary action by the Chief Executive of this country.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I desire to raise one more point for further clarification. Does the Senator from Oregon believe that under the decision in the Pink case, any American citizen, or any citizen of any country, was deprived of any substantial right, save the Russian holders of equity in an insurance company, who were affected by Russian nationalization?

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Missouri knows, I followed very carefully his argument in the Senate this afternoon. I find myself in agreement with the analysis of the Pink case as presented by the Senator from Missouri, including his analysis raised in the question just put to me.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

THE CONSTITUTION PROVIDES FOR THREE COEQUAL AND COORDINATE BRANCHES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say one more word with regard to the living checks in the Constitution upon the executive branch of the Government.

Of course the Senate could negate executive agreements, and should negate them, if it should be found, in the exercise of the constitutional powers of the Senate, that such agreements were not in the public interest. But the Founding Fathers did not write a Constitution that made the legislative branch supreme; they did not write a Constitution that made the executive branch supreme; and they did not write a Constitution that made the judiciary supreme. They wrote a Constitution that provided for the living checks of the three departments upon each other of which I am speaking this afternoon.

I say that the two-thirds vote check upon the President, in connection with either a treaty or the overriding of a veto is not a ridiculous check. It is a very effective and a very sound check. The record of the Senate of the United States will show that, time and time again, throughout the history of the country, the Senate has garnered the necessary two-thirds vote to override the President in a matter on which the Senate thought he ought to be overridden.

I simply could not follow the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] when he argued on the floor of the Senate, if I heard him aright, that the power of negation which the Senate has over executive agreements would not be effective. If this argument were valid, it would be ridiculous for me to make the argument which I now make. But I make it with pride, because I make it in light of the history of the Senate of the United States. The record speaks for itself. It has not been a ridiculous check; it has been an effective check. I have no doubt that the Senate can garner the necessary two-thirds vote to override a veto of the President or to override a position taken by the President in terms of an executive agreement.

I shall close my argument by saying that brilliant as was the argument made by the Senator from Georgia this afternoon, I do not go along with him, because I do not go along with his major premises. I say his major premises ought to be submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for careful analysis, so that the Senate can have the benefit of the expert testimony that should be taken before we are called upon to vote in the Senate for a constitutional amendment which, in effect, was drafted in the course of debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I now desire to turn my attention to the bill that has been put over until Monday, calendar 932, H. R. 6025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

LICENSING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN HONOLULU TO LEAHI HOSPITAL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to make my argument today in connection with the bill (H. R. 6025) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Visitor Hospital, a nonprofit institution, to use certain United States property in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., so that it may be printed in the RECORD, and so that the amendment I shall offer to the bill before I have finished may be printed, and lie on the table.

This is the second time in 2 days that there has been a frontal attack, on the floor of the Senate, on the so-called Morse-Byrd-Saltonstall formula. I regret it, Mr. President. I particularly regret that H. R. 6025 has been reported by the Senate Committee on Armed Services, because it was in the Senate Committee on Armed Services in 1946 that the Morse-Byrd-Saltonstall formula was devised.

Let us look into the facts of the case. There is in Honolulu a hospital, not a Government hospital, not an Army hospital, but apparently a city hospital; at least, it is a non-Federal hospital. Next to the hospital there is a tract of land containing 4.4 acres. Previously an attempt was made, through the offering of a bill, to give this property to the hospital. Now a new tactic is being used. It is proposed to lease the property without any rental charge to the hospital for parking purposes. It is not known exactly what the cost of improvements upon the property will be. The committee report states that the cost is estimated at $12,000. When a member of my staff called the Military Establishment, he was told that the cost might be as much as $20,000, apparently to place on the property a hard surface, such as asphalt, concrete, or something similar. Nevertheless, a considerable expenditure will be required in order to put the property in condition for a parking lot.

The report includes a letter from the Secretary of the Army, and I read from page 3 of the report, as follows:

> The hospital, which is financed both by donations from individuals and by the Territory of Hawaii, proposed to expend $12,000 in making the site suitable for its purposes but was not prepared financially to undertake the obligation to pay rental under a lease at the rate of $2,356 per annum which was determined by appraisal to be the fair market rental value of the site.

One of the reasons why it is sought to have the bill passed is so that the hospital will not have to pay the rental value.

I do not care what language may be used to clothe this giveaway. What the bill proposes to do is to give to a private hospital in Honolulu the use of a piece of property which, on the basis of the committee report itself, has a fair-rental market value of $2,356 a year.

Mr. President, we cannot start to tinker with principles and still have the principles remain intact. We cannot begin to make exceptions to the application of a principle, and still have the principle left. There are many institutions, private in nature, which do a great public good, and are located in the neighborhood of Federal property, which I can well imagine would like to get a piece of Federal property for use as a parking lot or for some other purposes.

Shall the Senate start now to pass any bill that any Senator may offer, which seeks, in his community, to turn over to a private charitable institution a piece of Federal property to be used as a parking lot for the institution, or property of any other nature that can be used for other purposes?

Mr. President, the property is part of a military reservation. The committee report shows that the Defense Establishment, speaking through the Secretary of the Army, agrees that the lease which is to be made shall be for 10 years; but the Federal Government can come in, at a moment's notice, and take this property.

It is an important piece of property to the Federal Government, and the report uses language which is very rich in meaning, if one will stop to consider the implications of the language used. I shall not expand on it other than to point out that the report indicates that the property will be used for aviation defense in case of attack. We know pretty well what that means. I assume it is to be used for various types of weapons, necessary to ward off an aerial attack on Honolulu, such as radar equipment, or for any of the new weapons being developed in connection with aerial defense. In any event, it is a valuable piece of property for defense purposes as far as the Federal Government is concerned.

Mr. President, if we are going to lease the property, it not only is proper that we put a provision in the proposed lease that the Federal Government can take the property over immediately, but I think the taxpayers of the country ought to be entitled to some rental for the property.

I understand that some of the proponents of the bill did not believe that the Morse formula applied to leases. Of course, it does. One would defeat the whole purpose of the Morse formula if, instead of conveying the property, the Government leased it for 10, 50, or 99 years, or for any other lease term, without reimbursement.

Suppose it was proposed by a bill that the Army installation next to the hospital could make available to the hospital, Army ambulances without charge. But, it is said, that is not this case. No; but the principle is identical. One cannot start drawing lines of distinction between types and kinds of Federal property. So I am going to offer an amendment which will provide that the hospital, under the terms of the lease, shall pay 50 percent of the appraised fair-market rental value of the property.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, that on page 2, line 2, there be stricken out the words "without consideration," and that there be inserted in lieu thereof the words "at a consideration of 50 percent of the fair-rental value."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I said before, I understood that the fair rental value of the property is $2,356 per annum. That means that the Federal Government would get 50 percent of such rental value per year for the term of the lease. I hope that, upon reflection, Members of the Senate will recognize that now is the time to call a halt to what appears to be a movement in this session of the Congress, apparently with too much support on both sides of the aisle, to consummate a giveaway program of surplus property.

Someone said to me, after the argument yesterday afternoon on the floor of the Senate, "Senator, how can you reconcile your insistence upon the application of the Morse formula to that piece of property out in Jackson, Wyo., and your proposal to give away surplus food to the hungry in this country?"

One would think that stating the problem, Mr. President, would show the difference. However, if the difference needs to be pointed out, let me say I recognize the obligation of the Government to use the resources of the Government to meet emergency situations. Included in such situations would be hunger, flood, pestilence, and other emergencies of that type which would cause our fellow citizens great suffering. Of course, I shall vote on the floor of the Senate for emergency funds or to give away surplus stores of Government-owned food in order to feed fellow Americans who find themselves in need of food and who do not have the wherewithal to buy food to keep themselves alive. It is a non sequitur argument to say that therefore I ought to vote on the floor of the Senate to give away property to individuals and to organizations which are capable of paying for the property.

Let us examine whether or not the hospital is capable of paying for the property. My office checked with the office of Mr. FARRINGTON, the Hawaiian Delegate in the House of Representatives. I do not know whether or not it had anything to do with postponing action on the bill today. If it had not been postponed, I would have presented the same information which I now present, and that is that Mr. FARRINGTON'S office did not consider the application of the Morse formula to a lease and did not explore the possibility of a rental payment. This afternoon Mr. FARRINGTON'S office advised my office that the hospital authorities had not been consulted about this possibility until I objected to H. R. 6025 on the call of the calendar, when he mailed tearsheets from the RECORD showing the objection and questions raised. His office advised my office this afternoon that he would be perfectly willing to have the bill go over until next week, in order that he could get in touch with the hospital authorities and determine whether or not the hospital authorities would be willing to pay some fair rental for the property.

Mr. President, it illustrates a point I made on the floor of the Senate yesterday. I do not care what bill disposing of Federal property is in question. If one takes the problem back to the people themselves, the hospitals, the clubs, the school districts, the local governmental officials who are seeking the property, in most instances they will say, "What we want is the property. That is what we are seeking. We are perfectly willing to pay whatever Congress determines to be fair and reasonable."

I would be very much surprised, Mr. President, if the hospital authorities involved in this case, understanding the problem, would not say, "Of course, we are willing to pay 50 percent of the appraised fair market rental for this property."

Mr. President, I am glad the bill is going over, so that an opportunity can be given to the office of Mr. FARRINGTON to get in touch with those people, and determine whether or not the hospital people in Hawaii wish to exercise a greater safeguard in protecting the interest of all our taxpayers in the Federal Government's property than is provided in this bill. I doubt that the hospital authorities, themselves, would join in this attempt to undermine the Morse formula if they understood the facts.

Mr. President, I close this part of my report today by saying that since 1946 the application of the Morse formula on the floor of the United States Senate has saved a good many hundreds of millions of dollars for the taxpayers of America. That is why, no matter how much I am steamrollered over by votes in the Senate, I do not intend to sit idly by when such bills are brought up by motion, after Senators cannot succeed with a giveaway on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. I intend to continue to object to this kind of a giveaway of the property belonging to the taxpayers of this country.

ADMINISTRATION ATTACKS UPON DEMOCRATS

Mr. President, that leads me to discuss the third and last topic which I wish to talk about in the Independent Party's report this afternoon. I was very much interested earlier this afternoon in the remarks of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] when he commented upon objections which have been raised by Democrats to the language which has been used by spokesmen for the administration in recent speeches. I quite agree with the Senator from Kansas, Mr. President; the Democrats should not be crying "foul."

ADVICE TO DEMOCRATS

What the Democrats should be doing—they have not been doing enough of it, at least—is to take to the American people the facts in regard to what the Eisenhower administration has been doing during its first year in office. All one has to do is take to the American people the facts regarding the maladministration of the Eisenhower administration. When that is done, Mr. President, let me tell you that all the name-calling of the spokesmen for the Eisenhower administration will not make a dent upon the voters of the United States.

As the Senator from Kansas has said today, Mr. President, I think the Democrats should stop crying "foul." They should come forward as a party with a constructive program upon issue after issue, as a few Democrats have done which will demonstrate to the American people that we have not reached a stage of statesmanship bankruptcy in the United States, when it comes to protecting the interests of the people. The Democrats should propose legislation which will show the American people how nonsensical it is for the President of the United States to utter the platitude that he is a liberal when it comes to matters of human values, but is a conservative when it comes to matters of economics.

Mr. President, it is impossible to separate the economy of the United States from human values. In my judgment all we need to do to retire a large number of Republicans from the Congress—and they sorely need to be retired in the public interest in 1954, Mr. President—is to come forward with some sound economic legislation which will protect the economic welfare of all of our people. The clear answer to the President is to offer and pass legislation that will do for all the people what they cannot do for themselves, but which needs to be done in the public interest. We should demonstrate to Eisenhower that human values cannot be separated from the economic interests and rights of the American people. He should be given a lesson in the true meaning of the liberalism of Lincoln.

Mr. President, the other evening when I heard the President of the United States in his radio and television speech quote Lincoln's statement about doing for all the people what needs to be done for them, I chuckled; I said to the little group sitting in my living room, who heard the President's statement, "How can he reconcile that statement with the legislative program he has proposed in his messages to Congress—a legislative program which for the most part does not protect the economic welfare of the people of the country, but plays into the hands of big business, which obviously has dominated his campaign and first year of his administration."

So, Mr. President, to my Democratic friends I say, "Do not worry about the language the Eisenhower spokesmen use. Take the fight to them; they have asked for it. Give them the fight in terms of specific proposals which will protect human values by protecting—as is so sorely needed today—the best economic interests of the American people."

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, to Monday, February 15, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 11 (legislative day of February 8), 1954:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John M. Cabot, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sweden.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Frank M. Kalteux, of Illinois, to be Comptroller of Customs with headquarters at Chicago, Ill., to fill an existing vacancy.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon, 18A, United States Air Force, retired, to be special assistant to the Chief of Staff for Air Force Academy matters, with rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Elmer Joseph Rogers, 294A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Roscoe Charles Wilson, 360A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Richard Clark Lindsay, 476A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frank Alton Armstrong, Jr., 427A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James Elbert Briggs, 356A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Carl Amandus Brandt, 563A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Delmar Taft Spivey, 385A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Kingston Eric Tibbetts, 436A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John Koehler Gerhart, 525A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Dean Coldwell Strother, 501A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Elmer Blair Garland, 322A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Matthew Kemp Deichelmann, 331A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Leland Samuel Stranathan, 405A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Edward Holmes Underhill, 421A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Roy Henry Lynn, 492A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Merrill Davis Burnside, 495A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert Oswald Cork, 523A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Paul Ernest Ruestow, 548A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Wiley Duncan Ganey, 553A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Walter Campbell Sweeney, Jr., 555A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Morris John Lee, 556A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. David Hodge Baker, 557A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Daniel Francis Callahan, 579A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Gordon Aylesworth Blake, 582A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John Paul McConnell, 611A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Burton Hobson, 616A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr., 624A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert Broussard Landry, 635A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William Oscar Senter, 648A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Francis Carroll, 23161A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Fay Roscoe Upthegrove, 76A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Reuben Columbus Hood, Jr., 498A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gordon Aylesworth Blake, 582A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frederic Ernst Glantzberg, 405A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jacob Edward Smart, 592A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert Haynes Terrill, 628A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Phillips Waller Smith, 897A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Alfred Henry Johnson, 270A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles Franklin Born, 365A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward Holmes Underhill, 421A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Dudley Durward Hale, 431A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert Oswald Cork, 523A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Wiley Duncan Ganey, 553A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Burton Hobson, 616A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr., 624A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Kern Delos Metzger, AO914698 (colonel, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Oliver Kunze Niess, 19022A, Regular Air Force, medical.

Col. William Lecel Lee, 430A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William Lafayette Fagg, 465A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Charles Bowman Dougher, 600A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lewis Leo Mundell, 1286A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Charles Bainbridge Westover, 1351A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William Grover Hipps, 1358A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John Spencer Hardy, 1502A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Thayer Stevens Olds, 372A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William Albert Matheny, 428A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John Reynolds Sutherland, 617A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Dale Orville Smith, 1074A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harvey Thompson Ainess, 1085A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Terence Patrick Finnegan, 18703A, Regular Air Force, chaplain.

Col. Don Orville Darrow, 1270A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Nils Olof Ohman, 1321A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Bruce Keener Holloway, 1336A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harold Cooper Donnelly, 647A, Regular Air Force.

Col. James Clifford Jensen, 1042A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Arno Herman Luehman, 1080A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Frederic Henry Miller, Jr., 1273A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Maurice Arthur Preston, 1337A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert Taylor 3d, 1347A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Ben Ivan Funk, 1500A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Marvin Christian Demler, 1550A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Clarence Theodore Edwinson, 1597A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Hewitt Terrell Wheless, 1609A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Henry Viccellio, 1728A, Regular Air Force.

Col. James Edwin Roberts, 1846A, Regular Air Force.

Col. James Valentine Edmundson, 1863A, Regular Air Force.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force for service as members of the Air National Guard of the United States under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Laurence Coffin Ames, AO131519, California Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Guy Nelson Henninger, AO129883, Nebraska Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Brig. Gen. James Alvin May, AO356464, Nevada Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Errol Henry Zistel, AO286558, Ohio Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Lewis Allen Curtis, AO729140, New York Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Col. Joseph Jacob Foss, AO944215, South Dakota Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Col. Maurice Adams Marrs, AO274899, Oklahoma Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Col. Winston Peabody Wilson, AO398325, Arkansas Air National Guard, to date from January 21, 1954.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Florida's Sunshine at Last Gets Tax Deductible Rating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 11, 1954

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sure that some of my distinguished friends in the Senate who like to go to Florida in the winter will be delighted to hear that a Federal judge, according to an Associated Press Dispatch from Cleveland in the Washington Star of today has just ruled that Florida's sunshine at last is entitled to a tax deductible rating.

In this particular matter, in connection with which I now ask to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, it appears that a tired business executive who went to Florida because of certain bodily ailments, having to pay $1,401 for the expense of the trip, was allowed that amount as a deduction on his income-tax return by a Federal court, indicating that for the first time in history, so far as I know, the value of sunshine, at least in a particular place, has been recognized as being tax deductible.

I commend the article to the close attention of my colleagues, so many of whom, I am glad to say, do come to Florida, the Sunshine State, during the winter.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Is it not correct to say that a great many of the benefits to be derived from the fine sunshine in Florida are predicated on getting the right doctor, who will insist that a person go to Florida as part of his treatment?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe that would be important.

Mr. HENNINGS. That would be a necessary predicate for the deduction, of course.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe it would be a most important feature of the whole matter, but for confirmation of that fact I would have to refer the Senator to some Senator who has had to seek leave of absence from the Senate because of ill health. Because I get my sunshine in Florida during vacations I have had the good fortune to not lose, from illness, as much as a single day in the nearly 8 years I have been in the Senate. Therefore I cannot give the Senator any authoritative information on that point.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then the Senator from Florida does not have any experience in that connection during the best season in his own State. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. I believe that the Senator from Missouri is correct in suggesting that Senators who go to Florida for the purpose of obtaining the benefit of the sunshine should get medical advice before they go if they want to receive a tax deduction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLORIDA'S SUNSHINE AT LAST GETS TAX DEDUCTIBLE RATING

CLEVELAND, February 11.—Florida sunshine is a tax-deductible item for a Shaker Heights insurance executive.

Contending the Florida sun had helped his hearing, William B. Watkins, 81, successfully appealed an Internal Revenue Service ruling denying the cost of a trip to Florida was a deductible medical expense.

Judge Marion J. Harron said she was convinced a 4-month Florida stay in 1949 was solely and primarily for mitigation of Mr. Watkins' hearing defect.

The cost of travel and lodgings—amounting to $1,401 in taxable income, or $577 in taxes—but not food, was deductible, she held. A $926 additional claim for food was voluntarily withdrawn by Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Watkins' attorney, Leonard S. Frost, said the executive has been wintering in Florida every year since 1949 and may reap tax benefits in later years. He is there now.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who wert the God of our fathers we thank Thee that in the annals of our national history we have the record of men and women whose life and character enshrined our country's noblest traditions and loftiest ideals.

Today we are paying tribute to the memory of an American patriot whose supreme ambition was to know and do Thy will.

We rejoice that he always kept the windows of his soul open toward the unseen and eternal, whence came his wisdom, strength, and courage.

Grant that we also may be inspired with faith and hope as we enlist in a crusade to bring peace and freedom to all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 9, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 666. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands and rights-of-way in the State of Wyoming to the town of Jackson, Wyo.;

S. 1386. An act to amend section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, relating to the meaning of the word "commodity";

S. 2772. An act to provide for the disposal of paid postal-savings certificates; and

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to request the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal-power project, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the engrossed bill, H. R. 4254, for the relief of Aneta Popa.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, which was read:

FEBRUARY 10, 1954.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on February 9, 1954, the Clerk today received from the Secretary of the Senate, the following messages:

That the Senate has agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) entitled "Joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation"; and

That the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of Representatives of the following titles:

H. R. 5959. An act to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government which retired officers may receive.

H. R. 5861. An act to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone government.

H. R. 5379. An act to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication.

H. R. 395. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

That the Senate has appointed the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES, and the Senator from Nevada, Mr. MCCARRAN, as members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures; and

That the Senate has passed Senate bills of the following titles:

S. 1184. An act to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State.

S. 1381. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

S. 1990. An act to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act.

S. 2313. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION ENROLLED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 395. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice;

H. R. 1129. An act for the relief of Katina Panagioti Fiflis and Theodore Panagiotou Fiflis;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Lamb;

H. R. 1516. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clemtine De Ryck;

H. R. 1674. An act for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler;

H. R. 2021. An act for the relief of Clarence R. Seiler and other employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 2618. An act for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez;

H. R. 2633. An act for the relief of Lee Sig Cheu;

H. R. 2813. An act for the relief of William E. Aitcheson;

H. R. 2839. An act to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands;

H. R. 2842. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 2885. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii to issue a right of purchase lease to Edward C. Searle;

H. R. 3027. An act for the relief of Tamiko Nagae;

H. R. 3228. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ursula Eichner Clawges;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of John James T. Bell;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of Eiko Tanaka;

H. R. 3619. An act for the relief of Rufin Manikowski;

H. R. 3728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Bonanno (nee Koubek);

H. R. 3733. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder;

H. R. 4439. An act for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham;

H. R. 4577. An act for the relief of Edith Maria Gore;

H. R. 4972. An act for the relief of John Jeremiah Botelho;

H. R. 5195. An act for the relief of Max Kassner;

H. R. 5379. An act to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication;

H. R. 5861. An act to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone government;

H. R. 5945. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States;

H. R. 5959. An act to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government which retired officers may receive; and

H. J. Res. 358. Joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Tuesday, February 9, 1954, he did on February 10, 1954, sign the following enrolled bills and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 395. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice;

H. R. 1129. An act for the relief of Katina Panagioti Fiflis and Theodore Panagiotou Fiflis;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Lamb;

H. R. 1516. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clemtine De Ryck;

H. R. 1674. An act for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler;

H. R. 2021. An act for the relief of Clarence R. Seiler and other employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 2618. An act for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez;

H. R. 2633. An act for the relief of Lee Sig Cheu;

H. R. 2813. An act for the relief of William E. Aitcheson;

H. R. 2839. An act to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands;

H. R. 2842. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 2885. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Lands of the

Territory of Hawaii to issue a right of purchase lease to Edward C. Searle;

H. R. 3027. An act for the relief of Tamiko Nagae;

H. R. 3228. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ursula Eichner Clawges;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of John James T. Bell;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of Eiko Tanaka;

H. R. 3619. An act for the relief of Rufin Manikowski;

H. R. 3728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Bonanno (nee Koubek);

H. R. 3733. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder;

H. R. 4439. An act for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham;

H. R. 4577. An act for the relief of Edith Maria Gore;

H. R. 4972. An act for the relief of John Jeremiah Botelho;

H. R. 5195. An act for the relief of Max Kassner;

H. R. 5379. An act to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication;

H. R. 5861. An act to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone government;

H. R. 5945. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States;

H. R. 5959. An act to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government which retired officers may receive; and

H. J. Res. 358. Joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

THE LATE HONORABLE ALLEN J. FURLOW

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness and a heavy heart that I announce to my colleagues in the House of Representatives the death of a very good friend and former colleague, the Honorable Allen J. Furlow, of Rochester, Minn. He passed away from a heart attack at the age of 63 in the city of his birth, Rochester, Minn., on Friday, January 29, 1954.

The late Honorable Allen J. Furlow served with distinction and honor as a valuable Member of the House of Representatives in the 69th and 70th Congresses. He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1924 as a Republican from the First Congressional District of Minnesota. In the same year, I was elected to Congress from the Third Congressional District of Minnesota. Since 1935, I have had the honor and privilege to represent the people of the First District, which was so ably represented by Allen J. Furlow during his 4 years of service in this House.

Allen Furlow had a host of friends. He was one of my best friends. I will always remember when we journeyed to Washington, together, as newly elected Congressmen in March of 1925 to look over the situation in the House of Representatives and to select our office rooms in the old House Office Building. We were young, freshmen Congressmen, but eager to tackle the relatively few routine matters before Congress and to get on the job. We waited 13 months after our election in November of 1924 until we were sworn in as Members of the House of Representatives in 1925.

Allen J. Furlow was a man of integrity and sterling character. He was always a gentleman, and with his charming and talented wife, there was a genuine glow of friendship and understanding which endeared them to their many friends.

Mr. Furlow was born in Rochester, Minn., on November 9, 1890, son of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel C. Furlow. He was graduated from the Rochester High School with the class of 1910, and later attended the University of Michigan.

In 1913 he and his friend, the late G. P. Gentling, purchased the Rochester Daily Bulletin, which they published for 2 years. In 1920 Mr. Furlow was a graduate with a law degree from Georgetown University in Washington, D. C., where he was a member of Theta Delta Chi and Phi Delta Phi fraternities.

Following graduation, he married Miss Ruth Irish at Pine Island, Minn. Mrs. Furlow survives with two sons, John Allen Furlow, of Chicago; and Dr. William Furlow, of Hanover, N. H. Other survivors are brothers, Frederick J. Furlow, of Rochester, and Walter and Willard of Washington, D. C.

Mr. Furlow enlisted in World War I as a private on October 1, 1917, and served overseas as a pilot in the First Air Corps of the United States Army in France and Italy. He was promoted to first lieutenant and was honorably discharged from service February 21, 1919.

Following the war, Mr. Furlow resumed his law studies and was one of the organizers of the Rochester, Minn., William T. McCoy Post of the American Legion. He was one of the principal speakers at the organizational meeting at the Rochester High School.

After graduation from law school, he returned to Rochester to enter law practice. He served as senator from Olmsted County in the Minnesota Legislature in 1923–24, and resigned the senate post to become First District Representative in Congress for the 69th Congress. He was reelected to the 70th Congress. He was a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. During his service in Congress, he introduced the law providing for a continuous honor guard at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery.

In 1929 and 1930, Mr. Furlow was a legal representative of the Curtis-Wright Corp. in Washington, and was an editor of the 1929 volume of United States Aviation Reports which brought up to date the development of aviation law in the United States. From 1934 to 1937, he was in the legal department of the Veterans' Administration in Washington, and returned to Rochester to resume the practice of law. In 1933, he was appointed by the Attorney General of the United States as a special assistant in cases assigned under the petroleum code.

In addition to his law practice in Rochester, he was well-known as a public speaker and toastmaster. Mr. Furlow presided over many dinners and public meetings. He took an active interest in public affairs.

Mr. Furlow was one of the principal organizers and charter members of the Rochester Kiwanis Club and served as its first secretary.

During the last few years, Mr. Furlow's law practice included representation of management in labor negotiations. He was joined in law partnership by John de J. Pemberton, Jr., and Franklin Michaels. He was also a member of the Olmsted County Bar Association, Third Judicial District Bar Association, Minnesota Bar Association, American Bar Association, and American Judicature Society.

In addition to civic organizations and the American Legion, Mr. Furlow was a member of the Rochester Lodge, A. F. and A. M., the Rochester Shrine Club, and the Presbyterian Church.

Allen J. Furlow was an outstanding citizen and a patriotic American. He served his country with distinction in both war and peace. His service as a Member of the House of Representatives in Congress is well noted on the pages of congressional history. His contribution to his home community, the State of Minnesota, and the United States marks him as a great American, who was respected and loved by his fellow men.

I will always treasure the memory of my friendship with Allen Furlow. His home and fireside were always open to me. His untimely death brings great sorrow to his wife and to his sons and also to his brothers and other members of the Furlow family, as well as to his many friends. I know that all Members of the 83d Congress will join with Mrs. Andresen and myself in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Furlow and her family in their sorrow.

Funeral services were conducted February 1, 1954, at the Presbyterian Church by Dr. Hugh B. Jones, with burial in the Rochester Oakwood Cemetery.

FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, during the past 13 years, as I understand it, the United States has given to foreign nations, in terms of dollar value, something over $90 billion. If one wanted to be critical, one could pick out expenditures for such things as building ski lifts in European mountain resorts, and say the whole foreign aid program was wrong.

Personally, when I heard that America was being ridiculed abroad, I laid this not on the steps of the past admin-

istration, but on the usual individual "crackpots" who always seem to find an outlet for their pet ideas in Government spending programs.

However, the overall objective of assisting foreign nations get on their feet economically was worthy and transcended in importance any poorly conceived and administered specific projects which were a part of the program.

Now, foreign policy emphasis is being directed toward assisting friendly nations by giving them arms and thus strengthening their defenses in order that they can resist aggression. This I applaud. I come to praise Caesar, not to bury him.

In the matter of giving military supplies, however, let us have it clearly in mind we are dealing with a two-edged sword. A loaded gun is not the thing you hand to someone who you are not sure will use it the way you intend.

Recently, a State Department official stated that the Arab States are "uncertain of themselves; uncertain of their friends; uncertain of their enemies; their governments are uncertain of their position, in many cases; and their people are frequently uncertain of their government."

Last year, Mr. Speaker, Congress made $30 million available for purchasing and giving arms to Arab States out of funds allocated to the Mutual Security Program.

How do we know such arms would not be used to defeat our own purpose? How do we know that our military aid will not simply stimulate the Arab States to renew their war on Israeli and thus the very defenses we hope to strengthen would be dissipated in another bloody division of potential anti-Soviet nation.

To me, it would be a terrible mistake, for example, to give military supplies and arms to Egypt—and yet I hear rumors that America is on the point of doing just that.

Again, I say, Mr. Speaker, to the Members of this body, let us think twice before we hand a loaded gun to an uncertain friend.

BOLZA BAXTER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, a motion to quash a subpena duces tecum, together with an application for an interlocutory injunction, has been served upon KIT CLARDY, subcommittee member of the House of Representatives on Un-American Activities, by one Bolza Baxter in a proceeding in the United States district court in Detroit, Mich., wherein Representatives VELDE and CLARDY are named as defendants. Bolza Baxter was subpenaed to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities in the city of Detroit. This step follows a pattern, a very familiar pattern. It is the third instance when members of Communist front organizations have resorted to the same tactics in an attempt to prevent the Committee on Un-American Activities from discharging its duties.

The plaintiff in this action happens to be the State chairman of the Labor Youth League of Michigan. This organization is a proscribed organization. It was so designated by the then Attorney General, Howard McGrath, as a subversive organization and also by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

This resolution authorizes the Committee on the Judiciary to take whatever steps are necessary in order to challenge the right of this member of a Communist-front organization to question the validity of the subpena and also to continue with the injunction proceedings, the object of which is to restrain the committee from conducting its meeting in accordance with its rules and procedure.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. I want to make a short preliminary statement as a predicate for my question. The gentleman is a member of this committee. He knows that since 1930 we have been investigating un-American activities. He knows, of course, that hearings have been held in all of the cities of the United States. Literally hundreds of witnesses have been subpenaed. Documents over a period of years have been seized, have been obtained from different sources, until there is no room to store them.

All the committees, beginning with the committee headed by Mr. Fish, which lasted for about 9 months, and the committee which Mr. MCCORMACK headed, which lasted perhaps 10 months, and the committee which I headed and which was renewed 7 times by the House of Representatives and lasted for 7 years—all of these committees, and every patriotic and civic or labor organization that has investigated this subject, have been unanimous in finding that communism is a criminal conspiracy.

Time and time again in the course of our hearings we discovered that Communists would commit any crime to further that conspiracy. At the very beginning of the movement two of the leading Communists were imprisoned for counterfeiting, to secure money with which to finance the party's activities. We succeeded in putting Earl Browder in the penitentiary because of a violation of the passport law.

It seems to me, and I want the gentleman's opinion about this, that after this long period of time, and after all these committees, headed by Democrats or Republicans, have concurred in the same finding that we are dealing here with a crime, and not with a political movement or a political party, but with a crime and a major crime, the worst crime that anyone can commit, because if someone steals your pocketbook he steals trash, you can replace it; but when he undertakes to steal your freedom and your liberty, then he is committing a heinous offense—does not the gentleman believe that in view of our declarations to the world that we are opposing a criminal conspiracy, the time has come when we ought to be consistent and outlaw the Communist movement in this country by appropriate legislation, and say to the world, "This is a crime and we mean to treat it as a crime, the same as all other crimes in the penal code?"

What does the gentleman think about that?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. He has made a great contribution throughout the years toward exposing this criminal conspiracy. The only reason why the Communist Party was never outlawed, as I understand it, is because Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the FBI, believed that to outlaw the Communist Party would drive it underground. Within the last few days that same gentleman has stated that the Communist Party has been driven underground. If that is the fact, I see no reason why the Committee on the Judiciary should not report appropriate legislation, very promptly, so that this criminal conspiracy may be branded for what it is.

One thing more. The gentleman has mentioned the tremendous amount of work that has been done in this field and has intimated that what is being done now is largely a rehash. In that connection, the gentleman might be interested in knowing that this organization, the Labor Youth League, which the Committee on Un-American Activities is investigating, was first known as the American Youth for Democracy and then the Young Communist League. So you see it smells the same.

Mr. DIES. In connection with the question of a rehashing, it is true that much of the current investigations are simply a rehashing of what was exposed years ago. It is true they have brought out some additional details and elaborations, and I do not want to disparage their work—I think there has been excellent work done and I feel it has been valuable to educate and alert the people; but in connection with Mr. Hoover's opposition, it is predicated upon the ground that if you drive them underground, then he cannot watch them. Let us be perfectly frank about this. The Communist Party was driven underground from 1919 to 1924 under wartime legislation. Our committee unanimously found, and when I say unanimously, I call your attention to the fact that that included Republicans the same as Democrats.

Mr. WALTER. Was not the division at that time 5 Democrats and 2 Republicans?

Mr. DIES. Five Democrats and two Republicans; that is correct. Our committee unanimously found during this period, as a result of a study we made of the progress of communism during the period that it was under cover, that it was not able to make any headway in this country; that they had no contacts and no influence. It became a threat when it was given the legal apparatus so that they could camouflage and masquerade their true aims and thus deceive innocent and gullible people. Furthermore, Mr. Hoover has been in possession of full and complete information with regard to Communists, those concerning

whom there is reliable evidence of communism, in the Government of the United States or who were on the Federal payroll since 1941. In 1941 we transmitted to the then Attorney General Biddle the names of 1,124 employees on the Federal payroll concerning whom we had reliable evidence of communistic affiliation. Permit me, if I may do so without trespassing upon the time of the House, to make myself clear. When I say "evidence" I do not mean we had the membership cards. In a few instances we did, but Communists had long before then destroyed or concealed their membership cards. But these 1,124 which contained the name of Hiss and White were affiliated with 2 or more organizations which were under the control of the Communists. It must be borne in mind there were literally hundreds of thousands of innocent and gullible people who joined Communist-front organizations. But these 1,124 were carefully analyzed and considered, and we believed that they comprised 98 percent of all Communists that were on the Federal payroll. We transmitted that list to Attorney General Biddle and it was transmitted to the FBI. I am interested to know what finally happened to 1 list in connection with the security firing of 2,200, and I think it is tremendously important to trace down those 1,124 or 1,125, which is an easy thing to do.

Mr. WALTER. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DIES. I am going to ask the gentleman this question.

Mr. WALTER. May I at this point interrupt the gentleman because on this charge, made by responsible officials of this Government, that there were 2,200 security risks, I sought the best information available, and I was informed that there were but 7 people whose loyalty was suspected out of that 2,200. I think an examination of the testimony adduced by the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the appropriation for the Department of State will disclose that there were 11 people in the State Department when Mr. McLeod became the head of the Security Division. Of that 11, 7 were in the process of being discharged when he came there and 4 were discovered in that whole operation by the present security officer of the Department of State.

Mr. DIES. I am sure in order to clear up this question, which seems to be of considerable interest to the country, it would be possible for your committee or some appropriate committee to simply take this list, a copy of which I can secure and which will give your committee the 1,124 names, which we believed constituted 98 percent of all people of communistic affiliations who were working for the Federal Government, and find out what the FBI did with it and what the Department of Justice did about it.

Are any of those people still on the payroll? When were they discharged? I think that reliable facts would serve a very useful purpose if some committee would follow that through.

Mr. WALTER. I would be very happy to submit that list to our committee, and I trust that the distinguished chairman will find time to deal with it appropriately. It is an extremely important matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have two questions in one. Is it not the opinion of the gentleman that this suit is a nuisance suit, but even though it is, it is absolutely necessary that the House take action?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. The answer is "Yes" to both questions. But I think this suit itself offers very persuasive evidence of the need to enact the kind of legislation the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has spoken of, because the man who has the temerity to bring this suit is a Communist. This is simply the traditional Communist technique of dilatory tactics by harassment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution (H. Res. 441).

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representatives HAROLD VELDE, KIT CLARDY, Subcommittee of the House of Representatives for Un-American Activities, have been summoned to appear on Monday, February 15, 1954, in the city of Detroit to testify and give their depositions in the case of *Bolza Baxter* v. *Harold Velde, Kit Clardy, Subcommittee of the House of Representatives for Un-American Activities*, pending in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, civil action file No. 13176; and

Whereas the service of such summons on Members of the House of Representatives who are members of a duly constituted committee of the House of Representatives will hamper and delay if not completely obstruct the work of such committee and its members in their official capacity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby approves of the special appearances of Representatives HAROLD VELDE, KIT CLARDY, Subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, in the aforementioned civil action; and be it further

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to direct the filing in the case of *Bolza Baxter* v. *Harold Velde, Kit Clardy, Subcommittee of the House of Representatives for Un-American Activities* (United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, civil action file No. 13176) of such special appearances on behalf of any of the Members of the House of Representatives named as defendants therein, and to direct such other or further action with respect to the aforementioned defendants in such manner as will, in the judgment of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, be consistent with the rights and privileges of the House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I did not intend to speak on the resolution before the House. I had in mind to inquire of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who spoke upon the legislation proposed, if in the event the legislation proposed by him, or any other legislation proposed and passed by the Congress became law, making it a criminal offense to participate as a Communist in the Communist Party, in the event that became a statute and became the responsibility of the Department of Justice, it would be no longer necessary to carry on in the House the activities of the Un-American Activities Committee, would it?

Mr. DIES. I would think if it becomes a crime it would be the problem of the law-enforcement agencies and the courts to handle.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. Later.

That, of course, does not follow, because there are other un-American activities than this Communist criminal conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States.

Before moving the previous question, Mr. Speaker, I think I should call the attention of the House to the fact that in the petition the plaintiff states in paragraph 4 that the Labor Youth League is an educational organization which exists for the sole purpose of studying the principles of Karl Marx.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] asked the question he did. I thoroughly agree with the answer given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] that there is need for continuing investigations, because subversive activities cover more than communism, although that is the principal field of investigation. Un-American activities go in many directions, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has so well found out as a result of his experience, likewise the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], as a result of his experience on the Committee on un-American Activities, and as I so well found out as chairman of the committee in 1934. One of the principal fields of activity of un-American groups is the field of bigotry. That is something we have got to watch very closely.

My committee investigated the Silver Shirts, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] followed it up, an organization led by a man named Pelley—the committee of which I was chairman and of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was chairman for several years. So I thoroughly agree with the answer given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to a very pertinent and proper question.

Might I call the attention of the House—and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] I am sure is acquainted with it because he succeeded me as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities: When I was chairman of that committee, to talk about communism made people laugh and scoff; they thought you were just trying to seek phony headlines that way when you talked about the potential dangers of communism. I could not of course get an extension of my committee into a second year. But a subcommittee was appointed in 1934 to investigate commu-

nism, fascism, and bigotry and I was chairman. As a result of that investigation Hitler ordered the German Bund disbanded. Certain of the elements of the German Bund attacked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and his committee vigorously followed and exposed their continued activity.

But my committee also found a Fascist threat. There was a certain group of wealthy people in New York City—people who were clients of one of the largest brokerage houses in the United States—still in existence. They were afraid the late Franklin D. Roosevelt was going to tax their wealth away. They hated Roosevelt, they hated him to the point where they got desperate-minded. They sent a representative over to Europe to investigate the veterans' setup, the veterans' organizations in Fascist countries in Europe. This particular man visited Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Portugal; and he recommended to his principals, this wealthy group in New York City possessing tremendous wealth, the formation or the establishment in the United States of a veterans' organization along the lines of one that existed in France at that time. They approached the late Gen. Smedley Butler; they approached him because they had to have a general to head it. They could not have an enlisted man, they could not have a general's general; they had to have an enlisted man's general to lead this new setup designed by them to subvert our Government into a dictatorship but with their particular kind of dictator. Smedley Butler led them on.

Smedley Butler was a great American. Smedley Butler kept leading them on to get all of the information from them for the purpose of exposing them at the right time. This same group sent representatives into the national youth camps, approaching the Reserve officers we had in there at that time who were giving some degree of military training to the youngsters who were in the camps in those days.

I ascertained about this plot. We summoned Smedley Butler and he told the truth. He exposed that group and their damnable conspiracy blew up.

So this present committee, as its last report states, has in mind not only communism but other forms of subversion that exist in this country. The last report of the Committee on Un-American Activities referred not only to communism but to a dictatorship along Fascist lines. Another group of wealthy people might rise today and they might approach someone who may not be a Smedley Butler. As the gentleman from Texas so well said, the Communists have deceived good, honest-minded people, and they might also approach someone else in this period of hysteria, in a period when the people's minds are inflamed.

Yes, we have cause to watch and watch properly the Communist subversive movements in America; but there are other types of subversion that would like to take over our Government for the purpose of establishing a dictatorship, just like in Germany there were many wealthy people, not all, but some, who supported Hitler because they thought when Hitler was dictator he would be their dictator. He proved otherwise.

There are people in this country who are mindful of the fact that 20 years ago it happened, the attempt was made. Fantastic? Yes. A fact? Yes. And it can happen again.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. May I ask the gentleman if it is the purpose of the gentleman's resolution to have these committee members submit to the jurisdiction of this court in question?

Mr. WALTER. No, indeed. Actually, it provides for a special appearance to challenge the jurisdiction of the court to consider either of the two issues raised in the pleadings filed in that court.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANETA POPA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Senate, which was read:

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the engrossed bill, H. R. 4254, for the relief of Aneta Popa.

Attest:

J. MARK TRICE,
Secretary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the Senate is agreed to.

There was no objection.

BIENNIUM HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I introduced H. R. 7818, which is a biennium highway bill. This bill, as introduced, is the result of hearings and findings of many weeks of study made by the Committee on Public Works last summer. I think that every subject contained in H. R. 7818 was discussed at our very extensive meetings. Hearing on H. R. 7818 and other bills relating to highways as introduced by Congressmen DONDERO, DEMPSEY, WATTS, MACK, OAKMAN, SCUDDER, PATTON, and others, will start on Monday, 10 a. m., room 1302, and we hope to finish on Tuesday or Wednesday afternoon. I hope that each Member of Congress will take advantage of the fact that the written hearings on the highway subject have been available not only in the Committee on Public Works but in the House document room for many weeks. I hope you will familiarize yourself with those hearings, and we will be very happy to have your comments or your suggestions as far as the subject of highways are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting, at this point, a comparison of the highway program now in effect, and the results if and when H. R. 7818 becomes a law:

Comparison in authorizations in Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 and proposed authorizations in H. R. 7818

	Public Law 413, 82d Cong., fiscal 1954–55	H. R. 7818, fiscal 1956–57
Federal-aid system:		
Primary system	$247,500,000	$270,000,000
Secondary system	165,000,000	180,000,000
Primary system in urban areas	137,500,000	150,000,000
Interstate system	25,000,000	200,000,000
Total	575,000,000	800,000,000
Federal roads:		
Forest highways	22,500,000	22,500,000
Forest development roads and trails	22,500,000	22,500,000
Park roads and trails	10,000,000	10,000,000
Parkways	10,000,000	10,000,000
Indian roads and trails	10,000,000	10,000,000
Public lands roads	2,500,000	
Total Federal roads per fiscal year	77,500,000	75,000,000
Total per fiscal year	652,500,000	875,000,000
Total for fiscal years	1,305,000,000	1,750,000,000
Special authorizations:		
Rama Road, fiscal years	4,000,000	4,000,000
Inter-American Highway 1953–54	16,000,000	16,000,000
Emergency funds	10,000,000	
Defense access roads	50,000,000	
Increased authorization for Baltimore-Washington Parkway	1,500,000	
Total special authorizations	81,500,000	20,000,000
Total authorizations 1952 act	1,386,500,000	
Total authorizations proposed in H. R. 7818		1,770,000,000

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which will authorize the President to use surplus agricultural commodities to improve our foreign relations, and to relieve famine, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 83d Congress, Senator SCHOEPPEL introduced a bill quite similar to the bill I am introducing today, to provide for the disposition of our surplus farm products.

The bill I am introducing would consolidate present laws on this matter which expire this year, and would provide continuing legislation. The Famine Relief Act ends March 15, 1954, and section 550 of the FOA Act expires June 30 of this year.

This legislation would authorize an appropriation for the Foreign Operations Administration with which it could purchase surpluses from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

These sales would be made either through private exporters or the FOA, and a safeguard in the bill provides that the sales must not interfere with the usual trade relations of the United States or friendly countries.

Secondly, the legislation would authorize an appropriation for FOA for emergency famine relief to friendly peoples abroad, regardless of the friendliness of their governments. We recall the great success of President Eisenhower's food-distribution program to East Germans last summer.

Under the provisions of this bill, the President would be permitted to use proceeds from the sales of surplus commodities for six purposes: First, for military assistance to countries of mutual defense organizations eligible to receive assistance under the act; second, for purchase of goods or services in friendly countries; third, for loans to increase production of goods or services in friendly countries; fourth, for developing new markets on a mutually beneficial basis; fifth, for grants-in-aid to increase production for domestic needs in friendly countries; and sixth, for purchase of materials for our stockpiles.

This bill is an attempt to use surplus American food and fiber to implement our foreign policy and strengthen the free world. It is in line with the thinking of President Eisenhower on this matter as expressed in his state of the Union message and his message on agriculture to the Congress. Finally, it should build up future markets abroad and assist in winning the friendhip of peoples on both sides of the Iron Curtain, for if there is one lesson we should have learned since the beginning of the Marshall plan, it is that food makes friends, whereas dollars may make enemies.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Colorado a question. Does the bill to which the gentleman referred contain a provision continuing the payment of subsidies on certain farm crops?

Mr. HILL. It has nothing to do with subsidies. Subsidies are paid on our products under another piece of legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman referred to certain legislation expiring in 1954, and that is why I asked that question. It has nothing to do with subsidies, then.

Mr. HILL. I would not say it has nothing to do with subsidies, but it certainly would use some of these surplus farm crops that we must dispose of.

MARIAN YEAR COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, in this Marian Year I can think of nothing that would be more appropriate than a Mother's Day postage stamp honoring Mary, the mother of Christ, and the world's greatest mother.

The Congress has delegated to the Postmaster General the prerogative of deciding on the subject and issuing commemorative stamps. I have written to the Postmaster General a letter calling his attention to the fact that a number of my constituents have requested that such a stamp be issued. At this time, I ask my colleagues to join with me in making this request of the Post Office Department.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, atomic energy is now at the very heart of all our plans for military preparedness and our hopes for material well-being. This fact should be reflected within the National Security Council, the final clearinghouse for the most important issues of national policy. Outside of the President's own office, the NSC is the highest policymaking body in the executive branch of the Government. On it sit the President, Vice President, the Secretaries of State and of Defense, the Administrator of the Foreign Operations Administration, and the Director of Defense Mobilization. The National Security Council was established in 1947 to transform the individual, oftentimes conflicting, policy recommendations of the major departments of our Government into comprehensive national policies—policies which merge the requirements of diplomacy, economic stability, and military preparedness into unified programs best designed to promote the security and welfare of our country.

President Eisenhower, in keeping with his campaign pledges, has brought new importance to the deliberations of the NSC. Moreover, this administration has wisely established the sound custom of inviting the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission to attend National Security Council meetings. This is most appropriate, for no person can better advise the President and the NSC on the critical matters of atomic policy than the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. So President Eisenhower is to be warmly commended for taking steps to make sure that the counsel and guidance of the Atomic Energy Commission Chairman is available at first hand to the top officials of our Government.

The time has arrived for us to go even further. I believe that atomic energy is far too crucial to this era, far too intimately entwined with the very essentials of our military planning, our foreign policy, and our national welfare to permit the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission to sit on the National Security Council only by invitation of the President. I believe he should be there by act of Congress. I am therefore today introducing legislation designed to reflect the proper role of atomic energy in national welfare and security policy. I ask that the National Security Act of 1947 be amended to make the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission a full-fledged and permanent member of the National Security Council, to serve as such no matter which party has the Presidency.

There is, I think, a foreshadowing of the future in the fact that atomic energy—which less than a score of years ago was hidden in obscure laboratories of universities—even now demands a central role in our national policy discussions. Atomic energy, whether we like it or not, has become inextricably woven into our daily individual and collective lives. We must accustom ourselves to living with it, and we must take it into account in all our highest policy determinations.

I urge speedy action on the bill I now introduce.

SECURITY FIRINGS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with growing impatience to wild charges from the Republicans against members of the Democratic Party. Usually those wild charges are linked with the recital of so-called security firings accomplished under the Republican administration. I know something about the paucity of fact in both. The failure of the Republicans to give to the American public concrete facts and figures on security risks and security firings leads straight to the conclusion that to some Republicans a security risk is any Democrat who has a Government job and the only security that is involved is that of the Republican Party.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 12 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

FOOD-STAMP PLAN

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to provide for the distribution of up to a billion dollars worth of Government-owned surplus food a year to needy persons in the United States by use of a food-stamp plan. This is a matter about which every Member of Congress is concerned.

I do not pretend that this is the final answer or that it is even an original idea, but it is my hope that it will provide the Agriculture Committee with some useful suggestions. All I know is that there are many needy people who are going hungry today, and that we are storing up and storing up and storing up food that is not being eaten.

I call your attention to the fact that the Department of Agriculture now has more than $6 billions worth of food in storage. I think it is absurd and tragic and cruel to build up these mountains of hoarded food while families on relief—or in genuine need but ineligible for relief—struggle along on less than a minimum diet and in some cases actually go hungry.

My bill is to replace an existing and, up to the last few weeks, little-used program under which the States must establish special machinery to obtain surplus food for needy families. Only a few States have set up the necessary certification and distribution machinery.

Some of the other States have shown some casual interest in the existing program, but most of them apparently do not have either the money or the inclination to arrange for the special machinery required under the present law.

Since relief is primarily a local problem, my bill permits local welfare bodies to participate in the surplus food distribution program either directly through arrangements with the Secretary of Agriculture or through their State welfare agency.

Although aimed primarily at families on public welfare whose food allotments cannot begin to assure them adequate diets at today's high food prices, my bill also provides for distribution of food stamps redeemable in surplus foods to persons in need of financial assistance but ineligible for relief for reasons not related to actual need, such as residence requirements or employability.

In Missouri, for instance, employability is a bar to public assistance. Yet we had the situation there of 5,000 farm workers, ready and willing to work but without jobs, who were actually going hungry. As farm workers, they were ineligible, too, for unemployment compensation. Fortunately, they will now get some of this food surplus on the State's initiative. But in many States, where residence requirements or other provisions of State or local law prevent some needy families from getting relief, their plight may not be dramatic enough to arouse the State government, but it is serious enough to overtax the resources of private charities. This situation has been getting increasingly worse as a result of mounting unemployment.

Last month on the floor of the House I made a speech on the sharp increases in the price of coffee. I have been deluged with letters from people throughout the country protesting the anomaly of ballooning Government-owned food surpluses and inadequate or substandard diets for many families not getting enough to eat.

After looking into the deficiencies of the present surplus food distribution system, it seemed to me a food-stamp plan was the best and most efficient way to get some of this surplus food moving out of Government warehouses and onto the tables of those now going without beef or butter or other dairy products the Government owns in such embarrassing abundance.

My bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to issue the stamps, redeemable for such kinds and amounts of surplus foods as he determines, to State or local welfare bodies to distribute to eligible families. It leaves up to the Secretary the determination of the actual food distribution procedures, specifying only that it be distributed in "packaged or other convenient form on the local level at such places as he may determine."

It would authorize the Secretary to establish standards under which the welfare authorities of any State or political subdivision may participate, and to allocate the stamps on the basis of the amounts and kinds of foods to be distributed and the number of persons eligible to receive it.

Surplus food distributed under this act shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) granted to needy persons by a State or any political subdivision thereof—

The bill states.

My plan would in no way affect normal food retailing operations, because the only people eligible under my bill would be families now unable to buy the commodities they would get in exchange for food stamps. They are people going without these foods. In many cases, they are actually hungry.

There is absolutely no reason for that situation when the Government is beside itself finding storage space for all the beef, butter, cheese, milk, cottonseed oil, and shortening, olive oil, honey, and other commodities it has been buying up under price-support or other purchase programs.

Rather than run a big bargain basement sale on butter to the Soviet Union, I would like to see some needy American families know what it is again to have an occasional pound of butter.

My bill is not intended as a solution for the farm problem, or even as a solution for the surpluses. It is intended only as a remedy for malnutrition or outright hunger in the midst of the greatest abundance God has ever given to any nation to enjoy.

RELIEF IN DROUGHT AREAS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which is a companion measure to one introduced in the other body by the two Senators from Missouri, a bill which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to lend assistance to people in drought areas in restoring their meadows and pastures. It seems that in the drought relief bill, which we passed in 1949 that the authority might exist, but apparently we are not getting the relief which we believe is necessary and is available. I would call attention to the remarks of the senior Senator from Missouri on page 1645 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, which goes into some detail in explaining this bill.

DEMOCRACY VERSUS COMMUNISM

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Minneapolis Star Journal.)

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, moderate and temperate men of both political parties are deeply concerned with the excesses which seem increasingly to mark our political discussions. The irresponsible and unreasoned claims upon virtue by extreme partisans and their delusive charges of evil against all opponents have disturbed men of goodwill everywhere in this country. It is therefore refreshing and encouraging to find a great daily newspaper, the Minneapolis Star, take issue calmly and objectively with such charges in its editorial columns of February 9. It is all the more encouraging because the Minneapolis Star does not find it necessary to use the tactics of those it attacks in making clear that truth is not the monopoly of any man or party. I commend this editorial to all of my colleagues who are distressed by this new rash of divisive partisanship which threatens both the program of the President and the well-being of the Nation.

The United States has been singularly blessed in that most of its public servants have been honest and upright men who have well deserved the confidence placed in them. We could not otherwise have survived these 160 years which have seen the rise and fall of governments in nearly every nation of the world. We have remained strong and prosperous and our progress continues steadily forward. Surely this is not mere accident, without direction or purpose.

We have withstood the two great evils of our times, communism and fascism, both rooted in atheistic materialism, both denying the dignity and worth of the human person. We have remained a source of strength to the whole free world because we have adhered to the

philosophy which shaped this Republic in its beginning. Our governments, Federal and State, have officially acknowledged our dependence upon divine providence and our Supreme Court has said without contradiction that "this is a religious people." Our Constitution and the constitution of our States have reaffirmed our belief in God and our respect for man made in His image and likeness.

It is disheartening to find men in and out of public life claim all virtue for any political organization and attribute all evil to its opponents. This failure to fix moral responsibility upon individuals and failure of make good and evil a matter of personal virtue or personal sin is actually a tactic of the very totalitarianism they supposedly oppose. Only men who deny the dignity and worth of man can attribute the sins of one man to his whole family, or his whole party, or his whole nation. The rest of us must recognize that because man is made free by his Creator to choose between good and evil, praise or blame is personal. This is the essence and the consequence of free will.

Communism must be reprehensible to any man who believes that the rights of human beings are prior and superior to any government. The Communist technique, thriving as it does on fanatic fervor and delusive promises, may lead some among us to abuse the very rights they share with us in order to undermine the rights of all of us. But to combat this abuse with untruths and destructive charges calculated to destroy the confidence of the citizen in his government is only another victory for the Communists we profess to fight. While hating the evil that is communism, we cannot permit ourselves to be used by Communists in sowing the seeds of distrust among our fellow citizens. We must instead fight the evil with constructive programs which destroy its breeding grounds and which strengthen the freedom it seeks to destroy.

Communism is bent on the dechristianization of human society and wherever it has been accepted men have lost their rights, their property, and their very lives. Recognizing this, we cannot ignore the demands of Christian justice which forbid us to violate the honor of our neighbor by slander, depriving him of something even more sacred than life and property.

I know most Americans are agreed that we must root out the subversive influences in our society without respect for position or party. But I know also that most Americans are agreed that we must maintain and safeguard our respect for the human person regardless of position or party.

The support that many parts of our President's program have received from both Republicans and Democrats should demonstrate that all of us are willing to rise above political labels when the course of good for our country is clear. We may sometimes find it not so clear, but in differing honestly we do not betray the trust placed in us by the people whom we represent. Rather we try to merit that trust by representing as best we can those who have made their wishes known by free ballot. To find extreme partisans implying lesser motives for empty political advantage is a reflection not only upon the Congress of the United States but upon the integrity of every citizen who fulfills his obligation to vote.

The right to vote is the right to dissent. We can vote for, and we can vote against, and when we are wrong we can correct ourselves. As long as this right remains inviolate, I think we can protect ourselves from the partisans who have so little faith in the American voter that they feel compelled to rewrite history to their own ends. I am personally convinced that the truth will prevail and that those who want to defraud the citizen of his rights must inevitably fail, whether they are Communists or self-appointed judges who use totalitarian techniques against anything they call totalitarianism. Because we are free and strong, I do not think it becomes any of us to resort to fear in debating the great issues of our future.

Because the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star displays that quality of common sense and detachment needed in discussing subjects so distorted by emotion and because it scrupulously avoids fanning the fires of demagogy with more demagogy, I think it is worthy of our attention.

JENNER VERSUS LINCOLN

Abraham Lincoln sort of took a beating last night. The occasion was the Lincoln day meeting of the Lincoln Republican Club of St. Paul, but the man they got to speak was Senator WILLIAM JENNER, Republican, Indiana, and you can't rightly say the Senator from Indiana speaks in the measured tones and restrained manner of the man who talked about malice toward none.

Last night JENNER waved the bloody shirt for fair, and no matter how hard you try to see it otherwise, his performance was less remindful of the martyred President—in whose name he spoke—than like those post-Lincoln Republicans who made "reconstruction" a fighting word in the South. It's a little difficult to imagine calm, judicious, honest Old Abe declaiming, as JENNER did, to the effect that an "invading army of alien intellectuals" had "for 20 years * * * plundered our country of its resources * * * debilitated our people * * * tampered with the security of the United States and permitted traitors to bring us close to military defeat."

And a person can't quite make out whether Senator JENNER just has no sense of the ridiculous, or doesn't recognize inconsistency—or whether he's just got an amazing amount of brass. Because after having hurled such epithets as "alien-minded planners," "civilian leaders * * * trading with the enemy" and "Benedict Arnolds"—to mention some of the milder terms—the Senator right piously denounced name-calling (and) denunciation of opponents.

It was in a thoroughly un-Lincolnlike manner, too, that JENNER implicitly accused former Secretary of State Acheson of treason, suggested—through a half-truth—that the late Harry Hopkins was responsible for Russia's atomic successes, and grossly maligned the reputations of Generals Omar Bradley, Hoyt Vandenberg, and Joe Collins, and Adm. William Fechteler as the Joint Chiefs of Staff who let Central Asia fall to the Communists.

President Eisenhower must be embarrassed by the tone of JENNER'S Lincoln Day oration—if he's heard about it. Especially by some of the things the Senator praised him for. Mr. Eisenhower, for example, will not like the suggestion that he has freed the Armed Forces from the kind of overall civilian control which is an American tradition.

A lot of Minnesota Republicans must be embarrassed about their Hoosier orator, too, those temperate ones at any rate who share Mr. Eisenhower's—and Lincoln's—principles and who would like to keep in the GOP fold those independent voters who made possible the presidential victory of 1952.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, although I was nominated by the Republican Party in my district in the last election, I did not receive an invitation to address any group to make a Lincoln Day speech, and I ask unanimous consent that today after other special orders that I may address the House for 20 minutes to make a Lincoln Day speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LOYALTY FIRINGS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if someone on the other side of the aisle wishes to do the Republican Party a real service on Lincoln's Birthday I suggest he call an editorial entitled "Or Whatever," in the Christian Science Monitor of February 11, 1954, to the President's attention. The President scarcely could miss the point in the implied suggestion that someone in the State Department who talks too much and too loosely is a security risk and should be separated from the Government service. I am extending my remarks to include the editorial:

"OR WHATEVER"

R. W. Scott McLeod, Security and Personnel Administrator for the State Department, declares that he does not think the American people are interested in a breakdown of the 2,200 employees fired by the Eisenhower administration as security risks. We question his assumption.

People do not care, said Mr. McLeod in a political speech, whether the dismissed employees were "drunks, perverts, Communists, or whatever—they just want us to get rid of them." But it has been repeatedly claimed by political spokesmen that the vast majority of those fired were subversives, and the American people are surely entitled to know whether this is so.

It is now reliably reported that only 11 out of 534 ousters in the State Department have been for reasons connected with loyalty. Even this small number cannot rightfully be referred to as "Communists," "spies," "traitors," or "subversives," but only as individuals whose loyalty is in doubt but who may be innocent. Mr. McLeod himself has made this point in a more carefully worded and reasoned interview published in U. S. News & World Report.

In his statement quoted above, the State Department officer mentioned two other categories of security risk and added a catch-all phrase, "or whatever." In the published interview he spells out the meaning of this phrase as including cases where "behavior characteristics * * * reflect on the reliabil-

ity and trustworthiness of an individual." This means that a man may be fired for talking too freely as well as for drinking too much, for perverting the truth about his educational background as well as for sex deviations which open him to blackmail.

Certainly all such people are security risks and should be separated from Government employ. But until the situation has been clarified further the suspicion will remain among some people that the Government has indeed been filled with spies and traitors, while others may suspect that the phrase "or whatever" covers even normal resignations, transfers, and economy firings in which some scrap of adverse information has been used to label the affected individuals as "security risks."

REPUBLICAN LINCOLN DAY ADDRESSES

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, "Just how crazy can politicians get?" the St. Louis Post-Dispatch asks editorially in its issue of February 5.

Republican orators have been using the birthday of Abraham Lincoln as an excuse to leave the impression that Democratic administrations for the past 20 years have been guilty of treason. They not only desecrate the memory of Lincoln but they insult the intelligence of the American people.

Have they forgotten so quickly that Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles—not to mention hundreds of other distinguished leaders of their own party participated in the affairs of our Government through those years—that they held high positions of trust and preferment in both the Roosevelt and Truman administrations?

The truth is that had it not been for the service of General Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles in Democratic administrations they would not be where they are today—in the No. 1 and No. 2 positions in our Government.

FASCISTS ALSO INVESTIGATED BY UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussion of a few minutes ago had by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and Mr. MCCORMACK's emphasis upon the desirability of including Fascists and other subversives in any consideration of the subject, I thought I should call the attention of the House to the fact that the House Un-American Activities Committee, of which I am a member, adopted rule 10, on July 15, as a result of a report from a subcommittee of that committee, of which I had the responsibility of being chairman. The full committee adopted our report and recommendation which expressly sets forth and identifies Fascists as types of persons who should be investigated as being subversives. I thought the House would be glad to have that information.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman include in his remarks a rather complete definition of a Fascist? I suggest the gentleman do that when he revises his remarks, if he does not care to do it now.

Mr. DOYLE. I supposed the gentleman knew what a Fascist was.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I do not, though I may have my own idea. There are altogether too many broad general statements.

Mr. DOYLE. If the gentleman does not, I shall be glad to try.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will enlighten me, I would appreciate it; and also, if he will include a definition of a Communist.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I herewith furnish for the information of the gentleman from Michigan the following text from the Congressional Library. This is the same information furnished me by said Library before Congress recessed last summer. I supply it now because I told the gentleman from Michigan I would furnish a definition. I did not happen to have it with me on the floor when I briefly spoke; nor, would time then permit to read it if I had had it in my possession then.

COMMUNISM: A SKETCH

The term "communism," derived from the Latin word "communis" does not occur much before 1840. It was coined in the secret revolutionary societies of Paris between 1834 and 1839. In the years 1840–72, the term came to imply revolutionary action for the violent overthrow of capitalist society. Socialism on the other hand, was the term used to describe constitutional activities for the reform of the economic system in the direction of national control of the means of production. Between 1872 and 1917, the term "communism" tended to disappear.[1] Since 1917, the meaning of the word has been narrowed down to denote the interpretation of Marxian doctrine proposed by Lenin when he came to power in Russia as a result of the revolution of November 1917.

The following definitions of communism are found in a 1931 report of the House Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities in the United States:

"* * * a worldwide political organization advocating: (1) hatred of God and all forms of religion; (2) destruction of private property and inheritance; (3) absolute social and racial equality; promotion of class hatred; (4) revolutionary propaganda through the Communist International, stirring up Communist activities in foreign countries in order to cause strikes, riots, sabotage, bloodshed, and civil war; (5) destruction of all forms of representative or democratic governments, including civil liberties, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and trial by jury; (6) the ultimate and final objective is by means of world revolution to establish the dictatorship of the so-called proletariat into one world union of Soviet Socialist republics with the capital at Moscow.

"Communism has also been defined as an organized effort to overthrow organized governments which operate contrary to the Communist plan now in effect in Russia. It aims at the socialization of government, private property, industry, labor, the home, education, and religion. Its objectives are the abolition of other governments, private ownership of property, inheritance, religion, and family relations." [2]

Bishop Fulton J. Sheen has defined communism in the following manner:

"Basically, communism is * * * a complete philosophy of life, * * * an integral comprehension of the world, different from all other secular systems in that it seeks not only to dominate the periphery of life but to control man's inner life as well. Communism has a theory and a practice; it wishes to be not only a state but a church, judging the consciences of men: it is a doctrine of salvation and as such claims the whole man, body and soul, and in this sense is totalitarian." [3]

According to Communist theory, the social revolution must be carried out by the proletariat's advance guard, which is the Communist Party, because the people as a whole, including large parts of the proletariat itself, have been educated in the pro-Communist era and, therefore, are unable to grasp immediately the new conditions of life under the new order.[4] The duty of the Communist Party is first to point out the faults of democracy under a capitalist regime. Then, when the inevitable crisis arises from either depression or war, this well disciplined Communist minority should be in a position to seize political power from capitalist leadership. Once power has been attained by the Communists, a dictatorship of the proletariat will be established under which the essential means of production, including all material resources, will be taken over by the state under a military communism. This organization would continue until the threat of counterrevolution is past. The Communist leadership would undertake the extermination of privileged classes, the education of the masses, and the erection of a highly integrated and closely coordinated economic system.[5] Communist theory states that the dictatorship of the proletariat is temporary and transitional. The period of dictatorship is to witness the withering away of the state. When the education of the masses is completed, and they are ready for communism, there would be no further need for states to exist. Another principle of Communist theory is that the establishment of communism in one or more countries must be followed by efforts to establish it in all countries, since communism will not be safe anywhere until it has been established everywhere.

To understand the progress and the dangers of the Communist movement, it must

[1] Beer, Max, Communism. In Encyclopedia of the social sciences. New York, Macmillan, 1931. v. 4: 81.

[2] U. S. Congress. House. Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities in the United States in accordance with H. Res. 220, 71st Cong., 3d sess. H. Rept. 2290 (Jan. 17, 1931), p. 4.

[3] Sheen, Fulton J. Communism and the Conscience of the West. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1948. p. 58.

[4] Kohn, Hans. Communism. In Encyclopedia Britannica. Chicago, Encyclopedia Britannica, 1950. Vol. 6: 135.

[5] Warne, Colston E. Communism. In the National Encyclopedia. New York, P. F. Collier, 1950, vol. 3: 195.

be regarded as a social and political secular religion. This must be the attitude because communism is not exclusively concerned with acquiring power and achieving social and political changes. It demands absolute dominance over every realm of life—spiritual as well as secular.[6]

FASCISM: A SKETCH

Fascism in the broad sense is simultaneously a philosophy and a way of life which requires that its followers serve the state with an unwavering faith and an unquestioning obedience. It makes fanaticism a virtue and weaves ideological concepts about the doctrines of race supremacy, the leadership principle, rule by an elite class, government under a single political party, the acquisition of living space, a totalitarian state, and the use of force as an instrument of national policy. The roots of modern fascism, especially the German, and to a less degree the Italian, may be traced to 19th century thought. However, it is economically a contemporary manifestation of mercantilism; politically an apologia for world conquest; and spiritually a quasi-religious cult with special symbols and rituals.

In a narrow sense fascism is the term used to describe the operation of the political, economic, and social institutions of the Fascist state. That state mobilizes all physical, social, and spiritual resources and activities, compressing them into a regimented whole. Primary emphasis is placed on power.[7]

A Fascist, of course, is one who subscribes to this philosophy and creed of fascism.

Fascism as a system of government originally was an authoritarian Italian movement begun by Benito Mussolini in March 1919. It came to power in Italy in October 1922. Later, fascism became the general name for similar movements in other countries, among which German national socialism became the most prominent example. By 1936, Fascist principles had become accepted to a varying degree by the governments of Austria, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Greece, and Japan as well as in Germany and Italy. By 1940, fascism could be regarded as a form of organization for society and as an attitude of mind which had its adherents in practically every country of the earth.[8]

The term "fascism" is derived from the Latin "fasces"—bundles, clusters, or groups—denoting in ancient Rome a bundle of rods with an ax borne before Roman magistrates as a symbol of authority.[9]

In its beginnings, fascism was not a doctrine and it had no clearly elaborated program. It was a technique for gaining and retaining power by violence. With great flexibility it subordinated all questions of program to this one aim. Mussolini's formula was the following: "Our program is simple: we wish to govern Italy. They ask us for programs, but there are already too many. It is not programs that are wanting for the salvation of Italy, but men and will power." Despite its flexibility, however, fascism was dominated from the very beginning by a definite attitude of mind which exalted fighting spirit, military discipline, ruthlessness, and action. At the same time, it rejected contemptuously all ethical motives as weakening the resoluteness of will. Fascism thus is power politics in one of its most naked forms. All theoretical considerations are subservient to what is regarded as the inexorable dynamics of the facts of a particular situation. Ultimately, everything depends upon the ever-changing decisions of the leader—decisions which cannot be discussed, but must be blindly obeyed and immediately executed.[4]

The idea of the absolute sovereignty of the state is the very kernel of Fascist social and political theory.[5] In many ways, fascism can be regarded as an exaggerated and even absolutized nationalism which entirely obliterates both individualism and humanity. The nation becomes the supreme arbiter, its service the one supreme duty. Only actions, thoughts, and sentiments which help to increase the power of the nation can be called good.

Fascism regards itself as a rejection, a complete and uncompromising denial, of the principles of liberalism and democracy as laid down in the English, American, and French Revolutions of the 17th and 18th centuries. It is a return to an authoritarian order based upon the subordination of the individual and the inequality of caste and rank. The liberty of the individual is denied in favor of the state, the inequality of men is proclaimed as immutable and beneficial. The achievements which liberalism had secured beginning with the English revolutions of the 17th century were not only abandoned, but also have been derided and combated as well. From its beginnings fascism has acted as the implacable enemy of democracy and of the rights of man. Its society is to be built strictly upon a hierarchical order. The rulers of the state are not to be elected by, nor are they to be responsible to the people. On the contrary, the people are responsible to the leaders whose appointment depends only upon those above them. Military discipline and blind obedience permeate the whole of civilian life. One of the chief slogans of Italian fascism was "credere, obbedire, combattere" (to have faith, to obey, to fight), and another was "Mussolini ha sempre ragiene" (Mussolini is always right).[6]

In conclusion, fascism means the seizure and absolute control of the entire life of the state—economic, social, political, and cultural—by a small group. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of worship, freedom of public assembly, all are ruthlessly suppressed. Unquestioning obedience to the leader is demanded of all people in the Nation. The least wavering means imprisonment or death. Retribution may be inflicted upon the person's entire family. A fascist regime is necessarily militaristic, nationalistic, dictatorial, and intolerant of opposition. Its ordinary instruments of policy are subversion, terror, war, deceit, and force.

[6] Surian, Waldemar. Bolshevism; an Introduction to Soviet Communism. Notre Dame, Ind., University of Notre Dame Press, 1952. p. 5.

[7] U. S. Library of Congress. Legislative Reference Service. Fascism in action. A documented study and analysis of fascism in Europe. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1947. p. 1.

[8] Kohn, Hans. Fascism. In Encyclopedia Britannica. Chicago, Encyclopedia Britannica, 1950; vol. 9: 101–102.

[9] De Kay, Drake. Fascism. In the Encyclopedia Americana. New York, Americana Corp., 1952; vol. 11: 50.

[4] Kohn, op. cit., p. 102.

[5] Von Beckerath, Erwin. Fascism. In Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York, Macmillan, 1931; vol. 6: 50.

[6] Kohn, op. cit., pp. 102–103.

TALK OF DOUBLE TAXATION IS DOUBLE TALK

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the expression which is being so frequently heard today of double taxation of dividends is a completely phony propaganda slogan, cleverly deceptive in its implication and totally without truthful basis.

Inspired and sedulously spread by powerful financial groups seeking to lighten their individual tax burden, it is deliberately—though temporarily, I hope—misleading the general taxpaying public as to what is being foisted upon them.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge any Government official, from the lowest to the highest, to point out where under law or regulations the recipient of dividends from stock is taxed twice on the money so received.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RABAUT asked and was granted permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR TO BE CALLED TUESDAY

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask that it may be in order on Tuesday next for the Speaker to order the calling of the Consent Calendar under the Consent Calendar rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

MIGRATORY MEXICAN LABOR

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 355) pertaining to Mexican labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

INTERIM AUTHORITY TO CLERK AND SPEAKER

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Tuesday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the other day I asked for a special order of 1 hour on next Monday should the House be in session, to commemorate the anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*. As the House is not to be in session on next Monday I ask that the order previously entered for me for that day be changed to Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

NAME CALLING

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is one of those happy occasions when I find myself sitting innocently but very interestedly on the sidelines reading the papers and listening to statements from the well of the House and from which we learn that the President has admonished the Republicans to quit being naughty and calling bad names when they refer to their Democratic friends and colleagues.

Tolerance is always an admirable trait.

Last week we were told by the former Speaker of the House, whom we all respect and admire so highly, that the Democratic backs were getting a little sore. I do not know what from—carrying the load of criticism they have been heaping upon Republicans and the Republican administration—or because they are worrying because of their mistakes and so wearing themselves down—I do not know what it is. Whatever it is they have my sympathy. But here is the point I want to make, if I may: Two Members of this body whom I respect and admire very greatly, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and my good colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], have special orders today. As I understood them, they intend to make Lincoln Day speeches. I hope as many Members as conveniently can will stay and listen. It has been a long time since I heard a real good Lincoln Day speech, and if they will be so kind, and if the President will be so kind, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] will be so kind and so considerate as to advise the Republicans just what names the Republicans can use—I do not mean necessarily from a parliamentary standpoint, but just to use outside, for example, what names Republicans can with propriety use when they want to describe the actions of the last two administrations or refer perhaps to legislation or investigations, and to some of the Members on the minority side, that is, the temporary minority side, and not transgress the rules of the House nor of good taste.

At present the way the situation stands and in view of the President's statement as interpreted by members of the opposition, we do not know what to do. Must we avoid all criticism of our political opponents and their doings? Being uncertain as to just what to do, strange as it may seem, I have not said anything. That shocks you, does it not? It amazes you that I have not said anything at all in this alleged name-calling contest?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that probably explains why they did not send the gentleman out to make a Lincoln Day address. He has been too nice to us.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman does not know how I appreciate that word. The former majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], is here. The gentleman from Minnesota does not know how much that warms my heart—tends to make me feel I am not altogether unworthy to serve here. I recall what the gentleman from Massachusetts said about me on at least two occasions. He said he had a minimum of admiration for me. That was parliamentary language. I do not know what he meant. I do not know whether he meant I was a Communist, a Fascist, a drunkard, or what. How thankful am I that the good people of the Fourth District of Michigan do not share his views. Someone was talking here about those people who have been discharged for security reasons. As far as I am concerned, I was not bothered much about that. If a man is a Communist, sure, we ought to let him go. If he is a drunkard, we ought to let him go. If he is a pervert, and there were some 200 at one time discharged for that, we should let them go because the Government lacks some degree of security if they are on the payroll. Somebody is apt to get up on the blind side of one and get some secret out of him. Of course, if you want to call him a Communist I think you should have the evidence—the same goes for any other charge that is made.

I have tried to stay within the facts and the parliamentary rules when criticism is offered and I propose to do so in the future.

But maybe sometime I will want to say something in the well of the House which might be slightly critical of the Democratic administrations, the two that have just gone by, or of some things said here, some argument that is made. That is the reason for asking that we be advised just how we can call attention to shortcomings on the part of the opposition, if there be such without incurring the displeasure of our President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN). Did the gentleman address a question to the Chair?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not a question; I just observed he is serving with as much ability and distinction as our elected Speaker. I hope the present occupant of the chair may continue to represent his great district and that he may also be elevated to the position which he is now so capably filling.

I request my colleagues from the Democratic side who intend to speak of Lincoln to make themselves clear, in view of the fact that the President has not told us just what we may with propriety say. Just what we may with propriety say when we are justified in commenting adversely on their policies and actions. Our former Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, has not told us. But if we do find any fault, probably we will not be able to, with anything you gentlemen on the minority side say or do, tell us how we can call attention to it without offending you because I do not want to offend anyone, not even my Republican colleagues, certainly not the Republican leadership. If you will do that I am sure many a Republican will appreciate it and for myself, may I thank you in advance.

OUR NATION—THE WORLD—NEEDS THE PHILOSOPHY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN). Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and my colleagues for unanimously granting me this special order opportunity on the floor of this great legislative body to speak of my deep appreciation of, and affection for, what that great citizen of the ages, Abraham Lincoln, did in his all too short lifetime for our beloved Nation.

On this, the anniversary of his birth, on February 12, 1809, as the son of Nancy and Thomas Lincoln, and the grandson of Abraham Lincoln, a distinguished Virginia pioneer who was killed by the Indians, I again find renewed inspiration and guidance by reviewing some of my personal files and library on him who was a member of this very legislative body during the 30th session of this Congress from March 4, 1847, to March 3, 1849.

I recall that upon most of the anniversaries of Abe Lincoln's birth, while I have been a Member of this House during these 8 years, it has been my great pride to have the privileges of this floor and of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to remind Members of Congress and the American people of at least a few of the untarnished, enduring virtues of this God-loving, self-sacrificing, and most humbly born and reared American.

For instance, some of these occasions when I have done so were on February 14, 1949, April 26, 1949, February 10, 1950, February 12, 1951, February 11, 1952, and at page A617 in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 9. With the assistance of the Congressional Library I called attention to verified sayings of Abraham Lincoln as State legislator, as Congressman, and as President. My remarks of February 10, 1950, in observation of the 141st anniversary of his birth was entitled "Our Nation—the World—Needs the Philosophy of Abraham Lincoln." That was 4 years ago. But, Mr. Speaker, would anyone now say that either our Nation or the world does not still need the applied philosophy of Abraham Lincoln? And because the record of many years last past so indelibly marks the fact that his wholesomeness, his inherent honesty, his righteous indignation at wrongdoing, his applied Christianity to

the problems of humankind, and his patriotic devotion on the highest possible level to his public duty, have been my guiding star which I have sought to follow in both my private life and my public life, I ask your understanding indulgence and allowance for me to further observe the fact that I cannot remember when, in my lifetime, the example of Abraham Lincoln's life was not my ideal of American citizenship. But, with this personal remark, I do now continue to recognize that my humble and sincere desire to speak adequately of his matchless service to our beloved Nation, does not give me either ability or wisdom enough to find the words or the language, with which to interpret my appraisement of this former United States Congressman and President of the United States, who has so appropriately been accepted as a citizen of the ages. Therefore, I again this morning, as before, merely undertake to call to your attention some of the instances, occasions, and experiences in connection with his life as a citizen and also as a public servant which are not generally described or referred to, in connection with the observation of this, the anniversary of his birth.

It is related with considerable authority that when Abraham Lincoln was a member of the Illinois State Legislature he exchanged several letters with one Austin Gollaher, one of his early boyhood friends, regarding his birthplace near Hodgenville, Ky., and that when Gollaher, as justice of the peace in the backwoods of Kentucky wrote State Legislator Lincoln and said in his letter:

I don't hold much with sentencing men to jail. Instead I sentence them to go to church regular for 6 months or a year. It works fine.

The Illinois lawyer answered and said:

I like your idea, but I wonder if God enjoys being used as a punishment.

In connection with the apparent fact that Lincoln never joined a church, I have noted in the written record that Lincoln was always reverent to the Divine and always sincerely respectful of Christianity; helpful and sincere in the promulgation of the principles of Christianity. It is establish that his father was a member of the Pigeon Creek Baptist Church, and that also Sarah Bush Lincoln, she whom Abe Lincoln adored and in later years called his angel mother, was an active member. Lincoln frequently quoted the Scripture and habitual reference thereto by him was manifestly founded upon his personal acquaintance with the Holy Bible. It was one of his most valuable assets, and gave him faith and wisdom.

In his 1846 campaign for election when his petty political enemies sought to use his nonchurch membership against him, Lincoln answered in writing and said:

That I am not a member of any Christian church, is true; but I have never denied the truth of the Scriptures; and I have never spoken with intentional disrespect of religion in general, or of any denomination of Christians in particular.

In this connection the more I read of his total life, I am more and more convinced that he preeminently knew God. He evidently experienced no ill effects from this very personal experience.

Having previously urged you, my distinguished colleagues, and all American citizens to visit as many as possible of the Lincoln shrines, especially in Indiana, Kentucky, Illinois, and Washington, D. C., I wish to again renew that emphasis. Because he was what he was, and because his life as a public servant is undoubtedly the one which we who follow him in public service would be most proud to emulate in even the remotest degree, I again urge that not only all adult Americans possible visit these historical Abraham Lincoln shrines, but that they take with them as many American children and American youth and young people as possible. Such activity cannot help but make a definite intelligible contribution to our great Nation's spiritual and material uplift and security.

The last time Mrs. Doyle and I stood at the doorway of the original birthplace cabin of Lincoln in the National Historical Park near Hodgenville, Ky., and there read one of his great sayings, which was delivered by him at Peoria, Ill., October 16, 1854, as follows:

Stand with anyone that stands right. Stand with him while he is right and part with him when he goes wrong.

I also recalled that the aforesaid saying was the one I noticed most frequently on walls of offices in and about the Capitol Building. For instance, recently I noticed it again in the first-aid room. When I asked the nurse why she had it there on the wall of the room, she proudly stated that it was because Lincoln had stated for her the way she believed people should do. Thereupon was another illustration of the increasing awareness of the American people that America would be much better off if, as a daily practice, the applied ideal of daily American experience and practice was to stand with anyone that stands right and to part with him when he goes wrong.

And another of his character-building sayings which will live in the hearts of every sincere, patriotic American who seeks to live nobly and perform his daily duties, was uttered by Lincoln in his great speech at Cooper Institute in New York City, February 27, 1860, is as follows:

Let us have faith that right makes might. And in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

During that historical debate with Senator Stephen Douglas, one of the master orators in American public life, in 1858, Lincoln again enunciated the same high principles for American public servants and private citizens when he said during one of those debates in answer to the political cynicism of Senator Douglas as follows:

On the contrary, nobody has ever expected me to be President. In my poor, lean, lank face, nobody has ever seen that any cabbages were sprouting out. These are disadvantages all taken together, that the Republicans labor under. We have to fight this battle upon principle, and principle alone.

So, because the record is so crystal clear in the premises I challenge your thought to the proposition that no officeholder in this history of our great Nation has ever so tenaciously or clearly spoken and worked on the basis of principle alone as did Abraham Lincoln.

My colleagues, these days when in the stress of and natural desire for political gain and advancement so many of us yield to the temptation to be petty and small; to overstate, exaggerate, and, even worse, toward our political opposition, it is clear as crystal to me that we as American Congressmen must adopt as our guiding motive those words of candidate-for-office Lincoln when he said:

We have to fight this battle upon principle, and principle alone.

When Mrs. Doyle and I last visited the birthplace farm and cabin where Lincoln was born and walked over some of the trails and paths which, no doubt, he had used, and then when we last visited New Salem, Ill., and Petersburg, Ill., these visits again helped us to understand why in Lincoln's message to Congress in 1861 he, amongst other things, said:

The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages a while, saves a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, and at length hires another new beginner to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all—gives hope to all, and consequent energy and progress and improvement of condition to all.

All of my adult life, including these more than 7 years I have now been a Member of this Congress, I have borne in mind what Abraham Lincoln wrote in his first message to Congress when he said:

This is essentially a people's contest. On the side of the Union it is a struggle for maintaining in the world that form and substance of government whose leading object is to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all; to afford all an unfettered start, and a fair chance in the race of life.

Is there any amongst you who today would disagree with the aforesaid paragraph in Lincoln's first message to Congress? Is there any of us today who hold contrary to this declaration by Lincoln to the Congress in session when he first became President of this great Nation? Is the purpose of us struggling to maintain in our great Nation that form and substance of Government as of this day and in this present session of Congress different than the content of Lincoln's first message? If any of you believe that the leading objectives of Government for which Lincoln gave his life are different now than when he was assassinated, I would like to have you state those differences.

And this leads me to make the observation that even President Lincoln was not without petty political enemies within his own political party, and within his own executive administration of our beloved Nation. Time does not here permit for me to more than just refer to one most sarcastic and bitter attack upon the President from Halls of Congress. For this instance I relate to a book in our Congressional Library entitled "Lincoln and the Radicals," by Thomas Harry Williams, copyrighted by the University

of Wisconsin, 1941, page 165 thereof, where the author says:

In particular they were infuriated because Lincoln had dared to threaten Congress with a veto before final passage of the bill. This was Executive usurpation of the rights of Congress, they cried. The President was trying to bully the representatives of the people; he was a dictator. Wade blasted Fessenden for "mousing around" the Executive Office to find out the Presidential will. Perhaps Senators were willing to abdicate the powers of Congress, he exclaimed, and crawl before the White House throne: "(We) ought to have a committee on vetoes; we ought to have a committee to wait on the President whenever we send him a bill, to know what his royal pleasure is in regard to it; and whether it contains anything he would like to modify. * * * I am astonished that men should come in here, creeping in at the back door, with vetoes." And the old Jacobin finished with a sneer that only a few favored Senators could secure an audience with the royal presence: "Others, when they go to see the President, find that they are debarred all access to him. Nobody can see him, it seems, except some privileged gentlemen who are charged with his constitutional conscience."

So it is that in these destiny-making days and partisan political contests for advantage and control in the Halls of Congress and the White House, it is well, is it not, that it is clearly remembered that even Abraham Lincoln, so appropriately and effectively referred to, was charged by leading members of his own political party in the United States Congress with having royal pleasure and with doing something which made it necessary for Members of Congress to be creeping in at the back door, with vetoes.

So it is too often true that in the course of conduct in public life in our great Nation, not only to men in high places with thoughtlessness and, yes, sometimes with deliberate design to destroy the usefulness of a fellow American—malign and irreparably damage the character and conduct of fellowmen; these fellow citizens being at least as devoted and as patriotic toward the American way of life as the petty, small brains and voices which attack them. The foregoing instance wherein Benjamin F. Wade and others maligned President Lincoln for their own selfish political aggrandizement is but one of many such similar instances which this great martyred President had before his untimely assassination at the murderous hands of Booth.

Mr. Speaker, in making these informal remarks, with a very clear awareness on my part of my continuing and total inability to do the subject justice by reason of any words or language in my vocabulary or sincere resources, I would feel unworthy of, and ungrateful to, the claims I have made since early childhood of my affection for and personal inspiration gained by reason of the life of Abraham Lincoln. It is he who has always been and is now my highest exemplification of American citizenship and of public service in the interest of the Constitution of the United States and our Bill of Rights.

One of the annual occasions in memory of Abe Lincoln here at the Nation's Capital is the annual program held at the Ford Theater, where Lincoln was assassinated, under the auspices of the National Park Service and the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia. It has been my pleasure to be personally present at these annual occasions these several years last passed and to actively participate therein. On February 14, 1950, I received the following communication:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., Feburary 13, 1950.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Please permit me to express our appreciation for your cooperation and assistance in serving as chairman of the Lincoln Anniversary Program at the Lincoln Museum yesterday. Thanks to you, it was one of the best programs we have ever had at the museum and it was attended by the largest number of persons. The audience of 485 was probably the largest that has been in the old Ford Theater Building at any time since the night of the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.

We know that you will be with us at our future Lincoln Museum programs, and we will be looking forward with great pleasure to seeing you.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD KELLY,
Special Assistant to the Superintendent.

And then on October 13, 1950, I was greatly pleased to receive advice from the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., that I had been elected to serve 4 years as a member of the board of governors of that nationally known group, the objectives of which, according to its constitution are:

Article II. Objects: The objects of the group shall be (a) the collection, preservation, and dissemination of knowledge respecting the history, biography, and worldwide influence of Abraham Lincoln, and to (b) honor the memory of that great humanitarian by appropriate convocations and exercises.

This Lincoln Group deserves your more active attention and help.

Mr. Speaker, that famous Gettysburg address given by President Lincoln November 19, 1863, has played such an inspiring place and plan in all of my high school, college, and later years that I again wish to give the exact wording thereof:

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth, upon this continent, a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived, and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of it, as a final resting place for those who died here, that the Nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow, this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here; but it can never forget what they did here.

It is for us the living rather to be dedicated to the unfinished work which they who fought here thus far so nobly advanced.

It is rather for us, to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that, from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Following are a few of his always pertinent sayings:

In using the strong hand, as now compelled to do, the Government has a difficult duty to perform. At the very best it will by turns do both too little and too much. It can properly have no motive of revenge, no purpose to punish merely for punishment's sake. While we must by all available means prevent the overthrow of the Government, we should avoid planting and cultivating too many thorns in the bosom of society. (To Secretary Stanton, April 18, 1864.)

Knowing, as I well do, the difficulty that poor people now encounter in procuring homes, I hesitate not to say that when the price of public lands shall be doubled or trebled, or, which is the same thing, produce and labor cut down to one-half or one-third of their present prices, it will be little less than impossible for them to procure those homes at all. (Speech at Springfield, Ill., December 20, 1839.)

All honor to Jefferson—to the man, who, in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people, had the coolness, forecast, and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there that today and in all coming days it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression. (Speech at Springfield, Ill., April 6, 1859.)

Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. (Annual message to Congress, December 3, 1861.)

Let them (workingmen) beware of surrendering a political power they already possess, and which, if surrendered, would surely be used to close the door of advancement against such as they, and fix new disabilities and burdens upon them, till all of liberty shall be lost. (Annual message, December 3, 1861.)

For my part I desire to see the time when education—and by its means, morality, sobriety, enterprise, and industry—shall become much more general then at present, and should be gratified to have it in my power to contribute something to the advancement of any measure which might have a tendency to accelerate that happy period. (Address to Sangamon County, March 9, 1832.)

The fight must go on. The cause of civil liberty must not be surrendered at the end of 1 or even 100 defeats. (Letter to H. Asbury, Springfield, Ill., November 19, 1858.)

Never add the weight of * * * character to charge against (a) fellow man, without knowing it to be true. I believe it is an established maxim in morals that he who makes an assertion without knowing whether it is true or false is guilty of falsehood, and the accidental truth of the assertion does not justify or excuse him. This maxim ought to be particularly held in view when we contemplate an attack upon the reputation of our neighbor. (Letter to editor of Illinois Gazette, Springfield, Ill., August 11, 1846.)

Persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true is simply malicious slander. (Cooper Institute address, New York, N. Y., February 27, 1860.)

A man cannot prove the negative, but he has a right to claim that when one makes an affirmative charge he must offer some proof to show the truth of what he says.

(Statement during debate at Ottawa, Ill., August 21, 1858.)

It used to be a fashion amongst men that when a charge was made, some sort of proof was brought forward to establish it, and if no proof was found to exist, the charge was dropped. (Speech at Jonesboro, Ill., September 15, 1858.)

Truth is generally the best vindication against slander. (Letter to Secretary Stanton, July 14, 1864.)

I believe we need nothing so much as to get rid of unjust suspicion of one another. (Letter to Charles L. Wilson, June 1, 1858.)

Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and, under the rule of a just God, cannot long retain it. (Letter to H. L. Pierce and others, April 6, 1859.)

I do not propose to question the patriotism or to assail the motives of any man or class of men. (Speech at Peoria, Ill., October 16, 1854.)

But we ourselves must not decline the burden of responsibility, nor take counsel of minority passions. (Speech at Bloomington, Ill., May 29, 1856.)

Let us be diverted by none of those • • • contrivances such as groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong; vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man. Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction to the Government, nor of dungeons to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it. (Speech at Cooper Institute, New York, N. Y., September 27, 1860.)

In my remarks on February 11, 1952, I closed the same with the very words with which I wish to close these remarks, this 12th day of February 1954.

Mr. Speaker, truly the birth, life, and death of Abraham Lincoln has deservedly achieved an enduring place in the affection of mankind and has miraculously shaped the destiny of mankind more than we Americans realize. So let us take heed of the simplicity, sincerity, sobriety, uncommon honesty, sympathetic generosity, unselfishness, and humility of Abraham Lincoln. I would not mind being able to contact and consciously copy some of his daily traits of habit and character. Would you?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FORRESTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday, February 23, 1954, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

LINCOLN DAY AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, February 12 is the day which a grateful and loving Nation has set aside to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln. It is also the day which the Republican Party has selected for special partisan purposes. On such a special day, I would not presume to speak to members of the Republican Party in my own name or in the name of the Democratic Party. I have attempted, therefore, to avoid this difficulty by trying to imagine what Abraham Lincoln might say to members of the Republican Party if he were addressing them today. I regret that there are not more members of the Republican Party on the floor today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The regularly elected Speaker is here; the Speaker pro tempore is here.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I do not mean to protest or criticize. I realize they are away on what they consider a good cause. I notice, however, the gentleman from Michigan has been left here or chosen to remain.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And there cannot be more than 20 of you Democrats here. You have nothing to be out in the country for.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The remaining member of the Progressive Party is here. I did notice an old Non-Partisan Leaguer on the floor a while ago. The gentleman from Michigan is in good company today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am in good company whenever I associate myself with the present minority party.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, if Lincoln were here today, I believe that he would speak to the Republicans somewhat in this manner:

Just as I did not expect the words of my simple address at Gettysburg to be long remembered, neither did I expect that I would some day be chosen—I cannot say as the spiritual leader—but rather as the man to represent and symbolize the spirit and purposes of the Republican Party. This heavy responsibility I bear alone. Whereas, in the other great political party this responsibility is distributed among 4 or 5 past leaders, the Republican Party, for some reason, has chosen me alone.

I did not expect such singular honor for a number of reasons. It is true that I was the first President elected as a Republican, and in my first term, served as a Republican during the difficult years of the War Between the States. I was not elected to my second term as a Republican but as the candidate of the Union Party, reluctantly supported by an important segment of the Republican Party. It was not left to me to carry on the difficult task of binding the wounds left by the great war or of reuniting the family of our Nation in peace and love as its political house had been rejoined by force of war. I do not know whether I would have succeeded even partially in this work had I been left to attempt it. I regret that my successor, Andrew Johnson, was not supported in his efforts to restore and rebuild what was destroyed and devastated in the war. On the contrary he was harassed and abused and subjected to the indignity of impeachment by the members of the party which is now called the party of Abraham Lincoln.

I do not repudiate that party. If the memory of me can serve the cause of justice and of peace in my country, and in the world, through its use as the instrument of a political party, I offer it without condition or limitation. My hope is that the best of me, of my life, will be used as the guide and example of the party that claims me.

History has certainly not proved that all of my practical political decisions were right. I have become less certain of the wisdom of some as time has passed. I will not, therefore, advise you on immediate and practical problems today. I will speak to you of principles of personal and political conduct, for of these I have become more certain.

I wish, first, to reaffirm my often quoted, and often contradicted, statement that the "legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities"—Springfield, Ill., 1854.

You must not bind yourselves to the changing as though it were fixed and unchanging. You must now, as the party in power, accept the responsibilities of that position, the responsibility for decision, as I was forced to accept it. I am the only Republican President who has made the hard decision to engage the citizens of this country in a major war—and, more particularly, war against other citizens of this country. This was not an easy decision. I knew, however, before my election, that it might have to be made. The words of my message to Congress, in December 1862, are applicable today. Then I said:

The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew.

Also:

But we ourselves must not decline the burden of responsibility, nor take counsel of minority passions. (Bloomington, Ill., 1856.)

Let us be diverted by none of those • • • contrivances such as groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong: vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man. (Cooper Institute, New York, N. Y., 1860.)

You are suffering some, I know, from certain excesses of the last campaign. This is done. For the future let me advise that—

No party can command respect which sustains this year what it opposed last. (Letter to Scott Galloway, 1859.)

We must remember that—

We must not promise what we ought not, lest we be called upon to perform what we cannot. (Bloomington, Ill., 1856.)

You are, of course, honestly concerned over the opposition part. I cannot ask you to treat the Democratic Party with charity, but I urge you to act without malice and with justice toward it and its individual members. The abuse and opprobrium which was heaped upon me by my political enemies did me no lasting

harm. I cannot be sure that it did not hurt them—my enemies or the Nation.

It is important that you guard against accusation without foundation.

I believe it is an established maxim in morals that he who makes an assertion without knowing whether it is true or false, is guilty of falsehood, and the accidental truth of the assertion does not justify or excuse him. This maxim ought to be particularly held in view when we contemplate an attack upon the reputation of our neighbors. (Letter to Illinois Gazette, August 1846.)

Persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true is simply malicious slander. (Cooper Institute, New York, 1860.)

The use of words and method of argument is of great significance.

A man cannot prove the negative, but he has a right to claim that when one makes an affirmative charge he must offer some proof to show the truth of what he says. (Ottawa, Ill., 1858.)

It used to be a fashion amongst men that when a charge was made, some sort of proof was brought forward to establish it, and if no proof was found to exist, the charge was dropped. (Jonesboro, Ill., September 15, 1858.)

I believe, as I stated in my letter to Charles Wilson in June 1858, that we need nothing so much as to get rid of unjust suspicion of one another.

The procedural rights of citizens must be preserved and protected.

All honor to Jefferson—to the man, who, in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people, had the coolness, foresight, and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there that today and in all coming days it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression. (Springfield, Ill., 1859.)

The fight for civil liberty must go on.

The cause of civil liberty must not be surrendered at the end of 1 or even 100 defeats. (Letter to H. Asbury, Springfield, Ill., 1858.)

This is not a special responsibility of the Republican Party, but one which is shared by all members of the Democratic Party as well. The War Between the States did not eliminate division and disagreement. The bitter memories of the war, and even more of the abuses of the postwar period, when my party—our party—held power, remain to plague both parties. We cannot escape responsibility for having permitted, in some cases prolonged and even promoted, injustices and abuses which nurture bitterness. Neither can the Democratic Party escape responsibility for having emphasized, perpetuated, and, to a degree, exploited this bitterness.

As in the time of my term of office, doubt and uncertainty, anxiety and fear are about in the land. I cannot resolve all of your doubts or allay all of your fears. I cannot promise the fulfillment of all your hopes. I can, and do, urge you to proceed with humility and trust in God. You shall make mistakes. Let those mistakes be the consequence of too much trust rather than of too much mistrust and suspicion; of truth and frankness rather than of deceit; of too great leniency rather than of too severe restraint; even of running the risk of being betrayed and destroyed rather than act the betrayer.

The political system which we have received from the founders of this country does not ask less of its citizens than do other political forms—rather more. It demands a measure of dedication, an inspired confidence that citizens of a democracy can progressively achieve a more perfect order, based upon justice but also on freedom. What we seek is not only an external and legal order of justice, but also an internal order based on justice freely accepted and written in the hearts and minds of all citizens.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My only purpose was to express my personal, and I think I may add, the appreciation of my colleagues for the very interesting, very instructive statement that the gentleman has made. Of course, we all know that the words of Lincoln are always inspiring, and I was wondering if the gentleman, although he did once or twice refer to members of his own party, would not accept the statement that those words of advice which he has given us should be addressed too to the members of the minority party at this time as well as to the majority members.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the members of the minority party would profit from them, but this is a day which is dedicated to the Republicans, and I thought that they might be particularly receptive on this occasion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I hope we are, but I hope that the Democrats do not mind sharing with us in the inspirations and the sayings that Lincoln gave us.

Mr. McCARTHY. I certainly agree with the gentleman in that hope.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I recollect my history, some of the remarks that the gentleman has quoted as coming from Abe Lincoln were directed at the vicious, bitter attacks made upon him and upon the Republican administration during those days by the Democrats.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not so much by the Democrats as by members of the Republican Party. There were some Democrats who participated, too. The severest critics, as I recall, were members of the Republican Party.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, there were severe critics among the Democratic Party, too, that brought about his comments.

Mr. McCARTHY. Lincoln spoke from experience, and I think that lends strength to his words.

POLITICS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as you know, in California we have a rather peculiar political situation in comparison with the rest of the States of the United States, and that is with respect to election laws which allow Democrats to file as Democratic candidates and also to file as Republican candidates and vice versa. This leads to some strange situations in California where men who are registered Democratic, such as myself, receive the Republican nomination, and a gentleman who registers Republican receives the Democratic nomination. This double filing occurred in the six times I have been a candidate for office in the House of Representatives. Three times in my own case I have been chosen by the Republicans of my district as their nominee, and the Democrats as their nominee.

Of course, when that happens, we have no opposition in the primaries unless some splinter party or independent party puts in someone against you. So, it is tantamount to election when you receive those two nominations.

Now, I do not particularly approve of this method and I have made speeches all over my State in opposition to this particular method. I feel that a Democrat should be a Democrat, and a Republican a Republican, and I have the highest respect for those two parties. I believe that it is necessary for there to be two good, strong parties in our Nation. I think one of them, of course, should be the Democratic Party, and I think that one should be the Republican Party. I am not one who believes that splinter parties should occur in these United States and put our democracy in the condition of the constitutional Government of France where so many splinter parties are found that it takes a coalition of parties of divergent views in order to have a working majority. I believe the stronger type of democracy is a type which has two strong parties.

Now, in order to have those two parties, we have to have men of good will on both sides and we have to get men on both sides who respect the men of the other side and respect the integrity of the two-party system. Attacks against either party, whether they be made by Republicans or Democrats, in the nature of an attack challenging the integrity or the loyalty or the patriotism of that party is, in my opinion, a very dangerous procedure. If the Democrats were successful in destroying confidence in the Republican Party through making unwarranted attacks, through making attacks which were not directed against the principles that the Republican Party believes in, but were directed at influencing the people of the Nation to believe that the Republican Party was a party of treason, that the members of the Republican Party were in league with communism or with fascism or any other subversive movement, then you would be striking at the very basic foundation of the strength of constitutional government. That would not be political partisanship, that would be descending far below political partisanship into the mud of the gutter, into the ratholes of political

ideology, into what I consider an un-American practice, because it is striking at an American principle which is basic to the foundation of our democracy and to the continuation of our democracy.

We have observed in the heat of campaign oratory people on both sides of the aisle departing from these high principles and the dedication to these basic philosophies of government. It is to be regretted that sometimes in the heat of partisan campaigns members of both parties do that which they are sorry for afterwards. But we are not in the heat of a campaign at this time. This is 5, 6, 10 months before a primary or a general election campaign.

A pattern seems to be evolving in one of the great parties where their speakers go throughout the Nation and give speeches with titles such as "Twenty Years of Treason," and casting opprobrium and epithets at Democratic officials, even to the point of questioning the loyalty of a past President of the United States.

In all of the criticisms throughout the years that I have heard of the Hoover administration I have never heard one Democrat stand up in a public forum and say that President Herbert Hoover was not a loyal American. I am serving on the Commission for Governmental Organization, by the appointment of our beloved Speaker MARTIN, with the former President of the United States, Mr. Hoover. Although I may differ with him on some of his philosophies of government, and I do, I also happen to agree with some of his objectives, it would never, however, occur to me to cast by imputation, implication, or direct allegation, a sentence or a word against this man's patriotism as a great American.

I have too much respect for the office of the President of the United States regardless of whether it is my President or your President. When they are elected to that office I know they are great Americans and that they have a consecration, a devoted sacred consecration to what is best for the welfare of the United States, the people of the United States. If they make mistakes or if they advocate policies with which I cannot agree, I do not impute disloyalty to them, or treason. I would rather say I thought they had made a mistake, or I wish they had not done that, that I think they have been ill-advised.

This, in my opinion, comes within the category of constructive criticism. You do not criticize the office of the President of the United States and say that the man who has occupied it or now occupies it is doing something which is done deliberately with knowledge and intent to commit treason against the people of the United States, for when you do that you destroy not the President, not the man against whom the allegation is brought, you destroy the confidence of the people of the United States in our form of government and in the devotion and sacred consecration to trust which every President from George Washington down to our own beloved President has possessed. That is the danger of the type of speeches that are being made against parties and holders of public office today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. From a political angle, I am not at all disturbed about these speeches that are being made because the individuals who are making them are overextending themselves and are showing the American people plainly their motives. So, from a political angle, I say, it does not disturb me, but it does disturb me when I think of what it is doing to the American people. The two great political parties may have their differences. They may talk about one another, but we respect one another. I respect the Republican Party. I believe in the two-party system from a practical angle as the best means of placing responsibility upon a particular party and their public officials under our form of government. But, when any member of a political party undertakes to accuse all members of the other political party as guilty of treason, either directly or indirectly, that is not simply un-American, it is politically unmoral. It is not even politically immoral, it is far beyond that, it is political unmorality. It only tends to divide our people. As I see it, it does not hurt the Democratic Party, because people realize the motives and the sinister purposes involved, and they cannot convict the Democratic Party any more than some individual member of the Democratic Party could convict the Republican Party, because over and above our party politics, we are all Americans. So, when these individuals go around the country talking that way, they are only injuring our country because they are engaging in political unmorality and bringing about disunity.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making a fine speech, and I think on this Lincoln's Birthday he might, if he has not already said so, suggest that the members of the majority party could well follow Lincoln's admonition when he said, "With malice toward none and with charity to all." That would be good advice for them to follow.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just ask the gentleman to yield so that I might ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] if he knows of anyone on either side of the aisle—of course, it would now be on the Republican side—who has charged all members of the Democratic Party with any particular thing. I do not recall any such statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman been reading the newspapers recently?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I have. I do not mean that I have read everything and I was not out to the box social so I do not know what they said there.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the box social is a perfectly proper thing, and that is regular party organization. I think it is perfectly proper. There is nothing wrong with that. I think it was good, sound, party organization. We have our meetings and it is perfectly proper for the Republicans, and that is a very fine idea.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was not criticizing, I just said that I was not there.

Mr. McCORMACK. As long as my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, has purged himself of that I feel happy.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish that I might proceed so that I might use the rest of my time.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman simply has to read the newspapers. He can go out in the lobby now and read the Associated Press dispatch. Just today a newspaperman showed me additional charges that have just been made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California declines to yield further.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have whatever time he wants, if that is a proper request, not to exceed 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I believe the time I have remaining is sufficient.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California has 8 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank my chairman. I always appreciate his kindness and thoughtfulness.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My question is this: Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to yield to suggest to him as he proceeds that he name the statements which were made. I know that I can read the newspapers, as the gentleman from Massachusetts suggested, but I was asking for some specific statement wherein someone—some Republican—charged all members of the Democratic Party with something that was wrong. That was all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost respect for the rules of the House, and, incidentally, for the rules of comity existing between both branches, to answer that question; because if I answered the gentleman's question I would probably violate the rules of the House, and I would never intentionally or knowingly want to do that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would accept that as my own answer to the gentleman from Michigan. I have always tried since becoming a Member of the House to abide by the rules of the House. I would not want at this time to make known the names or the lists of names of these people. They are in the public press. Everyone knows who they are. I will give the names to the gentleman off the floor of this House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Fortunately, thank God, we are living under a government of laws and not of men. The rules of the House of Representatives are the law of this body, so far as I am concerned and so far as any other individual Member is concerned. I respect the law. I want my friend from Michigan, who is my dear chairman of my committee, to realize that. I am a firm believer in a government of laws and not of men.

What disturbs me is the action taken by Mr. McLeod. I say this in no unkind sense at all, nor in any extremely partisan sense. Mr. McLeod is going around the country making speeches, when he is personnel and security officer of the State Department. A member of the Civil Service Commission says that he is violating the Hatch Act. Somebody else says he is not.

I see here my friend, the chairman of the House Administration Committee, Mr. LECOMPTE. Perhaps he, or somebody else, can decide whether or not there is a violation of the Hatch Act. Somebody ought to decide that. I think of the poor 21 or 22 employees of the Boston office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue who were prosecuted under the Hatch Act. And then I think again of Mr. McLeod who lifts himself above the law and then, as I have said, I think of these poor employees of the Boston office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue who were prosecuted for violating the Hatch Act.

Now, what about this gentleman? Is he above the law?

I could not very well answer the question of my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] without violating the law of the House, and I know he would not want me to do that and under no conditions would I do it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one observation?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I cannot refuse to yield to my colleague from California, and I am very glad to do so.

Mr. YOUNGER. While we are celebrating the memory of Lincoln, I think we might refer to Shakespeare, as I am reminded of one of his admonitions: "I think the gentleman protesteth too much."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman always makes a very fine contribution to a discussion. May I now proceed in the time which has been allotted to me——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to his very dear and beloved chairman?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman. I know that he will make a contribution which will go down in history as something that should be referred to by our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for that sarcastic remark; I appreciate it. My only point is this——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I hope my friend, after I kindly yielded to him, would not impute sarcasm to me.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is an admirable quality, I understand, and one of the methods Lincoln used to impress his views upon the people.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at point, while I do not intend to interrupt the gentleman, even though I yielded to him, I should like to say this.

In a speech at Peoria, Ill., on October 16, 1854, President Abraham Lincoln had this to say——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the gentleman finishing his speech now?

Mr. HOLIFIELD—

I do not propose to question the patriotism or assail the motives of any man or class of men.

I ask my friend to consider that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. After I kindly yielded to the gentleman I did not think it well of him to assail my motives.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I never question the gentleman's motives. I would not do such a thing as that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I accept the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has me wrong. My point is this. I understood the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and also the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] to say that certain individuals who spoke in behalf of the Republican Party were guilty of unmoral conduct, because they had charged the Members of the Democratic Party with some reprehensible conduct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if gentleman will yield for just a minute, I would like to have the RECORD corrected. I did not say "unmoral conduct." I said "political unmorality." That is different. Unmoral conduct may go far beyond that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I accept the gentleman's explanation of the difference, but I would like to know what is the difference between political unmorality and unmoral conduct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to defend the reputation of those I had in mind when I defended the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, if I may be pardoned for referring to myself, the gentleman now addressing the House was born in Kentucky, and this great man whose birthday we honor, Abraham Lincoln, was also born in the little town of Hodgkinsville, Ky. If I may go even further I might say that the older members of my family tell me that the Hanks family—Nancy Hanks was the mother of Abraham Lincoln—was a relative of my ancestors in the early days.

And now, having made my reference to that point I want to say that that is not the cause of my admiration for one of the greatest Presidents that we ever have had, but it is because of the principles that he stood for; and I want to give you one other principle that he stood for, because Abraham Lincoln was also a great admirer of another great President, Thomas Jefferson. He honored Thomas Jefferson for his contribution to American history. In a speech at Springfield, Ill., in 1859, Abraham Lincoln said:

All honor to Jefferson—to the man, who, in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people, had the coolness, forecast, and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there that today and in all coming days it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression.

He referred to Thomas Jefferson because he knew that Thomas Jefferson was a man who stood for the great principles of the common man; he knew that he stood for all the principles of the common man; he knew that he stood for all the principles of freedom, not only bodily freedom, but freedom of the mind. There is also this great truth in the words of Jefferson:

I have sworn eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

Because my colleagues, there is a tyranny of the mind the same as there is a tyranny of the body, and it is the tyranny of the mind, an ideological tyranny which some seek to impose and which was imposed in those totalitarian nations across the sea, not only the slavery of the body, but also the slavery of the mind. And how are you going to keep not only the body of man free, but also the mind of man free unless you respect the principles of freedom? Freedom to have difference of opinion, the freedom to take a position, to take it fearlessly and honestly in the open forum, not in a conspiratorial underground cellar, but in the open forum, to take a position and to support that position with all the strength of your mind and your body. And that is the tyranny which we have had to guard against. We have had to guard against the imposition of that tyranny of the mind that is done by making people afraid to speak, and by labeling them as left wingers, Socialists, Communists, appeasers of treason, associates of Soviet tyranny, and all of these other terms that have been used lately.

Mr. Speaker, when either party, or the orators, or the public officials of either party, stoop to this type of politics we go back to the days of political mire, the days of defamation of character that existed at the time that Abraham Lincoln was President in the White House; the members of the opposition party; yes, and members of his own party who refused him the second nomination—because the Republican Party did not nominate him for his second term; the American Union Party nominated him. The Republican Party of that day fought him with the most vicious type of defamation of character, all types of malicious character assassination, all types of literature which they put out against him. They even unjustifiably questioned the legitimacy of his birth. I could go on and on over the vicious things that were said against him in public. But the point I want to make is that that is not the way to build a strong America.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Do I take the gentleman to mean that when our opposition refers to the members of the

Republican Party as tools of the big interests, and refers to the program of the administration as give-away, that, of course, there is not such possible untimely implication in them? Do I take the gentleman to mean that those things are all right to say, but that only the things the gentleman has listed are the things that we should not have said?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman, whom I respect very highly, knows very well where the line of personal attack upon motive and patriotism occurs and where the difference of opinion occurs in the area of economic philosophy. He knows that without me telling him.

I may say to the gentleman that I differ with the gentleman's party on many economic positions. I do consider that some of those positions which the gentleman's party takes are not for the best interest of all the American people, but I do not impute any disloyalty or treason to the gentleman because he happens to differ with me on that point of view. I will give the gentleman his point of view.

There has been $29 billion worth of rapid tax amortizations granted, some of them by the former administration; I opposed them. For the present administration I opposed them equally as strong. But I did not impute either treason or lack of proper motive to either side in a case of that kind. At the same time that these rapid tax amortization certificates have been granted, it has been decided by the gentleman's party that we cannot raise the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1.25 an hour. Now, I happen to differ on that proposition. I do not impute any bad motives to the gentleman or his party.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman has raised a couple of points here that would require some little time to answer; but on the first, regarding the tax-amortization matter, the gentleman, I think, would leave the impression that it is all bad and has no useful purpose. I think that should be debated further.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I intend to make a speech on that subject. I do not say it is all wrong. I say it might be advisable, but I doubt very much the advisability of selecting special corporations for rapid tax amortization and not giving a blanket amortization to the little man as well as the big man. That is the point on which I differ with the gentleman.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. If the gentleman will yield for one further observation, I will not ask him to yield further. I have been present this afternoon and I have heard various speeches which complain about certain statements. I assume the complaint is accurate. The general idea being that the Democrats and all Democrats are accused in some way because this administration has lately announced that some 2,000 or some such number of people have been dismissed from the payrolls of the Federal Government. I think that the present speaker and others who have spoken on this subject are taking too much unto themselves. I feel pretty certain that all of those people who have been dismissed were employed by our Government under civil service and I think it is unnecessary—maybe this is magnanimous—for the gentleman's party to claim that all of those people were Democrats. I doubt that very much. I therefore think some of this complaint is really not justified.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 3 months before Pearl Harbor, in 1941, a very dramatic vote took place in this House, the extension of the Selective Service Act. It passed the House by a vote of 202 to 201. Every Republican Member of the House at that time but 21 voted against the extension of the law. I never impugned the motives of anyone of those Republican colleagues who voted against it. I disagreed sharply with their judgment, and in or out of the House of Congress, back home when I made speeches I said that they were just as good Americans as I, but in the exercise of their judgment in voting against the bill I disagreed with their judgment, which I had a right to do. But I never attacked their honesty, their motives, or their patriotism. I think that is the key—the difference between disagreeing on judgment and attacking motives or patriotism.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I believe that the words of Abraham Lincoln as written in a letter to Charles L. Wilson on June 1, 1858, are words that we may well take to our hearts today. In conclusion I want to give them to you, and I give them to you because I believe that we should have a strong America in this day of peril; that this is the time when we should be united; that this is the time when we need a united force against any of the proponents of tyranny, whether it be from the extreme left as practiced by the Communists or the extreme right as practiced by the Fascists.

So, I say in order to get that united force that we need to present as strong a combat force as we can against the dangers that beset us in this world, where the ideologies of slavery and freedom are in a death-grip struggle at this time, we might take the words of Abraham Lincoln as penned in that letter when he said:

> I believe we need nothing so much as to get rid of unjust suspicion of one to another.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. BURDICK in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. JONAS of Illinois).

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

Mr. METCALF.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. OAKMAN (at the request of Mr. KNOX).

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. SIKES) in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. SIKES).

Mr. DOYLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANAHAN (at the request of Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania).

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. BYRD.

Mr. RABAUT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MILLER of Kansas (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), until February 22, on account of official business.

Mr. CLARDY (at the request of Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan), indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 666. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands and rights-of-way in the State of Wyoming to the town of Jackson, Wyo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1184. An act to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1381. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1386. An act to amend section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, relating to the meaning of the word "commodity"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1990. An act to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2313. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to request the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 16, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1258. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 in the amount of $11 million for the Housing and Home Finance Agency (H. Doc. No. 321); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1259. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the

fiscal year 1954 in the amount of $1,831,909 for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (H. Doc. No. 322); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1260. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 in the amount of $150,000 for the National Mediation Board (H. Doc. No. 323); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1261. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands to be benefited in the Corning Canal area, Sacramento canals unit, Sacramento River division, Central Valley project, California, has been completed as part of the investigation required in the formulation of a definite plan for project development, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1262. A letter from the Postmaster General, relative to a request for reimbursement for the cost of handling franked mail, pursuant to Public Law 286, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

No. 1263. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to facilitate the entry of Philippine nationals for certain purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

No. 1264. A letter from the secretary, United States Olympic Association, transmitting the report of the United States Olympic Association pertaining to balance sheets and other financial statements for the calendar year 1953, pursuant to Public Law 805, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

No. 1265. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting certain information relative to a list of names involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

No. 1266. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

No. 1267. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Board and Administrator, Maritime Administration, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration for the fiscal year 1953; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1268. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 9, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the Ohio shoreline of Lake Erie, Euclid to Chagrin River, appendix XI, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 324); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with four illustrations.

1269. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 1, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Hampton Beach, N. H., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 325); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with six illustrations.

1270. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 15, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Kalamazoo River, Mich., with particular reference to Battle Creek, Mich., and vicinity. This report is submitted under the authority for a review of report on the Kalamazoo River, Mich., with a view to determining whether flood control improvements along that stream are advisable at this time, with particular reference to Kalamazoo and Battle Creek, Mich., and vicinities, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted on June 24, 1947; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3413. A bill to grant oil and gas in lands on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., to individual Indians in certain cases; with amendment (Rept. No. 1198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 355. Joint resolution amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 1199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 7839. A bill to aid in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 7840. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7841. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 7842. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to provide for the imposition of nominal charges or fees by the Commission for inspections, certificates, registrations, licenses, permits, or applications issued or provided by the Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 7843. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit certain employed persons to be paid annuities under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 7844. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 7845. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the computation of net capital loss and net capital gain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 7846. A bill to make affiliation with the Communist Party unlawful; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 7847. A bill to amend and supplement the reclamation laws to provide for Federal financial assistance in non-Federal projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 7848. A bill to grant longevity pay-step increases to Federal employees on an equal basis upon the completion by them of 10, 13, and 16 years of service, respectively; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7849. A bill to include all types of compensation paid to officers and employees of the Federal Government by the Federal Government within the scope of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 7850. A bill to make the United States Naval Postgraduate School a depository for Government publications; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 7851. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. R. 7852. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, relating to emergency feed and seed assistance to farmers, ranchers, and stockmen in connection with major disasters; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 7853. A bill to permit retired policemen, firemen, and teachers of the District of Columbia to waive all or part of their annuities, relief, or retirement compensation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 7854. A bill to authorize modification of the existing project for Bellingham Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7855. A bill to authorize certain modifications in the existing project for Port Angeles Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7856. A bill to authorize certain modifications in the existing project for Quillayute River, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7857. A bill to authorize the improvement of Shilshole Bay, Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7858. A bill to authorize improvement of Blaine Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7859. A bill to authorize certain modifications in the existing project for the Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7860. A bill to authorize certain modifications in the existing project for Everett Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 7861. A bill to provide that the maximum age at which certain individuals may be inducted under the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be 24; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 7862. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 7863. A bill to safeguard the rights of certain land owners in Wisconsin whose title to property has been brought into question by reason of errors in the original survey and grant; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7864. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 7865. A bill providing for the refund of employment taxes paid by farmers on services performed between January 1, 1951, and July 12, 1951, by agricultural workers recruited from Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7866. A bill to establish an effective program for the planning and construction of needed public works and to create the Office of Public Facilities Administrator; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 7867. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Demopolis Lock and Dam project of certain mineral interests in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 7868. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country without payment of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 7869. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 7870. A bill to provide for the distribution of certain surplus food commodities to needy persons in the United States, by use of a food-stamp plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 7871. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Quillayute River in the State of Washington in order to improve facilities for navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7872. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Port Angeles Harbor in the State of Washington in order to provide for a mooring basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7873. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Bellingham Harbor in the State of Washington in order to provide for a small-boat basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7874. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Everett Harbor in the State of Washington in order to improve facilities for navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 7875. A bill to authorize the President to use agricultural products to improve the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 7876. A bill to authorize the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the United States, to relieve famine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. J. Res. 373. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the 7-day period beginning June 27, 1954, as National Amateur Radio Operator's Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. J. Res. 374. Joint resolution providing that a study be made to determine the most appropriate methods and the estimated cost of reconstructing Ford's Theater in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. J. Res. 375. Joint resolution providing that a study be made to determine the most appropriate methods and the estimated cost of reconstructing Ford's Theater in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the arrest, trial, and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. Res. 442. Resolution authorizing additional copies of the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities entitled "Organized Communism in the United States" for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities and Members of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 443. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities entitled "Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the Year 1953" (H. Rept. 1192, 83d Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 444. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities relative to investigation of Communist activities in the New York area; and additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities relative to investigation of Communist activities in the Los Angeles area; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HART: Memorializing the Congress of the United States to continue the maintenance of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts urging Congress to pass legislation to prevent the Government of the United States from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to provide for Federal housing projects in the west, south, and north ends of Boston; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for two daily deliveries of mail to residence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to reduce the age requirements of recipients of old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing its firm opposition to the projected St. Lawrence seaway and particularly to any cooperation in this venture on the part of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 7877. A bill for the relief of Mid-Continent Distributors, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 7878. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7879. A bill for the relief of Albert Hermann Lehmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 7880. A bill for the relief of Norman J. Sarrat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 7881. A bill to validate a conveyance of certain lands by Southern Pacific Railroad Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to Morgan Hopkins, Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7882. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Sinatore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 7883. A bill for the relief of Sister Leonia (Luigina Toresan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas:

H. R. 7884. A bill for the relief of Rural High School, District No. 6, Highland, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 7885. A bill for the relief of Sohan Singh Rai and Jogindar Kaur Rai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE (by request):

H. R. 7886. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7887. A bill for the relief of William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 7888. A bill for the relief of James H. R. Stumbaugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 7889. A bill for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 7890. A bill for the relief of Alma K. Wetzstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 7891. A bill for the relief of Miss Christine Haas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 7892. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims in law or equity, which Maquinna Jongie Claplanhoo, of Neah Bay, Wash., may have against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

503. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of post-office clerks and carriers of Wellsboro, Pa., in support of legislation granting increase in pay; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

504. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Jersey City (N. J.) Chamber of Commerce, urging Congress of the United States to give serious attention to certain amendments to the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

505. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of EUB Church of Moville, Iowa, protesting the sale of liquor in military installations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

506. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Frank Severa, New Jersey State Prison Farm, Rahway, N. J., relative to stating a grievance relating to imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

507. Also, petition of the Chairman, Committee on Mindanao and Sulu Manila, Philippines, relative to requesting American and United Nations aid for the rehabilitation of the abaca industry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

508. Also petition of A. F. Levy, 1806 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., relative to an inquiry being made into the office of the United States Attorney General for relief of those suffering the deprivation of the equal protection of the law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Improved Benefits Under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H. R. 7840, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Hearings on this bill before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will begin at an early date.

This bill is jointly sponsored by all standard railway labor organizations. It provides for the liberalization of benefits to retired railroad workers, their widows and children, and increases the daily benefit rate for unemployed railroad workers. A summary of the changes proposed by this bill is as follows:

First. Widows benefits at age 60: Under present law aged widows are not eligible for survivors benefits until age 65. The bill reduces the eligibility age to 60.

Second. Disability work clause: Under present law, a disability annuitant is deemed recovered if he earns more than $75 in each of six consecutive months. The bill provides for withholding the annuity in any month in which more than $100 is earned. This will remove hardships on the one hand, and eliminate abuses on the other.

Third. Survivor's benefits for disabled children and widowed mothers: Under present law, a widowed mother and her child cease getting survivor's benefits when the child reaches age 18 even though the child may be completely disabled for any employment. The bill provides that if the child is permanently and totally disabled, the survivor's benefits to the widowed mother and child will continue beyond age 18.

Fourth. Maximum creditable and taxable compensation: Under present law, the maximum compensation that is taxable and creditable for both railroad retirement and unemployment insurance purposes is $300 per month. The bill increases this maximum to $350 both for tax purposes and for credit toward benefits under both the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance systems. In connection with establishing the new benefit rates for crediting this additional compensation under the Unemployment Insurance Act, it is also provided that the daily benefit rate shall not be less than one-half the last daily rate of pay at which he worked in railroad employment, but with a maximum of $8.

Fifth. Crediting of compensation earned after age 65: Under present law, compensation earned after retirement age is used in computing the annuity even though through lower earnings in later years this operates to reduce the annuity. The bill provides for disregarding such compensation—though crediting the service—if using such compensation would reduce the annuity.

Sixth. Receipt of both survivor annuity and retirement annuity: Under present law, a widow who has had railroad employment and is eligible for a retirement annuity in her own right and who would also be eligible for a survivor annuity by reason of her husband's employment has the latter offset against the former and cannot receive both; the bill provides for both to be paid.

Seventh. Delegates to convention: Under present law, service as a delegate to a labor organization convention is covered employment. These conventions frequently include delegates from units outside the railroad industry or outside the country who have no other covered employment. The accumulation of these trifling credits is of no substantial value compared with the nuisance of recording it and collecting the taxes on it. The bill excludes such service from coverage where the individual has no other covered employment.

Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter from representatives of all the standard railway labor organizations in behalf of this bill. I am happy to note that all these organizations are in full agreement in supporting this legislation.

RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1954.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to advise that all the standard railroad labor unions, including the four train and engine service brotherhoods and all the organizations identified with the Railway Labor Executives' Association, are in full agreement and in support of the draft bill which has been delivered to your office by Messrs. Johnson and Kolanda, which would amend the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance systems. For your ready reference, these recognized standard railroad labor organizations are listed.

Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; Order of Railway Conductors; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; Switchmen's Union of North America; The Order of Railroad Telegraphers; American Train Dispatchers Association; Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L.; International Association of Machinists; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America; Sheet Metal Workers International Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; International Brotherhood of Firemen & Oilers; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employes; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; National Organization Masters, Mates & Pilots of America; National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; International Longshoremen's Association; Hotel & Restaurant Employes and Bartenders International Union; Railroad Yardmasters of America; Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

The above organizations represent substantially all the railroad workers in the United States. We will be very grateful to you if you will introduce this bill and do all you consistently can to expedite its prompt consideration.

Respectfully yours,

LAWRENCE V. BYRNES,
Assistant Grand Chief Engineer and National Legislative Representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

A. M. LAMPLEY,
Vice President—National Legislative Representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

W. D. JOHNSON,
Vice President and National Legislative Representative, Order of Railway Conductors.

HARRY SEE,
National Legislative Representative, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. E. LYON,
Executive Secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association.

The "Treason" of Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago this month when a so-called people's court in Budapest, Hungary—a Communist kangaroo court with no more resemblance to a court of justice than a

Communist people's democracy resembles a real democracy—handed down the infamous verdict of guilty and sentenced Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty to life imprisonment, the free world was shocked and dismayed.

To any who had even a lingering doubt as to the depths of Communist depravity and barbarity, this made-in-Moscow decision was the final convincing evidence that free men and Communists do not mean the same things by the same words.

Cardinal Mindszenty was adjudged by his Communist captors and persecutors as guilty of treason. Did they mean treason to the people of Hungry? Of course not. The charge was treason to the principles of atheistic inhumanity, of animal-like cruelty, of degradation of the rights and dignity of mankind.

Yes, there can be no doubt that Cardinal Mindszenty was guilty of despising communism, of hating injustice and persecution and slavery, of fighting against the conquest of religion, of refusing to be a party to the degradation of the human spirit.

Farce though it was, his trial was the inevitable end product of Communist domination of his homeland, for men like Cardinal Mindszenty and the Lutheran Bishop Lajos Ordass who preceded the Cardinal in the prisoner's dock of the Communist court in Budapest stood in the way of Communist control over the minds of the Hungarian people.

On that sad day 5 years ago when a brave churchman stood before his tormentors and thanked God that his conscience was clear, this House was moved to action to protest the farce and cruelty of his arrest and sentence, and I am proud that I was privileged to vote for that resolution.

I am proud, too, that our Secretary of State at that time, Dean Acheson, promptly and in the name of the United States, labeled the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty and the persecution of Lutheran Bishop Ordass as attempts to discredit and coerce religious leadership in Hungary in order to remove this source of moral resistance to communism. He added that the people of the United States are sickened and horrified by these developments and fully comprehend the threat they constitute to free institutions everywhere.

The words spoken then are truer than ever today. The Cardinal thrust into a prison cell to live out his life in cruel confinement is today more than ever a symbol of the conscience of mankind in resisting the designs of communism to enslave the minds of men and banish religion from the face of the earth.

For Cardinal Mindszenty, this has been no new experience. On February 9, 1919, 35 years ago, he suffered for the first time the indecent affront and hardship of arrest by totalitarian rulers of his homeland. Then, too, it was by a Communist regime—that of Bela Kun. He was at that time held many months without trial as a hostage. It was as a man of 27, a priest for only a few years, that he first experienced the aggression of totalitarian rulers against religion. He learned then that those who would rule men's minds by force and violence feared religion and thus sought to destroy it.

The lesson learned then was repeated in 1944 when he was again arrested and jailed—this time by order of the Nazis, pursuing a similar goal of shackling or destroying religion. Then, more than 5 years ago, he began his third period of imprisonment by totalitarian criminals seeking to crush religion in Hungary.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles accurately described the true meaning of Cardinal Mindszenty's role in history last month when he said, on the anniversary of the Cardinal's arrest in December, 1948:

> The case of Cardinal Mindszenty, a defender of the faith and of human freedom against both of the great tyrannies of our time, is not closed. It is actively before the conscience of his countrymen and that of free peoples throughout the world. The prolongation of his unjust incarceration adds daily to the moral poverty of his captors.

Mr. Speaker, though Cardinal Mindszenty remains convicted under Communist theories of justice of the crime of treason, it is well to note on this fifth anniversary of that tragic occurrence that his guilt consisted of refusing to commit treason to his God, to his religion, to his countrymen or his fellow humans on this earth. His crime was to uphold decency. To communism, of course, no crime is worse. But to those who believe in God and practice His word, his actions stand as a true symbol of nobility of the human spirit.

Postal Employees and the Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, through the years Congress has established, by law, certain basic rights for postal employees. Notable among these rights is the concept that postal workers are entitled to compensation which will enable them to support themselves and their families in a manner consistent with American standards. This concept has been of great importance to the group of Americans who man the postal services.

When living costs rise, the postal workers, with their fixed income, are placed at a disadvantage. Their weekly earnings tend to cover less and less of their expenses. Previous Congresses have recognized this fact and have adjusted post office salaries upward when conditions warranted.

At the present time the average postal employee is again at a disadvantage, and he is slowly being squeezed by the daily demands which exceed his income. In this respect, and to emphasize how the postal employee is being caught under the relentless lever of higher costs, I am including a recent letter from one of my constituents in the postal service:

BECKLEY, W. VA., *January 25, 1954.*

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am requesting your continued support in effecting increased salaries for postal employees. After working 13 years in the Beckley, W. Va., post office I find myself living by a stricter budget than ever before.

Realizing that more pay is the old, old complaint, here is a brief résumé of my position:

Married, family of 4

	Monthly
Take-home pay	$303
Modest home payment	55
Food	125
Utilities	22
Total	202
	101

The above is figured roughly, but leaves $25.25 each week for clothing, school expenses for one, life and fire insurance, doctor and dentist bills, operation of 1949 Chevrolet, and the many incidental expenses that always pop up out of nowhere. Saving account was not listed, such items are now nonexistent for me.

The large majority of employees here work an extra job, or their wives work. This is far from ideal for a contented home life, or for best performance while on the job.

Surely an employee's welfare should be considered on at least an even basis with a corresponding dollar mark in the so-called postal deficit.

I do not consider myself, or my organization, particularly greedy. We were voted a salary increase July 1, 1951, which has definitely not kept us abreast of rapidly rising living costs.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL R. FEAZELL.

I call on Congress to recognize and act on this matter as previous Congresses have done. It is clearly the duty of this legislative body to remove the inequity which has befallen the people of the postal establishment over which they have no control. Only through congressional action can this situation be corrected. I therefore propose that a general pay increase be awarded our postal workers. Let no class of personnel be excluded.

The cost of living affects every worker from the lowest to the highest levels. We must, in all propriety, include postmasters who are the local managers of this great communication system, and who deserve to be given full consideration in this matter.

It is entirely proper that we should grant pay increases to those who labor daily to handle the mail. As a group, and a large group at that, they are widely noted for their loyalty and conscientious service. The postal carrier invariably commands the respect and confidence of his fellow citizens.

It is proper from an additional standpoint that we so act. The Post Office Department has developed into a great institution through the years. In general it has never been considered a moneymaking venture. Rather it has stressed service to the general public, and humanitarianism toward those who comprise its personnel. If we are to keep

the faith of this loyal group of men, and of our predecessors in these Halls of Congress, we must act to close the gap between the pay of the postal workers and their living expenses.

Sign Alaska Statehood Discharge Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, discharge petition No. 7 is now at the Speaker's desk. I trust it soon will have enough signatures so that the House of Representatives may proceed to consider H. R. 2982, the Alaska statehood bill. That bill was favorably reported by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on June 26, 1953 by a vote of 19 to 4. There is no sound reason why it should not be considered promptly, and every good reason why it should. This House last year passed the Hawaii statehood bill but we have had no opportunity to debate and vote on the companion measure for Alaska. As one who has always favored statehood for Hawaii and who has voted for it, I appeal to my colleagues to accord Alaska the same consideration Hawaii has had. I am convinced that if the Alaska bill were voted upon it would be passed by a substantial majority. In any event, we should have the opportunity to work our will on the statehood bill. I do not like to suggest that political considerations are involved here in denying Members of the House the privilege of considering Alaska statehood, but frankly I know of no other explanation.

It is true that the Truman administration endorsed, and enthusiastically, statehood for both of our organized Territories. It is likewise true that neither the state of the Union message in 1953 or in 1954 made any mention of Alaska statehood. That omission, however, sets up no barrier which we cannot surmount. We can do so by signing the discharge petition presented by the gentleman from California, Representative CLAIR ENGLE, and thus give ourselves on opportunity to pass on the merits of Alaska statehood, just as we already have done regarding Hawaii.

I should like to present to you the words used by General Eisenhower, before he became President, when in a speech made at Denver in 1950 he was quoted as saying that the granting of statehood to Alaska and Hawaii would serve the people of the world as a practical symbol that America practices what it preaches. For one, I am willing to stand on those words.

When this House passed the Alaska statehood bill in 1950, the Territory had 128,000 people. Now, according to official estimates, the population has passed that of the least populated State. The population gain between 1950 and 1952 was more than 44 percent, thus making Alaska the fastest growing area in the country. Its estimated population in 1952 was over 182,000.

Statehood for this great Territory should not be considered on a partisan basis. Partisan politics has no part in such a cause. I should like to remind you that both the Democratic and Republican platforms of 1948 and 1952 endorsed statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. I should like to point out that when the Alaska statehood bill was passed by the House in 1950, it commanded bipartisan support. With your cooperation expressed by signing Discharge Petition No. 7 we shall have the Alaska statehood bill on the floor again and I confidently predict to you that it will be passed and that it will command strong support from both sides of the aisle. I hope you will sign the petition before leaving this Chamber today.

B-N-G, a Remedy for Burns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the last session of Congress I inserted an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD referring to the new burn remedy, B-N-G, manufactured by the Worth Pharmacal Co., Oak Lawn, Ill. Mr. Speaker, a number of Congressmen in the last session referred to this product with high praises as to a number of instances that they had used it for their own families. I would again like to be one of those Congressmen to give a small report on my activities in connection with this product and call it to the attention of the House, and also to the attention of the National Research Council subcommittee on burns.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 7, a member of my family scalded her hand with some hot grease. The burn was severe and would have been a handicap to us as we were being entertained that afternoon. My wife happened to have a bottle of B-N-G in the medicine cabinet and applied it to the hand immediately and in a few minutes there was no pain and after 30 minutes the blisters had subsided. That night when she returned home there was no trace as to where she was burned. I would like to be the first to bring it to the attention of the House and the country that for some 9 years this company has been trying to obtain a burn test by the National Research Council subcommittee on burns.

It certainly looks like the National Research Council should approve testing this product for burns since it is my understanding they have approved research on the Kinsey report.

For the past 5 years, through its regional distributor, Mr. William W. Vaughn of 510 Arlington Village, Arlington, Va., former aide to Vice President Barkley, samples of this product have been distributed freely throughout the Washington area. Therefore, it has fallen in the hands of quite a number of people. I understand now that somewhere in the neighborhood of 100 physicians in the Washington area are familiar and have used it for burns. We think that this company should have a fair and equal test on burns by the National Research Council subcommittee on burns or under the supervision of the American Medical Association. For your information this company has been turned down a number of times in the last 9 years for a burn test by the National Research Council subcommittee on burns. Most everyone who has had any experience with this product for burns praises it highly for the results it has given. Mr. Speaker, this product is also good for treating dermatitis and also poison oak, poison ivy, and sunburn. At the close of my remarks I would like to include a letter from one of the outstanding skin specialists in the Washington area. The letter speaks for itself:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 6, 1954.*
Mr. WILLIAM VAUGHN,
Arlington, Va.

DEAR MR. VAUGHN: Relative to my letter of July 29, 1953, I wish to say that I have continued to use mung bean sprout extract (B. and G. tyrosinase solution) in several hundred cases of dermatophytosis (fungous infection) of the feet.

These cases have done well. Clinical cures have been exceptionally rapid.

I am convinced that there is great merit in this product and believe that further medical research should be done to explore the possible uses of this extract in the treatment of other diseases.

Sincerely,

JAMES Q. GANT, JR., M. D.

Utilization of Reserve Officers in the Regular Establishment as Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit a lengthy, well-written letter from Hon. John A. Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower. This letter relates to the utilization of Reserve officers in the Regular Establishment as enlisted men, and the letter follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1954.
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: This is in reply to your letter of December 22 in which you question further the propriety of permitting individuals who were given direct Reserve commissions to be inducted for enlisted service.

First, I wish to emphasize that the problem does not involve a mistake on the part of any military department in awarding Reserve commissions. At the time that the individuals in question were commissoned, there exsted in the active forces a justified procurement objective for officers possessing their qualificationa.

Failure to order these individuals to active duty in a commissioned status was not a matter of the service refusing to accept them on a voluntary status. Rather, reductions in personnel strengths necessitated by budgetary and manpower limitations required severe curtailment of officer procurement programs, as well as the involuntary release from active duty of large numbers of officers who wished to remain in the service. Those individuals awarded Reserve commissions direct from civilian status could have been accommodated on active duty only at the expense of releasing involuntarily additional experienced officers.

The fact that such Reserve officers cannot be utilized at this time on active duty and thereby remain liable for induction, would not justify termination of their commissions. The Armed Forces must maintain sufficient numbers of qualified Reserve officers, either in an inactive duty status or on active duty as enlisted men, to meet mobilization requirements. The individuals in question possess qualifications which make their retention as Reserve officers for this purpose highly desirable.

There is a further important reason why the commissions of these officers should not be terminated. As you know, those individuals given direct appointments who were under age 26 upon accepting commissions, acquired under provisions of section 4 (d) (3) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act an 8-year military obligation. The termination of their commissions prior to their entry on active duty would constitute fulfillment of their Reserve obligation. If subsequently inducted, they would have no further obligation for membership in a Reserve component following completion of their national service active duty requirement.

Since my letter to you of December 16 regarding this matter, the Air Force has made special provision whereby those draft-eligibles holding direct Air Force Reserve commissions may enlist for a 2-year term in the Air Force in lieu of being inducted for Army service. Individual notifications to this effect have been dispatched to these officers. This will enable the individuals to fulfill their national service active duty requirement in enlisted status and retain their commissions.

Utilization of Reserve officers as enlisted men is not without precedent. Many fine officers of World War II were individuals who had earned and held Reserve commissions while they were Regular Army enlisted men, and today there are many Regular Army and Air Force enlisted men who hold Reserve commissions in their respective services, including a considerable number who enlisted following their release from active duty during the recent reduction in force.

In the light of the factors outlined above I feel that the solution adopted in this matter is the one which under present circumstances best serves the interests of all concerned.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. HANNAH.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for Secretary Hannah's logic and reasoning. The matter, however, impresses me differently to the way it seems to impress Secretary Hannah. Many of the people in the Regular Enlisted Establishment to whom he refers as having Reserve commissions are people who are willing to accept enlisted noncommissioned status in order to remain on active duty although those people hold Reserve commissions.

I can understand that these people may wish to remain on active duty in order to continue uninterruptedly their military career and for retirement purposes. Even in these cases it is not a healthy situation that is produced when the Defense Establishment will permit commissioned officers to serve in noncommissioned grades.

The argument is far stronger in the case of Reserve officers to which I refer. I have in mind, for instance, the case of a Reserve officer who is drafted into the armed services because he is within the draft-age group. These men have offered to serve the Military Establishment in Reserve commission grades. They have been rejected by the Armed Forces because it is stated that they are not needed. The draft laws permit, and the Defense Department cooperates in, the drafting of these Reserve officers, forcing them to serve in enlisted grades against their will.

The matter is worse than this. A Reserve lieutenant in the Army may be drafted and placed in the Navy as an enlisted man. A Reserve officer in the Air Force may be drafted and sent to the Marine Corps as an enlisted man. This action shows, in my judgment, scant respect for a Reserve commission. It is not conducive to a buildup of pride and enthusiasm of the Reserve, whether it be an enlisted or commissioned Reserve, to realize that the Reserve commission is treated with scant consideration by the agency which awards it.

Commissioned officers in the National Guard are not treated in this way, and they should not be so treated. A fortiori, commissioned officers in the Reserve establishment, should be assured that their Reserve commission is a badge of honor and a symbol of pride, and we from the Congress, and Secretary Hannah from the Defense Department, should join in making the service in the Military Establishment fair and acceptable and should encourage our young men to enter on active duty with pride and enthusiasm.

The President Sets Us Right on Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, while I have criticized the President on occasion—especially on his farm program—in the spirit of fairness I have on many occasions given him full credit for what he has done and said.

His latest statement in regard to sending troops to Indochina will be applauded by most Americans. He stated, "I cannot conceive of a greater tragedy than for the United States to become involved in a war in Indochina or anywhere else."

That is what the people of the United States have been waiting to hear. That is what will mark this administration as differing from the past administration. This policy, if pursued, will have the overwhelming approval of the voters of the United States.

If this administration can think this policy through and eliminate some of the billions we are spending on other people's troubles that will be another milestone in preserving this country.

I believe in self-defense, but I have been fearful that we were spending so much of our wealth and the lives of our men in rummaging around the world to stop every backyard cat fight, that in the end we shall not be able to defend ourselves. After all, if it ever comes to the point of fighting for the preservation of the United States, I know of no country that would come to our rescue. If they so desired, many countries would be unable to aid us, and many of the nations that have been living off us will not be inclined to help us.

We have made few friends by our excursion in spending billions, scattering it throughout the world, and on the contrary, we have made enemies. Our wild expenditure of money has caused the people of many countries to feel that our purpose is conquest, when that is, and always has been, contrary to the intent of the United States. Therefore, this country should be strong, and remain strong. Our natural resources, the greatest in the world, should be preserved; our Armed Forces should remain strong, and the people of the United States relieved from this extra, arduous, and in most cases, useless expense. We cannot afford to lose thousands of our best men.

The fear that Russia is about to pounce upon us from the air is a war scare invented by Russia to keep us spending, just like we have been doing. We need not fear Russia, as no country on earth like the dictatorship now existing in that country, can ever hope to have the support of her people. Less than 5 percent of the Russian population participate in their government. This 5 percent rules the other 95 percent. The conditions existing in Russia today, if continued, will never make the Russians a united force in any war. In this country it takes a majority of the voters to bring into being any administration; and if war comes it will not be fought by a majority of the people of the United States, but by all of them. This powerful country, with that kind of support, should abandon this war scare, and pursue its regular way. Kipling had this pretty well thought out when he said:

If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
Or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch;
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you;
If all men count with you, but none too much;
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty seconds' worth of distance run,
Yours is the earth and everything that's in it,
And which is more—you'll be a man, my son!

Mr. Speaker, the efforts of the one-worlders in the United Nations to build a world government is a dangerous move. These advocates readily concede that the United States must give up some of its sovereignty in order to form this organization, but this country cannot afford, ever, to give up any of its sovereignty, as

it is the only government on earth that is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. The idea of having treaties of the United Nations attempting to hamstring our Constitution is an example of this "giving up some of our sovereignty."

My advice to the American people is to keep our defenses strong; preserve our form of government as it is, and then defend it against any power or combination of powers in the universe. Do not rely on others to come to our aid, but rely upon ourselves, and ourselves alone, to preserve the greatest government yet to appear on the face of the globe.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES G. OAKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 145th anniversary of the birth of one of the most illustrious Members this body has ever known—Abraham Lincoln. It is, therefore, most appropriate that we recall the life and character of this great American. This day calls, too, for a reflection of America as a nation. It calls for a return to the belief of our forefathers and their fervent faith in Almighty God. We must rededicate ourselves in order to find new strength to complete the tasks confronting us.

Last Monday I introduced in the House of Representatives House Joint Resolution 371, to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag by adding the words "under God" following the word "indivisible," making the pertinent phrase "one nation indivisible under God."

Our forefathers recognized the inherent truth that any government of and by the people must look to God for divine leadership in order to protect itself against tyranny and despotism. In the year 1620, when the first Constitution for the complete self-government of the people under its jurisdiction was devised in America, the Mayflower compact, in its opening sentence, declared: "In the name of God. Amen." This was open recognition of the need for the official conjunction of the laws of God with the Constitution and laws of the land.

On July 4, 1776, our freedom-loving forebears composed one of the world's great political masterpieces—the Declaration of Independence. It said, in part:

> When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

The same document speaks of men being "endowed by their Creator" with unalienable rights and appeals to the "Supreme Judge of the World" that this Nation be free.

Later, at Gettysburg, on November 19, 1863, Abraham Lincoln in a 2-minute dedication speech said:

> That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Throughout our history, the statements of our great men have been replete with references to God. Our Presidents have never failed to recognize man's subservience to his Master as the only form of servitude which assures life, liberty, and happiness.

It was William Penn who said:

> Those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants.

Four years before the Declaration of Independence, we find George Mason arguing to the General Court of Virginia that—

> All acts of legislature apparently contrary to natural right and justice are, in our laws, and must be in the nature of things considered as void. The laws of nature are the laws of God, whose authority can be superseded by no power on earth.

It was during the Presidency of Abraham Lincoln that Congress passed an act on April 22, 1864, directing that the inscription "In God We Trust" be placed on our coins. This avowal of faith has been imprinted on billions and billions of coins during the last 90 years.

Records show that under date of November 20, 1861, the then Secretary of the Treasury addressed a letter to the Director of the Mint, stating, in part:

> No nation can be strong except in the strength of God or safe except in His defense. The trust of our people in God should be declared on our national coins.

If this recommendation has been followed in a material symbol such as our coins, should not the same idea be infinitely more appropriate in relation to the pledge of allegiance to our flag and country? The Pledge of Allegiance is not a confession of faith. It is an affirmation of loyalty to a nation symbolized by its flag.

The tough moral fiber which has characterized this Nation's growth to a position of world preeminence must not deteriorate. It was fed on the belief that our destiny was bound to the will of God. It cannot survive unless this spiritual fuel is maintained.

Last Sunday, the President of the United States and his family occupied the pew where Abraham Lincoln worshipped. The pastor, the Reverend George M. Docherty, suggested the change in our Pledge of Allegiance that I have offered.

Dr. Docherty delivered a wise sermon. He said that as a native of Scotland come to these shores he could appreciate the pledge as something more than a hollow verse taught to children for memory. I would like to quote from his words. He said:

> I could sit down and brood upon it, going over each word slowly in my mind. And I came to a strange conclusion. There was something missing in the pledge, and that which was missing was the characteristic and definitive factor in the American way of life. Indeed apart from the mention of the phrase, the United States of America, it could be the pledge of any republic. In fact, I could hear little Muscovites repeat a similar pledge to their hammer and sickle flag in Moscow with equal solemnity. Russia is also a Republic that claims to have overthrown the tyranny of kingship. Russia also claims to be indivisible.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Docherty hit the nail squarely on the head. One of the most fundamental differences between us and the Communists is our belief in God. Communism rejects God. The spiritual bankruptcy of the Communists can be the very weapon we need to triumph in the struggle for men's minds. I say it can be, for the effective use of this weapon presupposes a firm code of spiritual and moral values. We take pride in the new look we have given our powerful military machine. I believe we need a new look just as urgently in our spiritual armor, and I am recommending one means of achieving it.

After attending church services last Sunday, President Eisenhower participated with churchmen of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths in an American Legion radio and television program that was part of that organization's back to God movement. The President said that this country needs now, as it ever has needed, "positive acts of renewed recognition that faith is our surest strength, our greatest resource." The President went on to say:

> Whatever our individual church, whatever our personal creed, our common faith in God is a common bond among us. In our fundamental faith, we are all one. Together we thank the power that has made and preserved us as a nation. By the millions, we speak prayers, we sing hymns—and no matter what their words may be, their spirit is the same—in God is our trust.

On this same program, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, one of our most eminent Protestant clergymen, declared:

> Our country will remain strong only as we remain religious.

Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, a leading prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, said:

> If we are to keep our rights and liberties, then we must also keep our God.

And, finally, Rabbi Norman Salit, one of the Nation's outstanding Jewish leaders, stated:

> If we can teach our children to live by the concepts of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, we can redeem them from moral failure.

I would like to take but a minute to answer beforehand the two principal arguments I anticipate in opposition to my amendment.

The first concerns the relationship of church and state. The phrase "under God" is all inclusive for all religions and has no reference whatever to the establishment of a state church. The first amendment of our Constitution prohibits Congress from passing laws respecting the establishment of a religion. One can pledge one's allegiance to a flag symbolizing a state founded upon a belief in God and, at the same time, accept the

doctrine of a separate church and state. A distinction exists between the church as an institution and a belief in the sovereignty of God. The argument that this amendment might be a breach of the separation principle cannot be material.

Secondly, the argument may be made that the proposed amendment violates the right of a person to disbelieve in God, a fundamental of a free democracy. However, there is a vast difference in making a positive affirmation on the existence of God in whom one does not believe, and on the other hand making a pledge of allegiance and loyalty to the flag of a country which in its underlying philosophy recognizes the existence of God.

I cannot accept either of these contentions as valid, if indeed they are at all. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the joint resolution I have introduced will place a new meaning on all the truths which this Nation holds so dear, enabling us to regain our reverence for God in this 20th century America, and making it possible for us to rediscover our own value and the solid basis upon which it rests. Then we, too, can say with Lincoln—"this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom."

H. R. 7530, To Make Tax-Free the Gain on the Sale of a Personal Residence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, I introduced in the House the bill (H. R. 7530) to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that gain from the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will not be taxed whether or not he replaces it with another residence.

This bill is intended to correct a situation which now places an unjustifiable financial burden on the mothers and fathers of our population. The home-buying experience of most American families usually follows this pattern.

The young married couple rents an apartment. Then, as children come along and they need more space, they purchase a small home. As the children move on to high school and college age, more livable space is required and the family moves again to a larger home. This is the general pattern.

The whole panorama of family life unfolds within these walls. This home is the scene of birthday parties, graduations, courtships, weddings, and when these events are but memories, the old home has served its purpose for this family.

Now the parents have completed the lifelong task of rearing the family and they desire to take a smaller home or move to an apartment. Then it is that the full force of the present unjust state of the law is felt. Uncle Sam steps in with a whopping tax bill on the total profit realized from the sale of the former residences.

This is the treatment the Government affords to parents who, in the rearing of their families, have played a tremendously important part in the progress and the economy of the Nation, and at a time in their lives which inevitably comes to most of us, when they want to retire to a smaller home or apartment to enjoy their just reward of peace and rest.

Such a state of the law penalizes these parents for the fulfillment of their family obligations; in effect that law punishes them after they have sent forth from the old home the families of the future, the bedrock strength of America.

This situation demands correction, and I hope the principles of my bill will be approved by the Ways and Means Committee.

Can We Afford To Prepare for Every Conceivable Kind of War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the risk and danger which the American people are voluntarily expected to assume as a result of the new look defense policy are implicit in a statement by Deputy Defense Secretary Roger M. Kyes. He said last November 12 that—

> We must reassess our strategic planning and logistics in the light of technological advances, and have the courage to discard the outmoded procedures and weapons which will no longer serve more than tradition.
>
> We can no longer afford to prepare for every conceivable kind of war. * * * We can no longer afford the luxury of the status quo in strategic planning.

I am impressed with the sentence: "We can no longer afford to prepare for every conceivable kind of war."

I submit that here is the very core of the weakness of the new look defense policy.

Our Nation's safety must rest on defense plans which will prepare us for every conceivable kind of war.

History provides innumerable examples where nations have failed to prepare for every conceivable kind of war. Twelve years ago France prepared to fight a defensive war in the Maginot Line and was not prepared for the kind of air war and the war of armor and movement brought to it by Germany. In our own Nation's Revolution, England was well prepared to fight a naval battle and an orderly encounter between highly disciplined and well-trained soldiers but was not prepared to meet the kind of war the "rag tail, bob tail" Revolutionary Army had learned from its experience in Indian warfare. Today, France is adequately equipped to deal with a sizable military force on ordinary terrain, utilizing conventional air power, armor, and mobile troops, but it is hopelessly bogged down in the kind of war it is fighting in the jungles and rice fields of Indochina. It is too much to ask of the enemy that he satisfy the Defense Department's own concept of defense and fight the kind of war for which his adversary is conceivably prepared.

The administration has committed itself to a calculated risk which it chooses to call its "new look" defense policy. In essence, the administration defense policy springs from political and budgetary considerations. Imprudent as it may have been, in 1952, the Republican office-seekers promised the American people a balanced budget. A balanced defense effort now becomes subordinate to the political implication of an empty campaign promise.

The administration has sent to Congress a budget in which 73 percent of the cuts are in national-security items. The Army, and to a lesser degree the Navy, bear the brunt of these cuts. The following are some of the effects of the military cut:

Army expenditures cut $4 billion—28 percent—from $14.2 billion to $10.2 billion.

Navy expenditures cut $800 million—7 percent—from $11.3 billion to $10.5 billion.

Army divisions cut from 20 to 17 divisions by June 1955.

Total military manpower cut from 3.4 million now to 3 million June 1955.

Army manpower cut from 1.5 million now to 1.164 million June 1955.

Marine manpower cut from 250,000 now to 215,000 June 1955.

Navy manpower cut from 770,000 now to 688,900 June 1955.

No new authority for Army procurement and production is being asked for.

Seven Navy combat ships to be put in mothballs—including 1 battleship and 1 cruiser.

Along with the budget, the Congress receives the suggested bromide: "We have an outstanding military expert in the White House. Who are we to question his judgment."

I cannot, and I hope that the Congress as a whole will not, accept this neat escape mechanism.

The Congress must make a searching inquiry and the American people must know the extent of the calculated risk they are expected to accept.

Political promises of the administration and the insatiable desire of the top 2 percent of the Nation's business and industry for more tax cuts should not stand between this Nation and preparation for every conceivable kind of war.

The new-look concept of defense may be characterized by reliance on fleets of long-range bombers carrying atomic and hydrogen bombs to the military and industrial targets of an enemy nation, with minor consideration given to the use of ground and naval forces. It must be borne in mind that the new Air Force budget is a total reversal of last year's cutbacks. Last year the administration cut the Air Force budget by $5 billion, canceled orders for 1,000 planes, and cut Air Force goals from 143 wings to 120 wings. In an about-face, the new budget increases the Air Force budget by

$600 million and raises the Air Force goals from 120 wings to 137 wings. The result is a loss of 1 year in Air Force buildup. Compare this to the statement by Presidential Candidate Eisenhower on September 25, 1952:

> We need a new administration * * * that will call a halt to stop-and-start planning; an administration that will not demobilize and then hurriedly remobilize.

Let me make it crystal clear that I am not playing off the Air Force against surface forces. We must have a strong retaliatory Air Force and adequate homeland defense. In addition, we must have a strong ground force.

Let me describe two conceivable kinds of war we might be forced by the Soviets to fight. Needless to say, we will be forced to fight the type of war for which we are least prepared. I ask you to consider in the case of each whether the new-look defense concept of the administration meets these threats.

AN ALL-OUT GLOBAL CLASH

The air war is joined. Washington, New York, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago smoulder in ruins. Millions of Americans are dead, wounded, or homeless. Our warmaking potential is seriously crippled.

In turn, a dozen of Russia's major cities and industrial targets are in rubble. Both nations convulse and gasp from the terrible punishment.

Russia, no longer able to sustain a continued effort from her homeland, sends her ground forces in all directions.

A weak European defense army is under assault.

Yugoslavia and Greece are neutralized by Rumania.

Turkey is fighting to save her own territory.

Japan cringes before the threat of Red China.

Chaos reigns in Korea, Indochina, British Malaya.

Italy is neutralized internally by Communists from within.

France is paralyzed.

London is in ruins and the British Commonwealth of Nations is powerless to render aid.

The United States stands in peril of losing its forces in France, its air bases, and great quantities of munitions.

The Russian submarine force harasses our shipping around the world.

As Russia overruns Germany and France, the United States is confronted with the decision of dropping atom bombs on the major cities of its Allies.

Russia consolidates its gain in Asia, France, Germany, Italy, and draws strength for its massive land forces which are surviving off of the substance of conquered countries.

At this stage, where does our new look concept turn the tide?

What I am saying is simply this: We could easily have an atomic standoff and lose a war as the result of the balance of power held by Russia in its enormous land armies.

Let us consider the other conceivable kind of war in relation to the new-look concept.

TWENTY YEARS OF COLD WAR CLASHES AROUND THE WORLD, PERPETUATED BY PUPPET REGIMES

No peace in Korea. We are faced with the indefinite necessity to maintain troops there or must assume perpetual support of South Korean military forces.

Indochina is lost to France.

Trouble is revived in Malaya.

Italy has voted itself a Communist form of government.

France is gripped by internal paralysis.

Japan is weak and Communists are gaining strength.

Red China has stepped up pressure on Formosa and threatens an active military campaign.

Communist gains are noted in the Arab States.

Communists are active in Africa.

Europe as a whole is apathetic to the threat of communism, and anxious to trade with the Reds.

Asia is all but lost.

Russia is systematically arming its new satellites.

Where, in the face of this picture, do we deliberately initiate an all-out atomic war? With what do we intervene to turn the tide? Unless we choose to initiate atomic war, we fight on the ground and in the manner of the enemy's own choosing. We must be prepared for more Koreas, and preparation must not be so meager that a commitment in the future comparable to Korea will leave us without reserves and incapable of defensive retaliation on the ground and on the sea, as well as in the air. Congress must recognize the necessity for a strong ground force and a Navy capable of delivering and sustaining it.

Lincoln and the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the memory of no other man has had the unifying influence for this Nation as that of Abraham Lincoln. There are many things for the South to recall in tenderness and appreciation but the utterances and actions of none arrayed against us in 1861–65 compare with those of the man who "though the leader against her in war can never be justly said to have been her enemy." These were the words of J. G. de R. Hamilton, of the University of North Carolina, in 1915, and he also said of Lincoln:

> With the rest of the united Nation the South will not only honor and revere but will cherish the name of her son, the first American.

The author probably meant that in Lincoln new and historic forces produced for the first time a distinctively American type of statesmanship. Jefferson might be regarded as occupying that position but if we consider influences with roots entirely in the New World, the tribute would doubtless be accepted without reservation, particularly since the South's great orator, Henry W. Grady, made use of the same language in his eloquent reference to Lincoln:

> From the union of these (northern and southern) colonists, from the straightening of their purposes and the crossing of their blood, slowly perfecting through a century, came he who stands as the first American, the first who comprehended within himself all the strength and gentleness, all the majesty and grace of this Republic—Abraham Lincoln.

The sources of the South's feeling are found in the great human qualities of Lincoln. When others misunderstood the South he seemed to know the mind and purpose of our people. When others expected humiliating admissions of error which the South could not give he asked only that we take our place as restored and honored members of the Union. To Mr. Adams in 1861 he gave instructions "not to indulge in expressions of harshness or disrespect or even impatience concerning the seceding States, their agents, or their people" and further to remember that the people of the South "throughout all political misunderstandings and alienations, still are and always must be our kindred and countrymen."

These are examples of the kindness of Lincoln in a period of intense bitterness and are evidences of his greatness of soul and loftiness of character. Surely, reflections upon Lincoln's use of the cement of charity should inspire us to conquer present-day divisiveness and march together regardless of party or sectional loyalties.

There are other reasons beside the charity of Lincoln for the South's cherishing his memory. Our years of reflection upon the forces which brought the rupture in 1861 has produced a clearer judgment regarding the impersonal character of those forces and has emphasized the fairness of Lincoln and the soundness of his policies for readmitting the South. Wisdom and fairness, as well as charity, won the South's affection. His sense of fairness often found expression in his speeches, as, for example, his message to the Congress on December 1, 1862, dealing with compensated emancipation:

> It is no less true for having been often said that the people of the South are not more responsible for the original introduction of this proposition (slavery) than are the people of the North.

Lincoln and Grant were kind to Lee as the great ordeal neared its close and the South could never forget a kindness to its most beloved son.

Lincoln's democracy, his simplicity, his appreciation of the common man—these were qualities which found a response in our hearts. In reverencing the memory of Lincoln we would not detract from the possessive feeling which is rightfully the North's and our pride is sufficiently served in recalling that he lived during the first impressionable years under southern skies and that he spoke feelingly of his southern heritage.

The South does not question that Lincoln shared our suffering in the war. To

his friend, George P. Floyd, the hotel keeper at Quincy, Ill., he said:

> I have not suffered by the South, I have suffered with the South. Their pain has been my pain. Their loss has been my loss. What they have gained, I have gained.

This was one of the deep and moving sentiments of his nature and partially accounts for the high place he holds in the affections of the South.

Such a life helps us to pierce the mystery contained in the beautiful lines of St. John: "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." Many of us carry the impressions gained in boyhood from those who could speak from personal memory of the work of this great man. From their accounts as from the pages of recorded history we conclude that the idea of human sympathy and limitless good will for a little while became flesh and dwelt among us.

House Joint Resolution 243, To Amend the Pledge of Allegiance To Include the Phrase "Under God"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in the first session of this Congress, on April 20, 1953, I introduced in the House, Joint Resolution 243, to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

That resolution would insert in the pledge the words "under God," so that the pledge would then read:

> I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

I have been most pleased to note in the press a report of the sermon of the Reverend George M. Docherty at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, the church at which Abraham Lincoln worshipped. The sermon was delivered on February 7 with President and Mrs. Eisenhower seated in Lincoln's pew.

Lincoln in his Gettysburg Address used the words "under God" and Dr. Docherty seized the opportunity to urge the phrase be added to the pledge. Without these words, he said, the pledge ignores a definitive factor in the American way of life and that factor is belief in God. Without that phrase, the pledge could be the pledge of any republic.

Relating how his children once described with strange solemnity the ritual of the salute to the flag, he added:

> I could hear little Muscovites repeat a similar pledge to their hammer and sickle flag with equal solemnity.

For Russia, he pointed out, also claims to be a republic, indivisible, with justice and liberty.

Dr. Docherty and I are not of the same Christian denomination, but I may say that in this matter he has hit the nail right on the head. You may argue from dawn to dusk about differing political, economic, and social systems, but the fundamental issue which is the unbridgable gap between America and Communist Russia is a belief in Almighty God.

From the root of atheism stems the evil weed of communism and its branches of materialism and political dictatorship. Unless we are willing to affirm our belief in the existence of God and His creator-creature relation to man, we drop man himself to the significance of a grain of sand and open the floodgates to tyranny and oppression.

An atheistic American, as Dr. Docherty points out, is a contradiction in terms.

This country was founded on theistic beliefs, on belief in the worthwhileness of the individual human being which in turn depends solely and completely on the identity of man as the creature and son of God. The fraudulent claims of the Communists to the role of champions of social, economic, and political reform is given the lie by their very own atheist materialist concept of life and their denunciation of religion, the bond between God and man, as "the opium of the people."

As Mr. Docherty so eloquently pointed out, the American way of life is more than the material total of baseball games, hot dogs, Coca-Cola, television, deep freezes, and other gadgets. "It is," he said, "a way of life that sees man as a sentient being created by God and seeking to know His will, whose soul is restless till he rests in God."

It is, therefore, most proper that in our salute to the flag, the patriotic standard around which we rally as Americans, we state the real meaning of that flag. From their earliest childhood our children must know the real meaning of America. Children and Americans of all ages must know that this is one Nation which "under God" means "liberty and justice for all."

The Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, yes; it was 44 years ago—February 1910—that this great organization, the Boy Scouts of America, was incorporated. Do not think for a moment, though, that that was the beginning of scouting. Dan Beard and Ernest Thompson Seton and many others had groups of boys learning scouting here in America long before that, and so had Sir Robert Baden-Powell and others in Africa and England and Europe. When Baden-Powell was asked whence he drew the principles for the great international family of Scouts, to which we are proud to belong, he listed traditions both worldwide and centuries old, such as the code of the boy knights of Cuchullain, the ancient Irish hero, the Bushido code of Japan, the code of King Arthur's Round Table, traditions of the American Indians, of the Zulus, and of the Pacific islanders. Scouting reflects also the Athenian and Spartan systems of training boys, and Baden-Powell's own system of training men in the South African constabulary.

What we celebrate, therefore, is not a beginning, but a culmination. Forty-four years ago, we drew together into one organization, one member of a great international brotherhood, all the scattered groups in this country that were working with boys in widely varied ways. Some groups stressed Indian lore, some woodcraft, some the pioneer tradition, some the legends of Arthurian chivalry, some religion, some athletics. It is inspiring to read, in the history of the Boy Scouts of America, how, one by one, each of these groups gave up its separate existence and contributed its special interests and qualities to the vast whole that is American boy scouting today. The leader of each such group then would take a place among the high officers of the Boy Scouts of America, and, in helping to lead the organization, would contribute his own special knowledge and abilities. Though Ernest Thompson Seton stayed with the Boy Scouts of America only until 1913, his contributions in planning the program were invaluable, and American scouting still bears the impress of his personality and interests. Daniel Carter Beard, too, a leader of long and faithful service, seems present in spirit wherever Boy Scouts get together. He stands to us as the ideal of American boy scouting, as Baden-Powell stands as the ideal of worldwide boy scouting. Let us never fail to honor the enthusiasm and devotion of such men as these and Livingstone and Boyce and the hundreds of others, in large or small positions, who joined wholeheartedly in the common cause of bringing the ideals of scouting to all American boys.

On such an occasion as this, too, it is fitting to recall how early and how enthusiastic was the support of church groups. The YMCA entered into the formation of the Boy Scouts of America so thoroughly and wholeheartedly that at first it was difficult to make it clear to the public that the Boy Scouts were not a sort of branch of the YMCA. Catholic and Protestant churches and Jewish synagogues have taken a leading part in sponsoring Scout groups and aiding Scout activities since the early days, recognizing the value of the Scout ideals of reverence and religious tolerance. The Mormon Church has promoted scouting with such vigorous enthusiasm that hardly any Mormon boy does not go through his period of scouting. The churches know that the Boy Scouts of America will always hold up before the youth of America the two ideals, basic to all religion, of service to God and service to our fellow man.

When a boy becomes a Scout, he begins to develop the best qualities of a man. Whether he is a Lone Scout, a member of a neighborhood patrol, or a member of a troop, he learns to take care of himself in all circumstances, to be independent and unafraid, to act on his

own initiative. While he is learning independence, he is at the same time learning to follow orders and directions accurately, and to work and play well with others. He is learning to work for concrete achievements and public recognition, as in the earning of badges and in working up the higher degree in scouting; but at the same time he is held constantly to the high ideal of at least one good deed to be done every day, without reward, record, or public notice. He learns to value his own rewards more for the recognition they bring to his patrol and troop than for any personal prestige. He learns, too, one of the most valuable lessons in life, that the real fun and joy of living always comes from struggling against difficulties, overcoming fears, and facing dangers, either alone or in a team with a few good friends.

Democrats and Republicans, we are all together in supporting the Boy Scouts of America. It is a nonpolitical organization, always counting among its honorary presidents and vice presidents the President and ex-Presidents of the United States, and among its most fervent supporters many of the most eager workers of both parties. So I think I, as a loyal Democrat and a good Scout, can close my remarks in no more appropriate way than by quoting the words of a rock-ribbed Vermont Republican, Calvin Coolidge. Speaking of the principles embodied in the Scout oath and Scout law, Coolidge made this simple and magnificent statement:

It would be a perfect world if everyone exemplified these virtues in daily life.

Conviction of Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on January 13, 1953, I introduced House bill 1574 to succeed House bill 451, introduced in 1951, and House Joint Resolution 383 in 1950. This bill provides:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be a felony for any Member of the Congress of the United States of America to accept or receive, directly or indirectly, any part of the salary or compensation of an employee whose compensation is paid by the United States, employed by him to carry on his official duties.

SEC. 2. Within 10 days after the close of any session of Congress, every Member of the Congress shall file a written statement, under oath, with the Secretary of the Senate or Clerk of the House (to which body the Member belongs) giving the names of those employed by him during such past session, the salaries or compensation received, and what part of said salary or compensation the Member has accepted or received, directly or indirectly, for any purpose whatever. Such reports shall be open for public inspection.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any Member of Congress to accept any money or any other thing of value from any person, firm, association, or corporation to enable such Member to maintain himself while acting as a Representative of the people, and those who offer and contribute to the maintenance of a Member of Congress shall be guilty of an unlawful act, and shall be liable to prosecution for a felony.

SEC. 4. When any Member of Congress files his statement under oath, as provided by section 1 of this act, he shall give a list of any contributions made to him while acting as a Member of Congress and said statement shall include the names and addresses of persons so contributing and the amount thereof.

PENALTY

Any Member who shall file a false statement as herein provided, or who accepts or retains any part of the salary of an employee, directly or indirectly employed by him in the discharge of his official duties, or who accepts money or any other thing of value from any person, firm, association, or corporation to maintain himself while acting as a Member of Congress, shall be guilty of a felony and shall be punished by a fine equal to twice the amount of the salary, compensation, or gratuity unlawfully accepted or received, and shall be subject to removal from the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, since I proposed the bill set forth above, two Members of Congress have been convicted of unlawfully withholding part of salary paid to actual or imaginary employees. If this bill had been in effect neither one of the convictions would have taken place, because I do not believe you would ever find a Member who would walk up and deliberately swear to a statement that was untrue.

Is it not better for Congress itself to direct its membership than to have the public courts clean up what Congress should do?

Every time a Member is convicted, it reduces the prestige of Congress with the people. When the people find out that the integrity of a few Members is being impeached by these convictions, it cannot help but reduce the respect which the people ought to have for the membership of Congress. I will try again to get action on this bill.

A Tribute to the Lithuanian Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago John Hvasta, a man who has known Communist oppression and has lived to tell about it, declared to his cheering Hillside, N. J., friends that he was able to survive the long months of confinement in the prisons of Communist Czechoslovakia and the arduous trials of a fugitive in a foreign land only because—as he said—"I always kept my faith in the American people and my faith in God. Had I lost that faith, I would have lost myself."

In these inspiring words, there lies a profound lesson for all of us, especially at this time when the division between the free and the slave world has been fast becoming more and more crystallized. Simply stated, it is that America must continue to give faith and hope to the many millions of John Hvastas who are now caught up in the awful grip of Soviet tyranny.

On this anniversary of Lithuanian independence it is fitting that the case of John Hvasta, to advance whose welfare I had never ceased my efforts, be singled out as an example of what can be done by a few individuals to keep alive the spirit of a man whose spirit might well have otherwise succumbed to the counsels of despair. That the same can be done for an entire nation, I have not the slightest doubt. Nothing is impossible in this world so long as the spirit and the will are vigorous and firm to press on to their conclusion dedicated objectives.

To the nearly 2 million Lithuanians now under Soviet domination, let America, therefore, pass on to them with resounding declaration the priceless and inspiring words of faith and freedom. Never can the present servitude of this great people be accepted with equanimity; never shall that nation and her courageous people be left in oblivion without hope, to expire as a nation in the awful solitude of forgotten history. America—as indeed the entire free world—has faith in the Lithuanian people that one day freedom shall be theirs.

Restoration of Ford's Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House of Representatives today a resolution which I hope will lead to restoring Ford's Theater where President Abraham Lincoln was assassinated on April 14, 1865. The joint resolution provides:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to make a study to determine the most appropriate steps which could be taken to preserve and interpret Ford's Theater, in Washington, D. C., as it was on April 14, 1865, and to determine the estimated cost of reconstructing the stage, boxes, and scenic setting. The results of the study, together with the recommendations of the Secretary with respect thereto, shall be submitted to the Congress as soon as possible after the study is completed.

The Secretary of the Interior shall include in his report to the Congress under the first section of this joint resolution an estimate of the cost of reinstalling the famous Oldroyd collection of relics in the Ford Theater building or in another suitable museum building to be erected on land to be acquired immediately adjacent to the Ford Theater building.

Ford's Theater has become a shrine visited annually by hundreds of thousands of people. Many express a regret that the theater has become a "warehouse museum." It seems to me appropriate that a measure looking to the theater's restoration be introduced on the birthday of the Great Emancipator.

Ford's Treater is owned by the United States and as Melvin D. Hildreth, Democratic national committeeman for the District of Columbia, pointed out recently, "Its restoration should be carried out by the United States."

Lincoln, the man of the people, belonged to all Americans. He is not the exclusive property of either political party nor faction of a political party.

Those who glibly proclaim themselves the political heirs of the Republican Party which he carried to victory in 1860 seldom quote what Lincoln said, and never match his clarity. As an example, this from his annual message to Congress on December 3, 1861:

> Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights. Nor is it denied that there is, and probably always will be, a relation between labor and capital, producing mutual benefits.

Nor is it likely that the Great Emancipator would have been a party to turning away one of the great musical organizations of this Nation—the Howard University choir—from the doors of the Lincoln Day rally on February 5, 1954.

The man who said "A house divided against itself cannot stand" would take a dim view of the present efforts of extremists in his party to turn neighbor against neighbor, to sow suspicion, to divide our country into warring factions.

When Lincoln finally succumbed to the wounds he had received, Secretary Stanton said, "Now he belongs to the ages." It is fitting and proper that the scene of one of the greatest tragedies in our history should be a permanent memorial to this great American.

Thirty-sixth Anniversary of Republic of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the impending commemoration of the 36th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania, on February 16, 1918, gives fresh meaning to the lesson which the free world should have learned from the destruction of free government in that country. The world cannot attain a lasting peace without adherence to those principles of justice and morality by which free men must always be governed. We can achieve nothing lasting when in the name of expediency we conveniently forget the very fundamental truth upon which this country was founded, that "Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." It is an appropriate time for us to affirm our belief in this principle and in the consequence which flows from it, the right to self-determination which exists for all nations, large and small.

February 16 marks the 36th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania, as a modern nation under a constitutional government. Lithuania as a national group, however, had existed from time immemorial, a people with its own language, its own culture, and its own traditions. These people are not related to the Russians or to any of the other Slavic peoples, but descend from an ancient people of a distinct nationality. How, then, can the seizure of this land by Soviet Russia be justified?

On June 15, 1940, in flagrant violation of existing treaties, which had been freely entered into, the Soviet Union occupied Lithuania. To give a show of right to this seizure, Russian representatives, supported by the Red army, staged mock elections, but 24 hours before the polls closed, Moscow announced the results of the elections. With this farcical background, the elections were null and void, and, from the point of view of international law, Lithuania is still an independent country. The great democracies of the West have never recognized this illegal act of Soviet aggression, and the Lithuanian people and the Lithuanian legation in Washington have never recognized the puppet regime installed and maintained by the Soviet Union. The Lithuanian people have not accepted the Soviet system and are stubbornly resisting it by means of an underground and by open resistance.

The Soviet authorities have taken from the farmers their land and everything that agriculture produces, pauperizing not only the farmers but the entire population of the country. The people are deprived of all human rights; religion is persecuted, and the many closed churches have been converted into antireligious meeting halls. Men and women under the slightest pretext or suspicion are thrown into prison, and without trial are deported to Siberian slave-labor camps. At least 10 percent of the total population of 3 million people have been deported to the Siberian wilderness.

Soviet rule is rule by the clubs and guns of the secret police, not by the people. By this brutal despotism, the Soviets have dominated Eastern Europe, building vast armies, organizing a strongly unified economic system which is subordinated to the aggressive plans of Moscow, regimenting the people and working toward communizing the younger generation and liquidating the upper and middle classes.

Poised behind its ring of buffer peoples, Soviet Russia constitutes an ever-growing threat to the security and well-being of the free world. It has become increasingly apparent that the policy of the United States toward the cause of Lithuania's independence was far too soft and mild.

In the past year, the Baltic committee, under the chairmanship of the Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN, has done much to reveal the nature of the threat to all liberty throughout the world, which is implicit in the subjugation of this brave people. Through the work of this group, of the Voice of America, and of voluntary organizations which seek to penetrate the Iron Curtain with the news that the cause of freedom has not been abandoned, the people of Lithuania will receive renewed hope. Strengthened by this hope, they will stand firm in their trust that someday they will once again take their place among the free nations of the world. And while this hope lives, they will remain a thorn in the side of the Soviet Union, to play a significant role in the eventual downfall of the Communist tyranny.

Lincoln's Devotion to Duty Prompts Suggestion for Republican Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in a speech at Cooper Institute, New York, on September 27, 1860, Abraham Lincoln, whose memory is honored by our Nation on this anniversary of his birth, set forth a principle which is especially applicable in the situation today.

> Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us—

Said Lincoln—

> nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction to the Government, nor of dungeons to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

In the sincere conviction that President Eisenhower observes this same dedication to duty, I am today asking, on the floor of this House, that he demand the resignation from office of the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

I believe the President wholly missed the point in his press conference of February 10 when he decried what he called extreme partisanship in the current dastardly and back-alley attacks by certain high officials in his administration and party against the Democratic Party and the loyal Americans who comprise it.

These vituperative orators are guilty of far more serious sins than extreme partisanship and it is incredible to me that the President could so underestimate their actions. Even so, he said in his press conference that he expected his subordinates in the executive branch and Chairman Hall to follow a more temperate view in the future.

So far as I know, there has been no response from Mr. Hall to the President's remarks and other Republican orators have repudiated the President's advice.

I am now asking the President to put some teeth into his words, to show by his actions that he means what he says. The President has no direct control over Republican Members of Congress nor over some of the divisive demagoguery now going on, but it is a plain political fact that the chairman of the Republican

National Committee would not have his office and could not long hold it if the President, the leader of the party, opposed him.

Mr. Hall's part in this plot to brand millions of Americans as traitors makes him the logical object of any firm action by the President to enforce his views.

Mr. Hall and his committee have sponsored the current nationwide tour of Republican luminaries whose disgusting antics have gagged the throats of every decent American citizen.

There is clear evidence in the record of the heavy hand of Mr. Hall and the Republican committee in the planned attack against former President Harry Truman, of which Attorney General Brownell was the mouthpiece.

Mr. Hall and his committee sponsored the Republican box-supper affair here in Washington at which Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams accused the Democratic Party of political sadism.

Mr. Hall has indicated his direct opposition to the President on the question of whether communism will be an issue in the 1954 congressional elections.

The real issue here is whether the President is actually the leader of his Party, whether he is the person with those admirable qualities of leadership which were endorsed by the majority of voting Americans in 1952. The time has come for the President to take his stand and grasp the reins of control. The vitriolic campaign of Republican oratory which Mr. Hall has sponsored and enthusiastically supported can lead to a division of the American people that will seriously weaken our Nation in this hour of crisis. Now is the time for the President to act. He can prove his dedication to the principles of Abraham Lincoln, to the principles of decency and fair play, by summarily dismissing Republican Chairman Hall.

Seven Great Pillars of Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of February 16, 1954, many of the Members of the House and Senate of this great Congress were the pleased and honored guests of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States at a sumptuous and beautifully appointed annual banquet here at the Nation's Capital. At each of our reserved places at the tables was a magnificently printed and prepared booklet in colors entitled "Seven Great Pillars of Civilization."

The appropriate words by this distinguished patriotic order were as follows:

May this brief sketch of mankind's spiritual and intellectual evolution serve as a reminder of some of the historic figures and events that shaped western civilization.

These strong pillars became a part of the structure of our Republic at its founding—symbols of the rights of man, for which the VFW was proud to fight on foreign soil, in hostile waters, and in the air. Today, all that America stands for is challenged.

May we resolve to meet this ominous challenge in the heroic spirit that preserved our Nation in other days of peril; a dedication to the principle "that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." (Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.)

The introduction to the booklet was as follows:

This is dedicated to promotion of America. To better perform this service we should become more appreciative of our own product, so that we can ward off the siren songs of our competitors, who, for the past 6,000 years, have been most successful at keeping the majority of their peoples starved and naked, and eternally desolated spiritually, morally, and physically. Also, and even more important, we have tried to design this booklet in such manner as to bring an awareness of the many pillars that go to make up our way of life, of which seven of the great ones are here set up—with a few thoughts as to how they could be effectively torn down.

And then on the pages following in beautiful color and arranged with great artistry and simplicity was the following text:

MAN, THE IMAGE OF GOD

God created man in his own image. So it is written in the Book of Genesis. Man is an individual. There can be none beside him to say otherwise; no mandate other than from God to make him stay put.

"Man, the image of God," means that no other label can be put on him; neither can he hide under another label, for man must always live with himself; it is the price he pays for his individuality. It is the still small voice that comes in the night—the conscience.

God created man in his own image. God is life, life is energy. Man, as all living things, must struggle for existence. Therefore, man must depend upon his own energy and convert it to human needs. His energy cannot be obstructed by another, neither can he be deprived of the fruits of his labor. This is the first great pillar of civilization. To topple it most effectively, deny man his individuality and replace it with a number; take his energy out of his control and circumscribe it by edict, involuntarily.

Opposite the foregoing Pillar of Civilization there was printed in beautiful color, magnificence, and artistry a drawing entitled "The Creation of Man," followed by the words:

This drawing is taken from a painting by Michelangelo, in the Sistine Chapel, Rome, and shows the divine spark of life passing from the Creator to the listless hand of man.

MOSES AND THE LAW

"1. Thou shalt have no other gods before Me.

"2. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath. Thou shalt not bow down to them or serve them.

"3. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

"4. Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thou hast to do; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt do no manner of work.

"5. Honour thy father and thy mother.

"6. Thou shalt not kill.

"7. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

"8. Thou shalt not steal.

"9. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

"10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, nor anything that is thy neighbor's."

If the individuality of man is the first great pillar of civilization, then the second is the Ten Commandments. They afford him his greatest opportunity: the option of choosing good or evil, for it is reasoned that man cannot know good without knowing evil. The choice is his. Man walks with freedom on one side but with responsibility on the other.

To work for the common good is ideal, but it can be no longer common or good if personal responsibility is placed in, or usurped by, manmade gods. There is no greater incongruity than the spectacle of man and law shuffling their feet to the tune of a manmade god who, under the guise of expediency, can today call lies the great truths of yesterday.

To destroy this second great pillar first convince man that he has no worth as a human being—admit to no external truths such as the Ten Commandments.

Opposite this pillar was a replica of a painting entitled "Moses Shows the Commandments to the People," followed by the words:

Moses is here shown as he came down from Mount Sinai after being summoned for the divine revelation of the law. In his absence, the people set up an idol in the form of a golden calf.

CHRIST AND THE GOLDEN RULE

Two thousand years after the great documents already touched upon were revealed to mankind, Christ came on earth. One of His great contributions to the world was a new commandment: "Love thy neighbor as thyself. Do to others as you would be done by. For whatever you do to the least of human beings you do it to mankind and yourself."

Although a gentle teacher and philosopher, Christ also was a fighter whose sword of truth defended the dignity of man as an individual, fought against the surrender of freedom, and attacked all combinations that stood between direct contact of man with his Creator.

So Christ lifted up into place the greatest of all the pillars of civilization—the importance of human brotherhood. The destruction of this pillar is the aim of the police state, accomplished by pitting human against human—blood brother against blood brother.

Opposite that page was a drawing entitled "The Good Samaritan," followed by the words:

Love thy neighbor as thyself—do unto others as thou would have them do unto you.

MOHAMMED, THE PRACTICAL PROPHET

In the year 570 A. D. the Prophet Mohammed was born. He believed that man must be judged but not controlled; each individual is free but responsible.

Drawn by this great freedom of spirit and brotherhood, the greatest minds of the Middle East and the Orient formed the Saracen culture.

In this culture, education flourished openly. Adapting the experience of others, they laid much of the groundwork of our modern science, medicine, agriculture, and personal hygiene. They invented, among other things, the zero (0), that concept in numerology without which engineering, chemistry, and measurements used in inventions and mathematical findings cannot exist.

There is no denying the Saracen contribution to civilization. The attempt to establish man as a brother, and to further the unhampering of man's thoughts and acts, raised yet another great pillar—most quickly undermined by relieving man of the opportunity of making his own ideas work.

Opposite this page was a drawing entitled "A Saracen University." The words below this drawing were:

There is no enrollment, and no diploma in these seats of learning, found in the mosque; the tuition is based on a voluntary agreement between teacher and student.

WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR

In the year 1066 A. D. William of Normandy defeated the Saxon King Harold at Senlac and became the conqueror of England. People accepted his kingship as coming from God. Secure in his seagirt island, he developed a tolerancy that enabled him to organize the ancient Anglo-Saxon heritage of the "moot"—that local liberty in which the community assembled to give its assent to their leaders' deliberations. In this manner free courts, speech, and the dignity of the individual were encouraged, so that soon the peasantry came to regard themselves as allies of the Crown. Thus we see the beginning of parliamentary institutions, with the conquest becoming the starting point of English freedom, and bringing into being a constitution upon which, 730 years later, we were to form our own great written document. In the conqueror's Domesday Booke we find the basic protection of life and property.

So rises another great pillar—a symbol of law and order, an impartial third party.

A very magnificent drawing opposite this page was entitled "William the Conqueror Being Lifted Up at Westminster" with the following notation:

On Christmas Day, 1066, William was lifted upon the shoulders of his knights so that all men could see, and therefore recognize their king.

JEFFERSON AND THE RIGHTS OF MAN

In 1776, Thomas Jefferson, in company with many American businessmen and farmers, drew up a document dealing with the rights of man, and thus created the cause of the American Revolution. In this new Republic no official would ever be permitted to think, decide, act, or judge as one man; a government was devised to divide these responsibilities of man into three parts: a Congress to think and decide; a President to act; and a Supreme Court to be referee. This Government was handed, by the people, a list of particulars which it must not do. This was the first document of its kind ever written. The Government was servant, and not master, and the Constitution is designed to make it stay that way.

Here, then, is that of which the sixth great pillar of civilization is made: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

An inspiring drawing of the Jefferson Memorial here in the Nation's Capitol appeared opposite this "pillar" stating, "Let everyone ascribe the faith and merit he chooses."

FREEDOM OF HUMAN ENERGY

"A wise and frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them free otherwise to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government." (Excerpt from writings of Thomas Jefferson.)

Down through the ages many human beings have starved. Many were intelligent people, and with fertile lands of great extent, and yet they were unable to get enough to eat. Modern nations have not been any exception for in Jefferson's day the French people were dying of hunger, and today, even in countries rich in ancient philosophies, famines kill millions. China and India are continually ravaged and in the 1930's thousands died of starvation in the richest farmlands of the Soviet Union.

How, then, are we to account for such abundance in America that the pangs of hunger are unknown; there has never been a famine recorded in this country.

Human beings still live in hovels with no windows, floors, chimneys. We, in America, take these features for granted, and regard electricity, and all its appliances and equipment as everyday necessities, easily available for our use. The forces of nature are harnessed for the use of humblest citizens; sanitation, hygiene, and other services are accepted without questioning, and are not even regarded as luxuries today.

These are facts. Why is it so? The answer is so clear that it will stand up under any scrutiny; simply put, it is this: Possession of freedom, which in turn produces freedom of possession. Without possession one cannot improve; if one cannot improve one has no incentive—no will, or purpose, to improve. Owning something is the first requisite for creating something. The impossibility of Edisons, Fords, and men like Dr. Bell cracking such technical problems of science and engineering, and converting them to human needs, in an authoritarian form of highly centralized government becomes evident when it is realized that the station of these men in such a government would deny them the greatest of all sources of invention and research, namely: incentive.

This booklet does not propose to show Americans as inheritors of a master race, and, as such, superior beings. We only have to remember that the direct ancestors of the people who brought this Government into being were Anglo-Saxons, and they starved alongside all the other nations. One thing they did have, however, was an instinctive sense of personal freedom. What this booklet has striven to show is the truth and the rightness of all the things that have contributed to our present form of civilization; that if we are to be a productive people we must have life, and if we are to have life we must be productive, and this life must be as free as the sun and the air that go to make up our world itself. Thus our seventh great pillar is dedicated to individual man; only he can create productivity, and only man can control the productivity he creates. To destroy this pillar, simply withhold from man the fruits of his own labor.

Following this, on the opposite page, was a magnificent drawing of a stained-glass window entitled "The Fruits of Freedom," which had been dedicated to science and invention.

Mr. Speaker, while the great and continuous patriotic services and contributions made by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America to the Nation's security and happiness are almost universally known and recognized by the appreciative millions of Americans, the printing and distribution of this very appropriate booklet, which was graciously presented to each one of the guests in attendance at the banquet, was only one of the occasions, I am informed, when the booklet is distributed in large and small quantities to leading citizens and public officials throughout the Nation.

In this connection I highly recommend that every thinking patriotic citizen obtain a copy thereof at the earliest possible date.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God: Conscious of the faults and failures which mar and stain the past, we are grateful that each new week brings us to the land of beginning again. May we receive new weeks and new days as Thy gifts, bringing new vigor, new hope, new opportunities to be strong and kind, patient and understanding, faithful and true. As we here seek a solution for the Nation's baffling problems may we not be found unwilling to pay the price of better things. Teach us the vanity and futility of a quest for salvation which leaves ourselves unchanged.

Direct our steps, guard us from error, deliver us from all evil. Help us to sit where others sit, seeing life's tangled skein through the eyes of those less fortunate than ourselves. So make us faithful ministers of this fear-haunted and stricken generation. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 11, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, February 15, 1954, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—RETURN OF BILL

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 4254) for the relief of Aneta Popa.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate this week.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia, for the year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN PHILIPPINE NATIONALS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the entry of Philippine nationals for certain purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CERTIFICATION OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification had been made of the lands in the Corning Canal for irrigation and agricultural purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolutions urging Congress to pass legislation to prevent the Government of the United States from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass legislation which will prevent the Government of the United States from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise, except as specified in the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for two daily deliveries of mail to residences

"Whereas the prompt delivery of mail is most desirable; and

"Whereas the public has been seriously inconvenienced by a reduction in the number of daily deliveries of mail to residences: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for two daily deliveries of mail to residences; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to reduce the age requirements of recipients of old-age assistance

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass legislation reducing the age requirements of recipients of old-age assistance to 60 years; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

Two resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge the Federal Housing Authority to continue the operation of the Lucy Mallary Village in Springfield

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to urge the Federal Housing Authority to extend the time for the operation by it of the Lucy Mallary Village in Springfield and to take such other action as may be necessary to prevent the sale of said Lucy Mallary Village at this time; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to provide for Federal housing projects in the west, south, and north ends of Boston

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide for Federal housing projects in the west, south, and north end sections of the city of Boston, said projects to be commenced immediately; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the United States Housing Authority, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Resolution 1

"Resolution opposing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway

"Whereas the Congress of the United States is again considering the proposal for the construction and development of the St. Lawrence seaway project; and

"Whereas it is apparent for many reasons this project is of dubious value; and

"Whereas it would require the expenditure of hundreds of millions and perhaps a billion dollars or more at a time when the full resources and energies of the Federal Government are needed for the continuing fight to guarantee the American way of life against communism; and

"Whereas it is probable that this seaway would be closed because of ice conditions for at least 5 months out of every calendar year, thus reducing sharply any potential benefits which might be expected from this project; and

"Whereas the completion of such a project would divert much oceangoing traffic from the port of Baltimore and would be a serious threat to the economy of the Baltimore area and of the entire State of Maryland; and

"Whereas it is a matter of doubtful statesmanship to expend untold sums of money on a project of doubtful value, while at the same time perhaps injuring irreparably the industries and the economies of the great seaports and industrial cities along the eastern seaboard: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland*, That this body expresses its firm opposition to the projected St. Lawrence seaway and particularly to any cooperation in this venture on the part of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Members of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"By the house of delegates, February 3, 1954.

"Rules suspended and adopted.

"JOHN C. LUBER,
"Speaker of the House of Delegates.
"CLEMENT R. MERCALDER,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates."

A resolution adopted by the Roseburg (Oreg.) Central Labor Council, protesting against any special exemption on income derived from dividends; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the San Francisco District, California Federation of Women's Clubs, relating to tax deductions for the costs of child care; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the San Francisco (Calif.) Council of Republican Women, relating to a revision of the Status of Armed Forces Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the San Francisco District, California Federation of Women's Clubs, relating to the amendment of the Food, Drugs, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Scioto County (Ohio) Democratic Central-Executive Committee, Portsmouth, Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 21

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress not to admit Alaska to statehood

"Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That the Legislature of the State of Mississippi does hereby express its opposition to the admission of the Territory of Alaska to statehood, and does hereby memorialize and urge the Congress of the United States not to authorize or provide therefor; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives of the United States from Mississippi.

"Adopted by the house of representatives January 18, 1954.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate February 1, 1954.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"President of the Senate."

By Mr. EASTLAND:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Mississippi; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Concurrent Resolution 20

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to act adversely on the petition requesting statehood for the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has been petitioned to admit to statehood the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the islands are known to be a hotbed of communism, with the biggest labor union, which dominates economic life, controlled by avowed Communists; and

"Whereas the allegiance of Communists is to Moscow rather than to the United States, and their power is likely to be used for political ends rather than for the attainment of economic goals; and

"Whereas Hawaii, unlike any of the present 48 States, is noncontiguous to the mainland, being over 2,000 miles distant therefrom; and

"Whereas the inhabitants of Hawaii have not been born and bred in American traditions and American customs, thus creating within the average Hawaiian an insular outlook; and

"Whereas the whole economy of the islands is ruthlessly dictated by a group of firms, known as the Big Five, controlled by a handful of men bound by inheritance, intermarriage, and a web of interlocked directorates; and

"Whereas investigation has proved that many Hawaiians are, in fact, violently opposed to statehood: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and earnestly petitioned to take adverse action on the petition requesting that the Territory of Hawaii be admitted to statehood; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from Mississippi, in the National Congress, and to the national commander of the American Legion, the national adjutant of Disabled American Veterans, commander in chief of Veterans of Foreign Wars, and national executive director of AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II).

"Adopted by the house of representatives, January 18, 1954.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate, February 1, 1954.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"President of the Senate."

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to exempt milk and other farm products from the Federal tax on the transportation of property

"Whereas the return from the Federal tax on the transportation of property is small; and

"Whereas said tax has proved burdensome to the farmers of the States and further reduces their income which cannot stand much reduction: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact such legislation as will exempt from the tax on transportation of property milk and other farm products being transported from the farm or place of production to market when both are in the same State; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the two Members of the United States Senate and to each of the Members of the House of Representatives from this State."

REDUCTION OF VOTING AGE—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, REVERE, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Revere, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide a reduction of the voting age to 18 years.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ordered, That inasmuch as the youth of America have, in the past, and will continue in the future, to defend and give their lives in the defense of our country, and have shown in times of emergency that they are capable of sound and mature judgment; the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact into law, the recommended legislation of the President; giving citizens 18 years of age the right to vote.

In city council, January 25, 1954.

Attest:

JOSEPH F. MCCHRISTAL,
City Clerk.

BENEFITS FOR VETERANS—RESOLUTION OF WILKIN COUNTY POST, NO. 2766, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, BRECKENRIDGE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Wilkin County Post, No. 2766, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Breckenridge, Minn., protesting the curtailment of benefits for veterans, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas during the past several months veterans' benefits have been seriously curtailed and limited by administrative action of the Veterans' Administration, Civil Service Commission, and by Federal legislation; and

Whereas such curtailment of benefits does and will work serious hardship on veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korean veterans unless such benefits are immediately and fully restored; and

Whereas these benefits which have been curtailed are principally the following:

1. Hospitalization: By the requirement of the filing of a financial statement (in effect a pauper's oath) with every application by a veteran for hospitalization in a veterans' hospital except in so-called service-connected cases.

2. Dental treatment: By the elimination of the 1-year presumption as to dental defects and granting of treatment only on a one-time basis.

3. Veterans' preference: By the elimination of the five points granted to veterans in civil-service examinations, except for those attaining passing grades.

4. Institutional on-the-farm training subsistence: By the periodical reduction in subsistence allowance for Korean veterans taking on-the-farm training: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Wilkin County Post, No. 2766, of Veterans of Foreign Wars, at a regular meeting duly convened on the 12th day of January 1954, That this veterans' organization record its disapproval and indicate its grave concern in the curtailment of these benefits for veterans and register its protest in such curtailments and by this resolution petition the Congressmen representing the veterans of this organization to commence immediate action and institute the necessary legislation to reinstate these benefits which have been curtailed and which are and will work a serious and grave hardship on the veterans who should receive these benefits: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution signed by the commander of this organization and attested by its adjutant be forwarded to the Representative and Senators of the State and district wherein this post is located to apprise them of our concern and interest in this regard and for the purpose of receiving from such Representatives and Senators an answer as to the position they now take or intend to take in restoring these benefits to the veterans.

Dated February 6, 1954.

ROY V. HANSON,
Commander.

Attested:

URVAN LE NOUE,
Adjutant.

MADONNA COMMEMORATIVE STAMP FOR MOTHER'S DAY, 1954, IN HONOR OF MARY, THE MOTHER OF CHRIST

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many citizens of my State of Minnesota

have written to me in recent days suggesting that a Madonna commemorative stamp for Mother's Day, 1954, be issued this May honoring Mary, the mother of Christ.

The symbol of Mary is, indeed, the noblest and sublimest expression of the true meaning of the dignity of motherhood. I believe this proposal deserves most serious consideration. I am, therefore, submitting it to the Postmaster General of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that resolutions and letters I have received be referred to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, for appropriate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LIBERALIZATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY LAW — RESOLUTION OF AERIE 2192, FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES, VALLEY CITY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Aerie 2192, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Valley City, N. Dak., favoring the liberalization of the social security law.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION FAVORING LIBERALIZED SOCIAL SECURITY

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Eagles was a leader in the campaign for enactment of the Social Security Act and the earlier campaigns for the passage of State old-age pension laws; and

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Eagles, by unanimous vote of delegates in national convention assembled, has urged the liberalization of the Social Security Act so as to extend coverage to all workers and to expand the program to protect wage earners against all major hazards of life and to adjust payments to meet increased living costs; and

Whereas the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his recent message to Congress, has urged that the Social Security Act be liberalized to provide that—

1. The minimum benefit for retired persons be increased from $25 to $30 per month, the maximum from $85 to $108.50.

2. Ten million additional persons be included in the security system.

3. The first $1,000 of annual earnings by retired persons be exempted from the regulations of the Social Security Act.

4. The "earnings base" for participants in the plan be raised from $3,600 to $4,200.

5. The 4 years of lowest income for such beneficiary be discarded in computing benefits.

Whereas friends of social security, Democrats and Republicans, have endorsed the President's suggestions as a long-step forward in providing adequate old-age security for all Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our aerie endorse the President's proposals for improving the Social Security Act, and respectfully urge the Congressman from our district and the United States Senators from our State to enact such recommendations into law.

Adopted this 4th day of February 1954.

VALLEY CITY, AERIE No. 2192,
KENNETH COLVILLE,
Worthy President.

Attest:
W. A. GALLOWAY,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 2728. A bill to authorize the collection of indebtedness of military and civilian personnel resulting from erroneous payments, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 937).

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

S. 361. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes (Rept. No. 938).

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

S. 2773. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756) (Rept. No. 939).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 507. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor Emilie Nell (Rept. No. 942);

S. 662. A bill for the relief of Julie Nicola Frangou (Rept. No. 943);

S. 893. A bill for the relief of David T. Wright (Rept. No. 944);

S. 915. A bill for the relief of Augusta Bleys (also known as Augustina Bleys) (Rept. No. 945);

S. 929. A bill for the relief of Cleopatra Stavros Milionis (Rept. No. 946);

S. 1209. A bill for the relief of Dr. Uheng Khoo (Rept. No. 947);

S. 1265. A bill for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer (Rept. No. 948);

S. 1594. A bill for the relief of Berenice Catherine Montgomery (Rept. No. 949);

S. 2534. A bill for the relief of Dora Vida Lyew Seixas (Rept. No. 950);

H. R. 711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth R. Ekholm (Rept. No. 951);

H. R. 752. A bill for the relief of Francoise Bresnahan (Rept. No. 952);

H. R. 788. A bill for the relief of Beryl Williams (Rept. No. 953);

H. R. 823. A bill for the relief of Abraham G. Sakin (Rept. No. 954);

H. R. 824. A bill for the relief of Demetrious Konstantno Papanicolaou (Rept. No. 955);

H. R. 828. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vincenzo Guzzo (Rept. No. 956);

H. R. 907. A bill for the relief of Wolodymyr Hirniak (Rept. No. 957);

H. R. 946. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louise Blackstone (Rept. No. 958);

H. R. 965. A bill for the relief of Michael Demcheshen (Rept. No. 959);

H. R. 1339. A bill for the relief of Dr. Soon Tai Ryang (Rept. No. 960);

H. R. 1358. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marcelino J. Avecilla and Dr. Teodora A. Fidelino-Avecilla (Rept. No. 961);

H. R. 1495. A bill for the relief of Louis M. Jacobs (Rept. No. 962);

H. R. 1649. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gisela Walter Sizemore (Rept. No. 963);

H. R. 1688. A bill for the relief of Henry Ty (Rept. No. 964);

H. R. 1795. A bill for the relief of Helena Shostenko (Rept. No. 965);

H. R. 1883. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor (Rept. No. 966);

H. R. 2035. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Michaline Borzecka (Rept. No. 967);

H. R. 2387. A bill for the relief of William M. Smith (Rept. No. 968);

H. R. 2504. A bill for the relief of Sisters Adelaide Canelas and Maria Isabel Franco (Rept. No. 969);

H. R. 2622. A bill for the relief of Maria Teresa Ortega Peres (Rept. No. 970);

H. R. 2623. A bill for the relief of Jose M. Thomasa-Sanchez, Adela Duran Cuevas de Thomasa, and Jose Maria Thomasa Duran (Rept. No. 971);

H. R. 2774. A bill for the relief of Endre Szende, Zsuzanna Szende, Katalin Szende (a minor), and Maria Szende (a minor) (Rept. No. 972); and

H. R. 3749. A bill for the relief of Woldemar Jaskowsky (Rept. No. 973).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 235. A bill for the relief of Rev. Armando Fuoco (Rept. No. 974);

S. 267. A bill for the relief of Pantelis Morfessis (Rept. No. 975);

S. 268. A bill for the relief of Harold Trevor Colbourn (Rept. No. 976);

S. 945. A bill for the relief of Moshe Gips (Rept. No. 977);

H. R. 1967. A bill for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co. (Rept. No. 978);

H. R. 3275. A bill for the relief of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc. (Rept. No. 979); and

H. R. 3832. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley (Rept. No. 980).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1062. A bill for the relief of Eliceu Joaquim Boa (Rept. No. 981);

S. 1156. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jaganath P. Chawla (Rept. No. 982); and

H. R. 2567. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers (Rept. No. 983).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2698. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi; without amendment (Rept. No. 984).

HOUSING

Mr. CAPEHART, under authority of the order of the Senate of February 5, 1954, filed on February 12, 1954, the bill (S. 2938) to aid in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities. The first and second readings of the bill having been previously ordered, it was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with the bill filed by the Senator from Indiana, on the bill (S. 2938) to aid in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities, a brief summary he had prepared, together with a joint statement by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and Representative WOLCOTT, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, on the same bill.

There being no objection, the summary and joint statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIEF SUMMARY OF HOUSING ACT OF 1954

TITLE I—FHA INSURANCE

1. Increases improvement and repair loans from maximum of $2,500 to $3,000 and repayment period from 3 years, 32 days, to 5 years, 32 days. Changes the existing maximum of $10,000 for multifamily improvement or conversion loans to $1,500 per family unit or $10,000, whichever is greater, and the maximum loan terms from 7 years, 32 days, to 10 years, 32 days.

2. Consolidates and simplifies statutory provisions limiting FHA mortgage terms and changes statutory mortgage limits so that the President under his discretionary authority (provided in title II) could raise mortgage

limits on sales housing to $20,000 on a 1- or 2-family house as compared to the present ceiling of $16,000, to $27,500 for a 3-family home as compared to the present $20,500 limit, and $35,000 for a 4-family home as compared to the present $25,000 limit. Maximum ratio of loan to value would be not to exceed the sum of 95 percent of first $8,000 and 75 percent in excess of $8,000. Under these provisions minimum downpayments could be $400 on an $8,000 house, $900 on a $10,000 house, $1,400 on a $12,000 house, $2,150 on a $15,000 house, and $3,400 on a $20,000 house.

3. The same mortgage terms would be made applicable to existing housing as to new housing.

4. Maximum repayment period on all loans could be increased by the President up to 30 years.

5. Permits the insurance under section 207 of existing multifamily structures, if located in a slum or blighted area and if part of loan is used to repair and rehabilitate the property.

6. President given authority to increase mortgage amounts for multifamily rental housing under section 207 on elevator-type structures up to $2,400 per room (present limit $2,000) and $7,500 per family unit (present limit $7,200). Ten thousand dollars per family unit limitation removed.

7. Where 65 percent of cooperatives are veterans maximum mortgage can be increased by President to $2,375 per room ($2,250 if less than 65 percent), and if elevator type up to $2,850 per room ($2,700 if less than 65 percent).

8. The maximum loan to cooperatives (section 213) would be increased from $5 million to $25 million if the mortgagor is regulated or supervised under law as to rents, charges, and methods of operation.

9. Consolidates all mortgage insurance authorizations and increases FHA insurance authorization by $1½ billion plus up to one-half billion dollars with approval of President.

10. Changes title II Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund by eliminating group accounts and substituting a general surplus account and a participating reserve account.

11. Authorizes new section 220 FHA insurance on new or existing family dwellings in designated areas in urban renewal areas and where HHFA has approved community programs for slum prevention and urban redevelopment. In such areas authorizes loans on houses with more than 4 family units of $35,000 plus $7,000 for each additional unit over 4. For multi-family units insurance on 90 percent loans with maximum of $2,250 per room ($2,700 in elevator type). Loan insurance would be available on same terms as in section 203 (sale) and section 207 (multifamily rental) until President authorizes higher limits within provisions of section 220.

12. Authorizes a new section 221 FHA insurance program on low-cost housing for families displaced as a result of slum clearance operations or Government action, where community requested such insurance and it met eligibility requirements of HHFA. The FHA Commissioner would determine the need and the number of units to be insured in a particular area. It provides—

(a) Maximum insured loan of $7,000, 100 percent insurance, ($200 cash down required for closing costs) 40-year loans on new or existing structures.

(b) Insurance of $7,000, 100 percent 40-year loans for repair and rehabilitation of dwellings for more than 10 families where mortgagor is nonprofit organization, public or private, and regulated by Federal or State Government as to rents and charges.

(c) 85 percent 40-year loans to builders to facilitate sales to owner-occupants under purchase contract or lease option agreements.

(d) Option to assign mortgages not in default after 20 years to FHA for 10-year debentures at Federal going rate at date of issuance.

13. Extends military housing (title 8) to July 1, 1955.

14. Terminates defense housing (title 9) at expiration date July 1, 1954.

15. Authorizes FHA insurance of "open-end" mortgages on 1- to 4-family houses.

TITLE II—MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES AND TERMS

1. Authorizes flexible mortgage rates and terms.

(a) Gives President authority to set maximum interest rates on FHA and VA loans at different levels for different classes of mortgages, but could not be more than 2½ percent above average market yields on Federal bonds having remaining maturity of 15 years or longer.

(b) President authorized to establish limits on FHA and VA fees and charges.

(c) President authorized to establish maximum maturities and minimum down payments on FHA and VA loans, also maximum dollar limitations on FHA mortgages.

2. Repeals section 504 of Housing Act of 1950 relating to fees and charges.

TITLE III—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

1. Recharters FNMA as constituent agency of HHFA, with HHFA Administrator as chairman of board of directors of five Government members.

2. Authorized to purchase FHA and VA mortgages or participations not to exceed $12,500 per family unit.

3. In effect, capital and surplus of existing FNMA would be used to capitalize new FNMA (estimate at $70 million).

In connection with the secondary mortgage facility (see 4) capital contributions of not less than 3 percent of the mortgage or participation amount would be required of all sellers to the association. In return nonrefundable convertible certificates would be issued to the sellers, to be exchanged for capital stock when Treasury stock is retired.

4. Establishes a new secondary mortgage market facility.

(a) To purchase eligible mortgages at prices (not above par) for particular classes of mortgages as determined by Board of Directors. Volume of purchases and sales, prices, charges, and fees would be determined with the view that excessive use of the association's facilities should be avoided.

(b) May enter into one-for-one contracts, but otherwise may not make advance commitments.

(c) To issue Association nonguaranteed obligations, not in excess of 10 times its capital, surplus, reserves, and undistributed earnings to carry out its secondary market operations.

(d) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest in such obligations up to $500 million, plus an amount equal to reduction in FNMA present portfolio, but not more than $1 billion, until Treasury stock in Association is retired.

5. Provides special assistance functions.

(a) President could authorize advance commitments and purchases of mortgages of various types and classifications as a support for special housing programs or to retard a serious market decline.

(b) Treasury would supply funds in return for obligations of not more than 5 years maturity.

(c) President could authorize not more than $200 million in purchases and commitments to be outstanding at any one time, but would have additional authority up to $100 million to enter commitments for mortgage participation agreements for a fixed 20-percent undivided interest in each mortgage, but with a deferred participation agreement to purchase the remainder in the event of default.

6. Liquidation of existing FNMA portfolio.

(a) Issue to public nonguaranteed obligations against its assets. The funds so obtained would be used to reduce existing Treasury's investment.

(b) Treasury authorized to purchase Association's obligations in sufficient amount to carry out Association's liquidation functions. Such obligations would have maturities of 5 years or less and the interest rate would be based on the average rate of outstanding Government obligations.

(c) Three hundred million dollars of the present authorization of FNMA for mortgage purchases would be made available for the special assistance program (see 5).

7. Separate accountability would be maintained for the (a) secondary market operations, (b) special assistance functions, and (c) management and liquidating functions of the rechartered FNMA.

TITLE IV—SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

All the amendments are designed primarily to broaden and redirect the present slum clearance and redevelopment program so as to assist not only the communities in clearing their slums, as is presently provided, but to prevent their spread by rehabilitating and improving blighted, deteriorated, or deteriorating areas. The criteria, terms and definitions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949 are changed in accordance with the broader scope of the program. In these larger areas, known as urban renewal areas, there could be carried out (in addition to the slum clearance and redevelopment now authorized) plans for voluntary repair and rehabilitation of buildings, clearance of deteriorated structures, and reconstruction of streets and other necessary improvements.

Requirements with respect to local responsibility and local action would be strengthened and increased.

The requirement that a commercial or industrial deteriorated area may be cleared with Federal assistance only if the area be redeveloped for predominantly residential purposes is eliminated. In other words, a deteriorated commercial site can be redeveloped for commercial purposes. However, there would be substituted a requirement that the project be in accordance with an urban renewal plan to achieve such community objectives for the establishment and preservation of well-planned residential neighborhoods.

The 2/3–1/3 formula for Federal local grants now in the law would not be changed. However, in the gross project cost might be included, in addition to those items now included, expenditures for carrying out plans for a voluntary repair and rehabilitation and the acquisition of property for the broader purpose indicated above, as well as the installation, construction, and reconstruction of streets, utilities, parks, playgrounds, and other improvements (which need not be in a slum-clearance area) necessary for carrying out the urban renewal plan.

TITLE V—LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

1. Extends preference in public housing, now limited to those displaced from public-housing or slum-clearance projects, to include also those displaced by other public actions, such as code enforcement and closing of structures, highway construction, etc.

2. Make payment of 10 percent of shelter rents in lieu of taxes mandatory for public-housing projects, except where this would reduce local contribution to less than 20 percent of the Federal contribution.

3. Permits localities to elect to charge full taxes provided they make up the difference in cash to maintain a local contribution equal to 20 percent of the Federal contribution.

4. Requires that the governing body and the public be informed of total local contri-

bution, including the difference between payments in lieu of taxes and amount that full taxes would require.

5. Provides that after projects are fully amortized, that net revenues go proportionately to Federal and local governments on the basis of their contributions, in order that in time such contribution may eventually be recovered as far as possible, and the projects be made self-liquidating.

TITLE VI—HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

1. Provides method whereby Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation may be served with notice of suit anywhere, and not just in the District of Columbia. Also bars enforcement of claim against the Corporation after 3 years from date of default, or, if the Corporation denies validity of the claim, after 2 years from the date of denial.

2. Increases maximum loan that a Federal savings and loan association may make (beyond exception already allowed) to $35,000, instead of the present $20,000 limit, set in 1933. Makes comparable changes as to collateral acceptable by Federal Home Loan Bank for advances. Also provides procedures for appointment of conservators and receivers of Federal savings and loan associations.

TITLE VII—URBAN PLANNING AND RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS

1. Provides $5 million to Housing and Home Finance Administrator for planning grants up to 50 percent of estimated cost to State, metropolitan, and regional area agencies for metropolitan or regional planning, and to State planning bodies to assist municipalities under 25,000 in urban planning.

2. Provides $10 million to resume non-interest bearing planning advances to local and State bodies for public works plans, repayable when construction is undertaken, in order that such works can be ready for construction if the economic situation should require it.

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Includes exemptions from preference provisions of unusual types of permanent Lanham Act projects and provides for a consolidated report to Congress on agency's activities instead of assorted reports on various programs and activities. * * * Provides for consideration to be given to the reduction of vulnerability of congested areas to enemy attack in carrying out housing programs.

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART AND REPRESENTATIVE WOLCOTT ON HOUSING ACT OF 1954

The Housing Act of 1954 contains comprehensive legislative provisions designed to (1) assure a high annual level of residential building starts, (2) equalize FHA mortgage insurance terms between new and old houses, (3) enable homeowners to have access to financing to better maintain, by renovation and repair, our existing housing inventory, (4) afford a broader approach to preventing and eliminating slum and blighted areas from our metropolitan areas, (5) provide a new source of housing supply for low-income families, (6) provide a secondary mortgage market, initially Government financed, to afford a more even flow of mortgage funds and make available needed housing funds in areas which are unable to provide such funds from local sources, (7) assure flexibility in mortgage terms to keep pace with general economic conditions, (8) provide funds to assist small municipalities in urban planning and (9) modernize existing provisions of several housing laws.

The new bill, consisting of eight titles, is the outgrowth of an intensive housing study inaugurated by the President last year when he appointed the Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs to develop a new and revitalized housing program.

FHA INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

New FHA insurance authorization granted in the amount of $1.5 billion plus an additional $500 million which could be made available by the President, would permit FHA to operate at last year's level of activity. In 1953 new housing starts approximated 1.1 million units. The new act would liberalize certain maximum mortgage insurance terms with respect to dollar amounts, ratio of loan to value, and maturity but they would only become operative upon direction of the President. Authority would be granted to equalize FHA mortgage insurance terms as between new and existing construction.

MODERNIZATION AND REPAIR LOANS

In keeping with the emphasis which the new act would place on maintenance and improvement of our housing inventory the limit on insured FHA title I repair and improvement loans for single family units would be increased from $2,500 to $3,000 and the term extended from 3 years to 5 years. With respect to repair and improvement of buildings for 2 or more families the existing loan limit of $10,000 would not apply provided the cost did not exceed $1,500 per dwelling unit, and the term would be increased from 7 to 10 years. A further incentive for improvement of existing housing would be provided through permitting FHA to insure advances made to a mortgagor under an open-end mortgage thus permitting him to obtain more favorable financing based on interest rates related to mortgage security.

HOME MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES AND TERMS

As previously noted the President would be given discretionary authority within the maximums provided in the act to vary FHA and VA ratios of loan to value and maturities and to carry FHA mortgage limitations on a per-room or per-family-unit basis. The President would also be given discretionary authority to set interest rates for VA mortgages and FHA mortgages and debentures, and related financing charges to assure that such rates and charges are geared to current economic conditions. A statutory flexible maximum for interest rates on FHA and VA mortgages would be established by providing that the maximum rate set could not exceed the average market yield on long-term Government bonds plus 2½ percent. The maximum rate set on FHA debentures could not exceed the average market yield on long-term Government bonds. The President would exercise the above-mentioned discretionary authorities after taking into consideration the then current investment market and conditions in the building industry and the national economy.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

The new act would provide for reincorporation and change of authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association. The new FNMA would have three functions, namely to provide (1) a true secondary mortgage market, (2) financial assistance for special housing programs, and (3) for orderly liquidation of the mortgages acquired by the former FNMA. Initially the capital stock of the association (in the amount of the former FNMA capital funds) would be provided by the Treasury but provision would be made so that users, through a capital contribution based on 3 percent of mortgages sold to the association, would build up equity funds to the extent the Treasury stock eventually could be retired. The association would be granted authority to sell its obligations in the private market to obtain funds in connection with functions (1) and (3) above enumerated. Such obligations although not Government guaranteed would enjoy the benefit of "backstop" Treasury borrowing authority which would be granted the association. The special-assistance function enumerated in (2) above would be financed direct from the Treasury. Borrowing authority for the secondary market function would be limited to 10 times capital funds but not exceeding a Treasury "backstop" of $1 billion. Operations under the special-assistance function could not exceed purchases, commitments, and participations in a total amount of $700 million outstanding at any one time. Borrowing authority under the liquidating function would be limited to the amount of mortgages held and commitments of the existing FNMA (not exceeding $3.35 billion) and would be progressively reduced by the amount of mortgage sales, repayments, and commitment cancellations. The Treasury "backstop" borrowing authority for this function would likewise be progressively reduced and eventually eliminated.

URBAN RENEWAL

The slum clearance and urban renewal provisions are designed to broaden and redirect the present slum clearance and community redevelopment programs by not only clearing slums, but requiring affirmative local action to prevent the spread of slums and urban blight. They would require communities, before being eligible to receive Federal assistance, to have an official plan of action for effectively dealing with the problem of urban slums and blight within the community and for the establishment and preservation of a well planned community with well organized residential neighborhoods of decent homes and suitable living environment for adequate family living. Special provisions would be included in the FHA insurance program for the construction and rehabilitation of dwelling units within urban renewal areas. These special FHA insurance programs would provide for the rehabilitation and construction of both single family and multifamily housing units. One special feature of the program would be 100 percent FHA insurance of mortgages up to $7,000 with 40-year maturities and small downpayments, available to displaced families in urban renewal areas. These special FHA programs could be assisted by FNMA, the Government secondary mortgage market, when authorized by the President, by either purchasing or participating in such mortgages.

The bill would also authorize up to $5 million in grants to localities to develop, test, and report on new and improved techniques for preventing and eliminating slums.

URBAN PLANNING AND RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS

Provides $5 million for planning grants up to 50 percent of estimated cost of such planning to State, metropolitan, and regional area agencies for metropolitan or regional planning and to State planning bodies to assist municipalities of under 25,000 population in urban planning.

Provides $10 million to resume non-interest-bearing planning advances to local and State bodies for public works plans repayable when construction is commenced in order that such works can be ready for construction if the economic situation would require.

HOME LOAN BANK SYSTEM

Provides a new procedure for the appointment of conservators and receivers of Federal savings and loan associations and a new system of administrative and court proceedings in cases involving noncompliance with rules and regulations of the Home Loan Bank Board where in the judgment of the Board the circumstances do not require the appointment of a conservator or receiver.

MISCELLANEOUS

There are several amendments which modernize and perfect existing housing legislation.

SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 100

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a more complete explanation of the Housing Act of 1954, which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has prepared for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency entitled "The Housing Act of 1954—A Summary of Provisions of the Housing Act of 1954."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 2939. A bill for the relief of Paul G. Hamel and certain dependents of the late Michael P. O'Donnell; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARTIN (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 2940. A bill to authorize certain beach erosion control of the shore of Fresque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2941. A bill for the relief of Kim Kwang Suk and Kim Woo Shik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2942. A bill to amend section 9 of the Hatch Act with respect to its application to officers and employees performing duties relating to employee loyalty or security programs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2943. A bill to provide for the transfer of all powers, duties, and functions of the Federal Civil Defense Administration to the National Guard Bureau of the Department of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2944. A bill for the relief of Silvia Dular; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2945. A bill for the relief of Eulalio Rodriguez Vargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2946. A bill for the relief of Patrick D. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 2947. A bill to remit the duty on certain bells to be imported for addition to the carillon of The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2948. A bill for the relief of Chaim Wolf Weintraub, Sara Liebe Weintraub, and Jorge Weintraub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BURKE, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. LENNON, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2949. A bill to continue authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DUFF:

S. 2950. A bill for the relief of Domenico Scaramuzzino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANDERS (by request):

S. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution declaring the right of sovereignty of the United States over certain areas of the Antarctic Continent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF HATCH ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the amendment of title 18 of the criminal code and that portion thereof known as the Hatch Act, for the purpose of making it illegal to engage in political activity for any Federal officer or official whose primary function or one of whose major functions relates to the administration of any employee, loyalty, or security program.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed textually in the RECORD, together with a statement I issued on Friday, February 12, describing the intent of this proposed legislation, and an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 13, entitled "Politics and Security" which bears on this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2942) to amend section 9 of the Hatch Act with respect to its application to officers and employees performing duties relating to employee loyalty or security programs, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 (a) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U. S. C. 118i), is amended by inserting before the last sentence thereof a new sentence as follows: "Nothing contained in the preceding sentence shall be construed to make the provisions of the second sentence of this subsection inapplicable to any officer or employee (other than the President, the Vice President, or the head of an executive department or independent agency) whose primary function or one of whose major functions relates to the administration of any employee loyalty or security program.

The statement by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE HATCH ACT TO COVER ALL SECURITY OFFICERS

Upon the convening of the Senate Monday, I will introduce an amendment to that part of the Criminal Code known as the Hatch Act, so as to forbid overt political activity by any Government employee whose function or responsibility is primarily, or includes in a major way, personnel security.

I consider it unconscionable that any employee, officer, or official of our Government, one of whose primary functions is to investigate, determine, or judge the loyalty or security of other employees of the Government should be permitted to participate in overt partisan, political activities.

It is unthinkable that political considerations should enter into the functions of personnel security. I am shocked even to think that there should be any doubt as to the complete impropriety of political activity on the part of any Government officer who presides over the delicate questions of individual loyalty and security.

If there is any room for different legal interpretations as to the application of the Hatch Act to any such employee or officer, whatever his technical or simulated rank, there can certainly be no question as to the moral proprieties. My proposed amendment would plug the legal loophole, if there is one. I hope it will be speedily adopted.

My amendment would apply not only to Mr. Scott McLeod but to every other security officer and security employee of the Government.

I believe that the Nation has been shocked by Mr. McLeod's recent activities just as it would be shocked if Mr. J. Edgar Hoover went out on a political speaking tour in behalf of the Republican Party or any other political party.

No personnel or security officer should be so permitted.

The possibilities for political intimidation of Government employees on the part of a security officer are unlimited and, indeed, are awful even to contemplate.

My amendment would not, of course, affect the Attorney General although I would personally think that in these times when internal security is such a burning question in the country, and so vital to our national preservation, that even he would retire from the forefront of political activity, because of his immediate concern with questions of individual loyalty and security.

The editorial presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 13, 1954]

POLITICS AND SECURITY

The controversy over Scott McLeod, State Department security officer off on a political tour, now turns upon whether or not he is barred from such activities by the Hatch Act. A Civil Service Commissioner advised that he is barred; the State Department decided he is not. The State Department has the final word, and there, it seems to us, that particular matter could rest. The real question is not one of narrow legality, but of the wisdom and expediency of having a man in a quasi-judicial position, charged with administering delicate personnel issues, become engaged in politics.

In the work Mr. McLeod is doing, it is not only important that his actions be fair and objective; it is also important that they seem so. Is it likely that his actions will seem fair once he has shown a political interest in building up the list of dismissals to the highest possible total? Will they seem objective once he has implied that his success, and the success of the administration, depend on the number of dismissals and firings? As security officer of the State Department he is doing on a limited scale what Mr. J. Edgar Hoover is doing on a much larger scale. Mr. Hoover is far too experienced and principled to turn up as the orator at partisan gatherings.

Mr. McLeod, when asked about his present course, replied that he didn't know "how you're going to work in Government and not be in politics." If he does not know that, he should not be in the post he now holds. The essence of free government is that there are areas where partisanship does not enter, and that the working of the two-party system does not prevent the fair treatment of indi-

viduals. Altogether Mr. McLeod's tour makes it look very much as if he had so misconceived his role as to make his continuance in the State Department of questionable benefit.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 940) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 60) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-4934625, Abbey, Alfred.
T-107480, Advocat, Judith (nee Levy).
V-777692, Ahn, Chung Oak.
V-777692, Ahn Moo Hei.
A-6610497, Aniag, Federico Enriquez.
A-2691316, Anninos, Spiros or Spiros Markantonatos.
A-5062766, Athanasiades, Peter or Panagiotis Michael Malakas.
T-142741, Aurora, Delantar.
A-5834397, Ayala-Rodriguez, Demetrio.
A-5919879, Back, Erik Nestor Ernfried.
0300-123824, Bahchavan, Marika Stellanou.
A-9707485, Ban, Chan or Ban Chan or Chin Bin.
V-905914, Barba, Teresa Felipe or Teresa Felipe Agcaoili Asuncion.
V-529612, Bartoli, Nondina Massetti.
V-1634429, Benjamin, Artzweek (nee Hartoun or Hartounian).
A-4037830, Benndetti, Cipro or Cipro Giovanni Mafaldo Bendetti.
V-455711, Bennett, Panalig Gomez (nee Jose) or Fannie Gomez Jose Bennett.
E-22435, Berger, Harry or Mordka Sznaieder.
A-3408662, Bing, Moy or Bang Moy.
0403-2698, Bonanni, Aristide or Harry Bonanny.
T-1807528, Brosch, Mary Elizabeth.
A-2363302, Burgos-Mariscal, Baltazar.
A-5072218, Burns, James Johnson.
A-6592473T, Butani, Kalyan Gyanden or Kalyan Gyandev Butani.
T-1497408, Caraviotis, Gerassimos or Jerry Caar or George Kalamiotis.
A-5347538, Carlsen, Alf Sofus.
T-1892575, Caro, Domingos Salvador.
A-1789328, Casella, Ilario Paul or Mario or Flavio Casella.
A-7266012, Castro, Mabel Christina De or Belle Sommers or Mabel Ferrav.
T-1495439, Cerda, Luis Mario.
T-2760826, Chan, Albert Jeung or Chan Foon Jung.
A-5396158, Chang, Tsuen-Kung.
A-4886664, Chen, Peter You Lo or Chen You Lo.
A-9559629, Chew, Dick Wah.
V-889258, Chiang, Richard Chi-Chen.
A-7415673T, Chiang, Richard Yu-Ying.
A-3119234, Chu, Sun Chang.
T-2072676, Chung, Charles Denson.
E-1174, Churchill, Sylvia Mary.
E-1173, Churchill, Harry George.
A-4403432, Clausen, Claudius Peter or Claudius P. Clausen or Claud Clausen.
E-2230, Comitas, Spyridon or Spyridon Lukas Komitas.
A-8117133, Crawford, James Monroe.
T-1497436, Curtin, William Arthur.
A-6685995, Cywiak, Czmul (Samuel).
A-6675172, Cywiak, Mania.
A-2733441, Daly, Rita or Rita Berman or Rita Medvied.
A-5910610, Deckellis, Salvatore or Sam Pepedicicio.
A-2934221, Depetrillo, Angelina.
A-1161587, Dettman, Heinrich Frederich or Hellman.
A-5998383, Dicenzo, Dorothy Josephine.
A-7476663, Digneo, Angiolina A.
0300-228588, Dolmo, Lorenzo Martinez or Patricio Lorenzo Dolmo Y Martinez.
A-7476513, Duculan, Ricardo Tangalin.
A-5061754, Felizardo, Manuel.
1200-41417, Fleisher, Walter Leon.
T-141338, Foisia, Faapio or Telesia Faapio Foisia.
A-6021829, Fong, Hong Yen or Larry Fung.
A-3224574, Francis, Fernando Emilio.
A-3115089, Franzan, Emil.
A-3536436, Fun, Fu Yue.
A-7270371, Gama, Ubaldo Vasquez.
A-6730889, Garcia, Adolfo Gonzales y or Enrique Najera.
A-7841472, Garcia, Inocencia Claustro.
T-1496107, Garcia-Leon Reynaldo.
0300-396679, Gillespie, Edmund John.
T-2760320, Gisler, Henrietta (Henrike) D.
A-7115195, Gmaz, Maryann Agnes.
0900/42120, Gobos, Angelo Peter.
T-2760278, Godinez, Cruz Romero.
A-6314246, Gomez, Jesus or Jesus Gomez-Porras.
A-7137250, Gonzales, Liselotte formerly Patzold (nee Tatsch).
A-4345185, Gorbach-Dansky, Edna or Gorback (nee Caplan).
A-9682095, Graikste, Fricis.
V-192461, Grazia, Antonio De.
T-1496875, Griffith, Chesley Allan.
A-1773828, Griffo, Onorio Vittorio.
A-5175586, Guertin, Walter Emery.
T-1496439, Haire, Rebecca Joyce.
A-6929726, Han, Lew Fee.
V-1485716, Hansen, Berthilde Marie Yonne (nee Agostini).
A-3652255, Harabalja, Gaudenzio or Rade Hardich.
A-7039526, Haro, Eduvijes Cota.
0300-349142, Harris, Virginia McKinney De.
T-2760110, Han, Fook.
A-3508069, Hauser, Frank Fredrick or Frank Hauser or Franz Haeuser.
T-1497354, Helgesen, Brynjulf Havernaas or William H. Helgesen.
0300-404729, Hellem, Torger.
A-6099177T, Henning, Leonarda.
A-6429734, Hernaez, Faustina Estraela or Marceline Espanto Benitez.
T-2760847, Hideshima, Juro or Joe Yama.
T-2760836, Ho, Huynh Ngoc.
A-7050162, Hologkitas, Ioannis or John Gitas.
A-4047719T, Holt, John Chi-Chong.
T-2760287, Holthouser, Jane Albright.
V-1022653, Horvath, Ladislaus or Richard Dickson.
V-1022652, Oss, Kenneth or Kenneth Dickson.
E-2211, Houri, Ibrahim.
A-5270901, Hull, Diedrich.
A-7258718, Ignatjeff, Galina or Galina Ignatieff.
A-1191039, Ino Motosaburo.
A-5104058, Inoue, Jube or Satory Ota.
A-6348277, Jadulang, Luisa Baraoed or Fidela Fermin Bartolome.
A-3227332, Jakobson, Viktor A. or Viktor Alexander Jakobson.
A-7392146T, Jen, Loy Gim.
T-2760313, Jew, Steven Chin or Chin Ta Ben.
A-9649397, Johansen, Frank R.
A-5159713, Joung, Jack Hing.
A-7383816, Joyce, Isabella Monica.
T-1496871, Juarez, Benito.
T-2760173, Kawada, Shigeru or Hideo Yano.
A-4583491, Kerr, Jane Young Ritchie.
A-7549306, Kishi, Masao.
A-7828194, Koutroulis, Demetre.
A-7828195, Koutroulis, Anastase.
1200-46282, Kramer, Herta Johanna or Rita Kramer (nee Maurer).
A-5045459, Kremenic, John Nick.
A-6139100, Kudo, Juan Sukehiro.
0300-414309, Kui, Sit or Seid Kwee.
A-6142212T, Kuo, George Chi-chu or Chi-chu Kuo.
A-8189333, Kuo, Ta-Hsien or Lawrence T. H. Kuo.
A-7983477, LaDuc, Juliette Grace.
A-7612531, Lalla, Anna Liisa (nee Ravantti).
A-6919673, Laue, Herbert Otto.
T-2760830, Laurentis, Gelsomina B. De.
A-8106987, Lee, Gee Wing.
T-2760235, Leong, Foon Yau.
A-8082612, Liufau, Moana or Wightman.
T-2760254, Luna, Concepcion Arias.
A-8082613, Ma'Alona, Pifolau L.
A-5696059, MacGregor, Donald Gordon or Cecil George Gordon Ballantyne.
A-3505715, MacKinnon, Malcolm.
A-7743501, Magalee, John Emanuel.
V-120091, Magrisso, Liza Niego or Liza Niego.
T-2760848, Makota, Mita or Shinichi Misumi.
A-7967332, Malinconico, Carolina.
0300-185373, Mapp, Leslie.
A-4193314, Marrinhas, Ismael Da Silva.
E-910019, Martinez-Guzman, Antonio.
T-2760840, Maruyama, Tomio.
A-7427012, Marzekandof, Nina.
A-5760254, Matsudo, Yorisuke.
A-5635890, Matsudo, Toshiko (nee Tanaka).
A-4991483, McLaughlinn, Ana Adela (nee Harty).
T-1497349, Meglio, Salvatore Di or Joe Vitiello.
0300-419066, Meighan, Ernesto Concepcion or Tony Meighan.
A-5620677, Mendez, Maria Correa vda. de.
T-2072689, Mendez-Correa, Jesus.
T-2072690, Mendez-Correa, Carmen.
T-1892719, Mendoza, Evangelio Barreto.
A-3521394, Mendrinos, Theodore George.
0300-210670, Merro, Antonio.
A-534984[illegible] Mickelson, Edith Esther (nee Bjorklund) or Michols.
T-2760257, Milner, Leslie James.
A-4717731, Munoz-Tirado, Alfredo.
T-2760263, Murphy, Norah Marie.
A-6387327, Nadkarni, Moreshwar Vithal.
1600-102807, Nakamura, Denzi or Joe Ikoma Kamimura.
A-7526846, Narian, Suraj.
A-4764451, Nelson, Evangeline Melinda.
A-7197846, Nelson, George Edward.
A-5057432, Novickis, Julian Jahn.
A-4876701, Nusenow, Jennie.
A-6792383, Ogiagea, Eudachia (nee Eudachia Rotova).
T-2760371, Ono, Chiyoji.
A-7371642, Orsi, Michele.
A-3206690, Ortiz-Carlton, Miguel or Miguel Carlton Ortiz or Miguel Ortiz.
0300-385723, Osbourne, Lewis Vincent or Osbourne Leslie.
T-2760811, Otani, Kohei.
A-5087633, Pai, Shu Tang.
A-5383161, Paul, Frances (nee Lau Cheng Shee).
A-6458726, Perez-Juarez, Raul.
A-4186066, Perez-Perez, Roman or Roman Peres or Ramon Perez.
T-1497418, Prudente, Nemesio Encarnacion.
T-2760272, Quan, Suet Ying (nee Suet Ying Lu).
E-42710, Ramirez, Emerenciana or De Martines or vda. De Martines or Valenzuela or M del or Turrey.
A-6976563, Ramos-Quintana, Juan.
E-43850, Recio, Pedro Sergio.
A-1336338, Richardson, Helen Wai-Fong (nee Shim) or Helen Wai-Fong.
A-6286745, Roland, Rita (nee Series).
0300-412971, Romano, Vincenzo or Vincent Romano.

T-1496081, Russell, Diana Lynn.
T-1496082, Russell, Sherrann Margaret Yvonne.
T-1497345, Sakahura, Eiichi.
T-1497344, Sakahura, Kiyoko.
T-2760846, Sakamoto, Zenichi.
A-5742858, Salvo, William Pasita or Guillermo Salvo.
T-1408506, Samiano, Felicidad Palpallatoc.
A-6711959, Sanchez, Maria Magdalena Valdez de (nee Maria Magdalena Valdez-Machado).
A-6587969, Sanchez-Nieblas, Vicente.
V-529774, Santina, Romano Della.
T-1892479, Savident, Verna Marjorie.
A-2588651, Sazaglis, Emanuel or Emmanuel Sojacklis or Sajacklis.
A-6199563, Semolic, Iuo Anton.
A-7081057, Sgarlato, Santo.
A-6425290, Shing, Tung or Dong Shing.
0804-7408, Silva-Gonzalez, Fernando.
A-9765536, Smith, Henry George.
A-9620245, Soesman, Hendrik Conscience.
A-5834217, Soita, George.
T-2643827, Soria, Luz Tapia.
T-1497426, Stagner, Jr., Gordon Hall.
T-142450, Steinberg, Robert.
A-6215881, Stenlake, Dora or Dorothy Freudiger.
A-6277626, Stephenson, Samuel Bolivar.
A-3511890, St. Pierre, Pierre Henry.
A-5337683, Strom, Carl Erik or Soderstrom.
T-2760832, Sumi, Zenkuro.
A-7283608, Sung, William Z-Liang.
A-7283610, Sung, Jr., William Kyi-Teh.
T-2760824, Tagumi, Fusao.
T-2760828, Tagumi, Asako.
T-2760159, Tahara, Rokoichi.
A-8001015, Tai, Chien.
V-1344365, Tai, Fen Liu.
0300-292150, Tambolini, Alberto Cesar.
T-2695559, Tesar, Anna.
A-4996462, Therkelsen, Kristian Dahl.
T-2760251, Thomasser, Thomas C.
A-2084203, Toba, Kojira or Susumu Imai.
V-703982, Uribarri, Maria Dolores Guinzanos.
T-2760189, Vargas, Eduardo Austria.
V-904452, Venenciano, Ricardo Viloria.
0300-186842, Villano, Molly Amelia or Molly Amelia Vine.
A-6297293T, Villarama, Jr., Antonio or Tony Villarama, Jr.
A-9783200, Visakis, Antonios or Antonios Vysakis or Antonios Bezakis.
T-2760306, Vonk, Cornelis Nicolaas.
A-6706054, Wall, Sonia Sookhdeo.
T-2073616, Wein, Fern Myrtle or Myrtle Fern St. Clair or Colleen Davis, or Fern Myrtle Jones.
T-64728, Weitz, Rayah (nee Sheindel Ratta Halberstam) or Rayah Halberstam.
T-2760829, Wong, Fook.
A-2659747, Wong, Shee Lum or Gum Hook Wong.
T-2783706, Wong, Toy On or Wong Poo.
A-8258735, Yaps, Gustaf Henry or Gustav Jobs or Jobe.
A-6139101, Yocum, Leonor.
T-2760818, Young, Alfred Acham.
A-7391983, Young, Helen Foong or Fung Yu Feng.
T-2760202, Young, Leong Kam or Leong Lai Ying or Chan Sow Lon or Violet Chan.
A-7539109, Young, Pau Lien.
E-901039, Zepeda, Amado.
A-7397001, Zoppe, Giovanni Alberto or Alberto Zoppe or Alberto Giovanni Zoppe or Giovanni Zoppe.
A-8091938, Hing, Lai Dong.
T-2695128, Poe, Richard Robinson.
A-3269637, Ming, Li.
T-2760195, Miyoshi, Shibeharu.
A-7439475, Montajano-Fernandez, Salvador.
A-5022981, Monti, Dante or Dante Napoleon Monti or Dante Cardel or Dante Demonty or Ramiro.
A-2849042, Morales, Santiago or Santiago S. Morales.
T-2760314, Moshovis, Christos Antoniou.
A-7491006, Moy, Pook Ming.
T-2760373, Alfonso, Maria Anderson.
A-9765372, Ali, Mohammed.
0300-367231, Arzu, Simon.
A-9013403, Azzopardi, Emanuel or Joe Gott or Gatt.
A-7036796, Baillargeon, Joseph Denis Roland.
A-1258558, Barretta, Giuseppe or Joseph Barretta.
T-1956114, Bartolo, Biodia Pena De.
T-1956115, Bartolo-Pena, Aurora.
T-1956116, Bartolo-Pena, Rosa.
A-6507006, Berger, Jechiel Nobek.
A-6465424, Berger, Liezi (nee Balzmann).
E-40207, Binkowski, Sylvia Dorothea.
0300-329285, Birch, Aubrey Samuel or Aubrey Alexander Burke.
0501-15938, Brightly, Irma Miers formerly Irma Miers.
A-5260319, Buttery, Carnette Leofrida (nee Arthur).
A-3072127, Camino, Francisco Luis or Francisco Camino.
A-3455567, Caruso, Nunzio or Nunzio Charles Speciale.
0900-58197, Casillas-Vega, Jesus.
A-2754547, Cassola, Giovanni Angelo or Giovanni Cassola.
0804-6856, Castro, Maria Eufemia Merino De.
T-1892628, Chan, Albert or Chu Hing or Henry Chu.
A-7007271, Chao, Phoebe Shih or Phoebe Stone.
A-7755805, Chao, Wu-Wai or Wu Wei Chao.
T-604401, Chock, Anna or Anna Mooi or Mui Chiu-Yung.
A-7050979, Choy, Mock or Mei Tzai.
T-2760252, Cinquini, Paolino.
T-1496059, Constantouros, George or Giorgio Anthony.
E-28183, Crawford, James Peter or Janis Peteris Skujins.
A-5804994, Domes, Miriam Katherine formerly Scott (nee Runchey).
V-922600, Dorsey, Dorrit (nee Dorrit Pollak).
0300-421138, Erwin, Henry George.
V-304627, Eshabarr, Ada Ferraz.
T-2760343, Fernandez, Luis Piedade.
A-8031554, Filis, Theodore George.
A-5276083, Firth, John Joseph or John Joseph Collins.
A-8031277, Frett, Alice Hilda Maud.
A-7363088, Gianias, Stavroula.
A-7363089, Gianias, Giannoula.
A-8031279, Gramm, Dorothy Noreen or Dorothy Noreen Ray.
A-7244910, Grunberg, Herman or Herman Greenberg.
A-2063378T, Hai, Wong Koon or Wong Shee Tong.
0300-164506, Halberstam, Chaim David.
A-7279436, Handeland, Katherine (nee Geswein).
A-2498890, Hing, Won or Wang Hing Wong.
A-3204928, Hofer, Alexander Karl.
A-3204977, Hofer, Alma Thekla.
A-2994125, Hulungo, Alex.
A-8078869, Jensen, James Bonilla.
T-1496883, Jensen II, James.
T-1496884, Jensen, Lillian.
A-5948272, Jleel, Abdul Rayman.
A-2921239, Jorgensen, Finn Roar.
0300-248929, Karg, Wilhelm Charles or William Charles Karg.
T-79659, Kaufmann, Un Soon (nee Park).
A-8082614T, Kerisiano, Leauga (nee Leauga Manu).
A-7476963, Khan, Awal.
A-9765882, Kobin, John Herbert or John Herbert Kabin.
A-5216277, Kun, Li Ping or Ping Kun Li.
T-1510176, Li, Chow Tze-te or Tze-te Chow Li (nee Chow Tze-te) or Tze-te Chow or May Chow.
A-3511499, Kwai, Liu.
E-2213, Langford, Phillip Jack or Purdy Langford.
A-8155663, Lee, Chia-Ting Chu.
A-3762789, Loo, Yat Kow or Loo Kow.
T-2072606, Lopez-Dias, Carlos.
0300-390568, Louis, Wing Hay or Louis Hay or Louis Wing Hay.
A-1543049, Malarciuc, Nicolai or Nicholas Malarciuk.
A-7251836, Mancuso, Maria (nee Maria Mone).
T-2760837, Maoki, Victor Usaburo.
T-2760155, Maoki, Elena Hitomi.
A-6143979, Maoki, Blanca Sadako.
T-2760157, Maoki, Libia Hideko.
T-2760156, Maoki, Eloy Mitsuo.
T-2672867, Martinez-Gutierrez, Miguel or Luis Martinez, Luis Renteria.
0900/64474, Martinez-Martel, Rosendo.
A-1695687, McDonald, Berl Forbes.
A-6985957, Medina, Virginia Garcia.
A-6502622, Mendes, Manuel Pinto y.
A-2475765, Mileto, Joseph.
A-2118749, Mineshima, Ryotaro or Ryotaro Minejima.
A-1365586, Montero, Manuel Sebastiano or Manuel Montero.
A-8205467, Nappi, Theodore Victor or Teodor Viktor Kos.
A-7915500, Ngow, Kwok Chong.
A-7057299, Pangtay, Concepcion.
0804-5560, Quiroz-Molina, Antonio or Ciro Martinez.
A-9545289, Rial, Francisco Riviero.
A-6149341, Riera, Francisco or Francisco Florentino Rey Riera Y Saborit.
A-7736801, Roderick, Mary Louise Pilon (nee Ladouceur).
A-7736802, Pilon, Harvey Gerard.
T-1956093, Roque, Sylvia Virginia.
0300-419561, Rosanna, Victorio or Victor or Victor Rosonno.
T-1956173, Sanchez-Rodriguez, Eliezar.
T-666954, Sanz, Petra Pardo or Anastasia Pardo Sanz or Anastasia Petra Pardo Sanz or Petra Pardo or Petra Pardo-Sanz.
0606-48862, Sardinas, Jose Penalver y.
T-1892549, Schuon, Marie Gertrud (nee Solomon).
0300-311027, Seidel, Margit.
A-9561973, Shaw, Sau or Saw Ping or Sin Tsan Zou or Zau or Shu Soon Ping or Sha Soon Ping.
A-9692901, Silberberg, Eduard.
E-29695, Soto-Nevares, Luz.
E-29691, Corral-Soto, Efren.
E-29692, Corral-Soto, Ubaldina.
E-29690, Corral-Soto, Arsenio.
A-5211356, Spagnuolo, Carmella Esterine (nee Valentino).
A-5041975T, Symonds, Freda Annette.
T-1510119, Sysmala, John Oskari or Yuho Oskari Sysmalainen.
T-1495866, Takahashi, Kazuyuki.
A-4096539, Takahashi, Yoshinobu or Yoshiharu Ishihara.
0300-396137, Tavarez-Jimenez, Colombina Altagracia.
A-7048753, Taylor, Argie.
A-3623624, Thiara, Bhagat, Singh.
0707-8623, Thompson, Alexander Woodrow or Alexander Reid or Jerema Beckford or Alexander Woodrow Jones.
A-5187721, Thomson, Andrew.
E-40208, Troulinos, Theofrastos.
A-9836727, Tsavolakis, George.
0300-390737, Tung, Wah or Chung Wah or Jung Wa.
A-27080797, Tyau, Hok Hen Kong (nee Hok Hen Kong).
A-6963120, Vasopoli, Suk Hyun Lee.
E-067382, Vasquez, Bernardo.
T-2626429, Villalobos-Allala, Juan.
A-2440470, Villalobos, Virginia Maria Ontiveros de.
T-1495436, Voropaeff, Victor Paul.
A-7125229, Weiss, Charles or Carol Balan.
T-106482, West, Edda May.
A-8317018, Woolf, Faith Elizabeth (nee Holmes) formerly Young.
A-2947182, Yuen, Kun Choy or Kun Yuen or Yuen Choy.
A-5055232, Adamantopoulos, Theologos V. or Thomas Adams.
A-9776887, Anastassatos, Panaghis.
A-8082615T, Aunu'ua, Itagia.

A-7203341, Bailey, Charles or Phillip Bailey or Phillip Augustus.
A-3536358, Bailey, David.
A-3921778, Ballejo, Juan or Vallejo.
A-6594348, Bendetson, Aaron or Josef Mandel.
0300-234210, Bowen, Lucille (nee Skeete).
A-5730147, Branco, Jose Rodrigues.
0300-394057, Butzalis, Vasilios Theodore or Bill Butzalis.
A-4362095, Cacerea, Hector Edward.
T-2659522, Calascibetta, Francesco.
A-8082529, Capetorto, Giovanni.
A-6650117, Cardenas, Jose formerly Jose Carrillo-Pintor.
A-6650116, Cardenas, Baldomero formerly Baldomero Carrillo-Pintor.
A-3801216, Carlsen, Carl Georg or Karl Georg Karlsen.
A-7469274, Chen, Wen Tsao or W. T. Chen.
A-3390109, Chong, Louie or Chong Louie.
A-6857753, Campean, Ignacio.
0900/61071, Diaz, Carlos Hernandez.
A-4173528, Eng, Jack Gang or Gan Chack Eng.
T-2585527, Fat, Lee Lin or Fred Lee or Lin Fred Lee.
A-8091889, Fernandez, Francisco Avelino Fernandez.
A-4831029, Fililinich, Anthony or Antonio Finilinck.
A-6609410, Foo, Hall John or Hall San Foo or Som Tuk.
E-079904, Forn Olga Rafaela.
T-479520 Frazier, Adelaida Roque or Adelaida Patricia Roque y Santiesteban.
A-9732347, Frederiksen, Karl Frederik.
A-4813522, Garcia, Matias Ponga.
V-963698, Gounaris, Calirol Spiros (nee Kalogritis).
A-1180097, Hassan, Saedie Ben or Saedie Hassan or Eddie Hassan.
V-928113, Hellenbrand, Maria Josephine or Maria Josephine Costa.
A-5837188, Holmberg, Arthur.
A-9694541T, Janin, Gilbert.
A-4454386, Johansen, Hjalmar or Hyalmer Guimala Johansen.
A-7222307, Johnson, Maria Grazia or Mary Grazia Restaino (nee La Gala).
A-6097897, Kato, Carlos Magoichi.
A-6139156, Kato, Shizuko.
A-6097891, Kato, Kasumi.
A-6097892, Kato, Kazuo.
A-6075942, Keating, Claretta Sellens.
A-5343310, Koufos, John George, or John Koufor or Ioannis Koufos.
A-2061908, Lakomski, Stanislaus or Stanley Lakomski or John Gumbola or Gumbole.
A-8155662, Lee, Chuan-Hsiang or Leo Lee.
A-7984771, Leong, Him Bo or Yen Leong.
V-754264, Leung, Victoria Hui-Fen Wang or Victoria Wang Leung.
A-7273968, Lombardo, Antonietta (nee Lombardo).
A-8196111, Maderakis, Evaggelos.
A-4386901, Matias, Calikto or Ernesto Matias or Ernesto Ibanez.
A-1294200, McDevitt, Francis J.
0300-355823, McKinney, Alonzo.
A-7439988, McLean, Jonathan Alexander.
A-2955414, Medina-Cepeda, Roman.
A-2386280, Meinhardt, Hans.
T-1956166, Medez-Sainz, Martin.
0300-406129, Mun, Tin.
A-6324196, Nicolini, Violet Gladys (formerly White (nee Violet Gladys Peachey).
A-5684909, Niro, Domenic Angelo.
A-5341376, Ohle, Mathilde or Elfriede Ohle.
A-2044457, Okajima, Hisa Takei (nee Takei).
A-3447248, Osmundsen, Olaf Sverre.
A-4551379, Paric, Theodoro Bozidar or Natalio Pariz or Nat B. Paric.
V-949897, Perullo, Felicidad Hernandez Rodriguez.
A-1004650, Read, John Patrick.
T-1956176, Rodriguez-Navarro, Eustacio.
A-5353593, Robinson, George Hiram.
A-4273182, Ropero, Mariano Moreno.
A-6819105, Rothberger, Louis or Leiduch.
A-7930630, Safran, Tibor.
V-545024, Sagredo, Gloria B.
0300-408873, Sagredo, Eduardo David.
E-37678, Salinas-Martinez, Eulalio.
A-3938269, Sgambelluri, Carlo Antonio.
V-782635, Shelton, Maria Helena (nee Beckers).
A-7445710, Shoenut, Josephine Mary formerly Smith, Docherty, McLaughlin, Steel, Camerelleri, Schneider or Boyd or Mary McKinley, or Mrs. Earl Coforth (nee Busby).
A-4114054, Simich, Andrew or Andrija Simic.
T-2760220, Singh, Kartara.
A-4981269, Smith, Robert.
A-4941433, Soufarapis, Damianos Thomas.
T-1510249, St. Amand, Marie Anne (nee Poitras).
T-1510250, St. Amand, Edgar or Joseph Edgar Felix.
A-8304554, St. Amand, George or George Cyrille.
A-5270114, Stangeland, Johannes.
A-4471370, Straussman, Yetta (nee Yetta Pepper).
A-3007625, Stuker, Frank or Stucker or Franz Stuker.
A-4780071, Tavares, Antonio Marques.
A-7445938, Toro, Filiberto Ramon del.
A-5059603, Traversoni, Robert Luigi or Luigi Traverso or Alberto Traversone.
0300-325178, Tselentis, Spiros or Spiridon.
1600-101412, Valenzuela, Irma Leija de or Irma Leija Abzave de Valenzuela.
T-1956165, Vasquez-Avila, Cristobal.
A-7457841, Venegaz, Pedro Diaz.
A-5720296, Vernie, Mike.
A-4036455, Williams, Nathaniel Joseph Samuel.
0300/47675, Wilson, Clifford George or Roy George Wilson or Roy Edwards.
A-6624882, Wong, Sung-Yuen.
A-7183457, Yerganian, Elpis Serkos (nee Persou).
A-5719771, Yurko, Anton.
A-2995373, Sakamoto, Rinichi.
T-1499135, Ali, Ahmad Yusaf or Joe Alley, 1411-1484, Alvarado, Juana Gonzalez De.
A-4356461, Angelis, Soterios or Sam Harris.
0300-309207, Antonsen, Halvor.
E-49879, Avera, Eugenia Baladad or Eugenia Baladad.
A-7802989, Bluehdorn, Fritz Heinrich.
A-5682921, Boettcher, Rudolf Gustav or Rudolf Faust.
0300-289243, Burton, Annegret or Annegret Schaede.
0300-289243, Burton, Gustav Adolf or Gustav Adolf Schaede.
0300-289243, Burton, Walter or Walter Schaede.
A-5612163, Butt, Chan or Chin Butt or Ng Hiwg Dor or Hing Diw Ng.
A-3318221, Calogridis, Theodore Dimitrois.
A-1819770, Cambria, Guiseppe.
A-6526244, Campbell, Lucius Ezekiel or Samuel Campbell.
A-3838658, Cervantez, Ignacio Cota.
0300-311168, Chang, Sheila Liu.
E-16164, Chisholm, John.
A-4083719, Choy, Song or Henry Choy or Choy Song.
T-2760255, Clancy, Ida Espanita.
V-905981, Claridad, Angelita Roldan.
V-575941, Concha-Cardenas, Eduardo.
T-2760964, Cortez, Faustino Acevedo.
A-7439858, Cortez-Bedoy, Armando.
0300-407883, Cowan, Morris or Morris Kogan or Moses Cohen.
A-3647357, Cruz, Guadalupe Castillo de or Guadalupe Puebla.
0402/16370, Diaz-Martinez, Jose.
A-6143947, Dodohara, Jitsuo.
A-6143946, Dodohara, Takeno.
A-6143944, Dodohara, Takashi.
A-6143942, Dodohara, Masako.
A-6143945, Dodohara, Tamotsu.
A-6143943, Dodohara, Hiroshi.
E-1225, Downer, Frances Veronica.
A-7805860, Escuton, Aida Lumaque.
A-1809863, Esteves, Joaquim or Jack Stevens.
A-5635045, Fermin, Thomas Joseph or Farmer.
V-339153, Fernandez, Silvio Rafael Almonte or Silvio Almonte.
V-338548, Almonte, Argentina Agustina Peralta De or Argentina Almonte (nee Argentina Agustina Antonia Elena Peralta).
A-5229425, Finch, Arthur Stephen.
T-2760283, Fong, Raymond Poy or Fong Sheu Poy.
A-5190582, Fonoimoana, Toa Gimamao.
A-5190588T, Fonoimoana, Line.
T-2659451, Fortin, Jeannine Marie.
V-162922, Friedle, Galina Marie.
T-2760256, Fulton, Robert Harper.
A-6847783, Fung, Hsien-Shih Yu or Hsien-Shih Yu.
A-1005750, Galvin, Antonia.
A-5799421, Galvin, Lola.
C-6072869, Galvin, Vita.
A-5987747, Garcia, Herman.
T-2760374, Garcia-Jimenez, Carlos.
A-7379730, Garcia-Marquez, Jesus Federico.
A-6006015, Garcia-Sanchez, Francisco.
A-4353149, Gioiello, Vincenzo.
T-609205, Gim, Shirley Li-Ying.
V-922004, Goetz, Walter Andreas.
A-9771442, Goncharoff, Aleksei Nikicith.
A-2380158, Gonzalez-Marcas, Camilo.
E-49880, Guerrero, Manuela Bulosan or Carmen Guerrero Lista.
E-49881, Guerrero, Cierli.
A-7188731, Gutierrez, Antonia.
A-6183693, Gutierrez, Edgardo Calloway.
A-4151737, Haidasch, Eleonora.
A-5821768, Hale, Samuel.
A-5320765, Hansen, Niels Kristian.
A-2181452, Hardy, Charlotte Maud.
A-1478011, Harsi, Oscar Joseph.
0300-398054, Hasim, Abdul.
V-779880, Hing, Archibald Harvey Mah.
T-1956134, Jara, Ramon.
A-6139148, Kamisato, Junken.
A-6139152, Kamisato, Ushi (nee Nakado).
A-6139149, Kamisato, Chieko.
A-6139150, Kamisato, Motoko.
A-6139151, Kamisato, Yasuo.
A-4294896, Katsipis, Evangelos or Angelos Cipas.
V-418197, Kauf, Anastasy Ludwig.
A-9511658, Kew, Chow Ah or Ah Kew Chow.
A-2140784, Klatt, Richard Gottlieb.
A-6804013, Koh, Byung Choll or Byung Soo Koh.
V-904964, Kureen, Ezra Shummail.
V-890211, Kwan, Sung Tao.
A-6763903, Kwoh, Huan-Tsing or Teddy Huan-Tsing Kwoh or Theodore Huan-Tsing Kwoh.
0300-303317, Kwoh, Emily Tzu-Ying or Emily Lu Kwoh or Emily Huan-Tsing Kwoh (nee Emily Tzu-Ying Lu or Tzu-Ying Lu).
T-2760366, Lam, Mee Gim Louie.
T-2760414, Lam, Betty Fung Tan.
0300-361849, Lee, Cy Gum.
A-3711135, Lee, Shue or James Lee.
A-6795338, Lewis, Rufus Emlyn or Michael Sheridan Nolan or Eugene Lewis or Rufus A. Lewis, or Rufus Euguen Sheridan Lewis.
A-6682660, Li, Zen Zuh.
A-7594569, Jen, Li Fong Soon or Soong Jan Fong.
A-3921543, Licon-Carrasco, Ramon.
A-3098631, Licon, Rosenda Rodriguez De.
A-9029164, Ligias, George or Giorge.
A-7539780, Ling, Victoria Kuo-Fen, M. D. or Kuo-Fen Ling or Victoria Rosamond Ling.
A-7444615, Lipschutz, Naftali.
A-6033428, Liu, An-Hwa.
A-6703462, Liu, Ann Ling.
A-7078785, Lopez, Julio Campos.
E-053649, Lopez-Garcia, Aurelio.
E-053650, Olmos-Garcia, Julia.
A-9658696, Lorenzo, Manuel or Manuel Lorenzo Pena.
A-7031302, Louie, Nancy Ma.
A-2933110, Lubrano, Salvatore.
E-44761, Martinez-Rodriguez, Thomas.
E-44762, Martinez-Rodriguez, Efran.
E-15098, McClean, Marion Agatha.

A-7177875, Meeks, Reginald Victor.
T-1497353, Miau, Charles S. C. or Shau Chong Miau.
A-3423342, Miller, John Constantine.
A-8196566, Monserrate, Martha (nee Leon).
A-8065219, Montes-Gonzales, Agustin.
A-6385639, Montes-Gonzalez, Alfonso.
A-6877589, Montoya, Miguel.
E-064649, Mora-Anguiano, Juan.
A-7093002, Muinelo, Luis Antonio Ortiz y.
A-2674257, Nunez, Rosenda Parra de.
T-2760197, Ngiam, Hai or Giam Sim Hai.
A-2031943, Nye, Gladys Catherine or Catherine Goodwin Nye.
V-889494, Orloff, Ivan Y.
A-3599586, Panton, Leslie Alexander.
T-2760250, Paolitto, Francesco Antonio.
0300-387233, Pedone, Paolo or Pablo.
V-435793, Pierce, Maria de Jesus Romero de.
T-2760318, Piretta, Battista.
A-6255887, Quispel, Jan Dirk or John Quispel.
A-5607811, Radich, Anton.
A-2399682, Radovcic, Felicijo or Philip Radovcic or Felicilo Radovcic or Philip Radovich or Filip Radovcic.
A-2028988, Rau, Willi.
A-5296696, Rodrigues, Domingos.
0900/41539, Rodriquez, Jorge Sanchez.
A-7240348, Rojas, Rogelio.
A-7240349, Rojas, Jaime.
A-1151154, Rubio, Alberto.
A-5536719, Sahlberg Olga Emilia.
0300-239870, Samaras, Fanoula.
A-5738547, Sanders, Constance Sophie (nee Howell).
T-1499170, Sanen, John Joseph.
A-7739679, Sang, Leung Mun.
T-1495423, Santana, Helen Alvarez.
A-3870550, Scala, Eduardo.
A-5040491, Schmidt, Mary Ann or Maureen Schmidt.
V-169425, Sehkon, Balwant Kaur.
A-5600896, Selak, George.
E-49911, Shee, Tang Seto.
A-4408554, Shek, Too or Shek Too or Do Dick.
A-8190870, Sikoutris, Michael Pericles.
A-9634473, Silvestre, Julio P.
0502-6579, Simsuangco, Enriqueta Vera or Sims.
A-5602759, Smet, Frans De or Frank De Smet.
A-6171155, Spencer, George McDonald.
A-4648310, Sum, Yip.
A-5967444, Takamura, Kiichiro.
0300-270370, Tchang, Paul, Kiakong.
0300-304548, Tchang, Rose Sui-Hwa (nee Sun).
T-141777, Te'o, Vaioleti Senine Kipeni or Senine Kipeni Te'o or Vaioleti Senine.
A-9245354, Teodosio, Lucio Guardino.
A-7178754, Terashita, Takeshi or Takeshi Matsuno or Yoshikasu Nozari or Jerry Nozaki.
0900/59013, Trejo, Estevan Sandoval.
A-4809136, Trencher, Rose or Rose Grand or Rose Rand.
E-067383, Trillo-Rodriguez, Apolonio.
A-3875034, Tsuchiya, Yoshiyuki.
A-6964557, Unger, Harry.
A-4448158, Vasquez, Placida DeMara de.
A-2033999, Vastarelli, Antonio or Antonio Vastarelle or Antonio Vastarella or Antonio Concetto Vasterelle or Antonio V. Concetta.
A-7469183, Villasenor, Raymundo.
A-7469184, Villasenor, Antonio Espino.
T-1497306, Villasenor, Maria Teresa.
T-1956097, Wang, Chien-San.
A-4936295, Whitney, Chapman Swain.
A-3693664, Wing, Syd Shiu or Sydney Wing-Shiu Wing Sit.
A-6353566, Winn, Alicia Feria.
A-7975202, Wisdom, Leon Lloyd.
T-2760413, Wong, Ding Kow or Angie Wong.
0704-4684, Wong, Helen Ai-Len.
T-2760303, Yamaguchi, Sumi.
E-49883, Yap, Joseph Fook On.
A-9533092, Yee, Ah.
1200-37259, Yee, Wong How or Wong Hom Lee or Yee Nam Gim.
1209-10307, Sing, Yee Loy.
A-9764943, Younus, Sheik Mohammed or John or Johenie Younus or Mohn Younus.
E-1313, Yudgudis, Antanas or Yuodgudis or Juodgudis or Anthony Yuga.
T-1495362, Adachi, Katsuhiko.
T-2783971, Adamec, Anton.
A-9801454, Ahmed, Nazir Uddin.
T-2670509, Ajolo, Eufemia or Encarnacion delos Santos or Eufemia Torio or Encarnacion Dela Rosa (nee Eufemia Bongolan).
T-2670511, Ajolo, Jimmy Jesus or Jesus Torio.
T-2670508, Ajolo, Leatrice Socorro or Socorro Torio.
T-2670510, Ajolo, Virginia or Virginia Torio or Filipina Delos Santos.
A-2384775, Baboura, Theodoros Nicolaos or Teddy Babouras.
1600-100879, Baustian, Carol Mary (nee Fergus).
A-3949927, Blyden, Ina Eudgenia.
V-749701, Bortolini, Pietro.
A-1578365, Bruneau, Therese Beatrice (nee Sevigny).
1515/1271, Bryan, Ruth or Galon.
A-6228522, Camporeale, Anastasio or Anastasia Camporeale Di Gennaro (nee Degnaro).
A-6314501, Carmona, Dolores.
A-3746465, Carregal-Rey, Juan or Jose Carregal Rey.
A-7445878, Charles-Tello, Pedro.
A-7445885, Charles, Marta Dominguez De.
A-9691860, Chevat, Vincent or Chebat or Vincente Chebat or Vincente Nicholas Chebat.
A-5347260, Chianello, Michele.
A-3981732, Chun, Wei Foo or William Chun.
T-1807527, Ciota, Odoardo.
A-5807143, Coster, Conrad.
A-5207735, Crose, Anton or Anton Cross.
A-6223744, Davies, James.
E-2210, Delano, Nora Bertha Hortensia (nee Migliorati).
T-1965175, Drew, Anne Lillian.
A-6362604, Ergas, Ronald Jonathan.
A-3396218, Faber, Josefa (nee Josefa Hutton) or Sophie Faber or Sophie Koehler.
A-3269360, Fink, Nathan.
A-4139678, Firt, Ching or Fat Chong or Chaing Fat.
A-4652050T, Fonoimoana, Mataniu Api or Mataniu Api Tuia.
A-1593703, Franz, Kurt Erwin Otto.
A-5305997, Friedrich, Josefa (nee Riesnhuber) formerly Mentboer.
A-5370523, Gamero, James Pacheco or Santiago Pacheco.
A-5967239, Ganiko, Yaju or Uaju or Jorge Ganiko.
T-209484, Gomez, Francisco Andres or Francisco Gomes or Frank A. Gomez.
A-9798375, Gonzales, Jesus.
A-5327663, Gonzales, Rita Garcia (nee Pivaral Perez).
A-5597777, Gottschalk, Walter or Harry Gottschalk.
V-427436, Grace, Vilma Carlota.
A-6421287, Grinblat, Israel David.
V-126592, Hernandez, Herlinda Pena (nee Herlinda Pena-Garcia).
A-6097844, Honda, Fujie.
A-3078969, Jacobsen, Arthur Conrad or Arthur Jacobsen.
A-6427473, Jadulang, Cresencia Casel or Dolores Mangligot Labangcop.
A-4007834, Jan, Chin.
A-1012212, Johansen, Ejnar or Einer or Ejnai.
0707-9127, Karnavas, Nicolaos or Nick.
A-4491759T, Katz, Bertha.
A-9135882, Kiviroski, Eino.
A-7284985, Kohn, Josef.
A-6830546, Kotakis, Dimitriyos Anastas or Dimitrios A. Kotakis.
T-2760962, Levy, Remedios Cisneros.
0800-251666, Lombardi, Giovanna (nee Giovanna Nardone).
A-4550888, Lopez, Carmen or Carmen Gonzalez Lopez or Emilia Ida Boan.
A-2078340, Lorentzen, Sven Reidar or Sven Lorentzen.
A-4460992, Lum, Ming Yick or Ming Lum or Ming Y. Lum or Eddie Lum.
A-7445275, Lumbreras-Martinez, Miguel.
A-7445555, Lumbreras, Santos Araujo de.
A-7317594, Maiar, Pawlo.
0300-280376, Malek, Herman.
0300-280374, Malek, Ligalia (nee Ella Taub).
E-43839, Martinez, Macaria Lara De or Macaria Lara.
A-7445309, Martinez-Siaz, Federico.
0300-277019, Mathes, Shalom.
T-1807526, Medina-Maris, Bernardino or Epitacio B. Medina.
A-7858263, Minguez, Jose Santamaria.
V-353648, Molina, Pas Gonsalez De.
E-901100, Montalvo-Saldivar, Sigifredo.
E-901101, Montalvo, Celestina Gonzalez de.
E-059642, Andrade-Gonzalez, Jose Refugio.
A-3643693, Mosrie, Abbes Joseph Hamed or Abbes Joseph Hamed.
A-6153103, Naganuma, Iwaichi.
A-6153102, Naganuma, Isoka.
A-6153098, Naganuma, Kiyoka.
A-6153100, Naganuma, Kazumi.
A-6153096, Naganuma, Sumika.
A-6153095, Naganuma, Kazuchigue.
A-6153097, Naganuma, Kazaharu.
A-6153099, Naganuma, Kazumi Julia Cesar.
A-5967437, Nakagawa, Yoshio.
A-6096818, Nakagawa, Kazuo or Julio Caesar Kazuo Nakagawa.
A-6153160, Nakasone, Katsujiro.
A-6153159, Nakasone, Makato.
A-6153156, Nakasone, Mitsuko.
A-5977610, Oyakawa, Yoshitatsu.
A-6153194, Oyakawa, Yae or Yae Miyagi-Oyakawa.
V-644957, Pasdermadjian, Bedros.
A-4829891, Pasetorek, Stepan.
A-5674937, Pollock, Ann Boyce or Ann Pollock.
E-052544, Pozo-Olaez, Jose Manuel Bernardino Del.
A-2623497, Ramirez-Vega, Jose.
A-6943413, Reilly, Frances Lilian or Persighetti.
E-901031, Rodriguez-Chaves, Alfonso.
E-901032, Rodriguez, Maria Luisa Patino De.
A-4831956, Schaller, Ellen or Ellen Ljungdael (nee Scharf).
0300-294420, Shan, Dong Ah.
E-49909, Shee, Chu Mark.
A-5190552, Sophas, Merietha Antoinette or Merietha Lucinda Martin.
A-1667289T, Sullivan, Michael.
A-7295723, Sung-Kao, Chang Daniel or Su Yuen Chang.
A-3408081, Weber, Paul or Nikandr Z. Gaidukevich.
V-351314, Wei, Peter Hsieng Lien or Wei Hsing Lien.
V-369382, Wei, Pearl Y. C. Shu or Pearl Yu Chin Shu Wei.
0300-268430, Westley, Fiorella Nannini.
A-3944758, Yow, Chow Ling.
A-4398933, Zimmerman, Dorothy C. or Dorothy Giffen (nee King).
A-8317033, Abair, Lillian Gates.
T-1496079, Aguilar-Castillo, Jose Rodrigo.
T-2760375, Albright, Angeles.
T-2760228, Alderman, Edith Victoria.
0900/39366, Amescua, Joaquin Suarez or Adolph Vesselada Soris or Robert V. Soria.
A-5306991, Arnes, John.
A-6726982, Ascencio-Garcia, Salvador.
A-5116120, Backman, Sybil.
A-2121297, Baratto, Lydia or Lidia Olivia Baratto or Lydia Menconi.
T-2760267, Barcellone, Ferdinando.
0300-257969, Berndt, Carl Albert Werner.
V-469367, Bien, Charles Wan-Nien.
A-7439148, Bonetti, Gaspare.
0900-65092, Brenco, Guglielmo.
T-1496857, Broadfoot, George Turford.
T-1497380, Browne, Adrian Santa Maria.

A-7197527, Buranis, Polyxeni Dimitriu (nee Badaliarou).
A-5909674, Carstens, Heinrich Harry or Heinrich Harry Carstens Schreiner or Henry Carstens or Heinrich Carstens or Harry H. Schreiner.
0300-264869, Celli, Domenico.
T-1760404, Chang, Hou-Chun.
T-1760405, Chang, Lan-Chuen Chen.
A-9508683, Chang, Wah Tsai.
A-2520258, Chao, Ming Chung or Chao Ming or Ming Kee.
A-4995256, Chester, Arthur Percy or Pearcey Chester.
T-2671920, Chu, Ah Dong or Ah Tsu Dong.
T-2760321, Cleope, Francisco Villegas.
A-9833810, Coelho, Carlos Valentin.
T-1495426, Conde, Edward Marcelus.
T-1495427, Conde, Isabel Laura.
A-9579506, Contreras, Victor Nicasio.
T-1499175, Cortez, Alberto.
V-38991, Cricelli, Rose or Rose Forlano.
A-6361065T, Cruz, Alipio De La or Alipio Tacot.
A-9621936, Czaplak, Jozef Stanislaw or Joseph Stanley Czaplak.
V-304963, Ducay, Livinia Causin.
A-5455408, Duffin, Ella Marie.
0300-418529, Edwards, George.
0300-217040, Fanouriakis, Manthos.
A-4565335, Feldman, Minnie.
A-7596984, Ferrer, Pierre Benoit.
0707-7449, Filipschi, Lucian.
T-1496084, Fitch, May Gertrude.
E-49013, Flores, Angelina Martinez De.
23-109884, Flores-Hernandez, Andres or Andrew Flores.
A-7863939, Flynn, Rosemary Dale.
A-3743395, Fook, Ng.
T-938080, Gadiot, Hulda Ruth.
A-1727782, Gaspar, Joseph.
V-581720, George, Constantina Thomas or Constantina John Thomas or Constantina J. Thomas.
A-6728271, Gluckselig, Elfriede.
A-6038750, Graham, John Lionel.
A-4637839, Guilherme, Augusto.
V-905641, Hale, Anthony.
A-5712360, Hamberis, Ioannis Andreas or George Sarris.
A-7284226, Hartwell, Marie Augusta (nee Joseph).
A-6089779, Hayner, Beatrice Baylon or Beatrice Libre Baylon.
A-1430048, Hrycak, Nellie or Nancy or Chrycak or Nellie Struck or Krondat.
A-5964211, Jacobi, Manfred.
A-5678422, Jones, William John.
E-49903, Jong, Susan Kong Suet (nee Susan Kong Suet Taam).
0300-419718, Joy, Yip or Yip Joy Sen or Yip Yiu or Yew or Jose Yat.
V-1598512, Karm, Aino (nee Rannamees).
A-3600259, Katsatos, Christos Demetriou or Christophores D. Gachos.
A-3809343, Kaufman, Morris or Maurice Kaufman or Meiser Koffman.
A-5902096, Kramis, Salim.
A-3989023, Klock Eugene.
A-9765829, Kosticki, Walter Wladyslaw or Kostecki.
A-1151409, Latiff, Roslie or Roslie Lattif.
A-1151583, Lattanzi, Bertha or Bertha Vogel Lattanzi or Bertha Josephine Vogel or Bertha Josephine Engelberger.
A-7397636, Lauser, Demetria D.
A-9556548, Lee, Shu Fong or Chu Fou.
T-2760411, Leong, Lum or Lam Leung.
0300-6859, Lepp, Boris.
T-2760270, Leung, Yuk Chung.
T-2760963, Levy, Marcel Rene.
A-9701850, Limanis, Oscar Valdenar.
A-2793099T, Lindstrom, Gustav Herman.
0400-47422, Lipson, Rebecca.
A-7041422, Lorenz, John Clarence.
A-6063032, MacGavin, William Ramon.
A-6718350, Mamatos, Stella (nee Virirakis).
V-890076, Kwai, Choo Tung Yuk or Choo Quai Fong.
T-2672866, Man, Choo Chee.
A-9765402T, Manof, Abdul or Abdul Manaf or Abdul Monof.
A-7363576, Marshall, Genevieve Marie Ghislaine (nee Lebrun).
A-1810027, Martinovich, Miljenko or Mel Anton Martin.
A-8021376, Martins-Batista, Jose.
A-9545588, Mavraganis, Dimigrios John.
A-5028090, McBrien, Mary Joseph or Mary Joseph Devany or Catherine Devaney.
A-1251408, Meraz-Flores, Julio.
0400/46404, Miller, Byron George.
A-6153063, Miyahira, Setsuko.
A-6153064, Miyahira, Tetsuo.
A-6153061, Miyahira, Emiko.
A-6153062, Miyahira, Tadashige.
A-6153065, Miyahira, Tadanobu.
A-2166140, Mon, Tse Gin.
A-6420372T, Mou-Lai, Morley or Morley L. or Morley Lai Cho or Morley Cho.
A-6183755T, Chow, Nancy Chow or Yinya Chos Cho.
A-7427570, Mueller, Robert.
A-7583122, Naef, Elizabeth.
T-2760827, Nakano, Hiroto or James.
T-2760217, Nakashoji, Yaichi or Frank Nakashoji.
A-2100540, Ng, Yuk Lin.
A-5773780, Nipp, Frank Lung.
A-7129706, Ogata, Akiko.
A-6185233, Onaga, Yoshihiko.
A-6185234, Onaga, Yuki.
A-6185235, Onaga, Yoshinori.
0900/64265, Ordaz-Velasquez, Rafael.
A-8259845T, Owens-Orjas, Sergio Orlando or Lino Garcia or Orlando Owens.
A-8134559, Pascua, Teodora Lagasca Inovejas or Petra Padua Faraon.
E-050405, Pena, Justo L.
A-7945407, Petersen, Sven Edvard.
A-6708954, Picariello, Dora (nee Villani).
A-7371644, Plumeri, Rosina (nee Plumeri).
T-1497350, Poy, Chow Gum or Sam Poy Low.
A-5645701, Primis, Angeline Paul.
A-9633972, Radovic, Sime.
E-050431, Rarangol, Nicanora Borromeo or Nicanora B. De Guzman.
A-5647947, Montanez, Rosa Raya.
T-1497429, Raya-Cerda, Beatrice.
A-1479617, Raymond, Ross.
A-5953803, Reynaldo, Juanito Romo.
A-4049057, Rodriguez, Daphne Lherisson.
T-1496060, Rodriguez, Juan J.
E-49073, Rodriguez-Flores, Evarardo.
T-1499176, Rodriguez-Larra, Oscar.
A-3452771, Rosen, Issie.
A-3400715, Rosen, Celia (nee Izon) or Sylvia Elson or Anna Gross.
T-2760298, Ruiz, Jesus Gonzalez.
A-4658895, Sacco, Emilio.
A-2984012, Sam, Yuen Chen Shee Chun Ah.
A-4503538, Sassano, Vincenzo.
T-1495434, Seoane, Frank Rocha.
E-49913, Shee, Tai Ling or Yuen Kyau Ling.
A-8227444, Soong, Ts Liung or John Soong.
A-4386630, Soong, Maying (nee Hsi).
A-1211143, Tadano, Takeo or Frank Tadano.
A-5343419, Tamm, Benita Marie.
T-141894, Taulalii, Eneleata.
A-5214235, Taube, Ester Amalia formerly Markkanen (nee Rasanen).
A-4931821, Ting, Robert Ung-Mah.
V-371424, Tom, Share Gum or Kenneth Tom.
A-7445935, Toro, Francisco Ramon-del.
A-6211861, Torres, Fortuna Orta De or Fortuna Horta.
A-3780431, Tripodi, Rosario.
A-4089056, Turner, Robert Weir.
A-7457016, Valle, Piera Maria or Gorini.
E-33543, Valoria, Theresa Garcia.
T-1496093, Vasquez, Josefa M.
0400/39400, Veneziale, Antimo.
A-3084937, Vieyra-Cuellar, Manuel.
T-1497431, Watanabe, Hyakujiro.
A-2696512, Westphalen, Harry or Harry Weston.
A-0901246, Wing, Ah or Huang Hui Hsien or Wong Hui Hsien.
T-2760361, Wong, Joong Seu Chin.
A-6851479, Yang, Yuan-Hsi.
A-6851670, Yang, Stella Chih Hsin.
A-9700101, Yee, Wong.
T-2760965, Yoshida, Tatsuki.
E-49905, Young, Ngan Nung (nee Ngan Nung Lee).
A-3023901, Yue, Kwok John.
V-371425, Tom, Bee Hall.
0300-400109, Johansen, Eilif Mainert.
0500-42905, Pelaez, Eusebio.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 941) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

E-49889, Abrahano, Rhody Mangaser (nee Rhody Maglaya Mangaser).
A-2556502, Acker, Leon or Judah Leib Acker.
A-6427474T, Agatol, Vicenta Tabisola.
A-2035023, Amoignon, Alexis.
A-7983435, Aycart, Jose Guillermo Le Biano y aka Jose Franquiz.
T-2672942, Barrera-Hernandez, Pedro.
A-5395197, Beltran, Fulgencio alias Joe Baltran.
A-1531635, Berger, Emma alias Emma Giacomelli.
A-4353509, Best, Albert Augustus or Albert Best.
A-7357996, Braga, Maria Etelvina Silva.
A-4697469, Brown, Madge.
T-2760280, Bun, Hong.
V-1250373, Cadora, Nameh Yusuf.
A-6282873, Carpio, Teodoro Obispo.
A-7350909, Carugati, Eraldo.
A-7350910, Carugati, Minerva (nee Faini).
T-1892648, Carvallo, Eladio Aris alias Eladio Aris.
A-7849504, Casavecchia, Faliero.
A-7044481, Castaneda, Javier or Javier Castaneda-Simental.
A-7044036, Castaneda, Ramona Lopez de.
A-7350894, Castillo, Hortencia Agor.
A-3292453, Cavallaro, Oreste.
A-1673510, Chen, Louis alias Chen Yon alias Yun Choy.
T-2760305, Chang, Chung Kuei.
A-9103566, Chang, Tom alias Chang Tack.
T-2760268, Chin, Sang.
A-4587736, Chiu, Gin-Hsing alias Chiu Gin Hsing.
E-49884, Chong, Kwai Yuen.
A-7399966, Chow, Hilary Gath (nee Hilary Gath).
A-6531339, Christ, Aspasia or Aspacia Christ or Aspasia Roata.
0300-67259, Clark, Frank Wesley or Frank Clark.
A-9776939, Colli, Vittorio alias Vittorio Mario Carlo Colli.
V-172600, Costa, Angela Aurora or Angela Aurora di Oliveira.
99591/618, Costa-Pereira, Jose da.
A-4435468, Cueneo, Carolina (nee Temacnini).
A-7978966T, Cyarvides, Feliciano Rafael Soto y.

V-906057, Dowell, Milagros E.
A-5345903, Dromi, Rose Maria aka Rose Marie Silipo or Carmelina Davello.
A-3402603, Eichin, Fred Wilhelm.
A-5687748, Ellers, Oscar.
T-1367776, Elauria, Ernesto.
E-33540, Ellis, May Louise.
T-290200, Engbrecht, Henry.
V-1412443, Escobar, Gustavo Jose.
T-2760292, Escueta, Melvin Dangilon.
T-2760291, Escueta, Rosadia Dangilon.
T-2760261, Faraguna, Frank Leo.
A-5993552, Ferrari, Luis Antonio.
T-2760381, Fung, George.
0300-146405, Garcia, Felix Crespo Y or Jose Estrada.
T-2760274, Garcia, Juan Melendez.
A-5987724, Garcia, Julio Cesar.
A-5987649, Garcia, Angela Perdomo.
A-5987746, Garcia, Elvia Maria.
A-5987742, Garcia, Oscar Rolando.
A-5987744, Garcia, Lydilia Angela.
T-2760398, Ghibaud, Ferdinand.
V-1194829, Giacomo, Pepe Filipo Di.
2272-P-25220, Gjuricic, Milan or Milos Gjuricic or Gjurich or Mike Gurick alias Stephan Vukerich.
E-086874, Gong, William Wing Jung.
T-2760317, Grossenbacher, Rachel M.
A-6029512, Haanraadts, Jacobus Aukelinus Hendrikus or Jack Haanraadts.
T-2760175, Hata, Fukakichi.
A-4797435, Hecke, Joseph Louis Van.
T-1496068, Hernandez, Victor.
T-2760284, Hill, Cecil Thomas.
A-5964006, Hlus, Alexander or Klus or Kluss.
T-1496088, Hoh, George Lok-Kwong.
T-676677, Hom, Toy Kim Chin or Chin Toy Kim or Hom Toy Kim.
0300-424284, Housey, Isabell or Elizabeth Hunter.
A-3916245, How, Quang alias Quang, Willie.
E-33529, Hwa, Woo Chiang.
E-33528, Woo, Lily Lee.
E-49266, Ibarra-Garcia, Jose Trinidad.
E-49268, Delgadillo-Ibarra, Maria Jesus aka Maria Jesus Delgadillo de Ibarra.
E-49268, Ibarra-Delgadillo, Jose Refugio.
E-49269, Ibarra-Delgadillo, Rafael.
E-49270, Ibarra-Delgadillo, Maria Guadalupe.
A-7483636, Iorio, Giuseppe Di or Joe Di Iorio or Joseph Di Iorio.
T-2760376, Jarroni, Giovanni.
0300-291057, Johnson, Clara (nee Isidore).
0707-7767, Kadas, Ilona Rozalia (nee Papp).
T-2760229, Kan, Wai Lum.
A-4762794, Karamatzanis, Diamantis Nicholas alias Diamond N. Tzanis.
A-1302620, Kelly, Louise Renee nee Boistart alias Louise Boacy alias Louise Piermattei or Piermattes.
A-8190821, Kemble, William.
T-2760162, Kimura, Teiko.
A-5365304, Klingstrom, Sven Adolf.
A-5364316, Kosik, Joseph or Koshek, alias Joe Hoffman or Joe Singer.
E-061206, Kshivda, Antoni or Krzywda.
A-6311232, Kwan, Elise aka Meu-Tshung Kwan.
A-6173423, Kwan, Kwo-Chun aka Fred Kwan.
T-1496880, Lee, Yue Shuen.
A-2330928, Lecanda, Angel.
T-1506099, Leith, Anne J. (nee Kavanaugh).
T-1892045, Leung, George Git or Leung Sun Git.
A-4743447, Li, Wu Wei or Wu Li Wei.
A-6618327, Lilley, Marion Elvia formerly Marion Elvia Bron.
A-5886736, Lopez-Nunez, Antonio alias Manuel Ful.
A-7469723, Louie, Huana Wan Hsing.
T-2761994, Luca, Sebastiano De.
A-7350805, Madden, Barbara Evelyn or Barbara Evelyn McCauley (nee May).
A-6363939, Mantele, Aurora.
A-8025125, Marce, Arthur Alfred Joseph De.
T-2760265, Markoulakis, Evangelos Gregoriou.
0300-395196, Martinez-Morino, Jose Manuel or Manuel Vasquia, or Manuel Rodriguez, or Manuel Vasquas.
A-2589768, Meder, Eduard or Edward Meder.
A-4882730, Menegheili, Rudolph alias Rudolph Louis.
A-9115959, Michkovitch, Alexandre alias Aleksander Miskovic.
0300-352660, Miller, Avril Anne or Avril Morais Nunez.
A-1096835, Moeva, Massillie or Jack Moeva.
V-537852, Mojica, Carlota.
T-1892728, Monde, Anne Marie or Anne Marie Monde Delgado.
1519/331, Mora Concepcion Fierro De.
1519/332, Carrillo-Fierro, Luis.
0300-286669, Murray, John.
1501-18468, Musleh, Jiries Musleh or Misleh Mislen or George Misleh.
A-4480024, Naungayan, Perfecta Inigo.
A-1385073, Newman, Asmus Bernard or Asmus Newmann or Newman alias Charles B. Newman.
A-5437110, Olausson, Carl Maurits alias Carl Maurits Leonard Olausson.
A-9764604, Palma, Biruta Blumentals, formerly Palmashuk (nee Biruta Blumentals).
A-8117171, Patsaros, Georgeos.
T-2760308, Patten, Remedios Van.
A-2874053, Perez, Antonio Fernandez.
2078/006, Quai, Moy Dong alias Jimmy Moy or Dan Moy.
A-5030148, Rano, Alfonso or Alfonso Ranous or Ranois.
T-2672868, Rashed, Jimmy.
A-3527227, Rembeci, Nasi P. or Athanas P. Vassiliau, or Muharen Nuri.
A-4398706, Rodriguez, Leodegario or Manuel Fernandez.
A-6758242, Rotberg, Lucien Syman.
0900-60515, Sabala, Jesus Villagomez.
T-2760200, Saeonin, Jim.
A-5994386, Salamone, Antonino or Antonio Salamone or Anthony Salamone.
A-6341307, Salmon, Helen Louise (nee Burns).
A-6112565, Santana, Jose Munoz alias Jose Santana Munoz.
A-4354018, Schmidt, Margaret.
A-5310349, Schmidt, Mathias.
A-7669705, Seamon, Gabriella Hecko or Seaman.
A-4991814, Seidler, Herman Paul.
A-4760223, Shee, Wong or Wong See or Wong Hay Zou.
A-6650207, Sidat-Singh, Grace or Grace Bissessar.
A-2243051, Simonias, Miroslav.
T-1892453, Smith, Iva Calvina.
A-4933092, Spitzner, Hans Nicholas or Nicolaus Spitzner or Johann Spitzner or Hans Spitzner.
A-5677642, Steinberger, Joseph Frank.
0707-K-7565, Stricko, Joseph.
A-7180914, Strick, Andrew William.
A-3809056, Torres-Reyes, Castulo Calixto.
A-2737956, True, Raymond.
A-5619226, Urahama, Tokuji.
A-9548130T, Vasques, Julio Aneiros or Julio Aniros or Julio Anniros Vazquez.
T-2760259, Vecchiardo, Giuseppe or Joe Wechiardo.
A-1489618, Venetiou, Stamatios or Stamatif or Steve or Stamatis.
A-9520413, Verginakis, George or Georges Konstantinos Verginakis.
T-1495337, Villanueva, Montano.
A-4302985, Vlahopoulas, Spiros.
V-772159, Warner, Johanna Maria.
A-6508749, Weinman, Leib or Leib Samuel or Leiv Seiman or Louis Weinman.
A-6216464, Wolinska, Alicia.
A-7415212, Wong, May I-Tseng Liang.
E-4645, Wong, Yong or Wong Yong.
T-1495435, Yasuda, Sei.
A-6096833, Yoda, Masao.
A-6154842, Yoda, Masuko.
A-6444688, Young, Andrew Gock.
T-1864515, Acoba, Marcela Ballesteros or Sabina Sagario Agas.
V-1572652, Aguirre, Maria Trinidad (nee Maria Trinidad Arana y Arrien).
T-2760290, Aksel, Ferdi Abdurrahman.
A-3717046, Alli, John.
V-246194, Avanche, Cynthia Alfonso.
0900-45346, Balagot, Reuben Castillo.
0900-45347, Balagot, Lourdes Ramirez.
T-1496407, Bandon, Frederick or Ferdinand Pantin.
T-2760674, Banegas, Mary Socorro-de La Cruz de.
A-7476997, Benito, Purificacion Martin de or Purificacion Martin-Buted.
T-2760655, Bermudez, Antonio Gomez.
E-057378, Chan, Him or Harry Chan.
A-4873451, Chikourias, Constantinos or Gus Chikas.
0707-8538, Chin, Thomas or Chin Wing or Chin Ming Horn.
A-7445517, Colunga-Olmos, Agustin.
A-7445503, Colunga, Concepcion Ayala De.
1409-14928, Colunga-Ayala, Jose.
1409-14929, Colunga-Ayala, Carlos.
1409-14930, Colunga-Ayala, Tomas.
T-2760673, Cruz, Victoriana De La Torre De La.
A-4735334, Cumella, Calogera (nee Marotta or Pietra Napoli).
A-3632610, Chang, Willie S. or Sze Ah Chung.
A-8282069, Cunha, Joao Gomes Da.
0300-421329, Cutler, Toba or Tau ba Cotler or Esther Tobe Chazin.
A-6931316, Davila, Pedro.
T-2598701, Davila-Hernandez, Jesus.
E-059669, Delgado-Morales, Raymundo.
E-059670, Delgado-Escamilla, Benito.
A-7450951, Dzanetatos, Evangelos.
A-1756596, Erzen, Cevdet Ali or Joe Erzen.
A-7604153, Estrella, Maria Velasco.
A-3327384, Flores, Jesus Olmos de.
A-3327383, Flores-Flores, Luis.
A-3998928, Flores-Olmos, Ramon.
1600-102095, Flores-Olmos, Maria.
A-3957794, Fong, Yong.
A-7391994, Franco-Gonzalez, Jesus.
A-7049530, Garcia-Leon, Domingo or Domingo Leon-Garcia.
A-8017191, Garrison, Dorothy (nee Chase).
A-6774257, Ghandi Sorab Khushro.
A-3709183, Giglio, Nicolino.
T-1496783, Glenfield, Robert.
T-1495424, Gobbo, Ubaldo.
T-2760378, Goitia, Victoriano Abadia or Victor Abadia.
A-5417727, Gomez, Gerardo Valcarcel y or Gerardo Valcarcel.
E-085755, Greenspan, Mollie.
T-2760367, Gucho-Gonzalez, Guadalupe.
T-2760366, Gucho-Gonzalez, Mary Luch Nunez.
A-3560032, Gustavsen, Gustav Bertin.
V-304441, Hernandez, Jesus Barbaza.
E-33805, Hoy, Lee.
A-6033460, Hu, Sien-Tsin.
A-6033467, Hu, Kwan-Ting Chow.
A-8031586, Hua, Ming Young or Meng Young Hua.
0300-346875, Jack, Eng Foon or Foon Jack Eng or Jack Eng or Foon or Foon Jack.
A-7399354, Jiminez-Nunez, Margarita or Margarita Jimines de Ramos.
A-3687538, Kannengieser, Anna or Anna Daskovski.
A-6963271, Kaprielian, Mardiros or Marco Kaprielian.
T-1496057, Kutz, Emery.
A-9948102, Landeira, Alvaro Pereira Y.
A-9687378, Law, Yam or Law Yam.
A-4892545, Law, Tai or Lew Share Tai.
T-2760412, Look, Shee Chan or Chan Shee Look.
0900/59540, Lopez, Juanita Garcia.
T-1496848, Lopez-Becerra, Fidencio.
A-8256789, Lopez-Salazar, Melesio.
T-2760102, Lu, Sung Nien.
T-2760103, Lu, Yu Lan Chen.
A-9553451, Marinkovich, Anton.
A-6615646, Marquez, Carlos Ramos.
A-8151362, Ramos, Maria Antonia (nee Abraira).
A-8117703T, Martinez-Garcia, Jose Antioco or Jose Martinez-Garcia or Jose Garcia or Jose M. Garcia.

A-4070522, Masciana, Vincenzo.
T-2760286, Meeuwisse, Gerardus Antonius Maria.
A-2544775, Metz, Julius.
A-6588576, Micelli, Anna or Anna Montella.
A-5209113, Mirna, Walther Maria Heinrich or Theodore Victor Roelof-Lanner.
T-1496078, Moreno-Sandoval, Pedro.
A-5968747, Nivon, Carmen Yglesias De.
A-7966216, O'Young, William Hui.
A-6938242, Partida-Gama, Francisco.
E-14051, Patterson, Johanna Wilhelmina.
0300/418126, Powell, Calvin Emanuel or Calvin E. Powell or Calvin Powell or Donald Wendell Powell or Donald W. Powell or Donald Powell.
0804-7471, Ramirez-Rivero, Alfonso.
A-4441999, Ramos, Antonio Munoz.
A-4944359T, Reguerin-Rodrigues, Joaquim.
E-13051, Reina-Cisneros, Marcello Julio or Marcello J. Reina.
A-1789812, Riemer, Gyorgy or George Riemer.
A-6719005, Robertson, James.
A-6958054, Rosales-Silva, Inocencio.
A-6958052, Rosales, Rosa Maria.
E-48433, Rubio, Guadalupe Murillo De or Guadalupe Muro De Rubio.
A-7863925, Salazar-Gomez, Daniel or Daniel Gomez-Salazar, or Pedro Salazar-Gomez.
0900/58598, Sanchez-Colin, Salomon.
T-1496083, Sanchez-Sanchez, Antonio.
T-1496080, Sanchez, Maria Carmen.
A-3266238, Schack, Preben.
A-2346279, Schiller, Frederick Hugo or Frederick H. Schiller or Friedrich Schiller.
T-2760108, Scholobohm, Eunomia T.
A-7249633, Sciuchetti, Remo.
A-1810755, Shung, Chen Yuet or Yuet Shung Chen.
E-15772, Sing, Joe or Chu Mon.
A-4757517, Sponarich, Michele or Nick.
A-9767586, Sundby, Kaare Sorensen or Kaare Sunby.
A-1474604, Swaby, Cyril James.
T-2760117, Swee, Sia Kim or Ling Ah King.
A-6424398, Takacas, Ferencz, or Frank Adler.
A-6438873, Tambocon-Linato, Patria Santa Maria.
A-1129158, Thomas, James Reyene.
T-1496874, Tong, Chong Wo.
A-7394695, Ulloa-Garcia, Leandro, or Epifanio Pedroza-Gonzales.
T-2760689, Uriz, Martin.
E-2218, Walsh, Catherine Josephine, or Catherine Bushey.
A-2572352, Weber, Robert.
A-1663455, Webley, Kenneth T.
A-5968748, Yglesias, Alexandro Nivon.
E-13086, Yu, Lang Ping.
E-13087, Yu, Liu Youn Feng.
A-5968746, Zafra, Carmen Verdugo.
A-5910613, Mejia-Barrajas, Miguel.
T-2072795, Morales-Gonzalez, Nicolas.
A-7392035, Selvera-Gutierrez, Jose.
A-7390753, Selvera, Maria Zarate de.
A-6985699, Aguilar, Eloisa Barrera de, or Eloisa Barrera-Moya.
T-1496892, Aguiniga-Sanchez, Reynaldo.
T-2760383, Aguirre, Ignacio Morales.
A-6857727, Albury, George Washington.
T-2637183, Alva-Gonzalez, Elias.
A-2397499, Alvarez, Tomas Casimiro, or Thomas Alvarez.
V-666045, Arroyo, Roberto Ramos.
V-336632, Au, Fong Chau August.
T-2760385, Barragan-Silva, Salvador.
E-3034, Barrientos-Martinez, Celso, or Celso Barrientos.
A-7016195, Barriga, Maria Gloria.
T-1496878, Campos, Virginia May.
T-1510218, Candelaria, Severino Magdaleno Y Fernandez, or Severino Candelaria.
A-9691862, Canillas, Eduard Chebat.
A-4779242, Cataldo, Vincenzo.
E-3291, Chan, Chin, or Frank Chan or Frank Chin.
E-3935, Chang, Yi Ming, or Mrs. Chin Kiang Chang.
E-3937, Chang, Nai Shun.
E-3938, Chang, Nai Yong.
E-3936, Chang, Nai Chong.
E-3934, Chang, Nai Hung.
T-2753797, Chavez, Julia Aguilera de.
E-050401, Ching, Marjorie Rosetta (nee Marjorie Rosetta Sarsin or Marjorie Rosetta Lam).
E-901117, Cisneros-Garcia, Ramon.
E-901119, Cisneros-Sanchez, Jose Guadalupe.
A-6252159, Clark, Nelly Burgos (nee Nelly Xerez Burgos).
A-4338668, Cobos, Roman.
0100-24366, Cognein, Flaviano.
A-7054538, Collins, Paul H. or Lothar Friedrich Hermann Lapp or Lopp.
A-7899939, Constantinescu, Constantin.
A-6936474, Costa, Manuel Zeferino Braz Da.
A-4065731, Esquibel, Placido.
A-3818366, Fagundes, Manuel Vieria.
A-9553253, Feldmann, Teodors or Teodors Feldmanis or Theodore Feldmann.
A-7983352, Felipe, Marcolino or Felipe Marcolino or Marcolina Felipe.
A-4930838, Filz, Richard Henry.
A-6534319, Fischer, Herman.
A-6843554, Fischer, Zuzana Schonbaum (nee Zuzana Schonbaum).
A-5241973, Fook, Huie Wing or Huey Wing Fook or Hoy Wing Fook or Henry Huie or Hoy.
A-3470218, Fernandez, Antonio.
T-1497369, Galvan-Arrelano, Cirilo or Cirilo Arcazola.
A-7476578, Guerra, Sabina Mata De.
E-33633, Halimah, Mail.
A-5055188, Hazenberg, Lambertus.
A-5516554T, Hecht, John.
A-5534285, Hoffman, Sonia (nee Schenker).
A-7384342, Hsiao, Tsui Beh or Betty Shaw or Betty Hsiao or Betty Chow.
T-2761379, Inouye, Hisao.
A-7983038, Kartchner, Elfida Alicia Corn De.
A-7978331, Kartchner, Verdel.
A-3328901, Kee, Wong.
A-4257255, Keller, Peter.
A-3556986, Koehler, Helga Mary (nee Binder).
A-9770811, Korn, Jacob or Carl Behrends.
A-5226407, Krisberg, Dorothy (nee Doba Friedman).
A-7366498, Kun, Lam Tung or Dennis Lin.
0900-45155, Lu, Eleanor or Eleanor Lin.
A-3620691, Lamberti, Francesco or Frank Lambert.
V-737077T, Lawee, Alfred Khedouri or Alfred Lawee Khedouri.
A-2873670, Lee, Kong.
A-6711103, Liu, Frederick Fu.
E-47582, Long, Aurora Swanson or Maria Luisa Swanson or Carmen Swanson.
A-7021858, Lozano, Edward Paul.
T-2760319, Lucchesi, Alfredo.
A-4758083, Lyons, Dorothy Edith (nee McGregor or Dorothy Edith Pastor).
A-4514742, Mayer, Mathias Lajos or Mathias Layas Mayer.
E-10454, McGinley, Joseph.
A-9133870, Mihatov, Thomas John.
A-5659625, Moncayo, Domingo Pedro or Domingo Moncayo.
A-5956192, Moore, Seamon James.
T-2760101, Mora-Escalera, Heliodoro.
A-6063045, Moreno, Paz Benedicto or Maria Paz Magdalena Benedicto.
A-5569927, Morgenroth, Sigmund.
A-5569926, Morgenroth, Lucie Gast.
T-2672412, Muziotti, Jacques.
A-9693024, Ngo, Chu Chuan.
A-5109697, Nitschke, Reinhold Ferdinand.
A-6960467, Palma-Cardenas, Jesus.
T-2671995, Pastorino, Luigi Giuseppe.
A-5293697, Pierson, Earl James.
A-4654701, Pommer, Alfred Gustav.
T-2760646, Reasola-Olvera, Javier.
T-1496782, Reyna-Bernal, Juan.
T-325737, Rivas-Garza, Avelina.
A-4575430, Rivera, Maria Consuelo Verdugo de (nee Maria Consuelo Verdugo-Espinosa).
A-5644209, Rosier, Marie Josephine De.
A-2549028, Rothie, Eddie or Oddie Rothie.
A-4698921, Russo, Jennie nee Cervasi or Giovanna Russo or Giovanna Cervasi.
A-5731289, Sabit, Vahdi or Mehmet Vahdeddin Sabit.
A-2941373, Saenz, Adela Ronquillo De.
T-1495328, Saiz, Juan Francisco.
T-1495329, Saiz, Olivia Irene.
T-1495330, Saiz, Jr., Juan Francisco.
A-1332786, Sala, Ferdinando or James F. Sala.
T-1496847, Salinas, Luis Garcia.
A-7376144, Sapir, Albert Abraham.
T-1496793, Sekigahama, Satori.
T-2760221, Seminario, Joseph Ysaac.
A-9663441, Seng, Lei or Lai Sing or Li Sheng.
T-1497413, Sepulveda-Salmeron, Rafael.
T-1496061, Shinoda, Sadao Frank.
A-0949600, Shun, Chang Ting or Ting-Hsun Chang or Tennyson Po-Hsun Chang or Po-Hsun Chang.
A-7930304, Chang, Anna May Ing or Anna May Hsi-En Ing or Anna May Hsi-En Ing Chang.
A-7424125, Simoni, Bianca Boicioni.
A-9767674, Sing, Chang Pah or Chang Pan Sing.
A-3379226, Soalihy, Abdullah.
T-1495431, Solari, Giobatta Ricardo.
0300-195653, Sontanes, Ana or Ana Chana Teitelbaum.
A-4272067, Sorrentino, Umberto or Albert or Alberto.
T-2760225, Sosa-Angel, Francisco.
A-7558995, Sotelo, Enrique Mayorga.
T-2276306, Spitz, Leon or Chaim Arye Spitz.
V-1431643, Spitz, Ester (nee Feldman).
0900/21835, Stock, Gwendolyn Eunice.
A-5004073, Suedkamp, Amalie Johanna or Amalie Johanna Sudkamp.
A-6924551, Talmadge, William Naftaly.
A-1020603, Tjensvold, Jacob Jacobsen or Jacob Jacobsen.
A-3274143, Umana, Lorenzo.
A-6534657, Ure, William Patrick.
T-1496070, Valdovinos, Joyce Elson.
A-5919251, Valerio, Elidio Lopes.
A-2031512, Vasquez, Jose or Trent Vasquez or Jose Trent (Trinedad) Vasquez.
A-7385768, Vela, Juana Evangelina Vega De.
A-5461905, Velliares, George Constantin or George Costas Velliares.
A-4684901, Verdin-Flores, Eleno or Delano Verdin-Flores.
T-2760401, Versola, Teofilo.
A-2488739, Voelker, Clifford Austin.
A-6419238, White, Harry Owen.
T-1892213, Won, Ong or Ong Wong.
A-4236745, Wong, Phoei Kwai.
A-9635020, Wong, Tsang.
V-778294, Wu, Tche-Wei (nee Tche-Wei So).
T-1496870, Yau, Chow Ping.
T-2760376, Yoshida, Noburu.
0707-7872, Young, Flordeliza Pael or Flordeliza Pael.
0707-8033, Young, Ruben Pael or Ruben Pael.
T-1496882, Yuen, Yick Hee.
T-303126, Zebroff, Elizabeth.
A-9302618, Kok, Lum Man.
T-2626088, Acosta-Maqueda, Domingo.
A-5026968, Aguirre, Encarnacion Gonzalez de or Helen or Helene or Elena Sallaberry.
V-606184, Aspiras, Angeles.
T-2672010, Ballin-Ramirez, Magdelano.
A-1812036, Barriga, Antonia Maria Salcedo De.
0900/36364, Bauer, Joseph Carl.
A-7491055, Benes, Vaclav Edvard.
A-5960640, Blumenthal, Ernst.
V-371604, Bow, Jean Chu.
A-7398318, Castaneda, Catarino.
1600/101499, Chavez, Virginia Pacheco-Ruelas de or Virginia Carrillo or Virginia Guardado.
A-8189429, Chin, Wah.

A–6362932, Clushon, Shirley Lyssa or Shirley Lyssa Carini.
E–2225, Dicker, Taimi Alina (nee Haino or Fleming or Oinonen).
T–56019, Dominguez, Agripina Hinojosa (nee Agripina Hinojosa-Gonzalez).
T–2671919, Economou, John Antoniou.
A–6727080, Espino-Garcia, Miguel.
A–7383199, Fedje, Gerd Annie (nee Berger).
A–1337444, Fenkohl, Fred John or Frederich John Fenkohl or Fred Johni Fenkehl or Fred Fenkohn.
A–5829251, Fite, Evelyn Agnes.
0707–6200, Foldi, Peter Andras.
E–053399, Freulings, Klaus Dieter.
T–1495120, Garcia-Escobedo, Felix.
A–5694536, Garz, Albert Rudolph or Albert Garz.
T–1496064, Gonzalez-Gudino, Jesus.
A–3502635, Gustavino, Oscar or Oscar Levine.
A–3277469, Haakonsen, Fred or Frithjof.
A–6853231, Hansen, Alice M.
E–059817, Hernandez-Hernandez, Jesus.
1209–9475, Houske, Caroline Minnie.
A–2908481, Jaso-Macias, Higinio Ignacio.
A–6343643, Katsaros, Efstathios.
A–6343644, Katsaros, Penelopi.
T–1496811, Kobayashi, Tomeki.
A–7841254, Kuang-Hua, Ch'eng or Alfred Kuang-Hua Cheng.
A–9523843, Lee, Ling Ah.
E–36304, Li Heng Yu.
E–6211985, Loh, Yuan Chiu.
A–6624917, Loh, Huan Pao (nee Wang).
A–6052296, Lomeli-Aceves, Sebastian.
V–292481, Mahvi, Abolfath.
V–292480, Mahvi, Josette (nee You).
T–2760694, Marrufo, Antonio Gomez or Antonio Gomez Marouf.
A–5267458, Martinez, Casiano.
E–059775, Martinez-Garza, Pedro.
A–5821019, Mattison, Frances Ida (nee Gerard).
A–7096918, McNeal, Emma Antonius.
A–8259729T, Melville, Cecil Agustas.
T–2760026, Mendoza, Benjamin Garcia.
A–5755983, Mitchell, Gwendolyn Bell.
T–1497419, Mormoris, Andreas Panaciotis.
A–6440324, Moscoso, Luis Saul.
A–1943954, Muller, August.
T–302911, Murguia-Puga, Francisco.
T–302913, Murguia, Encarnagion Vargas de.
A–5011983, Nagi, Ali or Abdu Hashen.
A–6874302, Najat, Mahdokht Mahnaz.
A–6727081, Nava, Socorro or Socorro Nava de Espino.
T–2585055, Niemi, Kalervo.
A–3937040, On, Joe Cing or Joe Hee Yeun.
A–7967507, Pate, Antonia or Pati.
A–9831029, Pepe, Vincenzo.
A–2107665, Perkins, John Rowley.
V–1339606, Potasi, Palolo or Palolo Asi.
A–6726238, Ramos-Colio, Gerardo.
A–5380057, Ratia, Wanda Anna or Wantia Anna Schmidt or Wanda Anna Karaka or Wanda Anna Meredyk or Wanda Anna Carlson.
E–057695, Raygoza-Martinez, Tomas.
A–4798742, Renteria-Sotelo, Elena.
T–2626303, Reyes-Villanueva, Pedro.
A–7469329, Reyna-Pena, Marcos.
A–7463894, Reyna, Antonia Garcia De.
A–1475849, Rodrigues, Manuel.
A–5046332, Salo, Eino John or Ruurik Arthur Harold Westerlund.
T–1497358, Sanchez-Mercado, Genaro.
A–6736860, Santa-Maria, Susanna Garavillas.
A–7036697, Scott, Miriam Augusta.
A–9948110, Serrano, Matias Nunes.
E–36310, Strauss, Martha Kaposty.
A–6380955, Sztejn, Samuel or Samuel Stein.
T–2760113, Tafoya, Andrea Gomez.
T–1496202, Tornowski, Max Frans.
T–2760677, Torres-Gonzalez, Paulino.
T–1496786, Toung, Kouang Kuo.
T–1496791, Trujillo-Montenegro, David.
A–8036426, Tso, Lin or Frederick Lin Tso.
T–934704, Tso, Sou-Cheng (nee Hung).
A–5072326, Vallejo, Pedro or Pedro Vallejo Fernandez.
A–4840919, Vega-Vasquez, Antonio.
A–4840907, Vega, Guadalupe Romero De.
A–7995695, Velasquez, Antonio Montano.
A–5336765, Villarreal, Nicolas Rincon.
T–2760222, Wain, Montague Charles.
T–2760245, Wallace, Francis La Fontaine.
A–6990520, Williams, John Jona or John Jona.
E–36307, Wong, Kam Kong.
E–36308, Lowe, Kwok Wun or Mrs. K. K. Wong.
A–5977644, Yamasaki, Chika.
A–4299927, Yen, Sit Chan or Harry Sit.
A–7821371, Ying, Lee Wing or Ying Lee Wing.
A–4147666, You, Eng or Ng You or Johnny Eng.
A–3986175, You, Ho Kee or Wing You Ho.
A–7476091, Zepeda-Banda, Pedro.
E–36282, Acebo, Mary Alisangco.
T–2760114, Acevedo-Echavarri, George or Jorge Acevedo-Echavarri.
E–1301, Agcaoili, Mabel (nee Rios).
E–1302, Rios, Weber.
0800–86904, Aguirre, Maria de Jesus Zapata.
A–6849224, Aispuro, Candelario Lizarraga.
A–5935558, Akerfeldt, Einar Ferdinand or Edhansen.
A–8017244, Alcantara-Trejo, Juan.
E–33735, Alferos, Marina Sebastian.
A–6009506, Alvarez-Reyes, Andres.
V–455688, Antaran, Adoracion Manapat.
A–4829281, Arraes, Jose Maria.
T–1495113, Balderas-Rosas, Jesus.
A–6810120, Barbosa-Torrentera, Carlos.
T–1496–326, Becerra, Margareta Jiminez De.
A–7957137, Becerril, Adolfo Alquicira.
A–5571563, Berner, Julia.
A–3796299, Brown, Ruth Pearl.
E–062618, Bueno, Gonzalo Medellin.
A–3477889, Burchert, William Max.
E–056806, Bzoch, Vladka Jane.
T–1496076, Carrillo-Villagrama, Daniel.
A–7445515, Castillo-Gallegos, Ventura.
T–1020254, Castromayor, Praxedes V.
T–1495997, Cerillo-Martinez, Gilberto.
A–7927369, Cervantes, Abelardo.
A–5756556, Cheng, Andrew I. S.
A–4874588, Cheng, Anna G.
A–6283269, Ching, Goon Yin (nee Goon Yin Cheong).
T–2672418, Cornejo, Alfonso G. or Alfonso Cornejo-Garcia or Ezequiel Mora-Diaz.
0700–16009, Craig, Emelia Marie.
0700–3141, Daikopoios, Tomo Jean or Thomas Jean Daicos or John or Vane or Ivan Dacoff or Ioannis Daikopoios.
A–5494277, Dias, Andrea or Andrea Celestina Diaz De Leon Y Brunet.
T–1496340, Diaz-Robles, Pedro.
T–1496339, Diaz, Jovita Soto.
A–7379204, Dinelli, Marta Marchi.
A–5620232, Dong, You Geou.
A–3270436, Doria-Ramirez, Jose.
A–4672326, Dornow, Ester Susanna (nee Trogen).
V–887347, Duarte-Garcia, Julio or Julio Cesar Edmundo Duarte y Garcia or Julio Duarte or Julio Duarte Garcia.
E–33917, Duck, Woo Quong or Woo Don Lin.
A–5587373, Ellingson, Edward Sevrin.
T–2672522, Ellis, Mary Lydia.
A–5882561, Espinoza-Diaz, Arturo or Arturo Espinoza or Antonio Ramirez.
T–1496310, Espinoza-Rodriguez, Jesus.
0300–306950, Etzler, Manfred or Reilly.
V–941465, Fumel, Fred Fulvio.
A–7123705, Gomes, John Gerhart or Ernest Gerhart Haack.
E–059914, Gracia, Juan Almazan.
1409–10346, Guajardo-Gonzalez, Benito.
T–1496808, Gutierrez, Norma Tatton (nee Norma Tatton).
T–2760315, Hartley, Ruby Helena or Ruby Helena Berntsen.
A–2429309, Hattori, Denzo.
A–7278926, Hausgenoss, Wolfgong Karl.
A–5100619, Hayashino, Shigeaki.
T–2672094, Hernandez-Rodriguez, Antonio.
E–062409, Herrera-Castillo, Jose.
T–1495105, Howard, Eloena Edna.
A–3483573, Hradil, Joseph or Josef Hzadil or Joseph Hodel or Hardil.
T–1495108, Hurtado, Eloisa Romero.
A–5349888, Jenssen, Carl Fritz Julius.
A–6919679, Kakaroukas, Demetrios or James.
A–5110837, Katz, Sara.
A–9631655, Khai, Tan Soen or Tan Khai.
T–1807531, Klemme, Anne Mary (nee Barton or Anne Mary Barton Ranck).
A–9699008, Kong, Cheong.
V–905855, Konrad, Josephine Joan.
A–3631104, Korn, Rose or Rose Kornhauser.
V–1334722, Kosaka, Kimiko.
V–332868, Kuhn, Karin Elfriede or Karin Elfriede Ginnan.
T–2671996, Kwock, Mu Mee.
A–6363560, Latosa, Purita Zurbito.
A–4439617, Lee, Get Fang or Lee Get Fang.
T–2672302, Luna-Vallon, Everardo.
T–1496798, Mah, Wai Lock.
T–2760201, Mar, Teresa Fong or Teresa Fong Chen or Chen Wei Fong.
T–2760649, Martinez-Vedusco, Alfonso.
T–1892394, Mat, Osman Bin.
T–2671891, Mata, Refugio Ruiz De.
T–2626256, Mendez, Roman Cruz.
0802–4671, Mendoza, Patricio Puenta.
A–1674785, Moreno, Esperanza Hernandez De.
E–082167, Nava, Jose Luis.
A–6671895, Nichols, Barbara Jane (nee Jones).
E–36315, Nobriga, Martha Faustina.
V–1257477, Noe Giuseppe Ambrosio.
T–2672030, Pacheco-Lopez, Andreas.
0300–366975, Pappas, George.
A–5670288, Payne, Lasarus.
A–3902995, Pena, Trinidad De La.
A–9577245, Penasales, Tomas Pabale.
E–062542, Perales-Guzman, Andres.
A–4561301, Piccolo, Vincenzo.
T–2760563, Rahim, Abdul or Abdul Maneer.
A–6904862, Ramirez-Hernandez, Pedro.
T–2672368, Rangel-Contreras, Pedro.
A–4189061, Rivera-Hernandez, Vicente.
A–4193438, Rivera, Dolores Vega De.
A–5969080, Robles-Reyes, Manuel.
E–084920, Rosin, Simon.
A–3177562, Rottman, Herman Ludwig or Konrad Koch.
A–7280096, Rumola, Carmela Vicenza.
T–2672069, Salgado-Larios, Alfonso.
A–5673286, Sampson, Samuel James.
A–1096870, Sanchez, Marta Cervantez De.
A–7890539, Santiago, Jose Refugio Munoz-De.
A–3783896, Schachtschneider, Carl.
A–4201416, Singh, Luz Morales De.
A–5612692, Sprude, John or Johan or Jan.
A–4147514, Tai, Lai.
T–1496885, Talantianos, Costas or Costas Tallas or Talas.
A–5582946, Taylor, Leon Jarvis or Leon Taylor.
A–3495192, Tongate, Josephine Catherine nee Cayenne.
A–7457019, Toy, Leung or Leong Toy or Leong Yen Hor.
A–2637370, Valencia-Doneos, Abelino.
T–1496322, Vaquero-Velasco, Alfredo.
T–1496323, Vaquero, Rosa Zavala de.
T–1496324, Vaquero-Zavala, Rosa.
T–2672056, Verduga-Mesa, Jorge.
0300–349602, Wainwright, Aston Percival.
0800/71173, Yamuni-Abdala, Juan Miguel.
A–3808101, Zavitsanos, Nicholas or Nick Zaveson.
E–42667, Almaraz-Mesa, Jesus.
E–48415, Amarillas, Maria Luisa Gallego de or Maria Luisa Gallego De Mara.
A–9654161T, Ascencao, Manuel.
A–5965863, Barragan, Felipa or Sister Mary Emmanuel.
A–4132980, Bauseler, Elizabeth (nee Elliott).
A–6769945, Bradford, Anna Maria Pasquino (nee Pasquino).
A–2574366, Braut, Antica Zgombic.

E-086472, Burgos, Elizabeth Lena or Isabel Alena Burgos.
0300/364107, Castro-Villasenor, Roberto or Robert Castro-Billasenor.
E-1351, Chang, Nai Zing Mimi.
A-6702143, Chen, Hung or Leslie H. Chen.
A-6534347, Chen, Ya-Sun or Pauline Chen.
E-093504, Chong, Cheung Lee or Lee Chong Fong.
A-9801065, Chin, Tim or Chin Yee Gim.
T-2672046, Cruz-Ortiz, Jose.
A-1101063, Dallah, Abrahim.
A-6955163T, Dandie, Castley Roy.
A-6307810T, Dandie, Rosalind Iona.
A-9678723, Dias, Jose Goncalves.
A-5818826, Dietrich, Otto Henry or Henry Dilton.
A-4066738, Dominguez, Antonio Joaquin or Esteves.
A-1282918, Duharte, Pedro Salo.
A-4949778, Duran-Roura, Juan.
A-5643359, Elliott, Frederick Ernest.
A-3195328, Fan, Fong You or Wong You or Fong Lee or Fong Chun.
A-4799954, Flynn, James Patrick.
A-5700183, Foo, Joe or Fok Joe.
A-4210540, Fung, Fung Haan.
A-5036098, Gallardo, Benjamin Mosqueda.
A-5050854, Gariffo, Carlo.
0300-387757, Geong, Leong or Geong Leung or Yick Cheung Leong.
T-2753737, Gomez, Cipriano.
A-6472070, Gonzales, Andrea (nee Andrea Rosalia Torres Rojas).
T-1496308, Gonzalez-Sanchez, Jose.
A-5990216, Gutierrez, Miguel Hermida.
A-5927017, Hamano, Yasuke.
A-7480701, Har, Mui Fung.
A-5967229, Harada, Banroku.
A-7371868, Hatzinger, Otto.
T-2760130, Henry, Elizabeth Shober.
T-2760107, Henry, Lawrence Edwin.
T-2760106, Henry, Alexander James.
T-2671979, Hernandez-Nunez, Phyllis.
T-2671981, Gonzalez, John Vincent.
A-5981989, Higa, Renyu.
A-3549971, Huang, Kechin.
A-3549947, Huang, Tchunki.
A-7019076, Huang, Therese.
A-7019080, Haung, Luc.
A-5280713, Ifil, Lionel Aldwyn or Lionel Foster.
A-2230259, Isobe, Frank Shichinosuke.
A-6616503, Iwamoto, Shizuko Suematsu.
A-6616502, Sakai, Teruko Suematsu.
A-6616501, Suematsu, Masayoshi.
E-42665, Jurado, Magdalena Luna De.
A-9655393, Keung, Kwok Chi or Chi Keung Kwok.
A-6153101, Kikuchi, Shizuka (nee Naganuma).
A-5972343, Komant, Edmund Alfred or Edmund or Edward or Eddy Komant.
0300-403994, Lashley, Charles Ellerton Adolphus or Charles E. A. Lashley.
E-082549, Lee, Sing Fook or Lee Sing Fook.
A-7850810, Mabalon, Gloria Villalva.
A-4632750, Manlapig, Pantaleon Cantanghal.
E-33548, Mark, Kim-Chuan Chen (nee Kim Chuan Chen Ow Yang).
A-7350031, Martinez, Enrique or Enrique Martinez-Enriquez or Enrique Sanchez-Martinez.
E-42653, Martinez, Maria Magdalena Hinostroza De.
A-4667587, Missick, Peblito Alois.
A-5977631, Miyashiro, Kamacho.
A-3600843, Monges, Josephine Castro.
A-5967513, Nakamatsu, Yako.
A-6153129, Nakamatsu, Kameyo.
A-6153130, Nakamatsu, Tokusei.
A-6153131, Nakamatsu, Sueko.
A-6153132, Nakamatsu, Seiko.
A-6153133, Nakamatsu, Seisun.
A-6153134, Nakamatsu, Masayoshi.
A-6153135, Nakamatsu, Shizuo.
A-5237849, Nakamura, Moichiro.
A-4676122, Nakamura, Oko.
A-3743498, Niemann, Jurgen August.
A-3168467, Nieto, Francisco or Francisco Oyarzum or Francisco Nieto Oyarzun or Oyarzun Nieto.
A-5982000, Nishioka, Shigeyoki.
T-1496888, O, Manuel De La.
0707-8766, Olson, Luz Talana.
A-6947388, Ontiveros-Zepeda, Geronimo.
A-7240667, Ontiveros, Julia Esquibel Di (nee Julia Esquibel-Castillo).
A-6608257, Perez-Perez, Francisco Jose Guillermo Ramon.
A-1999412, Pestel, Hans Rolf.
A-5170876, Reinhardt, Ernst Hans or Ernst Reinhardt or Ernst H. Reinhart.
E-7127, Rissardi, Giuseppi.
T-1495134, Rodriguez-Arrieta, Enrique.
0300-193463, Roig, Aida (nee Marti).
0300-200153, Roig, Ricardo or Ricardo Roig Escobar.
A-616742, Saleyman, Safa Mediha.
A-4155880, Santana-Venegas, Jesus or Jesus Venegas Santana or Jesse Santana.
T-1496054, Santillanes, Luis.
T-1496013, Santillanes, Manuela Nava.
E-086915, Sarin, Edward or Eduard Zarin.
A-5977600, Sato, Yasujiro.
V-905034, Saure, Emanuel Jose Raul.
A-6180801, Scheidegger, Macaira Limboy.
A-2531771, Schwartzman, Anna (nee Hirshman or Dukoff or Duhovnaia).
A-3451850, Semmler, Max or Maximilian Semmler.
A-6161498, Shiga, Yoshisada.
A-6161497, Shiga, Masako Takahashi.
0300-69640, Staack, Heinz or Wilhelm Heinz Staack.
A-8150977, Stanogias, Pete Vello or Pete Vello.
A-4955859T, Suleyman, Jemal or Jemal Suleejman or Jim Sam.
A-1599443, Sullivan, Selvin.
A-7744615, Sze, Denise Pei Yu Wei or Denise Yu Wei Pei Sze, or Dora Pei Yu Wei or Denise Ya-Wei Pei or Denise or Dora Yu Wei Pei or Dora Pei Yu-Wei Sze or Yu Wei Pei or Dora Pei Yu-wei.
A-5950757, Takata, Keichi.
A-5977659, Tako, Kokichi.
T-1495099, Talini, Luigi Alfredo.
A-5977656, Taura, Shizuo.
V-812915, Tomasowa, Helena Rosanne.
T-1496876, Uotila, John Waino.
A-9736769, Vintem, Francisco Rodriguez.
0300/389550, Wei, Young Min or Min Wei Young or Wei Yung.
T-1892129, Woods, Hamilton Patrick.
A-8259428, Wright, Robert Theophilous.
A-6062881T, Yang, Fu Hsine.
A-6095306, Yang, Kia Jing Shen.
A-3621532, Yet, Su or Yet Su.
A-9744863, Yip, Koom Man or Yip Man Koom.
A-5977640, Yogi, Jitsusei.
A-5905002, Yook, Lee or Lee Hong or Lee Yook Kew or Li Hung.
0300/397731, Yuen, Chun.
A-9948032, Palombella, Onofrio.

SPECIAL EMPLOYEES FOR SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 212), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms is hereby authorized to appoint four special employees to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the basic rate of $1,000 each per annum until otherwise ordered by the Senate.

EXTENSION OF APPOINTMENT OF ACTING SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I present a communication from the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, extending the period of service of the Special Deputy Sergeant at Arms who was appointed on January 2, 1954, to serve until February 15, 1954.

This action is deemed necessary in case any legal question should arise as to the authority of the Acting Sergeant at Arms in connection with obtaining a quorum, or in connection with other duties of that office.

The communication was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1954.

In accordance with authority conferred on me by Senate resolution agreed to December 17, 1889 (Senate Journal 47, 51-1, December 17, 1889), I hereby extend the appointment made on January 2, 1954, of C. A. Bottolfsen as Special Deputy Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate for the period from February 15, 1954, to March 15, 1954, to perform in my absence any and all duties required of or devolving upon the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate by law or by the rules or orders of the Senate.

FOREST A. HARNESS,
Sergeant at Arms, United States Senate.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REPUBLICAN ORATORICAL ATTACKS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me relating to a report of President Eisenhower's press conference last week in connection with attacks by Republican speakers on members of the Democratic party.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

I have read with interest the report of President Eisenhower's press conference last week. He was asked a number of pointed questions about the recent rash of oratory which broke out in such virulence at dinners held throughout the country in honor of the man whose life was a monument to "malice toward none and charity for all." The Republican faithful, apparently, were served up a dainty dish of venom along with their filet mignon. The President told reporters, in effect, that while he might counsel his "official family" and the chairman of the Republican National Committee to refrain from intemperate charges, he knew of no way to shut off all partisan attacks.

I think the President is right, especially when it comes to the willingness of members of his party in the Congress to take his advice. We in the Congress take pride in our independence, and it is highly unlikely that some of our Republican friends would meekly submit to any orders from their Commander in Chief—which he obviously is not inclined to give—to restrain themselves. Indeed, members of his party have made it quite clear that they intend to continue in the same pattern—that they intend to scourge us Democrats over the length and breadth of the land as a party of thieves and traitors and villains.

Despite the President's mild words, this is so patently a deliberate and organized attack that, much as he might like to, he cannot stand completely aloof from the mudslinging. He is the head of the Republican Party.

I would not presume to tell my Republican friends how they should conduct their affairs, although it takes no great powers of perception to realize that this kind of nonsense is scarcely in the national interest and certainly is not calculated to win the fealty and cooperation of the minority party in support of the President's program.

These political amenities do not disturb me. They are part and parcel of the free give and take with which each party pays its respects to the other. If some Republicans seem to have lost their sense of proportion, that is their problem. But I am surprised that we Democrats should have so lost our sense of humor as to allow ourselves to be upset by these rantings. I am amazed that we should even consider running to the President for help. And I am a little ashamed that we should whine and beg him to call off his boys. What kind of silliness is this? Are not we capable of standing on our own feet? Are not the principles and ideals of our militant party invulnerable against name-calling and political invective? Or are we a party of so little faith that we must strike our colors and cry for quarter?

I have serious doubts that intemperate attacks by some Republicans are the better part of political wisdom in their own interest. Excesses of any kind are repugnant to the American people and I do not believe that shoddy demagoguery will win friends or converts for the Republican cause. In my judgment, the more shabby the trick, the more blatant the lie, the more irresponsible the charge, the more it will help us Democrats. I think the American people are likely to start asking some disconcerting questions about what the Republicans have done for the country during the 13 months they have been in power, and they may even pry into the embarrassing vacuum which these diversionary attacks try to camouflage.

None of us is really so foolish as to believe that the President's program will stand or fall on the basis of whether we Democrats are treated with kid-glove diplomacy or are on the receiving end of slings and arrows of slander, defamation, and name calling. The program will stand or fall on its merits. I, for one, repudiate any notion that my votes are going to be affected by what some Lincoln Day orators may say about me or my party. Speaking for myself, I may say that I have no intention of abandoning my support of the President's position on the Bricker amendment. I hope only, as I have said before, that he will not desert us.

It is no secret that some of the members of his own party do not like the President's program and they particularly would like to block those portions of it which they suspect are carrying on those dreadful Democratic policies. I wonder if some of this abuse and vilification may not be directed against us Democrats in the deliberate hope of pushing us into opposing any and all of the President's proposals. If so, they are going to be disappointed. I know I speak for many Democrats when I say that we are going to support the President whenever we think he is right, and we have no intention of letting these attacks affect our judgment or our desire to cooperate for the good of the country. Whether he will be able to secure the same measure of support from his own party in the Congress is a matter on which there seems to be considerable doubt.

In the final analysis, I am completely willing to place my trust in the wisdom and good judgment of the American people. I think they are perfectly capable of distinguishing between truth and political claptrap. They are even likely to remember the shrewd words of a wise man who observed: "Where there is smoke there isn't always fire. Sometimes there's just a smoke machine."

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, an editorial appearing in today's issue of the Washington Post calls for rejection by the Senate of the various constitutional amendments which have been offered as substitutes for the Bricker amendment. The editorial calls for a change in the Senate rules, so as to provide for a yea-and-nay vote on all treaties. This is the proposed change I called for last year, as provided in Senate Resolution 145. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "HARMLESS SUBSTITUTES"

As debate is resumed on the Bricker amendment today, it is clearly apparent that no satisfactory curb on the treatymaking power has been devised. The hope that some constitutional amendment could be worked out to quiet the fears that Senator BRICKER and his supporters have aroused, without enveloping the treaty power in new confusion or disturbing the balance of power between the President and Congress, has proved to be an illusion. To be sure, the various substitutes offered have served the purpose of routing the original Bricker amendment, and that is no mean achievement. But every one of them leads onto spongy ground. We agree with Senator KEFAUVER in saying that the so-called harmless substitutes should go the way of Mr. BRICKER's original nostrum.

There is, of course, one useful change the Senate could make. Several persons have written to remind us that in 1952 3 treaties slipped through the Senate with only 2 Senators present and only 1 of those voting. Even though the treaties in question were noncontroversial and had the approval of the Foreign Relations Committee, the effect was to make a farce of senatorial advice and consent. Certainly no treaty should be approved without a rollcall to establish that a majority of the Senate is present.

This reform can be brought about, however, without a constitutional amendment. All that is needed is a change in the Senate rules. Indeed, Majority Leader KNOWLAND has already indicated that he will demand a rollcall vote on treaties coming before the Senate while he remains in his present position. We think this policy should be written positively into the Senate rules, but it is not necessary to put such details into the Constitution.

Another suggested change in the Senate rules would require that body to label each treaty approved as self-executing or nonself-executing. But the Senate already has power to do this. We can see no reason to give that power special emphasis in a rule. Usually there is good reason why a treaty should become law upon approval by the Senate or should be implemented by an act of the entire Congress, and the method to be followed should be made evident by the text itself. So long as the Senate can require supplemental legislation, there seems to be no point in inviting it to complicate the treatymaking process.

If the Senate wishes to do more than require a roll call on treaties, it can, as Senator KEFAUVER and 11 of his colleagues have suggested, pass a joint resolution that would restate, "as the sense of the Congress," the superiority of the Constitution over all laws, treaties, and executive agreements. The resolution offered by this group would also reaffirm the power of the courts to upset treaties in conflict with the Constitution and the power of Congress to nullify the domestic effects of any offensive treaty or executive agreement.

This resolution affords Senators an opportunity to go on record against the imaginary perils that Senator BRICKER has conjured up, without cluttering the Constitution with excess verbiage. In our view, the Senate should turn at once to this modest task, leaving the harmless substitutes in the same pile of relics to which the original Bricker amendment has been consigned.

THE NEW LOOK IN CONNECTION WITH THE MILITARY BUDGET SHOULD BE A TWO-WAY LOOK

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, prior to reaching an opinion on the new-look military budget, I have been attempting to analyze the figures in that budget and the reasoning behind them.

If the photographs in the current issue of the trade magazine Aviation Week, an outstanding McGraw-Hill publication, are correct—and I am assured that they are correct—then it is obvious that what some of us have feared for a long time has come to pass, namely, the Soviets are making further inroads on the air superiority of the United States in this air-atomic age.

We may have more nuclear bombs than they, but no one needs an excess number of rifles to destroy an enemy.

The first of these photographs, the article says, shows the Ilyushin–38, a modern swept-back-wing unit with four turboprop engines—a class we do not have. Its size, according to experts, would appear to be somewhere between that of our B–47 and B–52—that is, somewhere between medium range and long range.

The second photograph shows the Tupolev–200, a new and very long-range, swept-back-wing bomber driven by six turboprop engines. This bomber is of a weight and general performance comparable to our B–36, but far more modern. The article points out that the Tupolev–200 has great speed, atomic capability, and intercontinental range.

If this information is correct, I respectfully ask my colleagues to give full consideration to just what these disclosures mean to the security of the United States today and in the immediate future. Could it be that the Soviets already have had a new look for so long a time that to them it is now an old look—in any case a new look in being?

The article reports that the latter bomber is in squadron service in northern Russia, right across the polar cap from North America. If this be true, then the Soviet position from the standpoint of a combination of performance coordinated with atomic potential may be superior to ours, because we have not a single modern long-range bomber wing in action.

Note that both these new bombers, according to the experts, have radar bombsights.

Just prior to World War II, America had no knowledge of the possession of thousands of Zero fighters by the Japanese. The refusal to recognize the production ability as well as the engineering capacity of our enemy cost this country billions of dollars in treasure, plus many thousands of American lives.

Some years ago, when, as Secretary of the Air Force, I presented to higher authority photographs of the new MIG–15 I was told the Soviets were not capable of producing such a plane, and that probably the pictures were "faked." When we entered Korea and were greeted by hundreds of the at-that-time world's best fighter, the MIG–15, again it was obvious that we had underestimated both the production capability and engineering genius of our enemy—and this, too, cost us heavily in treasure and blood.

On May 20 last, at the time when some were bitterly protesting against the $5 billion Air Force cut, in a hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, the Department of Defense asserted that the United States had more long-range bombers than Soviet Russia; also it was stated that there were indications that the Soviet was concentrating on fighter planes and defensive craft. The Secretary of Defense added, "I think our people can take some comfort in that."

If the news story about the new bombers is correct, where is the comfort? On the contrary, we may now be looking down the barrel of a possible intercontinental attack.

Last September 29 the Secretary of Defense stated:

> The Russians' best bomber is an improved version of the B–29.

And on October 6 he added:

> It will take the Russians at least 3 years to get either the aircraft or a droppable bomb to deliver a hydrogen attack on the United States.

He further stated:

> We give the Russians credit for having aircraft that they just don't have.

If the story and the photographs to which I have referred are correct, how can one justify such statements?

Many persons believe the Soviets are ahead of us in the development of the hydrogen bomb. I do not know about that, but I do know that any statement made by the Department to the effect "it will take the Russians at least 3 years to get the aircraft to deliver an attack on the United States" was incorrect even before these photographs were published.

If America makes another mistake—this time in underestimating Soviet engineering and production ability with respect to long-range bombers, as we already have done with respect to fighters—it could well be the last mistake we shall ever be allowed to make.

A "new look" should be a two-way look. It should look inward with respect to our economic development and national military power. It should look outward so as to fix the nature of the power of a possible enemy.

Again I plead that the administration frankly give the Congress and the American people all truth about the strength of our possible enemy which will not help that enemy in its development of plans and weapons necessary to accomplish its oft-announced intention to destroy the free world.

FIFTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, 56 years ago today the Nation was horrified by the news that the U. S. S. *Maine* had been sunk in the harbor of Habana, Cuba. On a peaceful Sunday evening the great battleship was torn apart by a terrific explosion which cost the lives of 266 officers and men of its crew. The anniversary of that tragic event is worthy of national commemoration. It calls upon us to pay tribute to the honored memory of the gallant Americans who died on the battleship *Maine*.

It is likewise an appropriate occasion to recall with pride the heroic sacrifice of those who gave their lives for their country in the Spanish-American War and on the far-off islands of the Philippines. The destruction of the *Maine* was the beginning of our first overseas war. It sent our fighting men, our ideals, and our honor to the landing beaches of distant shores in defense of freedom. It marked a turning point in the history of the United States in the world.

On that eventful day in 1898 we embarked on a new course of destiny in world affairs. Today, 56 years later, the United States stands as the citadel of God-fearing freemen everywhere with farflung outposts of the air and the atomic age reaching to the ends of the earth.

The *Maine* was in Habana Harbor on a typically American mission, characteristic of our love of freedom. She was on a friendly visit to protect American interests on a neighboring island where the people were struggling for independence against cruel oppression.

The sinking of the *Maine* aroused a great wave of patriotic fervor that swept across the Nation like wildfire. Intervention in Cuba was demanded. "Remember the *Maine*" was the battlecry which united the North and the South.

With the declaration of war President McKinley called for 125,000 volunteers. More than 1 million offered their services. We went into war by land and sea in Cuba. On the other side of the world, 12,000 miles away, Admiral Dewey destroyed the Spanish Fleet in the Battle of Manila Bay, inside the guns of Corregidor. The remainder of the Spanish naval force was sunk and destroyed off Santiago, Cuba. Equally brilliant were the exploits of the Army, although handicapped by poor equipment and lack of supplies.

Historians, in the proper technical sense, terminate the Spanish-American War with the treaty of peace signed at Paris, December 10, 1898. But there was no peace in the jungles of the Philippines. Thousands of heroic Americans fought on for several years to quell the fanatical insurrection and to bring order to those islands.

Mr. President, I consider it most important to note that every man who served in the Spanish-American War and in the Philippine Insurrection was a volunteer. They fought with valor and heroism in the face of the most adverse conditions, yet they were the most poorly treated of all our defenders. The enlisted man's pay was $13 a month. He had no insurance protection, no bonus, no separation pay, no adjusted-compensation pay, no allotment service, no vocational or educational benefits. For 20 years after the war no provision whatsoever was made for service pensions. No hospitalization for Spanish War veterans was available until 24 years after the war ended.

There are today 69,642 living veterans of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection on the rolls of the Veterans' Administration. This number is decreasing at the rate of about 6,900 per year. There are only 84,289 widows and dependents on the same rolls.

Today we should recall the names of the units which participated in the first overseas operations by our land forces—infantrymen, cavalrymen, and artillerymen—who carried their regimental colors to the heights of victory.

In the Spanish-American War the overseas regiments serving in Cuba and Puerto Rico included:

The 23d Kansas; 8th Illinois; 2d, 3d, 5th, and 9th United States Volunteer Infantry; 1st United States Cavalry Volunteers. They were Col. Theodore Roosevelt's Rough Riders. Fourth United States Volunteer Engineers, 1st Kentucky, 47th New York, 6th United States Volunteer Infantry, 1st United States Volunteer Infantry, 2d United States Volunteer Engineers, 3d Illinois, 6th Massachusetts, 4th Ohio, 16th Pennsylvania, 3d Wisconsin, and 1st United States Volunteer Engineers.

The units of the old Eighth Army Corps in the Philippines included many of our great fighting outfits under brilliant leaders. They were:

Astor Battery of New York, 1st California, 1st California Heavy Artillery, 1st Colorado, 1st Idaho, 51st Iowa, 20th Kansas, 13th Minnesota, 1st Montana, 1st Nebraska, Nevada Cavalry, 1st North Dakota, 2d Oregon, 1st South Dakota, 1st Tennessee, Utah Light Artillery, 1st Washington, 1st Wyoming, and the 10th Pennsylvania Infantry in which I had the honor of serving.

Mr. President, we can point with the greatest possible pride to the fact that this was the only 100-percent volunteer army in the history of the world. It was an army of freemen, asking nothing but the honor and glory of serving their country and their flag. Only in this great free Republic could such an army ever have been created. Only Americans could have so nobly accomplished their assigned missions and objectives.

On this occasion I am happy to salute my comrades of 1898 who now serve their country as able and distinguished Members of this body:

The senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], lieutenant, provisional

company A, Rhode Island Militia; the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], sergeant, 52d Iowa Regiment, United States Army; and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], private, Company D, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has just called our attention to the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* in the harbor at Habana, Cuba, and mentioned units from Kansas.

This action set off the spark that kindled the Spanish-American War.

Kansas played an important part in that conflict, and we are proud of the record of the volunteers who answered the call of President McKinley and the Governor of our State.

It is interesting to note that Gen. Fred Funston, a Kansan who commanded the 20th Kansas, played an important part in the history of that war.

Being short of stature, he was called "Five Feet Five Fighting Fred Funston," and the pages of history tell of many of his military exploits and his ability as a military leader.

It is generally agreed that Gen. Fred Funston, had he not died early in 1917, would have been the commanding general of our troops in the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I.

I should like to mention that during my military service at San Antonio, Tex., I was given the last picture taken of Gen. Fred Funston during his lifetime. It is one of my prized possessions.

Other Kansas names which played a prominent part in that war are those of Col. Ed Little, Wilder S. Metcalf, Charles S. Huffman, and many others.

Kansans can well be proud of the fine men who have served our Nation from our State in the Spanish-American War and other wars.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in reply to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, let me say that I recall Gen. Fred Funston, then a colonel, very well. He commanded the brigade in which I had the honor of serving. He was a man slight in stature, but with a great appeal. The men who served under him had great confidence in him.

I think the Senator from Kansas is entirely correct in his statement that if General Funston had lived, he would have commanded our forces overseas in World War I.

ERRONEOUS STATEMENTS ABOUT EFFECT OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an unsigned leaflet which apparently is being given wide circulation in the State of Minnesota, and possibly in other States. The leaflet is being mailed in envelopes of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, of St. Paul.

I do not recall ever having seen more misleading propaganda than is contained in this sheet, which I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the leaflet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What the President's proposed flexible price-support program could cost Minnesota farmers

[Comparison of the 1953 farm values of Minnesota-grown grains and oilseeds based on actual production at actual 1953 support prices, with a 20-percent reduction in acreage and the administration's minimum proposed support prices, as outlined in the President's Jan. 11 message to Congress]

[Figures to nearest million dollars]

Product (entire production used to figure)	Farm values at support levels and production indicated		Difference	
	With 1953 production and present 1953 program	With 1953 production reduced 20 percent and proposed minimum loans and lowered parity	Down	Down
				Percent
Corn	$403,000,000	$234,000,000	$169,000,000	42
Oats (hitched to corn loan)	117,000,000	67,000,000	50,000,000	42
Barley (hitched to corn loan)	29,000,000	17,000,000	12,000,000	42
Rye (hitched to corn loan)	2,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	42
Wheat	34,000,000	19,000,000	15,000,000	45
Soybeans	68,000,000	44,000,000	24,000,000	36
Flaxseed	34,000,000	19,000,000	15,000,000	44
Total	687,000,000	401,000,000	286,000,000	42

Support prices are national average farm loan rates, which are slightly below Minnesota farm loan rates; State loan rates are not calculated, only county loan rates, and data are not available to figure a State loan rate; the national loan rates understate by 2 or 3 percent the actual value by counties.

Soybeans and flaxseed do not have a mandatory place in the AA of 1949; we assume a 75 percent-of-parity loan for soybeans, same as for corn; and a 60 percent-of-parity loan value for flaxseed, as compared with 80 percent for 1953, 70 percent for 1954, and 60 percent in 1955 and 1956.

Production of corn and other feed grains is not all sold, but instead fed to livestock and poultry on farm where grown, because this is more profitable than sale of case grain. Actual worth to farmers is therefore higher than indicated here.

JANUARY 1954.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as the leaflet discloses, it attempts to show that the income of the Minnesota farmer who is producing grains and oilseeds would be reduced 42 percent under the Eisenhower farm program.

This propaganda sheet purports to compare the income of the farmer with the income he theoretically would receive if the 1953 acreage of crops were reduced 20 percent, if the modernized parity formula were immediately put into effect for all crops, and if the minimum price permitted under the President's flexible support program were to prevail.

This misleading propaganda fails to state that the 20-percent reduction in acreage for wheat is required under the program which the opponents of the President seek to have continued.

It fails to state that under the law which they seek to continue, this reduction in acreage will likely be permanent.

Under President Eisenhower's set-aside program, this full 20-percent reduction in acreage would be unlikely, and any control programs in the future would probably be limited to only 1 year at a time.

In order to make the picture look worse, this propaganda also assumes a 20-percent reduction in acreage of corn, oats, barley, rye, soybeans, and flax. This is a ridiculous assumption, and thoroughly false.

The propaganda sheet assumes lower parity prices under the Eisenhower program.

The only crops possibly affected by removal of the present premium resulting from the use of the 1909–14 cost period would be corn and wheat.

The Minnesota farmer normally markets very little corn as grain. He markets a large part of his production through hogs, which today are bringing 25 cents a pound.

The premium to the wheatgrowers, amounting to 35 cents per bushel, would, under the Eisenhower program, be reduced only 5 percent a year until it reaches a balance, under the new parity formula, with dairy products, hogs, and other field crops.

The propaganda sheet assumes that the minimum support level for all commodities would prevail.

If the President's proposal, including the set-aside program, is approved by the Congress, the minimum support level would not possibly prevail.

Under the President's program, 90 percent supports would be mandatory so long as farmers keep production in line with demand.

Instead of reducing the income of the Minnesota farmer, the Eisenhower farm program would in all probability result in a substantially increased net income.

I do not know what prompted the preparation and distribution of such false assumptions and misleading propaganda in the envelope of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association. Perhaps it is desperation. Perhaps it is part of the political effort by some of President Eisenhower's opposition to spread fear among the American people and create a depression in an election year.

LICENSING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN HONOLULU TO LEAHI HOSPITAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6025) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Visitor Hospital, a nonprofit institution, to use certain United States property in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending amendment, which has been submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 2, it is proposed to strike out "without consideration" and to insert in lieu thereof "at a consideration of 50 percent of the fair-rental value."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the pending bill, H. R. 6025, has already been under some discussion on the floor. Last Monday the bill was passed over at the request of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The discussion of this bill has centered around the question of whether a lease should be granted to the Leahi Hospital without consideration.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who reported the bill in my absence, set forth the reasons why the Committee on Armed Services did not insert a provision requiring the hospital to pay rental for use of the property as a parking lot. The first reason was the revocable nature of the lease which made the tenure of the property indefinite. In other words, the Government could move in at any time it wanted to do so. So there was in effect a lease without leasing.

The second reason was the fact that the hospital will necessarily have to expend a certain amount of money to pave the acreage in order for it to be useful as a parking lot.

The third reason was the fact that the hospital, though supported mainly out of Territorial funds, is a charitable institution whose primary purpose is to treat patients suffering from tuberculosis.

On February 11, the Senate resumed consideration of the pending bill. The junior Senator from Oregon proposed an amendment to the bill which would require the hospital to pay 50 percent of the fair-rental value of the property.

The amendment reads as follows:

On page 2, line 2, strike out the words "without consideration" and insert in lieu thereof "at a consideration of 50 percent of the fair-rental value."

Since the bill was considered the last time the Committee on Armed Services, through its staff, has been in touch with the Delegate from Hawaii, who in turn has been in touch with the hospital authorities. The proposed amendment is entirely satisfactory to the Territory of Hawaii, which I hope will soon be a State, to the hospital authorities, and to the Delegate, Mr. FARRINGTON.

The junior Senator from New Jersey realizes that in all likelihood the bill will be passed without question now that there is no objection to the proposed amendment.

I wish to take this opportunity, however, to commend the Senator from Oregon for being alert in this instance to the application of what he calls the Morse formula. I believe that formula serves a very valuable purpose. The distinguished junior Senator from Oregon knows full well that as chairman of the Republican calendar committee through my service in the Senate I have tried to safeguard the Morse formula at all times.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I shall yield in a minute. I regret exceedingly, because of the nature of the bill and because of the charitable purposes which it would serve, that more thought was not given to the matter referred to by the Senator from Oregon when the bill was under consideration by the Committee on Armed Services.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to say that, in connection with the application of the so-called Morse formula, no one on the calendar committee has been more cooperative with the junior Senator from Oregon than the junior Senator from New Jersey. Time and again, in my absence, the Senator from New Jersey, knowing that a committee bill would violate the formula in my absence raised objection to the consideration of the bill, and notified me on my return that the objection had been raised. I always appreciated his action very much.

The bill which is now before the Senate involves a lease. There have not been a great many such cases brought to the floor of the Senate. As the Senator from New Jersey has stated, other circumstances are involved in the pending case, which caused the committee to report the bill without the inclusion of the Morse formula.

I appreciate the cooperation which has been extended to me by the Senator from New Jersey and by the Committee on Armed Services in connection with the pending bill. At least from my standpoint a very important principle is being protected by the action taken by the Committee on Armed Services and by the Senator from New Jersey. The acceptance of my amendment protects the Morse formula. It helps make clear that the formula applies to leases of Federal property as well as the sale of such property.

It is only fair to the Committee on Armed Services and to the Delegate from Hawaii that I advise the Senate, as I told him I would, that the Delegate from Hawaii called me on the telephone this morning and said he had been in communication with the hospital authorities in Hawaii, and as a matter of principle they had no objection to the amendment which I had offered last Thursday. He asked me if I would indicate with some emphasis the points to which I alluded in the original consideration of the bill. I assured him I would do so because I believe the points are very important when the persons responsible for it come forward with their appraisal of the fair rental value. They should take into consideration these points:

First, I indicated that there will be improvements made on the property amounting to between $12,000 and $20,000. No one seems to be certain as to the actual amount until the improvements are made to the property. I want the RECORD to show very clearly that to the extent these improvements are of value to the United States Government in its possible use of the property for defense purposes that fact should be taken into consideration when determination is made of what the appraised fair rental value of the property is.

That fact, of course, leads to the second point in determining what the appraised fair rental value is, namely, the fact that the hospital is on the property really as a tenant by sufferance. Legally that is what its possession is, and that factor should also be taken into account when determination is made of the fair rental value of the property.

Of course, it is not for me, or for any other Senator, to say when such factors are involved in an appraisement problem, what the rental figure should be.

I do not want the hospital to pay more than 50 percent of the appraised fair rental value of the property, taking into account any benefit which will accrue to the United States Government from the improvement of the property, which will be necessary, in order to put the property into such shape that it can be used for a parking lot.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator from Oregon is saying that the whole subject should be determined by real estate experts; is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. That is always what the Morse formula calls for. Determination will have to be made of the fair rental value. The property must be appraised. The committee report states the rental value is $2,356. I do not know whether that is the fair rental value. I do not want this amendment adopted on the basis of any assumption that half of that amount is the rent which is to be paid. The important factor which has to be taken into account is the rent which this amendment contemplates. The amendment does not mean, either, Mr. President, that whatever the hospital may have to pay in order to place a hard surface on the property shall be deducted from the rental value but that such amount may be deducted only to the extent that the Federal authorities can honestly say it constitutes an improvement which will serve the interest of the United States. I do not think we should ask the hospital to assume the full cost of surfacing the property if that would make it more usable for the Federal Government as a place for aerial defense.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is the ultimate purpose.

Mr. MORSE. That is the ultimate purpose. All these appraisal factors should be taken into account by real estate experts. I want the Government to get 50 percent of the appraised rental value of the property.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I share completely the views of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. When I accept the amendment I am accepting it, I am sure with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Armed Services.

I accept the amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], on behalf of himself and other Senators, which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 5, after the word "treaty", it is proposed to strike out the words "which conflicts with" and insert "or other international agreement which conflicts with, or is not in pursuance of."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	Martin
Anderson	Hayden	Maybank
Barrett	Hendrickson	McClellan
Bricker	Hennings	Monroney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Morse
Burke	Hill	Murray
Bush	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Payne
Byrd	Hunt	Potter
Carlson	Ives	Purtell
Clements	Jackson	Robertson
Cooper	Jenner	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kerr	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Symington
Ellender	Kuchel	Thye
Ferguson	Langer	Upton
Flanders	Lehman	Watkins
Frear	Lennon	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Williams
George	Magnuson	Young
Gore	Malone	
Green	Mansfield	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand the question now before the Senate is the amendment to section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, on page 3, line 5, and that it may be possible to obtain a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. The original amendment was modified at the end of last week. I wish to revert to the amendment, which has been printed and has been lying on the desks of all Senators for their study, and to submit a modification of that amendment, the modification being on page 3, line 5 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, to insert, after the word "treaty", the words "or other international agreement." Section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would then read:

> A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

Before I ask for the yeas and nays, I ask the Chair for a ruling on whether the modification may be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Michigan that he has a right to modify his amendment at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senator from Michigan now referring to the amendment proposed jointly by himself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], designated 2-11-54-A?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am now proposing a modification of the original amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator from Illinois will look at Senate Joint Resolution 1, which he will find on his desk, and turn to page 3, line 5, and after the word "treaty", insert the words "or other international agreement," he will then have the amendment in the form in which it is now before the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the amendment now proposed make the first section read exactly the same as the first section of the so-called George substitute?

Mr. FERGUSON. If it were agreed to, it would read the same.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator for the information.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator propose to discuss the amendment further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not, unless the Senator has a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. It occurred to me that there ought to be a physical quorum present before the Senate passed on it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, of course I am in opposition to the pending amendment, just as I have been in opposition to all so-called substitute amendments, for the reason that no international agreement or so-called executive agreement should be elevated to the dignity and the status of a treaty within the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, as I understand the amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and certain other Senators—namely, on page 3, in line 5, after the word "treaty", to insert "or other international agreement"—it is identical with the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. At this time I shall undertake to address myself not only to the pending amendment, but also to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I understand will come before the Senate a little later this afternoon.

I should like to speak briefly about a number of points raised in the discussion last Thursday between the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia and myself, concerning his proposed substitute for the Bricker amendment.

During the preceding debate on the substitute amendment of the Senator from Georgia, I stated that, in my opinion, his amendment would weaken the ability of the States to resist Federal encroachments, even though that was clearly not his intention.

The Senator from Georgia, disagreeing with me as to the effect of his amendment, stated his position in these words:

> No one need be worried for fear that I am trying to weaken the power of the States under the Constitution.

That statement appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 11, 1954, at page 1665.

Mr. President, without being legalistic, but in an effort as best I can, within my limitations, to reduce to the simplest terms to which it can be reduced a question which is legal in import, and which certainly relates to constitutional law and interpretations of such law on which many able and respectable lawyers dis-

agree, I desire to state that I believe the point at issue needs further development. That point is the President's right to use the device of executive agreements as an instrument of foreign policy. I believe the President's power in that respect is an implied power.

The other day the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], in the course of a colloquy with me, said he believed the President had no inherent or implied powers.

The Constitution at present contains no specific mention of executive agreements. The President's right to use this device as an instrument of foreign policy is an implied power stemming in large part from his powers as Commander in Chief and as manager of our foreign relations. Because the power to execute executive agreements is an implied one, and does not come from the provision of the Constitution creating the presidential treatymaking powers, the executive branch of the Government does not claim that executive agreements and treaties are interchangeable or that treaties can be bypassed by the use of executive agreements. If, however, we lift executive agreements to the dignity provided by specific constitutional sanction, which would be one of the results of the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, we may well open the door to their indiscriminate use by future Presidents who might be inclined to ignore the traditional difference between treaties and executive agreements.

The deep concern of some of us over the substitute of the distinguished and eminent Senator from Georgia stems from the belief we hold that if, by adopting the George substitute, we give executive agreements specific constitutional dignity future Presidents will have little reason to use the treaty procedure when they can obtain approval of executive agreements by a simple majority of both Houses of the Congress. This is so because under the proposal of the Senator from Georgia executive agreements approved in Congress would have all the domestic force and effect of treaties.

I shall refer to one of these exceptions, the annexation of Texas, to show that my concern over the George proposal is neither ridiculous nor fanciful. In the 20th century our Presidents have exercised restraint in the use of executive agreements in lieu of treaties. This restraint has been traditional with American Presidents. There have been, however, some important exceptions.

In 1844 the United States and the Republic of Texas signed a treaty under which Texas was to have been admitted to the Union. In June of that year, however, 2 months after the treaty was signed, the Senate rejected the treaty with Texas, largely on the basis of partisan opposition to President Tyler.

President Tyler was certainly a cautious President in the exercise of his constitutional powers. Following the Senate's rejection of the treaty Tyler sent the following message to the Congress:

> While I have regarded the annexation [of Texas] to be accomplished by treaty as the most suitable form in which it could be effected, should Congress deem it proper to resort to any other expedient compatible with the Constitution and likely to accomplish the object I stand prepared to yield my most prompt and active cooperation. The great question is not as to manner in which it shall be done, but whether it shall be accomplished or not.

Subsequently, in 1845, when it became apparent that Texas might decide to continue as an independent nation, the House of Representatives adopted a joint resolution authorizing the annexation and admission of Texas to the Union—Congressional Globe, 28th Congress, 2d session, 1845, page 194. Thereafter the resolution was amended in the Senate and passed by both Houses and Texas joined the Union. In passing I might note that Thomas Hart Benton, the great Missouri Senator, opposed the treaty from the very beginning, urging that the annexation and admission of Texas should be accomplished by a joint resolution.

The use of an executive agreement implemented by a joint resolution approved by a simple majority of both Houses to achieve an objective which had earlier been prevented by the two-thirds constitutional requirement when attempted in the form of a treaty was described in the following words:

> It is now admitted that what was sought to be effected by the treaty submitted by the Senate, may be secured by a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress incorporating all its provisions. This mode of effecting it will have the advantage of requiring only a majority of the two Houses, instead of two-thirds of the Senate.

And by whom do you suppose, Mr. President, these words were uttered? These were not the words of a Secretary of State during the Roosevelt New Deal, or of the Truman Fair Deal. They were not even the words of John Foster Dulles. These words—and I hope my southern colleagues mark this well—were spoken by that strict constructionist, John C. Calhoun, one of the greatest statesmen the deep South has ever produced, then serving as Tyler's Secretary of State.

Later, in 1868, the United States Supreme Court gave its approval of this use of an international agreement other than a treaty for the admission of Texas to the Union, as a proper constitutional procedure.

What has all this to do with the George substitute, which is being debated. It seems true that, contrary to the unsubstantiated fears of some Americans and the claims of those shrouded in the fog of isolationist schemes, few, if any, recent Presidents have given evidence of avoiding the treaty procedure through the use of executive agreements approved by simple majority of both Houses of the Congress. The history of the annexation of Texas should, nonetheless, serve as a warning to those who have failed to understand the dangers to States rights implicit in the George substitute. When we remember that even John C. Calhoun, without the support of Senator GEORGE's substitute to lean on, felt that a joint resolution approved by a simple majority of both Houses of Congress could be used in lieu of a treaty requiring the approval of two-thirds of the Senate, we have, Mr. President, real reasons to be concerned as to where the George proposal will take us. When we remember that the Supreme Court in 1868 upheld the use of an executive agreement approved by the simple majority of the Congress as a substitute for the more traditional treaty procedure, our grave doubts are fortified.

I have no fear, of course, that the Senator from Georgia is trying to weaken the powers of the States under the Constitution. But I have the gravest fears that, despite his sincerest intentions, the actual result of his amendment would be to work a most grievious weakening of the rights of the 48 States to protect themselves against Federal encroachment. I reiterate that I am sure that the Senator from Georgia does not intend this result, but it is the actual result that is accomplished by the amendment, rather than the intentions of its author, that is of importance.

In view of what I have said, I am unable to understand why the Senator from Georgia does not believe that his suggested amendment will do away with the historical and presently existing right of the States to demand a two-thirds approval of the Senate before an international agreement other than a treaty will be permitted to override State laws and State constitutions. I do not see why Senator GEORGE believes that future Presidents will not be able to introduce such things as the Genocide Convention, the Human Rights Covenants, conventions on socialized medicine, and the like, as executive agreements for the consent and implementation of a simple majority of both Houses of Congress, rather than as treaties for the consent of two-thirds of the Senate, as at present? Will not the smaller Southern and Western States be losing one of the greatest protections that was given to them by the Founding Fathers, and one that they have cherished and zealously guarded all through our long history?

Do the States of Georgia with only 10 Representatives, Arkansas with only 6, New Mexico with 2, and Arizona with 2, and other States wish to give up the protection provided by the requirement of a two-thirds vote of the Senate and match their strength with New York with 43 Representatives, Pennsylvania with 30, California with 30, Illinois with 25, Ohio with 23, and Michigan with 18, to mention merely some of the more heavily populated States? The situation certainly would apply with respect to the State so ably represented by the distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. I doubt that the small States want such a result. I know that the State of Missouri does not want to give up the traditional protection afforded it by the treaty procedure. I shall let other Senators speak for their States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Missouri yield for a question?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for a question.

Mr. GORE. It is a privilege to ask a question of the distinguished and able senior Senator from Missouri. Does the

Senator concede that an executive agreement can now become internal law, in some cases overriding State law, when in conflict therewith, through the action of the President, and without reference to the Congress?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall go into that point more fully during the course of my discussion, as I have on the three past occasions when I have undertaken to address the Senate. However, I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee what he means by internal law. I have never found any authentic definition of the term.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Is not the Senator a member of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am.

Mr. GEORGE. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] have talked about no one having defined the term internal law. I refer the Senator from Missouri to the hearings of his own committee, in which the question was discussed repeatedly by various witnesses who appeared before the committee. There was a discussion held of municipal law. There was a discussion held of domestic law. Finally there was a decision reached by the Senator's own committee to use the term internal law, as contrasted with external law.

I submit that statement also to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The Senator from Georgia did not pull any rabbits out of his hat. It is a subject which has been considered already by the Committee on the Judiciary. It has already had the advice of distinguished lawyers and jurists who are experienced in that field. Therefore I used the term "internal law," although to me it is a bit awkward. But it does not seem to be objectionable, and it has been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the distinguished Senator from Missouri is himself an able Member. I ask if that is not true?

Mr. HENNINGS. It was considered by the committee. However, I wish to call attention to the fact——

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, the Senator was in the minority.

Mr. HENNINGS. I was one of the minority of that committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator will let me finish I should like to say that I joined in the minority views as one of four such Members. Of course the fact that the term "internal law" was considered by the committee does not mean that it was adequately defined; nor that any committee definition or consideration gives the phrase "internal law" any standing.

Mr. GEORGE. But why did not the Senator——

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to finish my statement.

Mr. GEORGE. Why did not the Senator, as a member of a distinguished committee, insist upon its being defined, if he wanted the term to be defined?

Mr. HENNINGS. I was not a member of the subcommittee which considered the Bricker resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wanted to call that fact to the attention of the Senator and the Senate.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to have it called to my attention.

Mr. GEORGE. I wanted to do so because it has some bearing on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I wanted to call it to the attention of the Senator from Oregon also. In that regard it will be found that more than one witness discussed the question. I do not care to enter into any controversy about it. I selected the term because the committee majority had selected it. I thought the committee understood the term.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. Not at the moment. I shall undertake to answer the last comment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia with respect to the fact that the committee considered the phrase "internal law." Even though I was not a member of the subcommittee, I did join in a report with three other Senators, the so-called minority views, in opposition to what is known as the Bricker amendment.

One reason for my dilating further on the question of the phrase "internal law" is that no one really seems to know what it means. For example, John W. Davis, who I gather has some standing as a constitutional lawyer before this body and with the general public——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me——

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator from Georgia will let me read the telegrams at this time I will appreciate it very much. I telegraphed Mr. Davis:

FEBRUARY 10, 1954.

JOHN W. DAVIS,
New York:

In connection with Senate debate on Bricker amendment and other proposals, I would greatly appreciate receiving a wire collect as soon as possible stating your opinion concerning Senator GEORGE's substitute proposal to amend the Constitution to provide:

"SEC. 2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress."

Thank you.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
United States Senate.

In reply to my telegram, John W. Davis wired as follows:

YEAMANSHALL, S. C., *February 12, 1954.*

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Your telegram of 10th, section 2, George amendment, seems objectionable to me because its effect and interpretation are quite unpredictable. I am not familiar with the phrase "internal law." Assuming it means law within the territorial boundaries of United States and its possessions, only few executive agreements are so confined. Many have a foreign as well as domestic aspect. Are they to be good without legislation in one sphere but invalid in the other? I do not favor any proposed amendment the meaning and scope of which is not clear on its face. Better far than this that matters should be left as they are.

JOHN W. DAVIS.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri let me interrupt for just a minute? I should like to say that I have great respect for John W. Davis, but inasmuch as John W. Davis does not know what the Court will decide in all instances and in all cases there is no very good reason why we should follow his view on this matter. I believe I could show the Senator, and my dear friend, John W. Davis, if he were here, that in almost countless cases the Supreme Court has disagreed with his interpretation and with what he thought was the Constitution.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not believe there is any doubt about that at all.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Supreme Court itself disagrees among its own members. Some Justices disagree with their brethren in the interpretation of the Constitution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me repeat to the Senator that I used the words "internal law," because the able Committee on the Judiciary, of which the distinguished Senator from Missouri is an honorable and honored member, had used the term itself in reporting the amendment to the Senate. The term "municipal law" could be used, and that term was used in an old treaty, but perhaps that term is too narrow. The term "domestic law" could have been used, and in a very large sense I used it in that way. However, the committee itself used the phrase "internal law" and the phrase "external law."

Mr. President, if I have been misled, I have been misled by the light from heaven, represented by the distinguished Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENNINGS. The only reason I read the telegram from John W. Davis at this time was to indicate, not that John W. Davis necessarily speaks from Parnassus, or that he is infallible, but that as a lawyer of standing and as a lawyer of vast experience who often appears before the Supreme Court and who has for the major portion of his life been considered a profound constitutional lawyer, he himself does not understand what the term "internal law" means as used in the substitute of the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

If John W. Davis does not understand it, is it not conceivable that the courts may not understand it? Is it not conceivable that many members of the Judiciary Committee may not have understood it? If the Senator from Georgia undertakes to tax me with what some members of the Judiciary Committee had to say in a report, from which I dissociated myself by signing the minority views, I shall accept that responsibility insofar as in the judgment of other Senators I should accept it, but I repudiate the majority report; I repudiate the term "internal law," insofar as I can, be-

cause I do not think it means anything. It means one thing to one set of men, and another thing to another set of men. I think that applies to the courts, and as well to the Members of this body and to our brethren at the other end of the Capitol.

I shall be glad to yield now to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has yielded to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wanted to say that I have a great deal of respect for John W. Davis. I know that his voice is very persuasive on a great many legal points before the Nation. I want to acquit the Senator from Missouri of having approved the use of the words "internal law," because the Senator says he was in the minority and he dissented from the approval of that term. On that point, with all respect to my distinguished friend from Missouri, I simply observe that Ephriam is still joined with his idols.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Georgia has just made reference to what I said on the floor a few days ago, I desire to say that by reference I wish to reincorporate it in the RECORD, because he has said nothing today which modifies the remarks I made at that time.

I was aware of the fact that the Judiciary Committee had had some discussion of the phrase "internal law," but the fact still remains that the discussion took place as an incidental discussion in the Judiciary Committee when the Bricker amendment was before that committee. It was quite a different discussion from that which would have taken place if the attention of the committee had been focused on the George amendment, as the committee should do, and call before it constitutional experts to testify on the meaning of the George amendment with the phrase "internal law" contained in it.

I respectfully submit that any discussion which has taken place up to this time on the phrase "internal law" was wholly ancillary in its nature and effect, and it was an entirely different type of hearing than the type for which the junior Senator from Oregon is calling when he asks that the George amendment be sent back to the committee so that for the first time there may be before the Judiciary Committee a full-dress hearing on the phrase "internal law" and all its implications.

The second point I made—and I should like to have the Senator from Georgia give me some evidence on this point before he leaves the floor—was that thus far in the running of the cases we are still looking for a United States Supreme Court decision which gives a definitive meaning to the term "internal law" as that phrase is used in the George amendment.

I say it is a very serious thing to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, with all the respect I have for him and for his constitutional-law knowledge, on the basis of his definition of "internal law." So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, it is not good enough for me. I want to have brought before me whatever cases there may be on the subject, and I want to have the benefit of the testimony of the top constitutional experts of the country with reference to the meaning of to what I think is a new constitutional concept.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, we were unable, after running the cases, insofar as our abilities and understanding were concerned, to find in any of the decided cases a constitutional definition of the phrase "internal law." It certainly seems that when we are undertaking to amend the Constitution of the United States on the floor of the Senate we should know with certainty what that phrase means. As I said when I read the telegram from John W. Davis, I did not suggest that he was on a plateau of absolute infallibility, any more than I would claim such an attribute for myself, though I would more readily concede it to the distinguished Senator from Georgia——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Missouri is justified in that statement. I said I hoped John W. Davis was infallible.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not suggest that he is not fallible, and I would say that the distinguished Senator from Georgia would be heir to no greater fallibility than is John W. Davis.

But I think reasonable lawyers, good lawyers, able constitutional authorities, disagree. What right have we, as United States Senators, when there is a difference of opinion as to the meaning of a phrase, to embed that phrase in the Constitution of the United States and go to the country, saying, "This is what we have handed you. Now, work your will upon it in the State legislatures"?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield further?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely rose to say that I had used that term because it had been used by the Judiciary Committee after a prolonged hearing. I assumed that the committee had explored its full meaning. I can see that it is somewhat broader than the term "municipal law"; it is somewhat broader, maybe, than the term "domestic law." It may be almost equivalent to the term "law of the land." I do not know. I assumed that the Judiciary Committee, of which I knew the distinguished Senator from Missouri was an honored member, had explored it fully, and, because, in the very resolution reported to the Senate, that term is used. I hope the Senator will not think I claimed any superior wisdom in suggesting it, but I am sure it must have been suggested by some very learned persons who appeared before the Judiciary Committee. I am sure the members of the committee understand it. I do not believe, however, Mr. President, that there would be any misunderstanding of the term in the State Department or in the Executive Department, if we had the courage to say what we believe ought to go into a constitutional amendment.

That is my position, my whole position.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. Before the distinguished Senator from Georgia leaves the floor, let me say that I hope he will not tax the Senator from Missouri or other members of the Committee on the Judiciary with all things which may emanate from that committee of which I am very proud to me a member. The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] will recall that this morning in the Committee on the Judiciary there were a number of divided votes on certain questions. There is a great deal of business to consider in that committee, and we are confronted with many things as to which Members receiving one or another point of view disagree.

I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he thinks there could be any dubiety in the minds of reasonable men, in the minds of learned scholars, in the minds of constitutional authorities, or in the higher courts of this land as to the meaning, implication, and impact of the phrase internal law. If not, I think it would be most helpful to all to understand precisely what that phrase means, beyond cavil, beyond speculation, and beyond the realm of conjecture, because it is tremendously important in this discussion.

Mr. GEORGE. I have already tried to state my position on the phrase "internal law," and my definition of it. I now repeat what I have previously said, that any treaty or executive agreement which overrides an otherwise valid law of a State ought not to be entered into by any President or by the State Department.

I regard the fifth amendment as a limitation upon all powers of government. It is a limitation upon all, or it is a limitation upon none. I regard the limitations in the Constitution definitely as restraints upon the exercise of every power in or under the Constitution. That is my position.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Georgia and I are in complete accord in that regard.

Mr. GEORGE. I am very happy to note that fact.

Mr. HENNINGS. There is no question about that in the mind of anybody who understands the implications.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that statement, that premise, solves the whole question. If we are in agreement, then we should have no difficulty. I do not believe there can be any difficulty about the words "internal law." But I have not studied the question as has the Committee on the Judiciary. I did not have the opportunity to do so, because I am not a member of that committee. But I do not believe there is any real misunderstanding of the words "internal law." As used in the substitute, they simply mean that when, by a treaty or an executive agreement, it is proposed to override an otherwise valid law of a State or of the constitution of a State, that shall not be done. That is all I think the phrase means, and that is all I want it to mean.

I hope the Senator from Missouri will excuse me. I thought he was addressing himself to the amendment which had been offered and which now is in the same language I suggested, but not at first, because in very large measure it had been suggested by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and by the Committee on the Judiciary. With that amendment I am entirely content. I think we could do nothing less than to agree to it, even if we were disposed to set on our hands and do nothing. I think that could be done without any affront to the Constitution or to anyone.

I cannot see why my distinguished brethren, who are learned, earnest, and experienced advocates of the law, should be worried about the phrase "internal law," because we are dealing with two factors. First, every treaty and every executive agreement is concerned with the external effect of the treaty or agreement, which involves the exercise of the political power of a sovereign nation as it may affect another sovereign nation. That is external law beyond all doubt. I do not wish to affect that in any way. I have not suggested anything to affect it. I do not want to disturb it, because I conceive it to be essential in our system of government. In the case of an executive agreement, at the very moment when the President attaches his signature to it and delivers it, it becomes fully effective as external law. It sets up our obligations and presumably creates counter obligations on the part of the other sovereign to us.

But if anything in such an agreement touches upon, modifies, or overrides an otherwise valid law of a State of the United States, then such an agreement ought not to become law—until when? until the Senate by a two-thirds vote approves it? I do not think so. I think Congress, in the ordinary, normal method of making laws, should pass upon it.

When Congress has passed upon such an agreement, it will immediately become effective in the United States whether it be a treaty or an executive agreement. Then, so far as I am concerned, I shall acquiesce in it.

I know the United States is a sovereign nation. I want it to remain a sovereign nation. I have never suggested in any proposal I have put forward, and I never shall, that the hands of the United States Government should be tied in dealing with its political powers as they affect foreign nations. The moment the President places his signature on an executive agreement confined to external matters, the matter is ended, so far as I am concerned, because the President has acted. But if in such an agreement there is anything which touches, modifies, overrides, or repeals a provision of a State constitution or a State law, it ought to come before Congress for consideration. It should not be considered by only one branch of Congress, but by both, and should be dealt with in the ordinary, normal processes of legislation. That is my whole position.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield, to permit me to ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am seeking to learn what the amendment of the Senator from Georgia means. Would it be fair to say that what he is proposing, in part, is that there shall be established a requirement of the application by Congress of a doctrine of separability in connection with executive agreements as to internal and external matters, in the sense that the Senator has used the words "internal" and "external"?

Mr. GEORGE. In the sense that I am using those words, yes. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that my profound conviction is that Judge Cooley was entirely correct when he said that each branch of the Government has the responsibility, primary and absolute, so far as it is concerned, to determine what is and what is not a constitutional enactment. I utterly disagree with any appeal, however worthy the objective, that Congress should disregard what it believes to be constitutional limitations, in order to work what we think is an immediate good. I am certain the distinguished Senator from Oregon does not disagree with that premise.

Mr. MORSE. I do not agree with the principle. I have one other question. Is it the view of the Senator from Georgia that if at present the doctrine of separability is applicable to executive agreements, it is very confused in the present state of the law; and that, therefore, the Senator from Georgia believes the confusion ought to be eliminated by saying to the courts that it is the intention of Congress and the people, if the proposed constitutional amendment shall be adopted, that when the President signs an executive agreement, it shall be subject to the doctrine of separability?

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is correct. I have not explored the subject exactly as the Senator has stated it, but I think that is substantially and essentially my meaning.

Mr. MORSE. I want the Senator from Georgia to know that I have never been in any doubt as to his meaning. I believe he has made his meaning clear. I have simply been in doubt as to what a great many constitutional experts would say about the Senator's amendment. The doctrine of separability has a great many ramifications.

Mr. GEORGE. I admit that.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to know, in the light of full dress hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary, what can be said on both sides of the question before I vote. That has been the only plea I have made on that point.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand the position of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I merely wish to remind him of a fact, which he already well knows, that only the ignorant agree upon what a law is or how it should be interpreted; but lawyers always disagree upon legal questions.

Mr. MORSE. I also know that the people suffer when the ignorant disagree.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; but I also know, and I again remind the Senator, that if he will go as far as I have suggested here, at an early date he will go much further, because the American people understand the issue. I hope my friends will not mistake that statement. I do not mean that when the roll is called in some subsequent Congress, Senators present today will not be here. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENNINGS. That was what Jim Reed said at the time of the debate about the case of Missouri against Holland.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. He was right, and he was wrong. But I say that the American people understand this simple issue. They are not profoundly disturbed. A great many eminent lawyers are. A great many members of the American bar are profoundly disturbed about treaties becoming the internal law of the country, or the domestic law—let us not quarrel about terms—until Congress passes on them; but in the Constitution there are many restraints on the President. So far as I am concerned, I am satisfied that President Eisenhower will regard such restraints. I have no fear about what President Eisenhower will do about those restraints when they are called to his attention.

Furthermore, there is the power in the Senate to say, by a two-thirds vote, that a treaty may not become the law of the land. I think I have answered that simple question. I think that is sufficient to say with regard to treaties. That is my view of it. That is my opinion. I have not desired to project either House of the Congress any further into the treatymaking power than it already is under the Constitution of the United States.

My whole concern has been and is with executive agreements, with arrangements and understandings reached by the President with a foreign power. In many instances such agreements do affect and do touch internal law. I believe that, under our constitutional powers, we ought to say, and we have the perfect right to say to the people of the States: "Here is our proposal: Before an executive agreement affects your law, your State constitutions, you should have the right to pass on it, not as States, but through both Houses of your Congress, the Senate and the House, through the ordinary, normal processes of legislation."

I think that is going a long way toward States' rights. Although the distinguished Senator from Missouri did not say so, I think he meant to say that I should be following John C. Calhoun; and I am going to follow John C. Calhoun in many things, but not in the extreme States' rights view he expressed. It never has been my conception that a State had a right to nullify an act of the Congress of the United States, or to withdraw from the Union. It has been my conception that States had rights in the larger field of personal relationships which grow up in the States and which affect all their people, all their businesses, all their schools, and all their churches. There is an essentially sound doctrine of States' rights in that large field; and whenever such rights are abandoned, we will abandon liberty in this country, because one cannot maintain human liberty, one cannot promote freedom of the citizen, when one looks alone to a central government in Washington. Such matters must be handled in jurisdictions which are controlled and presided over by men who are elected by

local representatives, who are responsive to local opinion, and who can hear petitions for redress of grievances and correction of wrongs. That is my idea of States' rights. I do not measure up to the stature of the statesman referred to, but the opinions I have stated are my views of States' rights. However, I express again the profound conviction that something of John C. Calhoun's views will enter into the philosophy of the Supreme Court of the United States, and something of the magnificent doctrine of John W. Davis will prevail in the councils of that Court, when they decide the essentially States' rights issues now before the Court.

Mr. HENNINGS. Before the distinguished Senator from Georgia leaves, I believe he announced on Thursday that he would discuss the Pink case. The Senator was somewhat at variance with the interpretation some of us gave to that case. I advert to that because, at page 1668 of the RECORD, in response to a question which I asked the Senator from Georgia, he said:

> I confess that that is true so far as executive agreements are concerned, because had not the Pink case gone as far as I believe it has, keeping in line with the general trend of some of the decisions that have tended to interpret executive agreements as being very closely akin to treaties, I would not have offered my substitute.

I believe the distinguished Senator from Georgia said last week that the Congress, and particularly the Senate, had taken no action relating to the Litvinov assignment. Is that not correct?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I did not. The Senator misunderstood me. I read later what the Senator referred to. I referred only to the action which was taken with reference to the German claims in the First World War and the claims against Germany and her allies in the Second World War. In fact, we have taken such action in every war. We have created a commission to adjust the claims of citizens of the United States. That is all that was involved.

Mr. HENNINGS. I refer to page 1665 of the RECORD, wherein the following was said:

> Mr. HENNINGS. Let me ask a question regarding that point, please. Does the Senator from Georgia tell us that Congress did not implement the terms of the Litvinov agreement?
>
> Mr. GEORGE. I have no knowledge that the Congress ever acted upon those assignments.

Mr. GEORGE. What the Senator has read is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. The fact of the matter is that the Senator from Georgia was a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations at that time and that the Congress did create a commission to consider such claims. The fact further is that Congress at that time, prior to any judicial determination, by its vote, could have refused to accept the terms of such agreement. Is that not true?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no. The Senator is incorrect and misapprehends the whole effect of such matters as they came before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. We did sanction the creation of a commission to determine the claims of American nationals against the Russian Government and, in some instances, against Russian nationals who may have been representing the Russian Government; but we were not dealing specifically with the Litvinov agreement. In fact, I doubt that we had any knowledge of it. I know I did not. Certainly we were not acting with reference to the assignment which was made.

It is true that under the assignment, funds may have been available or may have been made available to pay some American claims; but far more was involved in what we were doing than merely the Litvinov assignment. As in the case of arrangements with Mexico, and with Germany in World War I, and with Germany and some of her allies in World War II, we were undertaking to appoint a commission which would adjudicate the claims, not only of our Government but of our citizens, against nationals of other countries who were engaged with Germany and against whom complaints had been made. That is all there was to that. Now they may have recovered whatever assets were recoverable under the Litvinov assignment. That I do not deny. I do not know, but presumably they did.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, does the distinguished Senator say, then, that Congress did act specifically upon the Litvinov assignment when the Senator was a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. GEORGE. Absolutely not, to my knowledge or recollection. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator deny that when the matter came before the Senate, the Senate could have repudiated the Litvinov agreement by its vote?

Mr. GEORGE. No, I do not deny that Congress could have, if it had known anything about it. The other House of the Congress might have resorted to the other very great remedy, which has been suggested, namely, that of impeachment; but they did not do it.

Mr. HENNINGS. But Congress did know about it, because Congress created a commission.

Mr. GEORGE. But the commission was to determine the validity of the claims of United States nationals against foreign governments or the nationals of foreign governments. That is all that was. We did that in the case of Mexico.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; I am aware of the Mexican Claims Commission.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. We were a little more generous in that instance, in that we provided the money with which to pay the claims.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator from Georgia suggest that at the time when the matter of the creation of the commission came before the Senate and the commission was created, the Senator from Georgia, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, knew nothing about the assignment?

Mr. GEORGE. Nothing on earth. I knew nothing of it, unless it had been before the courts. I might have read a court decision on it; but if I did, that was all. It did not come to us officially.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Georgia knows that the Pink case did not come until much later.

Mr. GEORGE. The other day I told the Senator from Missouri that I would discuss the Pink case if it were necessary to do so.

But let me invite the attention of my colleague from Missouri to one thing: I think he will find that the final court of appeals under the British system, from which we have obtained so much of our jurisprudence, requires all judges to write opinions, even though they agree with what has been found, for in that way courts and citizens can determine what was in the mind of the court. So I invite the Senator from Missouri to read just two things in connection with the Pink case: First, the headnotes.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have read the fifty-odd pages of that case, including the headnotes. I have read the entire case a number of times.

Mr. GEORGE. The headnotes specifically say what was decided. Presumably the judge who rendered the opinion might have had some control over the headnotes, although he is not responsible for them. I grant that; I have been on the bench of courts of appeal.

But I invite my colleague to read the dissent of Chief Justice Stone. There he will see that Chief Justice Stone was not setting up a strawman to be knocked down. He knew what Associate Justice Douglas and the other Associate Justices of the Court had agreed to; and he completely demolished every line of their reasoning, in my judgment. Let my colleague read that decision.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have read it.

Mr. GEORGE. Then the Senator from Missouri will understand the Pink case.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course on Thursday the Senator from Georgia told us that he would discuss the Pink case.

Mr. GEORGE. I may do so.

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me ask the Senator from Georgia whether he agrees with the position taken by Mr. Justice Owen Roberts in that case. He was one of the dissenting Justices, was he not?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; he agreed with the Chief Justice.

Mr. HENNINGS. He agreed with Chief Justice Stone, did he not?

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly.

Mr. HENNINGS. At this point let me read from a letter I have received from Owen J. Roberts, under date of February 11. The letter was in reply to a letter from me, relating to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia. Later, in the course of my prepared remarks, I shall advert further to the letter from Owen J. Roberts; but at this time I shall read from it, as follows:

> The Supreme Court of the United States reexamined the matter for itself, and found that the Russian decree had extraterritorial effect.

This letter is from one of the dissenting Justices, Owen J. Roberts, with whom the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] concurs.

I read further from the letter:

> But this nominally would be a question upon which the Supreme Court would not

review a State court. In order to reach out and take jurisdiction, a majority of the Court had to hold that Litvinov's assignment had the effect of overruling State law in this respect, and that President Roosevelt in receiving it so intended it. There is not a word in the record to show this; it is purely inference.

Mr. Roberts then writes:

Let me point out that Senator GEORGE's proposed amendment would not have altered the situation in the slightest. Congress knew—

Although the distinguished Senator from Georgia said Congress did not know of the agreement—

of the Litvinov agreement, approved it, and implemented it by providing for a commissioner to examine claims and distribute any funds that the United States might get under the assignment. See House of Representatives 865, 76th Congress, 1st session. See also joint resolution of August 4, 1939.

Mr. Roberts goes on to say:

But suppose Congress had gone even further and had affirmatively approved, ratified, and ordered carried into execution the Litvinov assignment. The same question would then have been presented to the Supreme Court, namely, Was so broad an effect to be given the assignment as to hold that it abrogated the law of New York concerning the distribution of an insolvent's assets? Clearly the administration would have prevailed in the Supreme Court on the same basis, namely, the construction of the assignment, as it did in fact prevail.

As I said in my telegram to you, and as I repeat, the George amendment would not have altered in the slightest the decision in the Pink case.

Former Associate Justice Roberts then writes:

I thought, when it was decided, that that decision was wrong. I still think so. But if there be any defect whatever, it is the defect in the attitude of the Supreme Court concerning the scope and the effect of the assignment. To strike down the power of a President to make necessary agreements in connection with the recognition of a foreign government and with many of the details of our daily relationships with our neighbors, because of what I think is the erroneous decision of the Supreme Court in the construction of a written instrument, seems to me to be the height of folly.

That letter comes from the Justice who joined with Chief Justice Stone in the dissenting opinion in the Pink case, which the distinguished Senator from Georgia has urged me to read, and which I have read repeatedly, but which I have been unable to interpret as being a foundation to justify an attempt to amend the Constitution of the United States in language and terms upon which the most eminent and respectable authorities, including both laymen and lawyers, are unable to agree, or which they are unable to understand.

I say it would be a reproach to this body, which is said by some to be the greatest deliberative body in the world, to endorse without its being submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration by it as to the meaning of the amendment of the distinguished and eminent Senator from Georgia. That committee should consider its possible effects and impacts not only upon our relations abroad and our international dealings with other countries, but upon dealings throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Of course the Senator from Georgia professes the greatest respect for the learned Judiciary Committee, from which he borrowed the term "internal law." However, the Senator from Georgia now seems well content and very happy to bypass the committee, when it comes to considering the meaning of his substitute amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. No, Mr. President; I merely called attention to the fact that the expression was contained in the committee's report, and that the committee took evidence regarding it.

Judging from what the distinguished Senator from Missouri has read from the letter from Mr. Justice Roberts, I think it clear that Justice Roberts is still of the opinion that the construction in the Pink case did override State law, clearly, definitely, positively. He says that my amendment would not have reached that situation. Suppose it had been in effect when the parties to that case in New York undertook to plead the Litvinov assignment, to which the President had assented. The parties to that suit could have said, "This agreement has never been approved by the Congress of the United States," and it would have been a complete answer to the suit, Mr. Justice Roberts to the contrary.

I might invoke the doctrine that while a juror may sustain his verdict, he is not——

Mr. HENNINGS. He may not impeach it.

Mr. GEORGE. He is not entitled to repudiate it.

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that it is coincidental that I happened to have been a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives at the time this agreement came before it. The distinguished Senator from Georgia was then a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. The Senator from Georgia having said that the Congress acted upon a number of agreements setting up commissions, if he will indulge me——

Mr. GEORGE. I mean at different times; not at that time.

Mr. HENNINGS. I invite attention to House Report No. 865, 76th Congress, first session, under the heading of "Claims of American Nationals Against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." The report quotes a letter to President Roosevelt, dated June 1, 1939, signed by Cordell Hull, then Secretary of State.

Mr. GEORGE. What is the date of it?

Mr. HENNINGS. I have just read the date of the letter, June 1, 1939. The date of the report is June 19, 1939.

I quote from the letter as it appears on page 2 of the House report:

It has not thus far been possible to bring about an agreement with the Soviet Government for the settlement of such claims, but on November 16, 1933, preparatory to the settlement of all claims and counter-claims between the two Governments, the Soviet Government assigned to the Government of the United States certain assets in this country. Some of these assets have been liquidated and covered into the Treasury where they have been deposited in a special fund; others are the subject of litigation now pending in our courts. Such of them as may be held to be payable to this Government under the assignment will be deposited in the fund as they are collected.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator that that agreement was published in 1933. It consisted of an exchange of letters between President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Mr. Litvinov, dated November 16, 1933. I shall introduce into the RECORD the photostatic copies of this correspondence as reported by the New York Times on November 18, 1933, at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. GEORGE. When was that letter published?

Mr. HENNINGS. In 1933.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not asking for the date of the letter. I am asking when it was published.

Mr. HENNINGS. The document which I hold in my hand was first printed in 1933, according to the notation. The copy which I hold in my hand is a reprint. The notation is to the effect that it was first printed in 1933. So we did have notice, of course, of the Litvinov assignment, and we did have notice of the recognition of Soviet Russia in 1933.

Mr. GEORGE. Even if we had notice of the Litvinov assignment we could not have had any notice of what the Supreme Court of the United States subsequently held, with five Justices on the majority side, and with the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Roberts dissenting. In a devastating dissent the Chief Justice answered all points in the case.

I repeat that what we were doing in the case of Russia was no more than what we did in the case of Germany or in the case of Mexico. It was no more than what we have done in all cases, namely, to create a Commission to adjudicate the claims of our nationals against the Russian Government, the German Government, or the Mexican Government, and also, in many instances, to adjudicate the claims of the United States.

The funds derived under the Litvinov agreement could have been only an infinitesimal part of the total claims which were asserted and have been asserted, or prevented, at least, against the Russian Government. We had a claim of some $11 billion, and up to this time, so far as I know, no great part of it has been paid. But certainly that sort of recognition did not put the Congress on notice of anything that was in the Litvinov agreement, or what the Supreme Court of the United States might hold. The holding of the Supreme Court is the signal of a danger against which we here seek to guard. We are seeking to provide that these agreements, which are not assented to by the Congress in the first instance, or even necessarily brought to the attention of the Congress, shall not become binding within the United States as a part of our domestic law, so as to override otherwise valid laws and provisions in State constitutions, unless the Congress—not the States—through the ordinary, normal process of lawmaking, shall have approved them.

Mr. HENNINGS. In the opinion of the learned Senator, would the ordinary process of lawmaking be to refer this

proposal back to the duly constituted Committee on the Judiciary for further examination of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. No. Frankly, I believe that the proposal to send it back to the committee is simply a method of interment or burial. At least, that would be the hope of some. That would not be true in the case of the distinguished Senator from Missouri or the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], but that would be the interpretation placed upon such action by the country.

This question has been before the Committee on the Judiciary for many months. I do not know for how long. This very question has been discussed. In view of those facts, I believe that we ought now to be prepared to act upon the proposal. I do not say that we must approve what the committee has reported, but we should approve a definite, positive policy, so that we can submit it to the people of the States.

Let me say to my friend that I have no fear of submitting a proposed constitutional amendment to the State legislatures. They will scrutinize it. They will give it life if it should have life. I have no fear of permitting them to do so. But I again say, without any attempt to warn any Senator, that we will now go as far as I have suggested, or that at a no great distant date we will go perhaps further. I do not want to take an extreme step which would disturb the proper relationship, as I conceive it to be, between the National Government and the States in the field of treaty-making.

Mr. President, I hope that the distinguished Senator will now address himself to the first amendment, which is the Ferguson amendment, although it is now the same as my amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will remain for a while, I shall address myself to the Ferguson amendment and to the Senator's substitute. To the best of my ability I shall undertake to do so as quickly as I possibly can. I had hoped that the distinguished Senator from Georgia would advert more to the Pink case today, as he indicated he would on Thursday.

Mr. GEORGE. No; I have already stated where the Senator can get the meat of the Pink case. If he will read the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Stone, he will get it.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator for his contribution. Is Justice Roberts still on the high plateau to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes; I have nothing to say against Mr. Justice Roberts, except that he is mistaken in what he says about my amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. In accordance with the distinguished Senator's request, I shall address myself both to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, as I stated at the outset, and also to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I made that statement when I began my address, and I repeat it now for the benefit of the Senator from Georgia.

I understand the Senator from Georgia makes the general assertion that the President alone can make executive agreements which are binding on the States, without even a majority of either House passing upon them. He relies on the dicta of one Supreme Court case for his assertion. All the Court held is that in the exercise of a specific power granted him under the Constitution, such as the President's power to recognize a foreign government, the President can conclude executive agreements which can override conflicting State policies or State laws. The holding is very narrow.

I believe the Senator from Tennessee wanted to ask a question at this point during the rather protracted colloquy between myself and the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. First I should like to conclude my remarks on this point, so that I can stay on the track, so to speak. When I have concluded my remarks I shall be very happy to yield to all Senators, until we turn the lights out. However, I should like to make these comments first. By so doing we may save some time.

Except for the dicta in this one case there is no indication that the Supreme Court has any intention of permitting executive agreements, which are made outside the President's specific constitutional powers, to override State laws.

It seems to me that any Senator who, like the Senator from Georgia, advocates that the States should give up to Congress one of their most potent and living protections against the encroachment of Federal power, namely, the two-thirds vote in the Senate, because he feels that the Supreme Court might, at some indeterminate time in the future, allow a President by executive agreements to act in derogation of the rights of the States, is not thinking of the doctrine of State sovereignty or the supremacy of the States under the separation of powers theory. As I have said before, this is rather fatal medicine for a hypothetical disease, or for something which has not happened and is not very likely to happen.

There are a number of other aspects of the debate which I wish to explore further. During his remarks on Thursday, the Senator from Georgia made several statements which indicated that he feared secret agreements can override State and Federal law. For instance he said:

> There must be an act of Congress carrying into effect those provisions of a secret agreement which override otherwise valid State laws. That is all I propose.

That statement will be found at page 1665, column 1, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I submit that the George amendment has nothing to do with secret agreements, be they treaties, executive agreements, or other international agreements. All the George amendment proposes to do is to prevent executive agreements from having effect as internal law unless there is an implementing act by Congress. We have just learned that the distinguished Senator from Georgia was a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and did act upon the so-called Litvinov assignment, of which he stated earlier today and the other day he knew nothing.

However, secret agreements, by their very nature, cannot possibly have any effect on internal law. How could a court—any court—possibly allow a litigant to make any use whatever of an executive agreement which has been kept a secret by the President? By the very fact that it had been kept secret, neither the litigant nor the judge would have any knowledge of it, obviously, and could not possibly make any use of it as internal law, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia now says he understands what that term means and wants us to understand what it means, because the Committee on the Judiciary used the phrase, and because other learned men, he says, used that phrase, and they must know what it means. Once an agreement is made public, it is no longer secret, and only then can a litigant use it.

Mr. President, I should like to anticipate the specious argument which might be made by asking the question, "Well, how about an agreement that is kept secret for 10 years and is then made public; would not that become internal law?" We have been touching on that question to some extent this afternoon. Whether it would become internal law would depend on the constitutional power under which it was concluded. But it is perfectly obvious, even if such an agreement is effective as internal law without any implementation, that no court would ever permit the prosecution of anyone for a violation of it, committed prior to the publication and prior to the time it could be presumed that the violator had knowledge of it. Any other result would be unspeakable and unknown in the American process of justice.

Thus I say, all the talk about secret agreements is completely irrelevant. The George substitute does not deal with them. In any event they cannot take effect as internal law until after they are made public.

During the discussion last Thursday, I suggested to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that the Congress could have negated the Litvinov assignment if it had chosen to do so but that the Congress on the contrary had chosen to implement this executive agreement. In reply to my statement, the Senator stated that, so far as he could recall, the Congress knew nothing about the Litvinov assignment until it became subject to litigation in the courts and that he did not know of any implementation by the Congress of this assignment. Later in the discussion I referred my distinguished colleague from Georgia to the act of Congress which implemented the Litvinov assignment, a joint resolution passed by both Houses of Congress and approved by the President on August 21, 1939—53d United States Statutes at Large, page 1199; House Report No. 865, 76th Congress, 1st session. This joint resolution in substance authorized the President to appoint a commissioner

to determine the validity and amounts of the claims of American nationals against the Soviet Union.

In reporting this measure to the Senate on behalf of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the Senator from Georgia was, as now, a member, Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, said:

> I do not know of any other way for American nationals to have an opportunity to present their claims against the Soviet Government. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 84, pt. 10, p. 10631.

It is perfectly natural that the learned Senator from Georgia would not have remembered that the Litvinov assignment was made public in 1933 and that the Congress in 1939 passed a joint resolution implementing it. During the time he has been a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate this committee must have handled thousands of items, and this joint resolution was adopted by the Senate after a very brief explanation of the measure by Senator Harrison. I bring these facts to the attention of the Senate merely to establish the fact that the Congress did know about the Litvinov assignment prior to the time it became the subject of litigation, and did, in fact, implement it by passing a joint resolution authorizing the President to set up a commission to determine the validity and amount of American claims against the Soviet Government.

The Litvinov assignment was effected by an exchange of letters dated November 16, 1933, between President Roosevelt and Maxim Litvinov, the then Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union.

The State Department published the Litvinov assignment in late 1933—Department of State Publication 528, Eastern European series, No. 1, old series. I hold in my hands a reprint of this agreement issued by the State Department in 1948. Also, the full text of the assignment was published in full in an edition of the American Journal of International Law published in January 1934.

Mr. President, last Thursday when I discussed the Pink case briefly with the senior Senator from Georgia, he referred a number of times to the philosophy of the case as a great danger to us all. I am not sure exactly what he means by "philosophy," but I presume that he means the paragraph or two of dicta in the case which, though unessential to the decision, speak of executive agreements having a similar dignity to treaties, whatever that may mean. I should like to point out that never has the philosophy of the case, nor have the dicta of the case, been put into practice by the courts, or, for that matter, ever been repeated by the courts even as dicta. As all lawyers know, most courts are prone to add obiter dicta to their opinions. Lawyers also learn not to take such dicta too seriously. It is only when it is implemented in a later case that it is of importance. The dicta in the Pink case have never been implemented by a later case. The possibility that it might be is no ground to amend the Constitution of the United States. If we amended the Constitution every time a Supreme Court Justice appended some far-reaching and vague dicta to an opinion, we would have as our Constitution an unworkable document a hundred times the size of our present compact and workable document.

In regard to this matter on February 10, 1954, I sent former Justice Owen D. Roberts the following telegram:

> In consideration of your dissent in Pink case which Senator GEORGE is principally relying on in support of his proposal, I would greatly appreciate receiving a wire collect as soon as possible stating your opinion concerning his substitute proposal to amend the Constitution to provide:
>
> "SEC. 2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress."
>
> Thank you.
>
> THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.

In reply Mr. Justice Roberts sent the following telegram:

> George amendment would not reach Pink situation. President has sole power to decide on recognition foreign power. He may as he did with Russia demand as condition that such power abandon or assign claims against our nationals. Trouble in Pink case was that Court read into mere assignment an intent to change State law, as to effect of assignment. I am still against any amendment.
>
> OWEN J. ROBERTS.

The telegram was followed by the following letter from Mr. Justice Roberts:

> FEBRUARY 11, 1954.
>
> DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: Pursuant to your telegram received this morning, I sent you a day letter today briefly stating why I did not think the Pink case was relevant to the present discussion of the proposed amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia a few days ago stated on the floor of the Senate:

> I confess that that is true so far as executive agreements are concerned, because had not the Pink case gone as far as I believe it has, keeping in line with the general trend of some of the decisions that have tended to interpret executive agreements as being very closely akin to treaties, I would not have offered my substitute.

Mr. President, I continue reading from the letter from Mr. Justice Roberts:

> I should like to elaborate that telegram so as to make more understandable my position concerning the Pink case.
>
> I do not suppose even the most radical advocate of limiting the President's powers would suggest that the matter of recognition or nonrecognition of a foreign government rests anywhere but in the executive. It has not been uncommon for Presidents to condition their recognition of a foreign government on that government's fulfilling certain conditions. I do not understand that it is proposed to alter this prerogative of the Chief Executive.
>
> In the light of these statements, I come to the recognition of Russia by President Roosevelt. Much hard feeling and difficulty had been created by certain claims against our nationals and certain refusals to recognize debts owed to our nationals. When President Roosevelt determined to recognize Russia, he imposed a condition that the U. S. S. R. should assign to the United States all claims against our nationals. This would mean a relinquishment of all claims to funds held in the United States for account of citizens of Russia and would no doubt furnish a fund which could be used to pay certain valid claims of our citizens against Russia and Russian citizens. Now it should be observed that President Roosevelt made no "agreement" as to what we should do for Russia. He merely exacted from Litvinov an assignment by the U. S. S. R. of all its claims against our nationals. Naturally the agreement did not specify what those claims were nor did it specify that all claims by Russia must be considered valid by the courts of the United States. It was obviously to be construed as an assignment of whatever would have been collectible by Russia and Russia's nationals against our nationals in whatever court had jurisdiction to adjudicate the validity of a claim. The Supreme Court so held in *Guaranty Trust Company* v. *U. S.* (304 U. S. 142), where it held that the defendant in a claim under the assignment could plead the statute of limitations. In the Pink case, the insurance commissioner of New York had paid all domestic claimants. Then a number of claims against the fund were filed by foreigners. The administration evidently decided to try to keep the foreigners from coming in on the fund so that it could go to the United States to be distributed amongst claimants against Russia. The Attorney General, therefore, took the position that the Russian decree of confiscation had extraterritorial operation, and was within the category of "claims" specified in the Litvinov assignment. The Court of Appeals of New York was of a different view. The Supreme Court of the United States reexamined the matter for itself and found that the Russian decree had extraterritorial effect, but this normally would be a question upon which the Supreme Court would not review a State court. In order to reach out and take jurisdiction, a majority of the Court had to hold the Litvinov assignment had the effect of overruling State law in this respect and that President Roosevelt, in receiving it, so intended. There is not a word in the record to show this. It is purely inference.
>
> Now let me point out that Senator GEORGE's proposed amendment would not have altered the situation in the slightest. Congress knew of the Litvinov agreement, approved of it, and implemented it by providing for a commissioner to examine claims and distribute any fund that the United States might get under the assignment. See H. R. 865, 76th Congress, 1st session; see also joint resolution of August 4, 1939, 53 Stat. 1199. But suppose Congress had gone even further and had affirmatively approved, ratified, and ordered carried into execution the Litvinov assignment. The same question would then have been presented to the Supreme Court, namely, Was so broad an effect to be given the assignment as to hold that it abrogated the law of New York concerning the distribution of an insolvent's assets? Clearly the administration would have prevailed in the Supreme Court on the same basis, namely, the construction of the assignment as it did in fact prevail.
>
> As I said in my telegram to you, and as I repeat, the George amendment would not have altered in the slightest the decision in the Pink case. I thought, when it was decided, the decision was wrong. I still think so, but if there be any defect whatever, it is the defect in the attitude of the Supreme Court concerning the effect and scope of the assignment. To strip down the power of a President to make necessary agreements in connection with the recognition of a foreign government and with many of the details of our daily relationships with our neighbors because of what I think is the erroneous decision of the Supreme Court in the construction of a written instrument seems to me the height of folly.
>
> Yours sincerely,
>
> OWEN J. ROBERTS.

As Justice Roberts points out in his letter the George amendment would have had no effect on the outcome of the Pink case. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia would not have altered the situation in the slightest. The Pink case is the case on which the distinguished Senator from Georgia seems to rely as the basis for the amendment which Congress is asked to adopt or to write into the Constitution on the floor of the United States Senate. The Litvinov agreement was implemented by the Congress and would have been approved by the Congress even if the George substitute had been part of the Constitution in 1933; and to strike down the necessary powers of the President to act for the Nation's safety in this atomic age would be the height of folly.

In discussing the Pink case on Thursday, the distinguished Senator from Georgia stated, at page 1665 of the RECORD:

> I am not complaining whether the Pink case deprives a United States citizen or a foreigner of his rights. If today, a foreign citizen can be deprived of his rights, tomorrow a United States citizen can be deprived of his rights, under the same theory or the same doctrine. I would never discuss this point upon so narrow a principle as that.

To me, at least, it is perfectly clear that the only deprivation of rights took place because of the expropriation decrees of the Soviet Government. There were many such decrees and they affected many shareholders, Russian and American alike. The whole object in making the Litvinov agreement, as recognized by the Supreme Court in the now famous Pink case, was to assure American creditors priority over Russian creditors in the disposition of assets of the expropriated Russian companies in this country.

The Supreme Court dealt at some length with the question of rights under the fifth amendment, which the Senator from Georgia discussed very ably this afternoon. On last Thursday, Mr. President, I read several pages of the Court's opinion on this point. The Court went to some length to spell out that since the expropriated companies were Russian companies, what Russia had done in the way of expropriation was not a matter for judicial consideration in the United States. Our laws and the provisions of our Constitution, as I am certain the distinguished Senator from Georgia knows, do not have extraterritorial effect, except in relation to our own citizens. So when the Senator from Georgia makes great point of the fifth amendment, certainly he must know it has no effect extraterritorially, except as affecting citizens of the United States of America. That argument would seem to me to be totally without merit.

Although aliens get the benefits of our laws and our Constitution so far as transactions occurring in this country are concerned, they must look to their own governments for any redress to which they may be entitled for losses occurring in their own countries. Palpably, we in this country cannot undertake to protect Russian citizens against decrees issued in Russia. The fact that a foreign citizen is not entitled to the protection of the fifth amendment, of which the Senator from Georgia spoke earlier, in relation to a transaction occurring abroad, whereas an American citizen might be entitled to it in an American court, is no justification whatever for the statement by the Senator from Georgia that:

> If today, a foreign citizen can be deprived of his rights, tomorrow a United States citizen can be deprived of his rights, under the same theory or the same doctrine.

The Senator from Georgia apparently bases his statement on the false premise, which I am certain he must understand, that our laws and our Constitution have extraterritorial effect for the benefit of aliens and citizens alike in relation to transactions in this country. I cannot conceive otherwise than that the Senator from Georgia must have misspoken when he undertook to explain the extraterritorial application of the laws of the United States. In point of fact, they have no such extraterritorial effect, as the Court so clearly points out in the Pink case, citing many earlier cases and restating, as all lawyers know, a well-known rule of law.

Another statement made by the Senator from Georgia needs, I think, some discussion. The statement to which I refer is the following:

> [The President] does, in the first instance, make his decision, and, as I have said, it puts upon him no great burden. I daresay the President does read every agreement he signs, and if it be an agreement which invades an otherwise valid right under a State law, the President would say so.

That statement was with relation to a question I had asked the President about a review of all the executive agreements.

The Senator from Georgia has said he presumes the President "does read every agreement he signs." Although I think many Senators seriously doubt whether the President reads all the executive agreements which are presented to him for his signature, rather than merely the ones which are pointed out as being important, the question really is of no great significance. I say this because the President of the United States actually signs only a very small fraction of the executive agreements which are concluded on his behalf. Most of the important ones are signed for him by his agent, the Secretary of State. But, in numbers, even these constitute a very small percentage of the total.

When the Senator from Georgia said the other day, in answer to a question, that the President must read the agreements in order to know what he is signing, it seems palpably inconsistent and absurd that any President could possibly do so, there being thousands upon thousands of such agreements made during the course of a year. The great bulk of executive agreements are signed on behalf of the President by our Foreign Service representatives all over the world. These agreements run into the thousands, even the hundreds of thousands, a year, and cover subjects ranging all the way from those of the gravest importance, such as the Korean armistice, to the most trivial. It is extremely doubtful whether even a large percentage of all these executive agreements ever are collected in one place. I doubt if even the State Department has anywhere nearly all of them. I am certain that no single person, nor one small group of persons, has cognizance of all of them. There is no need for it. I presume that if the George amendment were agreed to, a sizable appropriation would be sought to hire a staff to perform the rather artificial and needless task of collecting all executive agreements, an unrewarding, monumental assignment, virtually impossible of ever being fulfilled.

The Senator from Georgia also is unclear about the type of determination which the President or a group of his agents would have to make under the proposed George substitute amendment. At page 1668 of the RECORD, the Senator from Georgia says that the President, after reading an executive agreement he was to sign, would say so "if it be an agreement which invades an otherwise valid right under a State law."

I should like to point out that the determination which the President would have to make, or rather have made for him, in regard to thousands of executive agreements would not be whether the agreements invade "an otherwise valid right under a State law." The determination which he would have to make would be an extremely more difficult one; it would be whether a particular agreement should have "an effect as internal law," whether or not it invades an otherwise valid right under a law, State, Federal, or local. Or, to state it another way, it seems that what the President would have to decide would be whether any legitimate American litigant would like to use the executive agreement in an American court to help prove his case. What the proposal of the Senator from Georgia—and it would certainly apply to the perfecting amendment of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]—says is that "an international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of Congress." As I read the amendment, before a litigant can make any use of an executive agreement in court, whether or not it invades a State or Federal law, the agreement must be implemented by some sort of act of Congress.

If the George amendment should go into effect, certain executive agreements would automatically fall into the category of those which should be submitted to the Congress for implementation, although on their surface they might appear to have no effect on internal law in the eyes of a nonlawyer.

The Korean armistice is a good example. To a lawyer it is obvious that all sorts of litigants would need to use the agreement in court and the President would be bound to send it to Congress for implementation.

But the Korean armistice is a "cinch" case. There are thousands of executive agreements concluded yearly all over the world by many representatives of the United States. Who can possibly tell which of these will be of legitimate interest to some unknown and unforeseen

litigant? One can think of thousands of examples. Let us take, for instance, an agreement which is concluded for the President by our representative in Saudi Arabia with the government there, and which concerns the living conditions of certain categories of American oil workers on a particular project in that country. Can anyone readily foresee actual lawsuits in the United States which would require the pleading of such an agreement? It would not seem to comport with reason that anyone could.

It appears to me that almost any lawyer can think of plenty of hypothetical cases which might well arise and which would require that the agreement be used as internal law. For example, an American workman in Saudi Arabia might be injured in an accident in a company-supplied house. If he was seriously injured, he would probably be returned to the United States. In time he might want to bring suit against the oil company in a court in the United States, possibly on the ground that the company had been negligent in constructing the house in Saudi Arabia. Both the workman and the company would probably want to plead the executive agreement between the United States and Saudi Arabian Governments. I believe that this would require implementation by Congress. If the Congress had not implemented the agreement at the time the suit was brought, both parties would have a legitimate grievance either against the President for not having submitted it to Congress, or against the Congress for not having implemented it. That would happen under the so-called George substitute.

This example would apply to thousands of executive agreements every year. Even if all of them were collected in one place and examined by a single group of men, as yet undetermined, there would still be the almost insuperable problem of deciding which of them should be submitted to Congress as of potential interest to unknown American litigants. The end result of such a process would be that the President would, so as to be on the safe side, present thousands of executive agreements to the Congress every year, because once they were submitted to Congress the onus would be upon the Congress to take some action on them.

As I have said before during the course of the debate on the proposed constitutional amendment, I am at a complete loss to know what we could do with them; and if the senior Senator from Georgia has any suggestions as to how we could intelligently act upon these thousands of executive agreements, I would certainly like to be enlightened. Under the terms of his amendment, the Senate would get thousands of them, and I simply do not know what we could do with them that would be of any value to anyone. The only people who stand to lose under this system would be legitimate American litigants whose cases would be "fouled up" because the President had failed to refer to Congress, or Congress had failed to act upon, obscure executive agreements which no one could guess in advance would be of interest as internal law to anyone.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The question I have is on the point the Senator is discussing. Conversely to the situation the Senator has just stated, which is an important question in the discussion, would be the situation of a workman in Saudi Arabia who would have enforceable rights in the courts of this country, and the President would make an executive agreement, which would not be known to the public or to the particular workman or to anyone else, which would destroy the right of the workman to sue in this country under the procedures of our courts.

There is a double-barreled injustice involved. In the first case to which the Senator referred, if the Congress failed to act, an injustice might occur. In the second case, if no one knew about the destruction of an individual's rights by an executive agreement, an injustice would occur. I desired merely to call that situation to the attention of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from Iowa for his contribution. I undertook to discuss that subject earlier, before the distinguished Senator from Iowa came to the floor. I recognize that there is uncertainty and difference of opinion as to the effect of many executive agreements.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I raised the point only because I thought it was pertinent to what the Senator was discussing.

Mr. HENNINGS. As an able lawyer, the Senator from Iowa realizes, of course, that my point is that the amendment under discussion, together with all other substitute amendments or perfecting amendments, including the so-called George amendment and the Ferguson perfecting amendment, should go back to the Committee on the Judiciary in order that the committee may study their language. There seems to be, on the part of able constitutional lawyers, judges, and others who are interested in the matter, a great difference of opinion as to the effect of such amendments.

The George substitute amendment, and in particular the phrase "effective as internal law" contained in it, raised so many unanswered questions in my mind that I decided to attempt to find out whether or not it caused similar serious misgivings in the minds of some illustrious Americans whose judgment on this subject I value very highly. I sent the following telegram to Mr. John W. Davis, Gen. Lucius D. Clay, and Mr. Homer Cummings:

In connection with Senate debate on Bricker amendment and other proposals, I would greatly appreciate receiving a wire collect as soon as possible stating your opinion concerning Senator GEORGE's substitute proposal—

Which is virtually the same as the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and certain other Senators—

to amend the Constitution to provide:

"SEC. 2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress."

Thank you.

General Clay sent the following reply to my telegram:

My respect for Senator GEORGE is so great that it is difficult for me not to fully accept anything he proposes. However, I have seen no analysis which would indicate the types of transactions which would be affected by section 2 nor any authoritative statement of what constitutes internal law. For example, would the amendment curtail the essential powers of the President as Commander in Chief in event of an invasion of our soil, say, perhaps in Alaska? If this was a possible interpretation, it could result in catastrophe. With highest respect and kindest regards.

And Mr. Homer Cummings, the former Attorney General of the United States, sent the following reply:

Thank you for your courteous telegram. In my judgment the power of the President to deal with foreign affairs is set forth in the Constitution succinctly and effectively. It has successfully stood the test of time and experience, and no change is warranted. Any amendment, no matter what the phraseology may be, would introduce elements of doubt and uncertainty and might do incalculable harm. I am, therefore, opposed to the Bricker amendment or any substitute therefor, no matter what form it may take.

The wire from Mr. John W. Davis I read to the Senate earlier in my remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter, under date of February 12, which I have received from Mr. John Lord O'Brian, in response to the telegram I have read.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COVINGTON & BURLING,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1954.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: Replying to your telegram, permit me to say that despite the very deep respect that I entertain for Senator GEORGE I am strongly opposed to his proposed amendment, as indeed I now am opposed to all of the so-called substitutes. My opposition to the Bricker amendment was the result of historical study and my profound faith in the good judgment and commonsense of the American people and of their representatives in the Senate.

It seems to me that it is far safer to rest in that confidence than to introduce into our fundamental law such new phrases as "executive agreement," "internal law," etc. In these difficult and troublesome times and in those that are certain to lie ahead of us, there is a very real danger that such a constitutional provision might frustrate essential executive action with truly disastrous consequences. Least of all is there any excuse, in my opinion, for introducing into the Constitution reaffirmations of meanings which the courts have long attributed to it.

Furthermore, when the consideration of so grave a question reaches the present stage of discussing refinements intended to meet objections of particular representatives this is, to me at least, the clearest evidence of all that none of the proposed amendments are

necessary. If there is to be any experimenting, let it be by amending the Senate Rules, without tampering with the Constitution itself.

Thanking you for the opportunity to express my views, I am,

Faithfully yours,

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, to summarize my arguments in opposition to the George substitute, let me briefly note the following points. I have directed my attention to his suggestions because I am sure that his proposal or some variation of it is the only proposition the Senate is at all likely to adopt; and because the eminence of the Senator from Georgia, his great distinction as a Member of this body, and his accepted position as a constitutional lawyer and authority, give his amendment much greater weight than a similar proposal might have if it were to emanate from almost any other Member of this body. His amendment has the surface aspect of reasonableness. With the brilliance and prestige of the great Senator from Georgia to support the proposition, I am anxious lest my colleagues may adopt it. I have no fear that the Senate will adopt the extreme proposal in any of its variations urged by the Senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The Senator from Georgia urges that on the basis of the Supreme Court's dicta in the Pink case, we amend the Constitution in a manner that many eminent constitutional lawyers, including former Justice Roberts, who dissented in the Pink case, and also including John W. Davis, think would strike down necessary Presidential powers. Justice Roberts in his telegram and letter to me stated emphatically that the substitute amendment of the Senator from Georgia would have had no effect on the outcome of the Pink case, upon which our learned friend, the Senator from Georgia, relies absolutely, and as a result of which his amendment was spawned and first saw the light of day, according to the Senator's own statement.

If Justice Roberts is correct—and according to my view, there is no question but that he is correct—the entire case for the amendment of the Senator from Georgia falls.

Mr. President, in this connection let us bear in mind that Mr. Justice Roberts was one of the justices who dissented from the majority opinion in the Pink case; and the Senator from Georgia professes to have great admiration for and concurrence in that dissenting opinion.

Furthermore, the proposed amendment would make it easy and logical for Presidents to avoid the protection provided to States rights by the requirement that two-thirds of the Senate must consent if State laws and constitutions are to be changed by an international agreement.

Thus the Senator from Georgia would dilute his own power as a United States Senator, and certainly he would greatly dilute the power of all other Members of the Senate, particularly those representing States with relatively small populations, as compared to the population of New York, with its 43 Members of the House of Representatives, as well as 2 Members of the United States Senate. Under the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, such things as the Genocide Convention, the Human Rights Covenant, and so forth—highly controversial proposals which, as a matter of fact, have languished for some years in congressional committees—could be made domestic law in the United States through use of an executive agreement implemented by a simple majority of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is the Senator from Missouri willing to yield at this point or does he prefer not to be interrupted at this stage of the proceedings?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I had understood that the proposals the Senator from Missouri has just mentioned were the very things the supporters of these amendments have been saying they would protect us against.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is exactly correct; they are what the proponents of these schemes—if I may use that word; the amendments have been hasily devised and brought before us—to amend the Constitution of the United States, have said they would prevent, whereas, as a matter of fact, the present requirement for concurrence by two-thirds of the Members of the Senate must now be met before such proposals can be made treaty law.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So, in the Senator's opinion, the proponents of such amendments as the George amendment would make easier the adoption of such rather radical proposals as he has mentioned.

Mr. HENNINGS. Is there any question in the mind of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that that would be true?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. I wish to congratulate the Senator on the analysis of the Pink case which he made last week. I read it with great care.

I ask this question only to emphasize what seems to me to be a very obvious weakness in these proposals. Instead of strengthening the protection of the Senate and of the country against such supposed dangers, which have been the inspiration for the entire movement behind the Bricker amendment and its subsidiary developments, such proposals would make us more vulnerable to such dangers. I think the Senator has done an extremely able service in analyzing the Pink case, which I dare say very few Members of this body understand.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my distinguished friend from Arkansas for his contribution and for his kind observations with respect to me, some of which I certainly must disclaim.

I do not know whether the Senator was present the other day when I suggested that often lawyers have a great deal of fun, and silence the questions of opponents, when engaged in a discussion, by saying, "My opponent has no right to take any part in this discussion, because he has not read the Schultz case." Such a statement often disarms an opponent. Certainly the Senator has not read the Schultz case. Often the Schultz case has no bearing whatever on any part of the discussion.

I say that the Pink case has been misunderstood and so presented to the Members of this body as to indicate that it constitutes a real threat, when anyone who takes the time and trouble to read it can readily see that it is not in point at all. Mr. Justice Roberts, who sat in the Pink case, says clearly that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia would have had no effect upon that decision if it had been in effect.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I read every word of the debate last week, and as a consequence I even read the Pink case.

Mr. HENNINGS. I must compliment the learned Senator from Arkansas for having read the case.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator's analysis of the Pink case and what it means. It involves a complicated set of facts. I think it is difficult to understand. The Senator from Missouri has performed a great service in analyzing it and presenting his analysis to the Senate. There is no excuse for any Senator not reading that debate.

I had understood that the principal reason for the so-called George amendment was the Pink case. I think the Senator from Missouri cut away any excuse for that amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my distinguished friend for his observations. I may say that the Senator from Georgia himself says that the reason for his amendment was the decision in the Pink case. If the Pink case is established as the premise, and if we take the Senator from Georgia at his word, he having suggested that the predicate for his proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States is the Pink case, we see that in and of itself the Pink case is not in point in any manner whatsoever. That statement is not only sustained by other lawyers, but it is sustained by one of the very justices who sat in the case, Justice Roberts, who said that had the George amendment been in effect it would not have affected the ruling in the Pink case in any degree whatsoever.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know that the Senator from Georgia has formally agreed, but he has stated that he would specifically except certain agreements made in pursuance of the constitutional right of the President to recognize foreign governments.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Georgia has already stated that he would except any agreement made in furtherance of the recognition of a foreign government. In one breath he says he will accept what the Pink case might seem to hold, embodying, as it does, the Litvinov assignment and the agreement to recognize the U. S. S. R.; and on the

other hand he seems to repudiate it, because the Pink case is what causes him all the trouble and concern, and for that reason he has offered his proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

I think the Senator from Arkansas is eminently correct, and I thank him for his further development of this exceedingly important point. I believe that if Members of this body would read the Pink case—and I am sure many of them have done so with greater understanding than I—and then read the debate and analysis centering about that case, they would not agree to the substitute offered by the learned and distinguished Senator from Georgia.

I cannot conceive that he realizes that he would be surrendering, to a great extent, the power of the State of Georgia as a sovereign State, acting through its representation in this body, when he would dilute the power of that State by sending executive agreements over to the House of Representatives, where Georgia and every other State below the Mason and Dixon's line could be outvoted by the State of New York, for example.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is especially strange when one recalls the struggle which has taken place on the floor of the Senate to retain the two-thirds rule when proposals have been made to change the rules of the Senate. I have participated in that struggle at great length. I believe it is a correct and proper rule. Yet in this instance, in a little different way, it is proposed that we give up without a struggle.

Mr. HENNINGS. In effect the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] would destroy the two-thirds rule on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas is indeed correct. It seems incredible that such a proposal should come from the source from which it comes, namely, the State of Georgia.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is my impression also.

Mr. HENNINGS. However, the question is before us and we are asked to deal with it. The proposal is presented to us with gravity and seriousness.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want the RECORD to show that I am not in favor of destroying the two-thirds rule.

Mr. HENNINGS. I take it, then, that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas wishes to preserve the sovereignty of his State, to such extent as he can, and to preserve the rights to which his State is entitled under the Constitution as it now stands.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator has read the letter which Louis H. Pink wrote to the New York Times last Saturday. I placed it in the RECORD earlier in the day.

Mr. HENNINGS. I was present when the distinguished Senator placed it in the RECORD. I saw it in last Saturday's New York Times, and I wrote to Mr. Pink and asked him to write me a letter, which has not yet arrived.

Mr. Pink, the Commissioner in the case to which the junior Senator from New York refers, in his letter to the New York Times, said that had the George amendment been in effect, it would not in any way have affected his administration of the the so-called Litvinov assignment.

Mr. LEHMAN. At the time the case came before the courts, Mr. Pink was probably more familiar with it than anyone else except the justices of the court who finally made the determination.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the distinguished Senator from Missouri has rendered a very great service in so clearly and forthrightly analyzing the various proposals, including the George amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. He has drawn our attention to the fact that literally thousands of so-called executive agreements, many of which, of course, are purely technical in character, are entered into between our Government and other governments during the course of a year.

The Senator has also pointed out that if the question of approval were to have any effect at all, it would require either a close scrutiny of thousands of agreements, which would be a physical impossibility, or a general approval of such agreements.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is impossible to do that, as the Senator from New York well knows, he having been the chief executive of the Empire State of the Union for four terms, if I recall correctly. He is very familiar with the great burden of paper work and the literal and physical impossibility of the President of the United States examining all executive agreements, and, as the Senator from Georgia says, reading them and sending to the Congress those which in his judgment may affect internal law—whatever "internal law" means. We cannot agree upon the definition of internal law. No one knows with certainty what internal law means.

Mr. LEHMAN. I quite agree, of course. I am sure the Senator from Missouri will recollect that in the months which lie behind us, during which the so-called Bricker amendment was first discussed, its greatest emphasis, and practically its only emphasis, was on the necessity of safeguarding the sovereignty of the States and the rights of the citizens who reside in those States.

Is it not perfectly clear that if we give up the two-thirds vote that is required to approve a treaty which supersedes State laws, if not found to be in conflict with the Constitution, we would not in merely one case but possibly in hundreds of cases put Congress on record by a majority vote, not a two-thirds vote, as sanctioning a procedure which might very seriously affect and impede the sovereignty of the States and the rights of the individual citizens?

That is one of the reasons I am fearful of the George amendment. It seems to me that there is a very real danger that, instead of safeguarding the sovereignty of the States and the rights of the citizens, as has been claimed right along as the main purpose of the Bricker amendment, we would actually be tearing down the sovereignty of the States and imperiling the rights of the citizens of those States.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for his contribution. There is no question about it. Starting with the Bricker amendment and the three amendments to it—I believe three amendments have been reported by the committee since the Bricker amendment was first introduced; and now the Ferguson amendment and all the other perfecting amendments and the George substitute—as we go through all of them we become increasingly aware of the fact that there is being dug a series of pitfalls, if you please, Mr. President, into which the Senate might fall, simply because we have not completely and thoroughly discussed or studied them, or had the advice and help of many lawyers and judges and constitutional authorities as to what the precise effect of the George amendment might be.

Here we are, presumably responsible representatives of the States of the Union, with some of us about to vote on something which will, if put into effect, dilute our power as United States Senators and certainly water down the strength and sovereignty of our own States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that under the present system there are not more than 10 or a dozen or 15 treaties at the most which are submitted to the Senate during a year, and that those treaties, being small in number, can be carefully studied and analyzed, and that with a two-thirds vote in the Senate the interest of the country and of the States and of the citizens of those States are amply protected?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from New York is eminently correct.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to conclude my remarks first, if the Senator does not mind. Then I shall be very happy to yield.

Finally, our present constitutional system of checks and balances contains adequate safeguards against abuse of the power to make executive agreements. These are, first, the power of Congress to annul the domestic effect of any treaty or executive agreement by subsequent act of Congress; second, the power of the courts to invalidate any treaty or executive agreement which contravenes the Constitution; third, the power of impeachment; and, fourth, the power of public opinion, including a presidential election every 4 years.

I cannot agree with the distinguished Senator from Georgia that these safeguards are, to quote him, "ridiculous."

Mr. President, before yielding the floor I should like to ask the Senator from

Georgia the following specific questions, which I believe should be answered before we are asked to vote on his proposed substitute. Since he is not in the Chamber I suggest, after he has had the benefit of consulting the RECORD, that he may see fit to answer some of the questions tomorrow. I had hoped he would answer some of the statements in connection with the Pink case which were made on Thursday, when the learned Senator from Georgia told us he would come in today and set us right on that case, as to its meaning and its full import and implications, and with respect to his scheme, which is now presented to the Senate.

I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia:

First. Is there anything except dictum in the Pink case that justifies adoption of the amendment? Of course we understand that dictum is not a part of a decision.

I should also like to ask the Senator from Georgia:

Second. Does the Senator from Georgia believes his amendment would permit future Presidents to take proposals like the human rights covenant, put them in the form of executive agreements, and make them effective—to use a phrase of uncertain parentage and meaning—as "internal law," by getting a simple majority of both Houses of Congress to implement them? Then I should like to ask the distinguished Senator: If not, why not?

I should also like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia:

Third. (a) In view of the administration's objections to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, is the Senator willing to add to his amendment either or both of the provisos suggested by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]? If so, what are the texts of the provisos?

(b) Does not the Senator from Georgia believe that his amendment with these provisos added would ultimately result in an expansion, rather than a contraction, of executive power?

(c) Does not the Senator from Georgia believe that with either of the provisos added his amendment would confirm the holding in the Pink case?

Then I should also like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia:

Fourth. Who shall have the ultimate authority to decide which of the thousands of executive agreements each year should have legitimate effect as State law and should be implemented—we are speaking now of the President, the Secretary of State, and the various agents and officers the length and breadth of the globe—and who, the President or Congress, would bear the burden or onus for not implementing those agreements?

Fifth. Since there have been no hearings at all on this type of proposal, or on any variations of it, does not the Senator from Georgia believe that the Committee on the Judiciary should hold hearings and get expert testimony on the possible results and implications?

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article from page 3 of the New York Times of Saturday, November 18, 1933. It contains the text of communications accompanying our recognition of Russia, known as the Litvinov assignment. It relates to some of the correspondence which I have read and to other portions of the agreement.

There being no objection, the page from the New York Times was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WIDE RANGE OF TOPICS WAS COVERED BY THE ROOSEVELT-LITVINOV NEGOTIATIONS—TEXT OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACCOMPANYING OUR RECOGNITION OF RUSSIA

WASHINGTON, November 17.—The communications between President Roosevelt and Commissar Litvinov, of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which preceded the resumption of normal diplomatic relations, were as follows:

THE PROBLEM OF CLAIMS

WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 13, 1933.*

Mr. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States of America,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Following our conversation, I have the honor to inform you that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics agrees that, preparatory to a final settlement of the claims and counterclaims between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America and the claims of their nationals, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will not take any steps to enforce any decisions of courts or initiate any new litigations of the amounts admitted to be due or that may be found due it, as the successor of prior Governments of Russia, or otherwise from American nationals, including corporations, companies, partnerships, or associations, and also the claim against the United States of the Russian Volunteer Fleet, now in litigation in the United States Court of Claims, and will not object to such amounts being assigned and does hereby release and assign all such amounts to the Government of the United States, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to be duly notified in each case of any amount realized by the Government of the United States from such release and assignments.

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics further agrees, preparatory to the settlement referred to above, not to make any claim with respect to—

(a) Judgments rendered or that may be rendered by American courts insofar as they relate to property, or rights, or interests therein, in which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or its nationals may have had or may claim to have an interest.

(b) Acts done or settlement made by or with the Government of the United States or public officials in the United States or its nationals, relating to property, credits or obligations of any government of Russia or nationals thereof.

I am, my dear Mr. President,
Very sincerely yours,
MAXIM LITVINOV,
People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

OUR REPLY ON CLAIMS

THE WHITE HOUSE,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 13, 1933.*

Mr. MAXIM M. LITVINOV,
People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

MY DEAR MR. LITVINOV: I am happy to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of November 13, 1933, in which you state that:

(Here the text of the letter of November 13 is quoted in full.)

I am glad to have these undertakings by your Government and I shall be pleased to notify your Government in each case of any amount realized by the Government of the United States from the release and assignment to it of the amounts admitted to be due, or that may be found to be due, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and of the amount that may be found to be due on the claim of the Russian Volunteer Fleet.

I am, my dear Mr. Litvinov,
Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, unless Senators desire to ask me some questions, I now yield the floor.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR LOANS AND GRANTS UNDER TITLE V OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, when the Housing Act of 1949 was passed, we recognized the need for financial assistance to both farm and city families living in substandard homes if these families were to have an opportunity to obtain decent and adequate housing.

Title V of the act specifically authorized loans to farm owners to enable them to build, modernize or repair their homes and farm service buildings needed to operate their farms profitably. The original act authorized annual appropriations for 4 fiscal years, beginning July 1, 1949. Although the law was amended in 1952 to extend the appropriation authorities for an additional year, no provision for loan appropriations was made beyond the 1954 fiscal year.

The bill I have introduced would extend, and place on a continuing basis, the authorities of Title V of the Housing Act of 1949. Recognizing that loan authorization for farm housing purposes are dependent, in part, upon economic conditions and other budgetary considerations, this bill authorizes appropriations and borrowing authority in such amounts as Congress may from time to time determine.

The original act authorized appropriations of $275 million for farm-housing purposes. Only about a third of this amount was actually made available. The general curtailment of nondefense Government expenditures associated with the Korean campaign as well as certain building-material shortages that existed in past years are the principal reasons why the farm-housing program did not reach its anticipated volume. The amount available for the 1954 fiscal year was $19 million. The demand for these loans was so great that almost all of the funds were committed within 6 months. The Farmers' Home Administration has received thousands of applications that now are unsatisfied because the farm-housing funds were exhausted at such an early date.

Nineteen thousand and eighty-two farm families have benefited from the $94,356,000 of farm-housing funds that have been made available. With these funds they built or repaired over 16,000 farm homes, almost 14,000 farm service buildings, and 7,200 water systems. In my home State of Alabama, 724 families have received farm-housing loans to

build new and modern homes and 208 additional families repaired and modernized their homes. In addition, 368 farm service buildings and 623 water systems have been financed with farm-housing funds. Through December 31, 1953, $5,509,475 had been loaned to Alabama farmers for these purposes.

This is a mere beginning in solving the problems of substandard housing on our Alabama farms, but it does demonstrate the effectiveness of the farm-housing loan authorities in meeting a critical need for farm families for construction credit.

That Alabama farmers want better housing is shown by the fact that the demand for these loans was so great during the past year that 80 percent of the funds allotted to Alabama were obligated within 2 months.

The cost of these new homes has been exceptionally low. To a person accustomed to the price of city homes, it seems almost unbelievable that farm families should be able to build good, substantial homes at an average cash outlay of less than $6,500. While these homes are modest in design, they do meet all the generally accepted requirements of decent, safe, and sanitary living.

Low-cash cost when compared with similar urban homes results from a number of reasons. One is the fact that there is no land cost involved. Another is that the borrower and his family ordinarily are able to contribute a substantial amount of labor, and a third is that in many cases borrowers have been able to utilize such materials as timber, sand, gravel, or stone from their own farms or else obtain such materials from local sources at a low cost.

Low cost, however, does not mean low quality. Each of these homes is required to meet the construction standards of the Farmers' Home Administration. These standards protect the borrower against faulty construction and the Government against an unsound investment. The standards are flexible enough to permit a farmer to use his skills and ingenuity to build at minimum cost the kind of a home of which he and his family are justifiably proud.

In addition to providing financing for farm homes, the farm-housing program offers farm families an opportunity to build or improve service buildings needed to put their farms on a paying basis, and to operate them more efficiently.

A fourth of the farm-housing funds have been used for purposes such as building dairy barns and milking parlors, general purpose barns, poultry houses, and for installing water systems. While this has not been the largest field of activity of the housing program it has been a highly significant one. Through it some farmers have been able to put their units on a paying basis; others have been able to make necessary changes in their farm buildings to meet the changing requirements of our present-day agriculture; and others have needed to change their building facilities to use more efficiently their family labor and their land.

The nature of the farming business, one in which the family home and income-producing activities are inseparably joined, makes this authority an important phase of our farm-housing program.

The level of living of farm families depends upon the productivity of their farm. When through the addition or modernization of farm-service buildings farm families of moderate means, such as the one to whom farm-housing loans are made, are able to increase their income, they are better able to pay the cost of a decent home.

These housing loans to farm families who are unable to obtain their credit from the usual sources are sound investments. During the 4 years that the farm housing program has been in operation, borrowers have established a commendable repayment record. As of January 31 of this year, less than 5 percent of the borrowers had not paid in full the amounts that had become due on their loans. Approximately one-third had paid more than was due.

I am particularly proud of the repayment record established by the borrowers in Alabama. Of the almost 1,000 farm-housing borrowers who had payments due at the end of 1953, less than 1 percent had not paid the full amount due on their loan by January 31, 1953. These few are the families who did not have sufficient resources to meet the credit requirements of conventional lenders for a construction loan. However, as soon as they make sufficient financial progress to qualify for a loan from another source they will be required to refinance their Government loans with private or cooperative lending institutions. They only need adequate credit on reasonable terms and an opportunity to prove that they are good credit risks When the construction work is finished and the loans become seasoned, private credit agencies can and will carry the remaining debt.

The farm housing program is not in competition with private and cooperative credit, but rather it is an integral part of our total credit system that will enable farm families to have homes comparable to those enjoyed by city residents. I think we will all agree that a high percentage of our city families are well housed today because they have been aided in their home purchase or improvement through Government financed, insured, or guaranteed programs.

I take considerable pride in the fact that it was an Alabama World War II veteran who received the first farm housing loan made under the Housing Act of 1949. I wish all of you could have seen the transformation that took place on his farm when the ramshackle and dilapidated house that was too worn out to repair was replaced by a modern six-room home complete with running water, bath, and up-to-date kitchen.

Both the appearance of the farmstead and the efficiency of the farming operations were further improved by the addition of a new barn and the installation of a pressure water system.

All this was done with a $4,300 farm-housing loan coupled with careful planning to use most advantageously the materials that could be salvaged from the worn-out buildings that were replaced.

I mention this first farm-housing loan because it is both a typical example of the shocking condition of many of our farm homes, and a dramatic demonstration of how such a condition can be remedied by a soundly conceived and efficiently administered farm-housing program.

Although the inadequacy of farm homes has been less conspicuous and perhaps less publicized than the slums in the cities, a far greater percentage of our farm families are living in substandard houses than is true of urban families. Nationwide 1 out of every 5 farm families is living in a house that is so dilapidated that it either needs to be replaced or else needs major repairs. In Alabama only 1 farm family out of 12 has the commonly accepted convenience of a private toilet, bath and hot running water. One out of 4 families live in homes having less than four rooms. A high percentage of Alabama farm homes are not only inadequate but 1 out of every 3 needs major repairs or needs to be replaced.

The economic and social problems associated with inadequate housing on a fifth of our Nation's farms are too great to be brushed aside. The idea that privation and hardship necessarily are a part of farm life was commonly accepted during the years when our country was being settled, but today farm families want, and I believe they are entitled to it, the same conveniences that city people enjoy.

Farm families for one reason or another frequently have deferred home improvements until they had paid for their farms. The idea has prevailed among both farmers and lenders that the house was something to be improved out of savings and that it was not prudent for the farmer to borrow to give his family a decent home. This postponement of home improvements frequently extended beyond the years of greatest family need—the years when the children were at home. Particularly during these years, the household duties of farm wives meant hard labor and drudgery without such commonly accepted conveniences as electricity, running water, and efficiently designed and equipped kitchens.

This postponement of home improvements was largely because of economic necessity and not by choice. All too frequently farm families never did accumulate enough money to build a decent home. The possibilities of obtaining a long-term amortized loan to build a new home were exceedingly scarce; consequently, many of these families were forced to patch and continue to live in run-down and inadequate homes.

Today, farm families no longer accept the notion that because they chose farming as a way of life they need to live in homes that are inconvenient and inadequate. To the extent that private and cooperative credit sources can meet the building credit needs of farm families they should be encouraged to do so. Government loan guaranties and insurance have encouraged private capital to finance improved housing for our city families on a substantial scale. When private credit was not available direct

Government loans have been provided. What farm families want and need is a like opportunity to finance farm building improvements.

The farm housing section of the Housing Act of 1949 gives this opportunity to the farm families who cannot obtain their financing from private or cooperatives sources. The limited funds that have been made available under this act have proved its effectiveness in helping farm families of modest means improve their homes. We need to extend these authorities. They are an essential part of our national housing program which has as its objective the progressive improvements of our housing standards with the eventual realization of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family.

On behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill.

I request that at any time during the remainder of the day the names of other Senators may be added, because several Senators have expressed interest in the bill to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the request of the Senator from Alabama to add the names of other Senators is granted.

The bill (S. 2949) to continue authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to the committee amendment, inserting on page 3, line 5, after the word "treaty", the words "or other international agreement."

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Mansfield
Anderson	Griswold	Martin
Barrett	Hayden	Maybank
Bennett	Hendrickson	McClellan
Bricker	Hennings	Monroney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Morse
Burke	Hill	Murray
Bush	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Payne
Byrd	Hunt	Potter
Carlson	Ives	Purtell
Clements	Jackson	Russell
Cooper	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kennedy	Sparkman
Duff	Kerr	Stennis
Dworshak	Kilgore	Symington
Eastland	Knowland	Thye
Ellender	Kuchel	Upton
Ferguson	Langer	Watkins
Flanders	Lehman	Welker
Frear	Lennon	Williams
Fulbright	Long	Young
George	Magnuson	
Gore	Malone	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in explanation of my vote, I wish to say that I am going to vote against the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], because I am opposed to writing on the floor of the Senate, and without the most careful and painstaking study, any constitutional amendment on a subject of such fundamental importance. Therefore, I am going to vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators to the committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I shall vote against the amendment, because I am satisfied in my own mind, on the basis of the record made so far in the debate, that there is no clear showing that any amendment whatsoever is needed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment again be stated, and then that the section as proposed to be amended be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 3, line 5, after the word "treaty" it is proposed to insert "or other international agreement", so as to make the section read:

SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am going to vote against the amendment, because I do not think it is necessary. It is the present law, and an amendment is not needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr.

GILLETTE] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—62

Aiken	Ferguson	Malone
Anderson	Flanders	Mansfield
Barrett	Frear	Martin
Bennett	George	Maybank
Bricker	Gore	McClellan
Bridges	Griswold	Payne
Burke	Hendrickson	Potter
Bush	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Russell
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Saltonstall
Byrd	Hunt	Smathers
Carlson	Ives	Smith, Maine
Clements	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Thye
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Upton
Douglas	Kerr	Watkins
Duff	Knowland	Welker
Dworshak	Kuchel	Williams
Eastland	Lennon	Young
Ellender	Long	

NAYS—20

Cooper	Jackson	Morse
Fulbright	Kennedy	Murray
Green	Kilgore	Neely
Hayden	Langer	Pastore
Hennings	Lehman	Sparkman
Hill	Magnuson	Symington
Humphrey	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—14

Beall	Goldwater	Mundt
Capehart	Kefauver	Robertson
Case	McCarran	Schoeppel
Chavez	McCarthy	Wiley
Gillette	Millikin	

So the amendment offered to the committee amendment by Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and other Senators) was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "2-4-54-B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan for himself and other Senators will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, it is proposed to strike out all of line 10 to 15, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 3. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I do not believe that this amendment will require extended debate. At the present time the Constitution requires that a treaty be ratified by the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senators present. In the past, upon certain occasions we have seen treaties ratified when very few Senators have been in the Chamber. There has been no requirement for a yea-and-nay vote.

There is another provision in the Constitution which requires, with respect to action upon a veto message, what we are asking with respect to treaties. The Constitution provides that when the President of the United States vetoes a bill, the vote on the question of overriding the veto shall be taken by the yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

I am aware of the fact that some may say that the desired purpose can be accomplished by a rule of the Senate. But, Mr. President, if it is accomplished by rule, the Senate can, by unanimous consent, suspend the rule and vote as it has voted in the past. If we place the proposed amendment in the Constitution of the United States, where I believe it should be, the Senate cannot modify the provision by unanimous consent. The Senate will be required to follow the Constitution and vote by the yeas and nays, following a call for a quorum, as is the custom in the Senate; and the name of each Senator voting on a question so important as advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty shall be entered on the Journal, so that everyone may know who voted for or against ratification.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to inquire of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan whether this amendment could be described as the atom-bomb amendment, because it would be like using an atom bomb to kill mosquitos.

Mr. FERGUSON. My answer to that is, that I believe this provision would be beneficial, not only to the Senate, but to the Nation as a whole. It would be beneficial to require a yea and nay vote on the question of the Senate advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Michigan is similar to a resolution which I submitted last year, requiring that a rule be adopted which would provide for a quorum call and a yea-and-nay vote on any treaty coming before the Senate. So obviously I am not opposed to the purpose of the proposed amendment.

I hope that under any circumstances the provision will be made, by rule or otherwise, that no treaty may be considered by this body except after a quorum call, and that the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of the treaty shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote.

However, notwithstanding the fact that I was the author of the resolution, and notwithstanding the fact that I am completely in sympathy with the purpose of the proposed amendment, I feel constrained to vote against it, for the reasons I gave a few minutes ago.

I think it would be a highly dangerous thing under any circumstances for this body to attempt to write an amendment to the Constitution of the United States on the floor of the Senate, and without the most careful and painstaking consideration of all the aspects and implications of the amendment. I must vote against every such proposal relating to a constitutional amendment. I think we are proposing to do something which is greatly dangerous and which has never been done before, so far as I know, in the entire history of the Nation—something which I hope and pray will never be done in the history of the Nation.

I therefore feel constrained to vote against the pending amendment, notwithstanding the fact that I agree with its purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Michigan has pointed out, this amendment is similar to the provision which now appears in the Constitution and has appeared in the Constitution since the very inception of our Government. With respect to a presidential veto the Constitution provides:

If after such reconsideration two-thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of that House, it shall become a law. But in all such cases the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively.

I think the reason for that provision is very clear. When the President vetoes an act of the legislative body a serious situation arises when the Congress wishes to pinpoint the responsibility by overriding the Presidential veto.

I believe that if the debate on the Bricker amendment has done nothing more, it has brought home to the Senate and to the American people the importance of treaties and what treaties may do so far as internal law in this country is concerned. Once and for all we should be able to give assurance to the American people that never again will there be situations in which the Senate votes to give advice and consent to the ratification of a treaty when only a relatively few Members of the Senate are present in the Chamber.

The argument has been used that in the case of treaties a yea-and-nay vote might be taken by custom. That is true. We are now pursuing that course by custom. Nevertheless the Senate might in the future change the custom.

It has been argued that it might be provided by rule. That is likewise true; but also the Senate might change the rule. The adoption of the amendment before the Senate will give assurance to the American people that they will have the same safeguard in the matter of the ratification of a treaty which they now have with respect to the overriding of a veto by the President of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from California believe that a treaty is of greater dignity or more importance than a statute?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the discussions which have been had on the floor of the Senate, and the very real concern which has been expressed throughout the country, make it extremely important that provision be made in the Constitution for a yea-and-nay vote so far as treaties are concerned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from California believe that a treaty is of greater importance or of greater dignity than a statute passed by Congress?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I do not believe that a treaty is necessarily of greater validity.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not believe the Senator wanted to leave that impression. That is why I asked him the question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The difference is that in the case of a statute both Houses of Congress have an opportunity to pass on it. If a mistake is made in one House, the other House can correct the mistake. With respect to a treaty it is only the Senate, one arm of Congress, which acts on it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why does not the Senator agree that all of our votes ought to be by the yeas and nays, because a statute is of equal importance with a treaty?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the debate which has taken place on the subject of treaties and the fact that only one House of Congress acts upon treaties, and thus, with the President, is in a position to make law for the Nation, which, under the Constitution, becomes the supreme law of the land, suggest ample reasons for adding this additional safeguard to the Constitution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The point I wish to make is that if a requirement for a yea-and-nay vote is a good thing for treaties, it would also be a good thing for statutes, because they are of equal importance, so far as their effect on the country is concerned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Arkansas of course is perfectly free to pursue that argument at this time. We are now discussing the treatymaking provision of the Constitution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Did I not correctly understand the distinguished majority leader when he stated that the Constitution already provides for a two-thirds vote in connection with the ratification of a treaty?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. That provision is already in the Constitution. But the Constitution does not require a yea-and-nay vote. As the distinguished Senator from New York knows, in the past, certainly during the time the Senator from California has been a Member of the Senate, for 8 years, there have been instances of treaties being ratified by a two-thirds vote when there were relatively few Senators present on the floor and participating in the vote.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is perfectly true. However, if the Constitution requires a two-thirds vote of those present, obviously the question as to whether two-thirds of the Members were voting in confirmation of a treaty could be ascertained only by a yea-and-nay vote. Therefore, I believe that point is already safeguarded. I feel strongly that a quorum call should be had before a treaty is ratified, and every assurance should be provided that a quorum is present and a yea-and-nay vote is taken.

I believe the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader, in reply to questions of mine relating to the resolution which I submitted last year, did give assurance that in the future it would be ascertained, by means of a yea-and-nay vote, whether two-thirds of the Members of the Senate voted to ratify a treaty. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. We have been following that procedure this year.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to make it very clear, as I have previously, that I believe the question of the ratification of treaties, by a two-thirds vote of the Senate is already clearly established in the Constitution. If the custom of having a yea-and-nay vote is not pursued then of course the Senate is derelict. The Senate should not be derelict. I am quite certain that it will not be derelict in that regard, if we adopt a rule or pass a statute which will require such procedure.

I do not believe the question should be brought up at a time when we are considering on the floor what I believe to be important beyond description for the welfare of the country, namely, the limitation of the President's treatymaking power by a constitutional amendment. It is very unfortunate that the amendment submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio or any other proposal in the form of a suggested constitutional amendment should be considered in this manner, and I shall vote against the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What does the Senator from New York believe the framers of the Constitution had in mind when they required in the case of the submission of proposed constitutional amendments a two-thirds vote of each House of Congress? Does he believe they supposed that the Senate and the House of Representatives would merely rubber stamp a proposed constitutional amendment which was reported by a committee?

The Senator from New York says that the Senate cannot write a constitutional amendment on the floor. We are not expected to take merely the recommendation of only 13 Senators, who happen to be members of the Committee on the Judiciary, or of any other committee of Congress. Each of us has a responsibility. Each of us has taken an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. A part of our legislative function, if we believe that a constitutional amendment is not in the shape we think it should be, is to propose amendments from the floor.

The pending amendment is not a new proposal. It was submitted last July, so it is not something that has come in recently. It has been the subject of a great deal of discussion.

I do not subscribe to the theory that Members of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, when a constitutional amendment is reported, are foreclosed from making suggestions or offering amendments. To do so would be to abdicate the responsibility of 96 Senators to 13 Senators on a committee. I do not believe that was the intent of the framers of the Constitution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to point out again that since the Bricker amendment has been debated on the floor from the opening of this session of Congress, 3 or 4 other constitutional amendments have been proposed. They differ very greatly in their intent and in the effect they would have on the country.

I say to the distinguished majority leader that Members of the Senate and the people of the country as a whole are so confused on the issue that for us to attempt to write on the floor of the Senate a constitutional amendment which may affect the whole life of the Nation for generations, if not for hundreds of years to come, would be the height of folly. After all, we have gone along for 165 years under the present Constitution. I do not believe that any substantial number of people, if any, have ever been hurt by reason of any provision in the Constitution without the Bricker amendment. They have been fully and successfully protected by the provisions of the Constitution which we now seek to destroy.

We have heard about the Pink case. It has been debated day after day. I was Governor of the State of New York at the time the Pink case came before the courts. I can say to my colleagues the evidence shows that every citizen of the United States who had any claims against the Russian-owned insurance company was paid in full through the liquidation of that company. I do not believe one person in the State of New York was ever hurt because of the recognition of the Russian Government so far as it applied to the matters involved in the Pink case.

So, Mr. President, I feel that for us to attempt to rewrite the Constitution on the floor of the Senate, when there is great confusion in this House and among millions of people of the Nation, would be highly unwise.

I agree that we do not need on the floor of the Senate to agree to anything that a committee recommends. There have been many instances in which we have repudiated the recommendations of a committee. But we are considering a constitutional amendment. It will almost be impossible of repeal if it shall prove to be bad. It required 16 years to repeal the prohibition amendment and the country was almost split in two because of dissension and dispute. I fervently hope we shall not undertake to

rewrite the Constitution on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, before the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] took his seat, I attempted several times to ask him a question. It is a very short question, and I should like to ask it at this time.

As I understood his argument, it was that the provisions with respect to ratifying a treaty and with respect to voting on a Presidential veto are different in the Constitution as drafted, and that they should be the same. I should like to ask the Senator why he thinks the Founding Fathers made the provisions different in the Constitution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator is propounding that question to me, I assume that the Founding Fathers thought the situation would never arise where there would be a mere handful of Senators on the floor when a treaty was being debated, considered, and ratified. But the Senator knows that over the years, through custom or practice, unfortunately that type of a situation did develop. If the Founding Fathers had thought such a situation would develop, I think they would have written in a provision covering it. I have no way of knowing. I think it is a good safeguard for the Senate of the United States and for the American people to require the yeas and nays with each Senator recorded on a question so important as a treaty, which can have a far-reaching effect upon the lives and property of the American people.

Mr. GREEN. As I read the record of the Convention which drafted the Constitution, it seems to me the Founding Fathers devoted much more time to a discussion of the different provisions of the Constitution than we can devote to the thoughts and views of individual Senators. Those who drafted the Constitution paid infinite attention to the various provisions of that great document. I agree with my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who says that all changes proposed by way of amendment to the Constitution ought to be considered very carefully. The requirement as to voting on a proposal to amend the Constitution and a proposal as to voting on a Presidential veto need not be the same as the requirement relating to the ratification of a treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amendment now provides for striking out on page 3 all of lines 10 to 15, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof certain language.

I ask to modify the amendment by striking out the words "strike out all in lines 10 to 15, inclusive," and inserting between lines 15 and 16 this amendment, so we shall be voting not on an amendment to strike out, but simply on the placing of the amendment in the Bricker amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inform the Senator that since the yeas and nays have been ordered, it will require unanimous consent to modify the amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to say a word regarding the proposed amendment.

I do not object to its purpose, but I do not think it should be made a part of a proposed constitutional amendment. The same result can be accomplished either by an amendment to the rules or by statute. It occurs to me that the only real purpose of inserting it is to try to give an otherwise objectionable amendment some strength, because no one objects to a yea-and-nay vote on an important treaty. I think that is true on its face. I do not know of any Member of this body who would object to being recorded on a treaty. But the purpose of this particular proposal is to give strength to an amendment which otherwise would have a very difficult time passing this body. Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against it, not because I object to its purpose, but because the objective should not be reached in this way.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, what is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Michigan is before the Senate. The Chair has heard no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what is the modification?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the modification is to eliminate from my amendment the portion which would strike out lines 10 to 15, inclusive, and the language of the amendment in the Bricker amendment between lines 15 and 16 on page 3.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the amendment, then would be the insertion of a new section; is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It would not affect sections 3 and 4?

Mr. FERGUSON. The amendment would read——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a simple question. He speaks in terms of treaties. I think we should have some legislative history in connection with this amendment. What is the difference, in the Senator's mind, between a treaty and an agreement? I remember an occasion on the floor of the Senate when we were considering for 3 weeks a minor agreement. Some of us had worked on it for many weeks. It was an economic agreement. I would not want to call in the entire Senate to vote on such an agreement. I think we should know what is the difference between a treaty and an agreement. Is it what the Executive sends here and calls an agreement, or is there some legal or legislative definition?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish I could answer that question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish I could, too. I might vote for the Senator's amendment, if I could.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the Constitution, a treaty is that which the President of the United States——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Calls a treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. Negotiates and calls a treaty, and sends to the Senate as a treaty. That is a treaty, under the Constitution. It is that to which the amendment refers.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me ask another question. Suppose the President of the United States negotiates and sends to us a treaty regarding Germany. Suppose he calls it an agreement. Where are we then?

Mr. FERGUSON. This amendment would not apply in that event.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is an economic arrangement an agreement or a treaty, or a combination of both? That is what I do not understand.

Mr. FERGUSON. It could be, as history shows, a combination.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it not always a combination?

Mr. FERGUSON. Politically, it is that which the President sends to the Senate. That is why the first amendment proposed provided that a treaty which was in conflict with the Constitution would have no force or effect.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would the Senator from Michigan object to an amendment, which I should be glad to propose or to have the Senator from Michigan propose, to include both treaties and agreements? I think some economic agreements are more important in our world relations than are some treaties, which broadly have been referred to as political agreements. Would the Senator from Michigan object to an amendment which would apply also to all agreements?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I would object.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then the Senator from Michigan will have to define what is a treaty and what is an agreement.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not believe there should be included in this particular amendment, which relates to the requirement of a two-thirds vote of the Senate, a definition of an agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am perfectly willing to have my votes recorded. I wish all Senators could have been present during the time the whaling agreement was under consideration. There was a very interesting discussion of whales.

Mr. President, if we are going to act on this matter, let us do so in a proper manner, and not go half way. What is a treaty? What is an agreement? Let the amendment apply to both.

Some Senators who have been speaking about the desirability of being present have not been present in the Chamber when some of these matters have been under discussion previously. Let us be honest about the matter.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, before I make a very brief remark with reference to the amendment, I wish to say, in answer to the question asked by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that a few years ago, when I thought I knew something about the subject, I spoke at some length concerning it on the floor. I had addressed a question to the State Department, ask-

ing them to define, as clearly as they could, for my benefit, and for the benefit of all the Senate, what they thought constituted a treaty and what they thought constituted an executive agreement.

Their reply, as I read it on the floor of the Senate, was that a treaty was something they had to send to the Senate in order to get approval by a two-thirds vote. An executive agreement was something they did not have to send to the Senate.

At that time I stated to the Senate that the reply of the State Department reminded me of the time when I was a boy on the farm, and asked the hired man how to tell the difference between a male and a female pigeon. He said, "You put corn in front of the pigeon. If he picks it up, it is a he; if she picks it up, it is a she." [Laughter.]

With reference to the pending amendment, I am in thorough accord with its purpose. But when the Constitution was adopted, and when the Founding Fathers placed all the legislative power in the hands of a Congress composed of two branches, they did not place Congress in a straitjacket, so far as rules are concerned. They provided, by constitutional enactment, that each House should adopt its own rules.

While I am in thorough accord with what Senators are trying to do, does it make any sense, when we stop to think, that before such an amendment to the Constitution could become effective, it would have to be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the Senate and a two-thirds vote of the House of Representatives, and then would have to be ratified by three-fourths of the States. A thousand treaties could be submitted to the Senate for consideration and ratification before such a constitutional amendment might be ratified.

The only way to proceed in this matter is as provided by the Constitution. The objective which is sought by the Senators who have proposed the amendment relating to a yea-and-nay vote could be achieved by amending our own rules. It is not necessary to wait until three-fourths of the States have ratified an amendment to the Constitution before the Senate can provide for a yea-and-nay vote on treaties. All that is necessary to be done is to amend the rules of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course, I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Has the Senator from Iowa in recent history taken part in an effort to change the rules of the Senate?

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, yes; I may say in answer to the distinguished Senator from California, the minority leader. [Laughter.] I did not speak carelessly, Mr. President. The Senator from California has been the leader of an evanescent majority.

Sometimes it has been very difficult to make a change in the rules. Sometimes, as in a matter of this kind, where there can be no difference of opinion, it would be very, very easy.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] now has an amendment pending. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and I have offered an amendment to the rules of the Senate to effectuate what is sought to be done by the constitutional amendment under consideration. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona and myself could be adopted by a majority vote. It could be before the Senate within the next 10 days.

While it is necessary to accomplish what the eminent Senators who have offered the amendment are trying to do, why, in the name of all that is sensible, is it sought to be done by an amendment to the Constitution? Such a provision in order to become effective would have to wait until the proposed constitutional amendment were ratified by two-thirds of the Senate, two-thirds of the House, and then by three-fourths of the States.

Almost anything could happen. The eminent Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the equally eminent Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the very ineffective junior Senator from Iowa could well be in our graves before such ratification could be accomplished.

I would not vote against the proposal, because its purpose is clear; but I cannot conceive of anything more ridiculous than an attempt to make a correction of this kind through an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have been discussing with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] his objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan. I understand that he will not object now. It seems to me that if the request of the Senator from Michigan were agreed to, if unanimous consent could be obtained merely to insert the modification proposed by the Senator from Michigan between lines 15 and 16 in Senate Joint Resolution 1, rather than to strike out lines 10 to 15, inclusive, as was originally proposed, the proposal would be placed before the Senate in a clear, uncomplicated manner.

It has been the general, customary practice, as a matter of comity in the Senate, in a case of this kind, to permit a Senator to modify his amendment. The only reason why unanimous consent is now necessary is that the yeas and nays have been ordered.

I appreciate the position which has been taken by the Senator from Minnesota. I think what has been requested by the Senator from Michigan is fair and equitable. It is a request of the type that any Senator might make in a similar situation. I hope unanimous consent will be given.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the majority leader has discussed the matter with me. I wish to say that I do not view the Ferguson modification as a modification only. It has substantially altered the whole form of the proposed amendment known as Senate Joint Resolution 1. But I realize the desire of the Senator from Michigan is to have an up and down vote, so to speak, on a clean amendment, without its being attached to or eliminating other parts of the joint resolution now before the Senate.

I note that on January 27, a similar amendment, designated 1–27–54d, was offered by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. It is because the majority leader could call up his own amendment, if he so desired, which would accomplish the same purpose as that of the Senator from Michigan, that I am more than willing to withdraw my objection. I wish to cooperate with the majority leader. We have been most cooperative before. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has withdrawn his objection.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I said a while ago that there was the utmost confusion with respect to the provisions of the proposed amendment.

With great respect for my colleagues in the Senate, may I point out that what has happened in the Senate in the last half hour is most dramatic proof of what I have said. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and his colleagues have proposed an amendment, which has been lying on the desk for some little time. Yet within the last 5 minutes the Senator from Michigan has changed and very materially revised the amendment. He has taken out of the amendment certain provisions and he has greatly changed the purpose and intent of the amendment. His new amendment has not been printed or even read in the Senate.

Certainly, if action of that kind could have happened on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, it is, a clear indication of the great confusion that exists in the minds of Senators, and of the danger of proceeding with the consideration of any constitutional amendment through revisions, amendments, adjustments, compositions, or compromises on the floor of the Senate. That is exactly what is happening. It is a dangerous procedure.

I respect the position of other Members of the Senate, because I know they are just as sincere in their support of the Bricker amendment as I am in my opposition to it; but it nonetheless shows the danger in trying to write, on the floor of the Senate, a constitutional amendment which it will be practically impossible to repeal, and which may affect the lives of the people of the United States for a 100 years or more.

I have no objection to the purpose of the proposal. As Senators know, I originally suggested it. However, I certainly have very deep objection to being compelled to vote for the pending amendment or for any other provision of a constitutional amendment which changes the treatymaking powers of the Executive in such a manner as now proposed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the present proposal to retain sections 3 and 4 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 as printed on page 3? Is it true that the amendment is merely an addition and in no wise deletes any language?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct. It would be a new section, between lines 15 and 16.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan why he inserts a new section, 5, and skips section 2, section 3, and section 4, and jumps to the end of the so-called amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. There are other sections being offered. At the end of the voting the section numbers can be rearranged as they appear in the RECORD.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have participated briefly in the debate, but I desire the RECORD to show that I believe the Senate should vote by the yeas and nays on treaties and on agreements, if possible. I agree with my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] that this is a bad way to do it. I hope I shall be able to support the amendment to the rules offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I therefore intend to vote against the amendment, because I think, as does the Senator from New York, that this is the worst way in which we can proceed to try to determine the advice-and-consent powers of the Senate on treaties or agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the modification offered by the Senator from Michigan. Is there objection?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan if he has ever put down on a piece of paper what I am sure is a very worthy effort on his part to clarify that which was confusing, so that one who has had a little trouble in obtaining a clear mental image of what the Senator has in mind from what he has said would be able to look at the proposal and determine whether or not he would desire to object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not think I understand the question of the Senator.

Mr. KERR. Has the Senator put the requested amendment down on a piece of paper so that one may look at it?

Mr. FERGUSON. There are two parts to the amendment. One is to strike out all of lines 10 to 15, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof certain language. In its modified form the amendment would not strike out lines 10 to 15, but would be inserted as a new section between lines 15 and 16 on page 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Mr. KERR. Reserving the right to object, I now repeat the question to the distinguished Senator from Michigan. Has the proposed requested amendment been put down on a piece of paper so that another Senator can look at it and try to visualize what the amendment proposes to do?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have one here——

Mr. KERR. Is the answer "Yes" or "No"

Mr. FERGUSON. The answer to the question of the Senator is "No."

Mr. KERR. Then, Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished Senator write his proposal on a piece of paper so that it might be looked at in an effort by another Senator to get a clear picture, if possible, of what the distinguished Senator from Michigan has in his mind?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk state, for the information of the Senate, the proposed modification of the Senate joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the proposed modification.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, between lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 3. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator from Michigan is now proposing to strike out language which proposed to strike out a portion of the text, and that he is proposing certain language on the theory that two negatives make a positive?

Mr. FERGUSON. No, not at all.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from Michigan to say he would put the proposed language down on a piece of paper?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I sent it to the desk.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator from New York will wait just a moment——

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be very glad to wait. I thought the Senator from Oklahoma was through.

Mr. KERR. It may be that I am. [Laughter.] But before it is made official, Mr. President, I should like to be in as favorable a position with reference to the pending request as the clerk seems to be, because evidently somebody has provided the clerk with a piece of paper upon which the amendment was written.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. KERR. I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for yielding to me.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma was very appropriate. Yielding to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Michigan did scribble down on a piece of paper——

Mr. FERGUSON. No; the Senator from Michigan wrote it. He never scribbles.

Mr. LEHMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon. The Senator "wrote"—I will withdraw the word "scribble"—the proposed amendment, and it was read by the clerk. But I wonder how many Members of the Senate really understand or know what was in the proposed change?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, is the Senator asking a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am frank to say I did not hear it, and I do not yet know what the proposed change is.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the Senator asking a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to finish my statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; but I will reduce it to a question. I shall be very glad to.

Reserving the right to object [laughter]——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has yielded for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object to the modification.

I think this is a most dramatic demonstration of what is happening on this all-important question. I do not think a more important question has come before the Senate for many, many years than the proposal to adopt an amendment to the Constitution which would limit the treatymaking powers of the President.

After the amendment was proposed, a complete revision of it was hurriedly written on a piece of paper and sent to the desk. Frankly, I do not yet know what the change is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I prefer to finish my statement, and then I shall be very glad indeed to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, the procedure we have witnessed today is a clear demonstration of the manner in which this body, which is supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world, is approaching this all-important question. All of us recall what happened here only three-quarters of an hour ago.

No Member of the Senate has really given consideration to the newly proposed amendment. So far as I am concerned, I shall vote against it; and I shall have no hesitation—as I hope many of my colleagues and many of my fellow citizens of the United States will have none—in bringing the entire situation and the danger inherent in any of the proposed constitutional amendments as clearly and as forcefully as possible to the attention of the American people.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. With all due respect to my friend, the Senator from New York, there is nothing either dramatic or unusual about the request which has been made. On the contrary, the course requested has been followed time and time again in the normal legislative procedure in this body. All the Senator from Michigan is endeavoring to do is to have the Senate vote solely on the proposal whether a yea-and-nay vote shall be required on the question of having the Senate approve a treaty, so that question will stand on its own feet, unencumbered. That would be done by striking out the language appearing in the amendment as it came from the Ju-

diciary Committee, thus permitting those sections to be acted upon separately, and to stand on their own feet, as it were.

So the proposal is simply one to bring the matter before the Senate in an unencumbered manner, and thus to simplify the procedure, by having the Senate vote directly on the one particular question.

Thus, Mr. President, I see nothing unusual or horrible about the procedure. On the contrary, I think the Senate is performing its proper function, in taking up these matters item by item, in dealing with them one at a time.

Mr. LEHMAN. I realize full well that it is not ordinarily unusual for a Member of the Senate to revise or withdraw or change completely an amendment previously offered. However, the matter we are discussing today is not an ordinary one.

I am convinced that the distinguished Senator from California, for whom I have an extremely high regard, will agree with me that the question before us is one of the most important questions to come before the Senate or before the American people at any time within our lifetime. Therefore, I think it most improper for us to attempt to write a constitutional amendment on the floor of the Senate. Such an attempt is the height of folly, Mr. President.

I have called attention to the situation in order to show that the procedure which has been followed is a clear and dramatic demonstration of the evil and folly to which I have pointed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from New York that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment previously offered does not change a word in that amendment, insofar as it deals with the question of requiring that a yea-and-nay vote be taken. The proposal is only one relating to the Senate procedure in facing the issue.

There is nothing complicated about the proposal. At this time the attendance in the Senate is about as large as any I have observed at this session, except when an actual yea-and-nay vote was in progress.

So I think we are performing our highest function as Members of the Senate of the United States. I think we are constructively contributing to the debate and the procedure when we simplify the procedure and have before us the sole issue of whether the taking of a yea-and-nay vote on such a question shall be provided in the Constitution.

Senators may vote for or against the proposal; but at least the issue will be clearly before them, without being encumbered by any other proposal.

So it seems to me we are performing in a perfectly proper way our duties as legislators and as Members of the United States Senate, who under the Constitution are charged with some responsibility in connection with the process of amending the Constitution.

I repeat that I do not believe it was ever intended by the framers of the Constitution that Senators should sit mute and should not offer amendments and should not discuss amendments, but should act as rubber stamps in connection with a proposal submitted to them by either the Judiciary Committee or any other Senate committee.

On the contrary, it is the highest function of Senators of the United States to listen to the debate, make suggestions, and then vote them either up or down.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from California when he says that it is the highest function of the Senate to give consideration to proposed legislation which is presented in an orderly fashion. On the other hand, when an amendment to the Constitution of the United States is proposed, and when 3 or 4 alternative amendments to the Constitution are then proposed, the result is confusion in connection with a matter of such outstanding importance to the Nation as is the Bricker amendment.

So far as I am concerned, I cannot emphasize too strongly that I believe the matter now before us is more important than any other matter which has come before the Congress or the American people within my memory. I am deeply convinced that it is extremely dangerous to attempt to write such a constitutional amendment on the floor of the Senate. An amendment, once made a part of the Constitution, may last for generations to come.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from California whether the pending amendment contains any provision to the effect that a quorum of the Senate shall be present at the time when the two-thirds affirmative vote is required.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In that respect the amendment follows the language of the Constitution applying to the overriding of a presidential veto.

As the distinguished Senator from Arizona knows—and there is scarcely a Member of the Senate who has a better knowledge than his of the rules and procedures of the Senate—no responsible Senator in charge of such a measure would bring it to the floor of the Senate, for vote, unless he knew a quorum was present; for if a quorum were not present, then, under the requirement for a yea-and-nay vote, the absence of a quorum would be disclosed, and it would not be possible to have the measure acted upon by the Senate until a quorum was present.

Therefore, I do not believe that any Member of the Senate would bring up a measure which would require the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present and voting unless he knew a quorum was present. Precisely the same procedure is followed under the constitutional provision relating to the overriding of a presidential veto.

Mr. HAYDEN. Nevertheless, the advocates of the Bricker amendment have been, throughout the Nation, severely criticizing the Senate for ratifying a treaty one one occasion when only two Senators were present. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are mentioned in that connection as the two Senators who are supposed to have ratified the treaty. In view of all the discussion throughout the Nation about that matter, would not it be wise to provide that a quorum be present?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Arizona well knows that if a yea-and-nay vote were taken and if the vote disclosed the absence of a quorum, the Senate would be unable to transact any business until a quorum was developed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Nevertheless, there has been widespread criticism to the effect that on at least one occasion only two Members of the Senate approved a treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand the situation, if the proposed new section should become a part of the Constitution, in case a yea-and-nay vote were taken on a treaty, and the vote disclosed the absence of a quorum, the Senate could not transact any business until a quorum was developed. Automatically, there would be a quorum call, so a quorum would be voting. That is the rule.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. What would be the procedure in the Senate when a vote was taken if there were a provision in the Constitution that on the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote must be determined by the yeas and nays and the names of the persons voting for and against must be entered on the Journal of the Senate? There is another part of the Constitution which requires a two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting. Suppose the vote developed the fact that a quorum was not present. What would be the procedure then?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the language read merely "two-thirds"?

Mr. FERGUSON. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Constitution says "provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

The only requirement is that two-thirds of the Senators present must concur.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is advised that in the case which he has cited the Chair would rule that a quorum had not voted, and, therefore, the clerk would be directed to call the roll.

Mr. FERGUSON. For a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To develop a quorum. No proceedings could be conducted until a quorum was present.

The Senator is further advised that after a quorum had been developed, another vote would be taken.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, to me the situation seems very simple. Reserving the right to object—and I shall object—I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that all we have to do is to vote the amendment down. Then the distinguished Senator from Michigan can offer 2 amendments, taking care of the 2 different provisions.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KILGORE. The Presiding Officer has just stated what the ruling would be under certain circumstances. However, that statement is based only upon precedent, and not upon the Constitution or upon the Rules of the Senate. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is advised that under the Constitution the Senate cannot transact business without a quorum. Therefore, it is necessary to develop a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Presiding Officer has, of course, made a correct statement. The constitutional requirement for a quorum is found in section 5 of article I, which makes it very clear that a majority of each House is a quorum, and that business cannot be transacted without such majority, but that a smaller number may adjourn each House from day to day, and may compel the attendance of other Members, until a quorum is obtained.

I invite attention to the fact that in no respect does this amendment depart from the wording of the constitutional provision relating to the overriding of a presidential veto.

The present provision of the Constitution with reference to concurring in a treaty is found in section 2 of article II:

He—

Meaning the President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Nothing is said about a quorum. However, the earlier provision with respect to a quorum applies to this provision and to every other provision of the Constitution.

I hope we may be allowed to go ahead and vote. I am not a supporter of the Bricker amendment as it was originally drawn or as it was reported from the committee. But now, it seems to me, we have before us a confidence-inspiring provision which ought to be in any amendment which is submitted if an amendment is finally to be submitted.

The point made by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] was made under a misapprehension of fact. He made the statement that such a thing as rewriting an amendment to the Constitution has never taken place on the floor of the Senate. He is completely inaccurate in that statement. The very last amendment which was submitted and ratified, the 22d amendment, with reference to presidential terms, was rewritten entirely from beginning to end, in the debate on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Florida had some part in that debate at that time.

So the point is not well taken. It seems to the Senator from Florida that objection to voting on this amendment comes with very ill grace from a Senator who himself has recognized the need for such a provision by submitting a resolution precisely the same as the pending amendment, which resolution provided for an amendment to the Senate rules.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield gladly.

Mr. LEHMAN. I said previously, and wish to repeat, that not only am I strongly in favor of the purpose of the pending amendment, but I made the original suggestion that this point be covered by a rule of the Senate. I hope some provision may be made, in one form or another, because I believe that in the consideration of any treaty, or any other important matter coming before the Senate, there should be a quorum present, and there should be a yea-and-nay vote. I think we have been far too lax and careless in conforming to that principle. So there is no question whatsoever with regard to my point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. I still feel, with all the conviction that lies within me, that when a constitutional amendment of such importance is proposed—and I think the Senator from Florida will agree that there have been very few, if any, constitutional amendments, save those contained in the first 10 amendments, which are of as great importance as the pending proposal, or of greater importance—the way we are proceeding, by trying to rewrite, to compromise, and to adjust, is bad for the interests of the people of the country and bad for our relationships with foreign countries. I think such a proposal would impede our foreign relations. I think it would cause a stagnation, or at least a partial stagnation in the functioning of government. That is why I am against the pending amendment. It is not because I am against the purpose. I will acknowledge to my respected friend from Florida that I am in a very anomolous position in opposing a proposal similar to the one which I myself have made, and which I have advocated. I believe that the question of the manner in which we now propose to legislate on this amendment is so paramount in importance that I can allow nothing else to stand in my way.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it had been my hope—and still is—to obtain a vote on the pending amendment this evening, and then move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow. Merely in the interest of orderly parliamentary procedure, once again I should like to propound a unanimous-consent request, namely, that the request of the Senator from Michigan to modify his amendment to the extent of inserting certain language between lines 15 and 16 on page 3, be granted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say to the Senator from California that I have an amendment to propose to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. I am wondering if the granting of the unanimous-consent request would change the language so that I would lose my opportunity to propose my amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The language would not be changed. Whatever rights the Senator from Washington now has he would continue to have, regardless of the particular change now proposed, which is merely to insert new language as a section between lines 15 and 16 on page 3, rather than to strike out certain lines.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I did not understand the answer to the parliamentary inquiry a moment ago, in which the Chair stated that no business could be transacted in the Senate unless a quorum were present. A statement has just been made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who perhaps knows more about the rules of the Senate than any other Senator, or just as much as any other Senator, that a treaty had been ratified with only two Senators on the floor. I do not quite reconcile the statement of the Senator from Arizona with the statement made by the Chair. I should like to ask the Chair for a clarification of his statement that no business can be conducted by the Senate without a quorum being present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the case referred to a quorum was presumed to be present, and the contrary had never been shown.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say "presumed." A moment ago the Chair stated that a quorum was present. The Senator from Arizona said that only two Members of the Senate were present. I want to know what was the fact, not the presumption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the only way in which the absence of a quorum can be established is by a quorum call, or by a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then the Chair does not believe it to be possible to presume that a quorum is present under those circumstances. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states that that is in accordance with all the precedents of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Chair recognizes the fact, however, that a great deal of business is conducted by the Senate without a quorum being present. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not on the record.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say "on the record." I said the Chair does say so as a fact, does he not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is advised that the Presiding Officer cannot count to see whether a quorum is present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not ask the Presiding Officer that question. I asked whether it is not a fact that a great deal of business is conducted by the Senate without a quorum being present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not on the record.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] if he would object to modifying his amendment by including all agreements, not merely treaties. The reason I ask it is that if the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Georgia is adopted, it is very likely that in the

future there will not be any treaties, and everything will be brought to Congress in the form of an agreement, in order to take advantage of the majority rule. Does not the Senator from Michigan feel, if such an amendment as he proposes should be adopted, it should be applicable to all agreements?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe the amendment should be left as it is. If the George amendment becomes a part of the proposed constitutional amendment, then a section dealing with executive agreements can be taken care of. The pending amendment is purely intended to cover treaties, in connection with which a two-thirds vote is required to ratify.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not understand the Senator's answer. Does he mean that he anticipates that if the George amendment is adopted, another amendment will be offered?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will permit me to say so, if he will look at the Bricker amendment, as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, he will note a section in it dealing with the question of executive agreements. If the distinguished Senator from Arkansas desires to have a yea-and-nay vote required for Executive agreements, it seems to me that that is the section he should seek to amend.

What we are trying to do in this section is to cover the matter of ratification of treaties, which under the Constitution only the Senate acts upon, not the House, and which does require a two-thirds vote. We are dealing with a treaty section.

I plead with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas to let the Senate come to a vote on this issue. Then, if he desires to provide for a yea-and-nay vote in a section dealing with executive agreements, he can offer such an amendment to that section, either to the amendment reported by the Committee on the Judiciary or to any other amendment dealing with executive agreements which may be offered from the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no objection to voting on the pending amendment. I was trying to clarify the situation. I would not object to the amendment. I have already stated my position, which is that the objective sought should be accomplished by a change in the rules of the Senate or by the passage of a statute. I shall vote against it, not because I object to its merits, but because I believe the only purpose of offering it now is to try to strengthen and make more palatable a constitutional amendment, whether it be the Bricker amendment or the George amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator from Arkansas will read section 3 of the Bricker amendment, lines 10 through 15 on page 3, he will note the words:

> All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

The article refers to the ratification of treaties by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

It seems to me that the Ferguson amendment, since it does not strike out lines 10 through 15, as it originally proposed to do, but leaves in that part of the Bricker amendment which includes executive agreements, should be amended to apply to executive agreements.

What the Senator from Minnesota is saying is that the Ferguson amendment originally was intended to strike out the reference to executive agreements. The Senator from Michigan has asked to modify his amendment, but leaves intact the language pertaining to executive agreements.

Yet, when it comes to his amendment as it is applied to the Bricker amendment, it refers only to treaties. Therefore the discussion with reference to executive agreements and a yea and nay vote seems to be very germane and very pertinent.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator will have an opportunity to vote on striking out the language which was previously included under the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I happen to be one of the Senators who intend to cast their votes in favor of a yea-and-nay vote in connection with the ratification of treaties.

I am not at all impressed by the argument with reference to statutes, because the majority leader made it quite clear that a treaty is ratified by only one House of Congress, and I believe he made a very good point in that connection.

However, I must say to my good friend from Michigan that I believe in his haste to modify his amendment he failed to take into consideration the fact that he was striking out lines 10 to 15, which basically related to executive agreements, and now ends up with an amendment which touches only the treatymaking functions and leaves in the original proposal—by striking out the provision to eliminate lines 10 to 15—affecting treaties only, when the real problem is executive agreements.

Therefore I believe he has gone to the mountain and the product which has been delivered is hardly related to all the effort involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question. If we do not agree to the Senator's unanimous-consent request and vote on the pending amendment as it is, would it deal only with treaties?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Whereas if we leave it as it is, the second sentence, by referring to the proposed amendment, will apply both to treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. FERGUSON. If that part were to remain in the amendment; that is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not sure that I correctly understand the Senator. I am a little confused about what would be the effect of the amendment and whether it would apply to agreements.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the language in lines 10 to 13, inclusive, as I read it—"All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed upon treaties by this article"—were to remain in the amendment, it would apply. However, I do not anticipate that the language will remain in the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How will that language in section 3 be eliminated?

Mr. FERGUSON. On a motion to strike it out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we previously had a presumption by the Chair; now we are having assumptions on the floor of the Senate. What right has any Member of the Senate to assume that we will strike out any part of an amendment? We should proceed on the basis of amending an amendment in line with what is before us, not on what may happen. When we leave the Chamber some kind of accident may happen and we may be dead. We cannot afford to assume that we will strike section 3 or 4 or 5, or any other section.

I wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that while the Senator from New York was making his strong objection I felt he was possibly being too obstinate, which is very difficult for me to say about my friend from New York. But, now, Mr. President, I find he was dead right. The Senator from Michigan does not really know what the amendment means. The Senator from Michigan started out with a clean amendment to strike out certain language and add in lieu thereof the language of his amendment. The difficulty is that when he started to adjust it, what he did was to propose an amendment to the whole language of the Bricker amendment, which, in my opinion, does not relate to the core of the problem.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield in order that I may make a response to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The facts of the situation are simply these: It is true that the original amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan on behalf of himself and other Senators did propose to strike out certain language between lines 10 and 15, but at the request of a number of Senators who wanted to vote on this issue standing alone and not be deprived of the opportunity of voting on whether they wanted to retain the language as reported from the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Michigan sought to modify the amendment in conformity with such request. The Senator from Michigan asked to modify his amendment. It was an attempt to oblige Members of the Senate so that they might be able to vote on a single issue.

I quite agree with the Senator that no one has a right to assume that the Senate will do or will not do a certain thing; but unless we can arrive at a vote, we shall not know what the final answer will be.

All the majority leader is trying to do is to get the amendment to the point where a vote can be taken on it tonight. I would then propose that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow and consider the other amendments in order, so that Senators who desire either to retain certain sections or eliminate them will have an opportunity to debate and vote on them in turn.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that is the orderly and sensible procedure and one which both the Senate and the Nation will thoroughly understand.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, why is it not more orderly to wait until section 3 is deleted before an amendment is offered? If the Senator from Michigan anticipates that section 3 will be eliminated, let us eliminate it and then go on with the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the Senator from Arkansas that under the general procedure of the Senate perfecting amendments are first in order. The Senator from Michigan has 3 perfecting amendments, 1 has been adopted, 1 is now pending, and he has 1 which he had hoped to bring up today, but which it is now proposed to hold over until tomorrow. The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has an amendment which he has presented to the Senate and which is at the table. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has a substitute which is at the table. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is at the table.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that if we can vote on them in that order, we shall at least have an opportunity to get the expression of the Senate.

Each Member has his own ideas as to whether we should try to amend the Constitution on the floor of the Senate. We have previously discussed that situation. We have been debating this matter for several weeks. No Senator is being foreclosed from voting. We shall consider the joint resolution all week if the Senate so desires, but we are now at a point where I think the Senate understands the issue, and we are merely trying to get a vote at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I would rather vote on the first proposal of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment lettered "B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is a request now being made to withdraw the amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. To withdraw the Ferguson amendment which has been offered.

Mr. KERR. Does that refer to this specific document which the Senator from California so kindly furnished me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It applies to that specific document.

Mr. KERR. I shall not object, but I would remark that we could have saved some two hours of time had the request been made earlier in the afternoon when the understanding of Senators would probably have been clearer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Have not the yeas and nays been ordered?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, Mr. President; but the order can be rescinded by unanimous consent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Reserving the right to object, I want to say to the majority leader that I realize what is desired with reference to the amendment. When the Senator explained it to me I was perfectly willing to cooperate, and I am at this time. The truth is that this amendment might have been quickly modified on the floor of the Senate without full understanding of the situation. The first amendment was the one upon which we should have voted, because it applied to treaties. We ended up, however, by considering an amendment which applies to treaties attached to a provision applying to agreements.

I think the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] made a distinct contribution this afternoon when he said we were legislating without full understanding. At the time I thought he was incorrect, and I so indicated to a colleague of mine. If the Senator from Michigan wants to propose his original amendment, which is a clear amendment, we can vote it up or down, or we can follow along the line suggested by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The present situation is just what the Senator has described.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The majority leader is asking unanimous consent to withdraw the entire amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is the situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know the majority leader has been most patient, but, frankly, we are in rather a ridiculous position. We went up the hill and now we are coming down.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me a moment, all I am trying to do is to move along so that the Senate can proceed in an orderly manner.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why not vote?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It will undoubtedly require two rollcalls. I am going to make a suggestion. The hour is almost 6 o'clock. If permission is granted, the amendment will be withdrawn, a new amendment will be drafted, which will not be taken up tonight. It will be printed and lie on the table, and Senators will have an opportunity to study it, and we shall then have an opportunity to proceed with a fresh look at the situation at noon tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think the Senator's proposal is eminently fair. I should not want to be in the position of objecting to an orderly procedure such as he has outlined. Some of us did not participate in the debate for the purpose of obstruction.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The majority leader has not charged any obstruction.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, no; there are no charges at all. It is a matter of the record being quite complete.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to point out that I was perfectly willing to vote on the original amendment at the beginning. I made no delaying requests. I think it is better for the Senate to know whether the requirement for the yeas and nays is to apply only to treaties or to agreements, or to both. I think we should know that. If yea-and-nay votes are to be required only on treaties, though if I correctly understood the Senator from Michigan, the amendment would probably be made to apply later on to agreements, it seems to me we should know whether it applies to both.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan did not say that. He said it depended on whether that particular section was left in the resolution or was eliminated by the Senate. No one can guarantee that section will be kept in or left out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Do I gather that the Senator from Michigan thinks it will be left out?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is my personal opinion. But, after all, there are 96 Senators, and until they have voted, we will not know.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not see what would be wrong with determining to what the requirement for the yeas-and-nays will apply. We shall have to wait to decide that question until the Senate determines whether the section is to remain in the resolution. That seems very logical to me. But I do not wish to interfere with the program of the majority leader. I still think it would be perfectly proper to vote on the original amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I reserved the right to object. Probably I helped start this discussion, but I did so without having in mind any delay.

I asked the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] what I thought was a simple question. I think before the Senate passes on any of these amendments, there should be some legislative history as to what is considered to be a treaty and what is considered to be an executive agreement. I failed to get an answer, so I have prepared an amendment, which I wish to offer. I propose it in all seriousness. I think the Senate should vote on all these questions. So if the amendment under consideration is withdrawn, I now serve notice on the Senate that I shall propose an amendment to add, "and/or executive agreements." Unless there can be definitions of treaties and executive agreements, I cannot see any objection to the amendment which I shall propose.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, the Senator from Washington can offer what he wishes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand, but I should like to have a definition.

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot define the terms for the Senator from Washington, because of the conflict that now exists between the Constitution, the Supreme Court decisions, and the practice of the State Department. I cannot give a definition of or draw a line of demarcation between an executive agreement and a treaty. If I could, I believe many of the problems confronting us would be solved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan if the Executive head of the Government should send to the Senate an agreement or a treaty, or both, and should say, "This is an executive agreement," would the Executive be the determining power, or would the Senate decide whether it was a treaty on which it was asked to vote by the yeas-and-nays, or was an executive agreement on which it would not be required so to vote?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should say the answer would depend somewhat on the form of the proposal; but I believe in the majority of cases the Senate could consider it as a treaty, if the Senate desired to ratify the proposal in that form.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How would that be determined?

Mr. FERGUSON. By a vote of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That being the case, and since there is so much confusion about what is a treaty and what is an executive agreement, and where the line is to be drawn, would the Senator from Michigan object to my amendment, which would simply add "and/or executive agreements"?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I would object. I should be glad to discuss the question on the floor, but I would object now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not object to withholding the amendment now, but I may say to the Senate that when the Senator from Michigan reoffers his amendment I intend to offer an amendment adding the words "and/or executive agreements," because I believe the Senate should vote on all such matters, since executive agreements sometimes become more important than treaties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, please let me invite attention to the formulary proposed a little while ago by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] for the ascertainment of the meaning, if any, of the innumerable, confused and conflicting amendments to the bitterly controversial Bricker amendment now before the Senate. The beloved Iowa statesman proposed that we seek surcease of our present distress, not by means of a Shakespearean invocation of a must of fire, or a Miltonic supplication for the illumination of what is undoubtedly dark and the elevation of what is unquestionably low, but by simply adopting the method used by a certain farmer to determine whether his pigeons were of the masculine or feminine gender. Said the farmer, "Simply observe the pigeons while they are eating corn, and rest assured that every male that eats will be a 'he' and every female that eats will be a 'she'." Let me for a moment endeavor to rise to the height of the great argument which for weeks has been raging in the Senate over an attempt to alter the Constitution to an extent that would render it impossible for Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Webster, severally or jointly, to recognize it if it were encountered in the silent land. Let me enlarge the suggestion made by the Senator from Iowa so as to include another species of the animal kingdom as a possible source from which to obtain wisdom and discretion sufficient to enable us appropriately to dispose of the Bricker amendment whether in its present stark naked imperfection or in a more or less modified form.

In this case, we should not follow the scriptural advice to the sluggard to go to the ant for wisdom, because we would not wish to be guilty of offending this industrious, praiseworthy little insect by attempting to associate it with anything we have heard here today. However, it is suggested that instead of going to the ant or to the birds, as proposed by the Senator from Iowa, we go to the friendless insect, whose power of discrimination was immortalized by the renowned Roland Young, in his matchless and inimitable lines:

> And there's the bounding little flea:
> You cannot tell a female from a he;
> The sexes look alike you see,
> But he can tell, and so can she.

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, will not the eminent Republican leader, Mr. KNOWLAND, postpone the vote on the pending ponderous matter until tomorrow in order that we may have an opportunity to go to the birds, as suggested by the Senator from Iowa, and to the flea, as suggested by Mr. Young, for guidance in the performance of our official duty in this time of unparalleled confusion which prevails not only at the other end of the Avenue but also on Capitol Hill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, between lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to insert:

> On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the amendment I have just offered is now the pending question before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The amendment is the pending question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The hour being 6 o'clock, I ask that the amendment be printed for the information of the Senate and lie on the table. I understand it will be printed in the RECORD, thus affording an opportunity for all Senators to read the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to add, in line 2, after the word "treaty", so that it may become the pending question also, the phrase "and/or executive agreements." I offer that language as an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is advised that his amendment is out of order at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I ask why?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Because the amendment of the Senator from Washington is an amendment in the third degree, and thus would not be in order at this time.

The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is the amendment of the Senator from California a new amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is a new amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. If that be true, how could it have become the pending question, since it has not laid over a day?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I know of no rule of the Senate which would prevent the amendment from becoming the pending question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from California has offered a new amendment. Has the Senator withdrawn his old amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. I have offered this amendment in lieu thereof.

Mr. President, unless some Senator desires to present matters for insertion in the RECORD, I am about to move that the Senate stand in recess.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have not finished with the matter yet.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Washington. I have no desire to foreclose the distinguished Senator from anything he may wish to say, but I desired to advise the Senate what the program would be for the remainder of the week.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand, the Ferguson amendment is an amendment to the so-called Bricker amendment. I desire to ask the Chair if under the rules of the Senate there is any way by which I can propose an amendment to the new amendment which has just been offered by the Senator from California. May I offer a substitute amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from Washington that I think there is no question that the Senator can offer a substitute amendment, but the substitute amendment could be acted

upon only after the Bricker amendment had been acted upon by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is reminded that the amendment just offered by the Senator from California is an amendment in the second degree, it being an amendment to the committee amendment. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Washington would be an amendment in the third degree, and would not be in order at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I offer as a substitute for the amendment which is the pending question the same language I proposed earlier, namely, to add, in line 2, after the word "treaty", the words "and/or executive agreements."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is advised that that amendment also is out of order, for the same reason. The proposed substitute amendment is not in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I make this inquiry: After the amendment offered by the Senator from California has been voted on, if I proposed another amendment, would that amendment be out of order? Would it be in the same degree, because of the addition of four words?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the amendment were offered to modify the committee amendment, at that time it would be in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Whether the pending amendment should be voted up or down?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would have to be on amendment to some part of the committee amendment which is not affected by an amendment previously agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. For example, if the Ferguson amendment should be agreed to tomorrow by the Senate, could I offer a substitute which would add two words? Could I offer a new amendment which would add two words?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is presently considering the parliamentary inquiry of the Senator from Washington.

The Senator from Washington is advised that he may offer an amendment to any part of the committee amendment which has not been previously amended.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Am I correct in my understanding that if the Ferguson amendment is agreed to, I may not offer my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The word "foreclosed" would be correct in that instance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator could not offer an amendment under those circumstances.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment, which would add, in line 2 of section 3, after the word "treaty", the words "and/or an executive agreement."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I must object because, as I understand, the Senator from Washington will not be foreclosed.

I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the amendment of the Senator from Washington is not in order because it is an amendment in the third degree which would further amend the committee amendment, which has already been amended by the Senate; but if the proposed language were applicable to another section which had not been amended, the Senator would then be in a position to offer his amendment to that particular section. Do I understand correctly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has stated the situation correctly, as did the Chair previously.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not desire to amend another section. I wish to offer an amendment to the section under discussion, and I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in order to preserve the rules of the Senate—and I think orderly procedure would indicate that that should be done—I make the point that amendments in the third degree are not in order. The distinguished Senator is in a position to offer his amendment to another section dealing with executive agreements.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not desire to offer the amendment to another section; I wish to offer it to the treatymaking section, because the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] could not define the difference between executive agreements and treaties.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator from Washington desires to offer the amendment tomorrow, and the Senate does not adopt the Ferguson amendment, the Senator from Washington will be in a position to offer his amendment. The issue will then be before the Senate. Under the circumstances, it seems to me the proper procedure would be for the Senator to debate the question tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senate adopts the Ferguson amendment, then we are foreclosed from bringing executive agreements into the provision.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. That is a long-standing rule of the Senate. The rule deals with questions of amendment in the third degree.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agreed with the distinguished majority leader to withdraw the amendment. I could have kept my amendment pending. I thought the majority leader would not object to a unanimous-consent request to add executive agreements to the provision and let the Senate vote on it. The debate has been on that question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A very basic issue is involved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree that it is basic. That is why I am debating the question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand that there is a pending amendment before the Senate. The distinguished Senator from Washington is not foreclosed from offering his amendment to another section, nor is he foreclosed from offering it to this section if the Senate does not adopt the Ferguson amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is precisely the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I still ask unanimous consent to offer my amendment, and I ask it because I think it is only fair. For the past 2 hours, we have been discussing the serious question as to whether there is a difference between treaties and executive agreements. I agreed with the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] that the Senate should vote on all such agreements. Therefore, I am making a suggestion which I think the people of the country will understand. If we are to vote on all such agreements we should not be limited by the decision of the Executive as to whether a particular agreement is a treaty or an executive agreement. The parliamentary procedure would not allow us to act at the present time with regard to executive agreements. The Executive could call a treaty an executive agreement and foreclose the Senate from voting on it. In other words, his discretion would be flexible. I suggest that we close the door. I believe we should have an opportunity to vote on all these questions.

We know how the Senate sometimes becomes tied up in parliamentary procedure. If the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves is as has been described, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be allowed to vote on the question of whether or not executive agreements should be included in the provision requiring a yea-and-nay vote. I stand on my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 16, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 15 (legislative day of February 8), 1954:

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be members of the War Claims Commission, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Raymond T. Armbruster, of New York.
Whitney Gillilland, of Iowa.
Mrs. Pearl Carter Pace, of Kentucky.

DIRECTOR OF LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION

Charles H. Grossman, of New Mexico, to be Director of Locomotive Inspection, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Archie A. Alexander, of Iowa, to be Governor of the Virgin Islands.

UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

Don N. Laramore, of Indiana, to be judge of the United States Court of Claims, vice Evan Howell, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. John Alexander Klein, O7536, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as the Adjutant General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952:

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Wallace Harry Graham, AO343-889, Air Force Reserve.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Oates Hardin, AO170727 (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Chester Earl McCarty, AO235959 (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Randall Rampy, AO922-780 (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

*Col. Frederick Griswold Atkinson, AO910-458, Air Force Reserve.

*George Abbott Brownell, AO142136 (formerly brigadier general, Air Force Reserve).

Brig. Gen. William Porter Farnsworth, AO922626 (colonel, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

*Col. John Henderson Foster, AO284572, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. William Judson Fry, AO266683, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. John Spence Gulledge, AO265793, Air Force Reserve.

*Charles Augustus Lindbergh, AO215724 (formerly colonel, Air Corps Reserve).

*Col. Joseph Stacey Marriott, AO104544, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. Frank Thomas McCoy, Jr., AO310412, Air Force Reserve.

Maj. Gen. Kern Delos Metzger, AO914698 (colonel, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Walter Irwin Miller, AO913582 (colonel, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

*Col. Clayton Stiles, AO269341, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. Felix Louis Vidal, AO943500, Air Force Reserve.

Maj. Gen. Leigh Wade, AO403535 (colonel, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

*Col. Will Walter White, AO272508, Air Force Reserve.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles P. Andersen
Thomas R. McCalla
Gordon R. Papritz
Ernest E. Ritchie
Gerald K. Seiple

Daniel W. Urish (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Cecil C. Davis
Lee H. Sherman

The following-named officer to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles K. Deeks

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Donald F. Kingsley, Jr.
Arthur J. Wartes
Jack H. Zoellner

The following-named officer to be a lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Marvin H. Scott

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ernest M. Pennell, Jr.
Paul A. Koppes
Julius E. Lueders

*Subject to physical examination.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Louis J. Mendelis, D. D., LL. D., pastor of St. Alphonsus Lithuanian Roman Catholic Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Let us pray. Almighty and eternal God, divine governor of heaven and earth, look with favor and mercy upon this body of men to whom Thou, the source of all true authority, hast entrusted the framing of laws by which a free people consents to abide; do Thou grant them the tenderness of conscience to be ever mindful of the account they must render to Thee for the discharge of their sacred duties; give them a wholesome fear of tyranny and the alertness to sense every encroachment upon human rights and freedom; and impart to them the courage and the determination to preserve for us the liberty and the dignity with which Thou hast been pleased to invest Thy rightful children. Through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, who with Thee and the Holy Spirit livest and reignest, one God forever and ever. Amen.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 15, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 68. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Godschalk;

S. 123. An act for the relief of Anni Wilhelmine Skoda;

S. 205. An act for the relief of Evdoxia J. Kitsos;

S. 236. An act for the relief of Amir Hassan Sepahban;

S. 296. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Henry Litmanowitz (Litman);

S. 305. An act for the relief of Antonio Vocale;

S. 313. An act for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama;

S. 323. An act for the relief of Rose Cohen;

S. 353. An act for the relief of Li Ming;

S. 506. An act for the relief of Horst F. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar;

S. 569. An act for the relief of Lina Anna Adelheid (Adam) Hoyer;

S. 606. An act for the relief of Hannelore Netz and her two children;

S. 730. An act for the relief of Winfried Kohls;

S. 801. An act for the relief of Eugenio S. Roiles;

S. 825. An act for the relief of Karin Rita Grubb;

S. 973. An act for the relief of Dr. Jawad Hedayaty;

S. 982. An act for the relief of Helena Lewicka;

S. 1009. An act for the relief of Zoltan Weingarten;

S. 1018. An act for the relief of George Ellis Ellison;

S. 1226. An act for the relief of Stefan Virgilius Issarescu;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of Emmanuel Aristides Nicoloudis;

S. 1323. An act for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney;

S. 1443. An act for the relief of Jose Deang; and

S. 2689. An act to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1160) for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Tequillo.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2846) authorizing the President to exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii, notwithstanding the acts of August 5, 1939, and June 16, 1949, or other acts of Congress; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. D'EWART, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. REGAN, and Mr. ASPINALL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GRAHAM, Miss THOMPSON of Michigan, and Mr. WALTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may

be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Mansfield
Anderson	Gore	Martin
Barrett	Green	Maybank
Beall	Griswold	McClellan
Bennett	Hayden	Monroney
Bricker	Hendrickson	Morse
Bridges	Hennings	Mundt
Burke	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Payne
Byrd	Humphrey	Potter
Carlson	Hunt	Purtell
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Jackson	Russell
Clements	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kennedy	Sparkman
Douglas	Kerr	Stennis
Duff	Kilgore	Symington
Dworshak	Knowland	Thye
Eastland	Kuchel	Upton
Ellender	Langer	Watkins
Ferguson	Lehman	Welker
Flanders	Lennon	Williams
Frear	Long	Young
Fulbright	Magnuson	
George	Malone	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

REDUCTION OF AGE REQUIREMENTS OF RECIPIENTS OF OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to a reduction of the age requirements of recipients of old-age assistance.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on February 15, 1954, p. 1705, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

HOUSING PROJECTS IN BOSTON AREA—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to housing projects in the Boston area.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on February 15, 1954, p. 1705, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, relating to the prevention of the United States Government from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on February 15, 1954, p. 1705, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

DELIVERY OF MAIL TO RESIDENCES—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions of the General Court of the State of Massachusetts, relating to two daily deliveries of mail to residences.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on February 15, 1954, p. 1705, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

CONTINUANCE OF OPERATION OF LUCY MALLARY VILLAGE, SPRINGFIELD, MASS., RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, relating to the continuance of the operation of the Lucy Mallary Village in Springfield, Mass.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on February 15, 1954, p. 1705, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

REVISION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—RESOLUTION OF ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted on February 9, 1954, by the New York State Assembly, by a vote of 133 to 2, calling on the Congress to revise the so-called McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the people of the United States have always recognized the contribution which so many Americans of foreign birth and descent have made in the growth, progress, and development of the United States of America; and

Whereas these peoples have earned the respect and confidence of all Americans in their effort to recover from the devastating effects of World War II without relying upon self pity; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the world have courageously and with determination applied themselves to the rebuilding of their beautiful, friendly, and industrious nations; and

Whereas it is increasingly evident that the McCarran-Walters immigration law, which Congress approved over President Truman's veto, is in several of its provisions discriminatory against the freedom-loving people on account of their foreign birth of national origin; and

Whereas the American principle of equality before the law is violated by some provisions of the act referring to naturalized citizens; and

Whereas the restrictions enacted in this law against former members of totalitarian organizations, who have been converted to democracy, are detrimental to the interests of the people of a free world; and

Whereas the Democratic Party in its 1952 campaign platform pledged: "Continuing revision of our immigration and naturalization laws to do away with any unjust and unfair practices against national groups which have contributed some of our best citizens. We will eliminate distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens.

We want no second-class citizens in free America"; and

Whereas our recently elected President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, gave pledges to the people during the election campaign of 1952 that he would favor and support a revision of the discriminatory clauses of the McCarran-Walters Immigration Act, and revise the present unrational and unjust quota system so as to reestablish before the law equality for all citizens, both native and naturalized, and to allow admission of former members of totalitarian organizations who have proven convincingly, over a reasonable period of years, that they have become valiant fighters for freedom and against all kinds of dictatorship; and

Whereas our immigration laws and regulations are necessarily an integral part of the requirements of the foreign policy of the United States, these laws should be administered to provide a haven for the downtrodden victims of political, racial, and religious persecution so that our Nation will stand out as a beacon light of liberty and freedom at the court of world public opinion: Therefore be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized to enact such legislation as to make available to the people of such nations as are friendly to the United States, the unused wartime immigration quota of such nations; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 2951. A bill for the relief of Janis Vitins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 2952. A bill for the relief of Ambrose Anthony Fox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2953. A bill for the relief of Costanza Savina Germinerio Evangelista;

S. 2954. A bill for the relief of Christine Thum;

S. 2955. A bill for the relief of Maria Eheim and her child;

S. 2956. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Cesare; and

S. 2957. A bill for the relief of Eldur Eha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 2958. A bill for the relief of Ida Reissmuller and Johnny Damon Eugene Reissmuller;

S. 2959. A bill for the relief of Irene Essley; and

S. 2960. A bill for the relief of Barbara Herta Geschwandtner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2961. A bill authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to George C. Stratton and Ellen J. Stratton; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the period August 14–17, 1954, as American Law Student Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing for the establishment of the Small Business Committee as a permanent standing committee of the Senate. I regret that I have not had an opportunity to contact other of my colleagues, but I shall be happy to welcome them as cosponsors at any time.

Four years ago this month, the Senate voted into existence a select, nonlegislative Small Business Committee. Although he faced many obstacles in guiding that resolution through the Senate, our late esteemed colleague, Senator Kenneth Wherry, early recognized the important role which could and should be filled by a permanent committee given the responsibility to watch over the health and prosperity of the 4 million small-business concerns in the United States.

During the past 4 years, the Select Committee on Small Business has been on trial. I feel that it has served its apprenticeship and should now be reconstituted as a standing committee. I shall not long detain the Members of the Senate with a recital of the achievements and the fine record of our committee during those years, but a review of the annual reports of the committee reviewing the previous year's activities gives a vivid picture of the accomplishments of the committee and its staff during a most critical period in our Nation's history. The dislocations of the Korean war with its resultant economic upheaval were upon us before the committee was fully operative. Nonetheless, it immediately undertook studies and issued reports which contributed immeasurably to the mobilization effort by bringing additional productive facilities to the attention of the military and by preserving many thousands of additional firms which were threatened with extinction through overly onerous and poorly drafted controls on scarce raw materials.

Mr. President, we have prepared this resolution and urge its approval by our colleagues, since it will better define the activities of the Small Business Committee. Furthermore, by our action in making it a permanent standing committee with all the powers and prerogatives, except 1, of the other 15 committees, we are giving recognition to the vital role of the small-business men of the United States. I take this opportunity to ask most respectfully that the Rules Committee give prompt consideration to this resolution, since I feel that it will enable the Senate Small Business Committee to serve more effectively the business community when so many problems beset it from all sides.

The resolution (S. Res. 213), submitted by Mr. THYE (for himself and other Senators), was received, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, that rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"(5) (a) A standing committee to be known as the Committee on Small Business and to consist of 13 Senators shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress.

"(b) It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small-business enterprises, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of such studies and surveys. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction."

SEC. 2. The Select Committee on Small Business established by S. Res. 58, 81st Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, is hereby abolished. The employees, records, and property of the Select Committee on Small Business on the effective date of this resolution shall thereupon become the employees, records, and property, respectively, of the standing committee established by this resolution.

SEC. 3. Section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on 2 standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 21 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 9 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Small Business, or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may serve on 3 standing committees and no more."

SEC. 4. This resolution shall be effective on and after the date of beginning of the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO REQUESTS OF COMMON CARRIERS FOR INCREASED TRANSPORTATION RATES—AMENDMENT

Mr. SMATHERS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1461) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, concerning requests of common carriers for increased transportation rates, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

GATTAS E. MALOOF—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the bill (H. R. 5950) for the relief of Gattas E. Maloof was referred to the Committee

on the Judiciary following its passage by the House of Representatives.

The committee at its meeting considered the bill and authorized and directed the chairman to request that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill as it does not involve a claim against the United States, but would authorize and direct the Secretary of State to present a claim through diplomatic channels to the Government of Cuba, a foreign government.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of this bill (H. R. 5950), and that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, today marks the 36th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania. The circumstances surrounding the tragic plight of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors are well known. The Government of the United States will never recognize the forcible annexation of these countries by the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following these remarks, the text of a message I have prepared in commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE OF UNITED STATES SENATOR IRVING M. IVES ON THE OCCASION OF THE 36TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

It is once again a great privilege and honor to pay my deepest respects to Americans of Lithuanian descent as they commemorate the founding of the Republic of Lithuania. With this expression of greeting go my fervent hopes that the gallant people of Lithuania may soon be emancipated from the merciless oppression of the Soviet invaders.

The tragic and forcible annexation of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors weighs heavily on the conscience of the free world. The recent investigation by the House of Representatives of the United States Congress has portrayed to peoples everywhere the brutality of Communist tyranny and has underlined President Eisenhower's words: "Freedom is pitted against slavery; lightness against the dark."

The faith which binds us in this struggle is the faith which sustains the brave land of Lithuania in this dark hour. It is the faith of freemen from which is drawn the strength to resist and overcome Communist aggression.

The American people stand together on this 36th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day in their prayers that the birthright of freedom may soon again be Lithuania's possession.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, today in celebrating the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, we must keep in mind how far back the roots of this independence and national consciousness go, for it is the depth of those roots which has made the Lithuanian democratic tradition so lasting and so indestructible. The first independent Lithuanian state was organized more than 600 years ago. It grew into a flourishing kingdom—one of the most prominent in eastern Europe. The Lithuanians were a peace-loving people, devoted to the pacific development and enrichment of their country.

But because of the geographic position which Lithuania occupied, at the crossroads of two cultures, those of the East and the West, Lithuania was the victim of frequent incursions and devastations at the hands of her greedy neighbors. Eventually she became the prey of power politics; and in the 18th century Lithuania was forcibly annexed by Russia, and disappeared from the map of Europe as an independent nation.

Despite this disaster, however, the spirit of Lithuanian independence and freedom remained in evidence as much as in the glorious days of the early kingdom. The most brutal attempts of the czars to stamp out every last vestige of Lithuanian life met with little success. The people of Lithuania were biding their time, ready to seize the opportune moment once again to declare their liberty. That moment came 36 years ago, following the collapse of Czarist Russia during the First World War.

The years following World War I were years of great hope for the independent Lithuanian nation. The little Baltic republic made astounding progress in every field. She became a model republic. But before her efforts could achieve full fruition, the holocaust that swept all of Europe, beginning in 1939, brought an end to the Lithuanian Republic. Once again the pawn of international politics, Lithuania, with other Baltic states, was ruthlessly and without any legal grounds seized by the Soviet Union. In the immensity of the global conflict, the case of Lithuania and her neighbors was not given the due attention it merited. But today, more than ever, we are aware of the importance of this gallant nation.

In the 13th and in the 16th centuries, Lithuania was a bastion of Western European civilization, on the dividing line between East and West.

Today, the Baltic States still form a bastion of western civilization. The ideas of the West continue to live in Lithuania. Lithuanians' memory of their past and their common heritage with the West are ineradicable. So long as these endure, there can be no tyranny which can wipe out the spirit of self-determination along the paths of liberty. People and the independence of countries can be destroyed, but not a heritage or the ideas that are a part of it. It is for this reason that today we celebrate the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. For this reason, too, we know that the people of Lithuania will once again find freedom and justice, and that democracy will be restored to the great Lithuanian nation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to those of my colleagues in commemoration of the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence and pay tribute to the gallant struggle waged by that country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief statement which I have prepared on this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Thirty-six years ago the courageous people of Lithuania established a republic based on the principles of democracy and respect for the individual. To a people who had spent centuries in servitude and oppression it was a just reward that they should be enabled to take their place in the society of free nations.

But today Lithuania is once more a "nation of sorrows." The harsh Communist despotism has tried, like past oppressors, to destroy the land and the very soul of the people. However, the constant challenge of subjugation which the Lithuanian people have so indomitably met has given them an unquenchable spirit. Out of their affliction has come the strength to persevere in their fight for liberty and independence. The Lithuanian dream of self-determination has so long been a part of that country's heritage that it has become a national characteristic of its people. It is a trait that cannot be wiped out.

The proud people of Lithuania have not given in to Soviet domination, no more than they ever betrayed their national ideals to a foreign despot. Through sullen resistance, and through a still effective underground the Lithuanian people are continuing their fight.

In celebrating the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we pay tribute to this gallant struggle. But more than that, we affirm the fact that Lithuanian independence has never been crushed, and that we still recognize the existence, now in spirit, but let us hope very soon in reality of a democratic Lithuanian Republic.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the 36th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania is being observed today wherever free men rejoice in the ideals of liberty.

Established in 1918 as an independent, sovereign Nation, Lithuania gained the highest respect and admiration of the world as an outstanding example of self-government by a people to whom the cause of freedom was sacred and precious.

Today we find Lithuania in the 14th year of her enslavement under the yoke of tyranny and oppression. Her proud people have been robbed of their independence by the armed might of Communist aggression. Lithuania's plight grows more desperate with each passing year and the inhuman burden placed upon its people becomes more and more oppressive.

We take the greatest pride in the fact that the United States has never recognized the seizure of Lithuania and the other Baltic Republics by Soviet Russia. We honor them as independent Nations.

We join wholeheartedly with the Secretary of State, Hon. John Foster Dulles, in assuring the people of those captive countries that they are not forgotten, that we are not reconciled to their fate, and that we will never bargain with their Communist masters to confirm their captivity.

We rejoice that the spirit of national independence lives in the hopes and as-

pirations of Lithuania's courageous men and women.

We join them in prayer that God, in His infinite wisdom, may speed the day of their deliverance from Communist tyranny and that their beloved country may be restored to its rightful place of honor in the family of free nations.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, February 16, the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, under normal circumstances ought to be a day of great rejoicing for all Lithuanians and Americans of Lithuanian descent, many of whom reside in my State and are counted among our best citizens. But how can there be rejoicing when the Lithuanians are suffering under the oppression of Communist despots? How can there be gladness when Lithuania is burdened with the miseries of the regime imposed by the Kremlin? How can there be gayety when the dread somberness of totalitarianism darkens every Lithuanian street and byway? Because of the subjection of the people of Lithuania to Red tyranny, February 16 cannot be a day of rejoicing and gayety. Yet, because of the indomitable courage of the Lithuanians, February 16 can be a day of tremendous hope.

Lithuanians have had times of trial frequently in their history. In days gone by, foreign tyrants have held sway over the freedom-loving Lithuanians. Although these tyrants may have been able to destroy the liberties of the Lithuanian people, they were never able to suppress the dreams of independence in the minds of Lithuanian patriots, nor to quell the aspirations for freedom in their hearts. Those dreams and aspirations were in time fulfilled. After the First World War the Lithuanian people realized the hopes which they had long cherished, and on February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their national independence.

In the two decades that followed, Lithuania flourished. While Lithuanians happily enjoyed their freedom, they made good use of it, too. They improved their economy, and with the passing years grew ever stronger and wiser in the ways of self-government and democratic living. Their future appeared bright, when suddenly came the war of the giants.

First invaded by Soviet forces in 1939 and later crushed between the massive military machines of powerful Nazi Germany and gigantic Soviet Russia, Lithuania suffered successive occupations by these two totalitarians. In the end it was the Red armies of Stalin which won, and planted the emblem of the hammer and sickle where the yellow, green, and red tricolor once had flown. By force and fraud Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

The painful years that have ensued are recorded in infamy. The deportations, the enslavements, the destruction of political freedom and economic initiative are facts which have trickled through to the free world despite the curtain of silence behind which the Communists try to hide the countries they have overrun.

But we Americans know that the people of Lithuania are of stout heart. We know that faith and hope cannot be muffled in Lithuanian breasts. Inevitably the time will come when the tyrant's grip will weaken, when freedom will win over enslavement, and sorrow will be turned to joy.

The American people and Government have refused to recognize the Soviet Union's annexation of Lithuania. In many ways America is informing the world of Soviet misdeeds in Lithuania, and is mobilizing the moral force of world opinion against the oppressors, in the hope that Lithuania's day of freedom will be hastened and that the Kremlin's rule of misery and hatred will be forever overturned. With the utmost sincerity I express to all Lithuanians and Lithuanian-Americans my hope and prayer that that happy day will be soon.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues on this historic occasion in commemorating the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

It is an appropriate time for Congress to turn its attention to the desperate plight of the people of that ancient country. Their dramatic story is illuminated by the testimony of thousands of Lithuanians who have escaped to freedom from the iron grasp which the Soviets now maintain on their native land.

For many years prior to World War I Lithuania was dominated by czarist Russia; during that war the country was occupied by Germany. Taking advantage of the confusion which existed in Eastern Europe in the wake of the war, and fulfilling fervent hopes and decades of struggle, Lithuania declared herself and independent republic in February 1918. Under free self-government the country prospered.

At the beginning of World War II Lithuania was again occupied by Russia. Except for an interval of 3 years, when Nazi Germany was dominant, Lithuania has been under the control of the Soviets.

Terrible crimes have been perpetrated against the Lithuanians. Yet, adhering to the ideals and principles of the freedom they once possessed, Lithuanians at home and abroad have refused to give in to despair.

From the homeland we have had reports of an active undergound. In our own country Lithuanians have sacrificed themselves to promote the cause of their native country.

Let us encourage that spirit, for it not only brings closer the day when Lithuania will be once more an independent republic, but also contributes immeasurably to the security of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as we commemorate once more the anniversary of the founding of the democratic state of Lithuania, our hearts go out to the enslaved people of that country who in their long history have suffered so much to preserve their independence and their cultural identity.

Lithuania has known tyranny and oppression before. For 120 years, from 1795 to 1915, the Russian czars ruled over the country. They made every effort to stamp out the spirit of independence of the Lithuanian people. Yet they failed. In the end an independent Lithuania was recreated, an outpost of democratic civilization on the Baltic Sea.

I am confident that just as the Romanov czars failed to obliterate Lithuania, the Red czars of the present era will fail in their endeavors to achieve the same result. I am confident that the spirit of independence of the Lithuanian people will survive to see the dawn of freedom for Lithuania and for all other countries which have become the victims of Communist imperialism.

Mr. President, it was the same hope which I understand the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is about to express when he calls upon our Government to take firm and stern measures in telling the Red czars of the modern day, in unmistakable terms, that we will not tolerate nor will we condone, by either word or deed, their usurpation of power and their domination of freedom-loving peoples.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared in commemoration of the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. I believe it is entirely fitting that we in America should observe this anniversary, since it cannot be observed in Lithuania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

February 16 is a date as important to freedom-loving Lithuanians as the Fourth of July is to Americans, for it is the date of the declaration of independence of the people of Lithuania. It is a pleasure for me to join our citizens of Lithuanian ancestry and all Americans in celebration of this anniversary.

We shall continue to recognize and observe this day in tribute to the courage and spirit of Lithuanian independence. The ruthless tyrants in Moscow, whose armies have oppressed the people of Lithuania, have forbidden the observance of this day in the Lithuanian homeland, so it remains for us here in the United States and for others in the free world to celebrate this most important event.

We must use this occasion to say to the people of Lithuania who must live under the godless tyranny of communism that they are not forgotten. Their cherished freedom is not forgotten by the American people or by the United States Government. Our Government properly refuses to recognize the Soviet aggression which overran the nation. We have also, through measures like the Displaced Persons Act, of which I am proud to be an author, provided a haven in freedom for some 26,000 displaced Lithuanians.

History has taught us that the love of freedom which exists in the hearts of the people of Lithuania cannot be conquered or subdued by tyranny or aggression. I am certain that it will not be subdued. I join thousands of fine Americans of Lithuanian descent in working and praying for the liberation and freedom of the Lithuanian homeland.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the history of Lithuania reveals a persistent and valiant struggle to maintain her independence despite predatory neighbors.

For more than 120 years before the eventual achievement of independence on February 16, 1918, Lithuania suffered under the czars' intense policy of "Russification."

During the next 21 years, the Lithuanian nation demonstrated to all the world that it more than deserved its place among the independent states of the world, as evidenced by its stability and progress economically, politically, and culturally.

This happy period in Lithuanian history came to an end in 1939 when the totalitarian giants bordering Lithuania made their infamous pact whereby Hitler gave Stalin a free hand to obliterate the freedom of Lithuania and the other small Baltic Republics in return for Stalin's acquiescence in Hitler's invasion of Poland.

Shortly thereafter Soviet troops forcibly occupied Lithuanian territory and in June of 1940 Lithuanian independence came to an end when the little republic was annexed to the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, the Lithuanian people have since been subjected to the Soviet tyranny, save for the several years of equally brutal domination by Nazi Germany following Hitler's 1941 attack on his erstwhile Russian partner in crime.

The most encouraging factor in Lithuania's ceaseless struggle for independence is her consistent refusal to yield to the oppressor.

On this the 36th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania the American people, ever mindful of the blessings of their own Declaration of Independence, join with all Lithuanians in hoping for the day when Lithuania shall once more be free.

Mr. President, their courageous stand against tyranny will not be in vain.

No conqueror no matter how despotic can ever enslave a people with such a heritage of patriotic efforts to achieve independence, for they will never cease their efforts until they are free.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement which I have prepared with reference to the 36th anniversary of the independence of the great Baltic Republic of Lithuania printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

It is well that we in the Congress of the United States should note and observe this 36th anniversary of the independence of the great Baltic Republic of Lithuania. The history of the Lithuanian people and of the Lithuanian nation contains many heroic periods. I predict that the present period, when all the facts about it are known and the history of it is written, will be revealed as one of the most heroic of all.

I am sure that the iron heel of oppression under which Soviet Russia now grinds the people of Lithuania is still not heavy enough to stamp out the love of freedom among the Lithuanian people. Indeed, we know that freedom's light burns more fiercely today in the hearts of the Lithuanian people than ever before. They desire freedom. They are working to achieve that desire—silently but irresistably. In the end—I cannot predict exactly when it will be—they will achieve that freedom. No people who love freedom as the Lithuanian people do can be long denied.

In the history of the Lithuanian people there have been many long nights of darkness during which foreign oppressors attempted as best they could to eradicate love of country and love of liberty from the hearts of this gallant people. They have tried to stamp out both the language and the nationality. They failed.

They will fail again.

In their struggle to strike off the chains of slavery imposed by the Kremlin, the Lithuanian people have the wholehearted support of the American people. Shortly after the Lithuanian Republic was snuffed out by Soviet Russia, the United States Government proclaimed that we would never recognize the cruel act of aggression and suppression. The United States Government has maintained that position to this day.

There has been practiced in Lithuania, as in many other areas behind the Iron Curtain, the bestial crime of genocide, an attempt to destroy an entire people by terrorism, intimidation, dispersion, and enslavement. The slave labor camps in Siberia, we know, have more than their quota of Lithuanian patriots.

We are determined that the crimes that have been committed in Lithuania shall be recognized as crimes. We are determined that genocide shall be recognized for what it is by international agreement. We must continue to fight for the ratification of the genocide convention here in the United States.

On this occasion I am happy to extend my warmest greetings to all Americans of Lithuanian birth and descent and to all those Lithuanians who are not American citizens but who have found refuge and asylum in America.

I say to them, and I hope that they will help to transmit abroad this message of hope, that all who are devoted to freedom, liberty, and justice are resolved to hasten the day of the deliverance of Lithuania and its restoration as a full and equal member of the family of free nations.

CONDEMNATION OF ACTS OF AGGRESSION BY SOVIET RUSSIA AND INVESTIGATION OF SEIZURE OF LITHUANIA AND CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise today to ask unanimous consent to submit a special concurrent resolution, and to salute the unconquerable spirit of freedom of those peoples who have been enslaved by Russian communism.

I have chosen this day because it is the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, achieved after 125 years of czarist Russian thraldom, on February 16, 1918.

Lithuania, like Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, has suffered every torture that a sadistic conqueror could impose. At least 500,000 and possibly a million Lithuanians have been seized and sent to the torture camps in Siberia, to be starved or worked to death. Until we can get at the complete truth, it will be impossible to know the suffering imposed on these nations, but its enormity is horrifying.

When her independence was achieved, Lithuania set up a model government. It had a President and Cabinet, a freely elected Parliament, civil rights, and an independent judiciary. It protected civil rights, and men and women walked without fear of being arrested and shot without trial. It established land reforms and it distributed the land in a broad fashion and it protected individual property. It established farm and market cooperatives, schools, hospitals, and cultural academies. In 21 years, the standard of living of the people was doubled, and the progress was noteworthy in contrast with the lack of progress in Russia.

The Baltic countries made infinitely greater progress on their own resources than 150 million people could achieve under the Communist dictatorship.

On July 12, 1920, Soviet Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania, and in article I pledged that Russia "voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory."

On September 28, 1926, Russia signed a nonaggression pact with Lithuania, and this pact was renewed in 1931 with a 6-month cancellation clause. That clause was never invoked. On October 31, 1939, Prime Minister Molotov stated that "These pacts are inspired by mutual respect for the governmental, social, and economic systems of each of the contracting parties."

The real purpose of Communist Russia, the cynicism and crookedness of its pledges, soon became apparent.

On August 23, 1939, the two totalitarian dictatorships, communism and nazism, had signed their nonaggression agreement, and Poland was quickly divided. The Baltic Republics, under threat of force, were compelled to grant Communist Russia military bases, and in June 1940 when France was falling, communism struck at the Baltic Republics despite all its previous vows.

Cynically disregarding its solemn pledges, Russia moved in and took over these three Baltic countries. It held rigged Communist elections. But in Lithuania and other countries, people showed disapproval the only way they could. They refused to vote. In Lithuania, the Communists succeeded in herding only 16 percent of the people to the polls. On August 3, 1940, Russia proclaimed the incorporation of the Baltic republics into its own system and in so doing violated its repeated pledges.

Immediately, our great Secretary of State Cordell Hull denounced the Russian perfidy and announced that the United States would not recognize these aggressions. And on October 15, 1940, President Roosevelt in a great statement to the Lithuanian American Council said:

It is stated that Lithuania has lost her independence. It is a mistake to say so. Lithuania has not lost her independence: Lithuania's independence has only temporarily been put aside. Time will come and Lithuania will be free again. This will happen much sooner than you may expect.

The American position on this issue has always been the same. I am proud that President Roosevelt, President Truman, and recently President Eisenhower have followed the doctrine of nonrecognition and refused to condone these aggressions. On last Sunday, in Chicago, I was privileged to attend a great gathering of Lithuanian-Americans, who have done a magnificent work of keeping alive the spirit of freedom among their enslaved countrymen. There have been six separate mass purges in Lithuania, and an unknown number in the other nations. We should honor the

brave members of the resistance movements in these countries.

But we should do more than that. Not only the executive branch of Government, but the legislative should go on record as refusing to condone or recognize these aggressions. Lithuania's day of independence is a fittting occasion to move forward with a policy that will help strengthen resistance until freedom is attained—as it surely will be. It is time that the legislative branch and the people of the United States took an attitude on this thing.

In the case of those nations other than the Baltics, where we have granted recognition, the aggression was more subtle and even more devious. Recognition was obtained in those cases by means of solemn pledges to establish democratic governments, guarantee civil rights, permit free elections, protect religious freedom, and maintain the rights of individual property. Once our recognition was extended, the Communists then moved in, seized control by subversion and extinguished all rights in a midnight of tyranny.

These nations will rise again.

Freedoms will certainly be reestablished, religion protected and encouraged, property respected.

I propose in my resolution that the doctrine of nonrecognition be reaffirmed legislatively; that Communist aggressions and subversion be condemned in respect to all these countries; that the United States urge the United Nations to adopt this doctrine of nonrecognition, and to apply it universally; that we withdraw recognition of the governments of Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, all obtained by chicanery and deviousness.

Finally, I proposed that a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee investigate from all possible sources, and publish to the world, the destruction and subversion of human liberty and free institutions in all these and other nations brought under the hell of communism, that the enormity of human physical and mental suffering caused by the Communists may forever impeach them in history and in the minds of men.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 62) submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations as follows:

Whereas the United States doctrine of nonrecognition of the conquest of free peoples offers hope to the enslaved and starving; and

Whereas such doctrine is consonant with the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights; and

Whereas President Roosevelt and President Truman and their Secretaries of State through peace and war, strongly reaffirmed and supported such doctrine; and

Whereas through their leadership, this doctrine of nonrecognition was established as a fundamental principle of American statesmanship, and was made the basis for settlement with the Axis Powers; and

Whereas the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has forcibly and aggressively seized Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and through violations of solemn pledges seized Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, subjugating their governments and ruthlessly deporting millions of their citizens to camps of slavery in European Russia and Siberia; and

Whereas the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has replaced free governments with Russian or puppet officials, backed with Russian arms and the secret police: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress (1) reaffirms the doctrine of nonrecognition of the conquest of free peoples as a principle of international law, and reaffirms the refusal of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman to recognize conquests; (2) condemns the violations of solemn international agreements and the acts of aggression perpetrated by Soviet Russia upon the peoples of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia; and (3) requests the President to direct the United States representative to the United Nations to lay these violations of solemn pledges and acts of aggression before the United Nations, and to urge universal application by the United Nations of the doctrine of nonrecognition of the conquest by Russia of such peoples, and to withdraw recognition obtained by means of pledges later dishonored, until such agreements are kept to the satisfaction of the President; and (4) that the Committee on Foreign Relations, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, conduct an investigation of the illegal seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and the destruction of human liberties and free institutions in all such areas controlled directly or indirectly by world communism, including the treatment of citizens within those areas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for his very fine statement and for the recommendation he has made with reference to the severance of diplomatic relations with Communist-dominated countries, as a testimonial of our permanent antagonism and resistance to Communist tyranny.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN TODAY

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the text of a radio broadcast by Mr. Eric Sevareid on his CBS news broadcast for February 12, 1954. It reads as follows:

Many things about Abraham Lincoln can be argued; but no one can argue with the proposition that Lincoln never confused means with ends, technique with substance; he would never have understood a triumph of matter over mind.

With a slightly guilty bow in the direction of Mr. Goodman Ace, who employs the cold print of the Saturday Review to police the hot world of radio and television, I have been enjoying a gloomy private image of President Lincoln transposed upon the scene of contemporary Washington. On the occasion of the Gettysburg address.

There's a planning conference going on in the office of the President's news secretary. The ghostwriters are going over a mass of papers—suggestions from Cabinet officers as to what the President ought to say about the farmers, working people, taxes, and the next recruiting quotas. The chief ghostwriter is beating his brains out figuring how to cover the women's angle in the speech.

A secretary comes in and says, "The boss says he's just going to make a few general remarks, 2 or 3 minutes." There's consternation in the room. The draft suggestions are thrown in the wastebasket. The news secretary puts in a pool call to the networks and says, "Sorry boys, the 13½-minutes package is out." Consternation among the networks. Their teletypes chatter out emergency instructions to the radio crews to patch out with interviews of any Senators who will be present; TV camera crews are told to fade in shots of cemetery crosses and bereaved families of veterans.

At the railroad station the news secretary is half apologetic, half angry with the press party. "The boss hasn't written it yet. That's why there's no advances. Look, I know the early p. m.'s will miss it, but he's stubborn, and he's President." The Tribune man puts in a hot phone call to his home office suggesting they run a page 1 editorial on the lousy White House public relations.

In the club car, the Hollywood actor-director imported as TV counsel is talking to the national committee FR man. "I keep telling him to give them the grin, flash the old teeth. That sad look of his—the viewers will get the idea he's losing the war. He keeps saying people will just have to take him the way he is. But he makes with the jokes pretty good. If he'll get in a buffola to close with, maybe he can still send 'em home happy."

The chief ghost writer enters, collapses into a chair and says, "I've just seen his opening paragraph. Know how he starts? 'Fourscore and seven years ago.' Brother! After all I've told him about simplifying; he means 87 years ago why doesn't he say so? After all, his vote strength is with the common people, not the eggheads."

At the platform on Cemetery Hill, the TV pool director steps up to Mr. Lincoln, and, as conjured by Mr. Goodman Ace, the conversation goes like this?

"Mr. President, you'll open up on camera 2, that's this one * * * when the red light comes on, you start your speech. Then we'll cut to a profile. You'll stand about here. Oh, I'll take that shawl, Mr. President."

"Well, there's a chill in the air and I * * *"

"But you're not going to do the show in that shawl, are you?"

"Yes, I am."

"Well, I wish we'd have known—we could have had costume send one over. I'm afraid the lights are going to pick up all that fuzz around it. By the way, I'll get the make-up girl. We ought to trim that beard a little. It's kinda straggly and it might—"

"Oh, this is quite all right."

"But, Mr. President, this is television. At least we can touch up that right cheek. That mole is going to look like—"

"No, no, young man. It will be all right."

"But, Mr. President, you know you're following Mr. Everett. He's going to look quite distinguished with that white hair—oh, before I forget, your speech."

"My speech?"

"I'll have the boys run it off for the teleprompter * * *"

"No, I'll manage with this."

"With that? You're not going to read it off that envelope, are you?"

"Well, I had planned—"

"Okay, Mr. President, but Mr. Everett will steal the show. They'll come away talking about him. They'll little note nor long remember anybody else."

STORAGE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED GRAIN

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on numerous occasions early in 1952 I criticized certain storage agreements between the CCC and certain warehousemen in particular on March 13, 1952, I outlined and criticized a storage agreement which had been made between the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Baton Rouge Warehouse Co., of Louisiana. An account of my

remarks appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

For release that same day the then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles Brannan, speaking in Dallas, Tex., issued a statement in rebuttal. I quote a paragraph from the Secretary's statement:

Senator WILLIAMS is the No. 1 enemy of United States farmers, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan charged in a press conference here.

The quotation I have read is from an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 13, 1952. Continuing his statement the Secretary defended his storage transactions with emphasis upon the Camp Crowder deal which had been exposed a few days before.

On March 7, 1951, I referred further to the same case, and this time made the specific charge that Mr. Jack Cowart, a top Department of Agriculture official involved in the transaction, had accepted a bribe of $22,300.

On May 9, 1952, Mr. Jack Cowart testified before the Committee on Agriculture, where he emphatically denied that he had accepted any payments from the Baton Rouge Warehouse Co.

In yesterday's newspapers there appeared articles which set forth that this same Jack Cowart, the former high-ranking official of the Department of Agriculture, was found guilty of having lied before the Department's investigators in earlier testimonies and again before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in 1952.

As I read the article stating how Mr. Cowart had been convicted as a liar, I could not help wondering what that makes Mr. Brannan.

I ask unanimous consent that the item appearing on the United Press news ticker of May 9, 1952, be printed in the RECORD, followed by the article appearing in today's Washington Post entitled "Cowart Convicted of Lying to Government About Stock."

There being no objection, the item and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the United Press news ticker]

GRAIN STORAGE

Senate investigators were told today that Alex Campbell, former Assistant Attorney General, handled $2,800 in payment to Jack Cowart, former Agriculture Department official who collected a total of $22,300 from a warehouse he helped.

Accountant Carmine S. Bellino of the Senate Agriculture Committee staff said Campbell endorsed the checks totaling $2,800 and deposited them to Cowart's bank account at Dallas, Tex. He said Cowart, convicted recently of taking a bribe in another case, collected the other $17,500 from a Baton Rouge, La., warehouse through a check made to his mother-in-law, but also deposited to his account.

Campbell, who formerly headed the Justice Department criminal division, is now practicing law in Fort Wayne, Ind. He ran unsuccessfuly against Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, in 1950 as the Democratic nominee. The transactions were in 1951.

The disclosures came as the committee dug into Cowart's role in helping the Baton Rouge Warehouse Co., Inc., get profitable Government storage contracts.

Chairman ELLENDER denounced Cowart, who was not present, as "just a common, ordinary crook."

Cowart, who had been in the Agriculture Department since 1942, was removed last year. He was assistant to the production and marketing administrator at the time he showed an "unusual interest" in helping the Baton Rouge warehouse get storage contracts.

Bellino said Campbell and Cowart were "good friends."

Chief Counsel Paul Cotter said Campbell had been given a chance to make a statement and that Campbell felt that he "had been used."

"The question is whether he was used knowingly and willingly," Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, said.

ELLENDER said the entire record, including Bellino's research on Cowart's bank accounts, would be turned over to the Justice Department.

Bellino said Cowart's bank records also showed transactions with Vaughan E. Livingston, Campbell's law partner, and checks from J. Kenneth Edlin of Chicago. Bellino identified Edlin as an "ex-convict" who was mixed up in the Frank Nathan-Abraham Teitelbaum tax case investigated last year by a House committee.

The accountant said the $22,300 Cowart got from the warehouse was purportedly for sale of stock held in the name of Cowart's mother-in-law, Mrs. Z. Van Winkle. But neither Cowart nor Mrs. Van Winkle had ever paid anything for the stock, Bellino said.

Bellino said Cowart decided to handle the $2,800 through Campbell because he "needed legal protection."

Of the $22,300 total Cowart received, only $20,300 showed up in his bank account at the Lakewood State Bank in Dallas, the accountant said.

He produced photostated copies of the checks, which showed that Campbell endorsed some of them as "agent" and some as "retainer fees."

There was no evidence produced that Campbell kept any of the money.

Bellino said the checks were made out by the Baton Rouge warehouse to Campbell, who endorsed them for deposit to Cowart's account.

There were a total of six between February 28, 1951, and July 30, 1951. One was for $800, marked as 2 months "retainer fee." The other five were for $400 each.

Campbell left the Justice Department in 1950 to run for the Senate.

Bellino said Cowart's main bank account showed deposits of more than $54,000 for the period of 1949 through 1951. Of this, $15,861 was Government checks, he said. There was a total of $34,345 in various other checks.

He said the account records showed that there appeared to be some financial transaction between Cowart and Von E. Livingston, Campbell's law partner, who represented Kennett Murray Co., a livestock firm.

Bellino said checks also indicated financial transactions between Cowart and Robert J. Colina, an official of the livestock firm.

The accountant said Edlin, the Chicago ex-convict, vigorously denied any financial transactions with Cowart.

Bellino said Cowart normally carried large amounts of cash on his person and often cashed personal checks for friends. He said that might explain some of the many checks in the Dallas bank account.

The accountant said Cowart also maintained two other smaller bank accounts, one in another Dallas bank and one in a Sanger, Tex., bank. But both were small, he said. Cowart's wife also maintained an account here, he said.

The checks for Cowart were drawn by officials of the Baton Rouge warehouse firm on a Center, Tex., bank. All four of the partners were from Center.

Of the $22,300 paid Cowart indirectly, all but $2,000 showed up in his bank account.

The committee was told that Cowart showed such an active interest in the Baton Rouge warehouse that he demanded to see its financial statements once a month from the United States Warehousing Administration.

H. Stanford Yohe, the Administrator, said Cowart told him that Ralph Trigg, then Production and Marketing Administrator, was interested in the case and that he did not question Cowart, because the latter worked directly out of Mr. Trigg's office.

But later, Yohe said, he learned that Trigg had denied any interest in the case at all.

Cotter read from a transcribed long-distance telephone conversation in which Martin J. Hudtloff, then Director of the Warehouse Branch, told a subordinate: "You remember this (Baton Rouge) is hot politically. We must bend to meet the situation."

Asked what he meant, the red-faced Hudtloff told the committee that "A lot of people had their fingers in this."

Cotter asked if Cowart had a lot of political pressure behind him.

"I think that's so," the warehouse official said.

Hudtloff told how he once was ordered by Elmer F. Kruse, a superior in the Production and Marketing Administration, to personally attend a meeting at New Orleans about getting storage contracts for the Baton Rouge warehouse. That was October 4, 1949. The warehouse was approved the following month.

Hudtloff said he was surprised to find Cowart also at the meeting with the four men who were forming the Baton Rouge company.

[From the Washington Post of February 16, 1954]

COWART CONVICTED OF LYING TO GOVERNMENT ABOUT STOCK

(By Morrey Dunie)

Jack Cowart, former high-ranking Agriculture Department official, was found guilty in District court yesterday of making a false statement to the Government.

A jury of four men and eight women deliberated an hour and 40 minutes before returning the verdict.

Cowart, 48, of Dallas, Tex., was accused of lying to an Agriculture Department investigator in October 1950 when he denied owning any interest in the Baton Rouge (La.) Warehouse Co., Inc.

He was permitted to remain free under $1,000 bond pending a probation report. He faces a maximum sentence of 5 years' imprisonment and a $10,000 fine.

At the time of the offense, Cowart was Assistant Production and Marketing Administrator. When he testified during the trial before the jury and Judge James W. Morris, Cowart denied he "knowingly" made a false statement to the investigator.

The Government charged Cowart received 163 shares in the warehouse firm, although the stock was placed in the name of his mother-in-law, Mrs. Zoa Van Winkle, because Cowart was still with the Government.

Joseph A. Lowther, of the Justice Department, prosecuted Cowart, who was defended by Attorneys Emory W. Reisinger II, Lester May, and Howard Dailey.

Last October Cowart was acquitted of a charge in Alexandria (Va.) district court of receiving compensation from the same warehouse company while he was a Federal employee. Prior to the trial, Cowart had served 18 months in prison for receiving compensation from a prefabricated housing firm doing business with the Government.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the un-

finished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 1.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for himself and for the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], to insert a new section in the committee amendment on page 3, after line 15.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will first state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, between lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the pending amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 1 is not by itself of sufficient importance to warrant amending the Constitution of the United States. However, it does safeguard the exercise of the treatymaking power. It should be a part of any constitutional amendment designed to prevent abuse of the treatymaking power.

I would, of course, be opposed to requiring that all executive agreements likewise be approved by a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate. If such a provision were ever written into the Constitution, the Senate of the United States would be forced to disband. It would not have the time to carry out that responsibility and it would certainly have no time to discharge its other responsibilities.

The pending amendment will produce two highly beneficial results not heretofore mentioned in this debate. First, foreign governments and their citizens cannot reasonably be expected to appreciate fully the details of Senate procedure. As a result, when the Senate approves a noncontroversial treaty by the voice vote of only two or three Senators, other parties to the treaty and their citizens may well conclude that the United States Senate has no interest in the treaty. The pending amendment will prevent that unfortunate impression.

In the second place, the requirement for a yea-and-nay vote on treaties reenforces the doctrine that the treaty method should be used for the conclusion of the most important types of international agreements. In the past, the State Department has taken the position that treaties and executive agreements are wholly interchangeable instruments of national policy. As a result, the Senate has been asked to approve, as treaties, relatively unimportant agreements whereas international agreements of far greater importance have been submitted to both Houses of Congress or have been concluded by the President alone. When the pending amendment becomes a part of the Constitution, it will be much more difficult to contend that treaties and executive agreements properly can be employed interchangeably. The very fact that a record vote is required on treaties, but not on executive agreements, will lend much weight to the view that the treaty method is the only proper method for assuming on behalf of the United States important and long-term commitments.

The pending amendment will tend to make a President and his Secretary of State respect the traditional distinction between treaties and executive agreements. This traditional distinction was best defined in a Law Review article written in 1939 by former Assistant Secretary of State Francis B. Sayre, in which he said:

International agreements involving political issues or changes of national policy and those involving international arrangements of a permanent character usually take the form of treaties. But international agreements embodying adjustments of detail carrying out well-established national policies and traditions and those involving arrangements of a more or less temporary nature usually take the form of executive agreements (see Sayre, The Constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Act, 39 Col. L. Rev. 751, 755).

Mr. President, I think the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] would add much to the proposed constitutional amendment which is now pending and should be incorporated as a part of that amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to comment on an amendment which the Senate may reach today. I refer to the one numbered "2-3-54-C," which reads as follows:

On page 3, strike out all in lines 7 to 9, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. Clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution.'"

This amendment disturbs me very much, Mr. President, because it is a part of the record made on the proposed constitutional amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] which I respectfully state is in a very confused condition.

I should like to refer to this so-called perfecting amendment submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. It would amend article VI of the Constitution whereby all treaties made subsequent to 1789 must not only be under the authority of the United States, but also "in pursuance of" the Constitution. It is the retroactive feature which, in part, bothers me.

COMMITTEE DID NOT CONSIDER SUCH A PROPOSAL

During the long history of the Bricker amendment no proposal has been before any committee of the Senate which would change article VI of the Constitution.

Indeed, this particular proposed amendment never saw the light of day until a very short time ago. It was not until recently that any of its sponsors tried to explain to the Senate what its rather involved language was supposed to accomplish. Its sponsors have hinted that the White House finds no objection to this amendment, although it should be noted that the White House certainly has never endorsed it. At least, I know of no such endorsement by the White House. I am very pleased to stand on the floor of the Senate today and completely support the attitude of the White House toward the Bricker amendment as a whole.

FERGUSON-KNOWLAND PROPOSED AMENDMENT IS AMBIGUOUS

The amendment to which I am referring has all the clarity of the fine print in a footnote to a lease, and it makes me just as apprehensive as most of the fine print made me apprehensive when I represented the best interests of a client and always suggested that he study the fine print at the bottom of the lease offered by the counsel for the landlord.

It is my personal belief that no amendment is necessary and that the "compromise" amendments, which have been drafted on the backs of envelopes, should be voted down on the floor of the Senate.

After listening to the explanations of the Ferguson-Knowland amendment given by one of its sponsors yesterday, I have very grave misgivings concerning it.

As a preliminary matter the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was unable to answer the question of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] concerning the plausibility of using the words "in pursuance of." I believe that his unanswered question is worth repeating here, in the hope of a satisfactory explanation:

The phrase, "in pursuance of this Constitution," as applied to treaties, in the language of the substitute amendment, could very well be interpreted as meaning treaties which are made to carry out or put into effect the Constitution of the United States.

Since no treaties have been or will be made for that purpose—the Congress of the United States by the enactment of statutes and the courts of the land by their decisions being the agencies which implement provisions of the Constitution—this amendment, as now worded, becomes utterly meaningless when the language is strictly interpreted in the light of its proper meaning. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 4, 1954, p. 1334.)

Second, I am completely unable to comprehend why it would be at all necessary to amend article VI of the Constitution if the other amendment proposed by the Senator from California [Mr.

KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] should be adopted. That amendment would provide:

A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

With that amendment included, I do not know why there should be any discussion about amending article VI of the Constitution.

Even if the language of the proposed change to article VI is meaningful, the change seems to me to be entirely unnecessary. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] gave a rather metaphysical statement or explanation of a conflict which would exist between an unamended article VI and his other amendment about "treaties conflicting with the Constitution." But I fail to see where the conflict is. I am unable to see how a provision of a treaty which is of no "force or effect" could possibly be "supreme law of the land."

So that there will be no misunderstanding, let me state my position in this way:

Under the new section 2 as proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], a provision of a treaty which conflicts with the Constitution would be of no force or effect. Yet the Senator from California seems to be saying that it would still be the supreme law of the land under article VI of the Constitution unless we change that article.

I believe a further explanation by the authors of the amendment needs to be made, at least for the purpose of the legislative record and history of the amendment, because I respectfully submit that to date the debate on it has left the matter in a very confused state. I further submit that because of the confused debate on the amendment up to this hour, it is one of the problems that ought to go back to the Committee on the Judiciary, under a motion to recommit which I shall later make.

FERGUSON-KNOWLAND AMENDMENT POSSIBLE NEW FORM OF "WHICH" CLAUSE

I believe the reasons for wanting an amendment to article VI were revealed during the rather lengthy explanations of the proposed change made by the Senator from Michigan. In explaining its purposes, he made the following statement:

The amendment will thus prevent the delegation of executive, legislative, or judicial power to an international organization. Mr. President, I wish to repeat that this amendment will prevent the delegation of executive, legislative, or judicial power to an international organization, for under the Constitution these powers are vested exclusively in the President, the Congress, and the Federal courts.

* * * * *

Mr. President, I think we should state clearly that that is the purpose of the amendment, and that it would prevent these things, which many persons feel can now be done. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 4, 1954, p. 1310.)

When I heard this statement by the Senator from Michigan, it stirred up some memories. It turns out to be, as I have studied the record, almost the exact language of section 2 of the original Bricker proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 130 of the 82d Congress, which reads as follows:

No treaty or executive agreement shall vest in any international organization or any foreign power any of the legislative, executive, or judicial powers vested by this Constitution in the Congress, the President, and in the courts of the United States, respectively.

I think the record of this historic debate since the 82d Congress—and the debate has been going on since the 82d Congress—shows that this provision in the old Senate Joint Resolution 130 was violently opposed both by the administration and by a great number of witnesses who appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary in 1950. When the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] reintroduced his proposal as Senate Joint Resolution 1 in the 83d Congress, he changed the language somewhat, making it not quite so restrictive. Even in this milder form, it was resisted by Secretary Dulles and many other witnesses in the hearings in 1953, as the record before us shows. Even the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary, who supported the "which" clause, dropped section 2 of the original proposal of the Senator from Ohio.

I believe it has become clear during the various hearings that old section 2, which apparently has been resurrected, would inhibit United States participation in all sorts of very useful international endeavors. International organizations, such as, for example, the International Court of Justice, certainly exercise judicial functions.

I am speaking on this point today as the author of the Morse resolution of 1945 on the World Court. I have not changed my views at all since 1945, when I introduced the Morse resolution, which passed the United States Senate, establishing the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court in any matter involving a conflict between our Government and a foreign government, in respect to the settlement of which matter the foreign government is willing to submit it to the World Court for adjudication, save and except for the reservation which was attached to the resolution, namely, that it shall not apply to domestic issues.

Yet I am worried about the language in the amendment which will be before the Senate subsequently and to which I am addressing my remarks today, because the World Court exercises judicial functions. Does our participation in the International Court constitute a delegation of judicial power to an international organization? If it does then I do not see how we can escape the interpretation of the Senator from Michigan as to the meaning and intent of this amendment. At least, I think it lays the foundation for much confusion, conflict, uncertainty, and ambiguity, when and if the matter subsequently should come before the courts.

Under the Ferguson interpretation, would it be possible to extend the jurisdiction of the Court at some future date to cover the adjudication of claims of, or demands against, our citizens? On this question the State Department made the following statement in the hearings in 1953, page 834:

Having in mind the doctrine of sovereign immunity, it may well prove to be highly advantageous that we be able to afford our citizens access to an international tribunal for the adjudication of their claims against foreign governments. This in turn would require that they submit such claims, which might be in the nature of debts locally contracted, to the Court's jurisdiction and the reciprocal liability that might result from an adverse decision.

If for no other reason—and there are many other reasons—than the possible effect of this amendment on future World Court procedures and adjudications once the amendment becomes if it does, the law of the land, I argue today that the amendment ought to be sent to the Committee on the Judiciary for further consideration and clarification.

FURTHER COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION REQUIRED

I do not think such consideration and clarification should be attempted on the floor of the Senate by myself or any other Senator offering some penciled notes by way of a clarifying amendment which might clearly take the World Court out of the purview of the amendment, if it is not intended to have it within the purview of the amendment. I respectfully submit that the language used by the Senator from Michigan makes it quite probable that the World Court would come within the purview of the amendment.

If that is its purpose, I think it would be a great mistake. The situation I have outlined illustrates, as clearly as I can illustrate, the point I have been making on the floor of the Senate for several days past, that so many constitutional problems are, in my judgment, going to arise in respect to the amendments as they have been drafted in the course of the debate in the Senate that, in order to play safe, we ought, regardless of the number of weeks or months it may take, recommit the whole matter to the Committee on the Judiciary for further hearings and consideration by the top constitutional experts of the United States. Then let the committee submit a report, based upon its findings after it shall have analyzed the record made in such hearings.

I think we ought to play safe when it comes to a matter of amending the Constitution of the United States. I do not believe the time which will be required for further hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary can justify anyone taking the position today that the Senate ought to take action now.

Let me make one other point. I take it for granted that if the joint resolution shall be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, the committee will do its job. Under a motion to recommit, the job of the Committee on the Judiciary becomes a clear one to proceed to conduct early hearings on the amendments drafted on the floor of the Senate, such as the amendment to which I am directing my attention today. The committee then should submit to the Senate at the earliest date possible, commen-

surate with full and fair hearings, a report on the amendments.

Someone has asked "Would you be willing publicly to guess how long that would take?"

Yes, I am willing to guess. I think it should take not more than 6 weeks. If the Committee on the Judiciary does its job, it should take not more than 6 weeks to hold the hearings and to submit the report.

Mr. President, in the interest of playing safe, we had better be willing to take what I think would be a maximum period of 6 weeks for further hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary.

It is not a case of my not wanting to vote on the matter. I serve notice now, as I have so many times heretofore, that when called upon to vote, I shall vote against the Bricker amendment and all amendments to it, because I do not think any of them is necessary. Nevertheless, the amendments have been offered, and I think a scholarly job ought to be done by the Committee on the Judiciary, after calling before it the experts best qualified to testify on the subject, in the calmness of the reasoned discourse which can prevail in carefully conducted hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. President, we all know that with the heat of debate and the confusion which so frequently prevails here, the floor of the Senate does not happen to be a good place in which to be drafting and considering amendments, without the benefit and the advice of a report from the Committee on the Judiciary.

There are other possible effects of the proposed amendment upon international operations which disturb me. For example, what about the Baruch plan for the control of atomic energy? Under the Ferguson interpretation, I wonder if the Baruch plan may find itself in conflict with the amendment if it shall be adopted? I merely ask these questions, Mr. President; I do not purport to know the answers. I raise the questions to illustrate what I think the Committee on the Judiciary ought to consider.

Would it not be necessary for us to delegate certain executive powers to an effective international law organization? Does not the present international control of radio frequencies involve certain quasi-legislative functions on the part of an international organization? Would such functions be affected by this amendment? Would such functions be outlawed under the interpretation of the Senator from Michigan in his proposed amendment to article VI of the Constitution?

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not know; and I respectfully say I doubt if any of my colleagues know, either. I do not see how one can know, on the basis of the record which has been made to date on the question. Again I say this illustrates the importance of having the entire matter recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for hearings, so that experts more qualified than we are can testify as to whether or not the adoption of the amendment would have any effect on the operation of, for example, such an international radio commission.

The Senator from Michigan has said that the old section 2 of the Bricker amendment should now be read back into his new amendment to article VI. I believe this shows the true purpose of the proposed amendment.

My beliefs have been strengthened by certain statements made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. I speak of the Senator from Ohio with the greatest respect. However, the Senator from Ohio and I disagree on the desirability of the legislative program which he is sponsoring in connection with his proposed constitutional amendment.

Within the past 2 weeks, I listened to the Senator from Ohio on the Meet the Press program. He was asked whether or not he originally opposed the "which" clause. I understood him to answer in the affirmative, but I understood him also to say that many of the problems covered by the "which" clause had been handled in his original draft by section 2, which prohibited vesting any legislative, executive, or judicial powers in any international organization.

In accepting the Knowland-Ferguson amendments, the Senator from Ohio made the following statement on the floor of the Senate, as it appears on page 1333 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 4, 1954:

> I listened with great interest today to the speech made by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on the amendments endorsed by the administration. Specifically, I agree with him that those amendments, if adopted, will produce the following results:
>
> First. Prevent any delegation of the executive, legislative, or judicial power of the United States to the United Nations or to any other international organization.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that that is in line with the purpose and the intent of the provision of the first resolution the Senator from Ohio introduced in the 82d Congress; and, in my opinion, it has a good many—not all, but a good many—of the facets of meaning of the "which" clause, which, in my judgment, is revived by the language, in part, of the amendment under discussion.

I am fearful—and I speak now on this point as a lawyer—that the statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will constitute practically the entire legislative history, if the amendment is adopted, unless further hearings are held. It is quite important to write the legislative history plainly, and I think further hearings would help do that. Further hearings would also settle very clearly whether or not any of the attributes of the "which" clause are to be restored to the resolution by the adoption of the amendment designated as 2-3-54—C.

THE FERGUSON-KNOWLAND AMENDMENT WOULD BE RETROACTIVE

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was asked by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] whether the Senator from Michigan interpreted his amendment to article VI to be retroactive to 1789. The debate will be found at page 1334 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Senator from Michigan in reply said, yes, it would be retroactive.

The amendment would apply to such questions as the German debt settlement treaty, which was overwhelmingly approved at the last session of Congress. I think it unfortunate that it was approved; nevertheless, it was done. The treaty provided for the international arbitration of claims of American holders of German bonds. Is the arbitration court an international organization to which judicial powers of the United States have been delegated? Would the treaty become invalid under the retroactive interpretation given by the sponsor of the amendment to Article VI? If the sponsor means it would be retroactive, I respectfully submit that what I have just stated would be its effect.

As the record shows, I have no love for the German debt treaty; but I submit that casting doubt upon the treaties of 165 years is a high price to pay for the possible invalidation of the German debt treaty.

In a retroactive examination of all treaties concluded by the United States since 1790, such treaties as the United Nations Charter would have to be reviewed. Can we not see shades of the great San Francisco Charter debate of 1945 once again on the floor of the Senate, but with striking changes in emphasis because of some very interesting internal changes in the political complexion of the United States?

Who is to say that we shall not have to review the United Nations Charter? The Senator from Michigan is correct when, in answer to the question of the Senator from Minnesota, he stated that the effect of the amendment would be to make all treaties retroactive. The United Nations Charter is one of them. There are persons in this country who not only think we ought to review it, but that we ought to withdraw from it. The suggestion the Senate is considering may be the back door through which to accomplish their objective.

Woe be unto my country if, because of a period of political excitement—which is a very polite term for me to use in describing the present political climate in the United States—we find ourselves adopting an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which may result at least in a big "hassle" over whether or not we should withdraw from the United Nations, and provide a back-door means through which those desiring to do so may seek to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. President, I do not like to think of what might happen to my country in the decades immediately ahead if that should happen. If we have not learned by now that we cannot live by ourselves alone, if we have not learned by now that history, and the Great Mover of history, in my judgment, have placed a great responsibility on our country to lead the world, in the centuries immediately ahead, toward the goal of perpetual peace and real freedom for men and women everywhere, and if we do not grasp that responsibility and obligation now, I think our descendants will live to rue the day of our failings and shortcomings.

So, Mr. President, if the amendment is to be retroactive in effect—and one of the authors of the amendment has so stated on the floor of the Senate—then in my judgment the amendment may

raise the entire question of the constitutionality of our entering into the United Nations Treaty or Charter. Would not arguments be made that our acceptance of the United Nations Charter was unconstitutional because certain executive or judicial powers, or quasi-executive or quasi-judicial powers, including the World Court Charter, which is a part of the United Nations Charter, had been delegated to the United Nations?

All of this seems to me to be both needless and positively harmful. It illustrates the dangers involved in the acceptance of amendments which have been composed in corridors and floor huddles, and never have been scrutinized by the appropriate committees of the Congress, or subjected to full public debate following adequate committee reports.

The sponsor of the amendment, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], has been unable to give a successful explanation of the meaning of the words "in pursuance of" in connection with treaties, as opposed to laws. If we adopt this amendment, no one will know how much of the "which" clause has been revived until the Supreme Court passes on the question at an indefinite time in the future.

Furthermore, Mr. President, on the basis of what record would the Supreme Court pass on that question? It would do so on the basis of the very confused record which has been made in the course of debate on the floor of the Senate, without the advantage of having a report by the Judiciary Committee, following a hearing held by it, on the meaning of the Ferguson-Knowland amendment.

Under the circumstances not only is it not safe for us to pass on to the American people a recommendation for a constitutional amendment—and that is what we really are doing—but it simply is not good statesmanship for us to do so. We in the Senate have some responsibilities of statesmanship; and I respectfully submit that one of them is that we use the procedures of the Senate for the presentation of a record to the full Senate which we, in turn, can use as the basis on which to reach our judgments. Yet we do not have a judiciary Committee record on this matter.

I say we are not acting in a statesmanlike manner if we vote for the Ferguson-Knowland amendment containing the "in pursuance of" clause, when not even the authors of the amendment have yet made a clear statement in the course of the debate—and I speak of them most respectfully—as to what effect the "in pursuance of" clause would have.

Mr. President, I should like to urge in the strongest possible manner that we call a halt to the whole project of amending the Constitution on the floor of the Senate. It should be clear by now to most Senators that no emergency exists, and that the proposed "compromise amendments," hastily drafted and improperly considered, probably will create real dangers and fears to replace the hypothetical dangers and fears which exist in the minds of a few persons today.

Mr. President, I close by saying that the pending proposal is to amend the Constitution of the United States. Our basic charter contains the majestic phrases of freedom. The Ferguson-Knowland amendment would graft upon that charter a mumble of ambiguity.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATUS OF GOVERNMENT WORKERS IN MEAT INDUSTRY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on December 10 last, I had an opportunity to personally visit the plant of Hormel & Co. in Austin, Minn. During that time I had an opportunity to visit with some of the members and officers of the American Federation of Government Employees, local 368. These people are employees of the Meat Inspection Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry in the United States Department of Agriculture. They are loyal, effective, and hard-working employees of the United States Government.

During my visit I had an opportunity to observe the work of these Government employees. Theirs is a difficult task which performs a vital public service in protecting the high standards of public health which the American people have come to expect. I regret to say, however, Mr. President, that the United States Government as the employer is not meeting its responsibility fully to these employees.

At my request the membership of local No. 368 of the American Federation of Government Employees held a series of meetings to formulate their evaluation of our Government policy on wages and working conditions as it affects the employees of the Meat Inspection Division. Within the last few days I received a letter, dated February 6, from Mr. L. B. Dunfee, president of the Austin local of the AFGE, setting forth the results of their study. The letter is an impressive one and presents an impressive case demonstrating the need for increased salaries, more equitable overtime pay, the adjustment of status for nonveterinary inspectors, and an improved retirement system.

The importance and effectiveness of the letter leads me to bring it to the attention of the Congress. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the letter, with the accompanying exhibit, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I am also asking the Department of Agriculture for a report on this letter.

There being no objection, the letter and exhibit were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES,
MID LODGE No. 368,
Austin, Minn., February 6, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I regret that my work assignment prevented me from being present during your visit at our Government office the afternoon of December 10, 1953, in response to an invitation extended to you by Mr. P. L. Lattin, past president, Mr. W. P. La Porte, secretary, and Mr. J. V. Rollins, member of Local No. 368 American Federation of Government Employees. I am certain, however, that they presented to you a lucid, if brief résumé of a few of the more important problems confronting Meat Inspection Division employees.

As per your request for more detailed information at the time of your visit, and your letter of January 15 to Dr. H. J. Schick, I herewith submit for your edification pertinent data in support of our contentions.

We maintain that meat inspection employees pay is not compatible with that paid by private industry for work requiring even less responsibility, training, and skill. Common labor in the meat packing industry receives pay of $62.25 per week, based on $1.50 per hour for a 40-hour week plus fringe benefits of $2.25 per week. Here at this packing plant, the incentive system which increases the hourly work output, also increases the weekly common labor pay check to as much as $125 per week. The meat inspector must increase his speed to keep up with this high output operating schedule, but receives no such incentive pay. In fact this packing company runs some chain-driven operations at speeds in excess of those acknowledged by the Government Personnel Division to be maximum per man hour for safe, competent inspection.

A meat inspector, grade GS–4, receives base pay of $61.06 per week. If he is required to work 10 hours of overtime, his weekly pay will be increased about $20, however, most meat packers do not work overtime hours therefore, most meat inspectors receive only the basic rate. For more detailed explanation, see exhibit A enclosed.

Laws of the Congress of the United States demand that the meat packing industry, along with other industries, pay their employees at least one and one-half times their hourly rate for overtime work. Another injustice being perpetrated upon the meat inspector is failure by this same Congress to insist upon payment of true time and one-half to the meat inspector for overtime work performed. The intent of overtime pay at one and one-half times base pay is to penalize the employer; however, in the case of the meat inspector, he is the one being penalized. It is grossly unjust to pay the inspector for overtime work at rates which are actually less than his regular base rate. The meat packer requests the overtime inspection and pays the Secretary of Agriculture for it at premium rates, so why can't the meat inspector receive true time and one-half pay for this required overtime work?

To illustrate: A graduate veterinarian inspector, grade GS–9, earns base pay of $2.43 per hour for the first 8 hours per day. True time and one-half is $3.64. The overtime rate he receives is $1.77. Loss to the inspector is $1.87 per hour. Unfair isn't it?

Perhaps I should emphasize here that overtime work performed by Meat Inspection Division employees is paid for by the meat packer requesting such overtime and not by Government funds, therefore correction of

this injustice will not result in any added cost to the Government.

The simple solution to this injustice would be congressional action to raise the $2,980 ceiling used in computing overtime rates. (As continued in Classification Act of 1949.) This ceiling should be raised to $5,810, with overtime rates not less than the overtime rate computed on $5,810, for salaries over $5,810 per annum. This is the purpose of a Senate bill introduced by Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas.

The reason why the meat inspector is not receiving true time and one-half pay is explained in detail in exhibit B, enclosed. Exhibit B contains an excerpt taken from the field manual of United States Department of Agriculture Administrative Regulations.

Now a consideration of the grading of nonveterinary meat inspectors in comparison with veterinary inspectors. Meat inspection regulations provide for both veterinary and nonveterinary inspectors and specify type of work to be performed by each. All inspection performed in connection with the slaughter of animals is to be performed by veterinary inspectors assisted by nonveterinary inspectors. Processing department inspection is performed by duly qualified nonveterinary inspectors of several years experience who have advanced or been promoted from slaughtering assignments.

All ante mortem inspection (according to the regulations) is performed by veterinary inspectors; in fact many foreign governments have import laws requiring that all imports of meat from the United States be accompanied by a certificate, signed by the inspector-in-charge where the animal was slaughtered, attesting that such animal received ante mortem inspection by a veterinary inspector. The facts are that, at this official establishment there has never been a veterinarian assigned to ante mortem inspection during the past 8 years. The Bureau of Animal Industry simply does not have sufficient veterinarians to assign them to this work, so it is ably performed by the nonveterinary inspector.

All post mortem inspection is conducted by veterinary inspectors, assisted by nonveterinary inspectors. All viscera inspection is to be conducted by veterinarians; however, due to the shortage of veterinarians, the Chief of Meat Inspection has directed that meat inspectors may assist veterinary inspectors on viscera inspection, always under immediate supervision of a veterinary inspector. At this official establishment, we have 4 veterinary inspectors, whereas in 1940, a normal employment year, we had 11. It is difficult to recruit well-qualified veterinarians at the present entrance salary for Bureau of Animal Industry veterinary inspector, which is GS-7—$4,205 per annum.

I mentioned above that the meat inspectors must now assist veterinary inspectors conduct viscera inspection. Here at this establishment we have only 4 veterinarians, 2 who do only final dispositional inspection, and 2 who do viscera inspection assisted by the meat inspector. This company, as do the majority of meatpackers, has 2 killing floors which operate simultaneously; and on the hog-killing floor 2 viscera inspection tables which operate at the same time. One hog-killing viscera table requires 3 inspectors; the other requires 2 inspectors; the cattle-killing viscera table requires 2 inspectors; final inspection on the two killing floors requires 2 more, and ante mortem inspection another, 1 more for relief work totals 11. When the 2 veterinary inspectors are available, 1 works on the cattle viscera table and the other on one of the hog viscera tables, leaving the other hog viscera table to be manned exclusively by the ordinary meat inspectors. During the past summer these two veterinary inspectors were absent from this station doing relief work at other stations much of the time; therefore, the nonveterinary inspectors performed all of the viscera inspection and without immediate veterinary supervision.

This inspection is performed by meat inspectors with grade of GS-5 if available, and, if not, then by inspectors of grade GS-4, and if the shortage is acute, as it commonly is due to sickness and other absences, then by inspectors of grade GS-6, called from their inspection duties in processing departments; thereby reducing the number of meat inspectors available in these departments below a safe minimum required for protection of the public.

On the day you were here, Mr. Lattin and myself both grade GS-6 inspectors, were working on the hog kill viscera table, having been called from our processing-department assignments because of the shortage of help. We maintain that if the grade 5 or 4 or even 6 meat inspector is qualified to do, and is required to do this work which is supposed to be done only by a veterinary inspector, then he should be paid at least at the rate of a grade GS-7, which is the beginning grade of the veterinary inspectors. This is the principle of equal pay for equal work.

Now, when you contact Bureau of Animal Industry officials in Washington relative to this increased pay for nonveterinary meat inspectors performing veterinary inspectors' work, they undoubtedly will tell you that these meat inspectors always work under immediate supervision of veterinary inspectors.

That there is always at least 1 veterinarian working at the same table with 1 or more meat inspector. As I have explained to you, this is not true at this station and no doubt the same condition exists at the majority of inspected establishments around the country because of the shortage of personnel in the Bureau. You will probably be told that these men, since they are not graduates of veterinary schools, will not know the exact disposition of the retained carcass in all cases, yet it is just as true that because of training and experience they do know that a particular carcass is not fit for food and they can certainly affix a United States retained tag to the carcass holding it for further inspection and disposition by the final veterinary inspector just as well as can the graduate veterinarian. To further illustrate the aggravations of these circumstances created by the shortage of veterinary inspectors, there were recently hired at a nearby meat-inspection station two veterinary inspectors at grade GS-9, salary $5,060 per annum. These two men work beside and are learning to do the same work as experienced nonveterinary inspectors of grade GS-5, salary $3,410 per annum. Is this equal pay for equal work?

This condition can easily be alleviated by an increase in Department of Agriculture appropriations which will permit raising the grade and salary of the nonveterinary inspector to the level of the veterinary inspector whom he is replacing.

Another sore spot with the older employees is the unfair requirement in the Civil Service Retirement System Regulations that the annuitant must take a reduced annuity, in order to provide an annuity for his wife. Upon retirement from the Federal service, if the employee wishes to provide an annuity for his wife, in case he precedes her in death, his rate of annuity will be 90 percent of the full rate due him under the basic formula, with a further reduction of three-fourths of 1 percent for each full year his wife is under age 60 at the time of his retirement, but it may not be less than 75 percent of the full rate. His widow's rate of annuity will be one-half of his full rate.

We feel that as other retirement laws do not provide for such a discount to the annuitant, the Civil Service Employee should not be so penalized.

If there is any further information you may need to help you to a just decision in the matter of increased pay, true time and one-half, and adjustment of pay of nonveterinary meat inspectors performing the work of veterinary inspectors on killing floors, please do not hesitate to call on me.

We sincerely believe these complaints and request for relief are reasonable and just and also that all Federal employees must be granted an increase in salaries to meet steadily advancing cost of living expenses. Your able assistance in these matters will be greatly appreciated.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the views expressed in the above letter are the majority opinion of the membership of Local No. 368 American Federation of Government Employees as compounded and evolved in two meetings held for the express purpose of composing this letter in response to your request for information.

Respectfully yours,

L. B. DUNFEE,
President, Local 368, American Federation of Government Employees.

EXHIBIT A

A comparison of the actual earnings of a common labor worker in this meat-packing plant with that of a meat inspector working in the same conditions of blood, mud, sweat, and long hours, to wit:

Qualifications required for employment

Packing plant employee	Grade GS-4 meat inspector
None except a strong back....	Physical examination to qualify for competitive civil-service examination. Then he must have completed 6 months probation as GS-3 trainee.
$3,120 per annum, at $1.50 per hour, 2,080 hours.	$3,175 per annum, base pay at $1.53 per hour.
$112.50 per annum, 50 hours overtime paid for at 1½ times base rate.	$1,055 per annum, 500 hours overtime at $2.10 per hour which is less than true time and one-half.
$1,560 per annum, production or incentive pay.	No incentive pay.
$117 per annum, fringe benefits.	No fringe pay.
$218 per annum, profit-sharing check or bonus.	No profitsharing check.
$150 per annum, cost of hospital and sickness insurance paid for by employer and given free to employee.	No free hospital and sickness insurance.
$18 per annum, cost of life-insurance policy paid for by employer and given free to employee.	No free life insurance.
Unemployment insurance policy paid for by employer and given free to employee.	No unemployment insurance in the event of reduction in force.
1 week of vacation with pay annually.	13 days' vacation with pay annually.
Up to 70 days' sick leave with pay possible under free hospitalization plan.	13 days' sick leave with pay annually.
$5,295.50 per annum, total....	$4,230 per annum, total.

DAIRY SUPPORT PRICES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now address myself to the matter of the action of the Secretary of Agriculture as of yesterday in announcing a new parity price-support program for dairy products.

Many of us from farm States are greatly disturbed, I am sure, by the action of Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, in announcing the lowering of dairy price supports to 75 percent of parity.

It is now within his authority, of course, to make such a discretionary decision. However, nearly a month ago I wrote Secretary Benson urging him to continue support at the 90 percent level in order to give Congress ample time to

reach a decision on whether it wants to make such support mandatory, or prefers leaving it to the Secretary's discretion.

It would seem to me greater wisdom to avoid market confusion by avoiding any changes in our dairy-support program until the Congress has acted one way or another on various proposals before it. Our agricultural committee is now studying future farm legislation. I must question the Secretary's judgment in lowering the support level until he has had the benefit of our combined decision on the future of dairy programs.

Mr. President, the Secretary's action in selecting 75 percent of parity is a revelation of things to come, if Congress should adopt the flexible price-support program which has been talked about, and which would give the Secretary a choice between 75 percent and 90 percent.

Mr. President, I notice that when the Secretary has a choice, in going below the 90-percent parity price, the highest figure he has ever set has been 80 percent on soy beans; and in the most recent case he set 75 percent on butter.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed at this point in my remarks a copy of the letter I sent to Secretary Benson on January 18, urging him to retain 90-percent support for dairy products.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 18, 1954.

HON. EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Recent press dispatches quote you as saying you felt it would be necessary to reduce the support level for dairy products on April 1, the date the present commitment for support at 90 percent of parity expires.

May I respectfully urge you to reconsider any such decision, if it has been made, and take full cognizance of the detrimental effect any such announcement at this time has upon existing markets.

Because Congress now has under consideration enactment of new farm legislation that might well affect the support level for dairy products, it would seem most wise to avoid market confusion by avoiding any changes in our dairy-support program until the Congress has acted one way or another.

By indicating in advance you intend lowering the support level on April 1, I am convinced you are complicating rather than alleviating our surplus problem. It should be apparent that dealers will seek to unload their own inventories of butter on the Government at 90 percent of parity, if it appears they can later buy butter back at a lower percentage of parity.

It should also be apparent that considerable confusion will result in the market should you lower the support level, only to have the Congress subsequently enact legislation requiring support at 90 percent of parity.

In view of the fact that Congress has such legislation under consideration and may not reach a decision upon it by April 1, I strongly urge that you immediately publicly announce your intention to continue support of dairy products at 90 percent of parity for another year in order to give Congress ample time to reach a decision on whether it wants to make such support mandatory or prefers leaving it to your discretion. I firmly believe such assurance at this time would eliminate uncertainty and add considerably to stability of the market, and prevent undue dumping of butter inventories upon the Government by the private trade.

I concur in the concern you have often expressed over getting butter out of the Government's hands into useful channels of consumption, but deplore the lack of initiative or imagination shown so far by the administration toward creating new outlets for that purpose.

Last July Senator AIKEN placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from you inviting suggestions for improving our farm programs, and promising careful study and consideration of any such suggestions advanced.

Subsequently I placed in the RECORD the results of a study entitled "Dairy Diet Dividends," which I had made by a competent authority on nutrition. At that time I declared I was making the material available for study during the recess of the Congress, with the hope that it would make a useful contribution toward making more effective use of our dairy abundance. Included in the suggestions outlined in that study was a plan for supplementing the diets of persons on public old-age assistance with a partially-subsidized monthly allotment of butter, through a stamp plan making use of established State welfare departments and normal channels of private trade. The plan was outlined in detail in the August 1, 1953, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

May I ask, in accordance with your invitation for suggestions, whether this idea was thoroughly explored by your dairy branch? If so, I would appreciate being advised as to the conclusions of the department in regard to creating such a new outlet for butter and other dairy products among groups of our citizens whose incomes at present are too low to permit them to buy the amounts of dairy products needed for an adequate diet.

I would also appreciate being advised as to what other plans, if any, the Department now has to expand outlets for our dairy abundance.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall read one or two pertinent passages from the letter because I believe they express pretty well the arguments in behalf of a continuation of the high price support level. I said:

> Because Congress now has under consideration enactment of new farm legislation that might well affect the support level for dairy products, it would seem most wise to avoid market confusion by avoiding any changes in our dairy-support program until the Congress has acted one way or another.

Then I said:

> By indicating in advance you intend lowering the support level on April 1, I am convinced you are complicating rather than alleviating our surplus problem. It should be apparent that dealers will seek to unload their own inventories of butter on the Government at 90 percent of parity, if it appears they can later buy butter back at a lower percentage of parity.

I did not have in mind at the time that the Secretary would go down to the bottom, to 75 percent of parity. However, it is apparently obvious now that every butter producer and processor in American will unload all of his butter on the Government. He will unload all of it except that which is needed for current, day by day, needs, and later will come back to the Government and buy the butter for 15 percent less than he sold it to the Government in the first instance. It is neither sound economics nor good public policy. I make the prediction on the floor today that instead of there being fewer pounds of butter owned by the Government, as a result of the announcement by the Secretary, there will be more.

I further say that the reduction which the Secretary has ordered, under the law, will do very little, if anything, to improve the consumption of butterfat products or other dairy products.

I have already asked unanimous consent to have my letter to the Secretary of Agriculture printed in the RECORD. I hope it will be very carefully studied. I point out in the letter that a number of proposals have been made to Congress and I ask that those proposals be given very careful consideration.

It is rather strange, Mr. President, that it was a year ago that the Secretary of Agriculture announced the continuation at that time of 90 percent of parity. He said he did so in order that the Government would have an opportunity to study the question, and so that the industry itself could come up with plans and proposals.

The industry has come up with plans and proposals, Mr. President, and they have been rejected. The only thing the Government has been able to do in 1 year of study of the problem of surplus dairy production has been to reduce the price of butter by 15 points. It certainly did not require a year to do that. It could have been done in the first 12 seconds, rather than in 12 months.

The Secretary has taken action, which I consider to be very damaging. I feel that we should be fully aware of what a lowering of the support level means to America's dairy industry. It will wipe out an estimated $600 million of income of dairy farmers. Based on estimates of the National Milk Producers' Federation, for each point the support level is lowered, dairy income is cut down $40 million. The price support level was lowered 15 points. Fifteen times $40 million amounts to a $600 million loss in income.

I suggest that this is no time to be having further losses in agricultural income. No area of farm operation is more expensive than that of the dairy farmer. They have expensive operations in terms of the necessary machinery and plant, in terms of equipment, and in terms of additional help which is necessary to maintain such an establishment. It is not possible for a dairy farmer to convert from dairy production to cereal grain production without a tremendous loss of his capital. It is not so difficult for a grain producer to shift from one crop to another. It is easy for a corn producer to shift from corn to wheat; but it is not easy for a dairy farmer to shift to some other kind of production without a substantial loss. It is not uncommon for a small dairy farmer to have an investment of from $35,000 to $50,000 in dairy equipment. There is a great deal of loose talk about producers going into something else, but they simply do not go into something else without having to get a new start in life.

I serve notice, Mr. President, that regardless of the Secretary's action, I shall fight on the floor of the Senate to restore better protection for the dairy industry in Minnesota and in other sections of the country. The action of the Secretary of Agriculture is literally a death blow to a large number of producers. If anyone has any doubt about it, he should see some of the telegrams I received this morning. The farmers are asking questions. When is the Government going to reduce the cost of our farm operations? When is the Government going to reduce the cost of tractors? When is the Government going to reduce the cost of fertilizers? When is the Government going to reduce the cost of milking-machine equipment? It has reduced the cost of butter, but not the cost of that which produces the butter.

I would further make note of the fact that many of our dairy farmers have blooded herds, the finest cattle they can obtain. They have spent a lifetime in building up their herds. I would also point out that public-health laws have been passed in the effort to provide better health standards. Despite all this, we see a situation brought about whereby farm income in the dairy field will be definitely injured.

Mr. President, I desire to make it clear that I did not say the Secretary had merely to buy up surpluses. I am convinced in my own mind that there are other ways of handling the situation. One way which would be very effective would be the adoption of a system of production payments. I think there is more and more interest in such a proposal.

In addition to my own price support bill,—S. 1159—there are other bills before the committee, which deserve and which will receive very serious consideration. Regardless of what kind of a bill is reported from the committee, I am determined that efforts will be made on the floor to see that the dairy industry is treated equitably along with other producers. Whatever the rest of them get, the producers of dairy commodities should at least share equitably.

The National Milk Producers' Federation has drafted an amendment providing that the support level for dairy farmers be not less than the support level for basic commodities, such as the feed which dairymen must buy.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that a communication from the National Milk Producers' Federation be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think there should not be any more than a 5 percent change in the price support level in any 1 year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr AIKEN. Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not yet.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with what the Senator from Minnesota has said in regard to the heavy investment in the dairy industry and the difficulty which the dairyman has in adjusting to other production without heavy loss. I also agree with the claim that the dairyman should be put on an even basis, so far as supports are concerned, with the producers of other commodities.

There is one thing which bothers me with reference to that, however, and perhaps the Senator from Minnesota could enlighten me. I am wondering whether the dairy farmers, in return for 100 percent support, would be willing to accept marketing quotas. We know that the wheat grower has had a 20 percent cut this year, and there will be another cut next year. The cotton grower has had to take a 20 percent cut in marketing quotas this year, and there is probably a 15 percent additional cut coming next year. It is almost axiomatic that when there are price supports production must be adjusted to demand.

I have full sympathy with the desire of any dairyman to get price support and be sure of an income, but what bothers me is whether they can adjust their production without incurring very heavy losses. I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota could give us an idea of the thinking of the people of his great dairy State in that respect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should be delighted to try. I bow to the superior wisdom of the Senator from Vermont, who comes from a very fine dairy State, as well as a wonderful State in other respects.

I recall that last summer the newspapers of my State published a poll which showed that the farmers of Minnesota were going to vote 50–50 on wheat-acreage allotments. The Minneapolis Tribune carried a statement that 50 percent would vote for them and 50 percent would vote against them. The vote was 72 to 1 for acreage allotments. The editor was completely against any kind of controls for the farmer, so he read his views into the poll. When the poll came out, it was 50–50; but when the vote came out, it was 72 to 1. Every Member of the Senate will settle for a majority like that.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the dairy farmers of Minnesota be willing to do what the wheat farmers did?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not know. I have no crystal ball. All I know is what has happened in the past. I was told by wheat farmers, by newspaper editorials, by experts, and even by the Department of Agriculture itself, that acreage allotments would not be accepted. But when the choice was between 50 percent of parity and 90 percent of parity, it did not take our farmers long to make up their minds what they were going to do about acreage allotments.

I hope there can be brought before the committees of Congress a program with a high price-protection formula—not merely a support formula, but a protection formula. I should like to know how the farmers feel.

My complaint about Mr. Benson's action is that now, when an agricultural bill is before Congress, at a time when the distinguished Senator from Vermont, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, is about to reconvene the hearings—I understand the hearings are to start within a week—at the time we are about to consider the whole proposal of agricultural legislation, and to develop a comprehensive program, the Secretary of Agriculture lowers prices to the lowest level, to 75 percent of parity.

This is a very severe shock. Many persons expected a drop of perhaps five points. This greater slash is not in line with the views of the President of the United States. When the President was considering the modernized parity formula and its application in new legislation, he said, in effect, "Let us take it by stages. We will go 1 year, 2 years, and then 3 years, changing in stages, but not all at once." Now we find we have taken the full blow, from the highest parity price down to the lowest parity price, in one fell swoop.

All I am saying is that regardless of the problems of the Government—and the Government may have its problems—the dairy farmers are going to have their problems. If there is to be a choice between the Government being able to handle its problems and dairy farmers being able to handle theirs, I say the Government is better able to handle its problems.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I gathered from the Senator's remark that he felt the Secretary of Agriculture could have fixed the support anywhere between 75 percent and 90 percent of parity. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. But will the Senator agree that if the counsel of the Department of Agriculture told the Secretary that under the wording and the intent of the law the Secretary could not fix the support price above a minimum of 75 percent of parity, would the Senator then feel that the Secretary would have been justified in violating the law against the advice of his counsel?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. I think that if the Secretary had received that kind of counsel, perhaps he should have obtained a new lawyer.

Last year there was a surplus of butter. The law provides that the Secretary shall set the support price at such a level as to secure an adequate supply. It was on that basis that the counsel for the Department suggested to the Secretary that there should be low price supports, but we had a large supply of butter on hand last year, when the Secretary announced in March last that the 90 percent support price would be continued for another year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator recall that a year ago at this time we were in a shooting war, and American boys were being taken off the farms of Minnesota and other States and were being sent to the battlefields of Korea?

Mr. HUMPHREY. And they were being fed oleo. Yet butter was bought for them by the Secretary of Defense at a price of 15 cents a pound, an insult to every dairy farmer and every dairy producer in America.

I came from a committee meeting this morning, as did the Senator from Vermont, where we heard about the bill we are picking up for another war in Indochina. We are not short of wars or short of butter. We are short of a willingness on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to do something about the situation.

Mr. AIKEN. I cannot see how it was an insult to the dairy farmers of America to insist that the armed services feed our boys butter rather than substitutes for butter, even though the price was out of line. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that the administration probably should have done what the previous administration did, namely, to require the armed services, the ECA, and other agencies, to pay at least full price for farm commodities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is all I am asking.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it was a mistake to sell butter at 15 cents a pound. I feel the President should have ordered the agencies of Government to pay a respectable price, even if it were not the full support price. So there is no quarrel about that. However, I do not think it was an insult to the dairy farmers to insist that the Army feed our boys butter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is not what I said. I said it was an insult that the butter should have been sold at only 15 cents a pound. I say again that it was an insult to the farmers to sell it at only 15 cents a pound.

The Government has not taken much time to learn the answer to the problem. There are many ways in which the butter can be used. The administration may be greatly concerned with its desires for economy, but I want to know if the Government is going to cut the prices of tanks? We have a surplus of tanks and a surplus of ammunition. We have plenty of surpluses. We do not place an order with General Motors for a thousand tanks, and then, when we find that we really needed only 200, say to General Motors, "We will pay you 50 percent of the price on the rest of the tanks." No. We take the order at full price. If we do not, we pay the penalty.

We need the dairy industry. Regardless of whether it costs a little more to maintain it, we need it. Congress voted for fair labor standards, for a 40-hour week, for time and one-half for overtime. Congress voted for a fair trade law for retail merchants. It was a social decision to keep independent business alive. I suppose it could be proved that super markets and big chain store operators can sell tooth paste for less than a corner drug store can. But, Mr. President, America is made up of corner drug stores and hardware stores, independently operated. I am willing to pay a price to keep them in business.

If we fool around with the dairy industry, so that the dairy producers cannot make a living, we shall lose a great part of American agricultural life, which means so much to the social and economic welfare of the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I had hoped that when the Senator from Minnesota got into this discussion on the price of butter, he would bear in mind dry skim milk powders, cheese, and many other products which fall under the same yardstick.

While the Senator from Minnesota understands that I do not agree with him exactly concerning the levels at which supports should be placed on commodities, I wish to point out that in 1947 the Government had bought some 200,000,000 pounds of dried skimmed milk powder, the very kind of powder we now have on hand in surplus quantities. The Army told us in 1947 that it could not use it, but it finally did at fair prices.

I had occasion to go back to a file I had preserved, and I am thankful I have preserved it, because it has reminded me of the 200,000,000 pounds of dried skim milk which in 1947 cost the Government 9 cents a pound, as against 17 cents a pound now. It was sold by the Government at cost plus the cost of delivery to the spot of export to Germany and Japan. The Army did not want to use it, but they did. A man named Colonel Sams was the one with whom we were dealing. He found out that when dried skim milk was moved into Japan and Germany, it provided useful, nutritious food. Butter and milk contain the finest food values ever devised for human beings.

Colonel Sams found that the Army could take it at reasonable prices, and the farm program lost nothing on the deal.

I think it is wrong to drop the price of butter to 15 cents a pound when the Army buys it. I think the Army ought to pay a reasonable price. Good food like butter should be placed in veterans' hospitals. Congress has provided by law that veterans shall be served butter. I know when I spent some months in a tuberculosis hospital in the neighborhood of 37 years ago the food which the hospital authorities tried to supply us included plenty of butter, eggs, and other dairy products.

I do not subscribe completely to what the Senator from Minnesota has suggested, but the Senator is aware of my belief that the Congress has a responsibility to see to it that dried skim-milk powder is utilized properly. The Department has accumulated that product to the extent of 460 million pounds. There are places all over the world, such as in Korea, where such a product could be used. I think the farm programs should not be charged with the losses which will come from the accumulation of such products. Whatever the farmer has done has been in response to what the Congress and the Department of Agriculture have asked him to do.

A year ago I thought the support level was too high. I am on record with such an opinion. I believe the support level has come down more nearly to what it should be. I find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Minnesota on that aspect. I am endeavoring to support the statement in the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota that we should not dump such products on the market and say they are no good. The products are good, and the American farmers are providing products which are good for us.

For the benefit of the Senator from Minnesota I desire to read a quotation from Wallace's Farmer respecting the decision on butter supports. I read from page 6:

> In spite of heavy Government buying, butterfat in December was only 82 percent of parity, while whole milk was 90 percent.

The Senator recognizes, does he not, that the announced level was 90 percent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I do.

Mr. ANDERSON. The average, during most of the program, has been 84 percent. The actual level in December was 82 percent. If the 75-percent price support is to be followed by a drop similar to that which occurred when the 90-percent price support went down to 82 percent to the farmer, then we are in for more trouble.

I do not say the problem of the Secretary of Agriculture is an easy one. I commended the decision which he finally had to reach. However, I do not think this is the final solution of such problems. We need to bear in mind that there are uses for dairy products which the price support programs have sometimes tended to dislocate. In the case of milk going into the fluid market, the 90-percent of parity has been reached without trouble.

A few days ago, when the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was off the floor, I suggested that perhaps the Aiken stamp plan was the more attractive solution to many of us. The stamp program would make dairy products and milk available to children, who would thus have a reasonable supply of the most vital food available today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very pleased to receive the Senator's contribution. We have our differences of view. I am not suggesting there is only one view to be expressed on the floor of the Senate. I am stating that until Congress has had an opportunity to study the price support problem, the Secretary of Agriculture should not make a positive price support decision.

Fluid milk has a price support level of 90 percent of parity. The price support level does not directly affect fluid milk, but it affects it indirectly. This morning I listened to a radio commentator in New York. I heard him say that the agricultural price support law would affect the price of milk anywhere from 50 to 75 cents a hundredweight. I heard him say that it might result in a reduction of a cent a quart in the market price.

If my colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], were in the Chamber, I am sure he would agree with my statement that many of the fluid milk producers in Minnesota are already pinched in the fluid milk market. They are already in trouble. In spite of that, I received a letter from my home State of Minnesota in which the writer said

that the children were not receiving enough milk in the hot-school-lunch programs.

We ought to thank God that the dairy farmer is producing what he is. The United States is the only country in the world where people go on a diet voluntarily. People in other countries go on diets involuntarily.

What is the problem involved? Let us consider the dried solid milk accumulation. Why is there such an accumulation? Because there was too much fluid milk. Why was there too much fluid milk? In America today there are millions of children who do not get a glass of milk to drink. Money is squandered in this country on projects which are much less worthwhile than providing each of our school children with a glass of milk.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am deeply interested in this matter, as is the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, because New York State is the second largest dairy State in the Union. Dairying is the chief agricultural activity of the farmers of the State of New York.

I was very much interested in the question addressed to the Senator from Minnesota by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], as to whether a quota limitation could be or should be imposed on milk. It seems to me that the opinion completely loses sight of the vast difference between the production of milk and the production of grains, such as wheat, corn, oats, and rye.

The production of milk has great seasonal variations. May, June, and July are the months when the greatest amount of milk is produced. In other months the production of milk falls off in varying degree.

It has always been recognized that in order to maintain a steady supply of milk during the months of small production a dairy farmer would have to produce during the months of great production a supply far greater than possibly could be consumed during those months. In the case of wheat and corn, there is one growing season. The farmer does not have the regular and inevitable seasonal differences which a dairy farmer encounters in the production of milk.

I remember, and I think the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had the same experience, because we were governors of adjoining States at the same time, that I pleaded with the dairy farmers of my State, as I believe he did in his State, to buy more milk cattle, to raise more cattle, to feed them well, so that even though there should be an overproduction during the summer months May, June, and July, there would nonetheless be produced enough milk to feed the people of New York State, and also the people of the great cities of New England during the lean months.

It does not seem to me possible or practicable to have a quota limitation on milk in the same manner as a quota limitation is put into effect so far as grains and possibly other agricultural commodities are concerned. You cannot at will turn on or off the flow of milk.

I should also like to point out that obviously there has been no decline in the price of the feed which cows must consume if they are to produce milk. The prices of wheat and corn are no lower than they were a few months ago or a year ago; possibly they are slightly higher. The implements and supplies which the dairyman needs for the conduct of his business certainly cost no less than they did a year ago; possibly they cost more. On the one hand, there exists a stable, or possibly even an increased, cost of production; and, on the other hand, the farmer is experiencing an inevitable decrease of serious proportions in the income he receives from the sale of some of his products. That does not seem sound or just to me. It places the dairy farmer in between two crushing assaults. It places on him a burden which I think he will have great difficulty in bearing.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that I believe our farm population and the production of foodstuffs are of the utmost importance to the Nation. I believe the small farmer is the backbone of the Nation. In my State he does not usually vote for me, because he lives in upstate, Republican New York. But the problems of raising foodstuffs to feed our Nation and possibly other nations should be above politics. I feel that the farmers of New York and the hundreds of thousands of other farmers in Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa, Vermont, and other States of the Nation are the backbone of the Nation. We cannot afford to sacrifice them. Their prosperity is too vital to the prosperity and security of the whole country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, about a month ago I read in the New York Times, one of the leading newspapers of the Nation, an article entitled "Merchant Marine Asks Full Parity." It seems that the merchant marine presented to the Government a bill for a subsidy, saying, "We want to be paid a subsidy. Our operational costs are larger. Our income is less. Give us some money to make up the difference." Congress voted for such a program because the merchant marine is vital to the security of the Nation and is important to its commerce and well being. I refer to the merchant marine only to point out that in many areas of American life we have to make adjustments because they are important to the well being of the national economy.

I was delighted to hear what the Senator from New York said about dairy farmers as a group. I must say with equal candor to the Senator from New York that the strongest and the largest dairy-farming counties of Minnesota have not voted Democratic. However, this matter is not a political one. The men and women on the dairy farms cannot be sidewalk farmers; they cannot sit in a large law office in a big downtown building and purchase 2,000 or 5,000 acres of land and plant it. On the contrary, they must be on the job at 4:30 in the morning and until 9:30 at night; and they must produce 7 days a week, because the cows are not on a 40-hour week, and they do not stop giving milk on Sunday. They do not even listen to the admonition of the Lord; they continue giving forth of their produce even on the Sabbath. These farmers are the backbone of a balanced agriculture. Dairying is vital to soil conservation and to the nutritional well-being of the American people. Yet the country is complaining because there is too much butterfat.

At the same time, the people of many other countries of the world are almost starving to death, and are crying out because they are weak from hunger. On the other hand, Americans are crying out because there is too much food in the United States. Mr. President, if the only problem whichever faces our Government is that we have too much food, it seems to me we shall, indeed, be a very fortunate people.

On the other hand, a government which cannot figure out what to do with an abundance of food is a government which will never be able to balance the budget or to have a balanced economy, because if we cannot figure out how to give our ample supplies of food to people who were hungry and in need, how can we arrive at sound economics and sound fiscal policies?

Suggestion after suggestion is made about what to do; but the fluid-milk problem could be solved if we had the will to do so. Of course, it would cost something. The only thing that does not cost something is advice, and generally it costs something anyway, if it is bad advice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield? And, if so, to whom?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in view of the very able statement the Senator from Minnesota has made, does not he regard it as unfortunate that the budget the administration sent to the Congress provides for a cut, as I understand, of $15 million in the appropriation for the school-lunch program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Unfortunate? I say to the Senator from Illinois it is ridiculous. I do not know who prepare the items for the school-lunch program; but in case those who prepare that program have not heard about it, let me point out that the population of the Nation is growing by leaps and bounds. In case those who prepare the items for the school-lunch program have not heard about it, let me point out that the babies born in the period from 1946 to 1948 are beginning to enter the kindergartens, and are on their way to the first and second grades. The result is that the schools are bulging at the seams. Yet we are asked to reduce the school-lunch program.

Of course, the population of the cities is rapidly increasing. Fifteen percent of the population now live in rural areas; 85 percent live in metropolitan areas.

Obviously, it is as important for school children to have enough milk and enough food, as it is for them to have enough fresh air. Of course, if someone proposed to build schools without windows, he would be locked up in a sanitarium. Yet at this time the Government proposes that the school-lunch program be reduced. I am opposed to such a reduction. In fact, Mr. President, this Congress will be in session a long time if an effort is made to enact into law such a proposal.

There is going to be enough butter for the school children to eat; in fact, there is going to be enough butter for grandpa to eat, too. There will also be enough milk for both the children and all the other people of the United States to drink.

It is about time we called a halt to the kind of stalemate which has developed, when we cannot figure out what to do with our abundance of food. If our only answer is to reduce the price to a point where the producer cannot survive, then I say a Pandora's box of economic troubles will be opened, because every depression the Nation has had has begun on the farm. We have said again and again that depressions are farm-led and farm-fed.

Mr. President, whether we are called "prophets of gloom" or whether we are called "fear dealers," or whatever one may choose to call us, I say there is trouble in the Nation today. There are people without jobs. The farmers will be angry, too, because they are being taken for another 15-percent "tailspin." Plenty of problems confront the country today. This is not the time to aggravate the problems, for we shall never obtain the kind of economic stability we want by paying less for doing more.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

The distinguished Senator has just referred to accusations being made by some persons in the other political party against some who have called attention to the recession in the business tempo and the activity and the output in our country. I wonder whether my colleague is familiar with the fact that this morning a Federal Reserve economist said the dip in the Nation's economy has been sharper than was outlined in the President's economic report.

I read from an item just taken from one of the news tickers:

Winfield W. Riefler, assistant to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, said the Federal Reserve's index of production has now declined about 10 percent since last July.

This drop in production, he said, is equal to the full decline in the 1948–49 reaction.

While this decline does not change the diagnosis that the current reaction reflects primarily an unbalanced inventory situation, Riefler said it raises the possibility that it may in itself set forces in motion that will spread more widely over the economy.

Riefler testified before the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, which is holding hearings today on credit policy and its impact on the Nation's economy. A panel of bankers and economists generally supported the administration's credit policies to meet the current recession.

It seems that, although they are informed and are sufficiently aware of what is happening, in discussing it they refer to it simply as "the current recession."

I quote further from the statement made by Mr. Riefler:

"Information now becoming available indicates that the reaction to date has been sharper than was known when the [President's] Economic Report was in preparation," Riefler said.

Riefler said, however, that the decline thus far "does not seem to have shaken the general expectation of businessmen that it will be short-lived."

The President's report was presented to Congress 3 weeks ago, but was in preparation for weeks before that. In the message the President said the "contraction since last June or July has thus far been largely in the nature of an inventory adjustment"; in other words, businessmen were cutting down on their buying because their shelves were overstocked.

Riefler said "additional evidence" since presentation of the Economic Report "tends to confirm rather than modify the diagnosis" made by the President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let the Senator from Minnesota make one brief comment. I say this with certain fear and trepidation as I stand before the most distinguished economist in the Senate, and one of the most distinguished in the Nation.

I have been checking up on the so-called inventory adjustment. The recession of 1949 is used in comparison with conditions of today. I shall be very careful in my use of the word "recession."

In 1949 there was a $5 billion liquidation of inventory, but there was also a deficit of approximately $6 billion, in terms of the cash budget of the Government of the United States, which offset the inventory.

What is the situation at present? A $6 billion or $7 billion inventory adjustment is now predicted, but as of 6 months from today, February, it is estimated that the cash budget will be in balance.

That simply means that there is just that much less money in circulation. It means that much of a down-turn in the economy. The inventory adjustment in 1949 was offset by the cash deficit. The inventory adjustment in 1954, instead of being offset, is left $6 billion or $7 billion off what it would have been if there had been a deficit. So the deficit was of some good, in terms of a balanced economy in 1949.

The Senator from Illinois knows these facts much more definitely than I do. I do not think I have misstated the facts. I have spent some time with leading economists during the past 3 weeks. I am not worried about being called a prophet of doom or whatever other names our friends may use, the fact is that there are danger signs in the American economy.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to make this point: I do not desire to associate the immediate problem of the price support program for dairying with the overall general development of our economy, though I do not suppose they can be dissociated. Nor do I desire to make this a partisan question, because I am speaking today in reference to our agricultural program for people who are setting aside their partisanship. I make this statement without fear of successful contradiction: Democrat or Republican, when you are broke, you are broke. When the note comes due at the bank, the banker is not interested in your political credentials. He wants the money. It is about time for some people to leave their hide-bound politics and start to think about some downright economics—how to pay the bills, how to feed the family, how to keep business, maintain the farm, or keep the job. If we think in those terms, we shall get on with our task of building a stronger economy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. Later I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I heard the distinguished Senator's statement a little while ago with respect to criticism being made because there is an abundance of food. I believe the Senator will agree with me that evidently the present Secretary of Agriculture is dedicated to the creation of a scarcity of food. Does the Senator agree with that conclusion?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should say that the Secretary of Agriculture surely feels that the abundance which we have is unhealthy and undesirable. I must confess that as I look at his proposals it seems to me that he is relying upon what he calls the automatic workings of the marketplace, to give us just a little less than abundance, which would put us on the fringe of scarcity. That is the way to keep prices up.

Mr. KERR. I should like to have the Senator think for a moment about the situation which exists in this country today because of a little scarcity of coffee. Is the Senator aware of what a little scarcity of coffee is costing the American consumers this year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has put thoughts in my mind which are making my brain cells literally whirl. How right the Senator from Oklahoma is. The cost which the consumer has paid because of the coffee scarcity goes far beyond any program which might have been devised to help the coffee producers.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator aware that the little scarcity in coffee will cost the American consumers not less than $1 billion this year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota was not aware of that figure.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator give us the benefit of what he thinks a little scarcity in the wheat crop, in the production of dairy products, in the corn crop, or in the production of other foods might cost the American consumers in 1 year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that if the dairy farmers were to do what is sometimes done in other areas of American industry, and withhold their product or their labor from the market, as they did in the 1930's, the situation could become serious. As a boy I saw the ditches along our highways run white with milk as farmers turned over milk trucks, because the price of milk was too low. They could not take it to market and make any money. If the dairy farmers were to turn off the milk spigot, so to speak, everyone from the Secretary of Agriculture on down would be crying "Uncle, we have had enough." Prices would go up through the roof, and everybody would be crying for the product at any price. But our farmers are not that kind of people. Our farmers produce, and they expect to receive reasonable treatment from their Government. They expect to be allowed to produce at a fair price.

I have looked at the facts. The American consumer pays a smaller percentage of his earned income for food than any other consumer in the world, and he has a greater variety of food and more nutritious food. If we consider what the farmer receives for his product as compared with what industry gets for its products and what workers get for their wages, we see that the American farmer has not done too well.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. As a basis for the question, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that in this discussion, in my judgment, he is making a great contribution toward providing vital, wholesome, and necessary information to all the people of the Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KERR. I remind the Senator that, according to the information available from the statistical departments of the Government, in June of 1951 the food index, or cost of food paid by the American consumer, was at a figure of 112.3. According to my information, the last report of the Department of Agriculture indicated that the cost of food to the American consumer in January 1954 was practically unchanged, or within less than one-half of one point of being the same as it was in June 1951. However, information from the same Department discloses that in January 1954 the American farmer received about 20 percent less for the food he sold than he received in June of 1951. On the basis of that information, is it not perfectly clear that the claim of the Secretary of Agriculture that rigid price supports, or fair prices to the farmer, penalize the consumer, is wholly without foundation, and in reality the perpetration of a fraud on the American people by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a sort of political-economic hogwash, if the Senator wishes my candid opinion.

I have before me some figures, contained in a letter written to Mr. Don S. Anderson, Acting Director of the Livestock and Dairy Division of the Commodity Stabilization Service in Washington, signed by the general manager of one of the largest dairy cooperatives in the State of Minnesota, the Cass-Clay Cooperative Creamery Association, representing thousands of small farmers, the salt of the earth. The name of the general manager is Charles Ommodt—a good Norse name. He has a few things to say to the acting director of the Livestock and Dairy Division. I think the Senator from Oklahoma would be interested in some of the statements made in this letter:

For instance, permit me to point out to you that it takes a good hide to bring $2.50 today and still shoes are selling at $20 a pair. Farmers are selling their wool at 59 cents, yet they get about $2.75 out of a suit of clothes retailing up to $100.

Mr. KERR. That is a cowhide.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A cowhide; yes. The price of it is $2.50.

Mr. President, nobody is fooling the farmers of America. The support price of wheat could be reduced 50 percent and Wheaties would not go down 50 percent. I used that example before and I repeat it. In the same way, Mr. President, the price support on oats could go down 50 percent, and oatmeal would still be sold at the same price at which it is being sold today. Why? Because more advertisements would be put in the newspaper in an attempt to sell more oatmeal. The farmer would not get more of the money. It would be paid to advertising agencies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to follow up the discussion between the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oklahoma. It seems to me that Mr. Benson has a pretty good hide, too, when he goes around the country and tells people that the consumers, who number 140 million, according to his figures, are the ones who have to pay for the subsidy, so-called, which is being paid to the farmers by the Government. He does not think that farmers are consumers, apparently. He does not seem to realize the fact that it is a pretty petty practice on his part to try to set up one part of the population against another.

Is it not correct to say that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, stated before the Committee on Agriculture that in the past 20 years $16 billion has been paid in subsidies to farmers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that statement has been made.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, that is not correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He said that was the amount the Government had expended upon its price-support program and its agricultural program since 1933.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did he not include in that figure the loan programs connected with REA, rural telephones, FHA, and other activities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He did.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Including the work carried on by the Forest Service?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the actual amount which has been paid to farmers in the past 20 years?

Mr. HUMPHREY. About $1,027 million, or an average of 35 cents a person a year. God bless America, if we cannot afford to pay that much. It has cost 35 cents a person a year to put the agricultural economy of America, with fewer men on the farms, in a position to fight a war and to meet the conditions of a postwar period. Thirty-five cents a person a year is what it has cost for this so-called great outlay.

I say that the Secretary's Office—and I want to get this off my chest—if not the Secretary himself, has been laying down a barrage of propaganda to divide the farmers from city people. The effects of that propaganda are felt in every congressional office on the Hill. We are getting the information that a huge subsidy is being paid out from Washington at a terrible cost to the American people.

Let me say one other thing, Mr. President. I saw the report of the Secretary of the Treasury with reference to the stockpiles of goods, to which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] referred. In the report the Secretary of the Treasury evaluated the butter in storage at 38 cents a pound. The junior Senator from Minnesota is interested in a business. I say to my colleagues that if any businessman were to write off his inventory for tax purposes in the same manner in which the Secretary of the Treasury wrote off the inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation he would be in jail.

There is not a businessman whose tax reports have not been examined as to how much he writes off for tax purposes on what he calls spoiled merchandise.

Mr. President, I started taking inventories when I was 11 years old, and I have been doing it for 32 years. I know what must be done in keeping figures for tax purposes and how much can be charged off for losses from depreciated merchandise. The Bureau of Internal Revenue will not permit any private merchant in America to write off his inventory as the Secretary of the Treasury has written off the inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation, in violation of the law.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. MANSFIELD addressed the Chair.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to repeat that statement. He did it in violation of the law. The law requires him to evaluate the stores on the basis of their true value, not on the basis of their adjusted value. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would remind the Senator from Minnesota that the law to which he has referred was enacted in 1938.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The practice to which he refers has been in vogue each year since that time, so far as I know.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. In some countries murder was practiced, but that did not make it legal.

Mr. AIKEN. Probably the law can stand reexamination and possibly revision. I am glad the Senator from Minnesota has called attention to the high costs which the farmer must pay at the present time. I do not take it to

mean that the Senator is defending price controls. I am sure he is not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Vermont need not put such thoughts in my mind.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish the Senator would also include the extremely high prices on gasoline and oils which the farmer must pay, and which are contributory causes to the difficulties with which he is faced today.

I should like to make one other suggestion. I was interested in the discussion on economics between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], for whom I have great admiration, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Minnesota. As background material I would refer the Senator from Minnesota to the speech made by the senior Senator from Illinois on Washington's birthday in 1951. It is one of the best explanations of how the United States got into the difficulties of inflationary prices I have ever heard given in the Senate. I give the Senator from Illinois full credit for it, and I hope each Member of the Senate will read that speech, because it is one of the best I have ever heard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thoroughly concur in that statement. I recall the speech.

Mr. AIKEN. It explains to a very large extent the troubles, real or otherwise, which Members of Congress and the people of the country as a whole are experiencing today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield so that I may make a comment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the very kind words which the Senator from Vermont has to say about my speech of 3 years ago. It was not that good a speech. However, it did criticize the excessive buying by the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department in unlimited quantities of Government bonds and thus laying the basis for credit and price expansion. I think it was a great mistake on the part of the Federal Reserve Board and on the part of the Treasury Department at that time.

It should be remembered, however, that within a month after the delivery of that speech—and I do not say that the speech was a major factor in any sense—the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury reversed their policy and adopted a policy of buying moderate quantities of Government bonds, not unlimited purchases.

It should be noted that from March 1951 to December 1952 the general price level remained approximately constant. During that period wholesale prices were falling and retail prices were rising. However the average of the two was almost precisely constant. Therefore we had virtually 20 months of price stability. That was a very real period of advance.

I believe that the attitude of the administration in saying that they checked inflation is not correct. Inflation had been checked for 20 months prior to the election. What the "New Look" did came in 2 or 3 stages.

In December, by what may well have been a process of osmosis, the Federal Reserve Board discontinued the purchase of Government bonds. The total quantity of active bank credits shrank by approximately $4 billion in the next 5 months, despite the fact that the index of production was rising. This helped to initiate a price decrease.

Furthermore, the Treasury raised the interest rate too fast and too far, jumping from 2¾ percent to 3¼ percent, with consequent restriction upon loans.

These policies helped to bear unfortunate fruit later on in the year. We do not maintain that the policies of the Democratic Party have always been perfect economically, but we do say that by March of 1951 relative stability had been obtained, and bank credit was not being inflated—it was rising at approximately the same rate at which production was increasing—the two keeping pace with each other.

What happened after the election was the adoption of a hard metal policy of undue restriction. In these matters it is important to avoid restriction, contraction, and deflation as it is to avoid inflation. The happy medium is the course to follow. But that has not been followed. If I may use a somewhat vulgar illustration, sometimes when we are suffering from an internal disorder we take an excessive dose of castor oil. Then, when we recover from that, we take an excessive dose of bismuth. We oscillate from one condition of internal difficulty to the other. Our Republican friends gave us a large dose of the wrong economics.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his very fine presentation and analysis of his address of 3 years ago and of his thoughts since that time. I believe some of us concurred with the Senator from Illinois. I recall that I listened with keen attention, and, I hope, with an open mind and sincere purpose, to the argument of the Senator, and I felt as he did, that there had to be an accord reached between the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System. I noted that some of the political pundits and partisans who criticize those of us on this side of the aisle with reference to our views on fiscal policy tried to make it appear that we thought there should be no restrictions and that interest rates should be only at a nominal figure.

There is no evidence to support that description of our attitude or policy. We have felt that a good fiscal policy was of importance to the economy. We have felt that there should be restraints upon the price structure and the wage structure, and that in a period of declining production, declining employment, and declining consumer purchasing power, we might make adjustments more to liberalize credits and taxation. That would do more to keep this country on an even keel than would anything else. The public-works program should be just an addition to the fiscal policy.

I pay tribute to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and other Senators for their attention to our fiscal policy. I was delighted to hear the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] point out the fact that the President's economic report was prepared and had to be prepared, not by malicious intent, ahead of the date of its presentation. The facts upon which its conclusions are based are facts which had been gathered weeks and months prior to presentation.

The Council of Economic Advisers, to my mind, are very good, sound, able men. I think Mr. Burns and his two copartners are very eminent and learned men, and they were very careful in the economic report not to become too wedded to any one conclusion, recognizing that we live in a volatile period. I do not think we are doing a disservice when we suggest at times that there are symptoms which could lead to serious difficulty. If we have a friend who is not feeling well, whose eyes look rather glassy, whose complexion appears to be rather sandy, and who has a bit of palpitation of the heart, I do not think we are unkind to him to say, "Why do you not go to see a doctor?"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why does the Senator address his remarks to me? [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not address them to the Senator from Illinois, but I wanted to talk to the most healthy-looking specimen in the Senate, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], if he, with his good health, is concerned about present conditions—of what economists must be thinking about the general economy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of who gave rise to the terrible word "recession"?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not. It is one of the many things I do not know.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was first referred to by Dr. Mitchell, the greatest expert on business cycles in the world. For many years he was the head of the Bureau of Economic Research, and he classified business cycles into four classes: Revival, prosperity, recession, depression. Thus the word "recession" became part of our standard terminology.

Is the Senator aware of the fact that the right-hand man to Dr. Mitchell and the one who later succeeded him as head of the Bureau of Economic Research is Dr. Burns, who is head of the Council of Economic Advisers? He is a very estimable gentleman. Therefore, when the Senator from Illinois used the word "recession," which later caused him to be accused of being a prophet of gloom and doom, he was merely using terminology started by the foremost authority on business cycles in the world and who is the present chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say that anyone who starts to argue economics with the senior Senator from Illinois may feel that he had a bad night and did not realize what could happen to him, because the Senator from Illinois is one man with whom people might have a hard time in trying to dispute about economics.

I want to say, in all seriousness, that the Senator from Illinois, from his background of economics as both a practitioner and as a student and a scholar in that field, cited what he considered to be danger signs in our economic situation. The Senator did not say we were going to have a depression. He merely said there were signs of the times which indicated the necessity for corrective action, and he used the word "recession." I think he is to be commended. I believe there is a great deal of merit in that particular point of view. Go to any farm implement dealer in the State of Minnesota or in the State of Illinois, who has taken years and years of work to build up his business. He has extended his credit, and his inventory was heavy. He found his implements which were ready for delivery to consumers were not selling. Notes came due, and the implement dealer could not pay the notes, and he went out of business. Our automobile manufacturers can try to fool the people with their television programs, but the truth is that the automobile dealers all over the country have extra space filled with automobiles, not only 1954 models, but with some 1953 models.

We know that farmers buy more steel than do all the automobile manufacturers put together. They buy more petroleum products than does any other industry. They use more rubber than do all the automobile manufacturers put together, and they use more electricity than is used by Chicago, Houston, Baltimore, and Philadelphia. This is no time to be saying to them, "We will trim you for another 10 percent," when we see the farmer's share of the dollar coming down every year since 1951. In fact, it has gone down to 42 cents out of the consumer dollar.

We see real estate go down. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics reports that farm assets were reduced at the rate of three-quarters of a billion dollars a month every month last year. There has been a $9 billion liquidation in farm assets. If there were a $2 billion liquidation in any other industry in America, we would be much concerned. How many times do we have to be hit on the head; how many times does disaster have to fall upon us before we begin trimming——

Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] reminds me that I should correct my statement and say "pruning" instead of "trimming." I accept this expert husbandry advice.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I believe the Senator is as able an expert as there is in the Senate on the question of dairy production, prices, supply, and demand. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that the value of whole milk to the producer has declined drastically since June 1951?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly am. I made a brief comment about that an hour or so ago.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from Minnesota equally aware of the fact that the consumer today pays more for whole milk than he did in June 1951?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very much aware of that fact. I have before me a letter from my good friend, Mr. Charles Ommodt, operator of a big creamery. He is a practical man. He has not had time to come to Washington to learn what is going on. He is talking to the folks back home. He operates a big cooperative creamery. He wrote a letter to Mr. Don S. Anderson, acting director of the Livestock and Dairy Division, Commodity Stabilization Service.

Those names are changed so often that I cannot remember which service we are speaking about. Mr. Ommodt said to Mr. Anderson:

> Or take a quart of milk. After a farmer pays transportation to the plant, he gets about 7½ cents for the milk which sells for 20 cents.

That is in Minnesota, where milk sells at retail for 20 cents. In some other parts of the country the consumer pays 25, 26, or 27 cents for milk.

The dairy farmers of the United States will be hurt by the reduction from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity. While the reduction does not directly affect whole milk, it does so indirectly, through the effect the reduction will have on cheese, dried milk, butter, and similar products. I felt it was necessary that a voice of protest be raised in the Senate against this kind of action.

I wish to conclude by saying that, in my mind, the job of Congress is to make a most careful examination of all perishable commodities. We have a good, workable program for our storable commodities. We have never lost a dime on cotton; we have never lost money on corn, wheat, or any other storable commodities. We have a program which works. Yet the Secretary wants to tamper with it, although it works. We never had a better program. It has proved itself, both in peace and in war, to be a desirable program. But now it is found necessary to level it, or at least a big part of it, by 15 percent. We are taking that much off the safety valve.

I shall make another prediction on the floor of the Senate, without being an expert in these matters. With the very large surplus of corn in storage, the price of corn will be down next spring. By next spring there will be little pigs coming out of our ears, and the surplus of corn will disappear in a short time. The great surplus of corn which is being talked about will have become a thing of the past.

After that, there will be another problem to worry about. But first let us determine what is to be done with the perishable commodities.

The Soviet Union is firing one premier after another, liquidating its political commissars in succession. Why? Because the Soviet Union cannot produce food. The Soviet Union has produced a hydrogen bomb and has produced atomic bombs. The Soviet Union has 4 million men under arms. It plans to spend billions of dollars for defense. But there is one thing the Soviet Union has not learned how to do and that is to milk cows or to have enough cows to milk. The Soviet Union has not learned how to produce cereal grains and food fibers for a growing nation. The Soviet Union today stands literally on the brim of starvation in many of its areas because of the failure of its agricultural economy. Perhaps one of the reasons why the Soviet Union has not been more aggressive is that it remembers what Napoleon once said: that an army travels on its stomach. The Soviet Union is having serious problems—the problem of its scarcity of food, the problem of the failure of its farm people, the problem of the failure of its farm economy.

But, Mr. President, the United States is a Nation that has fewer men and women on the farms every year. This is a Nation which is growing at the rate of 2,700,000 persons every year, a Nation that, by 1975, will need another 100 million acres of cropland, or the equivalent thereof, under 1950 production standards, in order to feed its people.

This is a growing country. We have a great agricultural economy that has served us well. We have an agricultural commodity economy that produces great people, fine communities, country schools, consolidated schools, community churches, small villages and small cities, all of which are the backbone and hope of the social life and moral fiber of the United States.

We have an agricultural program designed to benefit this great group of people. We have provided for agricultural research, vocational education, soil conservation, farm credit, rural electrification, rural telephone programs, and farm price supports. I say that never has the Government of the United States done anything quite so well for such fine people as it has done in its agricultural program for America's farmers.

Therefore, I say that now the job is not to retard, but to go forward. The job is to see to it that we use the abundance that is ours for those who are in need. Our task should be to contemplate a little bit the tomorrows. Too often have we legislated for agriculture on an emergency basis. We need to have a long-range agricultural program, one that will give farmers some assurance for the days to come. If we do not do that, we are not going to get young people to go back to the farms. Why should young men and women go back to the farm lands, or go back to the dairying business, when they find that a Secretary of Agriculture can lower their prices 15 percent by a stroke of the pen? Not on your life.

Do you think, Mr. President, that any industrial worker in a union would take that? Do you think American business would take that? American business would come before Congress and protest. Are we to think that the great American transportaiton system would take that? The railroads of the country would go before the Interstate Commerce Commission and say that they had to have an increase in rates, and they would justify it on the basis of an increased overhead as compared to a fair, equitable profit. The private utilities would go before the Federal Power Commission and say they needed an adjustment of rates. The gas companies would do the same thing on the basis of equity

capital invested and a fair and reasonable return on the investment. Any business in America when it gets into real, serious trouble will come to Congress or the State legislatures and ask for fair and equitable treatment.

But here we see the breadbasket of the world, the hope of the world, as Lincoln said. The production of food and fiber is being played with to a point that hundreds and hundreds of people are becoming far more concerned about that than that we may mismanage our political affairs. The remedy will be of benefit, not only to ourselves, but to the world, and everyone in the world.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO LIMIT YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGES IN DAIRY PRICE SUPPORT LEVELS

Contrary to the objectives of the Agricultural Act of 1949, milk producers in 1953 did not realize the support levels announced by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary announced price supports that were intended to reflect 90 percent of parity to the producers of manufacturing milk. Actually only 84 percent of parity was received, causing a loss of over $100 million to the producers of manufacturing milk alone, and around $200 million to the producers of all milk. The total drop in price for all milk sold from farms from 1952 to 1953 was 13.5 percent. The total reduction in income was $400 million, even though the volume of sales in 1953 was 5.4 percent above that in 1952. This severe drop in income has been a severe shock to dairy farmers and has put a severe strain on their ability to meet mortgage obligations.

Furthermore, the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority under the 1949 act to reduce announced supports from 90 percent of parity to as little as 75 percent of parity. When it is realized that for each 1 percent that supports or prices are lowered that dairy farm income may be lowered by $40 million the prospective results become staggering. From 1952 to 1953 average prices received by farmers, for each 100 pounds of milk equivalent sold, dropped from $4.71 to $4.08. If the Secretary elects to lower supports the full limit of his authority, then the support level would be dropped the equivalent of another 62 cents per hundredweight. In that case dairy farmers might realize only $3.56 for all milk sold during the 1954–55 marketing year. Then, if 103 billion pounds are marketed, income would be lowered from $4.6 billion in 1952 for 97.7 billion pounds of milk to $3.56 billion. Thus we would have the devastating paradox of 5 percent larger supplies bringing one-fourth less money.

Such a development would hardly be in line with point 6 of the President's message on agriculture of January 11, 1954, in which he stated:

"In keeping with the policy of gradual transition, the Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority under the Agricultural Act of 1949 to insure that year-to-year variation in price-support levels will be limited."

Neither would such a development be in line with the 1949 act and recommendations for legislation by the President which insure that changes in price supports for basic commodities and certain nonbasic commodities shall be limited to definite steps and rules.

For these reasons the National Milk Producers Federation believes the 1949 act should be amended to provide for limitations on year-to-year changes in price-support levels for dairy products. For this purpose the attached amendment is proposed:

"The price-support level for milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat for any year shall not be reduced by more than 5 percent of the actual price intended to be reflected to farmers for the preceding marketing year, except that such limitation does not apply to reductions due exclusively to adjustments in the parity index.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the parity percentage level at which price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat are provided shall not be less than the parity percentage level at which rigid mandatory price supports are provided for the basic commodities." (To be added at the end of subsec. 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the United States Senate is truly a great deliberative body. There are, of course, occasions when it is not so deliberative. Discussions may not be as deep as the sea on occasion, but they are, at least, as wide as the 48 States.

I have been entranced this afternoon by what started as a protestation of the order or policy announced by the Secretary of Agriculture. It was not very long before that discussion encompassed the Federal Reserve System, the Economic Report, the Soviet Union, high price supports, utilities, and everything else under the sun. So now I propose to disturb the equanimity of the Senate for a moment or two with a fact or two. Facts as we know, are stubborn things, but now and then it is necessary to advance or present them.

If memory serves me correctly, in the year 1949 the United States Senate was under Democratic jurisdiction, so to speak. In the year 1949 the very distinguished former Senator from Tennessee, one whom I always counted as a friend, the Honorable Kenneth McKellar, was the President pro tempore of this body. If I remember correctly, in the year 1949 the very distinguished Texan, who presided often as Speaker of the House of Representatives when I was a Member there, was the Presiding Officer of that body. There was a Democratic majority in this body and there was a Democratic majority in the other body. It was in the month of October 1949 when the Senate and the House were Democratic, and when the incumbent in the White House had identity with the Democratic Party, that the Agricultural Act of 1949 was placed on the books. So, Mr. President, the act of 1949 is no piece of Republican villainy; it was a Democratic measure. The act of 1949 was not a concoction of a Republican Congress; it was the fruit of a Democratic Congress.

I bring to the attention of the Senate a section of the act which was passed in a Democratic Congress, section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949. If I can understand and if I can read the English language, this is what it states:

The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at such level not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 75 percent of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines necessary in order to assure an adequate supply. Such price support shall be provided through loans on, or purchases of, the products of milk and butterfat.

I may say to my amiable friend from Minnesota, that is the act of 1949 which was put upon the statute books of the Nation by the administration and by the party of the Senator from Minnesota, and which was signed by the President of the party of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator knows that the act was placed on the books after a very hard fight in the Senate. The mandatory price supports on commodities, with regard to which the Senator has read, were placed on the statute books only after there had been a long and bitter struggle on the floor of the Senate. Incidentally, there was a majority of some 62 percent of Democratic Members who succeeded in putting the law on the books.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not know about the vigor of the struggle which took place on the floor of the Senate, because I was not a Member of the Senate at the time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was.

Mr. DIRKSEN. However, I do know the Congress was in session that year for 290 days, and there was an abundant opportunity for a Democratic Congress to agree upon an agricultural policy. The statute to which I have referred was placed on the books.

Mr. President, that section is still the law of the United States. That section is now being administered by a Republican Secretary of Agriculture. If there is anything wrong with the law, one should look for the seed in another administration besides this, because the law has been on the books for the past 5 years.

Mr. President, I bring again to the attention of the Senate the language of the act which states that the Secretary of Agriculture shall support, at from 75 percent and not to exceed 90 percent, as the Secretary shall deem necessary, in order to assure an adequate supply. That is the only criterion in the law for the support of dairy products. With respect to other commodities, 7 or 8 criteria are provided; with respect to dairy products, there is established only one criterion, and that is the question of an adequate supply.

I think it necessary, in the interest of fact rather than fancy, to consider the subject of supply. It was stated on the floor of the Senate a year ago that there existed no surplus of staggering dimensions. I would rather let the facts speak for themselves as to precisely what the inventory stocks are, because if we are going to deal with a very important policy question, we should know the facts.

First of all, I bring to the attention of the Senate what the stocks of dairy products under Government control were on February 20, 1953, 1 month after Mr. Benson became the Secretary of Agriculture. At that time there were

in the hands of the Government a little more than 60 million pounds of butter, a little more than 22 million pounds of cheese, and a little more than 66 million pounds of nonfat milk solids. Those stocks were in existence 1 month after the new Secretary of Agriculture took office.

If one were to measure those items in terms of milk equivalents, one would have a figure of 44 million pounds of milk equivalents. That was a year ago.

I now call the attention of the Senate to what the situation was as of the 10th of February 1954, which is a rather current figure. There are presently on hand 270,559,320 pounds of butter.

That is a lot of butter. If the per-capita consumption is 26 pounds a person, as it was estimated to be for 1953, that amount of butter would feed 10 million people for a year, if my arithmetic is correct.

There are presently on hand 282,040,354 pounds of cheese.

That looks like a Rocky Mountain of cheese in the inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In addition, there are on hand 469,558,000 pounds of nonfat dried milk.

If ever I saw a mountain of cheese and other dairy products, and everything that goes along with it, Mr. President, that is indeed a mountain.

It was not so about a year ago; but see what we have accumulated since that time. As against the equivalent of about 1,044,000,000 pounds of milk, we have today the equivalent of 8 billion pounds of milk. And that belongs to the people of the United States of America.

The law—not a Republican law, Mr. President, but a Democratic law—says the Secretary shall support prices at not to exceed 90 percent and at a minimum of 75 percent, as the Secretary determines to be necessary, in order to assure an adequate supply.

The Secretary of Agriculture has a conscience. He is a very able and devout man, and a patriot and a citizen along with it; and I admire his courage to the end for standing up on the rock of conviction.

I have read the mandate in the law. What is an adequate supply? It is for the Secretary of Agriculture to determine. In view of the supply at the present time, when it is urged that the Secretary continue to buy at a 90-percent level, what are we to say to the consumers and to the taxpayers of the United States of America? It is their money with which these surpluses are being purchased, and such money has to be reflected in an appropriation or an expenditure bill which will constantly throw the budget out of gear. That is the supply situation. The Secretary of Agriculture, in conscience, must make a determination of what is an adequate supply. When he reaches that point, he has no other course to follow, in my judgment, than to reduce the price-support level if he is going to conform to both the spirit and the letter of the law.

I think I can speak with knowledge because, after all, the northern section of the State of Illinois is given over to huge dairy farms, and cheese plants may be found all over the State. So I have some interest in the price of dairy products, and I try to keep up with the matter. I know that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture for an opinion as to what he, the Solicitor, thinks is the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture under the law. The Solicitor has indicated the following:

> Unless the Secretary can conscientiously determine that a support level of 75 percent will not assure an adequate supply, it is his obligation under the statute to fix the support level at 75 percent.

You will note, Mr. President, that in all the welter of discussion here, the facts have not been brought forth. But people are going to ask about the facts someday.

This situation reminds me a little of a fellow who saw an automobile accident, and later was put on the stand during the trial of the case in court. Counsel asked him, "Did you see the accident?"

The witness replied, "Yes, sir."

Then counsel asked, "How far were you from the point of the collision when it happened?"

The witness replied without hesitation, "Twenty-two feet nine and one-half inches."

Counsel looked at the court and at the jury, and then said to the witness, "Mr. Smart Aleck, how did you know it was that close?"

The witness replied, "Well, when it happened, I took out a tape measure and measured it because I knew some fool lawyer would ask me that question." [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, we are going to be asked some questions. Mere words will not suffice as answers; the facts will be necessary.

So, first, here is the act, passed by a Democratic Congress. In the second place, here is an opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, as to what is the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture, under the law. The Solicitor's opinion is that—

> Unless the Secretary can conscientiously determine that a support level of 75 percent will not assure an adequate supply, it is his obligation under the statute to fix the support level at 75 percent.

Mr. President, there is the whole story.

I suppose I can amplify the matter somewhat, from some other figures; and I think that would be wise, because the country should have the figures.

The Government's inventory, which means the taxpayers' inventory, because it is their money which must be used, and it is their credit which must be pledged and hypothecated to purchase these commodities, on April 1, 1953, was as follows: 122,500,000 pounds of butter, 74,500,000 pounds of cheese, 169,300,000 pounds of nonfat dried milk.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from Illinois state again the date of those figures?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. It is April 1, 1953.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from Illinois read the figures again?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Butter, 122,500,000 pounds; cheese, 74,500,000 pounds; nonfat dried milk, 169,300,000 pounds.

Whole milk equivalent—if the preceding figures are expressed in terms of whole milk—3,195,000,000 pounds.

Mr. President, the people of the United States are rich in dairy products. These belong to them.

Some purchases have been made since that time, and I shall state them for the RECORD: 264 million pounds of butter have been purchased. O Mr. President, what a mountain of succulent, golden bread-spread that really is!

Two hundred and forty-six million pounds of cheese have been purchased.

Mr. President, I am quite a fancier of cheese. I suppose that is because I was brought up that way in a small town in Illinois. I like all kinds of cheese.

So I know we are not going to run out of cheese for a little while, because we have bought 264 million pounds of it.

Then we read that we bought 490 million pounds of non-fat dried milk.

What is the total, when expressed in terms of whole milk equivalent? The total is 7,740,000,000 pounds.

Of course some of it has been sold. I can supply those figures for the RECORD.

For utilization, as it is called, 121,000,000 pounds of butter; 43,600,000 pounds of cheese; 198,000,000 pounds of non-fat dried milk.

But the inventory, Mr. President—in other words, what we had on hand—as of February 1, 1954, is truly staggering. The inventory, which was purchased with money from the Federal Treasury—which, after all, is the same thing as issuing debentures and notes and other obligations which the Treasury must buy in order to supply the Commodity Credit Corporation with funds—is the equivalent of more than 8 billion pounds of whole milk.

In the face of that situation, what is the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture under the law? By the way, Mr. President, I repeat that law was written, not by a Republican Congress, but by a Democratic Congress, in October, 1949, and in the same month it was signed by a Democratic President. What conscientious administrator, could read that mandate and reach any conclusion other than the one reached by Secretary Benson?

That is the whole story. Of course he can go on; he can continue to use the credit of the Nation, and he can continue to pile up an even greater mountain of surpluses. But in that event what kind of caustic criticism would there be from the people of the United States?

Mr. President, the time has arrived to come to grips with this matter.

I may say the Secretary of Agriculture certainly has given consideration to the question of future production. I have before me some figures to indicate what the production was in other years. There is no need to encumber the RECORD with them at the moment; but the fact of the matter is that, first of all, mild

winters and good pasturage had something to do with the increased production; and, in the second place, when the drought came to the Southwest, it was a kind of intuitive notice to the farmers in the Northern area that perhaps they had better hold on and continue to milk their dairy cows. So those were the factors which finally led up to an increase in dairy production. As I recall, in the last year it was nearly 4 billion pounds, when expressed in terms of fluid milk, over what it had been before.

Mr. President, with that kind of production staring agriculture in the face, with a mountain of cheese and butter and nonfat milk solids already in the inventory of the people of the United States, what other action could the Secretary of Agriculture take?

That is the whole story in a nutshell. If we are going to get back to a durable basis, instead of buying butter, to be stored in caves and wherever else storage space can be found, and, instead of buying cheese and storing it wherever storage space can be found, let us get this program geared to a flexible basis, which is what existing law calls for. Then we shall have made real progress in the direction of a more stable agriculture.

Mr. President, I admire the courage of the Secretary of Agriculture for standing up to his responsibility under the law, no matter what kind of caustic criticism may have been heaped upon him.

I am sure production will continue as time goes on. So this problem must be solved by some durable remedies.

Mr. President, it is a fact that the whole general farm problem was not solved in the 20 years of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

Some question has been raised about unemployment. I wish to remind our friends on the other side of the aisle that from 1933 to 1940, inclusive—a period of approximately 8 years—and after 8 years of expenditures, there were still 9½ million unemployed in the United States. Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle talk now as if 2½ million or 3 million unemployed represent a terrible situation.

President Eisenhower has been in office only 14 months. I think he has done a great and resolute job. If we give him a little more time, I believe he will swing the country out of its difficulties, because I think the people of the Nation have confidence in his soundness and in his determination to assure prosperity in the United States, within the framework of a free, competitive system.

My friends on the other side of the aisle had 8 years to do so, but they did not reduce the unemployment figure very far, for if my recollection of the figures for 1940 is correct—and I am drawing entirely upon my recollection—there were still 9½ million out of work.

The farm program was not solved. It was merely side-tracked by the war. Put an army in Europe and all over the world, and what happens? It must be fed. Our civilization moves out with our Army. Everything goes with it. We want our soldiers to have the best. The home folks must also be fed. When our allies cannot smite the soil and make it produce, they must be fed also.

So the task of feeding the world, feeding our allies, feeding our own people, and feeding an army, which at one time put 18 million persons in uniform, placed a tremendous burden upon the agricultural plant of the United States.

The war is over, thank God. But let no one take credit for solving the farm problem for a little while. Let no one take credit for a solution which is built upon a graveyard prosperity, and upon considerations of young blood. No matter what my political tag might be, I would never undertake to claim the credit for a prosperity built upon the broken bodies of young Americans all over the world. I think a sense of shame would prevent me from doing so.

Production for our allies, for our own country, and for our Army necessarily diminished. Thank God, our boys are coming home. Most of the countries in the world, and the majority of the population in most of the countries of the world, address themselves to agriculture. It would be strange indeed if they did not start producing, so that they can pay off their debts and have something to sell in the markets of the world, to enable them to procure raw materials and other things which they need.

Exports will be diminished. The needs of the military are diminished; and the chickens are coming home to roost. It is just that simple. In an adjustment someone is hurt.

I see my old friend, the former Governor of West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], seated on the other side of the aisle. I was in his State the other day. I said to the people of that State, "We have developed a state of mind in which we have become accustomed to high prices, high wages, inflation, broken bodies, a disregard for young blood, and the purchase and procurement of the instrumentalities of death." How careless we were. Then suddenly we got the idea that, having sent our people and the other peoples of the world through the valley of the shadow of fear and blood and disaster, somehow we could escape the consequences.

Long ago there was a philosopher on the eastern seaboard by the name of Ralph Waldo Emerson. If ever there was an unchallenged truth, it is the law of compensation. There is a great truth that has never been challenged. It is the law of action and reaction, which Newton discovered, perhaps in an orchard, a long time ago.

How can we tear the economic and social fabric of a country apart and escape payment of the bill? How can we send young people down the road to Armageddon and not pay the bill? Bless you, Governor, if I thought we could escape entirely without economic hurt or pain I would resign my seat in the Senate this afternoon. The law of action and reaction hold good not only in the physical field, but in the moral domain as well. Long ago St. John the Divine wrote a great and profound truth when he said, in the Revelation:

> How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?

That is good gospel, JOHN BRICKER. It is good politics, and good economics. Yet we indulge in frothy talk and persiflage as though we could escape paying the bill. It would be strange indeed if those who planted the seed could escape paying the bill.

I say to my Democratic friends, "Do not throw such stones at us. You put the law on the statute books. A Republican Secretary of Agriculture is only enforcing the law which you placed upon the statute books. Now you quarrel about it, because circumstances and conditions have developed because of which we have butter running out of our ears and cheese running out of our ears when butter is not. We also have a surplus of nonfat milk solids."

That is the story. I do not wish to be too unkind. I know that an election is coming in 1954. I know that some things must be said for the record. But, Mr. President, the record, based upon fact, will be made, and I intend to make it as we go along, not for reasons of narrow provincialism and partisanship, but because I believe it is a necessary service to the country to make sure, in an hour when they may be some dislocation, that all the facts are known, for, if economic crucifixion is on the way, I remind our Democratic friends that we all will go down the drain together. It will not be a case of crucifying a political party. That was not the case in 1931, when there was a Republican President and a Democratic Congress. That President interviewed more than 165 Members of Congress. He came to Congress hat in hand. If anyone wishes to get the facts, they are in the record for all to see. The Republican President pleaded with Members of Congress.

A man from my own State, Hon. Henry T. Rainey, was the majority leader in the House of Representatives. He was my congressional neighbor. Anyone who is interested can look in his biography and see what he said to Gilbert Haugen. He said, "I do not intend to ask for favorable consideration for the President's program. I do not intend to ask the committees for favorable reports. We intend to beat him."

They did beat him. He was a great statesman. While they were doing that, they did something more. They crucified the country by failing to give the President an opportunity and the necessary weapons and the instrumentalities with which to lift the country out of its distress, which was caused by the inflow of depressive forces from all over the world.

That is only a reminder. I am speaking now as a citizen, rather than a Republican. I want to be sure that this country will not go down the drain. I will not chide anyone for talking about a recession. That is his own business. I try to be as restrained in my language as I can.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. But may the Lord help me never to lose sight of the greater objective, which comes before partisanship, or before any narrow concept which may be uttered on this floor. That greater objective is the health and vital-

ity of all the people of the United States. It transcends every party consideration.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana knows nothing of the program which might have been before the Congress in 1931. He was not here at that time. However, he would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois whether he can point to any legislation which the present administration or the Secretary of Agriculture has requested, which would actually benefit the farmers, which has been refused by the Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Speaker speaking of 1931 or the present time?

Mr. LONG. I am talking about the present time, of course.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Democrats placed this law on the statute books. The Secretary of Agriculture has the duty of enforcing it. Was the Senator present when I read the language of section 201 (c)?

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Senator realizes that he is not answering my question. My question is this: What proposal has the administration—either the President or the Secretary of Agriculture—made which would enable the farmer to get along better, but which Congress has refused to enact into law? I know of no opportunity that we have had to vote favorably upon any measure which would benefit the farmers. I know of no such measure with respect to which the Democratic side of the aisle has turned the administration down. Can the Senator point to one?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am afraid my friend does not correlate my statement with the statement made on the floor by the very amiable and distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. He was taking the Secretary apart for announcing that, beginning April 1 of this year, the price support on dairy products will be reduced to 75 percent. Section 201 (c) was placed upon the statute books by the Democrats. That law was signed by the President on the 31st of October 1949. If I remember my contemporary history correctly, that was a President from the State of Missouri.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to read it for the edification of my friend from Louisiana, but I yield.

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana is interested in any measure which will genuinely help the farmers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Louisiana is familiar with the legislative processes of this great deliberative body. It was sometime in January that the President delivered his state of the Union message. Within the past few days a bill has been introduced and is now in the Committee on Agriculture. Hearings are under way. My friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] makes the point that, in view of that fact, the Secretary of Agriculture should have done nothing. What about the law? What about the Secretary's conscience? What about the criterion in the law which says that he shall support not in excess of 90 percent or lower than 75 percent, depending upon what he determines is necessary in order to assure an adeqate supply?

Suppose the Senator from Louisiana were presiding over the Department of Agriculture, with 250 million pounds of butter running out of his ears, and the amount increasing day by day, what action would he take? Would he buy more butter and raise still higher this golden mountain?

The Solicitor of the Agricultural Department told the Secretary there was a mandate in the law. I believe it is a mandate; and if I were in the position of the Secretary, I would have done as he has done.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The question I had in mind was that there has been criticism even by the Secretary of Agriculture himself of the present agricultural law. Beef cattle declined as low as 50 percent of parity or less last year. The Secretary of Agriculture, after Congress adjourned, stated that the law was not adequate. Yet he waited a year without asking for any changes in the law.

I have heard of no request for a change in the law which would genuinely help those who are raising beef cattle.

If the Secretary of Agriculture is not satisfied with the law as it relates to butter or other agricultural products, he should send us a recommendation as to what would help to correct the situation.

In the main the proposals I have heard are proposals for a so-called flexible price support program, rather than a proposal which would give full parity of income to the farmers. I understand the pledge made by the Senator's party last year, was that the farmers would receive 100 percent full parity income.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend from Louisiana that I do not quarrel about the section of the law I have just read. The Senator from Louisiana is quarreling about it because the Secretary has put it into effect. When the mountain of surplus gets so high, what shall the Secretary do, except to invoke the provisions which were written into the law? I believe he is doing the right thing. How else are we ever to gear supply to demand?

I do not quarrel about it. It is from the other side of the aisle, that the Secretary has been taken to task. It is from there he receives protests because he has enforced a very sensible provision of the law.

Mr. LONG. I am not quarreling about that particular provision of the law. The point I make is that if the administration is not satisfied with the law on the statute books and if it feels the law is inadequate to provide for the well being of the farmers, it should recommend provisions which will help us do better. However, no revision has been requested which would insure farmers a greater parity income. If such proposals are sent to Congress I shall support them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Secretary of Agriculture is not quarreling about that particular provision in the law. If he needs some added authority it will be along the line of somehow expanding the consumptive use of the surplus commodities which are stored up in the country.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Illinois was referring to the time during the 30's when the Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives allegedly were not cooperative with the then President of the United States, who was a Republican. The only point I wish to make is that the same situation does not obtain today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no. My friend from Louisiana probably was not in the Chamber during the very interesting colloquy that took place a short time ago. It reminded me of the little ditty:

"The time has come," the walrus said, "to talk of many things:
"Of shoes—and ships—and ceiling wax—
"Of cabbages—and kings."

From cabbages and kings we went into the Federal Reserve Board, the price of hides, the unemployment situation, and a great many other subjects. It had all started out as a protest against the order of the Secretary of Agriculture which will go into effect on April 1.

I confined myself to that order, because I do not want the RECORD to be confused. I want the facts to be fully known.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, the Senator from Illinois is aware of the fact that the present program with respect to dairy products which is now in the law has remained in the law during the present administration. Is it not a fact that last April the Secretary of Agriculture could have reduced the support price and made it lower than 90 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly he could have reduced it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course he could.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, wait a minute. I want to be sure that my friend has all the facts. Did the Senator from Louisiana see the inventory position we had a year ago as compared with today? Expressed in terms of fluid milk, we have 8 billion pounds in the inventory today, as compared with 1,044,000,000 pounds a year ago. That is the difference.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last year, a little while after he was nominated for the position which he now holds, I asked him why it was that he did not make the support price less than 90 percent. He said he had been pressured into not doing it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend from Louisiana forgets the whole purpose of the law.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the purpose to have the Secretary pressured into taking action or not taking action?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course not.

Mr. ELLENDER. The support price could have been set between 75 percent and 90 percent. The mountain of butter to which the Senator from Illinois has referred would not be so high, if only the Secretary had exercised the right he had under the law to make it less than 90 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The only question is, When we get a mountain of it on our hands shall we use a flexible provision or not? The burden of the discussion this afternoon was that the law should not be used now.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the mountain of butter and cheese and dried milk now in surplus was created under a law which has been recommended by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly. No one quarrels about it. What we are trying to do is this: We say the law is all right and that that section is all right. We say, let the Secretary use it. But the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] protests when the Secretary of Agriculture undertakes to use it now.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to tell my friend from Illinois that the Secretary could have used the law last April, but he did not see fit to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He did not have to use it last April.

Mr. ELLENDER. He did use it in another direction. He made the support price 90 percent. He had to make a declaration prior to April 1 of last year, and he made it 90 percent, when he could have made it 75 percent or 80 percent or 85 percent. In answer to a question by me he said he was pressured into doing it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, well——

Mr. ELLENDER. We have the flexible law on the statute books now, and we can see how it works with respect to butter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not quarreling. The quarrel comes from the other side of the aisle. If I misstate the fact, let the Senator from Minnesota stand in his place and deny it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota will soon stand in his place and not only deny it but disprove it. I hope the Senator from Illinois will remain in the Chamber to hear my denial.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Illinois will be here. However, if I can hear and understand the English language, if the Senator from Minnesota did not take the Secretary of Agriculture to task this afternoon for issuing his order, then I am a Chinaman and I do not understand the English language.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois is not a Chinaman and he understands the English language. If the Senator from Minnesota had not taken the Secretary to task he would have felt derelict in his responsibility.

I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I have only started, and the Secretary of Agriculture will have more to come from me, and the Senator from Illinois may share in the blessings.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a confession, Mr. President. The Senator from Minnesota admits, of course, that that is what he was thinking. So I simply cite the record as a fact and I surrender the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, no one enjoys listening to the Senator from Illinois more than does the junior Senator from Minnesota. The Senator from Illinois is a brilliant speaker. He has a capacity of persuasion which is second to none. For the facts he has available, he makes a presentable case.

I should like to add a few comments which may be of some help to my distinguished colleagues, and also serve as some semblance of inspiration to the Secretary of Agriculture.

We have heard a great deal of debate this afternoon. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said it has covered everything from ships to sealing wax, and even the depression of the 1930's. I noticed that the Senator covered the 12 long years from 1920 to 1933 in approximately a split second. He commented upon the condition of the country from 1933 to 1940, and upon the fact that after those 7 years there were still some 8½ million unemployed persons. Then the number went to 9½ million in the next paragraph—anyway, to 9 million persons unemployed. But I would remind the Senator from Illinois that after 12 years of his party's leadership this country was prostrated, and the fact that the Democratic administration raised it up even to its knees was a feat second to none.

The Senator from Illinois has commented upon the fact that we on this side of the aisle are disturbed because there are 3 million persons unemployed. I am happy that the other side admits there are 3 million unemployed. The last figure I have seen issued by the Government was 2,800,000. In 1933, when Mr. Roosevelt took over, there were 15 million persons unemployed. The mess that was talked about was at least not an economic mess.

The Senator from Illinois makes a great point about the fact that we have gone into war and have built prosperity upon the terrible destruction of war. Other nations have collapsed because of war. Other agricultural economies have been destroyed because of war. Our country has not been destroyed. Our agricultural economy met the task of war and its responsibilities and came out strong with a modernized agriculture, with soil being rebuilt, with electricity on the farms, and with greater production and greater income. It is a tribute to the farmer that he went ahead with the program, with a great capital investment on his part, knowing that he had a friendly government.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. We took several million returning servicemen and found jobs for them at a time when the war industries were closing down.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. He brings out a pertinent fact.

The Senator from Illinois chastised me because I stood on the floor of the Senate and rebuked the Secretary of Agriculture for pulling out the props from under dairy farmers. The Secretary did not need to do that. The Senator says—and I use his own figures, which I took down rather carefully—that on February 20, 1953, there were 60 million pounds of butter, 22 million pounds of cheese, and 62 million pounds of nonfat milk solids. That was the surplus, above an adequate supply, which the Government had purchased under the 90-percent-of-parity program which had been in existence for quite a while.

Then the Senator from Illinois pointed out that on April 1, 1953, just 24 hours after the Secretary of Agriculture announced the continuation of 90 percent of parity for dairy products, to which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] referred, there were 122,500,000 pounds of butter, 74½ million pounds of cheese, and 169 million pounds of dried milk solids.

If the Secretary of Agriculture, on March 31, 1953, with all that surplus, could find an attorney in the Department of Agriculture who would advise him to continue price support at 90 percent, he could have found one in 1954.

The Senator from Illinois has selected a very feeble rod and reed upon which to rest his argument, on the basis of an adequate supply. There was more than an adequate supply at that time. If the Secretary was basing his judgment on adequate supply, he was doing an illegal act in 1953.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a photostatic copy of a leading newspaper in my section of the country, from which I should like to read a paragraph with reference to certain addresses given in Minnesota in 1952. It says at the top:

IKE AND ADLAI OUTLINE FARM PROGRAMS—EISENHOWER CALLS FOR 100 PERCENT OF PARITY; STEVENSON SUPPORTS DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S PLANK

Dwight D. Eisenhower made his bid for the important farm vote today with a plan which he said would guarantee present price supports for another 2 years, and then would lead to higher prices for the farmers.

He called for a wider range of farm-crop supports including "greater protection" for producers of perishable products such as meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables.

Eisenhower said that farmers' returns must be boosted from the present 90 percent of parity to a full 100 percent—but in ways that would "minimize Government control and protect farmers' independence."

"All I know of farmers convinces me," he said, "that they would rather earn their share than to have it as a Government handout.

"I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income," Eisenhower said, "and a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity—but full parity."

Mr. President, I hope it has been noted that the Republican candidate referred to greater production of perishable commodities, such as meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables. He called not for 90 percent of parity, but for 100 percent, and he said he would continue 90 percent for the next 2 years. The President of the United States kept his word. When it became known in this Capital that the Secretary of Agriculture was going to reduce price supports, the President of the United States saw to it that he kept his word.

Mr. President, it appears to me that with a little programing and planning we would not need to find ourselves in this situation.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois indicates that the only thing we can do is to buy butter. We have had a full year within which to figure out

something else. I suggest that last year when Mr. Benson authorized 90 percent of parity, the record will reveal that he called upon the dairy industry and upon his Department to figure out a better program, but after long study the Secretary of Agriculture came up with exactly what the Senator from Illinois is now criticizing, namely, the statutory language in the present law as amended and as added to the Aiken Act of 1948. In other words, the amendments of 1949 with relation to dairy price supports. This is what the President now suggests. Therefore, I ask this question: Are the President of the United States and his Secretary of Agriculture saying that all we are going to have is 75 percent of parity?

The Eisenhower proposals to this Congress called for a continuation of flexible price supports of 75 to 90 percent on dairy products. In fact, the language of the President indicated there is no need of a change. I think it is about time the farmers find out immediately whether they are going to get 75, 90 or 100 percent. I did not write these stories. I did not write the headlines. The name of the junior Senator from Minnesota is not on them.

I say the farm people were told as follows:

He called for a wider range of farm-crop supports including "greater protection" for producers of perishable products such as meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables.

I have a copy of the speech, so we need not look at the press reports. I ask Senators to listen to this:

September 6. Kasson, Minn.

Fourth, we must find sound methods of obtaining greater protection for our diversified farms, our producers of perishable foods. They yield the rich variety of meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables that support our nutritious national diet. As provided in the Republican platform, the nonperishable crops so important to the diversified farmer—crops such as oats, barley, rye, and soybeans—should be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops.

The Democrat planners have made the diversified farmer the forgotten man of agriculture. They keep saying, "There is no way of protecting perishables except through the Brannan plan." But we can and will find a sound way to do the job without indulging in the moral bankruptcy of the Brannan plan.

The moral bankruptcy of the Brannan plan? What happened to the moral program that came to Congress? We surely got the bankruptcy cleaned up, and the situation became very moral all at once.

If the wool growers could stand a little of that moral bankruptcy and get 90 percent of parity, perhaps other producers also can stand a little of it.

There are 1 or 2 other gentle observations I wish to make. Does the flexible price-support program mean it will be the minimum figure? I noticed that the President, in sending to Congress his program with respect to other agricultural commodities, says that there will not be any sudden drops in farm income; it will be in easy stages. The program will be a modernized parity formula, which will not become effective all in 1 year; it is to be extended. The President makes it very clear that as to corn, wheat, and cotton, there will be no sudden drop in the price-support program.

Yet now a group of American farmers, representing the backbone of American agriculture, are given a 15-percent clobber right over the head, all in one fell swoop. I say that is not equity. I say it represents a loss of from $500 million to $600 million a year in cash income to American farmers.

The question has arisen as to the mountains of surpluses. I am interested in knowing why the Senator from Illinois did not comment on the reduced budget for the school lunch program. The school lunch program budget is $15 million less than it was last year. If the Senator from Illinois wants to do something about the mountains of surpluses, let him advocate a school lunch program of a couple of hundred million dollars a year, which this country can well afford. There are children in our schools who need the food. The health of our people is as important as is any other aspect of our social life.

The Senator from Illinois points out that we have enough dairy products to feed 10 million people. That is exactly what I have recommended we should start doing. We have 4½ million people of old age. I should like to see some United States Senator try to get along on $35 or $45 a month. We have in this country 4½ million people who are receiving less than $50 a month on which to live. They cannot buy butter; they cannot buy milk. They do not live; they subsist.

Even though Congress extended an additional $5 a month for old-age assistance, the actual welfare payments we give to our citizens during the course of a year represent a puny, paltry amount. What about the aged, dependent people, the blind, the deaf, and the disabled? There are almost 9½ million of them. With a little imagination, we could get something done to help them. It would not bankrupt the United States of America; in fact, it would enrich the Nation.

Other things could be done, too. New means of marketing and new means of distribution could be found. The dairy industry itself presented two plans that I know of to the Department of Agriculture. Neither one of them was accepted; in fact, neither one was given public discussion to any degree.

I am simply saying, let us stop trying to see who gets the best of the other person in the argument here. It is wonderful for Senators to argue about this question, but I ask my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois, what about the $600 million loss of income to the dairy farmers of the United States? What is his program for restoring 100 percent of parity? The Democrats did not promise that. We were out-promised 10 percent the last time. We were out-bid on the hustings.

The photostatic copies of the statements to which I have addressed myself prove that to be so. It was said that 90 percent was not sufficient; that 100 percent was the goal. It was said that 90 percent of parity would be maintained for 2 years to come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have followed the argument of the Senator from Minnesota with a great deal of interest. I think he is making a good case and is making an honest appraisal.

We hear a great deal said these days about the flexible price support program. Of course, because of the action taken by the Secretary of Agriculture, dairy products have suffered a decline in price supports. It is my understanding that the President in his message, speaking of price supports of from 75 percent to 90 percent, referred to the wool industry, in which I am very much interested, because the people of my State depend to a certain extent upon the growing of wool. The President has come up with what might be considered to be a counterpart of the old Brannan plan. Does the Senator from Minnesota remember that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remember it well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator from Minnesota remember how the Republicans disliked it? They did not think a two-price system was worth anything. But what has President Eisenhower suggested as a means of alleviating the critical wool situation in the United States? He said, in effect, that the sheepman should sell his wool in the marketplace for what the wool would bring. Then the Government, out of revenue derived from the imposition of a tax on the importation of foreign wool, would pay the sheep grower 90 percent of parity for his wool.

Why should there be discrimination? I believe the sheep grower should get 90 percent of parity, and, if possible, 100 percent. I think the small cattleman should, too. But I believe the dairy farmer is entitled to it just as much as those who produce the six basic crops.

If I may go a little further, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota mentioned earlier this afternoon that subsidies paid by the Government to the farmers over a 20-year period amounted to a little in excess of $1 billion. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from Minnesota tell the Senate and the people of the United States how much in the way of subsidies business has received during the past 20 years, or merely during the past year?

Magazine publishers, newspaper publishers, those who build ships and who build and fly planes all receive subsidies. Why not make a comparison. Mr. Benson seems to be setting off the farm element as against the rest of the population. Let us try to determine exactly what the Government is paying in the form of subsidies, and how much business is getting. Let me suggest that we see how much business has received in subsidies, not for the past 20 years, but for the last year. How does the figure compare with what the farmers have received over the past 20 years?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Some time ago, in the month of September, I received from the Bureau of the Budget, the executive agency of the Government having to do with such matters, official reports setting forth certain figures with respect to what are known as special services to economic groups.

From these reports I find that agriculture received $463 million in 1952; $547 million estimated in 1953; and $2,857,000,000 for a 5-year total, from 1949 through 1953.

Business received $1,041,000,000 in 1952; $1,018,000,000 estimated in 1953; and $4,430,000,000 for the 5-year total.

Labor received $200 million in 1952; $206 million estimated in 1953; and $1,006,000,000 for the 5-year total.

These are not my figures; they are figures supplied by the Bureau of the Budget. They have been made a matter of public notice and of public discussion.

I think the situation has been stated quite clearly by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], in a presentation to the Senate. The distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER] made a breakdown of the actual cost of the price support program over a 20-year period.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. On the six basic crops, the loss, over a period of 20 years, was less than $21 million; on the nonbasics, over a similar period of years, it was $1,080,000,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So in the case of agriculture there is a loss, in a 20-year program, of approximately $1,080,000,000. During that period of time agriculture's income went up $84 billion. During that period of time agriculture has received 3 percent of the Government's peacetime expenditures; yet it represents 15 percent of the population.

I have studied the foregoing facts, but I am citing the figures from memory.

We ought not to be picking at any one group. I am not opposed to county newspapers having free circulation in their counties; I am for it. I am not opposed to magazines and newspapers having low postage rates, even less than the cost of distribution. I believe in the free press and the widest dissemination of magazines and periodicals. I am not opposed to American business being given help. I wish it to be given help. I am not opposed to American hospitals, both private and public, receiving Government assistance. I desire to have the best medical attention for Americans. I am not opposed to a sensible and reasonable expenditure of public funds to maintain solvency in America's agricultural economy. We can argue endlessly about what the price support level should be. The only question to be answered is, At what level is the breaking point between solvency and insolvency reached? What is the level of solvency and the level of insolvency in a price-support program?

When the Government, which is in the price support business, reduces price supports to 75 percent of parity, I think a burden rests upon the Government to show that Americans engaged in agriculture can live on such price supports. Let those responsible prove that such price supports will not mean the liquidation of the dairy industry. There will be hundreds and hundreds of little people, small farmers, who will never be heard. Their voices will never get to the floor of the Senate. Their articles will never appear in the great newspapers of America. They will be liquidated. They will have to sell their herds, lose their farm equipment, go out of business; and we will charge that to an "adjustment." The trouble with trying to define what is meant by "adjustment" is that it depends on who is getting adjusted. Every time a Republican administration adjusts America, it adjusts it downward; it never adjusts America upward. Why in the name of common sense we have to go through this process is beyond me.

I desire to reply to the argument of the Senator from Illinois about the adequate supply formula. The 75 to 90 percent formula is workable in theory and not in fact, because in April 1953 the Secretary of Agriculture supported dairy products at 90 percent, and the butter was still running out of our ears, to use the language of the Senator from Illinois.

In 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture decided to support butter at 75 percent, not 80 percent, not 82½ percent, not 87 percent, not even 77 percent, but the lowest figure in the book.

I say to the farmers of America this may be the shadow of things to come. If the Secretary of Agriculture can look upon a surplus and say it is so great that we have to go to the bottom of the scale of price supports, we do not have in effect a flexible price-support program, but a price-support program of the minimum 75 percent of parity.

I think the President realized that situation when he stated that a reduction in the price-support program should not go into effect hastily.

Corn, wheat, rice, and other grain products are to be adjusted in easy stages, but the administration is saying that the dairy farmer has been a good fellow and needs no similar aid. The administration knows that a dairy farmer cannot get out of the dairy busines without literally liquidating his assets, without wrecking his family's savings; so he will have to take it.

I rise on the floor of the Senate, on behalf of some of the finest farmers in America, to protest what I consider to be an unconscionable act on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture. I know I am voicing the sentiments of many Members of this body and many Members of the House of Representatives.

Last year when farm prices declined, Congress was not asked to pass legislation to relieve the situation which existed in the areas where large quantities of beef were being produced.

After the Congress adjourned, the Secretary of Agriculture traveled across the country, making speeches explaining the reason why the cattle farmer was in the situation he found himself, that it was due to a law passed by the previous Democratic Congress.

It seems to me that we should make the issue clear on the floor of the Senate that many of us desire to vote for a program which would make it possible for the Republican administration to keep the promise made during the last campaign; but we do not care to support a program which might mean the cotton farmer would be faced with the situation in which the dairy farmer now finds himself. We had hoped the administration would support a program which would guarantee 100 percent of parity to the farmers. I would be delighted to support such a program.

The recommendations of this administration with regard to cotton are 75 to 90 percent of parity. I hope that the Members from the cotton-growing States observe what has happened to dairy farmers who had 75- to 90-percent support prices for their products. The dairy farmers did not receive the benefit of even 80 or 85 percent; they were dropped to the bottom of the cistern. They were put at the bottom of the well, as low as they could be put.

I hope no one is being fooled. There will be a great deal of propaganda stating that the friends of the administration from the cotton States know that they will not be let down to 75 percent. I suggest that they try it for size and see.

Madam President, I previously read only one clipping which I had. I have before me a photostatic copy of the Saturday, September 6, 1952, issue of the Minneapolis Star. The Star had two editions on the same day. One of the headlines states, "Eisenhower's Farm Program. Asks 100 Percent Parity With Less Government Control."

Poor Adlai Stevenson. He had to defend just 90 percent.

Another headline states, "General Lashes at 'Agricrats.' Says Democrats Treat Farmer as 'Political Captive.'"

Who is the political captive today?

The second headline reads, "Eisenhower Calls for 100 Percent of Parity."

Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say that I know that the President, as a candidate and now, desires to see American agriculture have equity and fair play. I ascribe no ill motive to the President. I suggest only that he call the Secretary of Agriculture to the White House and have a conversation with him. The President had better talk to the Secretary of Agriculture, and not to the Solicitor. We do not want a situation resulting from the Secretary of Agriculture's asking the Solicitor what farm price supports shall be put into effect. I do not desire to rely upon lawyers in the Department of Agriculture to determine the future of American agriculture. Why did not the Secretary of Agriculture interview some dairy farmers and ask them what they should get? The Secretary of Agriculture did have dairy producers in his office. They did not approve 75 percent of parity. The dairy processors did not recommend such a figure; but the Solicitor, a lawyer, did, because the Secre-

tary of Agriculture desired to be sure he did not violate the law.

The Senator from Illinois said the Secretary of Agriculture is a man of conscience. I wish the Secretary of Defense had more of a conscience when he decided to pay 15 cents a pound for butter for the Army. Does the Secretary of Defense think farmers can receive 15 cents a pound for butter and be able to buy Oldsmobiles or Chevrolets?

I know the Secretary of the Treasury estimated that butter was worth 38 cents a pound in reserves. Yet the law states, and no Senator on the floor disputes it, that when there shall be an evaluation or an inventory of surpluses, those inventory figures shall be on the basis of the price supports which the Government has put into effect.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in an attempt to get the Congress to cancel the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which amounted to 700 or 800 million dollars, cited a large accumulation and stated that butter was worth only 38 cents a pound in storage. Yet the same government has sold it to another department for 15 cents a pound. The Secretary stated that oleo can be obtained for the same amount. I might tell the Secretary that one can obtain transportation from a $1,200 car just as one can from a Cadillac; but there is no comparison.

The Secretary of the Treasury states that butter is worth 38 cents a pound. Secretary of Agriculture Benson states it is worth 75 percent of parity. However, those who produce it and pay rent and taxes, who maintain homes, who clothe children and send them to school, who contribute to their churches, who join the PTA, who till the soil, who spend their lives in agriculture, say it is worth 90 percent of parity, which is 10 percent below fair play.

Since the administration is going to lower the prices the farmers receive for the products of their farms, I call upon the administration to lower a few other things. How about lowering a few taxes? The only taxes that are going off the books are the ones we prescribed in the 81st Congress.

Mr. LONG. How about lowering the price of coffee 50 cents a pound?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for the suggestion. Yes, Madam President, why is not the price of coffee lowered? Of course it is a foreign commodity, but it affects the folks at home.

There are many other things that can be done.

Madam President, I am sure the battle will continue to be waged in the days to come. I shall be prepared to continue it at any hour that is convenient to the opposition.

In the meantime, I call upon the Secretary of Agriculture to review the situation. There is still time to do so between now and April 1. I ask him to give consideration to the Congress. Let him let the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture give him some advice.

The Secretary of Agriculture should do for the dairy producers of my State of Minnesota what he has done for the tobacco growers. The tobacco growers have the benefit of 90 percent of the parity price for tobacco. Let the Secretary of Agriculture do for the dairy producers of my State what he has done for the sugar producers, who receive from 90 percent to 100 percent of parity for the sugar they produce. That program costs a great deal of money, but I am in favor of it; I voted for it. I wish to see the sugar producers make a living, too.

Similarly, Madam President, let the Secretary of Agriculture do for the dairy producers of my State what he has done for the wool producers, who also have the benefit of 90 percent of parity for their product—even if we did have to give it a little injection of Brannanism. [Laughter.]

But when it comes to helping the dairy producers, it is said that "things are getting tough," and that the parity price for dairy products should be lowered to 75 percent. I think such a move spells disaster, and I believe my statement will be borne out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I would not see the RECORD for this afternoon closed without referring once more to the facts.

To my colleagues who were not in the Chamber earlier this afternoon, because they were detained in committee meetings, I should like to say that earlier today the Senator from Minnesota lashed out against the Secretary of Agriculture for preparing to undertake on April 1, the beginning of the marketing year, to reduce the price supports of dairy products from 90 percent to 75 percent.

Madam President, of all those who have presented curious arguments and have indulged in the begging of a question, the Senator from Minnesota is indeed in a class by himself. He speaks about comparing price supports on dairy products with price supports on tobacco. Of course, a tobacco farmer can put tobacco seed in the ground or not put it in the ground, as he prefers. If he does not put the seed in the ground, no tobacco will be grown by him. A farmer who plants seed is thus able to reduce his crop. So quotas can be applied to tobacco. Similarly, quotas can be applied to cotton, corn, and wheat. They are susceptible to some measure of control.

On the other hand, it is not possible to say to a cow, "Do not give so much milk" [laughter], because so long as the dairy cattle are on the farm, the milk will flow.

So, what does my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, say? I want to be sure the people of his State will know, from the RECORD. He says, "Keep the present program going at 90 percent of parity, at least until we can get a better look—no matter what the law is, no matter what the conscience of the Secretary of Agriculture is. Keep it going. Buy the dairy products at 90 percent of parity; put them into storage. We will worry about the cost later; but keep up these price supports."

Where is the end to such a program, inasmuch as it is not possible to apply quotas to dairy cattle or to the production of milk?

My friend, the Senator from Minnesota, has a way of forgetting all the facts, at times. So I must refresh his recollection, by pointing out that in the last quarter of last year—and taking it as a basis—milk production in the United States was 10 billion pounds higher than it was in 1952. It is a little like the small boy who asked for a machine with which to make salt for everyone. When he got the machine, he kept on making salt. Finally he made so much salt that he threw all of it into the ocean, and that is how we got salt water. [Laughter.]

So we are urged to "keep the machine going."

We are spending $460,000 a day—just think of it—$460,000 a day—for rental on Liberty ships, for rental of caves and warehouses and refrigerator space in which to store surplus commodities. Yet the Senator from Minnesota says, "Keep the program going."

The fact that such a program adds to the public debt and to the budget seems to make no difference to him. In the next breath he says, "Let us have a little lower taxes."

Well, Madam President, how are we to have lower taxes unless we first stop such a program and curtail it, so that at least there is a chance to save a little money and bring the budget into balance?

The argument the Senator from Minnesota presents is a most curious one. Let us be sure the whole story is told, so it will not be lost in a nebulous maze of English language that goes all over the lot.

I am willing to let the facts speak for themselves.

I now yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know whether the Senator from Illinois will recognize my question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed I shall. I simply did not wish to prolong the discussion.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Illinois comes from a great agricultural State, which has important dairy interests. Although they do not compare in size with those of my own State of New York, yet I realize they are very substantial.

I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois will agree that I am correct in saying there has been no reduction—and I realize that a reduction cannot be initiated by the Secretary of Agriculture—in the price of the grains the dairymen must buy to feed to their cows, if there is to be a steady and substantial supply of milk; whereas, is it not a fact that the Secretary of Agriculture on his own initiative, and within the powers given to him by law, is going to reduce by 15 percent the price supports for milk and milk products?

In other words, the dairy farmer is to receive 15 percent less than he has been

receiving in the last month or the last year, although he will have to pay substantially the same price for all the feed he gives his cattle, in order to have them produce the milk the Nation requires. Is not that a fact?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether it is a fact. Let me ask my friend the Senator from New York: Does he wish to keep this kind of program going, and does he wish to continue to have surpluses accumulate, regardless of the factor of the relationship between cost and production and the return the farmer receives, and regardless of the necessity of reaching a point where there is at least a reasonable balance between supply and demand?

That is the whole purpose of flexible parity, and it is the purpose of the President's program.

But when the time comes to put it into effect, there is loud protest.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, now the Senator from Illinois has asked me a question.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, will the Senator from California yield to me at this time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to give my version of the present dairy product surplus situation in the United States.

In the past 3 or 4 years we have had 90 percent of parity incentive prices for dairy products. It was very proper to offer 90 percent of parity price supports, because a shooting war began, and we were faced with an emergency, and we did not know how long it would last.

The farmers have responded. They have very greatly increased the number of cows. I must say that a good deal of the dairy surplus comes from the territory of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and myself. We are producing about 18 percent more milk than we were 2 years ago, and the consumption has gone up only possibly 4 percent. That is the reason for our dairy surpluses. We have had unseasonably favorable weather. Up until this year we have had an adequate supply of grain in the country. We have had an adequate supply of roughage. We have had better cows than we used to have. So we have produced very large surpluses.

I find that this winter many of our farms are overstocked with cattle. Farmers have been buying Canadian cows this winter and paying as much as $350 a head. They have not had hay enough to carry the additional cows. They have been buying Canadian hay at high prices. They have had to buy more grain than usual, at a price which I think is comparable to that of last year. It was down in the fall, but I believe it is now up again. Of course, the farmers were caught in the squeeze, but the principal squeeze was caused by the increased production, which is about 18 percent so far as New England and New York is concerned.

With the lowering of the support price for butter, cheese, and powdered milk, New England, and I believe also New York, will receive that lowered support only on class II, or surplus milk. The price of class I milk will be fixed, as usual. In some parts of the country where there are marketing agreements, the price of class I milk is tied to the price of butter, just as it used to be in New England and New York. But in our area the price of class I milk is tied to the purchasing power of the people, as indicated by department-store sales. It is tied to the general price level, as shown, I believe, by the Federal Reserve bank, and it is tied to cost of production. In New England we are not tied to the prices of butter, cheese, and powdered milk. We are not tied to the price of butter in any respect.

What this will mean to us temporarily in New England is that, instead of a 90-percent guaranty for class II milk, we shall receive 75 percent for that percentage of our milk, which is so-called surplus.

As the able Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] stated a few minutes, or a few hours ago, we must have a normal surplus of 20 percent in order to take care of unusual demands for milk at certain times and upon certain occasions. But we are producing far beyond that point. I understand that in the Boston area we are likely to have a milk surplus of 60 percent sometime this year.

That does not make a favorable appeal to our friends in the Dakotas, Kansas, and western Minnesota, which are primarily manufacturing areas, because we contribute to the surplus which pushes their market down, and they do not like it very well.

Now that I am on my feet, I should like to clear up one other matter. The proposal to make payments on wool has been likened to the Brannan plan. I know that anything which suggests payments rather than loans and purchases is likely to be likened to the Brannan plan. However, I wish to point out certain differences. The main points of the Brannan plan were:

First, 100-percent supports for crops and commodities which comprise about 70 percent of the agricultural output of the country. That 100-percent support would certainly mean a surplus at all times, and low prices at all times.

The second point was the feature of payments to the producer to make up the difference between what he received in the market and 100 percent guaranteed support.

Third—and this was the really bad thing about the Brannan plan—it would have restricted production, as of that time, to approximately $24,000 per farm. It would tend to put most of the big producers, and particularly the dairy producers, out of business. It might not put them out of business entirely, but it would require them to bring their production down to $24,000 a year per farm.

The upshot of such a plan would be—and I suspect that was the result intended—to break up the very large farms and plantations and divide the land among people who did not have much land. In countries like Italy and other countries which are heavily overpopulated, I think it is probably essential that the large farms and estates be broken up and the land redistributed. But those are countries where there is not land enough to go around. Here in America we still have plenty of land. So I think the main bad feature of the Brannan plan was that it would bring to America plans which had been used in the countries of Eastern Europe, and which would not be acceptable to the people of the United States.

So it is true that the Brannan plan had provision for payments, but the Brannan plan, in guaranteeing 100 percent supports, also had provision for perpetual overproduction. It also contained the very unacceptable proposal for breaking up the large plantations and farms and redistributing the land among the people.

I certainly wish more people could live on the land. There is something about living on the land that makes one feel that he has a stake in his country. But when we break up an economical unit into several uneconomical units, we must consider that we are increasing the cost of production, and probably greatly increasing the cost of living for all the people of the country.

So let us not compare the payments proposed for wool or payments proposed for butter—and I think perhaps payments would work on butter, for a while, at least—with the plan which contained such revolutionary features as the virtual expropriation of land and redistribution of it among the people of a country which is already embarrassed by having too much land for present purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, will the majority leader yield to me for a brief statement? I wish to say something to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Vermont and I have worked together for 20 years, I believe.

Mr. AIKEN. We have worked together in the interest of the farmers.

Mr. LEHMAN. We have worked together to increase the prosperity of the dairy farmer and the dairy industry. I think we have never had any vital differences in all those years.

Mr. AIKEN. And we shall not have now, either.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the Senator will agree with me that at all times it was our aim to maintain some relationship between what the dairy farmer receives for his product and the price which he must pay for feedstuffs and other supplies essential in the conduct of his farm. That relationship has been greatly disturbed by this sudden action on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture. The high price of feed is maintained, and there is a very great reduction in the price which the dairy farmer receives for his product.

Mr. AIKEN. I am convinced that the Secretary had no other recourse, barring new legislation. He could not have done differently. With the support levels fixed at the minimum, I am convinced that there will not be an overall lowering of price for the New England-New York area of more than possibly 25 cents a hundred; and if we can expand the markets as we hope to do in the next few months, any lowering of price will be of very temporary duration.

I point out something else at this time. As the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New York know, I have been very much interested in trying to devise a system of getting surplus foods to the low-income families of the United States. I have been interested in it over a 10-year period. If we could do it there would not be any such thing as a surplus of dairy products, or a surplus of butter, or a surplus of meat products, or a surplus of leafy vegetables. As I say, I have tried to interest the Government in such a program for the last 10 years.

Yesterday for the first time I received an encouraging letter from the Department of Agriculture, stating that they were working on the proposal. They were inclined to be skeptical about applying it to the whole country without first having some experience with it. The Department's suggestion is that we might possibly want to work out a plan for setting up pilot programs, selecting an urban area at one point and a rural area at another point, and getting experience, which could be used in working out a proper plan later on. I was very much encouraged to get that official encouragement for the first time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Vermont for correcting the RECORD. I know it needed to be done with reference to the payment plan under the Brannan proposal. The Senator from Vermont is absolutely right.

Mr. AIKEN. There is a great deal more to it than the payments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand; there was much more to it than the payments. As a matter of fact, the compensatory payment idea was originally sponsored as one possibility by the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. That was written into the Agricultural Act of 1948. I refer to the provision for payments. When Secretary Brannan came up with his plan in the spring of 1949, Congress became incensed. I do not believe that is too strong a statement. Congress not only threw out all the provisions for the remainder of the Brannan plan but it threw out also the provision for the payment plan.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Congress threw out not only the bath water, but the baby along with the water.

I feel that the Senator from Vermont has been very constructive once more in citing to the Senate his persevering efforts on behalf of his food stamp plan. I am encouraged to hear that there is real interest in getting a pilot plant operation started. I believe we should have such beginnings.

I realize that the dairy surpluses represent a serious situation; but I also feel that if we spent a little time in trying to find outlets for the dairy products we would not have surpluses. We could find a better way to price the products than by merely buying and storing them. With respect to certain items, compensatory payments could be made. I am not prepared to think of it as being of universal application. It could be considered with respect to certain items, such as cheese and perhaps butter. I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no question but that the production of 120 billion pounds of milk a year is far less than the people of the United States should be consuming for their own good.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], to insert a new section in the committee amendment at page 3, after line 15.

Mr. KNOWLAND. May I inquire whether the yeas and nays have been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Mansfield
Anderson	Gore	Martin
Barrett	Green	Maybank
Beall	Griswold	McClellan
Bennett	Hayden	Monroney
Bricker	Hendrickson	Morse
Bridges	Hennings	Mundt
Burke	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Payne
Byrd	Humphrey	Potter
Carlson	Hunt	Purtell
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Jackson	Russell
Clements	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kennedy	Sparkman
Douglas	Kerr	Stennis
Duff	Kilgore	Symington
Dworshak	Knowland	Thye
Eastland	Kuchel	Upton
Ellender	Langer	Watkins
Ferguson	Lehman	Welker
Flanders	Lennon	Williams
Frear	Long	Young
Fulbright	Magnuson	
George	Malone	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from California for himself and other Senators. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, may we have the pending amendment stated for the information of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, between lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, I wish to speak on the pending amendment before the yeas and nays are taken. I shall be very brief.

I merely wish to repeat the gist of my remarks of last evening, when I said I would not vote for the proposed amendment to the Constitution now under consideration, or for any other constitutional amendment which may be brought before the Senate which would limit the powers of the President in the making of treaties or executive agreements.

The amendment presented by the distinguished majority leader undoubtedly would carry out the purpose covered by the resolution I presented to the Senate last year. I strongly urged, in a number of speeches on this floor, that the rule of the Senate respecting the taking of the yeas and nays on treaties be changed by requiring a quorum call and a roll call on each treaty. Both the majority leader and the minority leader carried out the intent of my resolution in spirit, even though the Senate did not adopt a new rule or pass a statute on the subject.

Madam President, the purpose of the pending amendment can be achieved without including such a provision in any proposed constitutional amendment which would limit the powers of the President in the making of treaties or executive agreements. It can be achieved by adopting a rule of the Senate or by enacting a statute. The provision can be made as tight as if it were contained in a constitutional amendment. There could be included in the statute or rule a provision that unanimous consent could not be given to waive the requirement of a quorum call, and a rollcall. The rule or statute would of course, become binding on the Members of the Senate in all cases.

Madam President, I feel that no such provision has any place in a constitutional amendment. I have said repeatedly and said it very strongly and with deep conviction, that I believe the adoption of any constitutional amendment curtailing the powers of the President to make treaties and executive agreements would be against the interest of this country; it would be highly dangerous and would inevitably lead to great difficulties in our relationships with other countries. Because of my strong conviction I cannot in good conscience vote for any constitutional amendment to achieve what is claimed to be the purpose of the Bricker amendment, the George amendment, and the several others now before the Senate.

In view of the fact that I am heart and soul opposed to any kind of an amendment to the Constitution which would curtail the treatymaking powers of the President, I shall vote in the negative on the substitute proposed by

the distinguished majority leader. It is unnecessary and in my opinion should not be written into the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for himself and other Senators. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent on official business. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent because of illness.

I announce also that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent on official business, and if present would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—72

Aiken	Ferguson	Mansfield
Anderson	Flanders	Martin
Barrett	Frear	Maybank
Beall	George	McClellan
Bennett	Gillette	Mundt
Bricker	Griswold	Neely
Bridges	Hendrickson	Payne
Burke	Hickenlooper	Potter
Bush	Hoey	Purtell
Butler, Md.	Holland	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Russell
Byrd	Hunt	Saltonstall
Carlson	Ives	Smathers
Case	Jackson	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Stennis
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Symington
Dirksen	Kerr	Thye
Douglas	Knowland	Upton
Duff	Kuchel	Watkins
Dworshak	Langer	Welker
Eastland	Magnuson	Williams
Ellender	Malone	Young

NAYS—16

Cooper	Hill	Monroney
Fulbright	Kennedy	Morse
Gore	Kilgore	Murray
Green	Lehman	Pastore
Hayden	Lennon	
Hennings	Long	

NOT VOTING—8

Capehart	McCarran	Schoeppel
Goldwater	McCarthy	Wiley
Kefauver	Millikin	

So the amendment offered by Mr. KNOWLAND on behalf of himself and other Senators was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam President, I call up the amendment offered by myself and on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], designated "2–3'54–C," and ask that it be read by the clerk for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, it is proposed to strike out lines 7 to 9, inclusive, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. Clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me, so that I may make a statement for the information of the Senate, since a number of questions have been raised?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would not expect to have the Senate continue in session this evening beyond 6 o'clock, perhaps 5:30, and would not expect to have any further voting this evening.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Michigan will be prepared to make an opening statement on the amendment and to reply to such questions as may be raised, so that the information may be in the RECORD tomorrow. I understand a number of important dinners have been arranged for this evening. I have not given advance notice to the Senate of an evening session. We have kept busy during the day. I am very hopeful that tomorrow we may not only reach a vote on this amendment, but also on the perfecting amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] at that point desires to make his motion to recommit, perhaps we might even have a vote on the motion to recommit, if the motion shall have been made. That would then clear the decks for discussion of the proposed substitutes which have been offered by a number of Senators.

Again, I express the hope that perhaps by Thursday the Senate may be able to reach a final vote on Senate Joint Resolution 1. Of course, that will depend on developments.

While I shall not make an announcement as to evening sessions for the remainder of the week, I hope Senators will keep in mind that either tomorrow or the following evening we might wish to run, not late into the night, but to a reasonable hour in the evening.

I desired to make this statement so that Senators may be advised in making their plans.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because of the legislative situation last night I was foreclosed from offering an amendment which would also have included executive agreements, an amendment similar in nature to the amendment just agreed to with reference to treaties. I offer such an amendment as a new section and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. I serve notice on the Senate that I shall call it up at the proper time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

THE NEW LOOK IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. A few days ago a number of Senators raised a serious question with reference to the so-called New Look announced by the administration regarding the Nation's military policy. I note in an evening newspaper that a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Carney, apparently has raised serious question about the new policy. I wish to read the following news article from Newport, R. I., published in the Washington Daily News of today:

BOTH SIDES MIGHT HOLD OFF IN FEAR—ADMIRAL CARNEY SEES WAR WITHOUT ATOMS

NEWPORT, R. I., February 16.—Adm. Robert B. Carney said today a future war may see a "nuclear stalemate" with both sides fearing to use atomic weapons because of the threat of retaliation.

Or, the Naval Operations Chief said, war could start with devastating atomic blows and wind up with "guerrilla bands armed with bamboo spears" stalking each other "across the remaining ashes."

Since the United States is not the aggressor and cannot tell what kind of war it may have to fight, Admiral Carney said, "we dare not entrust our safety to any single rigid and unalterable course of action." He forecast a role for sea power of "greater significance than ever before."

WARS VARY

His remarks to the Naval War College attracted attention in light of the administration's decision to rely chiefly on air-atomic power in its New Look military strategy. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles recently disclosed the "basic decision * * * to depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate instantly by means and at places of our choosing."

"If we are honest with ourselves," Admiral Carney said in his prepared text, "we will acknowledge that there are big wars, little wars, general wars, localized wars, Marquis of Queensbury wars, and savage, ruthless wars, atomic wars, and perhaps nonatomic wars." He said there was no way to know which kind of conflict would come next.

GAS, GERMS COMPARED

Admiral Carney compared his nuclear statement with what "has so far been the case with chemical and bacteriological warfare."

He said the Nation must "hedge our strategic bets," keeping both new and old weapons and methods in the military locker.

In light of the statement of Admiral Carney which I have just read, I think there is a real question whether this new policy, the so-called new look, was based on our overall military requirements or on political requirements. I believe it has become quite apparent that cutting the budget was uppermost in mind when the new policy was formulated. I think the position of Mr. John Foster Dulles, which is essentially a prepare-for-one-type-of-war policy rather than a prepare-for-varied-types-of-war policy, may be a doubtful policy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I shall yield in a moment.

I think the fallacy of the present policy that we can defend ourselves by preparing for a singular type of war is evident from the fact that we have no assurance that the Soviet Union will engage in a singular type of aggression.

On the contrary, to date the Soviet Union has engaged in varied forms of aggression. Atomic retaliation, for which we had a monopoly in 1947, did not stop guerilla warfare in Greece. It did not stop the Korean war. Nor is it stopping the war in Indochina today.

In the light of the statement made by Admiral Carney, a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I think the time has come when the Congress of the United States should hear directly from the military experts on the question whether we are preparing adequately to meet the kind of aggression with which we may be confronted tomorrow.

As was brought out on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, the record will disclose that Admiral Radford, in an appearance before the House Armed Services Committee in 1949, dissociated himself with the policy of atomic retaliation. I should like to read what Admiral Radford had to say before the House Armed Services Committee in connection with the inquiry on the B–36:

> I do not believe that the threat of atomic blitz will be an effective deterrent to war, or that it will win a war. I do not believe that the atomic blitz theory is generally accepted by military men.
>
> Our citizens must realize that its military leaders cannot make this promise—that there is no short cut, no cheap, no easy way to win a war.

I might interpolate at that point to say that there is no short cut, no easy way, to prepare this country adequately—certainly not, from a military standpoint, by cutting the budget.

I continue to read from the statement of Admiral Radford:

> We must realize that the threat of instant atomic retaliation will not prevent it, and may even invite it. We must realize that we cannot gamble that the atomic blitz of annihilation will even win a war.

Mr. President, Admiral Radford, who is chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made that statement at a time when America had a monopoly on atomic weapons. Under those circumstances the policy of atomic retaliation made sense.

It seems to me that a policy relying exclusively on atomic retaliation makes no sense when we no longer have a monopoly on atomic or hydrogen weapons.

I think Congress has a right to know the reason for the change in policy.

Let me refer to the statement of another member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a very able soldier, Matthew Ridgway, Chief of Staff of the Army. In a speech made on November 10, 1953, General Ridgway stated as follows:

> The ultimate determinant of military victory still is the trained fighting man with his feet on the ground.
>
> Our Nation may at some future date substantially alter the ratios of land, sea, and air strength in our present Military Establishment. But no evidence yet adduced today would validate such a course. Perhaps it never will. New weapons, history shows, have a way of canceling out.
>
> Each of the changes in technical capabilities has brought changes in tactics. Each has required changes in organization. None has resulted in reduced overall military manpower requirements.

Mr. President, General Ridgway made that statement on November 10, 1953, before the American Ordnance Association in Cleveland, Ohio. The statement would appear to be a sensible one. Since that time, apparently the Bureau of the Budget has reversed the military policy stated by General Ridgway. In view of the statements by Admiral Carney and General Ridgway, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe the time has come to raise a serious question regarding the present military policy announced by the administration. I think the Senate and the House of Representatives, should be fully and adequately informed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished junior Senator from Washington has indicated his belief that budget reduction and tax reduction have been placed ahead of national security, and that the reduction in the ground forces of the United States Army and Marine Corps and the mothballing of naval vessels are the result of budgetary goals.

Perhaps it will shed some light on the question if the statement of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Roger M. Kyes, is read at this point:

> We can no longer afford to prepare for every conceivable kind of war. We can no longer afford the luxury of a status quo in strategic planning.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield further, let me say I believe this is the first time I have ever known of a high administrative official of the United States Government in referring to the adequate defense of the Nation, to suggest that defense against Communist aggression is a "luxury" which, so he says, we cannot "afford."

A few days ago, in speaking on the floor of the Senate, I expressed grave apprehension about the present policy. At that time I expressed the opinion that the balance of terror which a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff today has said may prevent the use of atomic weapons in another war, might be sufficient to prevent a global war; but that this may not be the kind of war we shall have to face. Indeed, experience has shown that the Communist world seeks to spread the Iron Curtain by degrees, instead of by global war. Not only may global war not be the kind of war we may face; it may not be the greatest danger presented by Communist aggression.

The so-called new look has already failed its first test, namely, the Indochina conflict.

The imminent breakup of the Four Power Conference in Berlin in failure, the continued belligerency of the Soviet Union, and the continued pressure of Communist aggression, require the administration to take a new look at the New Look.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the statement he has made. I also wish to commend him for spearheading the questions he has raised about the New Look. His reference to Mr. Kyes, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, is a most important one.

Every Member of the Senate should stop to refresh his or her recollection of the situation which existed 1 year ago. At that time many of us were ridiculed because we raised a series of questions about the cut in the size of the Air Force. We were told we had at the head of the Nation this time a man who was the world's outstanding military expert. We were told he was a man who could tell us what was the right military policy and what was the wrong military policy.

I agree that he is one of the greatest military strategists in the world. I think he is an outstanding military officer—one of the best. But what has happened since that time certainly adds force to the contention we made then, namely, that by questioning the policy of a year ago we might be able to add to the sum total of our defense forces.

What happened, Mr. President? At that time we were fighting for 143 wings for the Air Force. We were ridiculed. Yet today, after having cut the Air Force to 120 wings, the administration has finally come around to 137 wings, but in the meantime a year's valuable time has been lost.

I believe it is high time that once again we ask questions about the new policy. It is quite evident the administration is following the same line of reasoning that it followed a year ago. A year ago we discovered that the cut in the Air Force was made through the Bureau of the Budget, as the result of a letter sent by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the Secretary of Defense. As I recall the testimony given before the Armed Services Committee or before the Appropriations Committee——

Mr. MAYBANK. It was given before the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. As I recall that testimony, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Kyes admitted, Mr. President, that they did not realize how much they had cut the Air Force.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield on this point?

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. They further admitted they had not consulted the Chiefs of Staff.

Following what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] said about Admiral Carney—and no one has greater respect than do I for Admiral Carney; I have known him; his ability is great; his integrity is unimpeachable—let me say that General Vandenberg said the same thing day after day, hour after hour, in testifying before the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

What happened? Every amendment which was submitted—I myself submitted several, as did the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and other Senators, who were agreed in favoring 143 wings for the Air Force—was rejected.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] submitted an amendment calling for the training of more flyers; but that amendment, too, was rejected. All such amendments were rejected.

In making this statement, I am not attempting to say, "I told you so," in referring to the statement I made a year ago. Furthermore, no one has greater respect than do I for the integrity, ability, and knowledge of war of the President of the United States. Nevertheless, the situation has been changing from day to day, ever since last year, when no one paid any attention to Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg.

I thank the Senator from Washington for yielding to me.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from the State of Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President perhaps I think more of the desirability of the new military budget—commonly termed the new look—than do some of my distinguished colleagues. I am studying that budget, and will make up my mind about it. In the meantime, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Washington several questions.

First, he was a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, was he not, when he served in the House of Representatives?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore, he knows a great deal about this subject.

Secondly the statement made by a great United States naval officer, Admiral Carney, would seem to be at variance with an address made in the month of January by the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles. Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not think there can be any doubt about it; they are absolutely inconsistent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last year we had before the Senate the subject of trade with foreign countries; and at that time there was a complete difference of opinion as between the Department of State and the Department of Defense, according to the best knowledge of the Members of the Senate.

Once again it seems there is a complete difference of opinion between the Department of State and a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who presumably would not be speaking if he were not speaking for the Department of Defense. Yet his speech would also seem to be at variance with the statement which my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee just read, made by the Deputy Secretary of Defense. Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In other words, the Deputy Secretary of Defense would seem to be supporting the speech made by the Secretary of State; and in his recent statements about "bomb rattling," the Secretary of Defense would seem to be supporting Admiral Carney's speech. Would that seem to be correct?

Mr. JACKSON. It would appear to be correct.

Let me also add that the question of the New Look is getting to be about as confused as the amendments which are being submitted to the Bricker amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Another question, if I may. In other words, would not it appear that not only is there a difference of opinion between the Department of State and the Department of Defense, as to how the Nation should be armed for its future security; but there would also seem to be a difference of opinion between top officials in the Department of Defense itself. Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest once more that those who are responsible for the future security of the United States should take one coordinated position so that we in the Congress may understand just what it is this administration plans, in order to provide us with maximum security at minimum cost.

Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not wish to yield at this point.

I heartily concur in the sentiments expressed by the junior Senator from Missouri. With his long experience as the first Secretary of the Air Force, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and in that capacity a member of the National Security Council, he knows whereof he speaks.

The record seems to disclose at this point that two of the three members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are opposed to this policy. Admiral Carney is a voting member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It seems, from the speech made by General Ridgway in November prior to the approval of the budget, that he too is opposed to the new look.

It would appear that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who is not a voting member of the Joint Chiefs, by his remarks before the House Armed Services Committee in 1949, indicated that he was opposed to the new policy.

In view of all that, I think certainly those of us who are to be called upon in the future to vote for appropriations have the right to know whether we are providing an adequate military defense for America.

Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the very important statement just made by the junior Senator from Washington. I believe that the United States Senate and the House of Representatives should be concerned with whether these policies are being made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the basis of full advice from all over the country, on the basis of information and intelligence which the Joint Chiefs of Staff receive, or whether they are being made by the Secretary of the Department of Defense and his assistants. Certainly if we are to change our policy so radically as to use atomic diplomacy, our policy is important enough not to be used as a subject for after-dinner speeches before a different assemblage each night. Certainly our posture of defense is too important to be turned over to a mimeograph machine operation conducted by the press corps in the Pentagon.

Under the Constitution it is the duty of Congress to raise and provide armies. When we neglect that duty and allow foreign policy to be shifted overnight, when we allow $5 billion to be cut out of our defense appropriations, as was done last year, without allowing the proper committees, the Armed Services Committees of the two Houses of Congress, the policymaking committees, an opportunity to hold adequate and thorough hearings, we are neglecting one of our most important duties. The subject was considered only in the Appropriations Committee, which is primarily concerned with budgetary matters, although many of the minority members are concerned with things other than budgetary matters. When we neglect our duty in that fashion, I think it is high time to have full-dress hearings before the distinguished committees to which the rules of the Senate delegate the execution of this important duty. I refer to the Armed Services Committees of both Houses. They should call before them the men whose statements have been quoted here today. The committee should take the testimony of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 1947, the Chief of the Army, and the Chief of the Navy branch. That testimony should be placed in the RECORD. Let us not turn over our vitally important foreign policy and our policy with respect to our posture of defense to after-dinner speakers or those who are engaged in grinding out new clichés, new looks, and other things which emanate from highly skilled press agents in the Pentagon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I do not intend to enter into a long debate at this time. However, let me say, for the benefit of the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Oklahoma, who has just spoken, as well as other Senators, that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate had before it the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Armed Services Committee has heard the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, as well as the corresponding officers of the Navy and the Army.

The committee has also heard from the Secretary of Defense this year. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee has heard the recent discussion by the Secretary of State. To the best of my knowledge and belief there is general unanimity of opinion regarding the amount in the budget, based on the authorization and based upon the planning.

I would not be frank if I did not say say that the Army, whose appropriations have been cut by $1½ or $2 billion, does not like the cut. But never in all the hearings, to the best of my recollection, has it been said that we are relying solely on atomic power or the ability to carry the atomic bomb. We are relying upon our ability to retaliate. We are relying upon building up a warning system in this country, so that we may be in a position to retaliate if we are attacked.

I will say to my colleague from Washington that so far as I know, the new Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the new Chief of Staff of the Navy, together with the Secretaries of those two branches, are in complete accord with the budget allowances for this year. I cannot truthfully say that the Secretary of the Army or the Chief of Staff of the Army is in full accord, but they realize that they have only a certain amount to work with, and they will work with it.

That is the basis upon which we are operating. I should be delighted, with facts and figures before me, to debate with the Senator the subject of the number of airplanes, and so forth. We could enter into an interminable argument on that subject. The distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who is on his feet, is an able and capable debater; but I believe I am capable of answering him.

That is all I have to say tonight. I wish to clear the deck by referring particularly to what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has just said. The committee has made it a point to hear all the witnesses to whom I have referred. The hearings have not been public. They could not well have been. They have been in executive session. So far as I know, if any Senator wishes to attend those executive sessions, he will be welcome.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, for whom I have great affection and respect, whether or not the Chief of Naval Operations said that he was in favor of the new look policy, which relies for its primary defense on atomic retaliation? I will say to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, that the statement which I have just quoted, attributed to Admiral Carney in a speech at Newport, R. I., is absolutely inconsistent with the policy laid down by the Defense and State Departments. Can the distinguished Chairman of the Armed Services Committee assure the Senate that Admiral Carney, who is Chief of Naval Operations, is in full sympathy with and supports this singular defense policy?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are two members of my committee on the Senator's side of the aisle. At least one of them was present when, to the best of my recollection, Admiral Carney said, with respect to the policy which was finally submitted as a part of the budget of the Defense Department for this year, that the part which applied to the Navy was satisfactory to him.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is referring to the budget proposal; but let me ask the distinguished Chairman of the Armed Services Committee once again whether he asked Admiral Carney if he was in accord, not with the budget proposal, but with the new policy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I cannot remember that anyone asked Admiral Carney the question in the words stated by the Senator. Certainly the impression I received—and I sat all through the hearings—was that the Navy Department, and the Secretary of the Navy, and Admiral Carney, who did all the talking for the Navy—the Secretary of the Navy did not do the talking—were in complete sympathy with the overall policies of the Defense Department as they are now being planned.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not a fact that the Chief of Staff for the Army is opposed to the new policy?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not say that he is opposed to the new policy. What I would say—and he was utterly frank about it—is that because the number of Army divisions has been reduced, the Army has been forced to make new plans and new assignments and to work out new methods of doing things. He was not in complete accord, of course, with the policy of cutting appropriations for the Army by a substantial amount.

However, he did state emphatically that he was willing to go forward and that they were making new plans, and that the Army would cooperate to the fullest extent. I believe my colleagues who were present at the hearing will bear me out in that regard.

I wish to make it clear, particularly to the Senator from Oklahoma, that our committee has been attempting to get this information.

Mr. JACKSON. I merely wish to say that I am satisfied that the statements made by the Chief of Staff of the Army and by the Chief of Naval Operations are totally inconsistent with administration policy. I believe we are right back to where we were a year ago.

We were told then that there was agreement on the policy with reference to the Air Force. When we got into it we found that General Twining, who became Chief of Staff for the Air Force, said that 143 wings were absolutely essential.

Every head of a Government agency, and every head of a Military Establishment must of necessity support the President's budget. That is his duty. It does not follow from the fact that he supports the budget that he is necessarily in favor of a policy carried out in the budget.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is trying to make a statement, but I should like to make just one more observation, and I thank the Senator from Missouri for letting me do so.

So far as General Twining is concerned, he was before our committee. Without disclosing any confidences stated in executive session, I can assure the Senator from Washington that the general purport of what he just stated was about like this. He was asked:

> General Twining, are you in favor of it or are you just saying it because you must go along with the bosses?

He answered that he believed that it was a good policy, that he was strongly in favor of it, and believed it was a sound policy for us to carry through.

I make that statement with two Senators in the Chamber who were present at the committee hearing. They can deny the statement if I am wrong.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not doubt for a moment that the statement is correct. The policy that has been announced is primarily an Air Force policy. As one Member of the Senate and as a former Member of the House who has fought for a long time to build up our atomic strength and our Air Force, I have never been of the opinion that we should defend this country and carry out our foreign commitments with the firepower of just one branch of the Military Establishment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My reference is to what he said this year, within a month. Let me make one further statement, and then I shall not further interrupt the Senator. I agree with the Senator from Washington that we should not exclusively rely on the atomic bomb or atomic energy. So far as the words "massive retaliation" or "immediate retaliation" or "strong retaliation" are concerned, I have never heard it said that we would rely entirely on atomic bombs.

We are relying on improved firepower. We are relying on the improved mobility of our Navy. We are relying on the greater strength and the greater carrying power and greater range of our airplanes. We are relying on the improved techniques of our Air Force. We are relying on the ability of our artillery to fire farther. We are relying on the improved ability of our Air Force to transport our Armed Forces. We are relying on all of those things. It is an overall greater strength and an overall ability to retaliate.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I have great respect for the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I must say that my interpretation of the new policy is different from the impression he has of that policy. To quote further from the article:

> Secretary Dulles recently disclosed the basic decision to depend primarily upon greater capacity to retaliate instantly by means and at the places of our choosing.

I believe it is very clear that primary reliance is being placed on our atomic striking power.

I am all in favor, and have been for years, of building up our atomic striking power. What disturbs me is that the Soviet Union, as history has shown us to date, is engaged in various forms of aggression. The fact that we have had a monopoly on atomic bombs did not stop Soviet aggression, and I do not believe it will stop Soviet aggression at

this time when we do not have a monopoly on atomic and hydrogen weapons.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Missouri in permitting me to interrupt. I shall be delighted to go into this subject more fully with him at another time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts for what he has said about me. I know he will be able to answer any questions I might bring up. The recollection of the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts with respect to what went on in the executive session of the Armed Services Committee is correct, according to my recollection.

The distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma has put his finger on a great part of this problem. He referred to the many speeches, comments, criticisms, suggestions, and the advice that emanates from the top officials of the various services. I believe the senior Senator from Massachusetts would be fair enough to agree with me that at times these statements are at complete variance with what we have previously heard in executive session in the Committee on Armed Services.

I do not understand how it is possible for the Congress to obtain, or for the people of this country to obtain a clear idea of how we plan to defend the United States, if after we reach an understanding of what is being told us in executive session in Armed Services, addresses, speeches, and comments are made which are at variance with what we have been told in committee.

Again I would respectfully bring to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who occupies such a position of respect and confidence in this administration, that provided the article to which the distinguished Senator from Washington has referred this evening is correct, then a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and a voting member, as the junior Senator from Washington has pointed out—has taken exception to a speech made by the Secretary of State.

Without getting into the merits or demerits of the address made by the Secretary of State, which later, in effect, was backed up by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, but, in my opinion later negated by the Secretary of Defense, I would ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services:

Where do the members of our committee, where does the Senate, where does the House of Representatives, where do the American people now stand when it comes to any real knowledge about the planned military policy of this administration?

AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, before the Senate at this time is a proposed amendment offered by myself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The amendment has two parts. On page 3 it is proposed to strike out lines 7 to 9, inclusive, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. Clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution."

Mr. President, as Senate Joint Resolution 1 came from the Judiciary Committee it contained what is commonly known as the "which" clause, which provided that a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by the enactment of legislation which would be valid in the absence of the treaty.

That was not a part of the original proposed amendment when it went to the Judiciary Committee. That language was added by the Judiciary Committee to the joint resolution.

This amendment, Mr. President, is to strike out that language and to insert:

SEC. 2. Clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution."

Mr. President, I made some remarks with reference to this amendment, as well as with reference to the previous amendment to amend section 1 of the resolution as it came from the Judiciary Committee by adding the words "other international agreements." I desire to review it so that Senators voting tomorrow may have a record of what we have in mind by this amendment, and also for the purpose of making clear the legislative history so that it may be used by courts in interpretation of the amendment.

Mr. President, the treatymaking power of the United States is in the President and two-thirds of the Senate. By article II, section 2, of the Constitution, the President has power, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." Both Houses of Congress, as a Congress, were not given control or power over the making of treaties. The President and the Senate have that power, and article VI of the Constitution provides that—

All treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Because there has been some misunderstanding of the supremacy section, I think it might be well to have clarified at this point, for the benefit of those who read the RECORD and who may not be familiar with the constitutional provision, that a treaty ratified under those conditions becomes a part of the supreme law of the land, along with the Constitution itself and statutes passed by the Congress pursuant to the Constitution. So that it is a part of the supreme law, rather than being supreme in the sense that some of those discussing the subject on the outside have tried to imply, thus putting a treaty in a place where it would be above the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished Senator from California.

What was sought to be done yesterday, when section 1 was amended, was to provide that all treaties or executive agreements, or international agreements other than treaties, which were in conflict with the Constitution, would be of no force or effect, so that it would be clear to the Supreme Court, in certain words, what the people of the United States have in mind with respect to their Constitution.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which applies to Congress, is as follows: "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

Mr. President, much has been said on the floor of the Senate about the case of Missouri against Holland. I wish to boil the case down to as small a space as possible, by saying that Holland was convicted under a law, passed by Congress, relating to the shooting of ducks in Missouri. He appealed his conviction to the Supreme Court, and his conviction was sustained by that Court, which held that the law under which he was convicted was valid and constitutional.

Where does Missouri against Holland fit into the problem before the Senate today? Congress had previously passed a law regulating the killing of migratory birds. A conviction was obtained under that law. A lower court, a court of appeals, held the law to be unconstitutional, stating that it was beyond the power of Congress to pass such a law. After the law had been held unconstitutional, the United States entered into a treaty with Great Britain, which, of course, included Canada. The treaty was not a self-executing treaty, but provided that Congress should implement it by law. Congress so implemented the treaty, and it was under the law implementing the treaty that Holland was convicted.

The Supreme Court of the United States held that the law, made in pursuance of the treaty—that is, to carry out the treaty—was valid. The Court could have said that the United States was authorized to enter into a treaty, and that the migratory bird question was a subject a treaty could regulate under article II, section 2, of the Constitution.

The action of Congress in implementing the treaty by a statute, was in accordance with article I, section 8, which provides as follows:

> The Congress shall have power • • • to make all the laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

The objections made by some persons to the Missouri against Holland decision is that, it was a violation of States' rights for Congress to regulate the shooting of a duck in Missouri. But the power to make treaties is prohibited to the States. Article I, section 10, of the Constitution provides:

> No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation.

The treaty-making power was one of the powers surrendered by the States to the President and two-thirds of the Senate consenting and concurring; and the right to implement such a treaty was given to Congress by article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

Those who objected to the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of Missouri against Holland proposed to amend the Constitution by what is known as the "which" clause, which reads as follows:

> A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of a treaty.

What this proposed amendment would do would be to limit the treaty-making power of the United States only to those things that Congress could do without the present treaty-making power.

Why this should not be done is that the original powers of Congress to make internal law was one thing, but Congress was given further power to implement treaties, according to article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

If the power to implement treaties is taken away, the whole philosophy of the Government of the United States will be changed. The "which" clause would do exactly that. It would take away the power granted to Congress by article I, section 8, of the Constitution to implement treaties. The treatymaking power would be restricted only to what Congress could do in the field of domestic law, a field which is entirely apart from our international relations, except in certain instances where Congress is given express power. I cite for example, article I, section 8, clause 3, which gives to Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations" and, clause 10, which gives Congress the power "to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations."

The treatymaking power should not be restricted as proposed by the "which" clause in the proposed amendment. Sometime later I shall discuss the two amendments now at the desk, known as the Bricker amendment and the George substitute.

The reason for the remaining part of this amendment, which is an amendment to article VI, is that without the amendment we would be faced with this dilemma: We would have amended article I of the Constitution by saying that any treaty or international agreement which conflicted with the Constitution of the United States would have no force or effect. But we would allow to remain in the Constitution the language in article VI which provides in absolute terms, as has been construed by the Supreme Court, that a treaty is the supreme law of the land if it is made under the authority of the United States. This means, and has been interpreted to mean—and I shall cite some cases to that effect—something different from "in pursuance of" the Constitution, which is used in relation to laws under article VI.

But, Mr. President, the words used are "under the authority of the United States" and the words "under the authority of the United States" have been construed to mean that a treaty is made by the President of the United States and is ratified by the Senate, or is advised and consented to by two-thirds of the Senators present.

Recently I made some remarks on this subject, and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] consulted Webster's dictionary with reference to the words "in pursuance." He said that the definition in Webster's dictionary meant "carrying out or into effect," and he was, therefore, worried lest the expression "in pursuance of" should be used.

But I say we cannot go to Webster's dictionary to get an interpretation of words used in the Constitution of the United States. I think a better place to go is to the decision of Chief Justice Marshall, in the first case in which the Supreme Court spoke about the unconstitutionality of laws under the Constitution, namely, the case of Marbury against Madison, a famous case decided in 1803, and reported in the first Cranch at page 137. I wish to read from the syllabus of that case:

> An act of Congress repugnant to the Constitution cannot become a law.

Let me turn to page 180 of the volume. I read two short paragraphs of the opinion of Chief Justice Marshall, merely to show what is meant by the words "in pursuance of the Constitution":

> It is also not entirely unworthy of observation, that in declaring what shall be the supreme law of the land, the Constitution itself is first mentioned; and not the laws of the United States, generally, but those only which shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution, shall have that rank.

Mr. President, I desire to emphasize the words "but those only which shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution shall have that rank."

Continuing to read from the opinion of Chief Justice Marshall:

> Thus, the particular phraseology—

What Chief Marshall means when he uses the words "the particular phraseology" are the words "in pursuance of the Constitution"—

> Thus, the particular phraseology of the Constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supported to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the Constitution is void, and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument.

I wish to emphasize the words "a law repugnant to the Constitution is void."

Mr. President, it makes no difference whether such language is applied to the courts or to any other department; such a law is void not only as concerns the court, but as concerns all other departments, and they are bound by the Constitution.

So it is clear in the question under discussion that when the words "in pursuance of the Constitution" are applied to treaties, we are in effect saying that such treaties must not be repugnant to the Constitution; if they are repugnant, they are void. It would be the same as saying that they are not authorized by or in conformity with the Constitution. They are in conflict with it. They are not in accordance with it.

I desire to make clear my interpretation of the language under discussion. Such language has been interpreted by Chief Justice Marshall. When we use the words "in pursuance of," we are not talking about carrying out the Constitution; we are talking about whether or not treaties are repugnant to the Constitution.

Mr. President, I have spent considerable time on the question, and I do not desire to speak at greater length; but I wish the RECORD to be clear on the point.

The same question was before the Court in the famous case of Missouri against Holland, which I mentioned previously. In that case Justice Holmes stated:

> Acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States.

The case is to be found in 222 United States 416, at page 433.

I wish to emphasize the words "while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States." As Justice Holmes stated, treaties are different from laws. Laws are to be made in pursuance of the Constitution; and treaties are to be made under the authority of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. At this point I believe it becomes important to indicate the historical reason for the difference in the language. At the time of the original adoption of the Constitution, the United States, under the Articles of Confederation, had entered into certain treaties with both Great Britain and France. Obviously, since such treaties had been entered into prior to adoption of the Constitution, they could not have been made in pursuance to the Constitution, but only under the authority of the United States.

In the discussion of the question, either today or tomorrow, we shall go into the reason why we go back to the adoption of the Constitution, but, of course, not before that time, in formulating the language of the amendment which the Senator from Michigan has presented on his own behalf and on behalf of certain other Senators.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct, and I wish to read the language, because it is clearly stated in article VI:

All treaties made, or which shall be made—

Indicating those made in relation to peace, prior to adoption of the Constitution, as well as those to be made after the Constitution was adopted—

under authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

Article VI also provides:

And the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator's amendment, if adopted, overrule the case of Missouri against Holland? Would it make the treaty involved in that case unconstitutional?

Mr. FERGUSON. It would overrule only one part of the case of Missouri against Holland. The amendment would effectively remove one of the premises of the decision in the case of Missouri against Holland, namely, that whereas a statute of the United States, in order to become the supreme law of the land, must conform to the provisions of the Constitution, a treaty may become the supreme law of the land if it is made merely under the authority of the United States.

That part of the decision and reasoning of Mr. Justice Holmes which I have just read would be changed by the adoption of the proposed amendment. We have the purpose in mind of removing that part of the law laid down in Missouri against Holland, and making it conform with section 1, which the Senate approved yesterday by a vote of 62 to 20. The two provisions must be considered together in order to avoid conflict in the Constitution, and at the same time carry out the idea we have in mind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not mean whether it would overrule the language of the justice. Would it in effect make such an agreement itself invalid?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. The amendment would not alter such an agreement; but it would alter the other premise of the decision in the case of Missouri against Holland, namely, that Congress can implement a treaty by legislation under the "necessary and proper" clause, even though it cannot enact such legislation under the grant of legislative power in the absence of a treaty.

In other words, the amendment would strike out the "which" clause, which, in my opinion, is contrary to this amendment. It is the purpose of the Senator from Michigan and other Senators who joined in the sponsorship of the amendment not only to strike out the words of the "which" clause, but to strike out the intent and the meaning of the "which" clause.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not sure that I quite understand the Senator. It seems to me the proposed amendment may be a little like the "which" clause, but in different language. I am a little uncertain about exactly what is intended.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. The "which" clause is entirely different. I have stated, but I shall repeat, that the "which" clause states that a treaty cannot be implemented by law unless such law could be enacted under the Constitution without the treaty. That is what the "which clause" provides.

But we do not provide that at all. We merely provide that a treaty that is repugnant to or is in conflict with the Constitution cannot be made.

But, Mr. President, it will be possible to implement, under article I——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I get lost when the Senator from Michigan says "is repugnant to." Does he consider the migratory-bird treaty to be repugnant to the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. No, not at all; and I so stated at the beginning. I think the decision was one to the effect that the United States Senate had a right to ratify, and the President had a right to make, the treaty, regarding migratory birds, under the treaty law of the United States.

All I say is that Mr. Justice Holmes' opinion, in which he said there was a distinction between treaties and laws made in pursuance of treaties, will no longer be the law.

This amendment is not the "which clause"; it has nothing to do with the "which clause." In fact, the amendment is repugnant to the "which clause."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me further, to permit me to ask several questions which are not exactly on the point under discussion, but which I am very anxious to ask before the session ends tonight?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Several days ago I read in the newspapers a statement to the effect that the Attorney General had furnished the majority leader with his views on the George amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. I prefer to have the majority leader reply to that question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A few moments ago, as I prepared to ask the question, the majority leader was in his seat; but now he has taken the chair.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer may be permitted to answer the questions of the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Let the present Presiding Officer say that he assumed the chair to relieve the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], so that he might ask several questions of the Senator from Michigan.

If the Senator from Arkansas will restate his question, the Chair, in his capacity as a United States Senator, rather than as the Presiding Officer, will endeavor to answer it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I said that several days ago I read in the newspapers a statement to the effect that the Attorney General had furnished the majority leader with his views on the George amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Were those the views of the Attorney General in his official capacity, or were they merely his personal reaction?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; they were his views, as had been requested by the Senator from California, in regard to the amendment in question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask these questions because, as the majority leader knows, no hearings have been held on the George amendment, and there is a great deal of disagreement among Senators as to its effect. We shall have to vote on it, and I am sure some of us would like to have the views of the administration's legal department. In fact, I am one of such Senators. Most of us, including myself, have not been parties to all the conferences and negotiations held on this matter. Yet I am sure all of us feel this is perhaps the most solemn obligation we have as Senators; namely, the obligation of passing on proposed constitutional amendments. Evidently the majority leader feels that he, himself, is in need of the opinion of the Attorney General, as evidenced by the fact that he asked for the Attorney General's views.

I wonder whether the Senator from California would agree that the rest of us also would profit by being informed of the views of the Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of course, the George amendment is not now before the Senate; but the Senator from California expects to discuss and debate the so-called George substitute amendment at the time when it is the pending business of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say that I feel the amendment is certainly one which has a considerable following. Yet I do not feel at all that I know what that amendment means. I should particularly like to have the views of the Attorney General on the amendment, if he has expressed them; and I should like to have them a little in advance of the time when we have to vote. It does not do me much good to have such views 5 minutes before the vote is taken.

If the views of the Attorney General have been given, I should like very much, as I believe other Senators would, to have the views of the Attorney General as to the effect of the George amendment, either as it now stands or as it is to be amended, if the Senator from Georgia is going to amend it in accord-

ance with certain discussions we have had here relative to the power of the President as Commander in Chief and the power of the President under his specific power to recognize foreign states.

I should like to know the views of the Attorney General on that point. In connection with a matter of such importance, I believe all of us should be given the benefit of any and all views—especially those of the Attorney General—as soon as they are available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The memorandum—it is in the form of a memorandum, rather than an official opinion—was made available, at the request of the Senator from California, while these discussions were going on.

It will be my purpose to make the memorandum available to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and the other Members of the Senate in ample time before the debate on the George amendment gets under way, and before any voting regarding that amendment occurs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I confess that I have had great difficulty in understanding the purpose of the amendment the distinguished Senator from Michigan is now discussing. A few days ago, when he first spoke on the amendment, I addressed several questions to him.

The Senator from Michigan makes the point that the purpose of the amendment is to insure that no treaty shall become the supreme law of the land unless it is made pursuant to the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. And "pursuant" in that respect, means not repugnant to or not in conflict with.

Mr. COOPER. I assume the Senator from Michigan would not propose an amendment to article VI, section 2, of the Constitution unless he believed some treaty had been ratified and approved, and had become the supreme law of the land, when the treaty was not pursuant to the Constitution. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; that is not a correct statement of my view.

Mr. COOPER. Then if such a case has not developed, what is the necessity for amending article VI, section 2, of the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, the Senator from Kentucky has already indicated his position; he did so in connection with the vote which was taken yesterday on the amendment which would not allow a treaty or an executive agreement to be in conflict with the Constitution. I recall that the Senator from Kentucky voted against that amendment—thereby indicating that he did not believe it necessary to have the Constitution amended in that way.

I am convinced that the Constitution should be made crystal clear, because of the decisions of the Supreme Court and because previous administrations—not the present administration—have taken the view that anything at all—anything at all, Mr. President—could be done by means of a treaty. I do not agree.

I believe no treaty should be valid if it breaches or is in conflict with or is repugnant to the unalienable rights and constitutional rights of the people of the United States.

According to the theory advanced by the Senator from Kentucky, the Nation did not need a constitution in 1787, when the Constitution was drawn up. According to the theory of the Senator from Kentucky, we did not need a constitution at that time because none of the things prohibited by the Constitution or the Bill of Rights was being done.

On the other hand, Thomas Jefferson said that the time to make a constitution is before the wrong it prohibits is done.

In the present case we have evidence that the horse can be stolen. Therefore, we had better place a lock on the barn door before the horse is stolen, rather than to wait until after the horse has been stolen.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the Senator's comments. However, I do not think the Senator from Michigan can state my views.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I do not intend to do so.

Mr. COOPER. Or my reason for opposing the amendment. What I am honestly trying to find out is the meaning of your proposals. I start with the basic idea that the Constitution ought not to be amended unless there is some reason for it. I am trying to find out the reasons which demand these amendments. I have a high regard for the Senator's profound concern about the entire problem of treatymaking. I have no objection to the provision which was proposed yesterday, except as it may become a section or a part of an amendment which I could not support.

Let me ask him a question. The Senator from Michigan states that he is trying to make sure that no treaty will become the supreme law of the land unless it is entered into in pursuance of the Constitution. Can the Senator tell me whether or not there has been a treaty, which became the supreme law of the land after having been negotiated by the President and approved by the Senate, but which was not in pursuance of the Constitution? Is there such an example?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; but the time to build an air raid shelter, if one is intelligent at all, is before the bomb drops. Today there are many shelter areas designated in the Capitol, and there are signs telling us where to go for shelter from bombs. However, no bomb has fallen on the Capitol during our time.

So I say that there is reason to believe that there is danger. There is language in court opinions which says that treaties are purely a political matter, and not a judicial question at all. By a vote of 60 to 20 the other day the Senate said that in its opinion there should be an amendment to the Constitution providing that any treaty or any executive agreement which is in conflict with the Constitution shall be of no force or effect.

Mr. COOPER. My own conviction is that the Constitution says just that without amendment. Of course, that is a matter of opinion and judgment.

Mr. FERGUSON. If it says it, what is wrong with stating it clearly, so that he who runs may read?

Mr. COOPER. I turn to the proposed amendment which the Senator is now discussing. Let us assume a case. Suppose that a treaty is negotiated and is sent to the Senate. The treaty deals with a matter which, except for the treaty, would be reserved to the States. That is the situation against which the "which" clause of the Bricker amendment was directed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I think the Senator will agree to that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I was against the "which" clause.

Mr. COOPER. Suppose the Senator's amendment should become a part of the Constitution, and then the kind of treaty which I have described should come to the Senate. I think the Senator has said that it would not be necessary to go to the States for implementing legislation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Absolutely. The States are taken out of the picture by the Constitution. The reason they were taken out was that two-thirds of the Senators present had to concur. It was considered at that time, and it is considered by some today, that historically Senators are ambassadors from the States, and that therefore they have a right under the Constitution to take away the constitutional privileges of the States, or the right to make laws in the State, if it is done by a treaty which is not repugnant to or in conflict with the supreme law, the Constitution, which is the law made by the people.

Mr. COOPER. My difficulty is this: The Constitution now fixes the manner in whch a treaty may be constitutionally approved, and then provides that when the treaty is thus approved, it shall be the supreme law of the land. I cannot, then, follow the Senator's argument that a treaty might today become the law of the land when it is repugnant to the Constitution. However, I leave that question for the moment.

Let us consider the example offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Let us suppose the Senator's amendment should become a part of the Constitution. Then suppose a state of facts similar to those in the case of Missouri against Holland. Would it be necessary, under the terms of the Senator's amendment, for the Congress to implement such a treaty by legislation before it would be of any effect?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. The Senate and the President of the United States can make a self-executing treaty. This amendment has nothing to do with the question of whether or not a treaty is self-executing.

Mr. COOPER. After the Senator's amendment had become a part of the Constitution, would he say that if a treaty similar to that involved in the case of Missouri against Holland were ratified, the Congress could pass legislation implementing the treaty which would be

superior to the laws of the State and the State constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Then, I ask, what is the purpose of this amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. The purpose is to prevent the making of a treaty, or laws under a treaty which are repugnant to the Constitution, or which are in conflict with the Constitution.

Mr. COOPER. Certainly no treaty could become the law of the land until it had been negotiated, signed, and approved by the Senate. If that had been done, how would it then be repugnant to the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. We come back to the proposition that if the President of the United States and two-thirds of the Senate approve a treaty, in the opinion of the Senator it cannot be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States. I do not share the Senator's view. The President and the Senate may be mistaken. The treaty may be repugnant to the Constitution; and the Supreme Court, the arbiter of the question as to whether or not the treaty conforms to the Constitution, would be the proper agency to allow our citizens to determine whether or not their rights were taken away in violation of the Constitution by a treaty which was repugnant to the Constitution.

Mr. COOPER. The Supreme Court has full power to make such a decision now. I think perhaps I now understand the purpose of the amendment, if my judgment is correct on the Senator's argument. Is not the Senator really arguing that if a treaty is negotiated and approved, and such treaty strikes at the Constitution itself, or at the Bill of Rights, the treaty may overrule the Constitution and Bill of Rights. Is that true?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. If it strikes at the Bill of Rights, it is then in conflict with the Constitution, and the court should hold it void.

Mr. COOPER. Does not the Senator think the court can do so today and would do so?

Mr. FERGUSON. If this amendment is agreed to it certainly would. Otherwise the Court should be impeached.

Mr. COOPER. I believe that the great doubt in the Senator's mind is on the question whether a treaty is inferior to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Is not that true?

Mr. FERGUSON. Inferior in this way, that the people's law, the Constitution, is the supreme law of the land; and anything else, either treaty law or statutory law, that is in conflict with the Constitution is void, as Justice Marshall said. That is constitutional government.

Mr. COOPER. I agree with the Senator entirely. I have no doubt in my mind that a treaty is inferior to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. But the Senator from Michigan does have that doubt.

Mr. FERGUSON. Today I do, because of words in certain decisions of the Supreme Court, and because of the attitude of certain persons in previous administrations in our Government. I do not wish to wait until the calamity happens.

Mr. COOPER. Is the Senator from Michigan afraid that the Supreme Court may hold that a treaty is of equal dignity or even the supreme law, over the Constitution and the Bill of Rights?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator must be familiar with all the decisions of the Supreme Court which, while not in direct point, yet in dicta—hold that treaties cannot overturn the Constitution or the Bill of Rights, and are subject to all the prohibitions of the Constitution. To further prove this truth, is it not correct to say that a legislative enactment by Congress can nullify a treaty?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not all treaties.

Mr. COOPER. It can nullify a treaty, is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not all treaties. I have a case in mind.

Mr. COOPER. What treaties?

Mr. FERGUSON. There are certain treaties which Congress cannot nullify because they were made under the Constitution, and Congress does not have authority in that field.

Mr. COOPER. I believe there are some agreements which the President could make under his constitutional powers, which perhaps Congress could not nullify. I am not certain about it. However, the Senator will agree, I am sure, that a law passed by Congress can nullify a treaty which has been approved by the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I do not go that far.

Mr. COOPER. It seems to me inconsistent to say that a treaty which can be nullified by an act of Congress is superior to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not saying that it is superior. I say that there are people who say so. I am not willing to rely upon the dicta of Justices of the Supreme Court. I think we ought to make it clear. I think we ought to spell it out. It should be made clear and clearly spelled out so that anyone who reads it will know what we are doing, and will know that from now on all treaties and laws made under treaties must not be in conflict with the Constitution. The Senator from Kentucky apparently is willing to rely on dicta.

Mr. COOPER. No; I am not. I am relying on the Constitution as it is. I am troubled about the Senator's amendment. While under article VI, section 2, a treaty is held to be the law of the land, his amendment says that notwithstanding that fact it shall not be the law of the land unless pursuant to the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. But today it could not be the law of the land unless it is pursuant to the Constitution. I take the position that it could not be the law of the land and so held unless it had been approved and is pursuant to the Constitution, because it is a creature of and inferior to the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. What about Justice Holmes?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator's amendment adds a provision which says that notwithstanding that fact it shall not be the supreme law unless it is entered into pursuant to the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. What the Senator is saying is that in his opinion the law is now what we intend to make it.

Mr. COOPER. I think it is so without question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well. I do not believe so.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator's amendment raises questions and doubts where to my mind there is no doubt. I have not been able to find any case or situation, and the Senator from Michigan is not able to state one, where a treaty has invaded the Constitution or the Bill of Rights.

Mr. FERGUSON. There are treaties now in the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate which would violate the Constitution of the United States and be repugnant to it and in conflict with it.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator does not believe that they would be permitted by the courts to stand, if repugnant, even if they were ratified, does he?

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, wait a minute. The Senator from Kentucky is saying that the Senate would not do it. A President of the United States negotiated such a treaty and sent it to the Senate. Why should I not be fearful that the Senate might some day ratify the treaty? Therefore I say it is mandatory that we add to the Constitution the provisions we have proposed.

Mr. COOPER. But we still have the courts if such a treaty is repugnant and violates the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. But why would a President of the United States send a treaty to the Senate to be ratified which clearly would be repugnant to and in conflict with the Constitution, if he did not believe and if his Secretary of State did not believe that a treaty was superior to the Constitution? That is what I am concerned about.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Michigan have in mind a situation whereby a treaty could be negotiated under the authority of the United States but, so far as internal law is concerned, and the effect of it on American citizens within the United States was concerned, it might set up an international tribunal to try a citizen for an alleged offense created in the international agreement or treaty which had been negotiated?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Which would cut completely across the Bill of Rights and deprive the American citizens of the constitutional protections we have learned to be fundamental under our form of government?

Mr. FERGUSON. Exactly; that is what we are trying to prevent.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment I shall be happy to yield. The amendment would prevent the delegation of executive, legislative, or judicial power to an international organization. I wish to re-

peat that statement. The amendment would prevent the delegation of executive, legislative, or judicial power to an international organization, for under the Constitution those powers are vested exclusively in the President, the Congress, and the Federal courts.

The amendment would prevent the United States by treaty or executive agreement from depriving any United States citizen of any rights or freedoms guaranteed to him by the Constitution. It would prevent the United States from conferring, by treaty, jurisdiction on an international court, to charge, try, and sentence a United States citizen for an offense committed in the United States. I believe that answers the question of the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. My belief is that the statement is an assumption, and an incorrect assumption, which gives rise to arguments in favor of the amendment. When the Senator says his amendment would prevent the deprivation of individual rights, or change in the division of power then he assumes that under the Constitution a treaty can now take away the rights of individual citizens, rights guaranteed to them by the Bill of Rights. The Senator has argued that a treaty could destroy the structure of our Government and the division of powers under the Constitution. I cannot believe it. I do not believe that any person who has studied the cases could believe it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Not believe it? Then why does the Senator object to our making it clear?

Mr. COOPER. Because I do not think it is the slightest bit cloudy now. The Senator assumes that there is a possibility of the Constitution being overridden by a treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator believe that the Secretary of State in the previous administration, who sent a certain treaty to the Senate, had in mind that he could do it?

Mr. COOPER. I do not know what the treaty was, unless it was the genocide treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. That is the only one.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. That has never been ratified.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is saying that if airplanes were above us, dropping bombs, he would not go into the shelter until after they had been dropped. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. I did not say that. But I would want to know if the airplanes were coming before running to shelter.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Secretary of State and the President sent a treaty to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. In fact, it came first to the Senate, and then it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COOPER. I would still ask the Senator this question: Is not his thesis based upon the idea that a treaty can be superior to the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what we wish to cure.

Mr. COOPER. I do not accept that thesis.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to speak tomorrow with reference to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I do not want to address myself to them at this time, because my remarks have been more lengthy than I had anticipated.

In the case of *McCullough* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316), Chief Justice Marshall said:

> The Government of the Union, though limited in its powers, is supreme within its sphere of action * * * But this question is not left to mere reason: the people have, in express terms, decided it, by saying "this Constitution, and the laws of the United States, which shall be made in pursuance thereof, shall be the supreme law of the land." The Government of the United States then, though limited in its powers, is supreme, and its laws, when made in pursuance of the Constitution, form the supreme law of the land.

This generally shows Marshall's concept, that "in pursuance" means "within the area of powers given to the Government of the United States, including implied powers. In the case then at bar, Marshall, examining whether Congress had the power to incorporate a bank, specifically stated:

> The act to incorporate the Bank of the United States is a law made in pursuance of the Constitution and is part of the supreme law of the land.

Mr. President, this sphere of action is controlled or limited. The words "in pursuance" do not mean to carry out, but, as I said before, they mean that a treaty shall not be repugnant to the Constitution; that is, it shall not be in conflict with the Constitution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter which I received from the legal adviser of the Department of State relative to an agreement between Canada and the United States entered into on November 23, 1948, and immediately following that to have printed in the RECORD from the Federal Reporter, 2d Series, 204, beginning on page 655, the reference to the case of United States against Guy W. Capps, Inc., running over to page 661.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEGAL ADVISER,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 8, 1954.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: In accordance with your request, I am sending you herewith copy of the agreement between the United States of America and Canada effected by exchange of notes signed November 23, 1948. This is the agreement involving the control of export of potatoes from Canada to the United States which was involved in the so-called Capps case.

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN PHLEGER,
The Legal Adviser.

(Enclosure: Agreement between United States and Canada re potatoes.)

POTATOES: CONTROL OF EXPORTS FROM CANADA TO THE UNITED STATES—AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND CANADA

THE CANADIAN AMBASSADOR TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

CANADIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., November 23, 1948.

The Honourable GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honour to refer to the discussions which have taken place between the representatives of the Government of Canada and of the Government of the United States of America regarding the problems which would confront the Government of the United States in the operation of its price support and other programmes for potatoes if the imports of Canadian potatoes, during this current crop year, were to continue to be unrestricted. After careful consideration of the various representations which have been made to the Canadian Government on this subject, the Canadian Government is prepared to:

1. Include Irish potatoes in the list of commodities for which an export permit is required under the provisions of the Export and Imports Permits Act.

2. Withhold export permits for the movement of table stock potatoes to the United States proper, excluding Alaska.

3. Issue export permits for the shipment of Canadian certified seed potatoes to the United States, but only under the following circumstances:

(a) Export permits will be issued to Canadian exporters for shipments to specified States in the United States and such permits will only be granted within the structure of a specific schedule. The schedule is designed to direct the shipment of Canadian certified seed potatoes into those States where there is a legitimate demand for certified seed potatoes and only during a short period immediately prior to the normal seeding time. A draft of this schedule is now being jointly prepared by Canadian and United States officials.

(b) Export permits would only be granted to Canadian exporters who could give evidence that they had firm orders from legitimate United States users of Canadian seed potatoes. Canadian exporters would also be required to have included in any contract into which they might enter with a United States seed potato importer a clause in which the importer would give an assurance that the potatoes would not be diverted or reconsigned for table stock purposes.

(c) The Canadian Government would survey the supply of Canadian certified seed potatoes by class and consider the possibility of giving precedence to the export of Foundation and Foundation A classes of certified seed.

(d) The names and addresses of the consignees entered on the export permit would be compiled periodically and this information would be forwarded to the United States Government.

In instituting a system which has the effect of restricting exports of Canadian potatoes to the United States, the Canadian Government recognizes a responsibility to the Canadian commercial grower in certain surplus potato areas and is prepared to guarantee a minimum return on gradable potatoes for which the grower cannot find a sales outlet. Although the details of such a program have not been finalized, it is anticipated

that the Canadian Government will announce, at approximately the same time as potatoes are placed under export control, a floor price which will be effective April 1, 1949, for certain carlot shipping areas in the East. To implement this program the Canadian Government would inspect the potato holdings of commercial growers in Prince Edward Island and several counties of New Brunswick on or after April 1 and would undertake to pay a fixed price for every hundred pounds of Canada No. 1 potatoes found in the bins. It is not anticipated that any actual payment would be made at that time and it would be understood that if any of the potatoes examined were subsequently sold or used for seed purposes the owner would forfeit any claim for assistance on such potatoes. In other words, the Canadian Government would make no payment on potatoes which move into export trade, or which are used for seed purposes.

It should be noted that the Canadian proposals to institute export permit control on Canadian potatoes and to inaugurate a price support program are contingent upon assurances from the United States Government that:

(a) The United States Government will not hereafter impose any quantitative limitations or fees on Canadian potatoes of the 1948 crop exported to the United States under the system of regulating the movement of potatoes from Canada to the United States outlined herein.

(b) The Canadian Government proposal, as outlined herein, to guarantee a floor price to certain commercial growers in the Maritime Provinces would not be interpreted by United States authorities as either a direct or indirect subsidy and that in consequence there would be no grounds for the imposition of countervailing duties under section 300 of the United States Tariff Act of 1930.[1]

If the United States Government in its replying note accepts the Canadian proposals and gives to the Canadian Government the assurances required, as outlined above, this note and the reply thereto will constitute an agreement on this subject.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

H. H. WRONG.

THE ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE TO THE CANADIAN AMBASSADOR

NOVEMBER 23, 1948.

His EXCELLENCY HUME WRONG,
Ambassador of Canada.

EXCELLENCY: The Government of the United States appreciates the assurance of the Government of Canada contained in your note No. 538 of November 23, 1948, that the Government of Canada is prepared, contingent upon the receipt of certain assurances from the Government of the United States, to establish the controls outlined therein over the exportation of potatoes from Canada to the United States.

In view of the adverse effect which unrestricted imports of Canadian potatoes would have on the potato programs of the United States and the fact that it is anticipated that the Canadian proposal will substantially reduce the quantity of potatoes which would otherwise be imported into the United States, and in the interest of international trade between the United States and Canada and other considerations, the United States Government assures the Canadian Government that it will not hereafter impose any quantitative limitations or fees on Canadian potatoes of the 1948 crop imported into the United States under the system of regulating the movement of potatoes to the United States outlined in the Canadian proposal.

The Government of the United States also wishes to inform the Canadian Government with respect to that Government's proposal to guarantee a floor price to certain commercial growers in the Maritime Provinces, that in the opinion of the Treasury Department, the operation of such a proposal as outlined by the Canadian Government would not be considered as a payment or bestowal, directly or indirectly, of any bounty or grant upon the manufacture, production, or export of the potatoes concerned and no countervailing duty would, therefore, be levied, under the provisions of section 303, Tariff Act of 1930, as a result of such operation of the proposal on potatoes imported from Canada.

The United States Government agrees that your note under reference, together with this reply, will constitute an agreement on this subject.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America.

[1] 46 Stat. 687.

UNITED STATES *v.* GUY W. CAPPS, INC., No. 6541

(United States Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit. Argued March 18, 1953. Decided April 15, 1953)

Action by United States against corporation, for damages for breach by defendant of its agreement that potatoes imported by defendant from Canada would not be used for table stock purposes. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk, Albert V. Bryan, judge, directed verdict for defendant, and plaintiff appealed from judgment thereon. The court of appeals, Parker, chief judge, held that executive agreement between United States and Canada that Canada would allow export of seed potatoes to a United States importer only on condition that contract of purchase include an assurance by importer that potatoes would not be diverted or reconsigned for table stock purposes, which agreement was not authorized by Congress and contravened provisions of statute dealing with same matter, was void, and contract based thereon was unenforceable in United States courts.

Affirmed.

1. CONTRACTS

Treaties

Executive agreement between United States and Canada that Canada would allow export of seed potatoes to a United States importer only on condition that contract of purchase include an assurance by importer that potatoes would not be diverted or reconsigned for table-stock purposes, which agreement was not authorized by Congress and contravened provisions of statute dealing with same matter, was void, and contract based thereon was unenforceable in United States courts. (Agricultural Adjustment Act, sec. 22, as amended by Agricultural Act of 1948, sec. 3, 7 U. S. C. A., sec. 624.)

2. UNITED STATES

No action can be maintained by United States to recover damages on account of what is essentially a breach of a trade regulation, in the absence of express authorization by Congress.

3. COMMERCE

Constitutional law

Power to regulate foreign commerce is vested in Congress, not in the Executive or the courts, and the Executive may not exercise the power by entering into executive agreements and suing in the courts for damages resulting from breaches of contracts made on basis of such agreements.

4. CUSTOMS DUTIES

Where purpose and effect of executive agreement between United States and Canada respecting importation into United States of Canadian seed potatoes, was to bar imports which would interfere with the agricultural adjustment program, failure of agreement to comply with provisions of Agricultural Act respecting limitations which might be imposed on imports which might interfere with the program, rendered agreement void. (Agricultural Adjustment Act, sec. 22, as amended by Agricultural Act of 1948, sec. 3, 7 USCA, sec. 624.)

5. UNITED STATES

Power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, expressly vested by Constitution in Congress, is not among powers incident to presidential office, and it cannot be upheld as an exercise of the presidential power to see that laws are faithfully executed.

6. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

The Executive may not bypass congressional limitations regulating foreign commerce by entering into an agreement with the foreign country that the regulation be exercised by that country through its control over exports.

7. CONTRACTS

Where contract was but the carrying out of an executive agreement entered into in contravention of policy declared by Congress, United States courts would not lend their aid to enforcing it against public policy of the country so declared.

8. CONTRACTS

Contracts permissible by other countries are not enforceable in courts of United States, if they contravene laws, morality, or policy of the United States.

9. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

United States

No cause of action exists under Federal law in favor of government suing in its sovereign capacity to recover damages which it claimed to have sustained while engaged in exercise of governmental powers, as result of violation of a contract made between other persons, nor can such cause of action be maintained by analogies drawn from private contract law permitting suit by one for whose benefit a contract is made to sue thereon, since such exercise of judicial power to establish new liability would amount to unwarranted intrusion by courts into field properly within control of Congress and as to a matter concerning which Congress had seen fit to take no action.

Joseph Kovner, attorney, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. (Warren E. Burger, Assistant Attorney General, A. Carter, Whitehead, United States attorney, and Austin E. Owens, special assistant to the United States attorney, Richmond, Va., and Edward H. Hickey, attorney, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., on brief) for appellant.

W. R. Ashburn, Norfolk, Va. (H. M. Jarvis and Ashburn, Agelasto & Sellers, Norfolk, Va., on brief) for appellee.

Before Parker, chief judge, and Soper and Dobie, circuit judges.

Parker, chief judge:

"This is an appeal by the United States from a judgment entered on a verdict directed for the defendant, Guy W. Capps, in an action instituted to recover damages alleged to have been sustained by the United States as the result of alleged breach by defendant of a contract with respect to the importation of seed potatoes from Canada. The district court denied a motion to dismiss the action (*United States v. Guy W. Capps, Inc.* (100 F. Supp. 30)). Upon the subsequent trial, however, the court directed a verdict and entered judgment for defendant on the ground that there was no sufficient showing of breach of contract or damage to the United States.

"The contract sued on has relation to the potato price support program of 1948 and the executive agreement entered into between Canada and the United States through the Canadian Ambassador and the

Acting Secretary of State of the United States. Pursuant to the Agricultural Act of 1948 (Public Law 897, 80th Cong., 2d Sess., 62 Stat. 1247) the United States committed itself to purchase from eligible potato growers, directly or through dealers, all table stock and seed potatoes that could not be sold commercially at a parity price. The purchase and disposal of potatoes under this program was carried out by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In a manifest attempt to protect the American potato market in which this price-support program was operating from an influx of Canadian-grown potatoes, the Acting Secretary of State of the United States, on November 23, 1948, entered into an executive agreement with the Canadian Ambassador, who was acting for the Canadian Government, to the effect that the Canadian Government would place potatoes in the list of commodities for which export permits were required and that export permits would be granted therefor only to Canadian exporters who could give evidence that they had firm orders from legitimate United States users of Canadian seed potatoes and that 'Canadian exporters would also be required to have included in any contract into which they might enter with a United States seed potato importer a clause in which the importer would give an assurance that the potatoes would not be diverted or reconsigned for table stock purposes.' In consideration of this agreement on the part of the Canadian Government, the United States Government undertook that it would not impose 'any quantitative limitations or fees on Canadian potatoes of the 1948 crop exported to the United States' under the system of regulating the movement of potatoes to the United States outlined in the Canadian proposal and would not consider the Canadian Government's guaranty of a floor price with respect to certain potatoes to be the payment of a bounty or grant and would not levy any countervailing duty on such potatoes under the provisions of section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930. On November 26, 1948, the Canadian Privy Council added potatoes to the list of products under export permit control and exporters of seed potatoes to the United States could not secure an export permit without complying with the conditions required by the executive agreement.

"Defendant, a corporation engaged in business in Norfolk, Va., entered into a contract in December 1948 with H. B. Willis, Inc., a Canadian exporter, to purchase 48,544 sacks of Canadian seed potatoes, containing 100 pounds each, to be shipped on the steamship *Empire Gangway* docking in Jacksonville, Fla., in January 1949. Defendant's officers admittedly knew of the agreement with Canada and stated in a telegram to an official of the United States Department of Agriculture that the potatoes were being brought in for seed purposes. Defendant sent a telegram to the exporter in Canada on the same day that the potatoes were billed stating that they were for planting in Florida and Georgia. Defendant sold the potatoes while in shipment to the Atlantic Commission Co., a wholly owned agency of Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., a retail grocery organization. No attempt was made to restrict their sale so that they would be used for seed and not for food, and there is evidence from which the jury could properly have drawn the conclusion that they were sold on the market as food displacing potatoes grown in this country and causing damage to the United States by requiring greater purchases of American-grown potatoes in aid of the price-support program than would have been necessary in the absence of their importation.

"1–3. On these facts we think that judgment was properly entered for the defendant, but for reasons other than those given by the district court. We have little difficulty in seeing in the evidence breach of contract on the part of defendant and damage resulting to the United States from the breach. We think, however, that the executive agreement was void because it was not authorized by Congress and contravened provisions of a statute dealing with the very matter to which it related and that the contract relied on, which was based on the executive agreement, was unenforcible in the courts of the United States for like reason. We think, also, that no action can be maintained by the Government to recover damages on account of what is essentially a breach of a trade regulation, in the absence of express authorization by Congress. The power to regulate foreign commerce is vested in Congress, not in the executive or the courts; and the executive may not exercise the power by entering into executive agreements and suing in the courts for damages resulting from breaches of contracts made on the basis of such agreements.

"In the Agricultural Act of 1948, Congress had legislated specifically with respect to the limitations which might be imposed on imports if it was thought that they would render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken pursuant to that act. Section 3 of the act, which amended prior statutes, provided in the portion here pertinent (62 Stat. 1248–1250, 7 U. S. C. A. sec. 624):

"'(a) Whenever the President has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title * * * he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

"'(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such * * * quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered * * * for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a), of this section * * * *Provided*, That no proclamation under this section shall impose any limitation on the total quantity of any article or articles which may be entered * * * for consumption which reduces such permissible total quantity to proportionately less than 50 percent of the total quantity of such article or articles which was entered * * * for consumption during a representative period as determined by the President.'

"4. There was no pretense of complying with the requirements of this statute. The President did not cause an investigation to be made by the Tariff Commission, the Commission did not conduct an investigation or make findings or recommendations, and the President made no findings of fact and issued no proclamation imposing quantitative limitations and determined no representative period for the application of the 50 percent limitation contained in the proviso. All that occurred in the making of this executive agreement, the effect of which was to exclude entirely a food product of a foreign country from importation into the United States, was an exchange of correspondence between the Acting Secretary of State and the Canadian Ambassador. Since the purpose of the agreement as well as its effect was to bar imports which would interfere with the agricultural adjustment program, it was necessary that the provisions of this statute be complied with and an executive agreement excluding such imports which failed to comply with it was void. (*Morgan* v. *United States* (304 U. S. 1, 58, S. Ct. 773, 999, 82 L. Ed. 1129); *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388, 55 S. Ct. 241, 253, 79 L. Ed. 446).) As was said by Chief Justice Hughes in the case last cited: 'We are not dealing with action which, appropriately belonging to the executive province, is not the subject of judicial review or with the presumptions attaching to executive action. * * * we are concerned with the question of the delegation of legislative power. * * *'

"5. It is argued, however, that the validity of the executive agreement was not dependent upon the act of Congress but was made pursuant to the inherent powers of the President under the Constitution. The answer is that while the President has certain inherent powers under the Constitution such as the power pertaining to his position as Commander in Chief of Army and Navy and the power necessary to see that the laws are faithfully executed, the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce is not among the powers incident to the Presidential office, but is expressly vested by the Constitution in the Congress. It cannot be upheld as an exercise of the power to see that the laws are faithfully executed, for, as said by Mr. Justice Holmes in his dissenting opinion in *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52, 177, 47 S. Ct. 21, 85, 71 L. Ed. 160), 'The duty of the President to see that the laws be executed is a duty that does not go beyond the laws or require him to achieve more than Congress sees fit to leave within his power.' In the recent case of *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer*, (343 U. S. 579, 72 S. Ct. 863, 867, 96 L. Ed. 1153), the Supreme Court dealt with the question in the following pertinent language:

"'Nor can the seizure order be sustained because of the several constitutional provisions that grant executive power to the President. In the framework of our Constitution, the President's power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker. The Constitution limits his functions in the lawmaking process to the recommending of laws he thinks wise and the vetoing of laws he thinks bad. And the Constitution is neither silent nor equivocal about who shall make laws which the President is to execute. The first section of the first article says that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States * * *." After granting many powers to the Congress, article I goes on to provide that Congress may "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof."'

"The rule was well stated by Mr. Justice Jackson in his concurring opinion in the case last cited as follows:

"'When the President takes measures incompatible with the expressed or implied will of Congress, his power is at its lowest ebb, for then he can rely only upon his own constitutional powers minus any constitutional powers of Congress over the matter. Courts can sustain exclusive Presidential control in such a case only by disabling the Congress from acting upon the subject. Presidential claim to a power at once so conclusive and preclusive must be scrutinized with caution, for what is at stake is the equilibrium established by our constitutional system.'

"6. We think that whatever the power of the executive with respect to making executive trade agreements regulating foreign

commerce in the absence of action by Congress, it is clear that the executive may not through entering into such an agreement avoid complying with a regulation prescribed by Congress. Imports from a foreign country are foreign commerce subject to regulation, so far as this country is concerned, by Congress alone. The executive may not bypass congressional limitations regulating such commerce by entering into an agreement with the foreign country that the regulation be exercised by that country through its control over exports. Even though the regulation prescribed by the executive agreement be more desirable than that prescribed by congressional action, it is the latter which must be accepted as the expression of national policy.

"7, 8. It is argued that irrespective of the validity of the executive agreement, the contract sued on was a valid contract between defendant and the Canadian exporter, and that since the contract was made for the benefit of the United States, this country may maintain action upon it.[2] The answer is that the contract was but the carrying out of the executive agreement entered into in contravention of the policy declared by Congress; and the courts of the United States will not lend their aid to enforcing it against the public policy of the country so declared. As stated, the regulation of imports from foreign countries is a matter for Congress and, when Congress has acted, the executive may not enforce different regulations by suing on contracts made with reference thereto. As said by the Supreme Court in *Oscanyan* v. *Arms Co.* (103 U. S. 261, 277, 26 L. Ed. 539), 'Contracts permissible by other countries are not enforceable in our courts if they contravene our laws, our morality, or our policy.'

"9. We think the action for damages may not be sustained for the additional reason that Congress has created no such right of action and we think that the principles laid down by the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. of California* (332 U. S. 301, 67 S. Ct. 1604, 91 L. Ed. 2067), are applicable here. This is not a case where the Government stands in the shoes of a private person and sues on a contract which it has made as much. It is a case where the Government sues in its sovereign capacity to recover damages which it claims to have sustained while engaged in the exercise of governmental powers, as the result of the violation of a contract made between other persons. No such cause of action exists under Federal law; and we do not think that analogies drawn from private contract law, permitting suit by one for whose benefit a contract is made to sue thereon, can properly be followed here. 'The exercise of judicial power to establish a new liability would amount to an unwarranted intrusion by the courts into a field properly within the control of Congress and as to a matter concerning which it had seen fit to take no action.' (*Gartner* v. *United States* (9 Cir., 166 F. 2d 728, 730)). In the case of *United States v. Standard Oil Co. of California*, supra, the Supreme Court, in denying recovery by the Government in an action grounded in analogies to private tort law, used the following language which we think pertinent, viz:

" 'Moreover, as the Government recognizes for one phase of the argument but ignores for the other, we have not here simply a question of creating a new liability in the nature of a tort. For grounded though the argument is in analogies drawn from that field, the issue comes down in final consequence to a question of Federal fiscal policy, coupled with considerations concerning the need for and the appropriateness of means to be used in executing the policy sought to be established. The tort law analogy is brought forth, indeed, not to secure a new step forward in expanding the recognized area for applying settled principles of that law as such, or for creating new ones. It is advanced rather as the instrument for determining and establishing the Federal fiscal and regulatory policies which the Government's executive arm thinks should prevail in a situation not covered by traditionally established liabilities.

" 'Whatever the merits of the policy, its conversion into law is a proper subject for congressional action, not for any creative power of ours. Congress, not this Court or the other Federal courts, is the custodian of the national purse. By the same token it is the primary and most often the exclusive arbiter of Federal fiscal affairs. And these comprehend, as we have said, securing the Treasury or the Government against financial losses, however inflicted, including requiring reimbursement for injuries creating them, as well as filling the Treasury itself.' [332 U. S. 301, 67 S. Ct. 1611.]

"For the reasons stated, we do not think that the United States can maintain the action for damages. The judgment for defendant will accordingly be affirmed."

Affirmed.

[2] There is a holding to that effect in a decision of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York in the case of *United States* v. *Carpenter* (113 F. Supp. 327).

THE CHARGE OF TREASON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to read, for the information of the Senate, an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Washington Post of this morning, February 16, 1954:

THE CHARGE OF TREASON

Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN has been asking the Democrats for a list of names that he can use without making them angry. I am afraid Mr. HOFFMAN has not quite understood just why the President disavowed the charges of treason in the Lincoln's birthday speeches.

The list of names that one politician may call another is almost, but not quite, unlimited. The list, moreover, can always be enlarged whenever a politician comes along with a knack for calling names. He does not have to refrain because his epithets will make his opponent angry. Indeed, politics being a rough and manly game, he may use names with the intention of making the other fellow so angry that he becomes rattled and does foolish things. This is a very free country.

There is, however, a blacklist on name-calling. The test is not whether the name makes a man angry; or whether it is coarse, mean, insulting; not even whether it is untrue. The test is whether the name is one which—if it is untrue and is not retracted—a man of honor cannot forgive. As long as the libel stands, there can be between him and the man who made it only an implacable enmity.

Treason, like murder, is a capital offense. To call a man a traitor, to accuse him of aiding and abetting treason, is to make a mortal accusation. If the accuser is right, the traitor should be brought to trial and, if convicted, he deserves to die. And if the man is falsely accused, if he is libeled and traduced by a deliberate and calculated lie, he must resent it and he must not rest until the accusation is knocked out. It is not merely his private right to vindicate his honor. It is his public duty to vindicate his honor. For the making of false accusations, especially of capital crimes like treason and murder, is a subversion of freedom of speech and grave disorderly conduct which threatens the integrity of a nation.

It is necessary to spell out why the charge of treason—made deliberately and with knowing untruth by one party against another—is an intolerable political offense? For those who have forgotten why, or perhaps have never known, let it be said that to incite one half of the people against the other half, putting between them the mortal issue of treason, is to enter upon the commission of a political crime which can bring terrible consequences.

It is a gruesome irony that this organized incitement of a fratricidal division of our people was begun, with the blessings of the chairman of the Republican National Committee, at meetings in honor of Abraham Lincoln. It makes one shudder at the desecration of his memory—at having to hear cruel and calculating voices summoning the Nation to civil disunity in the name of the martyr of the American Civil War.

The seriousness of the offense lies in the fact that, despite the President's disavowal of the charge of treason, the campaign is sponsored by the chairman of the Republican committee. The evidence is not conclusive but it is very strong that the resort to this tactic, the use of MCCARTHY, JENNER, and the like to force and fix the political issues, reflects a deliberate and highlevel political decision. With the President himself reluctant and protesting, it would appear from their actions that there has been a radical decision by the politicians of the Eisenhower ring of the Republican Party.

Beginning with Mr. Brownell's Chicago speech and his use of the FBI files for partisan purposes, going on to Governor Dewey's unprecedented—unprecedented for him—political violence and venom at Hartford and then down to Chairman Hall's encouragement of the firebrands—there is a remarkably clear pattern.

The Brownell speech marked a radical turn away from the principles and the ideals General Eisenhower represents. It was made almost immediately after the ominous Republican political reverses in Wisconsin, New Jersey, and New York. Since then the underlying economic trends have not been favorable to Republican political prospects. It is only too evident that the politicians around the President are very much frightened. The Brownell-Dewey-Hall line since the lost elections of last fall can be explained only by supposing they are afraid not only of losing the House of Representatives to the Democrats but also of losing their own party position and perhaps their political heads to the extreme anti-Eisenhower and anti-Dewey wing of the party.

Their new line is explicable only in terms of something like panic, fear, or a profound feeling of political insecurity. Their line is designed as protection against the exploitation by MCCARTHY of a political setback in November. If the election goes better than they now fear, they will still be in the saddle though considerably bedraggled in appearance. If the election goes badly, they hope—though almost certainly in vain—to make MCCARTHY share the blame and not to be able to raise hell at their expense.

The President, who cannot be happy about all this, might find it useful at this point to invite his political advisers to read and to ponder the famous and oft-told tale of Dr. Faustus and his pact with a very slick and plausible gent.

EISENHOWER AND LINCOLN—ARTICLE BY RALPH MCGILL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article by Mr. Ralph McGill, entitled "Eisenhower and Lincoln," which appeared in the Atlanta Journal of February 12, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EISENHOWER AND LINCOLN

There is no intent here to compare him with Lincoln, but there are parallels.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, talking with the press but a few hours ahead of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, suggested that political parties with small majorities speak softly and declared his need of the Democratic Party in the Government.

This outraged Senator JOE MCCARTHY, columnist David Lawrence, and others who speak for, and represent, the extreme right wing, or old guard, of the Republican Party.

Lincoln faced a similar problem.

The extremists in his Cabinet and in the Congress, as well as the hostile elements of the press, were saying that the Southern leaders should be tried and hanged or imprisoned. They were crying for a conquered province status.

Lincoln stood against it. He was saying the Union needed the South and its people and that they should be brought back into the Union without unnecessary humiliation or punishment.

Senators and Congressmen, as well as Cabinet Members, went about crying for the hangman's noose, for prison and for the most extreme and cruel forms of revenge.

TREASON

Today, Senator MCCARTHY'S voice and, to a somewhat lesser extent, those of JENNER and VELDE, along with some elements of the press, join in saying that the Democratic Party is "the party of treason."

"The party of treason, the party that sold our America, the party that brought in the Communists, the party of disloyalty."

It has a familiar ring. It sounds exactly like Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner of 1865–75.

But the President, speaking over the heads of these men, said that the Republicans, in office with a small majority, should speak softly. He needed the loyal American faith of the Democrats. Without them and their loyalty, the Government, with a bare majority, cannot go on.

He knew, for example, that Senator WALTER GEORGE, who brought forth the Democratic compromise in the BRICKER fight, was not a traitor because he stood there as a Democrat when he presented the compromise which saved the Republican Party from defeat.

The President, being a decent man, was trying, as did Lincoln, to deal with men driven by the lust of personal power. It was the excesses of Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens which drove the frustrated actor Booth to murder and thereby delivered the Nation into the hands of the extremists. President Eisenhower obviously recognizes the danger of the extremists in his own party.

LOYALTY

On the day the President so spoke, suggesting the extremists in his party cease their loud shoutings, it was revealed that of the 534 persons released by the State Department only 11 were in the security-risk status. Yet, the extremists have been saying to the Nation, "We have fired 2,200 for disloyalty." They were going out for their Lincoln Day speeches with this lie. It was a deliberate attempt to further their charges that the Democratic Party is the party of disloyalty and of treason.

An angry security officer shouts that the people aren't interested in why they were fired—they just wanted to be rid of them. Actually, most were fired for inefficiency, for drinking, and for other causes. But the Thad Stevenses and the Charles Sumners of today are saying all had been fired for security risks. They sought to make the firing of a drunk appear as the discovery of a traitor.

It was, and is, a Fascistlike lie—just as Thad Stevens and Charles Sumner used it to destroy the decent and reasonable policy of Lincoln.

The American people are loyal—Democrats and Republicans alike. They are confronted with men who would use, and foment, fear to attain unusual political powers for themselves. President Eisenhower sees it for what it is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as examples of what Mr. Lippman and Mr. McGill are talking about, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the following excerpts from speeches and press dispatches:

First. A statement by Stephen A. Mitchell at a press conference in Portland, Oreg., released by the Democratic National Committee on February 10.

Second. A quotation from a speech by Attorney General Brownell before the Executives Club of Chicago, on November 6, 1953.

Third. A quotation from a speech by Governor Dewey at Hartford, Conn., on December 16, 1953, from the New York Times of December 17, 1953.

Fourth. A quotation from a speech by Senator JENNER at Jeffersonville, Ind., on February 12, 1954, as reported in the New York Times, of February 13, 1954.

Fifth. A quotation from a speech by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] at Charleston, W. Va., on February 4, 1954, as reported in the Charleston Gazette of February 5, 1954.

Sixth. A quotation from a speech by Governor Dewey read to Brooklyn Republicans, as reported in the Washington Post of February 13.

Seventh. An article from the Washington Post of February 14, 1954, reporting a speech by Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Eighth. An excerpt from an article in the St. Paul, Minn., Pioneer Press, of February 9, 1954, reporting a speech delivered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] in St. Paul on February 8, 1954.

Ninth. An excerpt from an article in the Detroit News of February 7, 1954, reporting a speech by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] delivered at a banquet in Mount Clemens, Mich.

Tenth. Excerpts from a United Press article in the Washington Post of February 8, 1954, reporting statements by Leonard W. Hall, Chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Eleventh. Excerpts from an article in the New York Times of February 14, 1954, dealing with speeches by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and Mr. Scott McLeod.

Twelfth. An excerpt from a speech by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] delivered at San Mateo, Calif., on February 10, 1954.

Thirteenth. An excerpt from an article in the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times of February 8, 1954, reporting a speech by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] in that city.

Fourteenth. An excerpt from a speech delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] in Sarasota County, Fla., as reported in the New York Times of February 14, 1954.

Fifteenth. An excerpt from the New York Times of February 14, 1954, reporting on a speech delivered by Speaker MARTIN in Newark, N. J., on February 13, 1954.

Sixteenth. An excerpt from a speech delivered by Postmaster General Summerfield at New York on January 21, 1954.

Seventeenth. An excerpt from an article in the Washington, D. C., Times-Herald of February 5, 1954, reporting a speech delivered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] in Charleston, W. Va., on February 4, 1954.

Eighteenth. An article appearing in the New York Times of January 24, 1954, reporting a speech delivered by Speaker MARTIN in Philadelphia, Pa., on January 23, 1954.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT QUOTED, HAS NOT SEEN ACCUSATIONS—STEPHEN A. MITCHELL AT A PRESS CONFERENCE IN PORTLAND, OREG.

It is amazing to read the President's statement that "he has not seen any accusations by members of his party charging that Democrats are tinged with treason." He can pick up any paper in the country and see these charges almost daily—even from his own official family. (Publicity division, Democratic National Committee, February 10, 1954.)

QUOTE FROM ATTORNEY GENERAL BROWNELL'S SPEECH BEFORE THE EXECUTIVES CLUB, NOVEMBER 6, 1953

Notwithstanding all this, Harry Dexter White was a Russian spy. He smuggled secret documents to Russian agents for transmission to Moscow. Harry Dexter White was known to be a Communist spy by the very people who appointed him to the most sensitive and important position he ever held in Government service.

GOVERNOR DEWEY AT HARTFORD, CONN., DECEMBER 16, 1953

Whenever anybody mentions the words "Truman" and "Democrats" to you, for the rest of your lives remember that those words are synonymous with Americans dying, thousands of miles from home, because they did not have the ammunition to defend themselves.

Remember that the words "Truman" and "Democrat" mean bungling our country into war and the lack of courage or the capacity either to win the war or to win a truce.

Remember that the words "Truman" and "Democrat" mean the loss of 450 million Chinese to the free world. Remember that the words "Truman" and "Democrat" mean diplomatic failure, military failure, death, and tragedy. (The New York Times, December 17, 1953 (from text of speech).)

SENATOR JENNER AT JEFFERSONVILLE, IND., FEBRUARY 12, 1954

We won in 1952 because the Fair Dealers made one mistake too many * * * they ordered American youth to engage in a war halfway round the earth, in territory the Fair Dealers had carefully stripped beforehand of every American soldier and virtually every American gun. * * *

That was bad enough but worse was to come. They put every possible handicap on our fighting men. They deprived them of air support, and a naval blockade. They removed their commander in mid-campaign.

But the Americans did not know they were supposed to lose the war, so they won it.

Then the Fair Dealers stooped to the ultimate depths—they gave away the victory our men had won with their blood. (The New York Times, February 18, 1954.)

SENATOR MCCARTHY AT CHARLESTON, W. VA., FEBRUARY 4, 1954

The Democratic label—and I hasten to add this label is not deserved by millions of loyal Democrats—is now the property of men who have been unwilling to recognize evil or who bent to whispered pleas to traitorous men. * * *

He said the "label" was controlled by Democrats who were too weak or unwilling to fight treason; men whose political heritage is stained with blood of men betrayed in Taejon (Korea); men who walked side by side with the betrayers of Yalta; men who wear the political label stitched with the idiocy of a Truman; rotted by the deceit of an Acheson; corrupted by the Red slime of Harry Dexter White.

The hard fact is that those who wear the label Democrat wear it with the stain of a historic betrayal. They wear it with the corrosion of unprecedented corruption; they wear it with blood of dying men who crawled up the hills of Korea while the left wing politicians in the Democrat Party wrote perfumed invitations to the Communists to join them at the United Nations. (The Charleston Gazette, February 5, 1954.)

GOV. THOMAS DEWEY IN A STATEMENT READ TO BROOKLYN REPUBLICANS

Gov. Tom Dewey, of New York, * * * said in a statement read to Brooklyn Republicans * * * that Republicans found "The Government payrolls were crammed with men and women who were described as security risks," and "in some cases that description was an out-and-out understatement." (Washington Post, February 13, 1954 (Lincoln Day talks).)

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON POST OF FEBRUARY 14, 1954

Wendell B. Barnes, head of the Federal Small Business Administration, wrapped together in one speech all the Republican accusations. * * *

In his prepared text, Barnes spoke, too, of Communist coddling and lit into "fuzzy-minded New Deal Democrats" as "gloom and doom people" who now are peddling a "Fear Deal" and "scare talk."

While playing politics with human misery and the safety of the free world, he said, "they are crying all over the place and threatening to sabotage needed legislation if the President doesn't halt these terrible accusations." * * *

* * * it was Barnes, sworn in only Friday as a member of the Administration family, who swung the hardest punches at the Democrats.

Democratic "croakers," he said, are "crying at the top of their lungs that 'depression is just around the corner'." With world safety resting on a sound American economy, Barnes asked, "What penalty could be large enough for those who, in criminal folly, could reduce Western civilization to ashes?"

People from "the side which did some of the most dastardly character-wrecking of all time," he said, should be able to "take it a little better and not cry and whine that they won't cooperate even on meritorious measures unless the Republicans let up on them."

SENATOR WILLIAM JENNER IN ST. PAUL, MINN., FEBRUARY 8, 1954

Commenting on conditions when Republicans took over, he said: "Never had a political party, newly come to power, found such heaps of evidence of the stupidity, the corruption, even the treason of its predecessors."

"For 20 years our beloved country has been governed by an invading army of alien intellectuals," he declared. "Their ideas were foreign to every principle that has moved our people since the days, 4 centuries ago, when Englishmen clustered in their villages and talked of the tyranny of kings." (As carried in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on February 9.)

SENATOR JOSEPH MCCARTHY IN SPEECH AT BANQUET IN MOUNT CLEMENS, MICH., ON LINCOLN DAY

He reiterated his stand that communism is the issue of this year's campaign and accused the Democratic Party of being "dedicated to whitewashing communism and espionage."

"Naturally," MCCARTHY said, he considers it his duty to "call upon all good Democrats to desert the party of betrayal in this election year and help the Republicans clean up this Commie mess.

"The once great Democratic Party that has fallen on such evil days disgraces every decent, honest Democratic officeholder by placing the odious, immoral label of dishonesty and treason upon the party as Truman did."

MCCARTHY was asked if his own language was not "intemperate."

"I wouldn't call it that," he said seriously. (Detroit News, February 7, 1954.)

FROM UNITED PRESS ARTICLE IN WASHINGTON POST

Republican National Chairman Leonard W. Hall said yesterday that alleged communism under Democratic administrations will be a GOP issue in the coming campaign and the Republican Party endorses Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, who is making speeches about it. Hall said, in reply to a question, that he considers MCCARTHY an "asset" to the Republican campaign. He said MCCARTHY "is in demand all over" as a speaker, and the Senator himself "decides where he will go." (Washington Post, February 8, 1954.)

ROUNDUP OF LINCOLN DAY TALKS

Senator MCCARTHY, speaking in Madison, Wis., charged that the "Democratic administration over the past 20 years has deliberately and knowingly allowed Communists to take any position in Government they desire.

"The Democratic leadership has betrayed the confidence of millions of loyal, decent American Democrats."

In Worland, Wyo., Mr. McLeod declared that people "aren't interested in whether loyalty risks are drunks, dope fiends, sex perverts, or Communists—but they are interested in getting them out of Government." (The New York Times, February 14, 1954.)

SENATOR JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY IN ADDRESS AT SAN MATEO, CALIF., ON FEBRUARY 10, 1954

How does it affect you, my good friends, that because of that over the past 20 years of treason Communists have been able to infiltrate every policymaking position in this Government?

SENATOR JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY AS SPEAKER AT LINCOLN DAY DINNER AT MADISON, WIS.

As you know I and some others have been bringing hitherto undisclosed facts to the attention of the American people to show that the Democrat administration over the past 20 years has deliberately and knowingly allowed Communists to hold any positions in Government they desire—from handling topmost secrets to guiding our foreign and domestic policy. (Madison Capital Times, February 8, 1954.)

SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN IN AN ADDRESS PREPARED FOR A LINCOLN DAY GATHERING OF SARASOTA COUNTY, FLA., REPUBLICANS

Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, today termed the Roosevelt and Truman administrations "twenty years of socialistic experimentation and disloyal conduct by men in high places." (New York Times, February 14, 1954.)

NEWARK, N. J., February 13, 1954.—Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, said tonight that 1954 was a year of decision against atheistic communism and added that "evil disbelievers crept into power in our land" in the last 20 years.

"I believe what happens this year * * * will profoundly affect the future of all religious faiths," he declared in a prepared Lincoln Day address before Essex County Republicans.

Of those he called "evil believers" the Representative said: "They achieved some of the highest, most powerful positions in our Government. There seemed no stopping them. And then President Eisenhower was elected. In the battle for men's minds and souls, the Communists received a major setback." (The New York Times, February 14, 1954.)

SUMMERFIELD AT NEW YORK, JANUARY 21, 1954

Almost 2,200 people who were security risks are no longer using up your tax money. I am here to tell you we are not hiring any new ones. Somehow I do not feel too amiably inclined toward people who make treason a preoccupation.

SENATOR MCCARTHY AT CHARLESTON, W. VA., FEBRUARY 4, 1954

The issue between Republican and Democrat has been drawn.

On the one hand it extends from the hearth where Lincoln learned his ABC's. On the other it extends from the atheist sinkhole that spawned the evil of Karl Marx. (INS article in Washington Times-Herald, February 5, 1954.)

[From the New York Times of January 24, 1954]

MARTIN CONDEMNS TALK OF A SLUMP—ASSERTS "LEFT-WING EGGHEADS" TRY TO PROMOTE HARD TIMES AS CUE FOR SOCIALISM

PHILADELPHIA, January 23.—Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., charged tonight that left-wing "eggheads" were "trying to promote us into hard times for political reasons."

Their aim, he declared, is "to lead us into socialism."

In a speech prepared for the 46th annual banquet of the Philadelphia Real Estate Board, the Massachusetts Republican said that despite pessimistic statements of alarmists "there is not a valid economic sign today * * * pointing to anything like the unemployment of 1949–50, when these people were so silent."

The Nation is now going through a period of readjustment, Mr. MARTIN asserted, and today's unemployment figure of 2 million "may vary upward in the next few months."

"Despite this period of transition," he added, "the year 1953 just finished was the most prosperous in the history of our country, and the fact is there are 62 million American civilians at work today at gainful occupations."

Representative MARTIN's speech was billed in advance by his office as a major address, with a Nation-wide broadcast arranged.

FOUR-ALARM PROPHETS DECRIED

In 1949 and 1950, under a Democratic administration, the Speaker said, unemployment reached 3,400,000 and 4,750,000, but the "four-alarm prophets of the left wing * * *

were silent. There were no cries of recession, no cries of depression."

"Each time you read one of these political utterances," he advised, "go back and check up the gentleman's statements in 1949 and early 1950. You will find that the color of the coat has changed."

Mr. MARTIN charged that such left-wingers "infest" the Americans for Democratic Action, the anti-Communist organization that backs the principles of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

He said he knew of no responsible businessmen who were pessimistic about the economic outlook. Politicians, he added, know less about the country's economy than businessmen and economists, "and do more talking about the subject."

"These four-alarm prophets" of hard times, Mr. MARTIN declared, "are of a political persuasion that is either downright left wing or friendly to it. In fact, these gentlemen have been steadily preaching this doctrine since July 1952. They preached it all through the 1952 campaign, they have predicted a depression for each quarter of 1953 and possibly because Eugene Varga, the leading Soviet economist, is also preaching it—they are predicting a depression for 1954."

FINDS PUBLIC IS CALM

Businessmen, housewives, and farmers, he said, are aware of the fact that "we have been in a period of readjustment for many months," but "our people have remained pretty calm on the whole."

Mr. MARTIN also reviewed the first year of the Republican administration and predicted that 1,000,000 homes would be built this year, with private enterprise performing in "a manner so outstanding that public housing soon will become only a memory of the unlamented days of the managed economy."

Because of the narrow political margins in Congress, he concedes, no one can predict with certainty the fate of President Eisenhower's legislative program. But, he said, "the American people will demand its enactment, and they will get its enactment, if not by the narrow majorities of this Congress, then by sufficient majorities in the next Congress."

RECESS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 17, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Robert N. Oerter, Jr., Sixth Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we delight to come into Thy presence through Jesus Christ our Lord. As we come this day, our Father, we thank Thee that all we have comes from Thee. Do Thou give to us hearts filled with gratitude to Thee for Thy many and countless blessings. We ask Thy special blessing this day that as these men and women go about their work, Thou wilt grant to them courage and patience, that Thou wilt deliver them from any self-seeking and anything which would be contrary to Thy will. Grant to them the courage to do that which is right in Thine eyes. Grant, Lord, to them, profit from previous experience; grant to them wisdom; grant to them everything needful to perform this task of leadership for Thee. So, come into our hearts this day that we may be filled with joy and peace through believing in Thee. These things we pray in the name of the Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 12, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6025. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Hospital, a nonprofit institution, to use certain United States property in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 7893) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, Export-Import Bank of Washington, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1200), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARY reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill be the order of business tomorrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, is that the bill that was just reported, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The unanimous consent request is to waive the 3-day rule?

Mr. CANFIELD. In effect, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I object, Mr. Speaker.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following the legislative program of the day and special orders heretofore entered, and also to revise and extend her remarks and include a statement by Mr. Richards, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

NATIONAL FUND FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I am introducing a bill with the approval and consent of the American Medical Association, to incorporate the National Fund for Medical Education.

This organization is a voluntary, nonprofit association organized to interpret the needs of medical education to the American public; to encourage the advancement of medical training standards in the United States; to preserve academic freedom in the medical schools, and to foster the training of a sufficient number of competent physicians to meet the Nation's health needs. The National Fund for Medical Education was established in 1949.

Funds received by this organization are allocated annually to the Nation's 79 medical schools for unrestricted use in support of their teaching budgets in accordance with a grants policy approved by the fund's board of trustees. These awards are based upon the recommendations of a grants advisory committee, representing the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Medical Association, and the fund's advisory council.

As of December 31, 1952, the fund had distributed almost $3 million to the medical schools. These funds were contributed by industry, foundations, public-spirited citizens and the medical profession. While of substantial assistance, the grants made to date fall far short of the amount needed. Today, a minimum of $10 million is required annually if the schools are to maintain their academic standards and training programs.

Medical advances benefit society only if there is a large force of physicians to apply them. Without competent doctors, full realization of the benefits from the antibiotics, psychiatry, biochemistry and nuclear physics would be impossible—the great strides in public health, industrial medicine, and other important fields jeopardized.

This dangerous situation obviously cannot be met at the local level. The individual medical schools cannot obtain the funds necessary to restore medical education to a sound financial footing through separate, sporadic fundraising endeavors of their own.

They must be supported by every element of our economy, on the same plane with the Red Cross, the Community Chest, and our other great public service agencies, as a national resource indispensable to our country's welfare.

I am convinced that this organization is carrying on work of vital importance to the welfare of the Nation. In view of its national character, its service to the medical life in all parts of the country, the National Fund for Medical Education is uniquely qualified for a national charter. I am of the opinion that such a Federal charter will be of aid in accomplishing the important objectives of this organization. Moreover, this endeavor, supported and managed as it is by private enterprise, is an effective answer to increasing public clamor for Federal subsidies for medical education. What the Government subsidizes it controls. My bill will not cost the Federal Government one dime.

RECIPROCITY MUST WORK BOTH WAYS

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, in my campaigns I never criticized any individual as a member of the Democratic Party and I did not do so during the past Lincoln Day meetings. I joined and continue to join both Republicans and Democrats who asked for a change from the socialistic trend of the so-called New Deal and Fair Deal administrations. This represents an honest difference of opinion as well as a difference in economic and political philosophy.

The people requested this change in an emphatic manner at the polls in 1952, and President Eisenhower and the 83d Congress are giving that change to the United States. This means an orderly transfer from a war economy to a peace economy, from a controlled-economy state to an incentive-economy state. It will provide, in due time, a dollar with increased instead of decreased purchasing power, and greater freedom for both the producer and the consumer.

All of these points and many other notable accomplishments formed the basis for Lincoln Day speeches. This type of presentation should and does serve as an encouragement and a stimulus to all people who are lending their efforts in this orderly economic transition.

However, the recent Democratic candidate for Vice President did not choose to follow any such reciprocal arrangement when he spoke in Indiana recently, if the newspapers correctly quoted him. Instead, he not only implied but accused the Republican Party of creating hard times, depressions, and other economic ills whenever they are in power by following certain policies. If not by direct charge he insinuated that times were bad. Why did he not tell the true facts—that 1953 was the best peacetime year; that, despite a decline of farm prices starting during their last 2 years in office, farm prices now are advancing and that the farmer is expected to have an even better net return for 1954; that less man-hours were lost in 1953 than in any previous peacetime year; and that industry now is expanding in a manner that will provide a steady instead of a fluctuating employment.

No; this defeated Vice Presidential candidate seems to prefer to criticize others, but his party does not want anybody to criticize them.

Reciprocity works both ways.

THE LATE GLENN MILLER

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the late Glenn Miller, born in my district in Clarinda, Iowa, was a musician whose sensitive craftsmanship took him to the top of his art. Today, a decade after his untimely death, his records outsell all other orchestra compositions. A screening of Universal's production of The Glenn Miller Story, will open here in Washington, D. C., and all over the country tomorrow, February 17. I wish to commend to the attention of the membership an evening in the theater listening to the distinctive Miller arrangements and watching the fine story of his life, as portrayed by Jimmy Stewart and June Allyson. Hollywood can be proud of The Glenn Miller Story, just as Iowa is proud of Glenn Miller.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY WEEK CHARGES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, responsible Members would make a serious mistake if they allowed the spate of factional talk which took place during the Lincoln's birthday week to draw them into making communism in the United States of America the issue of the 1954 congressional campaign. I believe that the American people expect that responsible Republicans and Democrats will not be ricocheted—to use the idea in a popular song—into a bitter factional scrap based on sensational charges made by a few who wish communism to be the issue instead of the President's program. I cannot believe that men and women experienced in active political life would be distracted on the fundamentals by any such diversion, especially in view of the fact that the President himself, the leader of the party, and the Speaker have made so clear their own truly American understanding of the limits of partisanship; nor is it fair to consider the sensational charges made by a few the attitude of the rank and file of Republicans. I cannot believe that responsible Democrats will be diverted by these sensational charges from supporting an expansion of social security, a national housing program, improvement of unemployment insurance, a national health program, a review of labor-management legislation, a new farm policy, and vital measures concerning international security and trade.

The country and the Nation—indeed the whole free world—face vital decisions in these next months. Let us get to them and not risk serious injury to the whole cause of the free peoples by being distracted by a factional fight on shadows, fears, and bygones not documented with facts.

THE EISENHOWER BUDGET

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the people of our country are recognizing that we are living up to our campaign promises. Figures show that Ohio's share of the last Truman budget would have been $4,951,800,000.

Under the Eisenhower budget, Ohio taxpayers would pay $4,139,360,000, a reduction of $812,440,000. This figures out to be $623 for every man, woman, and child in the State based on the 1950 census figures, under the Truman budget as compared with $521 under the Eisenhower budget.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that we are as of now, making an average saving of $102 per individual per year. I am of the firm conviction that we can do better than this, but a saving of $102 for every man, woman, and child in the 17th Congressional District, as well as our State, certainly merits the consideration of all.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON asked and was granted permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday, February 24, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered; and that if the House should not be in session that day the special order be postponed until the next day, Thursday.

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE MALE NURSES AND MEDICAL SPECIALISTS TO BE APPOINTED AS RESERVE OFFICERS

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to authorize male nurses and medical specialists to be appointed as Reserve officers in the three branches of our armed service. This measure supersedes

H. R. 4447, which has been pending before the Armed Services Committee since last April.

The committee has taken no action on the pending bill because they have not received a report from the Department of Defense. I have been in touch with the Department and understand they would prefer a bill to confer reserve commissions on male nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, whereas H. R. 4447 would commission male nurses in the Army Reserve only. My new bill would give Reserve commissions to men nurses in all three branches of the service.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the armed services have never given commissions to men who have had full nursing training, but have used them as corpsmen, wardmen, and specialists of various kinds, with the ratings of enlisted men. In many cases the qualified man nurse finds himself assigned to some duty which has no relation whatsoever to his nursing training. We simply cannot afford to waste our nurse power in this fashion.

Our giving the male nurse proper recognition in the armed services would have a strong influence on encouraging more well-qualified young men to enroll in schools of nursing. We can use all the nurses we can get—male or female.

For every 100 men nurses commissioned, 100 women nurses could remain in civilian hospitals as key nursing personnel. There is an important need for men in both the military and Veterans' Administration hospitals. The man nurse would be particularly useful in the NP wards.

The bill is not mandatory, it does not force the Navy to accept a change in what is a very fine and an entirely unique method; therefore, it is to be anticipated that there will be no objection voiced by the Department of Defense.

SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON PROJECTS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS BEGINNING WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1954, AT 10 A. M.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith a list of the projects to be heard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, hearings on river and harbor authorizations initiated on February 2, 1954, will be continued beginning at 10 a. m. Wednesday, February 24, 1954. These hearings will cover favorable reports submitted to the Congress by the Chief of Engineers subsequent to the enactment of the River and Harbor Act of May 17, 1950.

The hearings will be before the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, of which the Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL, of Oregon, is chairman, and will convene at 10 o'clock each morning in room 1302, New House Office Building. All proponents and opponents of a project, including Senators and Representatives, will be heard on the day scheduled for the consideration of that project following the presentation by the representative of the Civil Works Division of the Corps of Engineers. All proponents and opponents should submit their names before the hearing to the clerk of the committee indicating the projects in which they are interested. If convenient, it will be helpful if local witnesses provide the committee with 20 copies of prepared statements at the time of their appearance.

Wednesday, February 24: Sheboygan Harbor, Wis., House Document No. 554, 82d Congress; Town River, Quincy, Mass., House Document No. 108, 83d Congress; Weymouth Fore River, Mass., House Document No. 555, 82d Congress; Hudson River, N. Y., House Document No. 228, 83d Congress.

Thursday, February 25: Savannah Harbor, Ga., House Document No. 110, 83d Congress; Mobile Harbor, Ala., House Document No. 74, 83d Congress; Mississippi River, damages at Louisiana, Mo., House Document No. 251, 82d Congress; Mississippi River at Chester, Ill., House Document No. 230, 83d Congress.

Friday, February 26: Green and Barren Rivers, Ky. and Tenn., Senate Document No. 82, 83d Congress; Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn., Senate Document No. 81, 83d Congress.

Tuesday, March 2: Holland Harbor, Mich., House Document No. 282, 83d Congress; Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex., House Document No. 89, 83d Congress; Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex., Senate Document No. 80, 83d Congress.

Wednesday, March 3: Guadalupe River at Seadrift, Tex., House Document No. 478, 81st Congress; Turtle Cove, Tex., House Document No. 654, 81st Congress; Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif., House Document No. 161, 83d Congress.

Thursday, March 4: Columbia River at the mouth, Oreg. and Wash., House Document 249, 83d Congress; Gold Beach, Oreg., Senate Document No. 83, 83d Congress; Umpqua River at Scholfield, Oreg., Senate Document No. 133, 81st Congress; Bellingham Harbor, Wash., House Document No. 558, 82 Congress; Columbia River between Chinook and Sand Island, Wash., Senate Document No. 8, 83d Congress.

Friday, March 5: Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, Wash., House Document No. 569, 81st Congress; Port Angeles Harbor, Wash., House Document No. 155, 82d Congress; Quillayute River, Wash., House Document No. 579, 81st Congress; Shilshole Bay, Wash., House Document No. 536, 81st Congress.

Tuesday, March 9: Copper River, Alaska, House Document No. 182, 83d Congress; Honolulu Harbor, Hawaii, House Document No. 717, 81st Congress.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LANDS IN HAWAII

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2846) authorizing the President to exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii, notwithstanding the acts of August 5, 1939, and June 16, 1949, or other acts of Congress, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SAYLOR, D'EWART, HOSMER, REGAN, and ASPINALL.

PARTISAN POLITICAL STATEMENTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] made an excellent point.

The man in the street does not necessarily share the excitement of political partisans. General statements of accusation against an entire political party, being inaccurate, are largely ineffective.

May I, as a former chairman of the political party, propose a fair swap?

I suggest that Republicans agree that Democrats generally are loyal Americans, that subversion and treason are personal to the offenders, and that these offenders are no longer in the Government.

I suggest that Democrats, in grateful return, stop trying to scare people into reducing employment by cutting out accusations against Republicans as alleged promoters of hard times.

Suppose Democrats stopped running against Hoover, and Republicans stopped running against Truman? Could we not just get on with mutually constructive efforts on behalf of all the people?

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today a number of Members of the House are giving speeches on the subject of Lithuanian independence. At this time I ask unanimous consent that all these remarks be grouped together at one place in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. ROONEY. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. When the brave Christian nation of Lithuania achieved its independence in 1918 it proceeded to advance with admirable celerity in every worthwhile avenue of progress. Herbert Hoover testified before our Baltic Committee that the three Baltic States had made more progress from the very low beginnings they had had 19 years before, than probably had ever been made by any series of states on record. But Lithuania lost her independence in 1940 to Soviet aggression and is now a captive nation: the Communist juggernaut mercilessly crushed defenseless Lithuania and then proceeded to sovietize her people. Lithuania symbolizes the cause of the captive nations, the cause of the captive nations that followed, such as Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and others. The cause of these captive nations is the cause of freedom. Until these nations which are entitled to their independence regain their freedom, the world is not going to have real peace. Their freedom is essential to world peace.

LITHUANIA FIGHTS ON FOR FREEDOM

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we honor the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence.

"How can those heroic people be independent," some might ask, "when their nation has been enslaved for many years, held in forced and unjust captivity by Communist Russia?"

The answer is that no nation can ever be conquered as long as the faith and the will of the people is stronger than that of their oppressors. Lithuania is occupied temporarily by an alien power, but it will never surrender.

Every suppression of human rights by the Communists, every indignity forced upon the Lithuanian people, and every material weapon that is employed to crush their spirit merely steels them in their determination to fight on toward the inevitable day of liberation.

Stalin is gone, as Malenkov will go, and others like them, as the dynasty of fear and terror that they have established reaches its peak and then declines, being mortal, for it has no identification with the eternal spirit that gives true life to mankind.

Knowing this, the Lithuanian people endure their present misfortunes, secure in the belief that communism with all its material might, cannot last.

We in the United States admire the courage and the faith of the Lithuanian people, because it is akin to that which fought for, won, and now maintains the independence of the United States.

As the future unfolds we will find ways to come to the aid of the gallant Baltic people so that they will regain their rightful place in freedom's family.

The record of Communist atrocities will be the nemesis that will turn on the tyrants and hunt them down to their inevitable doom.

The 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence points toward that day of reckoning.

DENYING THE REPUBLICAN CHARGE THAT THERE ARE COMMUNISTS AND TRAITORS IN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I have been rather nonplused, disturbed, and chagrined at so much talk by the Republicans to the effect that the Democratic Party is Red. Being a Democrat, this worries me somewhat. I am just wondering if this is not some kind of scheme whereby all Democrats are going to be branded as Reds, subversives, and traitors. I notice that the mugwump Governor from Texas has proposed that you hang all Reds.

Now that brings me to this thought: Is this a scheme to designate all Democrats as Reds and then hang them? You have made so many Democrats in the last 6 months by the manner in which you have handled the affairs of state that you are going to have to exterminate them or hang them, or else you are going to lose the election this fall. When we return in January, we will find many new faces—and those new faces, in my humble opinion, will be those of Democrats replacing Republicans who engaged in such idle and unfounded talk.

They talk about sweeping back the tide of waste and bankruptcy. I would like to call their attention to the days of President Herbert Hoover, when more banks went broke in a given time than have ever gone broke in the history of this Nation, before or since. Millions walked the highways and byways and begged for a job to earn a living, but no job could be had. Then, for 20 long years under the Democratic regime, plenty of jobs and plenty of money for industry were available. Why are they afraid to talk panic? This country cannot be talked into a panic. That depends on economic conditions. I remember that they talked about the same way during the Hoover administration. The statement of Sherman Adams, the adviser to President Eisenhower, inspires me to ask: Who said grass would grow in the streets if the Republicans did not win in 1932? Why, Herbert Hoover, who in 1928 promised two cars in every garage and a chicken in every pot. We did not get the car and we did not have the chicken. Who said in 1944 that if Franklin Delano Roosevelt were reelected, we would have no more free elections in the United States? You probably remember that it was Thomas Dewey, who wanted Mr. Roosevelt's job. Who said that social security was a conspiracy to put a dog tag on the people? Why, the GOP, and today it says it will extend and improve the same act. Who advised young Americans to quit their country and go to Australia if Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected? Who for 20 years has been saying this Nation is losing its liberties and becoming engulfed in socialism? Who recently declared that if we do not adopt the Bricker amendment, the President and two-thirds of the United States Senate will barter away our freedom? Who has been charging that the Government of the United has been infiltrated by Communists, thereby not only spreading fear and making good Americans fearful of Government employment but also encouraging the world to believe that America is going Communist? Who, in a Lincoln Day address recently under this title "Twenty Years of Treason," contended that the American people for 20 years through the free choice of their leaders have been traitors? Why—Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of course. Who are the Fear Dealers? Who are the political alarmists? Those who ever since their attempt to put the American people to sleep with the lullaby "Prosperity is just around the corner" have preached fear to the American people.

I think it is about time that the Republican Party, if it expects to win, base its claims on facts. They promised to reduce taxes but, by far, the majority of taxes reduced up to this time has benefited the large corporations and not the little man or laborer. The Republican Party cannot deny, in my humble opinion, that it is the party of big business. They still operate on the theory that if you let the fellows at the top, the big boys, make a lot of money, it will trickle down and all will be happy. But we still see that it will not work, as it has failed in the past, and today we face a panic because of the hard dollar created by the Republican Party. I have noted, with interest, that Mr. H. L. Hunt and other millionaires in Texas aid the Republican Party with their bankrolls. This is no different from the familiar pattern of a century or more of rich Americans contributing to political campaigns, senatorial and congressional as well as presidential.

The Republicans promised to balance the budget despite the warnings of leaders in the Democratic Party who said that it simply could not be done. But, still, they said they knew better. We have not seen their solution.

Now they cry that we left a mess. If there was a mess, then they are covering up that mess with a bigger mess. I, for one Democrat, am ready to meet this issue. Unless they about-face and support their leader, Dwight D. Eisenhower, they are doomed to defeat. Only one thing can save the Republicans; and I say in all candor, it is that they follow the leadership of the President of the United States, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower.

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all remarks with regard to Lithuanian independence appear together at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not—as I understand it, the gentleman's position before was that they should be included in the body of the RECORD and not in the Appendix of the daily RECORD?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on Lithuanian Independence Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it the gentleman from Pennsylvania has a special order today at which he expects to address the House at some length on this subject. I take it that the request of the gentleman from New York will not interfere with that special order?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I will amend my request to except those who have special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Lithuanian-American Council and its membership of nearly 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that today marks the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

As a member of the Special Committee To Investigate Atrocities in the Baltic States, my colleagues and I have been engaged for several months in investigating the facts concerning the communization and so-called incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. The facts which have already been brought out in our hearings clearly indicate that the attitude of this Government in refusing to recognize this act of Communist annexation has been eminently just and correct. The brutal grab of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors by the Kremlin was done in violation of long-standing treaties and against the expressed will and desires of the overwhelming majority of the people of those areas.

Although the Soviets attempt to give the impression that Lithuania is today an integral part of the U. S. S. R., I am convinced that the spirit of freedom and independence burns as strongly in that country today as it did 36 years ago when the Lithuanian people achieved their independence following World War I. I, therefore, express the hope, Mr. Speaker, that the plight of Lithuania and other Soviet satellites will not be forgotten by the Congress and the American people and that this Government will pledge itself to firm conviction that the people of Lithuania and all other Communist satellite peoples should and truly will one day regain their freedom and independence. May that day come soon.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, at this time the Republic of Lithuania at present enslaved by the Soviets is marking its 36th anniversary and it is fitting and proper that our great freedom-loving Republic should remember this liberty-loving people now dominated by the Communists. Permit me to briefly review Lithuanian history and its gallant struggle to remain free.

During the middle ages, Lithuania, whose boundaries extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea, was one of the great nations of Europe. Later, Lithuania and Poland were united under a common monarch, and when Poland was partitioned in 1795, Russia occupied Lithuania. For 123 years Lithuania remained under oppressive Russian domination and any ideas of a liberal and democratic nature which had been attained under the Polish union were ruthlessly suppressed by an intense policy of "Russification."

The study of the Lithuanian language was prohibited and the Lithuanian press was abolished. However, despite this bloody reign of terror the indomitable spirit of independence persisted and the growth of the underground movement in the country prepared the people for eventual freedom which came after the end of World War I.

It was during the German occupation that Lithuania proclaimed her independence on February 16, 1918, and by December 1922 she received de jure recognition by all the great powers.

For a period of 20 years definite progress was made in political, economic, and cultural fields, and Lithuania took her rightful place in the family of nations. However, independence was short-lived. The nonaggression pact signed between Hitler and Stalin in 1939, by which those two dictators agreed on a division between them of the smaller countries of eastern Europe, spelled the doom of Lithuanian independence. The collapse of Poland, brought about by the German and Soviet invasions, was followed by Soviet territorial demands upon Lithuania, which set into motion forces that led to her complete seizure in June 1940. Almost all the leaders of the country and other patriots were either deported to Russia or ruthlessly murdered.

The consistent and determined efforts of the Lithuanian people to achieve freedom was evidenced when the Germans invaded Russia in June 1941. They revolted against their Soviet oppressors and set up a provisional national government. However, a new oppressor, the Nazis, quickly extinguished any form of independence. Consequently, the underground now turned its efforts against Nazi tyranny.

Unfortunately, the later withdrawal of the German forces was not to be the end of Lithuanian suffering, for in October of 1944 when the Soviets drove the Nazi invader out of the country, they converted it into a Soviet republic.

Remembering the mass deportations under initial Soviet rule, over 80,000 Lithuanians fled to the Western Zone of Germany and the Soviet secret police screened the whole population and deported all persons suspected of enmity toward the Soviet regime.

Nevertheless, despite seemingly insurmountable odds the Lithuanians continue to resist Soviet oppression. Evidence presented before the House Baltic Committee last December indicates that the old underground organization which was so effective against the Germans and Russians during World War II, is still operating effectively. In fact, it has been estimated that more than 30,000 Lithuanians have been murdered for being members or suspected members of the underground. However, despite these severe losses new members quickly fill the ranks. One leading member of the Lithuanian Government in exile has stated that "he dreams of the day when his country will be a free member of the United Nations, but until that day comes, active and passive resistance will continue until the country's liberation or the extermination of the Lithuanian people."

In the light of such determination and devotion to freedom, in the presence of such courage and love of country we can all join with President Eisenhower when he voiced the present administration's feelings in a message before the Baltic Freedom Committee Congress held in New York in June. He stated that the seizure of the Baltic States was in violation of solemn treaty agreements and that we would maintain our steadfast policy of continuing to recognize the diplomatic representatives of the independent Baltic Republics; and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, when he said in a statement before a committee of the House:

> The Baltic peoples, in the face of every imposition, retain their will to be free and maintain their steadfast opposition to Soviet despotism. Terrorism has been prolonged now for 13 years. Many of their courageous and noble representatives have been executed, deported, or driven into exile. But their martyrdom keeps patriotism alive.

Today with all the freedom-loving people on the earth, we salute this gallant country which, though small in area, is great in faith, the faith that removes mountains and which in due time will restore liberty, justice, and peace to this stricken land.

LITHUANIA ENSLAVED, SHALL RISE AGAIN

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, American citizens of Lithuanian origin today will celebrate the 36th anniversary of the declaration of independence by their native land.

On February 16, 1918, shortly before the end of World War I, the Lithuanian people made known to the world their intention to avail themselves of the right to self-determination, which was one of

the few benefits accruing from that conflict. Thereafter, for 22 years the Lithuanian Republic, small as it was in both territory and population, bore itself proudly as a member of the society of free nations.

In 1939 Adolf Hitler and his Nazi legions set forth on the road of armed aggression which led ultimately to destruction of the German state. A year later, as a result of the iniquitous agreement, whereby Russia and Germany were to divide Eastern Europe between them, the freedom-loving Lithuanians were taken behind the Iron Curtain.

Afterward Russia fought in World War II on the side of the free world, ostensibly for the purpose of securing freedom for all time to all men, everywhere. But Lithuania remained prostrate beneath the iron heel of communism. Even in the heat of battle for human liberty the Communist conspirators of the Kremlin dishonored their word.

Only the people of Lithuania know in full the story of their sufferings at the hands of the Communist tyrants. Only they know the dire poverty to which they have been brought; the political executions; the planned starvation and torture; and the forced labor, from which only death brings release. Only the people of Lithuania know this story in full, and it is one they never will forgive or forget.

But the love of individual liberty, the initiative, and the energy of the sturdy Lithuanian people will not be forever held in tyranny. The same spirit which proclaimed Lithuanian freedom 36 years ago again will rise out of the darkness of slavery. Again the Lithuanian people will take their place among the free nations of the world.

For this reason let us pray for an early restoration of Lithuania as a nation of freemen, as a nation dedicated to the cause of human liberty throughout all the world for all time to come. Let us as the leading nation of the free world, do all in our power to further that cause, in Lithuania as elsewhere, so that suffering and slavery no longer may be the lot of even a few among the peoples of earth.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, 36 years ago today, out of the holocaust of World War I a new democratic republic emerged when Lithuania declared its independence. The new republic took its rightful place in the family of nations and its achievements of the next 20 years gave the promise of an ever more glorious future. But the continuing progress of this sturdy little republic was to be cruelly interrupted. The hard-won independence which had been gained in one global war was lost in another, and today Lithuania is ground under the heel of the Soviet oppressor.

We of the free world today know that there can be no peace on this earth so long as any people or any nation remains in subjection to another power, or enslaved by the tyrannies of a dictatorial regime. We also know that freedom and independence cannot come to those valiant people who have so long fought for it until universal peace is once again established. It is for this peace, and for the liberation of the enslaved millions of the world, that all freemen are striving today. Universal liberty is the concern of all free men. The cause of Lithuania is ours, nor can we, or any democratic country, rest until that cause has triumphed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Lithuania now a captive of Soviet Russia celebrates in exile on February 16 the 36th anniversary of her national independence.

The history of this courageous nation, written in the blood of its patriots, is replete with its never-ending struggle to retain independence and bespeaks the fortitude and perseverance of a God-fearing and liberty-loving people.

Roman historians as early as the first century spoke of Lithuanians as being skilled in tilling the soil while her independence as a state is recorded as dating back to the 11th century.

Down through the centuries this valiant nation has been a pawn in the hands of avaricious nations who continued to keep her in an almost continuous state of subjugation.

Partitioned, devoured, and kept in bondage, Lithuania has never allowed the fires of freedom to die out in her troubled heart. With an abiding faith in Almighty God Lithuanians from one generation to another have devoutly prayed for the day of liberation from their oppressors.

Their hope was kindled from time to time only to be rudely shattered by the deceit of the leaders of nations that posed as their liberators.

The shackles of serfdom were forged by Russia in 1795 and for 120 years the czars dominated Lithuania, ruling her with an iron fist.

In 1915 the Germans lifted the yoke of Russian oppression when they occupied Lithuania but it was 3 years later that the independence of this brave nation was proclaimed at Vilnius on February 16, 1918.

Two years later, the Polish conquest divided Lithuania, forcing the abandonment of the ancient capital at Vilnius and the moving of the independent government to Kaunas.

Russia, despite its signing of the Treaty of Moscow with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, in which it recognized Lithuania as a sovereign and independent nation, reneged on its solemn declaration by conspiring with Hitler in 1940 to acquire Poland, Finland, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

There followed a series of proposals from Hitler and Russia, all of them deceitful and based on false promises that Lithuania could regain the territory wrested from it by the invader, if she would abandon her neutrality and become an ally of Germany.

Hitler answered Lithuania's refusal by allowing Russia to invade her and permitting Red troops to attack and seize the ancient capital of Vilnius then in possession of Poland.

Once in Lithuania the Russians abrogated the mutual assistance pact they had signed with the Lithuanians and proceeded to replace the Lithuanian Government on orders from Moscow.

Fake elections in true Moscow style followed with the result that the doom of Lithuania was sealed when all political parties were outlawed and a new party called the Working People's Union was declared to be the only official party. The fake elections attracted only 16 percent of the voting population but Moscow concealed this fact, announcing to the world that 95 percent of the people voted for the new regime.

The Russian puppets now in control of the government through the rugged elections quickly passed a Moscow-prepared resolution imploring the admission of Lithuania to the Soviet Union. The resolution was promptly forwarded to the Kremlin on August 13, 1940, and approved just 13 days after the so-called new elections were held that sounded the death knell to Lithuania's independence.

For the past 14 years Lithuania has been behind the Iron Curtain and is subjected again to the tyranny and oppression that has haunted her down through the centuries. As a nation in shackles and chains Lithuania's history is written in the tears and blood that accompanies ruthless persecutions.

It is a sad spectacle for freedom-loving people as they behold with horror the plight of Lithuania and other nations who, like her, are in chains and under the iron heel of Soviet Russia.

The members of the select committee of the Congress of the United States now engaged in an investigation of the ruthless conquest of Lithuania and other Baltic nations are shocked as the bitter story of terror and atrocity is being unfolded and documented before the eyes of the world.

Meanwhile, Lithuania with its 3 million God-fearing people and over a million American citizens of Lithuanian descent have the sympathy and prayers of the American people, not only on the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence but until the day of liberation from her cruel oppressor. May God speed that day when Lithuanians everywhere can supplement their pleas for divine aid with a fervent prayer of thanksgiving for their deliverance from serfdom and the return of Lithuania to her former status as a free and sovereign nation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, 36 years ago today the Republic of Lithuania was founded, and I wish to join with my colleagues who have spoken briefly on the importance of this anniversary. The great tragedy of our times is not the great nations, whose people are to some extent the masters of their destiny. It is the small nations of the world, whose people are so often trampled underfoot. Let us, on this anniversary, remember again that our Nation is solemnly dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. And, indeed, it is not inappropriate to link this anniversary today with the memory of the great spirit who first said those words, and whose birthday we have so recently celebrated.

Abraham Lincoln is the great emancipator to the oppressed and the downtrodden of today, even as he was the great emancipator in his own time with respect to the narrower issue of out-

right human slavery. Let us assure our friends in Lithuania that the teachings and traditions of Lincoln are still alive among us. Let us make it clear that we shall never waiver from the high purposes and great resolves that guided him, and that have made the United States of America a symbol of light and hope and liberty ever since.

We are the great Nation which has never gobbled up a small neighbor or ally. We have stood resolutely throughout our history for the principle of self-determination for all peoples. It is important that we keep affirming this principle and that we miss no chance to demonstrate that we have not forgotten our friends who are enslaved by the Communist monster at this moment. We shall never forget them. And we cannot rest until the second great emancipation has been achieved and no corner of the world remains enslaved.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, four blocks from the Capitol, at St. Peter's Roman Catholic Church, is Father John Znotenas, whose life is a dramatization of the story of events in a small country during a world at war, and of life behind the Iron Curtain. On this day of anniversary tribute to the land of Lithuania and the spirit of the heroic Lithuanian people I know my colleagues will be interested in and moved by the story of his experiences.

In 1940, when Russia invaded Lithuania it was a peaceful agricultural Republic. It was building contentment and prosperity for its people through public education, advanced agricultural methods, promotion of the arts, the theater and the press. That was the year of Father Znotenas' ordination.

The young priest had been assigned as a teacher in a college near his home. When on June 15 the Russians took over, Father Znotenas was told that he could no longer be a teacher. Relying on the Russian Constitution which "guarantees" freedom of religion, Father Znotenas moved into the church and taught his classes from the pulpit. For this he was summoned by the Russian police. When he explained that he was conducting church service he was told: "I know the kind of service. If you don't want to be sent to Siberia, stop."

In 1941 the Germans came and Lithuania was between two hostile countries. In 1943 the Germans retreated. By that time the cattle had been slaughtered, the horses confiscated, food had been shipped to Germany and very short rations were left for the native population. The fire of independence burned underground. Proclamation of the Atlantic Charter revived hopes. But these hopes were dashed by the second Russian invasion.

In despair Father Znotenas, with 250 priests and 25,000 other people decided to make a break for freedom among the Allies. This decision was made after he had witnessed the intelligentsia of his town—doctors, lawyers, teachers, both men and women—loaded 70 to 100 into boxcars. The windows, which had been open to give oxygen to the cattle, were nailed shut. No one was permitted to bring food or water to the unfortunates. Those who cried out were shot down. For 2½ days the Lithuanians were forced to witness the suffering of their friends and relatives; then the cars moved off to Siberia and prison camps.

On his bicycle Father Znotenas skirted a procession of 15 to 20 miles long of refugees in cars and carts. The Russians parachuted on them from the air and charged them with tanks. The priest escaped into Germany where he found refuge in a Franciscan convent; from there to Switzerland, and finally as a DP, he came to the United States.

Besides his mother, Father Znotenas had 2 sisters and 2 brothers. The only news he has had from them is sad news. His mother was executed by the Russians for harboring a Catholic priest. One brother was slain. The others have disappeared.

Thirty-six years ago today, Lithuania was declared an independent democratic Republic. As a result of Russian occupation she has lost not only her independence but one-third of her population. Lithuania must be restored as a land of free people.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I can speak with some authority about the characteristics of the Lithuanian people. In my State of Rhode Island, where men and women of so many racial strains live and work together in peace and mutual respect, descendents of the ancient race of Lithuanians make a splendid contribution to our common culture.

We who know them see daily the evidence of intelligence and the industry for which they are renowned. They are a rugged people, able to withstand hardship—and in the happy life of America, their sons excel in every field of endeavor.

But more than their intellectual prowess, their willingness and ability to do hard work well, more even than their ancient valor for which they are renowned, they contribute to America in an outstanding way because they prize as sacred the things of the home. To them the family is the center of life. Children are brought up in the fear and love of God. They are good neighbors. They are good Americans, and America is the richer for having them with us.

Today, February 16, 1954, persons of Lithuanian extraction are celebrating the 36th anniversary of the independence of their mother country. This sturdy and freedom-loving people proclaimed their independence during the First World War on February 16, 1918, ending generations of oppression by the Russian Czars. Today, after another world war against tyranny and in defense of freedom, Lithuania is again under the iron heel of the oppressor. It is a sobering thought that for the people of Lithuania, this day cannot be other than a day of sadness. We in America, who so rightly cherish our own Independence Day, can well realize the feeling of sorrow that all Americans of Lithuanian birth must have at the realization that that great nation has been denied the very right to exist as an independent nation under a government of their own choosing.

The regime imposed upon Lithuania by communistic Russia has violated every man's individual freedom. It has persecuted religion, enslaved labor, and destroyed democratic principles. It has endeavored to instill hatred in the hearts of the Lithuanian people toward the western democracies. That they have not been successful is due only to the strong inborn love the Lithuanian people have for the cherished principles of freedom and liberty. Although the people of this nation are held in subjection by the ruthless Soviet power, the spirit of freedom imbedded in the hearts of all patriotic Lithuanians continues to carry on its fight for liberty.

It is more than a decade since tragedy struck Lithuania but history will assuredly show that his valiant nation cannot long remain in subjection. Tyrants can destroy men and institutions, but they can never destroy the love of liberty which springs eternally in men's hearts. The Lithuanian cause is not just a matter of concern for the people presently residing in that country. It is the equal concern of all freedom-loving peoples. Please God, may the day soon come when Lithuania can throw off the shackles of her oppressor and take her rightful place once more in the family of free nations.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on this day, February 16, it is fitting that we pause to pay tribute to a people who 36 years ago achieved national independence, although in this year 1954 there is little cause for the rejoicing and celebration with which a freedom-loving people might be expected to commemorate its achievement of the inalienable rights of all men the world over. Once again the people of Lithuania must remember the anniversary of their independence by praying for the day when these inalienable rights will be restored to their land.

At Vilna on February 16, 1918, after over a century of domination by the Russian czars, the independent Republic of Lithuania took its rightful place in the family of free nations, a place it enjoyed for 22 years until, with the advent of World War II, Lithuania was overrun by in turn Russian and Nazi aggressors. And, in 1940, the Soviet Union began the systematic program, which we have come to recognize all too well—planned starvation, collectivization, and physical enslavement, which program continues to the present day.

But although Lithuania is physically occupied by the Soviet Union, there can be no enslavement of the proud spirit of a people who have struggled so heroically for many generations past against the foreign conqueror's yoke. The United States Government by refusing to recognize the forcible annexation of the free Republic of Lithuania into the Soviet Union proclaims the faith of the American people in the eventual restoration of that nation to the freedom and prosperity which she has so dearly earned.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 36th anniversary of the day which all Lithuanians remember and revere because it is commemorated as the inauguration of Lithuania's independence. Lithuanian culture is one of the oldest on the European Continent. Unfortunately, Lithuania has been a victim of powerful neighbor nations extending back through the centuries.

Thirty-six years ago, when Lithuania became an independent nation, it immediately made progress and became one of the most progressive and cultured nations of Europe. Liberty-loving Lithuania was again taken over by a powerful, selfish and aggressive tyrant in 1940. For the next 4 years, Lithuania was desecrated by the Nazis and Soviets until in 1944, its usurpation became complete and the Kremlin has dominated Lithuania until the present day. Over a million of its people have been murdered or taken prisoner by the Communist dictators in an effort to dominate and liquidate the national identity of this patriotic and liberty-loving people. Deportations, arrests and humiliations have been inflicted, but the spirit of all true Lithuanians cannot be crushed. Lithuanians both in and beyond the borders of the motherland will never give up their fight for an independent and free government.

As chairman of the Katyn Forest massacre committee during the 82d Congress, I heard testimony of hundreds of witnesses revealing the barbaric and criminal mind which controls the leaders of the Soviet Union. Again, as a member of the Baltic committee which was recently created in this Congress, I heard witness after witness testify as to the brutalities, the massacres and the murders which were inflicted upon the Lithuanian people during the last 14 years. Testimony recorded by the Katyn committee and the Baltic committee has been broadcast throughout the free world and also behind the Iron Curtain and today the minds of the millions of people have been rekindled with knowledge of the barbarism which is the basic foundation underlying communism. The Baltic committee will hear further evidence and before its work is completed, a great deal of additional testimony will be assembled in order to completely unfold the horrid proceedings and aggressions that forced Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and other subjugated countries under the heel of the Kremlin.

The fight must continue and with the aid of all free nations and the underground behind the Iron Curtain, the day will arrive when Lithuania and other Communist dominated nations will be restored to liberty and freedom.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, on this the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania we send our message of hope to those unfortunate people who are suffering under the yoke of Soviet tyranny. Once again, as in the past, the people of Lithuania are making untold sacrifices for the sake of their independence and their national home. Lithuania has for centuries been the pawn of the great European powers. As a principal passageway from East to West, Lithuania has often been the scene of bitter conflicts between these two areas. As a result, she has for centuries been under the heel of a foreign despot.

And yet, the people of Lithuania, inspired by the democratic impulses of freedom, have remained steadfast and true to the traditions of their great nation. Although the land of Lithuania was enslaved, her soul remained free.

Today, the stories that come out of Lithuania are tragic ones—mass deportations, ruthless collectivization, suppression of every aspect of Lithuanian national life. But this is not the only news. The underground which was organized during the war is still in effective operation. By sullen resistance the Lithuanian people have greatly impeded the process of the sovietization of their beloved homeland. This is not a new process to them. Under the czars the Lithuanian people were subjected to the same measures—then it was called Russification. But no matter what the name of the attempted denationalization, it has never met with any fundamental success. We do not know when the Soviet tyranny will come to an end, any more than the men who proclaimed the first republic knew in advance the hour of their triumph. We do know, however, that now, as in the past, the Lithuanian people will hold true to their traditions and to the heritage of their forefathers.

It is our fervent hope, on this commemorative occasion, that the hour of Lithuanian freedom and independence is not far off. Until that longed-for day when Lithuania, once again, takes her place in the society of free nations, we must keep alive the hope of this gallant people. It is for this reason that the United States still recognizes the legality of the prewar Government of Lithuania. It is for this reason, and for the cause of justice, that our Congress has taken upon itself to study the illegal and ruthless seizure of the Baltic States. Let the people of Lithuania rest assured that we have not forgotten them, nor broken faith with them. Their cause is our cause—the universal cause of freedom and justice. No free nation can rest until all men are again at liberty to pursue the paths of their own destiny.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, a privilege for me to greet Lithuanian Americans on this 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence day.

May this day, which means so much to the enslaved people of Lithuania, revive their hopes to look forward to the day when their people will be completely liberated from Soviet domination, and, in fact, when all freedom-loving people will once more be free to determine the type of government under which they wish to live.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. Americans of Lithuanian descent will commemorate this anniversary pleading to the consciousness of the world to restore freedom to this brave and gallant country from the clutches of the Kremlin rulers.

Lithuania's history as an independent state dates back to the 11th century, always God-fearing and courageous, having been subjected from time to time to such a reign of terror that only their unfailing faith in Almighty God has sustained them. Just like Poland, Lithuania lost its independence in 1795 when they were partitioned and became pawns in the hands of Russia, Prussia and Austria. The Russians devoured the greater part and the smaller went to the Germans.

Lithuania's subjection to Russia lasted 120 years, that is from 1795 to 1915, when the German armies occupied the country. This interval coincided with perhaps the darkest period in earlier Lithuanian history. Yet Lithuania never lost hope of regaining her freedom and independence. Such hopes were revived when Napoleon crossed Lithuania in 1812 on his way to Russia. With the defeat of Napoleon the grip of Tsarist Russia grew tighter. In 1831 and 1863–64 open rebellions took place and were ruthlessly suppressed. In 1832 the university of Vilnius was closed. In 1840 the Lithuanian Statute—an elaborate system of laws first codified in 1529—was abolished and Russian law was substituted. The Lithuanian language was banished from the schools; officials were sent from Russia, and by a special decree it was forbidden even to use the name "Lithuania"; in its stead Russia imposed the style of the "North-West Provinces." In 1864 the infamous edict prohibiting the printing of Lithuanian books and newspapers in Latin characters was put into force and lasted for 40 years. Edict ended in 1904, therefore, 1954 marks the 50th anniversary of freedom of the printed word. It failed, however, to prevent the smuggling into the country of Lithuanian literature printed abroad, especially in Prussian Lithuania and the United States of America. An interesting phase of the national resistance movement, universally known as The Ausra—Dawn—Period, takes its name from the publication so styled, for which the great Lithuanian patriot, the late Dr. Jonas Basanavicius, was chiefly responsible.

The signing of the treaty of Moscow on July 12, 1920 wherein Russia recognized Lithuania as a sovereign and independent state, renouncing forever all claims to Lithuania's territory, was but a short-lived agreement, for 20 years later all agreements, peace, and her independence were rudely shattered. Lithuania, the Baltic countries, including Latvia and Estonia, found themselves again political pawns when they were driven into the clutches of Soviet Russia through negotiations of the 1939 nonaggression pact between Germany and Russia, which was signed at a time when Anglo-French representatives were in the Kremlin trying to obtain Russia's aid in curbing Hitler's desire to rule all of Europe.

The history of this brave and gallant little nation is written in the blood of its valiant patriots whose only desire was for freedom and independence and never reaching out to grab or annex neighboring territories. Today the same spirit of sacrifice is a dominant characteristic of the Lithuanian people.

It is a proud privilege that I can freely stand before you in this House of Representatives and join with you in saluting the Lithuanian people on their National Independence Day and I pray that it will not be too long before peace and freedom will be restored to Lithuania and the countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the gallant people of Lithuania and to the nearly 1 million

citizens of Lithuanian origin on this, the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Since the end of the Second World War, the hard-won peace we fought for has been constantly jeopardized by the aggressive policies of the Soviet Union's Communist overlords. The heart of our foreign policy has been to maintain the liberty and strengthen the unity of the free world in the face of this terrible threat.

Unfortunately, there are some freedom-loving peoples who were swallowed up by the Soviet Union during the war and cannot take their rightful place in the ranks of the free world at this time. For them this is a period of darkness because the light of liberty has been eclipsed. Until they win their fight for freedom, we must seize every opportunity to send them messages of hope and encouragement.

Accordingly, I am happy to join in the commemoration of the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence day. Thirty-six years ago, on February 16, 1918, the independence of Lithuania was declared after more than a century of forced annexation to the Russian empire. Her independence was recognized by the great powers, including the United States. The republic, founded on principles of self-determination, justice, and democracy, assumed her rightful position in the community of nations as a sovereign state. For 20 years the deep-seated nationalistic yearnings which had too long been frustrated were fulfilled.

Unhappily, Lithuania's geographical propinquity to the Soviet Union caused the proud new nation to be one of the first victims of Communist expansionism. By typical, devious methods which we have come to know so well in later years, the Soviet Union imposed its way of life on Lithuania during the turmoil of the Second World War, and even annexed it as the 14th Soviet Republic. The United States has steadfastly refused to recognize this annexation.

As in the rest of the Communist empire, justice has been trampled and freedom extinguished throughout Lithuania. Economic and cultural freedom has been suppressed, and tyrannical measures taken to prevent the free expression of the deep religious feelings of the people. Thousands of Lithuanians in the years since 1940 have been reported slain or banished in a never-ceasing effort to communize the people.

All these measures, however, have not been able to quench the patriotic spirit of the Lithuanians. Although news from behind the Iron Curtain is sparse, reports have steadily filtered through of continued national resistance.

Here in the United States, Americans of Lithuanian origin are doing all they can to encourage the Lithuanian people during their present captivity just as they did when Lithuania suffered earlier oppression at the hands of Russia. Charitable and fraternal organizations are dedicating themselves to maintaining the spirit which the Communists are trying to eradicate. I would like to call particular attention to the work of the Knights of Lithuania, a national organization founded in 1912, in organizing support for the fight for freedom.

The undaunted courage and faith of the Lithuanian people and their kinsmen in the United States deserves every tribute it will receive today. Because their kind of spirit cannot long be kept in shackles, we can be sure that some day this anniversary of independence will once again be celebrated in an independent Lithuania by a free people.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when the First World War came to an end in 1918, out of its wreckage emerged many new states in various parts of Europe. Of these newly revived, self-governing, and independent nations, Lithuania claims our attention because today, this 16th of February, is the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's political independence.

The Lithuanians, as the most numerous of the three Baltic peoples—the Estonians, the Latvians, and the Lithuanians—have secured for themselves a very significant place in the colorful and turbulent history of the Baltic region. Surrounded by powerful neighbors they have, during most of the past several hundred years, been subjected to foreign rule and have suffered much. Yet in that long period of subjugation they have successfully managed to keep alive their love of liberty and their patriotism. Their unyielding and uncompromising spirit on certain principles, their fervent devotion to their national traditions, and their firm belief in simple Christian tenets have served them well throughout their long history. And toward the end of World War I when they saw the chance of regaining their national independence, they took full advantage of it, and fortunately were able to make good.

The history of independent Lithuania for the next twenty years was one of growth and progress. In that short period, through sheer hard work and determination on the part of the industrious Lithuanians, the country prospered economically and made advances in social and cultural fields. It maintained good relations with its immediate neighbors and did its best to be at least on correct terms with the Soviet Union. In short, in the course of two decades Lithuania became a model democratic state in northeastern Europe.

But this blissful period of national independence came to an end at the outbreak of World War II. Lithuania, with her two weak neighbors, was the first victim of Soviet aggression. In October of 1939 the Soviet Union undermined Lithuanian independence when that weak country was forced to agree to the establishment of certain Soviet military and air bases in Lithuania. And in June 1940 when Lithuania was unjustifiably annexed to the Soviet Union, it ceased to be an independent country. In mid-1941 the Soviet armies were driven out by Nazi forces, and the Lithuanians had to suffer under nazism for 3 years. Finally, in August of 1944 the Red army returned once more, and since then Lithuania has been a part of the Soviet Union.

Today, under the oppression of Communist Russia, Lithuania has been completely sealed off from the free world. The whole country has become a large concentration camp. Ruthless tyranny is trampling under its feet everything sacred to the Lithuanian nation. Religious and political freedom are things of the past. All prominent national leaders are either imprisoned in distant concentration camps or have been shot. A large part of Lithuania's population, reportedly some 600,000, have been deported to slave-labor camps in Siberia and the country is being colonized by Asiatic immigrants. Nevertheless, in the face of all such tyrannical measures the mass of the people are still carrying on their resistance to their oppressors. They are still striving hard to hold on to their national ideals and aspirations. I am proud to state that this country has never recognized the annexation of Lithuania to the Soviet Union, and we still accord diplomatic recognition to the legal government of that country. This fact alone is heartening proof that the Lithuanian nation, which is today celebrating its independence day, has the sympathy and support of the people and the Government of this country.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, as freedom-loving people all over the world prepare to join with the people in Lithuania and those of Lithuanian ancestry everywhere in taking appropriate notice of the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, there is cause for hope that there has been some progress made during the year just past in the struggle for freedom and for peace.

The people of the United States admire and respect the Lithuanian people, not only through the valiant contributions which they have made to the pages of history through hundreds of years, but also because many Americans have had the opportunity to know thousands of men and women of Lithuanian ancestry as neighbors and to understand and appreciate their fine qualities. In my own State, official records confirm that there are more than 10,000 persons living in Connecticut who were born in Lithuania, and their native-born children and grandchildren number several times that many.

To these and to all others who glory in a free and independent Lithuania, I send the warmest greetings on this 36th anniversary, which is an occasion for all Americans to give thought to their friends and neighbors here who are of Lithuanian ancestry and whom we count as among our finest citizens.

The people of the free world will continue to strive with every effort, joining with their prayers, to bring about at the earliest moment the lifting of the Iron Curtain and the attainment for the people of Lithuania of full and final liberation.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, marks the 36th anniversary of the Lithuanian Independence Day. However, it is an anniversary unmarked by the jubiliation and ceremony befitting such an occasion. For today, independence in the Lithuanian homeland dwells only in the stanch but sad and heavy hearts of an enslaved people.

Since the forced incorporation of this freedom-loving Nation into the Communist orbit, many hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians have been murdered, starved and deported. A most carefully planned and executed program of genocide has been relentlessly pursued so as to completely exterminate the Lithuanian nationality. Communist Russia knows that by nothing less than total extinction of the language, customs, culture and ideals of this people can she hope to keep them subdued. Yet even these extreme and inhuman measures have not extinguished the hope and brave spirit which sustains the Lithuanians in their resistance to complete annihilation and the struggle for eventual freedom from Communist tyranny.

As we Americans join our fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent in the hope that their homeland shall one day regain its freedom and liberty, let us not be unmindful of the responsibility that we, as free men and a free Nation, have in the restitution of independence to all nations now enclosed behind the Iron Curtain. If I might venture to paraphrase Abraham Lincoln's famous words that our Government "cannot endure permanently half slave and half free," I say we cannot as Americans insure an enduring peace for our own Nation in a world half slave and half free. Therefore, on this anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, let us resolve henceforth to conduct our foreign affairs and assume our world leadership with strength and integrity, with no more compromises, no more Yaltas, Teherans, and no more inaction as when we allowed Russia to annex Lithuania and her Baltic sister nations. Only in this way can we hasten the day of liberation for our enslaved Lithuanian allies, and all who are enclosed behind the dark curtain of godless communism.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to incorporate the following statement regarding Lithuania.

Thirty-six years ago the people of Lithuania declared their independence and enjoyed twenty-odd years of independence as an exemplary nation, honorably fulfilling all her obligations as an honored member of the family of free nations. Her progress in economics, education, and agrarian reforms were remarkable.

Today, however, there is no free Lithuania, any more than there is a free Poland, Hungary, or Czechoslovakia. All are crushed beneath the heel of the Russian tyrant. Freedom, as we know it, is denied these unfortunate people, and this anniversary, which should be one of rejoicing and celebration, is filled with sadness for not only the Lithuanian citizens behind the Iron Curtain but also their friends and loved ones in our great free country.

We liberty-loving Americans are deeply concerned about the enslavement of the heroic people of Lithuania and others in like situations and we express the fervent prayer and hope that soon they will be reestablished as a free member of the family of nations.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, brave nations may be conquered by force of arms, their liberties curtailed by the oppressor's iron will. But never will the minds of free men be captured so long as their hearts burn with zeal for liberty.

As we pause today to commemorate the 36th anniversary of the Lithuanian Independence, let us make it an occasion for hopeful contemplation of the future. We who are free must hold high the glimmering torch so that the oppressed shall not lose sight of freedom.

We must continue to plan with unqualified resolution the ultimate peaceful liberation of those who are determined to be free.

In the people of America is vested the honorable responsibility of helping to restore to the downtrodden the measures of dignity which is their due.

As Americans of Lithuanian descent well know, liberty is not easily come by. It is a cherished intangible whose possession and perpetuation requires more struggle, more care, more effort than does the forceful annexation of physical bodies; more strength than that required for geographic conquests.

The spirit of independence will forever be part of Lithuania's people. With abiding faith and the will to be free, and with the unfaltering aid of the United States, Lithuania one day again will be independent.

So, on this day of commemoration, let us not reflect on the loss of liberty—let us pray for the future fulfillment of freedom to a brave and courageous people.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, 36 years ago, on February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania was proclaimed. Out of the tragedies of the First World War had sprung some blessings, among them the opportunity for this great Baltic nation to determine its own destiny once again, an opportunity which had long been denied by their Russian masters. I am sure that independence was never more welcome than it was to the heroic Lithuanians who had suffered under forced annexation to their aggressive neighbor since 1795.

For over a century the Russian rulers had carried out a policy of "Russification" by which they attempted to extinguish the Lithuanian culture just as they had its national identity. By this cruel policy the language was outlawed and the beautiful name "Lithuania" was officially abolished. More than once the courageous people of Lithuania rebelled in an effort to throw off the oppressive yoke. The failures they met did not discourage them, but instead strengthened their determination to be free.

Finally, on that day in February which we are commemorating now, the goal of freedom was achieved and Lithuanian independence was declared. The next 20 years constituted the happiest period in Lithuania's recent history. Outstanding achievements were made in the fields of economics, and government, and the Lithuanian culture flourished as a plant seeing the sun after years of darkness.

Unhappily, Lithuania has been deprived of its cherished freedom by the evil forces of communism against which we have mobilized ourselves and the rest of the free world. Its years of freedom are now a precious memory. But more than that, they are an inspiration, for true Lithuanians everywhere have faith that some day freedom will be theirs once again.

In the meanwhile, there is hope to be derived from a comparison of Lithuania's present captivity with the captivity of the 19th and early 20th centuries. Just as the earlier attempts at Russification did not succeed, the current attempts at communization will not succeed. Although Lithuanian patriots are killed, although worship is suppressed, although freedom is denied, the spirit of Lithuania can never be crushed. In their hearts the Lithuanians will maintain their religious faith and their love of liberty. Just as the Lithuanians rebelled against their conquerors in 1830, 1863, and 1905, they will continue their heroic resistance to Communist tyranny.

Here in the United States, Americans of Lithuanian origin, who have contributed so much to their new homeland, are performing a great service to all who love freedom, as well as to the country of their forefathers. They are keeping alive the spirit of 1918 when the forces of democracy triumphed and Lithuania attained its rightful stature as a sovereign state. They are reminding all Americans of every national origin of the dangers of communism. They are sending hope and encouragement to a very gallant people. I am proud to join with them in commemorating this 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to extend my felicitations and greetings to my Lithuanian American friends upon the observance of the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

One cannot fail to be profoundly interested in the destiny of the people of this brave little nation and to share the sorrow of the many Lithuanian-Americans gravely concerned over the fate of their kinfolk who have been enslaved by Soviet communism. The ceaseless struggle of the people of Lithuania against Soviet atrocities and their fight for the preservation of their ideals of liberty and equality should on this anniversary imbue the freedom-loving people of the world with fresh admiration for their courage and indomitable spirit.

We here in the United States must continue our steadfast adherence to morality and democracy and never hesitate to raise our voices in protest against such atrocities as those perpetrated against the Lithuanian people.

A glorious page of history will be written when justice and humanity finally triumph over the forces of communism and evil. It is my fervent hope that the day is not far distant when the people of Lithuania will be released from their Soviet bondage and regain the liberty and independence so cruelly extorted from them by the Soviet rule of terrorism.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, is Lithuanian Independence Day. To the people of Lithuanian descent it is both a day of joy and a day of sadness.

It is a day of joy because history recalls that it was on February 16, 36 years ago, that started an era of happiness and freedom for Lithuania, an era of more

than a score of years of independence to a little country that had been under Russian rule since 1795.

It is a day of sadness because the independence of their fatherland does not exist any more. The Soviet fist is today clenched tighter than ever over their country.

On this 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence—we who live in liberty and freedom extend to the people of Lithuania our assurance that we shall continue to support them in their fight for liberation so that they may once again be free to enjoy freedom and peace.

We assure them that we have not forgotten their valiant fights of the past against tyranny and dictatorship and we feel confident that the day will come again, as it did in 1918, when the people of Lithuania will rise in their wrath and break the yoke which the Soviets have placed around their necks.

We know that the present government of Lithuania is not one of the will of the people but one that has been imposed on them by brute force.

The history of Lithuania is one of struggle by a freedom-loving people to get along with their neighbors. It is also the story of a people that has been subjected to persecution at the hands of greedy nations who not only took over control of its government but also stifled religion by closing its churches, raided its libraries expelled thousands from the country, drove thousands into slave labor and armed services and chased into the forests other thousands of men and boys who refused to fight under the Germans or the Russians. These latter preferred to become guerrillas and to suffer undue hardships in order to carry on the harassment of the invaders.

The Lithuanians are fine people—industrious, conscientious, peace-loving, and loyal. These fine qualities are evident in the nearly one million Americans of Lithuanian descent who are in this country, as well as in the 26,000 Lithuanian displaced persons who have found a haven in the United States.

I am happy that our Government adheres to its statement made on July 23, 1940, in which the United States protested against the annihilation of the three Baltic Republics by Soviet Russia.

To the people of Lithuania we say: "Have hope. Your country will rise again. We are your friends."

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the occurrence of Lithuanian Independence Day in this 15th year of the invasion and conquest of that proud nation by brutish Soviet aggressors reminds the whole civilized world once again that none of us can count himself really a free man until freedom is restored to all who yearn for it. Nowhere is this yearning more sincere than in occupied Lithuania.

As a member of the House Baltic Committee—a select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the seizure and forced incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the U. S. S. R.—I have been profoundly shocked by the grisly facts our committee has been bringing to light on the cruelty, inhumanity, and depravity of the Communist invading and occupying forces. We have uncovered incontrovertible proof of the heinous crimes committed against the dignity of mankind and the peace of the world by the Red army and its political commissars in the enslavement of this sovereign nation.

Not since the trials of the Nazi war criminals at Nuremberg, in which I had the honor and satisfaction to participate, has any tribunal, I believe, uncovered a more shocking story of international barbarism.

The conscience of the world may occasionally seem to slumber or grow callous in the face of such long-continued oppression of a people as has been suffered by those of Lithuania these past 15 years. But Lithuania's tragedy is not forgotten. not ignored. The facts as they have emerged from our hearings have reawakened free men everywhere to the urgent need for Lithuania's restoration as a free, independent, sovereign people if truth and justice are to emerge triumphant over the forces of darkness and evil. We know that if any of us in any land are to feel secure in our own freedom, then Lithuania, too, must be free.

The Lithuanian people, throughout their history and throughout many periods of conquest and subjugation by alien hordes or godless oppressors, have always demonstrated that they prize liberty and human decency above all in their service to Almight God and to their nation. On their independence day I am proud to salute them for their courage and their faith, and to pray with them for their early deliverance from a bondage as severe and inhuman as visited on any people anywhere in the history of mankind. Through their sufferings, however, they live in the certain knowledge that they will prevail.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my friends of Lithuanian descent in the United States and in the free world in commemorating the 36th anniversary of the independent of Lithuania, a celebration which, so far as the homeland is concerned, can only be observed secretly in the hearts and souls of its citizens.

Everywhere in the free world, free people will continue to hope and to pray for the liberation of this great nation, and in so doing give expression of our concern and friendship for a brave and good people shackled temporarily by a godless tyrant.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a moment to express heartfelt sympathy and sincere admiration for the enslaved people of Lithuania. The courage and strength they are displaying today, in the face of trial and tribulation we dare not even try to comprehend, truly manifest the caliber of this nation.

We thought the Hitler regime was the epitome of cruelty. Today, with continued perpetrations of Soviet-controlled leaders who dominate their citizens with terror, force, and brutality, the Lithuanians realize now that Hitler's regime was just the forerunner to the sadistic, inhuman, regimented tactics currently employed by the Communist regime as it rules the minds and bodies of the some three millions who plead for survival in this Soviet-infested country.

I am proud, yet a little humble, that many of my constituents come from this oppressed country. For those who have been fortunate to come to a country wherein there is no fear to worship, to speak or to live as humans should, I thank God. I pray that more of their brothers may know soon the freedom they enjoy. And I welcome them today on the 36th anniversary of their gallant country.

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, 1954, marks the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. On this day 36 years ago the brave people of this ancient land proclaimed their national independence after 160 years of Russian rule.

During the 22 years that followed Lithuania clearly showed its right to a place among the democratic nations of the world. The splendid record of performance and the steady progress made were hailed by friends of freedom everywhere. This independence was cruelly brought to an end in 1940 when Lithuania became a tragic victim of Russian aggression.

I am proud to join with the nearly 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in their commemoration today and in the prayer that a new day of liberation will soon dawn for their relatives in their native land.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, once again the free world celebrates Lithuanian Independence Day, as we have been doing for the past 36 years on February 16th. It was in 1917 that the rebirth of that small but gallant nation took place.

Unfortunately for the last 14 years this day has been celebrated under different circumstances and in a different atmosphere than all of us would have liked to see. While here in the United States 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent are able to cherish and enjoy the liberties, the freedom and the rights of mankind offered to them by our laws and our way of life, there, in the country of their forefathers for the past 14 years, the brutal Soviet might has been keeping its grip on some 3 million people. These have been 14 years of slavery, privation, deportations, and fear of tortures inflicted by the MVD. To those who live there and have experienced it, these 14 years seemed like ages.

Last year on this very day of the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, I suggested that Congress should enact necessary legislation to investigate the circumstances under which the seizure of the Baltic States was performed. Today I can happily say that this was done by the Baltic committee which last December concluded its hearings on that case. The wealth of information thus obtained was certainly beyond expectations. The report of the committee should serve as a warning to all those who deal or may have to deal with Soviet diplomacy and their politicians. These hearings provided a striking example of Soviet gangsterism in the field of their foreign relations. I attended a hearing in Chicago when testimony was taken from Gen. Stasyz Hastikis, former head of the Lithuanian Army. The general told the committee

in detail how he was a member of the Lithuanian delegation to Moscow in 1939 was blackmailed by Stalin and Molotov, into agreeing to sign a requested mutual assistance pact. The technique of persuasion used by the Soviet leaders against the Lithuanian delegates, was the same as applied earlier, in 1938, by Hitler, when he ordered President Hacha of Czechoslovakia to come to Berlin, only to request from the latter a signature which was to end Czechoslovakia's independence. Although Hitler, in order to achieve his goal threatened the Czechoslovakian delegation with the dispatch of 1,000 bombers over Prague, as far as the Lithuanian delegation to Moscow was concerned, both Stalin and Molotov used other methods. For an entire day they kept their "guests" waiting at the hotel, and finally at 11 p. m. they ordered them to come to the Kremlin. There, taken by surprise, they were informed that according to the Soviet-Nazi agreement, Lithuania was to come under the Soviet sphere of influence, and therefore a mutual assistance pact between Lithuania and the Soviet Union was necessary. But this was not the end of it. To do what he called protect Lithuanians properly and secure the Soviet Union, Molotov demanded that the Lithuanians admit Soviet troops into their country. When in the course of that meeting, which lasted till 2 in the morning, the Lithuanian Ambassador to Moscow protested, Stalin's temper got out of hand and he said: "You, young man, sit down and be quiet." How strange to us and ironically ring the following words taken from paragraph 7 of that pact:

> Fulfillment of this treaty shall not in any way affect the sovereign right of the contracting parties, in particular their state organization, economic and social system, military measures and generally the principles of nonintervention in internal affairs.

Molotov, raising his toast on the same occasion, had this to say:

> We stand for an exact and honest fulfillment of the agreement signed by us on a basis of mutuality and declare that foolish prattle of sovietization of the Baltic States is of use merely to our common enemies and to all kinds of anti-Soviet provocateurs.

On June 15, of the following year, 1 day after the Germans occupied Paris, the Soviets marched into Lithuania and immediately after that staged their "elections." However, 24 hours before the close of polls in Lithuania, the London office of the Tass news agency announced the results: "Ninety-five and five-tenths percent of all eligible votes were cast for the Working People's Union Party," the only party on the ballot. Thus, Lithuania's sovereignty and independence was finally sealed.

There is no use to repeat how ridiculous sound Molotov's promises and good intentions, how cynical his speeches. One crime after another has followed, yet we still do debate with Molotov and with those who claim to represent the view of over 200 million people behind the Iron Curtain. Statistics of the first year of Soviet occupation of Lithuania show that 34,260 Lithuanians were deported to Siberia. By 1950 this figure grew to 500,000, including women and children. In other words one-sixth of the entire Lithuanian population has been moved to Soviet slave labor camps. As I already have indicated, the pattern remained always the same: It has happened before in Poland, then in Lithuania and in other Baltic States, it has been repeated in Korea and it may happen to us should we remain unprepared against the Russian threat.

As an American of Polish origin, I feel I must say a few words of the close relationship between Lithuania and Poland which prevailed in the past. The elements of history, the oppression experienced both under the czars and now under the Bolsheviks may well help both countries to think along the same lines. Where else in the world can we find an example of a union between two different countries that has lasted over three and one-half centuries? When in 1413 at Horodla the union between Poland and Lithuania was signed freemen with freemen and equal with equal, none of the deputies of either the Polish Sejm or the Lithuanian Diet dreamed that it will last almost four hundred years, and were it not for foreign interference the union would have lasted to this day. Both countries had their common foes and their common friends. Together they concluded treaties and together they participated in wars. Although they kept separate laws in each country a mutual administration was formed, yet with a separate monetary system, a separate army, and separate judiciary. The two shared one crown and elected their own kings whenever there was no heir to the throne. This unique union, unknown to this day in Europe's history, did not come into existence by physical force of one country over the other, but through the strength of the spirit and willpower of their respective people. The union was not molded by the sword, but by means of an ethical code of established laws and self-respect. Thus, this union between Lithuania and Poland became the prototype of a European federation, only on a small scale.

Today, while both countries have to face their own hardships in their struggle against the Red dictatorship, I am most happy to hear that only a month ago, here in the United States, efforts have been made between political leaders in exile from both Lithuania and Poland for future relations of both countries. On January 16, through the initiative of Lithuanian political leaders, a meeting was held with their Polish counterpart. The Lithuanians proposed a closer cooperation in the common struggle for the independence of their respective nations, as well as the furthering of a friendly atmosphere in a future free world. It is my sincere desire that this example might well be followed by other eastern European countries, because through unity only they will be able to throw off the shackles of slavery and preserve their independence in the future. It was this unity which kept both Lithuania and Poland alive and prosperous for 360 years.

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the annals of history contain many examples of how large and powerful states have conquered and subjugated their neighbors in a desperate march toward world conquest. The tyrannies which engaged in these imperialistic adventures were, in most instances, completely frank about their purpose. They conquered for the sake of conquest, and freely acknowledged their selfish aims.

On this 36th anniversary of the start of Lithuania's brief 20 years of independence, however, we are sorrowfully reminded once again of the unspeakable deceit and treachery of the Soviet Union, which loudly proclaims on the one hand its opposition to imperialism while ruthlessly suppressing freedom and liberty in every nation where it has gained control. It has sought to destroy the national character of the Lithuanian people it holds in bondage. It has made Lithuania into a slave state.

Here is an instance of a powerful military force seeking to swallow up the entire free world, yet at the same time professing its love of peace and its regard for other peoples. What better proof could there be than Lithuania of the duplicity of the Communist aggressors, of the emptiness of their pretensions?

Although Lithuania today is even forbidden to observe this anniversary, this day which should be its greatest national holiday, throughout the civilized world, and particularly here in the United States where we have refused to recognize the legitimacy of the forced annexation of Lithuania to the Soviet Union, friends of Lithuania and all who believe in freedom will mark this day and observe it in tribute to a brave people,.

As our Congress has established through hearings of the Baltic Investigating Committee, Russia's bloodstained guilt in Lithuania is a blot on all mankind—a shameful illustration of the bestiality which characterizes atheistic communism in all of its works.

Lithuania remains in chains, but the proud spirit of the Lithuanian people will survive, heralding a new day of liberation. We hope and pray the time will not be too far distant when Lithuania, free and strong and dedicated to liberty and justice, will once again take its rightful place in the concert of sovereign nations. I shall always consider it my duty to do everything I can to speed that great occasion.

In the meantime, and with profound sympathy for the plight of her helpless and cruelly abused citizens, I am proud today to join in America's tribute to Lithuania on Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, this day is for the Lithuanian people a day when they look back with pride to the 16th day of February 1918, when the people of Lithuania, after 123 years of Russian domination, declared their independence and formed a democratic state of their own. But it is also a day of sadness for them, when they reflect upon the terrible sufferings which the people of that nation have undergone since 1940, when they were occupied and taken over by Communist Russia.

On this day, many of us pause to pay tribute to that gallant nation and express our fond hopes for a return of their

freedom and independence. That is as it should be, but is it enough?

For many years our Government has followed a policy of containment of communism. With a change of administrations, hopes were expressed for the discarding of that policy for one of liberation.

The happenings of the last year have, however, given little factual evidence of any such change. There is, indeed, not much new that the people of Lithuania, or of any other nation behind the Iron Curtain, can find to buoy their hopes for early liberation.

My experience as a member of the congressional committee to investigate the seizure of the Baltic nation by Soviet Russia convinces me that there is much that we Americans can learn from the sad fate of the Baltic nations.

There was unfolded to our committee, from eyewitnesses, an almost unbelievably cruel story of brutality, inhumanity, and treachery, of mass murders and deportations, of torture, slavery, and hunger.

In these days when we still think we can do business with the Communists, through treaties and agreements, it would be worth our while to consider the way the Soviets treated their solemn agreements with Lithuania.

Between 1920 and 1939, the Soviets entered into at least eight separate agreements with the free Lithuanian Republic. In these agreements they solemnly agreed to a nonaggression pact and to mutual assistance. As late as October 10, 1939, they pledged to respect the independence of Lithuania. But only 7 months later, on June 14, 1940, their armies marched into Lithuania and the reign of terror began.

In the light of these historical facts, which have been confirmed in the testimony of Secretary of State Dulles before our committee on November 30, 1953, how can we expect these same Communist leaders today to show any more respect for any agreement they may sign with us, whether it is in Berlin or anywhere else.

I pay my deep respects to the courage, patriotism, and love of freedom of the Lithuanian people. I share the fond hopes and prayers of those who express faith in the restoration of freedom and liberty to that gallant nation.

But, with all that, I pray for a more realistic approach on the part of the western nations to the solution of the problem of the Communist menace, a menace which is gradually but surely moving nearer and nearer to us.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the little Republic of Lithuania declared its independence and it was free and independent until May 15, 1940, when it was ruthlessly occupied by the Russian Communists.

On this 36th anniversary of her independence I recall that the undying spirit of the brave Lithuanian people more than once in her history has made manifest its fervent patriotism. On this day as in days gone by throughout the world wherever a Lithuanian heart beats it is an indication and an assurance that Lithuania will shed her shackles forced upon her by a savage, merciless, and gigantic foe. But like the Bible story of David and Goliath, little Lithuania will meet the challenge and one day with the help of God she will destroy her enemy as David did Goliath. Miracles will never cease to happen as long as God is in His heaven and the faith of the Lithuanian people lives.

Communistic Russia will one day disintegrate and fall into dust but Lithuania and her brave people will come back into their own and assume their rightful place among the free peoples of the earth and live and expand as they are destined to do by God's will.

Therefore, people of Lithuania, because you have had faith in God you have never been abandoned by our Creator. You are destined to rise while the godless Communist forces which have temporarily dominated your native land must not and will not endure because they have acted contrary to God's will and because they have turned their faces away from God and his revealing truth.

So gird yourselves for the coming day and the great battle. Maintain your spirit like your faith, and the day will come when victory shall bring back as your reward, freedom, independence, and lasting peace.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Lithuanians in this country are observing an anniversary which is forbidden in their mother country. We are all fully aware of the tragic conditions in that part of the world and we share with Lithuanian-Americans their grave concern over the fate of their relatives in the homeland suffering under Soviet tyranny. Their fight for freedom is not only for their own liberation but it is a fight which all free men share throughout the world.

At this time I wish to renew my pledges of active assistance at all times to the courageous people of Lithuania in their struggle between freedom and slavery.

In this connection, I was very happy to work and support the adoption of the Baltic resolution passed by the House and feel a great deal of good can be accomplished by it. This action by the House brings a ray of hope for the liberation of enslaved Lithuania and the other captive countries. I am grateful to have had the opportunity to express by direct action my unwavering support of their cause.

I urge this Congress to continue to do its utmost in behalf of the people of this valiant nation and to take the proper steps to bring about the formulation of a vigorous policy program for the liberation of all enslaved people.

Great care should be exercised so that there will be no pacts with Bolshevist imperialism. So far leaders of various nations have failed through the United Nations to halt Soviet Russia.

The only way we can accomplish the liberation of Lithuania and other nations now in servitude is by completely defeating Soviet Russia in her attempts to communize and enslave the world. This is proving to be a costly and painful process but with the common efforts of all freedom-loving nations of the West, coupled with the faith and leadership of millions of liberty-loving Americans, we cannot help but eventually defeat the Communist menace.

Lithuanian-Americans are to be congratulated upon the excellent work they are doing to further the Lithuanian cause. Representing the million loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent in our country, they have formed various councils who have demonstrated splendid organizational ability.

This evening, my wife and I are attending a banquet in Baltimore of the Council of Lithuanian Societies in commemoration of the 36th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the people of Lithuania. We are indeed proud to have the privilege of joining with these fine people of Lithuanian descent, also, those in their native land, in hoping and praying for the return of Lithuania's independence and freedom.

On this occasion, let us, as citizens of the greatest democracy on earth, unite in rededicating ourselves to the cause of universal peace, never forgetting that the preserving of liberty and freedom is everybody's business.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest crimes ever perpetrated in the history of the modern era has been the willful seizure of the Baltic States and the willful destruction of their independence by Soviet Russia.

On this day upon which we celebrate the independence of one of those states—Lithuania—it is fitting that we demonstrate once again to the world at large the enormity and the infamy of the Soviet crime. For us of the free world this is a compelling moral duty, for those less fortunate than we must keep their patriotic tributes locked within the solitary sanctuary of their grief-ridden breasts.

The evil that men do often lives after them, and so it is in even greater degree with the evil that one nation visits upon another. Nations live on; they are something of the flesh and the spirit, while in a physical sense the life of man is by comparison no more than a fleeting adventure upon this unhappy earth. That the evil done to the people of Lithuania by Soviet Russia will vanish through the years is a prospect not likely ever to occur. Never shall the people of Lithuania forget. Never will the people of America forget this Communist treachery and infamy. Never will the free people of the world forget.

Soviet Russia did an abominable thing when, in the darkening days of world crisis in 1939–40, her leaders forcefully imposed upon the Lithuanian nation an arrangement, illegal and immoral, and one that breached the sovereignty and independence of the Lithuanian people. In an air of sublime innocence, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov, the archpriest of Communist tyranny, assured the people of Lithuania in October 1939 that the Soviet Union's military occupation of Lithuania through a forced pact of mutual assistance in no way implied the intrusion of the Soviet Union in the internal affairs of Lithuania, as some foreign interests, he said, were trying to make her believe. He went on to assert

that this pact was inspired by mutual respect for the governmental, social, and economic system of each of the contracting parties, and that Soviet Russia stood for an exact and honest fulfillment of its agreements on a basis of reciprocity. He further declared that foolish talk of sovietization of Lithuania was useful only to the enemies of Russia and Lithuania and to all kinds of anti-Soviet provocateurs.

But this assurance, like so many other Soviet assurances before and since, was worth no more than that measure of expedience which suited Soviet policy at the time. Before the next summer had been spent and before the harvest had been gathered, Soviet Russia annihilated with one great blow the strong legal structure that had been so carefully and so hopefully constructed by Lithuanian statesmen through 20 years of diplomatic intercourse. Soviet Russia tore asunder every obligation, legal and moral, that bound her to respect the inviolability of Lithuanian territorial integrity. Driven on by deep-seated, aggressive ideological motives, Soviet Russia willfully destroyed the independence and sovereignty of the Lithuanian nation.

Indeed, the crime that was committed there in distant Lithuania during the summer of 1940 is one that the world will long remember and few will ever forget. This was a crime without forgiveness, for it was not committed against one person, but rather against an entire nation. So grave was this misdeed that the entire Lithuanian nation has long since suffered with unmeasured pain and sorrow from its consequences. During the intervening years from that fateful summer of 1940 to this very hour there has been visited upon the Lithuanian people a catalog of injustices that would make the most mogorous nation feel its enduring burden. Suppression of political freedom; unwarranted restrictions upon economic life; destruction of cultural ideals and the persecution of religion—all are part of the cross that presses so heavily upon the Lithuanian nation. These are great burdens for a great nation of courageous people to bear. The time will come, and let us hope it is not far off, when the Lithuanian people will once again stand upon the native soil of their great land and breathe the atmosphere of freedom.

A courageous people who have once experienced the free way of life cannot be turned away from freedom or defeated by the mental and physical tortures of communism. Communism may reach the body, yes, it may even reach the mind, but it can never touch the soul of men who were once free. Just as surely as sunshine lights up the darkness, so too, will the bright clean flame of freedom, burning in the souls of men, light forever their pathway of duty and hope. Never will communism succeed in putting out this bright clean flame burning in the souls of freemen.

Before the tribunal of world history, however, the case of Lithuania will some day be decided. Until that happy hour, it is upon us, the free, that rests the obligation of not letting mankind forget the crime against Lithuania and the guilt that Soviet Russia must bear before humanity.

In our duty, we must ever be true.

In our cause, we must ever be determined.

In our resolve to do what is right and just, we must never falter.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on the eastern shores of the Baltic Sea lives a people who today, if they were free to do so, would be waving flags and rejoicing. For this would be their Fourth of July—their day for celebration of national independence. Instead of an air of happy rejoicing, however, a fearful stillness hangs over this land—for it is no longer a land of freedom and its people have little to rejoice about. Nevertheless, in the memories of Lithuanian people—for it is they of whom I speak—there yet remains a symbol of the freedom they have had, and, if it please God, will have again. That symbol is the day February 16, the day on which 36 years ago Lithuania became an independent republic.

Down through the years Lithuanians have kept their distinctive national character intact in spite of the harsh tribulations of their history. They can look back proudly to an ancient culture which developed in a great country—a country which at its height stretched all the way from the Baltic to the Black Sea. For centuries Lithuania suffered hardships at the hands of stronger and more aggressive neighbors. The country came to be greatly reduced in size. For well over a hundred years of its history immediately prior to the First World War, it was dominated by Russia. Then for a brief interval during that war, Lithuania was occupied by the Germans. Following the war, the unstable conditions in Eastern Europe gave this small country a chance that it had waited for; in 1918 the Lithuanians proclaimed their independence. Self-determination for these hopeful people became a reality. The future looked bright indeed. For a period of 20 years the country flourished; land reform was put into operation with a large degree of success. Transportation and communication flourished; the cities grew. Programs in education and health made notable strides.

Unfortunately for the Lithuanians and for all people who uphold the rights of national self-determination this period of progress for Lithuanians came to an abrupt end. All too short-lived was this brief interlude of freedom. The Soviet Union in 1939, violating a treaty with Lithuania, served an ultimatum on the government and proceeded to occupy the country. Lithuania had no choice but to comply with the demands which the Soviet Union made upon her; later the little country was forcibly incorporated in the U. S. S. R. Except for 3 years during the Second World War during which the Nazis overran Lithuania, the country has since remained under the complete domination of Communist Russia.

The harsh treatment which the Lithuanian people have suffered at the hands of Soviet Russia has been a source of deep despair and concern to all the free peoples of the world. Thousands of Lithuanians are reported to have starved to death, and other thousands to have been killed or deported out of their beloved country into the interior of the Soviet Union. These gross violations of the human life and dignity of a small defenseless land will remain forever as a blot on the pages of human history.

And yet, we ourselves gather a measure of hope when we are constantly made aware that there are thousands of Lithuanians whose spirits are not crushed by this heavy oppression—there are thousands, both inside and outside Lithuania, who are working in a spirit of patient devotion to keep alive and active the national traditions and aspiration of this sturdy little nation. From inside Lithuania we have reports of a flourishing underground. In our own country there are numerous groups acting on behalf of Lithuania in her fight for freedom. As long as this is true—as long as there remain hope and the will to work for this hope in the bosom of this people—then we need never despair—for such a spirit is the first and fundamental requirement in a movement to reestablish the rights of enslaved human souls.

HAIL LITHUANIA

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud indeed to make acknowledgment today of the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence and to join with millions of liberty-loving people in this Nation and all over the world in hailing this stalwart nation and great people.

While Lithuania has been shackled with the chains of oppression, the spark of liberty which was planted years ago in the hearts of her people will ever shine brightly despite the disappointments and disillusionments of our times.

The brave Lithuanian people know that human liberty is indestructible; that it may be suppressed for a while, that it may be visited with religious persecutions and bloodshed, but in the end it will reemerge more glorious than ever.

In keeping with our time-honored custom of helping the oppressed and victims of tyranny, it must be the province of this Nation always by word and by deed to keep alive the courage and to nurture the faith of millions of loyal Lithuanians, as well as other struggling peoples throughout the earth who are striving and fighting for liberation from dictatorship.

As a Member of this House, I pledge myself anew to the cause of Lithuania and I urge all our Members, indeed all Americans everywhere, to render determined support to the Lithuanian cause so that through our intercessions and the help of the Almighty that great nation and its noble people may once again breathe the air of freedom.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to put in the RECORD a letter I addressed to Miss Mary M. Kizis, director, Lithuanian American Information Center, 233 Broadway, New York, N. Y.:

NEW YORK, *February 12, 1954.*

Miss MARY M. KIZIS,
Director, Lithuanian American Information Center, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MISS KIZIS: After the First World War, an independent Lithuania announced that she intended to be a republic of free citizens, assuring justice to all; that the

aim of the state would be to give every citizen an opportunity to rise to the highest moral and material level and share in creating values which would add to the progress of all mankind. Independence strongly whetted the creative talents of her richly endowed people and they quickly started along the road to achievement in all fields of national endeavor.

In the autumn of 1939 the full force of Hitler's mania burst upon the civilized world and in the space of a few nerve-shattering months Europe was a quivering ruin. None felt the impact of this staggering event with greater effect than the peoples of the Baltic States, especially when der fuhrer revealed his secret relationship with the Soviet Union. The Lithuanians, through the years, have been stanch in their devotion to their national ideals, and this spirit still prevails with a ferocity of an emotion deprived of natural and normal expression.

The calloused masterminds of the Kremlin issue communiques with increasing regularity, making every effort to enhance our opinions as to the "happiness" of the various people they hold in ruthless subjugation. To the everlasting credit of the American people, we have not fallen for the party line. We have countered by never recognizing the annexation of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. We have granted haven to their displaced peoples, accepting 26,000 Lithuanians. With devastating logic, the House of Representatives of the United States adopted the Baltic resolution, creating the select Baltic committee to investigate the sordid spectacle of Soviet aggrandisement.

We say to the Lithuanian people, longing for cherished freedom: "Difficult as it is, hold fast to your hopes. The current exponents of sadism and corruption must soon be swept from the political arena. It is not in the nature of things that they long survive. Lithuania will again be able to say to the world that she is a republic of free citizens, assuring justice and dedicated to liberty."

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

SOVIET INFIDELITY AND LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, to maintain faith in one another in all human relationships is the simplest means for assuring universal justice and tranquillity. From faith is derived confidence, trust, charity, and love—all elements necessary for the continuation of an elevated society and a progressing civilization. Without faith in one another, society is debased; for, when men begin to distrust one another, when men are motivated more by the counsels of suspicion and fear than they are by higher ideals, elements are then abroad that will most assuredly harm, if not destroy the bonds of social unity. In a democracy faith in one another is a cardinal virtue, for what would become of the democratic way of life if man could no longer trust his neighbor?

Among the great powers of the world today and in past history Soviet Russia epitomizes the very essence of infidelity. Deceit, falsehood, immorality, all have been governing principles in Soviet relations with other nations. With a guileful sense of dedication to evil purposes, Soviet Russia has persisted in her course of conquest and tyranny, and of all the nations of the world that had fallen victim to Soviet tyranny, none more ably demonstrates the real essence of Soviet immorality in international relations than the case of Lithuania. By the seizure and forced incorporation of Lithuania into the U. S. S. R., Soviet Russia has won for herself the abomination of mankind.

The gravity of the transgressions upon Lithuanian sovereignty and independence was well demonstrated by a review of the instruments of diplomacy, recognized by international law, that had been concluded between Soviet Russia and the Lithuanian Republic and had governed their relations during 20 years of Lithuanian independence.

By the terms of the treaty of peace between Soviet Russia and Lithuania, the Soviet Government pledged that it recognized the independence of the Lithuanian Republic and that it would in no way violate Lithuanian sovereignty. In 1926 Lithuania and the Soviet Government concluded a pact of nonaggression, which reaffirmed Soviet pledges of inviolability of Lithuanian territory and sovereignty and added another stone to the structure of international relations between the two nations. By other international agreements—the Litvinov protocol which outlawed war as an instrument of national policy; the convention defining an aggressor, and others—Soviet Russia pledged its word to recognize and keep inviolate Lithuanian independence. And, of course, like any peace-loving people, the Lithuanian Nation had faith in Soviet promises.

To the misfortune of Lithuania, however, the pledges of Soviet Russia could not then, and never can be, taken as the honorable and faithful promises of an honorable and faithful nation. In October 1939, 1 month after German forces seized the western half of Poland and the Red army seized the eastern, the Soviet Government made the first breach in Lithuanian sovereignty when, by forcefully imposing upon the Lithuanian Nation a pact of mutual assistance, the Soviet Government acquired bases on Lithuanian territory for garrisoning Soviet military forces.

To the world Soviet authorities proclaimed that this was not a violation of Lithuanian sovereignty. In an effort to prove the purity of their action and to resanctify the illegality of their act, Soviet statesmen incorporated an article in the pact which said that the enforcement of the pact of mutual assistance would in no way impair the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, or more especially, their economic system or political structure.

This pledge, purely propaganda, was a faithless gesture of Communist expediency, for before the close of summer in 1940, Soviet Russia broke not only this pledge but all others. In one blow the Soviet Government destroyed all the instruments of law that had governed Soviet-Lithuanian diplomatic relations for 20 years, and with it destroyed the freedom of the Lithuanian nation.

That Americans should honor Lithuanians on this day commemorating the independence of their nation is an honorable and noble duty. That the real nature of Soviet menace should be bared before the world is no less a duty. In paying tribute to the great and courageous people of Lithuania on this day of patriotic dedication, let us, therefore, not be unmindful of those evil men who destroyed the independent republic we commemorate. In Lithuania, Soviet Russia has proved herself worthy of the appellation "abomination of humanity"; In Lithuania there is for the world to see a classic example of Soviet infidelity.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, I want to join other Members of the House in their expressions of admiration for all those who did so much to establish this independence and for those who today, inside Lithuania, still cherish and encourage the spirit of independence and freedom. I am confident that Lithuanians, as well as all freedom-loving people now under Communist domination, will regain the freedom of their country. I know that all Americans look forward to that day and want to do everything within their power to bring it about.

LITHUANIAN LIBERTY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to make a few comments on this, the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

This Baltic nation at present is enslaved by the Soviets who seized the reins of power unjustly in 1940. This seizure has not been recognized by the United States Government.

Because of Communist aggression this freedom-loving people is forbidden to celebrate this occasion. Free people throughout the world today are joining with the 1 million loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent in assuring the people in their homeland of their continued support in fighting Soviet suppression.

All of us who love freedom and liberty should work together to free the enslaved, no matter where they may be, and strengthen the spirit of independence in the hearts of men all over the world.

We must never forget that an attack upon liberty anywhere is an attack upon liberty everywhere.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 36th anniversary of the birth of the Republic of Lithuania. Now enslaved by Soviet imperialism since 1940, the tradition of freedom and national independence has not died among the Lithuanian people. The experience of the bitterness of long years of Communist domination of this once free Baltic nation has intensified the desire for freedom among her brave people. As a Member of this Congress I am proud that the United States has never recognized the Soviet seizure and incorporation of Lithuania. And those of Lithuanian origin everywhere can be proud, too, that their people have not accepted this domination, even though the presence of brute force enforces a temporary silence on the expression of their desires for freedom which they feel so earnestly. Americans will not forget Lithuania in her Soviet prison and looks, with her, to her ultimate liberation and reemergence as a member of the family of free nations.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, on this 36th anniversary of Lithuania's tragically short-lived independence there are

some encouraging evidences that the lesson of Lithuania and of other victims of Soviet duplicity are being taken to heart and are finding expression in the much more forthright and realistic American foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration.

At least on two different occasions during the current conference of foreign ministers in Berlin, Secretary of State Dulles specifically cited Russia's betrayal of Lithuania as a reason why no reliance can be placed on her promises of freedom and self-government. Mr. Dulles threw in Molotov's teeth the phony assurances given Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by Molotov himself in 1939, only a few months before the independence of those countries was lost.

The new firmness in rejecting Russian proposals for German unification and so-called freedom suggests that the lesson of Lithuania is at long last being heeded. That means infinitely more, for America and for the ultimate hopes of peoples enslaved by communism, than the most eloquent and sincere tributes of the brave Lithuanian people.

From other quarters, also, there are evidences of a new firmness and realism in American foreign policy. For example, a recent, little-publicized statement by a high official of the State Department gives additional assurance that the Eisenhower administration has no intention of extending diplomatic recognition to the Communist Government of China or of acquiescing in U. N. membership for Red China.

An article in the January 11, 1954, official Department of State Bulletin, written by Walter P. McConaughy, Director of the Office of Chinese Affairs of the State Department, flatly rejects either move and insists that the existing United States ban on trade, shipping, and financial relations with Communist China must be maintained. His article reflects straight thinking and straight speaking of a type deplorably lacking under the two previous administrations.

Mr. McConaughy points out that the Chinese Communists, while currently in control of the mainland of China, completely fail to measure up to the three important requirements for diplomatic recognition. They fail to meet the criteria of sovereign independence, consent of the people to the government, and adherence to treaty obligations.

On the contrary, as the State Department official notes, the Chinese Communists "are subservient to Moscow and international communism; they impose an alien minority rule by force and falsification on an intimidated, isolated, and misinformed populace; and they openly flout every Chinese treaty obligation, every principle of the U. N. Charter, and every clause in any reasonable formulation of human and property rights for aliens."

Mr. McConaughy points out that American recognition of Red China "would be an unthinkable betrayal of the Chinese Government and its people on Formosa and a grave disservice to the mass of Chinese people on the mainland," adding that the Formosan Government "is the only Chinese Government which represents in any measure the authentic aspirations and the bona fide national interests of the Chinese people."

All this is evidence that the State Department, under President Eisenhower's administration, is at long last coming into line with overwhelming public sentiment on this issue—sentiment expressed many months ago by unanimous vote of both Houses of Congress. It is a far cry from the Acheson policies which brought the Nation to the verge of recognition of Red China.

The first gross violation of sound principles governing diplomatic recognition occurred when President Roosevelt recognized Soviet Russia in 1933. He abandoned the policies of Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover and gave the Communist regime in Russia desperately needed support by his action.

I was the first Member of Congress to publicly advocate withdrawal of this recognition. I believe the very factors which argue convincingly against recognition of Communist China still support my advocacy of withdrawal of recognition of Soviet Russia.

Meanwhile it is substantial progress in a return to sound foreign policy to have the Director of the important Office of Chinese Affairs of the State Department so forcefully on record against recognition of Red China. It bolsters the faith that we will achieve still further realism and adherence to sound American principles in world affairs.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, no foe, however great, can for time without limit impose its will upon a nation of people who have the fierce and consuming ambition to be free.

The yoke of Soviet tyranny will be lifted from Lithuania; let no man dispute that.

This is the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, a day to be celebrated by freemen everywhere. In 1918 the Lithuanian people formed an independent republic and adopted a constitution fashioned after the one we revere so greatly.

Let me cite the preamble of the Lithuanian Constitution to demonstrate very vividly the thoughts which prompted independence and freedom in the hearts of these fine people:

In the name of Almighty God, the Lithuanian people, thankfully recalling the glorious efforts and noble sacrifices of its sons, made to deliver the motherland, having recreated its state independence and desiring to extend the firm democratic foundations of its independent life, to develop conditions of justice and equity, and to guarantee the equality, freedom, and well-being of all citizens, and suitable state protection for human labor and morality, through its authorized representatives, convened in the constituent assembly, August 1, 1922, has adopted the following constitution of the Lithuanian republic.

When I contemplate the friends I have of Lithuanian origin and their loyalty to the causes of freedom and justice in the United States, I know that by personal example they keep burning the flame of freedom in their native land. Lithuania cannot fail to be free. This Nation cannot fail to assist these brave people.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, the little Baltic State which was unjustly occupied by Soviet Russia back in 1940, and which has since been ruthlessly enslaved.

The United States has never recognized the fake annexation of Lithuania by Communist Russia. In fact, the American people have on numerous occasions protested against the atrocities perpetrated against the Lithuanian and other Baltic peoples. The Congress of the United States has granted a haven in this country to many hundreds of thousands of displaced persons and refugees since the end of World War II, and among these some 26,000 Lithuanians entered our country and are today loyal and productive citizens.

More recently, Congress has set up a Select Baltic Committee, which is now conducting an investigation of the forced seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviet Union.

On the occasion of Lithuania's anniversary, we reaffirm our solidarity with these heroic people and we renew our greetings and wishes that Lithuania will soon regain its independence from the yoke of communism. Their cause is a righteous one, they deserve our support and encouragement in their struggle for freedom.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial appearing in the February 16 issue of the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call captioned "Lithuanians Look Forward to Independence":

LITHUANIANS LOOK FORWARD TO INDEPENDENCE

This is the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence. Lithuanians living throughout the free world are holding patriotic meetings and raising funds to free Lithuania from the yoke of tyranny imposed on her people by Communist Russia. Their battle cry—"The Russians will not succeed in subjugating the Lithuanian people. They tried once before and failed. They will fail again."

February 16, 1918, carries as much significance to the Lithuanians as July 4, 1776, means to every American. But while we continue to enjoy our priceless freedom, Lithuania is again an enslaved nation, her people living under conditions far more terrible than her darkest days prior to World War I. For 40 years her churches were burned, her priests transported to Siberia, her press, language, and prayer books suppressed and her youth compelled to serve 25 years in the Russian Army.

Mayor Titus by proclamation has proclaimed today as Republic of Lithuania Day. Lithuanians of this area will observe the anniversary in a program on Saturday at school 20. Their efforts will speed the day when Lithuania takes her place as a peaceful country in a European community of nations.

Mr. Speaker, the 36th anniversary of this brave little nation's declaration of independence is being commemorated by the Lithuanian Citizens Independent Aid Club in Paterson next Saturday night. Unable to attend the event due to a prior commitment, I also include the following copy of a letter I addressed

to Mr. Anthony Gustus, chairman, under date of February 8:

FEBRUARY 8, 1954.

Mr. ANTHONY GUSTUS,
Chairman, Lithuanian Citizens Independent Aid Club,
Paterson, N. J.

DEAR MR. GUSTUS: I was delighted to receive the invitation to join with my good friends at home in commemorating the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. My only regret is that another commitment made sometime ago will make it impossible for me to be with you.

I would, however, be most appreciative if you would convey to my many friends of Lithuanian descent my best wishes on this memorable occasion.

Like so many free men throughout the world, I cannot look upon the cynical seizure of Lithuania and her Baltic sister states, Estonia and Latvia, by Soviet Russia without being sensibly moved. Indeed, what happened in those fateful months from September 1939 to August 1940, when the Soviet Government planned and willfully carried out schemes leading to the destruction of Lithuanian independence, will surely go down in history as one of the greatest crimes that one nation could ever commit against another.

Our duty, however—yours and mine—is clear: we must never cease in our efforts to dramatize to the world at large, and especially to those nations less inclined to see the intrinsic danger of communism, the case of Lithuania as being a clear illustration of Soviet faithlessness, cynicism and immorality. We must also continue to pay homage to this great nation, Lithuania, and to her courageous people so that by doing our duty as free men we might keep alive the flames of resistance within the breasts of those less fortunate than we; for it ought never to be forgotten that so long as we raise our voices in honor, and in protest, so long will those now enslaved be inspired to look into the future with undiminished hope.

With kindest regards and all best wishes, believe me,

Very sincerely yours,
GORDON CANFIELD,
Member of Congress.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence is an occasion for special observance. The people of the United States, through their elected representatives in the Congress, have expressed unmistakably their abhorrence of the enslavement of the peoples of Lithuania and of her sister republics of the Baltic. Last July a memorable resolution, introduced by Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin, was adopted by this House to create a committee to investigate fully the circumstances of the seizure of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union and the treatment accorded their peoples during and after their forced "incorporation" in the U. S. S. R.

In Washington, New York, Detroit, and Chicago, eyewitnesses, masked or from behind screens, have told this committee of monstrous crimes committed by the Red army in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Films, smuggled out in the closing days of the war, have explained in detail how the Soviets take over a country. Stories have been told of continued deportations from Lithuania during the past year.

But a note of hope has also emerged. Witnesses have told of a courageous and active underground movement continuing in Lithuania.

As this dramatic and terrible story unfolds, the American people will have before them incontrovertible evidence of the cruelty, duplicity, and evil purposes of Soviet communism. They will also see an unforgettable picture of the courage and steadfastness of the Lithuanian people.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on today and tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE FOOD SITUATION IN SOUTHEAST MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. During the past several days a lot of unfavorable publicity brought about by exaggeration and distortion of the facts has emanated from around my home community in Dunklin County, Mo., where various types of surplus commodity foods are being distributed to unemployed persons whose need is being certified by the local Red Cross chapter.

Due to the fact that the metropolitan press, as well as the national magazines, together with radio and television, seem interested in presenting only the spectacular and sensational, it has apparently been impossible to present a true picture of the situation to the public.

For this reason I would like to read a letter written by T. E. Miles, president of the Kennett Chamber of Commerce, and Jack Stapleton, Jr., publisher of the Dunklin Democrat in Kennett, which should serve to clear up some of the many exaggerations concerning this area of southeast Missouri and the needy families which have received help.

The following letter has been mailed to all of the metropolitan newspapers circulating in that area and also to the radio and television programs which have heretofore carried adverse publicity. The letter follows:

DEAR SIRS: For the past several days, Dunklin County has been very much in the limelight in the national press, radio, and television. Much of the information which has been published has been erroneous and distorted beyond fact.

It is very regrettable that such distortions have occurred, and we would appreciate any clarification you may be able to give this area.

Let us say first of all that Dunklin County is taking care of its own needy residents. All outside help, with the exception of Government surplus foods, is being refused or returned. Through donations from local residents and a newly organized public-works program, we intend to solve our own problems.

The decision to solve our own problems was reached this week at meetings held by businessmen and public officials.

We should also like to state that the number of persons actually needing food has been exaggerated by many mediums beyond all proportions. As can best be determined, approximately 600 families could be placed in the needy status, but very few of these could be classed as destitute.

This situation is characteristic of many agricultural counties, but from press reports, one gets the impression that the situation just started. Because of our seasonable demand for laborers, the lack of savings by some of these persons has caused the same situation year after year. Only the conflict about securing the actual food was new to this year's condition.

This county has the largest bank deposits of any rural county in the State of Missouri and is one of the richest—if not the richest—agricultural areas in the Middle West and Midsouth. Our land is not barren and is not waste land, as stated in some reports.

The fact that some few Dunklin Countians are hungry at this time of year cannot be attributed to the cottonpicker, although again this has been cited as the reason behind our situation. Our farm experts tell us that the cottonpicker plays little part in this situation.

The laborer who finds himself hungry at this time of the year actually makes more during a 12-month period than many laborers in other agricultural and industrial areas. Unfortunately, the pay comes at only two seasons of the year, and therefore, there is more temptation to spend it faster instead of saving for a time of need.

We hope this clarifies our situation better than many of the distorted reports which have been published or broadcast. We find it inconceivable that a reporter can visit our area for a few hours and return as an expert.

Let us restate that Dunklin County, which admittedly does have a problem, is solving it without outside help. We have recognized our problem, and like many other American communities, we are resolved to find a solution. We are finding that solution now.

Very truly yours,
T. E. MILES,
President, Kennett Chamber of Commerce.
JACK STAPLETON, JR.,
Publisher, Dunklin Democrat, Kennett, Mo.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today be vacated and that it be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

RECIPROCAL TRADE

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked this time in order to call the attention of my colleagues to the following United Press dispatch from Caracas, Venezuela. This is in the nature of a threat by Venezuela, to cancel trade relations over our attitude in considering quota limits on coffee and residual oil which they export to the United States. The brief dispatch follows:

CARACAS, February 12.—Venezuelans today threatened to cut off their $500-million yearly purchases from the United States if Washington adopts restrictive measures affecting Venezuelan exports such as oil and coffee.

Resentment mounted and became more articulate here against the Gillette bill, subjecting coffee trading to Federal regulation and against efforts by independent American oil producers to curb imports of Venezuelan oil.

Despite this Nation's rights under our Reciprocal Trade Act to flood our markets with cheap fuel oil, they are as a nation one of the worst offenders in placing restrictions on United States exports. Only a few months ago, they boosted import duties on American-made aluminum articles as much as 350 percent.

In face of such brazen disregard of treaty provisions I wonder why we go on calling our trade policy a reciprocal one.

PUBLIC HEARINGS OF HOOVER COMMISSION TASK FORCE ON POWER AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at its annual meeting in Miami, Fla., adopted a resolution on January 14, 1954, urging the Hoover Commission to enlarge the membership of its task force on water resources and power in order to provide for representation of public and cooperative agencies in the power field. The NRECA also requested that opportunity be afforded it to testify in hearings before the Commission or the task force.

As a member of the Hoover Commission, I have taken the position from the start that the task force on water resources and power should be broadly representative of the major viewpoints in this controversial field, including public as well as private power. Although the Commission has not accepted my proposal to enlarge the membership of the task force to include individuals with a public-power viewpoint, it directed, on February 8 that public hearings be held, with ample opportunity for all interested parties to be heard, and a verbatim transcript of the testimony to be available for examination by the press and the public.

Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Hoover Commission to direct one of its task forces to hold public hearings marks an unprecedented step in its procedure, and I wish to call it to the attention of the members. Although the task force on water resources and power is the only task force for which public hearings are mandatory at the present time, other task forces may decide to follow the same procedure. I am hopeful that public hearings will contribute to a series of balanced and well-rounded reports of the Hoover Commission.

I include with these remarks the correspondence of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association relating to presentation of testimony at task force hearings:

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1954.

Hon. HERBERT HOOVER,
Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, General Accounting Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association represents 91 percent of all the rural electric systems in this country and Alaska which are financed by loans from the Rural Electrification Administration. The 900 rural electric systems which we represent serve over 3½ million farm families and rural establishments.

As you know, the rural electric systems are locally owned and controlled. Their relations with REA have been twofold—REA has been the agency from which they borrowed all their capital funds, and REA has provided them with certain essential technical services which have helped to insure the security of the Government's loans and also aided the systems to do such a fine job of electrifying rural United States and Alaska. This job is far from completed; there are still over one-half million unserved farms and rural establishments, and also the loads of the rural electric systems are doubling every 4 years, which means there has to be REA loan funds available for the necessary heavying-up and other system improvements.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, the rural electric systems purchased and generated approximately 11½ billion kilowatt-hours. They purchased 50.4 percent of this from the power companies and 28.1 percent from Federal agencies (TVA, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation). Because of the importance of this power purchased from agencies of the Federal Government, we have definite interest in the Federal power program and the agencies concerned with it. Also, they purchased 7.9 percent from other public agencies and they generated 13.6 percent themselves.

It is our understanding that your Commission will examine the policies and administration of the REA and the agencies concerned with the Federal power program. Our people are vitally interested in the deliberations of your Commission in these areas. At our recent annual meeting in Miami, Fla., which was attended by over 5,000 farm people, they passed the attached resolution instructing us to request time for their representatives and members of our staff to appear before your Commission and the task forces on water and power and the lending agencies, and present the views of the rural electric systems.

We would appreciate your arranging suitable times for such hearings and notifying us of such dates far enough in advance so we can notify our people in various parts of the country.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
Executive Manager.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT NRECA ANNUAL MEETING, MIAMI, FLA., JANUARY 14, 1954

Whereas there has been formed a commission commonly known as the Hoover Commission to examine the administration of the agencies of the Federal Government and to make policy recommendations concerning the functions of the Federal Government, and there has been created a task force of this Commission on water and power to examine in particular the administration and policy of the agencies of the Federal Government concerned with power such as the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of the Interior, and the Army Corps of Engineers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Commission be urged to enlarge the size of the task force on water and power so as to provide for adequate representation of public and cooperative groups which at the present time are not represented on that task force; and be it further

Resolved, That it is essential in a democratic government that the people have the right to present their views before a commission with such sweeping authority. Therefore we strongly urge that the Commission permit us sufficient time to present our views before the full Commission and also the task force on water and power.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1954.

Mr. CHARLES D. CURRAN,
Task Force Administrator, Task Force on Water Resources and Power, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, General Accounting Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CURRAN: The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association represents 91 percent of all the rural electric systems in this country and Alaska which are financed by loans from the Rural Electrification Administration. The 900 rural electric systems which we represent serve over 3½ million farm families and rural establishments.

We, of course, are interested in the deliberations of your task force because of our relations with the REA and also, in many areas, the Federal power agencies, the Bureau of Reclamation, Southwestern Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, TVA, and the Army Corps of Engineers.

Our members, assembled at their annual meeting in Miami, Fla., on January 14, 1954, directed us to request time for a hearing both before the full Commission and the task force on water and power. A copy of their resolution is attached. Therefore, I want to take this opportunity to request time for the rural electric systems to appear before your task force and present their views on matters of interest to them and within the jurisdiction of your task force.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
Executive Manager.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1954.

Mr. PAUL GRADY,
Task Force Director, Task Force on Lending Agencies, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, General Accounting Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRADY: The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association represents 91 percent of all the rural electric systems in this country and Alaska which are financed by loans from the Rural Electrification Administration. The 900 rural electric systems which we represent serve over 3½ million farm families and rural establishments.

As you are probably aware, the rural electric systems borrow the capital they require from REA and repay it over 35 years with interest. At the end of calendar year 1953 loans in the amount of $2,780,000,000 had been approved by REA. Included in this total was $2,251,000,000 for distribution lines, $508,000,000 for generation and transmission facilities, and $21,000,000 for consumer facilities (loans which the systems make to their members for the purchase of wiring materials, plumbing, appliances, etc., where adequate local credit is not available).

We feel the relationship between REA and the rural electric systems is a healthy one. The systems are locally owned and controlled. Their relations with REA have been twofold—they have borrowed the necessary capital funds from REA and REA has provided certain services necessary to insure the security of their loans and assist them in accomplishing the fine job they are doing of electrifying rural United States and Alaska. But their job is far from completed—there are still over one-half million unserved farms and rural establishments and also the loads of the rural electric systems are doubling about every 4 years. This means that loan funds must be available for heavying up the lines and other system improvements.

We understand your task force will examine the administration and policies of the REA program. Our people, of course, are vitally interested in the deliberations of your task force. At their recent annual meeting in Miami, Fla., which was attended by over 5,000 farm people, they passed a resolution instructing us to request time for them and members of our staff to present their views before the task force on lending agencies.

Therefore, we would appreciate your arranging suitable time for such a hearing and notifying us far enough in advance so we can notify our people.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
Executive Manager.

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS SPREADS GLOOM AND DOOM

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in its investigation of the manner in which the Associated Press has reported on the various internal combustions of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I wonder if the committee has also made any effort to determine whether, under the guise of reporting news, the Associated Press is guilty of that much-discussed leftwing tendency to spread gloom and doom.

I do not ask this lightly, Mr. Speaker, for I understand that throughout last week prominent leaders of the Republican Party assured us there was no basis for either gloom or doom in the current economic situation—a self-correcting inventory adjustment, and that anyone who believes we are not enjoying remarkable prosperity is possibly subversive and certainly mistaken.

Under these circumstances, I was surprised, not to say shocked, that the Associated Press, already suspect of exercizing some rather uncomplimentary objectivity in its coverage of congressional activities, had the effrontery last week to report the fact that business failures in the preceding week were the highest for any week since April 1942.

This is, without doubt, a typical piece of gloom and doom reporting and I wonder if we should not investigate to determine if some hidden fear dealer wrote it.

The use of the April 1942 date is particularly suspect, Mr. Speaker, because as I understand it, many of the business failures of that wartime period were due to the inability of the businesses involved to obtain either materials to process or goods to sell or labor to do the necessary work.

On the other hand, those businesses which the AP included last week in its tabulation of those which went broke were not bothered by any shortage of goods or materials, or by any inability to find people to employ. They must have gone under, then, for entirely different reasons from those which went out of business during the previous record-high week of business failures in April 1942.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that businesses in so shaky a condition should have had the good grace and consideration to fail at some other time and not right in the midst of those assurances from the White House and the Republican National Committee that only gloom and doom spreaders see anything but the rosiest economic rainbows over our shoulders.

I suppose we cannot expect the Associated Press to suppress news of this nature, since the news services in this country make something of a fetish out of reporting just about everything that happens that anyone might be interested in reading about. Nevertheless, when next an investigator from the Committee on Un-American Activities does a rundown on how the AP handled some item involving the committee's affairs, it might be worthwhile for him also to examine into the authorship of such gloom and doom pieces as this one on business failures.

FORECLOSURES ON LAND CONTRACTS, DETROIT, MICH., AREA

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, one more indication of the seriously deteriorating economic conditions in the Detroit, Mich., area appears in an article in the Detroit News of Sunday, February 14, entitled "Foreclosures Rise on Land Contracts."

The circuit court commissioners in Wayne County who handle the preliminary foreclosure steps, report a 60-percent increase in the number of suits filed in December and January.

Stories like this have an ominously familiar ring to me. I was in the real estate business in Detroit at the start of the last depression and my office was the destination of a parade of home buyers, some with a considerable equity in their property, who came in to drop their land contracts in my lap as their economic security collapsed around them.

Bills have been introduced in the Michigan legislature for a moratorium on these foreclosures—does not that sound familiar—and I am studying this problem to see what possible Federal legislation may be of assistance.

I ask unanimous consent to include the article from the Detroit News at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The article follows:

FORECLOSURES RISE ON LAND CONTRACTS

(By Louis Tendler)

The effects of unemployment in the Detroit area were shown in a sharp rise in the number of land contract foreclosure suits being filed in the circuit court, a survey showed Saturday.

The 4 circuit court commissioners who handle the preliminary steps in the foreclosures of land contracts report a 60-percent jump in the number of suits filed in December and January, and some days the increase over the same period a year ago runs to several hundred percent.

"Until recently, we rarely got more than 2 or 3 land contract foreclosures a day," said Commissioner A. Tom Pasieczny, "but now it's not unusual for me to get as many as 35 in a single day."

MORATORIUM URGED

The plight of many Detroit factory workers who are having trouble meeting home payments contracted for during the lush wage-earning period of the last several years moved one State legislator to call for restoration of the depression-born mortgage moratorium.

Representative Stanley Novak, Democrat, of Detroit, has introduced 2 bills to this effect, 1 providing for a moratorium on mortgage payments in distress cases and a companion bill providing similar relief on land contracts. The bills would expire March 1, 1955.

Under both bills the distressed property buyers could go into circuit court, state their reasons for default, and, if the reasons are deemed adequate, obtain postponement of threatened foreclosure for any period up to a year within the discretion of the court.

During the moratorium period, the property buyer would be required to pay a fair rent and to keep up taxes, insurance, and the condition of the property.

The two bills are now being considered by the House Judiciary Committee.

"These bills are based on sound social principle and I am in favor of them," said Pasieczny. "They would give us the authority to give unemployed and distressed property buyers the kind of relief we cannot give them now."

MOST SELLERS PATIENT

Pasieczny said that only by adjourning foreclosure suits can the court commissioners provide any relief for distressed buyers. Some of the suits in his court have been postponed as many as 16 times to give buyers a chance to raise money to meet their defaulted contract payments, he said.

"I do what I can for them," he said, "but if I grant too many postponements, the lawyers for the other side go into the circuit court and get injunctions that take the suits away from me."

Generally, Pasieczny emphasized, sellers have been patient with their defaulted buyers but often they have obligations of their own to meet and this forces them to press for settlement.

Many of the home buyers, Pasieczny explained, purchased their homes on land contracts because they could manage only small downpayments, leaving themselves with large balances and correspondingly large monthly payments.

Pasieczny cited a recent case in which a veteran, his wife and two children appeared in his courtroom in response to a foreclosure suit on his $10,000 home. The veteran paid $3,500 down, spent $3,000 putting another bedroom in the attic, and regularly met his $75 monthly payments until he was laid off.

SIXTEEN ADJOURNMENTS

"I had adjourned that case 16 times because the veteran felt sure he could find another job," Pasieczny said. "But the plaintiff was pressed for money and threatened to appeal any further adjournments to the circuit court.

"I had to order that foreclosure despite those four anxious faces staring at me. I felt terrible."

Unlike land-contract cases, mortgage foreclosure suits have not increased appreciably in recent months. Homes purchased on mortgage usually carry a larger downpayment, leaving a larger equity in the hands of the buyer. Monthly payments usually are smaller and the larger equity gives the buyer greater incentive to retain his property.

TRANSPORTATION TAX ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to eliminate the 3-percent transportation tax on agricultural products. I believe this is a matter worthy of the attention of the House at this particular time and in this session of the Congress. Regardless of some claims to the contrary, the income of the American farmer has been on the decline. Wheat last year sold for $1.50 and $1.65 a bushel in my district, compared with $3 in 1948, and many other prices such as cattle have similarly declined. At the same time the farmer has to pay more for machinery, fertilizer, clothing, and other finished products. So I think anything that might help the farmer and encourage him at this time would be a very worthwhile undertaking. This 3-percent tax on transportation affects farmers in every State, the citrus fruit farmers in California, the livestock people, and the producers of wheat and corn. This tax should be removed without further delay as this step would help the depressed farmer when the future for him is not too bright.

SECURITY RISKS

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include copies of correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in the U. S. News & World Report magazine for February 12, 1954, at page 72 thereof, is quoted a verbatim interview with R. W. Scott McLeod, top security officer of the Department of State. I read the question that was then asked him: "When a man is fired as a security risk, does not that in the public mind mean the same as a loyalty risk?" I now read you his answer to that question: "It is confused with loyalty—I think that is true."

That, gentlemen, was on February 12, 1954. I now read a true and correct copy of a letter by me to the President of the United States dated January 15, 1954:

JANUARY 15, 1954.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am a member again of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Therefore, you will understand that, to me as such committee member, it is of utmost importance and concern to have an itemized breakdown of the 2,200 Federal employees which you are understood to have related publicly were cut off the Federal payroll under the administration's security program. That is, I believe it is important to the people of our great Nation that all of us know specifically how many of this number which you have quoted in your state of the Union message were cut off the payroll because they were found as actually subversive, and how many resigned before they had hearings, how many were found to be security risks because of habitual drunkenness, or lack of discretion, or homosexuality, or other specific causes.

This should include how many were cut off because of Communist affiliations or connections.

Mr. President, I am frequently asked the question whether or not conditions are improving with reference to the Communist conspiracy or subversive activities of the Communist Party in government. And you, sir, many months ago (I believe properly) stated that the executive department would handle its own problem in this regard.

But, to take out the uncertainty, the lack of present specific information, and in order to give the people the actual analysis of those who were cut off because they were actual security risks or on account of subversive activities or connections, I respectfully ask that you communicate to me by prompt mail, or that I be promptly informed with an itemized breakdown of them within the purview of this letter; to wit, the 2,200 Federal employees cut off the Federal payroll since you took over your very heavy responsibilities as President of our great Nation.

Respectfully,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1954, I received the following letter, dated January 19, 1954, signed by Gerald D. Morgan, Administrative Assistant to the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 19, 1954.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: This is merely an acknowledgment of the receipt of your letter of January 15 addressed to the President. You may expect a full reply shortly.

With kind regards,

GERALD D. MORGAN,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I will say that since I received that letter I have neither received a "full reply," nor any reply.

And now I read you a letter dated January 16, 1954, which I wrote to the Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C.:

JANUARY 16, 1954.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

SIRS: I am a member again of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Therefore, you will understand that, to me as such committee member, it is of utmost importance and concern to have an itemized breakdown of the 2,200 Federal employees which the newspapers and other sources relate you have announced have been cut off the Federal payroll within the last year. Also the President in his state of the Union message made the same announcement.

I believe it is of utmost importance to the people of our great Nation that all of us know specifically how many of this number were actually found as "subversive," and how many resigned before they had hearings, how many were found to be security risks because of habitual drunkenness, or lack of discretion, or homosexuality, or other specific causes.

This should include how many were cut off because of Communist affiliations or connections.

I am frequently asked the question whether or not conditions are improving with reference to the Communist conspiracy or subversive activities of the Communist Party in Government. I am also frequently asked how many Communists or other subversives have been found within the Government and discharged within the last year.

But, to take out the uncertainty, the lack of present specific information, and in order to give the people the actual analysis of those who were cut off because they were actual security risks or on account of subversive activities or connections, I respectfully ask that you communicate to me by prompt mail, or that I be promptly informed with an itemized breakdown of them within the purview of this letter, to-wit, the 2,200 Federal employees cut off the Federal payroll since the inauguration of our distinguished President of the United States, President Eisenhower.

Respectfully yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, but not until February 4, 1954, did I receive any reply thereto. On that date I received the following reply, dated February 3, 1954, from Philip Young, chairman, acknowledging receipt of a letter very similar to the one I wrote the President of the United States the day before:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1954.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: This will acknowledge your letter of January 16, 1954, requesting an itemized breakdown pertaining to the number of Federal employees released under the employees security program. I will get in touch with you at a later date.

Sincerely,

PHILIP YOUNG,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Young said: "I will get in touch with you at a later date." I have heard nothing further from Mr. Young, nor anyone for him.

Certainly the text of my letter to the President of the United States and also my letter to the Civil Service Commission, clearly shows that I was seeking important, pertinent information which I am still certain the American people are entitled to promptly and fully receive. I called attention in both letters

that I am a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee which deals with the problem of "subversives" under Public Law 601. Under the law it is the legal duty and responsibility of members of that committee to investigate the extent of subversive activities. I wrote these letters on my own responsibility and not on behalf of the committee.

Now a month has passed since the date of my two aforesaid letters. Also, I am aware that by later resolution of the House Un-American Activities Committee some weeks ago, said committee asked the same information, with a breakdown of the number actually found as "subversives." The committee has not yet received such information. Whereas, since the date of my letters to the President and the Civil Service Commission, over a month ago, there has been frequently reported in the daily press, over the radio, and otherwise, statements and claims by high Government officials charged with such matters, by Attorney General Brownell, by the Civil Service Commission, and other governmental departments, to the effect that it would take a good deal of time, work and analysis to answer the increasing demand by Members of Congress and by the public also that it be publicly announced as to how many of the 2,200, or the 1,400 figure frequently used, were discharged on account of "loyalty" as contrasted with the discharging under the definition of "security," I wish to now say, that I am this day critical of the fact that it is now apparent that in the discharge of these 2,200 Federal employees as announced by the President and others in high office, there evidently was not kept any immediately available separate lists of those who were discharged on the grounds of "loyalty." Mr. Speaker, the term "loyalty" in the minds of the general public, I am sure, carries with it the implication of "subversive" conduct. And certainly whatever number of employees were discharged on the grounds of "loyalty" should, therefore, have been carefully and immediately listed and kept separate from those who were merely "security risks" on the grounds announced by Mr. McLeod, in the magazine article.

There is radical difference and distinction between the factors presently used under Executive Order No. 10450 to discharge those who are separated from their jobs on account of security and integrity reasons and those who are separated from their jobs on grounds of disloyalty. Under such order, I hesitate to believe that those in high office today and who are responsible for firing those persons, however few or many there were, on the grounds of loyalty, neglected to, or did not, keep a very close and immediate and careful list of those who were discharged on loyalty grounds. If they did not, Mr. Speaker, why did they not? If they did keep such separate lists, it would be a comparatively simple and easy matter to total the number of such loyalty cases and announce that number. As I said, anyone found sufficiently disloyal to our beloved Nation to be discharged under Executive Order 10450 should, in my judgment, be immediately listed on separate and distinct lists. And these names should not only be promptly sent to the Civil Service Commission, but also to the FBI.

Assuming, therefore, that this brief analysis of the difference between loyalty cases and the security and integrity cases under Executive Order 10450 is correct, I now state that I believe it is in the interest of our national security, it is in the interest of giving the people of our beloved Nation the actual facts, for the administration to immediately release to the people of our Nation the number of loyalty firings and discharges which were listed by the governmental departments at the time that the persons were fired on the grounds of loyalty. Such a list should not have taken more than a very few days to assemble. I, of course, do not expect, nor ask, that their names be made public, but I do ask that further delay be eliminated and that forthwith the number of these persons be given to the public. Otherwise it will still stand in the public minds as a matter unnecessarily confusing. In fact, it is dangerously confusing. Whatever the facts the public should have them immediately. I am not afraid of the full information. Democracy is strengthened only in proportion as full honest-to-God facts and information are given the citizens of our Nation.

The factual truth will not hurt. The keeping from the public of the factual truth as regards "loyalty" and as regards "subversion," and as regards communism will continue to hurt. I cannot believe that anyone in the administration of our Government has a deliberate desire or intention that the American people be either misled or misinformed, or kept from having the full truth. Knowing the truth is what will help keep us a free people. It will keep us a freedom-loving people.

Furthermore, it is certainly in the interest or accurate information and guidance of the thinking and the actions of the American people that the announcement made of the numbers of those employees discharged on the grounds of loyalty shall specify how many of the total so discharged were persons the investigation of whom had commenced or been finished during the Truman administration, and how many were commenced and finished during the new administration. Until such full announcement is made it appears to me that it is as clear as crystal that four results will remain in full force and effect until the uncertainty is dissolved; to wit: First, the people will be confused as to what percentage of persons of the total number of 2,200, or 1,400, announced by this administration were found to be really disloyal under President Eisenhower's Executive order as contradistinct from the previous Truman loyalty orders; second, the American people will continue in a state of more or less anticipating fear that it is possible that the number or percentage thereof is very much larger than it may actually prove to be; third, unless they learn the facts promptly, millions of American people will no doubt conclude that the fight being put up against subversion and conspiratorial communism, for which so many hundreds of thousands of dollars of tax money has been spent, and is now being spent, is being unwisely expended, or on the contrary, when the announcement for which I now speak is made, the American people may have cause to conclude that the tax money is being wisely spent; and, fourth, the uncertaintly which now continues in the minds of the people as to what percentage of these employees were fired as being subversives, Communists, or disloyal, cannot but pyramid and do irreparable damage.

Mr. Speaker, how can we members of the House Un-American Activities Committee adequately or efficiently perform our official duties under Public Law 601 if such pertinent information as aforesaid is not promptly available to us? Why, Mr. Speaker, should it not be promptly available to the American people who pay the bills?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am making this inquiry for the purposes of inquiry only and not to object to any request. How much space can we take in the RECORD in making 1-minute speeches and in incorporating other matter?

The SPEAKER. Generally, the rule limits the remarks to 300 words unless unanimous consent is obtained to extend beyond that point.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I ask for unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, does that mean that I can go on for a page or two?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that on those days when the House has a legislative program, the remarks are to be limited to 300 words. When there is no legislative program, then there is not that limitation placed on remarks made by Members in 1-minute speeches.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, may I ask do we have any such legislative program today?

The SPEAKER. Yes, we do have a legislative program today.

WHO GETS THE RELIEF?—FORTY-THREE MILLION FAMILIES DO NOT

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, who saves taxes from partial tax relief on taxation of dividends?

When the Ways and Means Committee proposal for partial relief of taxation of dividends becomes fully effective after 3 years, the total loss in revenue to the Federal Government will be $1,200,000,000. A fair question to ask is: who will get the benefit from this tax proposal? Obviously, the people who own

publicly held stock and thereby receive dividends from corporations.

According to a survey made by the Federal Reserve Board, there are 47 million families in America. Ninety-two percent or 43 million of these families own no stock in any publicly held corporation in the United States.

Just 4 million families own all the publicly held stock in America. However, the Federal Reserve Board reports that a little over 300,000 own 80-percent of the total stocks, each of which owns more than $25,000 worth of stock.

In other words, 80-percent of the $1.2 billion in tax relief, or almost $960 million, will go to 300,000 families.

The other $240 million in tax savings will go to 3,700,000 stock-owning families, leaving 43 million American families receiving absolutely no benefit whatever from this provision to grant relief on the taxation of dividends.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members will hesitate to approve such an obviously discriminating proposal.

If Members make known their concern to the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means, it still may be possible to reverse this unfair decision.

NAME CALLING

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago our delightful colleague from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] admonished the Republicans, and he was joined in that reprimand, as I understand it, by the President, that the Republicans should be a little more careful in what they said. I assume however, that whatever the Democrats said would be all right for us to repeat. Would they call Republicans bad names—make unfair charges?—Oh, no.

On the 22d day of September, 1948, former President Harry Truman was commenting about the activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee. We all know that that committee has been and is engaged in trying to uncover and expose Communists, Fascists, and all other subversive groups including those harboring traitors. This is what the President said:

> That committee is more un-American than the activities it is investigating.

I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], I note they are both on the House floor, to tell us sometime if that is not a charge of treason made by the former President against the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Did either of the gentleman ever chide the former President for his use of those words?

CORNELIO AND LUCIA TEQUILLO

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1160, an act for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Tequillo, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no idea what this is. I trust in the future that we will be given some notice.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraw his request until the gentleman from Texas has had an opportunity to examine the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not know that I have any objection. But I would like to be notified when things like this are coming up.

The SPEAKER. The Chair anticipated that both leaders had been notified.

Mr. RAYBURN. If it has been cleared with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], I will have no objection.

Mr. WALTER. It is a very simple amendment. It simply makes the age of this child conform to the language of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 6, after "alien", insert "minor."

The Senate amendment was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. J. Res. 238, joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I want to call attention one more time to the fact that there is no such thing as "H. J. Res." It is a House joint resolution. I thought I would just make that suggestion again for the information, and amusement, perhaps, of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. GRAHAM, Miss THOMPSON of Michigan, and Mr. WALTER.

AMENDING TITLE VI OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch.

THE PRICE OF COFFEE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter from a constituent, and a coffee coupon. There is nothing new or startling about coupons obtained at food stores, but this one is rather unusual. Let me read the letter from this constituent:

> WATERLOO, IOWA, *February 8, 1954.*
> Congressman H. R. GROSS,
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR MR. GROSS: This coupon was enclosed in a sealed can of Maxwell House coffee, purchased recently by a friend at one of our leading grocers.
>
> Notice the expiration date, December 31, 1951.
>
> Where has this coffee been for more than 3 years?
>
> Thought this might interest you in view of the present coffee situation.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> C. J. NELSON,
> *1012 Williston Avenue.*

Mr. Speaker, I suggest one of the committees investigating the coffee situation might well look into this and ascertain how much coffee has been put away for this day of rocketing prices.

TAX REDUCTIONS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I hate to disturb the possibility of getting back to tranquillity in the House but I do not think the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, reckless as it is, should go unchallenged.

I think the people should know the facts as to the effort of the present administration to reduce taxes in a fair and equitable manner for all of our people. This is exactly what has been done.

I remember that it was the Republican 80th Congress that gave the people the first tax reduction they had had in 18 years of Democratic rule, when we controlled the House and Senate. We felt then that the people had gone long enough without a tax reduction, even though the party in power, when it had the power did not seem to think so. They called that bill a rich man's tax bill, even though it gave a much greater reduction to those in the lowest tax bracket, and to the working people.

The facts are it was the Republican Party in the 80th Congress that raised the tax exemption from $500 to $600, and by that act we exempted 5 million taxpayers in the lowest bracket from paying any tax at all, and that $600 exemption is still on the books. Yet they said, strange as it may seem, that it was a rich man's tax bill.

They, of course, are trying now to make the people believe the same futile

argument, and some of them seem a little disappointed that it is, again, a Republican administration that has effected sufficient economies in Government to, again, give the people a $5 billion tax reduction, which became a fact on January 1 of this year, and we're going forward with, perhaps, another one and one-half billion dollar tax reduction before this session adjourns, which will amount to a total tax reduction in the second year of the Eisenhower Administration of about $6½ billion.

Mr. Speaker, I can understand this may be a little embarrassing to some of the members of the opposite party, who during their twenty years of power continued to increase taxes and seldom, if ever, sought to give the people a tax reduction. However, we of the present administration must continue our policy of reducing the cost of Government and of reducing taxes, as often as the economy of our Government will stand it.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that those in the lowest income-tax bracket, and every laboring man began receiving a reduction of about 10 percent in their income tax last January 1, 1954; that those in the higher tax brackets receive a much lower percentage income-tax reduction.

The wage earners know that their increased social-security deductions go to their credit in that fund for their future.

Mr. Speaker, the point the gentleman from Pennsylvania was trying to make was that inasmuch as social-security taxes had been raised from 1½ to 2 percent that the increase holdout of the wage earner for social security just about offset the reduction in taxes he received. Yet he still received the 10-percent tax reduction and the extra contribution that he pays in social security is not only his for the future, but his employer also contributes from his business 2 percent, an equal amount for the sole benefit of the wage earner in the future.

Practically all heads of labor organizations in the Nation insisted that the Congress permit social-security deductions from wage earner and the employer to automatically increase under the law to 2 percent.

To try to mess up the social-security deduction and to claim that the wage earner and those in the lower bracket do not receive a tax reduction is completely erroneous and is done only to deceive the wage earner and those in the lower tax bracket when this administration has done two things he wanted done. It has reduced his taxes and allowed the social-security tax to advance from 1½ to 2 percent which amounts to greater benefits in social security for him or his family in the future. The workers know this, and they appreciate it.

When this administration returned to power a little over a year ago, we stopped unnecessary and wasteful spending, reduced the budget and the cost of Government for the very purpose of again following our policy of giving all the people a tax reduction, again giving the greatest percentage of reduction to those in the lowest bracket and the smallest percentage to those in the highest bracket.

What the laboring man wants first is a job, steady employment. Our tax policy is to give small business and big business enough of a reduction in taxes to give them the incentive to expand and make more jobs. We want an expanding economy.

We want the little-business man and the medium-sized-business man to feel that the Government does not want to take all of their profits, but is willing to reduce in a small way his taxes to encourage him to expand his business and make more jobs for the laboring man.

Mr. Speaker, if we can cause business to expand, we can give the working people what they want and must have. That is more jobs.

The laboring man is more interested in a good job so that he can pay a reasonable amount of taxes and yet have enough left to provide the necessities and some of the luxuries for his family.

Those who want to tax business to death, if they are successful, will stop the expansion of our economy, will stop the making of more jobs, and the laboring man in greater numbers will have no jobs, consequently no taxes to pay.

That is exactly what the workers of the country do not want.

The Eisenhower administration in its tax policy has two main points in view, one to reduce taxes and allow the people to have more money to spend in their own way, rather than to give it to the Government to be wastefully spent as has been the policy for the past many years. The other is to give reasonable relief to business so that it may expand and make more jobs for the laboring men and women.

That is our policy, and the critics who oppose this policy are opposing the best interest of every wage earner and taxpayer in the Nation from the lowest to the highest.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask this time in order to query the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] concerning the program for the remainder of the week. Someone mentioned to me the conference report on tomorrow. Will that be brought up?

Mr. ARENDS. At this time I cannot say surely, but it is possible to bring that up tomorrow after we complete consideration of H. R. 4646. I understand there is going to be an extension of the time. There is a question whether we can finish it today; then we will complete it tomorrow. I shall try to inform the gentleman a little later about that.

Mr. RAYBURN. What is the program after that, if I may ask the gentleman?

Mr. ARENDS. The appropriation bill, which was reported to the House earlier, and which will be taken up on Friday, instead of tomorrow, because of the objection made this morning.

Mr. RAYBURN. On Friday, if not earlier?

Mr. ARENDS. If not earlier; yes.

Mr. RAYBURN. I thank the gentleman.

SOCIAL-SECURITY FUNDS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for many years our Republican friends have been making the charge that money paid into the unemployment-compensation fund, old-age assistance, or earned-annuity funds and invested in Government bonds has been wasted, or there have been serious charges of that nature.

On pages 18, 19, and 20 of the hearings on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill for 1955 just released appears some very interesting testimony from Secretary of Treasury Humphrey in response to questions. He states:

> The difference is just this. The difference is that it is less inflationary to sell that $4 billion of bonds to these trust funds and park them there. That money has already gone out of circulation so far as the public is concerned.
>
> Mr. GARY. Has it been the policy of the Government all along to invest those fiduciary bonds in Federal bonds?
>
> Secretary HUMPHREY. Yes; it has been done all along and it is a perfectly proper procedure.

Secretary Humphrey goes on in his testimony and completely refutes the fallacious arguments that have been made in the past. Here is a Republican Secretary of the Treasury who absolutely confirms what has been done for the past 15 years with money paid in under the social-security law.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

DISABILITY COMPENSATION PAYMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 631) to provide that compensation of veterans for service-connected disability, rated 20 percent or less disabling, shall be paid quarterly rather than monthly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN,

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3986) to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF HOSPITAL AND HEALTH FACILITIES FOR INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 303) to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

TAX REFUNDS ON CIGARETTES LOST IN THE FLOODS OF 1951

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4319) to authorize tax refunds on cigarettes lost in the floods of 1951.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN RIGHTS AND INTERESTS IN AND TO CERTAIN LANDS CONVEYED TO THE CITY OF CHANDLER, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1081) to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6353) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT JURISDICTION OVER HIGHWAYS WITHIN WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7305) to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the bill, S. 2689, to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, is an identical bill to the House bill and has already passed the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the State of Ohio a retrocession of jurisdiction over the portions of highways described below within the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base to the extent that all laws of the State and all laws of the United States shall be applicable thereon and the United States and the State shall exercise concurrent jurisdiction thereover:

(A) State Route No. 4, beginning at Huberville, approximately 3,000 feet northeast of the intersection of Harshmanville Road with State Route No. 4, thence northeast to the Greene County and Montgomery County line, the above section of road being in Montgomery County, Ohio;

(B) All that part of State Route No. 4 lying between the Greene County and Montgomery County line and the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad underpass and being within the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundaries, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(C) Beginning at the point where State Route No. 4 passes the extreme south corner of the original Wilbur Wright Field boundary, said point being approximately 1,700 feet northeast of Huffman Dam, thence northeasterly to the corporate limits of the village of Fairborn, Ohio, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(D) State Route No. 235, beginning at a point where State Route No. 235 intersects and crosses an easterly boundary line of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, said point being approximately 1,700 feet north of the intersection of State Route No. 235 with State Route No. 4, thence westerly to the extreme west line of the reservation, excepting that part of the road lying between Haddix Road and the Osborn Road, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(E) State Route No. 69, beginning at the intersection of State Route No. 69 and original State Route No. 235, thence southwesterly with the east one-half of the road to the extreme southwest corner of the reservation boundary, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(F) Harshmanville Road, beginning at the intersection of Harshmanville Road with Yellow Springs Road in the village of Riverside, thence southerly with the east one-half of the road a distance of approximately 1,400 feet, thence continuing southerly the full width of the road to Airway Road;

(G) Yellow Springs Road, beginning at the intersection of Yellow Springs Road with Harshmanville Road in the village of Riverside, thence easterly with the south one-half of the road to the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary;

(H) Airway Road, beginning at the intersection of Airway Road with Harshmanville Road, thence easterly with the north one-half of the road a distance of approximately 2,000 feet, thence continuing easterly with the full width of the road to the Greene County and Montgomery County line;

(I) Spinning Road, beginning at the intersection of Spinning Road with the south right-of-way line of Airway Road, thence southerly with the west one-half of the road 1,973 feet to a south boundary line of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation;

(J) Glendean Avenue, beginning at the intersection of Glendean Avenue with the north right-of-way of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, thence northerly with the east one-half of Glendean Avenue, a distance of approximately 1,700 feet;

(K) Airway Road, beginning at the intersection of Airway Road with the Greene County and Montgomery County line, thence easterly to the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary, the point of ending being approximately 450 feet east of Skyline Drive;

(L) National Road (Huffman), beginning at a corner in the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary, said corner being in the National Road and approximately 200 feet north of its intersection with Airway Road, thence, with the west one-half of the road, northerly 4,400 feet, thence continuing northerly with the full width of the road to Old Route No. 4;

(M) Zink Road (New Germany Road), beginning at the intersection of the New Germany Road with the south right-of-way line of Old Route No. 4, thence southerly with the east one-half of the road, a distance of 890 feet, also beginning in the New Germany Road at a corner in the reservation boundary, the beginning point being approximately 1,400 feet southerly from the south right-of-way line of Old Route No. 4, thence continuing southerly with the westerly one-half of the road a distance of 1,587 feet;

(N) Old Route No. 4, beginning at the intersection of Old Route No. 4 with the southerly right-of-way of the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad, thence easterly the full width of the road to the part of the road right-of-way owned by the Commissioners of Greene County, Ohio;

(O) Sand Hill Road, beginning at the intersection of Sand Hill Road with an east boundary line of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation, the same being the west boundary line of the abandoned Cincinnati & Lake Erie Railroad, thence westerly to State Route No. 235;

(P) Haddix Road, beginning at the intersection of Haddix Road with State Route No. 235, thence northeasterly with the right one-half of the road to the Greene County and Clark County line;

(Q) Elizabeth Road (Johnson Street), beginning at the intersection of Elizabeth Road (in Old Osborn) with State Route No. 235, thence northwesterly to Haddix Road;

(R) Osborn Road, beginning at gate No. 260 at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary, thence northerly with the west one-half of the road to State Route No. 235;

(S) Airway Road, beginning at the intersection of Airway Road with the southerly right-of-way of Old Route No. 4, thence southerly with the westerly one-half of the road to the extreme southeast corner of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Area "D" reservation boundary;

(T) Old Route No. 4, all that part of Old Route No. 4 that may be within the boundaries of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Area "D". The location of the highways and the bounded areas are shown and identified by corresponding letter symbols on sheet No. L of a drawing designated: Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Basic Layout Plan, drawing No. EWFE 150, dated December 2, 1952, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army. This

act is effective only as to those portions of the highways and areas indicated in this act over which the United States has heretofore acquired exclusive jurisdiction and shall not affect portions of highways and areas, if any, over which exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction is now vested in the State of Ohio.

SEC. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction provided for in this act shall take effect upon the acceptance thereof by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 7305) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING FEE FOR EXECUTING AN APPLICATION FOR A PASSPORT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 423) to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport or a visa from $1 to $3.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections numbered 2 and 3 of the act entitled "An act making an appropriation for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921," approved June 4, 1920 (22 U. S. C., secs. 214 and 215), are amended by striking out "$1" wherever it appears in such sections and by inserting in lieu thereof "$3."

With the following committee amendments:

On line 3, strike out "sections" and insert "the first proviso of section"; strike out "and 3."

On line 6, strike out "secs." and insert "sec."; strike out "and 215."

On line 7, strike out "are" and insert "is,"; strike out "$1 wherever it appears in" and insert "the fee of $1."

On line 8, strike out "such sections"; also strike out "$3" and insert in lieu thereof "a fee of $3."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS AT CAMP BLANDING, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7512) to provide for the conveyance of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the Armory Board, State of Florida, in order to consolidate ownership and perpetuate the availability of Camp Blanding for military training and use.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey, upon the terms and conditions and for the consideration set forth in section 2 of this act, to the Armory Board, State of Florida (hereinafter referred to as the "board"), all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land (hereinafter referred to as "Federal land") situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Florida, and more particularly described as follows:

All of sections 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36, township 5 south, range 23 east; all of sections 19 and 30, township 5 south, range 24 east; all that part of section 31, township 5 south, range 24 east, lying north of Florida State Highway Numbered 550; all that part of section 6, township 6 south, range 24 east, lying north of Florida State Highway Numbered 550; all of sections 1 to 12, inclusive, except the west half of the northwest quarter and the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 2, and except the south half of the northeast quarter in section 10; section 17, except that part lying east of Florida State Highway Numbered 551 and south of Florida State Highway Numbered 48; all of sections 18 and 19; that part of section 20 lying west of Florida State Highway Numbered 551, except a triangular parcel in section 20 lying west of the right-of-way of Florida State Highway Numbered 551, south and east of the right-of-way of the north fork of Florida State Highway Numbered 48, and north and east of the right-of-way of the south fork of said Florida State Highway Numbered 48; and sections 28 to 33, inclusive, township 6 south, range 23 east; all that part of sections 16, 17, and 18, township 6 south, range 24 east, lying south of Florida State Highway Numbered 48, except the west half of the southwest quarter of aforesaid section 18; all of sections 19, 20, 21, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and section 28 except the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter thereof, township 6 south, range 24 east; and sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 18, and those portions of sections 9, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 30, township 7 south, range 24 east, lying west and northwest of Florida State Highway Numbered 68; excepting from all the above-described area all lands within the rights-of-way of State roads traversing the area described; all being in Clay County, Florida, and containing forty thousand one hundred forty-five and fifty-one one-hundredths acres, more or less.

Reserving unto the United States, however, all uranium, thorium, and all other materials determined pursuant to section 5 (b) (1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 761) to be peculiarly essential to the production of fissionable material, contained, in whatever concentration, in deposits in the lands above described, and further reserving unto the United States through its authorized agents or representatives at any time to enter upon the lands above described and to prospect for, mine and remove said materials before referred to, making full compensation for any damage or injury occasioned thereby, provided, however, such lands may be used, and any rights otherwise acquired by said Board pursuant to any conveyance of said described lands as herein provided for, as if no reservation of such materials had been made; except that, when such use results in the extraction of such material from the land in quantities which may not be transferred or delivered without a license under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as it now exists or may hereafter be amended, such material shall be the property of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and said Commission may require delivery of such material to it by any possessor thereof after such material has been separated as such from the ores in which it was contained, and also provided that if the said Commission requires the delivery of such material to it, it shall pay to the person mining or extracting the same, or to such other person as the said Commission determines to be entitled thereto, such sums, including profits, as the Commission deems fair and reasonable for the discovery, mining, development, production, extraction and other services performed with respect to such material prior to such delivery, but such payment shall not include any amount on account of the value of such material before removed from its place of deposit in nature, and further provided that if and in the event the said Commission does not require delivery of such material to it, the reservation hereby made shall be of no force or effect.

SEC. 2. The conveyance of the Federal land provided for in the first section shall be made upon the terms and conditions and for the consideration set forth as follows:

(1) In the event of the existence of any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President or by action of the Congress, the use of the Federal land, or any part thereof, shall, upon the request of the Secretary of the Army to the board, revert to the United States for the full period of such national emergency without cost to the United States. Upon the expiration of such national emergency such use of the Federal land shall cease in favor of the board, and the United States shall be under no obligation to restore the premises or to compensate the State for any waste or any damage to the property arising out of the use and occupancy thereof by the United States.

(2) In consideration of the conveyance of the Federal land, the board, acting for the State of Florida, shall agree not to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of all or any part of certain land or permanent improvements thereon (hereinafter referred to as "State land") comprising a part of the State-owned portion of Camp Blanding Military Reservation to any party other than the United States without the consent of the Secretary of the Army. The State land is more particularly described as follows:

TOWNSHIP 6 SOUTH, RANGE 23 EAST

The south half of the northeast quarter of section 10;

All of sections 13 and 14; a portion of section 15 more particularly described as follows: Beginning at a point on the east boundary line of section 15, said point being fifty feet south of the centerline of State Road Numbered 48; run thence south eighty-eight degrees twelve minutes forty-eight seconds west along a line, said line being fifty feet south of and parallel to the centerline of State Road Numbered 48, a distance of two thousand three hundred eighty-one and sixty-five one-hundredths feet to a point; run thence south fifty-one degrees forty-five minutes twenty-seven seconds east a distance of nine hundred fifty-three and fifty one-hundredths feet to a point; run thence south thirty-eight degrees fourteen minutes thirty-three seconds west a distance of one thousand nine hundred and seventy feet, more or less, to the northeasterly shoreline of Kingsley Lake; run thence southeasterly along the northeasterly shoreline of Kingsley Lake a distance of three thousand nine hundred and ten feet more or less, to the south boundary line of section 15; run thence easterly along the south boundary line of section 15 a distance of seven hundred eighty and ten one-hundredths feet, more or less, to the southeast corner of said section 15; run thence north along the east boundary line of section 15 a distance of five thousand two hundred thirty and ninety-three one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning; and all of sections 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 34, 35, and 36;

TOWNSHIP 7 SOUTH, RANGE 23 EAST

All of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24, except the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 10 and the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 20; all of section 25 lying northwest of State Highway Numbered 68; all of sections 26, 27, 28, and 29; and east half of section 30; all of sections 32, 33, and 34; and

all of section 35 lying northwesterly of State Highway Numbered 68;

TOWNSHIP 8 SOUTH, RANGE 23 EAST

All of sections 3 and 4 lying northwesterly of State Highway Numbered 68; in section 5, the following lots and blocks in Spring Lake Estates, according to plat recorded in plat book 2, page 53 of the public records of said Clay County, Fla., viz: all of blocks 1, 2, and 3; lots 1 to 10, inclusive, block 4; all of blocks 9 and 10; lots 1 to 10, inclusive, block 11; all of blocks 13 to 27, inclusive; all of blocks 31 to 44, inclusive; the north half of section 8 and all that part of the north half of section 9 lying northwesterly of State Highway Numbered 68;

all in Clay County, Fla., and containing thirty thousand two hundred thirty-four and twenty-five one-hundredths acres, more or less.

(3) In the event of the existence of any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President or by action of the Congress, the use of the State land, or any part thereof, shall, upon request of the Secretary of the Army, be vested in the United States for the full period of such national emergency without cost to the United States in accordance with the usual conditions contained in the United States Standard Form of Lease. Upon the expiration of such national emergency such use of the State land shall cease in favor of the board and such land shall be restored in accordance with the usual conditions contained in the United States Standard Form of Lease.

(4) In the event that the State of Florida or board shall at any time sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of, or shall attempt to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of, all or any part of the State or Federal land without the consent of the Secretary of the Army, all of the right, title, and interest in and to the Federal land shall revert to the United States without cost: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall prevent the State of Florida or board from disposing of interests or rights in land by lease, license, or easement or by contract of sale of timber or timber products, each of which shall be terminable at will in the event of need of the land involved during any national emergency and, insofar as these grants or sales affect Federal lands, shall be entered into only after the State of Florida or board and the United States, by and through the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall have reached an agreement whereby revenues received by the State of Florida from any such lease, license, easement, or sale shall be expended for the management of natural resources at Camp Blanding and its maintenance and preservation as a military installation and the sharing of any residual revenue by the State of Florida or board and the United States: *Provided further,* That exploitation of minerals by strip mining or similar operations shall be confined to the following Federal lands: In township 5 south, range 23 east, sections 19, 30, and 31; in township 6 south, range 23 east, sections 6, 7, that part of section 8 lying southwest of State Highway Numbered 121; those parts of sections 17 and 20 now owned by the United States and sections 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, and 32: *And provided further,* That exploitation of minerals by strip mining or similar operations shall be confined to the following State lands: In township 7 south, range 23 east, sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, all of section 20, except the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, section 29, and the east half of section 30.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADVISABILITY OF A NATIONAL MONUMENT IN BROOKLYN, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 582) to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL MONUMENT COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6455) to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created a National Monument Commission. Said Commission shall be composed of four Senators from the Senate of the United States to be appointed by the Vice President of the United States, four Representatives of the House of Representatives of the United States to be appointed by the Speaker of that House, and four eminent citizens of the United States to be appointed by the President of the United States. The Commission shall be bipartisan and the terms of the first Commissioners shall be for 1, 2, 3, and 4 years and subsequently shall be 4 years. Vacancies in the Commission shall be filled by the respective designator who appointed the original member. Members shall serve until their respective successors are appointed.

SEC. 2. It shall be the function of said Commission to secure plans and designs for a useful monument to the Nation symbolizing to the United States and the world, the ideals of a democracy as embodied in the five freedoms, speech, religion, press, assembly, and petition, sanctified by the Bill of Rights adopted by Congress in 1789 and later ratified by the States. Such plans shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Commission of Fine Arts.

SEC. 3. Said monuments shall be located on federally owned land within the George Washington Memorial Parkway adjoining the north boundary of Arlington National Cemetery west of Arlington Ridge Road and south of Arlington Boulevard on the heights overlooking the Potomac River, and that tract of land shall be and is hereby reserved for such purposes. The monument, upon its completion, shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 4. Said monument shall serve as an international shrine and a continuing memorial to the principles of the five freedoms and to all peoples and nations who have contributed to the establishment, promotion, and defense of those principles in the preservation of democracy throughout the world. It may include an appropriate structure or structures to house cultural displays and exhibits or symbolic features of national and international significance designed to accomplish the objectives of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 5. (a) Said Commission may establish rules and regulations governing its actions in carrying out the purposes of this act.

(b) The Commission members appointed from the Congress shall serve without additional compensation. Commission members appointed from private life shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of Commission duties. All Commission members shall receive reimbursement for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of Commission duties.

(c) The Commission is authorized to accept and utilize services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to pay any such personnel necessary traveling and subsistence expenses when engaged in the work of the Commission.

(d) Within the limits of its appropriations, the Commission is authorized to appoint such personnel, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as, in its discretion, it deems necessary.

(e) The Commission is authorized to request and secure the advice or assistance of any Federal agency. Any Federal agency furnishing advice or assistance to the Commission may expend its own funds for this purpose, with or without reimbursement from the Commission as may be agreed upon between the Commission and the agency.

(f) The Commission shall report annually to the President and Congress its progress and recommendations pertaining to such a memorial. Upon the conclusion of its work, the Commission shall promptly submit a final report.

(g) Thirty days after the submission of its final report the Commission shall cease to exist.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of the Commission.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, insert "The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members appointed by him to serve as chairman."

Page 2, line 22, change the comma to a period and strike out "and that tract of land shall be and is hereby reserved for such purposes."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT SO AS TO INCLUDE ONIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6435) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (a) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 2), is amended by inserting "onions," after the word "eggs," in the third sentence thereof, so that onions are added to the definition of the word "commodity" for purposes of said act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I present a summary of the reasons presented to the Committee on Agriculture, making appropriate the

passage of this bill, and ask that they be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

First. Onions are a perishable commodity.

Second. In view of the fact that onions grown in the United States do not find world markets and are limited even in the States to production areas, they are therefore susceptible to manipulation.

Third. Rules of contract market not accountable to the industry or the Secretary of Agriculture, of this perishable commodity in interstate commerce, is a dangerous practice, and must not be left unregulated.

Fourth. That the futures trading conducted on the Mercantile Exchange is affected with a national and public interest.

Fifth. That prices are generally quoted and disseminated as a basis for determining prices to producers and consumers in interstate commerce.

Sixth. Such a condition warrants careful regulation and scrutiny to prevent distortions of price and obstruction of proper distribution with resultant disastrous effects upon agriculture and the consumer.

Seventh. Inclusion of onions within the purview of the Commodity Exchange Act will place futures trading of onions under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture for the first time. Futures trading unless included in the CEA bars the Secretary of Agriculture from any regulatory jurisdiction over onions, yet producers, shippers, and receivers are under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture by virtue of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act.

Eighth. Such authority will obviate the patent danger of a futures contract market superseding the well established and highly acceptable provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act.

The unrestrained and unregulated futures contract market will either depress or unreasonably increase the price structure out of proportion to available supply and demand, as so often happened within the last 10 years. Specifically on March 23, 1953, onions sold on the Mercantile Exchange at a time when the attempted squeeze was then in operation at $4.75 per sack of 50 pounds. During this period, onions were kept out of distributive channels with almost no supplies available. All holdings were held at team track or cold storage pending delivery on futures contract. Within a period of less than 1 week, these same $4.75-per-sack onions were sold at a variable price of from 60 cents to $1 per sack. The fact is that in March of 1953 the accumulated storage holdings for delivery purposes were in the hands of a few speculators who already had started the squeeze in operations in February. I have been advised that there was also included a practice of offering to legitimate hedgers a price in excess of their hedge in order to prevent their delivery.

To indicate the speculative interest in the 1953 deal, 102,306 cars were traded, or almost 3 times the entire production. Prices ranged wildly. Often and regularly advanced the limit and created a situation so out of proportion to the law of supply and demand, and for at least a period of over 2 months prevented the proper flow at prices in accordance with the law of supply and demand to have entered into the consumer channels. This, of course, disrupted the whole onion picture, with devastating effect on growers throughout the country, with no appreciable benefit to the consuming public.

Placing onions under the CEA will remedy most of the problems that I have discussed previously herein, and will give an opportunity to the industry to effect and promulgate such rules and regulations governing the contract market, its members and traders which will assist in making that contract market a place where the commodity will be properly and fairly traded within the limitations of the ordinary speculative hazards, not increased by artificial manipulations carried on by unscrupulous interests who seek opportunity for weaknesses within the unregulated contract market, and dote on chaos instead of some form of stability.

The trade from the producers to the distributors, is in almost complete unanimity that there is a possibility of making the futures contract market an adjunct to proper distribution of an available crop, with a degree of certainty for both growers and distributors as well as the consuming public, and that this can be best accomplished under the regulation.

The administration of the CEA and the proper enforcement, in cooperation with the industry, can prevent unwarranted chaos. Under the CEA also there will be opportunities to promulgate such rules and regulations respecting short sales, elimination of certain contract months where need be, inclusion in the Board of Governors of onion people, establishment of an onion advisory committee, considering inclusion in the contract market of the other producing areas which begin harvesting in the spring, and very important is the fact that under the CEA practices which smack of manipulation will be punishable either by revocation of license, or the more severe penalties under the act. These are not available today.

The original premise anent the subject of futures trading in onions was for its complete prohibition, and while much can be said for this position, however, from a practical viewpoint of this whole subject, it has been concluded by most of the onion people that at this time the likelihood for a complete prohibition is so remote that the relief sought by including onions under the CEA is most practicable at this time.

PAY OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES FOR NONWORK DAYS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7554) to provide for compensation of certain employees on days when departments or establishments of the Government are closed by administrative order.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the Joint Resolution 127 of June 29, 1938 (52 Stat. 1246), is amended by inserting after "Executive order" the following: "or any day on which such employees are relieved or prevented from working solely because a department or establishment of the Government, or any part thereof, is closed by administrative order,".

With the following committee amendments:

In line 3, strike out "127."

In line 5, strike out "'"Executive order", the" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "'"by Executive order", the."

In lines 7 and 8, strike out "solely because a department or establishment of the Government, or any part thereof, is closed."

In line 9, strike out "order'," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "order issued under such regulations as may be promulgated by the President'."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVE LIMITATIONS UPON LAND CONVEYED TO MILES CITY, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4984) to remove certain limitations upon the purposes for which the city of Miles City, Mont., may use certain land heretofore conveyed to it by the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the city of Miles City, Mont., is authorized to utilize tract E in township 8 north, range 47 east, of the Montana principal meridian (which was conveyed to such city by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 946)) for such purposes as may be deemed by the city council of such city to be appropriate, notwithstanding any limitations upon the use of such property imposed by such act of August 8, 1946, or by the patent issued thereunder, and any such limitations shall hereafter be of no force or effect, except that all gas, oil, coal, and other mineral deposits which may be found in such lands, and the right to the use of the lands for extracting and removing the same, shall be reserved to the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 3 to 7, delete the words "utilize tract E in township 8 north, range 47 east, of the Montana principal meridian (which was conveyed to such city by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 946)) for such purposes" and insert in lieu thereof the words: "sell or convey for industrial purposes such portion of the thirty-seven and twenty-six one hundredths acres of land more particularly described in the act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 946) which were conveyed to such city by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to such act to be used for industrial and recreational purposes."

Page 2, line 1, following the word "thereunder" change the comma to a colon, strike the balance of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That any such sale or conveyance shall be at fair market value as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture at the date of appraisal, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the lands covered by this bill, and the net proceeds of such sale or conveyance shall be deposited in the general funds of the Treasury of the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to remove certain limitations upon the sale or conveyance of land heretofore conveyed to the city of Miles City, Mont., by the United States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVE CLOUDS ON TITLES OF CERTAIN LANDS IN COLORADO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5620) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to correct an incomplete and faulty survey in township 8 north, range 53 west, of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado, and to issue patents describing any new areas included in lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 in sections 1 through 6, township 8 north, range 53 west of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to correct a faulty and incomplete survey of lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 in each of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 5, township 8 north, range 53 west of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado by canceling and obliterating the northern boundary of the township as established by A. M. Fahringer in 1871 and by extending the subdivisional lines of the north tier of lots of each of said sections in that township north to the southern boundary of townships 9 north, ranges 53 and 54 west of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado as established by George V. Boutelle in 1868 and reestablished by Benjamin H. Smith in 1875.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue, to the holders of title of record, as of the date of completion of such correction, to lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 in each of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, township 8 north, range 53 west of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado, patents to any additional land included in their respective lots by reason of the correction of survey authorized by section 1 of this act: *Provided*, That a charge of $1.25 per acre shall be made for each acre or fraction thereof patented under the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That the boundary line established by George V. Boutelle in 1868 and reestablished by Benjamin H. Smith in 1875 is hereby confirmed and reestablished as the southern boundary of township 9 north, ranges 53 and 54 west, sixth principal meridian, Colorado, and as the northern boundary of lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 in each of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, township 8 north, range 53 west, sixth principal meridian, Colorado."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to remove clouds on the titles of certain lands in Colorado."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABOLISHMENT OF THE SHOSHONE CAVERN NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6251) to authorize the abolishment of the Shoshone Cavern National Monument and the transfer of the land therein to the city of Cody, Wyo., for public recreational use, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Shoshone Cavern National Monument, established by Executive proclamation of September 21, 1909 (36 Stat. 2501), is hereby abolished and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey, without cost, the lands embraced therein, aggregating 210 acres, to the city of Cody, Wyo., for public recreational use, upon such terms and conditions as he shall find to be equitable and in the public interest.

In order that the city may provide adequate public access to such property from the Cody-Yellowstone Highway (U. S. Nos. 14 and 20), the Secretary of the Interior is also authorized to convey without cost a right-of-way to the city.

In the event that the city of Cody shall fail to devote the said monument lands to the purposes of public park and recreational site within 10 years after the date of the enactment of this act or shall fail to maintain such land for such purposes for any period of 5 consecutive years subsequent to its devotion to such use or shall fail to provide adequate measures for fire control and watershed protection for the lands, or shall devote such lands or any part thereof to any other use not consistent with the purposes of this act, such lands and all improvements thereon shall revert to the United States. In such an event, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to declare a forfeiture of all grants and conveyances made pursuant to this act to administer such properties in accordance with the public land laws of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE MILITARY AND THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4231) to authorize appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of certain individuals who were killed in action or who died or shall die as a result of active service in World War I, World War II, or between the period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending on a date proclaimed by the President or the Congress.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the second paragraph of the act entitled "An act to establish a department or economics, government, and history at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, N. Y., and to amend chapter 174 of the act of Congress of April 19, 1910, entitled 'An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes'," approved June 8, 1926, as amended (34 U. S. C., sec. 1036a), as precedes the colon preceding the first proviso thereof is amended to read as follows: "That the number of midshipmen now authorized by law at the United States Naval Academy is hereby increased by one hundred from the United States at large, to be appointed by the President from among the sons of members of the land or naval forces (including male and female members of the Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of all components thereof) of the United States, who were killed in action or who have died, or may hereafter die, of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, or preexisting injury or disease aggravated, in active service (1) during World War I or World War II as each is defined by laws providing service-connected compensation or pension benefits for veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents, or (2) on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress under the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950,' approved May 11, 1951 (38 U. S. C., sec. 745)."

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (b) of the first section of the act entitled "An act to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1950 (10 U. S. C., sec. 1092a), is amended in the following respects:

(1) By striking out "One hundred and seventy-two" and inserting in lieu thereof "Two hundred and thirty-two";

(2) By striking out "forty from among the sons of members" and inserting in lieu thereof "one hundred from among the sons of members";

(3) By inserting "(1)" immediately before "during World War I"; and

(4) By inserting immediately before the colon preceding the first proviso of such subsection the following ", or (2) on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress under the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950,' approved May 11, 1951 (38 U. S. C., sec. 745)."

(b) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "two thousand four hundred and ninety-six" and inserting in lieu thereof "two thousand five hundred and fifty-six."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, change the word "or" to "of."

On page 2, line 6, strike the words "one hundred" and substitute therefor the word "forty."

On page 3, lines 6–10 inclusive strike without substitution.

On page 3, line 11, strike "(3)" and substitute therefor "(1)."

On page 3, line 13, strike "(4)" and substitute therefor "(2)."

On page 3, lines 22–25 inclusive, strike without substitution.

On page 3, after line 25, add a subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) This section shall apply to any Air Force Academy which is established by law before or after the date of enactment of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNAUTHORIZED WEARING, MANUFACTURE, OR SALE OF MEDALS AND BADGES AWARDED BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 459) to amend the act entitled "An act to pro-

hibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," approved February 24, 1923, as amended by the act approved April 21, 1928 (10 U. S. C. 1425), be amended to read as follows:

"The wearing, manufacture, or sale of any decoration, medal, badge, or ribbon which has been or may hereafter be authorized by the Congress or the President for the Armed Forces of the United States or the civilian employees thereof, or for any person who may render or contribute meritorious service in connection with the work of the United States of America Typhus Commission, or any decoration, medal, badge, ribbon, or veteran's service lapel button, which has been or may hereafter be awarded by any of the Departments of the National Military Establishment, or any decoration, medal, badge, or ribbon which has been or hereafter may be awarded to United States citizens or members of the Armed Forces by foreign governments in accordance with existent statutes, or the ribbon, button, or rosette of any such decoration, medal, or badge, or any colorable imitation of any of the said devices, or the reproduction in any form or by any means of the design of any of said devices, or of any colorable imitation of said design, is prohibited, except when and as authorized under such regulations as may be prescribed by the President or by such person or persons as he may designate.

"SEC. 2. Any person who knowingly violates the provisions of this act, shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and insert "that section 704, of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 704, title 18, United States Code."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF PAID POSTAL-SAVINGS CERTIFICATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7371) to provide for the disposal of paid postal-savings certificates.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all claims for payment of any postal-savings certificate, or other evidence of deposit in the postal-savings depository system, including duplicates, which certificate or evidence of deposit, including duplicates, are shown by the records of the Post Office Department to have been duly paid, shall be barred if not presented to the Postmaster General within 6 years from the date on which such records show that they were paid.

(b) Final determination as to whether payment properly has been made on postal-savings certificates or other evidences of deposit in the postal-savings depository system, including duplicates, shall be based upon the official records of the Post Office Department.

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, destroy, or otherwise dispose of, all postal-savings certificates, or other evidences of deposit in the postal-savings depository system, including duplicates, after the expiration of 6 years from the date payment thereon has been made as shown by the records of the Post Office Department.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of the sixth calendar month following the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after "That", insert "(a)."

Page 1, line 10, after "paid", insert "except in those cases where it is established that payment in fact has been made, by reason of fraud or misrepresentation, to a person not entitled thereto."

Page 2, line 7, after "Department", insert "except in those cases where it is established that payment in fact has been made, by reason of fraud or misrepresentation, to a person not entitled thereto."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the bills on the Consent Calendar eligible for consideration today.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

WAH CHANG CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5461) for the relief of Wah Chang Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Wah Chang Corp. the sum of $130,877.16, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of property and for removal expenses incurred as a result of the acquisition by the United States for military purposes of certain lands at Staten Island, New York City, N. Y., which had heretofore been leased by the said Wah Chang Corp. and upon which the said Wah Chang Corp. had erected and maintained a tungsten processing plant: *Provided*, That no part of the amount apropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims, whose duty it shall be, notwithstanding the lapse of time or the bar of any statute of limitations or previous court decision, to hear, consider, and render such judgment, as equity and justice shall require, on the claim of Wah Chang Corp. against the United States for compensation for loss of property and for removal expenses incurred as a result of the acquisition in the year 1942 by the United States for military purposes of pier No. 13, New York foreign trade zone, Staten Island, N. Y., which had theretofore been leased by said Wah Chang Corp. and upon which the said Wah Chang Corp. had erected and maintained a tungsten processing plant."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT VINCENT, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6033) for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

CARL A. ANNIS, WAYNE C. CRANNEY, AND LESLIE O. YARWOOD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2678) for the relief of Carl A. Annis, Wayne C. Cranney, and Leslie O. Yarwood.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carl A. Annis, Osgood, Ind., the sum of $241.70; to Wayne C. Cranney, Afton, Wyo., the sum of $315.45; and to Leslie O. Yarwood, Mohler, Wash., the sum of $186.60. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of such persons against the United States for compensation for personal effects which they lost on June 9, 1947, while serving as employees of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, as a result of the sinking of a dory belonging to the Coast and Geodetic Survey at Bruin Bay, Alaska. No part of the amount appropriated in this act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SGT. WELCH SANDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5158) for the relief of Sgt. Welch Sanders.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Welch Sanders, sergeant, United States Army, the sum of $15,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Welch Sanders against the United States on account of the death of his

wife, Garnette Brewer Sanders, and his infant son, William M. Sanders, on January 27, 1948, while passengers in an Air Force plane which crashed into White Horse Mountain located 12 miles east of Digne, France: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$10,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERRY PERKINS AND NORAH MEREDITH PERKINS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5433) for the relief of Perry Perkins and Norah Meredith Perkins, parents of Opal Perkins, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $20,000, to Perry Perkins and Norah Meredith Perkins, parents and sole surviving next of kin of Opal Perkins, deceased, a minor, 12 years of age at time of death, of Newcomb, Tenn. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the instant death of their son, Opal Perkins, on October 25, 1935, when he was burned and instantly killed as the result of an explosion caused by the negligence and wrongful conduct of employees of the Federal Government engaged in work on the public roads of Campbell County, Tenn., said work being carried on by employees of the Works Project Administration, and in the performance of which they stored quantities of road materials in iron or steel barrels on a lot in the town of Newcomb, Tenn., where children were accustomed to congregate and play, and which said road materials thus stored in said barrels generated and emitted when they were unstopped highly inflammable and explosive gases which, when they came in contact with fire, exploded. On the date on which the said Opal Perkins was burned and instantly killed as aforesaid, he was only 12 years of age and another child about the same age threw a lighted match into one of the said steel barrels containing said highly volatile and explosive materials, thereby causing the explosion which killed the said Opal Perkins as aforesaid: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$20,000", and insert "$6,000". Same page and line, strike out "Perry Perkins and Norah Meredith Perkins, parents and sole surviving next of kin", and after the word "to" insert "the estate."

Same page, line 7, after the word "deceased" strike out "a minor, twelve years of age at the time of death," and insert "and to pay the sum of $6,000 to the estate of Kenneth Ross, deceased, all residents".

Same page, line 9, strike out "sum" and insert "sums."

Same page, line 10, strike out "their son."

Same page, line 11, after the name "Perkins," insert "and Kenneth Ross."

Same page, line 11, strike out "he was" and insert "they were."

Page 2, line 12, after the word "exploded." strike out down to and including the word "aforesaid."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Opal Perkins, and Kenneth Ross, deceased."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AUGUSTA SELMER-ANDERSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6642) for the relief of Mrs. Augusta Selmer-Andersen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Augusta Selmer-Andersen, of Seattle, Wash., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Augusta Selmer-Andersen against the United States arising when a departure bond deposited by her on behalf of her adopted daughter, Bjorg Wennberg Iverson, was forfeited even though the daughter has been granted a suspension of deportation. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WARREN P. HOOVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7460) to pay Warren P. Hoover for services rendered the Army of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Warren P. Hoover be paid the sum of $550.08 out of funds in the Treasury of the United States for 32 days of work performed for the Army of the United States as a civilian employee for which he has not been paid at the rate of time and one-half per 8-hour day upon a salary of $2,600 per annum, the services being performed at the Muskogee Army Air Field, Muskogee, Okla., from October 3, 1942, to May 15, 1943, inclusive.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 3, strike out "That Warren P. Hoover be paid the sum of $550.08 out of funds in the Treasury of the United States," and insert in lieu thereof: "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $550.08 to Warren P. Hoover, of Eureka Springs, Ark."

At the end of the bill add: "': *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, and my Republican colleagues, permit me to call attention to the fact that a very prominent member of the Democratic Party, the party which now objects to the use of certain words by political orators who are Republicans, not so long ago, in fact just last fall, and the gentleman will be seeking election soon, made this statement: He said:

Ike is but the pretty bird in a gilded cage,
Whose sweet song and bright plumage are
supposed to hold your eye.

Now listen to this:

While the crows are in the kitchen gobbling
up the public's pie.

Does not that mean that the hard-working Republican Members of the Congress are, in some disreputable way taking things which belong to the people? That we in Congress are eating pie while the taxpayer is lucky to get a crust?

Then the gentleman added:

Modern day pirates have hoisted a new Jolly Roger over Washington.

Calling us pirates—think of it.

Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] please take note? I ask him—was that nice?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to make a statement in order to clarify the rules of procedure during the calling of the Private Calendar. Inadvertently, the Chair recognized the gentleman from Michigan to strike out the last word.

Under the rules of the House, of course, that may be done on bills on the Consent Calendar, but not on the Private Calendar. The Chair is simply stating that for the Members of the House.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the poem was so good, I ask unanimous consent that it may remain in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. What has been said will remain in the RECORD, of course, but the Chair is pointing out the rule for the guidance of Members of the House.

AUTHORIZING PATENT IN FEE TO ROBERT GRAHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4816) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Robert Graham a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Mississippi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to issue to Robert Graham, Shubuta, Miss., a patent in fee to the following-described land, to wit: Lots 3 and 4, section 5, township 9 north, range 7 west, St. Stephens meridian, north of the old Choctaw boundary, Mississippi: *Provided, however*, That the issuance of such patent shall operate only as a conveyance of right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described herein, but shall not affect any valid adverse rights of third parties should any such rights exist.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "of" insert the words: "all the."

Page 2, following line 3, add a new section 2 as follows:

"SEC. 2. The tracts of land described by the first section of this act shall be conveyed upon the payment by the said Robert Graham of the appraised value of the lands, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, if payment is made within 1 year after the Secretary has notified the said Robert Graham of the appraised price of the lands. The Secretary shall have the appraisal made on the basis of the value of the lands at the date of appraisal, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the lands by Robert Graham or his predecessors in interest. In such appraisal, the Secretary shall consider and give full effect to the equities of the said Robert Graham. The patent shall expressly provide that the oil and gas lease entered into between the United States and M. J. Peterson on August 1, 1948, shall continue in effect, subject to compliance with the terms and conditions set forth in such lease, until terminated in accordance with the provisions thereof. The patent shall also provide for the assignment to the said Robert Graham of all rights of the United States under such lease, but such assignment shall not include any rentals, royalties, or other charges accruing for any period prior to the beginning of the first complete lease year commencing after the date of enactment of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. REBECCA GODSCHALK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 68) for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Godschalk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Rebecca Godschalk shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNI WILHELMINE SKODA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 123) for the relief of Anni Wilhelmine Skoda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anni Wilhelmine Skoda, the fiancée of Andrew P. Hamilton, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Anni Wilhelmine Skoda is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Andrew P. Hamilton and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anni Wilhelmine Skoda, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anni Wilhelmine Skoda, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Anni Wilhelmine Skoda as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILHELM ENGELBERT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 153) for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

INSUN LEE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 179) for the relief of Insun Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Insun Lee shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 7, after the words "visa fee", strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVDOXIA J. KITSOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 205) for the relief of Evdoxia J. Kitsos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Evdoxia J. Kitsos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMIR HASSAN SEPAHBAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 236) for the relief of Amir Hassan Sepahban.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Amir Hassan Sepahban shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERRING CITIZENSHIP POSTHUMOUSLY UPON HENRY LITMANOWITZ (LITMAN)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 296) conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Henry Litmanowitz—Litman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, Henry Litmanowitz (Litman), the son of Mr. and Mrs. Morris Litmanowitz (Litman), of Cleveland,

Ohio, who was killed while serving with the United States Armed Forces in Korea, shall be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States at the time of his death.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FELIX S. SCHORR AND HIS WIFE, LILLY ELIZABETH SCHORR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 303) for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ANTONIO VOCALE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 305) for the relief of Antonio Vocale.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Vocale shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISAAC D. NEHAMA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 313) for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Isaac D. Nehama shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF ROSE COHEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 323) for the relief of Rose Cohen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rose Cohen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LI MING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 353) for the relief of Li Ming.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Li Ming shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HORST F. W. DITTMAR AND HEINZ-ERIK DITTMAR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 506) for the relief of Horst F. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Horst F. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS O. ROBITSCHER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 550) for the relief of Thomas O. Robitscher.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for further consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LINA ANNA ADELHEID (ADAM) HOYER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 569) for the relief of Lina Anna Adelheid (Adam) Hoyer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lina Anna Adelheid (Adam) Hoyer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANNELORE NETZ AND HER TWO CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 606) for the relief of Hannelore Netz and her two children.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, in the administration of such act, Hannelore Netz, the German fiance of Staff Sgt. Hugo H. Reiss, a United States citizen now serving in the United States Air Force, and her two children shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Hannelore Netz is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Staff Sgt. Hugo H. Reiss, and that, except as herein provided, she and her two children are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hannelore Netz, she and her two children shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hannelore Netz, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Hannelore Netz and her two children as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fees.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WINFRIED KOHLS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 730) for the relief of Winfried Kohls.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Winfried Kohls shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-

control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENIO S. ROILES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 801) for the relief of Eugenio S. Roiles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Eugenio S. Roiles shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KARIN RITA GRUBB

The Clerk called the bill (S. 825) for the relief of Karin Rita Grubb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Karin Rita Grubb shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JAWAD HEDAYATY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 973) for the relief of Dr. Jawad Hedayaty.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Jawad Hedayaty shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELENA LEWICKA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 982) for the relief of Helena Lewicka.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Helena Lewicka shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ZOLTAN WEINGARTEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1009) for the relief of Zoltan Weingarten.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Zoltan Weingarten shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE ELLIS ELLISON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1018) for the relief of George Ellis Ellison.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Ellis Ellison shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEFAN VIRGILIUS ISSARESCU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1226) for the relief of Stefan Vergilius Issarescu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stefan Virgilius Issarescu shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMMANUEL ARISTIDES NICOLOUDIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1281) for the relief of Emmanuel Aristides Nicoloudis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Emmanuel Aristides Nicoloudis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LYDIA L. A. SAMRANEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1323) for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lydia L. A. Samraney, wife of Corporal Joseph M. Samraney, a citizen of the United States, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER PENOVIC ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1432) for the relief of Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, and Nikola Maljkovic.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, and Nikola Maljkovic shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas

for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE DEANG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1443) for the relief of Jose Deang.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Deang shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIESELOTTE SOMMER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2108) for the relief of Lieselotte Sommer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lieselotte Sommer may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 7, insert "*Provided*, That her marriage to her United States citizen fiance, Sergeant Leroy Meininger, shall occur not later than 6 months following the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ALA OLEJCAK (NEE HOLUBOWA)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2151) for the relief of Mrs. Ala Olejcak, nee Holubowa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Ala Olejcak (nee Holubowa) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 7, insert "*Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called House Concurrent Resolution 197.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-7123468, Abdo, Zaki.
A-6818125, Abdullah, Naim Ezra.
A-3214298, Adler, Peeter Wilhelm.
A-6897062, Adesnik, Klara (nee Frejdson).
A-6568285, Adamsons, Arnolds.
A-6568274, Adamsons, Frida Kvitana.
A-6738932, Al-Hindawi, Ibrahim Yousif.
A-6738933, Al-Hindawi, Lily Heskel.
T-2760702, Al-Hindawi, Amira Ibrahim.
T-2760703, Al-Hindawi, Ferial Ibrahim.
A-6903675, Aron, Renee (nee Muller).
A-7078088, Apperman, Pepi Lazarovitz (nee Herskovitz).
A-9180348, Antonenco, Nicolai.
A-7249872, Apse, Laura Margareta.
A-7249883, Apse, Ivars.
A-6432771, Awad, Mahmoud Mohammad.
A-6991752, Baginski, Kazimiera.
A-6991754, Baginski, Paula.
A-6575180, Baron, Theodore S. or Theodore Solomon Zalcberg or Ted Baron.
A-7186428, Benjamin, Sassoon Joseph.
A-6953013, Bergef, Ignac.
A-6886878, Berger, Martin Adalbert.
A-6953288, Birnbaum, Salamun.
A-6755695, Bisharat, Alfred Hanna.
A-6623693, Bitker, Anna (nee Stereiny).
A-6886830, Blumstein, Morris.
A-6142352, Bytniewska, Barbara Franciska.
A-7631707, Bielic, Joseph.
A-6776589, Boury, Costandy Nicola or Qustandi Nicola Boury.
A-7073399, Barycki, Edward.
A-8117712, Bedar, Gregory Jacob.
A-6232680, Borkowski, Peter (Piotr) Stanley.
A-7828471, Brajnovich, Giuseppe or Josip Brajnovic.
A-6953006, Braun, Ignac.
A-6903771, Brauner, Zoltan.
A-6887567, Brauner, Irene (nee Rosenberg).
A-8039756, Balacich, John.
A-7975992, Bon, Ho Yee.
A-7243860, Bindemanis, Valija Alexandra.
A-6090162, Breuer, Alexander.
A-8057459, Breuer, Cecilia.
A-8057460, Breuer, Herman.
A-8057461, Breuer, Ignatz.
A-6887745, Breuer, Maximilian.
A-8082011, Breuer, Judita.
A-8082010, Breuer, Deborah.
A-7197544, Brody, Sophie Mary.
0300-411507, Bracco, Simeon.
A-6383645, Chang, Chia-Ling.
A-6849504, Chang, John Wei Kung or Wei-Kung Chang.
A-6829521, Chang, Kuo Hwa.
A-6033450, Chao, Jowett Chou or Chou Chao.
A-6356316, Chao, Cherie (nee Pin Hwa Chow).
A-6143084, Chao, Stanley Kuo-Shu or Kuo-Shu Chao.
V-13545, Chao, Lyn Chang (nee Lyn Chang).
A-7366251, Chao, Wen Ying.
A-7174561, Chao, Yung Yen (Tsao).
A-6866998, Charucki, Stanislaw.
A-8082016, Chen, Chi Hing.
A-6702179, Chen, Feng Chi (nee Feng-Chi Wu).
A-6606603, Chen, Shao Lin.
A-6620814, Chen, Sing Mei.
A-8091328, Chen, Tommy D. C.
A-8091329, Chen, Joyce (nee Liao).
A-8091330, Chen, Henry Tsu Ming.
A-8091331, Chen, Helen Tsu Wah.
A-6851574, Chen, Tsu-Chi.
A-6848435, Chen, William Tung-Yung or Tung Yung Chen.
A-6704083, Cheng, Laura Wei-Hsia or Wei-hsia Cheng.
A-8057479, Chow, Shu Liang.
A-6197751, Chow, Tsu-Ling or Charles Chow.
A-6967579, Chu, Liang-Wei.
A-6881801, Cohen, Estera Lola.
A-7975170, Cristoloveanu, Mircea.
A-5291487, Cheng, Wen Chin (Mary Chen) or Sister M. Frances Agnes.
A-7415147, Chin-Hsin, Gin.
A-6522841, Chan, Robin Mei (nee Chow or Chow Mei or Mei Chow).
A-6461143, Chang, Pei-Wen.
A-6999690, Chen, Li-Ching (nee Yen or Li-Ching Yen or Letty Li-Ching Yen).
A-6967369, Cheng, Han or Hans Jeans.
A-6699875, Chou, Hung Sheng.
A-6577556, Chu, David Lian Koon.
A-6577555, Chu, Eileen Catherine.
T-1495407, Chan, Clarence Bock Kun.
A-6967613, Chang, Bansun.
A-6848052, Chang, Betty Wu.
A-6620834, Chang, Cheng-teh.
A-6967631, Chang, Martha Guee-Fang.
A-6052404, Chao, Yu-Shai.
A-8057483, Cheng, Richard Kuo-Wei.
A-6620730, Chow, Hsiang Sheng or Johnson Chow.
A-6667193, Chu, Margaret or Mei Yu Chu.
A-6697607, Chitayat, Anwar Khadouri.
A-7096023, Chiu, Hung-Wen.
A-7133239, Carvalho, Elena Natalia or Sister Mary Jacinta.
A-7375367, Chang, Edward Al-To.
A-7276021, Chang, Angela Liu.
A-6206586, Chien, Ting or Timothy Ting Chien.
A-5998605, Chow, Sui Wu.
A-6403342, Chang, Jen Chi.
0700-18500, Chang, K. H. Ronald.
A-7355994, Chang, Y. S. Irene Hu.
A-7133272, Chang, Wen Hsiang.
A-6509104, Chien, Evelyn Peh-Sin Chien or Peh-Sin Chang.
0300-403710, Chuen, Tsang.
A-6474305, Calamaro, Raphael Joseph.
A-8021776, Carcich, Venanzio Joseph.
A-6982797, Carmona, Pierre Albert or Peter ("Pete").
A-6781203, Chammah, Ibrahim (Albert) Moise.
A-7118707, Chen, Ching Hua or Si Chan Chen or Theresa Chen or Sister M. Dominica Chen.
A-0901262, Chen, Melie Su-Tsung Cheng.
A-7193932, Chiang, Jen or John or Jen or John Chaing.
A-6857647, Dajani, Abdel Salam.
A-6837646, Dajani, Shihadeh Hashem.
A-7138290, Dieska, Jozef.
A-6919339, Dimitrijevitch, Alexander Radovan.
A-7073996, David, Salim Isaac.
A-7073997, David, Marcelle Salim Isaac.
A-7415665, David, David Salim.
A-7415667, David, Sammi Salim.
0300-307098, Dobritch, Alexander Alexandrov.
A-7955257, Dobritch, Jr., Alexander Alexandrov.

A–7200393, Dabora, Eliahou Khedhoory.
A–6613816, Dziadek, Abram.
A–7463593, Dimini, Casimiro.
A–6399898, Dogic, Nikola or Nikola Dogic.
A–6956241, Eross, Janos.
A–6818103, Ellenbogen, Jeno.
A–7983360, Faldic, John or Ivan Faldic.
A–8021389, Faldic, Romano.
A–6026524, Fang, Chen Shang or James Chen Fang.
A–6745034, Feresez, Miklos.
A–6952324, Fogel, Jeno.
A–6967583, Fong, Lucy Shu-Yu.
A–8057476, Foo, Sze Ah.
A–6868674, Fried, Ilona.
A–7362418, Frisch, Mozes.
A–7362416, Frisch, Ilona.
A–7362417, Frisch, Imre.
A–7097844, Friedman, Ernest.
A–6887746, Friedman, Sarah.
A–6851361, Fu, Wen Tou.
A–6887738, Fuchs, Arnold.
A–7955271, Fucich, Joseph or Josip Fucich or Giuseppe Fucich.
A–8082066, Fong, Lam.
A–7457864, Fu, An Ling.
A–7975404, Fah, Ching Kai.
A–8082041, Fable, Frederik.
0300–398084, Fat, Joe Mok.
A–8091056, Fook, Wong Pooh.
A–6444628, Geintze, Helen Andgela (nee Valente).
A–6971665, Glaser, Jacob or Jakob Glaser.
A–6903708, Grunberger, Hilda or Hilda Landau Grunberger.
A–6543892, Gruszka, Gerszon.
A–7052441, Gruszka, Stella (nee Matalon).
A–7052442, Gruszka, Tamara.
A–6868682, Gutter, Roza Klein.
A–7243365, Gottwald, Antonin.
A–6916048, Grossman, Alexander.
A–6891802, Grossman, Eva Kohn.
A–7073950, Grimm, Bela Stephen.
A–6886831, Goldenberg, Isidor Zoltan.
A–6923158, Gaspar, Ella (nee Feig).
A–7244304, Grigutis, Juozas.
A–7056024, Gold, Joseph.
A–7790705, Hagman, Louise.
A–6576640, Hamoui, Ibrahim or Albert Joseph Hamoui.
A–6401323, Harari, Maurice.
A–6405110, Harari, Joseph.
A–6937851, Hasal, Antonin Bohumil or Nizborsky.
0500–35379, Hasal-Ova, Josefa Antonie (nee Skorepova).
0500–40091, Hasal, Milan Jiri.
0500–35580, Hasal-Ova, Milica Jelizaveta.
A–6922085, Hawa, Joseph Salim.
A–7264280, Heckler, Barbara or Martin.
A–7863797, Horowitz, Edmund or Edmund Horski.
A–7863855, Horska, Maria (nee Maria Hahn or Maria Horowitz).
A–7886512, Horski, Andrew.
A–7863826, Horski, Allan.
A–6403566, Hsu, Elizabeth Kwang-Hsin or Kwang-Hsin Hsu or Elizabeth Hsu.
0300–391428, Hu, Tin An.
0700–16565, Hui, Po Ching Margaret.
A–6861991, Hwa, Su Wellington Chee.
A–6887025, Hwang, Tsaisia Sen.
V–221923, Hanikat, Erkki Fridolf.
1300–86586, Him, Chung Burk.
A–6569530, Horvath, Jozef.
A–7184281, Hardoon, Daphne Elizabeth.
A–6427756, Haron, Albert Sasson.
A–6444675, Hsia, John I-Sheng.
A–7118747, Hsiao, Chen-Hwa or William Hwa Shaw.
A–6027102, Huang, Hsiao-Tsung.
A–6843411, Hwang, Shih-Tsen or Hotspur Hwangin.
A–6173173, Hsie, Jen-Yah or Hsie Jen Dan.
A–7450577, Hoch, Elizabeth.
A–6749967, Hochberger, Jakub.
A–6744362, Hochberger, Hinda.
0300–396629, Harabaglia, Nicola Santo.
A–6771819, Hlass, Ibrahim Jiryes.
A–8021327, Hallika, Ulo.
A–7415176, Hwang, Chueh-Fei or Chester F. Hwang.
A–8057477, Hsun, Mu Hong.
A–7117922, Igla, Abram.
A–9778151, Ikmelt, Peeter.
A–7890662, Issak, Armiin Giuseppe.
A–7244300, Iesalnieks, Janis.
A–7915147, Jablonski, Jan.
A–6903673, Jakubovich, Markus.
A–6848583, Jin, Korda Kee-Dah.
A–7052343, Jacobowitz, Margit.
A–6862649, Jakubovic, Evzen.
A–7886278, Juriacco, Rocco.
A–6993772, Jaruzelski, Janusz Jan.
A–6887558, Karmel, Baila or Ilona Karmel.
A–6949989, Karp, Towie.
0300–286838, Kazda, Milada.
A–6830434, Khoursheed, Fareed Subhi or Farid Subhi Khurshid.
A–6771764, Khoury, Habib George.
A–6282161, Kiibus, Richard.
A–7097847, Kinel, Jacob.
A–6843649, Kingman, Eleanor Priscilla.
A–6936485, Klagsbrunn, Abraham Chaim.
A–7210289, Klagsbrunn, Hadasa.
A–6891825, Klein, Joseph.
A–6922681, Klein, Markus.
A–6936499, Klimas, Antanas.
A–6426400, Kazimi, Mahmoud Ishaq El.
A–6903763, Kegel, Sandor.
A–6886892, Kohn, Flora Schwarcz.
A–9061054, Kong, Foo Sui.
A–6712031, Koo, Thomas Cheng-Pang.
A–7116371, Kornreich, Sarah Sulamita Frankel.
A–7802998, Kornreich, Hirsch Meiloch.
A–7450145, Kuo, Nancy Huang.
T–1495413, Kwong, Mrs. Su Shang Chi.
0300–408001, Kow, Lay.
A–7078191, Kwan, Tsun-Ying or Lawrence Tsun-Ying Kwan.
A–8091335, Kaszer, Stanislaw.
A–7297270, Klein, Lajos.
A–7858082, Kucich, Gerolamo.
A–6862648, Katz, Josef.
A–6934997, Klapper, Mendel.
A–6860163, Klimesova, Vlasta Marie or Vlasta Klimes.
A–6707345, Krawczyk, Thaddeus Mathias or Tadeusz Krawczyk.
A–6933874, Kalisch, Judith.
A–9684346, Kan, Chan.
A–6847999, Kao, Lillian Chih-jen.
A–6732399, Kalme, Elmar.
A–6732400, Kalme, Akulina.
A–6771738, Khalil, Ahmad Zohair.
A–7073400, Kellman, Jacob.
A–6772578, Kruza, Zanis Alberts.
A–7821513, Ladon, Harald Eduard or Harold Edward Ladon.
A–7491271, Laktionoff, Vladimir Ivanovich.
A–6897066, Landau, Salamon or Salomon Landau.
A–7439753, Lang, Imre (Emery) Tibor.
A–6851689, Lee, Beatrice Dzun.
A–6847805, Lee, Mavis Shao-Ling.
A–6866943, Li, Hua-Wei or Howard H. Lee.
A–7594866, Li, Richard I-Hua.
A–6396666, Ling, David.
A–6980354, Loh, Chao Chi.
A–6763045, Loh, Chao, Fah or Ellen Chao Fah Loh.
A–6751952, Loo, Ti Li.
A–6441722, Lu, Milton Ming-Deh or Ming-Deh Lu.
V–890155, Lu, Sung Nien.
A–7283021, Lutyk, Andrew Nicolas.
A–6877780, Lee, Yih-Hung.
A–7056897, Levai, George or Gyorgy or Gyorgy Czeisler.
A–7056896, Levai, Margit (nee Varga).
A–6980347, Li, Hua.
A–6737878, Lieblich, Tibor.
A–7873182, Lovric, Hermenegild.
A–6686067, Lin, Ku Yin.
A–7248060, Loh, An-Veng.
A–7120703, Lam, Yat-Yin.
A–6958556, Li, Hsui Tung or Mayanne Lee.
A–6840804, Liang, Maria Mu-Lian or Maria Fok.
A–6958627, Ling, Timothy C.
A–6958626, Ling, Irene.
A–6847981, Liu, Shia-Ling.
A–7135773, Liu, Yei Fang or Liu Yei-Fang or Y. F. Liu.
A–6532537, Loh, Shirley Shao.
A–6851380, Loh, Wei-Ping.
A–7054429, Loh, Hwei-Ya Chang.
A–7118711, Lee, William Wah-Ying.
A–6986562, Lee, Francis Fan.
A–6916031, Leichtag, Margit Polatsek.
A–6709305, Li, Min Chiu or Min Ch'iu Li.
A–6552715, Lin, David Yao-Pei.
A–6403556, Lis, Eli Mojsze.
A–7134583, Lysakowski, Ryszard Stanislaw.
A–6712034, Lee, Ai-Shen Miles or Ai-Shen Miles.
A–6894840, Lee, Liu Man.
A–7450588, Ling, Dr. Ji-Toong.
A–7417097, Lewkowicz, Jozef.
A–7118668, Liu, Chin Lan or Mary Rosa Liu or Sister M. Rosa Liu.
A–9765740, Lysakowski, Marian.
A–7886319, Majewski, Felix.
A–7297272, Margittai, Jozsef.
A–7297273, Margittai, Olga.
V–738365, Maripuu, Hilda (nee Koobakene).
A–7828126, Mattesich, Beniamino.
A–6703205, McGregor, Donald Hudson.
A–6511892, Meizlik, Icik.
A–6917593, Miczynski, Zygmunt.
A–6719390, Mermelstein, Edith.
A–7125360, Monseu, Stanislaw Ludwik.
A–7125361, Monseu, Maria Stefania Okanska.
A–7283495, Monseu, Jerzy (George) Alfred.
A–7283496, Monseu, Renata Maria.
A–6953259, Mozes, Szmul.
A–7424935, Mulczet, Gabriella or Ella.
A–7197630, Maged, Aron.
A–7197629, Maged, Erna.
A–6887702, Milstein, Henry or Chaim Milstejn.
A–7868087, Miklos, Andor.
A–7095991, Miklos, Sophie Weiss.
A–9825098, Marek, Bronislaw.
A–6771743, Morcos, Elias Farah.
A–9765576, Matteoni, Anthony or Antonio Matcovich.
A–6142245, Na, Chung Sheng.
A–7095966, Nemes, Elemer or Elemer Nemes Lehocz.
A–6949985, Neuhauser, Alekander.
A–7873132, Neuhauser, Estera.
A–7873133, Neuhauser, Tibor.
A–6923771, Niederman, Armin.
A–7073627, Niederman, Lenca.
A–7145199, Niederman, Susana.
0300–287494, Nozicka, Jiri Josef Antonin.
A–6886893, Noskowicz, Naftali.
A–6955625, Nagy, Bartalan Istvan or Bartholomew Stephen Nagy.
A–7967085, Ni, Mary.
A–9500016, Noritis, Janis.
A–6772248, Obeid, Ali Abder Razzag Ali.
A–7125353, Orensztejn, Naftula Hirsz.
A–7125354, Orensztejn, Szyfra.
A–7366399, Orensztejn, Natan.
A–9729111, Osting, Erich.
A–6721803, Ovadiah, Eliyahu Joseph or Elijah Ovadiah.
A–7841091, Pai, Sin Yu.
A–7419932, Pao, Jenia.
A–8091325, Perissa, Anthony or Anton Perissa or Antonio Perissa.
A–7802996, Peroutka, Maria.
A–8065360, Pezzulich, Enrico or Enrich Peculic.
A–9776546, Pokutynski, Feliks.
A–7251984, Feng, Jean You-Chen.
A–6967655, Pan, Coda Hoong-Tao.
A–9798727, Perts, August.
A–7096146, Pere, Sinaida.
A–6610630, Polonski, Fania.
A–7243253, Polonski, Joseph.
A–6989702, Palu, Theodor.
A–6026520, Pan, Paul Mei.
A–6920454, Paulmann, Louis Phillip.
A–7184141, Pu, Yun Hsin.
A–7249072, Paipals, Fred.
A–7249071, Paipals, Zenta.
A–6848197, Paneth, Juda.
A–7052479, Paneth, Gabriella.
A–7049964, Paunovic, Trifun.
A–6452003, Royang, Thomas Tsao.
A–7054205, Ranky, William Octavius (Vilmos Octavius Ranki).

A-7197512, Rottenberg, Jenta (nee Bernzweig).
A-6887711, Rottenberg, Zygmunt.
A-6753464, Rajulaid, Toivo Eino.
A-6953530, Roosenbaum, Moorits.
A-6987948, Rozycki, Stanislaw Roman Jozef.
A-6938798, Rozenbergs, Janis Voldemars.
A-6938799, Rozenbergs, Mirdza Eleonora.
A-7457577, Saltoun, Haron Heskell.
A-6953465, Saltoun, Vivian Haron.
A-6953464, Saltoun, Ida Haron.
A-6953466, Saltoun, Haskell Haron.
A-6903747, Schreiber, Herman.
A-6891803, Schwarcz, Tibor.
A-9691837, Seng, Chee.
A-6614251, Sheena, Albert Haron.
A-7209347, Shen, Pao, G.
A-7209348, Shen, Wayfun.
A-7209349, Shen, Shirley Jo.
A-6847903, Sheng, David Shuan-En or Shuan-En Sheng.
A-6848519, Sheng, Lydia Ling-Chen Chang or Lydia Sheng or Ling-Chen Chang.
A-7081611, Shieh, Jwo Jye.
A-6411899, Silva, Cecilia Maria Basto Da.
A-6923164, Simsowitz, Sari (nee Simsowitz).
0300-286835, Smetacek, Zdenek.
0300-286836, Smetacek, Milada.
0300-286839, Smetacek, Eva Marie Anna Zdenka.
A-7830616, Sokal, Julie Chen-Chu (nee Yang, Chen Chu).
A-6954751, Spigler, Seli.
0300-287058, Stanczak, Ryszard.
A-8091344, Stepancic, Jakov or Giacomo or Jack.
A-6719269, Stern, Olga Mermelstein.
A-6877474, Strauss, Lino Leon.
A-7053578, Sugho, Louis Larry.
A-7053577, Sugho, Emilia.
A-9694065, Sulislawski, Kazimierz or Stanley Sules.
A-6620609, Sun, Keh-Ming.
A-7967086, Sun, Mey-En (nee Chen).
A-6848620, Sung, Chien-Bor or C. B. Sung.
A-6142921, Sung, Ya Bing or Robin Sung.
A-6855583, Sze, Clarence Saio-Ju.
A-4040525, Sze, Kenneth Chiache.
A-7110840, Szenczy, Sophie.
0300-288648, Stein, Bluma Szpigelman.
A-8057543, Szpigielman, Yakob.
A-6696204, Sung, I. Chung or Sung I. Chung.
0300-277030, Sandel, Adolf.
A-7078091, Sandel, Etela.
A-7210107, Shatohin, Victor George.
A-7210108, Shatohin, Olga V.
A-7399968, Shen, Chung-Yu.
A-8001360, Shohet, Isaac Haron or Ishaq Haroon Shohet or I. Shohet.
A-6958130, Szamek, Anna Marie.
A-6985373, Szumska, Jadwiga.
A-6848189, Shih, Chen Chong.
A-8065355, Stocovaz, Ruggero.
A-6516726, Strochlic, Zelman.
A-6515725, Strochlic, Ohaja (nee Zelenka).
A-6897057, Szapiro, Dora.
A-7244152, Saulesleja, Augusts.
A-6621140, Schwarc, Maxmilian or Max or Schwartz.
A-6582842, Schwarc, Alzbeta or Elizabeth or Schwartz (nee Tauber).
A-6582843, Schwarc, Gizela or Schwartz.
A-6681211, Shahabeddin, Jamal Zaki.
A-6967370, Shao, Stephen Pinyee or Shao Pinyee.
A-6848509, Shieh, Francis Shis-Hao.
A-6938813, Strelis, Arvid.
A-6704111, Sun, Pao Chang or Paul Sun.
A-6971794, Spuul, Lembit Indarlin.
A-6033425, Shen, Tso-Mei or Thomas Shen.
A-6798995, Stepe, Janis.
A-6887747, Stern, Eugen.
A-7198354, Stern, Teresia.
V-229916, Stern, Margita.
A-7197375, Stern, Szerena or Sarah Elizabeth (nee Wettenstein).
A-6805602, Schonfeld, Ludvik or Sarosy Laszlo or Larry Sade.
A-7125125, Schuller, Lore Margarete.
A-6903927, Shangh, Huang Ming.
A-7243861, Sumskis, Antons.
A-8082094, Sgaliardich, Antonio.
A-8082044, Shen, Sien-Wha Nyeu.
A-6881800, Simpser, Sloime or Sam.
A-6708744, Soong, Hsin-Chen or Seai Pau Soong or Agatha Soong or Sister Mary Gabriel Soong.
A-7142265, Tambaur, Vaino.
A-6847839, Tang, Yuet An.
A-6702203, Tao, Chien Ching or James Tao.
A-7078195, Tao, Yugn Taing or Norman Tao.
A-6849413, Teng, Lin-Cheun Lincoln or Lin-Chcun Teng or Cheunley Teng.
A-8065352, Terdoslavich, Mariano Agostino.
A-7886280, Tojagic, Rade Luka.
A-7415659, Tomkov, Oleg.
A-6884235, Torbeczko, Maurycy.
A-6975576, Tsang, Hai Ling (Schillings Tsang).
A-6488544, Tsao, Linda Wen-Mei.
A-6027105, Tseng, Paul Pao-Mong.
A-6904323, Tsien, Hong Yuan or Hong Yuan-Tsien.
A-6967544, Tsien, Wen-Hui (nee Kao).
A-8091332, Tsu, Lucille Liang-Ching.
A-6975611, Tversky, Roza or Rosa Lipkis.
A-6975612, Tversky, Feiga.
A-7868142, Tai, Shou Nan.
A-9914572, Tak, Ho Ming.
A-7200781, Tobolik, Peter.
A-7200779, Tobolik, Koenelia.
A-7863002, Turauskis, Vilma Kristina (nee Greizis).
A-6014816, Tsai, Wen-Cheh.
A-6938817, Tisins, Janis.
A-6938818, Tisins, Olga.
0300-410645, Tai, Chung.
0300-403715, Tong, Lim Ah.
A-6848502, Tsao, Ching Hua.
A-7463589, Ugricich, Matteo.
A-6794923, Urshan, Ruth.
A-7118781, Valvur, Heino Oskar.
A-8091373, Veske, Linda Kristine (nee Klider).
A-6463149, Voong, Edith Tse-Lieu.
A-7915649, Vaidre, Alexander or Aleksander Vaidre.
A-9825345, Vlacich, Antonio.
A-6646835, Viest, Ivan Miroslav.
A-7097886, Wald, Eguenia Poss.
A-6922687, Weingarten, David.
A-7125447, Weinreb, Jindrich or Henry.
A-7125417, Weinreb, Reili.
A-8091309, Weinreb, Robert.
A-8091310, Weinreb, Tibor.
A-6931484, Weisz, David.
A-7427290, Weisz, Rosa Dora.
A-6878042, Weisz, Ignac.
A-6819608, Wieder, Solomon.
A-6843404, Woo, Robert Kwoh-Tao.
A-7363104, Woo, Tao Fu or Robert Tao Fu Woo.
A-6283296, Wu, Chang Sheng.
A-6965803, Wojciechowski, Andrew (Andrzej).
A-6083627, Wang, An.
A-6849826, Wang, Lorraine Chiu.
A-9746779, Wojciechowski, Witold Wladyslaw.
A-9705251, Wah, George Cheung.
A-6851364, Way, May.
A-6923193, Weiss, Zitta Stern.
A-7290221, Weinberger, Elias.
A-7297285, Weinberger, Iloma (Elie).
A-8031863, Weinberger, Hedvig.
A-8031864, Weinberger, Hedvig.
T-1510164, Woloszyn, Bronislaw or Bronislaw Wolosyn or Wolzszyn.
0606-66138, Wang, David I-Jaw.
A-6877738, Yee, Chi Yu or Stephen Chi-Yu Yee.
A-6238161, Yang, Chen-Ya.
A-7363107, Yao, Florence Hui-En.
A-6660956, Yih, Wei Hong.
A-6849392, Yin, Yuan-Shi.
A-6851351, Yu, Alexander Shih Han.
A-6953055, Yu, Teh Chu.
A-6095748, Yui, Regina Shiao-Lien.
A-6975569, Yang, Yun-Wen or John Yun-Wen Yang.
A-9771052, Young, Wan.
A-7133252, Yu, Colleen Nai Huan.
A-8001251, Yung, Cheng Chin.
A-9693033, Yung, Wong Sung.
A-6620573, Yu, Ping Chang.
A-7249624, Yu, Ven Wei.
A-7262206, Yu, Jimmy Shi Kiang.
A-6847780, Yang, Chang-Lee.
A-6703458, Yen, Hsin-Kai or David Hsin Kai Yen.
A-6545333, Yen, Mei-Huei or Mei Huei Kuo.
A-8039700, You, Chien Shun.
A-6904363, Zaharia, Florin Constantin.
A-6862628, Zelig, Jack.
A-7863132, Ziemelis, Martins.
A-6707032, Zindulka, Marie Charvat.
A-6855662, Zoberman, Chaim.
A-7125136, Zafir, Arthur.
A-7125147, Zafir, Anna (nee Gestetner).
A-7863212, Zandbergs, Ernests.
A-7863213, Zandbergs, Milda.
A-6830537, Zloof, Ezra Meir or Ezra Meir or Ezra Meir Ezra.
A-8065359, Zlatarevic, Milan Goldschmidt or Milan Goldschmidt or Edward J. Meyers.

The House concurrent resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VERNON F. PARRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7251) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Vernon F. Parry, the right, title, and interest of the United States in foreign countries in and to a certain invention.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior may transfer to Vernon F. Parry, an employee of the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, by means of an appropriate legal instrument, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to a certain invention made by the said Vernon F. Parry, consisting of a continuous process for devolatilization of carbonaceous materials and apparatus therefor, as described and claimed in United States Application for Letters Patent filed in the United States Patent Office, on August 22, 1949, designated as serial No. 111,752: *Provided, however*, That such legal instrument shall reserve to the Government of the United States, in all departments, independent establishments, and corporate and other agencies thereof, the right to a nonexclusive, irrevocable, royalty-free license in the invention for all governmental purposes, and an exclusive right to grant sublicenses, consistent with the law of any foreign country in which the invention may be patented, for the use of such invention in connection with any production undertaken for defense purposes by the government of such country or by any person or company pursuant to any procurement contract with the government of such country or any of its instrumentalities.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Vernon F. Parry, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to a certain invention."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GABRIELLE STAUB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 962) for the relief of Gabrielle Staub.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gabrielle Staub shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States on January 26, 1941, the date on which she was recorded as permanently admitted.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Gabrielle Staub" and insert "Gabrielle Marie Smith (nee Staub)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Gabrielle Marie Smith (nee Staub)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUSNU ATAULLAH BERKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2441) for the relief of Husnu Ataullah Berker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Husnu Ataullah Berker shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGHERITA DI MEO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3961) for the relief of Margherita Di Meo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Margherita Di Meo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Di Meo, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GABRIEL HITTRICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4738) for the relief of Gabriel Hittrich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gabriel Hittrich shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIE TCHEREPNIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5085) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Tcherepnin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Marie Tcherepnin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JESSE BELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1705) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jesse Bell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Jesse Bell a patent in fee to the following-described lands located in Adams County, Miss.: The northeast quarter and the east half of the southwest quarter and the west half of the southeast quarter of section 2, township 3 north, range 5 west, Adams County, Miss.; and the east half of the northwest quarter of section 5, township 3 north, range 5 west, Adams County, Miss.; and lots 3, 4, and 5 of section 1, township 4 north, range 5 west, Adams County, Miss. The said Jesse Bell, having complied with all the provisions of section 2 of the act of July 14, 1832 (6 Stat. 523), was entitled to be issued a patent for such land in 1833; but no such patent was ever issued due to the fact that the documents required by such act were lost or misplaced after they had been duly filed by him.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 7 insert:

"SEC. 2. The tracts of land described by the first section of this act shall be conveyed upon the payment by the successors of Jesse Bell of the appraised value of the lands, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, if payment is made within 1 year after the Secretary has given suitable notification of the price of the lands. The Secretary shall have the appraisal made on the basis of the value of the lands at the date of appraisal, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the lands by Jesse Bell or his successors in interest. In such appraisal, the Secretary shall consider and give full effect to the equities of the said successors.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall issue patent for said lands without any reservation of minerals."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LAND

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 369 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for the exchange of certain public and private lands, and all points of order against such bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the rule be amended by striking out "1 hour," page 1, line 8, and to insert in lieu thereof "one hour and a half."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and at this time yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 369, which will make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 4646, to provide for the exchange of certain public and private lands.

House Resolution 369, Mr. Speaker, provides for an open rule with one hour and a half of general debate on the bill itself. All points of order against H. R. 4646 are waived and the rule provides that it shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now printed in the

bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill.

Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4646 was given a rule by the Rules Committee on last July 29, 1953, but at that time there was a certain amount of criticism of the bill in its present form, which led the author of the bill and other interested parties to decide to defer presentation on the floor until valid criticisms of the bill could be worked out in the form of suggested amendments to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, during the adjournment various Members of Congress and officials of the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service worked together on perfecting this bill, and have now eliminated most of the points of dispute in the bill.

On February 4 the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs filed a supplemental report on H. R. 4646, in which is set forth the amendment they propose to offer to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will see fit to adopt the rule, House Resolution 369, which will make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 4646.

I might explain that last summer when the objections to this bill first appeared, those objections became known to the author of the bill and to the Committee on Rules, and, in fact, to the entire House only at the time of the hearings held on the bill by the Committee on Rules. Prior to that time and prior to the time the bill was reported to the House, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held 2 full days of hearings on this bill. They were held about 2 weeks apart. Thus, any persons interested had ample notice and ample opportunity to appear and be heard.

At that time there was very little opposition voiced against the bill; none by interests outside of the Government. I believe that during those hearings Forest Service representatives appeared and did offer some objections to the bill in its original form. Some of those objections were removed by the amendment which became the committee substitute. But, when the Committee on Rules was holding its hearing on the bill, deciding whether or not it should grant a rule and send it to the floor, several Members appeared before that committee and raised a number of objections and criticisms to the bill as reported. As the author of the bill, I listened to those objections carefully and, realizing that since there appeared to be no objections to the principle of the bill, it seemed to me quite possible that all of the objections to that bill could be cleaned up with some very simple words in the way of an amendment.

One objection to the bill was that lands included in national parks, national monuments, wilderness areas, and so forth, should not be eligible for exchange. Such lands were never intended to be made eligible for exchange under the provisions of this bill. In the original draft of the bill that proviso limiting such areas was included. Later a few other suggestions as to areas which should not be included were made, so as the author of the bill I finally determined that it would be better not to attempt to name by name specifically those areas which would be excluded for fear that in naming only a few some other area might inadvertently be omitted. So, it was thought that that particular situation could be met by merely including in the bill that no exchange could be made unless it was in the public interest and, of course, it would not be in the public interest to exchange lands from the national parks, national monuments, and wilderness areas.

However, in the amendments which the committee will offer this proviso is included:

Provided, That federally owned timberlands so transferred shall not include lands within the boundaries of national parks, national monuments, wildlife refuges, administrative sites, wild or wilderness areas, forest experimental areas, and developed recreation areas.

I might point out that some of those areas were put in at the very last minute. They are all protected by the words "in the public interest."

This is another criticism:

The department or agency responsible for the administration of the federally owned land to be transferred would have no part in the selection of such lands.

The committee in discussing the matter in the hearing did not consider that that was really a valid criticism, but in order to remove any possible doubt one word was changed, the word "cooperate." We provided originally that the Federal agency shall cooperate. In the amendment the word "participate" is used which, of course, makes the agency having jurisdiction over the lands involved a partner in the whole transaction.

This objection is further met by the third proviso which provides for advisory public hearings to be held by the Department or agency having jurisdiction over lands which might be transferred.

Another objection which was raised:

Other processing operations in the same general area which depend on sustained production of the national forest would be injured if lands on which such operation depend for timber were transferred in an exchange as provided for in the bill.

That is really a matter which the public interest clause will take care of; so in connection with that subject the third proviso will read:

That transfers will be in the public interest.

Another objection:

One member declared that there should be some method of inspection to determine whether or not the landowner who seeks the benefit of the act is practicing sustained-yield management and will guarantee that he will maintain such practices in any Federal lands transferred to him.

The suggested amendment which will be offered provides for those matters to be settled by an advisory public hearing before any transfer is made.

This objection is answered in several ways, not only in the bill as written but in the proposed amendment. However, the point is assumed to be strengthened by (a) in the third proviso, which requires that one purpose of a public hearing is to determine whether "the private timberlands are being operated as a part of a forest area to provide a sustained yield of timber for processing purposes." So far as the additional guaranty is concerned, that would more properly be taken care of administratively by merely including a reservation in the deed of transfer.

Then there was the further objection that the agency taking the land should be required to reimburse the agency from which the land was transferred by transfer of funds.

The second proviso in the amendment to be offered will cover that.

The second proviso in the suggested amendment reads as follows:

Provided further, That any such transfer shall be made with reimbursement or transfer of funds for the value of timberland transferred as determined by the transferring agency.

It is pertinent to note that in connection with this proviso that such reimbursement to the Forest Service, which would be the agency from which practically all lands would be transferred, would be covered into the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt as provided in United States Code, title 16, section 499. This section reads as follows:

All money received by or on account of the Forest Service for timber, or from any other source of national-forest revenue, including moneys received from sale of products from or for the use of lands in national forests created under section 471 (b) of this title, and moneys received on account of permits for hunting, fishing, or camping on lands acquired under authority of sections 513–517 and 521 of this title, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt.

May I point out to the House that all of these objections, which are valid and reasonable criticisms of the text of the bill, have received the careful and earnest consideration of the committee. It has been the endeavor of the author of the bill to meet these objections. We think the objections will be adequately taken care of by the amendment which will be offered, and the principle in the bill is not injured one whit; as a matter of fact, the bill is actually changed very little, and this additional language is merely considered to be further safeguard against the transfer of land under improper circumstances.

The purpose of this bill is very simple and very clear. When an operator by the practice of good forestry and by the exercise of good business judgment has placed his business in such shape that his employees and the little community around his industry and he have reason to believe that that industry can operate perpetually, in other words, that his timber operation is on a sustained-yield basis, then when such an operator happens to find that his property is located where the United States Government is about to build a reservoir or for some other reason needs his land, and his land which will supply his permanent timber supply is to be taken by the Government

under condemnation proceedings, this bill would allow him to accept in exchange for the land which the Government is going to take away from him by condemnation similar suitable land instead of cash.

This bill has been criticized on the ground that it is a bill to bail out the big interests. I submit to the Members of the House that it is no such thing. It is quite the contrary. The owner of such a property, a mill with a balanced timber supply operating on a sustained-yield basis, obviously is a man of means and considerable wealth or he would not own that kind of property. Such an owner could be perfectly content, I think, to accept cash for his property because he could take the money and go elsewhere, and would be harmed very little by doing so. No; the people who are harmed and oftentimes ruined under such circumstances are the innocent third parties, the employees of that mill, who have bought or built homes in the community which has been built up around that industry, the people who have jobs there. I have known of mills where the jobs are held by the second generation. If their jobs are wiped out by the liquidation of that mill because of the Government's taking away its timber, they are the people who are hurt. The private owner of the timber is not damaged.

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. COON. The eliminating of all or a major part of a sustained-yield timber operation would throw many men out of work and would curtail or eliminate the income in an affected community. Would not this legislation protect workingmen and small-business men?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes; that is one of the purposes of the legislation, I may say to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. COON. Did not the Secretary of Agriculture in a letter discussing this bill on July 24, 1953, say, "We are convinced that an inequity with respect to private owners exists"?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes; the Secretary did make that statement. I am sure he well recognizes that this condition I have described is an inequity.

Mr. COON. So it would be true, then, that this bill would work for the benefit of the worker, by insuring employment, and for the small-business men and a stable economy in the community.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes. I may say to the gentleman that as the author of the bill it was that point in particular that impelled me to introduce it.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to call to the attention of the gentleman that where a condition exists such as was referred to by the gentleman, where a corporation or a company would jeopardize their sustained yield, I believe under Public Law 273 which was passed in 1944, the Leasing Act would permit the Federal Government to lease them certain acreage. The law is in effect now which would permit the Federal Government to lease them certain acreage that they would need to continue that sustained yield to keep up their activity and whatever industry might be involved, or wherever any employment may be affected.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I appreciate the gentleman's observation. It happens that I am author of the bill which became Public Law 273. I regret to say that it could not apply under the conditions which I have pointed out, which comprise the reasons behind this bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. The gentlemand said that the operation of the law, which was passed in 1944, would not apply in this situation and that the gentleman is the author of the bill and is familiar with it. At the present time, I want to point out under the existing law there is presently pending an application by 1 corporation, and I would like to read just 3 or 4 lines which are as follows:

> And it is proposed in this application (which has been forwarded to me) that the sustained yield unit consists of national forest land in either Sam Houston or David Crockett National Forest or both, such as will yield—
>
> And this is very important—
>
> 10 million feet of timber annually and (2) the sale of this timber to this organization be made to the new corporation without competitive bidding.

This is the type of guaranteed, sustained yield of 10 million board-feet which apparently is now lawful under the law. Does not the gentleman think that is the type of activity which gives them a guaranty of operating their mills?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that the 1944 act was very, very emphatically approved by the Forest Service. The principle involved in that act is very pertinent to the principle involved in this bill presently before us. The purpose of the 1944 act was to encourage sustained-yield management of timber held in private hands. There is just one really big thing wrong with forestry in this country today. There is one real big threat to the future wood supply of the people of this country, and that is that there is not enough timber now held in private hands operated on a sustained-yield basis. The legislation which is now before us I introduced with that thought uppermost in mind for the protection of the little communities, that is, if we can give an incentive to large owners or any owners of private timber to go ahead with their operation on a sustained-yield basis instead of on a cut-out-and-get-out basis, as has been the practice in lumbering operations for so many years, we will be making a contribution to the long-range forestry supply and program of this country. That is what this bill is for and that is why it has the approval of the American Forestry Association.

If the gentleman will bear with me, I would like to relinquish the floor, and Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 12]

Adair	Durham	Merrow
Addonzio	Fine	Miller, Kans.
Allen, Calif.	Ford	Miller, N. Y.
Barden	Green	Morgan
Battle	Gubser	Morrison
Bowler	Hagen, Calif.	Moulder
Brownson	Haley	Oakman
Buchanan	Harrison, Wyo.	Passman
Carnahan	Hart	Powell
Cederberg	Jackson	Prouty
Celler	James	Reece, Tenn.
Chelf	Kearney	Reed, Ill.
Chiperfield	Kearns	Regan
Clardy	Kee	Rodino
Corbett	Klein	Taylor
Cotton	Landrum	Thompson, Tex.
Coudert	Lesinski	Tollefson
Davis, Tenn.	Lovre	Velde
Dawson, Ill.	McCarthy	Weichel
Deane	McConnell	Willis
Dingell	Mailliard	
Dollinger	Mason	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CORBETT (at the request of Mr. FULTON) was granted leave of absence for 1 week on account of illness.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LAND

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, my attention was first called to this legislation about 3 days before we adjourned last summer. This bill was very suddenly called up before the Rules Committee at the 11th hour, and there was considerable insistence that the Congress act on this legislation in the 2 or 3 days remaining before adjournment.

I think this is a very dangerous piece of legislation. From the knowledge I have of this bill, it will jeopardize and gradually create an avenue of encroachment upon our national forests and our national park reserves. I think every Member should give this bill very serious study before he makes up his mind to vote for it.

It was only shortly after the turn of the century when a great President, Theodore Roosevelt, together with Gifford Pinchot, made a terrific battle against the lumber barons and succeeded in enacting legislation that has preserved up to this day our great national forest reserves. This bill will give the

lumber interests of this country an opening wedge to take over large sections of our national parks and our national forests and gradually usurp and take over some of the virgin timberlands of our national forest reserves.

I was startled at the time this legislation came before the Rules Committee to learn that certain organizations of this country, including the Izaak Walton League, the National Parks Association, the National Wildlife Federation, the Wilderness Society, and about 12 to 15 other conservation organizations, that represent millions upon millions of American citizens were not given notice or did not have an opportunity to testify before the committee when this legislation was originally heard and considered by the committee.

I attended a meeting here about 2 weeks ago of heads of various national wildlife and conservation societies. All they are interested in is to have this legislation recommitted so that these organizations representing millions of American citizens who have the welfare of our national parks public resources at heart may have an opportunity to testify in order to bring out the true facts as to the purposes underlying the passing of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, under this bill, whenever our Federal Government wants land for an atomic-energy plant, a dam site, or for any military or civilian purpose whatsoever, this will give the large lumber companies permission to come in before the Federal department that wants to take this land over for this Federal purpose and exchange off, acre for acre, virgin timberland in our national forests. This bill is aimed to cripple our national forest department because it will take transfer control to whatever Government department wants to use this land for Government purposes. Once the gates are opened it will take but a short time to cripple our timber reserves in our national preserves. It is a piece of legislation which every Member on this floor should give some very serious consideration before voting on the bill. It has all the earmarks of another well-concealed giveaway. This is an extension of the policy created by the tidelands oil legislation and public power curtailment which passed in the 1st session of the 83d Congress.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who just addressed the House saw fit to criticize the great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It seems to me that I should set the record straight. This bill was introduced on April 16, 1953. Public and open hearings were held on June 25 and July 14 and again before the full committee on July 15. Every Member and everyone who requested to be heard was heard during those hearings.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

I yield the gentleman 6 additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, we have a great national forest in Pennsylvania that was created by President Calvin Coolidge in a proclamation of September 24, 1923—the Allegheny National Forest of some 750,000 acres, a great part of which is in my congressional district.

Over the years I have watched this forest grow from a conglomeration of worn-out, run-down, cut-over forest land that nobody wanted then—into a productive area of real worth to my State and to the local counties in which it is located. Under careful and prudent management the Allegheny National Forest has become a source of many benefits to the 15 million people living within 300 miles of its boundaries. Through multiple use for timber, water, recreation, and wildlife a great many people benefit each year and the resources of my State are strengthened.

My colleagues in Congress are aware of the 151 other national forests in our Nation. They are found in 39 States from the coast of California to the Florida pinelands and from Maine to the vast forest areas in Washington State. Alaska and Puerto Rico also have national forests.

These forests have been a vital bulwark in America's efforts to protect and wisely use our God-given resources. Not only do they provide recurrent crops of valuable timber but also they are the source of clear streams, ample flows of fresh water, needed forage for livestock, abundant supplies of game and fish for the sportsman and a place of recreation and relaxation for millions of our citizens.

In the fiscal year just past our national forests returned receipts totaling over $76 million. In addition, it is estimated that the capital assets of the national forests increased in value more than $70 million. Last year's expenditure from regular appropriations for running these forests was $64½ million. Cash receipts alone thus exceeded expenditures by over $12 million. Over 33 million citizens visited the recreational areas in the forests and hundreds of thousands of sportsmen hunted and fished in the forests. These forests benefit many and are under the control of no individual or groups.

We in the Congress are responsible to the American people for the welfare of these Federal forests. It is our duty to see that no legislation is enacted to weaken or impair them. Their importance becomes doubly significant when we realize that less than 10 percent of the land area in the Nation is in national forests. This is a small margin of safety for the years that lie ahead.

Fortunately over the years the Members of Congress have been vigilant. No legislation has been passed that would jeopardize the present or future welfare of the national forests. We cannot afford to grow indifferent now.

It is my sincere hope that this Congress will not pass any legislation that will establish precedents which may later rise up to harm our great public forests. It is my opinion that we are charged with the responsibility to reject any legislation of which we are doubtful and that would establish precedents whereby our national forests or, in fact, any of our essential public lands might be encroached upon.

Last year, at the close of Congress, H. R. 4646 was reported favorably by the Rules Committee. Under the legislation as then proposed, a Government agency building a dam for irrigation or power purposes would be permitted to trade or exchange lands in national forests, national parks, national monuments, wilderness areas, and recreational areas for private forest lands under sustained yield that were to be flooded by the Government project. The Federal agency administering the lands would have had little or no say in the ultimate transaction. The furor raised at the time caused my very good friend, the sponsor of this legislation, Mr. ELLSWORTH, of Oregon, to withdraw the bill for restudy with those interested in an effort to develop a bill that would be satisfactory to those concerned.

You now have the Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs' report on the amendments that will be submitted today. They are certainly a considerable improvement over the bill as originally reported. However, I am now convinced that, notwithstanding the sincere efforts of the committee to provide satisfactory substitute language and to remove objectionable features, the legislation is still aimed at the national forests and will establish a precedent so dangerous in my opinion as to eventually jeopardize the future of our great public forests. It can go much further and set a precedent whereby not only national forest lands but other public lands could be used as trading stock in the development of a power, irrigation, or some other Federal project.

It is my firm conviction that our national forests should be left alone and no legislation enacted that would in any way open up avenues by which parts of these forest areas might be traded or exchanged.

This legislation introduces a completely new concept in the method of payment for private property when the Government exercises its right of eminent domain, namely, payment in kind instead of in cash for private timberlands needed for public projects. It can have far-reaching effects, cause much confusion and misunderstanding among our people, and eventually leave every national forest or other federally owned property open to inroads which could eventually impair their usefulness.

And if this bill is passed, I understand the local courts, not the agencies which we hold accountable for the management of our public lands, will have the final authority in requiring the exchange or transfer of federally owned lands.

Through the years I have served notice that I will be watchful for any move that might now or ultimately cause harm to our national forests. My colleagues in Congress have been just as alert. As I said, our national forests should be left alone. Again we must exercise our cau-

tion and not pass legislation which we will regret later. I feel certain we are supported in such a stand by millions of citizens represented by State and national conservation associations, fish and game clubs, recreation groups, wilderness areas supporters and independent timber operators and others. The host of people who benefit from the use of our public forests, parks and wildlife areas are the ones who are depending on us not to open the door even a little to any action that could ultimately, in my opinion, imperil our national forest program over the years ahead. If over the next 75 or 100 years we had enough exchanges, that would be permitted under this legislation, we might end up by having no national forests whatsoever.

Let me point out to the Members that others are not quite satisfied with this legislation. In fact, the report to accompany H. R. 4646, as originally reported by the committee, contains this letter, and I quote:

Hon. A. L. MILLER
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEAR DR. MILLER: Since sending you on July 10 the Department's adverse reports on the original and revised versions of H. R. 4646, further consideration has been given to the problem which this bill seeks to correct, and we wish that the report be withdrawn. We are convinced that an inequity with respect to private owners exists, but question that the full solution is contained in this proposed legislation. In the event no action is taken at this time, the Department would be glad, during the recess or adjournment, to work with the author of the bill, Members of Congress, or the Committee staff in an effort to develop an equitable solution which this Department could support.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Did the gentleman review the original report?

Mr. GAVIN. No; I have never seen this adverse report that they referred to.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. What reason did they give for changing their mind and reversing their position and being opposed to the bill?

Mr. GAVIN. I do not know. The gentleman will have to ask Mr. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, about that.

It is evident from this letter that Mr. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, considers that the full solution is not contained in the legislation as originally reported.

On January 27, 1954, I took the matter up with the Department of Agriculture to ascertain what their thinking was on this legislation at this time, and I am in receipt of a letter from J. Earl Coke, Assistant Secretary, as follows:

Reference is made to your telephone request of January 27 for the views of this Department on H. R. 4646.

By letter of July 24, the Department advised Dr. A. L. Miller, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that it questions whether the full solution to the problem which the bill seeks to correct is contained in the proposed legislation. The Department offered its facilities in working with the author of the bill or other Members of the Congress in an effort to develop an equitable solution.

In accordance with this offer, the Department has assisted Mr. ELLSWORTH in his efforts to find an equitable solution, and as a legislative service has developed certain amendments to the bill.

However, the Department feels that the bill raises an important question of policy and precedent as to whether the Government should compensate private owners in kind, in lieu of money, for necessary Government acquisitions of private property. Such a question would affect several departments in addition to the Department of Agriculture and is, we believe, a matter for congressional decision. Since we have not discussed this matter with the Bureau of the Budget or other departments, we feel it would be inappropriate to express an opinion as to whether H. R. 4646 should be enacted.

J. EARL COKE.

In this letter Mr. Coke states that they have not discussed the matter with the Bureau of the Budget or other departments as to the possible reaction in event this legislation should be passed.

Therefore, I think the Congress should proceed with caution before taking action on any legislation that would appear to be as controversial as this legislation appears to be.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, when this bill came up before the Committee on Rules, I was one of those who appeared in opposition to it. I was one who entered into an agreement with the gentleman from Oregon on the floor of the House just before the close of the last session of the Congress in which we agreed that we would try to work out a compromise, and in good faith we had a meeting with the gentleman from Oregon.

Shortly after this session of the Congress reconvened, the Nash people had a banquet here at which they gave conservation awards to many of the sportsmen and conservationists and the wildlife associations throughout the United States. At that banquet more than 20 national organizations, conservationists, and national park associations, and so forth, were represented. During that time several of the Congressmen who had opposed the bill met and tried to work out a compromise bill with the gentleman from Oregon. As he says, we did file our objections with him. Some of those objections have been met in a supplemental report, but I disagree with the gentleman from Oregon when he says that there were no objections to the principle of the bill.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. Gladly.

Mr ELLSWORTH. At the time we discussed the matter in the summer it did not seem to me that there was any objection to the principle. However, I discovered in our conference that there was this very distinctive difference of opinion on principle, and that is that you folks who oppose this bill are opposed to deeding any Government land to anybody, under any circumstances.

If the gentleman will yield further—and I will give him time to make up for this interruption—I would like to point out that during the 10-year period from 1943 to 1952, inclusive, the Forest Service has deeded a total of 549,822 acres of good standing timber out in the national forests to private individuals, and in order to understand how much that acreage amounts to, that is an area about one and one half times the State of Connecticut. So, actually your Forest Service has over the years been making trades of its timber land to private individuals and are taking in return cut-over land. I think the House should know that.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman. Iwill hold the gentleman to his commitment to give me a little additional time.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes, I will do that.

Mr. METCALF. I am not, and I do not think any of the other Members who are in opposition to this bill are opposed to the relinquishment of public land to private ownership when there is good and sufficient justification for it, but we are opposed to the principle of making in-lieu-payments of land when land is acquired for a public purpose. We are opposed to it when you acquire land for a post office. We do not feel that the man who had a small store or a home, whose land is taken for the building of a public building, should go to the Government and say, "You have to set me up in another store on another corner" or "You have to give me another home up the street somewhere." We are opposed to the exchange of land for any purpose. We feel that the historic, age-old method of settling these condemnation disputes by monetary consideration, inadequate as it is, is the best method that has been evolved, and we feel there should be no departure for the special interests or special privilege of forestry operation.

Now I want to say to my friend and colleague from Montana that I do not feel that any of us were criticizing the Interior Committee for not giving a full and complete hearing. I will grant that these organizations, these associations that I have enumerated, perhaps were negligent in failing to appear at the hearing. But, let me remind the gentleman that the bill as it came out of the committee was an entirely different bill than the bill that went into the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the proviso in the bill that was taken out would have protected the national parks and the national monuments, and so forth. That was what alerted these associations to the danger in the bill. Whether they were negligent or not, they should have an opportunity to be heard. They represent millions of Americans. They asked to be heard, and they should have an opportunity to present their case in opposition to this bill. That is the only point. It was not that we objected to the fact that they were not heard, it

is that now that they have asked to be heard we feel this bill should be recommitted, and they should have an opportunity to present their case to the committee.

I have introduced a bill that came out of this conference of conservationists and Congressmen interested in this proposition. That bill is H. R. 7683. Later I am going to submit some amendments taken out of that bill. I have introduced this bill simply for the purpose of showing that there was a good-faith attempt made to meet the objections the gentleman from Oregon had to our bill and the objections we had to his bill, and to get together. I feel that my bill, if it were passed in this Congress, would take care of the very proposition the gentleman from Oregon is complaining about and at the same time would protect the vital interests the people have in the national forests.

As I say, later I am going to present some amendments and describe to you what my bill would do. My bill provides that ownership shall not be transferred.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement made before the committee by a representative of the Department of Agriculture at the first hearing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

I am Howard Hopkins, the assistant chief of the Forest Service. I am authorized to speak for the Department of Agriculture but we have not gotten a statement from the Bureau of Budget as to its views on this legislation, Mr. Chairman. The amended H. R. 4646 provides that in any case and for any use where the Federal Government takes over forest land that is operated under a sustained-yield management to the extent that it will decrease the annual cut of the private owner and thence decrease his processing operations, the private owner will have the choice of either cash reimbursement or taking federally owned land with timber and growing capacity equal to reimburse him so that the annual cut will remain the same and the processing operations will be equal to what they were before the original take of the Government. Of the 461 million acres of commercial forest land the Federal Government has less than 20 percent. It has 89 million acres. But of those 89 million acres of commercial forest land of the Government, the Forest Service in the national forests has over 80 percent. The bulk of the land we are talking about which would be taken by this bill would come from our national forests.

The Department of Agriculture feels that this bill is undesirable from the public standpoint. To summarize those reasons I would like to state that first of all most of the land in the national forests which would be involved, to which this bill would apply, are also under sustained yield, with dependent processing operations and dependent payrolls, et cetera. So, it would just be a switch from one payroll, you might say, to another, without really any net benefit of the operating process which the bill is supposed to improve. In addition to that, the national forests have always tried to keep a certain number of small sales going each year with small, independent operators who would be very largely crowded out under this bill under the land that would be affected by it. Second, as you know, the national forest land is managed primarily from the standpoint of multiple use management. That is, with watershed values, recreational values, timber values, grazing values, et cetera. So in this case, land transferred from the national forests would be transferred from multiple single-use management. That is, primarily for timber production. Third, the bill provides no protection whatsoever for the land after it is transferred. That is, the ownership of the company or the corporation could change and they could destroy it completely or change the management or sell it or dispose of it. So you would change land that is dedicated in public ownership to continued good management to land under an ownership which might change in management on any day. Fourth, are the watershed management values of national forest lands which are often paramount even to the timber production. In this case the watershed values would probably not have much commercial value recognized as such and would not mean much to the individual owners receiving the lands. So they might easily be depleted very seriously. I think those watershed values might be of the greatest possible importance to the life of either nearby communities or even distant cities.

Next are the recreational values on the national forests in the way of public hunting, public fishing, camping, and picnicking which are involved. While they would probably have no commercial value recognized as such, if transferred under this law, nevertheless, they are of great value to local communities and to the public. They would probably be closed when they are transferred to private ownership and removed from public use. Also, there is little or no authority for the administrative officer in charge of the Federal land concerned, in this case the national forests, which would be the Secretary of Agriculture to either designate the area concerned or to indicate the extent of the public values which might justify and prove the desirability of keeping the land in public ownership. I know you want me to be brief. I will try to do so. I would like to give one other item. Down at the very end of this amended bill there appear the words "that such transfer is consistent with the public interest." That gives the impression that transfers which are not consistent with the public interest would not be consumated. In actual practice, as I see this bill, this section would not be used in most cases and therefore that provision is dead. That is, if it is not used. This second section where this public interest is brought in refers only to cases of condemnation. The Forest Service will not be using this bill to acquire land. It will be primarily the armed services, the Reclamation Service, the Atomic Energy Commission, or some of those outfits. According to the bill they would be the ones to negotiate with the private owner whose lands they are taking away. Let us assume, for instance, that they agree that the land they take away would cut down the production or the processing operations of the private land owner by 10 million feet per year. That might represent 100,000 acres of good timberland growing 100 board feet per acre per year. The Atomic Energy Commission or the armed services would say, "that is all right. We agree. That is fair enough." It might be fair enough from the standpoint of your bill. Then they would turn to the Forest Service and say, "Here is a plot of land of 100,000 acres which we have agreed you can transfer and should transfer over to the private owner." The bill does not leave any choice to the Department of Agriculture. It says it shall be transferred so this item of being consistent with the public interest would not come into the picture at all unless there was a condemnation and the private owner would be smart enough to realize the desirability from his standpoint of not getting into a condemnation case. So I think that section is not going to be used and therefore we should discount a great deal that last phrase which is perhaps a little sugar coating to a pill which I think is very undesirable from a public standpoint.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 13]

Adair	Ford	Meader
Allen, Calif.	Green	Merrow
Barden	Gubser	Miller, Kans.
Battle	Hagen, Calif.	Miller, N. Y.
Bowler	Haley	Morgan
Buckley	Harrison, Wyo.	Morrison
Carnahan	Hart	Moulder
Cederberg	Hoffman, Ill.	Multer
Celler	Holt	Neal
Chelf	Jackson	Passman
Chiperfield	Kearney	Powell
Clardy	Kearns	Reams
Corbett	Kee	Reece, Tenn.
Cotton	Keogh	Reed, Ill.
Coudert	Klein	Regan
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Rodino
Deane	Lovre	Taylor
Dingell	McConnell	Tollefson
Dollinger	McGregor	Velde
Durham	Mailliard	Weichel
Fine	Mason	Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LANDS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to all the debate that has been had on this bill because I am trying to find out what the shooting is all about and I cannot, for the life of me, understand what the opposition is to this bill, and I cannot, for the life of me, understand why the Forest Service should have turned its lobby loose on the Members of Congress to try and defeat this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that probably I am as disinterested in this bill as anybody in the House, because if there is any such project as a sustained operation of timber in my district, I do not know where it is and nobody has ever spoken to me about it. But, I do know that in southern Virginia and in North Carolina and in other States the lumber industry is a great industry. Our people have studied it and have come to learn something about it in recent years, and they are operating their properties on what is known as sustained yield operation; that is, a man acquires enough timberland so that he may grow timber as he cuts timber and thus keep his operation as a permanent industry in that community. There are many small

communities in the South—and I have no doubt in all of the other parts of the country—that have as their sustaining economic factor in that community a sustained production mill which produces not only timber, but produces employment, and often the only employment for the people in that vicinity. When the Government steps in, and a man has 30,000 acres of timberland under sustained production, and takes away 10,000 acres of it, it not only takes away that man's 10,000 acres—and it compensates him for it; he is not hurt, but he is put out of business, and a lot of folks are put out of business these days—but the people that are hurt are the poor workingmen who lose their jobs, because when that mill loses its sustained production those people lose their employment.

I have listened to this debate. It was indicated that this was a hurried thing, that it was brought out suddenly. It was not. The bill lay in committee for 3 months. In due course it was reported. It came to the Rules Committee. That was the first I ever knew about it. It was considered there for 2 days. It was brought here, and there were objections. It was agreed by the author of the bill that this matter could lay over the recess of Congress and the departments and the author of the bill would try to get it straightened out. They have done that.

I am sure Members want to be informed about this thing. I know most of the Members in this body, like myself, have no particular knowledge or no particular interest in this bill, yet want to do what is fair about it. That is all I am asking you to do, is to see that you do know and do what is fair about it. In order to do that, just take this little one-page bill and this little one-page supplmental report, and you will see what has happened.

The bill has been amended, and redrafted. It was approved by the Agriculture Department provided certain changes were made. Then the supplemental report was filed and an agreement was made by which certain committee amendments will be offered, probably half a dozen.

After studying this thing, I cannot for the life of me see how any reasonable person can offer any objection to this bill, and I do not think I have heard any reasonable objections to it by the gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate because I think perhaps almost without exception they have not had the opportunity to read the reports that are here on the bill and to understand exactly what this is all about.

It has been indicated here, for instance, that the lumber owners want something from the Government. Understand this: The private owners of timberlands are only asking one thing from the Government, and that is, "Leave us alone. Let us make our living and let us give employment to the people in our vicinity." That is all they ask. But if the Government has to have that property they say to the Government, "All right, take it if you have to take it, but don't put us out of business. Give us some similar land, not acre for acre but value for value. Give us similar land that the Government owns in our vicinity." What could be fairer than that?

I hope you gentlemen will consider this matter seriously before you just turn this bill down on the theory that somebody is asking something from the Government. Nobody is asking anything from the Government but to be left alone to attend to their business.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Does the gentleman know of any other interest where public property can be condemned for private purposes? That is the part that concerns me. Under this legislation, when private property is condemned for a public purpose the Government does not have the choice but the owner of the private property has a choice of requiring condemnation of public property for private purposes. I wonder if there is any example the gentleman can think of.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think the gentleman is under a misapprehension about it. In the first place, the owner does not even have the right to ask this because the bill itself in these amendments that will be offered says it shall be done only when it is in the public interest.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. With reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Ohio, is it not a fact that under the present law the Army engineers are authorized to transfer any lands it may have when it condemns certain lands for the purposes included in this bill?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to call to the attention of my distinguished friend that what this bill is trying to do is already incorporated in a law. Let me read it to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well if it is in the law, then the gentleman should not have any complaint about the bill, and it will not do any harm. These people who own this property are being put out of business. I think business is so bad in this country, and my friends on the right as well as my friends on the left have all been crying so much about helping business. I think we should help business, but let us not put them out of business.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman has had so much time but I yield nevertheless.

Mr. GAVIN. Public Law 294 which was enacted in 1944 states, "An act to promote sustained yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment and taxable forest wealth." Or, in other words, if there was a spot where there was a corporation or company that needed timber for a sustained yield to continue to operate, there is not any question but what the Forest Service could lease certain land necessary to continue the sustained yield. Here is your law. Now you want an exchange—you want the land.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further. The gentleman is going on the assumption that we can get along with the Forest Service. I have had a great deal of trouble in getting along with them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are 1 or 2 things that should be said regarding this bill before the matter comes to a vote. I believe the House should understand when we speak of the Forest Service of the United States we are talking of a tremendous institution. Do you realize that the United States Forest Service has jurisdiction over 10 percent of the entire land mass of the continental United States?

To give you an idea of the extent of this rather enormous bureaucracy, the land under the control of the United States Forest Service is equal in area to some 3 times the size of the United Kingdom which includes England, Scotland, Wales and the 6 counties of Ireland. That is a great deal of land. My friends it is not going to be ruined or disturbed if a few communities, after they have complied with the very rigorous restrictions contained in this bill to protect the public interests, come under this legislation. If these provisions are complied with, I do not think anything but public good and great good at that can come from the protection of these industries who qualify under this bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Under the amendments which the committee, will offer, and which I understand the committee has approved, does not the first amendment on page 2, as pointed out in the supplemental report, by excluding from the bill the national parks and other areas meet the objection which is being made to the original legislation by these various conservation groups?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. May I point out to the gentleman from New York that in the beginning I thought that that amendment would meet any and all objections because most objections came from the National Parks Association people, the Wilderness Society and some of these other societies. Now, apparently, the objection is to the idea of transferring any land at all controlled by the Forest Service, where you cannot build a fire unless you have a permit. The objection seems to be to the transfer of any land at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri) there were—ayes 117, noes 52.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for the exchange of certain public and private lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4646, with Mr. O'KONSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] is recognized for 45 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 4646 has as its general purpose preventing Federal land acquisition from interfering with sustained-yield timber operations. During the last session, on July 27, 1953, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported H. R. 4646, with certain amendments recommended.

At the hearing on this legislation before the Rules Committee last session, several Members appeared to voice objections to the wording of the bill as reported.

In view of the fact that several objectors felt time should be given them for the consideration and preparation of amendments to the bill which would remove their objections, it seemed advisable to delay final consideration of the bill until this session. Accordingly, with the approval of the leadership and the Rules Committee, the rule was not called up before adjournment; this was done with the understanding of both the sponsor and the objectors that amending legislation would be mutually developed during the interim.

At a hearing before the House Public Lands Subcommittee on February 1, 1954, the sponsor of the bill [Mr. ELLSWORTH] advised subcommittee members that, first, he had conferred during the recess with several objecting Members, with officials of the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service, and had then prepared an amendment to the bill initially reported to the House.

EXPLANATION OF THE PURPOSE OF THE BILL

With the understanding that amendments to the bill as originally reported will be offered, I shall only outline the general purpose and proposed operation of this legislation.

H. R. 4646, with its proposed amendments, would make it possible, under certain circumstances spelled out in the bill, for an owner of timberlands being managed and operated on a sustained-yield basis to be reimbursed in kind by the transfer of federally owned timberlands to him when the United States takes over his land for public use.

For many years—at least 50—it has been the policy of Congress to encourage development of our vast timber resources, and to insist upon good forestry practices; it has been the policy to discourage some of the earlier cut-out-and-get-out practices that prevailed in the past.

Toward this end the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, through the Forest Service, and Forestry Division of the Bureau of Land Management, have programed carefully development of timber areas on a sustained-yield unit basis; this system provides for replacement of cut timber with seedlings in such a manner as to establish a cycle permitting continuous operation accompanied by continuous replacement.

Close working partners of this Federal program for many years have been our hundreds and thousands of private timber operators, and other non-Federal owners of timberlands.

The problem, as presented to our committee, can be reduced to this:

To efficiently produce wood requires carefully planned and executed long-range forestry programs—silvaculture is the word, I believe, the professional foresters' use.

We have encouraged, over the years, private capital to interest itself in utilizing our vast forest resources on sustained-yield unit operation.

With billions of dollars invested, these hundreds of private and non-Federal timber operations and their employees are today pretty much anchored to fixed localities. Sustained yield timber operation demands that.

You build a plant, attract people to work in it; logging camps, logging towns, spring up; towns cluster around the manufacturing areas, the tree farm areas, and the logging areas.

Now, the departments of the Federal Government have the right—by acts of this Congress—to condemn land for various purposes: for military bases, for critical industries, for dam sites, roads, schools, highways, powerlines, various experimental tracts—for a multitude of purposes.

In the past 10- or 12-year period, approximately 35 million acres of land have been acquired by condemnation; perhaps more, since it takes the departments a long time—we have found in our committee—to total up those things.

A lot of those acres were in forests; that part of the forest land condemned was not considered as forest as such; it was taken for some other purpose.

When those lands go, that part of the economy which depends on sustained-yield timber operation to employ its people, to pay its taxes, to keep going—suffers proportionately.

The purpose of this bill is to prevent Federal lands acquisition from interfering with sustained-yield timber operations; if enacted into law, H. R. 4646 would allow these industries to continue operations by permitting the exchange of federally owned lands in the same community area for the private lands taken by the Federal Government.

Its enactment would not require any additional expenditure by the United States.

The Departments of Interior and Agriculture worked with the committee and the sponsor in developing this bill. The reports of those agencies are included in our report and supplemental report to the Speaker. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of the Interior report to our committee; Budget was unable to advise as to the relationship of this legislation to the program of the President.

We do not have many of those kind of operations in Montana, we do not have them very often in the Northern States or in the Eastern States. This bill is particularly concerned with the Southern States, especially where the pulp industry and similar industries are set up with a community around them, to carry on an operation that would be continuous over the years and not have a hit-and-go proposition, leaving the community stranded.

Here is a bill that has been written with the intent and the purpose of sustaining the economic life of small communities. It will not harm any of the national parks, monuments, or similar areas. Here is an opportunity, I think, to do a service for those communities in the South where they have established themselves around a timber operation on a long time sustained yield basis.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. As I understand it, the bill would only apply where there where like lands in that neighborhood; is that correct?

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. "Neighborhood" is not the technical word used. It is "community." What would the gentleman construe the word "community" as meaning? In other words, put it in the matter of miles.

Mr. D'EWART. It would be hard to put it in miles. It is more a question of transportation. If you set up a pulp mill or sawmill operation it is a question of how far you can transport the timber economically to that community to process. It is not a question of miles; it is a question of transportation.

Mr. COLMER. Then it is conceivable that this could apply in a radius of 100 miles?

Mr. D'EWART. I do not know of any place where they are transporting logs that far.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I believe the language speaks for itself. The language in the bill is "in the same community area" which I believe is pretty clear in referring to the immediate vicinity of the processing operation, which would preclude any operation of a thousand miles.

Mr. COLMER. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Oregon, the author of the bill, what his definition would be then of how far they could go? That is still pretty general. You are talking about a community area. Would it be considered feasible or practical to go 100 miles?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. It might in some communities or in some regions, but it would have to be determined by the agency having jurisdiction over the lands concerned. It would be easy for the Forest Service to say, "No, the lands that are suggested to be exchanged are not considered by us to be in the community area where there might be the request for the transfer."

Mr. COLMER. Then I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to this fact: I recall on one occasion when it was considered feasible and economical for the lumber people in the State of Mississippi, my State, to transport redwood timber from the gentleman's State of Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That, I might say, was the very reason why the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, when this bill was under consideration in committee, added the words "in the community area," because that very point was raised that the gentleman is now making. That language was inserted in the bill in the committee amendment for that purpose, putting it in the same community area, which would preclude any such operation as described by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. If I may say one other thing, the thing that really concerns me about this matter—and, of course, I am a private enterpriser—but the thing that concerns me about it is the possible abuse in the administration of it. I do not want to see anything opened up here whereby we might get the wrong kind of administrator in there that will go a long way toward destroying our national forests.

Mr. D'EWART. I would like to say in answer to that, before any of this trading can be done, there must be a public hearing, and it must be found to be in the public interest, and it must be approved by the Secretary.

Mr. COLMER. Who is going to determine what is in the public interest?

Mr. D'EWART. The Secretary.

Mr. COLMER. The Secretary?

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. Well, I get back to my point: It is conceivable that you might have some bad administration there.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I might say, in further discussion of that point, and it is an important point, I am one who believes we must pass laws that are, as Jefferson would say, binding the individuals with chains. I do not think we should pass a law because of the presence in office of some particular individual as administrator, so I am entirely in accord with the gentleman's point of view.

I believe, however, that the language of this bill so safeguards the public property that even a bad administrator would have difficulty in doing something contrary to the public interest, because anybody who seeks to have the right conferred by this bill must clearly demonstrate that he is operating a sustained-yield unit; he must clearly demonstrate that the land proposed to be taken by the Government seriously damages his business. He must show all those things before he is even eligible and even then the administrative agency can fall back and say, "No; we do not consider this is in the public interest." Of course, then the man has the right to appeal to the courts. In my opinion, whatever it is worth, I think that the bill has ample safeguards.

Mr. COLMER. If my friend will bear with me for this final observation, and I will desist, if you confine this to the area, I do not think you are going to get very far with your bill. If you confine it to that area and it is honestly administered, of course, we have a reason to believe it will be. It is not going to be very effective in very many fields.

Mr. D'EWART. When there are public hearings before action is taken, then good will and intent could be determined.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. In the gentleman's district and in my district you are familiar with the pulpwood operation where the pulpwood is cut and shipped to Wisconsin pulp mills. Now, suppose land is taken in that immediate area where the wood is being shipped to Wisconsin?

Mr. D'EWART. I would say to the gentleman, and I think he knows very well, that there is no privately owned sustained-yield unit in Montana.

Mr. METCALF. There is no sustained-yield unit under Public Law 273 in the whole United States, but according to the Forest Service there are 5 to 10 privately owned sustained-yield units on the branch of the Columbia River in Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. Not on privately owned land.

Mr. METCALF. On privately owned land; yes. I am talking about that pulpwood operation which is on privately and publicly owned land. Suppose some of the private land is taken and it is deemed to be a sustained-yield unit. Because it is shipped to Wisconsin it would be under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. D'EWART. I know of no such instance in Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I am talking about the operation up there near White Sulphur Springs where the pulp is shipped to Wisconsin.

Mr. D'EWART. There is not a sustained-yield unit in that area.

Mr. METCALF. Suppose there were one?

Mr. D'EWART. There is none. Certainly that does not involve a community, a sustained unit such as is proposed in this bill.

Mr. METCALF. The community is not hurt from it either way under the bill. I will say to the gentleman there are sustained-yield units in Montana that would come under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. D'EWART. We have one in the Libby area. It is largely Federal property. There is another large sustained-yield unit in northern California. We have a few of those in the Northern States. I know of none in my district, not a single one, and two-thirds of the State of Montana happens to be in my district.

Mr. METCALF. Most of the forest happens to be in my district.

Mr. D'EWART. We have large forests in eastern Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I concede that.

I want to bring up another point: The committee amendment says there shall be an advisory public hearing. What is the gentleman's construction of that? That seems to me to be not binding on the Department.

Mr. D'EWART. I think so. I think the final decision is left to the Secretary as to whether it is in the public interest. He can call a public hearing, and the proponents and opponents of the exchange can appear and advise the Secretary at that hearing, but the decision is left to the Secretary as to whether or not it is in the public interest. I think that is where it should be.

Mr. METCALF. I concede that. Does the gentleman think the Secretary could transfer this land without a public hearing, or does he construe the language of the amendment to mean that this advisory public hearing has to be held?

Mr. D'EWART. I would say that the public hearing should be held. There is interest on both sides and the question should be thoroughly aired before such an exchange is made.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. If I may interject at that point, there would be many instances where application would be made by an owner of land to take advantage of the provisions of this bill, which application would on the face of it be turned down. The language of that amendment was made to read "may without a public hearing" to relieve the necessity and cost of holding public hearings in those cases which were obviously not going to be granted. The Forest Service or any other agency will of course hold public hearings on any application that is apparently eligible. It was merely to save time, trouble, and expense that that provision was made permissive instead of mandatory.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The word "may" is in there instead of "shall." All you would have to do would be to say that "there shall be a public hearing before any transfer takes place." Therefore, if the transfer were turned down you would not have to have a public hearing.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That could be, but my judgment is that the language as it now reads will cause public hearings to be held in all cases where there is consideration of a transfer.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would be hesitant to speak on this matter which directly affects the people in my district, particularly the large timber landowners who stand to benefit greatly by this legislation, were I not moved by a sincere compulsion to outline the facts and figures pertaining to this proposed legislation, called by

some as the first step toward the spoliation of our great national forests, a timber reserve for this Nation.

Concisely, the problem is this: Shall we institute a Government policy of trading or swapping land needed for public use, highways, rights of way, damsites, atomic-energy centers, jet-airplane fields, military camps, and so forth, for our well developed and carefully guarded national forest lands, often many times more valuable per acre than the land to be gained by the United States. The Government now is ready and willing to pay fair prices for this land.

The big timber owners of this country are for this legislation. They say it is only fair and that they only want land for land, that it will close their sawmills unless they are given an opportunity to maintain their extensive timber holdings, but the fact is that private loggers and sawmills now cut every board foot of national forest timber.

A. Cite 34 big sales in Texas of over $5,000 each.

B. Cite 10-year contract for 273,000 cords of pulpwood.

C. Cite new contract application for 10 million board feet annual yield, at noncompetive aid.

Private millowners now cut all the timber. This bill will not grow any new trees, it will not create one board foot of timber and will but transfer the title of national forest lands to private owners.

Bill says "sustained yield"—if seriously interferes—this calls for substantial cuts every year. A small timber man does not have a sustained cut, he does not have enough trees maturing every year to cut. Sustained yield may mean stumps or cleared land in the first stages ready for planting, or it may mean 10-year-old pines, ready for thinning and pulpwood taking, or it may mean 20-year-old trees, beginning to mature. Almost any land in a big holding can fit into some stage of a sustained-yield program.

But neither small farmers nor big farmers—no farmers can qualify. No cotton farmers, no corn farmers, no vegetable growers, not a single homesteader who might have lived there 100 years can qualify. Not one small timber owner can qualify. This bill excludes everyone except large timberland owners. I cannot and be honest, fail to point this out to you as conscientious Americans, Democrat and Republican alike.

This will ruin and eliminate in every district in which it takes place the scores of small sawmills, independent loggers, and their employees of an opportunity to earn a living. They now can bid for national-forest timber under sealed bids. They got 360 in 1953 in Texas. Small loggers, some with good equipment and scores of men; some old nesters who cut pulpwood alone and hauled it out by mule. When transferred to the private owners they will be eliminated because these small operators cannot buy large tracts of land.

This bill fails to bring up a rather important point: Fabulous oil potentials. They are developing oil farther and farther up into and around these national forests and on this forest land the mineral rights are worth many millions. No protections lie in this bill for the United States. The land purchases in 1934 and 1935 provided for 25-, 30-, 40-, and 50-year reservations, at the conclusion of which times the minerals revert to the owners of the surface. It would be a splendid business program to buy land at its timber value and in addition get the oil potential forever. I do not chide these timber folks, but I do apologize for not originally appearing before the committee and bringing these facts to light. After the hearings I read the testimony and none of these facts were mentioned. This bill gives away precious rights of the American people—rights which I think American Congressmen believe should be safeguarded and preserved.

This bill transfers national forest land now operated for multiple use—maximum use of our natural resources—such as watershed protection, recreation—fishing and hunting, picnicking—grazing and timber growing to a single use, timber production. Private owners fence and post their land as they are certainly entitled to do, but with major holders owning hundreds of thousands of acres of land in my district the people will have no place to hunt, fish, camp, picnic.

There is no requirement in the bill relative to future protection, management, or production from the federally owned forest land once it is transferred to private ownership. Land dedicated to permanent good management would be transferred to land whose future management is dependent on the whim of the immediate owner.

The 658,000 acres represents fourtenths of 1 percent of the land area of Texas or 6 percent of east Texas forest lands. Ninety percent of this land was purchased from 11 large land owners in about 1934 at an average cost of $4.63 per acre after most of it had been clear-cut—no seed trees, just stumps. It was not worth any more than that then, but now it has been developed into valuable timber stands.

Taxes—a sore subject at best, but essential to our National Government and essential to the wonderful east Texas counties I represent—is another factor. The national forests pay 25 percent of their gross sales to the counties in which the land is located. Half goes to roads and half to schools. It virtually supports many an east Texas county. The forest also spends another 10 percent of the gross sales on access roads which also benefit the communities in which they are located. Taxwise the facts are:

The present average tax per acre in the 11 counties in which there is national forest land is approximately 20 cents per acre. The rate of return from the Texas national forests 25 percent refund to these same counties is more than 4 times the tax, or 88 cents per acre. September 25, 1953, the United States mailed a check to the State treasurer of Texas for pro rata payment to these counties for $575,317.89. They need it badly for schools and roads.

SUMMATION

There is no protection of the American public in this bill. It provides for "similar and suitable federally owned lands" to be exchanged. If the land is growing trees and one tract has 4-inch saplings and the other 12-inch saw logs—they are similar—both grow trees—pine trees. Any valuation should be determined by the national forest which inventory every tree and tract; the values under this bill can be fixed by negotiation or condemnation proceedings. The national forest "shall participate." I participated in a fight once with a left-handed boxer who knocked me down five times—sure I participated. The sugar coating is "An advisory public hearing may be held" to determine, first, a sustained yield; second, interference with existing processing, substantial or serious—not whether it will interfere with national forest sustained yield, research, watershed protection, recreational uses, grazing uses, special uses, fire protection, roads; third, in public interest.

Gentlemen, despite heavy political pressure to support this legislation, I cannot vote for this first step toward the destruction of our national forests and little independent sawmill operators and will recommend it be recommitted for further study and consideration.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Atlanta, Ga., February 2, 1954.

Hon. JACK B. BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: This is to advise you that I have received, through Supervisor Rasor, an application for the establishment of a sustained yield unit under the provisions of section 3 of the Sustained Yield Act of March 29, 1944. The application was signed by O. T. Dinkins, Stinson Huston, and B. H. Cauthon, Jr., as representatives of the subscribers and organizers of a new corporation for the purpose of buying and continuing the operation of the Trinity mill of Southland Paper Mills, Inc. It is proposed (1) that the sustained yield unit consist of national forest land in either the Sam Houston or Davy Crockett National Forest, or both, such as will yield 10 million feet of timber annually; (2) that the sale of this timber be made to the new corporation without competitive bidding.

The application has been received during the absence of Mr. Chas. A. Connaughton, regional forester, from this office. No immediate action on the application will be taken until Mr. Connaughton has had the opportunity to study it.

Very sincerely yours,
CHAS. A. CONNAUGHTON,
Regional Forester.
By REXIN E. PIDGEON, *Acting.*

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Even if they did bring about this exchange of land, what guaranty have you from any operator that he is going to continue to operate this particular acreage on a consistent yield basis over the next 75 or 100 years?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. None whatsoever. I thank the gentleman very much, and I will cover that in my statement.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. The present law provides that in any transfer from the Federal Government the mineral rights must be reserved. That is existing law.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. That is a splendid law. Does it also provide that the Federal Government will have the right of ingress and egress; will not have to pay damages for a right-of-way, and the slush pits and roads and other necessities for the development of oil?

Mr. D'EWART. Is the gentleman speaking of private land or public land?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. If they take the national forest and give it to somebody else, you reserve the mineral rights. Would they reserve the full rights to exploit those minerals without paying excessive damages?

Mr. D'EWART. This bill provides that the trade must be made in the public interest. The Secretary of the Interior would protect the public interest.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. This bill does not seem to provide that. It provides that an advisory group may be called together. They will discuss these three categories, whether there is a sustained yield, whether it will be materially affected, whether it is in the public interest or not. It does not point out that it may be dangerous to our national forests.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. In the event there is any controversy involved, then the final decision is left to the local courts; to the local courts. They determine what shall or shall not be done.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. It is also true that the negotiations to be made are to be made by the agency which desires control of this land. If the Corps of Engineers want to take some land, they will make the negotiations. If I am going to deal with your property, I am pretty easy to deal with; but you might, on the other hand, complain bitterly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute so that the gentleman from Oregon may reply to a question.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I just wanted to clear up a statement made by the gentleman. It is true that the language of the bill as now written does not in the first paragraph contain the term "in the public interest." But in an amendment which will be offered and undoubtedly approved, that is made one of the conditions of qualification for the transfer; that is, that the public interest shall be protected. So that that term will be in the bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill, because it strikes at the heart of the program for the preservation of our great natural resources. I am not satisfied that the time has come when we can turn those resources loose. Laws to do this must receive the greatest scrutiny and are not justified unless there is substantial and good reasons for their passage. I do not believe that this bill has been given a proper hearing. Sportsmen, conservation organizations, and others have protested to me that they did not have an opportunity to be heard on it, and I think they have a right to be heard.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I have not time to yield.

Mr. Chairman, remember that once standing timber is dissipated it takes many human lifetime generations before it can replace itself. Our forests have been ruthlessly cut over. The theory of the sustained yield is comparatively new, and it takes a long time when measured in the life of trees.

The forests, remember, are not valuable for the trees only; the forest houses our wildlife and makes possible our watersheds. The forests are not the exclusive right of timber operators, cattle grazers, and other people who use them for profit; they are part of the great natural heritage of this country; they are the property of the city dweller who seeks recreation in them. They are indispensable to the people of this country. Their value cannot be measured in today's values.

All of us have seen lands ruined for quick profits. I could show you mining lands in California ruined for all time and could show you overgrazed lands throughout the country that have been destroyed and cannot be replaced; and I caution that we go slow on legislation of this type. It must be thoroughly analyzed and all people concerned have had a chance to be heard on it. This has not been the case.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to correct the gentleman from California. He said the bill did not have a thorough hearing. I want him to listen to this.

The bill was introduced on April 13 last year. It had a hearing on June 25, July 14 and July 15. These were open public hearings, well advertised and no one was denied the opportunity of being heard. So as chairman of the full committee I resent very much the gentleman's implication that opportunity was not given, that this was sort of a secret operation that was carried out, because the record does not bear the gentleman out.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] an additional 8 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I happen to know something about the history of the acquisition of forestry lands during the depression. I supported the measure under which the Government acquired approximately 35 million acres of land. I know the reason for that acquisition.

In the first place, we had a very severe depression and a number of the timber companies were in dire straits. In the second place, we wanted to provide work under the CCC program of that time and reforest cut over lands. The Government bought this land in East Texas for approximately $3.75 an acre. It has reforested the land, and it has done a good job of reforesting. It owns large acreage in the section of the State in which I live.

In the town of Lufkin we are dependent almost wholly upon the manufacture of wood products. We have a paper mill, which employs directly and indirectly 1,500 people. We have some sawmills which employ a thousand or more people. We have very little farming. So that directly and indirectly the great majority of the people in the area in which I live depend upon the industries that are engaged in the manufacture of wood products.

In that area we have a project which has been approved by the Congress known as the McGee Bend project and the Rockland Dam project which contemplate the acquisition of several hundred thousand acres of land. At present the Government of the United States owns a sizable portion of East Texas. Under these projects which the Congress has already approved it will enlarge greatly its holdings.

It is essential to the industries in my area that they have an adequate reserve of pulp wood and of timber. It is vital to their operation. They have a reserve at present which is certainly not in excess of their needs, and in the event they expand, which we hope they will, they will need an additional reserve. It seems to me that if the Government is going to acquire additional land there is not anything unfair in permitting those industries which are dependent upon these reserves to receive in exchange for this additional land which we propose to take from them a part of that land which the Government has acquired in East Texas. These industries have a record of sustained yield and they have for many years conserved their timber.

What is wrong with that? The Federal Government already owns 24 percent of the land area of the United States. We acquired 35 million acres from 1938 to 1953 for our forestry program and 3 or 4 million additional acres for our atomic energy program.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. It is just a proposition, is it not, of giving a man land for land instead of cash for land?

Mr. DIES. What is wrong with the idea that private people ought to own land? Have we come to the time that we subscribe to the theory that the Government ought to own the land of this Nation. We already own 24 percent. How far do you propose to go? Both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party subscribe to the principle of private enterprise. There never has been a platform adopted by either party in which we have not reaffirmed our faith in the private enterprise system.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is it not also true that both parties take the attitude that the natural resources of this country basically belong to the people of our country?

Mr. DIES. No one is seeking to acquire natural resources. The Government need not lose one acre of this land if it quits acquiring land for all conceivable purposes. I grant you that sometimes those purposes are wise, but the gentleman knows that we have acquired land all over this country for sites, land that we no longer use, and they are actually giving away some of that land.

How much does this mean? Let us use a little common sense about it.

In the area where I live, in Lufkin, all of these companies have approximately 50,000 or 75,000 acres that will be taken from them by this huge reservoir of water. It will not be a drop in the bucket so far as the national forestry domain is concerned. All over the United States there will be a very small percentage of land to exchange unless you intend to move in the direction of acquiring the rest of the land of this country.

Now I will tell you this: I am not ashamed to believe in the virtue of private enterprise. I would rather have the citizens and the industries of this country own the land than to have the Government of the United States own the land. I recognize, of course, that the Government must acquire and own land for necessary and legitimate purposes. There was a time, I grant you, when the companies disregarded sound forestry practices. I remember when I was a boy and the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, [Mr. LONG] remembers the time, when the sawmills literally destroyed our timber reserves. It was a ruthless age. But, I can tell you that for the past 20 to 25 years, to my knowledge, the industries in my area have been practicing sound forestry principles. And, they have to do it. It is in their interest to do it. Unless they do, they cannot maintain their great industries, and when I say "great" I do not mean compared with the kind of industries that you have in the East because actually they are very small in comparison to what we see in New York and other areas. But, in our area they are vital to our economy and the majority of our people who must make a living. Everybody profits from it. This is not just for the benefit of a few sawmills or papermills. How much of the money that comes from timber do you suppose goes to the laboring people and the business people in my area? A sizable portion of it. They are as interested as are the industries because if the industries have an adequate reserve of timber and pulpwood it means that they are employed, and that they get a large share of the earnings.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to my very distinguished friend tell about how the Government went into Texas and developed these various areas that were complementary to the production of enterprise and employment of people.

Mr. DIES. Now, what is the gentleman's question?

Mr. GAVIN. And creating prosperity. The facts are, you do not have to take this project down there. It is a new flood control reservoir project. If it is going to jeopardize those areas and industries, it is not necessary for you to accept it. You want dams, you want reservoirs, you want to develop hydroelectric power; you want everything.

Mr. DIES. In that respect are we any different from the district that the gentleman represents?

Mr. GAVIN. So you want to take more Government land to rehabilitate and protect that which you have already developed. I just wonder where we are going to end up.

Mr. DIES. That is not the point. The point is that this Federal Government now owns 455,147,000 acres of land in the United States. You own 24 percent of the land of this country. Are we going to continue until finally we get 100 percent? If we do, then we become a socialistic economy.

Mr. GAVIN. Oh, no.

Mr. DIES. No one wants to wreck the national forestry program. The truth is this involves but a small fraction of the total acreage of our Government, and there is certainly every safeguard imaginable in this bill.

When you go into Federal court, and I have been in Federal courts representing people on the condemnation of land, I can assure you that you do not get any big bonus when you get through. You are lucky if you can get a reasonable value for your land. You have your courts to safeguard the interests of the United States. You have the Secretary of the Interior. The owners of private land condemned will not get any land in exchange unless they show that the acquisition by the Government will cripple the operation of their industries. So that here is every possible safeguard. There are some of us who pay lip service to private enterprise, but when it comes to the showdown we find every conceivable objection to any program which is designed to encourage and sustain private enterprise but not to destroy the public domain, not to diminish it, because the Government is getting land for land—the land they are going to acquire is valuable land. The owners do not want to exchange that land or to sell it. They would be happy to keep their present reserves. But to represent this as an effort by the sawmills or industry to grab public land is simply a misrepresentation. That is not true. They are trying to preserve what they now have so as to insure future operation. The people who are equally interested in this operation in my area are the working people, the merchants, the farmers, and everybody else and not alone the sawmills and paper mills. We have individuals who practice sustained yield, and I am advised that they will be eligible to relief under this bill.

Suppose I have 200 acres in the vicinity and the Government takes it, and I have been selling timber and pulp on a sustained-yield basis to the paper mills under this program, if they take my land from me, I can say, "All right, give me land of equal value in place of it." You cannot buy any more land in our country unless you pay considerably more than the courts will award you in a condemnation proceeding.

This not only protects the sawmills and the paper mills but it protects individuals who have land in the area and who have been selling their timber on a sustained-yield-unit basis.

So I would think that there is nothing vicious in this proposal or nothing unfair in it. It simply recognizes that if you are going to continue to acquire private land in the future the owner who loses his land can acquire public land under some circumstances if it is in the public interest. The man whose land is taken from him for a reservoir, which may not benefit him at all, may receive land of equal value where it is essential to the operation of an industry.

For instance, the reservoir we are going to build at McGee Bend, while it will help to some extent various sections of east Texas, will help chiefly the great industries in Jefferson County. That is fine, they need water. But the man whose land is taken may get no benefit whatever from it. All you are saying under this bill is that if you take an acre of my land you will give me back an acre if it is of equal value if I can comply with this act, and if the Secretary of the Interior finds it is in the public interest and if the court and the jury selected from among my fellow citizens find that the transaction is fair and in the interests of the country. What is wrong about that?

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

THE GOVERNMENT OWNS TOO MUCH LAND

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I favor this bill. I favor it because, like my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], I believe in private enterprise.

I favor this bill, also, because I believe that Congress sometime must take action to halt this month after month and year after year, grabbing of more and more land from private owners to place it under Government ownership and control.

Of the entire land area of the 48 States 23.89 percent is owned, controlled, managed, and administered by the Federal Government.

The total land area of these 48 States is 2,977,138 square miles. Of this, the Federal Government owns 711,166 square miles, or 455,146,725 acres. These Federal landholdings are the equivalent of more than 3 acres for every man, woman, and child in the United States. And these figures, mind you, do not include the additional enormous landholdings of the Federal Government in Alaska, Hawaii, and elsewhere outside continental United States.

Yet, despite the almost incalculable size of the present enormous landholdings of the Federal Government, the bureaucrats of the various agencies, like

Alexander the Great, constantly scheme to acquire new and additional territory.

They come before Congress with pleas that they need money to purchase additional property to "square up" the lands they now control in order to make these holdings simpler of administration. These bureaucrats always, somehow, profess they can simplify their management problems if they only can get more land under their control. They never can see that their problems would be lessened and simplified if they disgorged themselves of part of the vast empires over which they now hold dominion.

THE FEDERAL EMPIRE

The enormous size of the 711,000 square miles or more than 455 million acres of landed areas now under Federal ownership is so vast as to be beyond the capacity of the human mind to visualize or to comprehend.

The 711,000 square miles of lands now owned by the Federal Government and controlled by its bureaucrats is a domain that is 2½ times the size of Texas, or the equivalent to 10 States of Washington.

The land our Federal Government now owns in the 48 States and which our bureaucrats manage is equal to the combined total area of 11 of our Eastern States—is equal to the combined area of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, and Maryland, with the District of Columbia thrown in to boot.

MANY AGENCIES INVOLVED

More than 40 agencies are involved in the management of these enormous landholdings of the Federal Government.

For example, we have, according to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], 16 different agencies engaged in managing our federally owned timberlands.

Some may dispute the old saying that too many cooks spoil the broth, but none can deny that 16 cooks doing the job that 1 or 2 should do makes the dinner more expensive. We ought not to have 16 sets of bureaucrats from 16 different agencies when 1, 2, or 3 agencies could do the job much better, more efficiently, and at less cost.

WESTERN STATES HARD HIT

This great ownership of lands by the Federal Government works a great hardship on the Western States.

Of all the landed area of the 10 Western States more than 54 percent is in Federal ownership. In Washington State, 34.90 percent of all the land of that State is federally owned. In Oregon, 52.72 percent is owned by the Federal Government; in California, 45.74; in Arizona, 69.43; in New Mexico, 45.62; in Nevada, 84.71; in Idaho, 64.69; in Montana, 36.54; in Utah, 71.33, and Colorado, 37.35 percent is federally owned.

The opposition to this bill is making a mountain out of a molehill. There are few, very few, privately owned sustained timber units. Not any great amount of land will be affected.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. May I call to the attention of the gentleman that even though there are these big holdings, as the gentleman says, of Government land in Washington and Oregon, and these other States in the great northwest, during the last 20 years you have made most remarkable strides, more so than any of the other States in the Union have made. So it certainly has not been a detriment to you people in the Northwest that the Government has had any of this property. You refer to it as though it were a detriment and that it was holding back the development and expansion of the great Northwest. I cannot see where it has done any particular damage to any of the States in the Northwest.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Maintenance of the sustained-yield principle of logging is essential to perpetuating our timber supply. Loggers and timber owners ought to be encouraged to practice sustained-yield logging in order that we may have a perpetual timber supply. They should not be discouraged from practicing sustained yield.

This bill will encourage loggers and timber owners to practice sustained yield on their private holdings. If this bill is not enacted they will be discouraged from sustained-yield operations.

Sustained yield should be encouraged because it tends to assure a long range, perpetual supply of timber. We need great amounts of timber now and, due to our growing population, will require even more timber in the future than we now possess.

If the Federal Government takes a tract of timber away from a private logger for some public purpose it should give him other equally good nearby timber, as this bill proposes, to compensate him for the timber, the Federal Government took away from him; that is if the private owner is operating on the sustained-yield principle. If the Federal Government takes away logged land from the owner for Federal purposes then the Government should give him an equal amount of nearby logged land so that the owner may employ it for growing more timber, provided the logger has a sustained-yield operation.

This, in my opinion, is a good bill. It serves the interest of the public by assuring a long-range supply of timber. I hope the House will pass it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned over the contents of this proposed legislation. In the State of West Virginia we have two huge national forests, the Monongahela forest stretching from the Pennsylvania border almost to the borders of Ohio and Kentucky; and the George Washington National Forest, partly in Virginia and partly in the State of West Virginia.

We have been nurturing these national forests along for better than 50 years. Over those years the sportsmen of West Virginia have advanced money to the Government to buy up small tracts of individually owned land within the forest area so as to remove fire hazards and other such acivities within the national forests.

Now along comes this proposition, and I should like to say to you that West Virginia and the Appalachian area contain the greatest potential power sites of eastern United States. There are going to be flood control dams and power dams built. This issue is going to come up, when you are going to replace property you take from those power dams in the national forests. You are going to give them not only the right to cut the timber, but you are going to give them the right to the land. The first thing they will do will be to dispose of it to somebody to build a lake, and they will open up the national forests to recreation. Then you will treble and quadruple your fire hazards by letting them get into your national forests.

I sincerely hope that we will not be misled by this kind of legislation purely and simply in the interests of private capital and against public welfare.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, it has been implied here that there is not much at stake in the legislation under consideration and that it was a simple matter of fair play involved. But let me say to the House that there is a principle involved that will take more than a few hours this afternoon to resolve.

The Department of Agriculture stated it when it pointed out the bill "raises an important question of policy and precedent as to whether the Government should compensate private owners in kind, in lieu of money, for necessary Government acquisition of private property."

How can we expect to meet this question now when the House has had so little time to consider in greater detail the issue and principle involved?

Mr. Chairman, I think those of us who are opposing H. R. 4646 are sympathetic with the situation in which the large lumber organizations, which would benefit from the provisions of the legislation, find themselves. Most certainly any group suffering damage from Government work projects are entitled to redress, and I know that it is on this premise that this bill was submitted for consideration.

But it poses a considerable problem. It offers a solution only for a special group. It raises an important question of policy and precedent in a matter of Government compensation to private owners for necessary Government acquisition of private property. Few segments of our society are free from such possible Government acquisition, but in this bill consideration is given to only one group.

This is not merely my analysis of the bill; the Department of Agriculture itself, although it does not officially now express an opinion as to whether H. R. 4646 should be enacted, as late as February 10, 1954, in a communication to the Wilderness Society, stated:

The Department feels that the bill raises an important question of policy and precedent as to whether the Government should compensate private owners in kind, in lieu of

money, for necessary Government acquisition of private property. Such a question would affect several departments in addition to the Department of Agriculture, and is, we believe, a matter for congressional decision.

In considering such an important matter, the Congress should not limit its attention to a special group. What about the home owners, the filling station owners, the livestock raisers, the farmers, the businessmen, and any number of different groups who might in the future be forced to relocate because of some Government public work projects—would they not also be entitled to the same consideration as these few lumbermen? Last year, when it appeared an effort would be made to secure enactment of H. R. 4646, I pointed out its many faults in a statement which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 11, 1953. There were so many that it would take much more time than I have here today to enumerate them. Yet at that time the inference was made to the Congress that this was an unimportant bill and did not require too much of the time of the House.

I might point out that the bill since has been amended, but with all its amendments, the basic principle on which it was founded still makes it unwise legislation. After my statement appeared in the RECORD last year, I received a communication from the Honorable Lyle F. Watts, of Portland, Oreg., who from 1943 to June 30, 1952, was the chief of the United States Forest Service. Mr. Watts informed me that he had studied H. R. 4646 and prepared his own analysis, a copy of which he sent to me. Pertinent in this analysis was his contention that the bill is definitely special-privilege legislation on several counts. He outlined these counts as follows:

First. It applies only to those timber companies which are following sustained yield and operate their own manufacturing plants. Thus, the private owner who elects to sell his logs in the open market instead of operating a manufacturing plant is left out.

Second. It is a big-industry bill. Regardless of how good forestry a small owner practices, few if any of them can be said to be on sustained yield. Sustained yield requires substantially equal cuts each year. It is not feasible for a small owner to follow this practice. Thus it is a big man's bill.

Third. It gives special consideration to timberland owners. If such consideration is justified for well-managed timberland it is equally desirable for well-managed rangeland. I see no reason why it should not be as logical to apply the principle to well-managed rangeland in Wyoming, Colorado, or Arizona as to well-managed timberland in Texas, Oregon, or Montana. Certainly, if such a law passes as applied to timberland one might expect that in a few years it would be broadened to apply to rangeland. You see, well-managed rangeland, in large or small ownership, is really on sustained yield.

Fourth. If such consideration is given to owners of well-managed timber and rangeland, it should apply to such uses as dude ranches, resorts, and hunting lodges. These lands are on sustained yield.

Fifth. Thus, it seems clear that H. R. 4646 is truly a special-privilege bill. It will be made worse by broadening the present wording to include all types of land.

Mr. Watts further pointed out that H. R. 4646 gives no protection to the public as regards character and location of the lands to be selected in lieu of the private land taken by the Government. He pointed out:

First. The land-management agency whose land is taken has no voice in regard to the land selected.

Second. The area selected might well destroy a national forest management plan for a unit aimed to support a community or several small mills.

Third. There is no protection against a company so selecting land as to practically get control of a much larger area of Government timber.

Fourth. There is no protection against the selection of the entire shore line of a new, or old, reservoir and thus block higher public use such as public recreation.

Fifth. There is no protection against selection of areas critically needed as spring or winter range for big game.

Sixth. Thus, the removal of land from public ownership may well do more harm to the interest of all the people than it benefits the few.

Mr. Watts, former Chief of the United States Forest Service, definitely states that this is bad legislation, and I feel that the United States Forest Service shares his personal view. It is true that H. R. 4646 has been amended since last year, and while these amendments would seem to indicate protection for the public interests of the national forest, let me warn the Congress that they leave a big loophole, and through this loophole a few big corporations that own and operate vast acreages of timberland in the West and South can get what they have wanted all the time.

The major fault of this bill is still there. It is special-interest legislation. It has set a dangerous precedent in the management of public land under the jurisdiction of Federal Government.

The history of H. R. 4646 is a peculiar one. The bill cannot possibly benefit more than a handful of big timber operators. These are the few big operators who own lands in the way of authorized flood control, power, and irrigation reservoirs. Perhaps because they are big and can exercise influence far out of proportion to their numbers, they seek to be treated as a privileged class.

When a reservoir or other Federal project comes to a community, the little fellows who do not own enough timber to operate on what is considered a sustained-yield basis will have to sell out at a fairly appraised value. So will the farmers, the merchants, the hotel operators, the service station operators, and those whose homes are in the valley to be flooded.

But under this bill a handful of big operators, big wood-using corporations, would have a special privilege. They would be given in exchange for their lands a portion of the national forest which had been reserved to the people for a variety of important public uses.

Both the power of this little group of operators and the methods they have used in pushing this bill are alarming, Mr. Chairman.

Their persuasiveness even influenced the Department of Agriculture which yielded to their special brand of pressure and withdrew an unfavorable report on this bill, a report which honestly pointed out the faults of the bill. They effectively gagged the United States Forest Service which drafted the original unfavorable report.

The Forest Service is fully aware of the dangers inherent in this legislation. They recognize a special interest purpose, but they cannot speak up. They have their orders from the top echelon in the Department of Agriculture, which in this particular matter acts on the advice of the National Association of Lumber Manufacturers.

They were powerful enough, also, to get a favorable report on the bill from the Department of Interior. But that is not so surprising. The Department of Interior, whose policies are supposed to reflect conservation principles, is becoming noted for its tendency to look the other way when raids are mounted on national resources of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the loophole which keeps this bill a special interest device is found in the proviso for advance public hearings. In the case of a transfer of national-forest land under this administration, the Department of Agriculture or the Forest Service may hold a public hearing on the validity of the claim of sustained-yield operation, on the economic effects of the Federal acquisition, and on the question of whether or not the transfer of national-forest land to private ownership would be in the public interest. This sounds good, to be sure, but who finally decides whether or not the transfer would be in the public interest? Not the Forest Service. No; it can exercise absolutely no veto power under the provisions of this bill as amended. The final decision would be made by the land-taking agency; usually this would be the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

There is the loophole, Mr. Chairman. It is wide enough to drive a sawmill through crossways. And the word "participate" which the committee substituted for the word "cooperate" earlier in the amendment does not explain it away. That word gives the Forest Service no real authority, no veto power, not even a major voice in selecting public lands to be exchanged.

We have heard the charge made that the present national administration is inclined to cooperate with these special interest raids on our national resources. We hoped it was not true, the tidelands oil case to the contrary.

But, my colleagues, there is growing evidence that this is an administration bent on distributing our national resources to private interests. Most of the blessings are based on actions which do not come directly to the attention of Congress. They come around through

changes in policy here and there in the executive departments, in new interpretations of law, in new rulings for regulatory agencies such as the Federal Power Commission.

But, perhaps unfortunately for their causes, this little group of powerful timber operators had to come to Congress to get what they want. Mr. Chairman, if we had been awaiting evidence that special interests regard the present climate in Washington as favorable to giveaways, this is it.

The Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior, in my opinion, have yielded to a very persuasive group in this matter, but the Congress of the United States does not have to follow suit.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the dangers of this special privilege bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. ENGLE. Would the gentleman agree that where the Government can do it as a practical matter, there is no sound objection to compensating a man in kind when property is taken?

Mr. PRICE. I would say that we cannot resolve that question here this afternoon. I say I do not think we can definitely resolve that question in giving consideration to only one segment of the society. I cannot cover the full scope of that question in the few minutes allotted to me, and I do not think anybody in the House this afternoon can do so.

But I want to say that those who have opposed this bill on the floor this afternoon do not represent merely a few individual Members of Congress. There is a lot of opposition to this throughout the country.

I would like to read for the RECORD a list of organizations that are definitely opposed to this proposed legislation, and I would like to point out that these organizations are still opposed to this bill even though they are aware of the amendments which will be offered this afternoon.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I wish also to call attention to the fact that representatives of the Department of Agriculture stated that they have not discussed this matter with the Bureau of the Budget or other departments of the Government and, therefore, they thought it was appropriate to express an opinion on H. R. 4646, and as to whether it should be enacted.

Mr. PRICE. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. I do not think the Department of Agriculture is actually for this bill; and I am certain in my own mind that the people who know most about this problem in the Forestry Service are not for it.

May I point out a list of the national organizations that are opposed to it:

Wildlife Management Institute.
National Parks Association.
Izaak Walton League.
The Wilderness Society.
Emergency Commission on Natural Resources.
National Wildlife Federation.
Independent Forest Farmers Association of America.
The National Audubon Society.
The Sierra Club.
The Nature Conservancy.
The Forest Conservation Society.
The Outdoor Writers Association of America.
Numerous State wildlife federations and sportsmen's leagues.

There has been an attempt to leave the impression here that there was no interest in this legislation, that there was no real opposition to it. I want to say that throughout the State of Illinois most sportsman's leagues I know of, every wildlife federation group in the State have been in contact with me in opposition to this legislation.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Is it not true—at least it is my impression and I would like to have the gentleman speak to the point—that practically all that opposition arose as a result of its being the belief that this legislation would affect the national parks and national monuments?

Mr. PRICE. I would say to the gentleman that that first probably attracted more attention to the legislation; but as I pointed out in my remarks, these organizations are aware of the amendments that will be offered here this afternoon and are still insistent in their opposition to this legislation.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this bill, H. R. 4646.

Previous speakers have pointed out very ably the defects in this proposed legislation. I wish only to summarize briefly the principal reasons why I feel that I must oppose it.

At the outset let me say that I believe it has been demonstrated by the previous debate that this proposed legislation by its very nature can benefit directly only a relatively small number of business concerns—that handful of large operators with large enough holdings to conduct sustained-yield operations.

I hold no prejudice against the large operator, nor against the small one. Both play an important part in our Nation's economy and in the orderly harvesting of our annual timber crop. I recognize the necessity and the importance of the sustained-yield programs by private companies; and I recognize that a successful sustained yield processing operation requires vast timber holdings. In my State, our principle timber crop is the Douglas-fir, which requires an 80-year cycle. You have to own a lot of land to sustain operation of a mill by logging only one-eightieth of that land each year. But when a bill is presented for my consideration which directly benefits only a small number of the largest concerns in the business, and which does so by turning over to them a preferential right to acquire valuable national forest holdings, I must ask myself, and ask myself again, is this legislation really "in the public interest." I feel that I was elected by the voters of my State not to stand at the door and hand out our valuable forest lands to every special group that comes along and makes out a case for preferential treatment, but rather to regard our Federal timberlands as a public trust, and to keep the door tightly closed unless it is conclusively in the public interest to open it. I do not wish to see this bill or any bill become the drum major at the head of a preference parade.

Where does the public interest really lie? First, it is well-known that our national forests—and I think it is admitted on all sides that practically all of the land that will be affected by this bill will come from our national forests—our national forests are presently devoted to many uses besides timber: watershed, grazing, recreation, and so forth. There is not a line in this bill which says that the large operator who acquires valuable timber land from the national forests shall grant grazing rights, shall allow recreational use, shall conduct subsequent logging operations with due regard to water run-off and soil conservation programs. The bill transfers to the large operator the valuable mineral rights below the ground as well as the timber above it. This bill takes land which is an integral part of a multiple-use program and confines it to one use, that of timber, to the exclusion of all the others. I question whether this meets the test of "the public interest."

Not only is there no protection of the other uses of this valuable natural resource, but there is no guarantee, once the land is given to the sustained yield operator, that it will continue to be utilized as part of a sustained yield operation. We all know the vagaries of any business enterprise, especially over an eighty-year span. Once acquired, this land might be denuded of its valuable timber, or it might be sold to another for the same purpose. Bankruptcy or reorganization might ensue, and the land forever lost to careful management policies. The committee in supporting its amendments rather weakly argues that this problem might properly be taken care of administratively by merely including a reservation in the deed of transfer. I am no lawyer, but as a matter of common sense I question whether the administrative agency would have this power unless the bill specifically creates it. Furthermore, as a matter of common sense, I think this question of future control over the land is important enough that Congress should spell it out in the act, and not leave it to the uncertainties of administrative discretion.

What protection does the bill afford to the sustained-yield operation now conducted by the Forest Service? Very little, that I can see. I do not see that adding the requirement that the transfer "shall be consistent with the public interests" means very much. In one sense, no transfer would be in the public interest, for in one sense it is in the public interest to keep all of this timberland under Federal jurisdiction. I do not feel that this is what the committee

means by the inclusion of that magical phrase. But if not, then where do you draw the line as to what the words mean in terms of protecting the existing sustained-yield operations by the Forest Service? Neither the committee nor the proposed bill tells us.

Much has been said about protecting the community which depends on the existing sustained-yield processing operation. But what of the small operator, the "gyppo" logger, who depends for his livelihood on the timberland which is given away? Again, the magic words give us no satisfactory guide.

One further fact about this legislation concerns me. Traditionally, under the constitutional mandate of due compensation, the Government has always paid cash when it takes private property for public use. I recognize that in many instances, if not all, property values exist which are not adequately compensated by money alone. But in the long run our time-honored system for compensating private property owners in money has proven to be the only workable one. This system is difficult enough to administer, but our difficulties would be compounded many times over if we started a system of compensation in kind. If we pass this bill today, we can expect that tomorrow the farmers will be at the door asking for farmland, the rancher for ranchland, the miner for similar and suitable mining rights—all from Federal holdings. If today we grant this special privilege to the sustained yield timber operator, can we tomorrow say "no" to the grazing operator who demands compensation in the form of grazing land from our public holdings? Or to the duckblind owner who wants to shoot his bird on a Federal pond? We must legislate for everybody, not for the few. It seems to me that once we start on a program of compensation in kind, it would not be long before our comprehensive public holdings would be emasculated by piecemeal grants—ostensibly in the public interest.

I think this bill sacrifices the multiple uses of our national forests at the altar of a single use—timber; and I come from an area where timber is king. I believe there are inadequate safeguards for the existing sustained-yield programs of our national forests and for the interests of the small logger. I am seriously concerned that by adopting the principle of compensation in kind we will establish a cumbersome, expensive, and even dangerous precedent. I do not want to start a preference parade. I urge, therefore, that this bill be defeated. I am not satisfied that this proposed legislation truly would serve the public—and not the private—interest.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. In listening to the gentleman's remarks one might assume that everything done by the Government is good but probably everything done by private investors or private individuals is bad. I think it is pertinent to point out to the gentleman that the national forests are not being managed on a sustained yield basis. Only about two-thirds of the national forest area is actually under what might be called the sustained yield principle. I think it is unfair to assume that just because the land is in the ownership of the Federal Government it is being better managed than land in private hands, because the facts will not bear out that assumption.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to ask the question of any member of the committee who may choose to answer it for me. That is in relation to severance damages which is often part of the taking of land by the Government and the settlement therefor. What is the interpretation in this bill in relation to allowing severance damage on properties which are to be a part of the transaction under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. D'EWART. In answer to the question, the committee consulted with attorneys for the Department of Agriculture and attorneys for the Department of the Interior and we were informed that by using the phrase pro tanto, as shown on page 3, line 6, that would preclude severance damage.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. May I make further answer and say that the trading of land as set forth in the bill, under the protection as given in the bill, actually saves the Government money, because if industry in a community is ruined by the fact that the Government must of necessity take the bulk of the acreage of timber land from the industry, of course, severance damages which the gentleman refers to must be paid for in cash by the Government. That is a direct cost, a direct loss to the taxpayers of the country, whereas a simple exchange costs the Government nothing in the way of severance damages. I think that is a further excellent argument in favor of this legislation.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill and I do so because of one fact. I believe that the gentleman who sponsored this legislation has done so with a very proper motive and in what he considers the best interests of the people whom he represents. However, I must disagree with him because I can find nowhere in our history where there has been such an exception made to the general condemnation rule. As you know, if the Federal Government condemns property, the general rule is that an amount of money is paid in damages.

I am afraid that the bill is making an exception not just for the timber industry, but only for a small group. And, I wish you would all note that everyone who has spoken in support of this bill has been very strong in specifying to the Members of the House that there are only a few people in this country or a few businesses that would be benefited by this bill, and therefore I do not believe that an exception to the rule, which would allow not just people engaged in the timber business, but that small group engaged in the timber business who are on a sustained-yield basis, who have a special privilege of being allowed to take from the national forests the acreage to replace the land taken by condemnation, is good.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. In answer to the point the gentleman just made, one public good to rise from this legislation is an incentive for more sustained-yield operation on private land. As I said earlier in the debate today, the greatest defect, the greatest danger to the wood supply of our Nation in the long run is the cut-and-run practice of private enterprise. If we can bring a few more people in so that they can qualify under this bill, the practice under sustained-yield will make progress.

I would like to give a citation about this being the first instance of giving something in kind, trading land in kind, and condemnation. I refer the gentleman to the act of June 20, 1938—52d United States Statutes at Large, page 804; title 33, United States Code Annotated, section 558b—and the act of August 11, 1939—53d United States Statutes at Large, page 1414; United States Code, section 558–1:

> These measures empower the Department of the Army, whenever appropriate in connection with any civil-works projects, to exchange Government-owned lands for privately owned lands. Furthermore, it has been long standing practice for the Federal forestry agencies to exchange Federal for private lands (or timber) and millions of acres have to date been involved in these transactions.

In the last 10 years the Forest Service has deeded over 500,000 acres.

Mr. SAYLOR. I will concede that the gentleman is correct. There has been a practice of exchanging public land for private lands, but in those cases, I believe without exception, you will find out they were trying to do what has been referred to of straightening out the various leases of the national forests. It has not been the general practice to exchange lands indiscriminately such as this bill proposes.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. There has been the further theory, with which I do not quarrel too much, that they bring in cut-over land and put it under forest management in such areas. In some cases it is a benign practice, but it is a destructive practice in the long run, I think.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Does not the gentleman believe it is true that it is simply for consolidation at the request of the National Forest Service and in agreement with the particular owners that they have made these exchanges of land, to straighten out lines and consolidate the holdings, and with the full agreement from the inception of the National Forest Service, not by agreement with some other agency of the Government which disposes of their land but by discussing it with them?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I think the record ought to be straight on this swapping business. The Forest Service has followed a policy for years of swapping cutting rights on national forests for the fee title on private lands, which has shoved out the boundaries of the national forests in the West, and in my State has been one of those factors which has added almost 7 percent of the total ownership of our State to the Federal Government in the last few years. It went from 40 percent to something like 47 percent in the last few years.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. In further comment, may I say that I happen to be a member of a Senate-House joint committee appointed for the purpose of approving trades between the Forest Service and private owners. We do it continuously when we find it in the public interest. It is also for acquiring lands in and outside the forests in order not to lock up these areas.

I call the gentleman's attention to the bill we reported out of our committee, and which he supported, that had as its objective the trading of timberlands in Glacier National Park for other lands outside of Glacier National Park. I think it was good legislation. I think the gentleman believes it was good legislation. I think the State of Montana and the National Park Service both benefited by that trade. It was done with the approval of Congress.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. There was a specific trade specified in that act. I still think that was a good piece of legislation.

May I ask the author of the bill just one question, since it has been specified that if this bill is not enacted there might be some companies that might go out of business. I have not heard yet any one business specified.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I will be glad to give the gentleman the names of several companies that I happen to have here in my file. I am doubtful whether I should reveal the business secrets of these people. I will be glad to furnish their names privately to the gentleman, but I think as a matter of public record it would not be a fair thing to do.

Mr. SAYLOR. There is one other thing I should like to ask the author of the bill. Since he knows these, and the word "locality" has been used and has not been defined, would he be willing to have an amendment offered which would define "locality" in this bill?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I cannot see any objection, depending of course on the wording the gentleman has in mind. The intent of the bill very clearly is to confine the application to the community area as stated in the language, so anything that would clarify that certainly would meet no objection on my part.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, let us not forget we are dealing with multiple-purpose forest land, land that is not only useful and valuable for timber production, but land which is valuable for watershed protection, recreation, mining, grazing and other services. Now we are going to exchange the ownership of the land and give the timber operators control over recreation, we are going to give them the mineral rights under the land, and we are going to adversely affect the grazing interests involved. Let us not forget also that we are dealing with a very small portion of the people—5 to 10 in Montana. According to the Forest Service, we have 47 working units in that same area, 47 forestry sustained-yield programs that are operating which, according to the testimony of the representative of the Department of Agriculture that I put in the RECORD earlier today, the supervisor of national forests is keeping a certain number of small sales going each year to small, independent operators who would be largely crowded out under this bill under the land that would be affected by it. So the proposition boils down to this. We are going to let the big operators, 5 or 10 of them in my district, take over the land to the detriment of the 47 working units, consisting of 8 to 12 small independent operators—maybe 400 or 500 small, independents who will be adversely affected. We are not going to have a single additional board-foot of timber. If the gentleman's bill could add any timber, it would be all right. But we are going to flood this land which is going to be taken—we are going to build airfields on it or radar stations or what not. We are not adding a single thing to that community's timber supply. The only thing is that we are taking the timber from the small, independent operators and giving it to the big sustained-yield operators. Do not forget that.

I have in my hand two of the programs for the working units that are in operation in the northwestern part of my State. There are 55 pages here. They contain a program for the development of recreation and a program for the development of watershed control. They contain a couple of pages telling how water will be protected. I ask the gentleman from Oregon or anyone else, tomorrow when I submit an amendment on ownership, to explain to me where any of these private owners have such a program for recreation and for grazing and for any of these other multiple uses. Where do they have a 55-page plan for the development of other uses outside of the purely timber uses of the national forest?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I have given very careful study to this legislation. I cannot find anything in it that justifies the apprehension which has been stated here on the floor. I certainly would not want to be party to any bill which would turn over a vast area of the public domain of this country for the private benefit and use of any particular lumber operators. I am sure that is not what is occurring in this instance.

Let us take a specific case and examine it and see how this legislation would operate. Let us assume that you have a timber operation which permits you to cut a million board-feet a year in perpetuity on a sustained-yield basis. It may take as much as 100 or 200 acres of forest in order to do that. You have set up your operation with your mill. You have employed your men. You have built your little community dependent upon the operation of that lumbering enterprise.

Now along comes the Federal Government and builds a great water project and floods out one-third of your timber area. They will give you cash for it. Under the rules of condemnation they will condemn it if necessary, if a price cannot be agreed upon, and they will give you cash for it.

Some people may say, "Well, why do you not take that cash and go and buy yourself other timber in order to keep your mill operating, in order not to tear up this little community and throw all of those people out of employment?"

It just happens that you cannot always get hold of timber that is located to suit your needs, and so you are faced with this proposition that you are going to have to cut out and get out. You are going to have to run your mill, clean up your timber, and move out of the area; wipe out that little community and wipe out the employment. If some way is not found under these circumstances to continue a sustained yield operation of that mill, we defeat one of the policies which has constantly, over the years, had the endorsement of this Congress.

So what do we say in this legislation? We say, under those circumstances where it is practical, where it is in the public interest, that the agencies involved will endeavor to trade you timber to take the place of the timber that is being taken over by the Federal Government. In other words, instead of reaching into the Treasury and taking out cash and giving you cash for your timber, the Federal Government says, "We have a great backlog of timber, and because of the community interest and because of the interest generally in maintaining these sustained-yield units, we are prepared to try to find some other timber so that your sustained-yield unit can continue to operate, so that employment can continue for that little community which has been based upon that lumber enterprise." That is all it means.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. In just a minute. This bill is not mandatory. It does not require any Federal agency to hand any lumber operator a piece of property simply because he is flooded out. What this bill says is that where it is practical and where it is in the public interest they shall do it. This bill is a policy direction to administrators and it is a permissive piece of legislation, which would permit this to occur where it is practical and where it is in the public interest.

I just cannot see how my friends, especially on my side of the aisle, have gotten themselves so concerned over this

piece of legislation. We have fought for sustained yield in the West for years. In the country which I represent, 700 miles of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, we have ghost towns because lumber operators moved in, cut out, and got out. We do not like that kind of operation. We like operations that cut on a sustaining-yield basis, so that the community economy is protected. This bill moves in that direction, and it only moves in that direction in the public interest. So I see none of the dangers which my friends have referred to, and I have great respect for their opinions. Nevertheless, I am supporting this legislation because it supports a basic premise of good forestry practice; namely, sustained yield. It does that only on a practical basis, and only in the public interest. This is permissive legislation, not directive legislation; and it will be administered, I am sure, in the public interest.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. What is to prevent a man from whom private land is taken from going in and bidding competitively against other operators for the land that is left?

Mr. ENGLE. There is nothing to prevent it except the other bidders, and except for the fact that the timber is not always put up in just such a way that an operator can get hold of it. You must remember this: If you are sitting there with a mill and if you have your sustained-mill operation practically cut in two by a reservoir, the fellow who comes in and makes a bid against you knows that you are in the field of desperation bidding. What is there unfair about saying to a man, "Yes, we are taking one-third of your land, but we will give you timber for your timber"? What is wrong with that?

Mr. METCALF. Someone is going to be damaged. What is wrong in asking whether we are going to protect the little fellow as well as the big fellow in trying to pay monetary compensation for the damage when we take property from private individuals?

Mr. ENGLE. I would remind the gentleman, though, that there is plenty of timber to take care of the small operators anyway. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] pointed that out.

Mr. METCALF. If there is plenty of timber, then there is not anything to complain about, because the big operator and the little operator can come in and bid competitively, and the Government will benefit thereby.

Mr. ENGLE. There is plenty of timber in the national forests when you can get your hands on it, yes; that is what I am talking about. But why make these fellows scramble for it? And at a disadvantage?

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I referred some time ago to these exchanges which occurred between operators and the Department of Agriculture. Could the needs of this bill be accomplished now by contract between the operators and the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ENGLE. I cannot tell whether it be on an equal basis; in other words they might have to appropriate and also give cutting rights in the national forests.

Mr. SAYLOR. If they can do that can they not accomplish the same thing without this legislation?

Mr. ENGLE. They probably could; yes. But what's wrong with this legislation? There would be objection to turning over cutting rights in the national forests, too. This legislation simply involves swapping land for land, where it is practical and in the national interest. Why not make a clean deal of it as this legislation proposes?

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, because of the high personal regard I hold for the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], I wish to make this statement concerning H. R. 4646.

Early last fall I spoke at the Rotary Club in my own city, Toledo, Ohio. During the question period which followed the talk, Mr. George Shepard, a member of the club, asked me to state whether or not this bill would endanger the national parks. I told him that I uderstood there was a provision which excluded national parks, national monuments, wildlife areas, and wildlife refuges from the exchange provision provided for in this bill. It was my understanding then that H. R. 4646 included these provisions, as the bill did in its original form. This was before it had been amended to make it possible to take away from the people of this country part of their national parks and national forests.

The bill that is before the House now strikes out, among other things, the following words on page 2 of the bill, lines 1, 2, and 3:

Provided, That such exchange shall not include lands within the boundaries of national parks, national monuments, wilderness areas, or wildlife refuges.

Mr. Chairman, although this provision has been put back into the bill under pressure of opposition, I still see a definite danger in the bill. Every citizen of every State has an inalienable right and a definite interest in the national parks, national monuments, wilderness areas and wildlife refuges of our country.

I do not know what the reasons were that motivated the proponents of this bill in amending the original bill in order to take out this protective proviso or the causes which put it back in a modified form. But if this bill should become law in its present form it would be an opening wedge, or perhaps more realistically, the first blow or the axe and cut of the saw into the national parks and other preserves of the country. I think I can almost hear the voices of President Theodore Roosevelt and of his friend, the great conservationist, Gifford Pinchot, as they would cry out against the beginning of what they would term it, as I do, a desecration and spoliation of the forests in our national parks.

May I also quote from President Eisenhower's message to Congress, July 31, 1953, when he said:

In the utilization of these lands, the people are entitled to expect that their timber, minerals, streams and water supply, wildlife and recreational values should be safeguarded.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'KONSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for the exchange of certain public and private lands, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONSIDERATION OF TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL ON THURSDAY

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday next for the House to consider the bill H. R. 7893, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, under the general rules of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, when this request was previously submitted objection was made; but the gentleman who made the objection has told me since that it was perfectly satisfactory to him to have the bill come up on Thursday. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ELEVEN O'CLOCK MEETING ON THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ENGLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

PAGE BOY ACADEMY

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a con-

current resolution which I trust will have the careful and serious consideration of every Member of this great deliberative body. It is long past due in this age of rising child delinquency which has become so prevalent all over these United States.

My bill would create a Page Boy Academy for the housing of our 50 page boys, the 20 boys in the United States Senate and also the 4 boys acting in that capacity in the United States Supreme Court.

The naming of page boys comes under the patronage system—hence they may come from the 48 States—far and near. The maximum age limit of a page boy is 18 years and the minimum age is 14. The average age is between 15 and 16 years. Do you think that a boy between those ages—15 and 16—has reached years of discretion?

These boys, regardless of the age bracket they are in, have a take-home pay check of $240 per month. Do you think a boy, away from home, and on his own, is capable of handling this amount of money without any supervision?

I am told that about 25 percent of our boys live with their parents, relatives, or friends. Seventy-five percent of them are on their own. As a parent living in any one of the 48 States, would you want your boy—or girl maybe—at such a tender age, living down here alone, and with absolutely no supervision? Every Member of this House must know that the Nation's Capital has a reputation for lawlessness and which just now is being seriously attacked as it affects juveniles.

Because I have worked with youth over the greater part of my life, I have been particularly mindful of our page boys. I am sure they all come from fine families, and I am also sure that every Member of Congress has an obligation to see that they are just as fine when they leave our employ.

I have made it my business to talk with these boys and to observe their habits. One needs only to go to the cloakroom to find them eating snacks—usually ice cream, candy, and pastry, which, of course, dulls the appetite for regular and well-balanced substantial meals and does not make for good physical development. Over a period of months they have developed sallow complexions and probably a feeling of listlessness.

During the time I have been a Member of Congress I have lived in close proximity to the Capitol, and have observed many of the boys living in this neighborhood—not likely in those homes which are being restored—but in those old dilapidated houses which do not attract people of culture and discretion.

I am also aware that our boys have to walk less than a block from their work where they are free and able to purchase all kinds of filthy, obscene, and indecent literature. Can you not imagine what this could do to a boy who reads it alone in his room or, even still worse, with a group of boys?

Boys of 14 or 15 are neither mentally nor physically matured, and, in my opinion, every Member of this House is, to some extent, responsible for their well-being.

My bill would provide adequate quarters for these page boys, with a superintendent in charge, and a complete housekeeping staff, which would be responsible for their supervision as regards proper food, adequate hours of sleep, supervised recreation, and sufficient application to their school work. They are financially able, and should be required, to pay all living costs, and they should not be permitted to live elsewhere unless such home is fully approved by the superintendent.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many boys of 15, without any supervision, would give thought to attending church services or attending Sunday school once a week. The boys of 15 today will be the men of tomorrow. Are we here today helping them to meet that responsibility? I am sure many of our page boys are dreaming dreams to take our places. Please give them a break by helping to prepare them for the great responsibility which lies ahead in this great country. "Let us put first things first."

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BONIN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. Americans of Lithuanian descent, all firm believers in the freedom and human dignity of man, pay tribute to their relatives and friends who have suffered so much in the cause of freedom.

The Lithuanian people have little cause to rejoice while their proud nation lies prostrate under the feet of the Communist dictators in the Kremlin. Nevertheless, more than 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent will unite today in sympathetic observance of their independence day.

Prior to February 16, 1918, Russia ruled Lithuania with an iron fist for 133 years. Notwithstanding this ruthless oppression, the burning desire for freedom was never extinguished in the hearts and minds of the Lithuanian people.

During Russia's rule from 1795 to 1918, Lithuania's culture, industry, and economy deteriorated. Their people were exploited for the benefit of the Russian nobility. Farmers were recognized as the property of the landowners. The schools, the courts, and military were completely Russified.

The rule of Russian tyranny finally terminated on February 16, 1918. On July 12, 1920, Russia entered into a solemn agreement with Lithuania renouncing forever all claims to Lithuanian territory. In addition to this solemn treaty, pacts of nonaggression and mutual assistance were entered into between Lithuania and Russia. Despite all these solemn documents the future of Lithuania was again rudely shattered by the 1939 nonaggression pact between Russia and Germany. Once again Lithuania's hopes and prayers for peace, security, and independence were sold down the river by Stalin and Hitler.

As a member of the Select Committee of the House To Investigate the Seizure and Forced Incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the U. S. S. R., I heard exiled witnesses from these nations testify to the Soviet terror of 1940 and subsequent years. These hearings brought out these salient facts.

The first attack against Lithuanian independence was made in Pravda, the official mouthpiece of the Communist Party, in Moscow, on May 28, 1940. The following day, Lithuania was presented with a menacing note from the Kremlin charging that the Lithuanian Government conspired with foreign agents to kidnap and torture two Red army soldiers in order to force them to disclose Russian military secrets. The Soviet Government refused to accept Lithuania's explanations of this incident. On June 14, 1940, an ultimatum was presented to Lithuania by the Soviet demanding the immediate formation of a new government acceptable to the Communist dictators and the admission of more troops who would occupy all strategic points of the nation. Already having had placed large numbers of Red soldiers in Lithuania, in pursuance of the mutual assistance pact, the Lithuanian Government had no alternative but submit to these demands, which it did on June 15. On this same day, the occupation of all Lithuanian territory began. On July 16, 1940, the Soviet news agency Tass announced to the world that Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia had concluded a military alliance against the Soviet Union. These announcements were absolute lies but the Soviet required such announcement to hide its forced occupation of the three Baltic nations. On June 16, Soviet ultimatums were handed to Estonia and Latvia charging them with the same offense. The following day Soviet troops entered these two countries. Soviet officials also entered these small nations to take over their internal affairs. Disturbances were created, prisoners released from jails, men and women were arrested by the NKVD. New government officials, acceptable to the Soviet, were appointed. The so-called new government at once demanded the dissolution of the independent government and a decree was issued announcing new elections for the sovietized government. These elections were illegally organized to cover up all the deceit and hypocrisy of the Soviet Government. Only candidates selected by the new dictators could stand for election. Candidates of the old political parties were branded enemies of the people and were disqualified. On July 14 and 15 the fake elections took place. The results of these elections were announced in Moscow before the polling places closed. Under these circumstances, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia became subjects of the U. S. S. R.

The diplomatic representatives of Lithuania reported these facts to the governments to which they were accredited. The free nations of the world were not misled by Soviet activities, and, consequently, the United States has refused

to this day to give international recognition to the Communists' acts of aggression and violence in Lithuania.

During the first occupation of Lithuania in 1940 by the Soviet authorities, they proceeded to destroy the political, economic, and cultural life of the nation. The leaders of independent Lithuania were deported to concentration camps in Siberia. Thousands upon thousands of Lithuanian citizens were murdered by the Red troops. Women and children were arrested and deported. The industrial and agricultural life of Lithuania was nationalized without compensation to the rightful owners. The religious and cultural life of the country was ruthlessly attacked by the Soviet overlords.

We learned that during the second occupation of Lithuania—September 1944 to date—the Soviets began a systematic liquidation of all western order and culture. The agricultural system was collectivized, industry reformed, to serve the needs of the Soviet, the standard of living reduced to that of the Soviet slave. The free farmer became a slave of the State on a huge collectivized farm. The Soviet bosses turned back the pages of history 150 years. People who were reluctant to accept the new order were deported to the salt mines. The indoctrination of communism began in earnest in the schools, universities, farms, and factories, and the persecution of the Christian Church continues at a ruthless pace.

"Religion is opium for the people," the phrase coined by Karl Marx, is the doctrine of the Soviet education authorities. Belief in God is the archenemy of Communist thought. Religious faith is condemned as a relic of class society, deeply rooted in the peoples' minds, weakening the workers and encouraging in them an attitude of abject humility. The Soviets have a strict antireligious attitude, based on militant atheism. In Lithuania, religion is prohibited in the schools and may not be taught in the privacy of the home.

According to the Soviet code of moral conduct, everything that contributes to the victory of communism, irrespective of methods used, must be considered moral. Thus, there is no harm in lies, deceit, robbery, chicanery, or even murder so long as they serve the interests of communism. Socialist vigilance, regardless of ties of blood or friendship, is taught in all schools.

This summary is but a small part of the suffering and agony of the Baltic nations. I am happy that the Congress of the United States saw fit to expose the criminality of the Soviet dictators. The magazine America in its February 6, 1954, issue carried the following article:

During last December the select committee of the House to investigate the seizure and forced incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the U. S. S. R., of which Representative CHARLES J. KERSTEN is chairman, heard exiles from the Baltic nations in Washington, Detroit, New York and Chicago. The sworn testimony of 41 eyewitnesses of the Soviet terror of 1940 adds up to the most damning indictment of Soviet chicanery we have read to date. The Moscow New Times for August 12, 1953 had scoffed at the Kersten inquiry as a waste of money, since everyone knows that the Baltic States voluntarily asked to join the Soviet Union. The impressive procession of eyewitnesses disclosed a different picture. So do the valuable and revealing exhibits of treaties, military, death and deportation orders entered into the record. The record contains the testimony of a Catholic bishop, a prime minister, a defense minister, a commander in chief, a minister of education, Catholic and Lutheran clergymen, and teaching nuns. The brother of Antonas Snieckus, top Lithuanian Communist, testified. So did two survivors of the Cervene Forest Massacre. Besides Congressman KERSTEN, the rest of the committee (Representatives BENTLEY, BUSBEY, BONIN, MADDEN, MACHROWICZ, and DODD) have opened the way to a new method of historical research from which Americans may get an authentic understanding of the mentality and methods of Red conspirators. We hope that the select committee continues its hearings. Meanwhile, the testimony at hand, as engrossing as it is gruesome, should be edited for early publication.

I am pleased to have a small part in this 36th annual celebration of Lithuanian independence. The Lithuanian people have the sympathy and prayers of the American people. Eventually all the people behind the Iron Curtain will regain their freedom and independence. The process may be slow and painful but so long as there is faith in God, Lithuania will again take its rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BONIN], deserves much commendation and praise for having reserved an hour today to emphasize and observe in the House, Lithuania's remarkable history and present plight. His complete devotion to this subject is evident throughout the fine address Mr. BONIN has just made.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the 36th anniversary of the signing of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania at Vilna on February 16, 1918. For years the anniversary of this event was an occasion for annual celebration not only in Lithuania but throughout the world. On this 36th anniversary, however, there is little cause for rejoicing.

Lithuania is no longer an independent state but a victim of Russia's aggression, and I note with profound sadness the unhappy events that have led up to Lithuania's deprivation by force of its sovereign rights in self-government and incorporation into the Soviet Union. The plight of the Lithuanians today and their fellow sufferers under the Soviet Communist heel is tragic. Compassion for their suffering is felt not only by our loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent but by all Americans.

In our efforts to sustain the hope for freedom in the minds of the people of Lithuania and her good neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, the Kersten committee, composed of Members of the House, is conducting an investigation of the full circumstances and events attending the seizure and incorporation of the three Baltic States by the U. S. S. R. It is hoped that this documentation will not only expose the pattern of human and economic enslavement by the Kremlin, but will also lead the way in restoring to Lithuania and the Baltic States the liberty, freedom, and prosperity which they deserve.

The Lithuanians have every reason to look to the United States for support and encouragement, and our Government should exhaust every means at its disposal in demanding not only the release of all imprisoned Lithuanians, but also that all peoples being held as prisoners as the result of wars and aggression be freed. It is estimated that at least 200,000 of the people of Lithuania have been put to death, were deported, imprisoned, or are today existing as enforced laborers under the cruel domination of the U. S. S. R.

Despite the record of infamous crimes committed by Soviet communism on the once peaceful shores of the Baltic Sea, Lithuania has continued to assert itself through nationalist peasant uprisings and extensive underground resistance. Even under most oppressive conditions, Lithuania has, since the 12th century, nurtured her distinct history, language, national culture, and traditions.

On the occasion of the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, I join with her sons and daughters in fervent prayer and hope that with the help of Almighty God the steadfast spirit of an unhappy people will remain unbroken, and that the day of emancipation will, one day not too distant, become a reality. When the day of deliverance is at hand, then Lithuania's independence day will be one of true rejoicing.

Mr. CARIGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, on this day, as we pause to join the Lithuanian people all over the world in celebrating the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we salute a proud people, who despite diabolical persecution down through the years, has never bowed its head to the power of evil.

Over the years America has been enriched by the culture, the industry and the fervor of those brave men and women who have been able to escape from their homeland and bring their talents to this their adopted country. Today we join them in the prayer that a brighter day will soon dawn for the friends and relatives who have suffered so grievously in the name of freedom and liberty, and that Almighty God in answer to their prayers will grant them the opportunity of seeing in their lifetime the deliverance of Lithuania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my friends of Lithuanian descent in the United States and in the free world in commemorating the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, a celebration which, so far as the homeland is concerned, can only be observed secretly in the hearts and souls of its citizens.

Everywhere in the free world, free people will continue to hope and to pray for the liberation of this great nation, and in so doing give expression of our concern and friendship for a brave and good people shackled temporarily by a godless tyrant.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 36th anniversary of the national independence of Lithuania, and the free people all over the world once again raise their voices in encouragement and sympathy to the people of that valiant democratic republic

Despite oppression and torture at the hands of Communist forces, the spirit of the once-free Lithuania continues to live and burn brightly in the hearts of her sons and daughters, both within their homeland and abroad. Occupied by totalitarian power, incorporated forcibly into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, deprived of their individual, political, economic, and religious freedoms, the people of Lithuania long for the day when their country will once again resume its rightful place in the family of free nations.

It is my hope that in this trying period of their history, the people of Lithuania will draw encouragement from the warm regard which our country has held for them. American sympathy with the Lithuanian people has been manifest in our press and in Congress, as well as in the official policy of our Government, first declared on July 23, 1940, which has refused to recognize Soviet Russia's absorption of Lithuania and has persisted in recognition of the established democratic republic.

Mr. Speaker, on this 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, I want to extend my congratulations to the people of that brave country, and to all Americans of Lithuanian ancestry. I join in their prayer that the oppression of their native land may soon be ended.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, last year in advocating the favorable consideration of the Baltic resolution I foresaw the valuable effect the operations of the committee the resolution created would have in giving to the world the true story of Communist treachery which led to the enslavement of millions of people in eastern Europe. Among these are the people of Lithuania, who today would be joyously observing the 36th anniversary as an independent nation if they could free themselves of the oppressive yoke of their Russian captors.

It is but natural that Americans of Lithuanian ancestry and the thousands of Lithuanians who came from their homeland to become the fine type of American citizens should be concerned over the fate of relatives and friends who remain in their saddened country. It is, therefore, fitting that we in Congress today join with these Lithuanian Americans in solemn observance of this anniversary and offer with them sincere and devout prayer for liberation of Lithuania and all enslaved nations.

Lithuania enjoyed its independence for only a brief span of 20 years, since the founding of a Republic on February 16, 1918, but for centuries before the Lithuanian people held to their own language, their own culture, and their own traditions. They are steeped in proud history which fortifies them in their determination never to be subjugated to the domination of the ruthless Communist aggressor, with whom they hold nothing in common.

The Lithuanian people have not and will not accept Soviet rule nor will they be bound by the Soviet system, imposed on them by force of Russian treachery and armed might on June 15, 1940, when in flagrant violation of existing treaties, the Soviet Union occupied their country.

Although occupied and ruled by the Communist aggressor Lithuania maintains its independence through the fighting heart of its people who stubbornly resist their enemy by means of an underground and often by open resistance.

The United States and the other great democracies of the West have never recognized the illegal act of Soviet aggression and the Lithuanian people and the Lithuanian legation in Washington has never recognized the puppet regime installed by the Soviet Union.

So Lithuania still lives today as an independent nation, confident that one day the oppressors will be driven from her soil and that this new Republic will take up where its progress was stopped by Communist force in 1940 and again become an exemplary nation, holding a high and honored position in the family of free nations.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE "MAINE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore entered into, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have spoken on the anniversary occasion of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor on February 15, 1898. I do not recall a year in the last four decades or more when on February 15 I have not joined my comrades of the Spanish-American War in observance of the day.

Last night it was my privilege to participate in the ceremonies at the Department of Commerce Auditorium under the auspices of the United Spanish War Veterans of the District of Columbia. Department Commander George F. Cook was the able master of ceremonies.

As usual Dr. Aurelio F. Concheso, Ambassador of Cuba, was present. He was accompanied by his full staff, a gesture of graciousness which I with others appreciated. The distinguished Ambassador spoke with eloquence and sincerity. His remarks were a contribution to the long record of affectionate relationship of Cuba and the United States.

The United States Marine Band Orchestra, Master Sgt. Paul Gogel conducting, and Miss Gretta W. Ludwig, national auxiliary soloist, furnished a fitting musical background. The Marines, the Army, and the Navy all were represented by details of their picked men.

Two hundred and sixty-six lives were lost in the destruction of the *Maine*. Spanish War veterans every year meet to pay the tribute of love to the memory of the 266 who went down with the Maine. Every year that I have been a member of the Congress on February 15, or the next legislative day if on February 15 there has been no session, I have asked and graciously have been granted 1 hour for services on the floor of the House.

Today I have a special purpose in mind. I want to bring a little sense of shame to the membership of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

This body constitutes one of the greatest bodies of patriots in America. Tonight when we attend the dinner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and look around we will see almost the entire membership of this House in attendance, veterans of one or more of the wars of our country.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that in such a body it would be an easy matter to get favorable consideration for a bill to place naval veterans of the Spanish-American War on the same basis as Army veterans. Such has not proved to be the case.

I introduced a bill, H. R. 4490, in the first session of the 83d Congress. No one paid any attention to the bill. The subcommittee threw it in the wastebasket or whatever subcommittees do with bills that come along on their own merits and without benefit of high-pressuring. I did not have an opportunity to speak in behalf of the bill, so I wrote a letter to the members of the subcommittee. One member responded. He thought it was a good bill. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has been tops in my book ever since. As far as I know he was the only member of the subcommittee who was interested.

Mr. Speaker, February 15 is set aside to pay homage to the memory of the 266 men who died with the *Maine*. They belonged to the Navy. I can conceive of no more appropriate place and time than this and now to urge a complete change-about in the attitude toward a bill, the sole purpose of which is to place individuals who served in the Navy in the war with Spain on the same footing as those who served in the Army.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, unless the gentleman desires to proceed a little further? I

would interrupt at a later stage if he so desires.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. I would like to put in one more remark here, then I trust that the gentleman from Connecticut will come down here and read in full the remarkable article on the Spanish-American War which he showed me earlier in the day.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to congratulate my dear friend from Illinois who is now addressing the House. He is not only one of the most able but one of the sweetest and most lovable Members of this body. I know that the Spanish-American War veterans, their relatives, and their families throughout the country will deeply appreciate the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] this afternoon. Well has he said that the Spanish-American War was one of the most important events in the history of our country and that the sinking of the *Maine* which precipitated the Spanish-American War was of great importance in connection with the events that flowed therefrom, not only in the history of our country but in the history of the world.

In my opinion, the Spanish-American War was the turning point in the history of America because to me that has always been the turning point away from world isolation and into America taking its position in the world that the greatness of our country justified and warranted. It has taken many years, but that was the turning point and the events that have flowed from the sinking of the *Maine* and the Spanish-American War are of major importance not only to our country but to the world.

So I join with my dear friend from Illinois in the expressions he has given us and also congratulate him, as I said before, on remembering this great event. I know that the Spanish War veterans and all their families will deeply appreciate it. In connection with the bill that the gentleman has referred to and which the gentleman introduced, it seems to me to contain great merit. I shall be glad to cooperate with my friend from Illinois in trying to have the committee conduct hearings and to do everything I can to try and have the committee report the bill favorably.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I very deeply appreciate the words of the gentleman from Massachusetts. As to H. R. 4490, I am sure the gentleman will be interested in knowing that it was on the *Yale* that men of the 9th Massachusetts and men from the 33d Michigan went down to Cuba. We arrived there in the early days of the siege of Santiago. The sailors on the *Yale* and her sister ship, the *Harvard*, are among those who through a technicality have been denied equal rights with the soldiers they carried to Cuba.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, I think, will be interested in this, too. Looking over the newspaper files of the period I found the following editorial comment in the London Spectator on July 3, 1898:

> Are the American people aware that their country stands at the parting of the ways; that she is engaged in a war which may so develop that it may occupy years, create a national debt, and leave the United States with a powerful army and the first fleet in the world?

Those surely were words of prophecy.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to join with my colleagues in congratulating our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] for annually giving us a stirring address in bringing to us many of his personal experiences in connection with the Spanish-American War in which he was a participant. Earlier today, knowing that our colleague had again requested an hour to commemorate primarily the "remembering of the *Maine*," as he likes to put it, I showed him an address which was delivered by Rear Adm. Reginald Rowan Belknap, United States Navy, retired, who also is a constituent of mine, living at present at Madison Conn., who made a very stirring address before the Naval Order of the United States on Friday, May 1, 1953. In his address he reveals to us much of his personal experience, particularly surrounding the event of the sinking of the *Maine*, and also tells about its refloating some 14 years later. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] has always sought on occasions of this kind historical data and material which otherwise has not been known. In my opinion this fine address by this noble and inspiring naval man brings, I believe, for the gentleman from Illinois and for all of us and the country at large much data and information which would otherwise not have been recorded.

It is with that purpose in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I ask unanimous consent to have the entire speech of Admiral Belknap included in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. The address is as follows:

> Following are remarks by Charles Hann, commander general of the Naval Order of the United States, when he introduced Admiral Belknap on the 55th anniversary of the great victory of Adm. George Dewey at Manila Bay. Admiral Dewey was commander general of the Naval Order of the United States from 1907 to 1917:
>
> "To surpass the age of 80 with such distinction and affection as has marked the devoted and useful life of Rear Adm. Reginald Rowan Belknap is a noteworthy achievement. There were some who might have expected that career to come to a virtual end when Admiral Belknap retired from active duty in the United States Navy in 1927. But in the many years since, he has been active in the Massachusetts Bay tercentenary, the General Theological Seminary of the Episcopal Church, the vestry of Trinity Church in New York, the Naval Academy Association, the Loyal Legion of the United States, the Military Order of the World Wars, the Naval Order of the United States, of all of which patriotic organizations he has been the national head; the Seamen's Church Institute, Laymen's National Committee, Chelsea Citizens Committee, and many other religious, educational, and charitable enterprises, and throughout the Nation he is respected as a man whose naval and civic career has consistently reflected high principles and sincere beliefs.
>
> "A son of Rear Adm. George Eugene Belknap, Reginald Belknap was graduated with distinction from the United States Naval Academy in 1891; during the China-Japanese War he served with Marines in the Monocacy at Tientsin in the winter of 1894–1895, and in command of Marine Guard at the American Legation in Seoul, Korea, in 1896. He participated in the War with Spain; in the Chinese Boxer campaign; the Philippine Insurrection; and was in charge of building nearly 3,000 cottages and public buildings for about 18,000 persons made homeless by the Italian (Messina) earthquake in 1908.
>
> "He was made a division commander in the Atlantic Fleet in 1915 to develop minelaying and minesweeping, and in 1917–18 he organized and commanded the United States Mine Squadron of 10 minelayers and 4,200 personnel, which planted four-fifths of the mine-barrage in the North Sea, from the Orkney Islands, stretching 235 miles across to Norway, 25 miles wide—56,571 mines, endangering passage even to a depth of 240 feet.
>
> "Admiral Belknap served in the sailing frigate *Constellation*, cruisers *Chicago, Baltimore, Yorktown, Newport, Lancaster, Badger, Ranger, Brooklyn;* battleships *Indiana, Maine, Kearsage, North Dakota*, and commanded the *San Francisco* and battleship *Delaware* and *Colorado*.
>
> "His wide experience in and knowledge of international affairs was enriched by naval duty in China, Japan, Korea, Samoa, the Philippines, Australia, Germany, Italy, and England. He was aide to Theodore Roosevelt at the funeral of King Edward VII, served in the Bureau of Navigation, as Director of Strategy Department in the Naval War College and as commandant of the Naval Training Station, Hampton Roads, Va.
>
> "I am happy to present to you a wise, humorous, noble, and inspiring leader, Rear Adm. Reginald R. Belknap, DSM, past commander general of the Naval Order of the United States."
>
> REMEMBER THE "MAINE"
>
> (Address by Rear Adm. Reginald Rowan Belknap, United States Navy, retired, DSM, commander general, Naval Order of the United States, 1931–37, commander in chief, the Military Order of the World Wars, 1936–38, commander in chief, Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, 1947–51, before the Naval Order of the United States at the New York Yacht Club, New York City, on Friday, May 1, 1953)
>
> The slogan of 55 years ago, "Remember the *Maine*," is kept alive by the United Spanish War Veterans by memorial services on the anniversaries of that fateful 15th of February 1898, when the United States battleship *Maine* was destroyed in the harbor of Habana, Cuba, with the loss of two-thirds of her crew. Shocking in itself, the calamity was magnified by the *Maine's* being on a welcomed visit of good will. Indignant outburst in America was soon controlled, but our intervention to end the intolerable situation in Cuba became almost a certainty. Nine weeks later Congress declared war, a blockade of Cuba was established on April 22 and in the Far East Commodore George Dewey won the battle of Manila Bay on May 1, which we are celebrating as Dewey Day. The consequences of these actions, a hemisphere apart, were of worldwide effect and are still evolving.

Cuba, a colony of Spain, Pearl of the Antilles, rich in various resources and possibilities, had long been coveted by England and France, but to the United States the island's geographical position made the continuation of Spain's sovereignty there essential. Only 90 miles from our shores and bordering on Florida Strait on the east and Yucatan Channel on the west, Cuba in unfriendly hands could control intercourse in the Gulf of Mexico and with the Mississippi Valley. As long as Spain held possession, other European powers and Britain would keep hands off, while from Spain alone the United States need have no serious apprehension. Our Government had been foremost in recognizing the independence of Spain's other colonies in America and had backed them further by the Monroe Doctrine, which they in turn would buttress; as to Cuba, our policy was repeatedly declared unequivocally for Spain's sovereignty, with assurance to her of our support at all hazards. Any desire to annex the island or intervene in its affairs was almost as often disavowed. Such was our attitude for a century.

After the Mexican War, soldiers and adventurers on the loose began filibustering toward Cuba. Easy expeditions had no success and informed observers found the Cuban people not ready for revolt, nor ready for independence. The attempts at invasion, however, intensified the harsh tyranny of the Spanish rulers. The home government vested the Governor-General of Cuba with absolute power, subject only in extreme contingencies even to the supreme government in Spain. In language of today, the Governors-General went to town. In contempt of treaties, international law, humanity, and common decencies of civilization, on mere suspicion ships on the high seas or wherever found were seized and condemned, their crews and innocent passengers shot or cruelly maltreated. All down the line, subordinate officials conformed to their chief's example with zeal. Most of them were not Cubans but Spaniards, born in Spain. For them Cuba was not for Cubans but for Spain, and they ruled with a merciless hand. The status of the Cuban born was so inferior socially and politically that some husbands who could afford it would send their wives when pregnant to Spain for their confinement, for the advantage to their offspring of birth in the peninsula.

Following our Civil War, increasing intercourse with Cuba generated more and more interest among our people in the internal conditions of Cuba and the treatment of her people. All through his administration President Grant had to deal with Spain for ending the ravages of insurrection in Cuba. Harshness and violence by both the official and insurgent forces spread desolation and misery; outrages on the high seas and against American citizens in Cuba multiplied the grounds for official as well as popular protests. In 1875 war with Spain came very near. Spain herself was racked internally by disorder, distress, and revolution. Our Minister there wrote "Many of the most thoughtful men in Spain really long for a foreign war as the only efficient remedy for the domestic dissensions which now distract the country * * * it is the received opinion in Spain that for the commencing period of the war, Spain has a more efficient navy than ours." Fortunately, our Secretary of State, Hamilton Fish, and our Minister in Spain, Caleb Cushing, were men of the highest character and distinguished ability; still more fortunate was it that Mr. Cushing had been much in Spain, spoke the language with facility and was on terms of intimacy and friendship with many notable Spaniards, and he was everywhere recognized as strongly opposed to filibustering in all its various forms. Our diplomacy keeping control in the hands of the Executive, intervention was averted, the Spanish Governments decreed improvements in the island administration, insurrection was exhausted by 1878 and Cuba began again to prosper, its commerce rapidly growing, especially with the United States.

Ten years of barbarous misgovernment and ruthless cruelty, however, had changed Cuban loyalty to Spain into determination for independence. A group of Cubans was formed in the United States to work towards that end. This Cuban Junta promoted filibustering, to keep the cause vigorously alive, thus to convince both governments, of the United States and of Spain, that only independence would bring lasting peace in Cuba. Despite being outlawed by our Government, hindered and penalized by all such restraints as could be reasonably expected by any other government, the Cuban junta with increasing financial support and dodging here and there, kept up its activities. When revolt in Cuba came again it had the support of 200 clubs in the United States, Mexico, and Central and South America, every member contributing a tenth or more of his earnings. They were said to have started with a million dollars, a considerable sum in the nineties.

This insurrection, declared in February 1895, had been preparing as promised reforms failed of realization. The actual rulers in Cuba were still the peninsulares, Spaniards. When filibustering began, years back, they had organized, in political clubs and groups of volunteers who were armed but did not take the field. About 70,000 strong and politically powerful, they could frustrate any attempt at substantial improvement; reforms decreed in Spain were ignored or nullified in Cuba; more than one governor-general of liberal tendency had been unable to make headway, had to retire and was replaced by one of the reactionary type. Such was General Weyler who came to Habana after a year of insurrection. The hardened attitude in Spain towards Cuba was shown when the former governor General Campos arrived; the newspapers in Spain were indignant with him for suggesting autonomy for Cuba—"an insult to the nation." Our Minister in Spain under President Cleveland wrote later that "Spain could not give to her colonies what she did not herself enjoy, popular government as it is understood throughout the world."

Coupled with the disappointment in promised reforms was the severe blow given to the principal industry, sugar production, by the high tariff protecting our growers of beet sugar. Thousands of Cuban laborers were made idle and ripe for joining an insurgent army. The seriousness and the strong support of this insurrection, more than ever before, was recognized in Spain. Mildness prevailed in government measures for a year, with the purpose to protect persons, property and industry. The insurgents' policy was the opposite; as stated in the appeal by their commander-in-chief, Maximo Gomez, addressed "to honest men, victims of the torch:" (Gomez, be it noted, was not a Cuban. He was a Dominican, and not a soldier but a guerrilla leader.) "To place Cuba in the shortest time in possession of her dearest ideal * * * it matters not what means are employed" the insurgents were "determined to unfurl triumphantly, even over ruin and ashes, the flag of the Republic of Cuba." There were no pitched battles, it was guerrilla warfare. More and more troops from Spain, up to 100,000 by 1896, did not bring the answer. Being mostly infantry they could not cope with bodies of mounted insurgents familiar with the country and usually the mere presence of a guard would be the signal to set a sugar-cane field afire. Attempts to confine the insurgents to the eastern parts of the island failed. By the time General Weyler took charge, the insurgents were in the immediate vicinity of Havana. Nearly all labor having been suspended, Gomez prohibited the burning of cane fields in the western provinces but the boiling houses and machinery were to be destroyed if the managers attempted to resume work.

In the ruin and resulting distress and destitution, General Weyler now ordered that all persons in three eastern districts be concentrated in towns that were military headquarters, no travel without a pass, and the vacating of all commercial establishments in the districts. The consequent increase of clamor in this country and of talk in Congress for intervention did not deter Weyler from further drastic measures, of summary action against prisoners taken in action, and against any person giving aid to the enemy in any way whatever. So strong did feeling in America become that the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs on January 29, 1896, brought a report from its majority that "Congress would welcome with satisfaction the concession by Spain of complete sovereignty to the people of Cuba."

Without laboring the point further, President Cleveland and Secretary of State Richard Olney held firm control of the situation, within the scope of diplomacy, meantime fulfilling all requirements due Spain and our own integrity in fair dealing internaitonally.

After President McKinley took office in March, 1897, conditions in Cuba grew progressively worse, so much so that General Weyler was recalled in October, 1897, and the more fair-minded and just General Blanco succeeded. Conditions in Cuba were still scandalous before the whole world, but a turn for the better seemed in real prospect. Our new Minister in Madrid, General Stewart L. Woodford, secured decrees by the Spanish government for autonomy in Cuba and Puerto Rico and equality of rights for all citizens.

As nothing short of independence would satisfy the Cuban insurgents and extremists, they resisted autonomy savagely, one instance recalling the ancient custom of slaying the bearer of bad news. The Spanish Colonel Ruiz, endeavoring to lay before his friend, Colonel Aranguren, of the Cuban forces, the decree of autonomy, was summarily courtmartialed and executed. The Spanish partisans, too, the "peninsulares," opposed autonomy, which would have ended their monopoly of government offices. Notwithstanding such double opposition, in Habana and from there outward the new system slowly gained favor. General Blanco ordered that concentration be suspended, encouraged people to return to their homes and farms, promising protection. He stood for reform as a measure toward pacification. This was the reverse of Weyler's policy, of pacification first, "then I will not object to reforms if Her Majesty decides to grant them." Blanco also appropriated $100,000 for relief of starvation and to aid rehabilitation, and his appeal brought out generous contributions from Cubans of means, and with their characteristic generous sympathy our people gave largely for relief.

This favorable trend naturally gained slowly; destitution, starvation, disease, desolation, existed almost everywhere beyond Habana, and however beneficial autonomy and other reforms might prove to be, the official customs and impositions of centuries were not to be overcome in a few weeks, violently opposed as the intended reforms were. After 2 months of Blanco's promising rule, rioting broke out in Habana on January 12, 1898, requiring a large number of troops to guard the palace and our consulate and prevent demonstrations in public squares. Next day Consul-General Fitzhugh Lee telegraphed that no signs appeared of further disorder. Spanish officers had led a mob to attack offices of newspapers that had favored autonomy; one of them had disparaged the late Governor-General Weyler. He explained further that in starting the new system, the officials first appointed were Cubans, in order to assure all Cubans in arms that autonomy

was for their benefit and protection. In fine, the rioting was an affair among Spanish partisans themselves. He added that, though calm had been restored in Habana, a ship might be needed for the safety of Americans and should be held in readiness.

Our North Atlantic Squadron was still in Hampton Roads, though it had been decided in December to do the winter training in southern waters as usual for many years past, basing on Key West and Pensacola, Fla., and visiting various ports in Cuba and the Caribbean area. Against filibustering the battleship *Maine*, cruiser *Montgomery*, three torpedo boats, and several revenue cutters were stationed in the vicinity of Key West and Cuba; they had in effect been doing patrolling that properly belonged to Cuban naval vessels. But the squadron remained north for weeks after the usual time for moving south. That assembling so large a force was not the beginning of a naval mobilization but was the usual thing was made clear to the Spanish Minister in Washington; also, lest hostile intent be inferred from a move south, the squadron was being delayed there.

The Habana rioting, though of short duration, had greatly disturbed our people. The Spanish Minister noted this and promptly informed his Government, on January 14. He repeated to Madrid a private information from a New York Herald correspondent: that the President believed autonomy a failure, that he feared further disorders all over Cuba, in which event he would land consulate guards from our ships. The Minister expressed the belief that Spain would not submit to that, and the Foreign Minister in Spain said, "correct."

Ten days later, January 24, Mr. Day, the acting Secretary of State, told the Minister that the President had not departed from the attitude set forth in his speech to Congress, leaving the Spanish Government in entire liberty to develop its policy; that General Woodford's report concerning negotiations for a commercial treaty were so satisfactory that he was determined to send the *Maine* to Habana as a mark of friendship, as would be so stated to the press; that he felt it had been a mistake not to have had a man-of-war visit any Cuban port in the past 3 years, "for now what is a fresh proof of international courtesy is looked upon as a hostile act." The Minister of State in Madrid replied on January 25 cordially accepting the statement about the *Maine* and reciprocating such friendly courtesy a Spanish vessel would visit the United States. One did come, the armored cruiser *Vizcaya* arriving in New York 3 days after the *Maine's* destruction.

The Secretary of the Navy had released to the press on January 24 the statement: "The rumors which were current yesterday regarding the movement of the fleet and disturbances in Habana are far from having foundation. Circumstances have become so normal, the situation so quiet, and relations so cordial, our war vessels are to renew their friendly visits in Cuban ports, entering and leaving those ports to go to ports of other neighboring friendly countries. The first vessel to make a visit of this kind will be the *Maine*."

On the same day, Consul General Lee in Habana was informed by telegraph that the *Maine* would arrive in a day or 2. He at once telegraphed advising delay for 6 or 7 days to give the late excitement more time to disappear; and early next forenoon, January 25, he telegraphed: "In the temporary absence of the Governor General, other authorities profess to think the United States has ulterior purposes; say it will obstruct autonomy, produce excitement, most probably a demonstration." It was too late; there was then no radio; the *Maine* steamed in past Morro Castle at 11 a. m. on January 25, 1898.

It is pertinent to recall that until the First World War it was usual for a man-of-war to enter any port unannounced; only on special occasions would advance notice be sent. So for the people in general, except for the extraordinary conditions in the island, there was no cause for alarm in the *Maine's* entry, Saluting the port with the Spanish flag at the main and quietly forging toward a berth. A man-of-war usually makes an impression of favorable tendency; showing a sample of her nation's people, their standards of law and order, cleanliness, behavior, service discipline; their technical accomplishment; the ship's clean sides, gleaming brightwork, smart boats—all attract attention and among most observers good will. The old-fashioned graceful lines of hull and etching of spars and rigging were lacking; the *Maine* was more suggestive of a bulldog; but she and her contemporary *Texas* were rivals for good looks. A *Texas* midshipman delivered his executive officer's compliments to Lieutenant Commander Marix with: "The *Maine* is the finest thing afloat." Marix replied, "Tell Mr. Allibone the *Texas* is a dream."

No excitement, no demonstration attended the *Maine's* arrival. Captain Sigsbee had been enjoined to special precautions, but he soon found that the safeguards usual in our Navy were sufficient, and to have a patrol around the ship would imply distrust of the Spanish authorities. He had been in active naval service 35 years; like most of our naval commanders he was well informed on international usage. A few years later, Secretary of State John Hay was to remark, "I am always glad when the naval officer arrives on the scene; he always keeps within the situation." Captain Sigsbee formed a decided liking for General Blanco, as an administrator, as a patriot, and as a man of high character. Insurgency still racked the island; much of the distress and hunger had not been relieved; autonomy was hardly gaining; still, the prospect was hopeful. One, two, three weeks passed without untoward incident. At long last the Cuban problem seemed within sight of solution.

In the quiet evening of February 15, as the long, drawn-out notes of taps echoed back from Morro Castle, Captain Sigsbee was finishing a report wholly unrelated to Cuba. The master-at-arms reported 9 o'clock lights out; on deck were the officer of the watch, quartermaster, one of the anchor watch, and corporal of the guard; two officers were smoking by the after turret, the others below in their quarters, the crew in their hammocks. Except for the anchor light and standing lights below, darkness and quiet settled upon the ship, as usual in a man-of-war moored in a quiet, friendly harbor. All seemed serene, the captain could relax; he put on a loose coat and began a letter to his wife.

Half an hour later, earthquake and thunderclap startled all Habana. "The ship is sinking, sir." The captain and other officers and men groped their way to the poop, still above water. In the glare of burning woodwork forward could be seen the jagged ends of parts of the hull forced upward by the explosion. One boat remaining was lowered and assisted others from the Spanish cruiser *Alfonso XII* and the Ward liner *City of Washington* in rescuing survivors. Sigsbee ordered and saw the *Maine* abandoned; then in the midst of the throng on board the liner wrote a dispatch to the Secretary of the Navy:

"Maine blown up in Habana harbor at 9:40 tonight and destroyed. Many wounded and doubtless more killed and drowned. Wounded and others on board Spanish man-of-war and Ward Line steamer. Send light-house tenders from Key West for crew and the few pieces of equipment above water. No one has clothing other than that upon him. Public opinion should be suspended until further report. All officers believed to be saved. Jenkins and Merritt not yet accounted for. Many Spanish officers including representatives of General Blanco now with me to express sympathy.

"SIGSBEE."

The morning papers spread the appalling news. Expression of deep sympathy came immediately from the Spanish Government, the Navy, the Queen regent, the Spanish Minister in Washington, from General Blanco, and the Alcalde of Habana. The wounded were tenderly cared for; the recovered dead lay in state in the civil-government building for 2 days, then were borne with reverent ceremony in a formal procession of civil, military, ecclesiastical, and consular officials, attended by a vast throng all along the route to the beautiful Colon Cemetery; there the last rites were performed, three volleys fired, and taps. The authorities dedicated the ground to the United States in perpetuity.

Captain Sigsbee's warning to suspend judgment soon turned indignation to speculation on the explosion's cause. No guilt nor complicity on the part of Spain was imputed in any responsible quarter, but some critics blamed the island authorities for not safeguarding their submarine mines, attributing the explosion to stealthy action by insurgents to bring intervention by the United States.

In the depth of one night, a small rowboat from the direction of the Morro Castle passed near the *Maine* almost within hail. Had a mine and its anchor been slung underneath, their barrel-size bulk would have made the boat's progress very slow, as it had been. At her moorings the *Maine* had swung by wind or current always within one and the same semicircle. With a change of wind she swung into the other semicircle. A mine there could have been struck.

The Spanish authorities urged a joint investigation but our Government preferred a naval court of inquiry as would have been regular in any case. Capt. William T. Sampson, president, Capt. French E. Chadwick, and Cmdr. William P. Potter, members, and Lt. Cmdr. Adolf Marix, judge advocate. Any searching inside the wreck was prohibited by the Spanish authorities; in the circumstances otherwise the court made as thorough an examination and inquiry as possible, avoiding any semblance of haste through sessions lasting 23 days, signing its report on March 21. President McKinley referred it to Congress on March 28, invoking "most deliberate consideration." Without debate the report was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House adjourned.

Treating the *Maine* disaster as of no contributory significance proved futile. "Remember the *Maine*" rapidly gained popularity, and the still glaring horrors in Cuba kept our people afire. Diplomatic effort was intensified on both sides: General Woodford and the Spanish Ministers finding more and more agreement in unofficial talks; the Ministers realizing the imminence of crisis, invoking the good offices of other European powers, intimating that the President might appeal to the Pope. But other events aggravated the difficulty of averting a break. Congress on March 9 without a dissentient vote appropriated $50 million "for the national defense and each and every purpose connected therewith, to be expended by the President, and to remain available until January 1, 1899." This alone spelled death to autonomy; and now the President of the Cuban home-rule Government protested any effort by the United States to force on the Cuban people any form of government against their consent. On March 17, after an unofficial visit to see Cuba at firsthand, the highly esteemed conservative United States Senator Proctor in a speech in the Senate described conditions outside Habana as "desolation and distress, misery and starvation * * * the condition of the reconcentrados not overdrawn * * * the hospi-

tals beyond the limits of my vocabulary to portray."

Affairs were sweeping toward a crisis with irresistible force, which could be arrested only by an immediate cease fire. All parties longed for that; the obstacle hitherto immovable was Spanish pride. "This," Woodford cabled on March 31, "will not permit the ministry to propose and offer an armistice, which they desire to do, knowing it would bring peace by autumn; but such an offer by the ministry would bring revolution here * * * the ministry would go as far and as fast as it could and still save the dynasty * * * they know that Cuba is lost. Public opinion in Spain has moved steadily toward peace." On April 3 he cabled, "should the United States accept the Pope's mediation, Spain would do likewise" and the "ministry ask for the withdrawal of the American squadron (by this time in considerable force at Key West), as a mark of friendliness for Spain."

But while Spain's honor was being saved, Cubans were suffering every privation, dying by hundreds weekly. We had pressed for decision by April 15; on April 5 Spain agreed for May 4, provided the Cuban assembly would then approve and an armistice be arranged with the insurgents by some other agency than the Spanish Government. At bottom it was Spanish pride versus deeply stirred American sympathy; and on the long record of promises not made good and repeated endless procrastination, what confidence could there be in similar promises now?

That the President's message would go to Congress on April 6 and the substance of it was communicated to the ministry. It would recount the conditions in Cuba, the injurious effect upon our people, the character and conditions of the conflict and the apparent hopelessness of the strife; he would not advise recognizing the independence of the insurgents but would recommend measures looking to the restoration of peace and stability of government in the island, in the interests of humanity and for the safety and tranquillity of our own country. Presentation was delayed until April 9 for reception of representatives of Great Britain, Germany, France, Austria-Hungary, Russia, and Italy, collectively appealing for further negotiation in hope for an agreement that will secure the maintenance of peace and afford the necessary guaranties for Cuba. The President replied with appreciation of the humanitarian and disinterested character of the communication and expressed confidence that equal appreciation would be shown for our earnest and unselfish endeavors to end a situation of prolonged insufferableness. The postponement had been communicated to the Spanish ministry and on that day representatives of the greater European powers suggested that Spain should accede to the solicitations of "the Pope and that the suspension of hostilities was compatible with the honor and prestige of Spanish arms." Thereupon was the armistice ordered issued, on Saturday, April 9, thus complying with one of McKinley's stated requirements. But it was too late; the President's message had been written and it went to Congress on Monday, April 11.

Presidents Grant and Cleveland and Secretaries Fish and Olney had kept control of the Spain-Cuba-United States situation in their own hands; had either in critical moments transferred the matter to Congress, war would have resulted. Now that indefinite prolongation of the Cuban situation had become intolerable, McKinley turned to Congress, closing his message with: "The issue is now with Congress. It is a solemn responsibility. I have exhausted every effort to relieve the intolerable condition of affairs which is at our doors. Prepared to execute every obligation imposed upon me by the Constitution and the law, I await your action." As a supplement he stated the Queen-regent's decree of an armistice on April 9, adding "if this message attains a successful result, then our aspirations as a peace-loving Christian Nation will be realized." His stating this apart from the message implied that the Queen-regent's action came too late.

In the early morning of Tuesday, April 19, 1898, Congress adopted a joint resolution that recognized Cuban independence, demanded that Spain withdraw, authorized and directed the President to use armed force as necessary, and disclaimed any disposition to possess the island or to exercise control there except for pacification. The President signed the resolution at 11:24 a. m. on Wednesday, April 20; at daylight on the 22d Rear Admiral Sampson's fleet got underway to establish the blockade of Cuba; on April 25 Congress declared that war with Spain had existed since April 21; Commodore Dewey was cabled to capture or destroy the Spanish squadron in the Philippines.

In the week-long consideration of the President's message, the congressional committee report on which the joint resolution was based treated the destruction of the *Maine* as only a single incident in the relations with Spain and "if that calamity had never happened, the questions between the United States and that Government would press for immediate solution."

The court of inquiry reported, "The *Maine* was destroyed by the explosion of a submarine mine which caused the explosion of two or more of the forward magazines. The court has been unable to obtain evidence fixing the responsibility for the destruction of the *Maine* upon any person or persons." That was the main point in the report, based chiefly on the fact that part of the forward outer shell of the ship, normally 6 feet above the keel, had been forced up to 4 feet above water, 34 feet above where it would have been had the ship sunk uninjured; and other displacements were cited, all indicating intense pressure from below the ship.

The Spanish investigation attributed the destruction to internal explosion. The investigation record showed all diving work occupied only 17½ hours and the chief Spanish diver reported that "the bilge and keel of the vessel throughout its entire length was buried in the mud but did not appear to have suffered any damage."

The soundness of the American finding has support also in that Captain Chadwick was 1 of 2 members of the court who had attributed the destruction to internal explosion, until divers produced stark evidence of explosion under the hull. Such opinion seems explicable only by the fact that officers of their time had served in old-fashioned wooden ships where magazines were more exposed. In the Navy, magazine safety is a first priority: two inspections and temperature taking daily by a trustworthy gunner's mate; keys returned to the cabin and so reported—this is invariably strictly done. Special precautions having been enjoined, would any laxity here have been allowed in the *Maine*? Besides, smokeless powder had not been adopted; only brown gunpowder was on board, not affected by such heat changes as endanger smokeless powder.

Fourteen years later, in the administration of President William H. Taft, a considerate and sincere friend of Spain, the wreck of the *Maine* was removed from Havana. It was an obstruction, an eyesore and a reminder of differences better forgotten. A cofferdam was built and the wreck was floated. Examination in the open confirmed the finding of the court of inquiry. Yet, "convinced against their will, hold to the same opinion still," 30, even 55 years, later, belief in internal explosion persists. One correspondent present in 1898 wrote 30 years later, conceding that the court of inquiry's finding was "justified by the evidence then available, but no trace of a submarine mine had ever been found." True—like absence of most evidence of the cause of an exploded crashed airplane.

The reflected *Maine* with colors flying and naval escort was towed out of Havana to well offshore where the Gulf Stream is deep. The seacocks were opened, a national salute was fired, and photographs were taken; as her bow was about to go under, as she was half-length submerged, and as the stern, the flag still flying, disappeared in the deep.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, it was revealed last summer that the Department of Agriculture had secretly sold 80,000 tons of Austrian winter peas to a syndicate of insiders at a price of $30 a ton less than the price being offered to other buyers. The buyers, of course, had special qualifications. One of the men who handled the deal for the syndicate was a member of the Secretary of Agriculture Benson's Agricultural Advisory Committee; a cousin of a high official in the Department of Agriculture. Another is a friend of a Member of the Cabinet.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture investigated this deal and to me, personally, as a member of that subcommittee, it smelled. In fact, it smelled so badly that at the conclusion of the hearing, a department official of the Agriculture Department told our committee that in so many words, "we made a mistake but we ain't going to do it no more."

Evidently the Department of Agriculture was just kidding Congress last summer because they pulled another deal that outsmells the first one. This one makes the mink coat that I exposed a few years ago look small, and furthermore, it has an odor about like a pile of fish that has been lying in the sun for about a week. My attention was called to Big Deal No. 2 at the Department of Agriculture, by a letter from the Russell-Heckle Seed Co., of Memphis, Tenn., which reads as follows:

Hon. PAT SUTTON,
Tennessee Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SUTTON: We have on hand United States Department of Agriculture Commodity Stabilization Service Bulletin USDA 2744–53 announcing the sale of 15 million pounds of seed to the Albert Dickinson Co., Chicago, Ill., and 6 million pounds to the Sinason Teicher Inter-American Grain Co., New York City.

Following are the 1952 support prices advanced for this 21 million pounds of seed and the prices same was sold for as stated in the bulletin USDA 2744–53. The support prices listed for 1952 we believe to be correct, however, there may be a slight variation.

Commodity	1952 support price	Sale price	Pounds sold
	Per hundredweight	*Per hundredweight*	
Alfalfa (Washington)	$35	$10.00	6,000,000
Ladino clover	105	17.50	2,000,000
Red clover	35	13.50	4,380,000
Birdsfoot trefoil	75	10.00	120,000
Tall fescue (estimated)	20	5.00	500,000
Common vetch	6	2.77	6,000,000
Alsike clover	35	9.00	2,000,000

Bulletin USDA 2744-2753 states that this 21 million pounds of seed were sold in accordance with the Department's sales offer of October 2, 1953. We have no record of ever receiving an invitation to bid on this lot of seed and would like to know approximately how many seed concerns received this invitation to bid and if information of any kind concerning this proposed sale was given to any one of the seed-trade publications or the press.

The first information we had concerning this sale of 21 million pounds of seed was after the sale was consummated. Our firm has been in the seed business over 40 years and it is our thinking that we as well as all other seed firms should have some method of obtaining information concerning sales of this size which are being contemplated, as this information is vital to the entire seed industry in numerous ways.

We would appreciate your securing for us the following facts:

1. When invitation to bid on this seed was announced.
2. Method of announcing invitation to bid.
3. Who and how many were invited to bid.
4. Were any releases given seed publications or press.

We are mailing you under separate cover a December 9, 1953, issue of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, one of our local newspapers which carried a story on the first page, second section, concerning this sale of seed.

Thanking you, we are

Yours very truly,

RUSSELL HECKLE SEED CO.

Also, the Washington Daily News carried an article on December 10 by Mr. James Daniel, which reads as follows:

ADVISORY FIRMS GET A BARGAIN—SEEDY SALE FOR UNITED STATES

Agricultural Department has taken a substantial loss in a sale of Government-owned seed in which all but one of the buying companies was identified with an "advisory committee" appointed to help Government get the best price for its seed.

Here's what happened:

Last spring Agriculture Secretary Ezra Benson dropped price supports from hay, pasture, and winter cover crop seeds. He then appointed a 20-man advisory committee of seed dealers and farm co-op men to counsel him on disposing of the stocks acquired earlier in price-support operations.

FIRST OFFER REFUSED

Offers were submitted by seed companies in August on 23 million pounds out of a total of 120 million pounds then on hand, but Agriculture Department refused to approve any.

In October, the Department asked for offers on 21 million pounds of the same seed. This time it decided to accept the "best combination of bids," which yielded around $1,855,000.

The rejected August offers on the same amount of seeds would have brought in around $2,100,000. In other words, Government officials lost $245,000 more on the same than if they'd taken the August offers.

The bidders were substantially identical both times.

LOSS INEVITABLE

Since the seeds had originally cost Government around $6,100,000 with about $500,000 in accumulated storage, transportation, and other charges, total loss was around $4,500,000. A large part of this would have been lost no matter who bought the seeds.

In the final sale, the full quantity made available by Government of 6 out of 7 varieties of seed was acquired by a syndicate of 5 companies. The syndicate was headed by Lloyd M. Brown, president of the Albert Dickinson (seed) Co. of Chicago.

Mr. Brown also is chairman of the seed industry advisory committee (SIAC).

Other companies in the syndicate were:

The Craver Dickinson Co., of Buffalo, an affiliate of Albert Dickinson, Mr. Brown says.

Ed F. Mangelsdorf & Bro., of St. Louis, represented on the advisory committee by A. H. Mangelsdorf.

The Rudy Patrick Seed Co., of Kansas City, represented on the committee by Ross M. Eldridge.

Northrup, King & Co., of Minneapolis, represented on the advisory committee by Maurice Keating.

Here is what the syndicate got:

Six million pounds of alfalfa seed which Government bought at 35 cents a pound. The syndicate offered 12 cents in August. The sale was closed at 10 cents in October.

Two million pounds of ladino clover which Government bought at $1 to $1.25 a pound. The syndicate first offered 17½ cents and the price was the same in the final sale.

Two million pounds of alsike clover which Government bought at 25 cents. The syndicate first offered 13 cents a pound. The sale was closed at 9 cents.

A half million pounds of high fescue which Government bought at 20 cents a pound. The syndicate first offered 6 cents a pound. The sale was closed at 5 cents.

Four million three hundred and eighty pounds of red clover which Government bought at 35 cents a pound. The syndicate first offered 15 cents. The sale was closed at 13½ cents.

One hundred and twenty thousand pounds of birdsfoot trefoil which Government bought at $1 a pound. The syndicate first offered 15 cents a pound. The sale was closed at 10 cents.

In all, the syndicate got 15 million pounds of seed on an understanding that they'll have at least 6 months in which to sell the seed in Europe without competition from any other sellers given cut-rate bargains in Government-held seeds.

The other 6 million pounds of seed in the sale was sold to the Sinason-Teichner Inter-American Seed Corp. in New York. It brought 2.77 cents a pound.

Marcus B. Braswell, acting head of the Agriculture Department's Commodity Stabilization Service, gives these as the possible reasons for rejecting the earlier, higher offers:

Some seedmen feared seed would go to Canada and be reimported.

Some worried about the effect of Government sales on the price of new crop seed.

It wasn't clear in August that Europe could absorb so much seed.

The United States market price was higher in August than in October.

There were unacceptable conditions on the August bids which were compromised in October.

To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has never disputed any of the statements made by Mr. Daniel in his article.

Mr. Daniel's article, the letter from the Russell-Heckle Co., and my own inquiry have disclosed some very curious circumstances about this sale. Among other things:

First. Fifteen million pounds of seed which cost the Government more than $6 million was sold for less than one-third of its original cost.

Second. The seed was bought by a syndicate of five companies, composed of members of Secretary Benson's Seed Industry Advisory Committee and headed by the chairman of that committee.

Third. The Department of Agriculture did not advertise this bargain sale in the usual way, and never quoted any reduced prices on the seeds involved. Instead it sent out a special limited-circulation press release saying it was willing to consider offers. The Russell-Heckle Co. says it would have been happy to buy some of this seed at a higher price, but it never received any announcement that a sale at reduced rates was being held. All it got was an announcement that the sale had been made.

Fourth. The Department's offer of seed for sale on a negotiated basis was dated Friday, October 2, 1953. It specified that all offers to buy the seed must be received by 11 a. m. Monday, October 12, 1953. I can see no advantage to the Government in setting a time limit of just about 1 week on a multimillion dollar deal, but the advantages to a group of insiders in keeping out legitimate bidders who might pay a higher price are obvious.

Fifth. On October 1, just 1 day before the special limited circulation notice of October 2, the Department of Agriculture issued its regular monthly price list, which is published in the Federal Register and sent to all companies interested in purchasing Government-owned commodities. This regular price list quoted prices on the same 15 million pounds of seed which were sold to the syndicate later that month. The quoted prices were more than three times as high as the bargain rates paid by the syndicate. In addition, the regular price list contained this significant statement:

Assurance is given buyers * * * that prices of specified seeds will not be reduced before July 1, 1954.

Prices quoted for 5 of the 6 varieties of seed involved contained the following notation:

Price will not be reduced during period ending June 30, 1954.

This is what the Department of Agriculture was telling buyers who were not lucky enough to be on the Seed Advisory Committee while it was quietly negotiating a sale at a fraction of these prices to the men on the inside.

Sixth. In addition to cut-rate prices, the Department gave more favorable freight terms to its friends. Prices quoted to ordinary purchasers were f. o. b.; terms to the more favored were freight alongside ship at the seaport.

Seventh. Evidently the Department has once again given its friends the 6-month monopoly provision it used in the pea sale.

Eighth. The Department of Agriculture turned down bids in August on the same seed from the same people that were several hundred thousand dollars higher than the bids they accepted so quickly in October.

The Department of Agriculture issues regular monthly price lists of CCC commodities available for export and for domestic sale. These price lists are customarily published on the 1st day of each month, or the last day of the preceding month. They are widely circulated and are printed in the Federal Register.

The export sales price lists from April through October last year did not specifically list any of the seeds involved in this sale as eligible for export. However, each price list during that period contained a statement that such seeds

from the domestic sales list were also eligible for export, at the same prices offered for sale to domestic buyers. Therefore, the prices at which these seeds were offered for export were the same as domestic prices.

NORTHERN ALFALFA

The Department of Agriculture sold to its friends in the syndicate 6 million pounds of northern alfalfa, which had cost the Government 35 cents a pound, or more than $2 million. The lowest price at which this alfalfa was offered to ordinary buyers since July 1953 is 37½ cents a pound. It was still being quoted at a price of 37½ cents a pound last month. In addition, from August 1953 through January 1954, the price lists contained the following statement:

Price will not be reduced during the period ending June 30, 1954.

In August the syndicate bid 12 cents a pound for this alfalfa. The bid was rejected. In October the syndicate bid 10 cents a pound for the same seed and the bid was accepted. The loss to the taxpayers was about $1½ million.

LADINO CLOVER

Two million pounds of ladino clover was involved in the deal. The seed cost the Government $1.05 a pound. From June through October the Department offered this variety at not less than $1 a pound. From June through September the price lists carried the following statement:

Price will not be reduced during the period ending October 31, 1953.

In October the Department sold this lot to the syndicate at 17½ cents a pound. Loss to the Government was close to $2 million.

RED CLOVER

Four million three hundred and eighty thousand pounds of red clover were sold. The Department of Agriculture bought this seed at the support price of 35 cents a pound. It was offered to buyers with no influence from May 1953 through January 1954 at a price of 36¾ cents per pound. From August 1953 through January 1954 the official price lists contained this statement:

Price will not be reduced during the period ending June 30, 1954.

In August the Department refused a syndicate bid of 15 cents per pound. In October it accepted a bid of 13½ cents for the same seed from the same people. The poor taxpayer took it in the neck for another million dollars.

ALSIKE CLOVER

The Commodity Credit Corporation had on hand 2 million pounds of alsike clover for which it paid 20 cents per pound. It advertised this variety from July 1953 through January 1954 at a price never less than 27 cents a pound. From August 1953 through January 1954 the monthly price lists included this statement:

Price will not be reduced during period ending June 30, 1954.

In August the syndicate bid 13 cents a pound for this lot of seed, but the bid must have been too high because it was refused. In October, their bid on the same seed was reduced to 9 cents a pound and was accepted. The taxpayers were comparatively lucky on this little deal—it only cost them $200,000.

BIRDSFOOT TREFOIL

Government stocks of seed included 120,000 pounds of birdsfoot trefoil, acquired at a cost of $1 a pound. This seed was quoted from April 1953 through January 1954 to ordinary buyers at a price never less than 78¾ cents per pound. From August 1953, through January 1954, the monthly price lists stated:

Price will not be reduced during period ending June 30, 1954.

In August, the Department turned down a syndicate bid of 15 cents a pound. In October it accepted a syndicate bid of 10 cents a pound. For seed which had cost $120,000, the taxpayers received exactly $12,000—a 10-percent return on their investment.

We investigated this kind of a deal down at the Department of Agriculture once already. That time they all promised to be good in the future, but it evidently takes more than one little congressional investigation to keep them in the straight and narrow path. The House Agriculture Committee should undertake a thorough investigation of this matter and clean up the mess in the Department.

I am forwarding a copy of my remarks to the Justice Department, with a request that the Attorney General study the evidence for possible violation of Federal statutes.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] may address the House for 5 minutes and revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today Lithuanians throughout the free world are celebrating the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Lithuania, a nation with a glorious history extending over a period of 700 years, has known its periods of national sovereignty as well as its periods of alien occupation. The independence day being celebrated today covers the period of Lithuania's independence in this century.

To us Americans national independence has a great significance. We look back to the beginnings of our own national independence in 1776 and we take great pride in our American Declaration of Independence. The moral and political principles expressed in that Declaration sum up the guiding principles upon which our Nation is founded. We take great pride in our national independence and are dedicated to its preservation, no matter what the cost may be to us individually or as a nation. It is for these reasons that all thinking Americans are happy to join with their Lithuanian friends in the free world in celebrating this, the 36th anniversary of national independence.

Lithuanian independence was interrupted on June 14, 1940. On that day the masters of the Kremlin served an ultimatum on the then free and independent Lithuanian Government offering them the alternative of either signing a typical Moscow nonaggression pact or upon refusal to be immediately invaded by the Red armies. We know that the representatives of the Lithuanian Government were required to sign this pact with a gun placed at their heads. We also know that on the same day this coercive act took place, the Red armies were already invading little Lithuania. The events which followed are well-known to most of the Members of the House, and we shall never forget the crimes against humanity perpetrated by the agents of the Kremlin in Lithuania during and following World War II. We shall be ever mindful that the tyranny of the Kremlin continues unabated in the Lithuanian nation, and that the Lithuanian people have not and never will surrender to the world Communist conspiracy.

It would benefit us on this occasion to recall that Lithuania is only one of the captive nations in the prison of nations established and controlled by Moscow. The fate of other once free nations within the prison of nations is very much like that of Lithuania. Those of us who hold that Lithuania will and must be made free and independent again will find the means to this end once we come to fully recognize the Moscovite Empire as a prison of nations. Just as we cherish our national independence, so do the overwhelming majority of people in all these captive nations long for and strive for a restoration of their national homelands. A band of tyrants cannot long contain the rightful national aspirations which are today rampant within the Moscow prison of nations. When we harness this powerful human force solidly to our own national preservation, then and only then will Lithuania be free.

RESTORATION OF BILL TO PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the bill S. 1432 was passed. I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which that was done be vacated and that the bill be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. AYRES and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SADLAK and to include an editorial.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. DIES and to include a copy of H. R. 7894.

Mr. HOLIFIELD.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan in three instances.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENDER in six instances.

Mr. HILL (at the request of Mr. ELLSWORTH) and to include a report.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ALLEN of California, for 3 days, on account of official business.

Mr. MAILLIARD for 3 days, on account of official business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 11, 1954, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 395. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice;

H. R. 1129. An act for the relief of Katina Panagioti Fiflis and Theodore Panagiotou Fiflis;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Lamb;

H. R. 1516. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clemtine De Ryck;

H. R. 1674. An act for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler;

H. R. 2021. An act for the relief of Clarence R. Seiler and other employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 2618. An act for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez;

H. R. 2633. An act for the relief of Lee Sig Cheu;

H. R. 2813. An act for the relief of William E. Aitcheson;

H. R. 2839. An act to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands;

H. R. 2842. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 2885. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii to issue a right of purchase lease to Edward C. Searle;

H. R. 3027. An act for the relief of Tamiko Nagae;

H. R. 3228. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ursula Eichner Clawges;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of John James T. Bell;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of Eiko Tanaka;

H. R. 3619. An act for the relief of Rufin Manikowski;

H. R. 3728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Bonanno (nee Koubek);

H. R. 3733. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder;

H. R. 4439. An act for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham;

H. R. 4577. An act for the relief of Edith Maria Gore;

H. R. 4972. An act for the relief of John Jeremiah Botelho;

H. R. 5195. An act for the relief of Max Kassner;

H. R. 5379. An act to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication;

H. R. 5861. An act to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government;

H. R. 5945. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States;

H. R. 5959. An act to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government which retired officers may receive; and

H. J. Res. 358. Joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 17, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1271. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on the Department of the Army on Research and Development contracts for the period July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1272. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the First Semiannual Report of the Small Business Administration, covering operations between August 1, 1953, and January 31, 1954, pursuant to section 215 of the Small Business Act of 1953 (Public Law 163); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1273. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 686, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1274. A letter from the Chairman, District Unemployment Compensation Board, transmitting the 18th Annual Report of the District Unemployment Compensation Board for the calendar year 1953, pursuant to section 13 (c) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1275. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1276. A letter from the secretary, National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the report of the activities of the National Institute of Arts and Letters for the year 1953; to the Committee on House Administration.

1277. A letter from the assistant to the president, the American Academy of Arts and Letters transmitting the report of the American Academy of Arts and Letters for the year 1953; to the Committee on House Administration.

1278. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 26th report of action taken by the United States Maritime Administration, pursuant to section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, Public Law 498, 77th Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1279. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the 16th quarterly report on the Administration of the Advance Planning Program, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 352, 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 327); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANFIELD: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7893. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, Export-Import Bank of Washington, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota: Committee of conference. S. 2175. An act to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch (Rept. No. 1201). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1433. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2683. A bill to amend section 12 of the Alaska Public Works Act, approved August 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 629); without amendment (Rept. No. 1203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2848. A bill to amend section 89 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5627. A bill to amend Public Law 472, 81st Congress, approved April 11, 1950, entitled "An act to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National

Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7328. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; with amendment (Rept. No. 1206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7541. A bill to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; without amendment (Rept. No. 1207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 7893. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, Export-Import Bank of Washington, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 7894. A bill declaring the Communist Party and similar revolutionary organizations illegal; making membership in, or participation in the revolutionary activity of, the Communist Party or any other organization furthering the revolutionary conspiracy by force and violence a criminal offense; and providing penalties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 7895. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 7896. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that, for the purpose of determining the venue of criminal prosecutions thereunder, certain acts shall be deemed to have been committed in the district in which the taxpayer resides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 7897. A bill to amend the laws relating to the construction of Federal-aid highways to provide for equality of treatment of railroads and other public utilities with respect to the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of such highways by defining the term "construction" to include relocation and readjustment of utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of such highways and by prescribing the extent to which Federal funds may be used for the relocation and readjustment of such utility facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 7898. A bill to authorize male nurses and medical specialists to be appointed as Reserve officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 7899. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on the transportation of property shall not apply to the transportation of certain farm commodities and livestock from farm to market; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS (by request):

H. R. 7900. A bill to provide vocational rehabilitation for certain service-connected disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 7901. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to eliminate the requirement that a bond be posted in connection with the transmission of installment obligations at death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 7902. A bill to continue authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 7903. A bill to provide pensions for disabled unemployable veterans who served in a war, campaign, expedition, or insurrection beyond the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 7904. A bill to authorize certain beach-erosion control of the shore of Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 7905. A bill to establish the United States Customs Port Patrol in the Bureau of Customs for the purpose of enforcing the antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 7906. A bill to reenact and amend a portion of the Renegotiation Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr LANHAM:

H. R. 7907. A bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 7908. A bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 to require that committees of Congress account for counterpart funds which are made available for their local currency requirements pursuant to section 115 (h) of that act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK (by request):

H. R. 7909. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for retirement of certain officers and employees involuntarily separated from positions excepted from the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H. R. 7910. A bill to provide certain safeguards for animals which are to be used in scientific experiments; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 7911. A bill to appropriate money for the construction of the Calumet-Sag Channel, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 7912. A bill to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 7913. A bill to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 7914. A bill to incorporate the National Fund for Medical Education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 7915. A bill to remit the duty on certain bells to be imported for addition to the carillons of The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 7916. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide annuities for certain incompetent children of deceased railroad workers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 7917. A bill relating to the naturalization of certain merchant seamen who later serve in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 7918. A bill to provide for the enlargement of the Veterans' Administration facility at Fayetteville, Ark.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 7919. A bill to provide for payment of pension for nonservice-connected permanent and total disability to veterans of any war, regardless of length of service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 7920. A bill to require inside latches on the doors of household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 7921. A bill to require motor vehicles to be provided with suitable illuminated license plates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 7922. A bill to relieve certain undocumented American pleasure vessels from the requirements of clearance and entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAND:

H. J. Res. 376. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to formulate plans for construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. J. Res. 377. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating one day each year as National Library Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 378. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. J. Res. 379. Joint resolution granting the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the States of Alabama and Florida with respect to the location of the boundary line between those States at the mouth of the Perdido River and adjacent thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution establishing an academy for page boys; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. Res. 446. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House in respect to investigative procedure; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly respectfully requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the

United States to call to the attention of their associates in Congress the recent action of the house of representatives in creating a special committee of said house to investigate the high cost of coffee in Rhode Island, in tangible protest at public hearing against such prevailing high cost of coffee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge the Federal Housing Authority to continue the operation of the Lucy Mallary Village in Springfield; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANE: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to provide for Federal housing projects in the west, south, and north ends of Boston; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge the Federal Housing Authority to extend the time for the operation by it of the Lucy Mallary Village in Springfield; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts urging Congress to pass legislation to prevent the Government of the United States from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for two daily deliveries of mail to residences; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to reduce the age requirements of recipients of old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to provide for Federal housing projects in the west, south, and north ends of Boston; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to urge the Federal Housing Authority to continue the operation of the Lucy Mallary Village in Springfield; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts urging Congress to pass legislation to prevent the Government of the United States from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts relative to a study and revision of the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts against the passage of legislation depriving States of the power to regulate the discontinuance of railroad services in intrastate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to enact legislation providing for two daily deliveries of mail to residences; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relative to certain legislation seeking Federal financial aid for flood control and pollution abatement; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to reduce the age requirements for recipients of old age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts in favor of increasing benefits under the Federal Social Security Act to a minimum allowance of $100 monthly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts to take action to lower the high cost of coffee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 7923. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Beck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 7924. A bill for the relief of Giuseppi Clementi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7925. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dina Mianulli (nee Kratzer); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7926. A bill for the relief of Joseph Gangemi and Anthony Gangemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 7927. A bill for the relief of Maria Inez Santellan Medrano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 7928. A bill for the relief of Mariana de Rojas (nee Mariana Lopez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 7929. A bill to provide for the extension of a certain patent relating to one-piece dresses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 7930. A bill for the relief of Susanne Ingeborg Bernhard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 7931. A bill for the relief of Gunther H. Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 7932. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Schwalm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 7933. A bill for the relief of Rosalia Deutsch Meizlik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 7934. A bill for the relief of Nejdat Mulla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 7935. A bill for the relief of Daniel and Martha Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 7936. A bill for the relief of Marko Radic and Irene Radic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 7937. A bill for the relief of Hesna Hun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7938. A bill for the relief of Miss Martha Heuschele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7939. A bill for the relief of Isaac Piha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 7940. A bill for the relief of Caterina Cantele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 7941. A bill for the relief of Lt. Hayden R. Ford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 7942. A bill for the relief of Raymonde Rouxel Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7943. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dinka Feretic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 7944. A bill for the relief of John Nasharr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 7945. A bill for the relief of Bart Blaak (formerly Johannes J. M. Gijsbers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7946. A bill for the relief of Pai Shiu Chuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 7947. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Erika (Hohenleitner) Stapleton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

509. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Democratic State Committee of the State of Rhode Island requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to support S. 1663, providing for proper increases in the compensation of the Federal judiciary, of Members of Congress, and of United States attorneys and assistants to the Attorney General of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

510. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Miss Bertha Cole, Spokane, Wash., and 328 other citizens in counties of Spokane, Lincoln, Stevens, and Okanogan, requesting enactment of legislation that would prohibit all liquor advertising in newspapers, magazines, billboards, and over the air; and asking for a public hearing on all antiliquor advertising bills which were introduced in the new session of Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

511. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of Dr. J. R. McLemore, president, Paris Junior College, Paris, Tex., and 30 other presidents of junior colleges in Texas, who are members of the Texas Public Junior College Association, expressing approval of Public Law 550 as it exists and is operated at the present time; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

512. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the National Retail Hardware Association unanimously adopted at the 58th annual convention urging the support of the Davis bill (H. R. 5598), opposing a general sales tax and supporting certain amendments to the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

513. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Vicente A. Matias, Manila, Philippines, relative to Army of the United States status being revoked; to the Committee on Armed Services.

514. Also, petition of the president, California Federation of Women's Clubs, San Francisco, Calif., requesting the introduction of legislation to cover certain suggested omissions in the food and drug and cosmetic law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

515. Also, petition of the Chief Clerk, City Council of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., opposing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

516. Also, petition of the secretary, Roseburg Central Labor Council, Roseburg, Oreg., favoring personal income taxes being levied on income, regardless of source and opposing any special exemption on income derived from dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Farmers' Home Administration Doing a Commendable Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes today to review briefly the progress made under the lending program we set up last summer to help distressed livestock producers. I frankly believe that this program saved the livestock industry. I refer to the Farmers' Home Administration.

Last June cattlemen were faced with what looked like another dry summer. In some of the States—Colorado, New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Wyoming, and Texas—the drought was entering its fourth year.

Many of the cattlemen were liquidating their foundation herds. They had to. They lacked feed and they lacked the money to buy feed. In fact, many of them were carrying debts that they had run up fighting the drought of the year before. In normal times, feed dealers and bankers would have been able to carry them. But these were not normal times. The lenders already had a lot of credit on their books, the ranchers already had liens on most everything they owned.

Around mid-June the House Agriculture Committee held hearings on the need for emergency livestock credit and several of us took a quick trip to the drought area to get firsthand information on the situation. By the middle of July we had enabling legislation and appropriations to carry out the legislation cleared through both the House and the Senate. The emergency livestock loan program was ready to go.

We were fortunate, I believe, in having an organization already established and ready to take the authorities and funds that we made available and put them to use quickly. The Farmers' Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture has a nationwide organization that serves every agricultural county. This agency has many years of experience in the agricultural credit field and had handled emergency credit programs before. By the first week in August they had loan funds available in county offices from one end of the country to the other.

To date more than $29 million has been loaned to 2,900 livestock producers. That is an average of more than a million dollars a week. That is service where and when service is needed.

Let me tell you what that $29 million has done. It has kept foundation herds together, animals that if slaughtered, would have taken years to replace.

It has helped families hang on to their means of livelihood.

It helped thousands of cattlemen who never applied for a loan for it brought about orderly marketings that in turn strengthened the whole cattle market.

It helped the consumer for if there had been mass slaughterings of cattle last summer the cost of beef by next summer would have been so high you could not touch a steak with a 10-foot pole.

It helped private lenders for it bolstered the security of the loans they held.

By and large it strengthened, and I believe saved, the whole livestock industry.

Let me tell you how this loan program works.

The emergency credit is extended throughout the country to established producers and feeders of cattle who are temporarily unable to get the credit they need for regular credit sources. These cattlemen must of course have a good record of livestock operations and reasonable prospects for success with the help of the loan.

The loans are made to meet any usual expenses necessary to successful livestock operations.

Loans are made repayable within 3 years and bear 5 percent interest. Livestock loan committees, composed of men who are familiar with local livestock operations decide whether the applicant is eligible and approve the loans. Applications are made at the county offices of the Farmers' Home Administration.

I believe that everyone who took part in creating and carrying out this program of assistance to cattlemen takes pride in their accomplishments. I know that I do. When the legislation was being considered I was able to call attention to the fact that there are thousands of ranchers who carry on feeding operations as a part of their farming operation. These men raise their own feed and then buy enough young stock to consume this feed supply. The bill was revised to provide for the needs of these farmers. I also supported the measure as a whole.

Time does not permit naming all who took part in formulating this program. But let me mention a few. The chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, the Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE, spearheaded the action in the House, his capable counterpart in the Senate, the Honorable GEORGE AIKEN handled the bill in the Senate.

President Eisenhower and the Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson both took an extremely active interest in the legislation. In the Department of Agriculture, Robert Farrington and R. B. McLeaish, under whose direction the Farmers' Home Administration operates, worked long hours nights and weekends to see that the service was made available to farmers with maximum speed and efficiency.

The whole country can take pride in this program. For in the manner in which it was conceived and carried out we proved once more our ability to cope with any crisis. A nation's strength and endurance depends in the long run on its ability to meet emergency situations. The livestock loan program is a testimonial to this Nation's strength.

Special livestock loans as of Feb. 5, 1954

State	Loans approved		Applications pending	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Alabama	14	$100,975	0	0
Arizona	13	360,890	7	$264,815
Arkansas	338	524,855	23	68,280
California	[1] 13	5M, 880	9	197,940
Colorado	136	3,093,875	38	891,245
Florida	37	562,265	4	192,075
Georgia	32	306,550	0	0
Idaho	18	637,964	15	943,820
Illinois	2	18,600	0	0
Indiana	7	168,400	1	6,800
Iowa	1	2,000	1	1,575
Kansas	87	1,431,900	18	171,410
Kentucky	23	37,470	7	14,135
Louisiana	4	62,250	1	5,000
Massachusetts	5	11,100	1	1,000
Michigan	2	13,000	0	0
Minnesota	3	13,875	0	0
Mississippi	4	29,195	0	0
Missouri	692	946,490	48	46,680
Montana	93	2,658,845	41	1,358,765
Nebraska	4	62,450	0	0
Nevada	46	879,715	3	34,570
New Hampshire	1	1,000	5	5,320
New Jersey	13	32,690	0	0
New Mexico	210	2,437,408	22	490,880
New York	16	23,460	10	18,390
North Carolina	1	3,315	0	0
North Dakota	6	24,835	0	0
Ohio	5	7,790	0	0
Oklahoma	160	2,103,230	24	443,500
Oregon	3	149,113	5	364,580
Pennsylvania	19	28,395	15	17,850
South Carolina	1	7,870	0	0
South Dakota	50	593,340	11	170,970
Tennessee	18	25,400	2	1,500
Texas	709	10,004,890	64	795,350
Utah	38	606,304	9	187,885
Vermont	2	5,280	3	6,000
Virginia	52	167,630	6	7,900
Washington	0	0	3	115,857
West Virginia	22	12,395	3	655
Wyoming	28	636,695	8	324,700
Hawaii	5	47,675	2	8,200
Total	2,933	29,353,254	409	7,158,247

[1] 1 loan in the amount of $23,900 tentatively approved, has been finally rejected.

Due Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the people who live along the shores of Lake Ontario have been threatened with catastrophic damages to their homes and property if and when the two great international developments on the lake, the seaway and power project, become operative. Both projects can and may raise the water levels of the lake. Either or both may do so to the point where hundreds of millions of dollars worth of damage may be done to lakeshore properties.

We have a treaty with Canada which, presumably, protects people who are injured by virtue of water project developments along the international boundary.

But time and costly litigation have proved these guaranties almost meaningless. Because these are international waters our own courts have suggested hesitancy in assuming jurisdiction; and where they have done so, the Government of Canada has pleaded sovereignty and withheld agreement to be sued. As a result, the people of the lakeshore find themselves in an international no-man's land, where their constitutional guaranties under the "due process" clause are meaningless, and there is no machinery to implement the treaty guaranties which are, presumably, operative.

In order to overcome this dilemma, Representative KEATING and I have requested the International Joint Commission to undertake the establishment of an international tribunal to which residents of the lakeshore may turn for protection.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a copy of the letter which we addressed to the International Joint Commission earlier this month, together with a copy of the reply which we have just received from the assistant to the legal counsel of the Department of State:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1954.

CHAIRMAN,
International Joint Comission,
Washington, D. C.:

It has been noted with satisfaction that the order of approval authorizing construction of the St. Lawrence power project, under date of October 29, 1952, contains specific guaranties to the effect that "All interests on either side of the international boundary which are injured by reason of the construction, maintenance and operation of the works shall be given suitable and adequate protection and indemnity in accordance with the laws in Canada or the Constitution and laws in the United States respectively, and in accordance with the requirements of Article VIII of the Boundary Waters Treaty."

Nevertheless, long and costly experience, involving protracted litigation, has demonstrated that, in the absence of specific designation as to who is legally and financially responsible for such injury, the rights and properties of thousands of citizens of both countries may be destroyed and that they are, in fact, without adequate legal protection. Two recent instances illustrate the inadequacy of present machinery to deal with these matters.

In one case, affecting the water levels of Lake Ontario, the Canadian Government specifically assumed responsibility for damage to the properties of United States citizens which might result from the construction of a dam in the outlet from the lake. Yet, when destructive water levels resulted, and recourse was had to the courts of the United States, the Canadian Government interposed a plea of sovereignty, arguing that it could not be sued.

In a second case, recently adjudicated by the United States court of appeals, it was held that there is "at least considerable doubt" as to whether an order of the International Joint Commission is subject to judicial review.

Thus, in the first case (which, we are aware, does not directly involve the International Joint Commission, although the Commission acted to provide relief from the damaging high waters), the legal and Constitutional guaranties of protection and indemnity are inadequate; and in the second case, involving projects which involve great potential damage to the lakeshore property owners, the Court has indicated that orders of the International Joint Commission are probably above the law, so far as judicial recourse in the United States is concerned.

Under such circumstances, the guaranties of protection and indemnity written into the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 and reaffirmed in the International Joint Commission's Order of Approval of October 29, 1952, are meaningless, and, in fact, convey an implication of assurance that is deceitful.

The two great projects which are now taking shape on the St. Lawrence River, however much they may benefit certain interests, may spell catastrophe to the lakeshore property owners. We refer, of course, to the St. Lawrence seaway and St. Lawrence power project. These projects will involve not 1 but 4 entities, 2 on each side of the international boundary, any or all of which may be responsible for changes in the water levels of Lake Ontario which could be disastrous to the residents of the lakeshore. As evidence of the diffusion of responsibility in these developments, the International Joint Commission's order of approval of the power project vests control of the water levels of the lake at various points in (1) the Secretary of the Army, (2) the International Joint Commission, (3) the Federal Power Commission, and (4) the Congress. The Federal Power Commission, meanwhile, in authorizing the New York State Power Authority to proceed with development of power, has required that the power authority, rather than the United States Government, be held responsible for damages which may result from the project, notwithstanding the fact that the power authority has no funds and no program for taking care of such contingencies.

In this plethora of agencies, among whom legal and financial responsibility is hopelessly confused and diffused, the rights of the individual citizen who may be injured by their joint or several operations become lost in a fog of international complexities. Each of the entities involved can point to someone else as responsible, and there is no agency anywhere to adjudicate the matter.

In view of this situation, may we request that the International Joint Commission undertake, as a part of its continuing responsibility for the St. Lawrence power project and its study of the Great Lakes water levels, to formulate, without further delay, the precise means by which parties injured as a result of projects authorized by it in these international waters may obtain the protection and indemnification which, under the Boundary Waters Treaty, it is obliged to provide.

It is clearly insufficient to point to the appropriate courts of the respective countries, or to the Constitution and the laws of the two countries, as a proper recourse for injured citizens, for costly experience has shown these remedies to be inadequate. These are damages sustained as the result of the undertakings of supranational agencies with intermeshing objectives, and it may well require the creation of a supranational body to hear and adjudicate claims arising therefrom.

We are cognizant of the fact that the International Joint Commission is presently awaiting the findings of the International Lake Ontario Board of Engineers, with a view to making certain corrections in method of regulation No. 5. The treaty mandate to provide suitable and adequate protection and indemnity is not alone an engineering problem, however; it is juridical as well. Just as the Commission has created international boards of engineers and boards of control at various points along the international boundary, to handle the development and operation of these great international projects, it now appears essential to set up juridical instrumentalities to insure that legal and financial responsibility is defined and fixed in these undertakings. Otherwise, the rights of individuals, private and corporate, whose properties are damaged or destroyed by these developments, are in danger of being abandoned in an international no man's land.

May we request a statement from you at your early convenience as to what steps the Commission may contemplate with respect to this vitally important matter?

Very sincerely yours,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
Member of Congress.
KENNETH B. KEATING,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 15, 1954.

The Honorable HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: The receipt is acknowledged of a letter signed by you and Representative KENNETH B. KEATING dated February 4, 1954, concerning your desire to have the International Joint Commission undertake to formulate, without further delay, the precise means by which parties injured as a result of projects authorized by it in the St. Lawrence River may obtain the protection and indemnification which is provided for under the Boundary Waters Treaty of January 11, 1909.

It is understood that a similar letter has been addressed to the United States section of the Commission and that this matter is receiving active consideration by its members.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM R. VALLANCE,
Assistant to the Legal Adviser.

Malenkov Will Not Tell "Nothing to Nobody"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Macy's does not tell Gimbel's but Malenkov goes Macy's one better. He will not tell anybody. The U. N. has just published its fifth annual yearbook which amounts to a statistician's nightmare. It tells everything about everybody starting with the amount of money spent for agates and going down somewhere to zygotes. That is, it tells about every country except Russia.

Mr. Malenkov refuses to furnish any figures on the day-to-day living costs of his people and the expenses of the Soviet Union for such items as military defense are clouded by all kinds of guesswork. Not only does Mr. M. refuse to tell, he also stops Albania, Bulgaria, mainland China, Czechoslovakia, Eastern Germany, Poland, and Rumania from telling.

A good clue to why Malenkov will not talk comes from some of the living standard items. Out of 230 million radios in the entire world, approximately one-half are in the United States. Twenty-five million of these radios are in American automobiles. We have 1 physician for every 800 inhabitants. Only New Zealand reaches this mark with us. We use up 60 percent of the world's newsprint. Our farmers have

one-third of the world's fertilizer available.

No wonder Mr. Malenkov will not talk. He does not have much to talk about.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, during the past 20 years, many attempts have been made to remake American laws that have to deal with the domestic and foreign concepts of our American way of life. Some of these attempted changes have been openly made, but generally these substitutions and alterations have been deceitful, deceptive, and fraudulent. These modifications, in our age-old American rights, have generally been placed in a gaudy package bound with pinkish, red, and glittering tinsel, with a motto on the outside, "in the name of worldwide humanity." But the opponents of the Bricker amendment have used different wrapping paper because when you cut through their phony legalistic phrases, we see very clearly that their package is wrapped in the clearest of cellophane. Their whole package is designed to make the United States a vassal state in which the internationalists, one-worlders can get control of the sovereignty of the United States.

We, in America, have always won our battles for freedom and sovereignty when we could see our enemy. But the enemy who hides behind the Constitution, while plotting its destruction, is sometimes difficult to control. These modern international Socialists and Communists who use the fifth amendment as a cloak to carry on their so-called enlightening reforms are not always easy to apprehend.

The Bricker amendment, in simple language, is nothing more or less than an attempt to preserve and protect our American heritage.

It might be well to recall that this attempt to destroy our American heritage was started at San Francisco at the first organization meeting of the United Nations—and remember—the basic architect after months of scheming with the internationalist, socialistic, pink-fringe crowd was Alger Hiss.

The San Francisco meeting was nothing more or less than the public stage from which the United Nations concept would be launched—and again the United Nations package was wrapped up in gaudy tinsel—to proclaim to the world an organization for international peace—but the real objective of Alger Hiss, Joe Stalin and all the Red international socialists was a back-door entry to steal the sovereignty of the United States.

This weird organizational meeting opened without prayer so the atheists and other international one-worlders might not be offended at the mention of God's name.

Did the people of the United States elect the delegates to this organizational meeting? No. They were appointed. These delegates simply gambled with the destiny and sovereignty of the American people. Joe Stalin was not there. It was not necessary—because he had Alger Hiss there as Secretary-General. Edward R. Stettinius, one of the United States delegates, told the President of the United States that this United Nations—was a declaration and a constitution.

Emphasis was used as usual by the proponents of the U. N. to show that it was basically designed as a peace organization. Korea is the tragic example of this phony concept. When this U. N. Charter was ratified, it was a blow at American independence—it was dishonoring to the sound doctrine of George Washington and an insult to the memory of the Continental Army—and above all a slave act for the American people.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, has said:

> I made an error which I shall regret all the days of my life when I voted for the United Nations.

The basic objective of the Bricker amendment is to assure two things: that world government cannot be forced on the American people through the back door or by using the Trojan horse technique—and to be doubly sure that the civil liberties of the people of the United States be not destroyed.

Perhaps the Bricker amendment's chief and final objective is to guarantee our basic domestic rights. It is certainly a long jump from our fundamental concepts of basic American rights—if foreign states can change, alter or compel us to change our basic domestic laws. Yet many of those who oppose the Bricker amendment say we must submit to this—in order to show international cooperation.

Our own Constitution would have never been ratified by the States if the Bill of Rights had not been added to the Constitution as the first ten amendments.

The makers of our Constitution thought the Federal Government would only be concerned with treaties concerning boundaries, freedom of the seas, right to trade with foreign nations, etc.

Article VI of the Constitution says:

> . . . All Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

Edgar W. Waybright of Florida has this to say about the intent of the framers of the Constitution:

> They did not foresee that in 1848, a little man who had failed at everything, by the name of Karl Marx, would devise a scheme for a cruel worldwide dictatorship to enslave all mankind. They did not foresee that thousands of college professors, school teachers, ministers, labor bosses, writers, businessmen, lawyers, and doctors, could be led by a few sinister men consumed by the lust for power to turn the words of the Constitution upside down, and inside out, so that they would mean what the writers never intended.
>
> They never could in the wildest nightmare have imagined that these sinister men and these well meaning but shallow thinkers could take from the preamble of this great instrument the phrase "promote the general welfare" and interpret it to mean that these words taken from the context authorized, ignoring the rest of the Constitution, the creation of a Communist, Socialist, or Fascist "welfare" state.
>
> Likewise, the framers of this great instrument could never have dreamed that these same men could twist the above quoted words from article VI to mean that the President of the United Sates and two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, could by ratification of a treaty destroy at one fell swoop the Constitution of the United States, every State constitution in each and every one of the 48 States of the Union, and every State and Federal law.

By use of the present doctrine in the area of domestic law, the President with consent of the Senate can do anything he wants to do by treaty, regardless of the restrictions and prohibitions in the Constitution. This may seem to be a bold statement, but stranger and sadder things than this have happened.

Harry Truman, by a stroke of a pen and a telephone call, caused 130,000 Americans to die in Korea—simply using the authority granted in the United Nations Charter. The Constitution was nullified because it plainly states—only the Congress can declare war.

Patrick Henry well expressed the danger in these words:

> If treaties are made to infringe our liberties, it will be too late to say our rights have been violated.

Those who oppose the Bricker amendment just say "it can't happen here," domestic American laws are in no danger.

Recently the United States Supreme Court had this to say in one of their decisions:

> The U. N. Charter represents a moral commitment of foremost importance and we (the Court) must not permit the spirit of our pledge to be compromised or disparaged in either our domestic or foreign affairs.

These words coming from the Supreme Court—should warn us all—as a red flag of danger.

Secretary Dulles, before he was Secretary of State, pointed out on two separate occasions the necessity for the Bricker amendment. He said in a Louisville, Ky., speech—that treaties can change our domestic law and override the Constitution. But since he has become Secretary of State, he says the danger is unimportant because we will not do anything to undermine the Constitution. That in effect is what all dictators in history have said: "Just give me the power and I'll never misuse it."

Secretary Dulles now says the Bricker amendment would interfere with the international position of the United States. This statement leads to asking Mr. Dulles, the former associate and successor to Mr. Dean Acheson, "which is more important, the international position of the United States or the basic constitutional domestic rights of the American people?"

The great mass of the internationalists, the bleeding hearts for the downtrodden world humanity, the pinks, many scholarly unthinking degree-laden college professors, all are saying, "If we pass the Bricker amendment, we will be placing the President in a straitjacket in his treaty making power." That is just the point—he should be placed in a stratijacket if he makes any treaty or recommends one that in any shape, form or manner interferes or takes away any basic domestic rights of American citizens.

The American people have been accustomed to living under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. I believe they still prefer to live under the constitutional safeguards—rather than upon the mere promises of a court. Under the U. N., a supreme court consisting of Chinese, Russians, Arabs, Jews, Italians, and so forth, can make laws and ratify them because we are a part of the United Nations.

It is, therefore, virtually certain that unless we withdraw from the United Nations or secure an amendment to its charter or amend article 6 of our own Federal Constitution, all segregation laws, all laws prohibiting intermarriage of races, all laws fixing national quotas for immigration, and all laws which in some ways affect different races, different religions, different sexes, and different language speaking peoples will fail. This is already the supreme law of the land. The Charter of the United Nations was a treaty.

How easily could such a vicious treaty be slipped through? At least three recent treaties were legally ratified by one United States Senator. He didn't cast the deciding vote, he cast the only vote. They are now the supreme law of the land. If they had concealed any jokers, American law could not protect you.

Several major treaties have been ratified by a small handful of Senators. For instance, our mutual assistance treaty with Turkey was made the supreme law of the land by six Senators.

A distinguished jurist, Florence E. Allen, judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, recently had this to say:

> At first I was not particularly alarmed about all this, I said to myself, "Well, these international Socialists can draft all the laws they want to, but it will not affect the United States." But then I learned two things I should have known before, but did not. And these two things are the reason for the proposed Bricker amendment. Here they are:
>
> "Bear in mind, as I said before, that an international law called a convention is considered a treaty. In the United States treaties are submitted only to the Senate. They are not submitted to the House of Representatives. An ILO convention, for example, can be ratified as a treaty by a two-thirds vote of the Members of the Senate present on the day the vote is taken. Not two-thirds of the Senate—two-thirds of those present; and unless the question of a quorum is raised, only a handful present could put through the vote. That's how ratification of a convention might be slipped through."

I am sure we all remember when President Truman seized the steel companies. The Constitution gave him no power to take private property—so said a majority of the Supreme Court. But remember that the three dissenting judges said that our ratification of the U. N. had given our President power to seize private property, in defiance of our Constitution. Had these 3 judges been able to persuade 2 more judges to their way of thinking, our Constitution would be dead and we would be completely at the mercy of the United Nations.

Some years ago the Congress enacted a law concerning migratory birds; namely, ducks and geese. The President approved; no one questioned the validity of this act at the time of its passage. But subsequently, someone got arrested for shooting ducks out of season, and this migratory law was attacked because Congress had no power to legislate in this field—that the States had this power. The courts decided that this migratory bird law was unconstitutional. What happened: The United States made a treaty with Great Britain. Then the Supreme Court held that the Federal Government had jurisdiction over migratory birds; but they got this power by the treaty and Congress then got power from the treaty, which it did not otherwise have, to pass the law regulating the hunting of migratory birds.

That was the much discussed case of Missouri vs. Holland, decided by the Supreme Court in 1920. The Court there decided, notwithstanding the contrary view of Thomas Jefferson and many others, that although Congress under the Constitution did not have power to legislate on the subject of migratory birds, still if a treaty was first made, then Congress got from the treaty power which Congress otherwise hasn't got; and that the 10th amendment which, in the absence of a treaty, reserves all those powers to the States, did not stand in the way once a treaty was made. In other words, when the Constitution forbids the Federal Government from doing something, then all the Government needs to do is to make a treaty on the subject with some friendly country, and then the Federal Government acquires power over the subject. This has been called the "bootstrap doctrine" of Federal power, namely, that when the Constitution denies the power, the Government by its own voluntary act of making a treaty with another country, can acquire the power. So, by a broad treaty such as the United Nations Charter covering the whole gamut of human activity, the Federal Government becomes a government of unlimited power, so far as the States and people are concerned—the exact opposite of what the Founding Fathers thought they were creating when they carefully designed a federal government of limited powers only, as we all learned in school.

The Pink case in 1942 went even further. That was a "pink case" indeed. The Soviet Government confiscated the money of a private Russian insurance company held in New York for the protection of policyholders and creditors. In connection with recognizing Soviet Russia in 1933, President F. D. Roosevelt by a letter accepted from Soviet Russia an assignment of these confiscated private funds, agreeing to apply them on Soviet Government debts in the United States. The policyholders and creditors claimed the money, but the Supreme Court, by a 5 to 2 vote, solemnly decided that this "executive agreement" made by the exchange of letters overrode the fifth amendment and also the law of the State of New York. Under that decision, if a subject can be said to be part of the President's foreign policy, the 10 amendments and the Constitution cannot stand in the way. Thus the President, by signing a letter, takes over a large part of the legislative power. He gets dangerously close to one-man government by decree. Hence the Federal Government can by treaty or executive agreement do almost anything, regardless of the Constitution of the United States or the laws of the several States of the Union. To be specific, under the doctrine of the Pink case, we can send Americans abroad for trial on account of crimes committed here, without the constitutional safeguards to which they are entitled, or we can join a world government by treaty.

Perhaps there are many of you—who think that these executive agreements apply to big international policy matters and that your rights as a private American citizen are secure.

Treaties are going out of style because the internationalists say treaties are so cumbersome—and the most radical of the New York leftwing crowd say, "Congress is so provincial in an atomic age, this bunch of squareheads just doesn't have the proper viewpoint."

We all know about Roosevelt's secret agreements at Yalta and Teheran. It is estimated by the U. S. News & World Report that in the last 10 years, over 10,000 agreements have been made—most of them secret as far as the American people know.

We now know about Roosevelt's deals, throughout the world—let us take a look at a few bags of potatoes, under Truman's administration.

A man by the name of Capps, a Virgina potato dealer, found out that he could buy potatoes in Canada, pay freight, customs, and still sell them in Florida at a profit.

The reciprocal trade adherents who are always all preaching we must have free trade throughout the world to show this country's friendly good will and cooperation, evidently did not come to the defense of Capps and his potato purchase.

Capps, the Virginia merchant, bought about 50,000 bags of potatoes in Canada. He paid the Canadian price $88,350—freight charges of $19,417.60, customs duties of United States $37,000—and made a profit of $18,000. Two years later the United States Government sued him in Federal court for $150,486.

There had been an exchange of letters between Harry Truman's State Department and the Canadian Government in which it was agreed that Canada would attempt to prevent shipment of potatoes to the United States.

The Federal Government sued Mr. Capps on this executive agreement. The Federal Government also based its case on the fact that there was a high support price on American potatoes and Capps

had undersold our United States potatoes; hence this was used as the measure of the damages.

The Federal court in Virginia held that this exchange of letters had "the force of law" but also held the Government had not proved its measure of damages. The United States court of appeals sustained Mr. Capps. However, Mr. Brownell, the Attorney General, has appealed to the Supreme Court. He had told the Supreme Court "Nothing in the Constitution forbids this established practice," and that such letters as written by the President to the Canadian Government "are the law of the land."

It seems readily apparent if they can take the gold from insurance company stock holders by an agreement and give Russia a free hand in Asia by commitments at Yalta and Teheran, sue a dealer for a few bags of potatoes, it is high time that this loophole be plugged.

Mr. Frank Holman, former president of the American Bar Association, answers the foregoing question in the following manner:

The only possible answer that can be made to this is that in recent years there has gradually developed in our midst another kind of American than those who founded this great Republic—the American who is impatient with the slow and safe processes of law—impatient of constitutional restraints—the kind of American who prefers unrestrained power—the kind of American who believes in so-called 'unhandicapped' executive power.

Behind all this changed attitude of mind on the part of many of our high officials of Government is also the desire to change America from a republic to a socialistic state by and through the treaty process and eventually to use this device to put us into some form of world government. Mr. Dulles in his Boston speech on August 26, 1953, before the annual meeting of the American Bar Association 'let the cat out of the bag,' or half out of the bag, with respect to this matter. He pointed out that the United Nations Charter, by its own terms, comes up for amendment in 1955. It is now no secret that Mr. Dulles and others believe in strengthening the charter in the direction of world government, and that they are planning and hoping to do this by the treaty method in 1955. The clear answer to these diplomatic planners of world government is that whether we have or do not have world government is a matter for the American people to decide. World government should not be imposed upon them through 'treaty law' and through mere action of the President, the State Department, and two-thirds of the members of the Senate present and voting.

The former Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, and now ratified by Secretary Dulles, proclaim that there is no difference between foreign and domestic affairs and that treaties are supreme and can override the Constitution. Secretary Dulles has said, "Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law."

As you think about the merits or demerits of this Bricker amendment, keep this thought always in your mind. The Bill of Rights in the Constitution forbids the Congress to change your basic American rights, but without the Bricker amendment, since this Republic is now a member of the United Nations, your basic rights can be taken away by a treatymaking agency which consists of the President and two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.

The passage of this amendment will establish once and for all, the American theory that basic American rights cannot be changed by treaties or executive agreements; but without the Bricker amendment these rights can be changed and destroyed by such instruments.

The important thing for everybody to remember is that we are up against the most sinister, diabolical conspiracy in the history of the world to destroy the Constitution of the United States and the American way of life, destroy "the opportunity state" which has made us great, and substitute by the combination of outside force, internal fifth-column activities of force and deception, a slave state in which a government—a world government—shall dominate and control everybody in everything. It is unimportant whether this is called a "liberal" or "progressive" government, a welfare state, Socialist, a Fascist, or a Communist system, they all end up at the same goal post—a totalitarian dictatorship.

In any discussion that is had about the forces and events that are taking place throughout the world, particularly in Asia, Africa, and the Near East, one is always struck most forcibly with this phrase: "self-autonomy—home rule." This is the uppermost in these people's minds—these thoughts even come from Uganda, deep in the jungles of equatorial Africa. These backward and illiterate peoples, just emerging into modern civilization, are trying to light their future with the bright rays of "freedom and self-determination."

While many people of the United States seemingly want to hide our bright light of freedom in the dark recesses of that hideous, deceptive, and fraudulent house of the United Nations, this house of the United Nations could in the years to come, be just a shroud for our Constitution.

To the people of the Sixth Congressional District—Kansans all—people of northwest Kansas, descendants of men of royal blood, the pioneers, men and women who subdued and conquered the high plains with its drought—its violent upheavals of weather, dust storms, a land of water courses without water, a land of no high mountain peaks, no wonderland of scenic valleys nestling between forest covered hillsides, there is no hallowed Plymouth Rock, nor a Bunker Hill Monument, nor a statue of a Jefferson, Washington or Lincoln on a high hill to remind us of our ancient heritage. But there are living monuments in each city, town, and village and on the ancient homesteads—these are the men who in yesteryear gave their services in the Argonne, Belleau Wood, and on the Rhine, men who built bridges over the rivers of Europe, who drove tanks through the Siegfried Line, men who crawled off the ships on the beach of Normandy and waded through the snows of Belgium during the Bulge, and more lately men who took and held Baldy and Pork Chop Hills in Korea.

Most of these men are home. They want to live as free men in a free nation, paying a fair share of taxes to help maintain a government that is theirs—a free man's government—and not a government whose laws can be changed by an international body on some foreign shore.

Men of the Revolution, North and South, gave us our Constitution. We must protect it. The United States is your Government. It is not yet international.

Our trust must be in God, not men.

Ours is a government of constitutional law, not officeholders. Let us keep it so.

Lift your voice, protest to those who would come sneaking through the back door to steal your basic American rights.

The Bricker amendment must be passed.

Outlaw Communist-Dominated Unions in Defense Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPPESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I plan to introduce a bill in the House to prohibit the Government of the United States from entering into any defense contracts with any contractor or supplier where there are reasonable grounds to believe the employees are represented by a Communist-dominated union.

Communist-dominated unions are endangering the security of the United States. The United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, commonly known as the UE, is a Communist-dominated union which has infiltrated its Red tentacles into that indispensable industry of all-American production—the electrical industry. Right today there are many plants working on classified defense contracts where the UE is the collective-bargaining agent for the employees.

One such company where the UE is the collective bargaining representative of the employees is Vickers, Inc., of Detroit, Mich., a plant which I understand is almost entirely devoted to classified defense work. This plant is a glaring example of how the security of the United States is being endangered by the Communist-dominated United Electrical Workers Union. Vickers, Inc., is primarily engaged in producing hydraulic pumps which are an integral part of the control equipment for our military airplanes and ships. Without this essential, complicated hydraulic control equipment, these planes and ships cannot operate. It is essential to American security that no more war contracts be placed with companies such as Vickers, Inc., as long as the bargaining representative of the employees is a Communist-dominated union.

The legislation which I proposed would prohibit the Federal Government

from placing war contracts with companies such as Vickers, Inc., and other companies where the Communist UE or other Communist unions prevail.

This bill would also amend the Taft-Hartley Act by redefining the term "labor organization" to exclude organizations which are Communist dominated. Any Communist-dominated union would thereby cease to have any right to act as a bona fide union or representative of employees. The bill specifically empowers the Subversive Activities Control Board to investigate and determine if a labor union is a Communist-action or Communist-front organization as defined in the Subversives Control Act of 1950.

The bill also expands the Taft-Hartley non-Communist oath by requiring both labor officials and employers to execute such an oath annually and extends the oath to cover not only the Communist Party but also any other organizations determined to be Communist organizations by the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Following the MacArthur-Hoover Policies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent statement that he would withdraw two divisions from Korea and his firm warning to Russia that, if it is guilty of military aggression, there will be no fooling, indicates that we may at last have a sound traditional American foreign policy.

One of the reasons for recalling General MacArthur from the Far East, as you may well remember, was that he proposed that, if we were to continue at war in Korea, orders to limit our fighting to a certain area should be rescinded and he should be permitted to fight as a true soldier always fights—aggressively, with all the force and means at his command—to end the war with a victory as quickly and with as little loss as possible.

But, apparently, the Communist sympathizers in the State Department and in the administration wanted none of that, so MacArthur was recalled. They apparently preferred a stalemate.

You will also remember that former President Hoover suggested that, instead of dissipating our forces all over the world, trying to hold outposts that could not successfully be supplied and maintained with either men or munitions of war, we determine upon a line of national defense—one necessary to protect us—and one that we could successfully hold against all enemies.

In suggestions which I made, inserted in the RECORD, and sent out to the district, while deploring the war, I several times voiced the same thought—suggested that, if our men were to be sent to Asia to fight and die in what I considered unnecessary wars, we should, if we had the weapons which our military advisers said would win that kind of a war, by plane and bomb carry the war to Moscow.

In talks made on the floor and sent out into the district, it was my privilege several times to suggest a course of action similar to that outlined by General MacArthur and former President Hoover. I claim no credit for the conclusions reached at that time. They were just commonsense—the opinion of nine-tenths of our people, many of us without any personal knowledge of the wishes or power possessed by other nations.

Those conclusions were based upon our knowledge of history, upon our personal experience, upon the fact known to every man, woman, and child who has reached the age of discretion, that it is one of the easiest things in the world to attempt more than one can finish.

If now we will stay out of Indochina, avoid involvement in wars which do not vitally concern us, build up our own national defense, we will save American lives and ultimately attain a sound and lasting peace.

Preventing or lessening unemployment by sending young men to fight and die abroad is a destructive, inhuman policy.

That Day Is Here Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, March 15 has had a long and inglorious history from Roman times to our own. If President Eisenhower's suggested change of the tax deadline is pushed back to April 15, a whole new crop of radio and TV jokes will have to be hatched, and banks whose loans go up sharply in March will be revising their own estimates for some years to come.

Whatever may be the obstacles in the way of adopting the President's plan, there would certainly be a few psychological advantages of some importance. The head of the household would have 30 days more to recover from the deluge of Christmas bills which overtook him along about February 1, and the shock of out-go as opposed to the pleasure of intake would be lessened. Moreover, the spring of the year with other pleasant diversions looming on the horizon in the form of the opening game might alleviate the natural distress provoked by the drain and strain of tax day.

No matter how you look at it, March 15 or April 15, the responsibilities of our times may permit us to postpone, but not to eliminate our annual day of reckoning. The only thing that bothers so many of us is the thought that other folks in other lands whose arms we are strengthening do not always seem to be doing their fair share of our common tax task.

Sound Doctrine Then, Sound Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln is quoted as having said in 1863:

> You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. * * * You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn * * * and you cannot help permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

That one paragraph contains three statements, each a sermon in itself, each applicable to our present situation.

In recent years, we have heard much about "soaking the rich." Frequently, President Roosevelt, though he was a wealthy man himself, pilloried those who had more of this world's material wealth than did the average man. He denounced them as "princes of privilege." What he forgot or ignored, as do many others, was that one cannot take his worldly goods with him when he dies; that even if the very wealthy spend foolishly, someone profits by their foolish spending. He also ignored the fact—and it is a fact—that many who accumulate wealth furnish either employment or the opportunity to purchase necessities or luxuries which otherwise would not be available. Without money, a man cannot operate a mercantile establishment, build and operate a factory, both of which mean jobs. Why should anyone complain just because another has more wealth—especially when we all profit when it is used or spent?

The same truth is applicable to national affairs. To other nations we have given billions upon billions of dollars until it has now become a question of whether we can maintain a sound economic policy, enable our citizens to continue to have the same standard of living they have previously enjoyed.

If we continue indefinitely our domestic policy of, from the earnings of all, meeting the demands of, first, this, then that, and other pressure groups, we will find that we have finally, while increasing the number of those who have been aided by benefits paid from the Public Treasury, lessened the number of those who pay taxes until they can no longer carry the burden. Without an adequate tax collection from those who have, the Government cannot operate.

That we "cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than we earn" is a self-evident truth which we should now realize and act upon.

We now have a public debt of around $275 billion, with an interest charge of approximately $7 billion a year, and a deficit of $3,274,000,000 for the fiscal year ending in June of 1954; a predicted deficit in the fiscal year of 1955 of $2,928,000,000.

The remedy is not an increase in taxes. The remedy is to cut down our expenditures. If we do, we'll find that we can

get along very well without things which we mistakenly think are necessities.

Help the unfortunate? Certainly. But for those who are able to help themselves make available an opportunity to earn, not a gift, and then see that they do something for themselves.

Many of our troubles would be over if we would just follow the advice Lincoln—the honest, industrious, patriotic, and successful man—gave us so many years ago. Instead of crying about our troubles, why not rejoice over our blessings?

H. R. 7894

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN DIES
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill:

H. R. 7894

A bill declaring the Communist Party and similar revolutionary organizations illegal; making membership in, or participation in the revolutionary activity of, the Communist Party or any other organization furthering the revolutionary conspiracy by force and violence a criminal offense; and providing penalties

SECTION 1. Upon evidence which has been presented and proof which has been established before the Congress of the United States and the courts of the United States, there exists an international revolutionary Communist conspiracy which is committed to the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States and of the several States, such conspiracy including the Communist Party of the United States, its various components of affiliated, subsidiary, and frontal organizations and the members thereof.

SEC. 2. The Communist Party of the United States and its various components of affiliated, subsidiary, and frontal organizations and all other organizations, no matter under what name, whose object or purpose is to overthrow the Government of the United States, or the government of any State, Territory, district, or possession thereof, or the government of any political subdivision therein by force and violence, are hereby declared illegal and not entitled to any of the rights, privileges, and immunities attendant upon legal bodies created under the jurisdiction of the laws of the United States or any political subdivision thereof; and whatever rights, privileges, and immunities which have heretofore been granted to said party, its various components of affiliated, subsidiary, and frontal organizations and other organizations with the same revolutionary purposes, by reason of the laws of the United States or any political subdivision thereof, are hereby terminated.

SEC. 3. Whoever, therefore, being a member of the Communist Party of the United States or any affiliated, subsidiary, or frontal organization thereof, or any other organization, no matter how named, whose object or purpose is to overthrow the Government of the United States, or the government of any State, Territory, district, or possession thereof, or the government of any political subdivision therein by force or violence, knowing the revolutionary object or purpose thereof; or whoever participates in the revolutionary activities of the Communist Party or any affiliated subsidiary or frontal organization thereof, or any other organization with the same revolutionary purpose, knowing the revolutionary object or purpose thereof, is guilty of a Federal offense, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be sentenced to imprisonment for not exceeding 10 years or fined not exceeding $10,000, or both.

House Resolution 407

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I introduced a resolution calling for an investigation by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of barriers to the free flow of interstate commerce which are now being restored as the result of action by various States in retaliation for Ohio's axle-mile truck tax.

Since the introduction of that resolution, four southern States—Georgia, Alabama, Kentucky, and Virginia—have begun to tax trucks from Ohio in the dispute over reciprocal agreements and several other States have announced the cancellation of their agreements effective March 1.

The net effect of the breakdown in these reciprocal arrangements, under which trucks from one State could go into another without paying any additional fees or charges, is to resurrect the customs barriers which the commerce clause in the Constitution was designed to eliminate. With each passing day, the situation in the interstate trucking industry is becoming more urgent.

I have recently received a communication from Representative Roger Cloud, of the Ohio House of Representatives, the author of Ohio's axle-mile tax. Mr. Cloud has endorsed a congressional study such as I proposed, recognizing that the movement in free interstate commerce by trucks has increased so substantially in the past 15 years that problems have been created which the States themselves have not yet been able to solve.

It would seem that the time is propitious for the Federal Government to consider legislation standardizing loading rules for commercial vehicles engaged in interstate commerce and, if possible, to levy a uniform use tax applying equally to all such commerce in each State—

Mr. Cloud wrote.

Such a tax should not be levied, however, unless the Federal Government simultaneously vacated the gasoline tax, which it is now collecting, to the States. By no means should the Federal highway-tax load be increased in total. Like many other people I am averse to increased Federal intervention in governmental affairs but from the inception of our Government, interstate commerce has been conceded to be a field requiring Federal regulation—

Mr. Cloud added.

Admittedly, the issues arising out of the Ohio axle-mile tax are complex. They are far-reaching and of vital importance to the general public and economy of the Nation. Mr. Cloud is to be commended on the time and effort he has applied to this serious problem.

I am convinced that the creeping breakdown of reciprocity among the States is a proper area for examination by the Congress of the United States. It is the very purpose of the commerce clause in the Constitution to foster free trade among the several States.

Pleas for Federal action have come to me and, I am sure, to other Members of Congress from many of our constituents affected by the Ohio truck tax. It has been suggested that the Federal Government should step in to solve the problems of interstate relationships. Other proposals call for Federal standardization of rules and fees for interstate truck traffic. Other recommendations are that the Federal Government should withdraw from the gasoline tax field and permit the States to tap additional gasoline revenues in order to help finance their highway construction program.

The trucking industry itself, I understand, is to meet in Chicago March 8, 9, and 10 to discuss what Federal action might be necessary to restore reciprocity and alleviate the heavy burdens that will have to be borne by consumers from pyramiding of truck transportation costs.

I urge leaders of the trucking industry to be statesmanlike in their approach and to consider constructive proposals for halting the trend toward the breakdown of the American system of highways while at the same time recognizing the legitimate needs of States for additional highway revenues.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following letter addressed to me by Roger Cloud, of the Ohio house of representatives:

OHIO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Columbus, February 4, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I understand that you have recently introduced a resolution calling for a congressional study of taxes levied on commercial vehicles which are used in interstate commerce and particularly the Ohio mileage tax. I do not know the purpose for the introduction of the resolution, but if it is to promote a study on the proper rules to be adopted for the use of such vehicles in interstate traffic, then I commend you for it. There is an opportunity for you to perform a real public service in this field. There is now, and has been for some time, a real need for a standardization of rules for intercharges between States for vehicles engaged in such commerce and also for uniform rules governing load limits and vehicular dimensions.

The enactment of a road use charge for heavy vehicle highway usage in Ohio was made necessary by the adoption of a long-delayed highway improvement program. It is presently being levied on all heavy vehicles which use Ohio highways whether or not they are licensed within this State. Use taxes, including the gasoline tax, cannot be levied equitably unless applied equally to all highway users.

Nevertheless the charge has been made that the Ohio mileage tax has disturbed reciprocity and created trade barriers between States. Use taxes, again including gasoline taxes, do not erect trade barriers. Under them, all who are subject to their

application are charged in direct relationship to the benefit derived. There has never been any contention that gasoline taxes and turnpike charges, which are levied on all vehicles without regard to State lines, have acted as trade barriers. Rather, it is the imposition of high flat taxes on out-of-State vehicles which create obstacles to interstate commerce since these have no relationship to usage or benefit. The Ohio mileage tax does not serve as a barrier to trade, but Kentucky's high flat fee does. Ohio's charge is related directly to actual highway usage, while Kentucky's flat charge against Ohio trucks has no real relationship to usage. The courts, including the United States Supreme Court, have held that highway use taxes which are directly related to benefit are not in violation of the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution but that the exaction of flat privilege fees would be so construed.

The word reciprocity seems to hold different meanings for various persons. The dictionary defines it as equal treatment, but it is used by some, in the field of highway taxation, as meaning blanket forgiveness of taxation; wherein truck operators would pay truck taxes for use of highways in their own State, but none would be required to pay such taxes in any State except the State in which they were domiciled. It would seem hardly possible that the highway expansion programs which are needed in every State could be financed on such a basis. Again, this strange theory has never been applied to the major highway supporting tax—the gasoline tax.

It is wise to refrain from charging license fees, or other flat charges, on out-of-State vehicles and Ohio proposes to adhere to this practice. There are many indications that other States, also wrestling with highway finance problems, are leaning toward the adoption of a policy of avoiding flat fees in interstate highway charges.

The movement of freight in interstate commerce by truck has grown so tremendously in the past 15 years, that problems have been created in this field which have not yet been fully solved. If prudence is exercised, solutions can be reached which will not be damaging to the industry and will still accomplish a proper finance program for highway construction.

It would seem that the time is propitious for the Federal Government to consider legislation standardizing loading rules for commercial vehicles engaged in interstate commerce and, if possible, to levy a uniform use tax applying equally to all such commerce in each State. Such a tax should not be levied, however, unless the Federal Government simultaneously vacated the gasoline tax, which it is now collecting, to the States. By no means should the Federal highway tax load be increased in total.

Like many other people, I am averse to increased Federal intervention in governmental affairs but from the inception of our Government, interstate commerce has been conceded to be a field requiring Federal regulation.

In the absence of such Federal action, mileage taxes can operate successfully in individual States. Such problems of interstate relationships as do arise immediately after the adoption of such a tax in any State, can be readily solved by legislative action by individual States or through pacts made by several States. While Federal standardization of rules and charges in interstate truck traffic would be most advantageous to the commercial trucking industry, such is not necessary to the use of truck mileage or use taxes for highway finance.

I am now convinced, as I have always been, that the Ohio mileage tax is fair and just and that it can operate successfully. I am also convinced that the accomplishment of the highway program, to be partially supported by this tax, will reflect to the benefit of the trucking industry more than to any other class of highway users. This is as it should be for the trucking industry is a most important segment of our economy.

I have gone to considerable length to present some of my views to you for there seems to be considerable misunderstanding as to the views held by several of us who have recently been involved in the enactment of highway finance legislation.

Wishing you complete success in this and every other endeavor, and reiterating the belief that there is afforded you in this matter a real opportunity to render a distinct public service, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ROGER CLOUD.

Packages to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times on the floor of the House of my deep concern over Poland's distressing plight, and today I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "Packages to Poland," which appears in the February issue of the publication News From Behind the Iron Curtain, published by the National Committee for a Free Europe, which follows:

PACKAGES TO POLAND

A Polish decree imposing crippling customs duties on parcels from abroad appeared to be a new step in the Communist anti-West campaign. Propaganda proclaiming the imminent economic collapse of the United States and the low living standards prevalent throughout the West has too often been dispelled by the receipt of gift packages from abroad. It is estimated that 100,000 parcels, mostly from the United States, are shipped to Poland monthly, and that since the end of the war Poles have received $100 million worth of goods. Hitherto, the regime has tolerated these packages because they have relieved considerably the acute shortage of consumer supplies; now, they are to be curtailed, not only because they are an "invidious" form of pro-Western propaganda, but because the government must boost its supply of foreign currency.

Under the new decree, only books, periodicals, photographs, and medical equipment, such as hearing aids and artificial limbs, will be admitted duty free. For other goods, import duties are excessive; at the current official exchange rate of four zlotys to the dollar, Poles will have to pay about $15 on a new pair of nylon stockings and $10 on a used pair. The intention of the decree is that money rather than parcels should be sent from abroad to the official import-export agency, PKO (General Bureau of Savings). Then PKO will keep the money and the recipient of the gift will be given the equivalent in goods from special state stores. The government will thus be assured a supply of foreign currencies.

Due to the unfavorable artificial exchange rate of the zloty it is expected that people will be discouraged from sending money to Poland in place of goods. Ten dollars exchanged for zlotys at the official rate will buy just one pound of coffee. With the curtailment of gift parcels, the Polish people will be deprived of many products which are either unobtainable or far too expensive. A new pair of shoes—of poor quality—costs a person in Poland more than $40.

Mr. Speaker, the purport of the decree issued by the satellite Government of Poland seems to me to be aimed at breaking one of the few remaining ties which exists between the enslaved Poles and their kind friends in the United States.

Poland, which today exists in the state of enslavement to Moscow, knows that once the Communist conquest of a nation is achieved, then the true nature of the ruling power in the Kremlin reveals itself in the most tyrannical form of modern imperialism. The exorbitant taxing of parcels from the United States fits into the well-known pattern of complete Comunist bondage so ruthlessly imposed on peoples behind the iron curtain. In bringing this regrettable situation to the attention of my colleagues, I urge you to wholeheartedly support House Resolution 422, introduced by Congressman EDMUND P. RADWAN, of New York, protesting this latest Soviet state-sponsored device for internally solidifying its power in Poland.

Boy Scout Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, in connection with the annual observance of Boy Scout Week, I was privileged to meet in my office two Cub Scouts who were selected from the northwest area of our Nation's Capital to make presentations of Scout pins to Members of Congress. These boys, members of Pack 57, are Jimmy Korman, 3314 Stephenson Place NW., and Barry Handloff, 6120 33d Street NW., and were accompanied by their mothers.

During the presentation Jimmy stated to me:

I am a member of Pack 57. This week the Boy Scouts of America celebrate their 44th anniversary. As a representative of the Boy Scouts, I invite you to honor our celebration by wearing this pin during Boy Scout Week.

Then Barry placed the pin on my coat with the following statement:

It is a great honor for me to present this pin and we hope you will wear it in your lapel.

I was pleased to tell these boys that I most certainly appreciated their thinking about me, and that I would wear the pin with pride and honor.

The Boy Scouts of America is a wonderful organization, having high ideals for our boys, and their group is to be congratulated on the very fine work they are doing in molding the characters of American youth.

Armenia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, 33 years ago, February 18, the Armenian people rebelled against and overthrew a ruthless communistic dictatorship, which had been illegally and forcibly imposed upon them. Although these brave people have again felt the mailed fist of totalitarian communism, the spirit of liberty still abides with them, and in their land, and among all peoples of Armenian blood wherever they may be.

The Armenian people have a proud and noble ancient heritage. Throughout history their contributions have been noteworthy in trade, commerce, culture, and devotion to freedom. The Armenian people are not surpassed. Their family life and loyalty to each other in the things in which they believe have always been an inspiration. Those of them who have come to this country and their descendants live among us as good neighbors, as lawabiding, industrious, liberty-loving, loyal citizens. Like many other racial stocks, they have come here from distant parts of the world. Their historic culture, blended with our own, has thus added to the composite beauty and fullness of American life.

I have many friends among the Armenian people, whom I consider to be, not only good neighbors and good friends, but among our very best American citizens. They are wedded to the arts and practices of peace, yet their sons and daughters have ably, bravely, and unselfishly served this Nation in time of war and peril.

I am pleased, on this historic day, to pay my tribute to the Armenian people and the Armenian Nation and to pledge my absolute fealty to their cause of liberation and the recapture of their cherished civil liberties. I hope the day is not far distant when they will be freed from abominable slavery and bondage and be restored and reunited, as is their ardent, ever-present desire and purpose, to all free peoples throughout the earth.

May our good Armenian friends in this country be soon relieved of the anguish they feel for their homeland and for their dear ones so far away from our shores, who are visited with cruel serfdom and persecution for no reason than they are true to the faith of their fathers and to the principles of human liberty.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, where will you get your tax money next week?

Twelfth Report on Legislation of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include my 12th report on the legislation of the 83d Congress, which covers all of the legislation so far enacted at this session. It is my practice to report to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois on all measures that have passed both bodies and have been approved by the President. As my vote is in reality their vote, I feel under the moral obligation of an agent reporting to a principal to let my constituents know how I voted on each measure.

The 12th report follows:

DEAR FRIEND: In the first 6 weeks of the 2d session of the 83d Congress exactly 7 bills passed by House and Senate have been signed by the President, thus becoming public laws. This is the accomplishment up to date.

In previous reports to you I have covered the legislation of the 1st session of the 83d Congress. Report No. 11, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, 1954, pages 766–769, completes the coverage up to the opening of the second session.

Now continue:

PUBLIC LAW 289

S. 727. Repayment contracts for irrigation construction.

This is the first public law of the 2d session of the 83d Congress. It was passed by the Senate on July 18, 1953, in the closing weeks of the 1st session. Exactly 6 months later (January 18, 1954, 12 days after the convening of the 2d session) it reached the House and was passed on a voice vote without opposition. The measure was approved by the President on January 30, 1954.

I think you will find some interest in this. In irrigation projects the ability of the water users to absorb and repay the costs of irrigation construction is determined by studies undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation. Amendatory repayment contracts become necessary where existing contract requirements are beyond the wealth-producing ability of the project lands. The cost of the physical and economic analyses incident to the renegotiations has never been charged up to the irrigation districts as reimbursable. However, in legislation of recent years (affecting the Deaver, Prosser, Belle Fourche, Willwood, Bitterroot, Kittitas, and Okanogan Irrigation Districts) through inadvertance to authority was given to make the study costs nonreimbursable. Public Law 289 accomplishes that end.

PUBLIC LAW 290

H. R. 6665. Cotton allotments and marketing quotas:

There are about 26 million acres planted to cotton in 19 States (9,656,400 in Texas, 2,400 in Illinois). Public Law 290 sets a total national cotton-acreage allotment of 21,379,342 acres for 1954. That means about 5 million acres of cotton land left to be plowed under or turned to other crops.

To add to the headaches (very real in Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi) California and Arizona have gone into cotton growing in a big way. In California acreage is up from under 600,000 acres in 1950 to 1,400,000 acres. One reason: utilization of large tracts of irrigated lands by corporations with large capital and benefiting from special tax dispensations, much in the nature of subsidies. If interested further, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12, 1954, pages 171–172, for colloquy between Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator ANDERSON on $15,791,000 in tax certificates to one corporation and its subsidiary.

Arkansas, third State in the Union in cotton production, has 100,000 cotton farmers, average farm acreage 20. South Carolina has 39,000 cotton farmers with an average acreage of less than 5. On the other hand California, which has skyrocketed to fifth place in cotton production, has only 8,000 cotton growers, many corporations, practically no small farmers. With cotton now in overproduction the historical cotton States of Dixie are worried.

Irrigation in the Southwest is nurturing a competing giant for them; likewise, the development of water power in the Tennessee Valley is aiding and abetting the South's threat to the industrial position of the Middle West. An interesting and a changing world. By attention to the debates in Congress I try to keep sensitive to regional trends, to see signs of pending changes, some fairly immediate and some remote, and the effect upon the district and the people I am privileged to represent.

I voted for Public Law 290 as a matter of routine duty. There had been no cotton marketing quotas since 1950, due to Korea. But production for 1953 much exceeding 12 million bales (actually it went 2 million bales above the estimate of late summer); the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 required the proclamation of marketing quotas for 1954. As planting time was at hand delay in fixing the acreage allotment would have been unfair. The members from the cotton States seemed agreed that the limitation upon the acreage was not so drastic as to destroy the cotton economy. These included Congressman PAUL BROWN, who as No. 2 Democratic member of the Banking and Currency Committee invariably has shown sympathetic understanding of urban problems I have presented in the committee. Congressman BROWN is from the cotton country and I hold him in high esteem.

Public Law 290 was signed by the President on January 30, 1954. In its original form it had passed the House on July 31, 1953 (first session) but did not get to the floor of the Senate until January 12, 1954, in the second week of the second session. Bills introduced in the first session of Congress continue alive in the second session until disposed of.

PUBLIC LAW 291

H. R. 7209. Extends the Missing Persons Act until July 1, 1955:

The Department of Defense is currently carrying 3,205 persons as captured or missing in Korea. Latest official figures: Army, 2,608; Air Force, 336; Navy, 74; Marine Corps, 187. How many of these have been killed, how many are secret prisoners is not ascertainable. Our Government still maintains the Chinese are holding many American prisoners.

The Missing Persons Act (first enacted in 1942) is the only legislative authority for keeping them on the payroll and continuing payments to dependents. It was scheduled to expire February 1, 1954, but the Congress and the President came through with the extension just in the nick of time. Public Law 291 was signed by the President on January 30, 1954. It had passed the House 3 days previously. Of course, I with all other Members on the floor at the time voted for this measure.

PUBLIC LAW 292

S. 373. Trading with the enemy: Under the Trading With the Enemy Act right was given for the filing of claims for the return of property seized by the Custodian of Alien Property. This right, however, expired in 1949. Because of war-aftermath conditions, notice of the right did not come to general attention with the result that many with meritorious claims were shut out. Public

Law 292 extends the time for filing to February 9, 1955. Several claimants in the second district have spoken to me on this matter. I would suggest that they file their claims at once, as it is unlikely there will be another extension. As a matter of fairness, Public Law 292 went through by consent. Further extension, however, would interfere with the expeditious liquidation of the Office of Alien Property.

PUBLIC LAW 293

House Joint Resolution 354. Sixty thousand dollars for travel.

In 1953 the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, created in 1953 and known as the Hoover Commission, was limited to a $14,700 expenditure for travel. Public Law 293 increases the travel allowance to $60,000. Why? Congressman PHILLIPS (subcommittee chairman, appropriations), in recommending the increase to the House, said: "A great many of the members, advisers, staff members, and other people interested in the Commission are men who serve without pay; they are paid only traveling expenses." I am sure that Mr. PHILLIPS did not intend what a literal interpretation of his words might imply. There is, of course, no valid reason why the expense of travel and food should be greater for a volunteer than in the case of a paid staff worker.

The original Hoover Commission did a splendid work, because it was entirely nonpartisan, nonpolitical. Unfortunately, Public Law 108 of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, which created the present Hoover Commission, has no provision for minority representation. Despite the fact that in this regard it was politically rigged, I voted for it because of my deep belief in the objectives of the Hoover Commission as we had known it in earlier years. For the same reason, I voted for Public Law 293, but only after assurance had been publicly given to the House that no part of the $60,000 would be spent in foreign travel.

PUBLIC LAW 294

S. 15. Additional Federal judges: Republican lawyers seeking the security and dignity of the Federal bench will find interest in this legislation creating 27 new judges, 3 in the United States circuit court, 24 in the district court. None is in the Chicago area; one in Michigan. I voted to recommit the bill for the purpose of deleting the additional judges for Nevada and Utah. At present there is a Federal judge in each of these States (Judge Roger Foley of Nevada grew up in the Second District, was graduated from Chicago Kent College of Law.) I thought it an unwarranted waste of public money to create judicial jobs for patronage use and where no real need existed. Unfortunately, the House defeated the motion to recommit.

PUBLIC LAW 295

House Joint Resolution 358. Discharges indebtedness of Commodity Credit Corporation:

The Commodity Credit Corporation is the agency which the United States Government uses to support farm prices. It has been spending money so rapidly (storage charges alone total $14 million a month) that it got within a few dollars of its authorized debt limitation of $6.75 billion. In short, CCC and the farm support program were broke. To complicate matters, the Secretary of Agriculture seemed hesitant about asking Congress to raise the limitation on CCC's debt because that would add to the national debt which already is close to the authorized limitation.

What Public Law 295 does is unusual to say the least. CCC owes the United States Treasury $741,548,788. Public Law 295 orders the United States Treasury to give CCC a receipt in full, canceling the entire indebtedness. Thus CCC is given three-fourths of a billion dollars, not by an appropriation bill but by a subterfuge. In that its one and only purpose is to make it possible for CCC to violate the debt limitation law it is downright dishonest.

I think most Members of Congress resented the position in which we were put. The Department of Agriculture did not make known to Congress its financial condition until the very last moment. It was then a matter of going along with the Department in a weird and immoral act of legislation or permitting the farm-support program to collapse. Meanwhile a meeting of the House Banking and Currency Committee has been called for February 24, 1954, to consider H. R. 7339, a bill to increase CCC's borrowing authority.

PRESIDENTIAL VETO

In addition to the above bills that became public laws with the Presidential signature the House and Senate passed another bill which the President vetoed. This was H. R. 1917, providing for the coining of 50-cent pieces commemorating the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase.

I supported this measure in the Banking and Currency Committee on the reasoning that a commemorative coin is among the intangible influences to pride and patriotism that cannot be evaluated by the measure of small inconvenience its issue might impose upon the mint. Apparently this was the view of my colleagues generally since no vote against the measure was cast in either body.

In his veto message President Eisenhower referred to the fact that President Hoover had vetoed a bill of similar character.

President Hoover in his veto message of April 21, 1930, said:

"The monetary system of the country is created and exists for certain well-defined and essential purposes. Sound practice demands that it should not be diverted to other uses."

President Eisenhower in his veto message of February 3, 1954, said:

"The principal objection to commemorative coins is that they detract from the fundamental function of the coinage as a medium of exchange."

BARRATT O'HARA.

Next Item on Atom Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, out in Oak Ridge, Tenn., the atom scientists are hard at work on the next big step in the use of atomic energy for peacetime purposes. They are finishing work on a project which may lead to nuclear-powered aircraft.

The big difficulty is the perfection of some method which will protect the pilots of such planes from being exposed to the radiation of the atom. Thick walls or lots of water are the present methods of shielding the folks who have to work with atomic energy today.

But the people who are launching this project think that the techniques will be found. Some substance will come along with the magic properties required.

Ability, Not Disability, Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the sixth national wheelchair basketball tournament will be held in New York City on April 9, 10, and 11. It will be sponsored by the Fifty-two Association of New York, Inc., a nonprofit, nonsectarian, nonpolitical organization which since 1945 has been keeping its pledge that "the wounded shall never be forgotten" with outstanding programs of entertainment, job assistance, hobby programs, adapted sports, and other special rehabilitation services for hospitalized servicemen and veterans from Massachusetts to Virginia. Other chapters of the Fifty-two Association serve the wounded in Chicago, Buffalo, Los Angeles, and Miami Beach.

The national wheelchair basketball tournament is an exciting and dramatic sports demonstration of the significant rehabilitation idea that "ability, not disability, counts." The players come from California, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, New England, New Jersey, and the New York City area. They include veterans and nonveterans, disabled by polio, amputations, and paraplegia. Every game convinces the spectators that if these men can play wheelchair basketball so effectively, surely they can "play" wheelchair bookkeeping, bench assembly, watch repair, and many other kinds of useful work just as well.

The tournament will be held in the 212th AAA Group Armory, Columbus Avenue and 62d Street in New York City. There will be two games at each session, with sessions on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday afternoons, and Friday and Saturday evenings. Because this activity, like all of the Fifty-two Association's activities, is a nonprofit activity, ticket prices are set remarkably low in the hope that the largest possible number will attend.

It is worth noting that very few changes have been made in regular basketball rules as a concession to the fact that this game is played in wheelchairs. The safety record of this sport is as good or better than other competitive sports. Thrills and excitement are as high or higher.

Because of the game's tremendous values in physical, social, and vocational rehabilitation, the Fifty-two Association willingly accepts the financial responsibility, knowing that the tournament will probably result in a deficit. Last year's deficit of $2,500 was underwritten by the Bulova Foundation.

Attitudes toward the severely disabled, which play such a large role in the total adjustment of those disabled, are bound to be affected favorably by the encouragement of this activity; all who witness the games are inspired by the courage and ability of all the participants.

America is strong because we respect each individual for the contribution he can make to the national welfare. America is strong because of voluntary groups of citizens like the Fifty-two Association. America is strong because of the performance and spirit of all our men and women whether they are more or less disabled.

Wheelchair basketball may seem to be just a game. Actually, it is a moving symbol of our Nation's character. Men and women of good will can help to keep that character sound by encouraging such worthwhile public service activities like the national wheelchair basketball tournament. The Fifty-two Association at 840 Eighth Avenue, New York 19, would be delighted to receive communications from all who would like to attend any of the tournament sessions or know more about how they can organize or sponsor wheelchair basketball activities in their own communities.

Report on Military Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members the report on surplus military property prepared by the Subcommittee on Military Operations under the chairmanship of the Honorable R. WALTER RIEHLMAN. The report is identified as House Report No. 1196, being the sixth intermediate report of the Committee on Government Operations.

It was my privilege as a member of the Riehlman subcommittee to participate in a number of the subcommittee hearings at various military installations. Chairman RIEHLMAN and other members of the subcommittee, as well as the staff, are to be commended for their hard work and careful investigations in the field of military supply management in an endeavor to save the taxpayers' money and to improve the efficiency of the military services.

Judging from our findings in surplus property, Mr. Speaker, there is considerable room for improvement. Today we are witnessing the end results of excessive procurement, unrealistic stock levels and ineffective utilization of military supplies. The military services have on their hands a gigantic problem of surplus property disposal. During fiscal 1953 the Department of Defense disposed of personal property—as differentiated from real property—which originally cost the taxpayers $1¼ billion. In the next few years the magnitude of their problem will be several times greater.

Several years ago, when I called attention on this floor to the imminent development of a surplus-property problem—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 13, 1952—and to the importance of devising effective machinery to cope with that problem, it was difficult to arouse much interest. The agencies of government, content to pursue their usual routine, were inclined to make light of the problem. They displayed no great interest or concern to make ready for what is upon us today.

When the Hoover Commission was reestablished during the 83d Congress, and I was honored by the Speaker in being appointed to that Commission, I proposed that a task force be created to deal with the specific subject matter on surplus-property disposal. My colleagues on the Commission immediately accepted that recommendation and agreed to set up such a task force. The group now is engaged in making the necessary studies, and I am hopeful that it will present soundly conceived recommendations to the Congress at a later date.

In the meantime, I believe our Subcommittee on Military Operations is performing a very useful service by inquiring into the surplus-property field. The report to which I call attention today will be followed by further reports.

The Members will note in this report that for the $1¼ billion worth of property sold as surplus by the military services in fiscal 1953, the return averaged something like 6 cents on the dollar. I am convinced that the taxpayers should be getting a better deal from returns on surplus. A major difficulty is the lack of interest and experience of military officials in doing an effective merchandising job. In view of the billions of dollars involved in the entire program, surplus-property disposal requires a new appraisal and a fresh approach; it should no longer be regarded as a dull, routine chore by military officers temporarily assigned the disposal task.

It has been my view, and this report bears me out, that civilian merchandising experience should be brought into disposal operations. By offering some incentives to private industry merchandisers under proper safeguards to protect the Government, I believe that large portions of this vast surplus can be sold more expeditiously and for a larger percentage of return to the Treasury.

In a previous report—House Report No. 857, 83d Congress, 1st session—our subcommittee called upon the Department of Defense and the General Services Administration to prepare jointly a program for effective disposal of surplus. Under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the General Services Administration has basic jurisdiction in this field. I trust that the Agency will display enough ingenuity and imagination to come up with a sound and workable program and will not sidestep its primary responsibilities in handling surplus disposal.

Mr. Edmund B. Mansure, the General Services Administrator is aware of this rapidly growing problem of surplus property disposal and has recognized his primary responsibility under the statute for developing a formula which will insure maximum use of excess property among Federal agencies and maximum dollar recovery to the Government from final surplus disposal.

Further, he has assured our chairman, Mr. RIEHLMAN, that the subcommittee will be kept informed of the progress of the present study which is being made by his staff in this field.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Bricker amendment, as amended by the George amendment, was an effort to amend the Constitution so as to prevent a President, without the knowledge or consent of the Congress or the people, making what is known as an executive agreement with another nation or group of nations, which would have the effect of permitting the imposition upon the people of the United States of laws restricting their rights which have not been enacted by either the States or the Congress.

Our forefathers, in writing the Constitution, did a remarkably fine job, but they could not anticipate changing conditions, practices, or needs which might arise in the future.

That they expected the Constitution to be amended is evident from the fact that in article V they provided the procedure for adopting constitutional amendments. Twenty-two times the people have amended the Constitution in accordance with that procedure, once repealed an amendment.

It follows then that all this hue and cry by the opponents of the Bricker amendment that it, or any substitute offered in lieu thereof, would destroy the Constitution is—to use a common expression—"bunk."

The question now before the Senate is not whether President Eisenhower should be deprived of the power to make executive agreements with other nations without the knowledge or consent of the Congress or the people, but whether any President should have opportunity to exercise that power.

Apparently, no one dreamed of the necessity of an amendment similar in substance to the Bricker proposal until we discovered that both former President Roosevelt and former President Truman had made executive agreements, the results of which were to get us into two unnecessary wars, impose laws upon us which neither the States nor Congress had passed.

Our taxpayers are now being asked by United Nations to pay thousands of dollars to U. N. employees who were discharged because they were either commies or invoked the fifth amendment.

The thought and purpose involved in the Bricker amendment were sponsored by 64 Senators—more than two-thirds of the Senate membership—including both

Michigan Senators. Then, the internationalists—that is, those who want to permit the President of the United States and the United States to make secret executive agreements, that is, become involved in foreign entanglements, contrary to Washington's advise—and some who are willing to take a chance, apparently thinking more of pleasing foreign powers than they do of maintaining our independence, began to cry that the adoption of such an amendment was a declaration of a lack of confidence in President Eisenhower. It is no such thing.

Obviously, under the Constitution, President Eisenhower cannot hold that office to exceed two terms. What those who are in favor of this proposal to amend the Constitution are trying to do is to prevent any President from hereafter following the precedents set by former President Roosevelt and former President Truman in making secret agreements with other nations, which would automatically curtail the liberties of our citizens, impair the security of our Nation. Certainly, the people should be permitted to vote upon that proposition.

Though on the 26th of February, the amendment was defeated 61 to 30, lacking 1 vote of the necessary two-thirds, it will be up again. The Michigan Senators voted one for, one against.

President Eisenhower's Program: Eye Opener

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Eisenhower has given Congress a program which calls for action as well as study and debate. In an analysis prepared by an independent research organization, 196 separate proposals outlined by the President are listed. This is a bigger load than anything dished out for congressional consideration in the last 20 years. The only series to match this list came in the famous 100 days of 1933 when an avalanche hit the Nation.

The President's program is part of his effort to tighten the spending policies of the country, to balance the budget, to institute conservative financing, and, at the same time, to put our social-security program and our social outlook as well on a sound basis. Included in Mr. Eisenhower's requests are propositions for improved public-health facilities, more social-security benefits, a wider spread of homeownership, changes in the unemployment insurance setup, and modified agricultural benefits.

What is remarkable about the President's program is the universal agreement that it can be achieved without bankrupting the Nation. No greater testimonial could be offered to the skill and intelligence with which the Republican national administration has been handling its problems. Under the Democrats, a program comparable to President Eisenhower's would have called for spending more money than China has rice.

Postal Workers Deserve an Increase in Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, when the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee recently began its hearings on H. R. 2344, concerning the salaries of postal workers, I submitted a statement to the committee in support of that bill. The text of my statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. LOUIS B. HELLER, OF NEW YORK, TO THE HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE ON H. R. 2344

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to present my views to your committee concerning H. R. 2344, the bill to provide for an increase in the salaries of postal workers.

As in previous years, I am again glad to state my views and to urge full support and favorable action before your committee on this measure.

I have always maintained that the salaries of those employed in our postal service have never been adequately adjusted to meet the high cost of living since the end of World War II. I am even more so convinced of this fact today. Postal employees are a hard-working, conscientious, and loyal group, and they deserve due consideration.

Last July, a few weeks before the 1953 session of Congress had ended, I made a last-minute frantic appeal in the House of Representatives to take immediate action to approve salary increases for postal workers. I called the attention of my colleagues in Congress to two very important facts:

1. That long before the Government inserted no-strike provisions in laws affecting Federal employees, the postal workers had voluntarily given up all rights to engage in strikes—which is labor's most effective weapon.

2. That postal workers and other Government employees are prohibited from engaging in political activity in order to improve their situation.

I also stressed the fact that on their present rate of salaries postal workers are having a difficult time to cope with the high cost of living, which had reached an alltime high in 1953 and was still moving upward. I cited statistics to illustrate the plight of postal employees, stating that 75 percent are forced to supplement their income by taking on a second job or through the employment of their wives, and that many postal workers have incurred increased debts and numerous others are forced to borrow on their insurance.

Let me cite to you my concluding remarks on that occasion:

"There is no logical reason for Congress to tolerate such a situation. These postal employees deserve a fair and adequate remuneration for the services they perform. They should not be placed in a position where they are forced to take on additional jobs to be able to meet the high cost of living, or to have to borrow on their insurance or when their wives are compelled to seek employment.

"Action today is worth more than all the promises for tomorrow. It is still not too late, if there is a real and earnest will to remedy the situation."

The rest is history—and history records that nothing had been done in the matter during the remainder of that session. Now we are at the start of a new congressional session. I am hopeful that the long-awaited and overdue salary increase will be approved.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely recommend to the committee that it give favorable consideration at an early date to this bill, H. R. 2344. Its adoption will be of tremendous importance to the entire postal system and will be an important factor in improving conditions in that system and establishing the highest possible morale. I want to thank you for allowing me this opportunity to present my views in the matter.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, what is really going on in Indochina? Not only we cannot tell who is winning; we do not even seem to know who is fighting.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the light that never fails and the love that follows all the way, we bow at this wayside shrine of Thy grace confessing the sins that have stained our record; the remembrance of them is grievous unto us. We have fallen short of Thy expectations of us. We are shamed not only by the things we have done, but also by the things we have not done. We come praying for Thy cleansing and forgiveness and with an inner hatred for all that hinders Thy fullness from dwelling in us.

Trusting in the everlasting mercy, at the beginning of another day of service to our country and to Thee, our Father God, we would silence our thoughts, that, with all earth's strident voices hushed, we may feel Thee near. Even as we pause in reverence for this moment of communion, purge our shortcomings, we beseech Thee, in the flame of Thy love, that once more in the light of Thy countenance we may find peace. We ask it in the name of Him who is the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 16, 1954, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 179. An act for the relief of Insun Lee;

S. 2108. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Sommer; and

S. 2151. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ala Olejcak (nee Holubowa).

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 423. An act to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3;

H. R. 459. An act to amend section 704, title 18, United States Code;

H. R. 962. An act for the relief of Gabrielle Marie Smith (nee Staub);

H. R. 1705. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jesse Bell;

H. R. 2441. An act for the relief of Husnu Ataullah Berker;

H. R. 2678. An act for the relief of Carl A. Annis, Wayne C. Cranney, and Leslie O. Yarwood;

H. R. 3961. An act for the relief of Margherita Di Meo;

H. R. 4231. An act to authorize appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of certain individuals who were killed in action or who died or shall die as a result of active service in World War I, World War II, or between the period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending on a date proclaimed by the President or the Congress;

H. R. 4738. An act for the relief of Gabriel Hittrich;

H. R. 4816. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Robert Graham a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 4984. An act to remove certain limitations upon the sale or conveyance of land heretofore conveyed to the city of Miles City, Mont., by the United States;

H. R. 5085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Teherepnin;

H. R. 5158. An act for the relief of Sgt. Welch Sanders;

H. R. 5433. An act for the relief of the estates of Opal Perkins and Kenneth Ross, deceased;

H. R. 5461. An act for the relief of Wah Chang Corp.;

H. R. 5620. An act to remove clouds on the titles of certain lands in Colorado;

H. R. 6251. An act to authorize the abolishment of the Shoshone Cavern National Monument and the transfer of the land therein to the city of Cody, Wyo., for public recreational use, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6435. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act;

H. R. 6455. An act to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Augusta Selmer-Andersen;

H. R. 7251. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Vernon F. Parry the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to a certain invention;

H. R. 7371. An act to provide for the disposal of paid postal-savings certificates;

H. R. 7460. An act to pay Warren P. Hoover for services rendered the Army of the United States;

H. R. 7512. An act to provide for the conveyance of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the Armory Board, State of Florida, in order to consolidate ownership and perpetuate the availability of Camp Blanding for military training and use; and

H. R. 7554. An act to provide for compensation of certain employees on days when departments or establishments of the Government are closed by administrative order.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 197) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-7123468, Abdo, Zaki.
A-6818125, Abdullah, Naim Ezra.
A-3214298, Adler, Peeter Wilhelm.
A-6897062, Adesnik, Klara (nee Frejdson).
A-6568285, Adamsons, Arnolds.
A-6568274, Adamsons, Frida Kvitans.
A-6738932, Al-Hindawi, Ibrahim Yousif.
A-6738933, Al-Hindawi, Lily Heskel.
T-2760702, Al-Hindawi, Amira Ibrahim.
T-2760703, Al-Hindawi, Ferial Ibrahim.
A-6903675, Aron, Renee (nee Mulier).
A-7078088, Apperman, Pepi Lazarovitz (nee Herskovitz).
A-9180348, Antonenco, Nicolai.
A-7249872, Apse, Laura Margareta.
A-7249883, Apse, Ivars.
A-6432771, Awad, Mahmoud Mohammad.
A-6991752, Baginski, Kazimierz.
A-6991754, Baginski, Paula.
A-6575180, Baron, Theodore S. or Theodore Solomon Zalcberg or Ted Baron.
A-7186428, Benjamin, Sassoon Joseph.
A-6953013, Berger, Ignac.
A-6886878, Berger, Martin Adalbert.
A-6953288, Birnbaum, Salamun.
A-6755695, Bisharat, Alfred Hanna.
A-6623693, Bitker, Anna (nee Stereiny).
A-6886830, Blumstein, Morris.
A-6142352, Bytniewska, Barbara Franciska.
A-7631707, Bielic, Joseph.
A-6776589, Boury, Costandy Nicola or Qustandi Nicola Boury.
A-7073399, Barycki, Edward.
A-8117712, Bedar, Gregory Jacob.
A-6232680, Borkowski, Peter (Piotr) Stanley.
A-7828471, Brajnovich, Giuseppe or Josip Brajnovic.
A-6953006, Braun, Ignac.
A-6903771, Brauner, Zoltan.
A-6887567, Brauner, Irene (nee Rosenberg).
A-8039756, Balacich, John.
A-7975992, Bon, Ho Yee.
A-7243860, Bindemanis, Valija Alexandra.
A-6090162, Breuer, Alexander.
A-8057459, Breuer, Cecilia.
A-8057460, Breuer, Herman.
A-8057461, Breuer, Ignatz.
A-6887745, Breuer, Maximilian.
A-8082011, Breuer, Judita.
A-8082010, Breuer, Deborah.
A-7197544, Brody, Sophie Mary.
0300-411507, Bracco, Simeon.
A-6383645, Chang, Chia-Ling.
A-6849504, Chang, John Wei Kung or Wei-Kung Chang.
A-6829521, Chang, Kuo Hwa.
A-6033450, Chao, Jowett Chou or Chou Chao.
A-6356316, Chao, Cherie (nee Pin Hwa Chow).
A-6143084, Chao, Stanley Kuo-Shu or Kuo-Shu Chao.
V-13545, Chao, Lyn Chang (nee Lyn Chang).
A-7366251, Chao, Wen Ying.
A-7174561, Chao, Yung Yen (Tsao).
A-6866998, Charucki, Stanislaw.
A-8082016, Chen, Chi Hing.
A-6702179, Chen, Feng Chi (nee Feng-Chi Wu).
A-6606603, Chen, Shao Lin.
A-6620814, Chen, Sing Mei.
A-8091328, Chen, Tommy D. C.
A-8091329, Chen, Joyce (nee Liao).
A-8091330, Chen, Henry Tsu Ming.
A-8091331, Chen, Helen Tsu Wah.
A-6851574, Chen, Tsu-Chi.
A-6848435, Chen, William Tung-Yung or Tung Yung Chen.
A-6704083, Cheng, Laura Wei-Hsia or Wei-hsia Cheng.
A-8057479, Chow, Shu Liang.
A-6197751, Chow, Tsu-Ling or Charles Chow.
A-6967579, Chu, Liang-Wei.
A-6381801, Cohen, Estera Lola.
A-7975170, Cristoloveanu, Mircea.
A-5291487, Cheng, Wen Chin (Mary Chen) or Sister M. Frances Agnes.
A-7415147, Chin-Hsin, Gin.
A-6522841, Chan, Robin Mei (nee Chow or Chow Mei or Mei Chow).
A-6461143, Chang, Pei-Wen.
A-6999690, Chen, Li-Ching (nee Yen or Li-Ching Yen or Letty Li-Ching Yen).
A-6967369, Cheng, Han or Hans Jeans.
A-6699875, Chou, Hung Sheng.
A-6577556, Chu, David Lian Koon.
A-6577555, Chu, Eileen Catherine.
T-1495407, Chan, Clarence Bock Kun.
A-6967613, Chang, Bansun.
A-6848052, Chang, Betty Wu.
A-6620834, Chang, Cheng-teh.
A-6967631, Chang, Martha Guee-Fang.
A-6052404, Chao, Yu-Shai.
A-8057483, Cheng, Richard Kuo-Wei.
A-6620730, Chow, Hsiang Sheng or Johnson Chow.
A-6667193, Chu, Margaret or Mei Yu Chu.
A-6697607, Chitayat, Anwar Khadouri.
A-7096023, Chiu, Hung-Wen.
A-7133239, Carvalho, Elena Natalia or Sister Mary Jacinta.
A-7375367, Chang, Edward Ai-To.
A-7276021, Chang, Angela Liu.
A-6206586, Chien, Ting or Timothy Ting Chien.
A-5998605, Chow, Sui Wu.
A-6403342, Chang, Jen Chi.
0700-18500, Chang, K. H. Ronald.
A-7355994, Chang, Y. S. Irene Hu.
A-7133272, Chang, Wen Hsiang.
A-6509104, Chien, Evelyn Peh-Sin Chien or Peh-Sin Chang.
0300-403710, Chuen, Tsang.
A-6474305, Calamaro, Raphael Joseph.
A-8021776, Carcich, Venanzio Joseph.
A-6982797, Carmona, Pierre Albert or Peter ("Pete").
A-6781203, Chammah, Ibrahim (Albert) Moise.
A-7118707, Chen, Ching Hua or Si Chan Chen or Theresa Chen or Sister M. Dominica Chen.
A-0901262, Chen, Melie Su-Tsung Cheng.

A-7193932, Chiang, Jen or John or Jen or John Chaing.
A-6857647, Dajani, Abdel Salam.
A-6837646, Dajani, Shihadeh Hashem.
A-7138290, Dieska, Jozef.
A—6919339, Dimitrijevitch, Alexander Radovan.
A-7073996, David, Salim Isaac.
A-7073997, David, Marcelle Salim Isaac.
A-7415665, David, David Salim.
A-7415667, David, Sammi Salim.
0300-307098, Dobritch, Alexander Alexandrov.
A-7955257, Dobritch, Jr., Alexander Alexandrov.
A-7200393, Dabora, Eliahou Khedhoory.
A-6613816, Dziadek, Abram.
A-7463593, Dimini, Casimiro.
A-6399898, Dogic, Nikola or Nikola Dogic.
A-6956241, Eross, Janos.
A-6818103, Eilenbogen, Jeno.
A-7983360, Faldic, John or Ivan Faldic.
A-8021389, Faldic, Romano.
A-6026524, Fang, Chen Shang or James Chen Fang.
A-6745034, Feresc, Miklos.
A-6952324, Fogel, Jeno.
A-6967583, Fong, Lucy Shu-Yu.
A-8057476, Foo, Sze Ah.
A-6868674, Fried, Ilona.
A-7362418, Frisch, Mozes.
A-7362416, Frisch, Ilona.
A-7362417, Frisch, Imre.
A-7097844, Friedman, Ernest.
A-6887746, Friedman, Sarah.
A-6851361, Fu, Wen Tou.
A-6887738, Fuchs, Arnold.
A-7955271, Fucich, Joseph or Josip Fucich or Giuseppe Fucich.
A-8082066, Fong, Lam.
A-7457864, Fu, An Ling.
A-7975404, Fah, Ching Kai.
A-8082041, Fable, Frederik.
0300-398084, Fat, Joe Mok.
A-8091056, Fook, Wong Pooh.
A-6444628, Geintze, Helen Andgela (nee Valente).
A-6971665, Glaser, Jacob or Jakob Glaser.
A-6903708, Grunberger, Hilda or Hilda Landau Grunberger.
A-6543892, Gruszka, Gerszon.
A-7052441, Gruszka, Stella (nee Matalon).
A-7052442, Gruszka, Tamara.
A-6868682, Gutter, Roza Klein.
A-7243365, Gottwald, Antonin.
A-6916048, Grossman, Alexander.
A-6891802, Grossman, Eva Kohn.
A-7073950, Grimm, Bela Stephen.
A-6886831, Goldenberg, Isidor Zoltan.
A-6923158, Gaspar, Ella (nee Feig).
A-7244304, Grigutis, Juozas.
A-7056024, Gold, Joseph.
A-7790705, Hagman, Louise.
A-6576640, Hamoui, Ibrahim or Albert Joseph Hamoui.
A-6401323, Harari, Maurice.
A-6405110, Harari, Joseph.
A-6937851, Hasal, Antonin Bohumil or Nizborsky.
0500-35879, Hasal-Ova, Josefa Antonie (nee Skorepova).
0500-40091, Hasal, Milan Jiri.
0500-35580, Hasal-Ova, Milica Jelizaveta.
A-6922085, Hawa, Joseph Salim.
A-7264280, Heckler, Barbara or Martin.
A-7863797, Horowitz, Edmund or Edmund Horski.
A-7863855, Horska, Maria (nee Maria Hahn or Maria Horowitz).
A-7886512, Horski, Andrew.
A-7863826, Horski, Allan.
A-6403566, Hsu, Elizabeth Kwang-Hsin or Kwang-Hsin Hsu or Elizabeth Hsu.
0300-391428, Hu, Tin An.
0700-16565, Hui, Po Ching Margaret.
A-6861991, Hwa, Su Wellington Chee.
A-6887025, Hwang, Tsaisia Sen.
V-221923, Hanikat, Erkki Fridolf.
1300-86586, Him, Chung Burk.
A-6569530, Horvath, Jozef.
A-7184281, Hardoon, Daphne Elizabeth.
A-6427756, Haron, Albert Sasson.
A-6444675, Hsia, John I-Sheng.
A-7118747, Hsiao, Chen-Hwa or William Hwa Shaw.
A-6027102, Huang, Hsiao-Tsung.
A-6843411, Hwang, Shih-Tzen or Hotspur Hwangin.
A-6173173, Hsie, Jen-Yah or Hsie Jen Dan.
A-7450577, Hoch, Elizabeth.
A-6749987, Hochberger, Jakub.
A-6744362, Hochberger, Hinda.
0300-396629, Harabaglia, Nicola Santo.
A-6771819, Hiass, Ibrahim Jiryes.
A-8021327, Hallika, Ulo.
A-7415176, Hwang, Chueh-Fei or Chester F. Hwang.
A-8057477, Hsun, Mu Hong.
A-7117922, Igla, Abram.
A-9778151, Ikmelt, Peeter.
A-7890662, Issak, Armiin Giuseppe.
A-7244300, Iesalnieks, Janis.
A-7915147, Jablonski, Jan.
A-6903673, Jakubovich, Markus.
A-6848583, Jin, Korda Kee-Dah.
A-7052343, Jacobowitz, Margit.
A-6862649, Jakubovic, Evzen.
A-7886278, Juriacco, Rocco.
A-6993772, Jaruzelski, Janusz Jan.
A-6887558, Karmel, Baila or Ilona Karmel.
A-6949989, Karp, Towie.
0300-286838, Kazda, Milada.
A-6830434, Khoursheed, Fareed Subhi or Farid Subhi Khurshid.
A-6771764, Khoury, Habib George.
A-6282161, Kilbus, Richard.
A-7097847, Kinel, Jacob.
A-6848649, Kingman, Eleanor Priscilla.
A-6936485, Klagsbrunn, Abraham Chaim.
A-7210289, Klagsbrunn, Hadasa.
A-6891825, Klein, Joseph.
A-6922681, Klein, Markus.
A-6936499, Klimas, Antanas.
A-6426400, Kazimi, Mahmoud Ishaq El.
A-6903763, Kogel, Sandor.
A-6886892, Kohn, Flora Schwarcz.
A-9061054, Kong, Foo Sui.
A-6712031, Koo, Thomas Cheng-Pang.
A-7116371, Kornreich, Sarah Sulamita Frankel.
A-7802998, Kornreich, Hirsch Meiloch.
A-7450145, Kuo, Nancy Huang.
T-1495413, Kwong, Mrs. Su Shang Chi.
0300-408001, Kow, Lay.
A-7078191, Kwan, Tsun-Ying or Lawrence Tsun-Ying Kwan.
A-8091335, Kaszer, Stanislaw.
A-7297270, Klein, Lajos.
A-7858082, Kucich, Gerolamo.
A-6862648, Katz, Josef.
A-6934997, Klapper, Mendel.
A-6860163, Klimesova, Vlasta Marie or Vlasta Klimes.
A-6707345, Krawczyk, Thaddeus Mathias or Tadeusz Krawczyk.
A-6933874, Kalisch, Judith.
A-9684346, Kan, Chan.
A-6847999, Kao, Lillian Chih-jen.
A-6732399, Kalme, Elmar.
A-6732400, Kalme, Akulina.
A-6771738, Khalil, Ahmad Zohair.
A-7073400, Kellman, Jacob.
A-6772578, Kruza, Zanis Alberts.
A-7821513, Ladon, Harald Eduard or Harold Edward Ladon.
A-7491271, Laktionoff, Vladimir Ivanovich.
A-6897066, Landau, Salamon or Salomon Landau.
A-7439753, Lang, Imre (Emery) Tibor.
A-6851689, Lee, Beatrice Dzun.
A-6847805, Lee, Mavis Shao-Ling.
A-6866943, Li, Hua-Wei or Howard H. Lee.
A-7594866, Li, Richard I-Hua.
A-6396666, Ling, David.
A-6980354, Loh, Chao Chi.
A-6763045, Loh, Chao Fah or Ellen Chao Fah Loh.
A-6751952, Loo, Ti Li.
A-6441722, Lu, Milton Ming-Deh or Ming-Deh Lu.
V-890155, Lu, Sung Nien.
A-7283021, Lutyk, Andrew Nicolas.
A-6877780, Lee, Yih-Hung.
A-7056897, Leval, George or Gyorgy or Gyorgy Czeisler.
A-7056896, Leval, Margit (nee Varga).
A-6980347, Li, Hua.
A-6737878, Lieblich, Tibor.
A-7873182, Lovric, Hermenegild.
A-6686067, Lin, Ku Yin.
A-7248060, Loh, An-Veng.
A-7120703, Lam, Yat-Yin.
A-6958556, Li, Hsui Tung or Mayanne Lee.
A-6840804, Liang, Maria Mu-Lian or Maria Fok.
A-6958627, Ling, Timothy C.
A-6958626, Ling, Irene.
A-6847981, Liu, Shia-Ling.
A-7135773, Liu, Yei Fang or Liu Yei-Fang or Y. F. Liu.
A-6532537, Loh, Shirley Shao.
A-6851380, Loh, Wei-Ping.
A-7054429, Loh, Hwei-Ya Chang.
A-7118711, Lee, William Wah-Ying.
A-6986562, Lee, Francis Fan.
A-6916031, Leichtag, Margit Polatsek.
A-6709305, Li, Min Chiu or Min Ch'iu Li.
A-6552715, Lin, David Yao-Pei.
A-6403556, Lis, Eli Mojsze.
A-7134583, Lysakowski, Ryszard Stanislaw.
A-6712034, Lee, Ai-Shen Miles or Ai-Shen Miles.
A-6894840, Lee, Liu Man.
A-7450588, Ling, Dr. Ji-Toong.
A-7417097, Lewkowicz, Jozef.
A-7118668, Liu, Chin Lan or Mary Rosa Liu or Sister M. Rosa Liu.
A-9765740, Lysakowski, Marian.
A-7886319, Majewski, Felix.
A-7297272, Margittai, Jozsef.
A-7297273, Margittai, Olga.
V-738365, Maripuu, Hilda (nee Koobakene).
A-7828126, Mattesich, Beniamino.
A-6703205, McGregor, Donald Hudson.
A-6511892, Meizlik Icik.
A-6917593, Miczynski, Zygmunt.
A-6719390, Mermelstein, Edith.
A-7125360, Monseu, Stanislaw Ludwik.
A-7125361, Monseu, Maria Stefania Okanska.
A-7283495, Monseu, Jerzy (George) Alfred.
A-7283496, Monseu, Renata Maria.
A-6953259, Mozes, Szmul.
A-7424935, Mulczet, Gabriella or Ella.
A-7197630, Maged, Aron.
A-7197629, Maged, Erna.
A-6887702, Milstein, Henry or Chaim Milstejn.
A-7868087, Miklos, Andor.
A-7095991, Miklos, Sophie Weiss.
A-9825098, Marek, Bronislaw.
A-6771743, Morcos, Elias Farah.
A-9765576, Matteoni, Anthony or Antonio Matcovich.
A-6142245, Na, Chung Sheng.
A-7095966, Nemes, Elemer or Elemer Nemes Lehocz.
A-6949985, Neuhauser, Alekander.
A-7873132, Neuhauser, Estera.
A-7873133, Neuhauser, Tibor.
A-6923771, Niederman, Armin.
A-7073627, Niederman, Lenca.
A-7145199, Niederman, Susana.
0300-287494, Nozicka, Jiri Josef Antonin.
A-6886893, Noskowicz, Naftali.
A-6955625, Nagy, Bartalan Istvan or Bartholomew Stephen Nagy.
A-7967085, Ni, Mary.
A-9500016, Noritis, Janis.
A-6772248, Obeid, Ali Abder Razzaq Ali.
A-7125353, Orensztejn, Naftula Hirsz.
A-7125354, Orensztejn, Szyfra.
A-7366399, Orensztejn, Natan.
A-9729111, Osting, Erich.
A-6721803, Ovadiah, Eliyahu Joseph or Elijah Ovadiah.
A-7841091, Pai, Sin Yu.
A-7419932, Pao, Jenia.
A-8091325, Perissa, Anthony or Anton Perissa or Antonio Perissa.
A-7802996, Peroutka, Maria.
A-8065360, Pezzulich, Enrico or Enrich Peculic.
A-9776546, Pokutynski, Feliks.

A-7251984, Peng, Jean You-Chen.
A-6967655, Pan, Coda Hoong-Tao.
A-9798727, Perts, August.
A-7096146, Pere, Sinaida.
A-6610630, Polonski, Fania.
A-7243253, Polonski, Joseph.
A-6989702, Palu, Theodor.
A-6026520, Pan, Paul Mei.
A-6920454, Paulmann, Louis Phillip.
A-7184141, Pu, Yun Hsin.
A-7249072, Paipals, Fred.
A-7249071, Paipals, Zenta.
A-6848197, Paneth, Juda.
A-7052479, Paneth, Gabriella.
A-7049964, Paunovic, Trifun.
A-6452003, Royang, Thomas Tsao.
A-7054205, Ranky, William Octavius (Vilmos Octavius Ranki).
A-7197512, Rottenberg, Jenta (nee Bernzweig).
A-6887711, Rottenberg, Zygmunt.
A-6753464, Rajulaid, Toivo Eino.
A-6953530, Roosenbaum, Mooritz.
A-6987948, Rozycki, Stanislaw Roman Josef.
A-6938796, Rozenbergs, Janis Voldemars.
A-6938799, Rozenbergs, Mirdza Eleonora.
A-7457577, Saltoun, Haron Heskell.
A-6953465, Saltoun, Vivian Haron.
A-6953464, Saltoun, Ida Haron.
A-6953466, Saltoun, Haskell Haron.
A-6903747, Schreiber, Herman.
A-6891803, Schwarcz, Tibor.
A-9691837, Seng, Chee.
A-6614251, Sheena, Albert Haron.
A-7209347, Shen, Pao G.
A-7209348, Shen, Wayfun.
A-7209349, Shen, Shirley Jo.
A-6847903, Sheng, David Shuan-En or Shuan-En Sheng.
A-6848519, Sheng, Lydia Ling-Chen Chang or Lydia Sheng or Ling-Chen Chang.
A-7081611, Shieh, Jwo Jye.
A-6411899, Silva, Cecilia Maria Basto Da.
A-6923164, Simsowitz, Sari (nee Simsowitz).
0300-286835, Smetacek, Zdenek.
0300-286836, Smetacek, Milada.
0300-286839, Smetacek, Eva Marie Anna Zdenka.
A-7830616, Sokal, Julie Chen-Chu (nee Yang, Chen Chu).
A-6954751, Spigler, Sell.
0300-287058, Stanczak, Ryszard.
A-8091344, Stepancic, Jakov or Giacomo or Jack.
A-6719269, Stern, Olga Mermelstein.
A-6877474, Strauss, Lino Leon.
A-7053578, Sugho, Louis Larry.
A-7053577, Sugho, Emilia.
A-9694065, Sulislawski, Kazimierz or Stanley Sules.
A-6620609, Sun, Keh-Ming.
A-7967086, Sun, Mey-En (nee Chen).
A-6848620, Sung, Chien-Bor or C. B. Sung.
A-6142921, Sung, Ya Bing or Robin Sung.
A-6855583, Sze, Clarence Salo-Ju.
A-4040525, Sze, Kenneth Chiache.
A-7110840, Szenczy, Sophie.
0300-288648, Stein, Bluma Szpigelman.
A-8057543, Szpigelman, Yakob.
A-6696204, Sung, I. Chung or Sung I. Chung.
0300-277030, Sandel, Adolf.
A-7078091, Sandel, Etela.
A-7210107, Shatohin, Victor George.
A-7210108, Shatohin, Olga V.
A-7399968, Shen, Chung-Yu.
A-8001360, Shohet, Isaac Haron or Ishaq Haroon Shohet or I. Shohet.
A-6958130, Szamek, Anna Marie.
A-6985373, Szumska, Jadwiga.
A-6848189, Shih, Chen Chong.
A-8065355, Stocovaz, Ruggero.
A-6516726, Strochlic, Zelman.
A-6515725, Strochlic, Ohaja (nee Zelenka).
A-6897057, Szapiro, Dora.
A-7244152, Saulesleja, Augusta.
A-6621140, Schwarc, Maxmilian or Max or Schwartz.
A-6582842, Schwarc, Aizbeta or Elizabeth or Schwartz (nee Tauber).
A-6582843, Schwarc, Gizela or Schwartz.
A-6681211, Shahabeddin, Jamal Zaki.
A-6967370, Shao, Stephen Pinyee or Shao Pinyee.
A-6848509, Shieh, Francis Shis-Hao.
A-6938813, Strelis, Arvid.
A-6704111, Sun, Pao Chang or Paul Sun.
A-6971794, Spuul, Lembit Indarlin.
A-6033425, Shen, Tso-Mei or Thomas Shen.
A-6798995, Stepe, Janis.
A-6887747, Stern, Eugen.
A-7198354, Stern, Terezia.
V-229916, Stern, Margita.
A-7197375, Stern, Szerena or Sarah Elizabeth (nee Wettenstein).
A-6805602, Schonfeld, Ludvik or Sarosy Laszlo or Larry Sade.
A-7125125, Schuller, Lore Margarete.
A-6903927, Shangh, Huang Ming.
A-7243861, Sumskis, Antons.
A-8082094, Sgaliardich, Antonio.
A-8082044, Shen, Sien-What Nyeu.
A-6881800, Simpser, Sloime or Sam.
A-6708744, Soong, Hsin-Chen or Seal Pau Soong or Agatha Soong or Sister Mary Gabriel Soong.
A-7142265, Tambaur, Vaino.
A-6847839, Tang, Yuet An.
A-6702203, Tao, Chien Ching or James Tao.
A-7078195, Tao, Yugn Tsing or Norman Tao.
A-6849413, Teng, Lin-Cheun Lincoln or Lin-Cheun Teng or Cheunley Teng.
A-8065352, Terdoslavich, Mariano Agostino.
A-7886280, Tojagic, Rade Luka.
A-7415659, Tomkov, Oleg.
A-6384235, Torbeczko, Maurycy.
A-6975576, Tsang, Hsi, Ling (Schillings Tsang).
A-6488544, Tsao, Linda Wen-Mei.
A-6027105, Tseng, Paul Pao-Mong.
A-6904323, Tsien, Hong Yuan or Hong Yuan-Tsien.
A-6967544, Tsien, Wen-Hui (nee Kao).
A-8091332, Tsu, Lucille Liang-Ching.
A-6975611, Tversky, Roza or Rosa Lipkis.
A-6975612, Tversky, Feiga.
A-7868142, Tai, Shou Nan.
A-9914572, Tak, Ho Ming.
A-7200781, Tobolik, Peter.
A-7200779, Tobolik, Koenelia.
A-7863002, Turauskis, Vilma Kristina (nee Greizis).
A-6014816, Tsai, Wen-Cheh.
A-6938817, Tisins, Janis.
A-6938818, Tisins, Olga.
0300-410645, Tai, Chung.
0300-403715, Tong, Lim Ah.
A-6848502, Tsao, Ching Hua.
A-7463589, Ugricich, Matteo.
A-6794923, Urshan, Ruth.
A-7118781, Valvur, Heino Oskar.
A-8091373, Veske, Linda Kristine (nee Kiider).
A-6463149, Voong, Edith Tse-Lieu.
A-7915649, Vaidre, Alexander or Aleksander Vaidre.
A-9825345, Vlacich, Antonio.
A-6646835, Viest, Ivan Miroslav.
A-7097886, Wald, Eguenia Poss.
A-6922687, Weingarten, David.
A-7125447, Weinreb, Jindrich or Henry.
A-7125417, Weinreb, Relli.
A-8091309, Weinreb, Robert.
A-8091310, Weinreb, Tibor.
A-6931484, Weisz, David.
A-7427290, Weisz, Rosa Dora.
A-6878042, Weisz, Ignac.
A-6819608, Wieder, Solomon.
A-6843404, Woo, Robert Kwoh-Tao.
A-7363104, Woo, Tao Fu or Robert Tao Fu Woo.
A-6283296, Wu, Chang Sheng.
A-6965803, Wojciechowski, Andrew (Andrzej).
A-6063627, Wang, An.
A-6849826, Wang, Lorraine Chiu.
A-9746779, Wojciechowski, Witold Wladyslaw.
A-9705251, Wah, George Cheung.
A-6851364, Way, May.
A-6923193, Weiss, Zitta Stern.
A-7290221, Weinberger, Elias.
A-7297285, Weinberger, Ilonna (Elie).
A-8031863, Weinberger, Hedvig.
A-8031864, Weinberger, Hedvig.
T-1510164, Woloszyn, Bronislaw or Bronislaw Wolosyn or Wolszyn.
0606-66138, Wang, David I-Jaw.
A-6877738, Yee, Chi Yu or Stephen Chi-Yu Yee.
A-6238161, Yang, Chen-Ya.
A-7363107, Yao, Florence Hui-En.
A-6660956, Yih, Wei Hong.
A-6849392, Yin, Yuan-Shi.
A-6851351, Yu, Alexander Shih Han.
A-6953055, Yu, Teh Chu.
A-6095748, Yui, Regina Shiao-Lien.
A-6975569, Yang, Yun-Wen or John Yun-Wen Yang.
A-9771052, Young, Wan.
A-7133252, Yu, Colleen Nai Huan.
A-8001251, Yung, Cheng Chin.
A-9693033, Yung, Wong Sung.
A-6620573, Yu, Ping Chang.
A-7249624, Yu, Ven Wei.
A-7262206, Yu, Jimmy Shi Kiang.
A-6847780, Yang, Chang-Lee.
A-6703458, Yen, Hsin-Kai or David Hsin Kai Yen.
A-6545333, Yen, Mei-Huei or Mei Huei Kuo.
A-8039700, You, Chien Shun.
A-6904363, Zaharia, Florin Constantin.
A-6862628, Zelig, Jack.
A-7863132, Ziemelis, Martins.
A-6707032, Zindulka, Marie Charvat.
A-6855662, Zoberman, Chaim.
A-7125136, Zafir, Arthur.
A-7125147, Zafir, Anna (nee Gestetner).
A-7863212, Zandbergs, Ernests.
A-7863213, Zandbergs, Milda.
A-6830537, Zloof, Ezra Meir or Ezra Meir or Ezra Meir Ezra.
A-8065359, Zlatarevic, Milan Goldschmidt or Milan Goldschmidt or Edward J. Meyers.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1160) for the relief of Cernelio and Lucia Tequillo, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAYBANK was granted permission to be absent from the Senate Thursday and Friday of this week.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS TO ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 328)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, which was read and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and development contracts, Department of the Army, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the period August 1, 1953, to January 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON SEQUIM PROJECT, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Sequim project, Washington (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, on activities under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period October 1 through December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary-Treasurer, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, Mount Vernon, N. Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated December 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD AND MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration, for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON COORDINATION OF FORWARDING AND SIMILAR SERVICING OF WATERBORNE EXPORT AND IMPORT FOREIGN COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on coordination of forwarding and similar servicing of waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States, for the quarter ended December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY, KINGS POINT, N. Y.—RESOLUTION OF PHILIPPINE VETERANS LEGION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, at the request of the Philippine Charge d'Affaires ad interim, a copy of a resolution adopted by the Philippine Veterans Legion, relating to the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York City, N. Y. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CONTINUANCE OF PROVISIONS OF TITLE II, FIRST WAR POWERS ACT, 1941

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspensions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ADVANCE PLANNING PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of the advance planning program, dated September 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the board of national trustees, National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, relating to treaties and executive agreements, which was ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the following resolutions adopted in concurrence by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on January 21, 1954, and January 27, 1954:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of increasing benefits under the Federal Social Security Act to a minimum allowance of $100 monthly.

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries.

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of increasing benefits under the Federal Social Security Act to a minimum allowance of $100 monthly

"Whereas the rising level of prices indicate that current benefits available under the Federal Social Security Act are insufficient to meet the basic needs of the people; and

"Whereas these inadequacies seriously threaten the comfort and happiness of millions of American citizens, and call for a liberalization of our social-security legislation; and

"Whereas this problem of instituting a proper social-security program for the American people presents a vital question the answer to which cannot long be postponed: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as will provide that the amount of financial aid or assistance furnished to recipients under the provisions of the Federal Social Security Act be increased so that the minimum monthly allowance of each recipient be $100; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States not to pass any legislation granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress bills to grant aid to the Israeli Government; and

"Whereas it is the purpose of these bills to give financial aid in the form of grants to the Government of the ancient and traditional democracy now known as the Israeli State; and

"Whereas such assistance to the people of Israel in developing their natural resources, expanding their agricultural and industrial economy will mean a great productive capacity and will further the promotion of the security and general welfare of the United States and of Israel and will strengthen the ties of friendship between the people of the United States and of Israel; and

"Whereas such grants would further the basic objectives of the Charter of the United Nations: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Members in the Congress of the United States of America be and they hereby are respectfully requested by the General Court of Massachusetts to give intensive study and consideration to such

bills now pending in the Congress of the United States, and to use their best efforts to have this proposed legislation enacted into law; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of state to the presiding officers of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES—LETTER FROM MINNESOTA CHAPTER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS, LUVERNE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the Minnesota Chapter of the National Association of Postmasters, Luverne, Minn., in support of the bill (H. R. 6052) to readjust postal rates, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA CHAPTER,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS,
Luverne, Minn., February 10, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The board of directors of the Minnesota Chapter of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States assembled at Minneapolis, Minn., on January 30, 1954, went on record by unanimous vote favoring H. R. 6052 (2836), a bill to readjust postal rates.

It is therefore desired by the Minnesota chapter that you give favorable consideration to the support of this bill.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN E. JENSEN,
President, Minnesota Chapter.

CURTAILMENT OF DEFENSE OPERATIONS IN MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AREA—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by District Lodge No. 77, International Association of Machinists, A. F. of L., and all of its affiliated lodges, protesting against the curtailment of defense operations in the Minneapolis, Minn., area.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON CURTAILMENT OF DEFENSE EXPENDITURES, TWIN CITIES, BY DISTRICT LODGE NO. 77, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS, AFL, AND ALL OF ITS AFFILIATED LODGES

Whereas the controllers of Government funds allocated for the defense of our Nation are curtailing defense operations in this area; and

Whereas these curtailments affect the employment of many of our people that are employed in these projects; and

Whereas these people out of work affect the general welfare of all of our citizens in the community; and

Whereas there are plans to move certain of these defense projects to foreign lands to alleviate their unemployment situation; and

Whereas by so doing our tax dollar will be further depleted in the caring for our own unemployed and those made destitute by these programs; Therefore be it

Resolved, That all affiliated bodies of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor, the Central Labor Union of Minneapolis, the Trades and Labor Assembly of St. Paul, use all in their power to bring these facts to the attention of the administration, that our No. 1 American defense program is that we keep all of our people gainfully employed in these defense projects that are so efficiently handled under the American production method, and be it further

Resolved, That we shall be in favor of helping those of other nations needy in processed foods and manufactured equipment necessary for their own economy, made and produced by American labor and capital.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE MINNESOTA TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Telephone Association, St. Paul, Minn., on February 3, concerning the excise tax on telephone calls, and the method of reporting Federal excise tax, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY FEBRUARY 3, 1954, BY THE 45TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, MINNESOTA TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION, HELD AT THE RADISSON HOTEL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., FEBRUARY 1, 2, AND 3, 1954

Whereas prior to July 1, 1953, the excise tax on telephone toll calls was reported on Treasury Form 727 as a lump sum; and

Whereas subsequent to July 1, 1953, such tax was required to be reported on Form 720 in such a manner as to divide the tax on calls of less than 25 cents from the tax on calls of 25 cents and more; and

Whereas temporary relief from this requirement has been granted to the member companies of this association by the Director of Internal Revenue; and

Whereas the method of reporting such excise tax is burdensome, expensive and an undue hardship which serves no useful purpose; and

Whereas the administrative burden of collecting and reporting Federal taxes is already very great, this new method will cost members of the independent telephone industry $100,000 yearly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Minnesota Telephone Association, That the method of reporting Federal excise tax on form 720 is an undue hardship and burden and further that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be asked to rescind this method of reporting this tax; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota.

Attest:

KEITH W. VOGT,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Whereas there is a 15-percent tax imposed on the cost of local telephone service and a 25 percent tax imposed on the cost of long distance telephone service; and

Whereas such excise taxes originally imposed during an emergency have been continued and constitute a definite burden on telephone service; and

Whereas the excise tax on telephone service is identified very closely with the cost of the service and is regarded by citizens generally as one of the most objectionable of the excise taxes; and

Whereas although there are over 50 million telephones in the United States there are many persons who still desire telephone service or better service if they were able to afford it; and

Whereas the telephone has become a necessity in the business and social life of the United States and is no longer to be considered a luxury; and

Whereas the excise tax rates imposed on telephone service are higher than those imposed on jewelry, furs, and theater admissions, all of which are definitely considered to be luxuries; and

Whereas excise taxes have generally been eliminated from similar public-utility services such as water, gas, and electrical energy leaving telephone service as the only utility service still subject to an excise tax; and

Whereas the elimination of these excise taxes would promote the advancement of greater and improved telephone service, especially in rural areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembled member companies of the Minnesota Telephone Association, That they hereby allege that the excise tax on telephone service is unfair, discriminatory and an obstacle to the improvement of telephone service in the United States and that the excise tax on telephone service should be eliminated; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the United States Congress and that the officers of this association are authorized and directed to urge said Senators and Representatives to initiate or support legislation which will effect the repeal of the excise tax on telephone service.

Attest:

KEITH W. VOGT,
Secretary-Treasurer.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT PARITY FOR FARM PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF FLOODWOOD, MINN., LOCAL, FARMERS UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Farmers Union, Floodwood, Minn., local on February 9, in support of 100 percent of parity for farm products, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOODWOOD, MINN., *February 11, 1954.*

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a meeting of the Farmers Union Floodwood Local held February 9, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Be it resolved*, This Farmers Union local goes on record urging our Federal Government to provide adequate funds to pay 100 percent of parity for farm products and especially dairy products."

Sincerely,

GEO. K. CHAMBERS,
Secretary.

LAYOFF OF EMPLOYEES OF FEDERAL CARTRIDGE CORP.—TELEGRAM FROM MAYOR OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram

which I have received from Mayor Eric Hoyer, of the city of Minneapolis, concerning the layoff of 1,900 employees at the Federal Cartridge Corp., be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *February 9, 1954.*
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand that 1,900 Federal Cartridge Corp. employees in Twin Cities area will be laid off February 26 due to reduction in defense spending. Urge your continued and renewed efforts toward continuance of full production at arsenal to assure healthy skilled labor market in this area. Increased layoff at arsenal, Minneapolis, Moline, and other industrial plants in Minneapolis as now contemplated will result in substantial labor surplus and cause real economic distress. Your support urgently requested.

ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor, Minneapolis.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico; with amendments (Rept. No. 985).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 17, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 68. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Godschalk;

S. 123. An act for the relief of Anni Wilhelmine Skoda;

S. 205. An act for the relief of Evdoxia J. Kitsos;

S. 236. An act for the relief of Amir Hassan Sepahban;

S. 296. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Henry Litmanowitz (Litman);

S. 305. An act for the relief of Antonio Vocale;

S. 313. An act for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama;

S. 323. An act for the relief of Rose Cohen;

S. 353. An act for the relief of Li Ming;

S. 506. An act for the relief of Horst F. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar;

S. 569. An act for the relief of Lina Anna Adelheid (Adam) Hoyer;

S. 606. An act for the relief of Hannelore Netz and her two children;

S. 730. An act for the relief of Winfried Kohls;

S. 801. An act for the relief of Eugenio S. Rolles;

S. 825. An act for the relief of Karin Rita Grubb;

S. 973. An act for the relief of Dr. Jawad Hedayaty;

S. 982. An act for the relief of Helena Lewicka;

S. 1009. An act for the relief of Zoltan Weingarten;

S. 1018. An act for the relief of George Ellis Ellison;

S. 1226. An act for the relief of Stefan Virgilius Issarescu;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of Emmanuel Aristides Nicoloudis;

S. 1323. An act for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney;

S. 1443. An act for the relief of Jose Deang; and

S. 2689. An act to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THYE:

S. 2962. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2963. A bill for the relief of Frank (Franktisek) Sevik, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 2964. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota, for use as a State historic site, of the land where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. YOUNG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2965. A bill for the relief of Auguste Ida Angeli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2966. A bill to provide for the improvement of the Niagara River, to authorize the construction of certain public works to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River, to promote the national defense, develop power, aid navigation and flood control, fulfill the undertakings of the United States in the Treaty of 1950 with Canada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 2967. A bill for the relief of James Ji-Tsung Woo, Margie Wanchung Woo, Daniel Du-Ning Woo, and Robert Du-An Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2968. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Janicki and Stefania Janicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2969. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to include in the definition of "agriculture" the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained and operated for farming purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2970. A bill to provide certain benefits for persons who served on the United States revenue cutter *Bear* during its Arctic rescue cruise in 1898; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2971. A bill to amend section 4 (e) of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2972. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Santiago Cruz Galendez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 2973. A bill for the relief of Henry Duncan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 2974. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing without meeting the requirements of section 15 (8) (b) (ii) of that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949 RELATING TO LIMITATION ON DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENT OF PRICE SUPPORTS FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat, in connection with which I will make a brief statement.

It has been my conviction that before undertaking changes in the farm price support program, Congress and the administration should find the answer to our surplus problem, by controlled acreage and an intensified effort to market the surpluses abroad, as well as utilizing them in school lunch and welfare programs.

Action by the Secretary of Agriculture in announcing the price support level for milk for manufacture and butterfat sold by farmers from the maximum of 90 percent of parity now in effect to the minimum of 75 percent of parity, however, makes imperative immediate action by Congress.

The objectives of the bill which I am introducing is in line with the statement of President Eisenhower in his message to the Congress transmitting recommendations affecting the Nation's agriculture, in which he stated that the key element of the newly proposed program is "a gradual adjustment to new circumstances and conditions." The President specifically said:

> In keeping with the policy of gradual transition, the Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority under the Agricultural Act of 1949 to insure that year-to-year variations in price-support levels will be limited.

It has been a very grave concern of mine and I know it has been of the administration's, to realize that while the farmer's gross income has been higher in recent years, his net income has been on the decrease.

I specifically looked up figures on this very question recently. I checked the figures because of the charges that the farm support program was responsible for the high cost of living and the charge that we were holding our products and commodities so high that we were pricing ourselves out of the foreign market and also pricing ourselves out of the domestic markets in some products such as butter.

In examining the figures I found that in the calendar year of 1947 our gross farm income was $34,002,000,000 and the farmers received net $16,774,000,000. In other words, in 1947 the net income from farming and nonfarm sources of

persons living on farms as a percentage of the national gross income was 11.6 percent.

As we examine the figures for the calendar year of 1953 and these were the best approximate figures I could obtain, we find the farmers gross income was $35,100,000,000. Of that he received net $12,500,000,000 or nearly 7.4 percent of the national income for last year.

The farmer has lost too much out of the consumer's food dollar. He was actually only receiving about 45 cents of the consumer's dollar in 1953. That is the lowest the farmer's share of the consumer food dollar has been since World War II, in fact the lowest since 1941, when it was 44 cents. The high point in this period was 53 cents in 1945.

Think what it means that the net annual income of American farmers has dropped $4.2 billion from 1947 to 1953, and that their net share of the national income last year was only two-thirds of what it was 7 years ago.

The farmer knows what increased costs he has had to pay, and he can appreciate the consumer's feeling about the high cost of living, but does the consumer know that the farmer who grows the food is today getting less of the consumer's food dollar than at any time in the last 12 years?

The producer has been caught in this unfortunate situation, that his operating expenses have been held at the high inflationary level to which the Korean conflict carried them, but returns from his own commodities and produce have been rapidly sliding.

Mr. President, in connection with this matter, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I wrote the Secretary of Agriculture on January 21 be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2962) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The letter presented by Mr. THYE is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1954.

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing you to outline my views on some phases of our agricultural problem. These views, you will recall, I had indicated to you in our conference prior to the presentation of the proposed program to Congress.

One of the major problems we must recognize is that, in the main, the farmer has suffered too great a drop in his income. The prices that he receives have dropped drastically in many of the commodities and products, while his operating expenses are still on the level to which the Korean war inflation carried them, to say nothing of the higher school taxes levied on real estate and personal property, or township and county taxes. They are all up.

The machines the farmer must purchase in his normal operations are still at those inflationary price levels, likewise the repairs on his old machinery if he be so unfortunate he cannot afford to buy the new machines. Then there is the high cost of mill feeds, commonly known as high-protein feeds, which he must purchase to supplement his homegrown feeds for his dairy operations, poultry production, or any general livestock feeding operations. How the farmer can further suffer a loss in price and still continue to pay these inflationary costs is a question that we must consider.

I am in support of certain phases of the President's recommendations, such as isolating some of the surplus, placing it in reserve in a stockpile as an assurance againt some national or international catastrophe, such as a major drought could bring about.

The first step that we must take here in Congress and administratively is to demonstate our ability to handle this surplus, whether we isolate, stockpile, or barter it off in the international field. We must show that we can do it, or it will be like a black shadow threatening or weakening our own domestic markets as well as the international market. Our number one problem is to manage this surplus.

Secondly, the farmer last fall voted and agreed to reduce his acreage of wheat planted, in order to manage the surplus in wheat. He has willingly accepted reduction in the number of acres planted to cotton and I know that the producer of corn will likewise agree to a reduction in the number of acres planted to corn. Farmers will agree to put these acres into clover, alfalfa, or some type of legume crop that will be soil building, bringing a higher fertility in the land that will give greater assurance of production in the future if the need arises. With the use of such soil-building practices, farmers would be prepared to take such surplus acres out of production entirely.

These are two essential steps—take care of present surpluses and plan to manage and govern future surpluses. When we have proved our ability in this respect we can take the necessary steps toward the question of price supports and what our price supports should be. If we are successful in the first two steps, it makes no difference what your price supports are, because you will have full parity for agriculture at the marketplace, but you do not have it today. If you take 90 percent support off the basics, with the exception of pork, the prices would drop to the very level you reestablish. If you desire a change in production by adjustment in the price supports, what type of crop or livestock enterprise would you advocate that the producers divert to? I know we have a surplus in every category of grain or products with the exception of the pork. I believe that we don't need to encourage that by price, because pork production will be up in the coming year.

The effect of our agricultural economy is so important—it has its reflected effect not only in the smaller communities of our Nation but in industrial centers. The farmers provide a great outlet for heavy industry such as farm machinery, trucks, etc. I saw too many implement yards full of new machines last fall not to know what was happening to the farmer's purchasing power.

Mr. Secretary, I have just frankly set forth some of my thoughts as I believe I have some understanding in the field of agriculture. I am confident that we will work out an excellent, sound, administratively possible farm program, but we certainly cannot do so unless we are prepared to consider all these phases of the agricultural problem.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which, when approved, will convey to the State of North Dakota the 2½-acre tract where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried. This parcel of land, located within the confines of the Standing Rock Reservation in North Dakota, will be used as a State historical site.

It was my hope that the Department of the Interior would be able to convey title such as I am proposing without additional legislation. I have been advised, however, that this small portion of land could not be conveyed without congressional approval. I received further assurance from the Corps of Engineers that the land referred to in my bill is not within the taking line of the Oahe project.

I have been advised that the proposed transfer of this property meets with the approval of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Council, the county commissioners of Sioux County, and many prominent citizens on the Standing Rock Reservation. The Governor of the State of North Dakota and the State historical society also favor the transfer. Plans are underway to raise funds for the erection of a suitable memorial to be constructed in honor of that great and famous Indian leader, Chief Sitting Bull.

The State historical society and all others assisting in the project deserve special commendation for at long last taking the initiative in erecting a memorial of this nature. Passage of the instant measure is a necessary first step before work can begin.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the bill (S. 2964) to provide for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota, for use as a State historic site, of the land where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried, introduced by Mr. YOUNG, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the State of North Dakota for use as a State historic site all right, title, and interest, except as provided in section 2, of the United States and the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of Indians to that parcel of land within the Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak., which is the site where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried and is more particularly described as follows: The southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 12, township 130 north, range 80 west, fifth principal meridian, consisting of two and one-half acres more or less.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall—

(a) exclude conveyance of any rights to oil, gas, or other mineral deposits in the land conveyed, but the development of any such mineral deposits, which would in any manner interfere with the use of such land as a State historic site, shall not be permitted so long as such land is so used; and

(b) be subject to the condition that in the event the land conveyed should cease to be used as a State historic site title to such

land shall revert to the United States to be held in the same manner it was held prior to such conveyance.

IMPROVEMENT OF NIAGARA RIVER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the redevelopment of the waters of the Niagara River for power purposes, consistent with the Canadian-United States Treaty of 1950 and with the reservation adopted by the United States Senate thereto.

This bill replaces S. 1851 which I introduced on May 7 last year. An identical bill is being introduced in the House today by Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., of New York.

My purpose in introducing this new bill is explained in a joint statement I prepared with Representative ROOSEVELT. I ask unanimous consent that this joint statement be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

My bill is consistent with the terms of the reservation unanimously adopted by the United States Senate in August 1950, when it approved the Canadian-United States Treaty, which made additional waters from the Niagara River available for power purposes.

That reservation stipulated that the waters made available were not to be redeveloped save by specific authorization of Congress. They were to be developed, the Senate stipulated, for the public use and benefit. My bill is designed to carry out these instructions of the Senate, with which I was and am in full accord.

My bill takes cognizance of the fact that New York State is ready and willing to undertake the construction of this project and to make the initial outlay of the construction cost. Hence, no appropriation or involvement of Federal funds are required.

My bill does, however, spell out very carefully and very specifically a number of essential safeguards of the interests of the consumers. My bill also safeguards other essential public interests, such as the interests of national defense, the interests of other public agencies, and the interests of adjacent and neighboring States.

The chief feature of my bill, however, is in its safeguarding of the interests of the consuming public. By providing not only low-cost hydroelectric power but also a yardstick through preferences to public bodies, we will insure fair and proper competition and thus bring annual savings of tens of millions of dollars to all the consumers of electric power in New York State and in the adjacent area.

I hope that the Committee on Public Works, to which I expect my bill will be referred, will hold early hearings on this bill and on the other pieces of proposed legislation pending on the same subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2966) to provide for the improvement of the Niagara River, to authorize the construction of certain public works to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River, to promote the national defense, develop power, aid navigation and flood control, fulfill the undertakings of the United States in the treaty of 1950 with Canada, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The joint statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN AND REPRESENTATIVE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., ON THE INTRODUCTION OF A NEW BILL FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE WATERS OF THE NIAGARA RIVER FOR POWER PURPOSES

We have today jointly introduced a new bill providing for the redevelopment of the United States share of the waters of the Niagara River. This bill replaces S. 1851 and H. R. 5066 which we introduced on May 7, 1953, for the same purpose.

This bill provides for public construction and operation of the hydroelectric facilities at the Niagara Falls (1,500,000 kilowatts of capacity), with full consumer safeguards including preferences for public and nonprofit bodies, in contrast to the Capehart-Miller bill (S. 689) which provides for a direct giveaway to private interests; in contrast to the Ives-Becker bill (S. 1971) which provides for an indirect giveaway to private interests by means of bus-bar sale of State-produced power; and, finally, in contrast to the Case bill (S. 2599) which provides simply for an abdication of congressional jurisdiction over the Niagara waters.

The main difference between this bill and the one we introduced last year lies in its authorization of State construction by the New York Power Authority instead of by the United States Corps of Engineers. Hence, no Federal funds or financial involvement of any kind, for the construction of the power works, is required. Authorization is made, however, for Federal appropriations, which President Eisenhower has already requested, for the remedial works to preserve the falls. This is a purely Federal commitment under the terms of the Niagara Treaty with Canada.

While our new provision for State construction represents a considerable change in legislative means, it represents no real change in legislative ends, since our former bill, like the present one, was designed to achieve State ownership and operation of the Niagara Falls power facilities.

Our former bill was mistakenly called a Federal plan because it provided for construction by the United States Corps of Engineers. It was not a Federal plan. It was a State plan, just as this one is.

Our new bill, like our preceding one, provides for State ownership, operation, and maintenance of the project works. Our new bill, like the preceding one, strongly emphasizes and establishes safeguards for the interests of the consumers, of national defense, and of the adjacent States. The safeguards of the interests of the consumers, by means of the public preference yardstick and the requirement for promotional rates, among others, are the heart and soul of this bill, as they were of the preceding measure.

Our purpose in originally providing for Federal construction was to utilize the experience, skills, and facilities of the Federal Corps of Engineers. Furthermore, Federal financing of the construction, whether by bond issue or by direct appropriation, would have represented a considerable saving from which the consumers of the electric power would have benefited. Our original bill, provided, of course, for the sale of the federally constructed facilities to the government of New York State.

However, in order better to define the differences between our position and that of the New York State administration on this issue, we have now made necessary modifications so as to provide for all-State construction as well as maintenance and operation.

With this change, we have also, of course, eliminated the requirement for a Federal-State agreement and for the ratification of the terms of that agreement by the Congress and by the State Legislature of New York.

Consequently, we have tightened up and made more specific some of the consumer safeguard provisions which were to have been covered by the agreement but which under the terms of our new bill, will be contained in a license to be granted by the Federal Power Commission.

Our new bill emphasizes the multiple-purpose nature of the project, including the promotion of national defense and the promotion of the scenic and recreational aspects of the falls. Our new bill emphasizes other public interests involved, including navigation and the interests of other public agencies—national, State and local.

Our new bill omits the requirements contained in our previous bills for payments in lieu of taxes to State and local units of government. We believe that such payments should be made, especially to the local government unit, to compensate for income lost by use of local property sites, while recognizing at the same time that the locality will be greatly benefited by the availability of low-cost electric power in the vicinity. We believe, however, that the question of payments in lieu of taxes can best be determined in its precise terms by the State itself, by State legislation.

As has been already stated, the heart of this bill is in the safeguard provisions which we require to be included in the license to be granted by the Federal Power Commission. These safeguard provisions are as follows:

(a) A preference in the availability of power for sale to public bodies and nonprofit cooperatives. This will furnish a public yardstick whereby all power rates, throughout the State, will be measured, competition will be stimulated and all power consumers, whether public or private, will share, through lower rates, in the benefits of this public development.

(b) Transmission lines where needed to bring the power to the load centers. These will not duplicate private lines. Private transmission lines will be utilized where available at reasonable rates.

(c) Equitable distribution of a fair share of the power to neighboring States within economic transmission distance of the power site.

(d) Promotional rates to assure increasing consumption of power at decreasing rates.

(e) Primary concern for domestic and rural consumers in the disposition of project power.

These safeguards are protections of the public interest which have been developed over the past 50 years and which have been insisted upon in every major public hydroelectric development since the time of President Theodore Roosevelt. Congress has always insisted upon these safeguards in all public power developments. The same safeguards are codified in the Federal Flood Control Act of 1944.

The New York Power Authority, prior to its drastic reshuffling by Governor Dewey in 1950, was a leading advocate of these consumer safeguards, and, indeed, contributed to their development. New York State law, in fact, provides for much the same safeguards. But since 1950, when Governor Dewey reconstituted the membership of the

New York Power Authority, the law has been given a distorted meaning. Hence it is essential that the safeguards be carefully spelled out in any congressional enactment on Niagara power.

In summary, we desire to make perfectly clear the distinction between those who on the one hand advocate public development of this vital resource, with appropriate protection of the public interest, and those who, on the other hand, favor development for private profit, without regard for the public interest.

We are unalterably opposed to the Miller-Capehart bill which provides for the direct giveaway of this public resource to private interests. We are also opposed to the Ives-Becker bill which provides for public development, but without essential safeguards of the consumer and the public interest, thus constituting an indirect rather than a direct giveaway.

Our bill is for a Niagara power development by New York State in the interests of all the people of New York State—all the consumers of electric power—and of the consumers of other States within economic transmission distance of the Niagara site—New England, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio.

The issue between our proposal and the Miller-Capehart bill is public interest versus private privilege.

The issue between our proposal and the Ives-Becker bill is consumer protection versus bureaucratic control and bus-bar sale.

The Case bill, finally, is a denial even of congressional concern over the question. It would turn back the clock 30 years to the days before Congress asserted its primary responsibilities for safeguarding the public interest in the proper use and public benefit from publicly owned water resources.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 4 (e) of the Natural Gas Act. I am introducing it at the joint request of the distinguished mayor of the city of Minneapolis, Eric G. Hoyer, and the city attorney of the city of Minneapolis, Mr. John F. Bonner.

The purpose of the bill is to prevent a pyramiding of higher natural gas rates as a result of applications repeatedly filed by natural gas companies for new rate schedules before determination has been reached by the Federal Power Commission on pending applications.

The present law permits the proposed new rates to go into effect 5 months after the application is filed, even though the Federal Power Commission has made no decision. This means that a natural gas company can collect the rates proposed in its new application automatically after 5 months, by filing a bond with the Commission. While the bond is supposed to protect the consumer by covering rebates if the increases are denied it offers little protection when a series of applications keeps pyramiding the rates ahead of action by the Federal Power Commission.

The need for this proposed legislation is evident as a result of the experience which the city of Minneapolis and other cities have had in connection with natural gas service. The consumers in cities in Minnesota have recently paid a series of natural gas rate increases. The Northern Natural Gas Co. filed an application with the Federal Power Commission for a rate increase in 1950. Under existing law, the proposed new rates went into effect automatically after 5 months, even though the Federal Power Commission had not yet reached a decision on their merit. Our consumers are now paying that new rate which is being collected under bond. While the hearings on the first increase were in progress, the Northern Natural Gas Co. filed a second application and then a third application. In July 1953, Northern filed a fourth application for a rate increase. In June 1953, the Commission decided the first and second applications on their merits, giving Northern less than it requested. The same was subsequently true of the third application. Much of this has been in constant litigation because of the decision of the Northern Natural Gas Co. to appeal to the courts.

This constant series of new rate schedule applications plus litigation means that there is a long period of time in which the consumers of natural gas have been paying four successive increases in rates in spite of the fact that the Federal Power Commission and the courts in some of their decisions have decided that those rates are much higher than they should be.

This is most unwise, most unjust, and most unfair to the consumers of natural gas in our State. It is my hope that the Congress will act quickly in support of the proposed legislation.

The bill would defer for 15 months instead of 5 months the time period before proposed new rates go into effect. The bill would also give the Commission authority at any time within 30 days after filing of a new schedule to order an interim rate, charge, classification, or service to become effective for the 15-month period, providing, however, that this interim rate could be collected by the natural gas company only when the Federal Power Commission has records in its file demonstrating the need for this temporary rate increase.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2971) to amend section 4 (e) of the Natural Gas Act, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 423. An act to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 459. An act to amend section 704, title 18, United States Code;

H. R. 4231. An act to authorize appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of certain individuals who were killed in action or who died or shall die as a result of active service in World War I, World War II, or between the period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending on a date proclaimed by the President or the Congress; and

H. R. 7512. An act to provide for the conveyance of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the Armory Board, State of Florida, in order to consolidate ownership and perpetuate the availability of Camp Blanding for military training and use; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 962. An Act for the relief of Gabrielle Marie Smith (nee Staub);

H. R. 2441. An act for the relief of Husnu Ataullah Berker;

H. R. 2678. An act for the relief of Carl A. Annis, Wayne C. Cranney, and Leslie O. Yarwood;

H. R. 3961. An act for the relief of Margherita Di Meo;

H. R. 4736. An act for the relief of Gabriel Hittrich;

H. R. 5085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Teherepnin;

H. R. 5158. An act for the relief of Sgt. Welch Sanders;

H. R. 5433. An act for the relief of the estates of Opal Perkins and Kenneth Ross, deceased;

H. R. 5461. An act for the relief of Wah Chang Corp.;

H. R. 6642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Augusta Selmer-Andersen;

H. R. 7251. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Vernon F. Parry, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to a certain invention; and

H. R. 7460. An act to pay Warren P. Hoover for services rendered the Army of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1705. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jesse Bell;

H. R. 4816. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Robert Graham a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 4984. An act to remove certain limitations upon the sale or conveyance of land heretofore conveyed to the city of Miles City, Mont., by the United States;

H. R. 5620. An act to remove clouds on the titles of certain lands in Colorado;

H. R. 6251. An act to authorize the abolishment of the Shoshone Cavern National Monument and the transfer of the land therein to the city of Cody, Wyo., for public recreational use, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6455. An act to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6435. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 7554. An act to provide for compensation of certain employees on days when departments or establishments of the Government are closed by administrative order; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 197) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF HENRY F. HOLLAND TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations, I give notice that the nomination of Henry F. Holland, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice John M. Cabot, received at the Senate today, will be considered by the committee at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON NOMINATION OF ALBERT C. BEESON (PT. 2 OF EX. REPT. NO. 3)

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, as in executive session, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a supplemental majority report on the nomination of Albert C. Beeson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received, as in executive session, and will be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL MINORITY VIEWS ON NOMINATION OF ALBERT C. BEESON (PT. 2 OF EX. REPT. NO. 2)

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that certain supplemental views of the members of the minority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare concerning the nomination of Albert Cummins Beeson, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board, be submitted and printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DECORATION OF GEN. ERNEST O. THOMPSON BY THE AMBASSADOR FROM VENEZUELA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on Friday, February 12, in a ceremony in Washington, Dr. Cesar Gonzalez, Ambassador from Venezuela, conferred the Order of the Liberator on a great Texan and a great American, Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission.

Texans are never surprised when any additional honor is paid to General Thompson. He has earned many honors during his life of public service to his State and the Nation.

General Thompson is probably the world's outstanding authority on the proper role of governments in oil and gas conservation. His views are sought by every oil-producing country on the globe.

It was for his many years of service to the cause of conservation of the vitally important natural resources of oil and gas that General Thompson was honored by the Venezuelan Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Ambassador Gonzalez in presenting the Order of the Liberator to General Thompson be printed at this point in the RECORD, in order that all Senators may have an opportunity to learn something of the value of the service rendered by this great American and my good friend.

There being no objection, the remarks of Ambassador Gonzalez were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF AMBASSADOR CESAR GONZALEZ, OF VENEZUELA, CONFERRING ORDER OF THE LIBERATOR ON GEN. ERNEST O. THOMPSON

General Thompson, the Order of the Liberator, established in memory of Simon Bolivar, the great liberator of South America, is given by Venezuela to men and women from all parts of the world in recognition of great and eminent public services.

Most men are fortunate if it can be said of them that at some time in their lives they gave in duty and devotion something beyond that expected of every citizen. Unlike such men, yours has been a lifetime of continucus public service at great personal sacrifice. You are to be envied in being able to look backward with pride and self-satisfaction on having served ably at every level of public service. As mayor of your home community, Amarillo, Tex., your accomplishments were such as to receive national recognition. For more than 20 years you have served the State of Texas in the establishment and maintenance of petroleum conservation practices which are respected throughout the world. As a young man you served your Nation on the field of battle in France, contributing your efforts toward the end that all people might forever breathe the air of free men. From time to time you have represented your country at international conference tables, giving the benefit of your wide experience and tempered judgment for the cause of international unity and understanding. When your Nation again became involved in a second world conflict, you once more offered and gave your service by way of full attention to solving the problem of oil supply for the Allied Nations.

Without interruption you have continued to work tirelessly for the cause of free peoples. You have become known and honored not only as a pioneer in the field of petroleum conservation, but also for your consistent and persistent opposition to those forces that would waste our great natural resource, petroleum. So long as the term "petroleum conservation" is known, it will be synonymous with the name of Ernest O. Thompson. Venezuela is particularly grateful for the service you have rendered in this field, since we directly benefit from your foresight and wisdom by way of prolonging the ultimate yield of our petroleum resources, and thus provide a better way of life for the people of our country. The great service that you have rendered to the world's petroleum industry will continue to produce benefits for generations as yet unborn.

It is for such a lifetime of eminent service that the government of Venezuela has seen fit to honor you with this recognition. It is a great privilege for me, as a representative of Venezuela, to bestow upon you the order of the liberator, and to say to you with all the sincerity at my command that this honor comes from the heart of my people.

ROLE OF THE NAVY IN A POSSIBLE FUTURE WAR

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the course of the debate late yesterday afternoon on the so-called new look in national defense, there was inserted into the RECORD a brief account, as published in the Washington Daily News, of a speech delivered at Newport, R. I., by Admiral Carney, Chief of Naval Operations. At the time it was suggested that the speech, as reported by that newspaper, was inconsistent with the administration's policy.

I have checked with Admiral Carney, and from him I have received a letter in which he states that his personal views are not at variance with the approved national strategy and policy.

In order to clarify the record, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter of transmittal, together with Admiral Carney's speech, printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
February 17, 1954.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C

MY DEAR SENATOR: I enclose some copies of the unclassified talk which I delivered at the Naval War College yesterday.

I also have read the article in today's Washington News referring to my remarks at Newport, to which you have invited my attention.

My address dealt with the role of the Navy in possible future war and developed a philosophy which furnishes a clue to the future composition of our naval forces. It pointed up the variety of tools needed by the Navy to discharge its assigned responsibilities and predicted naval requirements on the obvious fact that wars can vary in scope.

In reply to your query, I wish to reassure you that my personal views are not at variance with approved national strategy and policy. Furthermore, the address which I delivered at the Naval War College had prior clearance in the Department of Defense in accordance with the customary procedure for any unclassified address or article.

I am grateful to you for bringing this matter to my attention.

Most respectfully,

ROBT. B. CARNEY,
Admiral, United States Navy.

ADDRESS BY ADM. ROBERT B. CARNEY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, TO THE NAVAL WAR COLLEGE, NEWPORT, R. I. FEBRUARY 16, 1954

The President of the Naval War College has asked me to speak on the Navy's role in future war. I accepted because the subject is vital, and because I felt a responsibility as the Chief of Naval Operations to offer my thoughts on this urgent and complex topic. Nevertheless, I accepted with no little trepidation, for in doing so, I am embarking on an extremely grave project—one which should have months of undivided attention in the preparation rather than the short time vouchafed me.

A few words describing my own mental processes in organizing this discussion may help you, and others, to clarify their own analyses.

As I endeavored to bring the title into focus, the word "future" caught my attention. I realized that the boundaries of "future" must be delineated before I could even begin to sort out the factors and arrange them into any intelligible pattern. Tomorrow? 1956? 1960? 1964?

For the purposes of this discussion, it makes a great difference which segment of the future we contemplate. Fortunately, the problems of the very immediate future solve themselves: We simply use what we have to cope with the initial conditions imposed upon us by the aggressor.

Contemplating from a military standpoint, the near and remote phases of the future, there is one cloudy stretch, the true significance of which too often is lost upon the planners. And yet, its very murkiness provides the key to its importance. I refer to that period of time which follows the beginning of hostilities.

Not being aggressively inclined, we simply do not know when war will occur, nor what will precipitate it, nor what it will produce, nor how long it will last. The only true sound conclusion to which we may come is that not being an aggressor nation we dare not entrust our safety to any single rigid and unalterable course of action; rather, we must—costly as it may be—be prepared for numerous contingencies. In short, even this first step—defining the meaning of "future"—counsels flexibility.

In reality the future is a moving thing like time; 1964 is the future to us now, but in 1964 people will be thinking of the future just as we are today.

The point is this: at any given moment we will be in possession of certain demonstrated facts and proven techniques and equipment, but will be groping into the future in search of improvement and progress. We can expect the future to present new factors to the equation only in the sense that the dawn is always new. That concept is not just a bit of philosophizing; it is important because it is subject to translation into terms of budgets and hardware and it provides a fundamental key to military business.

As far as the Navy is concerned, the bulk of the fleet will always be of the present and the proven past, spiced up with a leaven of the things to come. That fact does not shackle our imaginations but it will always serve to impose some physical limitations on our operational planning.

So much for future, per se. Let us now examine some other factors in our effort to see what the Navy's role would be, should we be forced to defend ourselves.

The title raises another pregnant question: What sort of war do we have in mind? If we are honest with ourselves, we will acknowledge that there are big wars, little wars, general wars, localized wars, Marquis of Queensberry wars, and savage ruthless wars; atomic wars and, perhaps, nonatomic wars. What can we expect? What can we count on to guide us in our planning? Again, if we are honest with ourselves, and have the wit to see the possibilities for varied political contingencies, we will conclude that we cannot say, for sure, just what kind of conflict the next international crisis might precipitate.

If the answer is atoms, that is one thing. Were the criterion to be no atoms, we are militarily right back where we started.

I cannot, nor can anyone else, forecast the blueprint for an ultimate showdown of the nations now in ideological conflict. It is entirely conceivable that we might see a limited use of atomic weapons. We might see, and probably will see, a continuation of the so-called brush fires. Or we might see, as has so far been the case with chemical and bacteriological warfare, a nuclear stalemate with both sides refraining for fear of retaliation.

Confronted with great uncertainty in this respect, I see no alternative but to hedge our strategic bets, ready to rush into the future, but also prepared to meet, and rely on, the methods of the recent past.

So, here appears to be another useful clue and one which bears out the idea born of our attempt to define the meaning of "future." Consequently, as another general conclusion, I would say that something new and something old are both needed in the military locker. Obviously, no more specific conclusions as to forces and weapons would be possible for the simple reason that we cannot pinpoint all possible threats, politically or geographically. We can only say that the current threat is posed by the Communist bloc and go on from there.

Whereas I am working—not too deviously, I hope—toward conclusions concerning the Navy, it must be borne in mind that the Navy is but one component of our armed strength; it must be remembered that military power is but one element of national strength. And global thinking forces us to recall that American strength is but one element—albeit a powerful one—of allied power. I shall not attempt to elaborate here, but I will ask you to keep in sight the fact that before we can get down to United States naval brass tacks, there must be a prior consideration of the roles and missions of the United States in the free-world scheme of things. Having defined our national role, we then fit together the economic, military, and other elements of our national strength and come up with a military strategy that will best support our national aims. Within the framework of a national military posture are dovetailed the roles, missions and tasks of the individual services.

The Navy's place in the great design will depend in part on the measures our side intends to initiate, and will also be powerfully influenced by the capabilities and intentions of potential enemies as we understand them. The size of our naval forces, and their composition will stem from the specific jobs to be done if we are to enjoy the seas' blessings and deny them to our adversaries. Certain it is that we want a Navy which can make a major contribution to projecting American power overseas and which can be depended on to hamstring any enemy effort to project his own strength in our direction via the watery highways and help to guard the ocean airways.

This sort of thinking, in actual practice, evolves into a series of steps which apply the tests of feasibility against the desiderata—looking into the purse of resources to see how far we can indulge our strategic appetite. This is really the way a new look evolves.

The approach to the current United States New Look has been just such a process of integrated analysis, with every predictable factor considered, and every responsible element of Government participating in the deliberations. Even public opinion has been in the act, for the public has evinced a keen interest in the New Look and it is a constant topic of public discussion.

This New Look will be reflected in a practical way, in force levels and budgetary support and these, in turn, will be worked out on the basis of acknowledged roles, missions, and responsibilities of the several services. The roles, missions, and responsibilities are, in themselves, formulas to cope with the strength and assumed intent of potentially unfriendly powers, and to permit our own side to initiate measures in support of our own objectives.

Stated in its simplest terms, the Navy's traditional job has been, and still is, to gain and maintain control of the seas. More specifically, the United States Navy, in conjunction with allied naval forces, must exercise positive control over those sea areas needed for our own uses and those other sea areas of critical importance to the enemy. The Navy will also have collateral tasks in support of the armies and air forces, and these additional responsibilities may be expected to increase with the Navy's ever-increasing range of tactical influence.

By "sea" we no longer mean the surface of the sea. The air above the sea, and the darkest depths below the surface, are now part and parcel of a vast 3-D strategic area. Both offensively and defensively our operations are being projected farther above the surface, and farther below it. Strategic air attacks may approach their targets from seaward; submarines will stealthily approach the coasts to launch deadly missiles. Missiles of all sorts will be triggered to their assault or defensive missions; some will carry atomic warheads. And mark you—the tidal wave of nuclear propulsion, although still barely visible, is rolling in; it is as surely building to crescendo as was the inevitable cracking of the atom itself. All of these things not only complicate but increase the urgency of the sea-controlling job.

And make no mistake—the sea still is, and, for the farthest foreseeable future, will be the avenue for the movement of the vast majority of the things and stuff and men that must be shuttled around in the prosecution of a war, and for the feeding of insatiable war industries.

The requirements of sea transport are not always understood, but an examination of the list of critical materials which our industry must seek from abroad would bring us to some gloomy conclusions if we thought the Navy could not keep the sea lanes open. Were we or our suppliers to be completely blockaded, the best we could hope for would be perilous isolation.

And if this is a matter of such importance to this fabulously endowed country, what of England and Japan? What of the Mediterranean countries with their willing and intelligent manpower and their impoverished natural resources. All of the spirit and passion for freedom of such allies would avail little, if they were to be throttled by the enemy at sea. This is a very real threat which takes an important place in any new look in search of the optimum strategy.

Our overall strategy—the plan for making optimum use of available resources—is strongly influenced by our appraisal of the capabilities and intentions of potential enemies. Our Navy thinking must take Russian naval thinking into account. Russian ground strength has long held our attention, and was in no small measure responsible for that urge for collective security which brought about the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. More recently, Soviet nuclear achievements have grabbed the stage and precipitated much sober thought—and a measure of hysteria.

In the meantime there has been another manifestation of major Soviet policy which has been eclipsed in the public thinking by these developments, but it is a development which merits our very serious consideration. I refer to Russia's emergence as a maritime power.

Unobtrusively, and without fanfare, she appears on the stage as the second strongest naval power in terms of numbers of ships in commission—second only to the United States. She is flooding the shipyards of our allies with orders for merchant tonnage and she is building formidable combatant types in her own plants. She has recognized the importance of naval aviation and is improving that arm of sea strength. At present, in keeping with her geographical position and basic naval policy, her naval air arm is land based, but we cannot exclude the possibility that she may at some future time build aircraft carriers.

Russia's Navy is the one Soviet service that is more heavily manned today than during World War II.

These are unmistakable signs that portend a steadfast Soviet determination to make a bid for a powerful place on the seas. Our cue is obvious; our own forces must be tailored, equipped, and trained to meet the challenge if need arises—and meet it successfully and decisively.

For our primary business of bossing the oceans in time of war, I see our operations including the old, savage, endless, nerve-testing campaign against the enemy submarine with our escorts plodding around the convoys and our hunter-killer groups employing every new device and weapon and

technique. I see massive attacks on enemy naval bases and threatening air fields. I see ships and planes on vigilance patrols to warn of impending air attack on our shores and to shoot down the planes and missiles that threaten. I see the old, grim mine warfare, though the mines and countermeasures may take new forms.

Guns, with their limited range, will become secondary to a family of swift and implacable missiles.

Electronics will perform lightning calculations for attackers—and electronics battles will be waged between opponents—measure and countermeasure momentary success frequent frustration.

The Navy will respond to calls for support in the strategic air struggle. It will be prepared to supply the Army and to give some direct air support to the troops.

The Fleet Marine Force will provide a powerful and highly specialized mobile striking force to seize beachheads and to outflank enemy's line of communications—a ready-poised element of the self-contained naval team, which is conceived, equipped, trained, and directed by a single great weapons-system understanding and dedicated to gaining and keeping mastery of the seas—the Navy.

These things we can forecast on the basis of our own objectives and our assumptions as to the capabilities and intentions of possible enemies. The crystal ball hints of other things but does not reveal them: The developments that would come about after the die of war is cast. About all we can predict of them is that they will prove to be merely new tools for the immutable fundamental role.

For example, the next war might start with an aggressive act of sufficient magnitude to warrant prompt, large-scale retaliation. Then would follow a period when both sides would pick up the pieces, dust off the atomic residue, and make a reestimate of the situation which might well result in both sides settling down to a struggle chiefly involving the old conventional weapons. Regardless of how the war is fought, of one thing I am certain. It will end on the ground, politically and economically, even if not by frontal assault. Guerrilla bands, armed with bamboo spears may stalk each other across the remaining ashes. But, and of this I am certain also, they won't walk on the water.

Actually, it is safe to say that future war will not change the Navy's basic role in the pattern of national defense. The campaign may be waged at a hitherto undreamed-of tempo; the destruction may dwarf all of the experiences of history; new and distant targets will come within reach; there will be crying need for electronics to supplement the capabilities of our inadequate human mental processes; there will be a greater inter-play and mutual dependence among the services and between allied forces. But it will be the old familiar job of controlling the sea for our own use and denying it to the enemy.

Today new concepts of war are being advanced as people ponder the effects of new inventions.

New concepts are often in conflict with time-tested procedures; some zealots will oppose new concepts—others will religiously oppose everything else. Special applications often are mistaken for new principles. Common sense shows that balance is needed and my earlier remarks about the new and the old give a good clue as to the nature of that balance at any given moment. We must keep a watchful eye on both extremism and entrenched conservatism. Time moves, and we must move with it—and even ahead of it if possible; but time's applicable lessons should not be junked.

The factors bearing on grand strategy are constantly changing with the changing fortunes and trends of nations; strategic conclusions must be periodicaly reviewed. Therefore, strategy itself is a fluid thing, shifting under the influence of the circumstances of the times. The principles of war (the implementation of strategy) are constant, but strategy itself changes.

Changes of strategy will induce changes in emphasis with respect to the tasks of the several services, but the fundamental roles and missions are far less subject to change. Were war of serious proportions to be thrust upon us in the near future, the role of the Navy under the new look strategy would be identical in most respects to its assigned job in World War II; there would, however, be variations from the exact pattern of operations of the past. For example:

We must be prepared to utilize atomic weapons on naval missions;

We must be ready to assist and support our sister services in atomic operations;

We must be prepared to utilize either atomic or conventional methods, depending on the way the conflict develops;

We must be ready to operate in conjunction with our NATO partners and the forces of other associated nations.

None of those things are departures from our fundamental role; they are new, true; but they are merely adaptations of new things to old and unchanging principles.

All factors taken into account—the increased swiftness of passing world events, the increased emphasis in Soviet maritime growth, the future trends of sea utilization, the potentialities of nuclear propulsion, and the historic dependence of the world on sea communications—I am convinced that sea power is on the threshold of greater significance than ever before.

Here a word of warning is very much in order. Allied sea supremacy is not an automatically assured fact. That depends on our composite efforts, our wisdom, and our determination. Sea supremacy, like the sea itself, is something that the sailor—and his country—must never take for granted.

If you will think back for a moment concerning the points I have made, you will be impressed with the staggering and increasing complexity of naval warfare, which raises an extremely important question. What sort of men will plan these forces? What sort of men will fight these complicated ships and weapons? Even a push button must be pushed and it will still require intelligence to estimate P-moment—it will still take disciplined teamwork to prepare everything to respond to the push—it may require even more guts and discipline than ever before to fight the battles of the future.

One thing is certain: No pushbutton will produce leadership, loyalty, quality, courage, character; and those are the essential ingredients of this weapons system which we call the Navy, no matter what the future may bring.

Certainly one of the most important roles of the Navy—in my opinion the most important—in peace and in war, is the developing of people who will be equal to the exacting requirements of peacetime preparation and to the gruelling ordeals of a war that may be worse than anything we have yet experienced.

There is much that the Navy can do in this respect on its own initiative. There is also much to be done which can only be accomplished with the help of the Government and the people from whom the Government derives its powers—and its mandates.

The staggering complexity of modern warfare, to which I just referred, poses another problem with respect to the people who man our Navy. Today, no one man can master all of the tactics, techniques, capabilities, and workings of the ships and planes and weapons and equipment of the Navy; a mere general understanding is no mean achievement. The moral is clear: Decentralization to indoctrinated and trusted subordinates is mandatory. And there is an equally apparent corollary: A large measure of specialization is inevitable, and the specialists must be accorded worthy goals within their specialties. Mark those points well, for the writing is on the wall, and if we fail to discern its meaning the Navy will suffer and will surely fall behind the times.

As an approach to the future, I would strongly urge an open-minded outlook with the hatch always cracked for the acceptance of new and sound ideas. I would caution against the danger of compartmented mentality, compartmented either in the sense of thinking of military power in terms of any single facet or in the sense of thinking of war only as it used to be. This sort of thinking is perhaps as great a threat to the security of the United States as the ponderous capabilities of the Soviet Union. The naval officer should never forget that naval strategy in its broadest sense will always involve the use of troops, ships, planes, military formations ashore, and fleets deployed at sea. I cannot conceive of a major military campaign for the future that would not involve full participation of all the services, and all of the capabilities of each, all closely interwoven in the fabric of total national power.

John Paul Jones told us that in our profession merely to be a good mariner was not enough. Had he been able to see into this era of technology and flight and atoms he would, no doubt, have counseled Navy men not to rest content with knowledge of maritime affairs. Today a military man of whatever service must, if he aspires to high command, be well grounded in the capabilities and roles of all services—and must comprehend something of the politics and economics which underlie military policy and military effort.

And as we extend our thinking outward we must also accept the fact that internally our profession is becoming ever more complex.

We must recognize that the slide rule is replacing the rule-of-thumb; that sound research, development, and building efforts are absolutely essential if the Navy is to carry out its future role.

A big order, but we cannot evade it. So, whatever this great weapons system of ours may look like in the future, the brain and backbone and guts of it will be human intelligence, human leadership, and fighting spirit. The role of the Navy will always be to apply those qualities to the task of mastering the seas.

DESIRABILITY OF PLACING EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION OF GUATEMALAN COFFEE

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, following the request of a constituent, I contacted the Department of State concerning the desirability of placing an embargo on the importation of Guatemalan coffee as a means of combating the spread of international communism in that country. I ask unanimous consent at this time to read into the RECORD a letter I received from Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton, relative to my inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. POTTER. The letter reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 12, 1954.

The Hon. CHARLES E. POTTER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR POTTER: I refer to your telephone request of February 10, 1954 for the Department of State's comments re-

garding the desirability of placing an embargo on the importation of Guatemalan coffee as a means of combating the spread of international communism in that country.

The threat of Communist penetration in the Western Hemisphere has been a subject of increasingly serious concern to the Department of State and careful thought has been given to action which might appropriately be taken to combat it. The Department feels that three principal criteria should be borne in mind in considering any proposed course of action: First, will it permit of effective execution? Second, does it offer promise of effectively strengthening democratic forces in the hemisphere and weakening communism? Third, can it be carried out without gravely prejudicing our hemispheric relations?

No mechanism presently exists for the imposition of an embargo on Guatemalan coffee, and the Department understands that specific legislation would probably be necessary for an embargo of this kind; as you are aware a resolution toward this end was introduced in the Senate by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH on February 8, 1954.

There is, as we are all aware, a worldwide shortage of coffee which has developed a strong seller's market in the past three months. Coffee prices have risen to unprecedented heights. Should we attempt under the present exceptional circumstances to embargo coffee exports from Guatemala to the United States, it is evident that this measure would be more likely to raise coffee prices in the United States even further than to prove effective in ridding Guatemala of communism. Under these circumstances I do not feel that the proposed measure would be advisable at the present time, but the Department will continue to watch the situation carefully as it develops.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

THE WORD IS INFLATION

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, movement causes friction and generates heat. The wild impetuosity with which this body is rushing toward the enactment of the President's program into law is not only causing heat but, if not interrupted, it might cause a conflagration that would "cut us off even in the blossoms of our sins with all our imperfections on our heads."

Therefore, for the threefold purpose of protecting ourselves, educating the administration, and informing the public, I venture to retard, temporarily, the velocity of the senatorial machine by reading an impressive, timely, praiseworthy editorial, entitled "The Word Is Inflation," written by Mr. Harry Hoffmann, a brilliant feature writer. This article appeared in last Sunday's Charleston Gazette, which is one of the country's great newspapers, and the most widely circulated one in West Virginia.

The Gazette was formerly owned and edited by the illustrious late William E. Chilton who, during the Wilson administration, was one of the most capable, prominent, and popular Members of this body. By all who ever had the good fortune to know him his memory will be affectionately cherished "to the end of the trail."

The editorial is as follows:

THE WORD IS "INFLATION"

While the national administration gropes to decide whether it should be called prosperity, depression, recession, or leveling off and administration spokesmen go about accusing Democratic "eggheads" and "political sadists" of trying to create a "fear deal," this country actually is in the throes of the most destructive inflation it has ever known.

The Republicans evidently don't want to use the word inflation because that is something they promised to end and, in fact, even have the effrontery to insult the public intelligence by saying they have ended it.

In 1952 the Republican platform and Republican campaign orators promised to abolish all price controls and let the law of supply and demand take care of inflation. "We believe," said the GOP platform, "in combating inflation by encouraging full production of goods and food and not through a program of restrictions."

Well, the Republicans were elected in 1952 and they fell all over themselves killing off all controls to let the law of supply and demand go to work on inflation.

And what do we have?

According to President Eisenhower, in his State of the Union Message on January 7, "the damaging effect of inflation on the wages, pensions, salaries, and savings of us all has been brought under control."

But—

When the housewife picks up a pound of coffee and finds 99 cents scratched off and $1.03 stamped in its place, then takes a 21-cent item and finds it is now 25 cents, that's inflation.

When you stop in to look over the "low priced" automobile that used to be $800, then $1,100, then $1,400, then $1,800—and find that it now costs $2,300 and more—that's inflation.

When you consider that you got a raise or two over the last couple of years and then suddenly realize that you're burdened with debts and haven't been able to save a dime, even though you've bought nothing but necessities—that's inflation.

When your landlord sends you notice that starting next month your rent will be increased by $14 a month—that's inflation.

When you realize that the utility bills that cost you about $17 a month a few years ago now add up to about $35 a month—that's inflation.

When you read that farmers are complaining about the low prices they are getting, you get the idea your food costs are going down—but then you go to the store and find your food prices are going ever higher—that's a squeeze for the farmer, uncontrolled price gouging for someone along the line, and inflation for you.

If you think these things are tough on you, consider the situation of the fellow who got his layoff notice and became one of the more than 2 million unemployed that have sprung up in recent months. For him, his income has been cut off but he still must face the inflation that is with us.

And what is the Republican administration doing about it? Why, it's quibbling over what to name the present economic upheaval—and talking about "Democratic eggheads" and "political sadists."

It is about time that the administration gets around to recognizing that the word for it is inflation—and then do something about it.

PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, I desire to make a brief statement. I hope we may make as much progress as possible today on the unfinished business. Tomorrow it is planned to have an executive session of the Senate to take up the nomination of Mr. Albert Cummins Beeson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

So far as today is concerned, Senators should be prepared to have the Senate remain in session at least until about 7 o'clock this evening, and the same thing tomorrow evening. I hope we shall be able to make substantial progress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it definitely the Senator's plan to bring up the Beeson nomination tomorrow?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. I stated that it was my intention to ask for an executive session tomorrow for the purpose of considering the Beeson nomination.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the Senator any idea about what time he will ask for the executive session?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I plan to ask for an executive session following the morning hour, very shortly after the Senate convenes at noon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator plan to keep the Beeson nomination before the Senate until it is disposed of?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, like all other Members I have received many communications concerning the Bricker amendment, and I am glad that my constituents keep me informed of their views on matters of national interest.

Among the many expressions of opinion which I have received there have been very few which approached the subject as dispassionately as the Junior Bar Association of Baltimore City.

In its communication the association stated that while the members were opposed to the Bricker amendment in the form submitted, they endorse the principle of affirming the supremacy of the Constitution.

Therefore, I would like to direct attention to the resolution adopted by the Junior Bar Association of Baltimore City.

The full text of the resolution follows:

Whereas the executive committee of the Junior Bar Association of Baltimore has resolved its disapproval of the Bricker amendment in the form now submitted to the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas said committee desires to clarify the significance of said vote: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Junior Bar Association of Baltimore does hereby recognize that the problems raised in the debate on the Bricker amendment are of utmost concern to the American people and that further study should be given to the subject of the treatymaking power under the Federal Constitution and to the determination of whether any constitutional amendment is advisable; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Junior Bar Association of Baltimore endorses in principle a constitutional amendment which will affirm the supremacy of the

Constitution over treaties and executive agreements, and will prevent treaties and international agreements with foreign nations from being used to affect or abridge constitutional rights in this country, provided that this is done in a way which will not interfere with the traditional conduct of what are in fact our external relations with other nations.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I served in both the House of Representatives and the Senate with Hon. James F. Byrnes, the present Governor of South Carolina, who afterward became a member of the Supreme Court. In talking with him when he was an associate justice, Mr. Byrnes said that during his service in the Congress he never fully realized how much importance the courts attach to committee reports. As every lawyer in the Senate knows, the judicial branch is frequently called upon to determine what was meant by the legislative branch in the enactment of a law.

Words used in a statute are often capable of being construed to have different meanings. Consequently, to determine what was actually intended, judges first study the report made by the committee which had the legislation under consideration. The committee report is presumed to be a statement of the calm and deliberate judgment of those who favored the enactment of a law. Statements made in the heat of debate on the floor of the Senate cannot be expected to carry as much weight as words written in what is supposed to be a carefully prepared committee report.

Section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 provides as follows:

> A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

On page 4 of the report of the Committee on the Judiciary on the pending resolution I find the following:

> In 1920 the Supreme Court of the United States was presented with a case involving the authority of a treaty and its relation to the 10th amendment to the Constitution. The United States had entered into a treaty with Great Britain for the purpose of protection of migratory birds and this treaty had been implemented by an act of Congress. The Congress had attempted to regulate the subject prior to the conclusion of the treaty but its legislation had been declared unconstitutional by two lower Federal courts. The right of the Congress to enact legislation pursuant to treaty, which it was unable to enact in the absence of treaty, was challenged by the State of Missouri in the case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416). The Supreme Court decided in that case, that the treatymaking power was not limited by the 10th amendment which reserves all rights not expressly delegated to the United States by the Constitution to the States respectively or to the people.
>
> The decision by Mr. Justice Holmes noted that laws of the United States are required to be made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties need only be made under the authority of the United States, which, according to Mr. Justice Holmes, may mean nothing more than observance of the requirement that treaties be negotiated by the President and ratified by the Senate.

On page 6 of the report submitted by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] for the Committee on the Judiciary the case of Missouri against Holland is again mentioned.

In describing what is intended to be accomplished by the resolution now before the Senate the report says:

> Section 1 removes any possible doubt whether a treaty must be consistent with the Constitution. It gives unequivocal constitutional effect to early judicial dicta not yet incorporated in binding decisions that no provision of a treaty which violates the Constitution or which is inconsistent with the nature of the Government of the United States or of the relation between the States and the United States shall be valid. (*New Orleans* v. *United States* (10 Pet. 662, 736); *The Cherokee Tobacco* (11 Wall. 616, 620–1); *Holden* v. *Joy* (17 Wall. 211, 243); *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258, 267); and see *Asakura* v. *Seattle* (265 U. S. 332, 341).) The inferences drawn by some persons from *Missouri* v. *Holland*, cited supra, and *U. S.* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation*, also cited supra, that the treaty power is unlimited in any field of alleged international concern, regardless of the Constitution, will be unqualifiedly negatived, and any doubt on this score forever put to rest.

The report continues with a third reference to Missouri against Holland:

> While some argument has been made that such dicta as contained in the Cherokee Tobacco case, cited above, and the case of *Geofroy* v. *Riggs*, also cited above, that the treaty power does not authorize what the Constitution forbids should abate all fears on the subject, the fact remains that *Missouri* v. *Holland, supra*, and *U. S.* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation, supra*, go in the opposite direction of an unlimited treaty power.

Then the report contains this final statement:

> In any event, since the last dozen years have seen hundreds of earlier decisions overruled and disregarded by the Supreme Court, it would be inappropriate to rest content on the dicta of earlier cases. Undoubtedly, it is best to establish once and for all, by unequivocal language, that the treaty power cannot be used for purposes in conflict with the Constitution.

It will be observed that in the extracts from the committee report which I have read to the Senate the case of Missouri against Holland is mentioned three times in a way which clearly indicates that in that case the Supreme Court decided that the treaty power could be used for purposes in conflict with the Constitution.

As the author of the pending amendment I would like to inquire of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] if he concurs in the views as thus expressed in the committee report.

If the words in his amendment "A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect" remove any possible doubt as to whether a treaty must be consistent with the Constitution, then I would like very much to have the senior Senator from Ohio say whether, in his opinion, if those words had been in the Constitution in 1920, would sound logic then have required the Supreme Court to decide that the Migratory Bird Treaty made with Great Britain on behalf of Canada in 1916 was in conflict with the Constitution, and, consequently, that the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 was unconstitutional.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is thoroughly familiar with the case of Missouri against Holland, and I would like to know whether, in the judgment of the Senator, such a provision would have caused the Supreme Court to make any different decision than it did?

Mr. BRICKER. In my judgment the words would not, standing alone, because the Supreme Court said very definitely in Missouri against Holland that the treaty was in accordance with the Constitution because of the supremacy clause of the Constitution. It said it conformed with the Constitution, and therefore it became the supreme law of the land. However, coupled with the other sections of the committee text, there is no question that the doctrine of Missouri against Holland would not have become law. Missouri against Holland would have been decided in another way very likely under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

The reason the decision created no more concern at that time was that the results were salutary, and there was then no organized effort to change the laws of this country by treaty, as there is today. That is the reason, on the basis of that section alone—many people think it is important—it does not reverse the decision of Missouri against Holland to the effect that a treaty is the supreme law of the land. The decision held that a treaty does not have to comply with the terms of the Constitution.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am glad to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. BRICKER. I have always taken that position.

Mr. HAYDEN. The intent of the committee was to make it clear that the Migratory Bird Treaty was not constitutional and that Missouri against Holland could be reversed?

Mr. BRICKER. Coupled with the remainder of the committee text, there is no question but that would be the result.

Mr. HAYDEN. With respect to the use of the commerce clause, I remember distinctly listening to the debate in the House of Representatives when the migratory bird bill was under consideration. Mr. Mondell, of Wyoming, a very competent lawyer, stated that he could not conceive that the situation could be met by power given to Congress under the commerce clause, because he had never heard of a consignee or consignor of a flying bird like a migratory duck.

Mr. BRICKER. In other words, a dead duck comes under the commerce clause, but apparently a live duck does not. However, under the expansion of the commerce clause beyond all elasticity, I believe there is no question that the Supreme Court today would have to decide the case exactly as it did then under the supremacy clause.

Mr. HAYDEN. I wish to make it perfectly clear that the author of the pending resolution to amend the Constitution does not construe the committee report in the way I would construe it or in the way in which a court might construe it. I should like to point out that if it should happen that a future Supreme Court of the United States should be constrained, after the ratification by the States of this proposed amendment, to be guided by the statements in the committee report, then it is perfectly obvious that the Court would have to decide that the treaty negotiated with Great Britain in

behalf of Canada in 1916 to be in conflict with the Constitution.

It is interesting to note that in Missouri against Holland the counsel for the State of Missouri and for the United States were in complete agreement that under the Constitution a treaty is exactly the same as a law.

Mr. J. G. L. Harvey and Mr. John T. Gose, Assistant Attorney General of the State of Missouri, and Mr. Frank W. McAllister, Attorney General of that State, in their argument for the appellant said:

> That a treaty stands upon an equal footing with a law of the United States is settled. (*Cherokee Tobacco* case (11 Wall. 616); *Ward* v. *Race Horse* (163 U. S. 504).) (252 U. S. 422.)

The Solicitor General and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Frierson for appellee said that—

> Whenever a treaty operates of itself it is to be regarded in the courts as equivalent to an act of Congress. But if it is only promissory, it is then clearly within the province of Congress to enact legislation necessary to put it into effect. (*Foster* v. *Neilson* (2 Pet. 253, 314); *United States* v. *43 Gallons of Whiskey* (93 U. S. 188, 196).)

If that be true, then such change in the Constitution as provided in the Bricker amendment would invalidate the action taken by the Supreme Court in declaring the Migratory Bird Treaty constitutional, then it is perfectly certain some millions of sportsmen in this country would be very much interested in seeing to it that the Bricker amendment would never be ratified by the legislatures of the several States.

To my knowledge, those who love to hunt and fish were more responsible than any other group of citizens for the enactment of the Migratory Bird Act of 1913, and later for the resolution adopted by the Senate requesting the President to negotiate a treaty with Great Britain on behalf of Canada relating to migratory birds.

The only exception to the rule that money gathered by taxes shall be deposited in the Federal Treasury and not devoted to any special use, is in the Duck Stamp Act. The money received from the sale of duck stamps is devoted to the protection of migratory birds. More than $4 million a year is collected in that way at the rate of $2 each from more than 2 million persons who are interested in hunting.

In addition, $10 million is collected from the excise tax on sales of arms and ammunition. That money likewise is earmarked for expenditure in the preservation of migratory birds. If there should be any possibility that the Supreme Court decision in Missouri against Holland might be overturned, then it is a certainty the sportsmen and hunters of America will use every means within their power to prevent such a change.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. The distinguished Senator from Arizona, having been a Member of both the House of Representatives and the Senate, is a man of the broadest experience. He is also one of our most eminent Members in point of length of service, as well as in ready comprehension and understanding of procedures, and certainly of the rules of the Senate and of constitutional precepts. So, having qualified him as a witness, although he needs no qualification as such, I should like to ask him a question. Is the Senator able to understand, or to get any light—if I may put it in that way—from the distinguished Senator from Michigan or from the distinguished majority leader whether the perfecting amendment which is now the pending question or the one which I understand is to follow, would in any way affect the decision in Missouri against Holland? If the distinguished Senator from Arizona would be good enough to answer that question, I should be very grateful to him. Or, perhaps, the distinguished majority leader would like to answer it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], in his discussion last evening, which appears in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, made it clear that in his judgment and opinion, in which I concur, the pending amendment would not have upset the decision in Missouri against Holland, if the amendment had been a part of the Constitution at the time Missouri against Holland was decided.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is what I understood the Senator from Michigan to say, but I wondered what, in terms of that case, of which so much has been made, this amendment is designed to do. What is its purpose? I cannot understand it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I made inquiry of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and he has assured me that his interpretation of his amendment is that it would in no manner affect and would not have affected the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Missouri against Holland if the amendment had been a part of the Constitution in 1920.

Mr. BRICKER. I said that first section of the committee report, standing alone, would not.

Mr. HAYDEN. What is there in the pending joint resolution that would affect the Missouri against Holland decision?

Mr. BRICKER. The "which" clause would reverse Missouri against Holland. That was the intention of the "which" clause. The intention was that treaties would not destroy the structure of the relationship between the Federal Government and the States. This amendment would not affect the result in Missouri against Holland as of that time. As I stated, in my judgment the Supreme Court would sustain it today under an entirely different section of the Constitution, as it should have done at the time it rendered its decision.

Mr. HAYDEN. The "which" clause would reverse the decision in Missouri against Holland; is that the Senator's statement?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; the "which" clause would have reversed the very theory or principle enunciated by the Supreme Court in Missouri against Holland, and would have prevented taking away powers from the States and giving them to the Federal Government. It would likewise have prevented those powers from being taken away and their being given to an international body.

If the Senator will recall the speech of John Foster Dulles in Louisville, he will note that Mr. Dulles said very definitely that treaty law is the supreme law of the land, that it is even more supreme than an act of Congress, that it can take powers from the States and give them to Congress, that it can take powers away from the States and from Congress and give them to the Executive, and can take powers away from the States and Congress and give them to an international body.

We do not wish to create such a situation that treaty authority could be used to destroy the Federal structure of the Government, upon which we have builded mightly, as the Senator from Arizona will agree. I am certain that the American people would not want to destroy that structure.

Mr. HAYDEN. I also read the testimony of Secretary of State Dulles in which he qualified what he said in his campaign speech to which the Senator from Ohio has referred.

Mr. BRICKER. I believe the word "qualified" is too weak a word. I think he reversed himself.

Mr. HAYDEN. Whatever it may be called, his subsequent statement was not the same as the one made at Louisville. The point I am trying to make is that if the effect of the "which" clause is to nullify the decision in Missouri against Holland, and the joint resolution proposing the amendment to the Constitution should be submitted to the States in that form the two million and more men who buy duck stamps would make it their business to see to it that the State legislatures would never ratify it—and I do not know of any more influential body of men, when it comes to influencing legislation, than the sportsmen of this country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California does not contend that the pending amendment does any such thing as that which the Senator from Arizona has pointed out. To the contrary, the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on behalf of himself and several other Senators, and which is now pending before this body, not only adds certain language to the supremacy section of the Constitution, but also specifically strikes out the "which" clause as reported from the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. What disturbed me was that anyone who takes the trouble to read the committee report cannot help but believe that in the minds of those who wrote the report there was the idea that section 1 of the Bricker amendment would have a direct effect upon the decision in the case of Missouri against Holland.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But I assume that the committee report which the Senator mentions refers to the resolution as reported by the Judiciary Committee, which has been somewhat changed.

Mr. HAYDEN. The same identical words are in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]; namely, that the provisions of a treaty which conflict with the Constitution shall not be of any force or effect. The committee, in writing its report, undoubtedly voiced what had been said by eminent orators, like Mr. Holman and Mr. Manion and even Raymond Moley in his Newsweek magazine column, who have indicated time and time again their desire to see that the Supreme Court decision in Missouri against Holland nullified, and for that same reason the Judiciary Committee report says:

> In any event, since the last dozen years have seen hundreds of earlier decisions overruled and disregarded by the Supreme Court, it would be inappropriate to rest content on the dicta of earlier cases. Undoubtedly, it is best to establish once and for all, by unequivocal language, that the treaty power cannot be used for purposes in conflict with the Constitution.

Before saying those words, the report speaks three times of the case of Missouri against Holland. Naturally, it would arouse anyone's suspicion that they were attempting to do away with the decision in that case which held that the migratory bird treaty was not in violation of the Constitution.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. There has been a great deal of confusion with reference to the proposed amendment. Efforts have been made to stir up various groups and elements of our society. One of the most typical efforts was a report that the amendment would require the approval of 48 States, or require the approval of a treaty by the Congress. No conclusion of that kind could logically be adduced from the report of the committee.

If the Senator is attempting to arouse the sportsmen of this country against the proposed amendment on the ground that it would reverse the decision in Missouri against Holland, it is certainly a vain effort, because that decision cannot be reversed, except in principle, so far as the report of the committee is concerned. There is no question about the salutary effect of the law. No one is attacking the sportsmen. They will be protected, just as will the rights of all American citizens.

If the Senator will refer to page 16 of the report he will find this language:

> The purpose of the "which" clause is to make it clear that Congress shall not acquire legislative power under treaties which it does not otherwise possess under the Constitution. This would negate the doctrine announced in *Missouri* v. *Holland* (cited supra), that Congress had authority to legislate in otherwise prohibited areas by virtue of its power to carry treaties into effect under the Constitution.

But there would be no reversal of the result produced by the decision in Missouri against Holland. That is the decided law of the country. The "which" clause, which I support, but which has now been deleted—and it was deleted only because of the opposition of so many Members of the Senate—is good law and it is sound. I do not think the Senator from Arizona or any other Senator on the floor wants to deprive a State of its police powers.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have heard that argument over and over again.

Mr. BRICKER. But the trouble is that people get into an awful hurry to bring about reform. John W. Davis boasts that he wrote to the State Department about giving power to the Congress by means of a migratory bird treaty. I do not think there is any question today, however, about the Migratory Bird Act being valid even in the absence of treaty. I think it could have been even in 1920 sustained on other grounds.

Mr. HAYDEN. The agitation in favor of the Migratory Bird Treaty began more than 20 years before the case of Missouri against Holland. They were good lawyers, as good as there are today, who decided that the commerce clause could not apply to migratory birds and that the only way action could be taken was by way of treaty. One of them was Elihu Root, who had been Secretary of State and a brilliant lawyer, who stated that a treaty would be the most effective way to bring about the protection of migratory birds.

In view of the language contained in the report and in view of what has been said here, if the proposed amendment is adopted, some person, arrested for killing migratory birds out of season, will be granted an appeal to the Supreme Court, and that Court will have to decide whether this proposed change in the Constitution had the effect of depriving the Congress of the power to enact the 1918 migratory bird law which is still a part of the Federal statutes.

Mr. BRICKER. I would not give a nickel for that man's chance of avoiding prosecution and the penalties to be inflicted upon him. I have read that case as often as has any other Senator on this floor. I do not want to do damage to the migratory bird control, and we are not by the proposed amendment doing any damage to it.

If the Senator will remember, three judges of the Supreme Court at that time were definitely in favor of deciding the case under the interstate commerce clause. The Senator mentions the fact that lawyers have said it is not within the commerce clause to control migratory birds. It was never considered by Congress, 34 years ago, that a man who operates an elevator in a building in the Senator's State is engaged in interstate commerce. But that is the law today.

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be. But the point I make—and I shall then conclude my remarks—is that if the committee report clearly stated in so many words what the Senator from Ohio has said, we might all rest content. But the way I read it, those who wrote the committee report had in mind that section 1 would affect the decision of the Supreme Court in Missouri against Holland.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD extracts from the Judiciary Committee print submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], containing statements by deans and professors of law.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

14. MAURICE H. MERRILL, PROFESSOR OF LAW, UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

The proponents of this amendment either distort or are unfamiliar with American history. They argue that *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416, 64 L. Ed. 641, 40 S. Ct. 382 (1920)) was an innovation and an encroachment on State rights under our constitutional system, and that, if it had been decided in the early years of our national life would have been immediately overruled by a constitutional amendment just as *Chisholm* v. *Georgia* (2 Dall. 419, I L. Ed. 440 (1793)) was overruled by the 11th amendment. Actually, the record is all to the contrary. All that *Missouri* v. *Holland* did was to hold that it was legitimate exercise of the treaty power for Canada and the United States, having a common interest in preserving the birds which migrate over their territories, to agree by treaty to protect them, and that Congress had power under article 1, section 8, of the Constitution (giving it power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution * * * all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof") to pass a law for enforcement of the treaty.

There was no more interference with States' rights by Congress in passing the Migratory Bird Act than there would have been by the President and the Senate in putting the same provisions directly in the treaty. And that treaty provisions could set aside State law, even in areas in which Congress had no general legislative power, was decided expressly by the Supreme Court of the United States 3 times in the first 30 years under the Constitution. The cases are *Ware* v. *Hylton* (3 Dall 199, 1 I. Ed. 568 (1796) (State confiscation law superseded by treaty of peace with Great Britain, as made effective and confirmed by art. VI of the Constitution)); *Hopkirk* v. *Bell* (3 Cr. 454, 2 L. Ed. 497 (1806) (State statute of limitations superseded by treaty)); *Chirac* v. *Chirac* (2 Wheat. 259 (1817) (State law as to capacity to hold realty superseded by treaty)). *Ware* v. *Hylton* was decided only 3 years after *Chisholm* v. *Georgia* and just after the ratification of the 11th amendment. Every judge who wrote in the case expressly stated that treaties set aside conflicting State law. Judge Chase said: "The people of America have been pleased to declare that * * * laws of any of the States, contrary to a treaty, shall be disregarded." Judge Paterson said: "* * * the Congress (referring to Congress as the treatymaking power under the Articles of Confederation) could by treaty, repeal the act, and annul everything done under it." Judge Iredell said: "I consider, therefore, that when this Constitution was ratified, the case as to the treaty in question stood upon the same footing, as if every act constituting an impediment to a creditor's recovery had been expressly repealed, and any further act passed, which the public obligation had before required, if a repeal alone would not have been sufficient." Judge Wilson said: "* * * the treaty is sufficient to remove every impediment founded on the law of Virginia." Judge Cushing said: "But here is a treaty, the supreme law, which overrules all State laws upon the subject, to all intents and purposes; and that makes all the difference." With such pronouncements, if the framers of the Constitution, and the people of the country, had considered the doctrine set forth to be contrary to their intent, would not there have been immediately framed and submitted a correcting amendment, just as was done in the case of the 11th amendment? Obviously, the

answer is "yes." Yet no such resolution even was introduced. The reason is that the decision was in accordance with the intent and the expectations of those who framed and ratified the Constitution.

Note that 2 of the judges who framed these statements, William Paterson and James Wilson, were members of the Constitutional Convention and that similar decisions were made shortly before this date by 2 other judges who sat in the Convention, Oliver Ellsworth, in *Hamilton* v. *Eaton* (Fed. Cas. No. 5,980 (C. Ct. N. C. 1792)); and George Wythe in *Page* v. *Pendleton* (Wythe, w11 (Va. 1793)). Unquestionably the statement that *Missouri* v. *Holland* is an innovation which would have been repudiated by the generation which adopted the Constitution is a distortion of history.

---

25. LEON H. WALLACE, DEAN, SCHOOL OF LAW, INDIANA UNIVERSITY

There has been considerable confusion both in statement of principle and of historical fact in the discussion of these three problems. As an example I cite you to the column of Mr. Raymond Moley appearing in this week's issue of Newsweek (vol. xlii, No. 1, p. 84, July 6, 1953). Mr. Moley observes:

"The mischief all started with some loose language from the usually careful Justice Holmes in a case in 1920. That case, *Missouri* v. *Holland*, had to do with a treaty dealing with migratory birds and an act of Congress carrying out the terms of the treaty which were in conflict with the authority of Missouri. Holmes, sweeping away the law of more than a century, declared the treaty to be supreme and, in fact, to have given to Congress a right it did not have before."

It seems obvious that Mr. Moley is referring to the first problem which I have stated; that is, that the terms of the treaties entered into by the United States may supersede State law. Mr. Moley is quite mistaken if he thinks this problem was first raised in 1920. He overlooks, for instance, the long line of treaties covering the succession to real property by aliens. These treaties between the Government of the United States and other sovereign governments started before the Constitution itself. The first of these bilateral treaties was with France in 1778, followed by treaties with the Netherlands in 1782, Sweden in 1783, and Prussia in 1785.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Mansfield
Anderson	Gore	Martin
Barrett	Green	Maybank
Beall	Griswold	McClellan
Bennett	Hayden	Monroney
Bricker	Hendrickson	Morse
Bridges	Hennings	Mundt
Burke	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Payne
Byrd	Humphrey	Potter
Carlson	Hunt	Purtell
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Jackson	Russell
Clements	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kerr	Sparkman
Duff	Kilgore	Stennis
Dworshak	Knowland	Symington
Eastland	Kuchel	Thye
Ellender	Langer	Upton
Ferguson	Lehman	Watkins
Flanders	Lennon	Welker
Frear	Long	Williams
Fulbright	Magnuson	Young
George	Malone	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], on behalf of himself and other Senators, on page 3, in lines 7 to 9.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I should like respectfully to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] whether he still intends to offer the amendment which apparently is to be the next order of business, following the vote on the pending amendment. He has another amendment, has he not?

Mr. FERGUSON. The next amendment is merely one to change a section number.

I believe the pending amendment will complete the proposed amendment to the Constitution, as it relates to treaties, and in one respect as it relates to international agreements. So the Senator from Michigan and all other Senators who sponsor the amendment believe it will constitute a complete amendment in relation to treaties.

The amendment will do three things: First, it will say to the courts, in clear language, "Any treaty which conflicts with the Constitution will be of no force or effect."

Mr. HENNINGS. In the opinion of the Senator from Michigan, is it necessary to say such a thing to the courts?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is necessary, for this reason: In various of its decisions the Supreme Court has held that treaty law is supreme, and does not have to comply with the Constitution. In other words, even though it conflicts with the Constitution, it is the supreme law of the land. When Mr. Justice Holmes rendered the opinion in the case of Missouri against Holland, he so indicated. I say there is dicta——

Mr. HENNINGS. There is dicta, and I believe the Senator from Michigan will admit it was somewhat vague——

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; but on the other side, the Court can always determine whether a treaty is constitutional, whether it violates the Constitution.

I say to my colleague that I believe the amendment is essential, for the reason that there has been developing—and with too much speed, I should say—the notion that treaties are supreme; that nothing in the Constitution limits a treaty; that the fact that a treaty is in conflict with the Constitution makes no difference, and, even though it does conflict, it can be held to be valid.

I believe there should be written in the Constitution express language laying at rest all such ideas, and indicating clearly that the supreme law of the land is still the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course, the Senator from Michigan will admit, I presume, that a treaty may be annulled, as to its domestic effects.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe a treaty can be annulled as to its domestic effects only if Congress has the power under the Constitution to do so. In view of the way the Constitution reads at this time, I am not one of those who believe that Congress can annul every treaty.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Michigan does not believe Congress can reach back, in other words, and annul a treaty which has certain domestic effects; is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, because under the decisions of the Supreme Court, certain things which can be done by treaty, cannot be done by Congress.

Personally, I have no complaint about treaties made in the regular course and approved by two-thirds of the Senate, and thus becoming the law of the land, even if under such treaties the States are required to give up certain powers, because I believe the entire philosophy of our Government, under the treaty-making power, is that two-thirds of the Senate can make a treaty and, after it is made, it becomes the supreme law of the land.

Under this amendment, if adopted, along with the amendments which were adopted day before yesterday, I would say a treaty would be the supreme law of the land, except that the courts would have to judge it from a judicial standpoint, in answering the question, "Does it conflict with the Constitution?" If it does conflict with the Constitution, or, as Justice Marshall said in Marbury against Madison, referring to a law, if it is repugnant to the Constitution, then such a law is unconstitutional. So a treaty repugnant to the Constitution would be unconstitutional.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may ask the Senator from Michigan a question?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is the Senator from Michigan entirely satisfied that the Supreme Court, in the first instance, would have the right to determine whether or not a treaty was constitutional?

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator mean as of today?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think there is grave doubt about it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. There is doubt as to whether one could even get into court and raise such a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. That is why I want this amendment to be adopted.

Mr. HENNINGS. Am I to understand that in the face of the line of cases to the effect that Congress may annul the domestic effects of a treaty, the Senator still believes that Congress cannot do so? We appreciate that the effects abroad, in foreign countries, become a matter to be determined by international law, once a

treaty has been made. But, as to the domestic effects, does the Senator seriously suggest that Congress does not have the power to annul the domestic effects of a treaty?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true with respect to certain kinds of treaties. However, I am not asking that that situation be changed.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have great respect for the Senator from Michigan as a lawyer, a former judge, and a scholar of ability. Under the theory of my distinguished friend, does he seriously urge that there are now in effect any treaties with respect to which the Congress should go back and work its will, annulling the domestic effects of such treaties?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I have not examined them all. There are great volumes of them. If I thought there were such treaties in existence, and Congress had the power, under the constitutional grant of power to Congress, to annul a treaty which we did not believe was a proper one, I would introduce legislation to that end.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator believe that we might have to go back and examine all existing treaties?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; but I believe that if anyone had a case in court, and were confronted with a provision of a treaty and told, "This is now the domestic law," the court could say, "In 1954 the Constitution was amended in such a way that we must look at that treaty in the light of whether or not it is repugnant to the Constitution, that is, whether or not it is in conflict with the Constitution."

Mr. HENNINGS. In terms of precise legal language, what does the Senator mean by "repugnant to the Constitution"?

Mr. FERGUSON. Exactly what Justice Marshall said. I think it means——

Mr. HENNINGS. That was in a part of the dictum in the case of Marbury against Madison.

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, no. This was not dictum.

Mr. HENNINGS. At any rate, it was 150 years ago. The word "repugnant" might have some nuances and varieties of interpretation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it means "in conflict with."

Mr. HENNINGS. I was merely trying to clarify the meaning.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the two expressions mean exactly the same thing.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I am concerned with the effect of the proposed amendment. Would it require that we go back and reexamine all treaties which are in existence as of today? That seems to be a very serious question with respect to the language. What will the courts find the language to mean? Must we go back and examine all treaties now in existence? What effect would the proposed amendment have? I cannot find the answer.

Mr. HENNINGS. I think that is a very valid question. Let me say to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Minnesota, that I have just been interrogating our learned friend from Michigan on that very point, as to whether we must go back, under the terms of this amendment; and if not, why he thinks it will be unnecessary to do so.

Mr. FERGUSON. Using the word "we" to mean the Senate or the Congress, it would not require us to go back at all. It would merely mean that in any case arising in a court, in which either the United States Government or a citizen was trying to exercise a right claimed under a treaty, the court would look at the treaty and say whether or not it violated any of the fundamental principles of the Constitution, whether or not it was in conflict with the Constitution. If it were, the court would have to hold that the right claimed was not established by the treaty, because if this amendment should be adopted as a part of the Constitution, all treaties in conflict with the Constitution would be invalid.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me ask one question, and then I shall be very glad to yield to my friend the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

I am having great difficulty, as must be evident, in getting enlightenment upon this amendment. I hope the Senator from Michigan will be patient with me.

Mr. FERGUSON. I certainly will. It is very clear to the Senator from Michigan, and I hope I can make it clear to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate the superior understanding of the Senator from Michigan. I do not say that with sarcasm, of course. It being the Senator's amendment, I am sure that he has studied it profoundly, and is conversant with it in all its aspects.

If the Senator does not want his amendment to reach back and to have effect upon treaties retroactively, I wonder why he does not provide in his amendment that it shall be effective only as of the date of its enactment. In other words, why create a sea of trouble and doubt for the courts and litigants to contend with, conceivably for evermore, but at least within the foreseeable future? Might it not even cast some doubt upon our participation in the United Nations?

Mr. FERGUSON. It might, if we were to interpret the United Nations Charter as being effective in the United States as internal law, and if judicial interpretation established the fact that it was in conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

Let me say to the Senator that no Member of the Senate who voted for the United Nations Charter had in mind that any of the provisions of that charter could be used as domestic law, which would be in conflict with the Constitution of the United States. I think America was shocked when the Chief Justice of the United States said that in his opinion the United Nations Charter had so altered the law of this land that it gave to the President of the United States authority to seize the steel mills.

Why should we not go back and look at treaties, in an effort to protect the rights of American citizens? The only reason why this amendment does not go back further than the establishment of the Constitution is that our freedom was obtained by treaties before the Constitution was established. We want the treaties which gave freedom to America to stand.

The amendment now known as the first section of the Bricker amendment, the section which was approved by the Senate by a vote of 60 to 20, reads as follows:

> A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

The meaning of that language is that all treaties back to the time of the establishment of the Constitution will be analyzed; and they should be.

Suppose we enact a law at this time, and it does not get into court for 20 years. Shall it be said that constitutional questions with respect to that law cannot then be raised? The 14th amendment was adopted after the War Between the States. It wiped from the statute books of many States, and from the constitutions of other States, provisions of constitutional and statutory law, because it related to the past as well as the future.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Michigan being a historian and a student of constitutional law, I am sure he will recall that no President in our history used to a greater extent the vast powers given to the President, which were intended to be given to the President under our Constitution by the farsighted geniuses who wrote it, than did Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Lincoln's actions in suspending the writ of habeas corpus and in issuing the Emancipation Proclamation were accomplished by Executive orders, were they not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe so.

Mr. HENNINGS. They were.

Mr. FERGUSON. But Mr. Lincoln, or someone under him, Mr. Lincoln himself did not do it, tried during the same period to suspend the writ of habeas corpus in the State of Indiana.

Mr. HENNINGS. That was in the Milligan case.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. The Supreme Court held that he did not have the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

Mr. HENNINGS. Would not that seem to prove the point—to some extent, at least, that under our system of the separation of powers, and our system of checks and balances, even a great President such as Abraham Lincoln, in his effort to preserve the Union, which was his motivating and driving force and objective, exclusive of all other things, including the slavery question, with the fate of the Union in the balance, and the going was very rough for the first 3 or 4 years, as the Senator well knows, could not go beyond a certain limit. In the Milligan case the court stepped in and called a halt.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. However, that case did not involve a treaty.

Mr. HENNINGS. It was striking at the exercise of excessive——

Mr. FERGUSON. Power.

Mr. HENNINGS. Excessive authority or power by the Executive.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. We recall that Congress then undertook to interfere with Mr. Lincoln in the conduct of the war by establishing what they called a Committee on the Conduct of the War.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. One of the great Senators from the State of Michigan was chairman of the committee.

Mr. HENNINGS. I believe it was Zachariah Chandler.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. They wished to call Mrs. Lincoln before them to inquire whether she was a traitor and whether her little sister, Mrs. Helm, had taken things through Confederate lines. None caused Mr. Lincoln more difficulty than Thad Stephens and Zac Chandler, Ben Wade, and others like them, who undertook to interefere with him and to whittle down and dilute his powers, and in so doing interfere with the progress of the war, by hamstringing and putting into a straitjacket the Chief Executive of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot agree with that statement.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator believes that they helped Mr. Lincoln. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe Congress and the Supreme Court of the United States stand between the people of the United States and their Chief Executive, except where the Executive is specifically given power by the Constitution. That is the great difference between the American form of government and governments of other nations. In Great Britain the Parliament has supreme power. In the United States it is the Constitution that says, "Thou shalt not."

Mr. HENNINGS. What is the supreme power in Britain, may I ask?

Mr. FERGUSON. Parliament. Britain has an entirely different form of government.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is not the situation here. In this country the power is divided. The people reserve certain inalienable rights. Those rights are granted to no one. That is the basis of the liberty and freedom of our people.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I ask my good friend from Michigan this question: Of course, we know, getting right down to the Civil War period, which came under discussion, that one of the reasons, among a variety of reasons, the Confederate States failed was that there was no strong central authority; that the President was not a strong President; and that the States were constantly undertaking to say what they would do and what they would not do, even with respect to the sending of troops. In the State so ably represented by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], Governor Brown refused flatly to furnish troops from that State, and he called the Georgia militia home from the front lines to defend Georgia.

Therefore is it not correct to say that in times of crisis—and apparently we are going to be in a crisis for the rest of our lifetime, and possibly for generations to follow—this country, under our system of separation of powers, needs not only a strong Executive but an Executive clothed with power to manage our foreign affairs in such a fashion and with such latitude and discretion as may be in the best interests of the Nation?

Is it not also correct to say that for 165 years—I know that someone will mention the Yalta and Teheran and Potsdam agreements—that no President has exceeded his authority in terms of either an Executive agreement or of treaty power?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would not agree.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course, we agree that Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam would not have been affected. I believe it is admitted that none of the amendments submitted would have affected the Teheran, Yalta, or Potsdam agreements, since they were so-called secret agreements and were made by the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces during the war. Is it not true that not one of the amendments would reach such agreements as those?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to answer the Senator's first question. With respect to it, I cannot agree with the Senator. I am not referring to any particular President, because I believe this question is above personalities, but I cannot believe that any Chief Executive of the United States should be the judge of his own power and of his own authority, whether he wishes to exercise such power or authority in international relations or in domestic relations. The minute that prerogative is conceded to him the Constitution of the United States is wiped away. It is impossible to operate a republic such as ours if we are to allow the Chief Executive to be the judge of his own powers. The purpose of the Constitution is to make certain that all public officials, whether they be legislative, judicial, or executive, shall not do certain things. The Constitution says, "Thou shalt not." If we were to adopt the philosophy enunciated by the Senator from Missouri, we would no longer have a Constitution in the United States.

Mr. HENNINGS. Which philosophy is the Senator referring to?

Mr. FERGUSON. The philosophy that a President of the United States can declare the emergency and, under that emergency, do anything. I believe he can do only those things which the Constitution permits him to do, and no more.

Mr. HENNINGS. I must disclaim having said any such thing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then I must have misunderstood the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to restate what I said.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator stated that the President should conduct international relations in any way he saw fit.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to restate it. I assume that the President acts within his authority under the Constitution. We take that for granted.

Mr. FERGUSON. If he acts under the authority given him in the Constitution, we agree.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course we agree.

Mr. FERGUSON. If he acts under the Constitution.

Mr. HENNINGS. I assume everyone thinks that the President ought to act constitutionally.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I say.

Mr. HENNINGS. The only difference between my point of view and the point of view of the Senator from Michigan as to this particular phase of the discussion is that I believe the President is entitled to be clothed with and to exercise to the fullest the plenary powers which were intended to be given to the President of the United States as the Chief Executive. I do not believe the people of the United States, when they elected President Eisenhower—or when they elect any other President of the United States—intended that the Congress should, after he has been in office a little more than a year, undertake to delimit and restrict him and put him under the greatest handicaps and difficulties in his conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States, when the President himself has stated that he is opposed to tinkering with the Constitution or to amending the Constitution. I believe the President is entitled to the full authority and prestige, responsibilities, and accountability which attach to his high office, given to him by the American people.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to answer the distinguished Senator in this way. There is not a word and there is no intention anywhere in the proposed amendments to take one particle or one iota of his powers away from him. His power is constitutional. We want his power to be judged by the Constitution. That is all we want.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan if he believes that the President of the United States has any implied powers.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am one of those who believe he has no implied powers.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator believes that the President has no implied or inherent powers?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what the Supreme Court held in the steel-seizure case, when President Truman seized the steel mills. The Court held he did not have such powers.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the Senator from Missouri that I fully agree with the Senator from Michigan that there is nothing in the pending amendment which would in any way interfere with the President's conduct of the foreign relations of the United States, provided, of course, that he acts within his constitutional powers. What the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan would do would be to spell out for all time to come that in acting in the field of foreign relations no President, be he a Republican or a Democrat, shall trespass upon the legislative power which

under article I of the Constitution is vested in the Congress, and that by the use of his foreign policy he shall not legislate and thereby encroach upon the power of Congress, which under the Constitution is given exclusive legislative power. The President has made it very clear that he does not want the Presidency to encroach or impinge upon the powers of Congress, and that he does not want Congress to encroach or impinge upon the powers of the Presidency. With that we fully agree. But we want to make certain that we are not surrendering to any Chief Executive the legislative power which is granted to the Congress under the Constitution.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I ask the distinguished majority leader this question? Does not the Constitution already provide for that? What is there in this amendment, in other words, that will make more certain anything that is not already contained in the Constitution of the United States? In other words, is not this amendment a redundancy? Is it not supererogation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; because, under article VI of the Constitution, which the distinguished Senator knows as the supremacy clause, we are dealing with the Constitution of the United States and laws enacted in pursuance of the Constitution. The Constitution and the laws enacted in pursuance thereto are the supreme law of the land, and then, in dealing with the treatymaking power, the Constitution provides not that treaties must be made in pursuance of the Constitution, but that they be made under the authority of the United States. There is a historic reason why that language was used, because at the time of the Constitutional Convention this Nation already had a treaty with Great Britain which gave the American Colonies their independence, and it had certain treaties in existence with France which had been negotiated under the Articles of Confederation prior to the Constitution.

So, obviously, we could not say that those treaties had been made under the Constitution. That gap having been left, and because of more recent decisions of the Supreme Court and of some statements made in other forums, there is a distinct possibility that a treaty becoming a part of the supreme law of the land might cut across the Constitution and the Bill of Rights of the people of the United States. This amendment would close that loophole.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does not my distinguished friend believe that Congress can annul and will annul the domestic effects of any such treaty?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is at least a debatable question. First of all, under present circumstances, would the courts take jurisdiction or would they look upon it as a political question? Would they say, "Was this treaty made under the authority of the United States? Did it have the signature of the President and the certification of the Secretary of State?" If that is the case, the treaty has been made under the authority of the United States. There is no requirement now, nor will there be, unless this amendment is adopted, that a treaty must be made in pursuance of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I ask the distinguished majority leader, for my further enlightenment, this question: Is it his view that this proposed amendment, if adopted, will reach back to the beginning of the effects of the Constitution?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is meant to reach back to the adoption of the Constitution. The Supreme Court, when considering a law passed by the Congress, has the right and the duty, I believe, to put the law beside the Constitution, and, if the law is not constitutional, to rule it out and declare it null and void, or, at least, those sections which are null and void. Whereas, at the present time, I do not believe the Court has that power relative to treaties. This amendment, in my judgment, would forever establish the power to lay a treaty next to the Constitution of the United States and say, Does this treaty conform to the Constitution of the United States? If it does, it is valid as the supreme law of the land. If it does not conform, it is invalid.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then the majority leader does concede that if this amendment shall be adopted, it might very possibly affect the constitutionality of our participation in the United Nations?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In my judgment, it would, if there is anything in our participation in the United Nations which would give that organization power to make rules as a part of the supreme law of the land to govern the rights and responsibilities of American citizens.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator knows that that is impossible.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I would not say it is impossible.

Mr. HENNINGS. Let us say it is most unlikely.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Except for the fact that there was a decision in a case in one of the lower courts of California, although it was not upheld by the Supreme Court of the State of California, which pointed precisely in that direction, to the effect that the United Nations Charter would permit certain things to be done which otherwise could not be done under our constitutional process.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan has already mentioned the fact that in the steel case the late Chief Justice of the United States apparently used an international agreement as one reason for giving power to the President of the United States to seize a great industry without due process of law.

Mr. HENNINGS. Was not that a very graphic and dramatic demonstration of the strength of our system under the separation and balance of powers? There the Executive sought to do something which the Supreme Court said could not be done. Has not that been the history of this eternal interplay, if we may call it that, the pressure of one branch of the Government against the others, throughout the entire course of our history? Sometimes we have a strong Executive; sometimes Congress seems to be in the ascendancy, and at other times the Supreme Court.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the distinguished Senator will yield further——

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to finish one point.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be happy to yield. Who has the floor, Mr. President?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think I have the floor.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understood that I took the floor only for the purpose of interrogating the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not want to monopolize the floor. The only reason why I took the floor was to interrogate my distinguished friend from Michigan.

I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader a question, which has also been in the mind of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and I shall yield to him in order that he may ask the question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator think that we should amend the Constitution every time some inferior court in California renders a crazy decision?

Mr. HENNINGS. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that if we are to follow the thesis and what appears to be the philosophy of some of our amending brethren on the floor of the Senate, we shall be amending the Constitution of the United States every time an inferior court or a superior court in one of the States speaks by way of obiter dictum, or when the Executive acts as if he wanted to do something in contravention of the limitations of his powers. Thus we shall be compiling a Constitution which will grow like Topsy and be denuding and constantly striking down the strength of the Executive by the emasculation of his powers, to such a point that we shall be like France, Italy, and some other countries where the executive means absolutely nothing because of splinter parties. That could well be the result of depriving the President of the authority to act in his capacity as the leader of his Nation in our relations abroad.

In these days of crisis, every day is pregnant with great decisions and great determinations in this sick world in which we live. Yet, Mr. President, we are talking about amending our Constitution, and our good Republican friends who have elected and supported the President are making an effort to limit, as the President himself has asked us not to do, and to strip him of authority to act under the Constitution. That, it seems to me, is incredible and unthinkable.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It so happens that the amendments presented by the Senator from Michigan on behalf of himself and other Senators are acceptable to the President. The President has indicated that the pending amendment is acceptable to him.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not want to press the point, or to suggest any impropriety in the high councils of the majority party, but has the President said that he thinks this amendment would be helpful to him, or has he said he thinks that possibly it may help to get some people off the hook, and save a few faces, and that if there can be worked

out some sort of a compromise which will not do too much damage, he will be glad to go along with it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the President say he thinks the adoption of the amendment under discussion would help him?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not intend to get into a discussion of conferences I have had with the President of the United States.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understand. I would not suggest that the Senator do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I stand on my responsibility as majority leader of the Senate and say that the amendments which have been presented by the Senator from Michigan are acceptable to this administration.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course, the discussion about the President's views arose because I had understood that the President did not want his authority limited, and was opposed to the so-called Bricker amendment or any perfecting or substitute amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will yield further, I wish to say the President made it clear that he would be opposed to any upset in the balance of powers, whereby, either the Executive could encroach upon the congressional powers or the Congress could encroach upon the Executive powers.

Speaking now of the amendment pending before the Senate, and not the Bricker amendment as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, on behalf of himself and other Senators, would not permit the Congress to encroach upon the Executive powers, and would make certain that the Executive could not encroach upon the congressional powers.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. Some of us have been undertaking, within the limits of our abilities and comprehension, to fight what we have thought, at least in part, to be the administration's battle in the Senate. We have had some help, but not very much, from the other side of the aisle, if I am not being invidious in saying so. Are any of the other amendments or substitutes with which the majority leader is familiar also acceptable to the President of the United States?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. The Senator has asked me a question, and I wish to say I believe the other amendments—at least the ones I have seen—are not acceptable.

Mr. HENNINGS. They are not acceptable. I asked that question because some of us, as my distinguished friend knows, have been working very much in the dark. At the outset, some of us, comprising a minority of four on the Committee on the Judiciary, joined in the minority views in opposing the so-called Bricker amendment, and also, I believe, the Watkins amendment thereto or substitute therefor. As I recall, there were at least three. Am I correct in my recollection?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. Some of us have undertaken to devote considerable time and energy in an effort to familiarize ourselves with the problems involved, because we have felt an attachment for the Constitution of the United States. I do not mean to say that I think the attachment is superior to that felt by any other Senators. I do not mean to suggest any self-righteousness or superiority in terms of patriotism. However, some of us have feared radical proposals which we believe would inhibit and cripple the Executive in the exercise of his functions as the President.

From time to time we read in the press that efforts have been made to compromise, for one reason or another, and to call certain learned Members of this body into meetings to see if they cannot get together in their proposals.

Some of us have held the view that the pending issue is one which is not susceptible of compromise; that the elements of compromise do not exist in the whole question; that either the proposed constitutional amendment is redundant—and I think that might be said of the pending amendment—or that it may contain uncertainties, ambiguities, hidden defects, or meanings not readily perceptible; and that by adopting such an amendment we would be entering into the realm of speculation and proceeding on an uncharted sea of conjecture, subject to the interpretation the courts may place upon certain aspects of the main amendment and some of the amendments proposed to it. Some of us think that when in doubt, it is better not to do anything than to undertake, by improvisation, by jerryrigging, and, to use another expression, by a little baling wire, to fix something in this body which may be palatable to a sufficient number of the 62 Senators who signed the original resolution in such a way as to make it appear that they were for something and still not for something.

I do not question the motives of any of my colleagues; I am sure the motives of each of them are as high as are mine and, I concede, they may be higher in perhaps many respects. I hope they are. However, to be bluntly frank about it, it is somewhat disconcerting to us to hear that some of these meetings and conferences are being held, and that the President now says he is for what he apparently at one time suggested he was against.

I appreciate the enlightenment which my distinguished friend from California has given us to the extent at least that the President of the United States is opposed to any substitutes or amendments other than the one now pending, offered by the distinguished majority leader and the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not wish to mislead the Senator. I do not know what amendments or substitutes may be offered other than those presently under consideration.

Mr. HENNINGS. I assumed that premise. I would not undertake to hold the distinguished majority leader, in whose words I have implicit confidence, to anything which has not yet been presented or of which he could not possibly have knowledge. I speak only of those amendments which are now before the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. At the very start of the debate I was obliged to disagree somewhat with the distinguished Senator—and I wish to do so again—on the matter of there being no basis for compromise. I wish again to point out to the Senate what I am sure the distinguished Senator from Missouri, as a student of history, well knows, that we would never have had the Constitution itself if there had not been many compromises. One great body of opinion thought that the representation in the Congress should be solely on the basis of population. Others thought that such an arrangement would lead to domination by the larger States, to the disadvantage of the smaller States; and so they felt every State should be represented on a basis of equality. The larger States differed with that point of view, because such a theory completely ignored the population factors, and, as a result, the functioning of true democracy.

Though the States differed on a basic principle, they were able to compromise other differences by having the States represented in the Senate on the basis of equality, and by having the States represented in the House of Representatives on the basis of population. That was a great compromise.

Those who had some doubts about adopting the Constitution indicated, in the great, historic debates in the Constitutional Convention, that they felt it would be wise not to adopt the Constitution until the first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights, had been agreed to and started in motion. The ink was hardly dry on the Constitution when the first 10 amendments were ratified. That was another great compromise.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I interrupt at that point? Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to say I do not believe it can be stated as a fact that, because efforts are being made to find an adjustment of differences, or to reach a compromise, as the Senator has pointed out, there is anything either wrong, or contrary to what has been done in our country in the past, or, indeed, even contrary to the very conception of the Constitution, which we are discussing on the Senate floor today.

Mr. HENNINGS. I certainly would not undertake to say that all compromises are in all respects bad ipso facto, merely because they are compromises. I might point out to my distinguished friend, however, that at the outset the people of the newly liberated colonies were undertaking to form a nation. Historically, every State which was carved from one of the Thirteen Original Colonies had a predominant, and we might even say a chauvinistic, sense of its own sovereignty as a Colony, and later as a State. The Colonies had a great deal of difficulty in getting Rhode Island to agree to ratify, for example. I believe Rhode Island was the last State ultimately to ratify the Constitution. The ratification by many of the States

hinged upon commercial aspects in the new Union. Many questions hinged upon matters of finance. They hinged upon the relationship of one State to another. As the Senator has pointed out, we could go on at some length discussing that feature.

However, certain compromises have been made in history for the purpose of avoiding facing up to an issue. Compromises have been made for the purpose of keeping the peace temporarily; for fear that someone might get into trouble. I refer to the Missouri Compromise, which I think had as much to do as any other factor in bringing upon this country the terrible scourge of the Civil War. There was, of course, the compromise of 1850, which was another one of a series of compromises entered into during a period when apparently there was some hope of avoiding armed conflict, but which, in fact and in effect, resulted in an intensification of the activities of the extremists in both the North and the South, the Abolitionists in the North, and the extremists in the Southern States.

So those compromises really did not settle anything. They were by way of temporarily placating and appeasing certain groups in the North and in the South, incident to their forms of industry; the agrarian South and the industrialized North; the great slave power in the South and the great money power in the North; and many other factors.

Therefore, Mr. President, when we speak of compromises, we do not say that of necessity a compromise need be an evil thing, nor do we say that it is at all times a good thing merely to reach a result and arrive at something which may seem to be a temporary resolution of a difficulty or problem.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, all of us are mortal. I happen to be one of those who believe that the men who served in the Constitutional Convention, in addition to their great learning and ability and knowledge of history, were working under a divine guidance or inspiration of some kind. Who are we to say that if the Missouri Compromise or the Compromise of 1850 only delayed for a period of 10 years the struggle between the States, there might not have been some kind of divine plan to have Abraham Lincoln at the helm of the country when the great struggle did break out, rather than to have at the head of the country some of his predecessors who might not have been able to save the Union? That is something we simply do not know.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course we do not know, any more than did the revisionists, who surmised what might have happened at Gettysburg if Longstreet's Corps had fired earlier, or those who surmised what might have happened on other occasions if thus and so had occurred.

I take it that the Senator from California will agree that the general theory of compromise is not at all times a good one.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Neither is it at all times a bad one.

Mr. HENNINGS. Certainly it is not wise always to compromise for purposes of expediency. That is almost the first maxim in McGuffey's Reader, is it not?

So I am interested to know that thus far the administration and the President of the United States are unalterably and firmly opposed to any amendment other than the pending one, which the majority leader says is acceptable, or to any substitute amendment.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I voted against the two amendments previously offered by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and certain other Senators. I shall vote against the pending amendment, and I desire to make a brief explanation of my position.

If the first amendment by the Senator to Senate Joint Resolution 1, and adopted by the Senate—the one providing "a provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with the Constitution shall not be of any force or effect"—and if the second amendment adopted by the Senate—the one providing for a yea-and-nay vote on the question of the approval of a treaty—were the only proposals before the Senate, I would not have been disposed to vote against them. I do not agree that the first amendment is necessary, and I am convinced that the Senate could adopt the second amendment as a part of its rules. However, if the two amendments were the only ones to be proposed, I would vote for them.

I voted against the two amendments because they are designed and intended to become a part of a larger amendment which I do not know that I shall be able to support.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me at this point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I voted for the first two amendments because I felt they were perfecting amendments. But the pending amendment is the most confusing of all the amendments which have come to my attention, and at present I am in a deep quandary of mind as to whether I should support it. That is one reason why I have been following the debate very closely.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, I desire to discuss briefly some of the considerations which are the basis of my position on the proposed constitutional amendment before us.

The basic premise of my consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1, the first proposal, and of the amendments which have been offered to it, is that the Constitution should not be amended unless there are conclusive or persuasive reasons for its change. It was on this basis that I decided I would not vote for Senate Joint Resolution 1, which proposes a radical change in the Constitution, and would alter the constitutional power of treatymaking.

I have previously stated, as have other Senators in the course of the debate, that if the Bricker amendment were adopted, it is true that a treaty dealing with matters delegated to Congress could not become effective until the treaty was implemented by the Senate and by the House. Thus the Bricker amendment would alter the constitutional power of treatymaking, for it would shift from the Senate to the entire Congress the constitutional power to approve treaties.

Under the Bricker amendment, if the subject matter of a treaty affected matters reserved to States, but for the treaty power it could not become effective throughout the Nation without legislative action by all the States. Thus the amendment would deny to the President and the Senate their existing constitutional power to conclude treaties. In practice, the amendment would give the States an effective veto in the case of treaties of that type, which had been approved by the President and the Senate.

Mr. President, it must be admitted that changed conditions and circumstances or interpretations of the Constitution by the Supreme Court of treaties which the people and the Congress in their considered opinion believe to be in conflict with the purposes of the Constitution or the great interests of the people of the Nation, might be valid reasons for making a constitutional change. I do not believe the supporters of Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 and, it seems to me, the supporters of the various amendments proposed to it, have demonstrated on the basis of actual fact that there are any great emergencies or dangers or interpretations of the treatymaking power which require the immediate change of the Constitution.

It is true that a large body of popular opinion in support of an amendment of some type has developed in the country. This opinion was developed chiefly in support of Senate Joint Resolution No. 1. I believe that in large part popular opinion in support of the amendment has been deevloped on the basis of assumptions which are incorrect and do not exist in fact. These assumptions, or at least some of them, are that the treatymaking power is being exercised in violation of the Constitution; that a treaty is superior to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; that a new interpretation of the Constitution—such as the interpretation in the case of Missouri against Holland—is threatening the Federal Government, the States, and individual rights; that the Constitution and the States are being threatened by some agreements which may be entered into, some day, by some international body.

I mention those assumptions because I think it will appear that the argument in favor of the amendment we are now discussing is based upon them and the fears arising from them. For a few minutes I desire to address myself to these assumptions.

First of all, it is incorrect to say that the treatymaking power can invade or supersede the Constitution or the Bill of Rights. It is simply a power delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government, to be exercised by the President and the Senate, just as other powers are delegated to the Congress itself. The treatymaking power is a creature of the Constitution, and cannot be superior to its creator. Treaties executed constitutionally are of equal rank with legislation passed by the Congress in the exercise of its delegated powers. Like any other action of the Federal Government taken under its delegated powers, treaties are superior to State laws and State constitutions. Treaties, like any other action of the Federal Government, are subject to the limitations imposed upon the Federal Government by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The Supreme Court has consistently so stated. It is true that there has not been, so far as I know, a case in direct point; but since the establishment of the Constitution, in many cases the Supreme Court has by dicta made its position clear. The well-known example, which has been quoted many times in the course of the debate, is the opinion in the case of *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (258 U. S. 1890), in which Mr. Justice Fields described in the following words the limitations on the treatymaking power:

> It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent.

A few minutes ago my good friend the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] gave as one of the purposes of his amendment that it might prevent an alteration of the structure of the Government of the United States, or that it might prevent some action by some international body which would invade the individual rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. Certainly, the language of Justice Fields, which I have just quoted contradicts that thesis.

The key phrase in Mr. Justice Fields' opinion is that the treaty power does not "extend so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids." The Bill of Rights forbids the Federal Government or any of its agencies or branches to invade the individual rights which it guarantees. Mr. Justice Fields' opinion, therefore, makes it perfectly clear that a treaty which contravenes the Constitution or the Bill of Rights could not be sustained.

As the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] pointed out, it is admitted that an act of Congress can supersede a treaty; yet it is being argued that, while a simple act of Congress can supersede a treaty, a treaty can invalidate the Constitution.

It has also been suggested that it may not be possible for one who believed his rights under the Constitution violated by a treaty to protect his rights in the courts. I do not believe any basis will be found for such a suggestion. In fact, one of the cases which has been cited in this argument, the case of United States against Capps, now pending in the Supreme Court, is proof that a citizen who believes his rights invaded by an executive agreement can pursue those rights in court. The case is now before the Supreme Court of the United States.

I make the point for this purpose: If the senior Senator from Michigan contends that a time may come in the future when some President or some Senate may unwisely approve a treaty which contravenes the Constitution or the Bill of Rights, the courts of the land will stand as a protection against such unwise action.

Second. Throughout this debate it has been implied—and again I enter into this preliminary discussion because the same assumptions are the basis of the amendment which is now before us, and again I say that they are incorrect assumptions—that the decision in the case of Missouri against Holland represented a new interpretation of the Constitution with respect to the treatymaking power, an interpretation which had not been intended by the Constitutional Convention. If that were not true we would not have before us the Bricker amendment. We would not have before us, I believe, the amendment which is proposed by my friend, the senior Senator from Michigan.

The popular impression is widely held in this country that prior to this decisions treaties were not supreme over State constitutions and State laws, with respect to subjects embodied in the treaties. This, too, I am certain, is an incorrect assumption.

The Supreme Court of the United States held, shortly after the adoption of the Constitution, in the case of Ware against Hylton, that the treaty of peace of 1783 with England prevailed over State law, and particularly over the Virginia law which had been enacted, interfering with the collection of debts owed the British. Yet in this debate several attempts have been made to place that decision of the Supreme Court upon a different basis than the decisions which have been rendered upon the very issue in question.

The constitutional debates and the decision of the Court established that those who wrote the Constitution considered fully the very issues which we are discussing today, and purposely wrote into the Constitution, in article VI, section 2, that treaties constitutionally ratified are superior to State constitutions and laws. They made this decision to enable the National Government to speak for the whole country, and for all States, in its constitutional agreements with other countries.

I come now to a third argument which has been made in this debate. It is the argument that, whatever may be the constitutional status of a treaty, new and dangerous circumstances may demand a constitutional limitation upon the treatymaking power of the President and the Senate.

The circumstances which have been argued in this debate—and we always come back to these circumstances—are that the United Nations and its subsidiary agencies, or some other international organization, are engaged in drafting treaties or agreements which, if approved by the Senate and the President, would impose legislation upon the Federal or State governments in fields which have been reserved to them and always regarded as peculiar to their institutions. They argue that such legislation would be imposed by some international body and, according to the argument which I have heard today, even without such an agreement being presented to the Senate.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. Will the Senator allow me to finish my thought? It has been implied in the national debate that because such agreements may be made and drafts may be prepared, by some international body, it is unpatriotic for a person to oppose amendments to the Constitution.

It has been said that some of those in the country who oppose the amendment favor the change of State institutions through the medium of international treaties. The implication has not been made against any Member of this body; but it has been made as against private individuals and organizations. Of course the same reasoning must follow Members of this body who oppose these amendments.

I can only say for myself that my opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1 is not based upon such grounds. I can understand that there are nations, particularly those which have recently gained independence, and which, without the benefit of our long experience of freedom, are eager to express their hopes and aspirations in international declarations, and even to secure those hopes through effective international law. I sympathize, as I am sure all other Members of this body do, with the aspirations of any people for freedom. However, I do not believe that it is proper to negotiate or enter into treaties for the purpose of legislating on the national level or the State level. Furthermore, I am not certain that if such a treaty should be approved by the Senate, it would be held constitutional by the Supreme Court as a proper subject of treatymaking. This opinion was expressed in a statement by a former Chief Justice of the United States, the great Chief Justice Hughes, which appears in the report of the committee. But in appraising this situation we must return to the Constitution to determine whether the agreements which may be drafted constitute any actual danger. No matter how many international drafts, covenants, or treaties are written, they cannot affect the United States, either internationally or through Federal or State law, unless they have been approved by the President and the Senate in the manner provided by the Constitution. I know of no convention or draft of any international body which has been agreed to except in a constitutional manner.

If a treaty which has been ratified endangers us, the Senate had the opportunity to examine it. I state again, I do not know of any draft or treaty which has been approved by the Senate which

does endanger us. Further, I know of no treaty approved by the Senate and sustained which has threatened the Constitution or the Bill of Rights, or, so far as I know, exceeds the traditional concept of proper treaty subjects.

Yesterday, in a brief colloquy with the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, I asked him if he could identify any treaty which had been approved by the Senate, which had not been executed pursuant to the Constitution. His answer was that he could not.

I do not take it upon myself to criticize anyone who has fears about what a future Senate or a future President may do. All I say is that the basis of such fears should be examined. I say further that unless such fears are sustained by fact, they ought not to lead us into a hasty amendment of the Constitution.

I turn now to the pending amendment, offered by the distinguished Senators from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The key section of this amendment is section 2. This clause reads as follows:

> Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause no treaty made after the establishment of the Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless entered into pursuant to this Constitution.

Before the Senate votes to amend article VI of the Constitution let us read the article, as it would be if the amendment were adopted. If this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States were adopted, article VI, clause 2, would read as follows:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

This would be added by the pending amendment:

> Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless entered into pursuant to the Constitution.

When the section, as it would be amended by these proposals, is read as a whole, I believe the questions surrounding its interpretation become apparent.

Article VI, section 2, now makes it clear that any treaty constitutionally made is the supreme law of the land. The language of the amendment, if it means anything, has the purpose, it seems to me, of altering or changing the meaning or effect of article VI, section 2.

If it does not intend to alter its meaning or effect, what is the necessity and the purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan? I can suggest the meaning the words may have, but I am not certain about it. I have found great difficulty in trying to determine what meaning they do have. It may be my own limitations which make it difficult. But last evening, when I engaged in colloquy with my friend from Michigan, at the end of the colloquy I was not sure what his purpose was.

Do the words "pursuant to the Constitution" mean simply that a treaty must be approved, as the Constitution now demands in article 2, section 2, that is, by the President and Senate, before it shall be the supreme law of the land? If that is what it means, certainly it adds nothing to the Constitution.

Yesterday, in his discussion of the amendment, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] stated that its purpose, among others, was to insure the effectiveness of and to complete the amendment which was accepted by the Senate a few days ago, which reads as follows:

> SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

If that is its purpose, it is a restatement of section 1 and it would seem to me that section 1 would adequately accomplish this purpose of the Senator.

If the first amendment, which provides that no treaty shall have any force or effect if it conflicts with the Constitution, should become a part of the Constitution, I cannot see the purpose of the pending amendment, which proposes to reach the same effect. It seems to me that it is redundant and useless.

The pending amendment is offered as a substitute for section 2 of the Bricker amendment. We must therefore assume that its proponents do not favor section 2, the "which" clause. Yet I am not clear as to whether the purpose of the amendment is to make effective the "which" clause in another form, or at least leave open the question as to whether a treaty which deals with a subject which may affect the law of a State cannot become the supreme law unless it is implemented by the States.

Yesterday, when I asked the distinguished Senator from Michigan if that was its purpose, he said it was not. I accept without question his statement. Yet, if its purpose is to alter or change the meaning of the present article VI, it must be comprehended by this body and perhaps eventually by a court that it has some such meaning.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the first place, at least speaking for myself, as one of the joint authors of the amendment, it is my belief and intent that it does not merely deal with the mechanical way of ratifying a treaty. I quite agree with the Senator from Kentucky, if that were all it was meant to do, it would be totally unnecessary. What it is meant to do is to require, insofar as being the supreme law of the land is concerned, that a treaty must be measured by and must be in conformity with the Constitution, in the same way that a statute passed by Congress must be measured by and must be in conformity with the Constitution.

So far as I am concerned, as a sponsor of the amendment, that is the very clear intent of the amendment. In other words, the Constitution is meant to be supreme, and treaties of statutory law are meant to be in conformity with the Constitution.

Mr. COOPER. That is the very point I raised. The distinguished Senator from California and the distinguished Senator from Michigan say that its purpose does not apply to the mechanics of the method of approval. The amendment which was adopted 2 days ago makes it clear that no provision of a treaty which is in conflict with the Constitution shall have any force or effect. If there is any reason for this amendment at all it must go to the types of treaties which can be negotiated, or it must have a limiting or prohibitory effect either upon the type of treaties, or upon the powers of those who negotiate treaties. It must have some such effect if it has any purpose at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sure the distinguished Senator's confusion over what the amendment means is due to the inability of those of us who have proposed it to explain it to him. I am sure that is the case. I shall try to boil its meaning down. We have already adopted the first amendment—let us call it section 1—which is specific. It provides that any treaty or international agreement which conflicts with the Constitution of the United States shall have no force or effect.

Sixty Members of the Senate believe that to be a proper constitutional amendment, or at least a proper part of a constitutional amendment. That being true, when we consider article VI of the Constitution we find that there is a section in that article which conflicts with that amendment, in that article VI of the Constitution, as it reads today, provides that a treaty made in conformity with or under the authority of the Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and the decisions have so held. There has been no decision by the United States Supreme Court holding a treaty to be unconstitutional. Justice Holmes in the case of Missouri against Holland, said there is a different meaning to the words which apply to a law under article VI than those that apply to a treaty under article VI. The law is judged by the expression in the Constitution: "in pursuance of the Constitution." When those words were left out of the Constitution following the word "treaty," it was held that treaties fall in a different category.

It is for that purpose, to judge laws and treaties alike—that they must not be repugnant to the Constitution, as Chief Justice Marshall said—that in the amendment which was adopted the other day the words "not in conflict with" were used.

Therefore, if we adopt both of the amendments and make them a part of the Constitution we shall have article VI of the Constitution in line with the proposed new constitutional provision that all treaties must be in pursuance of and not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

Therefore the amendment does have meaning. What would the Supreme Court say, if we adopted the amendment,

as we did, stating that a treaty which was in conflict with the Constitution of the United States had no force and effect, and allowed to remain in the Constitution a provision which said a treaty was supreme and could not be judged by whether it was in conflict with the Constitution of the United States?

It is to clear up that point that we seek to amend the sixth article of the Constitution, so that when it is read with the whole amendment it will be clear that the people of the United States, after the amendment is ratified by three-fourths of the States, will have said to the Supreme Court and to the whole country that a treaty made by the President with two-thirds of the Senate concurring, will be judged by the Constitution, and if it is in conflict with, or, as Chief Justice Marshall said, repugnant to, the Constitution, it will be of no effect. I am sure that is what the people of the United States want. They do not wish to surrender and they never intended to surrender their inalienable rights to the President and to the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. But, I may say, with all due respect, that his argument leads us back to the point I made at the beginning of my remarks, if the argument which the Senator makes is a valid argument for the adoption of his amendment, then it must be bottomed upon two beliefs: first, that today a treaty does not fall within the purview of the limitations and prohibitions imposed upon government action by the Constitution; and, second, that today a treaty could successfully contravene the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. If the Senator does not believe that, then there is no reason for the argument; if he believes that a treaty cannot override the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, no amendment is needed.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not what I personally believe or would personally think if I were a member of the Supreme Court. Certain remarks of Justice Holmes, Justice Sutherland, and Justice Douglas are the basis of my judgment. The Secretary of State, in the last administration, sent a treaty to the Senate which, if it had been ratified, would have violated the Constitution. I am satisfied that if the Senator will go into the books written by persons who have been part and parcel of the State Department in previous years, he will find statements which would seem to say to him and to me that we are old fashioned; that whereas we always thought, as lawyers, that the Constitution was above treaties, and they could not be in conflict with the Constitution, as a matter of fact treaties are on a higher plane than is the Constitution.

I want the citizens of the United States to know that we were correct when we were in law school and when we practiced before the bar of justice and thought that the Constitution was supreme.

Mr. COOPER. I do not want to quibble, but I suggest that the adoption of the amendment would not prevent the President or the Secretary of State from sending to the Senate any proposed treaty they felt to be proper. It would not prevent a decision by any court that such a treaty is constitutional or not constitutional. The Senator has said that there are some who take the position that a treaty can override the Constitution and can invade the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is taking the same position. He is saying in effect that it is so unclear whether a treaty can invade the Constitution or the Bill of Rights that he thinks some amendment should be adopted to prevent it.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. The Senator cannot judge what I am thinking on that point. I have offered the amendment because I think it is essential to the welfare of the citizens of the United States. I think this debate—not the part that I may play in it—will be a great thing for America. It will tell the people something more about their Constitution and about the three branches of government.

In my opinion, the President of the United States does not want to exercise any unconstitutional power in making a treaty. But we are speaking not only for ourselves today; we speak for the aged, for our children, and for our children's children. As I said last night, I am not one who wants to wait until the bombs have fallen before I go into a shelter. We have marked shelter areas in this building, not because bombs have fallen, but because there is a possibility that they may fall. Why should we wait until the rights of people have been taken away before we adopt an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit their being taken away?

Mr. COOPER. I say again that the amendment is based upon assumptions which are not supported by facts. One of the important facts which led the distinguished Senator to argue for the amendment is that international bodies are engaged in the drafting of agreements which, if approved by the Senate, might invade either Federal or State laws. None has been approved by the Senate. The Senator assumes again that a President might negotiate and send to the Senate a proposal which he believes unconstitutional——

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I did not say that.

Mr. COOPER. I am not referring to the present President, but to the future.

Mr. FERGUSON. I would not say that about any President. The President may think he has the power to do so. I am satisfied that the President who undertook to seize the steel mills thought he had the power to do so, but he did not have it. I want to make sure that if the President makes a mistake in judging his power, there will be language in the Constitution to cover the situation, so that the Supreme Court will say, "Mr. President, you have misjudged your power."

Mr. COOPER. Again, if such a treaty comes to the Senate, the Senator is assuming that the Senate will be so blind to its own duties and responsibilities, so ignorant of the Constitution, so insensible to the interests of the people, as to approve such a treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, does the Senator know that Congress has passed upward of 30 laws which have been held unconstitutional? Why does he challenge me on the question of what the Senate of the United States may do? Congress has misjudged its power on 30 or more occasions and has passed unconstitutional laws. The only thing that could protect the people of America from those unlawful acts of the Congress of the United States was the Supreme Court of the United States under the express terms of the Constitution.

Mr. COOPER. It is true that Congress has passed laws which have later been declared unconstitutional. I think there are more than 30 such laws. It might be argued, therefore, that the Presidents of the United States have been more careful in the exercise of their duties in negotiating treaties than has Congress in its delegated powers.

Furthermore, the Senator has said that legislation passed by the Congress has been tested by the courts and held unconstitutional. I make the point that if by some chance a treaty which was not pursuant to the Constitution should be approved by the Senate, it would be tested in the courts.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is all we are asking for by this amendment. The Senator and I agree that the Constitution ought to be clear to everyone. As the amendment now reads, as to a treaty which is made in conflict with the Constitution the Supreme Court would declare it to be void.

I have sat in the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. I saw a bill presented to that committee, the author of which later became the Attorney General. I questioned him as to whether the bill, if enacted into law, would be constitutional. He said, "You must remember that since the Constitution was drawn there was a treaty made which is known as the United Nations Charter, and under that we can now do what we want to do."

It is that which leads me to say that what the Senator from Kentucky and I thought was the law should be the law, and we ought to write it so that all who run may read.

Mr. COOPER. It is my contention that the basic instrument of our Government, the Constitution, ought not to be changed, and, certainly, it ought not to be changed in the manner it is now proposed to change it, by a series of amendments which have been hastily developed during the debate, unless there are very good reasons for their adoption. The Senator from Michigan admits that there has been no treaty approved by the Senate which has been contrary to the Constitution. The present safeguard of the Senate exists. The Senator himself has stated that the Supreme Court has stricken down some 30 laws which Congress passed by holding them to be unconstitutional. The safeguard of the Court is still present. No draft agreement of any international body can have any effect in this country unless it passes these safeguards. But because proposals have been drafted in a subsidiary organization of the United Nations and because one of them was sent to the

Senate by a former President of the United States, there has been whipped up in the country a fear of some possible change in the Constitution. This fear is enlarged by statements made on the floor of the Senate. One of the statements is that a treaty can override the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator states that the amendment has been quickly whipped up, that it has not had the consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary, and that that is one of the reasons why he does not favor it.

Mr. COOPER. No; I have not said that is a reason for my opposition.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have heard other Senators make the same statement on the floor of the Senate; but I call attention to the fact that everyone of the Senators who has said that, so far as I recall, has been one who is going to vote against what the Committee on the Judiciary reported.

Mr. COOPER. That is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. How then can it be said that there has been haste in drafting the amendment? That is not the reason why Senators are going to vote against the amendment, if they do vote against it.

Mr. COOPER. I have been trying to give my reasons.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. COOPER. I set forth the reasons why I have thought it necessary to vote against it. Before I conclude today I shall point out an area in which I believe an amendment should be adopted. I do not take the arbitrary position that there is no field in which an amendment would be appropriate; I am not setting myself up as an arbiter of the Constitution; but I do have the responsibility of developing my own views on the question under debate.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have enjoyed the debate with the distinguished Senator, because I know he is familiar with the Constitution. What I enjoy about our exchange of views is that the Senator and I agree as to what the law ought to be. I only wish to make it clear that in the future the law will be what we agree it should be, and the Senator does not wish to help me to make the law clear. I think that is where we stand.

Mr. COOPER. Yes, I do wish to make it clear and I have now as always the highest regard for the Senator's views, his knowledge and sincerity.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. It occurred to me at this stage of the colloquy, or discussion, that if my distinguished colleagues are offering perfecting amendments, it is quite obvious that they are not willing to accept what was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, because the amendments which have been proposed have been formulated since the joint resolution was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan is not willing to accept one part of the measure reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, namely, the "which" clause, which the proposed amendment would strike out. I have studied the report of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I concede the committee did a great job. However, it does not follow that because an amendment was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary this body should adopt it.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will yield further, I was a cosponsor of the joint resolution proposing the constitutional amendment, which was sent to the Committee on the Judiciary. When it came from the Committee on the Judiciary, it no longer was in the form in which I had orginally supported it as a sponsor.

As to the amendment being considered on the floor of the Senate, I learn that such distinguished and qualified Members as the Senator from Michigan had concluded that the Committee on the Judiciary had sent to the floor something in which the Senator could not concur, and therefore he has proposed amendments.

Such action leaves me in a further quandry as to whether I should accept what has been presented to the Senate on the floor, when such eminent Senators are attempting to amend that which the Committee on the Judiciary has presented for the consideration of the Senate.

I have been following the debate very carefully. I frankly state that twilight is rapidly appearing, and the sunlight of clear day is disappearing, during the very debate which has taken place on the question now pending, the amendment proposed to the joint resolution before the Senate.

As the debate between two distinguished attorneys, judges, and judicially qualified Senators has ensued, I as a layman, one not enlightened in the judicial field, have been somewhat confused as to what is the real answer to the question which the two Senators have advanced on the pending question.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is an able attorney. No one questions his ability. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is an able attorney, one who has long been so recognized as such, and he has been a judge. He has also had many years of experience in the Senate. Yet the two Senators are in disagreement, and I regard both of them as being outstanding Members of this body. I am trying to get some understanding on the question which confronts the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for an observation?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Speaking as one layman to another, is not the problem to which the Senator from Minnesota refers one which constantly faces the Supreme Court of the United States, when lawyers on that august body divide by a vote of 5 to 4 as to whether a law is or is not constitutional?

Mr. THYE. The country has been left in very good condition during all the years under which we have been operating under the Constitution. I am not going to compound the troubles of the Supreme Court by adding more confusion. I expect clarification of the question before I vote in favor of the amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that if what he has stated had been the attitude of the people when the 13th and 14th and 15th amendments had been proposed, they never would have been adopted. If that had been the attitude of the United States when George Washington was President of the United States, if the leaders had not at that time given consideration to the fears of the people and introduced the Bill of Rights, those amendments never would have been adopted. Their action has had a most salutary effect; it has kept the country free.

The 13th and 14th amendments contain a provision which has not yet been made entirely clear. I refer to the due process clause of those amendments. The fifth amendment of the Constitution contains the same provision. Yet questions involving those provisions are in constant litigation before the Supreme Court of the United States. There is now pending before the Supreme Court a question as to the meaning of the 14th amendment. The Attorney General of the United States is interested in the interpretation of that amendment.

Such questions can never be finally determined until individual cases are presented to the Supreme Court for its interpretation. The best we can do is set forth in clear and unequivocal English what we desire accomplished, and then the Supreme Court will determine in cases of the future as to what was decided by this body, the House of Representatives, and the three-fourths of the States of the Union that ratified the amendment. The fact that one does not completely know what will happen 100 years from now should not deter us from doing the right thing today.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. During the early part of this afternoon I listened to the colloquies which took place between the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the distinguished majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. The confusion and the uncertainty which was very clearly evident in respect of the effect of the proposed amendment demonstrates very strikingly what I have said to the Senate frequently during the last 2 days, namely, the great danger which is inherent and unavoidable in trying to write a constitutional amendment on the floor of the Senate. That is just exactly what we are trying to do.

A constitutional amendment limiting the treatymaking powers and the pow-

ers to enter into executive agreements of the President is of such importance and so vital in its effect on the Nation and its people that, in my opinion, every word—every single word—of a proposed constitutional amendment, should be critically studied and scrutinized so that we may know just what the implications of the language are and what its effect will be on our relations with other nations.

We are not doing that. We are attempting to write this highly important amendment right here on the floor of the Senate, where language is changed, where no real thought is given to the effect of the language, and where no real study has been given to the implications of the language. I think it is something which the Senate cannot possibly disregard in its consideration of the subject. To do so is extremely dangerous. We should now vote down any constitutional amendments which would limit the treatymaking powers of the President.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from New York for his contribution.

I might respond to a statement made a few minutes ago by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] in reply to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. The Senator stated that if the Congress, after the Civil War, had adopted the attitude which some Senators are taking, opposing amendment, there would never have been adopted the great amendments which were added after the Civil War.

I submit that from 1820 to 1860 the great issues which were settled in the Civil War were debated throughout the country. Compromise after compromise was made in the attempt to find a solution of those issues. A 4-year war was fought on those issues, a war which tore the country apart, but which in the end reunited it. Debates continued after the close of the Civil War. There was an experience of 45 years behind the 14th and 15th amendments. It is similar to the amendments we discuss today.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator believe that if at an earlier period Congress and the people of the United States, through their legislatures, could have adopted the 14th amendment and the other amendments, slavery could have been abolished and the 4-year war would not have been necessary and would not have been fought? It was because the legislative bodies could not agree on constitutional amendments to solve the problems which were before the people that the war ensued. That war occurred because the Members of Congress could not by constitutional amendment—by law, instead of by men—solve those problems.

Is it not time that the problems are solved in the Halls of Congress?

The Senator from New York has said no thought has been given to this amendment. It is possible he has not given any thought to the amendment, but I know that the Senator from Michigan and many other Senators have given thought to it.

Mr. COOPER. I have not said at any time that the Senator from Michigan has not given great thought to these amendments. To the contrary, I know that he has worked earnestly to find a solution. I have said that I believe the moving force for amendment is predicated in part upon assumptions which I do not believe are based upon fact or experience.

In the second place, I have said that the short period of time in which we have had an opportunity to examine the amendments has not been sufficient to afford the Senate as a whole the opportunity to debate and examine thoroughly the various implications of the amendments.

Moreover, there has not developed in the Nation a body of opinion either supporting or opposing the amendments; for example, I do not believe there is in the country any understanding of the amendment the Senator from Michigan now proposes.

I do not believe we should change the basic law of the land without actual need and the conviction of need.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does my colleague believe the late Charles Evans Hughes was a theorist?

Mr. COOPER. No; he was a great Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes. Does not my colleague think Charles Evans Hughes could recognize a danger when he saw one?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; and of course he did.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Then I ask my colleague to read the statement appearing on page 4 of the majority report on the Bricker amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I have read it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think it would be well to read it into the RECORD at this time, if I may have the permission of the Senator from Kentucky to do so.

Mr. COOPER. I shall be very glad to have my colleague from Maryland read it at this time.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I now read from page 4 of the committee report:

> If we take the Constitution to mean what it says it gives in terms to the United States the power to make treaties. It is a power that has no explicit limitation attached to it, and so far there has been no disposition to find in anything relating to the external concerns of the Nation the limitation to be implied.
>
> Now there is, however, a new line of activity which has not been very noticeable in this country but which may be in the future, and this may give rise to new questions as to the extent of the treatymaking power. I have been careful in what I have said to refer to the external concerns of the Nation. I should not care to voice any opinion as to an implied limitation on the treatymaking power. The Supreme Court has expressed a doubt whether there could be any such. That is, the doubt has been expressed in one of its opinions. But if there is a limitation to be implied, I should say it might be found in the nature of the treatymaking power.

That statement was made by one of the greatest Chief Justices the Nation has ever had. He was one of the greatest constitutionalists. Not only did he see the danger but he suggested it would become more and more imminent, and that something should be done about it. That is what we are trying to do in this case.

Mr. COOPER. I am familiar with the quotation. I believe it is possible that at some time there may be a decision of the Supreme Court which would impose limitations upon the treatymaking power.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. For the Senator from Kentucky, I have the greatest respect; he is my seat mate, and we chat about various matters; but I do not agree with him that an unconstitutional treaty has never been approved by the Senate. On the contrary, if the Senator from Kentucky will recall the days when the 18th amendment to the Constitution was in effect, he will realize that in order to accommodate our friend abroad, Great Britain, the President of the United States negotiated with Great Britain, and sent to the Senate, a treaty—which was approved by the Senate—which permitted British vessels to enter United States ports with unopened package goods aboard, in violation of the 18th amendment to the Constitution.

I respectfully say to the Senator from Kentucky, who said he could not imagine such a situation and who made the point-blank statement that such a case has never occurred, that that is such a case. Let me say, further, that what happened once may happen again.

Mr. COOPER. I do not know the facts, so I am not certain that the action taken in that instance was in violation of the Constitution. In that case the President may have acted under his constitutional powers given to him.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. But most certainly the 18th amendment to the Constitution prohibited the transportation of spirituous liquors in the United States. Yet those vessels were moving in commerce in the ports of the United States.

Mr. COOPER. But I do not believe the Supreme Court would hold a treaty valid which was in violation of the Constitution. Nothing the Supreme Court has said would lead me to believe that.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Some lower court opinions have expressly held that the making of a treaty is a political matter, and not one within the cognizance of the judiciary.

Mr. COOPER. In external matters, I think that it is correct that lower courts have so held.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Not only has it been held in certain decisions of inferior courts, that treaties are political matters, but the Supreme Court of the United States has so held in a long line of cases.

The Senator from Kentucky said that in the case referred to by the Senator from Maryland, the President of the United States might have acted under

some other power. Will my colleague designate what power that might be?

Mr. COOPER. The President has various constitutional powers, such as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, and the power to conduct foreign policy.

Mr. BRICKER. Under what power could the President have acted in that case?

Mr. COOPER. I have said I do not know the facts in the case. It is possible that in the case the President acted under a power granted him by the Constitution.

Mr. BRICKER. Will the Senator from Kentucky suggest what power that might be?

Mr. COOPER. I do not know; I have said I never heard of the matter until just now.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me at this point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am positive that the Supreme Court has held that the making of a treaty is a political matter; but I do not think any opinion of the Supreme Court has gone as far as have certain opinions of the lower courts which have held that they could not entertain a suit filed in order to determine whether a treaty was valid or invalid.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me at this point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The Supreme Court has gone so far as to say that in regard to questions relative to treaties, about all it can do is investigate to determine whether the treaty has been properly negotiated by the President and approved by the Senate, and then to determine what the treaty means, after it has been negotiated and approved.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I say in reply, that one of the cases cited in support of the amendment of Senator GEORGE, as well as supporting other amendments, is the one now before the Supreme Court, United States against Capps, a case involving an executive agreement, and in that case a citizen of the United States is asserting his rights against an international agreement. The Court is considering the rights of a citizen under an agreement made by the President of the United States.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield at this point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Kentucky also appreciates the fact, I am sure—I presume he is referring to the Capps case, the so-called potato case——

Mr. COOPER. Yes. The Capps case.

Mr. BRICKER. I am sure my colleague also appreciates the fact that in that case the petition of the Attorney General for certiorari alleged that the President of the United States can make an executive agreement, regardless of provisions of law to the contrary; and in the brief the Attorney General also stated that there are some 200 other agreements which would be held invalid if the Supreme Court were to sustain the opinion of the Circuit Court of Appeals. Has my colleague read that brief?

Mr. COOPER. I have not read the entire brief; I have read portions of it. In fact, the Senator from Ohio handed it to me a few days ago, during the debate.

Mr. BRICKER. That statement is contained in the brief.

Mr. COOPER. In that case I believe that, upon the facts, the Supreme Court should sustain the decision of the lower court. I do not know upon what ground the Attorney General appealed the case. It could conceivably have been to have the Court determine the fields in which a President can enter into effective executive agreements, without the necessity of congressional implementation and the fields in which Congress can regulate executive agreements. I simply do not know.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield further to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. In his brief the Attorney General stated that if the Supreme Court refused to reverse the circuit court of appeals, some 200 other agreements would be affected. No one knows what they are; they may be some of the secret agreements about which we have heard, or perhaps some of the 10,000 in regard to which the Secretary of State testified at the hearings.

Does not my colleague believe that if there are 200 executive agreements which violate or amend the law—agreements not authorized by Congress, mark you, Mr. President—then a very dangerous situation exists in the United States?

Mr. COOPER. In a moment I shall address myself to that point.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am speaking of treaties which come before the Senate. In the case of treaties, I cannot find any reason for adopting the amendments which have been proposed.

I conclude my discussion of the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] by saying that it is perfectly clear that article VI, paragraph 2 of the Constitution now provides, and always has provided, that a treaty which has been properly ratified is the supreme law of the land.

I do not know what the status of a treaty will be if the amendment of the Senator from Michigan should be adopted as a part of the Constitution.

Yesterday the Senator from Michigan said his amendment was intended to prevent a future President and a future Senate from making a treaty which had not been properly executed, pursuant to the Constitution. I believe that is the law today; I believe the Constitution so provides.

If the Senate were to approve a treaty which in some way invaded constitutional rights, I believe a decision to that effect would be rendered by the courts; and I am not now ready to accept the thesis that the Supreme Court of the United States would hold that a treaty is superior to the Constitution. Yet, I submit that that is the basis of the amendment which the distinguished Senator has offered. If he does not believe today that a treaty is superior to the Constitution and Bill of Rights, he is at least a little afraid that it is. I do not agree to that thesis. I think it would be unfortunate to suggest to the courts that such is the belief of the Senate. What would happen? In the 5 or 6 years before such an amendment could become a part of the Constitution the records of the debate in the Senate would be before the Supreme Court. If the debate indicated widespread belief that a treaty is superior to the Constitution, it might possibly have some influence upon some member of some court.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not wish to break into the logical sequence of the Senator's remarks, but I should like to ask him 1 or 2 questions at this time.

The Senator says that this amendment would not be ratified for 3 or 4 or 5 years.

Mr. COOPER. I do not know.

Mr. BRICKER. We have the assurance of the Secretary of State that none of the treaties which are imminent or threatening will be submitted by this administration. So we have a bit of grace in that regard.

I ask the Senator whether or not he favors the Covenant of Human Rights.

Mr. COOPER. I do not know all its provisions. I would favor certain parts of it simply as declarations of the aspirations of people, not as a treaty to be approved by our Government.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not mean the declarations. I mean the covenant.

Mr. COOPER. A few minutes ago—I do not know whether the Senator from Ohio was present in the Chamber at the time—I stated that I do not believe it is the proper function of the treaty-making power to attempt to change domestic law, whether it be Federal or State, by a treaty. I do not favor ratification of the Covenant of Human Rights for that reason. The institutions of our country must be developed under our own law.

Mr. BRICKER. For that reason?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator favor the proposed international court of criminal justice, which would try American citizens in some other country, without a jury?

Mr. COOPER. No; I do not.

Mr. BRICKER. Then the Senator from Kentucky is not very far from what I desire to do, at least by one-half of this amendment, and that is to make impossible the ratification of a treaty of that kind, or to make it impossible for it to become effective. The Senator realizes, does he not, that during the previous administration one treaty was submitted—and it still lingers in the Foreign Relations Committee—which would have ultimately made the jurisdiction of the international court supreme?

Mr. COOPER. I know that such a treaty was submitted. However, I think the Senator is in error in one respect. I

will return to my own views on that treaty in a moment. I think the Senator is in error when he says that the genocide treaty would make it mandatory that a citizen of the United States who violated the treaty, if it should ever become a treaty of the United States, be tried in an international court. I do not think it so provides. It provides that he would be tried if this country were to agree that he should. Returning to the treaty itself—its purpose to denounce racial destruction is good. I believe, however, that we cannot impose or enforce such a treaty. It is a matter for domestic law.

Mr. BRICKER. Of course, another question is raised, just as it is raised in connection with the International Labor Organization. This country would be called before the bar of international judgment and public opinion if it did not comply with the terms of the treaty. That is the difficulty we anticipate. It is one of the dangers we fear. Pressure will be brought, just as it is brought in connection with the ratification of other treaties. The Senator understands perfectly well that most of the treaties which come to the Senate for ratification are never the subject of testimony before committees, except on the part of the State Department and the administration which is particularly interested in getting them through the Senate. Very little attention is paid to them by the public. The public does not know what is going on, and usually does not know what has happened until someone becomes involved and is haled into court under a treaty. Does the Senator agree that before the American people are bound legally there ought to be wide discussion and debate, and full publicity, so that the people may know what the law which governs them actually is?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. Let me say this to the Senator from Ohio: He knows that a year ago when we first discussed his amendment I told him that I would not be a sponsor because I had not given it any study. After I had talked with him again I told him I could not be a sponsor because I did not agree with its provisions. However, I know that his action proceeds from his concern over the subject of treatymaking and from his deep conviction and patriotism. Everyone in the Senate knows that to be so.

Whatever may be the outcome of the joint resolution that he has offered, the Senator from Ohio has rendered a great service to the country in bringing the subject of treatymaking before the Senate, not only as it may affect these proposals, but also as it bears upon the responsibility of the Senate. The country owes the Senator from Ohio a great debt.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is very gracious to say so. I do not desire to assume all the credit. All I am interested in is preserving the rights of the generations to come, rights which the Senator and I have enjoyed as American citizens. As I see it, they are endangered. I do not want internal law to be made by treaties. I refrain from using the term "domestic law" because former Secretary of State Acheson, with the support of the previous administration, said that there was no longer any distinction between international law and domestic law. That statement was made in connection with events leading up to the covenants which we were discussing a while ago.

I want the law of this country to be made by the Congress of the United States. I do not know of any other way to accomplish that purpose except to prevent treaties and executive agreements from making internal law. If the Senator has any other method, I should like to know what it is.

Mr. COOPER. I believe that today under the Constitution a treaty which is properly ratified, on a proper subject can affect internal law. I believe the Senator from Ohio will agree with me on that point.

Mr. BRICKER. It becomes internal law, but I do not believe it should. I do not see why the President and two-thirds of the Senate should be able to legislate for the people of the country internally, when it was never so intended in the beginning.

Furthermore, unless this amendment is adopted, as has been suggested by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], not only will we have legislation by the President and two-thirds of the Senate, but we shall have legislation by the President and two-thirds of the Senate which, in the words of Jefferson when the Bill of Rights was being submitted, will be the law of the land. Jefferson could not conceive of the President and two-thirds of the Senate doing what all the Congress is interdicted from doing.

The result would be that the President and two-thirds of the Senate would have more power than the Congress. They could wipe out the Bill of Rights, according to Mr. Dulles. They could cut across the Constitution, according to Mr. Dulles. They could take powers away from the State of Kentucky and give them to Congress, or take them away from the Congress and give them to an international body. That is what I want to prevent. I want the President and two-thirds of the Senate to be bound, just as the Senator and I, as individual Members of the Senate, are bound, by the terms of the Constitution. I cannot see any objection to that.

Mr. COOPER. I believe that those who wrote the Constitution considered these questions and gave this unusual power—for a specific purpose—to enable the Nation to speak for all the States in its international agreements. If there are consequences which are harmful to the States which exceed constitutional power, the courts are open and available.

I have said all through the debate that I do not concede that a treaty is superior to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator and I differ on that point. I think the cases clearly indicate that a treaty may be so considered, and that appears to have been the view of Mr. Dulles.

Mr. COOPER. I have great respect for Mr. Dulles, not only as Secretary of State, but as an eminent lawyer. However, I think he was wrong when he said that a treaty might override the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator thinks he was wrong then and right now; and I think he was right then and wrong now.

Mr. COOPER. I do not think any court has ever held that a treaty can override the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. BRICKER. We argued that question the other day. I think there are many such cases.

I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Kentucky in thanking the Senator from Ohio for having brought this question up through the amendment which he has sponsored. I believe that not only this legislative body, but the entire Nation, is more conscious of the responsibilities of Congress and the Nation in connection with the drafting and adoption of treaties. The debate which has taken place on the floor of the Senate and the interest which has been created over the Nation have been wholesome from the standpoint of a better understanding of our individual responsibilities, and what might possibly be involved in treaties. I am grateful to the Senator from Ohio. I know that a great many citizens are grateful to him for having brought this subject up for debate. That is true no matter whether we vote the joint resolution up or down.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

I am reminded of the story of a college boy who was a little deficient in his Shakespeare. A motion picture of Hamlet came to town, and he decided that that offered a shortcut to a good grade, so he went to see the picture. When he returned some of the boys at the house where he was living asked him, "Bill, what did you think of the show?" He replied, "It was a sordid sort of thing, but it was just full of quotations." [Laughter.]

I have often said that if every American would read the Constitution of the United States at least once a year we would have sounder government and a better citizenship than we have. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his gracious remarks. I do not assume any personal credit. The proposed amendment has been discussed and supported by a great many people, including members of bar associations, medical associations, the Grange, the Farm Bureau, and many others.

Last week a school superintendent said to me, "We have studied the Constitution of the United States more this year than in any other year during my 15 years as a teacher in the public schools." That is rather gratifying to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. THYE. That is what I had in mind when I made my complimentary remarks about the Senator from Ohio. I know from the mail I am receiving that more people are reading the Constitution than ever before.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. In spite of the fact that for the moment I find myself in a position adverse to that of my distinguished friend from Ohio, I wish to observe that many people have gone to the Constitution and have come to understand it, as the distinguished majority leader and others have described it, as a document of inspired origin. Even many lawyers have gone to the Constitution, which has not seemed to be necessary for a good many of us since we left law school, and thereafter engaged in general, commercial, and other practime. We all remember Marbury against Madison and McCullough against Maryland, the old leading cases, but ofttimes we forget the principles and points involved in them.

I would be among the last certainly to question the motives of any Senator. As we grow a little older and become a little more mature and mellow in our outlook on many things, and understand our own areas of fallibility a little better, most of us are less and less inclined to question other people's motives or to attribute anything invidious or unworthy to anyone with whom we may happen to disagree.

I, too, wish to compliment my good friend from Ohio, for whom I have always had respect and admiration, and will continue to have, for having kept this debate on a high plane. We have not argued ad hominem. If at times some of us seemed to be carried away with our zeal for what we believe to be a just cause, we all understand that that is a license given to all lawyers.

Since the word "implementing" has become quite popular, it may also help a good many lawyers throughout the country, for us to implement the old saying, that when a lawyer's case is weak on the law, he talks about the evidence, and when his case is weak on the evidence, he talks about the law; but when his case is weak on both the law and the evidence, he talks about the Constitution.

It might add to the general enlightenment of juries and courts if lawyers studied the Constitution so that they could talk about it when they found their case to be without support and without foundation.

Mr. BRICKER. I have often heard it stated that when a lawyer is weak on both the facts and the law, he attacks the lawyer on the other side.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; in that way he makes his argument ad hominem.

If I may be indulged further by my good friend from Kentucky, I should like to ask him whether in his judgment the amendment offered by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is or is not 1 of 2 things. If we are to take one interpretation, does he think it is simply repetitive or redundant or a restatement of what is already contained in and now a part of the Constitution, or does he think it might, under another guise or interpretation, conceivably be a revival or a rejuvenation of what has been described as the moribund "which" clause?

What does the Senator from Kentucky have to say about it? I am sorry I missed a part of his earlier discussion. I was called from the floor. I wanted very much to hear all of it. The Senator may have discussed that point. If so, I apologize.

Mr. COOPER. I did discuss the point. I said I was at a loss to understand the meaning of the amendment. If it is to assist section 1, which was adopted by the Senate day before yesterday, it is a restatement. If it is not to do that, and if it has some other meaning, we have to search for that meaning, and some day perhaps the Court would have to do likewise.

Today the meaning of article VI, section 2, is understood by the Court. The senior Senator from Michigan has expressed the fear that perhaps a treaty could override the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The clear evidence of his fear, it seems to me, would be in such cases as Missouri against Holland, and the Court might reasonably ask: Is the purpose of this amendment to prevent such decisions as that—not to reverse that decision? I do not want to be extreme; I do not want to impute what is the Senator's meaning; but his amendment must have some meaning, or else there is no need for the amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. As the Senator suggests, would not the best evidence of that be a citation of the cases which would be affected by this amendment, that is, past decisions?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. Did I misunderstand the senior Senator from Michigan when I thought I heard him suggest that this amendment would not have any effect on Missouri against Holland?

Mr. COOPER. He said that was not so intended.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is my understanding.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall close my argument. A few minutes ago the senior Senator from Michigan suggested that those of us who oppose Senate Joint Resolution 1 and amendments to it must take the view that there is no area where consideration could be given to an amendment to the Constitution as it relates to treatymaking powers. Speaking for myself, it is an area which deserves the consideration of the Congress. It relates to executive agreements. I made a short speech on the subject about 2 weeks ago. In that speech I said I was concerned with the holding of the Supreme Court in the case of United States against Pink, regarding the effect of an executive agreement.

I do not intend to go into the facts of the case. They have been stated again and again on the floor, and have been ably developed by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I disagree with the statement which has been made that the Supreme Court held in the case that a treaty was superior to the fifth amendment of the Constitution. I submit there is nothing in the facts in the case which can support such a conclusion.

We know that the protection of the fifth amendment applies to American citizens and nationals of foreign countries who are on the soil of the United States.

The issue in the Pink case was not between a citizen of the United States and the United States. The Court said that the issue was between nationals of another country outside the United States and the United States, and for that reason no question about the fifth amendment was involved. The Court said "between the United States and creditors of the Russian corporation, who we assume are not citizens of this country and whose claims did not arise out of transactions with the New York branch."

As there was no contest between the United States and citizens of the United States or nationals of another country who were on the soil of the United States, the fifth amendment was not in issue. Anyone who knows the meaning of the fifth amendment would agree the holding was correct on the facts.

The Court did hold that an executive agreement, the Litvinov agreement, took precedence over State law, a law of the State of New York. It has been argued that it was a narrow decision and that certain facts in the case do not conclusively establish that the Court did so intend to hold. I cannot, however, escape the fact that the Court did hold in this case that the executive agreement was superior to New York law.

It does trouble me that under his constitutional power the Executive may enter into an executive agreement without the knowledge of the Senate or House and the agreement may upset Federal or State law. This differs from treaties, which the Senate has opportunity to examine.

I think that is a fair statement of the possible effect of an executive agreement under the holding in the Pink case.

The Supreme Court may modify that decision in the case now before it. I do not know. In the Pink case it was not necessary on the facts to hold that an executive agreement supersedes State law, but the Court did so hold. We must face that fact.

In the short statement I made 2 weeks ago, I said that unless substantive reasons were offered and developed to the contrary by those who have charge of our foreign relations—the President and the Secretary of State—I would vote for the George amendment as a means of correcting this situation.

It is a case to which the Senate of the United States and the executive branch should address their attention.

In my statement, made January 29, it said that the George amendment might be more far reaching than I knew; that it might invade the constitutional power of the President as Commander in Chief, and his power to conduct foreign relations; and that before the Senate voted on the amendment we should have the views of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State respecting the effect which the amendment might have upon Presidential powers.

I have been advised that the proposed amendment of Senator GEORGE, unless it is closely defined or limited, could have such a limiting effect upon powers of the President. Outside his treatymaking

powers, I do not know to what extent this is true, but we are confronted with that possibility. It has been stated again and again on the floor that there is no fear that the present President of the United States or the present Secretary of State will take any action, either in the negotiation of a treaty or of an executive agreement, without consultation with the Senate, the appropriate body. That is within the Senate's sphere of responsibility. It is certainly believed that they would never negotiate any agreement which would contravene the powers of the Congress or of the States. We are assured of that fact. This being true, and there being a conflict of opinion as to the effect of the George amendment in the Senate, and between the supporters of the amendment and the executive branch, I think the least we can do as a responsible body, is to hold proper hearings and to require, so far as we can, the agencies of the administrative branch of the Government to present their views upon the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does not the Senator know that the Senator from Ohio, in the early part of the 1st session of the 82d Congress, introduced a resolution substantially in the form of this resolution, and that we sent to the executive departments and every agency thereof which might have any interest in the controversy a request to appear before the committee and help us to work out the problem, and that almost all of them came but did nothing but find fault with the resolution or say that a question existed, but should be further studied?

Mr. COOPER. I did not know that. I was not here at the time. From the Senator's statement, it is evident that there was no cooperative effort upon the part of the executive branch of the Government at that time to develop such an amendment. I do not think that is the case today.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield further?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator feel that we can take this amendment off the floor of the Senate today and have it ever come back in our lifetime?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Maryland is a member of the Judiciary Committee——

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. With the opposition we have had to this amendment, we would never be able to get it back on the floor again. I am confident of that.

Mr. COOPER. What the Senator says is not in accord with statements made a few minutes ago, that there has been an earnest effort and a real debate in the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. In the Senate, yes.

Mr. COOPER. There is concern over a possible loophole in the treatymaking power. If there is a cooperative effort on the part of the administration, which I think we know the committee would receive, with the help of outstanding constitutional authorities throughout the country, I believe an amendment could be developed which would meet any real need in the situation.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Will the Senator tell me why those people have not come before the committee heretofore?

Mr. COOPER. I cannot answer the question.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. There has been ample opportunity. We have been begging people to express themselves on the amendment. We have not done that because we wanted to hamper the powers of the President of the United States, but we felt that there was a real danger. Many thoughtful men feel that there is a real danger and that language should be put into the Constitution of the United States to protect the rights of the people.

Mr. COOPER. I think there is opportunity to have such a discussion and development even after the debate.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Has the Senator any assurance that there could be such a debate following a recommittal of the resolution?

Mr. COOPER. I have no assurance of it. I was using such judgment as I have.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does not the Senator from Kentucky believe that the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland adds weight and force to his argument, in that the Senator from Maryland has said that there is such opposition to the amendment—and I take it that means to the substitutes and all attempts to rewrite and amend the Constitution on the floor of the Senate—that we would never get it back on the floor of the Senate? Does the Senator from Kentucky feel or believe that the people of this country should pay a penalty, if such were the case, for the failure of the executive department, the President and the Secretary of State, to make such proper representations to the Congress as might and should have been made, and should we all be penalized because the President and the Secretary of State, or their authorized agents, failed to come before the Committee on the Judiciary or its subcommittee when they were asked to do so?

In other words, is it being suggested that the matter go by default because the executive department have not hitherto expressed themselves to the committee? Is not the Senator somewhat heartened by the fact that opposition is burgeoning and growing to the point where we could never get the matter on the floor of the Senate again? I would say that if the George substitute and the other amendments are recommitted, I will, within my small sphere of influence and within the realm of my one vote, do all I can to see that the matter is brought back after further study and after we have had the benefit of testimony of constitutional experts, lawyers, and others.

Mr. COOPER. I know of no reason why that should not and could not be done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope my esteemed friend from Missouri will listen for a moment, because he and I were both on the subcommittee——

Mr. HENNINGS. I was not a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct. I think I heard probably more testimony than did any other member of the subcommittee. I think it might be worthwhile to refresh the recollection of Senators to the effect that, first of all, we heard 55 witnesses on this proposal; second, some 25 individual statements were filed; and, in addition to that, some 75 or 80 exhibits appear in the record, so that there is before us some 1,100 or 1,200 pages of assorted testimony.

Mr. HENNINGS. That relates, of course, to the Bricker resolution, does it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. Not to the George substitute——

Mr. DIRKSEN. If my friend will bear with me a moment, I should like to enlarge upon my statement a little bit.

In the previous Congress there was testimony amounting to 300 pages. In a hearing of this kind there is scarcely an angle of the amendment which has not been explored and fully ventilated. One can easily find out that every aspect, every divergent point, has been presented to the committee. If there is confusion anywhere, it is due to a failure on the part of the subcommittee and the full committee properly to ventilate the whole subject and to bring it clearly into focus.

My friend from Missouri speaks of the fact that perhaps the statement made by the Senator from Maryland is in support of the proposal that the resolution should be recommitted for further study. I am not unaware of the inertia with which we contend in the Congress. That was true when my esteemed friend and I served at the other end of the Capitol. If the resolution does go back to committee, it is no argument against the merits. It is merely that in this type of legislative process matters may get lost in the shuffle. I have many times used the instrumentality of recommitting bills, not only here but elsewhere; and while my words may have somewhat belied the purpose at the time, the fact is that there was in my heart the desire to send the measure back in order to get complete and permanent action. That is the purpose of a motion to recommit, say what one will.

So, Mr. President, if this measure goes back to the committee, I say to my distinguished friend from Kentucky that it will not be because it lacks virtue, but, rather, that it becomes the victim of the process in which we find ourselves today.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not have the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I want to corroborate everything my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has said about this resolution. When we look at the hearings it will be found that the first hearing was held on February 18 last year. As chairman of the subcommittee, I know that was the first order of business after we got organized. Some of the hearings lasted all day long. We sat day after day. We sat on the 18th, 19th, and 25th of February; on March 10, March 16, March 27, and March 31; on April 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. We sat a solid week the last time.

As chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I attended the subcommittee hearings. My distinguished friend from Illinois sat there and asked questions. When we were through, the late Senator Taft came over to me and said, "I doubt whether we can agree on the wording exactly, but I think I can draw up something which will be satisfactory." I am entirely satisfied that if Bob Taft had lived we would not have had these 2 or 3 weeks of debate on this question, because he had devoted a great deal of time and thought to the amendment.

I certainly agree with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois, that now is the time to get rid of it, and that it will not do any good to send the proposal back to the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator from Kentucky will yield for a further observation, the fact is that there is no unanimity about this question. Let us not argue about the merits of the proposal. There is little unanimity in this body or in the body at the other end of the Capitol, particularly when we come to a rather explosive field, and to the field of foreign relations.

For example, in considering proposals regarding selective service, my distinguished friend the Senator from Kentucky knows that there is a sharp difference of opinion both in committee and on the Senate floor, and both in the House committee and on the House floor. I have seen a time when a good many proposals relating to that subject have squeaked through by a majority of only one vote.

My friend the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] raised a question about representatives of the executive branch appearing before the Senate committee. That is a common practice. They perhaps see the question from a different point of view. However, we are concerned with a common objective and a common purpose. I do not share the confusion which was mentioned on the floor yesterday afternoon, when Senators were wringing their hands and saying, "Boy, am I confused." I think they have become confused either by their own devices or perhaps they do not want to see the light. I would not know.

However, I may say there is a good answer to any suggestion of confusion. If one reads the history of the Constitutional Convention, he will find that George Washington, when he wrote his brother shortly after it was over, said he was sensible of the imperfections in the Constitution, and it would take the people of another generation and another time to cure them.

Charles Pinckney expressed his confusion about some features. It was only a few days before the Founders had reached the final draft of the Constitution that they were at all settled upon the treaty power.

If one will read the report of the Committee on Style and the report of the Committee on Detail, both of which committees adopted drafts before the Constitution in its final form was drafted, one will learn that they invested in the Senate the power to make treaties and the power to appoint justices of the Supreme Court and ambassadors. I have the records available. I shall be glad to amplify and discuss the matter further.

When Members of this body say there is confusion on the question, I merely remind them that there was confusion when the Constitution was adopted. That confusion resolved itself, and the present confusion will likewise resolve itself.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not have the floor.

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Referring to the statements of the Senator from Illinois, I wish to say that certain provisions of the Constitution had been adopted by the Founding Fathers for one purpose, and then used for precisely another purpose when the time came for their use, such as the "necessary and proper" clause.

We are told by Alexander Hamilton, in the 33d Federalist Papers, that such a provision was adopted to prevent the States from destroying the Union. Now there is a turnabout. The Supreme Court, in the case of Missouri against Holland, uses that provision to destroy the States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder if the Senator has ever heard a debate in which there have been so many Senators saying they were confused?

Mr. COOPER. I have not had long experience as a Member of this body. The Senator may be addressing his inquiry to me on the supposition that I said I was confused. I do not believe I stated I was confused; I stated that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan was confusing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then the Senator is still confused?

Mr. COOPER. Not by my own reasoning, no. My reasoning tells me that the amendment of the Senator is confusing; but I am not confused.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope the few remarks by a few Senators about their state of confusion does not so confuse the Senate that we are not going to be able to see clearly what is needed and what we ought to do.

Mention has been made of the situation prevailing at the time of the drafting of the Constitution. We all remember what Mr. Franklin said after the Convention finished its deliberations. Mr. Franklin came out of the Convention, and a lady asked him, "What kind of a government have you given us?" Mr. Franklin said, "We have given you a republic, if you can keep it."

As I was driving down Constitution Avenue this morning, I observed an inscription carved in the stone of the Archives Building which I had not noticed there before—"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." That states in other words what Franklin said, that we may have a republic if we can keep it. Eternal vigilance is the price of our liberty. That is what we are trying to insure by the constitutional amendment. We are trying to preserve our constitutional government and the Republic we were given and to protect the liberties of the people by the exercise of eternal vigilance, so that the Supreme Court will in the future, by reference to these debates, and by reference to the words in the amendment and the provisions of the amendments which we have adopted, see that it should survey every treaty which comes before it and adjudge it by the terms of the Constitution, and, if it conflicts with the Constitution hold that it is not the law of the land to be used against a citizen. That is all we are trying to do.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to refer for a moment to what was suggested by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] a moment ago in regard to article VI. That article was adopted just previous to the ending of the Constitutional Convention. The debates on the article are not very clear; but I think they show, as forcefully as they show anything, that the amendment was adopted in order to require the payment of debts of American citizens to England. Funds had been paid to the State governments for the prosecution of the Revolutionary War. That was the first case that came to the Supreme Court involving an interpretation of the supremacy clause. Congress subsequently had to appropriate money to pay the debts. The debts were never paid by the citizens, as article VI intended they should be paid.

From that time on, I do not think anyone ever considered that a treaty should be internal legislation, until recent years.

Is it the opinion of the Senator from Kentucky that two-thirds of the Senate and the President of the United States ought to be able to enact internal law?

Mr. COOPER. I do not think they can enact internal law, but after the ratification of a treaty, the Congress can enact legislation which, but for the treaty, would not be effective.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the same thing.

Mr. COOPER. Not exactly, but I think it is the intention of the Constitution.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator know of any member of the constitutional convention or of any of the early leaders of our country who ever intimated or suggested that treaties would be used for anything except to govern the relationships between one sovereign nation and another sovereign nation in international affairs?

Mr. COOPER. There are certain treaties which have only external effect; other treaties must have consequence on domestic law. The founders must have contemplated that treaties would have an internal effect. At the very time of the adoption of the Constitution, the States were trying to negotiate treaties of friendship and commerce with France and with other countries, which had internal effect. We were having trouble doing so because England was unable to collect its debts in Virginia under treaty.

Jefferson has been quoted many times. Jefferson was not a member of the Constitutional Convention.

Mr. BRICKER. He was in Paris at the time, although someone during the hearings wanted to know what Jefferson's other activities during the Convention were.

Mr. COOPER. The Supreme Court decided the case of Ware against Hylton immediately after the adoption of the Constitution. They decided the case on the very grounds we are debating today. I cannot understand why anyone would believe the interpretation in the case of Missouri against Holland was a new interpretation. Ware against Hylton, which Missouri against Holland follows, was decided immediately after the adoption of the Constitution.

Mr. BRICKER. Jefferson's statement to the effect that certainly the framers of the Constitution never intended that the President and the Senate could do what the whole Congress is interdicted from doing does not meet with the Senator's approval?

Mr. COOPER. As I have said, Jefferson was not a member of the Constitutional Convention. He made the statement which my distinguished friend makes, and which other Senators have made.

Mr. BRICKER. Hamilton was a member of the convention, was he not?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. Hamilton said time and time again that treaties would never be used except in international affairs, and it was never contemplated that treaties would be used for the purpose of making internal law in the country.

Mr. COOPER. I agree with the statement that we would not negotiate a treaty for the purpose of making internal law.

Mr. BRICKER. But that might be the effect of it.

Mr. COOPER. I do not believe it is a proper subject of treatymaking to attempt—purely for the purpose of making internal law—to enter into such agreements. I believe that is entirely outside the scope of the treatymaking power, and would be violative of the Constitution.

Mr. BRICKER. I am doubtful whether a treaty might not, in the words of the Secretary of State, "cut across the Constitution." I wish to prevent such a thing.

Mr. COOPER. I must always return to the basic point, namely, whether we agree that today a treaty is superior to the Constitution. I do not think a treaty is superior to the Constitution.

Mr. BRICKER. At least my colleague agrees, does he not, that a great majority of the American bar say a treaty can be superior to the Constitution?

Mr. COOPER. No. I cannot reconcile that with their statement that Congress can regulate executive agreements—or with other statements by the bar. I do not believe that what my colleague has stated is a proper conclusion.

Mr. BRICKER. If there is a danger, would my colleague object to preventing that danger from coming to pass?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly not. My argument I make today is on the basis that a treaty cannot violate the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and that there are no facts which support the fear that it can. If I believe that a treaty cannot violate the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, then I must believe that there is no point in adopting an amendment to prevent the occurrence of something which we believe cannot possibly occur. It is a matter of principle, and we seem to have trouble getting together about it.

Mr. BRICKER. But if one believes there is a danger, does not my colleague agree that one who entertains such a belief should make a move to prevent that danger from bringing about dire consequences?

Mr. COOPER. Of course.

Mr. President, one thing which has disturbed me throughout the debate is that many organizations which have not clearly understood these amendments—and, of course, it is difficult for me and for many of us to understand the amendment—have entertained the belief, a belief which is widespread in the country, that things are being done today on the treaty-making field which are violative of the Constitution; that important agreements are being drafted, in international bodies, which might become the law of the land with or without Senate action. That feeling has helped build up the support for these amendments.

Mr. BRICKER. I think it should be built up. The Attorney General himself has said, in his petition for certiorari, that there are some 200 agreements—which I know nothing about, and I think my colleague, the Senator from Kentucky, knows nothing about them——

Mr. COOPER. No; I know nothing about them.

Mr. BRICKER. The Attorney General has said there are some 200 agreements which would be repealed if a treaty were declared not to be the supreme law of the land. I think we should know about those agreements.

Mr. COOPER. I agree that the amendments deserve the very close attention of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will not my colleague from Kentucky agree that the difference between his position and my position is that he agrees there is no present danger, and therefore he believes the amendment is not essential, whereas I hold a contrary view? Is not that the basic difference between us?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I feel there is a clear and present danger, and that the amendment is essential, in order to do what both my colleague and I agree should be done, namely, to have the Constitution clearly understood as being the law of the land.

Mr. COOPER. The difference is much more fundamental than that. I think the Constitution is the law of the land.

Mr. FERGUSON. I say it ought to be the law of the land.

Mr. COOPER. I think it is. When my colleague says it ought to be, he is casting doubt on the supremacy of the Constitution over any treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Constitution should be declared to be the supreme law of the land, so as to preserve the liberties of the people.

Mr. COOPER. Does my colleague believe a treaty could in any way alter the division of powers between the branches of the Government?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is done by the decision in the case of Missouri against Holland. I agree with my colleague that the decision in that case, the migratory bird case, is a proper one; the correct result was arrived at. However, the difficulty arises from the language used by Mr. Justice Holmes. He gave a different reason.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the statement has been made by many organizations—that certain treaties and agreements which are being drafted would deliver the United States to some suprainternational body, would take away the sovereignty of the United States, would affect the division of powers as between the various branches of the Federal Government, would destroy the State constitutions, and would affect the rights of individual citizens, as they are protected by the Bill of Rights. I submit that not one treaty which ever has been ratified does any of those things; and no decision by the Supreme Court has ever held that any of those things can be done. The present agitation is based in part upon these assumptions.

If there is real necessity for the adoption of an amendment, it should be adopted. I am inquiring, on the facts, if there is any such real necessity.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kentucky will yield to me at this point, let me inquire of him, Is it an assumption that the Justice of the Supreme Court who wrote the opinion in the Curtiss-Wright case said the treaty power was without any limitation whatever, and was inherent in government?

Mr. COOPER. He made the statement. However, the trouble is that the Senator from Maryland is willing to accept as law a dictum in that case.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. But that is contained in the majority opinion in the case.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Maryland is willing to reject the dicta of those opinions of the Supreme Court, which since the adoption of the Constitution have stated that a treaty is not superior to the Constitution.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Did not Mr. Justice Holmes in the Holland case say that in order for a treaty to be valid, it need only be made under the authority of the Constitution—that is, that it need only be formulated by the President and approved by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; and he qualified the statement by another statement in the opinion, which I shall read into the RECORD in a moment.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I have read the statement by which the Senator from Kentucky says Mr. Justice Holmes qualified his previous statement. However, many thoughtful lawyers in the United States, including the late Chief Justice Hughes, have believed, and now believe, that Mr. Justice Holmes did not so qualify his previous statement.

Mr. COOPER. My colleague is simply selecting 1 sentence from an opinion, and is saying that 1 sentence states the law.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, if one cannot see signposts of danger along the way, there is no use in having the power to see.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to read another statement of Justice Holmes in the same opinion.

Mr. President, in the opinion in the case of Missouri against Holland, Mr. Justice Holmes made the following statement:

> A treaty must not "contravene any prohibitory words to be found in the Constitution."

Mr. President, I have talked too long, and now I wish to close.

I believe all of us must agree that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio has received most thorough consideration, not only in the Senate, but in the country as a whole. It has received detailed consideration by the bar of the country.

As the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LANGER, has said, long, detailed, and thorough hearings on the amendment have been held before the Senate Judiciary Committee; and many distinguished lawyers throughout the Nation have given their views as to the effect of the amendment.

I believe it is fair to say that as a result of the study which has been made, the present consensus of opinion of the Members of this body is that the amendment should not be adopted; that is proved by the action of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and other Senators, in proposing various amendments to Senate Joint Resolution No. 1. We must assume that they do not favor the joint resolution. Their decisions, and that of other Members of the Senate is a decision which has been made deliberately and responsibly.

I think no Member of this body or no one else in the Nation can correctly say that the constitutional amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has not received thorough and mature consideration.

But, in the last few days a variety of amendments have been submitted. Although hearings were held on the Bricker amendment, hearings have not been held on the amendments recently submitted, and there has been little opportunity to discuss their meaning. Certainly we have not heard, in that connection, from those who are responsible for the conduct of our foreign relations, who would be affected by the amendments; they have not informed us what the consequences of the amendments would be.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield at this point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. In connection with the statement the Senator from Kentucky has just made, let me say that certainly the lesser is always comprised within the greater. A consideration of the "which" clause in the Bricker amendment encompassed all the problems about which the Senator from Kentucky has been talking and which are now being dealt with by way of the amendment. We have considered this subject carefully. The mere fact that we have not considered each part separately, is no reason for supposing that the subject has not received careful thought. It has received careful thought. I do not think the RECORD should carry the implication that it has not had careful thought. I know that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and many other Senators have spent literally hundreds of hours studying the subject.

Mr. COOPER. I will modify my statement, because it is true that if we discuss the whole subject of treatymaking, the whole includes all of its parts.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The whole certainly comprehends all its component parts.

Mr. COOPER. On the other hand, when a specific amendment is proposed, then, for the first time, the main body of the Senate directs its attention to it in an attempt to find its meaning and its consequences. The language is new and strange. I think the debate on this amendment has pointed out that truth.

The Senate must assume its own responsibility with regard to proposals for amendment of the Constitution. We need not be controlled by what the President may say. We can consider his views and the views of other members of the executive branch of the Government, but the final responsibility is ours.

Yet the President of the United States has indicated his concern about amendments which affect his constitutional powers. There is no fear about any action he might take during our consideration of the amendments. If there are fears about the extent of the treatymaking power it seems to me that the responsible course of action for the Senate is to take the fullest opportunity, when we know there is no immediate danger, to consider the views of the President and other members of the executive branch of the Government.

I cannot see anything unreasonable about such a suggestion. If it is feared that in following such a course there will be no amendment, perhaps it is because no amendment is needed. If an amendment were needed, I am sure that the Senate would take the necessary action.

I believe there is a loophole in the field of executive agreements. Frankly, I do not know whether the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] meets the situation. We are dealing with the basic charter of our Government. While fear should lead us to examine the question of whether or not an amendment should be made, whether a change should be made in the Constitution, I do not believe that we should change the Constitution merely because there are fears, and certainly when fear is not supported by fact.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 68. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Godschalk;

S. 123. An act for the relief of Anni Wilhelmine Skoda;

S. 205. An act for the relief of Evdoxia J. Kitsos;

S. 236. An act for the relief of Amir Hassan Sepahban;

S. 296. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Henry Litmanowitz (Litman);

S. 305. An act for the relief of Antonio Vocale;

S. 313. An act for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama;

S. 323. An act for the relief of Rose Cohen;

S. 353. An act for the relief of Li Ming;

S. 506. An act for the relief of Horst F. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar;

S. 569. An act for the relief of Lina Anna Adelheid (Adam) Hoyer;

S. 606. An act for the relief of Hannelore Netz and her two children;

S. 730. An act for the relief of Winfried Kohls;

S. 801. An act for the relief of Eugenio S. Roiles;

S. 825. An act for the relief of Karin Rita Grubb;

S. 973. An act for the relief of Dr. Jawad Hedayaty;

S. 982. An act for the relief of Helena Lewicka;

S. 1009. An act for the relief of Zoltan Weingarten;

S. 1018. An act for the relief of George Ellis Ellison;

S. 1226. An act for the relief of Stefan Virgilius Issarescu;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of Emmanuel Aristides Nicoloudis;

S. 1323. An act for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney;

S. 1443. An act for the relief of Jose Deang; and

S. 2689. An act to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], on page 3, in lieu of lines 7 to 9, inclusive, to insert certain other language.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Magnuson
Anderson	Gillette	Malone
Barrett	Gore	Mansfield
Beall	Green	Martin
Bennett	Griswold	Maybank
Bricker	Hayden	McClellan
Bridges	Hendrickson	Monroney
Burke	Hennings	Mundt
Bush	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hill	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Pastore
Byrd	Holland	Payne
Carlson	Humphrey	Potter
Case	Hunt	Purtell
Chavez	Ives	Robertson
Clements	Jackson	Russell
Cooper	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kerr	Stennis
Dworshak	Kilgore	Symington
Eastland	Knowland	Thye
Ellender	Kuchel	Upton
Ferguson	Langer	Watkins
Flanders	Lehman	Welker
Frear	Lennon	Williams
Fulbright	Long	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and for the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated, for the information of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, it is proposed to strike out lines 7 to 9, inclusive, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. Clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

EQUALITY FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the 83d Congress has a responsibility to meet and solve the economic crisis which today is facing the American farmer and his family. In the course of the many months Congress has been in session I have submitted a series of legislative proposals designed to restore and safeguard the prosperity of American agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of my program, entitled "Equality for Agriculture," be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUALITY FOR AGRICULTURE—SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S FARM PROGRAM (PRESENTED TO 83D CONG.), JANUARY 1954

Strengthening and expanding price and income protection for farmers while seeking to develop new outlets and new uses for our agricultural abundance have been keynotes of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S legislative proposals for an improved farm program, as submitted to the 83d Congress.

Measures sponsored or cosponsored by Senator HUMPHREY in the present session of Congress include:

Humphrey "equality for agriculture" price support bill (S. 1159): Carrying out recommendations of Minnesota State Legislature by:

1. Establishing price-support level at 90–100 percent of parity for all basic and other designated storable commodities;

2. Adding flaxseeds, soybeans, oats, rye, barley and grain sorghums to the list of storables supported by mandatory 90–100 percent price supports;

3. Making mandatory support of dairy products, cattle, hogs, poultry, and eggs at 90 percent of parity, but permitting use of such alternative methods to achieve support levels as compensatory payments, expanded school lunch program, domestic food allotment plan for low-income families, and development of international program for making such food supplies available to avert famine and combat communism;

4. Extending the period of firm mandatory farm price supports through 1957;

5. Extending use of present dual parity formula through that same period, instead of converting to so-called "new" parity formula at lower levels.

Farmer-run farm programs (S. 1847): Preserving elected-farmer committee system for administering farm programs in rural counties, plus election of State farmer-committees instead of appointment by Secretary of Agriculture.

Rotating storage stocks (S. 1064): Preventing deterioration yet avoiding price-depressing "dumping" of old stocks, through provision for "rotating" stocks, purchasing new commodities to replace those sold to avoid spoilage.

International Food Reserves (S. J. Res. 56): Creating world reserves through FAO to provide means of absorbing temporary market surpluses and make them available wherever they are most needed in world to prevent famine and starvation.

Wheat and Corn Set-Asides (S. 2102): Raising designation of "normal" reserves for wheat and corn before marketing quotas are required, with provision for setting aside contingency reserves beyond normal supply, withheld from regular market except in case of crop failure or emergency need in support of foreign policy—a safety "stockpile" specifically prevented from becoming a price-depressing overhang on normal markets.

Wheat for Pakistan (S. 1782): Emergency use of wheat reserves to combat famine in Pakistan.

Food for freedom (amendment to MSA bill, S. 2128): Authorizing President to use America's abundance to ease emergency famine conditions in world, support cold war; designate portion of FOA foreign aid for purchase of American farm products for countries needing them but lacking American dollars.

Emergency livestock credit (S. 2267): Liberalizing loans to livestock producers suffering economic hardship, whether in drought area or not, as part of emergency drought assistance.

Domestic food allotment (S. 2550): A food-stamp plan for increasing consumption among low-income families of farm commodities in surplus supply.

While not in bill form, Senator HUMPHREY also outlined two other proposals to Senate Agricultural Committee for study pending action toward stimulating wider use of American food at home and abroad:

Expanding world markets: Creation of an independent agricultural trading corporation to coordinate expanded efforts to seek foreign outlets for American food and fiber for relief purposes, for barter, for sale at concessional or soft currency prices, or any other means.

Dairy diet dividends: Increasing consumption of fluid milk, butter, and cheese among needy aged, dependent children, blind, and totally handicapped through partial consumer-subsidy to supplement meager allowances for public assistance. Consumption possibilities among 2,610,000 needy aged over 65, 2,016,000 dependent children, 98,380 blind, 167,513 permanently totally disabled, and 283,000 others on general public assistance rolls, all now lacking adequate amounts of dairy products in their diets, are sufficient to wipe out entire existing dairy surplus at minimum cost as investment in public health and welfare.

Other efforts outlined by Senator HUMPHREY as extended in behalf of Minnesota's farmers during 83d Congress include:

Urged and encouraged expanded school lunch program, increased beef and dairy product purchases for school lunch and overseas use.

Fought against raising of interest rates, tight-money policies which have restricted both farmer's credit and his market.

Supported more adequate loan funds for REA power and telephone programs, and fought for transmission line to provide lower-cost power from Missouri River hydroelectric projects to Minnesota.

Sought greater recognition of average family farmer in Department of Agriculture's advisory committee structure.

Supported maintenance of adequate soil conservation funds, opposed slashes in both ACP and SCS appropriations.

Backed increase in funds for agricultural research, over amount proposed by administration.

PRESENT ECONOMIC SITUATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there is another matter concerning which I should like to make a brief comment.

Yesterday's debate started out with some reference to the question of agricultural price supports, and we also ventured into the general economic situation of our country. I recall that there have been a considerable number of complaints regarding comments which have been made concerning a downward adjustment. One of our distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], has referred to the economic trend as a recession. Because of that he was severely criticized by high officers of the Government, and he has oftentimes been referred to as a fearmonger or as a prophet of gloom and doom.

I have before me, Mr. President, from yesterday's Washington Star an article entitled "Decline in Business Nears Recession of 1949, Economist Says."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's request for order. I think it would be well if some of my colleagues would listen to this, because I think it is of considerable importance.

This article refers to the decline in business which we are experiencing at the present time. I read from it:

American business in the past 6 months has experienced a decline which approaches the recession in 1949, Martin R. Gainsbrugh, chief economist for the National Industrial Conference Board, declared last night.

"The business downtrend warrants the label of recession"—

I want my Republican colleagues to listen to this. Here is one of the world's foremost economists, a man of great objectivity, integrity, and courage, Mr. Martin R. Gainsbrugh, chief economist for the National Industrial Conference Board, saying:

"The business downtrend warrants the label of recession and not rolling adjustment, which some have applied to it." Mr. Gainsbrugh told a meeting of paper-industry executives.

The economist spoke at a seminar for executives in the paper industry, conducted by the New York University Graduate School of Business Administration and the Paper and Twine Association.

Since mid-1953, said Mr. Gainsbrugh, the Nation's industrial output has continued to decline steadily.

"It is already nearly 7½ percent below its midyear peak and may be off as much as 9 or 10 percent by the time the February figures are unveiled," he said.

"If so, that index will have experienced as much contraction as in the 1949–50 recession, and in a shorter period of time."

I think that is very important, Mr. President. In other words, in a short period of time, in approximately 6 months, we have experienced a dip in industrial production equivalent to the one experienced in 1949–50.

Mr. Gainsbrugh asserted that of the 25 major industrial groups whose output is brought together to form the aggregate measure of United States industrial production, "not a single industrial group was higher at the year end than at midsummer."

"Even such typical growth industries as chemicals and petroleum were several percentage points below their summer highs," he added.

Mr. Gainsbrugh suggested that while inventory adjustment is essential, this alone will not solve the Nation's economic ills.

Mr. President, I have read this article not because I feel that Mr. Gainsbrugh is necessarily the last word in economic analysis, but because I am sick and tired of hearing men in high places, when anyone mentions some very difficult and hard facts, say that he is indulging in some kind of political propaganda that may lead the country to disaster. The truth is that America is not going to talk itself into a depression; the truth is that economic facts will determine whether our economy is strong. As I said yesterday, the economic facts reveal a softness in our economy. The facts reveal a reduction in carloadings, a tightening of credit, or a lack of credit for use by the industrial enterprises of America. They reveal, for example, that in the heavy construction industry—not homes, but heavy industrial construction—the number of contracts which have been let is 50 percent less than the number last year.

These are facts that cannot be laughed off. I notice the President said today that we can get an indication of what the future has in store for us by watching the month of March.

The month of March usually reveals some seasonal adjustments upward. In my section of the country we can then start home construction, because the frost is going out of the ground and weather conditions are improving. But Mr. Gainsbrugh tells us that within a short time we have experienced a recession as great as that which occurred in 1949–50. I think the Congress of the United States ought to take note of that.

I say this in the light of what we were discussing yesterday, because every time we lower our sights we invite more trouble.

We have heard much about the budget. I am not prepared to say what we are going to do about the President's budget proposals, but the President said there would be a $2½ billion deficit. That was based upon earnings comparable to the 1953 rate. There is no indication at all that the earnings will be on the 1953 basis.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator tell us whether the National Industrial Conference Board, which is responsible for the statement which the Senator has mentioned, is a left-wing organization, or is it a liberal group, a labor group, or an employers' group?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is an employers' group and is considered to be what I would call a constructively conservative, responsible group of employers representing some of the largest industries in the Nation.

Mr. LONG. Can we say, then, that responsible advisers of the industries of the country are saying that we are in a recession?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that statement cannot only be made, but I think Mr. Gainsbrugh has made it quite clear that our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who literally called the shot on what was going on in America, was not mistaken in the terms he used.

I am glad to see that he is now on the floor, and I call his attention to the fact that Mr. Gainsbrugh has stated that the downward trend in business warrants the label of recession and not rolling adjustment, which some have applied to it.

I feel we should keep this in mind as we discuss legislation, because I think we are going to have to face up to some of the facts of our economy. I think everyone here prays for continued prosperity in our land. Every man, woman, and child is pleased and eternally grateful for the cessation of hostilities, and we all hope that our economy can go ahead and be strong.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would not the Senator from Minnesota say that while there are many persons in the country aiming to suppress discussion of conditions, nevertheless, Mr. Gainsbrugh, a representative of employers, deserves the highest credit for speaking with accuracy and with courage?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do say so. I think we are indebted to men who are willing to state their feelings fearlessly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that while many of us may disagree with editorials in the Wall Street Journal, the news columnists of the Wall Street Journal have, for the past month, been meticulously honest, thoroughgoing, and correct in their statements of what is happening?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say that I believe the financial and the economic information which one gets from the Journal of Commerce and the Wall Street Journal can be relied upon; it has been honest; it has been objective, and it has been meticulous in detail. In fact, I recall that the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the junior Senator from Minnesota, and the junior Senator from Tennessee, and other Senators cited the Wall Street Journal and the Journal of Commerce, leading financial publications, to point out that the so-called hard money, tight credit policy the administration entered upon a year ago would lead to some of the very things we are seeing happen now.

I think it is fair to say that when a precipitous or sudden increase in interest rates and a too rapid tightening of credit occur, we are beginning to get the backwash of the economic developments being discussed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would not the Senator from Minnesota say it is extremely fortunate that in this country many who politically and in their philosophy may properly be termed conservative, nevertheless refuse to take the party line so far as facts are concerned, and report honestly and correctly?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is to the eternal credit of a large number of persons in American industry, in State, local, and Federal governments, and in many of our great research foundations that they maintain intellectual integrity in the presentation of facts.

I wish to say now that in the period of 1928–29 economists who had as much honor and integrity as Mr. Gainsbrugh were stating then, as Mr. Gainsbrugh now states, what the facts were. Many fine economists raised their voices in warning over the sudden expansion of credit in the stock market. Many fine economists raised their voices over depressed agricultural prices. Many fine economists during that period pointed out what was happening to real wages as compared with money wages.

Now, as then, there are propagandists who say it is not true. Then we had the prospect held up to us of something being just around the corner, that prosperity was coming, and that everything was going to be all right.

All I am saying is that we do have men of courage warning us. The Council of Economic Advisers has warned of an element of uncertainty as to the future.

I hold every one of those economists in the highest regard. All I am saying is that it ill behooves anyone in public or private life to ignore some of the storm signals being raised and some of the danger signals being discussed.

It would be much better for us to face up to the facts as they affect our economy, just as it is wise to do so in our international relations. There are some who would like to believe that the Soviet Union is not aggressive; there are some who would like to believe communism was neither a conspiracy nor contagious; but, the truth is, that Soviet Russian imperialism is aggressive and that communism is a dangerous conspiratorial force.

The wise and prudent nation and the wise and prudent person insist that they be prepared to meet the trouble and the threat. That is exactly what we must do in the Congress of the United States as we discuss the tax policy. It may provide for accelerated depreciation, which may be very desirable for some industries; but also let us discuss tax policies which provide adequate dependency allowances for the average family, so that consumer purchasing power may be maintained.

The junior Senator from Minnesota believes we should discuss these matters on the floor of the Senate. We can discuss them as men and as gentlemen, and as responsible citizens and officials of the Government, without doing discredit to the administration or anyone else.

I say to my colleagues, as a matter of fact, the greatest favor anyone can do for the administration, is to warn it now before it is too late. The greatest favor anyone can do for his country is to take preventive action before the catastrophe falls upon it. The best way to avoid danger is to exercise prudence and caution while there still is time. What I am suggesting is prudence and caution and constructive efforts to ward off what could be very disastrous possibilities.

I shall conclude by saying that I do not look forward to the possibility of the recessions' turning into a depression, because I think there is combined in the Congress of the United States and in the Government of the United States too much good sense and wisdom to permit such a disaster to befall us. Anyone in his right mind will move ahead of a disaster in order to see that it does not occur.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Apropos of what the Senator from Minnesota has just stated, not only have business leaders and economists become increasingly alarmed; but I noticed that the president of a great labor union, meeting in Miami, made very similar statements, and they were published faithfully in the Wall Street Journal. I mention that apropos of what some of the Republican spokesmen have said. However, I think Mr. Beck made a very potent statement when he said, "When your neighbor is out of a job, it is a recession; but when you are out of a job, it is a depression."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Washington for his contribution. I think Mr. Beck made a very fine contribution to the whole discussion when he spoke before the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor. His great organization is in contact with industry, so he is in a position to know economic conditions.

On our own ticker tape we have seen news from the Associated Press and the United Press as it comes rolling off the teletype machines. Some time ago the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad laid off 20,000 workers. There was only one reason for that, namely, there was not enough work to do. By examining the figures, one will find that carloadings are sharply reduced.

I have before me a news item concerning a statement by Mr. Winfield W. Riefler, assistant to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, in his comments to the Congressional Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Joseph R. Slevin, of the Washington Bureau of the Journal of Commerce, pertaining to Mr. Riefler's testimony, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLUMP HELD EXCEEDING PRESIDENT'S ESTIMATE—RESERVE ECONOMIST SAYS ACTIVITY HAS FALLEN MORE SHARPLY THAN REALIZED MONTH AGO; FEARS INVENTORY ADJUSTMENTS MAY HAVE WIDER IMPACT

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, February 16.—Business activity has fallen more sharply than was realized during the preparation of the economic report President Eisenhower sent Congress last month, a high Federal Reserve System official said today.

Winfield W. Riefler, assistant to the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, told the Congressional Joint Economic Committee that recent evidence "tends to confirm rather than modify" the President's finding that the business downturn has been "largely" an inventory adjustment. He declared it is "clear" that a close watch will have to be kept on business activity during the next 6 to 9 months.

PRODUCTION INDEX OFF

The Federal Reserve economist pointed out that the industrial production index "probably" has dropped about 10 percent since July—a fall as large as the entire decline of the 1948–49 recession.

The drop in output doesn't change the diagnosis of an unbalanced inventory situation but "it raises the possibility that it may in itself, set forces in motion that will spread more widely over the economy," Mr. Riefler warned. "It is impossible to evaluate this possibility at the present time," he continued.

In a more cheerful vein, Mr. Riefler said the sharpness of the decline does not seem to have shaken the confidence of businessmen that it will be brief. He noted that "final demand at retail has held up remarkably well" and that a sizeable reduction is taking place in excessive inventories.

MONEY GENERALLY AVAILABLE

Mr. Riefler stressed that the policies being followed by the Federal Reserve System have resulted in money now being generally available to borrowers in the important mortgage, corporate bond, and State and municipal security markets.

The policy of the Federal Reserve System, he said, "is to maintain the condition of active ease that was developed in 1953."

He offered this definition when Gordon W. McKinley, Prudential Insurance Co. economist, said he hoped Mr. Riefler would say Federal Reserve policy is "neutral." Mr. Riefler and Mr. McKinley were members of a five-man panel who testified at the Economic Committee's request.

The Prudential representative urged that the Federal Reserve not take further action to ease the money market. He made it clear he feared Federal Reserve moves would "serve only to knock down interest rates."

OPPOSES CREDIT EASING

Mr. McKinley offered it as his opinion that the Federal Reserve is engaging too extensively in open market operations. He contended that an adequate flow of funds to meet all sound demands is present now and that no further easing of credit is necessary or desirable.

"No purpose is served," he said, "by forcing interest rates down after sufficient ease has been introduced into the market to provide a plentiful supply of funds for all sound borrowing needs. To deliberately reduce interest rates beyond this point will not increase the volume of loans, and it appears to me to constitute a method of forcing life insurance policyholders * * * to subsidize borrowers."

Mr. Riefler told Mr. McKinley and Roy L. Reierson, vice president of the Bankers Trust Co., that both of them were mistakenly contending that it is only the availability of funds and not the interest rate that affects the demand for credit.

CALLS INTEREST IMPORTANT

"Interest is a very important price," he said.

Mr. McKinley estimated that the total supply of funds available for investment in 1954 will just about balance the expected demand at the present interest rate if the Federal Reserve does not add to bank reserves.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

He forecast that Federal Government borrowing demand will be about $4 billion less than it was in 1953, but that other demands "should be very close to last year's figure."

STATE SPENDING FIRM

The fact that State and municipal expenditures and also construction expenditures now projected for 1954 are currently firm in spite of the current contraction of production, Mr. Riefler had said earlier, is part a direct response to the readier availability of funds in the capital markets.

Two members of the panel issued strong warnings against too vigorous a Treasury attempt to shift the national debt into longer term securities during 1954.

Lengthening the debt is one of the major objectives of Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey. A Department spokesman gave assurance early this month, however, that the Treasury will not bring too much pressure on the capital market.

Mr. Reierson told the committee that Treasury efforts to reduce the amount of short-term debt outstanding "need be neither unduly zealous nor excessively ambitious."

Similarly, Lawrence H. Seltzer, professor of economics at Wayne University, declared that a policy of moderation and caution is called for.

Mr. Reierson and Mr. Seltzer pointed out that short-term Treasury obligations are an important source of secondary reserves for banks. "Under existing conditions," Mr. Seltzer said, "short-term Treasury securities are, in a larger sense, a part of the effective money supply of the country."

Mr. Reierson expressed confidence in the continuing desire of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System to follow flexible debt management and monetary policies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to note one comment, wherein Mr. Riefler told the committee that Treasury efforts to reduce the amount of short-term debt outstanding "need be neither unduly zealous nor excessively ambitious." In other words, he called for a policy of moderation and caution.

I think the advice needs to be heeded, so that when the Treasury starts refunding operations they will not lead to the same difficulties we had last year.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree that any administration should be careful that it does not erroneously assume that economic levels are going to be maintained on the same high plateaus as during the past several years? I notice one of the headlines in the Journal of Commerce, which the Senator has before him, to the effect that President Eisenhower underestimated the slump, and that the Reserve Board economist anticipates difficulties. If anyone is in error, it is the administration in estimating that the slump would be less than it is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. We can be expected to be righteously indignant when responsible officers of the Government refer to responsible Members of this body, learned in economics, government, and industry, as the "fear dealers," when the facts indicate that there is at least something to be concerned about. I have heard no one here express fear. I have heard an expression of concern. Concern at least is a constructive approach to problems; fear is a destructive approach to problems.

All I am saying is that it ill behooves those who are guiding the destiny of the Republic to address Members of Congress in terms of that kind when responsible economists, research organizations, and foundations point out important economc facts. All we are doing is warning of conditions.

If carloadings are up, all we may say will not affect industrial activity. If industrial production is up, it makes no difference what any Senator may say. What the policy of the Treasury is makes a great deal of difference, because it affects credit conditions of the Nation and of private industry. It makes a great deal of difference what the Federal Reserve policy is, because it will have a great deal to do with economic conditions. It makes a great deal of difference what the total tax policy of our country is, because it will have something to do with the economic development of the United States.

If each Member of the United States Senate proceeded to go out into the country and make a speech on economics, that in itself would not affect the general economic well-being of the Nation. It would not scare any contractor away from building a house. What frightens a contractor is the unavailability of credit or the necessity of paying higher interest rates. What frightens a railroad executive, such as the head of the Baltimore & Ohio, is to find there are not enough goods to load onto cars. What disturbs an automobile dealer in the United States is to find that sales are below his supply; in other words, that 1953 cars are still in storage and 1954 cars are arriving at the loading dock or at the depot.

It ill behooves responsible political leaders to question facts revealed in or out of Congress concerning the economy as being expressions of gloom, fear, trouble, or despair. When we have facts before us, we ought to guide ourselves accordingly. As tax legislation comes before Congress we ought to take into consideration the matter of incentive to give business an opportunity to expand and to accumulate capital reserves, so that smaller businesses can move ahead and invest, and we should also be interested in consumers having more dollars in their hands in order to keep the wheels of industry going by increasing consumption.

I have made it quite clear that I do not believe a public works program alone is the answer. It seems to me it is about time that those who say they are political liberals—if one can define such a term any more—should recognize that fiscal policy is even more important than a public works policy. It is about time for us to recognize that monetary and fiscal policies should be flexible, not inflexible, instruments of government.

I make this statement today because I am convinced a deliberate attempt is being made in the Nation to becloud the issue, to underestimate the facts, and improperly to report the developments. Unless voices are raised to alert the public about what may be in the offing, we may be "too late and too little" or "too little and too late." I hope that will not occur.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does my colleague remember the writings of the Greek historians Herodotus and Xenophon?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remember there were such distinguished, great Greeks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does my colleague remember that they wrote that it was the custom of the Persian kings when anyone delivered an unfavorable message to have the messenger executed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, Mr. President, in regard to matters of Persian history——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me point out that those Greek historians wrote about the situation in Persia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course I accept entirely any statement my colleague makes along those lines, for I have great respect for his knowledge, not only of economics, but also of history. That is why I say it is very foolish for anyone to attempt to challenge him on matters of economic fact.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was the custom of the Persian kings to put to death anyone who bore unfavorable news. So gradually the messengers brought only favorable news—with the result that the Persian kings became out of touch with developments, and ultimately the Persian Empire broke up.

I wonder whether those in the possession of political power today will wake up to the realities of that situation; and I wonder whether they can with profit learn that lesson.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with my colleague. Not only can we learn with profit of the courage of the present-day Greeks in their opposition to tyranny, but we can also learn with profit what some of the ancient Greeks have told us in their writings of the great truths, as applied to events in the days in which they lived.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

RESIGNATION OF DR. CLARENCE E. MANION FROM COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, there has just come to my attention a rather startling announcement, which I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues, and to place in the RECORD. The announcement has just come over the wire, and reads as follows:

Clarence Manion, Chairman of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, announced today that at the request of Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams he had submitted to President Eisenhower his resignation as Chairman and member of the Commission.

In announcing his resignation, Manion told the press:

"A few weeks ago certain newspaper columnists stated that I was to be 'fired' from the Chairmanship of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations because of my support of the Bricker amendment. This advance notice was confirmed on Lincoln's birthday when Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams requested my resignation. The Bricker amendment embodies a principle that I have openly supported for years. My devotion to this principle was well known at the time of my appointment as Chairman of this Commission.

"In view of certain Supreme Court decisions, I believe that a constitutional amendment is necessary to put the same limitations upon the treaty power that now apply to every other power of our State and Federal Governments.

"I was attracted to the Eisenhower candidacy in the last campaign when he said:

" 'The Federal Government did not create the States in this Republic. The States created the Federal Government. The creation should not supersede the creator. For if the States lose their meaning our entire system of Government loses its meaning and the next step 'is the rise of the centralized national State in which the seeds of autocracy can take root and grow.'

"In my judgment, this is the well-stated creed which underlies the principle of the Bricker amendment at the same time that it motivates the work of the Intergovernmental Relations Commission. I shall continue to give this creed every possible support."

Manion's letter to the President was accompanied by a progress report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. He complimented his associates on the 25-member Commission and predicted that their continued unselfish and diligent work would result in a history-making report. "I know of no similar commission that has done more constructive work in such a short period of time," Manion said.

Mr. President, this is a most unfortunate and regrettable situation. I know of no one who at any time has criticized the work of Dr. Manion, the former dean of the Notre Dame Law School, in his activities as Chairman of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. I know of no one in the United States who has a more extensive understanding than his of the relationship of the various functions of government—State, local, and Federal—in the United States. He has a profound apprehension, which rises above that of most great students of the law, of what we might designate constitutional interpretations; and he recognizes that the natural law of the rights of men, a God-given right, is beyond the power of government to take away.

He sees in the present situation, under the interpretation given by the Supreme Court, a possibility that those unalienable, sacred, God-given rights can be taken away from the people of the United States; that the Bill of Rights can be adulterated; and that the Bill of Rights might be destroyed by treaty law. His devotion to that principle has been very real and very deep.

A few years ago I spoke at Notre Dame, at Dr. Manion's Institute on Natural Law, and had the privilege of knowing some of the research work which has been carried on under his leadership at that great institution.

He brought to the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations the vast understanding and devotion to duty and the intense patriotism that are in his every fiber; and I think it most unfortunate that this incident has come to pass.

Dr. Manion might not have agreed with some other persons as to the Bricker amendment; but no one can doubt his sincerity. No one can question his integrity.

When the time comes that those who do not believe as do the leadership in Government cannot longer serve in public capacities, a threatening storm lies ahead.

I think I can say with assurance, Mr. President, that Dr. Manion has the support of the great majority of the American people. I am quite confident that when this issue is fully understood, 90 percent of the American people will be in support of his position on this particular question.

He has gone along with the developments in this movement—first on the part of the American bar, then the American Medical Association, the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Attorneys General of the States of the Union, and many other organizations, whose names are listed on 2 or 3 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in a recent issue. He has spoken to them in many sections of the country.

When he appeared as a witness before the Senate Judiciary Committee, I think he made as fine an impression as did any other witness who appeared there. He said this issue is one of the most vital that has confronted the Nation since the adoption of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. President and my colleagues in the Senate, I hope Dr. Manion continues in this campaign, and devotes his life and his great abilities to preserving the unalienable, God-given, divine rights of the people, ever to keep them within the spiritual realm, and to keep them out of the temporal power of either our own Government or any international authority to which some persons would turn over such rights.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I have just learned that Dean Clarence Manion of my State, former dean of Notre Dame University Law School, has resigned his position. I do not know what is back of it. I shall be most anxious to learn all the facts.

I do know that Clarence Manion is one of the truly great Americans of our day. I do know that he has been an outstanding citizen of my State for many, many years; that he served as dean of the Notre Dame Law School for approximately 10 years. I know he is a good American. He accepted an appointment on the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which, as I understand, was a commission established by the Congress, 5 members being named by the Senate, 5 members being named by the House, and 15 members being named by the President of the United States.

I know that Dean Manion's views with reference to the work in which he was engaged were well known, and that his views on the subject now being discussed before the Senate were well known at the time he was appointed to this very important Commission. I have just learned that he resigned at the request of Sherman Adams, assistant to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, congressional committees have been greatly criticized because it has been said that persons who appear before them are not confronted with their accusers. I hope that when the whole truth comes out we shall find that Mr. Manion has had an opportunity to be confronted by his accusers.

I do not think anyone could say that he is not competent and is not a good American. I do not think anyone would dare say that the commission of which he was chairman has not carried forward its work in an expeditious and proper manner. I do not know what is back of his resignation. I do not know who made the decision that he should resign.

Mr. President, I have just been handed a press release with reference to Mr. Manion's resignation, which reads as follows:

Clarence Manion, Chairman of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, announced today that at the request of Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams he had submitted to President Eisenhower his resignation as Chairman and member of the Commission.

In announcing his resignation Manion told the press:

"A few weeks ago certain newspaper columnists stated that I was to be 'fired' from the chairmanship of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations because of my support of the Bricker amendment. This advance notice was confirmed on Lincoln's Birthday when Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams requested my resignation. The Bricker amendment embodies a principle that I have openly supported for years. My devotion to this principle was well known at the time of my appointment as Chairman of this Commission.

"In view of certain Supreme Court decisions, I believe that a constitutional amendment is necessary to put the same limitations upon the treaty power that now applies to every other power of our State and Federal Governments.

"I was attracted to the Eisenhower candidacy in the last campaign when he said:

" 'The Federal Government did not create the States in this Republic. The States created the Federal Government. The creation should not supersede the creator. For if the States lose their meaning our entire system of government loses its meaning, and the next step is the rise of the centralized national state in which the seeds of autocracy can take root and grow.'

"In my judgment, this is the well-stated creed which underlies the principle of the Bricker amendment at the same time that it motivates the work of the Intergovernmental Relations Commission.

"I shall continue to give this creed every possible support."

Manion's letter to the President was accompanied by a progress report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. He complimented his associates on the 25-member Commission and predicted that their continued unselfish and diligent work would result in a history-making report.

"I know of no similar commission that has done more constructive work in such a short period of time," Manion said.

Mr. President, I am disturbed about the whole thing. I am shocked. I hope that whatever accusations have been made against this fine American statesman will be brought out into the open so

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that all may know why he has been asked to resign from this great Commission which, as I understand, was established by congressional act.

As I have said, congressional committees have frequently had hurled at them the statement that accused persons appearing before them are not confronted by their accusers. Certainly, Mr. President, this man has been injured. He is a fine citizen of my State. He has a lovely wife and five fine children. If his work on the Commission is unsatisfactory, if someone does not like the color of his tie, or does not agree with him, or if his breath smells bad, that is one thing; but if this man is to be made to walk the plank because he has certain fundamental views in which he believes, and in which he believed before he accepted this appointment, certainly all the truth as to what is back of this case should be brought out. If we are living in an age when things of this kind can happen without any reason at all, we are living in a dangerous era. I hope all the facts will be brought out, so that this great American, this fine Hoosier, will not be injured and his reputation smeared in our fine State.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I heard just a few moments ago with profound regret, and I must say with deep disappointment, that Dr. Clarence Manion, former dean of the Law School of Notre Dame University, who was Chairman of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, has resigned.

I have heard what the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] said about Dean Manion, as a man, as an educator, and also as one who had been chosen, pursuant to action by the Congress, to head this important Commission.

I could not remain silent after what I heard the Senator from Indiana say. It was only a few hours ago that I was in attendance, as one of the Members chosen by the Vice President of the United States as the head of the Senate, to assume the responsibility of membership on that Commission, with four other Members of the Senate. I know something about the integrity, the ability, and the forthrightness of Dean Manion, who was the head of the Commission. I am one who firmly believes that here was a patriot, a man who held high the precepts and the responsibilities entrusted to the kind of a Commission of which he had been chosen the head.

Mr. President, I say to my colleagues with utter candor, and in the most serious way in which I can express my thoughts, that Dean Manion has impressed the membership of this Commission because of his high regard for his duty and his faithfulness in performing the trust thrust upon him.

I do not know what the background of this last move may be. I am hopeful that it does not stem from some of the things about which the Senator from Indiana has just spoken on the floor of the Senate. There are members of that Commission who accepted their assignment who entertained certain views, but who did not refuse the responsibility of their appointment to the Commission because of their views and the principles they entertained, but rather because they could rise above personal views in the discharge of their responsibility.

I feel that whatever the reason for this dismissal or resignation is or has been, those who served with Dean Manion on the Commission should have the opportunity of knowing it very clearly. I do not mean by that to criticize those who had the right to call for his resignation, if that be what happened, but I say that if it means that a man who serves in a responsible position must bow to some influence when he, as an individual, feels that he has a right to express himself in the scheme of things in which we live in this country, then I say we might well look to what is behind this incident.

I shall wait and see and analyze and evaluate what the reason for the action may have been. I hope it was not what has been expressed on this floor today, because if that should be the case, then I believe we have taken a step backward, and not forward.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I have been reluctant to make any statement in connection with the dismissal of Dr. Manion, but I feel it very keenly. As has been stated by other Senators, I hope we have not come to the day when men of good will cannot express opinions divergent with those of administration leaders, without having reprisals taken against them.

I hope there is nothing of that nature in the dismissal of Dr. Manion. If there is, I very, very much regret it, because thereby the Government will be denied the services of many outstandingly able and fearless men, such as Dr. Manion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on behalf of himself and certain other Senators.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have supported the two previous amendments which were submitted by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on behalf of himself and certain other Senators. I did so because I thought those amendments would clarify and make simpler the issue which eventually, if Congress so votes, will be sent to the States, for consideration and either ratification or rejection.

However, Mr. President, I cannot support the pending amendment, because I think that instead of clarifying and simplifying the issue, it very greatly adds confusion to it, and would create additional grounds for misunderstanding, which are not created by either the original Bricker joint resolution or by the committee report. Because I believe that to be the case, I ask unanimous consent to address 2 or 3 questions to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], to make sure that my understanding of the situation is correct, because if it is correct I think it is rather apparent that this amendment, if adopted, would add confusion rather than tend to clarify the issues presented by the very important measure now under debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOLLAND. My first question to the distinguished Senator from Michigan is this: Is it not correct that the joint resolution now under consideration, without this amendment, would simply constitute one additional article to the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. The first section would be added, together with the provision relating to the method of voting.

Mr. HOLLAND. To make the point completely clear, am I correct in my understanding that the original Bricker amendment and the amendment as reported by the committee and now being debated, with the amendments which have been added to the joint resolution on the floor of the Senate, would still comprise one single proposed new article to the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, because it would be voted upon by the States as one constitutional amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. That was my understanding.

I should like to ask an additional question. Is it not true that if the pending amendment now offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan and other distinguished Senators were adopted it would make of the pending joint resolution not merely a proposed single additional article to the Constitution, but would also add a secondary proposal, to write into article VI of the Constitution of the United States a specific amendment to clause 2 thereof?

Mr. FERGUSON. It would amend article VI.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then I ask my distinguished friend if he will not concede that the effect of the adoption of the pending amendment to the joint resolution would be to make of the joint resolution, if so amended, a double-barreled proposed amendment, consisting, really, of 2 amendments to the Constitution, 1 to be a new and separate article, and the other consisting of words added to one of the original articles, namely, article VI, which is usually spoken of as the miscellaneous article of the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. But all dealing with the same subject, that of the treatymaking power. As I have previously stated, if we place in the Constitution the amendment proposed in the joint resolution, without the amendment on which we are about to vote, and take the amendment which is known as section 1, or what might be called the conflict clause, then we shall have in the Constitution as a whole a conflict between the section which provides that no treaty or other international agreement which is in conflict with the Constitution shall be of any force or effect, and article VI, which is the supremacy clause of the Constitution, with relation to laws and treaties and the interpretation of law—such, for example, as that given by Justice Holmes in the case of Missouri against Holland. There would be that conflict. As Justice Holmes stated, there would be complete supremacy of a treaty. There would also be the dictum that a treaty cannot be judged by the Constitution on the question as to

whether or not it is in conflict with the Constitution.

To eliminate that conflict between article VI and the new article which is proposed, we must amend article VI so that it will appear from the Constitution itself what the people have in mind when they amend the Constitution.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator for his complete candor. He has certainly justified the statement which I made in the beginning, that it was my understanding that the adoption of the pending amendment to the joint resolution would make the joint resolution double-barreled, and would effect two amendments—provided, first, the Congress submitted it in that form and the States ratified it—in that a brand new article, presumably to be article XXIII or whatever the proper number would be, would be added to the Constitution, and also the amendment would effect a specific amendment to article VI.

It is because of that fact, and because of the fact that I know of no specific precedent for such action, that I think the pending amendment would tend to make confusion worse confounded, and would create a very bad situation before the State legislatures and in the public discussion.

I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact that repeatedly in the submission of proposed new amendments which did conflict with provisions already in the Constitution, it was not thought necessary to provide specific repealers in the conflicting provisions. The Senator will find, if he goes through the Constitution, repeated evidence of the fact that there have been repealers by implication, by the adoption of new amendments—as, for example, by the adoption of the 17th amendment, relating to the election of United States Senators; also by the adoption of the 14th amendment, which repealed among other things, those provisions of article I which related to the presence in our Nation of persons who were not at that time free citizens.

There were numerous other occasions of that kind. It seems to the Senator from Florida—and this is his reason for opposing this particular amendment—that instead of clarifying the situation, the Senator would propose to confuse it vastly. We would hear the amendment debated from one end of the country to the other, as a double-barreled provision offering, upon one occasion, specifically to amend the Constitution in two particulars, at widely varying portions of the document.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator from Florida not consider that this action has a rather distinguished precedent, in that the first 10 amendments were offered to the States under the same circumstances?

Mr. HOLLAND. The first 10 amendments, if the Senator from Florida remembers them correctly, were amendments which added a great deal to the Constitution, and which were not offered as specific repealers of portions already in the Constitution. The Senator from Florida remembers—and he will ask his friend from Oregon to check him—that there are in the Constitution not just one, but perhaps a dozen or more instances in which it was not found necessary to present a double-barreled provision of this kind, but instead, those who were submitting amendments realized perfectly well that the Constitution could not mean two contradictory things, and that the adoption of a later provision in a particular field necessarily repealed the earlier conflicting provision, though there was no specific reference to such repeal.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida, without seeking to argue the question at length, feels that the submission of any double-barreled constitutional amendment which offers at the same time to write one new article into the Constitution and to rewrite one of the original articles, would be more confusing than any other proposal that he knows of that has been submitted as a proposed constitutional amendment. The Senator from Florida believes that there is no need for submitting the amendment in such a confusing form, and for that reason he strongly opposes the adoption of the pending amendment.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Let me invite the attention of the Senator from Florida to the fact that the first 10 amendments, along with 2 others, were introduced in a single group in the Senate, in the first instance, on September 25, 1789. They were considered by the Senate and by the House of Representatives and, in a group, referred to the several States.

The States thereupon eliminated or refused to ratify 2 of the 12 proposed amendments. So that was a 12-barreled gun instead of a double-barreled gun. When the ratification was completed it was a 10-barreled ratification, instead of a double-barreled ratification. The first 10 amendments covered every subject from personal liberty on through the division of powers between the Federal Government and the States.

The Senator from Oregon recognizes the validity of an argument that confusion could exist. If the Senator from Florida will permit me to say so, I will say that perhaps such confusion is caused by the fact that there is confusion resulting from court-made provisions of the Constitution, rather than from the Constitution itself.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Oregon. It is true that 12 amendments were submitted at the same time, but in each instance they were submitted as separate amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. The States voted upon them separately and rejected two of them, as the Senator from Oregon has stated, whereas in the present situation, if the proposed amendment should be adopted there would be two specific, different proposals for amendment of the Constitution, which would either have to be accepted together or rejected together. They would not be submitted as two specific amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Florida to the 14th amendment to the Constitution. Section 1 deals with the rights of citizenship. It reads:

> All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2 provides that "representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers."

Section 3 provides that—

> No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President or Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath as a Member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof.

Section 4 deals with the validity of the public debt.

The distinguished Senator says the pending amendment is a double-barreled amendment. That was a four-barreled amendment. It dealt with four distinct subjects. When he says there is no precedent for the amendment, I do not believe the Senator is quite correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am afraid the Senator from California has not followed me or has not listened carefully, because if he will look at the 14th amendment, he will find that it was submitted as a single amendment. When adopted it constituted a single amendment, although it did cover several subjects. It did not become the 14th amendment, and at the same time also specifically rewrite an earlier article of the Constitution.

Instead of being a four-barreled amendment, it was, instead, a single amendment, with various fields with which it dealt.

Incidentally, the Senator from Florida wishes he had time to talk about the 14th amendment from the standpoint of some other matters which were mentioned earlier on the floor, because the 14th amendment was not adopted by the clarification of thinking through the years as was stated by an able Senator, but instead was adopted under coercion by the enactment, over presidential veto, of the Reconstruction Act of 1867, which required, as a condition precedent to the regaining of their seats in the Senate and the House on the part of various

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

States of the Union, that they must first adopt the 14th amendment.

After various States of the North and the West had declined to adopt the 14th amendment, there was no chance of the 14th amendment entering into the Constitution unless the Southern States did adopt it. We would have an interesting additional page of history to talk about here, which varies completely from the approach which has been discussed by various supporters of the pending amendment, because the 14th amendment was not a product resulting from clarification of long and finally harmonious thinking on the subjects covered by it, but was adopted by coercion of the most extreme sort. That is recognized by all students of history.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that the pending amendment, if it is written into the Constitution, will have one objective, and that objective is to have the law of this land, the Constitution, provide that no treaty shall be valid if it conflicts with the Constitution of the United States. As a result we will not have a conflict between the new section we would put into the Constitution and article VI of the Constitution.

Mr. HOLLAND. I recognize the good intentions of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. However I should like to call his attention to the fact that the proposed new article relates not just to treaties but also to executive agreements, and relates also to the internal law of the United States, and relates also to the attempt to give to Congress power to regulate executive and other agreements, and relates also to other subject matters which appear in it, by reason of the amendments which have been adopted.

The Senator from Florida has a great deal of sympathy with the desires of the distinguished Senators who advocate the pending amendment to clarify the situation, and he will support the George amendment, with one or two additions, which he hopes the Senate will approve, but he is not willing to put himself in the position of submitting a constitutional amendment which proposes to write a new article into the Constitution and at the same time rewrite one of the old articles.

He can foresee the questions being brought up in every legislature of the Nation with resultant confusion of the most indescribable kind. The question would be asked: Are we going to amend the sixth amendment of the Constitution? Yes. Are we going to adopt a new amendment? Yes. What is the difference between the two actions we are asked to take?

The Senator from Florida does not think that is the way to adopt a constitutional amendment. If there is virtue and value in the proposed constitutional change—and the Senator from Florida does not propose to say that there is not much thought and much effort and much reasoning behind some of the elements that are involved here—let us submit it as a simple, understandable, single amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Florida says he is going to vote for the George amendment. The George amendment is a different amendment entirely. It applies only to internal law. Therefore, the Senator would have a triple-barreled amendment under his view.

Mr. HOLLAND. No, in my view there would be simply one amendment submitted as a proposed new article to the Constitution. The Senator has suggested an amendment under which this matter would look in two directions: a new article and a rewriting of one of the ancient articles which has been in the Constitution since 1787. I do not believe that is the simple or the reasonable or the understandable way of approaching a subject of this kind, and I regret to say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, much as I respect his professional ability and high patriotism, that approaching the matter in this way will bring on, if the amendment is adopted and submitted to the States in the present form, most confusing situations in the 48 States.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have only one more word to say. I feel that it is a clarifying amendment if taken together with the first section which has been adopted by the Senate by a vote of 60 to 20. It will do one thing. It will make clear that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land and that in the case of treaties the supremacy clause will provide that treaties shall be judged under the Constitution and if they are in conflict with it they shall be void and of no effect.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I believe there is not the slightest doubt that the Constitution is today the supreme law of the land and that there is no need whatever for the pending amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on page 3, in lieu of lines 7 to 9, inclusive, to insert certain language.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent on leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

If present and voting the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "nay"; the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

I announce also that on this vote the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Dirksen	McClellan
Barrett	Dworshak	Mundt
Beall	Ferguson	Payne
Bennett	Flanders	Potter
Bricker	Griswold	Purtell
Bridges	Hendrickson	Russell
Burke	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Ives	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Knowland	Watkins
Carlson	Kuchel	Welker
Case	Langer	Williams
Cordon	Malone	Young
Daniel	Martin	

NAYS—43

Anderson	Hennings	Magnuson
Chavez	Hill	Mansfield
Clements	Hoey	Maybank
Cooper	Holland	Monroney
Douglas	Humphrey	Murray
Duff	Hunt	Neely
Eastland	Jackson	Pastore
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Frear	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Fulbright	Kennedy	Stennis
George	Kerr	Symington
Gillette	Kilgore	Thye
Gore	Lehman	Upton
Green	Lennon	
Hayden	Long	

NOT VOTING—9

Capehart	McCarran	Morse
Goldwater	McCarthy	Sparkman
Kefauver	Millikin	Wiley

So the amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON, for himself and other Senators, was agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to call up amendment designated "2-4-54-A," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3 of the committee amendment, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 3. A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by the Congress unless in advising and consenting to a treaty the Senate, by a vote

of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, shall provide that such treaty may become effective as internal law without legislation by the Congress.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be made the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is the pending question.

Mr. BRICKER. I should like to ask the majority leader if it is intended to continue the session. I have prepared a speech on the amendment which I should like to deliver, but it will take longer than we can possibly continue tonight. The Senate has been in session since 12 o'clock, and it is now 6 o'clock. I should appreciate it if the matter could go over to a later date.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio I had hoped that there would be at least a brief opening statement, so the Members might have some background for the amendment. It was not proposed to sit beyond 6:30 or 7 o'clock this evening. Tomorrow the Senate will be considering the Beeson nomination, and we will not reach the consideration of the Bricker amendment until the Beeson nomination is disposed of, which may or may not be during the afternoon.

I thought perhaps the distinguished Senator from Ohio could make a brief statement so that those who read the RECORD may have some background of the proposed amendment. It certainly would be helpful to orderly procedure. Certainly there is no intention to take a vote or to have a prolonged session this evening.

Mr. BRICKER. I have prepared an analysis of the law as it exists up to this time and of the amendment which I have submitted. The amendment is very simple and easy to understand. It is written in very clear language. It states that a treaty or other international agreement shall not become the law of the land internally until it is made so by act of Congress, but that the Senate, in ratifying a treaty, can, by a two-thirds vote, make it internal law immediately.

Of course, when we resume consideration of the amendment I shall discuss that aspect at length; but that is one-half of the original purpose of the amendment which has been submitted. The matter was thoroughly explored in the committee. Many witnesses testified in regard to it. The original purpose of the amendment as submitted and reported by the committee was to provide that the Constitution shall be paramount and supreme over treaties, and certainly over executive agreements.

In order to carry out that purpose, a second provision provided that treaties and international agreements should not become internal law, except through acts of the Congress, and, under the "which" clause, acts of the State legislatures, if such treaties and agreements would violate the terms of a State statute or were inconsistent with a State constitution.

The "which" clause is not in the amendment now proposed; but it does give to the people of the country the protection of requiring congressional action, both as to treaties and executive agreements, before they become internal law.

That means that there will be thorough discussion of the issues on the floors of the Congress; there will be publicity given to the issues; there will be opportunities for witnesses to be heard before the various committees of the Senate and of the House; there will be local interest expressed. That is in contrast to what now occurs in the consideration of treaties, where practically the only witnesses are representatives of the State Department or other Government agencies which are interested in the ratification of a treaty. Many times we have experienced heavy pressure to consider ratifying treaties. No witnesses representing the public interest are called; no publicity is given to the issues involved; and oftentimes there is very little debate upon the floor of the Senate.

The Constitution of the United States provides that all legislative power shall be vested in the Congress—not a part of it, but all of it. Under the decisions of the Supreme Court up to this time, in its interpretation of treaties, the President, along with two-thirds of the Senate, can now make internal law. The President himself, under the interpretation by the Supreme Court of his powers, by making executive agreements, can make internal law.

It is to stop that kind of domestic legislation, and to make the provision of the Constitution requiring that Congress shall pass all laws an effective and vital provision in our whole society, that the amendment is offered.

Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain letters, articles, and editorials bearing on the pending business.

One comes from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of February 14; it is a letter to the editor, and is entitled "Women's Voters League Poll on Bricker Bill Refuted." I ask that it be printed. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the letter to the editor to which I have just referred, another letter on the same subject, from the Cincinnati Enquirer.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of February 14, 1954]

WOMEN VOTERS' LEAGUE POLL ON BRICKER BILL REFUTED

EDITOR, PLAIN DEALER.

SIR: So the official position of the League of Women Voters is against the Bricker amendment?

Many of us who are members of the league independently approve of the Bricker amendment or want legislation to protect us from abuses of treaties and executive agreements. Facts indicate that a reappraisal of the league's much-publicized stand is in order.

On July 15, 1953, a national announcement was made: "The League of Women Voters has no position on the Bricker amendment * * *"

On January 13, 1954, Mrs. John G. Lee, national president, wrote to President Eisenhower: "The league * * * is opposed to the Bricker amendment * * *"

On January 20, 1954, the Plain Dealer carried a news item: "A letter opposing the Bricker amendment went out from the Ohio League of Women Voters yesterday."

On January 19, 1954, the Ohio president of the league wrote to local presidents in Ohio: "I would like to ask that you report to the State office what action your league is taking in response to the January 13 call on the Bricker amendment. We have only very incomplete records of your reports to national on membership opinions."

A survey of four local leagues falls woefully short of Mrs. Lee's weight of opinion expressed. No poll of the Cleveland Heights league was made. Membership: 327. In Shaker Heights the polling consisted of taking a composite of expressions at a panel meeting of under 50 members in June 1953, plus a recent telephone poll of the 22 Shaker members. Membership: 700 plus.

In the Cleveland league, at a board meeting January 6, 14 members developed the position that: "As it stands, we are opposed to the Bricker amendment. We would favor a constitutional amendment which would require Senate confirmation of executive agreements and congressional approval of any treaties which deal with internal law." Cleveland league members were not polled. Membership: 382.

In Lakewood, the Bricker amendment was discussed at one league meeting in January. No poll was taken, but there was a unanimous agreement on necessity for legislation to protect against future abuses of executive agreements. (Membership as a whole (143) was not polled.)

The league must therefore set its house in order to avoid such editorial comment as that of the Washington Times-Herald, May 8, 1953: "The impartiality of this organization is legitimately open to question, and it will take more than perfunctory denials to overcome the suspicion."

DAISY MORRELL MCWHORTER.

CLEVELAND.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of February 2, 1954]

SPEAKING FOR ALL?

To the EDITOR OF THE ENQUIRER:

The League of Women Voters is, without question, an organization of merit. That it accomplishes a great deal of good in arousing women in general concerning their duties as voters and in stimulating interest among its members in particular in civic, national, and international affairs goes without saying.

My experience with the members of the neighborhood unit to which I formerly belonged was that they were a group of highly intelligent, extremely well-informed women, genuinely interested in the welfare of our country, not just for today but for the generations to come. I benefited greatly from their views, their information and knowledge.

However, I cannot subscribe to the policy of the board, whether local or national, which takes upon itself the responsibility of supporting any action without consulting its members.

In the Enquirer of January 27 the "local Board of the Women Voters" announced it had unanimously voted (and "sent telegrams") against the Bricker amendment.

The president of the local chapter, when asked if the various units of the league had been consulted, replied that they had not; that it was the board's decision; that a letter would be sent to the members and each could write a letter to Washington or not as they chose.

However, the inference is definitely left in the minds of many readers of their publicity that the league "as a result of more than a year's study" was against the Bricker amendment.

Just who is the "league"? The members who constitute the units in each chapter—or the "board"?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Do all the members of the League of Women Voters subscribe to this sort of thing? The board members are but a small part of the membership. Why should they not consult with the units before declaring a policy?

The inference is that all members of the League of Women Voters are against this amendment. Are they?

I wonder.

MARION H. ROLLER

CINCINNATI.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "United States v. Pink," which was published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of February 9.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES v. PINK

Could the President of the United States make an executive agreement with a foreign power which, by a stroke of the pen, would supersede the Constitution and override a State law? Offhand, you would probably say this would be impossible. But the debate over the Bricker amendment has brought to light an instance in which this actually happened.

It seems that in 1907 the First Russian Insurance Co. established a branch in New York. In compliance with the laws of the State it deposited money with the State superintendent of insurance to protect the claims of policyholders and creditors.

In 1919 the Soviet Government nationalized all insurance and issued decrees confiscating all property of private Russian insurance companies, wherever situated. In 1925 the State of New York took possession of the assets of the New York branch company, totaling more than $1 million, which was earmarked for distribution among creditors and policyholders.

But in 1933, after the United States had recognized the Soviet Union, Commissar Maxim Litvinov wrote a letter to President Roosevelt assigning those insurance funds to the United States to be used for the settlement of United States claims against Russia. Louis H. Pink, the New York insurance superintendent, refused to turn over the money and the Federal Government brought suit against him and other claimants to recover the funds.

This case, known as *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203), was decided by the Supreme Court in favor of the Federal Government February 2, 1942, by a vote of 5 to 2, with 2 Justices not participating.

It was argued on behalf of the policyholders and creditors that they were entitled to the money under the laws of New York State and that to take it away from them would violate the fifth amendment to the Constitution, providing that no person should be deprived of property without due process of law.

The Court held, however, that the Litvinov Assignment was part of the foreign policy of the United States and that it was cloaked with the dignity similar to that of treaties which, under article VI, clause 2, are the supreme law of the land. The syllabus laid down a number of propositions, including these: "Although aliens are entitled to the protection of the fifth amendment, that amendment does not preclude giving full force and effect to the Litvinov Assignment" and "State law must yield when it is inconsistent with or impairs the policy or provisions of a treaty or of an international compact or agreement."

Commenting on the treaty power as it now exists, Senator HOMER H. FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, told the Senate last Thursday:

"Mr. President, if we were to say that a treaty is on the same basis as the Constitution, then the President and two-thirds of the Senators voting would be able to change the Constitution. They would be able even to repeal it. Whereas if the people themselves wanted to amend the Constitution or to repeal it, they would have to follow the provisions * * * that amendments may be proposed by two-thirds of each House of Congress and shall become valid when ratified by three-fourths of the States legislatures or by conventions duly called in three-fourths of the States."

To which Senator JOHN W. BRICKER (Republican, Ohio) added: "A further danger exists in that under the interpretation by the Supreme Court in the decision referred to as the Pink case, the President of the United States alone can do that."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Bricker Amendment Foe Inconsistent," which was written by George Sokolsky.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRICKER AMENDMENT FOE INCONSISTENT

(By George Sokolsky)

Prof. Edward S. Corwin, learned student of government and now organizer of a campaign against the Bricker amendment, wrote a book some years ago entitled "The President—Office and Powers." It is a scholarly contribution to the subject.

So when I received a circular letter in opposition to the Bricker Amendment signed by Professor Corwin, I seized upon his book as an index to what the professor thinks on the subject. As regards the constitutional stipulations concerning the foreign policies and relations of the United States, Professor Corwin wrote:

"What the Constitution does, and all that it does, is to confer upon the President certain powers capable of affecting our foreign relations, and certain other powers of the same general nature upon the Senate, and still other such powers upon Congress; but which of these organs shall have the decisive and final voice in determining the course of the American Nation is left for events to resolve.

"All of which amounts to saying that the Constitution, considered only for its affirmative grants of power which are capable of affecting the issue, is an invitation to struggle for the privilege of directing American foreign policy."

What the Bricker amendment seeks to do is to eliminate this particular struggle, which often becomes unseemly, by clarifying the authority of Congress and the authority of the President. Such a clarification is necessary after the amazing and tragic performances of our Presidents at the Teheran, Cairo, Yalta, and Potsdam conferences which brought upon us the state of permanent war.

CONGRESS NOT INFORMED ABOUT WILSON'S INTENTION

Professor Corwin, anticipating one phase of the Bricker amendment by many years, wrote:

"Of course, when it comes to legislation which would be capable of tying his (the President's) hands because of his constitutional obligation in respect to law enforcement, a President has usually an effective weapon of defense for his policies in his veto power. The trouble is that an act which was put on the statute books with the approval of a predecessor, or even with his own approval, may later turn out to be seriously cramping. Thus, it was that President Wilson found it necessary early in 1914, when he was being subjected to strong pressure from Great Britain on account of his Mexican policy, to go before Congress and urge repeal of the Panama Tolls Act of 1911:

"'I ask this of you in support of the foreign policy of the administration. I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequences if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure.'

"No more striking acknowledgment has ever been made by a President of the actual power of Congress in the foreign relations field."

It is now clear that while Woodrow Wilson ran in 1916 on the slogan: "He kept us out of war," he already was in 1914 laying the foundation for getting us into war in the event that Great Britain was in danger of defeat.

Congress was never informed of Woodrow Wilson's covert negotiations nor of the efforts of Walter Hines Page, our Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, to support one side against the other in a war in which the Americans had no cause. The American people actually believed that Woodrow Wilson was keeping this Nation out of war.

BRICKER AMENDMENT OFFERS ACCEPTABLE ALTERNATIVE

Congress did, on March 4, 1913, pass a rider to the Appropriations Act forbidding the President to extend or accept any invitation to participate in any international congress, conference, or like event without specific authorization to do so.

To this caveat, Professor Corwin remarks sagely: "Shades of Cairo, Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam. * * *"

It would seem that one who has written page after page about the confusion that has arisen in our history because the powers of the President and of Congress in foreign relations have not been precisely defined, would favor a measure that does define those authorities precisely. Were his position that the authority over foreign relations be exclusively the President's, it would be preferable to the present confusion. But then we should have to reorganize the American government on a fascistic basis, making of our President a dictator, even in domestic affairs, as foreign relations and domestic affairs are today inseparable.

Is there then no alternative to confusion or fascism? The Bricker amendment offers such an alternative within the tradition of the American people.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bricker Change Reflects True American Tradition," which was published in the Columbus Dispatch of January 22.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRICKER CHANGE REFLECTS TRUE AMERICAN TRADITION

For 6,000 years—give or take a few centuries—man has struggled to free himself of the arbitrary and uncontrolled management of his life by governments which may be unlimited in their powers over the individual.

The American Revolution and the Constitution upon which the new United States was founded saw the practical attainment of that goal.

Government henceforth would be limited specifically in its power; at least the American Government would be. And it was assumed that when, and if, changes were ever made in the supreme law of the land they would be made to limit the Government's powers even further.

The proposed Bricker amendment to the Constitution, which would set out definitely that no treaty could violate the Constitution

is, therefore, in the true American tradition. It would limit the powers of the Government to commit the American people to treaty provisions which might erase some of our basic freedoms.

The importance of the treatymaking power and the extent of its reach are clearly defined now in the Constitution. Here is what it has to say about treaties:

"He (the President) shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur (art. II, sec. 2).

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding (art. VI).

"The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under the Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority" (art. III, sec. 2).

We have at the moment a case before us which illustrates the power of the treaty in affecting our personal freedoms. It is the case of Pvt. Richard T. Keefe, of the United States Army, who has been convicted of committing a crime in the courts of France and is now serving a sentence in a French prison.

Private Keefe did not have the advantage of his constitutional right to a trial by a jury of his peers, as guaranteed him by the Constitution, nor did he have the right to be tried in an American court under American law.

The reason is that under the NATO treaty, it is conceded that American soldiers on foreign soil may be tried in native courts, in the case of crime, and shall be punished according to the laws of the nation in which the crime was committed, rather than according to the laws of America.

Thus, for Private Keefe, an American citizen, the guaranties of the Constitution have been negated by a treaty, simply because a treaty can—and does override the Constitution itself.

And the courts of the United States are helpless to see that Private Keefe is given his rights because of the treaty which binds the judicial power to its terms.

Since the United States has reached what some of our political interpreters like to call a mature leadership in world affairs there will be many treaties involving us in the future.

Some of these, such as the covenants being advanced by the United Nations limit freedom of speech.

Are these to supersede the Constitution where the individual freedoms and liberties of American citizens are involved?

Already unwise and unexplored treaties and executive agreements have lost us an ally in China and have precipitated us into a Korean war.

The Bricker amendment is in the interests of the American ideal and goal of freedom. The fact that it might slow up executive action in the area of international affairs is no valid criticism against it.

This slowing up process of Government agencies, whether they be executive, judicial, or legislative is what makes American freedom real and substantial.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Danger and the Remedy," written by Raymond Moley, and published in Newsweek for February 15.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DANGER AND THE REMEDY

(By Raymond Moley)

The issue raised by the Bricker resolution and its various substitutes is not a mere lawyers' quibble. It deeply affects laymen everywhere and should be resolved by lay opinion over the Nation. Most of the legal argument is irrelevant for three reasons: (a) No one can tell what this Supreme Court will say about detailed language; (b) practically all the judicial opinions on the effect of treaties and international agreements have been swept aside by the *Missouri* v. *Holland* case in 1920 and the so-called Pink case in 1942; and (c) the vast machinery of legislation by international agreements that has come with the U. N. and other international bodies has exposed the social, economic, and political interests of every American citizen to new and strange legal restraints imposed not by the Representatives of the people in Congress but in fact by bureaucrats unknown to the public.

The Holland case arose because a statute of Congress giving the Federal Government authority to protect migratory birds had been declared unconstitutional. When that happened John W. Davis was Solicitor General. I shall let his state what happened in words used before the New York Bar Association in 1953:

"I took it upon myself * * * to march over to the Department of State and say to them—I think it was to Secretary Lansing in person * * * that if he would negotiate a treaty with Canada providing for the protection of these migratory animals which neither country was able to protect alone, and if under that treaty Congress should be empowered to pass a statute for their protection, I thought it would stand up, and it was so done." In that way the Constitution was breached by a treaty. The same John W. Davis is now head of the leading pressure group fighting the amendment.

In the Pink case the Supreme Court decided that an executive agreement between F. D. R. and Litvinov in 1933 was the supreme law of the land and superseded the fifth amendment and the law of New York.

In three preceding articles I have shown how, through international commissions, agreements are made which have controlled and can in the future control economic affairs within the country. A series of such agreements dealing with tin and other raw materials is in the works or is planned. There are pending in the U. N. international conventions such as the "human rights" contraption which could take the form of treaties or agreements binding upon the internal affairs of the country.

President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights, whose report in 1947 he heartily endorsed, cited *Missouri* v. *Holland* as authority for the statement that civil-rights legislation could be enacted despite constitutional barriers through an "international bill of rights."

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, also a member of the Davis group, in the first chapter of his book, Decision in Germany, makes the best of all cases for control in his account of the disastrous agreements that led up to the Berlin isolation and all the trouble since. It was an agreement that isolated Berlin. Even Potsdam was an agreement.

Two points embodied in almost all of the proposed amendments would provide the protection needed. There would be clear statements in an amendment that "a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect" and "a treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law * * * only through legislation by Congress." With these solidly in the Constitution, Congress can set up machinery to control and regulate international agreements.

The President and Secretary of State assure us that as long as they are in power there is no danger. But surely the President can see that there is not only a potential danger in the future but that it is reasonable for people to demand constitutional protection against such danger. That demand will not die with some cleverly contrived parliamentary trick that shelves this issue during this session. It will persist until there is firm assurance for the long future ahead.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Randall Warning." The article was written by Raymond Moley, and was published in Newsweek magazine for February 8.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RANDALL WARNING

(By Raymond Moley)

The Randall Commission on Foreign Economic Policy has issued a sharp warning to the President, the Congress, and the American people against the deadly peril to our free economy in some international agreements. Such agreements, allegedly entered into for the alluring purpose of stabilizing prices and sharing the supply of raw materials, may well introduce a new and sinister form of regimentation here and also lend our approval to the old European cartel.

Our State Department under Secretary Hull was ostentatiously dedicated to the principle of freedom of trade. It is therefore ironic that members of that Department now dedicate themselves to the imposition of shackles more serious than past high tariffs. The Randall report says:

"The commission * * * believes that such * * * agreements introduce rigidities and restraints that impair the elasticity of economic adjustment and the freedom of individual initiative which are fundamental to economic progress. Moreover, the types of intergovernmental commodity agreements thus far tried or proposed * * * involve commitments which could lead, if extensively employed, to very large outlays of United States Goverment funds * * * of indeterminate amounts."

Specifically mentioned and deplored was the International Wheat Agreement which costs us more than $500 million and was renewed in a mad hurry last July by the Senate without a record vote.

This sort of thing is already moving into other commodities such as tin. Last week I offered a prize example of how such agreements were put over through the International Materials Conference which operated without authorization of Congress and enforced its determination through war-emergency agencies. Such bypassing of Congress might well be done in the future through executive agreements little noted at the time but of profound impact on our economic life.

Let us for a moment see how such commitments fasten themselves upon us. In 1946 the Committee for Economic Development sponsored a study of the control of world trade by Prof. E. S. Mason, of Harvard, who was also for a time deputy to the Assistant Secretary of State for economic affairs. He wrote in his report that "to enable the machinery of international commodity control to function it will be necessary to reshape not only commercial policy but policies hitherto considered as belonging to the field of domestic relation."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Professor Mason turned up later as a member of the President's Materials Policy Commission, of which William S. Paley was chairman. The Mason ideas were deeply embedded in the official report of that Commission in 1952. Referring to the Habana Charter, which was considered and deliberately rejected by Congress, it said: "The United States has not ratified the treaty, but under a resolution of the United Nations Economic and Social Council is bound with other nations to recognize chapter VI as a guide." Thus when Congress bars the front door, use the window.

Now enters the U. N. Under the direction of the General Assembly the Secretary General called upon a group of economists from here and abroad. They rendered a long report last month which recommended the creation of a "watchdog" commission to advise the Economic and Social Council and its member governments. It also recommended that this commission operate in secret to consider measures to which it might not wish to appear publicly committed.

When the Paley-Mason theory is added to this, we have the complete picture. The U. N. sets up a commission to sit in secret and to recommend proposals to the Economic and Social Council, whose decisions are binding upon the United States, whether the Congress likes it or not. This kind of commitment was foreshadowed in the opinion of Chief Justice Vinson in the steel seizure case.

Can it be wondered that informed people are determined to bring all such agreements under the clear and effective control of Congress?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article—one of the best I have seen on the subject—entitled "They Want To Give America Away." The article was written by James Ratliff, and was published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of February 7.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY WANT TO GIVE AMERICA AWAY

(By James Ratliff)

Thousands of sincere, respected Americans are opposed to the Bricker amendment—chiefly because they don't fully understand it, in our opinion—but we'd like to direct a message to the bleeding-heart columnists and commentators who would oppose motherhood if it were renamed Brickerhood or Jennerhood.

When you blithely dismiss any need for an amendment restricting law by treaty do you really care that the overwhelming majority of American legal and patriotic experts are absolutely convinced of the need for some kind of amendment?

Even the President of the United States, who is "unalterably opposed to the Bricker amendment in its present form," has admitted that some form of amendment should be passed. How then can you continue to reject scornfully any legislation at all? Do you hate BRICKER more than you love your country?

Do you care that the American Bar Association has spent 5 years in endless research on the problem and has itself drawn up and voted overwhelmingly for the Bricker amendment as it now stands?

Or would you prefer to take the advice of the National Lawyers Guild, already asked to show cause why it should not be labeled subversive by the Attorney General, and which, along with the Communist Party, the Daily Worker and every leftist organization in the entire country, is solidly opposed to the Bricker amendment?

Would you take the advice of the League of Women Voters against the Bricker amendment? Or would you prefer to take the advice of the outstanding woman jurist in the history of the United States, Judge Florence E. Allen, who not only helped found the League of Women Voters but publicly urged them to do something positive about the danger from law by treaty?

Judge Allen, sitting this week in the Sixth United States circuit court of appeals at Cincinnati, is the author of a penetrating book showing the legal danger facing America in legislation through treaty.

Would you prefer the advice of John Foster Dulles, an international lawyer of vast experience, when he said in 1952: "The treaty-making power is an extraordinary power, liable to abuse * * * treaty law can override the Constitution * * * treaties can cut across the rights given to the people by their constitutional Bill of Rights?"

Or would you prefer the advice of this same John Foster Dulles a year later when he had become the Secretary of State of the United States, and anxious now to have a free hand in whipping up some fat treaties, made the incredible about-face of saying that you didn't have to worry about treaties any more because he was in there?

Would you believe John W. Davis, distinguished attorney and Democratic candidate for President in 1924, when he pooh-poohs the Bricker amendment today? Or would you be more impressed by Davis' own admission that years ago when he was an officer of the Department of Justice he had cynically urged the Secretary of State to pass a treaty with Canada to get around the annoying fact that a Federal law had been held unconstitutional? That treaty was passed, incidentally. It became supreme law and is the basis for some of the worry today.

Are you telling the truth when you say the danger from treaty law is only theoretical? Or would you care to discuss the theoretical danger with Pvt. Richard Keefe of the United States Army, who is rotting today in a French prison under a 5-year sentence from a French court? Private Keefe is the first American ever deprived by his own government of the United States Constitution in our history, thanks to the Status of Forces Treaty which is now supreme law for Americans.

Are you reassured when you say superciliously that the United States Supreme Court recently refused the President of the United States permission to seize billions of dollars worth of American private property under a treaty? Or do you get a chill when you realize that the Chief Justice of that same Supreme Court and two of his associates held that the President had a perfect right to seize those billions under the United Nations Charter? If two other justices had joined those three, the America that Americans have known since 1776 probably was gone forever.

"Tie the President's hands," "Curb the President's treatymaking power," are two of the clichés that you have used constantly in every story to load the dice against a fair break for America. Have you ever said once that nothing contemplated in the spirit of the Bricker amendment would make the President, or the United States, one bit worse off legally than any other country is today?

You have managed to alarm the President so much with this constant barrage of propaganda that he is openly intervening in a fight that the Constitution itself denies him a part. Presidents do not properly participate in constitutional amendments—they have no veto power over them.

It is ironic to hear you cry that the President must have a "free hand" to negotiate treaties when many of them are negotiated for us by Socialists in Europe and arrive ready for ratification in the United States so that they are merely handed to the Senate.

Are you then more concerned about any President of the United States having what you call a free hand, or are you willing to give equal concern to protecting the basic freedom on which America stands?

Hundreds of patriotic Democrats and Republicans have labored unceasingly to find agreement on treaty law protection under the Constitution. Aside from an occasional wild outburst from an uninformed politician, the opposition arose only at the last moment (after patient years of asking for objections).

In its organized phase the opposition comes strictly from the Senators HUMPHREY-LEHMAN—liberal columnist axis. Some of their arguments—constantly printed—are calculated, deliberate untruths.

At last we are getting a true definition of their concept of liberal. They are so liberal that they simply want to give America away.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 18, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 17 (legislative day of February 8), 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Henry F. Holland, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice John M. Cabot.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

H. Struve Hensel, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Frank C. Nash, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. William L. Howse, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for bringing this Nation into being and for sustaining it from the day of its birth until now. We pray that Thou shalt continue to bless and guard and keep us as a people. We thank Thee for the privilege of assembling in this place today. We thank Thee for those men and women who have been selected to be the representatives of free people. Guide and direct each one of them today as they deliberate upon these matters of importance before them. Our Father, Thou hast told us that if any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not. May that wisdom lead and direct and teach each one in his labor of love and of service for Thee today is our prayer in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communi-

cated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On January 30, 1954:

H. R. 6665. An act to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 7209. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1955.

On February 9, 1954:

H. J. Res. 354. Joint resolution amending Public Law 207, 83d Congress.

On February 12, 1954:

H. R. 2618. An act for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez; and

H. J. Res. 358. Joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

CITY CONSUMERS SHOULD BUY MORE BUTTER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, action of the Secretary of Agriculture in reducing butter price supports as of April 1 is clearly intended to deal with unmanageable surpluses and inducement to further surpluses which threatened to equal the potato price-support scandal and is a real effort to hold a more even balance between the producer and marketer and the consumer of butter. The responsibility now rests upon the consumer, the processor and the distributor, the dairy farmer and the Department of Agriculture to make this plan good. Butter consumption has dropped by almost one-half in the last 10 years from 1,870,000,000 pounds per year to 1,200,000,000 pounds.

Consumers should now buy more butter as the price becomes more attractive. Processors and distributors have got to keep their spread down and reflect lower prices at the producer level promptly to the consumer—the announcement that the retail price will remain the same in Washington is a bad precedent. In addition, following the example of industry, widespread promotion should be undertaken in cooperation with the producer to increase butter consumption. The producer should cooperate in an essential economic adjustment making up for lower prices in more efficient production and diversification of output as well as greater volume. The Secretary of Agriculture should get butter stocks into consumption as recommended by the National Milk Producers Federation in order to give the public the benefit of lower prices and encourage absorption of the enormous Government-held stocks overhanging the market. Secretary Benson is entitled to the support of representatives of consumers most of whom are in the big cities—he has had that support from me right along and he should have it from others similarly situated.

PRICE SUPPORT FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in line with what the gentleman from New York said about Secretary Benson's action, I think he put his finger on the crux of the matter when he said there is going to be a bad precedent, because prices are not going down in Washington. He is going to find out that dairy prices are not going down to the consumer very much any place; that this is going to be another gift to the processor at the expense of the farmer, and the consumer will be forgotten in the whole deal. If Mr. Benson has a dynamic new program, which he said he had a year ago, I think he ought to come up with some idea that would not hurt the farmer but would get the products of the farmer into the hands of the consumer at a price which the consumer can afford to pay. Milk prices were reduced to the farmer 25 percent in December and January in my district. How much of it came down to the consumer? Ten percent.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to urge all my colleagues to sign discharge petition No. 7, which would bring up for consideration on the House floor H. R. 2982, the Alaska statehood bill.

Every Member should recognize the fairness in allowing the House to work its will in regard to this very important legislation. Both political parties guaranteed to the voters of the Nation in the campaign of 1952 that they stood for statehood for Alaska. Now is the time to make good on that pledge.

The Alaska statehood bill has been favorably reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but it has become apparent that it will require completion of this discharge petition to bring it to the floor for action. I am convinced that when the bill reaches the floor it will be passed by a substantial majority.

In a speech made at Denver before he became President, General Eisenhower was quoted as saying that the granting of statehood to both Hawaii and Alaska would serve the people of the world as a practical symbol that America practices what it preaches.

And may I say that the signing of discharge petition No. 7 by every Member of the House would serve to show our political parties that we believe they should live up to the guaranties made in their campaign platforms.

OUTLAWING THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, on page 1869 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1954, will be found my bill to outlaw the Communist Party of the United States and its various components of affiliated, subsidiary, and frontal organizations, and to make membership in such organizations a crime.

This bill, as finally drafted, is largely the work of a very distinguished Democrat and member of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, Judge Michael Musmanno, who is the leading authority on the subject. I think the bill will be effective, and it is constitutional and will contain proper safeguards.

I will appreciate it if the Members of the House will read that bill, because if it is not reported by the Judiciary Committee, I intend to place a discharge petition on the desk.

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 328)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

For the purpose of strengthening the defense and economy of the United States and of the free world, I recommend that the Congress approve a number of amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. These amendments would accomplish this purpose, with proper security safeguards, through the following means:

First, widened cooperation with our allies in certain atomic energy matters;

Second, improved procedures for the control and dissemination of atomic energy information; and

Third, encouragement of broadened participation in the development of peacetime uses of atomic energy in the United States.

NUCLEAR PROGRESS

In 1946, when the Atomic Energy Act was written, the world was on the threshold of the atomic era. A new and elemental source of tremendous energy had been unlocked by the United States the year before. To harness its power in peaceful and productive service was even then our hope and our goal, but its awesome destructiveness overshadowed its potential for good. In the minds of most people this new energy was equated with the atomic bomb, and the bomb spelled the erasure of cities and the mass death of men, women, and children.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Moreover, this Nation's monopoly of atomic weapons was of crucial importance in international relations. The common defense and world peace required that this monopoly be protected and prolonged by the most stringent security safeguards.

In this atmosphere, the Atomic Energy Act was written. Well suited to conditions then existing, the act in the main is still adequate to the Nation's needs.

Since 1946, however, there has been great progress in nuclear science and technology. Generations of normal scientific development have been compressed into less than a decade. Each successive year has seen technological advances in atomic energy exceeding even progressive estimates. The anticipations of 1946, when Government policy was established and the Atomic Energy Act was written, have been far outdistanced.

One popular assumption of 1946—that the United States could maintain its monopoly in atomic weapons for an appreciable time—was quickly proved invalid. That monopoly disappeared in 1949, only 3 years after the Atomic Energy Act was enacted. But to counterbalance that debit on the atomic ledger there have been mighty increases in our assets.

A wide variety of atomic weapons—considered in 1946 to be mere possibilities of a distant future—have today achieved conventional status in the arsenals of our Armed Forces. The thermonuclear weapon—nonexistent 8 years ago—today dwarfs in destructive power all atomic weapons. The practicability of constructing a submarine with atomic propulsion was questionable in 1946; 3 weeks ago the launching of the U. S. S. *Nautilus* made it certain that the use of atomic energy for ship propulsion will ultimately become widespread. In 1946, too, economic industrial power from atomic energy sources seemed very remote; today, it is clearly in sight—largely a matter of further research and development, and the establishment of conditions in which the spirit of enterprise can flourish.

Obviously, such developments as these within so short a period should have had a profound influence on the Nation's atomic energy policy. But in a number of respects, our atomic energy law is still designed to fit the conditions of 1946.

Many statutory restrictions, based on such actual facts of 1946 as the American monopoly of atomic weapons and limited application of atomic energy in civilian and military fields, are inconsistent with the nuclear realities of 1954. Furthermore, these restrictions impede the proper exploitation of nuclear energy for the benefit of the American people and of our friends throughout the free world.

An objective assessment of these varied factors leads clearly to these conclusions: In respect to defense considerations, our atomic effectiveness will be increased if certain limited information on the use of atomic weapons can be imparted more readily to nations allied with us in common defense. In respect to peaceful applications of atomic energy, these can be developed more rapidly and their benefits more widely realized through broadened cooperation with friendly nations and through greater participation by American industry. By enhancing our military effectiveness, we strengthen our efforts to deter aggression; by enlarging opportunities for peacetime development, we accelerate our own progress and strengthen the free world.

Section 1 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 wisely recognizes the need for future revisions of the law. In its spirit and in consideration of matters of the utmost importance to the Nation's defense and welfare, I recommend that the Congress approve a number of amendments to the Atomic Energy Act.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER NATIONS

In this atomic era, the growth of international cooperation for the defense of the free world is the most heartening development on the world political scene. The United States is allied with many friends in measures to deter aggression and, where necessary, to defeat the aggressor. The agreements binding ourselves and our friends in common defense constitute a warning to any potential aggressor that his punishment will be swift and his defeat inevitable. These powerful influences for peace must be made as strong and convincing as possible.

Most of our friends among the nations have had little opportunity to inform themselves on the employment of atomic weapons. Under present law, we cannot give them tactical information essential to their effective participation with us in combined military operations and planning, and to their own defense against atomic attack.

Our own security will increase as our allies gain information concerning the use of and the defense against atomic weapons. Some of our allies, in fact, are now producing fissionable materials or weapons, supporting effective atomic energy research and developing peacetime uses for atomic power. But all of them should become better informed in the problems of atomic warfare and, therefore, better prepared to meet the contingency of such warfare. In order for the free world to be an effective defense unit, it must be geared to the atomic facts of this era.

I urge, therefore, that authority be provided to exchange with nations participating in defensive arrangements with the United States such tactical information as is essential to the development of defense plans and to the training of personnel for atomic warfare. Amendments to the definition of "restricted data" recommended later in this message will also contribute to needed administrative flexibility in the exchange of information with such nations concerning the use of atomic weapons.

To meet a specific defense need existing in 1951, the Congress approved a carefully limited procedure for the communication of information on the processing of atomic raw materials, reactor development, production of fissionable materials, and related research and development. These limitations should now be modified so that the authority to communicate information, adjusted to present conditions, may be better used to our national advantage.

In the development of peaceful uses for atomic energy, additional amendments are required for effective United States cooperation with friendly nations. Such cooperation requires the exchange of certain "restricted data" on the industrial applications of atomic energy and also the release of fissionable materials in amounts adequate for industrial and research use. I therefore recommend that the Atomic Energy Act be amended to authorize such cooperation. Such amendments should prescribe that before the conclusion of any arrangements for the transfer of fissionable material to a foreign nation, assurances must be provided against its use by the recipient nation for military purposes.

Sharing certain information with other nations involves risks that must be weighed, in each instance, against the net advantages to the United States. In each case, we must be guided by such considerations as: The sensitivity and importance of the data, the specific uses to which the information will be put, the security standards of the cooperating nation, its role in the common defense of the free world, and the contributions it has made and can make to the mutual security effort. Such considerations apply to the exchange or communication of information on general defense planning and the employment of conventional weapons as well as to the information that could be exchanged pursuant to these recommendations.

These recommendations are apart from my proposal to seek a new basis for international cooperation in the field of atomic energy as outlined in my address before the General Assembly of the United Nations last December. Consideration of additional legislation which may be needed to implement that proposal should await the development of areas of agreement as a result of our discussions with other nations.

In a related area, present law prevents United States citizens or corporations from engaging directly or indirectly in the production of fissionable material outside the United States, except upon determination by the President that the proposed activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security. Matters that have arisen under this provision have been ordinary business or commercial activities which nevertheless fall within the broad statutory prohibition because they might contribute in some degree, however minor, to foreign atomic-energy programs. The President should be enabled to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to make future determinations of this nature. This amendment is related also to the above amendment concerning the exchange of information with other countries, as arrangements for authorized exchanges of information with friendly foreign governments may involve participation by American citizens or firms in work in foreign countries. The proposed amendment would permit the Atomic Energy Commission also to authorize such participation.

All of these proposed amendments should make it clear that the authority granted must be exercised only in accordance with conditions prescribed by the President to protect the common defense and security.

PROTECTION OF ATOMIC-ENERGY INFORMATION

A special category of "restricted data," so defined as to include virtually all atomic-energy data of security significance, is now established by law. "Restricted data" are protected in the law by special espionage provisions, provisions relating to the control, dissemination and declassification of such data, and by requirements for personnel security clearance.

Personnel security: The provisions of the act relating to security clearances of personnel need improvement in several respects. The act does not recognize degrees of sensitivity of "restricted data." The same clearance requirements apply to any type of "restricted data," whether it be access by the unskilled construction laborer to "restricted data" of only marginal security significance, or access by a scientist to the heart of atomic weapons information. The Atomic Energy Commission lacks sufficient latitude under present law to determine the extent of personnel investigation needed for adequate security. Many costly background investigations required by present law are unnecessary. The Atomic Energy Commission should be permitted to relate the scope of investigation required under the act to the significance of the access to "restricted data" which will be permitted.

This amendment is especially pertinent to the proposed broadening of private participation in the development of atomic power. While such private participants will require access to "restricted data" on reactor technology, full investigations of all their employees who will have such access are not warranted because much of the data involved will not have significant security importance. Moreover, such investigations would impede and discourage the desired participation and would be unnecessarily costly both to Government and to industry. Where access to more sensitive "restricted data" is involved, the Commission must, of course, require full investigations.

Another security-clearance problem relates to personnel of Department of Defense agencies and to the personnel of contractors with those agencies. The Atomic Energy Commission may now disclose "restricted data" to such of these personnel as have security clearances from the Department of Defense. The "restricted data" so disclosed by the Commission are thereafter protected in accordance with Department of Defense security regulations. And yet, contractors of the Commission are precluded by law from granting the same personnel access to the same "restricted data" until they have had AEC clearances, based on investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Civil Service Commission.

As applications of atomic energy become increasingly widespread within the armed services, the necessity increases for communication of "restricted data" between AEC contractors and participants in related Department of Defense programs. The present fact that personnel engaged in military programs who have military clearances must be denied access to "restricted data" by AEC contractor personnel impedes cooperation between the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission in areas of mutual interest and causes unnecessary expense in time and money. I, therefore, recommend that the Atomic Energy Commission be enabled to authorize its contractors and licensees to afford access to "restricted data" to personnel engaged in Department of Defense programs who need such data in their work and who possess the proper military security clearances.

The definition of restricted data:

(1) A large body of "restricted data" under present law relates primarily to military utilization of atomic weapons. The responsibility for the control of much of this weapons information logically should rest with the Department of Defense rather than with the Commission. Many administrative difficulties that are produced by a dual system of security would be eliminated by the removal of this weapons information from the "restricted data" category and its subsequent protection by the Department of Defense in the same manner and under the same safeguards as other military secrets.

This method of handling weapons information is not possible under present law. "Restricted data" can be removed from the statutory "restricted data" category only by declassification, upon a determination by the Atomic Energy Commission that the publication of such data would not adversely affect the common defense and security. Declassification obviously is not the remedy. The remedy lies in reliance upon the standard security measures of the user, the Department of Defense. I recommend, therefore, that the statutory definition of "restricted data" be amended to exclude information concerning the utilization of atomic weapons, as distinguished from information on their theory, design, and manufacture.

(2) In addition to information which falls wholly within the utilization category, there is information which concerns primarily the utilization of weapons but which pertains also to their design and manufacture. In order to avoid difficulties in this marginal zone, I recommend legislation which also would authorize removal of such information from the "restricted data" category. This would be done only when the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine that it relates primarily to military utilization of atomic weapons and that it can be adequately safeguarded as classified defense information under the Espionage Act and other applicable law.

(3) Consistent with these changes, I recommend that the Department of Defense join with the Atomic Energy Commission in any declassification of "restricted data" which relate primarily to military utilization of atomic weapons and which can be published without endangering the national security. Thus, the Department of Defense will have an appropriate voice in the protection and declassification of such "restricted data" and the responsibilities of the Commission will be clarified with respect to all other "restricted data."

DOMESTIC DEVELOPMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY

What was only a hope and a distant goal in 1946—the beneficient use of atomic energy in human service—can soon be a reality. Before our scientists and engineers lie rich possibilities in the harnessing of atomic power. The Federal Government can pioneer in its development. But, in this undertaking, the enterprise, initiative and competitive spirit of individuals and groups within our free economy are needed to assure the greatest efficiency and progress at the least cost to the public.

Industry's interest in this field is already evident. In collaboration with the Atomic Energy Commission, a number of private corporations are now conducting studies, largely at their own expense, of the various reactor types which might be developed to produce economic power. There are indications that they would increase their efforts significantly if the way were open for private investment in such reactors. In amending the law to permit such investment, care must be taken to encourage the development of this new industry in a manner as nearly normal as possible, with careful regulation to protect the national security and the public health and safety. It is essential that this program so proceed that this new industry will develop self-reliance and self-sufficiency.

The creation of opportunities for broadened industrial participation may permit the Government to reduce its own reactor research and development after private industrial activity is well established. For the present, in addition to contributing toward the advancement of power-reactor technology, the Government will continue to speed progress in the related technology of military propulsion reactors. The present complementary efforts of industry and Government will therefore continue, and industry should be encouraged by the enactment of appropriate legislation to assume a substantially more significant role. To this end, I recommend amendments to the Atomic Energy Act which would:

1. Relax statutory restrictions against ownership or lease of fissionable material and of facilities capable of producing fissionable material.

2. Permit private manufacture, ownership, and operation of atomic reactors and related activities, subject to necessary safeguards and under licensing systems administered by the Atomic Energy Commission.

3. Authorize the Commission to establish minimum safety and security regulations to govern the use and possession of fissionable material.

4. Permit the Commission to supply licensees special materials and services needed in the initial stages of the new industry at prices estimated to compensate the Government adequately for the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

value of the materials and services and the expense to the Government in making them available.

5. Liberalize the patent provisions of the Atomic Energy Act, principally by expanding the area in which private patents can be obtained to include the production as well as utilization of fissionable material, while continuing for a limited period the authority to require a patent owner to license others to use an invention essential to the peacetime applications of atomic energy.

Until industrial participation in the utilization of atomic energy acquires a broader base, considerations of fairness require some mechanism to assure that the limited number of companies, which as Government contractors now have access to the program, cannot build a patent monopoly which would exclude others desiring to enter the field. I hope that participation in the development of atomic power will have broadened sufficiently in the next 5 years to remove the need for such provisions.

In order to encourage the greatest possible progress in domestic application of atomic energy, flexibility is necessary in licensing and regulatory provisions of the legislation. Until further experience with this new industry has been gained, it would be unwise to try to anticipate by law all of the many problems that are certain to arise. Just as the basic Atomic Energy Act recognized by its own terms that it was experimental in a number of respects, so these amendments will be subject to continuing future change and refinement.

The destiny of all nations during the 20th century will turn in large measure upon the nature and the pace of atomic energy development here and abroad. The revisions to the Atomic Energy Act herein recommended will help make it possible for American atomic energy development, public and private, to play a full and effective part in leading mankind into a new era of progress and peace.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 17, 1954.*

ATOM-FOR-PEACE PLANT IN LAWRENCE, MASS.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the United States is falling behind in the commercial development of atomic energy.

We must have atomic industries as well as atomic weapons.

There is no better place to get on with this modernizing process than in those areas that are losing their old industries and have not yet acquired new ones to replace them.

We urge the President to approve of Lawrence, Mass., as the logical site for a pilot plant to pioneer in this field.

First. Because this region has not been favored with the public hydroelectric power plants that have benefited other sections of the Nation, and have been financed in part by tax revenues taken from Massachusetts.

Second. Because Lawrence has a large pool of labor trained for production-type work.

Third. Because Lawrence is close to the greatest research centers in the world.

Fourth. Because Lawrence is in the process of industrial change.

Fifth. Because Lawrence, without raw materials or natural resources like cotton, wool, coal, oil, or minerals, must fill the gap, by development of atomic potentialities poses no bulk-transportation problem.

Sixth. Because Lawrence offers 100 percent community cooperation.

Seventh. Because Lawrence has been promised aid.

Appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission will rise from $2.2 billion this year, and reach $2.4 billion under the 1955 fiscal budget. This Government monopoly, under military secrecy, is not required to give a breakdown as to how, or where, such moneys are spent. We, therefore, request the President to recommend an atom-for-peace plant in the Lawrence area. We have the available plants and the skilled workers. We urge the Atomic Energy Commission to buy and lease these plants to private contractors like General Motors or Union Carbide, operate such a project itself, or encourage such growth industries in the application of nuclear energy to locate here.

This the Government can do.

With the great uranium resources being discovered in Canada, and with the rich industrial ore bodies being brought into production by United States companies in Labrador and Quebec, just to the north of us, and accessible by every means of transportation, Massachusetts is in a key position to participate in this newest phase of material progress.

As atomic energy is under Federal control, we must depend upon the United States Government to open the way for industrial development that will enable Lawrence and other labor-surplus areas to experience an economic rebirth.

For that we look to the President for bold, imaginative, and practical leadership.

We are eager to do our part.

Now we plead with the Government for its cooperation.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House today for 20 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LANDS

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for the exchange of certain public and private lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4646, with Mr. O'KONSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday all time for general debate had expired. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the committee substitute amendment printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point, as we propose to offer a substitute amendment for the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

That whenever the United States finds it necessary to acquire for any public use timberlands which are being operated as part of a unit to provide a sustained yield of timber for processing purposes, and such acquisition reduces the allowable cut of the sustained-yield unit to such an extent as to interfere with the existing processing operation, the department or agency responsible for the activity in connection with which such timberlands are being acquired shall, insofar as practicable, provide that similar and suitable federally owned lands situated within the same community area, economically accessible for the processing operation and adequate to permit continuation of the processing operation to the same degree as at the time of taking, shall be transferred to the owners of the private lands acquired, if said owners so elect, as compensation pro tanto for the lands taken. The values to be ascribed to the federally owned and privately owned lands involved in such transactions shall be fixed by negotiation or in the manner applicable to condemnation proceedings. The department or agency having jurisdiction over the federally owned lands shall cooperate with the Federal department or agency responsible for the activity in connection with which the timberlands are being acquired, in carrying out the provisions of this act, and, to that end, is authorized to transfer available lands to the other department or agency without reimbursement or transfer of funds.

SEC. 2. The court in which a proceeding for the condemnation of any such timberlands is pending shall have jurisdiction, upon notice and opportunity for hearing to the department or agency having jurisdiction of federally owned timberlands, to enter an order requiring a transfer of such federally owned lands in accordance with the first section of this act if it determines (a) that such federally owned lands meet the requirements for such transfer prescribed by the first section of this act, and (b) that such transfer is consistent with the public interest.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday there was some discussion as to whether there were sustained-yield units in the State of Montana. I had our committee staff contact the Forestry Division of the Department of Agriculture for timber management, and I wish to furnish the following for the RECORD. The Forest Service supplied me with this information, with specific reference to Montana and the Columbia River Basin in Montana and Idaho. The facts are these:

First. There are no privately owned sustained-yield timber operations in Montana.

Second. In portions of Montana and Idaho embracing the Columbia River

Basin there are 5 to 10 holdings now being managed with the objective of sustained yield operations.

Third. Three such Montana outfits have this objective; none can be said to be on a sustained-yield basis with privately owned lands at this time.

Fourth. The three are: J. Niells Lumber Co., Libby; Anaconda Copper Co.; and Diamond Match Co.

Fifth. The Niells Lumber Co. is not a privately owned sustained-yield operation under any circumstances. The capacity might approximate 100 million feet per year considering the land and timber owned by the company. There is nearby Federal timberland which could be used by competitive bid. To operate at mill capacity with sustained yield it would be necessary for this company to get 50 to 60 percent of its cut from the national forests.

Sixth. There are 11 national forests in Montana. The Forest Service has set up what it calls working circles. It is the intent to operate them as sustained-yield timber operations. Presently only two, Gallatin and Lewis and Clark, in eastern Montana, are substantially operated on a sustained-yield cutting basis.

Seventh. In Montana, 330 million board feet annual cut are available, and at the present time only slightly over 200 million are now being cut.

For the information of the House, at the present time in the United States there is a 6.8 billion annual cut available and a 5.1 billion annual cut actually made. The reason for these short cuts, of course, is lack of administrative facilities and accessibility, marketing, and so forth.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter in which I am deeply interested. I live in what is known as the Kisatchie National Forest in Louisiana. Practically all of that forest is in the eighth congressional district.

I find no fault with my friends who think they are doing right when they come here to try to fix it so that the Federal Government can acquire just a little more land. I know the argument is fine and nice to say that we are doing this for recreational purposes, that we want to raise more game, that we want to make it a better fishing place, that we want to keep the big boys from getting the land.

In my district the big boys do not have to get the land. The Federal Government has the land, and it sells the timber in such large quantities and it costs so much that a little boy cannot buy the timber and the big boys get it.

This thing does not work just the way you think it does. The Federal Government has been acquiring land for a number of years to the detriment of the citizenship of this country.

Let us see how they do this job. I would like just to show you how it works. During World War II they came into my district and the Federal Government acquired 157,000 acres. They moved 1,000 people off that land. They paid them the assessed price, which was $5 an acre. Those poor people were doing the best they could, hoping that some day the Federal Government would sell the land back to them. Finally the war was over and the Federal Government said, "Yes, we will sell the land back to you at just what it cost, but you must pay cash and you must make an affidavit that you are buying it for yourselves, and you cannot sell any part of this land to help you to pay for it."

Now these people have gone away and have built a small home somewhere. They spent all the money they got from the Federal Government. They had no money with which to buy back the land and very few people did buy back the land. What happened? The Forest Service got 157,000 acres of land at that time. All around these 157,000 acres of land that I am talking to you about is a forest, the Kisatchie National Forest. These poor little farmers begged the Government to trade them some land and they would be willing to pay the differences in the price of the timber that was on the land, but not 1 foot could they acquire. This day there are over a million acres in my district, and there is not 1 foot that any soldier who fought in any war can get so that he can have a home and take care of his loved ones. Little fellows walk the highways and byways, working by the day because they cannot get land, while a million acres are owned by the Government. Yet, these people cannot acquire that land. I tell you, my friends, it is high time that the Federal Government stopped going into business—the land business and the timber business. It is high time that we let the little individuals own some land. You talk about raising timber. Some of the prettiest timber that I know of is on small farms right in my district, owned by little farmers. The little farmer sells a few logs. He buys himself a car and he repairs his home. The timberland can be used for pasture and it is used for pasture. It is a grand thing. If this land, or at least some of it—and I have a bill in now by which I hope to accomplish this very thing—could be sold to small landowners so that they could make a better living, it would be wonderful. They talk about the Government paying taxes and they say the Government is going to pay taxes. Do not kid yourselves.

In my district there are three parishes today that could not operate their schools if it were not for the donations of money that they get from the State and the Federal Government, because the Federal Government owns all of the land and is paying no taxes on that land. Yes, they are going to pay some taxes—they do—they have had this land about 40 years. For the first 15 years they paid practically nothing and now they pay about 25 cents or less. Throughout the 70 years they have had possession of it and did not operate it, they paid less than 5 cents an acre. And yet that land stands there today. As I told you, they are deadening the oak trees and every tree that produces food. Yet, they say they are going to raise some deer and some squirrels. Why, there will not be enough food in that forest to feed one church mouse a year, to say nothing of a lot of deer.

I think we should look into this proposition. I do not think this bill goes far enough. I think we should pass a law requiring the Federal Government to pay a man in land, if he wants it, in sections where the Government is going to take land and in which it owns land, on which it is going to raise timber or for other purposes. Why, right off of my little farm, in the hills that I am talking about, they took 80 acres from me. Of course, I was fortunate in that I was able to buy my land back, but hundreds of people right next to me did not buy their land back. Today it is owned by the national forests. Do you want to do business with the national forest? You try it. You cannot drive a wedge into them to save your life. They are the most arrogant bunch in the whole United States of America. They will not talk to you about anything—I do not care whether you are a Congressman or a justice of the peace. You cannot do business with them. They are a closed corporation. They do not even keep an office here. You have to see somebody in Atlanta, Ga., if you want to get anything done in the Kisatchie Forest in my district. You cannot find out what is going on. If you think you can, just try it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill is passed. I cannot see any reason why anybody should be disturbed about the big boys going to buy up the land. The big boy has the land and if you cut it up in any way, he will do even better. Do you know who the big boy is? It is Uncle Sam. We come here and we talk against socialism. Oh, yes; I am opposed to socialism.

What is socialism? Under socialism, the Government owns the land, does it not? Then we are one-fourth Socialists now, because the Federal Government owns one-fourth of all the land in the United States of America. I say, let the land go back to the people and to private enterprise, if we do not need it for other purposes. If we need the land for schools, or if we need it for dam sites, or for something else, we can acquire that land.

This is just a step in the right direction. As I said, it does not go far enough.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The clerk read the committee amendment as follows:

That whenever the United States finds it necessary to acquire for any public use timberlands which are being operated as part of a forest area to provide a sustained yield of timber for processing purposes, and such acquisition reduces the allowable cut of the sustained yield operation to such an extent as to seriously interfere with the existing processing operation, the department or agency responsible for the activity in connection with which such timberlands are being acquired shall, consistent with the public interest and, insofar as practicable, provide that similar and suitable federally owned lands situated within the same community area, economically accessible for the processing operation and adequate to permit

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

continuation of the processing operation to the same degree as at the time of taking, shall be transferred to the owners of the private lands acquired if said owners so elect, as compensation pro tanto for the lands taken. The values to be ascribed to the federally owned and privately owned lands involved in such transactions shall be fixed by negotiation or in the manner applicable to condemnation proceedings. The department or agency having jurisdiction over the federally owned lands, shall participate with the Federal department or agency responsible for the activity in connection with which the timberlands are being acquired, in carrying out the provisions of this act, and, to that end, is authorized to transfer available lands to the other department or agency: *Provided*, That federally owned timberlands so transferred shall not include lands within the boundaries of national parks, national monuments, wildlife refuges, administrative sites, classified wilderness, wild or primitive areas, forest experimental areas, and developed recreation areas: *Provided further*, That any such transfer shall be made with reimbursement or transfer of funds for the value of the timberland transferred as determined by the transferring agency: *Provided further*, That before any transfer of federally owned timberlands shall be made under the provisions of this act an advisory public hearing may be held by the department or agency having jurisdiction over such lands for presentation of the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed transfer, including the views of interested persons as to whether (a) the private timberlands are being operated as part of a forest area to provide a sustained yield of timber for processing purposes; (b) the interference with the existing processing operation resulting from the acquisition of the privately owned timberlands will be substantial or serious; and (c) the transfer will be in the public interest. Notice of the hearing shall be given in such manner as will afford interested parties ample opportunity to appear.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will be found in the supplemental report and is in the nature of an amendment to the amendment. It is an amendment in the second degree.

You will remember in the debate yesterday it was stated that when this bill came before the Rules Committee in the last session, certain objections were offered to the legislation. Since then the proponents of the bill have met with the objectors and have done their best to write an amendment to the bill that would meet those objections. That is the amendment which has just been read.

I want to read very briefly the objections that were raised during the course of these meetings and then give you the citation in the amendment that meets those objections. It was an honest attempt to meet every objection that was raised.

Objection: Lands included in national parks, national monuments, wilderness areas, and so forth, should not be eligible for exchange.

Amendment: The first proviso in the suggested amendment reads as follows:

Provided, That federally owned timberlands so transferred shall not include lands within the boundaries of national parks, national monuments, wildlife refuges, administrative sites, wild or wilderness areas, forest experimental areas, and developed recreation areas.

Objection: The department or agency responsible for the administration of federally owned lands to be transferred would have no part in the selection of such lands.

Amendment: This objection is completely removed by substituting in the printed bill the word "participate" for the word "cooperate." This objection is further met by the third proviso which provides for advisory public hearings to be held by the department or agency having jurisdiction over lands which might be transferred.

Objection: Other processing operations in the same general area which depend on sustained-yield production from the national forest would be injured if lands on which such operation depend for timber where transferred in an exchange as provided in the bill.

Amendment: In the third proviso in the amendment which provides for a public hearing (c) reads as follows—and that—"the transfer will be in the public interest."

Objection: One Member stated:

There should also be some method of inspection to determine whether or not a landowner who seeks to benefit by the act actually is practicing sustained yield management and some additional guarantee that he will maintain such practices on any Federal land transferred to him.

Amendment: This objection is answered in several ways, not only in the bill as written, but in the proposed amendment. However, the point is assumed to be strengthened by (a) in the third proviso which requires that one purpose of a public hearing is to determine whether "the private timberlands are being operated as a part of a forest area to provide a sustained yield of timber for processing purposes." So far as the additional guarantee is concerned, that would more properly be taken care of administratively by merely including a reservation in the deed of transfer.

Objection: The agency taking the land should be required to reimburse the agency from which the lands are transferred by a transfer of funds.

Amendment: The second proviso in the suggested amendment reads as follows:

Provided further, That any such transfer shall be made with reimbursement or transfer of funds for the value of timberland transferred as determined by the transferring agency.

It is pertinent note that in connection with this proviso that such reimbursement to the Forest Service, which would be the agency from which practically all lands would be transferred, would be covered into the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt as provided in United States Code, title 16, section 499. This section reads as follows:

All money received by or on account of the Forest Service for timber, or from any other source of national-forest revenue, including moneys received from sale of products from or for the use of lands in national forests created under section 471 (b) of this title, and moneys received on account of permits for hunting, fishing, or camping on lands acquired under authority of sections 513–517 and 521 of this title, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt.

I think if you will examine the debate of yesterday which you will find in the RECORD you will see that these amendments offered at this time by the committee meet the objections that have been raised to the bill, and I urge the amendment be adopted.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. METCALF to the committee amendment: In line 23 of the proposed committee amendment change the colon to a comma after the words "developed recreation areas" and insert the following: "or any national forest lands being operated as a part of a unit to provide a sustained yield of timber for processing purposes."

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, the committee has examined this amendment and finds no reason why it should object to its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have several thoughts in connection with this bill which I think should be presented to the membership.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] made a lot of statements that I have had some experience with the Forest Service on. Speaking of lots for house building, I think that service is very cooperative. I happened to have been out in Dakota, Wyoming, and Colorado last year and I saw a number of areas the Forest Service had laid out in order to make possible the acquisition of land for homes for veterans and small people. If you have had any experience with real estate you know the worst thing that can happen to any area is for it to be developed indiscriminately, where there are no restrictions or definite plans for future development. That is what I know the Forest Service insists on a definite plan. I think it is a very wonderful provision.

I also hear about this enormous area of land the Government owns. I know that a number of Members here had the opportunity to make a trip to Las Vegas last year. I was fortunate enough to be privileged to sit up in the cockpit of the plane going out there for an hour or so, and let me tell you that if the Indians want most of that land out there I certainly would vote to give it back to them, because I do not see what it possibly could be used for unless we develop some way of getting water to them.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUMMA. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that less than 10 percent of the land area of the Nation is in national forests. With the growth of our population, which is now around 160 million, I do not think it is exorbitant to have 10 percent of our land in national forests. It is not as exaggerated as it might appear here from some of the statements that have been made as to

the amount of land held by the Government. Certainly this country is going to grow, and we need to preserve these national forests for the generations that are to follow. My personal opinion is that the national forests should be left alone. Under the amendment offered here today, the bill is certainly far more palatable than when it was presented during the latter part of the last session of the Congress.

Mr. MUMMA. I thank the gentleman for his observation. You know, we are getting into what the Lord has stored up over a period of thousands of years. Virgin timber on the west coast is rapidly disappearing. Up in Pennsylvania there is very little, if any, virgin timber left.

Another thing that has been brought out, and I think dragged around here a lot, is the matter of sustained yield. Sustained yield is nothing but the practice of good forestry. That is the objective. I do not believe that sustained yield can be accomplished with any assurance except by the Federal Government. It is a too long-range proposition for private industry. I have seen up in the coalfields of Pennsylvania where some of these large coal companies have initiated forestry on sustained yield in order to guarantee them a continued supply of mine props. Well, when the mining business got bad they sold the timber for whatever use they could make of it to pay current expenses, and there was no guaranty that they had to keep this up. That, I think, is the weakness of this bill.

We have had a lot of talk about sustained yield, but the gentleman from Montana, I think in his first statement this morning, said there was very little sustained yield practiced by private people, and that is the same thing that I mentioned in connection with the hard-coal companies. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. 25 or 30 years ago embarked upon a forestry proposition which was to maintain a supply of ties. The Bayless Pulp & Paper Co., at Austin, had previously supplied users of ties. A proposition of sustained yield. When the going got bad and the visible supply of timber disappeared, to maintain their financial position they started to cut in. I tell you, those hills in Potter County are pretty bare.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUMMA. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman's statement regarding the rather small amount of acreage in the country that is actually on sustained yield under private ownership is correct. But, that acreage is growing and has grown rapidly during the past 10 years under the tree-farm movement which has taken in some 3 million acres within the last 10 to 15 years. However, as I said on yesterday, one of the most important reasons for passing this legislation is that it is a direct and a very important incentive to private owners of timber to place their land under sustained yield so that, in the event the Government moves into their area, they might be able to qualify to have land replaced for the land which might be taken by the Government.

Mr. MUMMA. I thank the gentleman. I am very much for sustained yield. There is no use trying to provide the future with timber unless we have a sustained yield. But, there is no guarantee. May I ask the gentleman this question? Is there a guaranty in any of these bills that these companies will keep on practicing sustained yield? There is nothing in this bill that would guarantee that, I understand.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. May I answer the gentleman in this way. First of all, a provision can be put in the deed of transfer mentioned by the chairman of the committee. However, there is a better guaranty than that, that it is prudent business judgment to keep the property on a sustained-yield basis. It has been proven to be prudent business judgment. In other words, the owner will make money by keeping his land on that basis and grow the timber as a crop. I think there could not be any better guaranty than that, even though one could be written in legal terms.

Mr. MUMMA. Well, these big firms did pretend to know about practicing forestry, but they finally petered out on it. The absolute assurance of continued sustained yield is in letting the Forest Service make these timber sales, which you know they are constantly making out in your territory. I get the Western Forest Review, and there you will find big columns of sales of timber to small concerns. And, I know that the Forest Service does recognize the small logger. That is where they get the timber, and the small logger can get in there. Everyone cannot have a big mill, but they can take the material in.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. And the small owner can use it.

Mr. MUMMA. That is right, but the little fellow is not pushed out of the picture. Out there around the Simpson operation, there are several people who were loggers, who were buying Forest Service timber on sustained-yield areas and hauling to mills in the sustained-yield areas. I say that the definite assurance of this should be to let them in the national forests. They are just as much interested in maintaining a steady crop. Take out in those big Douglas-fir areas, lightning lops off the tops of them, and they are wonderful places for forest fires to originate; maybe 50 a day just occasioned by lightning.

Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to make a vote or lose one for this bill, but I am telling you, if you want this sustained yield, you better put this in some hands so that it is guaranteed. As I said, I cannot see anything in this bill that would guarantee it. Financial situations do change. In my short business experience I have found that it takes a fellow about 7 years to go broke. He is broke 7 years before he knows it. As his expenses go up and his capital starts to dwindle he cuts into those assets. That is what I have seen happen in Pennsylvania time and again.

Mr. GAVIN. I think the gentleman is correct. We know now that the national forests are under a sustained-yield program. But in the event the lands were exchanged and a corporation would take them over, and in 15 or 20 years it would go bankrupt, it could not continue to carry on the sustained-yield program because it would not be in existence.

I keep on getting back to this public law of 1944, where instead of exchanging lands any organization that would be affected in its sustained-yield program would come back, because this act states:

> To promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth.

I feel certain that arrangements could be made if any land was taken from a company whereby they could get a part of the national forest to continue their sustained-yield program to meet the needs and demands of that particular area which is affected.

Mr. MUMMA. My final statement is this: Does the average Member of Congress who is going to vote on this bill know that the majority of the trees which they are now cutting have taken at least 400 years to grow? The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] spoke yesterday of an 80-year rotation. Let us stretch it to 100. We are trying to accomplish in 80 or 100 years what the Almighty has taken 400 years at least to produce. It just cannot be done.

Give this matter serious consideration. Nobody is going to be hurt if this bill is not passed. There is not even a mineral provision in the bill.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to answer some of the statements made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has just spoken.

First of all, the last comment the gentleman made was that no one would be hurt by the failure to pass this proposed legislation. If that were true, this bill would never have been introduced. The reason this bill was introduced, and introduced by me, was that I know that if the Federal Government continues to build reclamation, flood control, and other projects where in the construction of which large acreages of timberland are acquired from private owners, there are going to be communities wiped out where people have jobs and homes and stores. If it were not for that fact this bill would have never been introduced. There will be great harm to quite a number of people if this bill is not enacted.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Can the gentleman point out the way in which a specific community would be put out of business? As I understand the facts, you are going to take out of production a given amount of timberland, but this bill will not grow any new timber, it will just

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

transfer the title of that land to the large lumber-holding companies. In other words, the same people would probably cut the timber and the hauler would be the same, but just the title to this land would be assigned to some other people—to private investors. You cannot cause any more timber to grow there, can you, sir?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That is the gentleman's assumption. As a matter of fact, it might or might not be true, because the owner whose lands have been taken by the Government has no assurance whatever that he will be able to buy timber to operate his mill. He has no guaranty whatever for the future.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further at this time. I may take time later when I will be glad to yield, but I do want to make a further point now with reference to some specific statements that have been made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. There is the assumption that he makes, and which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] makes as well as others, that because land lies within the forest boundaries with the title in the Federal Government that that land is being perfectly managed and is being ideally managed over a sustained yield program. That is very, very far from being a fact. Just because the land happens to be under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service is no guarantee whatever that that land is operated under a sustained yield. As a matter of fact, less than a third of the total acreage managed by the Forest Service is under what the Forest Service itself would consider or claim to be sustained yield practices. According to the reports of the Forest Service, they should be harvesting, if the property were actually managed under a sustained yield basis, somewhere around 6.8 billion feet annually. That is if those lands were operated under a sustained yield basis. As a matter of fact, production has never been over 5 billion feet, and the limit for all time, I believe, was last year. So this assumption that just because the Government owns something it is well managed, and that because it is privately owned it is badly managed, I think is a very erroneous assumption to make.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The facts are that undoubtedly the Forest Service would carry on a more extensive program if the Congress would appropriate money to permit them to increase their activities; is that not so?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I think that is so although the Forest Service does receive some $75 million a year, and they have about 10,000 employees. I think they are fairly well taken care of by the Congress. The one place that Congress has not taken care of the forest property is in the matter of money for roads, but that is another subject that is not within the scope of the bill presently before us.

Mr. GAVIN. The fact is that they are one branch of the Government that is really paying their own way right now.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. They are almost paying their own way but not quite.

Mr. GAVIN. According to their figures last year, they did a little bit better than pay their own way, in fact, they took in about $12 million more than they paid out.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The Bureau of Land Management really is operating at a substantial revenue return to the Treasury, but not this agency.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman believes, I am sure, that if the Congress would appropriate sufficient money to increase their activities they could carry on a more extensive program as far as the production of timber in the forests is concerned, is that not correct?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. May I say to the gentleman that if the Congress would appropriate the proper amount of money for road construction in and to the national forests so that the total harvest allowed in the national forest could be made, the property would be on a sustained yield basis, but the fact is that it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. METCALF: Amend the proposed committee amendment by changing the period to a colon after the words "to appear" on line 36 and insert the following: "*And provided further*, That title to the lands involved shall not be transferred, and that it shall be determined that such exchange of timber will not impair the efficient administration or operation of the overall unit of land on which the exchanged timber is situated."

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, the amendment reads in the first phrase, "title to the land involved shall not be transferred." The whole purpose of the legislation is to transfer title. Therefore, this amendment is contrary to the whole purpose of the bill.

Mr. METCALF. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order so that I may speak on the amendment?

Mr. D'EWART. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. What the gentleman from Montana says is correct. This language, "title to the lands involved shall not be transferred," is clearly outside the purpose of this bill and has nothing to do with the bill itself. The bill is based entirely upon the transfer of land, but the point that I want to make further is that that language goes much further than the purpose and intent of this bill. It goes clear out into far fields, for it says, "title to the lands involved shall not be transferred." There are privately owned and Government-owned lands involved. If this amendment should by any chance prevail, we are denied the ordinary condemnation proceedings of the Government for acquiring land. This bill would prohibit the transfer of any of these lands. It goes quite outside of the intent and purpose of this bill and affects other legislation which in itself is not germane to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Montana desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe, in view of the committee amendment in the supplemental report, that this refers to all lands involved. It refers only to the land that would be exchanged, lands that would be transferred to a sustained yield operator, rather than lands that would be transferred to the Federal Government in their acquisition.

As far as the amendment not being germane is concerned, the bill involves the transfer of timber rights; not the transfer of title. I think this amendment only secures to the Forest Service and to the Government the proposition that title shall remain in the Government, and the timber rights shall be preserved, which is the purpose of H. R. 4646 and is the stated purpose of the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'KONSKI). The Chair is ready to rule. The committee amendment provides that whenever the United States finds it necessary to acquire timberlands being operated as part of a unit to provide a sustained yield for processing purposes, the private owners from whom such lands are acquired may under certain conditions elect to be compensated therefor by exchange of other federally owned timberlands, and certain limitations are imposed upon such exchanges.

The amendment of the gentleman from Montana seems to have the same objective but it provides somewhat different and additional conditions upon such exchanges.

As is indicated in sections 3054 through 3056, volume 8, of Cannon's Precedents, to a proposition to accomplish a certain purpose by one method a proposition to achieve the same purpose by another closely related method is germane.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment of the gentleman from Montana falls into this category and, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday, we must remember that we are here concerned with land that is capable of several uses. While timber is growing on this land, the lands can be grazed, prospectors can explore for minerals on that land. Before the timber is ready to be marketed it becomes a wildlife refuge and recreation ground for hunters and fishermen. We are concerned in this country with opportunities for making a profit out of the timber, out of the materials, out of the beef cattle grazed on these various lands. None of us wants to impair the opportunity to make a profit on all of these forest lands, but we are also concerned with perpetuating these forest lands so that they can be held to make a profit for succeeding generations. We are concerned with the opportunity in each succeeding generation, so that the small operators can begin with a couple

of tractors, a bulldozer, and so on, and go to work and build up for themselves, under the free-enterprise system, a large sawmill operation.

That is why we want to preserve in the Forest Service this opportunity to allow smaller operators, independent operators to bid; and we resist the gradual consolidation into huge Federal ownership.

This amendment will do everything that the author of the bill seeks by his general legislation. He says that he wants to protect the timber owner who has a sustained yield in a constant supply of timber. If my amendment is adopted he will be protected in his constant supply of timber but the Forest Service will have jurisdiction over the land for all other multiple-purpose uses.

Let me give you a specific example relating to my district, because I know my district—and I apologize for always dragging it into this debate, but you can apply the example to your district as you know it and can compare it. In my district we have a site for the Libby Dam. Some day if Secretary McKay is right we are going to build Libby Dam. The J. Niells Lumber Co. that was mentioned by my colleague from Montana owns about 7,000 acres along the Kootenai River that will be inundated if Libby Dam is built. In all some 30,000 acres in this country will be inundated by that dam. Seven thousand acres will be flooded belonging to one private operator. If the Ellsworth bill is passed this operator will come in and exchange that bottom land for high-level watershed forests.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I presented testimony in my opening statement this afternoon that the J. Niells Lumber Co. operations were not a sustained-yield operation, and I quoted that testimony from the United States Forest Service.

Mr. METCALF. Yes, but if the gentleman will remember, on yesterday I read exactly the same statement from the Forest Service to the gentleman from Montana. They said:

> Sustained-yield management objectives are now being applied to a majority of the medium and large private holdings.

They went on and said further:

> In the portions of Montana and Idaho drained by the Columbia River from 5 to 10 major private holdings are now being managed with this objective.

That is exactly the language the gentleman used in his opening statement.

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct. They have that objective but they are not at this time on a sustained-yield basis.

Mr. METCALF. When we build the Libby Dam maybe the next year the J. Neills Lumber Co. will have a sustained-yield management objective.

Mr. D'EWART. Nor within the provisions of this bill because under the sustained-yield policy they would have to have 60 percent of their timber from the national forests and they could only get that in case the Forest Service was willing to sell.

Mr. METCALF. That is not correct. If the gentleman has read the plans drafted by the Forest Service in the matter of the Troy-Libby circle he will recall that there are negotiations going on right now between the Northern Pacific Railroad and the J. Neills Lumber Co. to acquire private timber holdings, and if they acquire the Northern Pacific Railroad's holdings they will have enough for a sustained-yield operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

(On request of Mr. GAVIN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. METCALF was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. METCALF. Let me point out that in the event that the J. Niells Lumber Co. which is now trying to establish the sustained-yield program which has had a hearing in Montana under Public Law 273 you have an actual sustained-yield program. In the event that those 7,000 acres are flooded they will be authorized by this bill to gain high watershed timber. They will have also to take over not only the timber but the recreation in that high-level watershed and they will have the Troy recreational area.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I think the gentleman misunderstands the bill. It does not give them the right to take over anything. The bill is on a purely permissive basis. The bill provides that the agency involved can permit it to be done. There is nothing in the bill that says they have the right to do it. Does the gentleman think that?

Mr. METCALF. If this bill is enacted into law when land is taken for a Federal purpose it gives a right in the event that you cannot convince a court that it is not in the public interest. If you went into court on a condemnation proceeding you would have the burden of proof to show the court that it was not in the public interest so far as the land being exchanged is concerned.

I want to point out that when this land is managed by the Forest Service in these working circles—my colleague from Montana mentioned 47 of them in the State of Montana—there is a program for protection of the recreational areas. Let me tell you some of the things they require.

First. Recreation: Harvest the timber products in such manner that cutting will not be detrimental to those areas where recreation is the dominant use. This will be accomplished by the following policies.

(a) A roadside strip of timber will be left along all primary and secondary main haul routes where intensive public or recreational use is contemplated. The reserve strip will be a width sufficient to insure the effective screening of the road and in no case will be so narrow as to cause excessive windfall across the roads.

(b) An effective strip of timber will be left around the borders of all lakes and streams to preserve the natural environment where intensive recreational use may be developed.

(c) All primary recreational use areas will be blocked out and cutting restricted to the minimum necessary to meet the potential recreational requirements.

(d) Insofar as practical, timber use roads will be located to provide access and protect recreational areas.

(e) Stream driving will not be permitted because of the detrimental effects of stream scouring, driving improvements, and sinkers upon the recreational potentials such as canoeing, camping, and fishing. This will apply to the secondary streams as well as the main river.

You turn this over to private timber operators and they will log right up to the level of the stream, they will cut every bit of timber up to the edge of the stream so that you could not tie a rowboat up there to a tree when you come in from fishing in the lake. They will cut right up to the edge of the road so that you will be driving through an area of denuded forests and over logged roads and areas that should be saved for recreational purposes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Anyone who is interested in conservation certainly should be for the gentleman's amendment because it gives the Government the right to keep up these things that are necessary, things that can be done even though logging is going on.

Mr. METCALF. Exactly. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

(At the request of Mr. FULTON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. METCALF was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, some of the most important services provided to the people of a community are these watersheds and recreational services that have very little commercial value. Who can appraise the value of a hunting or fishing stream? Who can appraise the value of a watershed?

The gentleman from Louisiana made an eloquent plea in behalf of the passage of this bill awhile ago; however let me say to him that if the watershed in my district, where the Missouri River rises, is not protected, it is going to affect the gentleman's district down there in Louisiana. On an exchange of land who can appraise the value of that watershed on a commercial basis? Who can appraise the potential value of minerals in that land and the value to prospectors? The mineral rights, apparently, under the gentleman's bill, will go with the land, which means that prospectors will be shut off. These people who are talking about private enterprise and freedom of opportunity are going to cut the freedom of opportunity of legitimate prospectors to search for minerals in the national forests.

Who can appraise the value of the taking away of a few acres from a base camp of a guide for hunting or fishing and the ancillary values of the national

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

forest to those people? We do not know what is going to happen.

Maybe these timber operators will say, we will let the hunters and fishermen roam the forests at will; but in their logging operations the fishing streams are not protected; in their logging operations we have not any protection of the temperature of the water and the keeping of the forage in proper shape around the streams. It is very seldom that even the most experienced operator under the sustained-yield program, and the best conservationists, from a cultural point of view, will spend additional money to preserve these recreational and these watershed values that are so essential to the community.

Mr. Chairman, it is for that purpose that I have submitted an amendment that title shall not pass. You get the timber in exchange, but the Forest Service maintains supervision over all these other services that are so valuable to the community, but upon which we can put very little commercial value.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I will be constrained to have to object if there are further requests for additional time.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a strange jumble of words. I urge the committee to reject it for a number of reasons.

First of all, the committee amendment, which the gentleman from Montana seeks to amend with this amendment now pending, was worked out most carefully. I happen to be the person who did finally submit the draft to the committee, but the draft was worked out with the help of the Solicitor of the United States Forest Service and one of the assistant chiefs. The amendment which is now pending, the committee amendment, is a workable, sound, administrative piece of legislation. What this amendment now offered by the gentleman from Montana would do to the bill, or what it would be administratively, nobody knows. There has been no testimony on it; there has been, as far as I know, no administrative department thought on it. It has an unusual wording. I submit to you that it is so ambiguous that it would make the House appear to be a little ridiculous to put it in a piece of legislation.

The second reason I believe it would be wise for the committee to reject the amendment is that the first phrase of the amendment says "that title to the land involved shall not be transferred." As I pointed out a little bit earlier, there are two kinds of lands involved in this bill, privately owned lands and Government lands.

The bill is presented for the purpose of making it possible to transfer lands under certain conditions. That is the intent and purpose of the bill. But, here we put in an amendment or talk about putting in an amendment which says that no lands or no title to any lands involved in the bill shall be transferred.

Let me point out that the bill is based upon the fact that the United States Government is about to acquire title to some lands, and it is with reference to those lands, and that particular situation becomes a particular part of this situation—it is with reference to those lands that this bill is drawn. Now, if we say, with this amendment, that the Government cannot acquire title to the lands which it proposes to take in the area where this bill might be applied, we have then collided right head on with all of the statutes having to do with condemnation. We say at one fell swoop to the agency which would build a project, for which it needs the land involved, "You cannot build that project because you cannot have title to the land." I think the amendment is unworthy of consideration, so I made the point of order. I think the committee should turn it down for the reasons I have given, but particularly because administratively it has had no consideration. In my opinion, after having talked with the Forest Service people on this subject for a long time, I am convinced that it is impractical administratively and should be rejected.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is to protect the conservation rights in the national property other than logging rights. When we say that for the purpose of conservation we want to have the streams protected, and we want to have a certain strip along roads that will not be logged, it does raise opposition from some of the supporters of the bill. They want to go through and cut ruthlessly, and cut right through an area because that is the best logging practice.

Second, we must realize this bill of course, is proposed really as an amendment to the United States sustained yield practice, to put limits on this conservation policy. We in Government know it is better that a forest be managed on a sustained yield basis at present, and certainly so for future generations. The proponents of this bill have some point in saying that for the current period if there is a particular processing plant being reduced or put out of business some attention should be given to that particular area, but this can be taken care of under present law.

My comment on the whole bill is this: Why should Congress give up its right to look into such specific situations? Why should we designate policies as in this bill so that it is just done administratively by delegating this power of discretion to bureaus? Let Congress keep the right it now has to act in these situations. I will help when special damage is caused to individuals or communities through proper protection of our natural resources, rather than give up the good national conservation practices. I assure you I will be one of those who will help correct the damage on the local community level. I do not like to give a blank check under this bill to these people, as we have seen many times the most priceless heritage of the American people exploited for the advantage of a few rather than protected for future generations.

Further, I think the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] adequately points out just how far these interests want to go when they want to cut timber clear through the properties without any reservations. We who are interested in conservation are interested in reserving portions of these areas for these conservation and sportsmen's uses, as well as protecting mineral, flood control, water rights, and others. So I am against the bill, but I will vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] as some saving grace for the bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I point out that this amendment is not carelessly drawn. I think some implication was made that it might not be germane and did not make sense, but I believe that the distinguished gentleman from Montana, our colleague on this side of the House, who has served on the Supreme Court of Montana, is quite competent to draw an amendment which is fair to everybody and means exactly what it says. That is this: Briefly, and in layman's terms, this amendment gives just what you call a timber deed to these people. I might point out to my esteemed colleague from Oregon that this timber deed gives them the timber the gentleman seems so interested in seeing these large corporations and timber owners get. I would like to see them get enough timber to keep their mills running. I contend they get enough timber now, and furthermore they are eligible to get enough timber under the March 1944 Public Law 273, which provides for these exigencies, to give large companies a sufficient sustained yield out of the national forests to keep them from ever having to close their mills.

I think this does exactly that. It retains all of the good aspects of our national forests. It leaves in them the management of this land and it leaves in them the watershed protection, the soil conservation, the grazing regulation, the right to put up cabins for our people, and to have control of hunting, fishing, and picnic areas. All those advantages would be there. All we would be doing by adopting this amendment would be to give the large companies the right to cut the timber off land that would be similar in fact and not acre for acre. That is the type of thing that all of us would like to see done. There is some merit to your proposal, and I think this amendment would go a long way toward making it fair to the American public. I yield now, sir, for your question.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. There is a very significant difference between the proposal which you make which actually is not quite clear in the amendment, as I read it. But, there is this significant difference in the proposal you have made, namely, to trade these people timber for their land. This is the difference, under the bill, as it is now written, with the committee amendment, if it is adopted, the proposal is to make whole a community or an industry by the transfer of land on which timber may be grown. That would provide, and will provide, a perpetual operation for that industry. All you propose to do is to trade that industry one crop of trees—one crop of

trees—a handful of trees. It has in my opinion, practically no value so far as the purposes of this legislation.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. In reply to your question, sir, I would like to point out that this amendment would give, as you say, one full harvest of timber equivalent to the timber which is now standing on that land, which means that it would probably cover a period of a 30-year growth. In addition to that, the Forest Service, sir, under the bill that you yourself are very familiar with, which became law in 1944 is authorized to give the people, to give to the big timber companies and the big sawmills like those in my own district, the right to a sustained cut per year off of the national forests. That will, as you say, maintain the communities' well-being and maintain jobs for the sawyers, the loggers and the mill hands and everybody concerned. In direct evidence of that, let me just refresh your memory. Yesterday, if you will remember, sir, I pointed out an application under this very law which would give one sawmill—one sawmill, mind you, the right to cut annually—that is every year and not just one crop but every year out of a large number of acres of national forest land 10 million board feet. That is enough to maintain a pretty good-sized mill. That is what they wanted it for so that these people will have jobs.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman has mentioned this other law, Public Law 273 enacted in 1944. I believe that is the correct number, Public Law 273. But that law has nothing whatever to do with the subject now under consideration. I know because I know the law thoroughly—I was the author of the bill. Under the operation of that public law, an operator, the owner of private timberlands, is allowed to make a contract which I concede is very favorable to him under some conditions, he must place all of the lands he owns under what amounts virtually to the control of the Federal Government. This is a cooperative sustained yield program which has nothing whatever to do with what we are talking about here today. I am sorry it keeps popping up in debate because it only succeeds in confusing the issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. May I reply briefly to what the gentleman just said?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-nine Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire of my friend, the gentleman from Montana, if I have a correct understanding of what he seeks to do by this amendment. The purpose of this legislation is to allow the Federal Government on a permissive basis solely and where it is practical and in the national interest to transfer the title to land for lands that are taken by condemnation where the condemnation proceedings would in effect break in two and destroy a sustained-yield operation. That is what we are driving at. I understand the gentleman comes along now with an amendment where he says we will not exchange the lands but we will give timber so that if by reason of the flooding of an area a sustained-yield operation loses a third of its timber, that timber will be replaced with other timber.

I understand the gentleman to say that, because of that, his amendment then will not impair the basic objective of this legislation but will carry out the basic objective of the legislation, to continue in operation these sustained-yield units. But, on the other hand, it will preserve other values and other uses in the national forest areas. Do I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. I take it, then, that the gentleman and some of his friends, who have been discussing this legislation for the last day at great length, are not then in basic disagreement with the objectives of this legislation, but the gentleman recognizes that these objectives are good and are sound; is that correct?

Mr. METCALF. In accordance with an agreement that I made with the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] at the conclusion of the last session, I made an honest effort to work out a compromise solution to the problem he had presented. This is one of the points in that honest effort that we have made for a compromise.

I am opposed in principle to any exchange of public lands in lieu of other land taken for public purposes, whether it is post-office land, or land for a country store, or anything else.

Mr. ENGLE. I understand that, but if we agree that the objectives of this legislation are sound, we go a long ways toward getting the mechanics straightened out.

I should like to ask the gentleman this. If a man has a sustained-yield operation, he has an operation on which he can cut over a long period of time, varying his cut so that always, where he has cut, timber grows up to take the place of that which he has cut, so that his mill can operate in perpetuity. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, however, it would not give a man the right to go back over a piece of timberland which would be traded to him for the timber taken away under condemnation; he would only get a cut once and, as a consequence, after the first go-around, his sustained-yield operation would then fail. Is that correct? And if that is correct, then the gentleman's amendment does not accomplish what he says it will and what he probably intends that it shall.

Mr. METCALF. I do not think the gentleman's analysis of the bill is correct. It was not my purpose in submitting this amendment to give the man only one go-around, as the gentleman called it. In Montana we cut some kinds of timber on an 80-year cycle, and other kinds of timber on a 100-year cycle.

Mr. ENGLE. What does the gentleman say about the amendment?

Mr. METCALF. I think it gives him this. We are transferring it so that he can have a perpetual sustained yield, just the same as they do under Public Law 273, for the timber alone. My only purpose in submitting this amendment is to insure that the Forest Service has control over these other ancillary services that do not go with the timber.

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad of one thing, that the gentleman agrees that we are trying to accomplish something in this proposed legislation that is worth accomplishing. I am afraid that the amendment does not do what the gentleman thinks it will.

Mr. METCALF. I am trying to make the proposed legislation a little more palatable in the event that it passes the House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] has offered an amendment to the bill which as he says will improve the measure.

The solicitors of the Forest Service and of the Interior Department indicate they do not understand the language of the amendment. It is not clear. The amendment the gentleman has offered was never considered by the committee.

I think the gentleman's contention is right, that he wants to make it a good bill; he recognizes the need for some legislation that will make it possible to handle some of these forest lands. But when the committee did not consider his amendment, when the Solicitor of the Forest Service said it is unworkable, it ought not be adopted. Your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs conferred with the Agriculture Department, the Interior Department, and the Forest Service on the language presently in the bill. As chairman of the full committee, I feel the amendment should be defeated. The amendment is not in the public interest.

It might be a good thing for the lawyers. The gentleman is a former judge. I am told by some good lawyers that this would be a lawyer's paradise because of its unworkability and because of the inability of the lawyers themselves to interpret what the gentleman's amendment does.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. The distinguished chairman of the committee is making a very strong argument for the proposition that we have insisted upon all along, that this bill should be recommitted to the committee for further study, and he has

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

admitted here that they have not studied some of the aspects of the legislation that should be taken up.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Just a minute; I want to correct the gentleman. We could have taken this up last year, but as chairman of the committee, I said "Let us not take it up, let us hold it over the summer and give it a chance to jell." Then we came back this year and took the bill up in the committee; we heard from the agricultural people, the Interior Department people, and the Forest people and they had no objections to the amendment that is presently before the committee.

I hope my colleagues will not adopt the amendment because it spoils the bill. We considered the bill very carefully and the amendment as agreed on by the committee is a workable one.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Does the gentleman from Montana desire me to yield to him?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman.

I want to say to the chairman of the committee that we have insisted at all times that there was a very gracious consent on the part of the gentleman from Oregon to put the bill over during the summer. But your committee failed to give it full and complete hearing to many of the interested people who requested a hearing. I have in my files copies of letters written to the chairman of the committee from such organizations as the Izaak Walton League, the National Wildlife Federation, and other organizations representing millions of Americans who have a right to be heard in these legislative committees and should be heard on conservation and should be heard on forest policy, and are concerned with the things that are written into this bill. But this committee of which the gentleman is chairman failed to give them proper consideration, and it is for that reason that it is difficult to come in here and to submit amendments to make a bill a little less unpalatable to submit amendments when the first time we see the committee amendment is in a supplementary report to a committee amendment that was adopted last year. That is why it is difficult to have a complete outline of all aspects of the bill. It is difficult to try to protect the public interest. This bill should be recommitted to the committee so that these millions of people may have an opportunity to study it, so that you would hear the various departments on such amendments as I have submitted, so that you could make a study of the impact of the bill and so that we could more carefully draw it in the light of all the other matters that are involved.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I ask the gentleman a question? As I understand it, his amendment is offered to make the bill more protective of the public interest and the Government's interest in the event that it should pass; but the gentleman's position is that no matter what amendments are adopted the best course to follow is to recommit the bill?

Mr. METCALF. That is my position.

Mr. McCORMACK. No matter what amendments are adopted, the gentleman is still opposed to the bill?

Mr. METCALF. I am still opposed to the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I just merely want to point out in reference to the matter of hearings, that the bill was introduced on the 13th of April, 1953. On June 25 last year we had a hearing and on July 14 and 15 we had hearings. The wildlife group and others were invited to come in. Then again this year in January we had some additional hearings on the bill. They were all open public hearings. These people were represented and they did present their views. While it may not meet with their approval at this time, I think this is the best bill we have and certainly, if the gentleman from Massachusetts pleases, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana was not considered by the Interior Department or the Forest Service or by the committee. It would make the bill unworkable and I hope the Members will not adopt an amendment of that type.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I merely want to call to the attention of my very distinguished friend from Nebraska, chairman of the committee, that no public hearings were held since this controversy arose and since the bill was reported out, although there have been a great many organizations that would like to have appeared before the committee to express themselves. It is true that interested parties did get together and work out these amendments which certainly are a great improvement over the bill that was reported out and makes it more palatable than when it first came out. But the facts are there are many organizations, individuals, and others who would like to have an opportunity to be heard. I am referring now to the general public. I think that is what my good friend from Montana is trying to point out, that this is a very controversial piece of legislation and the public should be given opportunity to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, that is what I conclude from what he has said.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana would make it a haven for lawyers because the solicitors of the department do not understand it. The amended bill as presented by the committee is an understandable and workable one, a bill that has been accepted by the Interior Department, the Forest Service, and the Agricultural Department, but not with the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. GAVIN. If his amendment makes it a haven for lawyers, certainly in the exchange of land that the gentleman from Montana pointed out would be highly controversial. You get into an exchange of that land for land in a forest; who is going to work out the details as to what is fair and equitable? Certainly we are going to have a lot of controversy if this legislation is enacted.

Another thing this bill does is it leaves the matter in the hands, as I understand it, and you may correct me if I am wrong, of the local courts. The local courts would have the final determination of what is equitable and fair.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. This will be a matter for the Federal courts; not local.

Mr. GAVIN. Oh, it would be for the Federal courts, but it is true that there would be a lot of controversial arguments as to the values, and so forth, in the exchange.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Someone mentioned the thousands of letters that came in on this legislation. We have in our files a total of eight letters on the bill from people expressing their opinions, dating back from 1953 through February 11, 1954.

Mr. GAVIN. Well, that may be, because when this bill came out nobody knew about it. It was suddenly before the Committee on Rules, and I went before the Committee on Rules. But, nobody knew what was happening, and therefore I was sufficiently interested in our national forests, and I was determined to find out just what this was all about. Consequently, the distinguished gentleman from Oregon acquiesced and said, after the great interest and the furor that was raised, that "We will withdraw the bill in an effort to work out something that is equitable and fair." Now, you recall that in the original bill you had monuments, parks, recreational areas, and wilderness areas. There are a lot of things that you have taken out and this is a much better bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. But, nevertheless, a great many of us are interested in the national forests, and there is where we are concerned.

The gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], too, is interested to the extent of what kind of exchanges are going to be made, who is going to make these exchanges, who is going to determine these exchanges, and I think the illustration that he brought out about the land that he referred to is a fitting one. Would the gentleman briefly give us that again? It was not clear what you said there about that problem.

Mr. METCALF. My comment was that when Libby Dam will be built, 7,000 acres of land in private ownership, belonging to the J. Niells Lumber Co., will be inundated. Now, that is bottomland of the Kootenai River. They can take in exchange high level land on an important watershed. They take over the watershed which is vital along the Kootenai clear down to Astoria, Oreg., to protect that water. Not only that, but they take over the mineral rights of that land. They can keep the prospector off, and the value that the land has for recreational purposes, they take that. My amendment says "When we flood your 7,000 acres"—it says that to the J. Niells Lumber Co.—"we will give you an equivalent amount of timber out here in the national forest, and we will keep control and supervision over the national forest for all of these other services."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. There is no doubt that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is correct. Why do they want more than the logging rights? Why not let the Federal Government keep control over these other things that will satisfy the conservationists, that will satisfy the sportsmen, that will satisfy the people on mineral rights?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I stated before that I will have to object. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to make it clear again that there are no sustained-yield units in Montana, by either the J. Niells Lumber Co. or others.

Then I would like to inquire if we can limit debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I have an additional amendment.

Mr. D'EWART. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Metcalf amendment to the committee amendment close in 5 minues.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, one of the arguments the chairman of the committee advanced was that the Interior Department had not approved this thing. I do not know that that is any great weighty argument here. The bill is now before the Congress, and the Congress is supposed to decide whether this is a good bill or a bad bill. I do not think we can necesarily say, "Well, if the Interior Department approves it, that is a good bill." I have heard a lot of arguments in past years about rubber-stamp Congresses. Certainly that would be a rubber-stamp affair if you say, "Well Interior has O. K.'d it so let's rubber stamp it."

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. The point I was trying to make a few moments ago was that if the Metcalf amendment is controversial this whole piece of legislation is just as controversial. The whole thing is controversial. Whether it has been developed to a point where it could be acceptable without being controversial is questionable in my mind.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman. I think he is exactly right. The whole bill is a haven for lawyers.

I notice the chairman made an argument there that convinced me that the Metcalf amendment is all right. He said it weakens the bill. From all I have heard here, the more you weaken this bill the better it is going to be for the American people.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Is it not true that the meeting on February 1 of the subcommittee of the Interior Committee involved only the gentleman from Oregon and the members of the subcommittee and some representatives of the Forest Service and perhaps the Interior Department? None of the Members of Congress who had indicated some dissatisfaction with the bill were invited to that meeting or allowed to participate. Neither were the wildlife associations, representing millions of American citizens, notified of that meeting. I do not mean to imply that the subcommittee did not make every effort within their prerogative, but it may be that they overlooked the fact that some Members of Congress and some representatives of the millions of American wildlife and conservation enthusiasts were not notified or given an opportunity to go before that subcommittee meeting.

May I point out that the people on this side are certainly convinced there is some merit in the bill and are desirous of having a full committee meeting wherein all the factors pertinent to this bill can be brought to light and some settlement can be worked out that will protect and safeguard the rights of the American people.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. All I have heard in the debate on this bill in the past few days indicates that it needs to go back to the Committee and it needs to be rewritten, and that these organizations who have a vital interest in it deserve and need to be heard.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. The gentleman asked a question as to the hearing on February 1. Is not that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. The subcommittee hearing which put out the second report, which we were not entitled to see until it was printed.

Mr. D'EWART. The hearing on February 1 was open to the public. All were invited. Representatives of the departments appeared. No one was excluded who asked to appear before the committee, and all that appeared were heard. We had representatives of the departments, we had representatives of those who met and tried to work out and meet the objections that were raised to the bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I thank the gentleman. Unfortunately, I had met with the group and with the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. D'EWART. I have to object to that, Mr. Chairman, but I move to strike out the last word, and will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Montana may I say that as a Member of Congress I was vitally interested in developing a bill which could be fair both to the big timber people, of whom I have lots in my district, and also to the public, of whom I have about 420,000. They are all interested in this bill, and I was. I wanted to go to that meeting. I had evidence that I wanted to present to that meeting, and yet I did not know a single thing about that subcommittee meeting and neither, as I understand it, did the gentleman from Montana nor several other gentlemen, Members of the Congress who had indicated a sincere interest in trying to develop this bill and to improve it, and make it a piece of legislation that we could vote for with confidence.

Mr. D'EWART. I would point out to the gentleman that the bill that is now before us is a result of our committee meetings. The meeting held on February 1 was the result of conferences held over several months to meet the objections of those who objected to the bill. That was the purpose of the meeting.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman indicates that the meeting to which he refers was a public meeting. I know the committee knew of my interest, but I cannot recall having received any notification that any such public meeting was to be held where we could present our opinion.

Mr. D'EWART. The regular notices that are given in all such cases were given of this particular committee meeting.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Do you mean to say that a notice was sent to my office?

Mr. D'EWART. No, I said that the regular notices that we give of all committee meetings were given of this particular meeting.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Were notices sent to the Wildlife Association and all who had written letters indicating a sincere interest in this matter?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. D'EWART. We do not do that on any occasion unless the people ask to be heard. We only send out the regular notices.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Were notices sent to those who had written letters asking to be heard on this legislation?

Mr. D'EWART. Not on the amendments which were considered at that meeting.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. On the legislation they had received such notices, but not on the specific amendments?

Mr. D'EWART. We held hearings at which they appeared.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Of course, they did not know that those amendments were going to be offered?

Mr. D'EWART. Yes, sir. It is my belief that they did. They had been consulted as to the amendments by the author of the bill over some 8 months.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. They were apprised of them? The wildlife associations and the Members of Congress who were interested knew of these amendments?

Mr. D'EWART. The amendments were worked out over 8 or 9 months by the author of the bill and the objectors and they must have known of them.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. No, sir. I am one of the people who objected and I never saw them, sir; until they turned up as a printed report. I never saw the amendments.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Leaving all technicalities out of this, obviously the amendment of the gentleman from Montana is to limit the exchange to logging rights so that other rights of conservation and mineral rights and all things that the Government is interested in are not touched. What is the real objection of the sponsors of this bill to limiting it, as the gentleman from Montana wants? Let us get down to the merits of this and leave out the technicalities. Why do you not limit it just to the logging rights?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The reason is that the language of the amendment does not do what the gentleman from Montana thinks it does.

Mr. FULTON. Then might I ask you, you agree then with the basic position of the gentleman from Montana on the merits but you just say the amendment offered by him is defective, is that right?

Mr. ENGLE. No, just the other way around. I say the gentleman from Montana agrees with the objective of this legislation and that it is fair and right, but he comes along with some language wherein he says we should do it in a little different way. I would say to him that all he is doing is giving these people one slice of the timber and it does not preserve a sustained-yield unit, which is what we are trying to do. Now, if he would patch up his language a little bit, there would be some of us who would not have very much objection to it. We believe in the long run it is better to stop the Federal Government from owning everything and having title to everything. We prefer swapping title for title rather than the cutting rights to the land.

Mr. FULTON. Why not swap the cutting rights?

Mr. ENGLE. I think if the committee is going to let the amendment go, he should fix the language so it does do what he says, but it just does not do it.

Mr. FULTON. Then you would be for the amendment if he fixed the language so that it would do what he says it does? Well, that can be taken care of in conference.

Mr. ENGLE. I would ask him to do this. I would ask him to vote for the bill after the vote on his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting quietly and inconspicuously as I can in a front seat here trying to find out what this is all about.

I finally came to this conclusion, which I think is rather sensible, that neither side knows what they are doing; neither side knows what they want to do; and, third, neither of you know that you do not know.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree on a limitation of time on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I understand that is on the Metcalf amendment?

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. That would not preclude time on another amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the advocates of this legislation should make a good case for it before the House accepts. I feel that they have not done so, and that they have not established that this legislation is necessary. I would like to have someone explain to me why this problem as stated is not adequately covered in the basic act of March 29, 1944, Public Law 273, 78th Congress, which contains this language:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior are further severally authorized, whenever in their respective judgments the maintenance of a stable community or communities is primarily dependent upon the sale of timber or other forest products from federally owned or administered forest land and such maintenance cannot effectively be secured by following the usual procedure in selling such timber or other forest products, to establish by formal declaration for the purpose of maintaining the stability of such community or communities a sustained-yield unit consisting of forest land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary establishing such unit, to determine and define the boundaries of the community or communities for whose benefit such unit is created, and to sell, subject to such conditions and requirements as the Secretary believes necessary, federally owned or administered timber and other forest products from such unit without competitive bidding at prices not less than their appraised values, to responsible purchasers within such community or communities.

The language of the act clearly establishes that when the economy of a community is going to be destroyed or is endangered because its economic base in forest products is being taken from it, that the Secretaries are instructed to sell timber and forest products in that community. It seems to me also that private interests—the businessmen are protected, because the law specifically states that this timber and these forest products shall be sold on a noncompetitive basis to purchasers within such community or communities.

It seems to me that adequate protection has been written into the existing law to meet the principal objections of those who are advocating this legislation. The economic base of the community is to be protected, and the men who are now processing timber with forest products in those areas have a right to preferential treatment on a noncompetitive basis, in order to secure timber and the right to process forest products. They will not secure title to the land. The law now provides that under condemnation proceedings they shall be adequately remunerated for any lands taken from them. It seems to me that this legislation is either unnecessary or else that it is, to some extent, dangerous. If the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] does not understand it, there is good reason for the House to hesitate.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The more the gentleman says the more I am becoming convinced that the question I am about to ask is one that the same Members cannot determine. Is this a public bill or a private bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. I would say it is quasi-public or quasi-private.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield, if the gentleman desires to answer my question.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I would like to point out one verifying fact. This provides that where a mill is going to lose a sustained cut, which will force it to close up and fire the employees, throw them out of their jobs, currently pending under this law is a request by one corporation in my district, requesting the right to buy from the national forest 10 million board feet, not for 1 year, as the gentleman from California was concerned about, but annually. The next year and every year they are going to buy 10 million board feet. The existing law, which was carefully drawn by the gentleman from Oregan some years ago, would provide that they also get it, and I quote from the application: "and that the sale of this timber be made to the new corporation without competitive bids."

I think that is adequate protection for the people who work in that particular mill. I do not know what else we could do unless we planed the lumber and stacked it for them.

Mr. McCARTHY. The gentleman's argument sustains my position.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Let it be shown, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Minnesota asked to be answered and I sought to answer him.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will yield to the gentleman if I have time. When I asked for the answer he did not arise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 62, noes 53.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. D'EWART and Mr. METCALF.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 76, noes 58.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: Page 3 after the D'Ewart amendment, insert a new paragraph as follows: *"Provided*, That such selection of lands and approval thereof be subject to the approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission."

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this amendment with the author of the bill and with members of the committee. If those on the other side agree, we are willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. METCALF: Page 2, line 16, after the words "operation be altered", insert a new section to be designated section 2 as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) Before the advisory hearing hereinbefore provided shall be held a board of survey shall be appointed in each instance to survey the privately owned lands that are being acquired by the Federal Government (1) to establish that they are being operated as part of a sustained-yield unit and (2) to appraise their value. The same board of survey, or another appointed for the purpose, shall survey the timber proposed to be exchanged (1) to establish its relative importance to the overall unit administration and (2) to appraise its value.

"(b) The boards of survey shall consist of one representative of the owner of the private lands to be affected, one representative of the Federal agency under whose jurisdiction are administered the lands on which the timber proposed to be exchanged is situated, and one disinterested private citizen acceptable to both parties."

And renumbering the succeeding section.

Mr. METCALF. Does the gentleman accept the amendment?

Mr. D'EWART. Our thought is that it is superfluous and unnecessary; that the provisions of this amendment are already in the bill.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, it will only take a moment to discuss this amendment. The gentleman from Montana and I cannot agree on sustained-yield units in our own State. The Forest Service in its letter to me has said that in portions of Montana and Idaho drained by the Columbia River from 5 to 10 sustained-yield units are being anticipated. Even the Forest Service does not know whether there are 5 or 10 sustained-yield units. The only point of my amendment is that in each case, when the land is going to be transferred, an impartial board should be appointed to determine, first, whether or not there is actually a sustained-yield unit in operation at that time and, second, to survey and appraise the land to be transferred, so that the Government, the Forest Service, the national forests, and the person whose land is taken will get a fair shake in the exchange. The board is in addition to the advisory hearings. It means just those two things, that there will be a determination that the land taken is a sustained-yield unit and the surveying and appraisal of the land.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I raise objection to this amendment because the amendment that was adopted a minute ago provides:

That before any transfer of federally owned timberlands shall be made under the provisions of this act an advisory public hearing may be held by the department or agency having jurisdiction over such lands for presentation of the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed transfer, including the views of interested persons as to whether (a) the private timberlands are being operated as part of a forest area to provide a sustained yield of timber for processing purposes.

In other words, the question of sustained-yield unit is in the amendment that was adopted a minute ago, and this language is superfluous and not needed and only clutters up the RECORD.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The amendment has no particular bearing on the bill, but I shall vote against it myself for the simple reason that it involves a further obligation on the Government, it involves a further cost, and that additional cost would accomplish nothing. It says that the board shall survey the timber proposed to be exchanged. Obviously there must be surveys already on record. I see no point in the world to putting up another board to spend Government money to do what has to be done before action on this bill can take place. I do not see that this does anything except set up further complicated machinery.

Mr. D'EWART. The second proviso in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana is to appraise its value. That is also in the amendment adopted a minute ago.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Does not the committee amendment that was previously adopted as amended have the provision "may" instead of "must," so that in the committee amendment as it now stands it is a discretionary matter, while the gentleman from Montana wants to make it mandatory? That is my first question.

Mr. D'EWART. The answer to that is that we did not make it mandatory because in the case where the trade was going to be turned down by the Federal Government a hearing would be unnecessary. It would only be an unnecessary expense.

Mr. FULTON. The second question is, Does not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana add a further stipulation, that is, that there must be a valuation for condemnation purposes in dollars, while, as the gentleman from Montana had previously brought up, there is some chance otherwise that bottomlands, for example, 7,000 acres of less valuable bottomlands could be exchanged for high range land or high drainage lands that might have mineral rights, water rights, or various other kinds of rights for recreational purposes? Unless you do have in here the translation into money terms there might be some way of not getting a fair exchange and, therefore, the Government not receiving the proper amount in return.

Mr. D'EWART. The amendment immediately before us, item 2, says to appraise its value. That is the wording. The amendment adopted a minute ago reads:

The values to be ascribed to the federally owned and privately owned lands involved in such transactions shall be fixed by negotiation or in the manner applicable to condemnation proceedings.

I gather that they both have the same intent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 73, noes 71.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the committee substitute?

If not, the question is on the committee substitute.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'KONSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for the exchange of certain public and private lands, pursuant to House Resolution 369, he reported the bill back to the House

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, while I have great admiration, respect, and affection for the chairman and members of the committee who have worked so sincerely and wholeheartedly on this measure, I regret that it is impossible for me to subscribe to its provisions. Accordingly, I shall vote to recommit the bill, and if that motion fails, will vote against the bill.

It is my studied opinion that this bill is contrary to the letter and spirit of our long-established national conservationist policy. Reading its terms, and listening to the excellent arguments advanced on both sides, I am persuaded that the measure, if enacted, would work serious damage and cause considerable detriment to the wise program we have adopted to conserve, protect, and develop our timberland and forest-land resources.

Since the issue presented touches not only upon these resources themselves in the economic and scenic aspects, as well as perhaps vital security considerations, and also in no inconsiderable measure upon the recreational outdoor life of the American people, it impresses me very much as a dangerous, unprecedented, and unwise proposal to insert in our existing organic law.

It has been asserted that the bill in effect would lead to unfair, preferential exploitation by private interests of our forest resources. That may or may not be so, although I would not predicate my opposition upon the assumption that our public officials administering the bill would ever be recreant to their duties. I should prefer to assume the opposite that they would invariably act in the public interest.

In my opinion, however, under the act the door would be open, solely upon the use of official discretion and judgment, to the exchange and permanent divestment by the Government of some of our most valuable and vital forest and timber resources. Certainly no strong case, it seems to me, has been made out for such a revolutionary change in policy.

It is my view that aggrieved citizens, corporate or individual, have ample remedy under existing statutes by which they can seek and, if warranted, obtain legal redress and compensation for any damage inflicted upon them as a result of any public operations of Government agencies.

Since I am committed to strong, vigorous, forward-looking conservation policies which shall embrace full protection of our great natural resources and their intelligent, sensible use and development I therefore will oppose this bill.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-six Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 14]

Ayres	Durham	Martin
Battle	Fine	Mason
Buckley	Ford	Merrow
Carnahan	Gubser	Miller, Kans.
Cederberg	Haley	Mills
Chelf	Harrison, Wyo.	Morrison
Ciardy	Hart	Preston
Cole, N. Y.	Hinshaw	Reece, Tenn.
Corbett	Kearney	Reed, Ill.
Cotton	Kearns	Rivers
Coudert	Kee	Scherer
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Taylor
Deane	Klein	Tollefson
Dingell	Lesinski	Velde
Dondero	McGregor	Welchel
Dorn, S. C.	Mahon	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 387 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LANDS

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. METCALF. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. METCALF moves to recommit H. R. 4646 to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. FULTON. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 161, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—226

Adair	Bush	Doyle
Addonizio	Byrne, Pa.	Eberharter
Albert	Camp	Edmonson
Alexander	Campbell	Elliott
Andrews	Canfield	Evins
Ashmore	Cannon	Fallon
Bailey	Carrigg	Feighan
Baker	Chiperfield	Fenton
Barrett	Chudoff	Fogarty
Bates	Church	Forand
Battle	Cole, Mo.	Forrester
Beamer	Colmer	Fountain
Bennett, Fla.	Condon	Frazier
Bennett, Mich.	Cooper	Friedel
Bishop	Crosser	Fulton
Blatnik	Cunningham	Gamble
Boggs	Dague	Garmatz
Boland	Davis, Ga.	Gary
Bolling	Dawson, Ill.	Gavin
Bonin	Delaney	Gentry
Bowler	Dempsey	George
Bray	Devereux	Gordon
Brooks, Tex.	Dodd	Graham
Brown, Ga.	Dollinger	Granahan
Brownson	Donohue	Grant
Buchanan	Donovan	Green
Burleson	Dorn, N. Y.	Gregory
Gross	Marshall	Selden
Hagen, Calif.	Metcalf	Shafer
Hale	Miller Calif.	Sheehan
Hand	Miller, Md.	Shelley
Harden	Mollohan	Sheppard
Hardy	Morano	Short
Harrison, Va.	Morgan	Sieminski
Hart	Moss	Sikes
Hays, Ark.	Moulder	Simpson, Ill.
Hays, Ohio	Multer	Simpson, Pa.
Hébert	Mumma	Small
Heller	Murray	Smith, Miss.
Herlong	Natcher	Spence
Heselton	Nelson	Springer
Hoffman, Mich.	O'Brien, Ill.	Staggers
Holifield	O'Brien, Mich.	Stauffer
Holtzman	O'Brien, N. Y.	Steed
Howell	O'Hara, Ill.	Sullivan
Hyde	O'Konski	Sutton
Ikard	O'Neill	Talle
James	Patman	Teague
Javits	Perkins	Thomas
Johnson, Wis.	Pfost	Thompson, La.
Jones, Ala.	Philbin	Thompson, Mich.
Jones, Mo.	Pilcher	Thompson, Tex.
Judd	Poage	Thornberry
Karsten, Mo.	Polk	Trimble
Kean	Powell	Van Zandt
Kelley, Pa.	Price	Vinson
Kelly, N. Y.	Priest	Vorys
Kilday	Prouty	Vursell
King, Calif.	Rabaut	Walter
King, Pa.	Radwan	Watts
Kirwan	Rains	Whitten
Kluczynski	Rayburn	Wickersham
Landrum	Reams	Widnall
Lane	Rhodes, Pa.	Wier
Lanham	Riley	Williams, Miss.
Lantaff	Roberts	Williams, N. J.
Lyle	Robeson, Va.	Williams, N. Y.
McCarthy	Rodino	Willis
McConnell	Rogers, Colo.	Wilson, Ind.
McCormack	Rogers, Tex.	Wilson, Tex.
Machrowicz	Rooney	Winstead
Mack, Ill.	Roosevelt	Yates
Madden	St. George	Yorty
Magnuson	Saylor	Zablocki
Mahon	Schenck	
Mailliard	Seely-Brown	

NAYS—161

Abbitt	Fernandez	Miller, Nebr.
Abernethy	Fino	Miller, N. Y.
Allen, Calif.	Fisher	Neal
Allen, Ill.	Frelinghuysen	Nicholson
Andersen, H. Carl	Gathings	Norblad
	Golden	Norrell
Andresen, August H.	Goodwin	Oakman
	Gwinn	O'Hara, Minn.
Angell	Hagen, Minn.	Osmers
Arends	Halleck	Ostertag
Aspinall	Harris	Passman
Auchincloss	Harrison, Nebr.	Patten
Barden	Harvey	Pelly
Becker	Hess	Phillips
Belcher	Hiestand	Pillion
Bender	Hillelson	Poff
Bentley	Hillings	Preston
Bentsen	Hoeven	Ray
Berry	Holmes	Reed, N. Y.
Bettis	Holt	Rees, Kans.
Bolton, Frances P.	Hope	Regan
	Horan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hosmer	Richards
	Hruska	Riehlman
Bonner	Hunter	Robsion, Ky.
Bosch	Jackson	Rogers, Fla.
Bow	Jarman	Rogers, Mass.
Boykin	Jenkins	Sadlak
Bramblett	Jensen	Scherer
Brooks, La.	Johnson, Calif.	Scott
Brown, Ohio	Jonas, Ill.	Scrivner
Broyhill	Jonas, N. C.	Scudder
Budge	Jones, N. C.	Secrest
Burdick	Keating	Shuford
Busbey	Kersten, Wis.	Smith, Kans.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kilburn	Smith, Va.
Carlyle	Knox	Smith, Wis.
Chenoweth	Krueger	Stringfellow
Clevenger	Laird	Taber
Cooley	Latham	Tuck
Coon	LeCompte	Utt
Crumpacker	Lipscomb	Van Pelt
Curtis, Mass.	Long	Wainwright
Curtis, Mo.	Lovre	Wampler
Curtis, Nebr.	Lucas	Warburton
Davis, Wis.	McCulloch	Westland
Dawson, Utah	McDonough	Wharton
Derounian	McGregor	Wheeler
D'Ewart	McIntire	Wigglesworth
Dies	McMillan	Wilson, Calif.
Dolliver	McVey	Withrow
Dondero	Mack, Wash.	Wolcott
Dowdy	Matthews	Wolverton
Ellsworth	Meader	Young
Engle	Merrill	Younger

NOT VOTING—47

Ayres	Dingell	Lesinski
Buckley	Dorn, S. C.	Martin, Iowa
Byrd	Durham	Mason
Carnahan	Fine	Merrow
Cederberg	Ford	Miller, Kans.
Celler	Gubser	Mills
Chatham	Haley	Morrison
Chelf	Harrison, Wyo.	Patterson
Clardy	Hill	Reece, Tenn.
Cole, N. Y.	Hinshaw	Reed, Ill.
Corbett	Hoffman, Ill.	Rivers
Cotton	Kearney	Taylor
Coudert	Kearns	Tollefson
Cretella	Kee	Velde
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Weichel
Deane	Klein	

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Deane for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Harrison of Wyoming against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Fine for, with Mr. Dorn of South Carolina against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Miller of Kansas for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois, against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Velde against.

Mr. Carnahan for, with Mr. Patterson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kearns with Mr. Mills.

Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Chelf.

Mr. Clardy with Mr. Haley.

Mr. Cretella with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Merrow with Mr. Durham.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Cotton with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Cederberg with Mr. Byrd.

Mr. Weichel with Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Gubser with Mr. Lesinski.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD with reference to the legislation just returned to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees of the legislative branch, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1201)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That Title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'SEC. 603. (a) Section 4 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" ' "(g) Any officer or employee in the legislative branch of the Government within the classes of officers and employees made eligible for the benefits of this Act by the Act of July 13, 1937, the Act of June 21, 1947, or the Act of July 23, 1953, who is separated from service on or after the date of enactment of this subsection after having rendered at least five years of service as such an officer or employee and after having become entitled to an immediate or future annuity under this Act shall, if he so elects at the time of commencement of such annuity, be paid, in lieu of an annuity computed under subsection (a), a life annuity equal to the sum of the following:

" ' "(A) 2½ per centum of the average salary, pay, or compensation received by him during any five consecutive years of allowable service at his option multiplied by the sum of the years, not exceeding fifteen, of his service as an employee described in this subsection and of his allowable military or naval service; and

" ' "(B) 1½ per centum of such average salary, pay, or compensation multiplied by the years of his allowable service other than service used in computing annuity under clause (A).

In no case shall an annuity computed under this subsection exceed an amount equal to 80 per centum of the highest average annual salary, pay, or compensation received by the officer or employee during any five consecutive years of allowable service. No officer or employee shall be entitled to the benefits of this subsection unless (i) there shall have been deducted and withheld from his salary, pay, or compensation for the last five years of his allowable civilian service, or there shall have been deposited under section 9 with respect to such last five years of service, the amounts specified in section 9, and (ii) the last eleven months of his allowable civilian service shall have been performed as an employee described in this subsection. Service performed prior to the date of enactment of this subsection shall not be counted for the purposes of this subsection in the case of any person not serving as an officer or employee described in this subsection on such date unless such person performs at least eleven months of service as such an officer or employee subsequent to such date. Paragraphs (A) and (B) hereof shall also apply in the case of any person who was heretofore or is hereafter separated from the service with title to annuity and who hereafter serves as a Member of Congress."

" '(b) Section 3 (a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" ' "Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any officer or employee in the legislative branch of the Government within the classes of officers or employees which were made eligible for the benefits of this Act by the Act of July 13, 1937, the Act of June 21, 1947, or the Act of July 23, 1953, serving in such position on the date of enactment of this paragraph, may give notice of his desire to come within the purview of this Act at any time prior to the expiration of six months after such date of enactment."

" '(c) Section 3A of such Act is amended as follows:

" '(1) Paragraph (3) is amended to read as follows:

" ' "(3) No person shall be entitled to receive an annuity as provided in this section until he shall have become separated from the service after having had at least six years of service as a Member of Congress and have attained the age of sixty-two years, except that (A) any such Member who shall have had at least five years of service as a Member of Congress may, subject to the provisions of section 6 and of paragraph (4) of this section, be retired for disability, irrespective of age, and be paid an annuity computed in accordance with paragraph (5) of this section, and (B) any such Member who shall have become separated from the service after having had at least ten years of service as a Member of Congress and have attained the age of sixty years may receive an annuity computed in accordance with paragraph (5) of this section reduced by one-fourth of 1 per centum for each full month he is under the age of sixty-two years."

" '(2) Paragraph (5) is amended to read as follows:

" ' "(5) Subject to the provisions of section 9 and of subsections (b) and (c) of section 4, the annuity of a Member of Congress shall be an amount equal to 2½ per centum of the average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by him as a Member of Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, multiplied by the sum of his years of service as a Member of Congress and his years of active service performed as a member of the armed forces of the United States prior to his separation from service as a Member of Congress, but no such annuity shall exceed an amount equal to three-fourths of the basic salary, pay, or compensation that he is receiving at the time of such separation from service."

" '(3) Paragraph (6) is amended to read as follows:

" ' "(6) In the case of a Member of Congress who becomes separated from the service before he completes an aggregate of 20 years of service as a Member of Congress, and who is not retired, the total amount deducted from his basic salary, pay, or compensation as a Member of Congress, together with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter compounded on December 31 of each year to date of separation shall, upon application therefor, be returned to such Member of Congress. No such Member of Congress shall thereafter become eligible to receive an annuity as provided in this section unless he again becomes a Member of Congress and redeposits the amounts so returned with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

on December 31 of each year and covering periods of service as a Member of Congress."

"'(4) Paragraph (10) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "and the term 'basic salary, pay, or compensation' includes (A) amounts received, for periods beginning on or subsequent to the effective date of this clause, as expense allowance under section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and (B) amounts received as such allowance for any period after January 2, 1953, and prior to such effective date, if the Member of Congress so elects and makes deposit therefor at the rate of $150 per annum together with interest thereon at 3 per centum per annum, compounded on December 31 of each year and covering periods of service as a Member of Congress; and the term 'active service performed as a member of the armed forces of the United States' means (A) active service performed as a member of such forces, during any war or national emergency proclaimed by the President or declared by the Congress, by a Member of Congress who left or leaves his office for the purpose of performing such service and (B) any other periods of active service, not to exceed an aggregate of five years, performed as a member of such forces, but shall not include any such service for which credit is allowed for the purposes of retirement or retired pay under any other provision of law, including Title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948."

"'(d) (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (a) of the Act of February 28, 1948—

"'(A) subsections (b) and (c) of section 4, and the last sentence in section 9 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall apply to Members of Congress; and

"'(B) subsections (c), (d), (e), (g), and (h) of section 12 of such Act shall apply in the case of Members of Congress dying on or after the date of enactment of this section. Such subsections shall apply to the widower of any such Member of Congress to the same extent and in the same manner as to the widow of any such Member of Congress, if such widower shall have been married to such Member for at least two years immediately preceding her death or is the father of issue by such marriage. Such subsection (c) shall also apply in the case of any Member of Congress who died on or after November 4, 1952, and prior to the date of enactment of this subsection, except that in such case no annuity shall be payable for any period prior to such date of enactment and no annuity shall be payable unless the amount of any lump sum death benefit heretofore paid under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is redeposited in the civil-service retirement and disability fund.

"'(2) Section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out "computed as provided in section 4 (a) hereof with respect to such officer or employee" in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "computed as provided in section 4 (a), section 4 (g), or section 3A hereof, as the case may be, with respect to such officer or employee as if he had retired under the disability provisions of this Act"; and by striking out "section 1, 2, or 6" in paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1, 2, 3A, or 6".

"'(e) Section 13 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence of the third paragraph thereof a comma and the following: "except that the annuity of an elected officer of the Senate or House of Representatives and any annuity granted under the provisions of section 3A shall commence on the day following the day on which salary shall cease, provided the person entitled to such annuity meets the age and service requirements for annuity at that time".'"

"SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided, the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the month following the date of its enactment."

And the House agree to the same.

HAROLD C. HAGEN,
GARDNER R. WITHROW,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
JOHN M. BUTLER,
H. H. HUMPHREY,
JOHN F. KENNEDY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same. Except for technical and clerical changes, the differences between the House amendment and the conference substitute are discussed below.

LEGISLATIVE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The House amendment added to section 4 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, a new subsection (g). Such subsection provided a new formula under which those officers and employees in the legislative branch of the Government, who were made eligible for the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, by the Act of July 13, 1937, or by the Act of June 21, 1947, and who retire on or after the date of enactment of the new subsection (g), could elect to have their annuities computed.

Under the formula contained in the House amendment, the annuity of a legislative officer or employee would be an amount equal to 2½ percent of the average salary, pay, or compensation which he received during any five consecutive years of his allowable service which he designated, multiplied by the sum of the years of his legislative service and the years of his allowable military or naval service, plus 1½ percent of such average salary, pay, or compensation multiplied by the number of years of his allowable service other than legislative service and military or naval service. The annuity so computed under the new formula could not exceed, in any case, an amount equal to 75 percent of the highest average annual salary, pay, or compensation received by such officer or employee during any five consecutive years of his allowable service. The House amendment further provided (1) that the new formula could be used in computing the annuity of such officer or employee only if he so elected at the time of his retirement, and (2) that such officer or employee would not be entitled to elect to have the new formula used in computing his annuity unless he had rendered at least six years of service as an officer or employee in the legislative branch and unless deductions or deposits shall have been made covering the last five years of his allowable civilian service.

The conference substitute adds to section 4 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, a new subsection (g) which is, in effect, the same as the above-discussed subsection (g) contained in the House amendment, except in the following respects.

In describing the classes of officers and employees in the legislative branch to which the provisions relating to the new annuity computation formula may apply, the conference substitute makes reference to the Act of July 23, 1953, in addition to the Act of July 13, 1937, and the Act of June 21, 1947, in order to make it clear that those temporary employees of the Senate and House of Representatives appointed at an annual rate of salary, who were permitted by the Act of July 23, 1953, to come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, are among the classes of legislative employees to be covered by the provisions of the conference substitute relating to the new annuity computation formula.

Also, it should be noted in this connection that the House amendment added a paragraph to section 3 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, which granted those officers and employees in the legislative branch on the date of enactment of the new paragraph, who are within the classes described in the Act of July 13, 1937, and the Act of June 21, 1947, and who had not elected to come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, an additional opportunity to elect to come within the purview of such Act by giving notice to that effect prior to the expiration of 6 months after such date of enactment. The conference substitute retains such provision of the House amendment and, in addition, by making reference to the Act of July 23, 1953, grants to the above-mentioned temporary employees of the Senate and House of Representatives the same opportunity to come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930.

The conference substitute also makes certain changes with respect to the eligibility of a legislative officer or employee to elect to have his annuity computed under the new formula. Under the conference substitute, such officer or employee must have rendered at least 5 years of service as an officer or employee in the legislative branch, rather than 6 years as required by the House amendment. In addition, such officer or employee will not be entitled to elect to have his annuity computed under the new formula unless the last 11 months of his allowable civilian service shall have been performed as a legislative officer or employee. A further requirement imposed by the conference substitute is that legislative service performed before the date of enactment can be used in the computation of annuity under the new formula only if the legislative officer or employee is (1) on the rolls on the date of enactment, or (2) if not on the rolls on such date, performs at least 11 months of service as a legislative officer or employee after such date.

The conference substitute limits to 15 the number of years of service (legislative service and allowable military or naval service) which may be used for the purposes of the 2½-percent computation. There was no such limitation in the House amendment.

The conference substitute further provides that the maximum annuity allowable under the new computation formula shall not exceed 80 percent of the highest average annual salary, pay, or compensation of an officer or employee for any 5 consecutive years of his allowable service. This limitation of 80 percent, which replaces the limitation of 75 percent contained in the House amendment, is the same as that now provided by the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, for officers and employees generally.

The conference substitute also contains provisions, not contained in the House amendment, which carry out the intent of the House amendment by making it clear that an officer or employee in the legislative branch who is separated from service in the legislative branch before he is eligible for retirement with immediate annuity may elect to have any deferred or future annuity to which he is entitled computed under the new annuity computation formula if such officer or employee is otherwise eligible to make such election under the provisions of the conference substitute.

In addition, the conference substitute changes the provision of the House amendment relating to the time when a legislative officer or employee must make his election with respect to the new annuity computation formula in order to make it clear that such election must be made at the time when the annuity becomes payable.

Another provision of the conference substitute not contained in the House amendment permits a person with service as a legislative officer or employee, separated from such service or from other Government service, with title to deferred or future annuity, before or after the date of enactment of such provision, who serves as a Member of Congress after such date, to elect to have such annuity computed under the new formula notwithstanding any other provision of the conference substitute.

The conference substitute also makes changes in the House amendment with respect to the application of the new annuity computation formula to annuities of survivors of legislative officers and employees under existing provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930.

Under section 4 (b) of such act, an officer or employee may elect at the time of retirement to receive a reduced life annuity and to have an annuity after death payable to his or her widow or widower. Under such section 4 (b) the annuity of the widow or widower begins on the first day of the month in which such death occurs or the first day of the month following the date on which the widow or widower attains the age of 50 (whichever is later) and is terminable on the death or remarriage of the widow or widower.

Under section 4 (c) of such act, an unmarried officer or employee in good health may elect, at the time of retirement, to receive a reduced life annuity and to have an annuity payable after death to a survivor annuitant, having an insurable interest in such officer or employee, during the life of such survivor annuitant, equal to 50 percent of the reduced life annuity of the officer or employee and terminable on the death of the survivor annuitant. No person is eligible to receive an annuity under section 4 (c), and an annuity under section 12 (c), of such act, based on the service of the same officer or employee, covering the same period of time.

Under paragraph (1) of section 12 (c) of such act, if an officer or employee dies in the service, after performing at least 5 years of allowable civilian service, his surviving widow is entitled to be paid an annuity, terminable on her death or remarriage, beginning on the first day of the month following the death of the officer or employee or following the date on which the widow attains the age of 50, whichever is later. Such annuity is equal to one-half the amount of the regular life annuity computed under section 4 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930.

Under paragraph (2) of section 12 (c) of such act, if an officer or employee dies in the service after performing at least 5 years of allowable civilian service, or if he dies after having retired, and is survived by a widow with a child or children, such widow is entitled to be paid an immediate annuity terminable on her death, remarriage, or attainment of age 50. The reason for termination of the annuity of the widow at age 50 is that the widow will then be eligible for annuity under section 4 (b) of such act if the retired officer or employee so elected at the time of his retirement. The annuity payable to the widow of an officer or employee dying in the service is equal to one-half the amount of the regular life annuity computed under section 4 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930. The annuity payable to the widow of a deceased annuitant is equal to one-half the amount of the regular life annuity which such annuitant actually was receiving at the time of his death (excluding annuity purchased by voluntary contributions) or, if such annuitant had elected a reduced life annuity, which he would have received if he had not made such election. Provision is also made in section 12 (c) for annuity payments on behalf of the child or children of the deceased officer or employee or deceased annuitant on the basis of the annuity payable to the widow under such paragraph (2) of section 12 (c).

It was the intent of the House amendment that the provisions of the House amendment relating to the new annuity computation formula should be applicable with respect to the annuities of survivors of legislative officers and employees which are provided for under section 4 (b) and (c) and section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930. The language of the House amendment, however, appeared to make the new formula applicable only with respect to survivors annuities provided for by section 4 (b) and (c) of such act and with respect to those survivors annuities provided for by section 12 (c) of such act in instances involving legislative officers and employees who die after retirement. The conference substitute removes the inconsistency on this point by making the new annuity computation formula applicable also with respect to annuities payable to survivors of legislative officers and employees who died in the service.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The House amendment added to paragraph (3) of section 3A of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, provisions under which a Member of Congress would be permitted to retire with a full annuity at age 60 years after ten years of service as a Member of Congress, or to retire at age 55 after ten years of such service with an annuity reduced by one-fourth of 1 percent for each full month the Member is under the age of 60. The conference agreement eliminates these provisions of the House amendment and substitutes in their place a provision which permits a Member of Congress to retire at age 60 after ten years of service as a Member of Congress with an annuity reduced by one-fourth of 1 percent for each full month the Member is under the age of 62.

Under existing law the annuity of a Member of Congress is based upon his average annual salary for the entire period of his service. The House amendment provided that the annuity of a Member of Congress shall be computed on the basis of any five consecutive years of allowable service designated by him—the same computation base provided for by the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, in the case of officers and employees generally. The conference substitute eliminates this provision of the House amendment but provides that in determining the amount of salary of a Member for annuity computation purposes only the salary received by him as a Member after the date of enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (August 2, 1946) shall be included.

The conference substitute also provides that a Member of Congress who is separated from the service before completing twenty years of service as a Member and who is not retired, may, upon application, have the total amount which has been deducted from his salary and deposited in the civil-service retirement and disability fund returned to him with interest. A Member exercising this privilege forfeits his right to a retirement annuity and cannot again become eligible to receive a retirement annuity unless thereafter he again becomes a Member of Congress and redeposits the amount so returned to him in the civil-service retirement and disability fund with interest. However, no interest is required covering any period during which he is not a Member of Congress. The House amendment contained no such provision.

The House amendment provided that amounts received by a Member of Congress as expense allowance under section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 shall be treated as salary for annuity purposes. Under the corresponding provision of the conference substitute, amounts received by a Member as expense allowance under such section 601 (b), for periods beginning on or after the effective date of such provision of the conference substitute, shall be treated as salary for annuity purposes. The conference substitute further provides that those amounts received by a Member as expense allowance under such section 601 (b), for any period beginning on or after January 3, 1953 (the date on which such expense allowance became taxable), and ending before the effective date of such provision of the conference substitute, may also be treated as salary for annuity purposes, but only if the Member so elects and makes deposit therefor in the civil-service retirement and disability fund at the rate of $150 a year with interest thereon at 3 percent a year, compounded on December 31 of each year and covering periods of service as a Member of Congress.

The House amendment contained provisions making section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, applicable to Members of Congress. Section 12 (c), which is discussed more fully above in connection with legislative officers and employees, provides for annuities for survivors of officers and employees of the Government dying in service and for survivors of retired officers and employees of the Government who die leaving minor children.

A provision of the conference substitute makes such section 12 (c) applicable in the case of a Member of Congress who dies on or after the date of enactment of such provision. The survivors annuities provided for by such section 12 (c) are also made applicable with respect to survivors of those Members of Congress who died on or after November 4, 1952, and before the date of enactment of this provision of the conference substitute, but only if the amount of any lump-sum death benefit paid on account of the death of such Member is redeposited in the civil-service retirement and disability fund. No annuity in such case shall be payable for any period prior to the date of enactment of such provision of the conference substitute. It is to be noted, however, that in making payments to widows of Members of Congress within this latter category, the Civil Service Commission will not be limited by the definition of the term "widow" contained in section 12 (d) (1) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so that the widow of a Member of Congress dying during such period, beginning on or after November 4, 1952, and ending before the date of enactment of this provision of the conference substitute, will be entitled to receive an annuity even though she was married to such Member for less than two years immediately preceding his death and was not the mother of issue by such marriage.

The conference substitute also makes applicable to Members of Congress certain other provisions of the Civil Service Retirement

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Act of May 29, 1930, which were made applicable in 1948 to officers and employees of the Government generally when the survivorship provisions of section 12 (c) of such act were first enacted. These latter provisions are for the most part provisions designed to make the then existing provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930 (relating to elective survivorship annuities and refunds of unused retirement contributions) conform to the basic change which was made in such act when the automatic survivorship provisions of section 12 (c) were incorporated in such act. If the new survivorship provisions are to be extended to Members of Congress, the conforming provisions, which have not heretofore been applicable to Members of Congress, should likewise be made applicable to such Members. The provisions referred to are discussed below:

Under the provisions of section 4 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as they applied to officers and employees generally prior to the 1948 amendments, and as they apply to Members of Congress at the present time, a person retiring may elect to receive a so-called forfeiture annuity, which is an increased annuity with a provision that no part of the contributions of such person would be returned upon his death. In any case in which the person retiring does not elect a forfeiture annuity, he may elect to receive a reduced annuity with an immediate annuity payable upon his death to a named beneficiary equal to fifty percent or one hundred percent of the reduced annuity of the person retiring. The reduction in the annuity of the person retiring would be based upon actuarial factors and would depend upon the ages of the person retiring and the beneficiary and upon whether the annuity of the beneficiary was to be one hundred percent or only fifty percent of the annuity of the person retiring.

In lieu of the above-discussed provisions, the conference substitute makes applicable to Members of Congress the existing provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of section 4 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930. These provisions have been discussed in detail in that portion of this statement dealing with the annuities of survivors of legislative officers and employees.

The conference substitute also makes applicable in the case of Members of Congress, as did the House amendment, the provisions of subsection (d) of section 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, which defines the terms "widow" and "child." In addition, the conference substitute makes applicable to Members the provisions of subsections (e), (g), and (h) of section 12 of such Act.

Subsection (e) provides for the disposition of the amount in the civil-service retirement and disability fund to the credit of an officer or employee whose death occurs before he has performed 5 years of service, or who dies without leaving a dependent entitled to survivors' annuity benefits.

Subsection (g) provides for the disposition of amounts remaining to the credit of a retired officer or employee in the case where he dies without leaving a dependent entitled to a survivors annuity or where the rights of survivor annuitants have terminated. In such case, if the amount credited to the individual account of the officer or employee exceeds the aggregate amount of annuity paid, the difference will be paid in the order of precedence specified in subsection (e) of such section 12.

Subsection (h) deals with the disposition of accrued annuity due upon the death of an annuitant.

The extension to Members of Congress of these provisions which are applicable to officers and employees generally will (1) make certain changes which are made necessary by the addition of the new survivorship provisions, (2) make certain changes in the order of precedence among the persons entitled to receive lump-sum payments, and (3) change the method of computing amounts of unused contributions returnable upon the death of an annuitant. Under existing law a balance is payable upon death of an annuitant unless there has been paid in annuities purchased by the contributions of the officer or employee an amount equal to the total amount to his credit at the time of retirement. Under the provisions discussed above, there will be a refund upon the death of an annuitant only if the amount to his credit in the fund at the time of retirement exceeds the total amount of annuity paid in his case.

The conference substitute also makes applicable to Members of Congress the present provisions of section 9 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, which provide for the rate of reduction to be applied to annuities where there is a failure to make deposit for past service for which no deductions were made. Under these provisions, the reduction in annuity is an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount of the required deposit. Under the provisions which applied to officers and employees generally prior to the 1948 amendments, and which have continued to apply to Members of Congress, the amount of the reduction is an amount equal to the amount of annuity (computed on an actuarial basis) which the deposit would purchase if made. This latter provision not only makes it more difficult to compute the amount of annuity, but also produces an incongruous result in that the older a Member is, and the shorter his life expectancy, when he retires, the more annuity a given amount of money will purchase, and hence the greater the reduction in his annuity.

The conference substitute also contains an amendment to the third paragraph of section 13 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930. Such paragraph provides that, in the case of a person separated from the service with entitlement to immediate annuity, the commencing date of the annuity shall be the first day of the month following the date of his separation from the service or the first day of the month following the month in which payment of his salary ceases. The amendment made by the conference substitute provides that, in the case of an elected officer of the Senate or House of Representatives, or a Member of Congress, who is separated from the service with entitlement to immediate annuity, the commencing date of the annuity shall be the day following the day on which payment of his salary ceases. The House amendment contained no such provision.

The purpose of this provision of the conference substitute is to remove an inequity with respect to such elected officers and Members of Congress. Under the Constitution of the United States the terms of Members of Congress end at noon on January 3. There is, therefore, an interval of almost a month between the date of separation of a Member with entitlement to immediate annuity and the commencing date of his annuity. The same situation generally obtains with respect to elected officers of the Senate and House of Representatives, entitled to immediate annuity, who serve until the close of a particular Congress. Other officers and employees of the Government who are separated from the service with entitlement to immediate annuity are able in most cases to fix the date of separation so that there is little or no interval in such cases between the date on which salary ceases and the date on which annuity commences.

The House amendment contained no specific provision prescribing the effective date of its provisions. Section 2 of the conference substitute provides that the amendments made thereby with respect to both legislative officers and employees and Members of Congress shall take effect on the first day of the month following the date of enactment of the conference substitute, unless otherwise provided therein.

HAROLD C. HAGEN,
GARDNER R. WITHROW,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, which comes back to the House in the form of a conference report, has been the subject of considerable study by the managers on the part of the House and Senate.

The legislation was fully explained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD appearing this morning, and you have just heard the statement of the managers on the part of the House read by the Clerk. However, I do wish to make this further explanation of the conference report.

We, of the House committee, thought we had a very excellent bill when we passed S. 2175 unanimously on February 2. However, after being in conference with the Senate, we find that some improvements could be made in the bill. While we were required to modify some provisions somewhat, nevertheless the final draft of this measure is, I believe, a very good one. We adopted a number of perfecting amendments and in some respects this measure was improved.

We have removed some of the provisions which might be criticized, even though without merit or justification. As now reported, the bill contains no basis for any criticism whatever. The bill, as a whole, rectifies deficiencies of the old annuity program. It brings it more into line with other Federal programs of this nature. The improvements we made should have been adopted long ago.

Therefore, I am pleased to report that, as a result of these conferences, there has been general agreement on the bill in much the same form as it was agreed to in the House without a single dissent.

I would like to pay a tribute to our staff members and assistants and to the managers on the part of the House and Senate for their effective and conscientious work which this conference report represents.

If this conference report is adopted and the bill becomes law, it will have the following effect on the retirement of legislative employees and Members of Congress.

In the case of legislative employees, the following provisions will apply.

First. Two and one-half percent of any 5 consecutive years' average salary multiplied by the years of service in the legislative branch, but not exceeding 15 years, will be the basis for computation for the annuities for legislative employees. Military service may be counted.

Second. One and one-half percent will be the basis for computation for other allowable Federal service.

Third. Deductions for the retirement fund must be made for the last 5 years of service.

Fourth. The employee's last year of Federal service must be as a legislative employee in order to come under the provisions of this bill. In case of re-

employment, it must be for a period of at least 11 months.

Fifth. Survivor annuities will take into consideration the revised retirement formula provided for legislative employees in this bill.

Sixth. Legislative employees who are not now members of the retirement plan will be permitted to participate if applications are submitted within 6 months after enactment.

In the case of Members of Congress, the following provisions will apply:

First. Present retirement age of 62 is retained, but Members with 10 years' service may retire at age 60 with their annuity reduced by one-fourth of 1 percent for each month under age of 62.

Second. Annuities will be computed on the average annual salary beginning with the date of enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act—August 2, 1946—and Members may count, for the purpose of salary, total compensation subject to taxation. In other words, Members of Congress may begin to consider their salary for retirement purposes as $15,000 from January 3, 1953, when that sum became the salary of Congress for tax purposes. The average annual salary for a Member retiring at the end of this term who takes advantage of the increased salary beginning January 3, 1953, and who has been in Congress since August 1946, will be $12,970. Each year of succeeding service will increase this average.

Third. The provisions of the House bill with respect to giving credit for up to 5 years past military service are retained.

Fourth. Annuities are provided for survivors of Members of Congress who die in office on the same basis as that for others participating in the Civil Service Retirement Act. Surviving spouses, if age 50 or with children under 18 years of age, would receive 50 percent of the annuity the deceased Member would have been entitled to.

Fifth. A Member who retires may take a reduced annuity and provide an annuity of 50 percent of the reduced rate for his or her surviving spouse on the same basis as other Federal employees. That is, the Member's annuity would be reduced by 5 percent on the first $1,500 and 10 percent on the remainder, plus three-fourths of 1 percent for each full year the wife or husband is under age 60 when the Member retires. The maximum reduction is 25 percent.

Sixth. An unmarried Member may provide an annuity for any named survivor with a reduced annuity to himself. The reduction in the retired Member's annuity varies from 10 percent to 40 percent, depending upon the difference in his age and that of his named survivor.

Seventh. A Member separated with less than 20 years' service may withdraw his contributions but will, of course, forfeit all rights to an annuity unless he later returns to Congress and redeposits the amount withdrawn with interest.

Eighth. Survivor benefits are extended to widows of Members of Congress who died since November 4, 1952.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Tuesday, February 23, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE WATERS OF THE NIAGARA RIVER

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced on this side and my colleague the junior Senator from New York introduced on the other side a new bill for the development of the United States share of the waters of the Niagara River. This new bill replaces S. 1851 and H. R. 5066, which we introduced a year ago.

The junior Senator from New York is extending our joint statement in the RECORD on that subject, so I will refrain from any further discussion of it on this side.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber when the vote was being taken on the motion to recommit the bill, H. R. 4646. I would like the RECORD to show that if I had been present, I would have voted to recommit the bill.

FARM PRICES AND GENERAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, probably one of the most important and also one of the least understood problems confronting the American people today is the question of the support of farm prices. It is a matter of importance to every segment of our American citizenship. Unfortunately, there is a widespread idea that the question of farm prices is one which is of importance only to the producer of agricultural commodities. Were that the case, I would agree that this Congress certainly would not take the action which I hope it will take to assure the continued support of agricultural commodity prices.

As I visualize it, the support of farm prices is absolutely essential if we are to maintain a reasonably sound economy in any segment of our population in the United States. To me, it is perfectly clear that if we allow farm prices to drop to the disastrous levels to which we have seen them drop in the past, that we will likewise see the same kind of disastrous depression which has, at times past, cursed our country.

I ask you to reason with me for a few minutes. I ask you to give thought to what I am saying to see if you, in your own mind, can disagree with it. I want to make a statement or two and I want you to test it in your own mind against what you know. I call your attention first to the fact that throughout the economic history of the United States there has never been, so far as I know, a time when the average of farm prices stood as high as parity, that the Nation did not enjoy widespread prosperity and full employment. Conversely, there has never been a time in the economic history of our country when the average of farm prices dropped as low as 75 percent of parity that the whole Nation did not suffer a devastating depression; when men did not walk the streets seeking employment; when industry was unable to operate profitably. I suggest that if there is anyone in this Chamber who disagrees with these historical statements I want them to challenge me now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is that?

Mr. POAGE. I suggested that if there was anyone who disagreed with my statement that when the average of farm prices stood at parity or above, the entire Nation was prosperous, and when farm prices dropped to an average of below 75 percent of parity that then the entire Nation suffered a disastrous depression. If there is disagreement I would like to have it expressed at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Surely, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I do not know so much about that, but I want to ask you just one question.

Mr. POAGE. I would like for you to answer my question, and then I will undertake to answer your question. I think that is a fair proposition. Suppose you answer my question. Do you disagree with my statement of economic history?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You may be right, I do not know, but what I do know is this. The insurance policies that I bought years ago and paid cash for do not even give me a return of 50 percent of what I paid for them.

Mr. POAGE. I am sure that is right; I am sure the gentleman is correct in that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And I have some of those.

Mr. POAGE. I am sure the gentleman is correct in that. I am equally sure that in the summertime the sun comes up earlier than it does in the wintertime. I agree that the gentleman is correct in his statement, although I am a little at a loss to apply it to the matter under discussion.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to my distinguished friend from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] commented on the value of insurance policies. Would the gentleman from Texas comment upon the value of beef cattle at this time

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

as compared with their value in months gone by?

Mr. POAGE. Of course, the price of beef cattle is disastrously low. Most farm prices are far lower than they should be and cattle are especially low.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How is it that I have to pay $1.09 in the market for a tough piece of sirloin, if the price of cattle is so low?

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman does not buy cattle in the meat market; he buys sirloin steak.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does not the sirloin steak come from the cattle?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, but the cowman does not sell the sirloin steak. He sells cattle. Unfortunately, what the cowman sells is bringing a very low price. What the consumer buys is bringing a much higher price. What the consumer buys has passed through a great many hands and has accumulated a lot of costs and profits before the gentleman from Michigan buys it. This very illustration should show just how many people, other than farmers, are responsible for the cost of living.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the genleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Of course, there was a proposition before this body and the other body to investigate the reason for the great spread between the price of steaks bought over the counter and the price of cattle. Of course the Republicans killed that investigation, or we might have found out why the gentleman has to pay $1.09 for a steak, while the cattleman is getting only a few cents a pound for his cattle.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I again yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. The gentleman said that we did not have prosperity when farmers were getting 75 percent of parity; but that we always had prosperity when they were getting above parity.

Mr. POAGE. That is correct. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania question that?

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Has the gentleman ever known of a time when the wages of labor were above parity when we did not have prosperity? Has the gentleman ever known wages to be under parity, the income of the laboring man, I am speaking of, when we did not have a depression? All of which means nothing.

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman is correct in his statement that wages very nearly reflect the national economic situation; and I do not think that as the gentleman said it all means nothing. I think the gentleman's observation that wages are high when times are good and wages are low when times are bad proves simply that wages are tied very closely to the general level of prosperity and that wages must in the long run fall when farm prices fall, and rise when farm prices rise.

On the other hand, I think since no one has dared to suggest that my conclusion concerning the economic history is not correct, that we can safely assume we can never have a depression when we have parity prices for farm products, but that we will always have a depression when we have an average of farm prices as low as 75 percent of parity.

I recognize that the next logical question, rather than trying to offer some facetious statement, would be, if you did not accept my philosophy, to ask me how I can prove that there is, indeed, a relationship between farm prices and general prosperity; and how I know that it is not the general prosperity that created the 100 percent of parity for the farmer rather than that the 100 percent of parity creating the general prosperity.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Not just at this time; I want to finish this thought.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a reasonable question and one that occurs to a reasonable and logical mind. I think that I owe the obligation to attempt to answer it, and I think that it can be answered. I believe a brief review of recent history will bring the answer to each of you as you recall from your own knowledge just what happened. If you will refer back to the beginning of World War II you will all recall that prices were low; food prices were low, wages were low, farm prices were low, real estate was low, consumer goods brought low prices. The war came on but it did not immediately increase the price of automobiles; in fact, you could not sell them at the beginning of the war. It did not increase the price of real estate; in fact, the market dropped with the declaration of war. It did not bring wages up; in fact, they remained stationary while men could not find work immediately. But the thing that did immediately go up was the price of farm products. The price of wheat went up, the price of cotton went up, the price of vegetable oils went up; those things immediately began to increase and as farm prices came up they inexorably lifted with them all other prices just as irresistibly as the sun drags the moisture from the sea, and sometimes from our Texas farms. They carried all prices up regardless of the fact that the Government was doing its best to put a stop to that increase.

Then you will recall a little later, leaving aside the fluctuations that occurred right after the close of World War II and the beginning of the Korean war, you will recall that after the Korean war got well under way and farm prices had reached another peak, you will recall that when the fighting began to slacken off about 18 months ago farm prices began to drop, and with the exception of a slight leveling off during the past 60 days, have continued to drop from a high of 113 percent of parity down to a present average of 92 percent.

You say: "Oh, yes, POAGE; and it did no affect the price of other commodities and it did not affect the wage scale because they all stayed high." And so they did—for a few months. In fact, before the momentum was spent some prices actually continued to move up. But every Member of this House has long since perceived the cracks in our economy, and well recognized that today all other commodities, wages, profits, and all the rest are reflecting the drop that has been occurring in farm prices.

I simply point out that farm prices have always led and have never followed general prosperity. I think it is fair to say that there are many other factors in our economy which are of tremendous importance, and one would be most foolish to suggest that wages was not one of those vital factors of the economy; but wages have not always led, wages have followed the general level of economic activity. Consumer goods have not led but have repeatedly followed. But, I repeat, farm prices have always led, and have never followed the general economic level up or down. After we recognize that fact we must realize the importance of farm prices on our general level of economy. If that be true, and it seems to me that the historical facts bear me out, then we must recognize that the maintenance of fair farm prices is of just as much importance to the man in Detroit, to the man in New York City, to the man in Los Angeles, as it is to the man in Nebraska, in Kansas, in Oklahoma, or in Texas.

We are faced with a question of whether we are going to make a serious effort to maintain the economy of our country or whether we are going to use the easy weapons of the demagog and try to create ill feelings between the consumer and the producer groups of our Nation. Unfortunately there have been responsible officials in high positions in this Nation who have within the last 10 days resorted to the tools of the demagog in order to try to drive a wedge of ill will and selfishness between the consumers of America on the one hand and the producers of agricultural products on the other. I deplore that kind of action because I know it can only lead to a weakening of our general economic structure. It cannot improve the lot of the consumer nor can it improve the condition of the producer. Since this thing was done by the chief advocate of the so-called sliding scale of price support, and since I look upon our Secretary of Agriculture as a sincere, albeit a mistaken individual, one who I cannot believe would premeditatedly do anything to injure the farmer if he realized the results of his actions, since I have such a high regard for the Secretary personally, I must conclude that he acted in desperation. Undoubtedly, he felt the lack of public support for his program. Undoubtedly, he was but blindly grasping for some weapon with which to continue the fight where logic had failed. I cannot believe that the Secretary of Agriculture deliberately set about to create suspicion or resentment against the agriculture producers of this country.

There has never been a political party in the United States, so far as I know, that has ever come out and suggested that it wanted to destroy the farmer, or that it wanted to break farm prices so that the farmer would become bankrupt. Why? Obviously, every party in

this country, including the splinter parties, have always recognized the importance of agriculture as the basis of our entire prosperity, and so recognizing that, every party has said, "We are going to try to improve the condition of agriculture."

Let us see how we go about making good on that pledge. For a good many years we have had on the statute books provisions that provided a support at 90 percent of parity on the basic storable commodities. Up until recent times we had lost no money on those 6 basic storable commodities, taken together. However, we have, according to the last figures available within the past few weeks, lost a net of $53 million on all of the 6 basic commodities during the 20 years that the program has been in effect. That is about $2,500,000 per year for the entire cost of our price support program on the basic commodities. I submit that we have never had a program which gave us so much for so little as that price support program on those 6 basic commodities—corn, wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts and tobacco. Those commodities are, of course, storable; those commodities are basic, and in connection with these 6 commodities we have statutory provision for the control of production which has enabled us to handle this program with a minimum of expense to the Government. I think it has been an outstandingly good program. I think it has been a bargain for the people of the United States, not simply to the farmers. It has been a bargain for the whole of America, because it has undergirded the whole economic structure of America.

We have had experience with this "fixed" support program.

We have enjoyed prosperity as long as we have kept the price of those commodities up to where they were bringing approximately parity in the market. Let us not forget that. Let us not forget, either, that we have likewise had considerable experience with this disappearing or depression support program. It is not a new program. It is the program which in the thirties repeatedly proved its inability to lift us out of a depression.

We are now offered a so-called new program which slides out from under the farmer every time he needs it. We have been offered a program which flexes only downward. We have been told "You take this and you will get 100 percent of parity in the market place." That was not our experience when we were supporting farm products at less than 90 percent of parity.

Now, there are those who talk to us as if the proposed program that is being sponsored by the Secretary of Agriculture and the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, was something new. Let us see how new it is. It says that if you are going to grow a large quantity of a commodity and you need a support price on it, we will let the support price drop, and in that way we will avoid controls. Now, do I state it wrong? Do I misrepresent the program which has been proposed? I do not intend to. I hope I have correctly stated it, and I think I have. If I have not, let any colleague correct me. It says that we will relieve ourselves of the necessity of controls by reducing the amount of support. It says that since we would cut our supports down to 75 percent of parity instead of 90, we would not need to have control programs.

Let us see. Do you remember, you men from the South, when we grew the most cotton in the United States? It was in 1937, if my recollection does not fail me: Nearly 19 million bales of cotton in 1937. What was the support price in 1937? I will tell you what it was. It was 53 percent of parity. Now then, if 75 percent of parity will relieve us of the responsibility of controlling a crop—and we had only a 53-percent support price in 1937—why did it not work to protect us from the overplanting which resulted in the greatest cotton crop we ever grew in America?

Let me call your attention to the fact that the same thing was true of wheat. The same thing was true of other crops back during those 30's. The support price was woefully inadequate; woefully inadequate, but we piled up greater surpluses than we have piled up since.

Now, my friends, a low support price does not mean that you will not pile up surpluses. On the contrary, it probably means that you will pile up even greater surpluses than ever.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that a farmer has certain financial responsibilities? He has to make possible a certain minimum income. If he has relatively nigh supports, he can get that income from a smaller quantity. If he has a low support program then he has to work harder and produce more to get increased yields in order to get the necessary dollars to meet his fixed requirement.

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right, and that is exactly what the farmer does, and as the result, unless you maintain the strictest kind of acreage controls and marketing quotas, you will have a larger surplus under a low support price than you will under an adequate support price. That is exactly the heart of the proposal which is being made to us. They are trying to sell it to us on the idea that if we will, in fact, reduce the support price, we will not need controls. Exactly the reverse is the truth of the matter. Exactly the reverse is the historical experience, and I am sure it would be the situation in the future.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for a question only.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Of course, when the gentleman says that low prices create bigger production, then you must say that higher prices would produce less production. Certainly there is no logic to that correlation there of an individual big crop and current low prices.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman please ask the question? I refuse to yield for a speech.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Please tell me what price supports have to do with this whole question.

Mr. POAGE. My time is limited. The gentleman from Pennsylvania cannot give me any more time. I will have to proceed.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania must recognize that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] correctly expressed it when he said that when the farmer finds he cannot make a living on the number of units he has been producing he seeks to produce more units. If he cannot get enough to feed his family in price, he seeks to get it in increased units.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POAGE. I am sorry. I cannot yield. My time is limited.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman cannot give me any more time than the other gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that is exactly what he did in the depth of the depression? He planted everything he could in order to get some income.

Mr. POAGE. He did.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. That is what our experience with these low-support prices has proven. It is not something new. The present Secretary of Agriculture has not developed something new when he talks about 75 percent of parity supports. We have had supports that low and even lower, and we did not escape the necessity for stringent controls. We have had a support of 90 percent of parity or above since only 1942, and we have had the necessity for acreage controls in only 2 or 3 of those years, whereas prior to that time when we had supports of less than 90 percent we had the necessity for acreage controls every year.

I point out that the basic principle on which they try to sell us this Benson-Kline plan has long since been proven false. We do not have to speculate on it. We know what has happened, and it has not worked to reduce the necessity for controls. If you reduce the support price to 75 percent of parity you must still maintain all the controls you have at the present time. You have to have the same kind of allotments, the same kind of quotas. The farmer simply gets less, and the farmer spends less, and industry employs fewer people, and the Nation makes less, and your national income goes down. Yet when we ask for a fish we are given this serpent, when we ask for a loaf we are handed this stone. When the people of America asked for a guaranty of 90 percent of parity and were promised 100 percent of parity, we are now given the assurance only that we will go back to the supports of the depth of the depression of the 1930's.

If the welfare of the American farmer were all that was involved you might get away with it, but the American laborer is involved, the American industrialist is involved, every citizen in this broad land has his welfare at stake. Are we going to allow anybody, no matter how high his

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

office in the United States, to drive the wedge of discord between the American producer and the American consumer?

I believe it is time that this Congress took action. I am not criticizing the chairman of my committee. He is one of the grandest friends of agriculture in this country. He is a Republican, of course, but CLIFF HOPE is also a sincere friend of agriculture, and I am ready to stand up here and say so. But I hope that my chairman will not be deluded by the call to postpone, to postpone, to investigate, to hold hearings. We need to take action now on the question of maintaining 90 percent of parity supports on the basic storable commodities, and we ought to do it without any further delay. I call upon my chairman to give every consideration to prompt action.

There are a number of bills before our committee which have that purpose. It is not a matter of introducing something new, it is a matter of acting upon what is already before us. It is not a matter of letting the Secretary of Agriculture come down here and ask us to go back to what we had in 1937. It is merely a question of this Congress going on record, as I know the overwhelming majority of this House wants to do, for having a firm 90-percent support program on these basic commodities for the good of the country.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Going back to one of your earlier statements about demagoguery, I assume you think it is demagogic to tell the public that we now have 3 or 4 million pounds of butter that we have held away from the consumers.

Mr. POAGE. No, I do not think that is demagogic, but I do think it is demagogic to try to drive a wedge between the fair-thinking people of America and the producers of America. Yes, I think that is demagogic.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Do you think it is demagogic then to let the people know the things that affect the consumers?

Mr. POAGE. No, I have not criticized the making of any statement which attempted to tell the people the situation. I have not criticized any statement about how much we have in surplus. On the contrary, I myself have repeatedly called attention to this situation. I think the people ought to know the size of our surplus stock. I have said, and the gentleman has heard me say in our committee, that we should sell these stocks for local foreign currency. I am sure the gentleman knows that I have a bill which proposes to dispose of those surpluses. I think they ought to be disposed of. I think they must be disposed of but I don't propose to break both our farmers and our economy by sliding support prices right out from under our farmers every time they need supports. What I am saying is that no man who is charged with the welfare of agriculture should go out and try to array one class of our citizenship against another class. I say that is demagogic, but as I explained, I am sure it was done in desperation, and without consideration.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I would like to question one of your statements when we talk about factual statements.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

THE CRIME SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEEHAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months I have been surprised and shocked to note the information which has come to my attention as to the present trend in the crime problem, both national and local, and what is being done about it.

Just last week I read in the U. S. News & World Report the following testimony by the very efficient J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, and the Nation's highest recognized law-enforcement official, incident to this matter and how crime in this country has reached record proportions:

Total crime increased 2.5 percent. Crime in the rural areas registered an increase of 9 percent, and crime in the cities registered an increase of 0.5 percent, compared with the first 6 months' average in 1952. I particularly call attention to aggravated assaults which, if the 1953 crime rate continues, will show an increase of 8.4 percent. The crime of rape shows an increase of 6.5 percent. Crimes against property increased 2.2 percent; auto theft increased 5.1 percent; burglary increased 3.4 percent; robbery increased 1.4 percent; larceny increased 1.2 percent.

Now, turning to the problem of youth in crime, of the 1,110,675 persons arrested in 1952, 7.8 percent were under 18 years of age; 13.3 percent were under 21 years of age; and 23.1 percent were under 25 years of age. As an indication of the participation of youth in crimes against property, it is observed that 7.8 percent of all persons arrested were 17 years of age or under. This group under 18 years of age accounted for 19.4 percent of all robberies, 36.9 percent of all larcenies, 47.8 percent of all burglaries, 52.6 percent of all auto thefts. They were all committed by persons 17 years of age or less. Nearly one-half of the persons arrested for crimes against property involved people who were under 21 years of age. * * *

There is one factor which may be the cause of the increase of crime, in my estimation. That is the abuse of parole, probation, and other forms of clemency which, to my mind, almost makes justice a mockery. I am strongly in favor of proper parole and probation and any form of clemency that tends to rehabilitate men, but I am vigorously opposed to the type of clemency which turns confirmed criminals loose upon society. I feel very strongly about that.

Just last September Special Agent J. Brady Murphy, of our Baltimore office, was killed in a gun battle by a man released by Federal authorities, a man with a long criminal record, a man who had assaulted a guard in a Federal penitentiary and who had been previously convicted of crimes in other parts of the country. He was conditionally released 5 years and 3 months before the expiration of his maximum sentence. Six months after his release he was killed in a gun battle in Baltimore, but it also resulted in the death of one of our agents and the wounding of another.

I might point out to this committee that 11 of the 18 agents of this Bureau who died in line of duty were killed by criminals who had been paroled or had been placed on probation or who had received lenient treatment in the courts. Of the 83,410 fugitives for whom wanted notices have been placed in our identification division, 10,926 represent parole violators, and 1,436 are probation violators. These figures speak for themselves as to the abuses of parole and probation procedures.

The terrifying statements included in Mr. Hoover's testimony relate, in my estimation, to the fact that nearly one-half of the persons arrested for crimes against property involve people who were under 21 years of age and further, that the last FBI agent killed in line of duty was slain by a man who apparently had been prematurely released by Federal officials, a man with a long criminal record, a man who had assaulted a guard in a Federal penitentiary, and who had been conditionally released 5 years and 3 months before the expiration of his maximum sentence. Quite obviously, had he been tried for the assault on the officer, or even had his good time been withheld, the life of this devoted public servant working for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to protect all of us would have been saved.

This prompted me to make certain inquiries as to the existing situation with reference to the treatment and release of law violators within the Federal jurisdiction.

During the past couple of months the press has carried information that James V. Bennett, director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the man who presumably was responsible for permitting the premature release of the convict who killed the FBI agent, has coddled certain Communist prisoners. It has been amply borne out that Carl Aldo Marzani, a former State Department employee who was convicted and sentenced to serve time for falsely testifying he had never been connected with the Communist Party, had attempted to smuggle certain Communistic writings from the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury, Conn., where he was confined to serve from 1 to 3 years on the prejury charge. On September 1, 1950, Marzani was charged by the officials at Danbury with this contraband violation. According to Bennett's own testimony, when questioned by Senator HOMER FERGUSON concerning this incident on June 20, 1952, Bennett assumed the responsibility for not prosecuting Marzani for this further violation of the law, and he also accepted the responsibility for ordering the restoration of a large portion of Marzani's forfeited good time for the specific purpose "so he could enroll in Columbia University for a course in creative writing prior to the expiration of the deadline for GI's to enroll for schooling, June 25, 1951." In other words, here we have a traitorous man convicted as either a Communist or a Communist lover, who was given the privilege of leaving the institution prior to the time he should have been discharged so he could be paid by the Federal Government for furthering his education.

In the Marzani case, a further interesting situation developed. According

to the testimony, Marzani was moved from Danbury to Lewisburg, and he was kept at Lewisburg for the last 3 months of his sentence in the company of Alger Hiss, with whom he consorted while in the Lewisburg prison. Hiss is too notorious in the annals of American perfidy for me to elaborate on this situation, but it is inconceivable to me that the Director of the Bureau of Prisons would permit these two notorious characters, who had worked together in the State Department, to spend time together in another institution when he had numerous other places in which he could have kept them separated.

Then, in June of 1952, John Gates, still the editor of the Daily Worker, was moved to Danbury on a temporary basis from the prison at Atlanta so he could be briefed by his attorneys, Vito Marcantonio and John Abt, on the evidence he was to give before the Subversive Activities Board. At the orders of the Director, Gates was not confined in a cell but was given a private room in the hospital at Danbury, a place usually reserved for sick persons, but a more comfortable room than otherwise would have been available. While occupying this room he was given certain privileges which other Americans could not receive, because after all, they had not been convicted as Communists. While in Danbury, it is my further understanding that Gates, on the Director's specific orders, was permitted to have visits from his relatives in New York City, who pleaded for this privilege, stating they had not been able to visit him in Atlanta, and these visits were arranged with the Director by Marcantonio, Gates' attorney.

Mr. Speaker, is it not a travesty that the Communists who are convicted in America are held in our up-to-date, modern and comfortable institutions, treated so gently, and given special privileges while thousands of our red-blooded American boys captured in Korea while fighting for our country were being tortured and even killed by their brutal Communist captors? It seems to me we should review our policies and thinking, for, in my estimation, the gentle treatment of this sort is certainly no sign of strength but will be interpreted by our enemies as a sign of weakness. I am thinking now of our boys in those front-line trenches, in 20 below zero weather, bleeding, suffering, and dying, for what? Is it to help make America secure, so their enemies in America who are trying to destroy the Government they are dying to save will be treated in this coddling manner?

But Communist inmates are not the only coddled ones under the soft control of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. This is the story of a full-scale riot and sex orgy which was largely hushed up and in which very little punishment would have been imposed had not the FBI stepped in. Even so, Bennett was successful in seeing that the most vicious and horrible events were suppressed. These are the facts:

The Federal reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio, which houses about 1,100 younger prisoners usually aged 18 to 24, is supposed to be a model institution. We are happy to report it did operate very well and received much public, private, and press acclaim for several years prior to September 8, 1952, when a full-scale riot took place from 4:45 p. m. until about 2 a. m. the next day.

The cause of the riot was supposed to have been food, but this was never established beyond an attempted whitewash of the matter by Bennett's assistant, Myrl Alexander, who flew to the scene from Washington. This food cause was claimed merely because the rioting started while the men were on their way to evening mess.

To quote partially from a front-page news report from the Chillicothe Gazette of September 9, 1952:

Nearly 800 of the 1,070 inmates started rioting in the prison yard at 4:45 p. m. Monday. Associate Warden Calvin announced the situation was entirely under control again at 2 a. m. Their gripe, apparently, was over food.

But the big 72-acre reformatory was far from normal. The rioters were locked in their dormitories. Only essential work details were being carried out.

News of the riot electrified Chillicotheans. City police joined forces with Ross County sheriff's deputies and State highway patrolmen and rushed to the institution, 2 miles north on route 104.

Armed with rifles, automatic weapons, and pistols they formed a line along the fence at the south end of the compound, where the demonstration centered. The prison yard and recreation area were a mess. The ground was littered with blankets, raincoats, mattress covers, mattresses. Several bonfires were started.

Limbs of trees were torn off by the inmates. They also pulled up small trees by the roots and jerked out cement posts and slats which had been imbedded in cement to form benches. They burned several sections of bleacher seats on the baseball diamonds, wrecked the first floors of three two-story brick dormitories, and smashed countless windows with rocks and clubs.

The prisoner shot and wounded during a mass rush on a warehouse was not identified. His name was withheld pending notification of relatives. A tower guard fired and broke up the warehouse raid. The bullet struck the prisoner in the buttocks. His injury was reported as a flesh wound and not serious. The two prisoners beaten by other inmates were not identified. They were hospitalized. It was reported one inmate, bruised and bleeding, reached the safety of reformatory guards only to dart away again, saying he was going back after his buddy.

The riot, which also included vicious sexual assaults, was finally quelled by the brave action of the two chaplains going among the men and urging them to desist. Other civilian personnel seemingly were unable to or unwilling to stop the riot.

The next day Alexander arranged the transfer of numerous prisoners to other Federal institutions. That is a customary solution in Federal prisons. He stated publicly the ringleaders would be punished administratively, meaning they would be deprived of privileges or good time—some only a few days, or all the law would allow.

But the FBI stepped in, and after intensive investigation lasting several weeks, presented numerous cases to the Federal grand jury at Columbus. The result was that 90 indictments which charged mutiny in a prison were returned, and the men were given added sentences by the judge ranging from 3 months to 8 years.

Yet the usually powerful FBI could not proceed thoroughly. For Bennett and Alexander pleaded not to have numerous sodomy charges pressed to avoid unfavorable publicity. They covered up even the case of one boy who was homosexually assaulted not once but seven times, and who finally escaped naked from this condoned torture and ran to the hospital, where his poor invaded body was stitched up by the United States Public Health Service doctor in charge.

So Bennett stays on the job. Betrayers of their country and its youth alike are treated gently in what some people would call modern penology. Modern tripe, if this is the measure of justice.

When I received the foregoing information I made certain additional local inquiries and found a shocking situation existed. This has been widely played up in the press, but I believe that for the first time I can consolidate the four most notorious local cases regarding prisoners released from the National Training School on parole and permitted to roam the streets freely thereafter to engage in rape, assault, and murder. The four outstanding cases which have come to my attention involve:

Clarence E. Watson was committed to National Training School on November 2, 1951, for repeated snatching of purses from women. He had a sentence for 2 years, 10 months, and 20 days, and also a prior record. On December 8, 1952, he was paroled by Bennett, who personally hears cases of District of Columbia juveniles. He violated that parole on January 8, 1953, only a month later, for carrying a switch-blade knife, hiding in a parked car and intimidating a woman there. The parole violation was reported by Police Officer Rothgab. Bennett first denied the violation had been reported, but later admitted it had. Watson was taken into court and fined $25, but was not returned to National Training School as a violator. He was permitted to roam the streets until July 17, 1953, when he was arrested for the rape and murder of Alyce O. Taggert. He confessed this crime. He also is charged with other serious crimes.

Wilbert Green was committed to National Training School early in 1945 for burglary and assault—stabbing. His sentence was for 4 years. He had previous records of larceny and burglary in 1938, 1940, and 1943. For the last charge he was sent to Blue Plains School, from which he escaped but later was returned. Despite this extensive record, he was paroled from National Training School on February 11, 1946, after serving only 1 year. While out on parole he was arrested for attempted burglary and returned to National Training School, but was reparoled. On May 16, 1947, he was again arrested for larceny but not returned as a violator. Later in 1947 he was arrested for burglary and taken into court and sentenced to serve 9 to 27

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

months. In 1950 he was again arrested for six different cases of burglary. For this he was sentenced for from 8 to 24 months—a shorter time than the prior charge. On November 15, 1953, he was again arrested after he had robbed and shot a Miss Lemke, secretary to Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado. He was sentenced for 13 to 39 years.

Giardo V. DeLorenzo was committed to National Training School for auto theft and paroled by Bennett on April 13, 1953, to an electrician in Wheaton, Md. This man reported DeLorenzo got into trouble and he fired him. He was not returned as a violator. Neither was he returned when on August 23, 1953, he was married without permission of the authorities. He was permitted to roam the streets until September 14, 1953, when he was arrested for breaking into the apartment of a G-girl and for raping her—threatening her with a large knife.

On January 14, 1954, another parolee from National Training School, Vincent Reese Spencer, age 17, was arrested while an extensive investigation was under way incident to the cold-blooded murder of Marine William Joseph Lindstedt. In his possession he had a .32-caliber automatic which he admitted he had stolen from the parked auto of Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, sometime last May. However, from May to January he was carried on the Bureau's records as one of its parole successes.

Mr. Speaker, it is getting so that decent, law-abiding citizens, especially our ladies and girls, are afraid to walk home on the streets, especially after dark, and further, they are not safe in their apartments, and a large portion of these offenses are being committed by people who have been released through the generous heart of the head of the Prisons Bureau, who apparently is more interested in favoring his prisoners than in protecting society.

But I went even a bit further to find out whether these were isolated cases of how prisoners are treated, and how other juveniles are treated while in various institutions. I am narrating at random a few shocking cases which show the apparent policy of the Bureau officials not to prosecute men doing time, regardless of how often they escape or what they do, how they are favored with the grace of parole in many cases despite their conduct.

Richard Stanley Styers, Jr., was received at National Training School on November 24, 1947, as a juvenile sentence. On March 10, 1948, he was transferred to the camp at Natural Bridge, Va., as a very favorable case. On June 10, 1948, he escaped from the camp, stole an auto, broke into service stations stealing candy, cigarettes, and a .38 pistol. He was not prosecuted for the escape or these new offenses and did not lose any good time. But he was sent back to the camp and subsequently broke into its warehouse to steal cigarettes. For this he was ordered to lose 60 days good time. He was then returned to National Training School and on July 2, 1948, he escaped from National Training School and stole an auto in Richmond, Va. He was not prosecuted for the escape or theft and did not lose any more good time but was granted the grace and favor of a parole from National Training School. He violated that parole, too, and was sent to Chillicothe as a violator.

Albert Kenneth Bankston was received in National Training School on November 17, 1950, on a minority term. Just 10 days later he struck the officer there in the admission unit over the head with an iron vise in an escape attempt. Fortunately the officer was not rendered unconscious and Bankston was thwarted in the escape attempt. He had recruited others to help him in this vicious assault. But he was not prosecuted nor did he lose good time. However, he was transferred to Chillicothe on December 13, 1950, for greater security. He was not punished otherwise.

Henry Walter Braham was received in National Training School December 22, 1947, and escaped in May 1948. He was returned from escape on July 30. He escaped again next April 12, but he was not prosecuted nor did he lose good time for these two escapes, despite the fact that while on escape status the first time he was involved in four unlawful entries.

The inmate known as "Low Brow" Baker while at National Training School about 1947 was found guilty of homosexually assaulting two smaller boys on two occasions. He was very large for his 17 years' age. He was not punished except by being transferred to Chillicothe, where a short time later he was caught by an officer while slugging a boy for objecting when he attacked another small boy whom he had forced into bed, and with whom he also was trying to have homosexual relations. The staff at Chillicothe ordered all earned good time forfeited for this offense and strongly recommended prosecution. This was refused by Mr. Bennett. Instead, Baker was transferred to Danbury, Conn., where he was promised his good time would be restored if he behaved. Some time later the Danbury staff recommended this restoration and it was approved.

The above are not isolated cases at all. A review of the files would show hundreds more of like import. For example, while at National Training School Thomas Kirkpatrick masturbated in the presence of a school teacher and his class and lost 20 "points" in his record as punishment. There seems to be a tendency to punish lightly lest the boys resent it and run away. Sex deviations are reported to be frequent. This is hideous.

Now, in attempting to study what has been and what could be done to try to teach these men and boys some proper social behavior and decent conduct, I happened to run across the following excerpt from the congressional Appropriations Committee appropriations directive for the fiscal year 1951, as follows:

> In its report last year, the committee stated that it was in complete accord with the then proposed reclassification of the positions of full-time chaplains at the prison institutions. It has been brought to the attention of the committee that this proposal has not been carried out by the Bureau of Prisons. It is expected that immediate action shall be taken to comply with the original intentions of the Bureau as approved last year by the committee. The committee urges that consideration be given to the provisions of travel funds for the advisory chaplain to enable him to consult with other chaplains, and also the restoration of the chaplaincy at Alcatraz Penitentiary.

I looked into the facts involved in this situation, and was amazed to find out that the previous year Bennett had agreed with the Appropriations Committee that if he could receive $29,000 additional, he could upgrade the pay of his underpaid chaplains to the legal civil-service level. He was given the $29,000 for this purpose, but used only a small portion to pay chaplains and the rest to pay other employees. It seems incredible that the head of a Government Bureau could be so insensitive to a congressional directive, but, nevertheless, these are the facts. I have in my possession further documentary evidence along these lines. The situation was so acute, and the officials handling the negotiations for the increase of pay for chaplains were so concerned with it, that when the executive secretary of the department of pastoral services of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ retired from his duties in 1950, after some 12 years, he stated in his closing report, in part, as follows:

> But I would be only half candid if I did not confess that it is on one aspect of our chaplaincy program that I leave the Federal Council with the greatest sense of frustration, that of the Federal prison chaplaincy. With few exceptions, we have secured excellent and well-trained men to fill these key posts. On matters which involved no money, we have had fine cooperation from the Bureau of Prisons. But in spite of every effort we have been able to exert, and even despite a study and classification by the Federal Civil Service Commission, the present administration of the Bureau of Prisons has still not accorded chaplains a status and salary commensurate with their training and their capacity as ministers of the church. I have not changed my view that, on matters of this kind, church and State can cooperate with mutual profit in a democratic society. But my faith has been strained. We must continue to press this point.

In these days when we must of necessity place so much trust on a truly moral and religious approach, our first and our last best hope, is it not a travesty on the very spirit of justice that it is necessary for a high clergyman to express himself in this manner with reference to the failure of a high Government official to carry out his discharged duties and to spend funds appropriated in the manner specified by congressional directive?

Now, where are we going with all of these problems?

In his testimony before the Appropriations Committee, the Director of the FBI, Mr. Hoover, further testified that in 1953, when education cost about $11 billion, or $272 for each United States family, and when the churches received donations of about $2 billion, or $50 for each United States family, crime costs about $20 billion, or $495 for each United States family. Mr. Hoover also testified that in the first 6 months of 1953, 6,470 Americans were victims of murder or manslaughter, and 1 million major crimes were committed.

A special Senate subcommittee has been set up to study this very important subject in connection with the juvenile delinquency situation. But what is being done about the treatment or attempted rehabilitation of these delinquents who are being sent to the various Federal institutions?

Mr. Bennett testified before Senator FERGUSON that he had no way of knowing how successful the work of the Bureau of Prisons may be. The Senator's questions and his answers, in part, are as follows:

Senator FERGUSON. How many of the men from the various years that you have paroled have become repeaters of either Federal crimes or State crimes?

Mr. BENNETT. No, sir; there are no such figures as that.

Senator FERGUSON. You mean to say that there is no way that you get reports back, where a man that you paroled, while he was either on parole or after he got off parole, violated another crime and went to a prison?

Mr. BENNETT. No, sir; we have no such followup figures of that sort available. I would like very much to have them.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you not think we ought to have them?

Mr. BENNETT. I certainly do.

Senator FERGUSON. How are we ever going to tell whether our parole system is working?

Mr. BENNETT. That is what I would like to know. And what is more important than that, Senator, you as a judge know. If the judge could tell what happened to these fellows after they had been to an institution——

Senator FERGUSON. That is what I would like to find out. I think we ought to know.

Mr. BENNETT. I do, too.

Senator FERGUSON. Because I do not know any way that we can tell whether our parole system is working, without that.

Despite Mr. Bennett's testimony, let us look at the record for the moment. Each year the Director issues an annual report entitled "Federal Prisons." There is a table 8 showing in each of these reports which indicates that 10 and 15 or 20 years ago the average percentage of people released on parole and who violated while under parole supervision was about 8 percent. The figure during the recent few years is more than twice that. This shows how unsuccessful the results are according to Bennett's own figures.

In the last report, on page 55 of the 1952 report on the Federal Bureau of Prisons, we read:

Close to half of the juvenile delinquents and about one-third of those committed for transportation of stolen automobiles violate parole.

What an indictment of our prison system. What would we think if half of the patients sent to a hospital failed to recover?

I have mentioned some of the glaring cases of parole violation where parolees have committed murder, rape, assault, and so forth. Now, are the juvenile delinquents at the National Training School being taught to kill with 1 or 2 blows? On February 10 of this year a 17-year-old inmate of the training school was killed in a fight with another inmate. What is being done with the aggressor? Is he receiving the same coddling treatment accorded to some of our Communists now in the Federal prisons, as I previously mentioned in the case of Marzani and the others? The Evening Star of February 13 carried the following comments about this death:

Deputy Coroner Christopher J. Murphy said the cause of death was shock and a brain hemorrhage resulting from trauma. It would take "a great deal more than a slap," he replied to a question, "to produce the injury which caused death."

Certainly Congress cannot ignore this important subject. Certainly society is entitled to some protection, and I therefore propose that a sweeping investigation and study of the entire Federal prison system be made as soon as possible.

This investigation should also include the riots at the Federal prisons at Alcatraz, Atlanta, Chillicothe, El Reno, and so forth, which cost the taxpayers thousands of dollars and death to several individuals.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding to me. I want to commend and compliment him on his very excellent statement, a very thorough and complete statement. I wholeheartedly subscribe to and endorse everything he has said here this afternoon. As the gentleman from Tennessee knows, I have worked with him for the past few weeks on this subject and we have talked to several of the same people about it. I can assure the Members of this body that everything the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] has said here this afternoon is absolute fact.

In line with his suggestion, I have today introduced in this House a resolution asking for a thorough investigation, a sweeping investigation, of all our Federal penal institutions, including our District of Columbia institutions, with particular reference to the Federal Parole Board which is headed by a Mr. Bennett.

Mr. SUTTON. I hope the Attorney General will close the files so that Bennett will not strip them before you get a chance to look at them.

Mr. BROYHILL. I have attempted to get some information from them myself, but have met with a blank wall so for as results are concerned.

Preliminary investigation reveals that the parole board of the federally operated National Training School in the District of Columbia has failed in the discharge of their duties to the public. Case after case exists where criminals of the lowest type have been freed on parole only to resume their life of crime. Efforts to find out why such felons received such soft treatment have been met with buckpassing and the merry runaround on the part of those responsible. Only a real down-to-earth congressional probe will bring out the real facts and those facts are essential to reducing crime within the District of Columbia and other cities throughout the Nation.

Such a probe should also determine why certain dirty citizens appear to receive preferential treatment in the matter of imprisonment in Federal prisons. Some of these Federal detention homes are known in the criminal world as country clubs. I believe that Lewisburg, Pa., has such a club. Obviously some of our criminal element is influential enough to make certain their time is served in such a Federal institution.

The National Training School in Washington, through its soft parole system, is a growing concern to law-enforcement officials of Washington, even though those officials will not admit it publicly.

It is high time that we tighten a parole system that permits the release of scores of hardened criminals to prey upon the citizens of Washington. It is high time that we stop coddling felons by imprisoning them in so-called country clubs.

It is gratifying to discover that good police work in Washington has reduced crime. It is also gratifying to find that over the past 6 or 7 months the judges in our local courts have been meting out stiffer sentences instead of slaps on the wrist. But despite this healthy reduction in the crime rate, the city of Washington has entirely too much lawlessness. It is still hazardous for women to walk the streets alone after dark. There is still entirely too much juvenile crime which the records show is on the upgrade. Something must be worked out between the district attorney's office and the juvenile court to deal more drastically with young people already embarked on a life of crime. Repeaters must be treated for what they are. It is good to remind ourselves that some of the Nation's worst gangsters and racketeers became criminals in their youth and we should act accordingly.

I sincerely believe that the investigation I propose will serve the best interests of the community and the Nation.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEEHAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, seldom in American legislative history have so many unwarranted, unsupported claims for a proposed piece of legislation been offered as are being advanced by advocates of the so-called St. Lawrence seaway.

Today I propose to consider the alleged hydra-headed advantages of this misnomer, the "seaway," and prove them to be misleading and fallacious. In so doing, I am convinced I will be performing a valued service to this body and our Nation, for the seaway bill, in my opinion, is inimical to the national interest.

Sponsors of the new-look version of the seaway are quick to indict opponents as men of narrow vision, motivated by sectional and selfish interests. Now the fact of the matter is that the exact opposite is likely to be the case; the opponents of this illy conceived measure are prepared to show how the national economy would be grossly injured by the project, while the proponents plead their

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

case on imaginary and visionary benefits to certain sections of the country; benefits, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, which, if for the sake of argument we allow will accrue, must be wrung from the national economy at the expense of sectional economies having their basis in the great and primary industries of coal, railroads, and maritime traffic.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we owe it to ourselves here in this Chamber to understand just what this proposed seaway is. We can begin our orientation of the project by stating that it is not, please let us understand, the old seaway idea that has been kicking around Congress for the past 30 years. It is not the seaway which would carry through to Detroit, Chicago, or Duluth. Rather, and this is important for us to realize, it is a bobtail version of the seaway which would extend only as far as Toledo.

Despite the fact that Toledo is the westerly terminus point of the proposed seaway, Mr. Speaker, the advocates of the proposal are showing themselves adept as lingual jugglers, for in a variety of ways and through various media they are furthering the impression that this partial seaway will confer all the inflated claims for the seaway to Duluth; in other words, Mr. Speaker, they are fostering the notion that our participation in this project is a bargain-basement buy.

As an illustration of some of the propaganda that they are using, this is the latest release of the lobbying group in support of the St. Lawrence seaway and it carries some 12 or 15 editorials from papers scattered throughout the Nation. I have checked and found that more than 50 percent of these editorials were written on the basis that the seaway was going to be built and extend as far west as Lake Superior to the port of Duluth. The whole propaganda on which they sold the seaway is that it was to be a major seaway project and now it is just a shortcut as compared to what was sold to the American people originally.

On this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote in part from a recent statement made by Mr. Thomas Kennedy, vice president of the United Mine Workers of America, in which he said:

> The inland waterway, as authorized in the bill now before Congress, proposes to go as far as Toledo, yet promoters of the seaway scheme are attempting to put over on the American public the phony that for $105 million America is going to get a seaway that extends to Duluth and will transform every city along the Great Lakes into a thriving seaport. The proponents of the present seaway legislation know full well that any such farflung development would run into billions upon billions of dollars. In the face of this great disparity, the seaway promoters have no qualms about misrepresenting its scope and proportions in statements on the floor of Congress, in the newspapers, in detailed published maps, and on TV.

The proponents of the so-called St. Lawrence seaway have always used as one of the principal justifications of their project the charge that it was opposed by selfish eastern interests.

The lobby report filed by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, the pro-seaway lobby, with the Clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate for the fourth quarter of 1953, reveals it received $45,822.25 during the 3-month period. Of this amount it received $22,222.25 from the 5 steel companies interested in the Labrador-Quebec ore development, $15,000 from the Ford Motor Co., and $5,000 from Chrysler.

The steel companies want the waterway, or the bobtailed version which stops at Lake Erie, to bring down their iron ore on a better competitive basis. The Detroit Board of Trade says that the waterway would make it possible for Mr. Ford to get his cars to Europe at $20 a car cheaper. If the grandiose scheme of creating artificial, part-time seaports more than 2,000 miles inland is realized, with the resulting unemployment on the eastern and gulf coasts, and throughout the coal fields, he will certainly need to sell his cars in Europe.

Actually the practical desires of those financing the prowaterway fight are not mentioned in the propaganda circulated by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association. It says only that the waterway is wanted for national defense. Just a group of superpatriots.

And now, just quickly, Mr. Speaker, I want to give you one more paragraph which follows closely in Mr. Kennedy's statement, which aptly summarizes the impact of this proposed bill. Mr. Kennedy states:

> Despite all the alleged benefits the boondogglers are claiming for the seaway, we know it will greatly damage the coal industry of the United States, hurt the railroad industry, give marked advantages to foreign shipping. The seaway will seriously affect many communities, add to growing unemployment, and open the floodgates to the vast volume of cheaply manufactured goods from Europe, produced by a labor market whose wages cannot begin to compare with ours.

Mr. Speaker, I was glad to note that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] on February 3 included in the RECORD Mr. Kennedy's statement made on behalf of and in the name of, the United Mine Workers of America. The statement was entitled "The Old Shell Game," and I recommend it to your attention for consideration.

As a Representative from the great State of West Virginia, Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to represent a district that embraces part of one of the vital and basic industries of our Nation—coal. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, there will be no disagreement with the assertion that coal is the fundamental factor that our whole industrial complex mainly depends upon for successful operation. Industrialists and economists everywhere are in accord on this. It was because of this primary fact that Marshall plan executives were so concerned about rehabilitating the coal industries in those foreign countries of the free world alliance after World War II, when our efforts were directed to making those nations self-supporting in the shortest possible span of years.

It was with gratitude and appreciation, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that I read the very thorough and enlightened discussion of the coal industry's relation to national prosperity and a strong America, by the able and distinguished Representative from Pennsylvania [Mr. CARRIGG]. His scholarly treatment of this subject was published in the RECORD on February 2, at page 1182, and I would urge each and every Member to acquaint himself with its contents so that he might be the better informed on this proposed seaway legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of this body to a pertinent report on this subject, just issued by the National Coal Association, which cites strong and germane reasons why this seaway bill should be rejected by Congress. This statement says, in part, and I quote:

> The construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway can very easily compound an economic situation in the domestic petroleum and coal industries which has reached havockal proportions. In addition, the railroad equipment and many other manufacturing groups, to say nothing of small-business men and industrial communities, will also feel the effects of this impact. I refer to the flood of unrestricted foreign oil, crude and residual, which is presently reaching our eastern seaboard markets, and which avenued via a waterway to the interior, could just as well inundate the markets of the Midwest and the Great Lakes areas.
>
> A very great part of the traditional and historical market for crude oil and products produced in the Midcontinent, Southwest and Rocky Mountain fields is located in the Midwest of the United States, including all of the Great Lakes area. Because of the concentration of industrial activity, this area is also a prime and major market for coal and other conventional fuels.
>
> The proponents of the seaway have on many occasions asserted that vast quantities of foreign produced crude oil will move into this market, and in fact, use their estimates of tolls from this source as a substantial contribution to the income which they say will make the seaway self-liquidating.

One of the major threats facing the coal industry of America, Mr. Speaker, is the flood of residual fuel oil which is inundating these United States. This importation has grown so that it now accounts for 36 percent, yes, that's the impressive figure, Mr. Speaker, 36 percent of the total volume of all the United States imports.

So that you may have a wholly clear conception of this rising traffic in foreign residual fuel oil, I am going to quote again directly from the National Coal Association's statement of February 11, 1954, which vividly recounts the story:

> Foreign residual oil, in the main, is dumped on eastern industrial markets and into a territory approximately 100 miles inland at prices that have no relation to the cost of production, and admittedly at much lower prices than the actual cost of the crude itself.
>
> This heavy oil is used principally by industrial installations, most of which already have standby equipment to burn coal, or could be easily converted to burn either coal or an accessible grade of domestic fuel oil. These heavy oils have no practical value as a source of heat for homes, or for powering American railroads, nor for fueling essential war machines, such as tanks, planes, and motor vehicles.
>
> The flood of this product which by domestic refining standards is considered as

unwanted commodity has been growing annually, while at the same time domestic refiners have been improving their refining processes in order that the residue product might be eliminated completely or reduced to a bare minimum. In 1946, residual oil imports amounted to 45 million barrels; in 1952 they amounted to 128 million barrels; and in 1953 the flood tide amounted to 134 million barrels. This increasing flood of residual oil unfairly undersells coal and destroys its markets, causes mines to close, impairs the capital investment of the coal industry, retards domestic exploration and development of new domestic oil fields, decreases potential traffic for American railroads; reduces opportunity for livelihood for thousands of coal mine and railroad workers; threatens the existence of thousands of small-business men, and entire communities and imperils the Nation's security by building up unwise dependence on foreign oil sources.

We would do well, Mr. Speaker, to pause and ponder what this deluge of foreign residual oil is doing to American industry. During the year 1952, the residual oil imports into America were at the rate of 366,515 barrels a day, which when computed on a year-round basis meant the displacement of 32 million tons of American coal. When this is traced out in practical economic and human terms it means the shutting down of coal collieries in this country; it means shorter workweeks for those mines able to continue operations; it means hundreds upon hundreds of mineworkers forced on relief rolls; it means the loss of millions upon millions of sorely needed payrolls and additional millions in the loss of railroad revenues; it also means, Mr. Speaker, the loss of tax dollars to local, State, and National Government; above all, it means the loss of opportunity to American citizens to their right of gainful employment; it spells want, privation, and human misery.

These are not idle figures of speech, Mr. Speaker, they are harsh, stern facts. Judging from the reports of this residual foreign oil for the week ending January 23, 1954, the imports of this product have increased to the staggering total of 529,900 barrels a day. Not a week, not a month, but 529,900 barrels a day, Mr. Speaker; and if this volume is facilitated, as it would be enormously by the construction of the seaway, think of the incalculable economic harm that would be done America.

The National Coal Association has made a projection, in terms of economic impact and injury upon American industrial life, based on the figures of January 23, as I have just given them to you. Here is the economic harm spelled out:

As a result of the residual oil importations, American coal producers lost $155 million;

American railroads lost $88 million in revenues;

American coal miners lost $79 million in wages, which would be equal to 22,000 jobs for 1 year;

American railroad labor lost $44 million in wages; and

The Federal, State, and local taxes, figured directly, without any attempted computation of indirect losses, amounted to $40 million.

In considering these depressing figures, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that at all times you have in mind that behind those statistics are human beings, American citizens who are being forced into unemployment because of the growing volume of this single import, a volume which will be accelerated by the construction of the seaway.

Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of these facts alone, we are justified in titling the seaway measure "A bill to promote American unemployment."

A calculated effort has been made, Mr. Speaker, to make out the seaway proposal as a needed national defense measure. I propose to go into this absurd claim in its various aspects. It just so happens that in concluding my consideration of the residual fuel oil question that I want to touch upon its relation to American national defense and so I will take the liberty of using this final reference to this angle of the problem as a bridge over to the body proper of the defense question.

On the defense problem, the National Coal Association offers these incisive and effective comments:

Foreign oil, as revealed in World War II, cannot effectively be brought into the United States by overseas tankers. Indeed, the movement from our own Gulf coast to the east coast practically collapsed during World War II. It has likewise been demonstrated, based on World War II experience, that any great expansion in the production from the domestic oil wells to meet the huge strain of full wartime effort cannot be expected. In World War II over 90 percent of the increased fuel demands in the United States in the first 12 months were met by coal and over the entire war period some two-thirds of all the extra fuel demands came from coal.

The only safety in war from a liquid fuel standpoint rests on oil wells already drilled and pipelines already laid. Going industries, whether producing oil, coal, or other fuels, are the only safeguards for national defense. Their peacetime level of production and capacity must be such as to take care of major needs in time of war. They cannot be starved by being subjected to the policies of foreign-oil producers or foreign-oil-producing nations. If a readiness to serve is demanded and required they must be given sufficient market to assure compensatory operations.

Any fair-minded individual would be hard put to take exception to such a soundly reasoned statement of the case.

In attempting to bolster up their defense case, Mr. Speaker, the proponents of the seaway made a last minute call for help to the Pentagon and came up with a letter from Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This document, Mr. Speaker, is notable for its wholesale assemblage of misstatements, and this is said in all respect to Admiral Radford, who had to rely upon subordinates for his information. A categorical refutation of the claims made by Admiral Radford in his "Five Before Twelve" letter to a Member of the other body, has been made by the National St. Lawrence Project Conference—in opposition—and I am certain that inasmuch as so much has been made out of the admiral's testimony that we go into it item by item.

Admiral Radford said—in a solicited letter to Senator FERGUSON, read in the Senate a few hours before the St. Lawrence vote:

Failure of the United States to participate at this time in the navigation features of the seaway would result in the construction of all the locks on the Canadian side of the St. Lawrence River wholly outside United States territory. As a result, no part of the seaway locks and lateral canals would ever be under the control of the United States. The United States would not have a voice in the control of the traffic through the seaway on an equal basis with Canada. The United States would then necessarily have to depend upon Canada to evaluate and take steps necessary to protect its interest in the matter of the operation of the seaway, not only in relation to toll charges and priority of transportation in times of emergencies, but also in relation to the physical security and control of the seaway. Although the Joint Chiefs of Staff can hardly conceive of a war in which we would be involved with Canada remaining neutral, from a national-security viewpoint we cannot ignore the possibility of such an eventuality. Since it is not customary for neutral nations to permit the use of their inland waters to belligerents its use could possibly be denied to us at the very time we needed it most by a failure on our part to participate jointly with Canada in the construction of the waterway, thereby insuring joint control of the United States.

The facts: An all-Canadian waterway would be on the American side in several places. This waterway would, in fact, cut across the American island of Galop.

The Wiley-Dondero bills would provide a voice only in a 46-mile section of the International Rapids. In the 1,100 miles of the St. Lawrence River to the east, wholly in Canada and in the Canadian-owned Welland Canal to the west, we would have no more control than we have now—the right by treaty to forever use the river on equal terms with Canada.

No tonnage originates in the 46-mile section. It would originate east of Montreal. What can we do about priority of transportation up there?

In this event our incoming vessels could not even get into the Gulf of St. Lawrence, much less 1,100 miles farther to the International Rapids, and outgoing they would be held up at the Welland Canal, in the neighborhood of Buffalo.

Admiral Radford said:

In amplification of the need for a protected route to additional sources of high-grade iron ore, I need hardly remind you of the difficulties we experienced in World War II in shipping needed oil and bauxite from gulf-coast ports and from South America to the eastern seaboard.

The facts: In 1942, the first year of World War II when we were having trouble with enemy submarines there were 13 enemy sinkings in this so-called sheltered route, right in the neighborhood of where the iron ore is to be loaded in the St. Lawrence River—2 west of this point and toward Montreal in May; 3 in July; 4 west and 3 east in September; and 1 west in October.

Admiral Radford said:

In addition to assuring the United States in time of emergency, the full benefits of joint participation in a shorter, more protected overseas route to the British Isles and Europe for transportation of military cargo.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The facts: The time for a 15-knotter from Montreal to Liverpool is 8 days 10 hours; from New York to Liverpool 8 days 12 hours. An additional 6 days would be required for it to get across the lakes and over the seaway to Montreal.

We assume the enemy would agree not to wage war in the 4 to 5 months seaway would be icebound.

Admiral Radford said:

Should we fail to participate jointly with Canada, then admission of foreign ships to American waters would be solely in the hands of, albeit a friendly one, a foreign nation.

The facts: We suggest they could be stopped at Galop Island, an American island but through which an all-Canadian seaway would have to pass. And if they are missed there they could be caught as they emerge from the Welland Canal. Canada would certainly have the say until the International Rapids are reached.

Admiral Radford said:

Should capacity of space of the seaway become a critical factor, then Canada would have control over priorities on the seaway use and various ships and cargoes in wartime, as well as in peacetime.

The facts: Canada, in any event will have this control for 1,100 miles before the International Rapids are reached. No tonnage will originate in the Rapids section where it is insisted we buy a voice. Traffic downbound from the lakes would be subjected to Canada's ownership of the Welland Canal.

An objective review of this fact versus fiction exercise, Mr. Speaker, is certain to persuade any unbiased person that the national defense claims for this seaway proposal are as unwarranted as its economics are unsound.

One does not have to be an expert, Mr. Speaker, to realize that things are not rosy with the American maritime industry. Each and every day the newspapers carry stories relating the difficulties of this important industry. It is apparent to a novice that it needs to be helped; certainly the last thing we should do is to visit new hardships on it, hardships that will be financed by American taxpayers' funds, to the advantage of foreign ship owners.

I said we do not need to be an expert to understand all this, Mr. Speaker, but if we do desire expert testimony on the subject, I refer to the testimony of Mr. Alvin Shapiro, director of research of the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., as an opponent of the seaway. Mr. Shapiro testified in part as follows:

Our views are confined basically to the navigation aspects of the proposed project on which we feel particularly qualified to testify since our organization is composed of shipowners and operators engaged in deepwater overseas and coastal trading.

Our aim is to promote our national maritime policy by assuring, consonant with sound business practices, the existence of an adequate, modern, and efficient American fleet to serve our important waterborne trades, domestic and foreign, and our national defense.

Any project which enlarges the trading opportunities for deepwater ships, and stimulates waterborne commerce in areas in which our vessels can operate would advance this national policy. If our members felt that the St. Lawrence Seaway would do this we would appear here strongly in favor.

We do not pose as military experts for the record is too replete with authoritative judgments of the highest possible source to cause us, as shipowners and operators, serious concern about the vulnerability of this long seaway to bombing and/or sabotage. Any such action could effectively bottle up ships west of the obstruction. The prospect of landlocking ships and the products of lake-shipbuilding or other national defense plants cannot be casually dismissed.

The principal reasons why we feel that the building of the St. Lawrence Seaway will not promote American-flag deep-water shipping are as follows:

1. It is proposed to create a waterway of a depth of 27 feet. Such a draft would not permit utilization of maximum carrying capacity in the operation of an overwhelming majority of our deep-water vessels. The control of the exact trim of a large ocean-going vessel under all conditions is a very delicate one and is affected by frequent changes which occur due to the consumption of fuel, water, stores, or other reasons. Competent navigators do not consider that it would be safe to send a deep-sea vessel over this waterway unless there were at least 3 feet of water under her keel at the lowest point. This automatically reduces the allowable draft to the lowest point to 24 feet.

It should be noted that in order to obtain a clearance permit in Montreal, large vessels must have a minimum clearance of 2½ feet; 3 feet for ships over 10,000 deadweight tons.

When fresh water is entered, the 3-foot clearance at tidewater entrance would be reduced by about 9 inches, due to the lesser density of the supporting water.

The committee may be interested to know that the designed draft of the Liberty-type cargo vessel is 27 feet, 8 inches; the Victory, 28 feet 6 inches; the new Mariner type, 29 feet 9 inches. These are average drafts and in operation the deepest point of draft may well be below the mean draft.

It is significant to note that of 77 ocean-going vessels currently building or on order in United States shipyards only 1, a coastal tanker, has a designed draft of less than 29 feet. For economic reasons the trend is definitely to larger and deeper draft vessels. Our best available information indicates that of all seagoing ships under construction abroad only a very minor portion of such tonnage will be usable on the projected seaway.

2. The United States privately owned seagoing merchant marine now totals 15,344,000 deadweight tons. Ships having a draft of 24 feet or less total less than 300,000 deadweight tons. Obviously then not even 2 percent of our privately owned American-flag merchant fleet could operate through this waterway with full utilization of weight-lifting capacity.

Foreign merchant ships are generally smaller than ours for basic economic reasons. Foreign vessels can operate at approximately two-thirds of our costs, primarily because their wages are far below those paid American seamen.

Due to this cost differential America's merchant ships are engaged in a great struggle to remain on the seas. It would be virtually impossible for us to compete other than through larger-size units of greater capacity in order to reduce per-cargo-ton operating costs. The larger the vessel the less important are the labor and other operating costs reflected in the overall expense per ton of capacity.

This situation is perhaps most perfectly demonstrated by the use currently being made of the present seaway with its 14-foot channel. During the 1952 navigation season 60 vessels made a total of 145 voyages from the Great Lakes to foreign ports, primarily in North Europe. * * * These vessels were small, with about 2,500 deadweight-ton capacity, 250 feet long, and naturally of shallow draft. Not one was of United States registry.

To encourage the investment of substantial sums of money in a project which is so one-sidedly disadvantageous to American ships in our own commerce, is, in our judgment, not in the public interest.

From this expert testimony, Mr. Speaker, it should be abundantly clear that the proposed seaway would do great harm to the American maritime industry. I repeat, what this important industry needs at the present time is constructive help, not ventures financed by the public treasury, from taxpayers' funds which are calculated to inflict serious damage upon it.

As we reflect upon all that has been claimed for this seaway measure, Mr. Speaker, we can well imagine that in a future day a student of legislative research could find a rich mine for exploration in the tortured history of this proposal. Mind you, it purports to be the single answer to national security, flourishing international trade, national prosperity—it purports to do everything but guarantee domestic tranquillity.

Stripped of all the fanciful claims made in its name, Mr. Speaker, what this bill amounts to is a river-deepening project, to be financed by the Nation's taxpayers, to facilitate the shipment of privately owned Labrador ore to five of the Midwest steel companies. This is Canadian ore, held jointly by Canadian interests and five American Midwest steel companies. I might add paranthetically, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Government gets a royalty on every ton of ore produced.

It might be well at this juncture, Mr. Speaker, to point out that there is no need for the Midwest steel industry to go far afield for a supply of iron ore, and go at the taxpayers' expense. There is an adequate supply of iron ore for a long, long time to come in the Lake Superior district, and also in the vast United States reserves of taconite. As to the ore produced in Laborator there is no question but that it can find a ready, profitable market in the East, an area where it is needed most, and that all of this can be accomplished without financing a sales accessory in the form of a seaway with funds from the United States Treasury. And while on this point, Mr. Speaker, and with your kind indulgence referring back briefly to the defense aspect, I would like to assert that should a national emergency in the form of war come upon us, and proceeding on the assumption that the east coast would be cut off by submarine warfare, this same Labrador ore would not be moved over the proposed seaway because it would be required for steel mills in the eastern United States. The shipments to this point, the eastern steel mills of the United States, could be accomplished best by deep-draft to Montreal where it would be shipped directly south by rail, the shortest and most efficient route which would not utilize the proposed waterway.

So from every viewpoint of adequate ore supply, national defense and prac-

tical economics there is just no good reason why the taxpayers of the United States should be required to finance a luxury ore route for Midwest steel companies.

Nor should we forget, Mr. Speaker, that the Labrador ore field will be in operation for a considerable period before the waterway would be completed. This would mean that ways and means of marketing will have been established without the waterway figuring into the marketing pattern. Expectation of this development is very real for Mr. George M. Humphrey, now the Secretary of the Treasury, and the then leader of the group that went into the Labrador ore field development, pointed this up in his testimony before the House Public Works Committee in June 1951, when he said:

> The farther we go without the seaway, the more difficult it becomes to use the seaway without incurring a lot of loss, because in order to use the existing facilities, as I pointed out, we have to build these expensive handling facilities that do not exist today. We get those built and we have got them and the tendency, you know, is that when you have something you use it as long as you possibly can to get what you can out of it.
>
> In addition to that, the type and character of the ship that we build has a lot to do with it, and if we get several ocean-going ships bought that cannot go up the seaway because they will be of a character and size that will not be available to go up the seaway, the tendency will be, of course, to try to use those ships and take the tonnage around the ocean instead of up the seaway.

I have taken the privilege of using this testimony, Mr. Speaker, because we are being asked to build this seaway for the steel companies with the prospect that they will not fully utilize it, if it should materialize.

We have noted Mr. Humphrey's statement as to the prospective purchase of vessels, of the ocean-going type that will not be able to use the seaway, and in this connection I would like to state that this process is already in operation. It is a matter of public record that the M. A. Hanna Co., one of the concerns of interest, on May 15, 1951, ordered two 30,000-ton ore carriers to be built in England, said carriers to be used for the transportation of Labrador ore. Republic Steel, another of the group backing the seaway bill, has also ordered two similar vessels. It is readily apparent that these vessels cannot use the seaway, and this illustrates again a glaring defect in the seaway proposal, the inadequacy of the proposed 27-foot chanel.

Now, the reason I brought this orderplacement of ore carriers up is to shed light on the minimum base of traffic projections upon which the Department of Commerce based its alleged self-liquidating volume of revenue through tolls. The estimates of revenue, to my mind, Mr. Speaker, are more imaginative than realistic.

Proponents of the seaway would finance it through bonds, bonds which must perforce become a direct obligation of the United States Treasury. An obligation that will force us to lift the ceiling on our national debt. Bonds will be issued in the amount of $105 million and will be satisfied through toll-producing revenues. So you can see at once that the matter of revenue-producing traffic for tolls is of vital concern. It may be assumed, Mr. Speaker, that the present traffic on the St. Lawrence would undoubtedly make use of the 14-foot canals on the Canadian side, which, incidentally, are toll-free, and are to remain so, even if the 27-foot waterway is constructed. Another thing that must be borne in mind is that the new version of the seaway only extends to Toledo, and not Duluth, as in the original proposal, so the prospective volume of tolls must undergo another severe shrinkage.

And what is equally important, Mr. Speaker, is for us to realize that this $105-million-debt burden that is going to be saddled on the American public for the special benefit of the Midwest steel companies is only the beginning. If this thing gets launched as proposed, Mr. Speaker, the sun will never set on the recurring requests for more and more millions to add to the project. A logical move, if we are hep to the strategy of the seawayers, will be to ask authorization for another hundred million to deepen the connecting channels of the upper Great Lakes, thus bringing this area into conformity with the waterway in the St. Lawrence River. We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that this section just referred to has always been considered an integral of the St. Lawrence Waterway. We may rest assured that its omission in this present legislation is not an oversight, but rather is considered a well-planned maneuver.

Once this thing got rolling, Mr. Speaker, there would be an endless round of calls for new financing. I can just visualize the proponents coming in here and saying: It is an unwise and unsound policy to have proceeded thus far, invested millions of public funds in this feasible project, and then allow it to linger half completed. Double your bets and consolidate and safeguard your investment. That is the way it will go, Mr. Speaker; you know it and I know it, and every Member of this body knows it. We have heard the same sad song so many times, and we must admit it, Mr. Speaker, it has a tear-jerking appeal.

One of the next things we would be called upon to furnish more money for would be to improve the Great Lakes harbors so they would be able to handle those vessels which could use a 27-foot waterway. This would be a natural followup. We have had the testimony that the cost of completing this phase of the ultimate project, that of improving the 17 typical harbors in the Great Lakes area so as to enable them to accommodate the vessels utilizing a 27-foot channel, would cost a minimum of $104 million, and those estimates are long out of date.

Is this not a fascinating business, Mr. Speaker, adding bits and pieces to this grand design, every bit and piece coming at an approximate cost of $100 million? Now what adds to the zest of the game, Mr. Speaker, is that when you get finished with all the elements, the increasing and costly elements, which we have seen run into hundreds of millions of dollars, you still are not anywhere in the realm of feasibility and practicability when you wind up with a 27-foot waterway channel.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, we must logically reach the conclusion that the proposal embraced by the Wiley-Dondero bill is already outmoded, that it will not and cannot achieve the objectives claimed for it, that its approval at this time could serve no other purpose than loose the floodgates for new and larger claims on the National Treasury; ultimately our country will be confronted with a demand for an adequate channel that by the best of the most conservative estimates would cost us at the very least $2 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the advocates of the seaway feel they have a compelling argument in the proposition that the seaway is going to be built by Canada anyway and it is to our advantage to buy a so-called favored position by our participation. This whole argument was discussed in a most penetrating and scholarly way by Mr. Walter Lippmann in the Washington Post on January 21, 1954, in a column which was designated "A Project Outgrown."

Right now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to quote briefly from Mr. Lippmann's article within the context of my remarks, but I judge his appraisal so valuable that I ask unanimous permission to have the Lippmann column printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Lippmann, reviewing the history of the seaway proposal, at the same time traces Canada's growth and industrial development, and reaches this conclusion:

> Canada is now quite rich and powerful enough to build a seaway out of her own resources.

Mr. Lippmann also takes cognizance of the strong sentiment in the ranks of Canadian officialdom to build the seaway herself. He states:

> There are strong reasons for thinking that the Canadians would not be disappointed, but on the contrary relieved, if in fact Congress (the United States Congress) decided to drop the joint project and to let Canada proceed alone with the seaway.

Mr. Lippmann then goes on to make out an argument in behalf of simple solutions to vexing international questions, which solution in this instance would be to let America step aside and allow Canada to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence and the courtesy of this body in allowing me the time to make this presentation. If there are some who feel I have proceeded at too considerable a length, I offer the explanation that I was endeavoring to consider this proposal on its overall, national merits and not on any narrow sectional or selfish basis. After long and careful study of this seaway project, I, like many of my colleagues from all sections of the country, are convinced that it will strike crippling blows to our coal, railroad, and maritime industries, and, in so doing, will undermine the strong foundations which are essential to an economically

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

dynamic America so essential for leadership in the worldwide struggle of the free world against the Communist conspiracy. We are equally convinced the seaway, if constructed, would strike against all American industry and business by allowing for a dumping of goods that have been produced in a labor market whose wage scales are grossly lower than ours. So, too, are we convinced that instead of being a national defense asset, it would be a national defense liability, on the front doorstep of the Polar route of attack from an invader, and a sitting duck for a bomb or a saboteur.

Mr. Speaker, I want to digress from my set speech long enough to give you some idea of just who is back of this proposed St. Lawrence Seaway.

Apparently there are certain members of the administration in high positions who consider this project a closed case. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who is drumming up support for what he calls the seaway bandwagon, took it upon himself to declare on the Senate floor 10 days ago that the seaway is "now rolling in high gear, and will move further ahead by a triumph in the House Rules Committee." It is unfortunate that many of us here in the House must read the Senate reports in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to find out what is going to happen in a House committee which presumably does not make its decisions until its members are in official meeting, but I suppose that we must accept these methods when high-pressure politics is applied to a bill.

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee also made this statement on the Senate floor:

> I want to urge all the citizens of our Nation who appreciate the significance of this great project to get in touch with their Representatives and respectfully ask them to support the seaway bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is unduly concerned with what goes on over in this wing of the Capitol. If he is so positive that the seaway bill is going to become law, I would suggest that he could better serve his country by getting in touch with the Secretary of State in Berlin before adjournment of the Big Four meetings and recommend some sort of agreement whereby no warfare will be permitted to take place in winter months. Proponents of the seaway call this extravagant dredging dream a defense measure, yet they admit that it will be frozen over 5 months of the year. Now, unless they figure on importing Russian wolfhounds to transport their valuable cargo over the ice, it seems to me that the scheme is not going to be of much help to the United States without a provision that all future hostilities are to be confined to the warm months of the year.

The fact of the matter is that this series of million dollar miles will open the way for expanding the havoc created by foreign residual oil on the coal markets of this Nation, and by so doing will further injure the United States coal industry and displace more and more miners. At the same time, it will deprive the railroads of coal traffic and cause increasing layoffs of railroad personnel. In which case there may not be enough coal available in time of emergency, and the railroads will have had no incentive to augment their stock of the freight cars necessary to get solid fuels where they are needed. I would suggest that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee take these facts into consideration before continuing his lobbying for the bill that would sell the American coal industry down the St. Lawrence and thus make this country more dependent upon the foreign fuels that are already interfering with our economic welfare and imposing a grave threat upon our security.

Mr. Speaker, I devoutly hope that the Members of this body in their wisdom and patriotism, in their enlightened dedication to America, will never allow this seaway folly to come to pass.

[From the Washington Post of January 21, 1954]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

A PROJECT OUTGROWN

Congress and the St. Lawrence Seaway bill have become like a man with an unanswered letter on his desk. Afraid to say yes and unwilling to say no, he puts off answering the letter until things have changed so much that the writer of the letter has begun to wish it would be returned unanswered.

The original project called for constructing the seaway from Montreal to Ogdensburg, N. Y., by a joint action of the Canadian and American Governments. The joint action is no longer needed to construct the seaway. There is considerable reason for thinking that on the balance it would be wiser to give up the project of joint construction and to let Canada build the seaway herself on her own territory with her own financing and with her own administration. If that were the way this long-disputed matter were settled, there would be left only the hydroelectric power facilities to be constructed by joint action of the Province of Ontario and the State of New York. That requires no further action by the Congress. The necessary license has been issued and all that remains is to have the matter settled by the courts.

The original plan for joint action has been talked about for decades. The present agreement was reached in March 1941. That was a few months before Pearl Harbor, and during the war the project, which had not yet been approved by Congress, was of course laid aside. It was revived after the war. But in session after session Congress has failed to ratify it.

In the meantime Canada was entering upon her extraordinary postwar growth—with the discovery of vast natural resources in oil, iron ore, and other minerals, and with a corresponding industrial expansion. The effect has been to increase and to make urgent Canada's need for the seaway and for the hydroelectric power which can be generated by the fall of the St. Lawrence River. But that is not the only effect of Canada's industrial growth. Canada is now quite rich and powerful enough to build a seaway out of her own resources.

In December 1951, after Congress had repeatedly failed to approve the joint undertaking, the Canadian Parliament passed an act enabling a Canadian St. Lawrence Seaway Authority to build the seaway as a Canadian project. It passed also another act, which enables the power development to be separated from the seaway and to be carried out by Ontario and New York, the two neighboring communities which would use the electric power.

For more than 2 years, therefore, the construction of the seaway has no longer depended upon our participation in the work and our contribution to its costs. This disposes of all the questions which Congress is debating insofar as they have to do with whether the seaway ought to be built, whether it is economically a sound project, whether it is a good engineering project, whether the estimates of the costs are correct, whether the seaway will have adverse effects on the railroads, and the Atlantic ports from Boston to Baltimore. For the seaway can be and will be built by Canada and the Congress no longer needs to or can decide whether it should be built.

The only important question now before Congress is whether we need and wish to be in on the construction of the seaway. The question really is whether we wish to exercise what is in effect an old and, in the circumstances, an obsolete option permitting us to buy ourselves into a partnership.

Two reasons are now advanced why we should do this. The one is that the seaway is vital to the national defense of the United States. The answer to that is that the seaway we are talking about covers only a very short part, something like a hundred miles, on a river than runs over a thousand miles through Canada. Our vital interest in the St. Lawrence as an element of defense depends entirely upon our relations with Canada and no fears need be entertained about that.

The other reason advanced for our exercising this old option now is that we would acquire thereby a say in the fixing of the tolls. That is not necessary since the matter of tolls is provided for by an international treaty which says that there can be no discrimination against American ships.

Canada, which honors her commitments so scrupulously, will of course go through with the joint construction if Congress passes the Wiley bill and we take up our option. But there are strong reasons for thinking that the Canadians would not be disappointed, but on the contrary relieved, if in fact Congress decided to drop the joint project and to let Canada proceed alone with the seaway.

On April 30, 1953, just a few months ago, the Canadian Minister of Transport, Mr. Lionel Chevrier, came to Washington and delivered a speech which, within the limits of the language of diplomacy, was, as I read it, a plea for leaving the seaway to Canada.

Canada has always, said the Minister, assumed complete responsibility for providing the navigation facilities from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to Lake Erie. Until this joint project was put forward, the United States had assumed almost complete responsibility for through navigation facilities from Lake Erie to the head of the lakes. It was quite natural, he said, that in the economic development of the United States active interest should have been concentrated upon the upper section of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes system. That was because of the vast iron ore deposits in the Mesabi Range just west of Lake Superior, because of the occurrence of limestone near Lake Michigan, and because of the large coal deposits in the areas south of Lake Erie.

But, he went on to say, for well over 200 years Canada has been actively interested in and exclusively responsible for the progressive development which has taken place in the St. Lawrence River from the gulf to Lake Erie. The first canals and the first locks were built by Canada and later the waterway above the international section was improved to 27-foot draft by the construction of the new Welland Canal. Every important betterment has been carried out and paid for by Canada at a cost of something like $300 million. Nevertheless ships of every nation have used the present seaway without payment of tolls for nearly 50 years. All that remains is the bottleneck at the International Rapids section. Since

we have refused to cooperate in removing it, the Minister pleaded in all but the words themselves that we step aside and let Canada proceed.

The United States has two paramount interests in this question. The first is that the settlement shall promote for the long future our good relations with Canada. The second is that the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence shall serve the best economic interests of the expanding economies of both countries.

As to Canadian-American relations, the question is whether, since it is no longer necessary, it is wise to enter into a partnership which will require a high degree of cooperativeness for a long time between the Canadian Parliament and the American Congress. Would it not be wiser to do what Mr. Chevrier all but asked us to do: to recognize that navigation facilities on the St. Lawrence from the gulf to Lake Erie are primarily a Canadian responsibility, and that from Lake Erie to the head of the lakes at Duluth they are primarily a United States responsibility? Is there any longer a compelling reason why we should gratuitously accept the hazards of the quarrelsomeness, especially as respects foreign countries, of contemporary legislatures?

The simplest solutions are almost always the best in international relations, and especially in this rather backward age when cantankerousness is so often mistaken for stouthearted patriotism.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] on the wonderful presentation of the facts that he has given us. I would like to associate myself with my colleague in his opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following those of my colleague [Mr. BAILEY] and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank my colleague from West Virginia for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my able and distinguished colleague from the Third District of West Virginia. He has made a statesmanlike presentation of the case against the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. He has considered it on the basis of the great harm it would do to some of our basic industries, and he has effectively exposed the fallacy of the claim that it would be an asset to our national defense.

It is not my intention to go exhaustively into the many objectionable features of this proposed legislation. However, I do owe it to the people of my State and to the constituents of my district to voice certain convictions I have on this matter.

The way to strengthen America and insure the security of this country is not to participate in a project which will inflict great damage upon the already prostrate coal industry, which will be extremely harmful to the great railway-transportation system, and which will deprive additional thousands of workers of their jobs.

While we discuss this question, shadows are falling over the coal collieries of the Nation—shadows that foretell curtailed production, reduced operation, shorter workweeks, more furloughs, and the drying up of mine-industry jobs. This is what is happening in the coal-mining communities of our country. Able-bodied Americans are being denied the chance to earn a livelihood for their families because coal markets are being lost. Only yesterday, I was advised by Mr. George J. Titler, president, District 29, United Mine Workers of America, Beckley, W. Va., that approximately 28,211 coal miners were cut off in southern West Virginia between October 1952 and January 1954. This figure does not include the many thousands of workers who, although remaining employed, are working only 1, 2, and 3 days per week. The coal industry is in the throes of a major economic depression, and it is a depression which is being felt in every vocation and in every community of the State. When the coal industry suffers in West Virginia, everybody suffers—grocery stores, hardware, and furniture stores, churches, wholesale houses, automobile sales agencies, theaters—nobody is left unharmed.

A great portion of this distress can be attributed to uncontrolled imports of residual oil; and legislation for United States participation in the construction of the St. Lawrence project will serve to compound the disastrous effects presently being suffered by opening up a waterway into the interior through which this foreign oil can inundate the markets of the Great Lakes and the Middle West.

A great part of the traditional and historical market for coal is located in the Midwestern United States, including all of the Great Lakes area. Proponents of the seaway are expecting vast quantities of foreign oil to move into this market via the seaway, and they use their estimates of tolls from this source as a substantial contribution which they say will make the seaway self-liquidating.

In a report issued by the National Coal Association on February 11, the catastrophic effects of foreign oil imports upon the coal industry and the railroads are impressively presented. I include a few quotations from this report for the RECORD:

> Another major foreign oil import is residual oil which accounts for approximately 36 percent of the total volume of all United States imports. In recent years, the imports of residual oil have increased at a much faster rate than imports of crude petroleum.
>
> This heavy oil is used principally by industrial installations, most of which already have standby equipment to burn coal, or could be easily converted to burn either coal or an accessible grade of domestic fuel oil. These heavy oils have no practical value as a source of heat for homes, or for powering American railroads, or for fueling essential war machines, such as tanks, planes, and motor vehicles.
>
> The residual oil imports in 1953 were the equivalent to 32 million tons of coal, lost to American production. The 1953 residual oil imports were at the rate of 366,515 barrels a day. In 1954, on the basis of the imports for the week ending January 23, the imports have increased to a daily rate of 529,900 barrels. The economic losses from such a tonnage displacement affects a wide segment of our American industry:
>
> Coal producers lost $155 million.
>
> Railroads lost $88 million in revenues.
>
> Coal miners lost $79 million in wages (equal to 22,000 jobs for 1 year).
>
> Railroad labor lost $44 million in wages.
>
> Federal, State, and local taxes lost $40 million (direct).

In the face of these figures and facts, is the Congress going to take action which will accentuate and intensify the present threat to the coal and railroad industries by providing foreign residual oil with a ready access to the midcontinent area? At the present time, foreign residual imports are largely being consumed on the periphery of the United States. Is it not enough that our coastal markets have been deluged with this foreign waste product? Or shall we go further and permit the flood to roll over the Great Lakes area and the Middle West?

In order that you may be fully cognizant of the potential threat to the coal industry and to the railroads involved in this project which will open up the Great Lakes area to foreign residual oil, I wish to include a report issued on February 8 by the Southern Coal Producers Association. This report reveals the bituminous coal tonnage delivered to Lake Erie docks by the Chesapeake & Ohio and the Norfolk & Western Railways during the years 1945 through 1953.

Year	Chesapeake & Ohio	Norfolk & Western
1945	15, 295, 086	8, 275, 011
1946	15, 661, 799	9, 851, 815
1947	16, 978, 862	9, 220, 327
1948	15, 986, 793	10, 121, 520
1949	11, 982, 064	7, 019, 698
1950	16, 935, 014	9, 227, 106
1951	12, 839, 665	7, 596, 047
1952	12, 904, 494	7, 185, 477
1953	14, 109, 116	[1] 6, 831, 744

[1] First 9 months only.

At least 95 percent of the shipments shown is from mines located in southern West Virginia. These figures do not include lake shipments by the Virginian Railroad, and, although they would be small compared with the shipments of the Chesapeake & Ohio and the Norfolk & Western Railroads, whatever shipments are made by the Virginian are totally mined in southern West Virginia. In addition to these figures, approximately 1½ million tons of coal go to the lakes area via the New York Central Railway each year from the north side of the Kanawha River.

Mr. Speaker, I need proceed no further in an effort to convince the Members of this House as to what the effect may be upon a coal-producing State like West Virginia when a seaway opens the gates for foreign oil to an area which is being presently supplied with coal in such vast amounts as are indicated by the above report. This legislation will create additional havoc in the coal regions. Of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

course, some of the automobile manufacturers will be able to send cars to Europe at cheaper transportation rates, but displaced American workers forced to live on relief payrolls will not be able to buy cars at home.

It is my suggestion that, rather than spend millions of dollars in an enterprise which will be detrimental to American industries and American workers, we should devote our energies to the appropriation of moneys to perfect techniques whereby synthetic products may be economically produced from coal, and more moneys for public works projects in the distressed labor areas. By so doing, we would be spending the taxpayers' dollars wisely and in a way which would benefit, rather than penalize American industries and American men.

INLAND WATERWAYS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today there is being held in the city of New Orleans a meeting of dynamic leaders of the Mississippi Valley who vision the opening of new worlds of wealth and opportunity in the development of a great system of inland waterways.

In the immediate start in digging the Calumet-Sag project these men of large interests and long industrial training see first, the surest means of meeting the economic pains of readjustment; second, multiplying the industries and the employment of inland America while adding to the business volume of the seaports; and third, in the event of war furnishing easily protected facilities for the transportation of men and material.

Participating in the meeting today are Henry F. De Bardeleben, chairman of the board of a large coal company at Birmingham, Ala., and of the Coyle Barge Lines of New Orleans, William W. Huggett, president of the North Pier Terminal Co., of Chicago, C. C. Taylor, president of the Mississippi Barge Lines of St. Louis, Mo., Robert E. Elliott, president of the New Orleans Petroleum Corp., of New Orleans, and others. Mr. De Bardeleben is the retiring president of the Mississippi Valley Association. Mr. Huggett, and Mr. Taylor were members of the executive board of the association.

These men represented the great centers of Chicago, St. Louis, and New Orleans. They united in a tremendous drive for Calumet-Sag. On February 8, 1954, when the Mississippi Valley Association met in convention at the Jefferson Hotel in St. Louis, President De Bardeleben reported on what had been done and sketched future plans. It was a very fine report on a very important and necessary work. The convention, however, was not disposed to go along with the program. The reason was that members whose interest was solely in local matters and who made the least contribution to the support of the association were in numerical superiority. The result was that the trio of leaders resigned from the Mississippi Valley Association and are meeting today in New Orleans to form a new association. The new association will be dedicated to the cause of inland waterways. With the united financial and moral support of Chicago, St. Louis, and New Orleans it will give new force to the demand for the immediate start on Calumet-Sag.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the full text of the annual report of Mr. De Bardeleben as president and chairman of the Mississippi Valley Association. It merits the careful and thoughtful reception by my distinguished colleagues. The report follows:

(By Henry F. De Bardeleben, president and chairman of Mississippi Valley Association)

An annual meeting such as we now attend should naturally be a time for summing up an evaluation of the work done over the preceding 12 months. At this time, as I give an accounting of my stewardship of your association, I can look back over the year just passed with satisfaction, for it has been one of activity and accomplishment.

This is one case where I should know what I am talking about. If I should be inclined to forget, I have some travel-warped joints that would remind me of the activities of the past year. Caught up in the swirl of developing activity that marked last year's progress, I found myself on a perpetual merry-go-round. As campaigns came to a head and projects jelled I found myself snared. I had planned no such activity when I met with you here last year. But events put the spurs to me and I reacted by beating a path between Birmingham, St. Louis, New Orleans, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Washington, Omaha, Kansas City, Minneapolis, and intermediate points. Many times during the past year I found myself placing association business and interests ahead of my own business and my personal interests. And I am not sorry. For I know now that I was playing a part in making this year one of the better years in the association's history.

One year ago we met here and outlined a course of aggressive and constructive action. Due to the passing of the man who had headed our association so competently and devotedly over a period of many years, a major problem naturally presented itself. It became necessary for us to seek outside executive leadership to carry on the work of our association and to develop programs and procedures. Under the circumstances, this amounted to a reorganization of the association. At that time, many of the projects touching the interests of all of us, as well as the Nation as a whole, had been for a long time in a sort of passive state. Those of us who were aware of the importance of our waterways were also keenly aware of the many sore spots along the system. But we had in operation no program of action calculated to bring about the necessary reforms and constructive activities which the situation demanded.

We realized that locks and dams along such vital waterways as the Ohio and the Warrior-Tombigbee, as well as other navigable streams, were in a state of neglect and threatened to collapse into the rivers they were supposed to serve. But very few people, other than those using these rivers, had the true facts. Most of us knew that the narrow, shallow, and crooked Calumet-Sag Channel at Chicago was a critical bottleneck that limited the whole scope and potential capacity of our inland waterways system.

These were the conditions we faced as we met in convention here a year ago. Today, because of the action decided upon at that time, a totally new and highly gratifying change has taken place. We are no longer alone in our knowledge of existing problems. We have behind us now the prestige of powerful friends, an awakening public sentiment, and the most vigorous support of an aroused press. This being the case, I think it is altogether fitting that we briefly review the accomplishments of 1953 and the manner in which these events were motivated and shaped.

At that time we brought into our association new blood, new force, and constructive ability. These new elements, as all hoped, would possess the know-how, would develop the techniques, and would help build up the necessary cooperation between business leaders and organizations and our association. Also, we hoped the new elements would make the necessary legislative contacts and evoke support from the press on a national as well as on local levels. Above all, we hoped through these mediums to be able to awaken the public to the importance of that magnificent national asset—our system of inland waterways.

A year ago these were our hopes. Today they appear in the substantial form of solid accomplishment. Let us look for a moment at the Cal-Sag project as an example of what we are talking about. And, as we approach the subject, let us make one point clear. We selected the Cal-Sag project deliberately—not as a regional problem that came ahead of any other project—but as one that is the most challenging. For 30 years this project has been talked by one group or another. Never at any time had the attention of the legislators or the public been directed to the necessity for action on the Cal-Sag. Against this 30-year background, the accomplishments of the past year stand out in bold relief.

Where before there had been little harmony, there developed full and complete cooperation. For the first time in Chicago history such organizations as the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, the Chicago Plan Commission, the Chicago Planning Advisory Board, the Chicago Regional Planning Association, the Chicago Port District Board, and the Chicago Sanitary District Board were united in the endorsement of the program of action proposed by our association for the furtherance of the Cal-Sag project.

Following this strong foundation laying further action brought into being the Chicago committee of our association. On this committee we have the most influential business, industrial, and labor leaders in the area. This is the committee which the Chicago Tribune called the strongest committee formed in Chicago in many years. Thus, in a series of constructive moves we lifted the Cal-Sag project out of the shadows into the full light of public consideration. For the first time in history, labor and industrial leaders have been welded into a working team to further the cause of our inland waterways.

With this powerful backing we launched an effective educational program, winning the solid support of the Chicago press, which gave us wide news coverage and powerful, forthright editorial backing. As this educational program went forward, the 16 sad miles of the Cal-Sag became one of the livest issues between the Great Lakes and the Gulf. As a direct result of this, the most potent and influential national magazines sent representatives to Chicago to study and report on the Cal-Sag story and its meaning.

As this occurred the inevitable happened. Official Washington awoke to the fact that they had in the Cal-Sag project, not one about which a few local interests were nagging them, but one that had behind it the full support of all interests as well as a thoroughly awakened interest in our entire inland waterway system. The action which followed was indicative of the changed attitude toward the Cal-Sag project. In a speech at Chicago when our program of education had begun to achieve results, Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engi-

neers, United States Army, gave the Cal-Sag project his strongest endorsement. Shortly after this, members of the House Public Works Committee visited Chicago, inspected the Cal-Sag Channel and endorsed the proposed job of widening and deepening as a must. At the present time our educational program on this project continues. And as it progresses the public pressure upon those in authority continues to grow.

At this point, I wish to ask a rather general question which I know many of you have been asking during the past months. That question is, "Why the emphasis on Cal-Sag?" And that question has a companion one which I have been listening to. It goes, "Isn't this or that problem just as important as Cal-Sag?"

The answer is a simple one. We had to begin somewhere. We had to demonstrate the effectiveness of a pattern which we propose to apply to every section of the midcontinent area. That pattern appears in the pulling together of leading civic organizations, in the committee which represents all interests in the community. It appears then in the educational program which draws strong support from the whole body of the press, from the daily papers to the big national magazines. Above all, I must stress the fact that your organization now has the personnel which developed this pattern and demonstrated that it possesses the know-how, the contacts, and the techniques necessary to put the pattern into effect in any sizable industrial center.

When we launched our campaign and our program of education along these lines, the inevitable happened. Cal-Sag ceased to be a local problem and became a national one. That channel ceased to be one that merely hampered Chicago's industrial expansion. Instead, it appeared in its true guise as a bottleneck that curbed and curtailed the operation and growth of our whole inland waterway system. Thus the Cal-Sag project was shown as vitally important to every industrial center from Superior and Duluth to the Gulf of Mexico. It was seen as a problem that affected New Orleans almost as much as it affected the city in which the channel lies. And I might add that this is true of every existing sore spot on our inland waterways, and of every problem affecting any of the seaports which serve as ocean outlets to this great system of waterways.

As the 16 sad miles of the Cal-Sag became one of the hottest topics in our midcontinent area, other sections served by our association began to demand that their problems receive some of the same treatment. New Orleans, for instance, gravely concerned with two major problems, wanted action. These problems of New Orleans are: the mounting threat of the diversion of Mississippi water at Old River and the proposed seaway. We were then ready to turn toward New Orleans and her problems because we had demonstraated our pattern in Chicago and had proved its effectiveness beyond any possible doubt. With the Chicago committee as an exhibit, the formation of the New Orleans committee became an easier job. The same type of educational program was launched from New Orleans. The threatened diversion of waters at Old River and the proposed seaway ceased to be local projects. They became projects which were vital to the whole midcontinent area. When presented to the public by means of our vigorous educational campaign, the attitude of the public toward these projects underwent a drastic change.

In the past, only those residing and working in the New Orleans area were acutely aware of the gravity of these problems. Today, the public from the Great Lakes to the gulf is keenly aware of the necessity for taking action on these projects. Official Washington knows it as it has never known it in the past. And I might add that official Washington and the public are going to learn a lot more about these and other vital projects before too long.

Continuing our program, we have now completed the organization of the St. Louis committee composed of the same caliber of outstanding business and industrial leaders which headed the committees at Chicago and New Orleans. With this committee now active, our association is continuing to attract to itself the highest type of leadership in the Mississippi Valley.

Of course, this pattern of action and program of education has behind it a wider and deeper significance than has appeared in our regionally based campaigns. That significance lies in a fact which we in this association have grasped over the years but which the public has not yet grasped. That fact is our inland waterway system—our greatest single national asset—is one great unified and interdependent system. Anything that transpires on any part of that system affects every other part. A problem existing anywhere along our system of inland waterways is everyone's problem. The sagging dam on the Tombigbee, the obsolete lock on the Ohio, the shallow channel on the Missouri, the inadequate channel on the Illinois—these are problems which actually belong to all of us who have an interest in the inland waterways.

While visiting the dams at the headwaters of the Missouri River, I learned that the water from these dams was sustaining navigation on the Missouri River at Omaha and Kansas City, and was affecting the stage at St. Louis as much as 3 feet. It is important at this point to mention that the people on the lower Mississippi River in the past may not have realized the value of the storage dams in the Missouri Basin. But at that time during an extreme drought and low water, together with diversion from waters in the Mississippi into Old River, the fresh water supply at New Orleans was jeopardized. The salt water from the sea was encroaching into the city's water supply and had it not been for the water released from the dams in the Missouri Basin, New Orleans' water situation would have been much more critical. The United States Army engineers reported these facts to our association and to the press.

Thus, it was driven home to the port cities on the lower reaches of the Mississippi that their interests were not right in their own backyards, but were scattered all along the length of our system of inland waterways, all the way up to the most remote headwater.

In like manner, through the vigorous educational campaign launched at New Orleans, it was clearly shown that the problem existing at New Orleans is of the most critical importance to every industrial center in the Mississippi Valley, for New Orleans as a great port of outlet is vital to this whole vast area. It is through this important port—now second in the United States—that the products of industry and agriculture throughout the midcontinent area reach the sea lanes leading to world markets. Therefore, anything that should cripple or limit the effectiveness of the port of New Orleans is their problem as surely as it is that of New Orleans.

One of the oldest of the truisms is that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link. And nowhere does this truism find better application than to our inland waterway system. Therefore, we must look upon this whole waterway as our chain. This vital system which this year will carry some 360 million tons of freight besides the some 200 million tons carried on the Great Lakes is a chain, and every lock, dam, channel, port installation, and facility on it from one end to the other is a link in that chain. When we observe a weak link we must see it as a threat to the efficiency of the whole system and act accordingly in full cooperation to strengthen that link so that the chain may remain capable of withstanding every strain put upon it. This is the sort of work that our former president, Lachlan Macleay, was doing in his last year with the association when he was bending every effort to assist those on the upper Mississippi to secure funds to start the Keokuk Locks.

In two world wars we have seen that chain withstand some terrific strains. This was particularly apparent during World War II when the submarine menace, coupled with tremendous wartime production demands, threatened to cripple the overall transportation system of the Nation. During that war our inland waterways responded magnificently.

The story of the contribution made by our inland waterways is an epic one. When it is fully told the Nation as a whole will perhaps begin to comprehend why this system constitutes our greatest national asset. It will also begin to comprehend how vital this system is to our continued defense.

In view of this, it is difficult to understand the attitude of Washington toward our inland waterways. And that attitude is clearly shown in the obsolete locks, the silted channels, and the sagging dams. Yet, on second thought, perhaps such an attitude is understandable. Government indifference and neglect always go hand in hand with public ignorance and apathy. To destroy the Government attitude we must, therefore, destroy the public ignorance and apathy. This we have started to do in our educational campaign. And we have found, in those cases where we have made our demonstration, that this ignorance and apathy can be replaced by knowledge and an eager public demand that the proper steps be taken by its servants in Washington. And this educational campaign which has already shown such magnificient results has only just started. We haven't really started to bear down as yet. But the time has come when we must bear down and use everything we have at our disposal. That is what we intend to do.

I am proud and happy to be identified with the Mississippi Valley Association. For in it I see tremendous possibilities and potentialities. Any association is only as great as the job it sets out to do and the territory it serves. The job before us is one of the greatest and most demanding that exists today. The territory served—our midcontinent area—is the richest and most productive on the face of the earth. Therefore, our goal should be to make of this association the greatest one in the United States—one with the widest possible influence for the public good. This is no idle dream. I am convinced, especially as I view our accomplishments of the past year, that we can build our association and widen its activities to make of it the greatest association in America. I firmly believe we should go forward with that goal constantly in mind.

To bring this about we must do an outstanding job of organization and education. That job can be done only when those who do the work have the wholehearted backing of every member now in the association and the many more who will join our ranks as the scope of the job becomes more apparent.

I have spoken about the pilot jobs of organization and education which we have carried through during the past year. This is an important part of the work but it is not all of it. There are many more areas in which we must operate, and other phases which we must tackle. For instance, an effort is being made to have a system of tolls and charges imposed upon our inland waterways. Our job in this instance has been outlined for us in the Constitution of the United States. For in this great document we find stated in unmistakable clarity the belief of the Nation's founders that our inland waterways should be free for the use of all, for all time. This intent so clearly stated in the Constitution has been maintained up to the present. Here, again, a program of education is needed to acquaint the public with

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the true facts of the case. We are launching this campaign and will push it forward with the utmost vigor.

So far, we have been discussing a subject that is but a part of the whole story of our inland waterways—navigation. We have been stressing this phase of the subject because it is here that we see plainly some of the projects demanding immediate attention. While we continue to press for modernizations and replacements of installations and facilities having to do with navigation, we are not losing sight of other activities. These, too, are responsibilities which our association must accept.

We find one highly important phase of this work in the Missouri River Basin. Here we have been pressing for work on the channel of the river, for installations and facilities to bring about better conditions of navigation. But we are keenly aware that in this area the task of soil conservation is a highly important one. The midcontinent area suffers when the mighty Missouri goes on a rampage. The whole area suffers with the loss of every inch of top soil that goes down into the rivers.

This job carries us into the headwaters of the Missouri where the flood-control dams are being built to bring about control of floods at their source. We are deeply and actively concerned with every measure of soil conservation that keeps the precious soil where it belongs. Yet, as we observed earlier, this activity dovetails neatly into our navigational interests. For these dams which control floods at their sources also impound waters that would otherwise cause destructive floods. This impounded water can then, as it has been during the droughts of the past summer, be fed into the rivers to maintain a depth necessary for the continuation of navigation.

So, you see, we cannot separate a single phase of activity from another. Nowhere is this more clearly seen than in the great overall phase of our work—education and ensuing action in the proper use and conservation of the water by which we live and without which we die.

Throughout this period when we were carrying forward our program of promotion and education, we have been keenly conscious that in every phase of our work we have been stressing private ownership and operation as opposed to any form of Federal ownership. In fact, the stand of the Mississippi Valley Association on this subject is quite clear. It is on record as being positively opposed to valley authorities.

In the case of the Federal Barge Lines, your association figured actively in the negotiations which finally saw ownership of the bargeline transferred to private interests and the burden of deficits lifted from the back of the taxpayer.

I have called our system of inland waterways our greatest national asset. If I had been referring merely to the waterways as navigational channels, I would have been guilty of exaggeration. But when I say that these waters in all their uses constitute our greatest national asset, I could not possibly exaggerate.

Over the past two decades we have witnessed something in the nature of a major phenomena as industrial might began its expansion in the midcontinent area. So great was this shift of industry that today the core of our national industrial might lies here on our inland waterways. The presence of these waterways as efficient and economical carriers of freight helped to bring about that shift. But the main reason for the shift lies in the nature of modern industry and its complete dependence upon water.

When industry uses water on such a gigantic scale the conservation of our water, its use and reuse, becomes all-important. The world is dotted with the ruins of civilizations that died because water failed them. Once the supply of water fails in a civilization, it is doomed. For there is no substitute for water. Here in the midcontinent area we have the Nation's greatest and most dependable source of water. It is a fact, therefore, that we in this area are responsible for that water upon which the Nation depends for its existence.

Our association is keenly aware of this responsibility. And, as we go forward on our work we must take upon ourselves the task of impressing the public with the vital importance of water. We must assume a position of leadership, become a guardian of this precious asset, water. We must see to it that all methods and techniques are studied and employed in the intelligent use and conservation of our water supplies.

Our course of future action is now unmistakably clear. Representing the whole midcontinent area and availing ourselves of the wide knowledge and sound judgment of leaders in every segment of our economy we must act as the pilot organization to carefully screen all projects—whether navigation, flood control or soil conservation. And from this screening we must choose the must projects which demand prompt and energetic action.

However, as we face the year immediately ahead, we must realize that in the present chaotic state of the world our primary concern is national defense. As we face this fact we must proceed to drive home the truth that in our inland waterways we have the most potent single weapon for our defense. In our waterways we have: the basic element that industry must have in order to produce, the system of transportation that is less vulnerable to enemy attack than is any other system, and a system whose carrying capacity in time of national emergency can be almost indefinitely expanded at a minimum of cost.

These are the facts which we propose to impress upon the public in our constantly expanding program of education. Every single project outlined for the bettering of our system of inland waterways is basically a critical defense project. We fully intend to proceed along these lines in all our publicity. The experience gained in the past year encourages us to redouble our activities and implant our proven pattern of action in every section of the midcontinent area. This is the inspiring task that faces us in the coming year—those of us who provide the support and encouragement as well as those who carry the work forward.

GOVERNMENT BY LABEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks we have witnessed a chorus of accusations on the part of some leading Republicans labeling the Democratic Party as the party of treason. All of us in this body who have worked together for years know the absurd nature of such charge, and know that the charge is made only for partisan political purposes. But these recent events have caused me to examine more closely the entire question of the power of governmental authorities to label any organization as subversive.

I have recently received in the mail from an association of lawyers known as the National Lawyers Guild a pamphlet entitled "An Appeal to Reason." It appears from this pamphlet that at a meeting of the American Bar Association our Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, announced that he had determined to list this organization as subversive. At the same time he stated that he was going to serve notice upon the guild of his intention to list the organization so that it could then have a hearing before him.

I must admit that I learned my law in the old-fashioned way and have not yet caught up with these new innovations. The way I learned law, decisions were supposed to be made after notice and hearing and not before. As a matter of fact, it is difficult for an old-fashioned lawyer like myself to understand why one should have a hearing at all if the decision has already been made.

The Attorney General in his speech stating that the Lawyers Guild was subversive found fault with the fact that the organization filed in court amicus curiae briefs contending that certain actions of the Department of Justice against Communists and alleged Communists were unconstitutional. According to the Attorney General, this made the organization subversive. Up to now I had thought that the word subversive had something to do with opposition to our Constitution and a desire to overthrow our Constitution by force and violence. Now I find out that according to the Attorney General the word subversive means to make a legal argument in court which differs from the position of the Department of Justice. This is another newfangled concept which, as an old-fashioned lawyer, I find hard to understand. Up to now I had thought that it was the right of every citizen to argue either in or out of court that he disagreed with the Department of Justice. Under Brownell's standard many of our distinguished Republican colleagues in the Senate side who are supporting the Bricker amendment are running a risk of being labelled subversive because they differ with Attorney General Brownell as to the interpretation of our constitutional provision with regard to treaties.

I have not been able to find any statute that gives the Attorney General the authority to list organizations as subversive. As I understand it, the Attorney General claims that this power comes to him from Executive Order No. 10450, our new Republican security order, and that the Constitution grants the executive branch of the Government this authority in order to protect our country from subversion. But I have seen nothing in the Constitution that says this in so many words. Like the novel notion that a decision now comes before hearing, this is probably another one of these newfangled ideas that an old-fashioned lawyer like myself has not as yet been able to get on to.

I think we are all aware that attorneys general are usually political figures active in carrying out the political program of the current administration. It would be an understatement to state that the present Attorney General is no exception to this rule. We have seen how he has misused his power as chief judicial law enforcer to make a partisan, political attack on our distinguished former President.

I think it is necessary for the House seriously to ponder this question. Can we trust this partisan, politically minded Attorney General, or for that matter any other Attorney General, with the power to label any organization as subversive? In the case of the Lawyers

Guild he does not even accuse that organization of having done or even planned to do anything that was illegal. Certainly, if the organization had done anything illegal, I would assume that he would prosecute them. To my mind, for the Attorney General to label and slander any organization that has done nothing illegal, because the Attorney General does not like the way that organization operates or because it opposes some position taken by him amounts to a gross arrogation of power. I think it time that we put a stop to this attempt to govern the country by smear and labeling.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations have until midnight tonight to file reports on H. R. 232, H. R. 7402, and H. R. 5605.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PRICE and to include extraneous material.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. EVINS).

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mrs. KELLY of New York and to include extraneous material.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. WILLIS and to include additional matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FINE (at the request of Mrs. KELLY of New York), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Tequillo.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 68. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Godschalk;

S. 123. An act for the relief of Anni Wilhelmine Skoda;

S. 205. An act for the relief of Evdoxia J. Kitsos;

S. 236. An act for the relief of Amir Hassan Sepahban;

S. 296. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Henry Litmanowitz (Litman);

S. 305. An act for the relief of Antonio Vocale;

S. 313. An act for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama;

S. 323. An act for the relief of Rose Cohen;

S. 353. An act for the relief of Li Ming;

S. 506. An act for the relief of Horst P. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar;

S. 569. An act for the relief of Lina Anna Adelheid (Adam) Hoyer;

S. 606. An act for the relief of Hannelore Netz and her two children;

S. 730. An act for the relief of Winifried Kohls;

S. 801. An act for the relief of Eugenio S. Rolles;

S. 825. An act for the relief of Karin Rita Grubb;

S. 973. An act for the relief of Dr. Jawad Hedayaty;

S. 982. An act for the relief of Helena Lewidka;

S. 1009. An act for the relief of Zoltan Weingarten;

S. 1018. An act for the relief of George Ellis Ellison;

S. 1226. An act for the relief of Stefan Virgilius Issarescu;

S. 1261. An act for the relief of Emmanuel Aristides Nicoloudis;

S. 1323. An act for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney;

S. 1443. An act for the relief of Jose Deang; and

S. 2689. An act to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 18, 1954, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1280. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of $5,500,707, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (H. Doc. No. 329); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1281. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1954 and for other purposes, in the amount of $395,099,255, together with several proposed provisions and increases in limitations pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 330); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1282. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1954 in the amount of $35 million for the Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 331); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1283. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation in the amount of $200,000 and a draft of a proposed provision for the fiscal year 1955 for the Department of Commerce in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 332); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1284. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1955 in the amount of $95,000 for the Executive Office of the President in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 333); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1285. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Report of the Department of the Interior on the Sequim project, Washington, together with related documents and letters of comment on the report, prepared pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1286. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1287. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1288. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1289. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1290. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions of the Administration, pursuant to the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period October 1, 1953, through December 31, 1953; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1291. A letter from the secretary-treasurer, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting the 12th annual report of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, pursuant to Public Law 539, 77th Congress, as amended by Public Law 721, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1292. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 16, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination and survey of Minnesota River, Minn., up to a point 10 miles above New Ulm, with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation and related purposes, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1293. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 7, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on, and preliminary examination and survey of, Sebastian Inlet, Fla., as authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on July 24, 1946, and requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted on June 1, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 79. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Kentucky to acquire non-Federal cave properties within the authorized boundaries of Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1160. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Tucson, Ariz., and to accept other land in exchange therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1570. A bill to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 50 years; with amendment (Rept. No. 1210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. Senate Joint Resolution 34. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand; with amendment (Rept. No. 1211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 7402. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of St. Joseph, Mich.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1212.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 232. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind.; with amendment (Rept. 1213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 7948. A bill for the relief of the city of Mobile, Ala.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7949. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7950. A bill to prevent Government defense contracts from being placed with companies whose employees are represented by Communist-dominated labor unions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7951. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 7952. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7953. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7954. A bill to provide for the improvement of the Niagara River, to authorize the construction of certain public works to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River, to promote the national defense, develop power, aid navigation and flood control, fulfill the undertakings of the United States in the treaty of 1950 with Canada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 7955. A bill to provide that it shall be a misdemeanor to misbehave in the presence of either House of Congress, or any committee thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 7956. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 7957. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain residual rights of the United States in a portion of the lands comprising Camp Joseph T. Robinson, Ark.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. J. Res. 381. Joint resolution for the establishment of a Commission to study the need for simplification, modernization, and consolidation of the public-land laws, to make appropriate recommendations for an effective public-land-law system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. J. Res. 382. Resolution providing that a study be made to determine the most appropriate methods and the estimated cost of reconstructing Ford's Theater, in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. Res. 445. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of Federal and District of Columbia penal and correctional institutions and of the administration of the laws governing the parole of persons imprisoned or detained in, or committed to, such institutions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. Res. 447. Resolution amending the Rules of the House in respect to investigative procedure; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to urge the Federal Housing Authority to continue the operation of the Lucy Mallary Village in Springfield; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolutions of the Massachusetts Legislature urging Congress to pass legislation to prevent the Government of the United States from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to provide for Federal housing projects in the west, south, and north ends of Boston; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to enact legislation providing for two daily deliveries of mail to residences; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to reduce the age requirements of recipients of old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7958. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Harding Lake Camp, Inc., of Fairbanks, Alaska, for use as a youth camp and related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 7959. A bill for the relief of Luigi Lavadera Lubrano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 7960. A bill for the relief of Luigi Dini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 7961. A bill for the relief of Henry Victor Packer and Mrs. Annie Irene Packer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7962. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugenia Gillian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7963. A bill for the relief of George Poulio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 7964. A bill for the relief of Ane Karlic Vlasich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7965. A bill for the relief of Kevin Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 7966. A bill for the relief of Mayer Rothbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7967. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Curro Tati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7968. A bill for the relief of Geraldine Gean Hunt and Linda Marie Hunt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 7969. A bill for the relief of Lamberto Angelino Petri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 7970. A bill for the relief of Cheddid El Kharrat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

517. By the SPEAKER: Petition of H. Joseph Mahoney and 737 others, Brooklyn, N. Y., requesting passage of Senate Joint Resolution 1, the Bricker amendment to the Constitution, relative to treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

518. Also, petition of the chief clerk, City Council of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., requesting an investigation of the exorbitant prices of coffee; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Protect Our National Forest From the Lumber Barons, Fellow Conservationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to H. R. 4646, and I shall vote against the bill. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to record my reasons for opposition to H. R. 4646.

I am opposed to the bill because from the past history of Wisconsin I am convinced that we should take every precaution to protect our great natural resources. Wisconsin, along with our neighboring States of Minnesota and Michigan, were once great timber producing States in the period from 1870 to 1910. This was in the period before we had any real national forests program to protect our resources.

Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan furnished billions and billions of board feet of some of the finest White and Norway pine lumber to build homes and other buildings for a large section of the United States. The lumber barons of that period gutted our State of its timber resources and at the same time they did nothing to replant the hundreds of acres of land that they exploited without regard to conservation for their day and for posterity.

The White and Norway pine trees are slow maturing trees. In fact, a Norway pine tree is not fully matured until it is from 300 to 400 years old. After the lumber barons raped our State, they left thousands and thousands of acres of barren land—land which is ill-suited for farming.

I am happy that we now have some areas of Wisconsin set aside for national forests. I want to see those areas protected from the greed of thoughtless timber operators who are more concerned with temporary gain and profits than they are in the welfare of future generations.

As I understand it, H. R. 4646 does not give us the needed safeguards to prevent a recurrence of what happened in Wisconsin from 1870 to 1910. We are back on the road in restoring those areas in Wisconsin that are not suited for good farming practices to the days when our State looked good with beautiful and stately pine trees. It will take another 100 to 150 years to make Wisconsin timber areas look like the State did in 1870.

I am sure that there are private timber operators who are now casting envious eyes on these timber acres and licking their chops over prospective profits. I would much rather see our Federal Government do the selective cutting of national forests in Wisconsin until we have fully matured trees. I also want to see sound legislation on the books to prevent a repetition of the 1870 to 1910 timber rape and steal in our State.

In closing, I wish to say that as a result of lumber barons' rape in that period we are paying higher prices for our lumber today in Wisconsin and adjacent States. We have to import a considerable amount of lumber from other States—particularly the Western States. The freight charges on a carload of western lumber are no small item in the building of a home. Also, the lumber from our own State is not of the high quality that it was in the period that I mentioned because we are cutting timber that is not properly matured.

Farm Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1954

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, for the years that I have had the honor to represent the 10th Congressional District of New York, I have questioned the program of Government price supports to the farmer. The present system was created as a temporary measure during the depression of the thirties. Oh, it has been revised over the years, but always to the benefit of the farmer and not to the taxpaying consumer who is an integral part of our economic system. The fact that this price-support system is economically unsound is evidenced by the huge Government-owned surpluses. Vast hoards of these products—priced beyond the reach of a large portion of American citizens—support this fact. I believe the present program is unjust and unmoral when the ultimate end of the program lies in the overflowing of Government warehouses with products achieved by labor. These same products could be consumed by Americans who would benefit physically and mentally.

There was one feature of the Brannan farm plan that was noteworthy—the release of perishable agricultural products to seek their level on the open market. Secretary Benson has now used his discretionary authority to reduce the support price of butter from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent. Had he taken this action a year ago, dairy surpluses would not have risen from 1,400,000,000 pounds to about 8 billion pounds. At this point let me mention that the Government now has 469 million pounds of dried milk; 282 million pounds of cheese and 270 million pounds of butter in storage.

I do not deny that the farmer needs continued assistance. I felt that way in the 2d session of the 82d Congress, and in an effort to be constructive, I introduced House Resolution 497. I have reintroduced this measure in the 83d Congress to create a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker to study the agricultural program for the purpose of considering necessary revisions and adjustments in the methods of assistance in line with our present national economy and with a view to reducing the existing high cost of living. I expected that the membership of this committee would represent both agricultural interests and consumer interests.

Greatly concerned over the ever increasing stores of butter by the Government, I wrote Secretary of Agriculture Benson on April 8, 1953, the following letter:

APRIL 8, 1953.

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I, like many others, am concerned over the abundance of perishable and other surplus commodities placed in storage as a result of the parity program. If there is any technicality in the law which prohibits a directive from the Secretary of Agriculture to permit greater consumption of these, then I urge an immediate change in this law.

In addition to the Commodity Credit Corporation funds supporting these perishable items, the Secretary can use annually 30 percent of the customs receipts for the following purposes: "to encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities, to encourage domestic consumption of such commodities by diverting them from normal channels of trade or increasing their use among persons in low-income groups". Under this law I believe the Secretary of Agriculture could use his authority to permit the use especially of butter, eggs, turkeys, etc., by the armed services which would save the Government billions of dollars.

The following figures showing the amount of butter and oleomargarine purchased by the armed services and the price per pound are self-explanatory:

BUTTER

December 1952: 1,746,419 pounds at $0.6957 per pound.

January 1953: 1,119,337 pounds at $0.6944 per pound.

OLEOMARGARINE

December 1952: 2,797,693 pounds at $0.1767 per pound.

January 1953: 3,014,289 pounds at $0.1768 per pound.

No one would object to the use of these commodities by their sons in the armed services.

To ask the consumer to buy butter at this forced price when he is already paying for it by subsidy to the farmer is not an equitable request, nor can these products be given to foreign countries under any aid program as an alternative. People do not use butter when they lack the bread to put it on.

If it is necessary to support farm commodities and if the concern of the Government over the surplus is actual, then why not maintain these prices at 75 percent of parity instead of 90 percent?

I will be very grateful for your advice in this matter and for your opinions concerning it.

Respectfully yours,

EDNA F. KELLY.

On April 21, 1953, Secretary Benson replied with the following letter and press release setting forth the 1953–54 dairy support level:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1953.

Hon. EDNA F. KELLY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. KELLY: This is in reply to your letter of April 8 indicating concern over the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

stocks of perishables and other commodities acquired under price support, and raising certain questions concerning the steps that can be taken to move these stocks into consumption.

Before answering your questions, we should like to point out that we share your concern about the problems created by the relatively large stocks of agricultural commodities which are accumulating under our present price-support programs. Our price-support programs should operate to provide food for consumers rather than food to be sold to the Government and then stored away in warehouses where it creates disposal problems. The entire question of our price-support programs is now being explored and we have requested suggestions as to ways in which the program can be improved from advisory committees, Congress, farmers, farm organizations, agricultural colleges, and others affected by these programs.

One of your questions relates to the ability of the Secretary to use the so-called section 32 funds to encourage the consumption of butter and other surplus commodities by the armed services. Programs to encourage domestic consumption under section 32 are limited to those programs which would divert surplus commodities from the normal channels of trade and commerce or would increase their utilization among persons in low-income groups. Programs involving transfers to the armed services would not come within these limitations. You may be interested in knowing that the Department currently has in operation a section 32 program under which butter is being donated to eligible section 32 outlets, such as the school-lunch program and charitable institutions. The Department also is in the process of negotiating the sale of some of its stocks of butter to the Army at reduced prices for use in place of margarine and other spreads.

Your letter also raises a question as to why the price of butter, and other commodities, is being supported at 90 percent of parity instead of 75 percent of parity. All of our price-support programs are conducted in accordance with the laws prescribed by Congress. In the case of the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—the Agricultural Act of 1949 makes it mandatory for the Department to support the 1953 and 1954 crops at 90 percent of parity, except where producers have disapproved marketing quotas. The support level for these commodities naturally affects the support level for others. Existing legislation would permit butter to be supported at less than the 90 percent of parity level announced. The reasons why we are continuing to support butter at 90 percent of parity are discussed in the enclosed press release. We appreciate receiving your observations about our price-support programs. If you require any further information in connection with the questions raised in your letter, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

SECRETARY BENSON ANNOUNCES 1953–54 DAIRY SUPPORT LEVEL

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 27, 1953.

Dairy product prices will be supported at 90 percent of parity for another year beginning April 1, according to the announcement made today by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

This decision follows the recommendation of the Dairy Advisory Group, congressional leaders, farm leaders, and others who have been consulted.

"A primary reason for continuing the maximum support allowed by the law," according to Secretary Benson, "was assurance from the dairy advisors that the industry would immediately start work on programs to reduce to a minimum governmental support purchases. The year will give the industry time to demonstrate to what degree it can solve its own problems.

"Here is one of the great agricultural industries," said Benson, "that has told us they want time to get programs into operation. We know the important dairy industry does not want to depend on Government price supports. The farm and dairy leadership now has the opportunity to demonstrate what teamwork will accomplish."

A representative work conference, including farmers and leaders of their organizations, processors, distributors, retailers, and consumers, will be called together at once. Each segment of the dairy industry will be asked to send representatives prepared to assume definite responsibility for a portion of the solution of the dairy problems. Secretary Benson said, for example, "dairy farmers can shift more rapidly to fluid-milk sales and away from butterfat.

"Milk companies can move more milk from butter-producing areas into regions needing fluid milk.

"Retail dairies, stores, and consumers can more actively promote the sale of milk and milk products.

"There are other adjustments which the industry can make to reduce the accumulation of surplus dairy products.

"The United States Department of Agriculture has offered to help, and the assistance of the agricultural colleges, experiment stations, and extension services can be depended upon.

"Dairy farmers and dairy industry leadership has a major challenge," continued Secretary Benson. "We believe they will put the dairy business on a more solid basis—with a minimum dependence on price supports. They have asked for time—we have agreed. Now we will all pitch in to get the job done."

Such price-support operations as are needed will be carried out through offers to purchase butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids.

Purchases of butter will be made on a basing-point method, using the four terminal markets of New York, Chicago, Seattle, and San Francisco, with appropriate differentials at other points in the country. This will be a change from the present policy under which butter has been purchased at a uniform price throughout the country.

The drop in the parity formula will reduce the butter price support about 2 cents per pound.

Program details, which otherwise will be generally comparable with those of present operations, will be announced by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, subsequent to Secretary Benson's letter of April 21, 50 million pounds of surplus butter were offered to the Armed Forces at about 16 cents a pound; this purchase to be in excess of their normal purchases.

On January 7, 1954, I protested to President Eisenhower and to the Foreign Operations Administrator, Mr. Stassen, the contemplated sale of butter to Russia. On January 18, Mr. DeLaney, Deputy Director for Mutual Defense Assistance Control, replied for Mr. Stassen as follows:

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1954.

Hon. EDNA F. KELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. KELLY: Governor Stassen is out of the country, and your telegram opposing the sale of surplus butter and cottonseed oil to the Soviet bloc was referred to me. I wish to acknowledge receipt of it, and to assure you on behalf of the Governor and myself that we are glad to have your views on this question and appreciate your letting us have them for consideration.

You know, of course, that the problem directly involves the sale of commodities by the Department of Agriculture and the granting of export licenses by the Department of Commerce. Nevertheless our agency has been among those participating in the interagency discussion on the problem.

Perhaps you noted the statement issued at the White House on Friday by Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks. This statement said:

"The law precludes my discussing the details of any application pending before the Commerce Department. But I can say this to you as a matter of general principle: I shall not approve any applications which would permit an exporter to buy butter at considerably lower prices than those paid by the American housewife and then send that butter into Russia."

Sincerely yours,

W. S. DELANEY,
Deputy Director for Mutual Defense Assistance Control.

The following day, January 19, I wrote Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks for further information on this contemplated sale:

JANUARY 19, 1954.

Hon. SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I will appreciate it very much if you will clarify for me a statement which you issued last Friday in connection with a plan contemplated at that time, to export butter to Russia.

I am particularly interested in your remarks, "I shall not approve any application which would permit an exporter to buy butter at considerably lower prices than those paid by the American housewife and then send that butter into Russia." Do I correctly infer that you would approve such application if the price paid by the exporter is the same or is higher than the price paid by the American housewife?

Also I would like to receive from your office a list of those items for which you have approved licenses for export to Russia and the Soviet bloc for the year 1953.

Sincerely yours,

EDNA F. KELLY.

His reply, which follows, did not answer my question, "Do I correctly infer that you would approve such application if the price paid by the exporter is the same or is higher than the price paid by the American housewife?"

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, February 12, 1954.

The Honorable EDNA F. KELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. KELLY: This will acknowledge your letter of January 19, 1954, in regard to a recently proposed export of butter to Russia.

I am sending you herewith an extra copy of my latest report to the President and the Congress on the administration of the export-control program. Chapter II thereof, pages 3–9, describes our security-export policy in considerable detail. You will note that there are a number of considerations other than price involved in our determination of which exports are permitted to the Soviet bloc.

Chapter VII of the enclosed report, pages 56–59, contains the information you requested concerning the actual composition of our recent trade with the Soviet bloc.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Secretary Benson for his action in reducing the Government support price on butter. This is a step in the right direction to bring the price within reach of the consumer, and we hope it will bring a decline in future butter purchases by the Government.

In the disposal of the stocks on hand, we must be alert that not one pound of butter, or any other surplus commodity, is sent to the Soviet bloc. I do not recognize any conditions which make it expedient to do business with a nation whose avowed purpose is world revolution, whose hands are still bloody from recent warfare, and who has given no evidence of good faith in making a lasting peace.

Traveling the Hotel Way With Ivan and Igor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1954

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a unique and interesting booklet published recently by the American Hotel Association as a part of its program to combat communism. The booklet is entitled "Traveling the Hotel Way With Ivan and Igor" It tells the story of Ivan, a Russian factory worker who was allowed a short vacation so that he could attend lectures on current doctrine of the party. After describing the almost unbelievable restrictions on travel in Russia, based on actual conditions which exist today, the pamphlet depicts the annoyances, discomforts, privations, and frustrations of the Soviet citizen who is fortunate enough to be granted the privilege of traveling at all.

By practical and concrete illustrations the booklet makes us conscious of the great blessing of freedom of movement we have here in America. After reading the booklet we realize that the comforts, conveniences, and services which we take for granted in America exceed the wildest flights of imagination of the pathetic Soviet citizen.

In the booklet describing the travel experiences of Ivan and Igor, the American Hotel Association clearly brings out the part the Nation's hotels play in our way of life. In contrast to restrictions amounting to almost a complete prohibition of travel in Russia, the pamphlet points out how Americans are encouraged to travel, and to meet and talk with other people in all parts of the country. It points out the comforts, convenience, and service of hotels are among the rewards of freedom here at home.

Other business groups can help to keep us aware of what freedom means to every one of us. In their institutional advertising, other industries can show how their operations contribute to the enjoyment of our freedom. I think the unique manner in which the American Hotel Association tells the story of its place in American freedom will interest every Member of Congress. Therefore I have asked that a copy of AHA's pamphlet be delivered to each of you. The 2 minutes required to read the pamphlet will be well spent.

Thirty-third Anniversary of Armenian Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 33d anniversary of the Armenian revolt against Soviet rule, and the free people all over the world once again raise their voices in encouragement and sympathy to the people of that valiant country.

Despite oppression and torture at the hands of Communist forces, the spirit of the once-free Armenian republic continues to live and burn in the hearts of her sons and daughters, both within their land and abroad. From the earliest revolt which occurred in Armenia on February 18, 1921, to the revolt in East Berlin on June 17, 1953, there has been one unbroken chain of uprisings and insurrections which, though they may not have had enough might to overthrow the Soviet structure in its entirety, have made impossible the consolidation and security of the Soviet rulers. Although occupied by totalitarian power, deprived of their individual, political, economic, and religious freedoms, the people of Armenia long for the day when their country will once again resume its rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mr. Speaker, on this 33d anniversary of the Armenian revolt, I want to extend my congratulations to the people of that brave country, and to all Americans of Armenian ancestry. It is my hope that in this trying period of their history, the people of Armenia will draw encouragement from the warm regard which our country has held for them. I join in their prayer that the oppression of their native land may soon be ended.

Research and Education in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1954

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is absolutely essential that the research and educational program in the general field of agriculture should be expanded and I think vigorous action must be taken in that direction

Accordingly, on January 18, 1954, my good friend and capable colleague, Congressman T. A. THOMPSON, and I addressed the following letter to the Secretary of Agriculture:

JANUARY 18, 1954.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
The Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In his message to the Congress on the subject of the Nation's agriculture the President said:

"Research and education are still indispensable if our farmers are to improve their productivity and enlarge their markets."

First of all we want to commend both you and the President for such a forthright statement on this phase of our agricultural program.

As you know so well, it is most important to continuously develop new and more productive plant varieties and to wage a constant fight against the ravages of disease, pests, and insects. We think that the progress we have made along that line is a monument to agricultural research; and we know that too little recognition has been given to that quiet and humble but very efficient small group of people engaged in that work.

But instead of relenting, we must double our efforts in that direction, else all our gains will be lost. Sugercane and sweet potatoes are cases in point, but the same applies to cotton, rice, and other crops.

For instance, it is absolutely essential to continue to breed superior varieties of sugarcane having hybrid vigor, early maturity, high sucrose contents, and resistance to both cold and disease. When one considers that only one out of about 250,000 sugarcane seedlings becomes a promising variety he immediately realizes that this tedious process is strictly a job for scientists. And the work simply must go on, because sugarcane degenerates to such an extent that an outstanding variety today may be worthless in a few years.

The same is true about sweet potatoes, except perhaps more so. This is illustrated by a statement made to us by Dr. Nulien Miller, who is connected with Louisiana State University. On the general subject of the development of new varieties, weevil control, and soil preparation in the production of sweet potatoes, Dr. Miller has probably done as much if not more for this industry than any living man. At a meeting some time ago we asked him, "Doctor, with all the progress we have made, suppose we stood still from here on in the field of research affecting sweet potatoes; what would happen to the industry?" Without hesitation, he said, "Well, the same as would happen to a swimmer who quits struggling in midstream. They would both die."

Very fortunately we have many Dr. Millers at our disposal in connection with agricultural research. We must use their brains. But that is not all; after the research is done the information must be passed on to the farmers.

We therefore respectfully suggest, Mr. Secretary, that the subject of research and education should be made the byword of the Department of Agriculture, and we especially urge you to take a last look at the budget before it is submitted to the Congress, to see to it that ample funds are provided to carry on the job.

With assurance of our esteem, we are
Sincerely,

EDWIN E. WILLIS,
Member of Congress.
T. A. THOMPSON,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to receive a reply indicating a proposed increase in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the budget of about $18 million for research and education. This is certainly encouraging but I personally feel that we should press for additional funds, for the reasons pointed up in my letter and in the Secretary's reply, which follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1954.

Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WILLIS: The letter of January 18, 1954, from you and Mr. T. A. THOMPSON is at hand and we appreciate very much your comments on the President's statement regarding the importance of research and education in American agriculture. We are in complete agreement with this viewpoint and hope to do all that is possible to carry it out.

The budget recently submitted to the Congress provides for a strengthened and expanded program of research and education. It includes an increase of almost $9.9 million for research and $8.3 million for the cooperative extension education work. To achieve a more efficient and stable agriculture and to provide for the future needs of a growing population, we fully agree with you that increased attention must be given to research and educational work on problems of agricultural production, conservation, utilization, and marketing. We firmly believe that an adequate program of research and education will enable us to solve many of the problems facing agriculture.

In your letter you commented on the progress that has been made in plant improvement and other fields of research during recent years. We thoroughly agree that a great deal of progress has been made and we also realize that there is much more to be done. In all of our crop-improvement programs, for example, we are striving to develop new varieties and strains that give good yields, that are resistant to the attacks of serious insects and disease pests, and to other hazards of production. We also take into account the question of the quality of the end product, realizing that unless this product is of real value to the farmer or processor it would not represent a real advance. In our plans for the future we hope to continue to strengthen and improve research and, through education, to get the results of research into effective use more quickly.

Since Mr. THOMPSON joined you in the original letter we are also writing to him.

Sincerely yours,

J. EARL COKE,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I have made a particular study of the subject of research and technology with respect to the sugarcane industry which is of tremendous importance to the district I represent in Congress. In that connection, I was honored to be invited to address the American Society of Sugarcane Technologists at their annual banquet in Houma, La., on February 15. In order to show the vital role of research and technology, their influence on our economy, their accomplishments in the past and the imperative need for expansion of this program I include herewith a copy of my address:

Mr. President, officers, guests, and members of the American Society of Sugarcane Technologists, I am very happy to be here among friends tonight, and I am honored that I have been asked to speak to this gathering of sugar technologists, many of whom are well known throughout the sugar-producing world. The pleasure of being here is doubled inasmuch as I am a native of a sugar-producing parish of Louisiana and am naturally interested in the sugar industry. In addition, I am the congressional representative of a large part of the sugar-producing area of Louisiana and thus have a very lively official interest in the industry.

Although not a technologist myself, I would like to talk to you about a few of the developments which have taken place in the industry, their importance, and the contributions made by the industry, science, and government to these developments.

The starting of a sugar-producing industry required research and technology because sugar does not grow on a tree for picking, but must be produced through a series of complicated mechanical and chemical operations. It was necessary from the beginning to devise methods for extracting juice from sugarcane. Although an individual might satisfy his sweet tooth by chewing on a stalk of sugarcane, such a process held little promise for development of a commercial sugar enterprise. Consequently, research to develop a juice extractor was necessary before the industry could start as a commercial venture. This initial research may have been rather rudimentary compared with today's standards, but it was research of a kind.

Research on the design of mills and the extraction of juice continues today at an accelerated pace, as you well know. Extraction was only one of the research problems of the early industry. Clarifying and boiling techniques were varied from place to place with improvements in both taking place as new ideas were introduced. By necessity, the earliest research was restricted largely to means of extracting sugar, but as these processes developed, attention was diverted to the production of higher quality sugar. Today, more research emphasis is placed on increased productivity in the field and increased recovery in the factory, but quality is still a very important consideration. Thus, it can be seen that the history of the industry has been one of continuous striving for better ways to do things.

If the industry is to continue to grow, research and technology must be given the necessary encouragement and support. The need to increase sugar production per acre means that research will continue to be necessary to develop better varieties and to improve agronomic practices. Parallel research in the factory should strive to put more sugar in the bag and to utilize the by-products which are available from the process. And finally, improved marketing practices must be developed if the industry is to grow more profitable and improve its competitive status.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS RESULTING FROM RESEARCH

Let's look at some of the research and technological developments which have significantly affected sugarcane growing and processing in recent years.

In the field of agriculture, many changes have taken place since the time this society was founded in 1936, as the Louisiana Sugarcane Technologists Association. The men who have been and are now members of this society have contributed significantly to these achievements.

Everyone here is familiar with the history of the variety research program which started several years ago and its importance to the industry. This program has had to cope with such problems in variety development as disease and insect resistance, cold resistance, sucrose content, purity, stubbling characteristics, and yield per acre. These are directly related to production of sugarcane as a commercial crop. In addition to these, other factors such as fiber content and milling characteristics must be considered for factory operations. More recently, growth characteristics and adaptability to machine harvesting have been considered.

Research in cultivation practices has not been neglected. One of the most noticeable changes has been the shift from mule-drawn to tractor-drawn cultivating tools. Heavier and more varied cultivating equipment has resulted from this change. Hoe hands have also become less plentiful and many cultivating jobs which were formerly performed by hand are now done by tractor-drawn tools. Flame cultivating has proven useful as an aid in weed control, and chemical herbicides have been developed into another major tool for control of weeds and conservation of our dwindling labor supply.

Soil fertility has been given attention. Such practices as follow plowing and use of legumes and other cover crops to aid in eliminating weeds and improve the tilth and fertility of the soil have received widespread consideration. Fertilizers and their proper utilization in the growth of sugarcane have been studied on different soil types and under other varying conditions. Nutrient requirements of sugarcane have been investigated as part of the fertilizer research program. Rate and time of fertilizer application have been the subject of research projects. One of the most outstanding fertilizer developments recently has been the use of both aqueous and anhydrous ammonia. They are now among the chief sources of nitrogen fertilizer. This development, in turn, has required research on methods for satisfactorily applying these fertilizers.

At the time this society was founded practically all sugarcane was harvested by hand, but at the present time it is harvested largely by machines. The changeover from hand to machine harvesting created serious new problems which are even now being worked on and solved. It is interesting to note that in one of the papers presented at the first meeting of the society the problem of trashy cane was discussed. The problem is with us today, although the industry has taken steps which partly offset the detrimental effects of trash until such time as the problem can be completely solved. The solution may now be at hand.

Mechanical loaders have been improved. Transportation of cane from field to factory has changed. Truck delivery has almost entirely replaced rail delivery.

Factory operations and processes have also had significant developments in recent years. The development of cold and insect resistant varieties introduced cane with higher fiber content. Since the mills in use at the time were not designed to handle such tough cane, capacity and milling efficiency inevitably declined. These problems have been and are being met by improved mill design and the use of higher milling speeds. New mill drives have been introduced to the factory to give greater flexibility to milling operations. Other processing equipment has been improved; high speed centrifugals have been introduced both to speed up production and to improve separation of sugar from molasses. Factory facilities which are not directly connected with processing have been improved as a result of research. Mill lubrication and lubricants have not escaped attention. More efficient bagasse furnaces have been developed, and in many cases, gas has supplanted bagasse as a fuel in order to utilize bagasse as a profitable byproduct.

Bulk handling of raw sugar has developed into a successful operation and resulted in conservation of labor, time, and materials to the benefit of the industry. Bulk storage of refined sugar has the effect of increasing the flexibility of the refining and of making it possible to handle peak loads as a matter of course.

Byproduct research and development have received more attention than ever before. The most recent development, a very significant one, is the utilization of bagasse as raw material for pulp production. Although this use has already been developed in other

countries and considerable research has been done in the United States in the past years, it is only recently that successful pulping methods have been realized in the United States. Even as we are gathered here, one of these methods is being commercially used not more than 30 miles away. Earlier, the well-known use of bagasse in making fiber board was an outstanding research development, and this use continues to be a very important one for bagasse.

Most recently, a process has been perfected to use bagasse for the production of furfural, which in turn is a raw material in the production of nylon—that outstanding result of research efforts. Commercial production of furfural from bagasse will be a reality in the near future.

Molasses has always been a source of chemicals of various kinds, mostly through fermentation—citric acid, yeast, ethanol, butenal, acetone, and others. However, research developments in the field of petrochemicals have caused the use of molasses by the fermentation industries to fall off appreciably. This has resulted in the need to develop other uses for molasses. Molasses has always been recognized as a good cattle feed and has been used as such for years. However, it is only within the past few years that the potential of this market for molasses has been recognized, and a more concentrated effort has been made to sell molasses for that use. It has resulted in more than 50 percent of our molasses supplies being sold for feed uses. This market can be further expanded.

Aconitic acid, a byproduct from cane, has been commercially developed within the past few years as a result of cooperation between the United States Department of Agriculture and the industry. The potential uses for this versatile chemical are quite numerous. Aconitic acid is a plasticizer and is used to make plastics more flexible. It is possible that this byproduct will continue to develop in volume in the future.

United States Department of Agriculture research played an important part in developing methods for the extraction of sugarcane wax. Wax has been extracted commercially in Cuba for several years and more recently also in the British West Indies. This byproduct may hold promise for the domestic sugarcane areas.

There are other possibilities for byproducts from sugarcane and in time research and technology are certain to uncover and utilize them to the benefit of the industry and all the people.

RELATED ECONOMIC PROBLEMS FOR RESEARCH

There are related economic problems to be solved if we are to get the highest possible returns from our sugarcane lands. Much progress has already been made along this line.

In that connection, I am sure you are all familiar with the Sugar Act and how it works. The Sugar Act was intended to and did provide some stability to an industry which has had serious ups and downs. The Sugar Act itself, however, is not a complete answer to all of the problems involved in the pricing and marketing of Louisiana's sugar. It needs to be administered more realistically.

And then, too, competition up and down the Mississippi Valley with beet sugar and among the sugarcane refiners themselves has sometimes led to price concessions very much below the New York price for refined sugar. Even today with the base price for canesugar in New York at $8.65 per hundredweight bag, the price for beet sugar in the territory west of Chicago is $8.00 and there have been reports of sales below the reported prices.

There is a Federal law which requires traders on the grain and cotton exchanges to make periodic reports of their transactions to the Government. Sugar, however, is exempt from that law. Is there any good reason for this? Perhaps research efforts should be directed toward improving the price reporting service as a means of encouraging sugar competition on the basis of more complete market knowledge. For example, two questions:

To what extent may discounts be greater under present marketing reporting than would be offered if all sellers and buyers knew more precisely the prices at which all recent transactions actually have been made?

Is it possible that the lack of foreknowledge of prices provides a situation in which greater margins may be made by the best informed speculators which would go to processors and cane growers in increased prices if better market information were available to all such persons?

Sugarcane prices and prices for most of the raw sugar are geared to a 5-month average of exchange prices from early October to late February. During most of this period and certainly after the turn of the year prices are subject to depressing influences, one of these being the start of the harvesting season in Cuba and Puerto Rico. The suggestion has been made that perhaps it would be better to market Louisiana sugar through the entire year. The higher prices obtained late in each crop year after the harvest seasons are completed in all of the supplying areas may be more than enough to offset the cost of building more adequate storage and other expenses. I do not know the answer and offer no recommendations at this time, but I do think that research should be directed toward this problem.

EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

Concrete measurements of the results of research and technological developments are very difficult to make. Not every research project leads directly to a commercial development. The accumulation of knowledge and data resulting from well-planned research spread over a period of time, however, certainly rewards the industry with greater success. Because of the gradual nature of the advances, it is typically difficult to assign dollar values to research and technological developments. Therefore, we must look at overall changes in the industry to give us the proper perspective on the value of research.

One of the measures of the value of research is the ability with which the industry has been able to meet new problems without a decrease in overall efficiency. As an example, the early freezes in recent years would have practically stopped the industry several years ago, but the industry coped with this serious problem in a satisfactory manner. Cold-resistant varieties played a single, prominent part in this success, but beyond this, the total background of technology which the industry had accumulated made a great contribution to the way this challenge was met.

Perhaps, the most significant measure of the value of research and technology is the reduction in man-hours and costs per unit of production.

We must recognize that research cannot be evaluated by its immediate effect on the industry. Instead, we must study its effect on industry over a period of years.

RELATIONS OF INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS TO RESEARCH

What is the relationship of technologists, the industry, scientific societies, schools of higher learning, and Government agencies to research and technological developments?

You technologists are very personally related to it because you are the ones who are doing research. You not only devise and carry out the experiments, you are also responsible for the development of new ideas and for the application of old ideas to new problems. It is from you that the developments are coming and must continue to come. Therefore, it is essential that you, as individuals, continue to apply yourselves to the problems of the industry.

The industry relationship is very important because the industry must supply a large portion of the financial support for research and development. It is essential that the industry promote research with a view toward benefits in the long run. Industry management must be able to recognize the value of research and make possible the continuation of research, for it is only through industry backing that research will continue. Industry must realize that it is only through research that it will continue to be able to cope with problems which arise from time to time.

Scientific societies also have an important relationship to research and technological progress. These organizations are playing an important role in the collection and dissemination of the results of research and technology. This is a very essential function, for without the dissemination of research information, duplication of effort and delay would result. Meetings which societies have, such as this one, are important because they bring people who are working in research together for the exchange of ideas and the stimulation of new ones. Discussion of problems usually results in many new approaches to a solution even though the problem is an old one. This exchange of ideas and information benefits the industry as a whole. Furthermore, the value of your research is not limited to the boundaries of the industry in the United States. By proper dissemination of information, as encouraged by your society, any sugar producing area benefits from it. Likewise, you can benefit by research from other areas.

Schools of higher learning also play a very important role in research. Everyone here is well aware of the value of LSU and its Audubon sugar school to the industry. This institution is not only constantly working on problems important to the industry but is also training entomologists, agronomists, engineers, chemists, and business administrators who will become an important part of the industry. LSU also provides facilities for other industries to work on problems which are related to sugar industry problems. It is also a very important source of information and disseminates it through its various bulletins and other publications.

The Federal Government also plays a vital role in research for the sugar industry. Congress appropriates funds for research projects which it considers desirable not only for the benefit of the industry but also for the Nation as well. Congress, moreover, has established our sugar policy by passing the sugar acts.

All of you here are well aware of the Sugar Act and its impact on the industry.

In order to have confidence in future development in the field of research, it is essential to maintain stability in the sugar industry. The Sugar Act was intended to provide that stability and the fact that few changes have been made in it since its original enactment indicates that the act itself has worked well, as distinguished from certain shortcomings in its administration. It is interesting to note how research has taken advantage of such stability and kept pace with the law. In fact, it might be said that research is now one step ahead of the Sugar Act. For instance, as you know, the Sugar Act has established a quota of 500,000 tons for the mainland cane area in Louisiana and Florida. And you are well aware of the fact also that with practically no increase in acreage our production now exceeds the quota established by the act, as a direct result of research both in the cane fields and in the mills. To meet the situation, the Department of Agriculture has imposed marketing allotments and acreage quotas. I think this is an unjust and wrong approach. In a way, it amounts to a penalty

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

for success in the field of research. I think the right approach is to reward the performance with an increase of the mainland cane quota.

Sugar-industry research in the Federal Government is primarily carried out in the Department of Agriculture. All of you are familiar with the experiment station here at Houma and with the work that has been done here. The station is conducting work on agronomy, entomology, plant disease, variety development and testing, farm machinery, and processing problems. In addition to the work there, the southern regional laboratory in New Orleans is conducting research on processing problems and by-products. The Department is cooperating with LSU on varietal work and on milling characteristics of new varieties. The station at Canal Point, Fla., is vitally important to the industry. The northern regional laboratory has done some very valuable work on bagasse and on molasses fermentation. Marketing studies have been made by the Sugar Division of the Commodity Stabilization Service.

The House Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, was instrumental in having the Bureau of Standards conduct tests on bagasse pulping processes for the production of newsprint. These tests showed that bagasse could be utilized for making satisfactory newsprint.

There are several industries which though not directly connected with the sugar industry do conduct research on industry problems. Machinery manufacturers of all kinds, engineering firms, chemical manufacturers are always working on industry problems. Their relationship is one of providing tools, services, and materials for use of the sugar industry. Their research in their own fields is thus as important to the sugarcane industry as the work carried on within the industry itself.

And we must not forget all groups of individuals in our area, including the extension-service people, the county agents, and others interested in agriculture generally, who help to do the work and disseminate the information among the farmers and millowners. The result of research must be brought home to those who need it. The message must be brought to Garcia.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

If the industry is to maintain its present level of productivity and to increase it in the future, it is essential that it support a vigorous program of research and development.

What should be accomplished by these programs? Increased productivity and complete utilization of all valuable byproducts to yield a larger gross return to the industry are the overall accomplishments to be attained. These will come about only as a result of the solution of problems in agronomy, genetics, soils, entomology, engineering, marketing, and all other phases of the entire industry. Another field which has received no previous mention is that of management and public relations. It is interesting to note that the society originally had a management section, and I recommend to you that this section be revived and stimulated to new efforts because this is a very important field insofar as the progress of the industry is concerned.

Who will be responsible for research in the future? The industry, of necessity, must bear a large part of the financial burden of future research, and it also must have the vision to determine what its research needs are. Research must, of course, return a profit to the industry, for without profit, the industry cannot exist. You technologists must continue your active interest in research problems in order to keep abreast of the problems. The scientific society must continue to foster the exchange of ideas and the dissemination of information. Governmental agencies, both State and Federal, must continue to support research which either cannot be handled by smaller groups, has a broader significance than the needs of the local industry, or is of such a fundamental nature that the industry cannot foresee a profit in a reasonable length of time.

I plead with you for close cooperation among all groups and for coordination of efforts so that research will yield a maximum return to the industry and the Nation.

Some old problems have been solved, but new ones will arise to take their place. We have accomplished much since the time of Etienne De Bore, but the industry cannot afford to stand still. We must progress; we must go forward.

Panama Canal: Memorializations and Modernization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1954

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Panama Canal has a great history. Many persons of various nations, professions, and positions in life contributed to the success of the undertaking, its construction, and subsequent operation. Many others will contribute to its future.

The December 1953 issue of the Canal Record, the always interesting monthly publication of the Panama Canal Society of Florida, with headquarters at St. Petersburg, Fla., was primarily devoted to the memorialization of Col. George W. Goethals, Chairman and Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission during the final years of construction, 1907–14, and the first Governor of the Panama Canal under the permanent operating organization.

It is significant, however, that this same issue also carries an announcement of the election of officers of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, an organization named in honor of Col. William Crawford Gorgas, the great sanitarian of the Isthmus, who served during the entire period of construction of the Panama Canal, 1904–14, and who, in 1952, was elected to the Hall of Fame in the University of New York.

The full text of the indicated announcement follows:

COL. JOSEPH F. SILER ELECTED PRESIDENT, GORGAS INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE; MAURICE H. THATCHER, VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL

The Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, at its annual meeting on October 30, 1953, in Washington, D. C., elected Capt. Miles P. Duval, United States Navy, retired, as a member of its board of directors for 3 years, the first time a naval officer has been so honored.

The other nine members reelected for the same period are former President of Panama Ricardo J. Alfaro, Dr. Herbert C. Clark, Mr. Robert V. Fleming, Senator Lister Hill, Dr. Alberto Lleras, Col. Joseph F. Siler, Dr. Fred L. Soper, Congressman John Taber, and Dr. Willard B. Wright.

Captain Duval is a recognized authority on interoceanic canal problems. He served as captain of the port, Balboa, C. Z., in charge of marine operations in the Pacific sector of the Panama Canal, 1941–44, during which time he developed what proved to be the first comprehensive plan for its operational improvement as determined from actual experience, known as the Terminal Lake plan. He also served as coordinator of Isthmian Canal studies of the Navy Department, 1946–49. He is the author of two important books on the Panama Canal: And the Mountains Will Move and Cadiz to Cathay, both by Stanford University Press.

Captain Duval is now working on what will be the third volume of his canal trilogy, also to be published by Stanford Press.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the foregoing, it is interesting to note that former Congressman Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, is the surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission that had charge of the construction of the Panama Canal and the author, while in the Congress, of the legislation that created the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, the work of which is supervised by the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine.

His many friends, in and out of the Congress, are very happy over the fact that he is yet in health and vigor, engaged in the practice of law in Washington, and giving generously of his time and talents in activities affecting the public welfare, such as are involved in the work of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.

In addition, it is particularly important to note also that the terminal lake plan mentioned in the quoted announcement is recognized by independent transportation experts not only as supplying the best canal for navigation but also as the most economic plan for the major improvement of the Panama Canal ever developed.

The principal features of the plan and its relationship with the Isthmian canal policy as a whole were presented in a notable address by its author, Capt. Miles P. Duval, 2 years ago before a distinguished audience at the Explorers' Club of New York.

At the same meeting, Mr. John F. Stevens, Jr., international economist and son of former Chief Engineer John F. Stevens, of the Isthmian Canal Commission, 1905–1907, who was the basic architect of the great waterway, 1906, and the first man appointed to the combined positions of Chairman and Chief Engineer 1907, stated what he considered would be the views of his late father as to the proper method for its modernization.

Together, these two statements form one of the most comprehensive treatments of the canal question ever presented. To make them available to the Congress and the Nation at large, I included both in an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, Appendix, part 8, January 15, 1952, page A163, under the title "Interoceanic Canals Problem," which I commend for serious study by all concerned with this subject.

To provide the Congress with adequate means for an independent and objective study of this important subject, my colleague, Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa,

and I introduced identical measures in the 82d Congress to create an Interoceanic Canals Commission. The same proposal, H. R. 1048, was reintroduced in the present Congress, and its early enactment is recommended.

Congressman Rodino's "Forgotten Man" Returns Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from the February 15, 1954, issue of Life. We in the Congress of the United States are familiar with the amount of work and effort rendered by our colleague, PETER RODINO, JR., of Newark, N. J., in seeking the liberation of his constituent, John Hvasta. For the past few years, Congressman RODINO has been in constant touch with the State Department, seeking their assistance to prevail upon the Czechoslovakian Government to release this Navy veteran from prison. Time and time again Congressman RODINO not only visited the State Department personally, beseeching them to insist upon action from the Czechs, but he delivered several speeches on the floor of the House of Representatives to his colleagues, crying out for timely assistance for this young man. Frequently he brought this unfortunate situation to the press of our country and other nations, citing the unfair and unjust punishment meted out to his friend while he was studying in their country. He refreshed their memories that this young citizen and veteran of the United States had never been a spy or agent of the United States.

He even carried his fight for the freedom of this victim to the White House to two Presidents of the United States. No stone was left unturned by Congressman RODINO to return John Hvasta; and I for one am pleased and happy that favorable results have been accomplished, in this acute and serious situation, by one man alone, PETER RODINO, JR., of New Jersey. He gained this wonderful result only by giving zealously and unstintingly of his time, his work, and his efforts during these long months of waiting and hoping, finally culminating in returning John Hvasta to his home town of Hillside, N. J.

Congressman PETER RODINO, JR., your colleagues, both on the Democratic and Republican side of the House are proud of you.

The article follows:

"FORGOTTEN MAN" COMES HOME

John Hvasta, a 26-year-old Navy veteran, went to Czechoslovakia in 1948 to study under the GI bill of rights. Last week he came home to Hillside, N. J., having learned a fantastic lot. Although he had served openly as a part-time employee of the United States consulate in Bratislava and was therefore not a man likely to succeed as a spy, he had been arrested as a United States agent and sentenced to 10 years in prison.

In 1950, while still a prisoner, Hvasta persuaded authorities to allow him to marry a Czech girl. In 1952 he broke out of the Leopoldov fortress in central Czechoslovakia. When Czech officials announced his escape, it was believed that he had been executed. But 4 months ago, after almost 2 years spent evading recapture, he appeared without his wife at the United States Embassy in Prague. All this time Congressman PETER RODINO, JR., of Newark, led a crusade in Washington for "the forgotten man." Then suddenly the Czechs commuted Hvasta's sentence and permitted him to come home.

Molotov's One Source of Satisfaction at Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article from Business Week magazine on Ed Murrow's outstanding television program, See It Now. I am sure those Members who read the article and who have seen the Murrow show on the air agree that it is one of the best public-service broadcasts currently shown on TV.

Last night, Mr. Murrow's program originated from Berlin and featured a panel discussion by a group of American and European newsmen covering the Big Four conference. With the exception of the one newsman from behind the Iron Curtain who participated in the program, the panel was unanimous that very little was being accomplished at the conference.

Howard K. Smith, European chief for the Columbia Broadcasting System, had what to me was a particularly noteworthy comment. Pointing to the unity among the Western Powers in resisting Molotov's divisive maneuvers at the conference, Mr. Smith said, as closely as I can remember the words:

About the only satisfaction Molotov has been getting here in Berlin comes from the stories in the Berlin newspapers about the self-mutilation going on in the United States as one political party charges another with 20 years of treason. That, I imagine, has given Molotov a great deal of satisfaction.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all being, whose glory flames from sun and star and who art the center and soul of every sphere: May we know this hallowed moment, pausing amid all the distractions and confusions which crowd the busy hours, that Thou art to each trusting heart how near; every virtue we possess and every victory won, and every thought of holiness enrich our parched and barren lives even as the sun's rays bring leaf and flower and fruit to the earth which is our home.

O make our hearts Thy dwelling place, and worthier Thee, Thou Spirit of purity and grace. Make us worthy of these days of world destiny in which Thou hast called us to serve the present age, days in which our common humanity faces powers of malignant evil seeking to debauch and enslave Thy sons and daughters. Enable us to incarnate the faith we profess, that, linking our endeavors to Thy eternal purposes, we may be faithful ministers of the truth which makes men free. We ask it in the name of that One who is the life and the way and the truth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 17, 1954, was dispensed with.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY—CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I may state that following the transaction of routine business I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Douglas	Hill
Anderson	Duff	Hoey
Barrett	Dworshak	Holland
Beall	Eastland	Humphrey
Bennett	Ellender	Hunt
Bricker	Ferguson	Ives
Bridges	Flanders	Jackson
Bush	Frear	Jenner
Butler, Md.	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Butler, Nebr.	George	Johnson, Tex.
Byrd	Gillette	Johnston, S. C.
Carlson	Goldwater	Kennedy
Case	Gore	Kerr
Chavez	Green	Kilgore
Clements	Griswold	Knowland
Cooper	Hayden	Kuchel
Cordon	Hendrickson	Langer
Daniel	Hennings	Lehman
Dirksen	Hickenlooper	Lennon

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Long	Neely	Smith, N. J.
Magnuson	Pastore	Sparkman
Malone	Payne	Stennis
Mansfield	Potter	Symington
Martin	Purtell	Thye
McClellan	Robertson	Upton
Millikin	Russell	Watkins
Monroney	Saltonstall	Welker
Morse	Schoeppel	Wiley
Mundt	Smathers	Williams
Murray	Smith, Maine	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF GOVERNMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the government of that District for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT, KINGS MOUNTAIN NATIONAL MILITARY PARK, S. C.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession permit in Kings Mountain National Military Park, S. C. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Baltimore, Md., favoring an investigation of the price of coffee; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the continuation of appropriations for Upper River Harbor, at Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

FARM PRICE SUPPORTS—LETTER FROM ELLENDALE FARMERS UNION COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, ELLENDALE, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter I have received from the board of directors of the Ellendale Farmers Union Cooperative Association, of Ellendale, N. Dak., relating to farm price supports.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELLENDALE FARMERS UNION COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Ellendale, N. Dak., February 1, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM A. LANGER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: We, the board of directors of the Ellendale Farmers Union Cooperative Association, take this means of expressing our views on the question of farm supports.

The big controversial question seems to be between the present supports and a flexible or sliding-scale deal recommended by President Eisenhower. We feel it is unfair on the part of the press, columnists, radio commentators in referring to farm supports that are less than 100 percent of parity as high supports.

If there was a demand for supports in excess of 100 percent of parity then such remarks and comments could be justified. It seems to us such comments are unfair to the farmers. City consumers can gather from this propaganda that farmers are a liability to the Government and that their high cost of living is because of high farm supports.

As to flexible supports, high when there is a scarcity, low when there is a surplus. that's the old theory of supply and demand. The twenties and early thirties gave us a good example of that. A scarce commodity, history has taught us, needs no support. Take for instance durum wheat, about $3.50 per bushel—far in excess of parity—but who has any durum?

It is when farmers have a crop that they need a support price which will justly compensate them to what they are entitled: not a fraction of parity or more than parity, but just 100 percent of parity.

Some may say, in fact are saying, Where is this going to put the Government? That is what seems to be worrying the Secretary of Agriculture. According to information less than 20 percent of the entire United States population are engaged in the production of food and fiber, which are not only essential, but a necessity for the daily livelihood of every human being. Therefore we feel that the entire population is obligated to those thus engaged for full parity and in the event that production exceeds the demand, or what is commonly called a surplus, if for instance such surplus is in excess of what is termed a sound stockpile for the security of the Nation.

Again, according to information there are a lot of hungry people in the world and as we have adopted a foreign-aid policy, we would suggest: give it away. That, in our belief, would do more to create good will and bring peace in the world than all the bombs that can be manufactured.

Hoping for your favorable support on this vital issue we remain,

Very truly yours,

RALPH GENTZ,
Chairman.
T. R. MATTHEIS,
HAROLD BILLEY,
CON BYMERS.
CLARENCE SAND,
Secretary.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2975. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to the Customs Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2976. A bill for the relief of Rudolf A. Tomaschewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2977. A bill to amend subsection 216 (c), part II, of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the establishment by motor carriers of reasonable through routes and joint rates, charges, and classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2978. A bill for the relief of George Poulio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 2979. A bill to provide for payment of retroactive compensation in certain cases where an employee of the United States is assigned to a lower grade to avoid separation through reduction in force and such assignment is found unjustified or unwarranted by proper authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2980. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a claim of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS IN STATE OF WASHINGTON—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the present session I have introduced in the Senate the following bills:

S. 2776. A bill authorizing the Shilshole Bay Breakwater project, Seattle, Wash.;

S. 2915. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington, in order to improve facilities for navigation;

S. 2916. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Bellingham Harbor in the State of Washington in order to provide for a small-boat basin;

S. 2917. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Quillayute River in the State of Washington in order to improve facilities for navigation;

S. 2918. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Port Angeles Harbor in the State of Washington in order to provide for a mooring basin; and

S. 2919. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Everett Harbor in the State of Washington in order to improve facilities for navigation.

The bills involve public works projects in the State of Washington.

Inadvertently, the name of my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], was not placed on the bills when they were introduced. I ask unanimous consent that his name be added as a cosponsor of the bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc.,

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Statement prepared by him relating to the fifth anniversary of the trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, together with a letter dated January 25, 1954, from Msgr. Bela Varga, president, Hungarian National Council.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE—UNAUTHORIZED USE OF FRANKED ENVELOPES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege, and ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. This morning I have been advised that apparently an undetermined quantity of my franked envelopes have been stolen and are being circulated in the United States mail, containing enclosures of material which could not possibly be reconciled with my political beliefs.

I wish to serve notice in the RECORD that I learned of this matter about 2 hours ago and I have called upon the postal inspectors for a complete investigation.

I also serve notice that if those guilty of this unauthorized use of my franking privilege are detected, I shall urge full prosecution under the law.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION—LETTER FROM C. L. GREIBER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am most anxious to see adequate funds voted for vocational rehabilitation. Our Wisconsin program has proved the value of investing in a good vocational educational program. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a persuasive letter I have received from the Wisconsin State director of vocational and adult education.

In his letter he pointed out that a trip he made last fall to West Germany convinced him that the tremendous emphasis which has been placed by West Germany upon vocational education has enabled that nation to make its rapid recovery from the effects of World War II.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate into the RECORD, the letter I have received from Director Greiber, of the State board of vocational and adult education.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
STATE BOARD OF VOCATIONAL
AND ADULT EDUCATION,
Madison, February 5, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As you know, the State board of vocational and adult education administers the Federal aids which are allotted to Wisconsin under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts.

I was disappointed to learn several days ago that the budget which has been recommended to the present session of Congress again provides for a recommended reduction in Federal funds for vocational education under the provisions of the George-Barden Act.

Although the recommended reduction this year is substantially less than the reduction which was recommended to the 1953 Congress, I am concerned regarding the effect which reduced Federal aids may have on the program of vocational education in this country. You will recall that the Congress last year by a large vote rejected the recommended reduction in Federal aids for vocational education under the George-Barden Act. It is also difficult to understand why a reduction in Federal aids for vocational education is recommended this year when the budget provides for a large increase in appropriations for agriculture and home economics extension programs.

The full appropriation authorized under the George-Barden Act which was passed in 1946 as an amendment to the George-Deen Act has never been appropriated by Congress. However, the appropriations which have been made have assisted materially in the further development of programs of vocational education in this country.

In September and October of 1953 I had the opportunity of visiting West Germany as a guest of the German Government to observe vocational education programs which are being carried on in that country. I am convinced that the tremendous emphasis which is being placed upon vocational education by West Germany has enabled that nation to make its rapid recovery from the effects of World War II. We must continue to develop training programs which will teach our citizens to work with skill in order to meet the competition of European industry in world markets.

We are told that Russia is continuing to emphasize training programs in skills so that their industrial and agricultural production goals may be achieved. We must continue to further develop programs of vocational education in our country because a well-trained citizenry is basic insurance for continued national security and economic prosperity.

While consideration is being given to reduced Federal funds for vocational education in this country, funds are being appropriated for sending specialists in vocational education to foreign countries to assist in the development of vocational training programs.

The Federal aids which have been allotted to Wisconsin have been effectively used to assist local communities in developing and conducting programs which will train the people for productive living. The State board of vocational and adult education has developed policies through which necessary training programs are promoted through the use of these Federal aids in communities where these programs might not otherwise be carried on. Training programs for indentured apprentices are financed through funds appropriated for trade and industrial education and a reduced appropriation would negatively effect such training in the State.

Under the policies of the State board, special grants of aid are given to small rural high schools that the programs of vocational agriculture and rural homemaking may be developed. Federal aid allotted to Wisconsin has not been reimbursed to localities as a subsidy, but is being used by the State board for the promotion of necessary training programs.

* * * * *

We greatly appreciate the fine support which you have given to the program of vocational education in this State during past years and know that you recognize the value of this important training program to the economy of our country.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

C. L. GREIBER,
State Director, Vocational and Adult Education.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—CONCLUSION OF TOPEKA, KANS., BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was very pleased to receive word today from Schuyler W. Jackson, dean of Washburn University, of Topeka, Kans., that the Topeka Bar Association has gone on record as opposing the Bricker amendment.

The association adopted the recommendations of a special committee which had been created during the 49th annual meeting of the association.

This firm demonstration of sound midwestern thinking on this issue is extremely gratifying, as another evidence of the understanding by sections of the American bar all over the Nation on the dangers of this proposal.

Unfortunately limitations of space do not permit me to reproduce the full text of the report of the special committee on the amendment. I do, however, ask unanimous consent that the text of the conclusion be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCLUSION OF LAW

Your committee as a result of its study of the law as it finds the law to be, has reached the following conclusions:

1. Under our Constitution neither a treaty nor an executive agreement can violate any constitutional provision or prohibition. The Constitution of the United States is supreme.

2. A valid treaty is subject to the provisions of a later act of Congress, the later in time being controlling.

3. The Senate may impose such conditions as it deems necessary as a basis for Senate approval of a treaty submitted to it, and has in fact freely exercised this power.

4. Congress may exercise indirect but absolute control over most treaties and executive agreements through its control over appropriations.

5. Treaties may be non-self-executing. Legislation implementing treaties may be required by the treaty, by Senate-imposed condition, or by the non-self-executing features of the treaty provisions.

6. The vast majority of all executive agreements are "statutory executive agreements," and are made in concert with the Congress. The question of respective spheres of power is vague.

7. All executive agreements are subject to previous or subsequent acts of Congress and to the Constitution of the United States.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT

The committee is opposed to the adoption of either the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) or the Knowland substitute amendment.

Discussing herein only the Bricker amendment, it is believed that section 1 restates the law as it now exists.

Section 2 would require legislation to give a treaty any effect as internal law. This could only be by legislation "which would be valid in the absence of treaty."

Treaties must affect internal laws to be of value to the signatory nations. Protection of rights of inheritance, power to own lands, to collect debts, to prevent discriminatory taxation, to control narcotics—all are examples of the traditional spheres of treaties, all affect internal laws, and none of these come under any specific grant of authority to our Federal Government, other than our treaty powers.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The frequently cited case of *Missouri v. Holland*, supra, involved a treaty approved by the President and the Senate, and the treaty required congressional legislation to make it effective. It did affect the internal law of a State, as have all the types of treaties cited above. It dealt with ducks, animals ferae naturae, and certainly the property rights of the State of Missouri were no greater in these ducks than it was in real property within the State of Missouri. Yet treaties affecting real property are accepted as being within the treaty power.

Such a provision as proposed in section 2 would seriously impair our national powers, and would adversely affect the Nation, the States, and its citizens. Our ability to obtain favorable international agreements would be reduced. Our approval procedure would be most cumbersome, and very probably in cases such as those cited above would require the approval of each of our 48 State legislatures, which would be tantamount to a prohibition of any such treaties.

Under section 2 the following procedure would have to be followed as to all treaties which would have internal force:

1. Signature by President.
2. Approval by two-thirds of the Senators present.
3. Approval by a majority of the House.
4. Approval by a majority of the Senate.
5. Signature of the President of the law (and others, as noted above, would require approval of the 48 State legislatures in lieu of approval of Congress by legislation).

Section 3 would make all executive agreements subject to the above provisions, and would also give Congress the power to regulate all executive agreements.

As heretofore noted, Congress does exercise considerable control over executive agreements under existing law. There is usually concerted effort by Congress and the Executive in this field.

But there is a multitude of executive agreements on every conceivable subject (customs, commerce, postal matters, trademarks, copyrights, aircraft, vessels, etc.), made as a part of the day-to-day business of this Nation as conducted through our State Department.

If Congress has the power to regulate the President in the field of executive agreements, it is impossible to predict how far a hostile Congress might regulate. Under our political system, the executive department has been recognized as a part of our tripartite system of Government. Any attempt to pass to Congress such a vast portion of the powers of the executive department should be considered on that basis.

Your committee recognizes the fact that executive agreements may be abused. Safeguards do, however, exist. No satisfactory definition of treaties as distinguished from executive agreements has yet been advanced. The question is one of great difficulty. We think this definition can best be made by the Supreme Court when the question is presented to that tribunal.

Your committee has faith in the Supreme Court of the United States, and believes that it will zealously protect the citizen of this country in his constitutionally guaranteed liberties; that it will continue to recognize the State as an integral part of our framework of government; that the power of treaty and executive agreement shall be used only for proper purposes in international affairs; and that a balance of powers and controls shall be maintained under our Constitution and our tripartite system of government.

TOPEKA BAR ASSOCIATION, SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE BRICKER AMENDMENT,
JOHN S. DAWSON,
BERYL JOHNSON,
E. R. SLOAN,
WALTER G. STUMBO,
LLOYD L. HALL, *Chairman.*

VOLUNTARY PRODUCTION CODE OF MOTION PICTURE PRODUCERS AND DISTRIBUTORS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have noted with satisfaction the statement issued by the heads of the eight large motion-picture producers and distributors emphasizing their devotion to their voluntary production code and their determination to make and distribute clean, wholesome pictures.

I desire at this time to join in the comments heretofore made by my very good friend the senior Senator from Colorado, praising the industry leaders for their forthright stand on so fundamental an issue.

It has been my privilege the past year to come into close contact with motion-picture leaders in my capacity as chairman of a small-business subcommittee studying problems in that industry. The overwhelming majority of the people in this business—the producers, the distributors, and the theater owners and operators—are fine, outstanding American citizens who are trying desperately to maintain their industry as the premier entertainment medium of the world. And it is worth noting that while the various elements have their interfamily differences, they stand united in their belief that the motion picture is the finest family entertainment, and they strive constantly to bring the public a better product.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the industry is experiencing serious economic problems. The exhibitors in my State are under great pressure as a result of declining box office and the effect of the onerous 20-percent admissions tax, which, incidentally, I earnestly hope will be eliminated in this session of the Congress. But, despite these difficulties, I know that no movie exhibitor in Kansas is going to put dollars above ethics by showing an off-color film.

They know that in these days, when we are all concerned with problems of juvenile delinquency, every motion picture should be the kind of picture that a man is not ashamed to take his wife and children to see. And if it is not that kind of picture, nobody else should want to see it.

The studies carried on by my committee show that the industry has problems, but it is clear that these problems are not going to be solved by trying to show pictures that do not conform to accepted standards of decency and morality. In my view, such pictures not only do harm to the industry as a whole, but in the long run will hurt those who make and show them. The American public is not going to pay for trash and filth in the name of artistic license.

None of us in this country want censorship of media of public expression. The motion-picture industry nearly a quarter of a century ago adopted a self-imposed code, and it has required its product to conform to those standards. In recent months a campaign has been waged by one or two picture makers and their publicity agents to modernize code standards.

Just how decency and morality and good taste are modernized is difficult to understand. Women's clubs and parent-teacher organizations and religious groups and all right-thinking people believe that morality is not a dress to be changed with every passing fad.

I am happy, therefore, to see that the responsible leaders in the production side of the industry make clear that they are not going to be stampeded into abandoning standards which have always been right and which have kept their product fit for family seeing.

In the best interest of the industry and the public I hope that everyone in and out of the industry will support their code. I urge every producer to make only code-approved pictures; I urge every exhibitor to show only code-approved pictures; and I hope that the public will patronize only code-approved pictures.

It is the one sure way of making certain that decent entertainment will always be the best entertainment.

NEED FOR MAINTAINING FARM PARITY SUPPORT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on many occasions I have commented on the critical farm price problem—the need to prevent farm prices from falling any lower.

I send to the desk a letter which speaks for itself on this issue. It comes from Mr. John A. Guziak, of Medford, Wis., sales manager of an auction company, who sees at first hand every day how Wisconsin and American farming have suffered.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Guziak's letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUZIAK REAL ESTATE & AUCTION CO.,
Medford, Wis., February 4, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am writing this letter as protest to our Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson's proposal to reduce dairy support prices effective April 1, 1954.

We in the real-estate and auction business have watched for the past year in grave dismay the constant reduction of our dairy farmer's net income. It has become more apparent each day that our Wisconsin farmer is becoming more and more faced with an economic crisis. Many of our young farmers who purchased farms after the end of World War II are already feeling the pressure of reduced prices and if the prospective reduction of dairy support prices becomes effective we are sure that many will be forced to lose their farms. I therefore urge you strongly to do everything in your power to continue high level supports for the dairy industry as we believe this is of utmost importance.

As for the present surplus of dairy products, I am sure that some of this problem could be solved by selling more dairy products to our Armed Forces and veteran hospitals.

I have contacted servicemen in this area serving in the Armed Forces and almost unanimously do they state that they see very little butter and the majority have milk once a day and cheese very seldom.

I have also contacted veterans who have been convalescing at various veteran hospitals and they also note the amazing lack of of dairy products being served there.

And to further substantiate the dairy farmer's dilemma, I find upon checking our records that at auctions held in the fall of 1951 in this community dairy cattle averaged $325 per head. The average price of dairy cattle selling at auction last summer averaged $145 for comparable cows.

I sincerely hope that through your efforts and those of your fellow men, you will be able to find a solution to the present butter-surplus problem without lowering dairy support prices.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. GUZIAK, *Sales Manager.*

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—PERSECUTION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH BY COMMUNISTS

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, this month marks the anniversary of an event which has truly aroused the conscience of the free world and men of good will everywhere. I refer particularly to the fifth anniversary of the trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty staged by the Communist regime of Hungary. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared with regard to this mockery of the principles of freedom and human dignity.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER OF MARYLAND

In the war against freedom and humanity that the Communists have been waging the Catholic Church has consistently been a focal point for attack, for in countries such as Hungary it has served as a rallying point for all freedom-loving men and women and as a source of moral strength. One of the most brutal episodes in this attempt to stamp out religion in the Communist satellites was the trial 5 years ago of the prince primate of Hungary, Cardinal Mindszenty. Aware of the great influence that Cardinal Mindszenty had with the Hungarian people, the Communists were anxious to remove him as a guiding force and to discredit him completely in the eyes of the Hungarian people. In doing this they hoped to achieve the double purpose of discrediting not only the man but the church as well.

At the trial held in early February of 1949 Cardinal Mindszenty was presented with a fantastic set of charges. He was accused of black marketeering, inciting to murder, and organizing crimes against the state. No one who has seen pictures of Cardinal Mindszenty before and during the trial can fail to see the methods used by the Communists in extricating his "confession." The Cardinal himself, aware that his captors would stop at nothing, wrote a message to his people declaring in advance any confession drawn from him would be the "consequence of human frailty" and therefore "null and void."

Actually the Communists were defeated in their own purpose. No one who heard the charges or who followed the conduct of the trial could escape the patent truth of the case, and what it was the Communists were attempting to do. Instead of discrediting the Cardinal and the Roman Catholic Church in the eyes of the people of Hungary, they emerged as even stronger forces in the fight against communism. Those who had been firm in their faith were now confirmed more than ever in the knowledge that under communism there could be neither freedom nor justice. Those who wavered became convinced of the impossibility of compromise between their conscience and totalitarianism. The trial which pointed out the terror and the falsehood upon which the new regime in Hungary was based brought new hope to the people, for they realized that it was a house built upon a foundation of sand.

The man whom the Communists hoped to destroy with slander and deceit emerged from the trial with even greater force and dignity. Cardinal Mindszenty is more than a martyr at the hands of communism. He has become a symbol to the enslaved people of Europe and an inspiration to the free world. Cardinal Mindszenty, like the other spiritual leaders of all the churches who have suffered mental and physical persecution, expresses the strength and the perpetuity of a belief which is indestructible because it is founded on truth and justice and the basic dignity of all free men.

CONTROL OF NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RAILROAD

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to acquaint the Senate with the contents of a letter which I addressed to Hon. Ralph H. Demmler, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, on February 17. To save the time of the Senate, I shall not read the letter, but I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks. I also sent a copy of this letter to the Honorable J. Monroe Johnson, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 17, 1954.

Hon. RALPH H. DEMMLER,
Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DEMMLER: It is with concern that I learn that interests foreign to New England are trying to obtain control of the management of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.

During my term of office as Governor of Rhode Island when the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad filed a petition in bankruptcy in a Federal court in Connecticut, I personally, in behalf of the New England Governors, endeavored to have the public recognized as a party in interest since a railroad exists not only as an investment for the stockholders, but as a public utility essential to the welfare of the community. This request, however, was denied by the Federal judge.

At that time the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad was bankrupt, the equipment was neglected, and miles of track were, in the opinion of reputable railroadmen, unsafe for traffic. The old management had allowed the rolling stock to become obsolete and the roadbeds to deteriorate. In some places they had become a safety menace—to say nothing of giving passengers a jolting, shaking, and uncomfortable ride which made walking more attractive as well as healthier. Bridges, overpasses, stations, and crossings were in need of repair with no funds available for that purpose. Besides the physical bankruptcy of this New England lifeline there was a financial bankruptcy brought about by interests not friendly to New England.

Under the present management, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad in a few years has become one of the modern railroads in the country, and I have been reliably informed that large sums have been spent on new rails, new roadbeds, new cars, and new engines and that a repair program of equipment and roadbeds is continuously in effect.

As a result the passenger and freight business of this railroad has increased in spectacular fashion and it is my understanding that the overhead and tax burden has been greatly reduced and several new sources of revenue such as the huge market terminal in Boston have been created through the imagination of the present management. The community has shared in the benefits resulting from these improvements.

In my opinion it is imperative that every Government agency interested in transportation and railroad investment be alerted and put on guard against the alleged unfair practices of those who would seize this railroad and eventually return it to the unstable condition in which it was when it went into bankruptcy in 1935.

There has recently been brought to my attention the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission No. 30980 entitled "Investigations of Practices of Norfolk Southern Railway Co. and Norfolk Southern Bus Corp." decided February 1, 1954. Some persons referred to in that report are now seeking to gain control of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. A reading of this report gives rise to fear that if control is wrested from the present management, the company may thereafter be operated not for the best interests of the people whom it is designed to serve but solely for the personal advantage of such new management.

I would request therefore, Mr. Chairman, that your Commission, insofar as it has jurisdiction in the premises, take appropriate steps to insure the stockholders of the railroad and the public be fully advised as to the identity and character of the persons who would displace the present management.

We of New England, particularly my State of Rhode Island, do not want abuses such as were reported by the Interstate Commerce Commission in its investigation of the practices of the Norfolk Southern Railway, now repeated on this New England railroad and by persons interested solely in their personal benefit and with no interest in the welfare of the communities this railroad serves.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the Securities and Exchange Commission will, as it has in the past, take the necessary steps within the limits of its jurisdiction to protect the interests of investors in this railroad and guard against the passing of the control of this railroad to railroad brokers working with foreign groups in other countries. I am satisfied that, if all the relevant facts are presented to the stockholders, the railroad will continue to be operated under its present management and for the benefit of the riding public and the general public of New England.

Yours very truly,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

SUPPORT-PRICE LEVELS ON MILK AND DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on several occasions during the past few days I have pointed out the serious plight of the dairy farmers of my State and of other States because of the fact that they must continue to buy, at very high prices, the feedstuffs which they feed to their cows in order to make milk. On the other hand, as a result of the lowering of the price supports recently announced by the Secretary of Agriculture, they will suffer a very considerable diminution in the prices which they will receive for the products of their dairy farms. That subjects them to a devastating squeeze and imposes on them a burden which will inevitably be very heavy.

I received today a letter from Mr. A. Morelle Cheney, secretary of the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association. I ask unanimous consent to have this very interesting and informative letter

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with an amendment he proposes should be enacted by the Congress, together with an explanation of the proposed amendment to limit year-to-year changes in the price-support levels.

There being no objection, the letter, the proposed amendment, and explanation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 11, 1954.

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The law is that Secretary Benson can lower support-price levels on milk and dairy products.

The law is that he cannot lower support prices on feed grains.

Dairy farmers must buy grains to feed cows to make milk.

The law should be that the Secretary cannot lower supports on milk and dairy products further or faster than he lowers supports on feed grains (basic crops).

Our National Milk Producers Federation has prepared an amendment to make the law what it should be. (Copy enclosed.)

We, representing thousands of dairy farmers in New York, Pennsylvania, Vermont, New Jersey, and Massachusetts, ask that you support this amendment.

Cordially yours,

A. MORELLE CHENEY,
Secretary.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

(To be added at the end of subsec. 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949)

The price-support level for milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat for any year shall not be reduced by more than 5 percent of the actual price intended to be reflected to farmers for the preceding marketing year, except that such limitation does not apply to reduction due exclusively to adjustments in the parity index.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the parity percentage level at which price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat are provided shall not be less than the parity percentage level at which rigid mandatory price supports are provided for the basic commodities.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO LIMIT YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGES IN DAIRY PRICE-SUPPORT LEVELS

Contrary to the objectives of the Agricultural Act of 1949, milk producers in 1953 did not realize the support levels announced by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary announced price supports that were intended to reflect 90 percent of parity to the producers of manufacturing milk. Actually only 84 percent of parity was received, causing a loss of over $100 million to the producers of manufacturing milk alone, and around $200 million to the producers of all milk. The total drop in price for all milk sold from farms from 1952 to 1953 was 13.5 percent. The total reduction in income was $400 million, even though the volume of sales in 1953 was 5.4 percent above that in 1952. This severe drop in income has been a severe shock to dairy farmers and has put a severe strain on their ability to meet mortgage obligations.

Furthermore, the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority under the 1949 act to reduce announced supports from 90 percent of parity to as little as 75 percent of parity. When it is realized that for each 1 percent that supports or prices are lowered that dairy-farm income may be lowered by $40 million the prospective results become staggering. From 1952 to 1953 average prices received by farmers, for each 100 pounds of milk equivalent sold, dropped from $4.71 to $4.06. If the Secretary elects to lower supports the full limit of his authority, then the support level would be dropped the equivalent of another 62 cents per hundredweight. In that case dairy farmers might realize only $3.56 for all milk sold during the 1954–55 marketing year. Then, if 103 billion pounds are marketed, income would be lowered from $4.6 billion in 1952 for 97.7 billion pounds of milk to $3.56 billion. Thus, we would have the devastating paradox of 5 percent larger supplies bringing one-fourth less money.

Such a development would hardly be in line with point 6 of the President's message on agriculture of January 11, 1954, in which he stated:

"In keeping with the policy of gradual transition, the Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority under the Agricultural Act of 1949 to insure that year-to-year variation in price-support levels will be limited."

Neither would such a development be in line with the 1949 act and recommendations for legislation by the President which insure that changes in price supports for basic commodities and certain nonbasic commodities shall be limited to definite steps and rules.

For these reasons the National Milk Producers Federation believes the 1949 act should be amended to provide for limitations on year-to-year changes in price-support levels for dairy products. For this purpose the attached amendment is proposed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. Struve Hensel, New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Frank C. Nash, resigned;

Col. Roy M. Gulick, United States Marine Corps, for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general subject to qualification therefor;

Gen. Otto Paul Weyland 63A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander, Tactical Air Command, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force;

Lt. Gen. Earle Everard Partridge 33A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander, Far East Air Forces, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force;

Lt. Gen. Orval Ray Cook 36A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be deputy commander in chief, United States European Command, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force;

Lt. Gen. Edwin William Rawlings 95A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander, Air Materiel Command, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force;

Lt. Gen. Bryant LeMaire Boatner 362A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, and to be lieutenant general in the United States Air Force; and

Maj. Gen. Truman Hempel Landon 93A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be the Inspector General, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, and to be lieutenant general in the United States Air Force.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—NOMINATION OF ALBERT CUMMINS BEESON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert Cummins Beeson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the nomination now before the Senate is that of Mr. Albert Cummins Beeson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term expiring December 31, 1954, a period of something less than a year.

The nomination of Mr. Beeson was submitted to the Senate by President Eisenhower on January 7, 1954, and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare scheduled a hearing on this nomination for January 20, 1954.

Since I prepared the notes for my remarks on this subject I received, this morning, supplemental minority views, to which I will not refer until I have made my main argument. At the end of my main argument I shall try to answer some of the points made in the supplemental minority views, which I understand have been circulated to all Senators.

I shall be glad to answer any questions when I have completed my statement, but I request, in order to have a continuity in my presentation, that I be allowed to continue without interruption until I have finished my statement of the case, acting as chairman of the committee.

On Wednesday morning, January 20, the committee convened at 10 o'clock to consider three nominations: that of Edward Steidle to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review; Albert C. Beeson, whose name is before us, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board, and Robert O. Boyd, to be a member of the National Mediation Board. Mr. Steidle testified first, and after 20 minutes of routine questioning was excused. Mr. Beeson took the witness chair at 10:20 and was questioned until 10:40, at which time none of the members of the committee had any further questions. Mr. Beeson

was thereupon excused. Mr. Boyd then appeared and testified until approximately 11 o'clock, at which time he was excused, and at that time the committee went into its customary executive session to consider the nomination and, if prepared to vote on it, to vote.

After very little discussion it was evident that the nominations of Mr. Boyd and Mr. Steidle would be approved by a voice vote. The members of the committee discussed the nomination of Mr. Beeson for some time, during which discussion a request was made by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], to defer voting upon his nomination until, as I recall, the Senator had had an opportunity to look further into his background, particularly into the lectures which Mr. Beeson had given at various educational institutions on the subject of management and labor problems. The Chair acceded to the request of the Senator from New York and set a meeting for 10:30 a. m. on Friday, January 22, which it was thought would be the time when the committee could vote on the Beeson nomination. The committee then unanimously decided also to defer reporting Mr. Steidle and Mr. Boyd until the further questioning of Mr. Beeson had been completed.

It is my distinct recollection that the first indication that any members of the committee would be reluctant to vote upon Mr. Beeson's nomination the same morning on which he first appeared, was given during the executive session, and even then there was no mention of calling Mr. Beeson for further testimony. However, some time on the following day, Thursday, January 21, the clerk of the committee was asked by the minority to have Mr. Beeson appear at the Friday morning hearing for a few further questions. As yet I had no intimation that this would be anything other than brief and routine, so that I had no thought of changing the designation of the meeting from the scheduled executive to open session, since presumably we would quickly proceed to vote upon Mr. Beeson's nomination.

It should be noted also that the meeting was set, not for 10 o'clock, the usual time, but for 10:30, because we thought it would give us adequate time to discuss the nomination and take a vote on it if we met at 10:30, instead of 10 o'clock.

When the committee assembled Friday morning with Mr. Beeson present, the question was raised by the Senator from New York as to whether the meeting should not be opened to the public. I regret that any difference between the members of the committee developed with regard to this question, and I accept full responsibility for the misunderstanding. I thought the committee was in executive session for the purpose of considering the nomination. However, Mr. Beeson was there, and the Senator from New York was justified in requesting an open session. I regret now that we did not have an open session, and I admit my share of the responsibility for not having one. However, it is pertinent to note, and the record will clearly show, that there was never at any point any suggestion that Mr. Beeson's testimony in the executive session would not immediately be made public. Our expectation that this testimony would be brief is indicated by the fact that the meeting was not scheduled to start until 10:30.

Mr. Beeson testified at length that morning, indeed, at such length that the hour of 12 approached before the minority members had finished their questioning. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] moved that the committee recall Mr. Beeson for questioning on the following Tuesday, January 26. Up until that point no one had requested to appear before the committee concerning Mr. Beeson's nomination, and no objections to it had been filed with the committee. In view of this fact and in view of the 2 hours of questioning which Mr. Beeson had already undergone, the Douglas motion was put to the vote of the committee.

I was, again, trying to expedite the action of the committee, especially as the White House was anxious to have the vacancy filled.

However, before voting the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] announced that he had received a telephone message from Walter P. Reuther, president of the CIO, protesting the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Beeson. I may say that Mr. Reuther did not request an appearance before the committee, but simply filed his telephonic objection, and followed it up with a telegram.

The motion of the Senator from Illinois was defeated by a vote of 7 to 6.

Nonetheless, in a desire to accommodate the minority, I inquired as to whether it would be agreeable to meet the following morning, Saturday, to finish up with Mr. Beeson. Several of the minority indicated that they would be out of town, so I called the meeting to further interrogate Mr. Beeson for 30 minutes after the recess of the Senate that afternoon, Friday, January 22.

The committee reconvened at 5:30 with 5 members of the majority and Mr. Beeson being present. This was a sufficient number to meet, but under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 an insufficient number to take action, so, after ascertaining that none of the committee members present had further questions of Mr. Beeson, the meeting was recessed until Tuesday morning, January 26, at 9 o'clock. The unusual hour of 9 was necessitated by the fact that for the entire week of January 25, as well as the following week, we had scheduled hearings on the President's recommendations for amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, which hearings were to commence each morning at 10 a. m.

We were very much embarrassed by this pressure on us in the matter of the nomination and the holding of the Taft-Hartley hearings at that time.

Over the weekend of January 24, both Mr. Woodruff Randolph, president of the International Typographical Union, and Mr. James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, CIO, requested to appear in protest of Mr. Beeson's nomination. These gentlemen were invited for the meeting on January 26. Mr. Carey did appear at that meeting and testified at great length. However, unfortunately, Mr. Randolph did not receive his invitation in time for him to get back to Washington, but he was represented at the hearing by his counsel, Mr. Gerhard Van Arkel, and was invited to file a statement. As the hour of 10 o'clock approached, at which time Secretary Mitchell was to finish his testimony on the President's Taft-Hartley recommendations, the committee went into executive session and voted to report Mr. Beeson's nomination to the Senate by a vote of 7 to 6.

That was supposed to clear the matter at that point, but some developments came up which I should like to explain in a little more detail.

Later that week a press release was issued by the minority raising the question of discrepancy between certain parts of Mr. Beeson's prior testimony and assertions of the newspaper in Mr. Beeson's home town, the San Jose Mercury. At Mr. Beeson's request I called, with the consent of the Senate, a special meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for 2:30 p. m. on Tuesday, February 2, 1954.

Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). The Senate will please be in order.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think some Members of the Senate would like to hear my statement.

This meeting was exhaustive and lasted without interruption until 8:30 p. m. Both Mr. Randolph and Mr. Feller, assistant general counsel of the CIO, appeared in protest of the nomination at this session. Before that meeting recessed, the minority requested that they be given an opportunity to question an official of the company formerly employing Mr. Beeson, the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., concerning certain details of the company's pension plan and Mr. Beeson's participation therein. As chairman, I supported this request of the minority and pursuant to my call the committee met at 10 a. m. on Friday, February 5, to hear Mr. Paul L. Davies, the president of that company. He came from some point in the Middle West, because he thought it would be helpful to explain his relations with the company and with Mr. Beeson.

This meeting lasted for more than 2 hours, and at the conclusion thereof there were no further matters with relation to Mr. Beeson's nomination which any of the members of the committee wished to pursue. Every witness was given a full opportunity to testify, and every member of the committee was given a full opportunity to question the witnesses.

Mr. President, I have gone at some length into the details of our hearings upon Mr. Beeson's nomination, because the charge has been made that I railroaded this nomination. I am sorry that, as often happens in these matters, there should be charges and countercharges, and I regret the small part I had in it.

As I stated before, I accept full responsibility for the actions of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with regard to Mr. Beeson's nomination,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and I regret any misunderstandings which may have arisen.

I think the misunderstandings have been cleared up. There has been no railroading and no pushing at all.

However, on this point it seemed to me, after the first day of hearings, that there was a move to delay action upon one of the President's important nominations indefinitely. It was difficult for me to believe otherwise in view of the fact that at that time no protests of the nomination had been filed with the committee, and no members of the committee had revealed any personal opposition to Mr. Beeson, or even any reason to suggest such opposition, except possibly the implication that Mr. Beeson was biased and antilabor. On that point I felt compelled to resist the implication that President Eisenhower would attempt to pack the National Labor Relations Board.

It was argued in the committee that by placing Mr. Beeson on the Board, the Board would be packed with three Eisenhower representatives, with the implication that the Board would be antilabor. I could not help but protest against even the suggestion that President Eisenhower would even consider such a thing. I still protest any suggestion of that kind.

Passing on to what we discussed in the committee, the issue first presented was solely whether a man with Mr. Beeson's background can perform a quasijudicial function without any bias reflecting such background.

Every man reflects the sum total of his background, his home environment, the influence of his family and friends, his education, his work, even his heredity. But these do not constitute the whole man. All human beings possess to some degree reason, conscience, and a sense of justice and morality. And it is precisely these attributes which enable men to arrive at judgments which often do not reflect their own background and are frequently contrary to their own personal interests.

I think we have all experienced occasions in our lives—I know I have—where conscience says, "No"; and we go the way conscience leads us. I believe every human being is motivated by a desire to attain the finer purposes. I want to give credit to anyone who may be appointed to a board such as the National Labor Relations Board with having that same detachment from his environment, his home influences, and his business influences, when he has responsibility imposed upon him.

Unless we are to accept the assumption which underlies most Marxist, even socialist, thinking, that men are always motivated by self-interest and unfailingly reflect the opinions and attitudes of the class or group to which they belong, we must, in seeking knowledge of a man's character and views, first look for evidence independent of his background. What has he done in the concrete situations in which he has been involved? How fair, honest, and objective has he been in reaching decisions where opposing interests were at issue? How has he resolved the crucial public problems which have confronted him? How has he expressed himself publicly on relevant public questions?

Only after the answers to these questions are known is it permissible to pass final judgment. It would seem to me that unless his actual conduct in these respects reveals a consistent inability to free himself from the bonds of self-interest or the influence of his background, it is hardly just to conclude that a person is incapable of impartial judgment.

This is the approach, I submit, which should be applied to Mr. Beeson. As I read the testimony, in all the charges which have been made against him, in all the protests to his appointment which have been received by our committee, not one bit of concrete evidence has been adduced indicating that Mr. Beeson is incapable of the objectivity and freedom from bias essential in a member of the National Labor Relations Board. To the contrary, such testimony as the record contains which bears on Mr. Beeson's actual conduct and specifically expressed views, indicates his lack of any animus against labor, and his freedom from bias in the controversial field of labor-managment relations.

Let us consider Mr. Beeson's actual record. If we consider the record to determine the question whether Mr. Beeson is qualified for the position, the record shows that in 1928 Mr. Beeson received a bachelor of arts degree from Stanford University.

In 1931 he received a master of business administration degree from New York University.

In the 10 years from 1930 to 1940 Mr. Beeson was a lecturer in economics at the New York Stock Exchange Institute.

In 1946, he was a lecturer in corporate finance and investments at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, in my own State of New Jersey.

In 1953 Mr. Beeson was a lecturer in labor relations at the University of Santa Clara, Calif.

In the summer of 1953 he was a lecturer in industrial management at the graduate school of business, Stanford University, Calif.

While Mr. Beeson's life experience has been partly in business, as I shall bring out a little later, he was also engaged to a large extent in academic participations.

Let us now consider Mr. Beeson's work experience.

From 1935 to 1940 he was sales manager for Francis I. du Pont Co., of New York, N. Y.

In 1941 he was an economist in the business research department of United States Rubber Co., New York, N. Y.

From 1942 to 1947, Mr. Beeson was director of industrial relations at the National Union Radio Corp., of Newark, N. J.

From 1947 to 1954 he was director of industrial relations at the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., San Jose, Calif., the position he has just left in order to accept this nomination.

This is the bare recital of Mr. Beeson's background, a background which, it is contended, unfits him to perform, in a fair and impartial manner, the quasi-judicial duties of a member of the National Labor Relations Board. What does the record disclose?

In the course of the hearings, Mr. Beeson declared:

> But I believe anyone in management today with any enlightened viewpoint is as much interested in labor's position as they are in management's position.

That is taken from page 3 of the hearings.

> The job as I see it, of the Board, is to administer the laws that are written as honestly as we can interpret those laws in Congress' meaning.

That statement is found on page 4 of the hearings.

After he had said he believed in the principles of the Taft-Hartley Act, he made this statement with regard to the interpretation of that act, as appears on page 5 of the hearings:

> Now, I think that my job has been as much taking care of the interests of the employees in our plants as it has been in perhaps arguing with them, with their representatives from time to time. I am particularly concerned with the position of the individual employee.
>
> • • • • •
>
> I have only argued one case before the Board. In that case the record shows that the union, very unusually, asked to absorb all of the blame and the cost if we were found jointly guilty of an unfair labor practice. We were found not to be.

That was a case, he explained to the committee, in which both labor and management were working together to solve a jurisdictional problem.

The next statement appears at page 11 of the hearings:

> If the unions knew how many times I had to go before the executive committee (of the company) and argue their case, I think they would be surprised.

The following statement is to be found at page 12 of the hearings:

> I was very pleased at the last lecture at Santa Clara to have a former union official who took the course come up to me and say that he was very much surprised to find that a person with my background had been able to be as objective and fair as I had. He felt that that was something that he had learned out of the course. I was very happy and proud of that, much more than other kinds of comments.

Mr. Paul L. Davies, president of the company which employed Mr. Beeson, testified as follows, at page 177 of the hearings:

> Mr. Beeson has many times argued in our management meetings that the best deal with labor was not necessarily the most expensive. He has been a strong protagonist for the necessity at all times in being competitive in area rates; he has been a strong protagonist of many issues that have come up in our management meetings when he felt that we were being too conservative. I can remember many times where it was necessary for me to make the final decision that I am sure he was not convinced, but obviously being a member of the team he went along.

The following testimony by Mr. Davies appears at page 186 of the hearings:

> Yes; that is one of the things that impressed me about Mr. Beeson before I hired him, the fact that he had been participating in some of these (labor-management) conferences, that he had been teaching. I had

recommendations from the university where he had been teaching. I do not know where it was. He was a broadminded individual who looked at all sides of the question, which I think is important for a company's industrial relations director.

* * * * *

I would say Mr. Beeson has been very sympathetic with the cause of labor unions.

In commenting on a course in economice for company employees, initiated by Mr. Beeson and financed by the company, Mr. Davies stated at page 187 of the hearings:

The labor leaders in San José were very enthusiastic about the course, the representatives of the unions with which we deal.

In referring to the four serious strikes which occurred during Mr. Beeson's 7 years with the company, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] made the statement:

Because of his (Beeson's) attitude in labor matters, which has precipitated four serious strikes.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] had raised the point as to why these strikes should have occurred if Mr. Beeson had such good relations with labor.

Mr. Davies, commenting on that, said, at page 147 of the hearings:

I think the responsibility for strikes definitely rests on management. We do not always take Mr. Beeson's recommendations in regard to what should be done in connection with negotiations. As you know, that poses economic problems and other things that are beyond the province of an industrial relations director to decide. So I think it is unfair to say "because of Mr. Beeson's attitude, which has precipitated four serious strikes."

To which the Senator from New York very generously responded, on page 197:

Mr. Davies, I certainly will accept your statement and ask that no weight be given to that part of my last statement.

These quotations from the record are the only ones that shed any precise illumination on Mr. Beeson's general philosophy of labor-management relations, his attitude toward labor unions, and the limits of his responsibility in handling the industrial relations of his employer. They reveal, if anything, a decidedly unbiased, indeed, a sympathetic, point of view toward those who sat on the opposite of the bargaining table.

Mr. Beeson, it is true, was drawn into some discussion of the specific contest between Mr. Denham, former General Counsel of the NLRB, and the International Typographical Union. Mr. Randolph, president of the ITU, commented extensively on Mr. Beeson's testimony on this point. I shall discuss this matter later in my remarks, but I do not believe that the evidence on this side issue impairs my conclusion concerning Mr. Beeson's general philosophy in the field of labor-management relations.

The case for the opposition on this point rests on the reiterated contention that a man with Mr. Beeson's management background is, solely by virtue of such background, incapable of objectivity and fairness.

Two other issues have been raised with respect to Mr. Beeson's appointment. In order to make the record complete, I shall refer to them. The first issue is as to Mr. Beeson's relationship with Mr. Guy Farmer, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board. Mr. Farmer was the first appointee of President Eisenhower to that Board, and he is now Chairman of the Board.

The second issue relates to the possible conflict of interest arising from Mr. Beeson's retention of an interest in his company's pension plan.

Implications with sinister overtones have been raised because Mr. Farmer, the Chairman of the Board, is a friend of Mr. Beeson and recommended him for membership on the National Labor Relations Board. What are the facts? Mr. Farmer, prior to his appointment to the Board, was a member of the law firm of Steptoe & Johnson. The Johnson of that firm is our old friend, Louis Johnson, former Secretary of Defense. This firm, among others, represented Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. in some aspects of its varied activities. Mr. Farmer, as the labor expert of his firm, represented the corporation in several of its labor problems including some involving proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board. Naturally, Mr. Farmer and Mr. Beeson got to know each other, and as it happened, to like and respect each other. When the new administration looked about for a capable successor to fill the existing Labor Board vacancy, Mr. Mitchell, the Secretary of Labor, suggested Mr. Beeson; Mr. Farmer recommended him among others.

I confirmed that information by speaking directly to Mr. Mitchell, because, from something that had been said in the testimony, the inference might have been drawn that Mr. Farmer had suggested Mr. Beeson. However, it was Secretary Mitchell who definitely had asked for Mr. Beeson's appointment.

Such a recommendation was neither novel nor unnatural. Mr. Gerard Reilly, a former member of the Board appointed by the late President Roosevelt, recommended former Board members Herzog and Houston. There is no evidence that this was ever regarded as irregular by anyone including those who now seek to find sinister implications in such a recommendation.

The opponents of Mr. Beeson's confirmation have also made much of the existence of a conflict of interest alleged to have arisen from what appeared to be Mr. Beeson's retention of certain rights under the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.'s pension plan. The facts are simple, and were clearly explained by Mr. Davies, the corporation's president, in his appearance before the committee.

Both employer and employee contribute to the pension plan. If an employee resigns before he has served 10 years and has reached the age of 50, he receives back only his own contributions; the employer's contributions go into the general pension fund and accrue to the benefit of all the other employees. During World War II and thereafter, the Federal Government, desperately in need of skilled and competent personnel, sought to attract capable men from industry, as well as from other spheres of activity. Taking a Government post entailed substantial sacrifices for many such individuals. The Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. thereupon adopted a policy of granting such men what the company's records describe as a "leave of absence." Those happen to be important words in this debate, because of some of the misconceptions and misunderstandings in the record. The effect of such a leave was to protect these men, in the event they subsequently returned to the corporation's employment, against the loss of the company's contributions to their pension funds. The corporation made no payments thereto during their absence.

This was the arrangement originally made for Mr. Beeson. He had no other ties with the corporation, and in all respects was a free agent. He had no duty to return to the corporation, and it had no obligation to reemploy him other than a self-imposed moral obligation to give him preference if there were a suitable position available in the event he decided to return. There was no agreement, no arrangement, and no understanding between Mr. Beeson and the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. for any future resumption of the employer-employee relationship between them. Mr. Davies, the corporation's president, made this abundantly clear in his testimony before the committee.

But in order that there be not an iota of doubt as to the completeness of the severance, Mr. Beeson, during the committee hearing on February 5th, 1954, offered to submit a formal resignation and surrender all his rights in the corporation's pension plan. By letter, dated February 5, 1954, Mr. Beeson formally resigned from the corporation, effective upon his taking his oath of office for the NLRB, thereby terminating as of that date any chance that the corporate contribution of about $4,400 would be retained in his name. That was the amount of money held in abeyance, and he would have to work an additional 4 or 5 years in order to get that money back. With the surrender of his pension rights, Mr. Beeson has removed even the remotest grounds for criticism on the basis of conflict of interest.

Mr. President, I have shown that a man's background alone cannot properly be used in determining his attitudes, his fairness, and his impartiality. Everyone has a background—it is an inescapable fact of man's existence.

Given this inescapable attribute of man, I have shown that a man's fairness and objectivity, or lack of it, can be determined only by reference to his specific conduct and utterances in dealing with concrete problems. But there is another requirement, an essential one, which every appointee to a position of public trust, particularly a position quasi-judicial in character, must meet. He must genuinely be determined to carry out the statute which he has been selected to administer, in accordance with the intent of the legislature which enacted it. It would be most desirable that he personally believe in the soundness of the policy or the philosophy which

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the statute expresses. But whether he so believes or not, he must be prepared to subordinate his own predilections or personal criticisms to carry out the law's intent. He is asked to interpret the law.

Mr. Beeson fully meets this requirement. He has stated, repeatedly, that he regards the Taft-Hartley Act, a part of which he will be called upon to administer, as a sound law. He believes in its policy, its philosophy, and its objectives. He has stated, as is only natural, that the act is not perfect and, like all legislation, can be improved.

Mr. President, we must always remember that the President of the United States has the duty to appoint individuals not only to the National Labor Relations Board but to far more important tribunals, such as the Supreme Court of the United States. Dare we indulge the assumption that the President of our country will select for such important posts men who are prejudiced or biased? Do we wish to tie the hands of our Chief Executive by telling him that he may not choose his appointees from certain segments, groups, or classes of our population? Along such lines I can see only the destruction of our traditional democracy.

In this connection, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the opposition which developed to the original nomination of the late Charles Evans Hughes to the Supreme Court because of an alleged previous connection with big business. I can do no better than read from a column by David Lawrence, published on February 2, 1954, commenting on the controversy surrounding the appointment of Mr. Hughes:

> The National Labor Relations Board is a "quasi-judicial" commission. In selecting members for it, as is the case with judges on a court, it is a serious thing to say that a man cannot be impartial after he takes the oath to perform judicial duties.
>
> Yet one of the most noted of all "liberals," the late Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, an independent, made a bitter fight against the confirmation of Charles Evans Hughes to be Chief Justice because of a charge that Mr. Hughes had accepted fees as a corporation lawyer. Mr. Norris lived to retract his charge and to commend the career of Mr. Hughes.
>
> The same kind of attack was made on Judge John J. Parker, of the United States Court of Appeals, who was nominated by President Hoover to the Supreme Court of the United States. Mr. Parker's confirmation was beaten by the shameful tactics of labor-union lobbyists, who charged that he once had sided against labor in an important case before the Federal courts. Today he is acclaimed far and wide—even by labor unions—as a truly liberal judge. But he never got the appointment as Supreme Court Justice that he deserved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD, at the end of my remarks, the full article by Mr. David Lawrence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, another case is that of Mr. James J. Reynolds, Jr., a distinguished member of the Board for a number of years, who was universally respected for his integrity and fairness, and who possessed a management background very similar to Mr. Beeson's. He had worked in Wall Street and eventually became the owner of a seat on the New York Stock Exchange. Subsequently he became assistant to the president of the United States Pipe & Foundry Co., in which capacity he had some dealings with the company's labor relations. Immediately upon his resignation from the Labor Board he returned to the United States Pipe & Foundry Co. as vice president with responsibility for labor matters in 5 of the company's plants, involving 5,000 employees. I have heard of no objections to Mr. Reynolds at any time on the ground that his management background rendered him incapable of impartial judgment. To my own knowledge and from my observation of Mr. Reynolds, I wish to pay him a tribute as being one of the fairest and most impartial men who has sat on a body such as the NLRB.

Similarly, former Board member John M. Houston brought to the Board long years of experience as a businessman, having indeed served at one period as director and president of the Newton, Kans., Chamber of Commerce, and for several years as director of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce. The only criticism ever made of Mr. Houston during his 10 years as a Board member was that he was, if anything, too sympathetic to organized labor.

On the other side of the picture we have former Board member Paul Styles, who was Mr. Beeson's predecessor. Mr. Styles had been a member and a functionary of the International Typographical Union, a labor organization which has been among those most bitterly critical of the Taft-Hartley Act, the law which Mr. Styles was called upon to administer. He had held other important labor-union posts. I cannot recall that those who now object to Mr. Beeson's appointment because of his background ever raised similar objections to the appointment of Mr. Styles.

As I have pointed out, it would be exceedingly difficult to find anyone for service on a quasi-judicial board who was entirely free from a background which might allegedly prejudice him in reaching his decisions. To adopt such a standard is to deprive our country of the services of competent men who are willing to serve it in these troubled times.

Mr. President, the next matter to which I should like to turn my attention is the difficult question of what suddenly stirred up a great deal of opposition to this nomination, after we had not heard from any opposition at the first hearing. This is a circumstance surrounding the Beeson nomination which has a rather curious aspect. Why were there no objections to his appointment until after the first hearing, during which Mr. Beeson had testified and been questioned? I rather think that it was not until Mr. Beeson, during that first hearing, had stated his belief in the soundness of the Taft-Hartley Act, that those who now oppose him decided on such opposition. I submit, Mr. President, that the fundamental objection to Mr. Beeson springs from his support of the very law which it must be his duty to administer as Congress intended.

But before I proceed to enlarge on this contention, I should like first to review again briefly the curious chronology of these events. On January 7, 1954, President Eisenhower submitted Mr. Beeson's nomination to the Senate. The nomination was well publicized both in the press and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On January 15, 1954, public hearings on the nomination were announced, and notice thereof was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I may interject here that we cannot be so naive as to believe that organizations like the CIO, the United Mine Workers, and the A. F. of L. do not carefully examine the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each day for items of significant interest to their organizations. The first hearing was held on January 20, 1954. Up to that point, no protest against the nomination had been submitted to the committee, nor had there been any request to appear in opposition thereto. It was during this session that Mr. Beeson expressed his belief in the soundness of and the need for the Taft-Hartley Act.

On January 22, 1954, the hearings were resumed. During the early part of this session Mr. Beeson was closely questioned about a possible bias allegedly arising from his previous experience. It was not until this session was almost over that the first protest appeared. Shortly before the committee recessed, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] announced that a telephone message addressed to the committee had been received from Walter Reuther, president of the CIO, protesting against Mr. Beeson's nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The Senator from New Jersey will suspend for a moment until there is order in the Chamber.

Let the Chair state that what the Senator from New Jersey is discussing is most vital to the Senate. If there are present those who do not wish to listen, they had better leave the Chamber.

The Senator from New Jersey may now resume.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that Mr. Reuther's protest contained no specific evidence of bias on the part of Mr. Beeson, nor did it reflect adversely on his integrity or honesty. It merely asserted that—

> The testimony of Mr. Beeson on Wednesday confirms his industry background and point of view (p. 36).

However, the only thing Mr. Beeson testified to on that day was the fact that he approved of the Taft-Hartley Act. Up to that time he had not said anything else which would afford any basis for such a statement in opposition.

Mr. President, I submit that Mr. Beeson's background was well known to Walter Reuther, at the time of the former's first appearance before the committee on January 20, and in all prob-

ability from the date of Mr. Beeson's nomination by the President on January 7. So it is apparent that it could not have been Mr. Beeson's background alone which gave rise to Mr. Reuther's protest, as well as those of other labor-union leaders, which followed.

Mr. President, what did Mr. Beeson say, during his first appearance before our committee, that could have moved Walter Reuther to object to this appointment to the Labor Board? Most of that hearing was devoted to the possible effect of Mr. Beeson's background and attitudes upon his administration of the law. There was no other evidence of alleged bias or prejudice. But Mr. Beeson did, in that session, declare his belief in the soundness and desirability of the Taft-Hartley Act. I cannot but believe that the protests which ensued were the direct result of this declaration. In other words, what should be regarded as an additional qualification for membership on the Labor Board, namely, approval of the statute which the Board administers, appears to be the real basis for the opposition to Mr. Beeson's appointment. I wonder whether the objectors would have voiced any opposition if Mr. Beeson had testified that he preferred the Wagner Act to the Taft-Hartley Act?

It was my feeling originally, when these points concerning Mr. Beeson's background was first made, that an attempt was being made to prolong the hearings; and as I said before, I regret there was a misunderstanding about the procedures, for which as chairman of the committee, I must take personal responsibility. My attitude was taken in good faith, because of the feeling I had that there was an implied criticism that the President of the United States was trying to pack the NLRB against labor.

It was because of this feeling on my part that I felt we should not prolong the hearings indefinitely, and that we should not reopen the hearings. In light of the subsequent circumstances and the alleged discrepancies in the testimony, I feel now that I should have urged the reopening of the hearings, in order to clear up any doubts in anyone's mind. The fact remains that the hearings were reopened; and we heard every person who asked to be heard, and each member of the committee was given all the time he asked for to have an opportunity to question Mr. Beeson and the other witnesses.

There were two principal witnesses who opposed Mr. Beeson. One was Mr. James Carey, president of the Electrical Workers, CIO, who opposed Mr. Beeson because he, Mr. Carey, opposes the Taft-Hartley Act, and has been constantly urging its repeal. Mr. Carey does not believe in the act; and, therefore, I can understand why he would oppose any appointee to the Board, who favors the principles of the act. I feel, frankly, this is an unsound position for Mr. Carey to take, because the Taft-Hartley Act is the law of the land today. Mr. President, I wish to say that Mr. Carey has a perfect right to take that position, for it is his consistent position, and I respect him for it. As we said at the time, we felt that Mr. Carey is the type of man who might be a member of the Board; and if he wished to serve on such a board, I would be perfectly willing to trust in his integrity.

Another witness who testified against Mr. Beeson was Mr. Randolph, head of the Typographical Union, who has opposed the Taft-Hartley Act since it was first passed, and has led a movement to test its legality in the courts. Mr. Randolph particularly opposed the handling of the General Counsel's office by the former General Counsel, Mr. Denham; and he was disturbed because although Mr. Beeson said he knew Mr. Denham only slightly, nevertheless, in general Mr. Beeson expressed approval of the way Mr. Denham had handled the office. It is understandable why Mr. Randolph should have felt strongly on this matter and should have opposed the nomination. I felt fully convinced that Mr. Randolph, when he appeared before us, was entirely sincere in his position to the nomination.

A third important opponent of Mr. Beeson was Mr. John L. Lewis. He did not ask to appear before the committee, but sent a strong telegram in opposition. Of course we all know that Mr. Lewis does not believe in any legislation of any kind on the subject of management-labor relations, and is especially opposed to the Taft-Hartley Act. He has asked me many times, when I have met with him, if we could arrange to repeal all laws relative to labor-management relations, and simply leave those matters to labor and management themselves. That position on his part is well known. So here again vigorous opposition would be expected to any appointee to act on a board which would sit in judgment on the meaning of the act.

Since the hearings closed and since Mr. Beeson's name was reported to the Senate, we have had a heavy barrage of telegrams opposing Mr. Beeson's nomination, apparently stimulated by the CIO.

There was no evidence offered of any employer pressure for Beeson's appointment, or anything other than an attempt to find someone qualified and available for this important job. It was brought out clearly in the testimony, as I stated before, that the nomination was first proposed to the President by Secretary of Labor Mitchell. There was no evidence that we could find in the record that Mr. Beeson is in any way antilabor in his attitude; and it seemed to me that his own candid testimony and that of Mr. Davies, his employer, demonstrated that even though he was employed by a company to deal with labor matters, his responsibility was to weigh both sides, and in many instances he advised his company to accept labor's position. Unless we rule out all industrial-relations men simply because they may be employed by our various corporations, it would seem as though Mr. Beeson had particularly good qualifications and preparation for this important job.

The whole tone of the opposition, I regret to say, seems to imply, first, there must inevitably be bias in the mind of any man who has had the kind of background Mr. Beeson has had; and, second, and more important, there is the clear implication that President Eisenhower intended to pack the Board with anti-labor members. This, of course, reflects on the two previous appointments of Mr. Farmer and Mr. Rodgers, who, when their names came up, had no opposition whatever. It has been suggested that there are many important pending cases on which the present Board is split 2 and 2, and that Mr. Beeson will have the deciding vote. I cannot answer this argument, because very properly the Board has not given out—and should not—any confidential information as to the status of the cases now before it.

In this connection, let me say that since the members appointed by President Eisenhower to the Board have been in office, 666 cases have been decided by it. I understand that approximately 14 or 15 cases are still before it. We do not know what members of the Board take what side or position regarding those cases; but we do know that the Board has not yet arrived at agreement regarding them. However, it is worthy of notice that only 14 or 15 cases are still before the Board, which, since the members appointed to the Board by President Eisenhower have been in office, has decided 666 cases.

Undoubtedly certain cases of interest to labor and management alike are now pending before the Board, but I have no way of finding out what the attitude of the Board is; and I think it would be inappropriate to ask. Similarly, none of us dares venture a guess as to how Mr. Beeson would vote on those cases, even if we knew what they involved.

Mr. President, to sum up my remarks, we are all aware that the primary function of a quasi-judicial agency such as the NLRB is to apply the law assigned to its administration in a fair and impartial manner and in accord with congressional intent. The members of such an agency are better equipped to perform this function if, in addition to fairness, they are expert in the field covered by the law and have an intimate knowledge of that field. In that respect Mr. Beeson is eminently qualified. For many years he had dealt daily with the innumerable problems that arise in the relations between labor and management. This experience will be of inestimable value to the Board as a whole.

Speaking for myself—and I am very sure I can speak for every other member of my committee—no one of us would want to see a biased board or a packed board. No one of us would want to see an antilabor board or an antimanagement board. We are all eager to have a board which will so administer the Taft-Hartley Act that management-labor relations will be improved. I would not vote for the confirmation of Mr. Beeson's nomination if I thought for a minute that he was chosen to pack the Board. I know perfectly well, from my many talks with the President of the United States on this subject, that he never would think of such a thing. He very properly has taken the position that he is trying to place the Board on a fair basis, as between both parties, in the difficult problems which are involved, and to see to it that the best qualified men are

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

available to take these quasi-judicial positions.

As I have pointed out, the real opposition to Mr. Beeson from the country at large emanates only from those professionals who are violently opposed to the Taft-Hartley Act itself and who are fundamentally opposed to President Eisenhower's overall approach to the way that management-labor relations should be handled.

The President has indicated his approach by his recommendations. We are studying those recommendations now. We are thinking in terms of the Taft-Hartley Act as the President has recommended that it be amended, so as to make it a better law.

As a consequence of this opposition, any man who believes in the principles of the Taft-Hartley Act or the President's approach to these problems will be opposed as a nominee to the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. President, I submit that in Mr. Albert C. Beeson the President has made an excellent choice for membership on the NLRB. Nothing in the record leads me to doubt his candor, honesty, or integrity. I shall speak later on some of the questions raised in the minority views. But the six minority members of our committee agreed with this in their report of February 1, 1954, on Mr. Beeson's nomination, although in the last report, a copy of which I received only this morning, they reversed their position.

Not a single challenge was made to his ability or his expertness in the field of labor-management relations and in the face of his experience none could properly be made. Not one item of specific proof was adduced reflecting adversely on his objectivity or impartiality. Mr. President, I recommend that the Senate confirm the nomination of Mr. Beeson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

At this point I wish to add some brief observations on the supplementary minority views, a copy of which, as I have stated, I received only this morning. Therefore, I have not had an opportunity to answer in detail by full reference to the RECORD.

I read from the supplementary minority views, which are very important:

> Mr. Beeson's testimony adduced after the writing of the original minority views impels us to annul the first sentence on page 7 of such views, which is as follows:
>
> "The members of the minority wish to emphasize that we do not question Mr. Beeson's candor, honesty, or integrity."

Therefore, the change of position of the minority on this point must have arisen since the date of the first report.

Reading further from the supplemental minority views:

> 1. Mr. Beeson falsely told the committee that he had resigned from the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.
>
> 2. Mr. Beeson falsely told the committee that he had given up his pension rights.
>
> 3. Mr. Beeson falsely told the committee that he had not made statements appearing in the San Jose Mercury.

The general conclusion was that because of these allegedly false statements, Mr. Beeson's nomination should be rejected.

Let us take up the first point. I wish to state the impression of the chairman of the committee, who sat through every hearing, and had the privilege of interviewing Mr. Beeson many times, to be sure that I was right in my conclusion with regard to his testimony. The first point is:

> Mr. Beeson falsely told the committee that he had resigned from the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.

He was asked whether he had resigned in writing, and he said he had not. He did say that he had resigned to the directors orally, and in amplification of that statement Mr. Davies stated later:

> We do not take a resignation in that form from a man who is going into the public service. A number of employees or members of our company have gone to Washington for a period of time to serve their country, and we give them a leave of absence.

Mr. Beeson said he had not had a leave of absence, but that he had resigned. That gives rise to the claim that there is a discrepancy in the testimony. Mr. Beeson actually had a leave of absence, not a result of his own initiative, but because the president of the company said that he placed this man in the same status as any other employee of the company who enters the public service. Mr. Beeson intended to come to Washington for only a year. Under the rules of the company, a leave of absence gave him priority of reemployment if he returned to the company after his period of public service and did not remain longer in Washington. But every relationship was severed. There was no obligation on the part of the company to take him back, and there was no obligation on the part of Mr. Beeson to go back to the company.

He himself stated that he did not know whether he would go back to the company or go somewhere else, but he did not rule out the possibility of going back. The testimony shows that. I do not understand why the statement is made that Mr. Beeson falsely told the committee that he had resigned under those conditions. It is difficult for me to justify such a statement. He was not trying to mislead the committee. At no time did Mr. Beeson try, by some subtle use of language, to mislead anyone. He was telling us that he had resigned and severed his relations with the company. Mr. Davies was the one who raised the point about what a leave of absence meant with the company.

On the first point, as to whether he used the word "resigning," or whether he said, "I am severing connections with the company," in any event he told the officials of the company that he was coming to Washington to accept this position for a year. So I do not feel impressed by the conclusion which has been drawn from the testimony on that point.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point? I do not wish to break the continuity of the Senator's argument, if he prefers to continue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I prefer to continue, and then I shall be glad to submit myself to questions from my colleagues.

There are various references to the question of resignation, but I think the most important reference is Mr. Davies' statement, which appears on page 192. Referring to the question of Mr. Beeson's resignation, Mr. Davies said:

> In our company we have always construed it that when we give a leave of absence for a man going into Government service, he has no obligation to return. We have sent men down to Washington. They have not returned. They have received better offers while they were down here, and they have not returned. I think it is a purely technical question. I would not be able to state exactly myself. He has severed all connections with the company as far as receiving compensation is concerned. There are no payments to be made to his group insurance or his pension fund while he is gone. He has no commitment to return to the company. In the event he decides to return to the company, the company has an obligation not necessarily to give him the same position that he has, but it has an obligation to give him preferred consideration for a position if he comes back.

That was Mr. Davies' statement. I think every member of the committee will agree that he was very frank in trying to answer our questions as to what the relationship was.

The next point in the supplemental minority views deals with the pension rights. I wish to speak on that subject. The second charge made is as follows:

> Mr. Beeson falsely told the committee that he had given up his pension rights.

What Mr. Beeson said was that his pension was discontinued from the time he gave notice that he was going to quit. He did not say at any time that the ultimate pension, if he returned and was to be reemployed, might not include contributions for prior service in case he remained the necessary number of years. As I understand, he has served under the pension scheme for 6 years. Even if he returned to the employ of the company, he would have to remain 4 years longer before he could pick up the accumulated pension which the company had put into the pot for his benefit. If he resigns entirely, he must give up his pension. If his resignation were demanded, that would be the price he would have to pay. He would have no look-in on the pension in the future. In taking the leave of absence to which Mr. Davies, his president, refers, he would be protected in the accumulated pensions, if he did come back. So he did have that much of an interest. He did not deny it anywhere in the record. The only question is whether in speaking about the situation he used the word "resigned" or referred to a leave of absence.

I cannot agree with that statement in the supplemental minority views after having talked with Mr. Beeson and after going over the subject with him in trying to determine what it was all about. I realize that some questions were raised about the number of months involved in the leave of absence, with which he was not familiar. He said he thought it was for a 6-month period. Someone else said something else. However, there was no intention on his part to deceive. It

was all brought about by confusion. I have talked to some of my colleagues who have pension rights with their companies, and perhaps some of them will discuss that subject later.

At best, the subject is very complicated. To say that he was trying to deceive or mislead the committee does not make sense.

My father, whom I respected more than anyone else, said, "My son, it is very easy to make statements. Sometimes we make mistakes, but a lie is an intention to deceive."

I raise the question whether anything in the testimony indicated that Mr. Beeson had the intention of deceiving the committee. I say he was confused. I know that in many ways he was a very poor witness. He tried to be frank, and perhaps he talked too much. However, there is no evidence whatever that there was any intention on his part to deceive, and nothing like it can be found in the record. If I felt there were, certainly I would not vote for the confirmation of his nomination. I take the position that that just is not so. He did not intend to deceive the committee, and unless he intended to deceive the committee it is improper to use the word "falsely," as used in the supplemental minority views which state:

Mr. Beeson falsely told the committee that he had given up his pension rights.

The next charge in the supplemental minority views is that—

Mr. Beeson falsely told the committee that he had not made statements appearing in the San Jose Mercury.

That was why the committee held the special hearing. We received subsequent statements from the San Jose Mercury, and we realized that there were two statements involved, and that there was a mixup as to which was which. That was brought out in the testimony. The committee had a representative of the Mercury ownership on the stand, and he explained the way the mixup arose. All the discrepancies were explained before the committee.

Mr. Wesley Peyton, who was the reporter, came before our committee. It was perfectly clear from what he said, when the question was put to him, that he was thinking about a different quotation than the one in which Mr. Beeson was involved.

There again I admit it is confusing. It is a very difficult and complicated matter. There was one reporter in California and another one in Washington, and they got different aspects of the same thing. There was one story about Vice President NIXON supporting Mr. Beeson, and another story related to whether Mr. Beeson had said it or not. However, Mr. Beeson was not trying to deceive anyone. He was trying to keep the facts straight. We got a statement from the San Jose Mercury, which was an entirely satisfactory explanation of the situation, and it reiterated their favorable opinion of Mr. Beeson's nomination for this important job, and expressed the hope that he would be confirmed.

I have not had time to go all through the charges, but I am told that there are many Members of the Senate who feel convinced by these three charges and will therefore vote against the confirmation of Mr. Beeson's nomination. That situation makes me sick at heart. Unless one reads all the testimony and gets the feeling of the entire hearing and understands Mr. Davies' attitude, and Mr. Beeson's attitude, and the relations between them, and unless one has sat through all the hearings, it is not possible to get the full picture. Of course reasonable men can always differ, but that is my opinion.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I promised to yield first to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. NEELY. I am glad to yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. PURTELL. The Senator from New Jersey was reading from the supplemental minority views which Senators received this morning. I believe the Senator omitted mentioning one of the paragraphs under charge No. 2, appearing on page 2 of the supplemental minority views:

Mr. Beeson falsely told the committee that he had given up his pension rights.

February 2: Mr. Beeson reaffirmed his statement of January 22 and read two paragraphs from the record of that January 22 statement. Without indicating the omission, or informing the committee of his action, Mr. Beeson omitted the sentence in the middle of the paragraph wherein he stated he had lost his pension rights.

I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether he weighed that argument, or gave it any weight at all, in view of the fact that on February 2 Mr. Beeson had submitted a written statement or printed statement?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. PURTELL. Did he submit it to every member of the committee?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. To the best of my recollection he gave every member of the committee a copy of the statement.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator's recollection permit him to state without any question that a copy of the statement was given to the reporter at the hearing?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It was given to the reporter.

Mr. PURTELL. I should like to read what that statement says. I am reading from the statement which was given to every member of the committee and to the reporter. Apparently a part of the statement was omitted by the reporter, and therefore the omission is the fault of the reporter. However let me read it:

Now, Mr. Davies made it very clear, and I agreed with him, that in no way would I retain any interest in the company. I do not need to tell you that I am no Mr. Wilson. I have an odd lot of stock in our company, purchased through a stock purchase plan. It is of no consequence.

This is the part to which I call particular attention:

Of course, I have lost my pension rights in making this severance.

That sentence was omitted. It is an omission of the reporter, I understand, and the reporter had a copy of the statement in front of him, I believe.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I might say in that connection that we have received a letter from the Alderson Reporting Co. which came to me today by special messenger.

This morning, when the supplemental minority views came to our attention we immediately communicated with the Alderson Reporting Co., who reported the hearings. The omission is due to a stenographic error. The reporter failed to transcribe his notes on that point. I shall read the letter from the Alderson Reporting Co.:

ALDERSON REPORTING CO.,
Washington, D. C., February 18, 1954.
Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have carefully checked page 26 of the record of the committee's proceedings of February 2, 1954, on the Beeson nomination. At this point Mr. Beeson was reading from his prepared statement and through a typing error the one sentence reading as follows was omitted from the record:

"I have lost my pension rights in making this severance."

The record should appear as it is typed in the prepared statement which Mr. Beeson was reading. Mr. Beeson was quoting the transcript of January 22, at the top of page 26 where the sentence appears in the transcript.

Sincerely,

HAROLD B. ALDERSON.

That speaks for itself.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from New Jersey agree with me that six of our colleagues in the Senate, after hearing the nominee in a series of meetings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, formed the opinion that his veracity was subject to serious question as to its reliability?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I never thought they questioned his reliability until this morning when I received the supplemental minority views.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I am directing my question to. It is perfectly obvious, is it not, that on the basis of the supplemental minority views six of our colleagues have come to the conclusion that the veracity and integrity and reliability of this nominee, in their opinion, are subject to serious question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is what the supplemental report appears to say. However, in the original minority views, of February 1, following the hearings, the minority stated:

The members of the minority wish to emphasize that we do not question Mr. Beeson's candor, honesty, or integrity.

Mr. MORSE. I read that statement in the minority views, but from the chronology of this case, which was so ably presented by the Senator from New Jersey, it would appear that subsequent to the filing of the original minority views there were further hearings at which questions were raised with respect to this nominee.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. A further record was made on which Members of the Senate could form a final conclusion as to the nominee. Are we not faced with the unanswerable fact, therefore, that six of our colleagues say, in effect: "We do not have confidence in the veracity and integrity and reliability of this nominee." Are we not confronted with that fact?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I assume that would be a correct statement, as the Senator puts it.

Mr. MORSE. That is perfectly clear; is it not?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have no reason to question that statement.

Mr. MORSE. Of course the Senator from New Jersey, as I know very well, in no way seeks to reflect upon the motives and the intellectual honesty of the six colleagues who signed this report with respect to their conclusions.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Certainly not. They have come to their own conclusion. I think their reasoning is unsound, but they have come to their own conclusion.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New Jersey has no intention of saying to the Senate that we should substitute the words and possible intentions and motives of the nominee for the words, intentions and motives of our six colleagues in the Senate. That is true, is it not?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I did not get the Senator's complete question.

Mr. MORSE. I will repeat it. The Senator does not take the position that we should substitute the words or the intentions of the nominee for the intentions, sincerity, and good-faith conclusion of our six colleagues.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is a matter of interpreting the record. Some of us received one impression and others received a different impression. I do not question their integrity.

Mr. MORSE. But six of our colleagues say, "Here is a nominee whom we do not trust." It is not a question of this man's background, so far as I am concerned, because I shall make what I think is a constructive suggestion later on in the debate this afternoon as to a person who I think should be made available to the President for a short term on the Board. I shall recommend Mr. Martin P. Catherwood, the dean of the School of Industrial Relations of Cornell University. No one, in my judgment, could question his background.

I think the President is in a very difficult position with regard to this nomination. I feel sorry for the President. The record is so confused that it has led six of our colleagues to come to the honest conclusion that he should be rejected. They find this nominee to be so lacking in integrity and honesty they feel compelled to submit to the Senate what I consider to be one of the most devastating reports ever submitted against a nominee since I have been a Member of the Senate.

I think the President ought to have some assistance in this matter. I do not believe we are serving the President well if we try to put through this nomination this afternoon. We should send it back to the committee in the hope that by that course of action the name will be eventually withdrawn and the President will come forward with such a nomination as the dean of the School of Industrial Relations of Cornell University, to whom I have referred, to fill the position for 10 months.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. I agree with my colleague from Oregon and with my colleague from New Jersey that there is no question about the sincerity of the Senators who submitted the minority views, but I should like to invite attention to the fact that part of their decision was based upon charge No. 2, that—

Mr. Beeson falsely told the committee he had given up his pension rights.

In a letter from the reporter who took down the hearings, the reporter acknowledges that it was a mistake of the reporter and not of Mr. Beeson. I can understand how the erroneous impression could certainly cause our colleagues to report as they did, but I would say that since we now have an acknowledgment from the reporter that it was his mistake, Mr. Beeson should not be charged with it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield on that point?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think I am a good enough lawyer not to accept with full faith a letter read on the floor of the Senate from some reporter. I think the reading of the letter is all the more reason why the nomination should go back to the committee. I think the original notes of the reporter should be examined by the committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Would it not have been in the interest of fairness and square dealing for the minority to have brought the matter to the attention of the chairman of the committee, so that he would have an opportunity to get a proper certification? We simply asked the reporter, and he made as fast a reply as he could.

Mr. MORSE. That is one course of action which the minority might have followed, but I would not say they were under any obligation to do that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, they were under no obligation to do it.

Mr. MORSE. The minority was preparing a report setting forth its views, as the majority prepared a majority report setting forth its views. I think the minority had a right to rely on the transcript of the record. I should like to ask some questions about the record.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. I am not a lawyer, but I must say, as a member of the committee, that I know not only that the transcript of the testimony was taken by the reporter, which might be subject to question, but, more than that, this statement was submitted to every member of the committee before the stenographic notes were taken, and I think every member of the committee had the statement available. It is not a question of whether the reporter made a mistake. It is a fact that the statement was in the hands of all committee members. Mr. Beeson submitted it to us before he even testified.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have served on many committees where statements were handed around before a witness testified, and very frequently members of the committee did not read the statements handed them. They even left them on the desk and walked out of the committee room without having read a line of the statement. We rely on the official transcript of the record. I assume the minority relied on the official transcript of the record.

Mr. PURTELL. I do not disagree with the Senator from Oregon. I merely wonder why we should charge Mr. Beeson with dishonesty or falsity when he had nothing to do with it.

Mr. MORSE. That is a question of fact.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. If it be true, as I have no doubt it is true, that Mr. Beeson made the statement that he had lost his pension rights, that statement was incorrect and untrue in itself, because he did not lose his pension rights until he resigned and his resignation was accepted, if it has, indeed, been accepted up to this time, because we have testimony in reply to many questions that, while a leave of absence may be given only for 6 months, it could be extended for an indefinite period at the pleasure of the president or the board. Undoubtedly it would have been extended. Therefore, this nominee had not lost his pension rights when he made his statement.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The issue is on the question of the deletion of the sentence to which reference has been made.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Whether Mr. Beeson omitted the statement or the stenographer omitted it, he did state that he had lost his pension rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is a question of how he defines the loss of pension rights.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is a subsidiary issue whether Mr. Beeson left it out deliberately or whether the stenographer left it out. If the stenographer did it, then Mr. Beeson should not be accused of it. But the fact remains that he said he had lost his pension rights when he had not lost them. Does not the Senator agree that that is true?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No; it is not exactly true, as the Senator states it, because Mr. Beeson stated in his testimony that when the time came for him to leave the company, his pension rights would stop from then on. He never made any reference to his other pension rights up to that time, until Mr. Davies came in. Mr. Davies said in effect, "We

look upon this as a leave of absence, not as a resignation."

Mr. Davies was simply saying, "We are going to protect Mr. Beeson in his position, if he should come back."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. When he made those statements at the first session, on Wednesday, and the second session, on Friday, prior to the long session which extended until 9 o'clock on a day in the following week, is it not a fact that the Senator from New Jersey did not understand that the maintenance of a large percentage of Mr. Beeson's pension depended upon his returning to the company? When Mr. Beeson said he had resigned and had lost his pension rights, was not the Senator from New Jersey under the impression, as I was, not that Mr. Beeson had lost those rights merely during the period of the 6 or 7 months he might have been away from the company, but that, in leaving the company, he had lost his rights to a pension altogether?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think that argument could be made. But, as I read the testimony over again, Mr. Beeson considered that his pension rights would stop from the moment he left the company.

We all know he would have been able to take out that part of his pension rights he had paid in himself. He could have taken out the $2,700 he had put in himself. That was never questioned. Yet the argument could be made now that he lost that part of his pension rights, too.

The argument against the pension is that he would not have the policy for 4 more years, and he may never get it back. He had lost those rights, so far as the continuity of the pension program went, under that part of the pension plan.

To say that Mr. Beeson intended to deceive us does not make sense.

Mr. KENNEDY. The point is what Mr. Beeson meant by referring to his loss of pension rights in connection with his statement about breaking away from the company and completely severing his ties with it. There is no question that he had a large economic interest in returning to the company next December. If he did not return to the company, he would lose more than $4,500. There was no implication or hint in his statement when he spoke about resigning from the company and losing his pension rights that he actually was talking about losing them only for the period of time he was on the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I cannot take the position that that was all clear cut in the testimony. I admit it is very confusing, but I cannot take the position during the debate here or from the testimony in the hearings that Mr. Beeson was telling a lie or that it was his intention to deceive us. I think this is a very confused matter.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would the Senator from New Jersey say that Mr. Beeson did not understand that the matter was of importance to the committee?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No; I believe he thought it was very important to the committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. Could the Senator from New Jersey state why Mr. Beeson did not, on January 20 or 22, make any statement about the fact that if he did not return to the company it would necessitate a loss of $4,000 or $5,000?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not understand the Senator's point.

Mr. KENNEDY. My point is that Mr. Beeson would suffer the loss of his company's investment in his pension over a period of years if he did not return; yet, is it not a fact that neither on Wednesday nor on Friday did Mr. Beeson make any suggestion that he had an economic interest in returning to the company? Rather, was it not his statement that he had lost his pension rights? Does not the Senator from New Jersey feel that Mr. Beeson in this instance misled us?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not think he misled us. I think the whole thing was confused until Mr. Davies came before the committee and said Mr. Beeson had resigned. I think Mr. Davies called that to our attention, because every employee of the company who had entered the service of the Government had been told that he would not be cut off from the standpoint of his pension being lost.

Mr. KENNEDY. But when he used the word "resignation," Mr. Davies explained that if Mr. Beeson had resigned he would have lost all rights to his pension. Therefore, when Mr. Beeson used the word "resignation" in his earlier testimony he implied to us that he had lost all pension rights. He should have said that he was on leave of absence, which required, if he were to maintain his pension rights, that he return to the company.

Do you not agree that when Mr. Beeson used the word "resignation" at an earlier hearing, according to Mr. Davies' statement, it would have meant that Mr. Beeson had lost his pension rights and all rights to return to the company?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. As I understood the Senator from Massachusetts, he said that Mr. Beeson had not indicated in his testimony, on either January 20 or 22, an interest in the pension fund. I wish to read from the testimony on January 22, at page 26:

> Senator LEHMAN. Mr. Beeson, you referred to maintaining certain interests in the securities of the company as part of the stock purchase plan in which you were a participant. Would you tell us about that, what that amounts to?
>
> Mr. BEESON. Yes, sir. I indicated—and you know what an odd lot is, it is 32 shares of stock.
>
> Senator LEHMAN. What is the value of the pension rights which you are severing?
>
> Mr. BEESON. Well, I have only been with that company 7 years. I was eligible after 1 year. The company has been, at my salary range, putting in about $110 to $115 per month. I should know, that is my business, but I am not exactly sure. One hundred twenty dollars a month perhaps; it cannot be more than that. I also have been contributing to it. If at the end of 6 months I have not returned to employment with the company—and there is no possibility of that; since this does not vest until 10 years, and only partially then—all the company's contributions go back to the fund.

Mr. Beeson did tell us on January 22.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I wish to read from page 25 of the hearings, as follows:

> With Mr. Davies' permission and my wife's agreement for the sacrifices involved here, I said if it would be offered me I would take it.
>
> Now, Mr. Davies made it very clear, and I agreed with him, that in no way would I retain any interest in the company. I do not need to tell you that I am no Mr. Wilson. I have an odd lot of stock in our company, purchased through a stock-purchase plan. It is of no consequence, of course. I have lost my pension rights in making this severance.

He had not lost his pension rights, because they still continued.

Mr. PURTELL. I do not wish to quibble, but here was a contributory pension plan, to which Mr. Beeson had contributed and to which the company had contributed. It was a plan under which Mr. Beeson would have received a pension in the future for services he had rendered in the past. I cannot understand why Mr. Beeson should have lost his pension rights, because we think of pensions as something to be received in the future.

I cannot tell what Mr. Beeson thought, but I can tell what I understood clearly from the testimony. I thought what Mr. Beeson had in mind was that he would lose participation in the future pension plan, because he had been building up his fund over a period of years.

Mr. KENNEDY. He did not lose his interest in the pension plan. He would lose only the contributions during the period of time he was serving with the National Labor Relations Board. He could pick it up again.

Mr. PURTELL. Only if he returned to the company.

Mr. KENNEDY. But if he did not, it would have cost him $4,500.

Mr. PURTELL. If he did not return to the company, it would have cost the amount which the company had contributed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield the floor, if the Senator from New York desires the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I do not wish the floor; I desire to ask a question.

The distinguished Senator from New Jersey has heard what our colleague the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has said about this matter. The Senator from Connecticut read the question I had addressed to Mr. Beeson, which I think substantially was, "What is the value of the pension rights which you will lose by reason of this severance?"

Mr. PURTELL. I read from page 26 of the hearings.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct. I was depending on the statement made by Mr. Beeson, "I have lost my pension rights in making this severance."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

That is exactly what I am complaining about, and what many other Senators are complaining about. Statements were made to us which we had a right to accept at face value as being accurate and correct, but they were not accurate or correct. This statement was not accurate or correct, because Mr. Beeson had not lost his pension rights by obtaining a leave of absence. I do not know that he has lost his pension rights even now, because he has resigned. Certainly, the company has received his letter of resignation, but the letter of resignation is dependent upon the status of the confirmation of Mr. Beeson's nomination by the Senate. Therefore, he will not lose his pension rights until his resignation has been acted upon and accepted by the company.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Somewhere in the testimony there is a statement as to when Mr. Beeson severed his connection with the company and when his pension payments stopped. The question is still confused. I am trying to make the point that I do not agree with the minority when they say that Mr. Beeson "falsely" said this or that. I admit there is confusion about the treatment of the matter. There is a question about it. That is why, when the showdown came, Mr. Beeson said, "I am willing to send in my resignation, to take effect if I am confirmed."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do I understand correctly that the pension rights are as between the employee and an insurance company that is carrying the insurance or the pensions, and not as between the employee and the company? The employee has paid in his money and the company has paid in its money. Do I correctly understand that an insurance company is the agency which is responsible for the payment of the insurance or the pension?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As I understand, the Senator from Michigan is completely correct. The entire matter between Mr. Beeson and the company which employs him will be determined by the rules of the pension plan which the company has with the insurance company.

Mr. FERGUSON. Am I to understand that the kind of pension involved is one wherein, even though the employee in the future gets the pension, it would not come from the company, but his relationship would be with the insurance company?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is true; but under the rules governing the relationship between the employer and the insurance company, the employee would not have a claim on that part of the general fund which the company had contributed unless the employee went back into the employment of the company.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the question I had in mind. Today, even though an employee continued to have pension rights, his rights are with respect to the insurance company rather than the corporation of which he was formerly an employee. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Is there not involved a question of the rights of the former employee to the money which the company has paid into the pension fund?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is correct; but the company does not get it.

Mr. HILL. The question involved was whether or not Mr. Beeson had really lost the rights which we assumed he had lost when he had resigned, as he said he had done, and as Mr. Beeson led the majority to believe he had done.

The majority, in their original statement contained in Executive Report No. 3, at page 2, stated:

> Mr. Beeson resigned his position as industrial relations director with the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., of San Jose, Calif., on January 16, 1954, in order to accept the appointment made by the President.

He did no such thing. He took a leave of absence in order to retain his pension rights; in order to retain for the future, if he went back to the company, the benefit of the money which the company paid into the fund; and in order to retain a preferred consideration for reemployment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That implies that he did try to deceive the committee by false statements. I take issue with the Senator in that respect.

Mr. HILL. I am merely stating the facts. I am not expressing an opinion.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think he was confused, just as I am confused as to what "pension rights" means.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, the corporation paid in a certain amount of money. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. And the employee himself paid in a certain amount of money. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let us assume that the employee had severed his relations with the company and his pension rights had expired. Would certain money be returned to the employee?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes; the money which he himself put into the fund.

Mr. FERGUSON. The money which he put into the fund?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would any interest on the money be due the employee?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes. I think the interest rate is 2 percent.

Mr. FERGUSON. What would happen to the money which the corporation had paid into the fund? Would the corporation have the money returned to it?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No. That money would go into the common "pot" for the general pension fund.

Mr. FERGUSON. And would be for the benefit of all the employees?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Beeson happened to be one employee among many fellow employees?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. He was; yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. How much money was involved which would revert to the benefit of all the employees?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The amount which would be payable to Mr. Beeson if he had returned to the employ of the company and remained the necessary number of years was a total of $4,400.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it the contention of some members of the committee that if an employee of a corporation had retained such pension rights for some time in the future, he would owe such an allegiance to the corporation, that he could not properly perform his functions as a member of the Board? Is that the contention which was made?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That was the issue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I oppose that statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am asking the question. I do not ask the Senator from Illinois to censor my question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the right to reply to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has yielded to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am merely trying to get some information. What I wish to know from the Senator from New Jersey is the sentiment of members of the committee in the case of a person who is in the position occupied by Mr. Beeson, with the company paying money into a pension fund and the employee himself paying money into the pension fund, if and when the employee leaves the employment and severs absolutely his connection with the company, and his pension rights expire, the amount of money the employee had paid into the pension fund is returned to the employee, plus 2 percent interest, and the money which the corporation, his employer, paid into the fund reverts to the general fund for the benefit of all employees. I am asking whether some members of the committee claim that if an employee does that, and the fund remains intact, and at some later time he might share in what he paid in and what the corporation paid into the fund for him, such an arrangement would prejudice the employee, and such a person should not be appointed to the board, because he would owe allegiance not only to his former employer but to all employers, and could not properly and impartially function as a member of the board? Is that what some members of the committee contend?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would not presume to know on what theory their objections was based; but a question has been raised as to whether, if he had any connection of any kind remaining with the company, it would cause bias in his judgment. That is the issue

as I understood it. The implication of the minority views is that if a connection with the pension fund had been established he would be biased.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator mean he would be biased against all corporations and all employers?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not know whether that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Will the Senator state whom he has in mind?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I am trying to ask a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has he reference to any particular members of the committee?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I am trying to find facts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator referring to the minority views?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I am trying to find facts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator read the minority views?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it possible that the Senator is referring to the minority members of the committee?

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator from New Jersey answer my question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. What was the question?

Mr. FERGUSON. What was the attitude of the members of the committee on the question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the committee was trying to determine whether or not Mr. Beeson was telling the truth when Mr. Beeson announced that he had left employment at a time when he had an interest remaining in the pension fund. In justice to the committee, it was felt that if Mr. Beeson had any interest remaining, the implication was that it might cause bias.

Mr. FERGUSON. That if Mr. Beeson had an interest in a pension fund, it would prejudice him or bias him in favor of employers? Is that the statement of the Senator?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would have to ask the membership how they felt about it. I think that was the implication.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I wished to know.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The other implication was that Mr. Beeson had said one thing at one time and another thing at another time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is there any danger that we may lose ourselves in the intricacies of the pension fund, and disregard the real objection of the minority, which is clearly stated on page 1 of the minority views; namely, that Mr. Beeson's early statements were distinctly misleading, to put it as mildly as possible.

Then the minority lists three specific matters, with full documentation, in which the statements were, to put it most kindly, misleading. That is the ground of the opposition of the minority, not the question of the intricacies of Mr. Beeson's pension rights, and whatnot. The questioning on the pension rights, however, did reveal contradictions in his testimony.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, the Senator is presenting the interpretation of the minority, and I think the Senator from Illinois is indicating his own view.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Am I to be led to believe, from the statement of the Senator from Illinois, that the theory of conflict of interest is completely out of the minds of the minority?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not necessarily. We sought by our questions to Mr. Beeson to discover the full facts of that situation. But the main grounds for our objection are the three instances in his testimony which were contradictory, and in which the real facts were developed only upon minute cross-examination, and when statements were solicited which corrected earlier statements.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The original stand of the minority on the theory of conflict of interest has been reduced to quite a minor detail; has it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The major portion of the objection of the minority is stated in the minority views, which I assume the Senator from Arizona has read.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes; I have read them with great interest. I might state that the consistency of inconsistency is showing its sweet head.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to address an inquiry to my distinguished friend from Illinois. I have read the minority views which the Senator has been discussing, and I am sorry the Senators subscribing to it say, in substance and effect, that President Eisenhower has sent to the Senate the nomination of a man who has been convicted by the committee of being a perjurer and a liar. No matter what the Senator states the language is, it is clear that the minority views have placed Mr. Beeson in that category and are trying to make the American people believe such a thing. Does the Senator actually think that the President of the United States had that intention?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course not; certainly not. I have never made any such statement. The President appointed Mr. Beeson before he made the statements which we have quoted in our report.

Mr. WELKER. I shall ask the Senator one further question. I have heard the Senator and his colleagues say many, many times that innocent people who have been on the witness stand were scared and nervous and shocked when they appeared before congressional committees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. WELKER. I have certainly read the testimony word for word; and if there is anything malicious about it, anything on which the nominee cannot be given the benefit of doubt, inasmuch as he came here all the way from California, and appeared before a group of sharpshooting Senators, I should like to know what it is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is quite possible that the witness was confused.

Mr. WELKER. If the witness may have been confused—and the Senator from Illinois says that is a possibility—then why ruin his life forever and say his nomination cannot be confirmed by the Senate of the United States?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly I do not want to ruin his life forever, and I am confident that his life would not be ruined if on the basis of the record of his confused and misleading statements the Senate decides he lacks the qualifications for this position. Martin Van Buren was once refused confirmation by the Senate, and he later became President.

Mr. WELKER. Certainly he would go from here a disgraced man, if, after President Eisenhower nominated him, the Senate of the United States said, "No; you shall not serve in that position because you did not answer correctly on the witness stand."

I am surprised at my friend, the Senator from Illinois. I hope he will be more temperate. I cannot think he has faith either in the nominee or in the President of the United States, or in his colleagues, when he makes such an accusation.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am glad to yield the floor, if some other Senator wishes to address the Senate on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield at this point?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I notice that at the second hearing, which occurred on February 2 and 5, when Mr. Davies, the president of the company, was before the committee, his testimony seemed to be overwhelmingly convincing on this matter. That testimony appears on pages 191 and 192. He testified regarding Mr. Beeson's feeling that he had severed his relationship with the company.

I read now from the hearing, at that point:

Mr. DAVIES. That is right. I think terminology is a very difficult thing. Mr. Beeson told me that he was leaving. When he told me he was leaving, I told him I was sure he understood that there was nothing that the company could do for him. We could not pay his moving expenses back here. We could not contribute to his pension plan, that he was entirely on his own, and that he knew that he was going to take a terrific financial beating. He did sever all connections with our company, except that it is our policy to give leaves of absence. I have had some experience with the term "leave of absence" and in different companies it is construed

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

in different ways. In some companies it is construed that a leave of absence has mutual obligations on both sides. In our company we have always construed it that when we give a leave of absence for a man going into Government service, he has no obligation to return. We have sent men down to Washington. They have not returned. They have received better offers while they were down here, and they have not returned. I think it is a purely technical question. I would not be able to state exactly myself. He has severed all connections with the company as far as receiving compensation is concerned. There are no payments to be made to his group insurance or his pension fund while he is gone. He has no commitment to return to the company. In the event he decides to return to the company, the company has an obligation not necessarily to give him the same position that he has, but it has an obligation to give him preferred consideration for a position if he comes back.

It seems to me that with that explanation, he has severed his connection, as far as anyone could sever a connection with such a company. When he gave his testimony, I believe that so far as he was concerned, he felt precisely that that was the case, namely, that he had severed his connection with the company.

We must always keep in mind, of course, that the appointment he has been offered is one covering only 1 year's time. If his nomination is confirmed by this body, he will come to Washington at considerable personal sacrifice. He is not a big businessman in any sense of the word. He is not even an owner of the corporation, except perhaps in the minor sense that he might have some small stock ownership. That I do not know.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. He owns 25 shares of stock of the company.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Twenty-five shares?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In any event, if any man could be a small-business man, not himself an employer, but a man who is working for a firm, here is such a man.

How are we to get persons of responsibility to accept jobs in the Government at considerable sacrifice to themselves, if when they come to Washington they receive the type of abuse which this man apparently received when he appeared before the committee? It seems to me that such persons will think several times before accepting such nominations.

There is nothing unusual, in any sense of the word, in what the nominee has done.

I hold in my hand the testimony taken when Mr. Durkin appeared before the committee which was considering his nomination as Secretary of Labor. I wish to read from page 4 of the committee hearing held on January 16, 1953. I read the following:

Senator TAFT. In short, to put it in a brief statement, you will regard yourself as a representative of the public in performing your duties as Secretary of Labor, and not the representative of any particular group?

Mr. DURKIN. That is correct.

Senator TAFT. And you will resign your position as president of the United Association, you said? I think you said you would leave your post.

Mr. DURKIN. I have taken a leave of absence with no authority to transact any of the affairs. I may return at some later date, and of course that is entirely——

Senator TAFT. You may return? Is there an agreement that you will return if necessary?

Mr. DURKIN. Oh, no; no agreement.

Senator TAFT. You mean you may; you are eligible to return, of course?

Mr. DURKIN. As a member, I am eligible to return.

I think Mr. Durkin's attitude was perfectly proper. He was leaving a great labor organization, and he had indicated he had taken a leave of absence, to do a job for his country. But he indicated that if the job ended or if his term expired, he would return to his former job.

In the case of the nomination now under consideration by the Senate, the nominee is leaving a position as an employee of an organization, and is coming to Washington, where he will receive a salary smaller than the one he received while in private employ. He testified before the committee, and I believe he honestly and in good faith answered the questions which were asked of him.

It may be, as has been suggested, that he was confused, inasmuch as he was appearing for the first time before a congressional committee, where questions were fired at him; and it may be that in his confusion he made statements different from the ones he would have made if there had been time for calm reflection. However, I am convinced that his statements were not made in an attempt to deceive the committee. I think the hearings indicate that he was proceeding in good faith.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. My question relates to the testimony the Senator from California has read. Did any member of the committee ever raise a question to the effect that Mr. Durkin had retained such an interest in the organization of which he had been president that he could not properly serve in the position to which he was nominated by the President?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Does the Senator from Michigan now refer to the hearings on the question of confirming the nomination of Mr. Durkin to be Secretary of Labor?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not recall.

Mr. FERGUSON. My colleague does not recall any minority views on that question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No; I recall no questions other than those similar to the ones asked by the late Senator Taft.

We asked the nominee about his past employment; and we voted to confirm his nomination, so far as that was concerned.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to refer to several of the questions asked of Mr. Durkin by Senator Taft, as follows:

Senator TAFT. You mean you may; you are eligible to return, of course?

Mr. DURKIN. As a member, I am eligible to return.

Is it not true that that indicated that he retained his membership, so that he could return; and is it not also true that he did not deny having an interest in the organization? That is true, is it not?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not sure, but I think that is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that, upon leaving this position in the Government, he immediately returned and went to St. Louis as a delegate to the AFL convention from the particular union of which he was a member, showing that he did retain his membership and interest?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not think he ever denied that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did he ever resign as union president?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I believe not.

Mr. President, a number of Senators are on their feet. I should like to yield to my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD]. First, let me ask the Senator from Nebraska if Mr. Durkin resigned as president of the union?

Mr. GRISWOLD. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then he retained his presidency of the union.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think so.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did anyone claim, in any report to the Senate, that there was a conflict of interest in that case?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No.

Mr. GRISWOLD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEELY, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD].

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, I think it should be brought out, in connection with the statement made by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], that Mr. Beeson was being entirely fair and honest in telling the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare exactly what he intended to do. I think the best statement made was that of Mr. Davies. It was quoted a few minutes ago. Mr. Davies said:

I think terminology is a very difficult thing.

It should be pointed out that Mr. Beeson did resign completely from the company. His payments stopped. His pension rights stopped. No more payments were to come in, and he would get no more out of the pension fund 6 months from then that he could at that time. His pension rights were stopped, but they were subject to reinstatement.

I think I should read the statement of Mr. Beeson on page 25 of the committee hearings:

I make no promise that if I am ever offered a job again by that company or another company, I won't consider it.

He was entirely candid in saying that he might return to the company. Therefore, although his employment rights were entirely severed, and although the company did not need to take him back, and he did not need to go back to the company, yet at no time did he tell the committee that he would not consider returning to the company.

Later I asked him whether he would be open to the possibility of taking employment with some labor union. He said he would, that he could take employment anywhere he wished, but he was entirely candid with the committee in saying that there was a chance that he might go back to the same company with which he had been employed. I think it is very pertinent to bring out the fact that while he had severed connections with the company, while his pension rights had stopped, there was still the possibility that they would be reinstated by reason of his taking employment with the same company.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to comment briefly on an observation made by the majority leader on two points, and one observation made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on one of the same points.

In connection with the argument concerning the Durkin case, as contrasted with the Beeson case, it should be pointed out that the two positions are entirely different. We are dealing with two entirely different types of appointment. In the Beeson case we are dealing with a quasi-judicial appointment, with the appointment of a judge, who must study the record of a case and render a judicial decision based upon the rules of evidence applicable to the hearing. We ought to see to it that there is no presence of bias in the qualifications of the judge.

In the case of the appointment of a Secretary of Labor we should consider the history of the Department of Labor and the purpose of the Department of Labor. The same is true of the Department of Commerce. As I have said on the floor of the Senate many times, and repeat today, at the head of the Department of Commerce we ought to have a man who understands commerce, who is a good spokesman for commerce, a man who will see to it that commerce is fairly represented in the administration.

In like manner, in the history of the Department of Labor, until recent years we have taken from the ranks of labor outstanding leaders of labor to represent labor in the Government as Secretaries of Labor. That does not mean that they are not going to pay any attention to the public welfare and the public interest, but it means that the heads of those two Departments of Commerce and Labor are in the Cabinet of the President for the purpose of seeing that the economic problems of commerce and labor are given adequate attention by the administration. The Secretary of Labor is not a judicial officer. Such findings as he makes in carrying out his administrative duties under legislation passed by Congress are not judicial functions in the true meaning of the term. They involved administrative findings of fact.

The second point upon which I wish to comment briefly is the implication in the remarks of the majority leader that this witness was subjected to abuse before the committee. I do not think that is so. In fact, I think some of the most penetrating questions asked of this witness were asked by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I was not present to hear the cross-examination, but as I read the cold type, I say that any comment to the effect that this witness was subjected to any abuse on the part of either the majority or the minority is not borne out by the record.

What I think happened is that this witness did not come clean in his testimony. He did not give the committee all the facts which he ought to have given the committee, with the result that 6 of our colleagues have come from the hearings with a doubt in their minds as to the reliability of this nominee. When 6 of my colleagues feel that a nominee is not deserving of their approval from the standpoint of reliability, I will look at the record of the nominee with great care before deciding to approve the appointment by my vote.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Oregon with respect to the treatment of the witness. The witness was treated fairly by all members of the committee. I tried to ask penetrating questions. We should ask penetrating questions.

I disagree with the Senator from Oregon in one respect. The witness may have been confused in spots, but I believe he was absolutely honest, and he did not intend to deceive the committee. I wish to reiterate that point.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I was a member of the committee last year before which Martin Durkin appeared. Our Democratic colleagues in the committee voted without any question in their minds, I believe, with respect to a conflict of interest. They voted for Martin Durkin, and so did I. I would vote again for Martin Durkin for a similar job. I am glad to note that Martin Durkin was not questioned last year on the subject of conflict of interest.

It is said that the position which we are now considering is a quasi-judicial position. Let us examine the position of Secretary of Labor from that standpoint.

The Secretary of Labor has authority to determine prevailing minimum wages under Government contracts. Likewise, under the Davis-Bacon Act, he has the authority to determine the minimum wages to be paid under Government contract. In this connection, it is noteworthy that while a member of the NLRB may disqualify himself where it would be necessary for him to participate in any decision in which he may be personally interested, the Secretary of Labor is required, under the law, to make determinations of a quasi-judicial nature irrespective of any personal interest in such a decision, and this duty, under the law, may not be redelegated.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. GRISWOLD. A great point has been made of the fact that six Members of the Senate have decided that Mr. Beeson is not eligible for this important position because of the fact that in their judgment he did not tell the entire truth to the committee. I should like to point out that, notwithstanding the fact that there was some confusion in his testimony, he did not lose a single vote in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, because all six members on the Democratic side of the committee had written a formal report recommending against the confirmation of his nomination long before the argument that his testimony was confusing had arisen. Their preliminary report was filed on February 1, long before the present subject matter was presented to us as a reason for refusing to confirm his nomination. On February 1 the same six members who recommend the rejection of his nomination because of confusion in his testimony then recommended against confirmation because of the fact that there was a conflict of interest. So they have changed their position. I can assure Mr. Beeson that he did not lose a single vote during that period among the membership of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The point I wish to make is that the same six Senators who now oppose his nomination for one reason which they think is the dominating reason, were just as much opposed to him long before that question arose. They first brought up the matter of conflict of interest. They brought up the matter of confusion in his testimony after the matter of conflict of interest had been presented to the committee. It was presented to the committee several times before they made their preliminary report.

I am not judging their motives. I am not insinuating anything. However, I think it is interesting to note that they all voted the same way later as they had voted earlier.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. HILL. I should like to obtain the floor later in my own right, but I wish to ask the Senator a question.

Is it not true that the members of the minority who voted against Mr. Beeson filed their original report basically on the proposition that they had not had a full opportunity to examine Mr. Beeson's qualifications and to develop the record as they thought it should be developed? It was recommended that the nomination be recommitted to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in order that there might be opportunity for further examination, further hearings, and further disclosure of facts.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not know what the motives were.

Mr. HILL. The record speaks for itself. May I read it? It reads:

> We, as members of the committee, and as Members of the Senate, do insist that we are entitled to full, fair, and relevant discussion and interrogation of any nominee for such a vital, quasi-judicial post. Having been denied reasonable opportunity to become fully informed as to these questions concerning Mr. Beeson's qualifications, we

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

are constrained, on the basis of his record and views now available, to recommend that the Senate refuse to consent to this nomination and recommit it for further investigation and report.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. So far as I am concerned, I believe the Senator from Alabama will agree that we had complete hearings after that.

Mr. HILL. No; we did not have complete hearings after that. We had two more hearings after that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Every witness who desired to appear or was desired by the committee was brought up and every question was asked of the witnesses that could possibly be asked.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to yield the floor, because I doubt anything can be gained by a continuation of this discussion. I would prefer to have the other side make their speeches now.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] read into the RECORD the conclusion in the minority views of February 1, 1954. He read the conclusion, with the exception of one sentence. I am sure the Senator from Alabama would want me to read that sentence. The first sentence reads:

> The members of the minority wish to emphasize that we do not question Mr. Beeson's candor, honesty, or integrity.

That sentence was not read into the RECORD by the Senator from Alabama, and I wanted it also to be in the RECORD.

Mr. HILL, Mr. GRISWOLD, and Mr. GOLDWATER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield first to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Connecticut read that statement. At that time we had not developed the facts. That is why we insisted that the nomination be reconsidered, so that we might have an opportunity to have the facts. At that time we did not question this nominee's integrity. It shows how fair we were. We did not question it; we did not want to question it. It was only on subsequent testimony, after the filing of the report, that we were constrained and forced to question his honesty and integrity.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think this is the appropriate time for me to yield the floor. If I do so we may be able to continue in a more orderly fashion, instead of my trying to yield to Senators.

I yield the floor with this final statement. I emphasize the fact, at the conclusion of my remarks as I yield the floor, that it appears to be alleged that Mr. Beeson falsely told the committee certain things, and I must protest that allegation vigorously.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 2, 1954]

LIBERALS AND THOUGHT CONTROL—SIX DEMOCRATIC SENATORS CRITICIZED FOR CHALLENGING BEESON'S NOMINATION FOR POST ON LABOR BOARD

(By David Lawrence)

Thought control and the punishing of a man for his previous affiliations or economic beliefs seem to be bad things when a liberal is the victim, but praiseworthy when the so-called liberals themselves want to keep a man out of the Government of the United States.

The latest example is the action of the six Democratic members of the Senate Labor Committee who formally recommended in their report to the Senate that the nomination of Albert C. Beeson, as a member of the National Labor Relations Board, be rejected. The report says frankly that the six Democratic Senators "do not question Mr. Beeson's candor, honesty, or integrity," but that they do question whether his experience as a spokesman for management in collective bargaining in the past would color his judgment.

If adopted as a policy in the Senate, it would mean that no man hereafter could work for the Labor Board who had ever served a trade union or the management side.

Such a rule would have disqualified Cy Ching, who recently retired as head of the United States Conciliation Service and who, before his service in the Government, was employed as head of the industrial relations division of the United States Rubber Co. Yet he did win the confidence of both labor and management.

Carried to its logical conclusion, this discriminatory policy would mean that labor mediators, arbitrators, and other personnel could never qualify for service in the Government in connection with the labor bureaus and boards of the Government if they previously worked for management or labor. It is the most dangerous kind of persecution, and the so-called liberals who are sponsoring it are plainly violating the basic principle of fairness in their recommendation.

It was the late President Roosevelt—the hero of the liberals—who first proclaimed the doctrine of thought control in respect to appointees for Government boards and commissions. In 1933 Mr. Roosevelt wrote a letter removing William E. Humphrey from the Federal Trade Commission because, as Mr. Roosevelt expressed it, he was sure that Mr. Humphrey's decision "would not go along with" the mind of the President.

This case was carried to the Supreme Court on a claim for back salary, and, by a unanimous decision, the Court held in May 1935 that Mr. Humphrey was a member of a quasi-judicial commission and therefore could not be removed for any such reason.

The National Labor Relations Board is a quasi-judicial commission. In selecting members for it, as is the case with judges on a court, it is a serious thing to say that a man cannot be impartial after he takes the oath to perform judicial duties.

Yet one of the most noted of all liberals, the late Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, an Independent, made a bitter fight against the confirmation of Charles Evans Hughes to be Chief Justice because of a charge that Mr. Hughes had accepted fees as a corporation lawyer. Mr. Norris lived to retract his charge and to commend the career of Mr. Hughes.

The same kind of attack was made on Judge John J. Parker, of the United States court of appeals, who was nominated by President Hoover to the Supreme Court. Mr. Parker's confirmation was beaten by the shameful tactics of labor union lobbyists who charged that he once had sided against labor in an important case before the Federal courts. Today he is acclaimed far and wide—even by labor unions—as a truly "liberal" judge. But he never got the appointment as Supreme Court Justice that he deserved.

When a man of good character, honesty and integrity comes up for confirmation by the Senate and his previous employment gives him experience in the subject matter, it would seem that all groups would be eager to give him a chance to serve. But the "liberals" in the Senate are playing politics, and they don't seem to mind the punitive tactics of "thought control" when they are doing the punishing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Albert C. Beeson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, in view of the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I believe it might be brought out at this time that the facts are that in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare prior to the taking of any testimony, the minority members had already made up their minds to oppose the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Beeson, but they wanted time to develop their reasons. In other words, the minority was opposed to the nomination from the start, but they wanted more time in which to find out why they were opposed.

In the early hearings there was no testimony given contrary to the character or ability or integrity of Mr. Beeson; but request was made of the chairman, who conducted the hearings in a most dignified and proper manner, "Let us carry on the hearings. Let us have more hearings. Let us have a meeting again on Tuesday. Let us have another meeting on Wednesday—on Thursday—on Friday."

Still nothing was heard adverse to the character and ability of Mr. Beeson. Instead many complimentary messages were received. So I say the minority were early opposed to Mr. Beeson's nomination but it took them a long time to find out why.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Apropos of what the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has stated, it should be noted that a request was made of the distinguished chairman to hold a meeting one evening for the purpose of interrogating Mr. Beeson. The meeting was held, but no Senator from the Democratic side showed up. It was an entirely Republican meeting. We did not have the benefit and the pleasure of meeting with the distinguished Senators on the left, and they certainly did not avail themselves of the opportunity that evening.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's statement, the fact

is that the committee approved the nomination of Mr. Rodgers to be a member of the Board, and we unanimously approved the nomination of Mr. Farmer within a half hour after he appeared before our committee. Both those men represented a more conservative point of view than did the men who had been appointed to the Board from 1947 on.

Therefore I am sure the Senator from Nebraska would agree that we had not made up our minds in advance to oppose Mr. Beeson on the ground that he had a particular attitude toward labor. We had unanimously approved Mr. Farmer and had also approved Mr. Rodgers. Only when Mr. Beeson demonstrated that he was not completely frank with the committee was the later conclusion drawn by the minority.

Mr. GRISWOLD. The Senators of the minority did join in a report opposing Mr. Beeson's confirmation before they brought up the allegation that Mr. Beeson's testimony was confusing. They opposed it on the ground of a conflict of interest and also because they wanted more hearings held.

Mr. KENNEDY. The point of conflict of interest was justified because at the third hearing evidence was revealed concerning Mr. Beeson's pension rights and the necessity of his returning to the company in order to maintain those rights.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Nebraska has stated that those of us who wrote the minority views of February 1 did not raise the question of Mr. Beeson's integrity and truthfulness. We did write one sentence in the conclusion, namely:

> The members of the minority wish to emphasize that we do not question Mr. Beeson's candor, honesty, or integrity.

Later, however, we annulled that first sentence because of the matters which had developed in the meantime.

I may say to the distinguished Senator that I was the one who first examined Mr. Beeson with regard to certain statements which he was alleged to have made. In other words, I raised the point about the appointment being proper on the basis of the statement that he was taking a leave of absence, but would return on the expiration of his leave of absence to resume his duties with the company.

I asked him that question. I quoted from the article which appeared in the San Jose newspaper. He categorically denied the statement I quoted. He said he had never made it.

He went further and said that the reporter who had sent the dispatch had apologized to him and acknowledged that it was not so.

I believed Mr. Beeson. I believed him at that time. Probably I was naive. Certainly developments proved that I was naive. My colleagues on the committee also believed him at that time. We only had certain facts. When we had the reporter and the editor and the publisher before the committee we got all the facts.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not have the floor. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] has the floor. I should like to complete my statement.

It was only when we had those witnesses before us, and they denied that they had misquoted Mr. Beeson, that we got the facts. Mr. Beeson, too, later agreed with me that he had made that statement. That was a false statement. He tried to befuddle the issue by saying "I got confused and I thought you were referring to the statement I made on the 5th or the 6th or the 7th of January."

I came back at him and I said it made no difference to me whether it was the 5th or 6th or 7th or the 8th or 9th. The question was whether he made that statement. He acknowledged that he had made it. When did he do that? When the facts were so strongly arrayed against him that he could no longer deny it.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, we can all become confused. If I am not mistaken, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] was somewhat confused in asking a question of Mr. Beeson. He said, "Did you make such a statement on the 7th?" There was no statement made on the 7th. The statement was made on the 6th and on the 8th.

So we can all become confused.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I prefer to finish my statement.

So, Mr. Beeson, as was the Senator from New York, was apparently confused. It is understandable why Mr. Beeson was confused in answering the question.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The statement was made on January 7. It was carried in the San Jose Mercury and News on the morning of January 8. The statement was made to the reporter on the seventh. Frequently a Senator gives a statement to a member of the press one day, and it will be carried in the newspapers on the following day. That is what happened in this instance.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. My friend did not want to yield to me.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, do my colleagues need any further proof of the situation confronting Mr. Beeson when he was questioned by nine Senators, just as we are asking each other questions now? [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, that would be almost an indirect criticism of the chairman of the committee, the able and distinguished Senator from New Jersey. On his behalf and in his defense I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut and to other Members of the Senate that the Senator from New Jersey conducted the hearings with great decorum and, at all times, with order and in a parliamentary manner, as they should have been conducted.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask a question with reference to the conflict of interest suggestion. The Senator from Alabama was on the committee which had the Beeson nomination before it when the Durkin nomination was considered. Was any question raised then as to whether Mr. Durkin had any pension rights?

Mr. HILL. The difference between Mr. Durkin and——

Mr. FERGUSON. No; that is not my question.

Mr. HILL. I shall answer the Senator's question. Mr. Durkin made a frank and honest statement. He said he was on a leave of absence. If Mr. Beeson had said, "I am on a leave of absence," the chances are that this question would not be before the Senate today.

Mr. FERGUSON. My question was as to whether Mr. Durkin had any pension rights.

Mr. HILL. He stated that he was on a leave of absence. I do not recall his exact testimony. A year has passed since that time. But Mr. Durkin frankly told the committee exactly what his situation was. That is the difference between his testimony, his frankness, his forthrightness, his candor, and the testimony of Mr. Beeson.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Reverting to the question of the statement which was made, or supposed to have been made, to the press, I think all Senators on both sides of the aisle who have had some experience in public life have recognized that at times we may talk to members of the press and not expect that we are making a statement for publication. I think that has probably happened to Senators on both sides of the aisle. We make an informal statement and do not expect the statement to appear in the newspapers.

Let me read at this point from page 82 of part 2 of the hearings a letter which came to the chairman of the committee from Mr. Joseph Ridder, publisher, San Jose Mercury and News, in which he said:

> San Jose Mercury and News feel that Mr. Al C. Beeson has adequately explained to their complete satisfaction the circumstances leading up to an untrue accusation by him that he had been misquoted in these papers. Mr. Beeson has apologized for the incident he describes as one due to confusion in his recollection of dates and reporters covering assignments concerning his consideration and subsequent nomination as a member of the NLRB. These newspapers wanted to set the report straight which has been done. We feel Mr. Beeson innocent of any suspected attempt to alter facts regarding his separation from Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. We feel his integrity, which

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

was questioned briefly during the heat of the issue, is above reproach. We wish to emphasize that our original opinion of Mr. Beeson as a commendable selection for the NLRB has not been lessened by the incident and feel that he will be entirely impartial in his dealings with cases before the NLRB.

JOSEPH RIDDER,
Publisher, San Jose Mercury and News.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to my distinguished friend, since the editor says Mr. Beeson explained the situation satisfactorily to him as to why Mr. Beeson had denied he made the statement that that may be true, but we have to consider the entire record, the fact that he had so testified, that he was not candid——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. All that has been said with regard to Mr. Beeson's explanation to the newspaper editor does not change the fact that the record shows Mr. Beeson did make the statement in question and subsequently explained his motives to the satisfaction of the editor. But we are dealing here with the question of whether his statement to the committee was a factual statement or something short of a factual statement in respect to his having said in the first instance what he was reported to have said to the newspaper. I think the record is entirely clear that his original statement to the committee was something less than a factual statement.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator from Oregon is correct about that.

Mr. MORSE. I arose to speak with respect to the interesting colloquy between the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. The Senator from Connecticut pointed out that the Senator from New York specifically asked if such and such a statement was made by Mr. Beeson on January 7, whereas it would appear that it was not made on January 7, but on January 8. I ask the Senator from Alabama whether he thinks Mr. Beeson had any doubt in his mind as to what the Senator from New York was seeking to elicit from the nominee, namely, "Did you or did you not make this statement?" What the Senator from Connecticut is trying to do to justify Mr. Beeson's testimony is to show that he has an "out" because the Senator from New York used one date in his question, when the statement was made on the following day. I respectfully submit that such an alibi is only evidence, in my judgment, that the witness was looking for an "out" in order to conceal the facts from the committee.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. In a moment.

Mr. Norman Bowman, staff writer, in his article on Thursday morning, January 8, 1954, had this to say:

He carefully dictated the following statement—

What was the statement?—

"The nomination by President Eisenhower is for a 1-year term. I expect at this time I shall return to my duties with Food Machinery upon completion of this period if it is granted me through Senate approval."

There was no doubt about it. As the Senator from Oregon said, the statement was clear. Mr. Beeson gave a categorical denial. He said, "I did not make the statement."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if he does not agree with me that the rather interesting defense of the nominee that he was confused is not a good defense, when the transcript shows the hearing was conducted in an orderly manner on the part of both majority and minority members. Here is a man who is named to participate as a member of a judicial body, to cross-examine witnesses at length, to be so clear-headed that he can at all times conduct an orderly hearing, and yet we are told that he came before the members of the committee, these "sharpshooters," as has been said, and became so startled and confused that he could not keep his head. I think such a lame excuse for his misleading testimony is an argument against this man so far as his qualifications are concerned.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that the hearings were held in the room that was for so many years occupied by the Supreme Court of the United States. We speak of it as the old Supreme Court room. I think the hearings were conducted with the same dignity and the same order that, time and again, I have heard cases presented before the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. The majority leader quoted the publisher of the San Jose Mercury in regard to whether Mr. Beeson made the statement the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] ascribed to him in his question. He denied making the statement the Senator from New York questioned him about with regard to his returning to the company at the end of the year's service on the National Labor Relations Board. He explained that the reason he denied that statement at a later meeting of the committee was that he thought it referred to the fact that on January 7 it was said that a statement appeared in the paper that Vice President NIXON was supporting him for appointment to the Board; therefore, in other words, he mistook the statement and denied that he had made the statement that Mr. NIXON was supporting him for the position on the Board.

But, the fact is, that the newspaper subsequently stated that he had made the statement. The San Jose Mercury later stated that Mr. Beeson not only made the statement that he was going to return to the Food Machinery Co. after his 1 year of service on the Board, but it also sent a message to the committee, which showed that he had made the statement that Mr. NIXON was supporting him for the position.

So there is no explanation for Mr. Beeson's misunderstanding the Senator from New York.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Since there is some question as to the dates, and I hope the Senator from Oregon is listening, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] asked the question, as it appears on page 25 of the hearings. There was a question as to dates. There were two different statements made, as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] already has indicated, one of which Mr. Beeson, as the subsequent testimony showed, had no knowledge of having seen printed.

The question asked by the Senator from New York was this:

Senator LEHMAN. The reason I asked that question, Mr. Beeson, is that it has been brought to my attention that on January 7 you were quoted in the San Jose Mercury as saying.

Speaking about confusion, speaking about different information, unless I am confused from this debate, I believe there was no statement printed on January 7 in the San Jose Mercury.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator from Connecticut that Mr. Beeson gave a statement to the reporter of the San Jose Mercury on January 7, which was carried in the San Jose Mercury on the morning of January 8.

But surely the Senator from Connecticut realizes that Mr. Beeson is a nominee for a very high judicial position. To be frank about it, there are not many offices in the Government which are higher than the office to which Mr. Beeson has been nominated. If his nomination is confirmed, he will sit as a judge on many important, highly complex cases of various kinds. Does the Senator from Connecticut mean to tell us that any question whether the article was published on the 7th or the 8th of January, when the statement was read to Mr. Beeson verbatim, et literatim, would make any difference?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I wonder if my friend, the distinguished Senator from——

Mr. PURTELL. From Connecticut; I can help the Senator.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if the Senator from Connecticut is basing his position on the ground that the nominee deceived or misled the committee. I wonder if the Senator is going to contend some kind of mental incompetence.

Mr. PURTELL. On the part of Mr. Beeson?

Mr. HILL. If that be the case, Mr. Beeson would be ineligible on that ground, too.

Mr. PURTELL. There is no question of attempting to defend anyone. We are trying to develop the facts. We want the facts. We are giving the facts. As a matter of fact, I should like to ask the Senator to establish a fact. Was there or was there not an article which was published in the San Jose Mercury on January 7?

Let me quote again the question asked by the Senator from New York:

The reason I asked that question, Mr. Beeson, is that it has been brought to my

attention that on January 7 you were quoted in the San Jose Mercury as saying.

Was there an article on the 7th of January in the San Jose Mercury?

Will the Senator answer that question?

Mr. HILL. Certainly. I have the floor.

The article which the Senator from New York read verbatim, et literatim, to Mr. Beeson, was given to the reporter of the San Jose Mercury on January 7, as I have said, and was published in the San Jose Mercury on the morning of January 8. Those are the facts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not a fact that Mr. Beeson, in answering the question put to him by the Senator from New York, indicated that the suggestion that the date was January 7 threw him off, and that he was under the impression that the Senator from New York was asking about a story published in the San Jose Mercury which stated that Vice President NIXON was supporting his appointment?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield, to permit me to reply to the Senator from Masssachusetts?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. PURTELL. That is the only purpose for which I am asking the Senator to yield.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. PURTELL. My understanding of the matter—and I have not referred to the record again—is that Mr. Beeson had in mind a conversation which he had had with a representative of that newspaper in Washington on January 4.

Mr. KENNEDY. With reference to Vice President NIXON?

Mr. PURTELL. I have forgotten what the conversation was about, but I know there was no article printed on January 7 in the San Jose Mercury of the kind we are speaking about now.

Mr. KENNEDY. When Mr. Beeson attempted to explain his confusion, he said:

> At that time the only article which I had seen or of which I was aware had appeared in the evening edition of the same paper of, I believe, January 6, 1954. That article quoted me, to my great embarrassment, as expecting a presidential appointment and claiming the support of Vice President NIXON. I had made no such statement.

In other words, he was explaining to the committee that the question asked by the Senator from New York referred to his statement that Mr. NIXON was supporting him. Is not that correct? Which statement did he think the Senator from New York was talking about?

Mr. PURTELL. I can only say to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts that if I were asked a question as to two articles which had been published, one prior to January 7, and one subsequent to January 7, but no article appearing on the 7th, I believe I would wonder as to whether the question referred to the first article or the second article.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield for that purpose to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HILL. I do not yield for that purpose.

I shall be delighted to yield for questions, if Senators will bear with me until I have made my remarks. Perhaps I can clear up some of the questions which have been raised.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York has been trying to attract my attention for some time, so I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. To me, the question whether the date was January 5, 6, 7, or 8 is one of the most trivial things I have ever listened to on the floor of the Senate. After all, we are not trying to prove that Mr. Beeson did not make the statement. That is the important point. I wonder whether the Senator from Alabama remembers this part of the statement by Mr. Albert Cummins Beeson, made before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on February 2, 1954:

> Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the committee to correct a statement in the record which has resulted in an unwarranted challenge to my personal integrity.
>
> On Friday, January 22, 1954, Senator LEHMAN asked me the following question:
>
> Senator LEHMAN said:
>
> "The reason I asked that question, Mr. Beeson, is that it has been brought to my attention that on January 7 you were quoted in the San Jose Mercury as saying:
>
> "'The nomination by President Eisenhower is for a 1-year term. I expect at this time that I shall return to my duties with Food Machinery upon completion of this period if it is granted me through Senate approval.'
>
> "Now, that would indicate at least unless there is some kind of an explanation, that you were still of the determination that you would continue your duties with this company."
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Beeson, that apparently is a call for a vote and I am afraid we will have to recess until the members of the committee can go to the floor and attend to their senatorial duties.
>
> Mr. BEESON. I am sorry.
>
> (Recess.)
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Will the committee come to order, please.
>
> Mr. Beeson, before you continue, I want to make a slight correction in the record. I stated that I received Mr. Paul Davies' telegram this morning. As a matter of fact I received it yesterday afternoon, and I want to be sure that my statements are correct as far as the record is concerned.
>
> You may proceed. I suggest that you start your statement again, and we can get the sequence of it.
>
> Mr. BEESON. Thank you.
>
> Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the committee to correct a statement in the record which has resulted in an unwarranted challenge to my personal integrity.
>
> On Friday, January 22, 1954, Senator LEHMAN asked me the following question:
>
> "Senator LEHMAN. The reason I asked that question, Mr. Beeson, is that it has been brought to my attention that on January 7 you were quoted in the San Jose Mercury as saying:
>
> "'The nomination by President Eisenhower is for a 1-year term. I expect at this time that I shall return to my duties with Food Machinery upon completion of this period if it is granted me through Senate approval.'
>
> "Now, that would indicate at least, unless there is some kind of an explanation, that you were still of the determination that you would continue your duties with this company."
>
> To that question I replied:
>
> "I did not make that statement, sir."
>
> At that time the only article which I had seen or of which I was aware had appeared in the evening edition of the same paper of, I believe, January 6, 1954. That article quoted me, to my great embarrassment, as expecting a Presidential appointment and claiming the support of Vice President NIXON. I had made no such statement.
>
> I had refrained from any public comment regarding this appointment since I had been informed that any announcement would have to come from the White House.
>
> On the afternoon of January 7, 1954, Mr. Willis called me from the White House to tell me that the announcement of my appointment had been released. Shortly thereafter I did talk with another reporter and it was at that time that I apparently made the statement to which Senator LEHMAN referred. That article—which by the way I have not yet seen—did not appear, however, until January 8, and Senator LEHMAN'S reference to January 7 led me to believe that it was the previous article which he had in mind.
>
> I did, therefore, make the statement to which Senator LEHMAN referred in his question.

Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Alabama, I wish to ask whether he has noticed a portion of a letter which was read by the distinguished majority leader in defense of the truthfulness, apparently, of the candidate who came before the committee for examination.

Mr. HILL. On what page is it?

Mr. LEHMAN. It is on page 82, and was read a few minutes ago by the distinguished majority leader. The letter is addressed to "Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, chairman, Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee," and it is signed by "Joseph Ritter, publisher, San Jose Mercury and News." The letter says:

> San Jose Mercury and News feel that Mr. Al C. Beeson has adequately explained to their complete satisfaction the circumstances leading up to an untrue accusation by him that he had been misquoted in these papers. Mr. Beeson has apologized for the incident he describes as one due to confusion in his recollection of dates.

That is a definite statement from the editor of the newspaper explaining that he is willing to accept the apology and the justification by Mr. Beeson, but he definitely states that the accusation made about the newspaper was untrue.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. In other words, we are dealing not only with misleading statements made to the company, but apparently "an untrue accusation"—and I am quoting the words of the publisher of the newspaper—made about the Mercury. The only reason why the newspaper has overlooked that is that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the editor does not want to harm a fellow citizen.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Washington; then I should like to proceed with my remarks.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senators who are on the floor today are anxious to get facts. I have listened for sometime to the discussion of the point which has been the subject of debate. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if he could advise the Senate whether it makes any material difference whether the statement made by Mr. Beeson to the San Jose newspaper occurred on January 7 or January 8, or is the Senate concerned with the fact of whether he made the statement?

Mr. HILL. I certainly do not believe it is material under any circumstances, but surely not under the particular circumstances under which Mr. Beeson gave the statement to the reporter on January 7, which was carried in the morning newspaper of January 8.

Mr. JACKSON. Therefore, our concern in seeking to get the facts, as someone has said, is to determine whether Mr. Beeson in fact made a statement which was at complete variance with his testimony before the committee.

Mr. HILL. He afterward admitted he did make the statement. There is no doubt about that. The record shows that by his own testimony.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Would not the Senator from Alabama think it might be well to complete the record by reading what Mr. Beeson said.

Mr. HILL. From what page is the Senator about to read?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I am about to read from page 90 of the committee hearings. It is entirely true that it does not make any difference whether the statement was made on the 5th, the 6th, or the 7th, except that it might explain why there was confusion in the mind of Mr. Beeson. From page 90 of the hearings I should like to read an answer by Mr. Beeson to a question asked by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I read from about the fourth paragraph:

> In short——

Mr. JACKSON. If the Senator will pardon me, when was this statement made?

Mr. HILL. It was made when Mr. Beeson was before the committee on February 2.

Mr. GRISWOLD. It was about the last time he was before the committee. I now read:

> In short, due to those confused circumstances, I at that time denied making the statement referred to by Senator LEHMAN. It was an honest mistake.

Mr. JACKSON. Why would he deny making the statement?

Mr. GRISWOLD. It was due to the confusion. I am asking the Senator from Alabama if it might not be well to complete the record and read what Mr. Beeson said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has yielded to the Senator from Nebraska. The Senator from Nebraska may proceed.

Mr. GRISWOLD. We cannot take one sentence from his statement and pay no attention to the rest of the statement. He proceeded:

> It was in no sense an attempt to mislead.

Here is a man who was being more honest than some others in heated debate may be, perhaps including myself. He continued:

> You will doubtless recall my voluntarily submitting a letter to Senator KNOWLAND in which I stated that I was interested in this appointment for 1 year only.

I have read the complete paragraph. He admits he made a mistake in answering the Senator from New York as he did, but it was an honest mistake, it was because of confusion. Does not the Senator from Alabama feel that it was well to complete the record at this point by reading this paragraph?

Mr. HILL. I yielded to the Senator in order that he might read the paragraph; but there was no confusion about the statement concerning Vice President NIXON. Nothing was said about the Nixon statement at the time the Senator from New York read to the nominee the exact statement which he denied. At the time the Senator from New York read the statement, Mr. Beeson did not say, "I made a statement about the Vice President." He just made a flat, categorical denial that he had made the statement. Now, then, after he sees he is trapped, is caught; after the editor of the newspaper sends a telegram to Washington stating he had made the statement; after the newspaper carries news stories confirming that he had made the statement, setting forth fully the circumstances surrounding the making of the statement, he comes forward and says, "I was confused."

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut, but I should like to complete my remarks.

Mr. PURTELL. I assure the Senator that if he will yield this once I hope I shall not interrupt his remarks again.

I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Alabama to the fact that only a part of the letter has thus far been read into the RECORD. Only a part of it was read. I think that in fairness to Mr. Beeson, in fairness to my colleagues on the floor, and in fairness to those who will act on the nomination the entire letter should be in the RECORD.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the letter was already put in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I have the floor; but I wish to be courteous to all my colleagues and perfectly fair.

What page is the Senator from Connecticut referring to?

Mr. PURTELL. The letter appears on page 82 of the hearings. I am referring to a letter addressed to "Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH" by Mr. Joseph Ridder, a portion of which was read by the Senator from New York. I should like to complete it.

Mr. HILL. It has not only been put into the record of the committee, but I think the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] read it. Where has my dear friend been?

Mr. PURTELL. Would the Senator object to my reading it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Connecticut? The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. HILL. The letter has been read into the RECORD within the past 30 or 40 minutes by the Senator from California, the distinguished majority leader. Why read it again?

Mr. PURTELL. Let me ask the Senator whether this part was read——

Mr. HILL. The entire letter, verbatim et literatim, was read into the RECORD by the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. PURTELL. Including the part in which they said Mr. Beeson was innocent?

Mr. HILL. The entire letter saying Mr. Beeson apologized for the incident was read into the RECORD by the distinguished senior Senator from California.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HILL. For what purpose does my colleague request me to yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. First, I should like to place in the RECORD two telegrams and a letter which I have received; the first telegram comes from the American Federation of Labor, and the other telegram and the letter come from the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America.

Thereafter, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, because I am sure there should be a large attendance of Senators to hear the remarks of the Senator from Alabama on this subject.

Mr. HILL. I am willing to yield for that purpose, Mr. President, if it is understood that in doing so, I shall retain the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes; of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. At this time I wish to read into the RECORD the following telegram which has just been received from George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor:

> WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1954.*
> Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
> *United States Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> Strongly urge you reject nomination of Albert Beeson to National Labor Relations Board. His background indicates a bias on the side of management. His contradictory statements at hearings show he does not possess calm and clear mental perspective needed on a board which is dedicated to impartial analysis of labor-management disputes.
>
> GEORGE MEANY,
> *President, American Federation of Labor.*

I also wish to read into the RECORD the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 9, 1954.*
Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building:

International Brotherhood of Teamsters strenuously objects to nomination of Albert C. Beeson as member of NLRB. Board as now constituted is strongly promanagement. This is clearly evident by its decisions since appointment and confirmation of last two members. NLRB is a quasi-judicial body and its membership should possess the impartiality of neutral judges. This quality Albert Beeson does not possess. He comes directly from payroll of management and is clearly employer minded and sympathetic to employers views concerning Taft-Hartley Act. We submit therefore that he is not qualified to become member of the NLRB and should not be confirmed to that position.

DAVE BECK,
President, International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the same organization, and an editorial from the New York Times, which strenuously opposes the nomination of Mr. Beeson.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSEMEN & HELPERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1954.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Issues fundamental to determining the kind of Federal participation we will have in labor-management relations are at stake in the Senate this week. They will be decided by action on the nomination of Albert Beeson to the National Labor Relations Board.

If the Board is to remain a quasi-judicial arm of the executive branch, and if it is to continue to represent the public interest in guiding the course of labor-management relations, I believe that Mr. Beeson should not be confirmed by the Senate.

In urging rejection of the nomination, I do not argue from a narrow partisan base—but rather as one sufficiently affected by whatever decision you make to want my opinion known to you.

The fundamental question is whether a man whose total professional experience in the labor field has been as representative of one or the other of the contenders at the bargaining table can reasonably be expected to adopt an attitude of impartiality when suddenly called upon to administer the national labor law in the interest of no one except the public. I believe that is too much to ask of any man.

I would not ask it of Walter Reuther, George Meany, or John Lewis—I would not want it asked of me.

My point is not that Mr. Beeson would be partial to management. What is important is that his appointment would undermine the public character of the NLRB—in the face of congressional intent and evolved public policy of preventing the Board from becoming an advocate of any interest other than the public's.

In short, we are at the fork in the road where the NLRB might well be converted into a partisan agency, sensitive to the whims of politics and indifferent to the general interests of the United States. I urge you to vote to insure that the NLRB shall never become a political plaything.

Very truly yours,

DAVE BECK,
General President.

[From the New York Times of February 10, 1954]

THE BEESON APPOINTMENT

Apparently the major claim on behalf of Albert C. Beeson for membership on the National Labor Relations Board, as developed during Senate Labor Committee hearings, has been his considerable experience in negotiating collective-bargaining agreements on behalf of management. Conceding his excellent record in this respect, we cannot see how it would qualify him for the exacting quasi-judicial position to which he aspires. Special abilities are required for that post and if Mr. Beeson possesses them neither he nor others have brought that fact to the attention of the Senate committee.

That Mr. Beeson comes from the ranks of management is not a count against him. So did James J. Reynolds, a previous member whose high qualifications and excellent record lent stature to the Board. Mr. Beeson's various and conflicting explanations of his supposed leave of absence or severance from his employing company were not calculated to enlist public confidence. His belated offer to forego certain pension rights after the Senate confirmed him suggests an attempt to bargain with that august body.

The NLRB is now divided 2 to 2 on 20 important cases which are held up pending appointment of a "swing" man. Unless the most competent choice is made the future administration of the Taft-Hartley Act will be unnecessarily embroiled in controversy which may well damage peaceful labor-management relations and react against the present administration.

The President and the Senate have been placed in an embarrassing predicament by the failure of the Republicans on the Senate Labor Committee to encourage full discussion of the Beeson candidacy before approving it by a party vote of 7 to 6. This blunder can be rectified by withdrawal of the nomination and submission of a better qualified candidate or by an adverse vote on Mr. Beeson in the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not like to suggest the absence of a quorum, unless my distinguished friend, the Senator of Alabama, is willing to have me do so.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Mansfield
Anderson	Gore	Martin
Barrett	Green	McClellan
Beall	Griswold	Millikin
Bennett	Hayden	Monroney
Bricker	Hendrickson	Morse
Bridges	Hennings	Mundt
Bush	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hill	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Pastore
Byrd	Holland	Payne
Carlson	Humphrey	Potter
Case	Hunt	Purtell
Chavez	Ives	Robertson
Clements	Jackson	Russell
Cooper	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kerr	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Symington
Ellender	Kuchel	Thye
Ferguson	Langer	Upton
Flanders	Lehman	Watkins
Frear	Lennon	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Wiley
George	Magnuson	Williams
Gillette	Malone	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have always been extremely reluctant to vote against an Executive nomination. My conception of the Constitution and my experience with the operations of our Government under it predispose me to favor wide latitude in the area of Presidential selection of officers. I have seldom voted against an executive nomination, and then only when I have conscientiously considered it to be my duty to do so.

But it must be remembered that the power of appointment is not vested entirely in the Executive, but it is distributed between the Executive and the Senate. Thus, while the President has the power to select and nominate the appointee, the nomination does not become effective until the Senate has given its advice and consent.

Under the Constitution the Senate has its definite, fixed responsibility with respect to appointments just as the President has his definite, fixed responsibility. It is clear that the Founding Fathers foresaw that, as the Republic grew, many executive officers would be required, and the power of appointment was wisely distributed between the Executive and the Senate. This distribution is one of the checks and balances in the Constitution. It imposes upon the Senate the vital responsibility of ascertaining whether or not a nominee is qualified and fit for the position to which he has been nominated.

When I first learned of the nomination of Mr. Beeson to fill the vacancy on the National Labor Relations Board I had no knowledge whatsoever regarding him. I had no information inviting any objection to his appointment. I was predisposed to support the nomination.

I regret to report to the Senate, however, that the record made in the hearings on this nomination has convinced me that the nominee is disqualified for a position on the National Labor Relations Board, and I am compelled to oppose his appointment. My objection is based almost entirely on the testimony of the nominee himself. For reasons unknown to me, Mr. Beeson's attitude was one of evasion. On relatively simple but important questions of fact we were able to get the truth only through rigorous cross-examination or by confronting Mr. Beeson with contradictory evidence.

Mr. Beeson testified with respect to at least four important factual situations affecting his status. These factual situations were all relatively simple, and it would seem that, of all people, Mr. Beeson would be the best informed. But Mr. Beeson misled, and indeed deceived, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He testified that he had completely severed his relationship with his company, the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. The fact is that he was on leave of absence, so that he could retain his pension rights and retain preferred consideration for return to the company.

In other words, if Mr. Beeson had peremptorily resigned, as he said he had, he would have lost his pension rights. At the time he came to Washington to accept this position in the National Labor

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Relations Board—subject, of course, to Senate confirmation—there was in the pension fund approximately $4,450 which had been paid in by the company and approximately $2,700 which had been paid in by Mr. Beeson. If Mr. Beeson had resigned from the company, he would have lost all right to any of the $4,450 and all right to any benefits which might accrue to him from that amount of money in the future, whereas if Mr. Beeson came here on a leave of absence, he would retain his right in this fund if he went back and worked for the company after completing his service on the National Labor Relations Board.

Furthermore, by taking leave of absence he had what the president of the company testified was a preferred consideration for return to the company. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Davies, the president of the company, testified that it was the practice of his company, when an employee left its service to come to Washington to accept a Government position, not to have him resign, but to give him a leave of absence, so that he might retain his pension rights and have preferred consideration if he wished to return to the employment of the company.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask one or two questions for purposes of clarification.

Am I to understand that if Mr. Beeson had completely resigned and entirely severed his connections with the company, as he stated, he would not then have been entitled to any benefits or any pension rights whatsoever, but would have lost the amount of money he had paid into the fund?

Mr. HILL. No; he would have received back the $2,700 of his own money he had paid in, but he would have lost any rights in the $4,450 which the company had paid in.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask another question or two. As I understand, he would have lost his rights with respect to the contribution which the company had made. He would have lost his pension rights as such. He would have been entitled only to have refunded to him the contribution which he himself had made out of his own earnings.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is it true that the company's contribution constituted a part of his earnings up to that time as an employee of the company, under the pension system which the company had in effect?

Mr. HILL. I should say that the company, in fixing his compensation, undoubtedly considered the fact that it would be paying into the pension fund so much money for him. As I say, the company had paid in approximately $4,450. I think any sound business would consider that fact.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is it our policy, or we making it our policy and our practice, to require one who receives an appointment to an official position in the Government, an appointment which is subject to confirmation by the Senate, to surrender and sacrifice whatever his labors have earned for him up to the time of his appointment, in order to make himself eligible for appointment to an official position in the Government?

Mr. HILL. I will say to my distinguished friend from Arkansas that, of course, I cannot determine the policy; but the opposition on the part of the minority to Mr. Beeson does not go to that question. It goes to the proposition that Mr. Beeson said that he had resigned, when he had not resigned, but had been placed on leave of absence. It goes to the proposition that Mr. Beeson was not candid and frank with the committee. He was evasive. He misled and deceived the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to understand that point, if the Senator from Alabama will yield further.

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. At the moment I am not challenging the position taken by the minority; I am merely trying to ascertain whether we make it a requirement, or are initiating a new policy, that anyone appointed to a Government position requiring confirmation by the Senate must divest himself of all interest he may have and must sacrifice anything he may have earned by his labors in the nature of a pension benefit in order to become eligible to hold office. That is what I am trying to decide. Apparently we are setting a new precedent, as I see it.

Mr. HILL. In the first place, I could not answer for the whole Senate on a question of policy, as the Senator realizes. As I say, the question he raises, although it is a good question, is not the question upon which the minority bases its opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Beeson.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand. However, is it the policy of the minority that such a requirement and such an exaction should be imposed upon one who has been an employee of a private company? The Senator from Alabama, I take it, is not premising his objection to the nomination of Mr. Beeson on the theory that, because he had not completely severed his relations with his employer, he is not therefore eligible. But the Senator is premising his objections to Mr. Beeson's nomination on the ground that he was not frank and candid but evasive and did not reveal, when he had the opportunity to do so, his real situation, as under all the implications and the questions asked, he should have done, including his investment and his rights under the pension fund. Therefore it is not a question of whether he was entitled to it or whether he had sacrificed it. The premise of the objection of the minority is that when asked these questions he was not frank and was not candid and did not reveal what the committee had a right to expect him to reveal in view of the questions that were propounded to him. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly right. That is the story exactly. In the debate earlier today the testimony of Mr. Durkin was referred to. He came before the committee. He did not say he had resigned. He said very frankly, "I am on a leave of absence." That testimony was in contradistinction with the testimony of Mr. Beeson, who said he had resigned, when he had not resigned at all, but was on leave of absence. He testified he had lost his pension rights in making the severance from the company. The fact is that he would retain those rights so long as he was on leave of absence granted by the company. Such a leave of absence had been granted until December 1954 when the term to which he had been nominated would expire.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama a question. Is it or is it not a fact that when Mr. Beeson left the company the company stopped paying into the pension fund any amount on his behalf, and that he in turn stopped paying into the fund any amount which he as an employee would normally have to pay into that fund? In other words, at that point, whether it was December 31, or whatever the termination date was, he lost any of his rights so far as building up the fund was concerned during any alleged leave of absence?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from California is correct in this respect, that when Mr. Beeson came to Washington and went on the Government payroll the company did not make any payment into the pension for him at all. While he was on the leave of absence the $4,450 which the company had already paid into the pension fund was held for him, to be for his benefit if he came back to the company.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am concerned with the statement which the Senator made with reference to Mr. Beeson having concealed something. Mr. Beeson gave this testimony during his second appearance in answer to a question by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from New Jersey will bear with me a little I shall read the exact testimony, and Senators can then reach their own conclusions.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The paragraph I should like to read is as follows:

Senator LEHMAN. What is the value of the pension rights which you are severing?

Mr. BEESON. Well, I have only been with that company 7 years. I was eligible after 1 year. The company has been, at my salary range, putting in about $110 to $115 per month. I should know, that is my business, but I am not exactly sure. One hundred twenty dollars a month perhaps; it cannot be more than that. I also have been contributing to it. If at the end of 6 months I have not returned to employment with the company—and there is no possibility of that, since this does not vest until 10 years, and only partially then—all the company's contributions go back to the fund. They do not go back to the company under the Treasury regulations. My money is returned to me at 2 percent interest. I have no further pension benefits.

Mr. HILL. On page 25 of the hearings Mr. Beeson stated:

I have lost my pension rights in making this severance.

Later, when the Senator from New York asked him what the value of his pension rights was, he stated how much they had amounted to and what the value was. He said if he did not return to the company in 6 months they were all gone. The truth is he had been given a leave of absence for 12 months. He was nominated on January 8, and he was given a leave of absence until December 1954.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I was going to read from the testimony.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to have the Senator yield at that point.

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the RECORD should be perfectly clear with respect to one point. The Senator made the observation that when Mr. Beeson had terminated his employment with the company, he went on the United States payroll. Of course, Mr. Beeson did not get an interim appointment. He is not on the Government payroll. He is off his company's payroll, and until his nomination is confirmed by the Senate he is not on the Government payroll. So, actually, he is now serving without compensation. I believe the RECORD should be clear on that point.

Mr. HILL. He is now on a leave of absence. I wish to read to the Senate the press release.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it correct to say that he is not now on the Government payroll?

Mr. HILL. He is not now on the Government payroll. He could not get on it without the consent of the United States Senate. That is why we are here this afternoon. I read from the press release which his company issued:

San Jose, Calif., January 15, 1954

Mr. President, it should be borne in mind that January 15, 1954, was 5 days before Mr. Beeson appeared before the committee and testified the first time. The first time he appeared before the committee was January 20.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *January 15, 1954.*

Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. President Paul L. Davies announced today that the position vacancy created by the appointment of FMC's industrial relations director, Albert C. Beeson, to the National Labor Relations Board in Washington, D. C., would be filled by Warren R. Philbrook.

Mr. Philbrook is currently in charge of the industrial-relations activities of FMC's chemical divisions, New York City. His new assignment is effective February 1 and will continue until December 1954, coinciding with Mr. Beeson's leave of absence from the corporation to fill an unexpired term on the NLRB. During his absence from FMC's chemical divisions, Mr. Philbrook's regular responsibilities will be assumed by his assistant, Mr. S. A. Pond.

Mr. Davies confirmed the fact that Mr. Beeson had not resigned, that he was on a leave of absence, that Mr. Philbrook had been placed in his position, and that another gentleman had been placed in Mr. Philbrook's position.

Mr. Beeson testified that he had no plans to return to the company, although he had previously stated to a reporter of the San Jose Mercury and News that he did expect to return upon the completion of the 1-year term on the National Labor Relations Board, to which he had been appointed. We know that he categorically denied to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that he had made that statement to a newspaper reporter. Afterward he came before the committee and admitted that he had made it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Are we to understand that Mr. Beeson testified he had no plans to return to the company, although his leave of absence was to coincide with the claimed date on which the president of the company said Mr. Beeson expected to return.

Mr. HILL. He said he expected to return to employment with the company and afterward he denied it before the committee.

Mr. LONG. Did he lead the committee to believe that he did not expect to go back to the company?

Mr. HILL. He said he had no commitment and no plans to go back. He had previously said he expected to go back.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GRISWOLD. I should like to interpose a question at that point in partial answer to the question of the Senator from Louisiana. I read from page 25 of the hearings:

I make no promise that if I am ever offered a job again by that company or another company, I won't consider it.

When he made that statement to the committee he left himself open to return to the company. There was no commitment to return and there was no commitment on the part of the company to call him back, but he did mention the possibility of his returning to the company.

Mr. Davies testified, later on, that what was going through his mind was that it was a leave of absence; that he wanted Mr. Beeson to come back; that he had sent other employees to perform service for the Government, and most of them had remained in such service.

There is involved a difference in terminology. Mr. Davies considered it a leave of absence, and Mr. Beeson was very candid in saying he had severed his ties, but he did hold open the possibility that he might return to the company.

Mr. HILL. There is no question about what was the attitude of the company. According to Mr. Davies' testimony, when a man took a job with the Government he was given a leave of absence. It was what Mr. Davies called preferred consideration for the purpose of holding a man's pension rights to benefit him if he returned to the service of the company. There is no question of the fact that 5 days before Mr. Beeson came before the committee the company announced that he was on leave of absence, which meant he retained his pension rights and his right of preferred consideration for return to the company.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The statement to which the Senator refers was issued in the name of the company, was it not?

Mr. HILL. It is dated at San Jose, Calif., January 15, 1954.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the president of the company made the announcement, which was carried in the newspapers, and the president of the company made note of the changes in personnel which would take place if Mr. Beeson's pending appointment to the National Labor Relations Board were effectuated.

Mr. HILL. That is the gist of it. Mr. Beeson wrote the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] that before making a decision he wanted to talk to the president of the company and he also said he wanted to talk to his wife. Of course, he had talked to the president of the company. I do not see how any reasonable man could make any contention that he did not talk to the president of the company. He gave the committee the idea that he had severed all relations with the company.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. Davies, the president of the company, made the announcement that the gentleman who was to take Mr. Philbrook's place in the New York office, I believe, would be in that place until December 1954. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. He said:

Mr. Philbrook is currently in charge of the industrial relations activities of FMC's chemicals divisions, New York City. His new assignment is effective February 1, and will continue until December 1954, coinciding with Mr. Beeson's leave of absence from the corporation to fill an unexpired term on the NLRB. During his absence from FMC's chemical divisions, Mr. Philbrook's regular responsibilities will be assumed by his assistant, Mr. S. A. Pond.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So it is true, is it not, that the date seems to be a continuing date, a repetitive date, in the relationship which concerns Mr. Beeson and his leave of absence from the company and his possible return to the company? Is that a correct statement?

Mr. HILL. The record absolutely shows that to be so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the press release to which the Senator has referred the same one which Mr. Beeson later repudiated?

Mr. HILL. No. The press release which he repudiated and later admitted was a press release appeared in the San Jose Mercury and News on the morning of January 8. In it Mr. Beeson was quoted as making this statement:

The nomination by President Eisenhower is for a 1-year term.

We are now in mid-February, and the appointment runs until December of this year.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The nomination by President Eisenhower is for a 1-year term. I expect at this time I shall return to my duties with Food Machinery at the completion of this period.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the statement which appeared in the San Jose newspaper with which Mr. Beeson took some issue. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is that the statement which the publisher of the newspaper later said had been made?

Mr. HILL. The publisher, Mr. Conn, said it had been made, and Mr. Beeson himself later admitted to the committee that it had been made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it fair to assume from the statements which the Senator has made and from the debate which has taken place so far that one would be led to believe that the relationship between Mr. Beeson and the president of the company was a normal relationship? When they talked about the matter of Mr. Beeson going into Federal service the term or phrase "leave of absence" seems to come to the forefront repeatedly in press statements as well as in testimony before the committee?

Mr. HILL. That is true. There was no doubt in the mind of Mr. Davies, the president of the company, as to what was meant by the words "leave of absence."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would it be fair to assume that if there was a doubt as to the meaning of the phrase, or some misapprehension or confusion concerning it, it would be indicative of a not very appreciative or sound understanding of normal business relationships? In other words, does it not seem that the president of the company would know what he was talking about, and does it not appear that if anyone had any doubt as to what was being talked about, there would be some repairing of the record, rather than a searching inquiry to find out whether it was a leave of absence or a sacrifice of pension rights? Is it not patent on its face that there seems to be a great deal of covering up and backtracking?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Minnesota is correct. The record absolutely confirms what he has said.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. In response to the question by the Senator from Minnesota, I point out that on January 20 Mr. Beeson said he had completely severed his relationship with Food Machinery.

On January 22, he stated that he had resigned as director of industrial relations.

On February 2, the majority report said that Mr. Beeson had resigned his position as industrial relations director. It was not until the San Jose Mercury story had been brought to the attention of the committee that we became aware of the statement made by Mr. Beeson that he expected to return to the company; that he had not resigned but was on leave of absence.

When Mr. Beeson came before our committee, the Senator from New York asked him if he had made that statement. Mr. Beeson denied having made it.

The editor of the San Jose Mercury then telegraphed the committee that the newspaper stood by the statement.

Mr. Beeson then came before the committee and said that because the Senator from New York had stated the date of January 7, he was under the impression that the Senator from New York was referring to a different story which had appeared in the newspapers to the effect that Vice President NIXON was supporting Mr. Beeson's candidacy.

With respect to this second denial, the editor of the San Jose Mercury later wired the committee that the newspaper also stood by that statement, that Mr. Beeson had said to them that Mr. NIXON was supporting Mr. Beeson's candidacy, and that he had not been misquoted.

Then it finally developed that Mr. Beeson was on a leave of absence, and would have to return to the company if he wanted to collect the $4,500 which the company had put into his pension fund.

Mr. HILL. With reference to the question of the severance of Mr. Beeson's connections with the company, at the hearing on January 20, the first day when Mr. Beeson appeared to testify, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] asked:

And you have completely severed your relationship with the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.?

Mr. Beeson replied:

Yes, sir.

On January 22, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] inquired:

Would you care to tell us how completely the severance is of your connection with the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.?

Mr. Beeson replied:

I resigned as director of industrial relations. I have no agreement of any kind, oral or written, requiring my return after the end of this assignment. I have lost my pension rights in making this severance.

On February 2, at page 102 of the hearings, Mr. Beeson testified in response to questions, as follows:

Senator HILL. Did you tender a written resignation?

Mr. BEESON. No, sir.

Senator HILL. You did not tender a written resignation?

Mr. BEESON. No, sir; but I did an oral resignation, to the board of directors.

At the same hearing, on page 94, the following question and answer appear:

Senator IVES. You have severed completely your connection with the corporation, have you not?

Mr. BEESON. Yes, sir.

At a later date, the committee had the opportunity of hearing a witness having knowledge of, but not being directly involved in the controversy, Mr. Paul Davies, president of the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. At the hearings on February 5, Mr. Davies testified as follows, as appears on page 191:

Senator LEHMAN. Mr. Davies, may I ask you whether Mr. Beeson has orally resigned from your company?

Mr. DAVIES. No, sir; he has not.

That was Mr. Davies, president of the company, testifying. He is the man to whom Mr. Beeson, in his letter to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], said he would have to talk before he made his decision about the appointment to the board.

It should be remembered that Mr. Davies said that Mr. Beeson had not resigned, but on page 101 of the record, Mr. Beeson made this statement:

Mr. BEESON. I have made the statement that I have resigned and severed my relationship, and the president of the company has confirmed that.

Let us see further what Mr. Davies said. I have called attention to the fact that the company was convinced that Mr. Beeson would be on leave of absence. Mr. Davies testified on February 5, at page 202 of the hearings, as follows:

Mr. DAVIES. The present status, sir, is that I have granted Mr. Beeson a leave of absence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did Mr. Davies make that statement following the assertions and the statements of Mr. Beeson that he had resigned orally; and was it following the letter to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], wherein Mr. Beeson said he would, of course, have to consult with the president of the company? In other words, does the statement by Mr. Davies conform with all the statements to which I have referred to?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Davies referred to all the statements to which the Senator from Minnesota has alluded. In fact, Mr. Davies was the last witness to be heard, and the only statement made at all, other than Mr. Davies' statement after Mr. Davies once took the stand, was the statement to which I shall advert a little later, a statement made at the time the chairman of the committee asked Mr. Beeson if he would resign now, and to which Mr. Beeson replied that he would resign now.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GRISWOLD. I think it is clear from all the discussion that there is confusion in terminology as between Mr. Davies and Mr. Beeson. I hope the Senator from Alabama, before he completes his remarks, will read the testimony of Mr. Davies at the bottom of page 191 and the top of page 192, in which Mr. Davies said:

I have had some experience with the term "leave of absence" and in different companies it is construed in different ways.

He then continued to discuss what he meant.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that there is no question about how "leave of absence" was construed by the Food Machinery & Chemicals Corp., because Mr. Davies said how it was construed by his company. This was not the first time such a situation had arisen. The company had had a numbers of persons leave its service to take employment with the Government. Mr. Davies' exact word was "practice."

A practice is something that is continuing. It does not happen only once; it happens on a number of occasions over a period of time. And the practice was to grant a leave of absence as Mr. Davies testified.

Mr. GRISWOLD. The Senator from Alabama is correct, but the Senator does not know what was in the mind of Mr. Beeson during the period of these discussions.

Mr. HILL. I could not know what was in Mr. Beeson's mind. Every day such matters are being threshed out. Courts have such problems before them day after day. It is not possible for a judge or a jury to know what is in the mind of a witness or in the mind of a defendant. We must act as reasonable men. We know what language means. We know what is meant by common speech, or when ordinary terms are used.

Mr. GRISWOLD. If the Senator from Alabama will allow me to complete my thought, I refer now to page 202 of the hearings, the interrogation of Mr. Davies by the committee. Mr. Davies said:

> The present status, sir, is that I have granted Mr. Beeson a leave of absence. If Mr. Beeson should decide to submit a written resignation to the company, then he would automatically forfeit the $4,424, and he would automatically forfeit any obligation on the part of the company to rehire him.

Mr. HILL. Yes—"on the part of the company to rehire him."

Mr. GRISWOLD. That is correct.

I continue:

> Senator COOPER. The substance of your statement, I gather, is that you took action on your own to say it was a leave of absence.
> Mr. DAVIES. That is right, sir.
> Senator COOPER. And Mr. Beeson has not participated in that decision?
> Mr. DAVIES. That is right, sir.

Mr. HILL. Certainly that is right. Does an employee grant a leave of absence to himself? I never heard of such a proposition as that. It is the president or the head of the company, the person in charge, who grants a leave of absence.

Mr. GRISWOLD. I am willing to concede what Mr. Davies considered to be a leave of absence; but that is not the point at issue.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Davies said it was the practice to grant leaves of absence.

Mr. GRISWOLD. The question is whether Mr. Beeson was telling the truth in his statement to the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to ask, for the purpose of the record, relative to the severance of Mr. Beeson's relationship with the company, is it not correct that Mr. Beeson went off the payroll of the company on December 31, 1953, or whatever the date may have been?

Mr. HILL. I am not certain the exact date is not in the record. From what I know of the record of the case, I should think that would be about the date.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then, is it not correct that Mr. Beeson gave up his office space in the offices of the company?

Mr. HILL. Yes, I would say he did that; and since his nomination, which was on January 8, and I suppose perhaps before his nomination, it would not have been unusual, if he knew he was to be nominated, to advise the company that he expected to be nominated, and then to come to Washington. I think he has been in Washington most of the time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it also correct that as of that date the company stopped paying into the pension fund their part of the contribution to the pension, and that Mr. Beeson stopped paying into the pension fund his part of the contribution?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly correct. I thought I had so stated previously. If the Senator wishes to have me say it again, I am delighted to confirm the statement. It is absolutely correct. However, the question is not whether Mr. Beeson is getting the benefit of the pension from the fund into which he has paid and into which the company has paid.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It seems to me, in all fairness, that Mr. Beeson has severed his relationship, so far as normal usage of the English language is concerned. He went off the payroll. He gave up his office. A successor was selected to take his place in the business. He stopped paying into the pension fund. The company stopped paying into the pension fund on his behalf. He not only went off the payroll of the company, but, because of the delay in the confirmation of his nomination, he has not gone on the payroll of the Federal Government. On being offered a position, he came to Washington, at a considerable sacrifice to himself. Apparently Mr. Davies, the president of the company, did not want Mr. Beeson to lose the right to benefit from the pension fund which he had enjoyed during his association with the company, even though he had completely severed his relationship with it, so far as normal usage of the English language is concerned. It was not desired that Mr. Beeson, who is not a wealthy man in any sense of the word, lose what he had earned under the pension fund, in view of the possibility that at some time in the future he might elect to come back to the company, though that was not certain either in Mr. Beeson's mind or in the company's mind.

So, in order that Mr. Beeson would not be called upon to make that additional sacrifice while serving the Government of the United States, Mr. Davies referred to a "leave of absence."

Then, under questioning by members of the committee, and because Mr. Beeson apparently felt, at that time at least, that members of the committee had some question in their minds as to whether there was a conflict of interest, Mr. Beeson said: "If you want to take that away from me, as of the date of my confirmation I will put in a written resignation, which will cut me loose from that pension fund also."

If the Senate desires to demand the last pound of flesh, I suppose the Senate has a right to do so. But it seems to me that when this man of modest means, who has had wide experience in the field of labor relations, is willing to come to Washington and serve his Government, a man as to whose integrity or loyalty to his Government no question has been raised, such an attitude should not be taken. Finally, in desperation, he says, "If you want to take that away from me, all right. Take that also."

That is the situation the Senate is facing today. There is no indication on the record that Mr. Beeson has deliberately tried to misrepresent facts to the committee. I am quite willing to admit there may have been confusion because of the interpretation which Mr. Davies placed on the severance of Mr. Beeson, and the interpretation which Mr. Beeson placed on his severance. If we can get into the public service, men who have the record for integrity, ability, and service to his community which Mr. Beeson has, the Government of the United States will be better off.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Mr. Beeson finally said, at the last minute, on the last day of the hearings, he would do that which he assured the committee he had already done. He had assured the committee he had resigned. At the last minute, at the last hour, so to speak, of the last hearing, Mr. Beeson said, in response to a question from the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], "If that is what the committee wants, I will do that which I said I have already done." He said he would resign. He had previously insisted before the committee that he had completely severed his connection with the company. The word "completely" is about as conclusive a word as can be found in the dictionary. He had insisted that he had resigned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to make just one point, in view of the remarks of the distinguished majority leader. I do not think the RECORD ought to be left standing as it is or as indicating that the minority in their opposition to Mr. Beeson's nomination are opposing him because they wanted to see that he gave up this, so to speak, last ounce of flesh, the pension. That is not the issue at all. The issue is, What did Mr. Beeson say about leave of absence, resignation, and pension? Those are not words which require a Harvard degree to understand. They are words which any senior in high school understands. I think it is commonly understood in business that leave of absence is not the same as being fired or resigning. I am sure that the employees who have been dismissed from the Government do not think they have a leave of absence. I am sure they know they are fired. We have been told they have been dismissed, and I am sure they do not think they have a leave of absence. I am sure that in being dismissed they have not been told they have a leave of absence. I do not know of any businessmen who become confused in determining the difference between leave of absence, resignation, and being fired. If a man is going to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board he ought not to confuse those terms, because he may find that a lot of employees will

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

want to give themselves leaves of absence.

Mr. HILL. I may say to my colleague that Mr. Beeson is supposed to have been dealing in the field of personnel. His previous work has been in the field of personnel.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, information regarding Mr. Beeson's educational background should aid all who are interested in the pending question to determine whether the appointee's numerous falsifications shown by the record are the result of innocent confusion or unholy intention.

Among the few statements Mr. Beeson made to the committee which have not been disproved or discredited are the following:

I was born in 1906; educated in Kansas City and St. Louis and Stanford University, where I received my bachelor of arts in 1928 in economics. I received my master of business administration at New York University, in business administration, in 1931.

About a year later I was invited to become industrial relations director for the National Union Radio Corp., a subsidiary of Philco, in Newark, N. J., with plants in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. There for 4 years I had experience largely with the old United Electrical and Radio Workers, and the general industrial relations problems of that kind of a plant. There were about 5,000 people in our 3 plants.

In 1947 I came to California as industrial relations director for the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. That company, with whom I have been associated until now, is a medium-sized company with about 13,000 employees, scattered across the United States in relatively small plants.

In addition to the foregoing, Mr. Beeson has served as an instructor in Rutgers College. In the circumstances, let us not shed any more crocodile tears because of the preposterous contention that Mr. Beeson did not know the difference between a resignation of his Food Machinery Corporation office or employment, on the one hand, and a duly granted leave of absence from that company for a short and specified period of time, on the other. If all Senators had the opportunity and patience to hear a complete exposition of the record, I believe that an overwhelming majority of them would become convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt that Mr. Beeson knowingly and intentionally made no fewer than five positive statements which have been proved to be as false as the statement of Ananias for which he was struck dead for lying. And I make no apology for using a biblical word for the telling of an untruth.

In the solemn discharge of our duty today let us remember that—

A lie may keep
Its throne a whole age longer, if it skulk
Behind the shield of some fair-seeming name.

And that—

Men in earnest have no time to waste
In patching fig leaves for the naked truth.

Let no one impute to me any partisanship in this important matter. In the committee that reported the pending nomination I moved the confirmation of Mr. Durkin, whom President Eisenhower appointed Secretary of Labor. And I have either supported or refrained from opposing every other nomination President Eisenhower has made which has come before that committee. I am fighting Mr. Beeson's confirmation for a reason identical with that which impelled me to oppose and help defeat the nomination of a man whom President Truman appointed Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia. That man was the President's friend. The appointee made his statement to the Committee on the District of Columbia, of which I was then the chairman and over which I, on the occasion in question, presided. And like Mr. Beeson he testified falsely. He later returned to the committee and attempted to rehabilitate himself just as Mr. Beeson has done. Subsequently President Truman, by whose side I sat in this body for almost a dozen years and whom I hold in the highest esteem, telephoned me an urgent request to support the confirmation of his appointee. I told him that I could not vote for the confirmation of any man who had intentionally lied on the hearing held to determine his qualifications for office.

My distinguished friend from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], who is now in the Chamber, was at the time to which I have just referred a diligent member of the Committee on the District of Columbia which rejected the Truman nomination. I trust that the Senator will remember the similarity of the record in that case to the record in the Beeson case which is now before us.

Let me protest the suggestion that was made by a distinguished Member a little while ago to the effect that the Democratic members of the committee, in submitting their minority report in strictly parliamentary language concerning Mr. Beeson's mendacity, insulted the President of the United States and thereby, in effect, charged him with the commission of some outrageous offense. In my opinion, all the Senators who signed the minority report are as innocent of any intention or desire to insult or censure the President for having appointed Mr. Beeson a member of the National Labor Relations Board as they are of censuring or blaming Jesus of Nazareth for having chosen as one of his disciples Judas Iscariot who later betrayed the Savior of the world. The minority members of the committee are as free from attempting to insult President Eisenhower in this matter as they are of blaming the immortal Washington for having appointed to an important military post, Benedict Arnold, who later proved to be the most infamous traitor in the history of the Nation. I doubt whether anyone—the President included—knew before the completion of the record before us how very untruthful Mr. Beeson is. In opposing the present nomination, I am trying to protect President Eisenhower against an increase of the confusion and troubles that are devastating his administration.

I am supporting the President in his opposition to the Bricker amendment more loyally than are 30 or more Senators of the President's own party. Let me cordially invite them to join me in protecting the President against both the Beeson confirmation and the Bricker amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me, to permit me to make a comment?

Mr. HILL. Let me inquire how long the comment will be, in view of the fact that some rather long comments have already been made. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. My comment will be very brief.

Mr. HILL. Very well; I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, Mr. President, I do not wish any Senator to become too excited or disturbed over the situation, for we should deal only with the facts. Certainly it is not proper to compare Mr. Beeson with Judas Iscariot or with Benedict Arnold. Certainly my colleague would not subscribe to the doctrine of guilt by association.

Mr. NEELY. I made no such comparison but simply pointed to the fact that certain Senators had been denounced for insulting the President by making the minority report.

My reference to Judas Iscariot and Benedict Arnold was as far from an intention to compare Mr. Beeson to these traitors as this Chamber is from the most distant star.

Mr. President, the Republican Party has much trouble now, but it will soon have more if Mr. Beeson is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we, too, wish to keep the record straight in connection with this matter.

I know the nominee is opposed by the Americans for Democratic Action, by the CIO, and by other organizations. However, I know the nominee has an excellent background; and if the record is carefully gone into, I believe it will show that he did not deliberately misrepresent the situation, and that he had severed his connection with the company, except with respect to his pension rights; and even as to them, he had severed his connection from the company, from the point of view that no further contributions were to come either from the company or from himself.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, Mr. Beeson's right to a pension has nothing whatever to do with my opposition to his confirmation. But his false testimony about that matter is one of the various efficient causes of my endeavor to prevent him from becoming a member of the most important Labor Board in the world.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield, so that I may reply to the remarks made about me by the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. HILL. I yield for that purpose, if it is understood that in doing so, I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, my distinguished friend, the Senator from West Virginia, was a great deal off base when he stated to this august body that I was a member of the subcommittee which heard the testimony of the man

who had been nominated to be recorder of deeds. I was not a member of that subcommittee. I never saw the nominee; I never heard his testimony. However, at a later date I read it. It is my opinion that he testified in a subcommittee of which I was not even a member.

I point out that the testimony he gave was rank, pure, and unadulterated perjury, all the way. Consequently, no proper comparison can be made between his testimony and the testimony of the nominee we are now considering.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho says that he was not present at that hearing, his statement is accepted as gospel so far as I am concerned. But he was a member of the committee at that time.

Mr. WELKER. I was a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, but I certainly was not a member of the subcommittee which heard that testimony.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator from Idaho was always so faithful in his attendance upon the committee meetings that I assumed he was present at that time. I am sorry that my assumption was not correct. Of course, the Senator was familiar with the case.

Mr. WELKER. I read the record; naturally I did that.

On the other hand, to compare the record in that case with the record in the case now before us would be a great injustice, I say to my friend the Senator from West Virginia.

I am not playing politics in this matter, either. I am thinking of a fellow human being whom I have never seen in my life.

I am not interested in what someone may telegraph to me in an attempt to tell me what I should do. I wish to do what is right to my fellowmen.

Whether the nominee is the best man for the job to which he has been nominated is a question for the President of the United States to decide. I dislike to see us engage in rancor and bitterness about a man whose life may be ruined as a result of this debate.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, however much we should like to have this cup pass from our lips, we have a very definite and fixed responsibility. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, in connection with this nomination we must recall that the Founding Fathers who wrote the Constitution provided that the President should select the persons to serve in various governmental positions, but that the appointments would not become effective unless the United States Senate advised and consented to them.

So, Mr. President, it is a fixed, constitutional, solemn duty, and responsibility which we are now called upon to fulfill in this situation.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate by long references to the testimony of Mr. Beeson—for instance, his testimony that he lost his pension rights, although in fact he had not.

Had Mr. Beeson, as he testified, lost his pension rights?

In his first appearance before the committee on January 20, Mr. Beeson testified—page 4:

Senator MURRAY. And you have completely severed your relationship with the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.?

Mr. BEESON. Yes, sir.

On his next appearance on January 22 he testified—pages 24 and 25:

Senator LEHMAN. Would you care to tell us how completely the severance is of your connection with the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.?

Mr. BEESON. I resigned. I have lost my pension rights in making this severance.

* * * * *

Mr. BEESON. If at the end of 6 months I have not returned to the company—and there is no possibility of that—all the company's contributions go back to the fund. My money is returned to me at 2 percent interest. I have no further pension benefits.

However, as I have indicated, the company president, Mr. Davies, announced on January 15—page 88—5 days before Mr. Beeson first testified before the committee, that Mr. Beeson had been placed on leave of absence from the corporation until December 1954, and Mr. Davies testified on February 5 with regard to leaves of absence—pages 179–180:

Mr. DAVIES. It (leave of absence) gives them a right to a preferred consideration, sir. It does not give them the guaranty that the job which they left will be available when they return.

Senator HILL. It holds for them their rights in the pension plan, does it not?

Mr. DAVIES. That is right, sir.

Senator HILL. In other words, whatever benefits they may have in the pension plan at the time they leave, such benefits as sums of money which your company has paid into the plan, when they go on leave of absence they hold those rights?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, sir; provided they return within the time for which the leave of absence is granted.

Senator HILL. Mr. Beeson has a leave, so your release said until next December; is that right?

Mr. DAVIES. That is right, sir.

Senator HILL. So under this leave he would retain his rights to your pension plan.

Mr. DAVIES. He would retain his rights provided he returned to the company.

Senator HILL. In other words, he retains those rights if he comes back and would be beneficiary of any sums you have already paid into the pension plan for him?

Mr. DAVIES. Would you like to know the sum?

Senator HILL. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. $4,424.50.

These are statements by Mr. Davies, the president of the company. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] asked Mr. Davies the following question:

Could Mr. Beeson sever relationship completely with your company—

That was what Mr. Beeson testified before the committee he had done. He had testified that he had completely severed his relationship.

Could Mr. Beeson sever relationship completely with your company by submitting a formal written resignation, and yet return to the company at some future date and maintain his rights to the company's contribution to the pension fund?

Mr. DAVIES. Definitely not, sir. Not only not retain his right to the contribution but the company would have no obligation, obviously, to give him preferential treatment in the event he wished to return.

Mr. Davies continued:

If there is a resignation, Mr. Beeson does two things: He forfeits any rights that he would have to any of the company's share of this (sic) $4,424 that has been contributed and in the second place, the company has no obligation whatsoever to reemploy him.

Mr. Davies further stated:

The present status, sir, is that I have granted Mr. Beeson a leave of absence. If Mr. Beeson should decide to submit a written resignation to the company, then he would automatically forfeit the $4,424, and he would automatically forfeit any obligation on the part of the company to rehire him.

Let me emphasize again that Mr. Beeson first testified that he had completely severed his relation with the company and had thereby lost his pension rights, and that, in any event, if he did not return to the company within 6 months such rights would be lost under the plan. But, as I have shown, Mr. Davies categorically denied the truth of both these assertions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Let me complete this statement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to make a comment which is pertinent at this point.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate that. I have tried to be courteous and generous. Let me complete my statement, if I may.

When confronted with these outright contradictions, Mr. Beeson in a belated and dramatic announcement from the rear of the hearing room attempted to clear the record of the foregoing discrepancies and, at the same time, strike a bargain with the United States Senate. When asked by the chairman if he would now submit a resignation to take effect upon his confirmation, he replied, and I quote:

Yes, sir. In the light of the time of the Government that is being wasted, and the work that is to be done, I submit that we are quibbling while Rome burns, and I am perfectly willing to make my sacrifice. I would like to add that I think it is setting a very unfortunate precedent for businessmen who have perhaps much larger pensions at stake, but my wife and I are glad to make the sacrifice. If that will make the Democratic side happier and more content in their minds, I am glad to do that.

In regard to that statement made by Mr. Beeson, the president of the company, Mr. Davies, when he was on the witness stand, said he was dumbfounded. Why did Mr. Davies voluntarily, on the impulse of the moment, make the statement that he was dumbfounded? No doubt because he knew that Mr. Beeson knew that he had leave of absence, and what the leave of absence meant so far as reemployment and pension rights were concerned, but that now he was giving up all that. In this statement Mr. Beeson said he would do what he had unequivocally stated he had already done.

In my opinion the Senate is entitled in the first instance to full disclosure from nominees. It is a rather strange

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and distressing situation that a committee of the Senate, in the consideration of a nomination for a high quasi-judicial office in our Government, is required to ferret out facts and supply rebuttal witnesses in order to get the testimony and the facts which should come freely from the nominee himself.

We can only speculate as to why Mr. Beeson was so reluctant to divulge the true status with regard to his pension; but it is clear that if the minority had not been alert, Mr. Beeson would have taken his seat on the National Labor Relations Board, and at the same time would have retained a direct pecuniary interest in the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.

It is also clear that but for the insistence of the minority on getting the facts and the truth, Mr. Beeson would not have been impelled to make the statement he did, in an apparent attempt to bargain with the Senate. Had we not been meticulous he would have succeeded in concealing his true status from the Senate. In my opinion his evasion and secretiveness amounted to a flouting of the United States Senate.

Did Mr. Beeson make a false statement to the committee when he stated that he had not made the statement appearing in the San Jose Mercury, that he expected to return to the company? The San Jose Mercury quoted the statement, which was made on January 7, and published on January 8, as follows:

The nomination by President Eisenhower is for a 1-year term. I expect at this time that I shall return to my duties with Food Machinery upon completion of this period, if it is granted me through Senate approval.

The quotation was read to Mr. Beeson, and his response was:

In the first place, I would like to correct something, sir. The reporter who is quoted as having sent that, Wes Peyton, is in this city. I did not say that. He apologized Wednesday morning to me for having so interpreted it. I got back from San Jose that night from being here in Washington, having seen Mr. Eisenhower. I was almost sick to read that quote. I made no quote. I had no appointment, and it was not up to me to say such a thing.

At this point, it appeared from Mr. Beeson's testimony that Mr. Beeson had been misquoted, and that the newspaper had printed an untrue story. But the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] wired the editor of the San Jose Mercury asking him about the story and received the following response:

Albert C. Beeson's statement was in January 8 edition of San Jose Mercury. Mr. Beeson did make that statement to one of our reporters. He did not make it to Wes Peyton as he testified. Wes Peyton did not apologize to Mr. Beeson. Repeat San Jose Mercury did not misquote Mr. Beeson. We are setting this straight for the record in Thursday morning's Mercury. Will airmail you clippings.

It is clear from the foregoing that somebody was not telling the truth and even Mr. Beeson perceived this. Consequently, he requested, and was granted, an opportunity to reappear before the committee. At this meeting he admitted—pages 89–90—that he had made the statement which the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] read to him, but, he explained, he had confused that statement with another newspaper article in which he had been quoted as claiming, or hoping for, the support of Vice President NIXON. I wish to point out that nowhere in the quotation read by the Senator from New York did the distinguished Vice President's name appear. Furthermore, the quotation was read slowly and clearly and there was nothing to indicate that Mr. Beeson had misunderstood. I wish also to point out that one of Mr. Beeson's alleged grounds for his confusion of the two quotations was that, at the time of his denial, he had not seen the news item to which the Senator from New York referred. I submit that this was immaterial. Mr. Beeson stated flatly: "I did not make that statement." To my mind the fact that he had not seen his statement in print, had no bearing whatsoever on the question of whether he did or did not make the statement. In my opinion this explanation, far from justifying the original misstatement, compounds it. At this point, serious question is raised as to whether Mr. Beeson was deliberately attempting to mislead the Senate.

Mr. President, I have raised several fundamental questions, such as Mr. Beeson's statement that he had severed all connection with the company when he had not; his statement as to his resignation, when he had not resigned; his statement as to the loss of his pension rights, when he had not lost them; his denial of the statement which he gave to the San Jose Mercury, and his subsequent admission that his earlier statement was not true.

I submit that if anyone will review the printed record and analyze the conflicting and evasive testimony contained therein, he will be convinced, as I am, that the nominee mislead and deceived the Senate committee, and that the nomination now under consideration should not be confirmed.

I firmly believe that we cannot confirm this nomination for this high judicial office and at the same time honestly discharge our duty under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In an effort to keep passion out of this discussion, and get at the facts, I should like to read to the Senator from Alabama from page 191 of the record.

In the summation of the Senator's argument he stated that he had brought up the matter of severance, the matter of resignation, and the assumption on the part of the nominee that he would lose his pension rights.

The Senator from Arizona keeps returning to this point: He is convinced that the nominee was confused. Having been an employer during my lifetime, I can recognize the confusion which might exist in a man's mind when he says to his boss, "I am going to quit," and then assumes all the things that might go with such action. I read from page 191, this being a quotation from previous testimony:

Mr. BEESON. I won't argue the point. I have made the statement I have resigned and severed my relationship and the president of the company has confirmed.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] then directed his next remark to Mr. Davies:

I think you are president of the company.

Mr. DAVIES. That is right. I think terminology is a very difficult thing. Mr. Beeson told me that he was leaving.

That confirms the argument we have been advancing, that Mr. Beeson did inform an official of the company that he was leaving.

Continuing the quotation:

When he told me he was leaving, I told him I was sure he understood that there was nothing that the company could do for him. We could not pay his moving expenses back here. We could not contribute to his pension plan, that he was entirely on his own, and that he knew that he was going to take a terrific financial beating. He did sever all connections with our company, except that it is our policy to give leaves of absence.

Mr. HILL. Let me say that previously Mr. Davies had explained what he meant by a leave of absence. Of course, the Senator from Arizona has read correctly what he said. He said "leave of absence." That is the nub of the whole thing. Mr. Davies explained exactly what it meant, and I read into the RECORD what he said a leave of absence meant to his company. Certainly Mr. Beeson left, but he left on a leave of absence, retaining pension rights and preferred consideration for return to the company, and he deceived the committee as to this fact.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What is meant by a "leave of absence" is very plain. It is set forth on page 10 of the company's retirement plan. The point I am trying to make is that Mr. Beeson actually felt he had gone through the necessary processes to sever his relationship with the company.

For the Senator's information, in my own company I maintain a similar retirement plan. An employee could come into the office and say, "I quit," but that would not mean that he would be deprived of his rights in our pension system. That employee would first have to go before a board of employees and offer his resignation, although he might think in his own mind that he had severed his relations with my firm.

I merely wished to inject these remarks so as to keep the record perfectly clear, because the Senator from Alabama is arguing the point, and I am trying to offer rebuttal to it, to show that we on the majority feel that Mr. Beeson was honestly of the opinion that he had resigned from his company and had severed all his relations with it.

Mr. HILL. I regret I cannot agree with my distinguished friend from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is perfectly obvious.

Mr. HILL. I believe the testimony shows that Mr. Beeson certainly had knowledge of what a leave of absence meant, and that he had knowledge that he was on leave of absence. Had he been frank and candid with the committee, and had he not deceived and misled the committee, he would have done exactly

what Mr. Durkin did. He would have said very frankly and openly, "I am on leave of absence." He would not have said that he had resigned. He would not have said that he had completely severed his connection with the company.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Hr. HILL. I shall be glad to yield the floor and let the Senator from New Jersey speak on his own time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the Senator desires to yield the floor, I shall be glad to be recognized for a brief statement.

I should like to correct two statements which occur to me at this time. I was rather concerned when the Senator from Alabama stated he thought Mr. Beeson was trying to make a deal or a trade of some kind. I am concerned, because I must take the responsibility for the question that was asked of Mr. Beeson about whether he would be willing to resign. There was no trade involved. After nearly 30 pages of discussion as to what was meant by leave of absence and resignation, I asked him a simple question. I asked this question:

Mr. Beeson, in the light of this discussion of the uncertainty about what words mean, are you willing to send your resignation, without any if's but's and and's, to this company to take effect in the event you are confirmed as a member of the National Labor Relations Board and take office?

In other words, I was trying to conclude that question and not have the committee argue about it any further. So, I asked him whether he was willing to pay the price of settling it, and he said he was.

The other correction I wish to make is in answer to the third charge, namely, that Mr. Beeson was not telling the truth with respect to the San Jose Mercury incident.

We had a great deal of testimony from the reporter concerned and from a representative of the publisher. I find at page 142 the following statement by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] with reference to this situation. He said:

Senator KENNEDY. As far as I am concerned, I think the explanation is satisfactory. I think that Mr. Beeson deserves—I am sure he is telling the truth in this regard and should not be unfairly abused in this matter as far as I can understand the situation. Thank you very much.

I do not know whether anything has happened to change the mind of the Senator from Massachusetts, but certainly he felt at the time that we had cleared up the San Jose Mercury matter and that it was hardly the basis for a charge of untruthfulness.

AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR CERTAIN DESTROYERS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, it is not my intention to delay the discussion and vote on the Beeson nomination, but I ask my colleagues to bear with me for a brief statement on a problem which is of vital concern, not only to Maine, but to every American interested in economy.

Two weeks ago on February 5, 1954, I spoke here in protest against the unprecedented and shocking action of the Navy Department in taking contract awards for the construction of three destroyers away from the Bath Iron Works in Bath, Maine, at a cost of $6½ million to the American taxpayers. The Bath Iron Works was the lowest bidder for that work but, in spite of this, the contract was awarded to another bidder whose bid was $6½ million higher than the bid of the Bath Iron Works.

The Navy Department did not inform the members of the Maine congressional delegation of this shocking action until the very eve of the public announcement of the contract award.

This morning, the Chief of the Bureau of Ships called at my office and informed me that in about 10 days the award for destroyer escort construction would be made and that the Bath Iron Works would not get any of the awards because it was not the lowest bidder.

Mr. President, I would like to know just what is the procurement policy of the Navy Department. Is it going to change the basis of its awards every time to suit its convenience? Why did it 3 weeks ago refuse to give the destroyer contract award to the lowest bidder and now plan to give the destroyer escort award to the lowest bidder? If it is to make the award on the destroyer escort contract to the lowest bidder, then why didn't it make the destroyer contract award to the lowest bidder?

I said 2 weeks ago that the shocking action of the Navy Department cast a shadow of suspicion over the entire defense procurement system. This latest action all the more confirms that statement and makes all the more necessary the investigations of the destroyer contract award that are being conducted at my request by the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Comptroller General of the United States.

What has become of the promises made by the Eisenhower administration for more economy in our Government and for less waste in the operation of our defense forces? Just what sincerity is there in the claims emanating from the Defense Department of "more defense per dollar"? In what strange manner is the junking of the competitive bidding system in the destroyer contract award a keeping of the promise of the economy pledge to the American people when it costs the American taxpayers $6½ million that could have been saved otherwise? How can the Defense Department claim "more defense per dollar" when it deliberately ignores the lowest bidder, and the best builder of destroyers in the history of our country, and awards the destroyer contract to another bidder at a cost of $6½ million to the American taxpayers?

Whatever the standard of convenience the Navy Department has used in these contract awards, there is one very clear fact: That the Navy Department has indulged in serious discrimination against the workers at the Bath Iron Works while granting a $6½ million subsidy to another yard—a subsidy that will have to be paid by American taxpayers who had believed the economy intent claims of the administration.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield for a question?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The contract, I take it, was let to a firm in the United States?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Then, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that perhaps we are lucky it was let within the United States. There have been contracts let recently to English firms and other foreign firms for repairs and for the furnishing of spare parts which could not be secured for electric generators and other equipment during the war. The pay for labor in the foreign countries is at the rate of 54 cents an hour, whereas, in this country, we pay much more than that. Is the Senator from Maine aware of such contracts?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I am aware of such contracts.

Mr. MALONE. When we are dealing with American firms, I think it is a good idea to let contracts to the lowest bidders, and have construction and repairs made under our own labor standards in America.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

NOMINATION OF ALBERT CUMMINS BEESON, OF CALIFORNIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Albert Cummins Beeson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Albert Cummins Beeson, of California, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the pending question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall delay the Senate but a very few moments on the Beeson nomination.

There is probably no power reserved to the Senate which is more difficult to exercise wisely than that of granting—or withholding—advice and consent to a nomination. There is probably no function which has caused more soul searching than that of confirming—or rejecting—a Presidential appointee. There is no duty more distasteful than that which on occasion requires one to vote against a fellow citizen.

This is an issue which goes directly to the heart of one of the most delicate

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

points in our Constitution, the relationship between the executive and the legislative branches of our Government.

The purpose behind this constitutional grant of authority is not very difficult to find. The authors of the Constitution were aware of the dangers that resided in a government too remote from the people. They thought there should be a check upon the powers of the President to staff the Federal establishment from top to bottom.

That check, they decided, was best exercised by the Senate—a legislative body of calm deliberation. Therefore, they made the President and the Senate partners in the nominating process—the President to initiate; the Senate to confirm or reject.

With both powers—initiation and confirmation—went implied responsibilities. I have never seen them written down. But they are there. They are inherent in the very situation, in the very need for our Government to work.

Uppermost in the responsibility implicitly assigned to the Senate—and I am not going to discuss any other responsibilities—is that of deciding the issue upon the basis of substantial evidence.

A nominee should not be approved because his views are popular, or rejected because his views are unpopular.

A nominee should not be approved because his views are in accord with the President, or disapproved in an effort to disconcert the President.

The simple tests should be: Is he a man of good character, with a clean record, who will endeavor to carry out the laws in accordance with his conscience? Is he a man who has a basic understanding of our institutions? Is he a man who approaches his job in a spirit of frankness and openness, concealing no information to which the public is entitled?

These are the terms which I applied in deciding for myself my vote on the nomination of Albert C. Beeson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board. These are the tests which he failed—and in failing lost my support and, I believe, the support of many of my colleagues.

I want to stress from the outset that I have never been impressed by the argument that Mr. Beeson could not be an impartial member of that Board. I doubt whether any of us really expect impartiality in such a position. We know that any man of sufficient intelligence to render a judgment between contesting parties is unlikely to be so devoid of sensitivity as to have no emotional bias involved in the contest.

Mr. President, in this regard, let me make a personal observation. I supported the Taft-Hartley law. I voted to override its veto by a Democratic President. I regarded that law as a desirable adjustment of the rights of management and labor, and I have not changed my opinion in that respect. No doubt there are areas in which it may be proper to consider amendments. But, in essence, I believe in the Taft-Hartley law, and I support it now.

What we are really seeking, regardless of the law which is now on the books, is a capacity for objectivity, an ability to subordinate bias to the facts and the law. We know this can flow only from a high moral character, from standards which are unyielding.

I have studied the record carefully. I cannot conclude that Mr. Beeson fits that description. I cannot agree that he has displayed the qualifications that should befit a candidate for an office of his public trust.

In coming to this conclusion, I am not invading the domain of Mr. Beeson's private thoughts. I do not know whether he was the victim of confused thinking, natural secretiveness, or a deliberate purpose to mislead.

I do know his statements were misleading. I do know that he concealed from the Senate information which was vital to its consideration of his nomination. I do know it was possible to obtain that information only by calling other witnesses and then confronting Mr. Beeson with their contradictory testimony.

Mr. President, we have reached a strange and distressing stage in our history if the Senate must resort to the tactics of a racket-busting grand jury in order to judge the fitness of a candidate for high office. We have reached a new phase in our development if a nominee can "dare" the Senate to learn the facts—and then expect confirmation when he is caught in his own contradictions.

I do not intend to dwell upon the actual contradictions themselves. They are well documented in the report issued by the minority members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The documentation cannot be challenged. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has very well fortified that documentation in his remarks to the Senate today.

Here is a man who said he had resigned when he had not resigned.

Here is a man who said he had surrendered his pension rights when he had not surrendered his pension rights.

Here is a man who denied that he had made certain statements when he had made certain statements.

Only two points have been made in his defense.

First, it is contended that he was confused over terminology.

Second, it is contended that since the hearings, he has resigned anyway and therefore the whole question is moot.

Mr. President, the first question can be answered quite simply. Mr. Beeson is a grown man with all his faculties. He is a man of considerable experience. He has fought the battle of life—apparently quite successfully.

I have studied the record carefully. He was questioned not about points of law but about points of fact—points of fact in a field where he is presumed to be an expert.

To assert that he did not know the meaning of such phrases as "resign"; "completely severed" his relationships with his company; "lost my pension rights in making this severance" does Mr. Beeson a disservice.

Can it be possible that he was truly confused over such elementary English?

I am more concerned, however, about the second argument—that Mr. Beeson has rendered the whole issue moot by finally issuing his resignation. It is shocking that this can be put forward seriously as a reason for resolving all doubts and confirming his nomination.

On January 20 Mr. Beeson told the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that he had completely severed his relations with his company. On January 22 he reiterated that statement. He went even further. He said that he had "lost my pension rights in making this severance."

I cannot conceive of a statement more unequivocal than that.

And yet, nearly 2 weeks later on February 5, Mr. Beeson tells us that he is willing to resign—provided that he was confirmed in his new office. Incidentally, even so, we did not see the color of his resignation until February 16.

Mr. President, I submit that this is playing fast and loose with the dignity and responsibilities of the Senate. Mr. Beeson, by his resignation on February 16, may have cleansed himself of legal impediments which would complicate his position on the National Labor Relations Board.

But has he abandoned his original reluctance to volunteer facts which are significant and material? I submit that he had not. He has merely permitted himself—protesting and unwillingly—to be bludgeoned into compliance with the plain intent of law and custom.

Must we hereafter constitute ourselves an enforcement squad to pry into the detail of the private lives of every nominee? Must all of us become snoopers? I think that will be our only course if we approve this nomination.

We will be informing every candidate for high office that he is perfectly free to conceal relevant facts from the Senate; to bypass the customs and the laws. All he has to do if he is caught is to confess error; to rig a hasty compliance with the customs and the laws; and to take the oath of office with full Senate approval.

Mr. President, I do not feel kindly toward those who flout the Senate and the functions it performs under the Constitution. I do not look with favor upon those who seek to mislead and deceive this body.

This is an issue which transcends Mr. Beeson. This is an issue of basic morality.

We were entitled to a full, frank, and voluntary disclosure of all the facts which might bear upon Mr. Beeson's capacity to fill an important position. We were not accorded those facts either fully, frankly, or voluntarily.

They were brought forth only by lengthy cross-examination and by calling other witnesses to present the evidence.

We cannot encourage this type of behavior. I am going to vote now and in the future to register my disapproval of this course of conduct.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this debate. Knowing what I do about the situation, I must confess that some of the criticisms which have been raised against Mr. Beeson are sound. I regret that that is the situation, but the record speaks for itself.

However, I have great confidence in some of those who know Mr. Beeson personally. I have never known him personally up to the present time. He is a man whose reputation is beyond question, a man whom I would approve from the standpoint of judgment. Without exception, every single individual to whom I have spoken, who knows Mr. Beeson, vouches for his integrity.

In my judgment, Mr. Beeson talked too much, and he talked too carelessly. I can well understand that a person appearing before one of our investigating committees—and that is what the committee was in this particular instance—might become befuddled and confused, might contradict himself, as Mr. Beeson apparently did, and might appear to offer falsehoods, instead of truth, when, in reality, he firmly intended to tell the truth.

I personally do not doubt Mr. Beeson's integrity, but there is more at stake than merely the question of his integrity. A nomination is before the Senate. The nominee perhaps comes before us in a shadow, and yet many people believe he is the right kind of individual for the position to which he has been nominated.

I am willing to take a chance on that, for several reasons. In the first place, I cannot remember a time during my period of service in the Senate when any nominee has been faced with a situation and with such challenges—not one, but a number of them—as those which now confront Mr. Beeson.

Mr. Beeson's integrity is at stake. I cannot imagine a man whose integrity has been challenged as Mr. Beeson's has been entering upon the duties of the position to which he has been nominated and not going out of his way to be scrupulously honest and scrupulously decent in all he does. That is his first challenge, and I am willing to take a chance on that aspect, knowing what I do about Mr. Beeson's record.

In the next place, in regard to the question of conflict of interest which has been raised, I leave it to my fellow Senators to confirm the fact that every Member of the Senate at one time or another has been faced with a condition of a similar nature, although perhaps not so extreme. I am referring to Senators who have served in legislative office for any great period of time. It is then we have to sit back and consult our consciences, and decide what is in the public interest and what is in our own interest, and where the interests may conflict.

As for myself, when it comes to deciding between my own interest and the public interest, I have always yielded in favor of the public interest when it is a matter of public duty. I am sure that is the attitude of every other Member of the Senate. So it will be when Mr. Beeson comes to serving in this quasi-judicial capacity on the National Labor Relations Board, in dealing with matters affecting relationships between management and labor.

True it is that his background has been exclusively with management. Does that make a man unfair? Does that make him unjust? I have not heard anything said during the debate this afternoon which was derogatory of Mr. Beeson, insofar as justice, fairness, and all matters related thereto are concerned.

Even Mr. James Carey, when he appeared before the committee, admitted he thought Mr. Beeson was fair and just. I personally put the question to Mr. Carey. All I ask of any man who acts in a judicial capacity is that he be fair, honest, and just all the way through.

That is the second challenge with which Mr. Beeson is faced. Knowing the reputation and the record of Mr. Beeson as I do, I am sure he is the type of person who will lean over backward, if I may use that term, and go out of his way, to be impartial, to be objective, and to be just, in deciding problems which will come before the Board.

There is a third challenge with which Mr. Beeson is faced, so far as he is concerned, and so far as the Republicans are concerned, and it is probably the greatest challenge of all. That is his responsibility to the President of the United States. After all, he was recommended and nominated by the President; he was the choice of the President, who not once, but at least twice, has spoken out publicly in his behalf. Mr. Beeson owes a great obligation to the President of the United States; and that is the greatest challenge of all with which he is faced. If he is the kind of person I think he is, I believe he will meet the challenge courageously, no matter what his background or what his past record may have been.

Mr. President, finally I wish to refer to a matter which has been mentioned in the course of the debate, namely, that the appointment is for only 10 months. If it were a 5-year appointment, I might feel differently about it; but it is for only 10 months.

I intend to vote today for confirmation of the nomination. If I am in the Senate at the end of 10 months, as I expect and intend to be, God willing, I shall vote against the continuation of Mr. Beeson in this particular office if he fails to meet the expectations which I have just expressed. I think the Senate may well consider that angle. This is not anything final. It is merely an interim appointment.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated, and because I prefer to take the choice of the President of the United States, I shall vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Beeson.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my opinion, under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution, the Senate of the United States should not function as a probation board. I do not think we should confirm the nomination under consideration this afternoon in the hope that Mr. Beeson will make good. The Senate must take the record before it.

In my opinion, in keeping with an obligation which we all owe the President of the United States under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution, the fairest thing the Senate could do for the President is to follow the course of action of sending the nomination back to the committee.

It is not for me to make the motion. I think it ought to come from either a Republican or Democratic member of the committee. However, in fairness to the President of the United States, I believe that is what should happen to the nomination.

Who among us can say for a certainty what would have been the decision of the President of the United States if he had known that this nominee would have made such a sorry record before the committee. We cannot be sure, but I desire to think, and I believe I am correct in thinking, that if he had known that the President would not have made the nomination.

This is a 10-month appointment, and we ought to take that fact into account as we consider the vote of the Senate this afternoon. I believe the President ought to be given an opportunity to fill the post for 10 months by appointing a man who, in my judgment, has not already destroyed his usefulness on the Board. Under the procedure of the Board, an affidavit of prejudice to be filed against a Board member is not available to counsel trying a case before the Board.

I do not believe there is a lawyer in the Senate who would not agree with me that if he were called upon to represent a client before a court which had as a member a judge with a record similar to the nominee in the hearings on the nomination, he would exercise the right to file an affidavit of prejudice against such a judge.

I think we also ought to think of the parties litigant before the National Labor Relations Board. In my judgment, I think we owe to them and also to the country the duty of seeing that the Board will not have on it a member who will be subjected to the dissatisfaction and the suspect of party litigants trying cases before the Board to which the nominee under discussion will be subjected.

It certainly is not for me to recommend to the President whom he should appoint, but I desire to urge, in greater detail, a suggestion which I made earlier this afternoon, because I feel sorry for the President. I think we ought to be of help to him, and I believe the best way to help him is to recommit the nomination. If the Senate decides not to do it, then I urge the Senate to vote down the nomination itself.

The background of a man, be it in the field of management or labor, does not make any difference to me, provided he has the capacity to fill the position. I should like to suggest the type of person I think should have the short-term 10 months' appointment to fill a post such as the one under consideration. I should like to suggest for the appointment the successor to the exceedingly able Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] as dean of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations of Cornell University, the present dean, Martin P. Catherwood. Dean Catherwood has a brilliant background in the field of management-labor relations. He was director of the New York State Planning Commission for a time. He was New York's first commissioner of commerce. He has been a professor of agricultural economics at Cornell University. He has arbitrated several very important labor disputes, and has mediated others. He was first

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

appointed by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], when the Senator was governor of the State of New York, as chairman of the State planning commission. Dean Catherwood was later appointed by Governor Lehman as commissioner of commerce. When Mr. Dewey became Governor of New York he reappointed Dean Catherwood as commissioner of commerce. At the present time he is a member of an emergency board appointed under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, making a study of the railroad dispute involving nonoperating railroad brotherhoods. He is the type of man who I think should be appointed to fill a position of 10 months' duration on the National Labor Relations Board, so that the President may have time to give more deliberate consideration to the selection of a permanent member of the Board. He is just one of many men who could be appointed for the short period of 10 months while the President could reconsider the entire matter of making a nomination to the Board.

Mr. President, I close by saying the question is not one of the background of the nominee, but the question as to his disqualification involves the confused testimony he gave before the committee—confused testimony which caused six of our colleagues, colleagues who are just as sincere as any of the rest of us, and who believes that on the basis of the record the nominee made, the Members of the Senate should not give their advice and consent in favor of confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. President, when six of our colleagues have submitted the views they did submit regarding the nomination; and when we read the record—an orderly record of an orderly examination of the nominee—and when we consider the confused record he made, I cannot escape the conclusion that he has not shown the necessary capacity to be a member of a quasi-judicial tribunal of the Government.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall speak for only a few minutes.

I intend to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Albert Beeson. The distinguished chairman of the committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], has outlined the reasons which led the majority members of the committee to report favorably on the nomination of Mr. Beeson.

I would not add to the statement of the Senator from New Jersey, except for the fact that our colleagues who are in the minority on the committee have based their opposition to the nomination on the ground that Mr. Beeson withheld facts from the committee; they charge him with downright dishonesty before the committee.

Mr. President, if we believe Mr. Beeson was dishonest in his testimony before the committee, his nomination ought not be confirmed by the Senate; no member of the committee who heard his testimony should vote for confirmation, and neither should any other Member of the Senate.

For myself, I wish to say that if I believed the nominee knowingly and deliberately withheld from the committee any testimony, or if I believed he was dishonest in his statements to the committee, I would not vote to confirm his nomination.

Like other Members of the Senate, I have served for a time in a judicial capacity. One who serves in such a capacity is inclined to believe that, to a small degree, he learns to judge men's sincerity and honesty. A few minutes ago, the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said that he had read the record of the hearings in this case, and that because of the inconsistencies in the testimony of Mr. Beeson he would vote against confirmation.

Mr. President, I heard all the testimony of the nominee. I heard the testimony given by Mr. Davies, the president of the company which employed Mr. Beeson. I also heard the testimony of the representatives of the newspapers which has been in question. After hearing and reading and studying the entire testimony, I do not believe there is any actual inconsistency in Mr. Beeson's statements, nor do I believe there was any purpose on his part to withhold testimony. Certainly I do not believe he is dishonest.

The minority of the committee charge that his testimony was false on several grounds. First, they say he testified that he had severed his connection with the company, when in fact he had not done so. The question as to whether he had severed his connection with the company arises from the fact that the president of the company, Mr. Davies, said in a newspaper story that Mr. Beeson was on leave of absence. If the president of the company and Mr. Beeson had discussed his severance, and if the president and Mr. Beeson had agreed that Mr. Beeson would be on leave of absence, then as a consequence there would arise at the conclusion of his Government service an obligation on the part of the company to rehire him, and an obligation on his part to return to the company. Such a state of facts would constitute a leave of absence and if there had been such an agreement, then Mr. Beeson was dishonest when he testified before the committee that he had severed his connection with the company.

However, that is not the case. Mr. Beeson said again and again, "I have severed my connection with the company. I have given up my pension rights. I am under no obligation to return to the company; it is under no obligation to rehire me."

Mr. Davies, the president of the company, in testifying before the committee, said, in effect: "Upon my own decision, and without consulting Mr. Beeson—I treated Mr. Beeson as being on leave of absence. I did this because other employees of our company who had gone into Government service were given leaves of absence."

The determination was not made by Mr. Beeson and the company; the determination was made by Mr. Davies, the president of the company, without consulting with Mr. Beeson. There is no evidence that Mr. Beeson knew of this determination.

In view of these facts, if all the evidence is read, it will lead to the conclusion—that, in his own mind, Mr. Beeson believed he had completely severed his connection with the company. Again and again he said, in the course of his testimony: "I am under no obligation to return; and they are under no obligation to rehire me; and I have given up my pension rights."

The second falsity charged is that Mr. Beeson was dishonest in saying he had given up his pension rights when it is alleged he knew that he had not done so. Again, the answer hinges on whether Mr. Beeson understood he was on leave of absence. If he was on leave of absence, his right to the money the company had paid into the retirement fund would have been retained for him. On the other hand, if he was not on leave of absence, then he would lose his right to the company's contribution and the money would go to the retirement fund. Again, Mr. Davies made the decision that he was treating Mr. Beeson as being on leave of absence. Mr. Beeson said that he was giving up his rights, that he was giving up everything he had in the fund, and there is no evidence to challenge that he knew otherwise.

It was not until Mr. Davies came before the committee and testified that he had decided Mr. Beeson was in the status of leave of absence and held for him the company's contribution that Mr. Beeson then recognized the situation. He then resigned, by letter, so there could be no question about company interest in the retirement fund.

If my colleagues will read the testimony, and ask whether there was any agreement between the company and Mr. Beeson, either as to termination of his service or his rights to the company's contribution to the pension fund, they will properly reach the conclusion, based upon the facts, as Mr. Beeson knew then, that he was perfectly honest in his position and in his testimony.

It is my opinion that the newspaper articles to which reference has been made would have no bearing in this case, and would be inconsequential, except for the other charges that Mr. Beeson made false statements with respect to his service or with respect to his pension rights. It would be mere quibbling to stress inconsistency if we do not believe the other statements were false.

My good friend on the minority side of the committee began the hearings with the opinion that Mr. Beeson was disqualified because he had worked for management. That is shown in the first report.

I agree with my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] that the position to which Mr. Beeson has been nominated will give him a great opportunity to demonstrate, in his service, the unsoundness of the positions that one who has worked for management or labor must always be biased and without objectivity and has complete fairness.

I have no doubt that Mr. Beeson intended to be honest in his testimony before the committee. I intend to vote to confirm the nomination.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, at the outset I had no intention of speaking on the pending nomination. I expected to say but one word, "nay," in voting upon the question of confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Beeson. However, the eminent Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] made a statement a few moments ago to which I wish to refer. He spoke of the fact that this was a nomination of the President, and ought to be supported.

No one in this body has been more sedulous than the present speaker in trying to prevent encroachment by one of the coordinate branches upon another.

Upon a previous occasion there was before the Senate the nomination of a member of the President's official family, sent to the Senate by a Democratic President. The present speaker thought he had some reason for personal resentment at the time, but because of the fact that it was a nomination in the President's official family the junior Senator from Iowa spoke on the floor in favor of confirmation.

In this particular instance I shall vote against confirmation, and I wish briefly to state my reasons.

Section 2 of article II of the Constitution, as everyone knows, states that the President "shall nominate"—that is solely his function, and not the function of anyone else—"and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law"—that is the instant occasion—"but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments."

When the Congress saw fit to establish the National Labor Relations Board, under its constitutional authority it could have provided that its members should be appointed by the President alone, by the courts of law, or by the heads of departments. But Congress saw fit to reserve for itself—and very properly so, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Iowa—the right to pass on the merits of persons who were to occupy quasi-judicial positions, as they have so often been described. They are really judicial positions. An appeal from the decisions of such officers is authorized, for review by courts of law.

It is not a matter of supporting the President, whether he be a Republican or a Democrat. Our responsibility is the responsibility which we reserved when Congress established this Board. It is not a question of whether it is the choice of the President. It is a question of exercising our responsibility. If it is the opinion of the Senate, in the exercise of its responsibility, that a certain nomination should be confirmed, that is a proper exercise of its responsibility.

The junior Senator from Iowa has read the record of the hearings, and has given considerable thought to this case. It is the judgment of the present speaker, without any implication of lack of integrity or lack of honesty on the part of this nominee, that the question is, Can he bring to the responsibilities of the position an absolutely unbiased and unprejudiced mind to exercise those responsibilities? The determination of that question rests with us as individuals. Unpleasant as I find such a decision for myself, it does not seem to me, under the facts and circumstances of this case, that this nominee can bring an unprejudiced and unbiased view to the exercise of the responsibilities which pertain to this office.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the appropriate place in the body of the RECORD a number of telegrams and other communications I have received concerning the nomination of Mr. Albert C. Beeson, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 17, 1954.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building:

On behalf of our membership we are opposed to the appointment of Albert C. Beeson for membership on the National Labor Relations Board. We need the ablest possible members to carry out the peaceful purposes of the industrial relations of our country. We urge you to protest this appointment.

JOSEPH POLLACK,
President, Local 11, Insurance Agents International Union, AFL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 17, 1954.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building:

In behalf of the administration of this local and its entire membership comprising approximately 29,000 musicians as well as in behalf of organized labor, we hereby protest the appointment of Albert C. Beeson for membership on the National Labor Relations Board.

CHARLES R. IUCCI,
Secretary, Local 802, AFM.

DENVER, COLO., *February 2, 1954.*

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Building:

When Albert C. Beeson was first mentioned for NLRB post, this union did not oppose him. We have learned, however, that he is on leave of absence from his position with a large corporation, to which he will eventually return. In view of that fact, we do not see how, if appointed, Beeson could possibly be considered an impartial member of the Board. We strongly urge you to keep this point in mind when considering Beeson's nomination for appointment to the NLRB.

T. M. MCCORMICK,
Secretary-Treasurer, Oil Workers International Union, CIO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 16, 1954.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We represent telephone operators in the New York hotel industry and vicinity. We oppose the confirmation of the appointment of Albert C. Beeson to the National Labor Relations Board. We have asked for a repeal of the Taft-Hartley law under which the National Labor Relations Board functions because the law is biased against labor and in favor of employers. We oppose Mr. Beeson for the same reason. His record as an industrialist relation director is opposed to labor and biased toward the employer. We ask your cooperation in opposing this appointment and leading the fight against it.

Very truly yours,

TELEPHONE OPERATORS UNION, LOCAL 1005,
MAE C. HEALY, *President.*
FLORENCE BUELL,
Recording Secretary.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 16, 1954.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As representative of 36,000 workers in the hotel industry we oppose the appointment of Mr. Beeson to the National Labor Relations Board as being unqualified. Labor has been sufficiently hindered by the Labor and Management Relations Act of 1947 (the Taft-Hartley law) which is administered by the National Labor Relations Board. It is therefore most urgent that the composition of the Board should have representation which understands labor and labor's problems from the labor point of view. Mr. Beeson, with his record of complete employer interest as industrial relations director of the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., is only an added scourge to the punishment inflicted by the Taft-Hartley law on labor unions.

NEW YORK HOTEL TRADES COUNCIL, AFL,
JAY RUBIN, *President.*
PETER A. MONRONEY, *Secretary.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 16, 1954.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building:

It is the belief of the membership of this union, which has jurisdiction over the pharmaceutical and chemical trades, that the appointment of Albert C. Beeson to the National Labor Relations Board would create confusion and render a great disservice to labor unions. We therefore urgently request that you use every effort to block the appointment of Albert C. Beeson.

DRUG, CHEMICAL, COSMETIC, PLASTICS, AND AFFILIATED INDUSTRIES WAREHOUSE EMPLOYEES, LOCAL 815, IBT,
GEORGE BARASCH,
Secretary-Treasurer.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 16, 1954.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN:

Our organization vigorously opposes confirmation of Albert C. Beeson as member of NLRB. His testimony clearly discloses his unfitness for such high office due to his lack of understanding of basic principles of Labor-Management Relations Act and his inability to impartially decide matters coming before the Board.

SAM SHEBITZ,
President, Paper Box Makers Union, Local 299, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, AFL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 10, 1954.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Joint Council No. 16, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, vigorously protest the appointment of Albert C. Beeson to membership on the National Labor Relations Board. Labor and management need the ablest possible members to carry out the peaceful administration of industrial relations in this country. We are therefore opposed to this appointment.

MARTIN T. LACEY,
President, Joint Council No. 16, IBT.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 9, 1954.*
Senator HERBERT LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: The members of local 325, UAW-CIO, wish to thank you for your stand against the appointment of Mr. Beeson as a member of National Labor Relations Board. We know of his record and we feel that he would not give labor a just and fair decision on any cases that might be brought before him.

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF
LOCAL 325, UAW-CIO,
VERNON DOLLEB, *Chairman.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 10, 1954.*
Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Central Trades and Labor Council, Greater New York, representing 750,000 organized workers, affiliated with American Federation of Labor, protests appointment of Albert Beeson as member of National Labor Relations Board. It is our belief that the selection of Mr. Beeson will add more confusion to present administration of National Labor Relations Board. Labor and management need the ablest possible members to carry out peaceful purposes of industrial relations of our country.

MARTIN T. LACEY,
President.
JAMES C. QUINN,
Secretary.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 11, 1954.*
Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I have been mandated by resolution of membership to vigorously oppose the appointment of Albert C. Beeson to the National Labor Relations Board. His evasiveness and attitude before a congressional committee, plus his background, certainly do not tend to inspire confidence in him in this key position.

Respectfully yours,
ERNEST R. ZUNDEL,
Business Manager, Local 266, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, AFL.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 22, 1954.*
Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I have, simultaneously with this message, sent a telegram to Chairman SMITH, as follows:

"Please accept this as a most emphatic protest against the appointment of Albert C. Beeson to the National Labor Board. His testimony against the International Typographical Union utterly wrong and indicates incompetency and extreme prejudice against one of the proven outstanding labor unions in the world. The NLRB decisions and the decisions of the courts upholding the NLRB decision in which the ITU was involved proved Robert N. Denham's campaign against us to be wrong. Mr. Beeson approves Denham's tactics and opinions. Please permit me to be heard before your committee on this matter so vital to organized labor."

I shall appreciate your help in the matter.
INTERNATIONAL TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION,
WOODRUFF RANDOLPH, *President.*

ALLIED PRINTING TRADES COUNCIL
OF GREATER NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., February 16, 1954.
Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The printing trades unions of Greater New York strongly protest the appointment of Mr. Albert C. Beeson as a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

It is our belief that the selection of Mr. Beeson will add more confusion to the present administration of the Taft-Hartley law, and we respectfully urge that you vote against this appointment.

Thanking you for your cooperation, we beg to remain

Respectfully yours,
LOUIS F. DONATO, *Secretary.*

AUTOMOBILE LODGE, No. 447, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
New York, N. Y., February 16, 1954.
Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Automobile Lodge, No. 447, which represents 3,000 automobile mechanics in the metropolitan New York area, wishes to protest as strongly as possible the proposed appointment of Albert C. Beeson to the National Labor Relations Board.

It is our belief that the selection of Mr. Beeson will in no way contribute to better labor management relations and we urge that you disapprove the proposed appointment of Mr. Beeson.

With best wishes, I am,
Very truly yours,
PETER A. GEIS,
Recording Secretary.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSEMEN AND HELPERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1954.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Issues fundamental to determining the kind of Federal participation we will have in labor-management relations are at stake in the Senate this week. They will be decided by action on the nomination of Albert Beeson to the National Labor Relations Board.

If the Board is to remain a quasi-judicial arm of the executive branch, and if it is to continue to represent the public interest in guiding the course of labor-management relations, I believe that Mr. Beeson should not be confirmed by the Senate.

In urging rejection of the nomination, I do not argue from a narrow partisan base—but rather as one sufficiently affected by whatever decision you make to want my opinion known to you.

The fundamental question is whether a man whose total professional experience in the labor field has been as representative of one or the other of the contenders at the bargaining table can reasonably be expected to adopt an attitude of impartiality when suddenly called upon to administer the national labor law in the interest of no one except the public. I believe that is too much to ask of any man.

I would not ask it of Walter Reuther, George Meany, or John Lewis—I would not want it asked of me.

My point is not that Mr. Beeson would be partial to management. What is important is that his appointment would undermine the public character of the NLRB—in the face of congressional intent and evolved public policy of preventing the Board from becoming an advocate of any interest other than the public's.

In short, we are at the fork in the road where the NLRB might well be converted into a partisan agency, sensitive to the whims of politics and indifferent to the general interests of the United States. I urge you to vote to insure that the NLRB shall never become a political plaything.

Very truly yours,
DAVE BECK,
General President.

UNITED RAILROAD WORKERS
OF AMERICA, CIO,
Topeka, Kans., February 9, 1954.
Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your action in connection with the confirmation of Mr. Albert Beeson as a member of the National Labor Relations Board is very commendable.

In our opinion, Mr. Beeson is lacking in the qualities essential to one on such an important position.

Very truly yours,
WM. TUCCIARONE.

TOPEKA INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL,
Topeka, Kans., February 15, 1954.
Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: It is with pleasure that I write this letter to you regarding your stand on the appointment of Albert C. Beeson to the National Labor Relations Board.

I wish to commend very highly the firmness of the action you have taken in regard to the appointment. You may like to know that our entire organization in the State of Kansas is behind you solid in your stand.

Sincerely,
WALTER C. BRYANT,
President, Topeka Industrial Union Council.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the appropriate place in the body of the RECORD, prior to the final vote, a statement which I have prepared, indicating reasons why I oppose the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Albert C. Beeson.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

I rise to oppose the confirmation of the pending nomination of Albert C. Beeson to serve on the National Labor Relations Board.

I do this with real regret. I dislike opposing executive nominations generally, and in this case the nominee was apparently willing to undertake a brief period of public service although it meant some personal sacrifice to him, the interruption of the career he had planned for himself, and the injection of some uncertainty into his future associations.

But our decision on the question of confirming this nomination cannot be based on such personal factors, however appealing they may be. Our obligation is to the broader public objectives which under the law the NLRB was created to serve. And in a broader sense our obligation under the Constitution is so to use our senatorial power of advice and consent so as to assure the highest standards of fitness in high offices.

I have therefore asked myself the question whether this nominee will meet the essential tests. After hearing the nominee and after reviewing the whole record again, I must reluctantly answer in the negative and oppose Mr. Beeson's confirmation.

As others have already stated, the National Labor Relations Board is a sensitive agency in the administration of our labor laws and in the successful functioning of labor-management relations. I agree with those who have stated that fair, impartial, and independent action by the members of this quasi-judicial body is virtually as important as the writing of labor legislation itself.

Effective service on the Board requires not only some general knowledge of labor-management relations, but also a thorough understanding of a complex law, an ability to apply its provisions to the ever-changing situations that arise in industrial disputes, and awareness of the instability injected

into employer-employee relations by sudden shifts in quasi-judicial interpretations of the law, a capacity to weigh with objectivity, perception, fairness, and courage the competing interests of management and labor or the conflicting claims of different unions, and a primary deep-seated devotion to the public interests, that the law is designed to protect.

Reluctantly I have come to the conclusion that this nominee does not present to the Senate the qualifications needed for this demanding task.

The members of the minority on your Labor Committee, as the record of the hearings reveals, sought to discover the facts that would enable the Senate to make a wise judgment. We wanted to make sure that there could be no personal interest of the nominee, no continuing relation with his employer, and no promise of future employment that would limit his objectivity and independence, or give rise to any conflicts of interest.

As we pursued lines of inquiry opened up by Mr. Beeson's own statements, we were puzzled by some of his explanations and then further confused by his explanations of his explanations. Finally, we were compelled to conclude that he was not initally as careful or as candid as he should have been in informing the committee on matters vitally related to these possible conflicts of interests—and his ultimate announcements, after lengthy questioning, of his intention to resign from his company and "sacrifice" his pension rights seemed a rather grudging concession to what he described as a "quibble" by the minority.

Let me summarize briefly the manner in which one explanation by the nominee seemed to require another and another.

When first questioned by Senator LEHMAN about a statement attributed to Mr. Beeson in the San Jose Mercury to the effect that he expected to return to the Food Machinery Corp. upon completion of his service on the Board for 1 year, Mr. Beeson first denied that he had made any such statement and declared that the newspaper reporter apologized to him for having so interpreted what he said.

When the editor on January 27 contradicted this denial and the reporter in question denied making any such apology, Mr. Beeson then later explained that he had confused the quotation mentioned by Senator LEHMAN with a statement attributed to Mr. Beeson in an earlier article. Mr. Beeson then conceded that he had made the statement about his returning to the company after 1 year, but declared further that he no longer had any such definite intention.

Mr. Beeson went on to explain that he had considered the reporter's statement to be an apology but that perhaps it had been merely an expression of regret for the misquotation in an earlier article to the effect that he had the support of Vice President NIXON for appointment to the NLRB position.

This further explanation that he had been misquoted in the earlier article has run up against a second denial from the editor of the San Jose Mercury in the telegram addressed to Senator MURRAY on February 5 and appearing on page 222 of the hearings.

The editor asserts on February 5 that Mr. Beeson did make the printed statement to one of their reporters and that the Mercury did not misquote him. And so the series of explanations ends with the apparent contradiction of the last explanation still unexplained.

The testimony on some of the other important questions concerning Mr. Beeson's severance of relations with the Food Machinery Co., and his pension rights and reemployment status is almost as contradictory and confusing.

I agree with the characterization of this testimony in the New York Times editorial of February 10, 1954, as follows:

"THE BEESON APPOINTMENT

"Apparently the major claim on behalf of Albert C. Beeson for membership on the National Labor Relations Board, as developed during Senate Labor Committee hearings, has been his considerable experience in negotiating collective-bargaining agreements on behalf of management. Conceding his excellent record in this respect, we cannot see how it would qualify him for the exacting quasi-judicial position to which he aspires. Special abilities are required for that post and if Mr. Beeson possesses them neither he nor others have brought that fact to the attention of the Senate committee.

"That Mr. Beeson comes from the ranks of management is not a count against him. So did James J. Reynolds, a previous member whose high qualifications and excellent record lent stature to the Board. Mr. Beeson's various and conflicting explanations of his supposed leave of absence or severance from his employing company were not calculated to enlist public confidence. His belated offer to forego certain pension rights after the Senate confirmed him suggests an attempt to bargain with that august body.

"The NLRB is now divided 2-to-2 on 20 important cases which are held up pending appointment of a swing man. Unless the most competent choice is made the future administration of the Taft-Hartley Act will be unnecessarily embroiled in controversy which may well damage peaceful labor-management relations and react against the present administration.

"The President and the Senate have been placed in an embarrassing predicament by the failure of the Republicans on the Senate Labor Committee to encourage full discussion of the Beeson candidacy before approving it by a party vote of 7 to 6. This blunder can be rectified by withdrawal of the nomination and submission of a better qualified candidate or by an adverse vote on Mr. Beeson in the Senate."

On the most favorable possible interpretation of these exchanges, it has been impossible for me not to conclude that the nominee was either less candid and more reluctant to disclose the full picture than he should have been with the committee, or that he has some difficulty in understanding the meanings of words and the full implication of the matters inquired about.

To me these are defects which require the Senate to refuse to give its consent to this nomination to a position that demands the careful, legal interpretation and sensitive balancing of rights and duties involved in this important quasi-judicial service.

Let me repeat that I have come to this conclusion reluctantly and only after careful reconsideration, for in manner and bearing I found Mr. Beeson quite likeable. But those attributes of his which may serve well in the day to day relations between employers and employees are not, in my judgment, sufficiently supplemented by the qualifications which are required in the post to which he has been nominated.

Another serious obstacle to Mr. Beeson's service as a fully independent member of his five-man board, in my judgment, is Mr. Beeson's relationship to the present Chairman, Mr. Guy Farmer. I do not suggest that there is anything illegal or improper in their previous association. But the record clearly shows that Mr. Farmer is the former attorney for Mr. Beeson's company; that he and Mr. Beeson were close friends, and that Mr. Farmer was the principal initiator of Mr. Beeson's nomination.

Perhaps it is possible, but it is extremely unlikely, that a man can sufficiently divorce himself from all such past association as to leave him fully and completely independent in the discharge of his responsibilities from day to day right alongside his close friend, former counsel, and sponsor. I am afraid that this dependence is even more likely in this NLRB position where interpretation of the law and the decision of other legal questions is such a major part of the work. Mr. Beeson himself is not a lawyer. He will almost of necessity rely to a degree upon those on the Board who are lawyers. And his tendency to rely more heavily upon the man with whom he has had a previous association of the type described is almost inevitable.

A letter I recently received from a well-known industrial executive and public servant, John M. Carmody, highlight this issue. It reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
February 6, 1954.

Subject: Beeson NLRB nomination.

Hon. PAUL DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAUL: Apart from the "conflict of interest" matter, which, incidentally, has not been adequately cleared up, by Davies' statement or Beeson's so-called resignation or his "while Rome burns" speech, there is another close relationship. I refer to the admitted fact that he was selected and recommended to the White House by the Chairman of the Board.

This would be bad enough if NLRB were simply an administrative body, but the decisive work of the Board lies in the quasi-judicial field. How would the Senate look upon a nomination for the Supreme Court if the Chief Justice deliberately went out and selected one of his colleagues to fill the next vacancy?

NLRB is not quite the Supreme Court, but in all of its judicial determinations it should not put itself on any lower level of ethics or morals, nor be allowed to. The Board has a very grave responsibility in the economic and social life of our Nation. No member of the Board, irrespective of partisanship or, in spite of today's concept of "making jobs," ought to be "in the Chairman's pocket." It is infinitely better for the public interest if men on quasi-judicial boards enter upon their duties as strangers to one another. Personal relationships, helpful or harmful to the public interest, will develop soon enough, but they ought not to start with the kind of personal obligation that is inevitable when the Chairman selects his colleagues.

Theoretically no member is responsible to any other member, except for courtesy and such respect as his colleagues deserve by their conduct. If the decisions of the Board are to be arrived at through the independent judgment of free members, there should not be even the implication of an obligation of any member to any other member, even the Chairman. The Chairman, except for certain delegated administrative duties, is only one member and has only one vote, unless he can get one or two "in his pocket" by selection.

This is no reflection on Mr. Beeson, except that he ought to see this distinction, but in my view it is fundamental in the constitution of quasi-judicial boards. The Chairman, of all persons, as a "judge" should be first to see this ethic.

This observation is made not only as a result of membership on the original NLRB, but membership on other quasi-judicial boards as well.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. CARMODY.

I find it impossible to conclude that, under all these circumstances involving an inescapable sense of personal obligation to a sponsor and a reliance and respect for one's own legal counsel, that Mr. Beeson can maintain

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the independence of judgment required for each member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. President, for these reasons and for the reasons more fully set forth in the supplemental statement of minority views, I believe the Senate should refuse to confirm this nomination.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, prior to the final vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Beeson, a similar statement by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY

I rise to oppose the nomination of Albert C. Beeson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

1. THE NATURE OF THE NLRB

Members of the Senate, regardless of party, recognize that their responsibility with respect to Presidential nominations is a unique one. The President is entitled to have his policies carried out by those whom he feels represent his philosophy. The President is entitled to appoint to the various posts in his administration those whose capabilities meet the standards he demands. But today we are speaking of a nomination to the National Labor Relations Board. It is not a policymaking branch of the administration which should be filled by one whose philosophy of labor relations is in keeping with the views of the political party in power. It is not a tripartite body, to which representatives of labor and management should be appointed. Its members do not serve at the pleasure of the President, nor for a term of years concurrent with the Presidential tenure. Its task is not primarily one of mediation or conciliation, or even the maintenance of peaceful labor relations, tasks where practical experience in the day-to-day relationships of labor and management might be of some value.

The National Labor Relations Board is instead a quasi-judicial agency, whose primary function is to interpret and apply the basic labor relations law of the land. As stated by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on January 25, 1954: "The NLRB is supposed to be a quasi-judicial body. * * * An important segment of the judicial process has been entrusted to these agencies, and therefore their members must conduct themselves in the judicial manner. * * * Like judges, they should be above the strife as far as is humanly possible." Congress, in enacting the Taft-Hartley law, intentionally separated the judicial functions of the Board from the administrative functions of the General Counsel's Office. Board members are, in effect, judges; and their decisions are of tremendous importance in the determination of the legal rights of labor and management.

Thus, Members of Congress have a special obligation to review with care the nominations to this quasi-judicial agency. Members of the Board should not only be well qualified, through experience with and study of the subject matter; they should not only possess a sincere desire to administer the law as it is written in an unbiased fashion; they must not only be shown to be incapable of employing other than strict judicial impartiality in their decisions; they must, in addition, be able to command the unquestioning trust, confidence and respect of the public and the parties with whom they must work. Mr. Beeson does not meet these qualifications.

2. OUR LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN MR. BEESON

With all due respect to Mr. Beeson, I will be frank to say that I would not have confidence in him as a member of the National Labor Relations Board. I cannot speak for the members of the majority; but I know that lack of confidence is shared by every member of the Labor Committee minority. I sincerely believe that if every Member of the Senate had our opportunity to listen to Mr. Beeson's testimony, his contradictions and his misrepresentations, they, too, would be unable to look upon this nomination without grave misgivings. As pointed out in a recent editorial in the New York Times: "Mr. Beeson's various and conflicting explanations of his supposed leave of absence or severance from his employing company were not calculated to enlist public confidence." Other editorials voiced similar opinions. Every important leader of organized labor, whose rights and jobs depend upon the impartiality of Mr. Beeson's decisions, has voiced his opinion that Mr. Beeson's testimony reveals a strong bias.

We have heard a great deal during the past week about the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln. We would do well today to remember his words: "If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem." Mr. Beeson has forfeited the confidence of his fellow citizens. On the first and third day of the hearings before our committee, Mr. Beeson told us he had resigned as Director of Industrial Relations of the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.

On the final day we learned this was not true. On the second day of our hearings, Mr. Beeson testified that he had lost his pension rights with the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. On the final day we learned that this was not true. On the second and fourth days of the hearings, Mr. Beeson denied making two statements attributed to him by the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury. We have learned from the editor of that newspaper that Mr. Beeson made both of those statements. To say that Mr. Beeson was frank to admit his errors, to say that he was guilty only of honest mistakes, is to fly in the face of the entire hearing record, the difficulty which the members of the committee had in eliciting the truth from Mr. Beeson and the fact that it was necessary to obtain the actual facts from other witnesses.

3. THE PRECEDENT CONFRONTING US

All of us know that in time past the National Labor Relations Board has not enjoyed the trust and confidence of all segments of the public or of those groups with whom it must work. The result was constant strife, exchanges of accusations, and destructive industrial relations. Surely the Senate does not want to repeat that mistake. Surely we do not wish to set a precedent whereby any future President, regardless of his party, whether he be extremely radical or extremely conservative, feels justified in appointing to this or any other quasi-judicial body, or to a judgeship, one whose own testimony has aroused the enmity and suspicion of a large segment of the public, management or labor, and the United States Senate.

We might, under other circumstances, overlook the fact that Mr. Beeson is the first appointee to the National Labor Relations Board to come directly from the ranks of active management of union leadership. We might overlook the testimony of Mr. Beeson which indicated that he had prejudged many of the issues to be determined by the Board. We might overlook the dangers inherent in appointing to the Board, upon the recommendation of the Board Chairman, one who has enjoyed a lawyer-client relationship with that Board Chairman. But we cannot overlook the lack of candor and honesty which characterized Mr. Beeson's deceptive and misleading testimony.

4. THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SENATE

It is my considered judgment that Mr. Beeson's conduct represents an affront to the dignity of the United States Senate and a threat to the nature of, and respect due, our quasi-judicial agencies. The President, of course, was unaware of these events when he proposed Mr. Beeson's nomination; and we would be performing a service to the President and the Nation, as well as upholding our own dignity and responsibility, by refusing to consent to this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Albert Cummins Beeson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	Martin
Anderson	Green	McClellan
Barrett	Griswold	Millikin
Beall	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Morse
Bricker	Hennings	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Pastore
Byrd	Holland	Payne
Carlson	Humphrey	Potter
Case	Hunt	Purtell
Chavez	Ives	Robertson
Clements	Jackson	Russell
Cooper	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kerr	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Symington
Ellender	Kuchel	Thye
Ferguson	Langer	Upton
Flanders	Lehman	Watkins
Frear	Lennon	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Williams
George	Magnuson	Young
Gillette	Malone	
Goldwater	Mansfield	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Albert C. Beeson, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board?

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "yea." On this vote the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr.

BURKE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea" and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would each vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—45

Aiken	Dworshak	Millikin
Barrett	Eastland	Mundt
Beall	Ferguson	Payne
Bennett	Flanders	Potter
Bricker	Goldwater	Purtell
Bridges	Griswold	Saltonstall
Bush	Hendrickson	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Holland	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Ives	Thye
Case	Jenner	Upton
Cooper	Knowland	Watkins
Cordon	Kuchel	Welker
Dirksen	Malone	Williams
Duff	Martin	Young

NAYS—42

Anderson	Hill	Long
Chavez	Hoey	Magnuson
Clements	Humphrey	Mansfield
Daniel	Hunt	McClellan
Douglas	Jackson	Monroney
Ellender	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Frear	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Fulbright	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
George	Kennedy	Pastore
Gillette	Kerr	Russell
Gore	Kilgore	Smathers
Green	Langer	Sparkman
Hayden	Lehman	Stennis
Hennings	Lennon	Symington

NOT VOTING—9

Burke	Kefauver	McCarthy
Butler, Nebr.	Maybank	Robertson
Capehart	McCarran	Wiley

So the nomination of Albert C. Beeson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board was confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of the confirmation of Mr. Beeson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I desire to announce that the Senate will remain in session this evening for insertions in the RECORD or statements which Senators may desire to make, but, of course, there will be no further voting. Tomorrow consideration of the Bricker amendment will be resumed. I assume there will be sufficient debate tomorrow to occupy the time I would normally expect the Senate to be in session, but there will be no vote tomorrow. I hope Senators will continue the debate on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

On Monday there will be the customary reading of Washington's Farewell Address, which will be done by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT]. Following that, I expect the Senate to stand in recess until the following day.

In other words, there will be no voting or any regular legislative session beyond the ceremonies commemorating Washington's birthday.

On Tuesday, I anticipate that there will be a full Senate session, and I trust we shall have some decisive votes on that day.

I hope Senators will keep themselves in readiness, because we may have to have several evening sessions next week. We shall see what progress we can make on Tuesday. There is further legislative business piling up on the calendar. I hope we may have the cooperation of all Senators.

Some time next week, when we have finished the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1, it will be the intention of the majority leader to ask for a call of the calendar, for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, starting where we left off at the last calendar call. That might be on Wednesday or on Thursday, when we have finished debate on the Bricker amendment.

That is as far in advance, Mr. President, as I can now predict.

For the information of Senators, I may say there will not be a Saturday session this week.

THE WOODEN CHURCH CRUSADE FOR GERMANY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, one of the most inspiring endeavors that has taken place since World War II is the wooden church crusade, designed to construct a spiritual wall against communism along the border that separates free West Germany from Communist East Germany.

I am proud that at least half of my colleagues in the United States Senate, the governors of 20 States, and many other distinguished gentlemen, including former President Herbert Hoover, are sponsoring this great movement, which has as its national chairman Fulton Lewis, Jr.

Each wooden church that is erected as a result of voluntary contributions from people throughout the United States will stand as a citadel of religious liberty against the menace of Satanic communism.

Each church, however humble, will be a shrine dedicated to the Prince of Peace, and a center of moral resistance to godless totalitarianism.

As we all know the Communist program of world conquest does not embrace material things alone. The Soviet conspiracy also seeks the conquest of men's minds and souls. The wooden churches built as a result of this crusade, in which so many of us here have joined, will serve as visible notice to any Red aggressors that beyond this spiritual line they shall not pass.

Mr. President, I have great faith not only in the efficacy of religion but in spiritual and moral strength gained from religious centers, however humble, where people may gather and worship God in freedom and in peace.

The little church, whether built of boards or logs, stone or brick, was the foundation of the American freedoms we enjoy today.

Little churches were the first permanent edifices in America, and from these little churches came the spirit that prompted the Nation's independence, and the Bill of Rights.

Little churches marked the advance westward of our pioneers, and the cross, book and bells and star of Israel preceded each great influx of settlers throughout our national domain.

Little churches today symbolize the soul of free America and, wherever steeples and spires may rise, they, and those who worship within them, will reach for freedom and God's guidance everywhere in the world.

War in Europe left a wake of ruined churches and cathedrals, but it did not destroy the spirit of religious people.

Communism seeks to destroy that spirit as well as all religious property.

Let us replace sacred properties that war destroyed with wooden churches and thus assure a home for the religious spirit and the worshipers who have survived.

May I wish for Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., and all contributors and sponsors, every success in this wooden church crusade.

DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last Tuesday I spoke out rather vigorously on this floor against the action of Secretary of Agriculture Benson in cutting the dairy-price support to the very lowest point he could under his existing authority, lowering it from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent.

I served notice then, as I repeat now, that I shall continue to fight against any such disastrous blow to Minnesota's dairy industry.

At that time I called attention of the Senate to an amendment proposed by the National Milk Producers Federation and placed a copy of it in the RECORD, asking for its consideration by our Committee on Agriculture.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

At that time, too, I emphasized this problem was an economic one, not a political one.

I am extremely pleased that my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] yesterday introduced that same amendment in bill form and called for its enactment as in keeping with the President's promise that any adjustments for agriculture would at least be gradual, and not come as a bolt from the blue such as Secretary Benson now proposes.

I wish at this time to ask that I be associated with the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota as a cosponsor of that amendment, serving notice that Minnesota stands united for fair treatment of the dairy industry regardless of political party.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I have just heard my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, refer to the bill, S. 2962, which I introduced yesterday. I welcome any other Senators to join as cosponsors of the bill, because I have a very strong feeling that the dairy industry will be faced with a very critical and serious situation if the support price should be dropped so drastically as to 75 percent of parity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of Secretary Benson's press announcement dated February 15, announcing that during the marketing year beginning April 1, 1954, the prices of milk for manufacture and butterfat sold by farmers will be supported at 75 percent of parity.

I wish to comment on this announcement and to quote from it, for I believe in itself it refutes some of the current propaganda about dairy support and shows Mr. Benson is putting the cart before the horse in proposing a reduction in price protection to dairy producers before making any constructive recommendation for increasing dairy consumption, or effectively using our abundance about which some people complain so loudly.

Mr. President, the same newspapers now hailing Secretary Benson's action have been complaining for several years about what they term "mountains of butter" piling up in storage, and threatening to spoil. Even the President, in his press conference this week, hinted at the danger of spoilage of our dairy reserves.

Mr. President, what does the Secretary of Agriculture himself say?

Figures, it seems, can be given different emphasis on different occasions, to meet different needs. Many of us recall the propaganda buildup a year ago, when the same decision was before the Secretary. I seem to recall his own complaints about the excess supply of dairy products on hand; I recall the newspaper articles and cartoons at that time about all this excess supply. It was only at the last moment, after Cabinet discussions in which the President's previous promises to farmers were recalled, as I pointed out Tuesday, that Secretary Benson agreed to continue the 90-percent support price.

Yet in the release of February 15, 1954, Secretary Benson says that when the price support level of 90 percent on milk and butterfat was announced a year ago—and I am now quoting directly from his press release:

CCC stocks of dairy products were relatively low.

Let me read further:

Production of milk and butterfat had been about equal to demand during the previous 4 years when prices of milk and butterfat had been supported.

In other words, Mr. President, the Secretary now publicly admits that 4 years of price support at 90 percent of parity did not throw production out of balance with demand, as so many have been trying to convince us; he now says that all the propaganda previously about excessive supply was all wrong—that the CCC stocks were relatively low.

He does not contend, Mr. President, that fair prices to the dairy industry caused the temporary increase in production this last year which he now seems to find alarming.

On the contrary, his press release says:

Among the factors that affected production during the past year were a repetition of mild winter weather which brought abundant pastures and increased off-season dairy production. In addition, drought forced beef cattle sales and a drop in prices which resulted in the holding in northern areas of cows which otherwise would have been culled from dairy herds.

Mr. President, what Mr. Benson says is that present overproduction in the dairy industry has been caused by unusual weather conditions and falling cattle prices that discouraged sale of cull cows. For once, I can agree with him. I cannot, however, agree with his suggested cure. One does not chop off his hand to get rid of a wart on his finger.

The Secretary of Agriculture by his own release concurs that the excess dairy production is a temporary situation resulting from an unusual set of circumstances beyond the farmer's control. The entire theory of price supports is to offer farmers some degree of protection against such unusual circumstances beyond his own control.

While I may have some doubts, the Secretary of Agriculture keeps insisting the decline in cattle prices has finally halted; so perhaps one of the reasons he gives for holding back cows which should be culled will take care of itself.

Now let us put at rest the President's worries about our dairy stocks spoiling.

Mr. Benson's release adds:

Recent inspection indicates that Government-held stocks of dairy products remain in good condition.

Mr. President, some comment has been made on this floor about the Secretary being legally compelled to lower price supports because of the discretion given him to determine the level "necessary in order to assure an adequate supply."

Let me quote again from Secretary Benson's press release:

He (Secretary Benson) explained that if our full dietary needs were met, there would be no surplus of milk and dairy products.

In other words, Secretary Benson admits there is no surplus of dairy production; we are just not providing for its proper use.

Secretary Benson concludes his press release with some advice I sincerely wish he would heed himself. He says:

The immediate problems of the dairy industry should be attacked through increased consumption of dairy products. * * * From the individual's standpoint, milk provides many of the most important human nutrients. It sustains life for the Nation's babies and extends life for its older citizens. It is food and beverage for young and old alike. Because of the many important dietary needs supplied by milk; it provides consumers with a relatively inexpensive food. Milk is the most important single source of calcium in our diet, yet this near-perfect food also supplies protein, riboflavin, thiamine, vitamin A, and other body-building essentials.

For the sake of the physical strength of the Nation, consumption of milk and dairy products must continue to grow. Use of milk must be pushed into areas where diets are deficient. These deficiencies exist in both metropolitan and rural areas. Here lies the real challenge to the dairy industry. The industry has already shown by special campaigns in test areas that milk consumption can be increased.

That is the end of his release.

How true. How true.

But how does Secretary Benson reconcile his words with his deeds?

If milk provides consumers with a relatively inexpensive food, what is all the nonsense about the price being too high?

If the immediate problems of the dairy industry should be attacked through increased consumption of dairy products, why does not the Secretary put the horse in front of the cart instead of behind it, and present to Congress a constructive plan for helping to increase consumption, instead of merely recommending that we try to cut down production by making it less likely the dairyman can produce at a profit?

If the use of milk must be pushed into areas where diets are deficient, why does not the Secretary first tackle that problem by eliminating some of the barriers now keeping midwestern milk from reaching our great metropolitan centers?

If the Secretary is really concerned about use of milk to sustain life of the Nation's babies and extend life for its older citizens, why has not some constructive interest been shown by his Department in my dairy-diet dividend proposal for making dairy products available to dependent children and the aged needy now on our public-assistance rolls?

There may be difference in this Chamber on the level of price support, but there are not differences, I am sure, on the vital necessity of taking a more positive course toward stimulating consumption.

That attitude has been reflected by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and by the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Why, then, has not the Secretary of Agriculture, after a year of study, not

approached the problem he complains about in this more positive direction?

By his own words we have no surplus, in face of dietary needs; by his own words our reserve dairy stocks are in good condition; by his own words supply has been held about equal to demand during 4 years of 90 percent price supports, only exceeding immediately effective demand through unusual circumstances of weather and low cattle prices during the past year alone.

Yet he insists on using dairy farmers as guinea pigs to gain a wedge of lower price supports which he admittedly desires for our entire agricultural economy.

Mr. President, I regret very much that I can only add to my growing conclusion that the President has not quite correctly explained the philosophy of this administration during some of his recent remarks. What he should have said was that this administration likes to talk as liberals, and to act as conservatives.

The gap between word and deed was never better exemplified than in the present treatment of American farmers.

I repeat this will not be my final word on this subject. The Senate will continue to hear about milk and dairying until this administration reverses itself and starts making its deeds live up to its words.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the press release issued by the Department of Agriculture on February 15, announcing the dairy support level at 75 percent of parity.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USDA ANNOUNCES 1954–55 DAIRY SUPPORT LEVEL AT 75 PERCENT OF PARITY—SECRETARY BENSON URGES INCREASED CONSUMPTION OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today announced that during the marketing year beginning April 1, 1954, the prices of milk for manufacture and butterfat sold by farmers will be supported at 75 percent of parity.

This decision was reached after lengthy discussions with farm leaders, dairy organizations, congressional leaders, and others who have been consulted.

Under the Agricultural Act of 1949 the Secretary of Agriculture must support dairy prices at a level between 75 percent and 90 percent of parity, the level of support to be whatever the Secretary determines necessary in order to assure an adequate supply.

When the price-support level of 90 percent on milk and butterfat was announced a year ago, the Commodity Credit Corporation inventory of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids was equivalent to approximately 1.44 billion pounds of whole milk, or about 1.2 percent of the milk production during the 1952–53 marketing year. CCC stocks of dairy products were relatively low. Production of milk and butterfat had been about equal to demand during the previous 4 years when prices of milk and butterfat had been supported. The outlook for milk production for the 1953–54 marketing year was uncertain.

Among the factors that affected production during the past year were a repetition of mild winter weather which brought abundant pastures and increased offseason dairy production. In addition drought forced beef cattle sales and a drop in prices which resulted in the holding in northern areas of cows which otherwise would have been culled from dairy herds.

The best current estimates indicate that production during the 1953–54 marketing year will reach about 122 billion pounds, an increase of about 5 billion pounds over the 1952–53 year. CCC stocks now on hand represent the equivalent of more than 8 billion pounds of whole milk, compared with 1.44 billion pounds a year ago. This 8 billion pounds is over 6 percent of the year's production.

Since production of dairy products during the past year has been more than adequate and the outlook for this year's production is good, Secretary Benson therefore has set the support level at 75 percent of parity.

Recent inspection indicates that Government-held stocks of dairy products remain in good condition. Studies for increased utilization of these stocks are progressing, and it is hoped that an announcement can be made in the near future.

Inclusion of some dairy products in the $2.5 billion set-aside proposed in President Eisenhower's farm-program message is also under consideration.

Secretary Benson today stated: "The immediate problems of the dairy industry should be attacked through increased consumption of dairy products. The Department of Agriculture will continue and emphasize its programs to assist the dairy industry in its current campaign to increase sales of dairy products."

He explained that if our full dietary needs were met there would be no surplus of milk and dairy products. From the individual's standpoint, milk provides many of the most important human nutrients. It sustains life for the Nation's babies and extends life for its older citizens. It is food and beverage for young and old alike.

Because of the many important dietary needs supplied by milk, it provides consumers with a relatively inexpensive food. Milk is the most important single source of calcium in our diet, yet this near-perfect food also supplies protein, riboflavin, thiamine, vitamin A, and other body-building essentials.

For the sake of the physical strength of the Nation, consumption of milk and dairy products must continue to grow. Use of milk must be pushed into areas where diets are deficient. These deficiencies exist in both metropolitan and rural areas. Here lies the real challenge to the dairy industry. The industry has already shown by special campaigns in test areas that milk consumption can be increased.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 19, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 18 (legislative day of February 8), 1954:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Albert Cummins Beeson, of California, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 16, 1954.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1954

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Reverend James Wallace Curtis, All Saints' Episcopal Church, Saugatuck, Mich., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, from whom cometh all wisdom and knowledge, guide us all this day as Thou didst guide our forefathers, that this Nation may continue with sure confidence to uphold and guard those inalienable rights Thou hast given us, that other peoples of the world may also seek those rights for themselves; and, help us, O Father, always to keep our eyes lifted upward that we may never forget Thou art the source of whatever talents and blessings we might have. We ask it in the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

OUTLAWING TOTALITARIAN DICTATORSHIP GROUPS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to outlaw any totalitarian party which advocates the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship. Of course, I have the Communist Party in mind, but I am using in my new bill certain definitions as they have been written into the statutes in 1950 and reenacted in 1952 in the McCarran-Walter Act. In using legal language tested in courts, I am striving to make the proposal effective as soon as possible and not susceptible to prolonged litigation. Also, in an attempt to have all our laws relating to treason, sedition, and subversive activities in one place, I am making my proposed bill a part of title 18 of the United States Code which covers crimes and criminal procedures.

I hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will start hearings on my bill very soon so that we may act on this necessary and timely legislation before the 83d Congress adjourns.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 16]

Ayres	Buckley	Chelf
Barrett	Carnahan	Clardy
Battle	Celler	Condon
Bolling	Chatham	Cooley

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Corbett	Kearney	Reed, Ill.
Cotton	Kearns	Rivers
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Shafer
Dingell	Klein	Short
Dorn, S. C.	Lucas	Small
Doyle	McCarthy	Steed
Durham	Martin	Sutton
Fine	Mason	Taylor
Gamble	Merrow	Tollefson
Haley	Miller, Kans.	Vursell
Harrison, Wyo.	Miller, N. Y.	Weichel
Hart	Patman	Wier
Hillelson	Patten	Wilson, Calif.
Holifield	Powell	Wolcott
Hyde	Reece, Tenn.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 372 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on a deficiency appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Reserving the right to object, may I ask if all items in this bill are of such urgent nature as to warrant immediate consideration?

Mr. TABER. Some of them are very urgent, where certain payrolls will be short unless it is taken up as quickly as possible.

Mr. CANNON. Are all of the items deficiency items?

Mr. TABER. Some of them are. I would say practically all of them are. There are some supplementals, but I would say most of them are deficiencies. Some of them are new items, like the Coast Guard item, in connection with loran stations. There are items in connection with defense matters, and there are some items that we will not carry in the bill, which came from the other body and they are very urgent.

Mr. CANNON. The bill is so drawn as to give it the status of a general appropriation bill?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. CANNON. And the gentleman wishes to take it up on Tuesday morning?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation on the gentleman's request, and reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works may have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

JOHN HVASTA, THE FORGOTTEN MAN, RETURNS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, there is a great struggle today between two different ways of life. One—the tradition of western civilization—holds that the individual and his liberties are of prime importance, the state exists for him. The other—the ideology of communism—denies all rights to the individual; he exists for the state and is completely subservient to it. We set no price on a human life, nor do we spare any effort to save it. The case of John Hvasta is a gratifying example of the importance of each citizen to the Government of the United States. John Hvasta—the once "forgotten man"—is back today, having escaped the clutches of the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia. All those who joined in the crusade for the freedom of John Hvasta asked for no greater reward than the satisfaction of seeing their task brought to a happy conclusion. I am proud to have been able to contribute in some small measure to this work, but above all I am happy to be able to stand before you today and to say, "Welcome home, John."

For 5 heartbreaking years, the family of John Hvasta lived in agonizing fear. None knew whether he would ever come home again. In 1948 John had gone to Czechoslovakia as a student. For awhile he was employed in our consular offices in Bratislava. He was mysteriously imprisoned by the Communist government in the fall of that year and sentenced to 3 years imprisonment on charges of espionage. Later that sentence was extended to 10 years. These charges were without any foundation, the fantastic fabrications of the Communist Czech Government. All attempts to obtain his release failed, and for a while John Hvasta became a forgotten man. Then, early in 1952, John took part in a six-man break from Leopoldov prison where he was being held. For 21 months he eluded the Czech secret police, helped as he himself has said, by God, and by many of the brave Czech people, who for their own sakes must remain nameless. His dramatic flight came to an end when he sought asylum in the American Embassy in Prague. Through the work of our new Ambassador, the Honorable U. Alexis Johnson, Mr. Hvasta's release was negotiated. It was a release secured not by shameful bargains and concessions, but through forceful negotiations on our part.

That John Hvasta is here today is proof enough to the American people that no individual is too insignificant or unimportant to merit every effort our Government can make to help him when he is in trouble. When the Hvastas came to this country in 1938, they did so to seek refuge from the Nazi tyranny and despotism which were soon to annihilate the rights of Czechoslovakia and its citizens. They adopted this land as their own. They know today what democracy can mean and do for the individual. But they and John knew it even in the dark days of his imprisonment. They had faith in freedom and in God, a faith which they never gave up. And today that faith has been justified.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to that of several of my esteemed colleagues who have proposed that the words "under God" be added to the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States.

Since having the privilege of attending the annual dinner of the Washington Pilgrimage of American Churchmen in 1953, at which this proposal was made, I have been studying it and discussing it with constituents in my district of various religious denominations.

I am able to report that the suggestion appears to have the support of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews alike, and I believe that there is strong public sentiment in favor of adding a recognition of the Deity to this pledge which is recited daily in schools across the Nation and on many patriotic occasions.

Particularly does it seem appropriate to offer this resolution in the period when we are commemorating the birthdays of two great Presidents, Lincoln and Washington, who repeatedly expressed the conviction that our Nation needs to recognize God if it is to attain true greatness.

It was Abraham Lincoln who first used the expression "this Nation under God" in his immortal Gettysburg Address.

History records no stronger exhortation to the American people to recognize the sovereignty of God than that which Lincoln voiced in his proclamation of March 30, 1863, calling for a national day of prayer. Speaking—as he might have done to Americans of this day, too—Lincoln said:

We have been the recipients of the choicest bounty of heaven; we have grown in num-

bers, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and enriched and strengthened us, and we have vainly imagined in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to the God that made us.

I am reminded, too, Mr. Speaker, as I offer this resolution, of the words of George Washington in his first inaugural at New York City April 30, 1789, when he said:

No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the invisible hand which conducts the affairs of men more than those of the United States. Every step by which we have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency.

President Washington acknowledged that sovereignty of God in the affairs of men which Samuel Adams so aptly expressed when, upon the signing of the Declaration of Independence severing the Colonies from the rule of George III, he remarked:

We have this day restored the sovereign to whom men alone ought to be obedient. He reigns in heaven.

Our own great President of this day, Dwight D. Eisenhower, has repeatedly in his public utterances expressed the conviction that except as America recognizes the spiritual foundation of our democratic institutions and the divine God-given dignity of man, we cannot preserve these free institutions against the forces of atheist materialism which surround us.

It is my belief that if we daily pledge allegiance to our flag as a symbol of "one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," we shall be reaffirming a basic truth. Our pledge of allegiance is not complete without a recognition of our basic faith.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. PILLION, Mr. MILLER of New York, and Mr. OAKMAN, in giving bipartisan, interfaith support to this proposal. It is my sincere hope that we will listen to the words of Lincoln, Washington, and other great men and will add this recognition of basic faith to our affirmation of our loyalty.

TUNAFISH IMPORTS

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest and considerable surprise the article in the current issue of Look magazine, by Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of the board of Studebaker Corp., former head of ECA, and chief exponent of free trade. Most of his statements are irresponsible, and not supported by fact. He said that in a talk with a Japanese businessman, he was told that Japan would buy thousands of American automobiles if they could get dollars. I quote from the article:

He—

A Japanese businessman—

was too polite to suggest that Japan's efforts to earn dollars by selling goods to us had met with one rebuff after another. When the Japanese tried to sell us tunafish and other products, they bumped into insurmountable barriers set up by American businessmen.

THE FACTS ON TUNAFISH IMPORTS

The tunafish industry on the West Coast normally employs around 30,000 fisherman and workers, and in 1952 the domestic production was a $150,000,000 industry. But this was a much smaller percentage of the total domestic market than in previous years, since, although total consumption has increased, the percentage of the local market usurped by imports, principally from Japan, and, to a lesser degree, from South America, has gone up tremendously.

Imports in recent years:

Frozen tuna:	*Pounds*
1948	9,143,000
1949	20,606,000
1950	56,712,000
1951	62,085,000
1952	69,003,000
1953 (first 10 months)	82,577,000

Tuna in brine:	*Cases*
1948	1,000
1949	4,000
1950	18,000
1951	445,000
1952	906,000
1953 (first 10 months)	1,105,000

FLEET CATCH

In 1948 the catch of tuna brought in by domestic bait-boat clippers amounted to 59.6 percent of all the tuna sold in the United States. By 1953 it hit an all time low of 38.3 percent.

THE TARIFF

Frozen tuna is imported duty free.

Tuna and bonito canned in brine have a 12½ percent ad valorem tariff, which is entirely inadequate to protect the domestic producer, in view of the drastically lower wages and other production costs abroad. This low rate resulted from a reciprocal trade agreement signed with Iceland in 1943—although Iceland neither catches nor exports tuna.

Tuna canned in oil, under a reciprocal trade agreement with Mexico, carried an ad valorem duty of 22½ percent to all nations—the most-favored-nation clause—and this resulted in a sharp upward trend in imports. However, cancellation of the Mexican trade agreement allowed it to revert to 45 percent, and this type of import is now held at a reasonable level. However, the change saw Japanese exports shift largely to tuna in brine, which is wrecking the domestic industry.

The tuna industry and its workers are not seeking the elimination of Japanese and South American fish from the domestic market. They do, however, insist that such competition would be on an equal basis with due consideration to wages and cost differentials.

WAGES

American fishermen cannot compete with foreign fishermen on a cost-of-living basis.

American cannery workers earn a minimum of $1.85 per hour. Japanese cannery workers make 50 cents per day. Japanese fishermen make about $29 per month, less than 10 percent of the earnings of American fishermen.

EXPORTS

The American industry does not export canned tuna. A recent survey by the Tuna Research Foundation of Long Beach, Calif., disclosed that almost invariably export licenses were required by other nations for tuna imported from the United States, and that, in most instances, no such licenses would be granted. The foundation was advised that the Japanese tariff on canned tuna was 20 percent. However, import licenses were required, and none would be granted. But even without these restrictions, exports would be impossible due to the higher costs of production for American fishermen and canners.

OUTLOOK

The quantity of canned tuna consumed in this country is expanding yearly. The Japanese, for example, are going all-out in building new vessels, yet at the present time there is not one tuna clipper under construction in the United States. The clipper fleet, due to numerous losses in sinking, is at a low. Further, the construction of trolling boats is at an absolute minimum. Why? The answer is simple: No one in his right mind will risk any capital in an industry faced with ruin due to unrestricted or low-tariff imports. (A statement by Mason Cases, chairman, Pacific Coast Fish Producers Institute, Terminal Island, Calif., to the Randall Commission.)

Mr. Hoffman closes by saying that as we do not have tariff barriers between or among the several States, why should we have any tariff barriers between or among countries? He might just as well say that because there are no immigration barriers between or among the States, why should we have immigration restrictions as to any nation?

So his argument falls by its own inconsistency. He does not take into consideration the fact that each State has safety, health, and labor standards, compensation insurance, unemployment insurance, and other statutory benefits, to say nothing of minimum wage laws from 10 to 20 times higher than wages paid behind the low-wage curtains.

One certain way to bring on a depression in this country is to import it by way of unrestricted imports of cheap-wage products or unrestricted importation of cheap labor itself. You could not get 10 votes in Congress to permit unrestricted immigration into this country of $1 a day labor. And yet, the two go hand in hand.

I deplore the fact that Mr. Hoffman should make such irresponsible statements.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was granted permission to address the House

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

today for 20 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7893) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, Export-Import Bank of Washington, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7893) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, Export-Import Bank of Washington, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] will be recognized for an hour and a half, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] for an hour and a half.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 50 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my presentation of the bill today I am going to ask members of the Committee to permit me to conclude my general statement. This is for purposes of continuity and clarity. At the end of that statement I shall be glad to yield for any questions.

I want now to say just a brief word about a wonderful team in the House of Representatives, the team that makes up the complement of seven members serving on what is known as the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Treasury-Post Office appropriations. I am privileged to be the chairman of the group in this Congress. The members of that team are: The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI], on the minority side; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JAMES], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], on the majority side. This group, may I say, is a truly dedicated group. Responding to the call of the chairman of the full committee, they came from different parts of the country to Washington 3 weeks before Christmas to begin hearings on this bill; this so that the program for this year could be expedited in the House; and today this team presents to you what I shall call an honest report, made in assiduous, most honest application to the testimony presented by witnesses from the Treasury and Post Office Departments. Every one of these Members is particularly well qualified to render a distinct contribution, which contribution is emphasized in the hearings and report now before you.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a special word about the ranking minority member, former chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. I have said this on the floor of the House before in using the following expression: "He is the salt of the earth." He is truly a great Congressman. In his day as chairman of this subcommittee we made extraordinarily important field studies that had never been made before by a like committee, enabling us better to understand the problems involved in the operations of these departments.

We operate in a nonpartisan manner. That was so under the leadership of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], and I think he will bear witness that is also true under my leadership at this time.

I do not have to tell you that the Treasury and Post Office Departments are the two great service departments of our Federal Government. They do not lend themselves very readily to meat-ax or serious cuts. However, it should also be stated at this time that last year the new teams that took over control of these great departments sent their requests to the Congress only after they had been cut as they had never been cut before, some $152 million in the Post Office Department alone and approximately $58 million in the Treasury Department.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The appropriation request for the Treasury Department is $578 million. I am using approximate figures in my statement, exact figures being found in the table appearing at the end of the report which you have before you.

The $578 million reflect a decrease of some $34 million below the current fiscal year funds, the major portion of this reduction being a change in the program of the Coast Guard where there is a reduction of some 5,000 military personnel and 800 civilian employees. Other minor reductions will be found in other activities of this Department. The reduction in the Coast Guard appropriation falls into three categories:

First, there is the so-called expanded search and rescue program in the Far Pacific going out to the Philippine Islands, Wake, Adak, and Midway, a program begun immediately post-Korea on the request of the Defense Department for search and rescue services in an area outside the area normally serviced by the Coast Guard. The military has now concluded it does not need this program except to the extent it can carry out its purposes itself ancillary to its other activities in the area. This program is now in process of liquidation and will involve the laying up of 11 aircraft and 5 vessels, a savings of $5,681,000.

The Coast Guard has been operating 5 ocean stations in the Pacific and 5⅔ in the Atlantic. Now, however, since determination has been made by the Air Coordinating Committee that there is no longer a civil requirement for these services, the Department of Defense is stating as a military requirement a need for 5⅔ stations, these to be operated by the Coast Guard on a reimbursable basis from Department of Defense funds. The new program will embrace 2 stations in the Pacific and 3⅔ stations in the Atlantic, 11 ships to be laid up as a result of this curtailment. The amount of $15,675,000 of the cost involved in the operation of these stations will be added to the Navy budget and it will reimburse the Coast Guard for the operation of the 5⅔ stations required by the Defense Department.

The third curtailment is in the port security program and has to do with the so-called shore side patrol. About 2,000 of the reduction in military personnel will take place in this item.

This patrol, which has to do with controlling access to docks whereon military defense assistance cargoes are loaded, is being lessened to a degree not believed inconsistent with security due to the fact that shipments of such cargo are decreasing, and it is further emphasized in testimony before our committee that the waterside patrol is being diminished in no way and periodic spot checks will be made. It is also pointed out that steamship companies involved will continue to maintain the additional protection necessary.

All other portions of the program are unaffected by this cut and there will be no wholesale dismissal of officers or enlisted men, headquarters believing that curtailment can be effected through normal expiration of enlistments.

In the Internal Revenue Service, testimony this year shows that almost $14 million will be saved next year through reorganization and other improvements, these funds to be plowed back into enforcement. Currently the Service is lacking some 850 of its full recruitment in this area. Savings will permit the appointment of at least 650 more agents making a total complement of 1,500 to be added to the force partially through the use of new civil-service registers. The Service, through its new training programs allowed in this bill, believes it can provide the services of capable men and carry out a program of strengthening its enforcement arm gradually with increased collection of revenue. If the program to eliminate filings by those whose tax on wages is fully withheld is carried out, millions of additional savings can be used to this end.

Insofar as the Bureau of Customs is concerned, the new Simplification Act plus increased efficiencies all along the line have enabled the Service to reverse

the trend of an ever-increasing backlog of unliquidated entries in collectors' offices, savings being directed to this end. Present requests of the Bureau which are allowed in full call for an overall net reduction in customs employment of about 100 men and it is the plan of the Service to meet this deficit entirely by attrition. There has been considerable newspaper comment that the Bureau intends to lower its enforcement standards and lift the barriers to smuggling. Testimony of the Treasury is that no change will be made in any customs procedures which will have any of these undesirable effects. The Service currently is engaged in a number of studies to simplify operations, improve service to the public, and conserve manpower, but it does not contemplate any action as a result of these studies which will harm overall customs control or endanger the revenue or welfare of the country. It is the plan of our committee to watch carefully the new procedures and programs of the Service during the new fiscal year and the Treasury has been advised that any revision found to be necessary even if it should mean additional manpower, should be immediately brought to the attention of the committee.

Our committee is intensely interested in the work of the Bureau of Narcotics and those who may have any apprehensions regarding the deep interest of the Government in meeting any challenge in this respect will be interested in the statement I am now very happy to make.

I am informed that for some time an intensive review of the narcotic problem has been going on within the Government. Several departments, including the Treasury, have important responsibilities relating either to law enforcement or to care and rehabilitation; and assistant secretaries of these departments have been meeting to review the adequacy of the Government's machinery for dealing with the narcotic problem. I am advised that this group will probably soon recommend to the President the formal establishment of an interdepartmental committee on narcotics which will advise the President on problems and developments in the field, work with State, local, and international groups, and provide a continuous and coordinated study of the problems. I am told that this development is by no means the result of any feeling that a narcotics crisis has developed in this country. It stems solely from the fact that the people in this administration who are responsible for the problem want to make absolutely sure that every sensible move that can be made is being made to control and to eradicate the curse of narcotic addiction.

The committee proposes a reduction in the amount requested of some $927,000, the major reduction of $402,000 being in the Bureau of the Public Debt, where some reorganization has been completed and further efforts along these lines are being considered. The General Accounting Office has made recommendations which are being studied for further economies.

In 1953, the actual number of average positions for the Department was 76,892. This number will be reduced during the current fiscal year to approximately 75,000 with a further reduction in fiscal year 1955 to approximately 74,200.

The workload throughout the Treasury Department remains high with little prospect for any decrease during the coming year, yet requests in the main for funds are less than for the current year reflecting reduced costs through economies that have been put into effect. For instance, in the Division of Disbursements, there has been a constant decrease of unit cost from 0.06402 cent in 1952 to an estimated unit cost of 0.04997 cent for fiscal year 1955. At the same time the production of each employee has been increasing.

Last year when the Postmaster General with his new management team appeared before our committee, we were impressed with the challenging and far-reaching program for improvement of the Post Office Department operations which he outlined. I so reported to the Congress.

At that time our committee requested and received the wholehearted support of the House in giving the Postmaster General the funds and flexibility that he asked in order to permit him to carry out his program to improve the service and at the same time reduce the postal deficit. The Congress approved a 1954 budget calling for expenditures of $2,832,000,000 and a deficit of $594 million.

We are now proposing approval of 1955 expenditures of $2,755,000,000, which will mean a deficit of $324 million. The essence of the 1955 budget is an increase in mail volume, very little change in expenditures and a substantial decrease in the deficit. I will give you the details of how that is all to be accomplished; but first let me tell you the post office story without the figures.

Last year the Postmaster General's program necessarily consisted largely of promises. I am happy to tell you that he has kept his promises.

First. The headquarters of the Department in Washington has been completely reorganized. Functions have been rearranged and streamlined in eliminating duplication of activities and excessive layers of supervision. Responsibilities have been more realistically alined and important functions have been added.

Second. Authority over post office operations is being delegated to regional field managers. The first region has been inaugurated in Cincinnati with jurisdiction over postal operations in the tri-State area of Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. Additional regions will be established in 1954 and the remainder in 1955. This decentralization will increase the responsiveness of the service to local needs and conditions by delegating management authority to field personnel commensurate with their responsibility; by allowing informed local personnel to solve local problems at a local level. It should reduce costs and improve public and personnel relations.

Third. A program of consolidation of post offices and rural routes is in progress. As of December 31, a total of 774 fourth-class post offices had been closed and modern rural service substituted, with improved service to the patrons, and a savings of approximately $900,000 annually.

Fourth. For the first time a modern personnel program has been put into effect. The major achievement in the field of personnel has been to introduce the merit system in the selection of supervisors. A survey of wages and salaries in all branches of the service has been undertaken by a firm of management engineers which should be useful in connection with legislation now pending.

Fifth. The appropriation structure has been rearranged along bureau lines to present a clearer view of operations and to facilitate presentation of estimates. The budget work for all bureaus has been reorganized and consolidated under the Bureau of the Controller.

Sixth. The Department is in the process of modernizing its entire accounting system including the monthly financial statement, to provide businesslike analyses of current operations in a form practicable for use in executive decision-making. Included in this program are the adoption of the whole-dollar accounting, simplification, and consolidation of cash handling, and many other improvements in the accounting and auditing field.

Seventh. Work performance standards have been developed for 22 different mail handling operations and pilot installations of these standards have been made at Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, Detroit, Cincinnati, and New York.

Eighth. Research on methods and equipment has been accelerated. The committee witnessed the showing of slides of pictures of mechanical improvement that are in process in the Post Office Department indicating the extent to which the Department is developing this program. Intensive experimental research is in progress to develop machines to take the place of expensive hand operations involved in the facing, canceling, sorting, and distribution of the mails.

Ninth. All means of transportation are being used as flexibly as possible to give patrons better service with less cost to the Department. The carrying of regular 3-cent mail by air is under experimentation as well as the trailer-flat car principle for movement of mail between cities in lieu of the use of rail storage or highway trucks. Air mail is being dispatched via the most economical carrier and routing where airline competition exists.

Tenth. The physical plant and equipment is being modernized. Plans are being developed for standardized buildings and construction components of various types in which adequate regard is being given to the working conditions, the use of conveyor equipment, motor vehicle approaches, tailgate space and overall patron convenience. A master real estate planning activity has been created which will study the movement of population, business, communication facilities, and other factors in relation to the choice of locations for post offices and possible physical expansion of present or new post offices, supply activities

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

are being decentralized, designs of motor vehicles simplified, the mail equipment shop in Washington is undergoing careful reorganization and modernization.

Eleventh. A division of rates has been established and a qualified director has been employed.

Twelfth. Additional improvements have been made by way of later mail collection service in 272 cities, window service hours over the country have been extended, and curb-side mail boxes have been improved for the convenience of motorists.

This is a great program of reorganization and it is exactly what our committee has wanted done in the post office for many years. The Postmaster General frankly states that these accomplishments are just a beginning.

The 1955 budget contemplates continued progress in complying with the President's promise to improve service and reduce the deficit. It provides for the continuation and further development of all of the 1954 programs. The major aspects include employee training, further regionalization, more consolidations, futher accounting refinements, broader application of work performance standards, improvement of work methods, more mechanization, continued research on all operating matters—including transportation—expanded service and gradual improvement of physical facilities and working conditions.

Before explaining the budget submission for 1955, I want to briefly review 1954, because the operations for that year become the base for 1955. The original estimate submitted by the Department on September 12, 1952, contemplated a deficit of $746 million for the fiscal year 1954. It subsequently developed that revenues for that year were inadvertently overestimated by approximately one hundred million which, had that been taken into account at the time of submission, would have increased the deficit to eight hundred and forty-six million. Postmaster General Summerfield's present estimated deficit for 1954 is $437 million, which is four hundred and nine million less.

The submission by the Post Office Department indicates an estimated deficit of three hundred and twenty-four million in 1955. This is one hundred and thirteen million less than the 1954 deficit. This is a remarkable record. In the short course of 2 years, the deficit will have been reduced from a potential eight hundred and forty-six million to three hundred and twenty-four million. Of this decrease Congress has contributed one hundred and sixteen million by relieving the Department of airline subsidies and costs of Government mail. The balance occurred upon initiation by the Department itself, in higher rates and by economies.

One of the most pleasing aspects of this budget submission is that, notwithstanding an estimated increase of 3.14 percent in the workload, the estimate reflects a decrease in employment. Clerks and mail handlers will be reduced by 4,024 positions. It will be necessary to increase the number of city carriers by 1,949 positions and rural carriers by 229 positions in order to improve service, principally in newly developed areas, but still the personnel needs for 1955 reflect a net reduction of 1,753 positions. With the exception of 1951, when a reduction occurred through a decrease in trips of the city delivery service, this is the first time since 1939—the earliest year for which accurate figures are available—that the man-hours will have decreased. When, oh, when, did you ever hear a report like that? Some will say we heard it in 1951. Yes; you did hear it in 1951 when the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] was chairman of this subcommittee, but that was when there was a reduction through a decrease in the trips of the city-delivery service from 2 to 1, a major reduction in manpower and costs indeed.

On its face the appropriation for 1955 appears to be less in dollars than 1954. This requires explanation since the figures are not wholly comparable. If adjustment is made for the elimination of airline subsidies from 1954, and certain other items, the 1955 appropriation is actually approximately $21 million greater.

You may ask why the new management, with its effective record, needs an increase of $21 million. Actually, personnel costs will be reduced by about $12 million, but minimum essential needs for new facilities and for expanded service in newly developed areas account for practically all of the difference. Here is how:

First. The amount for facilities provides for an increase of $11,395,000 for needed improvements in the physical plants and equipment of the postal service. There have been no new buildings constructed since 1938 and it is essential that badly needed improvements in space and equipment be instituted, if many contemplated future economies are to materialize. Included in this program are funds for 2,278 new vehicles to replace present ones and for the renovation of several Federal buildings under the modern light and color program.

Second. Approximately $9,500,000 is included for the additional city delivery and rural carriers. These positions are needed for the mandatory extensions of these routes to meet requirements for newly built-up areas and to relieve congested routes. This is approximately the normal rate of expansion that has been necessary for these branches of the service since the termination of the war, following construction booms and expansion of business generally.

Third. The remaining increases are for:

(a) Approximately $3,400,000 for the expansion of short-haul trucking service, star routes, highway post offices and mail messenger service, offset by decreases in railroad requirements and other charges, which increase approximates five-tenths of one percent as compared with a 3.14 percent increase in mail volume.

(b) Mandatory increases by law for postmasters and supervisors, which require another $3,600,000.

(c) The completion of the regionalization program together with the enlargement of the Inspection Service and the Controller's functions for the purpose of modernizing those activities will require an additional $4,900,000. This should produce material savings in operations for future years when the program is fully effective.

The budget submission for 1955 is on a 5-appropriation basis in lieu of the 4 presently used. This improvement was made at the suggestion of this committee for the purpose of effecting an improved budget procedure. The conversion to 5 appropriations has amply met this objection and at the same time improved the control of financial responsibility of the Department by having the individual appropriations follow bureau lines within the Department.

There are other changes which are equally important in modernizing the Post Office Department's budget structure. In addition to the necessary transfer authority for the purposes of flexibility, the new language provides for the payment of indemnities, unpaid money orders, and stamped envelopes from revenues rather than from appropriated funds. The payments of these items are mandatory and the accounting will be improved by the payment of these items from revenues rather than from appropriated funds.

These are the highlights of the Post Office Department's budget submission for the fiscal year 1955. The presentation is one that my committee is proud to sponsor. It reflects the splendid results of Postmaster General Summerfield's endeavors to provide a better mail service at less cost. He cannot do the job alone and it is only through the continued cooperation of the Congress that the full results of his program will be achieved.

The amount before you for the Post Office is a reduction of $4,614,000 by the committee from the President's budget figure for expenditures, which in turn is $50 million less than the Department had requested.

The committee gave a great deal of careful consideration to the 1955 budget before recommending reductions from the President's proposals. The hearings were very thorough and covered 404 pages of print. The result might have been a slightly smaller appropriation but it would also have meant a delay in time to accomplish the Postmaster General's reorganization program. Future budgets will certainly benefit if the program is carried out. The Postmaster General kept his promises last year and we believe he will keep them this year.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. At the time we had cancellation notes for the Commodity Credit Corporation before the House it was disclosed that in order to stay within the statutory debt limit the Treasury had encouraged the borrowing of money from outside sources. In this particular case it was at an increased interest rate. Can the gentleman inform me as to how much money has been borrowed in that fashion and the additional interest that the taxpayers have had to pay?

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentleman who is interested in this matter that our subcommittee conducted no

hearings on that subject matter; however, I have asked the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Burgess, to give me a statement thereon, particularly because I thought the gentleman would raise the question and with his permission I should like to read the statement.

Mr. MARSHALL. I wish to thank the chairman of this subcommittee for his usual prompt attention to the matter and since it is of much interest to the people throughout the country I am wondering if the gentleman will read the statement in the RECORD.

Mr. CANFIELD. I shall be glad to. May I say to the gentleman that he has been very kind today as he was on yesterday when he raised the question before the full committee. I appreciate his indulgence. This is what Mr. Burgess said on this item:

Since the beginning of its program in 1933, the Commodity Credit Corporation has utilized the services of banks in making loans to farmers on agricultural commodities. Banks use their own funds in making price-support loans and under the terms of an agreement with CCC may sell the producers' notes to the Corporation at maturity or prior to maturity. When banks do not keep their own funds invested in price-support loans the CCC must pick up the loans by borrowing directly from the Treasury.

In order to increase participation by banks in the program and as an aid to the Treasury keeping the public debt within the statutory limit, the CCC has made three offerings to banks for the purchase of certificates of interest in crop-support loans. These certificates are issued against a nationwide pool of unmatured crop loans. When the loans mature they are taken out of the pool and an equivalent amount of certificates must be redeemed unless other unmatured notes are available to replace the matured notes in the pool.

Certificates of interest have been used for a number of years in financing the cotton program. They are a convenient and practicable way in which to permit banks to participate in crop-support loans. The certificates are not obligations of a type requiring the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; they do not carry on their face any guaranty by the United States, and therefore they do not fall within the statutory debt limit.

The certificates of interest are not obligations of the Treasury. They are obligations of CCC redeemable on demand. The Treasury is obligated to advance money to CCC within the limit of its borrowing, now $6,750,000,000.

The following table gives some details regarding the three offerings of certificates of interest:

Date of issue	Interest rate	Amount
	Percent	*Millions*
Oct. 28, 1953	2¼	$357
Dec. 17, 1953	2¼	449
Feb. 2, 1954	2¼	351

Mr. MARSHALL. I wish to thank the chairman. I wish to say to him that we went into this matter rather thoroughly, and the Commodity Credit Corporation had been borrowing money from the Treasury at 2 percent interest which the Treasury had borrowed at rates down as low as 1½ percent.

I would like further, in order to clarify the record, to state that we were informed that because of this situation which arose, the Commodity Credit Corporation would not be charged with the difference in the cost of interest; that that amount would be assumed by the Treasury.

I wish to thank the gentleman for his prompt attention.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. As one who has been charged with the study of the Internal Revenue Service, I am particularly pleased to note that they are providing 1,500 more agents. Now, is there any provision for increase in pay for some of these agents who have a particularly important and responsible task to perform?

Mr. CANFIELD. No, there is not. Of course, I think the gentleman from New Jersey realizes that we, in our committee, do not have the authority to provide for such increase. However, as the gentleman from New Jersey has determined, we, on our subcommittee, feel that there should be a new reclassification providing for increased salaries to enforcement agents, and we understand from the testimony of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Andrews, that his Service is proceeding to that end. Most certainly, there should be a correction in this deficiency at this time. As the gentleman has indicated, this bill will provide for 1,500 new frontline enforcement troops in the Internal Revenue Service for the new fiscal year. I believe it is the intent of the Service to recruit and train additional manpower in future years.

Mr. KEAN. I believe it will result in substantially increased revenue, but I also believe that the men in important positions, with very responsible positions, should get more pay.

Mr. CANFIELD. I appreciate the testimony of the gentleman, knowing how fully he has gone into all phases of the problems of this service.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I want to compliment the gentleman on his fine presentation of the manner in which the Post Office Department is now being managed. Recently I received a communication from a businessman in my congressional district enclosing letters that he says clutter up his mail; letters that are simply addressed to patrons of post office boxes, boxholders. It was a sample of a letter which looks very much like a first-class letter, but which is carried at 1½ cents. He complains that his business mail is about to advance to 4 cents, and that the Post Office Department could very well do without its being used as a means of advertising, and complains that this 1½-cent letter costs as much to handle and causes him more trouble than his first-class mail, which is now 3 cents and is proposed to go to 4. Now, the authority for handling this type for 1½ cents is administrative and not legislative; is that not correct?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is my understanding. It is still in an experimental stage. This is also in the form of a pilot experiment. Of course, mail addressed to every box holder would have to be distributed to those box holders under the law. By not forcing addresses, much is conserved in the way of clerk manpower. They do not have to read those addresses. Those addresses do not have to be read, and there is distribution made at every box.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman I hope can see clearly and understand why business people object to all this vast amount of advertising mail at a cent and a half when their business mail costs them 3 now and the proposal is that it cost them 4 cents. It certainly brings on an additional cost of handling in the post office if the system is made more easy for advertisers.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sure the gentleman understands that the greatest proponents of this approach are businessmen who want great distribution of that type of mail referred to in some critical editorials as "junk mail."

Mr. BONNER. That is what this man calls it in his address to me, junk mail.

Mr. CANFIELD. I can assure the gentleman that this program has not been adopted in finality, and our subcommittee plans to watch it very carefully.

Mr. BONNER. But it is in use now. I was merely going to inquire whether in your hearings with the officials of the Post Office Department you had inquired just what they were going to do about this. As I understand, it is put in effect through administration and not through any act of the House.

Mr. CANFIELD. Due inquiry was made and it was developed that there was a distinct saving in this approach. However, whether it is wise to carry it out in finality or not we do not know, but we are watching it very carefully.

Mr. BONNER. Through the parcel-post system we have about driven the American Express and other express companies out of business. Through this system you drive the advertising commercial mediums that are private industry and pay taxes out of business, unless it is corrected.

Mr. CANFIELD. Of course the gentleman knows that if the user of the mail puts an address on the copy matter distribution must be made of that mail.

Mr. BONNER. I realize that and I understand that.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is the only difference.

Mr. BONNER. I think it should carry a higher postal rate.

Again I compliment the gentleman. I have great respect and admiration for him and hold him in the highest regard. I have been interested in listening to his presentation of the business of the Post Office Department.

Mr. CANFIELD. I appreciate those remarks, coming from one who was a secretary in yesteryear along with the gentleman now speaking in the well. I was inclined to think the gentleman was going to ask a question about the Coast Guard, because I know he is a very good friend of the Coast Guard. I assure him now that as far as the Coast Guard is concerned the operations of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

this committee were nil on the budgeted request.

Mr. BONNER. I am sure the Coast Guard is in good hands.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. May I ask whether the decrease in positions can be taken care of through resignations and deaths?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is the program. That is true. In an establishment of this kind it can be done easily that way.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. I join my colleagues of the House in expressing my appreciation to the gentleman from New Jersey, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], and the other members of the committee, for the presentation of this appropriation bill as early as this in the session. It indicates that if the other appropriation subcommittees will do likewise we may be able to adjourn a little earlier this year.

Mr. CANFIELD. We are anxious for the gentleman from North Carolina to get back among his people early in July, if possible.

Mr. DEANE. I invite the gentleman to refer to page 403 of the hearings of the Post Office Department. I noticed that the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] inserted there a page indicating the fourth-class post offices discontinued, 1952, 1953, and 1954. The gentleman from New Jersey who is now addressing us, of course, knows of my interest in this subject. I note my State of North Carolina is much ahead in these discontinued fourth-class offices. I do not know whether we in North Carolina desire to lead the pack or not. This table reveals that in 1954, 91 such offices were discontinued as compared, perhaps, with the next highest of 46. I just trust that the Postmaster General is going to make this a truly nationwide policy and not dig so heavily into North Carolina.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, that I do not think that is going to happen. In all fairness to the Postmaster General, I think the gentleman from North Carolina will recall he himself was the only congressional witness who appeared before our subcommittee last year to urge this very program and to stand by what the Postmaster General had done in his own State of North Carolina even though there was some criticism from some quarters. May I say that the gentleman from North Carolina who is propounding this question gave real impetus to this program in his statement. Savings are being made—proper savings are being made and I know that the gentleman wants such savings to be made. He certainly emphasized that when he appeared before our subcommittee.

Mr. DEANE. May I ask the gentleman when he has the opportunity to include as part of our remarks this significant table as part of our colloquy at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. CANFIELD. It is a nationwide program. The start was made in North Carolina, and the gentleman from North Carolina was strongly for the program. I am sure the program is going to be extended to other States in equitable measure and fashion.

Mr. DEANE. For the information of the gentleman, I notice that as of the end of 1954 there were 395 fourth-class offices in North Carolina, but I notice in other States there are 1,626 and 1,020. I am not directing any particular remarks to those particular places, but I do trust that the gentleman will see that this program is made nationwide.

Mr. CANFIELD. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. According to his testimony last year it was his understanding that these offices were being closed and that they would be followed by rural route service which would improve the service to the various patrons. He was wholeheartedly for it in his statement.

Mr. DEANE. I would like the gentleman to understand I am not opposing the idea because I can report that in certain areas where they have been discontinued in North Carolina that greatly improved service has resulted. I feel that after some of us take the rap for a period of time, it will show to the Department that it is a sound approach.

But what I want to see is that there be no discrimination and this table of fourth-class post offices discontinued indicates that North Carolina has felt the pressure more so than any other State.

Fourth-class post offices discontinued, 1952, 1953, and 1954

States and Territories	Number of 4th-class offices as of Jan. 1 of the following years			Number of 4th-class offices discontinued during the following calendar years	
	1952	1953	1954	1952	1953
Alabama	502	477	453	2	10
Alaska	194	198	193	4	6
Arizona	145	138	131	1	0
Arkansas	725	708	672	8	32
California	512	492	441	2	22
Canton Island	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline Islands	0	1	1	0	0
Colorado	303	290	277	6	3
Connecticut	43	36	33	1	0
Delaware	17	17	12	0	0
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	262	247	215	2	14
Georgia	381	371	322	4	34
Guam	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	13	14	15	0	0
Idaho	228	221	211	2	4
Illinois	450	424	382	7	17
Indiana	311	295	267	1	3
Iowa	329	318	286	0	9
Kansas	357	334	295	4	24
Kentucky	1,732	1,676	1,626	26	23
Louisiana	402	389	264	5	4
Maine	355	349	332	2	3
Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Marshall Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Maryland	258	244	232	3	5
Massachusetts	132	124	106	3	1
Michigan	304	294	255	4	8
Minnesota	353	333	301	2	16
Mississippi	364	348	314	4	26
Missouri	797	773	699	6	46
Montana	328	321	295	5	15
Nebraska	219	209	188	2	7
Nevada	71	68	65	2	2
New Hampshire	148	142	125	1	3
New Jersey	107	96	88	0	1
New Mexico	342	340	330	2	5
New York	598	583	518	1	26
North Carolina	551	516	395	9	91
North Dakota	290	283	271	1	3
Ohio	468	437	389	5	10
Oklahoma	431	412	393	5	8
Oregon	278	265	233	6	22
Pennsylvania	957	897	835	3	27
Puerto Rico	19	11	7	0	0
Rhode Island	12	11	10	0	0
Samoa	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	226	213	182	1	19
South Dakota	268	262	243	4	10
Tennessee	401	367	333	4	20
Texas	942	924	875	8	23
Utah	169	164	154	3	3
Vermont	173	165	156	2	0
Virginia	1,117	1,070	1,020	19	20
Virgin Islands	1	1	1	0	0
Wake Island	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	312	293	275	4	8
West Virginia	1,096	1,046	985	9	38
Wisconsin	244	234	196	7	18
Wyoming	170	164	156	4	3
Total	19,407	18,606	17,153	206	692

NOTE.—The difference between the number of 4th-class offices for each of the 3 years as related to the number discontinued is due to promotions of such offices to a higher class.

One other question I would like to direct to the gentleman from New Jersey. I notice in the report on page 36 that the interest on the public debt has increased by $275 million. Could the gentleman tell what brought that about?

Mr. CANFIELD. The bills that we have to pay are the cause of that. I think the gentleman knows what the Congress did last year in cuts.

Mr. DEANE. I was just wondering did the amount of the public debt increase over and above the amount of the previous year which would cause this additional increase?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may reply to that? From January 3, 1953, to January 4, 1954, the public debt increased $9 billion.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GARY. I think this increase so far as the interest on the public debt is concerned is attributable to two causes—first, the increase in the public debt and second, the increase in the interest rates which were allowed under the refinancing program this past year.

Mr. DEANE. Could that be broken down to show what that difference was?

Mr. CANFIELD. We do not have any breakdown at this time. We probably could get it, but I do not know whether we could get it in time for it to be in the RECORD of tomorrow. But certainly, we can get it for the gentleman. I think the gentleman knows that as a result of the operation by Congress last year some $13 billion were cut out of the so-called Truman budget.

Mr. DEANE. I want to join my colleague in expressing my appreciation to the gentleman for his interest in sound economy, as well as making our programs nationwide and not localizing them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have been hearing so much about this Truman budget. We are now into the Eisenhower budget for this coming fiscal year. Five billion eight hundred million dollars of that was in connection with our Air Force; was it not?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. That was with reference to the 120 air-group unit?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now it is up to 137. We Democrats who fought for 143 were told it was too high; that 120 was enough. Now it is 137. So if the President was right last year he is wrong now. If he is right now, he was wrong then. So $5,800,000,000 was for weakening the air defense.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am not going to superimpose my military judgment over that of President Eisenhower.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the fact is that the present policy is now 137 air group units. That is indisputable. You cannot dispute that. Last year it was 120. So there is a change of policy—wisely, I think.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am familiar with that, having one of the larger air bases in my district. They are only appropriating for putting planes in the air. They are only appropriating for planes which are actually being brought into existence this year. The plan on the other side of the aisle, as I understand it, was to appropriate for wings not yet in existence, and could not be built. We appropriated last year only for the planes that were to be built and are to be built this year. That is the explanation why we have only gone to 137 thus far. It is contemplated to go to 155.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, my time is running short and there are other members of the committee who should be heard. Unless there are some further questions bearing on this bill, I will not yield any further.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. One of the major contributions to the increase in the Federal debt has been the continuation of billions of dollars in handouts on foreign doles; is that not correct?

Mr. CANFIELD. In part.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. In view of the drive to increase trade and to increase travel, is the gentleman satisfied that the Treasury Department agents, who have to pass on so many of these matters, are adequately provided for under the bill?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes. The gentleman raises a question that causes me to qualify that answer. We have to watch the situation very closely, and this subcommittee is doing it. It may develop that some more manpower may be needed in Customs. If so, we are going to see that that manpower is furnished. $2.2 million of saving will be reflected next year through the simplification and modern procedure. This will help.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 75 minutes.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 60 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, before discussing any of the phases of this bill, I want to pay my respects to this subcommittee, of which I am justly proud. We have on this subcommittee persons of varied occupations. Therefore, the knowledge and experience of the members cover a wide field and qualify them to pass upon the various problems presented to the committee.

We have not been satisfied, however, with merely sitting down in our committee room and listening to witnesses, but this subcommittee has traveled far and wide actually visiting the various installations of the Treasury and Post Office Departments so that we might obtain firsthand information on the manner in which the money that is being appropriated by the Congress of the United States is being spent; and I think I may safely say to you that a great many economies have resulted from the trips of our subcommittee during these inspection tours.

I cannot say too much for the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee. I have been associated with him for many years. I had the honor and privilege of being chairman of the committee for a long time. I succeeded him as chairman, and now he has succeeded me. I can say that when I was chairman of the subcommittee he gave me the utmost cooperation; now that he is chairman, realizing it will be only for a very short while, I of course, will give him absolute cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, this is a nonpartisan subcommittee. I do not believe that there is a committee in the Congress that is less influenced by political considerations than this one.

The gentleman from New Jersey, GORDON CANFIELD, is an able chairman; he is fair, and he is honest. Having been on this committee for a long time and having given arduous study to its problems—because he is an indefatigable worker—he is thoroughly familiar with every branch of the Treasury and Post Office Departments. The people of the United States are indebted to him for the very fine job that he has done as chairman of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss this bill in detail; the chairman has very ably outlined it to you. There are, however, a few points to which I want to call your attention.

In the first place the cut in the appropriations recommended by our subcommittee this year is the smallest that has been made during my membership on the committee, but in all fairness it should be said that the Treasury and Post Office Departments are the oldest and most important departments of the Government of the United States. They are service organizations, rendering service to the people of the United States. No department of the Government comes closer to the people than the Post Office Department that delivers the mail to the people each day.

The Treasury Department, of course, collects the revenue of the Government without which the Government could not operate. It collects the customs duties on goods coming into the United States. In addition, it includes the Coast Guard, which is an important branch of the national defense of this country, the Bureau of Narcotics, the Bureau of the Public Debt, and the other bureaus that are absolutely essential to the proper operation of the fiscal affairs of the Government.

In my judgment, these two departments are the most economically operated departments in the entire Government. Our committee throughout the years, regardless of whether the Democrats or Republicans were in charge, has insisted upon economy in the operation of those two agencies. We drastically cut the appropriations of these departments last year. Apparently we did not cut them too drastically because they were able to operate under the appropriations allowed. But when they came back this year, one of the departments asked for a slight increase and in the case of the other we have a reduction in the request. Our committee was unwilling to do anything that would hamper the proper functioning of these two departments that mean so much to the orderly operation of the entire United States Government. Consequently, the bill which is presented to you today is the unanimous recommendation of the subcommittee.

Let us consider the Post Office Department. The committee report shows the appropriation for the Post Office Department is $16,345,750 less than the 1954 appropriation. This does not present the entire picture because there are certain items that are not reflected in the report. For instance, there was an item of subsidies to air carriers of $20 million which the Post Office Department paid during the present year and which next year will be paid out of funds appropriated to the Civil Aeronautics Board. There are in addition certain other minor items as indemnity for domestic mail, indemnity for international mail, money orders, and stamped envelopes that heretofore have been paid out of the appropriations for the Department. Next year for the purpose of simplification in the handling of these payments the bill authorizes the Post Office Department to pay those items, which are fixed items, out of the revenues of the Department.

Actually on a strictly comparative basis we are appropriating for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1955 $25,400,000 more than we appropriated for 1954. That is not a large increase, and it must be said in justification of it that there has been and is a continuing increase in the volume of mail. We thought when the Post Office reached the very high volume that it did during World War II that surely after the war was over the volume of mail would begin to decrease; but, on the contrary, it has increased each year

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and there is an estimated increase for 1955.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Was it increased to the point where those in metropolitan areas will soon see the restoration of the two-deliveries-a-day system as was promised by the administration?

Mr. GARY. So far as I am able to determine, I do not believe that the two deliveries a day in residential sections will be restored at any time in the near future. The facts are that it will cost $100 million per annum to restore the two-deliveries-a-day system. Today, I might say, the demand for the restoration of that service has completely subsided.

Now, I am frank to say that I, as chairman of this committee, was one of those who was responsible for that change. We insisted on economies, and the Postmaster General reduced delivery in residential sections to one a day in compliance with the demands, certainly, of the majority of our committee. I think it was a good move. I am opposed to reestablishing the service, and I do not believe it will be done at any time in the near future.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I know that the gentleman from Virginia, my former chairman, will recall that he and I disagreed violently on that particular issue; no personalities being involved.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman that we can disagree without being disagreeable.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true. That is the way it will aways be. We disagreed, but he won, and the order was issued and it has never been restored. It is a fact, however, that currently, right now, the Post Office Department is making pilot experiments in three cities of the United States, Minneapolis, Indianapolis, and Dallas, for the express purpose of finding out whether there is a real demand in those cities and whether it is feasible and economical to restore this service. That is the picture today.

Now, the testimony before our subcommittee was this: Insofar as the Department here in Washington is concerned, practically no letters are being received demanding the restoration of this service. In all fairness to my good friend from Virginia, I want to say this, that I, a long-time believer in this old order of things, am receiving no mail to that end.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I just want to say that as I remember what the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey, said last year, he stated that he was a two-delivery man himself, and that he wanted to give the new team a chance to get its feet firmly planted in the Post Office Department before bringing it up. The reason for my question was, of course, the fact that I thought a year was long enough to permit the new team to become familiar with its operation, and I wondered whether or not the new team had decided to restore the two-delivery system. As I remember it, the platform of the Republican Party stated that it would restore the two-delivery system.

Mr. CANFIELD. The Republican platform referred to more frequent service, and that policy is being carried out.

Mr. YATES. Is there more frequent service?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I, too, was one of those who put in a resolution for two-a-day delivery. I am getting mail, not now exactly directed at two deliveries, but complaining about the post-office service. I think some progress is being made in the flexibility of the local post offices in adjusting local conditions, and advance the hope that the Post Office Department will continue to show that flexibility and increase it in order to meet local conditions where commercial firms are mixed in with residential people, and where other steps can be taken to expedite mail delivery.

Mr. GARY. My remarks were limited to the two deliveries a day. I, too, am getting letters complaining of the Post Office Department service, but not with reference to the failure to get more than one delivery a day.

The Post Office Department is adopting many innovations, the effectiveness of which will be determined by time. There was inserted in the RECORD just a short time ago a survey that was made by the Chicago Tribune, if I am not mistaken, in which they sent out a great many letters throughout the United States. They made a similar survey during the last year of the previous administration. They kept account of the time of delivery of each letter. The survey made recently under exactly the same conditions showed that it took 4 hours longer on the average to deliver each letter under this administration than it took during the former administration.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. In my congressional district there are some 119 post offices. I stated last year that it has been over 2 years since I have received a complaint due to the limitation of residential delivery to one a day. At the time I was receiving complaints it was rather amusing to observe that many of the letters of protest came from citizens of towns that had no residential-mail delivery at all. That was a clear indication that most of the letters of protest were inspired.

I do not think there is really any room for argument with respect to how our citizens feel. They are not demanding a restoration of the two mail deliveries, and I think that, to a very large extent, it is political.

Insofar as I recall, I do not remember President Eisenhower promising two deliveries a day. I defended that on the floor last year. I think we would be going just a bit too far to accuse the present President of promising to restore the two mail deliveries a day.

Mr. YATES. I do not know whether the gentleman's remarks were directed to me, but what I said was that the Republican Party in its platform, as I recall, stated that it would pledge itself to a two-deliveries-a-day system. I have checked the platform, and it states, "More efficient and more frequent delivery service." I do not know whether this is another way of referring to the restoration of the two-delivery system, but I had that in mind because, of course, the two-delivery system has become almost a phrase apart in the use of those words. I thought I was justified in taking that phrase and applying it to the platform of the Republican Party.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentleman from the Chicago area that if there had been any demand throughout the last several months for the restoration of the two-delivery service in the city of Chicago you would have had a pilot experiment today. The reason you do not have it there is that there has not been any demand.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not intend to get into this colloquy, but I want to confirm that my own impression is just the same as that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. While the platform states, "We pledge a more efficient and frequent mail delivery service," I know that every letter carrier up my way understood that meant restoration of a two-deliveries-a-day service. I can remember distinctly prominent officers of a great organization of postal employees in my presence saying they got the promise and that it was going to come in the early part of 1953 when the Republicans took over. So there is no doubt in my mind as to what was promised.

These other arguments are very interesting. The gentleman from Illinois was asking about a promise and whether or not it was carried out. The gentleman from Virginia has said it has not been carried out, and there is no likelihood of its being done.

Mr. PASSMAN. I think in some circumstances there has been more frequent mail delivery. I think there has been some increased efficiency and improvements made in the Department. There are major issues on which I can differ with my colleagues on my right, and at the proper time I shall. I do not want to pick on some item that was really an issue in my campaign, and I won on that basis. I think it is very insignificant to pick up a little item like this where there is really no demand for the service and try to develop it into a mountain.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I was and am for the two-a-day deliveries but I cannot for the life of me see reading it into the Republican platform or trying to pin it onto the Republicans in the face of the ex-

press words. I think they prevail even over the distinguished gentlemen's ideas as to what was implied or what was promised outside the Republican document. I think it ought to speak for itself.

Mr. GARY. I simply want to say this, Mr. Chairman. I have been for the one-a-day delivery mail service from the beginning. I stood on the floor of the House one one occasion and took full blame for the change when some of the members of my committee did not agree with it. I will take whatever blame or credit may be attached to it at the present time. I am against its restoration. I want to point out that the restoration of such service will cost the people of the United States $100 million a year, and I do not think it is worth it. Consequently, I shall oppose it when any effort is made to restore it.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk about reducing the deficit in the Post Office Department. Under this bill it is estimated that the postal deficit will be reduced from an actual deficit of $663 million in 1953 to an estimated deficit of $329 million in 1955. I merely want to point out for the record that this reduction does not represent a saving in the Post Office Department. The decrease in the deficit is attributable to the fact that increased postal rates, effective since 1953, will yield $200 million more revenue in 1955. In addition, we are transferring the airmail subsidy that has heretofore been paid by the Post Office Department to the Civil Aeronautics Board where, in my opinion, it belongs, and that item is $80 million. We are also transferring the cost of penalty mail from the Post Office Department under a law which was adopted by the Congress last year, which I think is a proper law. Heretofore the cost of penalty mail has been charged against the Post Office Department. Under the new law each Government department will reimburse the Post Office Department for the cost of handling its penalty mail. These reimbursements total $38 million. In addition, the transportation of mail to service men abroad has been transferred to the Armed Forces which amounts to $2 million. The total of these items amounting to $320 million accounts for the decrease in the deficit. Nothing has been saved, the costs have merely been shifted from the Post Office Department to other Government departments, except in the case of the basic-rate increase.

Now, let us consider the question of this rate increase for a few moments because I think it is very important. The increase of $200 million has come about in the parcel-post rates. When the parcel-post law was first adopted in 1912, the Congress at that time evidently realizing that this new service would come in competition with free enterprise, apparently wanted to insure that the Government would not unfairly compete with private enterprise. The Post Office Department was entering into a new business of carrying packages which heretofore had been handled by the express lines. Consequently, they put a provision in that law which reads as follows:

> The classification of articles mailable as well as the weight limit, the rates of postage, zone or zones, and other conditions of mailability under this act, if the Postmaster General shall find on experience that they or any of them are such as to prevent the shipment of articles desirable, or to permanently render the cost of service greater than the receipts of the revenue therefrom, he is hereby authorized, subject to the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission after investigation, to reform from time to time such classification, weight limit, rates, zone or zones, or conditions, or either, in order to promote the service to the public or to insure the receipt of revenue from such service adequate to pay the cost thereof.

All postal rates theretofore had been fixed by the Congress, but the Congress authorized the Postmaster General to fix the rates for fourth-class mail so that parcel-post mail would not be carried at less than cost and thereby unfairly compete with private enterprise.

Apparently the Postmaster General did not pay any attention to that provision. I do not remember whether in those days he was a Republican or a Democrat, so there is no partisanship in this. I say that apparently he did not pay any attention to it because on February 28, 1925, the Congress passed another act. In the previous act they had authorized him to fix rates, but in 1925 they directed him to fix them. They made it mandatory for him to fix such rates as are necessary to make parcel-post mail self-sustaining.

Still the Postmaster General did not pay any attention to the law. Therefore, in 1950, when the Postmaster General came before our committee, I asked him why he was asking the Congress to increase parcel-post rates when the law directed him to increase them. He said that he thought the Congress should fix all of the rates and that he was recommending increases which he considered proper to the Congress.

He was asking for a supplemental appropriation. Our committee recommended and the Congress approved a provision which was put in that supplemental report, prohibiting him from drawing any money from the Treasury until he had complied with the mandatory provision of the law.

Since that time the Postmaster General has submitted two requests for increases to the Interstate Commerce Commission both of which have been approved. The second proceeding was started under the former administration, and was completed under the present administration, so this is not a partisan matter. Because of these proceedings at the present time parcel post is paying its way and therefore, when the postal-rate-increase bill comes before the Congress, there will be no parcel-post rate increase in it.

A bill has been introduced to repeal the provisions of the law to which I have referred so as to take the authority to fix parcel-post rates away from the Postmaster General. I am told that it is to be offered as a rider to this bill. I trust that this House will not vote to repeal these provisions of the law which are designed to prevent the Government from competing unfairly with free enterprise in the handling of parcel-post mail.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss briefly the reorganization of the Post Office Department. Frankly, I want to say that I think the post-office officials are doing a good job. We started the reorganization of the Post Office Department under the previous administration. One of the greatest needs of the Department at that time was a good accounting system. We started the installation of that system. The new administration has carried it on and the accounting system is being perfected in the Post Office Department. There has already been great improvement in that respect, and I am certain that it will continue.

The Post Office Department has finally created a personnel office. I think that has been needed for a long, long time. I have complimented the officials for attempting to put in a proper personnel system. A department that has approximately 500,000 employees needs a personnel system.

The one thing that our committee has been insisting upon for a number of years has been adequate research. We finally got a research division started in the Post Office Department several years ago, and the new administration is expanding it. The research division is developing numerous new methods of handling the mail which is improving the service and decreasing the cost.

One change that is in the experimental stage at the present time is the decentralization of the Department. The Hoover Commission recommended the decentralization of the Post Office Department. We were told at that time by the postal authorities that the recommendation was based upon the Canadian system, that the Hoover Commission had inspected the Canadian system and that they had recommended a decentralization with exactly the same number of regions as Canada had. Then we were told that before the Commission submitted its report the Canadians abandoned their decentralization system. The Department is now beginning to decentralize. We asked the witnesses who came before our committee about the Canadian experience. They said they did not know anything about past experience, but on that day they had a committee from the Canadian Government in Washington looking over our postal system, and that the Canadians are now definitely turning toward decentralization.

I think some decentralization is perhaps in order. The department has started an experiment in Cincinnati, marking out one region. They contemplate establishing 15 regions in the United States. Each of these 15 regional offices will have a personnel of 60. This will mean that altogether we will have approximately 900 additional regional employees, a large number of whom will be high level employees, because you will duplicate in each office practically the setup that you have in Washington; you will have a regional personnel officer, a regional accounting officer, and other regional officers for each bureau. It may be that some of this personnel will be supplied from the Washington office; it

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

may be that they can reduce the expense in Washington to take care of the increased regional expense. I hope they will.

In addition, they plan on establishing district offices in each region. In Cincinnati they have nine district offices. They tell us that they do not know just how many district offices they will have, but they think that is probably a good average. In that event they would have 135 new district offices. Each of these district offices will have about six employees, most of whom will be high-level employees. This will mean 810 district office employees. I want to mention this in contrast: In the Post Office you have a plan to decentralize by establishing 15 regional offices. The Internal Revenue was reorganized several years ago, and they established 17 regional offices. This year they came in and told us that they were reducing those 17 offices to 9 and that as a result of this reduction they are going to save $2 million.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. As I understand the gentleman from Virginia, he is not taking issue with the concept of the matter; he is taking issue with the number of offices projected by the Post Office Department?

Mr. GARY. What I am saying is that the whole plan should be considered very carefully. The Post Office Department is right in setting up an experimental region in Cincinnati and I hope they are going to study the working of the plan there long and carefully before putting the complete plan into operation, because the plan if improperly installed will certainly cost us more money rather than save money for the department. I am merely sounding a word of caution in the development of this program.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to commend the gentleman for his splendid presentation in connection with this report. I want to ask his comment on a certain section. If he has commented on it I have missed it. I am disturbed about the cuts that have occurred in several vital places connected with law enforcement and the prevention of crime. I recall a couple of years ago a great deal of talk about the increased emphasis that was going to be placed on law enforcement and the prevention of crime by this administration. Yet we find in this particular report that the Secret Service is being reduced by nine agents, we find that the Bureau of Narcotics travel funds are being cut. Certainly the mobility of those agencies is of vital importance in controlling the narcotics problem. The Customs Bureau is being cut 74. Those are the people who are charged with preventing the introduction of narcotics into this country. It would appear to me inconsistent with the statements and pledges of this administration that they are taking out of the law-enforcement agencies of this country travel funds and the personnel necessary to do the job. I would like to hear the comments of the gentleman on that particular point.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that thus far I have been discussing the Post Office Department. I have not reached the Treasury Department, which I shall take up at this time. So far as our committee is concerned we have cut these departments very little. As I said in the beginning, we cut the whole bill only $5½ million which is infinitesimal when you consider that it totals over $3 billion.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that in our operation we did not cut any of the agencies indicated by the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GARY. That is right. Our committee recommended no cuts in the agencies mentioned.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Am I to understand from that, then, that the sum of money cut from the travel account of the Bureau of Narcotics was recommended by the Bureau itself?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Or was that a Bureau of the Budget cut?

Mr. GARY. It was either the Bureau of Narcotics or the Bureau of the Budget, I do not know which. The amount recommended is the amount requested of our committee. We made no change in the item; neither did we make any change in the Secret Service. On the contrary, we had some heart-to-heart talks with the top officials of the Treasury Department with reference to the Secret Service. No cut has been made insofar as the safety of the President of the United States is concerned. Any cuts that were made have been in the field agents that are not engaged in defending the President of the United States or his family. We did not cut the Secret Service a dollar, we did not cut the Bureau of Narcotics. This committee is thoroughly in accord with the gentleman's views that those law-enforcing agencies should have adequate funds with which to do their work.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am very much relieved to hear the committee's position on this. I hope that the committee is not allowing the Bureau of the Budget to substitute its judgment and its appraisal of the needs of law enforcement for the judgment of the members of this committee which I believe would be much better than that of the Bureau of the Budget in connection with the law-enforcement problems of this country and the needs of those agencies.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman that I do not know whether the Budget Bureau cut those items or not. We never discuss any items with the Budget Bureau. We discuss them with the heads of the departments. We had the Secretary of the Treasury and his staff come in and testify. Then we had the head of each department testify. Dr. Anslinger came in as did Chief Baughman of the Secret Service and Commissioner T. Coleman Andrews of Internal Revenue Service. Those men came before our committee and told us that they could satisfactorily operate during the next year with the funds requested. We never cut any of them a dime, except I believe we made some minor cuts—I do not know whether they were included—because of printing costs. As a result of certain changes made in the Printing Office, it reduced the cost of printing to the departments, and we took into consideration those reductions. That is all the cuts we made in the bureaus referred to.

Let me say, I think the 80th Congress made a tremendous mistake back in 1948. We cut too deeply into the Internal Revenue Service, and we found that it had a tremendous effect on the collection of revenue. We have been gradually restoring each year the agents that were cut off at that time, and we are restoring more of them under this program because of savings that have been made elsewhere.

With respect to customs, they are saving substantial sums of money by reason of the Customs Simplification Act which we passed last year. I must say to you, very frankly, that they are spreading some of the inspection service in customs awfully thin. I am very much afraid they are spreading some of it too thin. We have cautioned both the Treasury and the Customs Bureau officials about that. We have told them that we do not want it spread too thin and they have promised to give very careful consideration to that program next year and, if necessary, increase the inspection service.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I know the gentleman is familiar with the evidence recently given by Mr. Hoover of the FBI that crime in 1953 was higher than it ever has been in this country.

Mr. GARY. That is right. And, with respect to customs, our committee, during the hearings, recessed for 3 days and went to New York and inspected the whole customs setup at the port of New York.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I appreciate very much the comments of the gentleman, and I think the committee has certainly given careful consideration to this problem. But my worry is that these men have come in with a gun pointed at their heads by the Budget Bureau to testify on what their needs are, just as they come before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and that is what I am fearful about.

Mr. GARY. Let us be frank. I share the gentleman's views, but after all we must have economies in this Government; we must, sooner or later, balance the budget.

Mr. EDMONDSON. But certainly the law-enforcement agencies should not be cut.

Mr. GARY. We did not cut them. To the contrary, we have been assured that the funds allowed in this bill are adequate to take care of those bureaus next year.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. The recommended reduction in the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1955 as compared to the 1954 appropriation is $34,145,400. Of that

amount the Coast Guard has been cut $30,685,700. The larger portion of the Coast Guard cut results from a reduction of the number of ocean stations from 10⅔ to 5⅔.

These stations are operated under international agreements, and when we say two-thirds stations we mean that one of the stations is being operated by the United States two-thirds of the time and by a foreign government the other third of the time.

Because those stations serve the Navy and other branches of the armed services the entire cost of operating those 5⅔ stations has been transferred to the Navy. I may say that I question both cuts. Those stations promote the safety of travel on the sea. They direct the airplanes that fly over the sea. In addition, they supply weather reports. They are most essential, in my judgment, to both civilian and military travel over both the Atlantic and the Pacific. But after conferences with the Navy and with the civil authorities an agreement has been reached to reduce the number to 5⅓. I hesitate to set my judgment against the experts, but I still think the move is a questionable one.

I also question the policy of transferring the cost of operating the 5⅔ stations to the Navy. The Coast Guard is going to continue to operate those stations, but the Navy is going to ask for the appropriation. What difference does it make? The appropriation comes out of the same Treasury. The Coast Guard does not have one Treasury and the Navy another. It is my judgment that if the Coast Guard is going to operate those stations the Coast Guard should get the appropriation and should have complete charge of them. I do not think we ought to have the hand of Esau and the voice of Jacob in this operation.

There are just two other matters I want to call attention to before closing. One of them will be found on page 18 of the proceedings.

I have heard a lot about balancing the cash budget. When the Secretary of the Treasury came before our committee I asked him what he meant by balancing the cash budget. You will find what he said there. He was perfectly frank about it. He said this: If we have a $4 billion deficit in the administrative budget and we take in $4 billion in social security taxes, which are trust funds set aside for a specific purpose, we issue $4 billion worth of Government bonds and put them in the security fund and take that cash out, and with that cash we balance the cash budget.

Of course, insofar as our fiscal situation is concerned it does not mean anything in the world. It means you are just transferring funds from one source to another. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of the Treasury admitted that one of his friends had said that the practice was dishonest. He said that he replied to his friend, "You operate a large business. You have a retirement fund for your employees. What do you do with the surplus in that fund?" The man said, "I invest it in Treasury bonds." The Secretary said, "That is exactly what we are doing."

Frankly, I think he is right. I do not think there is anything dishonest about it. My objection to it is this: I think one of the greatest dangers this country faces at the present time is the deficit financing that has been going on over a period of years. In my judgment, the time has come when we must balance the budget, period. And that means the administrative budget. We talk about national defense, but you cannot defend this country if the Nation is bankrupt. I think one of the soundest defense measures we could take would be to have a balanced budget. Now I do think it is wrong to shift the figures in a way so as to show a balance when you are increasing your national debt and thus convey to the people of the United States the idea that by balancing a so-called cash budget, which in reality does not mean a thing so far as our deficit financing is concerned, you are improving our fiscal situation. I find no fault with the methods the Treasury is adopting, but I do think we ought to stop talking about balancing a cash budget because we do not have a balanced budget in the United States today and we should not try to create the impression that we do. The time has come when both Republicans and Democrats, in my judgment, should put their shoulders to the plow and try to balance the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss for just a few moments the question of security risks.

Our committee completed hearings on the Post Office Department in December before the question of dismissals of Government personnel on security grounds became a prominent issue. Officials of the Post Office Department stated that an investigation of postal employees had started under the previous administration, that a number of cases were pending when the new administration took over, and that they are continuing those investigations.

In his state of the Union message on January 7, the President stated that under standards established for the new employee-security program, more than 2,200 employees have been separated from the Federal service. The statement created the impression in the minds of a great many people that more than 2,200 Federal employees had been discharged for disloyalty to the Government. A person holding a high position in the Government, who apparently speaks with authority for the Republican Party, stated that 90 percent of those discharged were Communists or perverts. That statement was untrue, but it created a false impression throughout the Nation. Other loose statements with reference to the 2,200 employees were made by other high-ranking members of the Republican Party.

This situation has cast a grossly unfair imputation upon several thousand employees who have been separated from the service. Now let us review the situation. President Truman issued Executive Order 9835 in 1947 directing an investigation of the loyalty of every Federal employee and every applicant for a Federal position. The FBI was directed at that time to make a fingerprint check and a name check of every employee in the Federal Government.

It was my privilege to serve on the subcommittee handling the appropriations for the Justice Department at that time, and we appropriated $20 million to pay the expenses of this investigation. The investigation, however, covered only the question of loyalty to the United States Government. In 1953, under Executive Order 10450, President Eisenhower extended this investigation to, and I quote, "develop information as to whether the employment or retention in employment in the Federal service of the person being investigated is clearly consistent with the interest of the national security." Under this order we are told excessive drinking is a ground for dismissal, as is also sex perversion, mental instability, and even incompetence.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the policy of dismissing such employees from the service, but I do object to placing upon them the imputation of disloyalty. Alcoholism is a disease; communism is treason when practiced in this country. Common justice demands that the alcoholics be separated from the traitors.

The situation calls for a breakdown of the 2,200 figure to show the causes of separation. I, therefore, questioned the Treasury officials at length with respect to their experience in dealing with security risks. The testimony touching this subject appears on pages 32, 416, and 680 of the hearings. Mr. Tuttle, general counsel, and acting personnel security officer of the Treasury Department, stated that 130 employees had been separated from the service during the past year under the security order. When asked how many of those had been separated for disloyalty, he stated that he did not have the figures but would supply them for the record. Subsequently a letter was inserted in the record which did not furnish the information requested. He, therefore, was recalled before the subcommittee and finally under pressure admitted that of the 130 employees separated only 3 had been separated on the grounds of disloyalty, and these were separated under the Executive order of the previous administration rather than under the new Executive order. The total personnel of the Treasury Department is 113,530.

Then Mr. Tuttle was requested to furnish information showing the number of dismissals on the grounds of disloyalty since the effective date of the first Executive order. Those figures will be found on page 687 of the hearings from which we find that 3 out of 114 dismissals in 1948 were on the grounds of disloyalty, the same number as last year; 2 out of 157 in 1949; 2 out of 183 in 1950; none out of 238 in 1951; and 1 out of 302 in 1952.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if the figures as disclosed with reference to the Treasury Department reflect the conditions existing in other departments, the people of this country have been grossly misled and are entitled to know the facts.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. PASSMAN. I wonder if the gentleman would agree that throughout the entire hearings every department head who came before our committee was interrogated on this same phase. Take the Coast Guard, on page 475 of the hearings, I asked the question of Admiral Richmond:

That same program has been in effect since the loyalty security program was inaugurated in 1947?

In other places we referred to it as the security program inaugurated by President Truman in 1947. Almost without exception, year after year, we find there were more actually discharged under the administration of President Truman than were discharged under the present administration. In 1952 the Coast Guard separated 143. In 1953 only 80 were separated by the present administration, and we all hope at the proper time that the President will come forth and give us a breakdown, not by name, but why these people were actually discharged, because it is confusing to the American people. When you refer to "security," the general public believes some person is disloyal to the Federal Government.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. CANFIELD. I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia wishes to yield at this time to some Member on his side.

Mr. GARY. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not use 15 minutes. I am going to make a rather brief statement.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, first I want to commend my chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], for the very fair, impartial, and efficient manner in which he conducted the hearings on the bill before you. My commendation is equally as strong for my former chairman, the very able and dependable gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. This warm feeling prevails toward the other members of the committee, including our very able and sincere clerk, Mr. Bob Lambert.

Year after year I have spoken on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, and I feel that I would be remiss in my duties as a member of the committee and as a Member of Congress if I did not reiterate what I have said on other occasions. I believe that the statistics and factual information furnished in my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 4, pages 4926–4928, will best explain my position and that statement shall be included as a part of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, to my way of thinking, Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield has done an outstanding job in handling the affairs of the Post Office Department. If he were given the proper authority by the Congress, he would put the Post Office Department on a self-supporting basis and, no doubt, go down in history as one of the greatest Cabinet members to serve in any President's Cabinet.

Postmaster General Summerfield has brought to the Post Office Department some of the foremost businessmen in our Nation. Many of these officials have made great financial sacrifice to serve their country. But there is a question in my mind as to how long this morale can suffice unless the Congress gives some consideration to the Post Office Department's request for badly needed revisions in our postal-rate structure.

I can see no reason for the Federal Government to continue to subsidize tens of thousands of businesses which operate solely to earn a profit and which use the United States mails to enhance their profits. I must apologize for a personal reference but I do want to state that I own my own business enterprises back in Louisiana and the type of businesses I operate require heavy use of the postal services, and I do know that if proper and badly needed postal rates are granted, that I can certainly absorb the small increase in cost out of my profits.

If the Congress in its wisdom would pass legislation adjusting postal rates to where the Post Office Department could operate on a financial self-supporting basis, I believe that each Member of Congress endorsing this needed revision would be highly commended by a large majority of his constituents.

If each Member of the Congress would find time to analyze the setup that prevails relative to subsidies to newspapers and periodicals, he would not hesitate to take the necessary steps to remove this unwarranted and unneeded subsidy. If there are those among you who feel that these large publishers who are in business for the sole purpose of earning a profit need a subsidy, then I suggest that you secure the annual balance sheets of those publishers with whom you are presently in sympathy. It would be a real eye opener.

I want to say again that I would gladly support legislation giving the Postmaster General the authority to set postal rates, first, because he possesses more knowledge of the problem than any other person, and it may interest you to know that in many countries the postmaster general is given this authority by law, and it has worked out very successfully.

I am not too sure that I would support legislation increasing postal rates on first-class mail inasmuch as this class of mail is more than self-supporting, but I am eager to support legislation that would put all the other classes of mail on a self-supporting basis. It may be argued that certain church and educational publications would be put out of business. I do not subscribe to this line of reasoning because every one of the publishers who fall into these categories have their own budgets and sources of revenue and could make adjustments accordingly. Because if we ever reach the point where we are in accord that the Post Office Department should be placed on a self-supporting basis, and then make exceptions, the exceptions could become the rule, and our purpose would be defeated.

STATEMENT BY HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN, OF LOUISIANA, ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE, MAY 14, 1953

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, I wish to say at the outset that I have a very high regard for my chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], and I want to commend him for the very fair, impartial, and efficient manner in which he conducted the hearings on the bill before you. My regard is equally as high for my former chairman, the very able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] and the same feeling prevails toward the other members of the committee and our very able clerk, Mr. Bob Lambert.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, there has never been an appropriation bill reported to the floor of the House that had any closer scrutiny or any more comprehensive and extensive hearings than the one before you.

In the bill before you the Congress is being asked to appropriate $2,832,250,000 to operate the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1954. It will cost almost as much to operate the Post Office Department in the fiscal year 1954 as it cost to operate the entire Federal Government in 1927. In fact, it cost only $2,974,000,000 to operate all branches of the Federal Government in 1927.

The annual operating deficit of the Post Office Department is almost as great as the cost of operating the entire Federal Government in 1916. In fact, it cost $734 million to operate all branches of the Federal Government in 1916. In 1952, the operating deficit in the Post Office Department amounted to $727 million. In 1953, the net operating deficit amounted to $642 million. The estimated deficit for fiscal year 1954 is $596 million.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, in my opinion the time has come for the Congress to give serious consideration to the advisability of putting the Post Office Department on a financially self-supporting basis. The very large subsidies to many classes of mail are primarily responsible for the tremendous annual deficit in the operation of the Postal Establishment.

In 1940 the postal establishment handled 27,700,000,000 pieces of mail, or an average of 210 pieces of mail for every man, woman, and child in the United States. In 1954 it is estimated that the postal establishment will handle approximately 58 billion pieces of mail, or an average of 329 pieces of mail for every man, woman, and child in the United States. This large increase in such a short period of time represents a 94-percent increase in total volume of mail handled and only a 51-percent increase in use of the mails per capita handled.

I would like to point out to the committee that the cost of handling the mails since 1945 has increased by $1,443,000,000. However, the revenue increase has amounted to only $390 million. In other words, the cost of handling the mail since 1945 has exceeded the increase in revenue by $1,053,000,000. Therefore I hope that the Congress in its wisdom will take cognizance of this situation and remedy the condition by giving the Postmaster General authority to set postal rates or pass legislation authorizing increased postal rates.

Personally I would support legislation giving the Postmaster General the authority to set postal rates because certainly he possesses more knowledge of the problem than most Members of Congress who have a multitude of other matters to consider. In many foreign countries the postmaster general is given the authority to set postal rates. If the Congress would extend that authority to our own Postmaster General, it could do so with veto power or maybe for a 2-year trial run.

I should like to point out to the committee where the greatest annual losses to the Post Office Department are occurring:

1. Fourth-class mail, which is, in the main, parcel post. In 1952 it cost the Post Office Department $638,264,000 to handle fourth-class mail. Revenues from fourth-class mail amounted to only $484,529,000. This left a net operating deficit of $153,735,000.

2. In 1952, on third-class mail, which consists primarily of circulars, it cost the Post Office Department $362,439,000 to handle this class of mail. The revenue on third-class mail brought in only $170,526,000, leaving a net operating loss of $191,913,000.

3. Now, here is one class of mail that is really alarming, and that is second-class mail. This class covers newspapers, magazines, and periodicals. In 1952 it cost the Post Office Department $291,758,000 to handle second-class mail. The revenue from second-class mail brought in only $51,371,000, leaving a net operating loss in 1952 on second-class mail in the amount of $240,386,000.

4. In 1952 there was an operating deficit of $32 million for domestic airmail, $21 million in foreign airmail, and $20 million in foreign-service mail.

5. There are large deficits in special services such as registered mail, insured mail, collection-on-delivery mail, special-delivery mail, and money orders.

In 1952 the only two services of the Post Office Department to earn a net profit were first-class mail and postal savings. The revenue from first-class mail amounted to $842,695,000. The cost of handling first-class mail in 1952 amounted to only $790,287,000, giving the Department a net profit of $52,407,000 on first-class mail and $6,717,000 on postal savings.

I can see no reason for the Federal Government to continue subsidizing tens of thousands of businesses which operate solely to earn a profit and who use the United States mails to enhance their profits.

I contend that newspaper publishers and magazine publishers are in business for the very same reason that I am in business and that is to make a profit on their investment. On that basis, why should not the Government remove this subsidy and permit them to operate their businesses like other business establishments which are not directly subsidized.

May we consider parcel post for a minute. A few years ago the Congress authorized certain adjustments in rates, weight, and size of packages, but even with the adjusted rate the Post Office Department is still losing $153 million annually on this class of mail and certainly the record is clear that the postal establishment is still having to compete with our great free-competitive-enterprise system. I do not believe that it was the intent of the Congress to pass legislation that would force the Post Office Department to compete with rail, freight, and express companies. Some of our friends believe that to adjust postal rates on second-class mail, which, I repeat, covers newspapers, magazines, and periodicals, would put these operations out of business. Such would not be the case and the record is clear.

Let me cite an example of just how little annual postage it is costing the weekly newspapers in my district to use the postal service and just how little it would affect them financially to put this class of mail on a financially self-supporting basis. Of course this same condition prevails in all congressional districts. Mr. Chairman, the figures that I shall cite cover the entire annual postage paid by these newspaper publishers for the calendar year 1950:

Newspaper No. 1	$11.84
Newspaper No. 2	14.78
Newspaper No. 3	27.71
Newspaper No. 4	35.37
Newspaper No. 5	39.85
Newspaper No. 6	48.72
Newspaper No. 7	60.90
Newspaper No. 8	70.51
Newspaper No. 9	70.65
Newspaper No. 10	71.50
Newspaper No. 11	73.01
Newspaper No. 12	74.62
Newspaper No. 13	79.06
Newspaper No. 14	82.62
Newspaper No. 15	117.25
Newspaper No. 16	177.82
Newspaper No. 17	179.13
Newspaper No. 18	239.30
Newspaper No. 19	244.16

I have a very high regard for all the editors, publishers, and personnel of the papers in my congressional district to which I have referred, but I sincerely believe that if these publishers would study the facts and figures of the postal establishment they, of their own accord, would endorse and recommend a program to remove these unnecessary and outmoded subsidies, because in the long run it would mean dollars in their own pockets. It may be considered politically dangerous to point out how little annual postage the newspaper publishers pay for their mailings; however, the newspapers, with few exceptions, have been clamoring loudly for economy in Government and the elimination of unwarranted and unneeded subsidies. On that basis I shall take my stand and let the chips fall where they may. My position on postal subsidies may hasten my involuntary retirement from the Congress, but I have never been afraid to speak and act for what I thought was right. So far as my own personal views are concerned, I am in favor of eliminating all subsidies and giving the Postmaster General the right to set postal rates either on a permanent, temporary, or veto basis.

If the Congress in its wisdom would pass legislation putting the Post Office Department on a financially self-supporting basis, I believe that each Member of Congress participating in this needed revision would later be highly commended by his constituents.

There has been a lot said about the restoration of two mail deliveries daily to residential sections. On that subject I should like to associate my views with those of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. In my congressional district there are some 119 post offices. It has been over 2 years since I have received a complaint due to the limitation of residential deliveries to one a day. At the time I was receiving complaints, it was rather amusing to observe that many of the letters of protest came from citizens of towns that had no residential mail delivery at all. This is a clear indication that those letters of protest were inspired. To return to 2 mail deliveries daily in residential sections would cost the taxpayers $80 million annually and even with the service reinstated only 32 percent of the population would receive 2 mail deliveries a day.

We all understand that most people work for a living and a great majority of those receiving residential deliveries go to work in the morning and do not return home until in the afternoon. So it matters not to them whether they receive their mail in the morning or in the afternoon. I shall never support a resolution or amendment that would reimpose this luxury.

Mr. Chairman, according to the most recent estimate, the population of the United States for the next fiscal year will reach 162,993,000, and on the basis of that population figure it will cost, if the present appropriation request is granted, every man, woman, and child down to the 1-day-old baby $17.39 for the postal service they will receive during fiscal 1954. If the rank and file knew it would cost them $17.39 per person for the mail service they will receive in fiscal 1954, I believe they would demand in large numbers that the Congress remove the many unneeded and outmoded subsidies and place the Post Office Department on a financially self-supporting basis. In my opinion this should be done at the quickest possible time.

I do not believe it possible for any business enterprise or any branch of the Government to accumulate a more efficient staff of businessmen and experts than are now handling the postal establishment. The new Postmaster General, Arthur Summerfield, and his entire staff amazed your committee with the knowledge they had acquired of the postal operations in such a short period. Most of the members of the postal staff are outstanding business executives and experts who are making a great financial sacrifice to serve our Government. They are fair, experienced, and determined to overhaul the postal operation from top to bottom, and with the cooperation of the Congress put the Post Office Department on a business basis. They need the support and encouragement of the Congress to do the job well and to accomplish their objective. I shall extend to them my full support. If given the opportunity, I will support legislation giving the Postmaster General the authority to set postal rates, believing as I do that in the end my small part in helping to accomplish this much-needed reform would win me new friends and the approval of a great majority of my constituents.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. CANFIELD. I will be very happy to go along with my distinguished friend from Louisiana in respect to giving the Postmaster General authority to increase postal rates, but with the proviso that any change in postal rates which may be made will be subject to the veto of the Congress, that is, later action on the part of the Congress.

Mr. PASSMAN. I would certainly support that type of legislation giving the Congress the right of veto.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JAMES], a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, in view of the very excellent presentations that have been made this afternoon by the chairman of our subcommittee and by the ranking minority member, I find very little to add that would be of value to the members of this committee at the present time. I most happily support those statements that have been made that have intended to indicate to you the spirit of friendship, mutual esteem and admiration, and even fraternal affection, that prevails in our committee.

We of our committee have a big job to do and I believe that we have done a good job. I believe that we have done a good job because our considerations have been given in an atmosphere of friendship. There are other persons who are important to our hearings also. We meet with the heads of every agency in the Treasury Department as well as with the Secretary of the Treasury. We hear the Postmaster General as well as all of the heads of all subdivisions of his Department. So that in all we have had before us a total of 96 witnesses,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Of those 96 witnesses not one came from civil life. They were all employees of the United States Government and they were presenting fairly and honestly their justifications for requests for funds to carry on the activities of their respective Departments and agencies for the fiscal year 1955. I believe that every man and every woman who appeared before us were made to feel that they had come into a friendly meeting. They were not there to be put on trial with respect to any of the activities of which they had charge. They were there to give us the facts that we needed in order to determine a proper appropriation for their further activity. For this reason I believe that we got a thoroughly 100-percent response from every one of these witnesses. It has been on the basis of the work we were attempting to do in discovering the needs of these departments and agencies, and upon the fullness, fairness, and responsiveness of the witnesses that we bring our bill to you today.

I do sincerely believe that there may be some question raised as to the adequacy of funds in a few instances. One instance has been raised here this afternoon as to whether the committee feels that the funds allotted are adequate. I would like to say in further answer to that question that in almost every case the head of the agency before us was asked this question: "Do you expect to come in for a deficiency appropriation or a supplemental appropriation?"

In no case do I remember that question being directed to a witness who responded in the affirmative. In each case they told us that they did not believe that they would need to come in for supplementary money, they believed what they had asked for would be adequate for their needs. On that basis we have, I believe, every right to feel justified in presenting to you today the figures contained in this bill for the activities concerned.

There has been another topic touched upon today which has been very well answered by the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member, and also supplemented by our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], and that is on the question of efficiency and improvement and more frequent mail services. The matter of 2-a-day delivery was not particularly in our minds when we discussed with the Post Office Department the matter of efficiency and more frequent deliveries, but we were genuinely interested in the improvement that would make for better deliveries, more frequent deliveries, and we did find on questioning and by voluntary information that a number of things are being done and have been done by the post office, without urging, to accomplish those promises and pledges that are contained in the Republican platform that has been read to you here today. Not the least of these efforts has been the finding and testing, with the idea of using, new and modern methods of handling certain phases of post-office operations. Such things in themselves will make for improvement and consequently more frequent deliveries of the mail. But, there are other ideas under consideration as well to attain those ends. One of the things that I think of, as developed in the hearings, was the matter of changing the time on which mail was to be picked up at the various stations in which it was deposited. It was discovered on experimentation—and it did not take very long to find out—that if a rearrangement of the schedule for picking up mail could be had, the mail could then be transported to its destination hours earlier than it would be if it had been allowed to remain in its deposited spot until the ordinary scheduled time. That resulted in rearranging pickup schedules to an extent where mail in certain instances that had been received as late as 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon was delivered in the first hours of the morning. That, of course, is an improvement in the mail service and in a sense it is a more frequent delivery of the mail.

However, this particular phase of postoffice service contemplates many changes. You will recall that not long ago the Postmaster General inaugurated a program of sending certain first-class mail to a destination where it was feasible to do so and where the cost was not prohibitive by airplane, giving in effect the same service to first-class mail that might be given to airmail as such.

There have been other ideas that have been tried out. There is one place in this great country of ours—and this is a great country from the standpoint of post-office transportation and service, because we have many miles to cover in transportation and at heavy costs—but there was a place in this land where the mail used to go down almost 800 miles south, in a certain State, because there was a river and lagoons and several other obstacles on one side, and the mail was transferred to other cars and sent many miles north, up the other side of those rivers and lagoons to be delivered. It did not take very long to reason that if the mail were thrown off halfway down the peninsula and carried across by truck to the other side, it would certainly reach the delivery points many hours earlier, and at less cost.

That is but one small instance, but the whole study, the whole program in the Post Office Department for achieving more efficiency and more frequent mail delivery is progressing, is bearing fruit and, in the end, will bring many changes that will be generally applauded by the people of this country.

I have great confidence in the men who are operating the Post Office Department, as have also my colleagues on this committee, as testified by their statements here today. We have a team of men under the leadership of the Postmaster General who are not there because they particularly wanted the job, but because they were sought out for their experience in a line of work related to certain operations in the Post Office Department. As the result, there are men today on the Post Office management team that have been great men in their own right, in their own fields, in their own specialized activities in private enterprise.

The Post Office Department needs many things. Among the many things it needs are new working spaces. For the most part, the major post offices of this country today are not working spaces, they are monuments to a bygone age. They are dark, and in many instances, dingy. That is one of the programs I feel we can look forward to if we ever get out of the need of spending so much of our substance on preparations for possible war, and preparations for defense, that will supply our people with great amounts of work to do for a considerable time to come. We have seen the ideas of the Postmaster General as designed for him by capable engineers, ideas for making post offices that are, in fact, efficient working spaces. It is going to take a long while to complete that program or even to make a great start on it, but it is under way.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure this bill will pass. It is a good bill.

Before making a few observations on the bill, I would like to express to my colleagues on the committee my appreciation for their friendship, their help, and good will. The hearings were lively. I think the people who appeared before the committee were as fine a group of officials as one could hope to hear, bar none. Each sought to strengthen America. I think it a salutary compliment to the United States, to this Government, that in spite of the tensions of the times we can still take time to lay differences on the line, wrap them up, and meet assembled in session, as colleagues and friends, to promote the best interest of this country.

I think a key issue in this bill is the new light in which Government cost accounting is placed. I hope it succeeds. I wonder whether we can expect and get greater responsibility in finance by delegating authority over money to someone outside the department running the function. Will the new set-up on weather stations put the Coast Guard on allowance, like a kid looking for his weekly two bits from Pop to go to the show? Will it cause a rivalry in the Defense Department? Give it a big-brother, run-along-and-play-Johnny attitude? I hope not.

The profit motive fires incentive in business. Salaries, bonuses, wages, dividends, and pensions depend on profit. Service inspires public officials, creates public trust, gives the citizen fullest protection for his profit and welfare. Are you at your best in government when responsibility is split from authority, especially in money matters?

In the cost allocations of this weather-station program we see a split in responsibility and authority. In war that has not worked. Will it create greater benefits to all concerned in peace? I look forward to the time when the Coast Guard will again control its budget, match cash accountability with functions—responsibility with authority. If the Department of Defense by this step thinks it can do a good job, give us greater protection, I wish it well.

I am sure, however, that the Department of Defense can, in the event of an

emergency, set up its own system of patrolling, independent of Coast Guard operations.

I am not very pleased over the cut in manpower of the Coast Guard, especially at a time when we hope for more trade, fruits of the recovery program we have had in the past few years. I like the word "guard." It should mean that we guard our coast, guard it for profit and the enforcement of law so that free enterprise will not be dissipated through bootlegging, black marketeers and sharp, cut-corner traders. I trust the tradewinds will restore to the Coast Guard its slashed reserve personnel.

Customs guards and inspectors at docks, at airfields and elsewhere check to give us revenue as well as to protect and enforce our laws. I offered a suggestion in committee, that a kitty of 50 cents on people who go and come from abroad be paid. That is a dollar round-trip. This means an annual take of $100 million or more. It will put customs in the black.

Lastly, as to transportation, I sense that major carriers on land, on water, and in the air are going to tangle under the new accounting setup. We are told today that railroads are not selling space for the mails to the Government as efficiently as other carriers. In committee it was not revealed whether post office accounting includes, for air contracts, the cost of bringing mail from town to airfield, getting it aboard the plane, sorting while the plane is in flight—none done as is done by rails in transit—and the cost of mail transport from airfield to post office. I trust the railroads will come out fighting to make sure that costs in contract bids are fully analyzed.

Rails must be helped. In an emergency, with highways gutted and clogged, rails will be a pivotal link in survival.

In closing, I would like to express my appreciation to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Postmaster General, and to all who testified for the manner in which they presented their case. It is not easy to come on the Hill and ask for more money when a job has been promised for less; sometimes it costs money, as we know, before one breaks even to do a job for future taxpayers. I hope that the Treasury and the Post Office, in balance, will leave the citizen with enough money to pay his bills and taxes. I will vote for this bill.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman has made some inquiry as to the firing or dismissal of certain Government employees. I wonder if he could tell us whether or not the firing of Dean Manion was for loyalty or security.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I have not studied that issue.

Mr. EVINS. Could it be possible that Dean Manion was dismissed because of his opposition to the TVA? His statement that the TVA was creeping socialism and that the TVA should be sold to the private power interests? In view of his known opposition to the TVA, I might add that I personally have no regret that he has been fired from the Government service.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I shall yield for as many questions to the gentleman as he cares to ask and answer for himself, time allowing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, there has been such a splendid and thorough explanation of this legislation before us, not only by our chairman, assisted by other members on his side, and by the minority chairman, that it would be repetitious and superfluous, to dwell on the provisions of the bill. I would like to devote a few minutes to what might be termed new leadership in the Treasury Department, which covers the Post Office Department. Of course this bill which we are considering covers the Treasury and Post Office, Coast Guard, and various other departments.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I gladly yield to the lady from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I simply wish to ask the gentleman before he begins on the main subject of his speech whether he is able to assure me that the failure to increase the Coast Guard appropriation would mean any diminution of service on the Great Lakes, particularly Lake Michigan.

Mr. VURSELL. None whatever.

Mrs. CHURCH. We can be assured that what service is there will be continued?

Mr. VURSELL. That is right.

Mrs. CHURCH. Is there any hope that ports like Waukegan will have their Coast Guard protection increased?

Mr. VURSELL. That I could not answer.

Mrs. CHURCH. But there is no diminution of the present service contemplated?

Mr. VURSELL. That is right.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I have the same trite question, What will it do to the Coast Guard in the Cleveland area on Lake Erie's shores?

Mr. VURSELL. It will not diminish its service in any way.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. We are finding that Cleveland is coming out of the small end of the horn in quite a number of instances in departmental domination. We lost our main hospital. I trust we are not going to lose our Coast Guard which is so important to us.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say from my limited experience here in Congress over the past 12 years that I believe in the representatives and heads of the departments that have come before us I have never seen men more dedicated to giving business leadership to Government; I have never seen a better array of brains backing up their patriotic determination in these critical times, not only to give the people through their various departments the best possible service, and better service than they have had before, but also through their organizational ability to bring the greatest possible economy to government in the hope eventually of balancing the budget and living within the revenue we collect. I agree with the gentleman from Virginia, that it is very important as early as possible, that the budget be balanced and that that be made the fixed and established policy of all administrations that may follow.

We have heard some criticism that there are too many big-business men—some of them have been referred to as multimillionaires—heading our departments of government. Why should we not have in Government men of the broadest possible business experience, successful business men? Because, Mr. Chairman, the United States Government is the biggest business in the world. Unfortunately, through the past 20 years our Government has been builded into the biggest, the most wasteful and extravagant bureaucracy the world has ever known; and it takes men of business experience, yes; the best business brains in the Nation to dismantle, reorganize, and get back to sound policies of government that will shake down this overgrown bureaucracy and again operate it on sound business principles.

It takes men like George Humphreys, the head of the Treasury Department, Mr. Folsom, Mr. Randolph Burgess, Mr. Chapman Rose, and others who are giving such successful leadership to government in the Treasury Department.

It takes topflight business leaders like Mr. Summerfield, Mr. Abrams, Mr. Hook, Mr. Kieb, and others who are doing such a commendable job in directing the Post Office Department. I feel sure Postmaster General Summerfield will go down in history as one of the greatest, if not the greatest Postmaster General we have had to date. Too much cannot be said for all of his most capable assistants.

Let me also pay my compliments to a great Democrat brought into Government from Virginia, Commissioner of Internal Revenue Coleman Andrews, who is rendering a tremendous and great service directing one of the biggest departments of Government. I think he is the best qualified man that we have ever had in charge of the Internal Revenue Service.

A great service, and a hopeful light for the future of this Government, is that the men the President has been able to persuade to come in and help our Government in these critical times are without exception men who are not only dedicated to the cause for which they give their service at a pittance compared with what they have been making in private life, but they are men who are willing to help do this job for the good of our entire country and all of its people.

I am sure the members of the Appropriations Committee and the Congress fully appreciate the type of business leadership now working with us.

A fine tribute was brought out here on the floor of the House, when the ranking minority member of our committee was able to tell a Member who queried him that we did not have to cut the expenses of various departments of Government. We did not suggest the cuts in certain departments in the Treasury;

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the department heads insisted that these cuts should be made and that there would be sufficient money left, that they could properly conduct the affairs of their various departments. What a timely and welcome change.

Mr. Chairman, can you imagine how many billions of dollars in the future can and will be saved to the taxpayers because we have businessmen of this type in Government who know how to organize, who know how to economize in Government so that they can live within their appropriations and not come back for supplemental appropriations, men who now work with and cooperate with our committees.

I was amazed at one little department, the mint. We had made such a reduction, with their help, a year ago, that I expected, and I think many members of the committee expected, they would have to come back for a supplemental appropriation. But they did not. When they did come back for their appropriation in this bill, I was surprised that they did not request an increase. And may I say that almost without exception, the various departments asked for less this year, notwithstanding the tremendous reductions that were made last year in these service organizations that cannot be reduced as much as most other departments. They asked for less. The mint, as we thought, had certainly been reduced by a very large percentage a year ago. They came in with a request for an appropriation of $4½ million. They had again reduced their own appropriation request by $200,000 for this year. They were asked the question how they were able to do it. They explained it, and the committee was satisfied.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the people, and all of the Members of Congress, are pleased with the leadership and the service that these splendid men at the head of the department are bringing to the Government. I feel certain that the Congress will back them up until the day shall come, we hope in the near future, when we can have a balanced budget, the result of applying sound business methods to government, which we have needed for so many years in the past.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 additional minutes. I have in mind that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] may have a question he would like to propound at this time.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. With others on this side, I have profound respect for the distinguished chairman and the membership of his subcommittee. I feel disposed to support their recommendations. But I wish assurance on one point. I was disturbed when my colleague from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], with whom I have enjoyed a long and affectionate friendship, was talking about balancing the budget. I wish to be assured that balancing the budget will not be put in priority to the payment of wages to postal and Treasury and other Government workers, in line with the increases which they are now reasonably requesting. I am sure there are many of us here who will not consent to an adjournment of this Congress until an $800 annual minimum increase has been voted.

What is the position of the chairman and of the committee? Is balancing the budget to take priority over doing the decent thing in the matter of the payment of wages?

Mr. CANFIELD. First, may I say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] that we cannot in this bill provide any increases for postal workers. Under the rules of Congress, we of the Appropriations Committee have to report out funds to implement existing laws. We cannot anticipate new laws. Insofar as the cause of the postal workers is concerned, speaking for myself, back early in December when our subcommittee was called here to Washington to start hearings on this bill, the Postmaster General came before our group as a witness. I questioned him on the Department's program with reference to increased salaries. In fact, that is the first time it was brought up insofar as this session of the Congress is concerned. I told him in the hearings that I believed a salary bill would be reported out and passed by the Congress and I read into the record the results of a questionnaire sent out to postal workers in my district by national organizations, having to do with their good and welfare. That questionnaire showed particularly among letter carriers, that most of them had to indulge in outside employment in order to be able to live properly.

I urged the Postmaster General and the higher echelons in his department, in their review of this picture, to go into that phase very definitely to find out why it was necessary for so many postal workers to engage in outside employment; and to come back, if possible, with some helpful remedial legislation.

Beyond that I am sure that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] will agree that we members of the subcommittee could not go at that time.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinios. I appreciate very much the explanation that the chairman has made. I knew from my private conversations with him, and from his public actions and statements, where he stood and the sincerity of his devotion to the public workers. But I thought it important to the country that the committee should be put on public record, the understanding being that if at a later time we legislate for substantial increases in the wages of Federal workers, the gentleman's committee and the Appropriations Committee as a whole will come forward with the funds and not try to hamstring the will of the House.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that if the Congress authorizes an increase in salary for postal employees and for other Government employees, each department upon which additional charges are fixed will then come before the Congress with a supplemental request, and a supplemental appropriation bill will be brought to the floor and passed in order to provide sufficient sums to pay whatever amount Congress recommends as the proper amount?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true. We will be mandated to carry through, and we shall do just that.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois, who is always so kind and gracious to me.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Many of the workers in the Internal Revenue Office in Chicago have been forced because of wage and working conditions to quit their employment. They are very much concerned.

Mr. CANFIELD. I hope the gentleman from Illinois has heard our report on this bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I have and I commend the gentleman and his associates on the committee for their realistic grasp of a serious situation.

Mr. CANFIELD. We are urging reclassification, particularly among the frontline enforcement troops of the Internal Revenue Service; $5,200 a year average per man is not enough for that type of work.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wonder if the chairman of the committee could take additional time to explain more thoroughly what is meant by the appropriation for educating workers in that Department? Is it intended to build up a new group of people to take the place of the older workers? In that I could see certain dangers as well as promise of some future advantage. I think it should be spelled out very carefully.

Mr. CANFIELD. No, indeed. It is for both approaches, one to train the present staff, the other to train new employees sadly needed. Up until the present time we have not had adequate civil-service registers. We are 838 short now in the frontline troops in the Internal Revenue Service, because we cannot get the men we need for that type of work. This new training program will help us meet the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

For administration and operation of the Post Office Department and the postal service, there is hereby appropriated the aggregate amount of postal revenues for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, as authorized by law (39 U. S. C. 786, 794a), together with an amount from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, equal to the difference between such revenues and the total of the appropriations hereinafter specified and the sum needed may be advanced to the Post Office Department upon requisition of the Postmaster General, for the following purposes, namely:

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of asking the chairman of the

subcommittee a question: First, I should like to say that I have a great deal of regard for the gentleman and I feel that his committee has done a very fine job on this bill. However, in view of what has been said about the decreases, the savings, and so on, I should like to ask about this increased appropriation for interest on the public debt. On page 36 of the report it works out at an increase of $275 million. Now the question I have is, is that because of an increase in the debt or is that because of an increase of the interest rates on the debt?

Mr. CANFIELD. Last year, as the gentleman may recall, there was a big maturity that had to be refinanced, and as the gentleman from Virginia has pointed out, there has been an increase in the interest rate paid out on securities. That was discussed earlier in the day.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes, I know that but the major proportion of this $275 million would probably be because of an increase in the interest rate; is that not correct?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. There is another question that I would like to ask and that is on the same page you have reduced by $342 million the amount appropriated for refunds on internal revenue collections. How can you predict in advance that they are going to refund that much less money?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is their best calculation of a permanent indefinite estimate. They have made mistakes in yesteryear and correction had to be made by the Congress. They can only estimate and the new service is trying hard to be as accurate as possible.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. I just want to point out that this is only an estimate and here we are with a bill which shows a net reduction, but when we get a few simple figures we may find out that probably is net increase which is going to be a little hard to put your finger on.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in his opening remarks, and I am interested in his breakdown of what was happening to the Coast Guard. I notice there you are reducing the Coast Guard stations from a total of 10 to perhaps 7?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is in reference to the ocean-ship weather-station program.

Mr. BAILEY. That is right.

Mr. CANFIELD. The reduction there is from 10⅔ to 5⅔ because Civil Aviation holds there is no requirement on their part, but the Defense Establishment holds that 5⅔ stations should be maintained. They are reimbursing the Coast Guard for the expenses involved.

Mr. BAILEY. I know, but that is not the point I am driving at. I had the opportunity of serving on a committee some 2 or 3 years ago investigating safety devices in harbors like Boston and New York and other places. We did not recommend any legislation because we found out that the Coast Guard did most of these inspections. Just what are you doing to the Coast Guard which would reduce them to the point where they could not make the inspections for handling devices for loading and unloading ships which they have been doing?

Mr. CANFIELD. They are not being reduced on that item at all. That has nothing to do with the ocean-ship program. They are not being reduced on that item which the gentleman is now discussing. The gentleman first started out and referred to the cut in the ocean-ship program which has nothing to do with navigation aids. That service is being maintained.

Mr. BAILEY. If you reduce the facilities in the Atlantic, they would have to reduce the facilities to properly safeguard those ports. But look at it from the point of view of security. Who is going to make the inspections? If an enemy should launch an attack and make a sudden surprise attack on us, how easy it would be to bring several ships into the harbor loaded with explosives. Who is going to make the inspection?

Mr. CANFIELD. The harbor patrol service of the Coast Guard is not being cut at all.

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad to know that.

Mr. CANFIELD. The harbor patrol service of the Coast Guard is not being cut at all.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman from West Virginia is talking about the port security program. That is being reduced.

Mr. CANFIELD. The shoreside patrol is being reduced. That is right. I pointed that out in my opening statement.

Mr. GARY. I thought the gentleman misunderstood the gentleman's question. He is referring to the Port Security.

Mr. BAILEY. For the benefit of the gentleman, that program covered some very unsatisfactory features as to certain companies being used in the port for the protection of the longshoremen. But along came the Coast Guard saying that if we proposed any legislation we were invading their authority; that they had authority to make these inspections. I am curious to know what you are doing to prevent them from carrying out that function.

Mr. CANFIELD. That function is not being taken away from the Coast Guard. It is being cut. The Mutual Security Assistance program, because of the lessening of these shipments and because of the help being accorded by the steamship companies involved, is being cut.

Mr. BAILEY. What ground have we for making reductions when that might involve our safety in time of war?

Mr. CANFIELD. I do not believe the Coast Guard would recommend these reductions if they felt that was true. We are not cutting the budget requested by the Coast Guard 1 cent, except as it applies to printing costs.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman for the information. I hope, however, that it works out all right, but I may have an opportunity to tell the gentleman different in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7893, directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to ascertain the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. I will be glad to inform the gentleman. It is our intention to adjourn over until Monday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman state what we may expect for next week?

Mr. HALLECK. Monday has already been set aside for the reading of Washington's Farewell Address. That will be the entire program for Monday.

The Appropriations Committee has filed a report on the deficiency bill. I understand there is no controversy about it. We expect to call that up on Tuesday.

I am hoping that the Rules Committee will grant a rule on House Joint Resolution 355, the so-called Mexican labor bill. It has been reported out by the Committee on Agriculture. If that rule is granted we will call that bill up after we dispose of the appropriation bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman have much hope that that will be done?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, I hope it will be.

Mr. RAYBURN. And that would be the program for next week?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. There are some other bills that are in the process of being reported. If they are reported and rules for them are granted we will try to call them up. But as I have heretofore stated to the gentleman sufficient advance notice will be given that the Members will have ample knowledge of what is going on.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public works may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill S. 2150, and that any member of the committee who desires to do so may have permission to file minority or supplemental views subsequent to the report of the committee, the said views to be printed as part II of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FORAND.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. Mack of Washington), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, February 22, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1294. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a note dated February 2, 1954, from the Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of the Philippines forwarding copies of a resolution of the Philippine Veterans Legion, Manila, Philippines, which petitions the support of measures that would provide for the financing by the Government of the United States of the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York City; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1295. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting the report of the government of the District of Columbia for the year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 12 of "an act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia"; approved June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 108); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1296. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Kings Mountain Little Theatre, Inc., which will, when approved by the regional director, region 1, National Park Service, authorize it to present its historical drama commemorating the Battle of Kings Mountain and the incidental sale of refreshments in Kings Mountain National Military Park, S. C., for a period of 6 months from April 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1297. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 14, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of harbor at Empire, Oreg., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 7971. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer for himself and his spouse, and the additional exemptions for old age or blindness, from $600 to $1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 7972. A bill to amend section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide, in the case of a fiscal year corporation which began business in 1949, that so much of a net operating loss as is allocable to 1950 may be carried over to the fourth and fifth succeeding taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 7973. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 7974. A bill to amend the statutes relating to crop loans, parity prices of agricultural products and conservation of natural resources, to promote conservation of soil fertility, to provide for benefit payments to producers for conservation practices, to provide for loans to producers on agricultural products, to regulate supply of crops and to thereby guard against famine and destitution, to promote orderly marketing of crops, to insure against unduly depressed price levels, to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, and to establish a board for such purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7975. A bill to prohibit certain acts and transactions with respect to gambling materials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 7976. A bill to amend the statutes relating to crop loans, parity prices of agricultural products and conservation of natural resources, to promote conservation of soil fertility, to provide for benefit payments to producers for conservation practices, to provide for loans to producers on agricultural products, to regulate supply of crops and to thereby guard against famine and destitution, to promote orderly marketing of crops, to insure against unduly depressed price levels, to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, and to establish a board for such purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 7977. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 7978. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 to provide that the assurances (of employment, support, and housing) required therein may be given by agencies and organizations approved for that purpose by the Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 7979. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7980. A bill to amend chapter 115 of title 18, United States Code, relating to treason, sedition, and subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND (by request):

H. R. 7981. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Makah Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 7982. A bill to authorize newspapers, permanently bound for preservation, to be transmitted through the mails at the rate provided for books; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 7983. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 7984. A bill to withhold Federal aid from certain schools located at installations under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense or the Department of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard which do not practice segregation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 7985. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. J. Res. 383. Joint resolution amending the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, with respect to the pledge of allegiance to the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 7986. A bill for the relief of Orlando Valeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 7987. A bill for the relief of Roger Feghali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 7988. A bill for the relief of Fred C. Gallander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7989. A bill for the relief of Helena Vendrinsky Casey and her child Helen Juliana Vendrinsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7990. A bill for the relief of Bernard Yoh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7991. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Peter Benezis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7992. A bill for the relief of Thomas Gregory Song; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7993. A bill for the relief of Miron Kolodziejczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7994. A bill for the relief of Nijole Brasenaite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 7995. A bill for the relief of Charalampos E. Gabrielides (Harry E. Gabrielides); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

519. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the executive board of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor calling attention to the acute economic problem that exists at the present time due to unemployment and requesting President Eisenhower to call a conference of labor and management to find ways and means to stabilize the economy at a level of full employment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

520. By the SPEAKER: Petition of H. Joseph Mahoney and 556 others, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging passage of House Joint Resolution 243 and Senate Joint Resolution 126, which would amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America to include the words "under God"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Armenian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1954

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, 32 years ago today, on February 18, 1921, the Armenian people broke shackles that had held them under Communist rule, a rule that had been imposed on them by force in December of 1920, and for several months were free to run their own Government.

During their short-lived period of freedom they displayed to the world that they were not only anxious but well capable of self-government.

Their dream of freedom had become true. The people were fired with enthusiasm and determination to rehabilitate their war-devastated country.

A parliament was established by free election, over 1,500 new schools were opened, the first Armenian university was established, organizations were set up to provide public housing, to build hospitals, to set up relief centers and orphanages.

But to their great sorrow, after only a few months, they were returned by force to Russian rule. They lacked the power to repel the invaders. But they retained their hope that the day would come when they would once again be free. Their hearts were broken, but their spirit has not dimmed. They, like the other enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain, will respond faithfully and well when the opportunity is presented to them to join the other freedom-loving people of the world.

We must not let them down. We must do all we can to help them break the grasp of the Red Bear, and free themselves from the persecution and suffering they have endured for so long.

We must help them regain their freedom.

Wellsville Flood-Control Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD a statement, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. DANIEL A. REED, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE CIVIL FUNCTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1954

Mr. Chairman and members of the Civil Functions Subcommittee, I appreciate this opportunity to submit this statement requesting favorable action on the proposed $26,000 item in the budget for advanced engineering and design in connection with the Wellsville flood-control project.

Year in and year out I have appeared before House and Senate committees in behalf of this project.

I respectfully request and urge that favorable action be taken upon the proposed $26,000 so that the planning of this project may be completed as soon as possible to enable construction to begin. The Army engineers can begin construction, it is believed, in 1956, if the full appropriation is made by that time, of course, and if the planning of the project is completed.

Wellsville, N. Y., is a splendid civic and industrial town and it is a short-sighted policy not to protect flood-ravished areas. More than once I have taken the floor to oppose sending billions of dollars abroad to build beautiful hotels, power dams, and railroads at a time when flood-ravished areas in our own country could not get the necessary appropriations to rebuild.

From September 1948 through September 1953, Italy has received from this country $12,800,000 in a counterpart fund, for flood-relief control.

There has been earmarked for flood rehabilitation in the Netherlands 400 million guilder ($105,264,000 of our money) which will probably be spent during this fiscal year.

I want to stress the fact that the industries in Wellsville, N. Y., endangered by frequent and devastating floods are industries engaged in national defense. For instance, the Air Preheater Corp. in Wellsville manufactures Ljungstrom preheaters, and it is the only manufacturer of them in the United States. They are for installation in steam plants, furnishing power for public utilities, atomic energy projects, navy yards, ordnance plants, synthetic rubber plants, and refineries producing high octane gasoline.

General Chorpening has advised this committee previously that there are a number of manufacturing concerns in Wellsville, such as the Sinclair Refining Co., Julius Kaiser Co., and Bausch & Lomb Co., all of which plants supplied equipment to the Armed Forces in World War II and are important at this time in connection with defense production.

Let me say this: Wellsville, N. Y., is subject to floods each year. It is a flooded defense area. The flood project has been authorized by law. An item of $26,000 for

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

advanced engineering and design is in the budget. It has the approval of the Army engineers.

This committee has vast material on the Wellsville flood-control project submitted by me and the Army engineers and others, which material gives all of the facts, therefore I shall not go too much into detail about this serious situation.

However, I want to call this to your attention; that flood damage begins in Wellsville when the river rises above 7.5 feet on the gage at the water and light plant. As a result of heavy rains the river rose above this stage early in the afternoon of November 25, 1950. It rose to 14.3 feet. The peak was the highest on record. The damage amounted to $400,000.

The population of Wellsville, N. Y., in 1940 was 7,641. Since 1942 flood damage in Wellsville has amounted to $1 million. (This is about one one-hundredth of the amount the United States has earmarked for flood rehabilitation in the Netherlands.)

In 1948 I had the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress supply me with official and factual information as to what the cost would be to each city, village, and town in my congressional district for the European recovery program. The cost to Wellsville, with its population of 7,641, was figured at $986,530—just $13,470 less than the million dollars worth of damage done to Wellsville by floods.

This small town's share of the foreign-aid program has just about equaled the million dollars it has lost in flood damage. I urge this committee to permit Wellsville, N. Y., to use some of its tax money at home for further planning of the Wellsville flood-control project. I sincerely hope that this committee will approve the $26,000 item in the budget for advanced engineering and design so that the planning of this project may be completed as soon as possible.

The threat of war is ever with us, as vast military appropriations indicate. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that we preserve our essential defense industries in Wellsville, N. Y., from flood damage as well as from enemy destruction.

Again I respectfully request approval of this $26,000 item for Wellsville, N. Y.

Fifth Anniversary of the Trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 18, 1954

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared in connection with the fifth anniversary of the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. We who are fortunate enough to be able to live in a country where we can worship our God in accordance with the dictates of our conscience should be mindful of those who cannot have such freedom of worship. I desire to call to the attention of the Senate and of the people of the United States the trial of the Cardinal of Hungary, because it demonstrates so clearly how religion is treated in other parts of the world.

I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the RECORD, following my statement, a letter dated January 25, 1954, which I have received from Msgr. Bela Varga, former Speaker of the Hungarian Parliament, and President of the Hungarian National Council.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

Religion is one of the greatest and most apparent differences which divides the free world and the areas dominated by Communist tyranny. Here in the United States, for instance, our Nation is founded on a basic belief in God and our people have the inherent right to worship God as the dictates of their conscience direct. Communism, on the other hand, rejects the very existence of God and often forbids its subjects to worship at all.

Nowhere is this more evident than in the Communist-ruled nation of Hungary.

I wish to call this to the attention of the Senate because this month marks the fifth anniversary of the trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, Prince Primate of Hungary. Five years ago this month the Cardinal was convicted by a Communist-Hungarian tribunal on trumped-up charges. I am certain that the details of that infamous trial are generally known to the American people.

This is a part of the general pattern of violent persecution of Protestants, Catholics, Orthodox and Uniates by the Communists.

Because of the tyranny of Communist rulers, the people of Hungary are forbidden to express their own horror at the treatment Cardinal Mindszenty received or to take effective steps to right the terrible injustices committed against him and against freedom.

We know how the people of Hungary must feel about the treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty. The great tragedy of Mohacs, August 29, 1526, stands as a historic memorial to their struggle against anti-Christian invaders from the East. This great battle is doubly significant in that upon its bloody arena fought some of the leading churchmen of the day, and Archbishop Tomori, who was in charge of the army, was among the dead.

The great traditions of Louis Kossuth are still alive in Hungary and repel every idea of the type inflicted on Cardinal Mindszenty.

We, here in the United States, must take this opportunity to refresh our memories with respect to the crimes committed against this primate of the church, and against all religion, and to renew our determination to erase these injustices.

HUNGARIAN NATIONAL COUNCIL,
New York, N. Y., January 25, 1954.

Hon. HOMER FERGUSON,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FERGUSON: The month of February marks the fifth anniversary of the trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, Prince Primate of Hungary, staged by the Communist regime of Hungary. News of the cardinal's arrest, on the second day of Christmas of 1948, was received with deep consternation by the entire free world. The world immediately realized that the Mindszenty case was not merely a concern of the Roman Catholic Church and the Hungarian nation, but that it affected the entire free world and every thinking man and woman. The circumstances of the cardinal's arrest, the utterly false accusations brought against him, the mock trial, filled the free world with alarm.

America, the land of freedom, instinctively sensed that Mindszenty stood for the principles of human liberty on which this great country was founded. No one in the United States had any doubt that Mindszenty had done the right thing. He did so because he foresaw the real goal of the Bolsheviks: the destruction of the subjugated peoples of Central Europe. The arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty in 1948 marked the beginning of a new era in the fight between Bolshevism and the Hungarian as well as the other Central European nations.

Since the silenced and oppressed Hungarian people are unable to express its opinion and feelings today, we who represent their interests on the free soil of the United States and in the countries of the free world, must speak for them in thanking you for your generous contribution to their fight for liberty and for your firm stand in the case of Cardinal Mindszenty. The moral support received from the United States greatly encouraged the Hungarian nation's resistance to Bolshevism, and was largely responsible for the fact that the Hungarian people did not lose faith and hope. On the contrary, their faith in ultimate liberation is today stronger than ever before, and their passive resistance has already shaken the Bolshevik regime to its foundations.

On the fifth anniversary of the arrest and trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, we appeal again to the conscience of all free men to keep the fate of the heroic cardinal and the cause of the suffering Hungarian nation before the forums of the free world, so that liberty and justice may eventually emerge victorious from this great human and national tragedy.

Sincerely yours,

MSGR. BELA VARGA,
Former Speaker of the Hungarian Parliament, President of the Hungarian National Council.

The United States Information Agency's Purpose Well Stated in Directive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the ninth semiannual report of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, which was filed with the Speaker on February 2 and published as House Document No. 311, deserves the thoughtful consideration of the Congress. This study, participated in by four distinguished Americans—Mr. Erwin D. Canham, Mr. Philip D. Reed, Mr. Ben Hibbs, and Mr. Justin Miller—reviews a 5-month period ending December 31, 1953, and offers some important recommendations, including one to the effect that Congress approve the President's directive defining the purpose of the United States Information Agency. This directive uses language which I believe adequately states the purpose of this important agency in the struggle to defeat Communist aggression, and states in positive terms the objectives of the United States. The mission of our Information Agency is defined by the President in the above directive as follows:

The purpose of the United States Information Agency shall be to submit evidence to peoples of other nations by means of communications techniques that the objectives and policies of the United States are in harmony with and will advance their legitimate aspirations for freedom, progress, and peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the Members will concur in the recommendation of the Advisory Commission since the language seems to be an admirable short statement of our objective.

Communist-Led Strikes in Italy Show Necessity of Outlawing Communist-Dominated Unions in United States Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill in the House—H. R. 7950—to prohibit the Government of the United States from entering into any defense contracts with any contractor or supplier where there are reasonable grounds to believe the employees are represented by a Communist-dominated union.

On December 9, 1953, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, testifying before a House Subcommittee on Appropriations, asserted that the Communist Party operations in the maritime, mining, electrical, and communications fields constituted a major and dangerous threat to our national security.

The present strike in Italy indicates how dangerous this infiltration into American industry can become for the United States in time of crisis. There are many plants today working on classified defense contracts where a Communist-dominated union is the collective bargaining representative for the employees. The legislation which I have introduced into the House would prohibit the Federal Government from placing any further defense contracts with companies where a Communist union prevails. In those instances where contracts are already existing, the Defense Department would be authorized to take any measures it deems appropriate to protect the security of the United States, including the right to terminate such contracts.

This power given to the Defense Department would be similar to that now existing in the Atomic Energy Commission with respect to the production of atomic energy.

Mr. Hoover, in his testimony referred to above, stated, that a national conference of the Communist Party held in August of 1953, reaffirmed the time-honored premise that control of the labor unions is of primary importance to the development of Communist revolution in this country. On that occasion, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover stated:

> In the regard to the infiltration of labor, the Communists regard labor unions as instruments to be controlled and used to develop the Communist revolution.
>
> A national conference held in August of this year of the Communist Party reaffirmed the time-honored premise that control of the labor union is of primary importance to the development of the Communist revolution in this country.
>
> They designed, particularly, the automobile industry as being the prime target because it is well known that it is one of the most vital industries to our national defense production.
>
> In New York, the party has set a goal for 65 percent of its membership to become employed in the basic industries of the country. Instructions were issued for the reorganization of the Communist Party in Los Angeles recently to organize on an industrial basis and party members were requested to secure work in the basic industries in that area, thus showing the trend of placing as many members as they can in the key industries of the country—the basic industries which if disrupted would materially affect our national defense. Currently, some trade unions operating in the maritime, mining, electrical, and the communications fields are chief strongholds of the Communist Party. The Communist Party still maintains its strongest bases in those unions, which were expelled from the CIO during 1949 and 1950. All of this poses a major and dangerous threat to our national security, because it involves these various unions that were expelled by the CIO. One of those unions represents a large portion of all employees in the electrical industry of the United States. Another union that was expelled exercises life and death control over our Pacific coast commerce; another union has members employed in the production of copper and zinc which are essential to the national defense efforts. (P. 164 of hearings before the House subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, relating to the Department of Justice, Dec. 9, 1953.)

EXPLANATION OF H. R. 7950

Section 1 of H. R. 7950 amends the Taft-Hartley Act by redefining the term "Labor organization" to exclude organizations which are Communist dominated. Any Communist-dominated union would thereby cease to have any right to act as a bona fide union or representative of employees.

Section 2 of the bill provides additional teeth in law by making it unlawful for a Communist-dominated organization to hold itself out as a labor organization, or act as one in any way. Also, it makes it illegal for a Communist-dominated organization to do anything which is an unfair labor practice for a bona fide labor organization to do.

Section 3 expands the Taft-Hartley non-Communist oath to require both labor officials and employers to execute such an oath annually and extends the oath to include any organizations determined to be Communist organizations by the Subversive Activities Control Board and to cover the 5-year period immediately preceding the execution of the oath.

Section 4 prohibits the Government from awarding new defense contracts to companies where there are reasonable grounds for believing that a Communist-dominated union is the representative of the employees. Where such contracts already exist the Government is empowered to take whatever measures are necessary to safeguard the security of the United States, including the power to terminate the contracts.

Section 5 specifically empowers the Subversive Activities Control Board to investigate and determine if a labor union is a Communist-action or Communist-front organization as defined in the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950.

TEXT OF H. R. 7950

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (5) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "but such term shall not include any organization which is directed, dominated, controlled, or influenced by or affiliated with the Communist Party of the United States of America, or any other organization which may be determined by the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist organization (as defined in sec. 3 (5) of the Internal Security Act of 1950), or any society, group, or assembly of persons who teach, advocate, or encourage the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States or the government of any State, Territory, District, or possession thereof, or the government of any political subdivision therein, by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

SEC. 2. Section 303 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and by adding after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any organization or group or assembly of persons which is not a labor organization to perform any act which has been defined by section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act as an unfair labor practice or which is unlawful for a labor organization to perform (other than refusing to bargain collectively), or to represent or attempt to represent any employees for the purposes of collective bargaining, or to file any petition with the National Labor Relations Board for an election or with respect to any alleged unfair labor practice or for any other purpose, or in any other way to act or attempt to act or represent itself as a bona fide labor organization."

SEC. 3. Section 9 (h) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The Board shall be without jurisdiction to entertain or to investigate any question affecting commerce concerning (1) the representation of employees, raised by or on behalf of a labor organization under subsection (c) of this section, or (2) any charge of an unfair labor practice made by or on behalf of a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10, or to hold any election or issue any complaint pursuant to any such petition or charge, unless there is on file with the Board, at the time of the original filing of the petition or charge, an affidavit executed within the 12-month period preceding such filing by each officer of such labor organization and by each officer of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit, stating that he is not, and for the 5 years prior thereto has not been, a member of the Communist Party of the United States of America or affiliated with such party, or in any manner a supporter of, or directly or indirectly a contributor of, money, services, or any other thing of value for the benefit, support, or advancement of such party or the principles advocated by it, or any other organization which may be determined by the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist organization (as defined in section 3 (5) of the Internal Security Act of 1950), or a member, contributor to, or supporter or advocate of any organization, society, group, or assembly of persons who believe in, teach, advocate, or encourage the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States or the government of any State, Territory, District, or possession thereof, or the government of any political subdivision therein, by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The Board shall also be without jurisdiction to entertain any charge of an unfair labor practice made by an employer unless there is on file with the Board a similar affidavit executed by the employer, or by the corporate officers in cases where the employer is a corporation. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable in respect to such affidavits.

SEC. 4. The Government of the United States shall not make any contract or place

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

any order for the installation, construction, development, purchase, manufacture, shipment, maintenance, or storage of any military equipment, munitions, supplies, or material, or for the construction, modification, or maintenance of facilities at military posts, stations, docks, or ships, with any contractor or supplier when there exists reasonable grounds for the contracting agency of the Government to believe that the collective-bargaining representative of any of the employees of the contractor or supplier, or of any subcontractor or subsidiary of the contractor or supplier, is not or does not represent a bona fide labor organization as defined in section 2 (5) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, whether or not there has been any determination by the Subversive Activities Control Board with respect to such organization. In the case of such contracts referred to in this section which are presently existing, the contracting agency of the Government shall have the power to make such regulations and take such measures with regard thereto as it shall deem appropriate under the circumstances to protect the security of the United States, including the right to terminate such contract.

SEC. 5. Section 3 (2) of the Internal Security Act of 1950 is amended by adding immediately after the word "fund" a comma and the following "or any group purporting to be a labor organization."

Equitable Salary Revisions for Postal and Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this time the statement I presented on February 9, 1954, to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of equitable salary increases for our postal and Federal employees.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to speak in support of these measures to equitably increase our postal and Federal employees' compensation. I know these proposals are being given the committee's most earnest and serious consideration.

It has been my privilege to repeatedly appear before your committee during these past few years to testify on the various bills to eliminate the salary injustices prevailing among the Postal Department's employees, as well as all Federal employees, whose wage scales have so seriously lagged behind the advances granted in the comparable fields of industry.

The request of the postal employees for an equitable salary readjustment should, in my opinion, have the particular sympathy of the committee and all of us. These people work hard, indeed, for the pay they get. They form a large group of our most reliable public servants. The service they render is fundamental and essential to the Nation. The security they enjoy is paid for by themselves. There are no more loyal people in our Government than those working in the Postal Department.

Now, whenever the cost of living rises, as it has been doing for the past several years, we all know that persons with fixed incomes suffer the most. Some workers can obtain raises to offset at least a portion of the increased cost of living, but those whose incomes are stationary or whose salaries are set by law have serious trouble trying to keep up with rising prices and maintain their family on a decent living scale.

Such is the current predicament of our postal employees. Their salaries are set by law, and it takes action by the Congress to raise their compensation. An important consideration in this connection is that while postal employees are organized, they are not allowed to strike; and, to have the record present the truth on this subject, let us remind ourselves that they have never shown any disposition to strike. They have been content to rely upon a sense of fair play on the part of Congress and the general public. Unfortunately, there were many trying years during which this reliance must have seemed misplaced, but nevertheless the postal employees never wavered in their loyalty, devotion, or efficiency in duty.

I am not going to unduly impose upon the committee by a lengthy recital of the changing economic conditions which have so materially reduced the buying power of the purchasing dollar in the hands of the American wage earners today. I realize statistical surveys and compilations have already been presented to the committee on that score.

May I just say I deeply believe, however, that it is pertinent to remind you that, if this Government is to uphold the tradition of honest service administered by loyal personnel, it must offer our employees wages comparable to other occupations of the same nature in private industry. By that I do not mean only a living wage, but a wage that will enable a postal and Federal employee to put something aside for the education of his children and the acceptance of such household emergencies as sudden sickness in the family without falling into staggering, discouraging debt.

May I also remind you that the best insurance against any misguided reception of false Communist propaganda by our Government employees is to wisely and practically extend them adequate salary compensation. It is only ordinary commonsense and recognition of the facts of life that if our Government employees are sufficiently compensated to enable them to meet their personal and family obligations with confidence and a high morale, then there will be no doubt of their loyalty as good Americans and their repudiation of Communist ideas.

I urge you, therefore, in simple justice, to promptly and favorably report a measure providing the substantial salary increase our postal and Federal workers so eminently deserve.

I thank the committee.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the hunger of heart which brings us daily to this altar of prayer which unites our spirits in a common fellowship of yearning and aspiration. Our littleness needs Thy greatness, our weakness needs Thy strength. We have found that unless we live in Thee we fail to do our best and to reach our highest, and that unless our restless hearts find rest in Thee we lack poise and tranquillity.

Lead us past all shams and subterfuges to Thyself. Even as we bow in peace and quietness in this historic Chamber our minds are filled with concern for multitudes who live amid confusion and in anxiety about what the morrow may bring. Grant that this Nation, of which we are privileged to be a part, in hours that are heavy with crisis may maintain its strength of purpose to do justly and to love mercy. Make our hearts tender and our consciences sensitive, and stir our wills to action. We make our prayer in the spirit of Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 18, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7893) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, Export-Import Bank of Washington, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ENTITLED "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTION REPORT"

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," for the period July 1 to December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Victor Haron Zakkay from a report transmitted to the Senate on April 15, 1953, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the first semiannual report of that Agency, for the 5-month period, August 1 to December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROCEEDINGS OF CONVENTION OF AMERICAN INSTRUCTORS OF THE DEAF

A letter from the president, convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, proceedings of the 36th meeting of that convention, held at Vancouver, Wash., June 29–July 3, 1953 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Maui Chamber of Commerce, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., relating to statehood for Hawaii, which was ordered to lie on the table.

PATENT OFFICE FEES—RESOLUTION OF OREGON PATENT LAW ASSOCIATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Oregon Patent Law Association, Portland, Oreg., favoring a continuance of the present fees for patent applications.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a meeting of the Oregon Patent Law Association was held on November 6, 1953, in Portland, Oreg., at which a quorum of members were present; and

Whereas a discussion of the question of the advisability of raising the Patent Office fees was had; and

Whereas it was the sentiment of the majority of those present at the meeting that the Patent Office fees should not at this time be raised: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Patent Law Association hereby recommends that the filing fees for patent applications charged by the United States Patent Office remain the same as they presently are. The raising of filing fees for patent applications would discourage or prevent some inventors from obtaining patents and the public, which is the ultimate beneficiary under the patent system, would thereby be injured. The Patent Office performs a highly useful public service and as such is entitled to support from public funds.

KENNETH KLARQUIST,
Secretary, Oregon Patent Law Association.

INCOME TAX EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN MINERS—RESOLUTION OF JACKSON COUNTY, OREG., CHAPTER, WESTERN MINING COUNCIL, INC.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Jackson County, Oreg., Chapter, Western Mining Council, Inc., relating to income-tax exemption for certain miners.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACKSON COUNTY, OREG., CHAPTER,
WESTERN MINING COUNCIL, INC.

We wish to call to your attention and request your comment on the resolution below regarding the income tax when the miner sells his claim, and the low price of gold. On motion duly made and seconded, the following resolution was unanimously approved at our annual meeting in Medford, Oreg., on January 22, 1954:

"Whereas under the Roosevelt administration during World War II the gold-mining industries were forced to close down their mining operations by act of Congress; and

"Whereas this act caused millions of dollars loss to the gold miners. The deep under ground mines have filled up with water, causing abandonment of the mines due to cave-ins and other hazardous conditions too numerous to mention involving a tremendous loss to the owners; and

"Whereas the prospectors and miners spend years of their time in searching for and development of valuable and strategic minerals necessary to the defense of our national security and by their own labor and expense develop their mines; and

"Whereas under the present law he is not allowed anything for this time and labor, and such drastic law discourages the prospecting for, and development of our mineral deposits, which is necessary for our country's preparedness; and

"Whereas in the event of a sale of their mine; under the present law, the miner must pay a heavy income tax after the purchase price and costs which he can show in dollars and cents: Be it

"Resolved, That the miner or prospector be exempt any revenue or income tax of any kind in event of a sale of his mine or prospect which he now owns or legally holds or may hereafter own or legally hold under the mining laws, unless his mine has been in operation on a paying basis sufficient to reimburse the owner for all his time, labor, production costs, etc; be it

"Resolved, That before any action is taken on bills now in Congress to return our Nation to a gold standard that the price of gold be increased to not less than $75 per fine ounce, and discourage the buying up of our low-priced gold by dope and gold smugglers, and also encourage the gold-mining industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each and every United States Senator and to the House Members and Governors of the 11 Western States."

Respectively submitted.

F. J. HALL, *President.*
MARY M. LEE KEY,
Secretary.

INCOME TAX ON CERTIFICATES OF COOPERATIVES—RESOLUTION OF NORTH CORVALLIS, OREG., FARMERS UNION 256

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the North Corvallis, Oreg., Farmers Union, No. 256, relating to the time for payment of income taxes on certificates issued by cooperatives.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas under the present Federal income-tax regulation, a farmer on a cash basis is required to pay income tax on a certificate issued by cooperatives, even though the certificate is not cashable at present, and there is no definite time that such certificate may be cashed: Therefore be it

Resolved by the North Corvallis Farmers Union, No. 256, in regular session at Mountain View School on February 2, 1954, That efforts be made to make it possible for the farmers to pay on the certificate when it is cashed, not when it is issued. And that a copy be sent to the State convention for further action there.

WM. R. TAGGART,
President.
FREDA LUEHRING,
Secretary.

CORVALLIS, OREG.

CONSTRUCTION OF NATURAL GAS LINE—RESOLUTION OF CITY COMMISSION, LA GRANDE, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Commission of the City of La Grande, Oreg., favoring the construction of a pipeline for natural gas from New Mexico field through eastern Oregon to Portland and Seattle, Wash.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 1341

Whereas the Pacific Northwest Pipeline Corporation has made application to the Federal Power Commission for permission to extend a natural gas line from the New Mexico fields through eastern Oregon to Portland and Seattle; and

Whereas in the opinion of the City Commission of the City of La Grande the availability of natural gas is important in the development of this area: Now, therefore, it is hereby

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Resolved by the City Commission of the City of La Grande, Oreg., That it encourage the construction of a pipeline by the Pacific Northwest Pipeline Corp. as above referred to and the city manager is hereby directed to make this fact known to the Federal Power Commission and to advise that Commission that the city commission favors the granting of the application of the Pacific Northwest Pipeline Corp.

Dated at La Grande, Oreg., this 3d day of June 1953.

Attest:

B. W. HIBBITS,
Recorder-Treasurer.
H. E. WADDELL,
J. L. SINDEN,
LYNN ANDERSON,
City Commissioners.

SPECIAL EXEMPTION ON INCOME DERIVED FROM DIVIDENDS—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the Central Labor Council of Portland, Oreg., and the Central Labor Council of Medford, Oreg., protesting against any special exemption on income derived from dividends.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL,
Portland, Oreg., January 28, 1954.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to advise you that the Central Labor Council of Portland, Oreg., at its last regular meeting held January 25, 1954, adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Central Labor Council of Portland go on record in favor of personal income taxes being levied on income, regardless of source, and that the Central Labor Council is on record as opposed to any special exemption on income derived from dividends."

Respectfully,
CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL OF PORTLAND, OREG.,
GUST ANDERSON, *Secretary.*

The following resolution was adopted by the Central Labor Council of Medford and vicinity at its last regular meeting held February 3, 1954:

"*Resolved*, That the Central Labor Council of Medford go on record in favor of personal income taxes being levied on income, regardless of source, and that the Central Labor Council is on record as opposed to any special exemption on income derived from dividends."

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 2405. A bill to authorize the exchange, upon terms fully protecting the public interest, of the United States Public Health quarantine station at Marcus Hook, Pa., for a new quarantine station (Rept. No. 986).

By Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 215. A bill to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods (Rept. No. 987).

By Mr. CASE, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 546. A bill to authorize payment for losses sustained by owners of wells in the vicinity of Cold Brook Dam by reason of the lowering of the level of water in such wells as a result of the construction of Cold Brook Dam (Rept. No. 988).

By Mr. UPTON, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 2120. A bill to authorize the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority to reconstruct and approve the toll bridge, and the approaches thereto, across the Piscataqua River at Portsmouth, N. H. (Rept. No. 989).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN (by request):

S. 2981. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN (by request):

S. 2982. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEORGE (for himself, Mr. KERR, and Mr. FREAR):

S. 2983. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the personal exemption and the exemption for dependents to $800 for the 1954 taxable year and to $1,000 for succeeding taxable years; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. GEORGE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2984. A bill for the relief of Roger Ouellette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2985. A bill to impose quotas on the importation of foreign wool and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2986. A bill for the relief of Argirios Tsamisis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2987. A bill to provide for the transfer of hay and pasture seeds from the Commodity Credit Corporation to Federal land-administering agencies; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 2988. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the State of Oklahoma for the use and benefit of the Eastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College at Wilburton, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 2989. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCHOEPPEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO ISLANDS OF GUAM AND AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to remove the Islands of Guam and American Samoa from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. I ask unanimous consent to have a statement explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2981) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. MARTIN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement by Mr. MARTIN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN

The purpose of this bill is to remove the islands of Guam and American Samoa from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. When the act was written, these two islands were under Navy rule and were bases of defense and supply. At that time, the events that were to occur were never visualized or contemplated. Insofar as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 was concerned, it was meaningless as it applied to these two groups of islands.

However, with the war and its after effects, the cold war, great and unprecedented events have occurred in that area.

Both of these two groups of islands are now under the jurisdiction of the Department of Interior, and governed by civilian governors. With a view to furthering our democratic principles of the right of self-determination, legislative bodies have been formed on both of these islands.

Both of these areas belong to the Asiatic or South Pacific economy rather than that of Continental United States. To try and enforce the Fair Labor Standards Act would not only preclude the starting of industrial enterprises which are badly needed, but would disrupt the economy of the trust territories, and that of surrounding areas and islands belonging to other friendly nations.

Recently, contractors for the Defense Department who are building defense installations on Guam brought 12,000 Filipinos to Guam for this work, and in order not to disturb the existing economy of the island, paid prevailing wages. Now they are being sued under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act for double damages. Therefore, to continue to apply this act will cause a loss to the United States taxpayer of needless millions of dollars. Furthermore, when the island goes back to its ordinary status, and defense work is completed, badly needed industries could not and will not establish themselves, with this act enforced. As a result, there will be a constant unnecessary drain upon the American taxpayer for appropriations to sustain some kind of an economy on the island.

In American Samoa the situation is even worse. Under 51 years of naval government the Samoans have earned their living chiefly as civilian employees of the Navy. Closing of the naval base put practically all of the people out of work.

The Department of Interior is aggressively attempting to interest industry in locating there, since they have a power surplus and

other facilities in addition to skilled workers trained by the Navy. They have interested some industries who are looking for markets in Australia, New Zealand, and the adjacent islands, but who still want to operate under American protection. Neither these industries, nor any other industries, would venture this move with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 still applicable to this island. Consequently, the economic life of American Samoa will continue to sink to a lower and lower level. Increased appropriations will have to be continued, if not increased, for an indefinite period of years.

Since these islands are part of the Asiatic or South Pacific economy, and since governors have been appointed for each of the islands, with separate legislative bodies, it would appear logical to permit the local governors and these legislative bodies to establish labor standards suitable for each island. These people are on the spot and have full knowledge of local conditions and the conditions in surrounding areas. This would seem to be a more workable solution than to attempt public hearings in Washington, 8,000 miles away, which again would mean the movement of personnel to and from the 2 islands to establish facts which are already known to the local governments.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7893) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, Export-Import Bank of Washington, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF W. NELSON WHITE TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 26, 1954, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of W. Wilson White, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS AND UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 26, 1954, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Duncan Wilmer Daugherty, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia.

Madison B. Graves, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada.

N. Welch Morrisette, Jr., to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina.

Cedric E. Steward, of Nevada, to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada.

Emmett Mitchell Smith, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas.

FORTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE OF CARL HAYDEN, OF ARIZONA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at the outset of the session, I should like to call attention to the fact that today marks a significant anniversary. It was just 42 years ago that one of the most beloved, most respected, and ablest Members of the Senate began his congressional career. I am referring to the senior Senator from Arizona, our esteemed colleague, CARL HAYDEN.

There is something reassuring about the future of a country which can produce leaders like CARL HAYDEN. He is a modest man, an unassuming man. He is not given to snap judgments and passionate outbursts that end in flaming headlines. Yet, I believe all my colleagues will agree with me when I say there is no more influential Member in either House of Congress.

His influence is due to his wisdom, his balanced judgment, his integrity, and his willingness to help others in finding a reasonable solution to their problems.

CARL HAYDEN'S service spans a period that has witnessed some of the most stirring events in our Nation's history. He entered the House of Representatives in 1912, just 5 days after his native Arizona became a State. He has served in Congress through three wars, a great depression, periods of boom, and periods of bust.

At every election, the people of Arizona returned him to office. They knew they had a great leader. The rest of the Nation can be grateful for their good judgment.

Mr. President, in times like the present, it is often difficult to see our way clearly. We are assailed from every side by people who have answers to all issues, solutions to all problems—answers and solutions which they offer in sometimes loud and strident voices. In the midst of this confusion, I can usually find the source of true wisdom in the calm reason of CARL HAYDEN. I have gone to him with my problems many times. I have never been disappointed in his answers.

The United States was doubly fortunate in 1912. It received a great State and a great leader. I am looking forward to many more years of service with CARL HAYDEN, and I know that I will profit through all my contacts with him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it was not my pleasure to be on the floor of the Senate last week, on the anniversary of the admittance to the Union of my State of Arizona, however, it is my extreme pleasure to be here today on the anniversary of the entrance of my senior colleague, CARL HAYDEN, into the service of his country, at the Washington level. I would feel myself most remiss in the performance of my duty according to my conscience if I did not express my deep feeling concerning the friendship I have enjoyed with my senior colleague for all the years I can remember.

Mr. President, my remarks are not prompted by political friendship, because CARL HAYDEN and I are of different political faiths. On the contrary, my remarks are prompted by a deep friendship in my heart and by recognition of the service he has given our country and our State.

I look back on all the years of my life that I have known CARL HAYDEN and I recall most kindly every contact I have had with him and with everything connected with his name. I remember his old ranch on the Salt River, near Tempe, which usually was called Hayden's Ferry, in the old days. In fact, Mr. President, I am indebted to CARL HAYDEN for many things, particularly for his ranch, at which at times I courted my wife, and also for his home in Phoenix, which served our love in a similar capacity when my wife lived there.

Mr. President, today CARL HAYDEN begins his 43d year of services in the United States Congress. He was sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives on February 19, 1912, just 5 days after Arizona came into the Union. He served in the House of Representatives until 1926, when he was elected to this body. In point of service, he is the oldest Member of both Houses of Congress.

We in Arizona feel very proud of Senator HAYDEN. We feel proud of him for all he has done for our State, and we feel even prouder of him for all he has done as an American. Today, in voicing my feelings concerning Senator HAYDEN, I know I join the 850,000 other people of my State—people of both parties—who entertain similar sentiments.

Mr. President, as a point of interest, let me state that the name of Hayden is an honored one in Arizona. His father, Charles Hayden, came to Arizona in 1858. That is not a long time ago in many of the States east of the Mississippi; but from the point of view of Arizona, 1858, when Charles Hayden first came to our State, was a long, long time ago. His father established the first ferry over the Salt River, in Arizona. I may say, for the benefit of my esteemed colleagues from California, that was in the days when the Salt River had water in it. Later Senator HAYDEN'S father operated a store at Hayden's Ferry.

Mr. President, to indicate the respect in which Arizona holds the great name of Hayden, let me point out that we

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

have named Hayden Mountain, in Coconino County, after his father; and we have named Hayden Peak, in Pinal County, after his father, and also Hayden Butte, in Maricopa County.

Mr. President, I do not wish now to occupy any more of the time of the Senate, although I could easily spend the entire day eulogizing this great man, but I do wish to join my other colleagues today in voicing the sentiments of my heart regarding the friendship I have for CARL HAYDEN, and in thanking him on the floor of the Senate for the assistance he has given me.

Mr. President, I think it very rare to find between two men the feeling which exists between CARL HAYDEN and myself—he being a Democrat and I being a Republican, but both of us working for the best interests of our own State. He made available to me the benefit of his many years of experience, his office, and the good hand of fellowship, when I first entered this Chamber, a year ago.

So, Mr. President, today I extend the warm hand of friendship to CARL HAYDEN. My prayer is that that friendship will continue throughout the years. Despite the great valley of politics which separates us, the common bond of friendship brings us together.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would not wish this occasion to pass without joining with the distinguished minority leader, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] in paying tribute to an outstanding Member of this body and a very great American citizen, the senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN.

Of course, Mr. President, it has been my privilege to know CARL HAYDEN during the period I have served in the Senate. For a time I was assigned to serve on the Committee on Rules and Administration, on which he served, and of which at that time he was chairman. During the period of my service in the Senate, I have also served with him on the Committee on Appropriations. I have always found him to be a most diligent, hard-working and able member of those committees.

However, Mr. President, my association with CARL HAYDEN goes back even farther than that. First of all, I wish to say that when I first came to the Senate from the neighboring State of California, which does from time to time have problems to meet, he was one of the first Members on the other side of the aisle to offer his good offices to help show me the ropes, and to aid me in some of the difficulties which faced me as a Senator of the United States.

CARL HAYDEN's relationship to my family goes far beyond the day, 8 years ago, when I first became a Member of the Senate of the United States, for he and my father served together in the House of Representatives, in the period from 1912 to 1915. My father had come to the House of Representatives in 1903, and served as a Member of that body for 12 years. CARL HAYDEN came there as one of the first Representatives of his State in the Congress of the United States. He had a long and distinguished career in the House of Representatives before coming to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, regardless of any partisanship—because when it comes to recognizing ability, character, and outstanding service to one's country, there is no middle aisle in this Chamber—I am glad, as majority leader of the Senate, to join in paying what I feel is a very well-deserved tribute to a great American and an outstanding United States Senator.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Senator CARL HAYDEN. In my service with him on the Appropriations Committee I have always respected his fairness in all his dealings, whether with those of us who represent Northern States, or with those who represent Southern States. His fairness has always impressed me. His ability and judgment are such as to command respect. For that reason it is a great pleasure for me to make these few remarks expressing my admiration for CARL HAYDEN and for the excellent service he has rendered, and continues to render, the Nation as a Member of this body.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in the Senate in paying tribute to a good man, an able man, an efficient legislator, and one whom all who know him have learned to love.

There is something about CARL HAYDEN that suggests humbleness, but also something which suggests the ability to work and get things done. He is not vociferous; he is not always talking; he never condemns or criticizes; but he is always on the job.

Through the years it has been my privilege to serve with him I have felt that here was a real man, a true American, wholeheartedly devoted to his country. In recent days I have come to know him as one who understands the Constitution and its significance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to join briefly in the tribute to our colleague, Senator CARL HAYDEN.

I knew him first in 1909 and 1910, when he was the sheriff of Maricopa County, and I was a schoolboy at Mesa, Ariz. He maintained order at our baseball games. I knew him then as a sheriff.

I listened to his colleague from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] speak about the Salt River when there was water in it. I never did see Hayden's Ferry, but I did cross the Salt River on horseback and in an automobile when the water was sufficiently low.

We respected Sheriff Hayden at that time. Later I came to know him in Washington as Senator HAYDEN. As one who has served for 6 or 7 years on the Appropriations Committee with him, I have respect for his knowledge of government, for his quiet, patient attitude in listening to those of us who wish to debate questions in the committee, and for his ability to work out arrangements which are satisfactory and which make possible legislation, which is almost invariably the result of compromise.

If we could all be as patient and conscientious as the Senator from Arizona, and have as thorough a knowledge of government as he has, we could well be proud of our activities in this body.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as one of the younger members of this body in period of service, I consider it a privilege and an honor to associate myself with the fine and thoroughly well-deserved tributes which have been paid this morning to our colleague, CARL HAYDEN.

From the very first day I came to the Senate, in 1949, I have received the utmost of encouragement and assistance and guidance from that great man, who has served for 42 years in Congress.

I know of no Member of the Senate who has more deservedly earned the respect and affection of his colleagues. He has shown himself to be a man of great ability, fair, conscientious, objective, and invariably kindly. I know of no Member of the Senate and of few men outside the Senate who are held in such high regard and affection as is our colleague, the Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN.

I wish to express my gratitude and appreciation for the service he has rendered in the United States Senate and to the entire American people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to join in the tributes which have been paid to the senior Senator from Arizona who today is completing 42 years of service in the House and Senate. I think this must be very close to an all-time record. Sometimes the amount of good which can be accomplished is in inverse ratio to the amount of time taken on the Senate floor in speaking, because I think there has been no one in the history of the Senate who has accomplished so much with so few words as has Senator HAYDEN. Never has a Senator done so much for his constituency and for his country with so small a flow of words. His speech is as restricted as are some of the minor streams in his State of Arizona, but his achievements have been mighty.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to add my word of tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona. To me he not only has been one of the great Members of this body, but he has been and is one of the greatest Americans whom I know. I was aware of his ability, his leadership, and his statesmanship before I came to this body. When I arrived he was one of the first Senators I met. He was in a position of considerable power with reference to assigning quarters to freshman Senators and also with reference to advising with them and having something to say about their becoming members of the committees to which they aspired. I became acquainted with him, and he was most helpful to me. I never saw a man more generous of his time not only in fulfilling the responsibility of the position he held, but also in being friendly, I may say, Mr. President, to those who were con-

scious of their need for advice and help, which he unfailingly gave. He has been a great comfort many times, Mr. President, as I have been permitted by his graciousness to advise and counsel with him with reference to matters which pertained to my responsibilities as a Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I congratulate the State of Arizona upon having one so able, distinguished, and devoted to represent it in this great body. I congratulate our country upon having the patriotic and devoted wisdom and leadership he has given and continues to give.

I expect to continue my association with the great Senator from Arizona, because he has been so wise in counsel and so friendly in attitude that there is one other thing which I desire from him. As I have contemplated the amazing record he has achieved of serving 42 years in the Congress, I have thought that possibly he might share the secret of that achievement with his junior colleagues.

In that regard, Mr. President, as I congratulate the senior Senator from Arizona on the many things he has done, I indicate to him that I hope to have the benefit of his further advice and counsel with respect to this other very important and desirable objective.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I wish to pay my respects to the great and distinguished senior Senator from Arizona. Since I have been a Member of the Senate, I have had work to do in connection with what is called patronage. The distinguished senior Senator from Arizona has performed a similar function on his side of the aisle. It has been necessary for us to be together many times. I have found the Senator from Arizona to be very cooperative and very helpful. I congratulate the State of Arizona upon having a Senator of his ability represent it in this body.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I desire to pay tribute to the senior Senator from Arizona, who today is celebrating—and we are happy to celebrate with him—his 42d anniversary as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

I may say that during the time I have served as a Member of the Senate—a little more than 3 years—I have been the recipient of so many kindnesses and so much consideration from the Senator from Arizona that I can never begin to repay him.

I have served with him on the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which he was chairman during 2 years of my membership. I have had the benefit of his wise counsel, his matchless judgment, and his highminded patriotism and devotion to duty.

I know that all of us have in our hearts not only affection and admiration for CARL HAYDEN, but that we devoutly hope he will be with us in the Senate for many, many years to come, to continue a service which has redounded to the benefit of the Senate, the State of Arizona, and the United States of America.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, since I have very recently come into the Chamber, I have just learned that today is the 42d anniversary of the beginning of the service in the Congress of the United States of our friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. Remembering so well his fine, friendly attitude toward me when I first came to this body as the most junior Member, and the friendship I had with the Senator while serving with him on a committee, of which he later became chairman, I welcome the opportunity to say a few words of tribute to this wise and honorable man. I use the word "wise" deliberately, because I have found him to be a man of deep wisdom and an American of great honor.

The Senator from Arizona symbolizes the unselfish public servant as much as does any Member of this body whom I have known, or as much as any man I have ever known.

The profound respect I have felt for the Senator was reflected by the fact that when I left the committee of which he was chairman, I wrote him a letter in which I compared his qualities to those I found in my father. I am sure every Senator agrees that is a man's way of paying someone the greatest compliment possible.

In my opinion the Senator from Arizona is one of the most capable Members of this body. His name is not mentioned frequently in the newspapers. When his name is mentioned, in some places people will ask what State he is from. I have frequently told such inquirers that the Senator from Arizona is one of the most influential Members of this body. His opinions are sincere, wise, and sound. As I have said, the Senator symbolizes as much character, devotion to duty, and unselfishness as any man I know of in public life—a model which any young man might well follow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the 42d legislative birthday of our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona. Senator HAYDEN is truly a Senator from Arizona for the Nation, and in the West, including my home State of Colorado, his name is legendary; it is a household name. We of Colorado have gone to him many times individually and in delegations in connection with such problems as mining, highways, irrigation, reclamation, and other great problems which are so vital to my State and to the West. We have never been turned away, but have always had a full opportunity to state the case. Not only is the Senator from Arizona a very fine man, but he is a very kindly man. As has already been said, he is very generous with his time on any question which anyone desires to bring before him.

I am proud to have this opportunity to pay brief tribute to so splendid a Senator as CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I rejoice that the Senate has paused in the midst of the consideration of its regular business to pay tribute to our friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], on this, the 42d anniversary of his becoming a Member of Congress.

I was privileged to serve with the Senator from Arizona when he still was a Member of the House of Representatives, and when I first went to that body. The Senator from Arizona was then one of the most respected, influential, hardest working, and ablest Members of the House. In the Senate he is outstanding in wisdom, in courage, in devotion to duty, and in the warm and affectionate esteem in which he is held by his colleagues.

No Member of the Senate can hope to excel him in his leadership, his effectiveness, and his remarkable capacity to achieve and to get things done for his State, his people, and the Nation. He is an inspiring apostle of strength, of prosperity, and of peace for our America.

The Senator from Arizona is ever the wise Senator, the effective legislator, the devoted public servant. May he live long to continue his shining services for the people of his State and the people of all the United States.

PRAYERS FOR DELIVERANCE OF THE PEOPLE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN DENIED THE FREEDOM OF WORSHIP

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and myself, I submit a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that on April 18 of this year, which is both Easter Sunday and the first day of Passover, churches and synagogues throughout our land should set aside a portion of their services for prayers for the deliverance of all those behind the Iron Curtain who are denied freedom to worship in their own fashion.

I ask that the concurrent resolution be read in full.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 63) was read, as follows:

Whereas our country has, from its beginning, been inspired by God and its citizens throughout its history have sought His divine guidance;

Whereas the dictatorship of communism is based upon atheism and directed toward the complete destruction of all religious worship;

Whereas this atheistic dictatorship has subjected religious leaders and their congregations to barbaric persecutions such as the world has not seen for nearly 2,000 years, as exemplified in Hungary by the torture of Cardinal Mindszenty and Lutheran Bishop Lajos Ordass, in Poland by the incarceration of Cardinal Wyszynski, in Yugoslavia by the imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac, in Bulgaria by the oppression of Protestant ministers, and by the persecution of Jews throughout the area dominated by communism; and

Whereas millions of worshipers behind the Iron Curtain are prevented by force and violence from the free exercise of their religious beliefs and rituals: Therefore be it

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress reverently requests the churches and synagogues of America to set aside a portion of their services on Easter Sunday and on the first day of Passover in 1954, both of which fall on April 18, for special prayers for the deliverance of all those behind the Iron Curtain who are denied freedom to worship in their own fashion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have shown this resolution to the majority leader, the minority leader, and the representative of the Independent Party. Later I shall ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution, following a brief statement.

Five years ago this month, in a courtroom in Budapest, Hungary, one of the great struggles in the bloody history of the fight for religious freedom took place. In the dock, before the pretense of a court, in a proceeding which was the pretense of a trial, there sat the pale, drawn figure of a great man. Upon his face was written and in his mechanical replies to questioning was echoed the weeks of torture, of humiliation, of degradation to which this man had been subjected to make him a helpless tool in the hands of his Communist persecutors.

The trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, Prince Primate of Hungary, more than any of the proceedings against clergymen of all faiths behind the Iron Curtain, shocked the world into realization that the Red terror was irrevocably committed to wipe out all religious freedom, yes, determined to root out all vestiges of religious life. Hundreds of clergymen of the Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox, and Uniate faiths in the great Christian community have gone to their death or enslavement since communism took over.

Cardinal Mindszenty in the eyes of many represented the tenacious devotion to Christianity which the Hungarian people have exhibited for many centuries.

In my mind, Mr. President, the fall of Cardinal Mindszenty is a symbolic repetition of the disaster which fell upon Christianity centuries ago when Hungarian arms were crushed. Yet the spirit of Christianity lived on in strength, because it has ever been the comfort of a people in distress.

Nowhere in the world does religious faith have a stronger influence or more profound disciples than in the areas of Eastern Europe that have fallen under the atheist rule of the Kremlin. Mr. President, I am certain that in the end the faith of the people so enslaved will come forth stronger than ever, for no force can destroy what God has given us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution without reference to a committee. As I have previously stated, I have shown the resolution to the majority leader, the minority leader, and the representative of the Independent Party, and they know of no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

THE PLIGHT OF THE DAIRY FARMER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have in recent days addressed this body on a number of occasions with regard to the serious plight in which the dairy farmers in New York State and other States find themselves. In my remarks I pointed out that the dairy farmers are caught in a disastrous squeeze because the price of their products will inevitably be very substantially reduced through the action of the Secretary of Agriculture, while the price at which they must buy their feedstuffs absolutely necessary for the production of milk will continue at its present level.

The Watertown Times, of Watertown, N. Y., has discussed this problem in a very thoughtful and accurate editorial entitled "Sacrificing the Farmers," which appeared in that fine and influential newspaper on February 17, 1954. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRIFICING THE FARMERS

This is no time to tamper with the farm income. The cut of from 90 to 75 percent parity for dairymen means a reduction of as much as 15 percent in his income, an income which is not high by any measure.

Today the Department of Agriculture says that the American farmer's share of the consumer dollar fell to a 12-year low in 1953. Out of every consumer dollar spent for food, the farmer received 45 cents. The farmer has not received such a small part of the dollar since 1941, when he received 44 cents.

Where do depressions start? They start on the farm and eat their way into the industrial centers. The economists in Washington have forecast that 1954 may be a retreat from the high pedestal of 1952 and 1953. No one questions that we are going through a readjustment. Certainly at a time when there are reservations about the ability of the Nation to maintain its present economic level, no one should arbitrarily cut the income of the dairy farmer.

The reason for the stock market crash of 1929 and the depression that followed was a failure by both the Nation and the public to recognize the agricultural distress that steadily grew worse during the 1920's. Farm depression was the result of the fact that the World War I farm prosperity did not last long enough to enable farmers to liquidate their debts. World prices for farm products fell. Foreign markets were closed. The exports, therefore, from the United States went down steadily from 1925. The farmer purchased less and less, so that by 1929 the productivity of the Nation's factories was greatly in excess of what the farmer, an important segment in the economy, was able to purchase.

Right after June of 1929, when the Agricultural Marketing Act was passed, at the request of President Herbert Hoover, agricultural groups were subsidized to the amount of $165 million. The Federal Government began buying in 1930 wheat and cotton in hopes that it would promote higher prices. By 1931, however, business was so bad that even this device did not function.

The cut in parity by Secretary Benson for 1954 is calculated to solve the problem of butter surpluses. But trying to solve a butter problem by threatening the existence of all dairy farmers is a backward and dangerous way to meddle with economics.

Senator LEHMAN said yesterday in Washington, "There has been no decline in the price of feedstuffs. The cost of farm implements is no less." He called the small farmer the "backbone of the country," and continued by saying, "The small upstate dairy farmer doesn't usually vote for me, but nevertheless he is important, and we can't afford to sacrifice him." That is exactly what is happening in this program to drop parity from 90 percent to 75 percent. The Agriculture Department is sacrificing the small farmer because of a problem of surplus in the production of butter. It is not only the dairy farmer of New York State who is the victim of this arbitrary action in Washington. It is the dairy farmer of Wisconsin and Minnesota, Iowa, and wherever dairy farmers are producing milk.

Eliminate the small margin of profit that the dairy farmer receives, and you produce two very dangerous economic consequences. The first is that you remove the dairy farmer as a buyer of consumer goods. This reduction of 45 cents a hundredweight in the price of milk is equivalent to the monthly payment for an automobile or a tractor. This is the equivalent of the monthly payment for a kitchen unit of freezer, refrigerator, and stove. That assumes, of course, that the farmer is a consumer of these items, and there is no better proof of the fact that he is than an analysis of his purchases for the last several years.

The second economic consequence is that the farmer, unable to produce milk profitably, cuts back on the size of his herd, and so those milk plants, cheese plants, and butter plants get less milk and are forced to close. This is a fact of economic dislocation that is far more serious than the previous cost of subsidies which in effect have primed the operation of these plants.

Meddling with farm income, particularly when the meddling is designed to reduce that income, is dangerous at any time. Farm income has never caught up with industrial income. The farmer has never purchased as many consumer goods as workers in industry. He is being cut back before he ever caught up. That is not healthy at any time, but particularly is it unhealthy at a time like the present when industrial production is outstripping consumer consumption.

There is not only economic danger, but also political danger for those who believe that this parity reduction from 90 to 75 percent is healthy and required now. It is not too late to stop this reduction in parity. The previously predicted price for blend milk for the month of April is $3.66. That is 11 cents less than it was in April of 1953. Does anyone think seriously that the dairy farmer can absorb a cut of 45 cents for the month of April and thereafter? That would be $3.21 milk. It has been many a year since the farmer received $3.21 per hundredweight for milk.

BATTLE AGAINST FIREWORKS MENACE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am hoping that very shortly the Senate Judiciary Committee will report H. R. 116.

This bill would control interstate shipment of fireworks by making it illegal to ship fireworks into a State whose laws prohibit same.

It is estimated that as many as 100,000 people have been harmed by fireworks in the last 30 years.

It is clear that the present situation is an intolerable one. Various States ban fireworks except at county fairs, and so forth, but find that children in their own States can answer an advertisement in some youngsters' magazine and receive illegal, dangerous fireworks through the mail.

Accordingly, H. R. 116 is, in my judgment, absolutely necessary in the public interest. It affords reasonable legal protection for legitimate manufacturers of fireworks, but most important of all, it protects the public interest.

A Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, of which I am personally chairman, has considered this issue with great care.

We have weighed various objections which have been filed to the legislation, but we have found that the objections are not persuasive and that no feasible alternative to H. R. 116 has been presented.

I have received a tremendous amount of mail from my own State of Wisconsin and from all over our Nation on the importance of this fireworks-control legislation being enacted.

I send now to the desk a representative sampling of such communications, including the text of an article published in the June 1953 issue of Kiwanis magazine. I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE OF WISCONSIN MUNICIPALITIES,
Madison, Wis., December 16, 1953.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We understand that a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which you are chairman, will on December 22 conduct a special hearing on S. 2245 which apparently is a companion bill to H. R. 116 which has been passed by the House of Representatives.

We were very pleased when the Senate Judiciary Committee submitted a favorable report on H. R. 116 and we were very disappointed that the Senate did not complete action on this measure before adjournment.

For many years the League of Wisconsin Municipalities has realized that public safety demands that the use of fireworks be stringently controlled. Consequently, this league has issued model ordinances for adoption by municipalities relating to the use of fireworks.

However, since it became apparent that municipal regulation could be undermined by the uncontrolled sale of fireworks just beyond municipal limits, this league later supported legislation at the State level to stringently control the use of fireworks.

It has now become evident that efforts are being made to use interstate commerce provisions as a means of evading State and municipal regulation of the use of fireworks. Therefore, it seems to us to be imperative that Congress close this loophole. We understand that another measure S. 1722 is pending which would not effectively control the situation.

We trust that the Senate can complete action on H. R. 116 immediately after it reconvenes and we trust that your subcommittee will do anything it can to help accomplish this result.

Very truly yours,
FREDERICK N. MACMILLIN,
Executive Secretary.

ILLINOIS SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF BLINDNESS,
Chicago, Ill., February 10, 1954.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: A very good friend of mine telephoned me from Wisconsin just a few minutes ago and read the statement concerning S. 2245, to prohibit the interstate shipment of fireworks in violation of State laws, which you included in your weekly newsletter of February 4.

I want you to know that we are very thrilled with your truly magnificent statement and we are confident that with support such as yours, the bill will be passed.

We look forward to prompt and favorable action, and are most appreciative of your clear understanding and objective analysis of the problem.

Sincerely yours,
DOROTHY GRAY
Mrs. Ben Humphries Gray,
Executive Secretary.

OFFICE OF DISTRICT ATTORNEY,
MILWAUKEE COUNTY,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 4, 1954.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: I happen to know * * * Congresswoman MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH (13th Congressional District, Illinois). She has introduced and sponsored House of Representatives bill No. 116 which in effect, precludes interstate shipment of fireworks to States which prohibit their sale within the receiving State. This bill passed the House, but unfortunately was not passed by the Senate.

Now a special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary is conducting hearings on Senate bill No. 2245, which is the companion bill of H. R. 116. You happen to be a member of this subcommittee.

I appreciate that you are fully aware of the attitude of the Wisconsin Legislature in reference to the sale and distribution of fireworks in this State, which in effect says "No" to any such sale or distribution. However, it has been brought to my attention that we still have just prior to the 4th of July, certain violations of the statute pertaining to prohibiting fireworks and in each case we find that the persons involved have secured the fireworks through mail or other means from States that do permit the sale. This in effect in many instances gets around our own statute and I believe causes our police no end of trouble. I do believe that Senate bill No. 2245 should be passed and I am soliciting your good offices to assist the law enforcement agencies in Milwaukee and other counties in Wisconsin to endeavor to cause favorable action to be taken on this proposed legislation. Its passage would be of real help.

Respectfully yours,
WILLIAM J. MCCAULEY,
District Attorney.

OFFICE OF STATE'S ATTORNEY OF LAKE COUNTY,
Waukegan, Ill., January 29, 1954.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It has been brought to my attention that you are the chairman of a special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary which is conducting hearings on Senate bill 2245, the companion bill to House bill 116.

Numerous fireworks tragedies have arisen within my county and I am deeply concerned relative to the outcome of this legislation in the Senate, together with the companion bill in the House of Representatives. Recently five of our youngsters met an unfortunate death through the medium of so-called safe-and-sane fireworks and the people of my county (Lake) have joined me in conducting an energetic war upon those who violate our State statutes relating to the sale of fireworks. We in Illinois have recently enacted legislation which in some measure protects our youngsters, but we are unable to cope with the problem of the interstate shipment of fireworks from mail-order houses and other distributors from outside this State. I am confident that each and every parent of Lake County, Ill., joins me in urging you to lend your very capable aid to this meritorious Senate legislation, and I respectfully ask you to encourage prompt and favorable action in conducting the necessary public hearings and subsequent consideration by the Senate.

I would be honored to appear before your committee at any time on a voluntary basis to testify and to encourage this legislation, and I know that the people of Lake County will be grateful to you if you can assist us in this request.

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT C. NELSON,
State's Attorney.

WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT THE FIREWORKS PROBLEM?

(By Lewis A. Riley)

The fire engines that shrieked through the darkened streets of Chicago one June night in 1951 were answering no ordinary alarm. As their wailing sirens converged on the blazing building, men and women, half suffocated with smoke, stumbled into the street. They watched, terrified and silent, as firemen fought to reach three infants trapped in their cribs. It was a hopeless battle.

The grimness of the disaster was written in morning newspaper headlines, which announced that three more lives had been lost to an old and deadly enemy: fireworks.

A thoughtless parent had held an exploding "aerial bomb" upside down on the porch of the doomed home. Unable to find the live charges, he had gone to bed, leaving them smoldering in a pile of trash. Night breeze fanned the fireworks into flame and the house caught fire. As the spreading blaze reached the kitchen, it touched off more fireworks, which exploded, sending superheated flames roaring through the old frame building. Thus one firework multiplied its lethalness a hundredfold.

The fireworks menace is old and familiar. It is an ironic fact that more than 100,000 Americans have been killed or injured celebrating Independence Day in the last 30 years, whereas only 10,000 soldiers were killed or disabled in the Revolutionary War to gain that independence.

One big reason for this senseless mayhem is the indifference of parents. Many mothers and dads still believe there is really nothing

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

very dangerous about "a few little firecrackers." Yet some of our most grievous disasters have been caused by seemingly insignificant fireworks.

It was a "harmless" sparkler that took the lives of four midwestern children in July 1951. One youngster apparently dropped a glowing sparkler in a can of turpentine in the back-yard garage. The blinding explosion that followed killed the innocent tots and left the building in blackened ruins.

Files of safety organizations are filled with similar tragic cases. In South Carolina three small boys perished when a lighted firecracker was thrown near a parked gasoline truck, causing an explosion. In Wisconsin a 17-year-old boy was killed by fireworks while he was swimming. A pal tossed a firecracker that exploded against the swimmer, rupturing his lung. In New Jersey a 57-year-old man died of a heart attack when a firecracker thrown by a prankster exploded in front of his car. In Oklahoma three boys were blinded when they broke open a firecracker and lighted it "just to see what would happen."

Any parent who doubts the lethalness of the fireworks he lets fall into the hands of his children need only glance through the sobering files of Armour Research Foundation. Every year this well-known laboratory analyzes bootleg fireworks confiscated by police, and the job, according to Chief Analytical Chemist Maurice Kayner, is a hazardous one even for an expert pyrotechnist. Common display fireworks, says Kayner, contain from 13 to 100 grains of gunpowder. One giant firework called a helicopter was found to contain 138 grains—as much gunpowder as a hand grenade.

The Armour Foundation reported that this extremely hazardous device was self-propelled and traveled at a terrific rate of speed. It is easy to misconstrue the proper way of setting it off and it might easily be set off wrong. If it hit someone, it would probably cause either bodily injury or burns because of its speed and the intensity with which it burns. Even the most dangerous fireworks, Kayner points out, are usually equipped with 3 or 4 second fuses which greatly increase the chances of a premature explosion that could maim and mangle.

Kayner emphasizes that it's not only big firecrackers that cause trouble. "Even a cap gun can be dangerous," he explains, "when a youngster's curiosity is aroused. One exploding cap is a trifling matter, but kids want more noise. So they stack up 5 or 10 caps and explode them with a rock. Then you begin to have an explosion that could cause serious burns or even a fire if inflammables are nearby."

The Illinois Society for the Prevention of Blindness counted 10 fireworks advertisements in a single issue of 1 young people's magazine last June. Scores of other periodicals are crowded with advertising inviting youngsters to celebrate the Fourth with a bang. Once a youngster's name lands on a manufacturer's mailing list he is in line for some really tantalizing literature on the art of self-destruction.

An Ohio manufacturer, in a trumpeting sales flier, offers a 1,500-piece all-noise firecracker assortment at the "wholesale" price of $4.95 ("approximate retail price: $14.15"). This tempting offer is bolstered by the provocative invitation to have a miniature Battle of the Bulge right in your own yard. In addition to a small arsenal of supercharged firecrackers, the collection contains such extralethal devices as a reporting aerial buzz bomb and a whistling siren aerial bomb.

A western manufacturer adds this money-making inducement in literature sent his young customers: "Amazing profits can be made by those who choose to sell our select-quality fireworks. Order a quantity at our low wholesale prices and sell them to your customers at our suggested retail prices. Act now and start making big profits at once."

Little wonder that organizations like the American Medical Association, the American Optometric Association, the Illinois Society for the Prevention of Blindness, and the American Foundation for the Blind are redoubling their demands for more vigorous enforcement of State antifireworks laws. Such statutes have been instrumental in reducing deaths and accidents in 32 States [1] which have adopted them since a model law was drafted about a decade ago by the National Fire Protection Association.

But roadside fireworks stands still turn up in these States in advance of the Fourth. Operators of these bootleg establishments are subject to both fines and imprisonment, but jail sentences are a rarity. Many authorities believe that if judges imposed maximum penalties (in most States a fine of $100 plus a 90-day jail term), illegal fireworks stands would disappear in a hurry. As it is, the peddler figures that if he is caught he will only have to pay a small fine, which is modest, indeed, compared with the tremendous profits that can be realized in a fortnight of selling fireworks.

A more serious loophole in the campaign against fireworks is the absence of Federal legislation banning the shipment of fireworks into States where they are illegal. Today many organizations are actively backing H. R. 116, a Federal bill which would plug this gaping hole. Introduced by Congresswoman MARGUERITE CHURCH, of Illinois, the measure would make it a criminal offense, punishable by a $1,000 fine and/or imprisonment for 1 year, to ship fireworks into States which have banned them. As Mrs. CHURCH explains her bill, "It puts shippers and carriers on notice that the Federal Government will not tolerate the use of interstate commerce for the purpose of circumventing State law."

The bill, first introduced in the 82d Congress, was unanimously endorsed by the House Judiciary Committee. It died in the preadjournment rush, however, and has been reintroduced in the current Congress. Since this was done, a note of urgency has crept into fireworks advertising. Typical is this very important message from one manufacturer: "The reason for us mailing you this catalog at this early date is: A bill is now up for passage in Congress to stop interstate shipments. If this bill passes we can no longer ship you fireworks. However, you could come directly to our warehouses. If you will want fireworks for this coming Fourth, we advise placing your order right now. Tomorrow may be too late."

Most authorities question whether the fireworks menace can ever be wholly suppressed. While Federal legislation restricting the shipment of fireworks would go a long way toward banishing illicit fireworks, it will still require constant vigilance by parents, teachers, community leaders, and law-enforcement officials to reduce the toll of fireworks tragedies. For the fireworks menace is like an old sore that never quite heals: As long as you keep fighting it, you can control it. But relax your efforts and all the old troubles quickly return.

[1] Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Among the best antidotes, says Mrs. Dorothy Gray, secretary of the Illinois Society for the Prevention of Blindness, are properly supervised public fireworks displays, which give youngsters all the thrill of fireworks with none of the dangers. "Community fireworks displays," she says, "take dangerous weapons out of the hands of children, who simply don't know how to use them."

Recognizing this fact, many Kiwanis clubs sponsor community fireworks shows on the glorious fourth. In Roosevelt, Utah, for example, Kiwanians hold an annual fireworks display. And in Silver Creek, N. Y., a spectacular fireworks show was used to climax a 2-day Kiwanis-sponsored civic celebration. A few of the many clubs which have arranged local fireworks shows are: Industrial Center, Detroit, Mich.; Columbus, Wis.; Colorado Springs, Colo.,; Winamac, Ind., and Sayre, Okla.

"Any injury or death resulting from fireworks is a needless one," declares Dr. George F. Lull, general manager of the AMA. "We should not feel that we are celebrating the birth of America properly or in the spirit that our forefathers wished until we can do it safely and sanely—without a single mishap."

To which every American parent—particularly those who have seen children blinded, maimed, and disfigured by fireworks—can add a solemn amen. For it is the American parent who will always be the first line of defense against the fireworks menace.

COMMENT ON SENATOR WILEY BY INDEPENDENT EDITORIAL SERVICES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I know that most of my colleagues are familiar with the vital news service known as Independent Editorial Services, issued here in our Nation's capital by Gen. J. M. McInerny.

I now send to the desk the text of an article, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALEXANDER WILEY

The success of ALEXANDER WILEY as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—and it has been a considerable success—is due mainly to his careful, persistent work in committee. If anyone doubts his success at this date, witness the vote on the St. Lawrence Seaway, and the fall of the Bricker amendment.

These were major engagements in a big war, and he won them both by outgeneraling his opponents inside the Republican Party and across the aisle. Senator WILEY is a committee Senator, as opposed to a floor Senator. He gets things done by digging into the facts of an issue; and once mastering them, he is in position to advance or to pull out. When WILEY finally comes out on the floor, he generally knows more about the issue than anyone present.

For a long time he was dimmed in glory by the superior showman, Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan. Now, he has come into his own, and his record for Wisconsin and the Nation is growing impressive. He has a background of normal political success. He was born in Chippewa Falls, Wis., on May 26, 1884, and grew up there. He entered politics through typically American methods. He was a small-town banker and lawyer, and at the same time ran a dairy farm. He is a

genuinely friendly man, and a person whom his friends trust implicitly.

His friends elected him to the school board, and then district attorney. He returned to private life in 1915, and did not emerge until he was elected to the Senate in 1938. In the meantime, he joined the Kiwanis Club because he liked the idea of its good will among businessmen. He became a governor of a Kiwanis district, and it is undoubtedly his contacts there which boosted him to the Senate.

WILEY has the faculty of picking able men to serve in his office and on his committees. The best of these is the present counsel to the Foregn Relations Committee, Julius Cahn, a powerhouse and a diplomat, with a sagacity far beyond his early 30's.

WILEY took over the committee when its tasks were the toughest in history. * * * As an old Kiwanian, he had time for the friendly hours of conversation with his colleagues, with earnest people of the diplomatic corps, and with real experts in the inside of foreign affairs, such as Bedell Smith and Allen Dulles.

His diligent work with John Foster Dulles in the delicate field of top-level negotiation has set a new high in cooperation between the legislative and executive branches. The important question which arises when a Senator's value is established, is whether or not he is able enough as a politician to stay around to continue his service. WILEY comes up in the next Presidential election, in 1956. He will be re-elected then if Ike is re-elected. It is a contest in which no act of the administration can be separated from WILEY—for he is probably the most important, if not the most publicized, administration spokesman on Capitol Hill.

The importance of foreign affairs in these years outweighs that of domestic matters, as much as we might wish it were otherwise. Thus, WILEY achieves an importance in contemporary history second to no man in the Senate. The political scene in Wisconsin is not especially divided on the merits of WILEY. Most of his fellow citizens know and understand him. There is no controversy. Hence, his political position as Republican incumbent should be unassailable—so long as the Republicans, generally, are successful.

INCREASE OF PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS UNDER THE INCOME-TAX LAW AND REDUCTION OF EXCISE TAXES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to claim 2 minutes under the rule, a practice which I have not heretofore followed, to introduce a bill, which I send forward to the desk, and to offer an explanatory statement in advance.

The President, during the week, has expressed an awareness of economic conditions in the United States, and has also renewed his pledge to the American people to use all powers of Government to meet any emergency which may arise.

As usual, the headlines referring to what the President actually said ran beyond his statement of fact. Nevertheless, he did recognize the existence of economic conditions which might call for the use of extraordinary powers vested in him.

I am introducing, on behalf of myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], three members of the Committee on Finance, an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code, to increase the personal exemption and the exemption for dependents to $800 for the 1954 taxable year, and to $1,000 for succeeding taxable years. The President indicated that the taxing power would be one of the weapons which might be available to meet any extraordinary increase in unemployment in the United States.

Let me say further, Mr. President, that I am not an alarmist or a prophet of gloom. I do not offer the bill to advance that purpose at all, if anyone has such purpose.

No less an economist than Colin Clark, of Australia and Great Britain, has indicated that the United States, in order to avoid a real depression would have to reduce the tax burden of the American people by no trifling amount, but by as much as $20 billion. Mr. Clark may be classed as being on the pessimistic side, but consistently so, and therefore at some time or other he must be on the right side, because if anyone is a consistent pessimist there will come a time when his pessismism will be justified.

Mr. President, the proposed amendment which I am offering on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], as I have stated, is what I believe to be the proper approach to this problem.

There are two things that ought to be done now in our economy so far as taxation is concerned. One is the increase of these exemptions. The second is the reduction or elimination of the excise taxes, where reductions or eliminations can be made. The Treasury will lose some money, but I wish to say now that the Treasury will lose some money if unemployment reaches 4 or 5 million people.

Therefore, this is the front on which this attack should be made. Whatever we do for corporations and whatever we do for the big business organizations may have an indirect effect on our economy, but what we do in this field, by leaving more take-home pay in the pockets of the workers, will increase the purchasing power, and will stimulate productivity in the United States. If we are courageous enough to take this forward-looking step, before our economy falls on its face, we can be of great service to the American people.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am introducing this bill, which I now send forward and to ask to have appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2983) to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the personal exemption and the exemption for dependents to $800 for the 1954 taxable year and to $1,000 for succeeding taxable years, introduced by Mr. GEORGE (for himself, Mr. KERR, and Mr. FREAR), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and his cosponsors for introducing a bill to increase the personal income-tax exemption from $600 to $800, together with a reduction in the excise taxes, in order to prevent economic conditions from getting worse.

Because these tax remissions will primarily benefit the low-income groups, the money thus remitted will be almost completely used to increase consumption, and hence will stimulate purchases from stores, thus reducing inventories, causing stores in turn to purchase more from wholesale establishments and from factories, and then causing factories to increase production and to hire more workers. A cumulative upturn could thus be developed.

So, Mr. President, I believe this is the most constructive step which could be taken in the present situation.

I wish to express my deep sense of indebtedness to the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Oklahoma, and the Senator from Delaware for their statesmenlike action.

It is sometimes said by members of the opposing party that what we should do is to give tax relief to those in the upper income brackets and to corporations in order to stimulate savings. I suppose such arguments will be fought out in the committees and in the Halls of Congress. I am certainly well aware of the long-time need for an increase in capital. The more capital a man has with which to work, the higher his productivity will be and the higher his real wage will be. But in the present situation, which is now admitted to be a recession even by those who formerly shied away from that term, what we are experiencing is that while savings flow into banks and financial institutions, they do not flow out of those institutions in the form of investments to the same degree. At such times as these, when there are idle factories, and large unsold inventories, business is afraid to borrow and banks are afraid to lend. With so much idle capital equipment on hand, business in general is rather reluctant to add to it by borrowing more capital. The result is that savings flow into the banks but do not flow out of the banks in the same degree, and there is a consequent sterilization of purchasing power. This is the reason why tax reductions for the upper bracket groups and corporations will not result in as much stimulation of employment as will the proposal of the eminent senior Senator from Georgia. In the present situation, it is more important to stimulate consumption than it is to stimulate savings.

I hope this issue can be discussed in a calm frame of mind, without any charges of demagoguery being thrown at its sponsors.

It is interesting to note that on yesterday, in testimony before the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, the former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. E. G. Nourse, who is known as quite a conservative man, said that what is needed is a reduction in consumption taxes. Testimony to this effect is coming from all quarters.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

So, Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Georgia is completely in harmony with sound doctrine on this point. We are very happy to have him as our leader in this matter, and I am sure we can pledge him not only devoted, but, I hope, intelligent support at the same time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], for his bold and courageous leadership in heading the sponsorship of the resolution which he has sent to the desk.

As indicated by him, we have read in the newspapers that the President, in his conference on the day before yesterday, made it clear that he recognizes the possibility of economic trouble today or tomorrow. He rightly expressed the hope that the month of March, as has often been the case in the past, would reflect a decided improvement in the economic picture, a reduction in the number of unemployed persons, and an increase in the number of employed persons.

The President went on, further, to say that if such an upturn does not occur, he will look with favor upon amendments to the tax laws which would result in increased purchasing power on the part of the greatest number in our country in order, not only, that present production levels might be maintained, but in order that those production levels might continually be increased.

It was in concurrence in the suggestion of the most effective manner of increasing the purchasing power of the average citizen that I was anxious to join with the great Senator from Georgia as one of the cosponsors of his proposed amendment to the tax laws.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, taxation is one of the most serious matters confronting any country. All of us want to have taxes as low as possible; but we cannot have high appropriations unless we provide the money with which to pay the bills.

For almost half a century I have advocated strong defense. I have advocated appropriations for defense, when to do so was extremely unpopular. In my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a great number of people are sincerely pacifists. They are opposed to war, and they are opposed to appropriations for military purposes. Regardless of that, I have always advocated sufficient appropriations to maintain a strong defense for the United States.

At present, regardless of what I have done in the past, I am one who feels there should be a drastic cut in appropriations for military purposes and for foreign aid.

I should like to see the budget balanced, and, in addition, I desire to have taxes reduced. Our President, in his messages to Congress, has already indicated that he desires to have balanced budgets as soon as possible. Likewise, he wishes to have taxes reduced as far as possible. But, Mr. President, that cannot be done unless the Government reduces expenditures. Where expenditures are to be cut is a matter that must have the very serious consideration of the House Committee on Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I am confident the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate will give every possible consideration to the reduction of taxes, a reduction which will assure an equitable distribution among the various taxpayers of the Nation. Where the reductions can be made can be ascertained only after the most careful consideration, and after it has been determined what the expenditures are to be.

If we fail to reduce expenditures and, at the same time, reduce taxes, it will be necessary to raise the debt ceiling of the United States. Personally, I should dislike very much to see that done. I am afraid that to do so would disturb our economy as much as anything else that could be contemplated.

I think it is the task of all of us, regardless of party affiliation, to work to reduce the expenses of the Government. I am certain Senators will remember that the President made the statement that he wanted the people to have more money to spend for the education of their children, and for the building of schools, hospitals, and churches. I think those were his exact words. I am fully in accord with those sentiments. But, Mr. President, our first job is to reduce expenditures.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join in the remarks of commendation which have been made by other Senators in praise of the great senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who, in my judgment, is not only one of the great Americans of our time, but who also possesses one of the really brilliant minds that have come to the Senate in the course of the history of the United States.

Mr. FLANDERS subsequently said: Mr. President, today the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], to whom this body listens with great respect, introduced a bill to change our tax laws. The bill, as I understand, proposes to raise the basic individual income tax exemption from $600 to $800 immediately and, later on, from $800 to $1,000.

The intent of the bill evidently was to make some contribution to consumer purchasing power in view of the conditions which are developing with regard to unemployment.

I should like to say, first, Mr. President, that a proposal of this sort is in line with the thinking of the administration. In the Economic Report of the President, at page 11, we find this passage:

> In discussions of the relation of public policy to the business cycle, this question is commonly raised: At what point should or will the Federal Government act in the interest of checking depression or inflation? The thought seems to be that the Government can stand aloof until some price index or unemployment figure reaches this or that magnitude.
>
> This is not a realistic concept of public policy. It overlooks the need for constant vigilance and preventive action, day by day and week by week.
>
> The decisions currently made by Government, whether in the sphere of taxes or housing or defense or agriculture or bank credit or any other major area, inevitably have implications for economic growth and stability, if not immediately, then in a later day. The new concept that is emerging in the practical art of government, as chapter 3 may already have suggested, is to subject every act of proposed legislation or administrative decision, as far as that is humanly possible, to review from the standpoint of the contribution it is likely to make, whether in the immediate or a more distant future, to the attainment of an expanding economy with maximum employment and without price inflation.

On Wednesday, in his press interview, the President replied to Mr. Slevin, of the New York Journal of Commerce, who had asked the President this question:

> "Mr. President, do you think the economic downturn has reached a point where consumers should get larger tax concessions than your program called for?"
>
> Answer. Well, he couldn't give an answer, an affirmative answer to that one at this moment.
>
> As they knew in the economic report, it stated that that was a measure to bring in very quickly when you saw this thing spreading very definitely.
>
> He would think that March ought to be sort of a key month. March was a month when, he was told, that employment began normally to pick up, and you had a definite upturn in the curve.
>
> Now, if that weren't true, he would say then we would have a very definite warning that would call for the institution of a number of measures. Possibly this tax reduction would be one of the first considered, although he couldn't say for certain.

So the first point I wish to raise with regard to the proposals of the Senator from Georgia is that they are not out of line with administration ideas.

Next, I wish to suggest that it was the part of wisdom to combine tax incentives for business with tax relief for consumers. That seems to me to be very much the part of wisdom, because from 1933 to 1939, a period of 6 years, all the endeavors and measures on the part of an administration whose principal problem was the reduction of unemployment were directed toward consumer relief. In spite of that, the Nation came out of those 6 years of intense effort, after the use of every imaginable means in the whole roster of Government operations, with only about 3 million fewer unemployed than at the beginning of the period—a drop from about 12 million unemployed to 9 million.

It seems as though there had been something amiss in that program, so arduously pursued over so long a time, and it was clear to me at the time, as it is clear to me now, that there was a complete misapprehension of the part which business plays in furnishing employment, in increasing production, and, in general, in playing its part in supporting the health of our economy. There would not have been so many persons unemployed, and they would not

have been so long unemployed, had the administration of that day understood the helpful part which business plays in our economy.

Therefore, I think it is good that the administration's program contemplates both incentives for business and relief for consumers.

But, as the President's words at his press conference reveal, it is possible that it may be necessary to suggest something a little stronger than the original proposals, in the direction of giving greater purchasing power to consumers through tax reduction. The proposals of the Senator from Georgia are, therefore, pertinent. I am a little disturbed, I may say, at the kind, and particularly the amount, of the tax relief offered. A raising of the basic exemption from $600 to $800 a year will result in a loss of $5 billion of tax money. A further raising of the exemption from $800 to $1,000 will result in a loss in income from tax money of between $9 billion and $10 billion. That is a very large loss, indeed. I am fearful that it might be so serious that the increase in the deficit which would result might be so great that the Nation would lose in inflation what it would gain in purchasing power.

It seems to me that this is a field to which we must give, in the next few weeks, the most careful study. It may be that the changes proposed by the bill are too great. It may be that there should be included in the bill some other measures of relief for the consumer, such as changes in excise taxes.

I know there are under consideration in the House a whole range of possibilities for improvement in the purchasing power of consumers. I know that the Committee on Finance, of which both the Senator from Georgia and I are members, the Senator from Georgia, of course, being a very much more senior member, will consider these matters as soon as they come from the House.

Together with the Senator from Georgia and the administration, I am satisfied that such changes can be made as will lie within the limits of practicability, and will make a contribution to the maintenance of employment and of production.

AID TO DISASTER-STRICKEN AGRICULTURE

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, Secretary of Agriculture Benson wants Federal assistance to farmers to be provided when farmers are stricken by "undue disaster." Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse has just advised me it will cost $308 million to help farmers restore their drought-ruined pastures, and that, in the opinion of Under Secretary Morse, this is more than the Federal Government should undertake to do. So we now have the spectacle of the Department of Agriculture declaring that "undue disaster" is too undue for it to lend any assistance.

It should now be completely clear, it seems to me, to the farmers of the Nation that the United States Department of Agriculture today is administered by persons, some of whom are hostile to them, some of whom think and have said that many farmers should be forced off the land, and who seem determined to achieve that end.

The Secretary of Agriculture has just taken action with respect to dairy farmers in a price-support order, which one dairy State Senator said would cost the dairy farmers $600 million, although President Eisenhower had assured Congress and the Nation less than a month earlier that no abrupt downward adjustment of agricultural income would be permitted.

The Secretary is now spending his time crusading to put grain farmers on sliding-scale price supports, which will lower their income by at least $1 billion or more.

It seems obvious that no relief, or even sincere sympathy, can be expected from the Department of Agriculture by farmers who face drought disaster.

I shall press for early hearings on a bill I, together with my colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], have introduced to authorize aid in the restoration of pastures which have been adversely affected by the drought, and I hope to ask the committee to make such aid mandatory rather than permissible. Representative PAUL C. JONES, of Missouri, has introduced a companion bill in the House of Representatives, and I know that he, too, will press for early action in that body.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there are a number of nominations on the executive calendar which I should like to have considered. It will not take very long. I have taken the matter up with the minority leader.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

Col. Arthur H. Frye, Jr., Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission; and

Col. William J. Ely, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

J. H. S. Ellis, of New York, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of H. Struve Hensel to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Air Force.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Air Force be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Roy M. Gulick for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, with the resumption of the debate on the so-called Bricker amendment substitutes, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a comparison of the six principal proposals for amending the Constitution in regard to treaties and executive agreements. This comparison has been prepared by the Committee for Defense of the Constitution, headed by the Honorable John W. Davis and the Honorable Lucius D. Clay. As Senators know, Mr. Davis is a native of my State of West Virginia, and is one of the most distinguished constitutional lawyers in the United States.

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The Bricker cross-word puzzle—Some simplified keys

[For each of the six different proposals, read down. For a comparison of each of their respective provisions, read lines A, B, C, D, and E across]

	BRICKER (Senate Judiciary majority, June 15, 1953)	KNOWLAND (July 22, 1953)	GEORGE (Jan. 27, 1954)	MCCARRAN (Jan. 29)	FERGUSON-KNOWLAND (Feb. 2)	BRICKER (New—Feb. 4)
Line A	1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.	1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with the Constitution shall not be of any force or effect. The judicial power of the United States shall extend to all cases, in law or equity, in which it is claimed that the conflict described in this amendment is present.	1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.	2. (Same as George.)	1. (Same as George.)	2. (Same as George.)
Line B				1. After the ratification of this amendment no treaty shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution.	2. Clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution."	1. (Same as Ferguson-Knowland.)
Line C		2. When the Senate consents to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.		4. Any vote in the Senate on the question of ratifying a treaty shall be determined by the yeas and nays	3. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.	4. (Same as Ferguson-Knowland.)
Line D	2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in absence of treaty.	3. When the Senate so provides in its consent to ratification, a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress.				3. A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by the Congress unless in advising and consenting to a treaty the Senate, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, shall provide that such treaty may become effective as internal law without legislation by the Congress.
Line E	3. Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to limitations imposed on treaties by this article.		2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress.	3. No international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States except through legislation.		

DOWN

BRICKER: Here the most drastic provision is the "which" clause of section 2—now apparently moribund. Also, there have been dropped in all the other proposals both its clause requiring that there must be legislation before any agreement can become effective as internal law (the mandatory non-self-executing requirement), as applied to treaties, and also its section that Congress shall have power to "regulate" all executive agreements.

KNOWLAND: This is advanced as not being intended to make any change at all in the present constitutional powers. It was specifically approved by President Eisenhower when introduced.

GEORGE: The only change in existing powers is made by section 2, requiring an act of Congress to make executive agreements effective as "internal law" a mandatory non-self-executing clause for executive agreements.

MCCARRAN: Here section 1 is new language, but is presumably not advanced as intended to change any present powers; it was apparently borrowed in advance from FERGUSON-KNOWLAND, which had been under discussion but was not introduced until 4 days later. The only obvious attempt here to change present powers is by borrowing from GEORGE section 2. But note that here the required implementation is not by "act of the Congress", but "through legislation"—which could include State legislation and thus suggest use of "which" clause limitations.

FERGUSON-KNOWLAND (also cosponsored by Senators MILLIKIN and SALTONSTALL): This (like the 1953 KNOWLAND) apparently is not intended to change present powers. It takes the form of three separate "perfecting amendments" to the original BRICKER proposal (so that they will come up to be voted on before the GEORGE proposal). The question mark in the last line is because the sponsors have indicated that they have not yet closed the door to some dealing with executive agreements.

BRICKER (new): Here the new feature is section 3, which would definitely make some change in the present powers. It creates the appearance of being much the same as the merely declaratory section 3 of the 1953 KNOWLAND. However, it has at least two important differences in the requirement for implementing legislation where the agreement is to become effective as internal law: (1) It requires the legislation in all cases, unless a two-thirds vote of the Senate on treaties specifically provides to the contrary (whereas the 1953 KNOWLAND merely recites the existing law that the Senate may require legislation if it wants to); (2) it applies this requirement not only to treaties but also to executive agreements (whereas KNOWLAND does not mention the latter). Thus, so far as executive agreements are concerned, the new BRICKER has the same effect as GEORGE section 2, in requiring implementing legislation for all which might need effectiveness as internal law—and would impose this requirement in all cases (since the clause granting relief by a specific Senate vote can by its very terms operate only in the case of treaties).

ACROSS

Line A This is substantially the same throughout all six proposals (though the 1953 KNOWLAND contains some additional declaratory matter). Most people would read it as merely declaring what the Supreme Court has many times said is the law anyhow—that a treaty cannot authorize what the Constitution forbids. However, after it became apparent that Senator BRICKER's "which" clause could not pass, he has contended that its elimination would not take the heart out of his amendment, and that his new version embodies "substantially all the objectives" of the old. Thus there is a chance that if section 1 were adopted, a Supreme Court in future years might find in it some indication that it by itself was intended to work some change and impose new restrictions on our treaty powers.

Line B This covers an historical point, and apparently is not intended to change anything. (When the Constitution was drafted in 1787, the Founding Fathers wanted to include as supreme law of the land not only future treaties, but also past treaties made by the United States under the Articles of Confederation. Thus the Constitution provides that the Constitution itself, and laws which shall be made *in pursuance thereof*, and all treaties made or which shall be made *under the authority of the United States*, shall be the supreme law of the land. This particular section (line B) is intended to make perfectly plain the fact that treaties must be *in pursuance* of the Constitution just as much as laws. The "after the ratification" clause will prevent the amendment from repudiating such preconstitutional treaties as those with France in 1778 and England in 1783.)

Line C This changes no powers, and could be accomplished by merely changing the Senate's rules of procedure.

Line D As already indicated, section 2 of the old BRICKER has apparently been largely abandoned—the "which" clause entirely, and the mandatory non-self-executing clause as applied to treaties. For a comparison of the 1953 KNOWLAND and the new BRICKER on their permissive non-self-executing clauses as to treaties, see the comments on the latter.

Line E Also the main clause of section 3 of the old BRICKER seems abandoned—the power to "regulate" and prohibit all executive agreements. There remain the mandatory non-self-executing restrictions of GEORGE, MCCARRAN, and new BRICKER. The great uncertainty lies in the extent to which they would nullify (until Congress acts) executive acts under the powers which the Constitution now vests solely in the President, such as his powers as Commander in Chief.

POSSIBLE BEST SOLUTION—LEAVE THE CONSTITUTION ALONE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from the Queens County Bar Association of New York opposing the Bricker amendment. I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 16, 1954.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I am pleased to advise you that at a meeting of the members of the Queens County Bar Association last night an overwhelming vote was registered in favor of a resolution opposing the Bricker amendment or any amendments at this time respecting the treatymaking powers contained in the Constitution. The Queens County Bar Association is the largest association of lawyers in the county of Queens, which has a population of 1,800,000 people.

A. JOSEPH GEIST,
Chairman, Committee on American Principles, Queens County Bar Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to the committee amendment, on page 3, after line 9, to add a new section.

Mr. BRICKER obtained the floor.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask that I may yield to the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] on a question of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE—NOMINATION OF EARL WARREN TO BE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary considers approximately one-half of all the bills which are submitted to the Senate, which, as every Senator knows, runs into thousands during a session. In addition to having hearings on a great many of these bills, the committee, of course, has to consider all nominees for judges, United States attorneys, marshals, and some other appointments.

The work of the committee appeared so voluminous to the senior Senator from North Dakota that, when he became chairman, he assigned various members of the committee as chairmen of subcommittees to expedite the work, with the result that we have the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] as chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee; the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] as chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization; the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] as chairman of the Subcommittee To Study Juvenile Delinquency in the United States; the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] as chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code; the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] as chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judiciary Machinery; the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] as chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trade-Marks, and Copyrights; the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] as chairman of the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification and also as chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations; the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] as chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights; and, until a few days ago, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], as chairman of the subcommittee having to do with the Alien Property Custodian; and myself as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries; the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation, and the Subcommittee To Investigate Problems Connected with Emigration of Refugees and Escapees.

When it came to the matter of nominations, the chairman felt that he would have subcommittees appointed, observing the custom, however, of not including a member on any subcommittee from the same State as the nominee. The chairman was particularly anxious to expedite every nomination that came from the White House; and the records during the last session, and during this session, will show that these nominations have been quickly and expeditiously processed and reported to the Senate, and that the Senate has taken prompt action upon them.

To do this, the chairman has often had to work until late at night studying FBI reports and considering letters of recommendation and letters of protest on a nominee.

Really, I thought I was getting along very nicely, because to the present date of this session we have not only considered hundreds of bills, but we have reported for confirmation 133 nominations.

My colleagues can imagine my surprise, therefore, when, in considering the nomination of the Honorable Earl Warren to be Chief Justice of the United States, I suddenly found the press all over the country attacking the committee for not acting more expeditiously and promptly.

The record shows that the President sent the nomination to the Senate on the 11th of January, and it was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee on the same day. A subcommittee was appointed on the 16th. On the 22d of January we announced that public hearings would be held on February 2. The policy of the committee has been to announce such hearings at least 7 days in advance of the scheduled date. On February 2 public hearings were held.

As the Senate knows, last week there were celebrations of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, which took approximately a week of the Senate's time, during which it was impossible to get a sufficient number of the members of a committee together to perform its duties.

The Senate is charged by the Constitution with the function of advising on and consenting to the nominations which the President submits. The Senate acts through its committees, and the committees can discharge their function fully only if they investigate charges presented to them prior to the reporting of a nomination to the entire Senate. When the committee does report the nomination to the Senate, the report carries with it the prestige of the committee. It also carries with it the implication that the committee has fully developed all of the facts of which it has had prior notice, and has found those facts to be insufficient to warrant an adverse report on the fitness of the nominee for the office to which he has been appointed by the President.

This responsibility to assist the Senate in its task of advising and consenting to nominations presented by the President falls most heavily upon the chairman of the committee to which the nomination is referred. In the particular case of the Judiciary Committee, it has been the practice for many years for the Department of Justice to submit an FBI report on the nominee, which must be read and evaluated solely by the chairman of the committee, since other members are not permitted to see the report.

If I were to discharge this function hastily, and if information derogatory to the nominee should become public after his confirmation, not only I, but the whole committee, might be subject to criticism. Furthermore, if the chairman should fail to take any step which would serve more fully to inform the committee, and if, through such failure, the committee should not receive information which, with the exercise of due care, could have been procured for the committee's consideration, the chairman should be subjected to criticism by the members of his committee.

The chairman cannot exercise his own judgment as to what may or may not be pertinent. He must get all the evidence that there may be, and must submit it to all the other members of the committee, for their consideration.

I will continue to discharge my obligations as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, guided by these principles. In other words, Mr. President, the committee is not made up of just one man. On the contrary, it is composed of 15 members, all of whom have worked together very cooperatively during the entire time I have been chairman of the committee.

In the matter of the pending nomination, the chairman is in the further position of having been an ardent supporter of the nominee, Earl Warren, for President of the United States in the last national election. I not only supported him, but gave speeches in his behalf.

If any information, whether by a letter, telegram, or by word of mouth, came to the chairman of the committee which he did not submit to the other members of the committee, he would be guilty of not doing his duty under his oath as United States Senator.

In any event, let me say, as chairman, that Mr. Warren's nomination has been processed just as rapidly as has been possible, in view of the objections which have come in. It is quite possible that if the President had designated a jurist to be head of the Supreme Court of the United States, rather than a man who

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

had been in politics practically all of his adult life, not so many objections would have been filed. Altogether, there were over 200 objections.

All the incoming communications with regard to the Warren nomination were turned over by the chairman for analysis by two members of the professional staff of the Judiciary Committee. The two staff members assigned to this work were Mr. Wayne Smithey and Mr. Jay Sourwine. I shall not say these two men are the ablest members of the staff, because all the members of the professional staff of the Judiciary Committee are able lawyers and good workers; if they were not, they would not be retained. But Mr. Smithey and Mr. Sourwine are good lawyers, in whom members of the committee, on both sides of the aisle, repose confidence. As a matter of fact, both of them have been on the committee for a great many years; they are not by any means recent appointees. My recollection is that Mr. Sourwine has been on the committee for 8 or 9 years, and Mr. Smithey has been on the committee for almost as long. They are trustworthy; they are objective; they are men of balanced judgment.

These two men were instructed by the chairman to jointly appraise every communication which had been received, and not to appraise them from the standpoint of the words that were used, but to determine the essence of each communication. These two staff members were instructed to determine which communications made charges adverse to the nominee, and to reduce such charges to their essentials, and to list the charges which, if true, would be properly within the investigatory jurisdiction of the committee because they would in law have bearing on the fitness of the nominee.

Mr. Smithey and Mr. Sourwine went through all the communications which were received up through the deadline of February 17. In other words, instead of dragging the matter along, the subcommittee said, "We shall give any persons who wish to submit communications or complaints, until midnight of the 17th of February." We so announced to the press.

Mr. Smithey and Mr. Sourwine found that 32 separate and distinct charges adverse to the nominee had been made. Many of these charges were repeated more than once, often being repeated many times in various ways; but when all the charges which were made had been boiled down to their essence, there were 32 separate charges. Mr. Smithey and Mr. Sourwine next considered these charges, in accordance with the instructions of the chairman, for the purpose of determining which of them, if true, would fall properly within the investigatory jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

I want it clearly understood that these staff members were not asked to substitute their judgment for the judgment of the committee with respect to the merits of any of the charges or the bearing that any such charge might have on the willingness of any Senator to vote for confirmation of the nomination. What they were told to do, and what they did, was a technical task: First, to sift all the many communications, and reduce all the charges made in them to what we might refer to as common denominators; second, to consider each of the summarized charges, for the purpose of determining whether, if true, it would be properly within the investigatory jurisdiction of the committee.

We did not want to include in the record any charges which, even if true, would not properly have legal bearing on the fitness of the nominee. Mr. Smithey and Mr. Sourwine followed instructions, and set aside on a separate list 22 of the 32 charges, as being charges which, from the legal standpoint, should not properly be considered as affecting the fitness of the nominee, even if true. That left 10 charges which, if true, would have legal bearing on the question of the fitness of the nominee. Those 10 charges will be placed in the public record at the open public hearing on this nomination.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not yield at this time. When I complete this statement, I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Let me stress the point, Mr. President, that the 22 charges which were put aside on a separate list, as being charges which, even if true, would not have bearing, from a strictly legal standpoint, on the question of the fitness of the nominee, have not been withheld from the members of the subcommittee. In short, Mr. President, every member of the subcommittee could see every charge, every letter, every telegram, everything which was sent to the committee, in opposition to the nominee. All these matters have been fully disclosed, I repeat, to the members of the subcommittee. These charges will be held out of the record by the chairman, unless the committee should otherwise instruct, because the chairman intends to be just as zealous in protecting this nominee from unwarranted embarrassment, and in protecting the committee from being used as a forum for personal recriminations against the nominee, as he is in protecting his committee from any charge that it has acted hastily or without full knowledge of the facts, and in protecting himself from any possible charge that he has withheld information from the committee or has failed in any way to do his duty in procuring for his committee all possible information which should be considered in connection with this nomination.

The subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination—being composed of 3 Republican Senators and 2 Democratic Senators—is perhaps as good as any subcommittee that was ever appointed to consider any nomination in the history of the Senate. Its members are experienced and unprejudiced. They are all good lawyers, and they are men of judicial temperament. They know judges and the qualifications of judges. In addition, the Senators on the subcommittee represent almost every geographical area of the United States. There is 1 from the North, 1 from the South, 1 from the East, 1 from the West, and 1 from the Midwest.

Mr. President, you can imagine my surprise, therefore, when on the 4th day of February 1954—the first hearing was held on January 16—there appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle, the following editorial:

LANGER strays far off base. Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, is putting on a meddlesome and disquieting performance in holding up the approval by his Senate Judiciary Subcommittee of the nomination of Chief Justice Earl Warren.

We think he should know, and does know, that the sleazy testimony and the 97 documents offered the subcommittee in protest against the appointment are without foundation or merit. The integrity of Earl Warren's career has been on the public record in California since the 1920's and cannot be successfully impugned by anybody, much less by the kind of witnesses heard.

A Senator with any sophistification, indeed, ought to be able, unaided, to discount the testimony of a Gerald L. K. Smith henchman like Dr. Wesley Swift, the Los Angeles Christian Nationalist; Senator HENNINGS tagged his organization with the label of "scurrilous." Furthermore, it is nothing less than offensive to any Californian who knows the score in politics that a moment's consideration should be given to the preposterous objections of Pension Promoter George H. McLain, who alleges that Warren has shown a "much too casual concern for the American Constitution."

The business of allowing crackpot insinuations to deter a senatorial proceeding is intolerable, and the effrontery of Chairman LANGER in suggesting that Chief Justice Warren may be asked to come up and answer such bigoted allegations is worse.

The chairman puts the entire subcommittee in the position of depreciating the dignity to which Supreme Court Justices are entitled and which they must have if our system of free government is to continue. By holding up the appointment he has knowingly created an aura of completely unwarranted suspicion around the Chief Justice. We call on LANGER to get his subcommittee back into session, sweep aside these insignificant protests and proceed with a vote to confirm.

Also an article from the Los Angeles Times of February 4, 1954, reading as follows:

THE WARREN AFFAIR

While there seems to be little doubt in anybody's mind that the nomination of former Gov. Earl Warren to be Chief Justice of the United States will be confirmed, the slowness of the Judiciary Committee in acting on the nomination is disturbing. Senator LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, mentions some 97 "documents" which he says have been filed in opposition, but does not tell what they are.

If this newspaper wants them, we will give them to it. We will write them out in full, if the Republican chairman says he wants them spread on the minutes. If they want that kind of scurrilous material printed, we will print all 97 documents.

Governor Warren has two impressive endorsements, one from the American Bar Association and another from the California State Bar, and two of the objections filed against him would be considered by most people to be as much in his favor as the endorsements. One was from the Gerald

L. K. Smith outfit and the other was from George MacLain, pension promoter.

I may say parenthetically that Mr. Gerald L. K. Smith has never appeared at any point in the entire proceeding. So far as I know, no member of the committee has heard from him, nor has the committee as a whole. There has been no communication of any kind—no telegram, no telephone message, or any other communication.

I continue to read from the article in the Los Angeles Times of February 4, 1954:

Some Chicago organization whose position is rather vague demands a full investigation of his qualifications.

The delay is not only disturbing to Governor Warren's friends but unfortunate in view of the high position he continues to occupy. If he were rejected, either by vote of the Senate or by that body's adjournment without acting on his nomination, it would not call into question the decisions he participates in, since the legality of his recess appointment is undoubted. But it would create an anomalous situation and one embarrassing to the High Court. The Senate owes him prompt action.

Also there was an article from the Wall Street Journal of February 12, 1954. That was only a month after the President of the United States sent the nomination to the Senate. The article reads as follows:

Warren's O. K. as United States Chief Justice is stalled by North Dakota's LANGER. The enigmatic Judiciary chairman, Senate cloakroom gossip has it, is dickering for a circuit judgeship for a favorite constituent. Besides, Brownell recently fired a Langer protege from the Justice Department. But no one thinks the ex-California Governor is in permanent danger.

That is certainly very interesting. So far as Mr. Brownell is concerned, he can fire anyone he wishes to fire. I think every other member of the subcommittee or of the full committee feels the same way. In all the discussions I have not once heard that any one of them wishes to keep anyone on the payroll. I am satisfied that if Mr. Brownell had been questioned by the Wall Street Journal on the subject, he would have denied the implication.

On February 18, 1954, there appeared the following editorial in the New York Times:

Earl Warren took the oath as Chief Justice of the United States last October. The Senate has been in session for 6 weeks, and still the appointment of Earl Warren has not been confirmed. It has not even been acted on by the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which the erratic WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, is (by grace of seniority) the chairman.

Senator LANGER has long been an advocate of bigger and better Federal patronage for North Dakota.

That is true. I certainly plead guilty to that charge. I am for more and bigger patronage for all the small States in the Union—for Idaho and other small States, which in my opinion have not been getting a square deal at the hands of this administration. The State of North Dakota is second to no other State in the United States in supporting the Republican Party; yet when it comes to patronage we have received almost nothing. I have found that the important nominations go to the large States. Minnesota receives a great many, as does California. New York gets most of all. When it comes to ambassadorships, even the District of Columbia gets some. I doubt whether any citizen of the State of Idaho has been appointed as an ambassador this year.

Mr. WELKER. None has ever been appointed from Idaho.

Mr. LANGER. Idaho is in the same condition in which North Dakota was until a few short years ago. I wish to shake hands with the Senator. I want him to know that if he decides to go after an ambassadorship he will have the full support of the senior Senator from North Dakota. I have been in Idaho. It is a great State. It sent Bill Borah and other great Senators to this body. Idaho is certainly as much entitled to have one of her citizens appointed as an ambassador as is any other State. The same thing applies to other positions in the administration.

Senator LANGER has long been an advocate of bigger and better Federal patronage for North Dakota.

That is the only true statement in the article. The article continues:

It now seems at least within the realm of possibility that he has been holding up the nomination of Mr. Warren as a rather dramatic means of pointing out that he is in earnest when he says he wants more Federal jobs for the citizens of his State.

That statement is made notwithstanding the fact that we have reported 133 nominations. The Wall Street Journal ought to know better than to make a foolish statement of that kind.

It is an understatement to say that if this really is the reason for the delay, it is inexcusable. The only other reasons could be the hostility of political enemies of Mr. Warren in California or the fears of a few arch-reactionaries that Earl Warren, one of the most distinguished men in American public life, may be too liberal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "LANGER Plays Small-Potato Politics," published in the San Francisco Chronicle of February 16, 1954. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to read it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LANGER PLAYS SMALL-POTATO POLITICS

Asking the FBI for a character check of Chief Justice Earl Warren is offensive and unprecedented and betrays a vindictive smallness of mind on the part of Chairman LANGER and the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has Warren's nomination under consideration.

Supreme Court appointments have never been subjected to FBI checks, as the Justice Department has correctly pointed out. That is what makes this sudden and disingenuous interest of LANGER's committee in the question of whether Earl Warren is or is not a subversive person a studied insult.

Every member of the committee, we are confident, knows the Chief Justice to be a thoroughly loyal American; the antipathy springs from the fact that Warren has always rejected the counsels of the reactionaries.

If LANGER succeeds in bulldozing the Justice Department into ordering the FBI to check up on Warren, no harm will come to him—he'll pass any scrutiny with flying colors. But the dignity of the Senate will be lowered by this cheap and needless performance, and it seems incredible that the rest of the Senators on the committee should let him get away with it.

There are, unfortunately, many opportunities for a chairman of a congressional committee to abuse his powers. So far as we can see, LANGER has overlooked no such opportunity in his handling of the Warren appointment.

Mr. LANGER. The Judiciary Subcommittee considering this nomination has held one open hearing on the subject. Some closed meetings have been held, and the Judiciary Committee considering the nomination has held one open hearing on the subject.

I continue with the quotation:

If there is any substantial reason why Mr. Warren should not be confirmed, and we do not believe for a minute that there is, it ought to have been considered by the subcommittee and the full committee weeks ago, so that the Senate could have disposed of the matter long before this. The present situation, which the better minds of the Senate ought not permit to continue, is intolerably embarrassing to the President, to the High Court, to Mr. Warren himself, and to the American people.

In view of the great publicity that has been given to the work of this committee in connection with this nominee, and in view of the charges made that there were some ulterior motives on the part of the chairman of this committee, I have decided to have an open hearing, with all these charges brought out, at 4 o'clock this afternoon. I gave notice of this yesterday to the press and inasmuch as three Senators have written me or requested me to let them know when the hearings will be had, I am now serving notice upon the Senate floor.

Such procedure will at least put an end to the rumors and innuendo which have been bandied about concerning this nominee. It will also provide an opportunity for the Members of the Senate, the press, and the public, to render more informed opinion upon the merits of this nominee for the position for which he has been selected. It should establish to fair-minded individuals that the committee, and its subcommittee, have not been sitting idly by, but rather have been functioning in the manner, and with the diligence, for which they were created.

I wish to thank every member of my subcommittee and every member of the full committee for cooperating with me. Every time action was taken it was unanimous action, including the action calling upon the Attorney General for an FBI report, which the chairman of the subcommittee discussed with the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. LONG, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BRICKER. If I may yield for that purpose without losing the floor I shall be glad to do so. I ask unanimous

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

consent that I may yield under those conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish to express my confidence in the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I hope he will not permit himself to be bludgeoned by unfair editorial writers into abandoning what he believes to be the proper procedure for his committee.

I have received some mail unfavorable to the present Chief Justice. Knowing what I know at the present time, I expect to vote for the confirmation of his nomination; but I believe the Senate is entitled to expect that its Judiciary Committee will thoroughly explore any derogatory information which may be presented against the person appointed to the lifetime position of Chief Justice of the United States, that any derogatory information that might have been submitted to any of us will be thoroughly explored, and that the committee will be of the opinion that there is absolutely nothing whatever to justify any fears before it moves to recommend the confirmation of this nomination.

Once a Chief Justice is confirmed there is no recourse on the part of the Senate. Certainly none of us would wish to impeach the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; nor should there ever be any cause for it. I should like to know that the matter has been thoroughly explored.

The Senator from North Dakota is doing the Senate a service in making certain that any unfavorable information is thoroughly investigated, so that there will be no reason why the nominee should not be confirmed as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

As one Member of the Senate, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from North Dakota for not having permitted any group to railroad him or to rush him in his consideration of any information that might come before the committee.

It is entirely true that anyone who has been in public life, either as a governor or other important official, may stir up various enmities and ideas on the part of some people, which for one reason or another may incite a certain amount of unfair criticism when his name is submitted to the Senate for appointment to high Government office.

It has been said that anyone who does not want to be criticized should not attempt to accomplish anything in his life. Certainly that is not the case so far as the present Chief Justice is concerned. Although we recognize the fact that much of the criticism directed against him perhaps is unfair, nevertheless we are entitled to know that all the criticism has been thoroughly investigated and that the committee charged with the responsibility is thoroughly satisfied that it has done a thorough job.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield under the same conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Colorado may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to concur in what my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has said. I have received mail unfavorable to Governor Warren, who has been nominated to be the Chief Justice of the United States.

In each case I did not run to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I made my own answer without asking anyone, and this is what I told my constituents and persons from other States who had written to me. I said I felt certain that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee would be absolutely and completely fair in appraising the nomination and that I had no fears whatever—and I am a supporter of the Chief Justice, I told my constituents—of the outcome, because of the complete fairness of the Senator from North Dakota.

I wish to concur in what my colleague from Louisiana has stated about not being rushed. I know the Senator from North Dakota will not be rushed. I did not need to hear his statement today to have complete and full confidence in the outcome of the whole matter in a most satisfactory manner.

As I understand our Government, the Office of Chief Justice is the highest office in the land, next to that of the President. I do not see anything wrong about taking a little time to run down what I believe, for the most part, to be wild rumors.

I recall that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] a few years ago was the target of a crank who took a shot at him.

Mr. BRICKER. It was not a pleasant experience, I will say to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad the crank was not a good shot, and I am glad he missed the Senator.

However, men in public life do have enemies. This is a democracy, and the people have a right to complain about any nomination, and have a right to inquire about it. It is the duty of the chairman of a committee, the Judiciary Committee in this case, to weigh and analyze and sift out such complaints, because this is a democracy.

Therefore I wish to join with other Senators in extending to the Senator from North Dakota my complete confidence that he will do a good job and a democratic job and will do it in the right way.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I think I should tell my colleagues that I work with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and have been working with him for many months. There is not a harder working man on the floor of the Senate. He has had to recommend the confirmation of approximately 133 nominations in a short period of less than 2 months. Many times the junior Senator from Idaho has been at his side and has tried in a small way to assist him.

The other day I asked the distinguished Senator from North Dakota if perhaps he could expedite the Warren nomination, on the ground and for the reason that it was personally embarrassing to the Senator from Idaho, since the Senator from Idaho enjoys a warm and close friendship with the nominee.

He told me that he would do his very best. I can vouch for that statement. He has done his very best. He has worked long hours. I am certain he will weigh the complaints he has received, and he will weigh them very carefully.

If the Senator from North Dakota will permit me, I shall be at the meeting this afternoon to do what I can to help him. I appreciate the task he faces. I know that Earl Warren, deep in his heart, has nothing to fear and appreciates the activity of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon under the same conditions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to say to my good friend from North Dakota that I commend him for the attitude he has taken throughout the hearings on the Warren nomination. We have not yet in the United States reached the point where the newspapers have taken over the confirming processes of the Senate of the United States. So I say to him, Do not worry about newspaper criticism. The Senator from North Dakota is one Member of the Senate who well understands the meaning of that advice, because I believe no Member of the Senate has been more villified by the press in unfair attacks than has the Senator from North Dakota.

I am satisfied that when the hearings are concluded we shall find the nominee highly qualified for the great trust reposed in him. I have known him for many years. It was my pleasure to campaign across the country for him when he was a candidate for the Vice Presidency. I know he will serve with great distinction. I think it is in his interests that the chairman of the committee and the committee itself take whatever time may be necessary to complete an analysis of the complaints which have been filed, although, like the Senator from Colorado, I am completely satisfied that when the complaints are analyzed they will be found to be without merit.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Jersey on the same conditions.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes which have been justly paid to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I happen to be a member of a subcommittee of that committee. Since the nomination came to the Senate we have been completely thorough in our search for the truth concerning the qualifications of the nominee.

This afternoon there will be a hearing, and I am sure that from the hearing will come real and thorough justice for the distinguished nominee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from California on the same conditions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to say that I am pleased to hear the announcement of the Senator from New Jersey and of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary that hearings are to proceed this afternoon in the matter of the nomination of the Chief Justice of the United States.

I wish, also, to testify to my complete confidence in the Chief Justice. I have known him for a period of more than a quarter of a century. I have known him as a young member of the State attorney's office in the city of Oakland, Calif.; as an assistant district attorney; as the district attorney of the third largest county of the State; as attorney general for two terms in the second largest State in the Union; as the nominee of his party for the Vice Presidency of the United States; and as Governor of the great State of California. He went before the people on three separate occasions and, with the overwhelming support of Republicans and Democrats alike, was selected for the highest office within the gift of the people of California.

I know his background as an able and competent attorney. I know his background as a distinguished public official. In my entire experience in public life—which has not been too short a time, although I am now only 45 years of age, for I served for some 8 years in the Legislature of California and have been privileged to represent my State in the Senate of the United States for a period of a little more than 8 years—I have known of no man who is better qualified to fill the position to which he has been nominated. I can say without fear of contradiction that I have never known in my entire public experience a man better qualified to serve under a nomination coming before the Senate of the United States.

I have never known a man with higher ideals of public service or of greater personal integrity. Certainly, of all the men I have ever known, he can stand the closest scrutiny by any committee, and I am certain that when the committee has completed its labors it will, by an overwhelming vote, recommend to the Senate the confirmation of his nomination, and that then this body will overwhelmingly confirm the nomination.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, having yielded for various statements, I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything in behalf of the Chief Justice, although I desire to do so. He and I served as attorney general of our States at the same time, and we had many conferences together, with many mutual problems to solve. I have visited him in his home and he in mine. I have absolute confidence in his integrity and ability, and I know he will respond to every challenge which may come to him in the high office to which he has been appointed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in today's Washington News, entitled "LANGER Swaps His Rhubarb for Plums."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROUGHAGE ON CAPITOL HILL—LANGER SWAPS HIS RHUBARB FOR PLUMS

An apparent bobble on patronage put the administration in a jam today with the Senator who is handling Earl Warren's nomination as Chief Justice.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican of North Dakota, is hopping mad because the White House failed in accordance with long tradition to consult him about the appointment of four postmasters in his State.

Senator LANGER is chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee which has been considering the Warren matter for weeks.

OFFENDED

He called a meeting of the subcommittee today and said he hoped to "get rid" of the nomination one way or the other so the full committee can consider it Monday. Approval is certain if it comes to a vote. But Senator LANGER will not promise that it will.

Senator LANGER has said he will block President Eisenhower's nomination of the four postmasters because he did not find out about them until he read about it in the newspapers.

"He told the Senate Post Office Committee the nominations were personally offensive," and this traditionally is enough to kill any nomination.

The fiery North Dakotan, chomping on his customary unlit, cellophane-wrapped cigar, denied he would hold up the Warren nomination because of his peeve.

But he did say that some recommendations he has made for North Dakota appointments, including one Federal judge, have been ignored so far by the administration.

"They have no connection with the postmasters or the Warren case," Senator LANGER insisted. "Each one stands on its own feet."

But the warning to the administration was clear.

YOUNG APPROVED

One old-time GOP Senator admitted privately that the administration blundered badly in its patronage dealings with Senator LANGER, especially with the Warren nomination still under his control.

The four postmaster appointees all come from counties dominated by the Nonpartisan League, the Republican-affiliated organization which forms his main backing. But he still opposes them because he wasn't consulted.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, Republican, of North Dakota, the State's other Senator, said he endorsed all of the postmaster nominees because they had approval of the GOP county and State organizations. Senator YOUNG is allied with the regular Republican faction in the State.

Two years ago Senator LANGER blocked Senate approval of all Presidential appointees for several days because no North Dakotans were receiving appointments to important Federal jobs.

He finally gave in to let some major nominations go through. The Truman administration shortly afterward came through with appointment of a North Dakotan to a Central American ambassadorship.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to discuss for a while this afternoon the issue which is now before the Senate, in the light of developments which have taken place.

The case of *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203) was decided by the Supreme Court in February 1942. Only in recent weeks has this incredible decision received publicity commensurate with its importance. For that, we may thank the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia. His substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 1 has focused national attention on the road to dictatorship opened up by the notorious Pink case.

It is necessary, however, to place the Pink case and Senate Joint Resolution 1 in proper perspective. Some Senators, being unable to refute Senator GEORGE's penetrating analysis of the Pink case, have retreated to the position that the so-called George substitute, while perhaps meritorious, should be studied by the Senate Judiciary Committee. Their position is entirely untenable.

In a recent column, Mr. Walter Lippmann commented as follows on Senator GEORGE's substitute:

> But for how long, and how intensively, has Senator GEORGE studied his own proposed amendment? How many men of equal competence and authority have been consulted? There cannot have been many. For the text of the new proposal has been published only for a few weeks. There have been no hearings. There has been virtually no expert discussion of it. There is available for the guidance of Congress and of the public almost nothing that is more than off-the-cuff comment.

I shall proceed to demonstrate that Mr. Lippmann's conclusions are devoid of any factual foundation.

For more than 2 years the Senate or its Judiciary Committee has had before it a proposed constitutional amendment designed to overcome the infamous Pink case. On February 7, 1952, 58 other Senators joined with me in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 130. A subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee held hearings. Section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 130 read in pertinent part as follows:

> No * * * executive agreement shall alter or abridge the laws of the United States * * * unless * * * Congress shall so provide by act or joint resolution.

That language was aimed squarely at the Pink case. In fact, on February 7, 1952, when I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 130, I said that the doctrine of the Pink case "would make the President a dictator with unlimited power." At that time, the proposed constitutional amendment recommended by the American Bar Association did not cover executive agreements.

Senate Joint Resolution 1 was introduced on January 7, 1953. The combined effect of sections 3 and 4 was to provide that an executive agreement, "shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress."

Hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1 opened on February 18, 1953. I was the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

first witness. I discussed at that time the danger of the Pink case in some detail, as may be found in the Record of Hearings, pages 6 and 7.

Senate Joint Resolution 1, as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee on June 15, 1953, provided that an executive agreement "shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation."

The so-called George substitute was first proposed on February 2, 1954. Section 2 provides:

> An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of Congress.

On February 4, 1954, I proposed an amendment to the committee text. It provides that an international agreement other than a treaty "shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by the Congress."

For more than 2 years, therefore, the Senate and its Judiciary Committee have had an opportunity to study the language of a proposed constitutional amendment designed to reverse the Pink case. That language has been in substantially the same form throughout the whole 2-year period. Objections by the present and by the preceding administration were answered at the hearings or in the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee. It is irresponsible for anyone to charge that the executive agreement section of the George substitute or that of my own substitute proposal is "new language" and therefore requires further committee consideration.

Of all the issues raised by Senate Joint Resolution 1, the one presented by the Pink case is the easiest to understand. Do we want the President to make internal law for the United States, or do we want all legislative powers to remain in the Congress as provided in article 1, section 1, of the Constitution?

Many opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 concede that the Pink case is not good law. How do they propose to change it without amending the Constitution?

Later in the course of my remarks, I shall discuss some of the erroneous charges leveled against the proposal to make executive agreements effective as domestic law only through legislation by the Congress. These charges are due to failure to read the hearings and the report on Senate Joint Resolution 1, failure to check legislation enacted by the Congress, or to a deliberate desire to confuse the issue.

Several weeks ago the majority leader introduced Senate Resolution 209, directing the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to make a study of executive agreements operating as internal law in the United States and the authority under which such agreements were concluded. At the same time, the majority leader asked the Under Secretary of State for similar information concerning executive agreements made during the past 10 years. It is curious, to say the least, that these studies were not made at some time during the past 2 years when the issue was before the Senate in both Senate Joint Resolution 130 and Senate Joint Resolution 1. In any event, in the record of hearings on both Senate Joint Resolution 130 and Senate Joint Resolution 1 Government witnesses failed to give one single example demonstrating any need for the President to make domestic law by international agreements not approved by either House of Congress.

We now come to a legal somersault by Secretary of State Dulles even more sensational than the flip-flop on his famous Louisville speech. Testifying in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1, Secretary Dulles said:

> The danger to the Nation, however, from agreements not submitted to the Senate as treaties, or to the Congress for legislative validation, cannot be great because, without either Senate or congressional action, these agreements cannot constitutionally become law of the land. (Record of hearings, p. 828.)

This statement by Secretary Dulles was no off-the-cuff remark; no curbstone opinion. It was contained in his prepared statement presented to the committee in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1. However, when Mr. Dulles finally discovered the latent power in the Pink case, he opposed any move to surrender it, the danger to the Nation from unratified executive agreements to the contrary notwithstanding. In other words, the Secretary of State opposes the executive-agreement section of Senate Joint Resolution 1 even though it would make the law exactly what he thought it to be in April 1953.

Before discussing the totalitarian power sanctioned by the Pink case I wish to set forth the facts of that case in chronological order.

1907: The First Russian Insurance Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the Russian Empire, established a New York branch and deposited with the New York Superintendent of Insurance assets to secure claims resulting from operations of the New York branch.

1918: Russian Government issued decrees nationalizing Russian insurance companies and their assets, wherever situated.

1925: New York branch ceased to do business; superintendent of insurance took possession of assets; thereafter, claims of domestic creditors were paid, leaving a balance of more than $1 million.

1931: New York Court of Appeals directed superintendent of insurance to pay claims of foreign creditors of the First Russian Insurance Co. Some payments were made prior to United States intervention in the case.

1933: United States recognized the Communist Government of Russia.

November 16, 1933: As an incident to the recognition, Maxim Litvinov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, wrote a letter to President Roosevelt assigning all amounts found to be due the Communist Government as the successor to the Russian Government to the Government of the United States. President Roosevelt accepted the assignment for the benefit of American citizens having claims against Russia or its nationals, but not against the New York branch of the First Russian Insurance Co.

1934: United States sued in Federal district court to recover assets held by Superintendent of Insurance of New York State. Supreme Court later sent United States to the New York courts for a determination of its claim.

1940: New York Court of Appeals held in favor of superintendent of insurance. Like the English courts in similar cases, the New York Court of Appeals refused to give Soviet confiscatory decrees any extraterritorial effect.

1942: Supreme Court held that Roosevelt-Litvinov assignment overruled New York law as declared by its highest court, and that the fifth amendment did not protect the judicially declared property rights against an executive agreement not approved by either House of Congress.

The Pink case stands for the proposition that the President, in recognizing a foreign government, can agree to policies that deprive persons of their property without due process of law. Speaking of the authority to recognize foreign governments, the court said:

> That authority is not limited to a determination of the Government to be recognized. It includes the power to determine the policy which is to govern the question of recognition. Objections to the underlying policy as well as objections to recognition are to be addressed to the political department and not to the courts (p. 229).

In his dissenting opinion, Chief Justice Stone assumed that the sweeping alterations of the rights of States and of persons could be effectuated by treaty or by a congressionally approved executive agreement. Mr. Justice Douglas and a majority of the Court based their conclusion on this premise:

> A treaty is a law of the land under the supremacy clause (art. VI, clause 2) of the Constitution. Such international compacts and agreements as the Litvinov assignment have a similar dignity (p. 230).

Having found that the President could by executive agreement determine all policies related to the act of recognition, it was a simple matter for the Court to conclude, and I read the conclusion:

> If the President had the power to determine the policy which was to govern the question of recognition, then the fifth amendment does not stand in the way of giving full force and effect to the Litvinov assignment (p. 228).

In other words, the Pink case squarely held that the fifth amendment does not protect property when that property is taken without compensation to further some foreign policy goal of the President. And, as Chief Justice Stone pointed out in his admirable dissent, the Litvinov assignment drew no distinction as between foreign and domestic creditors of nationalized companies. Due process under the fifth amendment extends to aliens as well as citizens. *Russian Volunteer Fleet* v. *United States* (282 U. S. 481). American creditors of the insurance company would have been deprived of their property by the Pink case but for the fortuitous circumstance that they had been paid off before the United States intervened in the New York litigation. A reading of the Court's opinion leaves no doubt whatever that the

result would have been the same as to domestic creditors.

It was suggested, however, by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] on February 11 that Congress specifically endorsed the Litvinov assignment. The Court did not rest its decision in the Pink case on congressional approval for a very good reason. As explained in the dissenting opinion of Chief Justice Stone, the Litvinov assignment could have been interpreted as assigning to the United States no greater right to property than that possessed by the assignor under applicable Federal and State law. That was unquestionably the understanding of Congress when, by joint resolution of August 4, 1939, a commission was created to settle claims to funds realized from the Litvinov assignment. The validity of some claims covered by the Litvinov assignment was not seriously disputed. But on August 4, 1939, the English and New York courts had consistently refused to honor Communist expropriation decrees. The Pink case was not decided until almost 3 years later. I do not believe that the Congress would have deprived foreign creditors of their property in order to pay American creditors having no claim whatever on that property.

A leading critic of Senate Joint Resolution 1 is Dr. Philip Jessup. Shortly after the Pink case was decided Dr. Jessup made the following comment, referring to the decision in that case:

> From the point of view of our constitutional law the decision may well mark one of the most far-reaching inroads upon the protection which it was supposed the fifth amendment accorded to private property. (36 American Journal of International Law 282 (1942).)

The Pink case held that an executive agreement not approved by either House of Congress causes State lines and the fifth amendment to disappear.

In *United States* v. *Guy W. Capps, Inc.* (204 F. (2d) 655 (4 Cir. 1953)) which we have discussed before on the floor of the Senate, certiorari was granted, and the Attorney General contends that an executive agreement limiting potato imports is valid even though it does not conform to an act of Congress. Great reliance is placed on the Pink case. The following statements appear in the Government's petition for certiorari—and this is vital:

> The initial ruling below—that the President cannot without congressional authorization consummate an international agreement which regulates foreign commerce, because that field is reserved by the Constitution to Congress (R. 166–167)—is inconsistent with this Court's decisions defining the Executive's foreign relations powers, as well as with the understanding of many decades.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> This Court has explicitly confirmed the President's capacity, subject to constitutional limitations, to enter into such executive agreements in appropriate cases. * * * Executive agreements so concluded have the same status as treaties * * * and are the supreme law of the land * * * subject to constitutional limitations.

The Pink case is spreading like a cancer through the body of American constitutional law. In 1952 the Court of Claims held that jurisdiction conferred upon it by the Congress had been ousted by an executive agreement not approved by either House of Congress. The Court of Claims held in effect, and I quote:

> The Byrnes-Blum agreement between the United States and France is the type of agreement which has been recognized as a treaty within the meaning of article VI, clause 2, of the Constitution and thus is a part of "the supreme law of the land." (*Etlimar Societe Anonyme* v. *United States* (106 F. Supp. 191, 195).)

By what strange logic can men justify giving an executive agreement, not mentioned in the Constitution, the same legal effect as a treaty? It is said that the President's power to make domestic law by executive agreement flows from his power as Commander in Chief and as the Nation's principal organ for foreign affairs. The Pink case held that the President's power to make domestic law by executive agreement was derived from his power to receive ambassadors.

I cannot think of a more dangerous stretch of legal authority than to be compelled to follow that conclusion. Such a contention was contained in the brief of the Attorney General on the petition for certiorari, wherein he contended that the President had such power, and wherein he asked the Supreme Court to sustain such power and to set aside an act of Congress. It was contended that the President does not have to conform to constitutional requirements, but in effect can make domestic law himself. The Attorney General had said in the footnote in his brief:

> On the importance of executive agreements as a means of carrying out current diplomatic business, see the authorities cited in footnote 17, infra, page 13. We have been advised by the Department of State that the validity of several hundred executive agreements would become questionable if this ruling became acceptable law. It would also cast substantial doubt on the authority of the United States to enter into routine arrangements with foreign nations.

How can a curb on the power of the President to make domestic law dictatorially and single-handedly interfere with his conduct of international relations? It is a grab for power such as we have never known in the history of the Republic. It must be stopped, and can be stopped only in one way, and that is by a constitutional amendment.

I have written to the Department of State and asked it to submit a list of agreements which the President has entered into which are contrary to the law of the country. I do not know whether or not I shall receive such a list. The reply may be that such materials are classified. That has been the practice of the State Department. However, the time has come for the Congress and for the American people to know about laws which the President is making without constitutional or congressional authority of any kind or character. When and if I receive such information, I shall bring it to the attention of the Senate for analysis.

It is clear that, in the absence of any executive agreement, the President has no legislative power, not even in his capacity as Commander in Chief. This cardinal principle was reaffirmed in the steel seizure case, wherein Mr. Justice Black said:

> In the framework of our Constitution the President's power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker. The Constitution limits his functions in the lawmaking process to the recommending of laws he thinks wise and the vetoing of laws he thinks bad. And the Constitution is neither silent nor equivocal about who shall make laws which the President is to execute (citing art. 1, sec. 1, of the Constitution). * * * The Constitution does not subject this lawmaking power of Congress to presidential or military supervision or control. (*Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer* (343 U. S. 579, 579).)

In the same case Mr. Justice Jackson said:

> His [the President's] command power is not such an absolute as might be implied from that office in a militaristic system, but is subject to limitations consistent with a constitutional Republic whose law and policy-making branch is a representative Congress. The purpose of lodging dual titles in one man was to insure that the civilian would control the military, not to enable the military to subordinate the Presidential Office. No penance would ever expiate the sin against free government of holding that a President can escape control of executive power by law through assuming his military role. What the power of command may include I do not try to envision, but I think it is not a military prerogative, without support of law, to seize persons or property because they are important or even essential for the Military and Naval Establishment (p. 645).

Why should we condone "the sin against free government," of which Justice Jackson spoke, merely because it is authorized by an executive agreement? No justification for legislative power in the President has been, or can ever be, advanced. Read the testimony of government witnesses in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1. They gave not a single example of an executive agreement which should become internal law without legislation by the Congress.

Only one objection was raised at the hearings to making executive agreements internal law only through congressional legislation. A memorandum of the Department of State suggested that reciprocal trade agreements might require double authorization by the Congress—record of hearings, page 838. The senior Senator from Missouri repeated the suggestion in his speech of February 5, apparently unaware that this threadbare argument was answered by the Senate Judiciary Committee, on page 30 of its report.

Mr. President, I should now like to address myself to 4 of the 5 questions propounded the day before yesterday, or last week, by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] with reference to the Pink case and the provision of Senate Joint Resolution 1, making executive agreements non-self-executing as internal law. Not only are these questions applicable to the proposed substitute of the Senator from Georgia, but they are equally applicable to my own amendment to the committee text.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The first question of the senior Senator from Missouri was:

> Is there anything except dictum in the Pink case that justifies adoption of the amendment?

The holding in the Pink case is that an executive agreement in some way related to the conduct of foreign policy—in this case, the receiving of ambassadors—is effective to override State law, and that the fifth amendment does not stand in the way of giving effect to such an agreement. Contrary to the contention of the senior Senator from Missouri and the contention of Mr. Justice Roberts, Congress did not approve the Litvinov assignment.

As a matter of fact, the dissenting opinion, in which Mr. Justice Roberts joined, specifically mentions the fact that the Litvinov assignment was not ratified by either House of Congress. Moreover, in the dissenting opinion, it was assumed that foreign creditors could be deprived of their rights to the fund in the hands of the Superintendent of Insurance by treaty or by a congressionally approved executive agreement.

The Roosevelt-Litvinov assignment was made in 1933. The Congress was never asked to approve the terms of the agreement; and, in fact, Congress never did give its approval. It is true that the agreement presented the Congress with an accomplished fact. Accordingly, it was necessary for the Congress to provide for the adjudication of claims of American nationals against the Russian Government which were to be paid out of funds derived from the Litvinov assignment. However, even at the time when Congress created the commission, by joint resolution of August 21, 1939, it had every reason to believe that the United States received by virtue of the assignment only funds which were determined under applicable Federal and State law to be owing to the assignor. At this time, it must be remembered, the uniform line of decisions, both in England and in the United States, was to the effect that the Soviet nationalization decrees had no extraterritorial effect.

Neither can I agree with the senior Senator from Missouri or with Mr. Justice Roberts that Senate Joint Resolution 1, as proposed to be amended by the Senator from Georgia, or by myself, would not have altered the result in the Pink case. The Litvinov assignment, as construed in the Pink case, would become internal law in the United States. If Congress had been asked to approve the Litvinov assignment, I am certain it would have done so only with an express stipulation that nothing in the assignment should be construed to deprive creditors of their rights to property as determined under the applicable laws of the States. Last year, for example, the Senate protected State constitutions and laws against treaties giving aliens the right to practice law, medicine, and other professions.

Neither can I agree with the senior Senator from Missouri in his statement that—

> We in this country cannot undertake to protect Russian citizens against decrees issued in Russia.

Mr. President, one-third of the world is now behind the Iron Curtain. Many nationals of those countries are now outside the Iron Curtain. Their property in the United States is entitled to the protection of the fifth amendment. No President, as a part of his power to receive Ambassadors from iron-curtain countries, should have the power to make internal law depriving nationals of iron-curtain countries, not residing therein, of the property they own within the United States.

The second question asked by the senior Senator from Missouri is whether the amendment would permit future Presidents to place proposals such as the Human Rights Covenant in the form of executive agreements, and to make them effective as internal law by act of Congress. Nothing in the amendment even by remote implication suggests that treaties and executive agreements can be used interchangeably. The distinction between the two which exists today, but which, unfortunately, is not always respected, is continued under the language of the proposed amendment. The net effect of both the amendment of the Senator from Georgia and my own amendment is to provide greater protection against abuse of the executive agreement making power.

It is possible today, under the doctrine of the Pink case, for the President to conclude a dangerous international agreement on his own authority, and to make that international agreement effective as internal law without congressional approval. That will no longer be possible under the provision that executive agreements can become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by the Congress.

The fourth question of the senior Senator from Missouri was, "Who shall have the ultimate authority to decide what executive agreements should be implemented?" That authority will rest, in the first instance, with the President of the United States. If the executive agreement is not intended to change Federal or State laws, then it need not be submitted to the Congress. On the other hand, if the President wishes his agreement to become internal law in the United States, it will be necessary for him to request implementing legislation by the Congress, assuming that such legislation is not already in force.

The final question of the senior Senator from Missouri was whether it would be wise to have Senate Judiciary Committee hearings on this proposal, since, as he said, there were no hearings at all on this type of proposal, or on any variations of it. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is 100 percent wrong, as I indicated earlier in my remarks. The phrase "internal law" was fully considered in the course of hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1. The phrase appears in the original joint resolution and in the recommendation of the American Bar Association. In the hearings, no Government witness contended that the phrase "internal law" was ambiguous in any way.

Mr. President, some question has been raised as to what internal law is. I think it is a very simple matter to understand. It is the rule of law which courts are obliged to apply in litigation involving persons or property within the jurisdiction of the United States.

In his speech in 1929 before the American Society of International Law, of which he was then president, Chief Justice Hughes said:

> If we attempted to use the treatymaking powers to deal with matters which did not pertain to our external relations, but to control matters which normally and appropriately were within the local jurisdiction of the States, then I again say there might be grounds for implying a limitation upon the treatymaking power, that it is intended for the purpose of having treaties made relating to foreign affairs, and not to make laws for the people of the United States in their internal concerns, through the exercise of the asserted treatymaking power.

In the case of *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation* (299 U. S. 304), Mr. Justice Sutherland, speaking for the Court, at pages 315 and the following, discussed at length the difference between the internal and external affairs of the Nation. Mr. Justice Sutherland said:

> The broad statement that the Federal Government can exercise no power except those specifically enumerated in the Constitution, and such implied powers as are necessary and proper to carry into effect the enumerated powers, is categorically true only in respect of our internal affairs.

At page 319, the opinion states that—

> As we have shown * * * the Federal power over external affairs (is) in origin and essential character different from that over internal affairs, but participation in the exercise of the power is significantly limited.

In the steel case—*Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer* (343 U. S. 579), at page 642—Justice Jackson said:

> But no doctrine that the Court could promulgate would seem to me more sinister and alarming than that a President whose conduct of foreign affairs is so largely uncontrolled, and often even is unknown, can vastly enlarge his mastery over the internal affairs of the country by his own commitment of the Nation's Armed Forces to some foreign venture.

Yet that is exactly the situation we face as a result of the decision in the Pink case.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DUFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I was trying to get clear in my mind some of the situations which would not be covered by internal law. Would the rights of American citizens on ships on the high seas be subjects which would not be covered by internal law?

Mr. BRICKER. That is a subject of international law.

Mr. LONG. Then, when the term "internal law" is used, it does not include the rights of American citizens on ships on the high seas, even under the American flag.

Mr. BRICKER. Nor in other countries.

Mr. LONG. What would the Senator's attitude be toward the legal rights of Americans in the Armed Forces residing on foreign soil?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator and I discussed that question a few months ago. My attitude is very well known. I am opposed to turning soldiers over to foreign courts anywhere in the world. I have said time and again, as I said on the floor of the Senate at that time, that the State Department had taken care of its people, but that I would never cast my vote in favor of making a member of our Armed Forces in uniform a second-rate citizen as compared with a representative of the State Department. I still feel the same way.

Mr. LONG. The Senator will remember that my vote supported his view at that time.

Mr. BRICKER. I remember the discussion very well.

Mr. LONG. Regardless of whether this subject is covered by the North Atlantic Treaty, or whether it relates to soldiers in other nations which are not members of NATO, the Senator believes that the term "internal law" would not apply to the rights of American soldiers, or the dependents of American soldiers, who happened to be living on foreign soil in friendly nations.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is correct; and I so stated in the argument.

Mr. LONG. Generally speaking, the Senator believes that the term "internal law" applies to relationships which exist within the United States, or to matters which come before the courts of the United States.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is correct. It refers to laws enacted by Congress, which the courts must apply in this country, within the United States.

The phrase "internal law" is used simply in contradistinction to external law. It means substantially to have effect as law within the United States. If the Senator from Missouri would like to read a detailed discussion as to the purport of the phrase "internal law," I respectfully refer him to pages 55, 56, 93, 1121–1123, and 1135 of the record—hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1. If the senior Senator from Missouri wishes additional citations to the term "internal law" in the hearings, I shall be happy to supply them to him.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator from Ohio know that the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], in his dissent or in the minority views, used the term "internal law" 11 times?

Mr. BRICKER. He used it 11 times. The minority views used it 11 times, and the majority report 15 times. So there was no question about the understanding of the term in the minds of members of the committee.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. He must have had some conception of what it meant. He used it 11 times.

Mr. BRICKER. I think he knew what it meant, just as I know the Senator from Maryland knew what it meant.

Even if the phrase "internal law" is not crystal clear, that fact would not necessarily mean that its incorporation into the Constitution would be bad. Mr. John W. Davis, a distinguished lawyer, informed the Senate that he does not "favor any proposed amendment, the meaning and scope of which is not clear on its fact." If that attitude on the part of Mr. Davis and the senior Senator from Missouri had prevailed in the First Congress, we would have had no due-process clause and no fifth amendment. In addition, if this same attitude had prevailed in a later Congress, we would never have written any due-process clause in the 14th amendment. Every thinking American should be proud of the fact that we prevent both Federal and State denial of life, liberty, and property without due process of law, even though the term "due process" is incapable of precise definition. Similarly, what would the senior Senator from Missouri say as to the meaning of the phrase "unreasonable searches and seizures"? We must remember that we are in the process of acting upon a constitutional amendment. We are not at liberty to write an amendment to the Constitution in the same way that we write amendments to the Internal Revenue Code. If the attitude of the senior Senator from Missouri and that of Mr. Davis had prevailed in the early days of our Republic, I daresay that the text of our Constitution today would embrace at least several volumes. Actually, of course, the senior Senator from Missouri wants no constitutional amendment whatever, no matter what its provisions may be. His vote yesterday proves that. He reminds me of any vegetarian on a steak fry. He will have none of the meat no matter how it is cooked, but he insists on telling everyone else how it must be prepared.

I have said that the effect of the Pink case is to establish one of the most dangerous principles ever laid down by the Supreme Court. Our Constitution was built as a bulwark against the power of government. It is the source of our greatness. It is the source of our personal liberty. The protection of individual rights and minority rights under the Constitution is the basic foundation of our greatness in the history of the world and our ability to contribute as mightily as we have contributed to the cause of freedom in other places.

I think it is necessary to consider an amendment which is more extensive and goes further than that presented by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in the so-called George amendment. I think it is necessary that we deal today with the treaty power as well as with the unlimited, dangerous, poisonous power of the President to make domestic laws by his own executive determinations.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Ohio was speaking of the argument that certain terms should not be used unless the precise definition of the terms is known. It occurred to me that if that argument were pursued, the original drafters of the Constitution would have been confronted with an obviously impossible task. They could never have drafted the Constitution.

Even today there is a term in the eighth amendment which I believe is a very good phrase used by the founders. I refer to the term "cruel and unusual punishments." Even today lawyers cannot tell precisely the meaning of the term, but everyone agrees that it is a good provision to have in the Bill of Rights.

Mr. BRICKER. It has a very salutary effect.

Mr. LONG. Cruel and unusual punishments should not be inflicted.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator for his contribution. The fact is that if the founders of the Constitution had been subjected to the same kind of dilatory tactics we have been confronted with in this situation, I doubt if they would have been able to get the constitutional draft before the people. Even then, after they had done it, there was a great demand that the Bill of Rights be submitted. It was submitted, and the 10 amendments were adopted. There was a great deal of protest against them. It will be remembered that Alexander Hamilton, great leader and powerful man that he was, said they were unnecessary and were anomalous because the proposal was to put into the Constitution something to prevent the Government from doing which it did not have the power to do.

Everyone will agree that the Bill of Rights has been one of the great principles in our expanding form of government to protect our safety and to preserve our personal rights.

The term to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred is used every day in our courts.

I wish to dwell for a moment on the need for some action with regard to treaties. Let me read again into the RECORD—I do not think it can be read too often—a portion of the speech of Mr. Dulles at Louisville, Ky., on April 12, 1952. What he said cannot be explained away. It is a clear statement. He said:

> The treatymaking power is an extraordinary power, liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution, treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are, indeed, more supreme than ordinary laws for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body; and they can cut across the rights given to the people by their constitutional Bill of Rights.

That statement by Mr. Dulles is based upon the interpretation of the treaty section of the Constitution of the United States in Missouri against Holland and in subsequent decisions. It is a complete distortion of and in contradiction with the intent of the treatymaking power as it was conceived by those who drafted the Constitution.

Let me quote from what Alexander Hamilton said:

> The power of making treaties * * * relates neither to the execution of the subsisting laws, nor to the enaction of new ones

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

* * *. Its objects are contracts with foreign nations, which have the force of law, but derive it from the obligations of good faith. They are not rules prescribed by the sovereign to the subject, but agreements between sovereign and sovereign.

Mr. President, we have heard a great deal of discussion on the floor of the Senate, as a part of the tactics of the opposition, to the effect that we do not need any protection by an amendment such as is proposed, because Congress can undo anything that has been done by treaty.

Treaties rest upon the honor and obligation of our country. The national honor of the Nation is at stake. Great leaders of despotic powers, one now current, have treated international treaties as but scraps of paper, more to be violated than to be honored. This country, honorable in its history and faithful in its international dealings, does not dare to get into the position where Congress can abrogate the obligations of a treaty even with respect to those that apply as domestic law.

What are we confronted with at the present time? The junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] very forcefully pointed out the distinctions in time as between today and 20 years ago, when Missouri against Holland was decided.

I should like to read what Mr. Humphrey wrote in January 1948 in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences. Mr. Humphrey at the time was director of the Division of Human Rights of the United Nations. He said:

What the United Nations is trying to do is revoluntionary in character. Human rights are largely a matter of relationships between the state and individuals, and therefore a matter which has been traditionally regarded as being within the domestic jurisdiction of states. What is now being proposed is, in effect, the creation of some kind of supernational supervision of this relationship between the state and its citizens.

In order to support that position Mr. Acheson, as Secretary of State, propounded the revolutionary doctrine that there is no longer any real distinction between domestic and foreign affairs.

So we are faced now with a complete revolution in the relationship between the American citizen and his Government, unless we write definable terms into the Constitution for the protection of the constitutional rights which the citizen enjoys and which made this country the great nation it is today.

Mr. President, let us go back. Many Senators on the other side are inclined to follow the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, or at least to follow the celebration of his birthday anniversary. I believe Thomas Jefferson responded as clearly as any American to the yearning of a people to be free and to govern themselves, and to have their rights inviolate and protected against even the power of the Government, or the masses, or on organized minority, or whatever the power might be. This is what he said:

In questions of power, let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

That is what the Founding Fathers tried to do. Now a new philosophy is being evolved by so-called leaders and many of the opponents of the amendment. They ask us to have confidence in men. "Trust somebody," they say. They say we should trust two-thirds of the Senate. They say we should trust the President. Of course I trust the President, and I trust the Senate, within its proper province. But, if the Founding Fathers in the first Congress had followed that philosophy of government we would never have had the inalienable rights of the American people protected against the power of the Government itself.

There are many things I should like to call to the attention of the Senate, but as we go on our course as a free country I believe possibly the most threatening red flag will be seen in articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter. Already there have been submitted in the Supreme Court of the United States briefs contending that those articles are self-executing; that they are today the supreme law of the land; that the laws of the States and the laws of the country and the Constitution itself fall under the impact of those two sections. The Supreme Court has not yet determined whether they are self-executing.

If the first section of the amendment which I have proposed is adopted, the Senate can then ratify treaties, and they will not be self-executing as internal law in this country, unless the Senate expressly so provides by a two-thirds vote.

What does that mean? I believe the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] will agree with me, as I am sure the Senator from Michigan and the other lawyers in the Senate will agree with me, that when we began the practice of law, and a client came into our office and asked us what his rights were, we could go to the code of our State and look up the decisions, which we had a way of running down, and likewise look up the Federal law. Treaties at that time were pretty well known. They were not jammed through without opposition witnesses. Publicity was given to them. There was pretty wide discussion of treaties in that day. At least we could find out what they were. Now what happens? When a client comes into our office and asks what his rights are, we must not only go to our State code and look up State decisions, and go to the Federal code and look up Federal decisions, but we must also determine what treaties have been enacted, and whether or not they are self-executing and will become internal laws of the land, affecting the American people in their daily living and in their business affairs.

Not only must we do that, Mr. President, but we must search to see whether the President has done anything personally to affect the internal rights of the people by way of amending a law or wiping out the constitutions of the States or the laws of the States.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. And after we have found out about that, would it not also be necessary to determine whether such a treaty was self-executing or non-self-executing, so that the citizen, in the conduct of his everyday affairs, would know to what extent the treaty would be effective?

Mr. BRICKER. The citizen does not know what the courts will do today or what they will do 10 or 15 years from now. Not only must we wonder whether the President has done anything of that kind, but we must start to find out. I find that the President has made, according to the brief of the Attorney General, 200 agreements of the kind and character which amend domestic laws. The agreements are secret. I am trying to find out what they are. I doubt that I can. But the American people have no means of consulting the Secretary of State and saying, "What agreements has the President made? What have you advised him to do which has changed the laws of our land and wiped out constitutions of States as well as State laws?"

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I hope the Senator from Ohio had better luck in finding out what is in those executive agreements than some of us have had up until this time. I recall that as chairman of a subcommittee, I was never successful in finding out what our rights were in connection with certain military bases.

Mr. BRICKER. At one time it was claimed before the Foreign Relations Committee that a certain treaty was a substitute for executive agreements which had previously been entered into. I wrote to the State Department asking for a list of those agreements and their terms, and I received, on the morning of the beginning of the debate on the floor of the Senate, a letter marked "Top Secret," and all it said was, "We cannot give them to you." [Laughter.]

They did not have to write to me indicating that something was top secret. It would have been kept in confidence. They do not want to give away one iota of their power over the people of the United States.

Let me quote from Justice Curtis in his decision of a rather important case which goes back to the establishment of the thinking of our country throughout the years until 1920. He said:

If the people of the United States were to repeal as much of their Constitution as makes treaties their municipal law, no foreign sovereign with whom a treaty exists could justly complain, for it is not a matter with which he has any concern.

The foreign sovereign between whom and the United States a treaty has been made has a right to expect and require its stipulations to be kept with scrupulous good faith; but through what internal arrangements this shall be done is exclusively for the consideration of the United States. Whether the treaty shall itself be the rule of action of the people as well as the Government, whether the power to enforce and apply it shall reside in one department or another, neither the treaty itself nor any implication drawn from it gives him any right to inquire.

That should be the concept of our Nation today, because, Mr. President, is it any business of a South African, an Indian, a Britisher, or a Frenchman, what laws we have in the United States deal-

ing with our people in their internal relationships, man to man, and man to his government, be it local, State, or national?

I am supporting the position of the Secretary of State when he said that we cannot change and ought not to change internal law by entering into agreements with other nations. That is why I say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is half-way along the line with me, that all we want to do is to keep intact the rights of the American people proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence as being inviolate and God-given in the spiritual realm. The most dangerous thing in the world to human liberty is the greed for power. Our Nation was conceived upon the principle that public officials are public servants, and I want to keep them that way.

REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Delaware desire to have me yield for the purpose of allowing him to make an insertion in the RECORD, without losing my rights to the floor?

Mr. FREAR. I shall take about 5 minutes, if the Senator from Oregon will yield to me, without losing his rights to the floor, while I read a statement for the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to accommodate the Senator from Delaware, but with other Senators desiring to obtain the floor, to make speeches, I do not think it would be courteous of me to yield now for other than insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. FREAR. I understand. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. MORSE. I decline to yield for other than an insertion in the RECORD. I am certain the Senator from Delaware understands.

Mr. FREAR. I understand.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the representative of the Independent Party has made several short reports to the Senate this week, but they were not formal in nature. In my report today, I intend to be very brief, although I intend to cover 3 or 4 topics.

INCREASED TAX EXEMPTIONS

First, I wish to comment on the George proposal of today for tax relief. I point out that since 1947 the representative of the Independent Party has been urging consideration of at least some of the major principles involved in the George proposal, because I believe that since 1947 the tax remedies suggested by him have been sorely needed in the United States.

I desire to comment upon the particular proposal as to the increase in individual income-tax exemptions. I do not share the fear the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has today expressed on the floor of the Senate, that there would be any danger if the George proposal were adopted to increase the exemption, first, to $800, and, later, to $1,000. I do not believe we would run any danger of losing revenue as a result of any inflation that might flow from that kind of exemption. It is impossible for me to believe that with an economic situation which, on its face, justifies such an exemption, there would be any danger of inflation resulting from an increase in the purchasing power of the people. Indeed, Mr. President, it would be very difficult to find any economic argument which would support the conclusion that the purchasing of the bare necessities of life, for which most of the tax saving would be used, would result in any inflationary increase.

Not only that but what we are confronted with at present is a decrease both in purchasing power and purchasing desire. Do not forget the latter, because the principles of psychology have as much part to play in the operation of our economy as any other principles. In fact, when applied in this field, the principles of psychology are in and of themselves economic effects of a very realistic sort.

In my opinion, there is a clear obligation on the part of the National Government to proceed forthwith to come to the assistance of the people of low income, who are beginning to suffer great hardship as a result of the galloping recession which is going across the land.

I am glad that at long last the President of the United States is not shocked by the use of the word "recession." I am glad that at long last the President of the United States is beginning to pay attention to the fact that that is what we have. I hope that when he gets back from the golf course in California he will not wait until March to proceed to take some steps to curb it. I do not know whether his allusion to March is in keeping with the old maxim that if March comes in like a lion, it may go out like a lamb. I think March is going to come in with a lot of trouble for the American people, and such trouble is going to continue to mount and climb unless the President of the United States stops talking in platitudes and preachments and proposes some specific measures designed to end the growing unemployment.

HIGHWAY DEATHS

I was very much interested in the great concern of the President regarding the report which was made by the Safety Council concerning highway accidents and loss of life on our highways last year. More than 38,000 of our fellow citizens were killed, and many times that number were injured and maimed. In his statement to the press the President said he was very much concerned about such casualties. If I understand the President's remarks correctly, he means we should do something about that situation in our local communities. He means we have the responsibility of arousing public opinion in regard to casualties on American highways, and that we must do everything we can to enforce safety measures in order to decrease the number of such casualties. I agree. All that should be done. But, by and large, that is mere preachment; whereas, what we need to do is pay some attention to the facts which confront us in regard to highway accidents.

The undeniable fact, as agreed to by all experts whose writings or reports I have read or listened to, is that we have reached a point where the highway system of America cannot handle the traffic. That is just a physical fact. What we need is a network of superhighways from coast to coast and from north to south.

Statesmanship calls for building those highways for the happiness and for the welfare of the American people. I speak on this point as a member of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate. Although my colleagues may be a little surprised to hear me refer to my working on any committee, I wish to inform them that I am on that committee, and that I am devoting myself to the work of the committee to the best of my ability.

The Committee on Public Works is concerned with the highway problem facing America. The members of that committee know we are not going to win much of the battle to decrease casualties on the highways of America until something is done about building better highways.

With the construction industry in the doldrums today, and with unemployment increasing, I should like to suggest to the President, if he has time to listen to the suggestion during an hour of relaxation while he is in California, that between now and the first of March he ought to be proposing a highway-construction program involving the expenditure of some billions of dollars, but over a long period of time, bringing into the Treasury of the United States many times the cost of the construction of the superhighways, as a result of the tax revenue which will flow from the new wealth brought about by the greater use of the highways. Such construction should be done not only to meet the highway needs of the Nation, but also as one of the earliest steps which should be taken in order to check rising unemployment.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION A NECESSITY

While suggestions are being made, I think the President should also give consideration to what some of our educators believe to be a fact, namely, that today American boys and girls are going to school when school facilities are less adequate to meet their educational needs than they were in 1920. It is a dramatic fact—and I should like to preach a little Jeffersonian philosophy to the President of the United States on this point—that the strength of our democracy can be no greater than the enlightenment of our people; and the enlightenment of our people in no small measure depends upon the standard of the school facilities of the Nation. That is why I think, particularly in view of the unemployment problem, that we ought now to be taking steps in the interest of promoting the general welfare of our people. We should devote some of our national wealth to the construction of school facilities to the extent of a few billion dollars, as a means of helping to meet the onrushing recession, which

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I think now has reached the point of causing great suffering to large numbers of our fellow citizens.

TAXATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

While I am on this general subject, I should like to say a word regarding a problem in the District of Columbia, because I am also on the Committee on the District of Columbia. In a small way, considering its jurisdiction, it is an important committee. We had better do something, in my judgment, to check some of the recommendations which are coming out of the Congress these days about imposing upon the residents of the District of Columbia a tax system which certainly is a good example of what happens when people are taxed without representation. The residents and businesses of the District of Columbia, in my judgment, are about to be taken for a financial ride by a political Congress which has jurisdiction enabling it to impose an undue tax burden, knowing full well that the people of the District of Columbia have no representation, not even a nonvoting delegate in the Congress.

What are the proposals which are being incubated now in the congressional committees? First, that we increase the tax rates in the District of Columbia; that we increase the excise taxes; yes, even that we increase the tax on meals which the people in the District of Columbia have to eat and the groceries they must buy. We will have an interesting discussion of that subject when it reaches the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate, Mr. President, because I can assure my colleagues it is not going to be accepted in that committee without protest.

We ought to face the fact that the Congress of the United States has an obligation to have the people at large bear a greater share of the cost of operating the District of Columbia, for the reason that so much of the activity in the District of Columbia is Government business. I have been on the District of Columbia Committee long enough to satisfy myself that the Congress of the United States does not appropriate a fair share of the cost of operating the District of Columbia. I do not propose to be a party to an attempt to transfer to those least able to bear the burden, an undue share of the fiscal liabilities and obligations of the District of Columbia. I have no hesitancy in saying that all the people of the United States, including the people of my own State, should make a greater contribution, through their tax contributions, to the cost of operating the Capital City, so much of the expense of which is caused by the activities, functions, and business of the Federal Government.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S ECONOMIC POLICIES

Mr. President, in my Independent Party's report of January 27 on the growing economic recession and the absence of an administration program to counter it, the able Senator from Connecticut made a valiant effort to justify the administration's economic policies. During the course of my remarks on the unwise hard money policies instituted by the administration early in 1953, in which I was joined by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Connecticut asked:

Is it not true that in the period to which the Senator from Illinois refers (December 1952–May 1953) the index of the cost of living was rising and that it has also risen somewhat this year?

Mr. President, in the interest of clarifying the record, I have ascertained the facts relative to the period under discussion. They are as follows:

(a) Consumers' prices: The Consumers' Price Index reached a peak of 114.3 percent of the 1947–49 average in August 1952. The index declined in September, rose slightly in October and November, and again declined in December 1952. Consumers' prices continued to fall in January and February 1953. In February 1953 the Consumers' Price Index stood at 113.4, almost one full percentage point below the August 1952 level. Mr. President, the conclusion is that it was not rising during the period referred to by the Senator from Connecticut.

(b) Farm wholesale prices: Between August 1952 and February 1953, the wholesale-price index of farm products fell from 112.2 percent to 97.9 percent, a decline of 4.3 percentage points. Therefore, again I say that is evidence of the fact that the hard-money policy could not be justified at that time on the basis of any argument that it was necessary, in order to check inflation.

The hard-money policy was begun by the Federal Reserve Board in December. In January, on the day before the President's inauguration, the Federal Reserve announced the raising of the rediscount rate to 2 percent.

In February the Treasury made its first move to raise the general level of interest rates and to raise the cost of servicing the public debt by shifting from short-term to long-term security offerings.

Mr. President, the record is perfectly clear that the Eisenhower administration could not place on the Federal Reserve Board the full responsibility or, in my judgment, the primary responsibility for the hard-money policy. The fact is that the Secretary of the Treasury was urging a hard-money policy almost from the time when he took his oath of office. There is no question that the President of the United States was a party to the proposal for a hard-money policy. As I indicated in the colloquy on January 25, this administration cannot "have it both ways," and now take the position that the responsibility for this policy rests upon the Federal Reserve Board, when the fact of the matter is that the fiscal spokesmen for the administration were advocating a hard-money policy, and the Secretary of the Treasury himself strongly urged the high-interest-rate program.

The record shows that both consumers' prices and wholesale prices were falling when the hard-money policy was clamped on the economy. Therefore, that policy could not possibly be justified, on the basis of the facts, on the ground that it was necessary as a check upon inflation.

The subsequent renewal of consumer price increases after April was not due to any inflationary upsurge in demand. Instead, the consumers were administered price increases made by monopolies freed from OPS control, and the increases were primarily for the purpose of preparing for the downturn in the second half of 1953.

At another point in my report, the Senator from Connecticut asked whether I knew that repeal of the excess-profits tax was primarily for the purpose of benefiting small-business men. Mr. President, I know that repeal of the excess-profits tax will enable the giant monopolies to sustain from 25- to 37-percent declines in earnings before taxes, and still have higher net profits than those they enjoyed in 1953. That observation is such an important one in connection with this subject, that I desire to repeat it: I know that repeal of the excess-profits tax will enable the giant monopolies to sustain earning declines of from 25 to 37 percent before taxes, and still be left with higher net profits than those enjoyed in 1953. If the Senator from Connecticut knows of many small firms which could stand a 25-percent cut in sales in 1 year and still remain in business—let alone retain the same after-tax income—then the risks have generally been removed from business.

The January 25, 1954 issue of Barron's magazine explains how it is possible for Big Steel to sustain a drop in output of 20 percent or more and increase after-tax profits. I refer to the article Steel Myth, subtitled "There Is No Magic in 100 Percent Capacity Operations":

With operations below capacity, steelmen can retire old and obsolete equipment, and in many cases they will be happy to do so. It is estimated that for the industry as a whole there is 6 to 8 million tons of production which is marginal, obsolete and costly.

Referring to the shutdowns at Homestead and Duquesne, Pa., and the planned shutdowns at Vandegrift, Pa., the article notes:

All this is tough on employment but it could lead to considerable cost savings.

Of course, Mr. President, the statement that business practice is "tough" on employment is an interesting comment. I'll say it is. But it illustrates how important it is to coordinate a Government program with a business program. If we leave these problems solely to business, if we look only to business to protect the employment interests of the workers of the United States, then, Mr. President, let me tell you, there will be periodic slumps in employment; and those who will suffer will not be big business, but will be the persons who are unemployed, because big business will protect its economic interests, through the resulting unemployment, as is pointed out by the quotation I have just given from Barron's magazine. That is why it is necessary, in order to preserve our great system of free enterprise, in which I believe, that we have a supplemental, coordinated Government program available at all times, so as to see to it that the little people of America, the unemployed workers, do not pay the cost of these maneuvers on the part of big business, when it is to the advantage

of big business to have a period of unemployment.

I say that these observations from Barron's point out the kind of monopoly cost-accounting that underlies the economic philosophy of those who counsel against aggressive Government action until a 25 or 30 percent decline has taken place.

The sad thing is that when we deal with declines of from 25 to 30 percent, we are dealing, not with cold statistics of production, but with bone and flesh and blood of human beings who are out of work as a result of the economic policies put into practice by business. It is in regard to those workers, those producers, that I continue to argue that the Government has a responsibility. It was in regard to those workers that we enacted the so-called Full Employment Act of 1946. Someone ought to place a copy of that act on the President's desk. I am afraid he is not aware of the existence of that law, because if he were aware of the purposes of the Full Employment Act of 1946 we would not be waiting for the Ides of March before talking about taking action to put men to work. We would not let the business practice of a decline of 25 or 30 percent go into operation before starting to consider the human interests of people who are unemployed.

On January 27, during the exchange with the able Senator from Connecticut I observed that many times in my experience here I have seen how big business benefits were obtained under the guise of helping small business. This experience prompted me to check the official records so that in case the Senator from Connecticut was correct and I was mistaken, I would have to revise my impressions gained from outmoded experiences.

The Treasury Department's latest data are for 1950. Statistics of Income for the year 1950 show that 2,752 corporations earning $1 million or more, out of a total of 424,000 corporations that paid taxes in 1950, accounted for 77.2 percent of all excess-profits tax payments. Within this group, 333 corporations earning $10 million or more in 1950 accounted for 55 percent of all excess-profits tax payments. Perhaps the Senator from Connecticut has a more prosperous small-business constituency than does the Senator from Oregon.

In discussing the administration's tax proposals I said they would in the main benefit the wealthiest businesses and individuals. I pointed out particularly the proposal for increasing the current volume of tax-free provision of financial reserves for depreciation of plant and equipment was unnecessary. I supplied data to show that the current volume of depreciation allowance was excessive.

In the Barron's article to which I referred above I found the following additional evidence to support my contention that accelerated depreciation is unnecessary:

> United States Steel may well earn around $5.90 a common share (in 1954) against $7.50 last year; Armco $5 against $6.50; Republic $7.40 compared with $9.25. Bethlehem would be hit harder, down to $7 from $11.50.
>
> Though the projected declines are not small, in each case current dividends would be well covered. And even this does not tell the whole story since earnings on a cash basis—due to the tremendous throwoff in accelerated amortization charges—provide still further coverage. In the case of United States Steel, this would mean an additional $2 a share in 1954; Armco $1; Republic $4.50. Bethlehem will not have plant writeoffs in excess of expenditures this year though it will in future years.
>
> The policy of rapid writeoffs and of storing up cash depreciation reserves in excess of expenditures to cover dividend payments in leaner years was also followed up through 1929. And in 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933 when the bottom fell out of the economy, and corporate profits after taxes were negative, corporate dividend payments continued to be made. In the very depths of the depression, corporate dividends continued to be paid.
>
> In 1930 corporate dividend payments exceeded after-tax net income by $3,045 million.
>
> In 1931–33 corporations showed an after-tax loss of $5.1 billions. Dividends paid during the same period totaled $9 billion. In the 9-year period 1930–38 dividend payments to corporate stockholders exceeded corporate net profits after taxes. For the period as a whole the excess of dividends paid over after-tax profits, including losses, was $20 billion. This came mainly from excess cash reserves set up for the ostensible purpose of replacing worn out plant and equipment in the future.
>
> Is the administration's rapid write-off tax proposal the means by which stockholders in favored corporations are to be taken care of in the next 9 lean years, with growing unemployment occurring at the same time. Have we reached the point where we are more interested in protecting the dividends of corporations than in providing jobs for unemployed fellow Americans?

When I made my report on the administration's economic policies I did not expect my appraisals to be confirmed as fast as they actually are. Indeed the day I asserted the deflationary debt-management policies that contributed to the recession had not been abandoned the Secretary confirmed this. The Secretary of the Treasury announced a record-breaking $21 billion proposed shift of short-term into longer-term securities.

Nearly $13 billion of short-term debt paying 1⅜ percent and 2¼ percent interest maturing in February and March is to be refinanced. Holders may exchange for either a 2½ percent 7-year-9-month bond or a 1-year certificate paying 1⅞ percent. In addition the Treasury will offer holders of $6 billion of 2-percent bonds and $2.2 billion of 2¼-percent bonds not due or callable currently, an exchange for the new 2½s. If investors elect to exchange all of the eligible securities for the new 2½-percent bonds the annual cost of servicing the public debt would be raised more than $100 million for each of the next 8 years.

More important than increasing the cost of servicing the public debt the Treasury by increasing the supply of bonds will tend to reverse any tendency for interest rates to decline and may pave the way for increases on new borrowing later this year.

Shifting from short-term into longer-term securities under the new free market principle of flexible bond prices will also reduce the liquidity of banks and other investors in Treasury securities, and thereby tend to restrict the availability of credit.

Mr. President, in concluding this part of my report I wish to point out to the President of the United States that he has done a job for the investors of the country in protecting their economic security. The time has come now for him to do a job for the unemployed so that they can have some security which will assure them the necessities of life. That is why he should come forward with a coordinated economic program in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Full Employment Act of 1946, of which he apparently is unaware. It is a program which, if followed, would result in the Government doing what is necessary to be done in order to put men back to work.

With regard to the tax phases of the topic which I have discussed, I not only shall support the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in the principle of his tax proposal of today, but I may, upon further study of it, come to the conclusion that he has not gone far enough, and that therefore amendments may be needed to raise the exemption to a point higher than he proposes. I shall reserve judgment on that question until I have studied additional evidence on the issue.

INCREASED EXEMPTION ON CHILDREN'S EARNINGS

However, I should like to recommend to the Senator from Georgia, inasmuch as he is a member of the Committee on Finance, that he in turn do what he can to assist me in obtaining early hearings on S. 1568, which has been reposing in the files of the Committee on Finance for some time. It is a bill which seeks to help the parents of America, both financially and with the moral training of their children. It is a tax bill which I offered some time ago. It proposes to increase from $600 to $1,200 the amount of money a child may earn without charging the parent on the tax return for the earning of the child.

In the short speech I made when I introduced the bill on the floor of the Senate I pointed out that a great many parents have children in high school or college who earn a part of their school expenses by taking part-time jobs, and that a good many of them find themselves in the position of having to stop when they have earned $599, because if they go over that amount it results in little or no family saving.

As every parent in the Senate knows, it is impossible to send a boy or girl to college these days for anything like $1,200 a year. When we send a boy or girl to college, if the child earns $1,200 toward his college expenses, we are faced with a substantial expense over and above $1,200.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

What is happening to the younger generation with regard to that point illustrates how a policy of the Government can result in developing some undesirable attitudes of young people toward Government policy.

In fact, I may say quite bluntly that it has a bad effect on the ethical standards of a great many of our young people. It encourages them to develop an attitude of somehow playing against their Government instead of working in cooperation with it. The economic facts are on my side of the issue so far as that bill is concerned.

The Senator from Georgia and his colleagues on the Committee on Finance should not only give early hearings to the bill but report it for favorable action at the earliest opportunity, so that that kind of tax relief may be provided to parents of boys and girls who are able to earn more than $600 and who want to earn more than $600, but who do not earn more. Instead, what do most of them do?

After a child earns $599 he says, "I might as well quit now for the rest of the summer." I do not believe that promotes very good child training.

Mr. President, in closing my report today I shall offer a few insertions for the RECORD which have accumulated over the past few weeks. I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to the committee amendment, inserting on page 3, after line 9, a new section.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this is an opportunity I long have sought. I assumed this afternoon that I would be able to speak directly after the distinguished Senator from Ohio had spoken. My name was on the list, but, somehow or other, it disappeared from the desk. But that is neither here nor there. The only reason I wanted the opportunity to speak earlier was that I have been absent from the Senate because of illness, but I shall, in spite of that, endeavor to carry on.

I took the floor in the early days of this debate and stated that the Bricker amendment or any of its "kinfolk" was unnecessary and, what is more, dangerous.

I have read that great minds discuss ideas, mediocre minds discuss things, and small minds discuss people. I shall discuss ideas.

Mr. President, in the opening days of the debate we heard certain principles or notions put forward which I shall recapitulate.

Claim 1: That under present rulings of the Supreme Court, the President, by making a treaty which is then approved by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators voting, can thereby make a law which will violate the Constitution.

This statement is false.

The Supreme Court has never in its history enunciated such a doctrine. Indeed, the Supreme Court has stated repeatedly that a treaty cannot do that which the Constitution forbids. See, for examples, *Clark* v. *Braden* ((1953) 10 How. 635) and *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* ((1890), 133 U. S. 258).

Claim 2: That under present rulings of the Supreme Court, the President alone, by making an executive agreement, can thereby make a law which will violate the Constitution.

This claim is absolutely false. No Supreme Court decision has so held. None will so hold as long as our present constitutional system exists. In fact it is highly questionable whether executive agreements, except those having statutory implementation of Congress, are part of the supreme law of the land to the same extent as statutory or treaty law. McClure himself has disagreed with this falsity that in agreement can violate the Constitution. See McClure, International Executive Agreements: Democratic Procedure under the Constitution of the United States (1941), pages 342–343. See also *United States* v. *Guy W. Capps, Inc.* ((1953) 204 F. 2d 331).

Claim 3: That the Supreme Court does not now have the power to declare a treaty unconstitutional.

In making such a claim, proponents set themselves above the Supreme Court as interpreters of the Constitution. The claim is, of course, false. It ignores the specific grant of judicial power to the Supreme Court in article III, section 2, clause 1. Chief Justice Marshall judicially pronounced the complete supremacy of the Constitution in *Marbury* v. *Madison* ((1803) 1 Cr. 137, 178). Mr. Chief Justice Taney plainly indicated in *Clark* v. *Braden* ((1853) 16 How. 635, 656) that the Supreme Court would annul a treaty if it violated the Constitution. The Supreme Court in the *Cherokee Tobacco* ((1870) 11 Wall. 616, 620–621) clearly said that a treaty cannot be held valid if it violates the Constitution.

The absurdity of proponents' claim is shown by the numerous instances where the Supreme Court has set a treaty provision aside merely because it conflicted with an ordinary act of Congress which was subsequent in date. Cherokee Tobacco, supra, *Hijo* v. *United States* ((1904) 194 U. S. 315), and numerous other cases.

Claim 4: That the President's treaty-making power is not affected in the slightest by the provisions of the Bricker amendment.

This is another basic error. It absolutely ignores the fact that most treaties of friendship and commerce reciprocally guarantee certain rights to nationals while in the country. In the United States most of these rights ordinarily are within the police power of the States. At the time of the Constitutional Convention, the Confederation was at a dead end as far as foreign commerce was concerned because the Confederation Government of the United States could not reciprocally guarantee rights of nationals of foreign countries. Consequently we had lost friends and allies sorely needed in those troublous times. This situation was rectified largely in that grant of treatymaking and executive powers in the Constitution. To say that the Bricker Amendment does not affect the President's powers ignores history and the Constitution.

Claim 5: That at the time of the adoption of the Constitution each of the original States possessed the peculiar features of sovereignty including the powers of making war or peace or alliances or treaties.

This is refuted by history and Supreme Court pronouncements. See Penhallow against Doane and other cases. The Second Continental Congress met in Philadelphia, May 10, 1775, and continued until the First Congress in 1789. The Continental Congress was not a council of 13 independent States. The United States, through the Continental Congress, not 13 separate States, was recognized by France, Holland, and Spain, three of the most important nations of the civilized world. It, not 13 separate States, made the treaty of peace after having raised an army and navy, directed a war, contracted debts, and performed many other recognized incidents of sovereignty in the name of the people of the United States, not the States.

Claim 6: That the Constitution has been repeatedly violated by exercise of the treaty power.

This statement is viciously false. Repeated assertions of the fallacy have been taken by proponents of amendment to have established the proposition. A treaty provision cannot even violate a subsequent act of Congress. That has been established time and time again.

I have been absent from this floor for almost 10 days, and my information with reference to these matters has come from the little time I have had to read the RECORD. When I was a boy, Mr. President, my father gave me a dollar watch, and, of course, being of an inquisitive turn of mind, I took it apart and could not get it together again. My father taught me the lesson, as a consequence, not to take a valuable watch and tinker with the works.

I remember, also, that when I was a boy one of my inquisitive friends wanted to see how close he could get to a buzzsaw, and he got so close that he lost a finger.

Mr. President, we have a Constitution of the United States, and we should not tinker with it. We should not fool around with it, because, by so doing, we are likely to endanger the peace, the dignity, and the precious liberties of the American people.

Claim 7: That under present rulings of the Supreme Court, the President, by making a treaty which is then approved by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators voting, can thereby make a law which will override State laws enacted within the reserved powers of the States under the Constitution.

This is a deliberately misleading statement. The reserve clause does not and never did vest such exclusive jurisdiction in the States in matters properly

the subject of treatymaking so that the Federal Government was left powerless. In fact, the power to treat such matters when they were proper subjects of international concern, was specifically denied to the States—article I, section 10, clause 1. See Madison's statement, Federalist, No. 44.

Claim 8: That the supremacy clause—article V, clause 2—of the Constitution makes the Supreme Court of the United States powerless to do anything about a treaty which contradicts our Constitution or any of its laws.

This type of statement is not only absolutely false, it also shows a shocking disregard for constitutional law, particularly article III, section 2, clause 1. Time after time the Supreme Court has held that an ordinary provision of law enacted by the Congress prevailed and has decided against the treaty provision.

First. *The Chinese Exclusion* case ((1889) 130 U. S. 581).

Second. *The Cherokee Tobacco* ((1871 11 Wall. 616).

Third. *The Hard Money* cases ((1884) 112 U. S. 580).

Fourth. *Hijo* v. *U. S.* ((1904) 194 U. S. 315).

Fifth. *La Abra Silver Mining Co.* v. *U. S.* ((1889) 175 U. S. 423).

Claim 9: That under present rulings of the Supreme Court, the President, by making a treaty which is then approved by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators voting, can thereby make a law which will override State laws enacted within the reserved powers of the States under the Constitution.

This is a deliberately misleading statement. The reserve clause does not and never did vest such exclusive jurisdiction in the States in matters properly the subject of treatymaking that the Federal Government was powerless. In fact, the power to treat such matters when they were proper subjects of international concern, was specifically denied to the States—Article I, section 10, clause 1. See Madison's statement, Federalist, No. 44.

Claim 10: That the alternative argument to proposed section 3, relating to executive agreements, must be that the President shall continue to have the power to make law by executive agreement which cannot be changed by Congress, and that such agreements may violate the Constitution and become law in the United States even though the Congress under the Constitution could not enact any such law.

This claim is deliberately misleading. Executive agreements, with very few possible exceptions, are subject to change and control by acts of Congress just as are treaties. The only exceptions are those agreements relating to receiving ambassadors—article II, section 3—and possibly some agreements entered into in the exercise by the President of constitutional powers as Commander in Chief. However, even these constitutional powers of the President must be exercised in a manner consonant with other grants of constitutional power, particularly those granted to Congress. As commander in chief, the President commands only those forces which Congress provides—I–8–12 and I–8–13— and governs through statutory law providing rules and regulations—article I, section 8, clause 14.

Claim 11: That for the first time in the history of the United States, the Supreme Court, in Missouri against Holland, permitted the Federal Government to accomplish, under the auspices of a treaty, what the Constitution did not permit it to do in the absence of a treaty.

This claim is absolutely false. It shows an unfortunate lack of knowledge of constitutional history and law.

The Constitution authorizes treaties covering subjects ordinarily left to the States, provided they are proper subjects of international concern. This includes matters such as inheritance of local property and multiple taxation of nations—*Chirac* v. *Chirac* ((1817) 2 Wheat. 259); *Burnett* v. *Brooks* ((1933) 288 U. S. 378).

Mr. President, I have read the 11 claims. I have one other statement to make.

Is the proposed amendment to the Constitution necessary? The following principles are, and have been since 1797, a part of United States constitutional law.

First. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with the Constitution of the United States is void. This principle has been enunciated by Chief Justice Taney in *Clark* v. *Braden* (16 How. 653). See also *The Cherokee Tobacco* ((1871) 11 Wall. 616); Geofroy against Riggs (1890), and other treaty decisions.

Second. The power to make treaties with foreign powers is limited to matters which are the proper subject of international relations. These standards are clearly stated in Geofroy against Riggs, supra, *Missouri* v. *Holland* ((1920) 252 U. S. 416) and other treaty decisions.

Third. Congress has power to enforce, amend, or repeal treaties and other agreements by the United States and foreign powers.

This principle was clearly stated in the *Hard Money* cases ((1884) 112 U. S. 580). It is consonant with *Ware* v. *Hylton* ((1797) 3 Dall. 199). With respect to agreements, it is demonstrated in the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 and in the application of the Reciprocal Trade Acts.

(At this point Mr. WILEY yielded to Mr. FREAR, who addressed the Senate on the subject of the International Wheat Agreement. His remarks appear after the conclusion of Mr. WILEY's speech.)

Mr. WILEY. There was another claim made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio this afternoon. He stated, in substance, that by making an executive agreement, the President thereby could make a law which would violate the Constitution. I do not hold with the Senator from Ohio on that point, and I believe no Supreme Court decision has so held.

Mr. President, what we are trying to do now is to sustain the division of powers which was provided by the Founding Fathers. Therefore, the President of the United States, having the best advice which the Nation can afford him, has reached the conclusion, and has so stated, that he, for one, will not agree that there shall be any amendment which would, in substance, punch a hole into the Constitution by changing the system of checks and balances.

This claim is absolutely false. No Supreme Court decision has so held. None will so hold as long as our present constitutional system, of a government of laws and not men, exists.

It is highly questionable whether executive agreements, except those having statutory implementation or based on statutory authorization by acts of Congress, or those involving the constitutional powers of the President such as to receive ambassadors and operate as Commander in Chief, without more, are part of the supreme law of the land. Yet, the proponents of the Bricker amendment persist in falsely claiming that the alternative to their proposal must be that the President shall continue to make law by executive agreement which cannot be changed by Congress, and that such agreements may violate the Constitution and become law in the United States even though Congress could not enact such law. Such claims not only are false; they are deliberately misleading.

Mr. President, how wise our forefathers were in leaving the matter of judicial determination not in the hands of Senators or other legislators, but in the hands of the courts. Thank God that power was not placed in the hands of the Senate, because we have seen some rather squeamish reasoning on subjects which have been here involved.

Executive agreements, with two constitutional exceptions already noted, are subject to change and control by acts of Congress, just as are treaties. Those exceptions are agreements relating to receiving ambassadors—article II, section 3—and possibly some agreements entered into by the President in the exercise of his constitutional powers as Commander in Chief. However, even such constitutional powers of the President must be exercised in harmony with other grants of constitutional powers, particularly those powers granted to Congress. As Commander in Chief, the President commands only those forces which Congress by statutory law has provided—article I, section 8, clause 12, and article I, section 8, clause 13—and governs through statutory law prescribing rules and regulations—article I, section 8, clause 14.

The false claim is made by the proponents of the Bricker amendment that, under the rulings of the Supreme Court, the President, by making an executive agreement, can make law which will override State laws enacted within the reserved powers of the States under the Constitution. This false claim may be based on misunderstanding or misapprehension of the import of the decisions arising out of the Litvinov assignment. I have already shown that no powers were reserved to the States to treat with foreign nations concerning problems of proper international concern which otherwise would fall within State jurisdiction. Keeping this proposition in mind, I now invite attention to the Recognition Agreement cases which are the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

basis for the false claims of the proponents of the Bricker amendment—*United States* v. *Belmont* ((1937) 301 U. S. 324).

The decision resulted from the demand of the United States upon the executors of August Belmont for payment of money deposited with him prior to 1918 by the Petrograd Metal Work Corporation of Russia, and the refusal by the executors to turn the money over to the Government of the United States.

The Soviet Government, on June 28, 1918, had decreed the confiscation of the property of the corporation, including its account with Belmont. Thereafter, the Soviet Government assigned that account to the Government of the United States as incident to a recognition agreement. The assignment was based on an exchange of correspondence between Commissar Litvinov and President Roosevelt.

It was judicially held that the intent expressed in the agreement was to assign all the claims of the Soviet Government to the Government of the United States. See *U. S.* v. *Bank of New York and Trust Co.* ((1935) 77 F. 2d 866, 871). This litigation established the fact that the chief interest of the United States was the protection of claims of our citizens and nationals rather than those of foreign claimants. However, New York passed a law—New York Session Laws, 1936, chapter 917, adding Civil Practice Act, section 997–b—providing that the title of the confiscating government was not to be recognized at least until after the expiration of the period within which creditors or stockholders could claim the assets. See 85 F. 2d 542, 544. Concerning this situation, the Supreme Court stated—Three Hundred and First United States Reports, page 330:

> We take judicial notice of the fact that coincident with the assignment set forth in the complaint, the President recognized the Soviet Government, and normal diplomatic relations were established between that Government and the Government of the United States, followed by an exchange of Ambassadors. The effect of this was to validate, so far as this country is concerned, all acts of the Soviet Government here involved from the commencement of its existence. The recognition, establishment of diplomatic relations, the assignment, and agreements with respect thereto, were all parts of one transaction, resulting in an international compact between the two Governments. That the negotiations, acceptance of the assignment, and agreements and understandings in respect thereof were within the competence of the President may not be doubted. Governmental power over internal affairs is distributed between the National Government and the several States. Governmental power over external affairs is not distributed, but is vested exclusively in the National Government.

What does this decision, then, say? It says the power is in the President to negotiate such understandings, and such power cannot be thwarted by a State. What it did not say, because it was obvious, was that Congress could by statute have the final word respecting the disposition of these deposits. *U. S.* v. *Pink* ((1942) 315 U. S. 203).

It is said that a treaty is a law of the land under the supremacy clause—clause 2 of article VI. "Such international compacts and agreements as the Litvinov assignment have a similar dignity."

That case was the judicial byproduct of the Litvinov assignment. Pursuant to the assignment, which was part of the recognition of the Soviet Government, on November 16, 1933, the United States brought an action to recover assets of a New York branch of a Russian insurance company then in the custody of New York Superintendent of Insurance Pink.

Although the Russian corporation had been nationalized and its property, wherever situated, purportedly confiscated by a 1918 decree of the Soviets, that decree had not been given effect in New York. The New York office had continued to operate until 1925, when Superintendent Pink took possession of its assets pursuant to a court order. In subsequent liquidation proceedings, all domestic creditors were satisfied. Payments to foreign creditors had barely commenced when the proceedings were stayed pending a disposition of the claim of the United States. The decision of the New York Court of Appeals was adverse to the claims of the United States—*United States* v. *Pink* ((1940) 284 N. Y. 555; 32 N. E. 2d 552)—but the decision was reversed by the United States Supreme Court. Speaking for the majority, Mr. Justice Douglas said:

> There is no constitutional reason why this Government need act as the collection agent for nationals of other countries when it takes steps to protect itself or its own nationals on external debts. There is no reason why it may not, through such devices as the Litvinov assignment, make itself and its nationals whole from assets here before it permits such assets to go abroad in satisfaction of claims of aliens made elsewhere and not incurred in connection with business conducted in this country. The fact that New York has marshaled the claims of the foreign creditors here involved and authorized their payment does not give them immunity from that general rule.
>
> If the priority had been accorded American claims by treaty with Russia, there would be no doubt as to its validity. Compare *Santovincenzo* v. *Egan*, supra. The same result obtains here. The powers of the President in the conduct of foreign relations included the power, without consent of the Senate, to determine the public policy of the United States with respect to the Russian nationalization decrees. "What government is to be regarded here as representative of a foreign sovereign state is a political rather than a judicial question, and is to be determined by the political department of the government." *Guaranty Trust Co.* v. *United States*, supra (304 U. S. at p. 137). That authority is not limited to a determination of the government to be recognized. It includes the power to determine the policy which is to govern the question of recognition. Objections to the underlying policy as well as objections to recognition are to be addressed to the political department and not to the courts.

In recognition of such a situation, Congress had passed the act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1199), providing for the adjudication by a commissioner of claims of American nationals against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Having found the power, due process was satisfied. For further information, see House Report 865, 76th Congress.

No broad "recognition doctrine" was established by that decision. It merely held that State policy could not thwart national policy in a delicate international situation. It did not hold that Congress was powerless to set aside that arrangement or similar arrangements. Only the situation giving rise to the decisions was unusual, but it must be remembered that the United States was dealing with an unusual nation.

Mr. President, I am sorry I was unable to listen to my friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] make his presentation a week or so ago. I have read his remarks with some concern. They had the sound of a cause in extremis. Perhaps that is why he named, with what appeared to me to be disrespect, some of the truly great American citizens of our day—John W. Davis, Anna Lord Straus, William D. Mitchell, Dr. Edward S. Corwin, and many others. I might say, parenthetically, that the Senator from Ohio quoted Mr. Davis today. Apparently the Senator holds Mr. Davis in high esteem. I say to the Senator that the people I have named do not need my defense or the defense of any other person. They are eminently equipped to defend themselves. They understand the need of maintaining intact the Constitution, as does the President of the United States.

The Senator from Ohio states that opposition to his amendment comes from those who yearn for the domination of a supernational government—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 5, 1954, page 1418. I take the implication to be that under the present Constitution this "domination by a supernational government" could be accomplished merely by a peaceful treaty arrangement. I say to my friend the Senator from Ohio that this could be accomplished only by action of "We the People" of the United States, in whom rests the true sovereign power; and it would require an amendment to the Constitution to accomplish that end. I further say to the Senator from Ohio that even if his amendment were adopted, the result would be no different. A constitutional amendment would be required to establish "the domination of a supernational government."

The Senator from Ohio is again wrong, and I disapprove of what he says, but as Voltaire is supposed to have said, "I will defend to the death your right to say it."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] has said that the executive agreement in the Pink case was never brought before the Senate for ratification, and that the Senate never had an opportunity to study it. He states:

> It was an agreement made solely by the President on his own initiative, and, in my opinion, it violated the fifth amendment and set aside laws of the sovereign State of New York without any action whatever on the part of the Senate of the United States. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 4, 1954, p. 1313.)

Let us examine that statement. Of course the recognition agreement was made solely by the President. He did it in the direct exercise of his constitutional power to receive ambassadors and other public ministers—article II, section 2, clause 1. As part of the recog-

nition agreement, the matter of claims of nationals was adjusted. The Supreme Court decided that this was not an undue extension of the power. Further, the Congress of the United States foreclosed all possible doubt by passing legislation for the adjudication of these claims. It is my understanding that the Senate of the United States did take part in this action—section 53, Statutes 1199.

The Senator from Maryland states his opinion that the agreement violated the fifth amendment. He thus sets himself above the Supreme Court as an interpreter of the Constitution of the United States. Even the late Chief Justice Stone made no such claim in that case. In his dissents, the Chief Justice did not question the power to make such an agreement; he questioned the fact that such an agreement accomplishing the transfer had been made—*U. S.* v. *Pink* ((1942) 315 U. S. 203, 250–251).

Further, he did not think that recognition required full faith and credit with respect to the admitted import of the Soviet confiscation decrees—id. page 251–252. His objection was to what he believed was the making of policy by the Supreme Court's sayings:

> Under our dual system of Government, there are many circumstances in which the legislative and executive branches of the National Government may, by affirmative action expressing its policy, enlarge the exercise of Federal authority and thus diminish the power which otherwise might be exercised by the States. It is indispensable to the orderly administration of the system that such alteration of powers and the consequent impairment of State and private rights should not turn on conceptions of policy which, if ever entertained by the only branch of the Government authorized to adopt it, has been left unexpressed. It is not for this Court to adopt policy, the making of which has been by the Constitution committed to other branches of the Government. It is not its function to supply a policy where none has been declared or defined and none can be inferred (p. 256).

Recently the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] discussed the Migratory Bird case. My distinguished associate is a careful student of law and government; a person of considerable scholarly attainment. I am certain that he did not mean to oversimplify this decision and its background. Does not the Senator from Illinois recall from his studies that legislation on the subject of migratory birds was under consideration as early as 1904? That during the period prior to the first act in 1913, the use of a treaty arrangement to take care of the problem was seriously discussed?—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 49, page 1489. In fact, Senator Elihu Root, of New York, presented a resolution—Senate Resolution 428, 62d Congress—requesting the President to negotiate a treaty, with other North American nations, for the protection and preservation of migratory birds—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 49, page 1494.

Senator McLean introduced a similar resolution—Senate Resolution 25, 63d Congress—which was adopted by the Senate—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 50, page 2340. So the treaty arrangement was not something hatched up at the last minute by Chief Justice White, Justice Holmes, or anybody else.

I want to read to you Dr. Borchard's own account of his part in the problem. I have heretofore brought this to the attention of the Senate in my memorandum inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 12, page A4470. I repeat the statement by Borchard—Treaties and Executive Agreements, Yale Law Journal, volume 54: 616, pages 632–633:

> The Federal cases were brought on appeal to the United States Supreme Court. Chief Justice White was very anxious to sustain the statute as essential to the operations of Government, for he observed, as did Justice Holmes in Missouri against Holland, that the States were quite unreliable in safeguarding this great natural resource, so necessary to agriculture. But the Court stood divided 3 to 3, 3 judges being ill or absent. The Chief Justice thereupon held the cases undecided upon until a full bench could sit, but in the meantime engaged the writer, then librarian of the Supreme Court, to make an exhaustive study of the law from Roman times until the present, to endeavor to show that the Federal Government must possess the power of bird regulation. The study, which occupied several months, reached the conclusion that the States alone were the repositories of the power to regulate migratory birds, since by no possibility could this migratory resource be called interstate commerce, which depends on acts of man. In the conversations with the Chief Justice and Dr. Holmes, of the Bureau of Animal Industry, there developed an idea, earlier suggested in a resolution introduced by Senator McLean, of Connecticut, that a treaty with Canada might be concluded, whereupon the legislation could be enacted again and rest for its constitutional justification upon the implementation of a treaty.

That, according to Borchard, is how the situation was established. Please note, Borchard refers to Dr. Holmes, of the Bureau of Animal Industry, not to Mr. Justice Holmes. Further, Borchard did not say to Chief Justice White: "You are on sound ground." His own account said he found no possibility that this migratory resource could be called interstate commerce. To this, the Senator from Ohio dissents, stating last Thursday that the results might well have been sustained under the commerce clause—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 28, 1954, page 939.

The Senator from Illinois asks: "Is it, then, so strange that when an issue of this kind is presented to the country and to the Senate of the United States, men should have deep convictions on the subject?"

I believe that they should have deep convictions, but they should be based on full knowledge and facts. They should not be based on fears, especially when knowledge and facts can dispel those fears.

Missouri against Holland did not expand the authority vested in Congress by the Constitution. Missouri against Holland represents a proper action by the Senate, the President, and later the Congress in the proper exercise of treaty powers specifically granted by the Constitution of the United States to the Senate and the President and just as specifically denied to each and every State. The other day I was glad to hear the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] state he had no trouble in understanding the case of Missouri against Holland. Yet, that was another case from which many of the fears and conjured-up apparitions have been developed.

The Senator from Illinois tried to lull us into the belief that the 1920's were peaceful and lackadaisical times. I remember how easily the words flowed from the mouth of the Senator when he was speaking of the peaceful twenties. There are few Senators here who will not remember the "roaring twenties" which began and ended in a terrific uproar. Need I remind my colleagues of prohibition, gang warfare, Teapot Dome, the stockmarket boom and crash, and the rest of the turbulence of that period? They were not years of "sweetness and tranquillity," as the Senator from Illinois should recall on second thought. Sometimes I think the salubrious, exhilarating atmosphere of the Senate does strange things to great minds.

The Senator from Illinois asks: "Do we have to wait until the horse is stolen before we lock the stable?" Well, in 165 years there has been no horse stolen. I say to the Senator that his question is improperly framed. The question is: "Shall we seal the door so that we cannot use the horse at all?"

The Senator from Illinois somehow gets Missouri against Holland all mixed up with Yalta and Potsdam. Adding to the confusion is the statement of the Senator from Ohio and his proposed amendment "would require legislation only if the treaty or executive agreement should become internal law"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 28, 1954, page 946. Either the Senator from Illinois infers too much, or the Senator from Ohio claims too little.

The Senator speaks of the Steel Seizure case. I say to the Senator that it was never inferred in the dissent that a treaty obligation could form a basis for ignoring or overruling the Constitution. If such an inference had even been suggested, it would have been noted by the majority and refuted. Discussions of treaty obligations cannot be taken rightfully out of context wherein are enumerated the statutory powers and obligations, particularly those of the Universal Military Training Act and the Defense Production Act.

The Senator from Illinois speaks of "an implementing act of Parliament" whenever a treaty has internal effect in Great Britain. Will the Senator cite such an act whereby the United Nations Charter was ratified?

I have seen a subsequent act whereby Great Britain qualified the application of a certain provision in a manner consonant with the power of Congress to pass a statute to amend, enforce, or repeal the effect of a treaty provision. See the Head Money cases.

The Senator from Illinois asks, "What about the Fujii case? What about the Oyama case?" Then he says, "There was Perez against Lippold."

What about those cases? Each was decided under the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America. They were not decided contrary to it. Does the Senator wish to abolish the Gettysburg Address and the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

teachings of the Apostle Paul because they were also mentioned in one of those cases with the United Nations as holding aspirations for a better world?

THE FERGUSON-KNOWLAND-MILLIKIN-SALTONSTALL SUBSTITUTE

Mr. President, because I was ill when the Ferguson-Knowland-Millikin-Saltonstall amendment in the nature of a substitute was introduced, I wish to say a few words about it. This proposed substitute has some of the same language in section 1 that is found in section 1 of the George substitute, and it is completely objectionable for the same reasons that the substitute is objectionable. In addition, however, it inserts further language so that section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, as reported, would read:

SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

I have shown how erroneous the assertions were, and I have shown that the Constitution is the very basis of our national economic and political health.

I do not know the reasoning process that gave rise to this proposal, the effect of which is an unnecessary and undesirable tampering with the Constitution.

I wish to preface my remarks with a statement by President Taft.

Mr. President, the hour is growing late, but I must read what former President Taft said, as follows:

The treatymaking power is a very broad one. Indeed, it is much more important under our Constitution than in any other country that I know. According to our Constitution, a treaty of the United States, insofar as its provisions are in appropriate form to operate as such, is a law in the United States, exactly as a statute of Congress is a law in the United States. I think I have already invited your attention to the fact that a treaty may repeal a law of Congress if it is inconsistent with it, and that a law of Congress may repeal a treaty. A treaty operates both as a binding contract with a foreign nation and as municipal law. As a contract binding upon both parties, it cannot be made to lose its obligation by a refusal of either country to perform it. It is thus broken, but the party injured by the breach has in international law a right to damages from the party breaking it. If Congress passes a statute inconsistent with the treaty, while it breaks the treaty it repeals it as municipal law. It does not relieve the Nation from its moral and international obligation to make good the breaches by damages or otherwise, but it does change the law which binds the officers, citizens, and others within the governmental jurisdiction of the United States, to comply not with the treaty, but with the law which abrogated it. This was the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Chinese cases. Under our treaty with China certain classes of Chinese were entitled to come into the country. Congress desired to exclude many of the classes thus entitled, and passed a law doing so. The law broke the treaty, but the immigration officers, the courts, and all persons within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States were obliged to conform to the act of Congress, and to exclude those Chinese who had the right to come in under the treaty but were forbidden to do so by the subsequent law.

The treatymaking power is in some respects wider than the power of Congress in the enactment of statutes, in this: As between the States and the Federal Government, congressional legislation is limited to a Federal field marked by the powers expressly granted to Congress within the Constitution and those which may be reasonably implied as necessary and proper to the exercise of the express powers. All other powers are exercised by the legislatures of the State within the restrictions of their respective Constitutions. The treatymaking power, however, is dealing with our foreign relations, and when we deal with our foreign relations, we are a Nation undivided, and presenting a united front. Everything, therefore, that is natural or customarily involved in such foreign relations, a treaty may cover, whether beyond the lawmaking power of Congress and within the control of the State legislatures, or not. Now one of the most usual subjects for consideration of a treaty is the rights of citizens or subjects of one country while resident in, or passing through, the country of the other, to security of life and limb, to the carrying on of business, or to the inheriting of property or its transmission. The subjects of regulating business in a State, the inheritance of property and its transmission are ordinarily within the cognizance of State legislatures and are not within the power of Congress. Yet by treaty, liens may be given rights in a State in respect to such matters even though this is at variance with the laws of the State, and to that extent the treatymaking power controls the statute of the State. It makes an exception to the State statute, in favor of the aliens whose rights are defined in the treaty. This has been decided so many times that there is no doubt about the correctness of the view. The Supreme Court has declined to imply the same limitations upon the treatymaking power as the Constitution imposes upon congressional lawmaking. It has said that the treatymaking power would not of course reach to changing a form of State government or perhaps parting with State territory, but it has left quite general and undefined the field that it may occupy.

The foregoing quotation is from President Taft, in the book Our Chief Magistrate (1926), pages 108 to 111. Thus spoke a great President and a great judge. Why is the treatymaking power so important in this country? Because, as President Taft stated, in domestic matters the executive and legislative powers are divided by the Constitution between the National Government and the States; but with respect to foreign countries the framers of the Constitution were most careful to vest the National Government with complete jurisdiction (id., page 104), so that when we deal with our foreign relations, we are a nation undivided and presenting a united front. This is as it should, and must, be.

Keeping in mind the statement of President Taft, let us turn to one of the Chinese cases. I refer to *Fong Yue Ting* v. *U. S.* ((1893), 149 U. S. 698). This is the decision of the Supreme Court sustaining the power of Congress to enact legislation requiring, contrary to treaty provision, the registration of alien Chinese, lawfully in the United States pursuant to treaty provisions, upon penalty of deportation for failure to so register. The decision amounts to a lecture on sovereignty and the powers of the National Government. It states the maxim of international law "that every sovereign nation has the power, as inherent in sovereignty, and essential to self-preservation" to forbid or admit foreigners, as it sees fit. Next, it states that the United States is not only a government, but is a National Government, and the only government in this country that has the character of nationality. It is invesfed with power over all the foreign relations of the country, all of which are specifically forbidden to the State governments.

For local interests, the several States of the Union exist; but for international purposes, embracing our relations with foreign nations, we are but one people, one nation, one power. * * * [T]he only American flag known throughout the world is the flag of the United States.

Then, in explaining how both self-executing and nonself-executing provisions of a treaty are subject to acts of Congress, it quotes from the Chinese Exclusion case *Chae Chan Ping* v. *U. S.* ((1889) 130 U. S. 581) the following:

The treaties [with China] were of no greater obligation than an act of Congress. By the Constitution, laws made in pursuance thereof and treaties made under the authority of the United States are both declared to be the supreme law of the land, and no paramount authority is given to one over the other. A treaty, it is true, is in its nature a contract between nations, and is often merely promissory in its character, requiring legislation to carry its stipulations into effect. Such legislation will be open to future repeal or amendment. If the treaty operates by its own force, and relates to a subject within the power of Congress, it can be deemed in that particular only the equivalent of a legislative act, to be repealed or modified at the pleasure of Congress. In either case, the last expression of the sovereign will control. * * * So far as a treaty made by the United States with any foreign nation can become the subject of judicial cognizance in the courts of this country, it is subject to such acts as Congress may pass for its enforcement, modification, or repeal.

The Senator from Michigan said—Committee Report February 4, 1954, page 1311—after emphasizing from the quotation the words "in that particular only,—"

But suppose that that particular (migratory bird) treaty had been a self-executing treaty. Suppose that treaty had been such that the Congress could not have acted upon it.

I say to the Senator from Michigan that his last statement supposes the impossible. The plain rule enunciated in the decision cannot be tortured into support of a thesis that the Congress of the United States is helpless after a treaty is once made and becomes thereby a part of the law of the land. President Taft and the Supreme Court could not have stated the true proposition more clearly.

The proposed substitute wording of section 2 is bad. Treaties made "in pursuance of this Constitution" can only mean in execution of the specific grants. As I said earlier, if this substitute is adopted, hereafter we shall no longer be a nation of one in international affairs. Instead, the United States will be the strangest national creature in existence—a nation of one on the Federal level, and a nation of 48 in all other matters. This illustrates why President Taft said the treatymaking power is much more important under our Constitution than in any other country.

State lines and divided executive and legislative powers make this so. If we wish to return to the acephalous Confederation government, although we are now in the atomic age, the Bricker resolution, especially as amended by this proposal, is the first and biggest step. It could easily be the fatal step.

Section 2 of the proposed amendment reads as follows:

Article VI of section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Notwithstanding the foregoing provision of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution."

This provision is subject to practically every objection I have heretofore raised with respect to tampering with the Constitution of the United States. Hereafter, if this amendment is adopted, we would not be a nation of one in international affairs. We would be the strangest national creature in existence—a nation of one in matters on the Federal level, and a nation of 48 in other problems.

The proposed language in effect would nullify every provision in every existing treaty of friendship and commerce not within the powers specifically delegated by the Constitution to Congress or the President, or found within the implications of those specific grants. This illustrates the complete absurdity of seeking language simply to allay baseless fears, when, in fact, there is no real constitutional problem in need of correction by amendment of the Constitution. Let us not court constitutional disaster, merely for the purpose of saving false faces.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I prefer not to yield at this time: first, I wish to finish my statement. As the Senator from Louisiana appreciates, I am somewhat fatigued, so I prefer to continue with my statement.

Reference even to simple rules of statutory or constitutional construction should warn Senators against acceptance of the hastily conceived and completely impossible language of the pending proposal. Any worthwhile treatise on statutory or constitutional construction or any digest of case law on that subject will give case after case stating variations of the rule that a legislative body is presumed not to have passed a meaningless measure. That is why even "declaratory language," if added to the Constitution, would be dangerous.

Let me refresh my colleagues' recollection of some of the statements on this rule of construction:

As a general principle of statutory construction, it will be presumed that the legislature, in adopting an amendment, intended to make a change in existing law. (*Mogis* v. *Lyman-Richey Sand Co.* ((1951) 189 F. 2d 130, 141).)

• • • [A] presumption exists that a legislature in adopting an amendment to a statute intended to make some change in existing law and therefore courts will endeavor to give some effect to the amendment. (*Lindsay* v. *Collins* ((1951) 96 F. Supp. 994, 998).)

Congress is presumed to mean what it says—*U. S. Lines* v. *Shaughnessy* ((1951) 101 F. Supp. 61; 195 F. 2d 385). Court must presume that Congress used no superfluous words. *Drier* v. *U. S.* (1947) 70 F. Supp. 888. In construing a law the United States Supreme Court must construe what Congress has written, and cannot add, subtract, delete, or distort words used. *Sixty-Two Cases of Jam* v. *U. S.* (1953) 340 U. S. 593. These are only a few of the statutory rules of construction which guide courts.

In construing the word "pursuance," as added to the supremacy clause by section 2 of the substitute proposal, the courts, in all probability will consider it to mean "in execution" of this Constitution. I know what the Senator from Michigan has said. I also note that he admitted to the Senator from Kentucky that his confusion over what section 2 means "is due to the inability of those of us who have proposed it to explain it to him.—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 17, 1954, page 1898.

Let us look at the proposed appendage to the supremacy clause of the Constitution of the United States. It says:

No treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution.

This is the supremacy clause they are tampering with—one of the most vital clauses, if not the most vital clause, of the Constitution of the United States. It is the keystone of the great arch of Federal power. The substitute language is worse than the "which" clause, for it would have retroactive, as well as prospective, effect. It would be a unilateral abrogation of all previous treaties of friendship and commerce, thereby placing the United States in the position of a country adhering to the practice of treating all international undertakings as mere scraps of paper, a practice condemned by all internationally respected nations.

I have heretofore taken the position that this type of language is a limitation which could only mean that all treaties would thenceforth be restricted to the execution of powers within the specific grants of the Constitution. This would, of course, make the area of State jurisdiction a treaty-law no-man's land. At least, it would turn the judicial clock back 130 years, to the same type of argument that was answered with respect to commerce by Chief Justice Marshall in *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (1824) (9 Wheat. 1, 210–211). Here, again, in the proposed substitute is the concept of dual federalism, which was rejected by the Founding Fathers, repudiated by the Supreme Court, and fought out in a bloody and disastrous civil war. If the Senator merely wishes to provide that a treaty provision shall not be repugnant to the Constitution, let him put that language in his substitute. Let him use in it the word "repugnant," and then there will be no question of the meaning.

I wish to reiterate and emphasize the fact that this wording cannot and will not be considered by the Supreme Court as superfluous or meaningless. Each word of the Constitution must be given due force and appropriate meaning—*Knowlton* v. *Moore* ((1900) 178 U. S. 41, 87). Furthermore, the Supreme Court will consider the historical origin, as well as the language—*Missouri* v. *Illinois* ((1901) 180 U. S. 208, 219). But when it seeks the historical origin of this ill-conceived language, it will find only an hysterical origin. Confusion will be compounded when the Supreme Court then insists on its right to judge the correctness of the course of the proceedings which gave rise to this language and the views expressed by the persons closely associated in its making—*Legal Tender Cases* ((1871) 12 Wall. 457, 561); *McCullough* v. *Maryland* ((1819) 4 Wheat. 316, 433). There will be no cloakroom journal to guide it.

As I have said before, in various conferences on proposed substitutes, it is a very dangerous business to seek amendatory constitutional language in a hurried compromise of desperation, especially when amendment to the Constitution is absolutely unnecessary. Remember, Mr. President, no word of the Constitution can be rejected as meaningless or superfluous. This rule alone requires either that the entire Bricker proposal be voted down now, or that it and all of this ill-conceived substitute language be returned to the proper committees of the Senate for further study and consideration.

The case of the proponents has been based on fear, not facts. Many earnest persons have been cruelly deceived by what was considered to be a reputable group in the American Bar Association. Let us not be overly concerned with saving their face. Let us be greatly concerned with saving the Constitution of the United States; for if a great power, such as the treaty power, can be destroyed by fear, then by the same tactic the Constitution and the Government of the United States under the Constitution can be destroyed.

THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE OF THE CONSTITUTION AND THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

I wish now to discuss article VI, clause 2, the supremacy clause of the Constitution of the United States. I desire to preface these remarks with a statement made by Mr. Justice Bradley 74 years ago and framed in an emotional setting. He said:

The greatest difficulty in coming to a just conclusion arises from mistaken notions with regard to the relations which subsist between the State and National Governments. It seems to be often overlooked that a national Constitution has been adopted in this country, establishing a real government therein, operating upon persons and territories and things; and which, moreover, is, or should be as dear to every American citizen as his State government is. Whenever the true conception of the nature of this [National] Government is once conceded, no real difficulty will arise in the just interpretation of its powers. But if we allow ourselves to regard it as a hostile organization, opposed to the proper sovereignty and dignity of the State governments, we shall continue to be vexed with difficulties as

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to its jurisdiction and authority. * * * See *Ex parte Siebold* (1880) 100 U. S. 371, 393–394.

Proponents of the Bricker amendment have sought to foster hostility to the Government of the United States rather than an understanding, and a true conception, of that Government and its powers. Time after time I have been told by former Bricker supporters that after carefully studying the Constitution and applicable case law, they were no longer vexed and they no longer accepted the Holman fear thesis.

I wish to shed a little light on article VI, clause 2 of the Constitution, which reads:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

With respect to the wording "anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding," it is erroneously claimed by some Bricker proponents that the word "constitution" in this position refers to the Constitution of the United States. This claim is refuted, of course, by mere inspection of the language of clause 2. It is the constitution or laws of any State which must give way before "This Constitution" of the United States and its laws and treaties.

The supremacy clause had its roots in the Confederation which had the right to make treaties but lacked executive and judicial power for their execution and adjudication. See Story, Commentaries on the Constitution, 1891, volume 2, section 1838.

The problem was firmly met at the beginning of the Constitutional Convention by the sixth resolution of the Randolph plan "that the National Legislature (meaning Congress) ought to be empowered to negative (that is veto) all laws passed by the several States contravening, in the opinion of the National Legislature (meaning Congress), the Articles of Union (that is the Constitution), or any treaties subsisting under the authority of the Union (under the Articles of Confederation)"—The Papers of James Madison, 1840, volume 2, page 732.

To show the evolution of the clause, I wish to quote the earlier version which shows precisely that the second use of the word "constitution" is with respect to those of the States. You will notice that in this version the plural form was used. The "Committee of style, etc.," adopted the singular form for the final draft. As reported August 6, 1787 by the Committee on Detail, the supremacy clause read:

> The acts of the Legislature of the United States made in pursuance of this Constitution [of the United States], and all treaties made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the several States, and their citizens and inhabitants; and the judges in the several States shall be bound thereby in their decisions, anything in the constitutions or laws of the several States to the contrary notwithstanding. (The Papers of James Madison (1840), vol. 3, p. 1234.)

For further information in tracing the development of this clause see also volume 2, pages 741 and 1119, and volume 3, pages 1408–1409.

Why was this supremacy over State constitutions or laws necessary? Because—

> "In sundry instances, as of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, the navigation laws treated citizens of other States as aliens. In certain cases the authority of the Confederacy was disregarded, as in violation, not only of the treaty of peace, but of treaties with France and Holland; which were complained of to Congress. In other cases the Federal authority was violated by treaties and wars with Indians, as by Georgia; by troops raised and kept without the consent of Congress, as by Massachusetts; by compacts without the consent of Congress, as between Pennsylvania and New York, and between Virginia and Maryland." (The Papers of James Madison (1840), vol. 2, p. 712.)

The problem of supremacy was soon before the Supreme Court in *Ware* v. *Hylton* ((1797) 3 Dall 199), which arose out of the treaty of peace with Britain. Mr. Justice Chase, who earlier had been chief justice of the General Court of Maryland, said that neither a State's constitution nor its laws could thwart the supremacy clause. He said—pages 236–237:

> If doubts could exist before the establishment of the present National Government, they must be entirely removed by the sixth article of the Constitution, which provides: "That all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the constitution, or laws, of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." There can be no limitation on the power of the people of the United States. By their authority the State constitutions were made, and by their authority the Constitution of the United States was established; and they had the power to change or abolish the State constitutions, or to make them yield to the general Government, and to treaties made by their authority. A treaty cannot be the supreme law of the land, that is of all the United States, if any act of a State legislature can stand in its way. If the constitution of a State (which is the fundamental law of the State, and paramount to its legislature) must give way to a treaty, and fall before it; can it be questioned whether the less power, an act of the State legislature, must not prostrate? It is the declared will of the people of the United States that every treaty made, by the authority of the United States, shall be superior to the constitution and laws of any individual State; and their will alone is to decide. If a law of a State, contrary to a treaty, is not void, but voidable only by a repeal, or nullification by a State legislature, this certain consequence follows, that the will of a small part of the United States may control or defeat the will of the whole. The people of America have been pleased to declare that all treaties made before the establishment of the National Constitution, or laws of any of the States, contrary to a treaty, shall be disregarded.
>
> Four things are apparent on a view of this sixth article of the National Constitution. First, that it is retrospective, and is to be considered in the same light as if the Constitution had been established before the making of the treaty of 1783. Second, that the constitution, or laws, of any of the States so far as either of them shall be found contrary to that treaty are by force of the said article, prostrated before the treaty. Third, that consequently the treaty of 1783 has superior power to the legislature of any State, because no legislature of any State has any kind of power over the Constitution, which was its creator. Fourth, that it is the declared duty of the State judges to determine any constitution, or laws of any State, contrary to that treaty (or any other) made under the authority of the United States, null and void. National or Federal judges are bound by duty and oath to the same conduct.

I need not remind Senators that the Supreme Court has since used the supremacy clause on numerous occasions to strike down provisions of State constitutions and State laws. For examples of the former see *Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha Ry.* v. *Latta* ((1913), 226 U. S. 519), voiding the application of Nebraska Constitution, article X, section 4; *International Harvester Co.* v. *Kentucky* ((1914), 234 U. S. 216), voiding section 198 of the Kentucky Constitution of 1891; *Guinn* v. *U. S.* ((1915), 238 U. S. 347), voiding Oklahoma Constitution, article III, section 4a, the so-called grandfather clause adopted in 1910; and *Hawke* v. *Smith* ((1920), 253 U. S. 221 and 231), voiding certain applications of Ohio Constitution, article III, section 1.

State courts have properly understood and applied the supremacy clause. This is West Virginia speaking:

> The constitution of this State is the supreme law of West Virginia; it is subject only to the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, all of which constitute the supreme law of the land. United States Constitution, article VI, clause 2. (*Harbart* v. *Harrison County Court* (W. Va., 1946), 39 S. E. 2d 177, 184.)

This is Florida speaking:

> The State may regulate the subjects of taxation and may authorize exemptions of property from taxation; and an amendment to the State constitution [of Florida] may, if so intended, modify an existing provision of the State constitution; but an amendment to the State constitution cannot modify the operation of any provision of the Federal Constitution. (*Gray* v. *Moss* ((Fla. 1934), 156 So. 262, 264).) See also *Gray* v. *Winthrop* ((Fla. 1934) 156 So. 270).

Even after Ware against Hylton, supra, the people demanding State supremacy did not give up the fight. I need not remind Senators that the Civil War was the disastrous result of their efforts. All of this was recently summarized by the Supreme Court as follows:

> Violent public controversies existed throughout the first part of the 19th century until the 1860's concerning the extent of the constitutional supremacy of the Federal Government. During that period there were instances in which this [Supreme] Court and State courts broadly questioned the power and duty of State courts to exercise their jurisdiction to enforce United States civil and penal statutes or the power of the Federal Government to require them to do so. But after the fundamental issues over the extent of the Federal supremacy had been resolved by [civil] war, this Court took occasion in 1876 to review the phase of the controversy concerning the relationship of State courts to the Federal Government.

Claflin v. Houseman (93 U. S. 130). The opinion of a unanimous Court in that case was strongly buttressed by historic references and persuasive reasoning. It repudiated the assumption that Federal laws can be considered by the States as though they were laws emanating from a foreign sovereign. Its teaching is that the Constitution and the laws passed pursuant to it are the supreme laws of the land, binding alike upon States, courts, and the people, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. (*Testa v. Katt* ((1947) 330 U. S. 386, 390, 391).)

Bricker proponents seek to revive these old issues. They seek to promote vexation at, and distrust of, the Government of the United States in general, and the President and the Senate in particular. But true conceptions of the nature of the Government of the United States soon dispel distrust and minimize vexations. Time and enlightened opinion work against the proponents.

THE GEORGE SUBSTITUTE

While I was absent from the Senate the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] offered a substitute. I have the highest regard for this distinguished public servant. When I heard about it I went to him and discussed the subject. I wish now to discuss for a very few moments the George substitute.

I wish to talk about the substitute which my good friend, the Senator from Georgia, says is necessary to protect his dead cat and dead cow.

The proposed substitute of the Senator from Georgia reads:

Section 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

This is the same language as section 1 of the Bricker resolution, as reported, with the phrase "or other international agreement" added. I wish to state my objections to section 1 before discussing section 2.

Section 1 is subject to all of the objections heretofore raised against its counterpart in the Bricker resolution. It continues the inference, implicit in the proposal of the Senator from Ohio, that it has been possible to violate the Constitution of the United States by treaty. No Supreme Court decision has ever given standing to this inference, but proponents, who have set themselves above the Supreme Court as interpreters of that great charter of freedom, continue to assert their fears that a treaty can have superiority in standing. So they ask us to amend needlessly to allay these fears. However, their proposals do more than this. They would destroy the balance of power so carefully established. I do not believe the people of the United States want the Constitution, and all that it has stood for in 165 years, tampered with for this purpose.

The addition of the words "or other international agreement" is the true danger in section 1. These executive agreements cannot now, and never could, override the Constitution. However, merely to allay the unfounded fears of proponents, they would become, by inclusion in the Constitution, constitutionally equal in standing to treaties; and the Constitution thereby would give substance to the thesis heretofore advanced by a few theorists, that treaties and executive agreements are interchangeable. I am repeating language which I used on the floor of the Senate months ago. I am sure that few Senators wish to furnish a basis for bypassing the Senate's treatymaking role. After the adoption of this amendment, a President, not wishing to risk the required two-thirds vote of the Senate, merely would negotiate the understanding as an executive agreement and then seek implementing legislation passed by a majority of both Houses of Congress. This would be similar to the British system, which seems to impress the proponents of the Bricker amendment.

That is something I cannot understand. Many of the supporters of the proposed amendment are anti-British, and yet its proponents wish to adopt the British system, just as in the beginning some desired to invest the other House of Congress with a great deal of power, and make it the equivalent of the House of Commons.

This issue was raised on the floor Thursday by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. It has been one of the reasons for my rejection heretofore of similar proposed compromises and substitutes. I am not willing to give the President more power, and I am unwilling to take power from the President.

There are other undesirable features in section 1. I have yet to hear an adequate grammatical or constitutional explanation of the meaning of the words "shall not be of any force or effect." We are discussing now international law and legal meanings. Does the language "shall not be of any force or effect" mean "appreciable"? Perhaps modern usage can give meaning to this construction, but I would prefer the consideration of wording consonant with the Constitution. However, I do not propose that this wording be sought on the floor of the Senate.

Section 2 of the George substitute reads:

An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress.

This apparently is to protect the dead cat and the dead cow. The Senator from Georgia has said, in effect, that he does not intend to impinge upon or dilute the constitutional powers of the President. Accepting this as the earnest intention of the great Senator, nevertheless mere inspection of the wording shows that it applies to all international agreements which would have effect as internal law, whatever that may mean. I need not remind Senators that, notwithstanding what was said here today, the term "internal law" is lacking in accepted meaning. However, I do not intend to labor that point, for it has already been discussed by others. Instead, I intend to address my remarks to, first, the main types of executive agreements; second, the exercise of resulting and auxiliary or implied powers; and, third, the basic rules of construction to be applied to amendatory action.

In general, there are five bases for executive agreements or action which should be considered:

The first type is composed of agreements implementing or construing treaties. In drafting treaties and in seeking language for the basis of agreements, ambiguous provisions sometimes result. It becomes necessary thereafter for the contracting nations to agree on construction or meaning in applying these provisions. This is usually accomplished by agreements which are auxiliary or ancillary to the treaty. If, because such agreements relate to some internal application of the treaty, they must be submitted for legislative implementation by the Congress, the entire process would collapse in a legislative maze. After all, there are said to be about 10,000 of such agreements each year. Proponents of the Bricker amendment have complained of inadequate consideration of treaties. Assuming that this may be a problem, proposals such as this merely would compound that problem.

President Taft has related a notable instance of the exercise of executive power in implementing an indefinite treaty. He said:

When I was Secretary of War, President Roosevelt sent me to Panama to adjust the relations between the United States and Panama under the Hay-Varilla Treaty. That treaty was very hastily drawn, and many things were left most indefinite, as for instance the boundaries of the Zone at the termini of the Zone. The Zone was not to include the town of Colon or the town of Panama and yet there was no official delimitation in the records of Panama or Colombia of either town. We were to occupy the same bed with the Panamanians, but our half was in the middle. This created in many ways an embarrassing situation, and in some way or other, a modus vivendi had to be established. The absence of it had caused great irritation and threatened to obstruct the carrying on of the construction of the Canal. I agreed with the President of the Republic upon a plan by which we might comfortably and peaceably take and occupy our half and the people of Panama might keep on either side. The plan contained a great many different provisions. I had no power to make a treaty with Panama, but I did have, with the authority of the President, the right to make rules equivalent to law in the Zone. I therefore issued an order directing the carrying out of the plan agreed upon insofar as it was necessary to carry it out on our side of the line, on condition that, and as long as, the regulations made by Panama were enforced by that government. This was approved by Secretary Hay and the President and has constituted down until the present day, I believe, the basis upon which the two governments carried on in this close proximity. (Taft, Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers (1925), pp. 111–112.)

He then mentions a little disturbance in the Senate over this necessary action. That is the former President and Chief Justice speaking.

The second type of agreement is that based on statutory authority. Excellent examples of this are the Philippine Trade Act and the Reciprocal Trade Acts. Terminatory and amendatory powers can be specifically provided here. Legislative control remains complete. That is the second topic.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The third general type is represented by agreements made by the President as Commander in Chief. In this capacity, he has heretofore exercised directly powers conferred by the Constitution. Strategy and other agreements applying internally are not exempted by any specific provision of the George substitute, and I will show later that rules of construction will not exclude this power from the operation of the proposed substitute.

The fourth general type of agreement is that made in recognizing a foreign nation and in agreeing to receive ambassadors and public ministers. This includes the setting up of international conferences which do, at times, take place within the territorial limits of the United States.

The fifth class is action taken by the President in the execution of the office of our Chief Magistrate. As pointed out by President Taft:

> In our domestic matters, the Executive power is divided between the President, the governors of the States, the legislative power between Congress and the legislatures of the States, and the judicial power between the Federal judiciary and the State courts; but when we come to governmental action with respect to foreign countries, we find that the framers of the Constitution were most careful to vest in the national government complete jurisdiction, and industriously excluded by express prohibition the interference of the States therein (Taft, Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers (1925), p. 104).

I desire at this point to review briefly the power of executive action derived by our Chief Magistrate from, or resulting from, the Constitution of the United States.

In *Ex parte Quirin* ((1942) 317 U. S. 1, 25) Chief Justice Stone, for a unanimous court, stated:

> Congress and the President, like the courts, possess no power not derived from the Constitution.

He then enumerated certain of the specified powers and duties.

You will note that he used the word "derived." It is well known that the President as well as the Congress and the Supreme Court have great auxiliary or implied powers which are derived from specific grants or from the Constitution itself. Story in his Commentaries refers to the general concept of the aggregate powers of the National Government, first enunciated judicially by Chief Justice Marshall in *American Insurance Co.* v. *Canter* ((1828) 1 Pet. 511, 540–541) as "resulting powers." Perhaps the best early exposition of these "resulting powers" is found in the Annals of Congress (6th Cong., 1st sess., Mar. 7, 1800). Under consideration was a resolution of Mr. Livingston calling upon the President to produce papers relating to his order to deliver Jonathan Robbins, charged with piracy and murder on the high seas, to British authorities under article 27 of the Treaty of Amity, Commerce, and Navigation between the United States and Great Britain. Congress had passed no implementing legislation covering the subject (id., pp. 511, 526, 531, 542).

The debate is not verbatim in the Annals. Representative, later Chief Justice, Marshall's statement, as reported, follows:

> The President is the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations. Of consequence, the demand of a foreign nation can only be made on him.
>
> He possesses the whole Executive power. He holds and directs the force of the Nation. Of consequence, any act to be performed by the force of the Nation is to be performed through him.
>
> He is charged to execute the laws. A treaty is declared to be a law. He must then execute a treaty, where he, and he alone, possesses the means of executing it.
>
> The treaty, which is a law, enjoins the performance of a particular object. The person who is to perform this object is marked out by the Constitution, since the person is named who conducts the foreign intercourse and is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. The means by which it is to be performed, the force of the Nation, are in the hands of this person. Ought not this person perform the object, although the particular mode of using the means has not been prescribed? Congress, unquestionably, may prescribe the mode, and Congress may devolve on others the whole execution of the contract; but, till this be done, it is the duty of the executive department to execute the contract by any means it possesses. Id., pp. 613–614.

The principle stated by Marshall in this debate was applied in the divided domestic field, noted by President Taft, in *In re Neagle* ((1890) 135 U. S. 1, 62–63). That is the case involving the killing of a man threatening to slay Mr. Justice Field, by a deputy marshal of the United States who had been assigned, by direction of the Attorney General, to protect the justice although there was no specific law providing for this protection. Affirming an order discharging Marshal Neagle from the custody of State officers, the Supreme Court said:

> The United States is a Government with authority extending over the whole territory of the Union, acting upon the States and the people of the States. While it is limited in the number of its powers, so far as its sovereignty extends it is supreme. No State government can exclude it from the exercise of any authority conferred upon it by the Constitution; obstruct its authorized officers against its will; or withhold from it, for a moment the cognizance of any subject which that instrument has committed to it [quoting from *Martin* v. *Hunter* ((1816) 1 Wheat. 304, 363)].
>
> To cite all the cases in which this principle of the supremacy of the Government of the United States, in the exercise of all the powers conferred upon it by the Constitution, is maintained, would be an endless task. * * *
>
> If we turn to the executive department of the Government, we find a very different condition of affairs [from that of the legislative branch]. The Constitution, section 3, article 2, declares that the President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed," and he is provided with the means of fulfilling this obligation by his authority to commission all the officers of the United States and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint the most important of them and to fill vacancies. He is declared to be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. The duties which are thus imposed upon him he is further enabled to perform by the recognition in the Constitution, and the creation by acts of Congress, of executive departments. * * * These aid him in the performance of the great duties of his office, and represent him in thousands of acts to which it can hardly be supposed his personal attention is called, and thus he is enabled to fulfill the duty of his great department, expressed in the phrase that "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."
>
> Is this duty limited to the enforcement of acts of Congress or of treaties of the United States according to their express terms, or does it include the rights, duties, and obligations growing out of the Constitution itself, our international relations, and all the protection implied by the nature of the Government under the Constitution?

The Court answered this question by referring to a historical incident, saying:

> One of the most remarkable episodes in the history of our foreign relations, and which has become an attractive historical incident, is the case of Martin Koszta, a native of Hungary, who though not fully a naturalized citizen of the United States, had in due form of law made his declaration of intention to become a citizen. While in Smyrna he was seized by command of the Austrian consul general at that place and carried aboard the *Hussar*, an Austrian vessel, where he was held in close confinement. Captain Ingraham, in command of the American sloop of war *St. Louis*, arriving in port at that critical period, and ascertaining that Koszta had with him his naturalization papers, demanded his surrender to him, and was compelled to train his guns upon the Austrian vessel before his demands were complied with. It was, however, to prevent bloodshed, agreed that Koszta should be placed in the hands of the French consul subject to the result of diplomatic negotiations between Austria and the United States. The celebrated correspondence between Mr. Marcy, Secretary of State, and Chevalier Hülsemann, the Austrian minister at Washington, which arose out of this affair and resulted in the release and restoration to liberty of Koszta, attracted a great deal of public attention, and the position assumed by Mr. Marcy met the approval of the country and of Congress, who voted a gold medal to Captain Ingraham for his conduct of the affair. Upon what act of Congress then existing can any one lay his finger in support of the action of our Government in this matter?

Thus the President, or the Chief Magistrate as Taft calls him, can and does take action on the basis of powers resulting from the nature of the office and the Government of the United States. These resulting powers, as well as those implied in, and auxiliary to, the specific grants of the Constitution are tremendous and must not be disturbed if the President is to function properly in the present age. The proper recourse for possible abuses is the polls, not this amendment.

I now desire to say something with respect to possible construction of the George substitute. The Supreme Court will harmonize, if possible, the provisions of the Constitution (*Holmes* v. *Jennison* ((1840) 14 Pet. 549, 570), and *Cohens* v. *Virginia* ((1821) 6 Wheat. 264)). To accomplish this purpose it will consider the debates on the language and current writings on the subject. (See *Legal Tender Cases* ((1871) 12 Wall. 457, 461), *Missouri* v. *Illinois* ((1901) 180 U. S. 208, 219), and *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* ((1819) 4 Wheat. 316, 433).) But, it will not permit these extraneous materials to vary plain meaning (*Railroad Tax Cases* ((1882) 13 F. 722, 740, writ of error dismissed (1885) 116 U. S. 138)). For ex-

ample, the 13th amendment had its origin in the previous existence of African slavery, but the generality of its language makes its prohibition apply to slavery of white men as well; and also to peonage and every other form of compulsory labor.

The George substitute plainly says that an international agreement shall become effective as internal law, whatever that means, only by an act of the Congress. This language carries no express exception. Further, the Constitution heretofore has not mentioned agreements in connection with the national treaty power. The word "agreement" is mentioned by the Constitution only in the preclusive restriction placed on the States in dealing with another State or a foreign power—article I, section 10, clause 3. The proposed amendment suddenly brings international agreements into the specific language of the Constitution and requires, without specific exception, implementation by acts of Congress before they become effective as internal law.

The Supreme Court has said that each word of the Constitution must be given due force and appropriate meaning (*Knowlton* v. *Moore* ((1900) 178 U. S. 41, 87)). But the Supreme Court must construe what Congress has written, and cannot add, subtract, delete, or distort words used (*Sixty-Two Cases of Jam* v. *U. S.* ((1953) 340 U. S. 593)). The Court will consider, of course, historical origin as well as the precise language (*Missouri* v. *Illinois* ((1901) 180 U. S. 208, 219)). But it will not take the explanation of the Senator from Georgia in the face of the language of his substitute.

Mr. President, I agree that there has been entirely too much confusion concerning the Bricker amendment and its ill-contrived substitutes. I trust I have not added to the confusion.

The basic argument began with Missouri against Holland. But the Senator from Ohio has said:

> I do not want to damage the migratory-bird control, and we are not by the proposed amendment doing any damage to it (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 17, 1954, p. 1890).

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has said:

> I never have been able to believe that treatymaking was endangered by the case of Missouri against Holland (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 11, 1954, p. 1663).

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has said:

> The objections made by some persons to Missouri against Holland, is that it was a violation of States' rights for Congress to regulate the shooting of a duck in Missouri. But the power to make treaties is prohibited to the States * * * The treatymaking power should not be restricted as proposed by the "which" clause (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 16, 1954, p. 1787).

All of this reminds me of the rather sensible remark of the chap who was in the railroad wreck and was thrown through a window with his nose fractured and otherwise injured. When interviewed by a news reporter wanting to know what he had to say, he replied, "This is a helluva way to run a railroad."

This is a rather bad way to be "monkeying" with the Constitution. I still remember, looking at my watch, that as a boy I used to monkey with it.

Paraphrasing this language, I want to say, this is no way—especially where it has been shown that there is no cause for an amendment, and that there is such a diversity as to what suggested amendments mean—this is no way to seek to rewrite any part of the Constitution.

Why, then, if Missouri against Holland is good or salutary case and constitutional law, is all this hullabaloo for months past, so completely confusing to that 4 percent of the Nation which paid some attention, necessary?

The Senators from Ohio, Georgia, and Michigan in effect have repudiated the "which" clause, which was 60 percent of the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. The Senator from Michigan now has obtained, however, the substitution of the "what" clause which is incomprehensible. He states that the "confusion over what the amendment means is due to the inability of the sponsors to explain it"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 17, 1954, page 1898. I say to the Senator from Michigan that the confusion over his "what" clause is due to the impossibility of adequately explaining it. He states that the words "in pursuance" do not mean to carry out, but "they mean that a treaty shall not be repugnant to the Constitution"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 16, 1954, page 1791.

Mr. President, if that is what the Senator means, why not use the word "repugnant"?

For the sake of argument, let us accept the Senator's interpretation. On February 16, 1954, the Senator from Michigan in stating his opposition to the "which" clause, said, "it would restrict the treatymaking power to what Congress could do in the domestic field. If the power to implement treaties were taken away from Congress," he said, "the whole philosophy of government would be changed"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 16, 1954, page 1787. Accordingly, if the Senator amends only against repugnance, and the possibility of repugnance is based on an inference, then nothing is accomplished. We have merely amended against that inference.

Here, then, is what we have in the Ferguson amendment. In section 1 we have constitutionally recognized and established the doctrine of interchangeability of treaties and executive agreements. This greatly upsets the constitutional balance of power in three ways. First, it brings in the House, with standing equal to that of the Senate. Second, it affords a means for completely bypassing the Senate role in the exercise of the treatymaking power. Third, it greatly increases the power of the President by permitting him to bypass a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

The majority leader has said that these amendments "are acceptable to the President"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 17, 1954, page 1894. But the President has voiced unalterable opposition to any amendment which would change the balance of power. It would be unconscionable, therefore, for him to accept a "joker" which would vastly increase his treaty-law-making powers. I do not believe that advantage should be taken of the confusion over the Bricker amendment to increase this power of the Executive. Further there are far too many other implications for comfort.

Between the proposed straitjacket represented by the Bricker "which" clause, and the overt grant of executive power by the Ferguson "what" clause, as explained by the Senator from Michigan, is a sensible middle course. This sensible middle course is the Constitution of the United States as it now stands, which has worked so well for 165 years. Under it we grew to a world power.

Mr. President, I think we should not tinker or tamper with this great charter. It is a great charter, and there is absolutely no need for interfering with what it has accomplished and what it will accomplish in the future.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wish to tell the Senator that I intend to agree with his argument about the so-called "in pursuance" clause. I fear that clause may be construed by the courts to be the "which" clause all over again. We received assurance in the course of the debate that that was not the intention of the author of the amendment. But I am inclined to agree with the Senator that a court may feel that the language had some purpose, and if it has any purpose at all, I am afraid the stated purpose of the "which" clause might be held by the courts to be the same as the "in pursuance" clause.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no contention made that this clause does not have a meaning. Does the Senator from Wisconsin think for a moment that it does not have any meaning?

Mr. WILEY. I do not think it has the meaning which apparently the Senator from Michigan thinks it has. There is a great deal of misunderstanding about its meaning. If the Senator will tell me what it means, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. FERGUSON. It means exactly what Justice Marshall, said in the Marbury case, namely, that "in pursuance of" meant that it was not repugnant to the Constitution. If it is repugnant, it is unconstitutional and void. It means the same as the word in section 1, "not in conflict with." According to decisions of the courts, we cannot have an absolute supremacy clause in one section of the Constitution, which makes a treaty superior to the Constitution, and then in another provision say that it cannot be in conflict with the Constitution, because then we have one absolute supremacy clause and a clause that does not give supremacy. That is the reason for changing the supremacy clause to make it compatible with the so-called "conflict" clause.

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator mean that it is not repugnant to the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what we mean.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. WILEY. Why does not the Senator use that language? We feel it has a very dangerous possibility.

Mr. FERGUSON. Who has so contended?

Mr. WILEY. A number of Senators.

Mr. FERGUSON. They cite Webster's dictionary; but if the time comes when we are going to construe the Constitution on the basis of Webster's dictionary definition of a word——

Mr. WILEY. The Senator has not answered my question. Why does he not substitute the word "repugnant"?

Mr. FERGUSON. Because the Supreme Court has held that the words "in pursuance of" have the same meaning as the word "repugnant."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The impression I had was that the amendment already contained language providing that if a treaty is in conflict with the Constitution it will be of no force and effect. If we put in additional language saying that a treaty is not valid unless it is in pursuance of the Constitution, it looks as if we were going to overrule the case of Missouri against Holland by putting a new "which" clause into the proposal. That was the argument made by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. If Senators will read the rules of construction which I have cited, which are the rules of the Supreme Court, they will find, in my humble opinion, that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is stating a matter which cannot be brushed aside by saying "It means 'repugnant,' but we refuse to use the word 'repugnant'."

Mr. LONG. If the Senator from Wisconsin will yield further, article VI of the Constitution provides:

> This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

It was always my impression that the laws of the United States were required to be made in pursuance of the Constitution, or, otherwise, they would be declared unconstitutional. When the language "made in pursuance of the Constitution" is added to the treatymaking power, it causes some of us to fear it means that a treaty could be declared unconstitutional.

Mr. FERGUSON. All we have to do is to read Chief Justice Marshall's opinion.

Mr. LONG. Marshall's opinion declared a law to be unconstitutional. If the same result had been attempted to be attained by means of a treaty, Marshall would have been constrained to declare the treaty unconstitutional, as not having been made in pursuance of the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am one who believes that the Supreme Court should be able to declare a treaty unconstitutional if it is repugnant to the Constitution or not in pursuance of the Constitution, which means the same as repugnant to the Constitution. The Supreme Court should be able to protect the rights of the people and to declare such a treaty unconstitutional, just as the Court can declare a law unconstitutional that is in conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the Senator and I would be thinking about the same thing if we should take the case of Missouri against Holland as an example. We find the Supreme Court actually held that the statute was not made in pursuance of the Constitution when it attempted to give Congress the power to regulate the shooting of ducks. When reference was made to a treaty, Justice Holmes held that a treaty did not need to be in pursuance of the Constitution; it need only be made under the authority of the United States.

At the time the case of Missouri against Holland was decided there was no provision in the Constitution that a treaty had to be made in pursuance of the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. That is why the Court held as it did.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator suppose that the decision would have been different than it was in Missouri against Holland if his "in pursuance" clause had been in the Constitution at that time?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say that the Court would have come to the same conclusion; but it might not have assigned the same reason. I think the decision in Missouri against Holland was proper, and that the subject of the treaty was within the jurisdiction of the treatymaking power, and I have always felt that way. I have always been opposed to the "which" clause.

Mr. LONG. I would have felt much better about the Senator's amendment, in which he used the "in pursuance", phrase, if I had felt the courts would interpret it in the way the Senator from Michigan would like to have it interpreted. But I have always felt that it would be interpreted differently. That is why I felt constrained to vote against the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is difficult for two lawyers ever to agree. I have been a member of the bar for some 40 years, and during my long experience, I have found it very difficult to get lawyers to agree to anything, so far as words and descriptions are concerned. But that does not mean there is confusion. Lawyers are not confused when they do not agree.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, while I was speaking, I was handed a letter from the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, in which was enclosed a copy of a letter sent by that organization to the President of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to the President of the United States, which relates to the position of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom on the Bricker joint resolution, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE
FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1954.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom has been working to oppose the Bricker resolution since it was first introduced as Senate Resolution No. 130. At our annual meeting held in Pittsburgh, Pa., June 16–20, 1952, we prepared a statement opposing this resolution and have been concerned about this issue ever since.

We believe that defeat of the Bricker amendment is of the greatest importance to our international relations and especially our active participation in the United Nations.

Therefore, we heartily commend your courageous and forthright stand opposing the Bricker amendment now before the Senate. We hope that you will continue to oppose it and any compromise. We believe that extended debate upon the issues involved will show that there is no need for such an amendment to the Constitution.

Respectfully yours,
ANNALEE STEWART
Mrs. Annalee Stewart,
Legislative Secretary.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

During the delivery of Mr. WILEY's speech,

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator from Delaware desire to make an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. FREAR. I have a statement I should like to make, which will require 4 or 5 minutes.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Delaware has always been very courteous to me. If his remarks will not be lengthy, I shall be glad to yield, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. FREAR. It will take me about 4 or 5 minutes to read into the RECORD what I have to say.

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from Delaware, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing his right to the floor, the Senator from Wisconsin may yield to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on July 13, 1953, this body ratified the International Wheat Agreement for a period of 3 years ending in 1956. During the debate on ratification I suggested that we adopt a reservation which would limit the life of the present agreement to a period of 1 year. I had hoped that this reservation would have been accepted, as I believed that the forthcoming study by the Randall Commission would give us a better basis on which to judge the value of this agreement to our farmers and to American citizens and taxpayers generally. I said, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 7, page 8612:

> Inasmuch as we have extended the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 1 year

and have established a commission to study the situation, I do not know that we are doing the right thing if we extend this agreement for 3 years. If we do so, I think we shall be bound to extend other agreements for 4 years. Conferences have been held regarding rubber, copper, and other commodities produced in other parts of the world, and we shall be asked to enter into some type of agreement concerning them. Such an agreement has not yet been presented to us. If in the case of wheat we enter into an agreement for a 3-year period, we may be setting a precedent which will cause difficulty. Since we have extended the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 1 year and have established a commission to study and make representations to the legislative body, it appears to me that we may be going out of our way in making this 3-year agreement. I believe there have been conferences with respect to cotton and other agricultural items. This agreement pertains only to wheat.

A few weeks ago the Randall Commission made its report, and I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the following statements by the Commission:

The International Wheat Agreement has contributed little to the solution of wheat problems of the United States and the world at large. Its chief significance has been to accord official sanction, on the part of the participating nations, to United States export subsidization of the United States quota when nonquota export prices were at or above the agreed maximum. At heavy expense to the United States Treasury, this has contributed to the persistence of excessive domestic support prices, which have given undue stimulus to wheat production here and abroad, and has tended to obstruct, rather than to facilitate, normal readjustments in United States agriculture, and to lead to abnormal accumulation of stocks of wheat. In the current season, when export prices are below the agreed maximum, the importing countries are relieved of their obligation to purchase wheat unless the prices drop below the agreed minimum level. Furthermore, the most important importing country is no longer a party to the agreement. Under these circumstances the significance of the agreement in relation to our wheat export problem is relatively slight.

The Commission recommends that during the life of the 1953 International Wheat Agreement its operation be kept under critical review, that efforts be made to make the organization contribute its maximum to solving pressing problems, and that its termination in 1956 be given consideration.

Apparently the Randall Commission now believes that the International Wheat Agreement was a mistake and that we should seriously consider abandoning it rather than extending it in 1956.

Mr. President, I also wish to place in the RECORD the recommendations of the Randall Commission concerning the use of intergovernmental commodity agreements for other commodities. The Commission said:

Proposals have been made to solve the problem of price instability by intergovernmental commodity agreements, involving export quotas, import quotas, price limits, reserve stocks, price stabilization purchases and sales (buffer stocks), production controls, or some combination of such devices. The Commission does not believe that extensive resort to commodity agreements will solve the problem of price instability; and it believes that such agreements introduce rigidities and restraints that impair the elasticity of economic adjustment and the freedom of individual initiative, which are fundamental to economic progress. Moreover, the types of intergovernmental commodity agreements thus far tried or proposed for the purpose of stabilizing prices involve commitments which could lead, if extensively employed, to very great outlays of United States Government funds in certain contingencies, of indeterminable amounts.

The Commission finds the same objections to the proposals for unilateral buffer stock action by the United States to stabilize world prices of raw materials and foodstuffs. Experience with the costs of efforts to stabilize certain commodity prices within the United States are an indication of the indeterminability of the costs of similar programs on a worldwide scale.

I think the Commission has made a significant contribution to our understanding of raw material markets, and I hope that the Senate will give these recommendations very serious consideration before ratifying any other commodity agreements which may be presented to us.

My interest in this problem has persisted over many years. I supported the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in his amendments to the Defense Production Act in 1952 to restrict the activities of the International Materials Conference, a form of intergovernmental commodity agreement. It was clearly shown in the debate at that time that the International Materials Conference was an attempt to implement chapter VI of the repudiated Havana Charter providing for such agreements.

I am still concerned with this problem, as the United Nations have just published a study entitled "Commodity Trade and Economic Development." This study will be presented to the U. N. Economic and Social Council at its next meeting in New York in March. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the recommendations of this study group.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PART III. CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER 9

Main conclusions and recommendations

265. We suggest in conclusion that it is important to remember what the various stabilizing devices can be relied on to achieve, and to proportion the measures taken to the degree of stabilization considered desirable.

266. Single-commodity agreements can prevent excessive short-run fluctuations in the price of the commodity. If, however, by design or accident, they are used to hold in check the long-run movement of prices, they will either break down or be maintainable only by restriction. We consider that restriction is wrong except in rare special cases.[1] Otherwise the choice of the type of agreement seems to us to depend largely on the special circumstances of the case. Provided the problem of finance can be solved, we think buffer stocks for individual commodities, or for a group of them, to be preferable to multilateral contracts. However, the nature and secular movement of particular commodity markets may render them unsuitable for buffer stock schemes while multilateral contracts may promise a measure of stability.

267. At present, we see no grounds for confidence that agreements for single commodities will be concluded in sufficient number to meet the more general demands of underdeveloped countries for stability of earnings.[2] While recommending examination of arrangements for the stabilization of several commodities by one agreement,[3] we note that there would still be difficulty in obtaining sufficient short-run stability without imperiling the agreement and without recourse to restriction. Multicommodity buffer stocks, in particular, would require an ample and assured source of finance, and the management of price policy in relation to them would be by no means easy.[4] While realizing the difficulty of obtaining adequate effectiveness and coverage by either single-commodity of multi-commodity agreements, we do not wish to discourage efforts in either form. If agreements covering a fair number of commodities could be achieved, it would be of benefit to many underdeveloped countries directly, and to all trading countries indirectly. We also feel that experimentation may well increase the knowledge of governments regarding the operational difficulties we have noted.

268. We consider that there is a useful place for general stabilizing measures, such as the proposal for contracyclical lending discussed in chapter 7;[5] this, while by no means giving an assurance of stability for particular commodities, would help to mitigate some of the worst effects of general cyclical movements. We also outline in that chapter[6] schemes for automatic compensation of large short-run changes in the terms of trade. These schemes might be considered as a possible means of providing compensatory finance if other measures are not adopted.

269. Some help could be expected from the national measures discussed in chapter 8. They are of two kinds. First, there are ways in which nations can, by measures within their domestic jurisdiction, help toward greater stability; such measures include the establishment of buffer funds[7] and a smoothing of the flow of contracts for heavy engineering goods.[8] Second, there are ways in which nations can be encouraged to avoid causing violent disturbance to the economies of other countries.[9] We also note the need for efficient coordination and integration of public policy in order to achieve economic development.[10]

270. Effective stabilization may well require the simultaneous adoption of national and international measures, and general schemes as well as those special to particular commodities. In this difficult and complex field, no action which helps toward the right result is to be despised, even if it is in itself incomplete and of limited effectiveness. If, however, governments wish to have an assurance of as much stability of price relations as is consistent with economic change and progress, then we are convinced that they must look beyond schemes relating to particular commodities and review the general structure of the world's monetary systems. It is, of course, beyond the scope of our report to explore all the various possibilities for monetary reform. We have, however, examined one of these alternatives because of its close linkage with primary commodity prices: this is the commodity reserve currency scheme. The committee did not reach full agreement on the theoretical merits and difficulties of this proposal, nor on the question of political acceptability. But we were agreed that the scheme deserves more study than it has so far received. We reiterate that governments should realize that the degree of stability which (to judge from

[1] See par. 142.

[2] See par. 175.

[3] See par. 183.

[4] See pars. 148 to 160, 184 to 188.

[5] See pars. 223 to 234.

[6] See pars. 235 to 240.

[7] See par. 247.

[8] See par. 251.

[9] See pars. 256 to 262.

[10] See par. 263.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

United Nations debates) many of them desire will not be achieved solely by a conglomeration of partial measures.

271. We have noted points which require further study. But we consider that the grave and long-standing problem of instability in primary commodity markets calls for immediate, effective, and coordinated action; and we have given thought to the first steps needed to achieve such action.

272. We have reviewed the existing machinery for considering commodity problems—including the Economic and Social Council itself and its regional commissions, the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements and its associated study groups, and the Food and Agriculture Organization and its Commodity Policy Committee. We note that there is no special provision for commodity stabilization among the functions of the International Monetary Fund or the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

273. It seems to us that there is at present no effective international procedure for discussing and proposing action on the general problem of stabilization—a matter which transcends the problems of particular commodities. The present organization is directed toward piecemeal action, commodity by commodity. We do not think that this is sufficient; a general and simultaneous approach to the problem of stability in its many aspects is required. It is possible that a gap in international organization has here arisen unintentionally, through the absence of an international trade organization as envisaged in the Habana charter.[11]

274. We therefore propose that the Economic and Social Council should establish an intergovernmental commission, which we will refer to as the Trade Stabilization Commission. In order to provide permanent representation for the most important trading countries and an adequate rotation of representation for the others, it would probably be necessary to have 8 or 9 member governments. The Commission would meet whenever it thought fit, but we envisage that it would be necessary to have meetings for a number of weeks several times a year. The Commission's work would stand or fall by the high quality of the representatives appointed by governments; but we think it important also that the representatives should be free to undertake serious and continued work, not limiting their service on the Commission to infrequent brief meetings.

275. We recommend that the Commission should be asked, during its first period of office, to examine suggestions for future organization in this field. We would expect that, as a consequence, the present distribution of responsibility for action, and also the assembly and publication of facts and statistics, could be coordinated and improved. We see no reason to expect that an improved and streamlined organization would require any substantial change in the budgets of the international organizations.

276. The Commission would be advisory and not executive, and its main tasks would be as follows:

(a) To consider and make recommendations to the Economic and Social Council on general proposals[12] for stabilization, whether they are referred to it by the Council as meriting examination, or originate in the Commission.

(b) To report on its activities to the Council from time to time; and when the stability of the world's markets appears threatened, to make prompt recommendations to the Council for appropriate intergovernmental action. Such recommendations would be embodied in reports to the Council, which would also be sent at once to all governments for their information.

277. The Commission would, according to usual United Nations procedure, have the advantage of the presence of nonvoting representatives of the Secretary-General and of the specialized agencies (the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Labor Office, etc.). It would have the help of these agencies on matters related to their functions, and the assistance of the United Nations Secretariat; we recommend that it should also have the power to seek expert advice from outside the United Nations organizations.

278. The work of the Commission would involve exchanges of views between governments on possible types of action to which they may not wish to appear publicly committed; and there is a very real risk that premature knowledge of the Commission's deliberations would produce harmful effects in the commodity markets. We, therefore, recommend that, contrary to usual United Nations practice, the Commission should meet in closed session except when it decides otherwise. We would expect that, in addition to the formal meetings, occasions would be required for informal exchanges of view among the representatives of the member governments, meeting in private.

279. We make these recommendations because we are convinced of the importance of the service which such a commission could render. The realization of this service depends on the willingness of governments to support the work by the appointment of representatives of high standing and quality. The Commission would be useless—or perhaps worse than useless—if governments were not convinced of the value of its work and willing to lend it their full support.

[11] See Final Act, United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment, Habana, 1948, article 72.

[12] These might include proposals of the kind discussed in preceding chapters, but we do not put forward the idea of a Commission as providing an alternative to the discussion of this report in the Council itself.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, there are still many people in the world who believe that the solution to the problem of instability in raw-material prices is to adopt more Government planning and control. I do not share their views.

Raymond Moley, in his column in Newsweek of February 8, 1954, reviewed the Randall Commission recommendations. I ask unanimous consent to have his discussion of the problem printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RANDALL WARNING

(By Raymond Moley)

The Randall Commission on Foreign Economic Policy has issued a sharp warning to the President, the Congress, and the American people against the deadly peril to our free economy in some international agreements. Such agreements, allegedly entered into for the alluring purpose of stabilizing prices and sharing the supply of raw materials, may well introduce a new and sinister form of regimentation here and also lend our approval to the old European cartel.

Our State Department under Secretary Hull was ostentatiously dedicated to the principle of freedom of trade. It is therefore ironic that members of that Department now dedicate themselves to the imposition of shackles more serious than past high tariffs. The Randall report says:

"The Commission * * * believes that such * * * agreements introduce rigidities and restraints that impair the elasticity of economic adjustment and the freedom of individual initiative which are fundamental to economic progress. Moreover, the types of intergovernmental commodity agreements thus far tried or proposed * * * involve commitments which could lead, if extensively employed, to very large outlays of United States Government funds * * * of indeterminate amounts."

Specifically mentioned and deplored was the International Wheat Agreement which costs us more than $500 million and was renewed in a mad hurry last July by the Senate without a record vote.

This sort of thing is already moving into other commodities such as tin. Last week I offered a prize example of how such agreements were put over through the International Materials Conference, which operated without authorization of Congress and enforced its determination through war-emergency agencies. Such bypassing of Congress might well be done in the future through executive agreements little noted at the time but of profound impact on our economic life.

Let us for a moment see how such commitments fasten themselves upon us. In 1946 the Committee for Economic Development sponsored a study of the control of world trade by Prof. E. S. Mason of Harvard, who was also for a time deputy to the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. He wrote in his report that "to enable the machinery of international commodity control to function it will be necessary to reshape not only commercial policy but policies hitherto considered as belonging to the field of domestic regulation."

Professor Mason turned up later as a member of the President's Materials Policy Commission, of which William S. Paley was chairman. The Mason ideas were deeply embedded in the official report of that commission in 1952. Referring to the Havana Charter, which was considered and deliberately rejected by Congres, it said: "The United States has not ratified the treaty, but under a resolution of the United Nations Economic and Social Council is bound with other nations to recognize chapter VI as a guide." Thus when Congress bars the front door, use the window.

Now enters the U. N. Under the direction of the General Assembly the Secretary General called upon a group of economists from here and abroad. They rendered a long report last month which recommended the creation of a watchdog commission to advise the Economic and Social Council and its member governments. It also recommended that this commission operate in secret to consider measures to which it might not wish to appear publicly committed.

When the Paley-Mason theory is added to this, we have the complete picture. The U. N. sets up a commission to sit in secret and to recommend proposals to the Economic and Social Council, whose decisions are binding upon the United States, whether the Congress likes it or not. This kind of commitment was foreshadowed in the opinion of Chief Justice Vinson in the Steel Seizure case.

Can it be wondered that informed people are determined to bring all such agreements under the clear and effective control of Congress?

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD Mr. Moley's column on the International Materials Conference, published in Newsweek of February 1, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—III

(By Raymond Moley)

The most important part of the Bricker proposal is section 3, which brings within the regulatory power of Congress the making of executive agreements by more or less anonymous bureaucrats throughout the vast ramifications of the Foreign Service. Most of these agreements originate in international commissions and operate with little notice and no control by Congress. They are a relatively new element in foreign affairs, and, what is most serious, they frequently deal with the internal affairs of the country.

Here is a brief sketch of such an operation. In December 1950 Socialist Prime Minister Attlee visited Washington and suggested the creation of an international operation to allocate and distribute raw materials on an international basis. A month later, the State Department announced the creation of such an apparatus, the International Materials Conference, with offices in the Department and largely paid for with American money. There was established a central group, composed of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France. Then seven committees were formed to allocate and control the price of certain raw materials. The international semantics by which this was designated, "entitlement for consumption," is, in Marxese, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

The IMC made clear the responsibility of each country for seeing that their allocations are not exceeded. In January 1952 Assistant Secretary of State Jack McFall said that there was "no statutory authority for the participation of the United States in this conference as it is one of many activities carried out in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States."

After the committees made all the decisions, they were enforced in the United States by the extraordinary powers of our various emergency agencies. The National Production Administration distributed tickets which totaled the United States entitlement to American consumers of copper. Price controls were used in the case of zinc. The OPS prohibited the purchase of zinc processed from foreign raw materials at a delivered cost above the ceiling price established herein. The powers of the Defense Production Act were used to limit domestic consumption of sulfur, so as to have a surplus for our friends abroad.

Thus, the State Department sponsored and brought about within our domestic economy what really amounted to an international cartel. In fact, in hearings before congressional committees and in debates it was made clear that Congress did not dream of such an agency as the IMC when it passed emergency legislation. Congress had charged the Munitions Board with the responsibility of accumulating a stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The IMC curtailed that stockpiling at a time when our forces were in a desperate crisis in Korea.

In the absence of the emergency agencies which were used in this case, the same thing could be done even more effectively through executive agreements.

This process of bypassing Congress stems from a deep-seated feeling by the bureaucratic elite that the public and its representatives are incapable of understanding the high ideals and fine thinking that prevail in international intercourse. Consider these notable last words of the maestro of the elite, Dean Acheson, addressed to the Foreign Service Association a year ago: "Make no mistake, there is a real battle with Congress. There is a great lag in the education and information between you who know the outside world and the great mass of the American people and their elected representatives. A great lag between you who know the facts of life," etc.

Acheson is gone, but most of the old State Department participants in IMC are still around and appeared before Senator MALONE's subcommittee this month. The central group was officially terminated on December 31 last, but its members have indicated their readiness to consult among themselves.

No wonder those who favor this bypassing of Congress are so fearful of section 3 of the Bricker amendment.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I conclude by saying that I am very happy to have been a cosponsor of the bill introduced today by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] proposing to increase the personal exemptions under the income-tax laws.

Lastly, I wish to thank my very distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, for yielding to me, since it will permit me to return now to the first State to enter the Union.

Mr. WILEY. I was very happy to make the time available to my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Delaware, for several reasons, principally because he had the good judgment on one occasion to see a very sweet woman from Wisconsin, and he took her as his wife.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947—SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, 8 years ago many Members of the United States Senate devoted long hours and back-breaking effort to enact one of the most difficult and complex pieces of social legislation ever to be placed on the statute books. This legislation has become known as the Taft-Hartley Act. It bears the name of the man who, more than any other, was responsible for its passage—a man who is revered by his colleagues and, yes, by the Nation as one of the great statesman of our time, the late Senator from Ohio, Robert A. Taft.

I have given considerable study to President Eisenhower's January 11 message on Taft-Hartley amendments. It is my conclusion that the President has found the true middle ground in this controversial subject. I am in enthusiastic agreement with his statement that the Taft-Hartley Act is sound legislation. I am convinced that the President's recommendations in no way detract from the basic purposes of that act. I have every confidence that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare shortly will report a bill incorporating the recommendations of President Eisenhower. It is my intention to support the bill.

The objective of the Taft-Hartley Act was to set up a fair and equitable framework in which management and labor could settle their own problems in a manner consistent with the best interests of all the citizens of this great country. No one who is even slightly acquainted with the complexities of labor-management relations and the intense fervor of competing interests could fail to appreciate the difficulty of achieving this objective.

In my humble opinion, we can, on the basis of 8 years of experience, look back with pride at the job which was done in 1947. The objective was achieved in most important respects.

In the debate which preceded the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, two problems vied with each other for the most attention. They were the closed shop and secondary boycotts. In both cases, the exhaustive testimony presented to the Senate and House Committees clearly established the substantive evils represented in these two issues. In passing the Taft-Hartley Act, Congress sought to eradicate these evils.

With the indulgence of my fellow Senators, I shall say a few words about one of these problems—secondary boycotts. The problem is still with us today.

The President prefaced his recommendations on secondary boycott restrictions with the statement:

The true secondary boycott is indefensible and must not be permitted.

I intend to point out today that there are a number of indefensible secondary boycotts which the present law does not touch. I shall then introduce a bill which seeks to cover these situations. My bill, in effect, is an amendment to the Smith bill, S. 2650, upon which hearings have just been concluded. It is my hope that the Committee will incorporate my bill in the bill it will report to the Senate.

An editorial appearing on December 18, 1953, in the Topeka Daily Capital poses the problem when it states:

The Taft-Hartley Act was supposed to prohibit secondary boycott, but smart union leaders and the lawyers have found loopholes in the law.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this place in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEEK SECONDARY BOYCOTT BAN

Innocent bystanders often suffer when labor unions strike against employers with whom they have disputes. Through the device known as the secondary boycott, it frequently happens that firms having no dispute are closed down because pressure is brought upon their employees by the striking unions. It works injustice upon employer, employee, and customer alike.

The Taft-Hartley Act was supposed to prohibit secondary boycott, but smart union leaders and their lawyers have found loopholes in the law. The United States Chamber of Commerce says that many businessmen will seek amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act in the next session of Congress to prohibit threats, coercion, and economic sanctions against neutral employers.

Some examples of recent secondary boycotts are enumerated by the Chamber. A union recently induced employees of a contractor to stop work on a new plant which an Indiana firm was building. The unions dispute was with the firm, not the contractor. It used the work-stoppage simply to bring pressure against its adversary.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN - LIBRARIES

Another example cited by the Chamber is that of a New Jersey refrigerated trucking service, which employed members of a local teamsters' union. When these trucks reached New York City, members of the New York local of the same union picketed the trucking company's customers. Employees of the customers refused to handle goods moved by the New Jersey company, and it went out of business.

Through the secondary boycott device employees, employers, and customers suffer losses through no fault of their own. An employer may find a picket line around his store or plant because a union is trying to organize one of his suppliers. The purpose is to prevent him from doing further business with the supplier until the latter comes to terms with the union. If the employer is forced out of business both he and his employees are injured, as well as his customers who can no longer buy his goods or services.

Since the secondary boycott is something like a big bully attacking a defenseless individual, it should be outlawed. It is conceivable that practically every business in a community could be closed, and seriously injured, when one union in a remote plant strikes and calls upon other unions to boycott all who do business with that particular firm. A simple amendment to the Taft-Hartley law will turn the trick.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the problem is with us today because President Eisenhower in his labor message has recommended three changes in the secondary boycott provisions of the act, all of which are concessions to unions. I have checked to determine exactly what my party promised during the 1952 campaign with respect to secondary boycotts. I found that the only speeches which might be said to commit my party on this subject were made by Senator Taft. Speaking on behalf of the candidacy of President Eisenhower at Benton Harbor, Mich., on September 24, 1952, the late Senator, also, said the law should be amended. He said:

Amendment to secondary boycott provisions both to cure inequities and to close loopholes.

I have seen no bill at this session which seeks to close loopholes in the secondary boycott provision. I know there are such loopholes.

Last fall a Kansas City television station began a series of broadcasts of the fights which were regularly held in a local building. The employees of the TV station did not want to join a union. However, the employees of the building in which the fights were held were unionized. The business agent of the building employees called on the manager of the building and told him to get the TV employees into a union or else to take the television cameras out. The TV manager thought that was a secondary boycott until he consulted his lawyer. He then learned that it was a secondary boycott, but that it was not covered by present law.

We had another example in the Kansas City area last summer. A manufacturer of prefabricated houses entered into contracts with a number of builders to erect a large number of such houses. The prefab manufacturer had a contract with the carpenters' union in his plant, but he had refused to agree to a compulsory membership contract. The business agent for the carpenters' union in the Kansas City area went to the builders and told them he would not permit them to use the products of the manufacturer. This was his way of forcing the manufacturer to agree to a union shop in a plant located over a thousand miles from Kansas City. Here, again, present law provides no relief.

I cite another example. This is presently happening to a small manufacturer in the small town of Augusta, Kans. I quote from the letter of my constituent:

We are currently in the 12th week of a UAW-CIO strike against our company, called because we would not agree to compulsory union membership. We began limited production 4 days after the strike began, and today we are operating normally with a full complement of workmen. However, we still have pickets out front, and the strike has boiled down to two weapons now being used by the union. Both of them involve secondary boycott. First—they have approached our customers and made every effort to incite our customer employees not to use our equipment. Second—they have enlisted the aid of other unions in an attempt to prevent consignments moving to and from our plant. Neither of these has been very successful, however, it has been and still is a constant battle to keep the supply lines open and to keep our customers satisfied.

Some of the activities described in the letter I have just read may be illegal under present law. But many of them are not. The trucking companies are not accepting cargo for delivery to his plant and are refusing to stop at his plant to pick up cargo because they have contracts with their union which provide that the trucking companies will not carry hot cargo. The NLRB has ruled such contracts to be legal. My bill seeks to overrule that decision.

Now I come to a situation even more disturbing to me. No group has a greater stake in a strong ban on secondary boycotts than American farmers. Yet decisions of the NLRB have stripped the farmer of any protection. His employees are not employees under the act for any purpose. A case establishing that principle involved a California grower. The union had been unsuccessful in organizing the grower's employees. It then persuaded the employees of the winery to strike to compel the winery to cease using the grapes produced by the grower. On those facts the case would seem to fall squarely within the language of the present law. However, present law uses the term "employees" and agricultural employees are excluded from the definition of employees in the definition section of the law. To cure that loophole, my bill substitutes the word "person" for the word "employees."

Farm organizations are alerting their membership to the secondary boycott problems.

I read from a pamphlet distributed by the American Farm Bureau Federation just a few weeks ago:

A secondary boycott is coercion brought against one employer to stop him from doing business with another employer involved in a labor dispute. The Taft-Hartley Act states it is an unfair labor practice.

This provision of the act has been seriously weakened. The National Labor Relations Board has, by a series of rulings, practically repealed this section of the act.

Farm Bureau favors strengthening the provisions of the act relating to secondary boycotts. Effective remedies, including private redress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a pamphlet which the Farm Bureau has published, which refers to secondary boycotts and unfair coercion against third parties.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'VE TALKED IT OVER AND DECIDED—NOW LET'S GET ACTION TOGETHER ON THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS PROBLEM

Farmers and wage earners have many mutual interests. A high level of employment and high production per man in industry, resulting in high real purchasing power, is essential to farm prosperity.

Wage earners have a right to organize, to bargain collectively, to strike in support of legitimate objectives.

But these are not unlimited or absolute rights.

These rights must be exercised with consideration to the interests and welfare of others, with respect to the basic rights and freedoms of all, with recognition of the need to avoid monopolistic practices.

Present labor-management law does not do this.

THE RIGHT TO WORK A BASIC FREEDOM OF INDIVIDUALS

The Taft-Hartley Act prohibits closed shop (worker must belong to a union before going to work) but permits union shop (must join union after employment). Failure to provide adequate remedies in act has permitted continuation of closed shop in many industries.

Denial of right to work without joining an organization is a violation of a basic freedom. Compulsory unionization contributes to nondemocratic practices of unions, aids control of unions by Communists and racketeers and furthers other abuses of power.

Farm Bureau favors—

Prohibition of all compulsory unionization. No worker should be deprived of his right to work by reason of failure to belong to any organization.

SECONDARY BOYCOTTS UNFAIR COERCION AGAINST THIRD PARTIES

A secondary boycott is coercion brought against one employer to stop him from doing business with another employer involved in a labor dispute. The Taft-Hartley Act states it is an unfair-labor practice.

This provision of the act has been seriously weakened. The National Labor Relations Board has, by a series of rulings, practically repealed this section of the act.

Farm Bureau favors—

Strengthening the provisions of the act relating to secondary boycotts. Effective remedies, including private redress.

INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING, A MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICE

When bargaining is on an industry-wide basis, or for a large portion of an industry, when bargaining breaks down, this results in an industry-wide strike.

This is the exercise of a monopoly power against the public. It leads to Federal intervention in settlement of labor disputes.

Farm Bureau favors—

A prohibition of industry-wide bargaining and strikes as monopolistic practices in restraint of trade.

FEATHERBEDDING, INTERFERENCE WITH HIGH PRODUCTION PER MAN

Featherbedding is coercion to compel uneconomic practices. It is theoretically prohibited by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Featherbedding practices reduce production per man and therefore reduce real pur-

chasing power. The anti-featherbedding provisions of Taft-Hartley have been nullified by court decisions.

Farm Bureau favors—

Prohibition of featherbedding. Adequate remedies.

STATES RIGHTS OFTEN OVERRULED IN ADMINISTRATION OF TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

The right of States to legislate on labor issues and to exercise police power is jeopardized by recent court rulings.

For example the Supreme Court recently ruled that Pennsylvania law regulating picketing was invalid because the Federal Government had assumed exclusive jurisdiction.

Farm Bureau favors—

Restoration to States of powers to legislate on labor management problems.

MONOPOLY

The exercise of monopoly power by industry, labor, agriculture, or government is a threat to the maintenance of successful self-government, preservation of private free enterprise.

Concentration of economic power in the hands of labor unions has progressed to the point that in many instances it may appropriately be termed "labor monopoly."

In their exercise of this monopoly power some labor unions have resorted to measures, which, if used by any other economic group, would result in drastic action under laws designed to curb monopoly and restraint of trade.

An increasing number of strikes are in effect directed against the public, against the general economy, against our defense effort, rather than against employers. (Examples: the 1952 steel strike, the 1953 New York milk strike.)

WHAT IS NEEDED

Amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act will be considered by Congress in 1954.

Most current proposals for amending the act under consideration by Congress do not deal with the basic issues. Some of the proposals have merit. Many of them, however, involve a weakening, in one form or another, of present provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The act has already been very seriously weakened by NLRB and court rulings during the past 6 years.

Now is the time for those who believe the act should be strengthened—to curb labor monopoly, to preserve the freedom of both employers and employees, and to protect the public interest—to be heard.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. Pratt, again quoting from the current issue of the Nation's Agriculture, wherein there appears a 2-page story devoted to the secondary boycott:

A secondary boycott is a boycott by a party not directly involved in labor-management dispute.

For example, if a dairy workers' union were trying to organize workers on dairy farms in a certain area and the teamsters' union stopped hauling milk from such farms, this would be a secondary boycott.

If the milk company refused to accept the milk, or if the workers of the milk company refused to work if milk from such dairy farms was received, either of these actions would be a secondary boycott.

Secondary boycotts are prohibited by the Taft-Hartley Act. The National Labor Relations Board is directed to seek an immediate injunction against any secondary boycott.

It would be wrong, however, to assume the Taft-Hartley Act has resulted in stopping secondary boycotts.

Actually the use of secondary boycotts is widespread. They are a very common feature of many, perhaps most, labor controversies. The threat of a secondary boycott is an extremely powerful force even when no secondary boycott is actually undertaken.

The major reasons for the widespread use of secondary boycott is that their intended purpose is often fully accomplished long before the NLRB can obtain injunctive action, and because the NLRB has found during the years since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, often by strained interpretation of the intent of Congress, numerous loopholes which have almost made the act's prohibition of secondary boycotts a dead letter.

The biggest hole in the act was breached when the NLRB ruled that if the union and employer had a contract which sanctioned secondary boycotts, this overrode the prohibition of the act.

For example, if the teamsters' union has a contract with employers permitting them to refuse to cross a picket line, they may use this to deny trucking services to any plant undergoing a labor controversy.

This is just one of the many NLRB interpretations which have virtually nullified the intent of Congress to prohibit secondary boycotts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Secondary Boycotts," published in the Nation's Agriculture of February 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECONDARY BOYCOTTS—FARMERS HAVE AN INTEREST IN THE MAJOR KEY TO UNION MONOPOLY

One of the major labor-management issues up for congressional review in 1954 is whether the secondary boycott provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act should be weakened or strengthened.

A secondary boycott is a boycott by a party not directly involved in a labor-management dispute.

For example, if a dairy workers' union were trying to organize workers on dairy farms in a certain area and the teamsters' union stopped hauling milk from such farms, this would be a secondary boycott.

If the milk company refused to accept the milk, or if the workers of the milk company refused to work if milk from such dairy farms was received, either of these actions would be a secondary boycott.

Secondary boycotts are prohibited by the Taft-Hartley Act. The National Labor Relations Board is directed to seek an immediate injunction against any secondary boycott.

It would be wrong, however, to assume that the Taft-Hartley Act has resulted in stopping secondary boycotts.

Actually the use of secondary boycotts is widespread. They are a very common feature of many, perhaps most, labor controversies. The threat of a secondary boycott is an extremely powerful force even when no secondary boycott is actually undertaken.

The major reasons for the widespread use of secondary boycott is that their intended purpose is often fully accomplished long before the NLRB can obtain injunctive action, and because the NLRB has found during the years since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, often by strained interpretation of the intent of Congress, numerous loopholes which have almost made the act's prohibition of secondary boycotts a dead letter.

The biggest hole in the act was breached when the NLRB ruled that if the union and employer had a contract which sanctioned secondary boycotts, this overrode the prohibition of the act.

For example, if the teamsters' union has a contract with employers permitting them to refuse to cross a picket line, they may use this to deny trucking services to any plant undergoing a labor controversy.

This is just one of many NLRB interpretations which have virtually nullified the intent of Congress to prohibit secondary boycotts.

During 1953 dozens of witnesses told the House and Senate Labor Committees of the use of secondary boycotts which had resulted in irreparable losses to many individuals and segments of our economy.

Review of the legislative history of the Taft-Hartley Act indicates Congress desired to prohibit secondary boycotts, to better balance the relative strength of unions and employers, particularly with respect to the small employer who is frequently extremely vulnerable to boycotts.

It was considered to be an unfair and inequitable practice to permit or compel third parties with no direct relationship to a controversy, to intervene in such controversy by a boycott of goods or services of the employer.

It would be a shocking idea to think that Congress might remove still further the few legal restrictions against secondary boycotts. But powerful pressures to do just that are being exerted.

For example, one of many proposals would provide that injunctions against secondary boycotts would be discretionary with NLRB, rather than mandatory, as now provided.

Short of outright repeal of Taft-Hartley there is probably nothing more desired by unions than further crippling of the remaining safeguards against the use of secondary boycotts.

Weak as the Taft-Hartley ban has become, it does prevent some boycotts. And so long as the act is not weakened, there is the possibility that court and NLRB decisions may close some of the loopholes.

Secondary boycotts have frequently been used to compel union organization against the desires of employees.

For example, a tire distributor, faced with a boycott of his product by many of his customers, may feel he has no alternative but to sign up with a union, irrespective of the wishes of his employees, or to give in to other demands made upon him such as set off of dues, etc.

The secondary boycott, even more than compulsory unionization, is the major key to union monopoly. The present weak law should be strengthened to plug the loopholes developed in recent years and to provide more effective remedies.

Farmers have a major interest in this issue not only as citizens interested in preventing monopoly but in connection with their interest as purchasers of production supplies and sellers of farm products.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, while it can be documented that there is no business which cannot be ruined by a secondary boycott, it is small business, the retailer, the main streets of America which are the most vulnerable. A retailer cannot exist with a picket line in front of his establishment. His customers do not even read the signs the pickets carry. It is so easy to avoid inconvenience by going across the street to shop. And having found what they wanted in the other store, they perhaps never come back to the picketed dealer. Retailers know these hard facts of life. When the union calls the small retailer on the phone and says "Take all the Shultz bread off your shelves," the retailer is inclined to comply. Shultz may tell him that the union is doing this to force Shultz to require his unwilling employees to join the union, but the retailer has to think about self-preservation.

Perhaps the retailer has more intestinal fortitude. He continues to handle

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Shultz's bread. Then the union follows Shultz's trucks and pickets the driver while he is delivering the bread to the retailer. Now the retailer has real trouble. He has that picket line out in front. It is a secondary boycott, but decisions of NLRB hold it is not covered by the act. The Board held that Shultz's truck is a part of his plan of business, that the union is still picketing Shultz wherever it finds him, and that it may legally do so. My bill seeks to close that loophole.

Let me read a short editorial appearing on the front page of the Bunker Hill Press, which says on its masthead that it is in the richest farming community in northern Indiana:

"Secondary boycotting" may be a meaningless term to most of us—but to a small-business man it may mean ruin. As for instance:

An ex-GI saved $1,000, got a truck and a partner, and started a delivery service. The partners worked hard, prospered, hired three other drivers.

In stepped a truck-drivers' union boss, demanding that the young partners and their three employees fork over $100 each and join the union. Already getting more than union scale, the employees refused. The union boss then demanded that the two partners pay the whole $500. They refused.

The union then began a secondary boycott—picketing the firm's customers. Thus pressured, the customers went elsewhere—and the firm went under.

The Taft-Hartley Act's ban on secondary boycotts was intended to prevent such ruinous attacks on business. But it has been ineffective. It should be strengthened—and enforced.

Mr. President, let us review briefly the reasons behind the attempt by Congress in 1947 to eradicate the evils of secondary boycotts.

The testimony before both labor committees in 1947 is filled with examples showing how many innocent people were injured, and even how some killings resulted, from secondary-boycott activity of unions.

There was the case of Edward and Robert Hunt, who had a motor-freight business in Philadelphia in 1945. They hauled principally for the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. As a result of organizational violence, a union member was killed. Edward A. Hunt was tried for the homicide, and was acquitted. Shortly thereafter, A. & P. signed a closed-shop agreement with the teamsters union; and all the contract haulers signed, except the Hunts. The Hunts wanted to sign, but the teamsters union would not permit them to do so.

The union would not permit the Hunts' employees to join; nor would the union permit any goods to be hauled for any persons who contracted with the Hunts. Confronted with the boycott which was threatening and accomplishing utter destruction of their business, the Hunts sought a Federal court injunction against the union activities. When the case finally reached the Supreme Court in 1945, the court held that the arbitrary destruction of a business by a labor union, through its closed shop and a secondary boycott, violated no Federal law, and that the Federal courts were without power to interfere. There is a serious question of whether the secondary boycott provisions of the Taft-Hartley law would have stopped the teamsters in the Hunt case, if they had been in effect.

Certainly the NLRB and the courts have held that the Taft-Hartley ban does not stop the coercion and intimidation of secondary employers, which was what happened to Hunt's customers.

Mr. President, at this late hour I shall not impose upon the time of my distinguished colleagues by documenting the legislative history supporting the conclusion that Congress intended, in passing section 8 (b) (4) of the Taft-Hartley Act, to do away once and for all with secondary boycotts. The late Senator Taft stated this intent many times. It has been accepted as a fact by both the NLRB and the courts.

The clear intent of Congress has not been carried out. The will of this great legislative body has been frustrated and circumvented by devious interpretations by the NLRB and the courts and by shrewd stratagems developed by powerful unions. Yes, Mr. President, I say to you that secondary boycotts are still with us today. It is for us to see that the job started in 1947 is carried through to a successful conclusion, without further delay. I am therefore introducing a bill which will, in my opinion, achieve the objective which all of us seek—namely, the eradication of secondary boycotts.

Mr. President, I was happy to see our great President say in his message on labor matters to the Congress that the true secondary boycott is indefensible. This was the prevailing view of the United States Senate in 1947. It was the prevailing view, in my opinion, of the great majority of our citizens, including many members of labor unions.

I have received many, many letters from members of labor unions, though not from labor union officials, and I think the same view is held today by the great majority of serious-thinking persons.

Mr. President, at this point let me say a few words on the subject of unions. I emphasis that I am not against labor organizations. I am for the principles of free, collective bargaining. My quarrel with unions, or with anyone else, for that matter, arises only when they seek to use unfair methods which trample on the rights which all of us hold dear. The secondary boycott is such a method. I am unalterably opposed to its use.

Mr. President, I have prepared a more detailed explanation of my bill, and I now ask unanimous consent to have the explanation printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCHOEPPEL EXPLAINING HIS AMENDMENT TO THE LABOR MANAGMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947, DEALING WITH SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

The bill which I have introduced today amends section 8 (b) (4)—the so-called secondary boycott section—of the Taft-Hartley Act. The purpose of the changes suggested in the bill is to carry out the original congressional intent to eradicate the evils of secondary boycotts.

There can be no question as to the intent of Congress in this regard in 1947. Evidence of this intent is contained in the oft-quoted statement made by Senator Taft on the floor of the Senate in June 1947, shortly before the passage of the act which reads, in part, as follows:

"The Senator will find a great many decisions * * * which hold that under the common law a secondary boycott is unlawful. Subsequently, under the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, it became impossible to stop a secondary boycott or any other kind of a strike, no matter how unlawful it may have been at common law. All this provision of the bill (sec. 8 (b) (4)) does is to reverse the effect of the law as to secondary boycotts. Our committee heard evidence for weeks and never succeeded in having anyone tell us any difference between different kinds of secondary boycotts. So we have so broadened the provision dealing with secondary boycotts as to make them an unfair labor practice." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 3, p. 4198).

Additional evidence is contained in the House Conference Report, No. 510 on H. R. 3020 at pages 43 and 44. The Supreme Court of the United States has said that the "substantive evil condemned by Congress in 8 (b) (4) is the secondary boycott." *I. B. E. W. v. N. L. R. B.* (341 U. S. 694). The NLRB itself has long since reached the same conclusion when it noted in *Wadsworth Building Co.* (81 NLRB 802). "The manifest intention of Congress to eliminate secondary boycotts as disruptive influences on interstate commerce."

The language of section 8 (b) (4) does not use the term "secondary boycott." Instead of using the term, those who drafted the wording decided to use specific language labeling as an unfair labor practice certain types of union conduct which form the structure of secondary boycotts or threats thereof. It is worthwhile pointing out that section 8 (b) (4) did not make unlawful a union technique—the secondary boycott—which had theretofore been regarded by the courts as lawful. Secondary boycotts have generally been regarded as unlawful. Writing in 1940 Ludwig Teller, a leading authority on labor law, said:

"American judicial decision has come into general agreement that there is a distinction between a primary boycott and a secondary boycott and, as shall be seen hereafter, the primary boycott, if peacefully carried on, is legal, while the secondary boycott is illegal because involving the exercise of coercion upon innocent third persons not parties to the dispute." (Ludwig Teller, Labor Disputes and Collective Bargaining, p. 454, 1940.)

In view of this conclusion, it might well be asked why an additional Federal sanction was necessary. The answer is clear.

In 1932, Congress passed the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which placed severe limitations on the power of the Federal courts to issue injunctions in labor dispute cases. Designed to prevent what some people had regarded as an abuse of discretion on the part of the Federal courts in issuing injunctions in labor dispute cases, the act was so broad in its sweep that employers with manifestly just cases against unions could hope for little relief in the Federal courts. Relief might also be available in the State courts, but differences in interpretation among the various States and also the variations in procedure made it difficult to get expeditious treatment.

As a result, by 1947, Congress took recognition of the injustice resulting from secondary boycotts and enacted section 8 (b) (4). It should be noted that the section covers certain types of activity which have not been traditionally regarded as a secondary boycott. On the other hand, there are one or two types of traditional secondary boycotts

or threats thereof not covered by the language of the section.

The interpretation of the boycott prohibition by the NLRB and the courts has shown, in many cases, a greater interest in protecting union activities than in carrying out the intent of Congress to outlaw secondary boycotts. As a result, large areas of activity have been carved out of the application of the statute. In these areas, secondary boycotts or the threats of secondary boycotts may be carried on without fear of sanction. In certain industries, such interpretations have almost completely nullified the effectiveness of the boycott ban.

There are those who argue that many of the interpretative loopholes can be closed by a more judicially-minded board. We hope that the recent appointments will once again justify the application of the term "judicially-minded." Nevertheless, Congress must see that the will of the people, as expressed through the Taft-Hartley Act, is carried out. Important matters of public policy should not be left to the interpretative vagaries of administrative agencies. Moreover, simple justice to neutral employers, their employees, and the consuming public demand that these changes be made without further delay. Who can predict when the NLRB will get around to reinterpreting some of these vital issues.

To these unwarranted exceptions can be added the skillful stratagems developed by the unions to take advantage of every weak spot in the original wording. It would indeed have been a miracle if Congress had written language in this very difficult field which would have completely taken care of all eventualities. Some inadvertent omissions do exist. The unions have been quick to seize upon them.

The wording contained in this bill is designed to correct the patently wrong interpretations and to fill in the inadvertent omissions. The changes will be discussed in detail in the following paragraphs:

1. Insertion of the phrase "at any place" after the third and again after the eighth word in section 8 (b) (4):

In interpreting section 8 (b) (4), the Board and the courts have developed the so-called primary situs theory. The development of the theory was felt to be necessary because it was thought that a strict reading of the language of the section would prohibit picketing at the primary situs of a labor dispute. This thought was, in turn, premised on the belief that picketing at the primary situs always had as an object the inducement of employees of secondary employers to refuse to cross the picket line and, therefore, to perform their regularly assigned duties. If this observation as to the objective of the picketing at the primary situs was correct, then it would have to follow that it was unlawful under the terms of 8 (b) (4) (A) unless some saving theory could be developed. Otherwise, one of the most usual and customary tactics in a primary situs would be unlawful. Much was made of the fact that Congress had shown no disposition to interfere with the traditional type of primary economic strike. It was assumed, therefore, that the picketing that had always gone hand in hand with such strikes should also be protected.

The background of the primary situs theory was laid in *Wadsworth Building Co., Inc.* (81 N. L. R. B. 802). The theory was first applied in *The Pure Oil Co.* (84 N. L. R. B. 315). In *Ryan Construction Co.* (85 N. L. R. B. 417), a majority of the Board permitted picketing of a construction entrance adjacent to the main plant that was used only by the employees of the construction company, the secondary employers. The objective of the picketing was clearly on the facts to induce the employees of the secondary employers to refuse to go to work. By applying of the primary situs theory, the Board condoned the picketing. The first application of the primary situs theory to the trucking industry is found in *Schultz Refrigerated Service, Inc.* (87 N. L. R. B. 92). There a majority of the Board permitted the union to follow the trucks of the primary employer to the premises of secondary employers. Although the purpose of the picketing was to influence the employees of the secondary employers to refuse to handle the products of the primary employer, no violation of the act was found by the majority of the Board. The trucks of the primary employer, said the Board, were in effect an extension of the premises of the primary employer. Certain limitations were placed on picketing of this type. See *Sterling Beverages, Inc.* (90 N. L. R. B. 401) and *Moore Dry Dock Co.* (92 N. L. R. B. 547). But the basic rule is apparently still in effect.

In *Interborough News Company* (90 NLRB 2135), the primary situs theory was carried one long step further. Union agents went to the premises of the secondary employers and urged employees not to cross the picket line of the primary situs. Because the activity sought to be induced was to take place at the primary situs, no violation of the fact was found.

In my view, the present act contains the appropriate tests to be applied in these situations. The Board has not seen fit to apply them. If the objective of the union's activity is to induce the employees of secondary employers to refuse to perform work, the activity is unlawful. On the other hand, if the activity of a union has as an incidental effect such inducement, it should be prohibited. Again, in my view, this would be a proper construction of the present wording. Obviously, there are going to be difficult borderline case where it is hard to tell whether the results of the union activity can be attributed to objective or incidental effect. However, I am sure that these judgments can be made by a competent tribunal. In the administration of the Taft-Hartley Act, the Board and the courts are faced every day with similarly difficult matters of factual interpretation.

To insure that a union activity will be measured in the context of the act as originally written, the phrase "at any place" is to be inserted as indicated above.

2. The phrase, "the employees of any employer", as it appears following the phrase, "to induce or encourage" is stricken out and in lieu thereof is added the phrase, "any person."

Section 2 (3) of the present act defines the term "employee" as follows:

"The term 'employee' shall include any employee, and shall not be limited to the employees of a particular employer, unless the act explicitly states otherwise, and shall include any individual whose work has ceased as a consequence of, or in connection with, any current labor dispute or because of any unfair-labor practice, and who has not obtained any other regular and substantially equivalent employment, but shall not include any individual employed as an agricultural laborer, or in the domestic service of any family or person at his home, or any individual employed by his parent or spouse, or any individual having the status of any independent contractor, or any individual employed as a supervisor, or any individual employed by an employer subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or by any other person who is not an employer as herein defined."

The term "employer" is defined in section 2 (2) of the present act as follows:

"The term 'employer' includes any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States or any wholly owned Government corporation, or any Federal Reserve Bank, or any State or political subdivision thereof, or any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, or any person subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization."

The Board in several cases has adopted the view that the inducement of those who are not within the statutory definition of the term "employe" is not unlawful. Thus, the inducement of employees of a railroad (who are not subject generally to the provisions of the act) was held not to be an unfair labor practice. (*International Rice Milling Co., Inc.* (84 NLRB 360).)

The inducement of agricultural workers might be treated by the Board in a similar manner. (*Di Giorgio Wine Co.* (87 NLRB 125, enforced 191 F. 2d 642).)

The inducement of such individuals—although technically not employees as the term is used in the act—is the type of inducement sought to be proscribed by section 8 (b) (4) of the act. A secondary boycott can be just as effective if conducted by the employees of railways or by agricultural workers. The secondary employer in these cases is just as much a neutral as the automobile manufacturer or the operator of a steel mill. These neutrals should be protected. The industrial strife over which they have no control should not be permitted to interfere with their businesses. In fact, it has been argued with some force that the broad legislative intent involved in section 8 (b) (4) can be used to justify interpretation of the term "employee" on a broader basis than that contained in section 2 of the act. The *International Rice Milling Co., Inc., et al.* v. *N. L. R. B.* (183 F. 2d 21), reversed on other grounds (341 U. S. 665).

The proposed language specifically proscribes the inducement of "any person."

3. The word "concerted," is stricken out where it appears before the word "refusal."

The Supreme Court in *N. L. R. B.* v. *The International Rice Milling Co., Inc.* (341 U. S. 665) held that the inducement of a single employee of a secondary employer was not the inducement of a "concerted refusal." The inducement in the Rice Milling case took place at the premises of the primary employer, as did the activity sought to be induced. From the decision it is not clear as to whether this was essential to the Court's basic finding. Nor is it clear as to whether the separate inducement of several individual employees of a secondary employer to refuse to perform work (again individually) would be unlawful.

The inducement of a single employee of a secondary employer to refuse to perform work is just as much a secondary boycott as the inducement of 10 or 20 to jointly refuse to perform work. Conceivably, there could be circumstances where the harm resulting to the neutral employer could be just as severe as the injury resulting from a refusal to perform by a group of employees. The word "concerted" has no relation in this regard to the secondary boycott problem. It should be, and therefore is, stricken from the present language.

4. Following the word "services" as it first appears in clause "(4)" the language set forth below should be inserted:

"(a) or (ii) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to enter into or give effect to any contract or agreement permitting employees in the course of their employment to refuse to use, manufacture, process, or transport or otherwise handle goods, articles, materials, commodities, or to perform services."

Perhaps the most extraordinary interpretation of the secondary boycott provision of the act is that now commonly referred to as the Conway doctrine. The doctrine takes its name from the first case in which the doctrine was developed (*Conways Express*

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(87 N. L. R. B. 972)). In this decision, otherwise unlawful inducement of the employees of secondary employers was permitted because of the existence of a hot cargo clause in applicable collective bargaining contracts and because of employer acquiescence in the refusal to handle work. In effect, the Board was permitting secondary boycotts by contract clause as long as there was employer acquiescence. The second circuit court in *Rabouin (Conway Express)* v. *N. L. R. B.* (195 F. 2d 906) affirmed the Board's decision on this point in the following language:

"The union cannot have committed an unfair labor practice under this section in regard to those employers who refused to handle Rebouin's shipments under the terms of the area agreement provision relating to cargo shipped by struck employers. Consent in advance to honor a hot cargo clause is not the product of the union's 'forcing or requiring any employer * * * to cease doing business with any other person'" (sec. 8 (b) (4) (A)).

The doctrine was applied in the *Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.* (105 NLRB No. 120). In a very recent case (*McAllister Transfer, Inc.* (17–CC–18)), a trial examiner for the Board applied the doctrine in a situation where there was no specific finding of acquiescence. The hot-cargo clause standing alone was regarded as sufficient to permit the otherwise unlawful activity.

It is obvious that this doctrine transfers the boycott issue from the Taft-Hartley Act to the bargaining table. Any union strong enough to force an employer to accept such a clause can carry on secondary boycotts with impunity. If this doctrine is left unchecked, it will not be long before very substantial areas of the American economy are completely removed from the boycott protection of the act. It is hoped that the present Board will reverse the previous decisions will come out once and for all with a clear statement in accordance with the well-settled view that important public policy as announced by the Congress cannot be frustrated by the terms of private contracts.

Whatever the present Board may do, it is essential that Congress speak with clarity and conviction on the issue. The language here involved will have the effect of overruling the Conway doctrine. It will label as an unfair labor practice efforts by a union to include a hot-cargo clause in a contract and will also label as unlawful union efforts to give effect to a hot-cargo clause which may already exist in a contract. The proscription proposed here applies equally to both oral and written agreements.

"(b) or (iii) to coerce or restrain employers by force or economic reprisal, or threats thereof."

One of the most damaging loopholes in the present language is the one which permits unions and their agents to threaten with unlawful secondary activity supervisors and other management officials who are not within the statutory definition of the term "employee."

This ruling was first issued by the Board in the *Conways Express* (87 NLRB 130, affirmed 195 F. 2d 906). It has been adhered to in *Arkansas Express, Inc.* (92 NLRB 255), *Roy Stone Transfer Corp.* (100 NLRB 856), and other cases.

The impact of this exception is tremendous. In the construction industry, for example, threats of trouble on the job (secondary boycotts) directed toward management representatives are just as effective as inducements of the employees of the secondary employer. Because of construction deadlines, most employers, particularly the smaller ones, can't afford to call a union's bluff. Much the same situation obtains in the trucking industry as well as in other industries. In fact, most small employers are easy victims of such threats. They have neither the benefit of expert legal counsel to keep them advised of their rights, nor economic resources sufficient to run the risk of trouble.

If secondary boycotts and threats of secondary boycotts are to be made unlawful, this situation must be quickly corrected. The language proposed achieves this objective.

Another loophole closed by this wording is the so-called secondary consumer or customer boycott. Under the present language, the customer entrances of a department store may be picketed with impunity by a union which has a dispute with the manufacturer of a product sold by the department store. A filling station which advertises on a radio station with which a union has a labor dispute may find itself on the receiving end of a threatened or actual customer boycott unless it agrees to cancel its business with the station. (*N. L. R. B.* v. *Service Trade Chauffeurs, Salesmen and Helpers, Local 145 et al.* (191 F. 2d 65), *Capital Services, Inc.* (100 NLRB 1092), *Crowley's Milk Co.* (102 NLRB No. 102).) In the case of the department store and the filling station, the pressure if acceded to, may force the companies to break valid contracts. This injury to neutral employers should not be permitted. It is also made unlawful by the wording here.

"(c) or (iv) to prevent or discourage the members of any labor organization from entering employment."

In *Joliet Contractors Assn.* (99 NLRB 1291 (petition for review of NLRB dismissal of portion of complaint denied, 202 F. 2d 606)) it was held that the inducement by a union of its members to refuse to accept or enter into employment with contractors regarded as unfair by the union was not an unfair labor practice even though such activity would have been so had the members been already performing work for the unfair employers. The Joliet case involved a typical product boycott. The union was trying to enforce its rule against the use of preglazed sash. Product boycotts have been held by the Board to be unlawful where the refusal to handle is by employees (*Sound Shingle Co.* (101 NLRB 159)). In the Joliet case the inducement was held not to be unlawful because it was directed toward individuals before they had accepted employment—that is, before the employer-employee relationship had come into being.

Whether this is a correct interpretation of the present language or not is a matter of some dispute. Nevertheless, this much is clear: the activity amounts to a secondary boycott. It is a form of economic pressure on neutral employers. It should not be permitted. Left unchecked, this loophole would go a long way toward removing the protection of the act in the construction industry, which was one of the industries most prominently mentioned in the congressional testimony as requiring relief from secondary boycotts.

The proposed language will have the effect of enforcing the rule set forth in the Joliet case.

5. At the end of paragraph "(A)" the following language is added: "For the purpose of this subsection the term 'person' shall include the United States Government and any State government or political subdivision or agency of either."

In two decisions the Board has held that agencies of Federal and State Governments were not within the definition of the term "person" as used in this section of the act. Consequently, otherwise unlawful inducement of the employees of secondary employers doing business with these agencies was permitted (*Sprys Electric Co.* (104 NLRB No. 147), *Al J. Schneider* (87 NLRB 79)). In both instances the activity engaged in by the unions amounted to the usual type of secondary boycott, but, because of the technicality, no violation was found.

Secondary employers who do business with Federal and State Governments are in just as great need of protection against secondary boycotts as are secondary employers doing business with anyone else. There is a grave reason to doubt that Congress ever intended this fine distinction to be made. In any event, the present rule should be changed. The proposed language will accomplish this result.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I now introduce and send to the desk the bill to which I have referred in the course of my remarks. I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2989) to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SCHOEPPEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, before commencing my brief statement this afternoon, I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] for his thorough study and detailed explanation of the dangers of the secondary boycott. That subject is now before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I assure my distinguished colleague that his remarks will be received most appreciatively by all the members of that committee, and particularly in view of the thought which lies behind his remarks.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank my colleague.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT AND THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during last year's hearings before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it became increasingly apparent to all of us that it was not in the Taft-Hartley Act that the inequities about which labor or management complained would be found, but, rather in the constant deluge of decisions by the National Labor Relations Board. That point was developed from day to day, not only by the remarks of labor leaders and not only by the remarks of management, but also by the remarks made by the general public, the group the Taft-Hartley Act was designed to help protect.

Mr. President, in this week's issue of Look magazine, I could not help but notice a very interesting article entitled "Taft-Hartley Gains Ground." At this late hour of the day, I shall not take time to present all the statistics compiled by the Opinion Research Corp., whose president wrote the article. Instead, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAFT-HARTLEY GAINS GROUND

(By Claude Robinson, president, Opinion Research Corp.)

The Taft-Hartley Act has enjoyed gradually increasing public acceptance since its passage in 1947. This comes out in a series of studies conducted by the Opinion Research Corp. The findings are important now because the labor law again is under review in Congress, and because President Eisen-

hower has proposed 15 changes in it. Thus, the perennial debate, which has raged since 1947 over our national labor policy, is again commanding the attention of editors, commentators, politicians, union leaders, and businessmen.

As we have done in the past, the ORC has turned to the question of what the public—and union members themselves—think about the law as it stands today. We have talked with farmers and city dwellers, union and nonunion people, well-to-do and poor. As in the three previous studies reported in Look, we find that major tenets of the law are generally accepted by large majorities of the general public and by large majorities of union members. This is shown on the chart at right.

One curious aspect of these studies, which have been made steadily since 1947, is that support for specific provisions of Taft-Hartley has always run vastly higher both with the general public and with union members than has support for "Taft-Hartley" itself. Thus, the very name of the law appears as a symbol. It has been tagged as a slave-labor system by union leaders, and many people have opposed the symbol, while accepting the contents.

Contrast the results on the chart with the response we found when we asked: "Do you think Congress should have passed the Taft-Hartley law, or not?" Here is the record:

[In percent]

	General public			Labor union members		
	Yes	No	Undecided	Yes	No	Undecided
1948	42	27	31	19	63	18
1949	35	39	26	17	69	14
Today	45	21	34	32	47	21

The very sharp decline in the vehemence of opposition, as represented by the heavy drop in the "No" vote, indicates to us that the symbol of Taft-Hartley as a slave-labor law is losing its power.

Extensive surveys of public opinion on labor matters show that the public overwhelmingly supports legal guaranties of the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively, and that the public is strongly opposed to union busting as a policy.

At the same time, American public opinion strongly backs putting a legal restraint on any group that seems to overstep its authority or that seems to be getting too powerful. The chart indicates that the public generally considers specific provisions of Taft-Hartley to be in this tradition. On the basis of our studies, we are convinced that the public will go along with changes here and there in the law. But the remarkable stability of opinion on labor issues, shown in our surveys through the years, probably indicates that a national labor law along the lines of Taft-Hartley, will remain on the books for a long time.

[In percent]

Nine key Taft-Hartley provisions and the percentage of support given each by the general public and by union members	General public			Union members		
	1948	1949	Today	1948	1949	Today
Requiring a 60-day cooling-off period before a strike	83	79	84	65	63	70
Delaying strikes in public service industries	83	83	87	70	71	77
Prohibiting Communists from holding offices in unions	84	82	90	80	83	89
Requiring unions to make regular periodic financial reports	86	82	89	78	80	89
Outlawing the closed shop	76	70	75	52	58	64
Allowing union dues checkoff only with workers consent	61	55	60	66	60	71
Allowing companies to sue unions for breaking contracts	83	79	81	68	71	67
Allowing employers to talk with employees about joining unions	76	68	73	57	58	60
Prohibiting political contributions by labor unions	56	42	59	41	36	52

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the tabulation included in the article by Mr. Robinson shows what those of us in politics have long known, namely, that the people of the United States like the Taft-Hartley Act; that the laboring man likes the protection of the Taft-Hartley Act, though, of course, the labor leaders dislike it. I repeat, however, that the Taft-Hartley Act was designed to protect the public, not to protect labor leaders, who naturally resent it.

A close study of the figures included in the article I have just had incorporated in the RECORD will convince even the most skeptical that the people of the United States like the Taft-Hartley Act.

But, Mr. President, the people want this act interpreted fairly. They want it interpreted fairly for management and fairly for labor. It should not be interpreted at any time in favor of either party.

During recent hearings before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, when the nomination of Mr. Beeson, which the Senate confirmed yesterday, was under consideration, those who opposed Mr. Beeson's appointment sought justification for their position, among other ways, by attaching undue importance to, and by subtly cloaking with sinister connotations, Mr. Beeson's statement that former boards have been biased. What kind of a justification is this? How accurate is Mr. Beeson's conclusion? I think it appropriate, indeed, that we look briefly for ourselves at the record and caliber of past boards.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks a very brief biographical sketch of each of the members of the National Labor Relations Board since its inception.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF BACKGROUND OF PRESENT AND FORMER MEMBERS OF NLRB

Francis Biddle, associate, Biddle, Paul & Jane, Philadelphia, 1912–15; Barnes, Biddle & Myers, 1917–39; Special Assistant United States Attorney, Pennsylvania, 1922–26; appointed member NLRB 1934.

Harry A. Millis, professor of economics and sociology, Arkansas University, 1902–3; professor of economics, Stanford University, 1903–12; professor of economics, University of Kansas, 1912–16; professor of economics, University of Chicago since 1916 and chairman, department, 1928–36; United States Immigration Commission, 1908–10; chairman, board of trade, and chairman of arbitration board, Men's Clothing Industry in Chicago, 1919–23; appointed to NLRB 1934.

Edwin Seymour Smith, with Dennison Manufacturing Co., Framingham, Mass., 1919–20; member, staff, Russell Sage Foundation, 1920–23; employment manager and personnel assistant, William Filene Sons Co., 1923–31; commissioner of labor and industries (Massachusetts), 1931–34; chairman, industrial disease commission (Massachusetts), 1933; appointed to NLRB 1934.

Joseph Warren Madden, professor of law, University of Oklahoma, 1914–16; private practice of law, 1916–17; professor of law, Ohio State University, 1917–21; dean of law, West Virginia University, 1921–27; professor of law, University of Pittsburgh, 1927–36; Chairman of NLRB, 1935–40.

John Michael Carmody, vice president in charge of industrial relations, Davis Coal & Coke Co., and vice president and general manager of its merchandising subsidiaries, 1923–36; editor of Coal Age and Factory and Industrial Management, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., 1927–33; Chief Engineer, Civil Works Administration, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, and member, National Mediation Board, 1933–35; appointed to NLRB 1935.

Donald Wakefield Smith, practiced law in Washington, D. C., and New York City, 1925–35, specializing in labor and immigration law and industrial relations; appointed to NLRB 1935.

William Morris Leiserson, Chief, Division of Labor Administration, United States Department of Labor, 1918–19; chairman, labor adjustment board, Clothing Industry of Rochester, N. Y., 1919–21; chairman, board of arbitration, Men's Clothing Industry of New York, 1921–23; Baltimore and Chicago, 1923–26; professor of economics, Antioch College, 1926–34; Secretary, National Labor Board, NLA, 1933; Chairman, Petroleum Labor Policy Board, 1934; Chairman, National Mediation Board, 1934–39; appointed to NLRB 1939–43.

Gerard D. Reilly, newspaper copy editor (Boston Traveler), 1929–30; practiced law associated with Goodwin, Proctor & Howe, Boston, 1933–34; reviewing attorney, Home Owners Loan Corporation, January–June 1934; attorney, United States Department of Labor, 1934; Assistant Solicitor, 1935; Administrator, Public Contracts Division, 1936–37; Solicitor of Labor, 1937–41; appointed to NLRB, 1941–46.

John M. Houston, engaged in retail lumber business, Newton, Kans., for 15 years; served 2 terms as mayor of Newton, 1927–31; Member of Congress, 1935 to 1943; appointed to NLRB 1943.

Paul M. Herzog, instructor, University of Wisconsin, 1928–30, and at Harvard, 1930–31; assistant to Secretary, NLRB, 1933–35; practiced law, 1936–37; New York State Labor Relations Board member, 1937–44; appointed to NLRB 1945.

James J. Reynolds, clerk, stock brokerage, 1928–33; member, New York Stock Exchange, 1934–39; assistant to president of United States Pipe & Foundry Co. and assistant director of industrial relations (progressing to these positions from laborer and foreman, 1939–43; active duty as naval officer, 1943–46; appointed to NLRB 1946.

Abe Murdock, served as county attorney in Utah, 1923–24, 1927–28; 1931–32; during same period served as city attorney for Beaver City, Utah, and for the Beaver County School District; engaged in general practice of law, 1922–32; 1932–40, served as member of the United States House of Representatives; elected to the United States Senate in 1940; appointed to NLRB 1947.

J. Copian Gray, personnel director, cost accountant, Remington-Rand, Inc., 1922–28; personnel director, assistant secretary-treasurer, Houdaille-Hershey Corp., 1928–40;

director, public and industrial relations, Buffalo Arms Corp., 1940–45; National War Labor Board, 1943–45; National Wage Stabilization Board, 1946–47; appointed NLRB 1947.

Paul L. Styles, textile worker, 1923–28; county printer, reporter, editorial writer of local weekly paper, 1929–37; field examiner, NLRB, 1937–43; regional director, NLRB, 1945–50; member International Typographical Union; president, Huntsville, Ala., Trades and Labor Council, 1929–37; appointed to NLRB 1950.

Ivar H. Peterson, assistant editor and associate editor of the Attorney General's Survey and Release Procedure, Department of Justice, 1936–38; attorney, NLRB, 1938–46; served as assistant director, employee-employer relations department, National Association of Broadcasters, 1946–48; administrative assistant to Senator MORSE, Oregon, 1948–52; appointed to NLRB 1952.

Philip Ray Rodgers, received doctor of laws degree in 1948; served as secretary to Senator James J. Davis, Pennsylvania, 1942–45; assistant professor, political science and public administration, American University, Washington, D. C., 1945–47; appointed and served as clerk, United States Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 1949–53; appointed to NLRB 1953.

Guy Farmer, attorney, NLRB, 1937–43; associate general counsel, NLRB, 1943–45; practiced law in firm of Steptoe & Johnson, 1945–53; appointed to NLRB 1953.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The best documented source of information concerning the personnel and policies of the first Board is found in the report of the Smith committee, a select committee created by the House to investigate the first National Labor Relations Board in 1939 of which Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, was chairman. This report is 175 pages long, and footnoted to some 20 volumes of testimony and exhibits.

The first Board appointed by the President was composed of J. Warren Madden, Chairman; Edwin S. Smith; and Donald Wakefield Smith. The name of this latter individual never appears in the Smith committee report. He may be disposed of with the statement that he was sentenced to prison with Mayor Curley, of Boston, for mail fraud, and, I believe, was pardoned, along with Curley, by ex-President Truman.

Edwin S. Smith's record of Communist activity began during his tenure of office when he was an officer in a series of conferences in Mexico, where he had a close association with Toledano, secretary general of the Mexican Workers Federation; a number of instances of secret meetings with Harry Bridges, in California, in Washington, D. C., and Baltimore; his refusal to permit review of Board employees alleged to be Communists; his complete bias in favor of left-wing CIO unions, to the prejudice of the American Federation of Labor, in his opinions; his attempt to intervene in strikes on behalf of the union where no matters concerning them were pending before the Board—in one case, to the extent of attempting to persuade the Filene Department Store in Boston to boycott the products of the Berkshire Knitting Mills because Berkshire did not deal with 300 of its 6,000 employees.

Nathan Witt, whom Lee Pressman identified as a fellow Communist cell member with him, was secretary to this first Board for several years. During this period, Witt ruled the Board's 22 regional offices with an iron hand. He used two hatchetmen, whom the Smith committee found to be equally sympathetic to communism, to do his bidding, which consisted of going from one regional office to another putting the pressure on the staffs of those offices to win recognition for the CIO by any means available, regardless of merit. The Smith committee report contains voluminous evidence on this point. Witt was almost as important a figure in the Washington office. He passed on authorizations to issue complaints and appeals from regional directors to issue complaints.

Mr. Madden, who was the Chairman of the first Board, was criticized most by the Smith committee for following the lead of Edwin Smith and Nathan Witt and for failing to discipline the Board's staff in the numerous instances described in which their activities were anything but those of an impartial Government agency. On April 19, 1939, Madden testified before the Senate committee to the effect that it was a violation of the law for an employer to call a Communist labor leader a Communist.

On page 631 of the testimony of William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, before the Senate Labor Committee on May 1, 1939, we find this appraisal of the Board by Mr. Green:

> We contend that its decisions are not fair; that the Board's approach was unjudicial; and that its administration was biased. We say that when the division of the labor movement came about, the Board devised its rules and decrees to give support to unions of our rivals to our great injury. We contend that even where a case did not present an issue between the current varying philosophies—that is, even in cases where the American Federation of Labor was organizing on the same industrial, plant, or group basis as was its rival—that the Board so devised its procedure and decree as to further the interests of our rivals. We do not think that any impartial person can look into the record of this Board's decisions and not be convinced that they are vigorous proponents of the cause of a dual movement.

Moving closer to the present time, we cannot restrain our attentions from the remarks delivered on the floor of the Senate by the late Senator Robert A. Taft, on June 4, 1951. Senator Taft said, in part:

> I am even more concerned today by the attitude of the present National Labor Relations Board. The general effect of their decisions since the 1948 election has been to whittle away some of the basic principles of the law. This is true particularly of those provisions which were intended to protect the individual workman against the arbitrary action of union officials as well as against similar action by employers. Apparently a majority of the present Board has not yet reconciled itself to the limitations the law places on compulsory union membership, it has been indifferent to the protection of employees from union violence and coercion, and it has failed to carry out the spirit of the law with regard to the signing of non-Communist oaths by union officials. In other words, when the rights of the ordinary worker happen to conflict with the desires of union officials, the ordinary worker is likely to lose before the present Board, although the decisions have almost always produced a dissent from one or more members. I would like to call the attention of the Senate particularly to decisions which seem to me, as one of the authors of the act, to undermine some of its most important principles. • • •
>
> In at least two cases since the first of the year, the Board has placed its stamp of approval on the preferential hiring of men through unions—even though the record shows that the only men referred by the unions for jobs were union members—American Pipe & Steel Corp. (93 N. L. R. B. 21). These cases may be distinguished from Pacific American Ship Owners Association (90 N. L. R. B. 167), where the union obligated itself by contract to make no discrimination between union and nonunion applicants in referrals for jobs, and there was no evidence that such discrimination was made in fact. These decisions go beyond the amendments passed by the Senate in 1949—which did not become law—and dangerously approach the authorization of a closed shop. • • •
>
> I find that the Board has continued to close its eyes to the rights of the workers who desire to continue at work during a strike. One of the most effective ways of discouraging the use of mass picketing and picket-line violence is to deny reinstatement to strikers who engage in such conduct.
>
> *Standard Oil Co. of California* (26 LRRM 1587 (Oct. 10, 1950)): Despite the fact that it has long been established by the courts that an employer need not reemploy a striking employee who has been guilty of acts of violence or other unlawful acts in the course of the strike, the Board in this case held the employer guilty of having committed an unfair labor practice where it refused to reemploy strikers who had committed the following acts—

This is very interesting—

> (c) Threw stones at nonstrikers inside the plant gates. The Board condoned this action on two grounds: First, the stones which the particular striker threw were small, and second, the stones did not travel far because the striker involved had a crooked arm and the stones therefore fell harmlessly. • • •
>
> (e) Followed nonstrikers in an automobile from the employer's premises to a bus stop, the evidence showing that the automobile was owned and driven by an employee of another oil company which was also being struck, and that police officers found the following objects in such automobile: A smoke bomb, 2 rocks, an ice pick, 2 hammers, and a 4-foot length of cord. The Board said that the strikers riding in the automobile did not know such objects were in the car and did not know to what use, if any, the bomb was to be put. • • •
>
> Decisions of the Board have tended to retard the effectiveness of the non-Communist oath when it has been necessary to rule on close legal points. • • •
>
> In *New Jersey Carpet Mills* (27 LRRM 1114 (Dec. 11, 1950)), the Board took a long step forward toward rendering ineffectual the non-Communist affidavits provisions of the law. The Board here held that an employer cannot defend its refusal to bargain with a majority union, which had not complied with the non-Communist affidavit requirements of the act, on the ground of the union's noncompliance, where the employer did not assert at the time of its refusal to bargain that it was motivated by such noncompliance. • • •
>
> I do not intend at this time to discuss the disparity of treatment by the Board so far as employers are concerned. Such cases as the following illustrate the length to which the Board is going to find employers guilty of unfair labor practices:
>
> (a) *Carter & Brother* (26 LRRM 1427 (Aug. 22, 1950)): Where the Board held it to be a violation of the act for an employer to seek an injunction in a Texas State court and ordered him to withdraw or seek modification of such injunction.

(b) *Schultz Refrigerated Service* (25 LRRM 1123 (Dec. 9, 1949)): Where the Board in effect removed the protection of the secondary boycott provisions of the act from all employers doing business with truckers by holding that a union did not violate the act by picketing trucks operated by a trucking company with which the union had a dispute while such trucks were on the premises of the trucking company's customers.

(c) *Heider Manufacturing Co.* (26 LRRM 1641 (Oct. 23, 1950)): Where the Board in effect dictated to an employer what terms he must agree to in collective-bargaining contracts.

(d) *Maryland Dry Dock Co.* (25 LRRM 1471 (Mar. 21, 1950)): Where the Board held that an employer could not ban the distribution on his property of insulting and defamatory literature by the union.

(e) The over-3-year delay in processing of cases against the International Typographical Union which so openly defied the law and announced its intention to circumvent it.

That is a quotation from the late Senator Robert A. Taft, who knew better than any other Member of the Senate the needs and desires and wishes of the American public as they pertain to the relationship between management and labor.

More recently still, the last witness before our committee in last year's hearings was Joseph C. Wells, who had shortly before resigned his position as Associate General Counsel of the Board. After listing numerous cases in which the Board had demonstrated its bias in favor of unions, he concluded:

"Why is it that the Labor Board, in administrating Taft-Hartley, has failed to carry out the will and intent of Congress? There may be various reasons, but in my opinion the principal reason is the fact that the Board as a whole has no sympathy for the congressional intent which was expressed in the act. In 1947, when this committee was considering the bills which subsequently became the Taft-Hartley Act, the Labor Board appeared before you and opposed almost every word, sentence, and paragraph of those bills. It found no good in any of them. Yet it was to that same Labor Board that Congress entrusted the administration of Taft-Hartley. I sincerely hope that this Congress will not make this same obvious error."

Mr. President, I have just read quotations from the testimony of Mr. Wells. In order to conserve the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the entire testimony of Mr. Joseph C. Wells before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare last year be published as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My name is Joseph C. Wells. I am, at present, employed as an attorney by United Aircraft Corp., of East Hartford, Conn., to counsel the corporation primarily in the field of labor relations. I do not, however, appear here today as the representative of that corporation. The privilege of being here is one which has been accorded me so that I may express my personal views with respect to the administration of the Taft-Hartley Act by the National Labor Relations Board.

My observations are derived from varied experience as an attorney in the field of labor relations. I joined the staff of the National Labor Relations Board in June of 1944 as an attorney in the Review Section and resigned in June of 1950 when I was associate general counsel in charge of the Policy and Appeals Division of the General Counsel's office. In the interim of those dates, I served also as legal assistant to former Board members Gerard D. Reilly and James J. Reynolds, Jr., and as a trial examiner for the Board. My employment with the Board covered the last 3 years of the Wagner Act and the first 3 years of the Taft-Hartley Act. Since then I have engaged in the practice of law as an associate of the Washington law firm of Hanson, Lovett, & Dale and joined the staff of the corporation counsel of United Aircraft Corp. in February of 1952. As a labor attorney, I have represented employers, including daily newspapers, radio and television stations, manufacturers, retail merchants, building constructors, and transportation lines. All but a small part of this practice has directly involved the Taft-Hartley Act and its administration by the Board.

I believe that it is the duty of our administrative agencies, such as the Board, to construe and apply the laws entrusted to them as nearly in accord with the intent of Congress as is possible. Congress is the legislative voice of the people; the administrative agencies are but its echo. If we are to continue a government of limited powers, the administrative agencies must in their every policy and decision faithfully reflect the will of Congress. Otherwise, the whim of the bureaucrat will be substituted for the judgment of the legislator; and our Government will become a government, not of laws, but of men. The best protection that the people can have against bureaucratic tyranny is strict adherence by our administrative agencies to the will and intent of Congress.

Whether the Board in administering the Wagner Act adhered closely to the intent of Congress does not merit lengthy consideration at this time. It is sufficient to note that the Board zealously administered the Wagner Act so that the basic congressional policies of that act, as well as objectives never intended by Congress, were reached. No right of labor or duty of management failed to receive the fullest enforcement by the Board.

The Board's administration of the Taft-Hartley Act, however, has been different. The difference is that under the Taft-Hartley Act the Board has narrowed the rights of management and the duties of labor which Congress defined in that act. This fact is evident after a review of only a few of the literally thousands of decisions issued by the Board.

In the Bonwit Teller case and similar ones the Board has established the doctrine that an employer may not address his workers on company time and property without granting the union an equal opportunity to address the workers on company time and property. This is an obvious limitation on the employer's right of free speech to communicate his ideas and arguments to employees. The Board has enforced the limitation rigidly. The Board, however, apparently recognizes no limitation on the right of unions to communicate their ideas and arguments to the workers. Thus, in the Maryland Drydock case [1] the Board ruled that an employer violated the Taft-Hartley Act by forbidding the distribution on its own premises of a union newspaper which characterized the company's president as a vulture and a double-crosser; accused the company's officials of embarking on a campaign of revenge that closely parallels some of the atrocious reprisals which were inflicted on defenseless people by that superman, Adolf Hitler; and stated that the company believed in the same kind of democracy that is used by Stalin; that the company's officials were Fascist-like in their thinking, drunk with their own importance, and oblivious to all concepts of human behavior because of their lust for still greater profits. The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit at Richmond, Va., found the Board's position to be so utterly lacking in merit as hardly to warrant consideration. After giving the Board a brief lecture on the obvious limitations of the right of free speech, the court added that there is nothing in law or reason which requires (an employer) to allow the distribution on his premises of defamatory statements insulting to those who have charge of his business.

It seems elementary that our constitutional right to freedom of speech is nowhere more important than in the field of labor relations. It is obvious that industrial peace is impossible unless every effort is made by labor and management to communicate to the workers involved their respective positions and reasons for these positions. The Board, however, while carefully guarding the rights of labor unions to communicate to the workers, has so restricted management's concomitant right that this right is substantially impaired.

The circuit court of appeals and the Supreme Court have done a great deal to curb some of the Board's inclinations in this matter. The Board, however, ignores the Court's admonishments in many instances. Thus, the Board has held in numerous cases that an employer violates the Taft-Hartley Act if, in any discussions with his workers, he permits even the most simple question to creep into his words. He cannot ask an employee if a union meeting was well attended. He cannot even ask why the worker feels he needs a union to represent him.[3] Six Circuit Courts of Appeals [3] have rejected the Board's doctrine on this matter and the Supreme Court [4] has refused to review their decisions. The Board, however, continues its attempt to enforce the doctrine, brushing aside the courts' decisions. Employers have the unhappy choice of either accepting this attitude of the Board or engaging in expensive and lengthy litigation to obtain a court decision in every case.

Obviously this partisan treatment by the Board of the right of free speech is not in accord with the intent of Congress. That intent is expressed as clearly as possible in section 8 (c) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Another area in which the Board has adopted a strict attitude toward employers and soft one toward labor unions is in the question of back pay for employees who lose wages because of discriminatory practices.

The Board has extended the act as far as possible to see that employees who lose wages because of an employer's unfair labor practices are reimbursed for such losses by the employer. Unions have also committed unfair labor practices which cause employees to lose wages. In these cases, however, the Board's enthusiasm for protecting the worker is somewhat dim, to say the least. Thus, in the Colonial Hardwood Flooring case [5] some workers attempted to enter the plant to work during a strike. The union picket line, supervised by a representative of the union, kept the workers out of the plant by means of vicious physical violence. The Board held here that it lacked any power to compel the union to compensate the workers for the pay they lost as a result

[1] *Maryland Drydock Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.* (183 F. 2d 538 (C. C. A. 4).

[2] *Standard-Coose-Thatcher Co.* (85 NLRB 1358).

[3] *NLRB* v. *England Bros., Inc.* (201 F. 2d 395 (C. C. A. 1); *NLRB* v. *Montgomery Ward & Co.* (192 F. 2d 160 (C. C. A. 2)); *NLRB* v. *Arthur Winer, Inc.* (194 F. 2d 370 (C. C. A. 7)); *NLRB* v. *Tennessee Coach Co.* (191 F. 2d 546 (C. C. A. 6)); *NLRB* v. *Ozark Drain Constructors* (190 F. 2d 222 (C. C. A. 8)); *Atlas Life Insurance* v. *NLRB* (195 F. 2d 136 (C. C. A. 10)).

[4] *NLRB* v. *Arthur Winer, Inc.* (344 U. S. 819).

[5] 84 NLRB 563, 565; see also *United Mine Workers of America* (92 NLRB 916).

of this violence. The Board's excuse in this case is one which it must admit is highly technical. A scholarly and exhaustive examination of this technicality is contained in a recent article in the Yale Law Journal.[6] The conclusion of this article is that the Board's position is incorrect.[7] The congressional intent certainly did not contemplate that the Board should have the power to grant back pay for wages lost due to an employer's acts, but no back pay where wages were lost due to the same acts committed by the union.

In the Board's decisions, violence committed by an employer or by a nonunion group is a serious matter. Thus, in one case[8] the Board held an employer obliged to protect union adherents from minor violence committed by nonunion employees. In another case,[9] however, a union picket threw a hammer through the windshield of a nonstriker's car. The Board in this case stated that while it did not condone the use of the hammer, it did not find it so flagrant as to cause the union employee to lose his right to reinstatement. The Board then held that after the employee put down his hammer and decided to return to work, the employer must accept him. It is obvious that these two cases do not reflect the congressional intent and discourage violence on the part of unions as well as employers.

The Board's attitude is not only soft with respect to violence committed on behalf of the union. It has gone further and held that the company violated the Taft-Hartley Act when it caused the arrest of strikers whom the company believed had engaged in violence on the picket line.[10] Thus, on one hand, the Board holds an employer obligated to protect union adherents from the violence of nonunion employees.[11] On the other hand, however, the Board holds that an employer who resorts to the courts to restrain violence or mass picketing and thus protect nonunion employees does so at his peril.[12]

The Labor Board has not only whittled down the rights of employers, it has seriously undermined the rights of the employees as well. Section 8 (a) (3) of Taft-Hartley, which authorizes the union shop, gives to all employees 30 days after a contract is signed to obtain membership in the union. Congress in conferring this right made no distinction between employees who had been members of the union before the union-shop agreement was signed and those who were not. The Labor Board itself made no such distinction for a number of years.[13] Recently, however, the Board has ruled that only employees who were not already members of the union, when the union-shop agreement was signed, are entitled to the 30-day period of grace, thus depriving all other employees of a right plainly given them by Taft-Hartley.[14] Taft-Hartley, in plain language, requires that all employees, under a union-shop agreement, be admitted to membership in the union on equal terms. Nevertheless, the Labor Board has recently held that a union may impose a higher initiation fee upon former members than upon new members. Thus, former union members were penalized for exercising the right given them by Taft-Hartley to withdraw from the union when there was no contract.[15] The Board in this case sanctioned the discharge of the employee involved because he had refused to pay the union's initiation fee, which was twice as high for him as for new members. The rule has the inescapable effect of giving unions a drastic weapon with which to compel employees to remain union members even where the union is unable at the time to secure a union-shop. The threat is that the member who quits the union when there is no union-shop requirement will have to pay twice as much or even more to hold his job if such a contract is later obtained. A more effective weapon in behalf of compulsory unionism is difficult to imagine.

Further evidence of union favoritism at the expense of the rights of employees is found in the Labor Board's arbitrary application of its 1-year rule. This rule, which was established not by Congress but by the Labor Board, provides that for a period of at least 1 year after a union has been chosen bargaining representative by the employees the employer must bargain with it.[16] The rule has its merits in terms of stability of bargaining relations, but it should not be applied in total disregard of the paramount right of employees to be represented by an agent of their own choosing. The Board, however, has sought to compel an employer to bargain with a union even though it was admitted that not a single one of his employees belonged to the union[17] and, still worse, even where the employees had publicly repudiated the union by resigning from it to a man.[18] As the circuit court at Cincinnati observed, in rejecting the Labor Board's position, the Labor Board would exalt form over substance and make the interest of the agent (the union) of paramount importance rather than that of his principals (the employees).[19] The rights sought to be protected by Taft-Hartley are the rights of employees, not those of unions.

The Board has frequently demonstrated its indifferent attitude toward enforcing the prohibition against the closed shop contained in section 8 (a) (3) of Taft-Hartley. The issue of the closed shop was one of the hardest-fought issues before Congress in 1947. No question can be raised that Congress resolved the issue by outlawing the closed shop. One might, therefore, expect the Board to be diligent in seeing to it that employees are not made the victims of illegal closed-shop arrangements. However, when the Labor Board had the opportunity to protect employees in the maritime industry and in the printing industry against illegal closed-shop arrangements, it refused to do so.[20] The Labor Board chose to take refuge in the legal technicality that since there was other evidence in the record that the unions involved had violated Taft-Hartley, it was not necessary to consider the illegality of their closed-shop demands.[21] Legal technicalities, however valid, are a poor substitute for vigorous enforcement of employee rights. The Labor Board's attitude also explains, in part, the fact that the closed shop is still not uncommon in America. If the closed shop is to be successfully outlawed, as Congress clearly intended, a Board more sympathetic to such objective should be selected to do the job of enforcement.

The Board's partiality extends not only to unions over employers and employees; apparently the Board prefers the CIO to independent unions. For many years the Labor Board held that a contract of more than 2 years' duration could not serve as a bar to a new election unless it could be shown that longer agreements were customary in the industry. In accordance with this policy, the Board last October refused to allow an independent union to set up its 5-year contract in the automotive industry as a bar to an election requested by the CIO.[22] But 4 months later, in January 1953, the Board permitted the CIO to set up its 5-year contract as a bar to an election in the automotive industry.[23] When the independent Lampworkers made their request in October 1952, the substantial part of the automotive industry had contracts of 5 years' duration; yet the Board would not change its policy until asked to do so by the CIO.

In enacting Taft-Hartley Congress intended to protect not only the rights of employers and employees but above all the rights of the American people. Because Communist-dominated unions are a menace to the security and welfare of the American people, as well as of union members, Congress has sought to drive Communists from positions of leadership in the labor movement. The instrument chosen by Congress was the non-Communist affidavit requirement of section 9 (h) of Taft-Hartley. We have heard a good deal about the ineffectiveness of this requirement but little has been said about the substantial responsibility of the Board for that result. Almost from the date of Taft-Hartley's enactment, the Board has so construed section 9 (h) as to render it ineffective to achieve the intent of Congress. The brief résumé that follows of the principal Board decisions relating to section 9 (h) supports this assertion:

(1) In October 1947, the Board held that Congress did not intend that the AFL and the CIO be required to file non-Communist affidavits under section 9 (h).[24] This decision was reversed 4 years later by the Supreme Court.[25] Now the Board is seeking to relitigate the cases that AFL and CIO unions lost against employers because of the Labor Board's erroneous decision.[26] In other words the Board is attempting to save the unions from the appropriate consequences of having refused to obey the law in failing to file the non-Communist affidavits required by Congress.

(2) In 1948 the Board refused to permit an employer to prove that a union, in order to circumvent section 9 (h), had amended its constitution so as to abolish several offices whose incumbents, being Communists, were unable to sign the required non-Communist affidavits, and then allowed those officers to exercise the same powers as before.[27] Also in 1948, the Board refused to permit an employer to prove that one of the petitioning union's officers was in fact a Communist and that hence his affidavit under section 9 (h)

---

[6] Vol. 62, No. 3, Feb. 1953, p. 488.

[7] "From the viewpoint both of statutory interpretation and of practical effects, the Board's position appears unsound." Ibid, p. 493.

[8] *N. L. R. B.* v. *Fred P. Weissman Co.*

[9] *Horn Manufacturing Co., Inc.* (83 N. L. R. B. 1177).

[10] *W. T. Rawleigh & Co.* (90 N. L. R. B. 1924, 1925).

[11] See footnote 8, supra.

[12] See footnote 10, supra. See also *W. T. Carter* (90 N. L. R. B. 2020, 2023, 2024); *Atlantic Metallic Casket Co.* (91 N. L. R. B. 1225); *Texas Foundries, Inc.* (101 N. L. R. B. No. 249).

[13] *Rock-Ola Manufacturing Corp.* (93 N. L. R. B. 1196); *Blue Ribbon Creamery* (94 N. L. R. B. 201); *Worthington Pump & Machinery Corp.* (93 N. L. R. B. 527).

[14] *Krause Milling Co.* (96 N. L. R. B. 536).

[15] *Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.* (99 N. L. R. B. No. 167, 30 L. R. R. M. 1171).

[16] *Frank Bros. Company* v. *N. L. R. B.* (321 U. S. 702).

[17] *Globe Automatic Sprinkler* (199 F. 2d 64 (C. C. A. 3)).

[18] *N. L. R. B.* v. *Vulcan Forge* (188 F. 2d 927 (C. C. A. 6)).

[19] *N. L. R. B.* v. *Reeder Motor Co.* (31 L. R. R. M. 2559).

[20] *International Longshore Workers Union* (90 N. L. R. B. 1021); *Chicago Typographical Union No. 16* (86 N. L. R. B. 1041).

[21] Ibid.

[22] *The Electric Auto Lite Co.* (Case No. 9–RC–1679).

[23] *General Motors Corp.* (100 N. L. R. B. No. 89).

[24] *Northern Virginia Broadcasters, Inc.* (75 N. L. R. B. 11).

[25] *N. L. R. B.* v. *Highland Park Mfg. Co.* (341 U. S. 322).

[26] *Magee Carpet Company*, issued February 11, 1953.

[27] *Craddock-Terry Shoe Corp.* (76 N. L. R. B. 842).

was false.[28] Moreover, in 1950 the Board did the incredible by refusing to entertain a challenge to the authenticity of a non-Communist affidavit filed by Harry Bridges, despite his conviction, a few months earlier, of perjury for having sworn that he was not a Communist in applying for citizenship papers.[29] The Board arrived at these decisions by arguing that it was not the purpose of section 9 (h) to require it to investigate the authenticity or truth of the non-Communist affidavits filed with it. Although Taft-Hartley does not require the Labor Board to make such investigation, it is equally clear that nothing in the statute prohibits the Board from doing so. Indeed, the Board itself has admitted as much in a brief recently filed with the circuit court here in Washington.[30] Since the Board had the choice, it should have in the interest of protecting the American people from Communist-dominated unions, chosen to hinder Communists from filing false affidavits rather than to shield them in doing so.

(3) In 1949 the Board held that an employer was not obligated under Taft-Hartley to bargain with a union whose officers had failed to file non-Communist affidavits.[31] This was a sound decision because obviously Congress never intended than an employer be required to bargain with a Communist-dominated union. But 2 years later the Board reversed itself and held than an employer must bargain with such a union unless he remembers to tell the union that he is refusing to bargain because the union has not filed the non-Communist affidavits.[32] If the employer forgets to say these magic words, then he may be guilty of refusing to bargain with the union although at that time it might have been completely controlled and operated by Communists.

(4) In 1950 the Board held that a union whose officers had refused to file the required non-Communist affidavits could nevertheless prevent the employees from gtting rid of it even to obtain a loyal and law-abiding union.[33] The effect of this decision is to enable a union to remain in power for as long as 5 years even though it has refused to obey the law, is probably Communist-dominated, and has been repudiated by the employees themselves. In startling contrast, the Board forces employees to get rid of company-dominated unions, thus demonstrating that it regards company domination of unions to be a far greater menace than Communist domination.

For a long time congressional committees have been investigating communism in labor unions. Early in October 1952 the McCarran committee asked the officers of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers (one of the unions expelled from the CIO) to reconfirm the non-Communist affidavits they have filed with the Board. They refused to do so on the grounds of self-incrimination. Did the Board act? No; it blithely ignored this activity of a Senate committee. However, less than 2 months later a Federal grand jury made headlines by asking the Board to move against certain other Communist-dominated unions whose officers had likewise refused to affirm their Taft-Hartley affidavits. The Board acted, apparently being more respectful of a grand jury than of a Senate committee. It reversed the policy to which it has obstinately clung for 6 years and proceeded to investigate the truth of the non-Communist affidavits. The unions, however, by pointing to the Board's often announced policy of not investigating these affidavits persuaded the district court to forbid the Board to do so. The Board has, of course, dutifully filed an appeal, which is routine in these matters. But appeals take time and these Communist-dominated unions continue to receive the benefits of Taft-Hartley.

In enacting Taft-Hartley Congress also sought to protect the American people from excessive use by unions of their right to strike. Apart from the national emergency strike provision, the instrument chosen by Congress was section 8 (d) of Taft-Hartley. The clear intent, as well as the plain language of section 8 (d), was to forbid strikes during the lifetime of a contract or, where a contract is terminable upon notice, for 60 days from the date of such notice. The Labor Board itself so interpreted section 8 (d) as late as October 1949.[34] But 5½ months later, following the replacement of Republican Board member Gray by Democratic Board member Styles, the Labor Board reversed itself by striking from section 8 (d) a whole line which Congress had included in the section. In the Wilson case[35] the Labor Board sanctioned a strike to compel the company to increase wages further only 60 days after a contract setting wages for at least a year had been signed. The result of the Board's decision is to make every contract, regardless of its term of duration, good for only 60 days. In a further effort to expand the right to strike regardless of contract or statutory obligations, the Board has recently ruled that a union may strike in violation of a contract agreement not to do so if the strike is caused by the employer's unfair labor practices.[36] This doctrine, of course, makes mockery out of labor contracts.

The practice of law before the Board is a difficult matter—principally because precedence has little meaning where it interferes with granting advantage to a union. For example, compare these cases. In one case, the Board held an election in which three choices appeared on the ballot. The results of the election were inconclusive, i. e., no choice obtained a majority of votes cast. The Board's rules, therefore, called for a runoff election between the two choices which received the highest number of votes cast. The original election had been held among 1,998 employees, and, according to the rules, the runoff election should be held among the same employees. The third choice, however, pointed out that subsequent to the runoff the plant force had increased by about 1,000 employees, and that adherence to the rule would disenfranchise these new employees. The third choice moved, therefore, that the Board hold a new election, with it on the ballot, to enable all 3,000 employees to vote on the three original choices. The Board granted the motion in order to better effectuate the purposes of the act.[37] In a later case, however, the identical situation occurred with a different result. There were three choices on the original ballot. The runoff rules would eliminate the third choice, and about 1,000 new employees would be disenfranchised. The motion was made to hold new elections to give all employees including the 1,000 new employees, a chance to vote on all three choices. The Board, in this case, permitted the 1,000 new employees to vote, but only to choose between the first two choices on the original ballot.[38] There was just one difference between these two cases. In the first case, the third choice on the ballot was a union; in the second case the third choice was "no-union." The Board gave no explanation of why the thousand new employees should be given an opportunity to vote for a union in the first case but not to vote for no-union in the second.

The history that I have outlined to you of the Labor Board's administration of Taft-Hartley has covered only a few of the obvious and readily discernible manifestations of the Labor Board's refusal to carry out the will and intent of Congress. The limitations of time and space do not permit a demonstration of the more subtle and devious channels which the Board has dug to circumvent the will and intent of Congress. A careful and extensive investigation of every aspect of the Labor Board's activities is the only way in which the full extent of its refusal to follow the wishes of Congress could ever be revealed. In my opinion such an investigation is urgently needed, is, in fact, long overdue.

In closing, there is one further thought that I would have the committee consider: Why has the Labor Board in administering Taft-Hartley failed to carry out the will and intent of Congress? There may be various reasons, but in my opinion the principal reason is the fact that the Board as a whole has no sympathy for the congressional intent which was expressed in the act. In 1947 when this committee was considering the bills which subsequently became the Taft-Hartley Act, the Labor Board appeared before you and opposed almost every word, sentence, and paragraph of those bills. It found no good in any of them. Yet, it was to that same Labor Board that Congress entrusted the administration of Taft-Hartley. I sincerely hope that this Congress will not make this same obvious error.

Therefore, I would urge you at this time to make the following changes:

1. Abolish the present Labor Board and reconstitute it with judicial functions only.

2. Give all its administrative functions and authority (over personnel, internal structure, and organization) to the Chairman named by the President.

3. Abolish the office of General Counsel. Establish in its place a new and completely independent agency, the Office of the Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act; and invest it with all functions, investigation, prosecution, and enforcement, but excluding judicial functions, now possessed by the present Labor Board or General Counsel.

4. Transfer present Board personnel to the new agencies, their appointments to be at the pleasure of the head of the new agency until such time as he makes permanent (or probational) appointments to necessary jobs.

5. Establish a congressional subcommittee, empowered to subpena witnesses under oath, to conduct a thorough investigation of every phase of the activities of the present Labor Board and General Counsel.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to appear here today.

Mr. GOLDWATER. From this brief, but highly authoritative, testimony regarding the attitude of the National Labor Relations Board in the past, why, indeed, should there be any wonder or concern over the fact that Mr. Beeson, highly competent and equipped as he is in this area, should have merely echoed the facts, affirmed the record, and spoken the truth regarding the bias of this Board?

Mr. President, in concluding my remarks, it is my prayer and my hope that

---

[28] *U. S. Gypsum Co.* (80 N. L. R. B. 779).

[29] *Alpert and Alpert* (92 N. L. R. B. No. 127); *U. S.* v. *Bridges* (90 F. Supp. 973).

[30] *Herzog* v. *U. E. et al.*, now pending before the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. See pp. 40–43 of Board's brief.

[31] *Andrews Co.* (87 N. L. R. B. 379).

[32] *New Jersey Carpet Mills* (92 N. L. R. B. 604).

[33] *Aluminum Company of America* (85 N. L. R. B. 915). See also Thirteenth Annual Report of the N. L. R. B., p. 32.

[34] *Chicago Typographical Union, No. 16* (86 N. L. R. B. 1041).

[35] *United Packinghouse Workers of America, CIO (Wilson & Co.)* (89 N. L. R. B. 311).

[36] *Mastro Plastics Corp.*, (31 L. R. R. M. 1499).

[37] *International Harvester Company* (74 N. L. R. B. 507).

[38] *United Aircraft Corporation* (103 N. L. R. B. No. 106, 31 L. R. R. M. 1592).

the charge of bias against the NLRB will end; that the Board as it is now constituted will prove to be an honest and fearless board, determined to interpret the Taft-Hartley Act as it was written by the Congress and as it is desired to be interpreted by the people of the United States.

As a member of the party that endorsed Mr. Beeson I shall be the first to criticize the Board if it does not stop the illegal interpretations in which it has engaged for many years. I will be the first to object vociferously if the Board bends over backward, either toward labor or toward management, because it is only through a fair interpretation of the laws of the Nation that the people can be protected.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 22, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 19 (legislative day of February 8), 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

H. Struve Hensel, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of sections 504 and 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Gen. Otto Paul Weyland, 63A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander, Tactical Air Command, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Earle Everard Partridge, 33A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander, Far East Air Forces, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Orval Ray Cook, 36A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be deputy commander in chief, United States European Command, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Edwin William Rawlings, 95A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander, Air Materiel Command, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Bryant LeMaire Boatner, 362A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, and to be lieutenant general in the United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Truman Hempel Landon, 93A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be the Inspector General, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, and to be lieutenant general in the United States Air Force.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Col. Roy M. Gulick, United States Marine Corps, for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our father's God, author of liberty, we come with sacramental remembrance that on this new day in the cycle of the passing year even the calendar makes obeisance at the shrine of patriotism. We come this day to thank Thee for the shining virtues, the moral wisdom, and the elevated patriotism of Thy servant the first President of the Republic, who still stands among us in lofty reserve. In this city which is baptized in his revered name, where the monumental shaft lifts its glistening whiteness to the bending sky telling to the generations following the supremacy of his unsullied character, we bow in this hallowed temple of the freedom he wrought to achieve, lifting our hearts in gratitude for the life and service of that one whom we reverently call the Father of His Country. With clamorous voices demanding our ears in this explosive day we would listen again to his calm and reassuring voice as, being dead, he yet speaketh with unerring judgment, exhorting us to union and harmony. Like him whom we this day praise and honor, may we be unswayed by passion or prejudice. May our patriotism be like his, who, being tested by the pedestals of ambition, turned from the temptation with indignation and abhorrence. So, as the ages roll on, may a grateful nation cherish the luster of his virtues and the greatness of his sacrificial devotion. We ask it in the name of the Master whom he adored and with the fervent prayer God Bless America. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, a Senator from the State of Arizona, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GOLDWATER thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 19, 1954, was dispensed with.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. SYMINGTON were excused from attending the sessions of the Senate for the next 2 weeks, while in the performance of official business of the Senate.

PROGRAM FOR THE DAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to announce that I expect to suggest the absence of a quorum, and after that there will be the reading of Washington's Farewell Address by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT]. I expect to move, following the reading of the Farewell Address, that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow. We do not plan to have a morning hour today, or to conduct any other business.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the order for the quorum call was rescinded, and further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate previously made, the Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] who has been heretofore designated to read the Farewell Address of George Washington.

Mr. HUNT advanced to the desk, and read the Farewell Address as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suf-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

frages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but

which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that

foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 23, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art man's refuge and strength in every generation, we thank Thee for this day in the annals of our national history when we are privileged to rehearse and remind ourselves of the illustrious qualities of character in the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

life of George Washington, whom we affectionately speak of as the Father of his Country.

Our hearts are inspired and enlarged with pride and patriotism as we call to mind his fidelity to the principle of human rights in championing the cause of the oppressed colonists, his fortitude in times of hardship, and his unwavering faith in divine providence.

Grant that in our own struggles with the forces of tyranny and despotism we may carry on with confidence and courage, having girded ourselves with the breastplate of righteousness, the shield of faith, and the sword of the spirit.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 18, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 2, 1954, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. METCALF read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering, and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from

the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to sake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to

be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith: Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love toward it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday, February 26, and for 20 minutes, on Monday, March 1, to extend those remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS (at the request of Mr. NATCHER) was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on tomorrow, February 23, after the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes tomorrow, February 23, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HAGEN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Tuesday, February 23, 1954.

CLAIMS OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF PRISONS—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 334)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval H. R. 395, "to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice."

This measure would confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to adjudicate the claims of employees and former employees of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provisions of law to the contrary.

The claimants seek compensation for overtime performed on Saturdays during the period beginning in March 1931, and ending in May 1943. They allege that they were not granted compensatory time off on some other workday as required by the so-called Saturday half-holiday law of March 4, 1931. Even for the most recent of the claims the 6-year statute of limitations expired several years ago.

The claims in these cases relate to work performed at different times over a period of more than 20 years. The official time and attendance records which would be required to prove or disprove the issues of fact have been disposed of periodically in the regular manner. Without doubt, necessary witnesses have died or are otherwise beyond reach. This is the very kind of situation which proves the wisdom of a statute of limitation. Without it in such cases it is doubtful whether we can have efficient and orderly administration of the affairs of Government.

If I were to approve this enactment, I could not in good conscience refuse to approve other bills setting aside the statute of limitations on old claims for overtime or other compensation for either individuals or groups of Federal personnel who delayed in presenting their claims.

Leaving aside these very important issues of principle and going to the legislative record of this bill, it would appear that the measure has been under consideration in one form or another since the first session of the 80th Congress. Each successive review by the Department of Justice has indicated that within the then existing statutory framework, Bureau of Prisons employees were granted appropriate time off.

In this connection, it must be remembered that the matter of authorizing payment of overtime compensation to Federal employees has been of gradual development. For almost 50 years, between 1893 and 1942, except where there was express authorization to the contrary, the statutes prohibited the payment of additional compensation for extra hours of service, and there was no law of general applicability establishing weekly hours of duty of Federal per annum employees.

The outbreak of World War II brought a close to the haphazard approaches to this problem. Under wartime laws and those enacted since, definite statutory limits were established to govern the workweek, overtime compensation, and holiday pay. Without doubt, by present standards, the working conditions of the Bureau of Prisons employees for a great part of the period in question would be considered onerous. But they were no more onerous than those applicable to many other groups of Federal employees. I believe it would be a mistake to single out the group covered by H. R. 395 for the purpose of dealing retroactively with an hours-of-work situation which existed during a long-past period that began almost 23 years ago.

Furthermore, I do not see how this bill could work full justice. Turnover in employment in the classes of employees covered by it was very high, and I have the gravest doubts that the intended benefits would reach more than the relatively few who would become aware of the existence of this act if I were to approve it.

I am in favor of providing Federal employees with the fullest opportunity to adjust grievances. I believe, however, that it is fair to confine them generally to the limitations of law and other reasonable conditions. This case, in my opinion, is especially an instance where the law and the principles of orderly administration should be permitted to prevail.

For these reasons I return the bill without my approval.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 22, 1954.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, further proceedings on the message will be postponed until tomorrow.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CHELF (at the request of Mr. NATCHER), for an indefinite period, on account of convalescing from an operation.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. HARRIS), for the week of February 22, 1954, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mr. HILLINGS in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. YORTY in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANTAFF.

Mr. PATMAN in two instances.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Tequillo.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 23, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1298. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the Air Force's semiannual report entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report" for the period July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, pursuant to section IV of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1299. A letter from the Director, United States Information Service, transmitting the First Semiannual Report of the United States Information Agency for the 5-month period from August 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, pursuant to section 1008 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1300. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report pertaining to settlements made under the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended, for the calendar year 1953, pursuant to section 222c (e) of title 31, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1301. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Victor Haron Zakkay, file No. A-6250123, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 1954, the following bills were reported February 19, 1954:

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7996. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. S. 2150. An act providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence Seaway in United States territory in the interest of the national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted February 22, 1954]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. Eighth intermediate report of the committee's operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 5605. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that transfers of real property from certain Government corporations to other Government agencies shall not operate to remove such real property from local tax rolls; with amendment (Rept. No. 1217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARENDS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7103. A bill to establish limitations on the numbers of officers who may serve in various commissioned grades in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 18, 1954, the following bill was introduced on February 19, 1954:

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 7996. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[Introduced and referred February 22, 1954]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 7997. A bill to promote the agriculture of the United States by acquiring and diffusing useful information regarding agriculture in foreign countries and the marketing of American agricultural commodities, and the products thereof, outside of the United States; to authorize the creation of an Agricultural Foreign Service in the Department of Agriculture; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 7998. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase from $75 to $250 a month the amount of outside earnings permitted without loss of benefits in the case of widows and children; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7999. A bill to amend section 9 (d) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 8000. A bill to promote the national security of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 8001. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 8002. A bill relating to the income-tax treatment of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 8003. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, relating to emergency feed and seed assistance to farmers, ranchers, and stockmen in connection with major disasters; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. R. 8004. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act so as to provide for assistance under such act in the restoration of pastureland, which has been damaged by drought or insects and the placing of protective vegetative cover on croplands which are not to be tilled for an extended period; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 8005. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8006. A bill to safeguard the rights of certain landowners in Wisconsin whose title to property has been brought into question by reason of errors in the original survey and grant; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 8007. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 8008. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 8009. A bill to provide for the commitment and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient funds for the proper and efficient administration of the unemployment compensation law of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to maintain the present tariff rates on lace imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 8010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anneliese Martin (nee Fesslmayer); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 8011. A bill for the relief of Sigrid Helene Manson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 8012. A bill for the relief of Clara M. Briggs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 8013. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Barrons and Masae Barrons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 8014. A bill for the relief of Wallace Housden Watt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

521. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of the County Brucellosis Committees, North-Central Pennsylvania District, urging that Federal in-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

demnity program be continued another year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

522. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce, Princeville, Ill., urging Congress to revise the present 15- and 25-percent rates on Federal excise tax on telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

523. Also, petition of the president, the New York League of Business and Professional Women, Inc., New York, N. Y., supporting House Joint Resolution 74, proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Navy Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday in the other body the procurement policy of the Department of the Navy was severely criticized in connection with the award of contracts for construction of certain combat ships.

Having previously commended the Department of the Navy to the Members of the House for the very action which a distinguished Member of the other body is now criticizing, I ask the indulgence of my colleagues to supplement my previous remarks.

First, I want to say there is only one thing in this picture that is shocking to my mind, and that is that we have no program in this country of private merchant marine shipbuilding construction. After the lesson of World War II, and now with the Soviet Union threatening the free world, with this country having undertaken to set up a global defense against such attack, it is inconceivable to me that no provision has been made to insure our security by the building and maintenance of a private fleet of fast, modern merchant ships. The point is, however, that other than to naval construction, our private shipyards have nowhere to turn.

That being the case, in the national interest, the least we can do is preserve certain strategic ship construction facilities so that in the event of war their mobilization potential and nucleus of skilled workers will be available.

The Department of the Navy has been assigned this latter task, and now when the Bureau of Ships awards a contract for construction of three destroyers to a yard which is destitute of work, the Navy Department stands accused of discrimination.

Lay men and women can throw stones in the one little well that gives water but there are factors in allocating naval construction work which should be understood.

There is such a thing as quality of work; there is such a thing as suitability of facilities; there is such a thing as a yard's particular experience in certain types of construction; there is such a thing as ability to meet time schedules. These and many other factors have a direct bearing on ultimate cost and record of economy.

For example, last year the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton in my own district was selected to modernize the first *Midway* class aircraft carrier, *Franklin D. Roosevelt*. Recently work began on the details of this modernization job, which includes the installation of a canted flight deck. I am told the design section of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard made certain proposals on modernization design which will result in savings of about $800,000. The Bremerton yard is a so-called carrier yard—it is experienced in this type of work. It saves the taxpayers money in this class of work.

The Bureau of Ships knows this. It recognized on the basis of records and statistics, of past performance, of trained manpower, of existing drydock facilities and other factors, that great savings can and will be made on carrier work when allocated to the Bremerton yard, just as it knows the special favorable factors, as well as unfavorable ones, of other yards.

Outside of allocating, here and there, certain construction work to help sustain private shipyards, the Navy Department is an excellent example of obtaining the most defense for the taxpayer's dollar. The award of the third *Forrestal* class carrier to Newport News Shipbuilding & Construction Co. at a saving of $28 million over the next lowest bid, is a case in point.

Of course, an award is much like the appointment of a postmaster—only one candidate is happy. Every Congressman knows what I mean; and Mr. Speaker, I for one compliment the Bureau of Ships on the way it has considered all factors—tax dollars, relative efficiency, and employment potential—in letting contracts. There just is not enough work to go around. For what business there is, I say the Bureau of Ships of the Navy Department is doing a splendid job for the taxpayers and for the national interest.

Criticism should be directed in another direction; because the solution does not consist of a changed policy of Navy procurement, rather it exists in a wiser policy of building and maintaining a private merchant marine—a fleet of fast, modern vessels to carry supplies in the event of enemy aggression, and meanwhile in trade and aid to carry goods from where they are to where they ought to be.

Political Asylum Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union and the international Communist conspiracy are the greatest threats to world peace. We can advance the cause of world peace if we encourage the internal disintegration of the Red empire.

One method to accomplish this is to aid Communist government officials to abandon their positions of leadership, defect to the West, and provide us with valuable information. Such a program, if successful, would create chaos and confusion behind the Iron Curtain and divert Soviet attention from its plans for world conquest and would weaken the control of Moscow over the Communist world.

I am introducing legislation today which provides for such a program. This legislation, to be known as the Political Asylum Act of 1954, would allow the admission into the United States of Communist government officials who renounce their allegiance to communism, flee from a Communist country, and supply information to the United States which is valuable and useful to our national security. Any Communist government official who is outside the Iron Curtain would be granted asylum if he refused to return to communism. The term "Communist government official" would include any person who is an officer, employee, or member of the military, naval, or air forces of any Communist country, or of the foreign service, or of the security or the intelligence organization of such country.

To avoid the possibility that members of a Communist official's family might be held as hostages, this bill would also allow his wife and children to enter the United States.

Mr. Speaker, last fall, as a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, I visited 26 countries. I found during the course of my travels, which took me into virtually every country on the perimeter of the Iron Curtain, from Berlin to Korea, that there are thousands of Communist officials who would defect if given proper encouragement. In the course of my discussions with many refugees from the Reds it was brought out that a large number of Communist government officials are civil servants from previous democratic governments who for their own personal safety have remained in the service of the Communists. To date our Government has barely scratched the surface in encouraging escape from behind the Iron Curtain. My legislation would provide a definite program of political asylum.

An undertaking such as I propose could have several salutary results.

First. We would receive valuable information which is not available to us today.

Second. We would create chaos, confusion, and distrust in the inner councils of Communist governments.

Third. Persons who renounce communism and come to the West could form the nucleus of new governments to be established at such time as the Iron Curtain countries are liberated, in much the same manner as refugee governments we set up during World War II. These groups could be clearinghouses for resistance movements and could form underground lines of communication between the East and West.

Mr. Speaker, we must recognize the fact that aggressive steps on our part are necessary to foment the breakup of the Red empire. It is folly to expect these countries to fall apart of their own accord in view of the police states that have been established.

I have studied this matter for weeks since my return from abroad and feel that now is the time for bold action by our country. The riots in Eastern Germany are an indication of the mass unrest which exists. The celebrated Gouzenko case and the defection of the Red diplomat in Japan this year are indicative of individual dissatisfaction with communism by Red officials. I have presented a draft of this legislation to various agencies of the executive branch of our Government with the hope that the administration will support my proposal.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a refugee bill nor is it a bill to increase immigration quotas. It is legislation designed to promote the national security of the United States. In order to be eligible for admission to our country there must be a bona fide renunciation of communism and the escapee must be able to carry out his part of the bargain by supplying us with information. Naturally all eligible persons should be screened to prevent entry of persons who would be a menace to the internal security of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House take prompt action toward enactment of my bill. If it becomes law, it will give the Russians such a bad time in their own backyard that they won't be able to launch further aggression.

George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, 101 years ago a new Territory was established which took the name of the Father of our Country, and 65 years ago this very day on February 22, 1889, a Federal enabling act was approved allowing the people of Washington Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union.

In commemorating the birthday of our first President I venture to suggest that if George Washington were alive today he would take great satisfaction in the State that bears his name—in its human progress, its development, and its living standard as well as its scenic wonders. Washington would appreciate a living memorial to himself of men, women, and children, of rich farms, of expanding industry, of good homes, churches, and schools amid the beauty of streams, lakes, forests, mountains, and seashore. The State of Washington would please the man who cherished dreams of a free people and a free Nation.

Mr. Speaker, under another great and good President, Dwight Eisenhower, who is likewise "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen," I am privileged to pay a brief, simple tribute to George Washington on behalf of my constituents who share the honor of his good name and heritage of his great deeds.

Air Force Disasters at Long Beach Municipal Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1954

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have risen before to point out the dangers of maintaining Air Force training and ferrying operations at airports located in metropolitan areas, and more specifically, at the Long Beach (Calif.) Municipal Airport. In the past 10 years 15 crashes have occurred in residential areas near this airport.

This is an average of one crash every 9 months. Twelve of the 15 tragedies involved Air Force airplanes. These 15 crashes were not all. Several others have occurred at locations more remote from this airport, but involving airplanes using it. Additionally many mishaps occurring within the actual confines of the airfield—which easily might have extended outside them—are not included in this number.

It is hoped that the following tabulation of these accidents will give the Secretary of the Air Force and the Congress additional information upon which to base a reevaluation of the wisdom of continued use of this airfield for military purposes:

1. May 14, 1944: P-47 (military) developed motor trouble on takeoff, landed vicinity Wardlow and Olive in built-up area. No casualties.

2. January 1, 1945: A-26 (military) being test flown crashed and burned in residential area 67th and Lime. Two killed, three houses demolished.

3. April 17, 1945: P-38 (military) motor trouble after takeoff, crashed and burned in open lot in residential area, south of Pacific Coast Highway, west of Community Hospital. Pilot killed.

4. May 9, 1945: P-38 (military) motor trouble on takeoff crashed west end of field. No casualties.

5. July 1, 1945: F-80 (jet) (military) overshot runway 30, crashed at northeast end. Pilot died of injuries.

6. August 29, 1945: P-61 Blackwidow experimental (military) crashed north of 223d Street west of Santa Fe, open field. Pilot parachuted.

7. November 15, 1945: USN Corsair (military) crashed in street 3300 block, Brayton Avenue, residential district. Pilot parachuted.

8. January 12, 1949: BT 13 (military) crashed in street 3500 Lemon, built-up residential district, damaged apartment house. Two killed, three saved, developed motor trouble after takeoff.

9. December 4, 1949: Beechcraft Bonanza (civilian) crashed in center of field. Five killed.

10. November 18, 1950: TWA Constellation (civilian), 56 passengers, developed trouble after takeoff from Los Angeles to Chicago, overshot runway 30, undercarriage and other under parts of plane demolished, gas tanks ruptured, etc., crashed 300 feet from end of runway. No casualties.

11. September 15, 1951: B-45 (jet) (military) crash landed in open field north of Carson, west of Lakewood golf course, plane burned. No casualties.

12. May 29, 1952: F-80 (P-33 jet trainer) (military) undershot runway 12 on field northeast corner. No casualties.

13. September 22, 1953: Civilian plane undershot runway 25R, crash landed east side Lakewood Boulevard, bounced across highway, through fence, into field. No casualties.

14. January 12, 1954: F-87 jet (military) crashed and burned in residential district, 19th and Raymond Avenue (Signal Hill). Nine killed, six houses demolished.

15. February 3, 1954, F-80 jet (military) undershot runway 30, hit blast barricade, skidded on belly 500 feet. No casualties.

Washington and the Cherry Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. LANTAFF

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1954

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, many delightful stories about our first President, George Washington, have endeared him to American schoolchildren. Perhaps the most famous of these is the tale of George Washington and the cherry tree. As the story goes, George Washington as a boy took his hatchet and chopped down his father's favorite cherry tree. When his father asked who had done this mischief, young George admitted the blame, saying, "I cannot tell a lie," and took his punishment like a man.

In more recent times, some modern day hatchetmen of one of our major political parties have been attempting to create the impression that the other party allowed our Government to become infested with traitors and subversives. They have done this by allusions to 1,456 subversives and 2,200 traitors.

It is now apparent that there is more fiction than truth in these wild charges. One of the hatchetmen who made them—a White House aide—has finally admitted 3 months later that his charges were false. The others might well profit by George Washington's example.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Postal Employees Deserve Adequate Increases in Salary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in our RECORD a statement I have submitted to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee:

STATEMENT FAVORING SALARY INCREASES FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with my several colleagues who have made statements before this committee advocating an immediate pay increase for the postal employees of the United States.

The case presented for increased postal salaries at this time is not based upon emotional, psychological, or even political considerations; rather, it is based upon simple economic logic and equity. This conclusion is compelled by any reasonable consideration of certain facts:

1. The relative purchasing power of the take-home pay of postal employees has continued to decline in recent years with a depressing effect upon their standards of living.

2. In the effort to offset this reduced purchasing power, it has become necessary for a great majority of the postal employees to accept additional part-time employment or allow their wives to enter the labor market to supplement the family income. This trend has an unfortunate effect upon the traditional social pattern of this group of American families.

3. There has been improved efficiency and increased productivity per man-hour of this group of Government workers.

4. Postal employees must spend long hours of their own time in the study of various subjects directly or indirectly relating to the performance of their duties in order that they may better serve their Nation.

Therefore, to overcome the bad effects of lowered living standards referred to above and to compensate for greater demands on the individual postal worker, pay-raise legislation can and must be enacted as soon as possible.

It has been said recently that such a pay raise at this time would tend to exert inflationary pressures because a pattern would be set for increased wage demands on the part of industrial workers. Unfortunately, the logic of this statement escapes me. Let us look at the facts in this case.

In the months between July 1951 and the same period in 1953—I mention 1951 because that was the date of the last enactment of pay-raise legislation for Federal employees—the weekly earnings for women clerical workers increased as much as 14.3 percent in Atlanta, Ga., and 8.4 percent in San Francisco, Calif. In this same period the gross average weekly earnings of production workers in all manufacturing industries in the United States increased by 11.6 percent; in the retail trade the increase was 8 percent; banks and trust companies increased 8.7 percent; insurance carriers, 10.7 percent; and gas and electric utilities, 13.2 percent. My friends, the advocates of pay-raise legislation for Federal employees are not endeavoring to set a new pattern for possible additional wage increases in the private sectors of the economy, but rather we strongly urge that Congress allow these employees to follow and catch up with the pattern which has already been set. They should be allowed to receive enough compensation for their toil to buy not only the necessities of life but also a few pleasures.

At a time like this, when a great many authorities, both in and out of Government service, are pointing up some of the storm warnings which now exist in our economy, I do not feel that any action on the part of Congress which would make available additional income to be translated into purchases of consumer goods would exert any particular inflationary pressures. On the other hand, it would seem that such increased consumer spending would more probably be a stabilizing influence.

For the reasons which I have outlined here today, I strongly urge that Congress act without delay in making a realistic salary adjustment for postal employees a part of the law of the land.

A Bill To Amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act so as to provide for assistance in the restoration of pastureland which has been damaged by drought or insects, and the placing of protective vegetative cover on croplands which are not to be tilled for an extended period.

A serious emergency now exists in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky which was brought about as the direct result of the drought of the past 2 years. The farmers of my district are without pastures and meadows, and many of them have exhausted their credit and resources. The crops of 1953 were consumed during the summer months in supporting the livestock. Many streams were dry for the first time in the history of the district. Beef cattle and dairy herds were disposed of due to the shortage of hay and other forage crops.

Winter rains and snows have been light, and unless we have good rainfall during the next few weeks our reserve of subsoil moisture will be dangerously low.

The Kentucky drought committee approved each of the 16 counties in the second district during the year 1953 for drought emergency assistance. The Secretary of Agriculture directed that the entire district be designated as a part of the disaster area of Kentucky.

There seems to be some misunderstanding on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture at the present time as to just what authority he has under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in the present emergency. Passage of this bill will clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture and the provisions of same will make it mandatory that practices designed to restore our soil's fertility be included in the ACP program for this year. It is imperative that relief provided by this bill be granted and that the Secretary of Agriculture carry out the terms of same during the year of 1954.

Comment on Statement of Chief Economist of White House—Purchasing Power Needed Now More Than Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1954

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Chief Economist Dr. Arthur F. Burns, who is head of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, is quoted in the New York Times today, February 22, 1954, as follows:

> As the facts are now, he said, if you cut a consumer's tax $1 he may spend from zero to $1, no more. If you cut business taxes $1, business may spend as much as $50. A new environment for business spending is created.

Not being an economist, I am at a loss to understand Dr. Burns' reasoning. I just wonder if all economists are agreed on his statement, particularly about business spending $50 for every $1 saving. Possibly there is a difference on the tax saving for a consumer, if you consider the particular consumer who receives the tax reduction of $1. If he is a wealthy individual and is already buying all the necessities, comforts, conveniences, and luxuries that he desires, Dr. Burns is probably right—that he will just put the $1 savings in the bank and it will not enter the blood stream of business and commerce. However, if the $1 in tax benefits is granted to a person in the lower-income group he will immediately spend it, and there is no reason why it should not accumulate in business transactions through velocity, the same or even better than if the $1 had been granted to business.

To my mind, that is the issue involved in the administration's tax program. The administration seems to want practically all the tax benefits to flow to business, whereas many of us in the Congress would like to see the benefits go to the consumers who need it and will use it as additional buying power. I have always contended that old-age recipients contribute more to the economy and general welfare of the people than the amount they individually receive. In other words, every dollar that an aged person receives he puts into immediate circulation. It probably goes into the hands of 20, 40, or 50 individuals or business concerns within the year. If 20 of these individuals or business concerns pay a 5-percent tax on it the Government has its money back by the end of the year.

If Dr. Burns refers to the kind of consumer who receives the $1 tax benefit as the one who will sterilize it and keep it out of circulation, he is right, according

to my judgment. But if it is given to one who will spend it, the behavior of that $1 is entirely different.

TWENTY-DOLLAR BAD CHECK AND FOUR HUNDRED DOLLARS IN BUSINESS

During the depression in the early thirties, in a certain town in the United States, a check for $20 was given by a person to a retail store in exchange for a $20 purchase of goods. The bank was closed that day and the bank holiday continued for more than 2 weeks. During that 2 weeks this $20 check went to the wholesaler, to one of the wholesaler's employees, to a doctor that the employee owed, to a druggist that the doctor owed, and from one to the other until this $20 check had gone into the hands, and had been endorsed by, 20 local individuals and business firms. When the bank opened it was presented for payment. The banker observed that it was given by a person who did not have an account in the bank. Looking at the 20 endorsements on the back, and recognizing them as being depositors in his bank, he decided that instead of turning the check down, and thereby causing a cancellation of $400 worth of business, he would charge each one of these customers of his bank $1 and open an account for the giver of the no-good check, and deposited to his credit $20—taking $1 from each of the accounts of the 20 endorsers. The check was then paid and each of the 20 was only required to take a 5-percent discount, or received 95 cents on the dollar. Velocity of money, of course, is just as important as the money itself.

CANNOT FATTEN HERD BY FEEDING BULL

The administration's policy of helping the people by benefiting a few wealthy individuals, who would not use their increased wealth to buy goods and services, is like the cattleman trying to fatten his herd by feeding the bull.

PURCHASING-POWER GOOSE NEEDED TO LAY GOLDEN EGGS

Our productive capacity is sufficient for our present needs. Automobile plants are capable of turning out 8 million cars this year, but will probably produce 5 million. Steel companies are producing at the rate of 74 percent. Our problem now is consumption of the production. This gap can only be filled with adequate buying power in the hands of the people who need it and will use it to buy goods and services.

Small Business Failures and the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1954

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to relate some statistics pertinent to the current "gloom and doom" situation which will disclose heartening facts rather than the wishful thinking of these melancholy prophets.

There has been a great deal of exaggeration, misinterpretation, and distortion of current economic statistics. An analysis of the statistics compiled by the Small Business Administration on business failures, about which there has been so much discussion, puts the situation into its proper perspective.

During the last 4 months, October 1953 through January 1954, failures have been on the uptrend. However, the failure rate is not significantly high. Here are the salient facts:

First. Total failures in 1953 were 8,862, only a slight increase over the 7,611 figure for 1952. This is an increase of only 1,255 out of a total business population of 4,200,000.

Second. During the last 4 months in which failures have been rising, the annual rate has amounted to only 10,040. This is far below the annual average of nearly 14,000 in the last 50 years.

Third. Let us compare this present failure rate of 10,040 which has caused so many shrieks of danger with the figures during the recovery period from the Roosevelt recession of 1937–38. During this period, in which business had supposedly gotten back on its feet, failures were 14,768 in 1939; 13,619 in 1940; and 11,848 in 1941.

Fourth. The number of businesses, however, was much smaller before World War II. It is therefore instructive to compare the failure rate per 10,000 concerns. The figure for the last 4 months is 36.6 per 10,000 concerns. The figure for 1939 was 70 per 10,000 concerns; for 1940 it was 63; and for 1941 it was 55. In other words, the failure rate during this period of Roosevelt prosperity ran between 50 and 100 percent higher than this present period.

We Should Continue Increases Provided in Public Law 555

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 555, which was approved on July 16, 1952, amended the Civil Service Retirement Act, inter alia, to increase the payments to annuitants receiving relatively small pensions, based on prewar pay scales, which were shrinking under the impact of the higher cost of living of the postwar period. It increased annuities $36 for each 6-months' period from the commencing date of the annuity to October 1, 1952, provided that such increase would not exceed $324 or 25 percent of the present annuity, whichever was less, and provided further that no annuity would be so increased as to exceed $2,160 by reason of the enactment of the amendment.

The act provided that the increases would terminate on June 30, 1955, or earlier as follows: First, termination on June 30, 1954, if Congress does not appropriate for the fiscal year 1955 an amount sufficient to pay the increases during the fiscal years 1954 and 1955; or, second, termination at the end of the second month following the third consecutive month for which the consumers' price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics is less than 169.9, which was the figure for April 1948. This is the old index which used 1935–39 prices as a base; but provision is made in the act for the BLS to furnish a conversion factor designed to adjust to the 1947–49 base.

Congress did appropriate $31,397,000 for 1954, and the President's budget for 1955 contains a request for an additional $29,623,000 for 1955. We may assume that this requirement will be met and that the funds will be available in the civil service retirement and disability fund to continue to make these additional payments to the annuitants receiving less than $2,160 a year until June 30, 1955.

The possibility that the consumers' price index will go down to 169.9 on the old index is very remote. The range of the index has been less than two points during the entire period in which the additional payments were made. For the latest date available, December 1953, the old index was 192.1. While we may say that the consumers' price index, representing the cost of living of low income groups, has been stabilized in the past 6 or 7 months, there is nothing on the horizon to lead us to anticipate a drastic decline of more than 22 points.

In passing Public Law 555, we in Congress recognized our obligation to this necessitous group of former Government employees. These annuitants are of an age when they incur additional costs for medical attention and attendance. Their total number and the appropriation necessary to maintain the increases provided will decline each year. A ceiling of $2,160 is not likely to be a luxurious or even a comfortable pension in their lifetime. We cannot permit this act to expire on June 30, 1954, and thereby reduce the amounts now received by these lowest paid annuitants who have been hardest hit by the new plateau of prices and the cost of living. The increases provided should be made permanent as applicable to the present recipients.

Misinformation and Untruthful Information About the Social Security Reserve Fund Answered by Secretary Hobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1954

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has, in her usual forthright

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and convincing manner, answered several questions concerning the social-security reserve fund that were propounded to me by a correspondent. I believe that the answers to these questions will clarify much of the misinformation that is being disseminated concerning this fund. I am inserting herewith the letter of inquiry and the letter from Mrs. Hobby in reply; also a statement that was attached to her letter, entitled "Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund." These two documents should clear up any question in the mind of any person concerning this important matter. They are as follows:

POLO, ILL., *January 1, 1954.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: The existing situation re the social-security fund seems very baffling. I have been trying to come at the exact truth through reading all I find printed about it and by correspondence with friends who, I had believed, knew something about finance and the general subject discussed.

I have written out several questions that seem to me pertinent, but I receive no answers. One of my friends sent the questions I posed to him to the U. S. News & World Report, which he claims animated the article in its December 11 issue titled "Your Old-Age Pension, etc," page 96. It covered the law (I suppose) but avoided my questions. At least, none was to be found in the article. I'm wondering if you will be so good as to clarify the matter. It seems clear to me that all attempted explanations of the bond substitution for the actual cash fund of some $18.5 billion in the social-security fund are fallacious if not downright falsifications—and there serving as coverups to delude the public. My questions follow:

1. Is it true that United States bonds have been deposited in the Treasury as security for cash taken from the fund? If so, do such bonds constitute genuine security?

2. Has the entire fund been converted to the use of the Government?

3. Assuming that United States bonds are being used as a guaranty or substitute for the cash taken, who owns the bonds?

4. Who gets the interest on such bonds?

5. Were the social-security beneficiaries, the payers-in and those receiving monthly checks consulted before the money was taken and the bonds substituted?

6. Will not taxes have to be levied to pay the interest on the bonds?

7. If so, will not the social-security payers and those receiving checks have to pay their share of such taxes? (Most of us believed we had paid all the premiums demanded by law of us to become eligible to receive benefits.)

8. If the fund dissipation is a straight borrowing transaction (which Secretary Humphrey stated in a radio quiz that it is), why doesn't the amount borrowed appear in the national-debt statements?

9. It seems to be generally held among the public that a special bond issue was provided by the Treasury to serve as security for the money taken from the fund. Not sold to the public but merely as evidence (I suppose) of the Government's good faith. Can this possibly be true?

10. If anything of the sort happened, are the bonds interest-free?

11. If interest-bearing bonds were in fact deposited in lieu of the cash used up by the Government, do not the 65 million workers pay the interest for the most part?

12. If the Government issued the bonds for the sole purpose of providing security and are not interest free but carry an interest charge, who receives the interest on such bonds? The Government?

Further study, without doubt, will pose many more questions. I enclose a memorandum coming from the U. S. News & World Report. I cannot believe there is any validity in its statements.

Sincerely and with high respects,
HENRY A. CHENEY.

MEMORANDUM

(From the office of U. S. News & World Report, December 22, 1953)

Many observers, some of them informed in finance, have contended that a social-security fund invested in Government bonds is no fund at all—that Government will have to raise revenue by taxes when it wants to pay out funds.

Misunderstanding about the nature and reality of the social-security reserve fund stems usually from a failure to think ahead to what will happen when Government has to use the fund to pay benefits.

When the time comes for Social Security to cash in its bonds in order to get cash to pay benefits, then the Treasury can do just what it does now when a bond issue comes due. It can sell a new issue of bonds, and use the proceeds to redeem the bonds now held by Social Security. The national debt does not rise—since one block of the debt is simply replaced by another—and no additional taxes are levied in this process.

If, of course, Government desires at the appointed time to cut its national debt and can get revenues from taxes with which to do this, then Government can take tax money and pay off the bonds held by Social Security. National debt will go down accordingly. Note that, in this process, the purpose of levying the additional taxes will be to reduce the national debt—not to pay off Social Security.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION AND WELFARE,
Washington, January 26, 1954.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: With your communication of January 5, you sent me the enclosed letter from Mr. Henry A. Cheney, Marco Polo Hotel, Polo, Ill., who requests answers to a number of questions about existing arrangements for financing the social-security program. The questions and answers are as follows:

Questions 1, 10, and 5. Is it true that United States bonds have been deposited in the Treasury as security for cash taken from the fund? If so, do such bonds constitute genuine security? If anything of the sort happened, are the bonds interest-free? Were the social-security beneficiaries, the payers-in and those receiving monthly checks consulted before the money was taken and the bonds substituted?

Answer. It may be helpful, at the outset, to realize that when the original contribution schedule and subsequent amendment thereof were enacted Congress was aware that there would be an excess of income over disbursements in the early years of the old-age and survivors insurance program. Recognizing that it would be unwise from an economic and financial standpoint to leave these cash balances uninvested, Congress prescribed the method of handling the money collected to finance the program.

The Social Security Act provides specifically that 100 percent of the taxes collected to finance the old-age and survivors insurance program are to be transferred to a trust fund which is kept separate from the general funds of the Treasury. The managing trustee of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund (the Secretary of the Treasury) is directed by law to invest in interest-bearing Government bonds that portion of the fund which is not required for meeting current benefit payments and administrative expenses of the program.

The investment of the fund's cash receipts in Government bonds constitutes the highest degree of security and, in addition, provides interest income which is available for payments to beneficiaries. The practice of investing the assets of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund in Government securities is exactly the same as that followed by banks, insurance companies, trustees for workers' pension plans, and other private investors who seek the most sound investment for their funds, and, at the same time, a reasonable income therefrom. In either case, the investor receives for his loan a bond or other form of obligation as evidence of the Treasury's indebtedness. When the Treasury repays the loan, with interest, the money becomes available for social-security benefits just as the Treasury's repayment of loans made by an insurance company makes this money available to the company's policyholders and beneficiaries.

Question 2. Has the entire fund been converted to the use of the Government?

Answer. None of the assets of the fund have been converted to the use of the Government. As indicated in reply to the preceding questions, assets of the fund have been invested in United States Government bonds. At the end of December 1953, the assets of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund amounted to $18,707 million. All of these assets, except for $416 million held in cash for current disbursements, were invested in interest-bearing Government securities.

Question 3. Assuming that United States bonds are being used as a guaranty or substitute for the cash taken, who owns the bonds?

Answer. The Social Security Act provides that the trustees of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund—the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—shall hold the fund in trust for present and future beneficiaries. The Government bonds, which constitute virtually all of the assets of the fund, are held in safekeeping in the Treasury Department in Washington, D. C., by the Secretary of the Treasury as managing trustee of the fund.

Questions 4 and 12. Who gets the interest on such bonds? If the Government issued the bonds for the sole purpose of providing security and are not interest free but carry an interest charge, who receives the interest on such bonds? The Government?

Answer. Interest collected on the fund's investments is added to and becomes a part of the trust fund and becomes available for the payment of benefits. A total of $2.7 billion has been received in interest during the period 1937–53.

Questions 6, 7, and 11. Will not taxes have to be levied to pay the interest on the bonds? If so, will not the Social Security payers and those receiving checks have to pay their share of such taxes? (Most of us believed we had paid all the premiums demanded, by law, of us to become eligible to receive benefits.) If interest bearing bonds were in fact deposited in lieu of the cash used up by the Government do not the 65 million workers pay the interest for the most part?

Answer. It is true, of course, that the Government will be required to levy taxes to pay the interest on and redeem the principal of the obligations issued to the trust fund. This levy will be borne by all taxpayers, including persons covered by the social security program. However, these taxes are not for the purpose of paying social security benefits. Rather, they are to pay for the costs of the war and its aftermath and the general operating expenses of the Government, that is, the purposes for which the money was originally borrowed. Taxes levied to cover the cost of, say, the war would have to be paid whether the bonds were held by the

trust fund or by some bank or insurance company. The fact that the trust fund, rather than other possible investors, holds part of the Government's debt means that the interest on the bonds accrues to the fund.

Questions 8 and 9. If the fund dissipation is a straight borrowing transaction (which Secretary Humphrey stated in a radio quiz that it is) why doesn't the amount borrowed appear in the national debt statements? It seems to be generally held among the public that a special bond issue was provided by the Treasury to serve as security for the money taken from the fund. Not sold to the public but merely as evidence (I suppose) of the Government's good faith. Can this possibly be true?

Answer. The Social Security Act as amended restricts investments of the trust fund to interest-bearing obligations of the United States Government or to obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States. Regular obligations of these types may be acquired on original issue at par or by purchase of outstanding obligations at their market price. About 12.5 percent of the investments of the trust fund fall in this category and are exactly the same issues as those held by life insurance companies.

In addition, the Social Security Act authorizes the issuance of special obligations exclusively to the trust fund. Such special obligations are required to bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest borne by all interest-bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the public debt. About 87.5 percent of the fund's investments are of this type.

The Government indebtedness represented by all the bonds held in the trust fund is a part of the national debt and is included in published figures on the debt. For example, a summary tabulation of the public debt at the end of 1953 appearing on page 9 of the Daily Statement of the United States Treasury for December 31, 1953, shows all the special issues held by the trust fund on that date as $16,005,605,000 bearing an interest rate of 2⅝ percent. Copies of the Daily Statement are generally available at public and university libraries.

Several copies of a fact sheet entitled "The Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund" are enclosed which Mr. Cheney and your constituents may find helpful in understanding the operations of the fund. I appreciate your giving me the opportunity of replying to Mr. Cheney's questions.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary.

THE FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND

The trust fund was established by the Social Security Act to hold the reserves of the old-age and survivors insurance program. Into this special fund in the United States Treasury go all the contributions made by employees, employers, and self-employed people under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program.

Guardians of the fund: A board of trustees, composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, holds the trust fund and makes regular reports to Congress regarding its operation and its amount.

An independent account: Receipts and expenditures of the trust fund are separated from all other accounts in the United States Treasury.

Expenditures: Benefit payments and administrative costs of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system are the only expenditures which may be made from the trust fund.

How the money is invested: That part of the fund not required for current expenditures is invested in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

The interest from such investments is added to and becomes a part of the trust fund. Thus the interest increases the size of the fund. The interest, like the original payments into the fund, may be used only for payment of benefits and administrative costs of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system.

The investment of amounts in the trust fund is similar to the investment of funds by banks and insurance companies. Banks and insurance companies do not store in a vault all the money deposited with them or paid to them as premiums. They put the money to work. They invest it so that it will earn interest. They invest it in securities, including United States Government bonds. Life-insurance companies, for example, now have about 14 percent of their assets invested in United States Government bonds.

The safest investment in the world is investment in United States Government bonds. Since money belonging to the trust fund is invested in United States Government bonds, it will be available for old-age and survivors insurance payments when needed. The law expressly provides that all Government bonds in which trust fund money is invested shall be available for payment of benefits at any time.

Status of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund as of June 30, 1953

[In billions of dollars]

Total income since 1936:	
Taxes	$26.0
Interest	2.5
Total	28.5
Total disbursements:	
Benefits paid	9.5
Administrative costs	.6
Total	10.1
Balance on hand:	
Cash	.6
Invested in Government bonds	17.8
Total	18.4

THE FINANCIAL SOUNDNESS OF THE TRUST FUND

Here is the opinion of some responsible authorities in the field of private insurance, investment, and Government finance.

1. Is it real, or a phony?

M. Albert Linton, chairman of the board, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co.; member, Committee on Economic Security, 1935; member, Senate Advisory Council on Social Security, 1948; etc., statement dated February 17, 1953, to the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"Many charges have been made that the trust fund in the old-age and survivors system is a phony or a fraud. As the program will probably come up for review this year it is important to arrive at the facts in the case.

"As a first step in understanding the problem, it helps to realize that those managing the OASI program find themselves in a position very similar to that of a life insurance company management. Moneys flow into them out of which benefits and expenses are paid. If there is an excess of income it must be invested, just as in a life insurance company. Life insurance companies have a wide choice of investments, among them Government bonds, of which they owned about $10 billion at the beginning of this year.

"The investment of the excess income of the OASI system is quite properly limited to Government bonds. If that limitation were not imposed and the funds could be invested in the securities of private enterprise, we would be on our way to national socialism. When investing in Government bonds, the OASI trustees are authorized to purchase them, either in the open market or directly from the Treasury. Some of the bonds in the trust fund are exactly the same issues as those held by the life insurance companies.

"However, to simplify administration, provision is made for the Treasury to issue special bonds available to the OASI fund, bearing the average interest rate on all Government obligations. By borrowing from the fund, the Government is relieved to a corresponding extent of the necessity of borrowing from the commercial banks or from the public generally. The fact that the bonds are special bonds does not change the essence of the transaction. However, the special tag has led to much misunderstanding. Nor is it changed by the fact that the trustees of the fund happen to be a part of the administrative branch of the Government.

"As a result of investing excess income, the OASI trust fund now amounts to about $17 billion—represented by Government bonds, some regular but mostly special. The question at issue is whether or not this trust fund is phoney or a fraud. Are the bonds no good because they are simply Government IOU's representing money that has been borrowed and spent by the Government?

"To throw light on the question, consider what would happen if the trustees should be authorized by Congress to make all of their bond holdings salable to the general public on terms as to interest rates and maturity dates which would be attractive to the market. If this should be done, and the bonds should be sold in due course to the public, then $17 billion of Government bonds would be in the hands of the public and $17 billion would be cash in bank standing to the credit of the OASI trustees. But, what would that benefit them unless they had need to spend it in the near future? They would want to receive interest on such funds until needed to meet obligations. Therefore, they would seek for places to invest it. Since the only proper outlet would be Government bonds, the natural thing for them would be to purchase the new bonds being issued periodically by the Treasury either for general purposes or to replace recurring maturities of outstanding issues. Then the cycle would be complete and the trust fund would be invested in regular Government bonds bought in the market in the regular way, and the former $17 billion in Government bonds previously held would be in the hands of the public. Nobody would be worrying about the fact that the Government had spent the money.

"It therefore is clear that intrinsically the Government bonds in the OASI trust fund are just as valuable as if they were owned by a private institution; and could be as easily turned into cash if Congress would make these salable and permit the interest and maturity dates to be set to meet market conditions. The claim that the trust fund is not a tangible asset simply is not true. * * *

"Double taxation? From what has been said it is clear that the excess income in the OASI trust fund has been invested in Government bonds for the benefit of the OASI system, and that these Government bonds are just as valuable an asset as though they were owned by a life insurance company. Let us now see how the ownership of these bonds serves to reduce further taxation.

"The OASI trust fund of some $17 billion produces interest amounting say to $400 million a year. This interest is raised by taxation just as though the bonds were in public hands. However, if the bonds were in public hands and the OASI system needed the $400 million to pay benefits—as one of these days it will—then $800 million would have to be raised in taxes—$400 million for interest to public bond holders and another

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

$400 million to the OASI system to pay benefits.

"However, when the $17 billion is in the trust fund, only $400 million need be raised—not $800 million—so that the interest dollars raised by taxation then become "double duty" dollars, serving two purposes. The excess income in the OASI system which is being invested in Government bonds is therefore building up assets which will reduce future tax burdens.

"This does not go to the heart of the question as to whether it is wise from other points of view to create trust funds. That is another matter. What we must avoid is to claim that the building of a reserve fund is a detriment to the future of the OASI system because it involves double taxation. The fact is that today's payroll taxes when invested in the trust fund will lighten the burdens on future taxpayers."

II. Will you pay the tax twice for old-age and survivors-insurance benefits?

The following statement of the Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Committee on Finance, 80th Congress, again gives an answer to this question:

"This reserve (the trust fund) has been invested in United States Government securities, which, in the opinion of the Council, represent the proper form of investment for these funds. We do not agree with those who criticize this form of investment on the ground that the Government spends for general purposes the money received from the sale of securities to that fund. Actually such investment is as reasonable and proper as is the investment by life-insurance companies of their own reserve funds in Government securities. The fact that the Government uses the proceeds received from the sales of securities to pay the costs of the war and its other expenses is entirely legitimate. It no more implies mishandling of moneys received from the sale of securities to the trust fund than it does of moneys received from the sale of United States securities to life-insurance companies, banks, or individuals.

"The investment of the old-age and survivors-insurance funds in Government securities does not mean that people have been or will be taxed twice for the same benefits, as has been charged. The following example illustrates this point: Suppose some year in the future the outgo under the old-age and survivors-insurance system should exceed payroll tax receipts by $100 million. If there were then $5 billion of United States 2-percent bonds in the trust fund, they would produce interest amounting to $100 million a year. This interest would, of course, have to be raised by taxation. But suppose there were no bonds in the trust fund. In that event, $100 million to cover the deficit in the old-age and survivors-insurance system would have to be raised by taxation; and, in addition, another $100 million would have to be raised by taxation to pay interest on $5 billion of Government bonds owned by someone else. The bonds would be in other hands, because if the Government had not been able to borrow from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, it would have had to borrow the same amount from other sources. In other words, the ownership of the $5 billion in bonds by the old-age and survivors-insurance system would prevent the $100 million from having to be raised twice—quite the opposite from the 'double taxation' that has been charged.

"The members of the Advisory Council are in unanimous agreement with the statement of the Advisory Council of 1938 to the effect that the present provisions regarding the investment of the moneys in the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund do not involve any misuse of these moneys or endanger the safety of the funds."

Membership of the 1948 Advisory Council: Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., chairman; Sumner H. Slichter, Harvard University; Frank Bane, Council of State Governments; J. Douglas Brown, Princeton University; Malcolm Bryan, Trust Co. of Georgia; Nelson H. Cruikshank, American Federation of Labor; Mary H. Donlon, New York State Workmen's Compensation Board; Adrien J. Falk, president, S. & W. Fine Foods, Inc.; Marion B. Folsom, treasurer, Eastman Kodak Co.; M. Albert Linton, chairman of the board, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co.; John Miller, National Planning Association; William I. Myers, dean, New York State College of Agriculture; Emil Rieve, Textile Workers' Union and Congress of Industrial Organizations; Florence R. Sabin, scientist; S. Abott Smith, president, Thomas Strahan Co.; Delos Walker, vice president, R. H. Macy & Co.; Ernest C. Young, Purdue University.

Treasury Secretary Humphrey's remarks concerning OASI trust fund

On the national NBC television program Meet the Press, Sunday, May 24, 1953, Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey was quizzed on fiscal policies by a panel of reporters. The following exchange concerning the OASI trust fund is from a transcript of the program:

Question: "May I ask you this (referring to old-age insurance), is it not true that you've already spent all the money we turned in and all we have is Government I O U's for the billions we've collected so far?"

Secretary Humphrey: "That is not true, and I'm very glad you raised that question, Mrs. Craig, because what we have done is this: as the money was collected for these pension funds and other funds of the Government, it's been the practice right along to take that money out of most funds and put in those funds Government obligations, Government bonds.

"Now, one day a businessman said to me, 'Isn't that practically thievery; aren't you just reaching in there and stealing that money?' indicating the same thought you've just had in mind. He was a man operating a large company; he had a large pension fund of his own.

"I said to him, 'What have you got in your pension fund? You have a large amount of pension funds on hand; what are your pension funds invested in?'

"He said, 'Ours are invested in Government bonds.' I said, 'So are ours.'"

Question: "You think that's a good way to do it?"

Secretary Humphrey: "I'm sure it's a good way, and in fact I think it's the only way to do it."

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE.

DEBT PAPER

Mr. Speaker, debt paper plays an important part in our economy. There is a great demand for debt paper. It is in the interest of banks that create or manufacture money, equal to several times the amount of the actual money that they possess. They are very much interested in having available at all times a big backlog or large supply of debt paper that can be purchased and placed in their portfolios. This is particularly true as to United States Government obligations, direct or guaranteed. This particular debt paper is riskless and, although the interest rate is low, considering the fact that a bank can buy from 6 to 10 times as much of it as it has in reserve, makes the low-interest obligations very profitable.

UNEARNED INTEREST

It is seriously contended, and with much logic and reason, that commercial banks enjoy a great special privilege in being allowed to purchase Government bonds on what is tantamount to the Government's own credit and continue to draw interest on the bonds purchased with created money. It is contended that interest so drawn is unworked for and unearned interest. At the same time, it is contended, with logic and reason, that if the banks are not allowed to increase their earnings in this way it would be necessary for the Government to subsidize them directly in order to enable the banks to render the public service they are rendering at such a low cost. It seems almost idiotic, but the truth is that practically all of our money is based on debt. If all debts were paid, we would not have sufficient money to do business, and we would be reduced to barter. We do not see screaming headlines about debt paper and its value, but in financial circles it is about the most important commodity under discussion and involves interest charges of billions of dollars a year. These interest charges are not always paid to people who use them to purchase consumer goods.

BANKS AND OTHER INVESTORS LOOK WITH DISFAVOR ON FUND

That brings me to the point I desire to try to make about the old age and survivors insurance trust fund. At this time the fund is approximately $18,707 million. Many financial institutions, including banks, do not look with favor on this fund. They would like to have the fund in their own portfolios in order that the interest when paid would be paid to them and would go to them and not go to the recipients of the fund. At the same time, looking at it from the standpoint of the people and the Federal Government, it is a wonderful thing for the interest that is paid to be used in the manner that it is used, which increases the fund and helps all the recipients of the fund.

I do not claim that all the objections to this fund come from those who are selfishly interested in getting it broken up, but I do not doubt that some of the opposition comes from that source. It all goes back to the desire of financial houses to have plenty of debt paper available at all times and certainly they are not expected to look with favor on the accumulation of trust funds over the country, including the Federal social security fund, that will take more and more of the present debt paper which will deprive them of the opportunity of buying by manufacturing more money on the books of the banks.

Political Asylum Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill, H. R. 8000, to provide for the admission into the United States of Communist government officials who

renounce communism and seek asylum. I hope that this bill, text of which is printed below, will receive early consideration by the House:

H. R. 8000

A bill to promote the national security of the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Political Asylum Act of 1954."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. (a) "Communist country" means the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and any country declared, pursuant to this act, by the Secretary of State to be governed or dominated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any other branch or subdivision of the international Communist movement.

(b) "Communist government official" means any person who is an officer, employee, or member of the military, naval, or air forces, of any Communist country, or of the foreign service, or of the security or the inteligence organization of such colountry, or of any agency working for a Communist country as defined in section 2 (a) of this act.

SPECIAL NONIMMIGRANT VISAS

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (28) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 184), a special nonimmigrant visa may be issued to any alien Communist government official and his wife and his children, who—

(a) renounce his allegiance to the Communist country's government and to the international Communist conspiracy which he has been serving;

(b) departs from a Communist country and proceeds to a country in the free world, or, being physically outside the border of a Communist country, refuses to return thereto;

(c) is determined, under procedures to be prescribed by the President, to possess information or other assets of special value to the United States in furtherance of its security program, and not to constitute a menace to the security of the United States of America; and

(d) agrees, actively, to cooperate with the United States in programs to expose and to defeat the purposes of the international Communist conspiracy.

AUTHORITY TO TERMINATE VISAS

SEC. 4. Nonimmigrant visas issued pursuant to this act shall be terminated by the Secretary of State whenever the country of origin of the alien shall no longer be governed or dominated by the Communist conspiracy: *Provided*, That the personal safety of the alien would not thereby be placed in jeopardy. The Secretary of State is further authorized to revoke any such visa when the best interest of the United States so requires.

NUMBER OF VISAS

SEC. 5. Not more than 1,000 such visas shall be issued pursuant to this act.

REPORTS

SEC. 6. The President shall report to the Congress on the operation of the program established under this act on December 31 of each year.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of mankind, to whom all souls are dear, while for this hallowed moment we bow and are silent, breathe on us, breath of God, fill us with life anew. We confess that unmindful of how fallible we are, forgetting that a humble and a contrite heart is the only sacrifice Thou dost require, too often pride of our own attitudes and opinions blinds us to the inadequacy of our judgments. We would put the direction of our lives into Thy hands, knowing that our wills are ours to make them Thine.

As in the hectic hours of these confused days, when the air is filled with bitter words, we turn to face waiting tasks and problems, bestow upon us the gifts of understanding, kindness, courtesy, and self-control. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 22, 1954, was dispensed with.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEMBER OF FEDERAL RECORDS COUNCIL

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under authority of the act of September 5, 1950, the Chair appoints Allen N. Humphrey, Chief of the Records Management and Services Branch of the Office of the Comptroller General, as a member of the Federal Records Council, vice Ellis S. Stone, transferred.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to implement and execute plans and recommendations of the Corps of Army Engineers relative to the dredging of Bullock Cove in the town of East Providence

"Whereas the Corps of Army Engineers has submitted plans and recommendations to the Congress of the United States for the dredging and improvement of Bullock Cove, so called, in the town of East Providence to the end that a yacht basin may be created at such site; and

"Whereas the creation of a yacht basin in Bullock Cove in the town of East Providence would advance the desirable objective of improving harbor facilities and extending the recreational advantages of a portion of the Narragansett Bay area; and

"Whereas advancing such objective would be beneficial not only to the people of the town of East Providence but also to the people of the State of Rhode Island as a whole; and

"Whereas said plans and recommendations are to be considered by Congress in the near future; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the State of Rhode Island through the general assembly, now requests the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the implementation and execution of the plans submitted by the Corps of Army Engineers relative to the dredging of Bullock Cove and the improvement thereof and the creation at said site of a yacht basin; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in said Congress be, and they hereby are, earnestly requested to use their concerted effort to bring about the implementation and execution of said plans and recommendations; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, authorized to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution urging the President of the United States, the Congress, the Secretary of State of the United States and the Tariff Commission to maintain the present tariff rates on lace imports

"Whereas the 1934 Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expires June 12, 1954, and will in all likelihood be extended by congressional legislation; and

"Whereas, the special commission on Foreign Economic Policy, created in 1952 by the Congress at the request of the President, to explore this Nation's economic relations with the free world, has recommended a reduction in tariff rates; and

"Whereas in the development of a policy with respect to this Nation's foreign trade proper and adequate safeguards should be provided for the welfare and security of the American people and for the protection of our domestic enterprises; and

"Whereas a reduction in the tariff rates on foreign lace products would result in the annihilation of the lace industry in the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

United States by foreign competition because of the disproportionate wage differential paid the lace workers in foreign lands compared to the wages paid in the United States; and

"Whereas the bulk of the lace industry of this Nation is located in Rhode Island, employing 10,000 highly trained people; and

"Whereas these Rhode Islanders would be forced into the ranks of the unemployed upon the closing of the lace mills: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States insist on maintaining the present tariff rates on lace imports and permit no reductions therein at the present time; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State of the United States enter into no agreements and make no concessions to any foreign nations which would entail a reduction in the present tariff rates on lace imports; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress, and more particularly the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, take every legislative precaution in extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to insure the maintenance of the present tariff rates on lace imports; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Tariff Commission and to each Member of the Congress, earnestly requesting that each use his efforts to see that action is taken which would carry out the purposes of this resolution."

AGRICULTURAL PRICE SUPPORTS—RESOLUTION OF PUTNAM FARMERS UNION LOCAL 2257, HUDSON, KANS.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Putnam Farmers Union Local 2257, Hudson, Kans., relating to adequate price supports on agricultural products.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUDSON, KANS., *January 25, 1954.*

Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Whereas agriculture is the foundation on which real democracy is built and strengthened;

Whereas the industries and population of the country is dependent upon agriculture; and

Whereas the incomes of rural people are insufficient without full price support: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Putnam Farmers Union Local 2257 meeting January 22, 1954, goes on record urging our Federal Government to provide adequate price support on agriculture; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary to our Congressman Clifford R. Hope, to Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson, and to the State Farmers Union paper.

The above resolution was adopted January 22, 1954.

MR. MACLEAN HEYEN,
President.
MRS. T. E. DUGGAN,
Secretary.

EXTENSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—RESOLUTION OF WALNUT VALLEY AERIE 2823, FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES, EL DORADO, KANS.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Walnut Valley Aerie 2823, Fraternal Order of Eagles, El Dorado, Kans., favoring the extension of the Social Security Act, as recommended by the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALNUT VALLEY AERIE, No. 2823,
FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES,
El Dorado, Kans., February 15, 1954.

Hon. ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BROTHER: Whereas the Fraternal Order of Eagles was a leader in the campaign for the enactment of the Social Security Act and the earlier campaigns for the passage of State old-age pension laws; and

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Eagles, by unanimous vote of the delegates in national convention assembled, has urged the liberalization of the Social Security Act so as to extend coverage to all workers and to expand the program to protect wage earners against all major hazards of life and to adjust payments to meet increased living costs; and

Whereas the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his recent message to Congress, has urged that the Social Security Act be liberalized to provide that—

1. The minimum benefit for retired persons be increased from $25 to $30 per month, the maximum from $85 to $108.50.

2. Ten million additional persons be included in the security systems.

3. The first $1,000 of annual earnings by retired persons be exempted from the regulations of the Social Security Act.

4. The earnings base for participants in the plan be raised from $3,600 to $4,200.

5. The 4 years of lowest income for such beneficiary be discarded in computing benefits.

Whereas friends of social security, Democrats and Republicans, have endorsed the President's suggestions as a long step forward in providing adequate old-age security for all Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our aerie endorse the President's proposals for improving the Social Security Act, and respectfully urge the Senators from our State to enact such recommendations into law.

Adopted this 15th day of February 1954.

MERTON KOONS,
Worthy President.
Attest: ORVIS THUMA,
Secretary.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE—RESOLUTION OF LITHUANIAN AMERICAN CITIZENS, NORWOOD, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian American citizens of the town of Norwood, Mass., February 14, 1954, to commemorate the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence. It is a fine resolution, and I think it should be included in connection with the remarks concerning the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. GEORGE'S RECTORY,
Norwood, Mass., February 16, 1954.

The Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

RESOLUTION

DEAR SIR: Lithuanian American citizens of the town of Norwood, gathered on February 14, 1954, to commemorate the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, held under the auspices of the Lithuanian Catholic Federation—

Having considered the present plight of Lithuania created by continued occupation by Soviet Union;

Taking cognizance of the steadfast adherence by the United States of the policy of nonrecognition of the spoils of aggression committed by Soviet Union;

Appreciating the cooperation which the President of the United States and the congressional leadership of both major parties extended in the passage of the House Resolution 346 creating a select committee to investigate the enslavement of Lithuania and the other two Baltic States;

Do hereby resolve—

To pledge cooperation with the Government of the United States in its efforts to resist forces of Communist imperialism and to achieve international peace and order based on principles of justice and freedom for all nations;

To express their sincerest thanks to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles; to Congressman Charles J. Kersten and the House Baltic Committee, to Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., other leaders and Members of the Congress of the United States, for strengthening the hope of liberation of Lithuania and other enslaved nations.

VINCENT J. KUDIRKA, *Chairman.*
ANDREW T. VENCKERS, *Secretary.*

REDUCTION OF PARITY ON DAIRY PRODUCTS—LETTER AND TELEGRAMS FROM WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, like my colleagues, I have been flooded by messages from all over my State protesting against the slash in dairy parity which is scheduled to go into effect on April 1.

I can deeply understand the feeling behind these messages because, having owned and operated a Wisconsin dairy farm for over 30 years, I know what it means to make a mere 6 cents per quart of milk while that very same milk, sold the same day to the consumer, triples and quadruples in price.

I have advised my colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] that I will cosponsor with him the bill, S. 2962, which he has introduced for the purpose of (a) holding dairy parity to the same level as mandatory supports on the six basic crops, (b) limiting any reduction in dairy parity to a maximum of 5 percent in a year.

I firmly believe that we can and should find ways of meeting the present so-called dairy surplus without slashing farm income still further.

I have pointed out that every major American depression has begun with a depression in farming. Therefore, it is incumbent upon us to prevent any further reduction in dairy returns.

To permit farm prices to sink still further will be to invite a chain reaction which could result in the gravest of harm to our country. Already, my own State, America's dairyland, has suffered severely. Delegations of farmers, of creamery men, of cheesemakers have made the long trip to our Nation's Capital to point out that they are caught in a terrible squeeze of low milk checks and high feed costs, labor costs, machinery costs, and fertilizer costs.

I present some of the many messages which I have received from my State. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and telegrams were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERY, WIS., *February 19, 1954.*

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Here in our midwestern, strictly dairy area, we are again given a rather abrupt stab in the back by Mr. Benson's decision to cut support prices on milk to 75 percent of parity.

To a small farmer depending entirely on fluid milk for his source of income, as is the case here in Wisconsin as well as most of the midwestern area, his already lowered income will be brought down to a point where all businesses will suffer almost as though a depression had hit the United States.

It certainly isn't good to be too pessimistic about these things but retail merchants and business people here in addition to the farmers can't help but feel that this move will be hard on us all. Our administration should realize that our Nation can only thrive if agriculture thrives, our prosperity starts from the ground.

Yours very truly,

LESTER A. SJOBECK.

PLYMOUTH, WIS., *February 22, 1954.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building:

We urge you support passage of amendment to Agriculture Act of 1949 limiting drop in support of 5 percent in any single year.

E. H. BRUGGINK,
General Manager, Wisconsin Cheese Producers Cooperative.

JANESVILLE, WIS., *February 20, 1954.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The farmer has been a whipping boy for a long time, and especially the dairy farmer, all of which has been brought about by unfair publicity, which has insinuated that the dairy farmer has been realizing unusual profits through the supports of products produced.

If you will take a look at the losses under the Commodity Credit Corporation price support program you will find that less than $2 billion have been lost as compared to $40 billion which the Federal Government has spent to help business recover from the results of the war.

The townspeople and generally all persons seem to have the opinion that the farmers have received an exorbitant price for the butter which the Government is holding. Actually by Government standards the farmer has received only 90 percent of a fair price. May I ask you, will you allow the impression to go forth that they, "the farmer," has received too much as wages for producing butter or any other farm product?

It would seem to me that we have all prospered to some extent regardless of Federal expenditures, but I do think it unfair to single out a certain industry, especially that one which is individually owned and try to insinuate that they are the only ones actually prospering from Government expenditures.

I hope that you have realized that the losses through the support program to the dairy farmer and all farmers have been only a drop in the bucket compared to the expenditures of the Federal Government in aid to all business and that after all it is the losses and the cost to the Federal Government that should be of interest to us.

The latest action taken by the Secretary of Agriculture indicates that support prices on dairy products will be 75 percent of parity. It is interesting to note that this means that the farmer is going to receive 25 percent less than a fair price when compared to Government standards. It is my opinion that the true story has not been conveyed to the American people, especially the story of the dairy industry.

On behalf of approximately 1,000 dairy farmers who are shipping milk to the Albion Co-operative Creamery, I urge you to do your utmost in seeing that the support of dairy products remains at 90 percent of parity as long as basic commodities are supported at 90 percent.

If as a last resort and if absolutely necessary we urge you support a program whereby supports will not be lowered more than 5 percent in any 1 year.

ALBION CO-OP CREAMERY CO.,
F. C. LINDSAY, *Manager.*

EDGERTON, WIS.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR UPPER RIVER HARBOR, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., on February 11, urging continuation of appropriations for Upper River Harbor at Minneapolis, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution urging continuation of appropriations for Upper River Harbor at Minneapolis, Minn.

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That Congress be urged to continue to appropriate sufficient funds, as requested by the United States Corps of Engineers, for the continuance of the extension of the 9-foot channel to the north city limits of Minneapolis; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be presented to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and that a copy be sent to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the Honorable Richard Nixon, Vice President of the United States, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, and each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Passed February 11, 1954.

W. GLEN WALLACE,
President of the Council.

Approved February 11, 1954.

W. GLEN WALLACE,
Acting Mayor.

Attest:

ARLENE R. FINKLE,
City Clerk.

FOREST RESEARCH—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA STATE LEGISLATIVE FORESTRY STUDY COMMISSION, GRAND RAPIDS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution passed by the Minnesota State Legislative Forestry Study Commission meeting in Grand Rapids, Minn., on February 13, supporting the President's request for a budget increase in forest research for the United States Forest Service, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the items included in the President's budget are of utmost importance to the future of Minnesota forestry, and

Whereas the industries are dependent upon the forests for raw materials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the forestry study commission of the State of Minnesota urge the United States Senators and Representatives to give their support to the President's request for a budget increase in forest research for the United States Forest Service.

REA APPROPRIATIONS — RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, KANDIYOHI COOPERATIVE ELECTRIC POWER ASSOCIATION, WILLMAR, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Kandiyohi Cooperative Electric Power Association board of directors on February 15, 1954, urging adequate appropriations for the REA, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas many of the electric cooperatives in the Nation are in need of additional funds for new construction, heavying-up of lines and circuit conversions, general system improvements to meet the ever-increasing demands for more power through greater usage, and

Whereas the success of many electric cooperatives is dependent to a large degree on the Congress of the United States in their making additional loan funds available for such purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Kandiyohi Cooperative Electric Power Association of Willmar, Minn., at their regular meeting on February 15, 1954, did unanimously solicit your help and urge that adequate funds be made available to the Rural Electrification Administration to support and carry on the work of that admin-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

istration so as to enable the cooperatives to heavy-up and meet the demands placed on them through their distribution, transmission, or generation facilities; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Senators and Congressmen from Minnesota and to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

FEDERAL AID TO ROADS—LETTER FROM HENNEPIN COUNTY GOOD ROADS ASSOCIATION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I received from the Hennepin County Good Roads Association in connection with H. R. 7818, having to do with the Federal Aid Road Act, be printed in the RECORD, so the whole Senate may benefit from these views.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HENNEPIN COUNTY GOOD ROADS ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 16, 1954.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Roads in the United States have now cycled back to their position in 1920. The original capital investment has worn out and needs replacement. The States then must carry a normal program, plus the tremendous cost of these replacements, and it is not in the cards on present State road incomes. The road user will face practically all of this new burden.

Back in 1917 the Congress imposed excise taxes on the motor vehicle—its parts and fuel—as an emergency war measure. The automobile was then considered a luxury item. In 1954 the same taxes are still imposed, but at much higher rates, and the motor vehicle is certainly no luxury item. We question the fairness of a tax for general purposes imposed upon a special category of taxpayers. We question it particularly at this time when this category is faced with new and heavy taxes. So great has the local problem became that it has resulted in a concerted movement which demands that the Federal Government abandon this motor vehicle field and leave it to the States.

We recognize that Federal aid for roads has no direct bearing upon these excise taxes. We also recognize that if the Federal aid system is to be maintained, it will need finance. We are thoroughly sold on this Federal aid system. It has served as a guaranty against diversion, diffusion, and misuse of road-user money. It has given us common standards and practices which have produced the finest road system in the world. We do not join in the movement which asks the Congress to abandon the road field as a tax source. We do believe, however, that such revenue should be dedicated to roads as soon as such action becomes practical.

In the Federal aid law the States are inhibited from the diversion to purposes other than roads of any more road-user revenue than was diverted in 1935, and yet the Federal Government itself diverts three-fourths of that revenue.

We like H. R. 7818 (McGregor bill) as a current practical answer to the pressures to which you are undoubtedly at present being subjected.

Cordially yours,

G. W. PRICE,
Manager, Hennepin County Good Roads Association.

EXTENSION OF SOCIAL-SECURITY COVERAGE—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA REGISTER OF DEEDS ASSOCIATION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Minnesota Register of Deeds Association in convention at Minneapolis, Minn., on January 23, 1954, be printed in the RECORD. The resolution expresses the opposition of the association to the extension of social-security coverage to the political subdivisions of the State of Minnesota and particularly to those public employees and officials of the State who have accumulated rights and substantial equities in the Public Employees Retirement Association of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Public Employees Retirement Association created by an act of the Minnesota State Legislature in the year 1931 makes it possible for all political subdivisions to operate under the provisions of the above act; and

Whereas the public employees retirement system of Minnesota covers positions of employees and officials of all counties, cities, villages, towns, townships, and school districts and has a membership exceeding 29,000 and represents a sound investment to the public as an employer and constitutes an orderly and adequate means for providing for the retirement of its members who are superannuated and have reached the climax of their productive period; and

Whereas the Federal Social Security Act, as amended, does not include the employees of various States and political subdivisions thereof, and there are now pending in Congress numerous bills which would have the effect of extending coverage of the Social Security Act to such employees; and

Whereas the general extension of the social security act to officials and employees of local governments as provided for in said bills is viewed with much concern by officials and employees of local political subdivisions of our State because it would seriously disrupt, confuse, and interfere with personnel and budgetary policies which could result in destroying the Public Employees Retirement Association unit by unit, until our existence could not be justified; and

Whereas the Public Employees Retirement Association, through the tireless efforts of its board and membership and excellent cooperation and supervision on the part of the Minnesota State Legislature, has developed and built a sound and constructive retirement system with very substantial benefits, namely, $200 monthly maximum basic annuity beginning at age 60 and over and up to $100 survivors' benefits commencing at age 60 together with numerous other substantial benefits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota Register of Deeds Association in convention assembled at Minneapolis, Minn., this 23d day of January 1954, respectfully urges and petitions you, as Senator from Minnesota in the 83d Congress, 2d session, to totally exclude from social-security coverage all of the political subdivisions of the State of Minnesota and the public employees and officials of these political subdivisions; and be it further

Resolved, That this association urges you to see that proper amendments are offered to pending bills in Congress to prevent the extension of social security to public employees and officials of the State of Minnesota who have accumulated rights and substantial equities in the Public Employees Retirement Association of Minnesota; and be it further

Resolved, That any amendment to the Social Security Act by the 83d Congress, 2d session, resulting in interference with our established rights in the Minnesota Public Employees Retirement Association would be construed as an intervention by the Federal Government in an area traditionally a matter for State legislatures to determine and control and this we sincerely believe would be wholly contrary to the basic principles underlying our Federal-State system of government; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Minnesota Register of Deeds Association be, and is, hereby instructed and directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Honorable Senator EDWARD J. THYE, to the Honorable Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, to the Honorable Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, to the Honorable Representative JOSEPH P. O'HARA, to the Honorable Representative ROY W. WIER, to the Honorable Representative EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, to the Honorable Representative WALTER H. JUDD, to the Honorable Representative FRED MARSHALL, to the Honorable Representative H. CARL ANDERSEN, to the Honorable Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, and to the Honorable Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN.

ROY CHRISTIAN,
Secretary, Minnesota Register of Deeds Association.

PARITY FOR FARMERS—RESOLUTION OF BUSINESSMEN OF ULEN, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the businessmen of Ulen, Minn., as published in the Ulen Union on February 10, be inserted in the RECORD at this point, together with the names of all the signator businesses. The merchants of Ulen, in this advertisement, urge 90 to 100 percent of parity for farmers. You will recall that about a month ago I had entered in the RECORD a similar appeal signed by the merchants of Thief River Falls, Minn. This is further evidence of the concern of the merchants of the rural communities of Minnesota that we have a strong and effective farm program.

There being no objection, the resolution, with the names of the signators, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARITY FOR FARMERS

Being the State of Minnesota is a majority agricultural State, the businessmen of this city feel that it is most imperative that we work side by side with those attempting to maintain a farm program which will enrich and develop the agricultural activities wherever they are a major industry or source of livelihood.

In view of the above conclusions, we the following businesses of this city (resolve):

That we go on record condemning any effort on the part of any Congressman, the Department of Agriculture, or any agency for attempting to disrupt the stabilization program, effecting all farm commodities.

We further resolve that Congress shall not only maintain 90 percent of parity, but shall try to establish 100 percent of parity for all farm commodities. We do not favor any tendency toward flexibility of price support, but urge Congress to maintain a production-control program which is necessary in order to have stabilized price support.

We further urge all business groups in other cities of this State as well as those of other agricultural States to go on record favoring similar resolutions.

C. E. Pederson, Merchant; M. J. Erickson Co., Garage; Big 5 Co-op, Hardware and Oils; Asleson Bros., Blacksmith Shop; Bjerke's Locker Service, Locker; Forsythe Garage Co., Auto and Implement Dealers; The Northwestern State Bank of Ulen; Ulen Co-op Creamery Association, Dairy Products; Wilcox Lumber Co., Building Materials; Reiten Hardware Co., Merchant; Arnold Wold, Merchant; Gunderman Pharmacy, Pharmacists; Soren A. Jensen, Blacksmith; Dr. D. S. Horn, Dentist; Henry Bakkum, Merchant; Harold Mesker, Cafe; A. M. Mellum, Service Station; Pastor H. M. Lybeck, Lutheran Pastor; Tri-County Co-op Association, Grain Elevator; Mrs. M. Nelson, Cozy Cafe; Ulen Hatchery, Chicks and Supplies; Ross Geithman, Barber; D. W. Murphy, Merchant; Ruth Harris, Coffee Shop; W. C. Lokken, Standard Oil Agent; Phil's Recreation, Billiards; O. M. Fevig Agency, Insurance; Dan Ogan, Ulen Electric; Super Service Station, Champlin Oils; R. H. Rosaaen, Ulen Implement Co.; Carl Melbye, Northside Service Station; Harry Fevig, Fevig's Service Station; A. A. Bulleyment, Ulen Theater; Ulen Union.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 5773. A bill to provide for the refund, under certain conditions, of money paid as premiums on United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance which is canceled for fraud; without amendment (Rept. No. 990).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2990. A bill for the relief of John A. Lynn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

S. 2991. A bill relating to the issuance of a trust patent to Lorraine Dennis Crawford Woods; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 2992. A bill to encourage and assist the production of strategic and critical metals, minerals, and materials in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2993. A bill for the relief of Ruth Wehrhan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2994. A bill for the relief of Edward H. Hon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2995. A bill to authorize male nurses and medical specialists to be appointed as Reserve officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2996. A bill for the relief of Sister Ramona Maria (Ramona E. Tombo); and

S. 2997. A bill for the relief of Renate Dressel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2998. A bill for the relief of Italia D'Elsio Mattia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 2999. A bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3000. A bill to exempt from the admissions tax amounts paid for admission to high-school wrestling and boxing matches; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 9 as Leif Erickson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BURKE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LENNON, Mr. LONG, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the week of May 2 to May 8, 1954, inclusive, as National Mental Health Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution authorizing the formulation and carrying out of a program for sending freedom messages behind the Iron Curtain; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BURKE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GRISWOLD, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal memorial commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to make the antitrust laws applicable to professional baseball clubs affiliated with the alcoholic-beverage industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN ADMISSIONS TAX

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to exempt from the admissions tax amounts paid for admission to high school wrestling and boxing matches.

The present law has been interpreted so as to be discriminatory against amateur wrestling and boxing as conducted in the high schools of our Nation.

Members of the Senate are aware that other amateur sports activities in high schools such as football and basketball are today exempt insofar as the collection of the admissions tax is concerned. There is no reason in my judgment to distinguish between those sports and wrestling and boxing. My bill is, therefore, designed to correct that inequity. Wrestling and boxing are fine sports and are essential parts of high schools wholesome athletic programs. I hope the Senate will see fit to accept my proposal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3000) to exempt from the admissions tax amounts paid for admission to high school wrestling and boxing matches, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, shortly after the end of World War II there came to light the fact that more than two million young men had been rejected for military service or had been discharged from the Nation's armed forces because of mental disorders. While the Nation had been aware that mental illness was a serious problem, it took this staggering and dramatic revelation to shock the people and to set off a wave of interest, concern, and action which swept the country from coast to coast.

One of the outgrowths of this surge of public response was the birth of Mental Health Week. In 1949 the National Association for Mental Health and the National Institute of Mental Health, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, launched the first national observance of Mental Health Week for the purpose of mobilizing the people into action in the fight against mental illness. The first observance of Mental Health Week was a very modest one, and not too many people heard about it; but within the very short span of 5 years Mental Health Week has become firmly established on the calendar of important national observances, and its influences have penetrated into literally every single

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

community in the country—into schools, churches, universities, hospitals, clinics, industries, trade unions, Government departments, professional organizations, fraternal clubs, and many others.

It is no wonder that Mental Health Week has caught hold, because the people have come to realize that the slogan "Mental illness is the Nation's No. 1 health problem" is not merely a slogan but an actual fact. They have come to realize that not only is mental illness the No. 1 health problem for the Nation, but also for each person individually. Every person in this country is concerned either directly or indirectly, with the subject of mental illness.

At this very moment nearly three-quarters of a million people in mental hospitals are suffering severe mental disorders. More people are hospitalized for mental illness than for all other illnesses combined, including polio, cancer, heart disease, tuberculosis, and all other physical disorders. One out of every 230 men, women, and children in the United States is in a mental hospital. And for every person inside a mental hospital there is at least an additional person who should be receiving mental hospital care but who is not because the hospital facilities are inadequate.

But it is not only in hospitalization that we see the effects of mental illness. We have only to read the newspapers on any day to see other frightening evidence—the suicides, murders, tragic accidents, and the mounting tide of juvenile delinquency. We have only to read the reports of the medical authorities to find that out of every 2 people coming to a medical practitioner, 1 is suffering from some form of mental disorder. The records of the general hospitals shall disclose that 1 out of every 3 people being treated is suffering from some form of mental disorder. The mental health clinics and the school guidance service report an ever-increasing number of emotionally disturbed children. The social welfare agencies tell of the many families breaking up as a result of emotional difficulties. The industrial records tell of the high rate of absenteeism, accidents, and turnover resulting from mental and emotional disorders.

There is literally not a single facet of personal or social life which is not touched in one way or another by mental illness.

These facts are not new. They have been dinned into our ears year after year by the National Association for Mental Health and its affiliates. Citizens' organizations have taken upon themselves the tremendous burden of alerting the Nation to this problem and of mobilizing the people for action to combat it. These are the facts that motivated Congress in 1946 to enact the National Mental Health Act, under which the National Institute of Mental Health was set up to carry on research and to help in establishing community mental health services.

These are the facts which have motivated Congress to make continuing provisions for the neuropsychiatric services of the Veterans' Administration, under which hundreds of thousands of mentally sick veterans have been helped back to health. These are the facts which have brought about concerted action by the executive branches of all of the 48 States. Only a short time ago—on February 8 and 9 of this year, to be exact—the Council of State Governments held a conference in Detroit to discuss the problem of mental illness and to act on it.

These and other signs show that the Nation is definitely moving forward in the fields of research, prevention, and improved treatment to combat mental illness.

From the research front comes heartening news. The National Association for Mental Health reports that its researchers who are working on the mental illness known as schizophrenia are making splendid progress, and that they are now in a position to start working out ways to prevent this disease. Schizophrenia accounts for more than 300,000 people in mental hospitals, and each year sends 50,000 new patients—mostly adolescents and young adults—to mental hospitals. It is, therefore, indeed gratifying to hear that science is closing in on this dreadful disease; but at the same time we must realize that these researchers are just barely scratching the surface, and there must be a tremendous expansion of research before any really effective results are obtained. This is also true of the other efforts to prevent mental illness and to give adequate treatment to the millions of people who are in need of it.

It is important for all the people to get behind this program and to join in every possible way with the National Association for Mental Health and its affiliated organizations in the fight against the Nation's and their own No. 1 health problem.

President Eisenhower said recently in a message to the National Association of Mental Health:

> The progress that your association has made in dealing with the distressing and serious problems of mental health is indeed laudable. It is encouraging to note that in your search for solutions to these problems you have emphasized local initiative and responsibility.
>
> I have long felt that in most problems affecting the individual the soundest solutions are found in concerted action of the people close to him—his family and his community.
>
> Because of this conviction, I commend you on the purposes of your association, the professional advances it has made, and the administrative practices that it emphasizes. May your excellent work meet with continued success in our land.

Mr. President, in keeping with the spirit of the President's comments, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], my colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I now introduce the joint resolution for reference to the Judiciary Committee, and request that the Committee promptly report the joint resolution favorably.

The joint resolution reads as follows:

> Whereas there is presently a great need for nationwide action for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness; and
>
> Whereas the National Association for Mental Health and the State and local mental health organizations associated therewith are working diligently in the fight against mental illness; and
>
> Whereas the Mental Health Fund is in dire need of public support in order to improve conditions in mental hospitals, provide more adequate treatment for the mentally and emotionally ill, carry on research in the field of the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness, and promote mental health education: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved, etc.*, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning May 2 and ending May 8, 1954, as National Mental Health Week, and urging the people throughout the Nation to cooperate in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness, and inviting the communities of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received, and referred, as requested by the Senator from Florida.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 130) requesting the President to proclaim the week of May 2 to May 8, 1954, inclusive, as National Mental Health Week, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROGRAM FOR SENDING FREEDOM MESSAGES BEHIND IRON CURTAIN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, now that the Berlin conference has proved, to all practical purposes, an almost total failure, I believe it is time that we get ahead with a program for reviving hope and sustaining resistance among those peoples enslaved by communism.

On September 27, 1952, in a letter to the town meeting at Old Sturbridge, Mass., President Eisenhower said:

> In the struggle against expanding communism, we must miss no oportunity to rally men and women everywhere to the cause of freedom and progress, as opposed to the reaction of totalitarian policies and methods. We must fully develop under efficient, able direction every psychological weapon that is available to us.

I agree fully with the President. The Communists do not hesitate to use against us every propaganda weapon in their arsenal, even when they are sitting at the negotiation tables with us on the pretext of attempting to work out peaceful solutions of disagreements.

Therefore, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize and direct a $2 million campaign of releasing ballon-carried freedom messages and small packets of freedom food to statellite peoples. This is but a pittance to spend in psychological warfare. I have read that Russia spends as much as $100 million a year on this purpose. But whereas they supply lies, we can and should supply truth and some food. A bit of cheese, a packet of dried milk wrapped in a freedom message will do wonders to upset the Communist propaganda and dispel the dreary lie of starvation in the United States.

I am convinced that such a program as I am proposing in this resolution would, if carried out, shake the control of communism over the satellite countries. One of the worst beatings communism has taken was when we made food freely available in Berlin. But that program could be made effective only in one restricted area of contact, and the Communists soon set up their barriers and prevented starving East Germans from reaching the food counters at the borderline.

Recently I discussed with the columnist, Drew Pearson, the balloon-message campaign which he and Harold E. Stassen, director of FOA, carried out several years ago. Mr. Pearson said that they succeeded in getting 11 million messages behind the Iron Curtain, and that the messages obviously had a profoundly unsettling effect on the Communists. Radio Moscow was prompt and violent in its denunciations of these messages as a new "aggression" by the "western warmongers." A new barrage of messages, coupled with small packets of food, could have even more violent psychological repercussions.

I believe that if we should carry out this program we would put the Communists on the defensive throughout most of the satellite areas. Therefore I invite Senators to support this program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 131) authorizing the formulation and carrying out of a program for sending freedom messages behind the Iron Curtain, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED MEMORIAL TO CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, for a number of years there has been a growing feeling among many Americans that in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, Capital of the United States of America, there should be a wholly fitting and adequate memorial to the great discoverer of America—Christopher Columbus.

This is not to say that the existing statue to Columbus on the plaza of Washington's Union Station is not a beautiful monument; but it is felt by many that this statue is not a sufficient memorial to one who exercised so transcendent an influence upon the history of the world.

Therefore, the Christopher Columbus Memorial Foundation, Inc., has been created.

The purpose of the foundation and its many friends is to pave the way by proper planning for the ultimate construction of an appropriate permanent national memorial to Christopher Columbus.

In this connection it has been suggested that an opera house suitable to the Nation's Capital is very much needed in Washington and would be wholly in order.

It is expected that the financing of this or any other such memorial to Christopher Columbus will be done largely, if not entirely, from private sources.

However, because of its significance as a part of our Nation's Capital and because of its international significance—inasmuch as it is anticipated that the Government of Italy will be interested in becoming associated with it—it has been deemed essential that the plans for this memorial be formulated through congressional action. For this purpose and pursuant to the course taken by the the Congress in connection with the Jefferson Memorial, I am sending to the desk for appropriate reference a joint resolution "authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus."

This Commission would consist of 12 Commissioners, of whom 3 would be appointed by the President of the United States, 3 would be Senators appointed by the President of the Senate, 3 would be Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and 3 would be members of the Christopher Columbus Memorial Foundation, to be selected by such foundation.

Inasmuch as this joint resolution is comparatively brief, I introduce it for appropriate reference and ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 132) authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Whereas there is no appropriate permanent national memorial to Christopher Columbus, in the Nation's Capital that is commensurate to his importance in the history of this country; and
>
> Whereas the American people owe a deep debt of gratitude to Christopher Columbus, and should erect an appropriate permanent national memorial which is symbolic of his genius and energy and is a universal and everlasting expression of faith in liberty and the spiritual advancement of humanity; and
>
> Whereas the erection of such a memorial by the American people would express their traditional and everlasting friendship to Italy, the native land of Christopher Columbus: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the "Christopher Columbus Memorial Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for the design, construction, and location of an appropriate permanent national memorial to Christopher Columbus in the city of Washington, D. C. The Commission shall be composed of 12 commissioners appointed as follows: 3 persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, 3 Senators by the President of the Senate, 3 Members of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and 3 members of the Christopher Columbus Memorial Foundation, Inc., to be selected by such foundation.
>
> SEC. 2. The Commission is authorized to—
>
> (a) make such expenditures for personal services and otherwise for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution as it may deem advisable from funds received for such purpose;
>
> (b) accept in its discretion from any source, public or private, money or property to be used in carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution or to be used in connection with the construction or other expenses of such memorial; and
>
> (c) avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, and such Commissions and Council shall, upon request, render such assistance and advice.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

SEC. 3. The Commission shall as soon as possible, but not later than the termination of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, submit a report to the President of the United States and to Congress of the progress of the work of the Commission, together with its recommendations and suggestions for further congressional action.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am happy to state that, aside from myself, the 53 cosponsors of this joint resolution are Senators from 37 States, representing a complete cross-section of the country, indicating the tremendous national interest in this proposal.

These cosponsors are the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. KENNEDY], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT,] the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

If any other Senators desire to be included among the cosponsors of this joint resolution, I invite them to have their names added at the desk.

In this connection, it is also noteworthy that a large number of the Members of the House of Representatives are simultaneously introducing a similar joint resolution in the House.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have the greatest admiration for Christopher Columbus, who was one of the foremost navigators of the world and a very great man. However, I understand that he never reached the continental limits of America, and I wonder whether a niche would be provided in the proposed structure which would recognize the accomplishments of Leif the Lucky and Eric the Red, who, as history seems to indicate, did reach the continental limits of America several hundred years before the historic voyage of Christopher Columbus. I say that without any attempt to detract from the accomplishment of Christopher Columbus, but I wish to keep history straight, as I understand it.

Mr. IVES. I think it is quite appropriate to do so. However, I should like to point out that the recognized discoverer of America, according to our history books, is Christopher Columbus.

INVESTIGATION OF POINT 4 PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution calling for a full and complete study of the technical assistance and related programs authorized by Public Law 535, 81st Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 214), submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Act for International Development (the technical-assistance program, Public Law 535, 81st Cong.) has been in operation for 4 years; and

Whereas that act declares it to be the "policy of the United States to aid the efforts of the peoples of economically underdeveloped areas to develop their resources and improve their working and living conditions by encouraging the exchange of technical knowledge and skills and the flow of investment capital"; and

Whereas the administration of the program has recently been transferred from the Department of State to the Foreign Operations Administration; and

Whereas reports have been received indicating in some areas of the world a tendency for purposes of the program to become distorted; and

Whereas if the technical-assistance program is to contribute to the foreign policy purposes of the American people and to hold full promise of helping underdeveloped areas to realize the full potential of democratic life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or a subcommittee thereof, hereinafter referred to as the committee), to consist of 6 members chosen equally from both parties by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee (in conjunction with 2 other Senators, not members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and not of the same political party, designated by the President of the Senate), is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of technical assistance and related programs authorized by the terms of Public Law 535, 81st Congress, as amended.

SEC. 2. The said committee shall, without limiting the scope of the study hereby authorized, direct its attention to the following matters:

1. The general level of authorizations of funds for the future to enable the program efficiently to achieve its purposes;

2. The relationship between the United Nations technical-assistance program and that conducted by the United States;

3. The coordination of United States agencies in operations within and outside the United States;

4. The extent to which the program has been able to utilize private agencies in achieving its purposes;

5. The degree of self-help and mutual assistance available in countries receiving technical assistance;

6. The relationship between technical assistance, economic aid, and military assistance; and

7. The effectiveness of the administration of the program in advancing the foreign policy of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Foreign Relations shall transmit to the Senate prior to February 1, 1955, the results of the study herein authorized together with such recommendations as may be found desirable.

SEC. 4. In the conduct of this study, full use shall be made of the reports submitted by the International Development Advisory Board. The executive agencies concerned with this program are requested to give the committee such assistance as it may require.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee is authorized to employ on a temporary basis until February 1, 1955, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants as it deems desirable and to reimburse the Library of Congress for such assistance as it may be called upon to supply over and above that normally made available to congressional committees. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the necessary expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations or the chairman of the subcommittee, as the case may be.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, my resolution gives recognition to the principle that a formal senatorial review of our basic foreign policy, at least, in this respect should be undertaken.

As I have said, the resolution calls for a full and complete study of the technical assistance and related programs authorized by Public Law 535, 81st Congress. It would entrust this task to a special bipartisan subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, to include two other Senators, not members of the committee.

I am confident that if the resolution is adopted we can expect a bipartisan study of the point 4 program similar to the one conducted on the overseas information program, under the successive and outstanding chairmanships of the

junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. It will be the same kind of study as the one now being conducted on review of the United Nations Charter by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the able senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. In short, the investigation will be thorough, responsible, and constructive. It will be the sort of investigation which will enable the Senate more effectively to discharge its functions in the field of foreign relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a short statement on the resolution printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

A FULL AND COMPLETE STUDY OF THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM IS NEEDED

Almost 4 years ago Congress gave approval to the Act for International Development. This act, Public Law 525, 81st Congress, is the legislative cornerstone of the point 4 program. Behind the point 4 concept is the belief that with our technical and scientific knowledge we can help the peoples of the underdeveloped parts of the world to make a better life for themselves.

When this program was proposed, it was not conceived of as a massive program of economic aid. It was not intended to transplant the American way of life to countries which, in terms of material progress, were centuries behind us. We did not expect to lend even a hoe or an insecticide sprayer unless we were asked to do so. What we planned to do, in short, was to extend a friendly scientific and technical hand, if it might be useful, to less fortunate countries.

From our own national point of view we saw point 4 as a means of reducing the threat to peace that grows out of human misery; of encouraging the sound development of free people by helping them to avoid the pitfalls of communism and other forms of totalitarianism in their eagerness for material development. We saw it as a long-range program which would bring us our recompense eventually, in an expansion of mutually advantageous economic relations; and most of all in the development of the warm friendship and respect that can grow out of sincere neighborly exchange and assistance. This idea had an appeal not only to the good sense but to the hearts of all decent Americans. It was rooted in the national tradition of consideration for the less fortunate.

When the point 4 idea was originally advanced it was greeted with great enthusiasm both here and abroad. In the 4 years that have elapsed since the passage of the International Development Act we have had an opportunity to observe the idea in action.

Our technicians and scientists have spread out into the remote corners of the world. They have imparted their knowledge to peoples eager to learn how they might use modern instruments to combat ancient enemies, to root out poverty, ignorance, and disease. Under the program, we have also brought many foreign students to this country for technical training. When they have returned to their homes they have often taken with them not only the keys to a fuller, healthier life for their native lands, but also a deeper and clearer perception of the basic decency of the American people. We have also learned much from other nations in this interchange of persons.

Just a few months ago in a visit to the Kingdom of Nepal in the Himalayas, I had occasion to observe an example of the point 4 program at its best. Less than a dozen Americans isolated from the rest of the world, working under conditions of great adversity, are creating a profound impact on the lives of 7 million people. They are doing this by introducing the most basic improvements in agriculture, sanitation, and education, by teaching the local peoples how to use a DDT spray, to build a safe well, to plant improved seeds, and to control plant diseases. I should like to read a section of a report which I made to the Foreign Relations Committee in November last year covering the work of this technical mission:

"NEPAL

"Wedged between Tibet on the north and India on the south, the Kingdom of Nepal is among the most isolated of nations. Except for the Gurkhas, who have fought in many lands, the people of Nepal for centuries have had little contact with the mainstream of world developments. Until 1947, the country had been visited by probably less than 50 western nationals. Previous to this study mission no Member of Congress had ever entered the country.

"Long isolation clearly reflects itself in the life of the nation. Electricity, automobiles, trains, telephones are practically unknown in most parts of the country. In a nation the size of the State of Tennessee there are only some 300 miles of highways and until this year none connected the capital of Kathmandu with the outside world. Economic techniques, which in many regions do not even include use of the wheel, are those which we generally associate with 500 to 1,000 years ago.

"Vast numbers of the 9 million inhabitants are unacquainted with newspapers, radios, or schools. Less than 2 percent of the population is literate. Modern medical care and facilities are available to less than 1 percent of the population, and consequently preventable diseases are rampant.

"In recent years, echoes of life in other parts of the world have penetrated into Nepal. Chinese Communist influence has reached the northern border via Tibet. Concepts of democracy and the hope for economic progress have begun to filter through from India and the West.

"There was a time when Nepal could continue its existence unaffected by developments elsewhere in the world. That time has passed. Outside forces playing upon the country and internal pressures of discontent have already produced an overturn of the ancient absolutist regime of the hereditary prime ministers (the Ranas). In its place has come the beginning of democracy. Marxist totalitarianism, however, competes for the loyalties of the Nepalese during this period of transition. A contest is now in progress which will draw the emerging nation either toward Communist totalitarianism or freedom. The outcome of this contest depends to a great extent on the rapidity with which the long pent-up, long-postponed, and now rapidly growing demand for economic and social progress can be filled by the adherents of democracy.

"The Foreign Operations Administration

"In this setting of extreme isolation, of economic stagnation, and of political transition, less than a dozen Americans have been engaged in seeking to help the emerging nation move in the direction of freedom. They are, for the most part, technicians in the field of agriculture, health, and mining. They have been operating for about a year, without fanfare and with a deep sense of dedication to the basic concepts of the point 4 program. Living conditions for them and their families, if they do not constitute an actual hardship, are certainly not luxurious.

"This small Technical Cooperation Administration mission which now operates under the Foreign Operations Administration is engaged in several lines of basic social and economic endeavor. Their work, in support of the efforts of the Nepalese themselves, is in the following fields: village improvement, agricultural development, public health, mineral exploration and education.

"A village-improvement program was inaugurated during the summer of 1952. American participation in this program consists of the training of Nepalese instructors in simple skills so that they, in turn, can help to improve the lot of the millions of villagers throughout the country. The first Nepalese graduates of the training classes are already at work in the villages. They are instructing the villagers in such elementary matters as building safe wells and household sanitation. They also are tackling the problem of illiteracy.

"Under an agricultural-development program, the TCA mission has been experimenting with new plants and seeds. The first year's trials indicate that agricultural production can be raised 20 percent simply by introducing higher yielding, disease-resistant seeds. Such seeds are now being distributed to the peasants. As a further aid to production, a project in plant disease and insect control has also been launched. Work also goes forward in livestock improvement, both in breeding and in the prevention of diseases. There has also been progress in replacing antiquated farm equipment with simple but far more effective devices. Plans are now being drawn up to extend the use of irrigation.

"In the field of public health, the major undertaking involves malaria control. Nepalese technicians are trained for this work and supplies of DDT and other equipment have been secured. There is promise that within a short time this scourge which causes more deaths than any other disease in Nepal may be virtually wiped out.

"In the mining field, the TCA mission has established a laboratory for analyses of specimens which is to be turned over in time to the Nepalese Government. It has also assisted in writing basic legislation designed to encourage private prospecting. In this work, there is close cooperation with a United Nations mineral specialist who has been assigned to the country.

"The educational program has involved both the sending of qualified Nepalese to the United States for advanced training and the development of a mass literacy program. The latter is based on a survey undertaken some time ago by Dr. Frank Laubach and will be carried out by village-improvement workers.

"The educational exchange program does not appear to be adjusted to the present requirements of the country. The immediate need is not so much for advanced technicians as it is for trained men, with practical working experience and with a capacity to show by doing.

"Efficacy of the TCA mission

"The TCA program in Nepal will cost the United States $600,000 in the current fiscal year. To this, the Nepalese Government is expected to add about an equal amount in local currency.

"The cost of TCA in Nepal to the United States is lower than that of any other country program in the Near East, Africa, or Asia. Fewer Americans are employed in Nepal than in any other TCA mission in this region.

"In these circumstances, the accomplishments of the American technicians during a year of operations in Nepal are remarkable. They are helping the Nepalese people to get out of the economic and social doldrums. In so doing they appear to have won the confidence of Nepalese of all political com-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

plexions except the Communists. There is a visible fund of goodwill for the United States in Nepal, which in all probability is traceable in large measure to the efforts of the TCA mission.

"Their success is a tribute to the good sense of the Acting Director and his staff. These Americans from the outset have recognized that the primary responsibility for development rests with the Nepalese people. They have kept the American mission small and auxiliary to the efforts of the Nepalese themselves. They have stayed out of the internal politics of the country. They have lived among a poverty-stricken people, maintaining decent American standards but avoiding the luxurious ostentation which afflicts too many of our official installations abroad. They have shunned high-pressure publicity and loudmouthed promises. Most of all, they have not permitted cynicism to drain the point-4 program of its spiritual content. In short, they live and work in the finest American tradition.

"The following statement by Paul W. Rose, the Acting Director of the program, indicates a deep perception of the role of point 4 in our foreign policy:

"'Some of our American citizens may question why we are doing this work in Nepal since they know that Nepal is not an important source of trade or raw materials. They realize, also, that Nepal is certainly not in a position to have great influence on world politics even though many people in Nepal and India refer to it as a buffer between Communist Tibet and democratic India. Those of us who are working in Nepal believe that America has a great contribution to make to freedom in Nepal, freedom from poverty, freedom from disease, and freedom from ignorance. We believe that we can contribute to these freedoms and by doing so make our own freedom more secure. We also believe that friendship is based on understanding and on mutuality of purposes. We know that, as we become better acquainted with the Nepalese and as the Nepalese know the Americans better, a more firm foundation for friendship and understanding will be created. These are necessary in a world where good neighbors are essential for peace.

"'The technical-assistance program should not lose this eminently sound and dignified concept. The identity of the program should not be obscured in slick reorganization plans which would make it indistinguishable from military aid. The program should remain one of long-range building of good will and mutuality of interest. If it does not, the good already accomplished will be lost, and we are likely to reap a harvest of enmity rather than friendship for our expenditures and our efforts.'"

Unfortunately, it is not possible to report as favorably on the operation of the point 4 program in some parts of the world. On the contrary, when I was in Indochina several months ago, I found considerable criticism of the conduct of the technical-aid program. Charges of extravagance, mismanagement and incompetence were common. Other Members of Congress, after inspections abroad have indicated the existence of questionable or distorted and wasteful practices in connection with this program in other areas. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], for example, was reported in the press to have discovered that many costly capital investments were being made by impatient and overly ambitious administrators of the point 4 program in some countries. This would hardly be in accord with the basic purpose of the act for international development.

Only a few days ago an Associated Press dispatch printed in the New York Times carried a lead paragraph which reads as follows: "How to get rid of money has been one of the toughest problems faced in Lebanon by the United States point 4 program of technical aid." According to this dispatch, it seems that Lebanon cannot decide precisely what is wanted in the way of technical aid. Meanwhile the FOA maintains 60 Americans and 137 local employees in this country of less than 1½ million inhabitants.

I do not know how much validity rests in these and similar reports. I do know, however, that in the 4 years that have gone by since the program was enacted into law, Congress has appropriated almost half a billion dollars for technical and related assistance. Despite these expenditures we have no assurance that the program is contributing as much as might be expected to the success of our foreign policy. We do not know if we are duplicating the work of the United Nations in this field or if they are duplicating ours. We do not understand clearly the relationship between technical and other types of assistance extended by this country.

We do not know, in short, if we are using the best techniques in the program for advancing the foreign policy of the United States. Yet, the manner in which point 4 is conducted is intimately tied to the success or failure of many aspects of our foreign policy. It is a principal avenue of contact between ourselves and many of the smaller and newly independent nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It is bound to have a lasting effect on the course of our relations with these nations.

We must be certain point 4 is constructive, that it is making friends, not enemies for this country. While endorsing the principle of point 4, therefore, I think the time has come for the Senate to look deeply into the practice. What is needed is a complete review of the program.

When the Act for International Development was under consideration in 1950, it was clearly the intent of the Senate to limit the initial authorization in order to permit a new look at the program after several years of experience had been accumulated in its operation. A report of the Foreign Relations Committee on this legislation stated at the time:

"Although it may prove desirable to continue the program for a period of years, the committee is unwilling at this time to place it on a permanent basis unless and until it has proved itself. Because the program is new and because it will take some time to set up the necessary administrative machinery as well as to secure the required technical competence the committee recommends that the Senate limit its present authorization to a period of 5 years."

This time limit was incorporated into the Senate version of the legislation but was removed in a conference compromise.

The principle of formal senatorial review of a basic foreign-policy measure such as this was sound then. It is sound now.

The resolution I am introducing gives recognition to this principle. It calls for a full and complete study of the technical assistance and related programs authorized by Public Law 535, 81st Congress. It would entrust this task to a special bipartisan subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, to include two other Senators not members of the committee.

I am confident that if this resolution is adopted we can expect a bipartisan study of the point 4 program similar to that conducted on the overseas information program under the successive and outstanding chairmanships of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. It will be the same kind of study now being conducted on review of the United Nations Charter by the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. It will be, in short, a thorough, responsible, and constructive investigation. It will be the sort of investigation that will enable the Senate more effectively to discharge its functions in the field of foreign relations.

LIMITATION OF DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENT ON PRICE SUPPORTS FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received from the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] requesting that he be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2962) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 20, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This will confirm my talks with you about the recent Benson pronouncement.

As I said to you personally, I feel that your bill, S. 2962, has merit, and I would like to be a cosponsor with you on the same.

We all appreciate that the economic health of our States depends on the economic health of our farmers.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON PROPOSED HOUSE LEGISLATION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that public hearings will begin at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, March 9, 1954, in room 301, Senate Office Building, on S. 2938, the Housing Act of 1954, and any proposed amendments thereto; also on certain other housing bills now pending before the committee.

Government witnesses will be heard on March 9, 10, and 11. Non-Government witnesses wishing to testify should contact Mr. Ira Dixon, clerk of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, not later than March 5, 1954.

INTER-AMERICAN AMITY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was extremely interested to note in the Sunday, February 21, New York Times a letter to the editor on the important issue of maintaining Pan-American unity.

The letter was written by the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, advisory editor of the Americas and one of the best qualified observers on the inter-American scene.

Dr. Thorning has been decorated by many of the governments and honored by the universities of the hemisphere; he is held in very high esteem by students of inter-American relations.

He points out in his letter the necessity of firm and continuing private enterprise type economic relationships among the 21 American Republics.

He points out further that the current inquiry into the problem of coffee should be conducted in a manner consistent with the maintenance of North, Central, and South American friendship.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR INTER-AMERICAN AMITY—OUR RECOGNITION OF IMPORTANCE OF HEMISPHERIC PROSPERITY ASKED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial of February 15, Inter-American Affairs, is right on the target. It is overwhelmingly evident that the mainspring of an effective good-neighbor relationship is to be sought in the field of economic policy.

Agreement on "the general principle" is not enough. Economic cooperation must be reflected in the standard of life of the workers, farmers and educators of the other American republics. What every self-respecting citizen in the Western Hemisphere desires and expects from the people of our own country is a fair price for his products.

Our good neighbors are not keen about loans, grants-in-aid, or handouts in any form. They want steady markets for the raw materials or mineral wealth that requires arduous labor to be separated from the soil. They recall the premium prices that were paid for Chilean copper, Mexican lead and zinc, Peruvian long-staple cotton, Brazilian quartz crystal (vital for electronic communications), Ecuadorian balsa wood (essential for life preservers), Uruguayan wood, Colombian-Venezuelan oil, and sugar from Cuba, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic, in time of war.

If the producers of these commodities, necessary when sea routes were hazardous, became accustomed to a somewhat better type of housing, food and clothing, they had a right to think that their wartime exertions and sacrifices would be remembered gratefully. And they are the first to point out, with reason, that every dollar spent in the United States for coffee, sugar, wool and oil comes back into the pockets of automobile and electrical workers, producers of farm machinery, canners, television and radio manufacturers, and even packers of meat products.

RETALIATION AGAINST RESTRICTIONS

How dangerous a policy of "wait and see" can become should be clear from the recent threat of the Venezueleans to cut off their $500 million yearly purchases from the United States if Washington adopts restrictive measures affecting Venezuelan exports, such as oil and coffee.

Another warning was sounded by Colombian Foreign Minister Evaristo Sourdis, who declared that if the United States Government places controls on coffee prices the repercussions "would shatter continental unity." Is it sensible to make huge investments in the cause of inter-American amity and then throw out "the baby with the bath"? In my judgment Dr. Sourdis is exactly right in proclaiming that "the question of coffee prices provides a test of United States good-neighbor policy."

What a golden opportunity there still is for the United States leaders in the White House, the State Department, and the Congress to emphasize, at this critical moment—eve of the 10th Inter-American Conference scheduled to open on March 1—that the whole inquiry into the price of coffee will be, and should be, conducted within the framework of friendship.

It would be easy for the spokesmen for the United States to bring home to our coffee consumers, whose legitimate interests need protection, that whereas a Latin-American plantation laborer receives about 10 cents an hour, the average wage for comparable work here may be more than a dollar an hour.

CONTROLLING SPECULATION

Above all, the investigation should be predicated upon the good faith of those whom we like to describe as our "good neighbors." If there is speculation—and there usually flourishes a gambling spirit when commodities are in short supply—it is an evil that can be controlled without destroying the efforts of thousands of Americanistas who have laid the foundations for friendship throughout this hemisphere.

Why cannot our inter-American conscience advise us that prosperity for the people of the other American republics is bound to produce a golden harvest for our own workers? May not this type of economic cooperation prove more realistic than storms of mutual recrimination?

Unless the stability, the tariff concessions, the tax relief, the public loans, the expanded technical aid, the extra stockpiling and the public relations (recommended both by Dr. Milton Eisenhower and the New York Times), we may find that our failure may be the equivalent of 30 Soviet divisions below the Rio Grande.

The Reverend Dr. JOSEPH F. THORNING.

WASHINGTON, *February 16, 1954.*

RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, it is very evident that wrong influences are at work trying to lead us or drive us into recognition of Communist China. Some of these influences come from abroad. Some of them come from our own country. Those which come from abroad have for some time been largely British. Unfortunately, Great Britain has always been strongly swayed by commercial considerations; and following the First World War commercial considerations with relation to Manchuria, with relation to Italy, and with relation to the Rhineland, brought on the Second World War.

Now Great Britain has recognized Communist China. Communist China refuses to recognize Great Britain, and holds her in contempt. We do not wish to find ourselves set in the same course. But there are still strong influences at work in this country looking to the recognition of Communist China. I do not know just where to look for them, but suspect that they are to be found in the hard core of diplomatic practice in the State Department. It is in accordance with diplomatic tradition and procedure that we should be recognizing governments with which we have no sympathy whatever; but the fact remains that this is a completely different situation from any that has occurred heretofore.

I wish to place in the RECORD, after a few further remarks, a statement by Hon. Joseph C. Grew, who is connected with the Committee of One Million, which is unalterably opposed to the recognition of Communist China. The chairman of the Committee of One Million is Warren Austin, who originated the phrase that Communist China should not be permitted to shoot her way into the United Nations. With these two experienced and able elder statesmen opposing strongly as they do this attempt to obtain recognition for Communist China, I feel that we should give them every support possible, and I urge the support of the Committee of One Million.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

USE OF VETO TO PREVENT RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. MALONE. Has Secretary of State Dulles ever said that we would use the veto to prevent the recognition of Communist China?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Nevada that I understand there is involved a question of procedure which has not been resolved. The point has been made that the veto does not apply in such a case. I would yield on that point, not to engineers like the Senator from Nevada and myself but to some of the many able lawyers whose countenances I see scattered around this Chamber. The question is too much for me.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MALONE. That may be true; but no difficulty or question is ever raised about the legality of the action of our State Department when it wishes to take positive action.

Furthermore, Secretary of State Acheson must have thought it applied when he asserted, in addressing a joint meeting of the Congress following his return from a tour of Europe, that we would not use it.

In 1951, on the occasion of the meeting between Great Britain, Canada, and the United States, the junior Senator from Nevada stood on the floor of the Senate, which at that time was meeting in the old Supreme Court room, and stated that as his considered opinion, there had been an agreement made between our own State Department and Great Britain to follow Great Britain in the recognition of Communist China and in the devaluation of the British pound. The agreement was publicly denied at the time, but the British delegation's return home was followed immediately by the devaluation of the pound.

The two nations agreed that we would follow the British in the recognition of Communist China and later Secretary Acheson by his own statement agreed that we would not use the veto to prevent such recognition.

Our present Secretary of State has never said that we would use our veto power to prevent the recognition of the Russian satellite, Communist China.

Mr. President, the Secretary did say at one time that we would be justified in using the veto to prevent recognition of Communist China. On another occasion the distinguished former Senator Austin said, as the Senator from Vermont has

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

quoted him, that we would not allow any nation to shoot its way into the United Nations. They have now stopped shooting.

I say again, Mr. President, that our present Secretary of State has never said that we would use the veto to prevent the recognition of Communist China. He has never by so much as a sign that the commitment of Mr. Acheson, not to use it had been reversed.

Mr. FLANDERS. I judge from this interchange of remarks that the Senator from Nevada agrees with me that Communist China must not be allowed to become a member of the United Nations, and that we must not recognize her until the situation is different from what it is at the present time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not know whether we are getting beyond our 2 minutes.

Mr. MALONE. I have 2 minutes. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

RECOGNITION WITH CONNIVANCE OF STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MALONE. It is the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada that public opinion is being deliberately softened for recognition of Communist China, and that, because of the desire of American business to follow the European nations in trading with Communist China and Russia, and that when public opinion has been softened to a sufficient extent the United Nations will recognize Communist China, with the United States prefunctorily voting against it. Then we shall be confronted with an accomplished fact of recognition, and we shall be told then that there is nothing further we can do. Communist China will be in, with the connivance of our State Department.

Mr. FLANDERS. I suggest that the Senator from Nevada and I, and everyone else so minded, join the Committee of One Million, which has hundreds of thousands of signatories already, and see if we cannot stem the undertow which is at work.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Why I Am Opposed to Recognition of Red China," written by Hon. Joseph C. Grew, who, as we all know, was for 10 years our Ambassador to Japan.

The article consists of an interview copyrighted by the International News Service, but I have the permission of the International News Service to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I AM OPPOSED TO RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA

(By Joseph C. Grew)

The sordid and heartbreaking story of what United Nations troops suffered at the hands of their Communist captors left no doubt in the civilized world as to the nature of communism. If there had remained any shred of support for the old myth that Chinese Communists were somehow different from their Russian comrades, if the wretched nonsense about agrarian reformers still prevailed, all this has been dispelled by the immutable evidence of the Korean war. The argument that we can best pry them loose from Soviet domination by recognition seems to me wholly illogical in the light of practical experience.

Even the 21 Americans who somehow chose communism over their birthright are obviously the victims of pressures more powerful than themselves. They are pitiful puppets, mouthing the discredited slogans of a ruthless dictatorship—for unfathomable reasons.

This negative side of almost world-wide opposition to Red China is very well-known. So well-known that we take it as a matter of course. But at a time when there has been a great deal of pressure toward foisting a wait-and-see attitude on the American public, it is even more important to know the many positive reasons for opposing any sort of recognition of the enemy as anything but the enemy.

Throughout southeast Asia there are some 12 million people known as the overseas Chinese. They are not merely run-of-the-mill citizenry, but in many cases form the backbone of the economic, social, and political life of the community. For them, Formosa continues to shine as the beacon of hope for that whole part of the world. Should the West, for any reason whatsoever, displace the Nationalist Government by the Communist, these 12 million people would then be forced to follow our lead. This would be only the first step in the total collapse of the East and its absorption into the Communist empire. It would be not merely victory for the Communists, but a literal and moral defeat such as the United States has even yet not known.

And at what a time. The Communist system gives many evidences of crumbling from within. The only thing that can keep it going is our willingness to make deals. And any deal we make is to their advantage.

Within the past year, international communism suffered two serious blows. On June 17 began the series of mass uprisings in East Berlin. For the first time the slave-subjects of communism were successful in mass demonstrations against their captors. The second defeat, and possibly even more significant, was the refusal of 22,000 Chinese POW's to accept repatriation. Here was not merely the proof of the nature of communism—here was a positive demonstration of the deep desire for freedom on the part of the people of Asia. Thousands of men by their willingness to sacrifice reunion with their loved ones, to abandon their return to home soil, and all the things that go with it, demonstrated that without freedom all is ashes. We, who have never known that desperate choice, cannot do less than support their courageous decision.

The great body of American people know this. But somehow, sometimes, in the counsels of the mighty, simple truths are mislaid. Within past weeks it has been suggested that it is not wise for the United States to take a firm stand either for or against recognition or for or against admission of Red China to the United Nations because it would destroy this country's bargaining power. There might come a time when we should modify our trade policies (from the present "no trade") on the basis of Communist behavior and American business interests.

Is not this a despicable proposal to put the dollar above security? When the United States of America compromises principle for expediency in this issue the worm will have entered the apple. The American public, which by the hundreds of thousands has been flocking to support the Committee for One Million's petition against the admission of Red China to the United Nations, understands that there can be no time when Communist philosophy and doctrine as practiced by Red China will be in the interest of any but the Communists. And the voices of the Americans who signed the petition of the Committee for One Million are, and will eternally, be raised in reminder of that fact. We, in the United States, have done what the Communists claim to do—listened to the overwhelming voice of the people.

Much has been made of the fact that the scrap iron we sold to Japan was returned to us in the form of bullets. How much more ironic, to the point of dishonor, to permit Chinese Communists to march into the United Nations buildings over the bodies of the United Nations troops they shot, tortured, and starved to death.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S PRAYER FOR OUR COUNTRY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, yesterday we read and carefully considered the wise counsel which has come down to us in the farewell address of George Washington.

Washington was a devout Christian. Out of his deep religious convictions he invoked a prayer for our country. He prayed that our Nation might always be a land of honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners.

We all pray that the time may come when the mind of every American may be imbued with the spirit of Washington's prayer.

I ask unanimous consent that the prayer for our country be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PRAYER FOR OUR COUNTRY

(By George Washington)

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought out of many kindreds and tongues. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be peace and justice at home, and that through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail. All of which we ask through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

NATIONAL ENGINEERS' WEEK

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the current week, February 21 through February 27, has been set aside in observance of National Engineers' Week.

Hundreds of cities across the Nation have planned programs and ceremonies in honor of America's engineering profession.

As Senators know, National Engineers' Week is observed every year during the week of George Washington's Birthday to commemorate our first President's notable engineering feats, many of which helped win our struggle for independence during the Revolutionary War.

As a registered professional engineer in my home State of Nevada and as a member of the National Society of Professional Engineers, which is the sponsor with hundreds of other engineering groups across the Nation of National Engineers' Week, I am especially happy to invite my fellow Americans to reflect a moment upon the many benefits the science of engineering has brought to them.

The President of the United States has written a very excellent letter upon this subject to Mr. T. Carr Forrest, Jr., president of the National Society of Professional Engineers. I ask unanimous consent to make it a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 9, 1953.

Mr. T. CARR FORREST, Jr.,
President, National Society of Professional Engineers,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FORREST: It is particularly fitting that the National Society of Professional Engineers has selected the week of Washington's Birthday as the period in which to observe National Engineers' Week. I heartily endorse this recognition of the engineering accomplishments of our Nation's first President, and I am delighted to use this occasion to pay compliments to America's engineers.

The Nation has long relied on the skill of its engineers. That skill has contributed to our comforts, our welfare, and our security against potential enemies. The responsibilities of our engineers become greater with the passage of each day, and each day we see new evidence of their success in meeting the tremendous challenge of our age.

To American engineers everywhere—to those working in this country and to the many abroad who are contributing to the cause of peace—I extend congratulations and best wishes. May the observance of National Engineers' Week in 1954 serve to remind our citizens once more of the great service performed by America's engineers.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE PUBLIC DEFENDER SYSTEM IN CONNECTICUT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, one of the major problems in the administration of public justice is the provision of adequate legal counsel to persons who lack the means to employ the services of a skilled lawyer.

Various proposals have been made in Congress from time to time to establish a public defender system in the Federal courts to insure that every person accused of crime, the poor as well as the rich, will have an opportunity to present his best defense.

Since 1917 my own State has had a public defender system in operation in each county of the State. Connecticut and Rhode Island, as a matter of fact, are now the only States in which the public defender system exists on a statewide basis.

The February issue of State Government, the magazine of State affairs, contains an interesting article, The Public Defender System in Connecticut, by David Mars, an instructor in government and international relations at the University of Connecticut. I ask unanimous consent that this informative article be printed in the RECORD for the benefit of Members of Congress who are interested in this important problem.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC DEFENDER SYSTEM IN CONNECTICUT

(By David Mars)

Equality before the law has long been one of the ideals of American jurisprudence. Too frequently, however, this ideal has not been realized in practice. No one but the most naive would assume that an impoverished individual usually has the same opportunity of winning his case in court as does an individual of wealth and resources.

In order to mitigate somewhat the inequity of this situation and to provide completely bankrupt persons with at least a modicum of legal aid, every State in America has made some provision to help indigent persons in their appearances before judicial bodies. In almost every case, the legal assistance provided for by the States takes the form of assigned counsel. In the system of assigned counsel, the court nominates an attorney to handle the case for the indigent person. The assignments ordinarily are made on an ad hoc basis in each case, and too frequently they go to young and inexperienced lawyers. Attorneys with well-established practices are usually reluctant to accept such assignments, since the fees are quite small, and in some cases nonexistent. Consequently—as many students of government have been quick to point out—the indigent person's case is bound to suffer as a result of the inexperience of his assigned counsel.

In addition to this grave defect in the system of assigned counsel, other irregularities, some quite serious, have crept in. They include such practices as attempts by the defending lawyer to extort additional money from the family of the accused person, persuading the accused to plead guilty in order to save counsel time and trouble, and similar maneuvers.[1]

The alternative to assigned counsel is the public defender system. The public defender is a public officer who is paid a fixed salary by a government, and in whom is vested the responsibility for defending persons who have been charged with crimes and who are unable to pay for their own defense. Such an office has existed in certain European countries for several centuries. Its first appearance in the United States was in Los Angeles County, Calif., in 1914. Since that date, several metropolitan areas, notably San Francisco, Cook County (Chicago), Douglas County (Omaha), and Hennepin County (Minneapolis), have adopted this plan. In 1917, Connecticut enacted legislation providing for a public defender in each county.[2]

Connecticut and Rhode Island are the only States in which the system is being used on a statewide basis. Its operation in Connecticut now will be described briefly.

Connecticut's eight counties serve as districts for the State's judicial system. In addition, parts of New Haven and Litchfield Counties together comprise the judicial district of Waterbury. In each of the State's nine judicial districts, a public defender is appointed. The appointments are made by the judges of the superior court sitting en banc at their annual meeting in June. In order to assure adequate defense for indigent persons, public defenders must be attorneys with at least 5 years' experience. They are charged with the responsibility for defending all persons accused of crimes where those persons are "* * * without funds sufficient to employ counsel for such defense."[3] Appointments are made for a period of 1 year, but reappointments are the regular practice, and public defenders serve, as a rule, until their voluntary retirement or resignation.

The salaries of public defenders are paid by the State[4] and are charged to the budget of the judicial department in the same way as are the salaries of all other officers of that department, such as judges and State's attorneys. The salaries vary approximately according to the population of the judicial district within which the public defender is operating. Following is a list of the counties and judicial districts of Connecticut, with their population (1950 census figures), and with the annual salaries of their public defenders:

	Population	Salary
Hartford	539,661	$4,800
Fairfield	504,342	4,800
New Haven[1]	364,061	4,800
Waterbury (judicial district)	207,667	2,280
New London	144,821	2,280
Litchfield[2]	72,928	1,680
Middlesex	67,332	1,680
Windham	61,759	1,680
Tolland	44,709	1,300

[1] New Haven County is the most populous in the State, with a population (1950) of 545,784, but 181,723 of these people reside in the 12 towns of that county which are part of the judicial district of Waterbury.

[2] Litchfield County has a total population of 98,872 (1950), but 25,944 of these people live in the 5 towns which lie within the judicial district of Waterbury.

No figures are available for the number of cases public defenders handle. However, several public defenders have estimated the number they try annually,[5] and on the basis of these estimates it may be stated that the fee earned in a case averages between $20 and $30, quite a modest amount. Public defenders are not barred from the private practice of law, and they may even undertake to defend criminal cases privately,[6] although most of them seem to avoid doing so. Since many persons charged with crimes are indigent, public defenders frequently find themselves handling the bulk of the criminal defense work in the county.

Anyone charged with a crime and without funds to retain private counsel may ask

[1] For an analysis of the inadequacies of the assigned counsel system, see Mayer C. Goldman, the Public Defender (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1917), Ch. II; Charles Mishkin. The Public Defender, Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XXIII, No. 4 (November 1931), p. 493; and Philip J. Finnegan, The Work of the Public Defender of Cook County, ibid., XXVI, No. 5 (January 1936), pp. 711–712.

[2] Chapter 225 of Public Acts of 1917 provides (in part) as follows: "The judges of the superior court at their annual meeting in June, or any judge thereof designated to hold any criminal term of said court, at least 30 days prior to the opening of such term, shall appoint an attorney at law, of at least 5 years' practice, to act as attorney in the defense of all persons charged with crime in said court when such person is without funds sufficient to employ counsel for such defense."

[3] General Statutes of Connecticut (Revision of 1949), sec. 8796. Ordinarily, the public defender, in his discretion, decides whether or not the person seeking his aid is "without funds sufficient" within the meaning of the statute. Persons who can well afford private counsel frequently try to enlist the aid of a public defender in order to avoid paying fees.

[4] Prior to 1946, public defenders were paid an allowance on invoice.

[5] Windham: 60; New London: 100; Hartford: 200.

[6] A public defender is prohibited only from appearing on behalf of the State in any criminal case in the court to which he is attached. The Connecticut Practice Book of 1951, sec. 16.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the public defender to defend him. The defender comes into the case after the accused person has been bound over by a lower court or a trial justice to the Court of Common Pleas or to the Superior Court.[7] If the accused is free on bail, he may come to the public defender's office and there arrange for his defense. Most indigent persons, of course, cannot raise bail, and hence are incarcerated while they await trial before the court to which they have been bound over. In these latter cases, the public defender enters the proceedings in one of two ways: (1) In some counties, the State's attorney furnishes him with a list of all those prisoners who are apparently without funds sufficient to provide for their legal defense, or (2) the public defender goes to the jail and interviews all prisoners who have indicated a desire to see him. In both types of cases, the public defender enters the case approximately 2 weeks before the term of court in which the accused is to stand trial.

It is the duty of the public defender to interview every prisoner who has asked to see him, or who has come to see him, and he must determine whether or not the prisoner is really without resources sufficient to pay for his own defense. As mentioned previously, the public defender is the person who decides whether or not the accused actually is indigent within the terms of the statute. However, he may be ordered to take a case by a superior court judge, after he has refused, in his own discretion, to do so.

Sometimes indigent persons are ignorant of the fact that they are entitled by law to a defender's services, and a conscientious public defender will make an attempt to discover whether or not there are any such persons in prison. In all cases, whether the defender meets his indigent client in prison or in his own office, he must have the consent of the accused before he may represent him in court.

A public defender's salary is paid to him solely for services rendered in defending indigent persons charged with crime. If a proper defense calls for spending money for such items as pictures, expert testimony, etc., the defender advances the money and is then reimbursed for these outlays upon submission of an itemized statement to the superior court. He is limited in the amount of money he may thus spend in one court term to 5 percent of his basic annual salary, but any judge of the superior court may authorize expenditures beyond that limit.

The system assumes that public defenders shall make no distinction between persons defended by them privately and those they defend because of indigence. One public defender writes, "The same devotion to the cause of a public defender client is called for as that assumed under the highest standards of professional conduct."[8] If it appears to the defender that his indigent client has been unjustly accused or that he has a strong legal case, he must fight for his advantage just as he would for his clients in private practice. Indeed, indigent persons are to be considered as his own clients, since they have no other legal defense. On the other hand, if the defender feels that the accused person has no case and is truly guilty, he advises him to plead guilty, and he then applies to the court for leniency.[9] In these cases, the State is frequently saved the great expense of conducting a trial.

Interestingly enough, a public defender, in preparing a case for an indigent person, may be able to provide him with a better defense than could be given by privately retained counsel; if the defender is on good terms with the police and the State's attorney, he may be given an opportunity to see the State's entire case against the accused, including such items as confessions, witnesses' statements, police notes, etc.

In general, the public defender system appears to have worked very satisfactorily in Connecticut thus far, and this at very small cost to the State.[10] All concerned, including judges and defenders themselves, feel that the system has proved to be one of great value to the judicial process in the State, insuring more nearly equal justice than is possible in jurisdictions where assigned counsel are used. Some criticisms have been heard at one time or another, and these deserve to be noted: (a) Charges of collusion resulting from intimacy between State's attorneys and public defenders, to the detriment of the accused; (b) the intimation (apparently spread by indigent persons who have received severe sentences) that the public defender is really a State's lawyer and only an adjunct of the State's attorney's office; and (c) dissatisfaction expressed, especially by police and law-enforcement officers, that the State must pay for both the prosecution and defense of certain classes of persons. One procedural criticism, noted by a public defender himself, is that the defender comes into the case at too late a date. Frequently, by the time the defender enters the case the accused has signed a statement or confession or in some other way has done somthing to make his ultimate defense much more difficult. This last defect could be obviated by providing for notification of the public defender as soon as a seemingly indigent person is bound over to await trial.

On the positive side a number of points may be made. The public defender system can easily be justified on humanitarian grounds. An indigent person charged with a crime sees mobilized against him the awesome machinery of the State—courts, police, prisons, etc. It is only simple mercy and humanitarianism to provide him with some means to defend himself.

Perhaps the most important thing to be said in favor of the system in Connecticut is that it furnishes some means of defense for indigent persons while it manages at the same time to avoid the various pitfalls and inequities of the assigned counsel system. As suggested earlier, the cost of maintaining such an office ordinarily is recaptured by the State in the savings accruing to it in those cases where the defendant is advised to plead guilty, thereby making a protracted court trial unnecessary. Thus the public defender system in Connecticut represents a saving of both time and money, and it promotes equity and the proper administration of justice.

[7] In a few cases, an accused person is brought directly to trial before the superior court on a bench warrant, but in the overwhelming majority of cases he will have had a preliminary hearing before a lower court magistrate or trial justice, and then bound over to a higher criminal court.

[8] Thomas R. Robinson, The Administration of Justice from the Standpoint of the Public Defender, Connecticut Bar Journal, XXV, No. 3 (September 1951), p. 267.

[9] In every instance, the indigent client is the final judge of how he should plead. Even in the face of a strong recommendation by the public defender to plead guilty, the client may insist on pleading not guilty, and the defender must so enter the plea.

[10] The total expense for public defenders in Connecticut in 1951–52 was $29,103.61, as compared with $87,880.77 for official stenographers, $116,118.20 for coroners, and $229,446.34 for State's attorneys. See State of Connecticut, Judicial Department: Report of Executive Secretary 1951–52, table V.

INADEQUATE TRAFFIC CONTROL AT WATERLOO, IOWA, AIRPORT

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the city of Waterloo, Iowa, with a population of approximately 70,000, is one of the most vigorous cities in the State for its size and the industries it fosters. It has also heavy air traffic north and south, not only commercial air traffic but private air traffic. The city has spent a great deal of money attempting to get air control established at the airfield. Thus far it has been unable to secure it.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated as a part of my remarks, at this point in the RECORD, an editorial from the Waterloo Courier of January 3, 1954, entitled "Waterloo Airport's Empty Tower."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERLOO AIRPORT'S EMPTY TOWER—II

Thirteen days ago the Courier called to the attention of Northeast Iowa citizens who utilize the Waterloo Municipal Airport that unfair political discrimination in the Department of Commerce and in Congress had caused the lack of adequate air traffic control here.

We pointed out at that time that 111 American cities with fewer scheduled airline departures than Waterloo have CAA-operated radio communication facilities and that 25 cities with less such traffic than Waterloo have both control towers and radio facilities.

Furthermore, we pointed out that the city, with the full approval and knowledge of the CAA, had borne half the cost of the $45,000 control tower recently erected on the terminal building. We noted that the CAA had expended approximately $115,000 for omnirange equipment which cannot be fully effective without air traffic control.

Moreover, we pointed out that the Waterloo Airport, by every yardstick used by the CAA, needed and required air traffic control. CAA officials, from top to bottom, have in the past and still today admit the need for these facilities.

But all that, we now discover, was only part of the story. We knew that funds for the much-needed facilities in Waterloo were omitted from the Department of Commerce budget for the 1955 fiscal year. However, we now discover that, despite this omission of Waterloo, the CAA has budgeted $5,000,000 for the establishment of new air navigation facilities. And what are some of the projects for which this money is proposed? Here is the story:

The CAA proposes to re-establish control towers at White Plains, N. Y., Bridgeport, Conn., a second airport at Baltimore, Md., Niagara Falls, N. Y., and Duluth, Minn. All of these except White Plains already have radio communication facilities and none of them has as much scheduled airline traffic as Waterloo. Only the one at White Plains and possibly the one at Baltimore (for which no figures are available) have as much total traffic, counting non-scheduled air movements.

Furthermore, the CAA proposes to establish new control towers at a second airport in Shreveport, La., a second airport in Philadelphia, and at airports in Moline, Ill., and Wilkes-Barre, Pa.—all of which already have radio communications. The second airports in Shreveport and Philadelphia have no scheduled airline traffic. The airports in Moline and Wilkes-Barre have more scheduled airline traffic than Waterloo but of course, already have the radio communications which are an important safety factor.

With the money being budgeted for control towers at airports which already have communication facilities, Waterloo's position as the victim of political discrimination becomes more infuriating. Last year passengers from 170 cties and towns in Northeast

Iowa (coming from 20 counties with a combined population of over a half-million people) embarked for air trips at the Waterloo airport.

By every yardstick of need and fairness, Waterloo is entitled to air traffic control facilities. But Northwest Iowa will get these facilities only if citizens, acting through the State's congressmen and senators, put on enough political pressure to obtain them.

PETROLEUM PRODUCTION IN NEVADA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, last week was a very eventful period for my State of Nevada. At that time it became the 29th petroleum-producing State of the Union. A well producing 200 barrels a day was discovered at a depth of 6,835 feet in Nye County in east-central Nevada, approximately 60 miles southwest of Ely, Nev., where one of the largest copper pits in the world is located.

Many wells are being drilled at this time in my State, with every prospect of further success. Reports indicate that it is not only the beginning of the production of this important commodity, but the State of Nevada is already known as a great producer of copper, zinc, lead, manganese, tungsten, mercury, and iron ore, and now uranium and petroleum have been discovered.

The prospects are that the production of both uranium and petroleum will materially increase in the very near future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of the remarks I have already made, certain newspaper accounts of the petroleum strike in Nevada.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nevada State Journal, Reno, Nev., of February 19, 1954]

OIL IN NEVADA

Discovered by a responsible company, Nevada's first oil well is now being developed and within a few weeks it will be determined whether or not an oilfield of commercial value has been found in Nye County.

We are all hopeful that the field will be extensive and that more oil wells will be opened in the vast area which geologists have been pointing to for years as a potential source of oil.

There have been many sporadic oil booms in this State. They were inspired by stock promoters in most instances in the past and as the result of the present discovery by the Shell Oil Co. it is reasonable to expect that oil-well promotions will be numerous in the near future. Some will be on the square and others will be conducted by fast operators. It is up to the people who want to gamble to be careful.

In the meantime the Shell Co., the Standard Oil Co., Gulf Petroleum, and other responsible companies will continue exploration work and it will be determined beyond shadow of a doubt whether or not oil in commercial quantities can be produced in Nevada.

[From the Elko (Nev.) Daily Free Press of February 18, 1954]

OIL IS DISCOVERED IN NEVADA

The magic words "we have hit oil" have been heard in the State of Nevada. The official announcement came from S. F. Bowlby, Pacific Coast vice president of the Shell Oil Co. yesterday. He qualified his announcement by saying the well promises to be the first oil production in Nevada.

The encouraging thing of course is that oil has been struck in the State which in the opinion of some geologists was the least likely to produce oil of any State in the Union. It is interesting to note also that oilmen of Utah enthusiastically hailed it as a major discovery. Some oilmen have never lost faith in the discovery of oil in the State.

The discovery is particularly important, too, in face of the fact that numerous other wells are being sunk in other Nevada locations, notably in Elko County and in the vicinity of Elko. We are making an announcement of a new drilling venture at Halleck on the front page of this newspaper today, which is an added indication of the interest being displayed in the State and of the faith being displayed by men who understand the oil business and who are not throwing their money away. These men are convinced that there are good chances of striking oil and their faith has been partially vindicated through the announcement made by the Shell Oil Co. officials.

Oil was on the lips of many people in this city today. Some insist that discoveries have been made in Elko County, which are being kept secret. This may well be, but this newspaper has checked with the officials in charge and they deny that any gas or oil has been struck at the well in the Metropolis district, or in any other of their Nevada operations. We accept this statement in good faith, feeling that the company officials would make an announcement if oil had been struck. There is the possibility of course that such an announcement would be delayed, as it apparently was in the case of the oil discovery near Ely.

In this connection it is interesting to read a comment made in Salt Lake City, which was as follows: "Shell did a good job of keeping its discovery secret while the firm rushed to file on surrounding acreages. Approaches to the wildcat were roped off and visits of oilmen and interested citizens were discouraged.

"Efforts of competing firms to get information from rig hands and testing companies apparently failed. But no one can keep a discovery of oil secret for long."

While it will be wise to approach the discovery in Ely with a note of caution until it is proven that oil is there in sufficient quantity to make it commercially profitable, no amount of caution can be expected to dim the enthusiasm of those who have been sure in their own minds that oil existed in Nevada. Some people take the stand that the discovery of oil in this vicinity will spoil Elko. However, personally, we are willing to take that chance since the discovery of oil any place will be a boon to the economic welfare of the country. There are times in Elko when we could well stand additional business which would be generated from such a discovery, and there is plenty of ground available for the future development of homes in this city.

It seems an assured thing that the discovery of oil in Nevada will lead to further intensified activity in the search for additional wells. It is estimated that as many as 75 holes have been drilled in Nevada since World War I. Now that oil has been discovered the total number of holes to be drilled should be greatly increased.

However, it is wise to hold a check on one's enthusiasm. There has been much speculation in oil in the past and this will continue. Before you invest your money be sure you are going to get value received.

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette of February 18, 1954]

EXCITEMENT SPREADS AS FIND CONFIRMED—SHELL OIL'S ANNOUNCEMENT IS HAILED BY RANK AND FILE

Discovery of the first oil in Nevada, confirmed late Wednesday by the Shell Oil Co., spread excitement in great ripples across the State today.

S. F. Bowlby, vice president of Shell's Pacific coast region, confirmed the find in a terse statement issued from his Los Angeles office.

And Gov. Charles H. Russell, in an official statement today, hailed the finding of a commercial oil field in Nye County.

He said the importance of Shell's find had been confirmed to him by the oil company executive.

FIRST PRODUCTION

Bowlby's announcement said the discovery promises to be the first oil production in Nevada. He said the strike was made at the Eagle Springs well in northeastern Nye County. The well is located near Currant, on United States Highway No. 6 about 60 miles southwest of Ely.

The oil company said a 4-hour production test recovered 30 barrels of oil from sands at the 6,453–6,533-foot level. The oil is of 26 gravity, described by geologists of medium or fairly good quality.

Bowlby said the company plans to continue drilling deeper before starting production from the well.

It was the first try made in the State by the Shell Co., although other major concerns have been searching for petroleum in Nevada on a fairly big scale since 1948.

However; the other companies made their tests farther north.

SWEEPING RUMORS

Even before the discovery was confirmed, rumors of the find swept the State and the Federal land and survey office in Reno handled numerous applicants for gas and oil leases on Federal lands.

Following the announcement, the office was swamped for the fifth straight day and A. L. Simpson, land office manager, estimates that one-half million acres of Federal land have been leased in the last 4 days.

Simpson said many of those applying for the leases knew exactly where they wanted them—as close to the Shell discovery as possible.

Simpson added he hasn't had time to study the situation as yet, but he believes there is little land available within several miles of the discovery. Land lying as far as 70 miles away has been leased, he declared.

MANY APPLICANTS

The hundreds of applicants have given addresses in Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, California, and numerous other States.

Oil and gas lease applications still were coming in today as fast as the office could handle them. Simpson has been telling the applicants to be patient, however. There are from 65 to 70 million acres of Federal land in Nevada and only about 6 million is under lease.

The Shell Co. began drilling at the discovery site on January 12, 1954, and the hole reached a depth of 5,500 feet in 10 days.

From the beginning, its operation has been what oilmen call a tight hole, meaning that it is top secret and no visitors allowed.

Only last week there were reports in Salt Lake City that Shell was planning to abandon the well. They were denied at that time, however.

The strike came several years too late for the company to claim a $25,000 reward Nevada had offered for the first oil well in the State. This was posted by the State legislature in the 1940's but withdrawn several sessions later.

STATE PROTECTED

If the well proves to be of commercial value, the preliminary work already has been completed for State regulation and protection of its oil resources.

The 1953 legislature approved a bill creating an oil and gas conservation commission and giving it powers to regulate the industry.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Governor Russell made note of this and other developments in an official statement as follows:

"Anticipating the probable discovery of oil in Nevada, I have endeavored during the last 3 years to encourage the prospecting for oil and at the same time set in motion steps that would protect the State of Nevada.

"In 1951, I advocated several measures to assure protection to the State and fully realized at that time that this work was preliminary. At the 1953 session I had prepared, through the cooperation of Dr. Vernon Scheid, director of the Nevada Bureau of Mines, an oil conservation bill which would protect the State and which set forth the procedures and restrictions relative to oil exploration. The legislature enacted the bill into law and since then rules and regulations supplementing the act were formalized and approved this month by the commission which consists of the governor, the State engineer, and the director of the bureau of mines.

"Following the passage of the act by the legislature, I asked for and obtained membership for Nevada in the interstate oil compact commission and Nevada was granted an associate membership until such time as the State becomes an oil producing State.

"The discovery of a commercial oilfield in Nye County by the Shell Oil Co., has proven the foresight and faith I had that oil would be discovered in this State.

"S. F. Bowlby, vice president of Shell's Pacific coast area, confirmed to me the importance of the oil discovery and that company is to be congratulated on its important find.

"The finding of oil in Nevada means that the search in Railroad valley, where the drilling was carried on by the company, as well as in other parts of the State, will be increased and in time, I have no doubt, other commercial fields will be brought in and will greatly add to the growth and economy of the State.

"Nevada has and now will increasingly benefit from leased Federal lands for oil prospecting and with a commercial field brought into production, will eventually derive direct revenue from such production."

The governor said that he believed oil production in the State could be taxed on the same basis as are the net proceeds from Nevada mines. Mining concerns are allowed to charge off exploration and development costs and then pay the regular ad valorem rate on net production value. The collection is administered by the Nevada Tax Commission.

On the basis of preliminary data released by Bowlby, University of Nevada geologists hailed the discovery as of tremendous significance to the State.

"It could mean a bigger boom than Nevada ever had from the fabulous Comstock lode," said Joseph Lintz, Jr., geology professor, who also is secretary of the oil and gas conservation commission.

A similar statement was issued by Prof. Vincent Gianella, veteran university geologist, now retired.

"From the preliminary data, it appears the well could very well prove to be a commercial producer of a good quality of oil," he said.

"The strike is especially significant because Nevada is virgin territory for oil. Development of an oil industry here would far surpass the past great mining booms," Gianella added.

LONG SUSPECTED

Geologists long have suspected the presence in Nevada of commercial oil deposits.

Writing in the Oil and Gas Journal on February 8, 1954, Frank J. Gardner, oil geologist, summarized the situation as follows:

"Evidences of oil and gas in the eastern basin of Nevada have been recorded in numerous cases in the form of surface oil shales, fossils containing small amounts of free oil, gas and oil seeps, and actual showings in wells.

"In eastern Nevada, then, the exploration geologist finds all the essential elements for the production of oil, except, so far, the oil; source rocks, reservoir rocks, evidences of migration, and favorable structures. The one final discovery medium will be, as always, the drill; and if present and indicated future drilling programs continue, Nevada may well be the 29th State to produce oil."

In 1951, R. G. Ten Eyck, a leading oil geologist, concluded a paper on Nevada as follows:

"It appears that all the elements necessary for origin, migration and accumulation of oil are present in Nevada. Considerable time, effort and money will need to be expended however, before an accurate appraisal can be made of oil prospects."

[From the Nevada State Journal, Reno, Nev., of February 18, 1954]

COMPANY CONTINUES FURTHER DRILLING—DISCOVERY LOCATED IN NYE COUNTY, 60 MILES SOUTHWEST OF ELY

ELY, February 17.—Discovery of what may become Nevada's first commercial oil field was announced today by the Shell Oil Co.

A 6,835-foot well, located in Nye County, near Currant, 60 miles southwest of here, produced 30 barrels of gravity 26 oil during a 4-hour-test period.

This would mean a daily production of 180 barrels, which oil experts said, would be definitely commercial if additional drilling in the area confirms the presence of a large oil pool.

The well was pinpointed in the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 35, township 9 north, range 57 east, approximately the center of the section.

The discovery was confirmed in Salt Lake City by S. F. Bowlby, vice president of Shell's Pacific coast area.

He said a well, known as the Eagle Springs unit No. 1, had recovered approximately 2,300 feet of oil during a 4-hour drill stem test. This would be the equivalent of 30 barrels of oil.

Bowlby said the discovery was made at depth of between 6,453 feet to 6,535 feet but he did not identify the producing formation.

Bowlby disclosed that Shell planned to drill deeper at the well site in order to study other horizons in the area.

Averill H. Munger, editor of the daily Munger Oil-O-Gram, said in Reno that "this very definitely indicates an oil discovery."

He cautioned, however, that the extent of the find would have to be determined by deepening of the well and by additional drilling of wells in the same general area.

Drilling of the Eagle Springs No. 1 well began January 12 of this year and at last reports it was down to 6,563 feet. It was originally planned as a 6,000-foot test well.

Oil experts said the test results did not necessarily insure that a commercial oil pool had been discovered, although geologists have long insisted formations in the Nye-White Pine County region in which the discovery was made indicated the possibility of commercial oil deposits.

OTHER TEST WELLS

Several other major oil concerns have been drilling test wells in the same general region of northcentral Nevada.

Standard Oil Co. has drilled three wells without announcing the results. The Gulf Oil Co. drilled 1 well in this region but abandoned the project and is now drilling 3 wells in the Wells-Metropolis region, 150 miles to the northwest.

Another oil-drilling project is under way in the Goodsprings area of southern Nevada near Las Vegas.

There have been unconfirmed reports that interesting findings have been made by drillers in the Metropolis-Wells area.

The United States Land Office in Reno has done a booming business during the past 4 years on the strength of the continuing drilling activity and oil leases have been taken out on several million acres of public land in Eureka, Lander, Elko, Nye, White Pine, and Clark Counties.

LAND-OFFICE BUSINESS

A. L. Simpson, manager of the Nevada land and survey office in Reno, estimated 5 million acres has been placed under lease.

He reported his agency has been doing a land-office business since Friday when rumors of the oil discovery near Currant first began to seep out.

"When I arrived at the office this morning there was a line waiting out the door and down the hall," Simpson said. "I hate to go down there tomorrow now that this news is out."

The Nevada Legislature several years ago offered a $25,000 bonus for the first discovery of oil in commercial quantities in the State but the offer was subsequently withdrawn.

Machinery was set in motion by the 1953 legislature to establish an oil conservation and production code anticipating the day when oil was discovered in commercial quantities in the State.

[From the Ely (Nev.) Daily Times of February 18, 1954]

JUST SAMPLES OF WHAT THEY SAY TODAY AROUND ELY ABOUT SHELL'S OIL STRIKE

Reactions on the street today were varied, smiles were on many faces, and, all in all, it was interesting to listen to remarks made by many of Ely's citizens regarding the oil discovery.

Ernest Morley, at the Standard Market, said, "If it's what we hear over national radio stations it should be the biggest thing ever to happen here. Our business has been better this year than last and this should make it better still. It should even do something for the mental attitude of our citizens. It sure looks good."

At Weber & Sundberg's they said, "Quite a bit of enthusiasm, hope they get a field like nobody's business, because it would help the whole State more than anything we know."

One woman, "Bet they cap it and don't use it for 25 years" (the pessimist).

Dale Bell said, "What do I think? I love the storm, its good for the country and I hope we get more of them. Oil? Oh, I think it behooves us to look the situation over and be cool, calm, and collected in order to see how this develops and to take advantage of it as a business opportunity when and if it develops. I think that the business people of this community should continue to conduct their business on the same level of good (business) practices, fair prices (no gouging, etc.) in order to encourage new businesses to stay in Ely."

One man was moaning he had just recently sold his oil stock. One woman on a pessimistic trend said, "It will only bring trash to Ely." Harold Jackson said, "Having lived here all my life, the situation is entirely new to me, but the pressure is here and I'm just waiting for it to blow up."

On the street someone said, "You're not dripping in oil today?"

William Isaacs, at the Family Liquor Store, had this to say, "If it is in productive quantity it will be a good shot in the arm right now. Another industry is always welcome. Wonderful."

Cecil Geraghty, "Most wonderful thing ever to happen to Nevada, especially the eastern part. It will give the people a lift."

Mrs. Beards, at the Lucille Shop, "Let us be cautious. Let us wait and see."

Harry Holman, "It's so new I don't know what to expect but we are so close to the workings that it should do much for Ely and create much competitive building. Even Salt Lake City is enthusiastic."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

No statements could be had from Mayor Broadbent or Darwin Lambert, executive secretary of White Pine Chamber of Commerce and Mines, as both are out of town. What a time to be away.

RUSSELL'S REMARKS

Gov. Charles Russell today hailed discovery of oil in commercial quantities in Railroad Valley, 60 miles southwest of Ely, as "wonderful news."

He said he had discussed the find by telephone with S. F. Bowlby, Shell vice president in charge of the Pacific area, and that the latter was very optimistic about the prospects for further development.

Russell said that anticipating the probable discovery of oil in Nevada, "I have endeavored during the past 3 years to encourage the prospecting for oil and at the same time to set in motion steps that would protect the State."

He recalled he had advocated legislation to accomplish this in 1951 and in 1953 prepared a bill creating a State oil and gas conservation commission which was enacted into law by the legislature. Members of the commission include Russell, State Engineer Hugh Shamberger, and Dr. Vernon Scheid, director of the Mackay School of Mines.

Later, he said he obtained an associate membership for Nevada in the interstate oil compact commission until such time as the State becomes an oil-producing State.

"The find of oil in Nevada means that the search for oil in the Railroad Valley and in other areas of the State will be greatly increased and in time I have no doubt but that other commercial fields will be brought in and will greatly add to the growth and economy of the State," he continued.

"Nevada has in the past and will now increasingly benefit from the leased Federal land for oil prospecting and with a commercial field brought into production will eventually derive revenue directly from such production."

[From the Ely (Nev.) Daily Times of February 18, 1954]

SHELL DRILLERS STRIKE OIL NEAR ELY—DISCOVERY MAY LEAD TO NEVADA'S FIRST COMMERCIAL FIELD

ELY, NEV.—The Shell Oil has announced the discovery of what may be Nevada's first commercial oilfield.

A 6,835-foot well located near Currant, 60 miles south of here, produced 30 barrels of gravity 26 oil during a 4-hour test period.

This would mean a daily production of 180 barrels, which oil experts said would be definitely commercial if additional drilling in the area confirms the presence of a large oil pool.

CONFIRMS DISCOVERY

S. F. Bowlby, vice president of Shell's Pacific coast area, confirmed reports of the discovery from Salt Lake City, Utah. He said a well known as the Eagle Springs unit No. 1 had recovered approximately 2,300 feet of oil during a 4-hour drill stem test.

He said Shell planned to drill deeper at the well site in order to study other horizons in in the Nye County area.

Oil experts said the test results did not necessarily insure that a commercial oil pool had been discovered, although geologists have long insisted formations in the Nye-White Pine County region in which the discovery was made indicated the possibility of commercial oil deposits.

TEST WELLS

Several other major oil concerns have been drilling test wells in the same general region of north-central Nevada.

The United States land office in Reno has done a booming business during the past 4 years on the strength of the continuing drilling activity, and oil leases have been taken out on several million acres of public land in Eureka, Lander, Elko, Nye, White Pine, and Clark Counties.

A. L. Simpson, manager of the Nevada Land and Survey office in Reno, estimated 5 million acres has been placed under lease.

OFFICE SWAMPED

A line of waiting applicants for oil leases stretched out the door of Simpson's office and far down the hall when he came to work this morning.

"It's been this way ever since last Friday when rumors of the discovery first began to seep out," he said. "I really hated to come to work this morning, now that the news is out."

Bowlby said the oil discovery was made at a depth of between 6,453 and 6,535 feet but he declined to identify the producing formation.

The Eagle Springs unit No. 1 well was begun January 12 of this year and at last report was down to 6,583 feet. It was originally planned as a 6,000-foot well.

EXACT LOCATION

Exact location of the well is as follows: 1,200 feet from the south line and 2,900 feet from the west line, northeast corner, 35.9 north, 57 east, Mount Diablo meridian.

Averille H. Munger, editor of the Daily Munger Oil-O-Gram, said in Reno that this very definitely indicates an oil discovery.

He cautioned however that the extent of the find would have to be determined by deepening of the well and by additional drilling of wells in the same general area.

STANDARD TESTS

The Standard Oil Co. has drilled three wells in the White Pine County area without announcing the results. The Gulf Oil Co. drilled one well in the same region but abandoned the project and is now drilling three wells in the Wells-Metropolis area of Elko County.

Another oil-drilling project is under way in the Goodsprings area near Las Vegas. In addition, there are several wildcat drilling operations under way in north-central and northeastern Nevada.

There have been unconfirmed reports that interesting findings have been made by drillers working in the Metropolis-Wells area, but officials in charge have made no formal statements.

[From the Nevada State Journal, Reno, Nev., of February 19, 1954]

"OIL" IS MAGIC WORD AROUND NEVADA TODAY—EXCITEMENT RUNS HIGH FOLLOWING STRIKE IN NYE COUNTY

(By Robert Bennyhoff)

One magic word was on every tongue in Nevada yesterday: oil.

Announcement by the Shell Oil Co. that oil in commercial quantities had been discovered in Railroad Valley 60 miles southwest of Ely in eastern Nevada was the topic of the day.

It was even the topic of conversation around the roulette wheels and dice tables which have proved to be Nevada's modern bonanza.

Shell announced 40 barrels of 26 gravity oil—meaning oil of medium or fairly good quality—had been produced during a 4-hour test period from the 6,583-foot well.

Shell struck oil in its first drilling venture in the State. At least a half dozen other wells have been drilled in the same general area by other firms within the past 18 months without success.

S. F. Bowlby, Shell vice president for the Pacific area, told Gov. Charles Russell by telephone he was "very optimistic about the prospects for further development."

Bowlby indicated the existing well would be deepened for further exploration and other wells would be drilled in the area to determine the extent of the oil pool.

GOVERNOR CONFIDENT

Governor Russell hailed the discovery as wonderful news for Nevada, whose past bonanzas have been silver and yellow gold—not black gold.

"I have no doubt but that other commercial fields will be brought in and will greatly add to the growth and economy of the State." Governor Russell said.

Joseph Lintz, secretary of the newly organized State oil and gas conservation commission, declared "I feel very, very optimistic * * * I feel the oil strike will prove to be commercial."

FAR FROM REFINERY

Lintz cautioned however that although drilling is fairly inexpensive in the Railroad Valley area, the big problem would be transportation. The nearest refinery is in Salt Lake City, nearly 200 miles to the northeast. The nearest railhead is at Ely, 60 miles away.

Manager A. L. Simpson of the United States Land Office in Reno reported his agency has been swamped with applicants seeking oil and gas leases for the past 4 days since rumors of the discovery first began to seep out.

Yesterday, after the news became official, his office was swamped with hundreds of applicants.

"We've been very, very busy," Simpson said. He reported most applicants were seeking the maximum lease the law allows, 2,560 acres. This costs $1,280 for 1 year plus a $10 filing fee.

Simpson estimated between 5 million and 6 million acres of public land in the State have been taken under oil and gas lease during the past 4 years. He added he believed very little unleased land was left in the region of Shell's oil strike but he added applicants were seeking land available anywhere in the upper half of the State.

Oil exploration first began in Nevada in 1908 but extensive drilling activity centered mainly in northern and northeastern Nevada has been underway by numerous major oil firms for the past 24 months.

At least a half dozen wells are being drilled in this region at the present time.

All Nevadans were hopeful the oil strike would mean discoveries far exceeding in value the billions taken from the now-closed mines of Virginia City, Tonopah, Goldfield, and the State's other historic mining camps.

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette of February 19, 1954]

VETERAN NEVADA PROSPECTORS WOO NEW QUEEN—EXCITEMENT SPREADS AS WORD OF OIL DISCOVERY REVEALED

(By Bryn Armstrong)

Veteran Nevada prospectors, formerly enamored of silver and gold, wooed a new queen today.

The magic word is "oil."

An excitement somewhat akin to that which must have followed the discovery of Virginia City, Tonopah, Goldfield, and the many other camps swept the State.

Shell Oil Co. started it by announcing oil had been found in Railroad Valley, in Nye County, about 60 miles southwest of Ely.

HOLIDAY MOOD

In Ely, the townspeople were in a holiday mood. They swamped the White Pine recorder's office to determine if any land parcels were lying around loose in the western county region. Representatives of major oil companies poured into Ely as word of the discovery had repercussions in the financial centers of Los Angeles, Salt Lake City, and San Francisco.

Men who should know, the geologists and geophysicists of the State, were predicting that if the preliminary signs are right, "there will be standing room only in Ely, Las Vegas, and Reno."

The Shell discovery, in its Eagle Springs well No. 1, hit what may be the jackpot on

its first try in Nevada. This contrasted sharply with the bad luck of other companies which have been prodding the State's massive formations for almost 50 years.

STARTS IN 1904

The search for oil started in Nevada around 1904, in a sporadic sort of way, when some holes were pushed into the Truckee formation west of Reno.

Around 1908 there again was a flurry of activity. This time the search centered around the East Walker River.

Then in the early 1920's, there was further activity around Fallon, Fish Lake Valley, and at Ibapah, east of Ely.

More recently, starting in about 1948, major companies have looked to Nevada for a source of petroleum and at least 8 wells, ranging in depth from 5,000 to more than 11,000 feet have been drilled.

This activity has been centered largely along the eastern reaches of the State, primarily in the area north of the recent Shell find.

Geophysical and leasing work reached a peak in 1952 when 81 crew-weeks of seismograph and gravity meter activity was recorded in the State by major companies. Companies which have held or hold leases in Nevada include Gulf, Shell, Standard of California, Carter Oil Co., Phillips Petroleum, and the Texas Co. In addition many independents have been active in the State.

SEARCH IN CLARK

There is current activity in Clark County by the Intermountain Associates on the Arden dome, and in the Jean area Big Basin Oil Co. also has a hole in the Sloan area.

In Elko County, Gulf has two wells, one in the Bishop's Creek region and another in the Thousand Spring Creek area north of Cobre. Inland Oil Co. has another test under way near Halleck.

Gulf also has a test hole in White Pine County in the Antelope-Ibapah area and there has been activity in recent months in Lander and Eureka.

Amidst all the excitement, there were calm voices to be heard, however.

CAUTIOUS WATCH

Reno business leaders adopted a cautious attitude.

"If it's true, it will be a great thing for the State," was oft-heard qualifying remark.

A veteran Nevada geologist, Dr. Vincent Gianella, who has retired from the University of Nevada faculty, cautioned that even if the Shell discovery proves to have commercial value, it may be some time before production can be started.

The transportation problem is, in itself, enormous, he explained.

Currant lies in the northeast corner of Nye County, miles from the nearest railroad, and the presence of a large pool of oil would have to be established before expensive transportation means, such as a pipeline, would be economically feasible, he said.

From other quarters, there also was the reminder that news of the discovery, and Nevada's warm climate, would attract the sharpshooters and promoters interested in capitalizing on the excitement, to the detriment of the gullible.

An optimistic note sounded from official circles, however. After conversing with Shell Company officials, Gov. Charles H. Russell today mentioned the "discovery of a commercial oil field in Nye County."

PLEASED IN CLARK

Las Vegas businessmen expressed pleasure today over news that oil had been discovered in commercial quantities in Nevada but generally could not forecast an immediate boom in either Las Vegas or Reno, contending that most of the action would be centered in the vicinity of Ely and Tonopah.

General benefit for the State's economy was the first interest of those interviewed.

C. E. Sutherland, banker and former resident of Tonopah, said he didn't look for much action in either Las Vegas or Reno directly attributable to the strike but was optimistic over the prospect of commercial oil production in the State. He said that since the story broke here this morning, he had several potential investors discuss the possibility of acquiring options on lands in the Nye county area.

R. J. (Dick) Ronzone, department store owner and former president of the chamber of commerce, said he "definitely" was optimistic over the prospects of a new major industry in the State. Ronzone, born in Manhattan, to the west of the strike, contended it would be good for the entire State and that he was particularly happy it would benefit his native Nye County to a greater extent than any other taxing unit.

Frank F. Garside, former Las Vegas postmaster and who witnessed several major gold and silver strikes while residing in Tonopah, said he had long been looking toward the development of oil in the State and felt that the Nye report was the real thing.

"I have invested in most of the gold and silver strikes and I know there are a lot more like me who will look over this discovery with a great deal of interest," he said.

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, during the course of the hearing on Hawaiian statehood there was some implication that the urgency of action on the Hawaiian statehood bill resulted from the fact that the Republican Party was desirous of getting two additional Senators. This was rather emphatically and vigorously denied by Members on the other side of the aisle. However, Mr. President, in Honolulu, on February 8, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] spoke to a Lincoln Day group there, stating that he predicted another star would be added to the American flag, and that there would be two additional Senators before the present session adjourns. He went on to say:

It will be up to you (the people of Hawaii) to make the two Senators Republican. Heaven knows we need them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an item from the Honolulu Advertiser of February 8, 1954, with reference to the remarks of the Senator from Utah.

There being no objection, the news item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENNETT IN HILO—SEES STATEHOOD THIS SEASON

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, Saturday night said that the die has been cast on statehood and predicted another star to be added to the American flag and two Senators to Congress before the present session adjourns.

Senator BENNETT spoke Saturday night at the $100-a-plate Lincoln Day Republican fund-raising dinner at the Hilo Hotel before 120 guests.

Senator BENNETT'S statement obviously eliminated Alaska from contention in the statehood issue when he added, "and it will be up to you (the people of Hawaii) to make the two Senators Republican. Heaven knows we need them."

The Senator lauded Hawaii frequently as, "these happy islands," and called the Territory "a bastion of liberty" and "a showcase of equality."

He said one of the strongest arguments in favor of statehood for Hawaii is the United States stamp of approval on a people whose main roots are in Asia. "Statehood will rebuff those who claim the United States will not accept Asians in full fellowship," he added.

Senator BENNETT compared Hawaii's fighting men in the Korean war with those who fought at Gettysburg as "giving their last full measure of devotion." He said the fact Hawaii sustained 3½ times the number of casualties in the conflict than the mainland is proof of the islands' devotion to American ideals.

The Utah Senator brought with him a motion picture to show Republicans in which President Eisenhower spoke to all Republicans.

BENNETT was introduced at the dinner by GOP Territorial committee Chairman Sam P. King. Glenn Mitchel, chairman of the Big Island County Commission, was master of ceremonies. Others at the head table included William Quinn, chairman of the Oahu $100-a-plate dinner; Gavien Bush, former county committee chairman; Mrs. Leighton Hind, Senator William H. Hill; Bina Mossman, GOP national committeewoman; County Chairman James Kealoha, and Gregg Hall, Hilo high-school senior, who recited the Gettysburg address.

The invocation was made in Hawaiian by the Reverend Ernest K. Richardson. Ray Kinney featured in the evening's entertainment.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

APPLICATION OF ANTITRUST LAWS TO CERTAIN PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL CLUBS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to make the antitrust laws applicable to professional baseball clubs affiliated with the alcoholic beverage industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) to make the antitrust laws applicable to professional baseball clubs affiliated with the alcoholic beverage industry, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, to me and millions of other Americans there is no business like baseball business. Due to the skill, strategy and surprise element always present, it is America's great national game. It belongs to the people and it symbolizes everything that is clean and wholesome. It has become a part of our national character and culture. The Supreme Court of the United States last November reaffirmed baseball's long established

dispensation from the antitrust laws of the Nation. There it will likely remain so long as it preserves all of its traditional aspects of physical prowess, competitive excellence, recreational enjoyment, and good conduct. Now the only problem is to keep it worthy of national respect and confidence. Professional baseball has created the all powerful office of commissioner whose primary duty it is, acting in the public interest, to keep it true to these high concepts.

Baseball did not evolve to this lofty station by accident. It reached it due to the absolute necessity for a beloved national athletic sport to become an American institution. Men foresaw the void which it would fill and the influence which it would exert on the development of the youth of the coming generations. As a result the Little League will field 3,000 clubs, the American Legion League 16,000 clubs, and the Nation's sandlots and high schools and colleges thousands and thousands of baseball clubs throughout the Nation this spring and summer. The members of the Supreme Court, the President's Cabinet, both Houses of Congress, and hundreds of Government officials, lay aside their great tasks and responsibilities each spring and go to Griffith Stadium to watch the President of the United States throw out the first baseball of the season. This is a traditional ceremony of long standing, colorful and meaningful. Only the exalted deserve such a tribute.

I noticed in the press last Sunday a pathetic story about two little children, Michael Rosenberg, aged 11, and his brother Robert, aged 6, who were being exploited to raise money for the Communist cause in the State of New York.

New York State Supreme Court Justice James B. M. McNally held a hearing to consider what to do with these children. Their grandmother, who was innocent of any crime, and who, from all appearances, is a very fine person and a good woman, had sought custody of the children. Judge McNally interviewed her, and this is the conversation which took place, as recorded by the Associated Press and as published in the Washington Sunday Star of February 21, 1954:

Justice McNally asked the grandmother if she ever would teach them to "hate this country."

"No, no, no," she said emphatically. She said she would teach them to love the United States.

"Never let anyone talk to them in derogation about this country," said Justice McNally.

Mrs. Rosenberg said she lived alone in a steam-heated 4-room apartment in New York and that she was able to take care of the children. She said she had retained a homemaker to help.

The children listened intently during the proceedings.

When Justice McNally announced his decision, Michael walked up, shook hands with him, and said:

"God bless you, Judge."

Then they talked for a while about baseball.

Mr. President, "Then they talked for a while about baseball." Does not that prove what I have just been saying, that baseball is the great national game, when little boys and a great judge talk across a table to one another in a language which both of them understand, and which means so much?

Today baseball, with all of its magnificent background and tradition, is threatened. Its basic structure, which is the major and minor leagues, is being undermined. Its purposes and objectives are being twisted, prostituted, and exploited by unscrupulous and unworthy interests.

In an all-out effort to stem this base and degrading tide before it engulfs all baseball, I am introducing a Senate joint resolution which, when enacted, might awaken the Commissioner to his responsibilities and cause him to restore the good reputation and good standing of professional baseball in America. Specifically, this resolution would make professional baseball clubs when affiliated in part or in whole with the alcoholic beverage industry subject to the Nation's antitrust laws. It will apply to the Nation generally.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my joint resolution be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas baseball is America's national game, and has exemplified through the years the finest traditions of the combination of vigorous competition, athletic skill, and keen strategy; and

Whereas baseball belongs to all the people of the United States, particularly the young people to whom it offers inspiration, teaches good sportsmanship, and boasts an outstanding record of honesty and integrity; and

Whereas the recent Supreme Court decision in the baseball case decided in November 1953 placed baseball in a unique position with respect to the antitrust laws; and

Whereas certain members of the alcoholic beverage industry have acquired and are acquiring ownership or control of professional baseball clubs competing in organized baseball; and

Whereas it appears that they are using professional baseball clubs as affiliates or subsidiaries to their main business of brewing and selling beer; and

Whereas this unholy alliance enguifing our great game of baseball is having an unhealthy influence upon the youngsters of America who follow baseball with the closest interest and who emulate its heroes with youthful enthusiasm; and

Whereas the possession by firms engaged in the alcoholic beverage industry of equities in professional baseball clubs results in the exploitation of baseball exhibitions as sales vehicles for the promotion of the monopolization of the brewing business; and

Whereas in the period from 1937 to 1953 the number of companies engaged in the brewing of beer declined from 700 to 300, although the national consumption of beer doubled, and the number of breweries continues to decline; and

Whereas only 25 brewing companies now account for the major portion of all beer sales in the United States, and are progressively gaining a strangle hold on the industry; and

Whereas the concentration of the beer business in the hands of a few large breweries and the destruction of the small local breweries are accelerated by the operation of professional baseball franchises as an adjunct of such monopolies; and

Whereas professional baseball itself becomes a business instrumentality when it is employed as an adjunct to or as an affiliate of a business such as the alcoholic beverage business, for the purpose of expanding that business, promoting its sales, or increasing its profits; and

Whereas Ford Frick, commissioner of baseball, whose function it is to protect the great public interest in professional baseball, recently stated, "I believe that all men in baseball, players and operators alike, must give more thought to their public responsibility and less to their selfish interest"; and

Whereas Commissioner Ford Frick, when speaking of the Supreme Court decision of November 9, 1953, said the decision "does not mean that baseball is granted a license to do as it pleases"; and

Whereas George Trautman, president of the National Association of Professional Baseball Clubs, stated that everyone in baseball has the responsibility to guard the game, its spirit, its mighty contribution to succeeding generations of our youngsters as clean recreation, as a teacher of fair play, and as an example of fair, yet earnest competition; and

Whereas the public interest demands that baseball, because of its unique role in the American way of life, be fully protected from any exploitation for selfish business purposes; and

Whereas the Supreme Court on November 9, 1953, in *Toolson* v. *Yankees* held that if there are evils in this field [professional baseball] which now warrant application to it of the antitrust laws it should be by legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That any professional baseball club engaged in competition in organized baseball which is owned directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by any individual or organization engaged in the production or sale of any public alcoholic beverage is hereby declared to be subject to the antitrust laws, as such laws are defined by section 1 of the Clayton Act (15 U. S. C. 12).

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, so that there may be no misunderstanding, while this resolution will apply to the country generally, it is aimed specifically at the beer-baseball combination in St. Louis, where Mr. August A. Busch, president, member of the executive council, and director of Anheuser Busch, Inc., has been permitted to gain control of the St. Louis Cardinal Baseball Club. He is using the St. Louis Cardinals to promote the monopoly of Anheuser-Busch over his competitors in the brewing industry, and at the same time he is ruthlessly and deliberately annihilating minor-league baseball in a large area of the Midwest. But in this crusade he does not give away beer. He gives away baseball and he takes a nice fat tax deduction in doing it. With Uncle Sam picking up the tab, it is nice going for a beer peddler.

The St. Louis Cardinals through the years have been one of the strongest piliars of organized baseball. The contribution of the St. Louis Cardinals to American professional baseball has placed it, and the good city of St. Louis, high on the pedestal of the sporting world. Through exemplary sportsmanship, determined spirit, and baseball skill, the Cardinals developed and welded together and fielded year after year the most competitive club in baseball. Who will ever forget the fighting spirit and never-say-die crusade of the beloved Gas House Gang?

This universal acclaim, prestige, and respect for a great city and a great ball

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

club has suffered a devastating blow under the last two Cardinal owners because with both of them baseball apparently did not come first. The first of these two is gone; the second remains with us still.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. As I understand the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Colorado, it is directed at ownership; it is not directed at any beer concern which might procure the advertising rights of the Washington Senators or some other baseball team?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator is correct. My joint resolution is aimed at a situation in which a beer concern purchases a baseball club and then practices monopoly with monopoly free baseball. That is what it is aimed at.

Mr. SMATHERS. Then, the purpose of the Senator's joint resolution would not apply, for example, to a beer concern in Baltimore or Washington, or in some surrounding area, which desired, as an advertising medium, to televise baseball games of the Washington Senators?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. The resolution would not in any way affect or concern such an operation; it would apply only where there is ownership in part or in whole by the alcoholic beverage industry. The resolution merely provides that if there is an ownership of a baseball club in part or in whole by the alcoholic beverage industry, such baseball club shall not be immune from the antitrust laws. The Senator is correct in his understanding.

The initial move of the St. Louis Cardinal beer-baron owner was to endeavor, without shame, to change the name of Sportsman Park to Budweiser Stadium. Judge Landis must have turned over in his grave when this proposal was made. Fortunately, according to the New York Times, an outraged public and an alert Ford Frick vetoed the idea.

But this was merely a temporary rebuff to the resourceful and hell-bent-for-minor league destruction Mr. Busch. This spring he is launching a wholesale invasion of minor league baseball territory in the Midwest. With total disregard for the welfare of these local clubs or the local breweries which serve their communities, Mr. Busch is broadcasting Cardinal ball games and Budweiser beer on an Anheuser-Busch network of 120 stations.

In civic, philanthropic, and social circles in St. Louis, Mr. Busch is favorably known and highly regarded; but to baseball he is a source of embarrassment, anguish, and frustration. Obviously, baseball to him is merely an opportunity to sell more beer, and is not important as a sport. A true sportsman never deviates from the unwritten law of "live and let live." A dyed-in-the-wool baseball devotee would not move into the field of minor league clubs and slaughter them like "sitting ducks on a pond" merely to sell a few more bottles of beer. Good sports do not build on the ashes of others. Baseball to August A. Busch is a cold-blooded, beer-peddling business, and not the great American game which good sportsmen revere. The Congress should treat his baseball enterprise in that light and deny him immunity from the antitrust laws. That is precisely what my Senate joint resolution would do.

The true meaning of my contention, when reduced to cases, is dramatically illustrated in the letter written to me by Mr. Harold Totten, president of the Three-I League. The Three-I League have provided excellent baseball entertainment for cities in Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa for more than half a century. Now Mr. Busch brutally and without conscience is destroying it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, a copy of the letter, dated February 10, 1954, written to me by Mr. Harold Totten.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, *February 10, 1954.*

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: With the minor leagues' radio and TV problem still so very much in the air, and in view of the story in this morning's newspapers, out of New Orleans, about the protest to the Cardinals regarding their 1954 broadcasting program in our cities, I am going to set down here, for your information and for whatever use you can put it to, the situation as it stacks up in the Three-I League for the coming season. I believe it provides some striking new fuel for our cause.

The outlawing of the old rule 1(d) on a basis of monopoly is held before us at every turn. Yet the Cardinals, as a result of their broadening of their broadcasting network, actually have so monopolized the broadcasting facilities in Three-I League cities that at least four of our clubs probably will be unable to air their own games. That, most certainly, is monopoly.

What concerns me is that the committee in New Orleans, according to the announcement quoted in the newspapers, didn't refer to this new and vicious development at all, but merely repeated the old complaints that have been voiced ever since rule 1 (d) was abolished—complaints that have brought no appreciable relief so far, in all these years.

At the present writing, Cardinal games will be broadcast in 6 of our 8 cities in direct competition with our own games. One station manager had the courage to hold out and will do the Cardinal games only when the local club isn't playing at home or on the road. Waterloo is out of Cardinal territory.

But this isn't new. It's been going on for years, and even though we know it hurts us, so far there's been nothing we could do about it.

However, something new has been added. In Burlington, which has only one radio station, the Cardinals have taken it over for their games. This station carried the Burlington home and road games last year. This year it will be unable to broadcast its games because its only radio outlet has been taken from it.

In Quincy, where both an AM and an FM station have been available in the past for the local club, the Cardinals have bought both stations, and now Quincy is without broadcasting facilities in its own city.

In Terre Haute, which had one FM station available previously, the Cardinals have taken this and Terre Haute cannot broadcast its games.

In Peoria, which this year is a Cardinal affiliate, the Cardinals themselves have bought, for $26,000, the station which carried the Peoria games last year. There is one smaller and less desirable station that may be able to carry the games there, but so far the club has made no progress at reaching an agreement.

That means that four of our clubs—three of them certainly—will be deprived of their radio outlets through this Cardinal monopoly of facilities in our cities.

In Evansville the Cardinals offered the station $26,000 for the rights, but the manager reluctantly but gamely turned it down. Their long-time baseball sponsor is a local beer which also carries other features on the station, and the manager thought it wise to preserve that good will.

The manager of the only station at Keokuk, knowing the interest of local people in the local team (this town of 16,000 people drew 76,000 paid last year), refused the Cardinals' lucrative offer for exclusive rights and readily obtained an agreement by which he carries Cardinal games when the local club is not playing. Which shows that something can be done if the right person will have the courage to stand on reason.

It's easy to find fault. But to do that we should have a remedy to suggest. We in the Three I League feel that we have that. The Cardinal network is maintained to sell Budweiser beer and further Cardinal attendance. This they must do by creating and maintaining friendly good will. Already there are complaints. A couple of ministers have been quoted to me as saying that the Cardinals are "taking our baseball away from our kids and feeding them beer."

How much simpler and more effective it would have been if the Cardinals—and Budweiser—had gone to each Three I city; agreed to pay each club a decent fee for radio rights; bought the broadcast of the local home and road games on the local station for a decent fee, too; and then had the arrangement to broadcast Cardinal games before and after our season and whenever the local team was not playing. Mutual promotional announcements for the local club, and for the Cardinals and Budweiser, would have reacted to the benefit of all. And in many cases the fee for radio rights could prove the difference between black and red ink for the local club. And how it would create good will for Budweiser and the Cardinals. How shortsighted can some people be?

That's about it, Senator. We, as a league, sent protest wires to Mr. Busch, Mr. Meyers, George Trautman, and Commissioner Frick at the time of the New York meeting. We have received no reaction as yet. I pass this along to you, as I said, for your information, and for your use if it can do any good for the cause. Meantime, if there is anything at all that I personally, or the league as a unit, can do to help in solving this problem, please do not hesitate to send out a call. I'll come a-runnin' to do anything I can.

My sincere best wishes.

Very sincerely,

HAL TOTTEN,
President, the Three I League.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter written to Mr. Busch by Mr. Robert Howsam, president of the Denver Baseball Club of the Western Baseball League, dated February 1, 1954, and a letter written to Mr. Busch by Mr. W. C. MacPhail, general manager of the Colorado Springs Baseball Club, in the same league, dated February 12, 1954, which letters protest the high-handed Anheuser-Busch policy of annihilation, and present unanswerable arguments against Mr. Busch's policies in the Western League.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DENVER BEARS,
Denver, Colo., February 1, 1954.

Hon. AUGUST A. BUSCH, Jr.,
President, St. Louis Cardinals,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. BUSCH: The clubs in the Western League are dismayed and upset over the press announcement that the Anheuser-Busch Corp. plans to broadcast Cardinal games in Omaha and in the other unfortunate minor league cities which are Cardinal affiliates. When your Mr. Walsingham made the shocking announcement of this new and very obnoxious policy, he added insult to injury in saying:

"I believe the Cardinals are serving all baseball in making this test" and if the experiment "is adverse it will hurt only the Cardinals."

Baseball is not a solo game. No club can put on an exhibition of baseball all by itself. It must have an opposing club. In fact it cannot have a season of scheduled baseball without league supervision, league competition and a league pennant race. Accordingly, you cannot hurt the Omaha Cardinals without at the same time injuring seven other baseball clubs and the league to which all of them belong.

The slogan of the Western League ever has been "One for all, and all for one." Whenever one of our clubs has been in trouble the other clubs have rallied to its cause. We split our gate 40–60 too, which is very helpful to clubs not drawing well for one reason or another.

Under your plan Omaha will be a "free loader" all around the circuit, but when the visiting clubs play in Omaha they won't make expenses. And Walsingham has the effrontery to call that kind of reciprocity "serving all baseball."

Traditionally, Omaha has been known far and wide as a great sports town, and especially a fine baseball town. It has one of the finest public-built baseball parks in the country. When you personally took over the helm at St. Louis, the Western League had high hopes for better things. What better public relations could Anheuser-Busch have than the revival of baseball in Omaha and the gratitude of the whole Western League area? Instead, you plan to exploit Omaha with St. Louis baseball without any regard for the Western League. Evidently you think Omaha has no civic pride and is merely a fine market place for the Anheuser-Busch product. The Western League territory cannot do other than resent your arrogant and selfish policy of destruction.

Omaha is a grand opportunity for Anheuser-Busch to prove to the skeptical enthusiastic fans of this country that your primary objective is to promote baseball. Please abandon your policy of killing the goose that lays the golden egg, and demonstrate that the sale of beer is secondary, and that Anheuser-Busch is worthy of the confidence and the support of the sporting fans of these United States.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. HOWSAM,
President, the Denver Bears.

FEBRUARY 12, 1954.

Mr. AUGUST A. BUSCH, Jr.,
President, St. Louis Cardinals,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. BUSCH: The Colorado Springs baseball club, a member of the Western League, expresses to you at this time our deep regret that you have seen fit to pursue the announced broadcast policy in Omaha.

It appears that the minor leagues are grasping for the rope of survival already, without this increased burden which you have placed on three of the higher classification leagues. Your policy can accomplish no good, other than possible increased sales of Budweiser beer and the creation of interest in the St. Louis Cardinals in the Omaha area. To me, it cannot appear anything but selfish, and I sincerely feel that it is a severe blow to your own public relations in the various affected league cities. Our club is a community operated club, and there are many stockholders and supporters of our club who naturally are antagonistic toward your product as a result of this announced policy. I cannot fathom that you have not considered this point.

As you may know, our gate split in the Western League gives 40 percent to the visiting club. Our cut in Omaha, as the opposing club of the Cardinals, is bound to be less, and it is obvious that the Omaha Club will not be greeted in the other cities with any particular promotional attractions. And further, you are striking a severe blow to the harmony and solidity of the Western League.

We most humbly beseech you to reconsider this action, and realize that in doing so the St. Louis Cardinals and the Anheuser-Busch products would gain the respect and support of so many in the sporting world.

Sincerely yours,

W. C. MACPHAIL,
General Manager.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, a copy of a letter which I wrote to Mr. Busch, dated February 9, 1954, to which I have not had a reply or even the courtesy of an acknowledgement.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 9, 1954.

Hon. AUGUST A. BUSCH, Jr.,
Cardinal Baseball Club,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. BUSCH: Why are you picking on the Western League? First it is Omaha, and now it is Wichita. Last year the Wichita Club received $6,000 from the radio station broadcasting their games in Wichita. This year the contract was canceled because the St. Louis Cardinals had arranged for that time to broadcast St. Louis Cardinal games.

Six thousand dollars may seem like peanuts to some, but it is the difference between local baseball or no local baseball in Wichita.

I cannot believe that your objective is to kill the Western League, but whether it is or not that is exactly what you are doing. Your Omaha broadcasts will be heard in Lincoln and Sioux City and will affect them seriously, and now Wichita goes down the drain. Because of the St. Louis invasion of the Western League, it is my considered judgment that the Western League may not operate in 1955. The consternation due to your policies is great and the situation is grave.

I plead with you, therefore, to cancel your broadcast plans in the Western League cities of Omaha and Wichita. We are begging you to not destroy the best class A league in the Nation.

Most sincerely,

ED. C. JOHNSON,
President and Treasurer, Western Baseball League.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it should be pointed out that there is a fast-growing monopolistic situation developing in America to concentrate in the hands of a few concerns the bulk of the brewing business. Baseball, radio, and television are innocent parties to that unhappy situation. In 1937 there were 720 breweries in the United States; in 1953 there were 312 with the number rapidly declining while the consumption of beer in this same period almost doubled. At the present rate of demise, 14 giant breweries will replace very shortly the 720 local breweries of 1937. To think there is no dangerous cannibalistic monopoly in this field is utterly fantastic and yet we give the beer-operated baseball franchises immunity from the antitrust laws.

To illustrate the plight of the small brewer who is being driven out of the brewing business by the giants, I am inserting two letters: one from the Hampden Brewing Co., Willimansett, Mass.; the other is from the Hull Brewing Co. of New Haven, Conn. These letters speak eloquently for themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the letters to which I have just referred, and a per curiam decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the celebrated baseball case; and also a St. Louis Associated Press story, dated February 20, 1954, which has just come to my attention.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAMPDEN BREWING CO.,
Willimansett, Mass., April 1, 1953.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: May I take this opportunity to convey my congratulations to you upon your recent speech denouncing certain breweries in their plot to capture baseball franchises and force their domination over America's small breweries by the tremendous advertising associated with baseball itself. I am in complete accord with your statement that there is a terrific death struggle going on in this country today between the large and small breweries. For more concrete proof of this tragedy, I shall attempt to familiarize you with conditions here in Massachusetts.

The casualty list of Massachusetts is appalling, as latest records show that five breweries have become extinct in less than a decade. The future of the remaining eight is quite dubious and it is my firm conviction that excessive taxes, both Federal and State, are directly responsible for this situation. The liquidation of these breweries has affected the stability of three groups; namely, Uncle Sam, Massachusetts (through the loss of taxes), and the security of the personnel employed by the defunct breweries. Senator, is this a healthy situation to have existing in any State?

On a national scale, the situation is extremely grave. Prior to 1920, there were 1,800 breweries operating in the United States against approximately 300 at present. The startling fact of the matter is that of the 300 operating breweries, the bulk of the business is controlled by 25 giant breweries. Another important fact—of the 300 breweries now functioning, less than 100 plants are realizing adequate profits to remain solvent. It is obvious that this situation cannot continue indefinitely and, in my belief, the only channel of salvation available for these "crippled" breweries is to seek Federal and State aid in the way of a fair and equitable tax schedule.

In an effort to save the brewing industry in Massachusetts, the Hampden Brewing Co. recommended a measure to our State legislature which, in effect, would propose

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

a change in the basic method of the taxation of malt beverages. The present method of taxing malt beverages on a gallonage basis, irrespective of sales value, is "unit" taxation. In other words, it makes no difference whether you pay $2 or $5 a case, the tax you pay is the same. Our bill, hereinafter known as House bill 1257, proposes a "percentage" tax. The rate of tax to apply on the wholesalers' and brewers' prices to retailers, as posted with the Massachusetts Alcoholic Beverages Control Commission. We believe that House bill 1257 has many advantages, including:

1. Corrects a tax injustice to the people of limited means.

2. Does not reduce the State's income from the taxation of malt beverages because the percentage rate, if based correspondingly to the present tax of $2 per barrel, would give added revenue on brands selling at a premium price. Sales figures show that the consumer in Massachusetts, as well as throughout the United States, purchases more beer at a premium price.

3. Is of definite help to the Massachusetts brewing industry.

The "unit" base soaks the poor purse and favors the rich. The proposed percentage rate will not reduce the State's tax yield and, if anything, would show a moderate increase which might protect Massachusetts' return in case of decreased consumption. From a "home industry" standpoint, the percentage tax helps the Massachusetts brewing industry because local beers sell at lower prices.

In closing Senator, may I further state that House bill 1257 benefits the consumer, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the industry. We respectfully solicit your opinion, and wish you continued success in your endeavors to save the family of America's small breweries of which we are a member.

Respectfully yours,

KARL H. BISSELL,
President, Hampden Brewing Co.

THE HULL BREWING CO.,
New Haven, Conn., April 10, 1953.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: The Hull Brewing Co. wishes to thank you sincerely for your speech before the Senate in which you pointed out the serious situation confronting the small brewer. We are painfully aware that the large breweries are rapidly squeezing us out of existence. We are in full accord with your remarks that the gigantic breweries are buying into baseball due to baseball's tremendous advertising value to beer. These advertising weapons in the hands of big breweries load the dice against the small brewer. At present, 14 giant breweries sell over 50 percent of the beer consumed in the United States.

If I may indulge on your time, I would like to recite what has happened in Connecticut since repeal. In 1934, we had 14 operating breweries in Connecticut. For the past 5 years, only 2 of us have been operating, a mortality of 12 in 19 years.

During the Second World War, the Hull Brewing Co. supplied beer in Connecticut to the many defense war workers. The out-of-State breweries withdrew completely from Connecticut or just delivered token orders.

In 1952, there were 1,383,515 barrels of beer sold in Connecticut. The Hull Brewing Co. sold 89,000 barrels of this or 6½ percent of the total. This situation is definitely brought about through mass advertising and monopolistic controls.

The Hull Brewing Co., established in 1872, has conducted a successful business for over 80 years. Now however, we have nearly reached the end of our rope. We would appreciate any help or suggestions you might be kind enough to offer us.

In closing, may we again thank you for the interest you have shown to the small-business man and particularly to the small brewer.

Sincerely yours,

THE HULL BREWING CO.,
GEORGE J. JACOB, *Secretary.*

NOVEMBER 9, 1953.

Per Curiam:

In *Federal Baseball Club of Baltimore* v. *National League of Professional Baseball Clubs* (259 U. S. 200 (1922)) this Court held that the business of providing public baseball games for profit between clubs of professional baseball players was not within the scope of the Federal antitrust laws. Congress has had the ruling under consideration but has not seen fit to bring such business under these laws by legislation having prospective effect. The business has thus been left for 30 years to develop, on the understanding that it was not subject to existing antitrust legislation. The present cases ask us to overrule the prior decision and, with retrospective effect, hold the legislation applicable. We think that if there are evils in this field which now warrant application to it of the antitrust laws it should be by legislation. Without reexamination of the underlying issues, the judgments below are affirmed on the authority of *Federal Baseball Club of Baltimore* v. *National League of Professional Baseball Clubs, supra*, so far as that decision determines that Congress had no intention of including the business of baseball within the scope of the Federal antitrust laws.

[From the Washington Post of February 21, 1954]

CARDINALS DROP BROADCAST PLANS TO MINOR-LEAGUE AREA

ST. LOUIS, February 20.—The St. Louis Cardinals today quietly canceled their plan to beam radio broadcasts of their games into minor-league cities.

The radio plan, arranged for the 1954 season, was announced by the club last month as an experiment to determine the effect of major-league broadcasts on minor-league attendance—long a controversy in baseball.

What the Cardinals hoped would help promote minor-league baseball, however, drew a quick blast from George Trautman, commissioner of minor-league baseball.

At the time of the Cardinals' announcement Trautman said: "There can only be room for one professional ball club in a community. If radio or television divide and steal the loyalties and interests, the team that represents the community will certainly suffer."

In reply the Cardinals said they thought they were serving all baseball by making the test.

Today, however, the Cardinals issued a short statement by President August A. Busch, which said previously planned broadcasts of Cardinal games in Omaha; Houston; Columbus, Ohio; Wichita; Indianapolis; Burlington, Iowa; Mount Vernon, Ill.; Paris, Ill.; and Muskogee, Okla., have been canceled.

No comment was made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, we are witnessing in the beer industry the very monopolistic development which the antitrust laws were designed to prevent. Their broad purpose is to end restraints of trade and commerce. These good laws were created when Congress found it necessary to protect the people against the oppression of high and mighty concerns who would control industry and commerce for their own selfish benefit. In a free enterprise system any concerted action by combinations of men or corporations to create a monopoly is an evil, and should not be protected.

While the Supreme Court held, in the recent baseball decision which I will insert, that professional baseball is not within the scope of the Federal antitrust laws, it was quick to point out "that if there are evils in this field"—professional baseball—"which now warrant application to it of the antitrust laws, it should be by legislation." Therefore, when I call attention to an evil which has developed and prepare legislation to correct it, I am following the mandate of the Supreme Court.

It cannot be denied that the major league baseball club in St. Louis is being used as an accessory in a monopolistic squeeze. The great national game is being used there by a very personable and able huckster to sell beer to the detriment of competing local breweries and the destruction of local baseball clubs.

If my contention is valid, then the Congress should accept the mandate of the Supreme Court and enact my House-Senate joint resolution to stop a monopolistic evil when we discover one.

In this evil business at St. Louis some of the clubs of the National League are not without guilt. Under National League rules, before a club can broadcast or telecast its baseball exhibition, it must have the consent of the other participating club. At least four National League clubs have given their consent to spray, without limits of any kind, minor league cities with Cardinal baseball and Budweiser beer. This vicious conspiracy entered into by certain National League clubs to destroy minor league clubs is all the more shocking since some of them have been making sanctimonious utterances against such a policy.

The commissioner of professional baseball says he is powerless to do anything about such things. I do not swallow that nauseating alibi at face value. The commissioner is supposed to move in when policies detrimental to baseball are practiced. I am sure he does not want the Supreme Court and the Congress to believe that neither the law nor baseball itself shall lay a restraining hand on a major league club when it gets out of line. Personally, I do not think the commissioner measured up to his high responsibilities when he permitted the Anheuser-Busch Co. to purchase the St. Louis Cardinals. He did intervene when Mr. Busch attempted to rechristen Sportsman Ball Park—"Budweiser Stadium." Just why he was so finicky about calling this park by its rightful name is beyond me, since he has expressed no righteous indignation about having the beer industry make a cat's-paw out of the St. Louis baseball club.

It should have surprised no one in baseball when Representative CELLER in the present session of Congress introduced H. R. 7949 which would restore professional baseball to the jurisdiction of the antitrust laws. If the major leagues want, in the sight of the law, to continue as a sport, they should live like a sport, and not take advantage of the courts and the Congress to pretend to be

a sport, while practicing the most obnoxious and savage brand of monopoly ever known in these United States. Either they must change their ways or be returned to the jurisdiction of the antitrust laws. The choice is up to the commissioner of baseball right now.

Phil Piton, the very able and popular "big wheel" in the National Association at Columbus, Ohio, who is running its affairs while President George Trautman is on vacation, told me that the association has objected vigorously to the Cardinal operation, but that there was little reason to hope that Mr. Busch would alter his policies. I do not like this defeatist attitude by the National Association. This is a life-or-death struggle, and the minor leagues and their association must recognize it as such and make an all-out effort to correct it.

I do not enjoy being compelled to propose that restraining laws be imposed on professional baseball. I love this sport too much for that. Nevertheless, a great wrong is being inflicted on minor league baseball by the major leagues. They could cure this difficulty if they would; but since they sidestep their responsibilities, their failure to correct these evils cannot be overlooked. Congress, the guardian of the people's rights and welfare, must remain diligent in protecting our economy against every monopolistic tyrant. That makes necessary the enactment of the Senate joint resolution which I have just introduced. Early and favorable action on it might obviate the necessity for enacting the more comprehensive Celler bill, H. R. 7949.

The Associated Press carried a story Sunday with a St. Louis dateline of February 20 which said the Cardinals were dropping their previously planned broadcasts of Cardinal games in Omaha; Houston; Columbus, Ohio; Wichita; Indianapolis; Burlington, Iowa; Mount Vernon, Ill.; Paris, Ill., and Muskogee, Okla. That 11th-hour concession is greatly appreciated. It will be of life-saving assistance to some hard-hit minor league areas during the 1954 season, but the enactment of my Senate joint resolution is vital for the good name of baseball.

NOMINATION OF CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the nomination of our distinguished Chief Justice will be before the full Judiciary Committee this week, and in view of the further fact that last week the nomination was reported favorably by the subcommittee to the full committee, I now send to the desk a communication I addressed on February 17 to the distinguished chairman, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I ask that the latter be inserted at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 17, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, I have joined with you and my other able colleagues of the subcommittee in the several days of consideration of Chief Justice Warren's appointment.

We have heard from various witnesses, none of whom, in my opinion, has presented particularly impressive arguments in opposition to the Chief Justice's confirmation. There has been discussion of the Chief Justice's political and social beliefs and a few of the decisions he made while Governor of California.

I can see just cause for careful study of certain of the charges which have been made.

But there is a limit, Mr. Chairman, to which our subcommittee should challenge the good judgment of the American people. So much of the testimony which we of the subcommittee have heard has been warmed-over personal opinion which in no way reflects upon the judicial wisdom or the integrity of Justice Warren that it may be beginning to create doubts about the new Justice, which, in my judgment, do not actually exist.

I am the first to agree that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court should be above reproach or suspicion. The testimony does nothing to reflect otherwise, and I think it is high time to give Governor Warren the right to wear his robes during good behavior, as provided in the Constitution.

I am forcibly reminded that I favored Chief Justice Arthur T. Vanderbilt of the New Jersey Supreme Court for the vacancy to the United States Supreme Court. This preference was made known publicly to the White House.

But this preference is unimportant, inasmuch as there is nothing in the record to date which seems to me to call for very much further delay on our part. I urge the early approval of this nomination by the subcommittee.

We have heard a good deal of prejudice, distortion, and haphazard legal opinion under the guise of testimony, although I do not accuse the Chief Justice's accusers of bad faith.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman—and I am sure you will agree—that a hearing on the nomination of the Chief Justice should be more than a forum for the disgruntled looking for a new opportunity to try their cases or give vent to personal spleen.

It is my hope that remaining testimony will be pertinent to the question at hand. Now that the subcommittee has requested an FBI report, it is my hope that we will be able to act with all dispatch when the report is received.

Mr. Warren was recently quoted in a newspaper here as saying:

"When men are free to explore all avenues of thought, no matter what prejudices may be aroused, there is a healthy climate in the Nation. Dissenters can let off steam. That is important, too. The greatest figures in American history have always recognized this as inherent in our system. The Founding Fathers themselves were not orthodox either in thought or expression. They recognized both the right and the value of dissent in their generation."

These are the words of an American with a profound understanding of some of the factors which have formed the basis of the American tradition of inquiry and dissent. I believe that in the Chief Justice's case we are carrying this "inquiry and dissent" to an unfortunate extreme.

I fear, Mr. Chairman, that if we delay specific action on this case beyond what, in these circumstances, is a reasonable period, we may well impair the time-honored value of the advice and consent clause of our Constitution. The clause to which I refer is one of the important links in our great system of checks and balances and I dislike mightily to even consider the possibility that the public would develop doubts about it without just cause.

It is my considered judgment that the office of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States is second only in importance to that of the Presidency. It, therefore, behooves us to safeguard both its powers and the person selected to execute those powers with all the care and caution we can marshal within the intent and spirit of the advice and consent clause.

With my very best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], inserting on page 3, after line 9, a new section.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, messages continue to pour into my office from all over the Nation regarding mounting opposition to the Bricker amendment.

For example, I have just heard that the Portland, Oreg., Chamber of Commerce had appointed a special committee to look into the amendment. After a full discussion, the committee, of which 18 members were present, voted 17 to 1 to oppose the Bricker amendment. It recommended that the chamber reverse its previous indorsement of the amendment. This is typical of many situations—when real experts study the amendment, they see that it is loaded with dangerous features which laymen often fail to detect.

As another expression from the opposite corner of the Nation, I send to the desk a telegram which I have received from an expert group—the Queens County (N. Y.) Bar Association—expressing its opposition to the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 16, 1954.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I am pleased to advise you that at a meeting of the members of the Queens County Bar Association last night an overwhelming vote was registered in favor of a resolution opposing the Bricker amendments or any amendments at this time respecting the treatymaking powers contained in the Constitution. The Queens County Bar Association is the largest association of lawyers in the County of Queens, which has a population of 1,800,000 people.

A. JOSEPH GEIST,
Chairman, Committee on American Principles, Queens County Bar Association.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 1 be printed so that it will appear as it has now been amended, and that the amendment in relation to article

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

VI be placed after the present article I, which has been amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of myself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], an amendment which would strike out lines 10 through 15, inclusive. I ask that the amendment lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, let me ask what those lines are.

Mr. FERGUSON. They include section 3, which the Senator from Ohio wishes to have stricken out, and section 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I previously asked unanimous consent to have printed, for the benefit of the Senate, the text of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

I now ask unanimous consent that sections 3 and 4, which are lines 10 to 15, inclusive, be printed in italics, and that a footnote be added on the print indicating that if the amendment which I sent to the desk, offered on behalf of myself and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], were adopted, it would strike out lines 10 to 15, inclusive, being sections 3 and 4. In that way the print will clearly indicate what is intended to be accomplished by the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TREATY POWER

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, for years learned scholars and profound legal thinkers in this body and in the country have been engaged in a truly great debate over the question, How can we prevent use of treaties or executive agreements to make in our Government secret changes which our people would never tolerate if submitted openly?

I shall not attempt to add to the legal learning which already has been brought to bear by those who have spoken on this issue; but there is another aspect of the question which perhaps has not been fully explored. I refer to the political issue.

The Government of the United States was established as a limited government with specific powers, operating under law. It remained so for nearly 150 years. In the last 20 or 30 years we have watched the growing threat of absolute government, using legal forms, but in all important respects operating above the law.

Of all the means used to change our Government under legal forms, the subtlest and most dangerous is perversion of the treaty power and of executive agreements in foreign affairs.

The Constitution provides that—

> All treaties made • • • under the authority of the United States shall become the supreme law of the land.

For 135 years it was universally supposed that the treatymaking power was, like all other powers granted under the Constitution, a limited one. Neither the President, the Congress, nor the Supreme Court was granted any authority to make or approve a treaty which violated the principles of government embodied in our great Charter. Few dreamed that any branch of the Federal Government could exercise, under the treaty clause, powers which were expressly forbidden to it in the body of the Constitution.

Why, then, do we need to reiterate what most people thought was obvious? Why do we need a constitutional amendment to restate what is implicit in every line of the Constitution? Why do we need this amendment today, if we managed so well without it for 165 years of our existence? Are our liberties confronted with a new threat which did not exist twenty-odd years ago?

The answer is "Yes," Mr. President. Today our liberties are faced with a most dangerous threat which did not exist 20 years ago.

In 1920, the Supreme Court handed down the historic decision, in Missouri against Holland, in which it was stated, for the first time, that Congress could exercise legislative power under a treaty, which it could not exercise otherwise under our Constitution.

By that decision, treaties were placed out of bounds so far as the principle of limited powers was concerned.

Since 1920, we have had the most insidious development of this new principle by one little extension after another.

The doctrine that treaties were outside the limits of the Constitution meant that they were above the laws of the States.

It raises fears that they are above the Bill of Rights, and even of the provision of the Constitution guaranteeing to every State a republican form of government.

The doctrine that treaties were above the Constitution was soon extended to executive agreements, which were meant to be simple, administrative devices for working out details of treaties and agreements whose substance had been approved by Congress.

In the Pink decision, the Supreme Court held that a personal agreement between President Roosevelt and Mr. Litvinov, which recognized the Soviet Union, effectively nullified provisions of the laws of New York State, and of the American Constitution, forbidding confiscation of private property.

The doctrine that the President could make personal agreements was extended to the doctrine that agreements made by any authorized member of the Government bureaucracy, in the name of the President, had the same effect as those made by the President.

Meanwhile, we committed ourselves to the United Nations system and undertook a vast network of legal responsibilities which has never been fully explored.

Mr. Vermont Hatch, member of the committee on peace and law through the United Nations, said in a memorandum submitted, at its hearings, to the Judiciary Committee:

> The United Nations Charter is one of the most far-reaching treaties that this or any other nation could enter into.
>
> It was subjected to but 4 days of formal hearings by the Senate, which gave its advice and consent to ratification 1 month and 2 days after it was signed.
>
> There was neither time nor opportunity for the people to study, debate, and digest its 111 articles and the 70 articles of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

At the same time the amount of Government business carried on by treaties increased enormously, and executive agreements increased even faster.

Mr. Dulles tells us that 10,000 executive agreements have been made pursuant to NATO alone.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Did he make that announcement before or after the Louisville speech?

Mr. JENNER. I think it was after the Louisville speech.

There were other changes, not in law but in policy.

The State Department became the advocate of a doctrine that the President had absolute power in foreign affairs, a doctrine to be found nowhere in the Constitution.

Obviously the President, as Chief Executive, is responsible for the conduct of foreign relations, but conduct is an executive responsibility.

It does not involve by indirection the exercise of legislative powers.

Alexander Hamilton pointed out, in the Federalist papers, that treatymaking is neither entirely legislative nor entirely executive, but that—

> The vast importance of the trust and the operation of the treaties as laws plead strongly for the participation of the whole or a portion of the legislative body in the making of them.

If Hamilton felt that way about treaties, it seems obvious he would have felt the same about executive agreements which make domestic law.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator quote again what he has just read from Hamilton? I had not heard that quotation in this debate.

Mr. JENNER. Hamilton said:

> The vast importance of the trust and the operation of the treaties as laws pleads strongly for the participation of the whole or a portion of the legislative body in the making of them.

The State Department also spread assiduously the doctrine that the distinction between foreign and domestic issues had disappeared.

Secretary Dulles has said he does not agree with that policy, but we do not know when another Acheson will occupy the office of Secretary of State.

The Department under recent Presidents apparently operated on the principle that treaties were submitted to the Senate for formal ratification only.

Dr. Wallace McClure, one-time Chief of the Treaty Division of the State Department, said in his book, written in 1941:

> For controversial international acts, the Senate method may be quietly abandoned, and the instruments handled as executive agreements.
>
> But for large numbers of purely routine acts, about which no public opinion exists, and no question as to their acceptability arises, the present method is desirable.

That is, the Senate is to be given plenty of busy work, so it will not have time to discover what policy changes are under way.

This is a total reversal of our constitutional system.

Under such a concept, the executive branch would handle all important matters, and the Senate would handle the multitude of details formerly left to the executive branch.

Secretary Dulles has said:

> Treaties can take powers away from Congress and give them to the President.
>
> They can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given to the people by their constitutional Bill of Rights.

Applying the logic of the Pink case, we can add that executive agreements do the same thing.

Now we begin to see the magnitude of our danger.

If we note that executive agreements today mean personal arrangements like that between Roosevelt and Litvinov, or administrative decisions by a minor foreign policy official in a distant country, like John Stewart Service; if we add that these agreements on foreign affairs now spread over areas formerly considered purely domestic, we come closer to the full measure of our danger.

Today the path to total dictatorship in the United States can be laid by strictly legal means, unseen and unheard by Congress, the President, or the people.

That is a rather strong statement, Mr. President, and I shall repeat it. Today the path of total dictatorship in the United States can be laid by strictly legal means, unseen and unheard by Congress, the President, or the people.

Why has this strange new use of the treaty power and of executive agreements grown by leaps and bounds within the last few years?

Why do we have an ever-growing number of treaties put before us which contain the threat of hidden sinkholes through which our liberties may ebb away?

Is some force at work changing the entire character of the treaties we are negotiating and the agreements we make?

The answer is "Yes."

We have a well-organized political-action group in this country, determined to destroy our Constitution and establish a one-party state.

This political-action group has its own local political support organizations, its own pressure groups, its own vested interests, its foothold within our Government, and its own propaganda apparatus.

Because I believe deeply in preserving the unity of true Americans I ask permission, Mr. President, to describe a little more fully this secret group which is the source of that perversion of treaty-making and of executive agreements, and all aspects of our foreign policy, which troubles us so much today.

One may call this group by many names. Some people call it socialism, some communism, some collectivism. I prefer to call it "democratic centralism." That is the type of government in which executive officials have absolute power under the outer forms of so-called democracy.

But I wish to stress one fact. The important point to remember about this group is not its ideology but its organization. It is a dynamic, aggressive, elite corps, forcing its way through every opening, to make a breach for a collectivist one-party state.

It operates secretly, silently, continuously to transform our Government without our suspecting the change is under way.

This revolutionary political corps operates as a fourth branch of government, never recognized in the Constitution but today equal in power to the other three branches combined.

The Constitution envisages a governmental establishment operating under the scrutiny of an elected President, his personally selected appointees, and an elected Congress.

Does anybody seriously believe that any President or any Congress can scrutinize hundreds of treaties, or tens of thousands of executive agreements stemming from NATO alone?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. LONG. Obviously it is impossible to do so, because we cannot even see them, if they are secret. We cannot even see half of them, let alone 10,000.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. We are not permitted to see them.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct. That is the fourth branch of government which has our country under its control.

During the Second World War, under Secretary Hull, the State Department had under a thousand employees.

Within a short while, under Dean Acheson, it grew to almost 10,000.

This increase was due in large part to its absorption of the personnel of wartime agencies like OWI, OSS, FEA, and the rest.

They bypassed the regular employees, and penetrated the Foreign Service.

The planners changed our historic State Department, as it operated under Mr. Hull, into a branch, in fact, the principal agent, of the ideological revolution started by Harry Hopkins, Alger Hiss, Henry Wallace, Owen Lattimore, Harry D. White, Frank Coe, and Harold Glasser.

J. Anthony Panuch, former assistant to Secretary of State Byrnes, testified before the Internal Security Subcommittee, that the purpose of this blanketing in of New Deal personnel was to bring about an ideological revolution in the State Department.

Mr. Panuch, who was in charge of weeding out Communists from among these transfers, was fired by Dean Acheson on 10 minutes' notice, when Acheson became Acting Secretary in General Marshall's term as Secretary of State.

Does anybody seriously think that 96 Members of the Senate, with the responsibilities they carry for every field of legislation, can cope with a State Department with a staff of 10,000 people, some of whom are directed by officials committed to secret political revolution?

Under such circumstances, what chance does anyone think we have, Mr. President?

I do not wish to indulge in any blanket indictment of the State Department or of any other Government employees.

Most of these people are honestly trying to do their best.

But this secret revolutionary corps understands well the power to influence the people about them, by praise and fear, and by creating a climate of opinion, by an elegant form of brainwashing, which convinces their coworkers of policies and slanted opinions they would never have chosen in the free air.

We see this, for example, in the innocent use of words like "democracy" in place of "representative government."

But remember that representative government emphasizes the barriers against absolute power, and democracy thinks there is no need for them.

If I seem to be extremist, the reason is that this revolutionary clique cannot be understood, unless we accept the fact that they are extremist.

It is difficult for people governed by reasonableness and morality to imagine the existence of a movement which ignores reasonableness and boasts of its determination to destroy, which ignores morality, and boasts of its cleverness in outwitting its opponents by abandoning all scruples.

This ruthless power-seeking elite is a disease of our century, Mr. President.

We cannot explain it here, though it is easily explained.

But Americans dare not refuse to admit its existence, while its members occupy so many positions of power in our Government and in agencies influencing public opinion.

This group within our Government operates today under its own unguided direction.

It is answerable neither to the President, the Congress, nor the courts.

It is practically irremovable.

It cares nothing for party changes directed by the sovereign people, but bows its head to the breeze, and waits for the officials set up by the Constitution to grow weary of the struggle.

This group in Government has a philosophy which is nowhere influenced by the Declaration of Independence, or the American Constitution, or the Federalist papers.

It has a strategy which is not derived from anything known to the two parties, operating under constitutional principles of open discussion and open voting on policy issues.

This group is no part of a constitutional republic.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. One matter which concerns some of us is that traditionally there was cooperation between the Executive and the Senate with reference to the making of treaties. In connection with the functioning of the Senate in advising and consenting to the ratification of treaties, it was assumed that the Executive would attempt to find out what the Senate would approve and what would be the wishes of those who represented the States in this body. Since the making of executive agreements has become more and more prevalent, the argument has been made that we do not need to know what an executive agreement may contain.

Mr. JENNER. And we do not know.

Mr. LONG. If the constitutional amendment were agreed to it would afford us an opportunity to know what is in some of the agreements. The agreements would not become law within this Nation unless approved by the Congress. Nevertheless, there is no way provided by the George amendment to assure us that we would have notice concerning the ways in which we are committed to send money overseas or to station troops on foreign soil, or even the obligation which may entail the necessity of sending troops to foreign lands, or, whether, in the event of an outbreak of hostilities, we might be required to go to war. There is the possibility that the lives of our citizens may be endangered without knowing what is contained in such agreements.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator is correct. The American people are not asking us to do something to take positive action, they are telling us to do so.

Mr. LONG. One thing which does concern me is that it is desirable to have some provision which would prevent a man's life insurance policy being made valueless, or the proceeds of a trust in which he has an interest being denied him. There is still a great danger that action might be taken in connection with these executive agreements which, in some manner, might cost a man his life in the long run.

Mr. JENNER. It belongs to a different political and governmental order.

It is the panzer column which, in our country, leads the world-wide advance of the one-party state.

This is political power, Mr. President.

It is ruthless, determined, political power. This political force is not standing still. It is moving forward with all the energy such a group possesses.

It conducts tactical retreats but only the more surely to advance to its own secret goal.

Americans have been reluctant to recognize the actual change in their Government. But the change is there.

Outwardly, we have a constitutional Government.

We have, operating within our Government and political system, another body representing another form of Government, a bureaucratic elite, which believes our Constitution is outmoded, and is sure it is the winning side.

From my work with the Committee on Internal Security, I assure you that the Communist strategists fully understand the nature of this new branch of our Government, if we do not.

Our report on Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments is full of instances of how carefully the Communists studied the emergency agencies set up by the New Deal, and how skillfully they moved from point to point, like soldiers advancing in enemy territory.

All the strange developments in foreign policy agreements may be traced to this group who are going to make us over to suit their pleasure.

We must consider our danger not only in terms of the treaties or agreements which have been completed, but in terms of those still in the pipelines, or already in effect but still invisible to Congress or the people.

I want to invite the attention of the Senate, Mr. President, to the subtlety and finesse of this hidden revolution.

To make it clear I will relate a story.

Under the Nazi regime in Germany, a man worked in a factory making baby carriages.

His wife was going to have a baby, but the Nazi government would not let anybody buy baby carriages.

So he decided he would secretly collect the parts he needed, one from each department, and assemble the carriage himself.

When the time came, he and his wife gathered up the pieces, and assembled them.

But when they finished, they did not have a baby carriage. They had a machinegun.

The story explains what has been happening to our form of Government.

Someone, somewhere, conceived the brilliant strategy of revolution by assembly line.

The pattern for total revolution was divided into separate parts, each of them as innocent, safe, and familiar-looking as possible.

The leaders did not intend to assemble the parts until they needed machineguns.

But let us keep in mind very clearly, Mr. President, that when the parts of a design are carefully cut to exact size, to fit other parts with a perfect fit, in final assembly, the parts must be made according to a blueprint drawn up in exact detail.

This does not happen by chance.

The men who make the blueprints know exactly what the final product is to be.

They have planned the final assembly years ahead.

They do not think they are making baby carriages.

Each of the legal points brought out in this debate is one of the little innocent-appearing parts within a master design for destruction of our Constitution.

Mr. President, I said I would not take up legal points, that I wished to speak of political policies and issues, but I shall take up one legal point.

That concerns the effect of the treaty we have already signed in the United Nations Charter.

Many of our people believe that, while the United Nations and its affiliates are preparing several hundred treaties, some at least of dubious value, the question of accepting those treaties and covenants is still open, and any threat to our Constitution and our liberties can still be dealt with under our law. That is what the people of this country believe. I have heard many Senators say so. I have never shared that confidence, Mr. President.

On January 28, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] analyzed the legal implications of the United Nations Charter, and among other things, said:

> Today, under the present state of the law, the Congress of the United States is no longer a legislature of delegated powers, to be exercised within prescribed limits, but a legislature of unlimited, and undelegated power.

He continued:

> The Congress of the United States today, because of power granted to it by treaty, could enact laws to control and regulate all education; to control and regulate all types of commerce, whether interstate or intrastate; to control and regulate all public health; to control and regulate all civil rights; to control and regulate all communications, whether interstate or intrastate, including rates and service; to control and regulate all public power, including rates and service, or to control all production of foods on farms and in factories.
>
> Adding these powers to its constitutional power to tax, the Congress of the United States today has virtually omnipotent legislative power.

I am sorry to say that I must agree with the Senator from Nevada.

I am sorry to agree with him because I know, as he knows, of the Alger Hisses who planned it that way.

The Senator reminds us that any judge, trying to decide on the constitutionality of a law today, would have to hold the Constitution of the United States in one hand, and the U. N. Charter in the other.

I want Senators to notice how cleverly the separate parts have been designed on this United Nations assembly line, and how neatly one part fits into another.

If they are not put together, it will never be guessed they are the parts for a machinegun.

The United Nations Charter is a duly ratified treaty. Article 55 of that Charter says that the United Nations shall—not may, but shall—promote certain objectives.

Article 56 provides, and note the importance of this clause, in revolution by assembly line:

> All members—
>
> Not some, but all—
>
> all members pledge themselves—
>
> Not shall pledge; the pledge is already made—
>
> to make joint and separate action • • • for the achievement of the purposes • • • in article 55.

The Attorney General has said that action under article 56 is obligatory.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is there not a provision in the United Nations Charter to the effect that each nation will act within its own constitutional processes? I ask the Senator the question because it has been urged that that provision might have the effect of placing a limitation upon the powers of the American Government that would not otherwise have existed.

Mr. JENNER. I think that under the theory on which we are operating today, the United States—either the States or the Congress—can have nothing to say about it. The treaty is the supreme law of the land, it is said, and the United States Government is obligated and bound by articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. LONG. What I had in mind was that it has been urged that there are provisions in the United Nations Charter to the effect that each nation will act within its own constitutional processes. From that it could be argued that the charter does not become automatically effective, but that, perhaps, there must be a constitutional amendment to provide for action if the action goes beyond the historic powers granted under the Constitution.

Mr. JENNER. Let us see how those parts fit together. I am talking about the machine gun that looks like a baby carriage.

Let us look for a moment at the objectives incorporated into our Government by article 55.

The United States is to promote full employment.

But the program of full employment was carefully examined by a committee of the House when it was proposed by Henry Wallace, as part of his campaign for 60 million jobs. Do Senators remember that?

In the appendix of the House hearings there is a full analysis of the provisions of this bill.

This analysis ends in the conclusion that full employment is in fact the Soviet doctrine of the labor army—the relentless incorporation of all workers in the nation into one mass organization, where freedom to change jobs, to stay out of work to write a book, or to raise one's status or profession, will inevitably disappear.

Article 55 says—and therefore the Congress must implement it—that the United Nations shall promote observance of human rights.

What does this mean?

Does it not mean that the United Nations, and not our sovereign States, will determine our immemorial rights?

This same section says the United Nations, and therefore Congress, shall promote universal observance of human rights, regardless of sex, language, or religion.

Does that mean that if we wished to give special protection to women, no State or city could do it?

Does it mean we must work toward the day when American women, like Soviet women will sweep the streets like men, and carry stone for building jobs, while their babies are brought up in a state nursery?

What exactly does this word "religion" mean?

Are we committed to demanding uniformity from our church groups on any matter which can be called human rights?

And whose uniformity, I ask?

Obviously the uniformity imposed by the United Nations.

Do we have here the "parts" for that establishment of a state-approved church, which has the "right" political slant, though our Constitution makers hoped permanently to prevent it?

Let us not be deceived by a minor point.

It is not part of the plan that any of these hidden powers would be prematurely used. Oh, no.

There is no intention to make visible the final result, until the masses have been conditioned, like Pavlov's dogs, to what they should feel and say.

This assembly line revolution is like a time bomb, Mr. President.

The mechanism is under complete control.

It is ready to go off, but it is not going to be set off until the time is ripe, until a switch is pulled.

The switch is not to be pulled until the American people are conditioned, or convinced that resistance is hopeless.

The Senator from Nevada has told us of the powerful State Department organization for propaganda against the Bricker amendment.

The role of all propaganda machines is to brainwash the American people, to keep them quiet till the day when the planners can assemble the "parts" which look like an innocent carriage for babies, but turn out to be a battery of machine-guns pointed at our Constitution.

The American people know the United Nations is preparing a series of treaties which would operate as domestic legislation, affecting our citizens in matters on which our Constitution does not permit even the Federal Government to legislate.

They would abolish our Bill of Rights and replace it with a body of stage-granted privileges and duties modeled exactly upon the Soviet Constitution.

The people of the United States believe those rights are still safe until Congress enacts a change. Many of our scholars and our editors believe it.

The Senator from Nevada believes we have already adopted the treaty which commits us to these new objectives, and to legislation to implement them on demand.

The Senator from Nevada says that any judge today, asked to pass on a law of Congress, would have to hold the Constitution of the United States in one hand and the United Nations Charter in the other. I agree with the Senator from Nevada.

The United Nations Charter contains the seeds of power to deprive our States of a republican form of government, guaranteed by the Constitution. It has within it the pattern for making the States into satellite provinces, subject to a Congress which, under the United Nations Charter, will have to tell them what to do.

The Charter of the United Nations will come up for revision in 1955. We have already appropriated money for a study of its revision. We must examine every one of these time bombs hidden in its innocent-sounding phrases before this year is over.

"The Congress today," says the Senator from Nevada, "could enact legislation taking over all private and parochial schools, destroying all local school boards—and substituting a Federal system." I agree with the Senator from Nevada. I believe the Congress could make a system in imitation of the Soviet system of education, and our courts would have to say that we signed away our rights when we consented to the Charter.

I further believe, Mr. President, that there is something very odd about the way in which the Korean war was directed by the United Nations. A President of the United States, acting as Commander in Chief over fighting men drafted under laws enacted by the Congress, accepted a commission to act as agent of the United Nations. He thereupon converted American fighting men, with a few men from other nations, into something called U. N. forces. The difference was very light, very delicate, but that is all one needs for a major operation.

Did that act snip the connection between the American President and the American Constitution, when he acted as an agent of the United Nations?

Were the members of our Armed Forces thereby taken out of the protection of American law and put under the "protection" of the United Nations?

What happened to the congressional power to declare war? Did the United Nations Charter transfer it to the President, the United Nations, or both? This new chain of command was never carried to its logical conclusion. But was that part of the plan? Is this another time bomb?

When it explodes, perhaps years from now, will we find that perhaps an unscrupulous American President could build armed power, through the American draft laws, and then use that armed might, under a United Nations assignment, as he saw fit, while the Constitution and the courts were powerless to restrain him?

Does Congress today have the power, and the duty, to give American resources in unlimited amounts to Patagonia or Newfoundland, under the requirement in the Charter that it must legislate to promote "higher standards of living"?

Is this the real meaning behind the unceasing propaganda for an innocuous-seeming point 4?

Will Congress some day vote what the Europeans call our "surpluses" to some United Nations fund, which will then use them to bring "higher standards of living," perhaps in Soviet Russia?

Let us not laugh at the idea. That is what the Soviet Union thought we were going to do in 1945. That was the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

meaning behind Mr. Wallace's plea for milk for the Hottentots and all the postwar argument that the American economy would collapse if we did not give our "surplus" to foreign nations.

Look up the hearings on postwar planning, Mr. President. You may be surprised.

This sharing of our substance is what the Soviet Union and the collectivist planners have been asking for again and again, in many forms. They do not want the United States to stand as an unanswerable argument against Soviet misery. The planners change their labels and their sales talk, but never their objective.

Do they know that some day, when we are tired enough, they will show how we have already been tied hand and foot by the soft-sounding, innocent words of articles 55 and 56?

Dr. Wirt, of my State, told us in 1934 that the plans were all drawn, the timetable established.

We have defeated many attempts at one-party government and absolute power. But with what result? The advocates of the dark revolution come up with newer, more subtle methods. They work every day for long hours on this and nothing else. Frequently we pay their salaries and those of their fellow workers from public funds.

While we go back to productive work to earn enough to pay taxes, they play games, inventing still subtler methods of achieving the goal they will never abandon.

Of all the devious routes which these secret revolutionists of the mimeograph machine and the microphone have discovered, the most dangerous is the perversion of the treatymaking power and the shift to executive agreements for legislating domestic and foreign policy.

I repeat, Mr. President, these secret revolutionists have a powerful political movement, with its pressure groups, its propaganda apparatus, and its technical bureaucracy entrenched in Government.

Their task is to make boobytraps which will blow up and destroy the loyal Republicans and Democrats who try to work within the Constitution.

Their goal is to set time bombs which will explode year by year for many years extending into the future carrying pieces of our Constitution with them, until the whole is destroyed.

Mr. President, we Democrats and Republicans have no more right to ignore those boobytraps and those time bombs than a general leading his armies into Germany or Japan in 1945 would have had the right to ignore boobytraps and time bombs left by enemy suicide squads.

We have a duty to find every one of them. We have a duty to rip them out, and not to cease from that effort until every political boobytrap has been located and every time bomb has had its fuse removed. We have a duty not to cease until every public servant who has worked to undermine the Constitution is removed from office. We must persevere until every member of its supporting apparatus, who is receiving public funds from hidden pockets of Government, is separated from the payroll.

That is not a future danger, Mr. President. The perversion of the treaty power and the misuse of executive agreements have meshed us into a system which rests on Soviet Russia's ideas of human rights, of full employment, of compulsory labor, and of government management of the press. They have meshed us into a system in which technicians of the United Nations can draft laws which override the domestic legislation of our States.

In the Internal Security Subcommittee, we have been looking at some of these technical experts in international agencies.

The perversion of treaties and executive agreements has probably meshed us into a system from which an unscrupulous President could raise American armies by vote of an American Congress, send them to foreign parts, and then, by accepting appointment as the agent of the United Nations, carry on wars the American Congress never voted, or forbid our fighting men to take part in wars Congress had declared, to protect our Nation.

Mr. President, in this effort we should start with the original decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Missouri against Holland. So long as it stands, all judges of lower courts are bound by it. If that decision is to be superseded, a new constitutional amendment is necessary.

It is our duty to initiate an amendment which makes it forever clear—as the Founding Fathers intended—that neither treaties nor executive agreements may be used to destroy government under law, to destroy the separation of powers, to undermine the republican form of government in the States, or to take away the protection for individuals in the American Bill of Rights.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio is not designed in any way to restrict the President's constitutional role in treatymaking. In this debate there is no shadow of a conflict between Congress and the executive branch. Some of the treaties which now concern us so deeply were approved by the President, accepted by the Senate, and have been, or probably will be, upheld by the Supreme Court. All three branches of Government are involved. All must be restricted.

The amendment is not designed to restrict the President in any way in the making of executive agreements serving their proper purpose, which is to implement policy decisions formally approved by the President and two-thirds of the Senate. Nothing in this amendment is designed to affect the separation of powers between the executive and the legislative branches.

The amendment is designed to block any President, any Congress, or any Supreme Court, from legalizing changes in the Constitution, through abuse of the treaty power, or misuse of executive agreements. In a nutshell, that is the purpose of the amendment.

There may be differences of opinion about minor details of the amendment, Mr. President.

However, among those who believe in the American Constitution, there can be no differences of opinion about the objectives of the amendment.

(a) The final amendment must close the door to the doctrine of Missouri against Holland, and must bring the legislative powers of Congress, under the treaty power, back within the principle of limited powers which the Constitution sets for every aspect of the Federal Government.

(b) It must limit the power of the executive branch to usurp, by so-called executive agreements, made without the consent of the Senate, the policymaking powers which the Constitution gives to the President and the Senate jointly.

(c) It must require that the Senate or Congress specify precisely when or how treaties and executive agreements are to govern American citizens in their relation to one another and to their Government.

(d) It must limit the power of the President, the Congress, or the courts, to approve domestic legislation, under the guise of treaties or executive agreements, which alters any part of our governmental system to another form of government, or deprives our people of any of their constitutional rights.

This is what the Republican platform deals with in its statement:

> We shall see to it that no treaty or agreement with other countries deprives our citizens of the rights guaranteed them by the Federal Constitution.

This is what President Eisenhower dealt with in his statement:

> I fully subscribe to the proposition that no treaty or international agreement can contravene the Constitution.

That is what the members of the Constitutional Convention intended. That is where we have stood for well over a century.

That is the position from which we have secretly been manuevered by hidden forces. That is the position which Congress, by amendment, would restore.

The genius of our Constitution lay in the precision with which it gave the national Government all the powers it would ever need, to deal with foreign governments and the threat of war, but barred it from using its powers against its own people to destroy their liberty. With Missouri against Holland, that distinction is gone.

The Congress in the proposed amendment is not trying to weaken by one iota the ability of the Federal Government to deal with foreign governments and the threat of war.

It is trying to meet a most insidious and dangerous attempt to give the National Government the power to destroy the liberties of the American people, to undermine republican government in the States, and to permit the Federal executive branch to operate above the law.

The only difference in our country today, on this question, is due to confusion over the source of the danger. Many of our people do not clearly see the political agency from which the danger comes.

The revolutionary cabal and its allies is threatened for the first time with loss of all the total power whose capture they had so carefully planned. They designed the overall strategy. They broke the whole up into precisely measured parts and carefully timed moves, which appeared to be wholly unrelated.

They trained their technicians, their organizers, and their propagandists.

They waited silently for the day when total power should fall into their hands.

Let us never forget—that was total power over all the people and all the resources of the United States.

Now they see their power shaken, their strategy failing, their edifice perhaps crumbling into ruins.

Perhaps they are not on the winning side after all. But they will fight. They will build up their propaganda.

They will use every ally, to prevent the American people from guessing how far the transformation had gone.

The American people are aroused, Mr. President. They love their Constitution. They believe it embodies the most effective system for the preservation of liberty ever devised by the mind of man.

The American people may be confused about minor issues. They may accept for a time so-called remedies for very real difficulties, which eat away at the foundation stone of their liberties. But once they recognize any act of government or party or faction as a threat to their Constitution, they will rise up in determined anger, and they will persevere until the Constitution is safe again.

The Constitution is the ark of our political covenant, the binding promise which holds us together as a Nation. Weaken our Constitution by any subterfuge, and the spiritual foundations of the Republic will crumble. It will not be long until the leader or the emperor arises to carry us along the road traced by republics before us.

The American people are not asking the Congress if it will preserve the Constitution. They are telling us.

The American people are not asking us to close the loopholes by which alien laws can be imposed on our country and our precious liberties undermined. They are telling us.

The American people have left to Congress the responsibility for drafting whatever amendments or statutes may be necessary to close forever this dangerous loophole in our political defenses. But they are not asking Congress whether it thinks the job is necessary. They are telling us.

As one of the original sponsors of the Bricker amendment, I wish to pay tribute here to the senior Senator from Ohio who has carried on his fight for years, first against public indifference and then against this propaganda machine.

I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] from the minority party, who have tried to help in finding words, on which all could agree, to serve our purpose.

As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I wish to thank the able lawyers who have given their time and energy to help the Congress in the thorough technical and scholarly work that needed to be done.

I wish also, Mr. President, to thank the patriotic women who came from all parts of the United States to tell Members of Congress what Lincoln said, namely, that the Constitution must be preserved.

These ladies asked nothing of us, Mr. President, in the way of jobs or favors or advantages for themselves. They asked us only to save our country. They were not thinking of party or faction or victory, Mr. President. They were thinking only of their sons, who were ready to fight for their country.

I am proud that the American people have risen to the danger, that they have mobilized in defense of the Constitution, so many Members of this body and of the other House, so many distinguished lawyers and students of political organization, so many patriotic men and women.

I am confident that a free people when aroused are more than a match for any revolutionary junta and its propaganda arm, however secretive and however ruthless.

In times of danger to our Constitution there can be no partisan differences between the historic political parties which work under the Constitution. Both parties have one primary aim—to root out the adventurers who are engaged in destroying the Constitution with their time bombs, and to reinforce the words of the Constitution so that there can be no misunderstanding again.

There can be no differences between the Congress and the executive branch. We have President Eisenhower's statement that no treaty must be made which is in violation of the spirit of the Constitution.

The line of division today is between real Democrats and real Republicans on one side, in defense of the Constitution, and on the other the secret revolutionists and those they have brainwashed, in their ruthless pursuit of power.

This must be the only political division in our country until the Constitution is secure.

I hope President Eisenhower's administration will go down in history as the moment when the revolutionary cabals, which perverted our treaties and executive agreements in foreign affairs, in order to convert us into a one-party state, are defeated at last, and the defenders of our Constitution gain their final victory.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE FOUR WINNERS IN THE SEVENTH ANNUAL VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the Voice of Democracy contest and to the winners of the contest.

The contest is sponsored by the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, the Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers' Association, and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. It has been held for the past 7 years.

During that time more than 1,000,000 students and other young people have participated in it. This year there were four winners of the contest. I am happy to announce that the four young people, the winners of the contest, are now in the gallery of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent, as I read the names of these young people, that they be permitted to stand so that Senators may see them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I believe it is a great honor which these young people have brought, not only to their respective fathers and mothers, who have participated in the educational advantages of their children, but to the States in which they live.

The names of the young people are: Philip M. McCoy, of the Argentine High School, Kansas City, Kans.; Elizabeth E. Evans, of the John R. Buchtel High School, Arkon, Ohio; Joseph H. Gerdies, Jr., of the Harrisburg Catholic High School, Harrisburg, Pa.; and Joel H. Cyprus, of the Wichita Falls High School, Wichita Falls, Tex.

(As Mr. SCHOEPPEL read their names, the four winning students rose from their seats in the gallery, and were greeted with applause by the Members of the Senate.)

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the scripts of the four winning broadcasts in the contests.

There being no objection, the scripts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Elizabeth Ellen Evans, age 16, John R. Buchtel High School, Akron, Ohio)

I am an American. Listen to my words, Fascist, Communist. Listen well, for my country is a strong country, and my message is a strong message.

I am an American, and I speak for democracy.

My ancestors have left their blood on the green at Lexington and the snow at Valley Forge—on the walls of Fort Sumter and the fields at Gettysburg—on the waters of the River Marne and in the shadows of the Argonne Forest—on the beachheads of Salerno and Normandy and the sands of Okinawa—on the bare, bleak hills called Pork Chop and Old Baldy and Heartbreak Ridge. A million and more of my countrymen have died for freedom.

For my country is their eternal monument. They live on in the laughter of a small boy as he watches a circus clown's antics—and in the sweet, delicious coldness of the first bite of peppermint ice cream on the Fourth of July—in the little tenseness of a baseball crowd as the umpire calls, "batter up!"—and in the high school band's rendition of "Stars and Stripes Forever" in the Memorial Day parade—in the clear, sharp ring of a school bell on a fall morning—and in the triumph of a six-year-old as he reads aloud for the first time. They live on in the eyes of an Ohio farmer surveying his acres of corn and potatoes and pasture—and in the brilliant gold of hundreds of acres of wheat stretching across the flat miles of Kansas—in the milling of cattle in the stockyards of Chicago—the precision of an assembly line in an automobile factory in Detroit—and the perpetual red glow of the nocturnal skylines of Pittsburgh and Birmingham and Gary.

They live on in the voice of a young Jewish boy saying the sacred words from the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Torah: "Hear O Israel: the Lord our God, the Lord is One. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy might."

And in the voice of a Catholic girl praying: "Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with Thee."

And in the voice of a Protestant boy singing: "A mighty fortress is our God, a bulwark never failing."

An American named Carl Sandburg wrote these words:

"I know a Jew fishcrier down on Maxwell Street—
With a voice like a north wind blowing over corn stubble in January. * * *
His face is that of a man terribly glad to be selling fish,
Terribly glad that God made fish, and customers to whom he may call his wares
From a pushcart."

There is a voice in the soul of every human being that cries out to be free. America has answered that voice. America has offered freedom and opportunity such as no land before her has ever known, to a Jew fishcrier down on Maxwell Street with the face of a man terribly glad to be selling fish. She had given him the right to own his pushcart, to sell his herring on Maxwell Street—she has given him an education for his children, and a tremendous faith in the nation that has made these things his.

Multiply that fishcrier by 160,000,000—160,000,000 mechanics and farmers and housewives and coal miners and truck drivers and chemists and lawyers and plumbers and priests—all glad, terribly glad to be what they are, terribly glad to be free to work and eat and sleep and speak and love and pray and live as they desire, as they believe!

And those 160 million Americans—those 160 million free Americans—have more roast beef and mashed potatoes—the yield of American labor and land; more automobiles and telephones, more safety razors and bathtubs, more orlon sweaters and aureomycin, the fruits of American initiative and enterprise; more public schools and life-insurance policies, the symbols of American security and faith in the future; more laughter and song—than any other people on earth.

This is my answer, Fascist, Communist. Show me a country greater than our country, show me a people more energetic, creative, progressive—bigger hearted and happier than our people; not until then will I consider your way of life. For I am an American, and I speak for democracy.

I Speak for Democracy

(By Joseph H. Gerdies, age 17, Harrisburg Catholic High, Harrisburg, Pa.)

Abraham Lincoln uttered more than a mere phrase at Gettysburg, when he spoke those now famous words, "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people." For every loyal American recognizes that phrase as Lincoln's definition of democracy.

When he said "of the people" Lincoln meant that people have the right to govern themselves. In other words, he meant that democratic government comes out "of the people." It is this principle which has made America the citadel of freedom, a place where men willingly cooperate with the law and where the law itself is felt to be in the classic words of Justice Holmes "the witness and external deposit of our moral life." In America, thank God, we are citizens, not subjects.

So the essence of the American Republic is a recognition of the dignity of manhood in all men. In its foundation this Government was an act of supreme confidence in man, a concession, such as never before had been given to human dignity. Its creation was, indeed, a bold experiment, the bravest political act recorded in history. In fact, liberty had never really been understood until it was caught up in a human embrace and embodied in a great and abiding nation.

In the second portion of his definition Lincoln said, "by the people." It was the conviction of the Founding Fathers that all power comes from the Creator through the people, and their desire to safeguard the exercise of that power, not directly by the people in their confused and scattered individualism, but through representatives seated in calm thought and timely research. The masses are not experts in the solution of complicated problems. But, they can delegate their problems to lawmakers of their choice, men in whose qualities and experience they have confidence. And, Americans know that if they don't like a particular law, in due course they can change it. That is the privilege of the American people, they can change their laws and their Government without ever meaning to change the Republic.

In concluding his definition Lincoln said, "for the people." Well, certainly American democracy has produced better results than any other form of government in history. Our high standards of living and education, our medical care, our freedoms are the envy of every nation on the face of this globe. At the same time the United States has become the most powerful country in the world, more powerful than the realm of any Caesar or Czar, ancient or modern, while remaining at the same time a community, preserving the neighborly qualities of its origin.

While the greatness of America is her democracy, the peril of America is also her democracy, for danger can come from the misuse of freedom. Democracy must not, therefore, be permitted to struggle alone for its existence; it needs the best that men can give it.

May our hearts beat with a love for our Republic; our tongues chant its praises with eloquence; may our hands be ready to work for it and defend it; and may we never forget the legend engraved on the base of the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost, to me; I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

That, my friends, is the voice of democracy.

I Speak for Democracy

(By Philip M. McCoy, age 16, Argentine High School, Kansas City, Kans.)

I am democracy.

I was planted as a seed in the minds of men by God Himself.

I blossomed forth into a world of tyranny and unhappiness.

In the minds of some I was just a passing fancy, but in others I became a dream, an obsession.

I was tried in Athens, speculated upon by Plato and Aristotle, obliterated by the Caesars, and crushed by feudal lords and kings during the Middle Ages.

In the 18th century I became an actuality in a struggling, youthful country where men sought true freedom.

For 175 years this country has been my home.

I have lived in magnificent buildings in Washington, D. C., and in tiny houseboats along the Mississippi. I have flourished in every classroom in the Nation. I have dwelt in beautiful green parks where families are free to rest and play as they wish. I have lived in newspaper offices where editors prepare daily editorials. I have lived in the voting polls where men choose their leaders.

I have not been contained within the covers of musty books nor held on a faded parchment beneath an airtight glass case.

Wherever there are men who seek me, there must I be.

Unless I am a part of the very lives of those whom I serve, I shall become a useless word.

Every day men throughout the world make great sacrifices for me. Many times men have given their lives that I might live.

How it hurts to see men die for my sake. How small and useless I feel as I watch those who love me prepare arms for war because of this love.

There are many things which make me realize how great a task lies ahead—an overcrowded school, an empty church, a broken home.

I shudder when I see a sign "Whites Only" or a family Bible covered with dust.

Then I wonder—how can I make the people see that I cannot be worn as a glove on a cold hand, that I cannot be turned off and on like an electric light; but that I can exist only as long as men have a sincere desire to live happily and peacefully with their neighbors.

Yet, how often I am filled with joy and gladness.

Millions of youth stand and pledge their loyalty to flag, to country, and to God.

On street corners, in barbershops, over back fences, people in two's and three's discuss freely their views on politics and government.

Sixty-one million persons go to the polls and vote according to their own ideas and opinions.

Then I realize that all is not lost. I see that the future is not a black cloud hanging over the earth. I know that men will live together in peace and prosperity, that some day the world will indeed be one world.

For I have become a part of the very beings of men, and as long as men have hearts and minds and souls, I shall live. For I am democracy.

I Speak for Democracy

(By Joel Howard Cyprus, age 17, Wichita Falls Senior High, Wichita Falls, Tex.)

Who are you? Yes, you. I am but a voice, but you are a living person, a human being. And you can answer me. You have no fear; you are not ashamed. You hold your head up high and say proudly, "I am Bill Smith. I am a Catholic."

Or your neighbor may say, "I am Saul Greenburg. I am a Jew." The couple down the street may answer, "We're the Robinsons. We are Christians."

And here I, the voice, begin to wonder. What is this? I speak into a microphone and ask a simple question like "Who are you?" and get back 3 completely different answers from 3 neighbors. How can this be? People as different as they are cannot function as a unit. And yet I see that an entire nation is formed of these diverse people. Indeed, I have good cause for wondering.

I ask another question: "Which political party do you favor?" And again, I receive answers like "the Democratic," "the Republican," "any reform party," "the party with the best ideas, no matter which one it may be." Again, too, I wonder. This is also impossible. Such opposing political views cannot live together in a single nation. Yet I look around and see that they can and do.

I try a third question: "How much money do you earn?" And for the third time each answer is different. They range from $20 per week to $250 million a year. I can see no sense, yet I can see a nation.

Again in my quest of knowledge I try a question: "Where were you born?" "England," "Texas," "Germany," "Outer Mongolia," "Brooklyn," "Timbuktu," "South Africa. * * *" The answers stream on and on. A nation with people from all over the world? Impossible. But an impossibility come true.

I continue my search, asking question after question. I seek something that holds this Nation together. And then, suddenly, it comes—the key to the whole affair. Quite innocently, I ask the question, "What are you?" And instead of a great deluge of answers come just one:

"I am an American. I believe in democracy. I am satisfied to let the opinion of the majority of the people govern my actions."

At last, I find my answer. Finally, I know. There is a simple explanation. Or is it so simple?

Two men hold opposing religious, political, and financial views. Yet these same two men are willing to work together to sponsor the homecoming dance for the local football team. These same two men meet casually on the street and greet each other as closest friends. One of these men has his house burn down and the other offers to help shelter his family until they find a new place to live. They cooperate to the fullest measure, and then we say that the answer is simply, "They are Americans."

And we are right.

It is their idea of principles and their idea of majority rule that makes America succeed. They believe that if the other fellow is down he should be helped back up; and they believe that, regardless of their views, if the majority involved favor something, it must be carried out.

My first question was all wrong. Rather than "Who are you?" I should have asked "What are you?" I would have gotten my answer immediately, for I would have heard a unanimous uproar, "We are America."

Oh, yes; just one more thing. You may be wondering. "Who am I?" I am the intangible. I have been flattering myself with my little quest for knowledge. For, you see, I—I am the voice of democracy.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a short biography of each of the four young contest winners be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the biographies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVENTH ANNUAL VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNERS

PHILIP M. M'COY

Mr. McCoy, a 16-year-old junior at Argentine High School, Kansas City, Kans., sustains an "A" average scholastically, as well as playing tackle on the Argentine football team. He participates in school dramatic and musical activities and is a member of the student congress. He is also a member of the United Christian Youth Movement Council and plans to make teaching his career. His father is a teacher.

ELIZABETH E. EVANS

Miss Evans, a 16-year-old junior at John R. Buchtel High School, Akron, Ohio, has won numerous writing and public speaking awards. A one-time city spelling champion, she is a member of the Akron Public Library teen-age book panel, plays a flute in the school band and orchestra, and serves on the editorial staff of her school newspaper. She is active in the National Forensic League, is president of the senior department at Westminster Presbyterian Church and is secretary of the high school Physics Club. She plans a career in the field of journalism.

JOSEPH H. GERDIES, JR.

Mr. Gerdies, a 17-year-old senior at Harrisburg Catholic High, Harrisburg, Pa., is State Forensic champion in Shakespearean reading and has won many public speaking honors. Winner of the CYO talent contest in 1953, he has served as master of ceremonies for a teen-age radio program for the past 2 years. He is president of Catholic High student council as well as the Interscholastic Student Council of the Harrisburg District. Mr. Gerdies plans to follow his father's career in medicine.

JOEL H. CYPRUS

Mr. Cyprus, a 17-year-old senior at Wichita Falls High School, Wichita Falls, Tex., ranks first in a class of 427 students. He has served as vice president of the National Forensic League, is very active in all high school activities, and in 1953 was first-place winner in the statewide piano playing competition staged by the Pan-American Student Forum. He has set up a complete photo lab in his home and has built a robot which actually performs under remote control operation. He is one of 40 finalists in the Westinghouse Science Talent Search (Feb. 25–Mar. 1, 1954), and plans to major in nuclear physics at MIT.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. It is very fitting and proper, inasmuch as these young people have been given the opportunity to come to the Capital City of the Nation and to visit its historic spots, that they should come here on the occasion of the observance of Washington's Birthday anniversary.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a unanimous-consent request and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the unanimous-consent request.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on the calendar day of Wednesday, February 24, 1954, upon the resumption of the consideration of the joint resolution Senate Joint Resolution 1, the so-called Bricker amendment, debate on the pending amendment proposed by Mr. BRICKER, inserting on page 3, after line 9, a new section, be limited to not exceeding 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. BRICKER and Mr. KNOWLAND, respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall object—I wish to explain the reason for my objection.

The majority leader, in accordance with his usual habit of extending to all of his colleagues the utmost courtesy, discussed the subject with me this morning. I told him I desired to talk with a few of my colleagues in the Senate whom I usually consult on parliamentary matters. I have consulted with them.

The majority leader, not seeing me on the floor of the Senate, very kindly sent a page to the restaurant, where I was having lunch, and asked me to come to the Chamber so that he could offer his proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

I shall assume full responsibility for the objection. However, I wish to say that several of my colleagues on the floor of the Senate share the point of view I am now expressing. We feel that the country is greatly benefitting from this great historic debate and that it ought to run its regular course. We feel that when we are confronted with an issue which is so vital as is this issue to the welfare of the American people, there should be no limitation whatever placed upon the debate. When the debate has been concluded we should vote, and we should vote without any attempt at all to limit the debate in any way.

Therefore, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I desire to say that the Senate will probably remain in session this afternoon until around 5 o'clock. I had been hopeful, after discussing the subject with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the author of the pending amendment, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and other Senators, including the minority leader, that the Senate might adopt a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the pending amendment tomorrow. Under the circumstances, it appears to me, in view of the number of speeches it has been indicated will be made today, we shall not get to a vote this afternoon. I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that it may be desired to have an evening session tomorrow and on Thursday, if necessary, in order to complete the debate on the unfinished business, the proposed constitutional amendment.

Therefore I hope all Senators will hold themselves in readiness for an evening session tomorrow and Thursday.

FLEXIBLE PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the proponents of flexible price supports often have claimed the so-called big farm operators wanted 90 percent supports and benefited most from that kind of a program. Mr. Tom Campbell, wheat king of Montana, makes nonsense of that kind of thinking in his statement carried by the Washington Post under date of Monday, February 22, 1954.

The headline of the article reads, "Montana Wheat King Urges Cut In Crop's Price Support." This is the position taken by most large producers. Tom Campbell and others of his kind could undoubtedly produce wheat for from a dollar to $1.25 a bushel, and make money. This is one way Secretary Benson can get efficient production, but to me it is a very undesirable way. Unusually large farmers all over the world have posed a real problem. Their large farms destroy the opportunity for small farmers.

A comparatively few farmers who produce on the scale of Tom Campbell could produce all the wheat needed in the United States. However, large holdings of land in Asia, Europe, and elsewhere throughout the world have made fertile ground for the spread of communism. It is in the farming areas of Asia, where the land is held by a few individuals, where communism is flourishing at its best.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

About a year ago when I visited the Philippine Islands I noted that in the rich agricultural area of the Philippine Islands most of the land was owned by only a few individuals. In such a climate, the Huks, the local Communists, were doing very well indeed.

Large-scale farming operations tended to increase following the depression years of the thirties. The unprecedented farm foreclosures of that period made it possible for a few farmers to accumulate the land necessary for these huge operations. Another period of low prices, with the resultant bankruptcy which would follow, would make possible another new batch of bonanza wheat farmers like Tom Campbell.

While I think Mr. Campbell's statement was probably made to support the position of Secretary Benson on the question of price supports, it tends to discredit some of the statements made by Secretary Benson himself. Tom Campbell obviously is trying to scare the corn and hog farmers when he states in this article:

> Wheat is worth $3.00 a bushel going through a hog, against $2.01 under 90-percent supports. We are going to raise more hogs.

This would imply that wheat is not being priced out of the feed and other markets as Secretary Benson contends. I do not think any corn and hog farmers need worry about any great amount of wheat being fed to hogs.

Mr. Campbell states that he is cutting his wheat acreage 25 percent to comply with the wheat quota act and that he is going to plant much of his diverted wheat acreage to flax, of which he states the United States does not grow enough. Mr. Campbell does not seem to be conversant with the facts. The estimated domestic consumption of flax for fiscal year 1953–54 is 32,800,000 bushels. The estimated production for the same period is 36,800,000 bushels. The average production a year for the 1948 to 1952 period was 40,600,000 bushels, and the average domestic consumption for the same years was 37,400,000 bushels.

On top of that, Mr. President, the Commodity Credit Corporation has a large supply of flax on hand. So, again, I think Mr. Tom Campbell is not conversant with the facts. He goes on to say that he may increase his production of barley. He will find tough competition from Canada that is pricewise.

I should like to read 2 or 3 paragraphs from a recent statement made by Mr. Ben C. McCabe, president of the International Elevator Co., which operates country elevators in the 4 upper Midwest States. He is also a past president of the Minneapolis Grain Exchange. He says:

> In recent years the imports of oats, barley, and rye have rendered almost useless our support program for those grains. The executive branch of our Government under previous administrations failed to act under the law. Our present administration has temporized in meeting this vital problem.
>
> Certainly Canada and Argentina would dislike to lose this market for their surplus oats, barley, and rye. But what kind of jackasses must they think we are to make loans to our producers of these grains at prices far above their market prices—freezing our own production out of consumptive use and importing a large part of our commercial requirements.
>
> Reports show that as of December 15, there were 43,366,000 bushels of oats, and 32,226,000 bushels of barley under loan.
>
> Our imports since July 1, 1953, to December 30, were—oats, 35,500,000 bushels; barley, 19,500,000 bushels.

Thus, Mr. President, we can easily see that imports are destroying a market we might have in that area for oats, barley, and rye.

Mr. President, I should like to read one more paragraph from Mr. McCabe's statement, which I think is very informative:

> Let me also point out one other angle in this case. Freight rates on grain in western Canada are set by statute at 3 percent less than they were in 1897.

Mind you, Mr. President—1897.

> These extremely low-transportation rates are provided by Parliament as one part of their farm program. As a result it costs the Canadian farmer at Coutts, Alberta, only 8½ cents per bushel to move his oats to Port Arthur. His neighbor across the border at Sweetgrass, Mont., has to pay freight of 24⅓ cents a bushel to move his oats to Duluth. This freight advantage of 16 cents a bushel compares to the import duty of only 4 cents a bushel. With this tremendous export subsidy, Canadian oats, barley, and rye will always undersell our domestic grains in the eastern market.

That is pretty tough competition for any American producer.

Tom Campbell exposes his ignorance of farm thinking when he states in this article, when speaking of Members of Congress:

> How wrong they are to be opposing the proposed program of "flexible" supports. Some of these legislators from the rural areas haven't got the courage of their constituents. The farmers who are producing these surplus crops are a very intelligent group. More than half of them are college graduates. And they have a high sense of patriotism.

Mr. Campbell seems to imply that anyone who is not in favor of flexible price supports must be lacking in patriotism. All the farmers ask is a fair price for the things which they produce. If the Secretary of Agriculture or anyone else can point out any other way by which the farmers can get a fair price for their products, their products other than through 90 percent supports, I will abandon my opposition.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did I hear the Senator mention the name of General Campbell?

Mr. YOUNG. That is corect.

Mr. MANSFIELD. He was in the news over the weekend. He leases 60,000 acres of land on the Crow Indian Reservation, and has come out quite definitely in favor of the Benson flexible price-support program, as I recall.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. General Campbell happens to be a resident of the State of Montana by means of remote control, because he has huge holdings in New Mexico as well as in Montana, and he operates on a large scale. I doubt very much that he speaks for the farmers of the United States. I know he does not speak for the farmers of Montana when he expresses his sentiments with reference to the flexible price-support program.

I certainly think, as does the Senator from North Dakota, that any farmer who advocates 90 percent or even 100 percent of parity is just as patriotic as is any other individual. I think it comes with ill grace from a man of General Campbell's standing to make the statement which he made. It goes to show that he is carrying out his same old policy of promoting things and trying to get in good with each administration as it comes into power. I think the Senator from North Dakota is doing a good service in exposing him.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the able Senator from Montana.

Most big operators would like to see more farmers frozen out so that they can increase their holdings. During the depression years land in my State was selling for as little as $300 or $400 a quarter-section. As a result, persons with money bought up sizable amounts of land, and they are now pretty large operators. Undoubtedly they can produce more cheaply. They usually have very few buildings. They oftentimes operate day and night. They buy good seed and they buy their machinery at cost. But when there is a large holding of land by one of the big operators, we usually have fewer schools in that area; and schools in my State account for about two-thirds of the taxes applied to land.

A poll presently being conducted by myself indicates very clearly that the farmers of my State are more than 8 to 1 in favor of 90-percent supports over flexible supports. The Farm Bureau of my State, which conducted a quite similar poll only a year ago, came to the same conclusion, and as a result, they switched their position from flexible supports to 90-percent supports. North Dakota is the second greatest wheat-producing State, and in the last election gave President Eisenhower the second highest percentage vote in the Nation.

Wheat farmers of Kansas, I understand, in a poll conducted by the Farm Bureau, also expressed themselves in favor of continuing 90-percent supports. This is the sentiment expressed in almost every farming State in the Nation where farmers had an opportunity to express themselves by ballot. Farmers' sentiment undoubtedly was responsible for the Grange, a great farm organization, last fall taking the position of at least temporarily continuing 90-percent supports.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entiled "World's Biggest Wheat Farm Owner Urges Cut in Crop's Price Support."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPOSES "WASTEFUL SURPLUSES"—WORLD'S BIGGEST WHEAT FARM OWNER URGES CUT IN CROP'S PRICE SUPPORT

(By Aubrey Graves)

The man who operates the biggest privately owned wheat farm on earth—a 60,000-acre spread at Hardin, Mont.—is in Washington to urge the Government to reduce

the price level at which it is supporting his crop.

The wheat king is 72-year-old Tom Campbell. His annual harvest has averaged 500,000 bushels in recent years. He thinks the present system of rigid high supports at 90 percent of parity, under which an 800-million-bushel wheat surplus has been piled up, is wrong. He believes that under present conditions the support level should be reduced to 75 percent.

"Seventy-five percent is a very liberal price for the commodity," he says. "The only way to get rid of these costly surpluses is to decrease the incentives for producing them."

Campbell has talked to President Eisenhower and Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson and has assured them of his support of their program which, he says would do just that. He is visiting also Congressmen from farming areas to tell them how wrong they are to be opposing the proposed program of flexible supports.

"Some of these legislators from the rural areas," he asserts, "haven't got the courage of their constituents." The farmers who are producing these surplus crops "are a very intelligent group. More than half of them are college graduates. And they have a high sense of patriotism."

Farmers as a whole understand, Campbell says, "that no program can survive long if it is not equally fair to consumer and producer." Farm bloc Senators and Representatives "make a mistake in not frankly recognizing it, too," he adds.

"I think the farmers would actually acclaim them if they should recognize the fact of these tremendous, wasteful surpluses, and the further fact that we can get rid of them only by reducing the incentive to produce," he contends.

This is not the first time Campbell has ventured to criticize the farm bloc in Congress. In 1942 he charged it did not truly reflect the interests of the Western grain growers. Burton K. Wheeler, then a Senator, retorted that his fellow Montanan was a promoter, not a farmer.

Campbell was born in a sod hut on what is now the campus of Montana's State University. He managed his family's 4,000 acres when he was 17. Last year's harvest was the 78th in the Campbell family. (His father harvested his first crop of wheat on his own land in North Dakota in 1876).

Campbell, while here, is trying to work out "some way to get the farmer's real feeling across to their Representatives." He thinks a "write and telegraph" plan would be helpful. He is urging the Department of Agriculture to use its radio facilities to encourage farmers to communicate with Washington.

Campbell says that under acreage allotments he and other Montana wheat growers are going to have to plant one-fourth less wheat this year. "We are not crying about this," he said. "The only way to grow less is to plant less."

What is he going to do with his diverted acres? He is going to plant them to flax, of which the United States does not grow enough, and to barley. Barley, he says, is good hog feed.

"Wheat is worth $3 a bushel going through a hog, against $2.01 under 90-percent supports. We are going to raise more hogs."

Campbell is the second largest individual land owner in the United States. Only the King Ranch in Texas is larger than his layout in Montana.

He seeds only half of his 60,000 acres each season. On some of his land, where the annual rainfall averages less than 16 inches, he gets 50 bushels to the acre. This is about three times the national average.

He says he does this by scientific farming. Studying his acres, he discovered that the wild plants in that partly arid land were widely spaced. "Nature grew just enough to be supported by the limited moisture," he explained. "So we took our cue from nature."

Instead of sowing the usual 60 pounds of wheat kernels to the acre, he sows from 15 to 18 pounds. During the "rest" he gives his acres every other year, he keeps down weeds and permits only those plants that provide natural fertilizer to grow.

He learned another profitable trick. Instead of planting his rows 6 or 7 inches apart, he drills them 14 inches apart, in wide contours, leaving valleys 9 inches deep between. These valleys catch the snow and rain and prevent undue runoff.

The Montanan is a great believer in soil conservation. He said he was worried, at first, that abolishing the seven regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service might be a costly mistake. He is satisfied now that there will be just as much conservation as before, or more.

He said President Eisenhower had told him that just as Churchill had not become Prime Minister to dissolve the Commonwealth, neither had he become President to dissipate our natural resources.

Campbell feels that if a landowner is not willing to carry out practices to prevent erosion and other soil wastage, the Government ought to have the right to carry out those practices and then assess the cost of them against the land.

"We do not own the land in any real sense," he maintains, "we are just the custodians of it. We have no right not to conserve it or to pass it along to future generation less fertile and productive than it was when we acquired it."

Campbell is not as sold on the Administration's power policies as he is its farm program. He is a little worried about a tendency to turn things over to private industry. "We can't let our resources get out of the hands of the people," he declares.

He would much prefer to see the granting of 99-year leases. "The Empire State Building is built on ground leased for 99 years. Ninety-nine years may seem long but actually, it is just a little scratch on the scroll of time."

"And at the end of 99 years, the resources will still belong to the people."

TARIFFS AND TRADE POLICY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the Report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, on which I had the privilege of serving, is now a subject of some debate throughout the country. Within the next few weeks, the Congress will receive from the President of the United States his recommendations in this highly important field. After the receipt of his message, debate on the issue of the future course of our trade relations with the world will be intensified.

Although the Commission made many recommendations in other important fields, public interest at the present time has centered largely on its proposals in regard to tariffs and trade policy. I have observed, in reviewing comment in the press and elsewhere, that there has been some misunderstanding of the scope of the Commission's recommendations in this area.

There is a general tendency in these times to attempt to simplify extremely complicated issues. So, in discussion of the Randall Commission's proposals in regard to the trade agreements program and the tariff, there has been a tendency to picture the Commission as divided by a conflict between "protectionists," on the one hand, and "free traders," on the other.

This has obscured the very important safeguards which the majority of the Commission insisted must be observed if the Trade Agreements Act were to be extended and the President's powers in tariff negotiations were to be broadened.

Mr. President, I shall not now take the time of the Senate to review in detail the Commission's recommendations. But I should like to refute one statement that is frequently made by some critics of the report. It has been repeatedly charged that the Commission's tariff proposals would result in the flooding of our markets by goods produced by low-paid foreign labor, displacing domestic products and creating widespread unemployment and distress.

Nothing could be further from the truth. In addition to carefully circumscribing the extent to which the President could reduce tariffs, the Commission insisted on retention of the "peril point" and "escape clause" procedures of the Trade Agreements Act which are designed, first, to forestall injury to domestic industry and its workers in the negotiation of new trade agreements and, second, to remedy such injury should it occur as a result of agreements made in the past.

In discussing the question of wage levels here and abroad, the Commission made this statement, on page 52 of its report:

One of the essential strengths of our entire economy is the vitality and diversification of our industry. While no clear-cut lines of demarcation can be drawn without overlapping, the submissions made to the Commission indicate that our industry falls into three broad classes.

The first class is that type of industry, generally referred to, with more or less inaccuracy, as the mass production industries in which for various reasons, methods or processes, size of markets, machinery, or other causes, unit labor costs are generally low here as compared with other countries and little or no problem exists with respect to imports.

The second class is one in which machinery and production facilities, generally speaking, are identical or at least similar here and abroad. In some of these the same number of man-hours goes into a unit of goods here and abroad; in others the use of labor is less efficient abroad than here and there may be other offsetting cost factors. Whether or not imports may be seriously damaging is dependent on factors which vary industry by industry, but in at least some of these the labor factor is the controlling element.

The third class is the so-called handicraft type where machinery is a minor element. Here quite obviously, with labor the major cost, imports can be not merely serious but destructive to the domestic industry without a tariff.

Yet all three classes or types of industry are a necessary part of our total economy, and in all of their variations they must pay wages generally in harmony with the general level of wages throughout the country. We would not have it otherwise; and we do not wish it to happen that the wage level in the third class and in some of the second class should be determined or seriously affected by the wage levels abroad in competitive industries.

What we have said does not single out an industry or industries for specific recommendation, but should make clear that a policy of gradualness and close consideration of the effects of action already taken is in the national interest at this time.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The Commission recommended elsewhere in the report that our negotiators refuse to grant tariff concessions on products made by workers receiving wages which are substandard in the exporting country.

Representative JOHN M. VORYS, of Ohio, and I felt that this recommendation did not meet the problem completely. While it may be desirable to raise labor standards abroad, and the pressure our negotiators can bring to bear by refusing to recognize substandard wages in other countries may help to accomplish that purpose, the pressing problem we face is to protect the living standards of the American workingman and his family. For that reason, Mr. VORYS and I joined in the following supplementary statement, which appears on page 63 of the report:

> We believe that in negotiating trade agreements, our negotiators should consider not only substandard and depressed wage levels, as described in the Commission's Report, but also wage differentials, in order to protect American labor.

I may say parenthetically that there is quite a distinction between substandard wage levels, as mentioned in the report, and what are called in the United States "wage differentials." The Commission pointed out that a standard wage level in a given country might be, for example, 50 cents an hour, and that if the wage paid in a given industry was 40 cents an hour, that wage was substandard.

But what we are talking about is the wage differential between whatever the wage level is abroad and the wage level in the United States, which in the same industry might be $1.80 an hour.

So what is being said is that our tariff negotiators should take into account the differential between the wage paid in a country that wishes to export to the United States and the standard wage level in the same industry in the United States.

We recognized the difficulty involved in using wage differentials as a hard and fast standard in setting tariff rates exactly, but we nevertheless were convinced that it was such an important factor that it must always be kept in mind by our negotiators.

Mr. President, in studying the trade-agreements program, I became convinced that the act of 1934, as amended to include the peril point and escape clause procedures, provides a mechanism by which we can select those imports needed to benefit and strengthen our economy—and there are many of them—and at the same time control the flow of competitive products from abroad so as to prevent injury to our domestic industries and their workers.

We are all aware of the many complaints which have been made concerning the administration of the trade-agreements program in the past.

I may say, parenthetically again, that as much depends on the administration of an act as on what the act itself is. I shall always remember a statement made to me by the late Senator Taft in New Haven before the 1948 election. The conversation took place during the 80th Congress. Senator Taft said the Wagner Act was not such a bad act, but it was the administration of the act which made it impossible to live with it. So I say now that the administration of the trade-agreements program is perhaps what has caused some of the criticism of it.

We must keep in mind, however, that the Tariff Commission has been reconstituted, and there are grounds for belief that it will be more aware of the problems of domestic industries and the men and women who man their machines, than apparently has been the case in former years.

The question of preventing harm to our industries and their labor force arises also at the point of negotiating trade agreements which involve tariff concessions on our part. I have recently written to the Secretary of State inviting his attention to the Commission's recommendations on this particular problem. My letter informed Mr. Dulles of the widespread feeling that there has been too little reciprocity in the so-called reciprocal trade-agreements program. In blunt terms, many believe that Uncle Sam at times has been a "sucker" at the conference table.

Mr. President, I shall now read my letter to the Secretary of State, for the information of the Senate and of others who read the RECORD:

> MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As a member of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, I have received many complaints about the past administration of the trade agreements program. These complaints have come from business leaders, not only in my own State of Connecticut but throughout the country, and from certain trade union officials.
>
> One complaint in particular I am taking the liberty of bringing to your attention at this time. It is the often-voiced criticism that representatives of the State Department, in negotiating trade agreements with other nations, have been insufficiently aware of the reaction upon domestic industries and their workers, should proposed changes in tariff rates be put into effect. It is claimed that our negotiators have gone to the bargaining table ill-equipped with economic facts and figures. There is also a widespread feeling that the Department's negotiators, if not actually hostile to business, have been lukewarm in their advocacy of this country's legitimate economic interests.
>
> In contrast, it is alleged, negotiators for other nations have been well-advised of the economic consequences of proposed tariff changes, and have been aggressive in driving the best possible bargain for their home industries.
>
> In this connection, your attention is invited to the following two sentences from the Randall Commission's Report, which appear at the bottom of page 49 and the top of page 50:
>
> "In the course of tariff negotiations, great care should be exercised in the determination of the principal supplier or suppliers of particular articles subject to negotiation as well as in identifying the lowest cost source of prospective foreign competition. Also, there should be closer consultation with domestic producers on technical problems without permitting them to participate in actual negotiations."
>
> In my view the Commission's recommendation contemplates that when tariff negotiations are conducted abroad, industry representatives should accompany our State Department negotiators to the site of the conference. While it may be desirable to exclude domestic producers from the conference table itself, their expert knowledge of industry conditions would be of great benefit to those who bargain for us, and should be readily available.

In other words, what I am saying there is that we should have expert knowledge at the point of trading, at the same time, at the same hotel, if you will, not at the conference table; but there should be some experts there who really know what the effects of tariffs may be upon American industry and upon the American workman, so that our negotiators can be well advised and act accordingly.

I continue with the letter:

> I sincerely hope, Mr. Secretary, that you will give careful consideration to these recommendations of the Commission. It is my belief that the Randall Commission's recommendations as to the trade-agreements program, would have much more support, both in the Congress and the business community, if there were greater confidence that the State Department would conduct tariff negotiations in the future with more realism than apparently has existed in the past.
>
> As you know, Great Britain's diplomatic representatives have never hesitated to fight for her economic interests at the conference table. There is no reason why our own diplomats should be hesitant or shamefaced in seeking to advance the economic interests of the United States. A bargain fair to both sides requires equal zeal on the part of both bargainers. If the fact' as to administration of the trade-agreements program in the past, as represented to me, are correct, we will need more traders in the Yankee tradition of David Harum on our side of the conference table if new trade-agreement negotiations are undertaken.
>
> With warm personal regards, I am,
>
> Cordially yours,
>
> PRESCOTT BUSH,
> *United States Senator.*

Mr. President, I hope that in the coming weeks Members of the Congress will find the time to study carefully the Randall Commission's report, not the press accounts of it, which I do not think adequately cover the scope of the report; but they should carefully study the report itself, which is a very concise, carefully worked-out document. The Commission had, of necessity, to face problems which vitally concern the Nation.

Acceptable solutions to those problems must be found if we are to retain the friendship of our allies, win the cold war against communism, and survive as a free people. The solutions which the Randall Commission has proposed may not be the only possible solutions. I have no doubt that the wisdom and experience of Members of the Congress may suggest alternatives. It is my belief, however, that the Commission's report has laid the essential foundation from which we can build to reach the solutions we must reach, or else suffer a crippling of our cold-war defenses.

As the Commission has said in the introduction to its report:

> The policies pursued and the actions taken by the United States in respect to foreign economic policy profoundly influence the destinies of all the peoples of the free world.
>
> Our Nation bears an awesome responsibility of world leadership. Though not of our seeking, it is one that we may be fated to bear for a long time to come. If we bear it with understanding, courage, and honor, we can make incalculable contributions to the cause of peace and the advancement of human welfare.

Mr. President, I sincerely trust that Congress, in acting upon the recommendations which the President of the United States will soon make to us on foreign economic policy, will make it possible for the Nation to discharge that responsibility of world leadership.

Mr. President, I have here a clipping from the Washington Star written by that estimable writer, Mr. Gould Lincoln, which begins as follows:

A major battle is building up over proposals to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks the article may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of February 23, 1954]

BIG BATTLE IN MAKING OVER RECIPROCAL TRADE—CONGRESS WARNED AGAINST RETURN TO SMOOT-HAWLEY

(By Gould Lincoln)

A major battle is building up over proposals to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It is likely to burst into full and open view as soon as President Eisenhower submits to Congress his own proposals regarding foreign trade and the tariff. This he is expected to do in March. The report of the Randall Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, designed to aid the President in his recommendations, has already been made public.

In general, this report proposes a 3-year extension of the life of the Trade Agreements Act, with the peril points, escape clause, and other safeguards. The President, it is recommended, may suspend or disregard these provisions if he deems it wise in the interest of the country's economy.

Well-heeled organizations on both sides of the tariffs issue are already in the field and working hard on individual Members of Congress, as well as conducting an educational campaign to obtain popular support. The Trade Agreements Act is due to expire June 12, unless congressional action keeps it alive. The opponents of the law as it now operates are preparing a bill which would curtail the present trade agreements program. On the other side, the supporters of the trade agreements system, who generally represent those calling for freer trade and a further elimination of trade barriers, are preparing to fight for Presidential recommendations for an extension of the act.

AUTHORITY DELEGATED NOW

One of the proposals of the Anti-Trade Agreements Act is that the act be allowed to die and that Congress take back its responsibility for fixing tariffs, which is now delegated with certain limitations to the United States Tariff Commission and the State Department which negotiates the trade agreements. This would be turning the clock back with a vengeance. It has been 20-odd years since Congress passed its last general tariff act, the Smoot-Hawley Act, during the Hoover administration. This same tariff law would be in effect immediately on the expiration of the Trade Agreements Act, though many of the trade agreements to which this country is presently a party would continue to run for 6 months or more.

When the Smoot-Hawley Act was put through, American industries claimed that they were in danger of competition with a flood of foreign imports made with cheap labor. The effect of the act was to raise the trade barriers and to lessen foreign imports, making it more difficult than ever for the nations debtor to the United States to sell goods and so pay their debts. Further, the act brought about retaliatory measures against American exports.

Today, fears of a lessening domestic market, with attendant economic recession, have brought an increased demand for higher tariff duties as a protection against a dumping of foreign products into this country at prices which would ruin American producers.

NEED LONG-RANGE POLICY

The administration was able to get a 1-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act last year, so that the President and his advisers would have an opportunity to explore the whole subject of foreign trade and come up with a program. The time has come to adopt a long-range policy, and with it has come greater demands for higher tariff protection from many American industries. It is suggested that in the end, however, the administration may have to settle for a 1-year extension of the act for a second time. Last year a group of oil producers fought hard for a quota limitation on residual oil imports. They were joined by several other industries which wished higher tariff protection. They are planning now to renew the battle.

On the other side are a number of important American industries which want trade barriers lowered—freer trade. Their contention is that this country must have a maximum foreign trade in order to help care for the great production of its industries. Obviously, trade is not a one-way street, and there must be imports as well as exports. An expanded trade can become vital to prosperity in the United States, they say.

A return to general tariff-making legislation, as favored by some of the antitrade agreements group, could lead to logrolling legislation in Congress on a major scale—where industries and their representatives in Congress pooled their strength to obtain their individual ends. For 20 years that kind of thing has been avoided. Such legislation helped ruin the Republican administration under Taft and Hoover, and could do the same for the Eisenhower administration.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE VOTE ON THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, three amendments to the committee text for Senate Joint Resolution 1 have been adopted. Those amendments are acceptable to the administration. They are acceptable to me. Standing alone, however, they do not adequately protect the American people against abuse of the power to make treaties and executive agreements.

My amendment to the committee text is now before the Senate. This amendment, combined with the three amendments already adopted, will achieve in large measure the original objectives of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Some of the cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 1 were disturbed by the so-called "which" clause in the text reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee. That clause did not appear in Senate Joint Resolution 1, as originally introduced. That clause was contained in section 2 of the committee text, reading as follows:

A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

The "which" clause has been eliminated from the modified text, but without lessening materially the value of the proposed constitutional amendment. Adoption of the modified text of Senate Joint Resolution 1 will vindicate the efforts of patriotic organizations and persons who have done so much to alert the public to the danger of treaty law. The new language will give added constitutional protection to personal rights, to States' rights, and to the independence of our great Nation.

My proposed amendment to the committee text reads as follows:

SEC. 3. A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by the Congress unless in advising and consenting to a treaty the Senate, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, shall provide that such treaty may become effective as internal law without legislation by the Congress.

If this language is added to the three perfecting amendments already adopted, we shall have before us a proposed constitutional amendment reading as follows:

SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

SEC. 2. Clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution."

SEC. 3. A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by the Congress unless in advising and consenting to a treaty the Senate, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, shall provide that such treaty may become effective as internal law without legislation by the Congress.

SEC. 4. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

Standing alone, sections 1, 2, and 4 do not provide adequate protection.

My position can hardly be called an uncompromising one. The administration objected most strenuously to the "which" clause and to the section of the committee text confirming the power of Congress to regulate executive agreements having external force and effect.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Those provisions have been eliminated from the modified text.

My amendment to the committee text retains two essential features of the original joint resolution. First, it helps insure that the American people will be governed by laws written by their own elected representatives, rather than by treaty provisions, the meaning of which is often impossible to ascertain at the time of Senate consent to ratification.

Second, my amendment to the committee text will prevent a President of the United States from making domestic law by international agreements not approved by either House of Congress. I cannot describe as adequate any constitutional amendment that does not contain those two essential safeguards. Accordingly, the vote on the pending amendment will be justly interpreted as a vote for or against the substance of the Bricker amendment.

Most of the supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 1 have understood the political necessity of modifying language to secure favorable action in the Senate. At the same time, they know that certain basic principles in the so-called Bricker amendment cannot be compromised. Any attempt to sell a watered-down substitute under that label could only be described as an effort to defeat its fundamental purpose.

Many lay supporters of the so-called Bricker amendment are not much concerned with constitutional niceties. Some are impatient with what they conceive to be legal hairsplitting. Nevertheless, they know there is a loophole in the Constitution. They know that attempts have been made to exploit the loophole at the expense of individual liberty and American independence. The American people want that loophole plugged. They do not want to hamstring the President. No one does. They do want to hamstring the extreme internationalists. To many Americans, the so-called Bricker amendment symbolizes effective protection against designs to undermine the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States by treaty or by executive agreement.

Much has been said about undermining the sovereignty of our country and relinquishing some of our sovereignty. Yesterday we listened to the reading of the message given by General Washington to the people of the United States in his Farewell Address. That was a plea for the maintenance of the sovereignty of the United States. Every Senator ought to know and remember, and keep ever before him, the idea that when we give up any part of our sovereignty, to that degree we give up independence. The Revolution which Washington led was to secure sovereignty, and his service as President was directed toward the end of maintaining our sovereignty, and thereby the independence of our country.

To keep faith with those who have supported me in this fight, I resolved long ago to labor to the end that an effective amendment to preserve our fundamental constitutional concepts be adopted. In my judgment, the so-called George amendment is inadequate to that end. It is good so far as it goes. It does not go far enough. For example, there is nothing in the George amendment to insure that laws for the American people will be made by their own elected representatives rather than by nonelected delegates to the United Nations and its satellite agencies.

Accordingly, the pending amendment gives every Senator an opportunity to be recorded for or against what is popularly known as the Bricker amendment. I hope that the record of this vote will receive wide publicity. No candidate for reelection to this body should be judged solely by his vote on one single issue, but where an issue is of paramount importance the vote should be publicized by all available means.

My amendment to the committee text contains no new substantive language. The substantive portion of my amendment has been before the Senate and the people for more than 2 years. It has twice been the subject of lengthy hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

My amendment to the committee text would make treaties and executive agreements nonself-executing, but with power in the Senate to make an exception to this rule in the case of treaties, if it is so desired by a two-thirds vote. The amendment provides that a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by the Congress, unless the Senate by affirmative action provides otherwise. I do not believe that the administration has any serious objection to make treaties nonself-executing. That is the rule in almost every other country. If the administration does have any objection to this feature of the amendment, it has not been disclosed to me or to the Senate.

I do not believe that I violate any confidence when I say that during 6 months of negotiation with administration leaders we were usually able to agree on the general principle that treaties should become effective as internal law only through legislation by the Congress. However, final agreement on language was never concluded because of one objection on my part and one objection on the part of the Secretary of State. Both of those objections have been overcome in the revised text.

My objection to providing that treaties should become effective as internal law only through legislation by the Congress stemmed from a desire to protect the reserved powers of the States. Many treaties contain provisions making them effective only to the extent permitted by the laws of the States, provinces, or other political subdivisions. Many of the treaties of friendship and commerce approved by the Senate last year contain such a provision. Naturally, I could not agree to any constitutional amendment that prevented the President and the Senate from showing a decent respect for States' rights in treatymaking. That difficulty, however, has been overcome in the revised text by permitting the Senate to approve a treaty calling for State rather than congressional legislation.

The State Department objected to making all treaties non-self-executing as internal law on the ground that the effective date of some treaties might be unduly or unnecessarily delayed thereby. That objection has also been overcome. In appropriate cases, the Senate by a two-thirds vote would be able to make treaties immediately effective as internal law.

The non-self-executing feature of my amendment does not alter in the slightest degree the traditional separation of power as between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of Government. It does not affect the existing powers of the President. It does not upset the balance of power as between Federal and State Governments. It does not surrender Senate prerogatives to the House of Representatives. I do not see how there can be any valid objection to making treaties non-self-executing as internal law subject to power in the Senate to make them immediately effective.

Our treaty supremacy clause is unique in that it permits the treatymaking agency to legislate with respect to purely domestic matters. It is coextensive with the legislative power of the Congress and that of State legislatures. In almost every other country of the world treaties do not become domestic law until implemented by the appropriate legislative bodies.

When Secretary Dulles appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee, he contended that this proposal of mine was considered and rejected by the Constitutional Convention of 1787. He referred to the motion of Gouverneur Morris that no treaty should be binding "which is not ratified as a law." Morris' motion was voted down 8 to 1 for reasons that are as valid today as they were then. His proposal called for legislative validation of all treaties. The pending proposal is limited to those treaties intended to become effective as internal law.

It has been my position from the very beginning that we should not in this amendment attempt to interfere with the President's international responsibilities or the treatymaking power of the President and two-thirds of the Senate in foreign affairs, but only to prevent the invasion of the power of Congress under the Constitution to make the internal laws of our country and for our people.

To understand why Morris' motion was rejected and why my amendment should be adopted, we need only to inquire why the Senate was chosen as the President's partner in treatymaking. Throughout the debates in the Constitutional Convention there are references to the need for secrecy in concluding some international agreements. Being smaller in size and therefore more likely to keep matters in confidence, the Senate was selected as the President's treaty partner. Even today, the Senate can act on treaties in closed executive session. How can anyone seriously maintain that the framers of the Constitution intended to give the President and the Senate power to make internal law by Star Chamber procedure?

On the contrary, all available evidence suggests that the treatymaking power was never intended to be an internal legislative power. For example, article I, section 1, vests all legislative power in the Congress. That is the only time the word "all" is used in the Constitution. That article explodes the assumption that a part of the legislative power was intended to be conferred on the President and Senate alone. In addition, Hamilton expressly denied any domestic lawmaking function of treaties in the Federalist, No. 75, when he said:

> The power of making treaties * * * relates neither to the execution of the subsisting laws, nor to the enaction of new ones * * *. Its objects are contracts with foreign nations, which have the force of law, but derive it from the obligations of good faith. They are not rules prescribed by the sovereign to the subject, but agreements between sovereign and sovereign.

Of course, the supremacy clause, making treaties the supreme law of the land, did operate to give treaties of the United States a domestic law aspect, although its limited purpose was to override the Revolutionary War debt legislation of the States. As a result it has always been difficult, and at times impossible, to determine to what extent treaties make internal law. For example, in 1833 the Supreme Court held a treaty to be self-executing, although only 4 years before the same treaty had been held by the court to be ineffective as domestic law without legislation. Compare *United States* v. *Percheman* (7 Pet. 51 (U. S. 1833)) with *Foster* v. *Neilson* (2 Pet. 253 (U. S. 1829)).

Today, the internal law effect of treaties is more unpredictable than it was a century ago.

In approving some treaties the Senate indulges in the dangerous pastime of writing an unknown and unknowable law of the land. That is no reflection on the ability of the Senate or its Foreign Relations Committee. Consider, for example, articles 55 and 56 of the U. N. Charter, about which there has been much discussion in this debate. Senators who served in the 79th Congress will recall the solemn assurances to the effect that those human-rights articles were mere statements of high aspiration and purpose, and without legal significance. As a practical matter, it was impossible for the Senate to write a reservation to the U. N. Charter.

Since 1945, the ambiguous language of articles 55 and 56 has been used as a basis for invalidating local law by a California intermediate court, which was later reversed, by a judge in Idaho, and by four Justices of the Supreme Court—*Oyama* v. *California* (332 U. S. 633 (1948) (concurring opinion)).

Nine years after adherence to the U. N. Charter we still do not know whether or not articles 55 and 56 supersede thousands of Federal and State laws.

The danger represented by articles 55 and 56 of the U. N. Charter will reappear time and time again in various forms. There is no reason why the Senate should remain helpless in the face of a demonstrated danger. The Senate's power of reservation works well possibly on bilateral treaties. Today, the multilateral treaty is the rule rather than the exception. With scores of nations involved, the use of precise language and an unrestricted right of reservation is virtually impossible.

For example, there is now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the Universal Copyright Convention. Article 20 expressly denies the right to attach a reservation to this treaty.

Amendments to the U. N. Charter may come before the Senate several years from now. The language is not likely to be distinguished for clarity any more than the language of the original charter. Reservations will be impossible.

Why should the Senate be forced to approve treaties with a prayer and a vain hope that the courts will agree with its guess as to the impact on domestic law, or to reject them because under one possible construction they would be dangerous to domestic rights? These difficulties are avoided under the language of my amendment to the committee text.

The report of the Senate Judiciary Committee contains an excellent discussion of the need to make treaties non-self-executing as internal law. That statement will be found at pages 8 to 13 of the report.

Moreover, a memorandum written by Dr. Edward S. Corwin on May 5, 1953, states that a considerable case can be made for making both treaties and executive agreements non-self-executing as domestic law. In fairness to Dr. Corwin, two facts should be noted. First, he suggests that the danger may not require the drastic remedy of a constitutional amendment. Secondly, Dr. Corwin wrote with some objectivity, not being at that time a cochairman of the misnamed Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power. Here is what Dr. Corwin said less than a year ago:

> Later, the Court set up the distinction between "self-executing" treaty provisions, which it held to be enforcible by courts, and "executory" provisions, which are addressed to the political departments and require to be put into effect by them. (*Foster* v. *Neilson* (2 Pet. 253; 1829).) The distinction has never been sufficiently clarified to permit prediction as to its practical application. This still remains the Supreme Court's guess.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> The comments on April 7 on the resolution by Secretary of State Dulles and Attorney General Brownell are, in my opinion, sufficient to dispose of sections 1, 2, and 4 of the proposed amendment. As to section 3, the merits of the question are less clear. Undoubtedly, a considerable case can be made for it. Adoption of it would bring our practice into line with that of other democratic governments. Treaties of Great Britain, for example, "which, for their enforcement by British courts of law, require some addition to, or alteration of the existing law, cannot be carried into effect without legislation." (Wade and Phillips, Constitutional Law, 205 (Longmans, 1931).) Treaties of the United States are, it is true, already subject to repeal as law of the land by Congress at its option. (*Head Money* cases (112 U. S. 580, 598–599 (1884)); *The Cherokee Tobacco* (11) Wall. 616 (1871)); *Botiller* v. *Domingues* (130 U. S. 238 (1889)); *Fong Yue Ting* v. *United States* (149 U. S. 698, 721 (1893)); *La Abra Silver Mining Co.* v. *United States* (175 U. S. 423, 460 (1899).) Such acts of repeal, however, furnish legitimate ground for complaint by the other party or parties to the treaty affected. *Head Money* cases, *supra*. It might be well to notify the world beforehand of this limitation to the effectiveness of treaties of the United States, even though the same limitation exists in the case of treaties of certain other countries. And it might be well to extend the same rule to executive agreements. Respecting these Secretary Dulles makes this statement: "The danger to the Nation from agreements not submitted to the Senate as treaties or to the Congress for validation cannot be great because, without either Senate or congressional action, these agreements cannot constitutionally become law of the land." But this, evidently, is not the theory of the Supreme Court. In *United States* v. *Belmont* (301 U. S. 324; 1937) and *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203; 1942) the Court took cognizance of the Hull-Litvinov agreement of 1933, and interpreted it as effecting a confiscation by the Soviet Government of assets of the New York branch of a Russian insurance company. In other words, a U. S. S. R. decree of confiscation was held to be operative upon property located in the United States.

That is the end of Dr. Corwin's discussion. He has been quoted extensively in the hearings, and I thought it might be well for the Senate to have his complete thinking on the amendment which is now before the Senate.

My amendment to the committee text would also untie the hands of the Senate in another respect. By virtue of the rule in *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416 (1920)), the Senate cannot by way of reservation to a treaty deny to the whole Congress its power to implement a treaty irrespective of the constitutionally reserved powers of the States. Thus, a Federal-State clause may relieve the United States of its international obligation to make a treaty completely effective throughout the United States. However, if Congress wishes to utilize its full power under Missouri against Holland, no Federal-State clause appended to the treaty by the Senate can prevent such action. There is no rhyme or reason why the Senate of the United States should be incapable of protecting the reserved powers of the States from the force of treaty law if that is its desire.

There is no way by which that power can be given to the Senate except by the adoption of my amendment to the text as already perfected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to be sure that I understand the Senator's interpretation of the language of his amendment to the committee amendment. The doctrine of Missouri against Holland, under which the authority of Congress is enlarged by the terms of a treaty, would, I understand the Senator from Ohio to say, be continued in the present amendment. The Congress consequently, under the Senator's amendment, could legislate, by reason of the power flowing from a treaty. Is that correct?

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct today even if we tried to put in a Federal-State clause. That handicap would not exist under my amendment, except as the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Senate may make it so. The Senate could make a treaty immediately effective, but the treaty would not become domestic law until so enacted by act of Congress, unless the Senate desired otherwise.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio what I am sure he already knows, and that is that I am not in favor of international compacts becoming effective as internal law in the absence of congressional approval. However, the question occurred to me, as the Senator from Ohio was discussing the case of Missouri against Holland. The language therein indicates that the right of the Congress would be restricted unless the Senate provided otherwise in ratifying a treaty.

Mr. BRICKER. No. A treaty would not become domestic law until made so by act of Congress, except that the Senate, in ratification, could make it immediately effective or self-executing, or effective through State legislation.

Mr. KUCHEL. In other words, the doctrine of Missouri against Holland is continued under the Senator's pending amendment in all those instances where the Congress sees fit to legislate in the field of domestic law.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from California is correct.

This problem is explained on page 1029 of the record of hearings by Mr. Carl B. Rix, past president of the American Bar Association. On page 621 of the hearings, a report written by Mr. John W. Davis and four other opponents of any treaty-control amendment agrees with Mr. Rix. That report concludes that a Federal-State clause in the U. N. Human Rights Covenants might be ineffective to prevent Congress from gaining power to fully implement the covenants.

Mr. President, this is the very heart, I think, of the entire amendment as it was originally conceived to protect the rights of the people of America from legislation by the President and two-thirds of the Senate or by an executive agreement alone, oftentimes made in secret.

I wish to advise the Senate at this time that I have not heard from the State Department as to what the 200 executive agreements might be to which the Attorney General referred in his brief on certiorari in the Guy W. Capps case. I hope to hear at an early date as to what they might be. But if it is a fact that there are now 200 executive agreements entered into by the President of the United States, making laws for the people of the United States about which the Congress and the people know nothing at the present time, it is impossible to have government by the consent of the governed under circumstances of that kind. This is a government, presumably, by consent of the governed. With reference to the ratification of a treaty, if it becomes self-executing, the people may not know until many years in the future what laws are affected or might be affected by its ratification.

We want to bring treaties and executive agreements within the purview of the Constitution, to make them subordinate to it, not above it, so that the American people may know what their rights are, that their domestic legislation is not only pursuant to the terms of the Constitution, but is in accordance with it, and not in conflict with it; and that legislation affecting them is enacted by the Congress of the United States which, under the Constitution, is the source of all legislative authority. That was the case until the distortion of the treaty-making clause in 1920 by the Supreme Court in the Holland case and in the Pink case with reference to executive agreements. I cannot overemphasize the importance of this particular amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood the Senator to state that there are some 200 such executive agreements.

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like the Senator to repeat, in no uncertain terms, his statement with reference to that matter, so that the people of the United States may know how the country is affected by executive agreements. If the Senator will repeat that portion of his statement regarding 200 executive agreements which have been made, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. BRICKER. The Attorney General, in his brief on certiorari in the Supreme Court in the Capps case, stated that 200 agreements might be invalidated under the circuit court of appeals decision. He said the State Department told him that there were 200 such executive agreements.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator know whether the Interior Department or any other department have such agreements, other than the State Department?

Mr. BRICKER. I have no idea, and no one else has. I am now trying to find out what are the 200 agreements to which reference has been made. The majority leader asked for an analysis of all executive agreements which affect internal law, and I do not think he has received any reply.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from Ohio. The only information the Senator has with reference to the matter is what the Attorney General has stated. Is that correct?

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct. It referred only to the State Department. There may be other instances. I know of an agreement with regard to international aviation which changed all the terms used by our aviators in this country to an international language.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. I know of that case myself.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the essence of the difference of opinion turn on the question whether treaties or international agreements which are in conflict with the Constitution shall not be made, as opposed to the statement that where internal law is involved, the Congress must act affirmatively?

Mr. BRICKER. There are two sections to the proposal; yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not that the essence of the difference of opinion, so that the question comes down to whether an agreement is in conflict with the Constitution—and, the further words, "in pursuance of the Constitution," are involved—as opposed to affirmative action by the Congress, as the Senator has so ably stated?

Mr. BRICKER. That is the essence of the difference of opinion, I can assure the Senator from Massachusetts. I believe executive agreements and treaties should not become domestic law unless there is an act of Congress covering the situation. There was never intended by the Founding Fathers. They regarded treaties made between one nation and another nation as instruments dealing with matters of genuine international concern. They depended upon the good will of the country with whom we had a treaty to carry it out.

There are those who contend that Congress has the power to change the domestic application of treaties. I think the proponents of such a position as that are on untenable ground. Treaties become the law of the land, and we cannot change them after they are once binding. Our integrity is at stake in a situation of that kind. Our obligations are firmly fixed, and we should not violate our international obligations. We want to be on a parity with the other nations of the world. We want Congress to take a look at an agreement before it becomes domestic law, as is done in Canada and, with minor exceptions, in practically all the other nations of the world. Before a treaty goes into effect, there has to be positive action by the legislative power.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the Senator's statement, because as I listened to the discussion this afternoon and to some of the other discussions, that seemed to me to be the essential difference of opinion.

Mr. BRICKER. Beyond that, in the field of executive agreements, which the distinguished Senator from Georgia covers in his substitute, I do not see how anyone can successfully contend that the President alone should be able to make laws or to avoid laws already on the statute books and nullify the Constitution of the United States. That is a practice which has developed and which was confirmed by the Supreme Court in the Pink case. It is the most dangerous power of which I can conceive to be placed in the hands of one man—the power to make laws for the people of this country and even to make them in secret and keep them in secret until some occasion may arise when the contents are made known.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio speaks of striking out lines 7 through 9, and inserting or adding the language of section 3.

Mr. BRICKER. That was changed by another amendment, so as to make the insertion between lines 9 and 10, I believe.

Mr. BUSH. As I understand, the Senate has already agreed to the so-called Ferguson amendment, pertaining to the revision of article VI of the Constitution, and containing the "in pursuance of" language. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Ohio that that amendment stands, and that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is intended to follow it?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DAIRY DISEASE CONTROL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a protest from the Governor of Minnesota against some of the economy being practiced by the Eisenhower administration.

Minnesota, as a great dairy State, has been hit hard enough by lowering of dairy price supports. Yet the Department of Agriculture is going even further in withdrawing its assistance from our efforts to clean up our dairy herds by eradicating brucellosis.

The new budget provides no funds for the payment of indemnities for cattle condemned for tuberculosis or brucellosis.

Minnesota's Governor Anderson and Commisisoner of Agriculture Myron Clark inform me that elimination of these payments jeopardizes the continuance of the Minnesota disease-testing program, which is reaching its climax. They say that withdrawal of full participation at this critical stage of the campaign to eradicate brucellosis might be disastrous.

We hear so much about economy these days that I want to impress upon the Senate that this communication from our Republican Governor and agricultural officials of a Republican State administration calls for adding $1 million to the Department of Agriculture's budget for brucellosis control.

I happen to agree with them most heartily that the elimination of these funds is another example of foolish economy, to the point of being a costly mistake rather than any real saving to the American people. I welcome, for a change, some of our State Republican leadership beginning to recognize the penny-wise and pound-foolish policies being invoked by the administration in regard to agriculture.

I call attention to the warning of these Minnesota officials that they do not feel able to carry on the work alone, and that, as a result, loss of the indemnities might prevent the State's sanitary board from being able to qualify many counties in the State to market their dairy products in accordance with the United States Public Health Service milk ordinance and code.

This is just a good example of the fallacy of the growing tendency in Washington to say, "Let the States do it; let the States assume a greater share of the burden." The simple truth is, as I have constantly warned, the States are either not able or not willing to assume the burden of these essential programs for the public's interest.

It is rather interesting to me that our own Republican Governor refutes the idea that farm programs should be left to the States, by saying in his letter:

> No real progress was made in the control and eradication of either of these diseases until participation was undertaken by the Federal Government. Great progress has been and is being made in both eradication programs since Federal participation was initiated.
>
> Federal participation in disease-control programs not only lends financial aid, but vital moral support to an eradication program. Withdrawal of full participation at this critical stage of the campaign to eradicate brucellosis might be disastrous.
>
> Control of diseases of domestic animals to be successful must be on a national scale. Disease organisms do not respect State lines, and embargoes against importation of livestock are incompatible to our national livestock economy. We therefore believe that Federal participation in disease eradication programs is essential.

Mr. President, it is a pleasure to have the support of our governor and commissioner of agriculture in efforts to protect Minnesota agriculture, and I certainly pledge them my strongest cooperation in seeking restoration of these funds.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Governor Anderson be published at the conclusion of these remarks, and be called to the attention of the appropriate committees of the Senate for action.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
St. Paul, February 17, 1954.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are informed that the budget of the United States Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1954–1955 includes no provision for funds for the payment of indemnity by the Federal Government for cattle condemned for tuberculosis or brucellosis. We believe this omission should be immediately corrected because it jeopardizes the continuance of the Minnesota testing program which is reaching its climax. We are urging all members of the Minnesota delegation to join in safeguarding this program of extreme importance to our agricultural State.

The Federal Government has participated with State governments in the payment of indemnity for cattle condemned on account of tuberculosis since 1917, and in the payment of indemnity for cattle condemned for brucellosis since 1934. No real progress was made in the control and eradication of either of these diseases until participation was undertaken by the Federal Government. Great progress has been and is being made in both eradication programs since Federal participation was initiated.

Federal participation in disease-control programs not only lends financial aid but vital moral support to an eradication program. Withdrawal of full participation at this critical stage of the campaign to eradicate brucellosis might be disastrous.

Control of diseases of domestic animals to be successful must be on a national scale. Disease organisms do not respect State lines, and embargoes against importation of livestock are incompatible to our national livestock economy. We, therefore, believe that Federal participation in disease-eradication programs is essential. However, if the Federal Government intends to withdraw from the disease-control picture, some advances notice should be given to the several States in order to permit State legislatures to amend their laws or provide funds accordingly.

In Minnesota, after more than 20 years of preparatory efforts, the program for eradication of brucellosis is now reaching a climax. Under Minnesota law, indemnity must be paid for animals condemned for tuberculosis or brucellosis. Unless the Federal Government participates, the entire indemnity must be assumed by the State. The 1953 legislature appropriated funds for the present biennium on the assumption that Federal participation would continue. If no Federal funds are available for the payment of indemnity in the fiscal year 1954–55, the amount which the State will be required to pay for this purpose will deplete the funds available for brucellosis control to a great extent. The result will be such that the State livestock sanitary board will be unable to qualify many counties in the State to market their dairy products in accordance with the United States Public Health Service milk ordinance and code.

A conservative estimate indicates that at least $1 million will be needed by the United States Department of Agriculture for the payment of indemnity if full participation is continued with the several States. It is respectfully and urgently requested that you exert every effort to have an adequate amount included in the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture, earmarked for the payment of tuberculosis and brucellosis indemnity.

Yours very truly,

C. ELMER ANDERSON,
Governor.

RALPH L. WEST,
Secretary, Livestock Sanitary Board.

MYRON W. CLARK,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. THYE. With respect to the Federal appropriation for the eradication of the various livestock diseases, I received the same communication which came to my colleague. I referred it to the Department of Agriculture, because I specifically wished to have the Department's recommendation before I proceeded to the Bureau of the Budget with the problem. A request for such an appropriation was omitted by the Bureau of the Budget.

I may say to my colleague that in the past year the State of Minnesota has had funds which have permitted it to go forward with its program of tuberculosis eradication. There was a time when there was a shortage in the Government funds to match the State funds, and at that time I took the matter up with the Department of Agriculture. I cannot speak with exactness regarding the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

figures, but, if my memory serves me correctly, the Department of Agriculture allocated an additional amount of something over $69,000 to the State of Minnesota. I shall furnish for the RECORD the exact figures, but I am sure the amount was in excess of $69,000. Those funds enabled the State to go forward with the eradication program, and it is doing so now without any curtailment or shutdown.

I shall join my colleague in the request of the Department of Agriculture and the administration that the program must be completed. There is no use going into a certain number of counties in any State in the Union, beginning to eradicate a disease, and then not finishing the job. If the work is not completed, a recurrence of the infection will occur. It is therefore necessary to completely eradicate such a disease in a State. Assistance must be furnished in eradicating livestock disease, whether the disease is in Idaho, Oregon, Minnesota, or wherever it may be. The job must be completed.

I say to the Bureau of the Budget and to the administration officials that it is shortsighted to begin the program and then stop the work before it is completed. If the disease being attacked is not eradicated in all communities and in all counties, there will be a recurrence of the infection.

I wanted the RECORD to show that I had received identically the same letter which was signed by the Governor of Minnesota, by Dr. West, the executive director of the Livestock Sanitary Board, and by Mr. Myron Clark, Commissioner of Agriculture of Minnesota. When I received the letter, I immediately referred it to the Secretary of Agriculture and asked for specific recommendations before I referred it to the Bureau of the Budget. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I would put forth every possible effort in the committee to provide an appropriation recommended by the Department of Agriculture to continue the eradication program. If I could not succeed in committee, I would take it up on the floor of the Senate, and I know I would have plenty of help from my colleagues.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank my colleague. I recall that he was active in the effort to get funds to fight brucellosis during the last year.

As the Senator knows from his own letter, the governor states that in its 1953 session the legislature had appropriated money for the coming year on the basis of Federal participation. It would almost necessitate a special session of our legislature if the State of Minnesota were to continue the program with its own funds. I believe when the Federal Government has made at least a moral commitment, even if not a binding contract, to continue the program, the program should be continued. I shall certainly give my fullest cooperation to my colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask two or three clarifying questions. I hope they will be clarifying.

Am I to understand that an appropriation for livestock inspection which has existed in the past has been eliminated from the budget now pending in respect to all States, or in respect only to Minnesota?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In respect to all States.

Mr. MORSE. So that the Federal Government, if the budget proposed shall be adopted, will no longer cooperate in the effort to eradicate contagious diseases in cattle?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; brucellosis and tuberculosis.

Mr. MORSE. My second question is, Has the money appropriated in the past been appropriated on a match-money basis, with States contributing a part of the funds, and the Federal Government a part?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I may state that in the State of Minnesota there is a public law which requires indemnity payments by the State sanitary board when it finds disease in cattle. Payment is made to the owner of the cattle.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield at this point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. It is not quite so simple as that. First, the people in the county affected have to vote. There must be received an agreement on the part of a certain number of producers in the county that they will sign up with the State for the eradication of the disease; it matters not whether the disease be brucellosis or tuberculosis. If the producers agree to join with the State in the eradication program, the State proceeds to pay a certain amount to the cattle owner which is based on the appraised value of the animal. If the animal is purebred, it is appraised at a certain value. If it is another grade, it is appraised at another value. The animal is sent to the market, and the State will then make as an indemnity payment the difference between the appraised value and what the animal brings on the market. The Federal Government has joined with the State in such a program, and has participated in paying for the difference which exists between the appraised value of the animal and what the animal brings on the market. In the case of Minnesota, the State would allow a certain amount, and the Federal Government in turn would allow a certain amount. That is the manner in which the particular program has been handled in the past.

If the Federal Government is going to fail to match such costs, then it will cease to do what it has done in the past in the program of eradicating tuberculosis or some of the other highly infectious diseases. I think the abandonment of such a program would be a mistake. I know the producers would think exactly the same as do many of the Senators now present, that if the program came to an end at this time the eradication program would not be as successful as it has been in the past.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say, by way of supplementation, that the program has now been in existence for 20 years, as the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota knows. According to the Governor's letter, the program has progressed on the basis of that experience. The county program to which the senior Senator has referred would be stopped at dead center, according to the Commissioner of Agriculture of Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I may say to my colleague that sometimes counties have refused to cooperate with the State. We in Minnesota have had difficulties over that question in the past 20 years. Some counties disagreed with the State livestock sanitary board and have not agreed to permit area tests. Therefore, there may be isolated instances where the State authorities cannot get the counties to cooperate. However, with regard to all counties which have agreed, the State has proceeded during the past 20 years with a program, first, of tuberculosis eradication, then with other programs, and at the present time there is in operation the brucellosis-eradication program. Of course, the herds in many counties were tested for tuberculosis last summer, and many herds were tested both for tuberculosis and the other disease. The State is in the process of finishing that program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is exactly the substance of the Governor's letter.

Mr. THYE subsequently said: Mr. President, I have just referred to my files to obtain the exact figures regarding the allocation of funds to Minnesota.

It was in the month of February that I succeeded in having a second allocation made to Minnesota. The first allocation was on the basis of $46,400. The second allocation was $73,600.

Earlier today I stated that I thought the allocation was approximately $69,000. However, I now have the correct figures, and I submit them in connection with my previous statement.

The figure I have just stated was the amount allocated to the State of Minnesota during the month of February in order to permit the program to continue, and so there would be no delay, cancellation, or termination of the services of the veterinarians who were engaged in the eradication program.

However, the budget for the fiscal year 1955 does not contain this item; nothing in the budget is recommended for this purpose.

Therefore, when I received the letter from the Governor of Minnesota, the Minnesota Commissioner of Agriculture, and Dr. West, executive secretary of the State livestock sanitary board, I submitted it to the Department of Agriculture, in order that it might have the benefit of the recommendations of those three gentlemen, and might be able to consider them in connection with the statement by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Department of Agriculture's policy statement. As I indicated, I also wished to have the letter referred to the Bureau of the Budget or to other agencies of the administration, because

I knew we expected to have an item for eradication of the disease written into the appropriation bill, for it is too dangerous to the human race to permit Bang's disease to exist in the cattle herds, inasmuch as the result would be the contamination not only of milk, but also of the carcasses which are processed in the slaughter yards.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I shall continue to work with him on these items, and I hope the program will be continued to its completion.

Mr. THYE subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, in fact, within the hour, my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], made reference to, and had printed in the RECORD, a letter which he had received from the Governor of Minnesota. The letter was cosigned by Dr. Ralph L. West, secretary of the livestock sanitary board, and Myron W. Clark, commissioner of agriculture.

At the time of the earlier debate I entered into a general discussion of the question with my colleague. Later I returned to my office and extracted from my files a copy of a letter which I addressed to Secretary of Agriculture Benson, dated February 22, referring to the letter I had received earlier from Dr. West, the executive secretary of the State livestock sanitary board dated February 18, 1954.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of February 18, 1954 addressed to me by Dr. Ralph L. West, secretary of the livestock sanitary board, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVESTOCK SANITARY BOARD,
St. Paul, Minn., February 18, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
Senator from Minnesota,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: Yesterday a letter signed jointly by Governor Anderson, Commissioner Clark, and myself was mailed to you. This letter referred to the omission from the budget of the United States Department of Agriculture of any funds for the payment of indemnity for cattle which react to the tests for tuberculosis or brucellosis in participation with the various States. This letter is supplemental thereto and is written by me as executive officer of the State Livestock Sanitary Board and also chairman of the committee on legislation for the United States Sanitary Association, and also expresses my personal views.

I understand the budget is now being considered by a House committee in Congress of which Representative H. CARL ANDERSON, of Minnesota, is chairman. I have also written a special letter to him, but, knowing your interest in livestock-disease control in this State, I thought you should be informed of the situation we are now facing.

Since the tuberculosis- and brucellosis-eradication program became cooperative projects between the State and the Federal Government, Minnesota has operated under a "memorandum of understanding" with the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture. In this memorandum the Federal Government, through the Department of Agriculture, agreed to share in the payment of indemnities for cattle destroyed because of reacting to the test. Since the cooperative work first started the Federal Government has never failed to participate equally with the State of Minnesota in such payments.

When the 1953 legislature made the appropriation for animal-disease control in this State, there was no indication the Federal Government intended to discontinue this participation, and the State appropriations were made accordingly. It is my opinion that disease control is definitely a nationwide problem and that participation by the Federal Government in all phases has been exceedingly valuable and should be continued. However, if it is the intention of the Federal Government now to withdraw from these eradication programs or any phase thereof, in all fairness to the various States, it seems to me that sufficient notice should be given so that State legislatures can guide themselves accordingly in amending laws and appropriating money. To suddenly discontinue participation in what appears to be a violation of the "memorandum of understanding" seems extremely unfair to State animal-disease control agencies and can be disastrous to the disease-eradication programs.

In addition to the situation we will face in the next fiscal year 1954–55, we also have a problem confronting us at the present time. We greatly appreciated the supplemental allotment to Minnesota for the present fiscal year for Federal participation in indemnity payments; however, we are now informed that even with this increased allotment and with the decreased payments as provided by amended Federal regulations last September, the funds for Federal payments in Minnesota are now exhausted. Dr. Driver, the veterinarian in charge of the Federal force in Minnesota, informs me that it will be necessary for the State to assume full payment of indemnities for the remainder of this fiscal year. I do not know if there are any additional funds available for a further allotment to Minnesota, and I would appreciate your advice as to whether or not any action can be taken toward securing such funds from any source, or whether an immediate deficiency appropriation might be made to take care of these payments for the rest of the present fiscal year.

It is my understanding that Federal payments are continuing for the remainder of this fiscal year in some States. It is true that the Minnesota program is more extensive than those conducted in most of the other States but it does not seem logical that Federal payments should be denied for that reason, if there is money for the payment of indemnity still available to the Department of Agriculture.

I realize that you are extremely busy at this time and hesitate to again write you regarding these matters, but if there is anything further that you can do or suggest that I might do, I would be very pleased to hear from you.

Incidentally, I have just received and read a copy of your letter of January 21 to Secretary Benson, giving an outline of your views on the agricultural problems. I wish to congratulate you on this letter, which I believe indicates clear and sound thinking.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

RALPH L. WEST,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my letter dated February 22, 1954, to Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 22, 1954*

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY BENSON: I am in receipt of a letter that had been jointly signed by Governor C. Elmer Anderson of Minnesota, Dr. Ralph L. West, secretary of the Live Stock Sanitary Board, and Mr. Myron W. Clark, Commissioner of Agriculture in the State of Minnesota, concerning funds for the indemnity payments in the eradication of the tuberculosis and brucellosis diseases, and also a letter from Dr. West. I am enclosing copies of these letters for your information.

I have been informed by your Department that the funds are exhausted and if this Federal participation is to be continued that additional appropriations must be made. I am, therefore, asking your assistance and advice.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I shall not ask that the letter of the Governor be printed at this point in my remarks, because my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota has already inserted it in the RECORD.

There was published in the St. Paul Dispatch of February 2, 1954, an article entitled "THYE Gets Funds To Fight Brucellosis," written by Alfred D. Stedman, which refers specifically to the question under discussion, and also reports that I had succeeded in obtaining the second allotment for the State of Minnesota, so that the disease eradication program could be continued without interruption or delay. The article refers specifically to the $73,600 to which I referred earlier.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Alfred D. Stedman may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THYE GETS FUNDS TO FIGHT BRUCELLOSIS

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

As a result of a conference held by Senator THYE with Secretary of Agriculture Benson, an allotment of $73,600 of Federal funds has been made to help Minnesota push brucellosis eradication among dairy cattle during the next 5 months.

This was disclosed today by Dr. Ralph L. West, executive officer of the Minnesota Livestock Sanitary Board. Dr. West is in charge of the work of freeing Minnesota herds of the livestock disease that, when communicated to humans, is known as undulant fever. Dr. West said he hopes the funds will be sufficient so that, together with this State's expenditures for the purpose, there will be sufficient money to pay indemnities through the rest of the Government's fiscal year, which ends June 30.

Under Federal economy measures, the United States Department of Agriculture already has reduced its allotments substantially and a further reduction to or near zero would have been forced if the new allocation of $73,600 hadn't been made. The money is used to indemnify dairy herd owners up to a maximum of $25 a head for grade cows and $50 a head for thoroughbreds that are found infected with brucellosis and removed by slaughter as sources of further danger to herds or handlers.

Hitherto shared 50–50, the Federal Government this year cut its share from a $12.50 maximum to $9 on grade cows and from $25 to $18 on thoroughbreds.

With the State making up the balance, the increased drain on State indemnity funds has been further aggravated by the worst drop in slaughter prices of cows in 7 years. This drop has brought market prices of animals slaughtered down in more and more

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

cases below appraisal values where indemnities begin.

These are $125 maximum for grade animals and $225 for thoroughbreds. Two-thirds of the margin below the appraisal can be covered by indemnity and one-third of the loss is stood by the owner. With both slaughter prices and the Federal share of indemnities declining, the burden on State funds has been rising.

Dr. West conferred by telephone with Dr. Robert Anderson, of animals disease control work, in Washington. Then Senator THYE took up the matter of Federal funds directly with Secretary Benson.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Minnesota will yield to me further, I may say I understand the procedure which has been followed in the past, but my question was whether the elimination of this particular item in the Eisenhower budget would not result in great discouragement to the cattle growers, both in Minnesota and in all the other States, and consequently fail in obtaining their cooperation and participation in the program. That would follow because, without the Federal matching money the cattle growers would not get so much for the condemned creatures as they would get with participation of Federal funds. Therefore, the cattle growers might take a chance on the animals recovering from the disease in some way, and would not go along with the eradication procedure. Am I correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct when he indicates that such action, if not at least a deathblow, would be at least a retarding blow to the progress of the program. When there is State, county, and Federal participation, as is contemplated by the program, it would be almost impossible to carry it out if there were not a budget estimate by the administration, and an appropriation by Congress, unless the State legislatures were reconvened and then dealt with the problem, and unless, again, they were able to obtain funds through legislative appropriations.

Mr. MORSE. Therefore, does it not follow that to the extent that the withdrawal of Federal funds has the effect of reducing the extent of the program of disease eradication among the herds in the Nation, the public health becomes endangered?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, Mr. President, this is one of the most effective public-health measures ever undertaken. I believe the public-health records will reveal that when tuberculosis eradication among the dairy herds was begun, some years ago, it had an extremely important effect not only on the health of the herds, but also on the health of the people. The same is true in the case of brucellosis.

Mr. MORSE. Has not the theory been that the people of the country as a whole have an interest in the eradication of contagious diseases among cattle, when the cattle are used either for milk purposes or for beef purposes which, without careful supervision, might result in endangering the health of the public?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, the public has a positive and definite personal interest in the success of the program.

Mr. MORSE. So this program seems to me to be at least one specific case in which leaving it to the States does not guarantee the best protection of the national public interest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that is so.

I say frankly that if this matter is left to the States, the program will be retarded for several years, and may very well die on the vine, so to speak.

Needless to say, if the program is discontinued, just another roadblock will be placed in the way of the fulfillment of better public-health standards in the Nation, because the safeguarding of the purity of food and the safeguarding of the health of livestock are of vital importance to the public health.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that this instance is another little lesson to the Eisenhower administration, teaching it that, after all, there are some national interests which need to be protected by the Federal Government, and cannot be relegated to the States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly that is my feeling; and I believe it is very unfortunate that the budget of the Department of Agriculture did not include this item. I repeat that the omission of this item is not economy, but is a serious mistake, and should not be permitted by the Congress.

I am sure that if we discuss this matter and have the congressional committees look into it, the item will be restored.

Furthermore, I wish to say that a year ago the President indicated, when he visited the great agricultural research experiment station at Beltsville, Md., his keen interest in agricultural research.

Mr. MORSE. That was a year ago.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. However, the agricultural research funds which were recommended were much less than the interest which was shown in the program at that time.

In the present instance, I say again that the appropriations being recommended do not jibe with the philosophy of consideration of the people.

The other day I heard someone classify the Eisenhower program as one that is liberal with people, but conservative with economics. The trouble is that if one is going to be liberal with people, one must be a little more generous with economics. That is what we are talking about at this time.

Mr. MORSE. My friend from Minnesota does not leave me with any enthusiam when he quotes what the President said more than a year ago. I recall a number of things the President said during the campaign that do not jibe with his present position.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was only refreshing my colleague's recollection.

Mr. MORSE. It does not need to be refreshed; I remember those statements very well.

Does the Senator from Minnesota recall that a few years ago a very serious outbreak of hoof-and-mouth disease occurred in Mexico—an epidemic which, if it had spread to the United States, would have jeopardized the cattle industry in our country?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, I do recall it. I also remember the very great efforts which were made by our Government to see that that epidemic did not spread to the United States.

Mr. MORSE. It is true, is it not, that at that time our Government did not talk about any matching of funds, but actually spent many million dollars in providing funds for the Mexican owners of diseased cattle, so that the diseased herds in the entire infected area would be exterminated? Is it not also true that from the standpoint of our public health, we were very glad to get rid of those diseased cattle in Mexico?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my recollection.

Mr. MORSE. I recommend that procedure to the Eisenhower administration, when there is at home a health situation applying to our livestock that threatens the health of all the people of the United States.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

SENATE RESERVATIONS TO TREATIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a number of the proponents of the so-called Bricker amendment have implied that the Senate cannot be trusted to do a good job in considering whether treaties should be ratified.

But I call attention, Mr. President, to the fact that the Senate does not have the reputation of being an "easy mark" when it comes to action on treaties.

Only last month we considered the Mutual Defense Pact with Korea. Before the treaty reached the floor, the Foreign Relations Committee attached a specific understanding to the resolution of ratification. The executive branch felt it was absolutely clear that the treaty did not obligate the United States to come to the aid of the Korean Republic in defense of areas which might come under Korean administrative control as the result of unlawful means. But the Senate was not satisfied. It attached an understanding making it absolutely clear that the United States was not in any way whatsoever underwriting any military ventures upon which the Republic of Korea might embark in the interest of unifying that country.

There has been much talk of the Genocide Convention. The impression is left that the Senate was about ready to approve that treaty, but that somehow the Bricker proposal intervened and prevented the Senate from taking precipitate action that would subject Americans to trial by an international tribunal. Mr. President, in the language of the street, all that is "baloney."

What are the facts? The Genocide Convention came to the Senate more than 5 years ago—in 1948. The Foreign Relations Committee referred the treaty to a subcommittee, which held 550 pages of hearings. When the subcommittee

sent the Genocide Convention back to the full Foreign Relations Committee it did so only after draping the convention with 4 specific understandings and 1 declaration. It specifically recommended that if the Senate were to give its advice and consent to the Genocide Convention it should do so with the statement that it was so doing "in exercise of the authority of the Federal Government to define and punish offenses against the law of nations expressly conferred by article I, section 8, clause 10, of the United States Constitution, and, consequently, the traditional jurisdiction of the several States of the Union with regard to crime is in no way prejudiced."

In other words, the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee which studied this question carefully recommended that the Senate, if it acted on the Genocide Convention, make it crystal clear that the Federal Government was exercising a delegated power, and was not enlarging the jurisdiction of the Federal Government by use of the treaty power. In fact, the point was bluntly made that the treaty was not in any way to be construed as impairing the traditional jurisdiction of the States in the field of criminal law. But even with these caveats the Foreign Relations Committee has not seen fit to recommend Senate action on the Genocide Convention. It still lies in the pigeonhole of the committee.

I am bringing out these facts because there has been a great deal of misrepresentation about the alleged looseness of the Senate in these matters.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has just pointed out to the Senate one of the effective checks which the Senate has, through its committee, in taking what time it desires before it submits to the Senate a report on a proposed treaty?

Mr. WILEY. Of course. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Is not delaying action on a treaty one of our checks and balances against an Executive if he sends to us a treaty which we think in the national interest calls for long and thorough study leading to reservations to be attached to the treaty?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is correct.

Only last year the Senate approved a series of treaties of friendship, commerce and navigation, but it did not approve those treaties without a reservation. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee found that some clauses in those treaties might overturn certain State laws which require citizenship of individuals practicing certain professions. What did the committee do? It recommended a reservation, which was accepted by the Senate, which made it clear that such State laws were not to be effected by the treaty. Again the comment of the distinguished Senator from Oregon is pertinent. It shows that we are not asleep, and that we who have been elected by the people recognize that we have trustee obligations to fulfill. One of them is to protect the constitutional process.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator think there is some merit in the point that is made by some of our colleagues, that a good deal of the criticism of what has happened, at least in respect to carrying out the advice and consent clause of the Constitution in relation to treaties, is that in some instances the Senate has not studied a treaty throughly enough? Does it not follow that if the Senate is at fault in not giving sufficient study to a treaty it should put its own house in order rather than propose to amend the Constitution along the lines of the Bricker proposals?

Mr. WILEY. I think that logic is sound, especially if we assume that we have not done a good job. But I think we have done a good job, because it is a very singular thing that in 165 years there has not been more than one treaty which the Senate or the Congress has set aside. That was the treaty with France. It was set aside when France broke its obligation, back in the early days of the 19th century.

Mr. MORSE. When I make reference to the argument that the Senate has not done a good job, it is used in reply to those who are heard to argue that some treaties have been approved which perhaps should not have been approved. If that be true, it only reflects on the Senate. It does not reflect necessarily upon an abuse of power by the Executive. The Executive sends the treaty to the Senate for its advice and consent.

The Senator has just finished pointing out one treaty to which we attached a reservation making it perfectly clear that the treaty would not supersede any State law. Perhaps that is a pretty good precedent, which the Senate ought to follow more frequently than it has followed it in the past.

The argument is sometimes made that there has been a tendency on the part of the Senate in years gone by to fall into the habit of rubber-stamping treaties which come from the White House. If that be true, we should not blame the White House for it. We should blame the Senate. The Founding Fathers placed upon the Senate an obligation carefully to check all treaties. If reservations ought to be attached and we do not attach them, no one is to blame but ourselves.

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator's logic is sound, but on the other hand, I do not believe there is any proof whatsoever that the Senate has ever rubber-stamped a treaty.

I believe that the facts are very clear and definite. When treaties have been sent to the Foreign Relations Committee, that committee has held hearings. It has taken testimony. It has gone into the language of the treaties. Time and time again it has attached reservations or interpretative clauses. It is true that there have been instances when treaties which were seemingly approved after full consideration in the Senate were approved, as was stated here the other day, when there was not a quorum present on the floor of the Senate. In the case referred to the treaties had previously been carefully studied and approved by the Senate. It must not be forgotten that this constitutional body does practically all its work through committees. I have never heard, since I have been in the Senate, any suggestion made that the Foreign Relations Committee has not done the job delegated to it as an arm of the Senate under the Constitution. In other words, it has looked after the treaties coming before it, ascertained the facts, and made whatever recommendations seemed to it to be proper.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for two further questions?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that we do not need a constitutional amendment in order a guarantee a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate, if the Senate properly does its job of amending its own rules?

Mr. WILEY. Of course, that is perfectly sound logic; and I hope the entire country will give heed to the Senator's statement on that point. A bill of goods has been sold to a great many people who were filled with fear when there was no basis whatever for such fear.

Mr. MORSE. The point having been raised, I will say that the reason I did not vote for a constitutional amendment requiring a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate on the ratification of treaties is that I do not believe, for example, in adding to State constitutions a great many trivial ordinances, thus making them the organic law of the State. Likewise, I do not believe in adding to the Constitution of the United States what is really, in effect, a rule of the Senate, and ought to be applied as a rule of the Senate.

We certainly do not need an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to compel Senators, who are elected by the people, to exercise properly the checks which is in their power by adopting a rule in the Senate which would require, as a matter of procedure, a yea-and-nay vote on the question of ratifying a treaty.

Such an amendment would merely be adding excess verbiage to the Constitution of the United States. There is no justification for making the Constitution a great traffic ordinance. We are really dealing here with traffic laws for the handling of legislation. Such regulations ought to be made effective by rules of the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Just a moment.

Of course, I agree 100 percent with the Senator from Oregon. My position on that subject coincides with his. However, I feel that there has been so much discussion about the need for this amendment that the proponents of the amendment have created a sort of fog. Now they want to throw a sop to the people who have been more or less befogged by their argument. That is the reason why they have put forward this proposal. I agree that it is a poor legal and business method to attempt to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

amend a fundamental, basic rule like the Constitution by including in it rules of procedure in the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin recalls that the question of approval by a two-thirds vote after a quorum call and a yea-and-nay vote was recognized by the majority and minority leaders a year ago, at the time I proposed a change in the rules which would require both a quorum call and a yea-and-nay vote. Both the majority leader and the minority leader then stated on the floor of the Senate that pending action by this body they would recognize the validity of such a rule and would insist in every instance upon a quorum call and a yea-and-nay vote.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations will agree with me that there is not the slightest difficulty whatever in taking care of such a situation through a change in the rules of the Senate, or by the enactment of a statute. The rule could be tightened up to such an extent that it could not be waived by unanimous consent. In that way the rule would be completely watertight.

Mr. WILEY. I agree fully. I have a recollection of what the Senator has said concerning the statements made by the majority leader and the minority leader. I agree with him that such a resolution, amending the Rules of the Senate, could be submitted today and adopted tomorrow.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin realizes that the proposed change in the rule, which was submitted by me last year has been reposing in the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that the committee has done nothing about it. The committee could have reported it to the Senate, and it could have been adopted in less than 5 minutes. Instead there has been put forward a proposed constitutional amendment embodying the same purpose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. That is the point I wished to comment on. The Lehman proposal for a change in the rules of the Senate by providing for a roll call vote on treaties has been before us for well over a year. If we are so much concerned about the principle involved, at least we should have adopted the Lehman resolution first. In that way, we could have observed how well its provisions worked. I am familiar with the argument: Oh, we have no guarantee in perpetuity that a future Senate might not change the rule.

When I think of how difficult it is to get the bewhiskered rules of the Senate changed, I do not have any fear that in the future a dynamic rule such as the Lehman proposal would be changed by a future Senate, or that any future Senate would tamper with such a rule.

The adoption of the resolution as the Senator from New York has suggested, would avoid the submission to the people of America of a constitutional amendment requiring that a rule of the Senate shall provide for a yea-and-nay vote on treaties. There is no need to clutter up the great basic and fundamental organic law of the Nation by such an amendment.

The last question I wish to ask of my good friend from Wisconsin is whether he will discuss the problem which earlier today concerned the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and which has also concerned a good many other Senators on the floor, which is the question as to what checks are now available to protect the people of America from any abuse of power on the part of the Executive in regard to so-called executive agreements.

I believe when we get down to that point we have placed the proponents of the amendment in such a position that they must either fish or cut bait, because they must say either that there are no adequate checks, or they must admit that there are adequate checks. I shall not discuss the subject further at this time, but shall await the Senator's discussion of it.

Mr. WILEY. My intention was not to discuss it today, because I believe the appropriate time will be when the second clause of the George amendment comes up for discussion.

I wish to continue to discuss what amounts almost to a slander of the Senate and of the committee of which at the present time I have the great honor to be chairman. I refer to statements that the Members of the Senate have been neglectful of their duties. Such remarks have a very deteriorating effect upon a good many people. When remarks of that kind are made they are read throughout the country, and the inference is drawn that we are not on the job and are not properly attending to the work entrusted to us. One of the jobs before us, as suggested by the two able Senators who have made inquiry of me, is that of protecting the Constitution. We must not add amendments to the Constitution which will poke holes into it, and in that way perhaps make out of the Constitution what amounts to a Roberts' Rules of Order. I should like to carry on my discussion along that line.

Mr. President, let me give one final example of reservations attached to treaties by the Senate.

The Charter of the Organization of American States contained a series of provisions which might have been interpreted—and I quote from the Foreign Relations Committee report—"as imposing obligations upon the United States to enact legislation relating to matters reserved to the 48 States under the Constitution." What happened? We tagged a reservation onto the treaty, stating:

> None of its provisions shall be considered as enlarging the powers of the Federal Government of the United States or limiting the powers of the several States of the Federal Union with respect to any matters recognized under the Constitution as being within the reserved powers of the several States.

Mr. President, there may be some Senators who are not willing to trust the judgment of Senators in the exercise of their constitutional function to advise and consent to treaties. I could understand it if this proposal had originated in the other House. But our constitutional fathers fixed the term of Senators at 6 years with the thought that one effect would be to create a body less subject to the political whims of the day. I think the record will show that we have been reliable. Those who support this amendment do not point to a single treaty which has gotten by the Senate without careful consideration and has upset the balance of powers of this Government. Yet they propose to upset that delicate balance by a proposed amendment that flies in the face of our experience and tradition.

Mr. President, I have been interested in this subject for the past 8 or 9 months. As I read some of the newspapers at the time, I remember the position they took. Many of the editorial writers were simply the victims of emotionalism, when they said the proponents of the proposed constitutional amendment were going to do a great job for the people of the country.

It is interesting to note the swing back. I referred today to an incident which took place in the State of Oregon, where a chamber of commerce had originally resolved in favor of the Bricker amendment. Then it appointed a committee to examine into the whole subject. They obtained the advice of the best attorneys in that section and of some of the judges of the supreme court of that State. As a result, they adopted a resolution against the Bricker amendment. In other words, a little light had come into the picture. Before that it had been a question of emotionalism. I put that resolution into the RECORD today.

A review which I have made of recent newspaper editorial comment clearly shows that opposition to the Bricker amendment is becoming stronger and that support for it is becoming weaker.

Mr. President, it will be remembered that at one time it was stated on the floor of the Senate that 90 percent of the bar associations were in favor of the Bricker amendment. Then the facts were developed. What happened, Mr. President? At the meeting of the section on international and comparative law of the American Bar Association, to which I previously referred, the vote was 7 to 1 against the Bricker amendment. The subject was taken before its board of governors. What happened there? One hundred and thirteen voted in favor of it, 33 against it, and 77 refused to vote.

As the various State bar associations examine the whole subject they are going on record against the Bricker amendment.

Mr. President, more and more newspapers are coming out flatly against any tampering with our Constitution. At long last they have recognized what our forefathers recognized and what some of us were taught when we worked our way through law school, that the Constitution was something with which we should not tinker.

It is significant that, at the same time, newspapers which once supported the Judiciary Committee version of the

Bricker amendment are beginning to call for a compromise.

What is happening, Mr. President, is that as public understanding of this issue increases, it is becoming more and more apparent that there is no real need to amend the Constitution at all and that any amendment conceived in haste and confusion is likely to be dangerous, no matter how innocuous it may appear on the surface.

The Dayton News, which believes that "there is no valid need for any amendment," holds that the George substitute is "about as acceptable a compromise as can be devised."

But overwhelmingly other newspapers opposed to the amendment also oppose a compromise.

A compromise would only becloud the issue—

Says the New York Times.

The amendment should be definitely rejected.

The one best thing to do with the Bricker resolution is to kill it—

Says the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The Hartford Courant adds that—

It will be good if Senator BRICKER continues to refuse to compromise—

So that there can then be a debate that will—

make clear the stupendous change in American Government that the amendment would actually bring about.

The Washington Post, New York Herald Tribune, Louisville Courier-Journal, Minneapolis Tribune, Washington Star, Providence Journal, Milwaukee Journal, likewise oppose any substantial compromise.

Support for the amendment is clearly wavering. Certainly this is no time for the opposition to weaken. There have been enough efforts to find a compromise. It is time to meet the issue head on.

Mr. President, I know that some well-meaning Senators have argued that passage of some amendment is necessary in order, first, to reassure the people who are said to be alarmed over an imaginary loophole in the Constitution and, second, to prevent a disastrous split in the Republican Party.

On the first point, Mr. President, I have previously cited Gallup polls to show that the state of public alarm on this issue has been greatly exaggerated.

The first poll showed that only about 19 percent of the people had heard of it, and were in favor of it to the extent of 7 percent, 5 percent were against it. Ten days later the poll showed that approximately 4 percent were in favor of it and 6 or 7 percent against it.

Mr. President, when I was a lad in college and read the debates of the Senate, I got the idea that here was a place where Senators argued the facts, calmly, having in mind what effect their statements would have on the minds of citizens. It seems to me that here, too, statements are made which have the effect of beclouding the issue. We have operated 165 years under this great instrument, and there is not a hole in it, though the argument has been made that we must do something to plug the holes. What those who make that argument mean is that they want to plug up the Constitution.

I have previously stated that public alarm with reference to the issue has been greatly exaggerated. But to the extent that it exists, it is due in large part to dissatisfaction with the previous Administration. The Constitution provides a remedy at the polls for that sort of dissatisfaction, and the people have already resorted to that remedy. I share with the New York Herald Tribune the hope that as the tide of mistrust of United States foreign policy ebbs, there will not be left in the Constitution "a residue that later generations will regret."

As to the second point, Mr. President, I have no fear of a split in the Republican party on this issue. The Constitution was drafted by men who put country above party. If the Constitution is to be amended, it must be on the basis of the issues involved, not on the basis of imagined fears of what it may do to a party.

Any amendment of our Constitution must be drawn and voted upon without regard to party interests. Every Senator on this floor takes an oath when he assumes office. He swears "that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same." By that oath, Mr. President, it seems to me that every Senator accepts a personal obligation to the Constitution that he must discharge on the basis of his own study, his own conviction, and his own conscience.

The American Constitution is the fundamental, organic law of this Nation. It can be amended only with great difficulty. It should be amended only when there is overwhelming understanding and support for amendment.

I do not believe most Americans understand what we are doing here. The debate of the past few weeks indicates that many Senators do not know precisely what the effect will be of the amendment we have before us. The President of the United States, his chief legal officer, and the Secretary of State have vigorously opposed draft after draft of amendments drawn by Members of this body.

The burden of proof must rest on those who seek to amend the Constitution. They must show the need for, understanding of, and overwhelming support for change.

I do not believe that burden of proof has been met.

The Senator from Michigan insists that "in pursuance of," as used in his amendment, means not repugnant to the Constitution and he cites Marbury against Madison—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 19, 1954, pages 2065–2066. That is the decision involving the so-called midnight judges. On March 2, 1801, the day before the close of his term, President John Adams appointed a number of justices of the peace for the District of Columbia under the authority of an act of Congress approved 3 days earlier. These appointments were confirmed by the Senate and commissions were executed. However, at midnight on March 3, 1801, when the term of President Adams expired, several of the executed commissions remained undelivered in the office of Acting Secretary of State John Marshall, the newly appointed Chief Justice. President Jefferson, coming into office the following day, directed his Secretary of State, James Madison, to withhold the commissions. Marbury, one of the appointees not receiving his commission, petitioned for a writ of mandamus, under the authority of section 13 of the Judiciary Act of September 24, 1789—First Statutes at Large, page 81—to compel its delivery. This section, among other things, attempted to empower the Supreme Court to issue writs of mandamus to any persons holding office under the authority of the United States.

The case fell into the lap of Chief Justice Marshall who held that, as applied to the Secretary of State requiring him to deliver to Marbury the commission signed by President Adams, the statute was an attempt to enlarge the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court which was fixed by article III, section 2 of the Constitution. Marshall said that Congress had no more power to do this than it had to change the requirements for proof of treason established by the Constitution. Of course such attempted enlargement of jurisdiction was repugnant to the Constitution. But remember this, Marshall was speaking of the system of checks and balances—the constitutional division of powers among the coordinate branches of the National Government. He told Congress it could not empower the Supreme Court to issue writs of mandamus to compel the President to do an act which was within his constitutional discretion. This is an entirely different problem from that posed by the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment of the Senator from Michigan is a limitation on the supremacy clause. Section 1 of his amendment already states that a provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with the Constitution "shall not be of any force or effect," whatever that means. Then he says that "notwithstanding" the supremacy clause, no treaty made after the establishment of the Constitution in 1789 shall be the supreme law of the land "unless made in pursuance of this Constitution." This provision involves the problem of the relationship of the Federal powers to State powers, not a problem of division of powers among the three coordinate Federal branches. This is the area in which the Senator from Michigan seeks to argue Marbury against Madison. He needs, instead, to examine the old arguments concerning dual-federalism and decisions like *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* ((1819) 4 Wheat. 316, 405–406) and *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* ((1924) 9 Wheat. 1, 210–211). You will recall that in the McCulloch case the Supreme Court upheld the power of the United States to incorporate a bank and it denied the power of the State of Maryland to tax that bank. Marshall noted that the Government of the United States was one of enumerated powers, and that within that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

sphere of power, it was supreme. Said he:

The Government of the United States then, though limited in its powers, is supreme; and its laws, when made in pursuance of the Constitution, form the supreme law of the land, "anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Gibbons against Ogden the second case, was a suit instituted by Ogden, the assignee of the exclusive statutory right to navigate, by steamboat, the waters of the State of New York which was granted by the State to Robert R. Livingston and Robert Fulton. He sought to enjoin the operation, between New Jersey and New York, of two steamboats by Gibbons under licenses issued pursuant to an act of Congress. The State court granted the injunction but this was reversed by the Supreme Court. Said Marshall:

In argument, however, it has been contended, that when the law passed by a State, in the exercise of its acknowledged sovereignty, comes into conflict with a law passed by Congress in pursuance of the Constitution, they affect the subject and each other, like equal opposing powers. But the framers of our Constitution foresaw this state of things, and provided for it by declaring the supremacy not only of itself [the Constitution], but of the laws made in pursuance of it. The nullity of an act, inconsistent with the Constitution, is produced by the declaration that the Constitution is the supreme law. The appropriate application of that part of the clause which confers the same supremacy on laws and treaties, is to such acts of the State legislatures as do not transcend their powers, but though enacted in the execution of acknowledged State powers, interfere with, or are contrary to the laws of Congress, made in pursuance of the Constitution, or some treaty made under the authority of the United States. In every such case, the act of Congress, or the treaty, is supreme; and the law of the State, though enacted in the exercise of powers not controverted, must yield to it.

Thus Marshall himself distinguished the two situations.

It will be noted that Marshall distinctly separated the classes into laws of Congress made in pursuance of the Constitution, meaning thereby in execution of specific grants and treaties made under the authority of the United States. If the latter are placed under the same limitation as the former, they will be restricted to the execution of specific grants of power.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks quotations from great Americans with reference to the Constitution.

There being no objection, the quotations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUOTATIONS FROM GREAT AMERICANS ON THE CONSTITUTION

No man is a warmer advocate for proper restraints and wholesome checks in every department of Government than I am; but I have never yet been able to discover the propriety of placing it absolutely out of the power of men to render essential services, because a possibility remains of their doing ill. (George Washington, letter to Bushrod Washington, Nov. 10, 1787.)

I wish now to submit a few remarks on the general proposition of amending the Constitution. As a general rule, I think we would much better let it alone. No slight occasion should tempt us to touch it. Better not take the first step, which may lead to a habit of altering it. Better, rather, habituate ourselves to think of it as unalterable. It can scarcely be made better than it is. New provisions would introduce new difficulties, and thus create an increased appetite for further change. No, sir. Let it stand as it is. The men who made it have done their work, and have passed away. Who shall improve on what they did? (Abraham Lincoln, June 20, 1848.)

The Constitution * * * is unquestionably the wisest ever yet presented to men. (Thomas Jefferson, letter to David Humphreys, March 1789.)

We may be tossed upon an ocean where we can see no land—nor, perhaps, the sun or stars. But there is a chart and a compass for us to study, to consult, and to obey. That chart is the Constitution. (Daniel Webster, speech at Springfield, Mass., Sept. 29, 1847.)

The Constitution of the United States was made not merely for the generation that then existed, but for posterity—unlimited, undefined, endless, perpetual posterity. (Henry Clay, speech in the Senate, February 6, 1850.)

The American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man. (W. E. Gladstone, Kin Beyond Sea, 1878.)

What other form of government, indeed, can so well deserve our esteem and love. (John Adams.)

[The Constitution is] the consummation of all former political wisdom; the trust of the present, the guide for all coming generations. (George Bancroft.)

Hold him an enemy to the country who derides fidelity to the Constitution and trifles with his solemn obligation to uphold it. (John Randolph Tucker.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE INCREASE IN UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on Sunday I participated in the Man of the Week television and radio program with representatives of the press. In the course of the program, we discussed the growing unemployment in the United States, and I commented upon the growing numbers of people in soup lines.

When the program was over, and until about 2 a. m. the next morning, representatives of some of the newspapers which are not particularly friendly to the junior Senator from Oregon called him on the telephone for further discussion of the matter of the soup lines. I wish to confirm today what I said to some of the newspaper editors and writers who called me, namely, there is no question about the fact that unemployment has increased to a serious degree. In fact, if we had accurate figures, which I am satisfied we do not have—because the administration cannot even agree on the base which it should use for measuring unemployment—I think they would show the number of unemployed persons in the United States today to be nearer 4 million than 3 million. There is no doubt that in various areas in the United States, especially in some of the industrial centers, there are today bread lines or soup lines.

Not many days ago I placed in the RECORD an article printed in the newspaper of the International Woodworkers, of Portland, Oreg., which contained pictures of a soup line at Blanchard House, one of the charity institutions of Portland, which feeds many unemployed men. The story, in part, said that more than 500 men were in the soup line on that particular day, and showed pictures of the soup line.

But when I talk about soup lines increasing in America—and I do talk about them increasing in America—I point out that every unemployment insurance line in America is a soup line in fact. Why are there persons standing in the unemployment insurance lines? They are in them to get the money necessary to feed themselves and their families, because they do not have the jobs with which to provide them with the cash to buy food. These are very orderly bread lines.

Judging from the comments of some of the newspaper editors who thought it was a terrible thing for me to mention soup lines and bread lines, the editors do not appreciate what the Democratic Party did for the United States when it sponsored the unemployment insurance legislation which now makes it possible to care for hungry people in a more orderly fashion than was the case in the Hoover-Mellon days. Now we have a rather orderly procedure for unemployed persons to call and get their unemployment insurance checks; but when they call for them, Mr. President, they are standing in a bread line.

The editors of the United States cannot gloss over that fact. They can decry all they wish to anyone's pointing out to the American people that the increasing unemployment under Eisenhower has increased the number of bread lines in the United States. That simply happens to be a fact. The records are perfectly clear that in State after State, including not only my own State, which but a short time ago had the highest unemployment rate in the United States, a rate of 12.7 percent, but also other States, such as Michigan, Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois, in which are located great industrial centers and concentrations of large numbers of so-called mass-production workers, the unemployment insurance lines have increased by tens of thousands of fellow Americans.

That is why I repeat on the floor of the Senate what I said on the television program on Sunday: The soup lines and the bread lines have increased during the past year. It is about time that the administration stopped waiting for the Ides of March. The administration should come forward now, in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Full Employment Act of 1946, and provide a Government employment program which is necessary in order to put the unemployed persons back to work.

So to my editor critics, since my broadcast of Sunday, let me repeat on the floor of the Senate today: "I care not what the State may be, check with the unemployment insurance officials of the State and ask them how much the bread lines in the State have increased in the last few months by way of idle men and women calling for their unemployment checks." Fortunately, unemployment-insurance procedure is an orderly legislative procedure passed by the

Democratic Party, which recognized that, after all, the Government has the obligation of protecting the general welfare of individual citizens of the United States who find themselves unemployed but are willing to work.

In speaking of the increase in unemployment it should be noted that thousands of workers are working only 2 or 3 days a week. This loss in employment greatly increases the total unemployment figures in the country. Partial employment is also partial unemployment. Thousands of people working on part time cannot supply the purchasing power needed to check a recession. I am satisfied that this unemployment problem can and will be solved if this administration will only take the steps necessary to stimulate the purchasing power of the low-income groups of the country.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Henry F. Holland, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice John M. Cabot;

John M. Cabot, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Sweden; and

Edward T. Wailes, and sundry other persons, for promotion in the Foreign Service.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

James W. Bingham, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 22, with headquarters at Galveston, Tex.;

James L. Latimer, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 21, with headquarters at Port Arthur, Tex.;

Roswell Buchard Perkins, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Bligh A. Dodds, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 7, with headquarters at Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

Morton P. Fisher, of Maryland, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States, vice Eugene Black, retired;

Harold R. Becker, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y.; and

Frank M. Kalteux, of Illinois, to be Comptroller of Customs, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

ADVISORY BOARD FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. H. S. Ellis, of New York, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. William J. Ely, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Arthur H. Frye, Jr., Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate, as in legislative session, took a recess until tomorrow, February 24, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Tuesday, February 23 (legislative day of February 8), 1954:

ADVISORY BOARD FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

J. H. S. Ellis, of New York, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

To be members of the California Debris Commission

Col. William J. Ely, Corps of Engineers.
Col. Arthur H. Frye, Jr., Corps of Engineers.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the God and Father of all mankind, may we have a clear understanding of the great mission of our country and our responsibility in preserving and perpetuating its ideals and principles.

Help us to sense the need of Thy guiding and sustaining presence as we daily confront conditions and circumstances which are far beyond our finite wisdom and strength.

Reveal unto us the secret of joyous and victorious living and may we be alert to every opportunity to prove to the world that we are a God-fearing and peace-loving nation.

May we be lovers of concord and earnestly strive in the spirit of unity and brotherhood to find the wisest and best solution to our many national and international problems.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 20, 1954:

H. R. 1129. An act for the relief of Katina Panagioti Fiflis and Theodore Panagiotou Fiflis;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Lamb;

H. R. 1516. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clemtine De Ryck;

H. R. 1674. An act for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler;

H. R. 2021. An act for the relief of Clarence R. Seiler and other employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 2633. An act for the relief of Lee Sig Cheu;

H. R. 2813. An act for the relief of William E. Aitcheson;

H. R. 2839. An act to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands;

H. R. 2842. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 2885. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii to issue a right of purchase lease to Edward C. Searle;

H. R. 3027. An act for the relief of Tamiko Nagae;

H. R. 3228. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ursula Eichner Clawges;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of John James T. Bell;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of Eiko Tanaka;

H. R. 3619. An act for the relief of Rufin Manikowski;

H. R. 3728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Bonanno (nee Koubek);

H. R. 4439. An act for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham;

H. R. 4577. An act for the relief of Edith Maria Gore;

H. R. 4972. An act for the relief of John Jeremiah Botelho;

H. R. 5195. An act for the relief of Max Kassner;

H. R. 5379. An act to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication;

H. R. 5861. An act to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone government; and

H. R. 5959. An act to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government which retired officers may receive.

On February 22, 1954:

H. R. 5945. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution requesting churches and synagogues to give special prayers on Easter Sunday for those denied freedom to worship behind the Iron Curtain.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 22 OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the bill I have just now introduced would amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to eliminate the language which now permits the United States and State and local governments to bargain with carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act and negotiate rates for passengers and property other than those in the carriers' published tariffs. These contract rates also are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission to determine their fairness and reasonableness.

The language deleted by my bill has been in the Interstate Commerce Act since its enactment. It was put into law at a time when the Government of the United States was so small that its shipments of passengers and property did not have a significant impact upon the economy of the carriers or the adequacy of our transportation system. The time has now come to delete this language, because the United States Government has become the largest single shipper in the world. The cargo tonnage and passenger transportation it controls can be used by transportation officers to play one carrier off against another, and even to play one form of transportation off against another, so that the carriers are encouraged to reduce the rates published by them in their tariffs, and established by the Interstate Commerce Commission as fair and reasonable.

The point has been reached where the United States Government is now in a position to violate, and is violating, the antidiscrimination provisions of the law which one branch of our Government is bound to enforce. Everyone will recall the original fundamental reason for the enactment of the Interstate Commerce Act. It was necessary to force the railroads—which then had a practical monopoly of public transportation—to refrain from discriminating in favor of big shippers and against small shippers. The scope and purpose of the Interstate Commerce Act has expanded since that time, but the antidiscrimination provisions of the law remain of basic importance. Nevertheless, the provisions of section 22, which authorize contract rates for the Government, in effect authorize discrimination in favor of the world's biggest shipper and against all of the smaller ones.

That the shippers of the United States are conscious of this discrimination is evidenced by the fact that the National Industrial Traffic League adopted a recommendation at its latest annual meeting that section 22 be amended along the lines I have proposed. Practically all of the transportation industry has felt the impact of governmental bargaining under section 22, and are urging the necessary amendments to section 22. I understand that the railroads are divided in their opinion as to the need for this amendment.

I hope it will be possible for the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House to devote its attention to this bill, because it involves a principle of transportation law and policy which is of the utmost importance.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 49, sec. 22), is hereby further amended by striking from the first clause of the first sentence thereof the words "for the United States, State, or municipal governments, or" and the words "or the transportation of persons for the United States Government free or at reduced rates."

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN ITALY

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago yesterday I had the privilege of addressing my colleagues here on the floor with respect to the subject of Cardinal Mindszenty's imprisonment and trial. I discussed at that time the whole question of religious persecution behind the Iron Curtain. Since that time I was asked, if I were consistent, why I said nothing about the situation in Italy with respect to certain actions taken by the Italian police and the Italian Government against the Church of Christ in Rome and Leghorn. I requested a report from the State Department on these activities which I wish to incorporate in the RECORD at this point and assure my colleagues that the subject of religious persecution anywhere is of very great concern to me, and I will pursue this matter just as closely as I did the matter behind the Iron Curtain.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 19, 1954.

The Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BENTLEY: Since our recent telephone conversation, the Department of State has received a detailed report from the American Embassy at Rome on the difficulties encountered by the Church of Christ in Rome and Leghorn.

Representatives of the Embassy met with the lawyer of the Church of Christ, Dr. Giacomo Rosapepe, on the morning of February 18. Dr. Rosapepe had just returned from Leghorn after a long session with the authorities there and informed the Embassy that an agreement had been reached to permit the Church of Christ at Leghorn to continue to function. The Italian Foreign Office has also made available to the Embassy the report of the Prefect of Leghorn on the incident which states that the only question involved was mixed English and Bible courses which were being given by a Church of Christ minister without the required permission. Italian law requires that foreigners who intend to institute or manage schools of any grade or rank, including courses in foreign languages, must receive special authorization from the Ministry of Public Instruction. Dr. Rosapepe agrees that this is the law and that English instruction cannot be given until this permission is granted.

Although services were disturbed by the Italian police on February 11 and 12, apparently in connection with the difficulty on the English courses, the Embassy reports that services were held undisturbed on February 13 and 14 and that on February 17 a Foreign Office official gave assurance to an Embassy representative that the church at Leghorn would be allowed to function.

With regard to the removal of the sign from the Church of Christ building in Rome, Dr. Rosapepe has appealed the police action through the courts. He was scheduled to appear in court on February 16. He has informed the Embassy that he believes he will obtain a favorable decision although the procedure may take some time.

The Department of State and the Embassy at Rome will continue to give this question their close attention and will extend every assistance to the Church of Christ in obtaining permission for language courses in Leghorn and for replacing the sign on the church building in Rome.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. H. BONBRIGHT,
Acting Assistant Secretary for European Affairs.

THE CATTLE FEEDER

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation for the relief of the cattle feeder who makes up a large segment of the population in my district. This legislation would make it possible for the cattle feeder to buy the corn from the producer that is under seal and for which the producer has a loan. In this legislation he would get relief by not having to pay the interest on the loan that the producer does not pay if he delivers the corn to the bin site. This legislation would make it possible for the feeder at any time to go to the producer and buy this corn, thus

saving him the interest which amounts in general to about 5 or 6 cents a bushel. That saving would probably be the difference between success and failure, as far as the cattle feeder is concerned.

TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, in my district there are a large number of farmers who depend upon small tobacco acreage allotments for their assured cash crop. Of these, a large percentage are limited to nine-tenths of an acre. Any allotment less than nine-tenths of an acre, requiring practically the same amount of time to cultivate, cure, and market, fails to provide an economic return.

I am introducing a bill to provide that no allotment of nine-tenths acre or less shall be reduced in any 1 year. The adoption of this provision will assure the farmer of the much-needed sure cash income upon which he usually depends to meet taxes and other fixed obligations.

Again, a great number of small farmers residing in my district, finding employment in nearby industrial plants most profitable, have for some years neglected to use their tobacco allotment, which, after 5 years of nonuse legally reverts to the State acreage allotment.

In this period of readjustment of the national economy, some of these rural residents, no longer able to find employment in industry, find it necessary to return to agricultural pursuits for their livelihood.

The bill I am introducing would permit these small landowners to recover their former allotments for the cultivation of burley tobacco and would assure them of a small cash crop so essential to this class of farmers.

This change in the law would add very little to the total of burley tobacco production, but in case lack of available industrial employment becomes a matter of concern the availability of these small tobacco tracts may mean the difference between self-subsistence and public assistance.

I trust the committee will recognize the need of this legislation and submit it to the Congress for action.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SHEEHAN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

FOREST SERVICE

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1954, during the debate on H. R. 4646, under the 5-minute rule, I made a statement "that in the Kisatchie National Forest, you could not buy an acre of land for love nor money; that it was a closed corporation."

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. WALTER M. MUMMA, made the following statement in rebuttal:

> The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] made a lot of statements that I have had some experience with the Forest Service on. Speaking of lots for house building, I think that service is very cooperative. I happened to have been out in Dakota, Wyoming, and Colorado last year and I saw a number of areas the Forest Service had laid out in order to make possible the acquisition of land for homes for veterans and small people.

I do not know what they are doing in the forests in Colorado or Wyoming or anywhere else, but I tried to make it clear that I was speaking of the Kisatchie National Forest in the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana. I repeat, you cannot buy 1 foot of land in the Kisatchie National Forest from the United States Government for love or money, although some of the best roads in the State of Louisiana cross this forest. Along these highways is land that will produce most any kind of vegetable and grow good cotton and corn—a most desirable place for a home. I have the names of more than 2,000 people from every State in the Union seeking homes in this very forest. I have gone so far as to ask the Department to make available to our soldiers and 4–H boys and girls some of this land along these good roads in the finest climate in all the world. Yet, to this day, I have not been able to persuade the Forest Service to sell these soldiers, who defended our country in time of war, 1 foot of land. And, may I say, many of them live in hovels and go here and yon looking for employment, when they could easily earn a living if they had a small piece of land. A number of these soldiers are disabled and crippled.

I have a bill in the Agriculture Committee now, H. R. 2725, which will do exactly what Mr. MUMMA said is being done in Colorado and Wyoming, and I hope we can get it to the floor of the House and that this Congress will remember what I am saying. If you will look into this, you will see that Mr. MUMMA does not know what he is talking about with reference to the State of Louisiana and the lands in the Kisatchie National Forest.

FOREST SERVICE

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make a controversy out of this matter but I do know that I am right in what I had said, and I think that this may be a case where we both may be right. I am certainly going to develop my point. I would advise the gentleman, if he is further interested, to ask the Forest Service and get it right from the feedbag rather than from the district office.

Mr. LONG. I have tried to do just what the gentleman is suggesting.

TAX REVISION BILL

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked and been given permission to address the House this afternoon. My subject will be provisions in the so-called technical tax revision bill which provide exemptions for dividends, exemptions for shareholders, stockholders, owners of corporations. I will show this afternoon that this is class legislation of the most unusual kind. It departs from our original concept, the original principle of taxation based on ability to pay. Those Members who are prevented from attending by committee meetings or other official business I hope will take the time to read my remarks because the figures will be startling as to the special legislation proposed by the Republican members of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on March 1, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

TAX REVISION BILL

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in understanding that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was going to carry on his discussion of the tax credit being given to dividends in his special order this afternoon. I, too, shall be present, and I have 20 minutes to address the House afterward to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

discuss the same subject, to point out how this is not class legislation and never has been. What we are trying to do in this bill is bring about a tax revision. That has to do with tax reduction only incidentally. I hope we will be able to get a tax reduction bill sometime later in this session, depending upon how our appropriations and expenditures shape up.

NATIONAL ENGINEERS' WEEK

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the week of George Washington's Birthday has a special significance for millions of Americans because it is also the time of the annual observance of National Engineers' Week. This year local celebrations will be held in more than 400 cities in every State in the Union.

It would be impossible to evaluate accurately the tremendous contribution engineering has made to our way of life and to the high standard of living which we enjoy. Although members of the public who are not very familiar with the work of professional engineers sometimes tend to think of them only as builders of roads and bridges, it is literally true that engineering affects almost everything. The food we eat, the clothes we wear, the buildings we live and work in—all are dependent upon the genius of the engineer.

National Engineers' Week is held annually during the week of Washington's Birthday to honor the engineering achievements of our first President, who built roads, bridges, fortifications, canals, drained swamps, and undertook many other projects which were notable engineering achievements in his day. General Washington's engineering skill often came to the aid of his country in trying times and it contributed largely to the winning of the Revolutionary War.

I am happy to pay honor to the Nation's engineers, and to the National Society of Professional Engineers, sponsors—with hundreds of engineering groups all over the Nation—of National Engineers' Week.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have taken occasion to commend the Post Office Department for some of the economies it has been effecting. However, at this time I am critical and I am offering some constructive criticism, I hope, because of the recent action of the Department in announcing a change in regulations permitting the mailing of third-class advertising material without specific address to householders which is similar to the box holder regulation. In the cities, even the small towns with city carriers, this is not practical. It is putting an undue burden on the post-office employees, particularly the carriers. It delays the delivery of the regular first-class mail. It is affording an unjustified subsidy to big business while at the same time destroying some small businesses. It is creating an unemployment problem. The Department is not justified in continuing this practice which actually increases the volume of a class of mail that is contributing to the deficit; and which was started some years ago, and was discontinued when it was found to be a failure.

MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, of all the achievements of which America is proud, there is one which stands high on the list—our achievement in the field of health. Today, the average life expectancy is between 65 and 70, an increase of more than 10 years in the last decade. One disease after another has been conquered. One miracle drug after another has been discovered by science to combat illnesses which used to scourge the Nation but which today have been all but wiped out.

Our people have been educated in methods of disease prevention and hygiene. Almost from the first minute that he enters school, the American child is taught requirements for good health, care of the eyes, the need for rest, exercise and play, dental hygiene, and so forth. In almost every classroom one may see posters and other educational material on the development of good health habits. Almost every school has physical training and physical hygiene classes. By the time he has finished high school the average American child has become thoroughly health conscious and has been equipped with the knowledge and incentive which will guide him throughout his life in the maintenance of good health.

This is a picture which should make us proud, and does. But if we look at this picture a little more closely, we will find something is missing. We have approached the problem of health as it affects our physical bodies in an admirable fashion but we have overlooked the equally important component of mental health. In our development of hygiene, prevention, treatment, and cure we have done a one-sided job—doing very little about mental hygiene and about prevention, treatment, and cure of the mental diseases.

Last year, nearly a quarter of a million children were seen by the few mental health clinics in the country. Perhaps a quarter-million does not sound like a very big figure, but it should be remembered we have pitifully few mental-health clinics in the entire country.

The National Association for Mental Health estimates that if there were enough mental health clinics they would be seeing and treating between 2½ and 5 million children a year instead of 250,000. It is the estimate of that organization that there are upward of 5 million mentally disturbed children today.

These are the children who will grow up to be the parents of tomorrow, lacking the good mental health parents should have. They will in turn bring up an even larger number of mentally disturbed children, thus perpetuating an ever-expanding vicious cycle.

It is possible to break this cycle—to reverse the trend of growing mental illness by providing adequate treatment to the children who are mentally disturbed today so that they will grow into mentally healthy adults. It is also possible to aid in breaking the cycle by giving adequate treatment to the mentally disturbed parents of today so that they can bring up their children in better mental health. In addition, it is desirable to carry on widespread mental health education so that children as well as parents may learn the fundamentals of mental hygiene, and practice them.

More than anything else, it is necessary to arouse the public to the threat of mental illness and to stimulate community action in the fight against it.

In a recent message to the National Association for Mental Health, President Eisenhower said:

> It is encouraging to note that in your search for solutions to these problems you have emphasized local initiative and responsibility. I have long felt that in most problems affecting the individual the soundest solutions are found in the concerted action of people close to him—his family and his community.

It is consistent with this principle that I have joined with my colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] in introducing a House joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of May 2 to May 8 of this year as Mental Health Week.

As further evidence of the truly bipartisan manner in which the resolution is offered I might tell you that in the other body Senator SMATHERS and 51 others have cooperated in introducing an identical resolution.

I am certain the Members of the House will wish to join us in promoting such a worthy cause by speedily enacting the resolution.

AID FOR SCHOOL PUPILS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read two short paragraphs from yesterday's Washington Post, quoting a teacher in the District of Columbia schools:

"There is not a week goes by that I don't find 5 to 10 children in need of shoes," she says. "Each week, we feed lunch and milk to countless numbers. It may seem strange but many of our families can't afford the luxury of milk, even under the school's penny milk program.

"This talk of a mild recession usually is thought of in terms of a slight decline in business, not in terms of human beings in need. I have been a principal for several years and emergency needs today are more widespread than I have ever seen them."

This is in face of the fact that we are supposed to have a surplus of milk and dairy products. The reason we have a surplus is because we do not have the proper way to get these products into the hands of the people who need them and at a price they can afford to pay.

CLAIMS FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE BUREAU OF PRISONS, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—VETO MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 334)

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill (H. R. 395) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

FOR THE RELIEF OF MRS. ANNA HOLDER—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 335)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith H. R. 3733, for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder.

This measure, in directing the payment to Mrs. Anna Holder of the sum of $10,000, would provide a special legislative settlement of her claim that she is entitled to that amount from the Government as the beneficiary named in two $5,000 policies of National Service Life Insurance.

These policies matured in May 1945. Mrs. Holder, the sole surviving designated beneficiary, thereupon claimed the proceeds. She established that the deceased serviceman, an orphan, had been reared from early childhood by her parents, and that she occupied a de facto relationship of sister for many years. The Veterans' Administration denied her claim, ruling that she did not come within the permitted classes of beneficiaries prescribed in the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. The correctness of the ruling of the Veterans' Administration under the applicable law is not disputed.

The Congress imposed specific limitations on the classes of beneficiaries permitted to be named under National Service Life Insurance maturing before August 1, 1946. Similarly, the Congress did not vest in the Veterans' Administration authority to grant exceptions from the general rule.

Therefore, it seems to me irrevelant and unwise to accept as justification for this bill, the fact that Mrs. Holder could now qualify as a beneficiary under existing law, which was not made retroactive.

On the other hand, I believe that it is relevant to take fully into account several other factors of great importance in connection with the national service life insurance program as it existed up to 1946. The insurance was issued at peacetime rates which it was recognized would provide but a small fraction of the cost of the program if the United States should become involved in a war. Consequently, provision was made that all benefits payable because of deaths due to the extra hazard of military service would, in effect, be paid from appropriated funds. This was done by reimbursing the trust fund for such costs. Under these circumstances, it was considered desirable to restrict those eligible for benefits to the categories of persons to whose support the veteran might be obligated to contribute.

Finally, I cannot overlook considerations of equity to all beneficiaries as contrasted with the individual case in which the deceased veteran named an ineligible person as the beneficiary of his insurance. I have expressed the view, on other occasions, that uniformity and equality of treatment to all who are similarly situated must be the steadfast rule if the Federal programs for veterans and their beneficiaries are to be operated successfully. Otherwise, inequities are compounded, as is fully revealed by statistics reported by the Veterans' Administration. More than 3,200 claims of designated beneficiaries for the proceeds of national service life insurance have been denied because they were not within the prescribed classes of beneficiaries. A great number of them involved relationships which appear to have been just as close and as real as that claimed by Mrs. Holder.

In my judgment, this is not a case in which the circumstances are so unique or exceptional as to justify a waiver of the law. I, therefore, withhold my approval from the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 23, 1954.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

And without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

FEBRUARY 18, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Member of Congress, Speaker of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely,

N. M. MASON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 30 minutes, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and one-half by myself.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, that is entirely satisfactory on this side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7996, with Mr. NELSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement general debate will continue not to exceed 30 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Missouri.

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries appropriations totaling $25,785,000. Of the total involved $5,500,000 is for judgments and adjudicated claims. We are anxious to get this through because it stops the flow of interest out of the Treasury on these claims.

Four million eight hundred thousand dollars is for the Treasury, and there is a transfer provision involving $7,620,000 out of Air Force funds to be used by the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Coast Guard for the erection of loran stations in the north.

There is also $4 million for penalty mail.

There is an appropriation of $360,000 for independent offices.

There is an appropriation of $15,125,000 for labor in the National Mediation Board, these figures representing items that have to be considered promptly and before very long or one or two of our setups will be in difficulty for funds.

I think that is all I care to say at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has consumed 2 minutes.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, from the beginning of our Federal fiscal system the reporting of a deficiency bill has always been a matter of particular significance. It has invariably indicated some oversight, some deficiency, some mistake, some lack of judgment, or some carelessness either upon the part of the Budget Bureau or on the part of the committee and others involved.

There are, of course, in all deficiency bills provisions for needs which could not have been foreseen, and there are items of that type in the bill before us now, deficiencies, for example which are the result of new laws passed too late to be reflected in the estimates made by the Budget Bureau or in the last annual bill on the subject.

But all deficiencies are, necessarily, the correction, or the attempt to correct, some error. Either we did not appropriate enough money or we appropriated without proper limitations or appropriated too much and the item in the deficiency bill is an effort to remedy such oversight.

In years gone by it was not unusual for the deficiency bills to be utilized in bootlegging funds for purposes which could not bare too close scrutiny by the subcommittees having original jurisdiction. In this way money which had been refused in the annual bill, or which the departments did not care to sponsor in the original estimates, could be thrown into the catchall of a deficiency bill considered by an independent subcommittee not too familiar with the subject and appropriated under the guise of a deficiency. When the committee was reorganized and members were limited to one subcommittee of five, the separate deficiency committee was abolished and effort was made to reduce the deficiencies to a minimum by referring them to the subcommittee of original jurisdiction. But even yet deficiencies occasioned by inaptitude somewhere along the line rise to plague us—as in some items of the pending bill. For example, under our urge to economize we simply cut too deep in the veterans' unemployment compensation item in the annual bill and now must refund it in a deficiency appropriation.

I fully coincide with everything that has been said by our distinguished chairman, Mr. TABER. He has handled this bill admirably under the necessities which occasioned it. Of the individual items there is perhaps only one that occurs to me as being of any particular note or warranting specific comment. That is the item providing for the salaries and expenses of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. We have here a rather surprising discrepancy between the request of the Commission and the response by the committee. The Commission is one of the most important of all now serving under the Government. Its personnel was selected with exceptional care and consists of eminent men with records of outstanding service in public and private life. Its chairman, in particular enjoys the esteem and regard of the American people and has served in many notable capacities, including the Presidency of the United States. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to find men better qualified by service and experience for the work of this important assignment. They requested, and the Bureau of the Budget approved, an appropriation of $1,831,909 which with their unobligated balance of $306,000 would have given them a total of $2,137,909 which they considered the minimum amount required for their work. That was their considered judgment. But the Committee on Appropriations cut $1,531,909 from the estimate, leaving only $606,000 out of the $2,137,909. Now I do not want to take issue with the committee and I do not express any disagreement with its decision. But a cut of 84 percent in the funds of an activity of this character and importance is unprecedented and perhaps would be better understood if the committee elaborated on the brief comment in the report. The Commission from the beginning has had my earnest interest and I am certain the interest and support of the Congress and the country.

It is not only under the management of able and experienced men but it is charged with duties and responsibilities which have long been under discussion and the country generally was under the impression that every possible step had been taken to secure permanent and effective readjustment when this Commission was selected.

We seem to be derelict in either one of two respects. Either the Commission is a disappointment in that they have completely misjudged their fiscal requirements and have asked for an appropriation 84 percent above what they should have asked at this particular time, or which they were reasonably entitled to expend—or the committee is derelict in cutting an unprecedented amount from an estimate for a much needed and widely publicized agency.

Certainly, someone has somewhere made a serious miscalculation, so serious that it requires an adjustment of 84 percent of the amount requested by the Hoover Commission.

Now, it just happens, coincidentally, that in this morning's newspapers Mr. Hoover is quoted as making a prediction which I am certain meets with the approval of every Member of the House; a prediction which is generally gratifying and which meets with the widest acceptation by the country at large. In view of the fact that we approve of his prediction of continued prosperity and are anxious to cooperate in its realization, it is to be regretted that there is such a wide difference of opinion between his agency and the committee reporting this bill.

But, Mr. Chairman, this leads directly to a question which I desire to submit this morning to the Congress and to the country. It deals with the most important subject that can be considered here on the floor during this session. The United States is now carrying a colossal public debt. Never before in the history of this country, or of any other country, has any nation owed as much money as we owe this morning. There have been times when the public debt ran a little above what it does today. There are two such instances as I recall: one at the close of the Second World War and one in February 1946, when the public debt ran a little in excess of what it does this morning, practically $275 billion. But, on both of those occasions we were in position to reduce it and did reduce it. For instance, at the end of the Second World War we promptly froze every allocation and rescinded $64 billion of the debt, bringing it down to $253 billion. Even at the end of the Second World War, with all of the huge expenditures involved in that great conflict, the public debt was more than $22 billion lower than it is this morning. Then again, in February 1946, when it ran up to $279 billion, we had in the Treasury at that time unencumbered and uncommitted, $26 billion which brought it down again to $253, far below the present astronomical total. So, we stand today owing more money than we ever owed before in the history of the Nation. Why, the interest upon it alone is more than the entire budget of the United States a comparatively short while ago.

We are faced with this situation: All of us agree that the budget should be balanced. That was the most solemn of all the commitments made in the last campaign. What progress is being made toward the redemption of that pledge? In the Treasury and Post Office bill—the first of the general supply bills to pass the House, the reduction in budget estimates was inconsequential. In this bill the reduction is practically limited to the cut in the appropriation for the Hoover Commission. If accomplishments up to this date are any indication of the reduction to be made in expenditures this fiscal year we will fall far short of holding the deficit down to the figure predicted at the beginning of the session—much less of balancing the budget.

And it is more serious than that. With economic barometers falling, it is evident that the national income is shrinking—even with the present tax schedules. With accelerating attrition in national income and with the loss of revenues heretofore drawn from current tax rates—and the failure of our campaign to reduce expenditures—we are facing a desperate situation. We are already far down the road that leads to economic collapse.

The alarming feature of the situation, Mr. Chairman, is not so much the size

of the debt. The alarming thing about it is that nobody seems to be alarmed. No one mentions it. No one suggests taking measures to remedy it. The idea seems to be that if we do not notice it, it will go away. If we do not pay any attention to it, it just won't be there. The only hope seems to be that we will wake some morning and find it was just a bad dream.

But it is there. It is increasing by millions every day. We haven't paid a penny on it for years. We haven't even thought of paying the interest. The only action so far suggested is that we raise the statutory limit so that we can continue to increase it without violating the law.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the great question before this Congress today. Unless we reduce expenditures, unless we maintain national revenues, unless we balance the budget, unless we start paying on the public debt, there are ahead of us the most serious economic consequences—there is ahead of us the certainty of great national disaster.

It is not merely a question of domestic economy. It is also the crux of our national defense. With national bankruptcy, we fall like a ripe plum into the waiting lap of the Communists who have so long predicted that very contingency.

Never before has such responsibility devolved upon any Congress as devolves upon this Congress in the handling of our fiscal affairs at this session. When are we going to balance the budget? Why do we not do something about the public debt? Why not immediately provide that every year, regardless of any circumstance or condition, we will reduce the national debt by a definite percentage? That is elementary common sense. Certainly that is the most businesslike thing we could do, and this is a business administration and a business Congress.

I was in Germany in 1945 at the close of the Second World War. I saw men going into the banks there carrying money in baskets. It was worth so little, it had to be handled in such huge volume, that when they went to make a deposit they actually carried the money to the bank in wicker hampers.

We have one alternative, Mr. Chairman. We either begin reduction of this debt or we eventually repudiate it. And already we are a long way down the road to repudiation. Already the purchasing power of the dollar is so depreciated that it will buy only half of what it ought to buy. Germany followed that road. Germany followed that road until her money was worthless. Even before the final collapse Germany was paying off its public debt with marks which were a millionth percentage of their face value.

Mr. Chairman, the creation of much of our national debt could not be avoided. We were under the muzzles of the enemy's guns. But that is not now even incidental to the problem with which we are confronted today. The question in this Congress is whether we will eat our cake, and drift, or whether we will do something about it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to reassure my distinguished friend the gentleman from Missouri that when he speaks of the money appropriated to the Commission which we know as the Hoover Commission and calls it a reduction he uses a word which was not used in the subcommittee nor in the Committee on Appropriations. This will be perfectly clear to you, Mr. Chairman, and to others, if you will refer to the hearings. The Hoover Commission was created last year. It was given an appropriation of $500,000. You will see on page 37 it did not go into action until the end of September. It had at the time of this hearing a little over $300,000 remaining. On page 36 of the hearings you will see we asked the executive director certain questions which indicated that this request had come very hastily to us, and perhaps had been an effort on his part to foresee activities which he was not yet prepared to describe. We said it looked as if he might come back to us in a few months better prepared to tell us the amount of money he wanted. Then, if you will turn to page 49, you will see we asked how long he could run on the existing money and how much he needed to run until June. The discussion which is indicated as being off the record was between the representatives of the Commission and the subcommittee and indicated that there would be another supplemental bill, perhaps in 30 days or 6 weeks, and undoubtedly a final bill, as is customary, at the end of the year, and that the Commission would be in better position to give an idea of its needs, and we would be in better position to give the money. I can assure my distinguished colleague, the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri, that there need be no concern; that this is not a reduction, but an attempt on the part of the committee to determine what amount should be appropriated, and, further, that there is no concern even on the part of the distinguished Chairman of the Commission itself, who would be the last person to ask for a blank check.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this makes the situation more unfavorable than I had anticipated. I had hoped the error, if there was an error, was on the part of the committee. The gentleman seems to indicate that the error was on the part of the agency which made this request.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is no error, neither on the part of the agency nor the committee.

Mr. CANNON. The Commission estimated their requirements, as you will note in the report, at $1,831,000. The committee cut that to $300,000, a reduction of 84 percent. Somebody was 84 percent in error.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, there are two items under Treasury in this bill.

The first item calls for an appropriation of $4,800,000 for the Division of Disbursement and is to cover the cost of reimbursement to the Post Office Department for penalty mail. It is an uncontrollable item, an immediate must, the Division being able to carry on for a very short time on available funds.

It should be stated that the Division of Disbursement is responsible for disbursing moneys of all departments except the Military Establishment, postal service, and certain corporations. It was Public Law 286, approved last August, that required the reimbursement to the Post Office Department from the date of approval on. The actual cost until the end of the current fiscal year was estimated at $4,965,000, but the Division hopes to absorb $195,000, through improved procedures. It has a good record in this respect. The second item does not call for an appropriation but provides for a transfer of $7,620,500 in funds from the Department of Defense to the Coast Guard to meet construction deadlines for the completion of a vital loran chain in the Arctic, a project given the highest military priority. Time is of the essence because the project in order to be completed for operation this year must be built during the approaching summer months.

Funds were originally granted the Coast Guard in the amount of $1,484,675 for the purpose of making preliminary surveys, initiating construction, and purchasing long-lead items in fiscal 1953. The balance of the funds were included in the so-called Truman budget but because these stations will be primarily used in support of Defense Department units, it was decided as a matter of fiscal policy that the charge for completion was properly one against the Defense Department appropriations. The language for transfer was held to be necessary.

Loran is a combination word for three words—"long" and "range" and "navigation"—and was developed during World War II. A chain is made up of a master and several slave stations placed at different land points and simultaneously sending out electronic signals which are picked up on instruments aboard aircraft and seacraft. Through mathematical measurements of the time difference in receipt of the several signals a line of position is developed and the craft determines an exact "fix." It can keep land, air, and sea units advised.

This loran chain is one of a number prescribed in a comprehensive plan of the Joint Chiefs of Staff setting forth the loran stations as a requirement. The stations are in the far north above the permafrost line, which substantially increases the construction costs over that of stations constructed elsewhere. The Defense Department requirement is that these stations shall be operational by the fall of this year, and since the construction season is limited generally from

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

July 15 to September 15, speed is necessary. The material for the construction of these stations must be purchased in the United States, staged and shipped north not later than the first of May in order that full availability may be made of the short construction season.

The Coast Guard will not of itself do the construction work. That has been assigned to the Army engineers who will have civilian contractors working in the general area this summer, although there are indications that this is the last summer that such contractors will be available. Therefore, if the station is not completed this summer, costs of completion will undoubtedly rise if contractors must be taken from the States. The extreme isolation of the area and the rigors of the climate are the factors that add materially to the cost. Conventional construction in the United States costs from $10 to $20 per square foot, depending on whether or not utilities are available, type of construction, labor areas, and other factors. For the heavy type construction employed in this project it is estimated that $25 would be the stateside costs. This would be increased enormously in the Arctic. United States Navy figures on construction costs at Point Barrow include an index of 4.0 for comparing costs there with continental United States costs. This index has been used in estimating in the instant case as it is believed that the difficulties encountered in this case will be equal to or greater than those of construction at Point Barrow.

The committee has reported this bill out with $1,000,000 less than requested only because certain items of cost appear to be excessive. The need or urgency is not questioned. It is hoped the amount will prove sufficient and the action being now taken need be no cause for delay in going forward with the project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I might ask a question of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. In your statement you said that the materials for these jobs in Greenland are being purchased in the United States. According to my information that statement may not be quite accurate, because I understand they are purchasing some in Holland. One of the complaints about the Army engineers is——

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yielded to the gentleman for a question, not a statement.

Mr. FULTON. Secondly, that they are buying materials that cost more to erect.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. CANFIELD. The information before the Committee, however, is that the main material for construction can be purchased from only one contractor, and that contractor is in the United States.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, there are two items in this supplemental appropriation bill, from the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee. The first is unemployment compensation for veterans. The request was for $20,500,000, but it did not reach the committee until last Wednesday afternoon and justifications have still not been received from the Department of Labor, so we obviously did not have time to hold hearings and report the bill to the full committee last week. The committee, however, realizes that this is an emergency and so has included $15 million without holding hearings, and we will consider the balance of the request when we have had time to hold hearings.

This is an uncontrollable item which is provided for in the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. The Department has at the present time enough money to last approximately 1 month. If the money is not appropriated it would be very disastrous, because, according to the law, every veteran is entitled to receive these payments if he is unemployed.

There is also an item of $125,000 for the National Mediation Board, which is necessary because of the considerable increase in the use of their arbitration and emergency boards by both employers and employees. The National Mediation Board's request of $138,000 for fiscal year 1954 was allowed in full in the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act for 1954. I think it is also appropriate at this time to mention that the committee and the Congress also allowed the full amount of the Department of Labor's estimated requirements for unemployment compensation for veterans.

The National Mediation Board used the $138,000 which was allowed them under the appropriation act of 1954 and in addition have received $85,000 from the President's emergency fund. They asked us for an additional $150,000. They justified $119,430 for specific items they think are reasonably foreseeable. In addition they asked for $30,570 as a reserve for contingencies. We have allowed the $119,430 and a slight additional amount for contingencies. We think that $125,000 is enough to carry them through to the end of the year.

There was also a request for $14,500,000 for grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment security administration. We have not included this item in the bill. The reason that is not carried is because we did not have time to have hearings. In fact we still have not received justifications from the Department of Labor. I think that this request should be looked over very carefully, especially in view of the fact that part of the request was for salary increases and another portion is to permit the return to weekly claims filing. There may be some good justification for these things, but we think that we should have rather extensive hearings before making a determination.

It is important, in considering this item, that there is about $3,800,000 in their contingency fund which is not yet obligated and which will carry them over until we can conclude our hearings. There is not the emergent need for funds for this activity such as exists in connection with unemployment compensation for veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired; under the consent agreement all time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," including hire of passenger motor vehicles, $300,000: *Provided*, That said appropriation shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the limitation under said head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954, as amended, on the amount available for expenses of travel, is increased to $100,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 4, at the end of line 15, add a new paragraph as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

"*Loan authorization*

"For an additional amount for loans under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, $30 million, to be borrowed in the same account as is authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1954."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we have an agency in the Department of Agriculture known as the Farmers Home Administration. It is a highly efficient and well operated division of the Government. It is presently headed by Mr. R. B. McLeaish, who is called the Administrator.

We have been making so-called FHA loans to farmers for many years. I am thinking particularly of the production and subsistence loan program of the FHA. These loans are made to enable the farmer to buy gasoline, to run his tractor, to pay for his groceries, to buy seed and feed and other items to enable him to stay on the farm. These funds cannot be borrowed by a farmer from the FHA if he is able to secure money from the local bank or otherwise.

The repayment rate on these loans since 1946 has been 93½ percent. In other words, of the loans made since 1946 which have matured, 93½ percent have been repaid and the anticipation is that approximately 100 percent of all of these loans will eventually be repaid. In other words, this is not in any sense a give-away program. It is a very effective program in enabling farmers to stay on the farm.

The Department of Agriculture has received in one way or the other applications, or estimated applications, which exceed the funds available to the extent of $45 million. My amendment would provide, not the full $45 million but $30 million to be loaned to the farmers if they cannot get the money otherwise. This money would enable many of them to stay in business; it would enable them to stay on the farm.

There is no worse economy than failing to provide adequate credit to people, good, earnest, hard-working American farm people, throughout the 48 States of the Union to enable them to carry on their business. In former years it has often been possible when these production and subsistence funds for the FHA were low to secure loans from banks, or, perhaps, the grocery man would carry the farmer on until the harvest season, or the blacksmith and the repairmen would carry these people. Money was not so tight then as it is now.

In the great Southwest where we have had such terrific droughts, many of the banks have gone as far as they can go under the banking laws to supply credit. An emergency situation exists. The banks cannot continue in what appears to be the fifth year of drought to finance the farmers in need of credit. Of course, they finance the overwhelming majority of them. So, the question is a little support, credit support, for our farmers; additional support. We have already provided $140 million for this program. This would increase it to $170 million. It is a very modest but efficiently operated program, and the chances are good that the ultimate repayment rate will approach 100 percent.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Is it not a fact that without this help these people will be driven off the farms; that there is no other way for them to stay in business, and that they now, when they make these applications, already have in prospect land which they can operate if they can be financed? Is that not a fact?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Now, I took this matter up with President Eisenhower and he wrote a sympathetic letter, and I am sure that had he the time to go into it thoroughly he would already have sent to us a budget estimate. I have taken it up with the Department of Agriculture, and officials say, "Yes, the estimate of applications for this type of loan exceeds the funds available by $45 million." We are going to wake up one of these days and we will not have the funds, and the Congress cannot take action overnight. I have waited for a budget estimate and would like to wait longer but this is a supplemental appropriation bill and my amendment is in order. This is where this sort of appropriation should be made, and it may be a long time before we will have an additional opportunity to provide these needed funds, and besides that many farmers are in need of the answer to a question which puzzles them: "Shall I leave the farm and go to town, give up my farm life, or shall I try to stay on?" He needs assurance now that the credit will be made available.

So, it is in that spirit and for that purpose that I offer this amendment. These funds do not have to be repaid in 1 year; they can be repaid over a period of 3 years. This is a very effective program. I see the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], who is very sympathetic to this program, present. He is a great friend of agriculture and the farmer, chairman of the subcommittee, and I know he is placed at a disadavntage, without a budget estimate, to go along with this proposal.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not a fact that the greatest weakness in what we have been trying to do for these farmers is based on the fact that we have not been able to assure them that we will go far enough, and the public has not known on any of these programs in the last year that we could go the whole length, and therefore the programs have not been as effective as they would have been had everybody known that they were going to be able to continue the program as long as it was needed?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is right.

Mr. POAGE. That has been the weakness in the cattle relief program, has it not, that we have not known that we could buy enough, that we have not known that we could buy enough feed, that we have not known that we would have enough money to make these loans? We have been told a lot of things that will come, we have been told that we will get help, but the quantity was not forthcoming. The gentleman is just trying to see that it will go around.

Mr. MAHON. I am just trying to see that it will go almost around. This is not an adequate sum.

Some of our agricultural programs are subject to criticism. Take the feed program. The taxpayer subsidized the ranchman, and sometimes the ranchman was worth a million dollars or more in his own right, but the taxpayer subsidized him with cheap feed. I am not complaining. The object of the program was all right. Of course, it was a giveaway program to some extent. I think it could be defended. But this FHA loan program is a program against which I have never in all my service in the House of Representatives heard anyone launch any serious objection. It is just a simple matter of enabling the farmer, usually a small farmer, who cannot get credit anywhere else, to stay on the farm. I think we would perhaps be willing to do this for people overseas under our foreign-aid program. Let us do it for our own people under this amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman from Texas is a distinguished former chairman of the very important subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee dealing with the military. Does he think this is exactly orderly procedure?

Mr. MAHON. My friend is correct. The procedure is not orderly. However, I am not so much interested in orderliness at this time when there are anxious farmers in New Jersey, Texas, and other States who are wondering whether or not adequate funds will be available. I offered the amendment in committee and it was defeated. I do not blame anybody for objecting to it and I do not blame anybody for voting against it now, but I think the amendment is sound and should be supported. My friend, the able gentleman from New Jersey, is correct that a better procedure would be a budget estimate from the Bureau of the Budget hearings, and the inclusion of the item in an appropriation bill by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago on this floor an amendment which I introduced provided an additional $10 million to the amount brought in for production and subsistence loans, raising that amount to $120 million. Last year, if you will recall, we brought in the same amount, $120 million, in the regular appropriation bill, and in addition we provided $20 million under the so-called disaster loan fund, making $140 million available for this fiscal year for what we term production and subsistence loans. I cite this instance to remind the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] that I have always felt, as he does, that this is a very worthwhile program.

However, Mr. Chairman, we are faced today with this situation. We have had no request from the Budget for any addition in this item. We have had no hearings relative to any possible supplemental items. The officials from the Farmers Home Administration appeared last week before my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture on the regular bill for fiscal 1955. They did not tell us of any dire circumstances due to the lack of subsistence funds at this time. In fact, I just telephoned the Department, and they informed me that they now have $25.2 million available in that fund, and that that amount will last through April, in their opinion. I am referring to their money for production and subsistence loans. It would seem to me that this picture is much more favorable than it has been in past years as far as funds in this category are concerned. I do not feel that the production and subsistence loans situation is bad at all at this time. If, in a month or so, something unfortunate develops, our subcommittee will bring any necessary request to the floor for consideration. But we are placed in a rather impossible situation here today. We are requested to agree to an item on which we have had no hearings and concerning which we have had no budget estimate. As the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] brought out, this is a little bit irregular.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I talked this morning with Mr. McLeaish who administers the program. I had called him and I want

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to make it clear that he is not urging the adoption of this amendment. He, I believe, will tell you as he told me, that their estimate is they lack $45 million being able to meet the estimated requirements for this year for the production and subsistence loans. He says he hopes to use some of the disaster money to meet about one-half or one-third, I believe, of this amount. The funds for the production and subsistence loans have been exhausted in the State of Texas, I know, for at least a couple of months. There may be some allocation to States that have not been used. The estimated requirement, the additional requirement for my own State is $9 million.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Let me call to the gentleman's attention this fact; beside the $25.2 million still available in the regular fund for production and subsistence loans, there is also approximately $17 million unexpended in the disaster loan fund, and that was the estimate given to our subcommittee last week.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The estimate of the $17 million to $20 million is an estimate of what will be left as of June 30.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As of June 30, that is correct, and certainly the Farmers' Home Administration, in case of dire need, and, keep in mind dire need comes within the purview of loans for the disaster areas, can take money from that $17 million fund and use it in that area.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. The disaster money will not fit the pattern of the production and subsistence program. Under the production and subsistence program a certain amount of refinancing is possible in order that the farmer can pay his running expenses and bills and even the interest on his indebtedness.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly, we recognize the fact that this is not exactly in the same category, but let me reiterate that the cases of dire need are covered by the disaster loan program. Let me reiterate that we do have $25.2 million left in the production and subsistence funds as of this date, and that will carry at least through April 30. Let me further state that the new money which the committee will make available in our regular appropriation bill will undoubtedly be in the neighborhood of $120 million, in my opinion, and that will be available for allocation as of July 1.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I make the categorical statement for the RECORD that the Department does not have $20 million plus in unobligated production and subsistence loans to be made to farmers of the Southwest. I do not understand the statement of the gentleman that they have unexpended or unobligated funds for that purpose. I know that they do not have. I know that the gentleman can find out before he reads over his remarks later in the day. There is no money in the Southwest, particularly in Texas, not one additional dollar, under this item that has not already been committed.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is in the neighborhood of $17 million to $20 million estimated as of June 30, which will not be expended out of what we term disaster loan funds, under the legislation which was enacted by the Congress last year, as you know.

Mr. MAHON. But I am not talking about the disaster loan funds now.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. All right, then let us go back to the $25.2 million that I referred to. The Department informed me today, through the clerk of our committee, that $25.2 million is available as of this date, and that that will be sufficient to take care of the demands for production and subsistence loans through April. I recognize the interest of my friend in this particular matter. We are all interested. This has been a bipartisan matter—in fact, 2 years ago, my amendment to increase this particular loan fund by $10 million was the only budget increase passed by the House that year. That indicates the good feeling in this House toward this program. Let us not harm this program by coming in here after by-passing the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, without any hearing and without any request from the Budget at all. I do not think it is good business. We do not want things brought to the floor of the House on that basis. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], on your side, assisted with the passage of my amendment 2 years ago and will join with my Republican colleagues to do whatever is necessary about this matter. You may be assured that we will give to Farmers Home Administration all of the money it can rightly use in their very good work.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman say for the record that there are now funds available under the Production and Subsistence Loans Program for the State of Texas?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No, not specifically for the State of Texas. I am speaking of the United States of America. Texas is just 1 of the 48 States to which this fund applies.

Mr. MAHON. In what States is this money available?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will see to it, as far as I can, that Texas is given the consideration it should have.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The disaster loans that were referred to a little while ago are available in States where the President has issued a proclamation; and Texas has been named as such a State.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes. However, I agree with Mr. MAHON that there are certain restrictions placed on this seventeen or twenty million dollars in funds which will still be available next June 30. But certainly the situation cannot be too bad or we would have had some Department of Agriculture official before us before this time, advocating that something be done. If anything is necessary, we will be the first to ask for more loan funds, as we have been in the past.

I hope you will do our subcommittee the credit of being realistic enough to take care of the situation if it does arise. You have always aided us, Mr. MAHON, in doing justice to the needs of agriculture.

Mr. MAHON. I have the utmost respect and admiration for the gentleman and his committee.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 19, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NELSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may be allowed to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PRICE SUPPORT FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have received a resolution from the New York Holstein-Friesian Association, Inc.

This association is very watchful, and quite properly so, of the dairy farmers' interests, which at times seem to be overlooked.

I am very sure that any help in disposing of surplus milk products will solve many of the dairy farmers most vexing problems.

Whereas the market for cattle is largely governed by price of milk, as well as general economic conditions; and

Whereas experience has shown that all price support by Government agencies tends to defeat their intended purpose by creating greater surpluses and, therefore, causing continued increases in Government purchase of commodities. This in turn builds consumer resentment and sales resistance to artificially high retail prices thus created: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New York State Holstein-Friesian Association assembled in annual meeting in Jamestown, N. Y., January 18–19, 1954, hereby goes on record as requesting congressional enactment of enabling legislation necessary to permit the setting up of a corporation for handling and disposal of surplus milk products by the dairy industry itself, along the lines proposed by the annual meeting of the National Milk Producers Federation in Houston, Tex., in 1953; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all Congressmen and Senators from New York State and to the United States Secretary of Agriculture, and to the chairmen of Senate and House Agricultural Committees.

CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT ANNUITIES

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] for 10 minutes.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the most recent retirement report of the United States Civil Service Commission contains two figures which, in my opinion, should be of concern to every Member of this Congress. These figures show that the average annuity paid under the civil-service retirement system for the fiscal year 1952 was $700 for retired men and $411 for retired women employees. Translate those figures into the terms of a monthly budget, and they mean that the average man retired under our civil-service system is receiving just $58 per month, while the average woman is receiving the even more pitiably inadequate amount of $34. And then try, if you will, to translate $58 a month, or $34 a month, into enough to live on for an entire month. This, to me, represents a shameful state of affairs.

Because I believe that we must face up to the fact that these small annuities can in no way be regarded as adequate to meet living costs, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 2850, which will increase Federal retirement benefits by $500 across the board.

It is true that the Congress, in 1952, made a cost-of-living adjustment in civil-service retirement benefits. But there were at least three things wrong with the bill passed by the 82d Congress.

In the first place, as the figures I have already cited will show, this increase was not enough. In fact, $700 a year is just about one-third of the amount retired elderly couples in New York City, and most other American cities, need to live on with a reasonable degree of security. It is just about one-third of what is required today to buy enough food, adequate shelter, and especially to provide the kind of medical attention which so frequently is a large budget item for people who have retired because of age.

In the second place, the 1952 law was inadequate because it did not apply to all persons receiving civil-service annuities. This was because of the ceiling contained in the bill which allowed the increase only in the case of lower annuity payments. My bill would reward all annuitants equally by increasing their amount by $500 each year across the board.

In the third place, the 1952 bill was a temporary 22-month increase scheduled to continue only until June 30 of this year. At the end of that time, it is true, the increase will be continued for another year if Congress votes the necessary funds to pay for the boost. But even if Congress so acts during this session, the increase will lapse on June 30, 1955, regardless of whether or not the next Congress votes for additional appropriations.

Now, you do not provide the kind of retirement income which gives people a real feeling of security with temporary increases geared to a cutoff date. You do not give our retired Government servants any feeling of assurance that they will not be in want when you say, as the existing law does, that the amount of the pension they will receive beginning July of this year depends upon whether or not Congress appropriates enough funds.

Remember that we are here concerned with a contributory retirement system, and that the men and women now receiving its benefits gave a portion of each paycheck received toward building up the retirement income upon which they must now depend. Remember, also, that the employee's contribution to the civil-service retirement system is unusually high both because the contribution rate is 6 percent of pay and because that rate applies to the whole amount of pay received.

The social-security tax rate, as you well know, has just been increased, but employees still pay at the rate of only 2 percent, and that only on earned income up to $3,600. Prior to January 1 of this year, the contribution rate was only 1½ percent. And many workers now retired are receiving social-security benefits for which their contribution rate was only 1 percent of income up to $3,000, the rate prior to the 1950 amendments.

Yet, the average social-security benefit today is around $50. The point here, of course, is that if civil-service annuitants were receiving as much proportionately in return for their contributions as do beneficiaries of social security, they would be entitled to at least four times as much money. Now, place the civil-service monthly average of $58 per month against the social-security average of $50 a month and you come out with a difference of just $8 per month. And remember that part of that $8 depends upon whether Congress appropriates the money this year.

Or take another example of a contributory retirement system which has been established by Federal law, namely, the railroad retirement system. Here, it is true, the tax rate can be compared with that which applies under civil service, because the employee rate is currently 6¼ percent, but this applies only on wages up to $300 per month. Civil-service employees, as I have said, pay on the entire amount of wages received.

But now let us compare the amount of benefits received under the two systems. Retired civil servants, as we have seen, are receiving an average of $58 per month. But retired railroad workers receive an average of $95.71 per month, or more than one-third more. Furthermore, the railroad system provides additional benefits on behalf of dependents and survivors while the civil-service system is largely geared toward paying stipulated annuities regardless of the number of dependents.

There is a definite reason and need for improving our Federal civil-service retirement system.

Because I am convinced that the need for more adequate pensions for our civil servants is urgent, on February 9, 1953, I introduced my bill, H. R. 2850. Let us not, in the press of other legislation, forget the great hardship which our present civil-service plan is producing in too many homes at a time of life when many of these people need money most. I urge your earnest consideration of my bill calling for an increase of $500 per year for every retired civil servant. Such action would be directly in line with the broad and humane principles enunciated by President Eisenhower. The time to help these unfortunate retired public servants is now, when the need is most urgent.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMUNISM, TREATIES, AND THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, our country is today facing more staggering problems than ever before in all of our history. These problems are so manifold that it would be impossible to discuss all of them if I were capable of doing so during the time allowed me today. We are living in a war economy and in constant threat of war; we are operating under an unbalanced budget, and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

confronted with the fact that there must be some form of tax relief. All of these problems and many more are worthy of discussion.

However, it is not to any of those problems I wish to address myself today. At this time I want to discuss, with all of the sincerity of my soul, three problems now confronting our Nation that are fundamental and which must be solved right. Those three problems are: First, communism; second, the danger of losing our way of life through treaty law; and, third, the danger confronting us by the United States Supreme Court usurping power that was never theirs, and thereby becoming the highest lawmaking body in the world and a lawmaking body from which there is no appeal.

To discuss these matters requires courage. We are now living in an age where anyone really defending America and its institutions must understand that he will be deliberately misunderstood, deliberately misinterpreted, and that the price of patriotism is that he be smeared and be called a reactionary, or a fool. The time has come that a man must be willing to pay the price for being a real American.

Certainly, the gravest danger any country has ever faced is the danger of communism. It corrupts everything it touches; it asks everything, it gives nothing but death and destruction in return; it is completely ungodly and pagan; it was conceived in bloodshed and murder is its way of life; it has been the major problem in this country for at least 30 years. During 30 years past, however, it has been coddled, winked at and blinked at in a way and manner unparalleled in this country. It is true that many good Americans rose up to do battle with this merciless foe, feeling, and, God knows they ought to have been authorized to believe, that all Americans would join in battle, and were unprepared for the terrific character assassination awaiting them and were sadly disillusioned and disbelieved by their own people. Certain, no political party in this country can claim a monopoly on fighting communism. The truth is, a few stalwarts in both major parties have valiantly warred against this enemy, while others in both political parties winked and blinked at it, and even joined in character assassination of those good Americans who did rise up early to do battle. I am thinking now of two distinguished Members of this body, Hon. MARTIN DIES, of Texas, and Hon. John Wood, of Georgia, who years ago had the courage to tell our country what we were facing, but who were set on by members of both political parties and who had to suffer condemnation for many years before plain and uncontrovertible facts made even the unwilling acknowledge that they were right all the time. Would to God the late E. E. Cox, of Georgia, could have lived to see this day and know at last the people are waking up to his warnings. The truth is—neither of the records of the two major parties are anything to brag about. As a matter of fact, their efforts have been so puny that it should humble both and compel repentance and a high resolve that from now on out they will do battle to this terrible enemy. Thank God, although it is late and does not do us too much credit, I think both major parties are now ready to do battle against that foe. If my thinking is correct, then that danger can be overcome and will be overcome. It is my hope that we have at long last learned our lesson—and that no longer will good Americans be vilified or smeared for standing for God and America against atheistic communism.

Now, regarding the matter of treaty law: Anyone advocating the curbing of dictatorship through treaty law can make up his or her mind to pay the price for so doing. Such a person can understand that he or she will be charged with trying to undermine the Constitution and to harass the United Nations—some of these charges being made by innocent but uninformed people, and some by those who really are afraid that their schemes for world government will be defeated. As a matter of fact, an amendment to our Constitution, curbing treaty law and executive agreements must be passed to preserve the Constitution itself. That is a paradox—but absolutely true. Few people understand that internationalists and one worlders discovered a so-called loophole in the Constitution that can and is being used to destroy our Constitution. Few people have even dreamed that a treaty made with a foreign nation on matters in direct conflict with our precious liberties accorded us under our Constitution, now by United States Supreme Court decisions, overrides our Constitution and deprives us of our liberties. Few people dream that a treaty with a foreign nation can annul our Federal, State, and city laws and ordinances. If the people knew—and they will sometime know—that now a treaty can even annul a city ordinance passed by the town or city council that they live in, they would shudder over what had come to pass.

Few people know—but be assured they will know—that the Secretary of State and the President can get together with a foreign nation and make a secret agreement violative of their Federal and State constitutional rights, and completely destroy their constitutional rights and annul their State laws passed by their State legislatures, and that such an agreement can even be pigeonholed and kept secret, and not even the United States Senate be allowed to look it over. Few people know—but I repeat that they will know—that Presidents have made such agreements and that such agreements have annulled laws of a sovereign State under the ruling of the United States Supreme Court. Few people realize that three justices of our United States Supreme Court held that President Truman had no inherent power, nor constitutional power to seize the steel industry, but that he did have the power under the United Nations Charter, and other pacts and agreements.

When the Republicans were on the outside looking in they thought that it was horrible that it might be suggested that Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson have that power, and I agreed with them. As a matter of fact, Mr. Dulles and I think Mr. Eisenhower was of the opinion that curbs must be erected against that power when campaigning in 1952. I hasten here to say that there are many Republicans as well as Democrats who still think that such power must be curbed, if we are to retain our liberties, but it is highly disappointing that Mr. Dulles and Mr. Eisenhower desire that power for themselves now. Candidly, Mr. Eisenhower had the privilege of becoming great, but he did not choose to exercise that privilege. Some day, however, some Chief Executive will live in history by taking the lead in saying "no man whomsoever can have the power to become a dictator in the United States. No man must have unlimited power." This is an issue that will be brought into the open, and I have no doubt what side will ultimately win, provided we have enough courageous men and women to carry on, regardless of threats of political defeat or any other punishment that might be inflicted. The result will be the handiwork, however, of those who were courageous in the heat of the day. It is said that one of this Nation's greatest lawyers has already paid the price for speaking up for the people, although this outstanding man says he supported Mr. Eisenhower because he understood Mr. Eisenhower to say that the powers of the States should be returned to them.

Few people know that executive agreements have been made with foreign nations dealing with not only the destiny of the people of the United States, but, indeed, with the people of the world, and that these agreements were not submitted even to the United States Senate for scrutiny at all. Few people know that Mr. Smith, of the Justice Department, has said that it would take at least 9 months to furnish to the Senate the list of executive agreements, made only by the President and his Secretary, completely without the advice of the Senate that affects internal law, which means that there are many agreements of this nature which might annul the constitutions both Federal and State, and precious laws sovereign States have passed. But, they will know in time. Few people know that the President and Secretary can, with a stroke of a pen, abrogate any law a State thought desirable. Few people know that left wingers and internationalists now deliberately choose the treaty and agreement route to obtain powers Congress would never give them. For instance, the report of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights issued in 1947 is most illuminating. On pages 97 through 135 of that report, we read the kind of legislation that group advocated, and the statement that—

> It is true that the Federal Government does not possess broad, clearly defined delegated powers to protect civil rights which it may exercise at its discretion. A detailed examination of the constitutional aspects of the civil-rights problem makes clear that very real difficulties lie in the way of Federal action in certain areas.

But, those boys gleefully state that they have a remedy, as will be noted from this quotation:

> In its decision in *Missouri* v. *Holland* in 1920, the Supreme Court ruled that Congress may enact statutes to carry out treaty

obligations, even where in the absence of a treaty, it has no other power to pass such a statute. This doctrine has an obvious importance as a possible basis for civil-rights legislation.

And again we read:

The Human Rights Commission of the United Nations is at present working on a detailed international bill of rights designed to give more specific meaning to the general principle announced in article 55 of the charter. If this document is accepted by the United States as a member state, an even stronger basis for congressional action under the treaty power may be established.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is crystal clear that civil rights which Senator RUSSELL so correctly defined as "civil wrongs," FEPC, and the like will be put into law, if these people have their way, not by any lawmaking body of our country but by a treaty wherein the far-reaching results were not understood, or even by a secret executive agreement. As I have previously said, though, Mr. Speaker, the people will know and while these usurpations of the people's rights may not be curbed now, an issue will arise and be kept alive until the people see that their constitutional rights and States' laws are preserved. No change can come without brave men and women; without much travail and suffering on the part of patriots; without men and women who will endure much. But, Mr. Speaker, the person is wrong who does not think we still have those kind of people, when the facts are known. Yes, this will be taken care of sometime.

This leads me, however, Mr. Speaker, to the discussion of what I think is the greatest danger of all, because this danger has not been pin-pointed and the people warned. To the task of warning my people, I now commit myself. That danger that I warn about now is the danger confronting us by the United States Supreme Court usurping power that was never theirs, and thereby becoming the highest law-making body in the world, and a law-making body from which there is no appeal until the people are aroused and constitutional curbs demanded and respected.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it was never intended that treaties were to override our Constitution or to apply to our internal affairs. It is only the late rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States that has brought this grave danger into being. There are many early decisions of our Supreme Court to the effect that a treaty cannot override our Constitution. Any experienced lawyer knows that this statement is true. However, I do not recall that our Supreme Court has ever held a treaty invalid. Thomas Jefferson said:

If the treaty power is unlimited, we have no Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, will anyone deny that fact? In *New Orleans* v. *U. S.* (10 Pet. 662), decided in 1836, and in *Doe* v. *Braden* (16 How. 635), decided in 1853, and in *Cherokee Tobacco* case (11 Wall. 1616), decided in 1870, and in *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U. S. 258), the United States Supreme Court upheld the views of Thomas Jefferson that the Constitution was supreme and that a treaty could not override its provisions. Thus, for 125 golden years our Supreme Court protected the constitutional rights of its citizens. It was only in 1920 that the new and dangerous doctrine was announced that treaties would render legislation valid that was unconstitutional prior to such treaty, this being announced in the case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416), which is the case the Civil Rights Commission embraced so wholeheartedly as heretofore related. Then in 1942, the United States Supreme Court in the case of the *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203) extended the doctrine of Missouri against Holland to executive agreements. In the Pink case, the President of the United States entered into an agreement with Soviet representative Litvinov regarding moneys in a New York bank which was being handled under the laws of New York by the courts of New York. This agreement was not submitted to either House of Congress, and did not receive Senate approval, but the agreement provided for a disposition of that money and took the money from the courts of New York by the stroke of a pen.

The United States Supreme Court held that such agreement superseded the law of New York and the New York court, and effectively disposed of ownership to this money. That decision held that this agreement had similar dignity with a treaty, although a treaty must be brought out into the open and the Senate allowed to debate and vote on it. Mr. Speaker, that decision is the undoubted basis for a dictatorship, whenever one chooses to exercise that power. It would be illuminating for us and for our citizens to read the late cases of *Nielsen* v. *Johnson* (279 U. S. 47); *Griffin* v. *McCoach* (313 U. S. 498); *U. S.* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation* (299 U. S. 304), and many others lately placed upon the records of the United States Supreme Court. Now, Mr. Speaker, New York can speak with experience. Other States have had their sovereign laws abrogated by treaties, and this danger is one that we all share in common and this danger must be wiped out by both parties and without partisanship.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I assert as a lawyer, that these dangers could never have arisen had the United States Supreme Court observed a simple, sound and indispensable rule of law that is hoary with age, and which is taught in all of the law books. I refer to the rule of stare decisis. There is not a State in the United States that is not familiar with that old rule and does not adhere to that rule. That rule is older than Blackstone and recited by Blackstone's Commentaries. Black's Law Dictionary defines stare decisis as follows:

To stand by decided cases; to uphold precedents; to maintain former adjudications—

And then cites many authorities—

Doctrine of stare decisis rests upon principle that law by which men are governed should be fixed, definite, and known, and that, when the law is declared by court of competent jurisdiction authorized to construe it, such declaration, in absence of palpable mistake or error, is itself evidence of the law until changed by competent authority.

Mr. Speaker, any other rule is an ambush to our most honest and law-abiding citizens. Our Government intended that our citizens could rely upon precedents of our courts, so that they could shape and govern their conduct and business principles in harmony with the law. In ancient days the rulers had their laws written upon walls so high that its citizens could not read them, yet the ruler could claim that the law was published and the rulers held the people liable for infractions of those laws that they did not know existed. Our United States Supreme Court has not improved upon that horrible ancient practice, for our United States Supreme Court refuses to be bound by precedent and our people do business under a decision of that Court under the handicap that they must understand that a ruling today is no protection whatsoever to a contrary ruling on tomorrow, and that bankruptcy could easily be caused by reliance upon a decision rendered by the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, unlimited power is dangerous. Our United States Supreme Court has repeatedly held that our Constitution shall not be interpreted as the framers of our Constitution intended, but that our Constitution would be interpreted in harmony with the times and in another era and not as in the horse-and-buggy days. Such theories and rulings of that Court will be found in the words of Justice Frankfurter in *Wolf* v. *Colorado* (338 U. S. 25, 27), and in Justice Frankfurter's work Mr. Justice Holmes' Constitutional Opinions, and in Justice Douglas's article on stare decisis, and in *U. S.* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 316, 319), and many other decisions.

Mr. Speaker, imagine the consternation that would have reigned amongst Jefferson, Madison, Mason, Hamilton, and the other architects of our Constitution, if some leftwinger or internationalist would have said to them: "You need not be so careful about the choice of the right word; there is no need to argue over exact language; do you not know that the Supreme Court you are creating will say that what you are doing will mean one thing today and an entirely different thing tomorrow; do you not know that the document you are spending months on will be as a chameleon changing its color and character according to the situation, or what the Supreme Court thinks is in harmony with the times?"

Mr. Speaker, I do not need to tell anyone there would have been no Constitution. Those men had suffered from unlimited power. Those men were playing for keeps. Those men were determined to take from despots and even from innocent or well-meaning people the power of destroying, through judicial lawmaking, the people's rights that had been won on the fields of battle, and the rights they had risked their necks to obtain. That is manifest, when one reads the provisions they made for changing the Constitution. The sole method of changing the Constitution was, and is, by amendments made by the legislative branch, passed by a two-thirds majority in Congress, and then ratified by three-fourths of the States.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. Speaker, it was when the members of the United States Supreme Court were referred to as "tired old men," and that Court was packed with members of a certain philosophy of government that felt that the Constitution must bend and break if necessary to accomplish the end desired, that even our Constitution was not safe. Lawyers doubt that the Justices referred to as "tired old men" were as tired as they were disgusted, for they were great lawyers and real Americans, and their ability, character, and integrity were never challenged or questioned. Some day, I believe we will build a monument of stone to their memory, but in the meantime, their memories are engraved upon the hearts of those who love the Constitution.

Let us see, Mr. Speaker, what has happened in the last few years.

For many years there was an unbroken background upholding restrictive racial covenants in deeds of conveyance, including deeds of conveyance in the District of Columbia, the seat of our government. Never had any of these solemn covenants been held illegal or that these covenants discriminated against any race, or that these covenants offended the Constitution, and the upholding of these covenants were entirely correct. Anyone could and should understand that the right to make these covenants were not limited to any particular race. It is true that these covenants usually contained the provision that the property deeded would never be conveyed to one of African or Chinese descent. Yet, persons of African or Chinese descent under the old rulings had the same right to incorporate in deeds of conveyance that the property deeded would never be conveyed to persons of the Caucasian race. These restrictions could not be judicially determined to have been imposed because of hatred to any race. The motivating cause for these restrictions was not race hatred, but to prevent the loss of property, occasioned by the well-known fact which no law can erase, that property in a neighborhood inhabited by mixed races immediately loses its value. Anyone can see this great truth in the city of Washington, where after the cases of *Shelley* v. *Kramer* (334 U. S. 1) and *Hurd* v. *Hodge* (334 U. S. 24) were decided by the United States Supreme Court on the basis evidently that they had a monopoly on determining the times, and that the minority must be allowed to triumph over the majority, it was held, that though these covenants were not illegal they were unenforceable, blocks after blocks of highly valuable property was reduced to a fraction of its previous value, amounting to confiscation of property.

These decisions did violence to the old maxim that every law student is aware of, to wit: "For every right there shall be a remedy," but our Supreme Court did not stop there. On June 15, 1953, that Court, through Justice Minton, with Justice Vinson dissenting, and Justices Reed and Jackson not participating, held in Barrows, et al. against Jackson, that a covenant made between petitioners and respondent, who each and all owned city lots in Los Angeles, Calif., in consideration of the mutual benefit to themselves, including respondent that none of the covenantors would ever allow any of their lands to be occupied by persons not of the Caucasian race, could not be the basis for an action for damages by petitioners against respondent by reason of respondent violating said covenant, although respondent had had the benefit of petitioners adherence to said covenant. In this case, the United States Supreme Court upheld the respondent in her deliberate violation of the covenant, although that Court said the covenant violated no law, and admitted that no vendee not of the Caucasian race was being molested or the property right of any such person being adjudicated. To so hold, violated every rule of law to the effect that "one may not claim standing in the courts to vindicate the constitutional rights of an outside or third party"—see *J. A. F. Refuge Comm.* v. *McGrath* (341 U. S. 123, 149–154); *Frothringham* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 447, 486–489); *Doremus* v. *Board of Education* (342 U. S. 429, 434); *Tileson* v. *Ullman* (318 U. S. 44). And said holding completely violated the rule of all courts that a party cannot challenge the constitutionality of a law unless he can show that he is in the class whose constitutional rights are infringed—*Bode* v. *Barrett* (344 U. S. 583, 585); *Tennessee Electric Company* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (306 U. S. 118, 144)—and in the instant case respondent was a Caucasian and could not have been in the group that respondent contended could have their constitutional rights infringed. The United States Supreme Court departed from a rule that has been law always in this country to the effect that no constitutional issue will be decided until it has a party before it who has standing to raise the issue. Justice Vinson deplored this ruling, saying that the respondent "does not ask the Court to protect her own constitutional rights nor even the rights of the persons who now occupy her property." And, he says further, "because respondent happens to have decided to act as the self-appointed agent of those principals whom she cannot identify—in order to relieve herself of the obligations of her own covenant—the majority finds itself able to assert the power over State courts which it asserts today."

Mr. Speaker, the damage to the property owners in this country by those two United States Supreme Court decisions will doubtless exceed the expense of some wars this country has waged. California's citizens now have no protection from actual confiscation of their property by unscrupulous persons who covenant with them, obtain advantages by other covenantors' honesty, and other advantages by their infamy. The loss in the city of Washington, D. C., already has run into many millions of dollars, and the same is true in New York and Chicago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, none of our legal precedents are safe. Pending now in the United States Supreme Court are cases challenging the school systems of many of our States, although there is not a single point raised in those cases that have not already been decided by that court many, many times heretofore. Nevertheless the Supreme Court has had one exhaustive hearing and ordered another hearing on these cases. Why the difficulty in failing to recognize well settled precedents is hard to understand. I refer to the case of Davis against County School Board of Prince Edward County, Va., and similar cases. There is only one thing that I can discover to be reasonably new in these cases, and that is, that a brief has been filed in behalf of the appellants by our present Attorney General, Hon. Herbert Brownell, Jr., and eight other members of his staff, asking the court to review and overrule their many cases holding that "separate but equal facilities satisfied all constitutional requirements" and hold instead that segregation in itself is unlawful per se. I am not unmindful of the fact that Solicitor General Pearlman pursued similar tactics under Mr. Truman's administration, but nevertheless, such tactics are wrong and cannot be condoned. Instead of the appearance of the Attorney General being as a friend of the court, it should be an insult to that court. I hasten to add, however, that the Supreme Court invited this insult. The Justice Department is no longer impartial to its citizens—it is now distinctly partisan. The Justice Department is not by that act engaged in preserving our Court's rulings, but is engaged in trying to overthrow those rulings. Indeed, evil days are upon us, when the Department of Justice arrays itself against one class of citizens in behalf of another class of citizens and attempts to destroy well settled law. I regret that the Attorney General took this step, for it simply is not good ethics and it is quite alarming that this high officer of the courts should be in the role of asking the courts to set aside its precedents. I observe, however, Mr. Speaker, that when an Attorney General asks a criminal court to construe a criminal statute liberally in order to convict a defendant upon a criminal charge, as Mr. Brownell did a short time ago, we might assume that the gentleman is so partisan that he completely forgets the law and the proprieties. Otherwise, he would, I think, feel that there should sometime be a finality to litigation.

The case of *Gong Lum et al.* v. *Rice et al.* (275 U. S. 78–87) is utterly sufficient for any unbiased mind to hold that the issue before the United States Supreme Court now has been settled against appellants and against the position assumed by the Justice Department of the United States against those States and its citizens. It is a full bench decision and written by Chief Justice Taft, November 21, 1927. Chief Justice Taft was a Republican and a citizen of Ohio. He was writing a decision on a case affecting the southern State of Mississippi that was entirely Democratic. Let me inject here the statement that no southern Democrat ever suspected or dreamed that Republican Justice Taft would, in the capacity of a judge, allow political philosophy to creep into a judicial determination. That decision said:

A child of Chinese blood, born in and a citizen of the United States, is not denied the equal protection of the laws by being classed by the State among the colored races who

are assigned to public schools separate from those provided for the whites, when equal facilities for education are afforded both classes.

Said decision cited decisions from the States of Massachusetts, New York, California, Kansas, Indiana, North Carolina, Missouri, Arizona, and Nevada in support of said ruling. Also, *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (U. S. 163, 537–545), decided by the United States Supreme Court May 18, 1896. Another case exactly on all fours with the present issue is *Cummings* v. *Richmond County Board of Education* (175 U. S. 528), decided December 18, 1899. That was a full bench decision and was written by Justice Harlan, and upheld the separate but equal facilities doctrine as applied to schools, and held further that where Richmond County, Ga., did have segregated schools, but provided schools for other races that were equal in facilities that temporary nonoperation of a school for other races was no ground for admitting a child of another race to the segregated white school of that county, it appearing that the board had not acted in bad faith.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General nowhere denies that the issue had not been settled uniformly against his contentions many times. Rather, the burden of his argument is that all of the other courts have misconstrued the law and that it is his duty to correct the courts, and further, that the Constitution can be interpreted according to the whims and fancy of a given membership. It would be amusing—were it not tragic—to read his illogical reasoning. For instance, on page 4 of his brief he says slavery was abolished while the Civil War was in progress. What slavery had to do with this issue will have to be explained by Mr. Brownell, but since he embarked into that realm, for the sake of correct history, I would like to tell him that slavery was abolished during the War Between the States only in the States of the Confederacy while slavery remained in several States fighting on the side of the Federals. Then, Mr. Brownell attempts to show that the Congress passing the 13th and 14th amendments intended that no segregated schools would exist. It is strange that Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner never knew that. Sumner was trying to accomplish this purpose up to the time of his death, which he would not have been trying to do, if it had already been done. As a matter of fact, when the 14th amendment was submitted to the States for ratification there were 37 States, and there is affirmative evidence that more of the States ratifying the amendment had segregated schools and continued to have segregated schools, than there were States that did not. It is interesting to note that Senator Charles Sumner who with Thaddeus Stevens were the most rabid on civil rights, wrote a convention in Columbia, S. C., in 1871:

> The right to vote will have a new security when your equal right in common schools is at last established. Help yourselves and others will help you. The civil-rights law needs a supplement to cover such cases.

That segregated schools were not abolished and were not intended to be abolished by constitutional amendments is completely proven by the fact that in the District of Columbia segregated schools have been uniformly maintained from the time the debates on the 14th amendment were being made in that city even to the present time. What more proof is needed?

Mr. Speaker, for 88 years the 48 States have understood that they were free to operate their schools upon the State level, subject only to the constitutional requirement that whatever public-school system was set up, equal facilities must be provided, and that so long as equal facilities were provided for all races segregated schools were completely lawful. My State and other States have built their school systems in accordance with the mandates of the United States Supreme Court during those 88 years. Now, these school systems, though patterned after the Supreme's Court's decisions, are threatened by the same court that told them they could erect those systems.

Mr. Speaker, my State is only 88 years removed from the War Between the States. My State has not had much money for schools or even for the necessities of life during much of that unfortunate period. Subject to my State's ability we have maintained public schools and though we had little money, the schools must have been successful, as our Georgians have been able to make great contributions to our country and equal contributions with any other State of the Union. Though my State's money was limited, we had schools for the Caucasian and schools for the other races. My State has done a splendid job of educating the other races and we will willingly match our colored population with any group from any State in the Union. Only in the past few years has my State had much money, but in the past few years, and right now in Georgia, one of the most ambitious school programs anywhere in our Nation is going on. Many millions are being spent for colored schools, and our colored population is satisfied and happy. Our colored citizens want segregated schools, believe me. On my desk now is a petition from the Southern Association for the Advancement of Colored People imploring, yes begging, that the Supreme Court be asked to let the schools remain separate. Of course, I cannot make any such request of a court as I am not a party or an attorney to the pending cases, which is not realized by that group of well-intentioned colored citizens. Maybe they feel that since Justice Douglas entertained a petition by an attorney who did not represent the Rosenbergs and was an interloper, that all bars have been let down and that he who gets the most is the one who asks the most.

Mr. Speaker, in my State there are thousands of colored school teachers with degrees that desire to carry on their profession, believing that under the rulings of the Supreme Court that equal facilities satisfied all constitutional requirements that they could safely select teaching as their life's work. They know now their jobs are in jeopardy. No, Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Brownell is not a friend of that group.

Mr. Speaker, I have already pointed out that Justice Frankfurter in his article contends that stare decisis is not applicable to constitutional questions. Chief Justice Vinson said, however:

> A line of decisions—long enough to warrant the respect of even the most hardened skeptic of the strength of stare decisis as an effective limitation upon this Court's exercise of jurisdiction in constitutional cases—establishes the principle which should stay this Court from deciding what it decides today. (*Barrows* v. *Jackson*, *supra*.)

So there are rules that stare decisis applies in constitutional questions and rules that stare decisis do not apply on constitutional questions. In other words, the United States Supreme Court takes its choice according to inclination. I humbly suggest that if stare decisis is ever applicable, and indeed it must be, then above all else, that rule must apply in the construing of our Constitution, the very foundation of our liberties.

Another queer rule of the United States Supreme Court is that there is no restraint placed upon it that is not self-imposed. There is a restraint imposed upon that Court and it is the Constitution itself. The Congress makes the laws and the Supreme Court interprets those laws. Congress and the people made the Constitution and the Supreme Court is only permitted to interpret it. When the Supreme Court makes laws it usurps power that is not theirs.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to point up this danger of legislation by the courts and awaken the public. I suspect others will do likewise in the days to come. This matter will receive attention, also, I firmly believe. I reiterate, I have complete confidence in the people once they understand. Those who do not have that confidence in the people will someday become keenly aware that the people prize their liberties and intend to keep them.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The gentleman has rendered a great service to constitutional government by delivering the speech which the House has just been privileged to hear. He has clearly and concisely pointed out the danger we face in having the system of checks and balances in our Government destroyed by the Judicial Department usurping legislative functions which does not belong to it. I compliment the gentleman for the fine discussion he has given us, and take this opportunity to express my appreciation to him for it.

Mr. FORRESTER. May I say to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, I deeply appreciate his fine comments. The gentleman as a distinguished lawyer in our native State has given long and most conspicuous and outstanding service as a jurist of our State, and in view of his ability as a constitutional lawyer, I am gratified, indeed, to know that he agrees with me in the discussion I have just had before the House.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. May I thank the gentleman for that kind reference. I reiterate that I do, indeed, agree with the conclusions that the gentleman has just expressed in his speech.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank you, sir.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

DEPRESSION OR PROSPERITY

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, this month of February is especially noteworthy on the calendar because of the occasion it affords for the celebrations of the birthdays of two of our greatest Presidents, George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. The day of tribute to the memory of Abraham Lincoln passed unmarred by any sour notes; but, sad to relate, the ardor of celebrating the birthday of George Washington was dampened by the aspect of a former Chief Executive taking to the air.

In his Washington's Birthday exposure to the limelight, Mr. Herbert Hoover proclaims he should be an expert on depressions—a belated claim to distinction, since history has already accorded him the honor, and in his role as an expert he would calm our apprehensions with a soothing reassurance that no depression is in sight. Great shades of the past—did we not have enough reassurances from Mr. Hoover back in the thirties to last us a lifetime?

We Democrats are being accused of talking the Nation into a recession. We may well admit to some apprehension when a nonexpert like Herbert Hoover speaks. The former President attributes the "dip, slump, recession"—his words—to "dehydrated optimism." To a Democrat nothing is slated to dry out optimism as such a statement from our depression President. We can only hope that if a depression is around the corner it will prove as elusive as Mr. Hoover's prosperity when it was around the corner.

UNITED MINE WORKERS WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to speak of the accomplishments of the United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund.

I think the time has come to appraise the results of a program rich in meaning to a very large and important segment of our population.

I refer to the laudable effort made to better the health and living standards of American coal miners and their families through the welfare and retirement fund of the United Mine Workers.

Many of my own constituents and personal friends in Kentucky have enjoyed its blessings for there are thousands upon thousands of beneficiaries throughout the whole coal-producing area in eastern and southeastern Kentucky. But, since coal is mined in 28 of our States the efforts of this broad program have nationwide significance.

As I speak now, construction teams are building 10 hospitals in the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia. Upon completion, these structures will mark the start of a new era in hospital and medical care. Completely integrated, with the advantages of centralized supply and coordinated administration, they may well set the standards for efficient, progressive hospital care in the future.

It has been my observation that practically all the people in this mountainous area feel that the construction of these hospitals will be one of the greatest accomplishments toward a better health program that has taken place in any period in our generation. I will not take time to recite the need because we all know the need.

I cannot agree with those who advocate nothing less than the removal of this most important subject from the obligation to bargain collectively, a matter which has so much to do with the compensation, the conditions of work and the welfare of wage earners. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I have always opposed any attempt or effort on the part of individuals who would suggest that the obligation to bargain collectively be so defined as not to include bargaining over welfare funds. Welfare funds and benefits have been provided in union contracts as a result of collective bargaining for many years, some as far back as the 1920's.

I notice a statement of Joseph E. Moody, president of the Southern Coal Producers Association, which appears on page 335 of the stenographic transcript of hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, January 29, 1954, wherein among other things he states:

> In addition, the fund has launched an amazing program to build 10 modern hospitals in the coal fields, at a cost of many millions of dollars. The last report I had was that contracts totaling $26 million had already been let, although this is not noted in the latest annual report of the fund.
>
> Certainly these hospitals will be fine things for the communities in which they are located. But they are a far cry from what we believe should be the responsibilities of the fund and a proper cost item for coal.

If you were to examine certain existing facilities in the coal regions of these States, you would be shocked at the type of facilities available to many people of those areas. The authoritative journal, Architectural Forum, devoted three elaborate layouts to the subject, fully exploring every factor incidental to the building of these hospitals. It told in graphic detail just why the UMW welfare fund undertook its hospital project.

It has meant cash on the barrelhead for more than 8,000 physicians and surgeons. Its commitments and contracts have been met in full. Despite the millions it has channeled into medical and hospital care, the welfare fund has never taken an arbitrary position. It has never attempted to dictate to the medical profession or to hospitals. It has never insisted upon standards other than those commensurate with those established and acceptable to such bodies as the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association.

If anything, the welfare fund is free enterprise in action. It stems directly from productivity of the coal miner. For every ton of coal he digs, 40 cents is currently set aside as a royalty, or human equity, if you please. From these royalties come such benefits as $100-a-month pensions for retired coal miners, widows' death benefits, the rehabilitation of crippled coal miners, disaster service benefits to take care of the family when sudden death strikes the breadwinner, and the finest medical and hospital care procurable.

All told more than a million and a quarter people are eligible to benefit from this welfare fund. That represents quite a few American citizens.

One cannot view the coal mining industry except as a thing apart. Incredible, but true, more than 100,000 coal miners have been killed at their work in the United States, close to 2 million have been injured and, as you well know those injuries are more than often of a serious and even critical nature. These men, mind you, were killed and maimed at their work—not at war.

You must also know that the amount of work provided the average coal miner is scarcely sufficient to maintain him in any degree of luxury in the light of today's living costs. You could peruse reports on hundreds of widows in the last year and find very few who had not inherited grocery bills, clothing bills, and other obligations. Whereas, on the average a widow in this country can rely on life insurance to relieve her financial burdens, this is seldom so in the case of the miner's widow. Who will underwrite him or, if so, for what premium?

If there is in our country a more deserving group of productive people fated to dwell in less inviting circumstances I would like to know where they are. Out of the years of misery in many cases, of strife to establish themselves as honorable workers seeking protection for their individual rights in their union organizations, has come something they have learned to cherish—their welfare fund.

Coal miners are too realistic to accept credos of nebulous promise. They are not those to be swept away by delusions of cradle-to-grave security. They are equipped psychologically to take in stride the shocks of fortune far better than most of us. They are entitled to a carefully thought-out plan for an adequate hospital program, planned on the goal of furnishing an entire hospital program to the whole area. The services which will be available in these 10 hospitals will be combined and integrated to provide the most effective and efficient care for our sick and injured. Personally, I am proud of the fact that 2 of the 3 base hospitals are being constructed on Kentucky soil—South Williamson and Harlan.

The welfare fund is predicated upon the productive factor. Hence, it is part and parcel of the bituminous coal industry and its prosperity.

There have been critics, and most of them coldly actuarial, who would have you believe that a welfare fund must be operated on the principle of a funded reserve. This may be all right if you are not concerned with urgent immediate need but it takes many years under

the most favorable circumstances to acquire funds yielding enough to do anything of substantial worth.

It seems to me that the welfare fund has established a pattern which might well be adopted by many other industries.

It has become customary to label anything a worker gains in collective bargaining beyond his wages as a "fringe" benefit. It can be a most inadequate and misleading label. How can you speak of health measures, pensions which spell security and self-respect for retired persons, and like provisions as "fringe" in the usual connotation of the word?

They are fundamental. They can mean the difference between a good life and a wretched one. Upon what else is based the American standard of living in which we take such pride? To whom should this standard apply if not to our hard-working citizens? Lip-service to them is indeed a disservice.

It should be emphasized, too, that no single group in the Nation has made a more vital contribution to the restoration of paraplegics and similar victims of crippling accidents which often doom men to a kind of shadow world. Thus far close to 3,000 coal miners have been given rehabilitation treatment in special centers equipped to do it properly. An impressive number of them are back working in such pursuits as precision machining, running elevators, light carpentry, and numerous other jobs for which the handicapped may qualify.

Widows and orphans are provided for by the fund through funeral and death benefits, which total $1,000 with full hospital and medical coverage for 1 year after the miner's death. In addition, the immediate and most pressing financial worries of the widow of any miner killed or seriously injured at work are paid through a special disaster service.

Perhaps it will be interesting to note that when the annual audit was completed last June 30 this fund showed expenditures of $138,963,942.52 for that fiscal year. Here is something that is very noteworthy: All of this expenditure except 2.8 percent for administrative cost went to miners and their dependents, the report states.

Let us see just how some of these benefits have been expended. We have a total of 394,528 separate benefits and services, and 266,421 beneficiaries. The biggest expense went for retired miners. There were 50,055 retired miners on the rolls as of January 30, drawing a pension at the rate of $100 per month. They are eligible to retire at the age of 60. A total of $58,945,707.49 was paid out in pensions to those retired miners last year.

Now, what is the next largest item that the United Mine Workers welfare fund is expended for? Fifty-six million, four hundred forty-four thousand, three hundred twenty-nine dollars and seventy-eight cents went for hospital and medical-care benefits. This provided 2,325,921 days of hospital and medical care for 230,670 cases. Of this money, 79 percent was for working miners, their wives and children and dependents. Eight and four-tenths percent was for disabled miners undergoing rehabilitation treatment. It is a well-known fact that through this fund thousands upon thousands of miners have been rehabilitated and put back into useful occupation, whereas they would have been cast off and thrown upon society, helpless for the remainder of their lives.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Kentucky is to be commended upon the facts that he is setting forth in this welfare fund. I know something about the mining industry over a long period of years.

The welfare fund as established by the United Mine Workers is a humanitarian step far in excess of anything that has occurred in this Nation up to date.

I also wish to commend the gentleman for his keen interest in not only the miners but also in the welfare of the coal industry as a whole.

The coal industry today is laboring under a severe handicap through the importation and dumping of residual oil on the eastern seaboard. This has resulted in 30 million tons of coal being displaced in the year 1952, which means 20,000 coal miners are out of employment. The gentleman has attempted in many instances to call the attention of the House and the country to the plight of this industry; and we all know of his interest in the coal miners themselves not only for his own State, not only for his own district, but also for the whole areas encompassed east of the Mississippi River and the coal-mining States. I am very happy to be present to hear the gentleman take the interest that he has in the coal industry.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. If my memory serves me correctly, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a coal operator, and I would like for him to tell the membership what has happened to his business during the last few months.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I hate to indulge in personal references, I may say to the gentleman, but in the 17 years in which I have been an owner and operator of my own properties this is the first time I have been unable to operate those properties and it is due to conditions as they are today.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. First I want to commend the gentleman from Kentucky for the very fine approach that he is making to this subject of the welfare funds, and I would like to ask him if it is not his opinion that if it were not for the United Mine Workers welfare fund at the present time many of these people who are the recipients of the various benefits he has outlined would be in want? Many of them would be in dire need; some of them probably would be dead for lack of medical attention, and certainly none of them would be existing in a condition that American people should exist in. In other words, the social security and other things they could get aside from the welfare fund are not realistic in the amounts they pay, and so they would be living at a very depressed standard of living if it were not for the miners' welfare fund. Is not that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. I agree wholeheartedly with the statement of the gentleman from Ohio. In fact, many of us, when an amendment was introduced to the social-security bill in 1949, did our dead-level best to get a disability provision into that bill. It went over to the Senate with the disability provision contained in it, but over there the disability provision was deleted by the Knowland amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Kentucky is making a very valuable contribution to the considerations of the House in giving to the Members of the House valuable information. I am glad to be on the floor while the gentleman is addressing the House and to be one of the beneficiaries of his remarks today because I find them not only beneficial to me but very educational. I am aware, of course, of this great human endeavor conducted by the United Mine Workers; however, I was not aware of the extent to which it had gone in bringing not only benefits to human beings whose years of productivity are over but also in the rehabilitation of injured miners and the benefits to their families, as well as to the families of those members of the union who have passed away.

What the gentleman from Kentucky is doing today is simply being consistent with his entire record as a Member of this body, not only in this particular field of human activities and of legislative endeavor but in all subjects of human activity. The gentleman has displayed in every case the same forward-looking sound, progressive viewpoint. The gentleman represents the people of his district not only with great ability but with dignity and strength and in an honorable, trustworthy manner. The people of the gentleman's district should feel highly honored in having the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky represent them in this great body.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for those kind remarks.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I think it might be appropriate for me at this time to say that I wholeheartedly agree with what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has just said. I have particular reason for agreeing with him, because, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] has appeared before our com-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

mittee I think as often as perhaps any other individual Member of Congress on behalf of causes in which I have personally agreed with him, perhaps not in every instance. I remember particularly when the social-security measure was before the Committee on Ways and Means for consideration. The gentleman from Kentucky appeared before us and argued very intelligently and very strenuously for the adoption by the committee of the provisions providing for permanent and total disability relief. Insofar as representing his district is concerned, he presented personally to our committee a very strong argument in favor of limitation of exports on oil so that the result of that action would be of benefit to the coal miners in his district. I might say that just recently, which is very much in the public eye, the question of increasing exemptions was raised. The gentleman from Kentucky appeared before our committee and suggested an increase from $600 to $800 in the exemption. He was one of those in the forefront of that movement which seems to be gaining headway every day and seems to be very popular among both elements of the membership in the House, so that I can very well agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] when he said that the gentleman from Kentucky has been in the forefront of those measures which seem to be and are for the benefit of those in the lower echelons of life, the lower income groups, and the union endeavors for raising the standard of living and the betterment of the entire economy of the country. I heartily agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and I congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Following what my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has said, I want to make one further observation. I think the finest legislator is one who tries to look into the future, to see the problems that might concern our people and our country and, to make his contribution toward meeting those problems that he, in his own mind, feels will arise in the near future. One of the dominating thoughts in my mind, in my entire public life, is that the best way I can make my contribution toward the preservation, the strength, and the progress of my country is by voting for legislation that would preserve and strengthen the family life of America; those families in the gentleman's district in Kentucky, the families in my district in Massachusetts, those little families, the backbone of America, the working people of America. I say that in a complimentary sense and not in any critical sense of those possessed of great wealth. All the people constitute America, but the real backbone of America is the average person living in the city and living on the soil; those little families. The very foundation of society and government is the family life of the Nation. If you have a strong family life, you have a strong government; if you have a weak family life, you have weak government, and one of the commanding things in relation to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] that addressed itself to me and has during the gentleman's years of service in this body is the fact that when he passes upon legislation he is always considering it in terms of preserving and strengthening the family life of our country. To me that is the kind of an ideal legislator, and in my mind the gentleman from Kentucky is an ideal legislator.

Mr. PERKINS. I am very certain I want to assure the gentleman from Massachusetts that I do not deserve those kind remarks, but still at the same time I appreciate them.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I would like to commend the gentleman for the fine statement he is making. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the splendid address, and am sure he is making a contribution which is beneficial to the House. I have been especially interested in the statements relative to the use of the miner's welfare fund for the building, maintenance, and operation of hospitals.

As the gentleman knows, a very fine statement was made in the state of the Union message of the President relative to extending the so-called Hill-Burton hospital program, but in the budget message which was submitted to the Congress the least funds were recommended for that purpose that were recommended for the last several years. So as an auxiliary to that program it is certainly important, I think, to continue the hospital program operated by the miner's welfare fund, because the funds recommended in the President's budget message for the continuance of the Hill-Burton hospital program are less than at any time in the past several years and would simply be quite inadequate for the purposes needed.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Tennessee has always been in the forefront in his efforts to obtain adequate funds for the construction of hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act. He has always recognized the great need for the construction of hospitals. In the district which I represent we have approximately 58 percent of the necessary hospital beds—that is, in the Big Sandy area—and approximately 48 percent in the Hazard area.

The selection of these hospital sites was based entirely on the basis of need. The section which the gentleman from Tennessee represents also lacks the necessary hospital beds. The Middle Atlantic States have approximately 72 percent of necessary and suitable hospital beds, while the State of New York has approximately 79 percent. The gentleman from Tennessee has made a great contribution to this country in recognizing the need for additional hospital facilities.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. May I say to the gentleman from Kentucky that I was most pleased to hear so many of our colleagues extol his merits here in the House. I thought I was probably somewhat alone in my admiration of the gentleman's devotion to his duty. Last week the gentleman appeared before our Subcommittee on Appropriations for some projects in his area, and his pleading for his people and for the benefit of the whole industry in that area was most impressive. There was a sense of deep responsibility in his position as the Representative of his people that was readily discernible by anyone within the hearing of his voice. He is the type of man with whom it is a pleasure to serve, because his sincerity and devotion to duty are readily apparent. I am pleased that so many others are of the same opinion, so I ask for this moment just to express my own opinion as to the gentleman's devotion to his people.

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope we do not embarrass the gentleman from Kentucky by our appreciation of him, but I hasten to join these others who have praised him for his excellent work. I am one who sits with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] on the Committee on Education and Labor. I have noticed his zeal, his determination, his tireless efforts for his people since he came with us on the committee. I extend my praise to him, and say I hope he remains with us a long time.

I also praise the gentleman for the statements he has brought to us regarding the United Mine Workers' welfare fund. It is something which deserves serious study by those of us here in the House. He is helpful to us in giving us these facts.

I join with these others who have said such very fine things about the gentleman from Kentucky. I certainly want my name to be listed among those who hope for him a long and successful public career.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his very kind remarks. As it happened he and I soldiered in the same camp—Camp Walters, Tex. We often disagree but our disagreements are honest and we always discuss our positions freely. As a result, both of us benefit by it. There are few Members of this body more active in legislative matters than the distinguished gentleman from Texas. He is a Member who always renders invaluable service to the district he represents.

Now, getting back to the observation made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], I wish to state that for the week ending February 13, 1954, there was a total of 2,105,465 weeks

of unemployment claimed. Initial claims for that same week amounted to 318,713. In other words, total insured unemployment amounted to 2,424,178 persons, and as it happened, last week there was a seasonal drop of 1 percent probably due to a 4-day week because of Lincoln's Birthday. With our unemployment problem facing us, I feel confident that the $800 exemption mentioned by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be forthcoming in the near future because the people in the lower income groups must have more purchasing power. I feel we have made some progress along that line.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not add my words of commendation about the gentleman from Kentucky. I wish to commend the people of the Seventh District of Kentucky for their wisdom and intelligence in sending Mr. PERKINS to the Congress to represent them here. I would like to ask the gentleman this question, if it is not true that the welfare fund is administered by a board of trustees, one of whom is appointed by the operators and one by the miners themselves and the other member is appointed by mutual consent; is that not correct?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. The fund is administered by the director, Josephine Roche; with the United Mine Workers President John L. Lewis; and Charles Owen, president of the Imperial Coal Co., of Johnstown, Pa. Those three administer the fund.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, if I am not incorrect in my recollection of the Scriptures, the Apostle Paul was a man of action. He was continually doing things. As we observe him at Athens, we find that he did not stand still and confer with flesh and blood in the face of a city filled with idols. He might have reasoned within himself that he stood alone; that he was a stranger in a strange land; that he was opposing deep-rooted prejudices and old associations of learned men; that to attack the religion of a whole city was to beard the lion in his den; and that the doctrines of the Gospel were not likely to have a very lasting effect upon minds steeped in Greek philosophy. There is no evidence, however, that such thoughts ever crossed the great mind of St. Paul. He saw souls perishing all about him; he felt that life was short and time was fleeting. He had confidence in the power of his Master's message to touch men's souls. He had received mercy himself, and he knew not how to hold his peace. He acted at once. What his hands found to do, he did with all his might.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have digressed to refer to that great apostle in the Scriptures because he typified action and service. He was concerned about the spiritual welfare of all mankind. My colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is another individual who is consecrated to the service of his fellow men, and he is constantly doing things for them. In the short time that I have been a Member of this body I have noted his interest in the material welfare of his district and his constituents. His district, the Seventh District of Kentucky, is much like the district which I represent in southern West Virginia. It is mountainous, the coal industry constitutes its basic economy, and it is affected by the same problems which affect my own. The gentleman has been constant in his efforts to support legislation to control the imports of foreign residual oil, a product that has adversely affected the economy of coal-producing States and created a great deal of unemployment. Through his efforts to bring relief to his constituency, he has, at the same time, acted in the best interests of the people whom I have the honor to represent, and for this I am gratefully indebted.

The gentleman from Kentucky has been a proponent of public-works projects, and he has consistently advocated the construction of reservoirs which would furnish industrial waters for use in his district, as well as a school-construction program. These are some of the things which this administration should concentrate upon at this time in trying to alleviate the economic suffering of our people.

I join with my colleagues in complimenting the able gentleman, and I shall not impose further upon his limited time, except to repeat a bit of verse which best portrays a rule of life by which he seems to live:

"How far away is the temple of fame?" said
a youth at the dawn of the day.
He toiled and dreamed of a deathless name,
And the hours went by, and the evening came
Leaving him feeble, and old, and lame
To plod on his cheerless way.

"How far away is the temple of good?" said a
youth at the dawn of the day.
And he strove in the spirit of brotherhood,
To help and succor as best he could,
The poor and unfortunate multitude,
In their hard and dreary way.

He was careless alike of praise and blame,
But after his work was done,
An angel of glory from heaven came,
And wrote on high his immortal name,
To proclaim this truth that the temple of
fame,
And the temple of good are one.

For this is the lesson that history
Has taught since the world began;
That those whose memories never die,
But shine like stars in the human sky,
And brighter grow as the years roll by,
Are the men who live for man.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to have permission to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to thank the gentleman for those remarks.

A Federal Government social-security survey last year showed that 97.1 percent of income received by the welfare fund was spent in benefits, an economy in administration cost seldom if ever equalled.

In contrast such leaders in the field of medical care benefits as Blue Cross were substantially below that figure. Blue Cross paid out 89.8 percent of its income in benefits. Other comprehensive and established plans ranged percentagewise in the eighties and low nineties.

I should imagine that in the face of such performance the coal miner, who is Mr. Exhibit A in the whole program, must be satisfied with how his fund is being conducted.

In this respect I wish to pay my compliments to the director of this great fund, Miss Josephine Roche, along with the other two trustees, John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, and Charles Owen, president of the Imperial Coal Corp., Johnstown, Pa.

The trustees, one representing the miner and the other the operator, are specifically named in the contract between the coal operators and the United Mine Workers. After the operators and union have named their representatives, the two select a third or neutral trustee, who happens to be Miss Roche, a former coal operator whose life has been devoted to public service.

The parties to the UMWA contract state in their pact that they agree the fund is an irrevocable trust created under the act, to endure as long as the purposes for its creation shall exist.

The contract spells out five general purposes of the fund and delegates to the trustees the authority to determine the amounts and classes of benefits and other related matters, within the Taft-Hartley Act's provisions.

FREIGHT RATE DISCRIMINATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to protest the ruling of the ICC which provides that they will permit railroads out of Philadelphia to cut their rates on imported iron ore 20 percent, thus putting Philadelphia on the same basis as Baltimore. At the same time the ICC refuses to grant the railroads operating from Boston and New York permission to cut their rates to meet competition from the southern parts of the country. It is most unjust. I hope all New England will join in my appeal to the ICC, Mr. Speaker, and I ask unanimous consent that I may insert an editorial from the Boston Post on the subject of this great injustice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The editorial is as follows:)

ANOTHER BLOW AT BOSTON

We seem to be getting it right and left from Washington these days. The latest is a ruling by the Interstate Commerce Commission permitting railroads out of Philadelphia to cut their rates on imported iron ore by 20 cents a ton, thus putting Philadelphia on the same rate basis as Baltimore. But at the same time, the ICC stepped in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and refused Boston and New York to cut their rates to meet this competition from the two more southerly ports.

With these imported ores from South America and Labrador increasing rapidly, and likely to become the chief supply of our steel mills in the next 10 years, this new ruling practically puts Boston out of the business, because with this additional 20-cent cut the two southern ports now will have a differential of 60 cents a ton.

If the railroads, through what used to be called in the old days a "community of interest," put into force such arbitrary differentials, the ICC would have hauled them up on the carpet and thrown the rate schedules out the window. Now this same ICC that is supposed to protect all the railroads aids and abets in this throatcutting.

DIVIDEND TAX CREDIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'KONSKI). Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, the Committee on Ways and Means, on the initiative of one of the Republican members, modified the provision it had originally adopted concerning the tax credit on corporate dividends.

As it now stands, when this provision becomes fully effective, a taxpayer will be able to have the first $100 of his dividend income-tax free, and then he will be allowed to reduce the amount of taxes he pays—and therefore to increase his take-home pay—by an amount equivalent to 10 percent of the remaining dividend income.

For example, a person with $2,100 in dividend income will be allowed to have $100 of this tax-free, and then he will reduce his tax bill by 10 percent of the remaining $2,000, or by $200.

As originally adopted by the Committee on Ways and Means, the final tax credit amounted to 15 percent, instead of 10 percent, of dividend income. Under the original provision, the total revenue loss, when the provision became fully effective, was $1.2 billion. Under the modified provision, the annual revenue loss will be $850 million.

Now I do not know why my Republican colleagues felt it necessary to backtrack on their original proposal for a dividend tax credit. It may be that they hoped to win more support for a more moderate provision.

My purpose in speaking today is to make it quite clear to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that while the Republicans have lessened somewhat, the enormous benefits that will go to the corporation shareholders of America, they have not changed one single bit the fact that this is, essentially, class legislation; they have not changed the fact that it will benefit only the wealthy; they have not changed one bit the principle involved which, Mr. Speaker, I believe to be wrong.

My purpose in speaking today is to make it crystal clear to my colleagues just who gets the benefit of this $850 million tax bonanza. My Republican friends will, no doubt, attempt to appeal to your sympathies for the widows and low-income families who derive much of their income from corporate dividends.

Shed no tears, my friends, until you have heard the facts. Then you can make up your own minds.

Just who does own the corporation stock in America?

A survey made public in the Michigan Business Review for January 1953 revealed that only 8 percent of all American families own any stock whatever; 92 percent own none.

This survey also showed that only six-tenths of 1 percent of all American families own four-fifths of all the publicly held stock in America.

So if the House passes this dividend tax credit provision, we will at most be benefiting only 8 percent of the American people—and we will be giving at least four-fifths of the benefit to only about one-half of 1 percent of all American families.

But that is not all we know about corporation shareholding and dividend income. An analysis of the Statistics of Income for 1950, prepared by the Internal Revenue Service, reveals the following amazing facts:

The 80 percent of all American taxpayers with incomes of under $5,000 a year receive only about 11 percent of all the dividend income.

Less than 4 percent of all American taxpayers—those with incomes of over $10,000—get 76 percent of all dividend income.

And finally—listen to this—eight-tenths of 1 percent of all American taxpayers—those with incomes of more than $25,000—get 55 percent—over half—of all of the dividend income.

Now if this does not represent class legislation, I do not know what does.

Finally, I think the following facts will dispel for all time the argument that may be put forward by my Republican colleagues about the widows and orphans who depend on dividend income for their livelihood.

The same statistics of income to which I have just been referring shows that of all taxpayers with incomes under $5,000, only 4.5 percent reported any dividend income at all in 1950.

Only 16.6 percent of those with incomes of between $5,000 and $10,000 reported any dividend income.

But about half of all people with incomes between $10,000 and $25,000 had dividend income and nearly three-quarters of people with incomes over $25,000 reported income from dividends.

Now let us find out just how much benefit various income groups get from this dividend tax credit. All of the figures I shall list apply to a family of four.

Such a family getting $3,000, all in dividends, pay $40 less than the same family with $3,000 in earned income.

Such a family getting $10,000, all in dividends, pay $672 less than the same family with $10,000 in earned income.

Such a family getting $100,000, all in dividends, pay $8,819 less in taxes than the same family with same earned income.

And a family getting $1 million, all in dividends, pays $89,841 less than a family with $1 million all in earned income.

Now I have always thought that most tax systems were so set up as to give an advantage to earned income—for which a person works and sweats—over invested income, which a person may earn just because he happens to be fortunate enough to be wealthy. This is the first time I have heard of reversing the policy and giving an advantage to invested income over earned income, and I believe it is an unhealthy change to make in the American tax system.

One final word: the Republicans argue about the evil of so-called double taxation—where the same dollar is taxed twice—once in the hands of the corporation and again when it comes into the hands of the individual shareholder. But I do not see them shedding any tears over the average taxpayer who suffers just as much from double taxation when he pays an excise tax on tobacco, or jewelry, which he is not allowed to deduct from his income tax. If double taxation is such an evil, why do not we eliminate it entirely from our tax system—and not just for the wealthy shareholders of this country?

Do not think that the $850 million that is in this tax bill for the shareholders of America represents the end. On the contrary, the Republicans themselves have admitted that this is just the first step. Once we adopt this entering wedge, there will be no stopping the benefits that will be given to America's shareholders.

This dividend tax credit provision represents the most extreme example of the Republican "trickle down" theory that is embedded in the tax bill now before the Ways and Means Committee. I hope that my colleagues will all give careful study to the facts I have presented, and that the dividend tax credit provision will be disapproved by this Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks tables containing the figures to which I have referred in the course of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The tables referred to follow:

Percent increases in take-home pay—dividend tax proposal

MARRIED COUPLE WITH TWO DEPENDENTS, ASSUMING $100 EXCLUSION AND 10 PERCENT DIVIDEND CREDIT

Amount of income:	*Percent increase in take-home pay*
$3,000	1.4
$4,000	3.5
$5,000	4.8
$8,000	7
$10,000	7.8
$15,000	9
$20,000	9.8
$25,000	10.4
$50,000	12.7
$100,000	16
$300,000	25.5
$500,000	31.3
$1,000,000	38.5

Analysis of receipts of dividends, by income groups

Adjusted gross income classes	Total number of returns	Percent of total number of returns	Cumulative percent of all returns	Number reporting dividends	Percent reporting dividend income	Amount of dividends received	Percent of total dividends received	Cumulative percent of total dividends
						In thousands		
Under $1,000	1,570,113	4.1	4.1	27,385	1.7	8,885	0.1	0.1
$1,000 to $1,999	5,996,778	15.7	19.8	198,338	3.3	77,572	1.3	1.4
$2,000 to $2,999	8,717,906	22.8	42.6	335,066	3.8	159,956	2.7	4.1
$3,000 to $3,999	8,668,606	22.7	65.3	418,587	4.8	194,694	3.3	7.4
$4,000 to $4,999	5,740,400	15.0	80.3	415,065	7.2	205,405	3.5	10.9
Total under $5,000	30,693,805	80.3	80.3	1,394,381	4.5	646,512	10.9	10.9
$5,000 to $5,999	3,025,165	7.9	88.2	352,603	11.6	195,690	3.3	14.2
$6,000 to $6,999	1,523,868	4.0	92.2	250,481	16.4	163,166	2.8	17.0
$7,000 to $7,999	797,054	2.1	94.3	175,790	22.1	146,476	2.5	19.5
$8,000 to $8,999	469,495	1.2	95.5	138,887	29.6	142,672	2.4	21.9
$9,000 to $9,999	299,177	0.8	96.3	105,968	35.5	131,142	2.2	24.1
Total under $10,000	6,114,689	16.0	90.3	1,023,149	16.6	780,146	13.2	24.1
$10,000 to $14,999	679,114	1.8	98.1	302,230	44.5	525,708	8.9	33.0
$15,000 to $19,999	256,019	.7	98.8	141,616	55.3	398,190	6.7	39.7
$20,000 to $24,999	139,837	.4	99.2	87,237	62.4	335,546	5.7	45.4
Total, under $25,000	1,074,970	2.9	99.2	531,083	49.4	1,259,438	21.3	45.4
Over $25,000	303,208	.8	100.0	223,801	73.7	3,231,823	54.6	100.0
Total	38,186,682	100.0	-------	3,172,114	8.3	5,917,919	-------	-------

Source: Statistics of Income for 1950, pt. I; Government Printing Office, 1953. Prepared by the Statistical Division, Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, if this is tax revision for the benefit of those who need it, I would like to have somebody explain it to me.

HON. EARL WARREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the Honorable Earl Warren, of California, the President's first nominee for the Supreme Court, will ultimately receive the overwhelming approval of the other body. In the light of that conclusion members of the California delegation in the House might be constrained to be silent about the whole subject of the attacks currently being made on the acting Chief Justice by critics who have largely been unidentified and who therefore remain faceless insofar as we are concerned.

I personally cannot remain silent with respect to the charges made as reported in the press because I am a Californian and have personal knowledge of the flimsy character of the charges made.

Earl Warren has a long record of honorable public service in California covering a period of many years and including service as district attorney of Alameda County, attorney general of the State, and Governor of the State. During such service he made enemies as any good public servant must. It is to his credit that the majority of these enemies come from the extreme right and the extreme left, the crackpot elements in our society.

Earl Warren could be aptly described as a progressive Republican. As Governor of our great State of California he recognized that it was the duty of the State to adequately care for the school and other institutional needs of its people. He fostered and developed a great highway program. He opposed unfair labor laws. He opposed the bigotry of racial and religious discrimination.

Contrary to allegations made he had a great deal to do with restricting the growth of organized crime in a rapidly growing State which was a target for criminal elements. As Governor, Earl Warren succeeded in establishing the crime commission. This commission over a period of years led the fight against gangsterism in California. Its record is public for everyone to see.

The fact that we have a lobby control law in California can be attributed to our former good Governor. Historically the California State Legislature has been beset with lobbyists. At one time it was known as the legislature of the railroads. At a later time other lobbyists exerted a dominant control. Earl Warren recognized the problem. He dramatized it to the people and he was able to bulldoze through the legislature a control law which would not have come into being without his efforts. I know this to be true because I was in the legislature at the time of passage of the law and I worked therefor.

Much publicity has been given to a reported statement of Mr. Warren that a certain liquor lobbyist had more influence with the legislature than did the Governor with respect to matters affecting his clients. I do not know whether or not the Governor ever made such a statement. Whether he did or not is immaterial because it was a factual statement of a condition for which the Governor was in no wise responsible, in fact a condition which existed in spite of his best efforts to eradicate it. The lobby control law I mentioned was designed to correct this and similar situations of extra-legal control by special interest groups in the State legislature.

The nominee has been accused by some unidentified accuser as being a 100-percent Marxist or of following a 100-percent Marxist line. Such a charge in this instance is valid only as a revelation of the crackpot mentality of the accuser. It is unworthy of discussion or consideration.

There is a larger significance to these charges than the personality of the nominee involved. They demonstrate the probability of abuse of public servants, in these times of hysteria, who seek rational solutions to our problems outside of the programs of the crackpots of the extreme left and the extreme right. It will be a sorry day for America if these persons can create a situation in which each of us must choose between one or the other and are precluded from seeking a middle ground in keeping with our tradition of freedom and free enterprise. At the moment of time when such a choice becomes mandatory for each of us, and certain elements in our community seek to force that moment, we will be on the threshold of a totalitarianism such as exists in Russia and existed in Italy and Germany. I hope that day never comes.

Moreover, this case should be an object lesson to those members of the Republican Party who engage in or who have condoned the use of the loose charge, the unverified accusation. Irrationality once loosed is not selective in its targets and the accuser of today may well be the victim of tomorrow. Most certainly the innocent are the first to suffer.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] on the remarks he has just made and to subscribe wholeheartedly to them. I think that what he has said is something that should be said by every single member of the California delegation in the House of Representatives. If some of us had had the opportunity and knew how this situation had been developing, probably we would have put it on public record before committees of the Congress. It was my privilege and pleasure to serve in the State Senate of California during Chief Justice Warren's first term as Governor of the State of California. There were times when we disagreed, but those disagreements were on the issues. There were times when we agreed and worked together for the best interests of the people of California, and the people of California who know Mr. Warren know him to be a sincere man, a clean man, a conscientious American, a good family man, and a credit to his family, himself, and his State, and the very fine position of Chief Justice to which he has been appointed. In behalf of all of these Californians, I think the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] has expressed shock and disapproval of these blind, ridiculous charges that have been made against this man on his appointment to the position of Chief Justice. I again commend the gentleman for the statement he has made, and say that I think it is a statement that speaks on behalf of the sound citizens of California in their regard for Chief Justice Warren.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I would like to join in the added comment of the gentleman from California [Mr.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

SHELLEY]. I know that he, too, has personal knowledge of the man of whom I speak, and his statement adds a great deal to what I have said.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I, too, would like to commend the gentleman for taking the floor to express his views from the other side of the aisle about the distinguished gentleman, the former Governor of California, Mr. Warren. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would not apply that same admonition, that he applied only to Republicans, to avoid the smear technique and those characteristics of critical actions on which I regret to say neither party has a monopoly.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I agree to that, certainly. No political party, in my opinion, has any monopoly on virtue, and both of them are guilty of evil, and it depends a great deal upon the personalities involved. That is one of the regrettable aspects of these blanket accusations that have been in the news recently, to wit, their lack of discrimination and slanderous disregard for the truth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'KONSKI). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SAYLOR asked and was granted permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

INVESTIGATION, RESEARCH, AND EXPERIMENTS RELATING TO RABIES AND RELATED DISEASES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced H. R. 8015, a bill to provide for the investigation, research, experiments, and other activities relating to the eventual eradication of rabies and related diseases from the United States.

During the past several weeks in my home city of Chicago, we have had a very dreadful experience with rabid animals, which has focused national attention on the problem. At the present time quite a number of other cities are having, to a lesser or greater degree, a similar situation with rabid dogs. These cities are Los Angeles, Calif.; Gary, Ind.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Louisville, Ky.; and Houston, Tex., and among other cities recently faced with the same problem were St. Louis, Mo.; Denver, Colo.; Memphis, Tenn.; San Antonio, Tex.; New Orleans, La.; Birmingham, Ala.; Seattle, Wash.; Billings, Mont.; and Oklahoma City, Okla.

From the diverse locations of the cities listed you will readily note that this problem is widespread throughout the United States.

It is estimated that in 1953 there were 10.5 million urban dogs, 6.9 million farm dogs, and 5.2 million rural nonfarm dogs; making a total estimated dog population of 22.6 million.

It is further estimated that approximately 600,000 people suffer dog bites annually, of which 50,000 to 60,000 receive Pasteur treatments. California alone reports 50,000 dog bites in 1 year, and in 1953 in the city of Chicago there were 85 confirmed cases, 11,000 dog bites, and 1,000 Pasteur treatments administered.

The enormous cost to the American public is rather difficult to estimate accurately. Assuming that a series of Pasteur treatments average $100 per person, there would be initially an estimated $5 million for Pasteur treatments. Then an estimated $10 million or more per year is spent on dog wardens by the various local communities, who, besides bearing the salary costs of the dog wardens, must provide quarters for housing stray dogs that are picked up. Further, there is the tremendous economic loss on farms due to the destruction of live stock engendered by dogs and other animals on which no accurate figures can be tallied.

In addition to the monetary problems, there are also the humane problems involving both human beings and the animals. Practically every parent today is conscious of the dangers occasioned by children being bitten by dogs. The minute a child is bitten, the parents are caused immediate anguish because they do not know whether or not the dog is a rabies carrier.

The Pasteur treatment for rabies requires a series of 14 to 28 shots. These are not very pleasant to take since they cause a great amount of discomfort and pain, especially for younger children. These average about $100 per series of shots. Science must and can provide a more humane treatment than the present painful series of Pasteur shots.

Another humane feature as far as the animals are concerned is that proper research will enable speedier diagnosis to prove if the animal is rabid. This research will bring about a perfecting of the vaccines administered to these animals. The finding of a more efficient type of vaccine for the dogs by improved methods of research would prove beneficial to the animals from a humane point of view in that a perfected rabies prevention vaccine would immunize them for a longer period of time, thus causing fewer shots and less discomfort to the animals.

In speaking of related diseases we are referring to the problems created by virus and bacteria types of encephalitis, pseudorabies, distemper, and nervous types of diseases relating to rabies.

Successful rabies control has been practiced in Europe, and since the end of World War II the disease has been eradicated in England, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and France.

With the development of a perfected vaccine and the addition of larger numbers of competent personnel who understand the problem, any community in the United States wanting to eliminate rabies can do so.

One of the principal objectives of the United States Public Health Service rabies project has been to study the potency of various prophylactic canine rabies vaccines, but the program has been inadequate because of limitation of funds.

Up to now this limited amount of rabies research has been successful in improving immunizing agents and with further research and investigation, great progress can be made in this particular field. By proper field research and with adequate personnel and funds for laboratory work, it is believed that the problem can be brought under control and eventually eradicated. An effective program would include funds for technical personnel, for project grants, and for research. Planning and close cooperation with State and local communities could be arranged on some sort of a matching-fund basis, which would certainly be justifiable inasmuch as rabies is a disease which does not recognize or honor State lines. The Public Health Service feels that rabies is an eradicable disease if the community or the State wishes to devote the necessary effort and support to the problem.

The Public Health Service, with an adequate research budget, could establish the proper size of animal colony where the disease could be studied under laboratory conditions in dogs, cats, foxes, skunks, bats, rats, and other animals. It is to be noted that just recently a new situation has arisen where rabid bats were discovered in both Florida and Pennsylvania.

It is not the intent of this legislation to inaugurate a compulsory program but to activate a program whereby through the use of personnel, research, and educational programs the local and State governments, with whom the greatest part of the program and control of the project would remain, would become the motivating factors in the eradication and control of rabies.

HALT VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION PERSONNEL CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in June of 1944, the Congress approved Public Law 346, commonly referred to by veterans as the GI bill of rights. Under section 101 of this law, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was authorized and directed to establish necessary regional offices, suboffices, and contact offices in the centers of population where there are no other VA facilities and where such facility was not readily accessible. We provided, under that law, many benefits for veterans and their dependents, such as disability compensation, education, and training, loan guarantees on homes, farms, and business. We also cared for the unemployed veteran and since then we have amended these laws, extended some, and enacted new laws.

Since this original GI bill was passed, our veteran population, due to the military activities in Korea, has increased well over 2½ million. Today, we have over 20 million veterans and this amount is increasing at the rate of 75,000 per

month. In my home State of Massachusetts, we have a veteran population in excess of 695,000.

When we voted these benefits I assumed that sufficient personnel would be trained to make them available, without any undue delay, to veterans and their dependents. VA offices were opened in the principal cities throughout the United States and from all reports that I have received, particularly from my own State, they have done an excellent job. Shortly after the first of this year, before returning for this session of Congress, I made an anual check with the regional office in Boston as to the effectivenesss of these offices throughout their area, because the necessity for maintaining these offices has been the subject of discussion in this Congress during the past several years. I was informed that approximately 350,000 veterans or their dependents visited these offices in the Boston regional office area during 1953 and that approximately one-quarter of a million forms, benefit applications or pieces of correspondence were prepared or answered by the contact service and over a quarter of a million telephone calls were also answered. Contact service has been extended to all veterans in VA hospitals and to those in State and county mental and TB hospitals and also to those who are physically or mentally unable to call at their offices for advice, guidance, and assistance.

We have enacted these laws as the representatives of a grateful people and if we fail to provide sufficient funds for personnel to administer these laws then it is like having a well-stocked store with no clerks to sell the merchandise.

Contact representatives who man these offices have gone through an extensive, formal training period, and are required to take continuous refresher training courses. It takes approximately 2 years to train an employee for this work. They are required to have a knowledge of all benefits administered by the VA and also to be familiar with laws enacted by the State for veterans and their families.

If these offices should be closed, veterans and their dependents would have two choices in getting information and assistance, either to travel to Boston at a heavy expense to many unemployed veterans or to correspond with the regional office, which would require trained personnel in the office to dictate the reply and stenographers to type it and then, after waiting the usual 10 days for the reply he may then have difficulty interpreting what it said.

In my home city of Lawrence, it would be a definite hardship on the veterans and their dependents if they were forced to go to Boston for information on veterans' benefits. My city has been declared a distress area. We have approximately 20,000 unemployed and the transportation cost from Boston to Lawrence would be in excess of $2, which means a lot to those out of work, or in part-time employment.

Some may say that the veterans' organizations can fill in the gap in the outlying communities. I have the utmost respect for the ability of the full-time service officers of the various veteran organizations, but if all the organizations pool their forces they would be unable to handle 10 percent of those who visit the VA offices daily, nor could they reach out to points away from the regional office. The service officers of many of these organizations confine their activities to their own members.

I want to emphasize another point. Contact representatives are not political appointments. During World War II a few qualified employees were transferred from other Government agencies to the Veterans' Administration contact service. Since 1945 every contact representative appointed had to be a disabled veteran and was required to pass a written competitive examination and also submit to an oral examination and an interview before taking his place on the civil service register.

The Government spent thousands of dollars training these men. Their job is not over. If history repeats itself their biggest job lies ahead. During the depression years subsequent to 1929 this service was taxed to its capacity. This can be verified by checking the records if they are now available. If this business depression or recession continues and the unemployment and part-time employment continues to increase, then will someone tell me where the veteran or his dependents are going to go for guidance and assistance? Since the announcement of the closing of the offices in my district, I have been deluged with protests from business, veterans, civic, and welfare organizations. Newspapers in the area have also protested these closings.

On Saturday, February 20, 1954, the New England rehabilitation conference of the American Legion was held in Boston. This group consisted of the department officers from the various New England States together with their full-time service officers and many of the post service officers.

Those of us who have been close to the rehabilitation work of the American Legion since World War I know that their major concern is not saving jobs for Government employees but service to veterans and their dependents and the efficient and economic operation of the Veterans' Administration.

Massachusetts Department Commander Coleman Nee in his welcoming address informed the group of his inspection tour of VA hospitals and offices in the Massachusetts area. He said:

> Every office I visited, veterans were waiting their turn for service. In some of the one-man offices 4 and 5 veterans were waiting. This number was exceeded in the large offices such as Worcester and Springfield. I saw this myself and I also on this tour talked to the post commanders in the areas serviced by these officers to determine their effectiveness. The post commanders in every instance praised the work of these offices and stated that they were a necessary part of the veterans' life and activities in this area.

The conference unanimously passed a resolution instructing the national commander of the American Legion to contact Administrator Higley and protest closing these offices as a distinct disservice to veterans and their dependents in the New England area, and further that the Bureau of the Budget formula that was used so successfully during the past 3 years as the yardstick determining workload whether offices remain opened, be again used. This formula required, in order to keep offices opened, 450 contacts per month in offices east of the Mississippi and 350 contacts west of the Mississippi.

In questioning officials here in Washington last week I was informed that proximity to VA offices, not workload, was the criterion for this reduction in field offices. Under this order, offices such as Fitchburg and Greenfield would remain open, and I believe they should but Greenfield would service a population of approximately 45,000 and Fitchburg 80,000, while such cities as Lawrence, that would service an area population of over 300,000, Lynn, Salem, Lowell, Brockton, and Quincy, each serving an area population in excess of 200,000 are scheduled for closing. This drastic cut in the face of our daily mounting unemployment and welfare rolls is difficult to understand.

In Massachusetts the 3 smallest contact offices each averaged during 1953, 545 contacts per month, while the offices in the larger industrial cities serviced between 600 to 1,500 per month depending on the population of the area serviced by the office.

In Massachusetts, I am advised that during the year 1953, the city of Lawrence, had an average of 960 contacts per month, 510 telephone calls, and prepared about 839 pieces of correspondence, such as veterans' forms or benefit applications.

That in the city of Lynn there is an average of about 600 contacts per month, 568 telephone calls, and about 400 pieces of correspondence forms or benefit applications.

That in the city of Chelsea—1 of the 3 small offices—there is an average of about 563 contacts per month, 369 telephone calls, in addition to correspondence forms or benefit applications.

I do not believe that any Member of this Congress wants to make it expensive or difficult for veterans to receive any benefits that they may be entitled to.

Therefore, in conclusion, let us provide sufficient funds to keep these offices opened all over the United States. To do this I have been advised that funds would be needed to keep about 400 or 425 employees who now staff these offices on duty.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE], on the remarks he has just made. I am well aware of the situation and the importance of contact representatives. As I understand, the regional office in Boston will have a reduction in force of about 80 to 85 employees of which between 35 to 40 will be contact representatives throughout the commonwealth; is that correct?

Mr. LANE. That is very true.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. McCORMACK. We have been through this on several occasions in past years. We had it under Democratic administrations. We faced reductions in force particularly in the field of contact representatives, and we worked it out along the line that the gentleman has stated and correctly stated in his speech. If this reduction in force took place, in my opinion it would bring about a sharp reduction in the efficiency given to our veterans in the processing of their claims.

Today I wrote a letter to the Veterans' Administrator urging him to reconsider this and setting forth reasons why I felt the reduction in force should not take place, among which were the reasons so ably stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE], who has also stated other convincing reasons.

A contact representative is a very important person in the Veterans' Administration setup. He is very important from the angle of the Government, he is very important from the angle of the veteran. I regret very much the order's going through bringing about this reduction in force particularly in the field of contact representatives. I am sure the Veterans' Administrator, if he will look into the matter, will realize that a mistake has been made and correct it. I know that is the purpose of the remarks made here by my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE], in the hope that the Veterans' Administrator will correct it and cancel whatever orders have been issued resulting in a reduction in force, particularly in the field of contact representatives. In connection with that, I join with the gentleman in urging the Veterans' Administrator to countermand that order.

Mr. LANE. May I sincerely thank the minority leader [Mr. McCORMACK] for his worthwhile contributions. I know that he is personally interested in this matter for the reasons we have both stated. The closing of these contact offices is one of those annual affairs that we have year after year. Mr. McCORMACK has at all times helped and assisted the congressional delegation from Massachusetts to prevent the abolition of these offices. On many, many occasions, he [Mr. McCORMACK] and you, Mr. Speaker [Mr. MARTIN], have scheduled meetings of the entire Massachusetts congressional delegation to meet with and confer with the budget officer of the Veterans' Administration of the central office and also the Veterans' Administration officials from Massachusetts. In past years both of you have arranged these conferences with the representatives of the veterans' organizations, and in that way we have worked zealously and efficiently to prevent the withdrawal of these services to our war veterans.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HIESTAND (at the request of Mr. HILLINGS), for the balance of this week, on account of official business.

TAX REVISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time in order to try to correct some misapprehensions that I believe are beginning to exist as to what the House Committee on Ways and Means is undertaking in this tax revision bill.

Essentially this is a tax-revision bill. It is a bill that has long been needed. This is the first time, really, since the income-tax law has been on the books that the Congress has ever undertaken to revise the code completely. The essential purpose is to eliminate the deadwood, to bring together the various court decisions, regulations, and so forth, that have been conflicting over a period of time, and to correct whatever inequities we can find.

This has been a 15-month job, and we are gradually nearing the conclusion. We have tried to eliminate as much as we could controversial matters in our discussions because most of the matters we have considered in these some 1,000 pages are matters that men can agree on because we know what the inequities are, if there are inequities, that we are trying to correct.

Very definitely we did not intend this to be a tax-reduction bill. Where there have been tax reductions they are purely incidental to other purposes we have been trying to achieve.

Two very basic agreements were made before we started on this bill. One was that we would not consider retroactive measures; in other words, what we were trying to do was to set out the code for the future so that all future needs would be met, with no attempt to correct the inequities and wrongs, if they could be called wrongs, that existed in the past.

The other thing we agreed on was that there would be no consideration of changes in rates so we would not get into this question of tax reduction per se. There is going to be, I hope, a tax reduction bill at some later time before the House. It depends upon what happens in connection with the appropriations and the Federal expenditures as to what we can do. But when we go into this question of where to reduce taxes, at that time we will consider whether it should be done in the field of enlarging the personal exemption by making it $100 or $200 more than it presently is. It is at that time that we will consider the question of whether we will reduce the corporate tax rate which so many people have said is too high. It is under that consideration that we would go into the matter of whether or not the corporate gains rates are too high, and whether those rates should be changed. All of those matters we have deliberately passed over and have not thrown into the hopper for discussion. As a matter of fact, there were many features about this tax bill where there are actually tax increases. In other words, we have been plugging up loopholes. But the purpose there was not to gain revenue. The purpose there again was to establish a more equitable system of taxation where we saw examples of people taking advantage of the way the tax laws had been written in order to gain certain special benefits as we saw them. We plugged up those loopholes. Again, I say not with the object in mind of gaining revenue, but simply to go ahead with the purpose of the tax revision program as I have expressed them. So where we have given tax benefits, it has been purely incidental to what we were trying to do. I will illustrate that with four examples. First, we gave an exemption for baby-sitting costs which did not exist before to working widows, widows and other mothers who have to work. The purpose of that was simply to clarify what were proper business expenses, and it was felt that the interpretations that have been made in the past as to what were business expenses were not broad enough to include what was very obviously, to me at any rate, an inequity. So some people got tax benefits, but the purpose which I am trying to get across is we were trying to abolish inequities and plug up loopholes.

Second, I might mention another big field where we granted liberalization-depreciation schedules for business. The purpose there was not to give a tax reduction. As a matter of fact, over a 10-year period there would be no tax loss to the Government. As a matter of fact, if anything, there would probably be a tax gain because the companies would write off in the early days of a new business, or at least try to write off their capital assets so that they could get their risk capital back, and then at the time when they were really making revenue, they would not have those credits to take and so would have to pay a heavier tax at a time when they were in a high tax bracket. But, the real purpose behind the depreciation schedules was as a result of the testimony we heard and testimony we have had from people throughout the country that there was a great discouragement to business to junk obsolete machinery and equipment. There was a reluctance to go ahead and put in new and improved equipment. As a matter of fact, the tax structure was such that it was encouraging companies to spend money fixing up old machinery when actually it would have been to their benefit and to the economic benefit of the country for them to have junked the machinery. It was solely the climate that the tax structure created that brought that thing about. So the object there was to accomplish economy and there was no consideration given from the tax reduction angle except insofar as we have made changes in these things and other things. We sort of kept tabs as to whether there was a tax gain or a tax loss so that the net total was such that we would be certain that we would not be endangering the budget in any way. Incidentally, the amounts involved in this whole tax bill are such that, I believe, they will not exceed $1.2 billion, if they amount to that, and probably most of them will balance off over a period of years. Third, the granting of additional benefits to teachers and other people on pensions and not on social security was not to give that group

any particular benefit, but to correct an inequity that had existed ever since the Bureau of Internal Revenue had held that social-security benefits were not taxable income inasmuch as the benefits were a gratuity. So the people on social security who were over 65 did not include in their income report for tax purposes what they received from social security. So these people like the teachers and others who were over 65 and retired who did not come under social security because we had not extended the law to them said that that was discrimination against them. The committee in its judgment felt that it was discrimination. I personally think so too. But I say it was not the purpose to give tax benefit or gain, but simply to correct an inequity.

Fourth. Another example of not trying to gain revenue or lose revenue was where we gave special credit to our people making foreign investments. Actually what tax effect that has I do not think anyone knows, but it was felt, from the standpoint of our foreign policy, to try to encourage private capital to go abroad. That was the objective involved there.

Fifth are stock dividends, and they are in exactly the same category. The desire is not to give any special credit or gain to a particular group of people. The problem we are concerned with is a very serious one. I can illustrate it by citing some 1951 figures on corporate financing. In 1951, $9 billion was invested by corporations in their expansion, but they got the money in the following way: Seven billion of that $9 billion came from issuing new corporate bonds and making new bank loans. Only two billion came from floating new stock issues. In the opinion of most economists, that is a very serious situation, if indeed it is indicative of what has been going on. If we go back to 1936, when this double taxation began, which, indeed, it is—but I might state that I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] on that—that unfortunately in any tax structure that I have ever seen, double or triple taxation, and sometimes taxes imposed 6 or 10 times, one tax upon another, is not an unusual thing. But this taxing of stock dividends was double taxation imposed upon the equity type investment. That is the investment in corporations in common stocks. The result has been that there has been less and less investment in common stocks and more and more investment in corporate bonds and bank loans. In other words, a corporation is confronted with the proposition that they are going to spend $2 million for expansion. The question is, "Where are we going to get the money from the investing public? Are we going to float a bond issue? Are we going to borrow it from banks, or shall we float a new stock issue?" Many of the economists—I am not an expert economist, but I agree with that school of thought, believe that it is a dangerous thing when we have reached the point where so little of our capital investment is going into the common stock form. If our theory is right on providing an incentive to have capital flow into the common stock formula as opposed to bonds and bank loans, there will be no revenue loss for this reason: If the corporation gains its money from bonds or bank loans, the interest it pays on those bonds and bank loans is deducted from that corporation's gross income. So it does not pay 52 percent or whatever tax the corporation pays on that amount of money, and there is a loss of revenue. Actually, if this incentive which we have written into this bill accomplishes what we think it will, it will encourage corporations to float more stock issues instead of issuing bonds or borrowing from banks. If it does no more than switch thirty billion of investments from bonds and bank borrowings over to common stocks, the gain will be a net gain to the United States Treasury, including the 10-percent formula that we have written into the bill as an incentive to bring this about.

As a matter of fact, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] will recognize that when we discussed this whole matter the question was at one time, Should we give these tax incentives at the corporate level or should we give it at the investor's level? Just the very fact that that was a very major item of discussion is an indication of what I am saying was the purpose behind what we finally did do. It was felt that for administrative reasons as much as anything else it was better to handle it in the fashion we did, at the investor level to accomplish the results.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has asked why the committee the other day retrenched and cut back and instead of keeping it a 3-package deal, made it a 2-package deal. One reason was because a lot of people were misunderstanding what was attempted to be done, and in order to eliminate some of that misunderstanding we cut it back. But the real question raised in my mind was: If this does not accomplish the purpose we think it will in the next year or the year following then, indeed, we should reexamine those efforts. There is no sense of putting it on a 3-year basis if after we started we could tell what was happening after it had run for a year or a year and a half. As a matter of fact the first part is really based on half a fiscal year, the second part is the first full year.

I am happy to state another thing, that at least in committee this has not been a division on political lines and I hope it does not take that trend. Fortunately many of the Members on the other side of the aisle recognize what we are trying to accomplish not only in this particular feature of the bill but in the entire bill itself, and on this particular question of stock dividends several of the minority party members went along with the majority. I hope that the argument does get down to a discussion of what is attempted to be accomplished and that the majority who are responsible for it at least be given credit for the theory that is behind their actions, and that that theory be discussed. If that theory is in error I am very happy to listen to reasons why people think it is in error. But this should never go off on the basis that we are trying to benefit a particular class, because that is not the case and it will not be the result. You have an investing public which consists of a certain group of people; all we are trying to do is to encourage the investing public when they put their investment dollar somewhere to put more of their dollars into common stocks than into bonds or into savings accounts in banks which funds the banks will reinvest in corporate loans. The argument of the law of the percentage of people who are presently stockholders in this country, as used by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is really not an argument against what we are doing. I would say that that is one of the very things that we are trying to do here. If we could get more people in the country to invest in the common stocks of our corporations we would be accomplishing a very desirable result. I am distressed that the level is as low as it is, and one of the reasons why the level is that low is because such a high premium has been placed upon investment in bonds and in savings accounts where the banks in turn invest the money by lending it to the corporations.

In conclusion I again say I hope we will look at this bill as a tax revision bill and when the time comes when we go into the possibilities of tax reduction that we then consider all aspects of tax reduction so indeed we can leave more money with our people and give the lowest income groups additional money so that they can spend it and improve their standard of living.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would be pleased to.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman, of course, does not dispute the figures I gave to the House this afternoon. He says he does not desire to give special benefits to anybody. He does not deny that it does give special benefits to some.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But I do deny that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I ask the gentleman just one question: Where is the workingman going to get the money to invest? Because he does not have enough money to live on now with prices as high as they are.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would remind the gentleman that many corporations, as the gentleman will recognize, have stock participation plans in which the lowest and most humble employee of the corporation can invest his funds. I think that is a plan that should be encouraged because I would like to see an expansion of it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That does not apply to the general public. There are but few corporations, an infinitesimal number compared to the whole in which the low-salaried person can invest. It is illusory, it is visionary.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is not visionary at all but something that exists. I would like to have the gentleman answer a question for me: Would not the gentleman like to see an expansion of this plan and have the people able to invest their money directly rather than place it in banks and have the banks make the loans such as has been going on? Now, that is not to benefit that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

class. As a matter of fact, we are going to get more tax revenue out of the investing class if we can encourage them to put more of their holdings in stocks than in bonds.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think it would be fine if we could give the workingmen a little more take-home pay so that they will have a dollar or two to invest.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Everyone agrees with the gentleman on that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. They do not have enough take-home pay to support themselves now.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not believe there is a man in Congress who disagrees with the gentleman on that. But how can you accomplish it? That is the question. Just stating that is our desire is not going to put money in his pocket. If we can balance the budget, which is the only way in my opinion of knocking out this inflation and putting cents back into the dollar so that every dollar he spends begins to buy something more, that is the way we are going to help him. Yet we have very little help from certain people in this House when it comes to getting the budget balanced and knocking out inflation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman does not believe in a hard dollar policy, does he?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Do I believe in the hard dollar policy?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I will say this to the gentleman: If the working men and people on pensions could buy a dollar's worth with a dollar instead of the 51 cents they have, you are right, I believe in it. That is what I want to do, put cents back in the dollar.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman thinks we should enunciate that hard dollar policy that was advocated a year ago and make the dollar harder to get?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, I did not say that. Let us not play around with words. The gentleman and I are too good friends to do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has talked about a balanced budget. We all agree with that. But why has it not been balanced by the present administration?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Because, No. 1, if the gentleman will recall, we were able to cut $13 billion out of the Truman budget.

Mr. McCORMACK. How much?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Thirteen billion dollars. We missed balancing it by $3 or $4 billion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(On request of Mr. McCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CURTIS of Missouri was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. Let me go on and say that we came within $3 or $4 billion of balancing the budget the last time.

Mr. McCORMACK. How much?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Three or four billion dollars, which pleased me considerably. We are within about that on this particular budget and the House still has to work over the first prepared Eisenhower budget. I for one am hopeful we might obtain at this time a balanced budget; but that has not been with the help of the previous administration who has given us all of these c. o. d.'s we find we have to pick up.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman uses a lot of stock phrases which have been battered around here, such as I O U.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not think so. Are they true? Whether they are stock phrases or not, are they true phrases?

Mr. McCORMACK. They are as far removed from the truth as anything can be.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Will the gentleman tell us though where they are not c. o. d.'s or I O U's?

Mr. McCORMACK. There has been battered around this Chamber for the last 15 years the argument that the money paid into social security and invested in Government bonds was nothing but I O U's.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. They are I O U's.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman admits that?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The other day Secretary Humphrey testified before a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. He is your Secretary of the Treasury, your party's Secretary of the Treasury and he said it is the only proper thing to do.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I did not say that it was not proper. I simply said they were I O U's.

Mr. McCORMACK. An I O U is something that may not be paid. That is the impression that is given.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, I did not say that.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the impression that is given. The gentleman will admit they are good I O U's?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I will put it this way: There are I O U's that are dependent on future taxation in order to pay them off and to the extent we preserve fiscal soundness in our Government they are good. That is what we are trying to do by balancing the budget.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman agrees with Mr. Humphrey that it is the proper thing to do, does he?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman is getting into a complicated subject. As the gentleman probably knows, I was on the subcommittee that studied social security and it is more involved than the gentleman might imagine.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me say to the gentleman that I was on the subcommittee that drafted the original social security bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. And I was upon the committee that drafted the amendments in 1938 and 1939.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Then the gentleman is quite familiar with the argument that was made at that time, and the fear of that time, that if this reserve fund were so large, as it would have to be for it to be actuarially sound, it might actually interfere with and involve Federal fiscal financing. As a matter of fact, if this were actuarially sound right now, your reserve fund instead of $18 billion would have to be around $60 billion.

Mr. McCORMACK. I admit if it would be actuarially sound, it would not be more than $18 billion.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Somebody said $200 billion, and I reject that figure.

Mr. McCORMACK. I doubt the $60 billion.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let us get back to what we are talking about.

Mr. McCORMACK. The only reason it is not actuarially sound is the fact that in bygone days——

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, under Democratic Congresses.

Mr. McCORMACK. The increase in the tax has been deferred.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Under Democratic Congresses.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no. That was a coalition of Republicans and some Democrats.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Under the gentleman's leadership, though.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no; not under my leadership.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Was the gentleman not the majority leader?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, but it was not under my leadership.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Was the gentleman opposed to it?

Mr. McCORMACK. I was in favor of the increase going into effect.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. And the gentleman was overruled. I am happy to hear the gentleman state he was. I think I would have been, too.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, the gentleman would have favored the increase taking place?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think I would, yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then the gentleman and I agree on that.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let us get back to what I originally said. The gentleman said my use of c. o. d. was a stock expression, and it is, but nevertheless it is a true one. The gentleman said it was not. We, under our system of appropriations, authorize all of these governmental agencies to obligate the United States Government on the credit of the United States for these long-lead-time items, and that is what I call c. o. d.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman should explain. In other words, every bond outstanding is a c. o. d.?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Well, in my use of the term c. o. d. I am not so much interested in United States Government bonds as I am in the obligations, the contracts, and the obligation of funds under letters of intent, and so forth, where the delivery of those products and goods contracted for will not be made for 2 or 3 years. We are beginning to pick up those tabs. The goods are being delivered, but they were ordered some time ago.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to ask one question which concerns me. Without getting into the argument made on both

sides by my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, and my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, there is one particular question I would like to get the gentleman's views on. The purpose of this is not to raise revenue; it is a loss of revenue, rather, is it not?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is incidental to what we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can see that. I will not argue that with my friend. It is a substantial loss of revenue.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. As I said, it will be around a billion dollars.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Might I say this, that is an immediate loss for this next fiscal year. On some of these items, as I say, over a period of 5 years we probably will pick up everything we did lose.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will not argue with my friend on that. That may be so and it may not.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is a natural hope. Now, the purpose is to try and extend stock ownership.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is true, yes, to have more equity capital.

Mr. McCORMACK. Having those two admissions in mind as to the purpose of the change, we have a serious problem in this country in connection with financing our States and our local governments in connection with the issuance of bonds, and a good part of that, if not all of that, is tax exempt.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. All municipals are, and that is something we all want to protect.

Mr. McCORMACK. And they pay 2½ to 3 percent, because of the inducement of being tax exempt, both on the Federal level and the State level.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. And in the course of a year that particular field of financial activity represents some billion dollars.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. In new bonds and the refinancing of them.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is the gentleman's viewpoint as to the effect that this new provision might have on the ability of States and political subdivisions thereof to sell their bonds tax exempt at the rate they are now selling for?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not believe it will have any effect on them. It might have a minimum effect because, after all, you are affecting the investment market. But the reason I say it might have a minimum effect is taken from the other angle.

Here is a corporation that wants to spend $2 million to expand. Is it going to do that by borrowing money from the bank or issuing bonds or issuing stocks? That is what we are thinking of. If the corporation will issue stocks instead of bonds, or instead of borrowing, then we will capture that market.

I see the gentleman's point. I do think there might be a mild effect on any form of investment. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman recognizes that I am concerned about that. I see the gentleman in turn appreciates the fact that there might be something to that. May I suggest that he look into that, because I understand it might have a somewhat serious impact upon the ability of our several States and the political subdivisions thereof to finance themselves successfully.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think the point the gentleman is making is excellent, and I will look further into it, but I say that these matters have come up before. Actually they are matters on which I would like to get the advice of the Committee on Banking and Currency. That really goes a little afield from the province of the Committee on Ways and Means. Of course we have to consider it, but the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency are the ones that should know the most about what we might be doing in affecting the investment market.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a fair observation. Did the gentleman's committee consider that aspect in connection with this particular project?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes. I raised it myself.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SHEEHAN.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KLEIN.

Mr. ADDONIZIO and to include an editorial.

Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. HAGEN of California) in two instances.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution requesting churches and synagogues to give special prayers on Easter Sunday for those denied freedom to worship behind the Iron Curtain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 25, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2974. A bill to add to the revised roll of the Indians of California certain Indians who made application for enrollment within the time fixed by law, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOLLEFSON: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6318. A bill to extend emergency foreign merchant vessel acquisition and operating authority of Public Law 101, 77th Congress, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 666. A bill for the relief of Michele Paccione; without amendment (Rept. No. 1221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 858. A bill for the relief of Kim Mi Hae; with amendment (Rept. No. 1222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1100. A bill for the relief of Peter A. Pirogov; with amendment (Rept. No. 1223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3145. A bill for the relief of Pramovil Vaclav Maly and Jarmila Maly; with amendment (Rept. No. 1224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3836. A bill for the relief of Petra Fumia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7559. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Madeleine Alice Aquarone; without amendment (Rept. No. 1226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 8015. A bill to provide for investigations, experiments, and other activities leading to the eventual eradication of rabies and related diseases from the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 8016. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 8017. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase the minimum benefits payable thereunder, to lower from 65 to 60 the age at which such benefits become payable, and to provide that deductions on account of outside earnings shall not be made in the case of beneficiaries 60 years of age or older; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 8018. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to make it clear that the admissions tax does not apply to ini-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tiation fees and dues paid to "knife and fork clubs" and similar organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H. R. 8019. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 8020. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain property of the United States Government (in Klamath Falls, Oreg.) to the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 8021. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain widows and widowers of retired employees and certain widows of employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 8022. A bill to relinquish the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States over Federal lands within the State of Maryland, and to provide that the United States and the State of Maryland shall hereafter exercise concurrent jurisdiction over such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 8023. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 8024. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 8025. A bill to encourage the redemption of corn from price-support loans for sale or use as livestock feed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 8026. A bill to provide for transfer of title to movable property to irrigation districts or water users' organizations under the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 8027. A bill to amend the act of March 6, 1952 (66 Stat. 16), to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 8028. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 8029. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 8030. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the Lewis and Clark Expedition; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 8031. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for certain disabled war veterans a deduction for income-tax purposes of necessary expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 8032. A bill to promote the agriculture of the United States by acquiring and diffusing useful information regarding agriculture in foreign countries and the marketing of American agricultural commodities, and the products thereof, outside of the United States; to authorize the creation of an Agricultural Foreign Service in the Department of Agriculture; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 8033. A bill to promote the agriculture of the United States by acquiring and diffusing useful information regarding agriculture in foreign countries and the marketing of American agricultural commodities, and the products thereof, outside of the United States; to authorize the creation of an Agricultural Foreign Service in the Department of Agriculture; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 8034. A bill for the incorporation of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 8035. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Illinois State Normal University; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEAL:

H. R. 8036. A bill relating to farm acreage allotments for burley tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8037. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended, in order to restore to certain officers and employees under such act the right to accumulate 60 days of annual leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 8038. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the Hot Springs School District and to Garland County, Ark., for school and for other public purposes, of certain land originally donated to the United States and situated in Hot Springs National Park, Ark., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 8039. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 in order to accord certain preference in Federal employment to wives, widows, and mothers of veterans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 8040. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 8041. A bill to provide benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration based upon service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps under certain conditions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8042. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 8043. A bill to adjust the rank of certain officers in the naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 8044. A bill to extend the authorization for funds for the hospitalization of certain veterans in the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 8045. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land located in Windsor Locks, Conn., to the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 8046. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 8047. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TEAGUE (by request):

H. R. 8048. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, so as to authorize a full and fair hearing of claims when demanded by the applicant; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 8049. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the personal exemption and the exemption for dependents to $800 for the 1954 taxable year and to $1,000 for succeeding taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8050. A bill authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 8051. A bill authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 8052. A bill authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 8053. A bill authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the week of May 2 to May 8, 1954, inclusive, as National Mental Health Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. J. Res. 385. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. J. Res. 386. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. J. Res. 387. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Commission to

formulate plans for construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. J. Res. 388. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. J. Res. 389. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. J. Res. 390. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. J. Res. 391. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permament memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. J. Res. 392. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H. J. Res. 397. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. J. Res. 398. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. J. Res. 399. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 400. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. J. Res. 401. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. J. Res. 402. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 403. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. J. Res. 404. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. J. Res. 405. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. J. Res. 406. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FINE:

H. J. Res. 407. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FINO:

H. J. Res. 408. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. J. Res. 409. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. J. Res. 410. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. J. Res. 411. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. J. Res. 412. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. J. Res. 413. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 414. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. J. Res. 415. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. J. Res. 416. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 417. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. J. Res. 418. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 419. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. J. Res. 420. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. J. Res. 421. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 422. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. J. Res. 423. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. J. Res. 424. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. J. Res. 425. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. J. Res. 426. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RAY:

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 430. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to formulate plans for construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. J. Res. 431. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. J. Res. 432. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. J. Res. 433. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington D. C., of an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. J. Res. 434. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. J. Res. 435. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. J. Res. 436. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate national memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. J. Res. 437. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to formulate plans for construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. J. Res. 438. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. J. Res. 439. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 440. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DODD:

H. J. Res. 441. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. J. Res. 442. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of the great Italian

navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. J. Res. 443. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WARBURTON:

H. J. Res. 445. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. J. Res. 446. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. J. Res. 447. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. J. Res. 449. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the week of May 2 to May 8, 1954, inclusive, as National Mental Health Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. J. Res. 450. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. Res. 448. Resolution to establish a committee to simplify wording of legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. Res. 449. Resolution providing for the reprinting of 500 additional copies each of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings regarding Communist activities in the Los Angeles area of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to implement and execute plans and recommendations of the Corps of Army Engineers relative to the dredging of Bullock Cove in the town of East Providence; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly urging the President of the United States, the Congress, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Tariff Commission to maintain the present tariff rates on lace imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 8054. A bill for the relief of David Del Guidice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 8055. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Hatridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 8056. A bill for the relief of Filippo Iuliucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 8057. A bill for the relief of Frederick P. Fulmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8058. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Birmingham, Ala.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 8059. A bill for the relief of Geroiamo Bogliolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 8060. A bill for the relief of Kate Fiorovic and Pave Fiorovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 8061. A bill for the relief of Saida M. Elfassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 8062. A bill for the relief of the estate of Grady Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 8063. A bill for the relief of Tom R. Hickman and Nannie Conley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 8064. A bill for the relief of Evagelos B. Tzarimas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 8065. A bill for the relief of Carlos Francisco, Manriqueta Mina and Roberto Mina Ver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 8066. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Eckerl Strickland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

524. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of 31 signers in behalf of H. R. 1227 (the Bryson bill), to control advertising of spirituous liquors on television and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

525. Also, petition of Emil Schweier Council, No. 1639, Knights of Columbus, Hartford City, Ind., in order to render greater glory to God and country, in support of H. R. 4308, S. 1468, S. 1482, and House Joint Resolution 243, signed by 25 members present in behalf of the entire membership of 92; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

526. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Republican State Central Committee of Rhode Island requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to support S. 1663, providing for proper increases in the compensation of the Federal judiciary, of Members of Congress, and of United States attorneys and assistants to the Attorney General of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

527. By Mr. PRICE: Petition of Aerie No. 743, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Belleville, Ill., calling upon Congress to enact into law the recommendations of the President of the United States as contained in his recent message to Congress on the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

528. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Central Labor Council, Klamath Falls, Oreg., in favor of personal income taxes being levied on income, regardless of source, and being opposed to any special exemption on income derived from dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

529. Also, petition of Meliton Q. Ramiro, Sibalom, Antique, Philippines, requesting relief for guerrilla soldiers who died in action but whose services were not recognized by the United States due to some causes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The American Legion Reader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1954

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Victor Lasky, well known New York reporter and writer, has chosen from the American Legion magazine a fine selection of articles of humor, fiction, and cartoons, which have been published in a book entitled "The American Legion Reader." This volume provides some very pleasant and provocative reading. Many of America's best known authors and writers are represented in Mr. Lasky's compilation, representing a great collection of material which has appeared over the years in the American Legion magazine.

Mr. Lasky, coauthor of the best seller, Seeds of Treason, an exposé of the Alger Hiss case, in editing the articles from the American Legion magazine, gives a very fine cross section of the ideals espoused by that periodical.

Columnists and book reviewers from coast to coast have acclaimed Mr. Lasky's anthology as the best of what has appeared over the years in the American

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Legion magazine—every article worth republishing. He is to be complimented on doing a magnificent job, introducing a book of rare quality and high entertainment value.

Increased Tax Exemptions Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the most equitable way to reduce income taxes is to allow higher individual and dependents exemptions. Accordingly I have introduced House bill 8116 to increase exemptions to $700 this year and $800 next year.

Our tax policies should, to the fullest extent possible, foster a dynamic, expanding economy. It is not enough that we maintain our total number of employed persons at a fixed, stable number. The increase in our population makes it imperative that our labor force constantly expand proportionately.

The unwise economic policies of this administration have contributed to the current downward trend in total employment and made certain individual tax reductions more necessary than would be the case otherwise. I believe in a balanced budget but adverse economic conditions have made the threat of a reasonable deficit less dangerous than increasing unemployment coupled with decreasing consumer purchasing power.

It is now painfully evident that the administration put the brakes on our economy too fast with its short-lived but fast-reacting "hard money" experiment. The effects of "hard money" were aggravated by the sudden sharp defense cutbacks which were ordered before plans for transition to civilian production could even be formulated.

The reason for the individual and dependents' tax exemption, according to my understanding, is to allow the taxpayer and his family enough income for subsistence before subjecting him to the income-tax levy. By this test it is evident that $600 is too low and should be increased before tax relief is voted for stockholders or corporations.

Only the needs of national defense and our fiscal situation justify keeping the exemption at less than $1,000 even for this year.

Increased consumer purchasing power should stimulate production and help reverse the current unemployment trend. Other methods now seem less desirable primarily because of the time factor.

Shortsighted campaign promises followed by rash fiscal policies have produced a serious threat not only to our own economy but also to the economic confidence of the entire free world.

As long as a tax-reduction device is to be used at this time it should be a fair one. Increasing the individual and dependents' income-tax exemption appears to be the fairest and most practicable way to try to stimulate economic activity through tax reduction.

The 100th Anniversary of the Construction of the Famous Horseshoe Curve on the Pennsylvania Railroad Near Altoona, Pa., February 15, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, 1954, the world-famous horseshoe curve on the Pennsylvania Railroad, just west of Altoona, Pa., was 100 years old. This curve was at the time of construction, and still is, an outstanding engineering feat, attracting an estimated 75,000 visitors each year.

In the early days of the 19th century three seaboard cities were in position to benefit from the growing trade of the West. Two of them, Baltimore and New York, were already on their way; the historic, paved national road was building from Baltimore to the Ohio country, and the Erie Canal was being dug to join the waters of the Great Lakes with the Hudson River and so open an inland route for New York.

Philadelphians, and Pennsylvanians generally, came to realize that they could not continue to rely on a transportation system that required from 18 to 35 days for a wagon loaded with less than 2 tons of freight, drawn over unpaved roads by 5 or 6 horses, to cross the State to Pittsburgh and the open vista of the Ohio River.

Pennsylvania's first solution was a system of canals and railroads, known collectively as the main line of public works, built by the State. This consisted of 82 miles of railroad from Philadelphia to Columbia, a 172-mile canal to Hollidaysburg—at the foot of the Alleghenies—36 miles of the Portage Railroad—built in 10 inclined planes over which cars were drawn by ropes and stationary steam engines—to Johnstown, and a 104-mile canal to Pittsburgh. This system was in operation by the spring of 1834. Passengers left Philadelphia at 8 a. m. and arrived in Pittsburgh the afternoon of the fourth day.

While it operated successfully, this arrangement was unsatisfactory in many respects. Service was suspended when the canals froze, the waterways were damaged by spring freshets and were affected by low water in the summer. And it was slow.

In 1839 the State legislature acted by appropriating $30,000 to finance a survey for a continuous railroad from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh, and Charles L. Schlatter was hired to carry it out. Schlatter's surveys covered three routes across the mountains, of which the middle route, up the Susquehanna, Juniata, and Little Juniata rivers to a crossing at the lowest peak in the area, appeared the most promising.

On April 13, 1846, the legislature's act incorporating the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. was signed by the Governor, providing for construction of a railroad from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh. A year later John Edgar Thomson was retained as chief engineer of the company, a selection which was most fortunate for the new railroad, and which is reflected in its operation to this day. He rose to become the Pennsylvania Railroad's third president—1852–74—and one of the world's greatest railroad executives.

Thomson resurveyed Schlatter's middle route and improved the line to provide lower grades all the way from Harrisburg to the mountains, distance of 134 miles. Other surveys to determine the best crossing, thoroughly exploring the ridges for a distance of 44 miles, were carried on for nearly 2 years until a satisfactory location was found late in 1849. Work was begun in 1851 on the mountain section of the railroad.

Meanwhile, in 1850 the new line reached Altoona, selected by the railroad in 1849 as the site for its principal shops and a major engine terminal. The line was continued on to Hollidaysburg, where a temporary connection was made with the old Portage Railroad to provide a rail route, using the inclined planes, across the mountains to Johnstown, to which the railroad was built eastward from Pittsburgh.

The first cars to operate over rails through to Pittsburgh, avoiding use of the canals, arrived December 10, 1850. This first rail link across the State included the State-owned Philadelphia & Columbia Railroad to Lancaster, the privately owned Harrisburg, Portsmouth, Mount Joy & Lancaster Railroad to Harrisburg, the new Pennsylvania Railroad and the Portage Railroad.

The most formidable problem facing Thomson in completing the Pennsylvania line across the mountains was construction of the summit tunnel to cut off the last 150 feet of grade. But the most spectacular engineering feat turned out to be location of the line along the east slope, from Altoona to the summit. The slope on the west side is more gradual and much less demanding of engineering skill.

It had been decided that the new line was to mount the east slope with a grade of not more than 1.8 percent, or a rise of 1.8 feet for each 100 feet of distance. Crossing low ridges southwest of Altoona, the line came to a valley running westward and followed it along the side of the ridge on a 1.75 percent grade. But about 5½ miles from Altoona the valley was found to split into two ravines, divided by another mountain. Across the valley at this point lay the ridge which could carry the rails on toward the summit at a 1.73 percent grade. To have crossed the valley from one ridge to the other would have required a great bridge with a grade of 4.37 percent—much too steep for practical railroad operation.

So, to gain distance and reduce the grade, Thomson's engineers built a huge earth fill across the first ravine—Kittanning Run, carved away the face of the dividing mountain, and crossed the second ravine—Burgoon's Run—by means of another great fill. The rails reached

the ridge on the other side of the valley in a great semicircle 1,300 feet across—horseshoe curve.

The earliest known use of the term "horseshoe" to describe the curve dates from 1862. In a railroad guidebook published by George H. Thurston it was stated: "This horseshoe bend is one of the greatest engineering triumphs of the age"—a description not diminished with the intervening years.

The new line between Altoona and Johnstown was opened for service February 15, 1854, eliminating the inclined planes of the Portage Railroad. Some grading and other finishing work remained to be done, but the line was opened as early as possible to capture the spring travel volume of 1854.

At first there were two passenger trains a day in each direction over the line. A local left Philadelphia at 7:30 a. m. and arrived in Pittsburgh 17 hours later, making all stops. Another left at midnight, taking 14 hours for the run. In March 1854 a third train was added, leaving Philadelphia at 1 p. m. on a 13-hour schedule. There were also three eastbound trains a day.

The exact cost of building the curve is not available, but Thomson's final cost estimate for the entire Altoona-Johnstown line was $2,745,000. The only portion of the work for which the cost is available is the summit tunnel, for which $450,000 was spent.

With completion of the new line it became evident that the Main Line of Public Works could not compete with the all-rail route. It was sold to the new railroad in 1857, including the Philadelphia & Columbia line. Four years later the Pennsylvania leased for 999 years the Harrisburg, Portsmouth, Mount Joy & Lancaster, placing the entire route from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh under Pennsylvania Railroad management.

Horseshoe curve lies 242 miles west of Philadelphia and 111 miles east of Pittsburgh. It is 2,375 feet long, its curvature is 9°15', and the grade is 91 feet per mile. The lower calk of the shoe is 1,594 feet in elevation and the upper calk is 1,716 feet high. From Altoona to the summit tunnels at Gallitzin—now 3 bores about 150 feet below the top of the ridge—trains ascend 1,015 feet in 11 miles.

Originally single-tracked, the curve was double-tracked during 1854. For many years it has had four tracks. Over its heavy-duty rails passenger trains operate on the two inside tracks, freight trains on the outside tracks.

Today the Pennsylvania's great fleet of streamliners, headed by the all-pullman Broadway Limited, traverse the horseshoe curve on their runs between East and West. The time between Pittsburgh and Philadelphia has been reduced to about 6½ hours.

Scores of freight trains powered, like the streamliners, by modern diesel-electric locomotives, carry the raw materials and finished products of industry around the curve in an unending parade of reliable, efficient mass transportation. The operation is an unmatched display of railroading at its best.

Drawn by this sight, and by the breathtaking natural beauty of the valley, an estimated 75,000 visitors yearly make their way to the curve over a paved road which follows an old Indian trail. In 1953, 16,600 of the sightseers took the trouble to sign a register in the refreshment shop at the site. They were from all 48 States, 7 Canadian provinces, 39 other countries, and from 65 of Pennsylvania's 67 counties.

No route more practical than that achieved by the horseshoe curve has been found across the Alleghenies. It has won and kept the admiration of the engineering world for its skillful design and execution, and for its builders' courage in undertaking the project in a day when it had to be done by strong-backed men wielding picks and shovels and assisted only by horses and drags.

Moving CCC Dairy Purchasing Division From Minnesota Is Not in the Interest of Economy and Efficiency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, all of us want to cooperate with the various departments and agencies whenever a proposal is made to increase the efficiency of the agency or lead to greater economy. However, sometimes a proposal is neither efficient nor economical. In my opinion, such is the case with the proposal of the Department of Agriculture to move the Commodity Credit Corporation Dairy Purchasing Division from Minneapolis, Minn., to Cincinnati.

Instead of saving money, this move will actually create substantial waste because fully 75 percent of purchases of butter, dried milk, and cheese have been made in the Minneapolis office entirely from producers right in that area. Minnesota and Wisconsin are predominantly dairy States and provide the greatest production of milk and milk products in the United States. All vendors and companies working with the Minneapolis office have had satisfactory cooperation, and the Department of Agriculture as well as suppliers have benefited immensely through close contact with each other. This close contact and experience would not be possible with the office located in Cincinnati.

No other commodity is experiencing such discrimination. Department of Agriculture headquarters for the cotton program are in New Orleans, the center of cotton production; in the case of wool, the headquarters and general operations office is in Boston. It just makes sense, then, that the natural place for the dairy office is Minneapolis since it is much more of a center of the dairy industry than Cincinnati.

I hope the CCC will reconsider this action in the interest of the majority of dairy farmers and processors and manufacturers of dairy products. In moving for efficiency and economy, let us be practical so that efficiency and economy will be real for all concerned.

Never Have So Many Organizations Felt It Necessary in the Interests of American Taxpayers To Unite in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is a generally recognized fact that the big push for the so-called St. Lawrence Seaway is coming from a small group of Midwest steel companies which have made an investment in Labrador ore and are seeking cheap transportation for their product at the expense of the taxpayers of this country.

I know, of course, that the project has been agitated in varying degrees over a period of more than 30 years. But the organized pressure for it is being largely supplied and financed by these six companies: The Hanna Co., Republic Steel, Youngstown Sheet & Tube, Wheeling Steel, National Steel, and Armco.

The reason I cite this influence and backing, Mr. Speaker, is that by comparison I want to show that whereas the force for the seaway is largely a steel combine, the opponents of this scheme are diversified groups, representing virtually all segments of our economy, ranging over the entire United States, united in their belief that the seaway proposal is inimical to the national welfare.

Not only does the opponent's list include representatives of business, transportation, shipping, and production, but high on the list are the United Mine Workers of America, the American Federation of Labor, several of the Railroad Brotherhoods, the entire maritime industry of the United States, as well as the port authorities of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, Wilmington, Charleston, S. C., Savannah, Ga., and the port authorities of all the gulf ports, and the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, the largest and most representative business organization of the largest port on the Great Lakes.

In addition, more than several hundred organizations from all sections of the country are affiliated in the joint endeavor to prevent the seaway folly being foisted on the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the organizations mentioned as opposing the St. Lawrence Seaway, let me read the names of the following organizations who are united in their efforts to defeat this economic monstrosity:

Alabama Department of State Docks and Terminals; Alabama State Chamber of Com-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

merce; Allegheny Regional Advisory Board; Altoona (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce; American Association of Railway Advertising Agents; American Coal Sales Association; American Merchant Marine Institute; American Mining Congress; American National Livestock Association; American Short Line Railroads; Amsterdam (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce; Anthracite Institute; Appalachian Coals, Inc.; Association of American Railroads; Association of American Ship Owners; Associated Industries of Alabama; Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association; Atlantic States Shippers Advisory Board; Auburn (Maine) Chamber of Commerce; Aurora (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce.

Baltimore Association of Commerce; Baltimore Chamber of Commerce; Beaver Falls (Pa.) Board of Trade; Beckley (W. Va.) Chamber of Commerce; Bergen County (N. J.) Chamber of Commerce; Binghamton Junior Chamber of Commerce; Bluefield (W. Va.) Chamber of Commerce; Blytheville (Ark.) Chamber of Commerce; Bogalusa (La.) Chamber of Commerce; Borough of Queens Chamber of Commerce; Boston Chamber of Commerce; Boston Grain and Flour Exchange; Bradford (Pa.) Board of Commerce; Bridgeport (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce; Bristol (Va.-Tenn.) Chamber of Commerce; Bronx Chamber of Commerce; Bronx Board of Trade; Bronx (N. Y.) Traffic Club; Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce; Buffalo Chamber of Commerce; Business and Civic Association of the Tonawandas, Inc.; Business Improvement Association; Butler (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce.

Camden County (N. J.) Chamber of Commerce; Campbell County (Ky.) Chamber of Commerce; Canal Carriers' Association; Cape Cod Chamber of Commerce; Central Western Shippers Advisory Board; Charleston (S. C.) Chamber of Commerce; Charlotte (N. C.) Chamber of Commerce; Charlottesville and Albemarle County (Va.) Chamber of Commerce; Chelsea (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce; Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce; Coal Trade Association of Indiana; Colorado State Chamber of Commerce; Columbus (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce; Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc.; Connecticut Chamber of Commerce, Inc.; Cortland (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce; Cumberland (Md.) Chamber of Commerce.

Danbury (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, Davis (W. Va.) Chamber of Commerce, Delaware Chamber of Commerce, Delaware State Coal Club, Dubuque (Iowa) Chamber of Commerce.

East Liverpool (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce, East St. Louis (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce, Elmira (N. Y.) Association of Commerce, Evansville (Ind.) Chamber of Commerce.

Findlay (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce, Flatbush (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, Foreign Commerce Club of Boston, Frankfort (Ind.) Chamber of Commerce, Freeport (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, Fuel Merchants' Association of New Jersey.

Galveston (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce, Garfield (N. J.) Chamber of Commerce, Glens Falls (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, Gloucester (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, Gloversville (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, Goldsboro (N. C.) Chamber of Commerce, Greater Wilmington (N. C.) Chamber of Commerce, Greenville (S. C.) Chamber of Commerce, Greenwich (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, Gulfport (Miss.) Chamber of Commerce.

Hagerstown (Md.) Chamber of Commerce; Hampton Roads Maritime Exchange; Hampton Roads Wholesale Coal Association; Harbor Carriers of the Port of New York; Hazleton (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce; Hornell (N. Y.) Board of Trade; Houston (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce; Huntington, Long Island, Chamber of Commerce.

Illinois Chamber of Commerce, Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, Inland Water Petroleum Carriers' Association, International Longshoremen's Association.

Jackson (Miss.) Chamber of Commerce, Johnstown (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce.

Lackawanna (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, Lawrence (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, Lewiston (Maine) Chamber of Commerce, Lima (Ohio) Association of Commerce, Lockport (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, Logan County (W. Va.) Chamber of Commerce, Long Island Association, Louisville (Ky.) Board of Trade, Lynn (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce.

Manchester (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, Maritime Association of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, Maritime Association of the Port of New York, Massachusetts State Chamber of Commerce, Merchants Exchange of St. Louis, Merchants' & Manufacturers' Traffic Bureau of Muskogee (Okla.), Merchant Truckmen's Bureau of New York, Meridian (Miss.) Chamber of Commerce, Mid-West Shippers Advisory Board, Millville (N. J.) Board of Trade, Mishawaka (Ind.) Chamber of Commerce, Mississippi Valley Association, Moline (Ill.) Association of Commerce, Montgomery (W. Va.) Chamber of Commerce, Morgantown (W. Va.) Chamber of Commerce, Mount Carmel (Pa.) Businessmen's Association.

Nashua (N. H.) Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Shippers' Advisory Board, National Coal Association, New Bedford (Mass.) Board of Commerce, Newark (N. J.) Chamber of Commerce, New Brunswick (N. J.) Chamber of Commerce, New England Shippers' Advisory Board, New England Fuel Dealers' Association, New England Traffic League, New Hampshire Manufacturers' Association, New Haven (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, New Orleans Association of Commerce, Newton (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, New York Board of Trade, New York Produce Exchange, New York State Chamber of Commerce, New York State Retail Solid Fuel Merchants' Association, New York State Waterway's Association, Niagara Falls Chamber of Commerce, Niagara Frontier Industrial Traffic League, Norfolk Association of Commerce, Norfolk Port-Traffic Commission, Norfolk-Portsmouth Traffic Club, Northwest Shippers Advisory Board, Norwalk (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, Northeast Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce.

Ogden (Utah) Chamber of Commerce, Ohio Valley Transportation Advisory Board, Oil City (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, Olean (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce.

Pacific American Steamship Association; Parkersburg (W. Va.) Board of Commerce; Pawtucket (R. I.) Business Chamber, Inc.; Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association; Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce; Peoria (Ill.) Association of Commerce; Petersburg (Va.) Chamber of Commerce; Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce; Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce; Port of Newark (N. J.); Port of Portland (Maine) Authority; Portland (Maine) Chamber of Commerce; Princeton (W. Va.) Chamber of Commerce; Propeller Club of the United States; Propeller Club, Port of Baltimore; Propeller Club, Port of Boston; Propeller Club, Port of Buffalo; Propeller Club, Port of Chicago; Propeller Club, Port of Cleveland; Propeller Club, Port of New Orleans; Propeller Club, Port of New York; Propeller Club, Port of St. Louis; Propeller Club, Port of Wilmington (N. C.); Pueblo (Colo.) Chamber of Commerce.

Reading and Berks County Chamber of Commerce, Rensselaer (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, Ritchie County (W. Va.) Improvement Association, Roanoke (Va.) Chamber of Commerce, Rochester (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, Rock Island (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce.

Sapulpa (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce, Scranton (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, Seacoast Regional Development Association of Portsmouth, N. H., Seminole (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce, Shenandoah (Pa.) Merchants Association, S. E. Shippers Advisory Board (Southeastern), Southern States Industrial Council, Solid Fuel Institute of Milwaukee, Southern Pine Association, Southern Traffic League, Southwestern Industrial Traffic League, Springfield (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce, Springfield (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, Staten Island Chamber of Commerce, Sweetwater (Tex.) Board of City Development, Syracuse (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce.

Tennesee Manufacturers' Association, Torrington (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, Trenton Chamber of Commerce.

United Real Estate Association (New York).

Vicksburg (Miss.) Chamber of Commerce, Virginia Coal Merchants Association, Virginia Manufacturers' Association, Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, Virginia Peninsula Association of Commerce.

Warehousemen's Association of the Port of New York, Washington County (Miss.) Chamber of Commerce, West of Central Park Association (New York), West Side Association of Commerce of New York, West Virginia Association of Retail Grocers, West Virginia Chamber of Commerce, West Virginia Coal Association, Williamstown (W. Va.) Chamber of Commerce, Wilmington (N. C.) Port-Traffic Association, Wilmington (N. C.) Port Commission, Wisconsin Coal Bureau, Inc., Worcester (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, Wyoming Valley (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce.

Yazoo County (Miss.) Chamber of Commerce, Yonkers (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce.

Fallbrook: Republican Run Around?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the bill passed by the House last year to settle the Fallbrook controversy is still pigeonholed in the other body where hearings have not commenced although over a month ago the interested citizens were promised hearings within a month.

This case certainly represents a Republican run around. By their vehement criticism of the lawsuit and its use for Republican propaganda during the 1952 campaign the Republicans certainly promised, at least by implication, that they would end the lawsuit and settle the controversy to the satisfaction of all parties. So far, although it was in July of last year when the House passed the bill to authorize construction of a dam and divide the water between the civilians and the military on a fair basis, there has been no action except promises interspersed with threats to renew prosecution of the lawsuit.

Both Democratic and Republican members of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who studied the problem felt this suit should never have been brought and urged that it be settled by joint civilian-military payment for a conservation dam and joint use of the water to be thereby impounded and conserved. We Democrats went directly to

President Truman about the controversy on more than one occasion. He interested himself in the matter and expressed sympathy with the solution provided in the House bill.

It was my amendment to a Justice Department appropriation bill which first started the move which prohibited funds for prosecution of the suit pending a solution of the controversy. That prohibition has so far been continued annually but it will expire again this June 30. In the meantime the Fallbrook bill is lying dormant in the other body and I have not heard of any Republicans obtaining appointments to even discuss the matter with President Eisenhower, much less protest this administration's stalling tactics.

It seems to me it is time for the Republicans to quit giving the victims of the lawsuit the run around. They should settle the controversy or admit that they were only interested in it to the extent it could be exploited for partisan political propaganda.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1954

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the celebration of Brotherhood Week, I wish to call attention to the excellent editorial on the subject appearing in the current issue of the AFL News Reporter:

Brotherhood Week, celebrated February 21–28, is a reminder that, although progress has been made in eliminating discrimination, much remains to be done.

Children still must attend segregated schools because their skin is of a certain color, although their fathers may have won medals for bravery on the battlefield.

Physicians may not practice in certain hospitals because of their religion, although many of their faith have made outstanding contributions to the science of medicine and the prevention of disease.

The barriers must, and will, come down. Until that time as Bernard Baruch says, each of us must fight bigotry wherever we find it and cleanse our hearts of blind animosity against our fellows.

Brotherhood Week is dedicated to the preservation of basic human rights, tolerance, and religious freedom. Brotherhood should be a virtue practiced in our daily lives; it is essential to our well-being as a Nation in these perilous times. The Communists want the world to think our democracy is a sham. America's discrimination against minority groups is our greatest single handicap in our efforts to win the friendship and respect of foreign peoples. The United States must demonstrate a continued and steady record of progress toward equal treatment and equal opportunity for all. In order to insure adequately the protection of civil rights, legislation is essential as a basic authority. I urge the Republican leadership to take early action on my bill, H. R. 366, and similar measures, designed to protect the rights of individuals to be free from discrimination or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Memorandum in Support of the Passage of Trip-Leasing Bill, H. R. 3203

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the trip-leasing bill, H. R. 3203, passed the House by an overwhelming majority several months ago. Since that time it has been awaiting action in the Senate. It is a bill of tremendous importance to the farmers of this country and to others as well.

In addition to the technical merits of the trip-leasing bill, H. R. 3203, there are a number of basic reasons from the standpoints of sound administration and good business practices why this bill should be passed by the Senate at an early date.

First. It is the duty of the Congress to make a policy determination with respect to a matter of far-reaching importance to various segments of the economy such as this, when the responsible Government agency has demonstrated as in this case its inability or unwillingness to deal with the problem decisively and forthrightly.

Three times during 1953 while the bill was under consideration by the Congress, the ICC amended the controversial 30-day minimum limitation as applied to agricultural hauling. The latest agricultural exception in the November 30, 1953, order cannot be regarded as any more permanent or fixed than the membership of the Commission itself or the thinking of its members.

As far as agriculture is concerned, we feel there will be no permanent policy determination in the matter until Congress acts.

Second. The agricultural exception which it has been proposed to put into effect on a permanent basis is discriminatory to those carriers who do not qualify under the special exception.

To illustrate, the trucks of cooperative canneries and creameries could freely trip-lease under the ICC's latest orders, whereas the trucks of other canneries and creameries could not. This is restrictive to agriculture as a whole.

Third. While major emphasis is being given by many, some opposed to H. R. 3203, to freeing transportation agencies generally from unnecessary regulation as much as possible consistent with the interest of the shipping public, it is difficult, if not impossible, to justify moving in the completely opposite direction with respect to the policy of leasing motor vehicles and imposing additional Federal regulation on selected groups within the framework of the transportation industry.

Fourth. The passage of H. R. 3203 is essential to prevent the ICC from taking a first step in implementation of its demonstrated opposition to the agricultural commodities exemption in the Motor Carrier Act.

Agriculture feels that once an inroad on the policy has been permitted, the breaking down process has begun. H. R. 3203 is essential to prevent the "camel from getting his nose under the tent."

The acknowledged ultimate objective of some of the interests opposing H. R. 3203 is the repeal of the agricultural commodities exemption in section 203 (b) (6) of the Motor Carrier Act. Defeating the passage of H. R. 3203 would be a major step in that direction.

Fifth. The Interstate Commerce Commission has reported to Congress in its 67th annual report that:

Enactment of H. R. 3203 would undermine the motor rate structure and recreate the confusion which prevailed prior to the passage of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935.

The above statement is completely misleading and is calculated to confuse persons who are not familiar with the actual provisions in H. R. 3203.

Before 1935 there was no Federal regulation of the motor carrier industry at all. From the passage of the Motor Carrier Act in 1935 to September 1, 1953, there were in effect practically no regulations affecting the leasing of motor vehicles by authorized carriers. In fact, during the years when there was a shortage of trucks, the Government actually encouraged the leasing of trucks by authorized carriers. The passage of H. R. 3203 would enable the ICC to keep in effect all the regulations it placed in effect on September 1, 1953, to regulate leasing and to prescribe "such other regulations as may be reasonably necessary in order to assure that while motor vehicles are being so used the motor carriers will have full direction and control of such vehicles and will be fully responsible for the operation thereof, in accordance with applicable law and regulations, including the requirements prescribed by or under the provisions of this part with respect to safety of operation and equipment." The immediately preceding quoted words are taken from the bill H. R. 3203. In short, under H. R. 3203, the ICC can do any and every thing it deems necessary to regulate leasing short of restricting the duration of the leases or the amount of compensation to be paid thereunder.

Under H. R. 3203, the ICC is affirmatively given far greater authority to regulate the leasing of trucks than it has ever exercised or attempted to exercise, through the years since the passage of the Motor Carrier Act, prior to the rules which went into effect on September 1, 1953.

In view of this record, it appears irresponsible for the ICC to report to the Congress that enactment of H. R. 3203 would "recreate the confusion which prevailed prior to the passage of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935."

This illustrates, from the point of view of agriculture, how imperative it is

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

for the Congress to act in this important matter.

Sixth. Division 5 of the ICC, the Division which handles motor carrier matters, and which by reason of experience is most familiar with the problems of the motor carrier industry, did not favor the inclusion of a 30-day lease limitation. In fact, the rules recommended by Division 5 did not include the 30-day lease requirement, or the requirement that compensation must be on a basis other than a division of revenues. H. R. 3203 does not prohibit in any way any of the rules recommended by Division 5 when this matter was formally considered by that Division, prior to action by the full commission. Certainly the Commission's Division 5, whose membership then was made up of Commissioners with years of experience in these matters did not make a recommendation which would undermine the motor rate structure or recreate the confusion which prevailed prior to the passage of the Motor Carrier Act in 1935. It is important to note that John L. Rogers, the first Director of the Bureau of Motor Carriers, ICC, was a member of Division 5 when that Division recommended against the adoption of a 30-day limitation on truck leases.

There are other reasons which support the early passage of H. R. 3203. The above points, however, are believed sufficient to establish the weakness of the position of the ICC in this matter and to show the merits of the position of those who are advocating the passage of this bill by the Senate.

Elmer A. Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1954

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Society for the City of New York was organized June 20, 1914, to promote friendly social relations among those born within the limits of the Greater City of New York; to cultivate a proper civic pride; to cherish and perpetuate the memories and traditions of our city; to preserve its good name at home and abroad; and to promote the welfare of the members. At its recent election, Elmer A. Rogers was reelected president.

Mr. Rogers was born in New York City on December 9, 1900, and received his education in the New York City public schools, the College of the City of New York, New York University, and New York Law School. He received his doctor of laws degree in 1922, and thereafter took postgraduate courses in government; admitted to practice of law in New York, 1927; United States District Court, Southern District of New York, 1929; United States District Court, Eastern District of New York, 1932; United States Treasury Department, 1924; Tax Court of the United States, 1948; United States Supreme Court, 1949; United States Customs Court and Federal Communications Commission, 1950; assistant to late Supreme Court Justice Henry L. Sherman in New York State senatorial contest before Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, 1928; special deputy assistant attorney general, 1931–32; member George Washington Bicentennial Commission, 1932; chairman, national committee on Americanism, Improved Order of Red Men, 1933; member of committee, Citizens Reconstruction Organization—the President's anti-hoarding campaign—1932; counsel to special committee, Washington Heights Taxpayers Association To Investigate Public Utilities, 1933; deputy great sachem, Improved Order of Red Men, 1931–37; member special panel of arbitrators, American Arbitration Association, 1939; assistant secretary of City Title Insurance Co., 1941; president, the First National Bank of Ardsley, 1943; national panel of arbitrators, American Arbitration Association, 1941; director of purchasing department of the Greater New York Civilian Defense Volunteer Office, 1943; served in the United States Coast Guard Reserve, 1944–45; member of the advisory planning board of the New York City Planning Commission, 1946–51; member of the mayor's committee for the celebration of the golden anniversary of the city of New York, 1948.

Author of All-Purpose Real-Estate Contract and Improved Form of Direct-Reduction Mortgage, 1941; Embezzlement: Its Income-Tax Problems, 1948; Federal Income-Tax Discussion of Illegal and Unlawful Gains, 1949; Comprehensive Mortgage, 1954.

Biography published in Who's Who in Law, Who's Who in the East, and Who's Who in New York.

Member of the following professional societies, clubs, and organizations: New York County Lawyers Association, formerly member of the membership committee and committee on professional economics; Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, formerly member of OPA committee and chairman of committee on unlawful practice of the law; American Bar Association; Munn Lodge, No. 190, F. & A. M.; the Consistory of New York City; Detectives Endowment Association, honorary member; National Democratic Club; Grand Street Boys' Association; Academy of Political Science; New York Society for the City of New York; Tammany Society or Columbian Order; Army and Navy Union, Alexander Blasius Garrison, No. 868, past chief of staff and honorary life member New York County Council; American Legion, Grand Street Boys' Post, No. 1025, past commander, chairman of committee on school awards for Americanism; Greater New York Civic Center Association, Inc., member of board of directors; Society of American Military Engineers; Welfare League for Retarded Children, general counsel; Stuyvesant Training Corps, organizer, 1915.

The New York Society for the City of New York was organized by such men as Hon. Samuel Ecker, and the late Hon. Frederick De Witt Wells, Hon. John J. Dietz, Hon. Frank Buckley, Hon. James J. Archer, Hon. John R. Davies, Hon. Seth Low, Hon. Alfred E. Smith, and Hon. James W. Gerard.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Kenneth G. Phifer, minister, Old Presbyterian Meeting House, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever blessed God, in whom is our hope and from whom is our salvation, look Thou upon us with Thy good favor as we pursue the tasks of this day. We are all too often inadequate to our responsibilities and all too often indifferent to our inadequacies. Make us ever aware of our need for a strength beyond our own, a wisdom higher than ours, and a confidence which comes from our having explored the deep sources of life. Give us honesty in our evaluation of ourselves, courage in our reactions to the pressures of this day, and loyalty to our own best selves. In this week set aside to remind us of our brotherhood with other men may we examine our lives earnestly and concretely in the light of our obligations to our neighbors. Bless our Nation to the end that her mission on earth may be fulfilled in service unto mankind and in compassion to all who are in need. We make our prayer in the spirit of the Elder Brother of us all, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 24, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. J. GLENN BEALL, a Senator from the State of Maryland, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BEALL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 23, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its

clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon, or so much of the afternoon as may be necessary to complete the hearing now in progress. I am making the request at the suggestion of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Lennon
Barrett	Gillette	Mansfield
Beall	Goldwater	Murray
Bricker	Gore	Pastore
Burke	Green	Purtell
Bush	Griswold	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Hayden	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Holland	Stennis
Carlson	Humphrey	Thye
Case	Ives	Upton
Flanders	Johnson, Tex.	Young
Frear	Knowland	
Fulbright	Lehman	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of the absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. WILLIAMS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation "Retired Pay, Department of Defense" for the fiscal year 1954, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL IN TOKYO, JAPAN

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the past year, $1,020 worth of surplus property had been disposed of in Tokyo, Japan, by the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON RESERVATION FROM APPROPRIATIONS CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the calendar year 1953, no reservations from appropriations had been made of lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION REPORTS, VOLUME 10"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its newly issued publication entitled "Federal Power Commission Reports, Volume 10" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON CLAIMS SETTLED UNDER MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, that under the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended, the claim of W. C. Parker had been settled in the amount of $346, during the calendar year 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Resolution 18

"House resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate sufficient funds for the proper and efficient administration of the unemployment compensation law of the State of Maryland

"Whereas the attention of the members of the General Assembly of Maryland has been called to the critical condition existing in the administration of the unemployment compensation law of the State of Maryland, which condition exists because of the serious lack of administrative funds supplied by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas these matters may be corrected by the appropriation of necessary funds by the Congress of the United States of America; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the general assembly to call these problems to the attention of the Congress of the United States of America; and

"Whereas one of the matters which has been forcefully brought to the attention of the members of the general assembly is the inconvenience to persons having business in the Baltimore office, being forced to stand outside in all kinds of weather for considerable periods of time waiting in line; and

"Whereas in many cities the work of the employment security organization is spread over a number of branch offices, so that the number of applicants at any one office is kept at a minimum, and the separate offices can more effectively handle the workloads; and

"Whereas the experience in the Baltimore office and elsewhere during the period of heavy layoffs demonstrates the need for a reserve appropriation from which the employment security board might draw in order to employ extra help in these times of unusual workloads; and

"Whereas the members of the house of delegates are informed that the Baltimore office alone needs for proper operation of required services at least 60 more employees in order to expedite the proper administration of its work in the face of these greatly expanded demands for service: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland*, That the Congress of the United States of America be requested to make the funds available for the proper and efficient administration of the unemployment compensation law of the State of Maryland herein referred to; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house of delegates be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the Employment Security Board, a copy to the Department of Labor, a copy to each Member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States, a copy to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and a copy to the President of the Senate of the United States of America.

"By the house of delegates, February 12, 1954.

"JOHN C. LUBER,
"*Speaker of the House of Delegates.*"

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"House Resolution 10

"House resolution requesting the United States Post Office Department to issue a commemorative stamp on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the founding of Fort Cumberland

"Whereas the date of January 26, 1955, will be the 200th anniversary of the founding of Fort Cumberland on the site of the present city of Cumberland in Allegany County, Md.; and

"Whereas this fort was completed on January 26, 1755, and immediately became of outstanding importance as a frontier outpost of eighteenth century civilization, serving as a base for General Braddock's campaign during the French and Indian War and as a protection for the colonists against the depredations of Indians; and

"Whereas in 1756 and again in 1758 the fort was under the personal command of George Washington, then acting as commander-in-chief of the Virginia military forces; and

"Whereas during the ensuing years the city of Cumberland served as a focal point for much of the development of the great areas of the Middle West, being in the early years of the nineteenth century the starting point for the famous Cumberland Road, sometimes known as the Old National Pike, the western terminus of the famous Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, and an important part of the far-flung Baltimore & Ohio Railroad; and

"Whereas Fort Cumberland and the city of Cumberland itself have been the center of such important developments in the history of Maryland and of the entire United States as fully to warrant the issue of a commemorative stamp in honor of the 200th anniversary of the founding of Fort Cumberland: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland*, That the Post Office Department of the United States be requested to give earnest consideration to the issue of a commemorative stamp, to mark the 200th anniversary of the founding of Fort Cumberland, on January 26, 1955; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Postmaster General of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, each Member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States, the Cumberland Free Public Library, and the Allegany County Historical Society.

"By the house of delegates, February 10, 1954.

"JOHN C. LUBER,
"Speaker of the House of Delegates."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relating to a continuance of the present tariff rates on lace imports; to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE) on February 23, 1954, p. 2098, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions adopted by the Central Labor Council of Astoria, and the Central Labor Council of Klamath Falls, both in the State of Oregon, protesting against any special exemption on income derived from dividends; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Baltimore Association of Commerce, Baltimore, Md., favoring the elimination of the capital gains tax; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Los Angeles District, California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring the elimination of all Federal supervision and control over Indian affairs and Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, Ill., favoring the prohibition of the shipment of fireworks into States where the sale of fireworks is prohibited; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Napa Post Office Employees Association, Napa, Calif., favoring a salary adjustment for post office employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 196. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; without amendment; and

S. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution to print the proceedings in connection with the placing of the statue of Marcus Whitman in the Capitol; without amendment.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 58. A bill for the relief of Suzanne Jacquet (Rept. No. 991);

S. 233. A bill for the relief of Jeno Csepio (Rept. No. 992);

S. 428. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chih Chiang Teng (Rept. No. 993);

S. 455. A bill for the relief of Johan Gerhard Faber, Dagma Anna Faber, Hilke Faber, and Frauke Faber (Rept. No. 994);

S. 487. A bill for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Balourdas (Rept. No. 995);

S. 490. A bill for the relief of Josephine Reigl (Rept. No. 996);

S. 518. A bill for the relief of Sister Marie Therese De Galzain (Rept. No. 997);

S. 520. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ivan S. Aylesworth (Rept. No. 998);

S. 552. A bill for the relief of Anna Urwicz (Rept. No. 999);

S. 740. A bill for the relief of Santa Maciaccia (Sister Maria Fridiana), Teresa Saragaglia (Sister Maria Eutropia), and Caterina Isonni (Sister Maria Giovita) (Rept. No. 1000);

S. 747. A bill for the relief of Jacek Von Henneberg (Rept. No. 1001);

S. 795. A bill for the relief of Josef Radziwill (Rept. No. 1002);

S. 924. A bill for the relief of Sofia B. Panagoulopoulos (Rept. No. 1003);

S. 946. A bill for the relief of Mona Lisbet Kofoed Nicolaisen, Leif Martin Borgium Nicolaisen, and Ian Alan Kofoed Nicolaisen (Rept. No. 1004);

S. 997. A bill for the relief of Chuan Hua Lowe and his wife (Rept. No. 1005);

S. 1517. A bill for the relief of Helen Knight Waters and Arnold Elzey Waters, Jr. (Rept. No. 1006);

S. 1937. A bill for the relief of Rev. Francis T. Dwyer and Rev. Thomas Morrissey (Rept. No. 1007);

H. R. 687. A bill for the relief of Sister Walfreda (Anna Nelles), and Sister Amaltrudis (Gertrude Schneider) (Rept. No. 1008);

H. R. 749. A bill for the relief of Shui-Fook Fung (Rept. No. 1009);

H. R. 1346. A bill for the relief of Zia Edin Taheri and Frances Hakimzadeh Taheri (Rept. No. 1010);

H. R. 2507. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Gatti (Rept. No. 1011);

H. R. 2817. A bill for the relief of George A. Ferris (Rept. No. 1012);

H. R. 3005. A bill for the relief of Charles Sabah (Rept. No. 1013);

H. R. 3236. A bill for the relief of Constantin and Lucia (Bercescu) Turcano (Rept. No. 1014); and

H. R. 3455. A bill for the relief of Jalal Rashtian (Rept. No. 1015).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 98. A bill for the relief of (Mrs.) Betty Thornton or Josefne Toth (Rept. No. 1016);

S. 208. A bill for the relief of Sister Constantina (Teresia Kakonyi) (Rept. No. 1017);

S. 327. A bill for the relief of Tarik S. Kaynor (Rept. No. 1018);

S. 584. A bill for the relief of Rosa Euler and her minor child (Rept. No. 1019);

S. 937. A bill for the relief of Virginia Grande (Rept. No. 1020);

S. 1138. A bill for the relief of John Soudas (Rept. No. 1021);

S. 1689. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cacila Gotthardt Gange (Rept. No. 1022);

S. 1863. A bill for the relief of Leo A. Ribitzki, Mrs. Charlotte Ribitzki, and Marion A. Ribitzki (Rept. No. 1023);

S. 2166. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Rena Carlson (Rept. No. 1024); and

H. R. 2214. A bill for the relief of Jaroslav, Bozena Yvonka, and Jarka Ondricek (Rept. No. 1025).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 474. A bill for the relief of Maria Yutriago (Rept. No. 1026).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

H. R. 2984. A bill to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation or pension purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years (Rept. No. 1027).

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I am authorized and directed to report favorably to the Senate a committee bill to enable the richly endowed and strategic American Territory of Alaska to qualify for statehood and to be admitted into the Union on a free and equal basis with the present 48 States, and I submit a report (No. 1028) thereon.

The committee bill is in the form of an amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 50, introduced on Jan. 7, 1953, by the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for himself and 14 other Senators.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate will be interested in the fact that this bill represents a considerable departure from the original bill and any previous Alaska statehood bills in its treatment of the resources and lands of the proposed new State. In the past it has been a common criticism of Alaska statehood bills that they pretended to make Alaska a State, while at the same time reserving to the Federal Government all the valuable land and resources of the Territory. The bill we present to you today attempts to give Alaska real statehood, so that it may grow and develop. It also proposes a measure of financial aid to the new State during a brief transition period following statehood.

Speaking again for the committee, I think we may take some pride in the improvements that have been made in this

bill. Six members of the committee including myself visited Alaska last summer and held careful prolonged hearings at which everyone was given a chance to present his views. Then at the beginning of this session an exhaustive study of the problem of Federal land holdings and Federal control was conducted by a subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

While I do not contend that this bill is perfect, I believe it is a bill under which Alaska can survive and grow. I hope the changes made by the committee will recommend themselves to the Senate.

It should be stated that the vote in committee on reporting the bill was 14 for and 1 against. A number of those voting to report the bill, however, reserved the right to oppose the measure on the floor.

We do not have the formal report ready today but hope to have it within a few days.

I respectfully commend the provisions of the committee's amendment to S. 50 to the consideration of the Members of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I merely want to compliment the Senator from Nebraska upon submitting the report and to state that I think the hearings which were conducted in Alaska were very beneficial to the entire question of the status of Alaska. The bill has received the most careful consideration that an Alaskan statehood bill could have. I conducted hearings on Alaska statehood in the 81st Congress, and participated in the visit to Alaska during the past summer. I know a great deal of work has been done in the past few weeks. I pay tribute not only to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska but also to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] for the very fine job done in drafting the bill. We spent Saturday on it until after 6 o'clock, and we worked on it again on Washington's Birthday and on the following morning. The Senator from Oregon has devoted a tremendous amount of service in that endeavor.

I thank the chairman of the committee and his colleagues for the very fine job which I think has been done.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I may say that no member of the committee, other than the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], has been more faithful in attendance or has done more work on the bill than has the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I heard the Senator from Nebraska say something about the report. Will the Senator repeat what he said with respect to when the report will be available?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. The report itself should be available by next Monday, if not before. The committee is working on it. It is pretty well prepared, but has not been completed so that it could be submitted today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When was the bill reported?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. The committee voted to report the bill. That has been done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When was that done?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. That was done several days ago. As I recall it was on February 4. We have endeavored to prepare the details of the bill in conformity with the desires of various members of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have been desirous of having the Alaskan statehood bill considered together with the Hawaiian statehood bill. I had hoped that the committee would report not only the Hawaiian bill, but also the Alaskan bill. In view of the fact that the Alaskan bill was reported by the committee on February 4, or was ordered to be reported, it seems to me that a reasonable time has elapsed, and I hope the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will do everything he can to have the report submitted at the earliest possible date.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I promise the distinguished minority leader that the report will be submitted promptly, and that it will be before the Senate by the time the Hawaiian statehood bill is ready for consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the distinguished chairman for that assurance.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT REPORT

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original resolution granting additional time for the filing of a preliminary report by the Committee on the Judiciary on the investigation of juvenile delinquency.

The resolution (S. Res. 215) was received and placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That section 3 of Senate Resolution 89, 83d Congress, agreed to June 1, 1953 (authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of juvenile delinquency in the United States), as amended by Senate Resolution 190, 83d Congress, agreed to January 27, 1954, is amended by striking out "February 28, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 15, 1954."

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 3001. A bill to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 3002. A bill for the relief of Han Hendrika Timmers Wingate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 3003. A bill for the relief of Lieselotte Brodzinski Gettman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 3004. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of streams emptying into Coos Bay, Oreg., for flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3005. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I desire to give notice that a series of public hearings has been scheduled to begin Wednesday, March 17, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room P–63—old Supreme Court room—of the Capitol Building, on the President's health recommendations. The hearings will concentrate first on S. 2758, which embodies the President's recommendations for expanding the scope of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; second, on S. 2759, which extends and improves vocational rehabilitation services; third, on S. 2778, which extends and improves the use of Federal grants for public-health purposes; and finally, on the President's recommendation for the establishment of a Federal reinsurance service to encourage broader coverage and protection through private and nonprofit health-insurance plans. I expect shortly to introduce a bill designed to implement the latter recommendation in order that an administration bill may be before the Senate and the committee in sufficient time for its consideration in this series of hearings.

Organizations desiring to be heard should notify the committee promptly in order that the schedule of witnesses may be completed. These hearings will be opened by the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, consisting of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] as chairman, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senator messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and fifty-six postmasters.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Earl Warren, of California, to be Chief Justice of the United States;

Walter H. Hodge, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2, district of Alaska, vice Joseph W. Kehoe, resigned;

J. Leonard Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky;

Maurice Paul Bois, of New Hampshire, to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire, vice John J. Sheehan, resigned;

Clarence Edwin Luckey, of Oregon, to be United States attorney for the district of Oregon, vice Henry L. Hess, resigned;

Robert E. Hauberg, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi;

Theodore F. Bowes, of New York, to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York;

Sumner Canary, of Ohio, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio, vice Donald C. Miller, resigned;

Heard L. Floore, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas;

Julian T. Gaskill, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of North Carolina;

Jack D. H. Hays, of Arizona, to be United States attorney for the district of Arizona;

Donald R. Ross, of Nebraska, to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska;

Louis Gorman Whitcomb, of Vermont, to be United States attorney for the district of Vermont;

Malcolm R. Wilkey, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Texas, vice Brian S. Odem, resigned;

Donald A. Fraser, of Connecticut, to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut;

J. Bradbury German, Jr., of New York, to be United States marshal for the northern district of New York;

George M. Glasser, of New York, to be United States marshal for the western district of New York, vice Raymond A. Morgan;

Tom Kimball, of Colorado, to be United States marshal for the district of Colorado, vice Maurice T. Smith, removed;

Peter Auburn Richmond, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia;

Dewey Howard Perry, of Vermont, to be United States marshal for the district of Vermont, vice Edward L. Burke;

Edward John Petibon, of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana, vice Louis F. Knop, Jr.;

Billy Eliza Carlisle, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Georgia, vice Edward B. Doyle, retired;

Xavier North, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio;

Louis O. Aleksich, of Montana, to be United States marshal for the district of Montana;

Eugene Levi Kemper, of Kansas, to be United States marshal for the district of Kansas;

Fred S. Williamson, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 3, district of Alaska;

Claire A. Wilder, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 1, district of Alaska; and

Albert Fuller Dorsh, Jr., of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 4, district of Alaska.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Vernon Woods, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Carl J. Werner, resigned.

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Frank Quarles, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Tennessee; and

John Overall Anderson, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee.

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Osro Cobb, of Arkansas, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas; and

Cooper Hudspeth, of Arkansas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Arkansas.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George Edward Rapp, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF DAVID McK. KEY TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the nomination of David McK. Key, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, was received today from the White House. I wish to give notice that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him relating to the problems of the legitimate theater, together with an address delivered by Ralph E. Becker at the annual convention of the Theater Library Association and other organizations, on December 27, 1953.

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, to those of us who can observe Estonian Independence Day in a free land, this is an occasion of profound significance. We who live in freedom may well wonder how and why human liberties were ever permitted to perish in the great area dominated by communism.

But we know that these freedoms, which have temporarily disappeared, must inevitably be restored. The people of Estonia have kept the fire of Estonian independence alive. No force on earth, whether it be communism or any other, can forever oppose man's determination to be free under God. This knowledge continues to inspire the land of Estonia as her people look toward a brighter future with the assurance that the day will soon come when independence will be a reality.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very pleased to take note of the 36th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Estonia on February 24, 1954.

The history and traditions of the Estonian people and the Estonian nation are filled with many great events and heroic episodes.

Today, when the aspirations of all people of Estonian birth and descent in our country and throughout the world are focused on their desire to free Estonia from the oppressive grip of Communist imperialism, it is of the utmost importance that the citizens of the United States hold fast to the purpose of advancing the day when liberty and self-government will again be instituted in that ravished country.

The full facts regarding the ruthless seizure of this great Baltic State must continually be brought before our people. We must work for the achievement of a world under law so that nations will no longer live in constant fear of aggression and of crimes of murder committed against entire peoples. To this end I continue to hope for the ratification by the United States Senate of the Genocide Convention.

We must be resolved that the hideous crime of genocide will be forever outlawed. We know that this can only be accomplished by full cooperation and participation of the United States in the provisions of the Genocide Convention.

On this occasion I wish to extend my sincere greetings to all Americans of Estonian birth and descent, and to all those Estonians who are not American citizens, but who have found haven and refuge in the United States. May they act as couriers of a message of freedom and hope to their friends and relatives abroad. I trust and pray that the day of liberation when Estonia will again join the family of free nations is not far distant.

On this historic day, celebrating the rebirth of the Estonian nation 36 years ago, let us renew our determination that Estonia will soon have another independence day—another occasion to celebrate Estonia reborn.

REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Lincoln's birthday anniversary, a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] held a hearing at Akron, Ohio, on the subject of proposed revisions of the United Nations Charter. This was the first time that a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations went to the people of the country to ascertain their views on a particular subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Problems of U. N. Charter Aired at Impressive Akron Meeting," published in the Trainmen's News of February 22, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS OF U. N. CHARTER AIRED AT IMPRESSIVE AKRON MEETING

AKRON, OHIO.—On Lincoln's birthday, this community experienced a quite realistic

application of Lincoln's ideal of "Government of the people, for the people and by the people." For the first time in American history, a United States Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee went out into the hinterlands and held formal Senate hearings, to obtain the views of the American people. Additional hearings in other parts of the Nation are planned.

These hearings were conducted by Senator ALEXANDER F. WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, chairman of Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, a member of that committee. Senator WILEY is also chairman of a special Senate committee of 8 Senators (4 Republicans and 4 Democrats) to study and report back to the Senate on problems of United Nations Charter review, the subject of the Akron hearings. The U. N. Charter provides for a revision in 1955.

Notices were carried to the people in Akron newspapers and by other methods of mass communication that if they wished to testify before the Senate subcommittee they need only make their wishes known. As is the case in testifying before all congressional committees, copies of the written testimony were requested to be submitted in advance. One witness who complained, although he had done nothing to request time before the committee, was given opportunity to testify, and did so. Senator WILEY's anxious desire to be fair to all was apparent to everyone. In the advance announcement of the hearings, WILEY said:

"We want to hear from the ordinary citizen who strives in all humbleness to find the answer which we are seeking—a better way to preserve and strengthen our country, and to establish a world at peace."

The Akron hearings should be an inspiration to every devoted American. Sixteen witnesses appeared before the committee. They represented churches, business and industry, labor, schools, and various professions. College professors and college students, library clerks, and substitute teachers, corporation officials and labor union officials all made their appearances.

Both Senators and audience received genuine satisfaction from several witnesses who began their testimony:

"Now, I don't represent anyone but myself."

It might be added that those witnesses gave some of the best testimony. The Senators must have found it a refreshing experience to depart from the lobbyists of the interests in Washington, to commune with the lobbyists of the individual grass roots people.

FOREIGN POLICY MADE INTERESTING

Normally one would not consider the subject of foreign policy of general interest and appeal, but the 100 or so people who attended both afternoon and evening sessions of the Akron Senate hearings were genuinely interested and happily entertained. With few exceptions, there was no name-calling—just two earnest and sincere Senators, a Republican and a Democrat, listening to many equally earnest and sincere fellow-citizens, all with a determination to make a better world wherein man's hopes and deepest desires for peace and progress might be guarded by international governmental machinery.

Senator WILEY's rich sense of humor, never allowing the hearings to become boring; Senator MANSFIELD's generous commendation of each witness for his contribution; nervous, quaking witnesses, making their first appearances before a Senate committee, witnesses whose love of truth, and determination to search for it, gave them the strength and poise that produced effective testimony; all this made a dramatic portrayal of free, democratic America at her best.

May there be many more such portrayals.

UNITED NATIONS OVERWHELMINGLY SUPPORTED

Of the 16 witnesses who appeared before the committee, only 3 opposed the U. N. and 1 of them admitted the U. N. had already accomplished much good. The hearings effectively demonstrated that the American people are determined to live in peace with their fellow citizens of the world; that they are conscious of the lessons of 4,000 years of recorded history, namely, that military force will not keep the peace; that universal enforceable disarmament in this atomic age is desperately necessary to the very existence of the human race; that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles is right when he insists that a system of world law must precede world disarmament. As a witness before the committee, Joseph G. Miller, Akron attorney, stated it:

"The heavy burden imposed on the American people to pay for past, present, and future wars cannot be reduced until a foolproof system of disarmament under the United Nations can be evolved. Certainly, the United States should not disarm unilaterally. Disarmament can only be achieved effectively through a foolproof system of inspection and policing by the United Nations."

All agree—strengthen U. N.

To this end, both Senators and witnesses were agreed that the U. N. should be revised to give it the strength to accomplish the high purposes for which it was instituted. Said Senator MANSFIELD:

"The United Nations has been required to assume responsibilities that were not present at the time it was established. Before these responsibilities it has been like a babe in swaddling clothes."

Witness Miller testified:

"I think that the men who drafted the present charter were wise in providing for the question of a charter review conference to appear on the agenda automatically at the end of 10 years. It would seem that ordinary prudence would dictate that the question of the workability of the charter be reviewed at a later date in light of new developments.

"Even our own Federal Constitution has been amended over 20 times, and our Constitution has been referred to as man's best example of a good basic document. So we should accept the necessity of review as being part of the normal process of civilization's development."

UNIVERSALITY FAVORED

Contrary to the isolationist name-calling and the nervous tensions that prevail in Washington and among politicians, witnesses in the Akron hearings seemed to be living nearer to basic American concepts and, therefore, feeling a greater courage and urge to express them. Chester G. Wise, an attorney speaking for the Akron Bar Association, recognizing the simple truth that government is needed mostly because of criminals and aggressors, rather than just for good people, demanded that Russia be kept in the U. N.

"Keep her in so we can watch her," said Wise. "If she's out, there's no telling where she'll ramble."

U. N. IS A PROTECTION

A refreshing contrast to the raucous, isolationist, fear-hate-suspicion-breeding cry of "Get the U. S. out of the U. N. and the U. N. out of the U. S.," was a dominant impression of the Akron hearings. There was a distinct feeling that a strengthened U. N. is needed to protect humanity. It was well voiced by Witness Thomas G. MacGowan, director of marketing research, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., and a representative of Akron chapter of United World Federalists, Inc. Said MacGowan:

"I believe you will discover that the people at the grass roots know more about the need for the United Nations, about its workings and about its strong and weak points than we are sometimes given credit for knowing. In recent years there have been growing efforts in this country not only to discredit the United Nations but to suggest that the American people are opposed to it and wish our country to withdraw from it. I feel sure that as this subcommittee visits communities throughout the country it will learn that the people everywhere support the United Nations strongly, want it to survive, and want it to move forward."

* * * * *

"I believe that the people at the grass roots in this country feel as I do, that the United Nations can reach the point where it will provide a solid assurance of continuing peace under a system of world law and order."

BRT PIONEERS

This feeling for the need of a strengthened U. N. and for adequate government at the international level has long prevailed among members and representatives of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. The BRT was represented by its then national legislative representative, Martin H. Miller, at the original international conference at which the United Nations was born, held in San Francisco, April–May–June 1945. At its 1950 quadrennial convention, BRT delegates from almost every community in Canada and the United States adopted two resolutions urging the strengthening of the United Nations into a limited world government with powers strictly limited to prevention of war and maintenance of peace.

DEATH OF LT. GEORGE G. JEFFRIES

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, my hometown of Frostburg was recently saddened by the tragic death of one of the finest young men our community has ever produced. At the same time we experienced a sense of pride because this young man gave his life, when he could have saved it, in order to spare others.

I knew Lt. George G. Jeffries and had the pleasure of appointing him to the United States Naval Academy. His record at the academy and after being commissioned fully justified the confidence his family and friends had in him.

Lieutenant Jeffries had an outstanding career and successfully completed a number of combat missions, but his great decision did not come in dramatic conflict with the enemy, but during a routine flight within the continental United States. The decision he made was an unselfish one. He chose to stay with his plane rather than endanger the lives of residents in Lake Charles, La.

Lieutenant Jeffries, by his unselfish decision, has shown us all how a hero dies.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in the Baltimore Sun of February 22, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HERO DIES IN LOUISIANA

Once in a while, a man must make a great moral decision which is also a decision for life or death. For Lt. George G. Jeffries, of Frostburg, the decision came in a Navy airplane over Lake Charles, La. The plane was falling, and threatened to crash into a thickly populated residential section of the city. Lieutenant Jeffries could have bailed out and saved his own life. He didn't have much time to decide; but then, men

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

who can make the right decision in crises like this don't need much time to decide. Lieutenant Jeffries stayed with his plane, cleared the city with it and died as it crashed in a ricefield. His family, in their loss, can know that he died for others, and can be very proud of him. The Navy and the Nation are proud of him, too.

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF LITHUANIA

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last week many Americans of Lithuanian origin celebrated the 36th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania. For several years now Lithuania and other Baltic States have been in the grip of Soviet aggression, but in commemorating this 36th anniversary the Council of Lithuanian Societies gave hope to their relatives and friends who remain under Soviet oppression.

At the anniversary meeting in Baltimore the Council of Lithuanian Societies adopted a resolution which pledges their support of this Government's efforts to secure peace in the world, and calls upon this Government to exert every effort to abolish the fruits of past Soviet aggressions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the resolution printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the annual banquet, commemorating the 36th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania, sponsored by the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, Md., held on February 16, 1954, at the Lithuanian Auditorium, 851 Hollins Street, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas Soviet Russia, in utter violation of the international treaties and her solemn obligations, occupied the territory of the Republic of Lithuania and imposed upon the population the ruthless regime of a police state; and

"Whereas despite the condemnation of these Soviet acts of aggression by the great powers of the free world, including the United States, Lithuania, as well as the other Baltic countries, is still subjected to the unscrupulous Kremlin rule of terror, murder, and deportations; and

"Whereas since the seizure of the Baltic States, the Soviet Union managed to take over many other independent countries and now represents the greatest menace to the civilization, culture, and religion of mankind the history has ever known; and

"Whereas the precautionary steps which the free nations have so far undertaken to avert this menace did not prove effective, in many cases, to impress the Kremlin masters: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Lithuanian Americans of Maryland, pledging their wholehearted support to the Government of the United States in its efforts to secure peace and stability in the world and to promote the cause of freedom and justice for all nations, express their sincerest thanks to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, the distinguished leaders and Members of the United States Congress and both Republican and Democratic parties for their continued support of the national aspirations of the Lithuanian people and, especially, for creation of the House Baltic Committee to document and establish the pattern of aggression and enslavement followed by the Kremlin rulers against the free peoples of the world; be it further

"Resolved, That the Lithuanian Americans of Maryland, appeal to the highest authorities of their beloved United States of America to exert, to the fullest, the American leadership in the fight for peace, justice, and freedom by inaugurating a positive and dynamic program of foreign policy to thwart the evil Communist designs for world domination and to abolish the fruits of all past Soviet aggressions; and be it finally

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Maryland Members of both Houses of Congress, the United States representatives in the United Nations, the Governor of the State of Maryland, the mayor of Baltimore City, the diplomatic and consular representatives of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in the United States, and the press."

ANTHONY J. MICEIKA,
President.
MATAS BRAZAUSKAS,
Secretary.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], to insert a new section on page 3, after line 9.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have several times commented upon the dangerous ambiguities of amendments to the Bricker amendment which the Senate has approved to date.

I send to the desk now the text of a memorandum prepared by Mr. Dana C. Backus, in which he points out several of these dangers. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS POSED BY THE KNOWLAND-FERGUSON SUBSTITUTE FOR THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

(By Dana C. Backus)

The "pursuance" clause and the "conflicts" clause in the Knowland-Ferguson amendment present certain legal problems. The difficulty in a declaratory amendment is to add language without changing meaning. The President put it very well in a press release, pointing out that it is strange to change things to keep them the same.

But to change things twice—in the "conflicts" clause and in the "pursuance" clause—in order to keep them the same gives rise to constitutional stuttering of a high order. The danger is that at the political level it will be argued that a hidden change exists in the double negative.

If the "conflicts" clause trims off all unconstitutional treaty provisions, then what is there for the "pursuance" clause to operate on? Thus, there is set up the argument that the "pursuance" clause must change something.

At the judicial level the courts may be expected to make a dispassionate approach to reach a correct result, but there is no reason for promoting an amendment which will raise the question of giving a new twist to the 10th amendment, or altering other established interpretations. A perfect example of the evils of incorrect legislative construction is found in Senator FERGUSON'S speech in favor of the "pursuance" clause (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 16, 1954, pp. 1790–91). He is a cosponsor and he said, and repeated for emphasis: "The amendment would prevent the delegation of executive, legislative or judicial power to an international organization." Thus, he says that the "pursuance" clause is the same as the old section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 130, which was subsequently revised by Senator BRICKER (sec. 2 of S. J. Res. 1, January 1953 version) and then dropped by the Judiciary Committee for good reason. The arguments of the Attorney General and the Secretary of State and other witnesses against the original section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 are set out in the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee hearings (see 1953 hearings, pp. 827, 913–918, 191 et seq.). In the 1952 report of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York (see 1953 hearings, p. 235, 241 et seq.), the evils of the original section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 130 are pointed out. The construction urged by Senator FERGUSON could outlaw the Baruch plan for the control of the atomic bomb, invalidate the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in many important respects, and destroy the command structure of NATO.

Such a record gives ground for political misconstruction of the "pursuance" clause, and gives the basis for the possibility that there might even be urged upon a court a judicial misconstruction. The country should not be asked to adopt an amendment which means so many different things to so many different people.

Even the "conflicts" clause, standing alone, carries the severe risk of legislative misunderstanding. In 1905, it was argued in the Senate that Mr. Hays' proposed arbitration treaties were in conflict with the Constitution. The treaties were never ratified. (Vol. I, Willoughby on the Constitution, pp. 473–5.) Happily, this view has not prevailed subsequently, but it exemplifies the type of political opposition which is invited by the attempt to write a declaratory amendment.

There have been some hints that the "conflicts" clause contains a hidden "which" clause (majority report No. 412, Senate Judiciary Committee, pp. 3–8). A recent example of misinterpretation of the "conflicts" clause is in the article of Mr. Hatch in the September 1953 A. B. A. Journal, page 811, where he states that the "conflicts" clause (BRICKER, sec. 1, which KNOWLAND-FERGUSON carry over) would invalidate the Baruch plan.

An incorrect construction of the Knowland-Ferguson amendment at the legislative level is a hazard which would have to be faced at every turn. This could be fatal in impeding desirable action. There can be more confidence in a proper judicial construction than in a proper legislative construction, but restrictive senatorial construction could smother desirable agreements which would never reach the courts.

The only solution is to keep the Constitution unamended. This result is a legally sound one, and every day that passes indicates that it is the course which the people will reward at the polls. Just this week the Queens County Bar Association in Republican Queens County, New York City, went on record opposing any amendment of the Constitution, and the Topeka Bar Association in Kansas recorded its opposition to either the Bricker amendment or the Knowland substitute amendment.

Let's leave the Constitution alone.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of a telegram which I have received from Mr. Raymond Pitcairn, a Pennsylvania attorney. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRYN ATHYN, PA., *February 21, 1954.*
Hon. ALEXANDER B. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It is now apparent to all thoughtful citizens interested in the Constitution that passage of the Bricker amendment or of any compromise is impossible, even the compromise requiring merely that treaties must be made in pursuance of this Constitution rather than under the authority of the United States, as the Constitution now provides, was carried by a majority of but 1 vote—14 votes less than the two-thirds majority needed to pass. To further prolong debate will waste the time of the Senate and jeopardize a constructive legislative program. Let's preserve the Constitution as it is.

RAYMOND PITCAIRN.

PRICE SUPPORTS ON DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, over the past weekend I returned to my home State and found, as I expected, Minnesota's dairy farmers shocked and indignant over Secretary Benson's drastic action in announcing that dairy price supports would be slashed to the absolute minimum of 75 percent of parity on April 1. Our dairy leaders are protesting, and in no uncertain terms.

Twice before I have spoken at some length on this floor in protest against the Secretary's action. I want to repeat what I have said before. This body shall continue to hear my voice raised in vigorous protest until this administration reverses itself and shows some real concern for the dairy industry, or the Congress takes the situation into its own hands and does something about it.

I desire to emphasize that the protest from the dairy industry crosses party lines entirely; it is an economic protest, not a partisan protest. It is a cry for simple justice, a protest against being singled out and discriminated against. It is a protest that comes from members of all farm organizations, not just anyone. And it is a protest, I find, that includes many in its ranks who previously favored some degree of flexible price supports, but now have had exposed to them the ruthlessness with which this administration violates its promises about gradual adjustments.

Mr. President, these protests come from men of such stature as Frank Stone, general manager of Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc., and George N. Pederson, general manager of the Twin City Milk Producers Association.

Even James L. Morton, president of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation which had asked Secretary Benson to lower dairy supports to some degree, expressed surprise that Benson had gone as far as he did in lowering price supports.

Mr. President, even before Secretary Benson's action I had received indications that not all Farm Bureau groups in our State agreed with the national viewpoint of lower price supports.

I ask at this time unanimous consent that a letter from the Acoma Township Farm Bureau be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks, showing they are on record to continue with 90 percent of parity.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUTCHINSON, MINN., *February 9, 1954.*
The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Acoma Township Farm Bureau consisting of 33 members discussed "parities" at our last meeting. It was the decision of the group to continue with 90 percent parity.

We would appreciate you giving this your sincere consideration.

Sincerely,
O. C. ATHMANN,
President.
Mrs. FRED BERNHAGEN,
Secretary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, because I believe the Senate should know the reaction of Secretary Benson's action from a great dairying State, I also ask unanimous consent to have appear at this point in my remarks an article from the Minneapolis Star of February 16, entitled "Dairymen Rap Cut in Support—See 35 Million Loss of Income in Minnesota," and starting off:

Minnesota dairymen and farm leaders expressed surprise and indignation today at Secretary of Agriculture Benson's announcement Monday that dairy price supports would be lowered from 90 to 75 percent of parity April 1.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAIRYMEN RAP CUT IN SUPPORTS—SEE 35 MILLION LOSS OF INCOME IN MINNESOTA

(By Randall Hobart)

Minnesota dairymen and farm leaders expressed surprise and indignation today at Secretary of Agriculture Benson's announcement Monday that dairy price supports would be lowered from 90 to 75 percent of parity April 1.

Spokesmen for the industry, which last year accounted for 19.6 percent of the cash income of Minnesota farmers, viewed the action as a violation of President Eisenhower's promise that the conversion to a flexible system of price supports would be gradual.

On the basis of last year's production of roughly 290 million pounds of butter, the lower support rate could mean the loss of more than $20 million from this product alone.

Russel Schwandt, secretary of the Minnesota Farmers Union, upped this estimate to $35 million when income from all dairy products produced in the State is considered.

Schwandt said his organization would appeal to Congress for a reversal of Secretary Benson's decision.

Frank Stone, general manager of Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc., said he thinks it is unfair that dairymen were singled out for such a drastic reduction while the six basic crops are guaranteed 90 percent of parity support for another year.

He said the dairy industry is willing to go along with a gradual conversion to flexible supports but had not expected a reduction of more than 5 percent a year.

George N. Pederson, general manager of the Twin City Milk Producers Association, said the drop to 75 percent of parity support "comes as quite a shock."

Dairy farmers, he said, are going to find it difficult to understand why they were singled out to receive "75 percent of what is supposed to be a fair price" for their products.

James L. Morton, president of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, expressed surprise that Benson had gone as far as he did in lowering price supports. The Farm Bureau, he pointed out, had asked that the reduction be limited from 5 to 10 percent this year.

Morton said, however, that the lower prices on dairy products, particularly butter, should mean increased sales to consumers.

If surpluses in Government hands March 31 are kept off the market, he added, prices may move up from 75 percent of parity very soon.

Less optimistic about increased butter sales is E. Fred Koller, University of Minnesota professor of agricultural economics.

"I don't believe reducing the price of butter 8 cents a pound is going to affect consumption very much," he said. "Demand is very inelastic and it must be remembered that the price will still be high in relation to oleomargarine."

There is hope, though, that the lower price of butterfat will result in more sales of fluid milk, ice cream and some other dairy products, he said.

(In Washington the Agriculture Department listed the areas under Federal milk marketing orders where fluid milk prices are expected to drop 1 cent a quart April 1. Included were the Duluth-Superior, Wis., the Minneapolis-St. Paul, and the Sioux Falls-Mitchell, S. Dak., areas.)

While some farm leaders insist lower price supports will mean higher production, Koller doesn't think this will happen.

There is some possibility, he said, that marginal producers will be discouraged and shift out of the dairy business.

"Perhaps the most hopeful possibility, though, is that others who are not now in the dairy business will be discouraged from entering it," he said.

Koller, a close student of the dairy situation in Minnesota, has advocated temporary direct payments to dairy producers during a transition period from wartime price supports to free market price levels.

For consumers, the consequences of lower price supports appeared bright, but industry spokesmen agreed that supply channels may dry up completely just before the changeover April 1.

Frank Stone of Land O' Lakes said it is a foregone conclusion that manufacturers of butter will sell every pound to the Government right up to the deadline.

"No one who plans to produce 100,000 pounds of butter in that period, for example, is going to risk losing $8,000 by holding it himself," he said.

Stone also said there is a possibility that the drastic lowering of supports might eventually bring about a shortage of dairy products as discouraged farmers quit the business.

This, he said, would defeat the purpose of the price-support law, which is to insure an adequate supply for American consumers. He pointed out that the present butter surplus is only a 2½-month supply.

All of the comment reflected concern about Secretary Benson's plans for disposal of surplus dairy products now owned by the Government. Although he has said he will try to keep them out of the normal domestic market, he has also said he doesn't intend to let stocks spoil in storage.

The importance of the Secretary's forthcoming decision to Minnesotans is indicated by last year's farm-income statistics. They showed cash receipts of $241 million for dairy products, more than from beef cattle and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

sheep, and more than two-thirds as much as receipts from all field crops.

Last month Minnesota farmers produced more milk than in any previous January in history, according to the State Federal crop and livestock reporting service. The total was 751 million pounds, an increase of 4 percent over January 1952 and 2 percent above the record set in January 1943.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the article referred to points out that the dairy industry last year accounted for 19.6 percent of the cash income of Minnesota farmers.

The Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of February 21 estimated, and I might add very conservatively, that the change in support levels means a loss of $2,500,000 per month to Minnesota farmers.

Mr. President, what good is going to be accomplished by this blow to the dairy industry?

I challenge the Department of Agriculture to produce any real evidence to refute the doubts of E. Fred Koller, professor of agricultural economics at the University of Minnesota, that this move is going to have any substantial effect on increasing consumption of dairy products.

I point out, Mr. President, that Dr. Koller is one of our most eminent professors of agricultural economics. At the time the Secretary of Agriculture announced this price support reduction as a means of stimulating consumption, one of the most learned men in the country contradicted the Secretary's prediction.

I further want to make clear my conviction that rather than solve any problems, I believe this latest move by Secretary Benson is going to create new problems.

While the lowering of support may well force to the wall many small dairy operators with limited financial resources, it may at the same time force others to expand production to make up the loss in total income.

I ask consent to have printed in my remarks at this point a letter to the editor of the Northfield (Minn.) News of February 18, from Joel H. Schilling, a director of the Twin Cities Milk Producers Association, indicating that such is his reaction.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREDICTS MORE DAIRY PRODUCTS SURPLUSES

To the EDITOR:

It seems to me that Secretary of Agriculture Benson broke faith with the dairy industry and the dairy farmer in his pronouncement lowering dairy products support price to 75 percent of parity as of April 1.

Shortly after becoming Secretary, he told dairy interests of the country that they had to come up with a self-help program by April 1 or else he would take it into his own hands. Three months ago such a proposal was given him by the National Milk Producers Federation, the voice of half a million dairy farmers, and he has chosen not to heed their suggestions on handling surpluses and stabilizing dairy prices.

His 75 percent of parity will in the long run defeat the very purpose for which it was meant. By reducing butter prices to the consumer approximately 8 cents a pound, it will no doubt clear out some of the Government's holdings. And what butter manufacturing plant is going to hold as much as 1 pound from now until the first of April?

But let's look at it from the dairy farmer's angle.

His take-home pay has been cut 15 percent while still feeding feeds supported at 90 percent of parity to produce a cheaper product. What is he going to do to meet past-due bills, ever-increasing taxes and rising overhead in quality control equipment?

He's going to put in 2 or 3 more cows, step up his volume so that, his 75 percent of parity product brings him the same return as a lesser volume under 90 percent.

The probable net result: much more milk, more butter, more surpluses.

I, as a dairyman, feel that this singling out of dairying for a reduced support program is unjustified at this time in view of the ever-increasing sales promotion program by the American Dairy Association and surplus disposal as outlined in the National Milk Producers Federation proposal.

Furthermore, the adoption of these proposals would give us a prospect of realizing a fair price for our product without Federal control of every dairy farm in the country.

JOEL H. SCHILLING,
Director, TCMPA.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, all the slide rules in the Department of Agriculture cannot take into consideration the human element involved in this setback for family farmers depending primarily on dairy products for income.

Fortunately some people have concern for human values as well as statistics.

Such is the letter I have here from Rev. Allen G. Hagstrom, pastor of the Foxhome Lutheran Church at Foxhome, Minn., asking me to continue the fight I am making against this blow to the dairy industry. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOXHOME LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Foxhome, Minn., February 17, 1954.

The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In my humble opinion, Secretary Benson's decision to drop the support to 75 percent on dairy products is going to work a terrific hardship on the small farmers of this community. The drop seems to be too drastic.

Please continue to fight against this move against the dairy industry.

Respectfully,

REV. ALLEN G. HAGSTROM.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, perhaps one of the finest editorials I have seen on this entire subject appeared in last week's issue of the Grand Rapids Herald-Review, of Grand Rapids, Minn., of which Larry Rossman is the fine and humane editor.

He very rightly looks at this problem through the eyes of human beings—hard-working men and women, who are having a lifetime of work destroyed.

Mr. President, there are cut-over areas of northern Minnesota where an entire generation has been spent in back-breaking toil clearing stumps and brush to convert wasted land into productive small-family farms. Dairy farming has been found to be the most advisable form of farming in these areas, and our extension agents and university experts have guided these people into dairying as the most efficient use of their limited resources. Yet they are the very people who will be hit hardest by this change. They are the ones some people callously write off as "marginal farmers," and say they will simply have to go out of business. What does Secretary Benson propose they do for a livelihood?

This problem is effectively analyzed in Mr. Rossman's editorial entitled "A Tragedy for Minnesota," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRAGEDY FOR MINNESOTA

Any reduction in the price supports for dairy products will be a high economic crime against agriculture in Minnesota and, particularly, northeastern Minnesota. That statement is not based upon provincial selfishness which believes that controls should be applied to other areas, products, and industries and not applied to these parts and their people. There are basic and good reasons why dairy production should always be encouraged. Discouragement will be a blow and, perhaps, a disaster.

Take a little look at the past and the present in this neck of the woods. This was the land of the pine and the big trees. The pine was cut. Stumps which constantly became harder remained. Brush and smaller trees took over where the logger had made his way. Then came those who would convert stumps and brush into farms. They made great strides in that task by the most heroic form of agriculture that exists. They cut out the stumps with axe and grubhoe, smoothed their fields with their arms and backs and made homes and homesteads by the most slow and difficult processes.

As these farms developed, their place in the scheme of agriculture became very apparent. These smaller fields are not adaptable to commercial growth of grains. The climate does not permit a sure corn crop and several factors limit the area in hog and beef production. The potato was, and still is, a staple root crop but small fields in this area are finding competition in the great fields of the Red River valley where planting and cultivation is most efficient and disease may be treated from the air. As the timbered area of Minnesota has grown it has become evident that the principal agricultural production must be in the form of milk and butterfat, that the cow must produce and enrich the land on which she lives.

The process of bringing the dairy production to its present level has taken a long, hard generation. Not only were the fields to be cleared and the barns built, but the area had to come to the realization that the cow was the basis of its farm life. It takes a long time to build dairy herds and a long time to make a generation of frontier farmers into capable dairymen. Nor does it take time to make any kind of a dairy herd but it takes a much longer time to build a profitable herd, to equip the farm as it should be made ready and develop the markets, near or far. The process of building a strong dairy industry in northeastern Minnesota has been brave, intelligent, and slow. To discourage that which is still building will strike not only at the pocketbook but the heart and the spirit of this great area.

Northeastern Minnesota is making some great economic progress. There is great employment in mines and the vast new plants which mark a new day in iron. Employment is marked by a high general wage level and increasing earnings based upon skill. Business in the communities is prosperous. By what line of reasoning should a great industrial area buy its milk, butter, and cheese at a price which will discourage, and perhaps

destroy, the neighboring farmers who produce these things? Of course that question strikes to the whole theory of partity prices, an issue too long for a column.

If there is too much wheat, the acreage of wheat can be reduced and should surpluses disappear those acres are ready and willing to go to work. The corn crop can be reduced and expanded almost at will. This is more true of pork than of beef. The dairy herd can be reduced and its production discouraged and decreased. Within a year or two the Nation might not have the milk that it needs and the damage of one thoughtless year can be overcome only through long years of slow restoration of the dairy herds. The dairy industry is a precious and sensitive thing. The belief that it can be put into the same economic straitjacket as corn and cotton is not even sensible. The willingness to milk cows and to manage dairy herds requires time and discipline. A lack of confidence that hard work will not be repaid will do damage beyond repair.

There are still other considerations. If there is too much wheat, people of the Nation will not eat it. Surplus potatoes will spoil. But America has never seen the day in which it had more milk than it could consume. There are millions of children who do not have the milk they need. There are millions of homes without butter and cheese. There are ways to sell things.

The automobile makers sell their cars. The boozemakers sell their alcohol. The merchant with too many winter clothes in a warm fall sells his surplus, and when his inventories are down he is back in the market. The encouraging thing about dairy products is that there is a vast and unsatisfied market; and if the Government wishes to dispose of a surplus, it can do so by the rapid process of reducing prices and the slower process of stimulating basic demand. In the process of establishing a fair price for dairy production there may be times of temporary surplus, a condition greatly to be preferred over a contingency of long-continued shortage. The children of America can grow stronger with the use of more milk. The cost of having that blessing is but pennies compared to the dollars that the United States spends for bombers and cruel devices maintained to destroy other lands and create greater hunger throughout the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to make one or two observations with reference to the editorial in the Grand Rapids Herald-Review and to read some passages from it:

Take a little look at the past and the present in this neck of the woods. This was the land of the pine and the big trees. The pine was cut. Stumps which constantly became harder remained. Brush and smaller trees took over where the logger had made his way. Then came those who would convert stumps and brush into farms. They made great strides in that task by the most heroic form of agriculture that exists. They cut out the stumps with ax and grubhoe, smoothed their fields with their arms and backs, and made homes and homesteads by the most slow and difficult processes.

As these farms developed, their place in the scheme of agriculture became very apparent. These smaller fields are not adaptable to commercial growth of grains. The climate does not permit a sure corn crop and several factors limit the area in hog and beef production. The potato was, and still is, a staple root crop but small fields in this area are finding competition in the great fields of the Red River Valley where planting and cultivation is most efficient and disease may be treated from the air. As the timbered area of Minnesota has grown it has become evident that the principal agricultural production must be in the form of milk and butterfat, that the cow must produce and enrich the land on which she lives.

The process of bringing the dairy production to its present level has taken a long, hard, generation. Not only were the fields to be cleared and the barns built, but the area has to come to the realization that the cow was the basis of its farm life. It takes a long time to build dairy herds and a long time to make a generation of frontier farmers into capable dairymen. Not only does it take time to make any kind of a dairy herd, but it takes a much longer time to build a profitable herd, to equip the farm as it should be made ready and develop the markets, near or far. The process of building a strong dairy industry in northeastern Minnesota has been brave, intelligent, and slow. To discourage that which is still building will strike not only at the pocketbook, but at the heart and the spirit of this great area.

Northeastern Minnesota is making some great economic progress. There is great employment in mines and the vast new plants which mark a new day in iron. Employment is marked by a high general wage level and increasing earnings based upon skill. Business in the communities is prosperous. By what line of reasoning should a great industrial area buy its milk, butter, and cheese at a price which will discourage and perhaps destroy the neighboring farmers who produce these things? Of course that question strikes at the whole theory of parity prices, an issue too long for a column.

If there is too much wheat, the acreage of wheat can be reduced and should surpluses disappear those acres are ready and willing to go to work. The corn crop can be reduced and expanded almost at will. This is more true of pork than of beef. The dairy herd can be reduced and its production discouraged and decreased. Within a year or two the Nation might not have the milk that it needs and the damage of one thoughtless year—

I emphasize what Mr. Rossman says in his editorial—

Within a year or two the Nation might not have the milk that it needs and the damage of 1 thoughtless year can be overcome only through long years of slow restoration of the dairy herds. The dairy industry is a precious and sensitive thing. The belief that it can be put into the same economic straitjacket as corn and cotton is not even sensible. The willingness to milk cows and to manage dairy herds requires time and discipline. A lack of confidence that hard work will not be repaid will do damage beyond repair.

Mr. President, I have read portions of the editorial. I commend the entire editorial to the reading of every Member of this body. It is one of the finest editorials I have ever read on the subject. Not only does it cite solid economic facts but also great humanitarian motivations.

Mr. President, many of our dairy farmers are meeting today in the Glencoe area of Minnesota, trying to decide where to turn in the face of the disastrous blow against them by a Department supposedly devoted to protecting the interests of agriculture.

They called this meeting, Mr. President, before Secretary Benson announced the full extent of the proposed drop in dairy supports. They called it in protest to what they expected would be only a drop to 85 or 80 percent. I can well imagine their feelings today, as they are faced with only 75 percent support.

They feel, and very rightly, that Secretary Benson has failed them.

I have here a copy of a letter to Secretary Benson from John F. Albrecht, a veteran Glencoe dairy farmer, setting forth such views.

I wish to read the covering note he sent me, which accompanied the copy to me of the letter he wrote to Secretary Benson:

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: My first personal contact with you was out at Lake Marion, at our McLeod County Farm Bureau picnic while you were still mayor of Minneapolis. Much has happened since that time—some good, some bad. The last time I saw you we were on the same stack of winter wheat at Montgomery, where we visited and pitched bundles. Keep up the battle for the Midwest, and I am sure the people will back you up.

JOHN F. ALBRECHT.

GLENCOE, MINN.

If any of my colleagues do not know what it is like to pitch bundles of wheat, I invite them to Minnesota to try it. They would have a little higher regard for the farmer, I am sure.

Mr. President, because it so well expresses the overwhelming sentiment of Minnesota farmers I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Albrecht's letter to Secretary Benson printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, together with my wired reply.

There being no objection, the letter and the telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLENCOE, MINN., *February 15, 1954.*

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inasmuch as the annual meeting of the Glencoe Butter & Produce Association will be held soon, being chairman of this organization, I feel that I should write to you in regard to the many problems that seem to be uppermost in the minds of many of our patrons.

It has always been my understanding that the Department of Agriculture, as represented by the Federal Government of which you are Secretary, should be the best friend of agriculture and the dairy farmer. From the statements of press and over the radio, it appears that we do not have a sympathetic and understanding view presented of our problem. We would expect that men who have no direct interest in agriculture would be critical and unsympathetic. For example, in a recent Dairy Record issue, of which we receive a copy in our plant, a writer stated that as far as he is concerned and for the farmers, it would be perfectly all right if butter did go down to 15 cents a pound. Without a doubt, this means that the income and his financial status is such that he would not be very much upset if the dairy farmers of the Midwest area were put through the wringer. We all know of a statement which you are credited with having made, that in order to get Congress to approve that of which you wish to carry out, you would be willing to take it to the 140 million consumers. Certainly we have enough adverse publicity and criticism of the dairy industry particularly as it refers to the dairy farmers. It seems to me that those with whom you have surrounded yourself with, and who are advising you as how to carry out this new farm program, particularly as it deals with the dairy products—specifically butter—do not have a true picture of the situation.

We here in the Midwest are in the area that, by reason of its location, must sell our milk and cream for manufacturing purposes. We are not so fortunate as those men who happen to live in the protected area of the thickly populated seacoast, southern, and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

central areas of the United States. Therefore, the amount that we receive per hundred weight for our production on the supposed-to-be of 90 percent of parity—which was the support up until this time but is actually only 84 percent—does not compare at all with those more favorably located. I feel that it is very unfortunate that we don't get more sympathetic hearing from your office.

I have gone through the period of time after the First World War, when I started farming, when the break in farm prices of 1921–22 almost wiped me out. I also survived the break of 1932 although there were times in that period when I could not make my interest payments and it was a very severe jolt. As far as I am concerned, my most productive years are past. I have managed to survive these other breaks but I am very much concerned about the young men who have been encouraged by GI loans and some assistance from home to venture into farming, particularly dairying in this county where 55 percent of our total net income is derived from dairy products. Certainly if the trend that you seem to be advocating from your Office and the unfavorable publicity which we get each day from all sources—what can I tell these young men will be the future of the dairy industry?

The only fair publicity that the Twin City press (mainly the Star Journal) ever gave agriculture was when my friend, John Brandt, gave to them as a paid advertisement, a picture with a full page cut of what the dairy farmer is able to earn and what his total pay is for each hour's work that he does as a good dairy farmer. In that statement, John Brandt stated that the better dairy farmer was receiving 54 cents an hour for his labor in his dairy, and since that time there have been 6 increases in freight rates and 3 major increases in salary of all nonagricultural workers. Since his death, it would appear that we have no one to present our cause to the public. I wonder if you appreciate what a 70-percent increase in freight rates and how it affects a small dairy plant as they buy equipment and supplies and ship their products to the eastern markets, how big a cut it makes in the rates that we get, and how great has been the increase in cost of equipment because of the high labor and freight charges that are made against these materials.

Inasmuch as we would like to help ourselves through advertising, and ADA, and when you in your office appear to be very critical and not too much concerned about our problem by saying that butter is too high priced, how can we overcome all adverse publicity from the many papers and over the radio? Does 54 cents an hour seem unreasonable pay for a dairy farmer? In spite of the fact that you plan to cut dairy supports to 80 percent (and perhaps lower, I suppose, if Congress had not established a 75 to 90 percent parity basis) you would even be tempted to cut it lower and thereby you hope to get more butter on the tables of the consumer at a lower price.

I have noticed that certain products which we as farmers have to sell, have been cut rather drastically in price in the last year. I have also noted, and I have tried to follow this very carefully, that instead of those products being sold cheaper to the consumer, that immediately the increased cost of labor and perhaps a little wider margin for the wholesaler and the retailer who handle these products has absorbed the decrease that was noted in the farm product and when it was sold, it still did not reflect 10 percent of the actual cut that we received on our products.

If this is true in butter, cheese, and other dairy products, regardless of where you finally stabilize it, you have so embittered the average consumer by constant talk of high-cost of butter in relation to the other things that we also as consumers must buy, it has not been fair or justified. The question remains in my mind as to whether the consumer will benefit and really use these dairy products that you are hoping to dispose of.

I wish you could be present with us at our meeting on March 3 as we shall endeavor to discuss our mutual problems as dairy farmers, that you could have lunch with us; and that you could tell us what your plans are and perhaps give us some assurance that we yet have a sympathetic and understanding leadership at the head of the Department of Agriculture. However, with the press of your duties and many engagements, I suppose this would be impossible, but I am hopeful that you will answer this letter so that I may have your answer to be read at our annual meeting.

I am very thankful that we have some men in Congress and otherwise who yet will stand up to defend us in this area. I am particularly thinking of Senators Ed Thye, and Hubert Humphrey, Representatives J. P. O'Hara, and August Andresen, and like Ancher Nelsen, the national REA administrator, who is willing to stand up against Fred Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of Interior, who appears to be very much opposed to our REA cooperatives, and I believe to all our cooperators, and our now deceased friend, John Brandt, who perhaps was agriculture's best voice, and who knew and understood what our needs were and who so often came to Washington to give a picture of what our problems were here in the Midwest.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Land O' Lakes because of the great work he did; Senators Thye and Humphrey; Representatives J. P. O'Hara and August Andresen; and Ancher Nelsen. These men are my personal friends and I value their friendship.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. ALBRECHT.

SENATE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1954.

JOHN F. ALBRECHT,
Glencoe, Minn.:

Congratulations on your fine letter to Secretary Benson. Please inform your dairy friends at their meeting Wednesday that I shall be carrying on my fight for their protection on the Senate floor, as I plan speaking on the dairy problem Wednesday in the Senate. I will call your letter to the attention of the Senate. I am cosponsoring with Senator THYE a bill to prevent the drastic slash proposed by Secretary Benson on April 1.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, protest against Secretary Benson's move is not enough to avoid this devastating blow.

We need action, and we need it quick.

On February 16, in speaking at length in protest of Secretary Benson's action, I presented to this body a copy of an amendment proposed by the National Milk Producers Federation to prevent such a drastic decline, and urged its favorable consideration by the Agriculture Committee.

On February 17, my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, introduced that amendment in bill form.

On February 18, I commended his action, and associated myself as cosponsor of the bill, S. 2962.

The same measure has been introduced in the House by several Representatives.

Mr. President, I sincerely believe it is a moderate backstop proposal to protect the dairy industry upon which this Congress can agree.

While not in itself resolving the future support level, it would prevent dairy supports from being dropped more than 5 percent in any 1 year, and would provide that dairy products be treated the same as other basic commodities rather than be discriminated against.

I today urge immediate action on the part of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry toward holding hearings and reporting this bill in advance of broader general farm legislation upon which the committee is diligently working.

There has been some talk of holding this proposal in abeyance until a new farm bill is reported to the Senate for action.

Being realistic, I do not see how the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will have such new legislation ready for us to act upon before April 1.

I wish to call attention of this body to the fact that April 1 is the deadline for the drop in dairy prices proposed by Secretary Benson. I urge as vigorously as I know how that we push for enactment of Senate bill 2962 prior to that date so as to avoid a welter of confusion in our dairy markets.

Giving priority to this bill would merely require the Secretary to hold in abeyance any lowering of the dairy support price until the Congress has reached a considered judgment on what to do about all basic commodities, and then to stipulate that any reduction be not more than 5 percent a year.

I appeal to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at least to give the dairy industry that much consideration—to act now to avert the course Secretary Benson proposes, until the Committee and the Congress have had time to reach a sound and wise decision on the future course of our farm policies.

In fact, I digress to say, I appeal to the Secretary of Agriculture to repudiate the action he has taken, to reverse his field, and to come back to a sensible program of dairy price supports. Surely by now he must have heard the voice of American farm people. Surely, by now he must know that the course he has set himself upon can lead only to economic difficulty. I hope our President will call the Secretary of Agriculture to his office, to remind the Secretary of his obligations to the American agricultural community.

As I have previously pointed out in the Senate, I had earlier urged Secretary Benson to adopt that course voluntarily—to hold up any adverse action until the Congress itself had made important decisions which must be made, decisions not only on support levels but on surplus disposal.

In all fairness, it must be recognized that the entire foundation upon which Secretary Benson made his decision might well be changed by programs this Congress could well enact for surplus disposal, and for wiser use of our abundance.

A few days ago I commented upon the press release of the Secretary of Agriculture, when he announced the drastic reduction in price-support levels. I want the Senate to know that the Secretary then said that our surplus stocks of dairy products were in good shape;

they were not spoiling. I ask the Senate to remember, and if they will refer to the RECORD, they will see, the exact words the Secretary of Agriculture used in giving the reason for the surpluses today. The reason was primarily, twofold:

First, the unusual weather conditions for two winters had encouraged increased dairy production.

Second, beef prices had been so low that farmers had not culled their herds and had not sold many of their dairy cows, which they would ordinarily have sold. The reason why they have not sold them is that when one can obtain only $5 or $6 a hundred pounds for a good dairy cow, it is not a sale; it is an outright giveaway of a great farm asset.

The Secretary of Agriculture continued by pointing out that for 4 years there has been a 90-percent price support on dairy products, and that in each of the 4 years up to to last year the demand and the supply had been relatively in balance. By his own words in the press release he has taken this precipitate action because of two factors: first, because beef prices are down; second, the weather has been unusual. I say that if the Secretary of Agriculture intends to make economic decisions based on the nature of the weather in the wintertime, America will have a very unpredictable agricultural economy.

Until we have had time to consider and act on such programs, therefore, I urge immediate hearings and action on Senate bill 2962 as at least temporary protection for the dairy industry.

As further justification for deferring any change in dairy-support prices until action has been taken on various surplus disposal and use programs, I ask at this time to have printed in the RECORD a communication from the National Milk Producers Federation, accompanying an outline of one such constructive proposal.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: You are well aware of the adverse publicity which the dairy industry receives daily through cartoons, editorials, and columnist comments. Butter is being used as the whipping-boy in reporting on the stocks of dairy products held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. As a matter of fact, the current inventory of CCC butter represents only about 2½ months' supply. However, serious consideration must be given to the problem of its disposal.

The National Milk Producers Federation has a proposal which we are confident will move butter to the consuming public. A brief explanation is attached. We hope it merits your support.

Very truly yours,

E. M. NORTON,
Executive Director, National Milk Producers Federation.

SURPLUS BUTTER DISPOSAL AS PROPOSED BY NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION

A sound and feasible proposal was submitted to the United States Department of Agriculture many weeks ago by the National Milk Producers Federation. In spite of the acute situation created by the butter surplus and the need for prompt action, no steps have been taken to put the proposal into effect.

In brief, the proposal contemplates the releasing by Commodity Credit Corporation of its stocks of butter into the domestic channels of trade at a reduced price which will reflect a lower price to the ultimate consumer.

The CCC will sell its bulk butter stocks to printers (commercial packagers) of butter at a price which, when averaged with the market price (approximately the support price), will move CCC butter out of storage. It is recommended that CCC start its program at a price level which would involve as little loss as possible on Government stocks. This price level can gradually be lowered until the consumer acceptance price is reached. As the stocks move and become short, this level could be raised so as to keep CCC losses at a minimum. The quantity of CCC butter to be made available to each printer would be a percentage of the quantity of butter handled by him in the regular channels of trade during a base period selected by the Department of Agriculture.

To illustrate:

	Per pound
CCC price to printers (may be higher or lower)	$0.30
Market price paid by printer	.65
Total	.95
Average	.47½

The $0.47½ per pound would be the price printers of butter would charge for all the butter handled, both CCC stock and regular commercial stock.

With an approximate $0.10 per pound markup, the price to the ultimate consumer would be $0.57½ per pound, or $0.17½ less than the present retail price of about $0.75 per pound.

FEBRUARY 10, 1954.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We need answers to some of these proposals, Mr. President, before we can make a wise determination on support levels.

I have endeavored to report as fairly as I know how the sentiment of the dairy industry in Minnesota against Secretary Benson's action.

I spoke to more than 3,500 good farmers at Moorhead, Minn., on Monday of this week, and spent more than 2½ hours visiting with them. They spoke to me about their unhappiness and their feeling of being let down by the proposals of the Department of Agriculture.

I would be remiss in objective reporting, however, if I did not also state, with profound regret, that our largest newspaper, the Minneapolis Star, has chosen to side with Secretary Benson against the dairy interest of our own State.

My views of the constructive rather than negative role that great newspaper should and could be occupying at this time are set forth in a letter to the editor of the Star, which I shall presently read to the Senate.

Again, I say, Mr. President, that I shall return to this subject again and again. The Senate will continue to hear about milk and dairy products until it acts constructively in the dairy industry's behalf.

If the Republican committeemen who so delight in reporting to my State the costs required to publish my remarks in the RECORD desire to do so on this subject, they are welcome to do it. The costs, which would be unnecessary if the administration would take proper care of the problems confronting our country, are picayune compared to the $2,500,000 monthly loss now threatened to our State's dairy industry.

At this time I desire to read into the RECORD my letter of February 22, 1954, to the editor of the Minneapolis Star:

FEBRUARY 22, 1954.

The EDITOR,
The Minneapolis Star,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: Now, if ever, every newspaper in Minnesota should rise above partisan considerations and assert their influence and leadership in behalf of the economic welfare of our State by coming to the defense of the dairy industry. It is discouraging and shocking to see the largest newspaper in the Midwest turn its back on our own economic interest as well as ignore the human considerations involved.

Minnesota's congressional delegation, on the whole, has put partisanship aside in fighting to protect our agricultural economy. It has particularly done so on the crucial dairy issue now before us. Senator THYE and I are standing shoulder to shoulder against the drastic cut of dairy supports to 75 percent of parity; we are cosponsoring an amendment to prevent that from happening. Every Member of the Minnesota delegation except one is against this drastic slash in dairy support; why am I alone selected for critical treatment in your editorials? We should be entitled to your support, rather than your opposition, for such unity in behalf of Minnesota's interests.

Your two recent editorials, Farmers Should Back Cut in Dairy Supports (February 16), and Better Plan, Senator? (February 18) are a distinct disservice to Minnesota's dairy industry, Minnesota's economy, and Minnesota's progress. They are misleading. They are factually wrong.

They are a blow against Minnesota's entire dairy industry. They reflect unfavorably on the sound judgment and reasonable views of the most experienced spokesmen for the dairy industry in our State. They challenge without foundation the views of the National Milk Producers Federation, the National Creameries Association, the Dairy Cooperative Institute, and many other such groups which are appealing for constructive help, not a stab in the back for the great industry they serve.

Farmers have a right to expect your help, not your opposition. This is not just a political issue. It is more than even just an economic issue, even though I do not see how you can so easily write off an estimated drop of $600 million in dairy income, a sizable amount of which would be right in our own State. By your own conservative estimates, Minnesota's loss in dairy income will amount to at least $2,500,000 a month.

When you talk rather callously about "some marginal farmers may be forced out of business," you are talking about hard-working people, human beings, and their life's work.

May I ask what you intend doing with the family farmers up in our cutover areas of northern Minnesota who "may be forced out of business?" What do you suggest these people, who have devoted a generation to converting old stump land into productive small operations of family dairy farms, do for a livelihood? Do you ask them to write-off as a readjustment their back-breaking toil of making formerly wasteland useful, and abandon it to brush once more?

I respectfully call your attention to a statesmanlike editorial written by editor Larry Rossman in the Grand Rapids Herald-Review of February 18—an editorial entitled to your thoughtful consideration, and one which I believe should be brought to the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

attention of all Minnesota people not fully understanding all that is involved in this dairy issue.

You have been great champions of soil conservation; yet no pattern of farming is more conducive to good conservation than dairy farming. Are you now encouraging Minnesota farmers to turn instead to only soil-depleting crops to make a living?

Both the facts and the assumptions of your editorials are open to serious question. You say support was kept at too high a level a year ago, and that a drop in support even then would have curtailed production and brought more consumer sales.

Even Secretary Benson doesn't agree with you. He says that when he fixed support level a year ago, and I quote him: "CCC stocks of dairy products were relatively low. Production of milk and butterfat had been about equal to demand during the previous four years when prices of milk and butterfat had been supported."

Secretary Benson says factors other than price brought excess production. Again I quote: "Among the factors that affected production during the past year were a repetition of mild winter weather which brought abundant pastures and increased off-season dairy production. In addition, drought forced beef cattle sales and a drop in prices which resulted in the holding in northern areas of cows which otherwise would have been culled from dairy herds."

Professor Koller, in your own columns, disputes your contention that the reduction in support level will lead to increased consumption.

You are factually wrong in saying that "No other real plan other than what is being followed has been proposed."

In good faith, the National Milk Producers Federation accepted Secretary Benson's invitation to come up with a new program. It did so. After long study it adopted a constructive dairy self-help plan at Houston last November, and submitted it to Secretary Benson—a plan proposed by a half million dairy producers, embodying the aims long fought for by Minnesota's own great John Brandt.

Secretary Benson rejected that proposal, and recommended instead that we keep the law as it now stands—then used that law to pull the rug out from under the industry to the maximum extent he could.

The National Milk Producers Federation went further, and recommended a specific domestic surplus disposal program—not the dumping overseas to which you so surprisingly refer, after your endorsement of plans to subsidize the butter for Russia.

Again, no action has been taken on surplus disposal—when that job should have been tackled before even considering the support level for the future.

Plenty of other plans, and sound plans, were advanced for Mr. Benson's consideration. The National Creameries Association recommended use of some form of compensatory payment, to protect the producer while permitting free market prices to the consumer. The dairy industry has stepped up its own sales promotion and advertising; producers have contributed willingly to such efforts. You are unfair to intimate the industry has not sought, constructively, to meet its own problems.

So you see there were other plans, both before Secretary Benson and before the Congress.

Because Congress has some of these other plans under consideration, I felt and still feel Secretary Benson acted prematurely in announcing the extreme reduction in support prices before the Agriculture Committees of Congress had completed their hearings and reached some decision.

Rather than just attack Secretary Benson after lowering the support level, as you infer, I had appealed to him in advance, for the sake of our dairy industry, not to change the dairy support level until Congress had determined what future policies and programs for agriculture should be.

Spokesmen for the dairy trade now confirm my warning to Secretary Benson that any advance announcement of intent to drop the support level would only lead to mass dumping of private inventories of butter onto the Government, from which they will be able to buy it back cheaper after April 1.

You wind up your editorial with a personal challenge, saying if I have a better plan than the administration's I should announce it.

May I remind you that the responsibility is with the administration which asked the people of America to put that responsibility in its hands? I remind you to look back at your own headline of Saturday, September 6, 1952, saying "Eisenhower Calls for 100 Percent of Parity," on an article starting:

"Dwight D. Eisenhower made his bid for the important farm vote today with a plan which he said would guarantee present price supports for another 2 years and then would lead to higher prices for the farmers.

"He called for a wider range of farm crop supports including greater protection for producers of perishable products such as meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables."

May I remind you further that Candidate Eisenhower in speaking specifically of perishables such as milk at Kasson said: "We can and will find a sound way to do the job."

I did not know, Mr. Editor, that the administration was waiting for a "Humphrey plan."

Yet, contrary to your partisan attacks, I have approached this problem constructively. Rather than just criticize, I have offered specific suggestions—to the Congress, to the Agricultural Committee, to Secretary Benson. I am sure if you were as devoted to reporting my activities in the Congress as you are to searching for ways to criticize my efforts you would be more familiar with my repeated recommendations that are now gaining increased support.

In introducing a price-support bill a year ago to carry out the recommendations of the Minnesota State Legislature, I specifically called for the Secretary to make use of a series of alternative methods of support which I outlined to avoid sole dependence on Government purchase and storage.

Rather than risk the kind of harmful overseas dumping of any of our surplus commodities to which you refer, I cosponsored a resolution calling for creation of international food reserves through the United Nations—a proposal subsequently given considerable support by the U. N. Food and Agricultural Organization.

Further, I emphasized that the dairy problem should be first approached from the standpoint of developing new outlets for dairy products—and offered specific means for doing so. I refer you to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 1, 1953, outlining my dairy diet dividend recommendations for increasing consumption of butter and milk among our aged people and dependent children. I refer you further to my cosponsorship with Senator AIKEN of a food stamp plan to put surplus commodities into the hands of low-income families.

Unfortunately, for a newspaper so free with its critical comments, you seem surprisingly uninformed on the constructive proposals that are before the Congress for meeting some of our serious agricultural problems.

It would be more encouraging if your own record was as constructive in proposing positive ways and means of meeting our problems.

For example, I would certainly welcome your support in opposing the $15 million slash in our school lunch program the administration now proposes. We should be expanding rather than limiting the opportunities for use of health-giving dairy products in the diets of our future citizens.

Do you really believe, Mr. Editor, that every American boy and girl is getting all the milk he or she wants, or should have?

If not, don't you think it would be more constructive on your part to use your influence toward seeing they get such an opportunity, rather than suggest that it's time to force some of our small dairy producers out of business?

Minnesota's dairy industry needs your help, not your hindrance.

Minnesota is recognized nationwide as a great dairy State. Our dairy industry deserves united support. We need the kind of unity in its behalf we have shown toward creating the new taconite industry. Won't you help provide the leadership for that unity?

Instead of your present negative approach, why doesn't the Star and its associated publishing interests throw the full weight of its resources and influence into a campaign for expanding the school-lunch program, providing milk and other dairy products to the aged and needy as a supplement to their meager public-assistance aid, increasing the dried-milk content of bread and other bakery products, and otherwise increasing the uses and outlets for our great dairy resources?

Until the Star awakens to the need for greater concern about the Midwest's agricultural economy, however, I assure you I shall fight on as vigorously as I know how to protect the interests of our great State, alone, if need be, but welcoming your help if you will give it.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Finally, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we now have less than a month and a half in which to take some remedial action. I hope that the Senate will at least stay the order of the Secretary of Agriculture in order to give the Congress time to review the basic legislation and the effect of the Secretary's order and also give time for producers to be heard and to bring their views to the attention of the appropriate committees of the Congress.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] inserting, on page 3, after line 9, a new section.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate for any extended period of time because already there has been lengthy debate on the proposed amendment of the Constitution. I do, however, wish to call the attention of the Senate once again to the fact that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio makes a substantial change in the present treatymaking provisions of the Constitution.

Article VI of the Constitution now reads, in part:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or

which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

Then, in article II, section 2, which deals with the powers of the President of the United States, the following is provided:

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors.

In addition to that, section 10 of article I of the Constitution provides:

No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation.

Taken in conjunction with those provisions, the following language in the 10th amendment to the Constitution, the last amendment of the so-called Bill of Rights, I think, makes it very clear where the treatymaking power rests:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

It seems to me to be very clear that the treatymaking power was specifically intended to rest in the Federal Government, that the States were to be denied the treatymaking power, and that the framers of the Constitution felt that, with the necessity for ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, adequate safeguards would be provided.

What I believe has caused concern in recent years has been the unusual wording of article VI of the Constitution. It was for that reason that the proposal was made, after widespread discussion, regarding the necessity of making a change in article VI. It is said that the provision, "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof," correctly indicates that the framers of the Constitution expected that every treaty would have to be measured within the general outlines of the Constitution; and that if a treaty did not conform with the Constitution, the treaty could be struck down by the courts.

However, when the framers of the Constitution proceeded to deal with treaties, they did not follow the same language, by saying that treaties had to be made in pursuance of the Constitution; but they stated that—

All treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

Certainly we can now understand—and that is particularly true of those who have read the debates in the Constitutional Convention—that this particular language was made necessary because of the fact that prior to the adoption of the Constitution itself, the Government of the United States had entered into certain treaties with Great Britain and with France, which obviously would not have been made in pursuance of the Constitution, since at that time there was no Constitution.

Mr. President, I am frank to say that it seems almost impossible to believe that the framers of the Constitution themselves considered there was any loophole in the Constitution which would permit a treaty to upset the Constitution or to cut across it. However, later court decisions and the passage of time and some of the developments which have occurred in the world at least make it reasonable to believe that at some future time the provision relative to treaties might constitute a very material loophole in the Constitution.

It seems to me that if we, as prudent citizens of the United States, and having responsibilities as Senators of the United States, believe there is such a danger, we should forthwith proceed to eliminate that potential. The Senate has already done that by the vote which already has been taken regarding the amendment to article VI of the Constitution.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GRISWOLD. There has been much discussion in this general field, to the effect that if something is not stated in the Constitution, there must be some reason why it was not stated there.

In reading article VI, I note in the last part of the second paragraph this statement:

And all treaties * * * shall be the supreme law of the land * * * anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

Does not my colleague feel that if the framers of the Constitution had intended that nothing in the Constitution of the United States should stand in the way of a treaty, they would have so stated? In other words, is it not proper to infer that the framers of the Constitution believed the Constitution would be supreme over a treaty, for the Constitution specifically provides, in article VI, that "anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

In other words, they provided that nothing in the constitution or laws of any State should stand in the way of a treaty. So if they had intended treaties to override the Constitution, would not they have so stated at that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think they would have. But the other argument might also be made, namely, that in dealing with the constitutions or laws of the States they expected that the State constitutions or State laws would be laid aside if they conflicted with the supreme law of the land.

Of course "the supreme law of the land," as I have understood it to be, does not mean that a treaty is supreme in the sense that it is supreme and above the Constitution; but the meaning is that a treaty is to be a part of the supreme law of the land, of which the Constitution—at least, to me—is the first and superior part; and then come laws made pursuant to the Constitution. So, it seems to me to follow logically that treaties must also be made pursuant to the Constitution, or otherwise the safeguards with respect to constitutional amendments provided by requiring a two-thirds vote of each House of Congress and ratification by the several States would seem to me to almost be no protection at all, because the States would be, in fact, deprived of the opportunity of voting on an amendment to the Constitution, if a treaty in and of itself could amend the Constitution merely by being negotiated by the Executive and approved by the Senate. In effect, that would shortcut the provisions for amending the Constitution.

In article VI the framers of the Constitution provided that—

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

That provision does not close what many persons feel to be a very real and material loophole in the Constitution.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Yes.

It has seemed to me that the framers of the Constitution intended that it should be supreme over all treaties. However, since that time there have been court decisions which place some cloud upon that construction.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator from Nebraska is absolutely correct.

Mr. GRISWOLD. I thank my colleague.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Certainly the framers of the Constitution—at least, in my judgment; of course, we cannot know everything that was passing through their minds—would not have provided the very difficult standards for amending the Constitution and then have worked out a short circuit by which, in a much easier way, it would still be possible to amend the Constitution, by having action taken by only the Executive and the Senate.

Mr. President, a problem now facing us arises from the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has proposed to the so-called George amendment a provision that a treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by legislation of the Congress. However, the Senator from Ohio provided further:

Unless in advising and consenting to a treaty, the Senate, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, shall provide that such treaty may become effective as internal law without legislation by the Congress.

Mr. President, such a provision for the first time would, in effect, bring the House of Representatives into the exercise of the treatymaking power. I have great doubt about the wisdom of so doing.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me at this time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall yield to my colleague in a moment.

Mr. President, the framers of the Constitution gave certain duties and responsibilities to each of the two Houses of Congress. For instance, in the case of revenue legislation, the Constitution provides that such legislation can originate only in the House of Representa-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tives. No matter how much a Member of the Senate may believe there should be a particular type of tax law, no tax bill can originate in this body, by introduction, in the way that proposed legislation is normally introduced in the Senate, and then go to the Finance Committee of the Senate, and subsequently be reported from that committee and be passed by the Senate and then go to the House of Representatives. Instead, the Constitution definitely cuts off the Senate from the initiation of any tax legislation. There are good and historic reasons for so doing. It is true that when the House of Representatives originates a tax bill and sends it to the Senate, the Senate has full power of amendment of the bill. Nevertheless, that procedure was established in the Constitution.

In the case of impeachments, the House of Representatives itself must take the first action. The Senate must thereafter act as a court of impeachment. There are very valid reasons for the taking of that step and the making of that provision.

So, in connection with the treatymaking provisions of the Constitution, I believe that the framers of the Constitution very wisely concluded that the treaty power should be vested in the President, with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate, and they deliberately, and after due consideration and discussion, vested that power in the President of the United States and in the Senate.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from California agree that the debates in the Constitutional Convention and the articles written by Alexander Hamilton in order to get the Constitution ratified, show definitely that it was never contemplated that treaties should make domestic law for the people of the United States?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That brings up the question of precisely what is domestic law. That question has been discussed on the floor of this body for a long period of time. I think the Constitution itself and the discussions in the Constitutional Convention make it clear, first, that the founders of the Constitution expected the treatymaking power to be vested in the Federal Government; and, secondly, that in the ratification of a treaty they intended the Senate, representing on a basis of equality each of the States, to be the branch of the legislature whose concurrence would have to be sought.

Mr. BRICKER. I agree entirely with the Senator. There is nothing in my amendment which would change that situation in any way. The President would still negotiate treaties and the Senate would ratify them; but they would not become internal law, as they have been made in recent years by decisions of the Supreme Court, until the Congress, which is the sole legislative authority under the Constitution, acted upon them after thorough debate, publicity, and so forth.

Originally treaties were approved by secret vote of the Senate, and could still be so approved. I do not think it was ever contemplated by the Founding Fathers—certainly it is not so indicated in the writings of Hamilton—that that should be the situation. It was not contemplated that secret treaties could make law for the people of the United States.

It will be remembered that Jefferson, in discussing the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, said that certainly the Senate and the President were never intended to do what the whole Congress was interdicted from doing in the Constitution itself, that is, to make law contrary to the terms of the Constitution. I think the Senator will agree to that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that is quite correct. Then we get into the whole argument, of course, as to what is contrary to the Constitution.

Mr. BRICKER. The only effect which the amendment I have offered would have upon the treatymaking power would be to make treaties non-self-executing unless otherwise decided by a vote of two-thirds of the Senate. That might be said to be an adequate protection. I do not so consider it. But, evidently, it is the sense of the Senate that we should not go beyond that point, that treaties should become internal law only by act of the Congress, that the President and the Senate should not legislate for the people of our country, and certainly should not legislate contrary to the provisions of the Constitution or in violation of them. Of course, an amendment has already been agreed to to take care of the latter situation. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio is directed toward the other point, relating to the self-executing features.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say at this point what I had intended to say earlier. The Senator from Ohio was not present in the Chamber when I began my remarks, although he came in very shortly thereafter. In my judgment the distinguished Senator from Ohio is to be commended for having brought this very important issue before the country, not only this year, but 2 years ago, and for having pursued the question so that it would become a subject of discussion and debate not only in the Senate, but throughout the country.

I think some very real questions have been raised as a result of this amendment having been presented. The Senate of the United States has already—at least in a preliminary way—indicated that it believes that there should be a constitutional amendment. However, we are still discussing the precise form which such constitutional amendment should take.

I do not agree with the Senator from Ohio in all particulars with respect to the amendment which was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee. But I feel that he has performed a useful service to the country, and personally I am glad that he has done so. I wish to commend him both in my capacity as an individual Senator and in my capacity as majority leader of the Senate.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from California.

Let me add that already much has been accomplished by the amendments which have been agreed to, although they do not by any means reach the entire question.

As serious as the treatymaking section which I have proposed is the section included in my amendment, and also included in the George substitute, with respect to the question of executive agreements, which, by the decision of the Supreme Court, have been elevated to the dignity and importance of treaties. The President can attach to a treaty any matter of related concern. The case which I mentioned dealt specifically with the recognition of ambassadors to the United States. In this way he can make domestic law. Does the Senator agree with the Senator from Ohio that that is a very dangerous situation? A President, by recognizing a foreign minister or a foreign power can amend or nullify the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I was about to reach that subject.

Mr. BRICKER. Then I shall withhold further questions until later.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I had been discussing the treatymaking provison, so far as the amendment of the Senator from Ohio was concerned, which takes his proposed modifying amendment a considerable distance beyond the amendment presented by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

When we turn to the field of executive agreements, I say quite frankly that I am greatly concerned by the distance we have been carried by the courts in relation to such agreements. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that I think this is a matter which needs the prompt attention of the Senate and of the entire Congress, for that matter, as well as the American people. The problem is how to find a way to draw a line of differentiation between a treaty and an executive agreement.

Of course, I speak only as a layman, and not as a distinguished lawyer, as do the Senator from Ohio and other Members of this body. However, as I have read some of the decisions and listened to the debate, I have been impressed with the fact that in a sense the courts have more or less scrambled treaties and executive agreements, so that the line of demarcation is no longer very clear. While under the treatymaking power there is the protection of a requirement for a two-thirds vote of the Senate, in the field of the executive agreement that safeguard does not apply.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to read into the RECORD at this point a letter which I addressed to Hon. Walter Bedell Smith, Under Secretary of State, on February 1, 1954. I addressed it to him because the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, was out of the country at the time attending the Berlin Conference. The letter reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1954.

Hon. WALTER BEDELL SMITH,
Under Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the discussions on Senate Joint Resolution 1, there has been a difference of opinion expressed as to the number of executive agreements involved in any constitutional provision that in order

for such agreements to have the effect of internal law congressional action would be required.

Article I of the Constitution states: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States."

The Constitution also gives the Congress power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

Please furnish me with information showing for each year 1943 to 1953 inclusive the number of executive agreements entered into with foreign governments or international organizations and the number of such agreements which have the effect of internal law. Also list those agreements affecting internal law which were based on prior or subsequent congressional action and those which had no congressional authorization.

I believe that it is essential that such information be made available prior to the submission to the States of the proposed constitutional amendment. Your early reply will be appreciated.

It is also my intention to introduce a Senate resolution requesting the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to make a complete study of this question. It is my belief that in the past the executive department has used executive agreements when the Constitution intended the treatymaking power to be used, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

I have before me the Acting Secretary's reply, which I should like to read before I yield to the Senator from Ohio. The letter reads:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 2, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have received your letter of February 1, 1954, in which you request information showing for each year 1943 to 1953, inclusive, the number of "executive agreements entered into with foreign governments or international organizations" and the number of such agreements which "have the effect of internal law." You ask also that there be listed those agreements affecting internal law which were based on prior or subsequent congressional action and those which had no congressional authorization.

The Department of State will endeavor to furnish you, at the earliest possible moment, the information which you request.

I am sure you will appreciate the fact that this necessarily involves studies of a highly analytical character. There would seem to be no well-defined rule by which many agreements may be said to have or not have "the effect of internal law." It is assumed that the task involves a determination as to which agreements have or might have an effectiveness that would be recognized by courts within the United States in determining cases which rely to any extent on the existence of such agreements (a reciprocal-trade agreement being one of the simpler examples). On that assumption, it would seem that the task will require an extended period of time on the part of our staff. It has been roughly estimated that the completion of the task may take a considerable period, 6 months as a minimum.

Sincerely,

WALTER B. SMITH,
Acting Secretary.

After I received the letter from the Acting Secretary of State, I reached him by telephone and requested him to proceed with the study covering the 10-year period, but that in the meantime, in order not to delay unnecessarily the Senate and the House, to send me a list of all executive agreements, entered into during the past 2 or 3 years, which would have the effect of internal law, because I felt the principle could very well be followed through and such remedial action as Congress might care to take could then be taken. I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Has the Senator from California received a reply?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have not received a reply, except that the Assistant Secretary told me verbally that he has ordered an addition to the longer list, which obviously would take a longer period of time, and that the shorter study would be made as rapidly as possible.

Mr. BRICKER. The State Department evidently has made a study, because the Attorney General, in the brief to which I referred, stated that in the judgment of the State Department approximately 200 executive agreements had either modified or repealed internal law.

The Attorney General did not list them. However, it seems to me, if the number can be stated that closely, that a study has been made and that a list should be submitted to the Senate.

I have also written to the State Department asking it to explain the meaning of the Attorney General's brief with reference to the executive agreements which had become internal law. Does the Senator from California agree that it is a very dangerous situation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. On that point, I fully agree with the Senator from Ohio and with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that it is a very dangerous situation. I am not referring to President Eisenhower or to President Truman.

Mr. BRICKER. No; it is a question of power.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is purely impersonal with me. It is a question of power. It is a question of how far that power should go with reference to the effect of executive agreements on internal law in the United States. The only question I raise at this time in connection with this very important matter is as to remedial steps which the Senate and the House, when the pending joint resolution goes to the House, as I hope it will, may feel it desirable to take or may wish to take under the circumstances.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from California agree that under my amendment, if it were adopted, the Senate could ratify a treaty, and it would be effective in its international aspects, but that it would become effective as internal law only when acted upon by both Houses of Congress? Does he not also agree that there would be no danger that an executive agreement—and many such agreements are entered into in secret and it is very difficult to find out about them, as the Senator from California now learns from the Secretary of State—would have any effect as internal law until it was made public and the courts had an opportunity to pass on it, while it would be effective so far as our international relations are concerned?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to keep treaties and executive agreements separated for the moment, although I have already stated to the Senator from Ohio that, as he well knows, in some court decisions a very fine line of distinction has been made between certain effects which an executive agreement can have and those a treaty can have. So far as the treatymaking provision is concerned, if the Senate in its judgment desires to require congressional action, that can be had without the provision offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio being added to the Constitution.

Mr. BRICKER. Is not the great difficulty that we do not know what the Supreme Court will ultimately say about whether a treaty is self-executing or executory in character? There is no way of anticipating that. Is that not correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. However, the Senator from Ohio will agree that there are certain treaties—I do not want to put him in the position of having to agree with what I shall say, because he may not agree with me—such as the Korean Treaty, which was ratified by the Senate, which do not have application to the internal affairs of the United States; whereas other treaties, which deal with commerce and navigation and friendship, clearly do have applicability to domestic matters in the United States.

Mr. BRICKER. The Korean Treaty would not in any way be affected by my amendment, of course.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. I might say that in order to have the situation clarified in Congress and among the people of the country we should make it clear that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio—and I believe this applies also to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia—relates only to such executive agreements as affect internal law.

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct. Internal law only. That is all. It has been very difficult to get that point across, namely, that we are dealing only with laws within the United States, affecting the people of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. I believe that point should be made clear. What we are trying to do in this debate is to throw light, not heat, on the subject; we are trying to clarify, not confuse, the general situation, and, therefore, we should try to make that point as clear before the Senate and the country as it is possible to make it.

Mr. BRICKER. I might say to the Senator from California that there has been no thought in the mind of the Senator from Ohio to interfere in any way with the international relations of the United States, or with the power of the President to act in foreign affairs. My effort is directed only to the segment of internal law or domestic law which we have been discussing. Of course, the word was changed from "domestic" to "internal" because of the State Department's propaganda to the effect that there is no longer any distinction between the two, and that when a matter

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of domestic law becomes the subject of a treaty it is international in character. Therefore, it was very difficult to face a situation of that kind and to draft language which would affect what we wanted it to affect.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully agree with the Senator from Ohio. I would not attempt to speak for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], but in the discussions which have gone on in the past several weeks, or for even a longer period of time, it has been made perfectly clear that in none of the situations has there been any desire to foreclose the President of the United States in his handling of international relations through the medium of executive agreements which have to be entered into, perhaps only for the period of a year, and which deal with various matters, such as the Berlin airlift, for instance, in connection with which letters or cablegrams are exchanged between our ambassador in a foreign country and the foreign government on a more or less routine matter.

I do not believe it was the intention, and I am sure it is not the intention—although both the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Georgia can speak much better for themselves—to interfere in any way with the President's conduct of our foreign policy in relation to agreements which have external effect only and do not affect internal law, whatever that term may mean, in the United States.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from California is exactly correct. In spite of the propaganda which the opposition has broadcast over the country, there was never any intention in any draft that has been submitted to or considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations to affect the President's power in foreign policy in any manner, shape, or form, or to interfere with the exercise of his power internationally. We certainly would not want to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that is true with respect to executive agreements. When we consider the treaty provision, I would not want to go quite so far as does the distinguished Senator from Ohio, because there is an honest difference of opinion as to whether a treaty, following the normal process of negotiation and ratification by two-third of the Senate, can have the effect of internal law without action by the Congress. There is a very honest difference of opinion on the treaty provision, but we are now speaking about the executive-agreement provision.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator agree with me to this extent, that originally the treaty power was interpreted as the relationship of one nation to another, and the executive agreement, or contract, or whatever we want to call it, was a gradual growth because of our expanding and more or less complicated international relationship, until the time came that a Mr. McClure in the State Department said there was no longer any real distinction between them, and that hereafter the treaty power would be used with reference to those things on which there was no dispute whatever, and the executive agreement would be used as to those things as to which there are important differences of a controversial nature? It was at least confusing. The Senate did not exercise the power to determine whether an instrument was a treaty or an executive agreement, and, finally, we reached the point where the President, himself, was making agreements without congressional action of any kind or character, and such an agreement had the dignity of a treaty.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know precisely when this happened. I think it has been a steady growth over the years.

Mr. BRICKER. It has been a gradual development.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Perhaps it has been accelerated in more recent years because of court decisions. I think it possibly may have come about because of the fact that at times the Senate has been called the graveyard of treaties, and to get a two-thirds vote of this body has many times been difficult. I think there may have been persons who were thinking of shortcuts to avoid the necessity of having to get a two-thirds vote of the Senate of the United States. That may itself have inspired the seeking of other ways to achieve what undoubtedly was considered a desirable objective.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator has referred to the phrase "graveyard of treaties." Does the Senator realize that only 1.4 percent of the treaties which have been submitted to the Senate have been turned down?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senate certainly has been discharging its constitutional obligation. We have taken an oath to support the Constitution, which is no less sacred to us or binding upon us than is the oath which the President takes to support the Constitution.

Mr. BRICKER. Generally, there is debate on the ratification of more or less important treaties, so that the public does have some understanding of the situation. We have had no treaties entered into in secret session for many years. So the situation is not so serious as it is with regard to executive agreements.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is correct. I know the Senator is using a relative term when he refers to important treaties. The Senate has indicated that even as to relatively unimportant treaties there should be a yea-and-nay vote so that the question would have more public attention and that there would be more individual responsibility of Senators in voting on treaties of lesser importance as well as those of major importance.

Mr. BRICKER. I think a great deal of the concern in the country has come about by the fact that too many treaties have been presented on the Senate floor without an adequate hearing, with no witnesses in opposition—the only witnesses appearing being from the State Department or the Army or from the administration—and without much publicity being given to the fact that the treaty was pending. When a treaty comes to the floor there may be only a few Senators present, so that the country has no understanding of what is being done. Oftentimes Members of the Senate have not appreciated the full import of a treaty. Language was written which, 20 years from today, may be declared by the courts as making the document self-executing, to the detriment of American citizens. It is that danger which has alerted the American people. They are alerted, I assure the Senator, to the need of some kind of an amendment to prevent arbitrary action.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wanted to point out at this time the difference between the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio and that offered by the Senator from Georgia, that offered by the Senator from Georgia dealing only with executive agreements, and that offered by the Senator from Ohio dealing with both treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. In this discussion it seems to me there are two questions which have bothered us all. One is to delineate between a treaty and an executive agreement, and the other is to reach a definition of the terms "domestic law" or "internal law," or whatever terms may be used.

It seems to me that in article VI the writers of the Constitution were especially trying to protect the provisions of the Constitution and the laws of the several States, and they provided that they could be overridden only by a treaty under the authority of the United States, written by the President and approved by two-thirds of the Senate. Could we not define the terms "internal law" and "domestic law," and could we not differentiate between a treaty and an executive agreement by saying that anything which is contrary—and I would take the words from the existing Constitution—to the constitution or laws of any State shall be considered a treaty and must be presented to the Senate of the United States in the form of a treaty and be approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator has raised the very vital point which I was next coming to in the discussion, as to how and in what way we could distinguish between treaties and executive agreements. While I think I recognize the danger as fully as do the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Georgia relative to executive agreements being used in a way to affect internal law and used, perhaps, in lieu of a treaty in that regard, the thing which disturbs me about both amendments—and it is a very real concern that I have—is that the language of the amendment as now written provides a method of short-circuiting the treaty-making power of the Senate of the United States, because getting a two-thirds vote in the Senate where each State is on a basis of equality and where each Senator has a great responsibility, may be—and I say "may be" advisedly—far more difficult at some point in the future than getting a bare majority of a quorum in each of the two Houses of the Congress. Certainly in this body it is much easier to get a bare majority than a two-thirds majority. I speak feelingly, as a majority leader without

a majority, in saying that getting a bare majority is a much different thing than getting a two-thirds vote. Certainly, getting a bare majority in the other Chamber, which does not have quite the freedom of debate that prevails in this Chamber, is quite different from getting a two-thirds vote in the Senate of the United States.

What we are proposing is, of course, entirely impersonal, because what we do will live after us, and it is not meant to apply to any particular President of the United States. I think the President himself fully understands that, in any position he has taken. It is not a question of personal viewpoint at all.

But what disturbs me is that we might be furnishing a readymade, short-circuiting method to get around the treaty-making power and responsibilities of the Senate of the United States. I plead most earnestly with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to give further consideration to that point.

I have given considerable thought to how we might logically draw a line to differentiate between treaties and executive agreements. It seems to me that one line of demarcation might be to say that an executive agreement could affect only the period in which the President who made the executive agreement was in office and, perhaps, an additional period of 6 months, until the new administration or the new Congress could consider the matter. Such a procedure would permit anything of a short term nature to be handled by way of the executive agreement route, whereas anything of a long term nature, meant to bind the country over a period of years, would have to be handled by way of the treaty route.

It seems to me that that might, once again, channel back into our constitutional processes what I believe was a very real desire on the part of the framers of the Constitution to make certain that the Senate, by a two-thirds vote, would have a check and a balance on the treatymaking provisions.

That would not, naturally, meet the problem which the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Georgia have raised, because even in, let us say, the 4-year period in which a President might be in office, he might enter into two types of executive agreements, one dealing with foreign policy alone, on which we would have no debate in the Senate—I think we are all in general, substantial agreement as to that—and the other of a type that might have the effect of internal law.

So even if the line of demarcation were to be drawn on the long term and short term bases, the problem raised by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] would not yet have been solved. In that regard, we might very well divide along the line the Senator from Nebraska has suggested: That an instrument which might upset State constitutions or State laws would be considered one affecting internal law, therefore, even though it were an executive agreement it would have to take the same route and go through the same processes as are required for the ratification of a treaty, namely, the securing of the approval of two-thirds of the Senate. Frankly, I should be inclined to view such a proposal with much greater approval than I do the proposals which have been made and I know they have been made with the utmost devotion to public duty and concern for the public welfare by either the Senator from Ohio or the Senator from Georgia, because I do not think any of us should wish to furnish, readymade, to any future Executive of the United States an easy way to short-circuit the treatymaking provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to the Senator from California that the point he is now discussing has been one to which I have given a great deal of thought. I have thought of it for several years, since first I read the case of Missouri against Holland, then the Belmont case, and particularly the Pink case, as we have come on down through the years.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And the Capps case.

Mr. GEORGE. And the Capps case. But I very frankly say that the only way to distinguish between an executive agreement and an international agreement which is handled by the President and his State Department and some foreign power, and a treaty, is to be found in the connotations of the document itself, and not in the denomination that we in the Senate may give it. In other words, it is necessary to see what the Executive has built on. I think we can arrive at a traditional or a historic determination or definition of a treaty as distinguished from an executive agreement in that way; but in no other way, in my judgment, can we do so.

I have thought of providing precisely what the Senator from California has suggested, that all executive agreements and all international agreements be lumped together and placed under the supremacy clause of the Constitution. Before they could become the supreme law of the land, they would have to be made in pursuance of the Constitution and would have to be concurred in by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. But think of the meaning of that. We would throw upon the Executive an impossible obligation, under conditions that now exist. We would throw upon the Senate, I think, an impossible duty, because the President probably makes in these times many hundreds of international agreements. All of them would have to come before the Senate, if any one of them came, for a two-thirds vote. That would entail such a cumbersome process that, in my judgment, it would not be workable.

The Senator from California is quite right in saying that many agreements are purely executive in character, but we would have to look at every one of the international agreements to determine from the connotation, from the object, from the purpose, from the subject matter, to see whether it was an executive agreement. In my judgment, in many, many instances there would be no dividing line; we could not distinguish one from another.

As I conceive the situation, it is a part of the proper function of the Chief Executive of this Nation himself to determine whether he shall proceed in all cases by formal treaty, or whether the matter is one which can properly be handled by executive agreement. I think that is just as much beyond the power of Congress, without a constitutional amendment, as are other powers which have been mentioned here.

I appreciate the concern of the Senator from California about the amendment, but the purpose, I can assure him, of the distinguished Senator from Ohio and of myself is not to short-circuit the treatymaking power, but, rather, to encourage the sending of treaties to the Senate when they should be sent here, because once they are made, we do not necessarily have to have, as I take it, any further action by Congress.

I do not desire to interrupt the Senator from California longer, but I should like to say that I think even Hamilton, in the Federalist Papers, contemplated that all treaties, while contracts between sovereigns, would carry with them sufficient power to put into operation the obligations of the treaty and, to that extent, might invade the field of domestic law.

I think it is necessary to start with the assumption that treaties, and frequently international agreements, must invade the field of domestic law, and what the Senator from Ohio and I are concerned about is to make certain that, if an agreement invades the domestic law or the internal law, then there shall be some formal approval of such agreement by the regular lawmaking processes of the Government.

So I do not believe it would mean short circuiting. I think there would be a choice between letting the President act alone, unsupervised, or having the executive agreement submitted to Congress, and letting both Houses of Congress decide whether it should become domestic law. That is my position.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I know the distinguished Senator from Georgia has given great thought to the question. He is one of the great constitutional lawyers of the country. I can say, without any mental reservations whatever, that there is not a Senator in this body whom I hold in higher regard for his ability and his service than the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am happy to discuss the matter with him, because he is an eminent and distinguished lawyer; I just happen to be a newspaperman. But these problems have also worried some of us who are not attorneys. I think they are very real problems.

It appears to me that there is an alternative, although the Senate, in its judgment, may not take it. It seems rather apparent that we do not as yet have all the factual information we need to devise an amendment relating to executive agreements, as we do have, I feel, in the field relating to the treatymaking

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

provision. Therefore, it seems to me that we are on much sounder ground with respect to the procedures that have been taken to date, dealing with the closing of any loophole in the treaty-making provisions, than we are in the field of executive agreements. So far as executive agreements are concerned, not only the Senator from California, but the Senator from Ohio and undoubtedly many other Senators have been in communication with the Department of State, in an attempt to get the facts as to the number of executive agreements which have been entered into, and the number which, in the judgment of the Department of State, would have the effect of internal law.

As I have previously pointed out, I have requested, from the Department of State, information on the subject relating to the last 10 years. We could perhaps expedite the matter by getting the information covering a shorter period of time. However, no communication on the subject has yet been received.

I still most respectfully say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that, while there is great merit in what he says, the difficulty in drawing the line is that perhaps each treaty or each executive agreement would have to be viewed individually in order to know which route it should take.

Nevertheless, it seems to me that once provision has been written into the Constitution for such a procedure, a President may always find it easier to get what he wants through support in the two Houses of Congress by a bare majority of a quorum, than to get a two-thirds vote in the Senate, and thus the Senate, whether or not it is its desire, will have destroyed the power of the Senate. I think such action would be most unwise, because by such an amendment an opening would be provided as wide as a barn door. Why should any President, who in the future might enter into agreements which, in his own conscience, he felt were for the best interests of this country, have to run the gauntlet of getting a two-thirds vote in the Senate, when it had been provided by an amendment to the Constitution that all the President need obtain in the way of support would be a bare majority in the two Houses of Congress? The Senate ought to consider that possibility most carefully before it makes such a basic decision.

Mr. GEORGE and Mr. BRICKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. If, when the two Houses of the Congress were asked to pass on such an international agreement as internal or domestic law, that is, law which would be enforcible in our own courts, and which would be as extensive as the jurisdiction of those courts in point of territory, and so forth, it was discovered that the subject matter was one which properly ought to have been dealt with by treaty and in a treaty, that in itself would be a good and sufficient reason for the Senate to reject it; and I have no doubt it would.

The Senator overlooks one fact with which we are now face to face. That is the hard and cold proposition that the international agreement which is made by the President alone, without any assistance of the Senate, is not passed on by any one else. The adoption of the amendment proposed by me, as well as the one proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, would provide for the passage of a law by the Congress through application of the ordinary lawmaking processes. I believe such a provision would afford more protection than the making of an international agreement by the President alone, or by the Department of State.

I grant to the Senator there is one weakness in my proposal, a weakness which I would have liked to overcome if it had been possible. The weakness is one which the Senator was discussing a while ago, that my proposed amendment, and the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, would perpetuate the perhaps illogical distinction between executive agreements, one of which is a treaty, and the other one of which is properly an executive agreement. However, in order not to perpetuate that illogical thesis, all international agreements would have to come before this body for consideration. If the latter should occur, the Senate would have adopted such a cumbersome process that the President himself and the Senate itself probably could not operate as they should. That is the real reason why I was forced to provide for the treatment of executive agreements as legislative matters. I think properly they are legislative matters, because there is only one aspect of them subject to ratification, and that is the domestic or internal law aspect.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I do not fully agree with him as to that aspect of the problem, although there is great validity in all the points he has raised. In the first place, there are undoubtedly literally hundreds of executive agreements entered into. For instance, in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which was passed by the Congress, the Congress has delegated certain powers, which it has constitutionally, to the Executive to negotiate and make agreements. Certainly no one would say such agreements affected internal law without approval of the Congress.

Mr. GEORGE. No, because Congress has consented to them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There are a great many other types of agreements which have been entered into by the Executive, such as that relating to the Berlin airlift, and undoubtedly many dealing with the exchange of prisoners of war in Korea, which would not, in the normal course of events, affect internal law. Until we get the breakdown from the Department of State, we shall not know what the situation is.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe it is impossible to break them down.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator may be correct.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not see any way of breaking them down.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Because this is such a far-reaching subject, I merely desire to say that it seems to me that until the Supreme Court finally determines the case of United States against Capps we must admit that the decision of Judge Parker, unanimously concurred in by the other judges of the Circuit Court of Appeals in upholding the Federal district court, at least goes a long way toward making clear that the President does not have unlimited power in the field of executive agreements, but, to the contrary, is kept within due constitutional bounds when he deals in matters which are clearly within the power of the Congress.

I shall not put the decision in the RECORD again, because it is rather lengthy, but I refer to the opinion in the case of *U. S.* v. *Guy W. Capps, Inc.* (No. 6541, U. S. Court of Appeals, fourth district), argued on March 18, 1953, and decided on April 15, 1953, which appears in 204th Federal Reporter, 2d series, beginning at page 655 and running through to page 661.

In that decision Judge Parker quotes from the rule of Mr. Justice Jackson in the concurring opinion in "the case last cited," which was the one just preceding that in the decision, and he said:

> When the President takes measures incompatible with the expressed or implied will of Congress, his power is at its lowest ebb, for then he can rely only upon his own constitutional powers minus any constitutional powers of Congress over the matter. Courts can sustain exclusive Presidential control in such a case only by disabling the Congress from acting upon the subject. Presidential claim to a power at once so conclusive and preclusive must be scrutinized with caution, for what is at stake is the equilibrium established by our constitutional system.

There are many other portions of the decision of Judge Parker which I think would, if sustained by the Supreme Court, give us some guideposts and landmarks which, up to this time, at least, apparently are lacking.

Pending that, it seems to me that the Senate, through its Judiciary Committee and its Foreign Relations Committee, might very well, and properly, press to get all such information—information which we now admit is lacking—by way of a constitutional amendment, making a provision which will, I respectfully say, permit future Executives to shortcut the treatymaking power of the Senate, in regard to the very important matter we are discussing.

In the meantime we would have proceeded. After all, Rome was not built in a day. Even the framers of the Constitution had no sooner put the Constitution into shape to be submitted to the then 13 States, than they themselves realized it was necessary and desirable to submit the first 10 amendments. So we cannot solve all these problems in one amendment at this particular time.

I think we shall have made great progress by making clear that at least the treatymaking provision of the Constitution should not leave the loophole which many of us fear exists in the Constitution, insofar as the treatymaking power is concerned.

This debate has brought out the very real danger which exists in the field of executive agreements, which may permit—particularly if the courts do not decide differently—the President of the United States to make domestic or internal law without the approval of two-thirds of the Senate. So at least we shall have made that much progress.

Thereafter, as a result of the studies to be made, and perhaps dependent upon what happens in the Supreme Court in the Capps case, we shall be in a better position, perhaps at the next session of Congress, to meet in a forthright and well-studied manner the entire question of executive agreements. It seems to me that would be a logical and more sound approach to the entire problem.

Mr. HENNINGS and Mr. BRICKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Missouri, who was first on his feet. Thereafter, I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, I am sorry I was detained in a meeting of the Judiciary Committee all this morning and considerable part of the afternoon, and thus could not be in the Chamber to hear very much of the argument which has been submitted today. I see present at this time two of my colleagues who also were in attendance upon that committee.

Let me inquire whether I correctly understand that the distinguished majority leader is opposed to any further amendments or substitutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In reply, let me say to the Senator from Missouri—who was not in the Chamber at the time when I commenced my remarks—that, of course, I do not wish to repeat all the statement I have already made——

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me say to my friend, the majority leader, that according to statements which have appeared in the newspapers, memoranda have been submitted, conferences have been held, and an effort now has been made by the Attorney General to devise something which will constitute an improvement over the work of the Founding Fathers, and we are told it may be sent to us by way of a compromise. Of course, some of us are not privy to these high-level consultations. We are just on the fringe, trying to defend the Constitution and to support the power of the Presidency and to uphold the administration.

However, I am sure my friend, the majority leader, can appreciate the fact that, without wishing to obtrude upon the sanctity of the Presidential office or upon the office of the Attorney General, it would be of great interest to some of us to know whether the position of the President or of the Attorney General or of the majority leader—who, most helpfully, indicated last week that it was the administration's position that it was opposed to all substitutes and amendments now before the Senate—has changed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In speaking today, I did not purport to speak for the President of the United States or for the Attorney General. I was expressing, on my own responsibility as a Senator of the United States, the very real misgivings I have both as to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and as to the approach proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], although I recognize the sincerity with which those proposals have been submitted to this body.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Because of the reasons I stated while the Senator from Missouri was not in the Chamber, I do not expect to vote for either of these amendments in their present form.

I recognize that both of them seek to meet a problem which I recognize as a very real one; and I believe it is a problem which the Senate and the House of Representatives will have to meet; I do not think it can be left as it is or brushed aside.

However, I do not believe we should open a door whereby a future President of the United States could completely bypass the Senate's power in regard to approving treaties. That is what I am afraid could be done under both these amendments.

I realize in my own heart that both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Ohio recognize that great danger. However, there is the quite logical argument: While that is true, yet at the present time, based on certain court decisions, the President can make internal law without the taking of action by even one House of Congress. So, although perhaps the proposed alternative is not the best possible one, it is better than what is now confronting the country.

As clearly as I can express it, I believe that is the basic problem now confronting us.

Mr. HENNINGS. If I may, I shall detain the distinguished majority leader for only another moment. Let me say I do not wish to interfere with the presentation of his argument, which is being made most ably; in fact, it impresses anyone—either one who is versed in the law or one who is not versed in it—as a most lawyerlike and able presentation. The Senator from California often disclaims being a lawyer; but in his manner of address and in his scholarly presentation, he belies his frequent disclaimer.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from California should have been a lawyer.

Mr. HENNINGS. Be that as it may, the argument has been made a number of times—I, among others, have made it—that the substitute amendment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia means many things to many men. Without at this time going further into that point, let me inquire whether I correctly understand that the distinguished majority leader has not received any memorandum or has not been given, in any way, any information——

Mr. WILEY. Or a green light——

Mr. HENNINGS. No; I was not going to be that blunt about it.

I will ask my distinguished colleague whether he has been given any enlightenment, from either the White House or the Attorney General of the United States, which would cause him to change the opinion he has heretofore expressed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I say quite frankly to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, in response to his question, that the position I have heretofore announced has not been changed since I have talked with him.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am carefully refraining from asking the distinguished majority leader to quote the President or to quote anyone else; I am trying to observe the proprieties.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Regardless of any memoranda which may have been presented, I have not quoted from them or have not used them in my argument, because I do not necessarily agree with every position the Attorney General of the United States may take. When I became majority leader, I did not consider that I surrendered my responsibility as a Senator of the United States or surrendered my right to use my own judgment on this matter or on other matters. I shall always try to make clear, in the course of debate, if the pending matter is one on which the administration has expressed its views, what those views are; but I have not in any way surrendered my own responsibilities as a Senator of the United States.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course, I am sure the majority leader will never do that.

Then may we take it as expressive of what the administration's position seems to be at this time—if the distinguished majority leader is in a sense a conduit between the administration and the party he has the honor of leading in this Chamber—that the administration's position has not changed from its position, as we understood it, of last week?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Missouri is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. If I may ask a further question, I shall no longer detain my distinguished friend and colleague, whom I thank for his tolerance.

Does the Senator understand that the President of the United States himself makes the executive agreements which we have been discussing on the floor of the Senate this afternoon? I believe I heard the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] say that the President himself reads, signs, and enters into executive agreements.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. I do not believe that the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Ohio, or the Senator from California has said that executive agreements are all made personally by the President of the United States. There are excutive agreements which are made pursuant, for instance, to the action of the American Ambassador in Ottawa and the Canadian Foreign Minister.

Mr. HENNINGS. They are made by many agents all over the world.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. I entered the Chamber some time after the Senator had begun his discussion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is what makes the problem so difficult, as the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Senator from Georgia has so well pointed out.

Mr. HENNINGS. And as we have undertaken to say during the course of the debate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is absolutely correct. I do not believe we can successfully dispute the Senator from Georgia when he says that if we ever undertake to pass upon all executive agreements the Senate will transact no other business. We have a difficult enough time transacting the business now before the Senate. Certainly if we had to consider a great mass of executive agreements of all types, many of which consist of nothing more than a letter, cablegram, or exchange of notes between ambassadors, we would be doing nothing else but that, and that would be a fantastic situation.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, may I ask one further question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. In the Senator's judgment, who would make the determination as to which of the vast number of agreements—certainly numbering thousands—affected what may be called internal law, or domestic law, for want of a better term?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator knows full well—or he would not have asked the question—that he is now dealing with the $64 question in connection with this great constitutional issue.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Missouri has tried to raise the question a number of times in the course of this debate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Frankly, I do not think we yet have the answer to that question. That is why I am opposing both the amendment of the Senator from Ohio and the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. I will say quite frankly that what I think we are seeking to find out is how we can prevent an executive agreement, which may have been negotiated in secret—and I say that in no sense that that necessarily makes it not in the public interest—from becoming domestic law without going through the legislative process, including hearings, and all other procedure. Ten years or 20 years later a citizen might be haled into court, either in a civil or criminal case, and learn for the first time that he had violated domestic law.

To me that seems to be the heart of the problem. I do not know the answer to the question. I doubt if any other Senator yet knows the answer to that question. That is why I have pleaded, so far as I could, with Senators who are present to listen to me. That is why I have particularly urged that we not take the route which has been proposed and open the door for circumventing the treatymaking powers of the Senate until we have found a better answer to that question than I think we have yet been able to accomplish.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I merely wish to correct the Senator from California when he says he does not believe that any of us knows how to meet the problem. I believe that the amendment presented by the Senator from Ohio or the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, making such agreements noneffective as internal law until approved by the Congress, would meet the problem.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I recognize that they would meet that problem; but it seems to me that a greater problem would be created which, in my mind, at least, would completely open the door for the circumvention of the treaty-making power of the Senate.

Mr. BRICKER. Madam President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. A moment ago the Senator from California read from the decision of Judge Parker in the Capps case.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the case which has been brought before the Supreme Court on certiorari by the Attorney General. He claims that if the Supreme Court does not reverse that opinion 200 executive agreements which have been entered into will be completely nullified.

Mr. KNOWLAND. To the best of my knowledge that is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. The Attorney General says in his brief that he was so advised by the State Department. The State Department has had 2 years since the original amendment was proposed to bring forward its objections with respect to any one of the agreements it wished to put into effect without ratification by the Senate or without action by the Congress, and not a single agreement of that type has been called to our attention. I will ask the Senator from California if he knows of any such agreement which the State Department has entered into, which ought to violate, repeal, or affect in any way local law.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that, speaking on my own responsibility, I know of none that ought to violate local law. Frankly, I am greatly disturbed by the Capps case.

Mr. BRICKER. And the Attorney General's position.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And the position of the Attorney General in the Capps case. As a layman I fully agree with Judge Parker's decision, which was joined in, as I understand, unanimously by the circuit court of appeals. I hope that decision may become the final decision in the case. However, we do not know what the final outcome will be. I do not know how many lawyers may differ with me on the question of whether or not that decision is sound. However, to me, at least, it seems to have set forth certain landmarks and lighthouses which channel the executive powers into a place where they are not so broad and extensive as they would be were the contrary true.

Mr. BRICKER. I agree entirely with the Senator from California on that point. I certainly hope the Supreme Court sustains that decision, contrary to the contention of the Attorney General. However, the lighthouses which the Senator mentions have been pretty much dimmed by the decision of the Supreme Court in the Pink case and the Belmont case.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The lights almost went out.

Mr. BRICKER. They went out.

I should like to ask the Senator another question. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] brought up a point which was raised 2 years ago in connection with the original amendment, namely, limiting the force of executive agreements to the tenure of office of the then President, and then having them submitted to the committee of Congress. They would become null and void 6 months after the tenure of office of that particular President. That proposal was objected to.

There was the further provision that executive agreements should not be used in lieu of treaties. I have been given to understand by the State Department that that is exactly what it would like to do. It is claimed that no suitable wording can be devised to bring about that result. In other words, the term "in lieu" is too indefinite to enable anyone to anticipate what the courts might do with it. But after all, that is what we are working toward. Executive agreements have their proper place in international relations, but they should not be used by the executive in lieu of treaties, which have a higher standing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully agree; and in the meantime, pending the time when we may be able to devise language which would meet this problem without creating a greater problem, personally I should be inclined to support a resolution which would make it the sense of the Senate that such agreements should not be used in lieu of treaties.

Mr. BRICKER. Of course, such a resolution would not be binding.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It would not be binding, but it would put the administration on notice. It seems to me that would be a far sounder procedure than to open the door, by means of a constitutional amendment, which again I plead——

Mr. GEORGE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope the Senator will listen to me for just a moment. Neither my amendment nor the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio would undertake to open any door at all, because both Houses of the Congress, each by mere majority vote, may now abrogate a treaty. One House cannot do it, but the two Houses can. Each House can take a vote, and if both Houses concur in a joint resolution or in an act, they can declare void an executive agreement.

My proposal and the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Ohio in that regard would not add one jot or tittle to the present power of the two Houses of Congress. So no opening of doors is involved. The door to which the Senator refers has already been entered, and has been entered so frequently and constantly that the runway is pretty slick.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say again to the distinguished Senator from Georgia

that, while I recognize the force of his argument, I must respectfully differ, because while it is true, of course, that the Congress can, by statute, modify a treaty either in whole or with respect to any part which in its judgment it has the power to modify, or cares to modify, however, such legislation is subject to Presidential approval. If vetoed, a two-thirds vote of each House would be required to overcome the veto.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true; but I am assuming to say only that nothing would be added to the powers of the two Houses of Congress by either my amendment or the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

I do not support all of the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. I do not care to interfere with the treaty-making power at all. That is my position. That is why I have confined my amendment to executive agreements and other international agreements. If I did not believe it was within the competency of the Senate to attach a reservation to any treaty providing that the treaty must be implemented by an act of Congress, I would heartily favor the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, on that point I fully agree with the Senator from Georgia.

I have already delayed the Senate for a longer period than I had intended when I rose on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I have stated the reasons why I believe the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio should not be adopted. I believe the same arguments, although on a little different basis, apply to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

I fully recognize the problem facing Congress and the country with regard to executive agreements. So far as I am concerned, I shall be glad to join with other Senators in seeking a sound basis of drawing a line between executive agreements and treaties, and placing proper limitations upon executive agreements which might have the effect of internal law.

However, it seems to me that in performing one of our most important duties as a legislative body, namely, proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States, in the field of executive agreements we do not as yet have sufficient information with respect to how large the field is.

Secondly, I do not believe we have as yet found a sound and constructive solution to the problem. Anything but a sound solution might result in destroying the treatymaking powers of the Senate. On the facts now before the Senate, Madam President, I am not prepared to vote to destroy those treatymaking powers.

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, I, too, am sorry that I was not present to hear all the discussion. However, the latest amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has given me considerable thought, and I have jotted down a few ideas which I wish to put into the RECORD. What I have to say may be repetitious of what the distinguished Senator from California has stated. Nevertheless, I feel it to be necessary, when we deal with such a vital subject as the Constitution of the United States that we, who have the responsibility, make our positions very clear.

First. The language of the pending amendment reads:

> SEC. 3. A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by the Congress unless in advising and consenting to a treaty the Senate, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, shall provide that such treaty may become effective as internal law without legislation by the Congress.

Second. So far as an international agreement other than a treaty is concerned, this is the same as section 2 of the George amendment and is subject to the same objections. The extent and implication of this section are not at all clear. What exactly is "an international agreement other than a treaty"? Does this term include an agreement to exchange ambassadors with a foreign power? If so, would such an agreement have to be approved by Congress before the foreign ambassador could be received and accorded the customary diplomatic privileges and immunities? Does this section extend to agreements which the President must make under his authority as Commander in Chief, such as, for example, joint defense arrangements with Canada which might involve the presence of Canadian troops on the American side of the boundary? These are merely indicative of the questions raised by this section which have not been carefully studied by any committee of the Senate.

Third. The Bricker amendment goes further, however, and applies the doctrine of the George amendment to treaties, as well as to other international agreements, with the proviso that the Senate, by a two-thirds vote, can make exceptions in the case of treaties.

Since a treaty has a greater legal standing that a lesser international agreement, and since a two-thirds vote in the Senate is more difficult than a majority vote in both Houses, the objections to the George amendment apply with all the more force to this aspect of the Bricker amendment.

Fourth. The Bricker amendment would mean that treaties could become effective in the United States only through: (a) a majority vote in both Houses of Congress, or (b) a two-thirds vote in the Senate. Inasmuch as a two-thirds vote in the Senate is already required for ratification of a treaty, the Bricker amendment would superimpose a requirement for a second two-thirds Senate vote. Thus, on every treaty the Senate would be confronted with the issue of whether to make the treaty effective itself or whether to bring the House into the picture. Under the present situation, in the case of a non-self-executing treaty, the House is automatically brought into the picture without action by the Senate. In case of doubt as to whether a treaty is or is not self-executing, the Senate can bring the House in by a majority vote, through a reservation which is effective despite the Senator from Ohio's misinterpretation of Missouri against Holland.

Fifth. The amendment is an invitation to controversy and confusion every time the Senate considers a treaty. It would provide another weapon to the wrecking crew. Senators who did not want to vote against a treaty could nevertheless ruin it by refusing to vote to make it effective.

Sixth. Lack of an affirmative two-thirds vote by the Senate to make a treaty effective as internal law might well be interpreted by other parties to the treaty as a reservation and might well make the other parties themselves more reluctant to carry out the treaty's terms. What would have been the effect, for example, if the Senate had ratified the German debt settlements without such an affirmative two-thirds declaration that they were effective as internal law? The amendment would open the way to situations in which the Senate would agree to accept concessions from other nations but would refuse to make reciprocal concessions.

Seventh. The amendment also has implications which make it curiously inconsistent, coming from the Senator from Ohio. It would mean that the Senate, by a two-thirds vote, could make a non-self-executing treaty self-executing. The Senate alone could do what now requires joint action by both Houses of Congress. The Senate alone could legislate for the House and for the whole United States. This is more tinkering with the constitutional balance of power, and those who oppose giving away the Senate's prerogatives are equally opposed to increasing them at the expense of the House and of the States. This is the "witch" clause in Cinderella clothes.

Eighth. The Senator from Ohio said that if such a provision had been in the Constitution in 1945—

> We would not have the problem today with respect to articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter.

This is more fantasy. We do not have a problem with respect to articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter. That problem exists only in the mind of a district judge in California and the mind of the Senator from Ohio. The California Supreme Court has taken care of the district judge, and the Senate in due course can take care of the Senator from Ohio.

Ninth. The amendment is just another way of making the treaty process more difficult, more cumbersome, and more confusing. It would raise more legal questions than it would answer.

Tenth. Finally, it is necessary to consider this proposed new section in relation to the three sections of Senate Joint Resolution 1 which have already been agreed to by the Senate. One of those sections provides that—

> A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

Madam President, another section provides that "no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The whole purpose of this drive to amend the Constitution was in the beginning purportedly to make sure that a treaty could not override the Constitution. This proposed new section goes far beyond that objective and concerns itself with implementation of treaties.

The question might also be raised as to what effect this section would have when taken in conjunction with the "in pursuance" clause which the Senate agreed to last week. That clause encompasses all treaties made "after the establishment of this Constitution." When is a treaty "made" in the meaning of this clause? Is it "made" when the technical process of ratification is completed, or is it "made" only upon the completion of all the acts necessary for it to become effective? If the latter is the case, then, the "in pursuance" clause plus the pending section would require the Congress and the courts to reexamine the effectiveness of every treaty concluded since 1789. It is difficult to imagine a way to create more confusion in our domestic law as well as in our foreign relations.

Mr. HENNINGS. Madam President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. The distinguished Senator is referring to the effect which the amendment would have upon all past treaties. Does the Senator believe that an executive agreement made 20 years ago could arise to confront a man so that he could be prosecuted, or in any way made to suffer a money damage, or have a criminal judgment rendered against him?

Mr. WILEY. If I correctly understand the question, the answer is "No."

Mr. HENNINGS. I heard such a statement made earlier in the debate this afternoon, but an opportunity was not afforded to answer it. Does the Senator for a moment think there is any doubt about the proposition that a man can be prosecuted for a violation of the domestic effects of an agreement of which he knew nothing and which had been made some years before? When I say "man," I mean an individual, a partnership, a corporation, or any other legal entity.

Mr. WILEY. No. I think the statement was broader than that. It referred not simply to an executive agreement, but an executive agreement which no one knew anything about except the parties. Of course the answer is "No."

Mr. HENNINGS. That is arrant nonsense, is it not?

Mr. WILEY. I think so. I think it befogs the entire issue which is before this honorable body. We have gone far afield. We have taken an oath to protect the Constitution of the United States. To me, that means something. If we are going to permit ourselves, because of either emotion or bias or because of some legalistic notion, to start tinkering with the most valuable asset we and our children have, namely, the Constitution of the United States, then it seems to me we are violating our oath.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam President, I have very little to say with reference to this particular amendment. What I have to say relates, I believe, to both the amendment of the Senator from Georgia and the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

I wish, first, to review the sections of the Constitution as they relate to treaties and executive agreements.

I find no law today, so far as the United States Government is concerned, with reference to agreements, but I do find that States are permitted to enter into agreements with other States or with foreign powers, with the consent of the Congress. The treaty-making power of the United States is in the President, with two-thirds of the Senate concurring therein. That is provided for in section 2 of article II of the Constitution, which states that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

Both Houses of Congress were not given control or power over treatymaking on behalf of the United States. Therefore, the President and the Senate alone have the power to make treaty law, and such law becomes the supreme law of the land under article VI of the Constitution, which provides "and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."

It is also provided that Congress shall make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution a treaty. That is provided for in article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which gives to Congress the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

So, the words "and all other powers vested in any department or officer" would certainly cover the treatymaking power.

In article I, section 10, of the Constitution it is provided that—

No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation.

Therefore, it is clear that the treatymaking power was one of the powers surrendered by the States to the President with two-thirds of the Senate consenting or concurring, and the right to implement such treaty was given to Congress under article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

Those who objected to the United States Supreme Court decision in the case of Missouri against Holland proposed to amend the Constitution by what was known as the "which" clause. That clause read as follows:

SEC. 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of the treaty.

What this proposed amendment would do would be to limit, so far as internal law is concerned, the treatymaking power of the United States only to those things which Congress could do in the absence of a treaty.

The reason why this should not be done is that the original power of Congress to make internal law was one thing, and the Constitution provided for that, but it is an entirely different thing when it comes to implementing treaties by law. If we took away this power we would change the whole philosophy of our present Government.

The law is clear that the treatymaking power was given to the President, with two-thirds of the Senate concurring, and the implementation of a treaty so made was given to Congress. But Congress was never intended to make treaties or treaty law with reference to our international relations. Under the "which" clause, we would restrict treaties to only what Congress could do in the domestic law field, not related to our international relations except where Congress is given power, as in article I, section 8, clause 3, to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and, in clause 10, "to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations."

The law of nations is the same as international law. What the French call international law is the law of nations. Congress alone can punish for violation of the law of nations, or international law.

It was suggested in the debate today that it might be possible for a treaty to provide for punishment under international law or for the violation of a treaty. I do not believe that any greater penalty could be imposed under the treatymaking power than could be imposed by Congress.

What is international law, or the law of treaties? Article 38 of the Charter of the United Nations provides as follows:

1. The Court, whose function is to decide in accordance with international law such disputes as are submitted to it, shall apply—

a. international conventions, whether general or particular, establishing rules expressly recognized by the contesting states;

b. international custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law;

c. the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations;

d. subject to the provisions of article 59, judicial decisions and the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists of the various nations, as subsidiary means for the determination of rules of law.

It is clear, then, that Congress alone was given the power to define and punish offenses against international law, or as described in the Constitution, the law of nations.

The treatymaking power should not be restricted as proposed in the "which" clause amendment. The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] does not insist on the "which" clause, but proposes a new amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 1, which reads as follows:

A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by the Congress, unless, in advising and consenting to a treaty, the Senate, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, shall provide that such treaty may become effective as internal law without legislation by the Congress.

The amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio differs only from the George amendment in

that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio would permit the Senate, by a two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting, to make a treaty effective immediately as internal law. If they did not do so, then the treaty would have to be implemented by an act of Congress.

The Senate now has the power to require a treaty to be implemented by an act of Congress, and this proposal adds nothing to, nor does it subtract anything from, the powers of the Senate.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia has proposed an amendment as a substitute for the "which" clause, section 2, as follows:

> An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of Congress.

The amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, as is also true of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, would introduce into our Constitution an entirely new constitutional concept of dealing with international affairs; namely, by the President plus a majority vote of Congress, instead of by the President plus two-thirds of the Senate present and voting. Either of these two proposals would, in my opinion, weaken the equality of the States. They would really affect the rights of the States to have a voice in the making of treaty law. The equality of Senators from each State is important. It is a strong cement, which has kept the Union together.

Article V of the Constitution provides—and I think rightly so—"that no State without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

Seldom has either political party two-thirds of the membership of the United States Senate. Normally one party has a majority. Seldom is it true that there is an almost equal division, as there is now. Therefore, the President, who usually has the majority of the Senate in his party—I am not now speaking of any particular President; I am speaking about the powers of the respective departments of the Government—is now required to seek support from the other major party, thus making a treaty strongly bipartisan.

I think that when we speak about the Senate ratifying treaties, we must keep in mind that this is true. This is one of the reasons why the Senate has tried to consider treaties and to consider the foreign policy of the United States of America in a bipartisan way, because the President, when he seeks to have a treaty made the law of the land, must go to the opposition party in order to obtain votes, so as to secure a two-thirds vote for ratification.

If a majority in the Senate and the House alone were required, a single party in power could work its will. To permit the ratification of a treaty by a majority would mean that fewer States would have a real say in the making of treaties, and the voice of other States in the making of foreign policy would be less effective. The idea of two-thirds of the States binding all is much different from saying that a mere majority can bind all.

Mr. HENNINGS. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Michigan may recall that some Senators have tried to make the point—and I am glad he has touched upon it again, because it is so vastly important in our consideration of the question—that if the Senate should adopt the Bricker amendment or the George substitute, the Senate would, in fact, be abdicating much of its power and responsibility, and certainly would be diluting the power of each Senator, since the Senate is constituted of two Senators from each of the sovereign States. Is not that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is true. That is borne out by the fact that for a number of years there has been a view in the United States, particularly since the time when the League of Nations treaty was not approved by the Senate, that ratification of a treaty by a two-thirds vote of the Senate was not the proper way to approve treaties; in other words, that it was too difficult a method. A movement was started in the United States to have the constitutional provision for ratification by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting changed to provide exactly what the George amendment and the Bricker amendment now purport to do. The advocates of such a change propose to have treaties approved by a majority of the Senate and a majority of the House of Representatives. When I speak of treaties, I do so because executive agreements could then be used as treaties. Executive agreements, which would in effect be treaties, would then, under the George and the Bricker amendments, be approved by a majority of the Senate and a majority of the House. It is thus proposed to change the constitutional provision for a two-thirds vote of the Senate for ratification of a treaty, to a majority vote of both Houses of Congress. I have never felt that such a proposal had any real standing or was desired on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland and Mr. HENNINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does not the Senator realize that the Senators who would vote for the present Bricker substitute would do so because they realize, as does the Senator from Michigan, that executive agreements are being made today in fields or areas where treaties should be made, and are not being brought to the attention of Congress at all? They are being made by the President alone, and we are very rapidly losing all control over executive agreements.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize what has been stated by the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Georgia, and now by the Senator from Maryland. I know that in the past Presidents have done that, and that the interpretation of the courts has permitted the line of demarcation between treaties and executive agreements to be so blurred that it is impossible at the present time, except by examination of the instrument as it comes from the State Department, to tell whether such an instrument should be called a treaty or an executive agreement.

The question is, How are we to find a means to remedy a situation which many Senators think—and I share their view—should be remedied? There ought to be some way of framing the language of the Constitution so that it would not be possible for an Executive, through his State Department, to change the constitutions of the States and the laws of the States by an executive agreement.

I am not one of those who believe that the treatymaking power should not by agreements affecting international matters change the constitutions or the laws of the States, because I believe that when two-thirds of the Senate speaks, in the conduct of the international relations of America, it ought to be able to speak for all 48 States of the Union in participating in making the law of the land.

There are those who will disagree and say that even two-thirds of the Senate should not, along with the President, be given that privilege. However, I repeat, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan, in behalf of himself and other Senators who cosponsored it, does provide that no treaty shall conflict with the Constitution or shall be made except in pursuance of the Constitution. If it is provided that such agreements shall not conflict with the Constitution, there will be preserved those inalienable rights of the people of the United States which the people never relinquish to their Government. Therefore, if the Senate shall adopt the three amendments which have been proposed, and which are now contained in the new print, at least one of the problems will have been solved.

The second problem is the question of preventing Presidents of the United States from negotiating executive agreements in the place of treaties, where such agreements would in effect repeal constitutions or laws of the States. If that problem could be taken care of, then the problem now under discussion would be solved. However, I do not think the three amendments under discussion solve that problem.

Mr. BRICKER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. In what field does the Senator think that Presidents and two-thirds of the Senate ought to be able to enact legislation internally for the people of the country?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not know whether the Senator from Ohio was on the floor when I was trying to give the definition of international law, but I was discussing a case in which a treaty might be made in relation to our external, foreign relations, which might upset some laws of the land. Let me give the Senator an example.

Mr. BRICKER. That is what I wish to have. I have been trying to get such information from the State Department.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. FERGUSON. I think one example would be in relation to aliens.

Mr. BRICKER. Of course, the Senator knows such a problem is covered by the Takahashi case.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that. One of the examples is the question of the treatment of aliens.

Mr. BRICKER. That question does not involve State action in any way; it involves only congressional action.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; but it might involve States. It might involve land tenure in the States.

Mr. BRICKER. The Takahashi case held that it did not.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me give the Senator another example. In the question of recognition of an Ambassador—if an Ambassador drives through the city of Columbus, and he is on official business, he is immune from prosecution under the traffic laws or the State laws of the State of Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. There is a very serious question whether such an Ambassador ought to be so immune; but, if he is, that is a matter of international law and not of treaty powers. It would be a matter of international law, the relations of one nation to another, if he is in the capacity of a representative of a sovereign.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is international law; and the truth is that international law is also the law made by treaties between nations. The example which I cited is one of the customs, one of the international laws, which has been recognized for years and years, from a time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary.

Mr. BRICKER. And there is no treaty authority covering that.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no treaty authority for it.

Mr. BRICKER. One might say it is just a matter of international recognition.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is one of the reasons why the Embassy of a foreign nation is considered to be land under its sovereignty. For instance, in this great city of Washington, Embassies are not subject to the building restrictions of the District of Columbia. Under international law, they are not subject to the building code relating to the height of buildings, the lot-line restrictions, or any similar ordinances.

Mr. BRICKER. It is purely a matter of international law.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Under the proposals of the distinguished Senator from Ohio and the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the historic role of the Senate in treaties is likely to be narrowed in favor of other international agreements which can be ratified by a mere majority of Congress.

One method of dealing with international affairs is the head of the state, the Commander in Chief, method, through treaty, the President plus two-thirds of the Senate method. Then we have the method now proposed before the Senate, whereby international agreements would be acted on by a majority of the Congress. The President could pick and choose and play off one against the other, thus destroying the unity of the country. The President would be entitled to select the method of dealing in international relations. He could use the method which required a two-thirds vote of the Senate, or the majority-of-Congress method. As was stated in the debate today, if the amendment should be adopted, there would be in the Constitution a provision which, in effect, would give the President the right to choose the method of making international agreements, whether by executive agreement or by treaty.

The proposal offered by the Senator from Georgia favors the large States, which can dominate the House in their vote, as against the small States. As I have said, such a situation would not make for unity in the Federal system, and would not take into account the fact that in the Senate the small States have equal representation with the large States. I believe the amendment would make it possible for the large States to dominate.

Mr. BRICKER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. A majority of the Senate could stop that immediately.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. A majority of the Senate could refuse, when it considered such an agreement, to vote in favor of it.

Mr. BRICKER. That is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. But as it is now—and I think it should remain that way—two-thirds of the Senate are required to approve an international agreement before it can become effective as a treaty.

Mr. BRICKER. Then how does my colleague propose to deal with the rather dangerous situation of individual rule by the President, through executive agreements?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not have the solution.

Mr. BRICKER. My colleague does not have the solution? I thought he was going to suggest a solution, later in his remarks.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. One of the reasons why I do not have the solution—and of course this matter has been stated in various ways on the floor of the Senate—is that we are considering a situation in which our great Nation deals with many other nations.

In connection with this matter, I have looked through the RECORD, which unfortunately is not indexed. Personally, I should like to be able to examine all executive agreements entered into by the United States during the past 10 or 20 years. The Senator from Ohio will recall that many of them are secret, and we cannot see them. However, I think they are of sufficient importance that the State Department should permit us to see them, so that we may be able to solve this problem.

If we could make a study of all the agreements, then we could determine what course we should take, and whether the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is the only way to cope with the problem. I should say that, in my opinion, it is not the only way.

Mr. BRICKER. It is not the only one I have suggested, of course.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

I would make one change in my colleague's suggestion, namely, I would not allow both Houses of Congress to deal with the matter. I would prefer to provide that the approval of two-thirds of the Senate, only, be required.

Mr. BRICKER. Even in the case of executive agreements?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes: even in the case of executive agreements, if they affect internal law and repeal or nullify a State constitution or a State law.

Mr. BRICKER. Then how would my colleague deal with reciprocal trade arrangements?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would deal with them in advance, in the way we have been doing.

Mr. BRICKER. However, both Houses of Congress act in that respect.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. On that basis a reciprocal trade arrangement would not be approved in the way a treaty would be approved, would it?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; not in the way a treaty would be approved.

Mr. BRICKER. The amendment I propose to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia would only provide that an executive agreement would not become domestic law until it was passed on favorably by the Congress. My amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia would not in any way affect international agreements.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that, but I also appreciate the fact that some international agreements affect domestic law.

Mr. BRICKER. I have been trying to find those for a long time. The two which have been referred to by the Senator from Michigan are being taken care of now.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

But when the Constitution provides—in article I, section 8, clause 10—that Congress has the power "to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations," that indicates that the law of nations, which is international law, is in existence, although from the criminal angle, from the point of view of punishment, either by forfeiture or by imprisonment or by fine, the Congress would have to impose the penalty, and thus the law would be applicable internally in the United States.

Mr. BRICKER. Does not international law obligate those in the United States who represent foreign countries to abide by the law of the land; in other words, require that the representatives of foreign countries in the United States and our representatives in other countries abide by the law of the land in which they are stationed?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. BRICKER. My colleague does not think it goes that far?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. That is why the representatives of foreign governments do not have to obey the speed laws or the building restriction laws or the building codes or other State laws regarding the height of buildings, or laws regarding many other things.

Mr. BRICKER. Could Congress now pass a law requiring them to do so?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not wish to answer that question now, because I am not sure of the correct answer. The statement has been made that Congress can repeal any treaty. I do not go that far, in reading the decisions of the United States courts.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not either; I agree with my colleague. There is a limitation upon the power of Congress to repeal any international obligation. I think the Senator from Michigan is correct on that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I think that is true. So I do not wish to answer my colleague's question; I do not know whether that matter comes in the twilight zone of a treaty which cannot be repealed.

Mr. BRICKER. However, that matter is not affected by this amendment.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me at this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to have my colleague answer a question which has occurred to me. He said that representatives of foreign nations do not have to abide by our speed laws or restrictions on the height of buildings or building codes. To whom is the Senator from Michigan referring?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am referring to Ambassadors and others who have diplomatic status in the United States—in short, the Ambassador from X country.

Mr. THYE. Their immunity arises only because they are representing a foreign country, in the diplomatic service, and are assigned as diplomats to serve in the United States, I understand. However, a businessman or other person coming into the United States from a foreign country would, of course, have to abide by our speed laws, building codes, and so forth, would he not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. THYE. Do I correctly understand that my colleague had reference only to the immunity of the Diplomatic Corps?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. Therefore, I was talking about international law.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, will my colleague yield further to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. My understanding of the reason why the House of Representatives participates in passing on reciprocal trade agreements is that such measures are revenue measures or tax measures, and affect the revenue and income of the United States; and therefore the House of Representatives, whose Members are directly representative of the people, should have a right to give specific consideration to such measures.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; that is not the reason.

Mr. THYE. It is not?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. A treaty could be used for tariff purposes. In fact, at one time that was the only method used in the United States to make tariff law.

Mr. THYE. It would have the effect, however, of determining the impact which imports would have on businesses in the United States, if there were no tariff which kept foreign products from entering our country.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. THYE. For that reason the House of Representatives is allowed to participate in the handling of such matters, inasmuch as the House of Representatives has direct responsibility to the people, because the Members of the House are directly representative of the people.

Madam President, if the Senator from Michigan will yield further to me, let me say that the thought has often occurred to me that one reason why the Senate has the responsibility of passing on treaties is that the Senate is the House of Congress in which only one-third of the entire membership stand for election in a given year, unless vacancies have been created as a result of death. So we see the wisdom of the Founding Fathers, who, in drafting the original Constitution, had in mind that since two-thirds of one of the Houses of Congress would hold office beyond any given election, they should have control over something so fundamental and so exceedingly serious as an international treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that was the intention in regard to treaties. The intention was also to have stability and permanence. The idea was to give stability and permanence to all laws made by way of treaties. It was also the purpose to require that two-thirds of the States approve—for, practically speaking, that is the effect of the requirement that a treaty be approved by two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present and voting—instead of to allow a mere majority of the States to exercise their will upon the other States. Our forefathers saw fit to provide, in that way, that if two-thirds of the Members of the Senate wished to approve a particular treaty, they would be able to do so. That very provision shows, as I have always said, that treaties were supposed to be made in pursuance of the Constitution, not in conflict with it.

However, the decisions which have been rendered are such that doubt has now been created about that matter, to such an extent that I believe there now exists a danger which should be cured by adopting the proposed amendment.

To return to these two proposals, and again to take up the question that the present proposal would favor the large States which could dominate in the House of Representatives as against the smaller States, and to comment further on the point that, under the amendment, any action proposed to be taken hastily would not be subject to being checked on by a two-thirds vote, let me say that in the Senate no distinction is made based upon the size of States. There are no large or small States. The States have equal representation in the Senate. Two-thirds of the Senate means, in reality, two-thirds of all the States.

These two amendments—and they are identical in one respect, as they relate to international agreements—would constitutionally authorize international agreements to be substituted for treaties, which now require a vote of two-thirds of the Senate to ratify them. The question now presented to each Senator is this: Does his State, or does he, wish to take from the Senate the historic treaty-making power and place it under another name, an international agreement, an agreement which could be ratified or could become the law of the land by a mere majority vote of both Houses of Congress?

As I have previously stated, I am not posing to state the answer to the thorny question which is before us. I believe it can be answered only after a study over a period of 15 or 20 years of the dealings of the State Department, that is, the executive branch, in our foreign relations, in order that we may ascertain the method by which the problem should be solved.

Madam President, I am unable at this time to vote for an amendment to the Constitution which would take from my State of Michigan its equality of representation in the Senate, and would eliminate the requirement that only by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting can any of the rights of a State be taken from it. Therefore, I believe that these particular amendments should be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. GEORGE. Madam President, while I am not supporting the Bricker amendment, solely because it includes treaties, and I do not think it necessary to disturb the treatymaking power by this amendment, my own view is that it is within the competency of the Senate, when a treaty comes before it, to provide that it shall not be effective until it is implemented. Therefore, I think that by any reasonable degree of diligence we can protect the rights which should be preserved so far as the treaty-making power is concerned.

I invite the attention of my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the fact that my amendment contemplates that when any sort of international agreement is made, it shall become effective as international law from the very moment the President, or someone with the President's authority, places his signature on it. Therefore, I have asked only that the two Houses of Congress have the right to pass upon such portions of that international agreement as might affect internal or domestic law. By that I mean the law which is enforceable in the courts of our own country, and coextensive with their jurisdiction.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. Do I correctly understand that if a treaty relating to migratory birds internationally were entered into it would be objected to unless it had been voted upon and agreed to by the two legislative bodies?

Mr. GEORGE. If it were a treaty, I would be willing to let the treaty itself govern.

Mr. THYE. I understand the point with respect to treaties. If I did not use the correct term, I intended to refer to executive agreements.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The question I have in mind is this: Would the Senator object to an executive agreement relating to migratory birds—I use that illustration because we have that question before us—unless it had been agreed to by the two legislative bodies? Or would the Senator require that the two legislative bodies pass upon such executive agreement before it became a law?

Mr. GEORGE. Before it became a law within the United States. The distinction is this: I should be perfectly willing—and I long contemplated exactly that move—to abolish the impossible distinction between treaties and other international agreements, and simply provide that all international agreements should be considered to be treaties, should require a two-thirds vote of the Senate, and should be in pursuance of the Constitution. The only real objection to that is the multiplicity of agreements which must be made at this time, and are being made. It would simply be impossible for the Chief Executive to carry on the international affairs of the country if he had to wait for legislative approval in advance.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. Would the Senator object to an executive agreement which would establish a quota of imports of wheat, rye, or barley from Canada, for example? Would the Senator require such an agreement to be acted upon by both legislative bodies?

Mr. GEORGE. I think it should be acted upon either by a treaty or by both legislative bodies, if I correctly understand the Senator's question.

There have been two notable examples—perhaps more, but two notable examples—in recent years of executive agreements made in pursuance of a congressional act passed prior to the making of the agreements. One was the Lend-Lease Act. The Lend-Lease Act authorized the President, by a vote of the two Houses of Congress, to enter into agreements to furnish arms and munitions to other free countries, to become the "arsenal of democracy," and to lend or lease such arms and munitions to any country in the world to which the President saw fit to lend them, if he believed such country was friendly to us and to the free world.

Pursuant to an act of Congress the President obtained an appropriation and the Government caused arms and munitions to be made, and they were furnished very nearly every country then engaged in war.

The Trade Agreements Act is another illustration. Both Houses of Congress, by the ordinary processes of lawmaking, passed a law authorizing the President to make trade agreements with certain countries if he found it advantageous to enter into such agreements.

Those are notable examples of the Executive obtaining his power from the Congress before he acts.

I wish to add one further suggestion to indicate the reason why I do not become frightened by the argument of the distinguished Senator that we may be giving up some States rights. Breaking down, for the moment, the distinction, or the effort to try to distinguish between an international agreement and a treaty, when an international agreement conforms to the Constitution it becomes effective as international law, or external law, from the moment the President affixes his signature to it, except with respect to those provisions which relate entirely to the internal affairs of the United States.

I can see no real reason why, when those internal affairs in the United States are called into question, we should not remand the question to the two Houses of the National Legislature, to be dealt with as is the case in the ordinary process of lawmaking. I grant that there might be some disposition to feel that in some instances there would be a better chance of approval offered in the two Houses by a mere majority, than through approval by the Senate alone by a two-thirds vote. However, if the international agreement is one that is traditionally a treaty, if the subject matter of it makes it a treaty, and if the text of it makes it a treaty, then I believe the Senate could refuse to ratify it as an international agreement if it had the effect of making internal or domestic law.

The only objection I have to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is that it does bring in treatymaking, and I believe the Constitution is sufficient on the issue of treaties.

I do not care to disturb that relationship; and I see no way by which we can deal with other agreements which are of less dignity or character—we may call them executive agreements, international arrangements or agreements, understandings, or whatnot—except by going back to the old Articles of Confederation, and doing exactly what the President thought the "which" clause, as it was originally reported by the committee, did, namely, leave the determination of the matter to the States—and I believe the President is entirely right on that point—or abolishing the distinction attaching to executive agreements and other international agreements, and treating them all as treaties, and subjecting them to the supremacy clause treatment in the Constitution and to a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

I believe that procedure is too cumbersome. It makes impossible the expeditious handling of the business that must be carried on by our country at this time.

The other way is to do as I propose to do, and as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] proposes to do, to wit, say that so far as the internal effect of an agreement is concerned, it must be approved in the ordinary, normal method of making a law, because it relates to internal matters and because it is within the jurisdiction of the two Houses, and they can pass it; or leave it just as it stands now and allow the President—and I use the word "President" as descriptive of the office only—or his Secretary of State, or his representative, to decide what shall be put into an executive agreement or other international agreement which may override State laws and State policies.

I have looked in vain through the Constitution where the limitations on treaties, referred to in the court decisions, from the first case down to the last case, are to be found.

From the very beginning of the Government down to the last case it is admitted that there are perhaps limitations upon the power to make treaties. It is pointed out in some instances that the limitations are to be found by considering the objective or the purpose of the treaty. Yet in not a single case has the court said that a treaty went beyond the Constitution; and therefore in not a single case has it pointed out any limitation upon treatymaking. I think Senators will look through decisions in vain to find it.

While I am perfectly content to believe it is sufficient, in diligently discharging our duty, so far as treaties go, to insist that the treaty conform to the Constitution and not violate or conflict with any of its provisions, and that that is as far as it is necessary to go so far as treaties are concerned, I believe in the field of executive agreements and other international agreements, which do not come to the Senate—that is, not ordinarily, although occasionally they might—we ought to have some additional safeguard beyond the mere signature of the authorized officer of the Government who enters into it.

I do not believe we are bringing the House into treatymaking when we do it. From the very earliest decision it was held that a treaty could not be abrogated except by a vote of both the House and the Senate. It is impossible to get an appropriation to carry into execution an executive agreement or a treaty without participation by the House. Therefore, in this narrow and restricted field of internal law or domestic law, where I admit it has been the established and proper interpretation of the Constitution from the beginning that there must be an exercise of some internal power—at least enough exercise of internal power to carry the obligations of a treaty or of an international agreement into execution—and where the House already has the same jurisdiction as the Senate, because under the Constitution, all legislative power is vested in the Congress, consisting of two Houses, it is not an improper suggestion to say that the House shall participate, along with the Senate, in deciding whether such an agreement shall affect internal law in the United States.

CODE OF FAIR COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, the representative of the Independent Party proposes at this time to make a relatively short weekly report dealing with two subject matters.

Judging from the headlines and press reports, the American people have been promised for tomorrow a Roman holiday, taking the form of a Roman circus by way of a Senate committee hearing television show. I could press the analogy because it whets the imagination. I do not propose to stimulate the imagination

on that point by a description of the congressional circus paraphernalia, personnel, and mental gymnastics that are causing some of our Senate hearings to rival the Greatest Show on Earth. I do propose to discuss a matter to which I believe the Senate ought to give very early consideration, namely, the procedures governing congressional investigations.

I intend to discuss it outside the realm of any ad hominem arguments. I shall, in the course of my remarks, unquestionably, refer to some of my colleagues in the Senate, but let me say at the outset that I shall not refer to them with any intention of violating the spirit or the intent or the letter of rule XIX. If any colleague interprets any remark I make as being in violation of rule XIX, I say at the outset that such is not my intent or my motivation. But, in my opinion, we have reached such a point in connection with Senate investigations that we must come to grips with the problem.

As Senators elected by the free people of our States, we owe them the obligation to protect the liberties and procedural rights of the American people who appear as witnesses before Senate and House investigating committees. As the Senate has heard me say many times, the substantive rights of the American people can never be any greater than their procedural rights. By their procedural rights, and only by their procedural rights, will they enjoy freedom and liberty.

Our constitutional fathers recognized that when in waging a successful revolution against the British Crown they opposed inquisitions and star chamber proceedings. The time has come to end, by action of the Congress, inquisitions and star chamber procedures in congressional investigations. The people of the United States have the right to demand it, and, in my judgment, they are demanding it.

I wish to say to my colleagues in the Senate that when emotions are aroused and anger flares it is to be expected that there should appear in the press such articles as one which I read from the pen of Walter Lippmann yesterday morning. I cannot insert the article in the RECORD because it violates rule XIX, but I certainly agree with the major thesis of the article. I refer to it as a good illustration of what a very responsible writer is likely to conclude when he permits, as I think in this case he did, his pen to give vent to the emotional feelings of many people on the subject of the abuses of Senate investigations. There are so many things in the article with which I agree that I hesitate to criticize any part of it, but I suggest to this noted writer that he has not given sufficient weight to something which I have risen on the floor of the Senate to try to preserve, namely, the precious right of the Senate of the United States to investigate. The power to investigate is a power which the Senate of the United States must not relinquish, because the power to investigate is one of the great safeguards the American people have for the preservation of their liberties and their freedom. But we owe it to the American people to provide some safeguards which will prevent procedural abuses of the power to investigate.

This body knows that I have held to the notion for quite some time that the rights of the American people are being abused in congressional investigations. Their rights are abused when witnesses called before Senate investigators are not guaranteed, as matter of right, a mandatory code of procedure that shall govern the operation of the investigation. I happen to believe that we cannot reconcile with the concept of government by law the exercise of arbitrary, capricious discretion by men, even though they are United States Senators conducting a Senate investigation. The exercise of such dangerous discretion is exactly what we have in the Senate of the United States today in respect to investigations by committees of this body. The abuse has reached such a serious point that it becomes now the duty of the Senate of the United States to adopt a code of mandatory procedures binding upon every Senate committee and House committee, I care not whether it be the McCarthy committee or any other committee. I think every American citizen is entitled to the same protection before any other committee that I say he must be given before the McCarthy committee.

Having mentioned the McCarthy committee, let me make very clear here today that I shall continue to do all I can to support the power of the Senator from Wisconsin, as chairman of the committee, to conduct investigations. But I shall do my utmost to take away from the Senator from Wisconsin and from the chairmen of all other committees of the Senate the existing discretion which now obtains whereby they can follow whatever rules of procedure they see fit to apply. That is why I shall talk in terms of specific recommendations this afternoon by way of a substitute bill for Senate Resolution 83.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Like the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I made a statement on giving the reasons why I voted for the appropriation for the McCarthy committee, although I have, as is well-known, strongly and consistently, over a long period of time, opposed the procedures and the tactics and the methods of the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon would subscribe to my statement, which reads, in part, as follows:

> I will continue to work with all my strength for a proper mandatory code of procedure for that committee and for all other committees of the Senate and of the Congress. But I would not wish to confuse my attitude toward methods and procedures of a committee and its chairman with my attitude toward the general investigatory powers of congressional committees. I believe in that power and its legitimate exercise. I do not believe that the proper cure for the disease, in this case or in any other case, is the paralysis of all the functions of the committee by cutting off appropriations. To withhold all funds from a legally constituted committee of the Senate would furnish grounds for a plausible claim that the exercise of its proper functions had been sabotaged. In this case, nothing would more conveniently play into the hands of its chairman, Senator MCCARTHY. I would not, by my vote, refuse all appropriations to a legally constituted congressional committee. I will, however, continue in every way open to me to fight for a fair set of rules and procedures which will prevent the perversion of congressional investigation into congressional inquisition.

I may say I am in full agreement with the attitude of the Senator from Oregon, and I am very proud to have been his associate when he introduced his original resolution some months ago.

I think the answer to the present evils is not the withholding of appropriations from legally constituted investigatory committees, but, rather the establishment of a mandatory fair set of committee rules and procedures.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with every observation in the statement just uttered on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from New York, and I am exceedingly proud to be associated with him in the resolution previously introduced. As he knows, a substitute resolution I am introducing this afternoon for Senate Resolution 83 is being introduced for myself and on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] as a cosponsor.

I wish to make a little further comment in regard to the McCarthy committee, because I am not such a novice in American politics as to be unaware of the interpretation that will be made by some persons of the remarks I shall make here this afternoon. There is no question that the junior Senator from Wisconsin and the junior Senator from Oregon have very little in common so far as American politics are concerned. There is no question that the junior Senator from Wisconsin is perfectly aware of the fact that we do not share very many political points of view. I am as opposed to communism as much as is he but I disapprove of many of the tactics, methods, and procedures he uses in his so-called fight against communism. I am opposed to them because I think they violate the rules of fair procedure within the spirit, intent, and meaning of the Bill of Rights.

I opposed his reelection in 1952, and I shall not be surprised if he reciprocates with opposition to my reelection in 1956. I hope he will be no more successful in Oregon than I was in Wisconsin. [Laughter.]

Nevertheless, Madam President, I hope I can always rise above personal differences and personal feelings when it comes to a question of principle. With respect to the power of the junior Senator from Wisconsin, as the chairman of a committee and as the elected representative of the people of a great State, to conduct investigations on the basis of principle I have no intention of sitting in the Senate, no matter how much the argument may be made to me that the end justifies the means, and voting to scuttle or undermine the precious power of the Senate to investigate. I shall not vote to deny a committee the power to investigate some matter even when the investigation is being conducted by the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

That is why, a year ago, to refer to the argument just made by the distinguished junior Senator from New York, I walked onto the floor of the Senate, and as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, questioned at some length the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], then the chairman and still the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. At the time he was presenting his request for appropriations for the investigation work of the committees of the Senate.

Prior to hearing the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], I listened to some of my colleagues in the cloakroom tell me they were going to do what they could to prevent those appropriations for investigations from going through the Senate. As my witnesses they would have to testify this afternoon that I said to them, "Not with my vote. If the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] can make a prima facie case for the appropriations he asks for, then, as chairman of the committee, he should have power to conduct such investigations in line with the judgment of the committee." It does not make any difference whether or not I think a committee is wise in conducting an investigation of some matter. If a committee decides to exercise its power to investigate and makes a prima facie case, backing up its request, then I shall not vote to deny it the funds.

That is a principle it is very difficult to get people to understand, when, after all, the end sought tempts a person to use any means which will accomplish the end. Thus many people seem to think that Senators should try to stop investigations by the McCarthy committee through resorting to the means of denying the Senator from Wisconsin appropriations.

The RECORD will show that after my colloquy with the junior Senator from Indiana more than a year ago, I indicated that I was satisfied that he had made a prima facie case for the amount of money he was seeking in order to have the investigation work of the Senate conducted by the committees whose requests for funds come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration. The RECORD will show also that I asked for a yea-and-nay vote. I was a little disappointed that I did not get the assistance in obtaining the yea-and-nay vote from some liberal sources in the Senate that I thought should have been standing shoulder to shoulder with me, because I was fighting for a great liberal principle. I use the word "liberal" in its truest sense, Madam President; I use it in the sense of the obligation of every liberal to protect the basic freedoms and liberties of the American people.

The power of the United States Senate to investigate represents one of the basic liberties of the American people, because it constitutes one of the great guardians against the development of abuses on the part of legislative, executive, administrative, and judicial officials and departments within our form of Government. It also makes possible for the elected representatives of the people to conduct an investigation into any problem or evil which may endanger our body politic and in respect to which a legislative remedy may be needed.

We know very well what the RECORD will show as to what the vote was last year when the roll was called on the request for investigation funds. The vote was unanimous in support of the appropriations. Many persons in my State and throughout the Nation did not understand my position, and subjected me to criticism. That does not concern me when I am satisfied I am right as a matter of principle.

Within this year, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] had the obligation to come to the floor of the Senate and present requests for appropriations for the investigations which are to be carried on under his jurisdiction. Again, there were some suggestions that he should not be allowed the funds. To Senators who had argued with me about the matter in the cloakrooms, I said, "If he can make a prima facie case for the funds he seeks, it is not for us to say, 'You shall not have the money with which to carry out the power that is yours as chairman of the committee.' What we ought to do is to proceed to adopt a code of mandatory procedure, which will eliminate the abuses of the McCarthy committee and of every other committee of the Senate that violates, from time to time, what I consider to be the basic procedural rights of witnesses appearing before congressional committees."

It may be recalled that during the colloquy on the floor of the Senate not so many days ago, I explained again why I would vote for the appropriation, once I had become satisfied that the junior Senator from Wisconsin had made a prima facie case for the amount of money he asked for. But also I made it clear that I thought the Senate should adopt a mandatory code of procedure which I think is sorely needed to check the procedural abuses of the McCarthy committee as well as of other committees.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not also a fact that the Senator from Oregon, like the junior Senator from New York, made it very clear that the mandatory code of procedure would apply to all committees, not only to one individual committee? Did we not make it clear that there was involved a principle which would make it possible to carry on in a legitimate fashion the investigations which are within the power and the right of the Senate, but which would protect witnesses and protect innocent persons who appear before Senate committees, or whose names had been brought into the hearings?

Mr. MORSE. The record is perfectly clear, I may say to the junior Senator from New York, that the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New York, in discussing Senate Resolution 83 on innumerable occasions, both in the Senate and on the public platforms of America, have made clear that such a mandatory code would be binding upon all Senate committees. The substitute which I propose to introduce today would make it binding upon the investigations conducted by any congressional committee of either the Senate or the House. I shall give my reason shortly as to why I think the time has now come for Congress to pass legislation which will be binding on all congressional investigations.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the purpose in the mind of the Senator from Oregon, as it is in the mind of the junior Senator from New York is to protect the right of investigations, rather than the abuse by inquisitions, which have been conducted by the McCarthy committee and possibly other committees within the last 2 years?

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from New York that I wish to protect the Senate from the growing criticism throughout the country that our investigations, in some instances, are taking on the characteristics of inquisitions.

Madam President, I have felt compelled to make these observations today as the result of all the comment that has been sweeping the country in recent days, following the so-called Zwicker case, involving General Zwicker as a witness before the McCarthy committee. I have read the transcript of the hearings as published in the press. I think I know enough about examination and cross-examination, and I think I know enough about what happens to men in the heat of debate or in the heat of a trial, to understand full well what happened in that case.

I am aware of the fact that the press is pointing out that General Zwicker was subjected to great abuse on the part of the junior Senator from Wisconsin. I wish to say, quite kindly, that I do not think the Senator from Wisconsin engaged, on that occasion, in very artful examination. It seems to me that even the cold print demonstrated that he did what no lawyer should do in the heat of a trial. The Senator from Wisconsin let his feelings overtake him to a point which affected the phraseology of the language he used in examining General Zwicker. The cold print supports the conclusion that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] became heated in his questioning to the point that he abused the witness.

I may also say as a lawyer, and as one who read the cold type of General Zwicker's testimony, that I did not think at some points he was a very direct witness. Many answers he gave are subject to the criticism that General Zwicker was obviously seeking to evade, when, after all, as a witness, he owed an obligation to the Senator conducting the examination to be completely frank in explaining to the committee the military restrictions under which he believed he was compelled to limit his answers to the Senator's questions.

Nevertheless, when those points are mentioned, I think I have said all that can be said by way of any extenuating circumstances involved in the hearings. In my judgment, the type of hearing which was conducted in the Zwicker case

is the type which should be brought to an end in the Senate of the United States. The McCarthy committee and any other committee which follows the procedure which characterized the Zwicker case should clearly understand that, as a committee, it is a child of the Senate. As a committee child of the Senate it should be held responsible for its misbehavior. However, the Senate, too, as a parent has responsibilities in this matter. It should provide the disciplinary check of a mandatory code of procedure binding upon all committees. My resolution seeks to meet that responsibility. As the parents of congressional committees, I believe it is incumbent upon the Senate and the House to enact some rules of procedure regulating what its committee children can and cannot do. That is why I stress so urgently this afternoon adoption of a code like Senate Resolution 83, so that there will be no repetition of the unfortunate procedure which developed in the McCarthy subcommittee hearing in the Zwicker case.

Madam President, in behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] I submit a concurrent resolution to be substituted for Senate Resolution 83.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 64), submitted by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN), was received, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Whereas investigation of matters of public importance through committee hearings is of vital importance to the discharge of the constitutional functions of the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the investigative power of congressional committees is derived from the power of the Senate to inquire into matters of public importance within its jurisdiction; and

Whereas article I, section 5 of the Constitution of the United States provides that "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings"; and

Whereas no committee of the Senate and only a few committees of the House have published rules of procedure to govern the conduct of hearings; and

Whereas controversy over committee procedure unnecessarily prolongs hearings and has resulted in court litigation; and

Whereas the committees of Congress have not always observed the rights of the individual and maintained democratic safeguards: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the following be, and hereby are, adopted as the Code of Fair Committee Procedure of the Congress of the United States:

HEARINGS

SEC. 1. (a) All witnesses at committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel.

(b) Counsel shall have the right on behalf of witnesses to participate in hearings in the following manner: (i) To advise witnesses of their rights, (ii) to make objections to questions and procedure, (iii) to make brief statements in support of objections, (iv) to submit legal memoranda in support of objections (which shall become part of the record, but need not be incorporated in the transcript of hearings),

(c) Rulings on motions or objections shall be made by the Senator presiding, subject to appeal to the members present on motion of a member.

(d) All testimony taken shall be relevant and germane to the subject of the hearing as set forth in the resolution or motion scheduling the hearing or amendment thereto adopted prior to the witness' appearance, and at least 24 hours prior to his testifying a witness shall be given a copy of that portion of the motion or resolution stating the subject of the hearing or so much thereof as will advise him of the scope of his interrogation and a statement of the specific subjects about which the witness is to be interrogated.

(e) It is the policy of the Congress that only evidence and testimony which is reliable and of probative value shall be received and considered by a committee. The privileges obtaining in the Federal courts shall be observed scrupulously.

(f) (i) Every witness shall have the right to make complete and brief answers to questions and to make concise explanations of such answers.

(ii) Every witness who testifies in a hearing shall have a right to make an oral statement or at his option to file a sworn statement which shall be made part of the transcript of such hearing, but such oral or written statement shall be relevant to the subject of the hearing.

(g) A stenographic verbatim transcript shall be made of all committee hearings. Copies of such transcript, so far as practicable, shall be available for purchase at regularly prescribed rates from the official reporter by any witness or person mentioned in a public hearing. Any witness and his counsel shall have the right only to inspect the complete transcript of his own testimony in executive session but shall be obliged to keep such testimony confidential. Within its discretion a committee may permit a greater privilege of inspection.

RIGHTS OF PERSONS ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY TESTIMONY

SEC. 2. (a) A person shall be considered to be adversely affected by evidence and testimony of a witness if: (i) the evidence or testimony would constitute libel or slander at common law absent the immunity conferred upon it by reason of being made before a committee of Congress or (ii) the committee determines that the testimony would subject the person to serious hardship, embarrassment, shame, or financial loss. This definition shall be liberally construed.

(b) If the committee has reasonable cause to believe that a person will be adversely affected by evidence or testimony to be received at a public hearing, that person shall be, so far as practicable, so informed in advance of the hearing.

(c) If a person is adversely affected by evidence or testimony given in a public hearing that person (subject to reasonable limitations of time imposed by a majority of the committee) shall have the right: (i) To have the adverse witness recalled upon application made within 30 days after introduction of such evidence or the termination of the adverse witness' testimony, (ii) to be represented by counsel (as in (1) (b) hereof), (iii) to cross-examine (in person or by counsel) such adverse witness, (iv) to appear and testify or file a sworn statement in his own behalf and, (v) subject to the discretion of the committee, procure subpenas ad testificandum and duces tecum, to procure witnesses and evidence in his defense.

(d) If a person is adversely affected by evidence or testimony given in executive session, prior to the public release of such evidence or testimony or any disclosure of or comment upon it by members of the committee or committee staff or the taking of similar evidence or testimony in a public hearing, such person shall have the rights conferred by subsection (2) (C) hereof and to inspect at least as much of the evidence or testimony of the adverse witness as will be made public or the subject of a public hearing.

(e) No testimony given in executive session shall be released without the authorization of the committee by majority vote at a meeting at which a majority of members is present.

(f) No report based upon evidence or testimony adversely affecting a person shall be released unless such evidence or testimony and the complete evidence or testimony offered in rebuttal thereto, if any, is published prior to or simultaneously with the issuance of the report.

MEETINGS AND REPORTS

SEC. 3. (a) Committee meetings, other than regular meetings authorized by section 133 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 837), shall be called only upon a minimum of 24 hours' written notice to the office of each committee member.

(b) Committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) shall be held only upon the majority vote of the committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present.

(c) A resolution or motion scheduling hearings shall state clearly and concisely the subject thereof which may be amended in the same manner prescribed in subsection (b) for the scheduling of hearings.

(d) No testimony shall be taken in any hearing unless a majority of the committee is present.

(e) No committee report shall be issued unless a draft of such report is submitted to the office of each committee member 24 hours in advance of the meeting at which it is to be considered and is adopted at a meeting at which a majority is actually present.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. As used in this act: "Committee" shall mean any standing, select, or special committee of the Senate (except the Majority and Minority Policy Committees) and subcommittees thereof.

"Person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, the new concurrent resolution makes several major changes in the original resolution.

When submitted last February 20, the resolution was directed only to the amendment of the Senate rules. It was limited at that time, because each House has a feeling of independence about its own rules. It was hoped that the Senate would set an example which the House would follow. That, unfortunately, has not come to pass, primarily because of the Senate's own inaction.

No Senate hearings have been held on Senate Resolution 83 or on Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, submitted by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and other Senators, including the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The Committee on Rules has held no hearing on the reform of committee procedures, despite the need for it and the introduction of these and other resolutions. The House has done a little better, if only a little. There have been hearings, and at least one committee has published its rules; but, in my judgment, I say respectfully, they could stand some improvement.

The problem is becoming increasingly serious. The resolution I am introducing today is a comprehensive Code of Fair Committee Procedure of the Congress of the United States.

The resolution provides for the following basic rights for witnesses:

The right to counsel.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I wish to pause at that point, because I know the answer which is made, that Senate investigations are not trials in the legalistic, narrow sense, and therefore they cannot be conducted in accordance with rules of procedure which prevail in court.

My faith in the judicial process as a vehicle for fact finding is much greater than that of those who make such an argument. I stand on the floor of the Senate today and say that, judged by the results, Senate committees which bring before them fellow citizens who are placed on trial before the bar of public opinion as to their innocence or guilt on a charge made by a committee, in fact make such witnesses stand trial.

I am willing to wait for an argument, which I think will not stand up under analysis, which will seek to justify the conclusion that we should not give to fellow Americans called into a congressional investigation the same procedural protection which they enjoy in any courtroom in America, when it comes to the matter of offering proof which may determine guilt or innocence.

We have reached such a point in the conducting of Senate investigations, which go into the question of the innocence or guilt of persons under investigation, that it is a legal fiction to argue that, in fact, such persons are not standing trial. The sad truth is that they are being greatly jeopardized by the failure on the part of the Senate to accord to them the right which I have just named, the right to counsel.

I think such a right is so important for the safeguarding of our liberties that I am willing to stand on the floor of the Senate today and label it as a nonexaggerated statement that, in an investigation where the question of innocence or guilt is involved the right of a man or woman to counsel determines whether or not, in the last analysis, that he or she is a free person in America.

It is very difficult to draw a qualitative line of distinction when speaking of depriving people in this country of liberties or freedoms which they should enjoy; but I am willing to say that there would not be personal liberty for individuals in America if they were deprived of the precious right to be represented by counsel. If a citizen does not have such a right, when he is in a situation which is tantamount to a trial, then he is the victim of an inquisition or a star-chamber proceeding. There can be no liberty for an individual in a society which maintains trial procedure by way of an inquisition. Our Founding Fathers recognized that, and, along with other causes of the Revolutionary War, were willing to fight a revolution to bring such a practice to an end.

I repeat that any citizen or any witness called before a Senate investigation should be entitled to walk into the hearing room protected by the precious freedom of representation by counsel—I care not whether it is the McCarthy committee or any other committee. It is my belief that the Senate has the duty of devising a mandatory code of procedure which will be equally binding upon the committee, the so-called defendant, and his counsel and all witnesses and parties to the hearing.

What is the check I am proposing as essential under the check-and-balance system which marks our form of government? The check of letting the courts decide, in the last analysis, whether or not the Senate has exercised its obligation, under the rule of reasonableness, when it comes to devising rules of procedure for the guidance of committees. I do not think the Senate can any longer permit Americans to be subjected to committee procedudes which can best be described as permitting badgering, abusive, and third-degree tactics.

In my professional labors as a lawyer before I came to the Senate, I worked on a series of crime studies, investigating, among other matters, the operation of existing Federal and State criminal-law procedures. In some sections of the Nation, in both jurisdictions—Federal and State—we discovered abuses of procedure on the part of law-enforcement officers which could be described as badgering, as third degree, as unconscionable methods of attempting to elicit confessions or statements from the witnesses or those accused. A study of the results, in our history, of various investigations of the administration of criminal law, will disclose that whenever the people of the United States have discovered that such tactics are used by law-enforcement officers, the people usually take a series of steps to stop such abuses. They usually get rid of the chief of police or the prosecutor or the detective or other law-enforcement officer who makes use of such procedures. The people get rid of the judge who allows such procedures to be followed in his courtroom; or they have legislation enacted—if it is needed in a given jurisdiction—to prohibit by legislative mandate all such abusive practices.

Madam President, I say we have reached the point where, as the parent body of Senate committees, the Senate had better adopt some mandatory rules which will guarantee to witnesses before Senate committees the basic precious procedural rights, the first of which I have mentioned, namely, the right to be represented by counsel.

Representation by counsel does not mean that all the counsel can do is sit in the hearing room and remain silent.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator from Oregon remember a speech or statement on this very subject, made some weeks ago by President Eisenhower? At that time the President said—I cannot quote his exact words, but I think I can state the intent of what he said, or the gist of it—that a man accused should, first, be permitted to know the charges which had been filed against him; second, he should be confronted by his accuser; third, he should have the right to answer the charges in a manner which would fully safeguard his civil rights and liberties.

Certainly there is no indication that any of those requirements, as set forth by the President, are being complied with in the slightest degree. At the present time there is no protection whatsoever; a witness before a congressional committee is not confronted with his accuser; he is not even given the right to know the nature of the charges against him; and certainly he is estopped from answering the charges in a manner which will protect his rights and liberties or which will bring to his defense such aids, with regard to evidence, as may seem proper and necessary to him or to his counsel.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New York is correct on this point, and the President is also correct on it. So is the ex-President. I am familiar with the position the ex-President took on this matter. My colleagues will recall that after I first offered a proposal for a mandatory code of investigative procedure in Senate committees, the then President of the United States, Mr. Truman, made a similar recommendation to the Nation. I am glad he did. However, I am perfectly willing to have my resolution, which is jointly sponsored by the Senator from New York, judged on the merits of its contents. We can cite—if there is a wish to have us do so—opinion evidence; we can cite an exceedingly long list of distinguished lawyers, judges, bar associations, and committees of the bar, in support of the principles I am raising my voice in defense of this afternoon.

However, I am not going to rely on opinion evidence. I shall rely on the inherent nature of the provisions of the resolution. Let them speak for themselves, judged from the standpoint of the history of the United States and the development of civil rights, liberties, and freedoms of the people of the Nation.

If the resolution is judged on the basis of that history, I do not think one vote can be cast, on merit, against it.

What is the second right the resolution guarantees? It is the right to be advised, in advance, of the subject matter to be taken up at the hearing. That right does not exist at the present time. If advance notice is had, it is had only because the committee in its discretion has chosen to give it. Today, a person can be haled before a congressional committee, and—unless he is dealing with a committee which in its discretion has adopted certain rules of procedure which result in giving him notice of the matter to be looked into—he will not have the slightest notice regarding the subject matter to be investigated at the hearing.

Of course, I know it is said by some, "But no one is really taken by surprise, because most of those who are haled before such committees have a rather good inkling of what is to be investigated."

Of course, that is another example of the alibi that the end justifies the means used. But it is not good enough if we are to be jealous guardians of the basic procedural rights of the American people, which rights are essential to the preservation of their liberties.

So the resolution the Senator from New York and I are submitting this afternoon guarantees to those who are haled

before Senate committees for investigation the right to be advised in advance of the nature of the investigation, so they will be able to proceed to prepare their case, so they will be able to consult with counsel and to have the benefit of counsel's advice.

Next, our resolution guarantees the precious right of being able to testify in one's own behalf. Of course, that means, the precious right to submit one's case in chief in an orderly way, without being badgered or third-degreed or abused in the attempt to do so. It means an orderly procedure whereby one takes the stand, after the case against him has been presented, submits his reply, testimony, and evidence, under orderly procedure, and then subjects himself to the cross-examination of the state.

Madam President, some say such a procedure would take too long. However, that is not the case at all. I am willing to assert without fear of successful contradiction, that if what really is sought in such investigations is the truth, and if the truth is not being sought, there is no right to conduct such investigations—it will be obtained in a shorter period of time by following those well recognized rules of procedure under the judicial process, rather than by using the kangaroo-court methods which have come to identify the procedures in connection with too many Senate committee investigations.

Our resolution provides for an orderly procedure in connection with the issues involved in the investigation. It will free the Senate from the very serious charge which is being made against it, these days, namely, the browbeating of witnesses, the charges which were exemplified, for example, by yesterday's article by Walter Lippmann, to which I referred earlier in my remarks. Charges which unfortunately have much truth to them and which discredit the Senate.

What else is guaranteed by this resolution? The right to be advised of adverse testimony before it is released to the public. That is a precious right. Of course, it means that there must be some testimony. Implemented, this procedural safeguard would bring an end to the anonymous smear material which is not even signed, but which is too frequently accepted into the record by our committees. Very frequently not even members of the committee know its source. We cannot reconcile that kind of offer of proof with the protection of the liberties of the American people within the framework of the spirit and intent of the Bill of Rights, which guarantees a fair trial.

As I indicated before, I am aware that my argument would not stand up in court in this respect—and this respect only: the cases are pretty clear that the United States Congress, in carrying out its investigating powers, is not conducting a trial within the meaning of a fair trial as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. But it is perfectly clear that frequently our committees violate the spirit and intent of the Bill of Rights. When, as in many of these investigations, committees turn themselves into quasi-judicial tribunals, I think it is perfectly clear that they owe an obligation to the American people to give them the protection of fair judicial processes, by such basic elementary guaranties of procedure as those which I have enumerated in this proposed resolution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator has stated—and I am in full agreement with him—that Congress has the power to order investigations and to give committees certain rights which in its wisdom it sees fit to give them. Does not that more than ever indicate and prove that the Congress of the United States has a solemn duty to make certain that the investigations which are authorized are conducted in a fair manner?

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment, it clearly does.

The next procedural right which I seek to guarantee and make available to accused parties appearing before congressional committees is the right, under reasonable rules of time limitation imposed by the committee, to cross-examine witnesses who give testimony damaging to them. There again, Madam President, if the matter gets into court subsequently as the result of a citation for contempt, the committee has nothing to fear if it has followed a course of action which the courts, in turn, find can be reconciled with the rule of reasonableness. If the committee cannot reconcile its procedures with the well-established judicial rule of reasonableness, of course, it ought to be reversed by the courts, in keeping with the check-and-balance system of our Government.

The guaranty for which I am fighting is one of the best means of bringing to an end the dangerous presumption which is developing in too many congressional investigations, that of the substitution of a presumption of guilt for the presumption of innocence. Put the witness under cross-examination, and he is put on proof. As I previously indicated, that means that there must be witnesses. One argument which is sometimes used against this particular procedural guarantee for which I am fighting is that allowing cross-examination of prosecuting witnesses would disclose the Government's hand. It is an objection without substance or merit. The examination can be done in secret, in executive session of the committee, if in a particular case it can be shown that for security reasons such procedure ought to be followed; and I am convinced that the courts would sustain such procedure. But I can no longer remain silent in the Senate on the question of the development to a dangerous degree of the presumption of guilt as a substitute for the presumption of innocence in congressional investigations.

One has only to read the transcripts of some of the hearings to know full well that that is the presumption which sometimes committees indulge in. Free Americans are brought before committees and challenged in effect to prove their innocence. One would think that our committees never heard of the rule as to the burden of proof. The burden of proof should rest upon the Government to establish the charges against those accused by a committee.

I know that we have the duty of conducting legislative investigations on various subject matters in order to determine what, if any, legislation in the public interest we ought to pass or repeal. But, in my judgment, we cannot justify a kangaroo court procedure as a means to that end. Even in the so-called legislative investigation process, I believe reasonable rules of procedure ought to be guaranteed to fellow Americans. I will not support the continuation of a process in the Senate which produces the kind of transcripts which are coming from some of the committees, so far as concerns the violation of the personal rights of fellow citizens haled before such committees.

What else would I guarantee? I would guarantee the right to have a stenographic record of testimony taken, the right to file a brief, and a rebuttal brief, if necessary, and the right, in the case of a contempt citation, to appeal to the courts for a review of the question as to whether or not the procedural rights of the defendant were in any way violated by the committee in conducting the investigation. It is that last guaranty which causes so much concern on the part of some legislators. They do not want to have the courts take a look to see whether or not we, as a legislative body, are following fair rules of procedure which do not violate procedural rights of fellow Americans.

I have taught the check-and-balance system for too many years to sit by and accept as sound the argument that the legislative prerogative of the Congress would be violated in any way by a procedure which guarantees a fellow American the right to have the courts look into the question of whether or not the legislative branch of the Government is conducting an inquisition or a star-chamber proceeding. It is time to guarantee this right to our fellow citizens.

Lastly, I mention the fact that my resolution guarantees that a majority of the members of the committee or of the subcommittee shall be present for the examination of a witness on the stand. That little guaranty would have prevented such a thing as the Zwicker case. That little guaranty would eliminate a surprising amount of public criticism these days about some of the investigations which have been conducted in this body in the past few years.

Too frequently such investigations have been one-man stands, assisted by staff members, without the checking influence of colleagues sitting by and saying, "Just a minute, Mr. Chairman; I think the chairman is going a little too far with that question," or "Mr. Chairman, I think you ought to allow the witness to complete the statement which he was in the process of making before you ask the question you are now asking him to answer."

Senators are a great check on each other when committee hearings are being conducted. I believe that citizens who are called before congressional committees, and who, after all, are human beings, as are the members of the com-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

mittees, are entitled to the check of the requirement that a majority of the members of a committee, or of a subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over the hearings, be present when a witness is under examination.

Madam President, we may have to adjust our schedules a little bit, but we had better not place our own personal convenience above the procedural rights of American citizens who are haled before investigating committees. If a majority of the committee cannot be present, let the hearing be postponed until a majority can be obtained.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, I do not want to press the matter which I am bringing up at this moment, but I do wish to present it for the consideration of my distinguished colleague, because it is very important. It is the necessity of having executive hearings actually executive and secret. I have in mind, in connection with the McCarthy subcommittee, particularly the investigation of the so-called Fort Monmouth situation. Those hearings were executive. They were held in the presence of one Senator. I believe that that Senator was the chairman of the subcommittee. They were executive hearings, secret hearings. The press, radio and television representatives, and the public were not permitted to attend those hearings. They were actually secret hearings.

Nevertheless the chairman of the subcommittee came out of the hearings every day, met the press, and gave to the press his version and his account of what had transpired at the hearings, and of what the witnesses had said at the hearings. The newspapers carried the statements of the chairman of the subcommittee with great headlines, leading the public to believe that what was said by the chairman of the committee after a secret hearing actually represented the developments at the hearing. I believe it is time to stop that kind of procedure.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, as my colleague knows, the substitute I am offering contains a provision which will prevent that kind of abusive practice, by requiring a majority vote in committee on any release that comes out of a committee after a secret or executive session had been held.

Mr. LEHMAN. I realize that to be the fact. However, I wish to emphasize my abhorrence of the tactics which have been followed along that line. Great damage has been done in many instances by bringing to the people of the country an entirely erroneous impression of what had actually transpired at the hearing.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator from New York, and that is why, as the Senator knows, we sought to prevent that abuse by requiring a majority vote of the members of the committee with respect to any release that may come out of the committee.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I wish to emphasize that point again. What the Senator has stated is perfectly true. However, even in an executive hearing, at which there is present a majority of the subcommittee or of the committee, unless the public or the representatives of the press and other media of communication are admitted, I believe there should be no statement made whatever to the press, because otherwise there is no possibility of checking the accuracy of such a statement.

Mr. MORSE. What our resolution seeks to do is to provide a procedure for the release of the official transcript, or a part of the official transcript which in the opinion of the committee the public interest requires should be released.

I may say to my colleague from New York that we do not have in the resolution—and I do not know how we could devise it—a provision which would prevent a colleague in the Senate, with the tremendous power that attaches to the position of a Senator, from saying what he desired to say to the press. It is only to be hoped that the discretion, the wisdom, and the very good judgment of a Senator will cause him to stay within the spirit and intent and purpose of such a resolution as the one I am offering.

Second. The substitute makes clear that the witness will be given, at least 24 hours before he is to appear, a copy of the resolution authorizing the hearing which states the subject of the hearing. And, he is to have the right to a bill of particulars of the matters about which he will be interrogated.

Third. The third major addition is as follows:

> No testimony given in executive session shall be released without the authorization of the committee by majority vote at a meeting at which a majority of members is present.

That is the problem to which the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] has just addressed himself.

Let us remember that each committee and subcommittee is the agent of the Senate and House. Each individual Senator and Representative is not clothed with the authority of the Congress to investigate. It is for a committee to decide how investigations shall be conducted and what disclosures are to be made.

One Senator may feel that counter-espionage is best conducted by headline disclosures. It is reasonable to expect that other Senators will feel that spies are not caught by headlines, but rather by expert undercover agents. At the very least, committee members should have the opportunity to decide whether an investigation has been fruitful and how the fruits should be used. A majority may very well feel that the fruit is green or overripe with age and handling.

These are all matters for committee decision, not the unrestricted discretion of a committee or subcommittee chairman who has achieved his position only by virtue of being the ranking member of the majority party.

If committees are to act responsibly, the committee as such must retain control of its functioning.

Madam President, I conclude my discussion of the first of two topics of the Independent Party's report today by saying that I am well aware of the fact that there will be many persons who, not having the benefit of the exact text of what I said on the floor of the Senate today, will undoubtedly, as my mail will show in the next few days, make some very interesting interpretations of my remarks.

However, I wish to make it clear that I stand on the record I have made this afternoon on the floor of the Senate and the record I have made in the past on this issue. I serve notice now that the representative of the Independent Party will continue to press for action on a mandatory code of procedure, binding upon all congressional investigations. I am perfectly willing—and my mind is perfectly open—to consider any amendment to the resolution any Senator may wish to submit. But the point I wish to stress is that we should take steps now to end the possibility of any more Zwicker cases.

According to the ticker, the Republican members of the committee apparently met today with the Secretary of the Army and came to some understanding which will result in at least one ring of the investigation circus not being played tomorrow. However, I suggest that we ought to return to the courtesy of mutuality in the Senate, and that if the members on one side of the table in a committee believe that a certain course of action should be followed they ought to take the members on the other side of the table into their confidence. Mutuality dictates that in fairness minority members should participate in forming a committee decision in respect to continuing or discontinuing or postponing or canceling an announced committee hearing.

I regret to read on the ticker that that was not done by the Republican majority of the committee. I know a majority vote is what talks, but, after all, when we are dealing with procedural rights before committees we should not overlook what I call the rule of mutuality. Apparently the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Stevens, has agreed to meet the demands of the Republicans on the McCarthy committee. The ticker tape carrying the news is not clear as to what face-saving powder has been used to cover up embarrassments. However, I shall not be surprised if the incident reflects to the discredit of the administration.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not a member of the Independent Party and I have not spoken as a member of that party. I have spoken, and I am now speaking, as a small part of the Democratic Party of which I am proud to be a member. I can say to the leader of the Independent Party that, like him, I shall do my utmost to bring about a fair mandatory code of procedure which will protect the right to investigate and at the same time will prevent inquisition rather than investigation. I am very happy, indeed to be associated with the Senator from Oregon in the introduction of this resolution.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his contribution, and I particularly thank him for associating himself with the Independent Party on this issue, because I am proud to have as my cosponsor of the resolution a man who I

consider to be the most outstanding liberal in American politics today, the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not claim that, but I thank the Senator.

Mr. KERR rose.

Mr. MORSE. Does my friend from Oklahoma wish me to yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. No. I wanted to take the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I have one other topic in my report today. I am delighted to have the Senator from Oklahoma present as I discuss the next topic, and I appreciated his attendance when I discussed the first one. I think he will find a particular interest in the second topic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

ACTION BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE WITH REFERENCE TO RAILROAD FREIGHT RATES

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I wish to say a few words in regard to the course of action which in recent days has been followed by the Secretary of Agriculture in an appeal to the Emergency Board established under the Railway Labor Act. I do not know whether the Senate is aware of it, but labor organizations throughout the country, outside the Railroad Brotherhoods as well as within the organizations of the Railroad Brotherhoods, are very much disturbed regarding the course of action which the Secretary of Agriculture has followed in connection with an Emergency Board hearing in Chicago on a railroad emergency case. The Secretary of Agriculture has sent a letter to Mr. Charles Loring, Chairman of the Emergency Board, at the Palmer House, Chicago, Ill., under date of February 3, 1954. This letter is now receiving some public attention because its public release is of recent date.

I am disturbed about it because of the schisms and the wedges of discord and discontent which I think the Secretary of Agriculture is driving into the American body politic in these days. The letter speaks for itself, so I shall read it:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 3, 1954.

Mr. CHARLES LORING,
Chairman, Emergency Board,
Railway Labor Act, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. LORING: Farmers, farm organizations, and the Department of Agriculture are greatly concerned with the problems confronting your Board.

At a time like this the American farmer and the general public would be seriously injured either by a prolonged strike of railroad workers or by an increase in railroad operating costs large enough to justify another general increase in freight rates. This Department has not attempted to estimate the cost of the benefits asked by railroad workers, but we understand that they may be substantial. We feel strongly that it would be unwise now to increase railroad operating costs by an amount large enough to provide any basis for another round of increases in freight rates on farm products.

In your study, therefore, we ask you to consider the following facts:

Then the Secretary of Agriculture proceeds through this letter to attempt to insert into the record of the emergency board the following statistical material:

1. Since February 1951 farm prices have dropped 19.5 percent.

2. Net farm income fell from $14.6 billion in 1951 to $13.5 billion in 1952 and to approximately $12.5 billion in 1953. This decline from 1951 to 1953 equals 14.4 percent.

3. The worsening of the farm situation cannot be laid to a drop in consumer demand. Retail food prices, for example, are 14.9 percent higher than they were 3 years ago.

4. One of the main causes of the drop in farm prices and farm income is the continued increases in marketing costs, of which railroad freight rates are an important part. In February 1951, the farmer was getting 49 cents of the consumer's food dollar. He now gets only 45 cents. Agricultural freight rates are now 10 percent higher than in 1951.

5. The railroads have been losing agricultural traffic since the end of World War II. We believe they would lose more if freight rates were pushed up still further. This would mean a loss of employment on railroads. Although agricultural production increased 12.5 percent from 1947 to 1952, the quantities of agricultural products handled by class I railroads declined 14 percent. Estimates based upon grain and livestock carloading indicate this decline has continued throughout 1953.

Since 1945 there have been 11 general increases in railroad freight rates. The present authorized rates on agricultural products are about 70 percent higher than in 1945. We feel strongly that another increase now would seriously injure the farmer and the general public. We realize the difficulties confronting your Board, but we urge you to find some solution which will neither bring about a work stoppage on our railroads nor give any justification for another increase in agricultural freight rates.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

In my judgment, this letter was gratuitous. It involved an intervention in a field in which Mr. Benson is anything but an expert, and, in my opinion, it will create a great deal of misunderstanding between farm groups, farm workers, and farm interests on the one hand and city workers on the other.

I think it is very unfortunate that we have a Secretary of Agriculture who on issue after issue seems to have a remarkable ability to put both feet and both hands into his mouth at the same time. He certainly did that in this case. What he has done amounts to an attempt to interfere with a judicial process under the Railroad Labor Act of 1926.

The background of this situation is approximately, as follows:

A Presidential emergency board was appointed pursuant to section 10 of the Railway Labor Act which emergency grew out of a dispute between the carriers and the 15 cooperating railway labor organizations that failed of settlement through direct negotiations and after the services of the National Mediation Board were invoked and proved fruitless. The National Mediation Board reported the dispute to the President and on December 18 the President announced that an emergency board would be appointed in keeping with procedures of the Railway Labor Act.

It was in 1941 that I was chairman of an emergency board which handled probably the major railroad dispute in the history of our country, and the same procedures I am outlining here in regard to the instant case were followed in that case as well as in all so-called railroad emergency board cases.

The President appointed the Board to consider the issues in dispute, which are as follows:

Improved vacation plan consistent with American industry generally.

Incidentally, it was in the 1941 case that there was recognized by our Board for the first time the principle of vacations in a segment of the railway industry, because the evidence showed clearly that it had become common practice in American industry generally.

The other issues are: Pay for holidays not worked; time and one-half for Sunday, as such; improvement in pass regulations for employees; insurance and health and welfare program.

It is alleged by the Railroad Brotherhoods that the proposed program will simply bring railroad employees up to standards already enjoyed by a large segment of American industrial employees.

Having worked in this field for a number of years, I cannot recall any Cabinet officer heretofore gratuitously intervening in a labor dispute in the railroad industry or in any other major nonagricultural industry.

We should keep in mind also that the recommendations when made by the Board will not be mandatory; they will depend for acceptance upon further procedures provided for in the act. For the life of me, I am at a loss to understand why the Secretary of Agriculture has gone out of his way to make himself a party to this dispute, taking it upon himself to say, as the first part of his letter clearly implies, that he thinks he is speaking for American farmers and American agricultural interests. I think he will be shockingly surprised to discover that large segments of American agriculture feel he has participated in a matter which is not any of his business.

Madam President, I desire to place in the RECORD at this point a telegram dated February 24, 1954, which has been sent to the President of the United States by a long list of railway organizations. Since it is a short communication, I shall read it.

FEBRUARY 24, 1954.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

We learned yesterday that Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, under date of February 3, 1954, addressed a letter to Judge Charles Loring, chairman of the Presidential Emergency Board now hearing dispute on request of 1 million railway employees for improved working conditions, in effect insisting that the Emergency Board not recommend any improvement for railway employees on the professed ground that American farmers are in desperate economic plight. Railway employees are in most complete sympathy with American farmers in the condition to which they have been reduced in the last year, but obviously the remedy for the unsound policies now prevailing in farm marketing is not to be found in attacks on other great groups of producing workers. This fallacy in the claims of Secretary Benson is the least of the objections to his conduct. Interference by a Cabinet member

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

in a proceeding that is required by law to be impartial is an unwarranted and outrageous infringement of the rights of railway workers under the Railway Labor Act. Such flagrant misconduct by a member of your highest official group merits the strictest reprimand, if not impeachment. Believing as we do that you would not and did not sponsor this breach of law and ethics we respectfully request that you remove, insofar as that is now possible, this impairment of the impartiality of this proceeding by publicly disavowing the act of Secretary Benson and securing the withdrawal of the letter in question. We further respectfully request an opportunity to meet with you to discuss the explosive situation created by Secretary Benson.

G. E. Leighty, Chairman, Employees' National Conference Committee; Michael Fox, President, Railway Employees' Department, AFL; Charles J. MacGowan, International President, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers; John Pelkofer, General Vice President, in Charge of Blacksmiths, Railroad Division; Irvin Barney, General President, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America; J. J. Duffy, International Vice President, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; A. J. Hayes, International President, International Association of Machinists; C. D. Bruns, General Vice President, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; Anthony Matz, President, International Brotherhood of Firemen, Oilers, Helpers, Round House and Railway Shop Laborers; George M. Harrison, Grand President, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees; T. C. Carroll, President, Brotherhood of Maintenance-of-Way Employees; G. E. Leighty, President, the Order of Railroad Telegraphers; Jesse Clark, President, Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; Capt. John M. Bishop, Secretary, National Organization Masters, Mates and Pilots of America; H. L. Dagget, President, National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association; H. L. Haselgren, Secretary-Treasurer, International Longshoremen's Association; Hugo Ernst, General President, Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union.

It is perfectly obvious that some of these representatives of labor are a wee bit hot under the collar. I have read their letter into the RECORD, however, not from the standpoint of intimating that I go as far as they go in their censure but because I wish to join in the protest of the conduct of the Secretary of Agriculture in this regard. If any emergency board wants the advice of any Cabinet officer, a board carrying out its functions under the Railway Labor Act, it will ask for it.

Judicial bodies or quasi-judicial bodies should not be subjected to the kind of pressure to which the Secretary of Agriculture has resorted. The Secretary should have waited until he was called. The board would have called upon him if they thought he had a contribution to make.

It is going to be a sad state of affairs, so far as the conducting of judicial processes by quasi-judicial bodies is concerned, if such bodies are to be confronted, after they have been appointed by the President of the United States, with the gratuitous intervention of Cabinet officers. In that respect I share the resentment of the officials of the railroad organizations that have protested to the President.

Madam President, this concludes the report of the representative of the Independent Party for this week.

I yield the floor.

INCREASE OF PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS UNDER THE INCOME-TAX LAW

Mr. KERR. Madam President, a few days ago I joined with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] in the introduction of a measure——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KERR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Texas, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Mansfield
Anderson	Gore	Martin
Barrett	Green	Maybank
Beall	Griswold	McCarthy
Bennett	Hayden	McClellan
Bricker	Hendrickson	Millikin
Burke	Hennings	Monroney
Bush	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Murray
Byrd	Holland	Neely
Capehart	Humphrey	Pastore
Carlson	Hunt	Payne
Case	Ives	Potter
Chavez	Jackson	Purtell
Clements	Jenner	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smathers
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kilgore	Sparkman
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Ellender	Kuchel	Thye
Ferguson	Langer	Upton
Flanders	Lehman	Watkins
Frear	Lennon	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Wiley
George	Magnuson	Williams
Gillette	Malone	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, a few days ago I joined the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] in the introduction of a measure designed to increase the individual and dependency exemptions of United States taxpayers, in reference to their income taxes, to $800 for 1954, and to $1,000 thereafter. I did so because of my conviction at the time that such a measure is badly needed and is best calculated to give additional purchasing power to millions of Americans at a time when I believe it is most desirable, and at the same time to give to millions of American taxpayers the form of tax relief which, in my judgment, would be of the greatest value to the greatest number.

Since the introduction of that measure, there have occurred a number of events which have demonstrated the need for the enactment of such a measure, and in my judgment have made it even more apparent that Congress should pass the measure at an early date.

Today I saw on the news ticker the following item:

> Wholesale food prices this week rose 9 cents, to the highest level in nearly 3 years, on the Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., index released today. This week's index of $7.20 is the highest reported since $7.21 on March 27, 1951. It compares with $7.11 in the previous week, $6.21 last year, and is 20.8 percent over the pre-Korea $5.96. The index represents the sum total of the price per pound of 31 foods in common use. Twelve items showed an advance, 8 declined, and 11 held unchanged.

Mr. LONG. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Are we to understand that is the food price index; or is it the index for the price of all commodities?

Mr. KERR. According to the news report based on the Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., index released today, it is with reference to wholesale food prices this week in the United States.

Mr. LONG. I am sure my colleague is quite familiar with the fact that all the prices the farmers have received for farm commodities have been very much down during the last year or so. Therefore, I am very much surprised to see that the prices paid by consumers, by housewives, are even higher than they have been for some time past.

Mr. KERR. The new index is an all-time high, as I understand. Certainly, according to the report, it is an all-time high for the past few years, and is more than 20 percent higher than the pre-Korea price.

Mr. LONG. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Would not the fact that the prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities have declined, while the prices paid by housewives have risen, tend to indicate that Secretary Benson may be in for a disappointment, if by cutting the price at which he has supported butter, he expects a similar reduction to occur across the market?

Mr. KERR. I think the Senator from Louisiana is eminently correct. I am not of the opinion that the Secretary of Agriculture believes that his reduction in the support basis for butter will result in a decline in the prices to be paid for food by American housewives.

This illustrates—as has been so well brought out by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana—the strange paradox now taking place, namely, the continued decline in the prices paid to farmers for agricultural commodities, and the continued increase in the prices paid for

food by American consumers. It further emphasizes the necessity for early consideration by the Congress of the tax-relief measure introduced the other day by the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Delaware and myself.

The second event which has taken place since the introduction of that measure, and which, in my opinion, is of great significance, was the action which I understand was taken yesterday by the House Ways and Means Committee. I understand that an effort was made in that committee by the Democratic members to amend the tax bill now under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee so as to increase the individual and dependency exemption in the internal revenue law. My information is that the proposal received the vote of the 10 Democratic members, but was defeated by the united action of the 15 Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee.

I am convinced that the American people are demanding and are entitled to an amendment to the tax laws providing increased individual and dependency exemption, in order to bring a measure of relief to the low-income groups, both with respect to their purchasing power and their tax burden. I hope that the House committee may reconsider its action and amend the bill so as to include the increased personal and dependency exemption sought in the measure introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Oklahoma, and the Senator from Delaware. I am of the opinion that the Congress would adopt such a measure before the tax bill now being considered by the House became law, as a part of the first tax measure passed by Congress.

Another event of which I have learned since the introduction of the measure referred to was the matter last referred to by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in his report for the Independent Party. I congratulate him upon calling the attention of the Senate and the country to the arbitrary action taken by the Secretary of Agriculture when, in his official capacity, he addressed a communication to Mr. Charles Loring, chairman of the Emergency Board under the Railway Labor Act, at the Palmer House in Chicago, Ill., in connection with the official actions of such emergency board, which is now undertaking to find a settlement to the controversy between railway labor and railway labor employers. I cannot conceive of a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States seeking to interfere with and use undue pressure upon a judicial body charged with the duty of a fair, impartial, and just adjudication of a question before it.

It has been apparent for many weeks that the Secretary of Agriculture, in a capacity alien to that for which he was appointed, has been seeking to divide the people of the country and aline them one against the other. He has sought to set the consumers against the producers when, in fact, the consumers and the producers of food are interdependent. If the Secretary of Agriculture were successful in setting the consumers against the producers, the only ones who would suffer more than the producers would be the consumers themselves. The only group more dependent upon another than the producers are dependent upon the consumers, are the consumers, who are dependent upon the producers. Yet here is another action by the Secretary of Agriculture seeking to set the farm producers of the country against the railroad workers.

I charge that in this action the Secretary of Agriculture was not representing the American farmer. I further charge that he was not representing the President of the United States. His statements bear out what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oklahoma, that the prices which the farmers receive for food have been dropping steadily for years. However, there is nothing in his communication which justifies or substantiates the position which he has taken.

Mr. LONG. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator would not contend, would he, that the Secretary was speaking for the benefit of the American farmers when he attempted to give the impression to the Nation that the price-support program has cost the Nation $16 billion?

Mr. KERR. The Secretary of Agriculture was spinning a fantasy out of his own distorted imagination when he made that allegation. It is not supported by fact, rumor, or speculative possibility.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that at the time he made that statement the actual figures which he himself was compelled to present proved that he had exaggerated by more than 10 to 1?

Mr. KERR. They proved that he had exaggerated by more than 15 to 1. I appreciate the kindness of the Senator in calling that subject to my attention at this moment.

Another event which has taken place since the introduction of the measure to increase the personal and dependency exemption is probably the most fantastic of all. As a member of the Finance Committee of the Senate I listened today to a statement and discussion by Mr. Dwight E. Avis, Director of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division of the Internal Revenue Service, in which he sought favorable action by the committee on House bill 5407. House bill 5407 is a measure which has been passed by the House and is now before the Senate. It is calculated to give tax relief to the distillers of spirituous liquors——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Whisky.

Mr. KERR. I questioned him on that point, and he said it went further than whisky. He was seeking relief for the distillers of distilled spirits, which I understand includes whisky. The amount of relief which the Treasury of the United States is seeking for the distillers of the country represents very large figures.

As best I could tell, the distillers have a liability to pay to the Treasury this year, on 8-year-old bonded whisky, or distilled spirits, or both, at $10.50 a gallon, on 16,504,137 gallons. According to my estimate, that amounts to between $173 million and $175 million.

According to the statement of Mr. Avis, Director of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, in the calendar year 1955 there will be on hand 26,276,000 gallons of distilled spirits, which under the law will have to be taken out of the distillers' bonded warehouses, and on which will have to be paid $10.50 a gallon, which will amount to approximately $275 million.

Mr. President, there are other possibilities which the distillers have contemplated, but under the law, as I read it and as presented by Mr. Avis, that will be the situation.

According to the further evidence of Mr. Avis, in 1956 there will be 88,843,000 gallons of distilled spirits and whisky, which under the law as now written will have to be taken out of storage or otherwise disposed of. To take it out of storage would cost the distillers $10.50 a gallon, or about $930 million.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Oklahoma is speaking primarily of a bill which relates to bourbon whisky. The reason is that the 8-year bonding period is traditional with bourbon whisky. I do not believe a similar bonding period relates to any of the other distilled spirits. Therefore, the Senator is obviously referring to a tax bill which relates to an overproduction of bourbon whisky.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to my good friend from Louisiana that I do not have information of my own either to confirm or dispute the statement he has made. I know he would not speak unless he was informed on the subject. The distinguished Senator was at the hearing, and I am referring to the testimony of Mr. Avis with reference to what he referred to as distilled spirits. As I understood him, he said that much of it was whisky. Whether it was bourbon or Hohenzollern or Republican, or what, I do not know. I wish to quote from the evidence of Mr. Avis, the Director of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division. Mr. Avis became quite dramatic in his appeal for the relief.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Oklahoma understands, does he not, that the problem, according to the evidence submitted to the committee, is an overproduction of liquor. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. I was coming to that point. I am convinced by what I heard from the distinguished Director of the Alcohol and Tax Division of the Treasury Department that overproduction is an element of the cause of the problem to which he addressed his remarks.

Mr. President, I have never seen a public official who seemed to be more devoted to a cause than Mr. Avis was, in his effort

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to secure relief in the form of lower or postponed taxes for the distillers of distilled spirits.

I wish to say that if the farmers of the country had an advocate in the administration who pursued the best interests of agriculture with a fervor and devotion equal to that of Mr. Avis for those who distill distilled spirits, his voice would echo around the world and give a semblance of worthiness to a Cabinet position not yet achieved by this administration.

Mr. Avis, who was such a devoted advocate for the distillers, presented a problem which had a sound of striking similarity to the descriptions we have had with reference to other problems. He said there was a surplus of whisky. I could not tell, Mr. President, whether his statement was prompted by sympathy in his heart for those who distilled it, or a desire in his heart to increase the consumption of a product by those who drink it. However, I wish to say that he was a zealous advocate of the cause to which he addressed himself.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. What impressed the junior Senator from Louisiana with reference to the bill is that if we were to extend the bonding period on bourbon whisky from 8 years to 12 years, at least, and if the industry were to get some tax relief, the public would get some whisky that would be aged a little longer in the keg. Most people believe that extending the period during which the whisky remains in the keg makes it a better whisky. My understanding is there is a provision in the bill to the effect that after the whisky is aged another 4 years, and greater tax relief is afforded the whisky industry, the industry will not be able to tell anyone—and it would be against the law to do so—that the whisky is 12-year-old whisky. The Senator from Oklahoma will recall that I tried to find out why such a provision was put in the bill, and the spokesman of the bill said it was put in because the whisky industry wanted it included, and that is what the Treasury was recommending.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Louisiana is absolutely correct.

With reference to the other part of the question asked by the Senator from Louisiana, I should like to say that there is one further thought in my mind. I was not convinced before the hearing, I was not convinced by anything said at the hearing, and I have not been persuaded by my own contemplation since the hearing that the public was ever going to be benefited by anything that was in the kegs, regardless of what price it had to pay or was permitted to pay.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Did it occur to the Senator from Oklahoma to suggest that it might be appropriate for Mr. Avis and Secretary Benson to exchange places?

Mr. KERR. I will say that if Secretary Benson had the ardor and the zeal for the farmers which Mr. Avis has for the distillers, he would become cherished and endeared, rather than spurned by them, as he now is.

I desire to read, Mr. President, a few of the things which were included in the remarks of Mr. Avis, Director of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division of the Internal Revenue Service:

> After the war, beginning with the fiscal year 1946, and for each succeeding fiscal year up to and including 1952, production greatly exceeded withdrawals and losses due to leakage.

I do not know what the word "leakage" means in that connection. I have heard of it in connection with the security of my country; I have heard of it in many other respects, but I hear of it here in connection with the production and stock of distilled spirits.

I continue reading:

> Year-end stocks in bonded warehouses increased from 307 million tax gallons for the fiscal year 1945 to 730 million tax gallons for the fiscal year 1953.

And then Mr. Avis said this:

> Regardless of the reasons which led to the accumulation of the present whisky stocks or the justification therefor, the facts are that the whisky surplus coupled with the forceouts and threatened forceouts of whisky reaching the limit of the bonded period has so depressed the bulk whisky market that bourbon whisky between 4 and 8 years old is being offered at cost of production, plus carrying charges, or less. Rye whisky of the same age is being offered at substantially below cost.

Mr. President, I do not know as to the accuracy of those statements. I do know that they were made by a representative of the Treasury Department seeking the passage of a bill which he said was calculated to bring relief to the producers of distilled spirits. I asked him if this bill which he recommended so energetically could be classified or identified as a bill to provide price supports for whisky.

I want to say this for his benefit: He camouflaged his answer to that question pretty well. My best interpretation of what he said is that he answered the question in the affirmative. He certainly did not answer it in the negative. He not only acknowledged but proclaimed that the distillers wanted this bill; that they needed this bill; that they needed tax relief from the Government; and that their condition which necessitated such tax relief from the Government was brought about by the over-production and a surplus of distilled spirits. He frankly portrayed a situation in describing which he reached his climax by saying that these factors have so depressed the bulk whisky market that bourbon whisky between 4 and 8 years old is being offered at cost of production plus carrying charges, or less, and that rye whisky of the same age is being offered at substantially below cost.

I asked the gentleman how it was that a representative of the Treasury Department was seeking legislation to provide a price support for whisky at the same time the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Agriculture were trying to impair or destroy the price supports for farm products in this country.

I wanted to ask him another question. I wanted to ask him why it was that if he was so interested in giving someone tax relief he did not come before the Finance Committee favoring a measure to give an increased exemption on personal income taxes, a personal and dependency exemption that would be of such great benefit to so many persons.

I have seen many things in the brief time I have been a Member of the United States Senate, but I never thought I would live to see the day when a responsible representative of the Government from a department which has done what the Treasury has done in seeking to impair the value of farm products would come before a committee of the Senate and ask for relief for the distillers of spirits on the ground that they are afflicted by conditions brought about by a surplus.

A few days ago, the Secretary of the Treasury made a statement that, in his opinion, butter was worth not to exceed 38 cents a pound. A little while before that, the Secretary of Defense, the great farmer from Detroit, had run a bluff on the Secretary of Agriculture, and had forced the price of 15 million pounds of butter down to 15 cents a pound. Both those actions were calculated to damage and impair the economic position of the dairy farmers of the United States, and to lay a foundation for the action by the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the support prices on butter and other bulk products.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Has that radical reduction been felt as yet in the consumer market?

Mr. KERR. Not at all. I say to my good friend, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, that he should indulge no hope that it ever will, lest he suffer a great disappointment.

Mr. KILGORE. Is not the whole process, then, to depress the price at the base, but to keep it high at the top?

Mr. KERR. The whole process is calculated to aid and abet in a two-pronged effort, one of which is to force the price of commodities down, to the producers, the other of which holds them up when the commodities are sold to consumers.

Mr. KILGORE. Shall we say that the action of the Department of Agriculture is designed to hold prices up to a point where the consumer cannot buy?

Mr. KERR. Except at high cost.

Mr. KILGORE. Would the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that such action is not limited simply to butter?

Mr. KERR. It is not at all limited to butter. I refer the distinguished Senator from West Virginia to the announcement made today by Dun & Bradstreet that wholesale food prices this week rose 9 cents to the highest level in almost 3 years, in spite of a continued decrease in the price received by the producer for food at the production level.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that the grower of cattle, who brings them up through the grass-feeding stage, is, as a result, being seriously handicapped by the present situation?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator from West Virginia wishes to be accurate, he should

be speaking of the producer of beef in the past tense, because the beef producer was crucified in 1953. The present program of the Secretary of Agriculture is to crucify the dairy producer in 1954.

Mr. KILGORE. When the support prices of butter, milk, and other dairy products are reduced, while prices are kept high on the feed which ultimately produces those articles by way of the cow, is not that a rather unrealistic viewpoint of the national economy? In other words, if the price of milk is going down, should not the price of grain also go down? If the price of milk is going up, should not the price of grain also go up?

Mr. KERR. It is a tragedy and an injustice to penalize the producer of beef or of dairy products. However, it would serve him ill if the only remedy the Department of Agriculture had would be to compel the producer of feed or grain to get down into the ditch of depression to which the Secretary has forced the producer of beef and dairy products.

It is my purpose, as I am sure it is the purpose of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and other Senators, to see to it that equity and justice are done to maintain a condition in which the producer of beef and dairy products will be lifted up to an economic level of reasonable prosperity, such as that which is afforded those who produce the basic commodities and other commodities which are supported at 90 percent of parity.

Mr. KILGORE. I am in entire agreement with the thesis stated by the Senator from Oklahoma, but is it not a manifest unfairness to raise the price of feed while lowering the price of dairy products? In other words, are we not confronted with a situation such as that experienced by the fellow who fed his cow sawdust, while putting green glasses on the cow? He said he was getting along fine until the cow died.

Are we not doing that with our dairy and beef cattle interests? In West Virginia, in order to fatten cattle, it is necessary to use seed cake, corn, oats, wheat, and other products. Since we do not raise enough of those products in our State, it is necessary to import an additional supply. If the importation price is set above the market price for those products, then those who purchase the products are crucified.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator allow me to answer the previous question first, because I might lose track of what it was by listening to the next question.

The Senator from West Virginia is eminently correct in saying that the producer of beef and dairy products cannot continue to pay more for what he feeds his cattle than he gets for his cattle or his other products when he sells them. I may say that the price of feed has not been raised by the Secretary of Agriculture. Actually, the Secretary has permitted the price of feed to decline, but he has forced the price of the products into a still greater decline. In fact, so far as beef is concerned, he will have forced it into a collapse before he has finished. If he is not checked, he will compel the collapse of the price of dairy products.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that there is a 12-months' marketing time for beef cattle? When that time has passed, the opportunity for marketing has been lost. Is not that correct?

Mr. KERR. I do not exactly understand the distinguished Senator.

Mr. KILGORE. When the 1-year, 2-year, or 3-year stage has been passed, the beef producer has lost his marketing opportunity, has he not?

Mr. KERR. The most advantageous time for a producer to sell his animal, other things being equal, is when he has it in good shape for marketing.

Mr. KILGORE. The best way to get into that position is at the 1-year, 2-year, or 3-year stage. With respect to beef or dairy products, it is not a question of pushing the beef and dairy products down; the floor is taken from under them. I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, that that includes cottonseed cake, as well as wheat, barley, oats, and corn. Prices for such products are supported, even though the free-market prices should slump below the support prices.

If the sale prices of such products were forced down to what the unsupported prices would slump to, people selling such products would be put out of business, would they not?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct, in that when the Secretary of Agriculture forces down the prices at which products are sold by the beef and dairy producers below the economic level of what they are compelled to pay for their feed, such producers face bankruptcy.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator for permitting me to ask the questions.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, the Secretary of Agriculture has forced down the price of butter in the face of a surplus and, in a measure, has denied relief to producers of butter, while at the same time another representative of the Treasury has come before a committee of the Senate and has described the situation resulting from the overproduction of distilled spirits, and the fact that the market for such spirits has been depressed because of too great a supply. He has asked the Congress to enact a law in the form of tax relief for the producers of distilled spirits.

Mr. KILGORE and Mr. GORE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Did not the Senator state earlier that the yardstick of the cost of production was used in the testimony he cited? If so, how is that yardstick applied to the farmer; or is it applied?

Mr. KERR. The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Agriculture disregard the yardstick of the cost of production of dairy products and farm products, and take action which is in reckless disregard of the cost of production, and to the damage of the producers because of the destruction of the yardstick. At the same time another representative of the Treasury has appeared before the Committee on Finance and asked it to give tax relief to the manufacturers of distilled spirits because they are being forced to sell their products at either cost or below cost.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to ask the Senator what he would do if he came from such a State as I do, where farmers buy their feed both for dairy and beef cattle, a State where are found the largest number of purebred Hereford herds, and which is the largest cattle producer east of the Mississippi, with the exception of Florida, a State which is a big producer of poultry and dairy products. I am not including fruits and various other products; I am referring only to what the Senator has discussed. The situation has been encountered where the price of beef is not properly supported, while the price of feed has risen. If the Senator represented such a State, what would he do?

Mr. KERR. If I were the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, I would do what I hope the Senator from West Virginia will do, and that is to demand that justice be administered by the Department of Agriculture not only to the producers of feed and basic commodities, but also to the producers of beef and dairy products. The Senator from West Virginia will find that the Senator from Oklahoma will join him in any effort he may care to make to bring about such a result.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for that assurance.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say that, so far as I am able at this time to remember, the first representative of the Treasury Department of the United States who has been before the Committee on Finance of the Senate asking for tax relief for any American taxpayer was the representative of the Treasury Department who came before the committee today and asked for relief for the manufacturers of distilled spirits. In my opinion such action is out of all proportion to equity and justice. I again say that, in my opinion, the first measure for tax relief which Congress should pass should be for an increase in the personal and dependency exemptions of American taxpayers, as provided in the measure offered a few days ago by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware, and the Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], inserting on page 3, after line 9, a new section.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Mansfield
Anderson	Gore	Martin
Barrett	Green	Maybank
Beall	Griswold	McCarthy
Bennett	Hayden	McClellan
Bricker	Hendrickson	Millikin
Burke	Hennings	Monroney
Bush	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Murray
Byrd	Holland	Neely
Capehart	Humphrey	Pastore
Carlson	Hunt	Payne
Case	Ives	Potter
Chavez	Jackson	Purtell
Clements	Jenner	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smathers
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kilgore	Sparkman
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Ellender	Kuchel	Thye
Ferguson	Langer	Upton
Flanders	Lehman	Watkins
Frear	Lennon	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Wiley
George	Magnuson	Williams
Gillette	Malone	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], inserting on page 3, after line 9, a new section.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the question of agreeing to the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the distinguished occupant of the chair, I should like to say that the previous occupant of the chair assured me that I would be recognized as soon as the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] had concluded his address. I was later informed that the distinguished Senator from Arizona desired to suggest the absence of a quorum, but that at the conclusion of the quorum call, I would be recognized.

Mr. President, I am somewhat reluctant to make the motion I am about to make. I certainly would not do so if I did not deeply feel an obligation to 48 Members of the Senate. As minority leader, I have obligations to those Members.

I had no knowledge that evening sessions were contemplated this week. I was not consulted about the wisdom of making such a move; and my first information was when an attaché of the Senate called me and told me that statement had been made on the floor of the Senate, in my absence.

Mr. President, I realize the problems of the majority leader, and I sympathize with him. The motion I am about to make in no way will reflect upon him personally. But, Mr. President, there are 96 Members of the Senate; and in a Senate so closely divided as it is today, I think we can demonstrate that the parliamentary system will function only if we work in cooperation with each other, if we accept each other's judgments, if we reason together.

Mr. President, we have spent 6 hours today considering proposed legislation, and the work in the Senate is sufficiently strenuous to cause me to think, that in the month of February, in the early part of the session, Members should not be asked to return to the Capitol and spend a long evening here. Most Members of this body come to the Senate early in the morning, and do their office work, and go to committee hearings, and come to the floor of the Senate at 12 o'clock.

Mr. President, it is now 6:15 p. m. We have been in attendance on today's session of the Senate for 6 hours and 15 minutes. If we are to have sessions longer than that, I think they should certainly come later in the session, after the necessity has been thoroughly demonstrated.

Mr. President, based on those reasons, I now move——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Texas to withhold his motion, which I recognize is not subject to debate; but, as a matter of comity and courtesy between the two sides of the aisle, since he has made the statement, I hope he will at least permit me to make a statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe in comity, courtesy, and cooperation. Although the Senator from Texas did not think he received all the cooperation to which he is entitled, in connection with the announcement that the Senate would have a night session, of course the Senator from Texas with great pleasure yields to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Members of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, that it is a very heavy responsibility for anyone to occupy this seat as nominal majority leader of the Senate, with some responsibilities regarding the progress of proposed legislation at this session of Congress. It is also a heavy responsibility that my good friend, the Senator from Texas, has in serving in the nominal position of minority leader of the Senate.

The Senate has not been in so closely divided a state as this one is, I suppose, in all its history. But I wish to say that, so far as I know, there has not in recent years been a situation where the cooperation has been more close between the majority and the minority leaders. I think I have leaned over backward, perhaps receiving some criticism from Senators on my side of the aisle, in giving advance information—sometimes a week or more in advance—regarding the legislative program. I believe I have given to the minority far more advance information regarding the legislative program than I can ever remember receiving during the 7 years I served in the minority in this body.

I intend to continue that practice, because I think that, after all, we have a common responsibility to a great Nation. We have many problems, both foreign and domestic. I feel my responsibility, and I shall attempt to carry it out.

I have very scrupulously attempted to discuss with the minority leader the various problems we have, and the reasons for the various steps we have taken. He and I have discussed together the question of night sessions in the Senate.

It so happens that during the present session of Congress we have had only two night sessions and they did not last very late. My recollection is——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from California would not wish to leave the impression, would he, that he and I discussed the night sessions which are referred to on page 2128 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, February 23?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I would not say that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from California made the announcement without my knowledge. Is not that a fact?

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as night sessions are concerned.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from West Virginia will permit me to do so, I should like to continue. I do not have the floor; the distinguished Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. President, we have had only two night sessions at this session of Congress.

The proposed constitutional amendment which is before us was brought up as the business of the Senate on January 20. We have been considering it for a period of approximately 5 weeks. Many Members, on both sides of the aisle, have expressed a very fervent hope that we might be able to complete our labors on the proposed constitutional amendment today and tomorrow.

The Senator from California, who happens to occupy this post of responsibility, has not been unreasonable, he believes.

Mr. President, I have not suggested that we have an all-night session.

If the minority leader intends to take over the control of the Senate, the minority might just as well take the responsibility for the legislative program, because it is too much to ask that the leader on this side of the aisle have the responsibility of presenting the program to the Senate, and then, on a procedural matter, at the hour of 6:20 at night, have the minority attempt to take over control, and yet still charge the

majority leader with the responsibility of advancing the very heavy program which has been presented to us.

I wish to say, with all the sincerity I possess, that that does not make for orderly procedure. The country is entitled to know where the responsibility for legislative procedures lies. We on this side of the aisle happen to have that responsibility. It might have been that those on the other side, with the Independent Party, could have taken over the responsibility and, before the country, fully assumed it and presented a legislative program.

I hope that we can finish our legislative program and adjourn at least by the time provided in the LaFollette-Monroney Act, which is July 31. Some Members of the House hope to get away by July 1. I think that is unduly optimistic. In my opinion, we shall be doing very well if we get away by the time set in the LaFollette-Monroney Act. But unless we make more progress than we have made to date, we shall not even hit that adjournment date.

Under the circumstances I think it is not unreasonable for me to expect some support from the other side of the aisle on a procedural matter, when we have been considering a measure before this body for 5 weeks, and when a number of Members on the other side of the aisle have pointed out that they hope soon to reach a conclusion on this issue.

Last week I announced that I hoped, if we could complete consideration of the pending measure reasonably early this week, to have a call of the calendar, and to avoid a Saturday session. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, if we cannot do so, unless control of the Senate is taken away from this side of the aisle—and the votes may be available to do it—I shall ask for a night session tomorrow if we are unable to finish our labors. I feel also that in that event I shall have the responsibility of asking for a Saturday session.

In the final analysis, this body is the judge of its own actions. Wherever a majority of the votes rest, there is the control.

During past years we have had a situation in July in which it has been necessary for the Senate to remain in session all night long, and sometimes night after night, to complete the transaction of the public business. I hope that by spreading the transaction of the public business more evenly over the entire session we may avoid all-night sessions, which are so hard on all Members of this body.

Mr. President, I have presented the case. I have presented it from a position in which no man has heretofore been asked to serve, a position in which I have the responsibility of being majority leader in this body without a majority.

If those on the other side of the aisle wish to take control away from the Republicans, they have the power to do it; but if they are to take it they should assume the responsibility before the country. I say that we cannot have an effective legislative program if the responsibility is here but the power is exercised on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from California frequently refers to himself as a majority leader with a minority; and he has made reference to all the problems that go with that situation. If anyone has more problems than a majority leader with a minority, it is a minority leader with a majority. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I do not seek to take control away from anyone. I have not been a Member of this body for a great many years, but I have worked around the Capitol for 23 years. Late in the sessions of Congress I have frequently sat in the gallery, on the floor of the House, and on the floor of the Senate. It has been my observation—and I have passed that observation on to the distinguished Senator from California on occasion—that very little legislative work is done at night sessions.

Yesterday we were able to recess the Senate before 5 o'clock. Certain Senators who desired to speak on the Bricker amendment had not prepared their speeches. I am told that certain Senators wish to speak on this subject tomorrow.

I know of no reason why it must be assumed that the minority leader is attempting to take over control of the Senate when he asks the majority leader at least to discuss with him what the plans of 96 Senators are.

I knew nothing about the proposed night sessions. The majority leader frequently talks with me about the Executive Calendar, the Private Calendar, and the bills which he expects to move to proceed to consider. However, the first information which the minority leader had—and I assume the first information which the distinguished leader of the Independent Party had—was the information he obtained from the RECORD. That is no way to run the Senate—or a railroad, either.

Mr. President, I believe in comity. I believe in cooperation. I have demonstrated it. Like the Senator from California, I have been criticized for doing so; but I know of no good reason, in the month of February, why 96 Senators should be called out of bed at night to vote on matters such as the pending measure.

For that reason I move that the Senate now adjourn.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas cannot yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. If the motion to adjourn is agreed to, will that mean that the Bricker amendment will no longer be the unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The position of the Bricker amendment will not be disturbed. It will be laid before the Senate automatically tomorrow, after the morning hour.

Mr. AIKEN. As new business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be laid before the Senate tomorrow after the morning hour.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Mansfield
Anderson	Gore	Martin
Barrett	Green	Maybank
Beall	Griswold	McCarthy
Bennett	Hayden	McClellan
Bricker	Hendrickson	Millikin
Burke	Hennings	Monroney
Bush	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Murray
Byrd	Holland	Neely
Capehart	Humphrey	Pastore
Carlson	Hunt	Payne
Case	Ives	Potter
Chavez	Jackson	Purtell
Clements	Jenner	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smathers
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kilgore	Sparkman
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Ellender	Kuchel	Thye
Ferguson	Langer	Upton
Flanders	Lehman	Watkins
Frear	Lennon	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Wiley
George	Magnuson	Williams
Gillette	Malone	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—48

Anderson	Gore	Kefauver
Burke	Green	Kennedy
Byrd	Hayden	Kerr
Chavez	Hennings	Kilgore
Clements	Hill	Langer
Daniel	Hoey	Lehman
Douglas	Holland	Lennon
Eastland	Humphrey	Long
Ellender	Hunt	Magnuson
Frear	Jackson	Mansfield
Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.	Maybank
George	Johnson, Tex.	McClellan
Gillette	Johnston, S. C.	Monroney

Morse	Pastore	Smathers
Murray	Robertson	Sparkman
Neely	Russell	Stennis

NAYS—45

Aiken	Dworshak	Mundt
Barrett	Ferguson	Payne
Beall	Flanders	Potter
Bennett	Goldwater	Purtell
Bricker	Griswold	Saltonstall
Bush	Hendrickson	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Jenner	Thye
Carlson	Knowland	Upton
Case	Kuchel	Watkins
Cooper	Malone	Welker
Cordon	Martin	Wiley
Dirksen	McCarthy	Williams
Duff	Millikin	Young

NOT VOTING—3

Bridges	McCarran	Symington

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 25, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 24 (legislative day of February 8), 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

David McK. Key, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Robert Tieken, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, vice Otto Kerner, Jr., resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Archie M. Meyer, of Arizona, to be United States marshal for the district of Arizona, vice Benjamin J. McKinney, retired.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Emile A. Pepin, of Rhode Island, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R. I.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Problems of the Living Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 24, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a brief statement which I have prepared on the problem of the living theater in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement, together with a stimulating address delivered before the National Association of the Legitimate Theater by the distinguished past chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, Mr. Ralph E. Becker, of Port Chester, N. Y., and Washington, D. C., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN CONFERENCE OPPOSES THEATER TAX

(Statement by Senator WILEY)

I recently heard from Mr. Ronald C. Gee, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Idea Theater Conference relative to the continuing heavy burden which the Federal admissions tax imposes upon the living theater in our country.

As we are all aware, the theater is an indispensable element in American culture.

It may not be generally realized that the present 20 percent tax involves more than simply the problem of the professional theater.

There are, for example, 1,858 college and university nonprofessional groups, I am proud that one of the finest such groups is our own University of Wisconsin Idea Theater.

There are 26,800 high school theater groups, over 1,400 community groups and over 111,000 miscellaneous amateur groups.

All of these are indirectly vitally affected by the revenue problems of the professional theater which, unfortunately, has been declining very seriously in recent years.

In other words, so long as young people in high school or college or community plays can look forward to the possibility of entering upon a stage career, they will be particularly encouraged in their nonprofessional theatrical activity.

But they now see in the world of the professional theater, a drastic drop in attendance; mass unemployment of actors; and all economic blight generally.

The American Educational Theater Association is but one of the many groups interested in this problem. It consists of over 2,000 members in every State of the Union, and at all levels of instruction, including children's theater, primary and secondary school theaters, college and university theaters, and community theaters.

UNITED STATES DOES NOT BELIEVE IN THEATER SUBSIDY

The United States is the only major country in the world where the living theater is not regularly subsidized by the National Government.

We still rightly believe that our private enterprise system is and should be sufficient to look after the cultural needs of our people without Government subsidy.

We see no reason for such subsidy, but at the same time, we know that tax conditions must be favorable for the private enterprise theater to continue.

ADDRESS OF RALPH E. BECKER, DELIVERED DECEMBER 27–29, 1953, ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE LEGITIMATE THEATER, INC., AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE THEATER LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY THEATERS, SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, NATIONAL THEATER CONFERENCES, AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL THEATER ASSOCIATION

The National Association of the Legitimate Theater, Inc., has retained me as its counsel in Washington. I am presently engaged, in its behalf, in a program which has for its objective the repeal of the Federal excise tax on legitimate theater admissions, including both the professional and nonprofessional theater throughout the country. The association was organized more than 20 years ago for the general welfare and preservation of the American living theater.

As you know, the legitimate theater—the American living theater—includes all presentations of both plays and musicals where live performers, whose roles develop the theme of the play or musical, are actually present and acting before an assembled audience. This term is also used broadly to include all groups and individuals, both professional and nonprofessional that present such plays, and all theaters used principally for the staging of such attractions.

As defined, the living theater is thus not confined to Broadway in New York, but includes many thousands of amateur and professional groups located in each of the 48 States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories. As such, it involves many thousands of people who earn their living in the theater and it provides entertainment to many millions who, as audiences, enjoy the living theater.

The living theater has always played a basic cultural and entertainment role in the United States. From the opening of the first theaters in Philadelphia and Williamsburg, more than 200 years ago until the present time, the theater has been the outstanding medium of culture and entertainment. It has served both as a training ground and as a final goal for artistic talent in all major entertainment media. Community groups and stock companies have provided invaluable experience from which the most talented may graduate into all other fields of entertainment.

This tax is a war tax. It was first imposed at the rate of one-tenth of admissions prices in World War I. Congress promised its removal after the war but it was not removed. It continued without abatement until World War II when, in 1944, it was doubled to one-fifth of the admissions prices. Again a promise of removal and yet the tax continues—it would seem forever.

Effective November 1, 1951, the Morano bill granted discriminatory exemption from the excise tax for certain nonprofessional, educational, and charitable entertainments, including the operas, symphonies, and certain other functions. That is the only inroad to date on the admissions taxes.

In effect, this war tax means that every fifth seat throughout the house is roped off for the Federal Government. The American living theater cannot afford this war tax.

As an outsider, I consider it to some extent presumptuous to talk to you about the economic conditions in your industry—the American living theater. Until I became engrossed in this present program, like all outsiders I had no idea of the economic distress in which your industry finds itself. Just as in any industry the views of an outsider, however, are sometimes most helpful and this is particularly true in the case of the legitimate theater industry since Members of Congress—in whose hands possible relief lies—are outsiders. They see the hits—the great money-making shows like South Pacific and Oklahoma. They buy tickets at premium prices for these hits, and for that reason think all is well and much money is being made in the theater. Figures which the outsider does not and which most Members of Congress do not know point dramatically to a sorry showing.

Only 63 professional plays and musicals were presented on Broadway in New York City last season, compared with an average of 108 productions in each of the past 22 years. This represented a decline of 68 percent from the 195 plays produced even during the depth of the depression in 1931–32.

One authority states that costs of production have quadrupled in the last 12 years while in New York City admissions prices have been raised 28 percent for drama—37 percent for musicals. One of the odd results of this situation is a recent musical play that played over 90 weeks both in New York

and on tour, but nevertheless lost $30,000. Conditions do not permit the further raising of prices. Attacked by the tremendous unfair competition of admissions tax-free entertainment such as radio and television, the theater has become further crippled. Excise tax relief in 1951 to the nonprofit and educational operas, symphonies, and certain other entertainments has only intensified such competition. Yet the theater is the very heart of the entire entertainment industry. Without it, motion pictures, radio, and television would suffer.

In the past 30 years the number of legitimate theaters has been reduced by over 100 percent. Practically no new theater has been built in over 25 years. Since 1930 the number of legitimate theaters in New York City has dwindled from 68 to 29. Since 1937, in New York City alone, 14 former legitimate theaters with a normal seating capacity of 16,955 have been taken over for either radio broadcasting or television performances. These theaters, as well as countless studios throughout the country where broadcasting or telecasting are carried on, are filled several times each day by tremendous audiences that are not only seeing entertainment without paying for it, but for which the Government is deriving no revenue in the form of taxes. It is live entertainment they are seeing too—the sort we provide, and not films, kinescope, or any other mechanical forms of reproduction.

There are some who say that relief lies in subsidy from the Government. The United States remains the only important country of the world which does not recognize the theater as an invitation worthy of subsidy from national funds. Even England, in the midst of her postwar financial troubles, recently appropriated the equivalent of $4 million for the establishment of a national theater.

It is worthy of note that in early 1949 a bill was introduced in Congress calling for Federal action in the promotion of theater arts throughout the Nation and requesting an appropriation for this purpose. The bill died in committee, but maybe the bill was meant to die. The American living theater does not want subsidy. It wants repeal of the war tax.

To this end, on August 5, 1953, the formal program for the repeal of the war tax was launched by testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington. The witnesses who testified before the committee were:

James P. Reilly, executive director, the National Association of the Legitimate Theater and the League of New York Theaters.

Henry Kaiser, counsel, American Federation of Musicians.

Lawrence Langner, on behalf of the National Association of the Legitimate Theater, the League of New York Theaters, the American Theater Society, the Council of the Living Theater, and the American National Theater Association.

Wolfe Kaufman, president of the Association of Theatrical Press Agents and Managers, AFL.

Dennis King, representing Actors' Equity Association and Chorus Equity Association.

Reprints of this testimony have been ordered and will be distributed on a selective basis throughout the country. These witnesses have told a story much more eloquently than I, of the absolute necessity for relief from the war tax.

It is now the purpose to implement and factually document the testimony of August 5, 1953, which is now included in the hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee.

An economic survey is now being prepared by Dr. O. Glenn Saxon, professor of economics at Yale University. This survey, when completed, will be submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, various officials in the Treasury Department, and other officials in the executive, administrative, and legislative branches of the Federal Government.

The economic distress of the industry, its contributions to the recreation, amusement, education, and culture of the Nation, and the unfair competition from other mediums of entertainment are all a part of the theme of our program. In addition, it will be stressed that legislative relief for the legitimate theater will involve the least revenue loss to the Government as compared with other industries paying the excise taxes. Admissions-tax collections from the living theater industry totaled less than $16 million in 1952. The alltime peak was only $17 million during World War II. To the industry, admissions-tax collections equal one-fifth of its total gross income. To the Federal Government they represent less than three ten-thousandths of 1 percent of total budget receipts.

The legitimate theater is suffering the greatest injury from the continuation of the war tax and upon the granting of relief could in innumerable ways express the greatest appreciation: In addition, the role of the legitimate theater in the social and cultural life in America and the high status in the public mind which it presently enjoys will be emphasized.

The theater is not just another business or industry whose existence or disappearance would mean little to the welfare of the country. It is one of the arts by which the greatness of a nation's culture is judged. It is an art to which our country turns instinctively when disasters threaten, when emergencies develop. Its great patriotic contributions to America during the World Wars cannot be forgotten. Its USO's and stage door canteens, its troupes of live actors touring the South Pacific and the Army posts in Alaska, Europe, and throughout the world are a familiar and beloved memory to all.

The relief which we seek will benefit all segments of the American living theater, not just the Broadway productions or the many hundreds of summer and winter stock companies throughout the country but the community theater, the college theater, and all other nonprofessional theaters as well.

As a part of the overall program it is imperative that this program receive the active support of all organizations and individuals who are affiliated with or interested in the American living theater. Actors' Equity, Chorus Equity, American Educational Theater Association, National Association of Community Theaters, Speech Association of America, American National Theater and Academy, Council of the Living Theater, American Federation of Musicians, National Association of Theatrical and Stage Employees, the Association of Theater Press Agents and Managers, AFL, the Theater Library Association, and many other interested organizations as well as individuals, in both the professional and nonprofessional American living theater are supporting this program and will play a vital role in the program.

Cooperation and assistance from community groups and the many nonprofessional and educational organizations within the theater will be of inestimable value. United support is most important and it must be remembered that the war tax affects everyone in both the professional and nonprofessional theater and that the aforementioned efforts are directed toward relief for all rather than for any one particular group.

Individuals and organizations in the community, educational and other nonprofessional phases of the American living theater are especially aware of this significance of the theater to the future of this country. Accordingly, the association is confident that they will unite in this effort for the repeal of the war tax.

It is hoped that if relief is granted at all, it will be granted to every group within the American living theater and that is the objective for which we have been striving for many months.

The only equitable relief to the living theater industry is outright repeal of the 20 percent admissions tax. Return to the discriminatory system of exempting from the tax all tickets up to 75 cents or $1 would do nothing to relieve the critical financial condition of the living theater.

At this time it is more important than ever that all individuals, associations, and organizations within or affiliated with the American living theater join in a united effort, that all the resources, talents, and energies of these groups be marshaled and coordinated along a solid front. The national association will keep all these groups advised of progress from time to time and will specify exact ways in which each group can help make the program a success.

The present Federal tax-revision program is approaching in scope one of the greatest legislative undertakings of all times. Staff subcommittees have been working for months on the entire range of revision problems. It has been the effort of the House Ways and Means Committee to bring to bear on the present tax-revision program a personal viewpoint and experience instead of merely the technician's approach. At least 40 different groups have testified before the House Ways and Means Committee on the matter of excise taxes. Coupled with the tax-revision program is the President's general legislative program. The budgetary problems are unusually complicated, particularly in view of the sympathetic view in Congress for lower taxes. Whether Government expenses can be cut sufficiently to permit tax relief in the excise-tax field is, of course, conjecture. It is more important than ever that we continue alert, active, and united.

In the President's veto message of the Mason bill which was sponsored by the Council of Motion Picture Organizations and which if approved would have exempted motion-picture theaters from the admissions tax, Dwight D. Eisenhower indicated that his disapproval was based not only on loss of tax revenues but also on the ground that it was unfair to single out on industry for relief at this time. President Eisenhower also indicated that a strong case could be made out for tax relief on other forms of entertainment subject to the admissions tax. For this reason we believe that the overall program upon which we have embarked and which seeks relief for the entire American living theater stands a greater chance of success than relief for any one particular group within the theater.

We believe that you can readily satisfy yourself from other sources that in joining us and lending our program your wholehearted support will lead to a greater possibility of success than, so to speak, going it alone.

We believe that you are interested in any project which will be of benefit to all types of theaters. Since our program includes, without any question, all groups in the theater, professional, educational, and community, we hope that we can rely on your support which we seek.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1954

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all being, who holdest the world in the hollow of Thine hand: Give us now, we pray as we bow at the altar of Thy grace, the emancipating consciousness that the rampant confusions of today are seen by Thee in their true perspective. In this quiet moment give us to see that so often the things that disturb us most, agitate our spirits, and seem to loom so large, are like the grass which groweth up: In the morning it flourisheth and groweth up; in the evening it is cut down, and withereth. Save us from mistaken magnitudes. Grant us a constant awareness of eternal principles whose majesty outweighs the temporal and the passing.

Bringing our cares to Thy fatherly understanding, even our concerns for the Nation in these storm-tossed days, may our hearts be kept in perfect peace as we stay our minds on Thee. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KUCHEL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 24, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment Compensation for Veterans, Bureau of Employment Security," for the fiscal year 1954, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

FLEXIBLE FARM PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM — STATEMENT OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY FARM BUREAU DAIRY COMMODITY COMMITTEE, FONDA, N. Y.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a statement of the position taken by the Montgomery County Farm Bureau Dairy Commodity Committee, at Fonda, N. Y., on the flexible farm price support program as proposed by Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Montgomery County Farm Bureau Dairy Commodity Committee meeting at the Old Court House in Fonda Monday evening went on record unanimously as favoring the flexible farm price support program as proposed by Secretary of Agriculture Benson. John B. Holloway, of Amsterdam, was authorized and instructed to carry the sentiments of the committee to the Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate.

The session was attended by 29 members of the committee for the purpose of studying the problems of Montgomery County dairymen and offering suggested activities for the dairy program for 1954–55. Every township in the county was represented.

Problems of Montgomery County dairymen as outlined by the committee include:

1. Milk marketing, including advertising and efficient distribution.
2. Reducing cost of producing milk.
3. Herd management, including the need for dairy records and disposal of poor producers.
4. Need to produce more home-grown grain, particularly corn for grain.
5. Herd health, with particular emphasis on sterility or nonfertility and mastitis.

The program suggested by the committee to meet the needs of county dairymen includes:

1. Support the milk advertising program.
2. Sponsor a "green-acres" contest to stimulate interest in improved pastures and high quality feed production.
3. Broaden the area of contact by getting new men on committees and into activities.
4. Have larger meetings with well-known speakers and follow up with news reports or service letters.
5. Continue herd health program.
6. Conduct machinery demonstrations or field days.
7. Encourage testing and culling of dairy cattle.
8. Keep informed on public policy for agriculture.

Roland Fox, of Fonda, was reelected chairman of the committee.

James Mead and Max Silka, of Amsterdam, Warren Casler, of Fort Plain, and Robert Shuster, of St. Johnsville, were appointed to the "green acres" subcommittee.

Those attending included: Robert Krum, Canajoharie; Richard Brookman, Fort Plain; Warren Casler, Fort Plain; Donald Klemme, Fort Plain; William Dusold, Canajoharie; Theodore Browngardt, Sprakers; Judd Chase, Sprakers; Stanley Elwood, Sprakers; Henry Lyker, Sprakers; Ludwig Piening, Randall, Kenneth Hughes, Fultonville, Edward Ingersoll, Fultonville; Kenneth Beyer, Fultonville; Harold Bellinger, Fultonville; James Mead, Amsterdam; John Holloway, Amsterdam; Lawrence Phillips, Amsterdam; Charles Persons, Jr., Amsterdam; Max Silka, Amsterdam; Roland Fox, Fonda; Roy Manelius, Fonda; David Fox, Fonda; Alton Dillenbeck, Fonda; Rutherford Downes, Fort Plain; William Lamphere, Fort Plain; Wilbur Saltsman, Fort Plain; Robert Shuster, St. Johnsville; and Eddie Bowers, St. Johnsville.

THE WESTERN MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, the plight of the western mining industry continues to be a matter of most serious concern. It has called forth protests from representatives of both management and labor because of the many mine shutdowns, which occur almost daily. Work schedules have been and are now being drastically cut.

Recently the State central committee of the Republican Party in Idaho met to consider the problem, and the result was a resolution calling upon the administration to take corrective action to save our hard-hit mining industry.

I desire to add my voice to that of the Republican committee in my home State, in urging that the administration soon take steps to end the disastrous trend which is unquestionably ruining the mining industry of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks, and appropriately referred, the resolution adopted by the Idaho State Republican central committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas over a period of several years last past, excessive imports of lead and zinc have flooded the American market with supplies of these metals which could not be absorbed and as a consequence the price of these metals has been forced down below the cost of production in the mines of the West, and

there has been at least a 70-percent shutdown of these mines; and

Whereas every dollar spent for domestic mine operation and the production of these vital metals is effective to its full value in the national economy of the United States, supporting the workingman, the retailer, wholesaler, farmer, railroads, trucklines, professions, and men and women in the service industries, as well as providing tax revenues and dividends to thousands of large and small stockholders in mining and related industries; and

Whereas to the contrary the dollars spent in foreign nations for the production of these metals have a very limited helpful influence upon the economy of this country and its citizens since only a few cents of every dollar are circulated here; and

Whereas it is our considered opinion that no more effective steps could be taken to weaken the defenses of this Nation and leave us relatively disarmed than to permit the continued shutdown of our western mines and the prolonged interference with our national economy which results from this situation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we call upon the President of the United States, the Congress, the Tariff Commission, and all other agencies of Government to immediately take whatever steps are necessary in their good judgment to terminate this vicious and destructive throttling of the mining industry upon which the strength and prosperity of the Nation so largely depends.

REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
WM. S. CAMPBELL,
State Chairman.

AID TO FARMERS IN MISSOURI—RESOLUTION OF MISSOURI BANKERS ASSOCIATION, COLUMBIA, MO.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Missouri Bankers Association, which was sent in a telegram to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson on February 11, 1954. The resolution calls attention to the disaster conditions resulting from the unprecedented drought in many areas, and urges the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately extend aid for the restoration of pastures, or advise the appropriate agency in Missouri that such aid to Missouri farmers is not to be expected from the Secretary of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBIA, MO., *February 11, 1954.*

EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution is sent you by the president, treasurer, executive manager of the Missouri Bankers Association and the chairman of the association's agricultural committee:

"RESOLUTION FOR AID BY THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO MISSOURI FARMERS IN THE SEEDING AND FERTILISING OF PASTURES DAMAGED BY DROUGHT IN 1953

"Whereas the drought of 1953, unprecedented in duration and severity, has brought disaster to Missouri farmers in many wide areas, especially in the form of damage to pastures and livestock; and

"Whereas the immediate reseeding or reestablishment of these damaged or dead pastures is necessary for the continuing profitable operation of Missouri farms, especially livestock farms; and

"Whereas this quick restoration of pastures by reseeding and fertilizing will require expenditures difficult for farmers who have lately suffered drastic losses; and

"Whereas all State and Federal agricultural agencies and farm organizations in Missouri have lately and jointly and most earnestly requested from the Secretary of Agriculture a program of aid in the restoration of Missouri pastures; and

"Whereas this request has been received by the Secretary of Agriculture but action upon it has been unseasonably postponed until further delay will be fatal: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is respectfully and earnestly requested to extend immediately the aid already sought for the restoration of Missouri pastures, or that he advise the appropriate Federal agricultural agency in Missouri that such aid to Missouri farmers is not to be expected from the Secretary of Agriculture."

JOHN ROGERS,
President.
R. A. EVANS,
Treasurer.
ROBERT E. LEE HILL,
Executive Manager.
O. J. STRATMAN,
Chairman, Agricultural Committee.

ELECTORAL REFORM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a great many Americans are interested in the problems involved in electoral reform, changing somewhat the functioning of our electoral college. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted by the 28th Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, on February 5, 1954, at the Statler Hotel in Washington, urging support of the so-called Mundt-Coudert amendment, relating to the election of presidential electors.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION URGING SUPPORT OF THE MUNDT-COUDERT AMENDMENT

Whereas the present method of electing presidential electors has narrowed the effective political foundation of the President to a few large doubtful and pivotal States whose electoral votes are vital to victory, and puts a high premium on the power of organized pressure groups; and

Whereas Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., and United States Senator KARL E. MUNDT have proposed in Congress an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that electors for the President and Vice President be elected in exactly the same manner as Senators and Representatives are elected, that is, 1 in each congressional district and 2 at large, or statewide in each State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 28th Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urges wholehearted support of the proposed Mundt-Coudert amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 95 and House Joint Resolution 1, which provides for the election of 435 Representative electors in congressional districts and the election of each State's 2 senatorial electors by statewide popular vote as United States Senators are elected.

(Adopted unanimously February 5, 1954, by the 28th Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense in session at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FERGUSON (for Mr. BRIDGES), from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 7996. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1029).

By Mr. DUFF, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 5509. A bill to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 relating to the percent of colonels in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army (Rept. No. 1030).

By Mr. DUFF, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. 2040. A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions (Rept. No. 1031).

By Mr. DUFF, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 897. A bill to extend the time for making application for terminal-leave pay under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended (Rept. No. 1032); and

S. 2247. A bill to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations of certain foreign nations (Rept. No. 1033).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON INTERLOCKING SUBVERSION IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original concurrent resolution to provide for printing additional copies of hearings entitled "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary not to exceed 25,000 copies of parts 15, 16, 17, and subsequent parts of the hearings entitled "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments," held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 83d Congress.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN (by request):

S. 3006. A bill to permit court review of Veterans' Administration decisions on issuance, reinstatement, or conversion of insurance;

S. 3007. A bill to limit eligibility of a stepchild and of a stepparent for servicemen's indemnity awards;

S. 3008. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951;

S. 3009. A bill to amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940;

S. 3010. A bill to amend subsection 602 (j) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended;

S. 3011. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to provide for transportation of the body of a veteran dying in a State veterans' home;

S. 3012. A bill to amend veterans regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for multiple sclerosis and the chronic functional psychoses; and

S. 3013. A bill to provide increases in the monthly rates of wartime service-connected death compensation payable to widows alone and to dependent parents; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3014. A bill for the relief of Helen Panagiotis Stamoulis, also known as Heleni P. Stamoolis or Stamouli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3015. A bill to provide that the price of whole milk, butterfat and the products thereof shall be supported at 90 percent of parity until April 1, 1955; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3016. A bill for the relief of Michele Nini and Emilia Nini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 3017. A bill for the relief of Thomas Barron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 3018. A bill for the relief of Frederick August Westphal; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. LONG, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 3019. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3020. A bill to authorize the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the United States, to relieve famine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 3021. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to authorize the terminal placement of railroad cars without separate charge therefor in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3022. A bill for the relief of Arthur Sew Sang, Kee Yin Sew Wong, Sew Ing Lin, Sew Ing Quay, and Sew Ing You; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3023. A bill for the relief of Palmira Smarrelli (nee Lattanzio);

S. 3024. A bill for the relief of Malvina David (nee Gabriel); and

S. 3025 (by request). A bill for the relief of Nikolaj Perehud-Pogorelski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3026 (by request). A bill to provide for the award of a suitable medal to George E. Clark; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3027. A bill to incorporate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina) (by request):

S. 3028. A bill to require the Postmaster General to reimburse postmasters of discontinued post offices for equipment owned by the postmaster; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROPOSED VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference eight bills relating to proposed veterans' legislation. The bills are recommended by the director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, and are accompanied by letters from the director explaining the bills.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying letters in each case be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bills introduced.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. MARTIN, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 3006. A bill to permit court review of Veterans' Administration decisions on issuance, reinstatement, or conversion of insurance.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 3006 is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: Enclosed please find copy of H. R. 6578, introduced in the House on July 28, 1953, same being a bill to permit court review of Veterans' Administration decisions on issuance, reinstatement, or conversion of insurance.

The national organization of the American Legion would be very grateful to you if you would be good enough to introduce a companion bill in the Senate at your earliest convenience.

Present law provides authority for the United States to be sued in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or in any other district court of the United States only in the event of disagreement as to an insurance claim.

The bill would permit the United States to be sued in any of the courts mentioned not only when a claim is involved but where exception is taken to a Veterans' Administration decision regarding issuance, reinstatement, or conversion of United States Government or national service life insurance.

Thanking you for your courtesy and cooperation, and with warmest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

S. 3007. A bill to limit eligibility of a stepchild and of a stepparent for servicemen's indemnity awards.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 3007 is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: Enclosed please find copy of H. R. 6936 introduced in the House on January 6, 1954, same being a bill to limit eligibility of a stepchild and of a stepparent for servicemen's indemnity awards.

The national organization of the American Legion would be very grateful to you if you would be good enough to introduce a companion bill in the Senate at your earliest convenience.

Section 1: Present provisions of section 3, Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 (pt. I, Public Law 23, 82d Cong., approved April 25, 1951), place a stepchild on a parity with a natural child and a stepparent on a parity with a natural parent for servicemen's indemnity awards as beneficiaries. Actually, the insured might never have met or been acquainted with either. It is possible, even probable, that the insured would have no idea that such a person might take precedence as beneficiary over some other person in the limited beneficiary class whom he would want to protect.

This bill would authorize an award to a stepchild or stepparent, designated as beneficiary by the insured, making certain that payment would be made if the person in service wanted this. Also, as is proper, if a stepparent, not designated as beneficiary, had nonetheless stood in the relationship of parent to the insured for 1 year or more at any time prior to the insured's entry into active service, such parent would be in the permitted class of beneficiaries.

For national service life insurance matured before August 1, 1946, when limitation on the class of beneficiaries was removed, there was the same restriction placed by Congress on the payment of that insurance as concerns a stepchild or stepparent that is proposed here for servicemen's indemnity purposes.

Section 2: This would require a claim by a person made eligible to an award and would authorize continuance of payment, to the end of the second month following receipt of such claim, to a person whose award would be terminated. It would also prevent duplicate benefit payments.

Thanking you for your courtesy and cooperation, and with warmest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

S. 3008. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 3008 is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: Enclosed please find copy of H. R. 6927 introduced in the House

on January 6, 1954, same being a bill to amend certain provisions of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951.

The national organization of the American Legion would be very grateful to you if you would be good enough to introduce a companion bill in the Senate at your earliest convenience.

Enclosed is copy of resolution No. 9 adopted at the May 1, 1953, meeting of our national executive committee:

Item 4 of that resolution seeks amendatory legislation to permit a person to revive a United States Government or national service life insurance policy if the term expires within 120 days after the separation from active service, upon application, payment of premium, and proof of good health, as is authorized presently when the term expires during active service.

Section 1 of this bill would accomplish this result. By virtue of approval July 23, 1953, of Public Law 148, 83d Congress, these term policies would be automatically renewed for a further term, if they were in force under premium-paying conditions or through premium waiver under section 622 of the NSLI Act of 1940, as added by the Insurance Act of 1951. However, if an insured permitted the term contract to lapse in order to obtain free servicemen's indemnity coverage during active service and for 120 days after separation, he could revive the lapsed term contract through present provisions of section 5 of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 only when the term expired in service. This bill would permit revival if expiry date fell in the 120-day period after separation.

Item 5 of resolution 9 seeks amendatory legislation to provide that the Government bear excess losses resulting from regranting or reinstating insurance without medical examination under authority contained in the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, so as to protect the participating United States Government and national service life insurance trust funds.

Section 2 of this bill will accomplish this purpose. The beneficial interest in the reserves in the USGLI and NSLI trust funds, created in the Treasury for these participating insurance programs, belong to the policyholders. Violence could be done the funds by imposition of substandard risks who are permitted by section 5 of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 to secure, without proof of good health, permanent-plan policies within 120 days after separation from active service to replace those surrendered for cash during service by authority contained in the stated section.

Enactment of this section is necessary to preserve the sanctity of the trust funds for which the Government acts as trustee.

Thanking you for your courtesy and cooperation, and with warmest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

S. 3009. A bill to amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 3009 is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: Enclosed please find copy of H. R. 6928, introduced in the House on January 6, 1954, same being a bill to amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940.

Also enclosed is copy of resolution No. 9 adopted at the May 1, 1953, meeting of our national executive committee. The proposed bill is to take care of item 3 of said resolution.

The national organization of the American Legion would be very grateful to you if you would be good enough to introduce a companion bill in the Senate at your earliest convenience.

The purpose of the bill is to waive all premiums on United States Government or national service life insurance term policies and so much of the premiums on permanent plan policies as represents the pure insurance risk for those insureds who were unable to apply for the waiver authorized by section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 because of being missing in action or captured by the enemy after April 25, 1951, date of enactment of the Insurance Act of 1951, which added section 622 to the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 and before April 26, 1952.

In this period of 1 year from April 25, 1951, those in active service would have had full opportunity to take advantage of the waiver provisions of section 622, unless in a missing or prisoner-of-war status, so a premium waiver, if they had sought one, would have been effective should they be missing or captured later.

Section 1 would make insurance nonparticipating, if waived under provisions of section 622 under any circumstance. As section 1 in effect provides for an automatic waiver under certain conditions or waiver retroactively upon others, the amendment proposed is necessary because presently it is provided that the insurance shall be nonparticipating only if the insured elects to have the premium waiver granted.

Thanking you for your courtesy and cooperation, and with warmest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

S. 3010. A bill to amend subsection 602 (j) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 3010 is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: Enclosed please find copy of H. R. 6926 introduced in the House on January 6, 1954, same being a bill to amend subsection 602 (j) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The national organization of the American Legion would be very grateful to you if you would be good enough to introduce a companion bill in the Senate at your earliest convenience.

Section 602 (j) of the NSLI Act of 1940, as amended, applies to national service life insurance matured before August 1, 1946.

The section presently prohibits payments of insurance installments to the heirs or legal representatives as such of the insured or of any beneficiary. Also, in the event no person in the permitted class of beneficiaries, to which payment was restricted before August 1, 1946, survives to receive the insurance or any part of it, no payment of the unpaid installments was permitted. However, if the reserve of a converted contract, together with accumulated dividends, less any indebtedness, exceeds the aggregate amount paid to beneficiaries, it does provide for payment of the excess to the estate of the insured, unless any sums paid would escheat.

This bill would require that insurance proceeds, which could not be paid under provisions of existing law, be paid to the estate of the insured, unless such sums would escheat. In this way, payment would be made to heirs of the insured to whom no payment is possible now because of the limited class of beneficiaries allowed before August 1, 1946.

Thanking you for your courtesy and cooperation, and with warmest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

S. 3011. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to provide for transportation of the body of a veteran dying in a State veterans' home.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 3011 is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington D. C., January 18, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: Enclosed please find copy of H. R. 6935 introduced in the House on January 6, 1954, same being a bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to provide for transportation of the body of a veteran dying in a State veterans' home.

Also enclosed is copy of Resolution No. 2 adopted at the October 16, 1953, meeting of our national executive committee.

This bill would authorize the Veterans Administration to pay for transporting the body of a veteran, eligible for a VA burial allowance, who dies in a State veterans' home, to the place of burial within the continental limits of the United States on the same basis as now provided for one dying in a VA facility.

Under the first sentence of paragraph III of Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, the Veterans' Administration will assume the actual cost of burial and funeral, not to exceed $150, and transport the body to the place of burial in the continental United States, where a veteran dies in a VA facility within the continental limits.

Up to $150 may now be paid by the Veterans' Administration, where a veteran meeting the allowance requirements dies in a State veterans' home for burial and funeral expenses and transportation of the body (including preparation of the body) to the place of burial.

Assumption by the Federal Government of the cost of transporting the body to its final resting place will make certain that the burial and funeral allowance is sufficient to assure a fitting burial for the veteran in recognition of his service to his country.

It is believed that equal treatment in this regard should be accorded the veteran, whether he has been domiciled in a State veterans' home or Veterans' Administration home.

The national organization of the American Legion would be grateful if you would be good enough to introduce a companion bill in the Senate at your earliest convenience.

Thanking you for your courtesy and cooperation, and with warmest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director

S. 3012. A bill to amend veterans regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for multiple sclerosis and the chronic functional psychoses.

The letter accompanying Senate bill S. 3012 is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: Enclosed please find copy of H. R. 6931 introduced in the House on January 6, 1954, same being a bill to amend veterans regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for multiple sclerosis and the chronic functional psychoses.

Also enclosed is copy of resolution No. 522 adopted at our 1953 national convention.

This bill would grant a statutory 3-year presumption of service connection, instead of the present statutory 2-year presumption, for multiple sclerosis. It would also grant a 3-year statutory presumption of service connection for the chronic functional psychoses instead of the present 1-year presumption now afforded by inclusion in a list of chronic diseases in a Veterans' Administration regulation.

Multiple sclerosis and the chronic functional psychoses would then be placed on a parity with all types of active tuberculosis.

The presumption is accorded only where the veteran's disability is thus held related to wartime service. The Government would have the right of rebuttal upon affirmative showing of inception before or after service.

By virtue of provisions of Public Law No. 28, 82d Congress, approved May 11, 1951, veterans of service in the Armed Forces during the Korean conflict would be granted the presumption through enactment of this bill on the same basis as the World War II veteran.

The national organization of the American Legion would be very grateful if you would be good enough to introduce a companion bill in the Senate at your earliest convenience.

Thanking you for your courtesy and cooperation, and with warmest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

S. 3013. A bill to provide increases in the monthly rates of wartime service-connected death compensation payable to widows alone and to dependent parents.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 3013 is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: Enclosed please find copy of H. R. 6934 introduced in the House on January 6, 1954, same being a bill to provide increases in the monthly rates of wartime service-connected death compensation payable to widows alone and to dependent parents.

Also enclosed is copy of resolution No. 100 adopted at our national convention of 1953.

Section 1: This section proposes a monthly compensation rate in wartime service-connected deaths of $85 for a widow with no child, instead of the present $75, and of $75 for a dependent mother or father, instead of the present $60, or where both are granted the benefit, $40 each, instead of the present $35 each.

This proposed amendment of paragraph IV of part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) pertains only to the survivors; the rates for the widows with children and for children, where there are no widows entitled to the benefit, remain undisturbed as shown by the bill.

There is ample justification for the recommended modest adjustment of rates. All other disability and death compensation and pension rates were increased in 1952 by approval of Public Laws 356 and 427 of the 82d Congress. The cost of living increased for these survivors as for everyone else. There are widows and dependent parents of deceased World War I veterans who are eking out a bare existence because the compensation award is their only income to meet their living expenses.

Section 2: This section would make the increased awards effective from the first day of the first calendar month after date of enactment and should facilitate the adjustments.

The national organization of the American Legion would be very grateful to you if you would be good enough to introduce a companion bill in the Senate at your earliest convenience.

Thanking you for your courtesy and cooperation, and with warmest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

HELEN PANAGIOTIS STAMOULIS, ALSO KNOWN AS HELENI P. STAMOOLIS OR STAMOULI

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, by request of Representative HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, from the 32d District of Pennsylvania, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Helen Panagiotis Stamoulis, also known as Heleni P. Stamoolis or Stamouli. I ask unanimous consent that Representative EBERHARTER's letter be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3014) for the relief of Helen Panagiotis Stamoulis, also known as Heleni P. Stamoolis or Stamouli, introduced by Mr. MARTIN, by request, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 3014 is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1954.

Senator EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: In connection with the private bill introduced by you in 1951 (copy attached) it is my understanding that administratively an adverse decision has been rendered.

However, representations have come to me from highly responsible sources in Pittsburgh that further investigation may disclose evidence that there is, indeed, a great deal of merit in the proposal to permit Miss Stamoolis to remain in the United States for permanent residence.

In view of these representations may I respectfully request that you introduce in the Senate a new bill which would have the effect as proposed in the one originally introduced by you in 1951.

With sincere personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,
HERMAN P. EBERHARTER.

AMENDMENT OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, the purpose of which is to increase the mainland cane-sugar quota 100,000 tons.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement entitled "The Mainland Cane-Quota Situation," submitted by the local representative of the American Sugar Cane League, be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3019) to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. LONG, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. SMATHERS) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. ELLENDER is as follows:

THE MAINLAND CANE QUOTA SITUATION

STATEMENT MADE ON BEHALF OF THE 83 PROCESSORS AND MORE THAN 8,000 GROWERS OF SUGARCANE IN LOUISIANA AND FLORIDA—THE MAINLAND CANE AREA

The mainland cane sugar area needs its quota increased from 500,000 tons to 600,000 tons.

Sugar production in the area in 4 of the last 5 years has been in excess of the 500,000-ton quota. The current crop will produce more than 640,000 tons.

This over-quota production is due not to increased plantings but to greater efficiency of operation in field and factory; the results of research done by private industry and scientists of the United States Department of Agriculture, which developed disease and cold-resistant varieties that give greater yields of cane and sugar per acre; more scientific farming practices and wider use of improved mechanical equipment.

Although more than 640,000 tons of sugar will be produced from the current crop only 500,000 tons can be sold. The effective inventory on January 1, 1954 was approximately 300,000 tons; actual stocks on that date were estimated to be 190,000 tons. Facilities are not available in the area for warehousing all of the over-quota sugar nor are all producers able to pay the high cost of carrying over that quantity of sugar until January 1, 1955, the beginning of the next quota year, and at the same time finance their next year's crop.

Proportionate share acres (acreage quotas) for 1954 established by the USDA require an acreage cut of 5 percent or 27,000 acres. This makes the total acreage of the area for 1954 20,000 acres less than the total acreage harvested in 1948, when the quota of 500,000 tons was established. Although the area will harvest 20,000 less acres, the estimated production of sugar is still greatly in excess of the statutory quota. A hearing on proportionate shares for 1955 will be held the middle

of this year and all statistics available at this time indicate that the area is faced with a further acreage cut of 30 percent effective for the 1954–55 crop year.

No farmer in the area can survive such a drastic reduction of his crop. Overhead costs on his greatly reduced acreage will still be as high as the overhead costs on the current crop and, incidentally, the current costs are the highest in the history of the area.

The cost of planting an acre of sugarcane is high. It is amortized over a period of some 3 to 5 years because that many annual crops of sugarcane normally are harvested from one planting. So, when a farmer complies with orders from the USDA to reduce his acreage, he must destroy a sizable capital investment.

The following table I shows the acreage of sugarcane and production and stocks of sugar for Florida and Louisiana and for the mainland cane area as a whole for the years 1949 to date:

Acreage of sugarcane and production and stocks of sugar

Crop year	Acreage			Sugar production			Jan. 1 stocks	Jan. 1 effective inventory
	Louisiana	Florida	Total	Louisiana	Florida	Total	Mainland area	Mainland area
	Thous. acres	*Thous. acres*	*Thous. acres*	*Thous. tons*	*Thous. tons*	*Thous. tons*	*Thous. tons*	*Thous. tons*
1949	301	39	340	414	105	519	70	184
1950	296	40	336	451	109	560	61	145
1951	301	40	341	294	[1] 123	417	110	187
1952	295	44	339	451	154	605	55	144
1953 [2]	302	45	347	481	159	640	64	177
1954 [2]						600	190	300
1955 [2]							300	400

[1] Unprecedented early freeze.
[2] Preliminary and estimated.

All of the sugar produced in the mainland cane area is sold in the Continental United States. The value of the current crop of sugarcane in Florida and Louisiana is more than $100 million. That $100 million constitutes new wealth derived from the sale of sugarcane and its byproducts in a trade area largely outside the States where the sugarcane is grown. However, practically all of that money is spent in Florida and Louisiana for labor, machinery, fertilizer and other items needed to produce and process sugarcane, and for family living. Thus, the mainland cane industry makes a major contribution to the economy of both Florida and Louisiana and to all of the United States of America.

Table II below shows the amount of sugar marketed and imported in the United States for the years 1948 to date:

Sugar marketed and imported

(Charges against quotas)

1948	7,094,135
1949	7,588,049
1950	8,273,853
1951	7,761,646
1952	7,906,130
1953	[1] 8,100,000
1954	[2] 8,400,000

[1] 1953 quotas as currently established.
[2] Secretary Benson's estimate of 1954 needs.

The figures in table II represent the approximate annual consumption of sugar in the continental United States. You will note that the consumption in 1954, according to the Secretary of Agriculture's estimate, will be more than 1,300,000 tons greater than the consumption in the year 1948. As you know, the population in the United States is increasing at a rate in excess of 2½ million per year. The per capita consumption of sugar in the United States is approximately 100 pounds, which means that as a result of annual population growth there is an annual average increase in sugar consumption of approximately 125,000 tons. The data in table I clearly indicates that the mainland cane area requires a quota increase of at least 100,000 tons, which mounts to less than 1 year's average increase in consumption in this country due to population increases.

The mainland cane sugar quota, like other domestic area quotas, is not automatically increased in proportion to increases in consumption as is the case with the quota for Cuba and other foreign countries which supply sugar to the United States. As a matter of fact, the Sugar Act provides for 100 percent of any increase in our consumption to go to Cuba and other foreign countries. A 100,000-ton quota increase for the mainland cane area could be made without lowering the basic quota of Cuba or any foreign country. It could be accomplished merely by requiring the foreign countries supplying our market to forego only 80 percent of 1 year's consumption increase due to population growth in our own country.

The mainland cane area's quota of 500,000 tons has not been revised since it was established by Congress in 1947.

The continental beet quota established at the same time is 1,800,000 tons. Only once in its history has the beet area been able to fill its quota. The beet area failed to fill its quota in 1953 by 180,000 tons; in 1952 by 240,000 tons; in 1951 by 100,000 tons; and in 1950 by 1,000 tons.

The principal reason for the consistent failure of the beet area to fill its quota is the fact that normally other crops are more profitable than sugar beets. Consequently, when farmers in that area feel they can get better returns per acre from beans, cotton, or wheat, they do not plant sugar beets and the area has a large deficit.

Puerto Rico's quota was increased by Congress January 1, 1953, by 170,000 tons to its present total of 1,090,000 tons. Although Puerto Rico for some time has talked need for more quota, representatives authorized to speak for the entire sugar industry of that island agreed February 23, 1954, in a meeting with representatives of continental beets, Hawaii, United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, and mainland cane, that because of the urgency of the Louisiana-Florida quota problem which outweighs Puerto Rico's problem, Puerto Rico would not ask for a quota increase at this time and would give all assistance possible in getting the mainland cane quota increased by 100,000 tons.

The Puerto Ricans further agreed that if and when they did ask for more quota, the request would be limited to raw quota only.

Hawaii has a quota of 1,052,000 tons. Spokesmen for that area stated that Hawaii does not seek a quota increase, but does reserve the right to ask for one in the future if such increase should be justified.

The Virgin Islands quota was increased January 1, 1953, from 6,000 to 12,000 tons, which is adequate for that limited area.

Two States—Florida and Louisiana—produce cane sugar. Twenty-two States produce beet sugar. The total of cane and beet sugar produced in the continental United States is less than one-third of the sugar consumed in the United States. When the production from the Territories of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands is added, the total production of sugar from all domestic areas is only a little more than half of the total sugar requirements of the United States.

Consumers have a definite interest in maintaining a sound domestic sugar industry, particularly that segment of the industry located in the continental United States. The value of the continental domestic sugar industry was impressively demonstrated during World War I—and again during World War II—when it was almost impossible, because of enemy submarine activity, to get sugar from foreign countries and from some of our offshore domestic sugar-producing areas. Now, in the face of a threat of a world war III, it is especially important to consumers that a dependable source of sugar be maintained on the mainland of the United States.

Beyond any doubt the mainland cane area has demonstrated its ability to produce consistently and economically 600,000 tons of sugar annually. Please help Louisiana and Florida to get it.

USE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO IMPROVE FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the United States, to relieve famine, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that I be granted not more than 5 minutes to make a statement in connection with the introduction of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3020) to authorize the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the United States, to relieve famine, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota to speak for not more than 5 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I hope this will be the last request for an extension of time. I think this morning hour today has been used a little indiscriminately.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana raise a point of order?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I do not at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request was for how much time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. For not more than 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair

hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, regardless of any differences on other phases of our agricultural policy I believe every member of this body recognizes the imperative need for expanding our overseas outlets, both through increased private export trade and through our Government making greater use of farm products to replace financial assistance as an arm of our foreign policy.

My interest in this matter has been repeatedly expressed on this floor and elsewhere. I am proud to have cosponsored with the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] the resolution calling for creation of international food reserves as a sound, long-range step in solving this problem in a multilateral way through agencies of the United Nations.

I have repeatedly in the past called for greater efforts on the part of our own Government in this direction, and I have supported every move toward that end. My interest in obtaining wheat for both India and Pakistan is well known. My support for granting authority to the President for use of our farm abundance to combat famine anywhere in the world is a matter of record.

On many occasions, I have backed efforts to make greater use of private facilities such as the great organizations of CARE and CROP in overseas distribution of food as a gift from the American people.

Mr. President, this Congress has shown a full awareness of the need to expand our overseas outlets. Many constructive proposals have been advanced.

I have studied all of these proposals, finding merit in most of them, but none covering the entire problem.

Mr. President, I believe this bill combines the best out of several proposals before this body and rounds them together in one omnibus measure that—

First. Extends the authority of the President, which now expires March 31, to use our abundant food supplies for famine relief.

Second. Authorizes the Foreign Operations Administration or such other agency as the President may direct to serve as a trading post for stimulating export sales through converting into dollars the foreign currencies received by exporters in payment for the sale of abundant agricultural commodities.

Third. Requires use of private trade channels to the maximum extent practicable in developing the sales for foreign currencies, and requires the use of private nonprofit agencies and organizations to the greatest extent practicable in carrying out famine relief operations.

Fourth. Provides safeguards against dumping that would substitute or displace usual marketings, and to assure to the maximum extent practicable sales prices consistent with world market prices.

Fifth. Provides for use of foreign currencies obtained through such sales for providing military assistance to friendly countries, for purchase of goods or services in friendly countries, for loans to increase production of goods and services, including strategic materials, for developing new markets on a mutually beneficial basis, and for acquiring materials for United States stockpiles.

Mr. President, all these proposals have been discussed in the Senate last year, this year, and in preceding Congresses. In fact, just a few moments ago we were discussing the same matters, during the speech of the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Because it is the intent of this bill to make use of America's agricultural resources as a positive arm of our foreign policy, rather than just in any sense a farm relief program, the measure provides for the cost to be chargeable to foreign assistance appropriations, rather than to the Department of Agriculture.

The authorization asked for appropriations is no higher than in other bills before the Senate to provide separately for famine relief authority and increased export trade through the mutual security program. I believe there is merit in combining the program into one package, although earmarking the specific amounts authorized for each, in order to provide some limitations.

Mr. President, I believe the bill conforms to the objectives of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation and the American Farm Bureau Federation toward an aggressive program of securing mutually acceptable trade agreements with other countries, and providing a clearinghouse for foreign currency as a means of moving surplus agricultural commodities and encouraging two-way trade in lieu of direct aid.

I further believe, Mr. President, that the bill meets the objectives set forth by President Eisenhower in his messages to the Congress.

Mr. President, in an address to the 16th Annual National Farm Institute, at Des Moines, Iowa, on February 19, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture offered some of the most constructive observations I have yet heard from a spokesman for agriculture in the executive branch of this administration. In the course of his remarks, Assistant Secretary Davis said:

> We must expand foreign outlets. This we can do (A) by promoting export sales through normal trade channels at fair prices, and (B) by promoting exports over and above normal amounts by accepting local currencies under conditions advantageous to both the United States and the cooperating countries.

Mr. President, those are the objectives of the bill I have introduced. I ask that it be held open, and I invite any interested Senators on either side of the aisle to join me in sponsoring this effort to make a constructive approach to carrying out one of the foremost objectives of American agriculture, and one to which President Eisenhower has given his public blessing on several occasions.

While I still believe the international food reserve approach is the eventual one which must be taken, it is imperative that our country act on its own, pending establishment of some multilateral program. For that reason, I have offered this new bill, which I believe includes several refinements of other proposals. I invite its careful study, particularly by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have shown such a constructive interest in this problem in the past.

INVESTIGATION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF UNITED NATIONS OF THE KOREA AND KATYN MASSACRES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution to force a showdown in the United Nations on the Korean massacres of American soldiers, and the Katyn massacre of officers of the Polish army.

I hope my concurrent resolution will receive speedy approval, and that we shall proceed at once to force organized communism to render an accounting at the bar of world opinion for these horrors.

For several years the Communists succeeded by their propaganda in creating doubts about their guilt in Poland. They successfully gave the impression that these massacres were perpetrated by the German Nazi armies. But they refused to permit an impartial investigation by the International Red Cross—just as, years later, they refused to permit an impartial investigation by the same agency into the Korean atrocities.

In both instances the Communist claim that others perpetrated the crimes, but those claims have been thoroughly exploded. Evidence gathered by the American forces clearly convicts the Communist Koreans, working hand and glove with their Russian-Chinese advisers and commanders, of the Korean slaughter.

A special committee of Congress, under the direction of Representative RAY MADDEN, of Indiana, a Democrat, has amassed evidence beyond any reasonable doubt that it was the Russian armies which cruelly slaughtered thousands of Polish officers in the Katyn Forest. Representative MADDEN's evidence would stand in a court of law. It is painstaking, carefully documented, and convincing proof. His committee report suggests that the United States bring the Katyn atrocities before the United Nations General Assembly for action. For some reason or other, this recommendation has not been followed, and the Katyn case has not been brought before the United Nations.

I have read the report of Mr. MADDEN's committee—a unanimous report, by the way.

These atrocities must not be forgotten, nor remain in the limbo of "unfinished business." They should be brought before the United Nations, with all the evidence and persuasion at our command, time and again, until Russia stands condemned before the world. They are a part and parcel of the pattern of Communist conquest and aggression—to invade, seize or subvert a nation, then slaughter all who could conceivably provide an effective resistance in the future.

The United Nations General Assembly, as a world forum, can take up where the Congress cannot proceed. It can proceed to bring these cases before the World Court, for a final judgment of Communist guilt. Russia ought to be made to stand up and defend these atrocities in a court of law; or she should be shown before the world as an outlaw nation unwilling and afraid to accept

the highest processes of justice. That is exactly what I hope this concurrent resolution will accomplish.

The United States should proceed at once to force this issue of wholesale slaughter and torture before the world, for its condemnation.

Mr. President, the concurrent resolution I am now submitting asks the State Department to bring the Katyn massacre before the Assembly of the United Nations, to have the matter referred to the World Court, to have Russia put on trial in the World Court for its actions in the Katyn massacre, and also to have Russia and China placed on trial in the World Court for the massacre of American soldiers in Korea.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 65), submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas a committee of Congress, after more than a year of investigation, has unanimously found that the Katyn massacre of Polish soldiers was perpetrated by the Soviet NKVD;

Whereas this committee has recommended that the United Nations proceed to bring Russia before the International Court of Justice for trial on charges of violating general principles of law recognized by civilized nations;

Whereas Russia not only has refused to permit an investigation of this crime by the International Red Cross, but likewise has refused to permit the investigation by the International Red Cross of similar atrocities committed against American soldiers in Korea; and

Whereas the massacre of Americans in Korea makes more pressing the necessity of action by the United Nations and the International Court of Justice to establish guilt of crimes of war in conformance with the policy established in the Nuremberg and other war trials: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to instruct the United States Representative to the United Nations to bring the Korea and Katyn cases before the General Assembly of the United Nations for the purpose of seeking an immediate and thorough investigation of such cases by the General Assembly, and, if such investigation indicates the desirability of further action, the reference of such cases to the International Court of Justice.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MUNDT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

TAX LEGISLATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and myself, I submit an amendment which we propose to offer to the tax bill when it comes over from the House.

The amendment has a dual purpose. The first section would reduce the present depletion allowance on oil and gas from 27½ percent to 15 percent. The second section proposes to make it mandatory for the departments to lease all public lands by competitive bidding, rather than under the present procedure of noncompetitive awards.

I ask that the amendment, together with a statement of explanation, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. AIKEN) is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add two new sections as follows:

"SEC. . (a) Section 114 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to percentage depletion for oil and gas wells) is amended by striking out '27½ percent' and inserting in lieu thereof '15 percent.'

"Section 9 of the Mineral Leasing Act for acquiring lands (30 U. S. C., sec. 358; Public Law 382, 80th Cong.) is amended by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 9),' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) On and after the date of the enactment of this subsection all deposits of oil and gas, whether or not within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field, leased under this act shall be leased to the highest responsible qualified bidder by competitive bidding under the same conditions as contained in the leasing provisions of the mineral-leasing laws applicable to the leasing of lands within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect any rights acquired by any lessee prior to the date of the enactment of this subsection, and such rights shall be governed by the law in effect at the time of their acquisition.'"

The explanation presented by Mr. WILLIAMS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

AMENDMENT TO THE TAX BILL

Depletion allowance

The proposed amendment (subsection (a)) would amend section 114 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code in order to reduce the deduction allowed for depletion of oil and gas wells from 27½ percent of the gross income from the property during the taxable year to 15 percent of such gross income. Section 23 (m) of the Internal Revenue Code allows a deduction, in the case of mines, oil and gas wells, other natural deposits, and timber, of a reasonable allowance for depletion and for depreciation of improvements. However, the depletion allowable under section 23 (m) may be determined, in the case of oil and gas wells and in the case of coal and metal mines and certain other mines and mineral deposits enumerated in section 114 (b) (4) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code, on the basis of a percentage of the gross income from the property during the taxable year. In the case of oil and gas wells, the allowance for depletion under section 23 (m) is, under the present law, 27½ percent of the gross income from the property during the taxable year, excluding from such gross income an amount equal to any rents or rental incurred or paid by the taxpayer in respect of the property. The proposed amendment would reduce the percentage to 15 percent. The proposed amendment would be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after the date of its enactment.

Require competitive bidding on leases of mineral rights

This portion concerns the manner in which the Government has been leasing and disposing of its valuable mineral rights for a fraction of their real worth. In an unbusinesslike method the mineral rights under our public lands are being leased by the Department of the Interior at millions of dollars below their marketable value.

This Department, under the provisions of a law passed in 1947, has been leasing public lands for the development of minerals by private negotiation at a nominal fee of 25 cents to 50 cents an acre, sometimes even lower, instead of negotiating these leases on a competitive-bid basis. This rejection of competitive bidding has resulted in the loss of millions of dollars annually. The policy of rejecting competitive bids, sometimes as high as $20 or $30 per acre and accepting only a nominal fee has been explained by the Department as being required under an interpretation of the existing law.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. John Alexander Klein, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as The Adjutant General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Laurence Coffin Ames, and sundry other officers, for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force for service as members of the Air National Guard; and

Charles P. Anderson, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Navy.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. UPTON:

Statement prepared by him on the tragic fate of the Lithuanian people under Communist rule.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR FERGUSON AND SENATOR McCLELLAN

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I wish to express warmest congratulations to my senior colleague from Michigan, Senator HOMER FERGUSON, who today is

celebrating his 65th birthday. He is a young man at 65.

Senator FERGUSON has had a distinguished career in the State of Michigan, and the State of Michigan is proud of its senior Senator. He served as a circuit judge in our great State from 1929 to 1943. He served in that office with great distinction. Senator FERGUSON served as a one-man jury in our State for a period of time in which he cleaned up graft, corruption, and vice in Detroit and Wayne County. When he became a candidate for the United States Senate, he left the bench. He was elected to the Senate in 1942.

The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan is known for his industry. He is one of the hardest working Members of the Senate. He is a man of conspicuous ability. He is kind and thoughtful, and always has in mind the welfare of the people he represents in connection with his consideration of the many major problems which come before the Senate.

So, Mr. President, it is with a great deal of pride and pleasure that I extend my felicitations to my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, HOMER FERGUSON, and wish for him many, many more years of fruitful public service.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to open the day, so far as I am concerned, with a very cheering and wonderful thought. Our best affections and hearty congratulations go today to the senior Senator from Michigan, HOMER FERGUSON, who today is celebrating his birthday. I know I speak for all my colleagues in expressing the wish that he will have many, many more happy birthdays and many, many more years of effective service in the Senate of the Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to join the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] and the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in wishing the chairman of the majority policy committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] a very happy birthday, and I hope he may have many more of them.

Let me also call attention to the fact that today is the birthday of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]; and I know all of us wish him many happy returns.

JOHN MCCLELLAN is one of those great statesmen who make us all proud to be Americans.

He is not a flamboyant character—not a man who speaks without thought. He is rather the kind of legislator who combines experience, ability and courage. The combination is one of the most effective that can be found in the Senate.

JOHN MCCLELLAN is a real leader of his people. He is a real leader because he speaks for them—because he places their interests at the forefront of his thoughts.

He has been an effective Senator for Arkansas—an able legislator for the whole country. The people of his State deserve congratulations for their good judgment and I join them in wishing him many happy returns of the day.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also desire to join my colleagues in wishing the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] many, many happy returns of the day.

Mr. President, it happens to be my privilege, and has been for some years, to serve with the senior Senator from Michigan on the Appropriations Committee, on which he is now the ranking Republican member. I have watched him perform his work with ability and distinction. He is always a very diligent member of the committee, and is regular in his attendance at its meetings. He handles with equal dispatch the work of the subcommittee to which he is assigned.

At present I am also serving with him as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and there he also takes a very keen and active interest in the work of the committee.

Senator FERGUSON bears the very heavy responsibility of being chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee, and he also takes a very active part in the work of that committee.

So, Mr. President, I am happy to join with his other friends and colleagues in wishing him many, many happy returns of the day.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I am very much pleased and honored to have this opportunity of joining my colleagues in wishing Senator FERGUSON a very happy birthday.

Pennsylvania is very proud of the accomplishments of HOMER FERGUSON. Both Senator FERGUSON and Mrs. Ferguson were born in Westmoreland County, Pa. We have watched with the greatest of interest their outstanding progress and achievements.

Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate, one of the first men I met was Senator FERGUSON. I have observed with much satisfaction and pride his work in the Senate. He has a very high conception of American ideals, and has earned a notable reputation as an outstanding legislator.

The people of Michigan are most fortunate in having him as one of their representatives in the United States Senate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I, too, desire to join my colleagues in wishing Senator FERGUSON many, many, many more pleasant birthdays here on the floor of the Senate. The Nation needs men of the ability, character, sincerity, and purpose that have marked the distinguished career of Senator FERGUSON. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have been privileged to serve with him, not only as a member of the full committee, but also as a member of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations. I know of his ability and his determination to obtain the facts and to deal properly and justly with all matters pertaining to the affairs of our Government, whether military or civil.

So, Mr. President, I desire to join my colleagues in wishing for Senator HOMER FERGUSON many, many more years of service in the United States Senate.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I, too, desire to join my colleagues in extending our warmest felicitations and greetings to our good friend and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from the State of Michigan, HOMER FERGUSON. I have known him for many years, and knew him for many years before serving in the Senate. I have had many pleasant and happy associations and relationships with him. At all times I have known him to be most able and most friendly.

Mr. President, I was gratified when his colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], referred to Senator HOMER FERGUSON as a young man. Certainly the senior Senator from Michigan gives every evidence of being young and active, as he diligently performs the heavy tasks which are his in the Senate.

So, Mr. President, I desire to join my colleagues in wishing for Senator FERGUSON many, many more years of service to his people and to his country.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to join in extending congratulations to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and in wishing him many happy returns.

I desire also, Mr. President, to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] upon his attainment of another milestone. The birthday of the senior Senator from Arkansas is a matter of note because of the outstanding service which he has rendered to his country and to his State.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it affords me pleasure to join with my colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and my other colleagues who have expressed their felicitations to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] on their birthdays.

The senior Senator from Arkansas has a distinguished record. At one point in his career he served as prosecuting attorney. He was elected to the 74th Congress to represent the 6th Congressional District of Arkansas. He served in the House of Representatives as a Representative for two terms, following which he was elected to the United States Senate, since which time he has been serving in the Senate with distinction.

I wish to add my voice to the sentiment expressed by the junior Senator from Tennessee in extending to the senior Senator from Arkansas best wishes and congratulations.

REPORT BY SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES ON FOUR-POWER MEETING AT BERLIN

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, yesterday the Secretary of State, Hon. John Foster Dulles, delivered a very important address, which was carried over nationwide television facilities last night. It was a report on the recent Four Power meeting in Berlin. Because of the importance of this address I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the address be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON BERLIN

(Address by Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, concerning the recent Four Power meeting at Berlin)

Last Friday evening I returned to Washington after 4 weeks of daily discussion at Berlin with the Foreign Ministers of France, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union—Mr. Bidault, Mr. Eden, Mr. Molotov. Also, on the way back, I met with Chancellor Adenauer, of Germany.

I find on my return that there is some confusion as to what really happened. That is not surprising. It is difficult to grasp quickly the results of 4 weeks of debate on many different matters. Indeed, the full results cannot be clearly seen for many months. I can, however, say that this meeting had two results which will profoundly influence the future.

First, as far as Europe was concerned, we brought Mr. Molotov to show Russia's hand. It was seen as a hand that held fast to everything it had, including East Germany and East Austria, and also it sought to grab some more.

Second, as far as Korea and Indochina were concerned, we brought Mr. Molotov to accept a resolution which spelled out the United States position that Red China might in these two instances be dealt with, but not as a government recognized by us.

You may ask whether it was worth while to go to Berlin and to make the great effort that the conference involved merely to obtain these results.

My answer is "Yes," and I have no doubt about that. Berlin cleared the way for other things to happen. The unification and the strengthening of West Europe may now go on. In Asia there could be a unification of Korea and an end to aggression in Indochina—if Red China wants it.

I do not predict that these things will happen. What I do say is that they could not have happened had it not been for Berlin.

II

Five years had elapsed since the Western Ministers had met with the Soviet Foreign Minister. During those 5 years much had occurred.

A war had started and been stopped in Korea.

A war had reached ominous proportions in Indochina.

Stalin had died and his successors talked more softly.

Six nations of Europe had created their coal and steel community and planned to move on to a European Defense Community.

Communist China had emerged as an aggressive military organization, allying its vast manpower with that of the Soviet Union.

In the Soviet Union itself, industrial and agricultural strains were developing.

In East Germany, the spontaneous outbreak of June 17, 1953, revealed, in one enlightening flash, how much the captives crave freedom.

What did all of this add up to, in terms of world politics? Many speculated and no one knew. The uncertainty was leading to hesitation, wishful thinking and some paralysis of action.

There was only one way to find out—that was to meet with the Russians and deal with them in terms of some practical tests.

III

We went to Berlin in the hope that Soviet policies would now permit the unification of Germany in freedom, or at least the liberation of Austria. Those two matters would, in relation to Europe, test the Soviet temper. We hoped to achieve those two results and we were determined to let no minor obstacles deter us.

The obstacles we incurred were, however, not minor, but fundamental.

The Soviet position was not at first openly revealed. It was masked behind ambiguous words and phrases. But as the conference unfolded and as Mr. Molotov was compelled to respond to our probing of his words, the Soviet purpose became apparent.

The seating and speaking order at the conference table were such that it always fell to me to speak first after Mr. Molotov. Then after me came Mr. Bidault, of France, and then Mr. Eden, of Britain. They carried with conspicuous ability their share of the task. Between the three of us, we exposed what lay behind Mr. Molotov's clever words. For the first time in 5 years the people of West Europe, America, and indeed all who could and would observe, sized up today's Soviet policy out of Mr. Molotov's own mouth, instead of by guess or by theory.

It amounted to this:

To hold on to East Germany.

To permit its unification with West Germany only under conditions such that the Communists would control the election machinery through all Germany.

To maintain Soviet troops indefinitely in Austria.

To offer Western Europe, as the price of Soviet good will, a Soviet-controlled Europe which would exclude the United States except in the nominal role of an observer along with Communist China.

This last Soviet project for what Mr. Molotov called European security was so preposterous that when he read it laughter rippled around the western sides of the table to the dismay of the Communist delegation.

Laughter is a denial of fear and the destroyer of mystery—two weapons upon which the Soviet Union has relied far too long. Both of these weapons were swept aside in one moment of western laughter.

But Mr. Molotov did more than just to furnish us with an occasion for ridicule. In that same breath, he told Germany that the price of unification was total Sovietization. He told Austria she was to be occupied until Germany paid the Soviet price. He told France that the western frontier of communism was to be the Rhine and not the Elbe. He told all Western Europe, including the United Kingdom, that the price of momentary respite was for the Americans to go home.

His final utterances were harsh. When he called for the abandonment of a European Defense Community, the dismantling of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the scrapping of United States bases he spoke with no soft words. Gone was the post-Stalin "new look." Thus he made clear what, to some, had been in doubt.

IV

The Soviet position admitted of no real negotiation. There is no middle ground between free German elections and the kind of elections which were carried on the eastern zone of Germany, where the people were forced to deposit Communist Party ballots bearing one set of names alone.

There is no middle ground between a free and independent Austria and an Austria infiltrated with Russian soldiers.

There is no middle ground between an Atlantic community defense system and "Americans, go home."

There is no middle ground between freedom and slavery.

For the clearest and sharpest and simplest exposition of these basic truths, all of us are indebted to Mr. Molotov.

In my closing statement before the conference last Thursday afternoon, I recalled that we had fought the Second World War for goals expressed in the Atlantic Charter, to which the Soviet Union had subscribed. One of these was freedom from fear. But, once victory was won, the dominant Soviet motive had been "fear of freedom."

There is no doubt in my mind that the Soviet leaders genuinely fear freedom. They do not feel safe unless freedom is extinguished, or is defenseless. That Soviet attitude made it impossible to achieve any agreement at Berlin in relation to European matters.

V

I have referred to the efforts of the western Ministers to require Mr. Molotov to expose Soviet policies in their reality. That effort gave drama to every meeting of the four. There was another aspect which carried, too, its drama. That was the effort of Mr. Molotov to divide the three Western powers.

Mr. Molotov occasionally complained that he was at a disadvantage because we were three to his one. But from his standpoint, that was an advantage. It is much easier to divide three than it is to divide one. If Mr. Molotov had achieved that division, he would have won the conference. In that respect, he failed totally. The conference ended with a greater degree of unity between the three Western powers than had existed when the conference began.

That unity did not come about merely because there had been prior planning. There had been able planning, and our United States staff was one of which all Americans can be proud. But no planning could anticipate all the moves which could be made by so shrewd a diplomat as Mr. Molotov and which called for instantaneous response. The unity that emerged was a natural and spontaneous unity which came from the fact that the three Foreign Ministers stood for governments and nations which were dedicated to the concepts of human liberty and national integrity which Mr. Molotov attacked.

VI

It is a tragedy for the peoples of Germany that Germany and Berlin must remain divided; and for the people of Austria that they remain occupied and economically exploited. It can be said, however, to the eternal honor of these peoples, that they would not have had us do other than we did.

The Austrian bipartisan delegation offered the Soviet Union every concession compatible with national honor. They firmly refused to go beyond that point.

We were constantly in contact with the government and political leaders of the Federal Republic of Germany and we knew that they did not want us to buy German unity at the price of making Germany a Soviet satellite. The Germans under Soviet rule had no government to represent them, but we saw them in East Berlin. They provided a startling and shocking contrast with the people of West Berlin. There we saw open countenances and everywhere welcoming smiles and gestures. In the Soviet sector of Berlin we saw only frozen and haggard countenances, as the people stood silently under the vigilant eyes of the ever-present and heavily armed police. A few waved at me from behind a policeman's back and many wrote me through underground channels. They made clear that they passionately wanted unification with West Germany, but they did not seek that unification on terms which would not really have ended their own enslavement, but would have merely extended that enslavement to their brothers of the West.

The alien peoples under Soviet rule can know that nothing that happened in Berlin has made less likely the unification of Germany, or the liberation of Austria and indeed the restoration of freedom to Poland, Czechoslovakia and the other satellite countries. At Berlin I did not conceal my views in this respect. In my closing remarks to the three other Foreign Ministers I said "we do not believe that the people of Germany or Aus-

tria or for that matter of other neighboring nations need to bury their hopes."

I am confident that in saying this I expressed the abiding sentiments of the American people.

The Governments of France and Britain rejected, without hesitation, the Soviet proffer of European peace at a price which would have meant Western European disunity in the face of the huge consolidation of Soviet power.

Thus it came about that, in relation to Europe, much has been revealed. The Soviet has offered its alternatives to Western planning and they are so repellent that there seems no choice but to proceed as planned. Certainly that is the United States conviction.

VII

I had two private talks with Mr. Molotov about advancing President Eisenhower's atomic energy plan. We have agreed on the next procedural step which will involve communication between Moscow and Washington through the Soviet Embassy in Washington. I should note in this connection that the Berlin Conference adopted a resolution to exchange views on limitation of armament as contemplated by a United Nations resolution of last November. It was, however, made clear that these talks would not replace, or cut across, the independent development of President Eisenhower's atomic energy plan.

VIII

We dealt also with the matter of peace in Korea and Indochina.

We wanted a political conference on Korea because we felt it a duty to ourselves, the Korean people and the United Nations to seek to replace a Korea divided by an armistice with a Korea united in peace. The Korean Armistice recommended such a conference with the Communists. But for over 6 months, the Communists had blocked agreement upon either the time or place or composition of that conference. As far back as last September, in agreement with President Rhee of Korea, the United States had proposed that the conference be held at Geneva. That proposal had been rejected. We proposed, also in agreement with President Rhee, that the conference should be composed of Communist China, Soviet Russia, North Korea, and, on the United Nations side, the Republic of Korea, and the 16 United Nations members which had fought in Korea. This proposal had been rejected.

The Communists insisted that a group of Asian "neutrals" should be present and that Soviet Russia would be among these neutrals and so not bound by conference decisions.

We were able at Berlin to settle all these matters. It was agreed that a conference will be held at Geneva, as we had long ago proposed, and that the composition will be precisely that which the United States, the Republic of Korea, and the United Nations General Assembly had sought. There will be no Asian "neutrals" there.

IX

Some profess to fear that the holding of this conference will imply United States recognition of Communist China. That fear is without basis. Those throughout the world who suggest that the prospective Geneva Conference implies recognition are giving the Communists a success which they could not win at Berlin. The resolution adopted at Berlin explicitly provides—I shall read the text—"It is understood that neither the invitation to, nor the holding of, the abovementioned conference shall be deemed to imply diplomatic recognition in any case where it has not already been accorded."

I had told Mr. Molotov, flatly, that I would not agree to meet with the Chinese Communists unless it was expressly agreed and put in writing that no United States recognition would be involved.

Mr. Molotov resisted that provision to the last. He sought by every artifice and device, directly and through our allies, to tempt us to meet with Communist China as one of the five great powers. We refused, and our British and French allies stood with us. When we went into the final session last Thursday afternoon, I did not know what Mr. Molotov's final position would be. So far, he had not accepted my position. We were to adjourn at 7 o'clock. At 6 o'clock—just 60 minutes before the final adjournment—Mr. Molotov announced that he would accept our nonrecognition proviso.

A Soviet concession of that order ought not to be ignored.

My basic position with reference to Communist China was made clear beyond the possibility of misunderstanding.

In my opening statement (January 26), I said "I should like to state here, plainly and unequivocally, what the Soviet Foreign Minister already knows—the United States will not agree to join in a five-power conference with the Chinese Communist aggressors for the purpose of dealing generally with the peace of the world. The United States refuses not because, as suggested, it denies that the regime exists or that it has power. We in the United States well know that it exists and has power because its aggressive armies joined with the North Korean aggressors to kill and wound 150,000 Americans. We do not refuse to deal with it where occasion requires. It is, however, one thing to recognize evil as a fact. It is another thing to take evil to one's breast and call it good."

That explains our nonrecognition of the Communist regime and also our opposition to its admission to the United Nations.

I adhered to that position without compromise. It is that position which is reflected in the final Berlin Conference Resolution. Under that resolution the Communist regime will not come to Geneva to be honored by us, but rather to account before the bar of world opinion.

X

The Berlin Resolution also touches on Indochina. It says that "the establishment, by peaceful means, of a united and independent Korea would be an important factor * * * in restoring peace in other parts of Asia," and it concludes that "the problem of restoring peace in Indochina will also be discussed at the conference."

This portion of the resolution was primarily and properly the responsibility of France. The United States has a very vital interest in developments in this area and we are helping the French union forces to defeat Communist aggression by helping them out with grants of money and equipment.

But the French and peoples of the Associated States of Indochina are doing the actual fighting in a war now in its eighth year. They have our confidence and our support. We can give counsel and that counsel is welcomed and taken into account. But just as the United States had a special position in relation to the Korean armistice so France has a special position in Indochina.

XI

I recognize, of course, that the Soviet Union would not have accepted, 100 percent, our terms for the Korean political conference, unless it expected to benefit thereby. But so do we.

I can think of some Soviet benefits that we would not like and should prevent. But I do not wholly exclude the idea that the Soviet Union might in fact want peace in Asia.

We can hope so, and we shall see. In the meantime, we shall keep on our guard.

There is, however, no reason why we should refuse to seek peacefully the results we want merely because of fear that we will be outmaneuvered at the conference table. No informed observers believe that we were outmaneuvered at Berlin.

We need not, out of fright, lay down the tools of diplomacy and the possibilities which they provide. Our cause is not so poor, and our capacity not so low, that our Nation must seek security by sulking in its tent.

XII

Berlin gave the free nations up-to-date, first-hand post-Stalin knowledge of Soviet intentions. That knowledge was not reassuring. It shows that the free nations must remain steadfast in their unity and steadfast in their determination to build military strength and human welfare to the point where aggression is deterred and the ideals of freedom are dynamic in the world.

We must continue to hold fast to the conviction that the peoples and nations who are today not the masters of their own destinies shall become their own masters.

If we do all of this, not belligerently, but wisely and soberly; if we remain ever-watchful for a sign from the Soviet rulers that they realize that freedom is not something to be frightened by, but something to be accepted, then we may indeed, as these eventful coming months unfold, advance the hopes for peace of the world, hopes so eloquently voiced by President Eisenhower last April, and again last December.

XIII

In all of this, we Americans have a special responsibility.

Over recent years, the fearful problem of dealing with Soviet expansion has brought many to a truly disturbing emotional and moral state. In a sense, brains have been washed to such an extent that many are tempted to trade principles of justice for some sense of momentary respite.

Our ultimate reliance is not dollars, is not guided missiles, is not weapons of mass destruction. The ultimate weapon is moral principle.

George Washington, in his farewell address, called upon our Nation to observe justice toward all others. "It will," he said, "be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great Nation to give to mankind the too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice * * *. The experiment, at least, is recommended."

That recommendation has, in fact, guided us throughout most of our national life and we have become the great Nation which Washington foresaw. This is not the moment to foresake that guiding principle. It is not a moment to flee from opportunities because we fear that we shall be inadequate. If what we stand for is right, why should we fear?

There are some in Europe who would have us forsake our friends in Asia in the hope of gain for Europe. There are some in Asia who would have us forsake our friends in Europe in hope of gain for Asia. We dare not be critical of them, for they are subject to strains which we are spared by our fortunate material and geographical position. Indeed, there are some Americans who would have us sacrifice our friends both in Asia and in Europe for some fancied benefit to ourselves.

I do not argue that American foreign policy should be conducted for the benefit of others. American foreign policy should be designed to promote American welfare. But we can know that our own welfare would not really be promoted by cynical conduct which defies moral principles. In a world in which no nation can live alone, to treat our friends unjustly is to destroy ourselves. We must stand as a solid rock of principle on which others can depend. That will be the case if we follow George Washington's advice and continue to be a people who are guided by "exalted justice."

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently I have had called to my attention an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, January 9, 1954, entitled "I Rode Uncle Sam's Gravy Train Overseas." This article, which was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was critical of the Foreign Service and perhaps left the implication that a good many of our public servants abroad are engaged in high living and are not devoting their best efforts to the interests of the United States.

I do not share the point of view that such abuses as are implied in this article are universal. I have visited a good many of our missions abroad and it is my conviction that, generally speaking, the Foreign Service of the United States is staffed with competent people, many of whom are making important sacrifices to serve their country abroad.

Last week I made a report to the Senate on my recent visit to the Far East. In that report I made some comments on the over-all caliber of the Foreign Service, which I now quote:

> I desire to pay special tribute to the career men and the members of the staffs of our Foreign Service. In many of these places they are working under extreme difficulties and great personal sacrifice. They deserve the confidence and support of the people of the United States.

Further on in the report I listed some of the encouraging aspects of the situation we encountered in our visit. Among those encouraging aspects I listed the following:

> Finally, we should point out that we were very favorably impressed by the quality of our leadership in Asia. Our ambassadors, on the whole, are outstanding as are our military leaders. * * * It is gratifying to meet such extremely able people in the field who are devoted to the best interests of the United States.

I make this statement for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I think it is time that the fine service being rendered by our public servants abroad should be properly recognized.

THE ST. LOUIS CARDINAL BASEBALL CLUB

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I am very glad to have this opportunity to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three telegrams which I have received in reply to the statement made on the Senate floor on Monday by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] about the St. Louis Cardinal Baseball Club.

The first telegram is from Honorable Raymond R. Tucker, mayor of the city of St. Louis, and is a copy which he sent to me of the wire which he has addressed to Senator JOHNSON. The second wire is from Honorable Aloys Kaufmann, president of the Chamber of Commerce of metropolitan St. Louis and was likewise sent to me as an information copy of a wire sent to Senator JOHNSON. The third telegram is a statement made by Mr. August A. Busch, Jr., president of the St. Louis Cardinals and Anheuser-Busch, Inc.

At a later date I shall have more to say about this controversy.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 24, 1954.*

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Copy of a telegram sent to Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

"As mayor of St. Louis, I want to call your attention to my opinion regarding Mr. Busch and the motives of his company in purchasing and operating the St. Louis Cardinals. The fact is that St. Louis was in great danger of losing the Cardinals to another city when Anheuser-Busch, Inc., came forward with the capital required to keep them here and to build a championship team.

"The St. Louis Cardinals are more than a St. Louis institution, and more than a Midwest institution. They are the home team of more Americans than any other major league baseball club. Mr. Busch respects that tradition and will continue it. He is an outstanding leader in St. Louis affairs and chairman of Civic Progress, Inc., our organization devoted to building a better St. Louis.

"The peoples of St. Louis do not think the Cardinals are being run for business purposes. They see much evidence that their owners are interested only in giving St. Louis the kind of National League baseball to which it is accustomed—winning baseball.

"Speaking for the people of St. Louis, I want to assure you that we have complete confidence that Mr. Busch will do everything he can to give the fans of this vast section of America a Cardinal team that they will be proud to root to a world championship."

RAYMOND R. TUCKER,
Mayor.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 24, 1954.*

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Statement by August A. Busch, Jr., president of the St. Louis Cardinals and Anheuser-Busch, Inc.:

"We respect the right of a United States Senator to make any comment or introduce any legislation, though we hardly believe it proper legislation to be aimed at an individual or single company.

"We do not want to enter into any controversy with Senator JOHNSON, but we believe the 100-year record of Anheuser-Busch, Inc., and our record since we have been in organized baseball speak for themselves.

"1. Anheuser-Busch, Inc., was a leader in its field before any baseball broadcasts—and even before organized baseball itself made an appearance on the American scene. To accuse us of using baseball to achieve a position in the industry we long have enjoyed is self-answering.

"2. Our record for the year we have been in organized baseball has been recorded.

"In the first place we bought the Cardinals only when we were certain that no other group could keep them in St. Louis. Then we proceeded to improve our stadium with one objective—to make the park more comfortable and baseball more enjoyable.

"Baseball broadcasting under brewery sponsorships is certainly not new. More than half of the major league broadcasts are under such sponsorship. Were it not for this sponsorship millions of fans would have been unable to enjoy baseball.

"I can assure fans that Anheuser-Busch, as owner of the Cardinals, will continue to serve the best interests of baseball and the public."

ST. LOUIS CARDINALS.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 24, 1954.*

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Information copy of a telegram to EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

"We are certain that Anheuser-Busch or Col. August A. Busch, Jr., president of Anheuser-Busch and the Cardinals, needs no defense by us. This telegram is simply to inform you that this 100-year-old company and its president have brought great credit to this community and this area through their business practices, civic spirit, and community participation.

"It was through the personal efforts of Colonel Busch and the expenditure of millions of dollars by the company he heads that kept the colorful Cardinals, one of our great civic assets, in St. Louis. Our citizens are grateful and Mr. Busch's subsequent conduct of the Cardinals has made them very happy.

"We are jealous of the reputation of our community and of its leading citizens and organizations and we are sure you would want to know how we feel.

"This telegram bespeaks the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of our citizens and the business community as well. We respectfully call it to your attention in the interests of fair play."

ALOYS KAUFMANN,
President, Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan St. Louis.

CLOSING OF POLISH CONSULAR ESTABLISHMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I know the Senate will be interested in the fact that I have received word, after considerable work on the matter, that the Polish consular establishments in the United States are to be closed. I read the following communication which I have just received:

> The Secretary of State presents his compliments to His Excellency the Ambassador of the Polish People's Republic and has the honor to inform the Ambassador that the Department of State has reviewed the activities of the Polish consulates general in the United States. After careful consideration the Department has reached the conclusion that these consular establishments serve no useful purpose in the conduct of relations between the United States and Poland at the present time. The United States Government, consequently, requests that the Polish Government close its consulates general at New York, Chicago, and Detroit and withdraw the personnel of those offices within a reasonable period for liquidating their affairs.

I can vouch for the fact that the Polish consulate in the city of Detroit has served no useful purpose and we are delighted that, as a result of our having taken up the matter with the Secretary of State, the Polish Embassy has now finally closed its consular offices.

PARITY FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide that the price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products thereof shall be supported at 90 percent of parity until April 1, 1955. I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate briefly on the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and ap-

propriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Mississippi may proceed.

The bill (S. 3015) to provide that the price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products thereof shall be supported at 90 percent of parity until April 1, 1955, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the action of the Department of Agriculture in reducing the support price of dairy products from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity comes at a singularly inopportune time. I have therefore this day introduced a bill to continue 90 percent support prices for dairy products for 1 year, until the new farm bill has been enacted, and the Congress has had an opportunity to consider permanent dairy legislation.

Mr. President, the economy of this country is now in a recession or mild depression. The unemployed number approximately 3½ million today. Unemployment, in my judgment, will rise considerably higher. I know that unemployment will rise much higher if we reduce farm support prices and thereby curtail farm income and weaken the structure of agricultural purchasing power which undergirds our economic well-being. If the American farmer cannot buy, the wheels of American industry will not turn. If agriculture, our basic industry, is not prosperous, then the manufacturing industries will not prosper, and there will be further unemployment and wage reductions in industry.

It is a crucial error, at a time when the Nation's economy is peculiarly sensitive to governmental policy because of deepening unemployment, to reduce support prices and cut farm income. It is as if a person coming down with a cold were forced to sit in a draft instead of being bundled up and kept warm and given a hot drink.

All that lowering support prices will accomplish, Mr. President, is to create more unemployment. If one deliberately wanted to intensify a recession into a real depression, I cannot think of a better way to do it than to impoverish American agriculture. I shall oppose any reduction in support prices for any farm commodity.

The price of dairy products, Mr. President, is tied to the price of grain. Grain is supported at 90 percent of parity. My judgment is that grain will continue to be supported at 90 percent of parity after the year 1954. It is wrong to support the price of dairy products at 75 percent of parity when the dairy farmer must pay 90 percent for his grain. It is unjust to impose such a cost-price squeeze upon the dairy farmers of this country. If grains are supported at 90 percent—and they should be—then the dairy industry is also entitled to a 90-percent-support price. This is but simple justice.

Dairying is a basic agricultural industry. It is one of the largest in this country; it is one of the most important in this country. There are 602,000 commercial dairy farms in the United States. A total of 2,007,000 farmers derive a part of their cash income from the sale of dairy products, not to mention the even larger number who produce dairy products for their own use.

Mr. President, the total number of farms in the United States is only 5,382,000. Over 2 million of them are dependent in a more or less substantial degree upon the sale of dairy products for their cash income. In other words, in lowering the supports on butter, milk, and cheese from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent, you are lowering the cash income of nearly 40 percent of America's farmers. History has shown that national prosperity is tied to farm prosperity. Why promote a depression by moving to impoverish 40 percent of the Nation's farmers?

No branch of agriculture contributes more to the health of the American people than does our great dairy industry. No farm group works longer hours the year around than do the Nation's dairy farmers and their families. It is elementary justice that they should receive 90 percent of parity for their products just as much as the remainder of America's farm population.

The dairyman's costs have not gone down, and will not go down. His income is modest enough as it is. The Department of Agriculture made a study of farm income on so-called typical farms in 1952. They found that on a typical dairy farm in western Wisconsin the average wage per hour received by the dairy farmer and members of his family was 71 cents. In eastern Wisconsin it was 74 cents. In the great northeastern dairy belt of New York and Pennsylvania it was only 55 cents per hour. No computation was made for the southern dairy industry.

By comparison, the per-hour wage earned on a typical cash grain farm in Illinois or Iowa was $2.29 per hour in 1952 and on a grain and stock farm in the same Illinois-Iowa area, $1.57 per hour. On a North Dakota wheat farm the income per hour of work was 49 cents. On a Washington State grain farm, the per-hour-of-labor income was $3.67.

Mr. President, the 55–74 cents per-hour-of-labor income of the dairy farmer and his family is one of the lowest per-hour incomes in American agriculture. The average factory wage rate for the entire United States in 1953 was $1.76½ per hour. Compare the $1.76½ per hour wage of American factory labor with the 55 cents per hour or the 74 cents per hour of America's dairy farmers and we find that factory workers received approximately 2½ times as much per hour as America's dairy farmers.

I am glad that America's factory workers do receive a good income. Their buying power is a powerful element in the maintenance of our prosperity. But, by the same token, the buying power of over 2 million dairy farmers and their families is equally basic for the maintenance of our prosperity. Seven or eight cents more per pound for butter or a cent more a quart for milk is a small price, indeed, to pay for the prosperity of our great dairy industry.

Never forget that our dairy farmers can buy far more automobiles, far more farm machinery, more refrigerators, more clothing, more furniture, and more of every type of manufactured product if their income is sustained at 90 percent of parity than they can buy if it drops to 75 percent. Economic equity is the key to continued prosperity and that is all I am insisting upon for the dairy farmer.

Why should the dairy farmers be singled out to be the victim of a deflationary policy in a time of economic recession when President Eisenhower is frankly promising and boldly proclaiming inflationary remedies for other phases of the economy? Surely such inconsistency does not make sense.

It will not fatten the dairy farmer's pocketbook to tell him he will sell more dairy products at 75 percent of parity than at 90 percent. He is currently selling all his dairy products at 90 percent, with the Government taking the surplus.

I am not trying to dodge the existence of surplus dairy products. They are no greater than other surpluses and less than some. Like other surpluses, they are impressive only in the cumulative sense. They do not frighten me at all; I view them as a blessing in disguise.

The remedy for surpluses is obvious—export. Western Europe, with its large consumption of breadstuffs, could use far more butter, cheese, and milk than it does today. The energetic, productive peoples of many foreign nations are eager to raise their standard of living. If we will take just enough additional foreign products to enable them to absorb our surplus dairy products and other surpluses, the exchange will become feasible. Or, because of the dollar shortage abroad, we could accept foreign currency for dairy surpluses and use this currency to pay part of our occupation costs and other military expenses. We have military establishments in 49 foreign countries at the present time. Western Germany, with 42 million people in an area the size of California, would, however, be our best customer for surplus butter, cheese, and dried milk.

In my 12 years in the Senate of the United States I have introduced a variety of bills looking to the export of our surpluses. Several have been enacted to the material benefit of agriculture, not only in my own State of Mississippi but in the Nation as a whole. A little further pressure on this export question, and I think we shall have our surplus problems solved.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to conclude my remarks first; then I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. THYE. On the subject of exporting dairy surpluses, I wish to commend the Senator from Mississippi for that particular reference, because I believe we have not exerted ourselves as a nation in that field to the extent we should have exerted ourselves.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, and I will say that I believe the suggestion concerning exportations is applicable to all our agricultural surpluses. They have

accumulated because we have not exerted ourselves or taken simple steps to remedy the situation.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, it has occurred to me, and I am sure it may have occurred to other Senators, that we could trade some of these perishable commodities for various things which would not deteriorate rapidly. We could trade them for metals and other things of that kind, of which it is almost impossible to obtain adequate supplies.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly; and or with the proceeds we could pay occupation costs and costs in connection with the bases which we are constructing abroad.

Every country from which we are buying military equipment is critically short of food and fiber of all kinds.

I will say this for Secretary Benson, that he is heartily in favor of exporting, so far as possible, surplus agricultural commodities. The hitch seems to be in the State Department.

Mr. President, if we had sold Russia our surplus butter recently when she desired to purchase it, our butter surplus would be down to manageable proportions. But 40 million Germans can eat a lot of butter, too, and if we are wise we will get our surpluses to them and to other foreign nations and not yield to a counsel of desperation here at home on this surplus question and liquidate our dairy farmers and promote a depression.

We can give our dairy farmers 90 percent of parity with the greatest of ease simply by exporting our surpluses.

Of course, we must meet competitive foreign prices of dairy products if we are to sell abroad. But the Secretary of Agriculture already has discretionary power to do this by utilizing section 32 funds comprising 30 percent of United States import duties on foreign goods.

Mr. President, an across-the-board reduction in agricultural support prices would throw this country into a drastic depression. I know of no better way to fight depression than to maintain agricultural income at 90 percent of parity and thereby enable the farmers of this country to buy the products of American industry. Farm prosperity is the best job insurance our factory workers can have. Retention of 90-percent support prices for dairy products is vital to the entire Nation because it is vital to the prosperity of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree thoroughly with what the Senator has said with reference to exporting our dairy products. I think it is nothing less than humiliating that we are prevented from selling a normal excess in a normal competitive world market.

I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi two questions. The first question is whether he would be in favor of permitting unlimited production of dairy products at a 90-percent price support.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me answer the Senator's first question first.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that is a good idea.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is a question which does not confront us at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. It will, very shortly.

Mr. EASTLAND. No. What we have got to do is to take the steps necessary to export these surpluses. I think that will cure the situation. In my opinion, there would have been large exports if it had not been for the action of the State Department in throttling them. We would not then have had the surplus of dairy products which we now have. If at some time in the future, in spite of the fact that we are exporting and selling competitively, there should accumulate a surplus which is unmanageable, that is another question. But that situation does not confront us today.

Mr. AIKEN. The fact remains that it does confront us. We are not permitted to export dairy products. In order to be exported they have to be licensed.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is my complaint, exactly. I do not think we should permit the whole price program to be destroyed and the Nation thrown into a depression because we do nothing about exporting our surpluses.

Mr. AIKEN. We have been faced for nearly 10 years with the opposition of the State Department to the exporting of American farm commodities. I agree with the Senator that it is time Congress, or someone, took some action to prevent such unwarranted interference with the farm prosperity of this country. I am willing to help to do something about it.

When any Government officials say the United States cannot export farm commodities on a normal competitive market, they are going far beyond the bounds of economic propriety.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me make a suggestion before the Senator asks his next question.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well.

Mr. EASTLAND. I think these surpluses are a blessing. The reason why I consider them to be a blessing is that the weight of the surplus, because of the problem which confronts us, will force the administration to take action to correct the situation.

Mr. AIKEN. My next question is, If we support one type of fats and oils at 90 percent of parity, should we not also support other types at the same level? If we support dairy products at 90 percent of parity, should we not also support cottonseed and soybeans at the same level?

Mr. EASTLAND. They are all interrelated, of course. Cottonseed is supported at 75 percent of parity. There is under way a drive to take off all price supports.

Mr. AIKEN. The soybean producers are conducting an intensive campaign. Can the Senator explain why the soybean producers are putting on such a campaign? Is it to bring about an increase in the support price for cottonseed?

Mr. EASTLAND. I did not know they were doing that.

Mr. AIKEN. I think every soybean association in the country has been urging Congress to raise the support level for cottonseed. Can the Senator conceive of any good reason for their doing that?

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, yes. I understand the State Department objected to the Department of Agriculture publishing daily price information because some foreign nation might object. I was given that information by a very high official in the Department of Agriculture. I should like the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who is one of the most powerful men in the administration, to verify that information.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not understand the point the Senator wants to have verified. My question was whether the Senator would insist upon 90-percent price support for cottonseed.

Mr. EASTLAND. I would insist upon the same support price that is applicable to soybeans. It would be the rankest kind of discrimination to support a product grown in the Midwest at one level and to support a product grown in the South at another level. In 1953 soybeans were supported at 90 percent of parity; cottonseed at 75 percent. Soybeans today are supported at 80 percent, and the drive is on to take off all supports and impoverish the farmer.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that when cottonseed was supported at 90 percent of parity the Federal Government was the only market for the oil, and that at the present time——

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I do not know those figures, but I will tell the Senator from Vermont that any time the Government is called upon to take 90 percent of a product because of the support price, the price has got to be lowered.

Whether the Senator's figures are accurate or not, I do not know. I do not think they are.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know the exact percentage; I do not claim to know. I simply had a feeling that the cottonseed support price was lowered to 75 percent after it was found that there was a good market and that producers were happy over that market at the present time.

I also have had a feeling that the soybean growers were putting on their campaign to raise the price of cottonseed in order to push a competitor out of the market. Furthermore, I have felt that there are persons who wish to keep butter out of a competitive position with oleomargarine. I do not know whether the Senator from Mississippi can explain that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to call the attention of Senators to the fact that the Senate is operating in the morning hour, for the transaction of routine business. The Senator from Mississippi is speaking under a unanimous-consent agreement that a few minutes may be devoted by him to a bill he has introduced. The Chair supposes the word "few" may be variously defined.

Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The able Senator from Vermont has just said something

about the cottonseed growers being very happy now with the price situation and the market situation. Does not the Senator overlook the very important point that the able Senator from Mississippi made a few minutes ago, namely, that the relief which the support price affords the tenant and sharecropper at cotton-harvesting time certainly does not apply now, because the tenant and sharecropper do not hold the seed now?

The Senator from Mississippi is talking about something which will help the man who produces the seed, rather than assistance that may be given after the seed gets to the processor.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Alabama certainly is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the Senator from Mississippi will agree with me in the statement of a fact of which I fear a great many people throughout the country are not aware, and that is that cottonseed really represents, to a great many persons in the cotton-growing section, the real earnings or net profits they receive from their cotton crop.

Mr. EASTLAND. To millions of them it is the principal source of income.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, when the cotton is harvested, the crop gets into the market immediately. Most of the small farmers in the cotton-growing sections of the South do not even take their cottonseed home; they dispose of it at the gin.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have just one other point to make. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Mississippi in yielding to me, for I know he is speaking under a limitation of time.

I wish to commend the Senator for something he said a few moments ago; that is, that the surpluses ought to be considered a blessing. As a matter of fact, I often have the feeling that there might develop in this country a psychology that surpluses are a curse, when, as a matter of fact, they ought to be considered a blessing. In most parts of the world the great struggle is to produce enough.

Mr. EASTLAND. We can export. We have not been exporting because we have not attempted to do so. We have been letting the surpluses pile up and thus destroy the production program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I wish to say, "Three cheers for the statement of the Senator from Mississippi." He has done a great service today by pointing out the importance of a sensible and effective price-support program, not merely with respect to dairy products, which are the current issue, but also with respect to the whole area of the commodities of American agriculture.

As the Senator from Mississippi knows, a few days ago I spoke on this very subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; and the Senator from Minnesota made a very fine speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to commend the Senator from Mississippi, particularly upon the foreign-trade aspects, because this afternoon I shall introduce a bill entitled "The Farm Trading Post Act," which will tie together a number of proposals which have been suggested either in resolution form or in statements by committees.

I reviewed the hearings of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of last year, and I have drawn up a bill which proposes to do exactly what the Senator from Mississippi is suggesting; namely, to stimulate the exportation of agricultural exports.

The Senator from Mississippi is exactly right when he says that a great deal more can be done than has been done. I think there has been much dragging of feet. There has been very little creative imagination.

The Senator from Mississippi has pointed out the importance of surpluses as a stimulant to the Government to get busy. I may say they are also important in terms of the consumer in the United States. The countries which have a shortage of any commodity pay much higher prices than we do in this country, where we have a price-support program.

We have looked upon surpluses as giving us a variety of goods from which to choose, in addition to the high quality of the goods we consume. We can look upon surpluses as a real blessing and as an economic asset.

I noticed a while ago that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] mentioned the possibility of exchanging some of our surplus agricultural commodities for more of the storable commodities necessary for our stockpile. All I say is that the administration and the Government seem to lack any creative imagination whatsoever. Their answer to the problem seems to be to reduce price, a process which ultimately results in liquidating a large number of producers.

Mr. EASTLAND. And also a deepening of the depression.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And a deepening of the depression; indeed, it does.

I point out, in collaboration with the statement of the Senator from Mississippi, that once prices have been reduced, a large number of smaller producers will have been knocked out of economic existence, which will cause an aggravation of the economic problem in the United States from which it may take years to recover.

Besides that, the herds in the dairy industry will have been destroyed by the thousands, and it will take anywhere from 3 to 5 years to recover from such a disaster.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has said is correct. There is one way to save a support program at 90 percent, and it can be saved; that way is to market the surplus products. Instead of that, the surpluses are being allowed to accumulate, so the whole program is falling of its own weight. Nothing has been done to reduce the surpluses, but they can be reduced in a hungry world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was on the floor last year when the Secretary of Agriculture set the 90 percent of parity price. The manner in which he did it, by delaying the announcement, did much, literally, to pile up butter and other dairy products in Government warehouses. That is the judgment of people who are engaged in the business.

I further say that during this period of time when price supports are going to come down, the Government will have just that much more dairy production on its hands. There will not be a producer who will hold any of his 90 percent of parity commodity until the day the 75 percent price support goes into effect.

Mr. EASTLAND. I can understand that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I further say that the Department of Agriculture has not seen fit to make a constructive proposal to Congress to deal with the so-called surpluses. Yet the Secretary of Agriculture himself said, in one of his recent statements, a press release which I read on the floor of the Senate, that during the 4 years when dairy production was under 90 percent support price, the demand for dairy products was almost in balance with the supply.

This is the answer to the question of what will happen if 90 percent support prices are in effect for a long time. We had them for 4 years, and had no surplus. The Secretary said the surplus was due to two factors: First, unusually good weather in the winter. No Secretary has a pipeline to the Weather Man upstairs, so that he will be able to adjust the weather according to the statistics of the Department of Agriculture.

The second factor which the Secretary reminded us of, which he said had increased the dairy production, was the low price of beef cattle, which resulted in farmers in dairy areas not culling out the cows from their herds.

I realize the Secretary of Agriculture cannot do much about the weather, but he could have done a little more about beef prices. These two factors have no relevancy whatever to the reduction of support prices.

I say the Secretary can produce no evidence whatsoever that a reduction to 75 percent of parity will in any way increase the consumption of butter fat.

Once a stable policy is established, once dairy producers know what can be expected, plus an energetic program of selling to foreign outlets in exchange for critically needed goods, there will be normal consumption and demand.

Mr. EASTLAND. There ought to be a congressional investigation of the State Department and the way in which it has hamstrung and prevented the export of agricultural surpluses. I have stated on the floor of the Senate that I do not think the State Department is an American agency of government, and I repeat that statement—I do not think it is an American agency of government. I think it has done everything to promote the interests of the foreign producer against the interests of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. While the Senator from Mississippi may not be able to be present when I can have the floor in my

own right, I expect to read a statement in connection with my introduction of a bill which wil be called The Farm Trading Post Act. I shall introduce such a bill today.

The bill will contain some mandatory provisions regarding the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture, to the effect that if such departments lack the necessary motivation for taking appropriate action on their own initiative under existing law, the Congress of the United States may provide the departments with some real motivation by legislative enactment.

Once in a while political appointees have to be taken into the woodshed and taught a lesson. I think the time has come when the shillelagh should be wielded in order to get some action on the part of those departments in the area which we have been discussing.

Mr. EASTLAND. Such provisions I believe are very essential.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

COVERAGE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY OF ADDITIONAL PERSONS

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, the President of the United States, in his state of the Union message, recommended bringing into the coverage of social security approximately 10½ million additional persons, including professional groups. It has been my observation through a period of years that the medical and dental professions do not wish to be covered by social security.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the president of the Weld County Dental Society, of Greeley, Colo., dated February 17, 1954, expressing the views of the Society on the question.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELD COUNTY DENTAL SOCIETY,
Greeley, Colo., February 17, 1954.

Hon. LESTER HUNT,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of February 5, 1954, I would like to submit the following reasons why the Weld County Dental Society opposes the extension of social security to the self-employed.

We did not debate or consider the political and economic philosophy or criticize the manner in which the program is administered. All these considerations depend upon the individual's line of thinking and political upbringing.

First we realized that the self-employed dentist, if he wants to be included, must pay 50 percent more than the salaried employee. Some colleagues in writing in favor of this bill have written that all pension funds are largely financed by passing the cost on to the consumer and if dentists were included it could be added to the cost of service. We feel that this is not right, for there is a large group among the 10,000,000 prospective new Social Security members, for example the farmers, that can't raise their fees. The raising of fees and cost to the consumers is not the answer to our rising cost of living nor does it help in our fight against socialized medicine.

Secondly, once the profession is in the program it is a compulsory participation and no one may withdraw in this generation or the next or the next.

Thirdly, the contributions payable are not contributions at all. They are a tax payable with your income tax. We feel our concern should be with the young dentists who will be following us and not with the present older group who will be paying a lower rate and only for a short time.

Here are the figures for the dentist starting in practice at the age of 25 paying on $4,200:

1954–59, 4 percent, $168 for 6 years	$1,008
1959–64, 5 percent, $200 for 5 years	1,000
1965–69, 6 percent, $252 for 5 years	1,260
1970 to age 65, 6½ percent, $273 for 24 years	6,552
Cost for 40 years	9,820
Interest on payment at 3 percent compound	7,902
Total actual cost of program	17,722

Even if the payments are raised from the present $85 a month to $100 a month the recovery of their own money at monthly payments of $142.50 would require a period of 12 years. Thus they would both have to live to the age of 77 to break even. This does not figure interest on their money after the age of 65. If they die near the age of 65 their estate receives nothing except $255 to help defray funeral cost.

The Longevity of Dentists, compiled by the ADA Bureau, show these statistics: Only 1.5 percent of all dentists died at ages between 35 and 39; that 5.6 percent died between 45–49; that 10 percent died between 50–54.

The insurance companies show the life expectancy of both sexes today to be 69. It becomes obvious that on an overall group basis, the feature of payments to minors under 18 after a dentist's death has less than one-sixth the value it suggests.

We compared the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program with several private insurance policies and found that the self-employed could obtain more security and secure an immediate estate for himself and his family through private insurance, mutual investment funds, and Government bonds.

We thank you for your attention to this matter and for your personal letter.

Sincerely yours,
J. P. HOLMES, D. D. S.,
President, Weld County Dental Society.

REDUCTION OF SUPPORT PRICES FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, the recent directive of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, reducing support prices for dairy products, has resulted in the receipt in my office of a series of telegrams from cheese manufacturers and dairy associations objecting to that directive. I ask unanimous consent that copies of such telegrams be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THAYNE, WYO., *February 24, 1954.*

Hon. LESTER C. HUNT,
United States Senate:

Home from NRECA meeting at Miami. Wish to advise that Benson's decision lowering parity will have its negative effect on purchasing power and obligations in Wyoming. To my observation most dairymen are at a loss about their future.

STAR VALLEY SWISS CHEESE CO.,
ERNEST BORG, *Manager.*

AFTON, WYO., *February 17, 1954.*

Hon. LESTER C. HUNT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Dairymen will suffer tremendous loss of income from support announcement of Benson yesterday. This loss of income to farmers now in debt will put many of them out of business. It looks almost like a managed program toward a depression. Congress should concern itself with a correction before it is too late.

CARL ROBINSON.

CODY, WYO., *February 16, 1954.*

Hon. LESTER C. HUNT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Secretary Benson's recent reduction of supports on dried milk, cheese, and butter will have a crippling effect upon dairying in Wyoming unless dairy farmers are provided with some form of temporary subsidy to make up the difference. We believe that lowering the price of butter to the consumer to get it off Government stockpiles is a necessary move, but some way must be found to cushion the drop in price to the producer. The present high cost of his dairy feeds, equipment, and buildings will not permit a lowering in price of the product he sells. Most Wyoming dairy farmers who have been working to improve their herds and standards in accordance with high State requirements are already operating on a very slim margin of profit. Reduction of that profit must be followed by a drop in standards of quality. We appreciate your continued support.

BIG HORN BASIN DAIRY PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
WILLIAM HILL, *Vice President.*
CECIL A. LEGG, *Secretary.*

TREATY RATIFICATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, at various times recently reference has been made to the fact that the Senate gave consent to the ratification of a treaty when there were only two Senators on the floor of the Senate. On that occasion I was 1 of the 2 present, and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was the second, and was then acting as presiding officer.

Inasmuch as the occasion has been referred to more than once, I have obtained and have before me a report by Dr. Carl Marcy, of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which gives a full and complete explanation of how the ratification which has been referred to took place and what led up to the report on the treaty. For that reason, Mr. President, I refer to it.

An examination of the record will reveal that the subject of the treaty was considered by a three-man subcommittee, of which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was the chairman. The subcommittee held public hearings, after which it reported to the full committee. The full committee considered the matter and reported the treaty on May 21, 1952. It was placed on the executive calendar on June 12, 1952, at which time the then presiding officer, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] who was chairman of the subcommittee, referred to the treaty and stated it would be considered when the executive calendar was called on the following day.

Inasmuch as the treaty had been acted on and was reported unanimously, and had been on the executive calendar for many days, and inasmuch as the statement had been made that there was no objection to the treaty, when the treaty was considered on the floor I saw no objection to considering it at that time.

Mr. President, I thought there should be in the RECORD a complete explanation

of the action taken on the treaty. I therefore ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks the full and official report of the transaction regarding the treaty, which was a convention with Ireland, as it appears in a publication entitled "A Note on Treaty Ratification," by Carl Marcy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NOTE ON TREATY RATIFICATION

(By Carl Marcy)

On June 13, 1952, with two Senators on the floor, the Senate of the United States gave its advice and consent to the ratification of three treaties which thereby became a part of the supreme law of the land.[1] One of the Senators did not vote. The other voiced his "aye" while serving as Presiding Officer.

The Conventions approved by the voice vote of one Senator were the Consular Convention with Ireland,[2] a protocol supplementary to the said Convention; [3] and the Consular Convention with the United Kingdom.[4]

Article II, section 2 of the United States Constitution provides that the President shall have power "to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." Even though, under article I, section 5, clause 2, "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings" how, as a matter of law, was it possible for the Senate, with but two Senators on the floor, one of whom did not vote and the other of whom was in the chair, to give its advice and consent to a treaty? And as a matter of policy was the Senate in this case properly discharging its responsibilities?

There has been frequent criticism of the Senate in recent months for alleged failure properly to discharge its treaty functions. Whether this criticism is justified depends upon a careful examination of the facts of each case. In this instance, the three Conventions were received by the Senate between 1949 and 1952.[5] A three-man subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee held public hearings on the pending conventions on May 9, 1952. On May 21, the full Foreign Relations Committee favorably reported the conventions to the Senate where they remained on the Executive Calendar until June 13, 1952, when they were approved.

On June 12, Senator SPARKMAN, who on that day was acting as Presiding Officer of the Senate and who had acted as chairman of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee considering the conventions, announced as follows: "In his capacity as a Senator, the present occupant of the chair gives notice that in accordance with the understanding between the majority leader and the minority leader, it will be his purpose tomorrow to call up two consular conventions and a protocol which are Nos. 11, 12, and 13 on the Executive Calendar." [6]

June 13 was a Friday. Toward midafternoon the majority leader, Senator JOHNSON, of Texas, announced that when the Senate concluded its business for the day it would recess until Monday. Senator MORSE then obtained the floor and began a speech on the Hells Canyon Dam. At about 6 p. m. he finished his speech, picked up his papers, and departed. During his speech Senators had drifted in and out of the Chamber and, on receiving assurances that no business was pending save the noncontroversial treaties, had departed. When Senator MORSE left, the only Senator remaining on the floor was Senator THYE, who made a few remarks on the St. Lawrence seaway. Senator SPARKMAN had been serving as Presiding Officer during the Morse speech and waiting for an opportunity to call up the conventions in accordance with his announcement of the day before.

When Senator THYE completed his statement, the presiding officer, Mr. SPARKMAN, said that without objection the Senate would proceed to the consideration of executive business. The treaties were then called up one by one, the resolutions of ratification read, and the question put by the presiding officer as follows: "The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of the Senator present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the convention is ratified." [7] There was no quorum call immediately preceding the voice vote, although the presence of a quorum had been ascertained by a quorum call earlier in the day. While the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does not, therefore, show which Senators were present and who voted, observers in the Senate Chamber noted that Senator THYE did not vote either for or against the conventions. The only Senator casting a voice vote was the Presiding Officer, Mr. SPARKMAN, who voted in the affirmative, and then, on advice of the Senate Parliamentarian, expressed the opinion that "two-thirds of the Senators present" had concurred in the resolution of ratification.

Since Senator THYE did not vote it seems obvious that two-thirds of the Senators present did not vote in favor of the resolution of ratification. The fact that Senator THYE did not vote against the resolution, however, might be construed as indicating that he "concurred" in the resolution. Senator THYE, when asked about the proceedings, told newspaper reporters: "I did not object." [8] His silence must be construed as consent if the constitutional requirements that "two-thirds of the Senators present concur" was met. If one construes the constitutional requirement to mean that two-thirds of the Senators present and voting must concur in resolutions consenting to the ratification of a convention, then the interesting question is raised as to whether one Senator present and voting constituted a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

The view that the treaties under discussion now have the effect of "supreme law" must rest on the presumption that a quorum of the Senate is present unless the question is raised "by any Senator as to the presence of a quorum." [9] In the case under discussion, since the question of the absence of a quorum was not raised preceding the vote, it is to be presumed that a quorum was present, and that the Senate acted properly. It is unlikely that a court will go behind the record which presents a prima facie case of proper action.[10]

Whether the Senate was properly discharging its responsibility in approving the pending conventions with but two Senators on the floor would seem to depend upon whether adequate opportunity was given for anyone who might have objected to any provision of the conventions to make his objection known. In this connection the following facts are relevant: (1) The conventions had been published and pending, substantially in the form finally acted upon, for nearly 2 years. Moreover, because of objections received by the Committee on Foreign Relations when the conventions were first submitted, the convention with the United Kingdom had been renegotiated and the convention with Ireland had been amended by a protocol.[11] (2) A subcommittee had been appointed to consider the conventions. (3) After due notice public hearings had been held, at which no one objected to the terms of the conventions.[12] (4) The favorable report of the subcommittee on the conventions was considered and approved by the full Committee on Foreign Relations. (5) The conventions, accompanied by the committee report, were on the Senate Calendar from May 21 to June 13, and during that period no one brought any objections to the attention of the committee or Senate leaders. Furthermore, during that period when items are on the calendar, it is normal for the minority policy committee of the Senate to examine pending matters to see if there are provisions to which the minority party may wish to take exception. (6) Twenty-four hours in advance of consideration by the Senate, notice had been given that the conventions were to be taken up and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate had agreed to their consideration.

Under these circumstances, it seems fair to conclude that there was sufficient public notice and opportunity for objections to be made known.

It is doubtful that this type of situation will soon arise again. On July 18, 1953, Senator LEHMAN introduced a resolution (S. Res. 145) to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate to require that "No vote upon the final question to advise and consent to the ratification shall be had unless, immediately prior to such vote, it has been ascertained by a rollcall * * * that a quorum of the Senate is present. The final question to advise and consent to the ratification shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote." [13] Senator LEHMAN discussed this proposed change in the Senate rules at some length, referring briefly to the case discussed here, to the fact that during 1952 the Senate acted upon 5 out of 25 treaties by a rollcall vote (the others being approved by a voice vote), to the approval of the Greek-Turkish protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty with six Senators on the floor (because of objection by Senator GILLETTE and others the protocol was subsequently recalled by the Senate and approved by a rollcall vote), and to Senate approval of a proposed constitutional amendment during a call of the calendar and without a rollcall vote. On July 20, Senator KNOWLAND, the acting majority

---

[1] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 13, 1952, pp. 7217–7228.

[2] Executive P, 81st Cong., 2d sess.

[3] Executive F, 82d Cong., 2d sess.

[4] Executive O, 82d Cong., 1st sess.

[5] See Legislative History of the Committee on Foreign Relations, S. Doc. No. 161, 82d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 49–50, for summary.

[6] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 12, 1952, p. 7131.

[7] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 13, 1952, p. 7228.

[8] Washington Evening Star, June 14, 1952, p. 1. For an interesting discussion of the reason for the requirement of a two-thirds vote of Senators present, see The Federalist, No. 75.

[9] Standing Rules of the Senate, rule V.

[10] But see *Christoffel* v. *United States* (338 U. S. 84), where the Supreme Court by a 5-to-4 decision in a contempt case permitted oral testimony to rebut the showing of the record that a quorum was present in a House committee. Justice Jackson, in dissent, noted, however (p. 92): "All the parliamentary authorities, including those cited by the Court, agree that a quorum is required for action, other than adjournment, by any parliamentary body; and they agree that the customary law of such bodies is that, the presence of a quorum having been ascertained and recorded at the beginning of a session, that record stands unless and until the point of no quorum is raised. This is the universal practice. If it were otherwise, repeated useless rollcalls would be necessary before every action."

[11] See Ex. Rept. No. 8, 82d Cong., 2d sess., p. 2, for discussion of this matter.

[12] The hearings were printed as an appendix to the report cited.

[13] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 18, 1953, p. 9129; see pp. 9129–9136 for discussion.

leader, announced that the proposal had been discussed with the majority policy committee and said: "As a matter of standing operating procedure in the future, we intend, in connection with all treaties, and on constitutional amendments as well, not only to ask for a quorum call, but to ask for a yea-and-nay vote, at least on the first of a series of treaties * * * We shall endeavor to follow that policy as a standard operating procedure from now on." [14]

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield, provided that in doing so I do not lose the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, shortly after the Senate convened today the Senator from Texas informed the distinguished majority leader that the Senator from Texas planned to refer to some press statements made by the majority leader after the session of the Senate ended on yesterday.

A moment ago I asked that the majority leader be notified that I was about to be reached on the list of speakers. I am informed that the majority leader is temporarily detained. Therefore I shall wait until his return to make my comments.

I express to the Senator from Montana my deep appreciation for his willingness to yield to me, but I shall postpone my remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have not participated extensively in the debate on the Bricker amendment, since much of the debate has been of a legal nature. In these matters I yield to those who are much more erudite in constitutional theory and precedent than I. I wish to assure the Senate that what I am about to say will not contain any reference whatsoever to the so-called Pink case.

Sitting on the sidelines, however, I cannot help but feel that we are talking round and round the real issue, because we are talking about too many issues. Thanks to the many learned expositions which have been made on the floor of the Senate these past few weeks, I have come to the conclusion that we are discussing not one question but four questions. All of these, to be sure, revolve around a fundamental issue, namely, the division of power among the several branches of government in respect to our relations with other nations. But each question has its own ramifications, and needs to be considered separately if the fundamental issue is to be clearly understood. So long as they are lumped together, the confusion can only deepen.

The Bricker amendment, in its original form, as I understand it, would bring about a drastic and four-sided reshuffling in the ratio of power among the several branches of Government. In effect, it would shift power over foreign relations away from the Senate and the Executive. At the same time it would enhance the power of the House of Representatives and the 48 individual State governments in matters affecting our foreign relations.

The first of the four questions we are really discussing then is whether to reduce the power of the Senate in the field of foreign relations relative to the other branches of Government. Is there a Member of this body who believes that the Senate has been so incompetent in the performance of its constitutional duties that it ought to be relieved of these responsibilities, even in part? I speak now of the Senate through 160 years of history, not any particular Senate. Has its record been so shameful, so inadequate that the Senate of the 83d Congress ought to go on record as bringing about a fundamental change in its role in American Government? I, for one, do not believe that this is so, and I doubt that any other Member of the Senate so believes.

The second of the four questions before us is whether or not to increase the power of the House of Representatives in the field of foreign relations. I have heard no demands from the House for such an increase. This proposed amendment originated in the Senate, not in the House. With all due respect for the great capacities of the other body in which I was privileged to sit for a decade, I would not force this added responsibility on it. The House already has unique responsibilities in the field of appropriations. They are necessary; they are just as valid as the Senate's unique role in foreign relations. I would change neither.

The third question which we are discussing is whether or not to project revolutionary responsibilities in the field of foreign relations on the 48 State governments. Except for those who would turn the clock back, not half a century, not even a century, but 160 years or more, this question hardly merits debate. The State governments themselves rejected a role in foreign relations when the Constitution was accepted. They provided instead for Senators to protect the interests of the States in the Senate. Both the senior Senator and the junior Senator from Montana were elected to safeguard the interests of Montana within the broad framework of the national interest. Those interests include any that may be at stake in our foreign relations. We will do our best to protect them. I am sure that other Senators will do the same for their States, and that they are fully qualified to do so.

If it is neither a desire to reduce the power of the Senate nor to increase the power of the House or the State governments, what, then, is really at issue in this debate? There must certainly be a real issue or the Senate would hardly spend weeks in debate on the proposed amendment.

There is a real issue and it has troubled me deeply as I am sure it has troubled other Senators. It is to be found in the fourth of the questions which are under discussion here, namely, the power of the executive branch in the field of foreign policy.

The Constitution specifically provides the President with certain unique powers to conduct our foreign relations, just as the other branches of government have unique powers in other matters. I do not question those powers which accrue to him as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

But in one aspect of our foreign relations, the treatymaking power, he does not have unique, but rather concurrent power shared with the Senate. Treaties are to be made by the President only with the advice and consent of the Senate. The most vital matters involving the relationships of this country with others are or should be conducted within this realm of concurrent power.

But it is precisely in this realm that an extra-constitutional device, the executive agreement, now threatens the fine balance of power which has been maintained under our system of government for a century and a half.

An executive agreement has been defined as an international agreement with a foreign government, entered into by the Executive with the consent of the Senate. It may be formally negotiated and signed, or it may be achieved by an exchange of notes, the governments merely transmitting diplomatic communications describing the terms of the understanding.

In the Constitution no specific authorization was given to the Chief Executive to make international agreements other than formal treaties, but this power has been exercised by him as the executive head of the Government in charge of foreign relations and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

I understand that the George substitute to the Bricker amendment makes it very clear, as indicated by the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, that his substitute in no way conflicts with the power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy or his authority to receive foreign envoys.

It will be argued, as it has been, that executive agreements are used almost exclusively in pursuance of authority delegated by Congress or to implement certain valid undertakings growing out of the unique powers of the President. That is true; and I think the device, so used, is necessary and useful and harmless to the principle of balance of powers.

But it is not in the mass of executive agreements that the issue is to be found. It is, rather, in the few—in the very few. For it is in the few, the very few, that this extra-constitutional device can be used to stretch the unique powers of the Executive. It is in the few that there lies the danger of usurpation, destruction of the constitutional balance, and, in the last analysis, the threat of executive tyranny.

[14] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 20, 1953, p. 9231; see also ibid., July 21, 1953, p. 9306, for additional discussion.

This is no imaginary fear which haunts me and other Members of the Senate. Executive agreements have been used to stretch the powers of the Presidency; and unless safeguards are established, there is no reason to believe that they will not continue to be so used. If the Senate will bear with me for a few moments longer, I will undertake to prove by specific example how this extra-constitutional device can undermine the power of the Senate in foreign relations. I will endeavor to show how this device can be used and has been used to erode that power and transfer it painlessly, almost imperceptibly, from this body to the executive branch.

For decades, treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation have been made with other countries by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. As Senators know, these are basic treaties which establish the framework of our relations with other countries. The Senate has traditionally given advice and consent to such treaties. It still does so, for the most part.

In 1933, however, the Department of State negotiated an agreement of friendship and commerce with Saudi Arabia. So far as I can determine, this was the first time an executive agreement, rather than a treaty, was used for this purpose. To be sure, the agreement with Saudi Arabia was labeled provisional in nature and was to remain in effect "until the entry in force of a definitive treaty of commerce and navigation."

Even though it was temporary, however, the State Department must have known that this executive agreement was treading on dangerous constitutional ground, for it added the following clause:

> Should the Government of the United States of America be prevented by future action of its Legislature from carrying out the terms of these stipulations the obligations thereof shall thereupon lapse.

This executive agreement was never replaced by a definitive treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation. Though the Senate has never given consent to ratification, it stands in equal force with genuine treaties dealing with the same subject matter, to which the Senate has given approval.

This agreement, Mr. President, established a precedent. Note now how the precedent is reinforced. Thirteen years later, in 1946, the State Department negotiated a similar agreement with the Kingdom of Yemen. The terms of the 2 agreements were practically identical except for 2 omissions. The agreement with Yemen no longer carried the phrase indicating that it was to remain in effect only "until the entry in force of a definitive treaty of commerce and navigation." Also omitted was the phrase, "Should the Government of the United States of America be prevented by future action of its Legislature from carrying out the terms of these stipulations the obligations thereof shall thereupon lapse." In place of the former is the phrase, "until succeeded by a more comprehensive commercial agreement."

In short, the State Department appears, in 13 years, to have reached the conclusion that the power to make treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation had become, at least in some cases, a unique power of the executive branch, that the consent of the Senate was no longer necessary, at least in some of these agreements.

One year later, in 1947, a third agreement of friendship, commerce, and navigation was negotiated with the Kingdom of Nepal. In printing the text of this agreement in its Bulletin, the State Department apparently still had a twinge of nervousness about the procedure it was following. It was constrained to point to two precedents. What were the precedents? The agreements with Yemen and Saudi Arabia.

Yemen, Saudi Arabia, and Nepal. These are faraway lands. Few of us could locate them quickly on a map. Still fewer have any direct concern with what transpires in them. Yet, the agreements which have been negotiated with them constitute a series of precedents which is of vital importance to our constitutional division of powers. None of them has ever been replaced by a regular treaty, yet all of them cover subject matter which traditionally has been handled by treaty.

Twenty-one years have elapsed since the first of these three agreements was negotiated. Was the failure to replace the agreements by permanent treaty an oversight or a conscious expansion of the unique powers of the Executive at the expense of the Senate? Is this example a straw man or a very real case of usurpation of power? Will the President now send these three agreements, or their permanent replacements, to the Senate for advice or consent, or after years and decades is the need still for temporary agreements?

How is the Senate to deal with the disappearance of its prerogatives in this fashion? By abdication to the House or to the 48 States, or by crippling the capacity of the President in the field of foreign relations? In each case, the remedy would be far worse than the illness. The answer for the Senate is to deal with the real area of danger and that area alone. The answer is to take only those precautions which are necessary to prevent a bureaucratic abuse of this extra-constitutional device, the executive agreement.

In my opinion this can be accomplished by the Senate if it will adopt the George substitute to the Bricker amendment. The George substitute reads:

> SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.
>
> SEC. 2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the George proposal as it now stands, and I shall vote for it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there may be printed a statement relative to executive agreements.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS: THEIR USE AND PRESENT STATUS

Executive agreements can best be described and understood if they are compared with treaties. By tracing the origin of the treaty-making power and contrasting treaties with executive agreements, it is possible to depict more clearly what executive agreements are, the manner in which they may be used, and their present status.

THE TREATYMAKING POWER

Under the Articles of Confederation, Congress, while it had power to enter into treaties, could not compel the States to observe them because of the veto power which they possessed. Satisfactory foreign relations under these conditions were difficult. To help correct this situation the members of the Constitutional Convention framed the Constitution so as to give the Federal Government alone the power of dealing with foreign countries and to enter into treaties with them. The question then arose as to who should exercise this power. Congress as a whole was considered too unwieldy to act expeditiously, so the choice was narrowed down to the President or the Senate. The customary international practice of other nations, plus the recognized need for speed and secrecy in negotiating treaties, favored placing this power in the hands of the President, but some of the founders felt that the power should reside in the legislative branch. A logical compromise was effected by which the President was empowered to negotiate treaties while the approval of the Senate was made a prerequisite of ratification. Article II, section 2, provides that "He (the President) shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

DEFINITION AND NATURE OF TREATIES

The treaty has been defined as an understanding or engagement between states which is usually concluded to establish, alter, or terminate mutual rights and reciprocal obligations.[1] Under the Constitution the responsibility for negotiating a treaty rests on the President. In practice, negotiations are normally performed by the Secretary of State, a member of the Foreign Service, or a specially designated emissary. After a treaty has been concluded with a foreign power it is submitted to the Senate for its approval before final ratification by the President. Many of the treaties so submitted are approved without change. But in numerous instances treaties are not acted on by the Senate, are rejected, or are approved only with reservations.

When a treaty has been ratified and has gone into effect the House of Representatives (as well as the Senate) must, under penalty of sacrificing the good faith of the United States, make the necessary appropriations or must pass such laws as may be necessary to carry it out. The House has objected at times to being thus coerced, but historical precedent and constitutional interpretation have upheld the power of the President and the Senate to act.[2] President Washington refused to submit papers on the Jay treaty on request of the House of Representatives, stating that it was clear from a vote in the Constitutional Convention that the House of Representatives did not share in the treatymaking power.

EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS: DEFINITION AND SCOPE

The word "agreement" occurs in article I, section 10, of the Constitution, which says: "No State shall, without the consent of Congress * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power." This serves to indicate that the Members of the Continental Congress recognized that different kinds of international

[1] Elmer Plischke, Conduct of American Diplomacy (New York, 1950), p. 268.

[2] Quincy Wright, The United States and International Agreements. In International Conciliation (No. 411, May 1945), p. 379.

agreements might exist, and it is argued by some authorities that, since the President was not forbidden to use the other kinds of agreements mentioned in the Constitution, he may rightly do so.

An executive agreement has been defined as "an international agreement with a foreign government entered into by the Executive without the consent of the Senate." It may be formally negotiated and signed, or it may be achieved by an exchange of notes, the governments merely transmitting diplomatic communications to each other prescribing the terms of the understanding.[3] In the Constitution no specific authorization was given to the Executive to make international agreements other than formal treaties, but this power has been exercised by him as the Executive head of the Government in charge of foreign relations and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

TYPES OF EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Although executive agreements are not submitted to the Senate for approval or ratification, they may have legislative sanction of some other kind, and may be classified accordingly in the following categories.

1. Agreements which are made with prior authorization

In this case Congress enacts basic legislation which authorizes international agreements for specific purposes. For instance, in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 the Secretary of State was authorized to conclude, with individual participating countries or any number of such countries or with an organization representing any such countries, agreements in furtherance of the purposes of the act.[4] Subsequently 105 executive agreements were made under the authority of this act and the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949. Forty-six agreements were made under the authority granted in the Lend-Lease Act.

2. Agreements which implement a treaty

Similar to agreements which are authorized by legislation are agreements which are authorized by treaty or are necessary to implement a treaty. These may generally be considered to have the sanction of the majority of the Senate which consented to the ratification of the treaty involved. Examples of this would be the agreement made for the extradition of a criminal under an extradition treaty or an agreement on the marking of a boundary delimited by treaty.

3. Agreements which are subsequently sanctioned or implemented by congressional legislation

In many cases an executive agreement requires appropriations or implementing legislation before it can be effective, for instance, the agreement to establish the seat of the United Nations in New York City. Congress gives its approval to this kind of agreement by passing a joint resolution giving it effect, or by making appropriations to carry out its provisions. This method has often been used in entering international organizations. Among organizations joined by the United States in this manner are the International Labor Organization, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Monetary Fund, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. These are sometimes called legislative agreements.

4. Agreements made on executive authority without any congressional approval

Probably the most controversial type of executive agreement is that which has not been previously authorized by legislation or treaty and is not subsequently submitted to Congress for approval by joint resolution. Agreements of this type are entered into solely on the powers of the President, either as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces or under his general foreign relations authority.

As Commander in Chief the President has entered executive agreements concerning the use of American military forces, military plans, exchange of prisoners, armistices, and many other subjects. A brief list of the surrenders and armistices effectuated by executive agreement includes the "Declaration for the Suspension of Arms and Cessation of Hostilities" which was signed some months prior to the treaty of peace following the Revolutionary War; the agreement concluded with Spain during the war of 1898, which included a number of nonmilitary principles; the armistice entered into with Germany and Austria during World War I; and the surrenders and armistices terminating hostilities in World War II.

The President's authority as "sole organ of external relations," as expressed by John Marshall in 1799, has been the basis for many other international executive agreements. Among these are the recognition of the Soviet Union in 1933, various arrangements regarding claims, and political understandings such as the Lansing-Ishii agreement of 1917.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Subject matter is not necessarily a means of distinguishing between treaties and executive agreements. The subjects of some executive agreements are of equal or even more importance than the subjects of some treaties. Executive agreements on occasion during World War II were concerned with matters of very great importance. Likewise, the form of treaties and executive agreements is often similar.

However, executive agreements are different from treaties in certain other characteristics. Whereas treatymaking is often a formal and lengthy process involving negotiation, signing, approval by the Senate, ratification, exchange of ratifications, and proclamation, an executive agreement may be made very simply because it does not go through the ratification process. This is sometimes the only feature distinguishing a treaty from an executive agreement.

Under the Constitution, treaties are the supreme law of the land. They supersede previous, conflicting laws passed by Congress. The legal status of an executive agreement is less definite. In international law executive agreements are usually considered equally as binding as treaties.

As far as they affect domestic law, however, there appears to be a greater degree of difference. While in some cases courts have held that executive agreements are of equal dignity with treaties and like them supersede previous, conflicting laws, other authorities contend that an executive agreement does not become the supreme law of the land unless supported by congressional action.[5]

ALTERNATE USE OF TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS

There are no formal rules as to when the treaty procedure should be used or when an executive agreement may be employed. The executive agreement has played its part side by side with the treaty in international political affairs. Since the Revolutionary War, when hostilities were terminated by executive agreement, it has been used from time to time to end wars (by armistice or surrender) and to prepare for peace. But when thus used, it has usually been followed by a treaty formally reestablishing peace. The executive agreement has also been used alternately with treaties in arranging membership in international organizations, in acquiring territory, and in settling disputes. The outstanding cases of the acquisition of territory by means other than treaties are those of Texas and Hawaii, which were annexed by executive agreement with the endorsement of Congress after the attempt to annex them by treaty had failed because the Senate refused to approve ratification.

Since the legal status of an executive agreement is less precise, a treaty is considered to have more prestige and be more durable. Accordingly it will be more often used for matters which relate to permanent arrangements. Executive agreements are more likely to pertain to routine or transitory matters.

Many authorities contend that practical expediency is the chief reason for using an executive agreement. Since one-third plus one of the Senators present and voting can defeat a treaty and the Senate has defeated or shelved many treaties in the past, there is sometimes reason for the Executive to be uncertain that a particular treaty will be approved. Furthermore, if speed is desired, an executive agreement may more likely be used than a treaty because the Executive may feel there is not time to wait for the consent of the Senate.

Although a secret treaty has not been concluded since 1790,[6] executive agreements have been kept secret in the case of the Taft-Katsura Agreed Memorandum of 1905, a protocol of the Lansing-Ishii Agreement of 1917, and the Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran agreements. Such secret agreements would hardly have been possible if the treaty form had been used.

Other authorities feel that the treaty process is just too cumbersome to use for the rank and file agreements necessary in the conduct of foreign affairs, especially as the number of international agreements is increasing yearly. To support this view are statistics which show that, as the number of international agreements in which the United States has participated has increased, the executive agreement has been used in an increasingly higher ratio than the treaty. The following chart[7] shows this increase to the beginning of World War II.

Period	Number of international agreements	Executive agreements	Treaties
1789–1839	87	27	60
1839–89	453	238	215
1889–1939	1,441	917	524

Since the war both the total number of international agreements and the ratio of executive agreements to treaties have continued to increase. One observer has stated that the ratio is now at least 10 to 1 against the use of the treaty procedure.[8]

In view of the large number of international agreements at the present time, "the President could not successfully deal with [foreign relations] if every agreement made by him on any and every question or subject of discussion * * * required the approval of the Senate before becoming effective. Such a procedure would * * * hamstring the President. * * * It would negate the underlying theme of the constitutional division of authority between the three branches of Government."[9]

[3] Plischke, op. cit., 273.

[4] Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, sec. 115.

[5] Quincy Wright, op. cit., p. 383.

[6] Green H. Hackworth, Digest of International Law (Washington, 1943), vol. V, p. 87.

[7] Wallace McClure, International Executive Agreements. New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, p. 4.

[8] John Sloan Dickey, Our Treaty Procedure Versus Our Foreign Policies, Foreign Affairs, April 1947, p. 359.

[9] Green H. Hackworth, op. cit., p. 397.

TERMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

Many international agreements contain time limits, and after the expiration of that time, the agreement simply lapses. Other agreements pass out of force because their terms have been fulfilled, or by mutual agreement of the parties concerned. When a treaty or executive agreement does not die a natural death in the above manner, the question arises as to how long the agreement is binding upon the parties.

Since a treaty is a pact between States, it binds not only the Government in authority at the time it is made but also subsequent administrations. The duration of executive agreements, however, is less certain. Some authorities contend that an executive agreement morally binds only the signing executive, not his successors; if they wish to continue, it is by voluntary act.[10]

On the other hand, the Chief of the Treaty Division, United States Department of State, in 1934 expressed the view that executive agreements with foreign governments entered into under one President continue to remain in force under his successors unless and until the statutes or regulations in pursuance of which they are entered into are repealed, or the specified time for their operation has expired or notice of a desire to terminate is given by one side or the other.[11]

During the period that an international agreement is in force, its terms are considered binding in international law. A party may terminate, or withdraw from, the agreement by the process of denunciation. Often the method of denunciation is prescribed in the terms of the agreement.

Although the Constitution does not specify which organ of the Government has the right or responsibility of denunciation of a treaty, notice of termination of treaties is given by the President. There are precedents for the Executive to act on his own initiative, or with the advice and consent of the Senate, or in accordance with congressional resolutions, or with later congressional approval.[12]

There is also various practice in the denunciation of executive agreements. It has been done by the President under authority granted in the act authorizing an agreement, as in the case of the trade agreement with Czechoslovakia which was revoked in 1939. Similarly, termination has been announced by the President under congressional authorization which he has requested, as in the case of the Taft agreement between the United States and Panama in 1923.[13] The President has also denounced executive agreements without congressional approval. This happened in the case of a commercial agreement with France which the Department of State declared had been superseded by the Tariff Act of 1909, and in the case of the Lansing-Ishii agreement which was superseded by the Nine Power Treaty of 1922.

Grounds for unilateral denunciation of a treaty are generally considered in international law to include the breach of a treaty obligation by the other party or parties. Writers in the field of international law appear to hold the view that, while in force, executive agreements are subject to the same criteria as treaties.

PRESENT STATUS OF EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

From the above brief account one may see how the President's use of executive agreements has grown apace as the United States has moved rapidly forward toward a position of leadership in the modern world. Various reasons for the use of executive agreements have been mentioned and certain advantages which executive agreements have over treaties have been indicated. However, the growing prevalence of executive agreements has caused concern to many observers, which has found expression in the public press and in congressional debate and resolution. The position of those wishing to curb the power of the President in the making of executive agreements may be very briefly summarized as follows: (1) the powers of the legislative branch of the Government are being usurped and, if the trend continues, the executive branch will have exclusive control over the making of United States foreign policy; (2) executive agreements are often made by means of secret diplomacy which denies to the people and to their elected representatives information which, if known, might prevent the transaction from being consummated (the Yalta Agreement is often cited a case in point); (3) the conduct of American foreign relations without the participation of the American people through Congress is essentially an undemocratic procedure.

[10] Edward M. Borchard, Treaties and Executive Agreements. American Political Science Review, vol. 40, p. 738.

[11] Herbert W. Briggs in the American Journal of International Law, vol. 40 (1946), pp. 381–382.

[12] Wallaces M. McClure, op. cit., p. 16.

[13] Green H. Hackworth, op. cit., p. 432.

Mr. GILLETTE obtained the floor.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Montana?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Texas may proceed.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Montana on his excellent speech concerning the danger arising from the use by the State Department of executive agreements instead of proceeding via the treaty route, especially with reference to the type of agreements the Senator has mentioned.

I should like to ask the Senator, however, what there is in the George substitute which would cause the executive agreements to which the Senator from Montana has referred to be submitted to the Senate for approval?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that practically every treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation with which I am familiar could in some way perhaps be considered to be applicable as internal law within a State itself. Hence, treaties which affect relationships between two sovereign nations have been referred to the Senate for ratification. Under the executive agreement procedure, agreements are not necessarily referred to the Senate. The result is that executive agreements along this particular line, of friendship, commerce, and navigation, seem to be coming into use, and treaties which must be considered constitutionally are going out the window.

Mr. DANIEL. But the George substitute refers only to international agreements that have to do with internal law. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. Then is there not need for some policy to be adopted to bring the type of international agreements to which the Senator from Montana has referred into the treaty realm so that they will come before the Senate for its advice and consent, if we are to keep international agreements from being used by the State Department to circumvent the Senate in its constitutional power?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the Senator from Texas. As I understood the senior Senator from Georgia, in discussing his substitute, he made the statement that it would be up to the President to decide which of the particular executive agreements conflict with internal law, and those would have to be submitted to the Senate and considered as treaties. So far as executive agreements covering friendship, commerce, and navigation are concerned, I do not believe they should be considered in that particular category, but should be submitted to the Senate as full-fledged treaties, so that they can be passed on by the Senate under constitutional provisions.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to interrogate the Senator from Montana.

Mr. GILLETTE. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, provided I do not lose the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Montana understand that there is any date upon which such agreements may be terminated by either side? Is there not a 30-day termination clause in the agreements?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know about the termination date.

Mr. HENNINGS. There is a 30-day termination clause in both agreements to which the Senator from Montana has referred, providing that the agreement may be terminated by either party to it within 30 days.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Usually there is a termination date. The one with the Kingdom of Nepal, the latest one, in section 12 reads:

> This agreement shall continue in force until superseded by a more comprehensive commercial agreement, or until 30 days from the date of written notice of termination, given by either party to the other party, whichever is the earlier. Moreover, either party may terminate paragraphs 7 and 8 on 30 days' written notice.

Mr. HENNINGS. I take it, since the Senator from Montana believes the agreements are improvident, and could be injurious to the United States, that he proposes they be terminated?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator misses my point, I believe. My point is that these executive agreements are in reality treaties, and as such should come before the Senate for consideration. I used

them as illustrative of the fact that under the Constitution there is no reference whatever to executive agreements. There is a need for such a procedure, I will admit, and I am in favor of the President using executive agreements to further the foreign affairs of the United States; but I do not believe he should usurp power in that particular respect, by using executive agreements in matters which could be better taken care of in the form of treaties, which would have to be considered by the Senate.

Mr. HENNINGS. I listened carefully to the Senator's excellent speech on the subject. I believe I understood his point. The Senator is aware of the fact, of course, that the agreements were published; is he not?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. When were they published?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The one with Saudi Arabia was published November 7, 1933; the one for Yemen was published May 4, 1946, and the one for Nepal was published in 1947.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is aware, is he not, that any Senator may offer a resolution to negate the effect of these agreements?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator propose to do that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not propose to do it, no; and I made no such assertion during the course of my remarks.

Mr. HENNINGS. I was asking for information. The Senator having raised the point, I wondered if he would in any way quarrel with the effect of these agreements, either externally or internally.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I quarrel with the aspect of the agreement which has to do with the sidestepping of the Senate in carrying out its duties with regard to treaties.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is aware, of course, that there are obstacles in the way of negotiating treaties involving what we may call formalities.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am aware of the fact that the Senate has been called the graveyard of treaties.

Mr. HENNINGS. I mean in reference to the specific cases which the Senator has chosen as illustrative of his point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator state his question again?

Mr. HENNINGS. I suggest that the Senator is aware of the fact that under the terms of the agreements which the Senator has chosen as illustrative of his point the Senate can take action upon them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. And the Senator is also aware of the fact that we have had some difficulty in consummating treaties.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. Would the Senator say that we should not have negotiated the executive agreements when the Senator must know that the United States is the beneficiary of these agreements?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let us hope that is true. I do not think it is a beneficiary so far as the Senate is concerned.

If the Senator from Missouri will indulge me, I should like to cite some figures to illustrate the growth of executive agreements. Too many of them are being negotiated.

From 1789 to 1839 there were 87 international agreements, of which 27 were executive agreements and 60 were treaties.

From 1839 to 1889 there were 453 international agreements, of which 238 were executive agreements and 215 were treaties.

From 1889 to 1939 there were 1,441 international agreements, of which 917 were executive agreements and 524 were treaties.

Since the war both the total number of international agreements and the ratio of executive agreements to treaties have continued to increase. One observer has stated that the ratio is now at least 10 to 1 against the use of the treaty procedure.

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator will yield further, the Senator has, for some obvious reason well known to him, selected two examples upon which he relies as illustrative of his point.

Does not the Senator agree that this country has been the beneficiary under the terms of those two agreements?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am sure we have received what we wanted, or we would not have signed them. But I may point out that these are the only ones I found. There may be more. In later years, since 1933—and, incidentally, the negotiations covering the Saudi-Arabia agreement go back 2 or 3 years beyond that—the trend has been to increase the usurpation of power in this respect, because we have so many more executive agreements to contend with, and we know very little about many of them. I think executive agreements are necessary, but I think there should be a check on their possible infringing on internal law.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not want to labor the point, but I think it is very important. I understand a great many executive agreements have been entered into within 3 years. Who is to decide whether any one of those agreements has any impact upon what has been said to be internal law or domestic law? Who is to determine that question under the terms of the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, in order to submit such agreements to the Senate and to the House of Representatives?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If I correctly understand what the distinguished Senator from Georgia has stated with regard to his own amendment, that would be a matter for the President to determine. In other words, it would be up to him to decide whether any executive agreement was in conflict with internal law. I assume he would work it out through the State Department.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then the man whose power is sought to be restricted, under the substitute of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, is the very man who is to determine what is to come before the Senate to be passed upon as executive agreements affecting internal or domestic law?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia, provided I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to cite one other example of how this form of usurpation of power by the executive branch has grown. I think that is the sole purpose of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] in his very excellent statement.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that in December 1950, Prime Minister Attlee visited Washington and suggested the creation of an international operation—note the language—to distribute raw materials on an international basis. A month later, the State Department announced the creation of such an operation, known as the International Materials Conference, the "IMC," as it is called, with offices in the Department of State, and largely paid for with American funds.

There was established a central group under this organization, composed of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France. Then certain committees were formed to allocate and control prices of certain raw materials. The IMC, as I shall call it for the sake of brevity, made clear the responsibility of each country for "seeing that their allocations are not exceeded."

In 1952, Assistant Secretary McFall, who was in charge of a part, at least, of the operation, issued a statement which contains this language:

> There is no statutory authority for the participation of the United States in this conference, as it is one of many activities carried out in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States.

I invite attention to the fact that these activities were carried out in the United States by regularly established agencies of the United States, such as the National Production Administration, the OPS, and other agencies. I also invite attention to the fact that most dealers in and fabricators of copper will tell us that even down to this day this organization did, in fact, affect prices in the United States through the regulations made under the agreement, which was extra-law, extra-Constitution, and extra-everything, except that it had been established by the State Department in the exercise of its authority over foreign affairs.

GRAIN STORAGE SHORTAGE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to take the time of the Senate to discuss a matter extraneous to the unfinished business, although it is of paramount importance to the agricultural interests of the United States.

Unless the Department of Agriculture promptly makes provision for at least 200 million bushels of additional grain storage space before the wheat and corn harvests this year, farmers will face another

year of acute shortage in storage space and disastrously low harvest-period prices.

The impending 200-million-bushel shortage of storage room is already affecting grain markets and causing declines in futures prices.

The Secretary of Agriculture must give the highest priority to securing adequate storage, using all the authority and funds available to him.

Within the last hour my attention has been called to a report on the news ticker that the Secretary of Agriculture has issued a statement with reference to the same matter, in which he calls the attention of farmers to the need of the farmers themselves to construct the additional storage facilities.

Mr. President, the Secretary would, in fact, do far better to stay in Washington solving the storage problem than making speeches around the country denouncing the price-support programs. If price supports are not working, it could well be because of failure to provide sufficient grain storage. If the Secretary will stay home and use all efforts to build the necessary storage, he will have no trouble keeping prices up to support levels.

Mr. President, the 1954 storm warnings are hoisted high for all to see who wish to see.

As early as January 22 of this year the Wall Street Journal printed a story headlined "Storage Squeeze Threatens a Farm Crisis by Midyear." The article stated the problem as follows:

> Where to store hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat and corn the United States will acquire this year in price-propping deals. Farmers can't get price guaranties unless they can find adequate storage space.

To demonstrate the immediate impact of the threatening shortage I quote a paragraph from an Associated Press dispatch datelined Chicago, February 4:

> The specter of not enough storage room for 1954 crops cast its shadow over the grain market on the Board of Trade today. Prices generally declined, particularly for those futures representing 1954 crops, on reports the Agriculture Department was concerned over the fact that it would not have enough room to store mounting Government surpluses.

In an extensive analysis of prospects for what it calls homeless grains, the Wall Street Journal on February 4 reported that the Department of Agriculture anticipates an increase in storage needs of 500 million bushels, but has in sight only 220 million bushels of storage space through the guaranteed occupancy storage program and use of the mothball shipping fleet. According to this calculation, there will be 280 million bushels of grain this year with no space to store it.

I ask how, in the face of these figures, the Secretary of Agriculture expects any price-support program to succeed. The price-support law requires farmers to find storage space for their crops if they are to place them under the price-support and loan program. If there is no storage space, the farmer can seek a waiver of this provision, but he bears the cost of any loss resulting from spoilage.

The Wall Street Journal article describes some of the current and proposed plans of the Department to find storage space, including wider use of the mothballed merchant ships and such other unorthodox facilities as abandoned army barracks, idle airplane hangars, vacant garages, deserted movie houses and other sorts of empty buildings. The article reports one official saying facetiously: "If that doesn't do the trick, the farmers will have to dump the stuff in their bathtubs or put it in the front parlor." The key paragraph in the Journal account is this one:

> But the new bin building, spurred by a variety of Government incentives, together with wider use of idle ships, will furnish no more than about 220 million bushels of new capacity, agriculture experts figure. The United States would thus be shy some 280 million bushels of storage space for grain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the February 4 Wall Street Journal article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOMELESS GRAIN—PRESENT STORAGE SPACE ISN'T ENOUGH TO HOUSE EXPECTED 1954 SURPLUS—NEW BINS, USE OF MORE IDLE SHIPS WOULD STILL LEAVE 280 MILLION BUSHELS OVER—FARMER LOSSES AND ELECTION

(By Gene E. Miller)

WASHINGTON.—Federal farm boss Benson and his aides are bracing for a new crisis. Their problem: Where to cache 280 million bushels of wheat, corn, rye, oats, barley, and other grains, due to be harvested this summer, for which no storage space is available.

For the Federal farm folks the crisis is political as well as agricultural. Price support law requires that if farmers put their crops under supports they must find storage space, or if none is available, seek a waiver of this provision and bear any resulting loss from spoilage. The scramble for space is likely to ruffle many rural tempers. Farmers whose crops spoil are bound to be more than just ruffled. This being an election year, Mr. Benson and his minions will be under heavy pressure to do something about the situation.

STUDYING THE OUTLOOK

Agriculture Department officials have made a private study of the storage outlook this year, trying to match prospective supplies of grains with available storage space in warehouses, grain elevators, and even mothballed merchant ships. Here are their unhappy conclusions:

When added to present record surpluses, this year's grain crops, even if yields are only average, will create the need for an extra 500 million bushels of storage space, atop the Nation's 7.7 billion bushels of grain storage capacity available last year.

But new bin building, spurred by a variety of Government incentives, together with wider use of idle ships, will furnish no more than about 220 million bushels of new capacity, agriculture experts figure. The United States would thus be shy some 280 million bushels of storage space for grain.

WORSE WOES?

Of course, widespread crop failures or a new war emergency could upset this prediction, and ease the storage squeeze. But unusually good crops, on the other hand, would aggravate the problem. And right now, the Department's crystal gazers are betting privately that grain production this year will be very favorable, despite 1954 planting curbs. If they're right, Mr. Benson's storage woes may be even worse than presently reckoned.

The upshot is hard to predict in precise terms. But officials concede that failure to find shelter for a big chunk of this year's crops of wheat, corn, and other grains can only result in heavy losses for some farmers.

One way out for the administration would be a hurry-up request to Congress for funds to finance Government building of storage bins. But this isn't likely; for one thing, it doesn't fit in with President Eisenhower's drive to get the Government out of private businesses.

FARM PROGRAM'S ROLE

More important, however, is the fact that construction by the Government of a flock of new storage bins doesn't jibe with Mr. Benson's long-range farm aims. He's busy trying to sell Congress on a new, fresh-start farm program designed to discourage overproduction of food and fiber in the future. He's also pushing plans to dispose of much of the Government-owned hoard of farm products, now valued at $2.7 billion and expected to jump to $4.2 billion by mid-1955.

The key to his scheme: A new system of flexible price supports that could be raised or lowered to encourage output of scarce goods, dampen production of commodities when surpluses threatened. This would replace the present rigid, high props under prices of wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts.

Mr. Benson thinks doing away with the present rigid supports will eventually solve the storage problem. But some influential lawmakers from farming areas are not inclined to approve such a scheme if it would mean lower price supports under crops grown in their home districts. As of now, the chances that Congress will approve Mr. Benson's plans are rated poor.

SOME PLANS

Meantime, Agriculture Department aides are wrestling with the more pressing problem of where to store the current farm glut until Congress decides what to do about it. Here are some of their plans:

The Agriculture Department already has decided to make wider use of mothballed merchant ships. This year the Government stowed about 28 million bushels of grain in ships on the east coast. But these floating warehouses, already taken into consideration in reckoning the storage outlook, have one disadvantage: The Maritime Commission insists the Agriculture Department be prepared to unload the wheat on short notice, in case of emergency.

The farm planners are counting on some other unorthodox storage facilities to help ease the pinch. Officials are prepared to turn to abandoned Army barracks and idle airplane hangars, the two types of buildings most readily converted into grain warehouses.

If such facilities aren't enough, and the expectation is they won't be, the Department is mulling an emergency order to Agriculture Department fieldmen to scour the countryside for any kind of empty buildings, from vacant garages to deserted movie houses, to use for storing grain.

"And if that doesn't do the trick," says one official facetiously, "the farmers will have to dump the stuff in their bathtubs or put it in the front parlor."

Actually, the Federal experts think the farmers may well be able to find extra storage space on their farms—without tying up the bathtub. For one thing, they figure, horses can be turned out to pasture, and wheat stored in the stalls. Or farm machinery

can be put in temporary sheds, and wheat poured into the barn.

Also, the Government is pushing a plan to make it more appealing for farmers to build their own storage facilities. Under a law passed last year, farmers can write off for tax purposes the entire cost of a new storage bin in the first 5 years, instead of spreading the depreciation allowance over a term of 20 years or more, as in the past. Until 1953 tax receipts are in, the Government will have no idea how this scheme is working, and even then it may not have an accurate count.

Under another program aimed at easing the storage shortage, the Government guarantees to use a certain proportion of a new storage bin for a given length of time. This plan, aimed at warehousemen and other builders of storage facilities, has not, however, been a smashing success. Since it was first announced late last summer, the Agriculture Department has received inquiries from enough builders to suggest a 530-million-bushel increase in storage capacity—more than enough to solve this year's storage problem.

CANCELLATIONS GROW

But builders have been dropping out of the plan at a fast clip. The Department has actually made use-guarantee agreements with builders accounting for 292 million bushels of storage capacity. But contractors already have canceled out 78 million bushels of this and further cancellations are expected, due to high building costs and other factors. Many of the original applicants were just curious, Department officials note.

Another reason for cancellations: Contractors are presumably leery of an oversupply of storage space a few years hence, if Mr. Benson is in fact successful in chipping away at the Government's heavy stocks of farm products. The Government guarantees use of the new facilities under the program from 3 to 6 years, depending on how much of the facilities Uncle Sam promises to occupy.

Officials say the use-guarantee scheme will add less than 200 million bushels of capacity to the more than 7 billion bushels of storage space now supplied by private warehousemen, elevator operators, and grain terminals. The rest of the Nation's grain-storage space, totaling about 639 million bushels of capacity, is owned by the Government. This is more than three-quarters filled with corn right now, and will be jammed close to capacity next October when the Government has to take over ownership of corn under loan from last year's crop.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, it may be that these figures are exaggerated and that the new crop will not be as large as foreseen. There is drought in the Midwest, as well as other unpredictable weather factors. I have obtained a report on the supply situation as viewed by Agriculture Department experts which is somewhat more conservative. At the same time I have information leading me to believe that the storage space under present plans will fall far short of what the Wall Street Journal writer predicts, thus leaving approximately the same gap between supply and available storage.

The USDA supply estimates of stocks, as we go into the harvesting of 1954 crops, as compared with stocks in the year previous, indicate that at the beginning of the current marketing year carryover stocks will be 393.3 million bushels net greater than last year. I ask unanimous consent that the table showing these carryover figures be printed as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Grain supply situation

[Million bushels]

Commodity	Beginning stocks, 1953	Beginning stocks, 1954	Change
Wheat	562.3	830.0	+267.7
Corn	768.8	890.0	+121.2
Rye	6.3	15.0	+8.7
Oats	255.5	235.0	−20.5
Barley	51.4	65.0	+13.6
Sorghums	7.3	12.0	+4.7
Soybeans	10.1	4.0	−6.1
Flaxseed	10.0	14.0	+4.0
Total	1,671.7	2,065.0	+419.9 −26.5
Net change (increase)			393.3

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, Senators will be interested to know that this table shows that whereas as beginning stocks last year we had 562.3 million bushels of wheat, at the start of this harvesting year wheat stocks will amount to an estimated 830 million bushels, an increase since 1953 of 267.7 million bushels. We had as beginning stocks last year 768.8 million bushels of corn, whereas at the start of harvesting this year we will have stocks of corn amounting to an estimated 890 million bushels, or an increase of 121.2 million bushels over last year. The net increase of all grains over the beginning of harvest in 1953 will be, according to these calculations 393.3 million bushels.

What are the figures for storage space? It is reported that the Department has located 35 million bushels of storage space in vessels of the mothballed fleet on the east and west coasts. The Department is also working on its guaranteed occupancy storage plan which is designed to encourage private building of additional commercial storage facilities.

If one reads the headlines of Department bulletins one gains the impression that nearly 294 million bushels of new storage space will be provided under this plan. Unfortunately the text of the releases does not justify this impression. Actually the program is sliding backward instead of advancing at the required swift pace.

The February 12 announcement, for example, declared that the total acceptances by commercial storage companies had risen by 1,282,800 bushels over the total on February 1. But it is revealed in the second paragraph that cancellations in prior applications had exceeded the new contracts by 400 percent. This rapid advance toward the rear, left us with net occupancy storage facilities of some 208 million bushels on February 12, or 6 million bushels less space than 2 weeks before.

For the edification of fellow Senators, I read these two splendid specimens of progress through publicity:

February 1 release. Headline, "Additional Acceptances in Occupancy Storage Program: Total now 292,156,824 bushels":

The United States Department of Agriculture today announced additional acceptances of applications totaling 3,012,500 bushels for participation in the grain occupancy contract program. * * * Today's list brings total acceptances to date to 292,156,824.

The Department also announced that cancellations and withdrawals by applicants of tentatively approved applications to date total 77,973,996 bushels. This leaves a net total of acceptances of 214,182,828 bushels.

The second release is dated February 12. Headline, "Additional Acceptances in Occupancy Storage Program: Total Now 293,689,624 Bushels":

The United States Department of Agriculture announced additional acceptances of applications totaling 1,282,800 bushels for participation in the grain-occupancy contract program. * * * Today's list brings total acceptances to date to 293,689,624 bushels.

The Department also announced that cancellations and withdrawals by applicants of tentatively approved applications to date total 85,445,496 bushels. This leaves a net total of acceptances of 208,244,128 bushels.

By this kind of public-relations legerdemain, Mr. President, we are increasing our available grain-storage space at the rate of a net loss of 6 million bushels in 2 weeks.

Some agricultural experts believe that cancellations under such a program may ultimately reduce the total net sign-up considerably below the present mark of 208 million bushels, and that new storage space actually ready through this bin-construction program may be as low as 150 million bushels by the time harvesting begins.

All these figures indicate our farmers are going to have to contend with at least 200 million bushels of homeless grain this year. If the prospective 393-million-bushel increase in grain carryover turns out to be correct, if storage space on mothballed ships is not more than 35 million bushels, and if the commercial storage-construction program provides only 150 million bushels of space, simple arithmetic leaves a gap in storage of 208 million bushels.

Even if the construction program under the guaranteed-occupancy plan holds up to the present level, with no more cancellations, we will be short 150 million bushels of storage space. Is it really the serious belief of the Department of Agriculture that such space can be found in old school buildings, garages, hangars, and movie houses?

After last year's experience when farmers suffered losses of millions of dollars because the administration would not or could not make the price-support and loan program work, there can be no excuse for failing to be ready this year.

Farm-price supports can work only if there is enough storage. If the Department of Agriculture refuses to do everything in its power to provide adequate grain storage, it can be charged—and it will be charged—with deliberate sabotage of the price-support program.

Mr. Benson must announce, and the sooner the better, that he is going to see that there is a home for every bushel of

grain. The Commodity Credit Corporation has all the authority it needs to let contracts for the construction of bins and other storage facilities. It has the funds to do the job, and if it needs additional funds it can come to Congress for them.

We seem to have difficulty impressing on those currently in charge of administering the farm program the simple fact that for a farmer to obtain a Government loan under the price-support program, he must have adequate storage for his grain. If the carryover of previous years fills all the storage space in existence, he cannot move his new crop into bins and granaries at harvest time.

What will happen to grain prices, come harvest time, if, as is conservatively estimated, there are 393.3 million bushels of grain more than last year which need storage space, but there are only 150 million or even 200 million bushels of space available? Are the wheat and corn farmers going to face the choice of dumping their new harvest on the market at ruinous prices or leaving it spoil on the ground?

The Secretary of Agriculture seems determined to blame the high level and rigidity of corn and wheat price supports on the fact that farmers are receiving less than full support prices.

As recently as February 10, Secretary Benson was quoted as telling a farm audience in Columbus, Nebr., that the price-support program is not working, and citing as proof that "the average market price of wheat is only 82 percent of parity" and "the average price of corn is only 79 percent of parity."

I wonder if it would not be the better part of wisdom for the Secretary to use every means at his command to provide for adequate storage space so that the price support program will be fully effective, instead of undermining farmers' faith in a program which Congress has approved, and which farmers themselves have repeatedly endorsed in democratic, secret balloting.

Just 3 days before the Secretary spoke at Columbus, the Omaha World-Herald printed an article on February 7, with the following headline: "Elevators Can't Hold All Grain—Storage Already Tight in Area; Corn, Wheat To Increase Squeeze."

The article asked:

> What is Nebraska going to do with all the grain? Omaha grain men agreed Saturday the State, and the rest of the country, faces an almost certain shortage of storage. James Lemley, Lincoln, chief of the price-support program in Nebraska, said: "We're going to be in real trouble in the summer."

The story continued:

> Tight conditions at the terminals mean the same conditions at country elevators and farm granaries. Farmers may be forced to pile wheat on the ground "temporarily if not permanently," said Harry C. Christiansen, a former exchange president. Omaha grain men said new facilities scheduled won't make much of a dent in the space picture.

Mr. President, I will repeat that last sentence, because it is of controlling importance as we face the new crop:

> Omaha grain men said new facilities scheduled won't make much of a dent in the space picture.

This fact is important not only for its own sake, but also the Department of Agriculture is claiming that its program of guaranteed occupancy will result in enormous additions to the Nation's storage capacity. The grain trade evidently does not agree with these claims.

Although, as I have pointed out, the Department has been showing gross acceptance figures in this program of about 293½ million bushels, with 85½ million bushels of space already cancelled, the Department is left with 70 percent of what it claims.

We will doubtless hear other claims in the next few months, telling us how many ships have been filled with grain, how many contracts have been let, how many empty barracks and school buildings have been transformed into storehouses for grain, and so on. But the proof of success or failure will come at harvest time, at the moment when farmers must either sell at distress prices or have available to them storage space into which they can put their grain under loan.

I am deeply disturbed over signs which are apparent so early this year that the storage program will not succeed. Farm income is too crucial in our Nation's economy to risk such a failure. I sincerely hope the administration reads those signs and does what it should do, vigorously, thoroughly, and immediately. If strong action is taken now, some of the damage later may be prevented.

The price-support programs will certainly not work if the Secretary of Agriculture fails to do all in his power to build enough storage for grain, fails to ask Congress for any additional authority or funds he believes he may need, and, on top of that, attempts to use the consequences of such failure as arguments proving the program will not work. Failure to provide adequate space last year was the major cause in low farm prices. If that failure is repeated again this year, obviously farm income will sag again.

Mr. President, the farmers of my State and the farmers of the whole Nation will not tolerate another year of inaction, postponement, and failure. Let no one try to brush aside these warnings of mine on the specious grounds that, for example, in my State of Iowa there may be enough storage to take care of local stocks of corn, or that drought or weather conditions may reduce the Iowa crop and thus ease the local storage problem. There is no certainty that such eventualities will occur, in the first place; and, in the second place, the farmers of my State know that prices in Iowa are affected just as much by a shortage of storage space in other States as in Iowa itself. Corn and wheat from all the producing States are sold on the same market in Chicago, and the forces that bear down on prices in Chicago originate in all the States, not in just one or two.

We from the great grain-producing region of America await with anxiety to learn what the Department of Agriculture is going to do about filling the gap in storage space in time for the coming harvest.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], inserting on page 3, after line 9, a new section.

THE TENTH INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on Monday, next, representatives of the various nations of the Western Hemisphere will assemble at Caracas for the 10th Inter-American Conference. The importance of this conference is emphasized by the fact that on the opening day our own Secretary of State, Hon. John Foster Dulles, will address the assembly, carrying a message to the conference from the President of the United States and the people of the United States.

It is incumbent upon all of us in the Congress, in my opinion, to take note of this occasion and, each in his own way and in accordance with his own capacity, as his duties permit, to make some contribution toward the success of the meeting. I hope there will be adequate and attentive representation of the Congress at these deliberations and discussions. Furthermore, I trust that a comprehensive report of the meeting and its results will be made to the Congress.

In my opinion, Mr. President, it is not presumptive to expect that the Secretary of State and his staff will return from the conference with some factual findings as to the degree of Communist infiltration into the Western Hemisphere. What we are seeking in this regard are the facts—just the facts. For too long, this subject, as well as the entire field of inter-American relations, has been brushed off with glib phrases, wordy reports, and noble-sounding clichés, which have not produced the results we must have. So, to repeat, Mr. President, I hope we can look forward to receiving "just the facts—nothing but the facts," from the meeting.

For instance, it is most important that we have the facts about Guatemala and its reportedly Communist-dominated government. There are reports that the Reds are winning in Guatemala without a fight. We are reading news accounts that, despite the fact the Communist strength in Guatemala is estimated at only 3,000 in a population of 3 million, the Reds have control of 51 of the 56 seats in the National Congress. A report of our National Planning Council states:

> At the present time [late 1953], the Communists are so deeply entrenched that it may no longer be possible to eliminate them by peaceful means.

Mr. President, it appears unknown to millions of people in this Nation, but reports are that right next door to the Panama Canal, only a few hours by air from vital oilfields and key industries in the United States, a Government has been established with the potential of weakening and subverting other Latin American countries and decreasing the strength, or perhaps the hope for, any allied inter-American anti-Communist action. What are the facts, Mr. President? Have the Communists actually opened a beachhead, or a bridgehead, in the Western Hemisphere—and, in fact, on the North American Continent? Have the Communists by stealth and ideological treachery infiltrated among our good neighbors? Have the Reds politically breached our defenses, in violation of the Monroe Doctrine—accomplishing by political maneuver and ideological propaganda what no nation has ever done, and what no nation could ever do, by force of arms? What is the truth about Guatemala? We made much of our continued use of the fine phrase "good neighbors." Have we been so long preoccupied with fighting communism in Europe and in Asia that there now is, in fact, a Red foothold right at our back door?

Mr. President, I hope this will prove not to be the case. I understand that our expenditures in Indochina, where for several years now we have been aiding the French in their struggle against the Communists, have reached a billion dollars. We have spent many times that amount in Korea and in other places in Asia, and many times that amount in Europe.

It is most important that we not lessen our support of other free peoples in the world in their struggle against communism, and it is vital to us that the Communists be repulsed in Indochina. But, in my humble opinion, there is a grave object lesson for us in Guatemala and in many other chapters of the current story about this great inter-America of which we are a part.

The Western Hemisphere is our home, and it must have our priority attention, just as it has the first love of the citizens of our country and the citizens of the other countries which are our neighbors. There are many reasons why Latin America should be our major diplomatic concern, rather than a casual one. Latin America, now with a population as great as that of the United States and Canada combined, will outnumber us by 550 millions to 250 millions in 50 years. In this fastest growing area, industrial and trade expansion goes apace, and already it is the busiest trading area outside Western Europe.

We look forward to the opportunities offered the United States in the Inter-American Conference. I feel sure that all of us in Congress look for the Conference to produce some further guideposts for a tightening of ties among the Americas.

Mr. President, in connection with the statement I have just made, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "Latin America—World's Fastest Population Increase Makes Good Neighbors Important to United States." The article was written by Richard Fryklund, and was published in the Washington Star of February 21.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN AMERICA—WORLD'S FASTEST POPULATION INCREASE MAKES GOOD NEIGHBORS IMPORTANT TO UNITED STATES

(By Richard Fryklund)

Latin America, with a population already equal to that of the United States and Canada combined, is the fastest-growing area in the world.

This fact alone would be enough to make Uncle Sam look southward, as he will be doing at the coming Caracas conference, to firm up ties with an important part of the world. But there is another good, practical reason for paying closer attention to Latin America: Much of that area is moving from an underdeveloped status onto a higher producing and consuming level. South and Central Americas are bound to grow more important in the near future, both economically and politically.

The population of Latin America, according to latest estimates, is about 173 million. Canada and the United States, the only two English-speaking nations, count about 13.6 million and 160 million persons, respectively. Three Latin American countries are more populous than Canada—Brazil, the eighth largest nation in the world with about 54 million; Mexico with more than 27 million, and Argentina with 18 million.

There are 62 cities in Latin America with a population of more than 100,000, compared with 106 in the United States. The third, fourth, fifth, and sixth largest cities in the Western Hemisphere are in Latin America: Buenos Aires (3 million), Rio de Janeiro (2.4 million), São Paulo, Brazil (2.2 million), and Mexico City (2.2 million).

THE FUTURE

All this is small potatoes compared with what is to come. While world population is growing at the rate of 1 percent a year and the United States is growing 1.7 percent a year, Latin America is swelling by 2.5 percent. If that rate continues, Latin Americans will outnumber North Americans 550 million to 250 million in another 50 years.

Reasons for the amazing growth are the high, steady birth rates (Chile, for instance, has had an annual birth rate of 32 or 33 a year per thousand persons since 1934; Venezuela is up to 44.3 per thousand and still gaining; no Latin American nation has as low a birth rate as the United States' 24.5) and steadily declining death rates (Peru, 9.2 a year per thousand, down from 16 in 1937; Argentine, 8.7 compared with 11.5 in 1937; Honduras, 10.7 compared with 18.2 in 1937; the United States' has dropped slightly from 11.3 to 9.7 over the same period).

Birth rates in Latin America, predominantly Catholic countries, are expected to remain high, but modern health measures are expected to lower the death rate further. So populations are expected to continue gains like these: Argentina, 13.5 million to more than 18 million since 1937; Brazil, from 38.7 million to 54 million; Mexico, 16.7 million to 27 million; Colombia, 8.5 million to 11.3 million.

Along with this population growth has gone economic expansion, reflected particularly in increased foreign trade. Eighteen percent of the world's trade now goes to or from Latin America, compared with 15.3 percent in 1937. This is of particular importance to the United States, as most of this trade (10.1 percent of the world total) is between North America and Latin America. This is the busiest trading area outside Western Europe and the artifically maintained sterling bloc.

Except for Canada, Latin America is this country's biggest customer and supplier.

Industrial production in Latin America is expanding with population: Almost doubled in Argentina since 1937; more than doubled in Chile; almost doubled in Mexico. As another indication of expansion, the number of railway passenger miles traveled in Argentina and Cuba almost tripled since 1947, doubled in Brazil and Mexico, increased by 50 percent in Chile. Rail freight ton-miles have almost doubled in the same period in Costa Rica, almost tripled in Ecuador, increased by 50 percent in Chile and 30 percent in Argentina and Brazil.

LIVING STANDARDS SOAR

Standards of living also are on the rise in the southern nations, although the increase is not as spectacular as that in population. Per capita incomes still average below the $500 mark, as compared with upward of $1,000 in Canada, Britain and Scandinavia, for instance. Since 1937 United States national income has quadrupled, Venezuela's has almost quintupled, Mexico's is up 600 percent, Guatemala's 500 percent, Argentina's 800 percent.

Food production has not expanded enough, however, to raise diets to desirable levels. Persons in Argentina and Uruguay take in enough calories, on the average, but persons in Mexico, for instance, lag by 17 percent, in Chile by 10 percent, in Brazil by almost 5 percent. Most countries are better off than in pre-World War II years, however: Average calories consumed per person in Brazil is up 10 percent, in Venezuela and Cuba up 5 percent, in Mexico up 12 percent, in Colombia up 20 percent.

Nutrition will improve faster in Latin America if wasteful agricultural practices are abandoned and if more arable land is put into production. Good land, however, is not plentiful in many countries, and food shortages threaten to be a real danger to Latin America if her population continues to expand at the present rate.

But school attendance is growing rapidly, an indication that Latin America is out to solve her problems over the long haul.

There can be no doubt that the expanding countries to the south will be increasingly important neighbors to the United States in the years to come.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "Caracas Parley To Focus Spotlight on Red Infiltration." The article was published in the Miami Daily News of February 21.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARACAS PARLEY TO FOCUS SPOTLIGHT ON RED INFILTRATION

(By Morgan Monroe)

WASHINGTON, February 20.—The United States and its Latin American neighbors are preparing for a policy showdown on Communist penetration of the Americas.

That subject dominates the political agenda of the 10th Inter-American Conference which opens March 1 in Caracas. The Communist issue promises to make the conference one of the most significant get-togethers in the history of the Organization of American States.

In addition, the high-level meeting will offer the Eisenhower administration its first opportunity to outline for Latin America this Nation's position on a number of other vital

inter-American matters. As the OAS policy-making body convenes only twice in each decade, the conference will set the pattern of United States Latin American relations for the next 5 years.

Overshadowing that long-term significance, however, is a pressing challenge to the immediate future of solidarity and security in the hemisphere. The challenge appears on the conference agenda in these words:

"Intervention on international communism in the American republics."

FAST-GROWING THREAT

That subject will focus world attention on Caracas in March. Free nations will look for evidences of renewed inter-American unity. Moscow will be watching for signs of Communist-encouraged nationalism, dissension, and anti-United States sentiment.

Since the last inter-American conference in 1948, the Soviet Union has pushed its penetration of the Americas to a point which makes communism the most critical item on the agenda of the forthcoming conference. Conditions in Guatemala and elsewhere in Latin America leave no doubt that the OAS nations are confronted with a fast-growing threat to individual sovereignty and collective security.

Guatemala, second largest and most heavily populated nation in Central America, is the chief source of immediate concern. Since 1948 the colorful country has become the first Soviet satellite in this hemisphere.

First by infiltration and more recently through political power, Communists have for 10 years worked toward their present entrenchment in Guatemala. The sustained Red effort has been shockingly successful. With control of government, all major political parties, labor unions, the press and radio, Soviet imperialism is today the most powerful influence in Guatemala.

MAJORITY NOT RED

But the majority of Guatemalans are not Communists. Political observers in Latin America estimate the number of hard-core Reds in control of the country at not more than 3,000 among a population of approximately 3 million. Yet Soviet-trained subversives, aided by fellow travelers who helped them rise to power, control 51 of the 56 national congress seats, together with the executive and judicial branches of government.

An extensive report released last December by the Washington office of the National Planning Association summed up Guatemalan Red strength in these terms:

"At the present time (late 1953), the Communists are so deeply entrenched that it may no longer be possible to eliminate them by peaceful means."

Unknown to millions in this nation, that situation prevails next door to the Panama Canal. And Guatemala is only a few hours by air from vital oilfields and key industries in the Southern and Southwestern United States.

Communist strategy therefore has been aimed at weakening and subverting other Latin-American countries. This is designed to decrease the possibility of governmental and popular support of any inter-American anti-Communist action. Red propaganda has been geared to alienate Latin-American sentiment from the United States. In the process of pursuing this strategy, Guatemala has been turned into a base for infiltration and subversion of other Latin-American nations.

Machinery with which to create an inter-American defense against Communist penetration will be at hand when the conference convenes. It is contained in the OAS charter and in agreements made at an earlier conference. The latter have since been known as the Rio treaty.

John M. Cabot, former Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, pointed out that both the charter and the Rio treaty contain provisions against intervention which could be invoked if warranted as the basis for concerted policy against Red penetration. But either of two things could stall collective action.

REDS APPLY PRESSURE

One is the attitude of the United States. Although the Communist subject appears on the conference agenda at the insistence of this Nation, there are misgivings in some parts of Latin America about how far the United States is prepared to go on the issue.

These doubts were spurred by a magazine interview with Cabot, circulated throughout Latin America, in which the Assistant Secretary's statements were interpreted as indicating the United States has cooled off somewhat on the Communist issue.

Whether those misgivings will reflect in official positions of the governments represented at Caracas remains to be seen. But it is certain that any anticommunism policy would require the wholehearted support of the United States.

The other factor which would prevent action is Red pressure on some OAS-member government, particularly those which are politically unstable. This pressure has been increased as the conference nears.

CHARGE RIDICULED

An example of methods employed by Latin-American Communists in their efforts to undermine unity at Caracas is the recent "invasion plot" charge by the Red Guatemalan Government. On January 29 that nation's puppet president alleged that four Latin-American governments were planning to invade his country with United States approval.

The charge was branded "ridiculous and untrue" by the State Department, and promptly denied by the accused Latin American nations. The allegation appeared to be an attempt to create suspicion toward the United States in the hope of stimulating disunity at Caracas. This purpose was pointed out by a State Department spokesman.

These and earlier developments make it clear that Latin American Communists are flexing their muscles in preparation for new political conquests. And it is equally clear that unless the free nations of the hemisphere take action at Caracas to halt the spread of subversion, Red expansion will continue at stepped-up pace.

That is why the Communist issue is the most urgent matter to be considered at Caracas.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "Inter-American Conference: Coffee, Colonialism, and Communism Will Be Top Issues at March Meeting," which was published in the Washington Star on February 21.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE—COFFEE, COLONIALISM, AND COMMUNISM WILL BE TOP ISSUES AT MARCH MEETING

(By Henry B. Lee)

The 10th Inter-American Conference meets at Caracas a week from tomorrow to try to resolve in 1 month issues that have been developing for years. These issues involve communism, colonialism, coffee, and diplomatic asylum. Some are deeply rooted in inter-American history. Most are interrelated, and all are complicated.

Each is loaded with implications for United States diplomacy. Some countries may oppose collective action against international communism. Some will insist on self-determination for Latin American colonies held by strong European allies of the United States. A stronger, Peron-led Latin bloc will press the United States for economic concessions.

In addition, there are issues involving disputes among Latin countries. The question of diplomatic asylum involves a tense dispute between Peru and Colombia. Guatemala and the Dominican Republic charge others with granting territorial asylum to promote revolutionary movements against them. Last week Costa Rica said it would not attend the conference because it is being held within sight of a jail crowded with Venezuelan political prisoners. Chile's Radical Party went on record Thursday in opposition to Caracas as the site for the same reason.

Thus this conference is confronted with the severest test since the first and founding conference at Washington in 1889. Its agenda is loaded with explosive controversies. It may be the first time a member state boycotts a conference.

MUCH TO LOSE

The United States, moreover, has much to lose and little to gain. There are several issues on which it can hardly take a stand without impairing relations with essential allies.

In historical perspective the conference is nonetheless important. It is the first under the Organization of American States, which replaced the old Pan American Union at the strife-torn 1948 Bogota Conference. The conference, supreme OAS body, meets every 5 years to formulate general policy for the next half decade. Since Bogota, the United States has scattered its foreign policy commitments about the globe in response to cold-war demands. Its inter-American commitments must be made in the light of globe demands.

It is in the light of these extended global demands that the United States wants collective inter-American action against the growing threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere. The need for such action is emphasized by the apparent control Communists have acquired in Guatemala and the election of a Communist-led government in British Guiana last spring.

Except for Guatemala, all Latin-American governments are anti-Communist to some degree. About half have broken diplomatic relations with Russia and outlawed local Communist parties. But some Latin countries say communism is a domestic or constitutional matter, and collective action against it may conflict with their principle of nonintervention in domestic affairs. Latin statesmen pushed this principle for many years and hailed United States recognition of it in 1934 as the cornerstone of the inter-American system. Some are more concerned about an infraction of this principle than the problem of communism.

COLLECTIVE ACTION

Even Guatemala's worst enemies in neighboring Central America are reported hesitant to subscribe to effective collective action. There are, however, some who will for a price—economic concessions.

At best, the United States can expect support from several dictators. This would place us in the poor ideological position of being supported by totalitarian regimes and opposed by democratic ones. To avert this embarrassment, we may delay a showdown for a later conference under better circumstances. Or we may get some neighbor of Guatemala to press the project.

Ironically, this issue, now directed at Guatemala, got on the agenda through the action of an earlier and more moderate Guatemalan

Government. It proposed at Mexico City in 1945 "to stop the establishment of undemocratic regimes" in the Americas. At Bogota the threat of "undemocratic regimes" was defined as "international communism or any other totalitarian doctrine." The fourth meeting of consultation (Foreign Ministers meet periodically to consider urgent matters) at Washington, in March 1951, ordered studies made of methods for fighting communism. The whole issue of communism will break open in the discussion of these studies.

The fact that Guatemala now has an "undemocratic regime" with an alien flavor will not deter that country from pressing this issue. Guatemala may see it as a wedge that can be driven between the Western Allies.

The agenda question relating to colonialism is another test for United States diplomacy. The presence of British, French, and Dutch colonies has become increasingly unpopular in Latin America. The 1948 Bogota Conference resolved that "colonialism and the occupation of American territories by extra-continental countries should be brought to an end." The conference also named a committee to study the whole question and submit a report at Caracas.

When this report comes up the delegations will divide along three lines—those considering European colonies a United Nations question, those suggesting the conference should produce at least another resolution supporting self-determination, and those with territorial claims against the British. Guatemala regards British Honduras as part of its territory occupied by Britain. Argentina feels similarly about the Falkland Islands; in fact, Argentina has issued stamps showing the islands as Argentine territory.

Naturally, these countries will scream "colonialism," if only to boost their claims against the British. Argentina also has territorial disputes in Antarctica with the United States, Britain, and Chile. Venezuela is still fretting over territory it lost to British Guiana in a border dispute with Britain and subsequent arbitration award in the 1890's.

The debate on colonialism is expected to involve recent British action in disposing of the Communist-led Jagan government in British Guiana. The Red-tinged Peoples Progressive Party claims it has solicited and received the support of several Latin governments against the British action. The Communist-dominated government of Guatemala is expected to carry the PPP torch at the conference. It may be joined by Argentina and Venezuela, both of which are officially anti-Communist. Thus will hemispheric politics make strange bedfellows.

The United States will, of course, take the position that this whole subject is out of order for an inter-American conference, where Britain has no representation. We may be joined by Chile and several others in holding it is a subject for the United Nations.

ASYLUM ISSUE

The United States will remain aloof from the issue of political asylum—a subject of political philosophy as well as political controversy in Latin America. Two conventions will be considered: Territorial asylum (in another country) and diplomatic asylum (in an embassy). The latter involves a bitter dispute between Peru and Colombia.

Five years ago Colombia granted diplomatic asylum to Victor Raul Haya de la Torre, left-wing Peruvian leader. Since then the legality of this asylum has gone to the World Court and back without a decisive answer. Meanwhile, Peru has stationed guards around the Embassy.

The dispute has become so bitter that the Inter-American Peace Committee has been trying to get the two countries to settle their dispute peacefully. It now has them negotiating bilaterally.

All concerned are anxious to keep it out of the Caracas Conference when the diplomatic asylum convention comes up. This convention gives the granting state the right to determine who is to be granted asylum. If the Haya de la Torre matter is debated in this connection, Peru may walk out of the conference.

The proposed convention on territorial asylum also has current political implications. For more than a century, Latin countries have granted asylum to political refugees. Some refugees have taken advantage of this asylum to foment revolutions back home, thus causing the principle of territorial asylum to conflict with nonintervention. In recent years the Dominican Republic has claimed several neighboring republics have been harboring its political refugees so they may return home as a revolutionary force and overthrow the government. Many alleged plots have been attributed to the so-called Caribbean Legion. Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo, the Dominican Republic's "strong man," charges that remnants of the legion are now in Costa Rica plotting against his government. Guatemala recently accused the United States and several Central American countries of a similar conspiracy.

The issue of fomenting revolutions or civil strife in another country will also be considered under another item on the agenda. The 1928 Convention on Duties and Rights of States in Event of Civil Strife required states to prevent aliens from forming armies on their soil to invade another country. It was signed by 17 states, but the practice continued. This conference will consider adding a protocol that would make the 1928 convention more effective.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

While these political issues are interesting and important for the stability of United States allies, the economic issues present a greater challenge to United States national interests. Here we must stand and be counted. And it looks as if we may be counted out before the voting is over.

For the first time since 1928 we have few economic concessions to offer. The Eisenhower administration has not yet clearly committed itself to reciprocal trade agreements. It is retrenching on foreign economic aid.

Latin countries will, however, enter the conference with the strongest economic bloc they ever had. They will negotiate on the inference Latin America must have markets for its raw materials. If the United States doesn't lower its tariff barriers, they will find markets in the Soviet bloc.

Coffee will be in the immediate background of economic debate. It will remain a symbol of the grievances among Latin countries whose economies are generally dependent on one or two basic raw materials, mostly sold in United States markets. These countries have often complained about prices for these commodities fluctuating between boom and bust. They say they prefer stabilized prices that will guarantee them prices commensurate with prices they pay for our manufactured goods. In short, they want the purchasing-power parity granted our farmers. Coffee-producing countries feel some American politicians have played for the housewife vote here by unjustly blaming them for high coffee prices.

Another grievance these countries have on the agenda involves the protection of purchasing power of monetary reserves against inflationary pressures. This issue stems from World War II when they sold many goods to us, but could not in return buy much manufactured goods from our war economy. When our goods did go back on the market after the war price controls were dropped and their accumulated dollar reserves were thus decimated.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

These issues of guaranteed prices and monetary reserves are related to another agenda item. The conference will discuss economic development of Latin America that could make it less dependent on producing one or two raw materials.

Here the United States has one of its best tactical opportunities. Instead of infusing economic development with handouts, we can insist this objective can best be reached by better treatment of United States private investments.

In connection with economic development the conference will consider a permanent status for the OAS technical cooperation program, development of oil and seafood resources in the submerged Continental Shelf and uniform customs and statistical procedures.

These economic issues are perhaps more critical than the administration realizes. President Juan Peron, of Argentina, has thus far met with only limited success in his efforts to form an economic bloc in Latin America against the United States. States now lined up with Peron are Paraguay, Chile, and Ecuador. But if his neighbors come away from Caracas emptyhanded, his success may not be so limited in the future. Already he is courting Nicaragua economically.

Latin countries that have stoutly resisted Communist infiltration have fretted at watching us pour economic aid into Italy and France, which have not so stoutly resisted communism.

If the administration is very much concerned about these impending diplomatic defeats, it is not evident. Almost on the eve of the conference John Moors Cabot, Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, was switched to an Ambassador's post in Europe. He will attend the conference as an adviser to his successor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "Trade Will Be a Big Factor at Caracas," which was published in the Washington Star on February 21.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE WILL BE A BIG FACTOR AT CARACAS

In nations as in individuals, the most sensitive nerve in the body is the pocketbook nerve. This will become evident as the Caracas conference unfolds next month, and baffling realinements take place.

For instance, when communism is up for discussion. Brazil undoubtedly will oppose the Guatemalan point of view, since the one nation is strongly anti-Communist and the other is dominated by Reds. But when the issue is coffee, the two countries can be expected to present a united front.

Coffee is a major item of export to the United States from 12 of the 20 Latin American Republics. Bananas are a chief export for six nations, cocoa and related products for five, and manila and sisal fibers for five.

The Latin countries are primarily producers of raw materials and consumers of finished goods. Thus they complement the United States in trade as ham complements eggs at breakfast. Chile produces iron ore and buys iron and steel mill products. Bolivia sells metallic ores to the United States and buys back machinery that contains these metals.

The position of the United States vis-a-vis the Latin Republics has changed in the years since the last Inter-American conference at Bogotá in 1948. At that time, the United States was principally an exporter; now it is an importer.

In 1948, the United States exported $3,166,000,000 worth of goods to Latin America and imported $2,352,000,000, for a "favorable" trade balance of $814 million. Last year, we exported something less than our 1948 total—$3,085,000,000 worth of commodities—but imported $3,400,000,000, or 44 percent more than we imported 5 years earlier. Our trade balance last year was "unfavorable" to the tune of $315 million.

The table below shows what we sold Latin America (exports and reexports) and what we bought (imports). Chief commodities exported to and imported from these countries also are shown.

The 1953 breakdown for exports does not add up to the total of $3,085,000,000 because this total includes $202 million of "special category" exports on which detailed information is withheld for security reasons.

Country-by-country breakdown follows:

Country	Volume of trade in millions of dollars				Chief commodities, 1953	
	Exports		Imports		Exported from United States	Imported to United States
	1948	1953	1948	1953		
Argentina	381	101	180	185	Machinery, cars chemicals	Wool, beef, tanning extract.
Bolivia	36	18	49	62	Machinery, cars, textiles	Tin, tungsten, lead ores.
Brazil	497	285	514	756	Machinery, cars, chemicals	Coffee, cocoa, carnauba wax.
Chile	105	96	179	243	Machinery, cars, iron and steel.	Copper, iron ore, nitrates.
Colombia	197	281	236	446	Machinery, cars, chemicals	Coffee, bananas, crude oil.
Costa Rica	29	37	23	33	Textiles, chemicals, machinery.	Coffee, bananas, abaca fiber.
Cuba	441	424	375	436	Foodstuffs, machinery, textiles.	Cane sugar, molasses, tobacco.
Dominican Republic	47	48	35	51	Textiles, machinery, cars	Cocoa, coffee, chocolate.
Ecuador	31	42	19	45	Machinery, cars, chemicals	Bananas, coffee, cocoa.
El Salvador	26	36	31	63	Textiles, machinery, chemicals.	Coffee, vegetable oils.
Guatemala	45	45	44	56	do	Coffee, fibers, bananas.
Haiti	20	28	19	15	Textiles, machinery, cars	Coffee, sisal, cocoa.
Honduras	27	36	13	31	Machinery, textiles, chemicals	Bananas coffee, abaca fiber.
Mexico	522	640	246	349	Machinery, cars, chemicals	Lead, coffee, petroleum.
Nicaragua	21	25	12	25	Machinery, textiles, chemicals	Coffee, vegetable oils, wood.
Panama	92	83	9	17	Textiles, chemicals, machinery.	Bananas, fibers, cocoa.
Paraguay	6	7	4	6	Cars, machinery, textiles	Tanning extract, vegetable oils, meats.
Peru	67	118	35	87	Machinery, cars, chemicals	Lead, zinc, copper.
Uruguay	60	24	58	53	do	Wool, wool tops, canned beef.
Venezuela	517	509	271	441	Machinery, cars, foodstuffs	Crude oil, fuel oil, coffee.

NOTE.—1953 totals include estimate for December; exclude "special category" commodities in export column.
Source: Bureau of Foreign Commerce, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. SMATHERS. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled: "Reds Winning in Guatemala Without Fight," which was published in the Washington Times-Herald on February 17.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS WINNING IN GUATEMALA WITHOUT FIGHT—WRITER SAYS SWIFT AID IS NEEDED THERE

(By Victor Riesel)

Three flying hours from the United States, and only two flying hours from our Panama Canal, the Communist international operates a replica of the Red military machine which it camouflaged as an agrarian reform party in China before it took over the entire mainland.

Just as that Communist machine in the Orient won by default, so have the Soviets virtually defeated us without firing a shot in Guatemala. Now only swift military and propaganda aid can keep all of central America from going Soviet in a few years.

This our State Department has known for years. To my personal knowledge it has been warned repeatedly by several authorities, including the most knowing of all, Serafino Romauldi, the AFL's Latin American expert, that the Soviets are using Guatemala as a vast base.

There have been warnings of submarine landings, of the use of Guatemalan passports by Red operatives, of the seizure and control of the General Confederation of Labor by Soviet agent Lombardo Toledano, of private Communist airfields, and of arms and money shipments to Central American Reds as far north as Mexico.

FRONTIERS HEAVILY GUARDED

So tough is this network that all the countries near Guatemala have informed the United States that they must guard their frontiers with heavy military contingents. The Soviets, operating in Guatemala, have been intriguing against Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama in Central America and against Cuba and the Dominican Republic in the West Indies. Our intelligence files are jammed with this information.

Soviet agents come and go about the Zocolo in Guatemala City, as though it were Red Square in Moscow. For example, during the first week of May 1952, the comintern sent a "rep" in by name of Comrade Ramirez. He arrived by air from Mexico City. He called a secret conference of all Central American and Caribbean Communist leaders.

Then this 45-year-old, well dressed, cultured agent got up and told the comrades how to intensify their undercover, anti-United States revolutionary activities in their respective countries. The Dominican intelligence services passed this on to the United States. We did nothing.

USE DIPLOMATIC OFFICES

There is a pro-Communist legion operating in Guatemala which receives its instructions and money through the Czech diplomatic mission there. Its weapons are Czech. In turn, this legion helps the military cadres of the labor federation now controlled by Toledano.

The link is not with Moscow alone. There are reports of submarine landings and departures of Chinese agents, too, who are specialists in land seizure.

The Soviet intelligence services operate through the Guatemalan diplomatic offices in Paris, traditional center of Russia's western intelligence.

Moscow's influence is also powerful in the Guatemalan radio and press. During the Korean war these media told the usual lies about our alleged germ warfare. The discredited film produced by sovietized Chinese accusing our forces of this type of warfare was shown in the public schools.

And there are government schools to train Communist land reformers and labor leaders.

NO ONE OBJECTS

For the Guatemalans to shout complaints against those of us who have huge files crammed with evidence of Soviet dominance is the sheerest arrogance.

For example when the completely Communist-controlled second labor union congress opened at the Teatro America in Guatemala City, January 29, the government officially congratulated it for perfection of its organization and discipline which is evident in every one of its member labor unions.

When Stalin died last year, the Guatemalan labor dictator, Victor Manuel Gutierrez, insisted that the national congress observe a minute of silence. Then one of Gutierriez's comrades called Stalin:

"The champion of democracy and a guide and teacher of humanity."

No one rose to object. Some congress, indeed.

To top it all, it is virtually illegal to be anti-Communist. The presidential guard shot down anti-Soviet students protesting the discharge of anti-Red members of the supreme court. Anti-Communist radio broadcasters have been beaten and arrested. Anti-Communist youth and political leaders have been murdered—machinegunned in Capone style.

The documentation is available. It has been for several years now. But apparently no one in our Government cared much. Now what are we waiting for?

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8069) to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, sometimes in the heat of debate we use words we later regret. It is a human failing to which all of us are prone. It is an unfortunate human failing, because frequently it drives men so far apart that they are unable to work closely and harmoniously together.

Mr. President, I was somewhat shocked this morning to read a statement by the distinguished Senate majority leader to a correspondent of the reliable New York Times. The distinguished senior Senator from California, in referring to the vote last evening on a purely procedural question, after the Senate had adjourned said: "It's a filibuster."

The distinguished majority leader then explained his theory, that the Democrats in this body were somehow

filibustering against the administration's legislative program.

Mr. President, I have a great deal of affection for the Senator from California. I hope and presume that he must have spoken those words without weighing all their implications. I yielded to him last evening, but he did not make that statement on the floor of the Senate, where it could be refuted. The correspondent of the New York Times did not have my views on this unfounded charge before the article appeared.

I also assume that the majority leader spoke without reflection or without looking at the record, because on last Saturday the distinguished majority leader telephoned me, asked me for my reaction and the reaction of as many Democrats as I could consult, about a proposed unanimous-consent agreement with respect to the Bricker amendment and the pending amendments thereto. I assured the distinguished majority leader, when he first called me, that the Senator from Texas had no objection to an agreement on a specific time to vote, and was ready to vote.

On Monday, after consulting with many of my colleagues, I again assured him that, so far as I had been able to determine, no Democrats would object to his proposed unanimous-consent agreement to vote.

Mr. President, I cannot believe that the Senator from California would think that the Democrats would be willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement in the midst of what he termed their effort to filibuster. Ordinarily I would let such statements pass without further notice, but a reflection has been cast upon certain Members of the Senate; and, in a spirit of friendliness and courtesy, I wish the RECORD to be kept straight.

First of all, Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has not detected any evidence of a filibuster. The Senator from Texas thinks that charge was unfair and untrue. It is still early in the session. It may well be that some Senators have indulged themselves in lengthy remarks; but if that be the case, the greater indulgence has been exercised over on the other side of the aisle. A rough check has been made of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for this session. It discloses that only a little more than 40 percent of the column space has been taken up with Democratic speeches. The Democrats have taken up a little more than 40 percent, although they have 50 percent of the membership of this body. I will concede that it is the best 40 percent. It is the best half of the discussion. But if there has been any filibustering, as was charged by the majority leader after the Senate adjourned last evening, it has come from the other side of the aisle.

Personally I am willing to defend the party of the distinguished majority leader from such a charge. I do not think his party has been filibustering either. Although the Senator from California used 18 columns of the RECORD yesterday after returning from Philadelphia the day before; although it was necessary for us to have numerous quorum calls in order to keep the Senate in session until 5 o'clock—after he had used 18 columns speaking on the amendment, intelligently and thoroughly, it is true—I would be the last one to charge the majority leader with filibustering. However, the RECORD should be made clear. If there are any undue delays they could be because of a surplus of Republican oratory. I might suggest, inasmuch as the majority leader has talked more than 10 times as much as has the minority leader, that perhaps there has been a surplus of oratory from directly across the aisle.

Even more important is the statement of the Senator from California that the delays are designed to block the administration's program. Just what is being blocked? Is the so-called Bricker amendment a part of the administration's program? That was not my impression, although frequently in the days in which we are now living impressions are not always confirmed. Perhaps the majority leader has some information on that question which has been withheld from the minority leader. At any rate, it was the Republican policy committee, not the Democratic policy committee, which scheduled the Bricker amendment for floor debate. We Democrats did not schedule it, although we are ready to vote upon it, and we have been ready to vote upon it for many days, as I assured the majority leader last Monday.

Does the distinguished majority leader imply that labor legislation is being held up? Such legislation has not even been written by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Does he imply that the tax bill is being held up—a tax bill which has yet to emerge from the House Ways and Means Committee? Does he imply that the farm bill is being held up, when hearings have not even started? Is the Senator implying that appropriation bills are being held up, when only one minor measure has even cleared a subcommittee?

Perhaps the Senator thinks, as he indicated to the newspaper reporters, that Hawaiian statehood is being held up. If so, I assure the Senator that the Democrats are ready to vote on the so-called Bricker amendment and proceed with the Hawaiian statehood measure whenever the Senator from California makes the motion. I remind the Senator that on February 4, his own committee voted to report a companion measure, the Alaskan statehood bill, and on February 24, the report had not even been written. Who is blocking what?

Mr. President, we are ready to vote as soon as the Republicans, including the distinguished majority leader, cut down their speeches and allow us to reach a vote. I might point out that the majority leader himself, as I have previously stated, only yesterday used 18 full columns in the RECORD. In other words, the distinguished Senator from California is asking us to listen to Republican speeches all day long and then return to the Senate, after being roused out of bed at night, to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] or some of the other Republicans perfecting amendments. Then, when I woke up this morning, I read that I had been obstructing the President's program. No, Mr. President. I wish to make the situation abundantly clear. I ask my distinguished friend the majority leader to stop, look, and listen.

There was only one issue involved in yesterday's vote. That was the issue of one-man rule versus orderly procedure—one-man rule versus the wishes of the majority of the Members of the Senate.

The Senate has many serious problems on its hands. Over the years it has found that its burdens can be eased by following the rule of comity and cooperation on purely procedural matters. I believe that has been the experience in every legislative body that I know anything of. The general rule has not been broken in the memory of anyone with whom I have talked in the Senate. It is customary for the majority and the minority leaders to keep each other informed on timetables, to exchange views, and to make every attempt possible to agree on behalf of a majority on both sides of the aisle on purely procedural matters.

Mr. President, there are 47 Members in this Chamber who come to me for information concerning the schedule of the Senate. Sometimes I am able to give them the information, if the press has been kind enough to inform me what the program is. Today the program for this evening, if there is to be a program, and for tomorrow evening and for Saturday was graciously given to me by alert newspapermen. In fairness, I should say that after I received the information and passed it on to one or two Members on my side of the aisle, the majority leader let me in on the secret.

When the Senate majority leader, a few days ago, scheduled a night session for yesterday, without informing the minority leader, as well as many of the other 94 Senators, I felt it was a new and dangerous policy. It is a policy which I do not expect to emulate in the Senate next year when we are in the majority.

What the majority leader in effect said was that 48 Members of the Senate can find out when they will go to work and how long they will be required to work if they are avid readers of the newspapers, or if they do not overlook the RECORD the next day.

Mr. President, I do not believe that is the way to treat Members of the Senate. I do not believe that is the way to treat even half the Members of the Senate. I know it is not the way to treat the Independent Party. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, all of us know that Senators work long and hard hours. The majority of us start our working day at 8 o'clock in the morning. By 6 or 7 o'clock in the evening, after the sun has gone down, we have put in 10 or 11 hours of hard work. I do not think that it is fair to ask the Members of the Senate this early in the session, without consulting them and without their acquiescence, to return to the Chamber in the evening, when actually, as we all know, no program is being blocked, there is no log jam of legislation, and there is no emergency of any

description. It is particularly unfair when they object, as many of them have. I recall communicating their objections to the majority leader some weeks ago, when we had an impetuous announcement to the effect that the Senate would meet at 10 o'clock in the morning and stay in session until late in the evening on several evenings.

Mr. President, I am not a man who is hard to get along with. For 7 months I worked with the previous majority leader of this body, the late Senator Taft. I have stated before, but it will bear repeating, that there was never a cross word between us. There was never an occasion on which the Senate was stalled for even 30 seconds over a pure question of procedure.

Prior to that time, as acting majority leader, I worked in close cooperation with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who then was minority leader and, who is now the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate. Not once, while I was acting majority leader and the Senator from New Hampshire was minority leader, did a situation like this arise. We tried to find out what the majority on both sides felt was reasonable, fair, and just; we tried to agree on it, and then we let one or the other announce it to the Senate.

Mr. President, I should like to have the same relationship with the present majority leader as I had with Senator Taft and with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I believe I have tried my best to demonstrate a deep sense of friendship for the majority leader. However, Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show, when it comes to the issue of one man—one man—determining how long we work and when we work, without consulting with other Senators; when it reaches the point of one-man rule versus orderly procedure, I am not going to be very cooperative.

I would suggest that we all try the path of cooperation and comity. The Senator from Texas will do his level best to hold up his part of the load and he will always meet the majority leader 50 percent of the way.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to carry on this discussion today. My distinguished friend and colleague on the other side of the aisle has already made mention of the fact that I have occupied a few pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I suppose in the normal exercise of the duties of a majority leader, in making motions, and so forth, the majority leader in the Senate must occupy more space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD than the minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. However, the Senator from California does not have to charge his sins to the Democrats. The Senator from California charged that we were taking the time and that we were obstructing the program.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say to my friend from Texas—and he is my very good friend—that in the period of time I have served in the Senate, both as acting majority leader during the illness of Bob Taft and since then, I have consulted very fully with the distinguished Senator from Texas, as is quite proper and as I intend to do in the future. I should like to add that nothing that has been said here today will in the slightest diminish the very high regard and feeling of friendship I have for the Senator from Texas.

However, in order to keep the record straight, it should be pointed out that on several occasions, well in advance, I had indicated to the Senate that, in the interest of orderly procedure and the dispatch of the public business, it might be necessary to hold an evening session. I discussed the matter with the distinguished Senator from Texas. I fully understand his point of view in opposition to evening sessions, and his reasons therefor. I certainly would not take any offense with his differing with me as to the necessity of holding evening sessions.

I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18, which was Thursday of last week, at page 2005 of the RECORD, I said:

> I hope Senators will keep themselves in readiness, because we may have to have several evening sessions next week. We shall see what progress we can make on Tuesday. There is further legislative business piling up on the calendar. I hope we may have the cooperation of all Senators.
>
> Some time next week, when we have finished the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1, it will be the intention of the majority leader to ask for a call of the calendar, for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, starting where we left off at the last calendar call. That might be on Wednesday or on Thursday, when we have finished debate on the Bricker amendment.
>
> I admit I was a little too optimistic at the time.
>
> That is as far in advance, Mr. President, as I can now predict.
>
> For the information of Senators, I may say there will not be a Saturday session this week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from California had no discussion with the minority leader as to the evening session referred to, as he admitted last night.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I had no discussion with the Senator from Texas about it. I did not know what progress we would make, but I had to the best of my ability served notice, under my responsibility, not on the basis of one-man rule, because the Senator from Texas and I both know there can be no one-man rule in this body, and there should not be. Whoever occupies this position, having in mind the Senator's optimistic estimate as to who may occupy it next time as majority leader, would be faced with the same problems. We never know from day to day whether we can finish debate and vote on a measure. If there had been a vote by 5 or 6 o'clock last night there would, of course, have been no need for an evening session. On the day before yesterday I did not precipitate an evening session without advance notice. I said it might be necessary to hold an evening session on the following day.

I do not care to prolong the discussion, Mr. President, but I should like to put into the RECORD for the information of the Senate the fact that I think I have given advance notice of the program of the Senate as far in advance as it was possible to see. I am informed—I have not had an opportunity personally to check the information—that in the 33 days on which the Senate has been in session, I have given notice on 25 occasions, as far in advance as I could see, as to what the program of the Senate would be. As I said last night, I gave to the minority notice on the same day our own Policy Committee had the information.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum showing the dates on which I have given such notice to the Senate.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Date:	Page
Jan. 6	4
Jan. 7	77
Jan. 11	90, 118
Jan. 14	255
Jan. 18	353
Jan. 19	451
Jan. 20	468, 495
Jan. 22	631
Jan. 25	703
Jan. 25	829
Jan. 28	923
Feb. 1	1051
Feb. 2	1120
Feb. 3	1229, 1243, 1256
Feb. 4	1296
Feb. 5	1407
Feb. 8	1423, 1472
Feb. 9	1578
Feb. 10	1607
Feb. 11	1663
Feb. 16	1782
Feb. 17	1887
Feb. 18	2005
Feb. 23	2178
Feb. 24	2217

Twenty-five times in the 33 days of session.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have felt that in the past the distinguished majority leader has given such information. I think that in the 25 instances to which the Senator refers, with the possible exception of two, there were joint agreements. The Senator has said in effect, "This is what we should like to do. We have considered it and reasoned it out, and have added some things and eliminated others, and we have agreed." That is not the policy to which I am objecting. In at least two instances, the first information I had about the program was when I read it next day in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not care to prolong this discussion. I am anxious to get on with the voting on the pending amendment, which is that of the Senator from Ohio [Mr.

BRICKER] to Senate Joint Resolution 1. I hope we can finish it this afternoon by 5 or 6 o'clock. If we shall not have finished it by that time, I shall recommend to the Senate, of course, understanding that the Senate is the sole judge of its deliberations, that we hold a session this evening. I would not expect the Senate to be held in any prolonged session this evening, certainly not beyond 9 o'clock. I would recommend, also, that we have an evening session tomorrow, and, if we cannot finish the work by that time, I would recommend that we hold a Saturday session.

Senators may not wish to meet that schedule, but I have the responsibility for making that recommendation.

I understand the Senator from Texas is opposed to evening sessions, but I think most of the Senators—and I have talked with a number of them from time to time on both sides of the aisle—have at least indicated that, in their judgment, after debate has proceeded for a certain length of time, oftentimes a vote can be obtained by holding an evening session when otherwise the debate may be thrown into another week.

I do not think I have been unreasonable in making my recommendations. We have had only two evening sessions so far this year. I hope we shall not have to have many of them. I have been a Member of the Senate long enough to know, however, that in the closing days of the session it is frequently necessary to meet until very late at night, or all night. I think that is a hardship on Members of the Senate. But if I am to be foreclosed as to holding evening sessions, I think there will be a great many things in the President's program which will be very difficult to accomplish. I want to be in position to recommend in February or in March or in April evening sessions of the Senate if that be necessary in order to keep the legislative program moving along.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, as the minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has well stated, a number of us who are particularly interested in the pending amendment have been ready to vote for some time. When the courtesy was shown me a few days ago of inquiring as to whether I would be opposed to a unanimous-consent agreement to vote, I said that I personally would not be opposed to it, but as I represented others, I was trying to express, in connection with a number of other Senators, the view that we were opposed to any amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

We have felt that the debate has about run its course in terms of being useful or constructive in helping the membership to reach a proper conclusion based upon the facts, the evidence, and the arguments.

I wanted to ask the distinguished minority leader—I mean, the distinguished majority leader——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not sure but that the Senator was correct the first time. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENNINGS. Some 10 days ago, with reference to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the distinguished Senator from California suggested, on page 1789 of the RECORD of February 16, that he had in his possession a memorandum from the Attorney General of the United States. I took it that the memorandum related either to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio or the substitute amendment of the Senator from Georgia, or both, and that it also related to certain provisos which might have been added to the so-called George substitute, having reference, particularly, to the powers of the President as Commander in Chief and to the authority of the President to receive foreign ambassadors and ministers, and as to whether, in the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States, such provisos would tend to cure any of what seemed to some of us to be patent defects in the substitute amendment.

I hope I am not transgressing on any confidence, but it seems to some of us that upon the eve of voting, upon the threshold of our taking a vote, certainly, on the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, and, thereafter, upon the substitute amendment, as I understand the legislative procedure, we might have the benefit of the memorandum which the distinguished majority leader assured us some 10 days ago would in due course and at the proper time be made public, and of which the Senate would be given the benefit.

I hope I am not in anywise at this time bringing any pressure to bear upon a matter which certainly is within the discretion of the majority leader, but I am certain that some of us would like to have the benefit of the opinion of the Attorney General with respect to the amendment and the substitute, so that we might conceivably study the opinion and be guided to some extent by it, if it meets with our views, or at least, be enlightened by it.

For that reason, I think it would be most helpful if we could know at this time, I may say to the distinguished majority leader, what the memorandum contained. Is there any objection to letting us have it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, as I pointed out to him before I had received the memorandums from the Attorney General's office, dealing with this subject, and I suppose other prospective amendments which had been discussed from time to time, I have not felt at liberty, up to the moment, at least, to put them into the RECORD or make them available. At least, they were not given to me with the understanding that they would be made public; and until I shall have become completely satisfied that that would be the proper thing to do, I would not wish to make them available.

Frankly, I can see no reason why, I may say to the Senator, they should not be made available, and during the course of the afternoon I shall try to determine whether there would be any objection to having them made available.

Mr. HENNINGS. Without attempting to engage in any disputatious contention with my good friend, the Senator from California, I was relying upon his statement, which appears at page 1789 of the RECORD of February 16. I shall read it only for the purpose of refreshing the recollection of the distinguished majority leader, if I may take the liberty of doing so, with full recognition that it is within his discretion as to how and when, or if and when, he desires to release the letter or memorandum, if such exists.

The majority leader, who was the Presiding Officer at the time, made the statement in reply to a question asked him by the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]:

> The PRESIDING OFFICER. The memorandum—it is in the form of a memorandum, rather than an official opinion—was made available, at the request of the Senator from California, while these discussions were going on.
>
> It will be my purpose to make the memorandum available to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and the other Members of the Senate in ample time before the debate on the George amendment gets under way, and before any voting regarding that amendment occurs.

My reading of that statement was not, of course, for the purpose of impeaching my good friend, the distinguished Senator from California, but many Senators have been relying somewhat upon the release of the memorandum of the legal adviser of the President of the United States, the Attorney General. We have been told that we would have the benefit of it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall give the question further consideration, to see if the memorandum can be made available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from California labor under the illusion that the minority leader would have ever agreed to a unanimous-consent agreement in the middle of a filibuster he is alleged to be conducting?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. I think the Senator from Texas misunderstands the situation. I have not charged that the Senator from Texas was personally conducting a filibuster, but I did indicate that, in my judgment, if I am not to be in a position to recommend an evening session so as to help clear the decks of pending legislation after a reasonable period of debate—and it seems to me that 5 weeks is a reasonable period for discussion——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It seems so to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. When we come to other proposed legislation, perhaps equally controversial, and we near the end of the session, the entire legislative program could be blocked.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not wish to lend any credence or attach any substance to the majority leader's news-

paper charge that we on this side of the aisle are filibustering; but before we proceed with the voting, I wish to confirm my memory.

Does not the majority leader recall my assuring him on Saturday of last week and on Monday of this week that, so far as the Democratic leader was concerned, the Senate could proceed to a vote on the Bricker amendment, and on all related amendments, under a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have not disputed the Senator's statement that he thought the unanimous-consent agreement I proposed——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does not the Senator from California recall that statement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I recall it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In that respect, certainly we have been in complete agreement. The only point I wish to make—and I am certain the Senator from California will agree—is that on last Friday the Senator from California said there would be no Saturday session; that no business would be transacted on Monday; that very likely there would be no votes on Tuesday.

On Wednesday it became necessary to have several quorum calls in order to carry on the business of the Senate until almost 5 o'clock. Then, like a blast out of the sky, it was decided that we should do our legislating in the dark, after the sun had gone down.

The Senator from Texas believes that the majority leader and the minority leader can reason these problems together, without asking the indulgence of all our colleagues. I have assured the distinguished majority leader that I am at his call at any time of the day or night. I will be in touch with him as soon as I receive such a call.

But I think, and the vote last night seems to indicate, that a majority of the Senate believe that at this stage of the game we would lose more than we would gain by asking Senators to work more than 7 hours per day in the Senate Chamber.

I hope that these remarks will be persuasive with the Senator from California, and that he will consider them.

I think the occurrence last evening did not expedite the business of the Senate in any way. I do not believe it will expedite the business of the Senate this evening.

I appeal to the Senator from California to attempt to evolve, in cooperation with the minority, a program which will bring about expeditious action. There is no tendency on this side of the aisle to delay legislation. Our desire is to solve our problems efficiently, instead of having Senators called back at night in order to try to legislate in the night. We have never been successful in doing that, and the record of every legislative body establishes the point that to do so is a mistake.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for his remarks, and also for his cooperation, which has been very helpful during this session. I thank him sincerely. I shall certainly endeavor to make the cooperation mutual for the remainder of the session.

I should like to have a vote on the pending amendment. I can assure the distinguished Senator from Texas that since I did not plan to have the Senate continue in session beyond 9 o'clock last evening, I do not quite understand his statement that it would have been necessary to get Senators out of bed.

Mr. President, may I ask what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], to insert, on page 3, after line 9, a new section. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. With reference to the point just made by the Senator that it had not been his plan to keep the Senate in session longer than 9 o'clock, this is the first information I have had of that. I thank the Senator for telling me on Thursday what he had planned to do on Wednesday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That statement was made several times yesterday during the discussion.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I am afraid I did not understand the majority leader, in connection with my request for the Attorney General's memorandum, which was adverted to 9 days ago, on February 16, as to whether we are presently to have the benefit of the memorandum, before the vote upon the pending amendment, or are to have it sometime hereafter; and if so, about when? I assume the distinguished majority leader has the memorandum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I now recall the incident which the Senator has read into the RECORD, it occurred at a time when very few Senators were in the Chamber, and I had been called upon to preside.

Mr. HENNINGS. The distinguished Senator from California was occupying the Chair.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I did not, obviously, have my papers with me at the time the Senator from Arkansas raised the question. I mentioned at that time that I hoped to have the memorandum available prior to action by the Senate on the so-called George amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from California a question. I am definitely of the opinion that I shall vote for the Bricker amendment, the one on which a vote has been ordered; but it might be that the argument of the Attorney General, or his memorandum, would be so convincing as to cause me to change my mind. Certainly I should like to know what the memorandum contains before I might possibly make a mistake. I think the Senate is entitled to know, one way or the other, whether the memorandum will be made available, before action on the Bricker amendment is concluded.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe I had indicated to the Senate at an earlier date, and my statement stands, that so far as both amendments were concerned, the Department of Justice did not feel that either one was acceptable as it stood.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the distinguished majority leader propose to give the Senate the benefit of the memorandum, with its citations, and prepared somewhat in legal form, so that we can apply the reasoning and conclusions of the chief legal officer of the United States to the amendment, or are we to be restricted and, therefore, constrained to accept the statement that the Attorney General approves of neither the Bricker amendment, which is the pending question, or the George amendment, without any reasons therefor being given?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think I made clear to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that it was not in the form of a formal legal opinion. I believe I said that in my statement. It was in the form of a memorandum, and it was a rather brief one. It was addressed to the Senator from California. I am not normally in the habit of making public personal correspondence, or correspondence of that kind, without the permission of the one who sent the information, because it was not written for public purposes. If it had been, it would have been released some time ago.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not wish to quibble, or labor the point, but I had understood from reading the RECORD, and I happened to be on the floor at the time, that a memorandum had been sent by the Attorney General to the majority leader. Relying only on what the majority leader said, I had understood the memorandum was to be released and made public for the benefit of the Senate. I do not necessarily wish to hold the majority leader to that commitment, but the majority leader stated:

> It will be my purpose to make the memorandum available to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and the other Members of the Senate in ample time before the debate on the George amendment gets under way, and before any voting regarding that amendment occurs.

Of course, the debate on the George amendment has been under way for some time. The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] spoke to it this afternoon. A number of us have addressed ourselves to that amendment over the period of the last 2 weeks.

I would appreciate it very much if the distinguished majority leader could tell some of us who are interested whether or not we are to be given the benefit of any opinion from the Attorney General of the United States relating to the Bricker amendment or the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, known as the George substitute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Before the Senate starts voting on the question, after a quorum call, as soon as I can leave the floor of the Senate I shall endeavor to determine whether the memorandum can be made available.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], inserting on page 3, after line 9, a new section. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the discussion. I desire a vote to be taken on it at the earliest possible time. I do not think I could be charged with filibustering in any way on the pending amendment, or on any other amendment, so far as that is concerned. My remarks shall take only 1 or 2 minutes.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the particular amendment now pending. I refer to a few statements which I made the other day, when some of the Senators now here were not present on the floor.

The three perfecting amendments to the committee text already adopted are acceptable to me and to the administration. Taken together, however, they afford inadequate protection against the danger of treaty law.

In my judgment, the so-called George amendment is also inadequate. It is good so far as it goes. It does not go far enough in that it does not make treaties as well as executive agreements nonself-executing.

For the advice of my colleagues now on the floor, let me say that this amendment would merely place the United States in the same position in which practically every other country in the world is at the present time in regard to treaties.

My amendment to the committee text retains two essential features of the original resolution. First, it helps to insure that the American people will be governed by laws written by their own elected representatives rather than by treaty provisions, the meaning of which is often impossible to ascertain at the time of Senate consent to ratification. And, secondly, this amendment to the committee text will prevent a President of the United States from making domestic law by international agreements not approved by either House of Congress. I cannot honestly describe as adequate any constitutional amendment lacking those two essential safeguards. The George amendment contains the latter provision exactly in the words I have used. Accordingly, the vote on the pending amendment will be properly interpreted as a vote for or against the substance of the so-called Bricker amendment. The pending amendment gives every Senator an opportunity to be recorded for or against what is popularly known as the Bricker amendment. To the best of my knowledge—and this is very important—no administration spokesman and no Member of the Senate has objected to the provision making treaties nonself-executing as domestic law subject to the right of two-thirds of the Senate to make them effective immediately as internal law.

In my statement yesterday and in previous statements, I pointed out that it is constitutionally impossible for the Senate of the United States to protect the reserved powers of the several States by including a typical Federal-State clause in a reservation to the treaty. As an example, I have referred to the Senate reservation to the Charter of the Organization of American States approved by the Senate in 1951, which has been referred to on the floor of the Senate today. That reservation reads as follows:

> None of its provisions shall be considered as enlarging the powers of the Federal Government of the United States or limiting the powers of the several States of the Federal Union with respect to any matters recognized under the Constitution as being within the reserved powers of the several States.

Yesterday the senior Senator from Wisconsin referred to the same treaty and to the Senate's reservation in an effort to show that the Senate was capable of protecting States rights in advising and consenting to treaties. Obviously, the senior Senator from Wisconsin and I cannot both be right on this point. One of us must be wrong. Such a reservation either protects the reserved powers of the States or it does not. In my judgment, it does not. My amendment to the committee text will make such a reservation effective.

This is a point on which lawyers both for and against any treaty-control amendment are in substantial agreement. Mr. Carl B. Rix, past president of the American Bar Association, believes that a treaty-control amendment is necessary. In his appearance before the Senate Judiciary Committee, he pointed out—as shown on pages 1029 to 1031 of the hearings—that the reservation attached to the Charter of the Organization of American States is totally ineffective for the accomplishment of its intended purpose.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] said he wanted the rights of the States protected. In the amendment I have submitted, provision is made for protecting all the States, so far as it is in the control of the Senate to do so; under the provisions of the amendment, the Senate will be able to make effective, as internal law, any treaty.

The reason why such a reservation is ineffective is that the Senate cannot, by way of reservation to a treaty, deny to the whole Congress its constitutional power, under the rule of Missouri against Holland, to implement a treaty, the reserved powers of the States to the contrary notwithstanding. There is no rhyme or reason why the Senate of the United States should be incapable of protecting the reserved powers of the States from the impact of treaty law, if that is its desire.

A report of the New York State Bar Association opposing any treaty-control amendment was signed on June 6, 1952, by William D. Mitchell, John W. Davis, Lewis R. Gulick, John J. Mackrell, and Harrison Tweed. This report appears on pages 618–625 of the hearings. The report shows very definitely that that is the opinion of the attorneys who were making the investigation for the New York State Bar Association.

The signers of the report are leading opponents of any limitation on the treatymaking power. But on page 621 they admit that a Federal-State clause may not be effective to protect the reserved powers of the States. They point out that under the rule of Missouri against Holland Congress would probably have full power to implement all provisions of the Human Rights Covenants, notwithstanding any attempted limitation on the power of the Congress by the Senate.

It has also been brought out in the debate that the American Bar Association's section on international and comparative law does not agree with the position of the American Bar Association itself. The American Bar Association has consistently following the recommendations of its committee on peace and law through the United Nations, and has consistently rejected the recommendations of its section on international and comparative law. It is significant, therefore, that the committee on peace and law and the section on international law were able to agree on the point that a Federal-State clause could not protect the reserved powers of the States. This conclusion appears in the September 1, 1951, report of the committee on peace and law of the American Bar Association, at page 36. That committee and the American Bar Association section on international law reached agreement on the following conclusion:

> An international treaty cannot be safeguarded by a clause in the treaty or by reservation or understanding against the expansion of the limited power of the Federal Congress in the United States to such extent as necessary to fulfill the obligation under the treaty if Congress determines to exercise such power.

Mr. President, several inaccurate statements made yesterday by the senior Senator from Wisconsin should be corrected. He said the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association approved the Bricker amendment by a vote of 113 to 33, but that 77 refused to vote. Actually, the vote was in the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, which is the association's official spokesman. I am reliably informed that all members of the house of delegates who attended the meeting in Boston last year voted on the issue. The 77 members of the house of delegates who did not vote were unable, for one reason or another, to be in Boston at the time of the meeting of the house of delegates.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin also said that as various State bar associations examine the subject "they are going on record against the Bricker amendment." Mr. President, to the best of my knowledge, the New Jersey Bar Association is the only State bar association opposed to this amendment. On the other hand, the amendment has been approved by the National Association of Attorneys General, and by the following State bar associations: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas,

Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and several others, since I made the tabulation.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the pending amendment is in substance, if not actually in words and form, the amendment which has been approved three times by the American Bar Association, by the American Medical Association, by the Farm Bureau of the United States, by the Grange of the United States, by the Association of Attorneys General—which has twice approved the amendment at the association's national sessions, and by other national organizations, as set forth in the 3-page list which will be found in the RECORD.

Mr. President, it is my hope that for the protection of the liberties of the people of the United States, the Senate will go on record to the extent of providing that treaties shall be confined to the powers given under the Constitution, and that the unalienable rights of the American people shall be protected from invasion by treaties or by executive agreements.

If we do that, we shall have responded not only to the requests and, in fact, the demands of the various organizations I have mentioned, but, I am confident, to the wish and will of 75 percent of the people of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in view of certain statements made a little earlier today, to the effect that the majority leader's remarks have taken up a certain number of columns in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to assure the minority leader that I had not intended to speak again on the pending subject.

I rise to speak now only because of the point which has been raised regarding my inquiry of the Attorney General as to whether it would be permissible, so far as he was concerned—and since at least one Senator had made such a request—to make his memorandum available.

I wish to say that I am prepared to make it available but not for the purpose of prolonging debate in the Senate.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader will yield to me, let me say that I did not understand him to say the memorandum is being released only because I requested its release.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; but the Senator from Missouri has called the memorandum to my attention. Frankly, because of the many problems I have had, the matter had slipped my mind.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does not the Senator from California believe the memorandum may illuminate the subject, as well as enlighten us regarding some of the doubt which may have surrounded the entire, broad question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Frankly, Mr. President, I think most of the points covered in the memorandum have already been covered amply in the debate. However, I am prepared to read the memorandum.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JENNER in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Mansfield
Anderson	Gore	Martin
Barrett	Green	Maybank
Beall	Griswold	McCarthy
Bennett	Hayden	McClellan
Bricker	Hendrickson	Millikin
Burke	Hennings	Morse
Bush	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hill	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Neely
Byrd	Holland	Pastore
Capehart	Humphrey	Payne
Carlson	Hunt	Potter
Case	Ives	Purtell
Chavez	Jackson	Robertson
Clements	Jenner	Russell
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kerr	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Thye
Ellender	Kuchel	Upton
Ferguson	Langer	Watkins
Flanders	Lehman	Welker
Frear	Lennon	Wiley
Fulbright	Long	Williams
George	Magnuson	Young
Gillette	Malone	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the memorandum which has been referred to reads as follows:

MEMORANDUM

It is now suggested that the George amendment to the Constitution should be modified so as to take the following form:

"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"SEC. 2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of Congress—"

This was the additional language which was then under discussion, which I do not believe—at least up to the present time—has been included in the amendment of the Senator from Georgia—

"but this section shall not be construed to affect the power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States as provided in article II, section 2, of the Constitution, or the power of the President to receive ambassadors and other public ministers as provided in article II, section 3, of the Constitution. The enumeration of certain powers of the President in this section shall not be construed to deny or disparage other powers vested in him by the Constitution."

It is assumed that the enactment of section 1 would be for the sole purpose of making it clear that no treaty or other international agreement could override or contravene the Constitution.

Section 2 in its now proposed form appears to have the purpose of preserving the constitutional balance of power between the Executive and Congress in accordance with the views expressed by the President. This is accomplished by excluding from the sweep of the section agreements made by the President within the scope of his constitutional powers as Commander in Chief and to receive ambassadors, and by then providing that the enumeration of these powers shall not be construed to deny or disparage the President's other powers under the Constitution.

To eliminate possible misconstruction and the contention that while presidential powers are not to be curtailed, they are nevertheless within the limitations of the section, it is suggested that it be modified so that the meaning may be perfectly clear. The section would thus read as follows:

"SEC. 2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of Congress, but this section shall not apply to any agreement made under the power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States as provided in article II, section 2, of the Constitution, or under his power to receive ambassadors and other public ministers as provided in article II, section 3, of the Constitution, or under any other powers vested in him by the Constitution."

Your attention is called to a possible effect of section 2 both in its original and revised form. It might be contended that this section could be used to elevate executive agreements implemented by majority action of the Congress to a level where it might be possible to substitute them for treaties.

The memorandum directed to the pending Bricker amendment reads as follows:

MEMORANDUM

Substitute amendment, Calendar No. 408, to Senate Joint Resolution 1 of 2-4-54-A, is as follows:

"SEC. 3. A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by the Congress unless in advising and consenting to a treaty the Senate, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, shall provide that such treaty may become effective as internal law without legislation by the Congress."

This proposal in the first portion would take section 2 of the substitute amendment of Senator GEORGE and add to it the words "a treaty or other" so as to cause a limitation on the effectiveness of treaties within the United States similar to that provided for executive agreements in the George draft. It would radically change the treaty process. An act of the Congress would be required to make a treaty as well as an international agreement effective within the United States and by so doing there would be transferred to the House a substantial portion of the participation in foreign affairs which has been the exclusive domain of the Senate since the Constitution was adopted.

This provision would require two separate procedures for any treaty to have domestic effect. First, it would have to be ratified by two-thirds of the Senate and thereafter legislation by a majority of the Congress would give it effect within the United States.

This proposal uses the term "internal law" which is not found in the Constiution or any of its amendments. Since this phrase is not what is known as words of art and lawyers who have worked in this field have generally commented that it is impossible to know what it means, enactment of the section would place in the Constitution an expression as to the meaning of which we can only speculate.

The latter part of the section merely gives expression to the power the Senate now has

and would cause the treaty to become effective within the United States without any action by the Congress. If it is intended merely to deal with the question as to whether a treaty shall be self-executing, that could be handled much more satisfactorily by not amending the Constitution and merely have the treaty recite when it should become effective.

Concerning international agreements the section would transfer presidential powers in the field of foreign affairs and as Commander in Chief to the Congress and thus materially disturb the historic division of powers between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. There might be serious consequences to limiting the President's power as Commander in Chief concerning his ability to provide for the protection of the United States. Insofar as it is necessary or desirable for executive agreements to have effect within the United States, the hands of the Executive would be tied during such time as Congress is not in session. The President would not be allowed to make effective within the country the same kind of agreements that were made in Europe during the last war should there be an attack on the Western Hemisphere or the United States.

This proposal would also limit the power of the President under the Constitution to receive Ambassadors and Foreign Ministers and to conduct foreign relations. An act of Congress would be required to give legal effect to the President's agreements in this area. Authority of the President would be so seriously curtailed that it could not be expected that responsible governments would deal with him on the basis of equality.

Regard should be had for numerous day-by-day agreements that have to be executed by the President or on his behalf in the handling of the ordinary business between the United States and foreign countries. If Congress had to act on each of these agreements, delay in itself might make the action of little, if any, value. If Congress happened to be in recess the situation could not be handled if it involved any application within the United States.

The amendment does not indicate whether the Congress would have any power to authorize action in advance. In fact, it is quite clear as to treaties that Congress could only act if the Senate consents to ratification. The courts might decide that in view of such language Congress can act as to executive agreements only when they have been negotiated and it is known just what legislation is required by the Congress. It could be fairly assumed that the adoption of such a section will involve the United States in many years of litigation to determine just how little power the Government had in trying to handle a particular emergency situation involving its foreign relations.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I ask the distinguished majority leader whether the memorandum from the Attorney General in opposition to both the so-called Bricker amendment and the George substitute is expressive as well of the views of the President of the United States, as the majority leader understands them to be?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; this only purports to be a memorandum from the Attorney General of the United States. I do not want the Senator from Missouri to bring the President into it. I have already stated to him what my judgment was on that point. So far as I know, the President has not read the memorandum. I do not think it was submitted to him. I assume that the Attorney General of the United States is a member of the President's official family.

Mr. HENNINGS. I certainly do not want, necessarily, to attach to the expressions of the Attorney General the imprimatur of the President of the United States, except that I should like to elicit from the majority leader whether it is his understanding that the President of the United States does concur with the conclusions in the memorandum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; and I will say to the Senator from Missouri that I do not wish him to press me on that point. So far as I know, the memorandum is known to the Attorney General, his office, and the persons who drafted it. I have no knowledge that the memorandum was submitted to the President, that he read it, or approved it. I do not want any inference drawn, other than that it came as a memorandum from the Attorney General in response to my request.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to make it clear to the distinguished majority leader that it is not my purpose to draw anything from him by inference which is unsupported or not justified by the facts. Of course, it has been the common understanding, and has been verified by the majority leader, as he stated on the floor of the Senate, that the President is opposed to all pending amendments and substitutes.

Now, Mr. President, at the 11th hour, before we vote, we have read into the RECORD the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States. I assume that the Attorney General is speaking in his capacity as the chief legal officer of the Government and of the administration and in his capacity as the legal officer of the President. That is a fair assumption, I assume.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Attorney General is not the official legal adviser to the Senator from California. I submitted an inquiry to him. He returned to me a memorandum which is not in the form of a formal opinion. I do not know just how formal the Attorney General is when he is asked for an opinion by the President. I assume he gives the President an opinion in the nature of a legal brief. In my opinion the memorandum I have before me is not in that category. It is rather short in itself. It is only what it purports to be, namely, a memorandum from the office of the Attorney General to the Senator from California in response to an inquiry made by the Senator from California.

I believe we should let it rest there, because I do not know, and I have no knowledge, that it was ever submitted to the President of the United States.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the majority leader.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is this the memorandum which I requested of the majority leader about a week or 10 days ago?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from California believe I have ample time and that other Members of the Senate have ample time to consider it, approximately 2 minutes before we vote?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the memorandum to which the Senator from Arkansas had reference the other day pertained to the George amendment, which is one of the two memorandums I have read today.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for one more question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have only one more question. As a lawyer, I understand that the terms "memorandum," "legal opinion," and "brief" are often used interchangeably. We have short memorandums, and we have many lengthy ones. We have short briefs and other types of briefs. The distinguished majority leader does not suggest, I assume, by way of any disparagement or other implication relating to the stature of the memorandum, that it is not the Attorney General's best opinion on the subject.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; the Senator knows I did not have that in mind. I have not attempted to disparage it. However, I did not want to have read into it some implication that should not be read into it.

Mr. HENNINGS. I stated my question in the affirmative, because I am sure the Senator from California does not intend to disparage it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before I proceed I should like to inquire of the distinguished majority leader by whom the memorandum was signed actually.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The memorandum itself is not signed.

Mr. GEORGE. So far as my amendment is concerned, that is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The memorandum itself, I may say to the Senator from Georgia, is not signed. Neither memorandum is signed. The memorandums came to me under a letter of transmittal from Mr. J. Lee Rankin, Assistant Attorney General. My information is that it was written at a time when Mr. Brownell was out of town, but he was consulted by telephone and was familiar with the general facts in the case. It was actually sent to me by Mr. J. Lee Rankin, Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement.

The power to amend the Constitution of the United States, by a two-thirds vote of the Senate and the House of Representatives, forgetting for the moment the power of the States themselves to pass upon the amendment, is a power which is not given to the Attorney General or to any other officer of the Government. It is given to the House of Representatives and to the Senate of the United States. The President does not have to approve a constitutional amendment. Why should he? The President acts under the Constitution of the United States. Constitutional amendments go to the people themselves

who are sovereign in the Nation. The President is not called upon to approve or disapprove. I would not be critical of the President if he expressed his opinion as a citizen or as an officer of the United States, but we are now dealing with fundamentals.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] will not forget that if we are to be governed by what the Attorney General says or by what the President says, then we may as well go home and let the President and the Attorney General operate the entire Government, even on so vital a question as a proposed constitutional amendment, which must go to the people of the States and in order to become a part of the Constitution must be approved by three-fourths of the States. They have the final right.

I would resign my seat, Mr. President, before I would be governed by such an odd Attorney General as is the present Attorney General on the subject of a constitutional amendment. I would think I was occupying a position of which I was entirely and utterly unworthy.

The Attorney General of the United States has stated that he does not like the Bricker amendment. I have said I do not agree with it in one respect, which is a vital respect, to my mind, but I appreciate the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Ohio and the great service which he has rendered in this contest.

We are asked to take an amendment not of the Attorney General himself, though he is a rather curious kind of an Attorney General, but we are asked to take the memorandum of one of his assistants. Next year we will be asked to take the recommendation of one of the clerks in the Department of Justice and to abdicate the high responsibility we have—of doing what? Of formulating a constitutional amendment to be submitted to the States for their consideration.

The Constitution places no responsibility upon the executive branch and it places no power in the executive branch in that regard.

I am speaking plainly, Mr. President, because this is more important than is any immediate constitutional amendment. If the President, whoever he may be—and I have disclaimed any purpose of questioning any acts of the present President, and I have said that no particular order of the present President was a matter of concern to the people of the United States in the sense that they should be apprehensive of what may or may not happen—if the President of the United States, or his Attorney General, or an assistant to the Attorney General—and, next year, a clerk in the office of the Attorney General—can tell the Congress of the United States what constitutes a proper amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which must be referred to the very source of power in this Republic, namely, the sovereign people themselves, then we have come to a pitiable state.

I know very well that the President has not sent any message to the Senate on this question. I can assure the Senator from Missouri that he has not, because he would not do that.

I am not surprised that even the Attorney General has not; but he has an assistant who would send up a memorandum. So far as the merits of his memorandum are concerned, they are entitled to respectful consideration, just as the comments of anyone else would receive respectful consideration. I assume that the Attorney General appeared before the Judiciary Committee and made his statement and presented his case. I am sure he was discharging a duty which he owed to the Judiciary Committee. He may have been speaking the sentiments of the President, or he may not have been. But what I am trying to say, Mr. President, is that everything has gone when men in this body do not have the courage to decide what constitutional amendment they will submit to the people of the States.

I cannot make it any plainer. The President does not have anything to do with it. He does not approve or disapprove the amendment if it be passed by the Congress. He may be concerned about it as a citizen, a well-informed citizen, and a citizen of proper motive and purpose, all of which I accord to the President. That may be true, also, of the Attorney General. But that is not their function. Not at all.

Mr. President, a few days ago we heard read Washington's Farewell Address. He appealed to all his successors and to all the American people who would come after him not to disregard or evade or destroy the Constitution by usurpation, but if, from experience, there should be any needed changes, to submit such changes in the way provided in the Constitution, to the people themselves or their representatives.

That is all that is suggested by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. Is he wrong in that, whether we agree or disagree with his total proposal?

That is all I am suggesting. Is there anything wrong about that? If two-thirds of the Members of this body do not wish to submit a constitutional amendment, all well and good. But I abjure Senators not to go back home and say that they based their action upon the written memorandum of an assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. Find a better basis on which to put it.

Mr. President, there are some Members of this body who think no constitutional amendment should be submitted. All good and well. Any Senator who honestly so believes that can vote that way. He is all right and is on safe ground.

I have tried to show by what I have said, and other Senators have tried to show, that there was a reason for some constitutional amendment. I have tried to trim one down to the very minimum that would reach what I believe to be an evil which has developed under our present system.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio is proposing almost the same amendment, except that he wishes to make treaties also the rule in local courts, so far as their jurisdiction extends, only when the provisions of a treaty, affecting internal law, have been approved by Congress, or by congressional legislation, which I believe is the phrase the Senator from Ohio uses, and means the same thing, in my opinion.

Mr. President, I have said repeatedly that I myself do not wish to disturb the relationship between the States and the Federal Government in the field of treatymaking, or the relationship between the executive branch and the Congress, or the Senate, in the field of treatymaking. I believe that when a treaty is submitted, and two-thirds of the Senate consent to it and vote for it, that is sufficient, and that we either know or should know the meaning of the treaty before we vote upon it; and when we vote to ratify it, nothing further should be required to make the treaty the law of the land, or domestic law. I have heretofore so stated.

I have also said that I think the 10th amendment answered itself in this contest. I am a profound believer in the rights of the States. I believe in local self-government as strongly as does any other Member of the Senate, but I know very well that under the 10th amendment, and under the Constitution, the States themselves surrendered the power of treatymaking, and expressly denied it to themselves in another section of the Constitution. I know very well that the 10th amendment itself is not a limitation upon the power of treatymaking, under every decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, from the earliest days down to the Curtiss-Wright case in very recent years.

I know very well that it has been the rule, ever since the debates in the Virginia Convention, when the two leading members, advocating the Constitution or criticizing, as the case might be, themselves stood on the floor of that convention and said that treatymaking was not limited, even by the 10th amendment. It was limited, it was said subsequently by the Court; and the Court in almost every case has been at pains to point out that the treatymaking power was not an unlimited power. But it never having been decided that any particular treaty went beyond the Constitution itself, no authoritative ruling ever has been made by the Supreme Court of the United States as to just where the limitation is to be found, save the general statement in the Constitution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So that the record may be kept clear, and for the benefit of Senators who may have entered the Chamber subsequent to the reading of the memorandum, I wish to say that I do not think it is quite fair to the Office of the Attorney General to say either that they are interposing themselves in this discussion, or have, in fact, as the Senator may have implied, sought to instruct Members of the legislative branch of the Government as to how they should vote.

The fact is that the memorandum was prepared at my request, in order to get such facts as the Department of Justice might have from the legal viewpoint, as to what the effect would be of certain

proposals which had been made in two amendments before the Senate. I thought it was entirely proper to make such a request.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not question that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It so happens that with respect to the language which the Department indicated might be satisfactory to them, I fully agree with the Senator from Georgia that the language went so far as to nullify the amendment. I may say to the Senator from Georgia that I feel there are other factors which would cause me to vote against the amendment. I outlined some of them yesterday, because they are serious ones, as the Senator understands.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not critical of the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The factor most disturbing to me is that I am fearful that, while the Senator from Georgia desires to solve the problem relative to executive agreements, we may inadvertently be putting into the Constitution a way of bypassing the normal treatymaking power of the Senate of the United States, by making it much easier for future Presidents to handle such questions through the method of merely getting a bare majority in the Senate and the House to approve, which would be a much different situation from getting a two-thirds vote of ratification in the Senate.

I make this statement for the RECORD merely because I do not think the Attorney General, in fairness to him, should be placed in the other light.

Secondly, this memorandum, is not from some minor clerk. I do not think that is the issue. The memorandum happens to have come from an Assistant Attorney General, a man who has been familiar with the situation and with the discussions that have been in progress. The request I made was to the Attorney General of the United States, but during his absence a letter was sent to me, signed by Mr. Rankin. That is the whole story.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am not critical of the Senator from California. I am not critical of any Senator who seeks the opinion of anyone, whether he be the Attorney General, an Assistant Attorney General, a lawyer, or someone else in whom the Senator has confidence. I am not at all critical.

What I am saying is that with respect to the submission of a constitutional amendment to the people of the States, neither the President nor his executive officers, whether the Attorney General or someone else, have anything to do with its consideration, unless Senators desire to avail themselves of the information or knowledge of such persons.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think we all agree on that. It is a very sound principle, and the Founding Fathers provided that only ratification by the two Houses of Congress and three-fourths of the States should be involved in the adoption of constitutional amendments. But I think it is perfectly legitimate, and the American public might have an interest, if there were to be an upset of the balance of power between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government, for the President to make known his views, should he decide to do so, or to have them made known by someone else, who is a citizen of the United States and a responsible officer of the Government. Senators are not required to be bound by such views, any more than the Senator from Georgia would subscribe to a certain point of view simply because it had been expressed by a member of the executive branch of the Government.

I simply thought the RECORD ought to be clear that the memorandum was not furnished as a voluntary act on the part of the executive branch, but only at my request.

Mr. GEORGE. I am certain the President has not said anything about this amendment specifically. If so, I do not know about it. I feel the same way so far as the Attorney General is concerned.

But I wish to emphasize again that there has become apparent too much of a disposition—and I say this with utter kindliness—for Senators to rely upon bureaucratic advice. Do Senators think I am overstating the case? How many times have Senators had hurled into their faces the statement that so and so, in a department, has written a memorandum, has made a statement, is opposed to certain legislation, or favors some other legislation?

The United States Senate will become utterly worthless to the people of America in the making of proposed constitutional amendments if it is to take the advice of all the bureaucracy which has been built up, which flourishes in Washington, and which has such a hold upon many Members of the Senate, until individual Senators insist upon a memorandum being written, such as has been transmitted by someone in the Department of Justice.

I must repeat that in the submission of constitutional amendments to the people and to the States, the executive department as such has no responsibility whatever. As a citizen, yes, they have such a responsibility; but the primary responsibility rests in the Senate of the United States, and in the House of Representatives, at the other end of the Capitol.

George Washington adjured us to approach the question of a change in the Constitution only by the regular methods provided in that document itself; but there are some who are too afraid even to allow the people of the States, whom we represent here, to pass upon a constitutional proposal. I am not afraid of the action the people of my State, or the people of three-fourths of the States of the Union, may take on a proposed amendment to the Constitution. It is easy enough to find an excuse to dodge behind, but finally, and at last, no man worthy of his salt in this body will dodge behind the opinion of an executive officer who has no responsibility, no authority, and who is under no obligation even to express an opinion before this body.

Mr. President, my proposal differs from the proposed amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio only in one respect. I have emphasized it before, but I repeat it. I do not think it necessary to involve the treatymaking power in the amendment. I think the present procedure is sufficient, because my interpretation is—and I think no one will challenge it—that the Senate itself is competent, that it has the power and the authority, yea, the obligation and the duty, if it believes it to be its duty, to do one thing with respect to every treaty which is submitted to it for consideration, and that is to make sure that such a treaty affecting internal law will become effective only when implemented by an act of the Congress, or upon the happening of a certain event, if the Senate wishes to make such a reservation. Therefore, I believe we are fully protected, so far as treaties are concerned.

However, when it comes to the wide range of executive agreements, which may not be known to the Members of the Senate until long after they have been concluded, I think the Senate should be able to say, "Mr. President, your executive agreement becomes effective as international law from the moment that you put your signature upon it; but it does not become effective as internal law, which can be enforced by the courts of this country against our citizens, until the provisions of the agreement have been approved by an act of the Congress."

That is what the distinguished Senator from Ohio is proposing. In one respect that is all I have proposed, though I have gone somewhat further. I have said that my proposed substitute did not interfere with and could not be construed as limiting or affecting the powers of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, as provided in article II, section 2, of the Constitution as it now exists, or the power of the President to receive Ambassadors and Ministers of foreign countries, as provided in the third section, because the amendment proposed by me and the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio do not undertake to amend those sections of the Constitution. They do not touch them.

However, since later in our history we might possibly have a President who would attempt to use his powers as Commander in Chief to fasten upon the American people internal law which would affect otherwise valid State laws and State constitutional provisions, I wish to say now that no such colorable arrangement as that ought to be allowed to stand, unless the Congress of the United States has an opportunity to say "Yes" or "No" to such a proposal.

Mr. President, that is all there is to this whole fight, so far as I am concerned. All I desire to have provided is that treaties and executive agreements must conform to the Constitution or they shall be of no force or effect; and, secondly, that international arrangements or agreements other than treaties shall not become the internal law of the United States until they have been approved or passed upon by the Congress

of the United States in the ordinary and normal processes of legislation.

Mr. President, that is all I have said, and I have said it as one who ordinarily has as strong an attachment for the rights of States as any man living, and as one who would like to see States' rights respected. However, States' rights will not be respected under the broad powers given the President to make treaties, with two-thirds of the Senate consenting, unless the President himself respects them, and unless the Senate of the United States, in passing upon them, is able to state, "We will not go as far as this treaty demands that we go."

If the rights of the States are ever to be preserved, if local self government is to survive in America, it will be because of the vision of the men who make up the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I cannot conceive that any President, and I certainly do not for a moment believe that the present President, would desire to abrogate any provision of a State constitution or a State law without bringing it to the special attention of the Senate and saying, "This is a matter for your final decision and determination."

Mr. President, I rose to say what I have said because I profoundly believe that if, in our capacity as representatives of the people, we are to be bound by the bureaucrats in any department of the Government, if we are to hear only the voice of bureaucracy which comes to us from all the buildings up and down Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues, and elsewhere—if that is to be true of the Congress of the United States, or of the Senate as one of the Houses of Congress, then we are very nearly through.

But, Mr. President, to my utter amazement, some Senators wish to hear what the Attorney General has had to say or what someone else in an executive department has had to say on the simple but basic and fundamental question of whether the people of the United States are to be given the right to consider and to approve or disapprove a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I expect to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the so-called Bricker amendment. Should it fail to receive a majority vote, I expect to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who has just made a very eloquent and moving speech.

I am not at all in doubt as to the basis on which I shall explain my vote to the people of my State. I shall say to them that I am unwilling to have the treaty-making officer or officers of a foreign government, acting in conjunction with the President of the United States, write internal law which the Congress of the United States itself did not write. Likewise, I am unwilling to say that the treatymaking group of a foreign power can modify State law which has been made under the powers reserved to the States by the Constitution.

Having said that, I should like to raise a question which I think is pertinent, in view of what the Senator from Georgia has said. In the case of an ordinary constitutional amendment which does not relate to the powers of the President, I would concur heartily in everything the Senator from Georgia has said. But it seems to me in the present instance, inasmuch as the proposed amendment seeks to place a bridle on the power of the President, we should recognize that the executive branch might be pardoned if it thought it might speak in behalf of the powers the executive branch heretofore has exercised.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from South Dakota realizes, does he not, that no part of either my amendment or the amendment of the Senator from Georgia would in any way interfere with the President's powers in the field of foreign relations, but either of the amendments would only prevent treaties from making internal law or prevent executive agreements from making internal law.

Mr. CASE. Yes; and I heartily subscribe to that purpose.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me that this general amendment deals with the powers of the executive branch of the Government.

If the amendment were one modifying the powers of the President as Commander in Chief or the appointive powers of the President—all of which are embraced in article II, section 2, of the Constitution—does the Senator from Georgia think the executive branch, as the custodian of the powers granted the executive branch by the Constitution, should be entirely silent?

It seems to me that when there is proposed in the Senate an amendment which relates to the powers of the President or the powers of the executive branch, the executive branch might be expected to endeavor to uphold its dignity and the powers accorded it by the Constitution.

Mr. President, if my memory serves me correctly, when the question of repeal of the 18th amendment was under consideration, the Executive at that time spoke rather strongly. Perhaps it might be said he should have kept his mouth shut in such a situation, because the proposed amendment did not relate to the powers of the President.

The pending amendment does bear upon the powers of the executive branch. If a representative of the executive branch wishes to say something about preserving the balance of power between the three branches of our Government, it seems to me, at least, that he should be given a respectful audience.

I have not asked any part of the executive branch of the Government—either the Attorney General or his deputy or any clerk or anyone in the White House—about how I should vote on this question. I shall vote my convictions in this matter; and my vote will be in favor of the amendments which have been proposed.

But I do not think the RECORD should indicate that the executive branch should be forbidden to defend its traditional powers under the Constitution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as one of those to whom the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] referred as the group of Senators who oppose any constitutional amendment which would curtail or restrict the treatymaking powers of the Executive, let me say that I have not been greatly impressed by the memorandum of the Attorney General, although I wish to give consideration to it.

As my colleagues know, ever since the debates began, and even before then, I have been opposed to any constitutional amendment of this character.

For 5 weeks I have listened to the debate on the proposed constitutional amendment. I am not a constitutional lawyer, and I did not feel qualified to participate in the debate concerning the highly technical phases of the proposed constitutional amendment or regarding the weight which would be given by the Supreme Court to the language of an amendment which might be adopted. However, I have had very considerable experience in both the executive branch of government and in the legislative branch, and I am not certain that the lay approach to this important matter may not be fully as sound as that of highly expert men who are well grounded in constitutional law.

After listening to the debate for 5 weeks, it is clear to me that we have tortured both the law and the language, in order to draw up a synthetic constitutional amendment, when no amendment of any character is necessary.

After all, Mr. President, our Republic has lasted for 165 years. It has gone through great crises. It has been confronted with tremendous problems. Administrations have come and gone. The control of Congress has frequently changed. New States have been admitted to the Union. But there has never been a time when any State or any citizen of a State has been injured by any treaty or been discriminated against in any way because of the lack of a constitutional amendment such as any of those now proposed.

There is no reason now for us to endeavor to torture into existence a constitutional amendment, when none is even remotely needed.

A few days ago I listened to the debate on an amendment offered by Senator FERGUSON which lasted for many hours. There was a difference of opinion as to what was meant by the phrase "in pursuance of," by the phrase "not in conflict with," and by the phrase "not repugnant to." No Member of the Senate was able to define those terms; and the sponsor of the amendment said, "We cannot depend upon the dictionary for a definition." Mr. President, at that time I heard the debate regarding what was meant by the terms "which," "what," or "that." Amendments which have been brought before the Senate have been such that no Member of the Senate could adequately explain their meaning.

Last week, after hours of debate, the Senate adopted one amendment by a vote of 44 to 43. I can tell Senators that in the majority vote of 44, there was a

great difference of opinion as to the reason for the support of the amendment; and in the opposition of 43, there was by no means a unity of viewpoint. There was a great difference as to what was meant by that amendment, or whether support should be given for one reason or another. Yet that is the kind of amendment which we now have before us, an amendment of which we do not know the meaning. I doubt very much whether the Supreme Court will understand either the reason for the amendment or the meaning of the amendment.

In conclusion, let me say that the main excuse for a proposed constitutional amendment is, as I understand it, to limit alleged arbitrary powers of the President, powers which might cause embarrassment to our Nation, and also to safeguard States rights.

There is no Member of the Senate for whom I have a greater respect and regard than I have for the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. However, it seems to me that in the case of both the Bricker amendment and the George amendment the President would be given greater arbitrary powers than exist today, because he could choose whether to submit a treaty or an executive agreement. A treaty would require a two-thirds vote of the Senate. An executive agreement would require only a majority vote in the two Houses.

So far as State's rights are concerned, it is obvious that they would be reduced by reason of the fact that, today, a two-thirds vote is required to approve a treaty affecting a State and its citizens. Under the proposed amendment, which will soon come to a vote in this body, a two-thirds vote could impose any executive agreement on the States and on the citizens of the States. So I strongly urge my colleagues not to vote for any constitutional amendment at this time which would limit the treatymaking powers of the President. It would be bad policy. Inevitably it would lessen the authority and the power of the President to deal with other countries. It would cause embarrassment. It would serve no purpose. It would cause confusion.

To all intents and purposes, all these amendments have been written on the floor of the Senate, without adequate thought, without adequate consideration, and without adequate study of the effect they might have on the policy of this country and on the decisions of the Supreme Court. I think we would be making a monumental mistake if we were to approve any constitutional amendment which would lessen or limit the treatymaking powers of the President of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall speak for only 2 or 3 minutes.

I wish to make only two observations. First, my decision to vote against this amendment is in no way influenced by the Attorney General or any bureauerat. Long before this memorandum was made public I said that I was opposed to such amendments.

I have been very much astonished and amazed at the position of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I have participated with him and other Members from the South in an effort to preserve the two-thirds rule of the Senate. I participated as a junior member of that group. I felt then, and I feel very deeply today, that the two-thirds rule of the Senate is one of the most important and distinguishing characteristics of this body. I cannot understand how the most distinguished constitutional scholar in this body—and I so regard the senior Senator from Georgia—has come to propose to the Senate and to the country a measure which, in my opinion, would largely destroy the power of the Senate to prevent an improvident or unwise treaty from going into effect. By that I mean the two-thirds rule.

As I read the amendment which has been proposed, it is an invitation to the Executive from now on to submit international agreements in the form of executive agreements to be confirmed by a majority vote of both Houses. Everyone knows that, generally speaking, a majority vote of both Houses is much easier to obtain than a two-thirds vote in this body.

I think this amendment is an extremely serious attack upon the integrity of this body and upon our power to resist improvident agreements. It seems to me that it would cut down the States' rights to a very great extent.

We all know why the Senate was constituted as it was, under the compromises in the Constitutional Convention, to protect States rights. Small States similar to my State and many other States were afraid of being imposed upon by the larger States. That is why the two-thirds rule was instituted. That is why each State insists upon equal representation in this body.

In my judgment this amendment would be an open invitation to submit all international agreements in the form of executive agreements. No one has undertaken to say that there is any way, other than the judgment of the Executive, by which to distinguish between an executive agreement and a treaty. If the President chooses from now on to call all agreements executive agreements, there will be nothing in the Constitution and no basis that I can see upon which his judgment can be attacked. If he says an agreement is an executive agreement, it will be submitted to us in that form and we shall pass upon it by a majority vote. We have seen the time when a strong executive could obtain a majority vote in this body when he could by no means obtain a two-thirds vote.

I think this proposal has an important bearing on the two-thirds rule in the Senate with respect to limitation of debate. I make no apology now, and shall not apologize at any other time, with regard to my defense of the two-thirds rule with regard to limitation of debate. Certain Senators who some time ago thought it was a bad rule are beginning to think it is a little better rule, when they observe the differences and the changes which have come about in this body.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is making a very persuasive argument on the proposition that the amendment would cut down the treatymaking power of the Senate, which requires a two-thirds vote. Certainly we who serve in this body know that it is much easier to obtain a majority vote than a two-thirds vote.

The Senator has raised the point regarding the rights of the States. Does he not believe there is an additional factor? While there have been a few times in history when the Members of one party have constituted more than two-thirds of the Senate, over the long run normally neither party dominates this body by a very large majority. So by having the two-thirds requirement we at least have a bipartisan approach to any constitutional amendment, whereas otherwise there might be domination by a single political party.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's observation. He is entirely correct. I welcome the support of the Senator from California in opposition to the amendment, which provides for the ratification of executive agreements by a majority of both Houses of Congress. That is what it provides.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very much interested, of course, in the persuasive and cogent argument of the learned Senator from Arkansas. The suggestion has been made this afternoon that to seek an opinion from a qualified lawyer, or even a young lawyer, or a clerk, is improper, or might be beneath the dignity of this body, or might in some way be a surrender or an indication of an abdication of its responsibilities.

I believe that many of us have learned much from some of the most unexpected sources. If the Attorney General, who has been criticized as being an odd and peculiar fellow—and, of course, I am not saying that he is, and he may or may not be——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Missouri is not saying that the Attorney General is not.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know him very well, may I say to my friend from Arkansas. Be that as it may, while we as a Senate—and, I hope, without heat of blood or intensive feeling of rancor against any individual Senator or group of Senators because of the principles they may hold—are improving upon the work of the Founding Fathers of 165 years ago, and while we are addressing ourselves to the facts in this case and to the law, as suggested by the memorandum, whether it be from a clerk or a lowly Assistant Attorney General of the United States, or anyone who may not in his own esteem or in the esteem of others rise to the top and lofty height and dignified place occupied by a United States Senator, there are attorneys in the Department of Justice, there are lawyers in the law offices of the country, including John W. Davis, and those of

lesser eminence who may not agree with the views expressed by the Attorney General——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is the Senator from Missouri asking me a question? I have yielded only for a question.

Mr. HENNINGS. I was just about to ask the Senator a question. I appreciate the Senator's indulgence, as the distinguished majority leader indulged the Senator from Georgia for some 30 or 40 minutes. I assure the Senator that I will not press this upon his good nature or his time, but I should like to ask him, as one who understands the thesis and the principles and the effect of States' rights, as a Senator from the State of Arkansas, and as a Senator of the United States, whether he feels that in leaving the matter to the States or to the people of the States, as it has been put, he is failing to exercise or is abdicating his authority and responsibility as a United States Senator?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator, certainly not. I do not distrust the people of my State or of any other State. However, I believe it is our duty to make a recommendation which we believe to be wise, and not to accept simply what is submitted to us.

That leads me to the next point I wish to make. As I stated, I have no long speech on the subject. The second source of amazement, second to hearing the senior Senator from Georgia recommend a measure which would, in my opinion, seriously diminish the power of the States in the National Government and certainly the power of ourselves as representatives of the States, is that neither amendment, the one under consideration, offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], or the one offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], has ever been submitted to a committee. It has not been exposed to the study which we expect all measures to have before we pass upon them in the Senate. How many times have we seen a Senator rise on the floor of the Senate and object to an amendment to a bill on the ground that the amendment had not been submitted to a committee and that it was a very complicated amendment, and should receive study? We hear that all the time.

Certainly in the case of an amendment to the fundamental law of the land a committee ought to hold hearings for some time and then consider, deliberatively and at leisure, its significance and the significance of amendments proposed to it.

To some extent that may be the reason why the Members on the other side of the aisle solicited an opinion from the Attorney General, or anyone else, because they felt the need for some expert opinion as to what the proposed amendments meant.

I did not ask anyone's opinion. I did not ask the Attorney General's advice. Having heard that the majority leader had requested his views and had received them, and suspecting in my own mind that the Attorney General disapproved of these amendments, I of course asked the majority leader if he would make the memorandum available to the Senate. That was the reason I asked for it.

I do not want to leave the impression at all, which I believe was created by some of the remarks made by the senior Senator from Georgia, that I am simply following the advice of the Attorney General of the United States, because it has nothing whatever to do with my opinion. Long before his opinion was given to the Senator from California, I had made up my mind with regard to the necessity of the amendments which are now under consideration.

I certainly hope that the Senate will have sufficient interest in the Constitution to reject the amendments. If they are to be considered at all, they ought to be considered first by a committee, where some of the other Members of the Senate, who are just as much interested as I am in the preservation of the two-thirds rule, both as to the rule of the Senate, about which we have had some discussion, and also as to the two-thirds rule with regard to treaties, may have something to say about the subject.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas that he is quite willing to leave to the President of the United States the making of executive agreements which affect the internal affairs of States, but he is not willing to let Congress say that they shall become effective as such. In other words, the Senator is quite willing to risk the judgment of one man, rather than a majority of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I may be permitted to do so, I shall be very glad to comment on that statement. I believe that during the course of 165 years Presidents have submitted the most important and serious political agreements in the form of treaties.

Mr. GEORGE. A President does not present executive agreements to the Senate, may I say to the Senator from Arkansas. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. How many executive areements has he seen in that committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The reciprocal trade agreements are executive agreements, which are made in pursuance of our authorization.

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly; they are made in accordance with the majority vote of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly they are. So were the lend-lease agreements and operations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the 165 years of our experience, can the Senator from Georgia point out an executive agreement which has been harmful to this country, which would have been prevented by his amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes. That was pointed out this morning, and heretofore, but the Senator was too busy to worry about it. I merely wish to suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that if he is not willing to trust the majority vote of the two Houses, but is willing to trust the decision of the State Department or of the President, I do not see how he is a very strong advocate of States' rights.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am willing, and I hope to continue, to require two-thirds of the membership of this body to vote on all treaties.

Mr. GEORGE. So do I. I am not touching treaties at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The major agreements between this country and other countries are in the form of treaties. There is no authority in the Constitution, excluding the President's power as the Commander in Chief and the power of recognition, for executive agreements.

Mr. GEORGE. I beg the Senator's pardon. There certainly is.

I merely wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that if he is quite willing to trust one man rather than a majority of the Senate and of the House, he has a different concept of States' rights than I have.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to correct the implication of the Senator's remark that I was not interested enough to be here. I happen to be a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and the committee held a meeting to vote on its report. That is where I have been this afternoon, while the Senator has been giving these examples.

The Senator has been asked, as I asked the Senator from Ohio, to give examples of agreements which he regarded as being harmful to the welfare of this country and whose harmful effects would be prevented by the proposed amendments. As yet, I have not heard of a single one.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator from Arkansas understand that under the proposed substitute amendment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia the President is to determine and can determine whether to use the executive agreement route or the treaty route?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is very clear.

Mr. HENNINGS. There is no way, in other words, to control the Executive as to whether he shall use the treaty route or the so-called executive agreement route.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then, if certain executive agreements having an effect upon domestic law should be made, who would, then, determine which one of the many thousands should be sent to the Congress for the approval of the Congress?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Executive would determine it.

Mr. HENNINGS. So, we would wind up, under the terms of the amendment, with the Executive determining, first, whether he would use an agreement or a treaty, and he would have the sole power to determine which of the executive agreements should be submitted to the Congress?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to insert on page 3

of the committee amendment, after line 9, a new section.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Mansfield
Anderson	Gore	Martin
Barrett	Green	Maybank
Beall	Griswold	McCarthy
Bennett	Hayden	McClellan
Bricker	Hendrickson	Millikin
Burke	Hennings	Morse
Bush	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hill	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Neely
Byrd	Holland	Pastore
Capehart	Humphrey	Payne
Carlson	Hunt	Potter
Case	Ives	Purtell
Chavez	Jackson	Robertson
Clements	Jenner	Russell
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kerr	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Thye
Ellender	Kuchel	Upton
Ferguson	Langer	Watkins
Flanders	Lehman	Welker
Frear	Lennon	Wiley
Fulbright	Long	Williams
George	Magnuson	Young
Gillette	Malone	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 9, of the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by the Congress unless in advising and consenting to a treaty the Senate, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, shall provide that such treaty may become effective as internal law without legislation by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], both of whom are absent on official business, are paired on this vote. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—42

Barrett	Capehart	Eastland
Beall	Case	Ellender
Bennett	Chavez	Goldwater
Bricker	Cordon	Griswold
Butler, Md.	Daniel	Hickenlooper
Butler, Nebr.	Dirksen	Hunt
Byrd	Dworshak	Jenner
Johnson, Colo.	Maybank	Smathers
Johnston, S. C.	McCarthy	Smith, Maine
Kuchel	Mundt	Stennis
Langer	Payne	Watkins
Long	Potter	Welker
Malone	Russell	Williams
Martin	Schoeppel	Young

NAYS—50

Aiken	Hayden	Magnuson
Anderson	Hendrickson	Mansfield
Burke	Hennings	McClellan
Bush	Hill	Millikin
Carlson	Hoey	Morse
Clements	Holland	Murray
Cooper	Humphrey	Neely
Douglas	Ives	Pastore
Duff	Jackson	Purtell
Ferguson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Flanders	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Frear	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Kerr	Sparkman
George	Kilgore	Thye
Gillette	Knowland	Upton
Gore	Lehman	Wiley
Green	Lennon	

NOT VOTING—4

Bridges	Monroney	Symington
McCarran		

So Mr. BRICKER'S amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I call up the amendment designated "2-23-54-A," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, it is proposed to strike out all in lines 10 to 15 inclusive.

Mr. FERGUSON. This is an amendment to strike out from Senate Joint Resolution 1, as it was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, on page 3, lines 10 to 15, inclusive. It is a perfecting amendment. I should like to refer to a reprint of the amendment, so that Senators may have a statement of the way the amendment would read after the language in lines 10 to 15, inclusive, on page 3, is stricken out.

I think it is clear that, as amendments go, it would be, in form, a proper amendment to the Constitution. Because the last amendment considered was rejected, I do not think any debate is required on this amendment to indicate why the language on page 3, lines 10 to 15, inclusive, should be stricken out, since that language is no longer applicable, having related to what was sought to be done heretofore.

So far as Senate Joint Resolution 1 is now concerned, it would provide:

A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

The next amendment is known on the new print as section 2, page 3, and is as follows:

Clause 2 of Article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution."

The next section reads:

On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

The last section would be:

This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

I do not believe any further debate is necessary on this particular question.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask that the numbers be placed in the order in which they now appear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Several days ago I proposed an amendment which would also apply to executive agreements. The amendment is not designated by number. Would it be proper to call up that amendment now, or should it be called up later?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I desire to have the Chair answer the question propounded by the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Washington that the amendment would be in order now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Before calling up the amendment, I wish to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. His proposal reads:

Section 2: An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress.

The only difference between my proposal and that of the Senator from Georgia is that Congress would act, under its regular rules, and the yeas and nays would not be required. Is that the Senator's interpretation?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I think action might be taken without the yeas and nays, or it might be taken with the yeas and nays.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But if the yeas and nays were called for, in connection with a vote on an executive agreement, they would be ordered?

Mr. GEORGE. They would be ordered if they were called for by any Member.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, with that explanation of section 2 of the George amendment, it would probably take care of what I had in mind, the only difference being that I would order the yeas and nays, whereas the George amendment would provide for an act of Congress, under the regular rules. After second thought and reflection, I think that might be better procedure, and I

ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I now offer the substitute which I offered some days ago, at the beginning of the debate.

I should like to modify the substitute in one respect, at least. My substitute provided that, in lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the committee on page 3, lines 5 to 19, inclusive, certain language be inserted. I do not know the number of the section, but I have no desire to strike out the section which requires the States to act upon the amendment within 7 years after its submission. I would not include that requirement in my substitute. I wish to modify the substitute to that extent.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator have any objection to including in his amendment the provision which requires the compulsory yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. GEORGE. I have no objection, but there are some who think such a provision should not be included in a constitutional amendment. I thought if the Senate were to adopt an amendment which would require a two-thirds vote and then have it go to the House of Representatives, it would be sufficient. I certainly have no objection to such a provision. I would vote for it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. After the Senator's substitute was agreed to, would an amendment inserting a provision requiring a two-thirds vote be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that if the substitute is adopted, it would not be subject to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry. Is the George substitute, in the manner in which it is now presented, open to amendment, and could an amendment to it be offered which would incorporate in it the requirement of a two-thirds vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; that would be an amendment in the third degree, and would not be in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If I may make an inquiry of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, as I understand the parliamentary situation, if the substitute is offered without a modification which would include a provision requiring a two-thirds vote, there would be no way by which it could be amended, either before adoption or after.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the statement of the Senator is correct. I am perfectly willing to modify my substitute further by including such a provision, which has already been agreed to by the Senate. I do not know which line it is, but my amendment should strike out all after a certain line down to a certain line. I think it might be well to understand I am not opposing an amendment which would require a yea-and-nay vote, about which the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] have inquired. I am willing to include it.

I think some objection can be raised to it, but, since we already have the pattern of a yea-and-nay vote in the Constitution regarding the question of overriding a veto, I see no particular objection to it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand that the Senator has now modified his proposed substitute to incorporate the amendment to the original Bricker amendment which was adopted, and which requires a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly. Mr. President, I hope that is understood.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not quite clear on what the Senator has excepted from his substitute. Am I to understand that he is excepting from his substitute, and leaving in the Bricker amendment as it now is, as amended, section 5, requiring the compulsory yea-and-nay vote, and section 6, requiring that the amendment, if submitted, be acted upon within 7 years from the date of its submission?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct. I am adding nothing to my own substitute but those two independent sections, one of which relates to the period in which ratification must take place, that is, within 7 years after an amendment is submitted, and the other of which relates to the recording of the yea-and-nay vote on treaties.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have no desire to discuss the substitute further. It has been discussed many times by many Members of this body.

I do wish to emphasize one point, namely, that it is not a new proposal. The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate took testimony on all the proposed amendments. At least the substance of every proposed amendment, with one possible exception, which I am not embracing in my substitute, has been discussed in 1,266 pages of printed testimony. Every single phase of the issue which has been debated on the floor of the Senate was gone into in the hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary.

I wish to make just one more statement. I said, in the beginning of these debates, that the issue involved in the proposal to amend the Constitution was a divisive issue. I think it is. I regret that it is, because this is a time when our people should be united. I should like to see the issue settled, and that is why I have offered the substitute.

I could not fully agree with certain provisions of the committee amendment as reported. I did not think two provisions in particular were wise. I offered the substitute in the hope that we might be able to submit this matter at least to the House of Representatives, and, if the House concurred by a two-thirds vote, then the amendment could be submitted to the people of the States or the States themselves.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me state what seems to me to be the principal difference between the present Bricker amendment as amended by the proposal of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], in behalf of himself and other Senators, and the substitute proposed by the Senator from Georgia. The Bricker amendment, as amended by the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, adds the words, "treaty or international agreement that is in conflict with the Constitution."

Mr. GEORGE. Which is the same as my first section.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is no difference there?

Mr. GEORGE. There is no difference at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Michigan submits a proposal which amends article VI, clause 2, to add the words "in pursuance of the Constitution" to that clause; does he not?

Mr. GEORGE. He does. He proposes an amendment to the supremacy clause of the Constitution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not the principal difference between the proposal of the Senator from Georgia and the proposal, as now amended, of the Senator from Michigan as follows: Both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Michigan would provide that neither a treaty nor an international agreement shall be in conflict with the Constitution—on that point, there is no difference between the two Senators—and that a treaty shall be in pursuance of the Constitution——

Mr. GEORGE. I did not vote for that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Georgia did not?

Mr. GEORGE. No.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that the Senator from Georgia proposes that in the case of an international agreement, Congress must act upon it affirmatively; as I understand, he would provide that an international agreement must be in conformity with the Constitution, and that Congress must act affirmatively in case internal law is concerned.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the proposal of the Senator from Michigan is a negative one, namely, that such a treaty or international agreement shall not be in conflict with the Constitution, whereas the Senator from Georgia has advanced the affirmative proposal that action on such a matter would be required by Congress.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true, insofar as the internal law effect of such an international agreement is concerned—but not its external effect.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Have I not thus stated the difference between the George substitute and the Bricker amendment, as proposed to be amended?

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is substantially correct.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, my seat is behind that of the Senator from Georgia, and thus I could not clearly understand the modifications he has made in his amendment.

I should like to ask whether there is any modification in his amendment identified as "1-27-54-C," as he now offers it, as compared with the printed version. If so, what are the modifications? Will the Senator from Georgia state them in a few words?

Mr. GEORGE. No modifications have been made in the substitute as I originally submitted it; it remains in precisely the same language. However, I have added to my substitute—out of respect for the Members of the Senate, who could not amend my substitute, because such an amendment would be in the third degree—a provision for a yea-and-nay vote, a recorded vote.

Mr. CORDON. Nothing else has been added to the amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. There has also been added the other provision—in the original Bricker amendment—that the amendment must be ratified by the States within 7 years. But I have not changed anything whatever in the proposal I have made, except to add those two sections.

Mr. CORDON. And the amendment is now offered as a substitute for the entire Bricker amendment, as perfected; is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; for the whole of the Bricker amendment.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the distinguished Senator from Georgia interpret section 1 of his substitute as, in effect, requiring that treaties and international agreements shall be made pursuant to the Constitution?

Mr. GEORGE. I do. Therefore I did not vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from California, the Senator from Michigan, and other Senators, which would have amended the supremacy clause of the Constitution; that is to say, that was one of the reasons why I did not vote for that amendment. There were other reasons why I could not bring myself to support it. I feared what might be said under it.

One thing which certainly would happen under it would be that it would open up for determination the validity of every treaty made from the time of the establishment of the Constitution to the present time, if any litigant in any court were to raise that issue.

However, I construe section 1 of the substitute, which relates to a provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with the Constitution, to be the same as saying, "which is not in confromity with this Constitution" or "which is not in pursuance of this Constitution." That would be my interpretation, although I do not know what the courts might hold.

Mr. DANIEL. I agree with the Senator from Georgia. I merely wished to be sure the RECORD showed that was his interpretation and his opinion of this section.

Mr. GEORGE. That is my intention, and that is my belief.

Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that I am not proposing that a treaty or an international agreement which conflicts with the Constitution shall be of no force or effect. On the contrary, I am proposing that a provision of a treaty or international agreement which conflicts with or is not in conformity with or is not made in pursuance of the Constitution shall be of no force or effect. The other portions of such a treaty or international agreement might be perfectly valid. Under my amendment, only the bad parts of such a treaty or international agreement would be ineffective. That is all I have in mind.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not wish to go beyond that, and I do not think any other course would be safe.

Mr. President, my amendment has been discussed in full and I have no desire to discuss longer except to state that if anything is to be done in this field, now is the time to do it, because following the 44-43 vote on the amendment which relates to the supremacy clause, it is perfectly obvious that a two-thirds vote cannot be had in favor of the so-called Knowland-Ferguson amendment.

Mr. President, I am willing to submit the matter without further argument.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in support of a motion to recommit which I shall make at the conclusion of my remarks.

In the first place, the record made by the Senate on the Bricker joint resolution and the George amendment is the best exhibit I can offer in support of my motion to recommit. That is true because the totality of that record is at least so confused that the people of the United States are entitled to have the joint resolution and all amendments to it returned to the committee for consideration by the constitutional experts who would be called before the committee to testify as to the legal meaning and consequences of some of the terms which now have crept into the proposed constitutional amendment, as it has been drafted on the floor of the Senate during the debate. The Senate owes that much to the judicial branch of the Government. We have the duty of returning this proposal to the Judiciary Committee, so that the experts can testify at hearings of the committee as to the legal effects of the proposed amendment in its present status of draftsmanship.

As I said in my argument the other day, Mr. President, the present proposal includes the phrase "internal law." That phrase has yet to be interpreted and adjudicated in any decision by the Supreme Court of the United States.

In reply to my statement on that point, it was said that in the majority report and in the minority views the phrase "internal law" is used a number of times. So it is, Mr. President, but it is not used there definitely. Other Senators told the Senate that on the basis of the assumption that the members of the committee knew what the legal consequences and implications would be if that phrase became a part of the Constitution of the United States, the proposal should be adopted.

Mr. President, that is not the way we should amend the Constitution. In a constitutional amendment we should not use for the first time a legal concept which has yet to be passed upon by the courts of the Nation without at least calling in expert witnesses to testify as to its legal meanings and effects. We should not incorporate such a concept into the Constitution until, at least, we have heard from experts superior to ourselves. In the United States there are many who should be called, as constitutional experts, to testify before the Judiciary Committee as to the effects and implications of the phrase "internal law."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an analysis of the majority report and the minority views of the Judiciary Committee, showing the number of times the phrase "internal law" is used in them—but used nondefinitively. A record has not been made to date on the term "internal law" which is definitive in nature or which will help the courts in determining what the intent of Congress really was if the amendment is passed without further hearings.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 16, 1954.

An examination of Senate Report No. 412 on Senate Joint Resolution 1 discloses that the words "internal law" appear the number of times indicated on the following pages of the report:

MAJORITY REPORT

Page 8: 3 times. (No definition or discussion of possible meaning.)

Page 11: 3 times. (No definition or discussion of possible meaning.)

Page 12: 1 time. (No definition or discussion of possible meaning.)

Page 13: 1 time. (No definition or discussion of possible meaning.)

Page 16: 1 time. Very general. No discussion of the kinds of State law or the nature of the effect of treaties and international agreements upon it.

Page 20: 1 time. Extradition treaties as internal law.

Page 23: 1 time. No definition or discussion of meaning of "internal law."

Page 30: 3 times. Reciprocal trade agreements as "internal law."

Page 33: 1 time. Reiterates provision of Senate Joint Resolution 1 as reported.

MINORITY VIEWS

Page 36: 3 times. Quotes from various versions of joint resolution. No definition or discussion of possible meaning.

Page 41: 3 times. Quotes from various versions of joint resolution. No definition or discussion of possible meaning.

Page 49: 1 time. Specifies types of laws subject to being overriden. All examples concern military and emergency international agreements by President as Commander in Chief.

Page 52: 1 time. Specifies civil aviation and communications. These subjects are already subject to congressional control under the commerce clause of the Constitution.
Page 57: 2 times. No specification. Quotes from joint resolution.
Page 58: 1 time. Examples of international agreements as internal law re extradition, narcotics, and alien rights.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the argument is made that if we are to do anything about this problem this is the time to do it by passing some amendment developed out of the confused record of this long debate. I do not accept that premise either. Nor do I accept the argument that to recommit the joint resolution at this time is but a parliamentary device to kill it. I deny any such intention or motivation, because I believe that the recommittal of the joint resolution could result in bringing it forth again within 6 weeks if the Judiciary Committee does its job properly. This motion is not a device to kill it, but it is a sound, orderly proposal for bringing to bear upon the draftsmanship of the proposed constitutional amendment, as it has come to be drafted during the debate on the floor of the Senate, the judgment of outstanding constitutional experts as to what the effect of our debate really has been in terms of legal meanings and consequences.

If the Judiciary Committee does the job which I think it should do, by proceeding at once with hearings on the subject, it can certainly bring the joint resolution back within 6 weeks or 2 months at the most. That would still give us adequate time to pass in the Senate—if we decide to pass it—an amendment which really would have the benefit of careful analysis and a careful hearing before the Judiciary Committee, as well as a report based upon such consideration. I repeat that I think we owe it to the courts of the country to follow that course of action.

The last point I wish to make is by way of an answer to the argument that, politically speaking, this is the way to get the subject off our backs. It is not going to be done that way. In my judgment the chances are greater that no amendment will be passed than that one will be passed. I think we are pretty well agreed among ourselves that the only amendment which has a chance at the present moment is the George amendment, but I seriously doubt if it would come anywhere near receiving a two-thirds vote.

So we shall not solve the problem, so far as the political issue is concerned, by adopting the George amendment or by defeating the George amendment. I think the best way to solve it is to recommit the joint resolution to the committee, so that we may have an expert report on the legal meaning of the George amendment, and then take the results of that report to the American people and let them judge the public-policy question on the basis of such a hearing.

I close by saying that we owe it not only to the courts but to the people of the country, to give them the benefit of a Judiciary Committee hearing and a report on the implications, consequences, and legal effects of the George amendment as it has been drafted on the floor of the Senate.

Therefore, I most respectfully move that Senate Joint Resolution 1, with all the amendments attached thereto, including the substitute amendment, be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on the motion of the Senator from Oregon to recommit, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Mansfield
Anderson	Gore	Martin
Barrett	Green	Maybank
Beall	Griswold	McCarthy
Bennett	Hayden	McClellan
Bricker	Hendrickson	Millikin
Burke	Hennings	Morse
Bush	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hill	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Neely
Byrd	Holland	Pastore
Capehart	Humphrey	Payne
Carlson	Hunt	Potter
Case	Ives	Purtell
Chavez	Jackson	Robertson
Clements	Jenner	Russell
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kerr	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Thye
Ellender	Kuchel	Upton
Ferguson	Langer	Watkins
Flanders	Lehman	Welker
Frear	Lennon	Wiley
Fulbright	Long	Williams
George	Magnuson	Young
Gillette	Malone	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall not delay the vote on the motion to recommit but for a very few minutes. I oppose the motion to recommit. I do not ascribe to the author of the motion any dilatory tactics or the use of it as a device to delay final action on the pending resolution. There are those who may contend seriously and sincerely that the pending substitute should be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for further study.

In my opinion it can hardly be said that the Committee on the Judiciary has not considered all of the implications and effects the substitute proposal would have on our organic law. I note from the printed hearings that the Committee on the Judiciary has had the original proposal under consideration since it began hearings on February 18, 1953. I observe, too, that the record of the hearings contains in excess of 1,200 pages. It contains evidence submitted before that committee on every aspect and viewpoint of the issue. Certainly the provisions of the substitute are in no sense more complicated, drastic, or far reaching in effect and implication than were the provisions of the original Senate Joint Resolution 1, which the committee has had under consideration and under study for more than 1 year.

The question resolves itself into a determination, a decision, as to whether we shall submit to the several States any constitutional amendment on this issue. Senators who want no constitutional amendment at all, Senators who feel that there is no evil that should be eliminated or corrected, Senators who are opposed to providing any further restraint over executive power, in my opinion, should vote to recommit. Senators who believe in trying to do what the distinguished Senator from Georgia has indicated he proposes to do, Senators who believe that at least a very minimum of restraint should be imposed, should vote against the motion to recommit, and should support the pending proposed substitute.

Mr. President, the substitute contains very simple language. It is language which is clear and understandable and is appropriate and suitable as fundamental law of the land. There is certainly nothing complicated about it. Let me read the first section. It says:

A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

If I were to ask for a raising of hands of Senators present who believe that a treaty should be permitted to violate the Constitution of the United States, I wonder how many hands would be raised? I can hardly conceive any Senator would take that position.

Senators who believe that the treaty-making power should supersede the Constitution, that a new section of the Constitution might be written by the negotiation of a treaty, and by submitting that treaty to the Senate for a two-thirds vote, of course, will not vote for a proposal that will prevent changing the Constitution, as this proposal will prohibit it.

However, if Senators vote to recommit the substitute proposal offered by the senior Senator from Georgia, they will, in effect, by their vote take the untenable position that they are opposed to limiting a treaty to conform to the Constitution of the United States. The only other implication that could follow is that they favor the process of vesting a power in the President of the United States to negotiate a treaty and a power in two-thirds of the Senate alone to ratify a treaty that would supersede the Constitution, or to negotiate and adopt a treaty which would conflict with it. I oppose any such power. If any such power, by any strained interpretation now exists, I want by my vote to offer to the people of this country and to the several States of this Nation for adoption a constitutional provision which will remove and prohibit it.

I go to the second section of the George substitute. Certainly it is a very plain and understandable proposal. It contains no ambiguity. It reads:

An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress.

The Supreme Court has held, I believe unfortunately so, that an executive agreement made under the authority of the United States, as is the Constitution at present, is akin to, and has the same force and effect and is as binding upon this Government and on the several States, as is a treaty.

What is an executive agreement? It is said it cannot be defined. It is any agreement made by our President with a foreign government which is not submitted to the Senate as a treaty, or any agreement which is made under the authority of the presently existing Constitution, or any internal agreement or compact which is made by the Executive and is not submitted to the Senate in the form of a treaty for ratification. That is what an executive agreement is, and that is what this section in the George substitute is undertaking to reach.

There are many executive agreements or international agreements which have been entered into, which are binding upon our country and upon this Government and upon the several States of this Nation which have never been submitted to the Senate for ratification, and never submitted for legislative action. Under the holdings of the Supreme Court those international agreements are today the supreme law of the land.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS I do not wish to interrupt the Senator from Arkansas frequently, and I know we are all interested in saving time and in coming to a vote. However, I should like to ask the Senator a question, if he will indulge me.

The Senator has suggested, as I understand him, that presently an executive agreement is anything that is not a treaty and, consequently, not submitted to the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know of any other way to differentiate between the two.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is what I am getting at. I am seeking enlightenment, and I am certain other Senators are also, and I wonder whether the Senator can furnish it. Can the Senator, if he knows not the distinction between an executive agreement and a treaty, save that a treaty is something that comes to the Senate to be ratified an executive agreement does not come to the Senate to be ratified, what the distinction will be, in the event of the adoption of the George substitute, between a treaty and an executive agreement, other than to suggest the distinction in the mind, determination, and purpose of the Executive in employing either an executive agreement or a treaty.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not think the proposed substitute will change the present situation with respect to the difference between a treaty and an executive agreement. But I will tell the Senator what it will do. That is what concerns me, and that is why I support the substitute. There will be no future executive agreements or international compacts that are secret, about which we know nothing, which nullify the Constitution or change the law of any State of the Union, until and unless they are submitted to the Congress and legislation is enacted to implement and enforce them. That is the difference.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not wish to go into it any further. This is the last time I shall interrupt the Senator.

Does the Senator suggest that so-called secret agreements and secret understandings which take the form of executive agreements do not affect internal law until they are published, assuming we know what the phrase "internal law" means, which John W. Davis says he does not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. When such an agreement is published it may then be discovered that the act of a citizen may be a violation of it, or his rights may not have been protected.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator suggest that any citizen would be prosecutable in such an instance?

Mr. McCLELLAN. He might very well lose his property rights.

Mr. HENNINGS. Before the publication of the agreement?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; I did not say that. But he may very well lose his property rights.

Mr. HENNINGS. I cannot agree with my friend, but I shall not take his time any further.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I point out, Mr. President, that international agreements are being entered into all over the world, committing this Government to construct many large military installations. They are made upon certain conditions, concessions, and agreements, and all that the Congress of the United States knows about them, in most instances, is that we are supposed to make appropriations and spend the taxpayers' money in carrying out their terms. We do not know what are the terms, conditions, and obligations involved.

Mr. President, I feel that in the protection of America in this day of multitudinous foreign entanglements, the people have a right to know what is in them. And this Congress has the right to pass, by legislative processes, upon any international agreement or compact which reaches beyond international boundaries and into the sovereignty of States or which have the effect of repealing or nullifying the laws of the States of this Union.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is aware, is he not, that there are thousands, literally tens of thousands, of executive agreements which have been made within recent years? They probably run into thousands a year, do they not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am sure the making of such agreements has been greatly accelerated and increased in the past few years; and thus the danger inherent in them is greater than ever before during our national existence.

Mr. HENNINGS. Most of them are made, presumably, in furtherance of a bargain between the United States of America and nations abroad.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. We give something and we get something.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; but we do not always know what we are getting.

Mr. HENNINGS. We should know.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly we should. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator will bear with me for a moment, does the Senator recall any international agreement which he thinks was particularly hurtful or injurious?

Mr. McCLELLAN. There are many which have been proposed which would be very detrimental.

Mr. HENNINGS. But the Senator knows of none which have been made which are detrimental?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will say this to the Senator, that at the time the Constitution was adopted we were living in a philosophy of beware of foreign entanglements. Today we are living in a philosophy of assuming a large measure of world responsibility in accordance with our position in the family of nations which our economic power and our position would require us to assume. But, Mr. President, at the same time, I do not want a loose power reposed in the President of the United States that will permit him to make an international agreement that will have the effect of amending the Constitution of the United States or any provision of the constitution of any State, or nullifies internal law or affects it in any way, without that agreement being openly presented and being implemented by the Congress through legislation.

That is the only principle that the substitute before us undertakes to establish and to safeguard. That principle is sound. With the world situation what it is, and with the great number of agreements that are being made today, as referred to by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, it strengthens the position of those of us who are apprehensive. We know that such agreements have been made and are being made. We can provide a great measure of protection by adopting this provision in the Constitution, at least by submitting it to the several States for their judicious determination and approval.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I ask the distinguished Senator one further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course, through a so-called entangling alliance with France, we won our independence. I do not want to argue with my friend, whose legal qualifications and statesmanlike qualities no one knows better than I. He knows how I feel about him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator for his compliments.

Mr. HENNINGS. But what disturbs me is this: The Senator has indicated that because of a proliferation, because of the vast number of executive agreements being made, we should adopt the substitute which is now before us, which might, or might not, inhibit the number of such agreements. But the Senator

has conceded that the President can still act either by the treaty method or the agreement method to achieve an end. We have no definition or line of distinction or demarcation as to what may be a treaty and what may be an agreement. If the document comes to the Senate it is a treaty, and if it does not, it is an executive agreement.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I interrupt the distinguished Senator at that point, to point out that if this proposal is adopted, then an executive agreement must be submitted. The Senator agrees to that, does he not?

Mr. HENNINGS. That is exactly the point I am trying to reach.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The President makes the first decision. If it is submitted to the Senate or to the Congress as an executive agreement and this body then concludes that the President is wrong, and it should be submitted in the form of a treaty, the Senate by a majority vote can require it to be submitted as a treaty.

Mr. HENNINGS. Granted that the President may use an executive agreement or a treaty; granted that a treaty comes to the Senate for ratification and an executive agreement does not; granted that the President may execute it, if the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia be adopted, the President can still conduct our international relations by executive agreement, can he not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. He certainly can. That is he can still make agreements.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then, when we speak about that which may affect internal law, or, to use another phrase, domestic law, according to the amendment of the learned Senator from Georgia, in determining whether an executive agreement shall be submitted to Congress for action by the Senate and House, would it not be the President who would determine whether there was contained in the executive agreement anything which would have an impact upon domestic or internal law? Would it not, after all, essentially be the President himself who would determine, first, whether he wished to use the form of a treaty or of an executive agreement; and second, if he used one or the other, would he not decide whether it affected internal law?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The President might make the initial determination. But if, in fact, the treaty or agreement affect internal law, then the President's decision would be a mistake of judgment, which could be corrected. The courts then could provide a remedy, and a citizen's rights would be protected, despite the President's erroneous decision. That is what I want accomplished.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take up more time. I simply desired to state my position. I believe there is great need for a constitutional amendment in this field. Therefore, I do not believe the argument that the question should be restudied is at all persuasive, in view of the very simplicity of the language of the amendment and its clear import.

The whole subject matter, including every phase and angle of it, has had meticulous consideration over a long period, beginning with the time when the original proposal was before the Committee on the Judiciary, and I do not find it is necessary to resubmit it for further study. I believe the proposal in its present form is understood by every Member of the Senate. All Senators know what its effect would be. They have every reason to understand how the courts would interpret it, or how they would be compelled to interpret it.

I think the Senate should reject the motion to recommit, adopt the substitute, and proceed to final passage of the resolution as amended.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to recommit. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], both of whom are absent on official business, are paired on this vote. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 74, as follows:

YEAS—18

Douglas	Humphrey	Morse
Fulbright	Jackson	Murray
Gillette	Kennedy	Neely
Hayden	Kilgore	Pastore
Hennings	Lehman	Sparkman
Hill	Magnuson	Wiley

NAYS—74

Aiken	Flanders	Mansfield
Anderson	Frear	Martin
Barrett	George	Maybank
Beall	Goldwater	McCarthy
Bennett	Gore	McClellan
Bricker	Green	Millikin
Burke	Griswold	Mundt
Bush	Hendrickson	Payne
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Potter
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Purtell
Byrd	Holland	Robertson
Capehart	Hunt	Russell
Carlson	Ives	Saltonstall
Case	Jenner	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kefauver	Stennis
Daniel	Kerr	Thye
Dirksen	Knowland	Upton
Duff	Kuchel	Watkins
Dworshak	Langer	Welker
Eastland	Lennon	Williams
Ellender	Long	Young
Ferguson	Malone	

NOT VOTING—4

Bridges	Monroney	Symington
McCarran		

So Mr. MORSE's motion to recommit was rejected.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is not expected that additional votes on the Bricker amendment will be taken tonight, but I wish to ask unanimous consent that the amendment presented by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, in its final form, may be printed and be available to Senators tomorrow and that the amendment, in its perfected form, presented by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, may be printed in its final form, so that both amendments will be on the desks of the Senators tomorrow when the Senate acts on the pending joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am very hopeful that the Senate may be in a position to complete action on the joint resolution tomorrow at a reasonable hour. If so, I would not expect to recommend to the Senate that there be a Saturday session. However, I would wish to reserve judgment on my recommendation in the event the Senate does not complete action on the proposed constitutional amendment tomorrow.

I should also like to have the Senate advised of the fact that it will have for consideration tomorrow a conference report, which is a privileged matter, relating to the retirement benefits of legislative officers and employees and members of Congress. I call attention to the fact that it may be called up tomorrow, so Senators may have ample notice.

COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have discussed with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Texas, a bill which passed the House today. It is very short, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered this evening. First I ask that the clerk read it, for the information of the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 8069) to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, was read the first time by title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 3 of the act of July 10, 1953, entitled "An act to establish a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Commission, not later than March 1, 1955, shall submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress its final report, including recommendations for legislative action; and the Commission may also from time to time make to the President such earlier reports as the President may request or as the Commission deems appropriate."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of such act of July 10, 1953, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 6. The Commission shall cease to exist at the close of business on March 1, 1955."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have discussed the proposed legislation with the

Democratic Members of the Commission, and we have no objection to the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill would extend the authority of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to complete its work and to make its report from March 1 of this year to March 1 of next year, when it will expire. As one of the co-sponsors of the original legislation, I had hoped the Senate might pass the bill today, in order that the Commission might not pass out of existence. I hope it will pass in its present form, because the House of Representatives, which passed it today, is not in session.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from Michigan give us his assurance that the Commission will end its work in another year?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan feels certain that the Senate will not be asked to extend the life of the Commission beyond another year. It is the hope and the desire of the administration that the work of the Commission will be completed at an early date. I know every effort will be exerted to that end.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the Senate will not be asked to extend it any longer.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator referring to the Manion Commission?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Who is going to be the Chairman of the Commission?

Mr. FERGUSON. That will depend on the appointing power.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I object to considering the bill tonight, because I wish to go into it to some extent. I do not like the way a fellow Hoosier has been treated. No one had informed me that the bill would be considered tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is advised that his objection is too late, and that no objection was offered to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, that cannot possibly be true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asked if there was any objection to the present consideration of the bill, and the Chair thought he heard none. Therefore, the bill is under consideration.

Mr. CAPEHART. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear the objection until this moment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think I have the floor, but I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope the Senator will not object to present consideration of the bill. The question involved is merely whether the Commission shall continue its work.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why is it so important to act on the bill presently?

Mr. FERGUSON. Unless the bill is passed, the power of the Commission to make its report, will expire on the first day of March, 1954. The fact that there is no chairman of the Commission should not stop the Commission from doing its work.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator mean the life of the Commission will expire on March 1st?

Mr. FERGUSON. The power of the Commission to make its report and complete its work will expire on March 1, 1954.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is provided by law?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is provided by law.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then my good friend from Indiana could have remained as Chairman of the Commission until March 1, and the Commission would have expired at that time. Did Mr. Adams or the President know the life of the Commission was going to be renewed? Did they go completely out of their way to slap down a great American for a matter of 6 or 7 or 10 days?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say they must have considered that the Commission would complete its work.

Mr. CAPEHART. The life of the Commission is to expire automatically on March 1; is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state that if the Senator from Indiana insists that he did object at the time his objection should have been heard, the Chair will sustain the objection.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did object. I reserved the right. I should like to discuss this matter a little bit. Then perhaps I shall not object. The situation is that the Commission is to expire, as I understand, on March 1.

Mr. FERGUSON. The power of the Commission to make its report will cease then.

Mr. CAPEHART. A citizen of Indiana was Chairman of the Commission which, as I understand, would have expired on March 1, and within about 10 days of that date he was deliberately fired, when those who fired him knew that the life of the Commission was to expire on March 1. They did not know at the White House that the life of the Commission was to be extended for another year.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, as a member of the Commission, I can say to the Senator that the White House knew the Commission could not get its work done within the time prescribed in the act. That was known months ago. The Chairman, Dr. Manion, was one of those who joined with others of us in the thought that we should make application—as is done in the bill—for an extension of time, in order that the Commission might have a fair chance to explore at least the areas into which it had commenced investigation. It was for that reason that the bill was introduced. But the facts were known at the White House and were known to the Commission; and the proposed action is that requested by Dr. Manion.

Mr. CAPEHART. If they knew it was going to be necessary, why did they wait until the last minute to request the renewal—at a time when no one of us has a chance to debate or argue the matter?

Mr. CORDON. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I thought I yielded to the Senator from Indiana, but I shall not press the point.

I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon if it is correct, as I understand, that the request for a 1-year extension was made as a result of the unanimous vote of the Commission.

Mr. CORDON. That is my impression. In the Commission there was unanimity of opinion. As to whether the vote was unanimous, I cannot say; but I am under the impression that was the case.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I was away when this matter came up, but I want the world to know that I think this is a most unfortunate situation. It seems that if a Member of the Senate wishes to have anything done for his State, either by the Senate or the administration, he must begin to object and to obstruct. I do not like the way some things are happening.

I want the world to know that; I want the majority leader to know it; I want the President to know it; I want Mr. Adams to know it; and I want others to know it. Frankly, I, for one, am getting a little bit tired of being kicked around. I think that is true of other Members of the Senate who are just being kicked around. Unless we walk right up and put our heads in the noose and say, "Boys, do whatever you want to do," it seems that we get pushed around and kicked around. I am not in favor of that. I wanted the world to know it, and I wanted the President and Mr. Adams and the Independent Party, if you please, and the Democratic Party, and the Republican Party to know it.

Mr. MORSE. I already know it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am not angry about it. I am in good humor about it, but I want them to know that I do not like it.

With that explanation, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. How much time is to be allowed?

Mr. KNOWLAND. One year.

Mr. WELKER. When does the time expire?

Mr. KNOWLAND. On March 1, 1955.

Mr. WELKER. Then we have some little time to deliberate the matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. The present law expires on March 1, 1954. This bill proposed that the time be extended 1 year.

The House passed the bill today. The House is now in recess, and the present law will expire if the Senate does not act.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask why we cannot postpone this bill until tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Only for the reason that on tomorrow we shall have a fairly heavy program. We shall have the Bricker amendment, the conference report on retirement, and an appropriation bill. I hope we shall not have to have a night session tomorrow night. I do not wish to request a Saturday session.

I had consulted with Senators on the other side of the aisle, after the distinguished chairman had brought this matter to my attention.

Under all the circumstances, I was very hopeful that we could dispose of the bill tonight, so we would not unduly delay the proceedings tomorrow.

No Senator would be foreclosed from discussing the case of Dr. Manion or anything else he might wish to discuss, as the able Senator from Idaho knows. So I plead with him to let this bill be passed.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I am always willing to cooperate with my distinguished friend, the majority leader. But here we find ourselves in a position where none of us has heard about this matter, which comes before us at the late hour of 6:15 p. m. Perhaps some of us would like to study the matter a little. Like the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I am not too happy about this situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate so very much the excellent cooperation of the majority leader, so far as a night session this evening is concerned, that I wish to reciprocate as much as I can.

When he presented the bill, I had the Members on this side of the aisle analyze it and evaluate it. We were somewhat disappointed, because we understood that last year was a study year, but we thought this year we would have a chance to study the studies. [Laughter.]

But under the bill, an additional year is requested, in order to permit the study to be continued. While we regret to see a report postponed that long, we are willing to go along, because of the unusual circumstances in which the Administration finds itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, who objected?

Mr. MAYBANK. I objected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will lie on the table.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 26, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 25, 1954:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Theodore F. Stevens, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4, district of Alaska, vice Everett W. Hepp, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Charles Peyton McKnight, Jr., of Texas, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas, vice Stanford C. Stiles, whose term expires February 28, 1954.

William Raab, of Nebraska, to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska, vice Frank Golden, resigned.

Hobart Kelliston McDowell, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Texas, vice James R. Wright, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

TO BE COLONEL

Leland Francis Adair, O41473.
Frank Adams, O51189.
Daniel Wayne Allison, O29071.
Robert Marshall Bacher, O51045.
×Richard Lee Baldwin, O29113.
Aaron Bank, O28959.
Cletos Otho Bennett, O28966.
Curtis Hargrave Bennett, O41821.
George Walter Frank Biles, O39590.
Charles Henry Blumenfeld, O29763.
Lewis Alexander Bonifay, O29040.
John William Bowen, O18904.
Fred Brasted, O41854.
Gilbert Guion Brinckerhoff, Jr., O41686.
Henry Chesnutt Britt, O18891.
Kirk Patrick Brock, O41650.
Clarence O. Brunner, O29456.
Roy Thomas Bucy, O51188.
R. Beverly Caldwell, O51185.
Ross Rowland Caldwell, O51111.
×Peter Duryea Calyer, O17116.
×Hugh Thomas Cary, O18845.
William Turner Cathcart, O41521.
Arthur Clark Cheyne, O29512.
Carl Francis Chirico, O29506.
James Madison Churchill, Jr., O18907.
Robert Anthony Cliffe, O29515.
Theodore Philip Coates, O41480.
×Loris Ray Cochran, O18889.
Howard Coleman, O29457.
James Walker Connor, O29479.
Jewell Howard Cook, O39595.
John Garnett Coughlin, O18898.
Thomas Joseph Counihan, O17183.
James Winfield Coutts, O18875.
John Francis Cox, O41534.
Ronald Bryce Currens, O41816.
James Chase Damron, O41793.
Charles Salvatore D'Orsa, O18866.
George Thigpen Duncan, O18878.
×Kenneth Alfred Eddy, O29014.
Frederic Nelson Eichorn, O39636.
Marvin Columbus Ellison, O41494.
×Herbert Fred Farmer, O39704.
Louis Joseph Ferony, O50979.
William Floyd Foster, O51016.
Edwin George Fritz, O51063.
Russell Dwight Funk, O42067.
×Arville Ward Gillette, O18883.
Dan Gilmer, O18876.
Joe Edwin Golden, O18872.
×Ira Wellington Grande, O29503.
Clebert Leon Hall, O17779.
Robert Guy Haines, O29460.
Thomas Robertson Hannah, O18899.
Kenneth Kalmar Hansen, O29481.
William Virgil Harber, O39578.
Harley Douglas Harpold, O41831.
Marvin Hays, O41826.
Edward Blackburn Hempstead, O17649.
Charles Gates Herman, O18885.
Gerald Joseph Higgins, O19530.
Alton Arrington Hill, O29384.
Francis Hill, O19058.
Samuel Thomas Hill, O41680.
×Frederick Milton Hinshaw, O18867.
Harry Ernest Hornecker, O29082.
Frank Musser Hosterman, O38631.
William Hand Browne Howard, O39613.
Jerome Hubbard, O41814.
Roscoe Constantine Huggins, O18851.
Sydney Frank Hyde, O29035.
Rupert Ingram, O51103.
Edward Bedell James, O41549.
×Maximiano Saqui Janairo, O18098.
Clarence Melvin Jennings, O41643.
William Elton Kaley, O41818.
×O'Neill Keren Kane, O18150.
John William Keating, O18897.
Henry Alexander Keller, O39637.
Theodore Douglas Kern, O51209.
Stanley Adolph Kretlow, O39708.
John Christopher Lackas, O29366.
×Lawrence Donald Lally, O41674.
Charles Pirie Law, O41684.
Benjamin Albert Lentz, O29401.
Berkley Read Lewis, O29065.
Clarence Shirley Lewis, O29039.
John Cook Light, O39611.
Julian Broster Lindsey, O17772.
Harold Matheson Lindstrom, O28932.
Winton Henry Loveless, O39643.
John Joseph MacFarland, O18100.
Thomas Henry Magness, Jr., O51199.
Walter Danley McCahan, O28936.
Gerald Patrick McCarthy, O41617.
Joseph Maney McCarthy, O29043.
×Charles John McCormick, O51083.
Thomas Randall McDonald, O18892.
Robert Joseph McDuff, O28976.
Upton Albert McGill, O41659.
Alton Oscar McLane, O38658.
William Anderson McNulty, O18871.
Harry Theodore Meyers, O41608.
Edward Gibson Miller, O41633.
×Harold William Miner, O51102.
Roy Edwin Moore, O18880.
Montescue Theodore Moree, O41834.
Sam Francis Muffie, O51201.
Clarence Joseph Murphy, O39647.
Ruel Raymond Neiger, O39576.
Vardell Edwards Nesmith, O39669.
×Stephen Laird Nichols, O28844.
Charles Mason O'Donnell, O29010.
×James Dupree Ogletree, O29492.
Edward Julian Ormiston, O29015.
Wayland Henry Parr, O17565.
Ralph Emerson Pearson, O51077.
Maurice Anthony Peerenboom, O39684.
Wendell Woody Perham, O28999.
×Herbert Lloyd Phyfe, O29390.
Lunsford Clay Pittman, O39586.
Alfred Prahinski, O41620.
×William Clemens Pritchard, O29455.
Raymond Russell Ramsey, O29470.
Clarence Edward Read, O39602.
Frederick Wells Reese, O39600.
×Harry Brownwell Reubel, O29050.
William Pitt Ring, Jr., O29467.
Willis George Robbins, O51081.
×William Ray Robinette, O29539.
×John Edward Rogers, O41505.
Harold Carlos Rowe, O29413.
Charles Frederick Russe, O50967.

Ernest Allen Sallee, O41523.
Thomas Eason Sams, O28989.
×William Otto Schlotter, O41495.
Howard Ignatius Schmitt, O50987.
David Peter Schorr, Jr., O18861.
Arthur Lloyd Selby, O38669.
Leland Claypool Shannon, O29346.
William Summers Shoemaker, O39694.
Ernest Entler Smith, O29418.
George Waite Smith, O29013.
Lon Harley Smith, O18854.
Morton Solomon, O51002.
John Melvin Stark, O39622.
Ernest La Verne Stockton, O39560.
Frank Rockwell Swoger, O29429.
Kenneth Hensley Tando, O39695.
Homer Downing Thomas, O41621.
Hundley Thompson, O41663.
Millard Thompson, O28951.
John Day Tolman, O51191.
Admiral Brinkley Trammell, O41501.
Joseph Henry Twyman, Jr., O18116.
Hugh Anderson Vest, O39692.
Luster Azil Vickrey, O17592.
Homer Reamer Wallar, O51196.
Leon Wendell Walton, O29062.
×Frederick Reginia Weber, O18148.
George Winship Weego, O41484.
John Clinton Welborn, O18863.
Edmund David White, O29077.
Howard Raymond Whittaker, O29408.
Homer Widmann, O29032.
Harry Elsworth Wilbert, O41539.
Basil Emerson Williams, O51025.
×Zack Maroney Williams, O50966.
William Edward Williamson, O50970.
John Lea Wilson, Jr., O39587.
×Minor Keith Wilson, O41626.
Raymond Carlyle Woodes, O29067.
George Edward Woods, Jr., O41840.
Herbert William Wurtzler, O39596.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

TO BE CAPTAIN, JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

×Edwin Forrest Amberman, O63841.
×Paul Eugene Beckman, O66135.
×Eugene Julian Bell, Jr., O63676.
×William Alfred Cameron, O68331.
×Lawrence Woolf Caruthers, O67554.
×Joseph Carroll Chandler, O66142.
×Vernon Mercer Culpepper, O66145.
×Robert Nelson DuRant, O63803.
×Dan Henry Farr, O65554.
×John Edmond Flick, O64988.
×Milton Pritchett Garner, O68187.
×Morris Goldschlager, O65593.
×James Andrew Hagan, O66003.
×Guy Andrews Hamlin, O63740.
×Ralph Brock Hammack, O66004.
×James Reed Harrington, O66158.
×Roland DeWitt Hartshorn, O66010.
×James Victor Harvey, O68012.
×Bueford Gilbert Herbert, O64986.
×Morris Douglas Hodges, O65549.
×William Allison Horger, O63844.
×James Cornelius Hughes, O66024.
×Heyward George Jeffers, Jr., O66166.
×Reid William Kennedy, Jr., O68366.
×Malcolm Lee McCain, O64989.
×Shelton Ross Nelson, O65687.
×John Irving Nevin, O63804.
×Thomas Calvin Oldham, O66188.
×George Van Wyck Pope, Jr., O63485.
×Charles Mathew Powell, Jr., O65475.
×John Coleman Powell, Jr., O68395.
×Bernard Antony Ramundo, O65586.
×Richard Leo Rice, O65690.
×Francis Kost Richwine, O66084.
×Harry Earle Robbins, Jr., O66197.
×Wayne Guthrie Roberts, O63486.
×Edwin Morgan Schmidt, O63677.
×Donald Lyle Shaneyfelt, O64987.
×Billy Joe Shuman, O66098.
×Arthur Roland Slade, Jr., O63741.
×John Andy Smith, Jr., O63843.
×James Elsworth Stodgel, O67963.
×Charles Holland Taylor, O66641.
×Henry Russell Thomas, O65548.
×Robert Parrish Tomlinson, O65545.
×Jack Gorman Van Deventer, O65701.
×Hugh Tabor Verano, O64992.
×Howard Vincent, O65703.
×William Alexander Watt, O63742.
×Luther Charles West, O65704.
×John William Whelan, O64990.
×Edwin Hardy White, O66120.
×Wayne Graham Williams, O65550.
×Dennis Alexander York, O66212.
×Charles Arthur Zuccardy, O64991.

TO BE CAPTAIN, CHAPLAINS

×Kenneth Glenn Irwin, O66165.
×Edwin Allen Jones, O66168.
×Paul Ernst Klett, O67588.
×William Edward Paul, Jr., O67603.
×Lewis Burleigh Sheen, O67615.

TO BE CAPTAIN, MEDICAL CORPS

×Robert Vincent Anderson, O67548.
×Silas Michael Babin, Jr., O67549.
×Grover Cleveland Bolin, Jr., O65683.
×Glenn Brigham Burt, Jr., O66614.
×Harry Alvin Claypool, O67907.
×Jerald Rhodes Cureton, O67807.
×Vincent Keet Cutshall, O67562.
×Vincent Louis de Ciutiis, O65976.
×Thomas Sinclair Evilsizer, Jr., O69917.
×Robert Eugene Feighny, O67568.
×George Paul Foley, O67572.
×William Richard Howard, O67828.
×Clifford Clayton Lardinois, Sr., O67590.
×Philip Jhune Whan Lee, O67592.
×Bert Grover Leigh, O67593.
×Robert Vincent Locke, O67594.
×Thomas Ernest Mattingly, Jr., O67596.
×Foster Collins McCaleb, Jr., O67842.
×Christopher Ludwig Mengis, O69529.
×Clarence Paul Nay, O65537.
×Charles Offie Onstead, Jr., O67600.
×Merle Charles Page, O67601.
×Maurice Glenn Patton, O70012.
×James Philip Richardson, O67608.
×Mervin Herbert Schwartz, O67866.
×James Allen Shafer, O65464.
×Thomas William Sheehy, O67614.
×Frederick Jolley Sheffield, O67616.
×Victor Joseph Slominski, Jr., O67868.
×Vincent Charles Sweeney, O67875.
×William John Toland, O67626.
×Henry Thomas Uhrig, O67878.
×Nicholas William Van Leeuwen, O67630.
×Jack Frederick Wisman, O67886.
×Charles Joseph Zerzan, Jr., O68065.

TO BE CAPTAIN, DENTAL CORPS

×Joseph Stanley Churan, O68794.
×Cecil Franklin Clement, Jr., O67800.
×Roy Edwin Daniel, O69476.
×Robert Edward Dudley, O66616.
×Howard McKnight Duffield, O63847.
×Robert James Everhart, O68002.
×Robert Eugene Farrand, O65988.
×Walter Howard Fox, O66619.
×Joe Frisch, O61193.
×John Price Hathaway, Jr., O66624.
×William Clarence Hurt, O67831.
×Robert Duane Jeronimus, O67585.
×Fredrick Adam Karlson, Jr., O66627.
×Milton Junior Knapp, O67589.
×Donald Owen Lundquist, O65685.
×Billie Delmar McGrew, O67941.
×Ernest Beckwith Mingledorff, O64985.
×Samuel Craig Mooney, O63842.
×Edmund Casimir Pacocha, O65697.
×William Charles Pasternak, O70019.
×John William Plummer, O66071.
×Roland Courtney Sheridan, Jr., O65686.
×Thomas Joseph Smith, O68050.
×Charles William Summers, O70048.
×James Allen Turner, O69567.
×Charles William Vandas, O65590.
×Alfred Carson Waldrep, O70057.
×Billie Gene West, O63180.
×Louis Zislis, O68066.

TO BE CAPTAIN, VETERINARY CORPS

×Edward Ernest Dean, O65547.
×Garland Ray Farmer, O68342.
×Leslie Edwin Meckstroth, O65538.
×Erich Charles Mehnert, O68385.
×Richard Barton Morgan, O65540.
×William Everette Riley, O65553.
×William Eugene Rothe, O70031.
×Francis Lovell Thomas, O67624.
×Roy Walter Upham, O65551.
×Donald Harold Yost, O66129.

TO BE CAPTAIN, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

×George Franklin Harding 3d, O68354.
×Robert Donald Hart, O66009.
×Ernest Robert Kolovos, O68022.
×Russell Ellsworth Mason, O68382.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

*James Harrison Aarestad, O69576.
*George Howard Adams, O69450.
×John Talmage Adams, Jr., O69451.
×*Paul Garfield Adams, O68067.
×Franklin Wray Aldenderfer, Jr., O69581.
*George William Aldridge, O69582.
×Hubert Franklin Alexander, Jr., O68068.
×William Arden Alfonte, Jr., O63765.
×Shelby Glenn Alfred, O64722.
×John Charles Allen, O69583.
*Skinner Edward Anderson, O69453.
×Charles Edward Anthony, Jr., O64238.
×Raymond Edward Arnold, O64226.
×Harold Thomas Babb, O63758.
*Olin Justus Baird, Jr., O68075.
×Harold Lee Baker, O64244.
×Frank Philip Kendrick Barker, Jr., O64243.
×Edward Samuel Basanez, O69585.
×Samuel John Bateman, Jr., O63761.
×*James Daniel Bates, O63607.
*Alfred Kenneth Baum, O69587.
×*Adolph E. Baumann, O63554.
×*David Judson Baumgardner, O63594.
×David Allen Bell, O69459.
×Daniel Joel Benefiel, O69588.
×Ralph Olivett Benefield, O67788.
×Frederick Warden Best, Jr., O64245.
×John Julius Bilon, O69591.
×*Louis Robert Birkmeyer, O63576.
×John Ray Black, O64253.
×Robert Edward Blackwell, O64250.
×Robert Milton Bond, O69596.
×James Clare Bowden, Jr., O66136.
*Paul Francis Braim, O69598.
*John Francis Brandenburg, O69599.
*Edwin Ray Breed, O69462.
×James Philip Broady, O64237.
×Vincent Ignatius Brosky, O64232.
×*Albert Byrd Brown, Jr., O63625.
×*Dewey Everett Brown, O63597.
×William Robert Brown, O69603.
×*Russell Eldridge Brubaker, O63652.
×Baird Patterson Bryson, O69604.
×Bruce Fay Buck, O69465.
×Allan Arthur Buergin, O65331.
×*John Philip Burke, O63563.
×Robert Byron Burke, Jr., O65327.
×Joseph William Burkett, O69608.
*Lowell Eugene Burkholder, O69609.
×*Jack William Burns, O63631.
*James Robert Burns, O69610.
×John Taylor Busbee, O64259.
*John William Campbell, O69613.
*Ralph Julian Canine, Jr., O69466.
×Morris Clinton Cannon, O66140.
×Archie Eldon Carpenter, O65621.
×Joseph Rae Carvajal, O63756.
×William Russell Cashman, Jr., O64224.
×Ralph Gordon Chadbourne, O69617.
*Carlyle Hyatt Charles O69618.
×James Clark, O69468.
×Philip Lloyd Clark, O69469.
×Jack Richard Clawson, O63689.
×Carrell A. Clem, Jr., O69470.
×*Junie L. Clough, O63525.
*Walter Emerson Coleman, O70081.
×Harry Henderson Collier, O63691.
×James Hubert Cook, O69471.
×George Edward Craft, O64254.

×*Max A. Craig, O63654.
×George Dunmore Cram, Jr., O69475.
×Theodore Harrison Crane, O65335.
×Raymond Benson Cromwell, Jr., O63858.
*Edward Earnest Crow, O69627.
George William Curran 2d, O68091.
×*Louis Aaron Daigneau, Jr., O63565.
×*Earl Edward Daly, Jr., O63630.
×*William Edward Davis, O63608.
*Alan DeYoung, O69478.
×Bernard Wayne Dibbert, O64231.
×*John F. Dickson, Jr., O63633.
×*Thomas Jacob Dilbeck, O63685.
*Robert Roy Dobson, O69631.
×George Herman Doerman, O68095.
×Earl Dean Downing, O63698.
×John Joseph Doyle, Jr., O64255.
*William Thomas Duba, O69636.
×Christian Frank Dubia, O69637.
×*Ernest Mobley Eberhardt, Jr., O63583.
×Robert Carl Ebersberger, O63690.
×Robert Craig Effinger, Jr., O63696.
×Richard Lambert Ehni, O63864.
×*Robert Harvey Erdrich, O63657.
×*Donald Esper, O63581.
×*Randall George Eubanks, O63524.
×Norman Eva, Jr., O69641.
*Bill George Evans, O69642.
×Harry Feinstein, O63767.
×Curtis Dudley Fish, O69485.
*Stanton Entine Fisher, O69645.
*Frederick Felix Flemming, O69647.
*Harley Chalmers Fox, O69648.
*Albert Austin Fuerst, O69650.
*James Arnold Fyock, O69652.
×Gerald Owen Galvan, O64247.
×Dennis Verlin Gentry, Jr., O69490.
×Edwin Bernard Gentry, O64362.
*Raymond Gilchrist, Jr., O69491.
×Angelo Giambusso, O63687.
×Elijah Henry Girven, Jr., O66000.
×Rudolph Michael Goffredo, O69657.
*John Donald Gordon, O69659.
*Charles Stewart Graves, O69494.
×Sammie Lee Greene, O68349.
×Robert Lee Greer, O65326.
*Bob Leroy Gregory, O69663.
×Alton White Griffeth, O68106.
Warren Grile Hale, O64257.
Floyd Harold Hall, O63818.
×Francis Gail Hall, O68108.
×*James Arthur Hammond, O63664.
*Robert Blair Hankins, O69498.
*David Eugene Hardy, Jr., O69665.
*James Marion Harlan, O69667.
×Robert Luther Harper, O63699.
×Audley Chandler Harris, O69669.
×*Gerald Edwin Harris, O63606.
×*Edward Abram Hart, Jr., O63634.
*William Hart, O69502.
×Bernard Thomas Hassett, O63857.
×*Gene Lee Haupert, O63536.
×*John Edward Hazelwood, O68110.
*Howard Bennett Helm, O69673.
*John Thomas Henderson, O69675.
×Gustav Heningburg, O65622.
*Jack Alton Henson, O69677.
*William Frank Henson, O69678.
×*Clarence Thomas Hewgley, Jr., O63550.
×*Peter Eugen Hexner, O68113.
×William Wesley Higgins, O69681.
×*Irving Allyn Hill, O63590.
×William Joseph Hoar, O63694.
×Ernest Palmer Hoff, Jr., O63686.
×Herbert Sidney Holland, Jr., O69505.
*Joe Rice Hooker, O69684.
×Raymond Arthur Hopkins, O69506.
×Ralph Robert Hoppe, O68685.
×Cleo Noel Howard, Jr., O69507.
×Henry Coggeshall Howells, Jr., O69686.
×Johnson Hubbell, O64241.
*William Augustus Hudson, O69687.
*Lonnie Ray Huff, O69508.
*William Richard Huggins, O69689.
*Harold William Humphrey, O69691.
×*Robert Lee Hurd, O63580.
×Clarence Clifton Igo, O69692.
×Kenneth Ross Ingold, O63764.
*Jack John Isler, O69694.
*Walter Newit Israel, O69695.
*Arthur J. Jackson, O69509.
*George Thomas James, O69696.
×Herman Henry James, Jr., O69697.
×Daniel Franklin Johnson, O69700.
*Samuel Haigh Jopling, Jr., O69513.
*James Eugene Karo, O69515.
×Edward Arthur Kelley, Jr., O69516.
*Edwin Coit Kelton, Jr., O69707.
*Keith Reginald Keister, O69706.
*Marvin Emmett Kemp, O69708.
×*George Roger Kennedy, O63520.
×Edward Beckham Kenney, O63700.
×Otto Kerr, Jr., O63861.
×Roy Edward Kimble, O66174.
*Edward Lavoise King, O69711.
×*John Powell King, O63623.
×James Elmore Kingman, O63773.
×George Richard Kirmse, O64233.
Emory Winton Kline, Jr., O69713.
*Emil Eldon Kluever, O69714.
×Richard Hill Koenig, O69716.
*Carl Albert Koffler, O69519.
×Richard Dawes Kolter, O63692.
×Laurence Henry Krause, O69521.
*Wilbur Keith Kreigh, O69718.
*Kenneth Arthur Lagoni, O63567.
×*Clem Russell Lakin, O63560.
×*Marshall Austin Lanter, O63558.
×Keith Edward Larsen, O63688.
*John Robert Lauderdale, O69721.
*William Henry Lawler, O69722.
*Carl Allen Lee, O69724.
×Norman Joseph Le Mere, O69725.
×Samuel Shrewsbury Lewis, Jr., O64625.
×Gerald Aubrey Liebert, O68127.
×Frederick Donald Limmer, O63866.
×*Delmas Valgene Lippard, O63636.
×*Carroll Dean Logan, O63561.
×Domenic Fred Longo, O68131.
×Brutus Augustus Lowery, Jr., O68377.
×Lon Ulysses Lutz, O65324.
×Francis Joseph Lynch, O68379.
×*Donald Peter Malloch, Jr., O63553.
×Dick Robert Markwell, O65758.
×Paul Grey Martin, O63757.
*Bruce Douglas Mather, O68135.
×*Frank Albert Matthews, O63609.
×*Wallace Merle Maurer, O63592.
×*Warren Melvin Maurer, O63593.
×Leon McCall, Jr., O68136.
×*James Robert McClure, O63637.
×*Joseph Albert McDade, O68137.
×*Everette Glenn McGhee, O63627.
*Norman Francis McGinnis, Jr., O69738.
*John Edward McGlothlin, O69739.
*Leslie Gerald McNair, O69742.
×*Arlen Austin McNeil, O63647.
*Thomas Jackson McQuade, Jr., O63632.
×Samuel Littler Mecalfe, Jr., O64225.
×Jules Raymond Meyer, Jr., O69745.
*Woodburn Johnson Mickel, Jr., O69747.
×Myles Herbert Mierswa, O64240.
×*George Ellis Mills, O63599.
×John Chester Moon, O68140.
*Harry Lee Moore, O69750.
×*John Thomas Moore, O63661.
*Joseph Edward Moore, O69751.
×Arthur Dupré Moreland, O69531.
×Marcus Duncan Moreman, O69532.
Raymond Kenneth Mortensen, O69993.
×Harold Edward Mortimore, O64229.
×John James Mott, O66058.
*Harold Philip Mueller, O69754.
*Robert William Muller, O63648.
×Forrest Cooke Murphy, Jr., O63812.
×Joseph Bernard Murphy, O63816.
×*Razeal Nash, O63545.
×William Richard Needham, O65329.
*Paul Duane Nefstead, O69756.
×Charles Kendall Nichols, O68390.
×Leo Martin O'Brien, Jr., O69535.
×Lowell Elon Oder, O68203.
×Ralph Bartlett Osgood, Jr., O69760.
*Joe Maurice Palmer, O69764.
*John Worth Park, Jr., O69765.
×Theodore Graham Parkman, Jr., O63860.
×Rodney Gustavel Parrish, O69767.
*John Hale Pearson, O70014.
×John Albert Pedigo, O64239.
×James Cloy Pennington, O69768.
×Will Harrison Perry, Jr., O63755.
×Louis Peterka, O69769.
×*William Clell Petty, O63532.
×Y. Y. Phillips, Jr., O69540.
×John Wise Pick, Jr., O69542.
×Billie Ray Pierce, O68149.
×Bobbie Joe Pinkerton, O69543.
*William Isaac Pippin, O69771.
×*Donald Nuss Plants, O63552.
×Robert Lewis Plavnick, O64258.
×*Joseph Harrison Poole, O63853.
×Robert David Porter, O63769.
×*Jack Beckwith Porterfield, O63659.
×John Francis Prendiville, Jr., O63695.
×Herbert Howard Ray, O69549.
×Joseph Edward Reger, O61883.
×*Ralph Emerson Renken, O63653.
×Raymond George Rennebaum, O64235.
*Carl Reno, O69775.
×*John Henry Richardson, O63642.
×Albert Edward Riley, O63693.
*Donald Lorne Roberts, O69778.
×John Curtis Roberts, Jr., O64251.
*Antonio Rodriguez-Balinas, O68154.
*Richard Arlen Rooth, O69780.
*Peter Wayne Rose, O69781.
×Robert Richard Rudy, O69782.
*Johnnie Leotis Runnels, O69551.
×*Clifford Thomas Rutledge, O63538.
×Robert Brenner Rutledge, O64256.
×Gordon Curtis Russell, O64236.
*Robert Edgar Ryan, O68159.
×*Frank Wesley Sample, O63535.
×*Horace Murdock Sanders, Jr., O63598.
×Neal Wesley Sanders, Jr., O67978.
×Jack Edward Sappenfield, O64270.
×Robert James Saxton, O69784.
*William Emerson Schiller, O69785.
×*Robert Max Schlemmer, O63546.
*James Scudder, O69787.
*Eldred Steed Sessions, O69789.
×Joseph Phillip Seymoe, O57342.
*Wilbur Christian Shepard, O69792.
×*Joseph Andrew Shewski, O63595.
×*John Morris Shipley, O63582.
×George Pierce Short, Jr., O65328.
×*George Breckenridge Skinner, O63575.
×Ivan Lewis Slavich, Jr., O64223.
×*Kulman Bussey Smith, O63568.
×Hansel Young Smith, Jr., O63697.
×Joseph Winford Smith, O69797.
×*William Holden Smith, O63660.
*Joseph Lester Somers, O69561.
×John Ferdinand Spaid, O68171.
×Archie Lee Stamper, O64222.
×Thomas Eustace Steimer, O64228.
×Lewis Irwin Stein, O69801.
×*John Addison Stevenson, O63854.
×*Jerry Hyde Stilson, O63638.
×Robert George Martin Storey, O69806.
*Ernest Ervin Street, O63537.
×William Benedict Strong, Jr., O64252.
×Robert Bowater Sumner, O63859.
×Thomas Haruo Takano, O69564.
*Darwin Daine Talafuse, O63564.
×John Henry Talbot, O69810.
×*Albert Prince Taylor, Jr., O63663.
*David Colbert Thomas, O69815.
×Raymond Robert Thomson, O63820.
×Charles Joseph Treat, O67627.
×Ray Earle Tucker, O65330.
×Billy Gene Walker, O64248.
×Charles Francis Ward, Jr., O66117.
*James Weaver, O69572.
×Jonathan Mechem Weaver, Jr., O68174.
×Obel Hershel Wells, O69827.
×Marion Equiller White, O69830.
×*Nelson Lord Whitmire, O63588.
×Don Alvan Wilkinson, O63819.
×Lawrence Harvey Dean Williams, O69573.
×*Walton Springfield Williams, O63521.
×Donald Morton Wood, O64234.
×*Glenn Hudson Woods, Jr., O63544.
×*Donald Arthur Yoder, O63570.
×*Fletcher Robert Young, Jr., O63577.
*James Otis Youngblood, O69841.
×Richard Edward Zastrow, O69842.
×*Richard Gerhard Zeller, O63640.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

×Charles Robert Angel,, O69848.
*Robert Edward Bolger, O69863.
×Duke Constantine Bradford, Jr., O69864.
×Francis Joseph Carmody, Jr., O69876.
*Claudius Darlington Chewning, O69881.
*John Pershing Crawford, O69891.

×*Hugh Francis Daly, Jr., O69896.
×Stephen Peter Dittman, O69904.
×Kenneth Dane Garis, O69929.
×*Henry Vieth Griffith, O69938.
×Charles Robert Hamm, O69941.
×Robert Arvin Hedeen, O68111.
×Dan Heyward Horton, O69951.
*Joseph Irvin Hungate, Jr., O69953.
×Robert John MacLennan, O69975.
*Joseph Priestly Madrano, O69976.
John Dean Marshall, Jr., O69978.
×Gust Henry Mastricola, O69980.
×Robert Warren McKinney, O69986.
*Roy Lee Mundy, O69997.
*Herman Carter Needles, O70002.
*Emil Gilbert Shaw, O68163.
×*Robert Dudley Short, O63621.
*Jack Cunningham Smith, O70041.
×William Gail Storms, O70047.
*John Phillip Valentine, O70054.
*John Raymond Wagner, O70056.
×Paul Brown Welch, Jr., O70062.
*Robert Olin Whitmore, O70065.
×Vernon Halstein Wold, O63814.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by section 3, Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, approved May 16, 1950. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

TO BE CAPTAIN, ARMY NURSE CORPS

Sara Cecelia Mooney, N1752.
×Margaret Patricia Phillips, N1758.
Marian Agnes Tierney, N1750.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, ARMY NURSE CORPS

×Doris Sue Frazier, N2348.
Ellen Frances Gubics, N2611.
×Kathryn Alice Koenig, N2521.
*Phyllis Mae Loucks, N2606.
×Mary Elizabeth Mack, N2522.
×Ruth Anna Wilson, N2347.

TO BE CAPTAIN, WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Lottie Vera Blanton, J57.
×Francine B. Bundt, M10018.
×Barbara May Knickerbocker, J33.
×Bertha May Schrack, J26.
×Winnifred Eudora Soady, J65.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT, WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

×Florence Madeleine Bearden, J70.
Sarah Joan Dempster, M10150.
×Ruth Anna Emilia Rickers, J71.
×Margaret Elnora Waple, J72.

NOTE.—The officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) were promoted during the recess of the Senate.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Marion C. Sparks, Alabaster, Ala. Office established November 1, 1951.
James T. Easterling, Clio, Ala., in place of H. M. Snell, resigned.
Marjorie C. Joyner, Garland, Ala., in place of N. P. McCaskill, retired.
Robert M. Fike, Marbury, Ala., in place of W. R. Warrick, retired.
Frances J. Davis, Repton, Ala., in place of J. E. Nettles, Jr., transferred.
William F. Gregory, Rutledge, Ala., in place of A. G. Rushton, deceased.
Frank J. Leutner, Jr., Summerdale, Ala., in place of R. G. Underwood, transferred.

ARIZONA

David J. C. McKinsey, Elfrida, Ariz., in place of T. B. Patterson, transferred.
Mary G. Ferguson, Winslow, Ariz., in place of G. T. Stevens, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Catherine E. Warden, Carlotta, Calif., in place of Julia Mantova resigned.
Elmer J. Chadwick, Cotati, Calif., in place of R. A. Clothier, retired.
Elmer A. Glanzer, Dinuba, Calif., in place of S. E. Burum, retired.
Lois C. Doss, Forestville, Calif., in place of G. O. Athey, resigned.
Germaine A. Rock, Glen Ellen, Calif., in place of C. W. Marsh, declined.
Floyd Erdman, Herndon, Calif., in place of E. A. Erdman, resigned.
Walter E. Parke, Laguna Beach, Calif., in place of B. B. Coffin, resigned.
Dorothy K. Haines, Lake Hughes, Calif., in place of J. B. Hurd, retired.
John T. Boyd, Jr., Newport Beach, Calif., in place of W. H. Adams, deceased.
Ruth H. Hutchins, North Highlands, Calif. Office established July 1, 1951.
William J. Kelly, Penngrove, Calif., in place of Christine Bones, retired.
Ada V. Keener, Rockport, Calif., in place of M. H. Williams, resigned.
John F. Phillips, San Clemente, Calif., in place of B. M. Ayer, removed.
Leon P. Scammon, Saugus, Calif., in place of C. W. Ray, resigned.
William H. Wolf, Sharp Park, Calif., in place of J. Z. Silva, resigned.
Harry E. Van Cleve, Sunnyvale, Calif., in place of J. H. Fahey, retired.
Elizabeth S. Sobrero, Taylorsville, Calif., in place of M. B. Herring, deceased.

COLORADO

Charles E. Robison, Crowley, Colo., in place of G. W. Swift, resigned.
Thomas T. MacLiver, Trinidad, Colo., in place of B. B. Beshoar, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Helen C. Evangelist, Candlewood Isle, Conn., in place of J. L. Jone, resigned.
Lester P. Olson, Collinsville, Conn., in place of G. B. Moroney, retired.
Margaret M. Turner, East Windsor Hill, Conn., in place of M. B. Thornton, deceased.
Edward C. Butler, Southington, Conn., in place of J. J. O'Keefe, retired.

FLORIDA

Ira W. McCollum, Brooksville, Fla., in place of C. S. Ashbrook, retired.
Forrest S. Smith, Lake Wales, Fla., in place of M. M. Coates, retired.
John W. Harrison, Laurel Hill, Fla., in place of F. A. Labors, retired.
Frances D. Taylor, Malone, Fla., in place of O. L. Ward, resigned.
Louise A. Echols, Pelican Lake, Fla., in place of E. T. Jones, resigned.
Paul E. Albury, Tavernier, Fla., in place of R. H. Albury, resigned.

GEORGIA

Pierce E. Cody, Marietta, Ga., in place of W. E. Schilling, retired.

IDAHO

Thornton S. Lambert, Burley, Idaho, in place of H. W. Daven, deceased.
Frederick D. Shaw, Spirit Lake, Idaho, in place of R. J. Hamacher, retired.

ILLINOIS

Vernon F. Otto, Alhambra, Ill., in place of M. W. Pearce, resigned.
George E. Gillett, Avon, Ill., in place of G. A. McFarland, retired.
August J. Mier, Batavia, Ill., in place of Jacob Feldman, retired.
John H. Scattergood, Buffalo, Ill., in place of J. E. Robertson, retired.
Charles Smith, Calumet City, Ill., in place of J. S. Muckian, deceased.
T. Floyd Hughey, Dewey, Ill., in place of R. L. Drennan, deceased.
Merrill W. Volle, Golconda, Ill., in place of W. L. Smith, resigned.
Franklin A. Canaday, Homer, Ill., in place of R. M. Shoaf, transferred.
Fred H. Lancaster, Macon, Ill., in place of M. R. Beckett, transferred.
Fergus G. Anderson, Ohio, Ill., in place of C. W. Knuth, transferred.
Duane R. Jacobson, Pontiac, Ill., in place of C. E. Myers, deceased.
Leo C. Franklin, Prairie du Rocher, Ill., in place of W. C. Dufrenne, transferred.
Elmer P. Carter, Jr., Rosiclare, Ill., in place of O. M. Lamar, retired.
Robert A. Bachand, St. Anne, Ill., in place of C. J. Hanen, removed.
Harry E. Bigler, Urbana, Ill., in place of C. F. Loeb, retired.
Marcellus E. Senne, Woodstock, Ill., in place of W. W. Desmond, retired.

INDIANA

Fred L. Scarce, Fountain City, Ind., in place of Gene Harris, retired.
Chelcie J. Bebout, Freetown, Ind., in place of W. W. Goble, removed.
Earl R. Reid, Lakeville, Ind., in place of F. P. Rensberger, transferred.
Eldora L. Weigle, Otterbein, Ind., in place of W. N. Burns, deceased.

IOWA

George W. Hepworth, Chelsea, Iowa, in place of R. C. Formanek, transferred.
Donald E. Rollins, Chester, Iowa, in place of C. J. Murphy, deceased.
Arthur R. Kroppach, Davenport, Iowa, in place of E. J. Halligan, deceased.
France R. Wanberg, Galva, Iowa, in place of William Molloy, retired.
Merle J. McMahon, Hampton, Iowa, in place of R. A. Fox, resigned.
Wayne R. Bauerle, Harlan, Iowa, in place of H. W. Campbell, retired.
William E. Boyd, Liscomb, Iowa, in place of N. L. Meyers, resigned.
Bertie C. Ramus, Lu Verne, Iowa, in place of J. L. Lichty, retired.
Hazel F. Lawless, Macksburg, Iowa, in place of L. S. Lawless, deceased.
Fred E. Smith, Marble Rock, Iowa, in place of E. S. Jenison, resigned.
Merland J. Wackerbarth, Melvin, Iowa, in place of E. V. Pohlman, transferred.
Ronald R. Thompson, Merrill, Iowa, in place of I. W. Machamer, retired.
Ronald Metzger, Olds, Iowa, in place of C. L. Chrissinger, deceased.

KANSAS

Hallene T. Utter, Cherryvale, Kans., in place of J. A. Rogers, retired.
Louis B. Perkins, Elkhart, Kans., in place of J. L. Ketchum, transferred.
George H. Niesley, Ellis, Kans., in place of Fred Sessin, retired.
Walter W. Beggs, Ensign, Kans., in place of E. J. Reed, resigned.
Quentin L. Ault, Esbon, Kans., in place of Edward Grauerholz, retired.
Bernard A. Bieber, Kinsley, Kans., in place of P. P. Voran, transferred.
Raymond E. Brannan, Meade, Kans., in place of P. W. Smith, retired.
Warren R. Jones, Mulberry, Kans., in place of J. F. Buche, transferred.
Donald E. Burgardt, Park, Kans., in place of F. R. Kaiser, transferred.
Virgil E. Schreiber, Ransom, Kans., in place of Caroline Doerschlag, retired.
Clare S. Knerr, Talmage, Kans., in place of L. A. Fields, resigned.
Louis Henry Moritz, Tipton, Kans., in place of M. A. Arnoldy, retired.
George N. Fisher, Zenda, Kans., in place of I. F. Bridgess, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Chester Patton, David, Ky., in place of Russell Harman, resigned.

MAINE

Norman F. Townsend, Calais, Maine, in place of E. J. Doyle, retired.
Gilbert E. Michaud, Eagle Lake, Maine, in place of W. J. Furlong, deceased.
Ellwood H. Stowell, Freeport, Maine, in place of G. C. Bean, retired.
Donald D. Willis, Gardiner, Maine, in place of D. F. Kelley, deceased.
Charles R. Hubbard, Jr., North Berwick, Maine, in place of C. M. Staples, transferred.
Leon P. Spinney, Topsham, Maine, in place of L. E. Goud, retired.

Emerson R. Laing, Westfield, Maine, in place of T. F. Bean, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Catherine M. Schepp, Hatfield, Mass., in place of M. E. Sheehan, deceased.

Edith R. Caldwell, South Byfield, Mass., in place of D. S. Caldwell, deceased.

Benjamin Elliot Norton, Vineyard Haven, Mass., in place of A. A. Mayhew, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Albert E. Holmes, Bruce Crossing, Mich., in place of B. A. Jurmu, retired.

Norma L. Chesley, Ceresco, Mich., in place of Mina Cato, retired.

Mary M. Mitchell, East Leroy, Mich., in place of A. B. Jacobson, resigned.

William M. Duff, Gaastra, Mich., in place of O. A. Olson, retired.

Lawrence J. Brautigan, Grosse Ile, Mich., in place of G. W. Penglase, resigned.

Martin N. Hoppe, Hesperia, Mich., in place of M. L. McCallum, deceased.

Harvey W. Wilson, Nashville, Mich., in place of E. C. Kraft, retired.

Marjorie E. Watson, Novi, Mich., in place of M. A. Renwick, deceased.

Reino W. Hendrickson, Republic, Mich., in place of W. M. Zeitler, retired.

George O. Sheply, Rose City, Mich., in place of V. S. Nye, retired.

Calvin E. Sands, Three Rivers, Mich., in place of J. F. Cross, deceased.

John A. Dickey, Whittemore, Mich., in place of H. A. Graham, removed.

MINNESOTA

Vernon J. Larson, Bena, Minn., in place of R. C. McFarland, retired.

Dorin W. Anderson, Cosmos, Minn., in place of C. J. Larson, retired.

Raymond W. Schaper, Darfur, Minn., in place of A. T. Jaeger, retired.

Charles V. Miller, Jr., Darwin, Minn., in place of L. F. Jensen, removed.

Norman B. Gregerson, Dennison, Minn., in place of E. E. Trench, retired.

John H. Drenth, Hollandale, Minn., in place of F. P. Tostenson, retired.

Richard A. Heald, Ogilvie, Minn., in place of J. D. Folsom, transferred.

Bertha S. Bosin, Rapidan, Minn., in place of L. M. Just, resigned.

Luverne W. Lyons, Sabin, Minn., in place of A. M. Suedel, transferred.

Earl E. Watson, St. Charles, Minn., in place of M. N. Chisholm, retired.

Philip Milton Lindbloom, Stillwater, Minn., in place of J. P. McGillin, deceased.

Frederick G. Casper, Wahkon, Minn., in place of T. A. Garvey, retired.

Hilbert B. Anderson, Winthrop, Minn., in place of D. I. Bjorklund, transferred.

MISSOURI

Kathryn L. Rubottom, Cantwell, Mo., in place of E. V. Van Sickle, retired.

John C. Smith, Conway, Mo., in place of H. R. Porter, retired.

Jesse M. Long, Drexel, Mo., in place of W. S. Miller, retired.

Joseph L. Snyder, Holden, Mo., in place of J. T. Glass, transferred.

Joseph M. Dischino, Imperial, Mo. Office established November 1, 1951.

Kenneth R. McLain, Linneus, Mo., in place of J. N. Carter, deceased.

Dorothy Grace Hunt, Lonejack, Mo., in place of A. B. Leach, removed.

John B. Chipp, New Hampton, Mo., in place of G. E. Scott, retired.

Aaron Coleman Johnson, Verona, Mo., in place of W. J. Paschal, transferred.

Herbert W. Wipperman, Wellington, Mo., in place of E. L. Lauderdale, deceased.

MONTANA

Olive M. Coughlin, Brady, Mont., in place of J. L. Rose, resigned.

Edith G. Daniels, Dixon, Mont., in place of W. J. Brown, deceased.

Charles F. Walton, Harlowton, Mont., in place of G. C. Moore, retired.

Myrtle E. Erickson, Saco, Mont., in place of M. A. Fetterman, retired.

NEBRASKA

William C. Schleusener, Bancroft, Nebr., in place of A. E. Rumsey, resigned.

Leigh F. Coffin, Beatrice, Nebr., in place of J. C. Douthitt, retired.

Nellie I. Uerkvitz, Nebraska City, Nebr., in place of A. H. Barstler, retired.

Howard A. Toay, Norfolk, Nebr., in place of Marie Weekes, deceased.

Maurice C. Swanson, Pender, Nebr., in place of B. A. Freed, retired.

Carl E. Baldwin, Salem, Nebr., in place of M. M. Mason, retired.

Robert C. Briggs, Stella, Nebr., in place of T. H. Winfrey, retired.

Myron A. Gordon, Trenton, Nebr., in place of C. E. Major, transferred.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Charles Francis Leahy, Keene, N. H., in place of C. D. Roche, deceased.

NEW JERSEY

Edward C. Becht, Basking Ridge, N. J., in place of W. L. Scheuerman, retired.

Albert Pavao, Gillette, N. J., in place of L. E. Nelson, deceased.

George H. McCullough, Glassboro, N. J., in place of L. L. Ware, resigned.

Harold S. Maxwell, New Vernon, N. J., in place of Elsa Maxwell, retired.

William L. Kessler, Normandy Beach, N. J., in place of C. R. Neary, resigned.

William Russell Lindabery, Pottersville, N. J., in place of G. C. Lindabery, retired.

NEW MEXICO-TEXAS

Albert W. Mulloy, Anthony, N. Mex.-Tex., in place of P. E. Darbyshire, resigned.

NEW YORK

George H. Walter, Annandale-on-Hudson, N. Y., in place of William McMichael, retired.

Alonzo Winslow Valentine, Bayville, N. Y., in place of O. J. West, retired.

James W. Trimmingham, Branchport, N. Y., in place of M. G. Carpenter, removed.

Stanley C. Shaw, Ithaca, N. Y., in place of E. S. Sloughter, retired.

Leon E. Youngs, Johnson City, N. Y., in place of P. J. Perrault, resigned.

Alton D. Wiggins, Mannsville, N. Y., in place of C. H. Root, deceased.

Lola M. Dauch, Mongaup Valley, N. Y., in place of William Murtagh, resigned.

Alta M. De Silva, Mount Tremper, N. Y., in place of N. S. Wilber, removed.

Ralph P. Sinsabaugh, New Hamburg, N. Y., in place of J. V. Camely, resigned.

Anthoy J. Rivers, New Rochelle, N. Y., in place of J. C. Walter, deceased.

Earl E. Casey, Ontario, N. Y., in place of G. H. Doyle, transferred.

Ralph Britton, Rensselaerville, N. Y., in place of W. G. Britton, deceased.

Doris J. Barclay, Salisbury Center, N. Y., in place of L. E. Fairchild, deceased.

Thomas M. Powers, Scipio Center, N. Y., in place of G. J. McDonald, retired.

Urban C. Everling, Stony Brook, N. Y., in place of C. Q. Archdeacon, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Harold D. Anderson, Hot Springs, N. C., in place of J. K. Reeves, resigned.

Archie C. Holland, Kenansville, N. C., in place of J. L. Williams, retired.

Daniel C. Cox, Sr., Raeford, N. C., in place of L. P. Clark, deceased.

Herbert C. Rountree, Rocky Mount, N. C., in place of W. H. Smith, deceased.

Jack L. Leatherman, Vale, N. C., in place of D. F. Mosteller, transferred.

Charles T. Burke, Wilmington, N. C., in place of W. R. Dosher, retired.

OHIO

Elizabeth S. Donnett, Bidwell, Ohio, in place of E. N. Tarrier, resigned.

Edwin W. Kerr, Big Prairie, Ohio, in place of J. M. Hudson, retired.

Albert F. Bilek, Brecksville, Ohio, in place of W. E. Boyle, declined.

James W. Overholt, Bucyrus, Ohio, in place of R. C. Young, retired.

John E. Singleman, New Weston, Ohio, in place of C. O. Bell, retired.

Albert Russell, Pomeroy, Ohio, in place of C. H. Mullen, deceased.

Dorsel C. Riebel, Reedsville, Ohio, in place of K. L. Kibble, retired.

Edwin S. Naus, Upper Sandusky, Ohio, in place of C. U. Read, retired.

William H. Maxwell, West Lafayette, Ohio, in place of H. E. Hall, transferred.

Robert E. Hensel, West Manchester, Ohio, in place of A. E. Baker, transferred.

OREGON

Bill G. Crowther, Banks, Oreg., in place of K. V. Parmley, resigned.

William G. Thompson, Brookings, Oreg., in place of G. V. Smith, retired.

Louis E. Walker, Jr., Brownsville, Oreg., in place of J. E. Ferrell, transferred.

George L. Evans, Central Point, Oreg., in place of E. F. McDonald, resigned.

Walter J. Beumer, Depoe Bay, Oreg., in place of A. R. Kerr, resigned.

Harry A. Cool, Jr., Drain, Oreg., in place of C. M. Sawyer, retired.

Floyd F. Volkel, Gates, Oreg., in place of R. L. Brisbin, retired.

Anita B. Banister, Paisley, Oreg., in place of D. E. O'Connor, retired.

George D. Wilcox, Prineville, Oreg., in place of R. W. Zevely, retired.

Daniel W. Macy, Warm Springs, Oreg., in place of C. F. See, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Francis J. Yanes, Brockton, Pa., in place of S. C. Bassler, resigned.

Glenn L. Rohrbaugh, Codorus, Pa., in place of A. W. Kessler, deceased.

Albert M. Lind, Equinunk, Pa., in place of Roberta Canfield, resigned.

Frank B. Davenport, Fallsington, Pa., in place of C. E. Ottolini, resigned.

James A. Murrin, Franklin, Pa., in place of J. D. Plumer, retired.

Mildred M. Falter, Glassmere, Pa., in place of F. E. Tillard, transferred.

Edwin J. Carr, Hartsville, Pa., in place of S. M. Slight, resigned.

Charles J. Zuerl, Jr., Irvine, Pa., in place of J. J. Myers, retired.

Dean R. Wilt, Landisburg, Pa., in place of L. I. Wertz, transferred.

Wayne H. Anthony, Manor, Pa., in place of H. C. Kifer, retired.

Richard M. Dodson, Marion Center, Pa., in place of C. J. Cleland, transferred.

Edward W. Mathews, Media, Pa., in place of M. C. Fox, Jr., retired.

Nellie F. Higinbotham, Merrittstown, Pa., in place of Anna Fleming, retired.

William Edward Anderson, Morrisville, Pa., in place of G. W. Burgner, resigned.

Herbert M. Dissinger, Mount Gretna, Pa., in place of Roy Peiffer, resigned.

Dorothy J. Biresch, Ottsville, Pa., in place of A. V. Eichlin, resigned.

Mary Agnes Spence, Peach Bottom, Pa., in place of P. C. Shank, Jr., deceased.

Harry L. Schaefer, Ralston, Pa., in place of K. W. Hoag, resigned.

Robert E. Wilson, Sabinsville, Pa., in place of G. D. Wilson, deceased.

Raymond L. Rupert, Sykesville, Pa., in place of B. W. Weber, transferred.

Mary S. Byrd, Toughkenamon, Pa., in place of C. E. Reese, retired.

Emerson C. Gower, Trout Run, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1943.

Kenneth C. DeReiter, Trumbauersville, Pa., in place of Charles Gretzinger, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Floyd C. Hammond, Myrtle Beach, S. C., in place of G. S. Beard, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Orvis M. Gantvoort, Castlewood, S. Dak., in place of Violet Eliefson, resigned.

TENNESSEE

James B. Garner, Alcoa, Tenn., in place of B. H. Kinser, retired.

Betty L. Milton, Duff, Tenn., in place of E. A. Thornton, removed.

TEXAS

Edgar W. Cowling, Bridgeport, Tex., in place of E. E. Frost, removed.

John H. Reinicke, Crockett, Tex., in place of R. N. Allbright, retired.

Billy N. Fine, Petrolia, Tex., in place of M. A. Price, removed.

James W. Hampton, Smithville, Tex., in place of G. W. Kunath, Jr., resigned.

Dallas V. Farmer, Valley Mills, Tex., in place of J. G. Simms, retired.

Paul P. Berthelot, Victoria, Tex., in place of Leopold Morris, deceased.

UTAH

Frances P. Russell, Wendover, Utah, in place of R. M. Birdzell, resigned.

VERMONT

Frank D. Eggleston, East Dorset, Vt., in place of S. R. Sheedy, resigned.

Ralph B. Norton, North Bennington, Vt., in place of James McGovern, retired.

VIRGINIA

Theodocia C. Grant, Catawba, Va., in place of Jerry Morgan, retired.

WASHINGTON

Leland H. Jensen, La Conner, Wash., in place of J. M. Hurley, deceased.

James T. Roberts, Pullman, Wash., in place of J. O. Patterson, retired.

Peter P. Perry, Raymond, Wash., in place of Ralph Nelson, deceased.

Keith S. Marney, Waterville, Wash., in place of B. B. Schmitz, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bernard R. Osborne, Griffithsville, W. Va., in place of Opal Plott, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Robert W. Edwards, Beaver Dam, Wis., in place of J. L. Cunningham, deceased.

William H. Behrens, Brodhead, Wis., in place of C. H. Pandow, transferred.

Norman Losby, Eau Claire, Wis., in place of T. H. Murphy, retired.

William L. Chesley, Oconto, Wis., in place of F. J. Horak, transferred.

Ernest M. Strom, Ogdensburg, Wis., in place of Bertha Peterson, transferred.

Levern V. Newman, Platteville, Wis., in place of H. M. Harms, transferred.

Willie A. Johnson, Whitehall, Wis., in place of D. M. Warner, transferred.

WYOMING

Edith E. Carr, Midwest, Wyo., in place of L. M. Richard, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. James I. Logan, Jr., First Presbyterian Church, Chickasha, Okla., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou who art the sovereign ruler of the hearts of men, as we bow in reverence before Thee, may Thy spirit fill us with a vibrant awareness of Thy abiding presence and eternal vigilance over Thy creation and creatures.

The peoples of this Nation rejoice that it is theirs to be so represented in the national and international affairs of their democracy, and that by Thy ordering it is theirs to be so governed. As these men labor under such responsibility with which they are entrusted, and in these chaotic times of tension, turmoil, and confusion, impart to them the wisdom and ability to perceive that which is true, righteous, and just, and subsequently the courage to act in the light of their knowledge and faith.

Ours is a great heritage as a nation and people. God, grant that by our clear thinking and right acting it may be preserved in accordance with Thy will.

We seek Thy special providence in the life, thought, and deed of our Chief Executive and those of the executive staff: that through the efforts of these, our leaders, our Nation may continue to be a nation under Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 23, 1954, was read and approved.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY, 1955

Mr. CLEVENGER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1242), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROONEY reserved all points of order on the bill.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET BALANCING

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the mountain of alleged Republican economy has labored, and in the form of the savings in the State, Justice and Commerce Departments appropriation bill just now reported to the House has brought forth not an elephant, but a mouse. In considering the budget estimates in the amount of $1,313,920,960 for these departments, the actual savings would come to no more than $31,282,960 or 2⅓ percent of the budget request.

Of the total amount of the budget requests, $1,313,920,960, the committee according to its report allowed $1,147,638,000. But there must be added to this latter amount the sum of $135 million for 3 items which are definitely not savings at all, merely deferments of payment. These are $50 million for payments to air carriers, the subsidy dough, $30 million for the operating-differential subsidies in the Maritime Administration and $55 million for the Bureau of Public Roads Federal aid to highways program. The majority committee members will, I am sure, admit that these deductions which they made in the bill are not really savings to the taxpayer at all. The law presently requires that they be paid.

We now have the balance of $31,282,960. Or do we? Do we really have a 2½ percent deduction in the budget estimates? Because there is now pending in House Document No. 330 a request for supplemental appropriations in which President Eisenhower under date of the 16th of this month asks for $94,500,000 additional for two of these items, to wit, $29,500,000 for operating-differential subsidies, Maritime activities, Department of Commerce, and $65 million for the Bureau of Public Roads, Federal-aid highways, Department of Commerce, And you great Republican advocates of economy will vote for these two supplemental requests, as I think you should. You put off payment of this bill last year, and it has now caught up with you.

The American people must wonder what sort of budget balancing this is.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

ANNUAL MARDI GRAS BALL OF THE LOUISIANA STATE SOCIETY

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks to include a list of the names of the queens and the industries which they represent and the names of a number of prominent citizens from the Sugar Belt in Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, in the grand ballroom of the Mayflower Hotel, at 9:30 o'clock tomorrow evening, will take place the annual Mardi Gras ball of the Louisiana State Society.

Fifteen beautiful and charming queens will represent as many industries in the great State of Louisiana. Some of them are with us even now.

This year the theme of the ball will be the sugar industry. This is fit and proper because Louisiana is the cane-sugar bowl of the United States, which I have the great honor to represent in this body.

By custom, the name of the queen of this gala and spectacular occasion, as distinguished from the queens of industries, cannot be revealed until tomorrow night.

The king of the ball will be a fine gentleman, an outstanding businessman, and a very prominent sugar planter, Mr. Lawrence Levert, Jr., of Thibodaux, La., whose ancestors for a century before him made great contributions to the development of the sugar industry in my State.

Last year the Vice President of the United States was chosen to present the queen of the ball to his majesty.

Although by custom again, I cannot disclose his counterpart this year, I can say that he is a most prominent, highly beloved, and respected American who holds the highest post in his field of endeavors in another branch of the Government.

The names of the queens and their sponsors are as follows:

Miss Janell Babineaux, dairy queen; Miss Sallie Bateman, rose queen; Miss Irma Jean Bordelon, livestock and pasture festival queen; Miss Vera Boudreaux, shrimp queen; Miss Lynn Brock, queen sweetheart of the American Legion; Miss Julia Ann Burford, dogwood queen; Miss Rita Fay Coco, sugar queen; Miss Carol Curet, queen New Orleans spirit of Mardi Gras; Miss Betty David, international rice queen; Miss Audrey Fruge, queen of Jefferson Davis Junior Livestock Show; Miss Sydney Mae Maraist, Acadian queen; Miss Alice Safford, camellia queen; Miss Betty Strader, paper queen; Miss Tappy Tracey, forest queen; and Miss Elizabeth Hayes Wilder, peach queen.

The Louisiana State Society will be honored to be the host of prominent and outstanding citizens from the sugarcane-producing area, among whom are the following:

Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence C. Levert, Jr., Thibodaux; Mr. and Mrs. V. L. Caldwell, Thibodaux; Mr. and Mrs. Irving Legendre, Thibodaux; Mr. and Mrs. John M. Dupont, Thibodaux; Mr. and Mrs. Edward Hébert, Thibodaux; Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Coplon, Thibodaux; Mr. and Mrs. Ray Mullins, New Iberia; Mr. and Mrs. Leon Minvielle, New Iberia; Mr. Tom Bulliard, St. Martinsville; Mrs. John Abdalla, New Iberia; Mrs. Lucille Amacker, Bogalusa; Miss Lianne LeRay, DeRidder; Miss Louisette Breaux, Carencro; Mr. Robert E. Wall, New Orleans; Mr. Roy Angelle, Breaux Bridge; Mr. and Mrs. Elmer D. Conner, Jennings; Mrs. Fred Wilder, Ruston; Mr. and Mrs. Joe Elder Opelousas.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

ADDITIONAL IMPORT FEES ON WOOL

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, when this Congress voted supports for American agriculture, we did not contemplate that we would support the world prices of commodities produced in competition with ours. For that reason we passed section 22 of the Agricultural Act which said that when foreign imports were coming in at such a rate that they were damaging the support program for American agriculture, additional duties or quotas could be imposed. The Department of Agriculture in both the previous administration and this administration, has requested the imposition of additional import fees on wool coming into the United States from foreign countries. The decision of the Tariff Commission in this regard, on the request made by Secretary Benson last July, is now in the hands of the President. It is to be hoped that the President will take prompt action and eliminate the American taxpayers supporting the world price of wool through our attempts to assist our domestic growers in the production of an essential and critical material.

PUBLIC FUND RAISING BY CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS — TWO BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills to carry out the Federal Government's responsibility in respect of organizations raising money from the public for charitable purposes and enjoying tax exemption. One bill empowers the Postmaster General to stop use of the mails by such organizations whilch are resorting to any scheme or device of fraud or misrepresentation or utilizing names of sponsors without authority or not obeying State or local laws regulating such operations where they are seeking to solicit contributions. The other bill tightens the requirements for annual filing of information by charitable organizations which raise their money from the public to require (a) a complete disclosure as to income and expenditure for the purposes of the particular charity, cost of the raising of funds and other overhead; (b) the compensation of any professional fund raiser or professional solicitor and the arrangements made with such professional fund raiser or solicitor; (c) the salaries of all officials receiving over $5,000 per year as well as the names of contributors who are contributing over $500 a year; and (d) the way in which the trustees or other managers are designated.

The introduction of these bills is intended to coordinate with the report of the Joint Legislative Committee on Charitable and Philanthropic Agencies and Organizations of the New York State Legislature of which State Senator Tompkins, Republican of Queens, and Assemblyman Samuel Rabin, Republican of Queens, are respectively chairman and vice chairman. This committee's report after a detailed investigation in New York points out the evils which have occurred in the field of soliciting charitable contributions and recommends legislation. Their proposals have been supported in a special message from Gov. Thomas E. Dewey to the New York State Legislature on February 16, 1954. The legislation which I have submitted will also insure that this type of State regulation will be enforced with the cooperation of the Federal Government.

The Federal Government's intercession is required as there is a great deal of interstate solicitation of charitable contributions. A number of specific cases were cited by the Tompkins-Rabin legislative investigation as showing exorbitant costs for fund raising originating interstate, and gives as examples solicitations which originated in Michigan, Ohio, and California showing costs of fund raising up to 69 percent of the contributions collected.

The problem is a very appreciable one as it is reliably estimated that the amount of contributions secured in the United States from the public for charitable organizations exceeds $4 billion yearly. The New York report also points out that a major expense of most charitable fund-raising campaigns is in mailing costs. The types of misrepresentation unearthed relate also to the use to which the charitable contributions will be put and to unauthorized use as sponsors of the names of prominent people, including the President of the United States, the Director of the Veterans' Administration, and Senators and Representatives.

The impact of the investigation by the Tompkins-Rabin committee of the New York State Legislature has been great throughout the country. It is my desire that the public should with confidence support generously deserving fund-raising activities for charitable purposes which give material benefits for the purposes for which the money is collected. The overwhelming majority of some 40,000 tax-exempt organizations of this character in the United States are doing an honest and high-minded job of public service. The Federal Government has a responsibility to these organizations and to the people of the country to see that tax-exempt funds are used for the purposes for which they are stated to be collected without fraud, misrepresentation, artifice, or undue costs.

The bills I have introduced do not apply to religious or educational organizations or to fraternal, patriotic, or social organizations in respect of solicitations confined to their membership.

CONVICTION FOR CERTAIN CRIMES SHOULD PRECLUDE PENSION

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House, and Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, has introduced in the other body a bill to prohibit the payment of Government retirement benefits to persons convicted of certain offenses. It has long been recognized as a gross anomaly in the law that a Federal official or employee who has been convicted of subversive activities and other criminal acts still is able to partake of the bounties of the same Government which he has scorned, reviled, and betrayed by claiming pensions and annuities under a governmental retirement plan. It is unthinkable to me that a

felon, who has abused and misused the trust of his fellowmen, forsaken his fealty to the Constitution and disgraced his own name, should be able to demand and obtain a bonus for his infidelity.

This bill provides that whenever any official or employee of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government or of the Armed Forces of the United States, is convicted in a court of law of the offenses relating to espionage, treason, sedition, subversive activities, bribery, graft, and several other crimes involving the improper use of authority, influence, power or privilege, he shall be deprived of any annuities, pension, or retired pay to which he might otherwise be entitled on account of his service in the Government.

The bill would apply not only to those convicted of the crime itself, but to those convicted of perjury in falsely denying the commission of such a crime. This provision is designed to encompass such people as Alger Hiss, who was convicted of perjury in denying complicity in the perpetration of a criminal act.

Because of the law pertaining to legislation of this nature, it must be provided, and the bill does so provide, that the premiums paid into the retirement or annuity fund by such convicted person shall be returned to him with interest at the rates provided by law, and if the convicted person has died prior to the making of this refund, such refund shall be paid to the survivor according to the regulations applicable to the particular retirement fund. I think it is important to reemphasize the fact that the bill applies not only to officials and employees in the executive department but also to those in the legislative and judicial departments. That is to say, it included judges and other judicial officials and employees and Members of Congress who thus violate the public trust.

It seems to me that this is a matter of equity which should appeal to all fairminded men, and I earnestly trust that the committee will find time in its busy schedule this session to hold hearings and report the bill to the floor for early debate and favorable action.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report may have until midnight Saturday to file the report required by the Employment Act of 1946, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection of the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MEXICAN MIGRANT LABOR

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 450, Rept. No. 1243), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 355, amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may have until midnight tonight to file any report on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday, March 2, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE WILKES-BARRE DISASTER

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday afternoon I was an unhappy witness to a disaster striking the city of Wilkes-Barre, Pa. I saw pavements pushed up and sidewalks and homes cracked, gas and water mains completely shattered. Since that time I have been informed that additional quakes have caused damage to that fair city.

I have been in touch with the White House, with the Civil Defense Department, the Department of the Interior, and with the FHA. They have given me splendid cooperation and will continue to stand by to give Wilkes-Barre aid that may be necessary.

Investigations are underway at this time to determine the cause of this earth movement which has caused losses estimated at several hundreds of thousands of dollars to homes, buildings, streets, sidewalks, and public-utility lines in an 8-block area.

Within a matter of minutes, heavy damage crept through 900 homes and business places of this beautiful residential district of the city.

Gas fumes were noticeable throughout the stricken area and water escaped from numerous breaks in the waterlines.

I have been informed that the shock was so great that it was recorded on the seismograph of Fordham University in New York City.

The city officials are to be commended for the splendid manner in which they handled the situation. Fire trucks, civil-defense agents, special and regular policemen were on duty in the area immediately after the shock became known. This is a tribute to the people of my district in the time of emergency. I shall continue to help them in their difficult times. I know that the Federal agencies are ready to be of assistance in this tragic moment.

IMPORT FEES ON WOOL

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the views presented a few minutes ago by the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and express the hope that the President's concern over the wool industry, as expressed in his message to the Congress on January 11, means that he will take prompt action on the Tariff Commission's report to him which has just been filed at the White House. For more than 2 years the Department of Agriculture, under both the Democratic and Republican administrations, has been urging the Tariff Commission to recommend import fees on imported wool in order to protect the Government's wool loan program. In the meantime, a stockpile has been accumulating, sheep numbers have been decreasing, and the effectiveness of the loan program has been jeopardized. Certainly the need for the imposition of fees is more urgent now than at the time it was last requested, a year ago, by the Department of Agriculture.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my observation since becoming a Member of the Congress that you can get much publicity and much credit in the press and otherwise if you merely issue a news release from time to time, pointing out the total number of employees of the Government and complain about the total cost of running the Government. Certain benefits will come, too, politically and otherwise, through much of the press if from time to time you set out to do more and more in the way of paying higher and higher salaries though this will come from another segment of our population.

I have followed a course which does not have those benefits but which cause me to be taken to task in the press from time to time because the legislation of

which I was the author, section 1310, of the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1952, commonly called the Whitten rider, does control and limit Government employment. This provision does save money. In fact it is estimated by members of staff of the Appropriations Committee this provision saves half a billion dollars a year judged by what happened during World War II when we had no such controls.

This provision was written because in World War II we had no such controls. Agencies would offer a two or more grade jump to employees to get them from another agency or department. Then other departments would offer still additional jumps to get people in their agency. Different branches of the Government were competing for the same people. The result as shown by studies of the Treasury and Commerce Departments, was that the average grade of employees went up more than two grades. This was not spread among all employees, but the favored got many jumps, others none. This throughout the Government cost then and now hundreds of millions of dollars annually. In the absence of the Whitten rider in the Civil Service we were gradually working toward having many generals and few privates. Not only that but emergency agencies were taking employees with low classification and jumping them over employees with much longer service and much better training. Persons called into the military service were having their jobs filled permanently behind them. There were many other ills existing.

I hope the membership will read this Whitten rider. It does limit the total number of Federal employees to the total existing September 1, 1950. It does limit promotions to one a year unless examinations are taken or meritorious conditions are shown. It does require the various departments to report annually to the Congress each year the average grade and salary of employees in such department. But, Mr. Chairman, while it does regulate and set out a system of orderly operations with the course charted and does regulate promotions for employees, and prevent employees from jumping two or more grades, without an examination or without a finding of meritorious circumstances, it protects such regular employees from having someone who knows someone from jumping ahead of him. Because of what I considered to be erroneous interpretations by the Commission, I have amended the provisions from time to time to prevent such actions. The law today is as follows:

SECTION 1310 OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952, APPROVED NOVEMBER 1, 1951 (PUBLIC LAW 253, 82D CONG), WHITTEN AMENDMENT, AS AMENDED BY SECTION 1302 OF PUBLIC LAW 375, 82D CONGRESS, APPROVED JUNE 5, 1952

SEC. 1310. Immediately upon the enactment of this act and until termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950:

(a) The Civil Service Commission and the heads of the executive departments, agencies, and corporations shall make full use of their authority to require that initial appointments to positions in and outside the competitive civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel of the Federal Government above the total number of permanent employees existing on September 1, 1950: *Provided*, That any position vacated by a permanent employee called to military service or transferred to a national defense agency shall not be filled except on a temporary or indefinite basis. All reinstatements and promotions in the Federal civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis, and all permanent employees who are transferred from one agency to another shall retain their status as permanent employees in the agency to which transferred at the grade or basic pay level of their permanent positions in the agency from which transferred. All appointments, reinstatements, transfers, and promotions to positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall be made with the condition and notice to each individual appointed, reinstated, transferred, or promoted that the classification grade of the position is subject to postaudit and correction by the appropriate departmental or agency personnel office or the Civil Service Commission. All transfers of permanent employees made on a temporary or indefinite basis since September 1, 1950, shall be changed to a permanent basis as of the effective date of this act: *Provided*, That such employees shall retain their status as permanent employees in the agency to which transferred at the grade or basic pay level of their permanent positions in the agency from which transferred: *Provided further*, That any agency may promote any employee permanently to a position if such promotion will not increase the number of employees holding permanent positions in the grade of such position in such agency above the number in such grade in such agency prior to September 1, 1950: *Provided further*, That permanent promotions may be made to any position in a category for which the Civil Service Commission authorizes permanent appointments under the terms hereof.[1]

(b) The Civil Service Commission shall facilitate the transfer of Federal employees from nondefense to defense activities and encourage the retention of employees in defense activities, and shall provide reemployment rights for permanent employees in the activities from which such employees are transferred.

(c) The Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to prevent excessively rapid promotions in the competitive civil service and to require correction of improper allocations to higher grades of positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. No person in any executive department or agency whose position is subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be promoted or transferred to a higher grade subject to such act without having served at least 1 year in the next lower grade: *Provided*, That the Civil Service Commission for positions in the competitive service and the head of the employing agency for position outside the competitive service may by regulation provide for promotions of 2 grades in 1 year (1) to positions not higher than GS–5; (2) to positions not higher than GS–11 which are in a line of work properly classified under the Classification Act of 1949 at 2-grade intervals; (3) to positions in the same line of work when the employee has completed a training period under a training program approved by the Civil Service Commission for positions in the competitive service, or approved by the head of the employing agency for positions outside the competitive service; and (4) of an employee of the agency concerned when there is no position in the normal line of promotion in the grade immediately below that of the position to be filled: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not apply to any case involving an employee who is within reach for appointment to a higher grade position on a competitive civil service register, or is eligible for appointment, in accordance with a regular appointment system or procedure established prior to September 1, 1950, to a higher grade position outside the competitive civil service,[1] or being advanced up to a grade level from which he had been demoted or separated because of reduction in force, or being advanced to a grade level not exceeding that for which he had previously established eligibility as required by the terms hereof: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions hereof, and in order to avoid undue hardship or inequity, the Civil Service Commission, when requested by the head of the agency involved, may authorize promotions in individual cases of meritorious nature.[1]

(d) From time to time, but at least annually, each executive department and agency shall (1) review all positions which since September 1, 1950, have been created or placed in a higher grade or level of difficulty and responsibility of work or in a higher basic pay level, (2) abolish all such positions which are found to be unnecessary, (3) with respect to such positions which are found to be necessary, make such adjustments as may be appropriate in the classification grades of those positions which are subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or in the basic pay levels of those positions which are subject to other pay-fixing authority. Not later than July 31 of each year each department and agency shall submit a report to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives concerning the action taken under this paragraph, together with information comparing the total number of employees on the payroll on June 30 and their average grade and salary with similar information for the previous June 30, and each annual and supplemental budget estimate shall include a statement comparing the average grade and salary provided for in each item of appropriation or fund allowance therein with similar figures reported for the two previous periods.

Now Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that I had the help of the best experts in preparing this provision, including people from the Civil Service Commission; notwithstanding the fact that Republican and Democratic leaders of the Civil Service and Post Office Committee approved the provision, and notwithstanding the fact that all members of every conference to which it has gone approved it, shortly after the first provision I wrote became law, the Civil Service Commission prepared and the President issued Executive Order EO 10181, which continues in full force and effect as the order of the President, a copy of which I shall submit.

You will note that where in my provision I limited the total number of permanent employees to that of September 1, 1950, this Executive order says no permanent appointments shall be made except postmasters and Presidential appointments. Today we are 265,000 below the ceiling set out in my provision.

Where I provided for the use of temporary appointments to stay under the September 1, 1950, ceiling—and we are

[1] As method by sec. 1302 of Public Law 375, 82d Cong., approved June 5, 1952.

[1] As method by sec. 1302 of Public Law 375, 82d Cong., approved June 5, 1952.

265,000 under that ceiling now—the Civil Service Commission, under the order it prepared, set up the indefinite status for all employees after that date, with the resulting problems under the retention system.

Mr. Speaker, one candidate for Presidential nomination ran in the Washington area promising repeal of the Whitten rider. Now, apparently it is thought to be popular again by others to throw off all controls.

If the administration wants to spend more money, if it wishes to throw off all controls, if it wishes to go back to the conditions which prevailed when the Whitten rider was written, of course it can repeal it.

On the other hand, if it merely wishes to give permanent status to present employees, it can give that to 265,000 of them now.

If it wishes to get rid of the indefinite status it can do so by merely modifying the Executive order of the President—for no such indefinite status is called for by the Whitten rider.

I submit a copy of the Executive order now in force.

EXECUTIVE ORDER ESTABLISHING SPECIAL PERSONNEL PROCEDURES IN THE INTEREST OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

By virtue of the authority vested in me by section 2 of the Civil Service Act (22 Stat. 403), by section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended by section 3 of the act of January 24, 1942, 56 Stat. 15, by section 1753 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 631), and in effectuation of the purposes of section 1302 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 843, 81st Cong.), it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. (a) On and after December 1, 1950, and until such time as the President may find it no longer necessary in the interest of the national defense, all appointments in the executive branch of the Government shall be made on a nonpermanent basis except those of Presidential appointees and postmasters in all classes of post offices: *Provided*, That permanent appointments are authorized whenever, in unusual circumstances, the Civil Service Commission for positions in the competitive service, or the head of the agency concerned for positions outside the competitive service, determines that permanent appointments are in the interest of the Government: And *provided further*, That agencies may appoint on a permanent basis persons selected for permanent appointment prior to December 1, 1950.

(b) On and after September 1, 1950, and until such time as the President may find it no longer necessary in the interest of the national defense, all promotions, transfers of personnel from one agency to another, and, except as provided by section 2 (b) hereof, reemployment of former Federal employees shall be on a nonpermanent basis; and on and after December 1, 1950, any reassignment may, in the discretion of the head of the agency concerned, be on either a permanent or nonpermanent basis.

(c) To the extent not inconsistent with this order, appointments and position changes in the competitive service shall be made in accordance with civil service laws, rules, and regulations, and appointments and position changes outside the competitive service, shall be made in accordance with such regulations and practices as the head of the agency concerned shall find necessary.

(d) In making appointments under this order in the competitive service the recruiting facilities of the Commission and its boards and committees of examiners shall be used to the fullest extent.

SEC. 2. (a) The Civil Service Commission, whenever it determines it to be necessary in the interest of the national defense, shall prescribe regulations governing the release of employees (both within and outside the competitive service) by any agency in the executive branch of the Government for employment in any other agency, and governing the establishment, granting, and exercise of rights to reemployment in the agencies from which employees are released.

(b) In carrying out the provisions of section 9 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, or any other legal authority granting the right to reemployment in the Federal service, the Commission shall prescribe regulations limiting the right to reemployment of an individual to employment in the last position he occupied on a permanent basis or in one of equal seniority, status, and pay: *Provided*, That in such cases the Commission may by regulation provide for nonpermanent reemployment in a position of higher grade or salary.

SEC. 3. Persons given nonpermanent appointments pursuant to section 1 of this order are hereby excluded from the operation of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, unless eligible for retirement benefits by continuity of service or by reinstatement, or otherwise.

SEC. 4. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to prescribe regulations and procedures, in addition to those otherwise authorized herein, for carrying out its functions and duties under this order.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 13, 1950.*

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

VETERANS' BENEFITS, EDUCATION, JOB PREFERENCE, AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I received in my mail today a letter which I wish to read to the House and about which I wish to make a few comments. This letter is typical and representative of the tone of many letters that are coming to my office and, I assume, similar to letters being received by other Members at this time.

The letter reads as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHELLEY: I am writing you this letter to protest the proposed cuts in veterans' benefits, education, and job preference. These special interests who propose and endorse these so-called economic measures would undoubtedly scream their heads off if legislation was directed against their interests.

Veterans with service-connected disabilities and veterans who desire to avail themselves of the opportunity of free schooling should be given that chance and any money appropriated for that use is certainly not going to waste. After all these veterans are our boys and any help and education they receive will help the United States. I hope you will do all in your power to prevent these cuts but, more important, I hope you will convince other Congressmen to follow suit.

Another thing that I would like to inform you about in more detail is the unemployment here in San Francisco. There are a great many unemployed at the present time and no prospect of jobs opening up, but more serious than that is there are going to be more layoffs in the months ahead. The American Can Co. machine shop where I am employed is going to lay off about 25 men in the next few weeks. This is in addition to the 15 or 20 that have already been laid off. There is very little work to be finished and they say there is nothing in sight coming in. Something should be done now because the business upturn the administration expects in the spring is not going to come, and when that happens, that is, when business sees that the trend is going down they will cut back more yet and it may develop into quite a severe depression, or in any case severe enough to really hurt people with families and paying on a house, furniture, etc., and raising 2 or 3 children at the same time.

Thank you for reading this letter, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SLAVEIRO.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in preaching or spreading a fear doctrine. Much has been said recently about recessions, depressions, business declines, and such. Strong, and in some cases vicious, epithets have been aimed at those who have used such terminology. Mr. Speaker, I am not a sadist, nor am I tainted with treason—I do not care by what name you call the present situation—the condition exists and gets worse daily. The men, like the author of the above letter, who are being laid off daily and are unable to find work do not care whether it is a recession or a depression, deflation or a slump, inflation or a leveling off. To them it is hunger and problems for themselves and wives and kids. Those who are feeling it directly are looking to their Government for understanding—for recognition of an immediate and growing condition which is not healthy.

In the late twenties and early thirties Government closed its eyes to a similar situation, attempts were made to allay the worries of the people by peddling the pap that "prosperity is just around the corner." We found out, Mr. Speaker, that the corner was miles and years away; in fact, might never have been reached if a succeeding administration under Franklin Roosevelt had not recognized the situation and taken bold and courageous steps to meet it. Some of us went through those days the hard way and will not forget the lessons we learned. It is because of those experiences that I take this brief time to say—let us recognize the tone and meaning of the growing number of letters such as Mr. Slaviero's. The burden is on the present administration to present a program now which will prevent a sad repetition of history.

Unemployment is growing—call it what you will.

THE ST. LOUIS NATIONAL LEAGUE BASEBALL CLUB

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, legislation has been suggested which would prohibit the ownership of major league baseball teams by brewery interests. It has been further indicated that this prohibition was more or less directed against Anheuser-Busch, Inc., which last year purchased the St. Louis National League Baseball Club, familiarly known to millions of American baseball fans as the Cardinals.

I would like to point out to my colleagues in the House that there was great concern in the St. Louis area last year when it was reported that the Cardinals were to be sold. It was feared that the purchaser might be outside interests, who eventually might decide to move the baseball club to another city. It was with great enthusiasm then that all Cardinal fans and all civic-minded individuals in the St. Louis area welcomed the purchase of the Cardinals by Anheuser-Busch, Inc. This act gave assurance that the Cardinals would remain, as they should always be, a St. Louis institution.

In this connnection, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a statement made today by Col. August A. Busch, Jr., president of Anheuser-Busch, Inc., and the St. Louis National League Baseball Club; a statement made by the Honorable Raymond R. Tucker, mayor of the city of St. Louis; and a statement from the Honorable Aloys Kaufmann, former mayor of the city of St. Louis, and now president of the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan St. Louis.

These telegrams express not only the sentiment of the signers but of the millions of Cardinal fans in the St. Louis area. Colonel Busch himself has been an outstanding leader in the promotion of worthwhile civic affairs, and I am confident that the purchase by his organization of the Cardinals reflected his desire to perform another public service. The Cardinals are a very definite asset to the St. Louis metropolitan area and their loss to that area would definitely have been a serious economic blow. I feel that St. Louis is now guaranteed that the threat of such a loss is removed, and that this great baseball organization, which has brought so much fame to the community, will always remain a part of its life.

Civic leaders in St. Louis firmly support the new ownership of the Cardinals, and as the statements of Mayor Tucker and former Mayor Kaufmann indicate, all are united in the belief that Anheuser-Busch's purchase of the Cardinals was a forward step devoted to building a better St. Louis. They have complete confidence that Colonel Busch and his associates had public service paramount in their minds when they acceded to requests of certain civic leaders that they consider the purchase of the Cardinals ball club.

Colonel Busch's statement and the telegrams from Mayor Tucker and Mr. Kaufmann follow:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 24, 1954.*

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Statement by August A. Busch, Jr., president of the St. Louis Cardinals and Anheuser-Busch, Inc.:

"We respect the right of a United States Senator to make any comment or introduce any legislation, though we hardly believe it proper legislation to be aimed at an individual or single company.

"We do not want to enter into any controversy with Senator JOHNSON, but we believe the 100-year record of Anheuser-Busch, Inc., and our record since we have been in organized baseball speak for themselves.

"1. Anheuser-Busch, Inc., was a leader in its field before any baseball broadcasts—and even before organized baseball itself made an appearance on the American scene. To accuse us of using baseball to achieve a position in the industry we long have enjoyed is self answering.

"2. Our record for the year we have been in organized baseball has been recorded.

"In the first place we bought the Cardinals only when we were certain that no other group could keep them in St. Louis. Then we proceeded to improve our stadium with one objective—to make the park more comfortable and baseball more enjoyable.

"Baseball broadcasting under brewery sponsorships is certainly not new. More than half of the major league broadcasts are under such sponsorship. Were it not for this sponsorship millions of fans would have been unable to enjoy baseball.

"I can assure fans that Anheuser-Busch, as owner of the Cardinals, will continue to serve the best interests of baseball and the public."

ST. LOUIS CARDINALS.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 24, 1954.*

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As mayor of St. Louis, I want to call your attention to my opinion regarding Mr. Busch and the motives of his company in purchasing and operating the St. Louis Cardinals. The fact is that St. Louis was in great danger of losing the Cardinals to another city when Anheuser-Busch, Inc. came forward with the capital required to keep them here and to build a championship team.

The St. Louis Cardinals are more than a St. Louis institution, and more than a midwest institution. They are the home team of more Americans than any other major league baseball club. Mr. Busch respects that tradition and will continue it. He is an outstanding leader in St. Louis affairs and chairman of Civic Progress, Inc., our organizations devoted to building a better St. Louis.

The people of St. Louis do not think the Cardinals are being run for business purposes. They see much evidence that their owners are interested only in giving St. Louis the kind of national league baseball to which it is accustomed—winning baseball.

Speaking for the people of St. Louis, I want to assure you that we have complete confidence that Mr. Busch will do everything he can to give the fans of this vast section of America a Cardinal team that they will be proud to root to a world championship.

RAYMOND R. TUCKER, *Mayor.*

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 24, 1954.*

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House Office Building:

We are certain that Anheuser-Busch or Col. August A. Busch, Jr., president of Anheuser-Busch and the Cardinals, needs no defense by us. This telegram is simply to inform you that this 100-year-old company and its president have brought great credit to this community and this area through their business practices, civic spirit, and community participation.

It was through the personal efforts of Colonel Busch and the expenditure of millions of dollars by the company he heads that kept the colorful Cardinals, one of our great civic assets, in St. Louis. Our citizens are grateful and Mr. Busch's subsequent conduct of the Cardinals has made them very happy.

We are jealous of the reputation of our community and of its leading citizens and organizations and we are sure you would want to know how we feel.

This telegram bespeaks the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of our citizens and the business community as well. We respectfully call it to your attention in the interests of fair play.

ALOYS KAUFMANN,
President, Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan St. Louis.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to read a very timely press release. It says:

> All the evidence indicates that the worst effects of the unemployment will have passed during the next 60 days.

Now, who do you suppose issued that press release? Not Secretary Mitchell, not Secretary Weeks, not the President's press secretary; this is a press release dated March 7, 1930, by the Honorable Herbert Hoover, that self-appointed prophet of depression. He did not know a depression when it was draped around his shoulders.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, at this season when we celebrate Washington's Birthday, all of us in the Congress should be reminded to seek at least two things: First, a just and a lasting peace for all humanity. Second, prosperity and tranquillity here at home. These two objectives are so closely entwined that reason does not try to separate them. These, then, are our historic challenges as public servants. They are also challenges to the people back home whom we represent.

We can successfully meet these challenges in the days ahead by hard work, prudence, and faith—faith in God, faith in our country, and faith in each other.

In this time of charges, smears, distrust, and confusion, let each of us adopt as his own this prayer offered for our country by George Washington, our first President, a great public leader. I quote:

A PRAYER FOR OUR COUNTRY

Almighty God, who has given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves as a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties; and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought out of many kindreds and tongues. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of Government, that there may be peace and justice at home, and that through obedience to Thy law we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble suffer not our trust in Thee to fail. All of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

My colleagues, the road ahead will not be easy for us. The road traveled was not an easy one for those who served in these hallowed Halls before us. Out of the crucible of the years, they have handed us a great heritage. We must not fail them. May I have the courage and common sense to do my part and more as we struggle toward a just and lasting peace, and a sound economy and prosperity at home.

TAX SUPERMEN

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Ways and Means has been in executive sessions for about 6 weeks considering a so-called technical revision of the Internal Revenue Code.

The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and a staff from the Treasury Department have spent something over 2 years preparing for this revision.

All of us know that tax lawyers spend their entire lives trying to become experts in just one phase of our tax code. To even understand the major changes which are now being made in the tax laws by the Committee on Ways and Means would require at least a year's intensive study by the committee.

We must indeed be supermen to accomplish this work in 6 weeks.

The resulting complexities will match the fondest dream of any tax lawyer.

DAN CLEARY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is distasteful to me to assume a role of ungallantry.

I would sooner make excuses for the lady recently become a member of the War Claims Commission. She was new to Washington. All she had to guide her was the counsel and example of some of the Republican menfolks who had gone all out for name calling. It is understandable how the lady got the idea that as part of the upper echelon of the administration it was her official duty to smear Democrats.

If she could have kept herself in emotional check until the President had spoken on the subject of scandalmongering, she could have saved herself and the administration from what must be a real embarrassment to the man in the White House.

The gravity of the offense of Pearl Carter Pace does not permit an easy excusing thereof on the grounds that she is a lady. There is another lady I am thinking about—the young widow of Dan Cleary.

Dan Cleary was my friend. If ever a man walked with God, Dan Cleary so walked. He was the chairman of the War Claims Commission. No man ever worked harder, with more fidelity and integrity, or did a better job in the public service of these United States. He gave himself to his public duty even to the last beat of a brave and overworked heart. He died at the post of duty in the flower of his young manhood.

I stood in Arlington Cemetery a few weeks ago when they laid Dan Cleary to rest. He left behind a young widow and a family of young children. I think of that young widow as the finest flower of the ladyhood of Illinois. Hers now the job of carrying on alone, both mother and father, supporter and comforter, a job she will acomplish with courage and with glory as many women before her have done.

I returned from that scene of parting at Arlington, when Dan Cleary was left to sleep with the many other heroes of our Republic, shortly thereafter to read in the Washington Post that Pearl Carter Pace had gone to the Statler Hotel to address a gathering of 50 Republican national committeewomen. The Post quotes her as saying that her Democratic predecessors—that meant Dan Cleary—"had to be dragged, screaming and kicking, from their good sound berths."

That, of course, was entirely untrue in any sense, as the law we passed creating the Commission provided that the term of office of the Commissioners should be the life of the Commission, that is, until March 31, 1955.

Pearl Carter Pace, however, did not stop there. The Post quotes her as saying "apparently there is in Washington a bad odor connected with the War Claims Commission."

It should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the words ascribed by the Washington Post to Commissioner Pace were spoken within a few weeks after the burial of Dan Cleary, that there was not in the statement one iota of truth, that the administration of the War Claims Commission under Dan Cleary had been a pattern of efficiency and scrupulous honesty, and even at the time the false and smearing remarks were being made to the 50 Republican national committeewomen there were those at the Office of the Custodian of Alien Property—from which comes the funds for the War Claims Commission—who were saying that Dan Cleary killed himself by overwork.

To the credit of Estelle Jackson, writer of the article in the Washington Post, it should be recorded that after reporting the remarks of Pearl Carter Pace she added, "Other speakers at the session confined themselves to ladylike remarks on GOP accomplishments."

I venture the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that Republican men and women, like Democratic men and women, always will listen to arguments based on accomplishments, and will find disgust and distrust in false slander and the smearing of the dead.

DEPRESSION PSYCHOLOGY

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as one citizen I resent the organized drive to promote a depression psychology in the country. No doubt there are some people being misled by this talk, but a great many people who are making those claims are in a position to gain by them either politically or are in a position to advance certain causes which they think they can advance if the country is thrown into a depression. They are attempting to throw this country into a depression. Now the facts are that since World War II ended on several occasions there has been more unemployment than there is right now. The Republicans have a program that is going to remedy that and is remedying it now. These calamity speeches constitute a political conspiracy to throw the country into a depression.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM—WHEN?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska announced that the Republican Party has a program. My question is, When are we going to start working on that program?

PERSONAL TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a short table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Democrats, in this and the other body, are trampling over one another in their eagerness to propose bigger and better increased personal exemptions for our taxpayers. Where have they been during the past 20 years when their party controlled every Congress but one?

During the period Democrats were in power, here is what happened to personal exemptions. For a married couple or head of family, they fell from $3,500 to $1,000. For a single individual, they fell from $1,500 to $500.

The only increase in personal exemptions which has been made in the last 20 years was during the 80th Congress, controlled by the Republican Party.

It is quite clear that Democrats are uniformly in favor of increasing personal exemptions—except when they have the responsibility of governing.

Let me make this clear: If an increase in personal exemptions is possible, a Republican Congress will make it, and if personal exemptions are increased it will be because a Republican Congress has cut Federal spending to a point where tax relief is finally possible.

I include as part of my remarks the history of personal tax exemptions during the past 30 years:

Personal exemptions, 1925–54

Revenue act	Income year	Personal exemptions		Party controlling Congress when revenue act passed
		Married couple	Single	
1926–28	1925–31	$3,500	$1,500	Republican.
1932	1932–33	2,500	1,000	Democrat.
1934	1934–35	2,500	1,000	Do.
1936–38	1936–39	2,500	2,500	Do.
1940	1940	2,000	800	Do.
1941	1941	1,500	750	Do.
1942	1942–43	1,200	500	Do.
1944	1944–45	1,000	500	Do.
1945	1946–47	1,000	500	Do.
1948	1948–53 [1]	1,200	600	Republican.

[1] Plus an additional $600 exemption to persons over 65 and to blind.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS—ACTION VERSUS TALK

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the only calamity about talking about economic conditions that face our country is the calamity that may occur if we do nothing about them. As indicated by our distinguished former Speaker and now distinguished minority leader, we, on the Democratic side, are ready to do something about it. There is a condition facing this country that may get worse unless we do act. We are ready to act on our side. Are you ready to act on your side? Stop talking, start doing.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

CLEANING UP THE MESS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, our delightful colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], abandoning for the moment his program of calling to our attention the very descriptive names that some people have thought to apply—and I do not refer to any of those bad ones—to the actions of his party and of those on the other side, and the gentleman who followed him inquired as to when are we going to begin doing something about cleaning up the "mess." I cannot speak for the Republican leadership—I am just out of favor over here in that respect all the way through. For myself, let me say this. I did start to clean up the "mess" as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. We were getting along pretty well doing that job until the Democratic members on that committee, I would not say seduced, but anyway persuaded the Republicans to go along with them and cut off my authority. Oh, we were doing a good job and we were beginning to clean things up, and then your party stepped in over there and with the aid of some Republicans cut off that cleaning up job which was well on its way.

UNITED STATES v. WARREN L. STEPHENSON

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

FEBRUARY 25, 1954.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, I have received subpenas duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court as a witness in the case of the *United States* v. *Warren L. Stephenson* (No. 1838–53, docket), and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicates that the Clerk may not, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum, produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without such consent.

The subpenas in question are herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpenas referred to.

The Clerk read the subpenas, as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. WARREN L. STEPHENSON, No. 1838–53

To CLERK, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (LYLE O. SNADER), *Washington, D. C.*

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at Third and Constitution Avenue NW., fourth floor, courtroom 8, on the 1st day of March, 1954, at 9:30 o'clock a. m., and bring with you to the court of Hon. Charles McLaughlin, judge, the minute book of the Committee on Armed Services and the minute book of the Subcommittee on Defense Activities of the Committee on Armed Services, each for the year 1953.

This subpena is issued upon application of the defendant.

Nicholas J. Chase, attorney for defendant, 400 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

[SEAL] HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MABEL R. HOUSTON,
Deputy Clerk.

FEBRUARY 23, 1954.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. WARREN L. STEPHENSON, CRIMINAL CASE No. 1838–53

Spa ad test: Court of Chief Judge Laws.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE HONORABLE LYLE SNADER,
Clerk, House of Representatives, room P–42 Statuary Hall, Capitol Building

Bring all records of the Subcommittee on Defense Activities, House Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, relating to H. R. 125, including all resolutions and precepts on the committee and subcommittee pursuant to the said H. R. 125.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, March 15, 1954, at 9 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or the district attorney.

Witness the Honorable Bolitha H. Laws, chief judge of said court, this — day of — A. D. 19—.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By HAROLD G. DODD, *Deputy Clerk.*

[SEAL]

NOTE.—Report to New Courthouse, between Third Street and John Marshall Place on Constitution Avenue NW., courtroom No. 8.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 451) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the case of the United States against Warren L. Stephenson (No. 1838–1853, docket) pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, subpenas duces tecum were issued by the said court and addressed to Lyle O. Snader, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 1st day of March 1954 at 9:30 o'clock antemeridian, and on the 15th day of March 1954, at 9 o'clock antemeridian, and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Lyle O. Snader, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpenas duces tecum before-mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpenas duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents and papers in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpenas aforementioned.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up for consideration at this time House Resolution 400.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by section 17 of rule 11, as enacted by the passage of House Resolution 5 of the 83d Congress, 1st session, incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $300,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, investigators, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. That the funds granted shall remain available for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities until expended.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6 strike out the sum and insert "$275,000."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Do I understand this is a privileged resolution?

The SPEAKER. It is. The gentleman is calling it up as a matter of privilege.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Under the rules the Chairman has control of the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 1 hour to yield to whomsoever he desires.

Mr. LECOMPTE. And he has control of the matter of offering amendments.

The SPEAKER. A committee amendment is now pending. No other amendment can be offered unless the gentleman yields the floor for that purpose.

Mr. LECOMPTE. A motion to recommit, of course, belongs to some member of the minority opposed to the resolution. Would any motion except a motion to recommit be in order except by the gentleman in charge of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Not unless the gentleman yields for that purpose.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of the House are interested in this legislation. This is the annual appropriation for investigations by the Committee on Un-American Activities. The committee has already had in this Congress $300,000, and is now asking $300,000 for this year or the balance of the 83d Congress. The House Administration Committee has considered and has felt that some kind of an economy effort is in order and has voted a committee amendment reducing the amount from $300,000 to $275,000.

I think it will not be said that the House of Representatives is soft toward communism. The Committee on Un-American Activities convinced the subcommittee that there are detailed and elaborate plans in the making for prosecuting, investigating, and uncovering communism wherever it can be found in the United States.

The Members may be interested to know that the House of Representatives has already expended down through the years from 1938 to the present time, but not including this year, the total sum of $2,527,500 by the Committee on Un-American Activities, largely for investigating the presence of communism at some place wherever it may have been found within the United States. The committee, of course, was formerly known as the Dies committee, and was headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], now a Member of the House. He had charge of the investigations of the Dies committee for 6½ or 7 years, and during that time his committee performed a splendid service and spent $652,500.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts for a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not in any way vain, but just to keep the history correct, it happened that I was chairman of a committee investigating communism, fascism, and bigotry in 1934. Out of that committee came what is now the Smith Act. My committee recommended that act. For several years, though, I introduced bills and could not get a hearing on them. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] was fortunately in a position where he could include it in a bill, which passed a Democratic House and Senate and was signed by a Democratic President. The Foreign Registration Act was recommended by me. So, while I say it is not from vanity on my part, I do wish my friend from Iowa would keep the RECORD correct and at least say for the RECORD that I was chairman of a special committee that investigated communism. Prior to me, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fish, was chairman of an investigating committee that investigated communism. Out of my investigation at least came recommendations for certain bills which were enacted into law, all by Democratic Congresses and signed by a Democratic President.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that he is reciting some history I did not know about. I thought the Un-American Activities Committee originated with a resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. The gentleman is going back long before my time. I am admitting the truth and accuracy of his statement, but I will say that I had not heard of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can understand that because the gentleman from Massachusetts was very much alone in those years in fighting communism. I did not have many Members of the House supporting me, I did not have many Americans throughout the country supporting me because they thought it was just headlines when I warned them of the potential danger of communism, not only to our country but to the world. So, I am not amazed because I was a very lonely figure in those years. However, we did get the legislation through that we recommended.

Mr. LECOMPTE. For that reason, then, the gentleman will join with me in saying that we are not going to be soft on communism and the gentleman will join with me in helping to get this appropriation through?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am for it; yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman is in favor of the resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am only glad to refresh my dear friend's memory. It is only natural because there are very few who can remember back to 1934. There were so few at that time who were alarmed about communism. I was alarmed and I warned the country, but very few recognized the situation of that time.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Some of us had not come to Congress at that time.

Mr. McCORMACK. You were old enough to read the newspapers.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman agrees, then, there must be no backward step taken, that communism must be stamped out wherever it shows its ugly head?

Mr. McCORMACK. We all agree with the last statement of the gentleman and I join with him. There is no one more firmly entrenched in his strenuous opposition to communism than is

my friend from Iowa. I was just ahead of the gentleman 20 years ago.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I think it would be appropriate at this moment to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Smith Act, which the gentleman from Massachusetts is largely responsible for, has brought about the conviction, since its enactment, of the leading Communists in the United States. These convictions were appealed to the court of last resort and the act was found by that Court to be constitutional. It is our hope that through the continued efforts of this committee we will be able to find other people who have been gnawing at the vitals of our beloved Republic to the end that they, too, may discover the effectiveness of the Smith Act.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I just wanted to say that I was fully cognizant, although I hate to admit it, of the very fine work that was done so many years ago by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. I also am very happy that he mentioned another gentleman who goes back even further and who was the first member of that committee, and that was Mr. Hamilton Fish in 1930. For his work there, he suffered a good many smears and grievous wrongs, and I am certainly glad to see that the RECORD will show that he was the very first man who put up this fight against communism, as he came from my own district.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the House will undoubtedly today vote this appropriation for the Un-American Activities Committee as it has before on many occasions with an overwhelming vote. I voted for it myself on the last occasion, and when I voted for it I said I was doing that because I realized, and I think we all realize, that because you vote for an appropriation does not mean that you have to accept everything that the committee does with uncritical appraisal.

Now, there is a great stir in the country about this type of investigation, and the fact that Members vie with each other here in protestations about how they abhor communism is not going to cure that stir and is not going to reassure the American people.

I think we all have a very grave responsibility. The prestige of the whole Congress is at stake. This is not a situation where we can equip a committee with money and let them go ahead with a job and forget about it. It is a question as to our accountability with respect to the methods pursued in the investigation of communism in this country.

On two points, I know, we are, without any question, together. One is that we want to root out communism, and the other is that we are devoted to Congressional power of investigation which is one of the most stalwart bastions of the freedom of our society and which is so thoroughly entrenched in the spirit of the Constitution.

But, we cannot take lightly what has occurred in these investigations. When the Presbyterian Church, the National Council of Churches of Christ, the Episcopal Bishops, the Women's Division of the Christian Service of the Methodist Church—these are conservative groups—oppose the methods of investigation by committees in this field, the Congress must listen. When it is alleged that the free market in ideas is being inhibited and that treason is being confused with dissent we must listen. Regardless of what our opinions may be, the actions of congressional committees in this field, particularly the committee in the other body which is so much in the headlines today, not only affect finding out Communists and subversives, it affects the morale of Government employees, discipline in the Army, it affects United States relations with its allies, the research program of the United States Army in highly delicate subjects like radar at the Fort Monmouth Signal Corps Laboratories. When we read that scientists are thinking twice about going into or staying out of the service, I think it all comes down to this: I think the facts show, and I am going to give a few facts, that we have to have the whole Congress take the responsibility for these committees by legislating rules of fair procedure. Many distinguished people in the country have urged it. I respectfully say, and I do not say this invidiously, but I think we would be derelict in our duty if we did not at the least enact rules of fair procedure for Congressional investigating committees as recommended by leading bar associations and other authorities.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that the Committee on Un-American Activities has adopted a set of rules, and that every attempt possible is made to adhere to the provisions of those rules.

Mr. JAVITS. May I deal with that in a moment, because you know I have studied this subject very carefully. I am sponsoring in the House the rules offered by the Association of the Bar of New York and I would not speak without knowledge of the rules of the committee and what has been done under them.

Let us see what has been done with them. In the first place, many in the country have been deeply disturbed about the release of testimony given by a former Communist Party official, Benjamin Gitlow, associating two very distinguished rabbis, Rabbis Wise and Magnes, who were outstanding and revered leaders of their people and whom I knew personally, and associating Dr. John Haynes Holmes, one of the most distinguished Protestant ministers in New York, as having collaborated with the Communist Party. These are men who had widespread reputation for devotion to liberty and abhorrence of any totalitarian doctrine of practice.

As far as I can see this information was unscreened; nobody was permitted to testify against it; nothing of support was in hand with respect to it except that of having the testimony of an admitted former Communist; yet it was released to the public. I say rules that permit such methods and procedure are a real danger to the prestige of the Congress. You have to have some screening, some sort of substantiation, some opportunity to talk back, especially since Rabbis Wise and Magnes were deceased at the time of the report.

Second, there was a 10-hour hearing in connection with the complaint of Bishop Oxnam. What was he complaining about? I do not speak about his other complaints, but what he legitimately complained about was that the committee did not call him in and give him an opportunity in executive session to say, "Yes, I was a member of this; no, I was not a member of that," before releasing a file on him to the public. He had to do it in public session. Why? Because he had been pilloried publicly.

Third, the issuance of the subpena against Harry Truman, a former President of the United States. The rules of procedure of the committee state, and I quote:

> No major investigation shall be initiated without approval by a majority of the committee.

Nevertheless, the chairman issued a subpena against a former President of the United States. Even if you did not object to his issuance of that subpena—and I think there is a grave question as to whether there is any right in an ex-President to expect that the Congress is not going to subpena him, but certainly only after considered action and not on the motion of a committee chairman acting alone—what I say is bad about it is that when he did not honor the subpena, the whole committee accepted its not being honored, the Congress accepted it, and the country accepted it because they felt the whole matter had been handled wrongly. That is certainly a dangerous state in which to leave the prestige of the House of Representatives. I say it is very clear that Congress has to act on rules of procedure for congressional investigating committees and only that kind of impact will have any real effect.

It is fatuous to stand here and oppose this appropriation when it is going through, and going through overwhelmingly, but that does not stop any of us from standing up here and saying it is the conscience of Congress, the whole Congress, every one of us, that has to operate now. There is no excuse for its not operating, and we have the power in our hands to manifest it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the Chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE].

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, in your consideration of the requested appropriation for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I should like to say

a few words concerning the work and accomplishments of this committee during this Congress.

In 1953, the Committee on Un-American Activities held hearings in Washington, D. C.; Los Angeles, Calif.; New York City; Albany, N. Y.; Columbus, Ohio; Lansing, Mich.; Philadelphia, Pa.; and San Francisco, Calif. In the course of these hearings, the committee heard more than 280 witnesses, many of whom added greatly to the knowledge that the Congress has instructed this committee to acquire relating to subversive activities. All of these witnesses who appeared before the committee in response to subpenas were so called by the committee because we were aware that they possessed information which would be of value. I might say that it was not only Communists that we called; we called other witnesses, too, who had information about subversive activities.

I am pleased that a number of these witnesses did testify as to their experiences and associations in subversive activities, and regret that a number of the witnesses chose to refuse to furnish the committee with the information they possessed on the basis that to do so might tend to incriminate them. I believe the Congress should know that there was no instance in which a witness was questioned concerning Communist Party membership that the committee did not have proof of such membership. To further elaborate on this point, there was only one witness who was so questioned who denied Communist Party membership out of the sum total I have referred to. This denial was made in the face of testimony from four witnesses, and the matter is presently under consideration by the Department of Justice for possible perjury prosecution.

The Congress will certainly recognize that it has given a very broad mandate to the committee to investigate subversive propaganda and activities. I can say with pride that the committee has confined itself well within the limits of this mandate. The committee has investigated individuals and not groups. It has found that these individuals have been in many varied groups and occupations within the United States. The committee has, however, made no study of the various groups which these individuals have infiltrated. There has been no investigation of education, religion, labor, or any other field, but there were individuals named by witnesses before the committee who are associated with these fields.

Even though the Communist Party in the United States has to a great extent gone underground, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, during the past year, received from witnesses the identification of more than a thousand individuals who had been members of the Communist Party, and again I should like to point out that these identifications have been made public and, with but one exception, none have come forward and denied that they have been members of the Communist Party.

The attacks upon the committee and its members are certainly no less today than they have been during the history of the committee's existence. False charges are still being made as to the committee's purpose and intentions. I wish to assure you today that the committee is investigating subversion, and finding subversion.

There are those who claim that the work of investigation in the field of subversion should be left to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I believe that I can answer this with authority, having myself been a member of the FBI. The FBI, of course, is a fact-finding agency and the information it secures is of a nature that is made public only in the event of Federal prosecution. It is regrettable that in many instances in past years, the valuable information secured by the FBI has not been made public due to a lack of Federal prosecution. During the past year, there was at least one incident which points out the necessity of congressional investigations. After the FBI had conducted a thorough and exhaustive investigation and had reported to another executive agency the fact that an employee had been a member of the Communist Party, no action had been taken by that agency. Through the course of hearings conducted by this committee, positive identifications were made in public testimony identifying this Government employee as having been a member of the Communist Party. When confronted with this testimony, the witness admitted that he had at one time been a member of the Communist Party.

The instances are too numerous to mention where the FBI has secured valuable information concerning subversive activities that have never been made public, which would be of valuable assistance to Congress in its study for necessary legislation. The investigation to secure information for legislation on subversive activities can only be done by congressional committees.

There are charges of abuse of innocent people by the investigations conducted by congressional investigating committees. There has been only one instance in 1953, I repeat, where any individual who has been identified as a Communist before this committee has denied it, or if he has denied it, has subsequently retracted his denial, or action has been taken to prosecute the individual for perjury.

The committee recognizes that its primary responsibility, as designated by the Congress, is legislative. I should like to point out that over the 15 years that this committee has been in existence as a special and permanent committee, there have been 47 recommendations made by the committee. These recommendations have been for legislation or action that should be taken by the executive branch of the Government in order to strengthen the security of this country against subversion. Of these 47 recommendations, there has been action either by legislation or amendment, or some positive steps taken by the executive branch of Government in all but eight cases. In addition, you will recall that the Internal Security Act of 1950 came about chiefly from the work that was performed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The work of the committee during the past year, as reflected in its printed hearings and reports, shows that there have been approximately 4,000 pages of such hearings and reports printed during the past year. It might be of interest to you that this number is over twice that for any committee during a complete Congress in previous years.

The committee has continued its policy of furnishing reports from its files to Members of Congress, congressional committees, and authorized executive agencies. During the year, there were more than 6,000 such requests made of the committee and complied with. It has become standard procedure for most Government agencies operating in the field of security to have employees designated on a full-time basis to refer to the files of this committee.

In all, the year 1953 was one of the busiest and most profitable for the committee in securing information relating to subversive activities. The members of the committee had to devote an ever-increasing amount of time to the work of the committee.

During the year, there were 154 sessions of the committee, and that excludes the necessary business meetings which were held.

I assure you that the Congress and the people of the United States received full value for every dollar that was appropriated for the use of this committee, and I assure you that during this session of Congress, the committee will intensify its efforts to inform the Congress on subversive activities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VELDE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman said a moment ago that the FBI was a fact-finding agency. I had the idea that it was a fact-ascertaining agency, and then the agency to which the information obtained as a result of the investigation was forwarded made the findings on the facts.

Mr. VELDE. I think the gentleman is probably correct in his use of the word.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not mean to interrupt the gentleman except if the gentleman's impression is the same as mine, I knew that he would want the RECORD to be correct.

Mr. VELDE. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VELDE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have listened with considerable interest to the comment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. Will the gentleman who has the floor explain now the difference between a fact-finding and a fact-ascertaining committee?

Mr. VELDE. Well, it is just a matter of your choice of words, I think, and the gentleman from Michigan knows that. One word would probably be a little bit clearer in this particular case than the other. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts has chosen the correct word.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I made no observations of the gentleman's committee, of which the gentleman is chairman.

My observation is confined to what the gentleman said about the FBI being a fact-finding agency, and I said nothing about the committee. The gentleman from Michigan did not hear me correctly.

Mr. VELDE. Of course, I think the gentleman knows that the House Committee on Un-American Activities is a fact-finding body also.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. VELDE. That is the distinction that I made between it and the FBI. The work of the two is in no way comparable. The chief point of difference is the fact that the FBI cannot because of the secret nature of its work make any of the information relative to subversion public unless it is in a criminal case, whereas our Committee on Un-American Activities can make public the information that it obtains.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VELDE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I think the gentleman is overlooking one very important fact, namely, that the Committee on Un-American Activities has a very large library, and it furnishes to various Government agencies information that those agencies have not obtained. That is true even of the FBI. So that a large part of the money appropriated to the Committee on Un-American Activities is expended for filing clerks who are engaged in the preparation of this very large library.

Mr. VELDE. I thank the gentleman for calling my attention to that. The gentleman is correct.

I should like to answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] relative to the Bishop Oxnam hearings which were held. I want the Members of this House to know, I think you already know, but may I repeat that Bishop Oxnam came before the Un-American Activities Committee at his own request. He was given a choice as to whether the hearing should be an open hearing or in executive session. He is the one who asked for it to be in open session. I think this appropriation of $275,000 will be sufficient for the work of the committee this year.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VELDE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. In view of the fact that the Bishop Oxnam matter has been discussed, I think the membership of this body would be interested in knowing that not only was the hearing held at the request of Bishop Oxnam, but it was a public hearing at his request. The atmosphere which he has complained about publicly in many speeches—he has talked about a Roman holiday—if there was anything that resembled that—and I deny that there was—it was of his own making, because the audience was packed with a number that he brought there, and the session lasted away into the night, another thing that he complained about, due to the fact that his attorney had engaged passage to Europe, and at the request of the bishop, and at the inconvenience of many people, particularly myself, we sat there until late into the night and permitted the bishop to go on with his story.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE], a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield briefly.

Mr. JAVITS. I just want to reply that all this matter had all been made public before the Bishop asked to testify. I hope the gentleman will develop that.

Mr. DOYLE. Being a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, as I am again this session, as well as being on the Armed Services Committee also, I look on the Un-American Activities Committee as a committee that ought to function, as nearly as possible, absolutely nonpartisan. This is a must. I think we are making definite progress in that area. I hope so. I think we are.

I may be the only member of the committee who says so today, but I think we ought to have the full $300,000. I have told the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LeCOMPTE] of that fact; so it is no surprise to him that I take this position now. This is no time to economize—not a nickel's worth—in the field of exposing subversive activities wherever they are in my judgement. I think it is a step backwards; if it is thought of as economy to cut $25,000. In view of the strategic importance of the work before this committee; this work must be adequately performed every day. I am disappointed that the administration now in power in Washington including leadership in this House, takes the position that it is wise or timely to claim "economy" in this field of the work of the Un-Amercian Activities Committee.

We expend literally hundreds of millions of dollars throughout the world on the theory that our national security necessitates it because of the threat of aggressive or subversive or military communism. And yet, with John Edgar Hoover and other authorities in the premises advocating a continuous, vigorous, and vigilant effort against infiltration of subversive communism, not only in Government departments, but in all strategic organizations, I am dumbfounded that the House Committee on Government Operations insists that their claim to "economize" must also apply to making it less possible for the House Un-American Activities Committee to do fully the job which must be done. I know we have a little cash balance in the committee's treasury which was unused. But, my information is that this does not nearly amount to $25,000 at this date. Therefore it amounts to a real cut and reduction in the amount we ask for in the sum of $300,000. Certainly this House should compliment the committee for living within its budget, and in not expending funds which we felt could not be most efficiently expended right at the time. In other words, in the nature of our committee work, there are times we need to apply every ounce of effort to the problem. Then, there are times when we do not have to apply our full money allowances to investigations. So, this balance on our books is in itself evidence of a desire to efficiently and economically administer the money you give us.

The committee record shows, I think, that I have been about as regular in attendance as any member of the committee and have diligently done my full share of all responsibilities.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE].

Mr. VELDE. I wish to say to the gentleman from California as well as to the other members of the committee that I appreciate wholeheartedly the support the gentleman from California has given his chairman; that I am sure each one of us realizes the importance of his effort to keep this very important committee nonpartisan; and I am sure each member of the committee has done his utmost to fulfill that obligation.

Mr. DOYLE. I thank the gentleman from Illinois, my chairman.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] made some remarks about the set of rules and indicating inferentially that we have done nothing too much about following them. I wish to say very frankly that I, too, recognize that some of the rules have not been followed 100 percent; but, I think the record will also show that this is the first time any committee of Congress, so far as I can learn, has had any printed, published, and freely distributed set of rules to govern it. I have seen no record of this Congress showing that any of our predecessors have done anything about the printing, distributing, and circulating for the information of witnesses and lawyers before such committee a set of rules to govern the conduct of hearings before the committee. Nor do I find any place in the records of Congress, either body of Congress, where anything like rule 10 was ever promulgated. I especially call your attention to said rule 10, because it clearly sets forth available ways and means whereby any person named before our committee the first time shall be entitled to promptly receive all important information affecting him. I will incorporate the full set of rules of our committee at the close of my speech today. I, too, agree that we should be very careful and not even unintentionally hurt any person's reputation or employment. The committee knows that I strenuously oppose releasing testimony until it has been adequately screened. I strenuously have and do now oppose releasing the names of people who are going to be called before the committee as witnesses before they have testified, because sometimes we find that the first information we get even after a person is subpenaed cannot be promptly or at all verified. Also I think it is well recognized that the mere subpenaing of a person before our committee in many parts of our great Nation is equivalent of that person being irreparably injured. All the people remember about such person is that he was called

before our committee. They do not later read or learn that the fact may be that such person was not actually identified as a subversive person. Sometimes we call people before our committee in what we call exploratory hearings.

The Truman subpena has been mentioned. The record shows that I opposed that subpena. But I did not know about it until after it was issued. I immediately criticized my distinguished chairman for issuing it. I told him to his face that I felt it was a violation of rule 1, which provides that—

No major investigation shall be initiated without approval of the majority of the committee.

I am sure that the record in this untimely instance stands that a majority of the committee was not polled in the premises.

In the matter of the Bishop Oxnam hearing, I do know that the bishop had asked for it publicly. He got it publicly. He had also asked several times before, and a long time before, that the record in the committee files as to him be corrected to show what he claimed the truth to be. But prior to the hearing that he finally did have at his request he had not been granted a previous hearing for which he also made request. This is as I recall the facts to be. And then, of course, the record of the hearing clearly shows that at the conclusion of the committee hearing the committee voted unanimously that in substance there was no evidence of any Communist membership or affiliation on the bishop's part. If rule 10 of our set of rules adopted July 1, 1953, had been in effect, Bishop Oxnam would have been notified by registered mail that he had been named in testimony before the committee. This rule 10 then would have given him an immediate opportunity to protect the record if he desired so to do.

I feel that our committee is steadfastly seeking to improve our conduct so as to represent the real intent and purposes of Public Law 601.

The rules under which we now operate, in my judgment, are not entirely sufficient. But they are a sincere attempt to correct the procedures so as to establish reasonable procedures for legal council and so as to protect all of the rights of every witness. Since the question of rules has been brought up, I should frankly state that because I had the heavy responsibility—although a minority member—of being named by the chairman of the full committee to take the chairmanship of a subcommittee to suggest rules to the full committee, therefore, I think I am well aware of the fact that some rules I hoped for were not adopted. But I say we made distinct progress and I think we will make more progress in the field of rules.

I might say that at adjournment time last August I filed with the Special Rules Committee of the House of Representatives additional rules. Many of these applied especially to the Un-American Activities Committee, and which that committee did not feel then willing to accept. But some of the rules I filed with said committee applied to all congressional committees generally and specifically. This House should know that no witness, against his will, is required to testify under oath before our committee. It was not always that way but it has been for the last few years—ever since I have been on the committee. A witness is promptly informed that at all times he has the right to confer privately with his legal counsel. I hope the committee may soon adopt a rule granting the right of an attorney for a witness not to exceed say 5 minutes in time to examine his client before the committee so that if the witness has overlooked any fact or evidence he desired the committee to have, his worthy counsel then has an opportunity to bring out that evidence before the committee. Also I earnestly wish that some rule of procedure could be adopted whereby when by the actual presence of witnesses and legal counsel in the committee room there could be reasonable opportunity for examination of adverse witnesses—call it cross-examination if you will. But, of course, gentlemen, if the committee permitted anything like the usual cross-examination as conducted in the courtroom, or if the committee permitted lawyers to argue before the committee, then practically no progress would be made by the committee in the field of actual investigation of subversive persons or subversive conduct. In saying this I do not criticize the members of the bar for I am a lawyer and a member of the California State Bar Association at this time. I am also past president of my local bar association. I mention this so that you will understand I cordially respect the important province and functioning of the bar. But the ordinary procedure of evidence cannot possibly be made to apply to the prompt and thorough functioning of our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I know that under the parliamentary situation I may not offer an amendment to increase the amount back to $300,000; but if I could I would; because I feel that this is no time to make a cut on the theory of economy. For, Mr. Speaker, it can never be economy in the interest of our national security against subversives to do less than a 100 percent job in the field in which our committee is charged with responsibility under Public Law 601. There is no time to lose. Furthermore, there is no time like the immediate present to help uncover and expose to the daylight or patriotic American citizens those who continue directly or indirectly as active members or participate in the Communist conspiracy to eventually overthrow the constitutional form of government of our beloved Nation by force and violence. Instead of reducing our staff we should increase it I believe to such proportions as to be efficiently managed and administered. We should not, of course, go beyond that point. But anything less than arriving at that point through adequate appropriations of money from this great body will not be economy.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to make just a brief closing statement. May I make it clear that I do not countenance, tolerate, or approve any congressional committee, or any member of any congressional committee, taking advantage of any witnesses before a committee. Our committee is not a court. Our committee is not empowered to find guilt or innocence. It is an information-gathering committee for the purpose of reporting the facts and information gained from our hearings to the Congress. And we report to Congress with recommendations in the field of legislation which we recommend as result of our hearings and study in the field of subversive activities. There is no question in my mind that the Communist conspiracy originated and continues to be directed from the confines of a foreign nation. I think our committee records show ample evidence and testimony of this fact. I believe the hard core of communism in the United States either takes their directions and orders directly from a Communist Party in another nation, or that they themselves have originally come from foreign nations—and have brought their subversive aggressive Communist conspiracy and ambition and activities with them.

But, Mr. Speaker, our Un-American Activities Committee—yes, all congressional committees—in my judgment should be tolerant of other men's opinions. We must cherish and respect and fight for the right of other patriotic Americans to differ with us. We must continue to vigorously protect the rights of citizens who differ with us within the four corners of the Constitution to so differ with us. We must respect the other man's right to be considered wrong in our judgment. For, if we do not do so, he likewise has the right to disregard our right to be wrong in his considered opinion. To weaken or to destroy the other man's right of opinion so long as it is within the four corners of our American Constitution, in my humble judgment, is to destroy the very foundation of our constitutional form of government. For, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, this does not give any American citizen or any person residing within the United States of America the right, the privilege, or the opportunity, either directly or indirectly, to participate in anything which is part or parcel of the existing Communist conspiracy determined to overthrow all semblance of our democratic way of life by setting up a Communist dictatorship in the United States and to do that by force or violence if needs be when the time comes. I have said to our committee—I say it here—the committee should also investigate subversive propaganda and activities in the field of fascism and hatemongers. There are not less without the four corners of the Constitution. A dictatorship in any form is totally incompatible with our republic form of constitutional government. The radicals far to the right—the radicals far to the left who are so far either way that they advocate a dictatorship—these could also well be subversives in the sense of being willing to have our constitutional form of government subversively overthrown. I hope this appropriation of $275,000 will be this day unanimously approved. I hope it does not become a precedent for us later again giving to this important committee less than it asks for.

And now, Mr. Speaker, let me file with this short speech of mine a set of the rules of the committee adopted July 1,

1953. I considered it not only a great responsibility but an honor to be designated as chairman of the subcommittee of our full committee to submit rules of procedure for consideration of the full committee.

The following is the result thereof. It is these rules which are in force and effect presently.

RULES OF PROCEDURE, COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

I. INITIATION OF INVESTIGATIONS

No major investigation shall be initiated without approval of a majority of the committee. Preliminary inquiries, however, may be initiated by the committee's staff with the approval of the chairman of the committee.

II. SUBJECTS OF INVESTIGATION

The subject of any investigation in connection with which witnesses are summoned or shall otherwise appear shall be announced in an opening statement to the committee before the commencement of any hearings and the information sought to be elicited at the hearings shall be relevant and germane to the subject as so stated.

III. SUBPENAING OF WITNESSES

A. Subpenas shall be signed and issued by the chairman of the committee, or any member of the committee designated by said chairman.

B. Witnesses shall be subpenaed at a reasonably sufficient time in advance of any hearing, said time to be determined by the committee, in order to give the witness an opportunity to prepare for the hearing and to employ counsel, should he so desire.

IV. EXECUTIVE AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Executive:

(1) If a majority of the committee or subcommittee, duly appointed as provided by the rules of the House of Representatives, believes that the interrogation of a witness in a public hearing might endanger national security or unjustly injure his reputation, or the reputation of other individuals, the committee shall interrogate such witness in an executive session for the purpose of determining the necessity or advisability of conducting such interrogation thereafter in a public hearing.

(2) Attendance at Executive Sessions shall be limited to members of the committee, its staff, and other persons whose presence is requested, or consented to by the committee.

(3) All testimony taken in Executive Sessions shall be kept secret and shall not be released or used in public sessions without the approval of a majority of the committee.

B. Public hearings: (1) all other hearings shall be public.

V. TESTIMONY UNDER OATH

All witnesses at public or executive hearings who testify as to matters of fact shall give all testimony under oath or affirmation. Only the chairman or a member of the committee shall be empowered to administer said oath or affirmation.

VI. TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY

A complete and accurate record shall be kept of all testimony and proceedings at hearings, both in public and in executive session.

Any witness or his counsel, at the expense of the witness, may obtain a transcript of any public testimony of the witness from the clerk of the committee.

Any witness or his counsel may also obtain a transcript of any executive testimony of the witness:

(1) When a special release of said testimony prior to public release is authorized by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of any subcommittee; or

(2) After said testimony has been made public by the committee.

VII. ADVICE OF COUNSEL

At every hearing, public or executive, every witness shall be accorded the privilege of having counsel of his own choosing.

B. The participation of counsel during the course of any hearing and while the witness is testifying shall be limited to advising said witness as to his legal rights. Counsel shall not be permitted to engage in oral argument with the committee, but shall confine his activity to the area of legal advice to his client.

VIII. CONDUCT OF COUNSEL

Counsel for a witness shall conduct himself in a professional, ethical, and proper manner. His failure to do so shall, upon a finding to that effect by a majority of the committee or subcommittee before which the witness is appearing, subject such counsel to disciplinary action which may include warning, censure, removing from the hearing room of counsel, or a recommendation of contempt proceedings.[1]

In case of such removal of counsel, the witness shall have a reasonable time to obtain other counsel, said time to be determined by the committee. Should the witness deliberately or capriciously fail or refuse to obtain the services of other counsel within such reasonable time, the hearing shall continue and the testimony of such witness shall be heard without benefit of counsel.

IX. STATEMENT BY WITNESS

A. Any witness desiring to make a prepared or written statement[2] for the record of the proceedings in executive or public sessions shall file a copy of such statement with the counsel of the committee within a reasonable period of time in advance of the hearing at which the statement is to be presented.

B. All such statements so received which are relevant and germane to the subject of the investigation may, upon approval, at the conclusion of the testimony of the witness, by a majority vote of the committee or subcommittee members present, be inserted in the official transcript of the proceedings.

X. RIGHTS OF PERSONS AFFECTED BY A HEARING

A. Where practicable, any person named in a public hearing before the committee or any subcommittee as subversive, Fascist, Communist, or affiliated with one or more subversive-front organization, who has not been previously so named, shall, within a reasonable time thereafter, be notified by registered letter, to the address last known to the committee, of such fact, including:

(1) A statement that he has been so named,

(2) The date and place of said hearing,

(3) The name of the person who so testified,

(4) The name of the subversive, Fascist, Communist, or front organization with which he has been identified, and

(5) A copy of the printed rules of procedure of the committee.

B. Any person, so notified, who believes that his character or reputation has been adversely affected or to whom has been imputed subversive activity, may within 15 days after receipt of said notice:

(1) communicate with the counsel of the committee,[3] and/or

(2) Request to appear at his own expense in person before the committee or any subcommittee thereof in public session and give testimony, in denial or affirmation, relevant and germane to the subject of the investigation.

C. Any such person testifying under the provisions of B (2) above shall be accorded the same privileges as any other witness appearing before the committee, and may be questioned concerning any matter relevant and germane to the subject of the investigation.

XI. ADMISSIBILITY OF TESTIMONY

A witness shall be limited to giving information relevant and germane to the subject under investigation. The committee shall rule upon the admissibility of all testimony or information presented by the witness.[4]

XII. RELATIONSHIP OF HUSBAND AND WIFE

The confidential relationship between husband and wife shall be respected, and for reasons of public policy, one spouse shall not be questioned concerning the activities of the other, except when a majority of the committee or subcommittee shall determine otherwise.

XIII. TELEVISED HEARINGS

A. If a hearing be televised:

(1) Television facilities in the hearing room shall be restricted to two cameras, the minimum lighting facilities practicable, and the television production shall be available on a pool basis to all established television companies desiring participation.

(2) Telecasts of committee hearings shall be on the basis of a public service only, and this fact shall be publicly announced on television in the beginning and at the close of each telecast. No commercial announcements shall be permitted from the hearing room or in connection therewith, and no actual or intimated sponsorship of the hearings shall be permitted in any instance.

B. Upon the request of a witness that no telecast be made of him during the course of his testimony, the chairman shall direct that television cameras refrain from photographing the witness during the taking of his testimony.

XIV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. No committee reports or publications shall be made or released to the public without the approval of the majority of the committee.

B. No summary of any committee report or publication and no statement of the contents of such report or publication shall be released by any member of the committee or its staff, prior to the official issuance of the report.

XV. WITNESS FEES AND TRAVEL ALLOWANCE

Each witness who has been subpenaed, upon the completion of his testimony before the committee, may report to the office of the clerk of the committee, room 227, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., and there sign appropriate vouchers for travel allowances and attendance fees upon the committee. If hearings are held in cities

---

[1] The committee seeks factual testimony within the personal knowledge of the witness and such testimony and answers must be given by the witness himself and not suggested to witness by counsel.

[2] Statements which take the form of personal attacks by the witness upon the motives of the committee, the personal characters of any Members of the Congress or of the committee staff, and statements clearly in the nature of accusation are not deemed to be either relevant or germane.

[3] All witnesses are invited at any time to confer with committee counsel or investigators for the committee prior to hearings.

[4] The House Committee on Un-American Activities is a congressional committee, not a court (see pp. IV and V). Moreover, the committee has neither the authority nor the vast powers of a court of law.

A congressional committee conducts a search for information, not a trial.

The requirements of time, the nature of the fact-finding hearing, the complications of travel, the realities of expense, and the voluminous duties of Members of Congress all add together to make it impractical for courtroom procedure to be followed.

The committee has given frequent and diligent consideration to this subject, and has determined that in order to carry out its responsibilities imposed by law, the rules of evidence, including cross-examination, are not applicable.

other than Washington, D. C., the witness may contact the clerk of the committee or his representative, prior to leaving the hearing room.

XVI. CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

No recommendation that a witness be cited for contempt of Congress shall be forwarded to the House of Representatives unless and until the committee has, upon notice to all its members, met and considered the alleged contempt, and by a majority of those present voted that such recommendation be made.

XVII. DISTRIBUTION OF RULES

All witnesses appearing before the House Committee on Un-American Activities shall be furnished a printed copy of the Rules of Procedure of the committee.

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * *

"PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"Rule X

"Sec. 121. Standing Committees

* * * * * *

"17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

"Rule XI

"Powers and Duties of Committees

* * * * * *

"(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

"(A) Un-American Activities.

"(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member."

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 83D CONGRESS (H. RES. 5, JAN. 3, 1953)

* * * * * *

RULE X

Standing committees

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

* * * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

* * * * * *

RULE XI

Powers and duties of committees

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such time and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member. Rules and Manual, House of Representatives, 83d Cong., sec. 720).

* * * * * *

25. (a) The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable * * *. (Rules and Manual, House of Representatives, 83d Cong., sec. 735.)

"A committee may adopt rules under which it will exercise its functions (I, 707; III 1841, 1842; VIII, 2214) and may appoint subcommittees (VI, 532) which should include majority and minority representation (IV, 4551), and confer on them powers delegated to the committee itself (VI, 532)."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] for the purpose of making an announcement.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa giving me this time to make an announcement which I believe will be of considerable interest to the Members of the House. The senior Senator from Michigan, HOMER FERGUSON, and I have just returned from the State Department where we were handed copy of a note which has just been delivered to the Polish Ambassador reading as follows:

The Secretary of State presents his compliments to His Excellency the Ambassador of the Polish People's Republic and has the honor to inform the Ambassador that the Department of State has reviewed the activities of the Polish consulates general in the United States. After careful consideration the Department has reached the conclusion that these consular establishments serve no useful purpose in the conduct of relations between the United States and Poland at the present time. The United States Government consequently requests that the Polish Government close its consulates general at New York, Chicago, and Detroit, and withdraw the personnel of those offices within a reasonable period of liquidating their affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

WASHINGTON.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration, has turned this into a self-praise and admiration society, may I say that I was a member of the old Dies committee; but instead of going back only to 1934, like Mr. MCCORMACK, in connection with activities against communism, I made my first public speech against communism in 1921. I have been speaking on the public lecture platform against communism ever since that time.

As a matter of interest to the Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, I will release in a few days a list of 300 individuals who invoked the fifth amendment before congressional committees during the calendar year 1953. It will be catalogued so that you will know their names; you will know the department of Government they work in; or where they are employed outside of the Government, if they happen to be in private business. You will know the page numbers in the hearings where you can find the references to their refusal to answer questions.

I trust this will be a valuable document not only for the Congress but for the entire country.

While I realize there must be a good reason for reducing the amount for the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities from $300,000 to $275,000, I wonder if someone would explain it for my benefit.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] to answer that question.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I was going to say to the gentleman from Illinois that the reason the Committee on House Administration did reduce it by $25,000 was because the committee has that sum on hand, and they thought that $300,000 would be sufficient.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I was just going to make the same remarks to the House. There was $25,000 left over from last year's appropriation. Actually this Congress is appropriating for the Committee on Un-American Activities, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois, more than any other previous Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE], chairman of the committee, one or two questions about the operations of this committee. I know what it has been in the past, and I would like to have some enlightenment for the future. Your committee is not unlike many committees; it likes headlines. In the past your committee has used television and radio in your public hearings when you held meetings up in Michigan, up in New York, out in California, out in Illinois, Chicago, Philadelphia, and elsewhere. Who sets the policy in the use of

this television and radio? I know what it means politically.

Mr. VELDE. Does the gentleman have a question?

Mr. WIER. Yes. I am asking who sets the policy on the use of television and radio at these hearings outside of Washington.

Mr. VELDE. The committee has set the policy on the use of television and it is contained in our rules of procedure which I trust the gentleman is familiar with.

Mr. WIER. Are you still using television?

Mr. VELDE. Let me read the rule to the gentleman:

XIII. TELEVISED HEARINGS

A. If a hearing be televised:

(1) Television facilities in the hearing room shall be restricted to two cameras, the minimum lighting facilities practicable, and the television production shall be available on a pool basis to all established television companies desiring participation.

(2) Telecasts of committee hearings shall be on the basis of a public service only, and this fact shall be publicly announced on television in the beginning and at the close of each telecast. No commercial announcements shall be permitted from the hearing room or in connection therewith, and no actual or intimated sponsorship of the hearings shall be permitted in any instance.

B. Upon the request of a witness that no telecast be made of him during the course of his testimony, the chairman shall direct that television cameras refrain from photographing the witness during the taking of his testimony.

I know of no instance in which that particular rule on television has been violated by me or any member of the committee.

Mr. WIER. It has been a very good instrument politically.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and then I am going to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] to close the debate.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a copy of the report that my special committee made to this House. It is dated February 15, 1935:

Mr. MCCORMACK, from the committee appointed pursuant to House Resolution 198, 73d Congress, 2d session, submits the following report.

That report of the committee made reference to the investigation made previously by our former colleague, Hamilton Fish, of New York. In the report we said:

This committee confined its investigation to that period of time following the thorough inquiry made by the special committee, of which our colleague, Mr. Fish, of New York, was chairman.

You will find that we at that time obtained evidence satisfying us, and we so stated in our report, that communism was an international conspiracy not only against the United States, but against all free peoples of the world, dedicated to the overthrow by force and violence of our form of government.

We also investigated nazism in this country, and we forced them to disband.

We also discovered a Fascist bloc, which I referred to briefly the other day on the floor, where a certain group of wealthy persons in New York who bought and sold their bonds through a prominent New York brokerage house hated Franklin D. Roosevelt so much, and they were afraid he was going to tax all their wealth away, that they actually planned and plotted and conspired to overthrow our Government and to establish a dictatorship of the right, provided he was their dictator. At that time they approached Smedley Butler.

We also uncovered Pelley, the bigot, and his activities later were followed up by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. We also uncovered other bigot organizations that existed at that time. I am glad to note that the Committee on Un-American Activities is going not only into the field of bigotry in the United States but also any other subversive movement in addition to communism such as fascism. There are many Fascist-minded individuals in the United States today who would like to have our country diverted and subverted into a dictatorship of the so-called right provided the dictator is their dictator.

The recommendations of my committee are contained in the report. There is a recommendation out of which arose the Foreign Agent Registration Act. There is a recommendation that Congress enact legislation conferring upon the Secretary of Labor authority to shorten or terminate the stay in this country of any visitor admitted here under temporary visa, whenever in the judgment of the Secretary such visitor shall engage in the promotion or dissemination of propaganda or engage in political activity in the United States.

There is the recommendation giving the Army and the Navy the power to control Communist activities and subversive activities in any Army camp or a Navy yard. We found that in peacetime the Communists could and did go into Navy yards or Army camps and distribute their propaganda, and there was no authority to stop it. We recommended a bill which became law against great opposition giving the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy the power to control that condition by regulation.

We also found that when a committee was outside the District of Columbia and a witness refused to answer the United States Attorney could not take any proceedings under the law. The only time he could do so was if the special committee was sitting in the District of Columbia. We recommended an amendment to the law giving special committees the power wherever they might go throughout the Continental United States or in any of our possessions to refer matters to the United States Attorney, and that became law. Then the Smith law, which my friend the gentleman from Virginia so ably carried through under his leadership was recommended by my committee as follows:

That Congress should make it an unlawful act for any person to advocate changes in a manner that incites to the overthrow or destruction by force and violence of the Government of the United States, or of the form of government guaranteed to the several States by article IV, section 4, of the Constitution of the United States.

Might I say to my colleagues that that has a very interesting history. I introduced a bill carrying out that recommendation. It was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. For 3 or 4 years, I could not even get a hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary on that bill which I introduced, which is substantially the same as the Smith law because some members of the Committee on the Judiciary at that time took the position that the bill I introduced carrying out this recommendation violated States' rights. So we had our difficulty in those days. I know what the committee comes up against and I am very tolerant in my criticism of any committee investigating un-American activities. My friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] was a member of my committee and he and I and our former colleague, Mr. Dickstein of New York, are the only three Members living today; and there was Charles Kramer, of California, J. Will Taylor, and U. S. Guyer, all grand men. No three finer men ever lived. We worked together in harmony on that committee. We had no trouble and we had no difficulty working together but we operated under extreme difficulty because the fellow travellers were attacking us, and they were powerful in those days, as my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] well remembers. But the recommendations made by our committee became the law, and I am very happy to give credit to my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] because he put through one of the two main recommendations, which is now on the statute books as a law as a result of which the Communist leaders in this country have been indicted and convicted. All of these bills were passed by Democratic-controlled Congresses, and signed by a Democratic President, the late immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get in on this self-admiration society—I think enough of myself without having to come in here and proclaim my good qualities, if any, to all of you. If you want to know who fought the Communists and who did not in years gone by—it is fashionable now, you know, to give them heck—I suggest that you go back and read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read the record of the votes on the bills and the appropriations for that committe and then while you are reading it, I would say to my colleagues over here, do not forget over on that side, whatever their intentions were, they killed off two of the most effective members who ever served on that Committee on Un-American Activities—John Rankin, of Mississippi, and Mr. HÉBERT, of Louisiana. They put them off the committee. They did not want them on that committee any more. They were too effective. That is the only reason that I can recall. Now, think it over and read the record.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is agreed in this House today that we are not going to be soft on communism. The adoption of this resolution will convince the country, I think, that we are

going to combat communism wherever we can find it by all the methods that we can possibly use through our power of investigation and lawmaking. We are also observing a very important rule of economy when we undertake to save $25,000 of the taxpayers' money, by a committee amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the resolution now being considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the debate this afternoon on the appropriation for the Un-American Activities Committee there are a few comments I want to make just to keep the record clear. Since coming to Congress I have voted each year for the appropriation for the Un-American Activities Committee because I believe that it is incumbent on the Government of the United States to ferret out un-American activities and to publicize them, and, particularly, for Congress to be soundly aware of them.

I will vote for the appropriation again today, but there are several of the statements made in the debate today about which I feel strongly constrained to make some comment, and several phases of the whole unhealthy situation which deserve treatment at greater length than has been given to them so far.

For one thing, I think we should recognize that un-American activities are not confined to the sphere of communism. I feel that it is about time we had some report from the committee indicating that they realize their responsibility in these other fields, and that they are going into other types of un-American activities which, in the minds of many people, present a growing threat going unchallenged in this country. We know that the organized world threat today is communism, as controlled and guided from the Kremlin, but there are those who constantly make use of the claim that they are fighting communism to extend their own influence with a desire to control our Government in an equally un-American way.

The average American, in my experience, and particularly the great majority of the working people in this country, are to dedicated to our system of Government and the principles upon which it is founded to be sucked in by the Communist philosophy. My experience comes from having worked in the labor movement and from having literally fought the efforts of the Communist Party and Communists to dominate the labor movement and to dictate its policy. These working people are themselves liberals and progressives in their thinking, and they have a keen appreciation of the Bill of Rights and of the guaranties accorded to them thereunder. They are not Communists and they are willing at every opportunity to fight against communism.

The work of such committees as the Un-American Activities Committee and of other committees of the Congress of the United States, and of other groups in this country can, however, completely lose its effectiveness when they either intentionally or unintentionally use techniques which harm and injure innocent people and leave them with their livelihood destroyed. Such methods create the fear in the minds of many that those who are seeking out communism as members of these committees and groups are willing to sack many of the basic principles of our Constitution. That fear and that impression may be the thing which will, in the end, not only destroy the committees' effectiveness but undo the work which they were set up to do, and leave us without the weapons we need in fighting our enemies, both communistic and those who openly or secretly favor other forms of totalitarianism.

There has been a growing and grave movement lately to attack the basic guaranties of the Bill of Rights and, specifically, the provisions of the fifth amendment to the Constitution. I do not believe that we can strengthen America by breaking down the individual rights and guaranties we are trying to preserve and to build up. In that respect, and so that we may all have a clearer understanding of just what the fifth amendment was intended to do and why we cannot let it be undermined, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point a talk recently made by Justice Jesse W. Carter of the Supreme Court of California. He gives a comprehensive statement of the origin of the amendment and of its purposes. It is good reading for all of us now concerned with this present problem.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY JUSTICE JESSE W. CARTER, OF THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE WEST LOS ANGELES UNIVERSITY SYNAGOGUE FORUM AT THE UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL IN LOS ANGELES ON FEBRUARY 16, 1954, ON THE FIFTH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

The fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." This amendment was adopted in 1791. In California, at the precent time, our Constitution provides (art. I, sec. 13) in part, "In criminal prosecutions, in any court whatever, the party accused shall have the right to a speedy and public trial; to have the process of the court to compel the attendance of witnesses in his behalf, and to appear and defend, in person and with counsel. No person shall be twice put in jeopardy for the same offense; nor be compelled, in any criminal case, to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; but in any criminal case, whether the defendant testifies or not, his failure to explain or to deny by his testimony any evidence or facts in the case against him may be commented upon by the court and by counsel, and may be considered by the court or the jury."

You have all no doubt read, and heard, a lot about the privilege against self-incrimination. That privilege is guaranteed to the individual by both the Federal and State Constitutions in the provisions which I have just read to you. As you all have learned, both Constitutions are subject to construction and interpretation by the Federal courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States, and by the courts of California, including the Supreme Court of which I am one of the seven justices. The construction and interpretation placed on both Constitutions by the highest courts of the land—the United States Supreme Court, so far as Federal questions are involved—and the Supreme Court of California, so far as State questions are involved—are binding on all lower courts of both the Federal Government and of the State of California.

Inasmuch as the Federal Constitution was adopted first, I think it well to give you a very brief résumé of the reasons leading to the adoption of the fifth amendment on which the comparable provision of the State Constitution was patterned in order that you may understand why it was felt necessary to safeguard the individual from being compelled to convict himself. Beginning in about 1236 A. D. in England, there were ecclesiastical courts. These courts took upon themselves much of the burden of settling various disputes—not only those relating to church law and custom, but various other types of disputes. It was the practice of these courts at that time to submit both the great and humble to what was called an oath ex officio. The purpose of this inquiry was to discover suspected violations of church law or custom, or to establish the truth of either vague or definite charges not disclosed to the person questioned. If the persons summoned to appear did not do so, they were excommunicated; if they did appear they were forced to give testimony under oath, of not only the private sins of themselves but of others. This practice continued, despite various orders from the reigning kings that the King's courts had exclusive jurisdiction over all except matters of matrimony and testament and that they were expressly prohibited from holding such pleas in their courts. However, in criminal cases before the King's Council during this same period, an accused was required to appear in person, without counsel, and to answer the charges which were most likely not known to him in advance. If the accused did not immediately confess or explain the charges, he was put to the method known as the interrogatory examination. This practice brought such protest from the Commons that a statute was passed which provided that charges must be preferred against an accused by indictment or presentation and that "no man should be put to answers * * * [without] * * * due process and writ original, according to the old law of the land." This statute, however, was not long in effect and again the oath ex officio was the common practice. As each new monarch gained the throne, the measures put into effect by the preceding monarch were undone.

All that can safely be asserted is that the common lawyers both in the second half of the 13th and all of the 14th centuries and under Henry VIII and Elizabeth, resisted the inquisitorial procedure of the spiritual courts, whether Romish or English, and under Elizabeth, began to base their opposition chiefly upon the principle that a person could not be compelled to furnish under oath answers to charges which had not been formally made and disclosed to him, except in causes testamentary and matrimonial. To common lawyers a system which required a person to furnish his own indictment from his own lips under oath was repugnant to the law of the land. About 1640, the accused began to claim, and the judges to concede, that a man on trial could not be compelled to answer questions which would disclose

his guilt. Such compulsion was held to be illegal, most unjust, and against the liberty of the subject, and law of the land, and Magna Carta, and unfit to continue upon record. However, the privilege was not absolute. When a prisoner was arraigned, he was required to identify himself by holding up his right hand or by expressly admitting that he was the person charged. Then he was asked how he would plead—whether guilty or not guilty. If he refused to plead, the penalty depended upon the grade of the offense with which he was charged. If treason or a misdemeanor, he was treated as if he had pleaded guilty; if a felony, he was confined to prison with a meager allowance of bread on one day and water the next.

Later, in addition to the alternate bread-and-water diet, he was subjected to pressure—which meant just that: A sharp stake, or piece of wood, was placed under him, and a heavy weight sometimes as great as 400 pounds put on top of him. This usually killed him, or induced him within a period of an hour or so to plead either guilty or not guilty. Usually, even if the accused pleaded not guilty, the jury found him guilty and sentenced him to hang. This horrible and barbaric practice was not discontinued until 1772. At that time the statute of Twelve George III provided that if a person stood mute on his arraignment of piracy or felony, he should be convicted and the court should award judgment and execution as if he had been convicted by verdict or confession. In 1827, standing mute in any criminal case was by statute (seven and eight George IV) made the equivalent of a plea of not guilty.

From the middle of the 16th century to the middle of the 19th, the accused was subject to a preliminary examination before a committing magistrate and was expected to answer. He was not warned that he need not answer. If he refused to answer, or if he did answer, it was reported and put in evidence at his trial. Up to the middle of the 17th century, torture was used to extort confessions and no one seriously contended that such confessions were not admissible against the accused. In the 18th century, the accused began objecting to the use of coerced confessions, but it is not clear on just what ground the objections were sustained: whether the coercion affected the weight of the evidence, or whether confessions obtained by duress and violence or promises of benefit were considered to be not exactly reliable.

This, then, was the background in brief, which led our forefathers to the firm conviction that no man should be compelled to testify against himself.

If one is accused of something, or is asked questions about something, the logical way of looking at his refusal to answer is that he surely must know something about it or else why would he refuse to answer? In other words, it is said that the refusal to answer gives rise to an inference of guilt of something. In California, our law provides that an inference is a deduction which may be drawn from facts proven. Now, looking at this matter as intelligent men and women, has the fact that our hypothetical person has refused to answer questions proven anything? The only thing that is sure is that our witness has refused to answer. So far as I am concerned, there are no less than three inferences which may be drawn from such a refusal to testify: (1) That the witness is guilty; (2) that he knows something, or some fact, which might tend to incriminate him. Note that this second ground is not the same as the first. And/or (3) that he refuses to answer because he feels that the inquisitor has no right, and/or business, to ask him such questions. If we go back to the common law as it finally developed, we find that standing mute, in legal effect, pleads not guilty. How can standing mute carry any danger to the accused when it is the legal equivalent of a plea of not guilty? A canon of our law is that it is to be interpreted reasonably in view of accepted common law procedure. We have the old common law which says, in effect, that standing mute is in legal effect a plea of not guilty. We have the present day common assumption that if the witness doesn't answer, he must have something to hide. And we have the constitutional provisions which say, positively, that no man shall be compelled to be a witness against himself. If he refuses to answer is he, in effect, pleading guilty to an offense of some sort with the consequent stigma attaching? Or is he merely standing on his constitutional right which has been guaranteed to him, and if so, should he not be relieved of any and all blame for having claimed that right? If an inference of guilt arises, might he not as well answer all questions even though his answers thereto might tend to incriminate him?

The privilege against self-incrimination has been held by the courts to apply in all judicial investigations;[1] to proceedings before a grand jury;[2] and to congressional investigations.[3] The privilege has been characterized by Judge Cardoza (*Matter of Doyle* (257 N. Y. 244; 177 N. E. 489)) as "a barrier interposed between the individual and the power of the Government, a barrier interposed by the sovereign people of the State" which "neither legislators nor judges are free to overleap." In the light of this definition, let us consider a congressional investigation. A person called upon to testify there is only meagerly advised of the subject to be pursued; he is not as a rule represented by counsel and even if he is, since it is not an adversary proceeding, his counsel has no right to object to the proceedings; the lights are bright in the legislative committee room; newspapermen are present as are photographers and television cameramen. There are none of the safeguards of the courtroom—there is no right to confront the witnesses accusing our "person"; there is no judicial calm; our witness has only the fifth amendment with which to protect himself.

Suppose our witness is willing to answer all questions concerning himself, but is not willing to answer questions which might tend to incriminate others whom he knows, or has known. May he answer the questions whose answers are personal to himself and refuse to answer the others? No, he may not. This is because of the rule of waiver. The meaning of this rule is that if a person is willing to testify and does not claim the privilege of silence, he may then be questioned concerning any related matter. That which is related and that which is not related is the subject of much controversy which has been resolved in favor of permitting the widest possible inquiry. It is well known that congressional committees use witnesses as a means of getting information about other people. The witness has three choices in such a situation: (1) He may become an informer; (2) he may testify about himself and refuse to name others and go to jail for contempt; (3) he may claim the privilege in regard to himself although he would have preferred to tell all things personal to himself.

Let us carry our suppositious case one step further: Suppose our witness claims the privilege. What then? To the average mind, he has effectively admitted his guilt of the crime under consideration, whatever that may be. As for penalty, this witness does not yet go to jail, but there are other penalties just as severe. He loses his job, or position; he is subjected to severe criticism; he is subjected to adverse newspaper and radio publicity, commensurate in degree with his prominence in the public eye. He also has placed himself on the list of suspected persons and has guaranteed that more minute investigation will be made concerning him in the future. Suppose he has not claimed the privilege and has freely answered questions concerning his past and present life. If some of his answers do not tally exactly with what other witnesses have said, then he runs the risk of a prosecution for perjury. When one remembers something that occurred perhaps 30 years prior to the time he is recalling it, it is very likely that his recollection might differ from that of another person recalling the same transaction. In a court of law, this would merely create a conflict in the evidence, the resolution of that conflict resting with the trier of fact whether judge or jury. In a congressional investigation, such a conflict may expose one or the other of the witnesses to a prosecution for perjury. Again, remember that at the investigation, our witness has no right to confront his accuser and ask him questions or, at that time, to rebut what his accuser has said. That right of confrontation guaranteed by both the Federal and State Constitutions does not apply at such an investigation but only at a judicial proceeding. At a congressional investigation, a witness is accorded none of the safeguards known to the law and which we refer to as "due process of law." Is there not an analogy between such a proceeding and the situation as it existed in England in the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries? A witness compelled to answer and to provide his accusers, by reason of his own silence, or testimony, with the case against himself?

In other words, the result is very likely to be that, whichever choice he makes, he stands convicted. In a judicial system in which the accused must answer all questions, the police might be tempted to get the answers they wanted by any available means. The history of our criminal law reveals that there are no shortcuts to justice; a case must be made out against an accused who is innocent until proven guilty. He does not have to prove his innocence; the prosecution must prove his guilt. As Mr. Justice Holmes said: "We have to choose, and for my part I think it a less evil that some criminals should escape than that the Government should play an ignoble part."[4]

Let us again suppose that our witness claims the privilege conferred by the fifth amendment, and let us assume that he is wholly innocent of any crime. He may do so for several reasons: (1) He may have done something, or said something, or joined some organization which was, at the time it was done, said, or joined, devoid of any criminal aspect and may be so even at the time of the investigation, but his answers might be offered as evidence against him in a criminal case; (2) he might be willing to answer questions about himself, but unwilling to answer them about others, and thus afraid to answer the personal questions because of the doctrine of waiver; (3) he might be afraid that truthful answers might not check with answers given by someone else and thus subject him to a prosecution for perjury; or (4) he might simply and honestly disapprove of the entire investigation and the methods by which such proceedings are conducted, feeling that the questioning is not in accord with the principles of democracy laid down by the framers of our great Constitution for this wonderful country known as America. These reasons show that an inference of guilt is not the only inference to be drawn when the privilege is claimed.

In America, by constitutional provision, we have the rule that the Government of this country shall be divided into three

[1] *Smith* v. *United States* (69 S. Ct. 1000).
[2] *Blau* v. *United States* (340 U. S. 159).
[3] *United States* v. *Yukio Abe* (95 Fed. Supp. 991); *United States* v. *Emspak* (95 Fed. Supp. 1012).
[4] *Olmstead* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 438).

parts: The executive, legislative, and judicial branches and that these three branches shall remain separate and apart one from the other. By its congressional investigations, the legislative branch is, theoretically, questioning to aid in its legislative functions. This is the only purpose for which such investigations are permitted. To permit such investigations for any other purpose would be an invalid encroachment upon the judicial branch of the Government. From what we have read and heard of present day congressional investigations, it is difficult to say that the investigations can serve any useful legislative purpose, but it is not difficult to see that they appear to encroach on the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts without the judicial safeguards which there prevail.

How far does the privilege go? Does it extend to papers, writings, and personal effects? The Supreme Court of the United States has held that it does not protect an individual from producing in response to a subpena (a) a writing which is of a public, or a semipublic character or (b) a writing of which he is not entitled to possession in his capacity as an individual. Does it apply to the individual himself? Does it cover personal features, qualities, or conditions which he cannot control? Does it apply to the objective appearance of the individual's body, his measurements, his fingerprints, his footprints, his saliva, his breath, his blood? The answer is "No," that it does not. It has been held that blood taken from an unconscious person may be used in evidence against him;[1] it has been held that an accused may be forced to exhibit himself in the courtroom; try on hats, coats, shoes, and the like; it has been held that a doctor examining an accused for drunkenness may testify as to his findings made after various tests. In California, it was held proper for the contents of a stomach taken forcibly by means of a stomach pump by officers of the law to be used to convict one accused of narcotic addiction. The Supreme Court of the United States, however, reversed a majority of the Supreme Court of California and held that such conduct on the part of law enforcement officers shocked the conscience of mankind and was a denial of due process of law.

There can be no doubt that we are living in an age which, as a great man once said, "are times that try men's souls." We are constantly warned that we are surrounded with subversion from within and without. There can be no doubt that the entire world is in conflict. There can be no doubt but that the world has been in conflict before. Our forebears and we have weathered a Civil War, a Revolutionary War, and two great World Wars, to say nothing of lesser affrays. We must not forget that our great Constitution was written because the framers were firmly convinced that while individual rights must be circumscribed for the public good, those rights should be preserved as fully as was possible to the end that every individual should be accorded freedom of religion, of speech, of press, of peaceable assembly, that the right of privacy should not be violated, and that no person should be deprived of his life, his liberty, or his property without due process of law.

In times such as these in which we are now living, when suspicion and distrust of one's neighbor is the rule, rather than the exception, we must strive for a calm attitude. We must now allow ourselves to become hysterical and we must remember that our forefathers fought a bitter and terrible fight that we might have our Constitution and its safeguards for the individual. We must not permit legislation to be enacted without considering the balance between the object to be achieved and the liberties of the individual; we must study any such proposals with the greatest of care and caution.

There is now proposed a national law which would grant immunity from criminal prosecution to all who will testify concerning not only themselves but others. This law is proposed, primarily, as a means of overcoming the invocation of the fifth amendment by persons subpenaed by congressional committees. It is extremely dubious if the law would have the desired effect. For one thing, the immunity granted would, and could be, only immunity from Federal prosecution. Another reason is that any determined, unrepentant person engaged in subversive activity would still claim the fifth amendment. In an excellent article, written by Dorothy Thompson (Satan Versus Beelzebub, Ladies Home Journal, February 1954), she comments on the proposed law as follows: "The proposed law will not, I think, result in obtaining more evidence from reliable witnesses. Communists determined to keep the party's records secret will still invoke the fifth amendment; Communists wishing to protect themselves and important members of the party at the cost of lesser fry will exploit the law; ex-Communists who hate tattling obviously will not be moved by promises of immunity for themselves.

"It is a law for the protection of informers who are to be elevated into a position of special grace. And if such a law becomes sweet to the taste of the people, we shall be just a little nearer the point of an informer in every factory, apartment house, office and block, of children informing on their parents and teachers; just a little nearer to the end of all mutual trust, all social happiness, all freedom.

"In short, we shall be nearer to every evil that we hate, loathe, and despite in communism. This is certainly not the vision or desire of Mr. Browneli."

I think there has not been a day in the past, nor is there a day in the present, when all of us do not thank God that we live in America where we have freedom, equality, and justice for all—not just for a few. The practices which prevailed in Nazi Germany, and which we hear prevail in Russia and Communist-dominated countries, are abhorrent to all free Americans. If we are to keep our heritage of freedom, we must remember that the freedoms guaranteed to us by our Constitution are freedoms for all—for every person. Those accused of crime must be accorded every safeguard prescribed in order that those unjustly accused may not suffer the penalties which the law provides shall be inflicted on those found guilty after a fair and impartial trial. If we do not remember the fundamental basis on which our Constitution rests and work to preserve its mandates, then we shall be no better off than the peoples of those countries where freedom, equality, and justice for all is not the rule.

To return now to the discussion of the Un-American Activities Committee, it seems to me that the members of the committee, as a means of preserving its integrity and of assuring that it will be able to continue the essential job for which it was created, should be willing to listen to some of the constructive criticism which has been and is being directed at some of its methods and its courses of action. Rather than adopting an injured air and attempting to justify what they have done by attacking the integrity of their critics and attempting to render them suspect, the committee might well examine its collective conscience and put its house in order where such an examination shows that it is needed.

Toward that end, I offer the suggestion that in order to do a decent and effective job, the operations of the committee should be directed through the collective will of the majority of its members, and that it should not permit itself to be used by one man to promote his own personal objectives nor to provide a publicity sounding board by any individual, no matter who he may be or what the circumstances may be. Above all, the existence of the committee in pursuing a task vital to all Americans should not be threatened by allowing it to be used for political purposes in my own State or in any other State. I say that at this time because there is a widespread report in California that the committee is about to come out to the State again with the underlying motive of smearing the Democratic Party and its candidates in the coming campaign by tacking the label of Communists or Communist sympathizers on them. In all friendliness and sincerity, may I give a friendly warning to the committee that such tactics do not work. Neither will they be tolerated for long.

It was my privilege to serve for 8 years in the California State Senate. During that time I consistently voted for the continuation of the work of the un-American activities committee set up by the State Legislature. I did so, that is, until the committee began to be used for just such political purposes as I have mentioned. When that time came I stated on the floor of the State Senate that I was about to vote against appropriations for the committee and that I would continue to vote against them until the chairman of the committee and the personnel of the committee were changed. At that particular time in California the committee had become the tool of one individual, and there was no question but that it was being used by that gentleman for his own purposes and to expose to question and doubt the patriotism and loyalty of sincere and loyal Americans who had differed with him on political issues. As proof that this was the case, at a subsequent session of the legislature a change in the chairmanship and personnel of the committee was forced and since then it has functioned in an orderly manner. I bring that point up at this time because, notwithstanding the fact that the committee reports that it has adopted rules of procedure designed to correct abuses, there is a strong feeling that either the rules are not adequate or they are not being followed.

In subscribing to one of the points made by our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in his acute remarks, I want to state for myself here and now that the constant press stories about the activities of congressional investigating committees and their treatment of witnesses, including irresponsible and unsubstantiated statements made to the press by chairmen and members of such committees in which the loyalty of witnesses or prospective witnesses is questioned, can be just as un-American as anything the committees are investigating. That is the pity of great power placed in the hands of little men. The continuation of this situation

[1] *State* v. *Cram* (176 Oreg. 577); *People* v. *Haeussler* (41 A. C. 356).

makes it necessary for Congress to consider writing a uniform, strict, and adequate set of rules for the conduct of committees, governing their procedures so as to give full expression to the rights of individuals accorded to each of us by the Constitution of the United States. No committee member or chairman should be allowed to make a mockery of such orderly procedure by trying individual citizens in the public press.

The prime reason why the Kremlin and its gang of Commie stooges in this country seek to break down and overthrow our form of government here in the United States is the fact that our Constitution recognizes and guarantees the dignity of the individual, and the Bill of Rights written into the Constitution grants him inviolate protection in that regard. Because of that fact we are the roadblock to Communist conquest. Because of these things we have been the hope of persecuted peoples since our beginnings as a free Nation. Because of these things we are the hope of free people today and of the peoples who have lost their freedom to the Communist overlords. But we can kill that hope in the hearts and minds of those who cling to it if we ourselves, through a misguided zeal in the fight against communism, tear down those very guaranties which make us strong and force communism to set us up as its number one enemy—and consequently the last hope of those it threatens or controls.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of these grave doubts and these dangers my bitter opposition to communism and totalitarianism in all its forms impels me to vote for this appropriation today. But I sincerely hope that our committee and all committees of Congress will heed the things which have been said here today and will take what action is necessary to remedy the situation before they destroy themselves.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House is opposed to Communist tyranny and wants to do everything possible that will be effective in destroying this evil. No Member can honestly claim that any of his colleagues is less concerned about the Communist menace. How could any reasonable, normal human being hold anything but contempt for Communist agents and their dupes who seek to destroy all the human values which make us a civilized people? The long list of Communist crimes against humanity exposes it as a tryanny as brutal and as ruthless as any terror of all the ages past. Add to that the torture and murder of helpless prisoners of war in Korea and you have another bloody chapter of inhuman crimes which must arouse every normal person against the Communist philosophy. I do not think there is any disagreement in the House on how we feel about this matter.

But we do differ, and differ sharply as to how to fight the Communist menace. It is not enough to expose Communist agents and their deceptive propaganda. It is not enough to investigate, to imprison or to execute those who would betray America and the cause of freedom and democracy.

I am one of those who believe that we must also strike at the breeding places where the Communist seed takes root. I speak of unhappy homes, substandard homes that are dark and dreary. I think of widespread unemployment and the suffering that comes with it. I think of the millions of children denied their rightful opportunity for education and happy childhood. I think of needy old folks who in the twilight of life are without proper medical care and adequate diet despite great food surpluses and scientific progress.

It was when the Nation was in the depth of depression and despair that the seeds of communism took root and rapidly grew. It was in this period during the early 1930's that the Communist strength reached its high peak.

What proved to be the most effective weapon against Communist growth was the enactment of a program of social reform inaugurated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. It lifted the people from shanty towns on the dumps of the big cities to public housing and decent homes. Instead of long lines of jobless men the social reform program made possible full employment and prosperity. From soup kitchens and breadlines we marched forward to social security.

This New Deal program blocked Communist advance. Yet there were those who fought social reform measures as welfare state legislation and as something akin to communism. Powerful and selfish interests in our country have fought social reform ever since Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President. They have not hesitated to resort to tactics and methods which were similar to those practiced by the Communists, Nazis, and Fascists.

Fear of the people, the fear of democracy cause totalitarians of all varieties to make their appeal to emotions, hate, envy, and ignorance. Both seek to create confusion and disunity and to achieve their objectives by creating hysteria and to take the minds of the people off of the important economic issues.

A time like this calls for vigilance against the forces of totalitarianism of both the right and left as the distinguished minority whip has so well pointed out. I hope that the committee will strike at both extremes of the totalitarian evil.

Several years ago on the floor of the House former Congressman Andrew Jacobs made a statement which I believe is a good warning against a very ugly trend today. Andy was a very capable, sincere, and honorable Member. He always spoke truthfully and with much courage and sincerity.

While we were fighting rightwing totalitarianism in World War II, that is, the Nazis and Fascists, Mr. Jacobs pointed out that the leftwing totalitarians, the Communists, came forth singing hosannas and worked themselves into high places. They set up all kinds of deceptive fronts and innocent clubs.

And now when we are fighting leftwing totalitarianism or communism, Jacobs warned, we need to watch out for the rightwing totalitarians who will do the same thing and seek to get into important high places.

Mr. Jacobs' warning is a matter which deserves a lot of attention these days. Many tons of propaganda is pouring out of well financed reactionary front organizations. It should cause us much concern because of the danger to our free way of life.

I would like to see the appropriation for the House Committee on Un-American Activities doubled and the additional funds earmarked for a probe of some of these fronts which are spreading hate and confusion when unity and reason are most essential to our survival as a free nation.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 364, nays 1, answered "present" 4, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—364

Abbitt	Carnahan	Gary
Abernethy	Carrigg	Gathings
Adair	Cederberg	Gavin
Addonizio	Chenoweth	Gentry
Albert	Chiperfield	George
Allen, Calif.	Chudoff	Golden
Allen, Ill.	Church	Goodwin
Andresen, H. Carl	Clevenger	Gordon
	Cole, Mo.	Graham
Andresen, August H.	Colmer	Grant
	Cooley	Gregory
Andrews	Coon	Gross
Angell	Cooper	Gubser
Arends	Corbett	Gwinn
Aspinall	Cretella	Hagen, Calif.
Barden	Crosser	Hagen, Minn.
Bates	Crumpacker	Hale
Beamer	Cunningham	Haley
Becker	Curtis, Mo.	Halleck
Belcher	Curtis, Nebr.	Hand
Bender	Dague	Harden
Bennett, Fla.	Davis, Ga.	Hardy
Bennett, Mich.	Davis, Wis.	Harris
Bentley	Dawson, Utah	Harrison, Nebr.
Bentsen	Deane	Harrison, Va.
Berry	Delaney	Harrison, Wyo.
Betts	Dempsey	Hart
Bishop	Derounian	Harvey
Boggs	Devereux	Hays, Ohio
Boland	D'Ewart	Hébert
Bolling	Dies	Herlong
Bolton, Frances P.	Dodd	Hess
	Dollinger	Hill
Bolton, Oliver P.	Dolliver	Hillelson
	Dondero	Hillings
Bonin	Donohue	Hinshaw
Bonner	Donovan	Hoeven
Bosch	Dorn, N. Y.	Hoffman, Ill.
Bow	Dorn, S. C.	Hoffman, Mich.
Bowler	Dowdy	Holmes
Boykin	Doyle	Holt
Bramblett	Durham	Holtzman
Bray	Eberharter	Horan
Brooks, La.	Edmondson	Howell
Brooks, Tex.	Elliott	Hunter
Brown, Ga.	Ellsworth	Hyde
Brown, Ohio	Engle	Ikard
Brownson	Evins	Jackson
Broyhill	Fallon	Jarman
Buchanan	Feighan	Jenkins
Budge	Fenton	Jensen
Burdick	Fernandez	Johnson, Calif.
Burleson	Fino	Johnson, Wis.
Busbey	Fisher	Jonas, Ill.
Bush	Fogarty	Jonas, N. C.
Byrd	Forand	Jones, Ala.
Byrne, Pa.	Forrester	Jones, Mo.
Byrnes, Wis.	Fountain	Jones, N. C.
Camp	Frazier	Karsten, Mo.
Campbell	Frelinghuysen	Kearns
Cannon	Friedel	Keating
Carlyle	Fulton	Kee

Kelly, N. Y.	Norblad	Shafer
Kersten, Wis.	Norrell	Shelley
Kilburn	Oakman	Sheppard
Kilday	O'Brien, Ill.	Shuford
King, Calif.	O'Brien, Mich.	Sikes
King, Pa.	O'Hara, Minn.	Simpson, Ill.
Kirwan	O'Konski	Simpson, Pa.
Kluczynski	O'Neill	Small
Knox	Osmers	Smith, Kans.
Laird	Ostertag	Smith, Miss.
Lane	Passman	Smith, Va.
Lantaff	Patman	Smith, Wis.
Latham	Patten	Spence
LeCompte	Patterson	Springer
Lesinski	Pelly	Staggers
Lipscomb	Perkins	Stauffer
Long	Pfost	Steed
Lovre	Philbin	Stringfellow
Lucas	Phillips	Sullivan
Lyle	Pilcher	Sutton
McCarthy	Pillion	Taber
McConnell	Poage	Talle
McCormack	Poff	Taylor
McCulloch	Polk	Teague
McDonough	Preston	Thomas
McGregor	Price	Thompson, La.
McIntire	Priest	Thompson, Mich.
McMillan	Rabaut	Thompson, Tex.
McVey	Radwan	Trimble
Mack, Ill.	Rains	Tuck
Mack, Wash.	Ray	Van Pelt
Madden	Rayburn	Van Zandt
Magnuson	Reams	Velde
Mahon	Reece, Tenn.	Vorys
Mailliard	Reed, Ill.	Vursell
Marshall	Reed, N. Y.	Walter
Martin, Iowa	Rees, Kans.	Wampler
Mason	Regan	Warburton
Matthews	Rhodes, Ariz.	Watts
Meader	Rhodes, Pa.	Westland
Merrill	Riley	Wharton
Merrow	Roberts	Wheeler
Metcalf	Robeson, Va.	Whitten
Miller, Calif.	Robsion, Ky.	Wickersham
Miller, Kans.	Rodino	Widnall
Miller, Nebr.	Rogers, Colo.	Wigglesworth
Miller, N. Y.	Rogers, Fla.	Williams, Miss.
Mills	Rogers, Mass.	Williams, N. Y.
Mollohan	Rogers, Tex.	Willis
Morano	Rooney	Wilson, Calif.
Morgan	Roosevelt	Wilson, Ind.
Morrison	Sadlak	Wilson, Tex.
Moss	St. George	Winstead
Moulder	Saylor	Withrow
Multer	Schenck	Wolcott
Mumma	Scherer	Wolverton
Murray	Scrivner	Yates
Natcher	Scudder	Yorty
Neal	Secrest	Young
Nelson	Seely-Brown	Younger
Nicholson	Selden	

NAYS—1

Wier

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Blatnik	O'Hara, Ill.	Powell
Condon		

NOT VOTING—65

Alexander	Ford	Landrum
Ashmore	Gamble	Lanham
Auchincloss	Garmatz	Machrowicz
Ayres	Granahan	Miller, Md.
Bailey	Green	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baker	Hays, Ark.	Prouty
Barrett	Heller	Richards
Battle	Heselton	Riehlman
Buckley	Hiestand	Rivers
Canfield	Holifield	Scott
Celler	Hope	Sheehan
Chatham	Hosmer	Short
Chelf	Hruska	Sieminski
Clardy	James	Thornberry
Cole, N. Y.	Javits	Tollefson
Cotton	Judd	Utt
Coudert	Kean	Vinson
Curtis, Mass.	Kearney	Wainwright
Davis, Tenn.	Kelley, Pa.	Weichel
Dawson, Ill.	Keogh	Williams, N. J.
Dingell	Klein	Zablocki
Fine	Krueger	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Lanham for, with Mr. Celler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Canfield with Mr. Hays of Arkansas.
Mr. Hosmer with Mr. Ashmore.
Mr. Kean with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Auchincloss with Mr. Battle.
Mr. Clardy with Mr. Zablocki.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Thornberry.
Mr. Scott with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Hiestand with Mr. Machrowicz.
Mr. Hope with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Short with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Riehlman with Mr. Sieminski.
Mr. Krueger with Mr. Klein.
Mr. Sheehan with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Judd with Mr. Barrett.
Mr. Ayres with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Baker with Mr. Heller.
Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts with Mr. Bailey.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Garmatz.
Mr. Miller of Maryland with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Heselton with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Cotton with Mr. Chatham.
Mr. Utt with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Prouty with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Gamble with Mr. Fine.
Mr. Wainwright with Mr. Green.
Mr. James with Mr. Granahan.
Mr. Hruska with Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a statement in the RECORD following the rollcall on House Resolution 400 referring to Members of the House who were invited to the White House for luncheon and a conference with the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the reason the following Members were detained from answering the rollcall was because they were invited by the President to a luncheon and conference at the White House: JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS; W. STERLING COLE; NORRIS COTTON; GERALD F. FORD, JR.; JOHN W. HESELTON; JACOB K. JAVITS; WALTER JUDD; ROBERT W. KEAN; WINSTON L. PROUTY; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN; HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.; THOR C. TOLLEFSON.

COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8069) to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think in the confusion very few Members understand what this bill is about, so I wish the gentleman from Indiana would explain it.

Mr. HALLECK. I should be glad to do that. As the gentleman knows I discussed this matter with him before offering it.

This bill simply extends the time for the operation and reporting of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. We enacted the resolution creating the Commission in the first session of this Congress. There have been certain delays that were apparently unavoidable. While the Commission has made very considerable progress it has not been able to complete its work. The expiration date as originally set was March 1, next Monday. It has been deemed desirable, as I understand, by Members on both sides of the aisle, that the time for the work of the Commission be extended, and that is all that is involved here.

Mr. RAYBURN. In order to identify this Commission, it is what was known as the Manion Commission.

Mr. HALLECK. That is correct.

Mr. RAYBURN. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 3 of the act of July 10, 1953, entitled "An act to establish a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(C) The Commission, not later than March 1, 1955, shall submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress its final report, including recommendations for legislative action; and the Commission may also from time to time make to the President such earlier reports as the President may request or as the Commission deems appropriate."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of such act of July 10, 1953, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 6. The Commission shall cease to exist at the close of business on March 1, 1955."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUNDS FOR SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up for consideration at this time House Resolution 419 with a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 150, 83d Congress, as amended by House Resolution 339, 83d Congress, is hereby amended (1) by striking out "$355,050" and inserting in lieu thereof "$455,050," and (2) by striking out "$65,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$165,000."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

"That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause 8 of rule XI of the Rules of the House and House Resolution 150, as amended by House Resolution 339, 83d Congress, incurred by the Public Accounts Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, not to exceed $100,000 additional, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such subcommittee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this is a privileged resolution?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. And the same rules apply in this case as in the case of the resolution just agreed to by the House?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members of the House may I say that by the terms of this resolution the sum of $100,000 is provided for an investigation by one of the subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations, the subcommittee being headed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

It will be recalled that last July by adoption of a resolution by this House certain subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations were empowered to proceed with investigations on their own initiative. The $100,000 provided in this resolution is in addition to $65,000 provided during the 1st session of the 83d Congress, of which there was remaining on February 1, 1954, the sum of $22,619.92.

The chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], will be able to explain the plans for investigation by his committee much better than I can.

However, I understand he contemplates investigation of rackets that exist in three important areas in the United States, in the areas of Cleveland, Ohio, Chicago, Ill., and Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn. I am not advised as to whether he is going to investigate all rackets, but I presume that is a fair assumption. This could include numbers rackets, labor rackets, gambling rackets, or other activities.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to consideration of the resolution at this time unless it appears that a quorum was present when the resolution was authorized by the committee or unless the chairman of the committee will so state that a quorum was present. If he does, that will be satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], makes the point of order that a quorum was not present in the committee reporting this resolution. Unfortunately for the gentleman from Michigan, he makes his point of order too late. That should have been made at the time the resolution was read.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to make one correction. I did not make the point of order that a quorum was not present. The point of order was that consideration of the bill is not in order unless the record showed a quorum was present or unless the gentleman so stated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman should have made that point of order at the time the resolution was read.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provided for funds for the operation of a special function turned over to the Subcommittee on Public Accounts. This is a regular subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. At a meeting of the Committee on Government Operations held on January 20, it was determined by resolution to have this special function handled by the Subcommittee on Public Accounts rather than to create special committees to handle matters under this head. At that meeting there were 20 members of our committee present and they voted 19 to 1—and I think 1 person voted "present"—to have this matter turned over to the Subcommittee on Public Accounts of which I happen to be chairman. On both the majority and the minority sides the action was almost unanimous.

In connection with this work, no particular area has been suggested and no particular part of the country has been indicated as to where this activity will be done. A very capable staff has been engaged for the purpose of taking complaints and pursuing them in an orderly and proper manner. There is no disposition on the part of this committee to do anything that is in violation of the rules of the House or of the committee itself, nor is there any disposition on the part of this committee to expose anything but the facts. This committee is not engaging in pillorying anyone, but we propose to do a thoroughly good job.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I notice the gentleman says this committee has not been assigned to any particular area. In that connection, does "area" refer to jurisdiction, or is it a geographical term?

Mr. BENDER. It refers to geography.

Mr. BARDEN. In the previous statement reference was made to racketeering. I believe your committee is the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. BENDER. That is the full committee; yes.

Mr. BARDEN. Just how broad is this term "racketeering"? In other words, what I am trying to get at is a concise statement of what your committee expects to do.

Mr. BENDER. I regret exceedingly I do not have the resolution before me. I think it very clearly stated what was involved.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will give him a copy of the resolution if he wants it.

Mr. BARDEN. Just a moment. I thought the gentleman was going to explain what he was going to do with the $100,000.

Mr. BENDER. I will be glad to first comply with the request by reading this resolution. The $100,000 will be used for the purpose of engaging a staff to handle the subject. This is the resolution that was passed by an almost unanimous vote:

Whereas matters pertaining to alleged unfair and improper labor practices have been called to the attention of the committee; and

Whereas there is a duly constituted regular subcommittee: to wit, the Public Accounts Subcommittee, which is authorized to study the operations and activities of all Government departments except the State and Defense Departments; and

Whereas the committee is of the opinion that such allegations of unfair and improper labor practices and labor racketeering should be thoroughly and vigorously investigated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Public Accounts Subcommittee is hereby authorized and directed to investigate—

(1) Whether present Federal legislation and Federal agencies, officers, and employees adequately and properly protect individuals and business organizations from extortion;

(2) Whether, if such extortionary payments are made, they arise from ineffectiveness or lack of proper interpretation or enforcement of Federal statutes designed to protect civil rights, the free movement of interstate and foreign commerce, the Anti-racketeering Act of 1934, as amended, Federal legislation relating to the collection and distribution of welfare funds created by contributions from employers, and legislation relating to the levying and collection of Federal taxes, and the sufficiency thereof;

(3) Whether Federal agencies, officers, and employees charged with the duty of interpreting and administering the legislation above mentioned are using Federal funds efficiently and economically;

(4) Whether Government activity at all levels, designed to implement such legislation, is effective and economical; and, whether any amendments to the Federal legislation above referred to, or any other Federal legislation should be proposed to correct the existing situation; be it further

Resolved, That the Public Accounts Subcommittee is further authorized and directed to report to the full committee its recommendations, if any, as to what specific action, if any, should be taken by the full committee and by the Congress.

That is the resolution that was adopted by the full Committee on Government Operations giving this subcommittee this authority.

Mr. BARDEN. This is the committee's action here?

Mr. BENDER. That is right.

Mr. BARDEN. I am not concerned with the Committee on Government Operations investigating the Government agencies or Government activities, whether or not funds are being adequately spent, and so on, but the part I am concerned with is that I noticed in the gentleman's reading that the subcommittee was going to investigate labor practices, racketeering, and welfare funds. Somewhere in this Congress we ought to have a little coordination. Just this last week, I think it was, we set up a special committee and authorized it to investigate welfare funds. Now, you investigating committees are going to cripple each other running across the same path if you do not straighten out and stay within your proper fields.

Mr. BENDER. I called the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], when I heard that your committee had taken some action in connection with welfare funds. I

think after our conversation, he will confirm my disposition and the disposition of our committee not to cross wires in any way. There is so much to be done and so little to do it with in this field that if both committees were engaged in this activity exclusive of all other things there would be plenty to do.

Mr. BARDEN. I am very fond of my chairman and I cannot say too loudly that he is a very fine gentleman, and all that, but I do not see how the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Pennsylvania could agree that there will be no conflict, when I read here in plain English, "to the collection and distribution of welfare funds created by contributions from employees, and legislation relating to the levying and collection of Federal taxes, and the sufficiency thereof."

How can it be possible that there is not a conflict there?

Mr. BENDER. We cannot be sure that there will never be conflict. There will always be conflict as long as the world exists.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. My understanding of our conversation and my understanding of what is planned to be done by the subcommittee under the gentleman's leadership is this, that where there have been derelictions in performance by Government agencies they will be investigated. Where some of those matters enter into such fields as union welfare funds and the way they are administered, it is the gentleman's understanding that the Committee on Education and Labor of the House will have exclusive jurisdiction there. That is our understanding, as I know it from our conversations.

Mr. BENDER. Our disposition is not to conflict at all, in any jurisdiction, and certainly in the field where there is so much area to be covered. There is no disposition on the part of our committee to conflict with the gentleman's committee in any possible way.

Mr. McCONNELL. That is our understanding, and I am glad to hear the gentleman's statement. I can see where the Committee on Government Operations would naturally investigate those types of performances which have not either been efficient or correctly done by various Government bureaus and so on. But, when you come to the actual investigation of labor practices from the outside without the Government Bureaus being involved, that, I feel, should be under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor, and particularly the investigations and studies of the union welfare fund activities—I feel that most definitely belongs to the Committee on Education and Labor. I believe that is the gentleman's understanding, is it not?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. It appears to me there is a practical way of handling this. When you give two committees jurisdiction over the same subject, there is bound to be controversy regardless of who happens to be chairman on each of the committees. It would appear to me from what has gone on here that the jurisdiction of this matter which has been complained of clearly lies in the Committee on Education and Labor. It appears to me that the only way to get out of this situation is to withdraw this resolution and take the resolution back to committee and have it amended so that we will know specifically whose field of jurisdiction we are legislating on and appropriating for.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I thought probably the gentleman from Ohio would want to answer my query.

Mr. BENDER. It is unfortunate that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is not here. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I see that he is on the floor. He might answer the question because he understands the purpose of this.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for me to answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, may I say to the gentleman from Texas, here again is an illustration of the overlapping of jurisdiction which was created by the Reorganization Act passed by the 79th Congress. The plain fact of the matter is that the Committee on Government Operations, formerly called the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department is set up as an overall investigating committee, but its authority to operate is limited by the language of the statute creating the committee, which confines it to the efficiency and economy of the agencies of Government or people in the Government. Of course, under that same Reorganization Act each legislative committee, such as the Committee on Education and Labor is charged itself with determining as we go along how the agency over which it has jurisdiction is operating and how the law under its jurisdiction is operating. Now, then, to get to the specific question, and I am sure this would be agreed to, if in the resolution undertaking to create this subcommittee or to outline its jurisdiction language has been used that goes beyond the underlying language of the statute itself then whatever is included in the resolution would be of no force or effect, and could in no way give this subcommittee authority. Now before the gentleman shakes his head, I would like to complete my statement. As I was saying, then whatever is included in the resolution would be of no force or effect and could in no way give this subcommittee authority to operate outside the authority granted under the statute to the Committee on Government Operations. In other words, the resolution which is here before us and on which we are to vote is simply voting this subcommittee money to be used by it. It does not involve the reaffirmation or affirmation in any way of the resolution which was adopted in the Committee on Government Operations.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has called attention to a certain matter; that is, the Reorganization Act that we passed a few years ago. There was a great deal in that that I do not like and that I thought was superfluous.

Mr. HALLECK. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RAYBURN. There were two matters in it that I tried to look after. One was the matter of the increase in salary. I was for that. Then I followed the committee as far as I could to prevent the taking away from the speakership any more powers. I think those two purposes were accomplished, but, to be frank, they were the only provisions in the reorganization bill about which I was very enthusiastic.

But we get back to the proposition that there is a clear conflict of jurisdiction here brought about by the resolution passed by the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman not agree with me that by resolution within the committee no jurisdiction can be created that is broader than the jurisdiction invested in the Committee on Government Operations in the statute that created that committee?

Mr. RAYBURN. What is to prevent their doing it? You cannot put anybody in jail for it.

Mr. HALLECK. That is a practical question, to which I shall be glad to respond. What will prevent them from asserting jurisdiction beyond that conferred in the statute creating the committee is that, as Members of integrity of this branch of the Congress, they recognize the limitations of authority and jurisdiction; and I am quite certain that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] would say to us here and now, as chairman of the subcommittee, that he would not undertake to assert jurisdiction or authority that went beyond the language of the statute under which the committee was created.

Mr. RAYBURN. Why not take the resolution back to the committee and have it amended, and then come in with a resolution authorizing an appropriation of money?

I should like to call the attention of the gentleman to one more thing. In my legislative experience I think this is only the second time I have ever known of the House of Representatives voting money to a subcommittee of a regular committee. I think it is very bad practice.

Mr. HALLECK. That may very well be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the ranking member of the Committee on House Administra-

tion, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished minority leader has just mentioned the point which I wished to raise and which the membership of this House should clearly understand. Reference has been made to the Reorganization Act. This is the only committee to which funds are appropriated to its subcommittees. This was done last year at the beginning of the 83d Congress and the action at that time was called to the attention of the House.

I am not arguing against this bill. I supported it in the committee. But I think I am entitled to say that I raised the point in committee. I am not talking about the merits of the proposed investigation for which these funds are to be used, but about the method of appropriating funds directly to a subcommittee instead of the parent committee as is the case of all other committees.

Some time ago the Committee on Government Operations passed a resolution in committee, which came to the Committee on House Administration, which resolution made each of their subcommittees more or less autonomous insofar as the expenditure of funds is concerned. I understand there are practical reasons for that.

But I should like it to be made clear that this does not come through the initiative of the Committee on House Administration, but represents the request of the Committee on Government Operations.

I do not question the legality of it. I do question adherence to the spirit of what we intended in the Reorganization Act. It should be made perfectly clear that the responsibility for so doing is not on the Committee on House Administration.

I think the chairman of the Committee on House Administration made that point at the beginning of the 83d Congress, and reasons for so doing were given. But I think it is appropriate it should be brought to the attention of the membership at this time and that the membership take notice of the modus operandi of this resolution.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I want to make this statement in connection with this resolution: The gentleman asked who would determine the scope of this committee. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio. And he very promptly told me what his scope was going to be. Now, we start here with the whereas clause:

> Whereas the committee is of the opinion that such allegations of unfair and improper labor practices and labor racketeering should be fully and vigorously investigated—

Now, upon this resolution by the committee rests the $100,000 that we are appropriating.

I do not object to the gentleman from Ohio investigating anything in the world he wants to investigate if it is proper and if it goes through this House properly and the money is properly authorized and appropriated.

But it goes on down here and speaks of "prcperly protect individuals and business organizations against extortion." Then you go on a little further and you get to the Antiracketeering Act of 1934. I think that was about truck transportation or something.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It was the Hobbs amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. Yes. It was the Hobbs amendment.

Then the resolution wants to investigate the activities of the collection and disbursement of welfare funds and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, we just simply must have some orderly chart to go by. The gentleman from Pennsylvania who is chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and a very excellent chairman, has set up these subcommittees. He is proceeding cautiously. When we use this as the basis to appropriate $100,000—now the gentleman from Indiana made the most plausible, delightful explanation I have heard; and if ever I miscue and need somebody to explain some of my acts I really want to retain the gentleman. Now, do you not think this resolution lays the basis for the conduct of the committee by the chairman of the committee who will spend the $100,000?

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman is asking me——

Mr. BURLESON. I think I have the floor. If I have any time remaining I wish to yield to my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. BARDEN. Please, let the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] answer.

Mr. BURLESON. I will yield further as soon as I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Let him have the time.

Mr. BURLESON. Then I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana for an answer.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from North Carolina may I say that in the matter of jurisdiction, anything this subcommittee or the Committee on Government Operations undertook to do would have to be limited to the jurisdiction granted in the resolution that created the committee; and I would therefore insist that the areas or limits of operations conferred upon the Committee on Education and Labor should be reserved to them.

Mr. BARDEN. Does the gentleman agree that it should be stricken out?

Mr. HALLECK. No. Let me say to the gentleman that I do not believe here on the floor of the House we can undertake to control the actions of the committee. If the gentleman means to say that the $100,000 figure which has been determined on the basis of jurisdiction that could not be created and hints that the amount is too big then I might say that if that were true that might be a plausible argument; but again I go back to my original contention which is that no committee of the House of Representatives can enlarge its authority by any simple resolution creating any subcommittee within the committee or undertaking to assert an authority that it does not have.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUCAS. At no time did I hear the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], say he would not exercise this authority. Do you remember that he did not answer the question when it was before him? The gentleman now says, too, that it should not be stricken from the resolution. Therefore, when the House acts upon it, the House is giving that authority to the committee by voting these funds. No one can deny that.

Mr. HALLECK. I can deny it because I insist again that this is just simply a matter of supplying money to a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. In order that my position may be clear for whatever future effect it might have in the operations of this committee, if the money is given them to go ahead and operate, may I say that, in my opinion, the language of the resolution is too broad, having regard to the authority vested in the Committee on Government Operations. But I do not believe this is the way or the time to say to that committee: You have to take this resolution back creating that subcommittee and revise it.

Mr. LUCAS. What better way can we help? What attitude will the leadership take when the House Committee on Education and Labor asks for money to investigate welfare funds? There will be those among us who will say that we have already given $100,000 to Mr. BENDER's committee.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman that I have sought creation of a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor to study welfare funds and I have made it abundantly clear, as far as I am concerned, to everybody with whom I have spoken that that is a field in which your committee ought to operate except as the Committee on Government Operations might, if there was a governmental responsibility that involved economy or efficiency or a governmental agency or employee, might check that end of it, but not generally to investigate the large area of welfare funds. If I can make it any plainer than that, I do not know how I could do it.

Mr. LUCAS. The gentleman says they might investigate welfare funds because some Government official might be somewhere related to welfare some place, or the Government should have taken some action, therefore they find reason to go into that field; but the gentleman has not said anything about investigating racketeering. That is also in the resolution.

Mr. HALLECK. The investigation of racketeering is in exactly the same category. If, for instance, Federal statutes are being violated and it could be established that the Justice Department was not diligent in the prosecution of those violations, that would be a matter for investigation by the Committee on Government Operations; but the mere operation of so-called racketeering, except as it would directly affect the operations of the Government or employees of the

Government as it might refer to economy or efficiency, would be in the province of the Committee on Education and Labor and not in the province of the Committee on Government Operations.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a minute about the orderly way to do things. I think the explanation of my very beloved friend from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], instead of clearing the atmosphere has befogged it more and more and has shown definitely that this committee, speaking about the Reorganization Act now, is trying to violate—not trying to but is violating—the very provisions of that Reorganization Act when it went out and took jurisdiction of various committees. Everyone says this committee should not have the authority to go into and deal with subjects over which the Committee on Education and Labor has jurisdiction. Yet that is what you are doing when you appropriate this money under the present resolution. This is the second time that I have ever known of money being appropriated for a subcommittee in this House of Representatives in all the years I have been here. It is definite now, in my opinion, that this committee has transgressed the rules of the House of Representatives and that vital part of the rules that goes to jurisdiction of committees.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, loving this House and its rules and its precedents as I do, this resolution, in my opinion, should be withdrawn and the original resolution reconsidered by the Committee on Government Operations and bring it back here so that it will be in accordance with the rules of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I might add further in connection with the matter of appropriating money to subcommittees, that this is more or less, as I understand, an ad hoc committee; there is no reason to believe that there may not be many other subcommittees created under similar conditions. In other words, becoming subcommittees of subcommittees. Again, I am addressing myself to the principle involved and not to the substance or merit of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. I would like to ask the chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], how much did the Committee on Education and Labor spend for operations in 1953, last year.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I can answer that question.

Mr. MCCONNELL. A very small amount.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The Committee on Education and Labor had, last year, $50,000, of which $15,854.75 was expended; $34,145 remains.

Mr. POWELL. So, last year the committee, covering the field of education and the field of labor for our entire Government, which included labor rackets, Taft-Hartley, and other legislation in the field of education, spent $35,000.

Mr. LECOMPTE. No; spent $15,000.

Mr. POWELL. Fifteen thousand dollars.

Mr. LECOMPTE. You have $34,000 remaining.

Mr. POWELL. They spent $15,000. Now you set up a subcommittee to cover just one little tiny area that our entire committee covered, and you are giving that subcommittee almost seven times what the Committee on Education and Labor spent. I wonder where the economy of the Republican Party begins and ends, that is all.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The facts are that the House of Representatives, by resolution, last July separated the functions of the Committee on Government Operations and set up permanent subcommittees and vested them with authority. That was done last July.

Mr. POWELL. But still I cannot understand.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Well, the gentleman was a Member of the House at that time.

Mr. POWELL. I understand that. What I am trying to get at is this: How can you set up $100,000 for one subcommittee, which is six times the total amount spent by the full Committee on Education and Labor for the entire United States of America?

Mr. LECOMPTE. The Labor Committee got all of the money it asked for for its investigations.

Mr. POWELL. Then I think we should deal the same way with this subcommittee. I do not think a penny over $10,000 is necessary for this unless there is some other purpose behind this committee that is not presented to the House.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I think this ought to be said in fairness to the leadership on this side and also in connection with this appropriation and what was spent in the Committee on Education and Labor. When you investigate the various activities, particularly in the labor field and various types of racketeering, you are going to run into considerable money for a proper staff, and so on. Now, we held no investigations this last year. We held hearings on Taft-Hartley, but no investigation. When we get into the study and investigation of the handling of the union welfare funds, we will spend quite a bit of money compared to what we receive.

I want to say this: The feeling I have on the subject matter we are discussing is this: I can see where the Committee on Government Operations would investigate various activities of the agencies of the Government and where in spots they might be connected with labor activities, but I see no reason why in the resolution which set up this particular subcommittee a mention was made of the union welfare funds and their activities and the handling of them, because I can see no way where the Government agencies are involved with such a subject.

Mr. BURLESON. May I say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that I would not want to leave any impression of disparagement toward the work of the subcommittees on Government Operations or the chairmen of those committees. My observation has been that they have done some excellent work and have saved considerable sums of money, which I compliment very highly. Certainly I would want to make that very, very plain. I repeat that with me it is a matter following the proper method of appropriating money, and nothing more.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the discussion about the jurisdiction of committees, may I say that the Committee on House Administration does not institute or inaugurate investigations. It is the function of the Committee on House Administration to furnish the money when an investigation has been ordered. While an unfortunate controversy developed in the Committee on Government Operations a year ago, with the result that an unusual resolution was adopted, it is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration to pass on that controversy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to my friend from Michigan, the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, perhaps, as usual, someone will blame me for this little argument. Take note of what has happened there.

I have known about this racketeering and the misuse and misappropriation of health and welfare funds for a long, long time. Finally the administration came along and caught onto the popularity of the effort to expose it, and in the message on labor-management relations recommended that something be done about it. We had held some hearings. We got what you might call a bandwagon going, and the music sounded good, and some of my fellow colleagues on the committee decided they wanted to get on and ride. That was all right with me, because I had no monopoly of the opposition to the wrongdoing. But some committee members wanted to kick me around and were neither consistent nor careful in doing that job. So here we are in this little family quarrel.

On the question of jurisdiction I solved that problem as chairman of the committee by appointing a special subcommittee of three from the Committee on Government Operations, as had been done in the 80th Congress, and also by requesting the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor to appoint a similar committee, and then the two special subcommittees acted together. I happen to be on both committees. I was on the two special subcommittees. I am also on the Bender subcommittee. So I am not concerned here personally. I am sitting pretty whichever way it goes here today, because I am on both committees. I just cannot be lost. I will get my share in that pub-

licity so many Congressmen seem to want. I will get my share of that. I hope to do a good job, so do not think I am worried about that end of it nor about what happens to me.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] said, this is the second time the House has been asked to vote funds for regular subcommittees independently of the parent committee.

The Reorganization Act was an attempt to hold down the number of regular House committees to 19, and it did. Then in the 80th Congress I became disturbed because of some of the expense bills that some of the subcommittee chairmen were running up—and I will give you some illustrations of that—and of some of the employees the subcommittees kept on the payrolls. I did not want to sign vouchers for them, not me, not when one is called before a committee of the other body and there takes refuge behind the fifth amendment. I do not want to sign vouchers for a man like that or for a fellow on 2 payrolls, as 1 of the employees with the Bender subcommittee was. He was on the payroll of a private corporation and a committee payroll. He was paid twice for the month of March 1953—once by the private corporation, once by Uncle Sam. When I found it out, he had kicked back the two checks he had received from the private corporation, because he was then serving as a public official and that paycheck was much larger. That is why I did not want to go along with that procedure under which I, as chairman, was signing vouchers for subcommittee employees, relying on the certificate of the subcommittee chairman. I learned from experience that some of the expense accounts were not just what they should be. Then, too, I did not believe subcommittees, while Congress was in adjournment, should travel all around the country holding hearings, when no worthwhile results could be accomplished. I suggested to the subcommittee chairman that they economize a little. That was not—to put it mildly—a popular suggestion.

So what did my committee do? They refer to me as "chairman." I am chairman without any authority—in name only. You have all heard that old one about "a wife in name only." Here it is. That describes my chairmanship—at least so they seem to think.

So what did they do? They went along and voted out their own authority to travel hither and yon. I objected because we were elected on an economy program, elected as well to make at least a pretense of going along with an economy program. So I suggested the committee curtail some of their activities.

The members of the committee not only rejected my economy suggestion, but they went further and they said that the 5 subcommittees—and I have 1 which does not function—should be little independent empires with appropriations of their own to use as the subcommittee chairman saw fit—in not only going when and where he desired, to investigate whatever might occur to him, but to select his own employees and to fix their compensation—a provision contrary to the express terms of the Reorganization Act, which provides that the chairmen of the regular standing committees of the House shall be responsible for the expenditures of the committees.

Of course, it was natural for these gentlemen, even though their service here had not entitled them to it, to want to be chairman of what, in effect, was a regular standing committee of the House. Well, they grabbed that authority, and the House—in my judgment not knowing what it was doing—went along with them. So, with the aid of the House, acting, I am sure, without realizing the import of its action, they grabbed authority equal to that of a regular standing committee of the House. They brought about the situation to which the gentleman from Texas then, I understand, objected—a situation to which he now objects, for whatever may be his reason. Actually that procedure destroys party leadership, destroys House control over the expenditure of funds appropriated for a special purpose, and inevitably will involve the House in hearings which may bring discredit to the House as a whole. That is the situation which we will have if we do not nip that trend. You were warned about it.

Now where are we at today? The House apparently is now aware of the situation. That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to remedy the mistake. Let me give you an illustration of the way the Bender subcommittee, which asks for this $100,000, spends its money. I do not like the way some subcommittees spend their money just as they do not like what I do. In fact, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] the distinguished statesman who sits over here on my left made the observation from the floor that I was getting old and testy. I was—I am. But did he ever compare his actions with mine? You do not doubt it, do you? That, at least you will acknowledge.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] said—and whatever this may mean—I do not know—he said that I was constitutionally unconstitutional. Now whatever he meant by that, I do not know, care less. But I will tell you what the committee did. You talk about jurisdiction, now. I cannot talk to them over there on my left because the leadership over there once said it would "cut me down to size." They are welcome to try. They are welcome to try.

But, I will tell you what they did on this question of jurisdiction.

By a resolution offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS], who comes from a State where, I understand, the reason for the loss of the Republican governorship in the last election was due, in part at least, to the failure to watch the extortionists and racketeers in the State administration, the committee, by an overwhelming vote of those present—a few were absent—set up these five regular subcommittes, each with its own fund, its own staff, as little independent kingdoms, free of any control by the regular standing committee of the House. Each received its own allotment of the $355,000 which was given to the committee to carry on its investigations and to hold hearings during 1953—and, by the way, the preceding Democratic Congress had received $350,000 to cover similar expenses during 2 years and had turned back some $76,000 or $86,000 of that sum—and then away, under the new power, these regular subcommittees teed off.

But they were not content with grabbing that power for themselves. Under an express grant of authority by the full committee, I had appointed a special subcommittee of three to look into the manner in which Federal agencies were using public funds, interpreting Federal legislation—subjects clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations. The other members of the committee, so far as I know, never complained about the manner in which I had been doing the job or about the results achieved. Apparently, and with proper humiliation I say this, they were a little envious of the enviable publicity which had been given that special subcommittee because of the worthwhile job it had done. So, enthusiastically, they stripped me of my authority, liquidated the special subcommittee—though, generously, they did later grant it a 60-day reprieve, provided it acted only in Detroit and Kansas City.

However, being the member of a special subcommittee of three which had been appointed by the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I was privileged to participate in subsequent hearings, beginning on the 23d of November, 1953, in the city of Detroit, under the leadership of the gentleman from Kansas, the Hon. WINT SMITH, General SMITH, who, while he served courteously, acted judiciously, nevertheless, being a real general, permitted little foolishness on the part of individuals who would have sabotaged the hearings.

Now, the question as to how far a subcommittee such as the one which is now requesting this $100,000 will go. It is all very well to say that the jurisdiction of that subcommittee is limited by the Reorganization Act, by the Rules of the House. Unfortunately, experience has shown that when a chairman of a subcommittee, or, sometimes, of a full committee, gets out into the field it is extremely difficult to limit his acts. Permit me to call attention to the limitation on the jurisdiction of the regular Subcommittee on Public Accounts of the Committee on Government Operations. Mr. BENDER is chairman of the Subcommitttee on Public Accounts, and under the rules of the committee, the departments which fall under his jurisdiction are expressly named. The Department of Labor is not one of those executive departments named in the rules of the committee. Note the following:

A resolution adopted by the Committee on Government Operations in executive session on January 20, 1954, recited that—

Whereas there is a duly constituted regular subcommittee; to wit; the Public Accounts Subcommittee, which is authorized to study the operations and activities of all Government departments except the State and Defense Departments; and

The Committee on Government Operations had no authority to adopt that paragraph of said resolution for the reason that the jurisdiction of the Public Accounts Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations is limited by House rule XI, section 8 (a) (c) (2).

The rules of the committee defining the jurisdiction of the Public Accounts Subcommittee provide:

> This subcommittee is charged with the duty of examining budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations, as well as studying the operations and activities of the Government departments and agencies, including General Services Administration, at all levels.
>
> The area covered by this subcommittee will be the activities of the regular departments in the executive branch, except the State Department. These are: Agriculture, Commerce, Justice, Interior, Post Office, and Treasury.

It will be noted that the jurisdiction of this subcommittee is expressly limited by the rules of the committee itself to certain regular departments in the executive branch, and that excluded from that list is the Department of Labor, the Conciliation Service, and the National Labor Relations Board.

Under the statement that he was going to the Virgin Islands, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Accounts—except the accounts of the Labor Department and its agencies—the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] around November 15, 1953, took 5 members of his subcommittee and 4 members of his staff on a 5- to 12-day trip to the Virgin Islands.

The Interior Department proposed to sell Bluebeards' Castle Hotel, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, under section 484 (a) of title 40, United States Code, as amended in 1952 and 1953, and which now reads:

> Unless the Administrator shall determine that disposal by advertising will in a given case better protect the public interest, surplus property disposals may be made without regard to any provision of existing law for advertising until 12 o'clock noon, eastern standard time, June 30, 1954: *Provided*, That an explanatory statement shall be prepared and submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress and a copy preserved in the file of all cases where negotiated disposal occurs.

Under that statute the Department is required to notify congressional committees, among them the House Committee on Government Operations, of the intention to sell and the terms on which the property is to be sold. But the statute does not contain any provision which authorizes any committee of Congress to either approve or disapprove of the proposed sale.

Apparently the purpose of Congress was to see to it that Congress would be advised of proposed sales so that if it desired it could, by specific legislation, disapprove of a sale.

On the pretext that it was studying financial conditions in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands as they affect the budget and operations of the Department of the Interior, and an interest, "in the situation regarding the Bluebeard's Castle Hotel," the Bender subcommittee, during the period November 14–27, 1953, went to the Virgin Islands, but as of today has made no report to the full committee on either topic.

The expense bill shows items totaling $1,739.10. To this must be added, not yet shown by the vouchers, commercial airline transportation on credit cards, the best estimate of which is something over $1,100; a total of $2,839.10.

To this should also be added the cost of transportation by MATS, which is not required to be given on the expense vouchers. A fair estimated cost to the Government would be around $3,000.

Apparently this trip to the Virgin Islands is illustrative of subcommittee activities which I, as chairman of the full committee, suggested, in my letter of June 29, 1953, be curtailed. That economy suggestion seems to have been one of the reasons for denying HOFFMAN authority to appoint subcommittees to investigate the misuse of union health and welfare funds, racketeering, and extortion generally.

The chairman of the Public Accounts Subcommittee, who took four members of his staff on a job which, apparently, does not merit a report, is now asking the committee for $100,000 to investigate activities which may be punishable under a statute, the Hobbs amendment to the Antiracketeering Act of 1934, which he voted against.

And do not for one moment think that this request for $100,000 is all you will get. Already the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON], chairman of another subcommittee, who was given $66,000 for 1953 and expended $25,237.80 from August 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, and who had on hand January 1, 1954, $19,776.78, has prepared a request for some $52,000 for his subcommittee. Other subcommittee chairmen will be coming along with similar requests.

Now the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], who was making this request for $100,000, and, from his statement on the floor today in answer to the questions of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], apparently was not quite sure of what he did intend to do, has made several investigations, held several hearings, but to date he has not, so far as I know, filed a single written report of what he has accomplished.

Apparently he thinks his jurisdiction extends to the accounts of every executive department and agency, even though there is nothing allegedly wrong with those accounts. Note this: The Reorganization Plan sent up by the President relating to the Department of Agriculture was put into effect by Secretary Benson the latter part of November 1953, but less than 10 days later the gentleman from Ohio was holding a hearing, presumably to learn whether the accounts under the Reorganization Plan—which had been in effect but 8 days—were correct, covered everything they should. The jurisdiction to determine whether the reorganization plan was functioning economically and efficiently is vested in the subcommittee created for that purpose, not in the Subcommittee on Public Accounts.

Now, if you want to go ahead and give the gentleman $100,000 on this one, and limit the expenditure of that money to activities which the resolution of January 20 authorized that is all right with me and I will vote for it. I will not vote to give the Subcommittee on Public Accounts $100,000 until I know what it proposed to do with it. Just remember that I was doing the same job which he proposes to do with the assistance of the special subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. We were doing the same job for about $30,000 and some 22 individuals were indicted, as a result of our hearings and we would have gone ahead, we have some more information, which I offered, we have some skilled employees, and I offered the services of one of them, but the gentleman did not take them. He has his own.

I know this committee assignment will help him in his campaign for the nomination for Republican candidate for Senator from Ohio. That is all right too, because I wish him luck, but I do not want you to go ahead under any false impression that the expenditure of this $100,000 is solely to expose the abuses mentioned in the resolution of January 20, 1953.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will yield to the gentleman for a question if he has a question, but not for any attack on me.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is they tried to cut my throat. They tried to cut my throat over there and they spilled my blood all over the premises. They got themselves in a false position. That is what is the matter with them, and they do not know what to do next. They got themselves into the position where, when we were getting along all right and [we were] exposing the racketeers and extortionists, but we got too close to some politically high influential gentlemen and we were stepping on their toes, they said, "Call that old man, HOFFMAN, off." The committee did just that. Some one apparently said, "The first thing you know we are going to get into this mess ourselves." And they did. They did. And bless their dear hearts, after cutting me off from continuing the special subcommittee's activities, they will hear from me on the floor—occasionally—for I now have plenty of time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALLECK. The issue here seems to be one of jurisdiction. Does the gentleman contend that the resolution that was adopted in his committee, of which he is the chairman, undertaking to create this subcommittee is within the limits of the jurisdiction of his committee?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, sir, if you know how to operate it, but the committee members who kicked me around apparently do not. You opposed it all the time. You said we never—pardon me, pardon me—for the "you" business—the Republican leadership and the Republican members of my committee for 8 months said that the committee had no jurisdiction and then

when they learned, because of the investigations we had made and the hearings that we held and the newspaper comments, that it was a wonderfully fine thing to do, the committee crawled on the bandwagon and put George in the driver's seat—let George drive it, furnish the music and go down the road singing "Four Leaf Clover—Four Leaf Clover," on his way to the Republican nomination for Senator from Ohio. I wish George success but from what he failed to say here today, when queried by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], I fear he may miss the road.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. At the time this controversy was on in your committee—and may I say to the gentleman that his troubles are with his own committee and not with the leadership.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, I am the wrong guy.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman recalls I discussed with him the matter of jurisdiction which might be within the province of the Committee on Government Operations or a subcommittee, and that he and I talked about it and together we drafted certain language which was much more restrictive than this resolution, and at one time I thought would be adopted in his committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, you furnished the language and you told me committee members would not take it though it was acceptable to me. That was after the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] who had his little trip of 42 days around the world had gone running to you for help to cut me down to size. He made the statement, if I may be permitted a personal reference, that they were going to get me before they got through. And that they would go to the top to do it. And they did. But they cannot gag me—not as long as we have free speech from the well of the House.

The members of the committee, as well as the leadership of the House—and I am not referring now to the Speaker of the House, for he has been most kind and helpful—might be well advised if they would consider the question of permitting me to serve as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, with the same authority and in the same way as the chairmen of other regular standing committees are permitted to serve, rather than to deprive me, insofar as they can, of all authority of a chairman—a position which, through long service, I have earned, and to which I am entitled under the rules of the House.

If I am not to be permitted to serve as other chairmen serve—and truthfully they cannot charge me with being arbitrary, or unreasonable, or dictatorial, or discourteous, in committee proceedings—then I must find something to do, for, even though I am old and testy, even though I am constitutionally unconstitutional, even though the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] thinks I am in ill health, trembling on the edge of the grave, and I am sure he would not push me in—I must and I will find something to do.

Would it not be more conducive to harmony—is it not possible that I might accomplish some good work, operating strictly within the jurisdiction of the committee and in the regular way? Or, even though committee members to whom I may be personally objectionable might prefer that I be excluded from all committee activities, would it not be more conducive to an early adjournment after the enactment of a helpful legislative program, to permit me to serve as do other committee chairmen, rather than to have me on the floor day after day, unable to restrain myself from criticism of unsound policies or practices advocated by the present minority, which is a minority only because it lacks 2 or 3 votes? I ask that question in good faith. I hope the leadership of the Republican Party and its Policy Committee will give it a little consideration, remembering that I am but one of the 19 chairmen of the regular standing committees of the House. Remember that the House leadership on both sides of the aisle is watching with a little apprehension, and with the fear that the membership of other regular standing subcommittees may attempt to follow the disruptive practice put over by the members of the Committee on Government Operations.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], through the committee action on the 20th of January last was in executive session, referred to the vote by which my request for authority to appoint a special subcommittee was denied. Inasmuch as he made that reference, permit me to add that there were but eight Republicans present. I was one. You can guess as to how I voted. You can draw your own conclusions as to how the other 7 Republicans voted, and as to how 1 of the 7 cast 2 proxy votes.

In our committee it takes 16 to make a quorum, so you need no higher mathematics to know who furnished the votes to deny my authority to put a crimp in the doings of the racketeers and extortionists.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield for one further observation?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will yield for a question; not for an observation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, a great many of these things the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has talked about occurred only in the 80th Congress and the 83d Congress. I might say that in order to keep the record straight.

I do not think, since I have been a Member of this House, after a committee, after due consideration, had asked the Committee on House Administration or the old Committee on Accounts for a sum of money to make investigation, that I have ever voted against one of those appropriations in all of the years I have been a Member of this House. But I feel so deeply about this question of jurisdiction that I think my original suggestion should be followed, if we want to preserve the rules and precedents of this House. The present occupant of the Chair and I have, for years, been trying to see that that very thing is done. I am going to vote against this appropriation, because in the years to come I am not going to have somebody accuse me of even inferentially being a disciple of the doctrine that each committee has a right to fix its own jurisdiction. When you have that, you have no rules whatever in the committees of this House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has correctly said that these same controversies involving the Committee on Government Operations have prevailed only in the 80th and the 83d Congresses. I trust that he and the membership will bear with me, that this certainly has not been my fault.

May I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that I never said anything about cutting anybody down. I do not engage in operations of cutting people down. I have too many other things to do. I have tried as best I could to bring about the efficient functioning of the committees of the House of Representatives in order that our work might be done and done properly, within the limits of the jurisdiction.

The gentleman from Michigan and his difficulties in his own committee, where reference is made to leadership, was no operation of mine. The only participation I ever had in it was to try to work out something when I was called upon that would be generally satisfactory. That such has not been accomplished is evidenced by the situation here today. As I said before, the matter of jurisdiction, created by the Reorganization Act, as between the Committee on Government Operations and legislative committees, has been with us. With respect to many operations it will continue to be with us.

When the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] with his subcommittee was engaged in certain hearings and investigations, complaints were made to me about whether proper jurisdiction was involved. And there again, may I say he tried to suggest that I had called somebody off; neither he nor his committee nor anybody else. I deny it, because it is not true. This is a matter of getting along, as to the controversy, within the Committee on Government Operations.

The resolution that has here been adopted was a resolution adopted without any knowledge on my part. So far as I know it was supported by the overwhelming majority of the members of the Committee on Government Operations on both the Democratic and Republican sides.

The question here is this proposition before us of a subcommitee of a regularly created committee asking for money to carry on an investigation. Criticism is made of the resolution

adopted in the committee. The gentleman from Texas asserts that the vote on this matter here is an affirmation of the jurisdiction sought to be created within the committee outside of what I say now without any equivocation goes beyond the jurisdiction of the committee.

For myself I say that the basic law creating the Committee on Government Operations will govern and that the committee itself can create no jurisdiction broader than than conferred upon the committee by this underlying statute. So the vote here today is not to authorize this subcommittee to go outside of the jurisdiction of the committee, because it is a vote only for the money to that subcommittee.

I am going to vote for it. I know if they do not need that much money they will not spend it.

I shall also insist that the matter of jurisdiction be limited to that contained in the statute. When I sought to interrogate the gentleman from Michigan as to what I had undertaken to do with respect to the jurisdiction of the subcommittee he handed to me certain language that he proposed to offer. At that time I said to him very plainly and as fairly as I could that the jurisdiction sought to be there created went beyond what I thought was the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations, and I submitted to him language that was taken from the statutes; and I submitted it after consultation with the proper authorities here in the House.

The committee did not see fit to go that way, but rather to go the way that is here now before us. There again, that was not my determination; I had nothing to do with it. But it simply bears out my good faith, my constant position with respect to the jurisdictional problems here involved. I do not want any more overlapping than is necessary. I have for myself assurances that when this subcommittee is implemented with the money necessary to carry on its work there will be no desire on the subcommittee's part and no occasion to get into the fields that are outside the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations. On that basis, as I say, I am going to support the resolution.

Before I sit down let me add that I have read in the press statements attributed sometimes directly to certain people and then to other people quoting certain unnamed authorities that the Republican leadership or that Members of Congress here generally, or Members of the Committee on Government Operations on both sides of the aisle were seeking to protect labor racketeers. So far as I know, I have never engaged in any such operation as that; and, very frankly, I have resented the implication and some of the direct charges that have been made in that direction. I think this is a field that ought to be gone into; it ought to be done by the proper committees and within the jurisdiction of the underlying statutes creating those committees.

If I voted "no" here I suppose somebody again would accuse me of trying to stop this subcommittee from looking into labor racketeering. I am certainly not going to get myself in that position, for I am going to support this resolution.

I am sorry that the resolution adopted in the committee undertook to create a wider jurisdiction than I think the committee is entitled to. But I did not do that. All I can say is that the underlying law will prevail and that will be the limit of the jurisdiction of the subcommittee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, how does the time stand now?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to oppose anything that my congenial friend and fellow statesman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] wants. I am not trying to protect anybody here but myself and I am wondering since I read in the paper that he plans to hold hearings in Cleveland, if that is true. Could he answer that quickly "Yes" or "No"? Does he plan to go on television?

Mr. BENDER. I will answer the gentleman by saying that by resolution of the full committee television is not permitted unless it is authorized by a vote of the entire committee.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I hope they do not give you the authority, and I will tell you why. I had last year only one television station near my district and I tried to buy a little time around election and I could not get it because the Republicans had bought up all of the time. Now I have two television stations in my district and I want to be sure you are not going out there and take up all the time so that I cannot get on again.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be the minority member of the Committee to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations. We started out last fall with $50,000. That committee has a staff of 16 people. When the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] presented the matter to the House he said he wanted to look for Communists. I said then—the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] disagreed—that, "You are overlapping the Un-American Activities Committee." Today he [Mr. JACKSON] admitted there is a conflict of interest. So they set up a staff of 16 people down there. They are about out of money. We have had four or five meetings and up to now I have not been able to find out anything the staff has done except send out some questionnaires. One staff member told me yesterday they are not going to evaluate these; they are going to ask some disinterested party to evaluate them. I spent considerable time here on that committee. I made four or five trips over here during recess. Every time there was a meeting I was here.

I asked one of the men on the staff one day—he had been on the payroll at several thousand a year for about two months—what he had been doing. He said, "I have been thinking." I said, "Well, that is pretty good money for thinking. I have never got paid that well for just thinking." Up to now all they have done is think.

They have sent out questionnaires to the extent of $50,000 worth of money that this Congress gave them. They have a resolution now wanting $120,000 more.

You know, I would like to have lots more time to speak on this. I will get it when that comes up or at some subsequent time. I did not have much to do with hiring the staff. I voted to hire three of them. I recommended they put on a clerk. I recommended a name. Then they brought in a bunch of names one day and said, "We want to hire so-and-so and so-and-so to the extent of about 6 or 7 people. I said, "Let us investigate these people a little bit. I would like to know more about them." So they got mad at me for wanting to investigate, but they hired them anyway.

It turns out one of them was fired from a job on account of moral turpitude and I will tell you more about that when the time comes. I know the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] is going to be horrified about another one. He is a Socialist, or was. According to the Republicans, there is not any difference between communism and socialism. We are supposed to investigate them? Why, we have been infiltrated by them.

So I am wondering how much more money in this economy administration we are going to vote for investigations that overlap, which are unnecessary, in which there is a conflict of jurisdiction, and which publicity is the main impelling motive.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who opposed the original resolution as did I.

Mr. FULTON. Is the gentleman's committee investigating the same foundations that were adequately investigated by the Cox committee?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman has a good question there and I wish I could give him a good answer. But, you know, I have called up the committee numerous times and I cannot find out who they are investigating.

I will tell you about an interesting thing, which I am going to bring out in the hearings. One of the staff members said to one of the top men in one of the biggest foundations: "I do not know what you people are worrying about. This is only a temporary committee, it is only going to last until the first of the year, and we staff members have to eat after that." Maybe our hearings will get a television bid if some of our own staff members are doing things like that. I guess we are what they call an ad hoc committee. It is difficult for a layman to tell what that means, but I think that is what they did to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]; left him standing on his shin bones.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the House that this resolution now before us does not go into the matter of jurisdiction of committees. I personally felt that we might find ourselves in trouble a year ago when we adopted a new resolution with respect to the Committee on Government Operations, but that is not before this House now. The question now before the House is the matter of $100,000 for the investigation of rackets. May I say further that

members of Mr. BENDER's committee on both sides of the aisle went before the subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration and presented a budget that justified the expenditure of $100,000, and considerably more, and satisfied the members of that committee that it was going to be money well invested. That is the issue now before this House; not the jurisdiction of one committee or another.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would certainly like to give the House some information that I am well acquainted with on this matter, but I have no time to do it. I just want the House to know what the history back of this is. The very resolution that the full committee adopted to refer the matter to the Bender subcommittee was drafted by the chairman of the full committee. The situation in the committee was not just as Simon pure as the gentleman from Michigan says. There were some extraneous, compelling circumstances there that the House should be advised of. But, I have no time in a minute to tell the House about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield to correct a statement?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The resolution as written was not drafted by me.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, as one sincerely interested in the welfare of the labor movement, and as one whose own personal background in the movement in San Francisco includes some memorable fights, successful fights, to keep gangsters and racketeers out of organized labor, the choice presented to us today as to which committee shall have jurisdiction over a proposed investigation of racketeering which is claimed to exist is a tough one.

Based on what I have heard today and previously, the probability is that no committee which has expressed a claim to jurisdiction would conduct its investigation on a purely objective basis and out of concern for the welfare of organized labor. Every indication is that this investigation is proposed as an attack on labor itself, rather than on the few individuals who may in some instances be misusing a labor group for illegal ends. I make no defense of such individuals. They are betraying the trust of those whom they represent and of the whole labor movement. But the atmosphere in which this debate is taking place, and the attitude which would be taken in any investigation, is, I think, well expressed in what one member stated on the floor today when he commented that their committee would be investigating the labor movement and other forms of racketeering. That sweeping statement certainly indicates at least a possibility that the intention is not to do the labor movement a service, or to find out where the bonafide labor organizations have been imposed on by unscrupulous individuals, but to launch a broad attack on the labor movement itself.

I am just a little skeptical of the results which may be obtained or the conclusions which may be reached by any committee of this House, in its present temper, in an investigation of this kind if the Member's statement correctly indicates the purpose in mind. Therefore, as what might be called the lesser evil, I will vote to recommit the request for an appropriation. I believe that the conflicts of jurisdiction which have been pointed out today provide ample reason for tabling the whole matter until the conflict has been resolved. Let us hope that by that time the question will lie in the hands of those who may be more qualified to do the job in an impartial, fair, and constructive manner if there is such a job to be done.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, may I propound a unanimous consent request? I know the gentleman from Massachusetts has not had time, and I was wondering if we could extend this time 10 or 15 minutes by unanimous consent.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I would be heartily in favor of it myself.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to make such a request?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we extend the time for debate on this resolution 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. SHAFER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes, Mr. Speaker; definitely.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BARDEN moves to recommit House Resolution 419 to the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question on the motion to recommit is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on the division (demanded by Mr. RAYBURN) there were—ayes 123, noes 84.

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman for the information of all the Members what we may expect next week?

Mr. HALLECK. The Consent Calendar will be called on Monday, and we hope to call up after that the rule on House Joint Resolution 355, which is the rule on the Mexican labor bill. We hope to dispose of that Monday.

On Tuesday, and for the balance of the week, we shall first call the Private Calendar. That will be followed by the appropriations bill for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments. Following that will be House Resolution 438, having to do with the continuing operation and expansion of the so-called Kersten committee inquiring into the seizure and subjugation of the Baltic countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. RAYBURN. I assume the gentleman expects to take up the so-called Mexican labor bill on Monday and complete it even though there is a rollcall?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, that is right.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that if there are any further rules granted that might be ready for action later in the week I will keep the minority leader informed and give everybody ample notice so that they may be present.

Mr. RAYBURN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during rollcall No. 17 today, with regard to the Committee on Un-American Activities. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I was detained when the vote was taken on the resolution with regard to the Committee on Un-American Activities. If I had been present I would have voted in favor of the appropriation. I have always supported the work of this committee ever since I have been here. I think it is doing a good job of taking care of our economy as well as our Americanism.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CLERK HIRE, POSTAL ALLOWANCE, AND TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH SERVICE FOR MEMBERS OF HOUSE

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced H. R. 8068 for the purpose of increasing the clerk-hire and postage allowance of, and the telephone and telegraph service for Members of the House of Representatives. It is one part of a threefold plan to help overcome the financial problems confronting most Members of Congress.

The bill which I have introduced establishes House allowances on much the same basis as prevails in the other body. Members whose districts are under 400,000 would receive a 5-percent increase for clerk hire, postage, telephone and telegraph; those whose districts are between 400,000 and 500,000, a 10-percent increase in such allowances; those whose districts are between 500,000 and 600,000, a 15-percent increase, and those with districts over 600,000, a 20-percent increase. The total cost of this proposal would be approximately $450,000.

In connection with the preparation of this legislation, it was interesting to me to find that 204 districts surpass the national district average of 345,000 people. There are 66 districts between 400,000 and 500,000, 10 districts between 500,000 and 600,000, and 10 districts with a population exceeding 600,000.

I think it is generally recognized that in the larger districts, most Congressmen are forced to dig into their own pockets toward the end of the year for additional postage and communications expenses. It is also true that the employees from these districts carry a heavier workload at less pay than that prevailing in other offices. Certainly, the Congress itself constitutes the most glaring example of a violation of the age-old principle—equal pay for equal work.

For the information of the Members, I am including in the RECORD a copy of the bill which I have just discussed.

A second bill which I am having prepared will increase the travel allowance from 1 roundtrip per year to 6, while at the same time, lowering the mileage allowance from 20 cents per mile to 10 cents per mile. In my opinion, the recommendations of the Commission on Congressional Salaries that Members submit expense vouchers for six such trips to and from the district each year would be difficult to administer.

The current statute authorizing mileage for Members of Congress was adopted in 1866. Prior to that time a resolution had been adopted directing a Committee on Mileage to bring in a bill at an early date fixing the rate of mileage so as to equalize the compensation of Senators and Representatives in Congress. At the time when the 20 cents per mile was established the pay of Members of Congress was $3,000 a year and the prevailing mileage rate was 40 cents per mile. The following excerpt from a report prepared for me by the Library of Congress will be of interest to the House:

Senator John B. Henderson, of Missouri, offered the substitute amendment providing for compensation at $5,000 with mileage at the rate of 20 cents per mile. In support of his measure Mr. Henderson pointed out that too great a difference existed between the pay of Members of Congress. "For instance," stated Mr. Henderson, "we pay to one of the California Members $16,968.80 per Congress; that is $8,482 per year. We pay to another one of the Members $17,124.80. We pay to one of the Oregon Members $17,936, and to another of them $17,936, the same sum. We are paying to each one of those Members $11,936 in the way of mileage alone, their compensation being only $6,000; the mileage being double as much as their regular pay. * * * The Senator from Maryland receives $77.20 (mileage) per Congress; that is, $38.60 for each session of Congress; and he receives $3,000 per year for his services in this body." Mr. Henderson further asserted that the original mileage was adopted before railroads were known in this country, and the idea upon which it was adopted was that it was to be a part of the compensation of Members. "No idea was entertained that it was to be a part of the compensation for traveling expenses, but it was to be compensation for services rendered. In other words, those Members could not get home in order to transact any business, and therefore they ought to be paid a larger compensation.

Congress has ofttimes been criticized for providing itself with fringe benefits. However, what was a fringe benefit in 1866 to the Members of this body is today wholly unrealistic in compensating the Members for trips that they must make of necessity to their districts. In my opinion, an allowance of 10 cents per mile for 6 trips a year would be reasonable and proper.

As most of you know, I am retiring from Congress at the end of this term, primarily for financial reasons. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 15, 1954, appears a detailed article stating why I favor an increase in congressional salaries.

I am also including in the RECORD today newspaper articles and editorials from my district supporting increased salaries.

The Congress of the United States is the most fearless legislative body in the world. No task is too great, nor no problem too difficult to deter the Congress from standing up and speaking out in a conscientious and determined effort to resolve the situation at hand—until confronted with the question of increasing our salaries. In approaching this problem, certainty gives away to hesitancy and fear of ballot reprisal supplants the courage of conviction. However, the operating expense of our Congress is a little above 1½ percent of our entire budget. I for one am convinced that it is vitally necessary that the salaries of the Members of Congress and the operating expenses of this body should be increased to a more realistic level. I trust that the committee will give serious consideration to the proposal that I have submitted today, as a reasonable solution to the problem presented by the following findings of the President's Commission on Congressional Salaries:

1. The Commission concludes that the present scale of * * * congressional salaries has not been adjusted to keep pace with the growth of the duties and responsibilities of these offices.

2. The difference between salaries paid to Members * * * of the Congress and those paid in private enterprise to persons of similar ability, for less responsibility, has become too great.

3. The salaries paid to the Members * * * of the Congress have lagged far behind salary adjustments granted most officials of the Federal Government.

4. The salaries of Members * * * of the Congress are, and for a long time have been, grossly inadequate.

5. The present rates of salaries for Members * * * of the Congress tend to confine those positions to persons of independent wealth or outside earnings.

6. The present methods of payment of official expenses of Members of the Congress are antiquated and unrealistic.

NATIONAL ENGINEERS' WEEK

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite to the attention of my colleagues in Congress the fact that February 21–27 is National Engineers' Week.

This celebration is held every year during the week of George Washington's birthday in honor of our first President's notable engineering achievements.

Local celebrations of National Engineers' Week will be held in hundreds of cities in every State in the Union, and I should like to add my few words of praise for the engineering profession which has done so much for us all.

It is literally true that everything we eat, use, or wear has been touched, not once but many times, by the genius of America's professional engineers. One of the primary reasons we have been successful in maintaining our freedom in the face of the brutal aggression of the Communist nations is that the high

standards of American engineering have kept us ahead in the technological race to design and produce better guns, planes, tanks, and other weapons of defense. If America were to lose out on the engineering front, she would be hard put, indeed, to maintain her independence.

I would like to congratulate the National Society of Professional Engineers, and the hundreds of cooperating State societies and local groups who are sponsoring National Engineers' Week.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the RECORD may show that had I been present during rollcall No. 17, I would have voted for it, but I would have voted with reservations citing a specific warning that if we continue to operate against the sacred traditions in America and its people, we are now on the road to fascism. I thought I fought in World War II and in Korea to stay that hand and really defeat oppression, tyranny, confiscation, torture, and murder. I would not vote "yes" for this appropriation on the basis of spiraling us into Hitlerism.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the RECORD show had I been here on rollcall No. 17, I would have voted "yea."

MISSOURI OZARKS' SASSAFRAS TEA TO BE SERVED IN HOUSE RESTAURANT

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 26, sassafras tea will be served in the House restaurant and in the Senate restaurant. You are invited to ask for this most delightful drink during your lunch tomorrow. This beverage you will find is good either iced or as a hot drink. And to get the flavor at its best use both sugar and cream.

The sassafras roots from which the tea tomorrow will be made were sent to me by the citizens of my home county, Carter County, Mo.

I am confident that a cup of Missouri Ozarks' sassafras tea will bring back pleasant memories to many of us and will be a delightful experience for all of us. Ask for sassafras tea with your lunch tomorrow.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN GUATEMALA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 1 the 10th Conference of American States will convene in Caracas, Venezuela. This meeting of the American Republics will be a most significant one. In the first place, the OAS is the oldest regional organization of its kind in the world. At Caracas, the 21 member nations of OAS will meet to discuss problems of mutual concern and interest to the member nations, and in addition to perfect plans for the military defense of the Western Hemisphere.

A very difficult problem will have to be met by the conferees at Caracas. One of the member nations, Guatemala, is, in fact and in truth, today a Communist-dominated state in which the chief executive, if he is not a Communist himself, is so much under the influence and control of Moscow agents as to make any discussion of his personal political philosophy a matter of academic interest only. There will be no avoiding the issue of Guatemala at the Caracas conference, and to the extent that the member nations of OAS take definitive action to meet the Red challenge, the conference will be a success irrespective of other actions taken in the political, economic, and military areas. If the representatives of the participating Republics fail to take prompt and effective action in the case of Guatemala, little else that is done will be of any considerable importance.

Guatemala's neighbors, Mexico, Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Honduras have watched with concern the creeping Red tide engulfing their neighbor. Some months ago the Government of Guatemala bolted the newly formed Organization of Central American States when other members proposed a common front against communism. Guatemalan Communists have been beating a path to the Kremlin in recent months, obviously for the purpose of receiving instructions and directives for the future conduct of the struggle in the West.

Historically, Guatemala's relationships with the United States have been good. In times of need and distress among the people of that Republic, the people of the United States have rallied to their assistance with food, medical supplies, clothing, and tentage. Thousands of United States nationals know Guatemala as a beautiful land of mountains, lakes, rivers, and coastal plains, and as a tranquil and picturesque region in which to vacation. Economically, Guatemala has been able to maintain a sound internal economy in recent years, due to the excellent prices paid for coffee in the world market.

The other nations of the hemisphere have watched Guatemala drift, or be steered, as the case may be, into the position in which the country now finds itself without taking effective action on any front to slow the inroads being made by the Communist elements both in and out of the Republic's Government. The United States, aware that any action it might take would be seized upon by ultranationalist and Communist elements in other Latin Republics as a new evidence of "Yankee imperialism," has been reluctant to take the leadership in effective and hemispheric-wide action against the encroachments of the Communist agents. As a result, the situation has deteriorated until today the other Republics of the hemisphere find themselves confronted with a Korea in the West. Unlike Korea, however, Guatemala is surrounded by nations which view the Communists' inroads in that country with grave concern. Mexico to the north, and Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Honduras to the south, all have expressed their concern over the course events have taken, but, as in the instance of the United States, none has taken effective countermeasures to insure that the neighbor Republic does not become the first Soviet satellite in this hemisphere.

President Arbenz, of Guatemala, is by all accounts a captive of communism. It matters little to the free world whether his captivity is an unwilling one or whether he has embraced communism and the Guatemalan agents of the conspiracy of his own free will. The cold fact remains that the Government of the Republic is no longer capable of preserving its own integrity, nor of maintaining internal order against riotous and land-hungry campesinos except by acquiescence to the demands of the well-integrated Communist organizations. Guatemalans, many of whom supported President Arbenz in the 1944 revolutionary movement, are today fleeing their country and seeking political asylum in other Latin American Republics or in Europe.

La Prensa, of Mexico City, reported some days ago an interview with one of the political refugees en route to Switzerland. The news report stated, in essence, that political figures were leaving Guatemala before a "possible crisis." A reporter for the paper interviewed Alfonso Martinez Estevez, said to be a political and military figure of importance in Guatemala, and "an intimate friend of the President of Guatemala, Don Jacobo Arbenz."

According to the La Prensa report, Estevez was en route from Guatemala to Switzerland to take up residence in the latter country because of a threatened mass attack upon his person. Estevez is quoted as saying:

> I am still a close friend of Señor Arbenz, but since I cannot be useful to him, I retire. President Arbenz has lost his power and is practically a captive of the Communist Party and of its principal agents. Actually, there is no use trying to deal with him on questions of maintaining order.

Estevez said further:

> It is no secret now that the Communists have seized power in the direction of the agrarian reforms in Guatemala. In my capacity as head of that department, I have protested to the President without any practical results.
>
> Arbens, prisoner of the Communists—

The traveler continued—

> was incapable of stopping the invasion of the workers in Esquintla, and those of us who participated in the revolutionary movement of 1944 who are not Communists have quietly withdrawn our support of him.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should make it clear to the membership of the House that I have had no discussion of this speech or its content matter with the Department of State. I have no desire to embarrass the Department on the eve of the Caracas conference,

nor to make more difficult the work of those who will be delegates and observers of the United States delegation in Venezuela. The sentiments and observations in these remarks are my own, but I would feel that I had been guilty of a serious dereliction of my considered duty as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of that committee if I did not speak out now on the subject of Guatemala.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I want to thank my distinguished colleague from California for the research he has made and for the way he has presented his material both to the committee and as he is now doing it to the House.

One of the most important things that could happen to this country today would be to know the truth about the intrusion of communism, especially in the Western Hemisphere. We look to the gentleman from California as a specialist on the southern part of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio, and I might say in reply that the able work that has been done by her in her particular study area, the Middle East, is invaluable to those of us who are more or less specializing in the other areas and who must depend upon her wide knowledge and background.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. The gentleman is more than kind. What we have always done in the Foreign Affairs Committee since we had our small committees is to look to those who are chairmen of the subcommittees and ranking members to give us the leads and the truths in their areas. I thank the gentleman so much.

Mr. JACKSON. I would say in general that the system employed in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs of breaking down the full committee into geographical subdivisions not only facilitates the work but I believe is conducive to a better understanding of what is going on in the areas. I thank the gentlewoman.

In the face of considered affronts, in spite of expropriation and nationalization of legal foreign investments in Guatemala, irrespective of surveillance of our diplomatic representatives in that country, this Nation has pursued a course of watchful waiting, hopeful that calm voices would be heard above the clamor of the Communist conspirators, hopeful that the economic realities of life could be brought to the fore in Guatemala and realistically assessed by the government of that nation in the light of practical economic necessity. It now appears that these hopes were fruitless and that nothing short of positive expressions of disapproval will serve to indicate that this hemisphere and the people of the other republics do not propose to stand idly by while the Red tide engulfs Guatemala and its people, and constitutes a threat to the sovereignty of every other republic in the hemisphere. A showdown is imminent, and it remains only to be determined what course of action the republics of the hemisphere propose to follow. Tranquil and apathetic acceptance of the present situation in the Red-ridden nation will simply insure the rise of a full-fledged Communist dictatorship in Guatemala and that within a very few months.

Under the provisions of international agreements and treaties to which the United States is signatory, no economic sanctions can be brought to bear by Government action. Thus, it is impossible to embargo shipments of petroleum products, without which the Guatemalan economy would grind to a stop within a matter of weeks. It is likewise outside treaty agreements to forbid the purchase of Guatemalan coffee, without the dollar returns for which the present Government of Guatemala could not survive for 6 months.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that I refer to actions which the Government of the United States is presently without power to take. I make this distinction at this time because there are very effective measures which individual United States citizens can take at any time, and which I propose to suggest in proper order during my remarks today.

There are additional measures that the Government can take, and, in my opinion, the time has come to take them. For several years the United States has maintained in Guatemala a military and air mission. This mission has cooperated with the Guatemalan Government in the modernization and standardization of army and air force equipment and in the training of personnel of the two branches of the armed services in that country. The obvious purpose of such training missions in any country is to strengthen the ability of a nation to withstand aggression from without and generally to contribute to the overall defenses of the free world. Obviously, in the instance of Guatemala, there is no further purpose to be served in the training of the armed services to withstand outside aggression, in light of the fact that the principal forces of world slavery and confusion are already at work within the country and in the rear of the military establishment. The army's prompt action in suppressing anti-Communist demonstrations within the country must lead any observer to the conclusion that the military leaders of the nation approve and support the actions of the Red-dominated Government. No contribution to the overall defense of the hemisphere can be expected from the Guatemalan Army and Air Force in light of present political conditions within the nation, and the further retention of United States advisory and training personnel tends only to strengthen the military capacity of what must be considered an unfriendly Government. Guatemala can elect to live under communism if it chooses, but the other nations of the hemisphere are under no compulsion to either approve that choice or subsidize it in any way.

Technical cooperation projects now in effect in Guatemala as the result of agreements concluded between that country and the United States should be terminated when the present contracts expire. This Nation is seeking to assist its friends in making available funds and technicians for improvement in health, agriculture, and education. Again, there is no compulsion upon this country to continue such programs where an unfriendly or hostile government holds the reins of power. Other bilateral agreements, not subject to international control or convention should be terminated at the earliest possible date. These actions are not sanctions, but the exercise of national sovereignty and good judgment on the part of the United States.

Whatever course the Government of the United States follows with reference to the suggestions I have made they will be effective only if implemented by the individual citizen of this country and the business and industrial interests whose present operations insure a steady flow to Guatemala of the lifeblood of an economy—gasoline and oil. There is presently no power to embargo these products at the level of the Federal Government, and by the time action could be taken by all of the governments concerned, Guatemala would likely have to be enrolled on the tragic list of Soviet satellites. What is required at this time is a voluntary "no sale" on the cash registers of United States oil producers and shippers. Today's profits may be reckoned as yesterday's losses tomorrow, and it behooves United States producers to weigh the relative values involved. No one is saying, "You can't ship oil," but many concerned Americans in a dozen Republics are saying, "Why do you ship it to Guatemala?"

Nations today do a considerable business in United States dollars. Those nations with substantial dollar balances are in good shape. Those without them are compelled to manipulate currencies, risk uncontrolled inflation, seek grants and loans abroad, and generally to exist on a basis of day-to-day transactions to meet the basic subsistence needs of their own populations. The United States did not seek to bring about this condition of reliance upon the dollar, but circumstances and the last two great wars combined to bring about that effect.

Dollarwise, Guatemala is in good shape. Her economy, like that of several other republics, is based upon coffee. To the extent that coffee crops are good in Guatemala, times are good. To the extent that times are good, populations are docile and governments tend to perpetuate their tenures. The United States is one of the great coffee-consuming nations in the world. Coffee is not a luxury to the average North American, but a staple article of diet. Coffee prices today have reached an all-time high in this country, so high in fact that the President of the United States has called for an investigation of the situation in an effort to determine whether price rigging, speculation, or cartel operations are in any way responsible for the spectacular increase in the cost of coffee to the United States consumer.

With respect to coffee, I should like to make several points very clear. First, in what I shall say today about coffee, I

should like to have it clearly understood that I refer only to the coffee grown in Guatemala and purchased for consumption in the United States, for I am not concerned in these remarks so much with the price of coffee as I am concerned with the price of human freedom in this hemisphere. I will say, in passing, that the cost of all of the things which our friends and neighbors in South and Central America purchase from us—and Latin America is the best customer for our products in the world—have increased up to 500 percent since the conclusion of World War II. If the legitimate price of coffee is today controlled by available supply and world demand, and if the economies of several of our neighboring countries are stable as a result of that situation, we have a great deal to be thankful for. We profess, as a nation, to seek the stability and the economic independence of our neighbors to the south, yet many appear unwilling to accept the increased price of coffee as the price to be paid for the relative prosperity of several of our friends and neighbors. We should have learned from bitter postwar experience that we pay more as a receiver in the bankruptcy of a foreign national economy than we do when we buy and sell to nations whose economies are sound and whose treasuries held substantial dollar balances as the result of the sale of their own products in the world marketplace.

No one wants to pay more for coffee or for anything else than its just and fair value. The President's action to determine whether factors other than supply and demand are acting artifically to increase coffee prices will be welcomed by all Americans, including those who grow the coffee in Latin America, and whose profits have not kept pace with the rise in world price.

Guatemala's coffee keeps Guatemala's present Government in power. Although the total production in the country is less than 1 percent of the world supply, it is sufficient to provide basic subsistence and the importation of commodities and supplies, including oil and gasoline, required from abroad. The coffee harvest of Guatemala is purchased in large part by United States coffee buyers, and the coffee is in turn blended with other varieties to create the familiar brands known to United States consumers. As is true with gasoline and oil imports, the economy of Guatemala and the success of the Red-dominated regime are alike dependent upon the sale in the United States of the annual coffee yield. It is not too much to say that every pound of Guatemala coffee consumed in American homes today is added assurance that the dictatorship of the proletariat in Guatemala is brought a step nearer realization.

Again, the Government of the United States is powerless to act in the matter of the coffee purchases. But individuals, and by that I mean the American coffee buyers, blenders, and packagers are under no restraint or compulsion to do business with a Communist dictatorship. It is unfortunate that every pound of coffee containing a grain of Guatemala's product could not be clearly stamped for the benefit of American mothers whose sons died in Korea, and for the vast army of United States housewives who want no part of dictatorship in Guatemala or anywhere else.

Both in and out of Guatemala there are citizens of that beautiful land who are opposing the present regime. They are trying desperately to retrieve freedom before it is lost forever. Several newspapers have had the courage to oppose the coming dictatorship although it is questionable how long their expressions will be permitted. Foreign correspondents, including Sidney Gruson of the New York Times and Marshall Bannell, of NBC, were unceremoniously banished from the country a month ago for unfriendly criticism of the Government. Jules DuBois, the able and conscientious Latin American correspondent for the Chicago Tribune, was beaten seriously some months ago by a gang of Guatemala City Reds.

The Red plague in Guatemala has had its expressions outside of that unfortunate country. Societies of friends of Guatemala have been formed in Mexico. There is little question but that Guatemala is an important station on the Soviet courier route through Latin America. Guatemalan Communists, including Party General Secretary Jose Manuel Fortuny, labor boss Victor Manuel Gutierrez, and agrarian leader Carlos Manuel Pellecer returned from a mission to Moscow to report plans for the invasion of Guatemala by her neighbors and the United States.

The Organization of American States must face the Guatemalan problem squarely at Caracas on March 1, and a course of action must be decided upon which will be positive and effective. Better that Guatemala should walk out of the conference, if indeed that nation is represented, than the presence of a Communist threat to the Americas be brushed aside or an effort made to pretend it does not exist. The failure of the conference to take immediate and firm action within the framework of the OAS will simply mean that at an early date Guatemala's immediate neighbors must decide to follow an alternate and difficult course of independent action. If the Organization of American States is to repel foreign aggression anywhere at any time, the first clear challenge is at hand in Guatemala. The aggression is economic, political, and social and the hand of the Soviet Union is clearly to be seen.

Unwillingness to face the facts of aggression when they are clearly evident; a seeming inability to coordinate the efforts of the peoples in the free areas of the world in a common effort when the clear intent of aggression has been discerned has already cost the liberty of untold millions of human souls and a tragic cost in human life. Caracas can become the Munich of our hemisphere unless the member nations look to the history of our own day to discern the fate of those who misinterpreted Soviet designs or ignored them out of some assumed immunity from aggression.

The Soviet threat in Guatemala is aggression—and as surely so as if it were backed by the bayonets of the Red army. Today there is effective opposition within that nation—tomorrow there will be none. Today, the press is free to speak—tomorrow it will be silent. At the moment, the forces of peaceful persuasion, backed by firm determination can meet and thwart the Soviet design. A month from now—6 months—a year—and that opportunity will have passed.

The Organization of American States has a unique opportunity to meet the challenge of our day, a challenge which was shirked by other diplomats when Hitler was on the march, when Mussolini was rampant and when Hirohito marshalled his army of conquest unrestrained by more than the force of world moral opinion. The OAS can insure its place in history and revivify the faith of a world in collective security by prompt, determined, and effective action. Conversely, it can shatter the last hope of a free and peaceful hemisphere by inaction, inertia, or complacency at Caracas.

The United States has a stake in the outcome of this matter, but its stake is no greater than that of the other Republics who desire to maintain independence of action and freedom of determination in the face of the Communist threat.

The Latin American Republics were quick to mobilize against what was termed "Yankee imperialism" a few years ago. By concerted action they succeeded in changing a foreign policy which they felt, rightly or wrongly, impinged upon their economic sovereignty. Out of that common purpose came the era of the good neighbor and in implementation of that new policy the United States of America has put millions of dollars to work throughout the hemisphere in an effort to raise the standards of living, improve public health, and extend the benefits of public education. A community of interests and a common purpose welded Latin America together at that time, and the same immediate urgency that impelled the republics to concerted action then to insure economic freedom must be born again if political freedom is to survive in our hemisphere.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation of the statement and the ideas that the gentleman has just expressed. I agree with the statement he has made, but lacking the time, and I might say the ability to put them together in as concise and as clear way as the gentleman has done, I want again to express my deep appreciation.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman lacks the time, he certainly does not lack the ability. I thank the gentleman for his kind statement.

SURVEY OF HEALTH CARE SITUATION IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Bow). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, good health—not for just a few, but for all America—is essential to our national well-being and survival today. And to ensure such health,

adequate nursing care is essential both in the hospital and in industry, for home care and for clinic treatment—in short, in every phase of our national life.

What can be done? That question has long concerned all workers in the health field. But their varying beliefs and appraisals of the situation have not hitherto, so far as I know, been brought together in one study so that a synthesis of the best thinking in the field could be made available for study and action.

In an effort to take a forward step in this direction, I have just completed a nationwide survey. The results show a nationwide recognition of a critical and ever-increasing shortage of nurses, both registered and practical, to supply the Nation's overall needs. Unless something can be done immediately to reverse this trend our country will face a truly appalling crisis in health care.

I sent out 10,000 questionnaires to a list of representative nurses, doctors, hospital administrators, nursing schools, educators, laymen, State governors, Federal and State health authorities, and so forth.

The questions, briefly, were:

Do they believe there is a nurse shortage—if so, what are the causes; whether financial aid be needed and if so where; what they felt about Federal aid, State aid, or a combination of both.

The response was amazing both in volume and in the high caliber of thoughtful approach to so confused and many-faceted a problem. Nearly 4,000 replies were received—almost a 40 percent response.

Let me add here that I am deeply grateful to my colleagues in both the Senate and the House and to 35 State governors for replying to my inquiry and for the helpfulness of their suggestions.

In the entire survey, the answers were in many, many cases most detailed. The gist of those responses and what they signify I want to share with you today.

By unanimous consent I am inserting a summary of the survey findings with my remarks in order to put them at your disposal for study and possible further suggestions. The results seem to indicate an urgent need for remedial action, and indicate lines of approach which can guide us all in finding the road to ultimate solution for this very major need in the safeguarding of the Nation's health.

Let me touch briefly on just a few of the survey highlights. There is overwhelming accord that there is indeed a nursing shortage. Many opinions are given as to the different causes: financial, psychological, social. The difficulties attendant on securing sufficient new recruits to take nurse training are particularly emphasized as are low pay, and long and irregular hours. Competition from other fields and within the nursing field itself are emphasized.

The increasing trend toward early marriage is apparently very general, so general, in fact, that some advocated adjustment of nursing schedules to allow for the part-time or odd-hour services of young housewives and mothers who had had nurse training.

Many replies spoke of the seeming decline in altruism which expresses itself in the reluctance of many young women today to consider the role of ministering angel an adequate reward for low wages and poor working conditions.

Strong urging of financial aid carried with it in many replies the warning that money of itself would not solve the problem though it would greatly help. To this I heartily agree.

There were some few replies from those who wanted no aid at all, but the method most approved was Federal-State matching funds administered at the State level. Generally speaking, the greatest need was felt to be for general and private duty nurses.

Over and above the specific replies there was voiced a deep sense of the need for a large scale program of informative education to bring about a dramatic realization of the common problem presented by this short supply of trained nursing personnel to all segments of the nursing profession, to all sectors of the health-care field. Today, as the survey dramatically brings out, there are misunderstandings, misconceptions, antagonisms, and areas of disagreement between the various groups involved which must be lessened in the mutual interest of all dedicated to serving the Nation's health.

Such a program of education must stem from extended factual research which would supplement this survey of attitudes and opinions. As one of my respondents said:

> There is needed an objective study covering different types and sizes of institutions, different size communities and different geographical areas.

Many of those answering my questionnaire recommended that Federal funds be used for such research.

On such a basis of research and educational information there can be constructed, it seems to me, a sound structure which will ultimately meet not only the needs and desires of the profession but, even more importantly, the requirements of the ever-increasing population in America as a whole.

This is but a first step. Consultations are already in progress to see where the second step will lead.

REPORT ON NURSING

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to give you an analysis of the replies to the carefully considered questionnaire I sent out in December 1953 to individuals all over the United States who are concerned directly or indirectly with nursing and with health care. The larger part of the questionnaires was sent to nurses and to members of the medical profession, but a representative number of interested laymen was also included as well as State governors, presiding officers of State legislative bodies, and selected Federal Government officials.

Approximately 10,000 questionnaires were sent out. Some 3,850 replies were received. This represents a response of approximately 38.5 percent, a truly amazing total compared with the usual survey response.

Of the total replies, approximately 3,300 were carefully analyzed with results shown on the statistical tables appended hereto.

A representative sampling of the replies not included in the statistical tables revealed that they showed no significant deviation from the general attitude pattern established in the survey proper.

The questions asked in the survey were:

I. In your opinion is there a nursing shortage? In which field or fields: Teaching, administrative, general and private duty, practical nursing. Is the shortage critical in its effect on patient care?

II. What are the causes in order of importance?

III. Would the nursing shortage be substantially reduced by additional financial aid to schools?

IV. If additional financial assistance in education is necessary, in which field or fields is it most needed: Teaching, administrative, general and private duty, practical nursing?

V. Are you opposed to any form of Federal financial assistance to nursing education?

VI. If not, how do you consider additional financial aid to nursing education should be provided: State administered Federal funds, federally administered Federal funds, State administered Federal-State matching funds, other?

METHOD OF SURVEY ANALYSIS

Replies were separated into the following broad general categories:

Nurses: Registered nurse associations—officials of National, State, or local organizations; registered nurse registries; nurses not officially connected, that is, neither heads of schools of nursing, nor hospital administrators, nor directors of nursing in hospitals, nor association officers; directors schools of nursing; directors nursing services, that is, in hospitals, and so forth; practical nurses; visiting and public health nurses.

Hospital administrators: These were in turn subdivided into five geographical regions:

Eastern: Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia.

Southern: North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, Florida.

Middle Western: Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin.

Southwestern: Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona.

Pacific and Rocky Mountain: Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, California, Washington.

Medical school officers.

Physicians not on State boards and medical editors.

Laymen, including medical writers.

Educators.

Government officials—Federal officers, Congressmen, State legislators, governors.

State boards of health and other State health officers and nurses.

The resultant statistical breakdown is fully set forth in the tabular portion of this survey summary.

WHAT THE SURVEY SHOWS

Question I. Is there a nursing shortage?:

To the first question asking if there is a nursing shortage, the reply was an overwhelming "Yes." In certain cases

this affirmative answer was modified by the reservation, "Not in this area." The "No's" represent less than 2 percent of the answers.

The shortage was considered by the respondents to be most critical in the field of general and private duty nurses, next in the area of teaching, and third in the field of supervision and administration. Its effect on the care of the patients was considered critical or serious by an overwhelming majority of the respondents, though the sum of the "No's" and "In some area" answers is nearly 25 percent of all the replies to this question.

Question II. Causes of nursing shortage: The second question, asking the individual's opinion on the causes of the shortage called forth a variety of answers that fall into four general categories:

A. Recruiting and training;
B. On-the-job factors;
C. New factors in nursing field; and
D. General factors.

A. Recruiting and training: In this category, the competition of other jobs now open to young women directly after graduating from high school, or with short preparation obtained the largest number of counts. Next came high tuition, and finally length of training without stipend.

B. On-the-job factors: Low pay and long and irregular hours were deemed most influential in causing the shortage.

C. New factors: Here, the increased use of hospitals was most frequently mentioned, with resultant increased demand for general duty nurses. Competition of other nursing fields, such as public health nursing, industrial nursing, use of nurses in doctors' offices and the better working conditions, higher pay and ultimate security in the Government-managed nursing services were indicated as contributing to the shortage of general duty nurses.

D. General factors: In this category appear sociological reasons of a general nature not directly connected with nursing. Early marriage interfering with a nursing career, and the decline of altruism, that is, the new attitude toward nursing as a profession, were the most frequently mentioned of this type of shortage cause.

Question III. Additional financial aid to schools? The third question, whether additional financial aid to schools would remedy the shortage, showed this proportion: The answer "Yes" was given by about double the number of those who expressed doubt or negation.

Question IV. What fields need most financial assistance in education? General and private duty nurses received first place mention, with the training of teachers of nursing in second place.

Questions V and VI: Federal aid? The question of Federal aid followed the pattern of question I. The overwhelming majority were in favor of Federal aid, though many expressed reservations as to the control of the funds granted. Those that were categorically opposed represent about 17 percent of the total number of replies. State administered Federal-State matching funds received the greatest approval, with State-administered Federal funds next in order. Of the other methods suggested by the respondents, scholarships to individuals were most favored, with various suggestions about loans and the use of funds for advanced study qualifying the replies.

OPINION AND ATTITUDE TRENDS

In addition to answering the specific question, respondents frequently expressed themselves in detailed and carefully considered letters appended to the questionnaire itself. Insofar as it was possible, these addenda have been incorporated into the breakdown of replies to the specific questions. But there remain certain overall impressions or revelations of trends which should be taken into account.

First. Antagonisms: One is impressed by the existing antagonisms between registered and practical nurses; between trained and untrained practical nurses; between nurses, doctors, and administrators; between nurses on general duty and those in the armed services, veterans' hospitals, public health, and industry. Nor is there much sympathy between the young and the older nurses, and there is much complaining among the latter that there is no longer any devotion to duty.

Second. Negations and reservations re Federal aid: A second interesting fact is that in a great many cases where there was a negative answer to the question on patient care and on Federal aid to nursing education the respondent was equally negative in his attitude toward Federal aid in any form. However, these negations rarely included a "no" to the question on shortage, except in a certain number of cases where the reservation "not in this area" was emphasized. The training schools under religious administration and supervision were generally in favor of Federal aid federally administered.

Likewise, the lack of any recognized overall solution calculated to break through the impasse and the failure to come to grips with the problem of getting an adequate supply of nurses at all levels is apparent in the answers given by a considerable number of those who were in no way opposed to any form of Federal aid. Time and time again, even though no opposition is expressed, reservations as to its effectiveness are expressed, and there is doubt whether this measure, as a mere partial solution, will provide any help. The attitude seems to be, "Yes; do it, but do not expect any miracles from it unless much else is done." Those approving Federal aid were, in the majority of cases, eager to emphasize that the actual governing of the funds should be largely in the hands of the professionals, the boards of nurses' examiners of the States, the boards governing the schools, the educational agencies, the nurses' organizations.

How complicated the whole problem of Federal aid is was shown by some of the responses concerning State administered Federal and State matching aid, where it became clear that the machinery of such aid would be greatly impeded by special State legislation. And yet the summary table plainly shows, as we have pointed out, that this form would be most acceptable to the largest number.

Third. Training:

All kinds of suggestions were offered in the letters accompanying the questionnaires as to the kind of training best calculated to do away with the shortage. Many believed that a basic 2 years' course would be sufficient training for bedside nursing, with funds to be used for longer and advanced courses to fit experienced nurses for teaching and administration.

The general consensus of opinion regarding training was that the whole system of training and classification of nurses needs reconsideration in the light of changed conditions in and out of the hospitals.

Fourth. Practical nurses: The education and status of practical nurses was the subject of much controversial comment. Laymen and educators, as well as some of the hospital administrators, felt that with proper training this group could be most useful in relieving the higher echelons of many pressures in crowded hospitals where hospital insurance and the overaging of the population brings an ever-growing number of patients. From the groups of registered nurses, however, came complaints of the inadequacy and insufficient preparation of the practical nurses as well as recrimination against their salary and their semiprofessional status.

Fifth. Recruitment: The opinions on recruitment are similarly at variance. Some places report that scholarships are going begging; some that girls do not enter training because guidance at the high-school level does not inform them properly. Still others report that loans and scholarships to individuals, rather than grants to schools, would solve the pressing problems of high tuition and long training asked for by the present nursing schools. In this connection the approval of Cadet Corps methods was by no means general, many saying that the quality of these recruits left much to be desired. And some believed that better housing, more facilities for recreation and less restriction of student nurses would be a great inducement to obtain more nursing recruits.

Sixth. Other job opportunities: The feeling seems to be fairly general that competition of other job opportunities for the young women of today, jobs not requiring a lengthy and arduous training period, as well as the decline in altruism as a moving force where the incentive of high earnings is lacking, have much to do with the decline of interest in nursing as a preferred field of feminine activity. The fact that the reduced birthrate during the twenties and thirties makes for less "woman power" of an eligible age for nurses' training today was noted by many thoughtful respondents.

Seventh. Marriage: The fact that marriage is entered upon early in life, sometimes immediately after training, and that no provision is made in the arrangement of shifts and hours to overcome the difficulties of a nurse who has household and maternal duties was given by many as a reason for the attrition

within the profession. Tax relief for expenses incurred for the care of the children of the working nurse-mother as well as better payment for Saturday, Sunday, and night work were suggested.

Eighth. Poor personnel policies: Among those listed were insufficient vacations, lack of retirement funds, poor and unfair administrative policies, no standards of promotions, undemocratic requirements made by doctors and supervisors. Not the least frequently mentioned complaint was the lack of security as compared with other employment, particularly in most nonprofit institutions not under social security.

CONCLUSION

The differences in attitudes and the variation therein found between the different groups and—in the case of hospital administrators—between various regions point to the fact that any remedial measures to improve the situation should be preceded by and include a program of informative education. Such program must aim at creating a deeper understanding of the overall pattern of nursing need both among the public and among professional men and women dealing with nursing.

Such informational education should stem from extended factual research. As one of the respondents has stated:

> There is needed an objective study covering different types and sizes of institutions, different size communities, and different geographical areas.

Many of the respondents to this survey even recommended that Federal funds be used for such research.

STATISTICAL TABLES

Note 1: Since some respondents answered only part of the question and many gave more than one answer to some queries—example: "causes of shortage"—the total of recorded replies to one question has no relation to the total replies to another, even within the same category of respondents.

Note 2: Since the answers to question No. 2—as to the causes of nursing shortage—break down into many more parts than is the case for any other question, the statistical summary for No. 2 has been placed at the end of each of the tables in order to facilitate overall scanning of the survey findings.

TABLE I.—*Overall summary table*

(For details of the various category classifications see tables II, III, and IV.)

Summary	Nurses' groups	Hospital administrators	State boards of health [1] and other State health officers and nurses	Government [2] officials	Related groups	Total
I. Is there a nursing shortage?						
Yes	1,234	1,502	82	53	281	3,152
In some areas	45	14		2	12	73
No	26	32	2		1	61
1. Teaching	1,056	787	75	25	167	2,110
2. Administration	977	736	65	23	129	1,930
3. General and private duty	1,150	1,426	77	37	257	2,947
4. Practical nursing	755	739	59	27	143	1,723
5. Public health nursing	31		7	1	3	42
6. Psychiatric nursing	4			1		5
7. Effect on patient care:						
Yes	1,001	954	64	32	200	2,251
In some areas	111	135	6	3	15	270
No	84	148	2	1	22	257
III. Aid to schools:						
Yes	923	843	44	17	147	1,974
Doubtful	158	217	18	10	35	438
No	226	320	15	13	70	644
1. Teaching	981	565	62	19	113	1,740
2. Administration	755	427	55	13	78	1,328
3. General and private duty	694	1,051	31	17	152	1,945
4. Practical nursing	409	467	36	13	122	1,047
IV. Federal financial aid:						
Yes	1,085	1,188	67	20	213	2,573
No	164	299	7	25	53	548
Doubtful	17	19			2	38
1. State administered Federal funds	445	389	10	18	73	935
2. Federal administered Federal funds	272	203	6	3	44	528
3. State administered Federal and State funds	621	609	6	16	130	1,382
4. Other:						
a. State funds only	68	34			7	109
b. Individual scholarships:						
Federal	115	46			22	183
State	48	4			5	57
c. State aid to medical schools	18	2	1		3	24
d. Local funds	19	27			10	56
e. Voluntary support	15	16			4	35
5. Approve cadet corps method	14	25			2	41
Oppose cadet corps method	19	27	2			48
II. Causes of shortages:						
A. Recruiting and training:						
Poor recruiting	165	161	8	5	49	388
Lack of social esteem	97	51	8	3	22	181
High tuition	261	216	11	7	44	539
Length of training (including lack of stipend)	164	220	6	6	47	443
Training restrictions	72	149	7	6	17	251
Inflexibility of examiners	17	23			2	42
Competition, other jobs for high-school graduates	328	311	28	9	68	744
Lack of funds for advanced study	69	73	4		13	159
Lack of qualified teachers and schools	236	190	22	5	61	514
B. On-the-job factors:						
Low pay	468	395			89	952
Long and irregular hours	219	165	21	12	33	450
Poor personnel policies	169	49	10		7	235
Poor administrators	42	16	7			65
Improper use of training	90	74	11	1	18	194
Nurses' tasks not differentiated	39	60	2		3	104
Attitudes of doctors	21	7	4			32
Dislike of rural areas	60	52	3		1	116
C. New factors in nursing field:						
Increased hospital use	321	262	17	6	45	651
Increased health services	201	78	6	3	14	302
Increased population	67	45	3	1	9	125
Competition of other nursing opportunities:						
a. Government institutions	138	279	8	2	22	450
b. Public health, industry, etc	157	345	21		49	572
Shortened workweek in hospitals	18	61			9	88
Greater demand on time and skill from advanced technics	24	26	6	4	6	66
Hospitals' financial troubles	9					9

[1] Includes State boards of health, health officers, boards of nurse examiners, nurses with State boards.
[2] Includes Federal officers, Congressmen, and State legislators.

TABLE I.—*Overall summary table*—Continued

(For details of the various category classifications see tables II, III, and IV.)

Summary	Nurses' groups	Hospital administrators	State boards of health and other State health officers and nurses	Government officials	Related groups	Total
II. Causes of shortages—Continued						
D. General factors:						
Early marriage trend and motherhood	229	236	12	8	23	508
Effect of low birthrate in 1920's and 1930's on number of recruits available	60	31	3	2	15	111
Decline of altruism	59	125	7	4	13	208
Economic confusion	41	24	2		5	72

TABLE II.—*Detail of nursing group responses*

Nurses	Registered nurses' associations	Registered nurses' registries	Nurses not officially connected	Directors' nursing schools	Directors' nursing services	Practical nurses	Visiting and public health nurses	Total
I. Is there a nursing shortage?								
Yes	202	38	102	326	354	129	83	1,234
Some areas	17		3	6	14	3	2	45
No	5	1	2	7	7	2	2	26
1. Teaching	180	22	73	292	320	106	63	1,056
2. Administration	156	21	66	287	305	86	56	977
3. General and private duty	188	29	95	306	350	107	75	1,150
4. Practical nursing	114	4	47	247	191	110	42	755
5. Public health nursing	15	1	8	5	2			31
6. Psychiatric nursing	3					1		4
7. Effect on patient care:								
Yes	134	32	64	305	300	98	68	1,001
Some areas	12	2	6	32	36	18	5	111
No	17	2	4	20	27	8	6	84
III. Aid to schools:								
Yes	114	19	69	275	300	95	51	923
Doubtful	28	2	7	38	50	15	18	158
No	44	12	24	62	55	14	15	226
1. Teaching	152		62	286	333	92	56	981
2. Administration	128		49	233	242	60	43	755
3. General and private duty	111		53	167	250	68	45	694
4. Practical nursing	58		24	103	101	100	23	409
IV. Federal financial aid:								
Yes	186	25	92	305	293	116	68	1,085
No	33	11	14	33	42	16	15	164
Doubtful	2	1	2	6	2	2	2	17
1. State-administered Federal funds	62	6	42	140	126	43	26	445
2. Federal-administered Federal funds	52	4	14	100	81	16	5	272
3. State-administered Federal and State funds	105	20	48	148	189	69	42	621
4. Other:								
a. State funds only	20		1	37	7	1	2	68
b. Individual scholarship:								
Federal	36	2	7	37	28	1	4	115
State	5	5		18	18	1	1	48
c. State aid to medical schools	2		1	8	5		2	18
d. Local funds	5		2	5	3	1	3	19
e. Voluntary support	5		1	5		2	2	15
5. Approve Cadet Corps method	5	1	4	1		2	1	14
Oppose Cadet Corps method	6		2		10	1		19
II. Causes of shortages:								
A. Recruitment and training:								
Poor recruiting	25	4	11	80	41	13	21	165
Lack of social esteem	10	1	13	31	17	12	13	97
High tuition	41	6	21	60	84	32	17	261
Length of training (including lack of stipend)	23	4	16	38	56	16	11	164
Training restrictions	6		4	31	17	3	11	72
Inflexibility of examiners	8	3	1	4			1	17
Competition of other jobs for high-school graduates	53	3	16	106	98	27	25	328
Lack of funds for advanced study	7		1	43	14		4	69
Lack of qualified teachers and schools	48	3	18	64	66	27	10	236
B. On-the-job factors (in general hospitals):								
Low pay	75	13	42	109	147	52	30	468
Long and irregular hours	34	2	14	68	76	21	4	219
Poor personnel policies	31	2	23	37	49	15	12	169
Poor administrators	10	2	5		12	13		42
Improper use of training	15	1	9	46	14	5		90
Nursing tasks not differentiated			1	21	8	8	1	39
Attitudes of doctors	2		3	16				21
Dislike of rural areas	6		1	21	15	3	14	60
C. New factors in nursing field:								
Increased hospital use	56	8	20	94	97	29	17	321
Increased health services	44	3	6	59	71	11	7	201
Increased population	3	1	3	29	17	9	5	67
Competition of other nursing opportunities:								
a. Government institutions	17	3	10	40	43	12	13	138
b. Public health, industry, etc	36	5	10	27	54	10	15	157
Shortened workweek in hospitals	6				9	3		18
Greater demand on time and skill from advanced technics	10		2		3	7	2	24
Hospitals' financial troubles		1	4		3	1		9
D. General factors:								
Early marriage trend and motherhood	29	8	12	66	93	11	10	229
Effect of low birth rate in 1920's and 1930's on number of recruits now available	7	1		20	16	12	4	60
Decline of altruism	6	3	1	24	25			59
Economic confusion	2		1	22	12	3	1	41

TABLE III.—*Detail of hospital administrators' responses, also State boards of health and other State health officers and nurses*

Hospital administrators	State groupings						State boards of health and other State health officers and nurses [1]
	Eastern	Southern	Middle Western	South-western	Pacific and Rocky Mountain	Total	
I. Is there a nursing shortage?							
Yes	436	259	474	160	173	1,502	82
In some areas			11	2	1	14	
No	5	4	10	5	8	32	2
1. Teaching	242	130	272	77	66	787	75
2. Administration	210	130	249	75	72	736	65
3. General and private duty	431	246	420	157	172	1,426	77
4. Practical nursing	270	107	231	72	59	739	59
5. Public health nursing							7
6. Psychiatric nursing							
7. Effect on patient care:							
Yes	277	166	290	110	111	954	64
In some areas	79	18	10	11	17	135	6
No	35	41	12	25	35	148	2
III. Aid to schools:							
Yes	266	150	274	73	80	843	44
Doubtful	57	31	78	34	17	217	18
No	77	46	109	42	46	320	15
1. Teaching	185	89	181	50	60	565	62
2. Administration	130	63	146	40	48	427	55
3. General and private duty	315	174	329	114	119	1,051	31
4. Practical nursing	190	67	138	39	33	467	36
IV. Federal financial aid:							
Yes	363	210	372	97	146	1,188	67
No	57	49	91	64	38	299	7
Doubtful	5	5	2	7		19	
1. State-administered Federal funds	133	65	113	36	42	389	10
2. Federal-administered Federal funds	66	32	68	14	23	203	6
3. State administered Federal and State funds	199	119	189	40	62	609	6
4. Other:							
a. State funds only	9	11	7	4	3	34	
b. Individual scholarships:							
Federal	6	7	28	2	3	46	
State		1		1	2	4	
c. State aid to medical schools		2				2	1
d. Local funds	5	6	8	3	5	27	
e. Voluntary support	3	1	10	2		16	
5. Approve Cadet Corps methods	12		6	4	3	25	
Oppose Cade Corps methods		6	17	2	2	27	[2] 2
II. Causes of shortages:							
A. Recruitment and training:							
Poor recruiting	29	41	40	28	23	161	8
Lack of social esteem	18	11	9	7	6	51	8
High tuition	72	37	75	19	13	216	11
Length of training (including lack of stipend)	80	17	85	18	20	220	6
Training restrictions	48	19	47	14	21	149	7
Inflexibility of examiners	23					23	
Competition of other jobs for high-school graduates	93	60	81	35	42	311	28
Lack of funds for advanced study	13	24	14	8	14	73	4
Lack of qualified teachers and schools	31	60	37	33	29	190	22
B. On-the-job factors (in general hospitals):							
Low pay	123	54	104	50	64	395	
Long and irregular hours	52	21	44	15	33	165	21
Poor personnel policies	11	13	11	5	9	49	10
Poor administrators	16					16	7
Improper use of training	23	11	16	8	16	74	11
Nursing tasks not differentiated	24	13	23			60	2
Attitudes of doctors		4		3		7	4
Dislike of rural areas	4	12	16	9	11	52	3
C. New factors in nursing field:							
Increased hospital use	76	46	84	20	36	262	17
Increased health services	41	7	19	7	4	78	6
Increased population	11	4	27		3	45	3
Competition, other nursing opportunities:							
a. Government institutions	90	50	81	19	39	279	8
b. Public health, industry, etc	108	36	159	14	28	345	21
Shortened workweek in hospitals	28		24	6	3	61	
Greater demand on time and skill from advanced techniques	16			5	5	26	6
Hospitals' financial troubles	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
D. General factors:							
Early marriage trend and motherhood	64	37	87	20	28	236	12
Effect of low birthrate of 1920's and 1930's on number of recruits now available	9	4	18			31	3
Decline of altruism	34	23	28	25	15	125	7
Economic confusion		9		4	11	24	2

[1] Includes State boards of health, health officers, boards of nurse examiners, nurses with State boards.
[2] Opposed.
[3] Included in other answers.

TABLE IV.—*Detail of responses from: Medical schools, physicians (other than on State boards, etc.), laymen (general), educators, Government officials (Federal, State)*

Related groupings	Officers of medical schools	Physicians not on State boards and medical editors	Laymen (including writers)	Educators	Total	Government officials (Federal officers, Congressmen, and State legislators and governors
I. Is there a nursing shortage?						
Yes	70	68	92	51	281	53
In some areas	3		9		12	2
No	1	[1]	[1]	[1]	1	[2]
1. Teaching	57	27	57	26	167	25
2. Administration	50	20	43	16	129	23
3. General and private duty	67	65	80	45	257	37
4. Practical nursing	57	37		49	143	27
5. Public health nursing			2	1	3	1
6. Psychiatric nursing						1
7. Effect on patient care:						
Yes	55	39	70	36	200	32
In some areas		7	8		15	3
No	—5	10	5	2	22	1
III. Aid to schools:						
Yes	39	29	42	37	147	17
Doubtful	16	5	12	2	35	10
No	11	28	22	9	70	13
1. Teaching	39	17	34	23	113	19
2. Administration	35	10	23	10	78	13
3. General and private duty	39	40	53	20	152	17
4. Practical nursing	32	27	29	34	122	13
IV. Federal financial aid:						
Yes	54	49	66	44	213	20
No	12	19	17	5	53	25
Doubtful	1			1	2	[2]8
1. State administered Federal funds	25	7	27	14	73	18
2. Federal administered Federal funds	23	9	8	4	44	3
3. State administered State and Federal funds	29	24	39	38	130	16
4. Other:						
a. State funds only	1	1	5		7	
b. Individual scholarships:						
Federal	13	5	2	2	22	
State	4			1	5	
c. State aid to medical schools	2	1			3	
d. Local funds	2	1	5	2	10	
e. Voluntary support		2	2		4	
5. Approve cadet corps method	1		1		2	
Oppose cadet corps method	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	
II. Causes of shortages:						
A. Recruiting and training:						
Poor recruiting	12	3	21	13	49	5
Lack of social esteem	7	6	8	1	22	3
High tuition	11	5	19	9	44	7
Length of training (including lack of stipend)	14	16	14	3	47	6
Training restrictions	5		8	4	17	6
Inflexibility of examiners		2			2	
Competition of other jobs for high school graduates	28	15	14	10	68	9
Lack of funds for advanced study	6		4	3	13	
Lack of qualified teachers and schools	13	13	23	12	61	5
B. On-the-job factors:						
Low pay	26	17	25	21	89	
Long and irregular hours	11	8	9	5	33	12
Poor personnel policies	3		2	2	7	
Poor administrators						
Improper use of training	10	2	6		18	1
Nursing tasks not differentiated	2	1			3	
Attitudes of doctors						
Dislike of rural areas	1				1	
C. New factors in nursing field:						
Increased hospital use	16	6	15	8	45	6
Increased health services		1	8	5	14	3
Increased population	3	3	2	1	9	1
Competition of other nursing opportunities:						
a. Government institutions	4		16	2	22	3
b. Public Health, industry, etc	5	16	27	1	49	
Shortened workweek in hospitals	2	1	5	1	9	
Greater demand on time and skill from advanced medical techniques	1		5		6	4
Hospitals' financial troubles						
D. General factors:						
Early marriage trend and motherhood	8	11		4	23	8
Effect of low birthrate in 1920's and 1930's on number of recruits now available	5	2	6	2	15	2
Decline of altruism	2	5	5	1	13	4
Economic confusion			3	2	5	

[1] No opinion offered.
[2] No opinion.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that my distinguished colleagues in both Houses will find the survey of opinion on the shortage of nursing personnel and possible methods to move constructively to increase it will be of use not only to the membership but also to all who are working to meet the problem head on and do something constructive to solve it.

A FREE PRESS AND ITS VALUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article by Clark Mollenhoff.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as our distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. BOW], who is now presiding in the chair, fully realizes, while the Constitution guarantees a free press, and much is said and written in praise thereof, all too few realize the power of the press when a moral issue confronts the public.

All too often, when a vitally controversial issue arises, the people, inherently honest and desirous of fair play, have no accurate source of information other than the press, which will enable them to make a sound, just decision.

Almost invariably, when a fundamental issue arises and the people realize that a decision affecting their own welfare must be made, they turn to the press. They turn to the reporters, the columnists, and the editors, who, experience convinces them, are—in the case of reporters, factual; in the case of columnists and editors, sound, constructive thinkers and writers—rather than to reporters—and they are few in number—who tend to give a sensational twist to their news stories; rather than to columnists and editors who follow some party or political line—whose effusions almost always, no matter what subject is treated, tend to support their own political philosophy, or perhaps more accurately, opinions.

Those familiar with the facts have long realized that millions upon millions of dollars paid by employers to health and welfare funds, and a large portion of which otherwise would have reached the worker in increased wages, have either through mismanagement or extortion been diverted to the pockets of a comparatively few racketeers and their friends.

For many months I labored earnestly to present the picture to the public and, notwithstanding the determined opposition of a majority of the members of the Committee on Government Operations, did succeed in having a special subcommittee of that committee, which I appointed, join a similar subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, hold hearings at Detroit and Kansas City.

Then the Committee on Government Operations cut off my authority, but a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, beginning on the 23d of November, last, held a few days' hearings at Detroit.

Those hearings but gave publicity to facts, many of which were known to reporters who, in behalf of their papers, make a specialty of exposing situations which threaten the welfare of the citizens. The reporters wrote factual statements, the editors called attention to the moral issue involved, and the President in his message on labor-management relations stressed the necessity of hearings similar to those which had been held at my suggestion.

The story of the real impact of labor racketeering is finally being told in a nationally circulated publication and in such a manner that the people will understand what Congress is doing and is not doing on this issue.

Permit me to call your attention to the story, "How Labor Bosses Get Rich," in the current, March 9, issue of Look magazine, written by Clark Mollenhoff, an accurate reporter of current events, whose ability, integrity, and experience justify one's reliance upon his statements and conclusions.

Some of my colleagues may have been too busy to read the hearings or to glance at the reports, but if they are to fulfill their duty, they may well find time to read Mollenhoff's comment on this problem in Look.

Over the opposition of some of my colleagues, I have consistently sought to expose these rackets and have taken the position that it is the union member who is the real loser when crooked labor leaders take over negotiations. That point is effectively made in the article. Clark Mollenhoff's story is so clear, accurate, and instructive as to justify its insertion here. It is as follows:

HOW LABOR BOSSES GET RICH—LOCAL LABOR CZARS ACROSS THE COUNTRY ARE SHAKING DOWN EMPLOYERS AND JUGGLING THEIR UNIONS' FUNDS IN A RACKET FEW PUBLIC OFFICIALS DARE TRY TO STOP

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

Racketeering bosses of local unions are enriching themselves, or at least their relatives and friends, in a rash of shady deals uncovered recently across the country.

They are playing loosely with the millions of dollars in union funds they control. And they are dabbling in a sea of sideline enterprises that overlap their union responsibilities in such a way that the worker is the loser. Musclemen, blackmail, and murder dot the trail of the unscrupulous local labor boss who uses his respectable union as a cynical front for private plunder.

He is so strongly entrenched that national labor leaders either won't or can't get rid of him. Even local and State enforcement officials for the most part have abdicated to him. And neither major political party has dared to undertake a major investigation of him.

The whole story is being muted by labor pressures on Members of Congress. But a shocking insight into the racketeering operations of many local labor bosses has come from two congressional subcommittees.

Fighting against odds, they have laid bare part of the record of extortion, bribery, and ruthless use of union funds for private gain. The investigations of Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, Republican, Michigan, and the late Senator Charles Tobey, Republican, New Hampshire, have revealed the same ugly story in New York, New Orleans, Los Angeles, St. Louis, Kansas City, Minneapolis, Detroit, and Chicago.

THE LABOR SHAKEDOWN SKYROCKETS THE PRICES OF GOODS EVERYBODY NEEDS

The big labor shakedown, they found, soaks employers, swells defense costs and skyrockets the prices of goods and services everybody needs—with the ordinary union member the biggest victim of all.

Take the case of Joseph (Joe the Gent) Giantomasi, a notorious Newark, N. J., racketeer. E. Treverton Clark, the vice president of a stevedoring company, testified that Giantomasi took a $500 bribe from him to avert a threatened dispute. Giantomasi was business agent for two longshoremen's locals and was in a position to tie up the company's operations. Clark also told Senators that Giantomasi later tried to shake him down for $20,000, but that he refused to pay it.

Wages, hours, and working conditions for union members were unimportant in feuds between jukebox owners and William E. Bufalino, head of Local 985 of the Teamsters Union in Detroit. Congressional investigators heard testimony that Bufalino used his power as head of the union to enforce dictatorial control over the lucrative jukebox industry. Some employers said they were even forced to join the union in order to avoid bombings and other terror tactics that beset their "locations."

In Kansas City, Robert D. Sheehan, a pipeline-construction official, testified that he had to make money payments and buy clothing for several union officials to keep labor peace on construction projects. His statement, denied by the accused, was one of many charging union officials with soliciting or accepting bribes.

THE BLUES IN ST. LOUIS

And in St. Louis, Federal grand jury indictments charged 17 labor chiefs in that area with getting several hundred thousand dollars in shakedowns of construction company officials. Union members' earnings dropped as physical violence, work stoppages, and jurisdictional disputes set the stage, it was charged, for shakedowns of as much as $50,000 at a time.

Another way of operating has emerged in New Orleans. There, it was found that a 5-percent cut was being taken out of the take-home pay of every member of Local 1419 of the International Longshoremen's Association for union dues.

The initiation fee for joining Local 1419 is $200—as much as it would cost to join a good golf and country club. But the 5 percent cut the union has taken out of each member's pay is where the really big money has come in. Workingmen have been nicked by the local for a total of more than $1 million in 4 years. The money has poured into a fund that the high-living president of the local, Dave A. Dennis, has been investing in various union enterprises. Local authorities recently started an investigation of the enterprises.

Accountants warned Dennis that the accounting system used was inadequate, but he told congressional investigators that it would take too much time and money to install a better system. The union books showed that the 5 percent dues brought in a total of $335,000 in 1952. Congressional investigators, figuring from employers' payrolls, said the union books should have showed $404,000 in that year. Over a period of 4 years, the investigators reported, the discrepancy between employers' payrolls and the union books indicated that approximately $287,000 in dues was not accounted for. Dennis maintained that the investigators erroneously included in their computations the salaries of many nonunion workers who were not subject to the 5 percent levy.

Dennis was borrowing money for living expenses in 1948 before becoming president of local 1419; but by the time congressional investigators caught up with him, he had acquired real-estate holdings and was dabbling in other side businesses. One enterprise he set up was the Monarch Investigating Agency, which was hired on 1 or 2 occasions to work for his own local 1419.

According to his own testimony, Dennis furthered his personal interests by borrowing thousands of dollars belonging to the union without the knowledge or authorization of the members. Following the congressional investigation, an information was filed against Dennis charging him with misusing union funds.

Abuse of the workingman by labor czars was brought down to a system on the New York-New Jersey waterfront. That system—now barred under rules of the recently established New York-New Jersey Waterfront Commission—was the notorious shapeup under which all-powerful hiring bosses each day chose enough men for the day's work.

RYAN DID NOT OUST GANGSTERS IN THE ILA

Congressional hearings laid bare almost every conceivable type of labor racket on the bi-state waterfront. It was a condition that was choking off commerce in one of the world's greatest harbors, thus reducing the jobs available to union members. Shipping-company owners and stevedoring-company officials made cash deals with ILA officials that left union members with no representation.

The Senate subcommittee that made the investigation blamed much of the trouble on Joseph P. Ryan, who had been president of the ILA since 1927. He is under a multiple-count indictment for misapplication of his union's funds, but his major offense, as far as investigators were concerned, was his resistance to changing the corrupt shapeup and ousting of gangsters from union office.

One of the most notorious hoodlums among Ryan's top aides was Edward J. Florio, who served as an organizer from 1948 until 1952, when he was arrested and convicted on two perjury counts. Now serving a 3-year prison term, Florio got a 10 percent cut in a public loading operation on the docks while he was acting as business agent for the ILA.

The danger of union members being sold out by conspiratorial deals between employers and corrupt labor bosses has been recognized as long as labor unions have been operating. The advent of new fringe benefits, like health and welfare insurance, now has created new problems and what congressional investigators call new scandals.

In Minneapolis, Eugene Williams, a business agent for Local 544 of the Teamsters Union, was made administrator of the Transfer and Warehouse employees' pension fund and got a 7 percent cut of the fund for his troubles. He arranged a $10,000 advance through the union pension fund to finance a night club and bar. He also borrowed $1,800 in cash from the union office safe to help finance his bar. Williams says he repaid these sums to the union.

A classic example of the problem of controlling insurance placement and the resulting huge commissions has been found in the dealings between labor leaders and the Union Casualty & Life Insurance Co., of Mount Vernon, N. Y.

HE KNEW THE RIGHT PEOPLE

Dr. Leo Perlman, executive vice president of the company, was quick to see the advantages of cultivating such powerful labor bosses as James R. Hoffa, the Michigan Teamsters boss; Owen Bert Brennan, his top aide; Paul (Red) Dorfman, head of the Waste Material Handlers, local 20467 in Chicago, and Frank Darling, head of local 1031 of the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in Chicago.

Dr. Perlman guided Union Casualty & Life to a spectacular rise in a brief 4 year period. Union health and welfare insurance provided the impetus. A House committee investigative report said that the direct premium payments jumped from $1,460,000 in 1948 to an astounding $8,900,000 in 1952 and that nearly 77 percent of the 1952 premiums came from 3 big union insurance coups:

1. Health and welfare insurance covering more than half of the 35,000 to 37,000 workers in Darling's local 1031 in Chicago.

2. The health and welfare insurance of the Central States Conference of Teamsters, of which Hoffa is chairman. Hoffa is also trustee of the central states conference welfare fund, which deals directly with the insurance-placement problem.

3. The health and welfare insurance of the Michigan Conference of Teamsters, of which Hoffa is president.

Perlman, a 56-year-old immigrant, cleaned up more than $400,000 from 1948 through 1951 through Union Casualty & Life and the United Public Service Corp., also of Mount Vernon, N. Y. The latter concern, a general insurance management agency which he also headed, obtained the insurance for the former.

But the huge profits Perlman received were only the beginning. In 1949, the Union Insurance Agency of Illinois, in Chicago, came into being as an agent for Union Casualty & Life. It was a partnership operated by the wife and son of Dorfman, who is a labor chief with influential contacts spread far outside his Waste Handlers Union.

Allen Dorfman, 30, and his mother, Rose Dorfman, were immediately successful. Between 1949 and June 1953, investigators reported, the Union Insurance Agency of Illinois received over a million dollars in commissions, expenses, and allowances from Union Casualty & Life and the United Public Service Corp.

Congressional investigators turned up another fact. During the first 2 policy years, Hoffa's Central States welfare fund received premium refunds of $256,000. No refund was made in the third year. The fund's trustees, it was also found, agreed with Union Casualty & Life to reduce the insurance benefits to employees and their dependents. An unsatisfactory loss experience had created a drain on the insurance company, it was explained.

Meanwhile, the insurance executives wined and dined Teamster Chief Hoffa and even went into a number of joint business ventures with him that proved profitable. Hoffa said he received no money for swinging the insurance to the Dorfmans and Perlman, but he insisted on his right to draw a normal profit from joint business enterprises with these same people.

It wasn't his contacts in the insurance business that first propelled Hoffa into outside business enterprises. In fact, he's had so many little business operations going on that he has had difficulty remembering what precisely some of them were for. Here, however, are some that have come to light:

Hoffa and his aide Brennan became stockholders in the Terminal Realty Co. without putting up a dime. Oren DeMaas, former liquor commissioner of Michigan, put up $25,000 for them, and held their share of the stock as security for the loan, Hoffa has testified.

HE WAS A BUSY MAN

He got into a brewery operation with attorneys George Fitzgerald, former Democratic national committeemen from Michigan, and Carney Matheson, legal representative for large midwestern trucking interests. He testified he lost $20,000 on the venture and invested no more in it.

Hoffa also set up what he called a little syndicate known as P. M. I. to loan money. And a few years ago he had a one-sixteenth or a one thirty-second interest in the Columbus Trotting Association.

Hoffa's wife, too, has been in business. She held a one-third interest in the Theater Trucking Co. in her maiden name. With Brennan's wife, she operated the Test Fleet Corp., a haulaway firm leasing equipment to big commercial-trucking firms. Over a 4-year period, they have collected $65,000 in dividends.

In his insurance activities, Hoffa today has moved his Michigan Conference of Teamsters' welfare fund into a position where it could gain substantial control of the management of the Union Casualty and Life. In June 1951 the fund's trustees put $250,000 in the company's preferred stock. This made the fund the largest holder of preferred stock. With the payment of another $40 a share, the stock can be converted into common stock with voting privileges.

Congressional investigators have pointed out the problem involved when union ownership in an insurance company is such that union officials have an interest in curbing the claim rate of members of other unions insured by the company. But it took an eruption in New York to demonstrate how much of a menace the health and welfare insurance problem could be.

THE RACKETS ARE LUCRATIVE ENOUGH FOR MURDER

A long-time feud over representing workers at Yonkers Raceway, north of New York, ended last August 20 with the murder of Thomas E. Lewis, president of local 32–E, Building Service Employees.

It wasn't clear until after Lewis was murdered just why the presidency of that local union could be such an important piece of property. The investigation showed that the welfare funds of the union were handled through Alcor Agency, Inc. Labor Boss Lewis, his relatives, business associates and friends had used that agency to drain off more than $400,000 of the $1,479,000 contributed in a 5-year period, the investigation showed. Those commissions were more than double the normal administrative costs, and the State insurance department started a broad investigation of insurance firms that handle welfare policies for labor touching off in turn more insurance scandals.

The murder of Lewis and the insurance scandals were not the only labor-racketeering operations on the edge of the multimillion-dollar harness-racing business.

Indictments returned by a Nassau County, N. Y., grand jury have spelled out the basic story of plunder by labor bosses and their associates. William C. DeKoning, Nassau County labor leader, and 12 others were indicted for an alleged extortion of $345,000 in kickbacks from employees at Roosevelt Raceway. It was also disclosed that the labor leader was sharing in 10 percent of the profits of a catering firm operating at the raceway.

It has taken the probing of two congressional committees to prove that labor racketeering is more widespread than the few cases the Nation's prosecutors have had the courage to tackle. The late Senator Tobey, the righteous New Hampshire Republican, was the driving force behind Senate labor-racket investigations on the waterfront in New York, New Jersey, and New Orleans. When Tobey died, Senator JOHN BRICKER (Republican, Ohio) dissolved the subcommittee, and other labor rackets uncovered by Chief Counsel Downey Rice had no airing.

CONGRESSMEN WERE NOT HAPPY

The most tenacious of the labor-racket investigators has been Representative HOFFMAN, the sharp-tongued Michigan Republican. HOFFMAN and Representative WINT SMITH, a Kansas Republican, have been the

mainsprings behind House investigations that have touched labor racketeering in Detroit, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Minneapolis.

Even many House Republicans were fearful of the political consequences of a labor-racket investigation when HOFFMAN put the first congressional spotlight on the plunder of labor bosses. Republicans joined with Democrats to hobble HOFFMAN'S investigating, but the aggressive Congressman continued his work. Although they had no power to hold hearings, Chief Counsel William McKenna, Assistant Counsel Clyde Smith and Chief Investigator Les Condon produced enough evidence for HOFFMAN to force hearings.

HOFFMAN'S investigators exposed the close tieup between Bufalino, head of Teamsters Local 985 in Detroit, and the jukebox owners association which was dominated by Vincent Meli, Bufalino's brother-in-law.

Following the hearings, Bufalino, Meli, and five others were indicted by a Wayne County grand jury on charges that they used threats of physical violence and bombings to prey on jukebox operators, restaurant, tavern, and bar operators, owners of automobile wash racks and parking-lot operators.

A few days later, five more teamsters officials from the Detroit area were indicted on charges of milking construction firms of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Frank Fitzsimmons, vice president of Teamsters Local 299, and Daniel J. Keating, president and business agent of local 614, Pontiac, Mich., were among the five indicted.

POWER CAN CORRUPT

Congressional hearings in Kansas City were followed by indictment of Orville L. Ring, president and business agent of Teamsters Local 541, on 2 charges of embezzlement and 2 counts of second-degree robbery. Four others were also indicted in connection with violence, extortion, and misuse of funds in the Kansas City area.

The right to represent labor can mean big money. The wages and working conditions of the ordinary union member are only a handy tool when racketeering labor bosses seek to fatten their purses. The underworld has been quick to see the chance for big profit in the economic and political positions labor czars are able to control.

Some rank-and-file members of local unions tried to break the stranglehold, and were declared ineligible to hold office. Some were summarily ousted from their union and deprived of the right to work in the only trade they know.

Employers find it to their immediate advantage to let the labor boss have his way when he insists that a dishonest employee be retained, or that insurance or pension funds be used in a certain manner.

The Taft-Hartley Act and the rules of the unions themselves were designed to stop some of the sidelines of plunder, but the act is often inadequate or it is improperly enforced by the politicians who fear the labor bosses.

Although there were substantial numbers of indictments in the wake of congressional hearings, prosecutions alone are not the solution. All of the plunder has not been illegal.

It is up to Congress to expose fully what has happened under the present laws, and to draft new laws that preserve the institution of organized labor and provide democratic processes that will protect the interests of labor-union members in the future.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. WHARTON.

Mr. FORD.

Mr. DAGUE.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky and include an article from the New York Times of September 11, 1953, honoring Lt. Gen. Raymond Robert Wheeler.

Mr. ENGLE.

Mr. LANTAFF and to include a copy of a bill he introduced today and editorials.

Mr. KEATING to extend his remarks in tribute to General Wheeler following the remarks of Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. HALLECK).

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in three instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. METCALF and to include additional matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include additional matter.

Mr. MCMILLAN and to include an item from the Claxton Enterprise, Claxton, Ga.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KRUEGER, indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. THORNBERRY, for 1 day, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, March 1, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1302. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 in the amount of $15,000 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 336); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1303. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the 10th Quarterly Report of the Federal Civil Defense Administration on the contributions program for the quarter ending December 31, 1953, pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1304. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report pertaining to all reservations made regarding appropriations lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects, pursuant to section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 858); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1305. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued publication entitled "Federal Power Commission Reports, Volume 10"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1306. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, relative to requesting advice as to the action taken with respect to certain cases involving a list of names containing names of natives of Mexico and adjacent islands where there is an American citizen or legally resident alien spouse or minor child or children whose cases were rejected by the 2d session of the 82d Congress, pursuant to section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1307. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 14, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination and survey of Cubitt Creek, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5183. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CLEVENGER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6067. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 450. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 355, a joint resolution amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 1243). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1244. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1245. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 400. Resolution providing funds for the operation of the Committee on Un-American Activities; with amendment (Rept. No. 1246). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2111. An act to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each

day in Flag House Square, Baltimore, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1247). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4721. A bill to provide that the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to lands in the Owl Creek unit of the Missouri Basin project; without amendment (Rept. No. 1248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6154. A bill to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Fort Peck Tribe; with amendment (Rept. No. 1249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 113 pertaining to the Arab refugees and other problems in the Near East; without amendment (Rept. No. 1250). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MERROW: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 113 pertaining to the special study mission on international organizations and movements; without amendment (Rept. No. 1251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6052. A bill to readjust postal rates, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 419. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by clause 8 of rule XI, incurred by the Public Accounts Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations; with amendment (Rept. No. 1253). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 438. Resolution to amend House Resolution 346 so as to provide for an investigation and study of the subversion and destruction of free institutions and human liberties in certain areas controlled, directly or indirectly, by world communism, including the treatment of the peoples in such areas; with amendment (Rept. No. 1255). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 827. An act for the relief of Matthew J. Berckman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2634. A bill for the relief of Charles T. Douds; with amendment (Rept. No. 1228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2636. A bill for the relief of George Japhet; without amendment (Rept. No. 1229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2666. A bill for the relief of Martin G. Scott and Hanna von Gusmann; without amendment (Rept. No. 1230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4699. A bill for the relief of Robert F. Suczek; without amendment (Rept. No. 1231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4735. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Richard Orme Flinn, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4996. A bill for the relief of Col. Henry M. Denning, and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 1233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5765. A bill for the relief of Henry C. Bush and other Foreign Service officers; with amendment (Rept. No. 1234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6020. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Francis Nicholson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6477. A bill for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6594. A bill for the relief of Livio Brianesco; without amendment (Rept. No. 1237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7407. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt; with amendment (Rept. No. 1238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5772. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Leibbrand; without amendment (Rept. No. 1239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONES of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 502. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand; without amendment (Rept. No. 1240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1325. A bill for the relief of George L. F. Allen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 8067. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 8068. A bill relating to clerk hire and postage allowance of, and telephone and telegraph service for, Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 8069. A bill to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Passed the House of Representatives.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 8070. A bill to provide for the payment of uniform allowances to certain Naval Reserve officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 8071. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow the taxpayer to deduct from gross income, as a nontrade or nonbusiness expense, the cost of providing care for certain dependents if such care is required because the taxpayer is gainfully employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 8072. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 8073. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to provide that the transfer of an employee from one shift to another shall in certain cases be deemed to be a reduction in his rank or compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 8074. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of streams emptying into Coos Bay, Oreg., for flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 8075. A bill granting to persons in the classified (competitive) civil service the right to a hearing before removal or suspension, and the right to a judicial review of a removal or suspension; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 8076. A bill to make available to Korean prisoners of war certain benefits of the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 8077. A bill to provide for the distribution of certain surplus commodities to needy persons in the United States, by use of a stamp plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 8078. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 8079. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide old-age insurance benefits for certain permanently and totally disabled individuals under the age of 65, to provide that no deductions from benefits shall be made on account of outside earnings, and to extend coverage on a voluntary basis to certain ministers, teachers, and other professional persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 8080. A bill to provide for the creation of two additional permanent circuit judgeships and one temporary circuit judgeship for the ninth circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 8081. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 8082. A bill to provide for exclusion from the mails of mail violating certain State laws dealing with improper solicitations of contributions by charitable organizations and to forbid the payment of money orders therefor; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 8083. A bill to provide for public accountability by tax-exempt organizations, and other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 8084. A bill to provide for the reinstatement or reissuance of national service life insurance in cases where certain veterans suffering from service-connected

blindness have allowed their insurance to lapse or expire; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 8085. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 8086. A bill to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States, as a gift from the Republic of Chile, of a memorial to Gen. Bernardo O'Higgins, and for the erection of such memorial; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 8087. A bill to eliminate farm tractor fuel and certain other liquids from the manufacturers' excise tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 8088. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8089. A bill authorizing the creation of a Federal memorial commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 8090. A bill to promote the agriculture of the United States by acquiring and diffusing useful information regarding agriculture in foreign countries and the marketing of American agricultural commodities and the products thereof, outside of the United States; to authorize the creation of an Agricultural Foreign Service in the Department of Agriculture; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 8091. A bill to prohibit the payment of Government retirement benefits to persons convicted of certain offenses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 8092. A bill to facilitate the entry of Philippine traders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 8093. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 8094. A bill providing loans for the cost of improving the distribution system of the Salt River reclamation project, Arizona, for the purpose of conserving water resources and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 8095. A bill to expand and extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 8096. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct a bridge over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Roaches Run, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 8097. A bill to authorize the financing of a program of public works construction for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 8098. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 8099. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 8100. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to provide for the sale of surplus feed grains to farmers for feeding purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 8101. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. J. Res. 451. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal memorial commission to formulate plans for construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 452. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal memorial commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. J. Res. 453. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal memorial commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. J. Res. 454. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the settlement of Panna Maria, Tex.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 452. Resolution that it is the sense of the Congress that the Chinese Communists are not entitled to and should not be recognized to represent China at the Geneva meeting on April 26, 1954; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to continue Federal grants to State relief programs for the aged and to preserve the Federal social-security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the United States Post Office Department to issue a commemorative stamp on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the founding of Fort Cumberland; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 8102. A bill for the relief of Clarence Maxwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 8103. A bill for the relief of Montgomery Elevator Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 8104. A bill for the relief of Lucette Helene Adams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 8105. A bill for the relief of John (Jean) C. Athanassiades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 8106. A bill for the relief of Vida Kosnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 8107. A bill for the relief of Blanka Goldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 8108. A bill for the relief of Sister Filomina Luigina DiMartino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 8109. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helene Kelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 8110. A bill for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 8111. A bill for the relief of Americo Discepolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 8112. A bill for the relief of Chrisavge Christodoulopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 8113. A bill for the relief of Maria Koutra Prieto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Mr. STEED:

H. R. 8114. A bill for the relief of Jean Charles Ruf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 8115. A bill for the relief of Tannous Estephan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

530. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert F. Lavato, Pala Reservation, San Diego County, Calif., submitting comments and revisions to the bills H. R. 7322 and S. 2749; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

531. Also, petition of the chairman, Napa Post Office Employees Association, Napa, Calif., relative to H. R. 2344, providing for a salary adjustment for post office employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

532. Also, petition of Melba M. Cline and others, Dunlap, Ill., urging revision of the present 15- and 25-percent rates on Federal excise tax on telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

533. Also, petition of the chairman, Lithuanian Americans, Maspeth, N. Y., pledging support to the Government of the United States in its efforts to secure peace and stability in the world, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Tragedy of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. UPTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. UPTON. Mr. President, this week we commemorate the birth of George Washington, who led the American Colonies in their successful struggle for freedom. In contrast with the freedom which we enjoy is the serfdom of the peoples of central and eastern Europe under Communist rule imposed on them by the Soviet Union.

The fate of the Baltic States is a grim reminder of the perfidy of the Soviet Union. In 1939, these three little republics were forced by the Soviet Union to sign pacts of mutual assistance with the Kremlin. Under the guise of assistance, Soviet troops were lodged in these states, and were used to overthrow the existing free governments. Typical of the tragedy of these three states is that of the Republic of Lithuania. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement prepared by me concerning the tragic fate of the Lithuanian people under Communist rule.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRAGEDY OF LITHUANIA

February 16, 1954, marked the 36th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania. Ordinarily, such an event would be an occasion for celebration among Americans of Lithuanian descent and for an expression of friendly greetings from our Republic to the Republic of Lithuania. But such is not the case. The Republic of Lithuania, along with her neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, is dead—a victim of the ruthless Communist regime which crushed Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, East Germany, and China. Freedom died in these lands with terrible consequences for the people there, and for the civilized world.

Our Government extended diplomatic recognition to Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia on July 28, 1922. Three years earlier these little nations had declared themselves independent of Russia, an independence which Russia acknowledged in 1920. Although these events marked the beginning of the modern Lithuanian Republic, the history of the Lithuanian nation has been long and full of accomplishment.

The known history of the Lithuanian people extends back a thousand years. Only last year we observed the celebration of 1,000 years of Lithuanian nationality. Here in Washington at the Hotel Statler, a distinguished group of our Nation's leaders were the guests of a large gathering of Americans of Lithuanian extraction. The assembly paid honor to the cultural and political achievements of the Lithuanian people.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, in a statement before the Select Committee of the House To Investigate the Seizure and Forced Incorporation of the Baltic Republics by the Soviet Union, summed up the accomplishments of the Republic of Lithuania in this way:

"For two decades the Baltic republics showed the good fruits of freedom. Their creative accomplishments were impressive. Their natural resources were meager. But the peoples were skilled in agriculture and by their hard work they achieved a good measure of economic well-being. National arts and crafts flourished. They established a high standard of social justice and won worldwide respect as exemplary members of the family of nations. Their spiritual and moral strength, their love of liberty, their energy, and their self-discipline showed that they possessed those qualities which, more than mere numbers, area, or wealth, make for national worth."

Modern Lithuania is a small nation, but the contributions to freedom and the sacrifices for freedom which the Lithuanian people have made over the centuries are disproportionally large. Lithuania has been a free, independent state since the 11th century. At crucial times in the history of western civilization they have borne the brunt of invasions from the steppes of Asia. In 1326 the Mongol hordes swept westward from behind the Ural Mountains. They were stopped short of the heart of Europe by the Grand Duke Algirdas of Lithuania. We should also remember that, in our own time, the people of Lithuania were the first to defy Kremlin rule.

The suffering of the Lithuanian people and their Baltic neighbors at the hands of the Communists is a story of unparalleled horror. This story is now being unfolded before a committee of the House of Representatives. It is a true story, told by survivors who witnessed these things and somehow managed to escape. The details of these atrocities should be known to the free, civilized world. Let me list a few:

Proveniskes: Where several hundred peasants were murdered by the Soviet Army in 1940.

Cervene: Where 6,000 political prisoners were machinegunned by the NKVD. After the machinegunning, these martyrs were run over by Red army tanks. Only 20 survived, 6 of whom have testified before the House committee.

Panevezys: Where Lithuanian medical doctors were murdered.

Telsiai: Where the Communist police executed 100 Lithuanian Boy Scouts.

The free world owes a great debt to these Lithuanian heroes, and others like them behind the Iron Curtain. We must do all that we can to give them aid and comfort in their fight for freedom. It is, after all, our fight that they wage against incredible odds. The very least we can do is to make their sacrifices known.

We look forward to a future when free men, everywhere, can once more pursue their individual destines in freedom and dignity. This national administration is not content to silently acquiesce to the enslavement of nations like Lithuania. Secretary Dulles, on November 30, 1953, made this statement of policy:

"The captive peoples should know that they are not forgotten, that we are not reconciled to their fate, and, above all, that we are not prepared to seek illusory safety for ourselves by a bargain with their masters which would confirm their captivity."

The Soviet record in Lithuania is one of treachery, deceit, and brutality. It is a terrible example of Communist depravity. The resistance of the Lithuanians and the other Baltic people, on the other hand, is an inspiring memorial to the vitality of free institutions and to man's desire to live free.

Charlotte, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as several Members, interested in having the proposed Air Academy located in their home regions, have called attention in speeches here to the attractions they see in their respective areas, I feel that it is appropriate that I point out the merits of Charlotte, N. C. The record will show that a site near Charlotte was one of the finalists in the list of proposed locations considered by the Air Academy Site Selection Board in 1951.

If Charlotte could qualify as one of the top 7 locations in the country 2 years ago, it should even be higher on the list today, for this area, which I know intimately, continues its amazing growth and progress with each passing year.

What the 1951 Site Selection Board found noteworthy about Charlotte as a prospective site for the Air Academy were two attractions that cannot be duplicated anywhere in the country—an ideal climate which produces the desirable atmospheric conditions for flight training and a location superbly suited for an educational institution.

Charlotte's climate is unparalleled anywhere—not extreme in any season but with enough variety to offer flying experience under changing conditions such as an airman will undoubtedly face in combat. During the past year, the major commercial airline serving Charlotte was obliged to cancel only 18 flights, some on the same day, in or out of the city because of weather conditions.

I shall not quote Charlotte's mean temperature for a year since it is the extremes that bother people. I do wish to point out that in the winter there is little fog and, although it may freeze during the night, the ice seldom lasts until noon. In summer it gets hot—and where does it not get hot during the summer except in the mountains where serious drawbacks to air training exist—but Charlotte is close enough to the hills to be blessed with cooling breezes.

The site Charlotte offers for the Air Academy lies along an inland lake large enough for use by amphibious aircraft. From this location the Charlotte airport, only a few miles away, is easily accessible over excellent highways. But enough acreage is available at the proposed site for the Air Academy to build its own field if desired.

The location is approximately 200 miles from the ocean and about 100 miles from the crest of the Blue Ridge Mountains. While this section of our State is growing rapidly, neither the land nor the air is congested and there are no

nearby major targets to attract an attacking enemy.

The site at Charlotte is one of great natural beauty. The gently rolling, wooded terrain would form a perfect setting for a beautiful campus. Beauty of setting is recognized—ask West Point and Annapolis men—as a strong psychological factor in the education of young men who follow a strict curriculum which emphasizes not merely technical skill but strength of character, esprit de corps, faith and pride in country.

Annapolis, West Point, and Washington are only short flights away from Charlotte by an air route that crosses no mountain chain. Flight time from Washington to Charlotte is little more than 1 hour.

Nearby Davidson College, a renowned Presbyterian college for men, and Queens College for women, give Charlotte an academic atmosphere and will provide an opportunity for the cadets to have social intercourse with college students, both men and women, of their own age.

Charlotte is said to contain a higher percentage of church-going population than any major city in the United States. Whether this is true or not, I can certainly testify that it is unexcelled anywhere in its cultural, civic and religious life.

I believe Charlotte is exceptionally favored in the number of features the Air Force can be expected to specify as most desirable for the Academy. A detailed analysis of these features would be out of place here even if time and space permitted their listing. Some of them will be presented to the Site Selection Board in brochure form.

All I have attempted in this brief statement is simply to call attention to the fact that we who reside in the Charlotte area sincerely believe that we have the best possible location for the Air Academy in the entire country and we urge that our claims be carefully considered before a final selection is made.

Farm Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, I am quoting from today's press when I say that the Eisenhower administration's greatest domestic problem is farm surpluses. Even economically sound proposals to increase agricultural production are sheer foolishness under present conditions. Like the weather everyone in recent years has talked about our surpluses but little has been accomplished and many feel that it is high time that Congress take action.

I am today introducing a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for the sale of surplus feed grains to farmers for feeding purposes. To forestall grain speculation, penalties are provided. The Secretary will have discretionary powers as to the quantity to be disposed of and with the sole provision that the price shall not exceed $1 per bushel.

It is anticipated that such action will particularly and in the first instance benefit the dairy farmers of the entire country whose price support has been recently reduced to 75 percent while his feed grains remain at 90 percent of parity. These farmers use large quantities of wheat, corn, and other surplus grains in their rations which can be processed and blended in their immediate localities. Their feed bills frequently represent one-third of the total cost of their production so this is an important item to them and to the ultimate consumer of milk and other dairy products who will benefit through lower retail prices. In due course the price of beef, pork, and all retail meat prices will also reflect their decreased costs.

I am reliably informed that practically all of the large milk companies have plans which would reduce their cost of distributing milk to the consumer but they are satisfied with their present margin of profit and their plans are just gathering dust on the shelf. For instance in Akron, Ohio, one large distributor retails milk at 16 cents per quart while the average price of home deliveries throughout the country is about 26 cents. There is no reason why consumers in other localities should not enjoy similar price benefits and it is high time that Congress shows an active interest in consumer prices as well as the vast sums of the taxpayers' money that are daily being expended to store surplus wheat and other grains. This bill deserves the prompt and serious consideration of all Members of Congress.

Thirty-sixth Anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1954, we celebrated the 36th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania Day.

I join with citizens of Lithuanian descent, and all other American citizens, in sending to the people of Lithuania our solemn rededication that we have not forgotten them and their desire for freedom.

At the moment Lithuania is behind the Iron Curtain. We know from past history, however, that her freedom-loving peoples cannot, and will not, endure forever the brutal chains of Soviet domination. The day of delivery is approaching. The nations of the free world have given their pledge that every effort will be made to unshackle all nations from diabolical Soviet control.

The evidence emanating from Lithuania is that under Russian Communist rule the people continue to carry the torch for lost liberties. The history of Lithuania is marked with bravery and heroism of the highest order. Hundreds have been killed by the Russians. With all this tragedy Lithuanians still persist in this year 1954, to fight and fight and fight.

This gallantry of character will not go unrewarded. God in His almighty wisdom will one day have an accounting. In the interim we exhort the people of Lithuania—stand firm. God bless you. America sends her friendship and sympathies.

A Fine Tribute to General Wheeler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR.
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I am very glad to extend as a part of these remarks an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of September 11, 1953, concerning one of our most distinguished Army engineers, Lt. Gen. Raymond Albert Wheeler. The editorial refers to General Wheeler's selection for the post of Chief of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees—a very difficult and important assignment of duty. Following this appointment, however, a serious illness of General Wheeler's wife prevented him from entering on the duties thus imposed, and he was obliged to remain in the United States, and was never able to undertake the refugee labors. Nevertheless, what is stated in the editorial constitutes a well-deserved tribute to him, and for that reason it is now and here used.

General Wheeler, a native of Illinois, graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1911, and among many engineering assignments which have come to him were three in the Canal Zone; the first of which followed upon his graduation from West Point; later he was Assistant Maintenance Engineer, 1927–30, of the Panama Canal; and finally, in 1940–41, was Engineer of Maintenance for the Panama Canal, and Vice President and Director of the Panama Railroad Company. In addition to his Panama Canal service he has discharged his duties as an Army engineer with distinction and ability, both at home and abroad.

His domestic assignments of duty included those of construction engineer on the Mississippi, Ohio, and Kanawha Rivers, 1911–12; district engineer, Newport, R. I., 1920; instructor of engineering, Infantry School, 1920–22; district engineer, Wilmington, N. C., 1930–33; also at Rock Island, Ill., 1933–35; Assistant Engineer Commissioner, Washington, D. C., 1922–26; regional engineer, WPA, Chicago, 1935–36; resident member, Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, Washington, D. C., 1937–40.

His foreign and overseas tours of duty—in addition to those in the Canal

Zone—included services with the Corps of Engineers in Mexico, 1914; in Hawaii, 1915–17; in Europe, 1917–19; the posts of United States Delegate, Permanent International Association Navigation Congresses, Brussels, Belgium, 1936; Chief, United States Military Mission to Iraq, Iran, and India, 1941–42; Commanding General Service of Supply, United States Army Forces in India, Burma, China, 1942; and, following October 1942, on the staff of Admiral Lord Mountbatten; following February 1944, Deputy Supreme Allied Commander, S. E. A. C.; and in June 1945 he was appointed commanding general, India-Burma theater.

Following these distinguished and varied engineering and administrative labors, in September 1945, General Wheeler was appointed Chief of Army Engineers, Army of the United States, with the rank of major general for a period of 4 years. In this important office he discharged the duties imposed with his accustomed ability. He became a lieutenant general in March 1944.

He now holds the important position of engineering adviser of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), in the National Capital.

The editorial follows:

A SPLENDID NOMINATION

It is hard to imagine a better choice of a man for a job than the nomination of Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler for the post of Chief of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees. The task of improving the lot of some 800,000 persons who are adrift as the result of the conflict in Palestine is monumental. It requires administrative skill, engineering knowledge and ability, diplomacy and tact, and a readiness to absorb the punishment of long and hard work.

Those qualities happen exactly to describe our distinguished former Chief of Army Engineers. He has shown all of them in the course of a career that contributed greatly to the honor of the services and to the objectives of our country. General Wheeler has always been a builder and he has built wisely in the human as well as the physical sense. In the case of this post he has another prime recommendation. He knows the Middle East and southern Asia at first hand. He knows the people with whom he will deal. And he can win their confidence, as he has done in the past. The United Nations has the chance to get the best man for one of its hardest jobs.

Tribute to Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague from Kentucky in the tribute which he has voiced to the outstanding services to our country of a distinguished general, Raymond A. Wheeler. During World War II, I had the honor of serving under this great leader of men, who was beloved for his personal qualities and admired for his outstanding abilities. So long as the Army continues to produce soldiers like General Wheeler, the military security of our country will remain strong.

General Wheeler has fortunately continued his public service as engineer-adviser with the World Bank. His services there have been invaluable, as I know those associated with him in the work of that important institution would attest.

H. R. 8068

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. LANTAFF
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks that I made on the floor today, I submit herewith a copy of H. R. 8068, providing increased clerk hire, postage, telephone, and telegraph allowances for Members of the House, two editorials from the Miami Herald, and a column by one of the most outstanding and respected columnists in south Florida, Bill Baggs, of the Miami Daily News:

A bill relating to clerk hire and postage allowance of, and telephone and telegraph service for, Members of the House of Representatives

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act relating to telephone and telegraph service and clerk hire for Members of the House of Representatives," approved June 23, 1949 (2 U. S. C., sec. 60g), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives shall be as follows:

"(1) At the rate of $13,125 per annum in the case of each Member from a district the population of which is less than 400,000;

"(2) At the rate of $13,750 per annum in the case of each Member from a district the population of which is 400,000 or more but less than 500,000;

"(3) At the rate of $14,375 per annum in the case of each Member from a district the population of which is 500,000 or more but less than 600,000;

"(4) At the rate of $15,000 per annum in the case of each Member from a district the population of which is 600,000 or more.

No person shall receive basic compensation from such clerk hire at a rate in excess of $5,000 per annum."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act of June 23, 1949 (2 U. S. C., sec. 46g), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) In the case of any Member of the House of Representatives other than the Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, the majority whip, and the minority whip, there shall be paid under the first section of this act—

"(1) Toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of the Member aggregating not more than 157½ minutes a month if such Member is from a district the population of which is less than 400,000, except that if such aggregate number of minutes is not used in any 1 month the balance may be used at any other time during the term of office of such Member in which such month occurs;

"(2) Toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of the Member aggregating not more than 165 minutes if such Member is from a district the population of which is 400,000 or more but less than 500,000, except that if such aggregate number of minutes is not used in any 1 month the balance may be used at any other time during the term of office of such Member in which such month occurs;

"(3) Toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of the Member aggregating not more than 172½ minutes a month if such Member is from a district the population of which is 500,000 or more but less than 600,000, except that if such aggregate number of minutes is not used in any 1 month the balance may be used at any other time during the term of office of such Member in which such month occurs;

"(4) Toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of the Member aggregating not more than 180 minutes a month if such Member is from a district the population of which is 600,000 or more, except that if such aggregate number of minutes is not used in any one month, the balance may be used at any other time during the term of office of such Member in which such month occurs.

"(b) In the case of any Member of the House of Representatives other than the Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, the majority whip, and the minority whip, there shall be paid under the first section of this act—

"(1) Charges on strictly official telegrams sent by or on behalf of the Member aggregating not more than 1,050 words a month if such Member is from a district the population of which is less than 400,000, except that if such aggregate number of words is not used in any one month, the balance may be used at any other time during the term of office of such Member in which such month occurs;

"(2) Charges on strictly official telegrams sent by or on behalf of the Member aggregating not more than 1,100 words a month if such Member is from a district the population of which is 400,000 or more but less than 500,000, except that if such aggregate number of words is not used in any one month, the balance may be used at any other time during the term of office of such Member in which such month occurs;

"(3) Charges on strictly official telegrams sent by or on behalf of the Member aggregating not more than 1,150 words a month if such Member is from a district the population of which is 500,000 or more but less than 600,000, except that if such aggregate number of words is not used in any one month the balance may be used at any other time during the term of office of such Member in which such month occurs;

"(4) Charges on strictly official telegrams sent by or on behalf of the Member aggregating not more than 1,200 words a month if such Member is from a district the population of which is 600,000 or more, except that if such aggregate number of words is not used in any one month the balance may be used at any other time during the term of office of such Member in which such month occurs."

SEC. 3. Section 6 of such Act of June 23, 1949 (2 U. S. C., sec. 461), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. As used in this act—

"(1) the term 'Member' or 'Member of the House of Representatives' includes a Representative in Congress, a Delegate from a Territory, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico;

"(2) the term 'district' includes a State in the case of a Member elected at large from such State, a Territory, and Puerto Rico."

SEC. 4. (a) The allowances of Members of the House of Representatives for each fiscal

year for the purchase of United States air-mail and special-delivery postage stamps shall be as follows:

(1) $131.25 in the case of each member from a district the population of which is less than 400,000:

(2) $137.50 in the case of each Member from a district the population of which is 400,000 or more but less than 500,000;

(3) $143.75 in the case of each Member from a district the population of which is 500,000 or more but less than 600,000;

(4) $150 in the case of each Member from a district the population of which is 600,000 or more.

Such allowances shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

(b) The tenth paragraph under the heading Contingent Expenses of the House in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1953, is amended by striking out "the amount allowed to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico for each fiscal year shall be $125 each and to standing committees $50 each;" and insert in lieu thereof "the amount allowed to standing committees for each fiscal year shall be $50 each;".

(c) As used in subsection (a) of this section—

(1) the term "Member" means a Representative in Congress, a Delegate from a Territory, or the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico;

(2) the term "Members of the House of Representatives" includes Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico;

(3) the term "district" includes a State in the case of a Member elected at large from such State, a Territory, and Puerto Rico.

SEC. 5. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1954.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald of January 18, 1954]

BETTER PAY FOR BETTER MEN

If Congress needed its backbone stiffened to vote itself adequate salaries, it can point to the recommendations just made by President Eisenhower's Salary Commission.

That 18-man Commission said Congressmen are grossly underpaid and should not hesitate to vote themselves a $12,500 pay raise to $27,500 a year.

At the same time it urged increases of $10,000 each for the Vice President and Speaker of the House and $12,500 to $14,500 yearly increases for overworked and poorly paid Federal judges.

The recommended increases are not out of line with what thoughtful students of government have long urged. The Commission said the net cost of $7,508,793 was a small price to pay for the advancement of the public interest which is served * * *.

It repeated the familiar argument that present low salaries not only drive competent officials into private employment but tend more and more to restrict the positions to persons of independent wealth or outside earnings.

This was one of the major points emphasized by the American Bar Association in a formal statement by the Senate Judiciary committee last April 14.

Urging a salary scale "at once dignified and bearing some measure of decent relationship" to their responsibilities, the association said:

"To do otherwise is to make the Congress open only to the wealthy few and thus to do disservice to the constitutional intendment and to strike a blow at the foundation of representative government. Economy in this sense is both false and dangerous . . . to hazard it at the sacrifice of ability without purse is to pay lip service to the democratic ideal and to reward with a pittance men to whom we have committed our purse, the general regulation of our Federal policy, our relationships with other nations, and, all too often, fateful issue of peace or war."

At those hearings many members of Congress testified their present pay was not big enough to cover the cost of maintaining two homes, the expense of frequent campaigning, and the variety of social expense incidental to their office.

It was for precisely these reasons that Congressman WILLIAM LANTAFF of Miami recently announced he would return to private law practice.

Like others without an outside income, he found the constant worry over financial problems distracting and enervating to a point where it interfered with his efficiency as a legislator.

Actually, a salary increase for our legislators is long overdue.

Congress has not had a raise since 1946 when it increased salaries from $10,000 to $15,000.

Inflation and taxes, however, have more than canceled out the increases, leaving them poorer than before the war.

We believe no thoughtful person will quarrel with them if they follow the Salary Commission's recommendations to the letter.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald of January 5, 1954]

AS WE SEE IT—CONGRESS HAS A SALARY PROBLEM

Congress has long had its eye on a pay raise but has been reluctant to take responsibility for hiking its own.

Yet the evidence brought out at hearings of the Senate Judiciary Committee shows that our Representatives are worse off today with their $15,000 than they were in 1939 when they received $10,000 a year.

There is almost unanimous agreement that they must be given some financial relief or we will see more announcements like the one just made by Miami's Representative BILL LANTAFF.

LANTAFF said bluntly that the financial hardships of serving, of maintaining two homes and of trying to conduct both public and private business were forcing him out of Congress. He will not seek reelection. At the conclusion of the present session of Congress he will return to his private law practice.

Supporting LANTAFF'S statement, the Senate Judiciary Committee pointed out that the compensation of a Member having one dependent and no outside sources of income actually comes down to $6,724 in terms of 1939 purchasing power.

Obviously that is wholly inadequate in view of the numerous demands on our legislators. That view is shared by virtually all groups working for better Government. They urge pay increases in the interest of attracting good men to Washington and keeping them there.

We think the majority of voters would agree that a sound increase would not be out of line if it would keep experienced legislators like LANTAFF on the job.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Daily News of January 4, 1954]

WHAT WE PAY FOR

(By Bill Baggs)

On the seventh day of Christmas, a gentleman with no partridge in his pear tree, took a hard look back at 1953, also 1952, 1951, etc.

He considered that Mr. Lincoln once phrased as "whither we are and whither we are tending."

He decided that he was tending fast toward personal bankruptcy.

Here he was, at 40, a talented, knowing man who had sat in the National Congress for 4 years. He had helped to save the patient taxpayers of America hundreds of millions of dollars, and by his own reform studies, had directly saved the same burdened animals tens of millions of dollars.

Yet in his hand was a checkbook, his own, and the figure under that little heading "amount forwarded" was less than $100.

If you forgive the obvious, things to this man didn't seem to add up.

THEY WILL QUIT

So, BILL LANTAFF decided then to quit the Congress and to come home to Miami and practice law. He is assured here of an income three or more times what the people of the Nation will pay him.

This new year, about 25 or 30 other men will quit politics. They will not be defeated at the polls. They will be defeated at the grocery store.

A Member of the Federal House of Representatives is entitled to get $12,500 a year, plus a taxable $2,500 expense account. Thousands of Americans, looking at 15 grand for 12 months, possibly will splatter in the sentiment that they might be able to make ends meet, and even overlap, with that income.

These same thousands probably do not have the special expenses of a Congressman above the routine demands. Mr. LANTAFF has 3 children, one a 12-year-old, and it is time to begin thinking of college for the growing lad. Washington is an expensive place to live. The rent for the Lantaffs was almost $200 monthly. The coal bill, urged upward by entertainment in the house, sometimes ran $50 monthly in the bleak winters that nature lowers on Washington.

"ON YOU"

There is the special account of entertaining. Men who support a candidate (who wins) often show up in Washington, and many a national legislator has heard the remark:

"Well, where are we going tonight?"

The remark should be amended to:

"Well, where are we going tonight on you?"

It was only a short time ago that another able man from Florida quit Congress for economic reasons, Hardin Peterson.

In our Congress are 531 women and men. The decisions which will keep this Nation growing, or let it slide slowly into decline, must be joined on the floors of that Congress. No 531 citizens have such a responsibility as the Federal legislators of America.

PATRIOTS, BUT

In industry, of course, we pay men what we think they are worth. We pay many civil-service employees more than $15,000 a year. An entertainer in a nightclub using second-hand jokes can make more than $15,000 a year.

It seems time we put aside our own grocery bills for a moment, and took the same hard look Mr. LANTAFF did at this problem. It is not the personal problem of 531 women and men. It is your problem and it is mine. There are many patriots in America willing to neglect pure economic opportunities, and thereby serve the Nation. But I think generally it is true, even unto Congressmen, that we shall get approximately what we pay for.

Forty-second Anniversary of Girl Scouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 12 Girl Scouts everywhere in the United States will observe the forty-second anniversary of the founding of the movement to which they

belong. It was on that date, back in 1912, that Juliette Gordon Low organized the first Girl Scout troop in the United States and started the nationwide movement which has grown to more than 2 million members.

Girl Scout Week, March 7–13, a 7-day observance, will open on Girl Scout Sunday, March 7. The theme of the week will be Know Your Neighbors—Know Your Nation.

Girl Scout Week will open on Girl Scout Sunday when troop members and leaders will attend their churches in uniform.

As the founder of Girl Scouts, Juliette Low held as an ideal an organization in which all girls could be brought together in common understanding through activities of common interest which would help them gain valuable experience in the important business of living, playing, and working with other people.

The organization has been built on the fact that while its program of activities has grown with the times, its principles have remained the same. Membership in the organization means acceptance of certain ideals and a personal code of ethics, such as the Girl Scout laws and the Girl Scout promise.

I am proud to say that over 17,000 Girl Scouts in greater Cleveland, Ohio, accept the same pledge, live the same code of honesty, service, loyalty, and kindness, and are united with Girl Scouts and Girl Guides all over the world by a bond that transcends the differences of language and custom.

Through scouting the girl acquires many skills which help her adapt to adult responsibilities. The program has been consistent in its objectives ever since scouting was founded by Juliette Low. The purpose of Girl Scouting then as now has been "helping girls develop as happy, resourceful individuals willing to share their abilities as citizens in their homes, their communities, their country, and the world."

Underlying the Girl Scout program is a firm ethical principle based on one's duty to God, one's country, and one's neighbor—a practical application of the moral code which is common to our three major religions. The Girl Scout expresses that principle through service—by carrying out her family responsibilities, by learning to live as a friend and neighbor with her fellows in the community, by giving of her time and energy to make life happier or more satisfactory to others.

Statement of Purpose and Justification of Administration's Legislative Program on Personnel Management

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the administration I have today introduced a bill intended to carry out a part of the administration's legislative program on personnel management. Under unanimous consent granted me by the House, I am including herewith the statement submitted by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission explaining the purpose and justification of the legislative program included in the bill. The statement follows:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY CHAIRMAN OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

REVISION OF PAY SCHEDULES OF THE CLASSIFICATION ACT

Purpose

Without changing the lowest and the highest rate of pay of the Classification Act, to adjust the pay scales of the various grades so as to secure a better internal alinement; specifically, to relieve the compressions in the middle salary brackets; to recognize more adequately the differences among these grades in difficulty and responsibility of work; and to provide adequate money incentives in promotions to more difficult or responsible work.

Justification

The pay schedules of the Classification Act are founded upon grades or levels of difficulty and responsibility of work. Naturally, this basis has facilitated the construction, revision, and administration of pay scales. In addition it is intended to provide a firm and fair basis for promotions, transfers, and reassignments to higher positions as the employee develops in knowledge, ability, and experience and his capacity for accepting heavier responsibilities.

However, uniform dollar increases and other salary increase formulas since 1945 have compressed the middle grades of the Classification Act so close together that they do not lend themselves effectively to all phases of personnel administration.

Where, between a lower job and a higher job, the pay differential is too small compared to the responsibility differential, there is little or no incentive to an employee to aspire to the higher job and little financial reward that the Government may offer for undertaking new and weightier responsibilities.

The proposed revision of the pay schedules is intended to improve their structure in this respect.

New schedules are proposed of both the General Schedule and the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule. Other proposed legislative provisions in the bill contemplate having but one continuing schedule, the General Schedule. Crafts, trades, and labor employees are to be shifted to prevailing wage schedules within a year. Guards, firefighters, and messengers will be shifted to the General Schedule within 6 months. Until these shifts are completed the revised Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule would apply.

The structural form of the existing pay schedules is maintained. Except in grades GS–16 and GS–17, there is no change in the number of grades, the number of steps within a grade, or in the amount of within-grade step increases. Like grade GS–18, grades GS–16 and GS–17 are each proposed as a single rate grade.

The proposed pay schedules would affect approximately one million employees. The range of adjustments in rates would run from no increase to $800 a year. The average increase would be $150 or slightly more than 3½ percent. Based on Classification Act population as of September 30, 1953, the estimated cost for the first year would be approximately $151,500,000.

POSITIONS IN GRADES GS–16, GS–17, AND GS–18

Purpose

1. To increase the Classification Act limit from 400 to 700 positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18.

2. To remove existing limitations on the number of positions allowed at each of these grades.

Justification

The Clasification Act of 1949 specifically provides a ceiling of 400 on the number of positions that may be authorized at grades GS–16, 17, and 18. The act provides for 25 positions at GS–18, 75 at GS–17, and 300 at GS–16. We believe that the ceiling should be raised to 700 and that all limitations on numbers allowed at each grade should be eliminated.

At present 465 positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 have been authorized in addition to those specifically provided by the Classification Act. These are authorized for given agencies and programs through the Defense Production Act and various reorganization plans and appropriation acts. These positions are provided to meet particular special needs and would not be affected by the proposed general legislation.

An increase in the number of positions at grades GS–16, 17, and 18 is necessary in the interests of Government program requirements, sound and equitable pay administration, and accurate position classification. The Civil Service Commission recently asked for agency estimates of their need for positions at these grades. More than 700 additional positions were requested by the Federal agencies involved. Initial Commission review indicates that at least 300 of the requested positions warrant classification above grade GS–15 on the basis of their duties and responsibilities. These positions would be distributed among 26 different agencies.

Almost half of the requested additional positions are in the fields of engineering and scientific research for which there is a critical shortage of qualified personnel. The provision of appropriate pay rates for needed positions in these fields would help to place the Government in a fair competitive position with private employers for these shortage skills.

None of the 300 positions which warrant classification above grade GS–15 can be placed in the correct grade because of the present Classification Act ceiling. Thus the present ceiling actually is contrary to the policy of equal pay for substantially equal work expressed by Congress in the Classification Act. This creates serious pay inequities among employees, some of whom receive considerably less pay than their work assignments call for.

The limitation on numbers of positions at each grade over GS–15 also hampers effective administration and correct classification of jobs. For example, although a position warrants classification at grade GS–18 it may be impossible to place it in that grade because the quota for grade GS–18 positions is filled. As a result the position must be placed in grade GS–17, or even GS–16, depending on the availability of "spaces" in these grades. Under this proposal, the Civil Service Commission would continue to maintain close control on the number of positions at each grade through prior review and approval of every classification action above grade GS–15.

We estimate that the salary cost of placing 300 additional positions in grades above GS–15 would approximate $550,000 a year.

LONGEVITY PAY INCREASE FOR EMPLOYEES IN GRADES GS–11 THROUGH GS–15

Purpose

To authorize longevity salary step increases for employees in grades GS–11 through GS–15.

Justification

Longevity pay increases are now limited to employees at grades GS–10 and CPC–10 and below. Approximately 11 percent of the Classification Act employees are above these grades. The incentive provided by longevity pay increases is as essential in grades above GS–10, where opportunities for advancement are more limited, as it is in the lower grades.

At present, about 13,000 employees in grades above GS–10 are at the top of their grades. Not all employees at the top of their grades are eligible for longevity step increases and some are eligible for more than one such increase. We estimate that about 8,000 employees over grade GS–10 might now qualify for longevity step increases. On this basis, the first year cost of the proposed legislation for employees in the executive branch would be approximately $1,585,000.

TEMPORARY ADJUSTMENT OF MINIMUM PAY RATES IN ORDER TO RECRUIT AND RETAIN NEEDED PERSONNEL

Purpose

To authorize the Civil Service Commission to permit recruitment to Classification Act positions at within-grade salary rates above the minimum rate of the grade whenever it finds that such action is necessary to attract and retain needed personnel.

Justification

The Commission's recruiting experience indicates that for certain types of jobs in specific localities it is sometimes impossible to obtain persons who will accept Government employment at the minimum rate of the appropriate Classification Act grade. Where this is true, in the interests both of recruiting and retaining qualified workers, the Commission should be able to set a proper within-grade salary rate as the official minimum rate for given positions in specified agencies and localities.

Pay above the minimum rate would be authorized only where absolutely necessary to recruit and keep employees who cannot be obtained at the minimum rate. These within-grade rates would be reexamined periodically and reduced to the minimum rate of the grade as soon as recruitment conditions allowed.

PAY FOR CRAFTS, TRADES, AND MANUAL LABOR POSITIONS

Purpose

1. To exclude crafts, trades, manual-labor and other similar positions from the Classification Act of 1949 and pay them in accordance with local prevailing wage rates.

2. To move all other positions from the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule (CPC) to the General Schedule (GS) of the Classification Act.

3. To abolish the CPC pay schedule of the Classification Act.

Justification

Under this proposal, the CPC pay schedule would be abolished and the approximately 116,000 positions now in it would be placed either in the General Schedule of the Classification Act or would be paid on a local prevailing rate basis under wage boards or similar pay authority. This change was contemplated when the Classification Act of 1949 was passed. Various maintenance work and similar positions were not consolidated in the General Schedule but rather were placed in a separate pay schedule (CPC) to facilitate later transfer to a local prevailing rate-pay system.

Over 750,000 Government crafts and labor positions in production and construction work are paid on the basis of local prevailing wage rates. A much smaller number of similar positions in maintenance work (about 69,000) are paid under the statutory, nationwide CPC pay schedule of the Classification Act. This means that employees having similar qualifications, performing similar duties, appointed from the same civil-service lists, and many times working side by side are paid at different rates. The proposed legislation is necessary to eliminate this pay inequity. This action is also necessary to place the Federal Government in a better competitive position with private industry in the recruitment and retention of blue-collar workers.

Moving the 69,000 crafts and labor positions to a local prevailing rate basis would leave 47,000 positions in the CPC schedule. The proposed legislation would transfer these 47,000 jobs (consisting of such occupations as guards, meesengers, and firefighters) to the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949. This would simplify the pay structure of the Classification Act. The number of grades under this act would be reduced from 28 to 18.

We estimate that the total cost of placing 69,000 of the present CPC schedule jobs on a prevailing wage basis and transferring the other 47,000 to the GS schedule would be approximately $36,500,000.

The proposed changes are in line with the recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (first Hoover Commission) that rates of pay for blue-collar workers should be fixed and adjusted in relation to prevailing local wage rates.

PREMIUM PAY

Purpose

1. To authorize, for salaried employees covered by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, (a) a time-and-one-half overtime pay rate for employees with salaries up to the maximum rate of grade GS–9, now $5,810, and (b) an overtime rate of one and one-half times the hourly equivalent of the maximum rate of grade GS–9 for employees above that salary, subject to a ceiling on aggregate pay (base pay plus overtime pay) at the top rate of grade GS–15, now $11,800.

2. To give agency heads the option of granting compensatory time off in lieu of overtime pay for irregular or occasional overtime duty performed by employees whose salaries are above the top of grade GS–9.

3. To authorize additional annual pay, in lieu of hourly rates of premium pay, for employees whose working conditions are not suited to payment of hourly rates for overtime, night, and holiday work.

4. To provide "call-back" overtime pay and to make other relatively minor changes in existing premium pay provisions.

5. To prescribe statutory policies on tours of duty for salaried employees.

Justification

Other than temporary wartime legislation, the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 was the first general statute providing overtime, night, and holiday pay for salaried employees of the Government outside the postal service. With minor changes in 1946, the 1945 statute has remained the basic premium pay authority.

The legislative proposals on premium pay are designed (a) to adjust the overtime pay rates of the Federal Employees Pay Act, primarily to take account of changes in salary schedules since 1945, and (b) to revise the overtime and other premium pay provisions of the act in the light of administrative problems which have arisen during the nearly 9 years of the act's operation.

Overtime pay rates: The Federal Employees Pay Act establishes a time-and-one-half overtime rate for employees whose salaries do not exceed $2,980 a year. Above this salary level, overtime pay is provided in accordance with a diminishing scale. This scale decreases from the full time-and-one-half rate at $2,980 to a flat rate of $628.33 for 416 overtime hours (8 hours a week for 52 weeks) for employees at salaries of $6,440 or more. The $628.33 figure amounts to less than half the straight-time rates, even at the $6,480 salary level. Overtime pay, like other premium pay, is subject to a $10,330 ceiling on aggregate pay (regular salary plus premium pay).

The proposal would provide for (a) overtime pay at a time-and-one-half rate for employees at salaries up to the top rate of grade GS–9, now $5,810 (b) overtime pay at a rate equivalent to time-and-one-half of the top rate of grade GS–9 for employees above that salary level, and (c) raising the ceiling on aggregate pay to the top rate of grade GS–15, now $11,800.

Extending the time-and-one-half overtime rate to salaries above its $2,980 maximum under the Federal Employees Pay Act is necessary to maintain a reasonable degree of consistency with the original intent of the act, standards set for industry by Federal statutes and regulations and existing practices of American industry.

We believe that the time-and-one-half overtime rate should cover employees at salaries up to the top rate of grade GS–9, now $5,810. This level is sufficiently low to exclude from the full overtime rate most employees in the executive and administrative group and the higher professional levels. At the same time, it would extend the time-and-one-half rate to certain groups with special overtime problems, such as quarantine inspectors of the Public Health Service and to the lower levels of engineering and scientific positions, where the existing rates of the Federal Employees Pay Act have proved disadvantageous to the Government in times of national emergency.

For employees at salary levels above $5,810, the proposed legislation would set a fixed dollars-and-cents hourly rate of overtime pay, equal to the time-and-one-half rate on a salary of $5,810. This fixed dollars-and-cents rate becomes equal to a straight-time rate in the grade GS–13 range, and less than a straight-time rate at grades GS–14 and GS–15.

Overtime pay above grade GS–9 is necessary to maintain reasonable differentials between aggregate pay rates (salary plus overtime) of employees and their supervisors when the workweek is extended, for example, to 48 hours. The Federal Government does not have available the devices used by American industry to meet this need, such as lump-sum salary adjustments and various kinds of bonuses.

The fixed overtime rate proposed would maintain exactly the same differentials in aggregate pay rates for an extended workweek as the differentials in regular salary rates. For example, there is a difference of $665 between the salaries of an employee at the middle rate of grade GS–10, $5,675, and his supervisor at the middle rate of grade GS–11, $6,540. The same dollars-and-cents overtime rate is proposed at both these salaries. Thus, if the Government in time of emergency should be placed on a 48-hour workweek, the employee and his supervisor would receive the same overtime pay. The difference between their aggregate pay rates, base pay plus overtime pay, would continue to be $665, equal to the difference between their regular salaries.

Overtime pay, as well as other premium pay, would be subject to a ceiling on aggregate pay at the top rate of grade GS–15, now $11,800, rather than the existing ceiling of $10,330. This proposal would restore the ceiling to its grade level from 1946 to 1949. It would conform with the ceiling used for such other purposes as the proposed extension of longevity rates, the highest grade of the Classification Act in which an agency may place a position without advance approval by the Commission, and rates for experts and consultants under the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946.

Compensatory time off in lieu of overtime pay: The Federal Employees Pay Act requires

that overtime be paid for in money unless the employee himself asks for compensatory time off. The proposed legislation would continue this requirement at the lower salary levels but would require monetary overtime pay for employees at salaries above $5,810 only when the workweek is extended, for example, to 48 hours. Agencies would be authorized to decide whether employees at salaries above $5,810 would be given compensatory time off duty or paid in money for irregular, unscheduled overtime work.

In practice, agencies and employees alike generally consider irregular overtime work of personnel at the higher grade levels to be voluntary and such overtime is not paid for. The proposals recognize this practical situation and would bring the overtime pay statute closer to administrative practice. It would still permit an agency to pay in money for any overtime work at these levels which, for example, it might consider exceptionally burdensome.

Special provisions for certain kinds of work: Two special types of Federal employment do not fit well within the standard overtime pay provisions. Some employees, such as fire fighters, are on duty for long periods but are in a standby status for much of their time on duty, at their stations ready to answer any calls but not performing actual work. Hours of work of certain other employees, such as investigators of criminal activities, cannot be controlled administratively in the usual way. Such assignments as trailing suspected criminals require substantial amounts of unscheduled overtime work and night and holiday duty.

The Federal Employees Pay Act includes these two groups under its hourly premium pay provisions. This has resulted in administrative problems and, in the case of such employees as fire fighters, unwarranted expense to the Government. Accordingly, the Commission is proposing additional pay on an annual basis for these groups in place of hourly rates of overtime, night, and holiday pay.

Under the Commission's proposals, employees with long tours of standby duty could receive additional annual pay at rates up to 25 percent of their rates of base pay. The additional annual pay would take the place of all other overtime, night, and holiday pay. Because they would already be on duty for 48 or more hours a week, as a rule, these employees would not be affected by any extension of the Federal workweek.

The Commission is proposing additional annual pay, not in excess of 15 percent of base pay rates, for employees, such as investigators of criminal activities, whose hours of work are not subject to the usual administrative control and whose duties require substantial amounts of unscheduled overtime, night, and holiday work. The additional annual pay for such employees would take the place of other pay for unscheduled overtime work and for night and holiday duty. These employees, in addition, would receive overtime pay on the same basis as other employees when the work-week is extended, for example, to 48 hours.

The proposed additional compensation on an annual basis for these two groups would be easy to administer, fair to the Government, and equitable for employees, especially those investigators whose peculiar working conditions now frequently require substantial amounts of overtime work without any overtime pay at all. Like overtime pay for other employees, the additional annual pay would be computed on only the first $5,810 of an employee's salary rate and would be subject to the $11,800 ceiling on aggregate pay.

Other premium pay proposals: The most important of the other premium pay proposals is that on call-back pay.

In American industry, it is common to guarantee a certain minimum amount of pay for an employee called back to work on one of his days off or after having finished a regular day's work and gone home. Although call-back work is found in the Federal service, special call-back benefits are not authorized by the Federal Employees Pay Act. The proposal would authorize a minimum of two hours' pay at the overtime rate for any employee called in for overtime work on one of his days off or after having finished a regular day's work. This would protect the employee from being called in for assignments of such short duration that pay for only the time on duty would be grossly inadequate compensation for his inconvenience. This minimum would also apply to non-overtime holiday duty.

Other proposals would make very minor changes in night differential pay provisions to meet specific administrative problems that have arisen, and would enact into law the principles currently expressed in rulings of the Comptroller General on overtime of employees in a travel status.

Tours of duty: The Federal Employees Pay Act prescribes a basic workweek of 40 hours, to be scheduled on not more than 6 days of any 7 consecutive days. Other than this, the act places no restriction on scheduling of employees' tours of duty.

The proposed legislation would include a statutory statement of policies on work schedules of employees covered by the act. The policies expressed would be mandatory except where an agency would be seriously handicapped in carrying out its functions or costs would be increased. Proposed provisions would require weekly tours of duty to be scheduled in advance, on 5 days of the week, Monday through Friday, if possible; the 2 days off duty to be consecutive; the same working hours each day; workdays not in excess of 8 hours; that the basic workweek not be shifted to avoid holidays; and that work schedules not include split shifts with a break of more than 1 hour.

Most of these requirements have at some time been proposed as a basis for premium pay. Proposals to require overtime pay for work in excess of 8 hours on any day have been especially numerous, as have proposals for premium pay for Sunday work included in an employee's basic 40-hour workweek.

Some Government activities, such as operation of hospitals, weather services, and airways communications and flight control, require Sunday duty. Others, such as construction inspection, which are necessarily synchronized with hours of contractors or other business establishments, may require more than 8 hours of work on some days, and cannot always be scheduled in advance.

The Government should not be penalized by having to pay premium pay rates whenever its activities require deviations from the usual tours of duty. In the absence of such penalty pay provisions, however, we believe that employees should be assured that they will not be assigned to undesirable tours of duty unnecessarily. The proposed statement of policies on work schedules would provide such assurance.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' INCENTIVE AWARDS

Purpose

1. To place authority for direction of the Government employees' incentive awards program with the Civil Service Commission.
2. To authorize Presidential honorary awards to civilian employees.
3. To authorize monetary awards based on governmentwide savings when appropriate.
4. To make employees under all pay laws eligible for all types of awards.
5. To eliminate salary increase awards and provide for cash awards in their stead.
6. To eliminate the present $25,000 annual limit on total cash awards an agency can make for adopted employee suggestions.
7. To eliminate the present $1,000 limit on individual cash awards for employee suggestions.
8. To eliminate the present maximum (an amount equal to three within-grade salary steps) on certain cash awards.
9. To specifically extend the awards program to cover inventions by Government employees.
10. To permit delegation, within departments, of the authority to make awards.

Justification

At present monetary and honorary awards for civilian employees of the Government are authorized under a number of different laws administered by different agencies. There are a considerable number of statutes authorizing awards for employees of given agencies. In addition, responsibility for administration of other awards applying to employees in all agencies is split between the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission. The Commission is responsible for superior accomplishment pay increases under title VII of the Classification Act, while the Bureau of the Budget is responsible for cash awards for efficiency under title X of the Classification Act and employee suggestion awards.

Consolidation of present laws: We believe that consolidation of existing laws authorizing incentive awards would improve and simplify administration of a coordinated Government-wide program. Such legislation would cover all monetary awards and honorary recognition for employee suggestions, inventions, superior accomplishments, personal efforts contributing to the efficiency, economy or other improvement of Government operations, and special acts or services in the public interest.

Program responsibility: The present split responsibility of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission for direction of the Government's incentive awards program hampers effective administration. Because the program is primarily a personnel-management function it should be administered by the Civil Service Commission. The Commission, of course, would seek the advice and assistance of the Bureau of the Budget on the management-improvement aspects of the program.

Presidential honorary awards: Public recognition by the President of outstanding employee accomplishment or service would provide a valuable incentive to improved employee performance and would increase public understanding of the work of the Federal service. For example, a Presidential award might be made to the outstanding supervisor in Government each year. Under this legislation the President could establish such awards and provide for agency nomination of candidates for them.

Awards based on governmentwide savings: Monetary awards are now based only on savings achieved in the employee's own agency. Where a suggestion or an accomplishment produces savings in a number of agencies, this additional benefit is not considered in determining the amount of the award made to the suggestor. It should be possible to make equitable monetary awards based on the full savings to the Government.

Employee eligibility for awards: Cash awards for efficiency under title X and pay increases for superior accomplishment under title VII are now available only to employees under the Classification Act. Employees paid under wage-board authority and under the Postal Pay Act are not eligible for either of these types of awards. There appears to be no reason for limiting award eligibility for efficiency and superior accomplishment in this way; the practical value of such awards to the Government should be realized to the greatest practicable extent.

Elimination of salary-increase awards: Superior accomplishment awards under title VII of the Classification Act are pay increases of one salary step in the employee's grade. Since the amount of such a salary

step is greater in the higher grades, this results in awards according to base pay rate rather than according to achievement. Salary increase awards produce other inequities. Because they can be made only within the regular salary schedule their value depends also on the employee's salary step within the range for his grade. Depending on a number of factors not related to savings achieved or the employee's accomplishment, the net worth of a salary-increase award under title VII varies from practically nothing to $1,500 or more. Because of this inequity salary-increase awards should be eliminated and cash awards for superior accomplishment used in their stead.

Elimination of annual limit on total agency suggestion awards: There is now a statutory limit of $25,000 on the total cash awards an agency can make in any one year for adopted employee suggestions. The military departments are exempted from this restriction. The present limit has forced a curtailment of the awards program in the Veterans' Administration for several years. It will soon force curtailment in other agencies if the present rate of increase in the use of the suggestion program continues. This situation produces the undesirable effect of limiting the number of awards which can be made for worth-while suggestions.

Elimination of limit on individual cash awards for suggestions: There is now a statutory limit of $1,000 on any one cash award for an employee suggestion. The military departments are exempted from this restriction. At present an employee suggestion must have produced savings of $375,000 to warrant a $1,000 award. If the savings run into millions of dollars as has happened in some cases the award would still be $1,000. A recent survey shows that almost two-thirds of the private businesses that have suggestion systems place no maximum dollar limit on their awards. We believe that the amount of Government employee suggestion awards should also be directly related to resulting savings without arbitrary limits.

Maximum limit on other cash awards: Title X of the Classification Act places a maximum on cash awards of an amount equal to three salary steps within the employee's grade. This results in monetary awards based on rank instead of relative accomplishment. For example, for achieving savings of $3,000 a CPC–1 employee could be awarded a maximum of $180. A GS–5 employee, $375, and a GS–15 employee, $750. The present limitation diminishes the incentive value of the awards.

Awards for inventions: Existing statutory authorities provide for awards for employee inventions under some circumstances. These authorities differ in that they apply to different employee groups, and do not afford uniform treatment. In some cases private relief bills have been used to obtain rewards for an employee inventor. An interagency committee of the Government Patents Board has studied this problem and concludes that employee inventions should be covered under a governmentwide incentive awards program. Our proposed legislation would carry out the recommendations of the committee on this point.

Authority to make awards: Cash awards under title X of the Classification Act may be granted only by a top agency awards committee. In an active program this means that a burdensome workload falls on the central approving committee in large agencies such as the Department of Defense, Veterans' Administration, and the Post Office Department. The committee members with operating jobs do not always have the time required for careful review of awards recommendations and the effect of centralized approval is to delay consideration and thus impair successful operation of the awards program. Agencies should be authorized to make appropriate delegations of authority to approve awards in the interests of program efficiency and effectiveness.

During recent years the Government's awards program, even with its deficiencies, has produced large dollar savings and many important operating improvements for the Government. We believe that the proposed legislation would greatly increase the effectiveness of this program and thus further promote the administration's goal of increased efficiency and economy.

SECTION 1310 OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1952

Purpose

To repeal section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1952, as amended by section 1302, Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (Whitten amendment).

Justification

Section 1310 introduced restrictions on Federal personnel management soon after the sudden expansion of the Federal service as a result of the Korean emergency. Its objectives were (1) to prevent any increase in the number of permanent employees of the executive branch, (2) to prevent unduly rapid promotions, (3) to prevent overgrading of positions during the emergency, (4) to encourage transfer of employees to defense work, and (5) to protect the rights of permanent employees called to military service or transferred to defense activities.

While there has been general agreement with these broad objectives of section 1310, this administration believes that they can best be achieved through flexible administrative action rather than by law. The attempt to administer needed emergency restrictions by rigid legislative control has produced serious administrative problems and inequities to employees.

THE RULE OF FIVE IN SELECTION

Purpose

To authorize appointing officers to select 1 from 5 qualified candidates whose names have been certified to them rather than from only 3 in filling positions in the competitive civil service.

Justification

We believe that this proposal would improve the efficiency and quality of the Federal civil service. By almost doubling the appointing officer's range of choice it would make possible better matching of applicant's qualifications and personal characteristics with position requirements.

Under the rule of five regular civil service examining practice would be followed, with a list of qualified candidates being sent to the appointing officer. The only change involved would be that the appointing officer could select from among the top 5 instead of the top 3 qualified persons on the list. The basic principles and procedures of competitive merit and veteran preference, such as the current procedures on passing over veterans, would continue to be observed.

This proposal is in line with the first Hoover Commission's recommendation that appointing officers be given more leeway in the selection of personnel.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL WORKERS

It is understood that the Department of Labor is presenting recommendations to Congress with respect to legislative proposals for covering Federal employees under unemployment compensation. Accordingly, specific legislative language for this purpose is not included.

Purpose

To provide unemployment insurance coverage for Federal employees comparable to that granted to employees in private industry.

Justification

Financial protection against unemployment is particularly important for Federal employees because of the typical fluctuations in Government employment levels. In spite of general impressions to the contrary, the risk of unemployment is as great in Government as it is outside of Government. Government functions do not continue at a consistent level. Some activities become obsolete and are discontinued. Appropriations are cut and staffs are reduced accordingly. Certain activities are self-limiting or temporary. There is a constant movement of workers back and forth between Federal employment and private industry; the absence of unemployment insurance protection for Government employment places these workers at a disadvantage.

The employment statistics clearly show the great fluctuations in Government employment. For example, in June 1938 there were approximately 855,000 civilian employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government. As a result of the defense program and our entry into World War II, this figure increased to a peak of 3,770,000 in June 1945. After the war, Federal employment dropped until it leveled off at about 2 million by June 1950. As a result of the Korean conflict, Federal employment again increased to approximately 2,600,000 in June 1952. It has since declined to less than 2,400,000.

The recent reductions in force of Federal workers have reemphasized the need for extension of coverage under State unemployment insurance laws to these workers. In calendar year 1953, for example, there were approximately 155,000 employees who were involuntarily separated.

Unlike employees in private industry, these separated Government employees cannot apply for unemployment insurance to tide them over while they are seeking other work. In the past, these separated Federal workers have been forced to depend on their contributions to retirement funds and accrued annual leave for financial assistance while looking for other jobs. Neither of these sources of income can be regarded as a proper substitute for unemployment insurance. Recourse to annual leave accruals is an unintended use of the leave system which is designed for recreation purposes and for visits back home.

Separated Federal workers who are forced to withdraw their retirement contributions wipe out their rights to retirement pensions based on such service. Thus, to provide needed current income, they have to risk their future financial security. Even this source of income is not available to the more than 600,000 indefinite employees who are covered under old-age and survivors insurance rather than under the Retirement Act. It should be noted that the turnover in employment is especially heavy in this group of employees who have no retirement contributions to withdraw, and who, as a rule, have little or no accrued annual leave which can help tide them over a period of unemployment.

Pennsylvania State Council of Farm Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Pennsylvania delegation were honored on February 16 by a visitation from representatives of the Pennsylvania State Council of Farm Organizations. The group consisted of Messrs.

Joseph W. Hallowell, J. Collins McSparran, Beatty H. Dimit, Mark S. Hess, Clarence C. Smith, George W. Slocum, George Goodling, William S. Hagar, Albert E. Madigan, Joseph O. Canby, Ralph L. Culver, and M. K. Zimmerman.

In discussing the agricultural situation, the members of the council set forth their views in the following statement of policy:

We favor a strengthening of programs of research and extension with special emphasis on marketing.

We favor the continuation of cooperative programs of Federal and State Governments controlling diseases of plants and animals.

We favor a gradual reduction of price supports.

We favor the elimination of agricultural conservation payments.

We oppose the reclamation of new farm lands.

We favor economy in all branches of Government.

We favor the maintenance and strengthening of broad basic policies of Federal services to agriculture; the gradual elimination of direct subsidy to agriculture and all other segments of the national economy; and the adoption of a sound economic agricultural program designed to protect and preserve this basic industry.

We favor the elimination of the Federal tax of two cents on a gallon of gasoline.

We oppose the elimination of trip leasing of trucks by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

We favor agricultural representation on the committee appointed by the Secretary of Commerce which is to formulate the transportation policy of the administration.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the delegation who were present expressed themselves as being satisfied that the council speaks for a large portion of Pennsylvania farmers and took note of the fact that its membership is spread among this list of farm organizations:

PENNSYLVANIA COUNCIL OF FARM ORGANIZATIONS

Pennsylvania Flower Growers, Pennsylvania Horticultural Council, Pennsylvania Nurserymen's Association, Pennsylvania State Grange, Pennsylvania Association of Farm Cooperatives, Pennsylvania Farm Bureau Federation, Eastern States Farmers Exchange, Pennsylvania Horticultural Association, Interstate Milk Producers, Dairymen's League, Dairymen's Cooperative Sales Association, Pennsylvania Guernsey Breeders Association, Pennsylvania Crop Improvement Association, Pennsylvania Holstein Association, Pennsylvania Raw Milk Producers Association, Pennsylvania Mushroom Growers Association, Pennsylvania Dairy Goat Association, Pennsylvania Poultry Federation, G. L. F. Cooperative, Pennsylvania State Bee Keepers Association, Pennsylvania Christmas Tree Growers Association, Pennsylvania Association of Artificial Breeders Cooperatives, Pennsylvania Jersey Cattle Club, Pennsylvania Poland China Association, The Farmers Cooperative, Pennsylvania Society of Farm Women, Hampshire Swine Breeders Association, Chester White Swine Breeders Association, Lancaster County Tobacco Growers, Aberdeen Angus Breeders Association, Duroc-Jersey Swine Breeders Association, Pennsylvania Vegetable Growers Association, Pennsylvania Hereford Breeders Association.

Eight Hundred Dollar Increase Should Be the Bedrock Minimum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have requested a hearing by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on measures now pending. I understand a large number of Members have made similar requests and it will be a matter of weeks until all can be heard, making allowance, of course, for other witnesses, many of them from out of town.

Originally I had been scheduled by the committee to appear before it on February 16, 1954, and I so notified my constituents who had written me on the subject. I did appear on that date, only to learn that the Postmaster General by an unexpected development was before the committee for the entire time available. Pending the time when I shall be called by the committee, I am extending my remarks to include the statement I have prepared for delivery. It follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I would be ashamed to go home and face honest people in the Federal service if while here I did not do everything within my power to advance legislation offering relief so long, so cruelly and so unfairly withheld. As I am not a member of the committee, this opportunity of voicing my convictions is doubly appreciated.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that close to 100 Members of the House will testify, some already have testified, for legislation proposed to give the fullest measure of justice to the Federal workers in the humble places. The $800 annual postal increase provided in the pending measure is the very least that any real friend of the postal workers can consider. In my considered opinion the minimum should be $1,000. As it has been put at $800 in the bill, no real friend of the postal workers should permit $800 to be used as a bargaining figure.

The fact that so many Members of the Congress are participating personally in these hearings is proof that the postal workers, indeed all of the Federal workers, have strength and power. These Congressmen would not be here in such unprecedented numbers if the American people from coast to coast were not behind the just demands of the Federal workers.

It is more important to us as a nation founded on principles of morality that we deal fairly and honestly with our faithful servants in the humbler places than that we balance the budget.

There are other ways of bringing the Post Office Department to solvency than committing grand larceny on the men and women who have made the United States post office a pattern throughout the world of efficient public service. These men and women are entitled to a minimum increase of $800. Every cent less than $800 that is given them is as money stolen from those who have earned it.

MATTER OF SOUND POLICY

I am here to recommend a favorable report on H. R. 2344 as a matter of sound business policy.

The business and industrial world depend for their daily functioning upon efficient mail service. Efficiency demands a trained, experienced personnel. Today postal service is suffering from a labor turnover that private business would not attempt to survive. Wages paid to postal workers cannot hold personnel against the wages which private industry can pay. The result is that the post office can neither attract ambitious youth nor hold experienced workers.

Recently 30,000 applications for Civil Service examinations were passed out in the Chicago area. Five thousand people were asked to take that examination; the post office hoped to get 100 out of the 5,000. Some of the main activities in mail distribution require an experience of at least 4 years for perfection.

If a complete working force is continuously drained of its help no efficiency can be developed and we all pay the cost. Experienced employees are leaving the service attracted by better pay elsewhere. Failure to attract energetic younger help and losing the experienced older employees means an eventual breakdown in the whole service. Letters coming into my office tell a story of discouragement and loss of morale that survey of the speed of mail (or lack of speed) fail to analyze.

RATION OF SKIMMED MILK

The 81st Congress gave to postal workers a ration of skimmed milk which it euphoniously called a "raise." Since then the gap between take-home pay and the cost of living has widened until the two are no longer within shouting distance of one another. Within the past year postal workers in the Chicago area have been faced with a series of increases. For example: (1) Rents have increased with the ending of rent controls; (2) real-estate taxes have jumped; (3) Illinois Central commuters' fares have increased 25 percent; (4) telephone rates are higher; (4) gas rates have increased; (6) streetcar fares have jumped. Increased costs of these items have been accompanied by increased costs of food and clothing. The postal worker must pay the increased costs of 1954 out of a salary that lagged behind the cost of living in 1952.

HUMAN SIDE APPEALS

There is however another side, the human side, to my appeal for an $800 increase in salary for postal workers. The American people whose charity has encompassed the globe and embraced both friend and foe, do not wish to be placed in the position of demanding that the postal workers shall serve them at the expense of their own home life, health, and security. Yet we Americans are pretty much in that position today.

Hundreds of letters coming into my office present a picture of which we cannot be proud. To eke out existence the postal worker must get a part-time job in another field, thus leaving him no time to spend with his family.

His wife must work. That means no mother to supervise their children or just to give them that which every child needs, a mother to greet them when they return from school and to help them with their homework. Instead the child of the postal worker must shift for himself after school. If, without supervision, he becomes one of our growing numbers of juvenile delinquents, that is too bad for them, but not for us?

I cannot hear our American fathers and mothers agree to such a thought.

WHEN ILLNESS COMES

The letters which I have received tell another story. The postal worker cannot save for emergencies. When they come, they mean cashing in on insurance policies, borrowing on other tangible goods and assets. To be sure the Letter Carriers Association operates a hospital and surgical program for which the letter carriers themselves pay. Experience with these plans shows that they are inadequate when major emergencies develop.

As a matter of good business, as well as in the name of humanity, I recommend a favorable report on H. R. 2344.

GREAT MERIT IN H. R. 2585

I recommend also the enactment of H. R. 2585. This is not a pay raise bill as such. It reclassifies supervisory employees in the field service of the Post Office Department into 36 step-rate grades comparable with those for other postal employees and employees in other Federal services.

Supervisory employees of the post office do not now have ingrade promotions comparable with other postal employees and employees in other Federal services. H. R. 2585, therefore, merely corrects an inequity and like H. R. 2344, will serve to improve the postal service.

Since supervisory experience does not count there is now no inducement for a man to remain in that branch of service. The Hoover Commission has recommended the adoption of the provisions of H. R. 2585 as a means of improving postal service.

IN CLASSIFIED SERVICES

H. R. 4556 and similar measures make various increases in compensation to employees in the classified services. One letter, which I have received, comparable to others in the same vein makes the following points:

"Both in the interest of justice to Government employees and in the interest of good government such a pay raise is urgently needed so that the Government may retain young and well-qualified employees. At the present time, inability to retain such employees is seriously affecting the efficiency of Government operations.

* * * * *

"As a meat-inspection employee, I am impelled to call your attention to the seriously inequitable rates of overtime pay for employees of Federal Meat Inspection. These employees are compelled to work probably more overtime than any other group of employees in public service. Many work over 60 hours per week and some as many as 70 hours at arduous tasks. Their overtime rate is much less than time and one-half and in most cases even less than straight time. I am not referring to high administrative officials but to routine inspectors. In my own case, my overtime rate is 60 cents per hour less than straight time. These rates result from the overtime law enacted in 1945 which provides for progressive reduction in overtime rates on salaries over $2,980 per year. A number of pay raises since that date have made the $2,980 figure entirely unrealistic and the present deplorable situation is the result.

"HOW INSPECTION WORKS

"Under the circumstances, employees feel that they are paying a large part of the cost of Government operations. This is particularly true in meat inspection where the Department of Agriculture collects $2.40 per man-hour from the packer receiving overtime inspection.

"Under this system the Department of Agriculture is encouraged to perform as much inspection as possible on overtime, as overtime inspection is not chargeable to the appropriation but to the packer, and to the extent that the rate is inequitable, to the employees.

"It is true that under an act approved July 24, 1919 (41 Stat. 241) the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay overtime compensation to meat inspection employees at rates which he may determine and charge all overtime rates to the packer; but for years the Department of Agriculture has informed us that it would be contrary to good policy to pay its meat inspection employees a higher overtime rate than that paid to Government employees in general.

"Under these circumstances the Government is guilty of gross duplicity for, under the Public Contract Act, contractors engaged on public contracts are compelled by the Government to pay their employees full time-and-one-half rates for overtime, but the Government refuses to pay its own employees even straight time rates for comparable work. * * * It appears we can secure redress only through legislation."

IN CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, again I must express my appreciation of your courtesy in giving me this opportunity to speak my heart and mind in support of legislation proposed for the betterment of the conditions surrounding the Federal employment. I trust that the action of the committee will be favorable and thus consistent with the great weight of American public opinion.

A Columbus Memorial Commission Should Be Established

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, no man, by his character and accomplishments, is more worthy of honor than Christopher Columbus; and no country on earth is more happily obligated to do him honor than our own United States. We honor him for what he was and we honor him for what he did.

Character and accomplishments usually go together. The one is the result of the other. When we consider carefully those traits of character which made Columbus remarkable in what he undertook and in what he achieved, we may be surprised, though we ought not to be, to find in him an epitome of our typical American character that has brought us as a nation into world leadership. In that sense Columbus was the first American.

He had imagination. He was gifted with vision. He saw when others were blind, and looked ahead with anticipation where others failed to look at all. His westward-directed gaze that brought him to the New World was continued by the early settlers, and it carried them across the continent. They builded as they went, always guided by that constructive imagination that is the source of all great achievement.

Columbus was a modern American also in his use of scientific knowledge and instruments. His imagination, of which we have spoken, was not a wild undisciplined daydreaming, but was an originality stemming from and nurtured by the best science of his time—science in distinction from superstition and folklore. He was the "Connecticut Yankee" of his age.

To a scientifically disciplined originality he brought the quality of high courage. He would risk his life and his reputation on his westward hopes. And he had the power of imparting this courage to all about him who were not absolutely immune. This is the prime quality of leadership. It is what has made America and Americans great. Columbus had it.

And it was a courage that did not falter nor fail in the face of difficulty, delayed success, or even apparent defeat. Columbus displayed what has come to be a characteristic American quality—persistence in spite of difficulty and opposition. He has become the very symbol of persistence, the embodied ideal of those who sail on and on when others would turn back.

A chief source of those qualities may be found in his faith. Columbus had faith in God. He believed that God had a plan for the world as well as for him personally, and that he was working in partnership with God and in accordance with His Providence. He expressed this idea clearly to Queen Isabella. His faith explains his courage and his persistence. One who is in league with the Eternal cannot know base fear. A sense of duty and of destiny forbade him to quit. So has America progressed in the centuries since. And we as Americans have nothing to fear unless we lose that power which is born of faith.

There is still need in this old world for leadership based on originality, imagination, science, courage, persistence, and faith. We hope that it may continue to characterize our own dear land. Truly Columbus was the epitome of our American character. We are the beneficiaries and the continuators of his work. No other land can more fittingly do him honor.

Many of us feel that the time has come to erect a fitting national memorial to Columbus here in the Capital City of our Nation. It is true that there is an exquisite little monument over in front of Union Station, of a type and size suitable for a small city. We want a Columbus Memorial Commission appointed to consider plans for a monument of national proportions, a monument which in size and design and position will do justice to the man in whose honor it is erected and also to the Nation building it.

Some days ago a writer in one of the Washington papers suggested that this proposition was originated and promoted because the Senators and Representatives concerned were ignorant that there is a monument of Columbus at the Union Station. The article named Congressmen who denied such ignorance and one who admitted the charge.

Now, let me ask you, What stronger evidence could be adduced to indicate the inadequacy of the little monument at Union Station than the admission of a Congressman that he did not know of its existence? It would be interesting to know what a poll of the city of Washington would reveal concerning the percentage of residents who have never heard of the beautiful little memorial at Union Station. It is time we had one that people would know about, and I believe that a properly constituted Memorial Commission is the best approach to the problem.

Seaboard: A Good Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been interested in sound programs of conservation. A real cooperator toward that end in the territory it serves is the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. This company has been most active in forestry development work throughout the Southeast in the States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama. The Seaboard has taken the lead in this work with vocational agriculture forces through such groups as Future Farmers, Young Farmers, and veterans enrolled in the institutional on-the-farm training program.

This company has just completed the first in a series of programs for 1954, a cooperative forestry demonstration held near Starke, Fla., and which was witnessed by more than 500 farmers. Appearing as guest speaker on this program was my good friend and colleague, the Honorable D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS.

An editorial which appeared in the Claxton Enterprise, of Claxton, Ga., brought out forcibly the efforts of this company in education work:

SEABOARD: A GOOD CITIZEN

Last Wednesday's forestry demonstration in Hagan brought over 500 farmers, Future Farmers, and others to see the latest methods and ideas in handling one of the largest crops in this country. It was planned and executed by Bob Hoskins, industrial forester of the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., with the help of Ellis Sikes, vocational agriculture instructor of Claxton, James Brannen, county agent for Evans County, and District Forester Walter Stone of the Georgia Forestry Commission.

The Seaboard, in selecting Evans County and putting its full efforts, publicity and manpower toward making this demonstration a success, has shown to be a first rate member of this community.

In advance of what a lot of farmers are gradually realizing, they know that timber resources are one of our greatest assets. We are centrally located, have plentiful supplies, and intelligent farmers who can carry out the new and best practices being developed.

The Seaboard's industrial men have seen our best side and are bending every effort to develop and help our prosperity. Like any other good citizen, they realize that we must each one do the most we can to improve our community, for, in the long run, we will all benefit. We appreciate their efforts.

Approximately 1 year ago I had the pleasure of appearing as guest speaker at a similar demonstration held at Mullins, S. C. This demonstration was also sponsored by the industrial department of the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. in cooperation with the vocational agriculture department of Mullins, the South Carolina Forestry Commission, and the Extension Service. At this particular meeting more than 600 farmers were in attendance.

Participating on this program were Warren T. White, assistant vice president of the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co.; R. D. Anderson, associate director of vocational education for South Carolina; A. E. Kunz, district forester, South Carolina Forestry Commission; C. Hall, extension forester; H. L. Stoudemire, agriculture teacher at Mullins; and Bob Hoskins, industrial forester, Seaboard Railroad, who was in charge of the program.

Considerable emphasis was placed on timber stand improvement, which practice can be carried on by the farmer during his slack season and which yields a number of valuable forest products. The effectiveness of such programs has played a major role in the increased production of pulpwood in Marion County. Pulpwood production for Marion County for the years 1949–51—based on information contained in Forest Survey Releases Nos. 35, 69, 38—was 4,790 cords, 6,039 cords, and 7,982 cords, respectively. Following the forestry demonstration in January 1952 the production increased to 13,674 cords—nearly double the production for 1951. According to E. C. Pickens, assistant State forester in charge of management, South Carolina State Commission of Forestry, during the past 18 months the increase in requests from Marion and Horry Counties was sufficient to interest the county forestry board and legislature members from the 2 counties to request additional professional forestry assistance for their areas. A bill was introduced in the State legislature in the spring of 1952, and passed, providing for an additional forester to be hired to work Marion and Horry Counties, primarily in forest-management activities. This forester assumed his duties on July 15, 1953, with headquarters in Conway. The request for seedlings in Marion County increased in 1952–53 over that for the past 2 years.

The Seaboard Air Line Railroad has shown itself ready to help strengthen and develop its territory economically through sponsoring and promoting sound forestry.

High Rents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am most unhappy to have to report to the House a growing volume of complaints coming to me from renters in the south side district of Chicago which I represent.

Henry Wilson, of the office of the corporation counsel in Chicago, calls my attention to 3 cases, in 2 of which the tenants are now looking for homes in the suburbs. Mr. Wilson writes:

Movement to the suburbs is not by homeowners but by tenants; high rents not high taxes is the primary reason. The grumbling one hears indicates that the cases submitted to you by me in this letter are not isolated ones. In many areas throughout the country tenants will be at the mercy of landlords for some time to come. The complete removal of controls is one of the mistakes the Republican Party will pay for next November.

FACTS IN THREE TYPICAL INSTANCES

Cases cited by Mr. Wilson are:

Case No. 1: Tenant has occupied an apartment in this 13-apartment building for 17 years. After meeting previously allowed increases, he is now asked to pay a $42 a month increase (from $78 to $120). In April 1953 he was compelled as shown by enclosed receipted bill to pay $168 for decorating.

Case No. 2: Tenant moved into apartment in August 1953 after paying $300 to clean and decorate. He is now asked to pay an increase of $52 a month (from $68 to $120), failing to do, he must vacate.

Case No. 3: Tenant has occupied an apartment in this 19-apartment building for 20 years. She is now asked to pay increased rent from $62.50 to $90 under a lease running only to next September 30, indicating another raise at that time.

Mr. Wilson continues:

From these cases you can see the whole picture. The enclosed rent receipts and notices of increases are contrary to the publicized real estate board's denials and are substantial evidence of what is happening in Chicago. In view of the Chicago Real Estate Board's assertion that rents are now stabilized and that increases of more than 5 to 10 percent are not warranted you may wish to consider the advisability of introducing a new rent control bill, providing that rents shall not be increased more than 10 percent over the amount of rent paid on January 1, 1954.

PREPARING FOR THE STORM

Mr. Speaker, in the first session of the 83d Congress I pleaded with my Republican colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee to have confidence in the President of the United States to the extent of giving him the authority to reimpose rent controls in the event of necessity. With an economic storm even then building up, I thought it nothing short of folly to leave real estate entirely without any stabilizing protection against price gouging.

I pointed out to my Republican colleagues that while the first to suffer would be the tenants it would not end there. The hardest hit in the long run would be the honest holders of equities in real-estate properties. It happened in the early thirties, when real estate investments were washed away as completely as though hit by a tidal wave. As surely as night follows day it will happen again if heed is not given to the experiences of the past.

The crash of the late twenties and early thirties could have been averted. If we are to have another such devastating disruption of our economic life, a good deal of the blame will be on Republicans who refused to trust their own Republican President with emergency authority to act promptly and effectively in the presence of an emergency.

The Chicago Real Estate Board has recognized the truth in my contention. The board knows that unfair and unreasonable rent demands on the whole do more mischief to property owners than to tenants. When the demands are by the necessities of the moment agreed to, false real-estate values are created

since the manner of fixing a sales price is by multiplying the total gross rentals. Excessive rentals, geared to high wages and overtime, of course, can be paid only as long as wages continue high and there is extra pay for overtime. Usually, the price-gouging owners sell when total gross receipts are at high level and it is the new owners who are left holding the bag when unemployment comes, and, even though wages continue fairly high, overtime is eliminated, and in consequence, there is a material reduction in family income.

The Chicago Real Estate Board strives as best it can to preserve the stability of real estate. I am told it has taken the position that rent increases this spring should not reflect an increase of more than 5 or 10 percent. Unfortunately, however, the board cannot control the actions of any landlord who insists upon having things his own way regardless of the ultimate disaster to befall.

If the Republican members of the Banking and Currency Committee had been disposed to place their trust in the President of the United States, as I had suggested, and the rent-control bill introduced by me had been approved and passed, neither the Chicago Real Estate Board nor tenants in the classification described by Henry Wilson would be in the present unhappy position.

This is decidedly no time for anyone to attempt a boat-rocking stunt. Make no mistake, we are in a storm. If real estate starts sinking as it did in the early thirties we are well on our way to the big depression all over again. It must not happen. A depression destroys not only property but hope itself.

Whether he knows it or not, every landlord who goes it alone, despising his tenants' appeals to reason and the real-estate board's counsel of caution, is contributing to an economic engulfment from which he can have no hope of being spared.

Mr. Speaker, my conscience would not be easy if I did not do everything in my power to protect the American home, on the level of both ownership and tenancy, from the storm now gathering and which we are told will become more severe before its abatement. Consequently, I shall introduce this week a bill reestablishing Federal rent control on this simple basis. First, no rent either of residential or of commercial property to be more than 10 percent greater than that obtaining on December 31, 1953; and, second, the law to become effective and operative in any community only when and if the President of the United States declares the existence of an emergency and an urgent necessity in the public interest.

There is nothing drastic in this. It is as much common sense as carrying an umbrella when the skies are heavy. If it does not rain you do not have to open the umbrella. If the President thinks he can keep things from busting wide open, he does not have to use the power my bill would give him. It is just that simple. It can be the means of stopping a recession becoming a depression.

But voting for it, of course, does require of a Republican that he put his faith in President Eisenhower. Not many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were disposed in the first session to go that far in faith revelation.

Bill Amending Reclamation Contract Repayment Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to settle some of the long controversy in regard to contracts under section 9 (e) of the 1939 reclamation law.

This bill relates to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. Its purpose is: First, to provide for renewal of contracts under section 9 (e), second, assure credit toward repayment and eventual repayment of construction costs; and third, give assurance of permanent water service.

The bill provides that a long-term contract entered into under section 9 (e) of the 1939 act could be renewed by the Secretary of the Interior, at the request of the other contracting party. Such renewal would take into consideration increases or decreases in construction, operation, and maintenance costs and improvement or deterioration in the contracting party's repayment ability.

There are two provisions in the bill which assure credit toward repayment and eventual repayment of construction costs. First, the bill provides that any contracting party entering into a long-term contract pursuant to section 9 (e) will be credited each year, toward repayment of construction costs, with the amount paid in excess of the operation and maintenance expenses. After the sum of such credits is equal to the amount established as the party's appropriate share of the construction cost, then no construction component will be included in the water charges. Secondly, it provides that a long-term contract entered into under section 9 (e) can be converted to a contract under section 9 (d) at such time as the amount of the construction costs remaining to be repaid can be repaid within the term of a contract under section 9 (d).

With respect to assurance of permanent water service, the bill provides that any party to any contract entered into pursuant either to section 9 (e) or section 9 (d) will have first right to a stated share of the project's available water supply during the term of the contract or any renewal thereof. Upon completion of payment of that part of the construction cost assigned for ultimate return by the contracting party, the right to a stated share of the project's water supply would become permanent.

REA Loan Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, a recent news story quoted a Rural Electrification Administration official—believe it was Deputy Administrator Fred Strong—as saying REA will wind up this fiscal year June 30 with $45 million it cannot lend anyone.

This, the United Press dispatch continued, may lead REA to ask Congress for the second straight year to curb its generosity in voting loan funds for rural electric cooperatives.

I am at a loss to understand how REA can say it has more money than it can use—while at the same time the agency is stalling applications for loans.

This year, REA's new authorization was $135 million. There was a carryover of $30 million. REA rescinded $15 million of old loans, and there was a $45 million contingency authorization.

With a total available of $225 million, the agency laid down a planned loan program of $135 million, or $90 million less than was available. There was a planned carryover of $45 million. And it was planned to let the $45 million contingency revert to the Treasury.

The law provides that 50 percent of new money must be allocated among the States on the basis of the number of unelectrified farms in that State as a percentage of the total unelectrified farms in the Nation. The other 50 percent is allocated among the States at the REA Administrator's discretion—provided that no State gets more than 10 percent. Carryover funds are subject solely to that second requirement.

One Montana cooperative, seeking a loan, was told recently that more loan applications had been received from cooperatives in Montana than there were loan funds allocated to our State for loan purposes during fiscal 1954, and that therefore REA could not promise to consider the application this fiscal year.

I called the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and asked if there were other such cases. I was told that 48 systems have had loan applications for $36 million pending with the REA for what the applicants consider an unreasonable length of time.

It may be that applications from Montana cooperatives have exceeded the allocation. It would be an amazing coincidence if this were true in every other State represented by the cooperatives whose applications have been pending for some time.

Had this year's planned loan program been based upon the total available instead of $90 million less than that, perhaps these 48 systems would not now be standing in line, hats in hand—and the REA might not be able to say truthfully that it has $45 million it cannot lend to anyone.

The news article follows:

[From the Washington Post of February 17, 1954]

FORTY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS IN REA FUND GOES BEGGING

The Rural Electrification Administration will wind up the current fiscal year June 30 with $45 million it can't lend anyone, an official said.

This may lead REA to ask Congress for the second straight year to curb its generosity in voting loan funds for rural electric cooperatives.

REA last spring asked Congress to authorize $90 million for new electrification loans. With available holdover funds, the agency planned to lend $135 million this fiscal year.

Congress decided that wasn't enough and voted $135 million in new funds, making $180 million Congress pressed into the Agency's hand.

REA just didn't use the extra money. The surplus on hand June 30 will equal the $45 million Congress pressed into the agency's reluctant hand last year.

Fight To Save "Olympia," Dewey's Flagship, in Naval Victory at Manila Bay

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a statement prepared by me for presentment to the Committee on Armed Services on the occasion of my appearance before that distinguished body in support of H. R. 6815, a bill introduced by me for the restoration of the U. S. S. *Olympia*. The *Olympia* was Admiral Dewey's flagship in the memorable naval victory in Manila Bay on May 1, 1898. Her last mission was to bring home to his own United States the Unknown Soldier of World War I.

H. R. 6815 provides that the *Olympia* shall be berthed permanently in or adjacent to Chicago, a gracious recognition of the large contribution of the Middle Western States to the Navy of the United States.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity of speaking in behalf of H. R. 6815 and your graciousness in according place on your calendar to an item of sentiment.

The enactment of H. R. 6815 will not add to the material strength of the defenses of our country. The U. S. S. *Olympia* never again will ride the waves in line of battle. Repair, equip, and restore her with all the skill of modern engineering and construction and you cannot bring back the majesty and the power of the past.

Her place now is in that imperishable fleet of American naval traditions. American youth of my generation, of preceding and succeeding generations, have been brought up on those traditions of American ships and American sailors. So may it continue. May the blood of young America never cease to tingle at recital of naval victories from *Old Ironsides*, from the *Olympia* under Dewey at Manila, to the climaxing and never equaled triumphs of World War II that gave to these United States the supremacy of the seven seas.

I believe in the power of monuments and of memorials in the shaping of a national character in the molds of a patriotic nobility. Nowhere better than in Washington are we brought to realize the vitalizing and inspiring effects that are produced. Daily I have watched the visitors, young and old, coming to Washington as to a national shrine, eagerly making the rounds of the statues and the monuments and the sites of great historical import. Never have I seen on any face any expression save that of respect, usually one approaching the look of religious awe. Mr. Chairman, I know as all my colleagues know that the best way to make good Americans even better Americans is to prove that a good American who has done much for his country is not forgotten when he is dead.

The U. S. S. *Olympia* was Admiral Dewey's flagship at Manila Bay. It was at Manila Bay on May 1, 1898, that Dewey, commanding the *Olympia*, electrified the world and started our country on the road to world destiny by a quick and decisive defeat of the entire Spanish fleet in the Pacific.

HER LAST MISSION

I shall return to the narrative of the years of sea service of the *Olympia*, but first I wish to mention her last mission. It was in September of 1921 when she was assigned the duty of bringing home for burial in Arlington Cemetery the Unknown Soldier, representative of the heroes of the American Forces of the World War. She left Philadelphia Navy Yard on this mission on October 3, 1921, reaching Plymouth on October 16, 1921. She arrived at the Washington Navy Yard on November 9, 1921 with the Unknown Soldier. In 1922 the *Olympia* was placed out of commission.

As the last remaining veteran of the Spanish-American War in the National House of Representatives, I have a natural, and I trust an understandable interest, in the preservation of the *Olympia*. As a veteran of World War I, I am sure I will be joined by all the veterans of that war, many of whom are serving in the House, in the desire to preserve the ship that brought home the Unknown Soldier. As an American I have the faith that I am joined by all other Americans in the prayer that the *Olympia* will be saved as a continuing inspiration to the good deeds of patriotism.

TO BE BERTHED IN CHICAGO

House bill 6815 provides that the *Olympia*, after restoration, shall be berthed in or adjacent to the port of Chicago, provided such is, in the determination of the Secretary of the Navy, feasible, otherwise in Philadelphia Navy Yard. I can assure the committee that the permanent presence of the *Olympia* in the Chicago area would be greatly appreciated by the people of the great Middle West. We are proud, Mr. Chairman, of the large contribution made to the Navy of the United States by personnel coming from the States of the Middle West and many of it passing through the Great Lakes Naval Training Station. We venture the thought that the Navy would derive much satisfaction from the permanent berthing of this historic vessel in the waters in or adjacent to Chicago.

In the event, however, that the location in the Chicago area should not be feasible in the determination of the Secretary of the Navy, my bill provides for the permanent berthing in the Philadelphia Navy Yard. It is all a matter for the Secretary of the Navy to decide.

HISTORY OF U. S. S. "OLYMPIA"

The *Olympia*, protected cruiser, was built at the Union Iron Works, San Francisco, Calif. Authorized on September 7, 1888, her keel was laid in 1890. Launched November 25, 1892, and named for the capital city of the State of Washington. She was commissioned on February 5, 1895.

Her dimensions are: Length overall, 344 feet 1 inch; breadth on waterline, 53 feet ½ inch; normal displacement, 5,865 tons; speed, 21.69 knots; armament, ten 5-inch, 51-caliber, two 3-inch, 50-caliber, antiaircraft; complement, 34 officers, 346 men.

After service as the flagship of Rear Adm. F. V. McNair, from 1895 to 1898, cruising in waters of Japan, China, and Sandwich Islands, the *Olympia* became the flagship of Adm. George Dewey in command of the Asiatic squadron on January 3, 1898, Capt. G. V. Gridley, United States Navy, commanding.

On May 1, 1898, at the Battle of Manila Bay, the *Olympia* led the attack on the ships of the Spanish squadron. Admiral Dewey in his autobiography states:

"At 5:40 when we were within a distance of 5,000 yards, I turned to Captain Gridley and said 'You may fire when you are ready, Gridley.' While I remained on the bridge with Lamberton, Brumby, and Stickney, Gridley took his station in the conning tower and gave the order to the battery. The very first gun to speak was an 8-inch from the forward turret of the *Olympia*, and this was the signal for all the other ships to join in the action. The action lasted from 5:41 a. m. (with an interruption of 3 hours) until 12:30 p. m. and ended in the destruction of the enemy's vessels."

On account of the ill health of Captain Gridley, Comdr. B. P. Lamberton was ordered to take command of the *Olympia* in June 1898. The vessel continued with the Asiatic Squadron until she went out of commission November 8, 1898, at the Navy Yard, Boston, Mass.

In January 1902, the *Olympia* was recommissioned under command of Capt. H. W. Lyon, and joined the North Atlantic Squadron as flagship in April 1902.

From December 1903 to April 1904, the *Olympia* was protecting American interests and lives in Panama, going on the same service in June to Smyrna and Turkey. In May 1905, and from July to December 1905, she was on a similar mission in Dominican waters.

OUT OF COMMISSION

This vessel was placed out of commission on April 2, 1906, at the Norfolk Navy Yard, but was recommissioned on May 15, 1907 and cruised with the midshipmen from the Naval Academy. Placed in reserve at Annapolis and later taken to Charleston, S. C., where she remained in ordinary until 1916.

When the United States entered the world war, the *Olympia* was en route from St. Thomas, V. I., to the Norfolk Navy Yard. A week later she was designated flagship of the United States Patrol Force (commander of the Patrol Force, Rear Adm. Henry B. Wilson, and Capt. Waldo Evans, in command of the *Olympia*).

She was employed in patrol duty off the coast of Nova Scotia and ocean escort for British merchantmen en route to and from New York and the war zone. On April 28, 1918, she sailed from Charleston for Europe, arriving on May 20 at Scapa Flow, Scotland, and arrived at Murmansk, Russia, May 24. She transported Lieutenant General Poole, of the British Army and a small detachment of troops. They drove off an attack at Pechenga.

On June 8, 1918, the *Olympia* sent a detachment 150 strong to Kandalaska to assist in guarding that point. When the Murmansk Government broke with the Bolsheviki allied troops landed in Murmansk. In August a detachment from the *Olympia*, under Captain Bierer, took part in the successful expedition against Archangel. This same detachment, under Lieutenant Hicks,

bore their share in the pursuit of the retreating Bolshevists to the interior, having some hard fighting.

CRUISE OF BLACK SEA

In December 1918 the *Olympia* became the flagship of the Commander, United States Naval Forces, Eastern Mediterranean, visited ports along the Adriatic and made a cruise of the Black Sea.

In September 1919, the *Olympia* was under way for Trau, Dalmatia, having been informed by the Italian senior naval officer present of the occupation of Trau by renegade Italian troops from the Italian-occupied zone, which he urged the United States naval authorities to induce to return to the Italian zone prior to an inevitable clash of arms with the Serbian military authorities. Arriving at Trau, a landing force of 101 men and officers disembarked. The mission having been accomplished, the landing force returned to the ship which returned to Spalato the same evening.

On November 7, 1920, *Olympia* assisted in the delivery to the Italian Government of the ex-Austrian battleship *Radetzsky* and ex-Austrian battleship *Zrinyi*. These two vessels held in trust by the United States after the armistice were towed out to sea and delivered to the Italian authorities as per agreement.

At Ragusa, Dalmatia, assisted in caring for refugees who had landed there and were in desperate circumstances due to hunger, lack of shelter, and the outbreak of typhus and smallpox. The ship distributed fuel, soap, clothing and food and the medical officer cared for the sick.

The *Olympia* remained in European waters until May 4, 1921, when she left for the Philadelphia Navy Yard. She participated in the bombing exercises of the ex-German ships *Frankfort* an *Osterfriesland*.

In September 1921 she was assigned the duty of bringing home for burial in Arlington Cemetery the Unknown Soldier, representative of the heroes of the American forces of the World War. She left the Philadelphia Navy Yard on this mission on October 3, 1921, reaching Plymouth October 16. She arrived at the Washington Navy Yard on November 9, 1921, with the Unknown Soldier, where she was met by representatives of the Army and Navy and the other services.

In 1922, the *Olympia* was placed out of commission.

During the Sesquicentennial Exposition, visitors to the exposition were admitted to the *Olympia* as part of the Navy's exhibit at that celebration.

SINKING OF THE "MAINE"

Mr. Chairman, it was the sinking of the *Maine* in Havana Harbor on February 15, 1898, that brought on the war with Spain. Four and a half months after the sinking of the *Maine*, Dewey with the *Olympia* as his flagship had wiped out the entire Spanish fleet in the Pacific. I ask consent to include in my remarks the complete roster of men who went down with the *Maine*. The list is of officers, sailors, and marines who were killed or drowned or subsequently died of their injuries. My purpose in including this list of heroes at this time is to emphasize the fact sometimes glossed over by some that no one group, no one sect, no one nationality has a monopoly on American heroism. These are the names of the 266 who died on the *Maine* 56 years ago. Anglo-Saxon names and Japanese names, Irish names and Jewish names, German names and Scandinavian names, Italian names and a Korean name, names of men of all colors, of many faiths and countries of origin, names now that glorify the roll of American heroes who went to their deaths 56 years ago.

The list follows:

"F. W. Jenkins, assistant engineer; D. R. Merritt, lieutenant junior grade; John T. Adams, James P. Aitken, John Anderson, Holm A. Anderson, Charles Anderson, Gustav A. Anderson, John Anderson, Alex C. Anderson, Frank Andrews, Abraham Anfindsen, Bernhard Anglund, Harry Auchenbach, John P. Barry, Lewis L. Barry, Henry S. Baum, Jakob Becker, John R. Bell, Fred Blomberg, John Bockbinder, Fritz Boll, James Boyle, Leon Bonner, Heinrich Brinkman, Arthur Brofeldt, Adolph C. Bruns, Edward Burns, Robert Burkhardt, Frederick F. Butler, Thomas Caine, Walter Cameron Herbert M. Carr, Wm. R. B. Caulfield, Suke Chingi, Charles A. Christianse, Thomas Clark, James C. Clark, Michael Cochrane, Thomas M. Cole, William Coleman, Wm. Coleman, Anthony Conroy, William Cosgrove, Charles Curran, Berger Dahlman, Charles Dennig, Wm. Donoughy, James Drury, George Edler, Charles F. W. Eiermann, Andrew V. Erikson, John P. Etts, Karl Evensen, Charles F. J. Fadde, Rudolph Falk, George D. Faubel, William J. Fewer, Trubie Finch, Frank Fisher, Alfred J. Fisher, Michael Flaherty, Lewis M. Fleishman, Patrick Flynn, John Fougere.

"Bartley Fountain, Charles Frank, James F. Furlong, Patrick Gaffney, Frank Gardner, Thomas J. Gardner, Wm. H. Gorman, Joseph F. Gordon, James A. Graham, Edward P. Graham, Patrick Grady, Wm. A. Greer, Michael Griffin, Henry Gross, Reinhardt Grupp, John A. Hallberg, Wm. Hamberger, Charles A. Hamilton, John Hamilton, Wm. Hanrahan, Edward Harris, Milliard F. Harris, Daniel O. C. Harley, Thos. J. Harty, Charles F. Hassell, Charles Hauck, Howard B. Hawkins, Albert B. Hennekes, Benjamin H. Herriman, Frederick Z. Holzer, Gustav Holm, Alfred J. Holland, Wm. J. Horn, Wm. L. Hough, Patrick Hughes, Otogiro Ishida, Peter C. Johansen, Charles Johnson, George Johnson, John W. Johnson, Peter Johnson, Thomas J. Jones, Harry Jectson, Carlton Jencks, Frederick L. Jernee, Charles F. Just, Michael Kane, John A. Kay, Hugh Kelly, John Kelly, Alexander Keskull, Harry J. Keys, Fritz Kihlstrom, Frederick E. Kinsey, Thomas F. Kinsella, Yikichi Kitagata, Frederick H. Kniese, George W. Koebler, Charles Kranyak, Hugo Kruse, Charles Laird, William Lambert, Luther Lancaster, George Lapierre, Edward Lawler.

"James M. League, William J. Lee, Daniel Leene, Samuel Lees, Gustav Leupold, John B. Lewis, Daniel Lewis, George Lieber, Jorgen J. Lorenzen, James Louden, Clarence E. Lowell, William Lund, John T. Lydon, Matthew Lynch, Bernhard Lynch, Benjamin L. Marsden, Johan Martensson, James H. Mason, Carl Matiasen, John Matza, Hugh McConigle, John J. McManus, Francis J. McNiece, Elmer M. Meilstrup, John Merz, Eldon H. Mero, George Miller, William S. Miller, George Mobles, Edward H. Moore, William Montfort, Gerhard C. Moss, John H. Moss, Noble T. Mudd, Cornelius Murphy, Tamekicki Nagamine, Sophus Nielsen, John C. Nielsen, Charles M. Nolan, William Noble, Mas Ohye, Gustave C. Ording, James O'Connor, Thomas J. O'Hagen, Patrick O'Neill, Henry M. O'Regan, Frederick Paige, John Palmgren, Robert Perry, Francis C. Phillips, James Pinkney, John Porter, John Powers, Daniel Price, Thomas J. Quigley, Charles P. Quinn, Joseph Reilly, William A. Reiger, Newell Rising, Wm. Henry Robinson, Peter Roos, William Rushworth, Clarence E. Safford, Michael E. Salmin, August Schroeder.

"Charles A. Scott, Joseph Scully, Joseph Seery, Walter S. Sellers, Patrick J. Shea, Thomas Shea, John J. Shea, Owen Sheridan, John H. Shillington, Alfred Simmons, Carl A. Smith, Nicholas J. Smith, Nicholas Stevenson, Isa Sugisaki, Frank Sutton, Kashitara Suzuki, Frank C. Talbot, Daniel J. Tehan, George Thompson, Frank B. Tigges, William H. Tinsman, Constantin Todoresco, Thomas Troy, Martin Tuohey, Joseph F. Walsh, John Wallace, John Warren, Charles O. White, Robert White, George W. Whiten, Johan E. Wickstrom, Albert Wilson, Robert Wilson, George W. Wilbur, John H. Ziegler.

"Marines: Henry Wagner, first sergeant; John Bennett, Vincent H. Botting, George Brosnan, James T. Brown, James R. Burns, John H. Dierking, Michael J. Downing, Charles E. Johnson, William J. Jordan, Edward F. Kean, Frank Kelly, George M. Lauriette, Peter A. Losko, Joseph P. Monahan, John McDermott, C. H. Newton, P. J. Newman, A. H. Richter, James H. Roberts, Joseph Schoen, H. E. Stock, James Strongman, E. B. Suman, E. B. Timpany, H. A. Van Horn, Asa V. Warren, A. O. Wills."

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the committee will act favorably on the proposal to preserve the *Olympia* as a reminder of the glory of the past and as an inspiration to brave deeds and noble thoughts in the years ahead.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, February 25, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who givest the day for work and the night for repose, grant to us a deep sense of Thy presence in the return of this morning hour when duty, that stern echo of Thy voice, calls Thy servants, these representatives of the public good, again to counsel for the Nation's weal. Despite earthborn clouds of misunderstanding and suspicion, keep us from the cynicism that corrodes and from the blight of disillusionment. In all our ways make us ever loyal to that high adventure which seeks the larger, nobler design for our struggling race to live together according to Thy will for the good of all. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DWIGHT GRISWOLD, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GRISWOLD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 25, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CIVIL DEFENSE CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal Civil Defense Contributions Program, for the quarter ended December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the quarter ended September 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BROWNWOOD PROJECT, TEXAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Brownwood project, Texas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by Buffalo (N. Y.) Aerie 46, Fraternal Order of Eagles, relating to liberalization of the social-security law; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Rural Electric Systems of the United States, at Miami, Fla., relating to the power policy of the Department of the Interior and its Missouri Basin Bureau of Reclamation marketing criteria; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the confirmation of the nomination of Earl Warren to be Chief Justice of the United States; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to continue Federal grants to State relief programs for the aged and to preserve the Federal social-security program

"Whereas the General Court of Massachusetts considers it inconceivable that the Congress of the United States would take away retirement benefits earned under the present system; and

"Whereas the full faith and credit of the United States Government lies behind the benefit rights contained in the law: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to continue the present level of grants to State relief programs for old-age assistance; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the General Court hereby urges the Congress of the United States to broaden the present Federal social-security program to include persons engaged in the professions, in agriculture, and in domestic services; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

FEDERAL TAXATION — LETTER FROM GOLDEN VALLEY, N. DAK., LOCAL 1157, FARMERS UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from the president of the Golden Valley, N. Dak., Farmers Union, Local 1157, embodying a resolution adopted by that organization, relating to Federal taxation.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLDEN VALLEY, N. DAK.,
February 10, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The Golden Valley Farmers Union met last night and adopted the following resolutions:

1. We favor the elimination of the 2-cent Federal tax on tractor gas now in effect.

2. We favor freedom from income tax to anyone having a gross income of $7,000 or less annually.

3. We are still in favor of 100 percent of parity.

4. We also resolve that no U. N. troops be sent to Indochina.

Thanks for your effort in the farmer's cause.

GOLDEN VALLEY LOCAL NO. 1157,
MRS. HILDA BACKFISH, *Secretary.*

P. S.—We all enjoyed the article in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post on the most baffling man in Washington.

JOHN LINDEMAN,
President.

DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS—STATEMENT OF MILK PRODUCERS COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS OF NEW ENGLAND

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a statement issued on behalf of the principal milk producers cooperative associations supplying milk to Boston and other markets in New England, at a meeting held in Montpelier, Vt., relating to the dairy price supports and the agricultural program proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Following the announcement by Secretary of Agriculture Benson of the sharp reduction in support levels for manufactured dairy products, representatives of the principal milk producers cooperative associations supplying milk to Boston and other markets of New England met in Montpelier, Vt., on February 18, 1954.

The meeting was held primarily to consider what steps should be taken to meet the acute price cost squeeze now confronting dairy farmers.

The following statement was approved unanimously by producers and cooperative leaders present at the meeting, and a committee was appointed to present their views to the Secretary of Agriculture and Members of Congress:

"1. Dairy farmers of New England have already suffered a substantial reduction in prices and income under the operation of the fluid-milk pricing formula. The present supply-demand factor in the formula has operated to reduce the class I fluid-milk price to producers by 66 cents per hundredweight since the fall of 1952. This decline is in addition to an earlier reduction of 44 cents per hundredweight brought about as a result of the original supply-demand formula factor. Dairy farmers, therefore, have already taken a total reduction of $1.10 per hundredweight in the fluid-milk price which is equivalent to 2½ cents per quart.

"These declines have not been accompanied by corresponding reductions in milk-production costs.

"2. Purchased feed is a major item in milk-production costs in New England. The announced reduction in dairy products support levels to 75 percent of parity while feed prices continued to be supported at 90 percent of parity imposes a hardship and injustice on dairy farmers. It forces a drastic readjustment on prices which farmers receive for their milk while no corresponding adjustment is in prospect in feed prices and other costs."

The reduced dairy-support levels will result in a further decline of about 60 cents a hundredweight in prices received for milk in excess of fluid requirements at a decline of about 30 cents per hundredweight in the blended price paid to producers. This decline is in addition to reductions in fluid-milk prices which have already occurred under the operation of the existing supply-demand factor in the pricing formula.

New England dairy farmers recognize the problems arising from general surplus of farm products but know that a sound dairy economy requires a proper relationship between milk prices and production costs.

They are prepared to accept downward adjustments in milk prices which are accompanied by corresponding adjustments in feed prices and other costs.

ARMY BASE FACILITIES, BOSTON, MASS.—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF BOSTON

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted on February 15, 1954, by the City Council of Boston, Mass., relating to the proposed closing of the Army base facilities in Boston.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the members of the Boston City Council are most anxious to preserve the vital Army base facilities which mean so much to the economy of the city of Boston and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts during the time of war; and

Whereas these facilities represent an estimated value of over $50 million, and would take a great deal of time to replace during the time of a national emergency—should they be closed and allowed to decay; and

Whereas engineering experts have recently determined that the dock bases are in imminent danger of collapsing and that necessary repairs to bulkheads and pilings will cost in the neighborhood of $12 million; and

Whereas the closing of the Army base docking facilities will undoubtedly detour a large amount of the present shipping business away from Boston with the consequent loss of employment to hundreds of our longshoremen and others; and

Whereas the policy to close these facilities, rather than expend the funds necessary to properly repair them, is a policy, as well pointed out by the Boston Herald in an editorial of February 11, 1954, Economy by Abandonment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Boston City Council, in meeting assembled, calls upon the Members of the congressional delegation from Massachusetts to intercede forthwith with the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Defense, and, if need be, with the President of the United States, in an attempt to obtain reconsideration of the predetermined policy of closing the base, and urge that the necessary repairs be made to assure the preservation and continuance of the operation of the Army base which is so vital to Boston, and be it further

Resolved, That in presenting the request, the delegation further point out to the authorities previously mentioned, the economic hardship which Boston, Greater Boston, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts are already suffering because of the contract awards to other areas for manufacturing of goods and the building of such items as the third *Forrestal* type carrier which was recently lost to the Greater Boston area.

In city council February 15, 1954. Adopted.
Attest:

WALTER J. MALLOY,
City Clerk.

AIR ACADEMY IN RHODE ISLAND—RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Rhode Island General Assembly at the January 1954 session, and subsequently approved by Gov. Dennis J. Roberts, advocating the establishment of an Air Academy in the State of Rhode Island. Both Senator GREEN and I endorse this recommendation, and with due deference to the other States, we feel that Rhode Island would be an ideal locale for the new Air Academy.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to work for the establishment of an air college in this State

Whereas in the State of Rhode Island there are already existent training facilities which would afford air personnel the opportunity for line, staff, administrative, and other training; and

Whereas there are also ample housing accommodations for any increased military population, student or staff, involved in the establishment and maintenance of any such air college: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly now respectfully calls these facts to the attention of the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, requesting each to work for the establishment and maintenance of an air college in this State; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit to said Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution.

LAYOFFS OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES—RESOLUTION OF ST. PAUL, MINN., TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the St. Paul, Minn., Trades and Labor Assembly at a recent meeting, protesting the layoffs of employees now taking place in that area in certain plants, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly that 1,900 workers will be laid off by February 26, 1954, at the Federal Cartridge Corp. at the Twin City arsenal plant, and that hundreds of employees of the Minneapolis-Moline and Donovan, Inc., Co., shell plants at said arsenal have already been laid off; and

Whereas the efficiency of operation of these plants ranks among the highest due to the excellent type of skilled workmen available in St. Paul, and the cost of operation of said plants ranks favorably with other similar manufacturing concerns throughout the country; and

Whereas it has been definitely ascertained that Minnesota has not been allocated its appropriate portion of defense contracts, based on its population and productive ability; and

Whereas President Eisenhower has stated that if reductions are to be made in personnel of plants of this nature that due consideration should be given to the labor market in the area in which said plants are located;

Whereas the laying off of 1,900 men and women during the month of February, and hundreds more thereafter in the immediate succeeding months, will result in a substantial labor surplus in St. Paul and cause real distress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly do hereby protest the laying off of more than 400 employees at the Donovan, Inc., and Minneapolis-Moline plants at the Twin City arsenal, and we further protest the further contemplated layoff of some 1,900 employees of the Federal Cartridge Co. in this area; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Eisenhower, the Secretary of Defense, Senator Thye, Senator Humphrey and all of the Congressmen from Minnesota, with a letter urging them to do all in their power to stop any further layoff of employees at the Twin City arsenal plant.

Dated at St. Paul, Minn., February 12, 1954.

PRICE SUPPORTS ON DAIRY PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF OTISCO COOPERATIVE CREAMERY ASSOCIATION, OTISCO, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the board of the Otisco Cooperative Creamery Association at its meeting on February 17, 1954, opposing the drastic cut of supports on dairy products, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OTISCO COOPERATIVE
CREAMERY ASSOCIATION,
Otisco, Minn., February 20, 1954.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At our regular board meeting of the Otisco Cooperative Creamery Association, held the 17th day of February, the following resolution was passed, with instructions that the secretary forward said resolution to our Senators and Representatives.

"Whereas we oppose the drastic cut of supports on dairy products, we feel the dairy industry has been singled out for an unfair gesture from the Secretary of Agriculture, with relation to other supported products. We therefore urge you to try and do what you can to remedy this situation. If we have to take a cut in supports we feel the same should apply to other supported products."

Sincerely yours,
OTISCO COOPERATIVE CREAMERY ASSOCIATION,
EDGAR E. PETERSON, *Secretary.*

PARITY ON BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—RESOLUTION OF GRYGLA (MINN.) FARMERS UNION LOCAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Grygla (Minn.) Farmers Union Local at their last meeting favoring 90 to 100 percent of parity and opposing the sale of public power and transmission lines to private utilities, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRYGLA, MINN., *February 18, 1954.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

DEAR SIR: The Grygla Farmers Union Local adopted the following resolutions at their last meeting:

"The Grygla Farmers Union Local goes on record favoring 100 percent of parity on basic

commodities. Oats, barley, soybeans, and rye should be considered basic and be placed on the mandatory-support list.

"We favor the extension of the 90-percent support law for dairy products at least 3 more years and the use of compensatory payment direct to the producer rather than stockpiling of surplus dairy products.

"We favor mandatory support for livestock; this support also should be given direct to the producer in the form of compensatory payments."

NO. 2

"We are opposed to the sale of public power and transmission lines to private utilities and we favor the present preference clause and are opposed to any change which would make the REA cooperative estimate their power needs far in advance.

"We favor more appropriation for REA transmission line from public power projects. We are opposed to giving the Hells Canyon damsite to Idaho Power Co., as it is a direct infringement on the rights of the people living in that area."

ARTHUR NORDBY,
President.
Mrs. ALBERT MOE,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. IVES, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 6130. A bill to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under Lanham War Housing Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1034); and

S. 2937. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing without meeting the requirements of section 15 (8) (b) (ii) of that act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1035).

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2846. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940; with amendments (Rept. No. 1036).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. CARLSON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3029. A bill for the relief of Miroslav Slovak;

S. 3030. A bill for the relief of Helmut Cermak and Hana Cermak;

S. 3031. A bill for the relief of Antonin Volejnicek; and

S. 3032. A bill for the relief of Bohumil Suran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 3033. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary; and

S. 3034. A bill for the relief of Simos Marmaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3035. A bill to provide for transfer of title to movable property to irrigation districts or water users' organizations under the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3036. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish programs for the use of acreage diverted from production by the establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 3037. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Alaska (37 Stat. 512) to provide for the commitment and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3038. A bill for the relief of Bart Blaak (formerly Johannes J. M. Gijsbers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim retained rights in a certain tract of land to the Board of Education of Irwin County, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROGRAM OF ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish programs for the use of acreage diverted from production by the establishment of acreage allotments. I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3036) to require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish programs for the use of acreage diverted from production by the establishment of acreage allotments, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. THYE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

One of the major problems which we face in this country in adjustment or stabilization of crop production is the use of acres which are diverted from production of certain commodities. Encouragement must be given to the use of this land in soil-building practices rather than its use for crops which may create surpluses in other commodities.

It is important that an adequate program be developed to take care of this problem.

For that reason, I am sending to the desk a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish programs for the use of acreage diverted from production by the establishment of acreage allotments.

The bill would amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in setting forth the requirements for a program for the use of acres diverted from production.

It directs the Secretary of Agriculture to make soil conservation payments to encourage that acres diverted from the production of basic commodities by marketing quotas or acreage allotments be utilized for soil conservation purposes instead of for the production of commodities for market. Payments would equal at least 25 percent of the value of the basic commodity which would have been produced on lands participating in the program.

At least 10 percent of the lands taken out of production on account of allotments or quotas on each farm would be eligible to participate; and participating lands would also be eligible for payments under the general soil conservation payment program.

The maximum payment to any person for any year would be $2,500, and every person who participated would be entitled to at least $25.

In establishing practices, the Secretary would give consideration to practices normally used in the area. The Secretary would be given authority to enter into land rental contracts for the purpose of the program, which authority is denied to him with respect to other soil conservation payment programs by the first paragraph of section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

The authority of the Secretary to make soil conservation payments expires with the end of this year.

Since the program provided by the bill contemplates the continuation of soil conservation payments by the Secretary, section 2 of the bill extends the time within which the Secretary may make such payments for an additional 2 years.

This section is similar to legislation which has been passed from time to time since section 8 was added to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in 1936.

ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH ACT

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to give the Territory of Alaska a modern, efficient system of providing for the mentally ill of the Territory.

Members of the Senate may be surprised to know that the Territory of Alaska has today no authority whatever to control the program of caring for its own mentally ill. All authority over that function was specifically reserved to the United States Government in the Alaska Organic Act.

Furthermore, the present procedure for handling this problem in Alaska under the present Federal law is outmoded to the point of being ridiculous and cruel. Under present law, no person who is mentally ill may be committed to an institution for treatment until after he has been found by a court to be guilty of the "crime" of being insane. The whole system of handling the problem of mental illness in Alaska is at least 40 or 50 years out of date.

My bill would provide a modern, humane method of handling this problem. Furthermore, full responsibility would be given to the Territory of Alaska for the operation of the program.

I hope it may be possible for my committee and the Senate to consider this

bill promptly, and to get final action before the end of the session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3037) to amend the Organic Act of Alaska (37 Stat. 512) to provide for the commitment and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOMINATION OF FRANCIS F. HEALY FOR REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia transmitting, pursuant to law, the nomination of Francis F. Healy for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a period of 5 years, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Statement prepared by him on the subject of Lithuanian independence.

"THE NEMESIS OF POWER—THE GERMAN ARMY IN POLITICS 1918–45"—EXCERPT FROM BOOK BY JOHN WHEELER-BENNETT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in view of the extremely interesting controversy between the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Army of the United States, I believe the Members of the Senate will be interested in an excerpt from an important recent book entitled "The Nemesis of Power—The German Army in Politics 1918–45," by John Wheeler-Bennett.

I ask unanimous consent that the excerpt referred to be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[The Nemesis of Power—The German Army in Politics 1918–45, by John Wheeler-Bennett, p. 293]

Both von Papen and Hugenberg persisted in regarding the Nazis as turbulent but useful allies, who, if handled with cynical "realism," could be utilized to the greater glory of the German Army or of the cause of German conservative reaction. The alliance with the Nazis appeared to many generals, and also to many conservative leaders, as an inspired means of eliminating any danger of revolution from the extreme right. Patronized and controlled by the army and the conservative right, the NSDAP seemed an appropriate instrument for the creation of national unity, for it had already demonstrated its masterly technique in dealing with the masses, and had achieved a popular following such as no other national group had succeeded in obtaining. For a considerable period of time there were conservative leaders, such as von Papen; generals, such as von Fritsch; and public men, such as Schacht, who aided and abetted Hitler because they believed that he could be controlled by the groups and interests which they represented. Not until they had riveted the fetters upon their own wrists did they realize who indeed was captive and who captor. The self-delusion manifested in 1933 by men who could and should have known better is something of which only Germans are capable.

COMMUNISM—EXTRACT FROM WORKS OF V. I. LENIN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently, in a letter from a learned and wise man, my attention was called to a short passage written by one V. I. Lenin, the leader of the Communist revolution in Russia in 1917. I think we can assume that Lenin had some understanding of communism.

In view of present conditions in our country, I believe this observation of Lenin will be of interest to the Members of this body. I ask unanimous consent that the passage by Lenin be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Selected Works of V. I. Lenin, vol. 10, pp. 143–147]

At present, the millionaires of all countries are behaving, on an international scale, in such a manner as to deserve our heartiest thanks. They are hunting down bolshevism with the same zeal as did Kerensky and Co.; they are overdoing it and helping us quite as much as did Kerensky. When the French bourgeoisie makes bolshevism the central point of the election campaign, abusing the comparatively moderate or vacillating Socialists for being Bolsheviks; when the American bourgeoisie, having completely lost its head, seizes thousands and thousands of people on suspicion of bolshevism and creates an atmosphere of panic spreading broadcast alarming stories about Bolshevik plots; when the British bourgeoisie—the most solid in the world—in spite of all its wisdom and experience, commits acts of incredible stupidity, founds the most richly endowed societies to combat bolshevism, creates a special literature on bolshevism, and engages for the struggle against it an extra number of scientists, agitators and priests—we must bow and thank Messieurs the capitalists. They are working for us.

SECRETARY DULLES' POSITION ON THE BRICKER RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to clear up some confusion deliberately promoted by the supporters of the Bricker resolution. Time and time again they have intimated that the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, was at one time in favor of the Bricker amendment. In support of this claim they quote the following from a speech he made at Louisville, Ky., on April 11, 1952:

The treatymaking power is an extraordinary power, liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution, treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are, indeed, more supreme than ordinary laws for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights.

That is the opening paragraph of Mr. Dulles' speech at Louisville. He was then a private citizen. The remainder of his speech has been happily ignored by those who quote that paragraph. What else did he say? Let us take a look at the rest of the speech. I, for one, do not believe in quoting out of context. In the same speech, Mr. Dulles also said:

There is room for honest difference of opinion as to whether our Constitution needs to be amended as proposed or whether the President and the Senate should retain their present powers, for possible emergency use, at the same time insuring more vigilance to the end that treaties will not undesirably and unnecessarily encroach on constitutional distributions of power. Whatever one's view on this matter, it is surely in the public interest that this whole problem should be thoroughly explored.

Is this an endorsement of the Bricker resolution? All I read in that statement is an opinion that the "problem should be thoroughly explored."

The main body of the Secretary's Louisville speech was devoted to a discussion of the negotiation and ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty and the related security pacts in the Pacific, which Mr. Dulles so brilliantly conducted. He cited these treaties to his audience as models of the proper use of the treatymaking power, employing the "advice" as well as the "consent" of the Senate. I concur with him completely, as I am sure other Senators do also.

To him, this process followed the intent of the founders of the Constitution. I quote again from the same speech:

This extraordinary power seems to have been deliberately intended by our founders, in order to give the Federal Government untrammeled authority to deal with international problems. They apparently relied upon the fidelity of negotiators to our form of government, and upon the vigilance of the Senate, with the necessity for a two-thirds vote, to protect against abuse of the treatymaking power.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time available to the Senator from Wisconsin, under the 2-minute rule, has expired.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to call this matter to the attention of the Senate. Not only did the Secretary not specifically endorse the Bricker resolution, but he also pointed the way for checking whatever opportunities existed for abuse of the treatymaking power. Mr. Dulles' speech was, in effect, a plea for nonpartisan legislative executive cooperation in treatymaking. This is shown by these words:

We ought to have nonpartisan executive-congressional cooperation in relation to all treaties and, indeed, to major foreign policies. It is true that the Constitution gives the President the exclusive initiative regarding foreign affairs. But he cannot succeed if he cannot get his treaties ratified, if he cannot get the money to implement his policies, or if foreign governments believe that his policies are liable to be reversed every 2 years in consequence of congressional or presidential elections.

That is the speech that is supposed to be a rousing acclaim for the Bricker resolution, and the speech that is supposed to be the antithesis of what Secretary Dulles stated to the Judiciary Committee last year, in speaking in opposition to the Bricker resolution. In both statements I find almost nothing with which I would disagree. His testimony before the Judiciary Committee is primarily an elaboration of his earlier Louisville speech.

In his testimony on April 6, 1953, Secretary Dulles stated:

The treatymaking power, as it was written into our Constitution, is, to be sure, a large power. Treaties made by the President and concurred in by two-thirds vote of the Senate become law of the land. No limitations upon the treatymaking powers are explicitly defined in the Constitution or decisions of the Supreme Court. But the treatymaking power is not an unlimited power. All of the Supreme Court cases which deal with the subject are uniform to that effect.

Furthermore, while the Constitution provides that treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be supreme law of the land, they only rank on an equality with congressional enactments.

The effect of any treaty as internal law can be overcome by a simple act of Congress.

I pointed out a few minutes ago that in his Louisville speech, the Secretary was essentially promoting full public discussion of the Bricker resolution. This public discussion, he averred before the Judiciary Committee, had served its purpose.

He also said:

During recent years there developed a tendency to consider treatymaking as a way to effectuate reform, particularly in relations to social matters, and to impose upon our Republic conceptions regarding human rights which many felt were alien to our traditional concepts. This tendency caused widespread concern. * * *

I believe that that concern was then a legitimate one. * * * But I point out that the arousing of that concern was a correction of the evil.

There has been a reversal of the trend.

Mr. Dulles also elaborated on his previous plea for closer and nonpartisan executive-legislative teamwork in treatymaking. He said:

The Constitution provides that the President shall have power to make treaties by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. This administration recognizes the significance of the word "advice." It will be our effort to see that the Senate gets its opportunity to advise and consent in time so that it does not have to choose between adopting treaties it does not like, or embarrassing our international position by rejecting what has already been negotiated with foreign governments.

I heartily agree with him. I cannot fail to point out, however, that this is entirely consistent with the sentiments he expressed at Louisville the year before.

Mr. President, I hope the proponents of the Bricker resolution will note these statements and will cease picturing the Secretary as a one-time firebrand for this proposition. The record shows that although the Secretary was deeply concerned with the treatymaking provisions of the Constitution, he took no extreme position before he became Secretary.

He told the Judiciary Committee:

I have been sympathetic to the point of view reflected in Senate Joint Resolution 1, and I have so expressed myself. I have, however, now come to the conclusion that this whole matter requires further study, because analysis of the pending resolutions show that they may seriously weaken our Government in the field of foreign relations in ways which, I know, the proponents of the resolution do not intend or desire. The two different proposals before you, and independent drafting efforts of my own, convince me that it is difficult, if not impossible, to amend the Constitution so as to exclude possible abuses, without incurring risks that are far greater than the risk that the present powers will be abused.

Mr. President, I admire Mr. Dulles greatly. His concern with this vital constitutional question led him to study the matter thoroughly, and led him to the conclusion, in short, that the cure was worse than the sickness. In a later speech before the American Bar Association at Boston on August 26, 1953, he stated:

I can say to you soberly that the proposed amendment * * * would have a calamitous effect upon the international position and prospects of the United States. * * * It would make it impractical for the President to conduct foreign affairs and would throw upon the Congress in this respect a daily and incessant responsibility which such a numerous and already overburdened body is, in practice, incapable of discharging.

These are the words that reflect Mr. Dulles' true attitude about the joint resolution under our consideration, and not the few sentences quoted out of context by the Bricker resolution advocates.

Are we to condemn a man because he is big enough to educate himself on a problem, to weigh all sides of a question, and to arrive at a conclusion which may differ in some respects from vague conceptions he held before? I should say not. Two beloved Americans had appropriate words for this situation, and I commend them to my colleagues:

CONSISTENCY

R. W. Emerson—Self-Reliance, 1841:

A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines. With consistency a great soul has simply nothing to do.

Senator Henry F. Ashurst—speech in the Senate, February 24, 1937:

Whoever in his public service is handcuffed and shackled by the vice of consistency will be a man not free to act as various questions come before him from time to time; he will be a statesman locked in a prison house, the keys to which are in the keeping of days and events that are dead.

WOOL AND THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask that I may be permitted to address the Senate for 4 minutes at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Wyoming may proceed.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, last July, when the question of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was before the Senate, I joined with the senior Senator from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and other Senators in proposing an amendment which would have made the findings of the Tariff Commission under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act binding upon the administration. As all of us know, section 22 comes into play only when foreign imports reach such proportions that they make our agricultural support programs ineffective. I joined in sponsoring the Magnuson amendment because the wool industry of my State of Wyoming, and of the Nation, is the prime example showing that section 22 is not working; and as a representative of this substantial portion of the economy of the State of Wyoming, I felt that the amendment would have been exceedingly beneficial to that industry.

A month or so previously, I had written the President, congratulating him on the action he had taken in imposing quotas on imports of cheese and other dairy products, and urging that he take the same action in the case of wool, which is considered by our military experts to be a strategic material.

Much to the surprise and disappointment of the wool industry, the President, when he wrote to me on June 25, advised me that he had addressed to the Chairman of the Tariff Commission a letter to the effect that its 1952 investigation of wool imports was for the year ended April 30, 1953, and that a report by the Commission would serve no useful purpose.

The National Wool Growers summarized our thinking when they wrote me that they were "caught completely by surprise, and all of us think this is beyond all understanding. It means complete dismissal of the old case and we would have to go through all the same procedures again to get another hearing. It is a very disappointing conclusion to a lot of hard work by the industry and our friends on Capitol Hill."

Woolgrowers, hoping to accomplish something to support their industry at

this session of Congress, had requested the Senator from Washington to offer an amendment to the Trade Agreements Extension Act, for the sole purpose of strengthening the act.

On the floor of the Senate on that afternoon of July 2, during the debate on the Magnuson amendment, the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] acknowledged that the wool industry is in dire distress, and that the administration realizes that fact. We were given the impression that the amendment need not be adopted because the administration was taking steps to aid woolgrowers. In answer to a direct question which I asked him, the distinguished Senator from Colorado said:

> The Secretary of Agriculture has informed me that he has requested the President to instruct the Tariff Commission promptly to institute an investigation in connection with wool, under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.
>
> The White House informs me—and has said that I might disclose the fact—that early next week the President will instruct the Tariff Commission to make that investigation for the current wool year, and that the President will also bring the whole wool problem before the Economic Commission, which is provided for in the pending bill. The President believes there are some basic things, not fully answered by section 22 action which are troubling the wool industry, and he hopes for some constructive suggestions along that line.

It is most gratifying to those of us who have worked so long and so hard to assist the woolgrowing industry to note that the recommendations of the Tariff Commission with respect to wool are now on the President's desk. I have every reason to believe that they contain good news for the wool industry, and I sincerely hope that the President will see fit to act speedily upon these recommendations and give the woolgrowers positive proof that their industry is receiving the assistance it has so long needed.

LIMITATION ON DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENT OF DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to make a statement which will require 6 minutes, relative to a bill which I introduced on February 17.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on February 17 I introduced S. 2962, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat.

As is well known, the Secretary of Agriculture announced a few days previously a reduction in the price support level for milk for manufacture and butterfat sold by farmers during the next marketing year from 90 percent of parity, the maximum permitted under the agricultural act, to 75 percent of parity, which is the minimum permitted under the act.

This drastic action if carried out is certain to have widespread adverse effect upon the dairy industry, one of the most important segments of our entire agricultural economy.

In introducing S. 2962 I expressed the opinion that Congress will have to act to limit the extent of these variations in any given year if we are to avoid a ruinous situation in the dairy industry and resulting damage to our entire economy.

I cannot agree that a reduction in the price support levels on dairy products from the maximum permitted in the law to the minimum permitted in the law represents a gradual adjustment or a limited variation, and that is where I believe the policy announced by the Secretary of Agriculture with reference to dairy products is particularly unwise.

Since S. 2962 was introduced I have had many expressions of support for the objectives which the bill seeks to establish, including endorsements by many Members of Congress who are concerned, as I am, that we do not set in motion further drastic cuts in farm income that will create a recession in agriculture and undermine the economic health and well-being of the Nation.

I am happy to announce to the Senate that 22 colleagues in this body have now requested an opportunity to join me as cosponsors of S. 2962.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of these Members be added as cosponsors, and that the RECORD show that I have introduced S. 2962, on behalf of myself and the Senators whose names I shall read. I list these names so that in any new printing of the bill the names of the Senators indicated will be listed as cosponsors.

On the day I introduced the bill the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] asked, on the floor of the Senate, that he might join as a cosponsor. Therefore, I list his name first.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] wrote me a letter, and I told him that I would be happy to have him join as a cosponsor.

Later the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] joined as cosponsors.

Several other Senators have told me that they will support S. 2962, although they do not wish to be listed as coauthors at this time. If there are some who would like to be so added I believe their names can still be listed.

It is my understanding that if there is a reprint of the bill, the names of these cosponsors will appear on it and that when the Senate committee reports on this measure it will be noted that there are now 23 Members of the Senate who join in the sponsorship of this vital measure at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota that the names of other Senators be added as cosponsors? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I believe that this legislation is of prime importance, particularly because of the fact that the order of the Secretary of Agriculture with relation to the price supports for dairy products during the next marketing year takes effect as of April 1, which is scarcely a month away.

Entirely aside from the ruinous effect which we believe this proposed policy on the part of the Government would have upon the dairy industry, it seems to me that it is very important that the intent of Congress with reference to this matter should be clearly indicated at this time.

Therefore, I strongly urge that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry take steps to give immediate consideration to this bill.

I believe that the time is opportune to conduct hearings during the coming week and to provide adequate consideration of the more stable and orderly program which is laid down in the bill and which, in effect, is in accordance with the President's own statement to Congress relative to his newly proposed program for agriculture in which he said that "in keeping with the policy of gradual transition, the Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority under the Agricultural Act of 1949 to insure that year to year variations in price-support levels will be limited."

Any delay in consideration of the far-reaching effect of the Secretary's order on dairy price supports so far as Congress is concerned, or uncertainty as to what the future may hold, will simply add to the distress which is certain to result in the dairy industry from the policy formulated by the Secretary of Agriculture to take effect April 1.

In order that we may more fully understand the price situation with which the dairy producer is confronted, particularly in view of the further drop that is certain to follow the drastic change proposed in the support level, I have obtained figures from the Twin City Milk Producers Association showing the average prices paid to producers for 3.5 milk for each month during the past 7 years.

I ask unanimous consent that this table be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Twin City Milk Producers Association, average pool price for 3.5 milk

Month	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953
January	$4.01	$4.60	$3.48	$3.36	$3.82	$4.37	$3.92
February	3.77	4.56	3.29	3.35	3.90	4.43	3.81
March	3.69	4.43	3.19	3.18	3.89	4.23	3.81
April	3.48	4.49	3.17	3.18	3.98	4.23	3.67
May	3.27	4.41	3.21	3.22	3.98	4.11	3.55
June	3.27	4.47	3.22	3.20	3.88	4.12	3.56
July	3.69	4.71	3.41	3.36	3.95	4.27	3.77
August	3.94	4.63	3.67	3.55	4.02	4.60	3.85
September	4.28	4.29	3.70	3.55	4.04	4.64	3.86
October	4.11	3.78	3.70	3.57	4.10	4.64	3.88
November	4.37	3.70	3.70	3.59	4.22	4.54	3.89
December	4.80	3.70	3.58	3.73	4.30	4.07	3.72
Average per hundredweight	3.89	4.314	3.443	3.403	4.006	4.354	3.774
Less hauling	.222	.222	.222	.222	.222	.222	.222
Net per hundredweight	3.668	4.092	3.221	3.181	3.784	4.132	3.552
Net per quart	.0785	.0876	.0689	.0681	.0810	.0885	.0761

Mr. THYE. The Twin City Milk Producers Association is a large marketing cooperative organization in the Minneapolis and St. Paul area made up of approximately 6,500 producer members.

It furnishes 90 percent of the milk consumed in that metropolitan area.

In this cooperative, administrative costs are kept at a minimum and it is not a profitmaking organization, so that the price paid the farmer reflects accurately the market situation.

Another factor relative to this cooperative which makes these figures significant is that 59 percent of the milk produced by the association is sold as grade A fluid milk in the Twin City market and consequently the price paid the farmer is higher than if this organization depended solely on the manufacture of butter, powdered milk or cheese for its outlet.

It is to be noted that the net average price per hundredweight received by the producers in the Twin City Milk Producers Association was $3.55 in 1953—and this is 3½ percent butterfat milk—in comparison with $4.13 in 1952 and $3.78 in 1951.

The chart which I have inserted in the body of the RECORD will show clearly the specific background, by years and by the months in the years, of the situation as it exists.

The net price received by the producer per quart of milk last year averaged a little over 7.6 cents a quart. If any person accuses the producer and the support program as being a factor in the high cost of milk which the consumer must pay, or in the high cost of dairy products, such as butter, he should take a good look at the figures, because if the producer, with his investment in the operating unit as a farmer can realize only 7.6 cents a quart, when 59 percent of the milk produced by the association is sold as grade A fluid milk in the Twin Cities market, such a person is not aware of the price situation.

This figure clearly indicates what proportion of the retail price of milk to the consumer is received by the farmer who produces that milk, and is a very clear answer to the contention that has been heard that the producer is receiving an unfair proportion of the amount the consumer pays for dairy products.

I am certain, Mr. President, that fair examination of the situation will clearly show that any further drastic cuts in the prices the dairy producer receives for his products will have a serious effect.

I repeat, therefore, that it seems to me imperative that Congress give consideration to this matter immediately and I must, therefore, urge that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry conduct the necessary hearings on S. 2962 as soon as they can be arranged.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am delighted to accept the invitation of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] to add my name as a cosponsor of the bill.

THE PLIGHT OF THE SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, we have heard a great deal of talk about the health, or possible lack of health, of the Nation's economy. Some would have us believe that a recession is definitely on the way. Others argue that it is already here. Many, many others, and I among them, believe that the Nation is in good shape from an economic standpoint, and likely to remain so, despite some soft spots that have made their appearance here and there.

That there would be a slowup in some field is only normal, and to be expected, after such a period of full and expanded production as has been the almost universal situation throughout the years since V-J Day.

However, optimistic as we may be about the general situation, it does no good, and may, indeed, do a great deal of damage, to close our eyes to evidence concerning drastic situations which should not, and cannot be overlooked. Such a situation exists today in the once-great shipbuilding industry of the Nation. It has had a serious effect upon the economy of the Port of Baltimore and the State of Maryland. And the conditions in my home city and State are duplicated to greater or less extent in most, if not all, of the other important port areas of the country.

An article which appeared in the Baltimore Evening Sun of yesterday paints the picture in all its gloomy features. The opening paragraph puts the matter so succinctly, and so forcefully, that I ask the indulgence of the Senate while I read it:

A gloomier bunch of industrialists than the Nation's shipbuilders today could hardly be found. Accustomed as all are to the feast or famine routine which has plagued this American enterprise, most of them are talking as if this time the industry might be going down for the count. Their spokesmen are saying that unless somebody does something to stimulate private shipbuilding very soon, this country's capacity to produce ships in an emergency will be compromised beyond hope of recovery.

Whether any general recession may ever develop—and I am convinced that there is nothing in the immediate business and industrial situation to justify any serious alarm—I am just as definitely convinced that there is real reason for concern about the future of the American shipbuilding industry. Many thousands of skilled American workers, and their families, are dependent upon this industry for their livelihood. The economy of these shipbuilding areas is being seriously affected. It is high time that the Congress likewise give serious consideration to the problems incident thereto, and I ask unanimous consent to have the Evening Sun article reprinted in the body of the RECORD following my remarks. I make the further request that my colleagues take time to read this article, so that they may be acquainted with the situation it so well depicts.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLOOM IN THE SHIPYARDS—THE GOVERNMENT'S PLANS FOR MEETING DECLINE IN NEW BUSINESS

(By Walter C. Paine)

A gloomier bunch of industrialists than the Nation's shipbuilders today could hardly be found. Accustomed as all are to the feast or famine routine which has plagued this American enterprise, most of them are talking as if this time the industry might be going down for the count. Their spokesmen are saying that unless somebody does something to stimulate private shipbuilding very soon, this country's capacity to produce ships in an emergency will be compromised beyond hope of recovery.

Here are the facts of the present situation. At the moment the last keel called for by a contract with any private yard in the United States will be laid in April. Except for four naval vessels, all ships now building will be launched and the ways of private shipyards will be empty by the end of the present year.

The sharp downward trend in American shipbuilding is clearly shown in the records kept by the Department of Commerce. As of February 1 there were only 42 oceangoing vessels under construction in the United States, as compared with 88 in February a year ago. Employment in the 15 yards capable of building such ships has fallen from about 55,000 workers as of February 1953 to less than 44,000. The last keel has just been laid at the local yard of the Bethlehem Steel Co., and unless new business develops the number of shipworkers at the company's Sparrows Point shipbuilding division yards will be down by October to about one-twelfth

of normal strength. It was the vice president of Bethlehem's shipbuilding division, Mr. Daniel D. Strohmeier, who said last July, "There is not a private shipyard in the United States that has not already passed the point where new orders were necessary to forestall mass layoffs of personnel."

Seven months later shipbuilders are still looking for new orders. Now they say they are hard pressed to keep even a nucleus of skilled workers together. They explain that the present situation is not comparable to the famine of 1948 when some yards held onto men by obtaining subcontracts for bridge pontoons, car floats, and other work related to shipbuilding. Similar opportunities won't be available this year, builders say, and because this is the most serious dip in American shipbuilding since World War II, they fear that many workers will decide to quit shipbuilding and look for jobs in more stable industries.

For the first time since the war both building and repair business are feeling the press of foreign competition. In 4 years Germany, which launched 800,000 gross tons of shipping last year, has come back into second place behind the pace-setting United Kingdom. In third place last year and just ahead of the United States was Japan with 575,000 gross tons. An Italian yard launched last year's largest passenger ship, a 29,000-ton vessel similar to the Andrea Doria, while Germany and Japan split commercial honors with two mammoth tankers of about 25,000 gross tons each. What irks American builders most, however, is that the economy axe should spare the Navy-administered $237,000,000 construction program for NATO in foreign yards when no funds have been requested to stimulate shipbuilding at home.

For lack of any obvious evidence to the contrary, shipbuilders tend to assume that the Defense Department and the Maritime Administration are sitting on their hands about this whole matter. But quite the opposite impression is to be had by talking to President Eisenhower's new Maritime Administrator, Mr. Louis S. Rothschild, a department store executive from Kansas City, Mo., who makes no pretense to expertness about ships.

Mr. Rothschild believes that the demand for governmental economy and the return of foreign competition make it imperative that the shipping industry become more of a working partner with Government in the maritime field.

The goal of the Maritime Administration is a stabilized, privately owned and operated merchant fleet that will be adequate for trade and for defense. The active United States seagoing merchant fleet now consists of 1,367 vessels of at least 1,000 tons gross. Of these, 1,247 are in private hands; the rest are Government owned. Only 269 of the privately owned vessels are under operating subsidy agreements. In addition, there are 1,980 ships in the reserve fleet, 1,500 of them obsolescent Liberty ships. So far as adequacy for trade is concerned American ship operators have about all the dry-cargo ships they can profitably employ.

Despite the administration's desire to stimulate world trade it is a sad fact that the volume of cargo offerings is falling. Moreover, the recovery of foreign merchant fleets is reducing the share of world cargoes carried in high-cost American bottoms. It would be unrealistic in the extreme to suppose that competition from foreign carriers (and builders) will not increase. American builders, Mr. Rothschild suggests, must face these facts along with American ship operators.

Shipbuilders may question the adequacy of the present fleet in an emergency but, as the Administrator points out, the Department of Defense sets the policy here. So far, the Navy has expressed a desire to have more tankers on active service. Accordingly, the Maritime Administration is offering a trade-in-and-build program whereby tanker operators may sell good used tankers to the Government for depreciated book value or less. For every two tankers traded in the company must agree to build a new one with about twice the capacity and greater speed. The Maritime Administrator will ask Congress for funds sufficient to acquire 40 tankers under this program. This would encourage the building of 20 new tankers. As a further inducement to building legislation has been introduced to facilitate long-term charters with the Navy.

Mr. Rothschild also sees hope of encouragement of new shipbuilding in another quarter. Fifteen lines which receive operating subsidy help from the Government have definite obligations to replace obsolete ships. Applications are now in hand for two new $20 million passenger ships with strong prospects of a third. Applications for other special-type ships are anticipated. Henceforth, Mr. Rothschild would give ship operators a freer hand to design the types of ships they want rather than try to sell them a Government design based primarily on ease of conversion for defense purposes.

The third prong of the Maritime agency's program is novel and, indeed, exciting. Instead of requesting vast sums to replace ships in the reserve fleet it proposes to break out four old Liberty ships for a test. New, speedier, bow sections would be grafted on each of these tubby warhorses and they would be experimentally repowered, one with a steam turbine, another with a geared diesel, a third with diesel-electric drive. The fourth would be given a revolutionary powerplant as yet untried in an American ship—the gas turbine. Mr. Rothschild has gone straight to private industry for help with this project. He wrote letters to 12 companies and was surprised to receive 20 replies.

The Liberty test is expected to show the cost and feasibility of converting the reserve fleet quickly into faster ships for emergency use. Mr. Rothschild also hopes that the direct solicitation of help from private industry on the gas turbine will establish a precedent for partnership between free enterprise and Government agencies. Assuming that Congress approves the funds necessary to carry out Mr. Rothschild's program, would there be the promise of enough new building to satisfy apprehensive builders? Probably not. But at least it would provide enough to tide them over in a period of inevitable readjustment to America's changed position in world shipbuilding.

RETIREMENT PROVISIONS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of February 16, 1954, pp. 1937–1940, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the widespread misunderstanding which prevails both in and out of Congress concerning the congressional retirement program in general, and this bill in particular, compels me to make a statement concerning the accomplishments of the conference committee, whose report is before us today. It is extremely important that all Members of Congress and the public have an accurate comprehension of this subject, if we are to become engaged in either intelligent legislation or discussion thereon.

Permit me to mention two facts which Congress should have before it in considering the present bill, if we are not to be led into embarrassing or unsound positions with respect to it. In the first place, it is commonly asserted that our program is self-sustaining through contributions paid in by Members. This is very far from the truth; and although no separate computation is made, experts agree that the Government's contribution to the congressional retirement program is higher than that of Members of Congress themselves, and will be still higher under this bill. Such a contribution is not improper, for the practice is similar to that followed in most contributory pension systems; but it is important that the Government's contribution bear a close relationship to our own.

Secondly, many Members believe that our retirement fund is "in the black." Of course, any retirement fund in its early years receives more in contributions than it pays out in benefits; but such a fund is not "in the black" in terms of its actuarial soundness; for accrued liabilities are built up by the members paying into the fund, liabilities which in our case are greater than the present and contingent assets of our fund at the present rate of Government and member contributions. Indeed, the rate of disbursement under the congressional plan, as of June 1953, was approximately $350,000 a year without counting lump-sum death benefits and withdrawals; while the total possible contributions to the plan, if every Member of Congress contributed, would be $400,000 a year. It will thus be seen that we are not "in the black" in any sense of the word.

We must expect that far more money will be drawn out of the fund in the years to come than is being put in. In considering what action should be taken, I think we should be conscious of that situation confronting us.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum. The Senator from Massachusetts is making a very important statement, and I think the Members of the Senate should hear it. Therefore, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for that purpose——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do, Mr. President, with the understanding that I may retain my right to the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Martin
Anderson	Gore	Maybank
Barrett	Green	McCarthy
Beall	Griswold	McClellan
Bennett	Hayden	Millikin
Bricker	Hendrickson	Monroney
Burke	Hennings	Morse
Bush	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hill	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Pastore
Byrd	Holland	Payne
Capehart	Humphrey	Potter
Carlson	Hunt	Purtell
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Jackson	Russell
Clements	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kennedy	Sparkman
Duff	Kerr	Stennis
Dworshak	Kilgore	Thye
Eastland	Knowland	Upton
Ellender	Kuchel	Watkins
Ferguson	Langer	Welker
Flanders	Lehman	Wiley
Frear	Long	Williams
Fulbright	Magnuson	Young
George	Malone	
Gillette	Mansfield	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). A quorum is present.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to compliment the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for the very excellent job they have done as conferees on the part of the Senate. The report which the conference committee has brought back to the Senate is, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, vastly improved over the bill which passed the other body, even though I think there is room for additional improvement. I cannot support the bill in its present terms.

Before I suggested the absence of a quorum, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts had made two statements, which I believe Members of the Senate now present will want to hear.

Did not the Senator say that the present system could not, over a period of years, be self-sustaining?

Mr. KENNEDY. The point I made was that there was a misconception regarding certain aspects of the retirement plan. Many Members feel it is self-sustaining. That is not so. Even today the Government must make a contribution to the fund; and under this bill the contribution of the Government will have to be larger. I regret that fact, but there is nothing improper in such an arrangement. A nonemployee, or employer, contribution is made in practically all pension funds, including the social security and civil service retirement funds.

The second point is that many Members feel the fund is in the black. In a sense, it is in the black as of today; but that fact means nothing, because increasing liabilities have accrued, and will continue to accrue over a period of years. In the early years of such a fund as this, those who contribute to it are younger, of course, than they will be later, when they will begin to draw the benefits they are now building up. Eventually, payments to recipients will be far greater than the payments made by those who contribute to the fund. These liabilities accrue over the years. Therefore, from an actuarial standpoint, the fund is not actually in the black. If anything, it is in the red. In considering the bill, Senators must recognize that fact.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an additional question?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If the provisions of the conference report become law, on an actuarial basis, what percentage of the retirement benefits is it contemplated that Members of Congress and the taxpayers, respectively, will pay in the future?

Mr. KENNEDY. If the Senator will permit me to make my statement, I will cover some of these points. I will discuss the House bill which the conferees originally had before them, and the changes which they made in it, and I shall attempt to answer the question of the Senator. The answer to the question as to the degree of Government contribution is not easily obtainable.

THE CONFERENCE REPORT IS BASED UPON FULL INQUIRY INTO THE FACTS

When Senate bill 2175 first came before the conference committee, the misinformation and lack of information which accompanied it was distressing. The various reports and staff memoranda on which the conferees were expected to reach their decisions contained, I later found, repeated misstatements and half-truths. Although the bill consists wholly of amendments to the Civil Service Retirement Act and is to be administered by the Civil Service Commission, no report on the bill had ever been requested of that Commission. Nor had the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee ever studied the bill, it having been referred in this body to the Government Operations Committee. I now believe that the bill would have been more properly referred to the Senate Civil Service Committee, for that committee—to which it was referred in the House—has the legal responsibility for such legislation, despite an opening clause in this bill placing these civil-service retirement amendments in the Legislative Reorganization Act, to which I think they do not belong. Moreover, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee must consider the effect of such legislation upon other groups of Federal employees who may seek special retirement benefits.

Obviously, we do not operate in a vacuum. The benefits which will be given our employees will be a goal up to which all persons who come under the civil-service retirement fund will attempt to bring their standards. I supported the bill in the committee and in the Senate. But after further examination, I am persuaded that the bill should have gone to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, because the members of that committee are the ones who will face demands from civil-service employees who are eligible to participate in the civil-service retirement fund.

By such a statement I do not intend to show anything but the greatest respect for the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. Without her efforts over a period of weeks, I do not think we would have come to an agreement on the conference report. Because of her efforts the bill was substantially improved over the one which was first received from the House. In addition, we were greatly assisted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who has labored on the problem for a long time.

Similarly, this bill had at no time been referred to the Kaplan Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel, which Congress established in 1952 on the recommendation of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee in order to study just such proposals; nor had it been referred to the Segal Commission on Congressional and Judicial Salaries, which had a task force report on congressional retirement. Perhaps most important of all, at no time had any actuarial estimates been obtained to give us a picture of the cost of these proposals. Only the briefest hearings were held in the Senate, and as no formal hearings were held in the House, and no discussion took place in that body as the bill was passed on the Consent Calendar, the conferees did not have the benefit of such discussion.

I venture to predict, Mr. President, if the Senate had at that time quickly agreed to the House amendments, we would have justifiably brought the wrath of the public down upon us. A substantial increase in our own pension plan, without full public discussions or hearings, would not long have escaped the public eye. The result would have been public disrespect, political embarrassment for Senators, and certain failure for any salary increase recommendation.

For these reasons, Mr. President, the most important accomplishment of the conference committee was its willingness to abide by the sound principles of the legislative process. The services of an outstanding actuary, Mr. Robert J.

Myers, of the Social Security Administration, and his cost estimates, recommendations, and analysis of the misleading statements in the materials before us, were obtained, as were those of the able Chief of the Civil Service Retirement Division, Mr. Andrew Ruddock. Both Mr. Ruddock and Mr. Myers also worked with the conference committee in a series of long sessions devoted to rewriting the pending bill. As a result, I believe the bill was substantially improved. I would not suggest that all the amendments proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and myself were adopted by the conference committee, but without the amendments which were adopted the cost of the bill now before the Senate would be 50 percent greater, or an average annual additional cost of $600,000.

This brings me to the second major accomplishment of the conference committee, namely:

THE CONFERENCE REPORT EXCLUDES THE MOST FAR-REACHING CHANGES PROPOSED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RETIREMENT SYSTEM

The pending measure contains many substantial improvements in the congressional retirement program, all of which are, however, of a conforming or technical nature. These include limited provisions for prenormal retirement, inclusion of the $2,500 expense account in the salary base on which contributions are paid and benefits computed, credit for up to 5 years of military service preceding congressional service, and benefits for survivors of Members who die in office. All these changes are in conformity with the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act, or are otherwise patently justifiable, while, at the same time, substantially modernizing and improving our retirement program. One more far-reaching amendment was to change the basis of elective joint and survivors' annuities for Members from an actuarial to a nonactuarial basis. This means that a Member who, after exercising his survivorship option, presently receives $4,081 would instead receive $4,575, and his widow would receive $2,500 instead of $2,040. The present value of this increase under the insurance tables is nearly $8,000 for such a couple. I should like to mention briefly, however, some of the provisions for Members of Congress which were excluded by the conference committee.

Senate bill 2175, as it passed the House, would have permitted Members of Congress to retire on an annuity only slightly reduced, at age 55, with only 10 years of service; and, for those with 10 years of service, the House reduced the full retirement age from 62 to 60. It may well be, as in the case of all other amendments which I shall discuss, that these House amendments were based upon justifiable principles, for certainly the congressional retirement program is in need of a thoroughgoing reexamination and revision. But it would not have been wise to act upon such a far-reaching change without full hearings and consideration in both the Senate and the House. The eligibility requirements proposed for Members of Congress under the bill were far more liberal than those which prevail in most other Government and most private programs.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield at this point?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Although I do not intend to vote for the conference report, I must commend the members of the conference committee for making the measure far more acceptable and removing provisions which I think not only would have outraged the public's sense of propriety, but perhaps would have cost the Government large additional sums of money, as a result of the provision in the bill as passed by the House to permit prenormal retirement at age 55, and the further provision which would have lowered to 55 the age of beneficiaries under the social-security system. Those provisions were deleted by the conferees.

As the bill came to the Senate, it would have permitted, would it not, earlier retirement, at a very minor reduction in the retirement benefits?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes; a reduction of only 15 percent in the amount of the benefits. Yet all actuarial tables show that if, as proposed in the bill as passed by the House, retirement had been permitted at age 55, the reduction in payments or benefits should have amounted to almost 45 percent.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate very much the action taken by the conference committee. I also note with approval and appreciation that the conference committee in its report prohibits the granting of retirement benefits, based on a $15,000 salary going back to 1946, as I believe was provided in the original bill as passed by the House.

Mr. KENNEDY. In the original bill as passed by the House, such a change was proposed for Members of Congress. At present salaries are averaged for the period in which the Member concerned has been in office.

As the proposal came to us from the House, it would have permitted use of the highest salary in any 5-year period, and would have permitted a "buy-back" on the newly added $2,500, even for those years before the period when Members of Congress began to pay a tax on it, when that amount was merely a nontaxable expense allowance. That would have meant that a Member of Congress, by paying less than $750 for the 5 past years, would have been able to have his retirement benefits computed on the basis of $15,000, even though his average salary for the past 20 years had been $11,000. That would have resulted in eligibility to receive an increase in payments valued at $22,000, under standard insurance tables, as a result of the payment of $750.

In the case of a Member of Congress retiring at age 65, after 30 years of service, by the payment of $750 the value of his benefits would have been increased $36,000.

So I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma, who has had wide experience in this field, understands what would have been the public reaction, particularly when no hearings were held on this part of the bill and when there was no floor debate, the bill being passed during the call of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly agree that anything done to affect the remuneration of Members of Congress, whether affecting their salaries or their retirement, should be done in the full light of day, with the maximum amount of publicity and the maximum amount of study. That is why I objected to the bill, and that is why I joined the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts in opposing these great increases without corresponding assessments upon Members of Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I still feel that the bill, as it affects the Members of Congress, should not be before us today, because I believe that further study is needed.

Some of the points I have in mind have been mentioned by the Senator from Massachusetts. For instance, the $15,000 salary which Members of Congress draw at this time, properly should be eligible for use in connection with the computation of retirement benefits as of the date when the payment of that salary was provided for by law. That is what the measure reported by the conferees provides; does it not?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand, under the conference report there will not be created the fiction of a "buy-back" to 1946.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct. Furthermore, I think the conference report contains a provision which is very fair, namely, for those Members of Congress who have been in service in Congress for a long time, a cutoff date is set as of the date of passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Mr. MONRONEY. However, none of the Members of this body would be affected to any great extent by that provision, because the salary beginning in 1930, I believe, or approximately around that time, was $10,000 a year. So the provision regarding an average salary of $7,500 would affect very few of the Members of Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY. However, it would have meant use of the average of $10,000 over a period of 16 years—from 1930 to 1946—which, in case Members of Congress receive a pay increase, would affect their average time. So I believe the cutoff date provided is a very fair compromise of the problem. In addition, as was suggested, the provision for prenormal retirement at age 55 was eliminated completely. Under the conference report, the provision is for retirement with 10 years of service at age 60, and with a reduction of 6 percent in the annuity.

Mr. MONRONEY. I still question the wisdom of that provision. But I suppose it is the best possible compromise to be had, if one is to be reached.

I feel that we should not be acting on a conference report whose sole purpose is to improve the retirement program for congressional employees.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will indulge me further, I should like to say that of course I recognize, and always have recognized,

in connection with a congressional retirement plan, that there would be a foreseeable time in the distant future when the liabilities under the retirement plan, figured strictly on a bookkeeping or actuarial basis, might build up to such an extent as to require payments in addition to the ones the Members of Congress have made into the fund. However, after 8 years, and with the greatest turnover that has ever been experienced in Congress—for there were three turnovers, politically, in the House and the Senate in the period between 1946 and 1954—and with great numbers of Members of Congress leaving the House and the Senate during that time or reaching age 62, and thus becoming eligible for retirement, the fact remains, does it not—I am so told by the civil-service officials who keep the books—that the cash payments which the Members of Congress themselves have made into the fund exceed the total outgo during that period of time by more than $1,500,000.

Mr. KENNEDY. Of course, that is true. However, this year the payments under the congressional plan—for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953—were $500,000. If every Member of Congress were a member of the system, the total payments would be $400,000. So although I think it is true that in the early days there is a surplus, yet, according to the information I have, there is already an accrued liability of approximately half a million dollars a year.

Mr. MONRONEY. However, those making that computation, with all due regard to their past experience, are arriving at their figures on an actuarial basis, as if they were dealing with young men who were entering the service at age 25, and subsequently would retire after many years of service, and in most cases would retire rather promptly upon attaining the age at which retirement is first possible.

On the other hand, we do not have to look into a crystal ball, in order to know that not all our colleagues in this distinguished body and not all the Members of the body at the other end of the Capitol automatically retire upon attaining age 62. Instead, we find that many Members of both Houses elect, on their own choice, to forego receiving retirement benefits, in order that they may remain in the congressional service. As a result, the final retirement payments are decidedly reduced.

Although I agree that we should not create in the retirement fund an unmanageable surplus—of course, it looks as if the fund is likely to break even—yet it seems to me that, barring an unforeseeable situation, which experience in the past 8 years does not indicate as probable, this program will be likely to be on a cash-balance basis, rather than have to be under an assessment plan similar to that applying to fraternal insurance.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Oklahoma has probably done more work on the question of retirement than any other Member of Congress. I will say to him that even as of today, if the disbursements are almost equal to the total contributions, or within a few thousand dollars of the total contributions, it can hardly be said that the fund is actually in the black.

I read from a memorandum furnished me by Mr. Myers, actuary for Social Security and consultant on civil-service actuarial problems:

> At the end of June 1953 there were 88 retired Members of Congress receiving annuities at a monthly rate of $25,580. Making an approximate allowance of 10 percent for survivor annuities in force, this results in a total annual rate of disbursements of $335,000. The total payroll of Members of Congress at the $12,500 rate is about $6⅔ million, so that the current rate of disbursements for annuities is 5 percent of payroll. This figure would be further increased if data were available on lump-sum payments for deaths and other withdrawals and if allowance were made for the fact that not all Members of Congress participate in the plan so that the covered payroll is not as high as $6⅔ million.
>
> Even so, this "bedrock" minimum figure of 5 percent as the current cost of the program is clear indication that the system is not operating at a profit from the contributions of Members alone, as is sometimes stated or implied.

I am conscious of the fact that this is not a normal actuarial problem; but if the total contributions are now about $400,000 a year, and the disbursements are $335,000 a year, there will be a still greater liability in the future. The best information is that the actually accrued liability to the Government each year is half a million dollars.

Mr. MONRONEY. That depends on how long Members live after they leave Congress. That was why I was opposed to setting the age at 55 years, and why I am oposed to setting the age at 60. At age 62 we acquire far less liability for the years of retirement benefits. I feel that the proper course would have been to increase our contribution. If there still remains a $75,000 cash balance after the payment of all benefits——

Mr. KENNEDY. I did not say that. There is certainly a carryover from previous years, when the money coming in was greater than the disbursements, but as of June 1953 the balance would have been about $65,000, theoretically, if every Member of Congress had contributed.

Mr. MONRONEY. On the plus side, not the negative side.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has done a great work in studying this question. I ask him if the figure he has given includes earnings at 3 or 3½ percent, which I believe is the rate earned by the civil service retirement fund, including the deposits of employees. Does the figure which the Senator gives include earnings at 3½ percent on $1,500,000?

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the Senator mean the interest?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. I am informed that that is not included.

Mr. KENNEDY. That would really amount to only about $45,000 or $50,000 a year additional. It is important. However, I make the general statement, subject to correction, that our fund is not actually in the black, even though the figure I suggested, on a theoretical basis, would indicate that it is $65,000 in the black, for the fiscal year 1953, even if we add the figure which the Senator has suggested, representing interest on the fund.

According to the information I have from Mr. Ruddock, the Retirement Chief of the Civil Service Commission, it is calculated that every year we build up an accrued liability to the Government of $500,000. That statement may be subject to correction. The calculation is not the same as that involved in a mortality table. Nevertheless, that is the assumption upon which the Commission operates. Today the necessary Government contribution is slightly greater than our contribution. One of the reasons why I think the bill should have gone to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service instead of to our committee is that that committee could have made investigations and could have made estimates as to how much greater the cost of this bill will be.

I am not sure that the Senator and I are in agreement. The best information I can obtain is that the Government makes a contribution which is slightly greater, as of today, than our contribution.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is theoretically. If every Member of Congress contributed 6 percent to the fund and all Members who have retired were paid, we would have had a balance in the black of more than $1,500,000, and we would still be operating on the basis of a surplus of collections over disbursements of an amount in the neighborhood of $45,000 a year.

Mr. KENNEDY. Theoretically. I cannot accept as a basis of opposition to the bill the assumption that as of today the fund is in the black and that this bill will increase the Government contribution. The Government is already contributing. I agree with the Senator that this bill would increase the Government contribution. I think it should be considered by the Senate whether we should increase our contribution. As of today, I believe that the Government is required to make a contribution.

Mr. MONRONEY. I cannot agree that it makes a contribution. It may be setting aside a reserve for future contingencies; but balancing the money which came in as against the money paid out during 8 years in which there were three violent turnovers, the fund is still left $1½ million in the black, and we are still accumulating a surplus of $45,000 a year. We have not included in that calculation the interest over a number of years at 3½ percent.

I grant that 20 years from now the Government may have to meet a contingency, but I do not believe that we are going to make that contingency cost small by paying additional benefits at this time. That is why I question the wisdom of trying to do so without additional contribution.

Mr. KENNEDY. I agree with the Senator that this proposal will increase the cost to the Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I feel that it is very important that both the Senate and the public have a clear understanding of this

subject. This is not a pay-as-you-go plan. Every actuary who appeared before the committee, and every specialist, indicated that the plan which was originally designed, calling for a 6-percent deduction, with the age of retirement 62, is not a pay-as-you-go plan. It is not unusual for a retirement system to be in the black in its early days, and then to have an accumulated deficit over a long period of time. That is true of the present civil service retirement system, which has a large deficit, which the Government will have to meet. The Government's contribution to our own civil-service plan would not necessarily be sufficient to take care of all the needs if everyone were to retire—in other words, if the entire system were to be solvent. So I do not think it is correct to say that it is a plan which is solvent on the basis of the contributions.

The present plan permits retirement at age 62, with 6 years' service. The conference report permits retirement at age 60, but requires 10 years' service, with 6 percent less in the annuity benefits. As Senators know, the House report set the age at 55, with 5 years' service.

Mr. KENNEDY. I believe that the provision which we inserted will save about $125,000 a year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The House set the age at 55. We felt that if the age could be set at 62, with 6 years' service, a plan based on age 60 but requiring 10 years' service was equitable, provided the annuity were reduced.

I wish to make this point clear in order that it may not be thought that a bonanza is being handed out on the basis of age 60. Up to date the retirement system has been in the black. If anyone believes that the retirement system will remain in the black over a long period of time, under present contributions, and with the present rate of retirement, he has not studied the actuarial figures. Every expert who appeared before us indicated that the Government would have to make a contribution. I see nothing wrong in that. We require private employers to make substantial contributions to the pensions of their employees.

So far as survivors' benefits are concerned, it is my opinion that survivors are more entitled to benefits than those who are receiving them.

Mr. KENNEDY. In considering some of the items to which we finally agreed, I am reminded of Morley's statement to the effect that politics is one long "second best." We were not operating on a blank sheet. We were operating on the basis of a bill which had received unanimous support in the House, so we could not get everything we wanted.

As the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, the change in the age from 55 to 62 resulted in decreasing the cost to the Government by $125,000. I think the second major service rendered by the conference committee was the change to the basis of the best 5 years, and the provision with respect to purchase of annuity for back years, which will save the Government a large expenditure of money. I shall discuss that in a moment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So that there will be no misapprehension, the age 55 provision is no innovation on the part of the committee. As a matter of fact, the Civil Service Retirement Act provides for retirement at age 50, if the occupation is hazardous, such as occupation with the FBI. It also provides for retirement at age 55, at age 60, and also at age 62. The problem which confronted us was connected with the fortuity of elective office in this country, particularly with respect to Members of the House. It must be remembered that the average term of a Member of the House is 6 years.

I may add, in line with what has been stated, that the whole civil-service retirement fund is in liability in excess of $5 billion, over assets. Of course, some of it may be a potential liability, but the fact remains that approximately $5 billion is a liability excess.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and I were members of a joint committee of the House and Senate years ago when we wrote into the Legislative Reorganization Act, very properly known as the LaFollette-Monroney Reorganization Act, a provision for salary increases and also for congressional retirement.

I am not at all sure, and I draw entirely on memory, which extends over many years, but I believe that even at that time it was thought rather doubtful, considering all the factors, whether even then the system was on a sound actuarial basis when it started. My opinion was that it would have to be projected into a period of years before it would ever reach that objective.

Mr. KENNEDY. We have heard discussion of the period of 6 years as being the average service of Members of the House. As of June 1952, the average term for Members on the retirement rolls was 15.5 years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am afraid that average is not based on figures that go back far enough. I am sure it begins at a recent date. If we go all the way back it will be found that the average service is around 6 years.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who was a very able and helpful member of the committee in drafting the Reorganization Act, one reason I question the value of the actuarial table is because the picture presented by experts of the same department when the Legislative Retirement Act was first considered was so much worse, in fact, than is proving to be the case.

Now, with 8 years behind us, we are still collecting more than we are paying out, and we still have a reserve of $1,500,000,000. Eventually, of course, if all of us live longer, or if we retire at age 62, it is conceivable that the fund will run into a deficit.

The promise was never made to the country that the fund would be self-sustaining. We knew, as a matter of fact, that at a future date it might be necessary to have contributions made to it by the Government. To what extent it was difficult to estimate, but the estimation at that time was far greater than the estimation is today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Probably as a general observation it might be said that the railroad-retirement system, the social-security system, the civil-service retirement system, and all the other retirement systems should at some time or other be reexamined from an actuarial standpoint. I doubt whether any of them are on a sound actuarial basis, because we keep amending them from time to time, pulling them one way at one time and in another direction the next time. However, that fact should not stand as an objection to the conference report, because that is an overall survey that must be made, and included in it, of course, must be the whole civil-service retirement fund.

If I may be permitted to make one further observation, the Senator from Massachusetts mentioned the fact that he had some doubt whether the conference report should come before us as an amendment of title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act. The fact is that in the Reorganization Act, section 601 of title VI dealt with congressional salaries, and section 602 of the Reorganization Act dealt with congressional retirement, and it was a modification and amendment of the Civil Service Act of 1930.

Therefore, technically and very properly speaking, what we have before us today is an amendment in the form of a new section to title VI, which we call section 603.

In my humble and considered opinion I think it is very properly a part of the Legislative Reorganization Act. I do not believe we are stepping out of character in the method we are pursuing.

Mr. KENNEDY. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I did not mean any criticism of the procedure followed by the subcommittee of which I was a member. I do know that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] felt that the bill should have gone before his committee first. What I am concerned about is that the Senator from Kansas and his committee will be the ones who will be subject to all the pressures which will be created by our action on this legislation.

While we all agree that the position of Members of Congress and of legislative employees is different from that of other employees, it will be the task of the Senator from Kansas to emphasize that difference. Therefore, perhaps it would have been the fairer and more appropriate procedure if the bill had been referred originally to the Senator from Kansas and his Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, even though I concede it was not improper for it to have gone to the Committee on Government Operations. Perhaps from a long-range viewpoint it should have gone to the Senator from Kansas and his committee.

With respect to the original proposals for retirement age, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be included at this place in my remarks a table showing the eligibility requirements for benefits at normal and prenormal retirement ages under selected pension plans.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Eligibility requirements for benefits at prenormal retirement age and full retirement age under selected pension plans

Plan	Prenormal retirement requirements		Full retirement requirements	
	Age	Years of service	Age	Years of service
Proposed for Congress under House version of S. 2175	55	10	60	10
Conference report	60	10	62	6
Congress at present	(1)		62	6
Federal judges	(1)		70	10
Federal civil service (including legislative employees)	55	30	62	5
			60	30
Social security	(1)		65	[2] 10
Railroad Retirement Act (men)	60	30	65	10
United Mine Workers	(1)		60	20
American Telephone & Telegraph	55	25	60	20
	(3)	30		
General Motors	60	10	65	10
U. S. Rubber	55	20	65	20
Goodyear	55	20	65	15

[1] No early retirement.
[2] At end of transition period.
[3] Unspecified.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, these provisions were removed from the bill by the conferees; the present full retirement age of 62 was maintained; and retirement at age 60, with 10 years of service, is to be on a reduced annuity similar to the reduction in other civil-service retirement plans. This amendment reduced the estimated average cost of the measure by some $125,000 a year.

Secondly, the House bill provided that the basis for computing congressional retirement benefits was to be changed from the average salary received by a Member during his term of service to the average salary received during his 5 highest years of pay. This was combined with a proposal boosting the salary, for retirement purposes, from $12,500 to $15,000, by including the expense allowance; and to permit Members to purchase the value of this extra $2,500 for past years by depositing the 6 percent contribution on that amount for such years. Thus a payment of less than $750 for 5 back years would enable a Member retiring at the close of this year to have his retirement benefits computed on the basis of $15,000, even though his average salary over the past 20 years was only $11,000. This would have resulted in an increase in his annuity of $2,000 a year, that increase alone being worth over $22,000 under standard insurance tables. In the case of a Member retiring at the end of this year at age 65 with 30 years of service, his $750 deposit would raise his average salary for retirement purposes from $10,600 to $15,000, and his annuity from $8,000 to $11,250 a year. The value of this increase alone, for which he paid $750, would have been nearly $36,000 on the standard insurance tables. I might repeat that I heard many times in discussions on this bill that the average length of service of a Member of Congress was only 6 years; but the actual average service of all Members on the retirement rolls as of June 30, 1952, was 15.5 years.

I shared the belief of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that before such an extensive change in our program should be adopted, it should be the subject of careful study and hearings in both Houses. For these reasons, these provisions were deleted from the bill; the career average was retained as the basis for the average salary for retirement purposes, although a cutoff date as of the time of passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act was justifiably added; and a provision was added prohibiting the back purchase of the extra $2,500 for annuity purposes prior to January 3, 1953, when this expense account was first treated as taxable income. Savings to the taxpayers through the adoption of this amendment have been estimated to be an average of $100,000 a year.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the amount include legislative employees?

Mr. KENNEDY. Not this particular amount. I shall discuss the provision relating to legislative employees in a moment. I might say that when the bill came before us last year, when an attempt was made to permit legislative employees to take their best 5 years and the 2½ percent rate the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] pointed out that such a provision was not included even in the Congressional Retirement Act, and therefore should not be included in a legislative employees retirement act. I agreed with him. When the bill went to the House, there was inserted such a provision for Members, as well as for legislative employees. That is how the best-5-year provision for Members, which I have discussed, came to be in this bill.

As I shall point out, when the bill went to conference the conferees provided that employees may use the best 5-year provision but use the 2½ percent for no more than 15 years. Beyond 15 years the rate would still be 1½ percent.

The conference committee made other improvements in those provisions of Senate bill 2175 relating to congressional retirement as set forth in detail in the conference committee report. Two amendments which are supported by consideration of both logic and economy are those which place survivors' annuities for death before retirement on the same basis as under civil-service retirement; and permitting Members to withdraw their contributions upon separation from service, the same right afforded all those covered by the civil-service retirement system. As a result of these efforts, it can justifiably be said that the changes in this bill in the pension plan for Members of Congress are primarily of a conforming or technical nature, and do not represent a complete departure from past practice.

I turn now to that part of the bill dealing with the retirement program for legislative employees.

THE CONFERENCE REPORT ADOPTS A MORE JUSTIFIABLE RETIREMENT SYSTEM FOR LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES

Senate bill 2175, as it passed the other body, proposed that legislative employees be permitted to compute their retirement benefits on the basis of their 5 highest years of average salary, and to apply to that figure a multiple which represented the product of their total years of legislative service multiplied by 2½ percent, as compared with the 1½ percent figure presently used by them and all other Federal civil-service employees. This would have increased some benefits by as much as 75 percent, and increased the cost to the taxpayers by several hundred thousand dollars a year. The justification for these added benefits was on the grounds that legislative service is inevitably of briefer tenure than service in the executive branch; although statistics recently gathered show that from 40 to 50 percent of new Federal employees entering each year leave within 1 year. However, these proposals went far beyond providing greater protection for short-term legislative workers and greater incentive for career legislative employees, and concentrated their benefits primarily upon those who had not suffered the hazards of legislative tenure. Also, if no restrictions were to be placed upon such extra benefits, similar treatment would be demanded by a variety of Federal employees whose work involves special hazards or insecurity. For these reasons, the conferees adopted an amendment limiting the application of the special 2½-percent feature to no more than 15 years of legislative and military service, the remainder of such service to be computed at the normal multiple of 1½ percent. This is still a generous proposition, amply protecting both short-term and career employees of the Congress, but it has been estimated that the average savings to the taxpayers from this amendment alone could be as high as $350,000 a year.

Other amendments were adopted which increased the protection offered employees. The bill was clarified to apply specifically to short-term employees who are forced to go back to private life through the death or defeat of their Member. Years of service and maximum annuity provisions were retained at the normal civil-service levels, instead of being made more restrictive as proposed in the House bill. Eligibility requirements for participation in this plan were broadened, while at the same time loopholes permitting others to take advantage of it were closed.

In summary and conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to state that the pending measure, as rewritten in conference, represents a sound and justifiable improvement both in the bill itself and in our two legislative retirement programs.

I wish to express my appreciation to my colleague the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who labored long and hard on the bill. We were in agreement on the provisions of the bill, with

one exception. He expressed the opinion that the bill should not go into effect until January 1955, because he felt there was some question whether Members should vote for a provision which applies to them while they are in office. I believe his suggestion is a good one, but I do not believe it to be a completely proper one in this case.

I think the bill now provides improvements in the system which are reasonable and acceptable, and, therefore, I did not see any objection to having them go into effect as of the first of the next month after the bill is passed. Except for that, our harmony was complete.

Mr. MONRONEY. Members who were not serving when the program was adopted would be denied benefits unless they were reelected to Congress and admitted to the benefits of the act.

My question is, Is there any provision in the bill with regard to legislative employees coming back for a brief period of a month or 2 months, so that, having accumulated 15 years of service and no longer intending to work, they will be able, by putting in a short period of service, to establish a long line of congressional service?

Mr. KENNEDY. We accepted a period of 11 months. When the bill was first considered, there was some question that apparently a day's service would requalify an employee which would have exposed the system to some abuse. So an employee must serve for 11 months.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the Senator think that is sufficient?

Mr. KENNEDY. We proposed 2 years, and then it was changed to a year. Then it was felt that because Congress convenes on January 6 or 7, it would be fairer to make the period 11 months. So, once again, I think, a compromise was made, and it was at least acceptable.

Mr. MONRONEY. In other words, if the change had not been made, a former Member of Congress would be denied congressional retirement and could have worked in a Member's office for 1 day or 1 week and would have been able to validate his entire back service under the employees' retirement fund.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the Senator mean a former employee in the legislative service?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say, a Member of Congress or a former employee, being denied the benefit of retirement because of having no service at the time of the passage of the act, could come in, under the bill as the House passed it, or as it is now, and work for 11 months and be eligible for the full time of his congressional service.

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not think the problem of the Member of Congress coming back as an employee was considered. I would have to get some technical information on the question as to whether——

Mr. MONRONEY. I am inclined to believe he would be eligible. But the best compromise that could be obtained was 11 months.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. I would say, in answer to the earlier question of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] that—although the figures are extremely rough, they represent the best estimate we could get—that the cost of the benefits of this bill as of now would be that the employee or Member would still contribute 6 percent of payroll and the taxpayers 14 percent, over a period of years. If the bill had gone into effect as the other body drafted it, the percentage would have been greater.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the Senator points out, that is the maximum. If we take these actuarial tables and extend them to the ultimate, that would be the maximum. One of the difficulties is that an expert actuary carries out the figures infinitum. I suppose it is his duty to show the worst side of every possible expense we are going to have. I think it is fair to say for the RECORD that actuaries are extremely able people, and they bring us the most depressing and the most hard-hitting facts they possibly can produce to the ultimate moment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The able junior Senator from Massachusetts and the able junior Senator from Minnesota have referred to the testimony of actuarial experts. Was that testimony taken by the established Senate committee, or by the conference committee?

Mr. KENNEDY. By the conference committee. The witnesses were Mr. Ruddock and Mr. Myers.

Mr. GORE. Did the standing committee of either House of Congress hold hearings and obtain actuarial testimony upon the bill?

Mr. KENNEDY. The House committee held no open hearings. What provisions they made as to getting actuarial information I could not say. So far as our own subcommittee is concerned, hearings were held, but the services of an outside actuary were not obtained.

Mr. GORE. So it remained for the conference committee actually to get testimony from an actuarial standpoint on this subject?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. I will say to the Senator, in all frankness, that if it had not been for that conference committee hearing, the Members of Congress would not have realized exactly what they were doing. The evidence given earlier was that the expense to the taxpayers was minimal, and there was even a question as to whether there would be any expense to the taxpayers.

Mr. GORE. Who gave that erroneous information?

Mr. KENNEDY. As I said in the beginning, the statements which were provided, in my opinion, were not in accordance with the later information which we obtained from actuaries and from other experts.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is saying, in very nice language, that the reports of the committees to the House and the Senate, presumably prepared by committee staff members, did not present the true facts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I make no comment on the procedure in the other body. I could not say what information they secured before they acted. But the information first presented to the conference I considered to be very inaccurate, approaching the point of being misleading. This is one reason why I stated that the question should have gone before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the Senate in the beginning. I do not think there is any doubt that until we secured the services of Mr. Ruddock and Mr. Myers we were acting completely in the dark.

Mr. GORE. Does not the able Senator consider the first responsibility and the first duty of committee staff members to be that of supplying accurate information to the Senate upon which it can act?

Mr. KENNEDY. I certainly agree.

Mr. GORE. I wish here to express a word of reproach, which I have in my heart and which I have heard expressed by other Members of the Senate, at an attempt to mislead the Senate, which was evidently made by whoever prepared the committee report.

I should like to ask the Senator one further question. Is it not the tendency in the country for the retirement age to be advanced in industry and in the professions, rather than lowered?

Mr. KENNEDY. I would certainly say that I think there is a real effort to recognize the fact that people live longer and that their lives stretch over a longer period of time when they can engage in gainful employment. The tendency has not been completely reflected in official tables. But I agree with the general thesis that in many cases the retirement age is too early.

Mr. GORE. Nevertheless, even in the light of the statement of the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois that the civil service retirement system faces a $5 million liability, we are considering a bill which will lower the age of retirement and increase the benefits without corresponding increase in contributions on the part of the beneficiaries.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that the question of compromise in conference is always a difficult one. As I said, we were not dealing with a clean bill. We made very extensive changes in the provisions which represented a great saving to the taxpayer, and while there may be some provisions which I think are excessive, nevertheless, I believe that, taken all together, the conference bill should be accepted by the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. Can the Senator elaborate a bit with respect to the additional benefits to survivors, which are provided in the bill? Perhaps the Senator covered that question before I came into the Chamber.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is one of the provisions of the bill which, at the present time, is perhaps most unsatisfactory, as it pertains to the period after congressional retirement.

The survivors' benefits which are now provided in the bill permit a Member to make a decision as to whether he shall accept the annuity completely for himself, or whether he shall accept a survivorship benefit annuity. If he accepts a survivorship benefit annuity, the payment to himself and his survivors would be somewhat different under this bill,

the reduction being changed from an actuarial to a nonactuarial basis. The payment to his wife, if she has children under 18 years of age, would be reduced a lesser amount, according to the civil-service retirement formula.

Mr. MONRONEY. Do I understand correctly that the proportion of the retirement law as it affects survivors' benefits has not been changed for Members who have retired? The bill does nothing to increase the benefits to Members who have now retired, or who will retire in the future? Benefits to survivors and the choice of survivorship benefits will be identical in the future with what they have been in the past, with the sole exception, as I understand the bill, that Members who die in office, not having made their election to take a reduced annuity for themselves, in order to pass benefits on to their wives, will have made it impossible for the survivors to receive anything except lump-sum payments. Therefore, the widows of Members who have died in office will have been placed at a disadvantage as compared with widows of Members who may have ceased their service in Congress only 3 or 4 days before death, but who had made declaration for the reduced annuity. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, in part. As the Senator has said, special provision has been made in the bill for widows of Members who served in this Congress or who were elected to this Congress. There were 5 or 6 Members who were not covered, and whose widows would have received only a lump-sum benefit. Because the proposed legislation came up early in the last session, I think it was most appropriate to include them. I am glad such action was taken.

It is true that one of the amendments in the bill was to change the basis of electing between a joint-benefit annuity and a survivorship annuity. A Member who exercises the survivorship option receives a lesser amount. It is no longer to be actuarily reduced, but it is a lesser amount, which enables him to make provision for his widow.

Mr. MONRONEY. Has that amount been increased over the amount provided for in the past?

Mr. KENNEDY. The total, on a standard actuarial table, represents an increase. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. In other words, under the bill, a Member will be able to provide more for himself, while still permitting his widow to receive her annuity, than would have been the case under present law?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct. Once again, I may say that I should have preferred that this provision be given further consideration because, as the Senator from Oklahoma knows, we had no opportunity for hearings.

Perhaps the Senator could argue that the annuity has not been reduced enough to take into account the benefits that a Member receives and that his survivor will get. That is true.

Mr. MONRONEY. But there is no added cost to the Member for the additional benefits acquired.

Mr. KENNEDY. No. The only cost involved would be in the fact that his benefit would not be fully reduced if he exercised his survivorship option. It seems to me that one of the matters which the Senate committee should consider is whether we should not, since the bill is to be enacted, consider increasing our individual contributions to the fund, which is a step I would support.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the ratio of the survivorship benefit to the reduction of the Member's benefit approach or correspond roughly with the benefit already in effect under the civil-service retirement system as it pertains to Government employees?

Mr. KENNEDY. The increase in the benefit under the survivorship option is not actuarial. The Member does not take a reduction, in all frankness, which corresponds with the increased protection his widow would receive. However, I believe it is in accordance with the general civil-service procedure.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is at about the same ratio; is that the fact?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am certain the civil-service system is not based on an actuarial ratio.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. As if the money were divided, to benefit 2 persons instead of 1.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me cite an example of what this would mean.

A Member who, after exercising his survivorship option, presently receives $4,081 would instead receive $4,575 under the bill; and his widow would receive $2,500 instead of $2,040. The present value of this increase under the insurance tables is nearly $8,000 for such a couple.

So there is no doubt that this represents, under the present system, a substantial increase for the Member, and, under the additional provision of the bill, an additional increase. Nevertheless, I believe it would be proper for Congress to take action which would prevent the present situation, under which the widow receives only a lump sum.

On the whole, I believe the bill as rewritten is a step forward. However, when the Kaplan committee has completed, in March, its study of all retirement funds, Congress might well consider whether it should raise the amount of contributions by Members from 6 percent to 7, 8, or 9 percent, in order to bring the payments more in line with the amounts disbursed.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to thank the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts for the enlightened and thorough understanding he has of the matter. While I cannot support the bill, I believe he and his colleagues have done excellent work in removing many of the provisions which I am certain he thought were extremely excessive when the bill was considered previously.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Martin
Anderson	Gore	Maybank
Barrett	Green	McCarthy
Beall	Griswold	McClellan
Bennett	Hayden	Millikin
Bricker	Hendrickson	Monroney
Burke	Hennings	Morse
Bush	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hill	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Pastore
Byrd	Holland	Payne
Capehart	Humphrey	Potter
Carlson	Hunt	Purtell
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Jackson	Russell
Clements	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kennedy	Sparkman
Duff	Kerr	Stennis
Dworshak	Kilgore	Thye
Eastland	Knowland	Upton
Ellender	Kuchel	Watkins
Ferguson	Langer	Welker
Flanders	Lehman	Wiley
Frear	Long	Williams
Fulbright	Magnuson	Young
George	Malone	
Gillette	Mansfield	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, first I should like to say that I believe in the principle of a sound retirement system, whether it be for Members of Congress, legislative employees, other Government employees, or employees in private industry. However, that is not the question we are discussing today.

I am opposed to this conference report because I do not think it is actuarially sound. There is no provision whereby those who benefit will pay any part of the extra cost. I think it is most unfair not only to the taxpayers who will be called upon to foot the bill but also to the millions of other Government employees who are paying into the retirement fund at exactly the same rate as that at which the Members of Congress and the legislative employees will be paying, although the other Government employees will not derive similar benefits.

It has already been admitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who ably outlined the conference report, that no hearings were held on the bill. It is admitted by all concerned that the committee report which accompanied the bill in the first place was erroneous, in that it did not tell the Members of Congress the true facts as to the ultimate cost to the taxpayers.

Furthermore, at the time when the bill was considered, an actuarial estimate of the cost of the bill was not available to the Senate. According to my knowledge, one was not available to the House of Representatives, either.

Mr. President, we have heard much discussion of how the conferees supposedly saved the taxpayers substantial amounts by reducing the benefits originally proposed. However, it seems equally appropriate, if not even more so, for someone to point out to the Senate and to the taxpayers the cost of those provisions which actually are included

in the conference report. This report benefits everyone but the taxpayers.

As a brief explanation of what is incorporated in the conference report, I should like to point out that, simply stated, the conference report, if adopted, would provide a flat 66⅔ percent increase in the retirement benefits of every legislative employee with 15 years or less of service. That increase is over and above the retirement benefits to which he now is entitled. Furthermore, the conference report would give these legislative employees that 66⅔ percent increase in retirement benefits without any additional contribution whatever on their part.

At the very least the retirement deductions required from both Members of Congress as well as legislative employees should be increased from 6 to 8 percent.

In the case of legislative employees having 30 years of service, 15 of which can be counted under the new formula and 15 under the old law, they are being granted a flat increase, in their retirement benefits, of 33⅓ percent, as compared to the benfits to which they now are entitled—and, again, without a corresponding increase in the contributions they make. For those who have a period of service between 30 years and 15 years, the percentage increase in benefits would be in proportion.

As a specific example, let me point out that a legislative employee with 15 years of service, at an average salary of $5,000 annually, would, under existing law, receive retirement benefits of $1,125 a year when he reaches retirement age, and retires. Under the conference report, if it is adopted, the same employee's retirement benefits will be increased 66⅔ percent, or he will then receive $1,875 a year. The average life span of such an employee, after retirement, is, according to the actuarial estimates, 12 years. That means that to that person we shall be voting a bonus of $9,000, without having that employee make any additional contribution to the fund.

A legislative employee having 15 years service receiving a salary of $10,000 a year will, under the new formula, be given an increase of $1,500 a year in his retirement benefits, or an increase of 66⅔ percent—again without any additional cost to him. That would mean that to that legislative employee we shall be voting an outright bonus of $18,000, based upon the actuarial estimates of the average 12-year life span of such retired employees. We can multiply that figure to a greater or lesser degree, depending upon the service the employees have rendered, in order to find the amount of bonus which, under the conference report, would be paid to other legislative employees. However, the example I have cited gives a reasonably accurate picture of the proposal now before us.

Remember these legislative employees will still be paying into the retirement fund only 6 percent, or the same as the 2½ million other Government employees now pay. Of course, it should be noted that this same inequity applies to Members of Congress as well as legislative employees.

Neither group will be paying anything for the additional benefits they will be receiving.

Much the same can be said in the case of the provisions of the conference report which affect the retirement benefits of Members of Congress. By means of the conference report we shall be reducing the retirement age for Members of Congress to 60, which means they will be able to draw retirement benefits for 2 additional years. True, under the conference report the retirement benefits are reduced by 3 percent per year under 62. However, based upon any actuarial estimate, the 6 percent reduction will not offset the increased benefits which will accrue as a result of providing for the additional 2 years.

Furthermore, by means of the conference report we shall be changing the period for computing the retirement benefits for Members of Congress in that, under the report, the computations will be based on the average salaries paid to Members of Congress from 1946 to the present time. In discussing the meaning of that proposal, let me use the same example which was used by the Senator from Massachusetts, who pointed out that if the conferees had accepted the proposals contained in the House report, the result would be that a Member of Congress who had 30 years of service would, upon retiring, and by paying $750, receive additional retirement benefits worth $36,000. The conferees rejected that proposal.

However, there is still included in the conference report a provision to the effect that a Member of Congress who has had 30 years of service will, by paying $750, be able to increase his retirement benefits by $1,825 a year, which, on the basis of the actuarial estimates, will amount to a bonus of $22,500. This is based upon the same 12 years average life span.

Mr. President, I think we should point out the details of what is proposed to be done under the conference report, rather than place so much emphasis on what has been saved by the conference committee in their rejection of some more fantastic proposals.

I do not think it is proper that additional benefits be given to either the Members of Congress or the legislative employees, without having them make correspondingly increased payments into the retirement fund. In short, their contributions to the retirement fund should be increased by a minimum of 8 percent. If the benefits are to be increased, the payments to be made by Members of Congress and the legislative employees should be increased accordingly.

Mr. President, I would have no quarrel with the present conference report, if it is provided, at the same time, that contributions to the fund shall be increased in direct proportion to the increased payments which are proposed to be made, in the case of both the Members of Congress and the legislative employees.

Mr. President, if Congress agrees to the conference report, I think we shall have placed ourselves in an impossible situation, and will be unable to say "No" to the 2½ million other Government employees, who are paying into the retirement fund at exactly the same rate, namely, 6 percent, as are the Members of Congress and the legislative employees. After all, Mr. President, the civil-service retirement fund was never intended to be a relief program for Members of Congress or for any type of Government employee. It was set up on the basis of supposedly being a sound retirement fund, into which the employee would make payments in direct proportion to the retirement payments to be made to him.

I believe we should reject this conference report, and should let the entire problem as to congressional retirement, legislative-employees retirement, and all other retirement provisions come before the appropriate committees of Congress, with the proper officials representing the actuarial departments making their estimates of the cost. Any revision should only be made after we have had a report from the Commission which was set up last year by the same Congress.

Mr. President, if I correctly recall, Congress appropriated approximately $250 million for this Commission, for the sole purpose of having it study retirement legislation and make recommendations to the Congress for revision of our complex retirement laws. However, without waiting for that report, it is now proposed that we boost our own retirement benefits and those of our legislative employees alone, by taking action which, as nearly as I can determine its meaning, will on the average be equivalent to giving to Members of Congress and our legislative employees a bonus of approximately $7,500 each. This estimate is based upon the average life span as submitted by insurance companies' actuaries and based upon the average increases provided.

Mr. President, I think the conference report should be rejected, and I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. What was the request of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator think it would be appropriate to have a quorum call? We certainly want the yeas and nays on this question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No business has been transacted since the last quorum call.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, we can take care of that situation. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Delaware to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wished to make certain what the purpose of the rollcall was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is for the purpose of developing a quorum. The Chair did not rule as to whether or not the demand for the yeas and nays was sufficiently seconded.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is my understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report on Senate bill 2175.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—61

Aiken	Hendrickson	Long
Barrett	Hennings	Magnuson
Beall	Hickenlooper	Malone
Bennett	Hill	Mansfield
Bricker	Hoey	McCarthy
Butler, Md.	Holland	Millikin
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Pastore
Capehart	Hunt	Payne
Chavez	Ives	Potter
Clements	Jackson	Purtell
Cordon	Jenner	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Dirksen	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Duff	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Kefauver	Thye
Flanders	Kennedy	Upton
Fulbright	Kerr	Watkins
George	Kilgore	Wiley
Gillette	Knowland	Young
Green	Langer	
Hayden	Lehman	

NAYS—30

Anderson	Ellender	Morse
Burke	Frear	Mundt
Bush	Goldwater	Neely
Byrd	Gore	Robertson
Carlson	Griswold	Russell
Case	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Cooper	Martin	Sparkman
Douglas	Maybank	Stennis
Dworshak	McClellan	Welker
Eastland	Monroney	Williams

NOT VOTING—5

Bridges	McCarran	Symington
Lennon	Murray	

So the report was agreed to.

C——148

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I wish to commend all of the conferees on the constructive manner in which compromises on the bill were worked out. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] contributed greatly to the result. I particularly wish to commend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for the assistance rendered by him. He was actually the Senate authority on the matter, as he was one of the principal drafters and authors of the Legislative Reorganization Act which this bill amends and which originally set up the congressional retirement system. He did most of the steering on the part of the Senate Republicans in the conference on this bill.

I also want to commend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], whose suggestions, views, and actions contributed greatly to getting out the unanimous conference report. Without his efforts we would not have been able to present the conference report to the Senate.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. DANIEL obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me so that I may make an announcement to the Senate, with the understanding that he will not lose his rights by so yielding?

Mr. DANIEL. With that understanding I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from California may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is now a little after 2:30 o'clock. I am hopeful that we may be able to vote on the pending George substitute within a reasonable period of time, to be followed later today by a vote on the final passage of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

If we are able to complete our labors this afternoon and evening, it will not be necessary to have a Saturday session of the Senate. If, perchance, the Senate is not able to complete its work today, as majority leader I would recommend to the Senate that we hold a Saturday session.

If we are able to complete our work today, I would propose that on Monday next we have a call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, from the point where we left off on the last call of the calendar; in addition, I would propose to take up the Executive Calendar, with all the nominations on it, including that of the Chief Justice.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the majority leader, in view of the length of the debate, in view of the decision of the Senate yesterday not to recommit the joint resolution, and because I do not know what more can possibly be said to make it more confusing in the RECORD than it is at the present time, I will be perfectly willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement, at the pleasure of the majority leader, to vote on the George amendment at some time that may suit the convenience of the majority leader and the minority leader. I make that statement because I believe we have exhausted the possibility of adding to the measure anything more of substance or anything more by way of constructive effort or debate. I believe the poor courts will have trouble enough, if we pass the joint resolution, in finding out what it means, without our making it more confusing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] will permit me to pursue the matter a bit further, I should like to propose, after consultation with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] a unanimous-consent agreement that at the hour of 4 o'clock this afternoon the Senate proceed to a vote on the pending George substitute, with the time between now and 4 o'clock to be equally divided, and to be controlled, respectively, by the proponent of the substitute, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and on behalf of the opponents, by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if the majority leader will add to his proposal a date when we can vote on the final passage of the entire Bricker proposal, I would not feel constrained to object. But we have been waiting for weeks to vote on the proposal, and there should be a time fixed when we can vote on it one way or the other.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The majority leader also has been trying to expedite the efforts to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yielded to the majority leader for the purpose of presenting a unanimous-consent request. I wonder if the Senator will include in his request that I may have the floor immediately afterward.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to include that, under the circumstances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair inquire whether the Senator from Texas yields the floor now?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, when the unanimous-consent request is granted——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object. At some time this afternoon I intend to reply to the remarks made yesterday by the majority leader. I do not know how long it will take me to reply to them, but I intend to do a thorough job. Therefore, I object.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not have the floor. The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] has the floor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield so that I may propound a question to the majority leader?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is my understanding correct that the calendar will be called from the time of the last call, February 8?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, after weeks of debate, the versions of the Bricker amendment now remaining before the Senate have been shorn of the most controversial language and narrowed to two basic and important provisions.

The first would assure the American people that treaties and other international agreements will not be valid if they conflict with the Constitution. The second, as contained in the George substitute, would prohibit international agreements other than treaties from becoming effective as internal law without an act of Congress.

Not only would the adoption of such an amendment safeguard the constitutional rights of our people, but it would relieve the fears and doubts which have caused so many of our citizens to turn against the United Nations and other efforts at international cooperation.

Our country's leadership in the family of free nations and our cooperation with other nations for mutual defense cannot continue to be effective unless these programs have the consent and support of the American people. Such consent and support are essential to our participation in international law. It has been shaken by the attempts of those who would misuse international councils for the writing of domestic law binding upon the people of the United States in their own country.

Mr. President, that is exactly why we have this proposal before us toady. That is why now there is on the part of the American people fear and suspicion of the United Nations and other international organizations which our people did not have in years gone by. It is because certain forces in the world have sought to use international organizations to impose domestic laws which are binding upon the people of the United States.

I appeal to every Member of the Senate who believes in international cooperation to help provide the constitutional safeguards which will allay the present fear of international agreements shared by so many of our people. The American people should be assured that cooperation with other nations can be had through the U. N., NATO, and other organizations without relinquishing powers of national sovereignty and domestic legislation to such agencies.

Last year I had the honor of presenting this point of view at the annual banquet of the American Society of International Law in a speech entitled "The Congress and International Law." I also spoke last year at the annual banquet of the American branch of the International Law Association. I have belonged to both of these international law organizations for several years. I say this so the Senate may know that my point of view is not isolationist. On the contrary, it is my sincere hope that the day may come when international law will replace force in the settlement of disputes between nations just as in time domestic law replaced physical combat as a means of settling differences between individuals.

As one who believes that international law is the avenue of hope for peaceful relations among the nations of the world, I am frank to say that its usefulness is being threatened and retarded by those who would use it as a roadway for domestic legislation. Those of us who hope in international law, in the United Nations, in the Atlantic Pact and similar arrangements should be the first to see that they are not used to supersede our Constitution or to change internal law. They were never intended for that purpose. Many people in our own country who believe in international cooperation have become fearful that our Constitution does not protect our individual rights from being overriden by international agreements. The fear is real, and it is serious. The dangers must be met and abated.

Today no one will deny that there are forces in the world which have departed from the concept that international law should govern sovereign states rather than internal relations of individual citizens. They would reach beyond the laudable object of stating goals and aspirations for the people of all nations to write compulsory changes in the internal affairs of the nations of the world.

In a world of unequal national resources, and uneven national experiences, this effort to level individual rights is clearly a threat to the wealth of rights amassed from American experience by the citizens of this Nation. The threat is further intensified by the fact that this effort is being formulated and advocated through international political forums in which representatives of the Soviet bloc have equal rights of authorship with western nations.

This bloc has displayed far greater zeal for advancing international political controls over individuals of other states—by that I mean other countries—than in adhering to or accepting the authority of international law over their respective sovereignties.

Although never intended for that purpose, the United Nations has sponsored conventions and covenants which, if ratified, would affect or could affect, the domestic rights and relations of American citizens as between themselves and between them and their own government. In 1948, Mr. John P. Humphrey, then Director of the Division of Human Rights of the United Nations, admitted that this was a revolutionary procedure in international law. Mr. Humphrey wrote in the January 1948 issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences:

> What the United Nations is trying to do is revolutionary in character. Human rights are largely a matter of relationships between the state and individuals, and therefore a matter which has been traditionally regarded as being within the domestic jurisdiction of states. What is now being proposed is, in effect, the creation of some kind of supernational supervision of this relationship between the state and its citizens.

There is no doubt that the Founding Fathers intended that our rights as American citizens—rights as between citizens and rights as between citizens and the government—were intended to be dealt with by the processes of domestic legislation, not by any treatymaking power or any international council.

Is it any wonder that some citizens of the United States, who believe in international cooperation, and that organizations such as the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which can hardly be called isolationist, become fearful when they hear officials of the United Nations declaring that they hope to legislate for the citizens of this country in that body—a forum in which votes are cast by the Soviet bloc as well as by other nations which do not have as high a standard of individual rights as we have in the United States?

Examples of such proposals which disturb the American people are currently numerous. The United Nations' Declaration of Human Rights, for example, has been shorn of its original status as a mere "declaration of aspirations" and has become the basis for a proposed covenant which might abridge rather than enlarge or even maintain the individual rights now protected by our Constitution. Many sincerely believe that the declaration—if translated into a treaty and approved by this body—would not only alter the American Bill of Rights, especially the rights of free speech and free press, but that it would override the constitutional qualifications for President and Vice President, set aside principles of our immigration laws, and reach into the body of our social and welfare legislation.

Of course, Secretary of State Dulles, who recognizes the dangers of treaty law—and who once said "it can override the Constitution, and cut across the Bill of Rights"—insists that President Eisenhower will never submit the Human Rights Covenant, or some of the other matters dealing with the domestic rights of our people, to the Senate for approval. That is assuring for the time being, but there are those of us who prefer a permanent and binding assurance that no President, not even with a two-thirds vote of the Senate, may enter agreements with other nations which violate or abridge the rights of American citizens. There are those of us who want to see such an interpretation written into the Constitution so that the courts will be bound thereby.

The opposition says that no treaty can override the Constitution or conflict with it, and still be valid. I agree that that should be interpreted as the law of the land today, but, Mr. President, and fellow Members of the Senate, the law

is not what we think it is or what we say it is. The law is what the Supreme Court of the United States interprets it to be.

The Supreme Court has never written a decision squarely holding that a treaty cannot conflict with the Constitution or supersede it. The Supreme Court has never directly held that the Constitution is supreme. Of course, there have been dicta, but every Senator knows that the Supreme Court of the United States, as it is presently constituted, pays little attention to dicta in cases where the Court thinks a different rule of law should be written, when it comes to a square holding on the point at issue.

The problem is that our Supreme Court has never made any direct holding that the treaty power is limited by the Constitution, or that its exercise must be pursuant to and not in conflict with the Constitution.

Our Constitution says that treaties, equally with the Constitution, "shall be the supreme law of the land," but the Constitution does not say that treaties need be subject to it. In *United States* v. *Reid* ((C. A. 9) 73 F. 2d 153, 155), the Court said:

> It is doubtful if courts have power to declare the plain terms of a treaty void and unenforceable, thus compelling the Nation to violate its pledged word, and thus furnishing a casus belli to the other contracting power.

United States v. *Thompson* (258 Fed. 257) further emphasizes the practical effect of this situation, pointing out:

> The power to make treaties has been frequently before the Supreme Court, and there is not a single instance in which a treaty has been declared unconstitutional, although many of them affect rights exclusively under the control of the States, and, if enacted as statutes by Congress, would have been void.

It is true that long ago in *Hauenstein* v. *Lynham* (10 Otto 483 (U. S. 1880)) the Court supplied the dicta that the treaty-making power does not "authorize what the Constitution forbids." This, however, was before the case of Missouri against Holland, in which the Supreme Court upheld, under the authority of a treaty, a type of Federal regulation which previously had been stricken down because it was unauthorized by the Constitution. Thus, a Federal power which was unauthorized by the Constitution was held to be authorized by the treaty.

I do not believe that our Founding Fathers intended that treaties should authorize that which was forbidden by the Constitution or that they should have the effect of delegating additional authority to the Federal Government in domestic affairs. The trouble is, they did not say so, and neither have our courts concluded against these possibilities. If anything, they have given added weight to the possibilities. They have led Secretary of State Dulles to say one one occasion:

> Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. * * * They are, indeed, more supreme than ordinary laws for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights.

It may satisfy some persons to have the same Mr. Dulles say, "We are not going to submit that kind of treaty to the Senate. We will not have anything to do with such treaties in this administration. You can trust us." But that does not satisfy the junior Senator from Texas, and I do not believe it satisfies the American people.

If unabated, the present popular fear of international organizations, such as the United Nations, could limit or destroy our Nation's participation in international law, because the foundation of law, internal or external, is the consent and support of those governed by it.

The popular will can restrict or destroy our effective participation in the United Nations and other international compacts and agreements. I am convinced that this will be the result if we do not provide the constitutional safeguards which will allay the present American suspicion of international agreements.

Anthony Eden, the British Foreign Secretary—and the Senate knows he is not an isolationist—sounded this warning at the United Nations General Assembly on November 11, 1952, in the following words:

> If we attempt to stretch the meaning of the charter and extend the areas in which the United Nations has jurisdiction, we run grave risks, unless we can carry all our fellow members with us, of weakening the very structure of the United Nations. For this reason I regard it as very dangerous that this organization should attempt to intervene in the domestic affairs of member states. Or that it should in any way contravene the terms of article 2, paragraph 7, of the charter.
>
> The object of our organization is to promote general international cooperation and good feeling. It was never intended to be an agency for controlling the domestic policies of its various members or for intervening between them and the territories for which they are internationally responsible.
>
> I am a profound believer in the United Nations. I have worked for international cooperation since the early days of the League of Nations and I cannot, I think, be accused of being lukewarm toward international institutions. It is precisely because I place such hopes in the part the United Nations can play for peace that I sound this note of warning.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has made a very fine address on constitutional law, and I wish to pay my great respects to him.

Is it not a fact that the United Nations Charter is shortly to be revised?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes; I believe that is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is to be revised in 1955. Has the Senator any assurance of who is going to do the revising?

Mr. DANIEL. No; I have not.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then, the Senator does not know what the revised charter will be?

Mr. DANIEL. I have no idea.

Mr. MAYBANK. Nor does anyone else know; is that not correct?

Mr. DANIEL. All I know is that under article II, paragraph 7 of the charter, it is made clear that the United Nations is not supposed to deal in domestic law or strictly internal problems of member nations. In spite of that, the United Nations is writing covenants and agreements which would affect the rights of our citizens. It is being done intentionally, and it is being stated to the world by U. N. officials that a revolutionary doctrine is being put into effect.

Mr. MAYBANK. There is no assurance that even such provisions will be revised, is there?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator is correct.

I wish the Senator from South Carolina to understand full well that I am in favor of the United Nations and with the original purpose of the organization, which was a noble purpose. We should try to make the organization successful. I do not wish to see the United Nations ruin itself by trying to legislate for the people of this country or other countries of the world. It has enough to do in trying to bring about peace and prevent disputes between nations without trying to write domestic law for their citizens.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say I voted for the United Nations Charter, but before the ink was dry on the document, which was framed in San Francico and which put the United Nations into being, the veto power had been incorporated in it. As the distinguished Senator has said, there were certain limitations on the types of laws the United Nations could pass.

I am in favor of the United Nations. I should like to see the United Nations protected. I should like also to see citizens of the United States protected by an amendment whereby their rights cannot be interfered with by any law enacted by the United Nations. I should like to see a provision whereby certain groups could not change the charter to suit themselves, because nobody knows how it is going to be changed.

Am I not correct?

Mr. DANIEL. I think the Senator from South Carolina is correct and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. President, the warning which was given by Mr. Anthony Eden to the U. N. Assembly is the warning I am trying to repeat to the Senate today.

Secretary of State Dulles sounded the same warning in his speech at the regional meeting of the American Bar Association in Louisville, Ky., in 1952, in which he said:

> It is always tempting to look on treaties as an easy way to make high ideals come true. Actually it may do more harm than good for one nation to attempt by treaty to impose its moral standards on another people. Human rights should have their primary sanction in community will and when treaties ignore that, and try to substitute an alien will, the treaties themselves usually collapse through disrespect, dragging down the whole structure of international law, order, and justice.

That is my premise this afternoon, Mr. President, that this trend toward writing domestic law in international councils is really harmful to our future efforts to bring about international cooperation.

It is because I believe in international law and the possibilities of cooperation among nations through international compacts and agreements that I think we should remove that which is causing disrespect and suspicion and threatening the whole structure of our Nation's participation in these processes. We should stop even the possibility of writing in international councils the type of domestic law which relates to the rights of American citizens as between themselves and as between them and their own government. This type of legislation is delegated by article I of the Constitution to the Congress in certain fields, and is otherwise reserved by article X to the States and to the people.

Mr. President, I was one of the 64 signers of the Bricker amendment. It contained no "which" clause at the time, and it contains none now in its present status. I did not intend for it to upset the balance of powers designed by the writers of the Constitution or to embarass the President in his conduct of relations with other nations, and I am sure that the other Senators did not. I simply wanted to assist in making it certain that no treaty or other international agreement could supersede the Constitution or abridge the God-given and constitutionally protected rights of the American people. I wanted to make it certain that purely domestic legislation shall be written here at home rather than in international forums. These objectives are in accord with the spirit and intention of the writers of our Constitution and not contradictory thereof in any respect.

The present versions of the Bricker amendment have been trimmed down to these bare essentials. How any provision of the present Ferguson-Knowland amendment or the George substitute can harm this Nation in its international relations I cannot see. I do see how they can help us in our international relations by regaining the support of a majority of the American people for our necessary and important role in international affairs.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will agree to one of the pending texts and approve it with the vote necessary for its submission to the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. First, let me say I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Texas. His most analytical and scholarly approach to the problem has been sound in every way.

Does the Senator realize that Secretary of State Dulles stated he would not submit any of these so-called treaties to the Senate for ratification? Does the Senator also realize that, although in the hearings it was stated that the Genocide Convention had certain dangerous qualities, and that it would not be submitted to the Senate for ratification? Does the Senator know that within the past 2 weeks representatives in the United Nations voted for and urged each nation to ratify that convention? Does the Senator realize also that our representatives are continuing to work on an International Court of Criminal Justice, which would allow American citizens to be tried anywhere in this wide world in courts made up of judges not of our own choosing, or at least judges who would not be confirmed by the Senate, in which courts American citizens would be deprived of the right to a trial by jury which is guaranteed to them under the Constitution?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator is correct. As a matter of fact, I believe one American boy is already serving a term or sentence after having been tried by a foreign court without a jury. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is correct. There are several such cases, as I understand.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not know about the recent action of our representatives in the United Nations urging that the various countries ratify the Genocide Convention.

Mr. BRICKER. It was so reported in the press within the last week or 10 days.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator for calling it to my attention.

I wish to say further that men sometimes change their minds. The Secretary of State might change his again and submit some of those agreements for ratification. I do not believe he would submit to this Congress any agreements which would seriously damage the rights of the American people; but I wish to be sure that such a thing cannot happen in either this Congress, the next Congress, or at any time in the future. I do not wish to see the President, with two-thirds of the Senate, have the right to take away any of the inalienable rights of the American people, which are supposed to be protected by the Constitution.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from Texas. I agree entirely with everything he has said, and I am sure he agrees with me that we must depend upon the laws and the Constitution, and not upon the judgment of men, to protest the inalienable rights of the American people.

Mr. DANIEL. I certainly do.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. First, Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Texas for his very fine presentation and his clear, cogent, and sound reasoning. I wish all other Members of the Senate could have been present to hear his remarks. He is a very fine thinker and a very exhaustive scholar in the realm of constitutional law.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his extravagant remarks.

Mr. STENNIS. I mean sincerely every word I have said.

One of the main points, as I understand, which has been made is that the Senator from Texas feels that the success of our efforts in the realm of international relations and international affairs is being imperiled by a certain trend of thought in the international sphere and by an attempt made possible as a result of imperfection in the treaty-making clause of the Constitution to put over by means of treaties or other agreements as the law of the land measures which are purely internal in effect. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct. There is a realm in which the treatymaking power should be used and must be used in connection with the relations between nations. But we destroy our effectiveness and public support in that realm when we seek to expand it to include activities which belong in another realm—namely, that of domestic legislation. That trend disturbs the American people and causes them to fear even those agreements which properly come in the realm of the treatymaking power.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand, the Senator from Texas realizes that many of the treaties and agreements are necessary, and that it is essential for the President to have that far-reaching power—perhaps the greatest power ever possessed by or bestowed upon any one man. I understand that the Senator from Texas feels that much of that is necessary; he is only trying to protect the internal laws from being swept away, as an incident to the exercise of the necessary treatymaking power.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct. I may say to my colleague, who has been a distinguished lawyer and judge in his own State of Mississippi, that as he understands there is a very practical reason why it should be possible for one to go to the statute books an find what is the domestic law, the internal law, as it relates to all citizens of the United States and to the States and to the National Government. Lawyers and judges throughout the United States could not possibly have available to themselves all the treaties and international agreements of this country. They should not be put to the task of obtaining such treaties and international agreements, in order to know what is the domestic law, in order that they may be able to advise citizens and clients of their rights.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Texas has stated a great deal better than I myself could my feeling and thought in this matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I desire to compliment the distinguished junior Senator from Texas. Although I cannot go along with his complete thesis, especially as it applies to the Bricker amendment, nevertheless I think he has brought to bear the real significance of this debate by his emphasis on the use of executive agreements.

Can the able junior Senator from Texas tell the Senate what, in his opinion, will be the value of the George substitute, which now is before us for consideration?

Mr. DANIEL. I think adoption of the George substitute, and its final enactment as part of the Constitution, would go a long way in stopping the attempt at writing domestic law in international agreements.

The first section of the George substitute provides that treaties and inter-

national agreements cannot supersede or conflict with the Constitution and still be valid.

It will be remembered that a few days ago the Senator from Georgia said his interpretation of the first section of his substitute is that treaties and international agreements must be pursuant to the Constitution and under the authority of the Constitution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the Senator from Texas agreed that point with the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct, and I agree with Senator GEORGE's interpretation of the effect of the first section of the George substitute.

Insofar as international agreements are concerned, I think the Senator from Montana himself made perhaps one of the most enlightening speeches delivered on this floor concerning the dangers incident to international agreements.

The George amendment would put an end to those dangers, insofar as agreements relate to internal law, by providing that such international agreements must be submitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives and must be passed upon by both Houses. I think that is a very wholesome and important provision.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long. I have no specially prepared speech to make, but I desire to mention some of the vital points, as I view them, which are involved in this grave question.

First, I desire to express a very deep sense of gratitude and appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. Many Senators, on both sides of the aisle, have contributed to the debate; but I think the Senator from Ohio, through the weeks, months, and even years of his long labor—for which he has not been thanked very much—by the very fine way he has brought out the major points involved in this far-reaching question, by his sound reasoning, and, in fact, even because of some of the unpleasant things to which he has been subjected, has shown himself all the more clearly to be worthy of my high opinion of him, and of my original appraisal of him when I first came to the Senate; namely, that he is a fine, outstanding statesman and an unselfish laborer in the vineyard of good government. The Nation owes him a great debt of gratitude for the splendid work he has done. Regardless of the outcome of the amendment, I think great good will come from this debate, to which, of course, many other Senators have also contributed greatly. Certainly great good will come from it for many years.

Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few minutes, in a nontechnical and nonlegal way, about the now famous Pink case.

Excellent arguments have been made, by Senators on both sides of the aisle, as to whether the decision in the Pink case is merely dictum—in other words, an extraneous statement by the court, a "fill-in," not a hard-and-fast rule laid down by the court and, therefore, not something which must be followed—or, whether, on the other hand, it is what we lawyers call stare decisis; in short, a precedent, and therefore binding on the Supreme Court of the United States and all the other courts of the land.

Fine arguments have been made on both sides of that question. However, I submit that, as a practical matter, it makes absolutely no difference whatsoever whether that case is stare decisis, and thus a binding precedent, or whether it is merely dictum, because in this instance we are trying to legislate against a trend of the times.

We think the trend of that decision and other decisions, and the trend of a great deal of thought in that connection, is reckless, and is gradually finding its way into judicial precedents and into our laws and into our thinking. Furthermore, we believe that trend and that thought overlook some of the basic, fundamental considerations which are necessary if our Government is to remain sound.

Some courts have a way at times of making laws of their own. Sometimes that is almost necessary. At any rate, the Pink case is a precedent, to the extent that it is a handy peg upon which any judge or group of judges can hang the firmest kind of binding and far-reaching precedents. It is the trend that we are trying to cope with.

I think it is time to let the people have a word on this broad question, in the plainest, simplest language it is possible to devise. That is just what the George substitute is; it is plain, simple language from the people. Let them pass on the question. They feel that there is need for something to plug some of the loopholes. I feel that they desire to express themselves in the plainest, simplest language, language they can understand. Lawyers can argue endlessly as to what the language of the amendment means. The people know what it means. The people feel that protection for them is needed.

Most of the arguments now made against amending the Constitution are exactly the same as the arguments which were made against the original 10 amendments. It is a historic fact that the great George Washington himself said, in effect, that they were not needed. A great many other learned men, some of whom had taken part in writing the Constitution, took that position. Others thought differently. There was no doubt about what the people thought. So the first 10 amendments were adopted. They became known as the Bill of Rights. Who would want to repeal any part of even one of them?

What has time proved as to the wisdom of that simple, plain language, which emanated more or less from the people? The Bill of Rights constituted an addition to the great fountain of wisdom represented by the body of the Constitution itself. There had been an assembly at Philadelphia for 60 or 90 days, from which the organic law itself came. That document was an expression to meet the need for security.

During the intervening 165 years conditions have changed. We have grown from a nation of 3 million people to a nation with a population of 160 million. We have developed from an obscure nation on an obscure continent into the leading and most powerful nation in the world, a nation which carries the greatest responsibilities.

Certainly, it is not inappropriate to take another look at the Constitution and see whether or not some more plain, simple language from the people is needed. We are living in a time when, every morning, news broadcasts from every corner of the world carry mention of half a dozen or more trouble spots where the United States is vitally concerned, and in connection with which the President of the United States has responsibilities. This Government has a leading responsibility in that connection.

That is another reason why I am satisfied, from observation, that neither the present President of the United States nor any future President can possibly have time to give personal attention to as much as 10 percent of the power which he wields. It is a physical impossibility. The people do not fully realize that fact, but we here realize it. The President does not have an opportunity to pass on more than 10 percent of the top policy decisions for which he is responsible. He is more and more in the hands of his staff, more and more in the hands of those who represent him all around the world, more and more at the mercy of and in the hands of those who represent him on the multitudinous home fronts in which this Government is involved every day of the year, day and night.

We now have military forces of some kind in 49 countries. The wires which come into the Pentagon, and which are used solely for military purposes, are open, active, and operative 365 days and nights of the year, as year follows year. That is a simple illustration of the multitudinous responsbilties whch are loaded upon the shoulders of the man who is President of the United States, whoever he may be. That is one more reason why he and the people need some kind of safeguard, in the plainest, simplest language. Decisions are being made by his representatives who are far removed from the people back home and their problems. Men in the State Department, men in the military, and many others, are not supposed to be cognizant of the problems of the people back home and of their attitude. Still, of necessity they represent the President. In many respects they formulate top policy.

The George substitute as modified is a simple amendment. All it does is to say to the President, "Go ahead with your vast duties and responsibilities. We will not curb you in any manner or in any respect with reference to treaties. We will not curb you in any respect even with reference to executive agreements, except to this extent: When an executive agreement affects us back at home, whether we live on the Atlantic seacoast or on the Pacific, in the South or in the North, we want you to let the Congress look at the agreement and pass upon it.

Then we shall be satisfied. The Congress will know what the agreement means, and can exercise its judgment. Then we shall know more about what the problem is, and more about what we are supposed to do. We will submit to that law as we do to all other law."

That is all the people ask. Someone may say, "You should not do that. You are proposing to destroy the two-thirds rule, under which these agreements must be approved by two-thirds of the Senate."

With all deference to those who make that argument, and I am sure they are sincere, it seems to me that the question is very simple. A treaty must be approved by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. We do not propose to disturb that rule. As to an executive agreement, it does not have to go anywhere for approval. It is the supreme law of the land from the time it is entered into. We have no opportunity to know about it. The people have no opportunity to know about it.

We propose a simple rule that, insofar as it affects internal law, Congress shall have the opportunity to pass upon any such agreement. The courts can define the term "internal law." It is no more difficult to define than any other term. All we say is, "As to internal law, there must be the approval of the representatives of the people."

Someone may say that such a rule would result in the practice of transferring everything from the treaty side of the ledger to the executive agreement side. If any President of the United States should wish to follow such a practice, and we may have such a President in the future, he would be the type who would transact business under the present law through executive agreements every time he possibly could. In connection with such agreements he would not be required to go anywhere to obtain approval. He would not have to tell anybody what he had done. So the type of President who might build up the bad practice of coming through the door on the wrong side of this Chamber, the executive agreement side rather than the treaty side, would not come to Capitol Hill at all under the present law.

Who would lose under such a rule as is proposed? The President would not lose any necessary power. The people would gain, because their representatives would have an opportunity to pass upon proposed agreements which might affect them in their internal affairs. I believe there is great strength in the commonsense of the common people, and I plead for the adoption of the George amendment on that basis this afternoon, on the commonsense of the common people.

The people feel that something should be done. They feel they wish to express themselves in this plain, simple language. Although it does not go as far as I believe it should go, I submit the language of the George proposal goes a long, long way as a practical matter in meeting the needs of the Nation. It will strengthen the Constitution and strengthen the power of the President of the United States, and put confidence where there is now uncertainty, not in the occupant of any office, but because of a trend of the times. I hope the amendment will be agreed to by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from Mississippi, especially because he was very gracious in what he said about me. I deeply appreciate what he said. If I have had some part in revitalizing the Constitution of the United States and in making it a living doctrine of liberty, which it was intended to be, there is great compensation for me.

I should like to recite a little incident which happened a few years ago. I studied constitutional law under a great professor, a great public servant, and a former Senator of the United States. I met him at luncheon 5 or 6 years ago, and I said to him "Senator, are you still teaching constitutional law at the law school?"

He said, "No, no, John; we have moved that subject over into the department of ancient history."

The Senator from Mississippi referred to trends. There has been a trend toward neglecting this foundation law, on which we have builded so mightily. I know the Senator from Mississippi agrees with me that we should make it again a living, human document.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi agrees with the Senator from Ohio. I had the privilege of studying constitutional law 25 or 26 years ago, but my knowledge of it has all been repealed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I know the hour is getting late and that Senators desire to vote on the George substitute. However, for the record I wish to stay that I was one of the original sponsors of the Bricker amendment when it was introduced by the Senator from Ohio on February 7, 1952. In the past few years certain events have transpired which have made me feel that an abuse of executive authority was being exercised in the making of executive agreements—Yalta and Teheran being outstanding examples. In addition, certain court decisions concerning treaties and dicta contained in those decisions made me fearful that our States are in danger of losing some of their fundamental rights and powers retained by them when the Union was formed and our Constitution adopted.

These matters have been debated at great length during the discussions of Senate Resolution 1 by outstanding constitutional lawyers. The decision in the Pink case has been interpreted by various lawyers who reached different conclusions, but I agree with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the distinguished constitutaional lawyer who so ably represents his great State, that if we are to preserve the rights of individuals and of the States, we must do so by saying that executive agreements which can override the laws of the States must not be made merely by one man but must be submitted to the Congress.

This is a government of laws, not personalities. People have great confidence in President Eisenhower, but no one can know who will succeed him, nor does anyone know what the composition of the Supreme Court will be 20 years from now. We must, therefore, eliminate personalities from this issue and confine our consideration to the merits of the various substitutes and amendments which have been offered to the original resolution.

As illustration of what I have in mind—President Eisenhower wrote to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Ohio read from this letter during the debate. The President in that letter said that he had no intention of making any agreements on giving atomic information to other nations without action by the Congress. A later President might not take this attitude, and Congress should take steps to protect the American people. A further illustration of the change that may come over personalities is that some time ago Secretary Dulles was very much in favor of the Bricker amendment. Now he has changed his mind. For what reason, I certainly do not know.

Much has been made of the wisdom of the Founding Fathers in the writing of the Constitution, and change is resisted because of the great worth of that document. Certainly, the Founding Fathers had no conception of a United Nations organization of which we are now a member.

Mr. President, when the delegates of the various nations met in San Francisco to frame the United Nations Charter, before the debate on that question had stopped resounding throughout America they adopted the veto provision. Certainly the Founding Fathers had no conception of such an organization, and even the Senate, which ratified the United Nations Charter, knew very little about it. I believe that next year the charter ought to be revised, even though no one now knows how it will be revised.

Articles 55 and 56 of the charter, or treaty whereby we joined that organization, are concerned with civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights. There are arguments about whether or not these articles are self-executing, but there is a possibility that agreements under these articles might be made setting up uniform fair employment practices, uniform labor legislation, uniform educational standards, uniform divorce laws, and other aspects of our domestic life which would be denied Federal Government under the terms of the Constitution.

The opinions of two of the Supreme Court Judges in the steel seizure case that the President had the power to take over the steel industry seemed to rest on the basis that the President has implied powers to implement and carry out treaties and that as a result of certain treaties entered into by the United States, the President was justified in taking such a drastic step. Fortunately, this was only a minority opinion, but as I have said before—who knows who will be on the Supreme Court some years in the future, and who knows what their decision will be.

No one fought harder against the last administration, in the steel seizure case, than the senior Senator from South Carolina, who was chairman of the Joint

Committee on Defense Production, of which the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] was also a member.

Mr. President, there are many reasons why I believe these safeguards should be added to our Constitution. These additions would be, in my opinion, in the nature of perfecting amendments. They are new safety devices, if you please, designed to meet new threats conceived in the minds of men who would subjugate our national entity to the cobwebs of some supreme organization.

These are my fears today of what the future—based on the past—may hold. Therefore, rather than rely on the unpredictable actions of some future President, Secretary, or court, I urge the adoption now of the proposal of the senior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, at this juncture in the consideration of the substitute amendment offered by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] I rise in opposition to the amendment. It should be borne in mind that the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] have made excellent speeches, as always, and I am sure their remarks have been made as a matter of conviction, and are born of study and research.

There is plenty of room for difference of respectable opinion upon the issue, as I have tried to say many times. During the course of the debate on the issue during the past few weeks some of us have tried to the best of our ability to build a case for the record. We have tried to build a case founded upon law, upon the facts and, I hope, upon commonsense.

Of all the great and important debates which have taken place in this body, and of all the significant decisions that have been reached here, none has probably been more far-reaching than the debate here over the present issue and the decision we are about to make. Whether we realize it fully or not, Mr. President, we are at this historic moment faced with a heavy responsibility—a responsibility which we cannot, indeed, we dare not, rationalize or take lightly, but one to which we are bound by the stern dictates of duty and conscience. The United States Senate, representing all the States of our Union, the States of the most powerful nation of the world, to whom freemen everywhere look for inspiration, is assembled here to vote upon an amendment to the Constitution which has served us faithfuly for 165 years.

For what we do here today we shall stand accountable not only to our own people but to the people of the world and indeed to history. Should we not, Mr. President, exercise the same prudence, the same judgment, that we would employ in the conduct of our own affairs or our own business or in decisions vitally affecting the welfare of our own families?

Although the reasons for my opposition to the proposed amendment, and to all of the various substitute and compromise amendments, have, I hope, been made clear, I should like to summarize certain facts briefly. I have generally agreed with my good friend the Senator from Georgia on virtually all questions that have been presented to the Senate since I have served here. My position, adverse to his on this issue, is one which I chose with great reluctance and after much thought and study, and one which I was impelled to take as a matter of conscience and because of my attachment to the Constitution as I understand it. It would be presumptuous of me to suggest that a substantial number, at least, of my colleagues had not studied the substitute amendment now before the Senate and are not familiar with its terms, its implications, and its full impact. I am sure that all conscientious Senators have done this, and I hope that in my feeble way I have been able to make some small contribution to our common understanding of the issue.

On four occasions I have undertaken to analyze the salient points of the issue and to set forth my objections in language stripped, insofar as I have been able to do so, of legalistic confusion and technicalities.

As I have understood the position of the Senator from Georgia, he was motivated to offer his substitute amendment primarily by two things. First, he believes that because of the Supreme Court ruling in the recently heralded and now famous Pink case, the President has too much power on his own, without the approval of the Congress, to conclude executive agreements that can override State law. And, second, the Senator fears that unless the Congress agrees to what he considers a moderate change in the Constitution concerning the presidential power, we may be forced to accept such an extreme and radical proposal—and one to which he, also is opposed—as the amendment reported by a majority of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and supported by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and others.

As I have indicated, however, I think the Senator from Georgia is mistaken in his contention that the Supreme Court's decision in the Pink case enlarged the President's power to conclude, on his own, executive agreements that can override State law. In the Pink case the Supreme Court merely reaffirmed the President's power to override State law by concluding executive agreements on his own without getting the approval of Congress—in this case the Litvinov assignment—when such an executive agreement is a valid exercise of his power as manager of our foreign relations to recognize new governments and to receive ambassadors. This is exactly what the Supreme Court did in the Pink case, Mr. President. It did this and nothing more.

This power to recognize a new government, invoked by President Roosevelt in concluding the Litvinov assignment, is not new with the Presidency. It has been part of this great office since the founding of our Republic. Of course, the Presidency is a powerful office. It was intended to be a powerful office. Our Founding Fathers, in their wisdom, recognized that its power derived from the people, as does all power lodged in any of the three separate and coordinate branches of our Government under our Constitution. It is partly because American presidents have used the great power of their office and used it for the benefit of our country that we have come to our present position of primacy and power in the world.

With regard to the particular power to recognize governments and to receive ambassadors, the Senator from Georgia has said, if I have understood him correctly, that this is a right of the President, and that he does not want to interfere with it in any way. If a proviso is added to his substitute amendment—a proviso that specifically excepts from its effect the President's power to receive ambassadors and to recognize governments—the President would then retain all the power necessary to conclude executive agreements on his own and without any action by the Congress, as has been said on many previous occasions.

I say again, Mr. President—and I believe it is of the utmost importance that this point be clearly understood—it was exactly this kind of agreement that was involved in the Litvinov assignment. It was exactly this kind of agreement that was the point at issue in the Pink case. As Justice Owen Roberts said in a telegram to me, and as he repeated in a letter dated February 11, 1954:

> The George amendment would not have altered in the slightest the decision in the Pink case. * * * To strike down the power of a President to make necessary agreements in connection with the recognition of a foreign government and with many of the details of our daily relationships with our neighbors because of what I think is the erroneous decision of the Supreme Court in the construction of a written instrument, seems to me the height of folly.

Moreover, the proposal of the Senator from Georgia would, in my opinion, result in dignifying executive agreements with constitutional sanction and would, thereby, make it easy for any President to avoid, with complete propriety, the treaty procedure requiring the approval of two-thirds of the Senate. Under his proposal, the President will, in effect, be authorized to send to the Congress, in lieu of treaties, executive agreements requiring approval by only a simple majority of both Houses of the Congress. And these executive agreements, approved by a simple majority of each House, Mr. President—not by two-thirds, but, let me emphasize, by a simple majority—could override State laws and State constitutions. In my judgment, this would deal a hard and a severe blow to States' rights and State sovereignty. What would this mean to the smaller States with few Representatives in the House, as compared to States like New York and California with large congressional delegations? It would mean that we would deliberately undercut the ability of the smaller States to protect their State laws and public policies against encroachment by the Federal Government. I hope that my colleagues from the smaller States will bear this in mind. I hope that when they cast their votes on this critical issue they will understand fully that, should this proposal succeed, future Presidents will be able, with full propriety, to send such matters as the Genocide Convention and the Covenant

on Human Rights—to which many Senators are opposed—to the Congress in the form of executive agreements, rather than as treaties requiring approval by two-thirds of the Senate.

I emphasize further, Mr. President, that many eminent lawyers and constitutional authorities oppose the substitute amendment because it would introduce into the Constitution new and vague language—language which may well cause interminable difficulty, not only to the President in executing the powers of his office, but also to legitimate American litigants in American courts.

I wish to read to the Senate at this time a telegram I received from Mr. John W. Davis, one of the Nation's most learned lawyers and a universally respected authority on constitutional law. I read this telegram the other day, but only a few Senators were present at the time, and I think it is so important that it merits the attention of every Member of the Senate. Mr. Davis said:

> George amendment seems objectionable to me because its effect and interpretation are quite unpredictable. I am not familiar with the phrase internal law. Assuming it means law within the territorial boundaries of United States and its possessions, only few executive agreements are so confined. Many have a foreign as well as domestic aspect. Are they to be good without legislation in one sphere, but invalid in the other? I do not favor any proposed amendment, the meaning and scope of which is not clear on its face. Better far than this that matters should be left as they are.

It seems to me there can be no question, as Mr. Davis makes so clear, that if we accept this proposal, we will be writing into the Constitution of the United States vague and obscure language which may have future effects and interpretations entirely unpredictable at this time.

The second reason for the proposal of the Senator from Georgia, as I understand, is his fear that if we do not adopt his amendment or a similar one—which he considers to be, and which actually is, more moderate and reasonable than that proposed by the Senator from Ohio—we shall, in time, be forced to accept some such proposal as the Bricker amendment which would strike at the very heart of our Constitution.

If this be the case, Mr. President, I say let us go to the country. Let the issue be fully debated and understood by the citizens of our country. If, then, the people decide, through political elections, to change the Constitution and to put the President in a straitjacket, then the will of the people will be done and the Constitution, of course, will be changed. I have no fear that this will ever come to pass.

As I have said before, the powers of the Presidency derive from the people, and when the people of this country elected Dwight D. Eisenhower as President of the United States in November 1952, I believe they clearly intended that he should succeed to all the historic and traditional and constitutional powers of all the Presidents who preceded him. I would remind my Republican friends, in all good feeling and kindness, that President Eisenhower has emphatically stated his opposition to any amendment which would cut down the Presidential powers. He has strongly urged us not to paralyze his power to act swiftly and effectively in the national interest. If any of my Republican colleagues persist in voting for this amendment or for any other unacceptable compromise, they will not only repudiate the position of the President of the United States but, I believe, will be casting a clear vote of lack of confidence in the head of their own party. I believe that the American people had no intention of electing a President and thereafter striking down his power or diluting it.

Confident as I am that the American people would soundly reject any such proposal, I am at a loss to understand how we in the Senate of the United States, fully aware of our responsibilities to our Nation, can seriously entertain a proposition that might, at times, under certain conditions, paralyze our own foreign policy. What would we achieve if we plow stubbornly ahead and actually tie the hands of the President? Would we have protected our country or our liberties or our people against any danger, real or imagined? In the face of real danger, with the threat of Russian imperialism hanging like a dark cloud over free men everywhere on the globe, have we as Americans no better alternative than to immobilize the Commander in Chief, so that he is powerless to act quickly and effectively in a national emergency. Mr. President, such a solution flies in the face of the law, the facts, and the realities of the world in which we live. We should reject it utterly and completely, once and for all.

As for the dangers which exist mainly in our imagination—and we have heard much talk about threats and possibilities—I think it is time that we recognized them for the unsubstantial and chimerical things that they are—albeit they may cloud our vision and, for a time, obscure our judgment. The Senate of the United States stands on trial today before the court of world opinion. If we abandon our historic position, we stand convicted as men of little faith. If we sacrifice statesmanship for expediency, we shall have gained no profit by our barter, and we will have lost immeasurably in stature and prestige throughout the world.

We cannot be driven by a spirit of expediency or the counsel of fear, Mr. President, to accept any proposal. We must not debase the Constitution of the United States by embedding in it some vague words which have no precise meaning to us even now.

In the opinion of many Senators and of many qualified constitutional lawyers and students, this would serve only to open broad areas of doubt and confusion for some unknown and unpredictable future interpretation. When we undertake to improve upon the work of the Founding Fathers, every presumption, in my opinion, should abide with our Constitution as it now stands. We should at this hour remember the 18th amendment and its unhappy effect upon our country. I hope that we will act with maturity and reason to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States. Let us, by our vigilance, preserve that testament of the faith of a free people. Let us preserve inviolate this charter of our liberties which has been our inspiration for 165 years that it may endure as the foundation stone of our strength in a troubled and perilous world.

Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from Georgia spoke very plainly on the danger of permitting the President of the United States—that is, any President, not merely President Eisenhower—or his Attorney General, or any other adviser or assistant, to determine the course of action which the Senate might take on this or any issue merely because of the prestige and influence that stems from his high office. This is an important point, and I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Georgia that we should not be governed in our actions only by the desires of any President without regard to the logic and merits of the issue. The nature of the present issue before the Senate, treating as it does with the Presidential powers to conduct our foreign relations, makes it imperative that Senators as well as the country know as precisely as possible the views of our Chief Executive, who is the manager of our foreign affairs. It is also important to know the views of his chief legal adviser, the Attorney General, and his first officer in foreign affairs, the Secretary of State.

I also might say in passing that it should be of interest to the members of the President's own party to know the views of their leader. Of course, of late, there appears to be considerable doubt as to whether what we call the Republican Party is really one party or two—the President's party and the party of his opponents. While the President has not sent any formal messages to the Senate on this question, I have gathered from reading the newspapers that he and his immediate advisers have conferred extensively on the issue with Senators from the other side of the aisle. Also, as I recall, President Eisenhower has, at several press conferences, expressed some alarm over the various proposals to amend the Constitution in order to cut down his power as the Nation's organ in foreign affairs. As I remember, the President said in effect that it would be strange to amend the Constitution in order to show that it was going to remain the same.

As I see it, the philosophical origin of the present efforts to amend the Constitution lies in an honest desire on the part of many Americans to avoid entangling alliances. The Senator from Georgia only yesterday referred us to Washington's Farewell Address, which was read to the Senate last Monday by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT]. I do not label the Senators who have this deep and sincere concern over international and world affairs isolationists. I do not like labels, because they are never accurate. I think they are misleading and oftentimes unfair. It is obvious, however, that those who wish to amend the Constitution in a manner which I think will render ineffective the Presidential powers in foreign affairs, view our role in the present world situation, with all its dangers, far

differently than some of the rest of us do. Just as I think it inappropriate to place the label of isolationists on all those who advocate these proposed changes, so likewise I think it inappropriate for anyone to place the label one worlder or internationalists on all those who think the United States must assume leadership in the free world, with all the awesome responsibility and anguish lying in such a role.

In my effort to have President Eisenhower's views on this issue recorded as fully as possible, I have been motivated by my belief that the country and the Senators who bear the same party label as the President should understand thoroughly his reaction to the efforts to strip him of his essential power to act. I think it is fair to say that some members of his own party who apparently do not think this Nation should assume world leadership and the responsibility which goes with it, stand ready to destroy the time-honored constitutional arrangements necessary for such leadership.

If it finally appears that there are two Republican Parties locked in deadly combat over whether the President or the Congress shall be supreme in matters of foreign policy, I think this should be made clear to all our people.

The issues involved in this great debate will not be settled here today or tomorrow, regardless of what happens on the floor of the Senate. Those who wish to cut down the Presidential powers because of their fear of American leadership in the world will continue in their efforts to render the President ineffective in foreign relations. Those of us who believe the President must retain all the great historic powers given him by the constitutional framers in 1789 will likewise continue to fight without quarter to preserve that strength which we believe is so vital to the United States in its position of world leadership.

I now yield the floor.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I shall take just a minute or two to emphasize the fact that we are not by the amendment in any way interfering with the President's world powers or the leadership of this country in world affairs.

The Senator from Missouri has said we are before the court of world opinion. Every Member of this body is before the court of public opinion in the United States on this issue. If the issue is not solved satisfactorily, it will be in every campaign in every congressional district and in every senatorial campaign in every State of the Union, and it should be there. We cannot deny the sincerity and the patriotism of the dozens, and even hundreds, of organizations which are supporting the amendment as it was originally submitted.

Mr. President, just one more suggestion: Quotations have been cited from 2 distinguished men, 1 of them a former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Owen Roberts. It was Owen Roberts who said, a few years ago, at Ottawa, that "We must forget the silly shibboleth of sovereignty."

Mr. President, sovereignty means independence. If we give up our sovereignty, we give up, in the same degree, our independence.

A year ago, in a debate with me on the question of this amendment, Owen Roberts said definitely that he was in favor of this amendment, and that he did not want any ad hoc committee, in which he had no vote, to determine the domestic law for him and for all other citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, let me now refer for a moment to John W. Davis. I went to the Supreme Court, when that Court had before it the celebrated steel seizure case. There I listened to every word of the argument which was presented. John W. Davis' last sentence to the Supreme Court, on that occasion, was an appeal to the Court to abide by the law and the Constitution. He quoted Thomas Jefferson, the patron saint of the political party represented by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle; and he said to the Court, "Let us hear no more of trust in men, but let us tie them down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

Mr. President, one further word: The distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] suggested that we should uphold the hands of the President of the United States. So far as I know, the President has said nothing in this regard. If he has made a statement in opposition to the amendment, then he has changed his mind, for the Republican platform contained a statement in favor of the amendment, and the President ran for election upon that platform. I supported him, and I will support him again; and that is more than the Senator from Missouri can say. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senate that I am not attempting to reflect upon the position of the President. I am not attempting to take away, and do not wish to take away, one iota of the power, responsibility, or authority of the President in international affairs.

However, the American people did not elect Dwight Eisenhower or anyone else to the Presidency, for the purpose of letting the President seek to make legislation for the people of the United States and take away the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thought it might be well to amplify a little what the Senator from Ohio has said. I shall not speak very long, because I do not desire to detain the Senate.

One thing which has been discussed on the floor of the Senate comes to my mind now, in connection with the hearings which were held on the so-called Defense Production Act 2 years ago. I never was so astounded in all my life as I was when I heard representatives of the State Department and representatives of other agencies testify, before the committee, that there had come into being a strange, hybrid agency known as the International Materials Conference. We took very considerable testimony on that matter at the time. Then we discovered—as my friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] well knows, because he was there, and he participated in the cross-examination—that there was being proposed an almost worldwide organization, to include as many countries as they were able to include, to hit upon the idea of determining all the available raw materials in the world which were particularly of a strategic or critical nature, and to make allocations on the basis of the entitlements of one country and another in that particular field. That testimony is available—literally hundreds of pages in regard to the entire story.

I was further amazed when suddenly we were confronted with a report by a United Nations committee to the effect that if it were possible to work out a satisfactory arrangement to divide all the critical materials in the world, insofar as seven commodities were concerned, perhaps the same plan would work with respect to every other commodity. As a result, we would have had the spectacle of United States industries, for instance, having to depend for the continuity of their operations upon what some group in the State Department or elsewhere might say as to the amount of tungsten or the amount of vanadium or the amount of petroleum or the amount of other commodities which our industries might have. All those things were proposed to be handled by agreement. Mr. President, if the United States and its complete economy are to be submitted to such an undertaking, without giving the Congress a chance to pass on the matter, then I shall feel very sorry, indeed, for the future economic welfare of our Nation.

Mr. President, I shall not prolong the discussion by talking about the aviation treaty or about the copyright treaty or about any of the one-hundred-odd other treaties and conventions which have been developed by the International Labor Organization; there will be no point in having me belabor them this afternoon.

I simply emphasize what has been said by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], namely, that all of these have the effect of domestic law; and then what we have, in effect—by convention, by treaty, or by international agreement—is a lawmaking power which completely bypasses the Congress, unless something is done to retain that power and to give Congress a chance to take a look at it and to determine, as the representatives of the people, what shall be done insofar as the internal law is concerned.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, as modified, to the committee amendment, on page 3, in lines 5 to 19, inclusive.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bricker	Byrd
Anderson	Burke	Capehart
Barrett	Bush	Carlson
Beall	Butler, Md.	Case
Bennett	Butler, Nebr.	Chavez

Clements	Holland	Monroney
Cooper	Humphrey	Morse
Cordon	Hunt	Mundt
Daniel	Ives	Neely
Dirksen	Jackson	Pastore
Douglas	Jenner	Payne
Duff	Johnson, Colo.	Potter
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Ellender	Kefauver	Russell
Ferguson	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Flanders	Kerr	Schoeppel
Frear	Kilgore	Smathers
Fulbright	Knowland	Smith, Maine
George	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Gillette	Langer	Sparkman
Goldwater	Lehman	Stennis
Gore	Long	Thye
Green	Magnuson	Upton
Griswold	Malone	Watkins
Hayden	Mansfield	Welker
Hendrickson	Martin	Wiley
Hennings	Maybank	Williams
Hickenlooper	McCarthy	Young
Hill	McClellan	
Hoey	Millikin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 26, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the committee amendment, on page 3, to strike out lines 5 to 19, inclusive, as amended, and insert certain language, which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

SEC. 2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress.

SEC. 3. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—61

Anderson	George	Mansfield
Barrett	Gillette	Martin
Bennett	Goldwater	Maybank
Bricker	Gore	McCarthy
Burke	Griswold	McClellan
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Payne
Byrd	Hoey	Potter
Capehart	Holland	Robertson
Carlson	Hunt	Russell
Case	Jackson	Schoeppel
Chavez	Jenner	Smathers
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Dirksen	Kerr	Watkins
Dworshak	Kuchel	Welker
Eastland	Langer	Williams
Ellender	Long	Young
Flanders	Magnuson	
Frear	Malone	

NAYS—30

Aiken	Hendrickson	Monroney
Beall	Hennings	Morse
Bush	Humphrey	Neely
Cooper	Ives	Pastore
Douglas	Kefauver	Purtell
Duff	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Ferguson	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Knowland	Thye
Green	Lehman	Upton
Hayden	Millikin	Wiley

NOT VOTING—5

Bridges	McCarran	Symington
Lennon	Murray	

So Mr. GEORGE's modified amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand the parliamentary situation to be that even though the committee amendment, as amended, has been agreed to, the Senate may still have a yea-and-nay vote on final passage?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The only purpose of the voice vote on the question of agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended, was to establish the George amendment as the amendment which the Senate has agreed to, in lieu of the committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the final passage of the joint resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 2–1–54–A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair requests the Senator from Tennessee to withhold calling up his amendment, because the Chair had agreed to recognize the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I quote from the Evening Star of yesterday, February 25, from an article on the front page, entitled "KNOWLAND Urges New System of Naming Committee Heads." The subhead reads: "Move Appears To Be Aimed at LANGER, Who Backed Democrats on Adjournment."

I read from the article:

In a surprise move which appeared to be aimed at Senator LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, Republican Leader KNOWLAND, of California, today suggested a change in the Senate's time-honored seniority method of picking committee chairmen.

Although he mentioned no names, his proposal came on the heels of the delay in approval of Chief Justice Warren by the Judiciary Committee, of which Senator LANGER is chairman.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LANGER. I continue to read from the article:

Senator LANGER also was the lone Republican who voted with Democrats late yesterday to adjourn the Senate over the wishes of Senator KNOWLAND.

Asked if he had any particular situation in mind, Senator KNOWLAND said he didn't want to go beyond his statement, but "you can draw your own conclusions."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I request the Presiding Officer to obtain order in the Senate so we may hear the senior Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota will suspend until the Senate is in order. Senators who find it necessary to converse will please leave the Chamber and converse in the corridors or cloakrooms. Senators will take their seats. Visitors to the Senate floor will be careful to observe silence so that we may hear the senior Senator from North Dakota. The Senator from North Dakota may resume his speech.

Mr. LANGER. I continue to read from the article:

CITES "SHACKLING" OF SENATE

The Republican leader told reporters today it is time that the Senate "free itself from being shackled by the seniority system."

He proposed as one possible change in the selection of committee chairmen that they be chosen from the top-ranking two or three majority members on each committee.

Under the present system, the man with the most seniority becomes chairman automatically, unless he already is head of another committee which he does not desire to relinquish.

Senator KNOWLAND recently referred to an open hearing conducted by Senator LANGER on the Warren nomination as "the most shocking event" during his 8 years in the Senate. That was the hearing in which Chairman LANGER made public 10 unevaluated charges individuals had filed against Mr. Warren.

SEES NEED OF SYMPATHY

Senator KNOWLAND said today that the heads of committees should be "at least people who give a little more general sympathy to the views of the majority party" than some chairmen have in the past.

Mr. President, I ask that I be not interrupted until I have finished with what I have to say. Then I shall be very glad indeed to answer any questions any Member of the Senate may desire to ask me.

The Senator from California did not refer to me by name.

I thank the Senator from California for picking up my papers. He is always so kind to me. [Laughter.]

The Senator from California did not refer to me by name. Nevertheless the story went out all over the country, and I am making this speech as it applies to him only if he referred to the senior Senator from North Dakota, which of course he did.

Mr. President, I have read what the Senator from California stated to the press. I wish to compare my Republicanism with that of my friend from California. I want to compare the record of North Dakota in the national elections with that of the State of California. In the State of North Dakota we have two political factions in the Republican Party. The faction which I head is in the majority, and I have headed that faction for a great many years, as my distinguished colleague from North Dakota will verify. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, when the late Wendell Willkie ran for President, he carried the State of North Dakota. Tom Dewey ran for President, and he carried North Dakota.

Mr. Dewey ran again and carried North Dakota. Mr. Eisenhower ran in the last national election and carried North Dakota by the largest vote of any State in the Union, population considered, except the State of Vermont, which beat North Dakota by one decimal point.

Mr. President, that is the record of North Dakota. In the elections referred to, when North Dakota voted uniformly for the Republican nominees, Minnesota, to the east of us, except in the last national election, and Montana, to the west of us, except in the last national election, voted every time against the nominees of the Republican Party in those national elections.

Mr. President, every time there has been a reorganization of the Senate I have voted with the Republican Party.

The press on various occasions has said I rode with Truman—I refer to Harry Truman—on his train, all over North Dakota. To that I plead guilty. I was delighted to ride with him. In the first place, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that a United States Senator is a State official, and when Mr. Truman invited the Governor of North Dakota and myself to ride on his train, he was not there simply as a candidate; he was there as the President of the United States. It gave me great pleasure to ride with him from early in the morning until late at night. We started from Breckenridge, Minn., early in the morning, and we finished up at Williston, N. Dak., at midnight.

I may say that on that occasion Representative BURDICK, who has been elected on the Republican ticket time and time again, joined us at Williston and took a great deal of pride in introducing the President in his hometown of Williston.

Did not the Republican presidential candidate go to South Carolina and other Southern States and ask for Democratic support? There is apparently nothing wrong about that. Several Senators on this floor supported him, even though they come from Democratic States. Numerous governors elected on the Democratic ticket in the South openly supported President Eisenhower. In other words, he wanted their support.

It made no difference to me how he conducted his campaign, but the Eisenhower machine in the State of North Dakota was against me, as were the Taft machine in Ohio, the Stassen machine in Minnesota, and what little machine Warren had in the State of North Dakota. As my distinguished colleague knows, the so-called reactionary old crowd—the R. O. C.—in the State of North Dakota was against me. I do not think I missed any of them. I had against me the oilmen in Texas, who, according to their sworn report which has been filed, poured in thousands of dollars to defeat me. I had against me the private power companies. In fact, everyone was against me except the common people of the State of North Dakota. I had against me a candidate who has been governor three times, who was a Member of Congress, and a man who has a very fine family life, a man who could not be honestly criticized with reference to his morals or his character. He was against me chiefly on the issue of public power.

Mr. President, I say I rode on Truman's train, but there is one thing I have never done in my life: I have never run on the Democratic ticket, as has my distinguished friend, the leader of the Republican Party from the State of California. [Laughter.]

According to press reports, the distinguished leader of the majority wants to have the system of electing chairmen of committees revised. He did not mention me by name, but he inferred that he wanted to throw me out.

Mr. President, with reference to the Warren nomination, I think every Member of the Senate is entitled to have the record showing precisely how the Warren nomination was handled. I made a speech upon this floor a few days ago, stating in detail exactly what I did as chairman of the committee, and I will leave it to the judgment of the Senate as to whether there was an hour's delay in taking up the nomination of Mr. Warren and following it to its full conclusion. Yet the newspapers charged there was.

First of all, Mr. President, I was in a very embarrassing position, Mr. Eisenhower's North Dakota crowd being against me, the late Senator Taft's crowd being against me, and Mr. Stassen's crowd being against me, all of whom were stronger than poor Mr. Warren who, apparently, had the poorest machine in the State of North Dakota.

When the Republican convention took place I found there was only one man among all the delegates who would support Mr. Warren. He is an officer and member of the Non-Partisan League. When he asked for my judgment I told him that if I were in his place I would vote for Mr. Warren for President of the United States.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the official minutes of the Republican National Convention which was held at Chicago in 1952. Of course, I was not present, because my distinguished colleague was there with his R. O. C. friends. But the record shows that my friend voted from beginning to end, all through that convention, for Mr. Earl Warren for President of the United States. He never deviated. He represented the faction of the Republican Party to which I belong in the State of North Dakota.

So, Mr. President, I almost had to lean backward when the nomination of Mr. Earl Warren was sent to the Senate. Mr. Warren is a good friend of mine—or, at least, he was until a few days ago. [Laughter.] He may be yet.

So, when the nomination came to the Senate I took exceptional care to be absolutely certain that we had a committee that would be fair to Mr. Warren. So, as I stated a few days ago on the floor of the Senate, I appointed a subcommittee, with one member from the East, one from the West, one from the South, one from the North, and myself. What could be more fair than that?

The nomination came to this body from President Eisenhower, not on January 6, as the newspapers might lead us to believe, but it came on Monday, January 11th. It was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary on the same day. It physically came to the committee on the next day, the 12th.

I took my time in selecting a subcommittee that would be absolutely fair, and on the 16th of January that subcommittee was appointed.

Every Senator is familiar with the fact that after a subcommittee is appointed, 7 days' notice must be given. I have before me the notice which was given on that day for a hearing to be held on February 2. That notice states, as all

Senators know, because they have read them hundreds of times, that anyone objecting to the nominee can appear. The hearing was set for February 2, which was just as soon as it could be set after the subcommittee had been constituted.

Then what happened? On February 2 we held an open meeting, followed by an executive meeting.

Then, it will be remembered, Lincoln week intervened. Some members of the subcommittee desired to make Lincoln Day speeches—that is, Republican Members, not Democratic Members. There were a few Democratic Members who, I think, would have been available for a hearing, but some Republican Senators wished to make Lincoln Day speeches. So the next hearing was set for February 15. Lincoln's birthday was February 12. The absent Senators returned in time for the meeting on February 15.

When that hearing began there were roughly 197 complaints against the nominee. So a subcommittee meeting was called for 4 days later, Friday, February 19. At that time the subcommittee went over the matter very carefully. We did not conclude our action, so we met on Saturday. Tired as we were, we had a meeting on Saturday.

At that meeting, we had a full report from the two members of the staff whom we had designated to conduct an investigation: Mr. Sourwine, who for years has been counsel to the committee, and who now is assigned to the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and Mr. Smithey, another excellent lawyer, who is assigned to the Republican side of the committee. Both of these excellent lawyers had gone over every single complaint.

When the Lincoln's birthday celebration was finished, and the members of the subcommittee had returned, we told our counsel that we wanted to go over the analysis they had made.

They reported that out of 197 complaints, there were, in their opinion, a great many of which the committee did not have jurisdiction. Some complaints did not amount to anything, but we were told there were 10 complaints, possibly 11, which, in the opinion of the committee counsel, the subcommittee should consider very, very carefully. I may say that these 10 or 11 complaints were read in detail. There was one which the subcommittee thought should not be brought up, so the number of complaints to be considered was limited to 10. We then said we would report the complaints to the full Committee on the Judiciary at our next meeting.

A quorum could not be obtained on Monday, which was the regular meeting day, but the chairman of the committee did not let the matter lie over a week; he called a meeting, first, for Tuesday. A majority of the members could not attend on that day, so the meeting was set for Wednesday, February 24.

We had a meeting on that day, at which the nomination was submitted, and then a further meeting was held.

Among the complaints which had been received was one—and it appeared at the very first hearing—from a man in Los Angeles named Roderick J. Wilson. I had never had the honor of making that gentleman's acquaintance. I did not know who he was. But his letter was sent in by a man named Burr McCloskey, whom I do know, and who, by the way, formerly lived in Ohio and was a friend of the late Senator Taft. He was head of an organization called United Labor Party, or something of that sort. Some years ago, at the request of Senator Taft, I went to Ohio and attended a meeting of that organization. That was where I again met Mr. Burr McCloskey.

Immediately at the committee meeting an argument arose as to whether Mr. Wilson should be allowed to testify. Up to that time, every single vote of our subcommittee had been unanimous. I say today to the distinguished majority leader that every single vote, until we came to report on the nomination of Mr. Warren, had been unanimous. In every case, I believe, the full subcommittee attended, except in one instance, when the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] was making a speech on the floor of the Senate.

I, as chairman, had called a meeting of the subcommittee, to be held in the room of the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], but the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri could not attend.

Mention has been made of delay. There was a time when the subcommittee was perfectly willing to send two staff members to California to make a full and complete investigation of the nominee. It was agreed that any member of the subcommittee, or all of them, could go to California and take as much time as might be necessary to conduct the investigation. That was occasioned by the strange fact that our subcommittee had no FBI report on Mr. Warren.

I hold in my hand the text of the law creating the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is section 299, title V, pertaining to the executive department, and reads:

> For investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice and the Department of State, as may be directed by the Attorney General, the Attorney General is authorized to appoint officials who shall be vested with the authority necessary for the execution of such duties.

It is under that section that the Department of Justice has control of the FBI, which is headed by J. Edgar Hoover.

In the subcommittee the question arose, Should we have an FBI report? The Office of the Attorney General took the position that no Chief Justice ever had been investigated by the FBI. I hold in my hand a copy of the investigation hearings held in connection with the nominations of, for example, Mr. Justice Tom Clark and Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter, among others, who had been nominated to be Associate Justices of the Supreme Court. The Department of Justice said that the late Chief Justice Vinson, who, by the way, had been, at least, examined before the committee, had been exempt from FBI investigation.

I hold in my hand a record of appointments to the Supreme Court. It consists of an investigation made by a student or a professor—I do not know which—of the University of Wisconsin, by the name of John P. Frank. In any event, it is fully documented. It says that all the New Deal appointees to the Supreme Court, from Senator Black to Attorney General Murphy, had been present at hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary, and had been available for examination, had any Senator desired to ask questions. Mr. Justice Frankfurter was the only one who was actually examined.

Senators will be interested to know that, according to the investigation made at the University of Wisconsin, no lunacy test is required for appearance of witnesses at congressional hearings. [Laughter.]

The Pierce Butler appointment was delayed for days because of communications from a man of doubtful mental balance, and a crackpot convention turned out to oppose Judge Frankfurter.

There was no way by which the chairman of the subcommittee could have ascertained whether or not the people who wanted to appear as witnesses were lunatics or whether they were crackpots or whether they were fine honest citizens.

About that time I received a telegram, which to me certainly was very interesting. Mr. Roderick J. Wilson desired to testify. The Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Rogers, said, "Why, that man is a fugitive from justice. Certainly we are not going to hear a man who is a fugitive from justice."

As I have said, I did not know what the situation was. I received many telegrams from people who stated they ought to be heard or they ought to be subpenaed; but, in my mind, this telegram settled it. It is from Oakland, Calif., the hometown of my distinguished friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and he ought to know and probably does know about it. The telegram reads:

> As executive director of the Grand Jury Association of California for the past 16 years and confirming long-distance telephone to you this morning—

He had called me by long distance, asking me to call Mr. Wilson—

> regarding status of Roderick J. Wilson's charges now pending before your committee. It appears that in order to clarify full justice to all concerned, your committee should subpena Roderick J. Wilson, Hotel Lake Merritt, Oakland, Calif., to appear before your committee to testify immediately.
>
> LESTER O. WISLER,
> *Executive Director, Grand Jury Association of California.*

I should like to ask what any Senator present on the floor would have done if he had been the chairman or a member of the Judiciary Committee. So the committee voted unanimously to hear Mr. Roderick Wilson. Of course, the chairman was in an extremely difficult position. I did not know Mr. Roderick J. Wilson. He had called me the night before. He wanted to see me, but I said, "You please be at my office at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning." The next morning when I got there he had two lawyers with him, I think. Mr. Burr McCloskey was there, and the Capitol Police were on hand. Certainly the chairman of the committee was not going to be in the position, with the Attorney General of the United States saying Mr. Wilson was

a fugitive from justice, of not having him arrested the moment he showed up. I could have been charged with being an accessory after the fact or of harboring a fugitive. So we had the Capitol Police there. They promptly took Mr. Wilson into custody. That was the first time I had ever seen the gentleman.

Then it developed that he was not a fugitive under United States laws but that there was outstanding a warrant in California for Mr. Wilson as a fugitive from justice.

I sent a telegram to Mr. Rogers, Deputy Attorney General, telling him I had his man there for him, and that they could come and get him any time they wanted him.

In the meantime the police took him to the station. They did not want to hold him, because there was no warrant for him. The result was that someone in the Attorney General's office called someone in California, and a warrant was telegraphed to Washington so this so-called fugitive from justice could be held.

In the meantime, the committee met and decided to hear what Mr. Wilson had to say. So we listened to Mr. Wilson for 2 hours or 2 hours and a half.

I remind the Senators that I had already given notice on the Senate floor that the hearing was going to be an open meeting. Any member of the subcommittee could then or at any time before the hearing or at the hearing who desired to could have objected to the open hearing, which the distinguished majority leader said was "the most shocking" he had ever seen in his life. But the majority leader sat here. He did not object to an open meeting. Nor did a single member of that subcommittee object to an open meeting, then or at any time until after the hearing had started.

I am a great believer in open meetings. I believe that when business of the public is being transacted, the public is entitled to know whose testimony the committee is hearing and what kind of people are testifying.

I very frankly was concerned with the possibilities, so I was in favor of an open meeting. But there was no objection. To the hearing I invited the distinguished majority leader, the other Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Deputy Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Rogers.

More than that, the subcommittee knew Mr. Wilson was going to testify to events which occurred in California. The committee said it had no objection to having present Mr. Rogers and Mr. Olney, now head of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, and more recently the man who was in charge of crime investigations in California. Mr. Olney attended the hearing. At various times he asked questions of the witness.

When the committee concluded the hearing, it promptly reported the nomination. There was some discussion, but the nomination was reported by a vote of 12 to 3, with the senior Senator from North Dakota voting to report the nomination. Certainly no honest man can say there was any delay in taking action on the nomination and the newspapers and radio commentators simply lied when they so stated.

I remind the Senate that the hearing was set for the second day of February. The subcommittee set the date of the hearing as early as possible. However, in San Francisco the press broke loose. The San Francisco newspapers led the attack. Whom did they attack? They attacked not the committee but the senior Senator from North Dakota. News of that attack went all over the country. It was cleverly organized. Newspapers making the attack included the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal. All of them attacked the chairman of the committee, when, I repeat, every vote of the subcommittee, certainly up to that time, had been unanimous.

Among the things the newspapers said was that I wanted Federal patronage and was holding up the nomination of Mr. Warren because I wanted to get some postmasters and some other appointments in North Dakota.

I think such an accusation deserves an answer, and I do not know any better way to answer it than by reading from the testimony of the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Rogers, who attended that meeting. I have called Mr. Rogers, and I have his full consent to read exactly what he said at that particular time. The substance of it simply is that at no time was the matter of patronage ever mentioned in discussions with the chairman or any member of the subcommittee or full committee.

Here is what he said:

> Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say, as an afterthought, that we want to disassociate ourselves from any criticism of this chairman about this matter. Nobody in the Department of Justice has said anything critical of the chairman or of the committee members, and I personally regret very much some of the stories that have appeared in the papers; and I want the members of the committee to know, and the chairman to know, that they did not emanate from us. We have never said the things that appeared in the papers, and we appreciate very much the cooperation we have had from this committee, not only in this case, but all during the session last year, too. We appreciate it very much indeed.

As chairman, I asked this question of Mr. Rogers:

> I want to ask you one question. Have I ever discussed, even remotely, North Dakota patronage in connection with the Earl Warren affair?
>
> Mr. ROGERS. The chairman has never suggested that. We have never had any disagreement on patronage at all in relation to matters before the committee, and I certainly have never believed that anybody in the Department of Justice has; and I hope the record is clear on that.

That certainly answers all the defamatory newspaper articles and radio speeches to the effect that the nomination of Earl Warren was held up because of patronage.

Now I come again to the matter of an FBI report. I have told about the Associate Justices who appeared before the committee voluntarily, and subjected themselves to questioning. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to what John Foster Dulles did when he was nominated, a little over 1 year ago, to be Secretary of State. What was the first thing he said? He said, "I want to be investigated by the FBI."

A little later we had before us the nomination of our former distinguished colleague, Henry Cabot Lodge. We remember there had been some talk to the effect that some of the employees at the United Nations were members of the Communist Party. At the first interview Henry Cabot Lodge gave, he said, "I want to be investigated by the FBI."

And I believe both Mr. Dulles and Mr. Lodge were.

Undoubtedly, some of the Members of the Senate have served on juries or have tried cases in court. When a defendant does not take the witness stand, of course, the jury is instructed by the court that, under the Constitution, the defendant does not have to take the witness stand.

I wish the Senate to know that Mr. Earl Warren did not appear and subject himself to any kind of questioning before the committee. I want the Senate to know that only after the committee said it wanted to have an FBI report—and after I had written a letter, at the committee's direction, to the Attorney General of the United States—then, for the first time, we got an FBI report. But it was a limited FBI report. No field investigation was made. Of course, we still had the mass of complaints against the nominee.

We received that FBI report. As chairman of the committee, it was submitted to me, and I told the members of the committee what was in the report, which was, as I have said, a limited FBI report, without—I repeat—any field investigation.

Despite the fact that Mr. Warren did not appear, despite the fact that we had no FBI report based on a field examination, but in view of the fact that some of the Senators had known Mr. Warren for a long, long time, the committee, after considering everything, gave Mr. Warren a fine recommendation; 12 of us, including the chairman, voted to report the nomination favorably to the Senate.

The nomination is now before the Senate, for the Senate to act on as it chooses.

The other matter I wish to mention is the attacks upon me by the newspapers, without the Republican leader of the Senate, the majority leader, lifting his voice to help the chairman of the committee, or without his giving to one newspaper an interview to the effect that this was the attitude of the entire subcommittee; in fact, if one word had come from the majority leader, the leader of the Republican Members of the Senate, the senior Senator from California, I would not have been subjected to the overwhelming mass of publicity in the newspapers and over the radio. One word from this man, who sits here, would have stopped it. In my office, if my colleagues care to see them, I can show them hundreds of letters and telegrams. I shall read one. I shall read it for a

reason which I shall explain in a moment. The telegram comes from Oakland, Calif., from the hometown of the majority leader. It reads, as follows:

You silly moron.

ROBERT C. SPOTT.

Mr. President, I have previously been called almost everything in the world except that. It took a man from the majority leader's hometown in California to call me that name.

Let me say in all modesty that in high school I was the valedictorian of my class. I was the head of my class in college at the University of North Dakota. I was the head of my class at Columbia University, at that time the largest university in the United States. I just do not believe that a man who has been valedictorian of his class, all along the line, is a moron. But the wire typified how prejudice had been falsely created.

Mr. President, I have told my colleagues exactly what the situation was.

The distinguished majority leader has said that in a few days, or at some time in the future, a meeting of the Republican caucus will be called, in an effort to get rid of the seniority rule in connection with the chairmanship of Senate committees.

Mr. President, if this were a political campaign, and if I were running for reelection to the Senate from the State of North Dakota, I would welcome having the majority leader come to North Dakota, and I would gladly debate with him in any town in my State. I do not know when the distinguished majority leader will call a meeting of the Republican caucus, for the purpose of revising the seniority system in regard to the chairmanship of Senate committees. But sooner or later—whether a month from now or 2 months from now, or at any time before we adjourn—the question will come upon the floor of the Senate, and I want to tell the majority leader now that if ever in all his life he thought the senior Senator from North Dakota would not fight, if he ever thought the senior Senator from North Dakota does not have any friends on the floor of the Senate, let him bring up that matter—the sooner the better. I challenge him to bring it upon this floor, in broad daylight, under the spotlight of pitiless publicity, so the world may know every reason the Republican majority leader may have for recommending that the seniority rule in the case of Senate committee chairmanships be changed.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude by saying that during all 13 years of my service in the Senate, I have tried to live up to my oath of office. I have tried to do my duty.

Of course the newspapers in North Dakota have the statement the majority leader made yesterday and it will appear in large headlines in newspapers all over North Dakota.

But strangely enough, I have an abiding suspicion that the majority leader will not fool the people of North Dakota, no matter whether he issues 50 statements, one more derogatory than the other. The people of that State have a habit of appraising what is said about a man whom they elect to public office.

I was particularly delighted in a committee meeting by the fact that a resolution was introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [KEFAUVER] expressing confidence in the chairman.

I cannot close without quoting one of the finest statements one man ever made about another. When I spoke here 4 or 5 days ago, at the conclusion of my speech the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] made this statement:

Mr. President, I think I should tell my colleagues that I work with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and have been working with him for many months. There is not a harder working man on the floor of the Senate.

Of course, I think he praised me a little too much when he said that. I think many other Senators work harder than I do, but I do the best I can. I shall explain that statement before I close.

The Senator from Idaho continued:

He has had to recommend the confirmation of approximately 133 nominations in a short period of less than 2 months. Many times the junior Senator from Idaho has been at his side and has tried in a small way to assist him.

The other day I asked the distinguished Senator from North Dakota if perhaps he could expedite the Warren nomination, on the ground and for the reason that it was personally embarrassing to the Senator from Idaho, since the Senator from Idaho enjoys a warm and close friendship with the nominee.

He told me that he would do his very best. I can vouch for that statement. He has done his very best. He has worked long hours. I am certain he will weigh the complaints he has received, and he will weigh them very carefully.

The statement issued to the press by the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate brings out the fact that I was the only Republican voting with the Democrats 2 or 3 nights ago for adjournment. I discussed that subject with the leader before I voted. I discussed it with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

I think it is no secret that I have not been well. I was in Georgetown Hospital for some time. Only a little while ago four leading physicians in Washington headed by the distinguished Dr. William Howell, tried to do to me what the late Senator Taft's physicians did to him, namely, to have me walk around on crutches. They took one X-ray after another. I said to them that I could not imagine the senior Senator from North Dakota walking around on crutches in the Senate Chamber, and I refused to do it.

I told the Senator from California that I was not well. The night before, with the Assistant Attorney General Mike Horan I spent long hours going over FBI reports. We sat together until nearly 9 o'clock. There were many nominations, and FBI reports to go over. That night I had supper about 10:30. I call it supper. I supposed my distinguished friend calls it dinner, but in North Dakota we call it supper.

The next night we were busy almost as late as the night before, going over FBI reports. Tomorrow or Monday, when the nominations come before the Senate for consideration, Senators can see the result of my labors. It is quite a job to go over 133 nominations.

So when this question arose I said to my leader—at that time—that I was very tired, and that I intended to vote to adjourn. I do not mind telling him and other Senators that I went home and went to bed. I have been consulting Dr. Calver for more than 2 months, in addition to care from physicians downtown. However, I do not want my friends to worry about my health. On Lincoln's birthday I bet $100 that I would live longer than the chairman of the Republican State Committee of North Dakota, who has been down here keeping me from getting any patronage.

I do not want any sympathy. Men from North Dakota are pretty tough. My refusal to walk on crutches was largely a matter of pride. It was not because I thought there was nothing wrong with me. The doctors say that, paradoxically, my right leg is 11 years older than my left leg. [Laughter.]

So I say to my colleagues and to the leader that I serve notice that whenever he is ready to bring up the subject of seniority, I am ready to accommodate him. I think some Republican Senators may agree with my viewpoint on the subject of seniority. I hope some Democratic Senators will do likewise. After all, I voted with them the other night to adjourn. With some Republican support and some Democratic support, I have a sneaking suspicion that I shall be able to defeat any effort by the Republican leader to change the rule with respect to seniority.

Whether I continue as chairman of the Judiciary Committee for only a few months longer, or for the full 5 years remaining in my term, I promise the best service I can render, the most honest service, the most efficient service; and I shall try to be the kind of Senator my friends in North Dakota want me to be. They know me—they trust me and I will not betray that trust and confidence.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As one member of the Judiciary Committee, while I am not a member of the subcommittee which has been handling the Warren nomination and was not present and cannot speak of the open meeting that has been criticized, I wish to say that I feel that the distinguished chairman of the committee does not deserve other criticism which has been directed at him and with which I am familiar. This criticism which has been directed his way, should be directed at the action of the entire committee, not at our chairman.

At the conclusion of the hearing at which Governor Warren's nomination was approved by the committee, I think every member expressed confidence in the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and in his fairness. It was pointed out, I believe by almost every member present, that any delay which had been occasioned was due to the action of the committee, and not the chairman.

I know of one particular instance which I think illustrates one point at least. There was some criticism of the

distinguished chairman because there was a delay in connection with an FBI report. Frankly, I think it is ludicrous and pointless to require FBI reports on men like Governor Warren and others who have been appointed to the Supreme Court, men who have served for many years in public life, and whom Members of the Senate know personally. I do not think FBI reports should be required in such cases.

But the chairman of the committee asked the committee for guidance in connection with an FBI report. The committee was informed that a rule of the committee required FBI reports of judiciary nominations. Since there was a rule, the chairman was instructed to secure an FBI report before proceeding with the Warren nomination. He did so. For that he was bitterly criticized. That criticism should have been of the committee, not of the chairman.

I wish to say further, Mr. President, that during my service on the Committee on the Judiciary its chairman has given everyone a chance to be heard, and he always tries to handle the proceedings of the committee fairly. As one member of the committee I wish to express my fullest confidence in the actions and deliberations of our distinguished chairman.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything about the subject this afternoon. I was a member of the subcommittee which considered the nomination of Chief Justice Warren.

There are some matters connected with the record which I believe ought to be made clear. I was not on the floor of the Senate last Friday at the time the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary made his speech. I did not know that he proposed to hold a public meeting. I went to the meeting, as my notice of the meeting called for. When I arrived there I found it was a public meeting with kleig lights and television and radio, and everything else that goes with a public meeting of that kind.

I am not opposed, ordinarily, to public hearings. My exception was taken to the matter that was presented—matter that had not been evaluated or investigated, which amounted to a series of charges made by irresponsible people, and bared to the world and sent out under conditions providing for nationwide publicity. That is one thing I objected to.

I also objected to the procedure followed at the meeting. It was contrary to what the committee had been doing through one of its other subcommittees, namely, the Subcommittee on Internal Security. In that subcommittee the witnesses are first screened in an executive session before they are brought into a public hearing. In that committee we try in every way possible to protect people from publicity when baseless charges are made. Only if substantial evidence is elicited at an executive hearing is it ever made public, or do we ever hold a public hearing on it.

At the last previous subcommittee meeting held prior to the public hearing of last Friday a suggestion was made that the subcommittee go to California and hold hearings there on the nomination of Chief Justice Warren, with respect to his fitness for the position. Such a motion was made and I objected to it. The motion was not pressed to a vote. I understood at that meeting it was finally agreed that if any of the members of the subcommittee had any further doubts with respect to the charges against Chief Justice Warren the subcommittee would send staff investigators to California to interview the people who had made the charges, to ascertain whether there was any substantial evidence to support the charges.

I was amazed and surprised when I walked into the committee room and found the room crowded with photographers and other publicity facilities at a public hearing which was already under way. I was more than amazed when the charges were made public at the direction of the chairman. They were charges which I thought were going to be investigated. I thought it would first be determined whether the witnesses were reliable and whether they could give any substantial evidence.

The chairman of the committee stated that there have always been unanimous votes on all questions in the subcommittee. The record will show that is not an accurate statement.

After the Friday public meeting to which I have referred the subcommittee went immediately into executive session. I made a motion favorably to report immediately to the full committee the nomination of Chief Justice Warren. A motion was made to recess or to adjourn, in the form of a substitute motion. Two of us, as member of the subcommittee, voted against that motion. When the question came up with respect to hearing the testimony of this man Wilson, who had theretofore, according to public notice, been given an opportunity to appear at a previous public hearing, if he wanted to appear. There was no formal rollcall, or anything like that. I turned to the committee and to the stenographer who was taking down the proceedings, and said, "I want to be recorded against hearing the witness because he already had been given full opportunity to appear at the first public hearing held by the committee." I did not feel we should dignify that man's charges, because he had not come up with a single bit of evidence nor did he indiciate that he had anything substantial to present against the Chief Justice.

When we heard him, we wound up by finding that he could not testify against the Chief Justice on anything personal, because all he know about the Chief Justice personally was good. He was relying on rumor and on publications which attacked the Governor. He was even relying on a crime commission report which was made by a commission that had been appointed by Governor Warren.

I have no feud with the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota. I have been working with him, and, so far as I am personally concerned, I have been getting along with him very well. However, I was amazed when the public hearing was scheduled—it was not ordered by a vote of the subcommittee—and at what took place in it. I regret that I could not be on the floor of the Senate when the chairman made his speech on Friday. I was tied up in a hearing during the week. We had an Indian hearing going on at the time. Therefore, I did not know about the public hearing which had been ordered by the chairman. I did object seriously to what was taking place in the public hearing. I did not associate myself with it then, and I do not approve of it now.

I am not against public hearings. I know of cases in which the Judiciary Committee has held executive meetings on various candidates for the judiciary, and those hearings were sealed and never revealed to this day.

I have respect for the Senator from North Dakota, and I am not making this statement for the purpose of hurting him in any way. I am trying to give to the Senate and to the country an account of what happened and the reason why I made the objection I did make in the committee at public meeting on Friday. I believe I was justified in making the objection.

A man like Chief Justice Warren should not be subjected to a broadcast by a very fine staff member reading, under the chairman's direction, charges which had not been evaluated, and in connection with which not a scintilla of evidence had been submitted, or with no evidence being presented to sustain the charges; and also in view of the fact that at our previous meeting we had decided to check, through our staff members, to see whether there was any evidence which supported the charges.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I doubt very much that the junior colleague of the distinguished majority leader, or, for that matter, any other Senator, needs to stand and vouch for his integrity, or loyalty, or devotion to principles, or, indeed, for his ability to call the shots as he sees them.

The other day the senior Senator of California saw fit to refer to some of the procedures which took place in the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and to label them as "shocking." I wish respectfully, but at the same time as firmly as I can, to join with him in that apt description of what transpired in the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary at the time it was scheduled to sit in hearing upon the nomination of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Earlier on the afternoon of the hearing the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, who is the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, said, at page 2045 of the RECORD of February 19:

> In view of the great publicity that has been given to the work of this committee in connection with this nominee, and in view of the charges made that there were some ulterior motives on the part of the chairman of this committee, I have decided to have an open hearing, with all these charges brought out, at 4 o'clock this afternoon. I gave notice of this yesterday to the press and inasmuch as three Senators have written me or requested me to let them know when the hearings will be had, I am now serving notice upon the Senate floor.

So the committee met and the hearings were held. There were no witnesses present, but there was presented a series of communications from individuals, mostly from the State which I have the honor, in part, to represent which were vitriolic in character, which were contemptible, and which attempted to destroy and sully the reputation of a man who has given almost his entire lifetime in the public service to the people of California.

It may well be that some persons find there is nothing unreasonable in a public hearing enlivened, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] has suggested, by television cameras grinding and newspaper reporters and others present. It may well be that that constitutes, in the minds of some of my colleagues, a reasonable manner in which to conduct a hearing. But I must violently disagree with them. To me it is unreasonable. To me it is shocking at a public hearing to have read into the record charges which come before the committee in the form of letters which are unsubstantiated, unverified, and which, by their very dissemination across this country, are damaging; letters which do violence to the integrity and the reputation of the individual to whom they relate.

I wish to make one more point, Mr. President. I was extended the courtesy by the chairman and members of the subcommittee to attend the subsequent executive hearings of the committee. I listened to the individual who appeared before the committee and who, in executive session, testified. I was delighted to see that, in a matter of moments after that individual had concluded his testimony and left the room, the committee, by an overwhelming vote, reported favorably to the Senate the nomination of Chief Justice Warren.

So, Mr. President, I want to aline myself with my senior colleague in emphatically saying that I consider the manner in which the hearings were conducted to have been unreasonable and shocking, and I, for one, am ready to consider changes in the rules of the Senate on the lines which the distinguished senior Senator from California has recommended.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have listened to the statement of the procedure followed by the Judiciary Committee, and I judge that it all boils down to the fact that the majority of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee had power to determine the procedure which the committee would follow, and it apparently did not exercise the privilege to vote against a public hearing, if it did not want a public hearing.

SENATOR LANGER'S DEVOTION TO MAJORITY RULE

Mr. President, I know BILL LANGER well enough to know that he does not function as a dictator, but as a democrat spelled with a small "d." I know him well enough to know that if the majority of his colleagues insist upon a particular procedure, the majority will prevail. So I am a little at a loss to understand what the trouble is all about, because, under the organization of the Judiciary Committee, if I am correctly advised and if I properly interpreted the statements made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, there is nothing which prevented a majority of the subcommittee, when the matter was within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, or prevented a majority of the full committee, when it was within its jurisdiction, from following whatever course of action the majority wished to decide upon, so far as procedure was concerned. But, however tragic the situation may be—and I think it is a tragic one, because I believe a distinguished colleague of ours has been unwarrantably attacked and done a great injustice—out of such a tragedy I hope some good can come, and I think it will come, because it pinpoints again the importance of the Senate as a Senate doing what it can to bring about a reform in Senate committee procedures applicable to all committees.

Therefore, Mr. President, I desire to make these brief comments with respect to a suggestion which I understand was made earlier this afternoon by the chairman of the Republican policy committee [Mr. FERGUSON].

PROCEDURE FOR COMMITTEE REFORM

I have read with interest the story on the ticker that the chairman of the Republican policy committee has announced that that group is undertaking a study of committee investigation procedures.

The announcement indicates that the staff of the policy committee will assemble whatever existing rules the committees have. It is then proposed that the chairmen of all Senate committees will be brought together for discussion of procedures that might be adopted to improve investigations. It was further announced that it was not decided whether any proposals would be made to the Senate for the adoption of committee procedure rules. I am not particularly interested that the policy committee chairman stated this move is not a result of the proposal made by Senator LEHMAN and myself for a mandatory code of fair committee practices.

If the policy committee chairman is looking for information, let me assure him that practically no congressional committees have published rules. If the policy committee chairman is wondering whether committee procedure reform is required, he is in the position of a plumber who is undecided whether there is a leaky faucet at the very time that he is knee deep in water.

The proposed procedure is not only inadequate but ill-advised. It is not good policy for the policy committee to formulate legislation, and still less is it its function to prescribe rules for the conduct of Senate committees. Such legislation should come from the Rules and Administration Committee rather than from a partisan committee of a political party division of the Senate. Indeed, one of the very abuses that requires cure is the conduct of committees by one party without consultation with members of the minority. Yet the policy committee chairman proposes a procedure whereby only Republican chairmen will consider procedure reform.

If anything is within the special province of the Senate, it is the subject of its internal regulation. The rules of the Senate for the conduct of its agents—its committees—should be considered by the Rules Committee based upon several resolutions now before it and whatever others may be introduced.

I would not wish to discourage an inquiry into committee procedure reform by saying that this move comes too late. However, it assuredly is too little.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator——

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is identified as "2–1–54–A," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have it stated in full, or to have it printed in the RECORD?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to have it printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. KEFAUVER, for himself and other Senators, is as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That the following historic principles are solemnly affirmed: (a) That the Constitution of the United States is superior to all domestic laws and to all treaties and other international agreements; (b) that neither a treaty nor any other international agreement can prevail over subsequently enacted laws of the United States intended to alter the domestic effect thereof; (c) that the courts of the United States, in deciding cases before them, have not only the power but also the duty to declare unconstitutional and invalid any provision of such domestic law, treaty, or other international agreement which conflicts with the Constitution; and (d) that under its Constitution, the United States, as a completely sovereign state in the community of nations, must always retain and exercise all of those attributes of sovereignty incident to the making of treaties and other international agreements which are possessed by independent states under the law of nations.

"SEC. 2. That it is the sense of the Congress that the Senate, in giving its advice and consent to the ratification of a treaty has the power to provide that the treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of legislation by the Congress.

"SEC. 3. In view of the extremely important nature of treaties and constitutional amendments, subsections (1), (2), and (3) of this section are enacted by the Congress: (a) As an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of that House to which they specifically apply; and

such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and (b) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

"(1) Rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end of the last paragraph of section 1 the following:

" 'No vote upon the final question to advise and consent to the ratification shall be had unless immediately prior to such vote, it has been ascertained, by a rollcall ordered for such purpose, that a quorum of the Senate is present. The final question to advise and consent to the ratification shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote; the yeas and nays shall be considered to have been ordered upon any such question; and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.'

"(2) Rule XV of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

" '5. No vote upon the question of engrossment and passage of any joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States shall be had unless, immediately prior to such vote, it has been ascertained, by a rollcall ordered for such purpose, that a quorum of the House is present. The question of engrossment and passage of any joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote; the yeas and nays shall be considered to have been ordered upon any such question; and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the House.'

"(3) Rule XII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

" 'No vote upon the question of engrossment and passage of any joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States shall be had unless, immediately prior to such vote, it has been ascertained, by a rollcall ordered for such purpose, that a quorum of the Senate is present. The question of engrossment and passage of any joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote; the yeas and nays shall be considered to have been ordered upon any such question; and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.' "

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, underlying the various proposed amendments to the treaty clause of the Constitution is a deep-seated suspicion of our international relations. Some of the proponents of these amendments fear that dire consequences may flow from our membership in the United Nations. Some Senators have repeatedly said that while the original language of the Constitution was quite adequate for the days when it was framed, it is no longer sufficient because we now live in the day of the United Nations. Some persons believe the United Nations is a rather rough place, and that our membership in it puts us in constant jeopardy.

From my observation, most Senators do not go along with this premise. They have no fear of international organizations. They feel that while international organizations may fall short of perfection, they offer us the only real hope of peace, and they have seen for themselves how closely the affairs of nations are being related. I regret to say that I also observe that there is a widespread belief among some Members of the Senate that the public is far less enlightened than are the leaders.

People do not trust the U. N., I am told. A wave of isolation is sweeping across the country.

Some Members of the Senate have frankly stated that while a constitutional amendment obviously is not needed, perhaps some meaningless and empty amendment should be adopted, in order to reassure the public, which we are told is atremble with fear and needs comfort of this kind.

Frankly, I have never succumbed to such counsels. I think the people, in their desire to cooperate with other nations, in the interest of peace, are often ahead of some of us who represent them.

I am delighted to find some objective and scientific information on these public attitudes. The Elmo Roper organization has made a survey of opinion on international organizations. To the best of their ability, they selected an adequate sample which fairly represented the entire country in terms of geography, sex, age, economic circumstances, race, education, religion, political party, and veteran status.

The survey disclosed that only 9 percent of the population wanted the United States to pull in its horns and retire to a state of isolation. Seven percent could be classed as hopeless; they felt there was little hope in struggling for peace; that war probably was inevitable. Eleven percent had no opinion. The other 73 percent believed that the United States should stick with the United Nations as it is now constituted, or should enter into still closer ties with other peoples. The report was completed in December 1953, and, I submit, is the authentic voice of the American people. It is not a timid voice. It is not the voice of a people who want their President to be lashed to the mast to make sure he is not lured by the siren song of the United Nations.

I urge every Senator to read the results of Mr. Roper's careful survey. I especially invite the attention of those Senators who themselves do not lack faith in the United Nations, but who feel that their constituents do. Mr. Roper has written a full description of the survey in the current issue of Public Opinion Quarterly, which is published by Princeton University. The article is preceded by an introduction by former Secretary of the Air Force, Thomas K. Finletter. The report is thoroughly objective and contains important information to the effect that our constituents do not fear the United Nations. On the contrary, they want it to grow and to increase in strength and importance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the few pages constituting the report proper be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The study which is reported here was designed to measure the American public's attitudes toward isolation and several kinds of world cooperation which this country might pursue as a means to peace. Besides trying to learn how many people—and what kinds of people—believe in world cooperation, the study sought to find out as much as possible about their reasons for believing as they do. The study was undertaken with the avowed intention of making the results available to any group of citizens interested in the question of peace and the part this country should take in the world, with the hope that their efforts might be better guided by this knowledge.

In all, 3,502 personal interviews were conducted by trained interviewers among a national cross-section of the adult American population during the early part of September 1953. A modified area method of sampling was used to determine selection of the people interviewed. In order to insure breadth of scope in the inquiry as well as to guard against imbalance in the questioning, a committee was formed to consult with the Roper organization in preparation of the questionnaire. This committee was composed of W. H. Ferry, Thomas K. Finletter, Clinton S. Golden, Eric Hodgins, Earl D. Osborn, and H. Christian Sonne.

THE BACKDROP

The mood of the American people on world affairs as we have measured it in this survey is essentially one of guarded pessimism, but not fatalism. The years of international tension have left a mark of awareness of the dangers of imminent war and deep respect for the difficulties in achieving any kind of lasting peace.

For instance, 53 percent of the people think another world war is almost certain within the next 25 to 30 years. Only 35 percent believe it might be possible to avoid it. The balance are uncertain what they think. Most pessimistic are the young people who have come of age in the last few years. Most optimistic are people with a college education.

But only 6 percent of the people want to see us go to war with Russia. And an even smaller number—4 percent—want us to stop our arms buildup and come to an appeasement-type of settlement with the Russians. Clearly, the American people want to steer a middle course between these two extremes. Twenty-three percent are content to rely completely on our military buildup. The largest group, an easy majority, coming to 59 percent, believe we should keep up our military guard, but should go beyond this and exhaust every avenue that might bring about peace and an easing of the tensions between East and West.

By an overwhelming margin, the people of this country are convinced that the United States cannot escape another major war should one break out. By a count of 81 to 9 percent, they believe we would find it impossible to sit out any war in Europe, and by a 60-to-20-percent margin that we cannot avoid becoming involved in any major Asiatic war.

Yet 60 percent of the people believe we are doing the best we can to prevent war. The three things these people list most frequently as our best positive moves to avert world war III are in order: our program of foreign aid, our efforts to support international organization, and our military rearmament program.

Twenty-six percent feel that we are falling short in our efforts to avert war. These people offer such criticisms as our giving away too much to other peoples, cutting our military strength, too much appeasement of Russia, too weak a policy in Korea—should have followed MacArthur, and not minding our own business. This is the minority view, but its adherents are both substantial in number and have vocal and powerful spokesmen.

As a people, we have our divisions and our areas of agreement. We are evenly divided as to whether or not the Russians really have

enough atomic bombs to launch an attack—34 percent think they do, 36 percent they do not, and 30 percent simply don't have any idea. The division in high-ranking administration circles concerning Russian atomic power is clearly reflected in this difference of estimates among our people. But we are agreed, by a decisive 82 to 9 percent count, that in the event of another war, this country would suffer serious destruction from atom bombing.

Clearly, the source of our uncertainty is our inability either to get together with Russia and the Communist world or to force them to come to a settlement. Yet by a 2 to 1 count, the American people with an opinion about it believe it is wise to have Russia in rather than out of the United Nations.

In short, we feel that we are embarked on more or less the only course we could follow in our national quest for peace, but we tend to be pessimistic about the chances of averting ultimate war. We are convinced, on balance, that the forces of world communism will probably block and subvert steps that might lead to world peace. But we want Russia in rather than out of the one organization most people feel is the best hope for achieving peace—the United Nations. We have become realists about how difficult peace is to win. When pressed, we are more pessimistic than optimistic. But we have not lost hope for we know that our very survival is at stake.

Out of this welter of underlying hopes and expectations emerges a pattern of American attitudes about world organizations. For the purposes of this study, we gave people six alternate choices, and asked them:

"While everyone seems to agree that peace is an important thing, there are a good many different views as to how to bring it about. Here are some different ideas; there's one on each of these cards. (Respondent given set of cards, one for each of the propositions listed below.) Will you look through them and tell me which you come closest to agreeing with?"

The answers to this question are shown in table 1.

TABLE 1.—*Attitudes about world organization*

	Percent
We shouldn't get tied up in any more alliances or joint commitments with other countries and we should aim at getting out of as many as we can as soon as we can. (This is the isolationist view)	9
We should continue to work along with United Nations just about as we have been, gradually trying to make it better as time goes on. (This is the United Nations "as is" view.)	21
We should immediately get behind strengthening the United Nations and do everything necessary to give it more power and authority than it has—enough to actually keep even a strong nation from starting a war. (This is the stronger United Nations view.)	35
In addition to continuing with the United Nations, we should also unite with the friendly democratic countries into one government in which each member nation would in effect become a state, somewhat like the different States in this country. (This is the Democratic Union view.)	6
We should start now working toward transforming the United Nations into a real world government of all nations of the world, in which every nation would in effect become a state, somewhat like the different States in this country. (This is the world government view.)	11
Some of these ideas are good, but we won't get any of them working in time to prevent war, so we'd better not rely on them. (This is the hopeless view.)	7
No opinion	11
Total	100

In evaluating these results, it should be realized that some overlap may exist in some of these propositions—at least in some people's minds. When asked for their second choice of these propositions, certain patterns appear that suggest the differences between them may be more of methods than of objectives. For example, when world government people were asked for their second choice of these propositions, they tended to divide between the stronger U. N. and democratic union views. And more whose first choice is a strengthened U. N. took the democratic union and world government positions as second choice than either the isolationists or U. N. as is people.

Here, then, we have the broad outlines of American public opinion on the outlook for world organization. The range is wide. The spread is from isolation to hopelessness as the extremes with some form of world organization in between. The vast middle group—nearly 6 out of every 10 people—pins its hopes on the United Nations, either as now constituted or as strengthened. Those who want to go beyond the U. N.—even beyond a strengthened U. N.—are greater in number than those who want to roll back time and give up on world cooperation.

In a day when the United States is contemplating a vast program of atomic defense expansion, when we are absorbed in the horrors that hydrogen warfare might bring, we might with profit take a closer look at the six basic types of outlook our survey has measured. The evidence will not help our military planners appreciably in how to make more efficient plans for war. But it might help those concerned with this Nation's destiny to determine the next great try for peace. For if there is one element which might hold the key to mankind's bid for peace, it might very well be the American people themselves.

DIFFERENCES BY GROUPS

International organization has been the subject of a good many generalizations and few facts. For years images have been conjured up about the "isolationist Midwest," about the "world government-minded young people," about the "internationalist East," about "women being less for world organization than men," and a number of others.

The facts from this survey indicate clearly that rather than differences by groups, uniformity is much more likely to be the rule. Isolationist sentiment can be found among nearly every important segment of the population—and in nearly equal numbers. World government support is drawn from nearly every major group—again, in nearly equal numbers.

Part of the significant news from this study is that support for each of the various positions comes from just about every important segment of the population, and that differences between groups are far less significant than we might have been led to believe. Table 2 illustrates this fact.

Our study went behind these initial positions and tested for consistency and stability of point of view for each. An examination of these results yields a number of clues about the motivation of the people who took each position. The first group I shall deal with are the "hopeless," not because they are most important, but because they are the least positive and most "offbeat" in their views.

THE HOPELESS—7 PERCENT

Seven percent of the American public believe that there is little use left in struggling for peace. These people are more convinced that another world war is inevitable than any other group among us. They tend to divide into one group which feels that war is absolutely unavoidable and there is nothing anyone can do about it, and another group which feels that since war is inevitable, we should arm ourselves as much as possible. And a few would even start a war with the Russians at the most opportune and strategic moment.

If they were assured that war could be averted through some miracle they now do not believe in, most of these people's second choice as to the course America should follow would not be that of isolationism:

TABLE 3.—*Second choice of the "hopeless" group*

	Percent
Isolationism	29
Continue with U. N. as is	19
Strengthen U. N.	26
Union of democracies	8
World government	14
Don't know	16

When given a list of possible reasons for their views, 54 percent of these people answered "the best thing to rely on is a strongly armed United States"; 28 percent said that "human nature being what it is, we'll always have wars," and 23 percent said, "Russia will upset every plan for peace anyone tries to make."

All in all, these people have lived through the strains of the past generation and have found nearly any hope for peace baseless. They are dim about the prospects of the world surviving war, but are resigned to the inevitable. In a very real sense, they are the hopeless in our midst.

SHADES OF ISOLATION—9 PERCENT

Nine percent of the American people regret that the United States hasn't pulled in its horns and retired to a state of isolation. These people feel by and large, not only that we have gone too far in what we have done but that the time has come to pull out of our international alliances and commitments.

As might be expected, these people tend more than others to believe that the United States should have taken a smaller part in world affairs since the end of World War II. Minorities of them—but substantial minorities—think that it might be possible for us to stay out of another war in either Europe or Asia, that we are far from doing the most we can to stay out of another war, but that perhaps we won't be as pulverized by an atomic blitz as some warmongers claim we will.

Some in this isolationist group reject the idea of strengthening the United Nations on the grounds that the U. N. doesn't do anything anyhow, some fear that it will become too powerful, and others feel that any further involvement in world affairs will simply end with Uncle Sam picking up the tab. They reject the idea of a democratic union of countries on the grounds that such an idea will never work, we have no business getting involved with other nations, and people being as different as they are, nations never will be able to work together. When given a list of reasons for holding isolationist views, respondents selected the answers shown in table 4.

TABLE 4.—*Reasons for not getting tied up in alliances with other countries*

	Total percent
There are enough things to do here at home before worrying about the welfare of foreigners	58
All other countries do is to take our money and give nothing in return	55

TABLE 4.—*Reasons for not getting tied up in alliances with other countries*—Con.

	Total percent
We can do more good by being a good example to other countries than by getting mixed up with them	53
Countries in Europe and Asia have always been in wars and always will be and we don't have to let them drag us into their wars	42
We will lose our sovereignty if we keep on getting mixed up with other countries	26

It is interesting to note that, compared with the other reasons, the risk of losing our sovereignty as a Nation pulled relatively less weight. By and large, however, the isolationist group is not very confident that their point of view is going to prevail here in the United States. When asked to give their estimate of the chance of their position emerging as the dominant one in this country, 38 percent thought it would. But 34 percent felt there was little chance that a majority of people would rally to their banner, and the remaining 28 percent weren't sure.

Actually, a high 87 percent reported they have done nothing to spread their points of view, such as belonging to organizations, discussing their position with friends, or engaging in work of other sorts. As a group, they seem not to be very active, despite the great activity of some of their spokesmen.

If their position ever comes to prevail in this country, a few of them say it will be because a MacArthur type of administration will come to power, or there will be a breakup among the allies of the free world, or eventually people "will come around to finally knowing what really goes on around the world."

They seem to be convinced that they are pitted against a concerted campaign on the part of the last Democratic administrations and now the Eisenhower administration to lead the American people down the road to international involvement. As a group, they are most certainly opposed to America's internationalist foreign policy, past or present.

Interesting is the fact that over the past 8 years since the end of World War II, we have little evidence that this group has either grown or diminished appreciably. It remains a tight core of people whose spokesmen have at times bitterly assailed nearly every measure this Nation has taken to move closer toward world cooperation. They are more inclined than others today to rely on our own military strength, and there is some sentiment among them—but not a majority—for "getting the war with Russia over with" at the most opportune moment. They have little use for the United Nations, but—since we have it—a substantial minority are willing to endorse the proposition that the U. N. be strengthened in its power to control atomic energy and to declare war on an aggressor nation. But this is far from a vote of endorsement of the world organization.

These people are somewhat defensive about their position, but hold firm to what they believe is the only course for America to follow. For nearly a generation now, they have been fighting this rear-guard action, and feel justified—not in spite of but rather because of—World War II, the Korean war, and the continuing conflict between the two poles of power on earth. But they are only 9 percent of the population.

LET'S KEEP DOING WHAT WE'RE DOING—21 PERCENT

Twenty-one percent of the people in this country feel that the surest, soundest, and best way to work for peace is to work along with the United Nations about as we are doing. As a second choice, most of these people will choose strengthening the U. N., rather than return to isolationism.

Most "U. N. as is" people are convinced that America is in world affairs for keeps. Mostly they are convinced that we would not be able to stay out of a major war in Asia or Europe. They are the most likely group to say that we have been doing just about all we can to prevent another world war. And they tend to take the middle positions on the way to handle our relations with the U. S. S. R. and the Communist world. These people don't want war, nor do they want appeasement. They want to keep strong militarily, but don't want to close the door to negotiation. Table 5 shows what main reasons they give for holding the point of view they do.

The chief image that emerges here is that the U. N. is valuable and important as a debating forum and as a place to keep our eye on Russia. Coming well down in the list of reasons cited by these people are fears about changing the veto provisions of the great powers or of giving up our national sovereignty. The main reasoning of these people is that the U. N. is good and sufficient as it is now constituted.

TABLE 5.—*Reasons for working with the United Nations much as we have been doing*

	Percent
The world needs a forum where all nations can express an opinion	65
It's a good way to keep an eye on Russia	46
The United Nations does a lot of good work with health, children, and so on	57
It is important to keep the veto the way the United Nations now has it	21
We are doing just about enough as it is. Going any further would mean giving up our sovereignty	21

These people reject isolationism, they say, because we simply cannot revert back to the way things were 15 years ago, we are far too committed to other nations to break our good word, or because we need other countries for our own survival and protection. While most would take strengthening the U. N. as a second choice position, there is a feeling that this is pushing things too much.

This is not to say, however, that these people conceive of the U. N. as a debating forum or observation center alone. In answer to a series of direct questions on specific U. N. powers, a substantial minority said they'd like to see the United Nations reduce armaments of member countries to the point where its own armed forces are larger than any single country; a majority would like to see the U. N. control atomic energy; and a majority think it should declare war on aggressor nations. Seventy-nine percent want the U. N. to do some one or two or all three of these—and every one of them means action.

As a group, these people are confident—90 percent of them—that their view will remain the prevailing one in the country. They feel they are riding with the majority, in sharp contrast with the isolationists who are defensive and a good deal more doubtful their position will win out in the end.

About half of them don't readily think of any specific thing that would either give the United Nations a serious setback or make it more powerful. But some can foresee a setback as a result of disagreements or a falling out among member nations, or if the Communist world were to become more recalcitrant than it has up to now. On the other hand, some see the United Nations becoming more powerful as it registers more successes and as the world teeters closer to the brink of war, and people feel they "must look to the U. N. as the last best hope for peace."

But, as with the isolationists, a full 84 percent of these people report they do nothing to propagate their position. By and large, these people are conservatives, but also internationalists. They feel they have learned the basic lessons of the last half century, but they don't want to push things beyond the limits they think are workable and feasible.

FOR A STRONGER UNITED NATIONS—35 PERCENT

Thirty-five percent of the people—the largest single group in our population—feel that our best chance for peace is a stronger United Nations.

On the whole, these "strengthen the U. N." people feel that the United States has been on the right track in world affairs. They are inclined more than most other groups to believe that there is a chance to avoid World War III. But they feel overwhelmingly that there is no way for this country to escape participation if a war should come—either in Asia or Europe. They want this country to depend only partly on a military buildup, but also to undertake fullest possible negotiations with the Communist world to see if some honorable settlement can be worked out.

These "stronger U. N." people might be described as the more articulate and perhaps more decisive "first cousins" to the "keep the U. N. as is" group. When pressed for a second choice, the bulk say they would select this latter alternative. It will be recalled that the "keep U. N. as is" people mostly selected "strengthening the U. N." as their second choice. And as with that group, these people—81 percent of them—are confident that the chances are very good that their hopes will prevail and the U. N. will be strengthened in the period immediately ahead.

The background to this point of view is shown by the answers we received to a question listing possible reasons for feeling the U. N. ought to be strengthened (see table 6).

TABLE 6.—*Reasons why the U. N. ought to be strengthened*

	Percent
A powerful United Nations is the only way to handle Russia	61
A powerful United Nations is the only answer to the atom bomb	43
The United Nations is the best way to bring about universal disarmament	40
Either the United Nations should be given real power, or it should be dissolved	36
The United Nations is not much more than a debating society now	16

People in this group are not critical of the concept of the U. N. They are of the opinion, however, that it could do much more with "adequate power."

When this "strengthen the U. N. group" were asked about certain specific U. N. powers, majorities favored requiring every member nation in the U. N. to reduce its armaments to a point where the U. N. has a bigger military force than any other country. Even higher majorities want the U. N. to control the atomic bomb, and to have the power to declare war on an aggressor nation. A high 88 percent want the U. N. to accomplish one or more of the three—reduce armaments, control atomic energy, declare war on aggressors. However, a majority of these people are not willing to hand over authority to the U. N. to set immigration quotas for various nations, or to determine tariffs and trade laws. Their chief focus appears to be on the military security aspects of United Nations power.

They also are aware of the problem of "giving away too much control over America to the rest of the world." For instance, when asked why they wouldn't go along with the democratic union or world government idea, the chief objections they gave were that these ideas probably wouldn't work, and they impinged on our national sovereignty.

Just what specifically might happen to speed support in this country for strengthening the U. N. isn't yet readily apparent to a good many of them. But some feel support may increase as the threat of war grows more

imminent and people feel that a stronger international body is needed to deter potential aggressors. Some also feel that with the passage of time, the U. N. will register some further successes and thus will enhance its reputation and will be able to acquire greater authority. And some also believe that with more public education and information about the U. N., the process of strengthening the organization will be speeded up.

A deep schism among member nations is considered the principal possibility that might make this country draw back from a stronger U. N. Some also see possible deterrents to a stronger U. N. in an economic depression in this country, a spreading of a false sense of security among the American people, political disunity, or even in a growth of indifference in this country toward the U. N.

All in all, however, these people are confident that the U. N. will not only survive, but will acquire new and greater powers within a matter of a few years. While 80 percent say they don't do anything to further their beliefs, 20 percent say they do. Six percent say they talk with people to try to get them to want the U. N. strengthened; 4 percent say they are good citizens, buying Government bonds, voting, and pursuing other activities they feel help the United Nations; 3 percent report that they belong to some group which is working in international affairs; 2 percent report that they work with a church group supporting the U. N.; 2 percent say they pray for the world organization; 1 percent teach or lecture on the subject; 1 percent say they are studying or reading up on the U. N.; and a final 1 percent say they help by giving it moral support.

From what these people have seen of the United Nations, most feel there is nothing wrong with the U. N. that giving it more power and authority won't rectify. They are not critical of the world body and what it has done. They simply would like to see it do more. And the difference between what the U. N. is now and what it might be, they believe, might be that crucial margin between war and devastation on the one hand, and survival and peace on the other.

UNION OF DEMOCRATIC COUNTRIES—6 PERCENT

Six percent of the people feel that in addition to carrying on with the United Nations, we should join in a new partnership with other democratic nations constituting a single government.

These democratic union people are especially pessimistic about the possibilities of averting world war III. They also tend more than others to feel that this country has not taken a large enough part in world affairs since the close of World War II.

Their main reasons for selecting their position are shown in table 7.

TABLE 7.—*Reasons for favoring a union of democratic nations*

	Percent
A union with other democratic countries would solve a good many of the economic problems now existing between us	66
We have to really combine with other free countries if we're going to beat communism	60
A union of democratic countries is the most practical first step toward world government	52
We'll never get anywhere trying to work something out with dictatorships	23
After all, there are people in the world no more different from us than Texans are from New Yorkers	17

It is of interest that about half of these people see this proposition as a practical, first step toward world government. However, it should also be pointed out that about half the people who are for a union of democratic countries do not see it as a world government step—but perhaps as a substitute for it.

These people tend to be against merely strengthening the U. N., on the grounds that the United Nations, even if given more authority, would not have enough power to act decisively. They are against the specific, immediate, world government proposal, chiefly because they believe it won't work and it goes too far, at least at this time.

Like other groups, a good many haven't crystallized their ideas as to what kind of things might speed or slow up a democratic union of nations. But some feel that the idea of a democratic union would be enhanced if the Communist threat grew worse, or if there were more cooperation among the democratic nations, or if the United States engaged in a program of assistance to more countries. Some can see their idea being hampered by disagreements between the free countries, by trouble or a war with Russia, and a few fear a depression in this country, a failure of this country to support its allies, or a failure on our part to make democracy work at home.

The first countries to join in such a union in the minds of these people are Great Britain, France, and Canada. However, upon direct questioning 70 percent would like to see Australia in, 57 percent West Germany, 48 percent the Union of South Africa, 46 percent Japan, 46 percent Spain, 45 percent Turkey, and 41 percent India. The country on the list about which they expressed most qualms over admission was Yugoslavia.

While 43 percent of the people favoring this position do not think the chances are very good for achieving it, and 20 percent have no opinion, 37 percent do think there is a good chance for it. But among all, 84 percent say they don't do anything to spread their point of view.

All in all, these people feel they stand on a middle ground between full and complete world government and something different from the present United Nations. They are, on the whole, not as optimistic over the ultimate success of their viewpoint as those who would strengthen the U. N. But they do feel that the United States should take the lead in an endeavor in world organization beyond what has been tried up to now, and in believing this, they are hopeful that their numbers will grow.

A GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD—11 PERCENT

The final group are those people who want us to start working now toward one world government for all nations in the world. Eleven percent of the people in our nationwide cross section hold to this view.

More of these people than in most other groups feel that the United States should have been taking a larger part in world affairs, and they are also more optimistic about avoiding world war III than most other groups. They are also more inclined to think this country could do a good deal more to avert another big war. The chief reasons they give for holding their world government position are shown in table 8.

TABLE 8.—*Reasons for favoring world government*

	Total percent
The money everyone spends for arms could be spent for health, better living standards, and education, but only if all or most of the world is united into one government	55
The world is too small to have separate nations any more; what affects one affects them all	41
One government for all nations would let every part of the world develop its full economic possibilities	38
One government for all nations is the only thing that will save us from the atomic bomb	29
It's the best way to get universal disarmament	21

Those people who have formed opinions of what would speed up world government most often cite international tensions between East and West. Some pin their hopes on nations getting used to working together. A few see more education and information as an answer. On the other hand, those who have thought about what might slow up world government mainly fear a war with Russia or a falling out among the nations of the world.

Their criticism of a union of democratic countries is partly because they think it simply won't work, partly out of the conviction that it isn't fair to leave out any nations, and partly because they think it will drive the world even more into two opposing camps. By a 47-to-37-percent margin, they think the chances are good for a world government, and the median time expectancy is within from 5 to 29 years.

Out of the many approaches and many answers in this study, seven major facts emerge about the American people and their views toward the world today:

1. There is no doubt whatsoever that the adult population of the United States is definitely committed to internationalism and international organization in one form or another.

2. It is evident that the isolationist point of view has been overrepresented both in the daily press and in Congress. Only a small minority of the people are diehard isolationists. Numerically, they are a small segment of the population.

3. For all of the criticism, maligning, and outright condemnation that has been directed at it, the United Nations is still considered the single best hope for peace by a substantial majority of the people.

4. A significantly large percentage of the American people—34 percent—appear to be at least receptive towards some form or degree of world government. This 34 percent figure is obtained by totalling all those who selected the world government or democratic union choices as their first or second choices. Equally significant is the fact that if one groups all those who selected a strengthened U. N. either as their first or second choice, the total is 54 percent of the entire population.

5. Despite the wide-spread suspicion and lack of confidence in the Soviet Union, a majority of the people still want the Russians in the United Nations. The majority of people have not yet closed the door to some kind of honorable settlement.

6. The vast majority of Americans reject the alternatives of appeasement or preventive war. They hold the hope that some kind of negotiations can be conducted between East and West, with the possibility that eventual peace may emerge. The weight of public opinion on how to handle Russia is clearly behind the general outlines of policy initiated by Truman and continued by Eisenhower.

7. Every position—whether isolationist or internationalist—draws its support with great evenness from all parts of the population. The news here is not the differences but the similarities that exist among us on this question of where we go in search for survival.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this debate began when the Committee on the Judiciary reported the Bricker amendment. The Bricker amendment now has been rejected, and in its place the so-called substitute of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has been adopted.

The first point I wish to make is that while there has been much discussion of the main amendment, there has been no direct committee consideration of the substitute offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia. There is

no such imperative need for amending the Constitution of the United States as to necessitate the Senate passing a constitutional amendment to which careful consideration has not been given.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I simply wished to advise the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate cannot pass a constitutional amendment. All the Senate can do is to pass a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment, leaving to three-fourths of the States the question of ratifying it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina, is, of course, correct. The Senate can pass a resolution to submit an amendment to the legislatures of the States.

The Senate has an important responsibility in connection with the kind of resolution it passes submitting a constitutional amendment affecting treaty-making, because treaties are peculiarly within the prerogative, under the Constitution, of the Senate. A great many fears have been expressed about various things that might happen. We have heard much talk about men on horseback and men who might become dictators in the White House. Likewise, we have heard much talk about the dictum in a single Supreme Court case. There has been much talk about the kind of treaties which might be submitted in the future. But, the record of the United States Senate and of American Presidents in connection with treaty-making has been very good. The Senate and the President have been most careful in the consideration of treaties. There has been no great criticism of what has happened in the past. There is only a fear of what might happen in the future.

Mr. President, I think we ought to proceed with confidence in the United States Senate, with confidence in the President, and with confidence that all our elected officials will perform their duty and meet their responsibilities in the future as they have in the past.

I believe this debate has done considerable good. It has been extremely important. In the first place, I think it has caused many Americans, who never before have paid very much attention to the treatymaking provisions of the Constitution, to consider those provisions very carefully. Moreover, it will put future Presidents and future Supreme Courts on notice that the United States Senate intends to guard most zealously from usurpation by treaties any of the rights guaranteed to the people under the Constitution. The debate has also emphasized the important role the Senate plays in the making of treaties, and that the Senate will be even more careful in the future than it has been in the past.

From all the discussion which has taken place, my opinion is that no defects have been shown which would justify amending the Constitution. I think some confusion exists, not only among Members of the Senate, but also among the people of the country. There has been some dicta on the part of the courts, and some law-review articles have been written on the subject, but I believe any uncertainty which might exist is not justified, and could be settled simply by a joint resolution which could be passed without amending the Constitution. Therefore, together with a number of my distinguished colleagues, I propose an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which, omitting the caption, I shall read:

That the following historic principles are solemnly affirmed: (a) That the Constitution of the United States is superior to all domestic laws and to all treaties and other international agreements.

I think almost everyone agrees that that is the law today. The Supreme Court has stated time and time again that it is the law. It is difficult to see how the President or the United States Senate could accomplish something which is beyond the Constitution. Substantially, this is the language of the first section of the George amendment and the Bricker amendment. So I think a mere statement in a Senate joint resolution would settle any question about the Constitution being superior to a treaty. As shown in *Marshall* v. *Gordon* (243 U. S. 521), the Supreme Court can very well consider this as further evidence of legislative intent. I do not believe we need to upset the jurisprudence of more than 160 years by passing a constitutional amendment in connection with something which is already the law of the land and which a simple joint resolution can reaffirm.

The second provision reads:

(b) that neither a treaty nor any other international agreement can prevail over subsequently enacted laws of the United States intended to alter the domestic effect thereof.

Mr. President, that is the law today. Some question has been raised about it, but this provision of my resolution would put the Supreme Court on notice that, as a matter of legislative intent, the Congress of the United States expected that historic doctrine to be continued in effect.

(c) that the courts of the United States, in deciding cases before them, have not only the power but also the duty to declare unconstitutional and invalid any provision of such domestic law, treaty, or other international agreement which conflicts with the Constitution.

Such a provision would put the Supreme Court on notice that we expected that no argument or confusion which may have come about as a result of the debate on the floor of the Senate would relieve the Supreme Court of the responsibility of declaring as unconstitutional any provision of a treaty which interfered with domestic law in conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

Subdivision (d) provides:

That under its Constitution, the United States, as a completely sovereign state in the community of nations, must always retain and exercise all of those attributes of sovereignty incident to the making of treaties and other international agreements which are possessed by independent states under the law of nations.

There has been some discussion on the floor of the Senate to the effect that perhaps the United Nations may be able to take over the powers of the United States; that we might become subservient to the United Nations. That, of course, would be impossible. There is no foundation for such arguments; but the adoption of such a provision as I suggest would be legislative history which would make our intention clear.

Section 2 of the amendment provides:

SEC. 2. That it is the sense of the Congress that the Senate, in giving its advice and consent to the ratification of a treaty has the power to provide that the treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of legislation by the Congress.

That is a practice which is and has been followed on many occasions by the United States Senate. It is a legal limitation, a reservation which may be attached to a treaty to the effect that if the treaty is to become effective as internal law, it must be by act of Congress.

Section 3 provides that, in connection with any constitutional amendments, the rules of the House and the Senate shall be changed so as provide for a yea-and-nay vote.

It also provides that, in connection with a vote upon the ratification of any treaty, there shall be a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. President, the requirement for a yea-and-nay vote in connection with treaties is, of course, a part of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]; but if that is a good requirement, we should not have to wait 3 or 4 years until a constitutional amendment may be adopted. There is no reason why we could not put it into effect now.

Furthermore, the Constitution is a remarkable document in that it is brief, it does not go into detail, and it sets forth general principles. I am sure that many constitutional lawyers would object to what I think is indeed inappropriate, namely, the writing into the Constitution of the United States of any changes in the rules of the United States Senate or the House of Representatives.

The amendment of the Senator from Georgia has some aspects which might be confusing. In the first place, it would be difficult for the Department of State or the President to know just what agreements would become effective as internal law. What would constitute internal law has not been given careful consideration by a committee or by constitutional lawyers. It is a subject concerning which there is much confusion.

Furthermore, one of the important parts of the treatymaking provisions of the Constitution is that unique provision for ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. It is very difficult to differentiate between an executive agreement and a treaty. A treaty is an agreement between two or more nations. As has been so well pointed out, if it is desired to retain the requirement of a two-thirds vote of the Senate for the consent to the ratification of treaties, I am afraid the Senate in adopting the proposed amendment will be taking a step which will enable an executive to submit the subject matter of treaties as executive agreements. Then under this amendment they will become effective as internal law by a simple majority vote

of the two Houses of Congress. It would be doing away with a great deal of protection which the people now have under the Constitution—the requirement of a two-thirds Senate vote.

The only real basis which I have seen for the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is the statement of dictum in the Pink case. Various and sundry constructions have been placed upon that dictum. I am confident that the dictum in the Pink case is not going to be implemented by the Supreme Court.

There is now pending in the Supreme Court an appeal from a decision of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in the so-called potato case, wherein the Fourth Circuit held an agreement to be invalid which conflicted with a statute of the United States. I think the case will place the dictum in the Pink case in its proper perspective; that is, that unless the international agreement deals with international affairs, it will not under any circumstances be effective as internal law in violation of the law of the various States. The case will be decided shortly. It is an appeal from an opinion by Judge Parker, who is an eminent member of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals.

I think the decision in that case will confirm the argument that there is no reason for a constitutional amendment such as has been proposed by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I think the Supreme Court will affirm the decision of Judge Parker in the potato case. In construing the Pink case I am sure it will be decided that international agreements must deal with international affairs and not with domestic affairs.

So, Mr. President, there is not any great urgency for passing the joint resolution at this time. There is no evidence before the Senate that it should abdicate its responsibility. There is no evidence that the President or Secretary of State will do anything other than protect the best interests of the people of the United States. So pending a further decision by the Supreme Court in the potato case, and pending a further study of the whole matter, I think the passage of the joint resolution which I have sponsored, which states the legislative intent to be followed by the Supreme Court, will put the President and the Secretary of State on notice that the historic principles are affirmed by Congress. I think the adoption of the joint resolution in that form will be entirely sufficient. I believe much good will be done by amending the rules of the Senate and the House to provide for yea-and-nay votes in connection with the ratification of treaties or votes on constitutional amendments.

Mr. President, I particularly feel that my amendment in the nature of a substitute should be adopted at this time, in place of the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], because any amendment to the Constitution of the United States should not be made on the basis of what might happen in the future; and the Constitution should not be amended on the basis of an amendment offered on the floor of the Senate without careful consideration by the Judiciary Committee.

I believe my substitute amendment will provide ample time for further consideration of the entire proposal. In the meantime I hope there will be these important changes in the rules of the Senate and the House, so as to give the American people certain assurance to which I think they are entitled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], on behalf of himself and certain other Senators.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, submitted by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the committee amendment, on page 3, in lines 5 to 19, inclusive.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate. I shall simply ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement of my opposition to the proposal under discussion this afternoon. Let me say I have already discussed this matter.

In my opinion, at least, Mr. President, we heard one of the finest addresses the Senate has ever heard, when today the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]—not in a loud voice, not with a roar of emotion, but with the still, small voice of reason—told us plainly the direction in which we are going. Nothing can be added by me to what he said.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask to have a statement by me on this question printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

SENATOR GEORGE'S PROPOSAL

I wish to comment briefly on the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Georgia. We all admire and respect the Senator from Georgia as one of the ablest Senators of our time. His knowledge of the Constitution and his political wisdom have helped resolve many difficult situations both in the committees of the Senate and on the Senate floor.

But I submit that the proposal put forth by the distinguished Senator from Georgia is so full of question marks and is so fraught with unknown dangers for our constitutional system that it certainly should not be accepted without a very careful study.

His proposal, as we know, reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"SEC. 2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress."

Section 1 of this proposal is identical with a number of others previously discussed on this floor and requires little comment. If all it is intended to do is to reaffirm what is now already true, then it is unnecessary, and dangerous because courts will look for hidden significance in this kind of a declaration. Why do we have to repeat what judges have already said over and over again? Is there any credit to the scholarship of this great Senate in such repetition?

But it is section 2 which concerns me today. This simple little statement is literally loaded with legal boobytraps. And the worst of it is that it is impossible to foretell here and now what effects it will have in countless different types of situations.

Let me mention just a few of the more obvious pitfalls in this proposal. It says "an international agreement other than a treaty." Why, this would include not only executive agreements made by the President in the ordinary conduct of foreign relations, but also a multitude of administrative arrangements concluded by him as Commander in Chief. Can anyone think of a more dangerous shrinkage of his power? Suppose, for example, we had to move allied troops and material across the United States. It might be necessary for an executive agreement to be made in such emergencies without waiting for Congress to waive the application of local laws to the members of such forces. Section 2 might compel the President to break the Constitution in order to save it. We certainly don't want our Chief Executive in time of peril hiding behind some clause that was hurriedly slapped into our Constitution.

On the other hand, although the purpose of section 2 is to limit the executive-agreement power, it will almost certainly have the effect of elevating such agreements to the stature of treaties. It practically tells the Chief Executive that he doesn't have to negotiate treaties to create internal law in the United States, that he can do this by an executive agreement. Why should the President resort to the more difficult treaty procedure, which requires the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate, when he can accomplish the same result by a majority vote through an act of Congress? Instead of reducing the President's powers, this provision would actually increase them at the expense of the Senate. Is that what my colleagues desire?

Another dire consequence is this: One of the most routine of executive acts under our system is the recognition of a foreign government. Sometimes this is accomplished by an exchange of notes, particularly when we wish to obtain assurances from the new government that certain rights of our citizens will continue to be respected. But section 2 would subject this process to the will of Congress. And once that has been accomplished, it is easy to carry it a step further, to the point where Congress is actually indicating to the Executive how, when, and under what conditions a government should be recognized. This is just too fantastic. It would hamstring the President in a vital field which is given to him and to him alone under the Constitution.

Tampering with this recognition business is tricky for several other reasons. Our courts have repeatedly said that recognition was an act of executive policy, which they would not challenge. From the fact of recognition they have drawn certain consequences in adjudicating the private rights of litigants. Generally these relate to the legal effects of action taken by a government with respect to property either within or outside of its borders. Indeed, the actual status of a recognized foreign government in our courts differs from that of an unrecognized one.

Does anyone here today have the slightest notion of just what effect section 2 will have on this problem, or what our courts will do with it? We know one thing for certain. The courts are going to be very confused at the intrusion of the legislature into a domain of executive action. All of a sudden they may find it necessary to determine what the legislative policy was. In short, I view with alarm such a creeping restriction upon the established policy functions of our Government.

While I am on the subject of recognition, it is only fair to observe that section 2 would

surely have the effect of overruling the decision of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Pink* in 1942 (315 U. S. 203). That was the case, you may remember, in which an executive agreement was held to have the effect of superseding a contrary policy of the State of New York concerning the effect of certain confiscatory Soviet decrees on assets located in New York. Erasing that decision from the books would not make me very unhappy, because I have always felt the case was wrong, anyway. But surely we are not going to adopt a constitutional amendment just to get rid of a court decision with which we disagree.

I confess, the more I examine this proposal of my distinguished colleague from Georgia, the more uneasy I become. Every time I look at it I see something I hadn't noticed before. But it does seem clear that section 2 would leave international agreements "other than treaties" effective as international law, binding between the United States and another nation, even though an act of Congress is needed to give them internal effect. This would place us in a most awkward position. Do we really want such an undesirable situation?

On the other hand, notice that section 2 requires an act of Congress before an agreement other than a treaty can be effective as internal law. This phrasing, by expressly excluding treaties, reaffirms by inference the proposition that treaties may become effective as internal law without an act of Congress. I wonder if this was intended.

While we are on the subject, just what does the phrase "internal law" mean in section 2? Could it be construed as referring to Federal law alone, or does it mean State laws and the rights arising under our common law system? And would the necessity for congressional action, before these agreements are effective internally, apply even to those executive agreements which had previously been authorized by statute—such as, for example, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act? If so, double legislation would be needed with possible inconsistent positions being taken on the two different occasions.

No, there are too many uncertainties, too many unpredictable consequences, too many imponderables for me to lend my support to this proposal of the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I honestly believe, with a conviction that I cannot easily throw off, that this is a Pandora's box of troubles that could plague us beyond any measure which we can now foresee. For all these reasons, I do not feel that it can be adopted safely as a beacon to guide this great Nation of ours during the extraordinary times confronting us today.

Section 1 of the substitute of the Senator from Georgia is substantially the same as the language submitted to me on January 5, 1954 in the conferences preceding the debate on the Bricker amendment. It was proffered as innocuous language which would not change the basic division of powers among the coordinate branches of the Federal Government. I rejected the proposal after careful study because I believed it would furnish a constitutional foundation for the claims, recently made by certain writers, that treaties and executive agreements are interchangeable methods of achieving international objectives. I believe that the position I took at that time was sound. I still believe that it is sound.

In my speech on the floor of the Senate on February 19 of this year I discussed 5 types of executive agreements or actions which would be affected by the substitute of the Senator from Georgia. I do not intend to restate in detail these 5 areas of action. The first type you will recall, I said, is composed of agreements implementing and construing treaties. The second type is that based on statutory authority, and this type, of course, remains completely under congressional legislative control. The third type is represented by agreements made by the President as Commander-in-Chief. The fourth type of agreement is that made by the President in recognizing a foreign nation, in agreeing to receive its Ambassadors and public ministers, and in setting up international conferences which take place, at times, in this country. The fifth type is represented by action taken by the President in the execution of the office of our "Chief Magistrate," as President Taft referred to him. I need not again quote the statements of President Taft with respect to the type of executive action taken in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal or reiterate the historical incident stated In re Neagle to illustrate this last type of action.

It has been inferred on the floor of the Senate that inadequate consideration has been given to treaties. I deny that this is so. Further, much ado has been made of the fact that the Supreme Court has never held a provision of a treaty unconstitutional. I do not believe that this is so remarkable considering the fact that in the entire history of the country only a handful of treaties, about 1,500, have been submitted to the Senate. Still further, in adjudicating the treaty provisions of those actually advised and consented to, the Supreme Court has adhered to a rule it applies with respect to statutes enacted by Congress. If the same result can be achieved on another basis, the Court will not declare the act of Congress unconstitutional. Of approximately 70,000 laws enacted by the Congress since 1789 the Supreme Court has found only 73 provisions, not even 73 acts, unconstitutional. Is there still concern for the fact that no treaty provision has been held to be unconstitutional?

Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that the Senators who claim that inadequate consideration is given by the Senate to treaties, are correct. Will the situation be helped by a constitutional amendment which requires 10,000 executive agreements a year be thrown into the Senate legislative hopper for consideration? I believe that the cure for the imagined sickness would be fatal. If the Senate, as is falsely alleged by the proponents of change, cannot now find time to adequately consider treaties, how can it find the additional time to consider all of these executive agreements?

The proposal of the Senator from Georgia represents one of the strangest three-way switches ever proposed in the Senate. It reminds me of the old coin-matching game of "odd man wins." In this case, the Senate is the obvious loser before the switch ever begins. Let us see how this substitute will work. The President will lose constitutional powers with respect to certain executive arrangements which I have called to your attention. However, he will achieve at the same time power whereby he can bypass the two-thirds vote of the Senate on treaties, by using executive agreements as an interchangeable instrument in dealing with foreign nations. These agreements will then merely require a simple little implementing act passed by a majority of the House and the Senate. The President may consider this an adequate return for giving up certain of his executive powers as Commander in Chief and as President. Under the George substitute the House would achieve practical equality with the Senate in the conduct of foreign relations. This, for decades, has been a dream of the House. Its greatest advocate in recent times was Representative Sol Bloom, late chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, who sponsored an amendment giving the House equal status. His amendment passed the House but died in the Senate. Now, the Senate, for all practical purposes, will be giving up its treaty-making roll if it agrees to the George substitute.

It has been said that a civil-rights law can be made by means of a treaty arrangement or by executive agreement. This is not true. Civil rights are not the proper subject of self-executing treaty lawmaking arrangements. An early Supreme Court decision indicated quite plainly that individual rights of subjects of a foreign nation, were not the proper subject of concern of the United States. Conversely the rights of citizens in the United States are not the proper subject of treaty arrangements with foreign nations.

For the sake of argument, however, let us assume that civil rights are a proper subject of present treaty lawmaking powers, at least a two-thirds vote of the Senate would be required for the ratification of such a treaty. If the George amendment is adopted, the objective could be accomplished merely by an executive agreement implemented by a simple act passed by a majority of both Houses of Congress and signed by the President. Is that what the Senator from Georgia wants? Is that what the Bricker people want? My impression heretofore has been that the Bricker people wish to restrict the treaty lawmaking powers, not enlarge them.

I have demonstrated time after time the undesirable features of Senate Joint Resolution 1 and all of its substitutes. The only safe solution to the problem is to vote down not only the original proposal but all substitutes and amendments which will upset the present system of checks and balances.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Martin
Anderson	Gore	Maybank
Barrett	Green	McCarthy
Beall	Griswold	McClellan
Bennett	Hayden	Millikin
Bricker	Hendrickson	Monroney
Burke	Hennings	Morse
Bush	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hill	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Pastore
Byrd	Holland	Payne
Capehart	Humphrey	Potter
Carlson	Hunt	Purtell
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Jackson	Russell
Clements	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kennedy	Sparkman
Duff	Kerr	Stennis
Dworshak	Kilgore	Thye
Eastland	Knowland	Upton
Ellender	Kuchel	Watkins
Ferguson	Langer	Welker
Flanders	Lehman	Wiley
Frear	Long	Williams
Fulbright	Magnuson	Young
George	Malone	
Gillette	Mansfield	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I know the hour is growing late, and I do not wish to detain the Senate. I do not intend to speak for more than 10 minutes at the most.

I have left the desk of majority leader because I wish to make it very clear that what I say is not said as majority leader, but is said in my capacity as an individual Senator of the United States. I wish to make that perfectly clear so that no person in this Chamber will be under any misconception.

So far as I know, the President of the United States has not changed his view that the only amendments which were

acceptable to the administration were those which were presented by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on behalf of himself and a number of other Senators. I say that in order that there may be a clear understanding that there has been no change in the situation, and in order that no Senator may vote under a misapprehension.

I have left the desk of the majority leader because I feel that I have an obligation, when speaking in my individual capacity, to make that very clear.

So far as the so-called Bricker proposed amendment to the Constitution is concerned, I have worked very diligently over a long period of time to see if there could not be found an area of agreement which would be acceptable to the sponsors of the amendment—some 64 Senators—and the administration. I felt that I had that duty and responsibility, not only as chairman at the time of the Republican policy committee, but as acting majority leader at the time of the illness of the late Senator Taft, and during the period of time I have been the majority leader of the Senate.

I do not intend to recite all the details of the long discussions which went on over a period of a great many months. Some day perhaps the full story can be told. There were times when I felt that there was a possibility of reaching an agreement, but it proved not to be possible.

Let me say again that the only amendments which, so far as I know, have been acceptable to the administration have been the amendments presented by the Senator from Michigan.

I voted against the George substitute in the hope that we might have the final choice on the basis of the committee amendment in its perfected form, but the decision of the Senate was otherwise.

It seems to me that at this point the Senate has a choice either to kill an amendment in which there is great interest—and proper interest, I think—throughout the Nation and in this Chamber, or to pass the amendment which is before us and send it to the House of Representatives, where undoubtedly extensive hearings will be held and where other changes may be made to the proposed amendment by the House of Representatives. The joint resolution would then come back to this body in a conference report, and approval of the conference report would require a two-thirds vote in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I have had some very grave misgivings relative to the situation, not so much from the standpoint of encroachment by the legislative branch upon the Executive power, which I would oppose strongly, but because of the encroachment over the years by the Executive upon the legislative power.

As a result of some of the court decisions which have been made in recent years, and more particularly when the Capps case was called to my attention, it has appeared to me that a dangerous tendency has been developed of encroachment by the executive branch of the Government upon the proper constitutional legislative powers of the Congress.

In my responsibility as a Senator of the United States, and speaking only for myself, I cannot, under those circumstances, ignore that situation.

I believe the House of Representatives can improve upon the proposed amendment if it is sent to the House. I had hoped that the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] might be prepared further to modify the amendment which he offered while it was still open to modification but not to amendment. I believe that the House of Representatives may change the language of the amendment which is before us at this time. The 5 weeks of debate has brought to the attention of the people of the country the very real need for some steps to be taken to curb the tendency, which has been growing over the years, toward the gradual encroachment by the Executive on the legislative power of the Congress of the United States.

For that reason, and speaking only in my individual capacity as a Senator, I intend to vote for the amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very glad indeed that the majority leader spoke this evening in his capacity as a Member of the Senate. If he had spoken as majority leader I might have hesitated to argue with him the course which I think the situation deserves. But since he has spoken merely as a Member of the Senate, in a position similar to that which I hold, representing my State—and, I hope, the people of the Nation—I feel justified in answering him.

As my colleagues know, I have opposed any form of constitutional amendment which would limit the treatymaking powers of the President of the United States. I have done so because I felt that it would seriously hamper our relations with foreign countries and our relations with other free nations with which we must cooperate if we are not willing to accept a position of isolation.

The distinguished Senator from California has said that he is not wholly satisfied with the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, but that he is willing to have it go to the House, in the hope that the House will amend it and improve it.

It may be that the distinguished Senator from California is satisfied to vote on one of the most important issues that has come before the Congress of the United States and say, "I am willing to let this matter go to the House, in the hope that the House will improve the amendment, in the hope that, as a result, we shall get from Congress an acceptable document."

Mr. President, I think what we are doing is one of the most dangerous and inexcusable things that any great deliberative body could do. I have heard a great deal about our duty to place before the American people the opportunity to vote to accept a constitutional amendment. I have as much confidence in the American people as has any other Member of this body, or any other man in the United States. I believe that, generally speaking, when the American people, the voters of the United States, know all the facts, their decision in almost every instance is accurate—not necessarily with regard to personalities or with regard to the selection of their public officials, but I know of very few cases when the American people, given an opportunity to vote and express themselves on great issues, have gone far wrong.

Let us not delude ourselves, Mr. President. The amendment, if we pass it, will never go to the American people as individuals. It will go to the legislatures of the 48 States. The legislatures of the States are subject to great pressures, political, social, and others. It will go to the legislatures, which will consider the matter along party lines. A State which has a Republican-dominated legislature by a certain margin will almost inevitably vote in accordance with the Republican party line. That is also true of a Democratic-dominated legislature, of course.

I have seen it occur time and time again when a constitutional amendment was submitted to the States for consideration. It was not the man in the street who voted. It was not the man in the street who expressed his opinion. It was a handful of State legislators, many times influenced by outside pressures, who ratified such amendments.

There are very few instances of a constitutional amendment, passed by the Congress, being repudiated by the State legislatures. The child-labor amendment was one exception. With that exception I do not remember any other instance of an amendment being repudiated.

Therefore, Mr. President, let us not talk about the right of the people, of the individual voters, to express their opinion. They have no vote. They have no power to express their opinion. That power rests entirely in the legislatures of the States, which are called upon to ratify the proposed amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from New York recognize the fact that in the Constitution with respect to amendments to it it is provided that to amend the Constitution, an amendment, after being passed by a two-thirds vote in the Senate and the House of Representatives, must be passed by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, or by constitutional conventions in three-fourths of the States, if the latter method is provided in the amendment? That is the way in which the Constitution has been amended ever since the Constitution was adopted That is our constitutional system.

If the Senator from New York is dissatisfied with that method or system, he may offer an amendment to change the method of ratifying proposed amendments. But, inasmuch as that is our constitutional system, it seems to me that it should not be criticized on that basis.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to say further that this is an important matter, and I will have my say on it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. LEHMAN. I will have my say.

Mr. MAYBANK. A point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Under the rule, the Senator who is speaking must stand at his desk.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be delighted to stand by my desk, if that is the only argument that can be raised. Of course, the Senator from New York knows what the Constitution provides.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator is supposed to stand at his desk.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes. Because the Senator from New York understands the Constitution he has emphasized the fact that the argument to the effect that the people will have an opportunity to express their opinion with regard to the amendment is utterly fallacious. The decision with regard to the ratification of any amendment proposed by the Congress of the United States comes only before the State legislatures. I am not quarreling with that procedure. I accept it. I accept the procedure of ratification by State legislatures or by constitutional conventions. Possibly in 1 or 2 States there may be other rules and regulations with regard to it. However, I know from my own experience—my experience may not be so great as the experience of the distinguished Senator from California—as the chief executive of the State of New York, that when a constitutional amendment comes before the legislature it is almost inevitably accepted, not after due consideration, but because the members of the assembly and the members of the senate say, "Well, the Congress of the United States has passed it. The Members of Congress are important men; they are fine men; they are serious men; they are patriotic men"—and I agree with that estimate of the Members of Congress—"so we will follow them, and we will vote to ratify the amendment."

Mr. President, let us not believe that the people of the United States, the individual voters in the United States have anything to say about the ratification of a constitutional amendment or its nonratification, whether it be the amendment before the Senate now or any other amendment which may come before the State legislatures for ratification.

Mr. LEHMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a statement recently made with regard to the George amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

I wish to speak briefly on the pending substitute, the so-called George amendment, which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

I would like to point out that this amendment contains provisions for limiting the President's powers to make executive agreements with other nations of the world. Mr. President, we are being asked to adopt this amendment to the Constitution without any clear understanding or study by the Members of the Senate of the nature of the executive agreements which the United States is now a party to, or an orderly and full hearing before the proper Senate committee on the nature and problems evolving from the President's powers to make executive agreements.

Some days ago the distinguished majority leader asked the Secretary of State to provide the Senate with a clear listing and analysis of the nature of existing executive agreements.

In a reply to the majority leader's request the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Walter Bedell Smith, informed the Senate that such a study will take at least 6 months to complete.

I ask my colleagues, is it possible for us, here on the floor of the Senate, to undertake any orderly analysis of the nature of existing executive agreements, and the problems which may arise in the conduct of our foreign relations if we hastily adopt this ill-advised amendment with no expert testimony or advice to guide us?

Surely, the logical step for all of us—those who feel that some restrictions on the power of the President to enter into such agreements are desirable and those of us who do not feel that such restrictions are necessary—is to defeat this pending amendment, and all other constitutional amendments, and instruct the proper committees of the Senate to await the report of the Secretary of State. When this report is available, we can then proceed to a reasonable and calm evaluation of this problem.

The hearings before the Judiciary Committee on Senate Joint Resolution 1 and Senate Joint Resolution 43 were hearings on an entirely different proposal than the one now before us. These hearings were primarily devoted to a consideration of the treaty powers, and only incidentally with the powers to enter into executive agreements. We need a complete study and analysis of the content, scope, procedure, control, and impact of executive agreements. We do not have such a study before us. I think we would be derelict in our duty if we pass any constitutional amendment without such a study.

I would now like to address myself to the method which is being proposed to regulate the power to enter into executive agreements. Personally I do not think that an amendment to the Constitution is the way to proceed. I warn, Mr. President, against using the pending proposal as a means of appeasing the small and vocal minority in our country which has been so loudly clamoring for a constitutional amendment.

I would like to point out to the Senate, that last year both the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] felt that the proper manner by which executive agreement powers of the President should be regulated was through the enactment of a statute by the Congress.

On January 7, 1953, they introduced Senate Joint Resolution 2, which would have provided for statutory regulation of executive agreements. If such regulation is desirable, and I wish to emphasize that I am not at all convinced that it is desirable, it would seem to me that this is the proper method.

I believe that we are only inviting judicial chaos when we amend the Constitution with hastily contrived words and phrases—words that do not appear in any place in our Constitution as it stands today—namely, "internal law"—words which, I predict, will result in years of confused litigation, while the conduct of our foreign relations stands stymied and ineffective awaiting final court decisions on the multitude of questions which will surely arise under this new amendment.

While I am not a lawyer, I know the vast numbers of cases which have arisen over the interpretation of such single words and brief phrases in the Constitution as "the general welfare," "interstate commerce," and "due process."

To comprehend the scope and impact of an amendment to the Constitution we need only look at the newly published Senate Document No. 170, the historic study of the Constitution made under the direction of Dr. Edward S. Corwin, by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Two hundred of the 1,200 pages of this document are devoted to the interpretation of just one constitutional amendment—the 14th amendment. Here is a clear example of the impact which the constitutional amendment can bring on the whole structure and relationship of rights and protections under our Constitution.

Yes, Mr. President, a statutory provision regulating executive agreements would seem a much more logical, much more reasonable manner of proceeding if a case can be made for such regulation.

Let us not today take an action which we will regret in the years to come. I call upon the Senate to reject the George amendment and to reject all other constitutional amendments.

Let us proceed, through the proper committees, including the Foreign Relations Committee, to undertake a complete and definitive study of the problems involved in the President's powers to enter into executive agreements, and then, if necessary, provide for such statutory regulations as might seem desirable, if they prove, after careful and sober study, to be desirable.

Let us preserve the Constitution as a charter of our basic law, not as a catch-all for our hasty fears and prejudices.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall take only about 2 or 3 seconds. I wish to correct the record. I was one of the original sponsors of the so-called Bricker amendment. The amendment which has been reported by the committee is an entirely different amendment. Perhaps the committee should not have included all the names of the original sponsors, but should have called the amendment an amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary. I wish the record to show that I shall vote against it even though I was an original sponsor of the original Bricker amendment, which is entirely different from the amendment now before the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for more than 2 or 3 minutes. I wish to repeat what I have said so often in the debate, that in certain respects this is a divisive issue.

I entered into a consideration of this subject and undertook to cooperate with the distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle who have interested themselves directly in this particular amendment, namely, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and other Senators, including the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The amendment which is suggested, Mr. President, and which is now ready to be voted upon by the Senate is one solution of a pressing problem before the American people.

All I wish to say to my friends on this side of the aisle is: "Mark my words, now, gentlemen; you are going to submit a constitutional amendment, and it is

going to go to the States for their consideration. You will do it now, or you will do it later."

This is the best amendment which can be worked out. It does not disturb the historic and fundamental relationships between the President of the United States and Congress, or between the United States and the States themselves.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Georgia for the fine contribution he has made. Every section of the amendment as it now stands was contained in the original amendment, or in Joint Resolution 130, or in Joint Resolution 1, except the contributions made by the distinguished majority leader with regard to the vote, which I believe to be very helpful to the whole treaty situation.

I am very anxious that the resolution shall pass. I would have desired some changes in it and a strengthening of it, but I bow to the will of the Senate. Every measure that goes from the Senate is a compromise, to a degree. No bill is completely to the satisfaction of any Senator, but he bows to the will of the majority.

Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from Georgia and those who have supported us in bringing this vital issue before the American people. I want to make the Constitution of the United States a living, vital force for freedom here and around the world, and we are striving to that end.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio, and I desire to pay my respects to him for the great service he has rendered in making this a living issue with the American people.

Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall not take much time of the Senate, but I feel that I should express my opinion at this time, as a Senator, because, finally, every Senator present will vote his conscience upon this particular amendment.

I wish to pay my respects to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Georgia. We worked long hours together in an effort to prepare an amendment which we believed could be properly submitted to the people and their legislative bodies in the various States, and become a part of the Constitution. I believed there was need for a constitutional amendment. I have not changed my mind about that. But I say to the Senate that I do not feel that this is the constitutional amendment that should be submitted to cure the evil which exists. I know it is argued that this will cure a lesser evil, but I think we should not choose between evils, if we can find a better way.

I have stated on the record that I think we are changing the very fundamentals of our Constitution as they relate to treaties. I feel sincerely that in this amendment we are saying to future Executives of the United States, "We have made constitutional executive agreements which can be submitted to the Senate and the House and which can be implemented by legislation." I say, "implemented by legislation"—by a mere majority of each House. Our forefathers, who drafted the Constitution, believed that if we were going to have treaty law it was bound to take from the States rights and privileges which had been reserved to them; and, therefore, if we were going to take away constitutional rights and privileges under State constitutions, if we were going to repeal their laws it should not be done by both Houses of Congress, but should be done by the Senate of the United States, by the votes of two-thirds of the Senators, which, in effect, meant two-thirds of the States.

Mr. President, there is quite a difference between saying that the Constitution of my State of Michigan can be repealed, or that a State law can be repealed, by a mere majority of the Senate and a mere majority of the House of Representatives and saying that a two-thirds vote of the Senate is required.

Mr. President, some absurdities are involved here. We are saying in this amendment, if it shall pass, that two-thirds of the Senators present must be recorded as voting on a treaty, while at the same time an executive agreement, which can do exactly what a treaty can do, can be passed on the consent calendar. That is what this amendment provides.

This great deliberative body should do its very best, I believe, to submit to the people an amendment which every Senator in his conscience can say is the very best we can devise.

I suggest to the Senate that the reason I am voting against the joint resolution is that I sincerely believe this great body can do a better job than has been done in this amendment. I did not vote for recommittal. I felt we had done one thing: We had made it clear to the world, to every judge in this land, that the Constitution cannot be violated by a treaty or an agreement. But we have now changed that. We are now saying that if a President desires to submit to the Congress an executive agreement, it can be passed on the consent calendar, without a yea-and-nay vote, and by a simple majority.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I must respectfully say to the Senator from Michigan that that is not true as a matter of record. There is not anything said about the consent calendar. There is one thing said, namely, that so far as internal law is concerned, the two Houses must vote upon it. The Senator is saying far more than that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, no.

Mr. GEORGE. I think he is.

Mr. FERGUSON. I beg the Senator's pardon. I do not want to say more than that. I merely want to say, as I have said, that if we implement an executive agreement we must implement it by law.

Mr. GEORGE. As to its internal effects only.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. We would not have to implement it in any other way.

Mr. GEORGE. And we do not have to implement it at all, now.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I only say that the law which would implement it can be passed on the consent calendar. That is the way this amendment would permit to be done.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I simply want to say to the Senator that I think he has made a very able and profound statement in support of his long-held position on the whole issue. I congratulate him and express the hope that those who have stood solidly behind him will continue to do so. I certainly intend to do so myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. BRICKER and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Nevada would each vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—60

Anderson	George	Mansfield
Barrett	Gillette	Martin
Bennett	Goldwater	Maybank
Bricker	Gore	McCarthy
Burke	Griswold	McClellan
Butler, Md.	Hendrickson	Millikin
Butler, Nebr.	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Byrd	Hoey	Payne
Capehart	Holland	Potter
Carlson	Hunt	Robertson
Case	Jenner	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kerr	Sparkman
Dirksen	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Watkins
Eastland	Langer	Welker
Ellender	Long	Williams
Frear	Malone	Young

NAYS—31

Aiken	Duff	Hayden
Beall	Ferguson	Hennings
Bush	Flanders	Hill
Cooper	Fulbright	Humphrey
Douglas	Green	Ives

Jackson	Monroney	Smith, N. J.
Kefauver	Morse	Thye
Kennedy	Neely	Upton
Kilgore	Pastore	Wiley
Lehman	Purtell	
Magnuson	Saltonstall	

NOT VOTING—5

Bridges	McCarran	Symington
Lennon	Murray	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution is rejected.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WATKINS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. HENDRICKSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there will be no further voting this evening. After Senators have had an opportunity to make insertions in the RECORD, I shall move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next. On Monday we shall have a call of both the Executive and the Legislative Calendars, the call of the Legislative Calendar to be from the point where we stopped at the last call of the calendar.

COLUMBUS—ADDRESS BY VINCENT MASSARI

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on February 23, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], on behalf of himself and 52 other Senators, introduced a joint resolution which would authorize "the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction, in the city of Washington, of an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus." Mr. President, that joint resolution is a most timely one, and I am proud to be 1 of its 53 sponsors.

On October 12, 1953, in the city of Pueblo, Colo., I had the privilege of hearing an eloquent address on Columbus, which was delivered by Vincent Massari, a popular citizen of Pueblo. Since Colorado has the honor of having originated Columbus Day as a holiday, Mr. Massari's able address should be of interest in connection with the joint resolution sponsored by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and 52 other Senators, including myself. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Massari's address printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, and as additional support on behalf of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBUS DAY ADDRESS, 1953

Toastmaster RUSSELL, Senator JOHNSON, Congressman CHENOWETH, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, Winston Churchill hailed a taxi in The Strand and asked to be driven to the British Broadcasting Corporation.

"Sorry, mister," said the cabbie. "Ye'll have to get yourself another cab. Mr. Churchill is broadcastin' in 30 minutes and I wouldn't miss it for all the fares in London."

Churchill was so flattered that he pressed a pound note into the cabbie's hand. The latter looked at the money in astonishment and came to a quick decision. "You're a bit all right sir." he exclaimed. " 'Op in, and to 'ell with Mr. Churchill."

I am not going to pass out $5 bills, but I do want to talk about Columbus Day.

We are assembled this evening to celebrate Columbus Day for the 56th consecutive year. Pueblo started even before the State declared Columbus Day a legal holiday.

I do not think that it should be necessary to stress once more the fact that the first State in the Union to recognize Columbus Day as a legal holiday was the State of Colorado as far back as 1907.

The State of New York, which followed, copied exactly the draft of the law approved by our State. We are especially proud of that because our newspaper, L'Unione, the Columbian Federation and all the local lodges, chiefly the Columbus Lodge, in Colorado, spared no effort in this campaign of recognition and gratitude toward the fearless navigator. In 1905, our Columbus Monument was inaugurated with great festivities. The first law was passed in 1907 by the 16th General Assembly of Colorado and signed by Gov. Henry A. Butchel, following the Columbus Day proclamations of 1905 and 1906 by Gov. Jesse F. McDonald.

The pen used by Governor McDonald to sign the first proclamation is now in Genoa with other historic relics of Columbus.

The example of Colorado was followed by 38 other States, until 1935, at a joint session of Senate and House of Representatives, Congress vested the President of the United States with the power to issue a proclamation every year for a National Columbus Day.

Last June, while visiting the lodges of the Columbian Federation in the eastern cities, in New York I stopped at the public library, checked several newspapers of October 1905 and I was amazed to discover an Italian daily, Il Tempo, of October 12, 1905, with the news of the Pueblo celebration spread all over its front page, together with a picture of our monument and an editorial. I want to tell you some of the ideas the editorial emphasized.

I quote:

"Let the Italians of New York, and all others with a clear comprehension of the worthy ideas that bind them to the motherland take a bow to the city of Pueblo. Around the monument to Christopher Columbus may a festive rumble of applause rise thunderously to the sky.

"The soul of the Italians of Pueblo are with you.

"It is fitting that the people of Colorado, dreaming the greatness of their mother country, filled with patriotic sentiment for the new land which they have chosen for their home, felt it their duty to consecrate a day to the great Genoese. That was the beginning in America of the celebration of Columbus Day, which might be appropriately called the feast of the nativity of this land.

"Lucky for you that today Italians everywhere can shake hands around the statue of Columbus, blessing the hour significant of Italianity on American soil, and to see the 12th of October proclaimed an American holiday.

"Yoirs is a victory that cannot be reduced to miserable dollars.

"Who can measure its significance?

"It is possible to calculate by yards or by inches the monument to Columbus, erected by Italians in the heart of New York there where the metropolitan arteries converge to partake of oxygen and vigor among the flowers and the trees of Central Park, but who can really say how much good was done by that piece of marble, planted there to challenge, with the times and the storms, the sneering laugh of the fanatics. Who has attempted yet to evaluate the influence exercised upon the public, by that mute and solemn witness holding at the top of the figure of the Ligurian and at the bottom the symbols of the genius and pride of our race?

"Who can tell today the good that all foreigners in a foreign land—owe to that monument?

" 'Cry, cry: Hail Italy.' And see to it that your guests who will bless him whose name is now being honored, will join with you in saying that Italy still lives.

"Let the strangers know that you are strong and united, that you are capable of renewing, after centuries, the very great feats of the great navigator to face the unknown ocean, in a magnificent dream, moving on a stormy sea toward a new world.

"Accept our salute, O countrymen, O true Italians of Pueblo, on this day in which you arise with an incomparable feat of energy and of love for the land of your birth. You are marking another goal on the progressive path of the Italians outside their native border; another point is reached by sheer virtue of soul and willpower, by those who crossed the ocean with the rusty anchor of hope and fortune.

"Italy must be great because of its historic nobility. And you Italians of Pueblo hold true to the thoughts that burn in the hearts of the sons of Italy, whose aim is to touch every border and to penetrate the soul to all people, where there is fire and where there is ice, where there are ruins and there is resurrection.

"Italians of Pueblo, greetings.

"SYRIUS."

Thus the eloquent editorial ends.

Here is the account of that historic ceremony in Pueblo, on October 12, 1907, as reported by the New York Italian daily, Il Tempo, in its story of that great day in Pueblo, Colo.:

"The city is bedecked with flags. All public offices, schools and stores are closed, this being a legal holiday.

"Bands are playing in the streets. A mass of people, taking advantage of the reduction in railway fares granted by the railroad companies, are pouring into the city from all parts of the State.

"A great crowd is waiting at the station for the arrival of the Governor and his staff. Preparations are complete for a great welcome to the Governor, who proclaimed Columbus Day a legal holiday.

"Societies, arriving at every moment, are welcomed with the greatest enthusiasm.

"The draperies covering the monument will be removed by Miss Lina Chiariglione, daughter of Ettore Chiariglione, General President of the Columbian Federation.

"Senator Casimiro Barela, the author of the bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday, was among the first to arrive here. The Senator was given a tremendous ovation.

"The greatest success is assured for the banquet to be given at Mineral Palace. More

than 500 persons will participate at the banquet.

"This evening the city will be splendidly illuminated.

"Carnegie Library, in front of which stands the monument, is artistically decorated.

"Today's celebration will be the greatest that Pueblo has ever witnessed from the day of its foundation.

"The monument erected by the Italians of Pueblo stands in front of the public library of that city.

"The bust of Columbus is colossal and is sustained by a high pedestal very imposing for its slender lines and the nobility of its ornamental figures.

"The face of the navigator shows a very effective touch and strong lines.

"On the column, in front, are sculptured a wreath of holly, with the flags of Italy and America crossed, the American eagle and two clasping hands, symbols of the Columbian Federation, which shares honors for the erection of the monument with L'Unione of Pueblo.

"At the sides of the pedestal there are two marble globes: Two Worlds.

"At the base there is carved this inscription:

" 'To Christopher Columbus, on the 12th of October 1905, with the hope that first among the glorious days, the world will remember this memorable date.'

"Author of this great work of art is the sculptor, Pietro Piai, born in Vittorio Veneto, Province of Treviso."

Many suspect we celebrate Columbus because he was born in Italy. Not at all. The reason we celebrate Columbus is because he discovered America and through that discovery it became the land of opportunity, and the empire of democracy.

If we were convinced beyond any doubt that Erickson and not Columbus was the discoverer, we would celebrate that day as we celebrate this day for Columbus.

A learned Norwegian translated some Scandinavian writing on a stone near Spokane and learned that Vikings from Scandinavia were fighting Indians in this continent 482 years before Columbus arrived.

He says Norsemen came here, crossed the continent, left records in many places. Of course they did, and so did others long before Columbus was heard of.

The Mongolians came over; our North American Indians are descended from them. Some of the widely scattered members of the Semitic race came also by way of China. Their descendants are to be found and identified among certain Mexican Indians. It is not hard to cross the Bering Strait.

Columbus, however, made the real discovery, and will not lose the credit even though it should be shown that some people came here less than 20 years after the Ark of Noah landed on Mount Ararat.

If Columbus had not discovered America in 1492, somebody would have discovered it later.

But it was the discovery at that particular moment and in that particular period of European history that unleashed a chain of events which culminated in the Declaration of Independence and in the Treaty of Paris.

Had America been discovered 50 years or 200 years later we do not know what course the history of the world would have taken.

Probably there would have been no Pilgrim Fathers, no *Mayflower*, no Walter Raleigh, and no Pocahontas, no Washington, and no Jefferson.

But all that is mere hypothesis. Let us stick to facts, and the facts are that Columbus, and not Erickson, revealed a New World to the Old World in the year of our Lord 1492.

That is indeed the most important date in the history of humanity.

We Americans of Italian extraction are especially proud of Christopher Columbus, not only because he blazed the trail, but because his first voyage prompted other Italians to follow his path.

It would be impossible to recall, in short time, the magnificent role played by the Italians in the development of America, from Columbus to Giannini.

In every field, from agriculture to industry, from music to painting, from sculpture to science, the Italians have left an indelible imprint on American civilization.

When I stopped in Washington last June, my good friend, Congressman CHENOWETH, took me to the rotunda of the Capitol to admire the magnificent paintings and alfresco by the Italian artist Costantino Brumidi.

As the time is limited, I trust you will allow me to mention a few facts regarding the contributions of Italians to America's wars. Undoubtedly, all races and all national groups have done their share in winning America's battles ever since the days of Lexington and Concord, but it is questionable if any one ethnical group has contributed more, in proportion to its population, than the Italian.

Even before Thomas Jefferson penned the Declaration of Independence, his friend Filippo Mazzei assisted him in the formation of a military company of volunteers in Virginia and enlisted in one of them, in 1775.

In 1774 Phillip Mazzei wrote an article in Italian in which are found the following words:

"All men are by nature created free and independent. Such equality is necessary in order to create a free government. It is necessary that all men be equal to each other in natural law. A true republican government cannot exist unless all men from the richest to the poorest are perfectly equal in their natural rights."

Does it not sound to you like the preamble of the Declaration of Independence by its famous author Thomas Jefferson?

During the Revolution many Italians enlisted under George Washington. How many they were we do not know, because in most cases their names had been Americanized, as it happened to Cosimo dei Medici, who changed from Medici to Madacy.

Medici, incidentally, distinguished himself at Brandywine and played an important role in the creation of the United States Cavalry.

On the same strength, the first Secretary of the Navy was of Italian origin, for he was descendant of the famous Cabots.

Above them all, however, towers Col. Francisco Vigo, whose services to America are inestimable, for he made possible the victory of George Rogers Clark at Vincennes in 1779 and, through it, the conquest not only of the old Northwest but also of all the land from the Mississippi to the Pacific. A monument to Vigo was dedicated in 1936 by the late President Roosevelt.

During the Civil War literally hundreds of Italians, mostly political refugees, enlisted in the Union Army. Those men were not mercenaries like the Hessians. They were all men of the highest principle, men who were compelled to leave Italy because of political conditions and who joined the Union Army for their high conception of human liberty.

The commissioned officers alone numbered more than 200, including 4 generals.

The most distinguished name in the history of the United States Navy, however, is that of Louis C. Sartori, who rose from midshipman in 1809 to captain in 1860 and commodore in 1870. Another Sartori served as acting assistant surgeon in the Navy from 1861 to 1864.

Since the Civil War the names of Italians and Americans of Italian origin who served in the Army and Navy of the United States are too numerous to mention.

In the war against the Indians we find Major General Sanno and Colonel De Rudio, who was with General Custer in the famous massacre.

The role played by Italian-Americans during the World War may be best stressed by the fact that they received a much higher share of distinguished service crosses than their number in the United States called for. The first to die in the First World War was John Eopolucci, assigned to the SS *Aztec* as gun captain. He was awarded the Congressional Medal for his heroic stand.

And I could add many and many others in the First and Second World Wars and Korean war like Basilone, another Congressional Medal of Honor recipient; Captain Salzarullo, hero of the Guadalcanal; Captain Gentile, Lieutenant Commander Noce, of Denver, but my time is limited and I do not intend to annoy you any longer.

I want to remember only that we may be Italian-Americans in domestic affairs, but when facing the enemy we certainly are "Americans only."

I close with the words of Clarence M. Depew at the dedication ceremonies of the World Columbian Exposition at Chicago:

"All hail Columbus, discoverer, dreamer, hero, and apostle! We here of every race and country recognize the horizon which bounded his vision and the infinite scope of his genius. The voice of gratitude and praise for all the blessings which have been showered upon mankind by his adventure is limited to no language, but is uttered in every tongue. Neither marble nor brass can fitly form his statue.

"Continents are his monument; and unnumbered millions who enjoy in their liberties and their happiness the fruits of his faith will reverently guard and preserve, from century to century, his name and fame."

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 886, S. 49, which is the Hawaiian statehood bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in order that it may be ready for consideration when debate begins next week, I submit an amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. It is an amendment relating to Alaskan statehood, and is proposed as title II of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

The Chair has received a petition from the Governor of Hawaii, containing 116,000 names in favor of statehood for Hawaii. The petition will lie on the table.

COMMONWEALTH STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the bill providing for statehood for Hawaii has been made the unfinished business, I should like to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Puerto Rico Chief Rejects Statehood," published in the Miami Herald on February 19. My reason for asking that this appear in the RECORD is that the Governor of Puerto Rico points out the virtues of commonwealth status, and it is my understanding that an amendment will be offered to the Hawaiian statehood bill to give Hawaii commonwealth status instead of statehood.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUERTO RICO CHIEF REJECTS STATEHOOD

SAN JUAN, P. R.—Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín Friday rejected the idea of statehood for Puerto Rico, saying that joining the United States would cost the island a great deal of its own freedom.

In a message to the legislature, Muñoz said the present commonwealth status is definite and grows dynamically in its political forms.

Statehood, the Governor said, would mean that Puerto Rico would lose control of two-thirds of its contributive (taxing) potentialities and the right to use them in the way dictated by the legislature.

The Governor also rejected the idea of separatism from the United States. "The Puerto Rican people," he said, "voted against separatism and I disregard separatism because I believe in the spiritual greatness of the American Union, which is even greater than its economic power."

PROGRAM FOR MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the plan of the majority leader is to take up on Monday the Executive Calendar and act on the nomination of the Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And on all other nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What is the plan with respect to the supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is the desire to have the supplemental appropriation bill considered on Monday also, because I understand that certain of the Government agencies and committees of Congress will not have funds with which to continue operations unless a supplemental appropriation is provided.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it the majority leader's intention to complete consideration of the Executive Calendar and the supplemental appropriation bill before proceeding to consideration of the Hawaiian statehood bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. It is also desired to consider on Monday the bill which the Senate discussed last evening, relative to the extension of the life of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations for 1 year.

ACTION OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD AS AFFECTING NORTH AMERICAN AIRLINES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, within recent days the Civil Aeronautics Board has handed down a decision which will deprive one of our largest operating airlines, the North American Airlines, the right to continue operations.

I had hoped to make a few remarks on that action in the course of the day, but since the hour is so late, I ask unanimous consent, in lieu thereof, to have printed at this point in the RECORD the remarks which I had intended to make.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

I believe it is important to bring to the attention of the Senate policies being followed by an agency of this Government which are contrary to the intent of Congress and detrimental to the best interests of the Nation. I refer to the actions of the Civil Aeronautics Board which are apparently aimed at preventing any new company from entering air transportation.

Specifically, since 1938, when the Civil Aeronautics Act was passed, the Civil Aeronautics Board has not certificated a single passenger carrier over the major trunk routes. Indeed, the number of carriers has actually been reduced through mergers from 18 to 13 and I understand that before the end of the year the number will be down to 12. Yet in the same period traffic over these routes has increased twentyfold. Was there ever a more fertile field in which to permit new companies the opportunity to be born and grow? Yet the Board has prevented any new company from getting permanent operating authority. Is this in accord with our basic heritage of freedom of opportunity?

Oh, I know that the Civil Aeronautics Board has a pat answer. They always say: "But we have certificated feeder carriers to serve the small towns. We have certificated air freight carriers." But they never, never seem willing to face the fact that they have failed to permit a single new company to have permanent operating authority over the trunk routes. The Civil Aeronautics Act gave the Board no charter to prevent permanently any new company from entering air transportation. Congress certainly never dreamed that in passing the Civil Aeronautics Act it was ceding the skies over the trunk routes forever to 13 companies.

This Nation's tremendous economic vitality stems from its freedom of economic opportunity—the chance to go into business and do a better job than the next fellow. This freedom of opportunity has stimulated the innovator—has resulted in our tremendous industrial advantage over the rest of the world. We have never countenanced a rigid pattern in an industry. Such rigidity can only lead to stagnation and eventual economic decay.

We have a good example of what the innovator can do in air transportation and yet it is against this very innovator that the Board has mustered all its power in a campaign to drive this company out of existence.

North American Airlines was started in 1946 by a group of veterans with an idea—an idea that the future of air transportation was in low-cost mass transportation rather than in the high fare luxury trade. These people were the Henry Fords of the airline industry.

During the past 8 years, North American has developed this idea until it is now the 11th largest airline in the United States. Last year it flew over 285 million revenue passenger miles and it has a perfect safety record. North American's brilliant concept of air coach which was scoffed at as being impractical 8 years ago is now accepted by the entire airline industry and even the Civil Aeronautics Board looks to air coach as the future base of air transportation.

The Civil Aeronautics Board was created in 1938 to foster and promote the development of air transportation. Did they foster or promote the development of air coach? Did they seek to insure a climate in which this new company could grow? Did they attempt to assist it at all? The record will show that the Civil Aeronautics Board has carried on a shameful campaign of persecution against this company, trying to harass it to death. The fact is that North American has survived and prospered despite, rather than because of, the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Let me give you an example of the type of harassment that the CAB has resorted to. The Board has ruled that North American may not use the word "American" in its name. Apparently the Board feels that Congress sanctioned it to cede 35 percent of the aviation industry and any use of the word "American" to a single company.

The Board is currently conducting enforcement proceedings against North American for alleged violations of the Board's economic regulations. In this proceeding the Board seeks revocation of North American's operating authority. What are these violations? No question of safety is involved since North American has never had an accident. First, the Board charges that North American has failed to list the address of passengers on its tickets, although the Board admits it does not require other airlines to do this. Second, the Board charges that the company failed to file certain operating agreements with the Board, although these agreements have been on file with the Board for over a year. Third, the Board charges violation of ownership restrictions. Fourth, the Board alleges that North American flies too frequently.

In the kangaroo court in which the Board makes the rules, tries the violator, and fixes the sentence, there is no doubt that the Board can find North American guilty. But isn't the penalty entirely out of proportion to the violations? Does the Board possibly have the justification for putting this airline out of business?

North American is operating under a temporary exemption. It has applied to the Board for certificates of public convenience and necessity, the orderly way provided by the Civil Aeronautics Act for giving permanent operating authority. However, the Board seems to be intent on putting North American out of business before it can be heard on its application to serve the public.

A good example of how unreasonable and closed the Board has become on this case is the proposal for settlement of the economic enforcement proceedings made by North American last week. This airline offered to turn in its present operating authority for cancellation following the conclusion of the hearings on its applications for certificates. If the Board has any reason left, they would have accepted this proposal. It assured the Board that North American could be forced out of business within a

short time, the Board's apparent aim. At the same time, North American would be assured of its day in court, would be assured of a fair chance. But the Board turned that down in its mad campaign against this new company in air transportation.

This controversy may mark a serious turning point for the airline industry. If the Board puts North American out of business, the Board is saying that air transportation is closed to the innovator—the man with a new idea who wants to start a business. From a practical standpoint the Board is freezing our present pattern of airlines.

It is hard for me to see how a new company could enter the airline industry at this point. It requires hundreds of thousands of dollars to prosecute applications for certificates of convenience and necessity. In view of the Board's position of not certificating any new trunk airlines, no prudent businessman could make such a speculative plunge on a long-shot gamble that the Board might reverse its policy. Perhaps this is a major flaw in the Civil Aeronautics Act. Although the act establishes procedures through which new companies can come into the aviation industry, the Board has established a strong precedent for refusing such applicants. I hope that the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will carefully examine this question of the right of entry into the air-transportation industry during its forthcoming hearings on the McCarran Act.

I think the committee must also consider the very serious problem posed by any Government regulatory body. Too often the regulatory body becomes controlled by the industry it is supposed to regulate. In this connection, we have recently seen a disturbing case where a major airline applied for a new route to the Civil Aeronautics Board at 8:45 in the morning. The Board met at 9 and granted the new route at 9:08. This 8-minute decision for the largest company is in striking contrast to the years it takes smaller companies to get Board consideration. This incident certainly raises the question of why this one large company was able to get such prompt action, action that was taken without notice to any of the other interested parties directly affected by the decision.

It raises the question of the motives behind the Board's present moves against North American Airlines, an airline that might conceivably compete with the same powerful company that was able to get the 8-minute decision from the Board. I hope that the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will examine very carefully whether any group outside the Board is dictating the Board's campaign to put a smaller competitor out of business.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 1, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 26 (legislative day of February 25), 1954:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Francis F. Healy for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1954.

IN THE NAVY

Adm. Lynde D. McCormick, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as president, Naval War College.

Vice Adm. Jerauld Wright, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, Atlantic and United States Atlantic Fleet.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 26, 1954

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement on Lithuanian Independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

(Statement by Senator DIRKSEN)

On February 16 we honored a people whose saga is as old and as strange, as sad and as proud as that of any in the Western World. The Lithuanian people may indeed be proud. They have repeatedly survived vicissitudes which would have downed a lesser breed of men. Their homeland a peaceful hamlet between two mountains of force, a frequent battleground beset from west and east, the people of Lithuania have been scattered but undivided, conquered but ever cowed. Escaping the heel of the Germans only to fall under the yoke of the Russians, they have nevertheless maintained an independence of action and of spirit that is enduring. Their story is full of such anomalies. They are at once young and old. Though their history goes far, far back into the centuries, the anniversary which we celebrate today is that of the proud young nation which became of age between World Wars I and II. No sooner had it reached maturity—a political conditions which at its birth represented the consummation of a long overdue right to independent status—than it was again seized by the Russian giant. The legality of this seizure the United States has never recognized. It has refused to recognize so unjust, so ill-founded an action.

The Lithuania we recognize is a Baltic State. It is not a part of the Soviet Union. It is one of the three republics newly established after World War I in recognition of their right to the liberty which, though lost to them for centuries, was their rightful heritage. Possessing as they did an independence in their hearts, in their ideals, in their literature, and in their language, miraculously preserved in spite of suppression, the Lithuanians showed their ability to recreate their nation when given the opportunity. After nearly 800 years of domination, their own individuality and their own aspirations, suppressed but never dying, were allowed to flourish. With epic greatness they turned to new achievement.

The blood of the Lithuanian defenders ran in their veins; but they were a peace-loving as well as a brave people. For more than a thousand years they had been content to work out their destiny and had preserved their identity on the shores of the Baltic, apart from the Slavs. A separate branch of the Indo-European family, with their national spirit dating back to the early centuries of the Christian era, the Lithuanians have a language which attests their age. One author has called it the most antique in its forms of all living languages of the world; but, perhaps more correctly, it can be unquestionably designated "the best-preserved, living language of the Indo-European family."

At one time the realm of this ancient race extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea. The town of Vilna—so dear to the Lithuanian heart, and the source of so much trouble—became the capital of the country in 1323. This period marks the summit of Lithuanian glory. Shortly thereafter the country, rich in forests and in rural areas, became the envy of Germanic neighbors. Russia, meantime, was advancing from the east. Lithuania had fallen upon evil days. After serving for several centuries as a battleground, Lithuania found herself with the last remnants of her independence torn from her, by the Russia of the Tsars.

Under Russia her lot was a hard one, but the national spirit was never killed. Emigration began. The United States became a haven for large numbers of Lithuanians. They never forgot the less fortunate at home. With the coming of the Russian Revolution in 1905, the time seemed to have come for Lithuania's liberation. Many of her sons returned. Within 10 years, however, she was again to be the bloody battleground between Germany and Russia. Again her forests were the target. They were devastated. Her freedom was delayed. But not for long. In spite of destruction and the desperate efforts of Germany to block the move, Lithuania was proclaimed an independent state on February 16, 1918. Thirty-six years ago today.

Among the steps which the new Lithuania took to rebuild her country, a primary one was the planting of trees. In the towns small, single oak saplings were carefully guarded by wire, and pointed to with pride, as symbolic of the country's aspirations.

Like the oak trees they planted, the Lithuanians are stalwart. The country, young and promising, has again been slashed back to its roots, this time by Communist aggression and tyranny; but those roots are practically indestructible.

Have you ever tried to eradicate an oak tree? Even a very small oak tree? Over 2 feet high or so? The limbs and the trunk may disappear beneath the ax; the stump may be battered to the level of the ground. But the oak is not dead. From its roots will spring a multiple-trunked tree, more hardy, more persistent, more difficult to batter down than its predecessor.

The spirit of Lithuania is as the root of the oak. It has persisted in spite of innumerable slashings; it has been battered beyond visible existence, but the basis, the roots of regeneration remain. We may, therefore, expect that an independent Lithuanian nation will rise again.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1954

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, new every morning is the love our waking and uprising prove. As we bow in contrition and reverence at the beginning of another week whose tasks and problems await, we would bring our perplexities to the light of Thy wisdom. Thou knowest the temptations which lie in wait as we walk our pilgrim way, with its unknown, distant scenes. Always we feel the pull of selfish and unclean motives and enticements which endeavor to sully the record for which some day we must give an account. Shine Thou into our souls with the white light of Thy splendor, before which every vileness must shrink away.

This day, as we act and speak for the Nation, may the thoughts of our hearts and the words of our lips and the decisions of our minds be acceptable in Thy sight, O God of our salvation. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 26, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and announced that on February 27, 1954, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 68. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Godschalk;

S. 123. An act for the relief of Anni Wilhelmine Skoda;

S. 205. An act for the relief of Evodoxia J. Kitsos;

S. 236. An act for the relief of Amir Hassan Sepahban;

S. 296. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Henry Litmanowitz (Litman);

S. 305. An act for the relief of Antonio Vocale;

S. 313. An act for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama;

S. 323. An act for the relief of Rose Cohen;

S. 353. An act for the relief of Li Ming;

S. 506. An act for the relief of Horst F. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar;

S. 569. An act for the relief of Lina Anna Adelheid (Adam) Hoyer;

S. 606. An act for the relief of Hannelore Netz and her two children;

S. 730. An act for the relief of Winfried Kohls;

S. 801. An act for the relief of Eugenio S. Roiles;

S. 825. An act for the relief of Karin Rita Grubb;

S. 973. An act for the relief of Dr. Jawad Hedayaty;

S. 982. An act for the relief of Helena Lewicka;

S. 1009. An act for the relief of Zoltan Weingarten;

S. 1018. An act for the relief of George Ellis Ellison;

S. 1226. An act for the relief of Stefan Virgilius Issarescu;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of Emmanuel Aristides Nicoloudis;

S. 1323. An act for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney;

S. 1443. An act for the relief of Jose Deang; and

S. 2689. An act to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] be excused from attending sessions of the Senate beginning today and for the next 2 weeks, for the purpose of attending the 10th Inter-American Conference, which convened today at Caracas, Venezuela. The Senator from Rhode Island was designated by the Secretary of State as a congressional adviser on the United States delegation to the Conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CASE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the morning hour there be a call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, from the point reached at the last call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. After the call of the roll, it is my intention, if agreeable to the Senate, to take up the Executive Calendar, following which the Senate will proceed to consider the Legislative Calendar, as just agreed to.

Also for consideration today is the supplemental appropriation bill, which is on the calendar, but which obviously would not and should not be passed during the call of the calendar.

It is also desired to consider by unanimous consent the matter which I mentioned to the minority leader last week, the bill providing an extension of 1 year, the time when the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations must make its report. Action was held over from last week, and the bill should be considered today, because today is the last date, under the law on which the commission can make its report.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	Maybank
Barrett	Griswold	McCarthy
Beall	Hayden	McClellan
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Burke	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bush	Hill	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Murray
Byrd	Humphrey	Neely
Carlson	Hunt	Payne
Case	Ives	Potter
Chavez	Jackson	Purtell
Clements	Jenner	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smathers
Duff	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Ellender	Kuchel	Thye
Ferguson	Langer	Upton
Flanders	Lehman	Watkins
Frear	Lennon	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Wiley
George	Magnuson	Williams
Gillette	Malone	Young
Goldwater	Mansfield	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I announce further that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate attending the sessions of the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela, as a congressional adviser on the United States delegation.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent on official business of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Cabot to be Ambassador

Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sweden.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry F. Holland to be Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roswell Burchard Perkins to be Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Morton P. Fisher to be a judge on the Tax Court of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE—ROUTINE PROMOTIONS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for routine promotions in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service of a routine nature be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of collectors of customs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the nominations of collectors of customs be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank M. Kalteux to be Comptroller of Customs with headquarters at Chicago, Ill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the nominee has indicated that he will not be able to serve. At the request of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I ask that the nomination be passed over temporarily.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Earl Warren to be Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement regarding the Chief Justice of the United States.

Earl Warren was born in Los Angeles, Calif., on March 19, 1891, the son of Methias H. and Chrystal (Hernlund) Warren. He received his bachelor of laws degree at the University of California in 1912, and the degree of doctor of jurisprudence at the University of California, in 1914.

He holds the degree of honorary doctor of laws from the University of Redlands, College of the Pacific, University of Southern California, Santa Clara, Mills College, Cornell (Iowa) College, Occidental, Jewish Theological Seminary, Union (New York) College, and the University of Alaska.

He married Nina P. Meyers on October 14, 1925. His children are James C., Virginia, Earl, Dorothy, Nina Elizabeth, and Robert.

He was admitted to the California bar in 1914. He practiced in San Francisco and Oakland from 1914 to 1917; he served on the California Assembly Judiciary Committee of the California Legislature in 1919. He was deputy city attorney of the city of Oakland from 1919 to 1920; deputy district attorney of Alameda County from 1920 to 1923; chief deputy district attorney from 1923 to 1925; district attorney from 1925 to 1939; attorney general of California from 1939 to 1943; and Governor of California from 1943 through 1953, until his appointment as Chief Justice of the United States.

I have known the Chief Justice for almost 30 years. I know him as an outstanding American and a person of unimpeachable integrity. He possesses great ability, and I think he is an outstanding choice to be Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the people of California regard Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, with great pride. Shortly the United States Senate will overwhelmingly confirm the nomination of a distinguished native son of the State which I have in part the honor to represent, to be the 14th Chief Justice of our country.

Chief Justice Warren has devoted almost an entire lifetime to the service of his native commonwealth. Recognized as a distinguished lawyer, he enjoys an unsullied and high reputation as an able public administrator, not only within the legal profession but also beyond that realm, in the entire broad field of governmental and public administration.

Some time ago the New York Times published an illuminating article entitled "'Unpartisan' Chief Justice of the United States." I ask unanimous consent that several pertinent paragraphs of the article be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNPARTISAN CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

(By James Bassett)

LOS ANGELES.—Earl Warren, of California, called to his country's most honored judicial post in his 62d year, combines in a curious way some of the attributes of Abraham Lincoln, Hiram Johnson, and the average man.

If you ask him what sort of politician he is, Mr. Warren is likely to recall Lincoln's self-appraisal: "I'm a slow walker, but I never walk backward." And like the late Senator Johnson, of California, he has made a name for himself as a ruthless prosecutor of dishonest public officials, then as a highly individualistic governor.

But perhaps Mr. Warren can best be characterized as a spectacularly average man, self-made in a self-made State. His parents, he likes to say, could not even "afford the luxury of a middle name" for young Earl. And all his life he has worked, beginning with his grammar-school years when he peddled ice for 25 cents a day, until, today, he occupies the No. 1 seat on the Supreme Court. * * *

As the former Governor's friends and followers put it, Warren has been preparing himself for just such a responsibility throughout his 34 years in public life. His whole makeup is judicial, deliberative, and rational. His record indicates a keen sense of the legal nature of things. They point out further that some of California's, as well as the Nation's, best jurists have been men who approached the bench "cold," whereas some of the worst have been legal experts steeped in over-warm regard for cold textbook law.

In his unprecedented three terms as Governor of America's third largest State, Warren signed some 10,000 bills. None were overthrown by judicial review; and exceedingly few of his careful vetoes of other legislation were overridden by the legislature.

Beyond the question of Earl Warren's lack of formal judiciary experience is the more fundamental issue of his political, economic, and philosophical beliefs. A guide to these beliefs is provided by his writings, speeches, and actions as Governor.

* * * * *

"The radical," Warren says, "will be satisfied with nothing short of revolutionary change. The reactionary will be satisfied with nothing short of retrogression."

Neither extremist view, he thinks, commands more than a small minority of the total populace. Therefore, he says, the "70 or more percent in between * * * make the decision for the Nation. * * * These people represent the backbone of our citizenry. They are the vast majority of the working people of our country as well as most of the people in our businesses and professions."

In California he applied his philosophy to a peculiar brand of unpartisan, personalized politics—something his friends, and foes, termed Warrenism. Warrenism worked. In a State where Democrats outnumber Republicans 3 to 2, he managed to swing huge majorities in his favor, simply by presenting his own case—or brand of government—to the people.

Back in 1930, when as district attorney he was cleaning up an Augean stable of corruption in Alameda County, Warren remarked: "The public never turned me down. I took my story right to them, told them the facts bluntly, and when we get into a pinch they stayed with us."

So successful has this practice been that, in 1946, he swept into his second gubernatorial term by leading both party tickets in the primary.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the pride of the people of my State of California, I sincerely feel, is in no lesser measure likewise the pride of the people of the United States. An outstanding professional lawyer and, indeed, an outstanding American, is about to be confirmed for the highest judicial post in the Nation.

It is fitting at this moment to refer to the canons of professional and judicial ethics of the American Bar Association. The preamble of the canons con-

tains a statement which should appeal to the Members of the Senate, and to the citizens of the Nation generally, upon an occasion such as this:

> In America, where the stability of courts and of all departments of Government rests upon the approval of the people, it is peculiarly essential that the system for establishing and dispensing justice be developed to a high point of efficiency and so maintained that the public shall have absolute confidence in the integrity and impartiality of its administration. The future of the Republic, to a great extent, depends upon our maintenance of justice pure and unsullied. It cannot be so maintained unless the conduct and the motives of the members of our profession are such as to merit the approval of all just men.

Aside from all the professional qualifications which the Members of the Senate and the people of our country know are possessed by the 14th Chief Justice of our highest court, they underscore the President's appointee as one whose integrity is well known and of which, win or lose, litigants before the highest court of our land in the future can be well assured. In Earl Warren's decisions integrity and Americanism will prevail.

Mr. President, during his long years of public service, Chief Justice Warren has been motivated by one simple goal for his country: clean, strong, honest American Government, in the executive branch, the legislative branch, and in the judicial branch. Now the head of the Nation's judiciary, that goal will continue to be his.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Earl Warren, to be Chief Justice of the United States?

The nomination was unanimously confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter H. Hodge to be a United States district judge for division 2, district of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States attorneys.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of United States attorneys are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States marshals.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of United States marshals are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. John Alexander Klein to be Adjutant General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air National Guard.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Air National Guard are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed this day.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the information of the Senate, particularly for the information of Senators who were not in the Chamber earlier today, following the regular morning hour I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills and other measures on the Legislative Calendar to which there is no objection, starting at the point where the Senate ended its consideration of measures on the last call of the calendar, with the exception that Calendar No. 373, S. 1691, to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia and to cross Kenilworth Avenue, NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes, which has been added to the list of measures on the calendar to be considered today.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 338)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from April 1, 1953, to September 30, 1953, and describing, in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 1954.*

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Kings County Council Ladies' Auxiliary of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, at Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to the extension of veterans' benefits to members of the Armed Forces who served in Korea, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII—AUTHORIZATION TO TRANSMIT PETITION TO NATIONAL ARCHIVES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to transmit to the National Archives the signed petition which was laid before the Senate on Friday last relative to statehood for Hawaii. It is a very large petition and it takes up a substantial amount of space. I think it contains 165,000 signatures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADMISSION OF RED CHINA INTO UNITED NATIONS—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF LAWRENCE, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Lawrence, Mass., with reference to the admission of Communist China into the United Nations. The purpose of the resolution is to oppose such admission, and with that I am in full accord.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution of City of Lawrence, Mass.

Whereas the admission of Communist China to the United Nations would destroy the purpose, betray the letter and violate the charter of that organization; and

Whereas the Red Chinese have disregarded every rule of civilized human behavior in imposing slavery upon the people of China and in murdering and torturing innocent civilians and prisoners of war, among which were some of our own young men; and

Whereas such admission to the United Nations of the international gangsters who control the mainland of China would destroy the prestige of our own Government and of the United Nations.

We hereby urge every citizen of Lawrence, Mass., to voice his opposition to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations by affixing his signature to a petition which is now being circulated throughout the country by the Committee for One Million. Through such action, we will help strengthen the hands of our own Government and let our friends in Asia know just where we stand on this issue.

JOHN J. BUCKLEY,
Mayor.
JOSEPH E. CARNEY,
JOSEPH R. SUMIC,
LOUIS J. SCANLON,
JOHN W. FALLON,
Aldermen.

RENDITION OF MUSICAL COMPOSITIONS ON COIN-OPERATED MACHINES—LETTER FROM WISCONSIN FEDERATION OF MUSIC CLUBS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from the Wisconsin Federation of Music Clubs, signed by Mrs. A. A. Ladwig, secretary, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1106, relating to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines. I present the letter for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, together with all the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with all the signatures attached, as follows:

THE WISCONSIN FEDERATION OF MUSIC CLUBS,
February 25, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman of Subcommittee,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The State Board of the Wisconsin Federation of Music Clubs passed a resolution requesting your personal attention to the favorable passing of legislation relative to the juke box bill—Senate bill 1106.

Motion was passed to have the secretary send this mesage with the names of all members who were present.

Yours truly,

Elvira G. Ladwig (Mrs. A. A. Ladwig), Secretary; Mrs. W. Paul Benzinger, Oconomowoc; Mrs. Marjorie Kaye, Oshkosh; Mrs. Ragnhild H. Congdon, Kenosha; Minnie M. Larsen, Kenosha; Mrs. R. A. Dougan, Beloit; Alice Walter, Burlington; Mrs. Ben Roderick, Brodhead; Mrs. A. A. Mellentine, Stevens Point; Mrs. O. T. Slagsval, Eau Claire; Mrs. E. A. Sletteland, Pigeon Falls; Mrs. D. S. MacKinnon, Milwaukee; Mrs. E. Woody Kuhlman, Milwaukee; Mrs. Morton Hull Starr, Whitewater; Verna Zeidler, Milwaukee; Mrs. Lillian Schuler, Milwaukee; Elfrieda H. Roth, Sheboygan; Mrs. Henry Koehnlein, Waukesha; Mrs. W. A. Freehoff, Waukesha; Mrs. L. A. Salisbury, Fond du Lac; Mrs. Lyle Brown, Waupun; Mrs. C. E. White, Madison; Mrs. A. A. Ladwig, West Allis.

APPROPRIATION FOR FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Nonpartisan League, whose chairman is Mr. Joe Wicks, of Cannon Ball, N. Dak., relating to appropriations for the Farmers' Home Administration in North Dakota.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is reported that the Farmers' Home Administration has exhausted its appropriation within the State of North Dakota; and

Whereas there is a great demand for further loans from the Farmers' Home Administration as a result of poor crops, drought, and increased contaminations of the crop by rust: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the county chairman of the Non-Partisan League in session at Bismarck, N. Dak., this 30th day of January 1954, That additional appropriations be made to the Farmers' Home Administration in North Dakota for further loans within the State and that the President of the United States be asked to declare North Dakota a disaster area; that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the entire membership of the House and Senate from North Dakota.

JOE WICKS,
Chairman, Cannon Ball, N. Dak.,
Nonpartisan League.

RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted at various meetings of the American Legion in the State of North Dakota which were sent to me by Bette Sherman, deputy to Mr. Erwin R. Kruger, county service officer.

All these resolutions are alike with the exception of the names of the people at the bottom of them. I ask unanimous consent that although only one resolution be printed, the names of those sponsoring the remaining resolutions appear at the end of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution and names referred to were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas when our country is in peril and the sons of Americans must go to war to protect all that is dear to us, nearly everyone waves flags and is ready to back up the man in uniform; nothing is too good for him, so they then say; and

Whereas as soon as the war is won, the shooting and fighting stops, and the doughboy or GI Joe returns to his home (if he is fortunate enough to return), he soon discovers that a number of the very people for whom he offered to sacrifice his very life, have grown cool toward him and that even downright resentment exists in some quarters (since he has become an ex-serviceman); and

Whereas instead of remembering that GI Joe may have spent months in a living hell, and, as often happens, lay in military hospitals for weeks and months on end (and even now, as a civilian, he may have to return periodically to a veterans' hospital for further treatment), some of his voluble countrymen, who were willing to verbally back him up with a lot of promises when they needed him (and, incidentally, reap the immense economic, social, and political benefits directly resulting from the wartime activities of GI Joe), now openly declare he is costing our Government (the greatest the world has ever seen) too much money; that he is not entitled to care in a Government hospital or at Government expense; that our great Nation cannot afford to pay him adequate disability pensions, compensation, etc.; and

Whereas statistics from the United States Department of Commerce and the Veterans' Administration show that in the year 1890, when national income was $10,701 million, our Nation spent $106 million, or a little more than ninety-nine one-hundredths of 1 percent of that total income for the welfare of our ex-servicemen and their dependents; and

Whereas the national income for fiscal year 1953 was approximately $306 billion, and only seventy-eight one-hundredths of 1 percent of that figure was spent in that fiscal year toward the welfare of our veterans and their dependents; and

Whereas it can clearly be seen that we are now spending a much smaller percentage of our vast national income than our Nation felt our veterans were in need of and entitled to 63 years ago, and that the needs of our veterans in 1953 have certainly not lessened, by any stretch of the imagination; and

Whereas in the light of the foregoing, there is no reasonable need for the Federal Government to make, in the name of economy, any reductions in the expenditures covering actual benefits to, or take care of, the defenders of our great Nation and their dependents, as is now being done; and

Whereas there is every reason why the expenditures for veterans' benefits should be increased, instead, because of the ever-increasing number and needs of our veteran population, due to the wars (and resulting unstable economic conditions), under which those, opposing such expenditures, are ever increasing, for the most part, their own private economic, social, and political standing, at the very evident expense and sacrifices of their fellow men, women, and children directly participating in, and/or affected by, such conflicts and aftermaths: Now be it hereby

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to carry in all appropriation laws affecting the Veterans' Administration and all veterans' affairs, provisions explicitly denying the arbitrarily assumed right of any Government official or group to, in any way whatsoever, impound, withdraw, or otherwise reduce such appropriations, or any portions of them, since such actions are now having a detrimental and demoralizing effect upon the lives of many deserving and legally and morally eligible veterans and their dependents; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be strongly urged and encouraged to increase such appropriations as the need for such increase is shown by the ever-increasing numbers of our veterans and their dependents, always remembering to include the safeguards above mentioned, thus protecting the veteran and his dependent against being deprived of the benefits otherwise provided for; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be submitted for proper and effective disposition to

the North Dakota department headquarters of the American Legion.

JOHN RIPSDORF UNIT NO. 91, AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY, NEW SALEM, N. DAK.

HENRY BIFFERT UNIT NO. 100, AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY, HEBRON, N. DAK.

ALMONT POST NO. 231, AMERICAN LEGION, ALMONT, N. DAK.

SCHAFER-BOYE-LANGE POST NO. 69, AMERICAN LEGION, FLASHER, N. DAK.

POWER POLICY OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—TELEGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram sent to me from Casper, Wyo., and signed by Carl Bechtold, international representative, Eighth District, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L., relating to the REA.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASPER, WYO., *December 15, 1953.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator from North Dakota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L., has members employed by the REA cooperatives, private power companies, and Federal public power enterprises. The success and survival of the REA cooperatives is of vital concern to us, to the Government as mortgagee, and to the public as consumers being serviced by REA's. The power policy being proposed by the Department of the Interior means almost certain destruction and bankruptcy to REA cooperatives who are conscientiously trying to make their organizations pay in order to repay their loans to the Federal Government. Any action on the part of your committee to delay for at least 1 year the adoption of proposed power policy for further study will be appreciated by all of our membership in Wyoming regardless of what their employment source might be.

CARL BECHTOLD,
International Representative, Eighth District, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L.

THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter received from a farmer of Hope, N. Dak., by the name of Harold A. Willmert, dealing with the farm situation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOPE, N. DAK.,
December 5, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: In reply to your letter of recent date will say that there are quite a few things that Congress could do to help the farmer, and there are a lot of things being done that are causing a lot of concern, as well as a lot of hardships, at least to the farmers of our great Northwest.

This man Benson seems to want the farmers to go through some sort of freezing-out process, and would like to see a large part of the so-called inefficient farmers fall by the wayside. What, pray tell me, are we going to do with the farmers that he calls inefficient, but in fact, are finding themselves on the short end of ledger, mostly through no fault of their own, but because of falling prices and poor crops due to rust, drought, etc. Industry has the inefficient worker, but has to put up with him and can't even fire him. Don't we have too few farmers now? Do we want to cause a lot that are on the farms now to have to move off? Is a surplus of perhaps a billion bushels of wheat worse than say 10 million bushels too little? Are we going to be penalized for keeping the people of this country well fed when the least little thing could have caused a shortage? Take the drought in the Midwest this summer, had it come 3 weeks earlier we would have ceilings on the corn prices instead of Benson wringing his hands in despair crying surplus and what are we going to do with them. He should be the happiest man in the world in feeling secure as to the food supplies we have. Don't we have say $200 billion invested in atomic bombs and defense of Europe, and the taxpayer isn't mentioned in this case? What is a paltry $5 billion invested in food stuffs which we might well need sooner than we think compared to this other $200 billion which we should never use, or if we do, we will have no further need of anything.

Secretary Benson sure is grateful to North Dakota, which gave the Republicans the greatest majority of any State last election. He goes so far as to even be deceitful, supports oats and barley at the same rate as last year, but changes the parity formula, so in the long run it lowers the price of oats 7 cents and barley 10 or 11 cents. Flax also got a trimming of fifty-some cents a bushel. Now he wants to support wheat at 90 percent but wants to change the parity. Well all I can say is that we farmers in the Northwest aren't like the cow that the farmer put green glasses on so she would eat straw thinking it was hay, aren't going to be fooled by this neat little shell-game trick. I have been a Republican all my life and have never voted for a Democratic President, but so help me, I will never vote for a Republican President as long as I live. The Republicans waited 20 years to get back in power, and it took only 1 year to get themselves out. In fairness to you Senator LANGER, I think you have the interests of the people of our State at heart, but I think it is time all of you Congressmen from North Dakota get together and see that legislation detrimental to North Dakota does not get passed.

What kind of a program does Benson have? None that I can see. What are they doing about Canadian rye and oats? Not much, bragging about cutting imports of oats to 23 million bushels after the damage has been done. We could have used 10 million acres to grow the wheat, oats, barley, rye, and flax that have been imported the last year. How can I or the rest of the farmers support a $300-billion debt in the United States and Canada's economy as well, on $1 corn, $1.25 wheat, and $3 flax as Benson would like to see? Well I don't expect Congress or Secretary Benson to put out any constructive legislation, so I am going to act accordingly. If they want a depression, they have a good start, and I for one, have pledged myself to quit buying anything at all that I possibly can get along without. I have averaged buying $5,000 worth of farm machinery every year for the past 10 years. I shall get along with what I have. I am going to tighten up while I can, some others will do the same, a lot of others will have to. Republicans will lose control of Congress this next election. I have offered to wager $25 that they would but have found no takers as yet.

Well Senator LANGER, you asked for it, so I have tried to send you my views. I have lived in Hoover's time, and this administration sounds too much like his prosperity around the corner. I am not a Farmers' Union member but belong to the Farm Bureau, and surely not proud of Mr. Kline, the Farm Bureau's president.

With best wishes,

HAROLD A. WILLMERT.

SERGEANT DICKINSON—ACTION OF UNITED STATES ARMY—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written to me and signed by Mrs. R. S. Sandin, dated February 2, 1954, relating to Sergeant Dickinson.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDERWOOD, N. DAK.,
February 2, 1954.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a taxpaying, clear-thinking citizen of the United States, I am writing to protest vehemently the action being taken by the Army against Sergeant Dickinson.

Circumstances alter cases, as every intelligent person must know. Perhaps, and more than likely, in the position in which Sergeant Dickinson found himself, those who seem determined to make him suffer unreasonably could not be too sure just what they might do, and certainly not at 23 years of age. Life to us all is precious. Under stress of fear of losing it, any one of us, I am sure, could not definitely say what we might or might not be inclined to do—to what lengths we might go. Everyone makes mistakes. Granted, perhaps, this boy did. He has, nevertheless, realized his mistake, chose to return to his own country, and, I am certain, to return a loyal, no doubt repentant, citizen. Let's give him the chance he has coming.

If higher authority cannot be tolerant, understanding of and sympathetic with the youth of our country who were thrown into the midst of the hell of Korea and communism, what incentive is there for those youngsters who are stymied, mentally warped, in a Communist compound to come back to their own country? What security have they to which to look forward? Should they want or dare to return home?

No. The whole idea is wrong, and in so expressing my feeling on the subject I am voicing an opinion that is widespread in our community that this boy must be given a chance to live as a normal, loyal citizen, without the disgrace and suffering of a court-martial heaped on to an already tortured mind.

Should it be that I have written to the wrong party, Senator, will you please see that it is directed to the right place.

Respectfully,

Mrs. R. S. SANDIN.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committe on Banking and Currency:

S. 2845. A bill to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1037).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 3039. A bill to amend the grant provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 3040. A bill to provide financial assistance to the Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts, California, in the construction of the Tri-Dam project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 3041. A bill to exempt States and political subdivisions thereof from the tax on conveyances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRISWOLD:

S. 3042. A bill to provide for the acquisition by Reserve officers of a classified civil-service status; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 3043. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of Arizona or on the Navaho Indian Reservation in the State of New Mexico for religious, educational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GOLDWATER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 3044. A bill to provide adequate diets for the unemployed and their families in distress areas of unemployment; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3045. A bill for the relief of Margaret Isabel Byers;

S. 3046. A bill for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman;

S. 3047. A bill for the relief of Luzia Cox; and

S. 3048. A bill for the relief of Rosetta Ittner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3049. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish policies and programs for the use of acreage diverted from production by the establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. COOPER):

S. 3050. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 9 as Leif Erickson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF GRANT PROVISIONS OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the grant provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

The purpose of the bill is as follows:

First. To maintain the basic program of vocational rehabilitation in the States by allotting to each State which maintains its State appropriation Federal funds equal to 100 percent of the administration, guidance and placement expenditures, and 50 percent of the case-service expenditures for the base year 1953.

Second. To provide for the extension and improvement of the program by allotting additional Federal funds to the States on a population basis, with one State dollar required to earn one Federal dollar, without regard for categories of expenditures.

Third. To end the obligation of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to reimburse States for expenditures in excess of allotments.

Fourth. In States having two rehabilitation agencies, to provide for dividing funds between them in keeping with the ratio existing in the base year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3039) to amend the grant provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LEASE OF CERTAIN RESTRICTED INDIAN LANDS, ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of Arizona or on the Navaho Indian Reservation in the State of New Mexico for religious, educational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3043) to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of Arizona or on the Navaho Indian Reservation in the State of New Mexico for religious, educational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the Indians of Arizona and the Navajo Indians in New Mexico to make leases on their reservations.

At the present time, 19 million acres in the State of Arizona are occupied by Indian tribes. The reservations set aside for the Indians are in the process of being developed into areas of agricultural and mineral value. Under existing law, the tribes do not have the right to enter into leases. Therefore, I have introduced the bill which has for its purpose the correction of that situation.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO OAKDALE AND SOUTH SAN JOAQUIN IRRIGATION DISTRICTS, CALIFORNIA, IN CONSTRUCTION OF TRI-DAM PROJECT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for Federal support of what is to me a fine example of local initiative. It provides Federal assistance to permit the financing and construction of the Tri-Dam project on the Stanislaus River in California.

This is not Federal assistance in the usual sense. On the contrary the Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts, agencies of the State of California, at the cost of $1¼ million have completed the planning and engineering of the $50 million irrigation hydroelectric Tri-Dam project. These people, approximately 30,000 in all, have voted by an overwhelming majority to assume the repayment of this $50 million project needed for the enlargement of their irrigation water-storage facilities.

The proposed legislation would authorize a Federal loan to the districts of an amount equal to that portion of the cost of the project properly applicable to irrigation but not exceeding $10,370,000. This latter figure is for initial financing and because of first costs which prevent the immediate contemplated financing of the project through issuance of revenue bonds.

To me this is a fine opportunity to apply the announced policy of our administration which is the recognition of the common responsibility of the Federal, State and local Governments toward improvement of our Nation's resources.

Mr. President, in this instance there is not only local participation but the people of the districts have indicated a desire to assume the whole burden of the project. When the Federal loan is repaid as provided in the bill, there will be all of the benefits of a federally sponsored project without ultimate cost to the Federal Government. It is certainly within our national interest to encourage such self-help when it is intelligently pursued and relieves the Government of further concern.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3040) to provide financial assistance to the Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts, California, in the construction of the Tri-Dam project, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES UTILIZATION ACT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to implement the authority of existing law so as to provide the Secretary of Agriculture broader authority to utilize surplus agri-

cultural commodities to aid unemployed persons and their families.

The bill is modeled after the section 32 program which has worked so well and which will continue. The bill will augment the assistance to the unemployed and their families available under the section 32 program.

The bill recognizes the following basic facts:

First. The reduction and termination of certain national defense activities is creating unemployment in many communities, particularly mining and manufacturing areas.

Second. Other economic factors are also creating unemployment.

Third. Extensive unemployment imposes excessive burdens on State and local welfare agencies.

Fourth. Unemployment compensation payments are inadequate both from the standpoint of the amount of the payment and their duration.

Fifth. Relief of the distress and suffering of unemployed people and their families is a matter of deep concern to the Nation.

Sixth. Congress has established the principle of using surplus agricultural commodities to alleviate distress.

Seventh. The American people—including the unemployed and their families—own through the instrumentality of their National Government stocks of beef, butter, cheese, powdered milk, vegetable oils, peanuts, and other food commodities in excess of market requirements, and the Government from time to time acquires perishable commodities to alleviate surpluses.

Eighth. The disposal of such commodities to State and local welfare agencies for distribution to the unemployed and their families would not only be of great benefit in conserving and promoting the health of the recipients, but would also provide a means to prevent spoilage and would benefit the farmer by helping to stabilize prices of farm commodities by the removal of surpluses.

Ninth. There is in existence in the National Government an established system for determining the extent of unemployment in particular areas throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article from the Washington Evening Star of February 11, 1954, stating that the Department of Agriculture is donating Government-owned surplus foods to about two hundred thousand needy persons in West Virginia, Arkansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wyoming, Colorado and California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, these foods are being distributed under provisions that have been in the law for many years authorizing the utilization, for welfare and disaster purposes, of agriculture commodities purchased with section 32 funds. The officials of the Department of Agriculture charged with the administration of the section 32 program advise me that requests for surplus commodities for the relief of needy families have increased sharply in recent weeks. These officials point out that if the present rate of requests continues long or increases to any great extent, section 32 funds may soon be inadequate to meet such requests. They cite the limited amount of such funds and the limitations which the law imposes upon their use.

The President in his budget message advised that there will be in the section 32 fund in fiscal year 1955 a total of $421 million, derived from $241 million in carry-over funds, plus $180 million available from current tariff collections.

The President advised that anticipated expenditures will amount to $235 million. We know that this estimate necessarily had to be based largely on past experience, as it was impossible to foresee the extent of unemployment.

After deducting the anticipated expenditures, we see there will be left approximately $186 million in the section 32 fund, for use in meeting unanticipated needs of all the established programs, including the school-lunch program. These programs must be fully protected.

As I have stated, there are also limitations imposed by the law on the use of section 32 funds—limitations that restrict the types and quantities of commodities that may be purchased with section 32 funds either direct from producers or from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. For instance, the law provides that section 32 funds shall be devoted principally to perishable nonbasic commodities other than those commodities designated in title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949. The designated commodities in title II are those nonbasics that carry mandatory price supports. The designated foods are honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat.

Yet these designated nonbasics and the basics are the commodities that are in largest supply among the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

So we readily see that we may soon have our heads against the ceiling in respect to our ability to fulfill, from section 32 funds and commodities, the increasing number of requests for assistance arising from unemployment.

The purpose of our bill is to implement the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture so as to enable him to augment—with stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation—the amount of surplus food available to the unemployed, from section 32 sources.

I want to make it clear that the authority conferred upon the Secretary by our bill is additional authority and not authority in lieu of that conferred upon him by any provision of existing law and this is specifically spelled out in the bill. In other words, the bill fully protects established section 32 outlets, such as the school-lunch program, and insures that no funds or commodities needed by such established programs shall be diverted from such programs.

Existing law authorizes the disposal of Commodity Credit Corporation owned stocks for welfare purposes if deemed by the Secretary as necessary to prevent spoilage. But no provision is made for the use of funds to reduce the large, bulky storage-size packages and quantities to a size suitable for distribution. Nor does the law provide authority for the use of funds for distribution in the manner provided in the case of section 32 acquired commodities.

Our bill will provide the Secretary of Agriculture this additional authority, including the authority to use section 32 funds for repackaging and distribution to the extent that such funds are in excess of the needs of previously established outlets for section 32 acquired commodities.

Mr. President, the persistent rise in unemployment in the Nation is a source of deep concern. While we have continued to look hopefully for a downward shift in the present trend of unemployment, Government agencies report a further sharp rise.

The Government figures on unemployment, covering substantially the same period, vary. The most conservative figure covering the period from the first week in December to the first week in January was published early this month by the Bureau of the Census. The Census Bureau reported the number of unemployed at 2,359,000—an increase of 893,000 in 1 month. On the other hand, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor reported the number of unemployed increased by 2 million between mid-December and mid-January.

Recently the Department of Commerce, using a different system of measurement, reported total employment in January at 59.8 million, with 3,087,000 unemployed. This is some 728,000 more unemployed than previously reported by the Department of Commerce for the same period.

Included in the figure of 59.8 million employed are 6.9 million workers employed from 15 to 34 hours a week and another 2.1 million workers that were estimated to work only from 1 to 14 hours a week; and, of course, the figures on the number of unemployed represent only the number of breadwinners that are out of jobs and do not take into account the number of people in their families that are dependent on these breadwinners.

The figures added together do not, of course, constitute any great percentage of our total population. But if we are to give the unemployment figure its true meaning, we have to break it down and see how it is spread among different areas of the country having the highest concentration of jobless persons. This is best accomplished by reference to the bimonthly reports of the Bureau of Employment Security that are based on measurements of the extent of unemployment in areas covered by the surveys conducted by the Bureau.

The January reports of the Bureau show many cities and areas in the Nation where at least 6 percent of the total labor force is out of work. There are many other areas where the extent of unemployment approaches this figure. There are still other areas in the Nation that have not been surveyed.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the Bureau's explanation of its four employment survey classifications, and a list compiled by the Bureau showing the cities and areas included in each category as of January.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. I ask to have included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks articles from the Washington Evening Star of February 9 and the Washington Post of February 10 relating the fact that Detroit, Mich., has, since the publication of the January report, been shifted from the classification described as moderate unemployment to substantial unemployment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. I also ask to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks another article from the Washington Evening Star of February 10, headed Southern Economy Burdened by Jobless Back From North.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. I have just referred to the shift of Detroit into the most critical unemployment classification. I am informed that Toledo, Ohio, has experienced a similar shift and that the commissioners of the city of Los Angeles, Calif., have recently requested that their city be shifted from the classification moderate unemployment to substantial unemployment.

I ask to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an article from the Washington Post of February 25 stating that the Government has added six more areas to its critical unemployment list. The areas are, according to the article, Battle Creek, Mich.; South Bend, Ind.; and the Quad-Cities area of Illinois and Iowa. The cities generally referred to as the Quad Cities are Moline, East Moline, and Rock Island, Ill., and Davenport, Iowa. They make up what is commonly called the Detroit of the farm machinery industry. Also listed in the article are three smaller areas: Hudson, N. Y.; Welch, W. Va., and La Crosse, Wis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to point out that in my own State of Alabama, Gadsden and Jasper are in the most critical unemployment classification. Jasper is in the coal mining region of Walker County. Other areas are in the classification of moderate unemployment. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] who is a sponsor of this bill, well knows that in his State, Corbin, Hazard, Madisonville, the Middlesboro-Harlan area, the Paintsville-Prestonsburg area and Pikeville are all in the most critical unemployment classification. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] who is also a sponsor of this bill, is fully aware of the fact that the Texarkana area in his State is in the most critical unemployment classification. Other areas in both Kentucky and Arkansas are in the classification of moderate unemployment.

The reports of the Bureau of Employment Security, to which I have just alluded, and its findings that I have just incorporated into the RECORD, show conclusively that contrary to many predictions of improved conditions, job opportunities have steadily diminished. Unemployment is creating excessive burdens on many State and local welfare agencies.

Let me emphasize the care with which this bill has been drawn. We have geared the assistance to be provided by the bill to the classifications established and reviewed every 2 months by the Bureau of Employment Security for the precise purpose of insuring that the foods distributed under the bill go only to areas found by the Bureau to be distress areas. This means that relief under this bill will stop automatically for any area at such time as the Bureau finds that such area is no longer a distress area.

The wisdom of this provision is that the foods shall go only to those areas in greatest need and thereby cause a minimum impact upon regular food channels. We believe that merchants in our distressed areas would welcome aid to their friends and neighbors who have for so long been their customers but are now unable to properly feed their families because they are unemployed.

Our aim being, as I have stated, to channel surplus foods into areas of greatest need, it seems desirable from the standpoint of uniformity of action to provide that aid to the unemployed under the section 32 program be likewise geared to the distressed area classifications of the Bureau of Employment Security.

We have taken pains to insure that no other welfare needs being served by the section 32 program are in anywise altered. In other words, the bill does not disturb or limit in any way the channeling of section 32 commodities to State and other public institutions, such as mental hospital or to State welfare agencies serving the aged, the sick and disabled, the blind and dependent children, and disaster victims, or private charity organizations such as Red Cross, the Salvation Army, Community Chest, and similar organizations performing the same type of service.

The only change relates to instances where assistance goes primarily to the unemployed who are members of the labor force and their families. In such instances, the section 32 assistance, like the assistance provided from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, will be geared to the distress area classifications of the Bureau of Employment Security.

Furthermore, the bill provides that in areas where assistance is already being furnished to the unemployed with section 32 commodities, such assistance may be continued. In other words, any area that is receiving aid under the section 32 program on the date of enactment of this bill may continue to receive it. I wish to emphasize once again that the bill makes no change in nor does it alter in anywise whatever the school-lunch program.

Unemployment, particularly in certain localities, is as we have seen increasing at a rapid rate. The harvest season in Florida and in similar climates is already here for some agricultural products and is rapidly approaching in other. This bill offers the means for matching food surpluses with the food requirements of the unemployed and their families. Now is the time for action. I urge the Senate to promptly consider and pass this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks on the bill, a report from the unemployment bureau as to the number of unemployed, and a classification of areas of distress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The bill (S. 3044) to provide adequate diets for the unemployed and their families in distress areas of unemployment, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. CLEMENTS, and Mr. FULBRIGHT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Agricultural Commodities Utilization Act."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "State" means the several States and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Governor," in the case of the District of Columbia, means the Board of Commissioners.

(c) The term "welfare agency" includes only an agency of a State or of a political subdivision of a State.

(d) The term "distress area" means an area classified by the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor as an area of substantial unemployment.

CERTIFICATION OF DISTRESS AREAS

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Labor is authorized and directed to make continuing studies of unemployment in the United States and to certify to the Secretary of Agriculture at least bimonthly these cities or areas which he determines as a result of such studies to be distress areas.

PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 4. Upon receipt of certification by the Secretary of Labor that a city or other area is a distress area, the Secretary of Agriculture shall notify the Governor of the State within which the area is located that such area is eligible for assistance under this act, and shall make a public announcement of such eligibility. Upon receipt of a request from the Governor of such State for assistance under this act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make available to such State and local welfare agencies as may be designated by such Governor, such amounts of Government-owned surplus agricultural commodities (a) as may be necessary to provide adequate diets (or to supplement existing diets to the extent necessary to provide adequate diets) for unemployed persons and their families found by such State or local agency to be in need of such assistance, and (b) as may be available for such purposes.

COMMODITIES AVAILABLE FOR ASSISTANCE

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to use for the purposes of this act (a) any agricultural commodities acquired through the use of funds made available under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (Public Law 320, 74th Cong.), to the extent that such commodities are in

excess of the needs of previously established outlets therefor, and (b) any agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price support operations.

DELIVERY OF COMMODITIES

SEC. 6. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide for the preparation for delivery and the delivery of commodities under this act to State and local welfare agencies, or to any agent designated by such welfare agency for such purpose, and to pay the expenses of transportation of such commodities to the point of delivery, but none of the costs of further transportation or local distribution of such commodities shall be paid by the United States.

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture shall terminate the delivery of commodities under this act to any area whenever—

(a) The Secretary of Labor determines and certifies to the Secretary of Agriculture that such area is no longer a distress area; or

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture finds that such commodities are not being used for the purposes for which they have been made available under this act.

COOPERATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to consult with State and local welfare agencies, and to enter into such agreements with such agencies as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 9. Sums made available to the Secretary of Agriculture under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (Public Law 320, 74th Cong.), which are not needed for other authorized purposes, may be used by the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this act, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be necessary for such purposes. Any such sums may be used for making payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation to reimburse the Corporation for its investment in commodities used by the Secretary for the purposes of this act and for any expenses incurred by it in making such commodities available for such purposes.

SEC. 10. The authority conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture by this act shall be in addition to and not in lieu of the authority conferred upon the Secretary by any other law; except that no agricultural commodities purchased with funds made available to the Secretary under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (Public Law 320, 74th Cong.), shall be used for the purpose of providing assistance primarily to unemployed members of the labor force and their families, except to the extent authorized, and in the manner provided by this act. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the continued use of such funds in any area in which they are being used for such purpose on the date of enactment of this act.

The matters which, on request of Mr. HILL, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, are as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 11, 1954]

UNITED STATES FEEDING 200,000 NEEDY IN 11 STATES

Officials said yesterday the Agriculture Department is donating Government-owned surplus foods to about 200,000 needy persons in 11 States.

Most of those receiving food are said to be rural families, who suffered heavily from drought and crop failures last year, and coal miners who long have been out of work.

States in which the food is being distributed include West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Arkansas, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wyoming, Colorado, and California.

Officials said that while surplus foods have been available for distribution to needy families for many years, the demand has been very small in recent years until the last few weeks.

The foods being donated include butter, cheese, dried milk, and in some areas canned beef.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 9, 1954]

DETROIT IS CALLED DISTRESS AREA—WILL GET CONTRACT PRIORITY

Detroit, the Nation's automotive capital, has been declared a distressed area with "substantial" unemployment. This entitles it to preference in obtaining Government contracts.

The Labor Department announced last night it has added the city to a list of 20 other major cities and 31 smaller communities with more than 6 percent of their labor forces out of work.

The department's Bureau of Employment Security acted on the basis of a special study by the Michigan Employment Security Commission which reported 107,000 jobless in the Detroit area in mid-January. This is 7.1 percent of the civilian labor force there.

FIFTEEN THOUSAND CUT IN 30 DAYS

The Michigan commission reported that 15,000 automotive workers had been released in the past 30 days.

Walter Reuther, CIO and United Auto Workers president, had asked for the survey after Detroit was left off the Labor Departments most recent list of distressed areas, although it reported unemployment at 6.2 percent.

Commissioner Robert C. Goodwin of the Bureau of Employment Security explained to a congressional committee last Friday that the group IV—distressed area—rating was withheld from Detroit because many workers there were laid off temporarily with instructions to report for work within 30 days.

GET CONTRACT PRIORITY

Group IV listing entitles Detroit companies to special consideration in award of Government contracts. In the event of a tie bid, a company in a distressed area automatically gets preference over a company in a nondistressed area.

The Michigan study predicted an upturn in Detroit employment by mid-May in line with anticipated increased auto sales.

[From the Washington Post of February 10, 1954]

WILSON CALM OVER DETROIT IDLENESS TOTAL

Secretary of Defense Wilson said yesterday that "I wouldn't worry about Detroit."

Commenting at a news conference on Monday night's announcement that the auto capital has been designated as a distressed-labor area, the former General Motors president added:

"Come spring, it's going to be all right."

The announcement from the Labor Department added Detroit to a list of 20 other major cities and 31 smaller communities with more than 6 percent of their labor forces out of work.

Wilson, commenting generally on the situation, said the Detroit area is well able to look after itself in any period of temporary labor surplus.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported, meanwhile, there was a decline of 2 million workers on the payrolls of industry, transportation, Government, and trade between mid-December and mid-January.

The nonfarm total of employment last month—47,700,000—was the largest ever reported for the month except in 1953 BLS said. It was 646,000 smaller than a year ago because of factory layoffs; in nonmanufacturing industries, January employment was the highest on record.

Factory payrolls dropped by 380,000 between mid-December and mid-January, BLS said. This drop, appreciably larger than usual, was described as the sharpest reduction for the season since the recession year 1949.

STUDEBAKER NIGHT SHIFT ENDED; 2,500 LAID OFF

SOUTH BEND, IND., February 9.—The Studebaker Corp. discontinued its night shift today and laid off more than 2,500 employees.

P. O. Peterson, executive vice president in charge of manufacturing, announced production will be consolidated into a single day shift and the work staff cut to about 12,000.

This is slightly more than half of the peak employment of 23,000 workers in 1953.

Elimination of the night shift meant that day-shift workers who have been on a 32-hour week will go back on a 40-hour week.

AID STATIONS SET UP FOR ARKANSAS JOBLESS

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., February 9.—State and Federal agencies moved today to help an estimated 4,000 to 5,000 hungry, ill-clad persons suffering from seasonal unemployment and last summer's drought in northeast Arkansas.

State Welfare Commissioner A. J. Moss said offices were opened at Lepanto and Marked Tree this morning as the first step toward providing food and other aid for the needy families in Poinsett and Mississippi Counties.

Other offices will be opened at Harrisburg, Trumann, and Tyronza, he said.

The Production and Marketing Administration's surplus commodities division at Dallas and the State Commodity Distribution Office were planning to provide food.

[From the Washington Post of February 25, 1954]

SIX MORE AREAS PUT ON CRITICAL JOBLESS LIST

(By Maureen Gothlin)

The Government had added 6 more areas to its critical unemployment list, bringing to 59 the number eligible for special Federal help in trying to create jobs.

The new areas include three major industrial centers—Battle Creek, Mich, South Bend, Ind., and the quad-cities areas of Iowa and Illinois. Also listed were three smaller regions, Hudson, N. Y., Welch, W. Va., and La Crosse, Wis.

The Labor Department blamed the increase in unemployment on layoffs in the auto industry, farm machinery, coal, textile, general durable-goods manufacturing, transportation, and trade.

An area is listed as having substantial unemployment when 6 percent or more of its labor force is jobless, with no immediate prospect of increased work. In such areas firms may bid on certain Government contracts set aside to relieve unemployment in distressed cities.

Meantime, Government officials said there is a good chance employment will pick up next month. To bolster their optimism, they have Census Bureau statistics showing that employment has risen in March in 12 of the past 13 years.

Since the unemployment census started in 1941, the number of jobless has increased in March only once. That was the immediate postwar year of 1946. Even during the 1949 recession, employment rose by 480,000 in March.

Mr. Eisenhower conferred with AFL President George Meany, who has expressed concern about rising unemployment. The Chief

Executive also met with State labor officials and union representatives attending a labor conference here.

[From the Washington Star of February 10, 1954]

SOUTHERN ECONOMY BURDENED BY JOBLESS BACK FROM NORTH

MEMPHIS, TENN., February 10.—There are signs that the South's economic stream is being complicated by an undercurrent of drift-back job seekers.

These unemployed are southerners, most of them laborers and former farmworkers, who went North during the 1940's, lured by high wages.

During the last few months, a lot of them, in the wake of northern industrial layoffs and other reasons, are coming home.

Any sizable drift back would add to pressure already felt in the Cotton Belt, coming on top of cotton-acreage cutbacks, mechanization, and day cropping.

EIGHT THOUSAND NEAR HUNGER

Some farm leaders believe the homing workers are the underlying cause of the situation in upper east Arkansas and part of the Missour bootheel, where about 8,000 are reported on the edge of hunger.

"I think the biggest trouble is that a lot of people who went up North are coming back," Hilton Bracey, manager of the Missouri Cotton Producers' Association, said today.

"And a lot of people who usually move on somewhere else stuck around. There are lots of factors. Drought, maybe, but it's hard to put a finger on it."

APRIL WILL TELL

There won't be any clear picture until about April, when planting is under way and seasonal layoffs in industry usually end.

For unemployed farmworkers, another factor is the cotton-acreage cutback imposed by law because of the cotton surplus.

Reduced cotton acreage has put an undetermined number of tenant farm families on the road. There isn't enough cotton land to go around. Some farm owners have turned to day cropping.

Under this method, the farmer hires workers by the day when he needs them. Under the old sharecropping system, the worker remained on the farm. If he ran out of money in midwinter, the planter would advance credit on the next crop.

UNEMPLOYMENT CLAIMS

Louisiana and South Carolina reported a normal seasonal increase in interstate claims. Arkansas noted an increase, but "not too great a trend."

Sharp increases in such claims were counted, however, by Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and North Carolina.

In Tennessee about 8,000 interstate claims are on file, double last year's total.

Alabama: Interstate claims up to 2,839 for January, 100 percent over the previous 4-month period.

Georgia: A steady increase of claims over the past 5 months, ranging from 770 in September to 1,873 in January.

Florida: January claims 4,865, about 1,000 more than for the same period in 1953.

North Carolina: 2,745 new interstate claims in January, a 91.4-percent increase over 1953.

EXPLANATION OF CLASSIFICATION CODES

Group I—Areas of labor shortage: Areas in which labor shortages exist or are expected to occur in the near future which will impede "essential activities."

Group II—Areas of balanced labor supply: Areas in which current and prospective labor demand and supply are approximately in balance.

Group III—Areas of moderate labor surplus: Areas in which current and prospective labor supply moderately exceeds labor requirements.

Group IV—Areas of substantial labor surplus: Areas in which current and prospective labor supply substantially exceeds labor requirements.

ADMINISTRATIVE REGIONS OF THE BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Region I: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Rhode Island.

Region II: New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico.

Region III: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia.

Region IV: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee.

Region V: Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio.

Region VI: Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Wisconsin.

Region VII: Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Region VIII: Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas.

Region IX: Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming.

Region X: Arizona, California, Nevada, Hawaii.

Region XI: Idaho, Oregon, Washington, Alaska.

CLASSIFICATION OF LABOR MARKET AREAS ACCORDING TO RELATIVE ADEQUACY OF LABOR SUPPLY, JANUARY 1954

Region I

Group I: Hartford, Conn.

Group II: Bridgeport, Conn.; New Britain, Conn.; New Haven, Conn.; Stamford-Norwalk, Conn.; Waterbury, Conn.

Group III: Portland, Maine; Boston, Mass.; Brockton, Mass.; Fall River, Mass.; Springfield-Holyoke, Mass.; Worcester, Mass.; Manchester, N. H.

Group IV: Lawrence, Mass.; Lowell, Mass.; New Bedford, Mass.; [1] Webster, Mass.; [2] Providence, R. I.

Region II

Group I: None.

Group II: Buffalo, N. Y.; Rochester, N. Y.; Syracuse, N. Y.

Group III: Newark, N. J.; Paterson, N. J.; Perth Amboy, N. J.; Trenton, N. J.; Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N. Y.; Binghamton, N. Y.; New York, N. Y.; Utica-Rome, N. Y.

Group IV: Atlantic City, N. J.; Gloversville, N. Y.;[2] Mayaguez, P. R.; Ponce, P. R.; San Juan, P. R.

Region III

Group I: None.

Group II: Baltimore, Md.; Charlotte, N. C.; Allentown-Bethlehem, Pa.; Harrisburg, Pa.; Lancaster, Pa.; York, Pa.; Hampton-Newport News-Warwick, Va.; Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.; Richmond, Va.

Group III: Wilmington, Del.; Washington, D. C.; Greensboro-High Point, N. C.; Erie, Pa.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Reading, Pa.; Roanoke, Va.; Charleston, W. Va.; Huntington, W. Va.-Ashland, Ky.; Wheeling, W. Va.-Steubenville, Ohio.

Group IV

Cumberland, Md.; [2] Asheville, N. C.; Durham, N. C.; Winston-Salem, N. C.; Altoona, Pa.; Clearfield-DuBois, Pa.;[2] Indiana, Pa.;[2] Johnstown, Pa.; Pottsville, Pa.;[2] Scranton, Pa.; Sundbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel, Pa.;[2] Uniontown-Connellsville, Pa.;[2] Wilkes-Barre-Hazelton, Pa.; Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Va.;[2] Covington-Clifton Forge, Va.;[2] Beckley, W. Va.;[2] Fairmount, W. Va.;[2] Morgantown, W. Va.;[2] Parkersburg, W. Va.;[2] Point Pleasant, W. Va.;[2] Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.[2]

Region IV

Group I: None.

Group II: Jacksonville, Fla.; Miami, Fla.; Atlanta, Ga.; Macon, Ga.; Aiken, S. C.-Augusta, Ga.

Group III: Birmingham, Ala.; Mobile, Ala.; Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.; Columbus, Ga.; Savannah, Ga.; Jackson, Miss.; Charleston, S. C.; Greenville, S. C.; Chattanoogo, Tenn.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Memphis, Tenn.; Nashville, Tenn.

Group IV: Gadsden, Ala.;[1 2] Jasper, Ala.;[2] Cedartown-Rockmart, Ga.;[2] La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell, Tenn.;[2] Newport, Tenn.[2]

Region V

Group I: None.

Group II: Flint, Mich.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Kalamazoo, Mich.; Lansing, Mich.; Saginaw, Mich.; Akron, Ohio; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Columbus, Ohio; Dayton, Ohio; Hamilton-Middletown, Ohio; Loraine-Elyria, Ohio; Youngstown, Ohio.

Group III: Louisville, Ky.; Battle Creek, Mich; Detroit, Mich.; Canton, Ohio; Toledo, Ohio.

Group IV: Muskegon, Mich.;[1] Corbin, Ky.;[2] Hazard, Ky.;[2] Madisonville, Ky.;[2] Middlesboro-Harlan, Ky.;[2] Paintsville-Prestonsburg, Ky.;[2] Pikeville, Ky.;[2] Ionia-Belding-Greenville, Mich.[2]

Region VI

Group I: None.

Group II: Aurora, Ill.; Chicago, Ill.; Rockford, Ill.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Madison, Wis.

Group III: Davenport, Iowa-Rock Island-Moline, Ill.; Joliet, Ill.; Peoria, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; South Bend, Ind.; Duluth, Minn.,-Superior, Wis.; Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Racine, Wis.

Group IV: Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort, Ill.;[2] Terre Haute, Ind.; Vincennes, Ind.;[2] Kenosha, Wis.[1]

Region VII

Group I: None.

Group II: Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Des Moines, Iowa; Wichita, Kans.; Omaha, Nebr.

Group III: Kansas City, Mo.; St. Louis, Mo.

Group IV: None.

Region VIII

Group I: None.

Group II: Tulsa, Okla.; Dallas, Tex.; Houston, Tex.

Group III: Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ark.; Baton Rouge, La.; New Orleans, La.; Shreveport, La.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Austin, Tex.; Beaumont-Port Arthur, Tex.; Corpus Christi, Tex.; El Paso, Tex.; Fort Worth, Tex.; San Antonio, Tex.

Group IV: Texarkana, Tex.-Ark.[1 2]

Region IX

Group I: None.

Group II: Denver, Colo.

---

[1] Areas in the Group IV column marked with an asterisk do not meet the criteria for classification as chronic labor surplus areas in which certified defense facilities may receive additional tax amortization consideration.

[2] Smaller areas covered because of substantial labor surpluses. These areas are not part of the regular major area reporting program of the Bureau of Employment Security and its affiliated State employment security agencies.

[1] Areas in the Group IV column marked with an asterisk do not meet the criteria for classification as chronic labor surplus areas in which certified defense facilities may receive additional tax amortization consideration.

[2] Smaller areas covered because of substantial labor surpluses. These areas are not part of the regular major area reporting program of the Bureau of Employment Security and its affiliated State employment security agencies.

Group III: Salt Lake City, Utah.
Group IV: Albuquerque, N. Mex.[1]

Region X

Group I: None.
Group II: San Diego, Calif.
Group III: Phoenix, Ariz.; Fresno, Calif.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Sacramento, Calif.; San Bernardino-Riverside, Calif.; San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.; San Jose, Calif.; Stockton, Calif.; Honolulu, T. H.
Group IV: None.

Region XI

Group I: None.
Group II: None.
Group III: Portland, Oreg.; Seattle, Wash.; Spokane, Wash.
Group IV: Tacoma, Wash.[1]

ESTABLISHMENT OF ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish policies and programs for the use of acreage diverted from production by the establishment of acreage allotments. I ask unanimous consent that the bill together with a statement by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3049) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish policies and programs for the use of acreage diverted from production by the establishment of acreage allotments, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Congress hereby finds and declares that the disruption of the orderly planting of farm commodities due to the use of acreage allotments made necessary by wartime production and the failure of American farm production to move in world trade impairs the purchasing power of farmers and that these conditions affect the planting of other crops not under acreage allotment, will tend to increase the surplus of nonbasic commodities, and will not increase soil fertility, and whereas we have exhausted about 40 percent of our fertile soil and with a greatly increasing need for the restoration of our soils if generations to come are to enjoy our present high standard of living.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish a program for the use of acres taken out of production because of the declaration of acreage allotments.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture shall provide, through agreements with producers or by other voluntary methods, that acreage of commodities subject to acreage allotments in order to be eligible for this program must be taken out of production of any crop sold in normal channels of trade or used in the production of any product sold in normal channels of trade. Diverted acres are to be used solely for soil-conserving purposes. Practices to be used in carrying on this program are to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, taking into consideration soil-conserving practices normally used in each farming area of the country. Such acreage shall also be eligible for benefit payments under any soil-conservation program now in effect or to be put into effect by the Congress.

SEC. 3. Rental or benefit payments in connection with such agreements or other methods shall be determined by taking not less than 25 percent of the average county per-acre yield of the commodity subject to acreage allotments and multiplying by the support price of said commodity to arrive at the per-acre rental or benefit payment. Payment shall be made as far as practicable on contiguous tracts in order to encourage soil-conservation practices, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to make payments not in excess of 10 percent of the acreage that would be diverted because of the establishment of acreage allotments.

SEC. 4. No payment shall be made to any cooperator in such program for less than $25 nor more than $2,500.

The statement by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

One of agriculture's most pressing problems is what to do about acres diverted from production of crops in oversupply.

We can ease that problem by providing the proper incentive for diverting such acres into conservation farming building up our soil to meet future needs.

During an address before the 16th annual banquet of the Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul last December, I outlined some of the constructive steps I felt needed to be taken for American agriculture.

Among my suggestions was this comment: "We need adequate incentive premiums to convert 'diverted acres' under production restrictions to soil building conservation practices, rather than to other competing and soil depleting crops."

That is just what my bill proposes to provide.

This is a constructive move supported by all of the great farm organizations, and called for by President Eisenhower in his messages to this Congress.

Resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation at its convention in Chicago the same date I was speaking about "diverted acres" in St. Paul, call for stockpiling fertility in the soil, building a "soil fertility bank" as a reserve for use in national emergencies.

My bill would encourage such conservation of our resources, at a time when we are troubled with production not beyond human need but beyond current effective demand at prices reasonable to the producer.

Without a positive program of wise land use, the diverted acres taken out of production because of the declaration of acreage allotments will only tend to increase the surplus of nonbasic commodities and help defeat the very purpose of acreage allotments.

We spend millions every year to mothball our naval and merchant marine vessels. Isn't an even better investment in our future standard of living and defense to "mothball" our diverted acres, not merely preserving them as we do ships but actually improving them while they are "resting" in reserve?

Under this bill, benefit payments per acre would be determined by taking 25 percent of the average county yield per acre of the commodity under acreage controls and multiplying it by the support price of the commodity.

We have already exhausted 40 percent of our fertile soil, and only a concentrated program of restoration will assure us of the food our rapidly growing population will need in the future.

Now, when acres must be diverted from production of some of the cash crops without upsetting the farmers' purchasing power, which must be maintained for the good of all, seems the logical time to move forward on our conservation efforts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Minneapolis Star, long one of the Midwest's most active champions of conservation, has called for such an approach as my bill provides. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Star on Tuesday, February 23, entitled "Soil Banks for Idle Acres," be published in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL BANKS FOR IDLE ACRES

Troubling many farmers and officials is the question of what to do with land taken out of production when acreage restrictions on basic crops go into effect. The surplus problem won't be solved if a man cuts down on his wheat acreage only to increase his barley planting.

In a letter to the Star, Lester M. Anderson, of Litchfield, Minn., accuses us of propagandizing against the farmer in the name of the consumer. He says farmers are quite willing to accept crop controls. For the acres thus released he suggests a Government payment to cover rent and the seed to put the land into soil-building grass.

The Star is very much interested in maintaining farm income because this whole region is largely dependent on farm prosperity for general prosperity. What we have warned against are high support prices which build up surpluses and threaten a revolt against the whole support idea. We think Government supports should be insurance against drastic drops in income, but that farmers should produce for the market, not for Government storehouses.

As for soil-building payments, we think they offer a way out of the idle acre problem. Government officials are talking about soil banks, by which they mean storehouses for fertility. Bills are already before Congress to implement the plan.

Under the old PMA, so-called conservation payments were made—and to some extent still are being made—to farmers for practices which have little relationship to soil conservation. But if a program is evolved which actually encourages the building up of the soil, all Americans should support it. A nation which is growing by 3 million population a year will some day need all the good earth that can be found.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, by increasing the penalty rate on tobacco marketed in excess of acreage allotments from 40 percent of the previous year's average price to 50 percent of the previous year's average price.

The basic strength of the tobacco program, and, in great part, the great success of the program can be traced directly to the acceptance by the growers of the need to revise the program from time to time to meet changing economic conditions. The approval of changes made from time to time can easily be demonstrated by the fact that since 1939, marketing quotas and acreage allotments have been approved by the growers in referenda held every third year. The last overall vote resulted in 96

[1] Areas in the Group IV column marked with an asterisk do not meet the criteria for classification as chronic labor surplus areas in which certified defense facilities may receive additional tax amortization consideration.

percent of the growers favoring quotas in the Burley, flue-cured, and dark tobacco areas, representing over 98 percent of all the tobacco grown in the United States.

The measure introduced today meets with the approval of the great majority of the growers, and represents, in their judgment, a sound approach in discouraging the production of excess tobacco, the continuation of which, if not checked, could constitute a threat to the future of the program. The bill has the endorsement of the organized growers association, the Kentucky Farm Bureau, and other interested and allied organizations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3050) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. COOPER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LEIF ERICKSON DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to proclaim October 9 as Leif Erickson Day.

People of Scandinavian descent all over the United States are proud of the fact that they played a part in the early discovery of America when the distinguished Scandinavian explorer, Leif Erickson, became the first European to set foot on the soil of North America.

It is fully appropriate the United States Government recognize that the link between Scandinavia and the United States should be duly commemorated by the proclamation of Leif Erickson Day. I urge favorable consideration for my resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) requesting the President to proclaim October 9, as Leif Erickson Day, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FILLING OF VACANCIES ON FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution. It refers to the Federal Reserve Board and the operations of the Federal Reserve Board, particularly the Open Market Committee. I make note of the fact that there have been vacancies on the Federal Reserve Board since October 30, 1952.

I also note that the law of the Congress establishing the Federal Reserve Board calls upon the Executive, the President, to fill such vacancies so that the Board may be thoroughly representative of not only the economic functions of America, but also the geographical areas of our country.

I further make note of the fact that the resolution pertains to the operations of the Open Market Committee and its relationship to the members of the Federal Reserve Board.

I suggest that the resolution be carefully studied. It seems to me that one of the most important areas of study and interest today is the matter of fiscal and credit policy.

I also make note of the fact that the Federal Reserve Board at the present time and for a period of more than a year and a half has been without its full membership; and I consider such a condition to be the result of a lack of fulfilling the requirements of the Congress of the United States.

The resolution (S. Res. 216), submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Whereas Congress has, by legislation long debated and duly enacted, created a Federal Reserve Board to consist of seven members to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, said Board to operate as an agency independent within the Government, not subject to control of any other department of Government except the Congress, but specifically provided that said Board should report to and be under the direct supervision of the Congress; and

Whereas the Congress has given said Board broad discretionary powers in the conduct of its affairs and in its supervision of the Federal Reserve System, the regional Federal Reserve banks and their respective branches and the Federal Open Market Committee; and

Whereas the Congress has also created by legislation the Federal Open Market Committee as an integral part of the Federal Reserve System, giving this committee also wide discretion in the conduct of its affairs, and the Congress provided that said committee should consist of the 7 members of the Federal Reserve Board plus 5 presidents of 5 separate Federal Reserve banks, said 5 to alternate from year to year between the 12 Federal Reserve bank presidents; and

Whereas the Congress, when it determined that the number of members of the Federal Board should be seven, did not reach that decision by chance or caprice or by compromise, but only after long and serious and objective and nonpartisan consideration and debates; and

Whereas the legislative history shows that the number seven was finally determined as being the minimum number in the opinion of the Congress which would achieve fair geographical and functional representation on this powerful Board for all sectors of our economy and all sections of our vast country; and

Whereas Congress in the creation of the Federal Open Market Committee was careful to limit to five the number of Federal Reserve bank presidents who would be members of said committee in order to insure a working majority at all times of Federal Reserve Board members, who are Presidential appointees confirmed by the Senate, as against the five members composed of Federal Reserve bank presidents, who are elected to their bank positions by the boards of directors of the respective Federal Reserve banks, two-thirds of the membership of which boards consists of commercial bankers or their representatives; and

Whereas there are now and have been vacancies on said Federal Reserve Board, one since June 30, 1952 (for more than 1 year), and another since January 31, 1954, thereby causing an upset in the balance of power in the Federal Open Market Committee, contrary to the intention of the Congress; and, further such vacancies deny equitable representation on the Federal Reserve Board itself of the various geographical sections of our Nation and the multiplicity of economic elements thereof; and

Whereas the law specifically provides that the Board shall consist of seven members, that when a Board member's term expires he shall serve until his successor is appointed and qualified, and that the President shall appoint to fill vacancies occurring in the Board, such provisions indicating clearly that it was the intent of the Congress that there be constantly seven members on the Board; and

Whereas by the use of the word "shall" instead of the word "may," it was clearly indicated that the Congress intended it to be obligatory upon the President to maintain at all times the membership of said Federal Reserve Board at the statutory required number of seven members; and

Whereas the said Federal Reserve Board is particularly an instrument of this Congress, answerable only to the Congress, and is the only instrument of the Congress through which it may discharge its responsibility for the conduct of the monetary and credit policies of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to select immediately proper and qualified citizens to fill these vacancies on the Federal Reserve Board and submit the names of such citizens to the Senate for confirmation as provided by law, in order to correct the present unfair and unsound predominant influence of private bankers in the Federal Open Market Committee and, further, to remedy the lack of proper balance in geographical and economic representation on said Federal Reserve Board, and thereby, by such appointments to restore said Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to its intended number and necessary form as an instrument so important to the Congress in the exercise of its responsibilities in monetary and credit matters.

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—THE TRUCE OF THE BEAR

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a patriotic, timely, and inspiring address entitled "The Truce of the Bear." Its author is the renowned Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris. Every morning he prays that Senators will be provided wings to flee from hell, and every night that stars will guide their feet to heaven.

On a certain occasion the Master uttered these words:

Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist.

So said Jesus of John, so say I of the beloved Dr. Harris.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—THE TRUCE OF THE BEAR

(By Frederick Brown Harris, minister, Foundry Methodist Church; Chaplain, United States Senate)

The hideous face of atheistic world communism at long last is unveiled for all who have eyes to see. It is the most monstrous mass of organized evil that history has known. It is the sum of all villainies. The idealistic mask which, from the genesis of this deceptive revolution, covered its cruel sadistic countenance now has been torn to shreds by heartless policies and designs which crucify all decent impulses. Often in earlier days that utopian false face has deceived high-minded, gullible liberals.

The closest counterpart to this ghastly system in the animal world is the octopus, whose reaching tentacles drag the victim to a horrible death. To avoid detection, the devilfish inks the sea about it. So this satanic system blacks out visibility.

The explanation of the isolating curtain is succinctly suggested in the New Testament, whose inexorable insights the Soviet blaspheme: "Men love darkness better than light, because their deeds are evil." The incarnate iniquity which today faces freemen at ever so-called conference has forfeited all claim for respect and credence. To gain its ends it openly accepts as part of its technique the twisted methods laid down by its prophet Lenin: "It is necessary to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful methods, even concealment of the truth." Its dealing with those brought within its fell clutch at home or in subjugated countries is a shuddering recital of torture, slave labor, blackmail, and liquidation.

Even to this day prisoners of World War II, by the thousands, far from home, are scourged like galley slaves under inhuman conditions to help build the strength of a system they loathe. For the accomplishment of set goals a coterie of gangsters who seized power have murdered millions. The ruthless regime is lower in its practice than primitive, cannibalistic tribes. Even they will not turn on their own. The Soviet savagely and treacherously mark their highest chieftains for death and call it a purge. Any means is used to break resistance or deviation. The tales told by those who have escaped from the hell of the police state are almost incredible. The army of terrified refugees fleeing from the Red terror in East Germany makes the voice of Russia more potent in accusation than the Voice of America.

As gradually those still fortunate enough to be on the outside of this fantastic world have peered into the abysmal tyranny of this abomination of abominations it becomes evident that the whole spiritual concept in which the free world has been nurtured is not only ridiculed, but held in complete contempt. A keen student of what actually has been going on in this debased "experiment in human welfare" sums up his findings in one sentence: "By purges, propaganda, by the use of terror and intimidation, human beings are being rendered utterly plastic, by being stripped of their dignity, to say nothing of rights, and turned into anonymous particles with no will and no judgment of their own."

The Magna Carta of human rights and dignity is not in the rantings of Marx, but in the revelation of Christianity. In that majestic, redemptive movement is the promise for man's emancipation from all that would make of him a chattel or a slave. The One who is the truth declared in deathless words that rings down the ages: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Across 2,000 years that truth has been marching on. It is the releasing word which blazed with a dazzling effulgence, never before seen in political decrees, in the American Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. They mirror Christian fundamentals: All men equal under God and the law endowed with rights inalienable, rights which no government can give or take away. For a thousand groping years the world had been waiting for this new charter.

The true symbol of the emancipated man is not Lenin but Lincoln. In the true utopia man's rulers are not the elect but the elected. Christianity is the real revolution which will yet free all men, Russians included with all the innate religious instincts of that great people. Atheistic communism is but a counterrevolution against the great and final revolution which came out of Palestine. That spurious counterfeit Red revolution denies God and man, freedom and spiritual verities. It repudiates everything which is lifting men slowly, but surely, to their destined inheritance as the sons of God.

No wonder the blind masters of the Kremlin go to all lengths to pull up the roots of supernatural religion and especially to detract from the Christian tradition by bringing it down to the level of astrology and soothsaying and presenting it as a relic which no longer matters. But, ah, stored in that relic is the dynamite of God which will yet pulverize that refuge of lies!

Inasmuch as democracy pure and undefiled is the social expression of Christianity, it follows that America, with her vast moral and material might, is the one foe totalitarianism most fears and hates. Communism as directed from the Kremlin is out to dominate the world. It knows that to do that it must destroy the United States of America. That is its goal and strategy. Nothing is more important than that the free world be alerted to that fact. The unvarnished truth about this aggressive, worldwide, criminal syndicate presents so vile a picture that it is a defiling experience for any free people to go through the motions of any negotiations with her robot representatives.

With any political agreements necessary to make it possible that the Christian revolution and the spurious Communist revolution for the time being, in this dread atomic day, may together occupy the planet, this article does not deal. What military strength must be massed to face the increasing might of communism around the earth is not the legitimate concern of this column. But it becomes crystal clear that both these systems cannot finally survive. To paraphrase Lincoln, and in a vaster sense than he could know, this world cannot remain half slave and half free. Let us say it bluntly: The foul thing the Kremlin symbolizes must be destroyed. It must perish from the earth—but not just by guns or bombs. This heinous incarnation of demoniac perversion must be pierced by the sword of the truth which makes men free.

The most devastatingly explosive thing in the world is truth. Again and again, history proves that there is no force equal to the pulverizing impact of facts. We sadly confess the denials and betrayals of democracy by some who march under its banners. But that is not the point. There are certain verities at the heart of things which can no more be abrogated than can gravitation by some fanatic's dictum.

The Soviet's inverted vocabulary cannot revise the dictionary, so that black becomes white, tyranny democracy, peacemaking, warmongering. This liberation enslavement, and grotesque system built on dead men's bones and on the seared souls of the living must be shattered by the glorious light of freedom. That means its ultimate destruction. The mills of the gods grind slowly. But they grind.

God's truth, which dispels darkness, already has written on the walls of the most obscene thralldom ever to contaminate great peoples the ancient prophecy of doom: "Your covenant with death shall be disannulled. Your agreement with hell shall not stand. Your refuge of lies shall be swept away. When the overflowing scourge shall pass through, ye shall be trodden down by it. The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

In the light of that judgment it follows that we cannot accept any truce except as a stage in the war that knows no retreat. Appeasement of this malignity must be resisted as virtue turns from the devil. We deal with an insatiable leopard which cannot change its spots. Compromise is impossible. Only eternal vigilance can save us from acceding to suggestions of a trickery which to sign would mean the sure doom of our Republic and all that the free world holds dear.

The Russian bear, subtle and cunning, presents a global threat. For that beast, as with us, it is all or nothing. May the God of truth give us a new breed of Rudyard Kiplings, to see now what he discerned so clearly a half century ago. Concerning that same marauding bear that prophet-poet warned.

"When he stands up like a tired man, tottering near and near,
When he stands up as pleading, in wavering, man-brute guise,
When he veils the hate and cunning of his little, swinish eyes,
When he shows as seeking quarter, with paws like hands in prayer,
That is the time of peril, the time of the truce of the bear."

THE TWIN CITIES ARSENAL

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, early in February I was in communication with the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles Wilson, relative to some letters and telegrams which had come to me from constituents in the State of Minnesota dealing with the munition plants in the vicinity of the Twin Cities, particularly with respect to their activities being curtailed or perhaps even being closed down.

I received a letter from the Department of the Army, under date of February 11, 1954, to which I replied under date of February 15, 1954. Finally, on the 26th of February 1954, I received a complete report from the Department of the Army, signed by the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army. The letter gives information concerning the munitions plants in Minnesota and also with respect to offshore plants. Further, it deals with contracts now in force and what is contemplated in that regard in the future. I ask unanimous consent that the letters to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: I am writing with reference to our recent conversation concerning the situation whereby Twin Cities Arsenal production is being curtailed, while at the same time the Government is conducting offshore procurement programs.

As you know, with the cessation of hostilities in Korea, the combat expenditure of ammunition stopped and the extensive training expenditure was materially curtailed. However, the existing production rate resulted in a rapid buildup of stocks which necessitated a reexamination of the Army's entire ammunition procurement program. This review is of a continuous nature and takes into consideration the current peacetime period, the position of worldwide stocks, training requirements and mobilization requirements, and the desire to maintain a going production base as long as possible. As a result of this review and reexamination, cutbacks and stretchouts have been instituted throughout the ammunition program. As with other producers, this has resulted in a reduced production rate at Twin Cities Arsenal.

Under the mutual defense aid program, as formulated by the Congress, the establishment of a sound mobilization production base overseas for military end items, to include all components, was deemed essential.

In accordance with this national policy, orders for military items for the use of our allies have been placed offshore.

I think it interesting to note that present offshore ammunition procurement programs, had they been scheduled with producers in this country, would serve only briefly to sustain our present expanded production rate.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SLEZAK,
Under Secretary of the Army.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 15, 1954.*

The Honorable JOHN SLEZAK,
Under Secretary of the Army,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SLEZAK: I have received your letter of February 11, made in reply to the inquiries which I submitted directly to the Secretary of Defense relative to the extent and effect of the production curtailment at the Twin Cities Arsenal and other plants in that area.

While I appreciate that cessation of hostilities in Korea would necessarily require a reexamination of ammunition production requirements, I specifically requested information as to the effect which offshore procurement has had with respect to curtailment of production in the United States, leading to extensive layoffs of workers. You merely state that had our ammunition procurement programs been scheduled with producers in this country this would serve only briefly to sustain our present expanded production rate.

In other words, what I am trying to obtain from the Department is information as to whether consideration has been given to the impact on the unemployment situation of large-scale layoffs in the Twin City area. What is the extent of our offshore procurement? Is it being increased? If so, in what countries? What further adjustments at the Twin Cities Arsenal and other nearby plants are contemplated?

The questions to which I must find the answers are: How many American workers have been displaced by the offshore procurement? Are offshore procurements being made at the expense of American workers and American manufacturers?

Your letter of February 11 does not give me sufficient facts upon which to base a conclusion as to the desirability of the Department's current policy in this matter. I shall appreciate having further information in answer to the specific questions I have raised.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: In the absence of Mr. Slezak, permit me to reply to your communication of February 15 requesting detailed information concerning contemplated adjustments to be accomplished at the Twin Cities Arsenal and the impact of offshore procurement on American producers.

Plans contemplate a further reduction in the operations of contractor operators at the Twin Cities Arsenal prior to June 30, 1954. The Federal Cartridge Corp., the small-arms-ammunition producer, has recently discontinued its "C" shift and is presently operating two 8-hour-per-day, 5-day-per-week shifts; and it is anticipated that a further reduction to one shift will be accomplished by May 1. The Donovan Corp., the 155-millimeter shell producer, is presently operating two 8-hour-per-day, 5-day-per-week shifts and will reduce to one shift by March 1. Minneapolis Moline, the 105-millimeter shell producer, is currently operating one 8-hour-per-day, 5-days-per-week shift. The contracts of the Donovan Corp. and Minneapolis-Moline expire in June of this year and, on the basis of current production schedules, they will be able to continue a single-shift operation until that time.

There are no other ammunition producers within the Twin Cities labor area with the exception of the Anoka Plant of the Federal Cartridge Corp. Currently, no change is contemplated in production at this facility.

Future production requirements will not provide sufficient work for all producers currently manufacturing ammunition. However, each will be afforded an opportunity to submit proposals on such work as will be available. These proposals will be carefully evaluated prior to award of contracts with cost, quality of product, reliability of manufacturer, and the existence of distress labor areas being among those factors considered in the selection of facilities to be retained. If Donovan Corp. and Minneapolis-Moline are selected for this continuity production, they will probably be able to extend operations well into the future.

The MDAP-Army offshore procurement program was developed, pursuant to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, to insure a sound logistic future for NATO and other allied forces which requires that they be able to support themselves in combat from local sources. The establishment of a substantial indigenous production base is prerequisite to attainment of this objective. United States facilities to which offshore procurement of ammunition could be diverted are required to meet United States forces mobilization requirements in the event of an emergency, and should not be considered as a production base for mutual defense assistance program mobilization requirements. In the selection of military items to be produced offshore, emphasis has been placed on items of high combat mortality and those ammunition items in which the greatest deficiencies in United States production would occur in the event of an emergency.

Contracts and awards obligated by the Army worldwide for MDAP offshore procurement of military end items during fiscal year 1953 aggregated $968.7 millions, of which $776.7 millions was obligated for the production of ammunition. This program encompassed the regular MDAP requirements for Europe, the French budgetary support program, and the Pleven commitment which supported requirements for metropolitan France and Indochina, and Far East MDAP and special Far East Command reserve requirements. These items were for consumption of NATO and other allied forces.

As of this date, no obligations have been made during fiscal year 1954 for MDAP-Army offshore procurement. This program is currently being coordinated by the Director of Offshore Procurement, Office of the Secretary of Defense, and has not been finalized. However, planned Army obligations for offshore procurement during this fiscal year are estimated at $540.2 million of which $440.9 million are programed for the procurement of ammunition. Obligation of these funds is dependent upon obtaining contracts satisfactory with respect to prices, quality, and delivery.

As a basis of comparison between the extent of the procurement of ammunition offshore and that being accomplished through United States production, it is pointed out that the dollar value of ammunition deliveries by United States producers during fiscal year 1953 was $2,600 million, deliveries estimated for fiscal year 1954 aggregate $3,500 million, and projected deliveries for fiscal year 1955 are estimated at slightly below $1,500 million. In contrast, the dollar equivalent of deliveries of ammunition contracted offshore in conjunction with MDAP-Army procurement are estimated at $196 million for fiscal year 1954 and at $318 million for fiscal year 1955.

MDAP-Army contracts were awarded offshore during fiscal years 1950 through 1953 in the amount of $1,300,000,000 for the manufacture of military equipment and munitions. The equivalent dollar value of these contracts represented approximately 16 percent of the total MDAP-Army programs during this period. Distribution of contracts by countries was as follows:

	Percent
France	47
Italy	17
United Kingdom	18
Belgium	4
Greece	2
Japan	6

With the remaining 6 percent being distributed among Denmark, Formosa, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. Inasmuch as no MDAP-Army offshore procurement contracts have to date been awarded during fiscal year 1954, it is not feasible at this time to forecast a distribution by countries of planned offshore obligations previously cited.

Estimates of the numbers of American workers who are affected adversely by MDAP-Army offshore procurement are not available, and if computed would be highly hypothetical. It is reiterated that production of ammunition being contracted offshore through the MDAP-Army program is for delivery to, and consumption by, NATO and other Allied forces. Funds used are appropriated for foreign aid specifically and are not part of the Army's regular budget. Items procured under MDAP contract offshore are not for United States troops either in this country or overseas. The procurement agencies of the Army are being utilized only as agents in connection with MDAP offshore procurement contracting.

In addition to the MDAP-Army offshore procurement discussed above, approximately $15 million was obligated during fiscal year 1953 and $60 million during fiscal year 1954 for offshore procurement of munitions for consumption by United States forces. In evaluating the effect on United States producers of this $75 million in contracts overseas, it should be borne in mind that generally these items either were required locally in such small quantities and were of such a character that production overseas was more economical, or production of foreign-licensed items was being accomplished for test purposes.

I trust that the detailed information which has been presented herein will satisfactorily comply with your inquiry. Mr. Slezak's letter of February 11 outlined the primary reasons necessitating the actions which are being taken to curtail ammunition production within the United States.

Please do not hesitate to call upon me if I may be of further assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. HIGGINS,
Deputy Under Secretary of the Army.

THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 23, a Senator made the following statement in this Chamber:

I care not what the State may be, check with the unemployment insurance officials of the State and ask them how much the bread lines in the State have increased in the last few months by way of idle men and women calling for their unemployment checks.

In this regard, I invite the attention of the Senate to a news article which appeared in the February 25, 1954, issue of the Baltimore Sun, under the

headline "Employment in State Rises," and Mr. President, I would therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, the complete text of this article.

Also, Mr. President, on the same subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, an interesting article from the February 12, 1954, issue of U. S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of February 25, 1954]

EMPLOYMENT IN STATE RISES—DROP IN COMPENSATION PAYMENTS REFLECTS JOB GAIN

Unemployment in Maryland, as reflected by State compensation payments, is showing a slight decline, Daniel E. Klein, chairman of the employment security board, announced yesterday.

In effect, this could mean that more jobs are becoming available in the Maryland area, for it shows that less jobless persons are applying for or drawing unemployment compensation.

DECLINE IN ALL THREE CATEGORIES

Mr. Klein said that this finding is based on an analysis of trends that developed in the unemployment compensation program in the State during the last 2 weeks in January.

Also, the week ending February 20 showed a decline in all three categories observed, namely, the number of new claims filed, the total number of compensation checks paid and the amount of money paid in benefits.

In comparison to the same 8-week period last year, the three categories show the following change:

	1953	1954
New claims	23,342	48,033
Total checks paid	99,909	192,117
Total amount paid	$2,007,769	$4,614,377

Mr. Klein said yesterday that about $375,000 of the increase in benefits is due from an increase of $5 in the maximum weekly benefit amount, raising it from $25 to $30, which became effective last June 1.

DROP IN NEW CLAIMS

For the week ending January 2, the records show that 7,883 new claims were filed, and 17,686 checks were mailed totaling $421,514.

By February 20, the new claims had dropped to 3,945, although the number of checks had increased to 26,106, totaling payments of $632,884.

[From U. S. News & World Report of February 12, 1954]

JOBS IN UNITED STATES STILL PLENTIFUL—MOST PERSONS CHOOSY AS TO WORK AND PAY THEY'LL ACCEPT

Jobs remain plentiful in the United States even though unemployment is reported to be rising a bit. In fact, more people are at work today than have usually been working in most of the booming postwar years.

Actually, by ordinary standards, the country is enjoying practically full employment. Nearly 60 million people have steady jobs—a goal that was regarded as close to fantastic only 10 years ago—and less than 4 percent of the labor force is counted as jobless. Not so long ago, New Deal economists were saying that, if unemployment could be held to 5 percent of the labor force, the country would really be enjoying full employment.

There also are quite a number of prospective employers who are looking for workers. Householders still find it difficult to get workmen promptly for needed repairs or improvements. Maids are few and cooks have virtually gone out of fashion. Farmers have been getting along year after year with fewer and fewer hired hands, not so much because they need less help but because they can't find help. The help wanted columns of most city newspapers at this time heavily outweigh the positions wanted ads.

These are all signs that the vast majority of American workers still are able to find employment. Their pay, moreover, stays high. The average hourly earnings of factory workers are higher than they ever have been, although weekly pay checks often are trimmed a bit because a good many plants have reduced overtime. The Commerce Department finds that fewer factory workers now are putting in extra hours than at any time since early 1950.

What this means, really, is that American industry no longer is operating under forced draft, as it had been since the Korean war began. Most of the evidence to date suggests that the dip in business activity that began in the middle of 1953 is simply an adjustment closer to a normal rate of operations. It could mean, further, a more efficient rate of operation and perhaps a prelude to some price cuts as industry manages to reduce costs.

JOBS LOST

In this process, some workers have lost jobs. Unemployment now is about 500,000 more than a year ago. A good bit of this increase, however, involves women, young people and older workers. The great bulk of men between 25 and 65 years of age, the customary breadwinners of American families, are holding down jobs. Among the total number of jobless, only about half are men 25 and older.

In few communities is unemployment a severe problem. The only areas of real distress reported by the Labor Department are in textile and coal-mining centers, whose industries have been relatively depressed for some time.

Most of the workers out of jobs are those without experience and with no skills. In Hartford, Conn., for example, a shortage of skilled workers is reported, although there is a surplus of unskilled help. That condition is fairly typical.

Some of the unemployment now reported also results from the refusal of workers to be downgraded, or persuaded to accept lower paying jobs. During the boom sparked by the Korean war, a good many workers were upgraded and got jobs for which they were not really fitted. Now these marginal workers are being laid off, and many are reluctant to return to their former tasks.

Some union men, too, are reluctant to take jobs outside their industry because they are afraid to risk their seniority standing and their pension rights. They prefer a period of temporary idleness to giving up these benefits.

AID TO JOBLESS

Unemployment insurance often acts to spur this trend. A large portion of workers recently laid off are entitled to unemployment benefits. Sometimes these benefis run as long as 26 weeks, or half a year. That reduces the pressure on people to seek new jobs in different lines of work, or even in different communities. Unemployment benefits buy some of the necessities of life while the worker waits in the hope that his regular job will open up again. In some places it is reported that companies keep unemployment rolls and payrolls in balance by laying off workers who are entitled to benefits and then rehiring people who have exhausted their benefits.

There is a definite expectation, too, that jobs will reopen. Midwest farm-machinery plants are reported to be calling back workers who were furloughed some months ago when production was cut back. Detroit's unemployed auto workers don't expect to stay idle through the year. The textile industry is looking for an upturn in orders before long. Construction workers expect to find jobs when the building industry takes its usual seasonal upturn.

In short, there is nothing in the present picture to indicate that the relatively small numbers of jobless will increase by any large amount, or that those who now hold jobs are about to lose them. Also many of these now listed as "idle" might find work if willing to accept jobs considered by them as unsuited to their skills.

FEWER WORKERS

Figures on employment suggest further that labor, as well as plant, was working under forced draft during the post-Korean boom. In other words, more people held jobs than normally would be looking for jobs. This is indicated by the fact that the labor force—the total number either at work or looking for work—has been shrinking since last summer. People in the labor force now are reported to number almost 600,000 fewer than a year ago.

What happened was that a good many workers, drawn into jobs by the prospect of high pay, just left the labor market when their jobs ran out. In this group are thousands of women who have gone back into their homes, young people who have returned to school, older persons who have retired. The shrinkage in the labor force is evidence that a good many job losses were taken in stride, without hardship. Apparently, a sizable number of workers took jobs in recent years because of choice rather than necessity. When layoffs came, they chose not to look for other jobs.

Another sign of job abundance is disclosed in more detailed figures on where people work. Employment is higher than a year ago in wholesale and retail trade, which ranks next to manufacturing as the most important employer of labor. Banks, insurance companies, and real-estate firms also are employing more workers than a year ago. So, too, are the service industries, which include repair shops, laundries, dry-cleaning establishments, as well as professional services such as engineering, medicine, and law. Commerce Department figures show that wage and salary payments to people outside the producing industries have been quite steady since last August. There is little reflection of a business downturn in these fields.

The want-ad sections of newspapers give further indications of job openings. Many firms are looking for salespeople and office help. There is a strong demand for engineers, draftsmen, machinists, tool and diemakers, and others with high skills. The shortage of schoolteachers is acute and is not expected to be met for several years. Farmers also are pressing the Government for an agreement with Mexico so that the farm-labor situation can be eased.

The downturn in activity, in fact, centers primarily in manufacturing. Even here, there are few signs of outright distress. Factory employment is down from the peak, but it still is higher than the monthly average for any year before 1953. And the Federal Reserve Board index of factory production shows output still to be running substantially ahead of the 1947–49 average.

The end of the boom has brought little evidence that any severe decline is generating in the American economy. What seems to be happening is a gentle settling back to a less hectic pace. After 6 months of this settling process, production continues to be high and sales volume is being well maintained. Prospects are that boom peaks will not be reached again this year, but jobholders appear to have little to worry about.

PRICE SUPPORTS ON DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received numerous letters from constituents who reside in cities in the State of Wisconsin, asking why I take the position that milk and milk products should be placed on a 90-percent parity basis. I have replied to them that the State of Wisconsin produces approximately 16 billion pounds of milk. If the parity price on milk should be reduced 50 cents, it would mean a loss of $80 million in the economic stream of the State of Wisconsin. Persons who write from the cities apparently do not want the support price to be in effect, and I ask them, "What is going to happen to your stores and to the economic life of the State which depends upon that $80 million in Wisconsin's economic life stream?"

I receive letters saying, "We did not understand it that way."

There was a very challenging statement made not long ago by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in which he contended that income-tax exemptions should be increased to $800. If that should be done, it would amount to approximately $5 billion for consumers to spend. The sum of $80 million in my State would mean the difference between economic health and sickness.

Mr. President, it is not simply in the interest of the farmer that we are contending; we are contending in the interest of the general welfare.

A day or two ago one of our distinguished citizens, William O. Purdue, general manager, Pure Milk Products Cooperative, representing more than 18,000 farmers, who produce almost 2 billion pounds of milk, was in Washington speaking on this subject. He made a very challenging suggestion in relation to the surplus problem. I recognize that the problem has two facets: First, the matter of better economic health, and, second, the matter of getting rid of the surplus.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter from Mr. A. W. Patterson, chairman of the shippers and purchasers committee of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, showing that within the past year individual citizens have shipped abroad some $50 million worth of products, which is a contribution to the solution of the surplus problem, but in the statement of Mr. W. O. Purdue he tackles the problem from another angle. I think the statement is very challenging, and I ask unanimous consent that it also be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF VOLUNTARY AGENCIES FOR FOREIGN SERVICE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 26, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As you will recall, the Congress approved appropriation of $1,825,000 for reimbursement during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, of ocean freight charges on shipment to certain areas of relief supplies by American voluntary agencies including the members of this council listed on the reverse.

Largely as a result of the large amounts of surplus dairy products made available to our agencies on a donation basis by the Department of Agriculture, the volume of our shipments of relief supplies has been substantially greater during the current fiscal year than in previous years. Dried milk, butter, and cheese shipped by voluntary agencies in the current fiscal year have already totaled over 65,000 tons valued at approximately $50 million (on which the Government is no longer required to pay storage charges). When this trend became evident, the Foreign Operations Administration took steps to obtain from the President an additional $2,500,000 to cover these ocean freight reimbursement needs.

The purpose of this letter is twofold:

1. We wish to inform you that reports received from overseas representatives in many countries of our member agencies continue to attest to the effectiveness of this program. Not only are these shipments of American surplus dairy products and other relief supplies making a vital contribution to the relief of human need and suffering, but also the American origin of the goods is widely known to the recipients, as is indicated by the countless letters of thanks and appreciation received by our agency representatives overseas from recipient individuals and organizations in many countries throughout the world.

2. We wish to express our appreciation of the action taken by Congress in voting funds for reimbursement of freight costs on relief shipments by voluntary agencies and to express our conviction that Government freight reimbursement facilities have played an important part in permitting our agencies to help meet human needs throughout the world and thereby create goodwill and friendship for America.

We therefore wish to thank you personally for your part in facilitating this important action by the Congress and to express our hope for continuation of similar support in the coming fiscal year.

Sincerely yours,

A. W. PATTERSON,
Chairman, Shippers and Purchasers Committee.

STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO DAIRY PRICE CONTROLS BY WILLIAM O. PURDUE, GENERAL MANAGER, PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE, FOND DU LAC, WIS.

Pure Milk Products Cooperative is the largest milk producers bargaining cooperative in the Nation. We have a membership of dairy farmers in excess of 18,000 residing in the State of Wisconsin.

I appear before you today to appeal to each of you to support the overwhelming majority of farmers in Wisconsin in their pleas to continue price supports for dairy products at not less than 90 percent of parity and to use your influence to bring about the necessary legislation to make this possible.

The proposed cut in dairy support prices announced by the Secretary of Agriculture will mean a reduction in income for Wisconsin dairy farmers of at least 65 cents a hundredweight for milk or more than $95 million annually.

This slash in the support program would mean a reduction in income of $10½ million annually to the membership of Pure Milk Products Cooperative alone. Pure Milk Products is the largest milk producers' cooperative in America with a membership of over 18,000. The annual production of this cooperative last year was 1,666,000,000 pounds of milk. It will exceed 1.75 billion this year. At no time have dairy prices sunk to the level of 75 percent of parity since the early days of depression in 1930–33. This cut in supports spells ruin for the American dairy farmer. The reduction from 90 to 75 percent means the lowest percentage of parity realized by dairy farmers in the past 20 years.

In the past year, 90 percent of parity did not yield a 90 percent return for manufactured milk to the dairy farmers of Wisconsin. Support prices in the past year were calculated at approximately $3.34 a hundred pounds of milk used for manufacturing purposes, but actually the farmers in this State only received $3.20 to $3.25 per hundredweight from the major plants.

While major plant operators were paying below support prices to the farmer, the same companies have been in a position to sell their products to the Government at the full 90 percent level. More than one large concern in Wisconsin has purchased milk from producers as currently as December at prices as low as $2.95 per hundredweight and enjoyed a market with the Government of 90 percent of parity or approximately $3.34 a hundredweight yield.

This reduction in supports will not reduce the surplus. Every critical period in prices has shown an increase in milk production on the part of the dairy farmers. Dairy farmers are prone to boost their milk production to keep the level of their income at about the same figure. This procedure can be traced as far back as the records for milk production go for the United States.

The early 1930's was a demonstration of this procedure. Milk production in those days jumped from 100 billion pounds annually to as high as 105 billion pounds.

How did our present increase in production come about? Dairy farmers answered a patriotic call. Dairy farmers all over the Nation were pleaded with by the President, Secretary of Agriculture, and every other agency in the Nation that makes contact with the farmer to increase milk production for the war purposes. They responded by boosting production from a level of 115 billion pounds annually to a high of 120 billion pounds of milk in response to the patriotic call to serve their Nation.

Dairy farmers now are entitled to an opportunity for an orderly retreat from this high production and it cannot be done overnight without the assistance from the same people that brought on the plea for more milk to get into the field and plead with the farmers to reduce their herds.

I believe there are today in the Nation enough "boarders" (low-producing cows) which could be sent to slaughter and reduce milk production of the Nation between 6 and 8 billion pounds annually. This could be done almost overnight with the help from all available agencies.

If the President of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture, chairmen of Agriculture Committees in the House and Senate, county agents, and all other agencies pleaded with the dairy farmers for a nationwide program of production of economy instead of high production, our problem would be solved.

To say the American dairy farmer is surprised by the announcement of the new support program is putting it mildly. Only a few short days ago while I was in Washington, we were given to understand by the Secretary that he would proceed in an orderly manner to reduce support prices by degrees. The President indicated in his message to Congress that this should be the policy. Most dairy farmers believed that the President meant just what he said, that reduction in support prices would not exceed 5 percent of parity. The President in his message said "that agriculture should be protected against too drastic a drop in income" and recommended 5 percent as being the maximum allowed in a single year. He referred to this as an orderly transition. It

is inconceivable for anyone to believe that 15-percent reduction in support levels comes under the head of orderly transition, especially when it means a 25-percent drop in dairy-farm income of our 1954 and 1955 prices are set by this new support level.

If Wisconsin dairy farmers are to be expected to receive in proportion under this program the same treatment they did under the program which will expire April 1, then dairy prices can be expected to drop as low as $2.20 per hundredweight for manufactured dairy products. No industry in America could stand such a reduction in its sale prices while at the same time everything it purchases to bring about these sales has increased.

Dairy farmers continue to pay more for every item they buy to make their production than they did at any time in the past 12 months with a very few exceptions. The board of directors of Pure Milk Products were called for a special session to consider future immediate action with respect to obtaining new legislation nationally to gain at least 90 percent of parity support for dairy products. The cooperative will not cease in its efforts to obtain at least 90 percent of parity. Dairy surplus holdings on the part of the Government which have been singled out almost daily in the newspapers, represent only 2½ months' supply for the Nation. This is not large when compared to Government holdings of other commodities such as wheat, representing 1 year's supply, and cotton and cottonseed oil, representing more than a years supply.

We are solidly behind the principle of removing surpluses and have offered several plans to the Government to remove these surpluses at little or no loss to the Government. I also feel that dairy production should be reduced in an orderly fashion, not in a manner that will spell ruin to dairy farmers and especially those of Wisconsin.

Wisconsin dairy farmers stand to receive the brunt of the most severe agricultural income reduction of all other States in the Nation by the very nature of the Secretary's announcement.

A review of total production by years

	Billion pounds
1930	100
1935	101
1940	109½
1945	121½
1948	115½
1949	119
1950	120½

REDUCTION OF "BOARDERS" (LOW-PRODUCING COWS)

We could eliminate our stockpile of surpluses almost overnight by eliminating the so-called boarders in the Nation's herds, at the rate of 1 to 16. That is to say, if we eliminated 1 out of every 16 cows, which is a conservative figure as a boarder, we could reduce milk production in excess of 5 billion pounds annually.

HOW IT COULD WORK

If we'd take the lowest production per cow with respect to annual production, use the average of 1925 to 1939 when the average dairy cow was producing 4,379 pounds—then use the cow population for 1953 which was estimated at 22,256,000. There would be, conservatively speaking 1,391,000 head of poor producing cows available for culling.

This figure multiplied by the annual production of the lowest figure published recently of 4,379 (1925–39) would give 5.85 million pounds of milk annually as a reduction.

This program has far more merits than has attracted the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture. This program was presented to the Secretary of Agriculture by Pure Milk Products Cooperative, February 6, 1954, in the Secretary's office.

The program was adopted by resolution by the National Milk Producers Federation executive board in session, Friday, February 5, 1954.

The program has a lot more merit if it is to be considered as a method of price support. I will dwell upon that later. It is necessary here to review how we came into this tremendous surplus of production. In 1925 to 1939, our annual milk production was about 100,400,000,000 pounds. In 1940, this production had increased to 109 billion largely because of low milk prices.

Then came World War II, and this is an important era in milk production to review and remember how we came about producing more milk than our Nation would consume. It is a pathetic picture. Every public-spirited person who came in contact with farm people were called upon by the President of the United States, and by the Secretary of Agriculture, by the War Production Board and every public-spirited organization who was trying to be of some patriotic service to his country. These people put on the most dramatic program of pleading with farm people to increase production—increase all phases of agricultural production—for food and fiber. Special emphasis was placed upon milk production. The plea went up that we were desperately short of shipping space for food, and that dairy products could be condensed and dried and take up so much less space than other food items. So dairy farmers were especially singled out to serve their country, and a patriotic plea went up to them to increase milk production—the dairy farmers of America and especially of Wisconsin responded wholeheartedly to this cry of more milk production. They wanted to be patriotic and serve their country. You will recall during this period that huge subsidies were handed out as bait—some not quite in the form of bait to increase milk production.

There were subsidies as high as $1.20 a hundredweight if my memory serves me right, in some of the Southern States. Wisconsin was paid as much as 60 cents a hundredweight to encourage more milk production and as I have said Wisconsin dairy farmers responded beyond the fondest dreams of all of our war agencies. We lifted our milk production from a former high of 115 billion pounds to 119,828,000,000 pounds in 1945. Then the war ended, and there was not so much need for milk production. Shortly thereafter the Korean war came on, and tremendous demands were again made upon the producers of Wisconsin for dairy products for manufactured products. They responded again and continued the high flow of milk.

The point I am trying to make here is that if we as a public-spirited group of American people would put forth the same effort and the same patriotic spirit of saving our agriculture as we did to save the world, then I am quite sure if it was done on a national basis, that farm people again would respond to reason of economy and reduce their herd thereby reduce the milk production, and at the same time increase their prices due to the law of supply and demand, to the point where I believe there would be no need, no legal reason, for price supports, because I believe that milk production would level off to such a point that prices in turn would increase upward to where dairy products for manufacturing purposes as well as fluid milk purposes would soon reach a level of in excess of 90 percent of parity. Let's pursue this reasoning a little bit further and assume that we are seeking a program of price support that would require less outlay of dollars, and at the same time provide food for the starving nations that we are trying to help. Assume the average weight of the average "boarder" cow to be around 1,000 pounds, and assume that the Government wanted to reduce milk production, and not persecute the dairy farmer. It would be a very simple matter to indemnify "boarder" cows at up to 10 cents a pound for beef and have less money involved in these cows than 1 year's production of milk and butter to be supported at the new 75 percent parity level, and believe me, farmers would really get rid of the boarders.

For example: Taking the lowest milk production record since 1925: 4,379 pounds with 172 pounds of butterfat—the butterfat would yield a little over 200 pounds of butter—for example: use 200 pounds at the new 75 percent level, butter would be supported at Chicago at 57½ cents a pound. This would amount to $115 dollars that the Government would have invested in the production of this "boarder" cow for butterfat alone—saying nothing for the amount of skimmed milk that would be produced. The Government could save a minimum of $15 per cow by encouraging farmers to cull their herds and get down to economic milk production, eliminate the surplus and have less dollars involved.

Therefore, I appeal to you as Members of Congress from Wisconsin to use your best efforts to help bring about an orderly retreat in this overproduction of dairy products—bring about a retreat that will not mean financial ruin to the average dairy farmer of America.

In conclusion, I would like to point out another apparent injustice—one that has been passed over—this whole program of supports has been geared to the large type operator—that is the favor has been in the direction of the largest operators. The huge corporation farms of America that produce cotton, corn, and wheat, soy bean operators—these are the farmers that will receive the highest percentage of parity—those are the farmers that need less margin to operate on than the small farmers operating dairy farms.

I believe I am safe in saying that the average dairy farmer of Wisconsin who milks 18 to 20 head of cows has far more money, proportionately, in land and machinery and cattle, invested in his little plant, than the average wheat grower has invested in his tremendous plant. Yet, these dairy farmers have been singled out at the Nations whipping post. They are to be pictured as the one seeking more and more Government help—when as a matter of fact, they are not asking for that—our only plea is that dairy farmers be given equality of treatment, justice of treatment, and an opportunity to survive in an economy of equality. Not that their prices be supported at 75 percent of parity and the commodities they have to buy from brother farms be supported at higher percentages of parity.

We are not asking that supports be brought down, or supports brought up. We are asking that there be an equality among all crops in a comparable manner rather than in an arithmetical manner.

Wisconsin dairy farmers have demonstrated their faith in you. This was done last November—a year ago. They placed their confidence there year after year. They have voted for you. Now, they are asking that you work for and vote for them, and the welfare of all our people of this Nation.

IMPORTS AND SURPLUSES DESTRUCTION OF AMERICAN WORKMEN

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator if he includes in his remarks the butter surplus which now confronts the Nation?

Mr. WILEY. When I use the word "surplus" I am speaking particularly in relation to the dried milk and cheese surplus which we have in the State of Wisconsin, and to the butter surplus which

involves butter produced mostly in Minnesota and Iowa.

Mr. MALONE. Do the butter imports from Denmark, Sweden, and the Low Countries aggravate the surplus situation about which the Senator complains?

Mr. WILEY. I think they do, to a certain extent. The quantity is small, but I think it does have an effect upon what we might call the market price.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be interrogated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether he thinks increased foreign imports would help to aggravate the surplus in the commodities included in the Senator's complaint.

Mr. WILEY. I am sure it would be a very serious mistake to open the gates to any commodity, whether a manufactured product or anything else, of which we have a surplus in this country.

I have talked to various big business men who have gotten away from the trade-not-aid program as being simply a mythical solution. They recognize that the best market in the world is the United States of America and that 97 percent of it is supplied within our borders. We should not give away that market by attempting to get more markets abroad.

On the other hand, when it comes to the question of trade, there is a field in which we can utilize our surpluses. I shall have something to say with reference to that subject within the next few days. I think it can be done to the advantage of America and to the advantage of other nations.

MORE TAXES AND DEFICITS

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that butter and cheese and dried milk are only 3 of 500 or 600 products as to which the surplus problem is being aggravated at this time. There is a similar problem with reference to zinc, lead, tungsten, oil, crockery, watches, machine tools, textiles, wool, cattle, and several hundred other products which industries are being destroyed with imports from the low-wage and sweatshop labor nations. They are being shipped from other countries, under the State Department trade agreements, and we are now considering coming up with more tax money to solve the problem.

Our only solution for 22 years is more taxes and more deficits. Does that make sense?

Mr. WILEY. I think what the Senator from Nevada implies is that it is necessary to think this problem through. The markets of America cannot be permitted to be flooded by cheap imports. To do so would be perfectly ridiculous. We shall not help the world or help ourselves if we incapacitate ourselves or make ourselves inadequate to meet head on the economic and political problems which are constantly arising.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

CONGRESS ABROGATED ITS CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. MALONE. I am very much interested in the problem referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin. I think that until we can work out of the surplus problem, deliberately created, it will be necessary to continue certain subsidies.

But at the moment the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, named "reciprocal trade" to sell free trade to the American people transfers the constitutional responsibility of Congress to regulate foreign trade to the Executive, meaning as it has worked out, the State Department. The State Department has been busily engaged for 22 years in selling the industries of America down the river for a mythical political gain from foreign nations.

So I say to the Senator from Wisconsin if the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 is allowed to expire on June 12 of this year, as it will if not again renewed, the regulation of foreign trade reverts to the Tariff Commission as an agent of Congress—and they are directed under existing law to adjust the duties or tariffs on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, and we are back in business.

The Senators and Congressmen are now wearing out their trousers crawling up to a State Department begging them to put an oxygen tent over their industries to prolong their life in competition with like products from the sweatshop labor countries, when the Constitution of the United States—article I, section 8—says it is their job in the first place. It is a humiliating experience just to observe the subservience of Congress.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to comment on that situation. I think what the distinguished Senator from Nevada has in mind is that the so-called reciprocal treaties should be allowed to expire. "Reciprocity" is another term like "trade, not aid." If it is utilized properly, and is really mutual, and if we protect ourselves in the operation of it, reciprocity can be mutually advantageous. If, perhaps, we deal with other nations who do not play according to the rules of the game, and who, after they have agreed, make their own rules and upset the applecart, so to speak, by engaging in practices which are anything but reciprocal, the result, of course, will be disastrous to America.

In further reply, I may say that the world has been shrunken by the inventive genius of man. In January a meeting was held in Washington, at which it was disclosed that two-thirds of the world is in the red, or has a deficit, from the standpoint of dairy products, while one-third of the world seems to have, for the time being, a surplus. The problem is one of distribution of dairy products.

In the State of Wisconsin, speaking along the lines the Senator from Nevada has just mentioned, there are lead and zinc mines. I think we have made a serious mistake in not looking after the welfare of the mining industry in certain portions of our country, so that if a great catastrophe or emergency should arise, those mines would be operating and able to take care of the demands of the Nation.

I think we shall have to be a little more practical in our dealings with certain nations. We shall have to keep our eyes open. As I have said once before, we shall have to have a few Scotchmen dealing for America.

CONGRESS SHOULD REAFFIRM ITS RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. MALONE. I respect the Senator from Wisconsin for his views, which are very frankly free trade with such foreign nations; but if the United States Congress continues a course of action in accordance with his views, and continues to abrogate its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade on a purely economic basis, by extending the act beyond June 12, leaving it in the hands of the executive, which inserts the political factor in our dealings with foreign nations, then, in my earnest opinion, this Nation will most certainly average its living standard with such nations, and there is no place for our living standards to go but down.

A report will be coming to the Senate in connection with Senate Resolution 143, which will show the subterfuges foreign countries use to avoid any show of reciprocity.

The report will show the currency manipulations of the foreign countries for the trade advantages. Such countries utilize quotas, specifications, exchange permits, trade permits, subsidization of exports and many other tricks and manipulations to avoid any reciprocity. They simply do not carry out their part of the agreement, they never have, and they never intend to when such agreements are entered into.

The words "reciprocal trade" are mouthed around the Senate on both sides of the aisle. Those two words do not occur in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which was never intended to make trade agreements reciprocal, and the agreements are not reciprocal.

The trade agreements are made by the Department of State, which has been engaged since 1934 in dividing the markets of this country with the foreign nations of the world—our markets are the source of our income.

Until we get our feet back on the ground in this Nation, and until Congress reassumes its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade and to fix duties, excises, and imposts on an economic basis, there is nothing the Members of the Senate and the House can do except to keep spending additional money secured from the taxpayers to help depressed areas, which we ourselves have depressed through the trade agreements, by putting industries in those areas which are uneconomic on the face of it or they would be there already; as long as we continue to mouth catchwords and phrases which have been created for us by such foreign nations for 22 years, phrases such as reciprocal trade, dollar shortage, and trade, not aid, just so long will we be hearing complaints such as the distinguished Senator is making here today.

"Trade, not aid," was invented by Butler, Chancellor of the Exchequer, in November 1952. The junior Senator

from Nevada told that one on him in November of 1952.

The British, including the sterling bloc nations, have secretly laughed at us because we have used their slogans. They never have kept trade agreements, and they never intend to keep them.

IT IS UP TO CONGRESS

Until Congress has the guts to reassume its constitutional responsibility to do for the American public the work it was created to do, it deserves very little credit.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his fairly good résumé of what has happened in some instances, but I am frank to say that reciprocal trade treaties, under the circumstances where the nations have kept faith, have proved, time and time again, to be mutually beneficial.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to have the Senator cite one example of a country that has kept a trade agreement made under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. WILEY. If there is anything to indicate that Congress has been remiss, I think the Senator would be remiss if he did not show in what respect the machinery does not work. If it is found that an international partner or nation with whom we are entering into trade agreements does not play the game, then we should simply have adequate machinery available to dispose of such an agreement immediately and to cancel it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

LET THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT EXPIRE—THREE METHODS OF DESTRUCTION

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that Congress has such machinery, and it is in good working order, except that Congress abrogated its constitutional responsibility through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—so-called reciprocal trade—as extended—it now expires on June 12, 1954.

This act transferred the constitutional responsibility of Congress to the executive branch, meaning, as it worked out, the State Department, which does not know an industry from a bale of hay, and for 22 years they have been busily engaged in transferring the jobs and investments to the low-wage-standard-of-living nations. The State Department is always after some fancied political advantage, but they have never ended up with either a political or a financial advantage. I defy the Senator to name one instance in which a trade agreement ever has been kept by a foreign country.

There are three approaches to destroy this Nation:

First. The political approach, identified as communism. This approach did not start yesterday. It started with the recognition of Communist Russia in 1933.

Second. The economic approach, the foundation of which is the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, transferring the responsibility of Congress—article I, section 8, of the Constitution—to regulate foreign commerce and to adjust the duties, imposts, and excises, which we call tariffs and import fees, to the executive. GATT, General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, organized at Geneva, is based upon the act. The International Trade Organization, ITO, and its successor, is based on GATT. The whole house of cards for world-cartel control crumbles with the expiration of the act.

Third. The constitutional approach, which the Bricker amendment was meant to halt—that of executive agreements and commitments with proper authority.

Mr. WILEY. I do not desire to pursue the matter further. What I had in mind at the outset, and I repeat it, is that I cannot believe the administration would want to see a State, like my own State of Wisconsin, suffer. Wisconsin has been self-supporting; it has never asked for Government aid in any enterprise. It is a State which is about 50 percent agricultural and about 50 percent industrial, making a really balanced setup, and is made up of sturdy folks from Europe and their descendants, who, on the good basis of self-initiative and work, have built up the State to the point where I think it is about the best-balanced State in the Union, economically, politically, and otherwise.

The point I am trying to make in my brief remarks is that we must not, in the pursuit of far-off buyers, forget ourselves. Even the Good Book contains a lesson to that effect, when it says that he who does not look after his own is himself unworthy of being helped.

I am satisfied a solution can be found for the problem of the surplus if we attempt to solve it, but we must not make the surplus an excuse to paralyze the economic growth of a great commonwealth like Wisconsin. That was the reason I rose to make these remarks.

Mr. President, I now desire to turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

FEDERAL AID TO NEEDY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a letter from a taxpayer in the Poynette School District which I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues. This letter points out the plight of the needy school districts which fully qualify under Federal school-aid regulations, but which cannot receive funds because of insufficient appropriations.

My own feeling is that, if the Congress agrees on the value of a policy of Federal aid to schools in defense areas, then it should be willing to support that policy with adequate funds.

I doubt if a single legislator would quarrel with the vital need for proper education for our young folks. This generation of post-World War II children should not be denied the privileges of adequate schooling merely because they happened to be born at this particular time.

We cannot postpone consideration of this problem. As parents and grandparents, we in the Congress must face up to it today, while the children are growing. I for one intend to give my support to adequate Federal funds for education in distress areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter I have received from Mr. James F. Clark, an attorney of Madison.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELA, CHRISTIANSON & ELA,
Madison, Wis., February 18, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter to me in answer to my inquiry regarding the application for Federal aid by the Poynette School District, application No. 54–C–402 and No. 54–E–507, filed pursuant to Public Laws 246 and 874.

We understand that our school district was denied building aids pursuant to application No. 54–C–402 filed under Public Law 246 because of the insufficiency of the appropriation of funds to pay the aid to all districts which qualified and that therefore the aid was paid to those districts which had the highest priority in terms of need.

As a taxpayer in the Poynette School District and on behalf of your constituents and the school board of that district we respectfully request that you use your influence and direct your efforts toward the adoption of legislation which would provide the necessary appropriations to cover the application for aid of all districts which are qualified to receive the same under the law but which have been denied the same solely because of insufficient funds. We in the Poynette district are only too appreciative of the desperate situation facing many school districts in our country because of insufficient funds to build proper school facilities for the increasing number of young Americans who must be educated, many of whose parents are working in Federal or federally subsidized plants.

I can truthfully say that everyone with whom I have talked in our district and in the surrounding areas of the State is heartily in favor of more Federal aid to school districts both for building and operational purposes.

Thank you sincerely for your cooperation in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES F. CLARK.

AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH IN THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter I have received from Mrs. Marian W. Epton, of Portland, who is State chairman of national defense of the Oregon Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, commending the Governor of Oregon for his proclamation of February as American history month in Oregon.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
Portland, Oreg., February 8, 1954.

Senator GUY CORDON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CORDON: In response to a request which I made to Governor Patterson on behalf of the Oregon State Society, DAR,

the Governor has issued the following proclamation which you may like to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Recognizing the splendid efforts of the Daughters of the American Revolution in fostering greater interest in American history and realizing the urgent need of a rededication of our people to the full appreciation of our glorious record of development, Gov. Paul L. Patterson has designated the month of February as American History Month.

"Governor Patterson urged all to give special observance and that our public schools, colleges, and universities give primacy to the study of American history."

Yours sincerely,

MARIAN W. EATON.

COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 8069, an act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Let me say that I have discussed this matter with the minority leadership. The bill is one which was under consideration last week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8069) to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 8069) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we are about to have a call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, from the point where the last call of the calendar ended—in other words, to begin with Calendar No. 935, Senate bill 2728, to authorize the collection of indebtedness of military and civilian personnel resulting from erroneous payments, and for other purposes.

In a moment I shall suggest the absence of a quorum; but at this time I should like to ask unanimous consent that there be considered first, during the call of the calendar, instead of at the end of the calendar call, a bill which it was agreed, at the last call of the calendar, would be called during this call of the calendar. I refer to Calendar No. 373, Senate bill 1691, to authorize the Potomac Electric Power Company to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia and to cross Kenilworth Avenue, NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	Maybank
Barrett	Griswold	McCarthy
Beall	Hayden	McClellan
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Burke	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bush	Hill	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Murray
Byrd	Humphrey	Neely
Carlson	Hunt	Payne
Case	Ives	Potter
Chavez	Jackson	Purtell
Clements	Jenner	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smathers
Duff	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Ellender	Kuchel	Thye
Ferguson	Langer	Upton
Flanders	Lehman	Watkins
Frear	Lennon	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Wiley
George	Magnuson	Williams
Gillette	Malone	Young
Goldwater	Mansfield	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). A quorum is present.

CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION WORK BY POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the order previously entered, the clerk will call Calendar No. 373, Senate bill 1691.

The bill (S. 1691) to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia, and to cross Kenilworth Avenue NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes, was announced as first in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, which amendments had been agreed to on July 28, 1953.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that they have heretofore been agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on February 5, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], after conferring with other Senators who had considered the bill, submitted certain amendments which he had intended to propose at this time. It was his intention that the amendments be printed and lie on the table, but they were referred to the District Committee, which has not had a meeting, and therefore has had no opportunity to act on the amendments. Therefore, I send to the desk at this time amendments identical with those previously submitted by the Senator from South Dakota, and ask that they be read and considered en bloc at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, beginning with line 7, it is proposed to strike all of section 3 down to and including line 11 on page 5.

On page 5, line 12, it is proposed to strike "SEC. 4." and in lieu thereof insert "SEC. 3."

On page 5, after line 20, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. The authority granted herein shall not be construed to authorize any construction or relocation or removal of railroad track or tracks, or the construction of any structure which will prevent continuous rail transportation by standard railroad equipment by and between the railroad tracks of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and the premises of the Benning plant of the Potomac Electric Power Co. via the tracks of the East Washington Railway Co. and the Capital Transit Co., except that this section shall not preclude the construction of an overpass at Deane Avenue, or preclude temporary interruption of the railroad transportation service described in this section when necessary to any construction on Kenilworth Avenue, or when necessary for construction of facilities described in section 1 of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the amendments are rather complicated. Before they are agreed to, I believe it would be in order for the distinguished Senator from Maine to make an explanation.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the first amendment I have proposed strikes all of section 3 of the bill. When the bill was first reported by the District Committee, Potomac Electric Power Co. felt that it would need authority to acquire some of the property of Capital Transit Co. which lies near the bridge authorized by this bill. The power company is now satisfied that it will not have to have the condemnation authority provided by section 3 to construct the proposed bridge, and to meet an objection of the Capital Transit Co., has agreed to the elimination of section 3.

The second amendment proposed merely renumbers the following section as section 3.

The third and final amendment proposed is designed to meet the objections of those parties having an interest in the arrangement by which coal is delivered to the power company's Benning plant by a combined use of the tracks of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, the East Washington Railway Co., and the Capital Transit Co. It merely states that the authority to build the bridge at Foote Street shall not be construed to authorize any construction, relocation, or removal of tracks or the construction of any structure which will prevent continuous rail transportation to the Benning plant over these combined facilities. The committee, in considering this bill, clearly understood that this alternative route to the Benning plant would not be disturbed by this bill and is glad to have this clarifying amendment which will remove any doubt on this point.

Mr. CASE. I merely wish to say that the pending bill was previously passed on a call of the calendar and then restored to the calendar, after action on it had been vacated, at the request of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. Other Senators who also indicated an interest in the bill felt that as originally drafted and introduced by me the bill confiscated some existing rights. My understanding is that the form of the bill as now presented is satisfactory to all parties concerned, and that it does not in any sense confiscate any rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the present or future public convenience and necessity require or will require the construction and operation of the crossings, tracks, and other facilities authorized by this act, and that—

SECTION 1. Potomac Electric Power Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the United States of America relating to the District of Columbia and a domestic corporation of the Commonwealth of Virginia, its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to construct, operate, and maintain in the District of Columbia railroad tracks providing a direct connection between the area bounded by Kenilworth Avenue NE., Benning Road NE., Foote Street NE., and the Anacostia River (hereinafter called the Benning plant area) and the right-of-way of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. in parcels 176/100 and 176/101 in said District; to construct, operate, and maintain an overhead bridge carrying such tracks across said Kenilworth Avenue NE.; and to construct, operate, and maintain in the Benning plant area all such industrial sidetracks, switches, crossings, tracks, turnouts, extensions, branch tracks, spurs, sidings, and connections as in the opinion of said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors or assigns, may be or become necessary or expedient or advisable for the development and use of the Benning plant area for such uses as may now or hereafter be permitted by or under the zoning regulations and maps of the District of Columbia as now or at any time hereafter in effect; and said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors and assigns, is hereby further authorized, until said overhead bridge is completed and ready for operation, to construct, operate, and maintain across said Kenilworth Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia, a railroad-track crossing at grade to provide a direct connection between the Benning plant area and said right-of-way of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., and from said crossing at grade to construct, operate, and maintain in the Benning plant area industrial sidetracks, switches, crossings, tracks, turnouts, extensions, branch tracks, spurs, sidings, and connections to the extent hereinabove authorized; and said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors and assigns, is hereby further authorized, in connection with the tracks, crossings, and other facilities herein authorized, to construct, operate, and maintain such electrical or other equipment and installations as in its opinion may be necessary, expedient, or advisable for the operation of said tracks, crossings, and other facilities: *Provided*, That upon completion of said overhead bridge, but not later than 1 year from the date of approval of this act or within such further period of time as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall permit, said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors and assigns, shall remove from said Kenilworth Avenue said temporary railroad track crossing said avenue at grade authorized by the provisions of this section.

SEC. 2. Before any portion of the construction work authorized by section 1 of this act shall be begun on the ground, a plan or plans for such portion shall be submitted to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for their approval, and only to the extent that such plan or plans shall be approved by said Commissioners shall such portion of the construction work herein authorized be permitted or undertaken: *Provided, however*, That such approval shall not be unreasonably withheld by said Commissioners.

SEC. 3. Said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to permit any railroad company or companies to use the bridge, Kenilworth Avenue grade crossing, industrial sidetracks, switches, crossings, tracks, turnouts, extensions, branch tracks, spurs, siding, and connections authorized by section 1 of this act to the extent deemed necessary or expedient or advisable by said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors or assigns.

SEC. 4. The authority granted herein shall not be construed to authorize any construction or relocation or removal of railroad track or tracks, or the construction of any structure which will prevent continuous rail transportation by standard railroad equipment by and between the railroad tracks of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and the premises of the Benning plant of the Potomac Electric Power Co. v/a the tracks of the East Washington Railway Co. and the Capital Transit Co., except that this section shall not preclude the construction of an overpass at Deane Avenue, or preclude temporary interruption of the railroad transportation service described in this section when necessary to any construction on Kenilworth Avenue, or when necessary for construction of facilities described in section 1 of this act.

COLLECTION OF INDEBTEDNESS OF MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL—BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will now proceed with the call of the calendar beginning with Order of Business 935, Senate bill 2728.

The bill (S. 2728) to authorize the collection of indebtedness of military and civilian personnel resulting from erroneous payments, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over for further study. I object to its consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

RENEWAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION FOR CARRYING MAIL ON WATER ROUTES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 361) to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Senate bill 361 was reported favorably by the committee with the following amendments: The word "inland" preceding the words "water route" was deleted which removed the restriction confining the routes to the continental United States. The remaining changes are necessary to make the proposed legislation conform to existing law which earlier amendments modified.

The extension of the desirable provisions applicable with respect to star-route contracts to contracts for water-route service should result in many instances in eliminating the necessity of terminating contracts and inviting new proposals for service, since there is little turnover in contractors at the end of the 4-year contract period. The giving of weight to satisfactory performance as the basis for continuation of their services will result in better morale among the contractors and provide added protection against the losses incurred in investment through underbidding of contracts.

The Postmaster General may renew the contract without advertising route for bids, where the service has been satisfactory, with the original contractor or where the original contractor has failed to give notice of his desire to renew the contract within 90 days, the Postmaster General may award the contract to the subcontractor operating thereunder. It gives the Postmaster General in his discretion, with the consent of the contractor, the right to readjust the compensation paid under the contract for increased or decreased cost occasioned by changed conditions during the term of the contract that could not have been anticipated at the time of the original or renewed contract.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does not the bill go so far as to include sea transportation?

Mr. CARLSON. It provides for contracts for water route service. It extends the provisions which now apply to star route contractors with regard to the renewal of contracts and adjustment of compensation under the contracts.

Mr. GORE. Was not the bill amended to grant the same privilege to ocean-going vessels carrying mails?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Tennessee is correct. It was amended to include the provision which he has suggested. Such amendment had the approval of all the departments concerned.

Mr. GORE. What was the position of the Post Office Department with respect to the bill after the amendment was added.

Mr. CARLSON. So far as I know, the Department favored the provision. It had its representatives at the hearing when the amendment was proposed and discussed and adopted. Therefore, I understand that it had the approval of the Post Office Department.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am informed that the bill would cover a great many contracts, and that since ocean mail has been added it is now a bill dealing with large contracts, whereas

the bill as originally introduced merely provided relief for star route carriers.

Mr. CARLSON. If there is any question about whether it has departmental approval, I would be willing to have the bill go over.

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from Tennessee would be prepared to withhold his objection if the proposed amendment were stricken out, but he would not be prepared to allow the bill to pass at this time with the amendment in the bill. Therefore, if the distinguished Senator would not object, I would suggest that the bill go over.

Mr. CARLSON. Personally, I would be happy to have the bill go over, because I wish to check into it further myself.

Mr. GORE. I congratulate the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

TRANSPORTATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF MAILS ON MOTOR-VEHICLE ROUTES

The bill (S. 2773) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756) was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Senate bill 2773 authorizes the Postmaster General to use his discretion in contracting or using Government-owned motor vehicles for the transportation and distribution of mails.

The committee reported the bill favorably with two amendments. The first amendment on page 1, line 8, provides that the Postmaster General would have the option either of using private contract or Government-owned motor vehicles. The second amendment is on page 1, line 9. The clerks covered therein are now known as "postal transportation clerks" instead of "railway postal clerks."

This proposed legislation removes the restriction which prohibits the establishment and operation of motor-vehicle service, equipped to distribute mail en route, where adequate railroad facilities are available. Under the present law, the Postmaster General is only authorized to contract for the carrying of mails and railway postal clerks on routes between points where it is found that railroad facilities are inadequate or are not available.

S. 2773 will allow the Postmaster General at his discretion to contract or use Government-owned motor vehicles for the transportation and distribution of mail en route. The new yardsticks to be now applied will be that of economy and service and the extended latitude for establishing highway post offices, such as are provided herein, will give the desired flexibility of schedules and service. They will be controlled by the needs of the Post Office Department and made to conform to their service needs rather than to conform to passenger needs as in the railroad service.

It is believed that by the removal of this restrictive provision which prevents free competition and by the proper administration in its freedom to choose the most efficient and economical methods of transportation of mails, the Post Office Department can offer greater service to its patrons at lower cost.

The Postmaster General, Bureau of the Budget, and Comptroller General recommend favorable consideration of this legislation in their reports.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have a particular case in mind in the State which I have the honor in part to represent. The Post Office Department seems to be quite eager to eliminate railway service to an important town in my State. The citizens of the community are very much opposed to the elimination. Under the bill, as I understood the explanation, the Postmaster General would be given complete discretionary authority to change the railway mail service to highway post office service and truck service. Does the bill include also bus service?

Mr. CARLSON. I believe that is correct. Under the amendment the Post Office Department is authorized to set up a motor carrier mail service. In addition to the federally owned and operated trucks, the Post Office Department would be authorized to make contracts with private carriers, which it cannot do at the present time.

Mr. GORE. May I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Kansas if there was a division in the committee on the bill, or whether the action of the committee was unanimous?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to state that the bill was unanimously reported by the committee, and the members of the committee hoped it would receive early approval because there was a need for the proposed legislation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I withhold objection to the bill. I do not object, Mr. President.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The purpose of the bill is to save money for the Post Office Department, is it not?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes; and also to improve the service in communities where train service is being removed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2773) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756), which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments, in line 8, after the word "to," to insert "use Government-owned motor vehicles or," and in line 10, after the word "and," to strike out "railway postal clerks" and insert "postal transportation clerks," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756), is hereby amended by striking out that part which precedes the first proviso and by inserting, in lieu thereof, the following: "The Postmaster General is authorized to use Government-owned motor vehicles or contract for carrying the mails and postal transportation clerks on routes between points where, in his judgment, conditions justify the operation of such service in motor vehicles especially designed and equipped for the distribution of mail en route."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 60) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 60 provides for the approval by the Congress of approximately 929 cases which have been recommended by the Attorney General for adjustment of immigration status to that of permanent residence. Appropriate quota charges are made in each case.

These cases were under the old immigration law, pursuant to which the Attorney General was empowered to suspend deportation of certain limited types of cases and to adjust the status of the alien involved to that of permanent residence, but his action is subject to affirmative congressional approval. Each of these cases has been carefully scrutinized for eligibility and for merit and their approval is recommended.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. By whom were the beneficiaries scrutinized, and who made the recommendations?

Mr. LANGER. They were scrutinized, first, by the Immigration Service, and then by the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. GORE. Was there a written recommendation?

Mr. LANGER. Oh, yes. This is under the old law.

Under the new law, the Immigration and Nationality Act, the categories of suspension cases requiring affirmative congressional approval have been limited so that affirmative congressional approval will be required only in those cases of suspension of deportation in which an adjustment of status is made for an alien in the criminal, subversive or other restricted categories.

Each case is gone into very carefully and reported to the full committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 60) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of this concurrent resolution see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15, 1954, p. 1711.)

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of this resolution see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15, 1954, p. 1715.)

MRS. ELEANOR EMILIE NELL—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 507) for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor Emilie Nell, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I find there is no report from the Department of Justice on this bill. I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee will give us an explanation of why the Justice Department has not made a report on the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, first of all, I shall give a report on the bill.

This bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 23-year-old native and citizen of Germany who last entered the United States on August 22, 1952, as a visitor to attend the funeral of her deceased husband who had been serving with our Armed Forces in Germany at the time of his death. The beneficiary is presently residing with her husband's mother, and, except for the death of her husband, she would have been eligible to enter the United States as a nonquota immigrant as the wife of a United States citizen.

This case was brought to my attention by the American Legion of the State of North Dakota. An American soldier had married in Germany and had died, and the widow is now living with her mother-in-law.

There was a report made on July 30, 1953, by the Department of Justice. I read:

JULY 30, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request of the Department of Justice for a report relative to the bill (S. 507) for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor Emilie Nell, there is annexed a memorandum of information from the Immigration and Naturalization Service files concerning the beneficiary.

The bill would grant the alien permanent residence in the United States upon payment of the required visa fee. It would also direct that one number be deducted from the appropriate immigration quota.

The alien is chargeable to the quota of Germany, which is not oversubscribed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. What explanation does the distinguished Senator have for the lack of a Justice Department report on this bill? Is there a change in policy?

Mr. LANGER. No. The Acting Commissioner is an agent of the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice has full charge of immigration and naturalization and names the Commissioner of Immigration. The Commissioner of Immigration once in a while goes to foreign countries, and during his absence there is an Acting Commissioner.

Mr. GORE. Does that same situation hold true with respect to other private immigration bills on the calendar?

Mr. LANGER. It holds true in certain cases, and in others it does not. It depends upon who makes the examination. There is a memorandum attached to the report which goes into the matter very fully. In other words, it has been approved by the Department of Justice.

Mr. GORE. I am not sure that I can follow the conclusion which the distinguished Senator reaches. I hesitate to object to the passage of a bill with reference to which the Senator gives such assurances. I wonder whether he would object if the bill should go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection to its going over until next week.

Mr. GORE. That would be better.

Mr. LANGER. I am perfectly willing to have it taken up next week.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

JULIE NICOLA FRANGOU

The bill (S. 662) for the relief of Julie Nicola Frangou was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Julie Nicola Frangou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DAVID T. WRIGHT

The bill (S. 893) for the relief of David T. Wright was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill? It involves the sum of $617.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the proposed legislation would pay to David T. Wright, Berkeley, Calif., the sum of $617 to reimburse him for losses suffered as a result of his being discharged during 1951 from his position as a steamfitter with a private contractor at Fort Richardson, Alaska, because of a determination by the United States Army, later found erroneous, that the claimant was a poor security risk.

This mistake was due to the fact that the Army confused the claimant with another individual of the same name. As a result, the claimant was forced to return to his home in California at his own expense, and to secure other employment.

The claimant asks reimbursement in the sum of $617 to cover transportation costs, travel time, and loss of salary during 10 days until he secured other employment after his untimely discharge.

The claimant cannot recover under the Federal Tort Claims Act, since, in this instance, the Army's mistake resulted from the exercise of a discretionary duty to which the Federal Tort Claims Act does not apply.

The Depatrment of the Army has no objection to the granting of an award in a reasonable amount.

The Bureau of the Budget makes no objection to the Army's report.

Does the distinguished Senator from Tennessee follow me?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, here is a man having the same name as another man who was found to be a bad security risk.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, with that explanation, I have no objection to the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to David T. Wright, 1525 One Thousand Oaks Boulevard, Berkeley, Calif., the sum of $617, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of losses suffered as a result of his being discharged in September 1951, from his position as a steam fitter for the Urban Plumbing and Heating Co. at Fort Richardson, Alaska, because of a determination by the United States Army, later found erroneous, that he was a poor security risk: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

AUGUSTA BLEYS (ALSO KNOWN AS AUGUSTINA BLEYS)

The bill (S. 915) for the relief of Augusta Bleys (also known as Augustina Bleys) was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wonder if we may have an explanation of the bill. I observe that the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado, the author of the bill, is in the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill would permit Augusta Bleys, also known as Augustina Bleys, to remain in the United States and to become a citizen. Mrs. Bleys came to the United States in 1949 as a teacher and nurse for a British consul, who later returned to Great Britain. She is a native of Holland. She was born in 1912. Mrs. Bleys has remained in this country since the return to Great Britain of the British consul by whom she was employed.

She took a course at Glocker-Penrose Hospital, in Colorado Springs. She is not a registered nurse, but is a practical nurse.

She is also a very talented and accomplished musician. She plays the flute

with the Denver Symphony Orchestra. She is a very splendid person in every respect. Unless the bill is enacted she will be deported. Mrs. Bleys is the kind of person who, I am certain, we desire to have become a citizen of the United States. If she is permitted to become a citizen in accordance with the bill, her entrance into the United States will be subtracted from the quota of Holland, so it will not mean that she will be received into this country in addition to the number permitted in the quota. If Mrs. Bleys is permitted to enter the country, it will mean that the United States will have the advantage of a very talented musician and a very splendid citizen, and a fine woman.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Augusta Bleys (also known as Augustina Bleys) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CLEOPATRA STAVROS MILIONIS

The bill (S. 929) for the relief of Cleopatra Stavros Milionis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cleopatra Stavros Milionis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DR. UHENG KHOO

The bill (S. 1209) for the relief of Dr. Uheng Khoo was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I observe that the able senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the sponsor of the bill, is in the Chamber. I wonder if he will explain the bill.

Mr. BUSH. The distinguished junior Senator from Florida does me great honor. This is a bill which I introduced. Dr. Uheng Khoo is a woman who has been very highly recommended to me by Dr. Edmund Sinnott, dean of the graduate school of Yale University, and also head of the department of science at Yale University. She has also been recommended by Dr. James G. Horsfall, director of the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station.

Mrs. Khoo was a British national of Chinese parentage. She was born in Malaya in 1921. I shall not go into her entire background, but the gentlemen whose names I have mentioned, in whom I have absolute confidence, speak of her as a young woman whose good character goes along with her excellent qualifications. I have no hesitancy whatsoever in recommending favorable action on the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Uheng Khoo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ESTATE OF SUSIE LEE SPENCER

The bill (S. 1265) for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. This bill proposes to pay the sum of $7,500 to the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, of Spartanburg, S. C., a Federal employee who was killed in 1943 during the course of her employment. Death resulted from the negligence of a fellow employee. The claim of her husband for death compensation under the provisions of the Federal employees Compensation Act was denied upon the ground that he was not fully dependent upon her for support at the time of her death.

The Department of Labor opposed an identical bill of the last Congress on the ground that it was contrary to the underlying principles of the Federal Employees Compensation Act. It observed that the act is aimed at compensating employees for loss of wage-earning capacity upon which they are dependent, and that it provides for equal treatment of employees. The Department of Justice concurred in the views of the Department of Labor.

Identical bills passed the 81st and 82d Congresses, but were vetoed by the President. Both veto messages were predicated upon the ground that the Employees Compensation Act is limited to those persons who are wholly dependent for support upon the deceased employee at the time of death.

The committee believes that this claim should not be so narrowly confined. The fact that the present claimant was not wholly dependent upon his wife, and for that reason alone his application for compensation under the act was denied, does not operate to bar claimant from petitioning the Government for a redress of grievances.

In considering this claim under the general rules governing tort liability in accordance with the rule of the place where the act occurred, and with special cognizance of the findings of the Navy's investigating officer, the committee is constrained to view this claim favorably, and in doing so it is acting upon a petition for redress of grievances presented by the claimant. The committee intends no circumvention of the Employees' Compensation Act.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Would not the Federal Tort Claims Act provide relief in this case?

Mr. LANGER. No; it would not.

Mr. GORE. Is it because this case is not within the jurisdiction of that act?

Mr. LANGER. It is not within its jurisdiction. As I said a moment ago, previous legislation in behalf of this claimant was twice vetoed by the President on the ground that the Federal Tort Claims Act applied. As a matter of fact, it does not.

I do not know of a case which the committee has considered more carefully than it has this case, because of the fact that it might establish a precedent. I may say that the bill was reported unanimously after the committee had gone into the matter in great detail, with all members of the committee being present.

Mr. GORE. I do not understand what the able Senator from North Dakota said about the bill establishing a precedent.

Mr. LANGER. I said the committee went into the matter very carefully, because we did not wish to present a bill which might have established a precedent on the part of the committee itself. The committee considered the case solely and purely upon the merits, as it was presented by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. GORE. Will the bill, if passed, establish a precedent?

Mr. LANGER. The committee does not think so. We think that under the peculiar circumstances and the peculiar set of facts involved, a precedent would not be established. As a matter of fact, the person concerned was not covered by the Employees' Compensation Act.

Mr. GORE. Was the decision on the part of the committee actuated purely by the equities in this particular case?

Mr. LANGER. Solely by the equities in this particular case. The committee is of the opinion that the bill is not unlike many others previously considered favorably by Congress and approved by the President, granting monetary relief to the surviving spouses who have died from injuries caused by the negligence of an employee of the Government. The committee, therefore, recommends favorable consideration of the bill.

Mr. GORE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for

a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, of Spartanburg, S. C., the sum of $7,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Susie Lee Spencer sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Navy locomotive at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Va., on December 11, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES ACT OF 1933, AND OTHER ACTS—BILL PASSED OVER

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have called out of order Calendar No. 1037, S. 2846, because it is necessary for me to leave the floor in order to attend a committee meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2846) to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we may have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. BUSH. It is not my intention to ask for action on or to explain the bill today. I asked that it be called because I shall object to its consideration. I think the bill deserves very careful consideration by the Senate. It represents a great deal of work and a very thorough review of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. I think the questions involved are too important to be dealt with on the basis of a bill to which there is no objection. For that reason I object to the immediate consideration of the bill, and I thank the distinguished Senators for their courtesy in allowing me to have the bill called out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

FRANKLIN JIM

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar 970, H. R. 1883, be taken up out of order. I am in somewhat the same situation as is the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, since I shall have to leave almost immediately to attend a committee meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1883) for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to strike out "to the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor" and to insert in lieu thereof "Franklin Jim, a."

Mr. GORE. Before the amendment is considered, I wish to reserve the right to object to the consideration of the bill at this time. The bill proposes a grant to a boy for an accident, and, so far as I am able to learn from the report, the liability of the United States Government is not clearly established. It may be that the author of the bill has information which I do not have. Before consenting to its present consideration, I desire to have an explanation of the liability of the Government.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is deeply interested in the bill, because it is for the purpose of partially compensating an Oklahoma Indian who, as a 13-year old boy, was attending an Indian boarding school at Pawnee, Okla. His name is Franklin Jim. He is a full-blooded Pawnee Indian. He and some other boys were assigned to assist in the operation of a sorghum mill.

Mr. GORE. By whom was the assignment of duty made?

Mr. KERR. The assignment of duty was made by the principal of the school.

I shall read to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee a quotation from the statement by L. E. Larson, principal of the school:

> As principal, I assume primary responsibility for permitting the operation of a machine with exposed gears. I am familiar with various regulations on safety, but the oversight occurred because it was a rented machine and only operated 2 or 3 days each year. Usually it was operated only by adults. Mr. Overman, Mr. Morris, Mr. Lane, and Mr. Walquist all share with me, in a degree, the responsibility for the accident. Each of these four men should have voiced vigorous protest at boys working near the machine. All were deeply shocked and grieved that the accident occurred. Boys are never permitted to drive tractors, disks, drills, or other power implements. This was the one exception and we paid for it.

This 13-year old boy was taken off one job where he was working in the building and, by the order of the principal or one of the teachers, directed to work at the sorghum mill. He protested against it, but was directed to go ahead and do the work assigned to him. In doing it, this accident occurred, by reason of exposed gears in a machine which violated not only the safety rules of the State of Oklahoma, but those which reasonable prudence would have dictated. The result was that the boy lost most of his left hand.

Franklin Jim has been seeking to be compensated for a number of years in order to finish his education. I should like to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee to a statement in the report showing what has happened to the young man since that time.

Mr. GORE. Before the Senator reads that, will he yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. Yes, I yield for a question.

Mr. GORE. In the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma, was the teacher clearly acting as an agent of the United States Government when making the assignment of duty to the students?

Mr. KERR. I cannot believe other than that that would be the necessary interpretation. The 13-year-old boy was in a school, and under the supervision and control of those in charge of the school, and he had no choice but to do that which was assigned to him to do.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the report contains a story which has a great deal of human appeal to it. This young man was admitted to the Pawnee-Ponca Hospital, at Pawnee, Okla., on October 10, 1945. The diagnosis was a crushing wound of the left hand. The treatment was amputation of the thumb, second, third, and four fingers of the left hand. He was dismissed on November 16, 1945.

During the summer of 1950 he had to go to the hospital at Tulsa, Okla., where he had a finger stump removed to facilitate use of the rest of the hand. Assistance for the operation was provided by the State Vocational Rehabilitation Service.

Because of the failure of the Government to meet its responsibility, this claimant, then a boy, now a young man, has had a very rugged experience, while seeking assistance from the vocational rehabilitation service, assistance in the way of an Indian Service educational loan back in 1950 and 1951, and further assistance to continue his college education through an additional educational loan.

Because of what happened to Franklin Jim under the circumstances described, he is physically disabled from working as an average American citizen. Therefore, in the interest of his own welfare, and in order to enable him to take care of himself and the family which he hopes to have, he is compelled to educate himself so that he may make a living in a more highly useful occupation than that of a day laborer.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is an able lawyer and a very responsible Member of the United States Senate. As author of the bill, if he states that upon his considered judgment there is liability on the part of the Government, then I shall accept his opinion.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for his statement. I say to the distinguished Senator that this young man is not permitted to go into court and establish his claim. His only recourse is to appeal to the Congress of the United States. I think every element of justice and equity would indicate a direct and affirmative answer to the question asked by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma.

If the Senator will yield further, I had some question about the amount of the payment. Is the Senator satisfied that $5,000 should be disbursed in this case?

Mr. KERR. I think $5,000 is inadequate. In the report there is a notation that in the 82d Congress a bill was enacted which provided for the payment of $5,000 to Harvey Marden for similar injuries which occurred in the United States Government laundry at the Mescalero Indian School in Mescalero, N. Mex., in 1932, which bill became Private Law 278 of the 82d Congress.

I really think the amount is inadequate and that, as I have indicated, it is fully justified.

Mr. GORE. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in connection with this bill, I should like to say that the majority calendar committee has studied this case and desires that ample consideration be given to it. I believe there was liability, and, furthermore, judging from the statement of the superintendent of schools, negligence was almost admitted.

However, I should like to address a question to some member of the Judiciary Committee. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has raised a question about the amount of the claim. What is the policy of the committee in regard to considering a resolution which would simply refer all such cases to the Court of Claims for determination of the actual damages?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, in answer to the question of the Senator from Kentucky, let me say that, in the first place, I doubt that the Court of Claims would have jurisdiction over such cases. In the second place, the Judiciary Committee can handle such matters much better than they could be handled downtown.

When the bill came to the committee, we considered all extenuating circumstances. We took into account the fact that the boy had been given some aid by way of education and had been carried along on the reservation, and not completely cut loose. We thought that under the circumstances the amount of $5,000 was a reasonable and adequate recovery in this particular case.

Mr. COOPER. Even though the committee might believe there is liability in such cases, it could, by means of an appropriate resolution, refer them to the Court of Claims for determination by it of the amount of damages.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I also call to my colleagues' attention the fact that the bill had already passed the House of Representatives, and in that connection the House had voted for the amount of money named. Our committee concurred in the finding of the House.

Mr. COOPER. I say again that in this particular case there is no disposition on my part to object on the basis of the facts, because I myself believe there is liability. However, case after case and bill after bill of this sort would seem to indicate that at times such matters could be referred to the Court of Claims for determination by it of the amounts due.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Of course, I think the Court of Claims is an excellent court. However, its jurisdiction is restricted to cases arising in contract. Its docket is 3 or 4 years behind. If claims of the character of this one were added to the court's already crowded docket, it would never get through with its work.

Inasmuch as this claim is one of a category on which the Judiciary Committee has customarily passed, I believe the committee should retain control of these cases, at least until further study.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Maryland has said. I wish to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to a letter, appearing in the committee report, from the Honorable Grady Lewis, who was the attorney for this Indian boy. The letter is dated June 10, 1952, and in it Mr. Lewis urges favorable action. I read from his letter:

> It will be borne in mind that several years have elapsed since this boy suffered the loss of almost an entire hand. He has, in one way or another, been able to remain in school and does not need a lot more time to finish college. If a sum that would slightly compensate him for his being made a cripple for life, together with an additional amount that would enable him to finish his college course, could be appropriated now, it would meet the actual needs of the situation.
>
> As attorney, I am quite willing to, and do, waive any claim for any fee that I might earn representing this minor.
>
> I hope the committee will see fit to grant this consideration to this worthy young man.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> GRADY LEWIS.

Mr. President, I appreciate the expeditious action of the Judiciary Committee in reporting this measure, and I appreciate the attorney's waiving of his fee, in order that the amount voted by the House of Representatives may be voted by the Senate, and in order that action may be taken and relief granted.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the amendment which has been submitted by the Senator from North Dakota is for the purpose of taking care of the situation arising from the fact that the claimant attained the age of 21 after the bill was reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota, which will be stated again.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "to the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor," and insert in lieu thereof "Franklin Jim, a."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Franklin Jim."

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration, out of order, of Senate bill 2698, Calendar 982, to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi. I make this request because I have an appointment in one of the departments. Therefore, I should like to have the bill considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, Senate bill 2698, provides for an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi. In order that there may be no confusion as to why this additional judgeship was not considered in connection with Senate bill 15, the omnibus judgeship bill, which recently passed the Congress and was enacted into law by the signature of the President, I shall state that the judgeship was not considered in the early study of Senate bill 15, which had passed the Senate and the House in the last session, when it became apparent that relief should be given to the southern district of Mississippi.

In the September meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, an additional district judgeship for the southern district of Mississippi was recommended by that body. In view of the fact that Senate bill 15 had at that time passed both Houses, there was no way in which this recommendation could be included in that legislation.

The facts are that, of the 86 districts in the United States, in 1953 the civil caseload for the southern district of Mississippi has made that district the fourth highest caseload district in the United States. This rise has been due primarily to contract cases. For example, actions dealing with Government contracts soared from 22 in 1952 to 102 in 1953, which, of course, is almost an increase of 5 times the number of cases in that category. Contract actions under the diversity jurisdiction of the court have risen from 36 to 49, which is also a substantial increase.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Why was it that the Judicial Conference did not make this recommendation soon enough to permit this matter to be considered in connection with the general bill which was passed recently?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know why the Conference did not make the recommendation sooner. The recommendation was made by the Judicial Conference in September of last year, and at that time the omnibus bill had passed both Houses and was in conference.

Mr. GORE. Therefore, this matter would not then have been in order as an amendment to the bill; is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. And not having been in either the Senate version or the House version of Senate bill 15——

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the circumstances, the conference committee would have no jurisdiction. In fact, I did not request the conference committee to consider this item.

Mr. President, I may note that the southern district of Mississippi is a one-

judge district, and the device of assigning judges from other districts for temporary help has been extensively used; but even with that temporary help, the caseload has continued to increase. In 1941, as of June 30, there were pending before the court 241 civil cases. As of June 30, 1953, this figure had risen to 365, so that it is obvious that over this period of time it has been impossible for the court to keep abreast of its work. Should this increase be allowed to continue, the southern district of Mississippi will find itself in the same dire circumstances as were many other districts which were given help by the enactment of Senate bill 15. In fact, the southern district of Mississippi is rapidly approaching that condition, and something must be done.

The same increase applies to criminal cases. The national average of criminal cases commenced per judgeship for 1953 was 171 per judge; while the figure for the southern district of Mississippi was 286. The Congress has been made aware of the distress existing in the Federal judiciary system due to the overload of the dockets, and thus enacted S. 15 to alleviate this situation. Unfortunately, the southern district of Mississippi was not included at that time.

On the basis of the facts related, the recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the unanimous recommendation of the Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which considered this bill, and the unanimous recommendation of the full Judiciary Committee, I think the bill should be enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the southern district of Mississippi, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts	Judges
"* * * * *	
"Mississippi:	
"* * * * *	
"Southern	2
"* * * * *."	

FIRST PREFERENCE FOR FORMER OWNERS OF CERTAIN DWELLINGS SOLD UNDER LANHAM WAR HOUSING ACT

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am obliged to leave the Chamber to attend a meeting. I ask unanimous consent, out of order, that Calendar No. 1036, House bill 6130, be called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6130) to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under Lanham War Housing Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, upon first study this appears to be general legislation; and under the procedure under which we have been operating recently, it is doubtful whether it should be considered on the call of the calendar. However, I should like to have an explanation from the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that it is general legislation, but it is extremely fair and equitable legislation.

I read from the committee report, which is very brief, and which I think covers the question rather clearly:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6130) to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under Lanham War Housing Act, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

Under the existing provisions of section 607 (b) of the Lanham Act, preference in the purchase of all permanent housing is required to be given (1) to veteran occupants, (2) nonveteran occupants, and (3) to veteran nonoccupants who intend to occupy the housing.

Most of the dwellings being disposed of under the Lanham Act were built by the Federal Government and were not in existence at the time the Government acquired the property in the project in which they are located. In one project, the Shanks Village project in New York, and possibly in one or two other isolated cases, however, at the time the Federal Government acquired the property a small number of permanent dwellings were already located on the site. This bill would give to the former owners of these existing dwellings a preference in purchasing them prior to that of veterans and present tenants. It would not give any preference to former owners of real property with respect to the sale of vacant land or of housing which was constructed by the Government.

The bill, it is important to note, gives the Administrator discretion in granting preference to former owners. This discretion could be used to take care of situations such as exist in one project where some of the dwellings are located on land which has been reserved for right-of-way of a federally aided highway. In such an instance it would not be feasible for the first preference to be given to former owners of the houses. There may be other cases where it would not be practicable to give such a preference.

The Housing Administrator could also provide a reasonable time limit on the duration of the preference or attach appropriate conditions to the sale, for example, that families now residing in the houses shall have a stated time in which to find other accommodations before they can be evicted.

Since your committee has been advised by the Housing Administrator that the legislation would avoid hardship to former owners, since it affects not more than an estimated 70 housing accommodations, and since your committee is satisfied that it would not disrupt the disposition program nor impair the aforementioned general preference provisions, your committee recommends that it be enacted.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, the Senator from New York has presented a very persuasive argument for the passage of the bill. Personally I favor its passage; but the question is raised as to whether a bill proposing general legislation should be passed on the call of the calendar.

Mr. IVES. It is frequently done, especially when it is noncontroversial; and this seems to be noncontroversial.

Mr. GORE. At the call of the calendar previous to the last one, criticism was voiced on both sides of the aisle against the consideration of bills proposing general legislation on the call of the calendar. The distinguished senior Senator from Florida raised the question. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] raised the question on the other side of the aisle. At that time there seemed to be considerable sentiment against the consideration of bills proposing general legislation on the call of the calendar.

It is not for the junior Senator from Tennessee to lay down any policy; but Senators absent themselves during the call of the calendar and, pretty generally, as they have said to me, do not expect general legislation to be enacted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. We would certainly greatly restrict the operation of the unanimous Consent Calendar if we were ever to accept as the policy of the Senate that no general legislation shall be considered on the call of the calendar. I respectfully say to the Senator from Tennessee that I think our policy has been not to consider general legislation which we say is major in scope; but so-called general legislation which is minor so far as its scope is concerned is considered on every call of the calendar.

I do not believe that our committees could do business if, in considering so-called minor bills, we had to look forward to a scheduled discussion of such bills following a motion to proceed to consider them. I think we might as well adopt a 12 months' calendar so far as our attendance is concerned, if we ever adopt such a rule.

In my judgment the test which we must apply goes to the question of our wisdom and discretion in deciding whether or not we are dealing with a bill so major in scope that, from the standpoint of public policy, we think it ought to be opened to general debate and have a time set for its consideration, as the result of a motion.

I am sure all Senators will agree with me that time and time again on the call of the calendar we have considered so-called general bills. However, for the most part they are unanimously recommended by the committee and, as the Senator from New York has said, they are noncontroversial. We operate in that way to expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not the function of the calendar committees on both sides of the aisle to notify the majority or minority leader if a certain legislative proposal is one which should be taken up separately? In the absence of such procedure, the Senate would not be able to transact its business.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished Senator from Maryland raises an interesting question about the function of the calendar committee. The junior Senator from Tennessee has been undertaking to discharge that function, and has been personally criticized for allowing bills to pass on the call of the calendar when they were general in nature. The distinguished Senator from Oregon says that if they are noncontroversial, it is all right. He says that the scope shall determine whether we should allow a bill to pass on the call of the calendar.

The bill in question would appear to be minor in nature, but upon the explanation of the distinguished Senator from New York, its scope appears to be rather broad. It is a general amendment to the Lanham Act.

Mr. IVES. The scope is broad only in appearance. It is not actually broad at all, because there are too few properties to be affected by the proposed legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. First, let me say most sincerely that I believe the Senator from Tennessee and his colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] on this side of the aisle, have been doing a remarkable job on the calendar. I believe they have been following the very sound policy of permitting so-called minor bills, although they may be general in scope, to come before the Senate on the call of the calendar, and they have held for motion bills which are either highly controversial, even though minor in nature, or what we consider in the Senate to be so-called major legislation. Each of us knows when a bill comes up whether we are dealing with major legislation or a so-called run-of-the-mill bill.

I respectfully say that the pending bill is the type of legislation which is only minor in scope, although general in application, in the sense that it fits the general rule, but its application makes it a very minor bill, it seems to me.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the understanding of the able Senator from Oregon, of the difficulties under which the members of the calendar committees perform their duties. I am persuaded in this case to withdraw my objection. However, I hope that the discussion will serve to illustrate the difficulties which we who serve on the calendar committees in performing a rather thankless task, encounter in permitting to pass without objection proposed legislation, which may appear minor in nature to one Senator, but very major in nature to another Senator.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that, after all, all Senators know the members who serve on the calendar committees. I agree that the members of the calendar committees perform a heroic and thankless job. I have great respect for the members of the calendar committees on both sides of the aisle. However, the fact remains that last Friday it was announced that the Senate would have a call of the calendar today. Every Senator had a right to voice his objection to the calendar committee on either side of the aisle. Every Senator understands that failure to voice objection with the calendar committee means that no objection will be made by the calendar committee. Therefore, I believe the situation is well taken care of.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the the Senator from Tennessee yield further?

Mr. GORE. First I should like to say that there are on the calendar today bills on which reports have reached the calendar committee only today. On last Friday the Senate concluded a historic debate. A few Members of the Senate have left town on official business, and some Senators have left the city on personal business. I am quite sure that there are a number of bills on the calendar of which those Senators have had no notice whatever. There are bills on the calendar of which I had notice only since I came into the Chamber.

Therefore, the rule does not always apply. I now yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. I wish to supplement what the Senator from New York has stated. I believe that Members of the Senate who are not members of the calendar committees have an obligation to defend the members of the calendar committees when they carry out their functions.

However, I also believe we have the right to object when a Member of the Senate asks the calendar committee to proceed to exercise some kind of blanket objection to a category of bills, without specifying a particular bill. To do so is to ask the calendar committee to do something it has no right to agree to do. Every Member of the Senate has the duty either to be on the floor of the Senate when the calendar is called, or to file with the calendar committee a specific objection to a specific bill.

I, as one Member of the Senate, object to any attempt on the part of any of my colleagues, or any group of my colleagues, to make the calendar committee a sort of general objecting committee to a category of bills which some Members of the Senate desire to characterize as bills proposing general legislation.

I say to the members of the calendar committees that if they yield to that kind of objection they are doing the rest of us a wrong. The rest of us have a right to have the calendar considered on the basis of specific objections filed with the calendar committees by individual Senators. But I do not believe that the work of the Senate should be handicapped by a general, unspecified objection, filed with a calendar committee. The members of the calendar committees, in turn, should not assume that responsibility for other Members of the Senate. I believe the rest of us ought to make it very clear to the Senate that we do not expect the calendar committees to be subjected to that kind of procedure, because it is not fair to the other Members of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, what the distinguished and able Senator from Oregon says sounds very good, but it does not work out that way so far as my experience as a member of the calendar committee on this side of the aisle is concerned.

For example, there is on the calendar, and has been on the calendar for the past several weeks, a bill to grant statehood to Hawaii. So far as I am concerned I have not had one Member of the Senate request me to object to the bill. I have objected to it several times, on the ground that it is general legislation and important legislation, and that it is legislation which is too important to pass on the call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection.

Therefore, if we are to sit here merely as a register of objections filed by other Members of the Senate, we would minimize and practically eliminate our functions.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Tennessee has been objecting to a bill granting statehood to Hawaii, and it has been perfectly proper for him to do so. It is in keeping with the policy I have just discussed. But, if the Senator from Tennessee is objecting because he has a feeling that some of his colleagues do not believe that legislation which is general in scope should be passed on the call of the calendar, then I say most respectfully I believe it to be a bad policy. I believe we are entitled to have individual Senators specifically object to bills for specific reasons. We ought not to have general objections filed with the calendar committees, and the members of the calendar committees should not feel compelled to carry out requests which are in the nature of so-called general objections. When the Senator from Tennessee objects to a bill granting statehood to Hawaii there is always the power in the Senate to move that the bill be considered and I do not believe any harm has been done by following that procedure.

If the kind of bill now before us is to be objected to on the ground that it proposes general legislation, and it is necessary to wait until the majority leader will let it come up on motion, that kind of legislation will never get before the Senate, and it will die at the end of the session, because the majority leader probably never will find the time to have it brought up on motion for consideration by the Senate.

I hope the calendar committees, in their conferences together, will consider the point which the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Oregon are raising this afternoon. We are trying to do two things. First, we are fighting to protect the jurisdiction of the calendar committees in that we do not believe that the members of the calendar committees should be handicapped in the way that some Senators are trying to handicap them. Secondly, we are trying to expedite the business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would remind Senators of the 5-minute rule.

Mr. GORE. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Tennessee that in the year I have served as a member of the calendar committee on the majority side, no member of the majority has ever protested or filed any protest with the majority calendar committee that it has failed to prevent the passage of general legislation on the call of the calendar.

I agree with the statement of the purpose of the calendar committees which was made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. We consider it to be our function to register objection made by members of the majority, if they are not able to be present. Furthermore, I would say that if as an individual Senator I believed, or if my colleague, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] believed, or if the members of the minority calendar commitee believed there was some question as to whether a bill was of major interest, we would have a right to object individually.

Each of us knows, when a bill is called on the calendar, whether we are dealing with major legislation or a so-called run-of-the-mill bill.

It is a matter of individual objection. We believe that the protection against the passage of proposed general legislation a call of the calendar lies not only in the hands of the calendar committees, but in the power of any Member to be present and to object. We certainly do not take the position that we are some supercommittee attempting to determine what type of legislation can be passed upon a call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] if any check has been made with veterans organizations as to whether they have any objection to the elimination of veterans' preferences.

Mr. IVES. No. I happen to be a member of several veterans' organizations, myself, and I have heard of nothing of that kind.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator knows of no reason why veterans might feel that this bill might take away some of the preferences which Congress has previously given to them?

Mr. IVES. It would take away the preference to the extent which I have indicated in reading the report. It is very limited in that the original owners of the property themselves should have a vested right in it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the able Senator from New York have the same feeling as to other properties which may have been taken by the Government, and then, when the Government is ready to dispose of them, is it his opinion that the former owners should have first priority in repurchasing the land?

Mr. IVES. There is something besides land involved. There are houses. If it were only land, I would not feel that way about it. That is why discretion is left with the Administrator.

It was at first proposed to make it mandatory. I objected to that, myself. After all, I think the discretion should be left with the Administrator.

Mr. SMATHERS. I ask these questions only because it may be that an effort is being made to establish some new policy. As the Senator well knows, there are many instances of property being taken at the time of the war from private owners and used for military installations, and since that time the military installations have been removed. Now the question arises on the part of most of the property owners as to why they do not have a right to get back the property. The law says they cannot do so.

Mr. IVES. If the bill were on a broad scale I would have opposed it, but it is so limited in its application that I do not think any damage could occur from it.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6130) to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under the Lanham War Housing Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle for their courtesy.

EXTENSION FOR 5 YEARS FOR VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN FOR ADMITTANCE TO LOW-RENT HOUSING

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar 1038, Senate bill 2937.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2937) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing without meeting the requirements of section 15 (8) (b) (ii) of that act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator from New York agree that the same general situation regarding the bill just passed applies to this bill?

Mr. IVES. I think here we have even a clearer case because the law expires today, and we are having to extend it to August 1 in anticipation of a new housing act which it is expected will be passed before Congress finally adjourns. It is very essential that the law be extended.

Mr. GORE. The title of the bill refers to amending the United States Housing Act of 1937, so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing. It involves a 5-year period.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator from Tennessee wish me to read the committee report?

Mr. GORE. I shall appreciate it if the Senator will do so.

Mr. IVES. The report reads as follows:

> The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2937) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing without meeting the requirements of section 15 (8) (b) (ii) of that act, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment, and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.
>
> This bill as introduced would have amended section 15 (8) (b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent public housing without meeting the requirement of such section that they must have come from substandard housing at the time of admission to public housing. Unless extended, this period expires March 1, 1954. Your committee has amended the bill to provide for a temporary extension to August 1, 1954, in order to give your committee an opportunity to consider this provision in connection with other housing legislation pending before the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2937) which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "than", to strike out "March 1, 1949" and insert "August 1, 1954", so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 15 (8) (b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U. S. C., sec. 1415 (b)) is amended by striking out "not later than 5 years after March 1, 1949" and inserting "not later than August 1, 1954."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should like to have considered three bills out of order. They are Calendar Nos. 1000, 1001, and 1003, Senate bills 740, 747, and 924, respectively. I make this request because there will be a meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at 2:30, which I must attend, and I should appreciate it if we can consider these three bills at this time out of order.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we have been working for some time this afternoon, and have considered approximately only 12 bills. I recognize the reasons which require certain Senators to ask that certain bills be considered out of order. I simply suggest that we can never finish the calendar if such a practice is continued. I shall not object in this instance, but, for the sake of orderly procedure, I think we should in the future proceed with the regular call of the calendar.

SANTA MUCIACCIA AND OTHERS

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for not objecting.

Mr. President, I first ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Order No. 1000, Senate bill 740.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 740) for the relief of Santa Muciaccia and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. KENNEDY. This bill is for the purpose of permitting three Sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary to remain in this country to help man the staff of a hospital. These three Sisters are now working as nurses at the Joseph P. Kennedy Memorial Hospital in Massachusetts. They came from Italy in 1949, and they are all vitally important to the administration of the hospital, and, therefore, would like to remain in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 740) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Santa Muciaccia (Sister Maria Fridiana), Teresa Saragaglia (Sister Maria Eutropia), and Caterina Isonni (Sister Maria Giovita) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

JACEK VON HENNEBERG

Mr. KENNEDY. I next ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Order No. 1001, Senate bill 747.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 747) for the relief of Jacek Von Henneberg.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to a Polish young man. He had 3 brothers, 1 of whom was killed by Communists. He went to England and studied architecture and has established himself in the community. A former Governor of Massachusetts, and other citizens who know him well, recommend him. I have known him well, and I think he would be a good addition to this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 747) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jacek Von Henneberg shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SOFIA B. PANAGOULOPOULOS KANELL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Order No. 1003, Senate bill 924.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 924) for the relief of Sofia B. Panagoulopoulos Kanell.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this bill concerns a young girl, Sofia B. Kanell, who was adopted by an American citizen. In 1948 she was approximately 10 years old. She is a grandniece of an American who adopted her. Her family suffered hardships as a result of the guerilla struggle in Greece. A number of members of her family were destroyed. Therefore she has been adopted by her great uncle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Sofia B. Panagoulopoulos Kanell, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. George V. Kanell, citizens of the United States.

BERENICE CATHERINE MONTGOMERY

The bill (S. 1594) for the relief of Berenice Catherine Montgomery was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Berenice Catherine Montgomery shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DORA VIDA LYEW SEIXAS

The bill (S. 2534) for the relief of Dora Vida Lyew Seixas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dora Vida Lyew Seixas shall be classified as an immigrant under the provisions of section 101 (a) (27) (C) of that act.

REV. ARMANDO FUOCO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 235) for the relief of Rev. Armando Fuoco, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee," to insert "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rev. Armando Fuoco shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PANTELIS MORFESSIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 267) for the relief of Pantelis Morfessis, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Pantelis Morfessis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HAROLD TREVOR COLBOURN—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 268) for the relief of Harold Trevor Colbourn was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 26-year-old native of Australia who last entered the United States as an ex-

change scholar to attend college. After receiving his degree, he attended Johns Hopkins University to obtain a doctor's degree in history. The beneficiary is married to a lawful resident alien and is employed as instructor in American history in a State college.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator from Maryland know whether there is an amendment prepared to the bill, which would provide that the young man would have to repay to the Government the money which he has received under the Exchange Students Act for his education?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. There is no amendment to cover that situation.

Mr. SMATHERS. Under those conditions, I am constrained to object, because I know several Senators have objected to similar bills introduced on behalf of students who, after having come to the United States, and having studied under the Exchange Students Act, applied for permanent residence. It was believed that the students should at least reimburse the Federal Government for the amounts which had been paid to them. Until that is done in this case, I shall object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MOSHE GIPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 945) for the relief of Moshe Gips, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Moshe Gips shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELISEU JOAQUIM BOA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1062) for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", and on page 2, line 1, after the word "available", to insert "The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel the deportation proceeding heretofore instituted against Eliseu Joaquim Boa as well as the order and warrant of deportation issued therein; and the said Eliseu Joaquim Boa shall not hereafter be subject to exclusion or deportation from the United States by reason of the same facts upon which the outstanding order and warrant of deportation were issued", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eliseu Joaquim Boa shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel the deportation proceeding heretofore instituted against Eliseu Joaquim Boa as well as the order and warrant of deportation issued therein; and the said Eliseu Joaquim Boa shall not hereafter be subject to exclusion or deportation from the United States by reason of the same facts upon which the outstanding order and warrant of deportation were issued.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. JAGANATH P. CHAWLA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1156) for the relief of Dr. Jaganath P. Chawla, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "Dr.", to strike out "Jaganath" and insert "Jagannath", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Jagannath P. Chawla shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Jagannath P. Chawla."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 8069) to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and it was signed by the Vice President.

TRAGEDY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I withhold my request.

Mr. SMATHERS. I desire to ask the Senator from Maryland if he is suggesting the absence of a quorum because he has obtained information from the news ticker that several Members of the House have been shot at from the House gallery, and he believes it to be wise to have a quorum present before a decision is reached as to what the Senate should do in the circumstances?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I may say to my good friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Florida, that I shall suggest the absence of a quorum so that the majority leader can come to the Chamber and be apprised of the situation; and then, after consultation with the minority, either move to recess or continue with the call of the calendar.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able senior Senator from Maryland if it is his intention to proceed with the call of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It was my intention to do so.

Mr. SMATHERS. Has the Senator given any consideration to requesting a recess until tomorrow, out of respect for the Members of the House of Representatives who have been injured in line of duty?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes, I have. The majority leader has just appeared on the floor of the Senate, and I shall ask him to answer the question of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in view of the circumstances in the other Chamber, and the concern of the Members of the Senate for our colleagues in that body, I am about to move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. If the circumstances are such that we should proceed with the call of the calendar tomorrow, the intention is to proceed from the point at which the call was interrupted today. In the meantime, I shall be in touch with the minority leader on any further developments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 2, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 1, 1954:

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

John M. Cabot, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sweden.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Henry F. Holland, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Roswell Burchard Perkins, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Morton P. Fisher, of Maryland, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1944.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

To be Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister of the United States of America

Edward T. Wailes, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 1:

George M. Abbott, of Ohio.
Garret G. Ackerson, Jr., of New Jersey.
Max Waldo Bishop, of Iowa.
Howard Rex Cottam, of Utah.
Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama.
Avery F. Peterson, of Idaho.
James B. Pilcher, of Georgia.
Harold M. Randall, of Iowa.
Horace H. Smith, of Ohio.
Henry E. Stebbins, of Massachusetts.
Carl W. Strom, of Minnesota.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 2:

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
Robert M. Carr, of California.
Harlan B. Clark, of Ohio.
Leon L. Cowles, of Utah.
H. Francis Cunningham, Jr., of Nebraska.
Donald D. Edgar, of New Jersey.
James W. Gantenbein, of Oregon.
William M. Gibson, of New York.
Theodore J. Hohenthal, of California.
John P. Hoover, of California.
Richard A. Johnson, of Illinois.
Edward P. Maffitt, of Missouri.
Roy M. Melbourne, of Virginia.
David A. Thomasson, of Kentucky.
Rolland Welch, of Texas.
Thomas K. Wright, of Rhode Island.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 3:

Kenneth A. Byrns, of Colorado.
John A. Calhoun, of California.
William H. Christensen, of Ohio.
Adrian B. Colquitt, of Georgia.
William N. Dale, of New York.
Donald A. Dumont, of New York.
Clifton P. English, of Tennessee.
Joseph N. Greene, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Henry A. Hoyt, of California.
Charles E. Hulick, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Spencer M. King, of Maine.
LaRue R. Lutkins, of New York.
George E. Miller, of New Jersey.
David G. Nes, of Maryland.
Herbert V. Olds, of Virginia.
James L. O'Sullivan, of Connecticut.
Richard I. Phillips, of California.
Ernest V. Siracusa, of California.
Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., of California.
S. Roger Tyler, Jr., of West Virginia.
Livingston D. Watrous, of New York.
Harvey R. Wellman, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 4:

Philip E. Haring, of Pennsylvania.
Hendrik van Oss, of New Jersey.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 4 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Alfred L. Atherton, Jr., of Massachusetts.
James J. Blake, of New York.
Frank E. Cash, Jr., of Minnesota.
Thomas J. Corcoran, of New York.
Samuel D. Eaton, of New York.
Richard T. Ewing, of Maryland.
Richard G. Johnson, of New York.
Bruce M. Lancaster, of Mississippi.
Roye L. Lowry, of Washington.
Frank E. Maestrone, of Connecticut.
Eugene V. McAuliffe, of Massachusetts.
Richard M. McCarthy, of Iowa.
Sandy MacGregor Pringle, of New York.
Herbert F. Propps, of Wisconsin.
Ernest E. Ramsaur, Jr., of California.
Thomas M. Recknagel, of New York.
William Perry Stedman, Jr., of Maryland.
Galen L. Stone, of Massachusetts.
William H. Sullivan, of Rhode Island.
Charles R. Tanguy, of Maryland.
John M. Thompson, Jr., of Florida.
William H. Witt, of South Carolina.
Robert L. Yost, of California.
Robert W. Zimmermann, of Minnesota.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 5:

John A. Baker, Jr., of Connecticut.
Harry G. Barnes, Jr., of Minnesota.
John W. Black, of Washington.
Samuel C. Brown, of Rhode Island.
William A. Buell, Jr., of Rhode Island.
Pratt Byrd, of Kentucky.
Christian G. Chapman, of New York.
Elwin F. Chase, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
George T. Churchill, of Colorado.
W. Kennedy Cromwell 3d, of Maryland.
Frank J. Curtis, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Arthur R. Day, of New Jersey.
William L. Eagleton, Jr., of Illinois.
Theodore L. Eliot, Jr., of California.
James B. Engle, of Iowa.
Raymond E. González, of California.
Herbert I. Goodman, of Pennsylvania.
Harry W. Heikenen, of Minnestota.
Gordon G. Heiner 3d, of Maryland.
Henry L. Heymann, of Pennsylvania.
Max E. Hodge, of New York.
Lewis Hoffacker, of Arizona.
Robert B. Houston, Jr., of Missouri.
Wharton Drexel Hubbard, of New York.
Heyward Isham, of New York.
James R. Johnston, of Ohio.
Walter M. McClelland, of Oklahoma.
John A. McVickar, of New York.
William B. Miller, of Ohio.
Grant E. Mouser 3d, of Ohio.
Paul M. Popple, of Illinois.
Clifford J. Quinlan, of Minnesota.
Frederick H. Sacksteder, Jr., of New York.
David T. Schneider, of Massachusetts.
Peter A. Seip, of Iowa.
Roland C. Shaw, of Massachusetts.
Herman T. Skofield, of New Hampshire.
Paul A. Smith, Jr., of Virginia.
Richard E. Snyder, of New Jersey.
William F. Spengler, of Wisconsin.
Daniel Sprecher, of New York.
Jack A. Sulser, of Illinois.
David R. Thomson, of the District of Columbia.
Theodore A. Tremblay, of California.
William N. Turpin, of Georgia.
J. Robert Wilson, of Pennsylvania.
Orme Wilson, Jr., of New York.
Arthur I. Wortzel, of New Jersey.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Harold R. Becker, of New York, to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y.

Bligh A. Dodds, of New York, to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 7, with headquarters at Ogdensburg, N. Y.

James W. Bingham, of Texas, to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 22, with headquarters at Galveston, Tex.

James L. Latimer, of Texas, to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 21, with headquarters at Port Arthur, Tex.

SUPREME COURT

Earl Warren, of California, to be Chief Justice of the United States.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Walter H. Hodge, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2, district of Alaska.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

To be United States attorneys for the district indicated with their respective names

Jack D. H. Hays, of Arizona, district of Arizona.
Osro Cobb, of Arkansas, eastern district of Arkansas.
J. Leonard Walker, of Kentucky, western district of Kentucky.
Robert E. Hauberg, of Mississippi, southern district of Mississippi.
Maurice Paul Bois, of New Hampshire, district of New Hampshire.
Theodore F. Bowes, of New York, northern district of New York.
Donald R. Ross, of Nebraska, district of Nebraska.
Julian T. Gaskill, of North Carolina, eastern district of North Carolina.
Sumner Canary, of Ohio, northern district of Ohio.
Clarence Edwin Luckey, of Oregon, district of Oregon.
Heard L. Floore, of Texas, northern district of Texas.
Malcolm R. Wilkey, of Texas, southern district of Texas.
Louis Gorman Whitcomb, of Vermont, district of Vermont.
George Edward Rapp, of Wisconsin, western district of Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

To be United States marshals for the districts indicated with their respective names

Claire A. Wilder, of Alaska, division No. 1, district of Alaska.
Fred S. Williamson, of Alaska, division No. 3, district of Alaska.
Albert Fuller Dorah, Jr., of Alaska, division No. 4, district of Alaska.
Cooper Hudspeth, of Arkansas, western district of Arkansas.
Tom Kimball, of Colorado, district of Colorado.
Donald A. Fraser, of Connecticut, district of Connecticut.
Billy Elza Carlisle, of Georgia, middle district of Georgia.
Vernon Woods, of Illinois, eastern district of Illinois.
Eugene Levi Kemper, of Kansas, district of Kansas.
Edward John Petitbon, of Louisiana, eastern district of Louisiana.
Louis O. Aleksich, of Montana, district of Montana.
J. Bradbury German, Jr., of New York, northern district of New York.
George M. Glasser, of New York, western district of New York.
Xavier North, of Ohio, northern district of Ohio.
Frank Quarles, of Tennessee, eastern district of Tennessee.
John Overall Anderson, of Tennessee, middle district of Tennessee.
Dewey Howard Perry, of Vermont, district of Vermont.
Peter Auburn Richmond, of Virginia, western district of Virginia.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. John Alexander Klein, O7536, to be The Adjutant General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force for service as members of the Air National Guard:

Brig. Gen. Laurence Coffin Ames, AO131519, to be major general, California Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Guy Nelson Henninger, AO129883, to be major general, Nebraska Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Brig. Gen. James Alvin May, AO356464, to be major general, Nevada Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Errol Henry Zistel, AO286558, to be major general, Ohio Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Col. Lewis Allen Curtis, AO729140, to be brigadier general, New York Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Col. Joseph Jacob Foss, AO944215, to be brigadier general, South Dakota Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Col. Maurice Adams Marrs, AO274899, to be brigadier general, Oklahoma Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Col. Winston Peabody Wilson, AO398325, to be brigadier general, Arkansas Air National Guard, to date from January 21, 1954.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to the grade indicated in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be ensigns

Charles P. Andersen
Thomas R. McCalla
Gordon R. Papritz
Ernest E. Ritchie
Gerald K. Seiple
Daniel W. Urish
Cecil C. Davis (Naval Reserve aviator)
Lee H. Sherman (Naval Reserve aviator)

To be lieutenant (junior grade), Medical Corps

Charles K. Deeks

To be lieutenant (junior grade) Chaplain Corps

Donald F. Kingsley, Jr.
Arthur J. Wartes
Jack H. Zoellner

To be lieutenant, Dental Corps

Marvin H. Scott

To be lieutenant (junior grade) Dental Corps

Ernest M. Pennell, Jr.
Paul A. Koppes
Julius E. Lueders

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

John W. Crozier, Benson.
Richard E. Lawrence, Jerome.
Ollie C. Wilson, Scottsdale.

ARKANSAS

Thomas H. Edwards, De Queen.

CALIFORNIA

Amey L. Weiser, Aptos.
Robert H. Marshall, Bakersfield.
Edwin R. Vetter, Big Creek.
Emil J. Nelson, Brookdale.
Martha L. Ward, Canby.
Carl H. Stahlheber, Chula Vista.
Charlie L. Veitch, Compton.
Ellen G. Goforth, Covelo.
Ronald L. Pascoe, Gustine.
Donald H. Onstad, Ione.
John Healy, Livingston.
Edward S. Chadburn, Needles.
William L. Klette, North Fork.
S. Merritt Williams, Palm Springs.
Eugene E. Schulenburg, Pismo Beach.
John H. Shewman, Pomona.
Warren J. Bond, San Quentin.
Louis Sibilio, Santa Maria.
Leola E. Heins, Shingle.
Alma W. LaChambre, Sunset Beach.
Elizabeth J. Otto, Temecula.
Harold E. Rolfe, Topanga.
Blythe W. Richards, Tracy.
Charles Hugh Ross, Tulare.
Warren P. Hollingsworth, Turlock.
Roy A. Ray, Upland.
Fred H. Jenkins, Watsonville.

COLORADO

Austin C. Bledsoe, Fleming.
Phillip J. Woods, Las Animas.
Reba L. Bradley, Palmer Lake.

CONNECTICUT

Ellen S. Breining, Bloomfield.

FLORIDA

Thelma S. Speer, Boca Grande.
Bernard O'Brien, Panama City.

GEORGIA

Mattie H. Chandler, Keysville.
Lloyd C. Ricks, Macon.
Albert D. McKee, Moultrie.

ILLINOIS

Carrie L. Smith, Bellflower.
Donald W. Fraser, Blue Island.
Alan E. Rigg, Bone Gap.
Charles E. Eyestone, Brownstown.
Gertrude E. Dean, Flossmoor.
Harley Gustine, Greenfield.
Orville O. Rathbun, Gridley.
Frank A. Smallwood, Harmon.
Gregory M. Sheahen, Highland Park.
James A. Hight, Karnak.
Milo L. Craig, Kewanee.
John S. West, Lockport.
Cynthia Afton Stewart, Olive Branch.
Edgar J. Baldwin, Palos Park.
Curtis Fenton, Sims.
Harold J. Winans, Sycamore.
James L. Rousey, Wapella.
Kenneth J. Tate, Waterman.
Clifton M. Evans, Waukegan.

IOWA

Arthur M. Robinson, Bayard.
Kenneth C. Anderson, Clinton.
Ralph O. Woods, Colfax.
Louis F. Obye, Estherville.
Keith H. Radloff, Farmersburg.
Stewart L. Schwab, Guthrie Center.
Donald E. Clayton, Hamburg.
Lewis L. Welden, Iowa Falls.
James Emerson Evans, Joice.
Goldie M. Schneider, Popejoy.
Erwin G. Dieter, Rock Rapids.
Norman W. Jespersen, Royal.
Morris G. Dahl, Sloan.

KANSAS

Esther L. Thomm, Athol.
Reuben H. Moore, Holton.
Edward J. Schoenhofer, St. Paul.

LOUISIANA

Alton Leander Lea, Baton Rouge.
William C. Tucker, Haynesville.

MAINE

Ralph A. Miles, Jr., Burnham.
Arthur Atwood Anderson, Caribou.
Bentley L. Glidden, Damariscotta.
George W. Warren, Dover-Foxcroft.

MARYLAND

Nelsie M. Hannon, Accokeek.
Robert R. Ripple, Clinton.
Anna V. Groves, Glenn Dale.

MASSACHUSETTS

Martha Helen Lindsey, Huntington.
Mabel Griffin, Mendon.
John J. Gobell, New Bedford.
Emile F. St. Onge, Ware.

MICHIGAN

Lewis G. Howe, Bath.
Clair E. Courtade, Buckley.
Bernard C. Shankland, Cadillac.
Lawrence A. Olson, Coleman.
Harold J. Geers, Kent City.
George W. Crist, Litchfield.
James Martin Littlejohn, New Buffalo.
Carl E. Dennis, Rockford.
George E. Osgood, St. Johns.

MINNESOTA

Harvey M. Madson, Grand Rapids.
Keith W. Oleson, Isanti.
Darrell W. Matter, Lyle.
Carrol J. Strom, St. James.
James P. McCoy, Savage.
George H. Carrell, Zumbrota.

NEBRASKA

Eugene J. O'Neill, St. Libory.

NEW JERSEY

Wilbur F. Rue, Allentown.
Thomas Alfred Stevens, Cape May.
Margaret H. Merrill, Essex Fells.
Wilbur A. Smock, Farmingdale.
Robert P. Wichmann, Little Silver.
Richard G. Haffey, Longport.
Eleanor S. Howell, Stewartsville.
Harry Thomas Applegate, Toms River.
George R. Baldwin, Wenonah.
William C. Nestor, Westfield.
Leon E. McElroy, Woodbridge.
Louis A. Pime, Woodbury.

OREGON

William A. Rees, Fairview.
Glendora V. Smith, Grass Valley.
Walter E. Sneddon, Lowell.
Robert R. Ireland, Milton-Freewater.
Herbert R. Parker, Oakland.
James H. Grieve, Prospect.

PENNSYLVANIA

Franklin Levis Stringfellow, Chester.
William H. Anderson, Ebensburg.
Earl M. Miller, Elizabethtown.
Kathryn E. Kurtz, Leacock.
George A Paul, McConnellsburg.
Elmer B. Neff, Mount Holly Springs.
Milton L. Dodge, Smethport.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Florence M. Weiland, Marion.
Vada E. Koehne, Oldham.
Elmer R. Humeston, Redfield.
Chester A. Beaver, Yankton.

TEXAS

John Brice Jones, Baird.
James T. Jolley, Clarksville.
Dudley C. Jernigin, Fort Worth.
William X. Priesmeyer, Garwood.
Mario M. Seymour, Jacksonville.
Nell G. Pryor, Kirbyville.
Julia W. Toalson, Kyle.
Guy Wetzel, Longview.
Rufus L. Boren, Mart.
Cecil F. Sorell, Mission.
Bertrand T. Hansen, Navasota.
Frank N. Cook, Olney.
Allie M. Sanders, Scurry.
Thomas Everett McClanahan, Slaton.
Margie Hugonin, Tomball.

VERMONT

Lois G. Hughes, Bomoseen.

VIRGINIA

Pitzhugh L. Davis, Altavista.
William L. Skinnell, Bedford.
Tousley M. Hooker, Berryville.
Marian H. Gardner, Fredericks Hall.
Thomas W. Travis, Keysville.
James M. McIntosh, Orange.
Wilbur R. Johnston, Winchester.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose divine laws and beneficent purposes are the only foundation of a social order wherein dwelleth righteousness and peace, we thank Thee for this new week.

Grant that daily we may be inspired to see that the human race, which is

one in origin and destiny, must also be one in a great fellowship of good will and friendship, of sympathy and service.

Help us to understand that if our religious faith has in it the principle of the fatherhood of God then its practice must be that of the brotherhood of man.

Show us how we may hasten the dawning of that blessed time when the human heart shall be impervious to all feelings and attitudes of hatred and prejudice and bigotry.

May men and nations everywhere be partners in the moral and spiritual enterprise of building a nobler world order and may each day be radiant with the promises of a more magnanimous and brotherly spirit.

In Christ's name we bring our petitions. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 25, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 27, 1954, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Tequillo.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) entitled "Joint resolution granting the status of a permanent residence to certain aliens"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. HENDRICKSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MARCH 1, 1954.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on February 25, 1954, the Clerk received on February 26 from the Secretary of the Senate, the following messages:

That the Senate has agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2175) entitled "An act to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch"; and

That the Vice President has appointed Allen N. Humphrey, Chief of the Records Management and Services Branch of the Office of the Comptroller General, as a member of the Federal Records Council vice Ellis S. Stone, transferred; and

That the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 54–8.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILL

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, February 25, 1954, he did on February 26, 1954, sign the following enrolled bill of the Senate:

S. 2175. An act to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 338)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from April 1, 1953, to September 30, 1953, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 1954.*

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House a bill which will authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay transportation and handling charges within continental United States for surplus agricultural commodities which are donated to agencies and organizations for distribution to needy persons.

Under the present law, CCC is prohibited from delivering the commodities to the recipient agencies. The law provides that surplus foods may be donated to school lunch programs; Federal, State, and local public welfare organizations; private welfare organizations operating within the United States; and private welfare organizations—such as CARE—for distribution to needy persons outside the United States, but the recipients must pay transportation and handling costs from the point of storage.

This bill will authorize CCC to pay not only transportation charges within the United States but also packaging and handling charges necessary to make the food available to the recipient agency, and storage charges not to exceed 30 days at the point of delivery.

The purpose of the bill is to permit CCC to deliver surplus commodities in bulk to organizations and agencies for their distribution. CCC is specifically prohibited by provisions of the bill from undertaking any of the distribution to individuals.

Although CARE and similar agencies are not mentioned in the bill, it will permit CCC to deliver surplus commodities to ocean ports within the United States and there turn them over to such organizations for relief distribution overseas.

It is far better to give food away than to let it spoil. If it is needed in our own country for distribution to needy persons, I think it should be used here. If there is more than we need for that purpose, then we should make it available for relief overseas.

If my bill is enacted, I think it will make possible a big increase in distribution of our surplus foods to needy people both here and abroad.

Latest figures of the CCC show that it has on hand, among other commodities, the following quantities of foods: 275 million pounds of butter, 290 million pounds of cheese, 482 million pounds of dried milk, 452 thousand 100-pound bags of dry beans, 551 thousand gallons of olive oil, and 8,368 tons of peanuts.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the donation of food commodities

Be it enacted, etc., That section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1431), is hereby amended by deleting from the last sentence thereof the phrase "at the point of storage at no cost, save handling and transportation costs incurred in making delivery from the point of storage," and by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding "*Provided*, That such commodities may be made available by donation in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture determines necessary or appropriate to effectuate the policy of this section including the payment by the Commodity Credit Corporation of repackaging, handling, and other services, and transportation within the continental United States from points of storage or acquisition by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the points of delivery to the recipient agencies and organizations, and storage within the United States for a period of not to exceed 1 month after delivery to such agency or organization, but the Corporation shall not incur any expense, other than such storage, with respect to distribution of the commodities after such delivery."

AMENDMENTS AND IMPROVEMENTS TO OUR SOCIAL-SECURITY LAW

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 25 I introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide insurance benefits to schoolteachers, ministers, attorneys, physicians, and other professional people and to provide social-security protection for totally and permanently disabled persons who have heretofore contributed to the social-security fund and become insured, and after considerable study over several months, this bill which I am introducing, I think, makes many other amendments to the basic law that will greatly improve our entire social-security program.

First. Schoolteachers: Of all of the professional people in America, the schoolteachers over the last half century have been the worst of the underpaid group. Their salaries have not kept pace with modern times. Although they perform one of the most essential functions for all American people in helping to educate the youth of America, yet most professions and many occupations that do not require the long years of training and which are not nearly so important to the people of this country receive much more in compensation than do the schoolteachers.

Under our present social-security law, unless an entire group of schoolteachers in some State or political subdivision votes and elects to come under the social-security program, then a teacher in this profession cannot have the benefits and protection of social security.

We have recently amended the social-security law so as to make it possible for individual businessmen to make their contribution to this program and to come under the protection of social security. It is my opinion that each individual schoolteacher should have the right and be allowed to make the choice of contributing to the social-security fund and receive the benefits of social-security insurance on an individual basis. This should be allowed without any deductions whatsoever from any retirement fund that the teacher may be entitled to on a State level. The amendments in my bill which I am introducing today will provide for all of these things for schoolteachers.

Second. Up to the present time many of the professions, including attorneys, doctors, dentists, ministers, architects, public accountants, engineers, and the like have not had the privilege of coming under and participating in the benefits of the social-security program. When you think about these very large groups of professional people here in America, there can be no sound basis for discriminating against them, and it is my opinion they should have the same privilege, on an individual basis, to voluntarily contribute to the social-security fund just as a businessman is now allowed to do, and if these professional people desire to come under the social-security program they should be allowed to do so.

However, it is my opinion that these professional people, just like the schoolteachers, should be allowed to make their election upon an individual basis. The bill which I have introduced will enable all of these professional people mentioned above and several other professional groups mentioned in the bill to come under the social-security program, pay their individual contributions to the fund and receive its benefits like other American citizens that are now under the program.

Third. In thinking over basic ways to improve and enlarge the benefits of the social-security program for the American people, I have concluded that one of the most glaring defects in the present law is the failure to protect the man or woman who has paid into the fund and becomes fully insured but who, on account of accident or sickness, has become permanently and totally disabled and a charge upon his or her family or society, sometimes many, many years before reaching the retirement age of 65.

I feel sure that every Member of Congress has on many occasions known industrious, hardworking people in their home district who had for several years paid into the social-security program but who, before reaching 65 years of age, became permanently and totally disabled. This creates a very pitiful situation and one that this great country of ours should remedy. When a person has paid into the social-security program long enough to be fully insured under the present rules and regulations, if that person really becomes permanently disabled and cannot work, then I think he should receive social security insurance benefits immediately regardless of his age.

The payments of social-security insurance benefits to the totally and permanently disabled who are fully covered by their contributions to the fund should not depend upon any enabling act of any State legislature. It should be a part of the fundamental law that when these conditions exist, a person should be entitled to begin to receive his insurance benefits from the social security fund immediately and without any roadblock that might be put in the way on account of some State not passing enabling legislation to enable its disabled citizens to participate in the benefits of the fund. The bill which I have introduced provides for this protection for the permanently and totally disabled people.

Fourth. There is another far-reaching, and I think beneficial, provision in the bill I have introduced to amend the social-security law. That provision eliminates the restriction presently existing upon the amount of money a person can earn after he becomes 65, retires, and becomes entitled to receive social-security benefits.

When the social-security program was initiated many years ago, it had the foolish provision in it that if a person receiving social security earned as much as $15 per month, then that would cut him out of receiving social-security payments. Later on this work clause permitted such persons to earn $50, and there has been progressive changes for the better permitting our older citizens to work and earn money and at the same time receive their social security that they had paid for out of their past earnings along with contributions from the Government.

The unsoundness of a limitation upon the earnings of people after they become entitled to receive social-security benefits becomes more apparent as time goes on. This roadblock to earnings on the part of our older citizens has been contained in many of our pension plans, such as railroad retirement and so forth, as well as in our social-security program. In all of these instances, we have improved the situation by increasing the amount that a person who is retired can earn without losing their retirement benefits.

Although we have improved the situation, we have not entirely removed the evil. There is no basic cause why there should be any work limitation clause in the social-security law at all. If we continue to deny our older citizens the full and free privilege of working, earning, and creating wealth for themselves and the American people, we will continue to do this country a great disservice. There is no reason why a man or woman of 65, and in reasonably good health, should not continue to work and earn all they can. It helps their morale, it will enable them to live and enjoy living more, it is beneficial to their families, helpful to the community in which they live because they do many useful services, and if we could free our older citizens from this work limitation clause several million people past 65 could work and help to create wealth and prosperity for our people.

My bill provides if a man or woman becomes fully insured, has paid in all the contributions required for the number of years required, when they reach retirement age, they can receive social security and work, if they desire, and earn money without handicaps or limitations. The present administration, through the great Committee on Ways and Means that has jurisdiction of the social security and old-age assistance laws, is now and has been for several weeks engaged in a profound study of our social-security system. It is my belief that this great committee will come up with a very much broader and greatly improved social-security law.

The bill which I am introducing today upon these vital subjects, of course, will be referred to this committee for its consideration. It is my opinion that the new bill to be considered later on in this session by the Congress will provide for larger payments of social security and old-age assistance and that the fund will be more secure and rendered more nearly solvent and that the people who have paid into and rely upon social security will be greatly benefited by the new act, when passed.

I hope and believe that the members of the committee will take into consideration the improvements included in my bill and that when the new bill on social security comes out from the committee for debate upon the floor of this House, that we will find the 4 or 5 amendments contained in my bill incorporated in the general bill.

TARIFF LEGISLATION

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of my State and of the whole Northwest are also gravely concerned with several other aspects of tariff legislation. I trust Congress will give serious consideration to our problems when it undertakes any revision of our tariff structure.

A great number of our important industries and their employees are dependent on the production of goods and products which are being driven from the domestic market by cheap imports, made possible largely by low wages paid abroad.

Among these are the raising of tulips, iris, and daffodils; the tuna and Pacific ground-fish industries; the hardboard and plywood producers; and the Northwest tree-nut growers. And now imports of cheaply produced red raspberries from abroad are beginning to threaten red raspberry growers in my district.

The thousands of people directly dependent on these industries for their livelihood face critical times unless this Congress faces up to its responsibilities and realistically revises our foreign trade and tariff structures to afford them needed protection.

Just let me cite a few examples.

The two States of Washington and Oregon are the center of the production of daffodils, iris, and tulips in the United States. In my district, alone, are grown some 30 million King Alfred daffodils annually—more than are grown in all of Holland. But faced with growing imports of foreign flowers, produced at the low-wage rates prevailing there, the growers of the Northwest are facing bankruptcy. An excess of foreign bulbs are being dumped on the United States market at prices below the cost of domestic production.

As a result, in 1952, domestic growers, even after selling most of the crops below cost, were forced to destroy their unsold surplus amounting to about 25 percent of all their iris and 20 percent of their top quality narcissus.

The reason for this depression is not hard to find. A March 1953 report by the United States Tariff Commission showed that between 1937 and 1952 the import duty on narcissus bulbs from the Netherlands was lowered from $6 per thousand bulbs to $3, and the number of bulbs imported jumped from 6 million to more than 28 million. Likewise, between 1950 and 1952 the ad valorem duty on iris bulbs was reduced from 10 to 7½ percent, and the total of bulbs increased from 50 million to nearly 70 million, or about 40 percent.

Another important industry to the Northwest which is being seriously hurt by cheap imports is the manufacturing of hardboard. Six of the nine domestic producers of this vital national defense item are located in Washington or Oregon, and of seven more domestic plants under construction under the target expansion goal set by the Defense Production Administration, three are in Washington and three are in Oregon.

Now, at the very time that this tremendous Government-encouraged expansion of domestic hardboard capacity is being completed, and when current domestic markets are shrinking and a buyer's market is being encountered, the domestic industry is facing constantly increasing imports of foreign hardboard from Sweden, Finland, and Canada.

Particularly the Scandinavian hardboard has been coming into more and more ports and is being sold at lower and lower prices—far below the prices domestic producers can afford to charge.

As a result of the reciprocal trade agreements program, the United States duty on foreign hardboard was reduced from 30 percent ad valorem in 1930 to 15 percent in 1936, and since 1947 has been cut to $7.25 per ton, or not less than 7½ percent nor more than 15 percent, ad valorem.

Census Bureau figures I have recently seen indicate that through the first 8 months of 1953 imports of hardboard increased 65 percent from Canada over the like period of 1952, that they were 3 times greater from Finland and 8 times greater from Sweden.

These vastly increased imports have already had a serious impact on the domestic industry. Our producer has been forced to lay off more than 350 employees; another reports production cutbacks of 50 percent, and others have gone on 2- to 4-day workweeks or have cut down on shifts.

Another industry in the forestry field which is of prime importance to the people of the Northwest is the manufacture of plywood. The industry, likewise, is suffering from a lack of adequate protection, and plywood made in Japan, at wage rates drastically below those of our own workers, is now coming into this country in greater and greater volume.

Another great and vital industry to the Northwest, as well as to the whole west coast, is the taking and processing of fish. This includes the taking and distribution of tuna, salmon, halibut, and otter-trawl and drag fisheries. There are several thousand ships and an estimated 20,000 or more fishermen employed directly in the taking of these fish, plus many thousands more who make a living from the processing and distribution of them.

And, yet, with imports from Japan and South America growing at an alarming rate, these American ships will be driven from the seas and the American factories closed up unless relief is granted soon.

In 1953, more tuna was imported from Japan than was produced domestically. Other import threats are comparable, and will continue to become more dangerous unless protection is granted the domestic producers.

It is simply impossible for American fishermen or processors to compete with the Japanese. The average American fisherman, for example, in order to live must earn at least two times as much as the Japanese fisherman is paid. Cost of boat construction, gear, repairs, and so forth, are all much higher in this country. Foreign competition has already forced a number of fisheries and processing plants out of business or compelled them to greatly reduce operations. With many of our seacoast towns depending on the fisherman and his earnings, this depression in the fishing industry has a far-reaching and serious effect on entire communities.

The groundfish fleet in the Pacific Northwest has shrunk from some 250 boats a few years ago to only about 40 today, and imports have increased 1,100 percent since 1940, from 9 million pounds in 1941 to 102 million pounds in 1952.

Canadian fishermen and processors earn an average of 98 cents an hour, while their American counterparts make an average of $2.04 per hour.

The industry must have immediate tariff and quota protection if it is to survive, and its thousands of workers continue to earn a living.

There are many other industries, such as the raising of tree nuts including filbert which are important to the Northwest, where tariff and trade policies are critically hurting Americans.

The nut industry has consistently sought relief from the Tariff Commission under existing provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and under the countervailing duties and antidumping laws from the Treasury Department. But this relief has just as consistently been denied them.

We in the great Northwest believe firmly in trade and commerce among the nations. We will encourage it whenever it is fair trade and in the best interests of America. But we do not believe this Nation should deliberately follow a trade policy that forces American businesses to close and puts American citizens out of work; that opens up our domestic markets to goods produced at substandard wages which would be illegal in the United States.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to bear these facts in mind when it comes time to consider revisions of our foreign trade and tariff legislation.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY—BILL INTRODUCED INCLUDES RULES OF FAIR PROCEDURE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, to those who are devoted to a bipartisan foreign policy for the United States and to a dynamic and progressive domestic policy, alike, the question of congressional investigations of communism and subversion and how to conduct them must be definitely settled or we will be completely bogged down and our attention diverted from the settlement of other issues vital to national security and prosperity and world peace. Anne O'Hare McCormick, in the New York Times of last Saturday,

February 27, calls this the "No. 1 issue in American political life." Such a situation could effectively play into the hands of those who are opposed to the administration's legislative program and must have the urgent attention of those who are for the administration's program.

It is for these reasons that I am today introducing a bill to establish a Joint Committee on Internal Security to replace in the field of investigating subversion and communism the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Subcommittees on Internal Security and on Investigations of the other body having as their principal activities this kind of investigation. Rules of fair procedure are specified in my bill to be followed by the joint committee.

A vital aspect of my bill provides that the joint committee may, under conditions it specifies, delegate these investigations to other standing committees or may recommend commissions for particular investigations to be created by law. A joint committee will avoid duplication and competition between the investigating committees of each House, will better discharge the responsibility which is that of the whole Congress, will make more likely the adoption of rules of fair procedure to govern these investigations and legitimately the rights of individuals, and will best correct excesses in such investigations which have been occurring.

Congressional investigations of subversion and communism have shown such wide ramifications having a direct effect on the foreign policy of the United States, the morale of Federal employees, and the discipline of the Army, as well as involving materially industry, religion, and higher education, and almost every other phase of thought and learning, as to call for the considered responsibility of the Congress which can be best expressed through a joint committee. Nor can we overlook many right fringe and so-called native hate movements which seem to have taken a new lease on life lately, endeavoring to trade on the strains of the day.

The power to investigate is a vital part of the power of the Congress under the responsibilities apportioned to the three branches by the Constitution. It is an essential element of our freedom, and it is very important that the Congress take measures to insure that the people's confidence in it will be unimpaired.

The rules of procedure for the joint committee provide for a clear statement of the legislative objectives sought in the investigations; a major investigation to be undertaken only as approved by a majority of the committee; executive hearings to establish witnesses' credibility before public hearings which are likely to result in charges against individuals; the right of witnesses to counsel; the right of the witness or one adversely mentioned by a witness to have notice of this fact to make a reasonable statement in his own defense and to an opportunity for reasonable cross-examination and presentation of affirmative testimony to rebut testimony affecting his reputation adversely; a requirement that no individual member of a committee or employee may release reports or charges or material from a committee file except what is authorized by a majority of the whole committee; the broadcasting and televising of witnesses whose reputation is at stake or those whom they call in defense be permitted only with the consent of the witness; and that committee members or their staffs do not write or speak about investigations in process for compensation.

The bill provides for a joint committee of 14, 7 each from the House and Senate, appointed respectively by the Speaker and Vice President, and bipartisan in nature.

An additional advantage of a joint committee is that the rule of seniority need not apply in the selection of a chairman, and therefore the committee has much more flexibility in its operation. The joint committee is given the power of subpena, the right to have a staff, and all other necessary powers, all subject to the rules of fair procedure referred to above.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, following any special orders heretofore granted.

FURNISHING OF INFORMATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have obtained unanimous consent to address the House today for 30 minutes. My subject will be "I Do Not Believe the Material You Have Suggested Would Be Useful"—An Outrageous Refusal by the Secretary of the Treasury To Furnish Information of a Nonconfidential Nature to a Member of Congress.

To those who may not be able to be on the floor this afternoon because of the press of other official business, I respectfully make the request that you take time to read my remarks, believing that they will be of interest to each individual Member.

SWEETPOTATO WEEVIL AND PINK-BOLLWORM-CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, southwest Louisiana, including the Third Congressional District which I have the honor to represent in this body, is one of the largest sweetpotato-producing areas in the United States. The State of Louisiana, as is well known, also produces great quantities of cotton.

An adequate sweetpotato weevil-control program and a continuation of the pink-bollworm-control project are vital to these two important agricultural industries.

SWEETPOTATO WEEVIL-CONTROL PROGRAM

The program is a cooperative project between the United States Department of Agriculture and the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina. Its purpose is for the protection of the sweetpotato farmers and the industry from heavy losses due to the weevil, which is the most destructive pest affecting this leading horticultural crop; and to likewise prevent the spread of the insect to weevil-free areas within these States and to other sweetpotato-growing States. The States involved are now expending approximately $409,000, or 70 percent, of the current budget program, and their ratio of manpower is 3 to 1. The States have maintained this percentage contribution for several years.

The Federal budget for the fiscal year 1955 provides for $50,800, a 76-percent reduction in funds currently available for this work, which is entirely inadequate to maintain the program in an effective manner. This problem, which is interstate in nature, requires Federal participation in program planning and coordination between States relating to surveys, quarantines, educational information, assistance in eradication and control procedures and research.

With a reduction in cotton acreage there will be a substantial increase in acres devoted to the production of sweetpotatoes, which also means additional work will be required to keep the weevil infestations to the minimum.

If the proposed budget of $50,800 is adopted it will result in the collapse of this program, causing great losses to an industry in the States now producing more than 60 percent of the total production of sweetpotatoes in the United States, which has an estimated value of more than $88 million for 1953.

This project has been successful in eradicating the weevil from some 50 counties and from many thousand farms in the affected States. In some years losses to farmers have been reduced by $2½ million or approximately four times the average annual program cost.

Therefore, it is urgently requested that a minimum Federal appropriation of $250,000 be provided for this project in order to bring about a more equitable distribution of the workload by increasing Federal manpower and equipment to assist the States in the effective control, eradication, and prevention of spread of the sweetpotato weevil.

PINK BOLLWORM CONTROL PROJECT

The pink bollworm of cotton is one of the most destructive of all insects. The amount of damage done to cotton will vary according to intensity of infestation, conditions comprising natural control and artificial control measures practiced. Probably the only reason that it does not do more damage in the United States than the cotton boll weevil is because the cotton-producing States have not become as generally infested by this pest. However, grave concern has been

expressed concerning the potential danger to the cotton industry of the United States should the pink bollworm become firmly entrenched.

This pest is now present in the States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Arkansas, which was found infested for the first time in 1953. It is likewise present in Mexico. In 1952 this insect was responsible for the loss of $34 million to the cotton industry of 39 counties in south Texas.

It is estimated that an additional sum of $280,000 to the present proposed Federal budget of $1,070,100 will be needed to effectively conduct this expanded project.

During the 1953 season new infestations were found in Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Arkansas. The cotton-producing South is now being threatened, and any relaxation in this program will result in severe losses to the cotton farmers. Additional funds must be provided for personnel, equipment, and travel expenses to enforce the control and quarantine regulations in the newly infested sections of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. Traffic inspection on roads leading out of the heavily infested areas of Texas and at stations along the Louisiana-Texas and Arkansas-Texas boundaries must be strengthened. The limited amount of work conducted on this phase of the program during the last 2 crop years has shown great value in intercepting large quantities of live pink bollworm, especially in baggage and cotton-picking sacks of migrant picker crews moving to noninfested States.

In 1953 an infestation of pink bollworm was found on the west coast of Mexico which definitely presents a serious threat to the cotton-growing areas of Arizona and California. Additional funds must be expended for an increase in the inspections for incipient pink bollworm infestations on the west coast and Lower California cotton-growing areas of Mexico.

In recent years sufficient funds have not been provided for making the necessary surveys in Florida for wild cotton. This is an essential phase of the program and additional funds are needed to satisfactorily conduct this work.

Therefore, it is urgently requested that the sum of $1,350,000 be provided by the Federal budget for this project. The infested and some noninfested States are now and have been providing funds for this project.

POSTAL AND FEDERAL PAY PROPOSALS

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include an address I delivered before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I made the following statement at the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee public hearing on pending postal and Federal pay proposals, March 1, 1954:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity of appearing before you at this time for the purpose of presenting my views as to the Withrow-Rhodes proposal to increase postal wages $800 per annum. These hard-pressed loyal employees of the postal establishment have not had an upward wage adjustment since July 1, 1951. At that time, the former chairman of this distinguished committee, and later Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Hon. Robert Ramspeck, testified that it would require a 21-percent increase in wages to bring postal and Federal employees in line with the Bureau of Labor Statistics Index in regard to the cost of living.

The actual increase granted by Congress in July 1951 fell far short of the mark and averaged somewhere around 13 percent. Since 1951, living costs have continued to rise and there appears to be no immediate relief in sight. Moreover, the Bureau of Labor Statistics representatives who appeared before this body some 10 days ago readily agreed that the wages in private industry had increased about 16 percent since July 1951.

If the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures are correct, and I believe they are in line with similar studies on the overall cost of living—then the postal and Federal workers are most certainly entitled to the modest amount proposed in the Withrow-Rhodes measure (H. R. 2344) and similar pending bills.

While expressing approval of the horizontal $800 wage-increase proposals, I am, however, constrained to withhold approval of the recommendations made by the Postmaster General on what is known as the Fry report. A complete reclassification of the postal wage structure is, of course, necessary, desirable, and long overdue. However, any proposition that affords a 35-percent wage increase to the postmaster at Chicago, Ill., and a meager increase of less than three-tenths of 1 percent to letter carriers and postal clerks in grade 3 ($10 per annum) is absurd.

If I am correctly informed, the postal authorities spent some $50,000 for the Fry & Associates report, which was hastily prepared in about 3 months. I am reliably informed that none of the representatives of the postal organizations or employees unions were consulted. Let me say that the distinguished and able members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, along with the leaders of the various employee organizations, could have done the job more effectively and without additional cost to the taxpayers.

In the absence of a proper reclassification measure, I suggest, therefore, that an immediate across-the-board increase will relieve present hardships among postal and Federal employees.

I shall be pleased to join with my colleagues in supporting the Withrow-Rhodes bill when it reaches the floor of the House of Representatives.

Again I thank you.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia asked and was given permission to vacate the special order granted him for today, and to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday, March 8, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

MARCH: NATIONAL SECURITY MONTH

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on this first day of March, I would like to take note of the fact that this month has been designated by the national commander of the American Legion, Mr. Arthur J. Connell, as National Security Month.

And at the same time, I wish to call attention also to the fact that during this month of March the American Legion will observe the 35th anniversary of its founding. This outstanding occasion, which will be officially celebrated on March 15–17, comes as the Legion boasts the greatest membership in its history.

Mr. Speaker, the patriotic and ever-vigilant activities of the American Legion need no extended comment—they are so well known and applauded that additional praise here would be superfluous. During the month of March when the American Legion will specifically observe National Security Month, however, I feel sure that the entire Nation will take note of and support the continuing efforts of this great veterans' organization to make our Nation secure from her enemies both within and without America.

WHERE DO WE STAND TODAY WITH COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most menacing problems facing the world today is the spread of communism throughout the world. It is reported that the Soviet Union has brought within its control behind the Iron Curtain some 800 million persons. We have sent thousands of our young men overseas in the Korean war—many of whom paid with their lives—and other military operations in an endeavor to halt the spread of communism and to prevent it from taking over the entire world.

I know of no one in public service who has rendered more outstanding and effective service in tracking down Communists and Communists saboteurs and Communist fellow travelers in the United States than J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He speaks with authority on this subject. I was particularly interested in the factual and interesting discussion by Mr.

Hoover which recently appeared in the American Legion magazine in the March 1954 issue, on the subject, Where Do We Stand Today With Communism in the United States? and I include Mr. Hoover's remarks as a part of this discussion:

WHERE DO WE STAND TODAY WITH COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES?

(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation)

ANSWERS SOME QUESTIONS THAT PUZZLE MANY AMERICANS

Question. Has there been a decline in recent years in the number of Communists in the United States?

Answer. Yes. In January 1947, there were approximately 74,000 members of the Communist Party in the United States. In July 1948, the top 12 Communist Party leaders were indicted on charges of violation of the Smith Act. This was the first legal action instituted against the top leadership of the Communist Party. In January 1949, party membership was approximately 54,000. On October 14, 1949, the Communist Party leaders were found guilty. As of December 31, 1949, party membership numbered less than 53,000. On June 25, 1950, the war in Korea began; and on September 23, 1950, the Internal Security Act of 1950, which called for the registration of all Communist-action organizations, went into effect. By December 31, 1950, party membership in the United States numbered less than 44,000. On June 4, 1951, the Smith Act was upheld constitutionally, and during the summer of 1951, additional Communist leaders were indicted under this act. By January 1952, party membership totaled less than 32,000; and as of September 30, 1953, it numbered approximately 24,000. That is a decrease of 50,000 members, or about two-thirds of the total membership, since January 1947.

Question. Has there been a corresponding decline in Communist influence in the United States?

Answer. I would not say that Communist influence has declined in direct ratio to the decrease in members. The influence of the Communist movement can never be determined in terms of members. Many of the members who have dropped out of the Communist Party are still sympathetic with some of the aims of the party and can still be counted on to assist in certain phases of party work. The large number of members who have defected or have been expelled in recent years does not represent the most influential or the most devoted members. Those who now remain in the Communist Party are essentially the real nucleus of hard-core Communists who are devoted to Marxism-Leninism and are willing to obey any party instructions. Essentially they are the members who were the most influential 6 years ago. The party still has its publications, its schools, and its fellow travelers. On the other hand, the prosecution and incarceration of the leading functionaries have forced the current leadership underground, which has hurt their effectiveness. Public exposure has neutralized the influence of many other members. These factors have been a damaging blow to the overall influence of the party.

Question. What has been the greatest blow suffered by the Communists in this country in recent years?

Answer. Unquestionably, the greatest blow they have suffered has been the successful prosecution by the Government of over 60 of their leaders for violation of the Smith Act. This has deprived the party of much of its most powerful leadership, disrupted many of its operations, and heavily drained its financial resources. It has thrown confusion, uncertainty, and fear into the rank-and-file membership. It has made them realize how thoroughly they have been investigated for a long period of time and how closely their activities have been observed, with the result that they have gone underground and have invoked such strict security measures among the membership that they cannot operate nearly so effectively as in past years. It has revealed to them that some of their most trusted comrades were actually informants for the Government, which has created suspicion and distrust of their associates. It has caused many of the less devoted Marxists to drop out of the party, and some of them to make a full disclosure to the FBI of their knowledge of Communist activities. It has turned the spotlight on the Communist conspiracy against this country, so that the American public has now seen it in true perspective and has taken an enlightened stand against this foreign-inspired menace. This positive action by the Government has been and continues to be a staggering blow to the Communist Party.

Question. What is our greatest present danger from American communism?

Answer. So long as public opinion is aroused and there is widespread resistance to Communist infiltration the greatest danger lies in the moment of great emergency which would arise should the Soviets try a Pearl Harbor sneak attack. Then, by disrupting our defense program, they could do us the most damage. It is of utmost importance to the security of our Nation that we maintain a constant state of preparedness to repel successfully any attack and to deal swiftly and effectively with any aggressor. Any breakdown in our productive ability would imperil our national security now, and would create a crucial situation in the event of open hostilities. For that reason we must take every precaution to safeguard our productive might.

Question. Do you think the public has been getting a fair picture of the danger from Communists within this country?

Answer. I feel that the press, radio, television and congressional investigating committees have done much in recent years to educate the public as to the nature, operations, and objectives of communism; and the educational program of the American Legion has been particularly effective.

Question. Do you think the public now understands and appreciates the danger?

Answer. Those who are interested in learning about the Communist menace have certainly had the opportunity to become better informed during recent years; but, of course, there are many people who are apathetic about the danger and consequently have little or no understanding of it.

Question. Because of the Korean war most Americans now recognize the overall menace of armed aggression. They also know that Soviet spies have been at work in this country. However, is it not true that most Americans are hazy when it comes to Communist fronts, how they operate, and what should be done about them?

Answer. The fact that there are so many Communist front groups now operating in the United States leaves no doubt that many Americans have not checked into the underlying purpose and nature of such organizations before becoming affiliated with them.

Communist front groups are organizations of a disguised character which the Communist Party uses to further its aims. They would appear on the surface not to be under Communist control, and their ostensible objectives would seem to be entirely legitimate. Only in this way can they attract the support of many individuals who would not openly uphold a known Communist Party program.

Front groups are particularly valuable to the Communist Party as a recruiting field for potential party members, as a source of funds, as a pressure group advocating a particular Communist program and as a means of disseminating Communist propaganda. They are established either by actually organizing a new group around a particular issue or by infiltrating a legitimate existing organization. Among those who participate in front groups are open Communist Party members, concealed Communists, fellow travelers and Communist sympathizers.

Legal action has been taken with respect to such organizations. The Internal Security Act of 1950 provides that organizations determined by the Subversive Activities Control Board to be Communist front organizations, and officers of these organizations, must register with the Attorney General; and certain restrictions are placed upon such organizations and persons. The Subversive Activities Control Board has been holding hearings on certain organizations on the Attorney General's list, to determine whether they are Communist front organizations within the provisions of this act.

It is highly important that any person "Stop, look, and listen" before he allows his name to be used by any newly created organization with whose aims he is not completely familiar.

Question. You have often predicted that the Communists would go underground when things became hot. With public resentment increasing, hasn't there been a general movement from open Communist organizations to more or less nebulous front organizations?

Answer. Very definitely. Almost all Communist Party activity is being carried on in a disguised manner. Many of the top leaders and most trusted members of the party have gone underground, and the rank-and-file membership carry on party activities through Communist front organizations and even through infiltrating legitimate organizations. For example, under party instructions they have joined parent-teacher associations, church, civic, and similar groups in which you would not expect to find them. They are transferred to different sections of the country where they assume fictitious names and backgrounds and infiltrate unsuspecting groups and right-led labor unions in order to further the Communist program. Therefore it will be increasingly difficult for unsuspecting citizens to detect Communist influence in organizational activities.

Question. This, then, means a tougher problem for Americans since the fight moves into a twilight zone. Issues are confused, and the public is confused. How can communism be fought most effectively in America today?

Answer. I have always felt that an alert, informed citizenry is our most potent weapon against communism. The vast majority of Americans are patriotic, loyal citizens. They abhor treachery, deceit and any forces which would deprive us of our freedom and democratic liberties, and will not long tolerate the perpetuation of such evils. Through the schools, churches, press, and radio, the public should be given the facts about communism. Not through demagogy or appeal to their prejudices and fears, but through a clear, factual, truthful presentation, the public should continue to be informed of the real purposes, objectives, loyalties, and methods of operation of the Communist Party. Because Communist strategy is based on deceit and its true motives are concealed, communism cannot flourish under the spotlight of truth. The more fully it becomes exposed to the public eye, the more limited becomes its area of effective operations and the more restricted the number of people who will be duped into serving its evil purposes.

Along with informing the public of the truth concerning communism, and publicly exposing it as the foreign-inspired conspiracy

that it is, another effective method of fighting communism is by prosecuting Communists for violations of Federal law.

Question. Where can the private citizen go to get authentic information about organizations and individuals he suspects?

Answer. To determine the organizations which have been designated by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450, one should either contact the Department of Justice or refer to issues of the Federal Register dated May 12, 1953, July 21, 1953, and October 6, 1953, which contain all designations by the Attorney General up to September 25, 1953. The fact that a particular organization does not appear on the Attorney General's list, however, does not necessarily mean that the organization is clear of subversive influence. Actually that organization may be under investigation, and an individual should be careful of what organizations he joins and should keep his eyes open to detect Communist influence. With regard to obtaining authentic information about individuals he suspects as being Communists, there is no one single source to which he can go to obtain complete information. The FBI must necessarily keep the contents of its files confidential.

Question. How can the individual assist the FBI in its investigation of subversive activities?

Answer. By voluntarily furnishing any information he may have concerning subversive activities to the FBI, and by cooperating in any way he can when requested to by the FBI, the individual is not only rendering valuable assistance but is also measuring up to the responsibilities of good citizenship.

Question. Specifically, if a person feels he has valuable information, how should he go about offering it?

Answer. He can write to me personally; he can go in person to the nearest field office of the FBI; or he can call the nearest field office and arrange for a special agent to contact him. The telephone number of the appropriate FBI office is listed on the first page of all telephone directories. He can be certain that his assistance is appreciated and that his identity will be kept confidential if he so desires.

Question. There is a certain amount of confusion in the public mind concerning the functions of the FBI. Some people feel that "we should not permit Congress to go after alleged subversives since this is a function of the FBI." Others maintain that the FBI could round up all the subversives in the country on short notice; therefore, what are we worrying about?

For the record, will you explain just what the FBI can do and what it is not permitted to do?

Answer. By Presidential directives, legislative enactments and instructions of the Attorney General the FBI has the responsibility of investigating espionage, sabotage, subversive activities and related domestic intelligence matters and of serving as a coordinating agency for the dissemination of domestic intelligence information to other Federal agencies authorized to receive it. The FBI is a fact-finding agency and does not institute prosecutive action on the basis of its investigative findings. Information reflecting a violation of Federal law is referred to the Department of Justice for an opinion as to prosecution. Any information received which pertains to the responsibilities of some other Government agency is transmitted directly to that agency without recommendation or evaluation.

While the FBI for years has exposed the Communist conspiracy, it cannot divulge the confidential details of its files as to specific individuals. A congressional committee having the power of subpena and contempt citation is able to focus public attention on specific situations.

Question. Can a person who believes that the FBI has wrongly pegged him as a Communist present his side of the case so the record shows his version?

Answer. Not only can he present his version, but the FBI welcomes any such person's coming in and relating his story. We are a fact-finding organization and we are just as zealous to protect the innocent as we are to detect those who pose a threat to the internal security of our country.

Question. Ex-Communists are held in low regard by some people who maintain that they shouldn't be trusted and their testimony is worthless. What is your experience with ex-Communists in this respect? Have these people to any great extent redeemed themselves by the help they have given you?

Answer. The assistance which ex-Communists have given to the FBI has been invaluable. Having had their eyes opened to the true nature of the Communist conspiracy, many of them have reevaluated the privileges of American citizenship, have realized the duties inherent in such citizenship, and, through making a full disclosure to the FBI of the information they possess, have made contributions of great value to the internal security of this country. The truth of their testimony has been verified by corroborating evidence. Many ex-Communists have been tested by vigorous and searching cross-examination, and their opponents have been unable to contradict their testimony. Many of them have suffered ostracism, public rebuke, and social distrust as a result of their breaking with the Communist Party and testifying against it. All religions teach that redemption is possible for any man who sincerely repents and seeks to make amend for his errors. The sincerity of a former Communist can be judged by his willingness to stand up and be counted and by taking positive action to attempt to rectify his wrongs. I am always glad to see ex-Communists make their change of conscience and philosophy a matter of record, assume earnestly the responsibilities of good citizenship and join in the fight against the evil they formerly espoused, and I welcome the information which they can furnish.

Question. We have asked about past and present dangers. Can you indicate what the Communists are planning for 1954 and later?

Answer. The Communist Party has three primary plans for future action. One is the infiltration of labor. In this respect the party is concentrating on the infiltration of right-led unions, or non-Communist-dominated unions, and labor unions in the basic industries. Its vicious purpose is both to influence the trade union movement in this country and to be on the ground floor in the event the labor movement ever forms a third major political party in the United States.

A second diabolical plan is to infiltrate and strengthen its ties within the two major political parties in this country, in order to advance more effectively the interests of the Communist Party within the existing political framework and to bring about a new political realinement in this country on the basis of which the Communist Party hopes ultimately to be the dominating force.

A third and probably the most important plan is the continuation of the so-called peace offensive. Here the Communists are attempting to capitalize on the deep desire of the American people for peace. They would lay sole claim to any real efforts to achieve that goal; yet it is their Soviet masters who make the achievement of world peace so difficult. In order that we may not be misled by Communist peace propaganda, it is important that we understand the Marxist-Leninist distinction between two kinds of peace—lasting peace, obtained only after world revolution; and temporary peace, regarded as a tactical necessity as the tide of revolution ebbs and flows. In short, the peace which figures so prominently in Communist propaganda today is a temporary tactical peace designed to strengthen the Soviet Union and to stupefy its adversaries.

Question. The lone individual often feels he can do nothing to fight communism, and in most cases there is not a great deal he can do. However, there are some things open to him. What are they?

Answer. Every loyal American citizen can and should join in the fight against the Communist menace. These are some of the things each person can do:

1. Learn the facts about communism—its history and objectives, its program and techniques in this country. The better informed one becomes, the more rapidly he can detect Communist influences and the more intelligently he can fight communism.

2. Through such media as the press and radio, keep up with Russia's stand on matters of foreign policy. The Communist Party in America will take the same position, and the party line will fluctuate as Soviet foreign policy changes. Sudden reversals in Soviet policy will cause members of the party to make sudden similar reversals in their pronouncements, which is one of the best ways to spot Communists.

3. Become familiar with the names of organizations publicly cited as Communist fronts, and refuse to join such groups, to sponsor their causes or to contribute to their fund drives.

4. Be alert to Communist tactics in unions and other organizations. Outmaneuver them. Keep them under control and in the minority at all times and attempt to eliminate or neutralize their effectiveness. Openly oppose their efforts to promulgate pro-Communist activities or resolutions.

5. Keep Communists out of official positions in schools, churches, and other institutions where they can poison the minds and influence actions of youth.

6. Exercise your privilege to vote and keep Communists and their sympathizers out of public office.

7. Develop an intelligent, participating interest in civic affairs and programs for social improvement. Don't let Communists claim a monopoly in such matters or move in and direct established programs.

8. Report to the FBI immediately any pertinent information relating to subversive activities.

9. Conduct no private investigations of suspicious persons or organizations, but leave that to trained investigators who are authorized to perform such investigations. Do not become involved in the Communist movement for whatever worthwhile motives without first discussing the matter thoroughly with the FBI and establishing a cooperative relationship.

10. Learn as much as possible about America—its history, government, culture, laws, and heritage of freedom; and make the practice of democracy its own bulwark against subversion. Speak up for America and work for America.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 18]

Abbitt	Burleson	Dawson, Ill.
Battle	Byrne, Pa.	Dingell
Blatnik	Campbell	Dorn, S. C.
Bolling	Chatham	Durham
Bosch	Chelf	Gamble
Brownson	Clardy	Gary
Buckley	Corbett	Gwinn

Hart	Morgan	Robeson, Va.
Hillelson	Moulder	Robsion, Ky.
Kearney	Osmers	Roosevelt
Kelley, Pa.	Patman	St. George
Keogh	Patterson	Scrivner
Kirwan	Pillion	Scudder
Kluczynski	Powell	Sheehan
Krueger	Price	Short
Lantaff	Prouty	Sutton
Lesinski	Radwan	Taylor
Lipscomb	Reed, N. Y.	Vursell
McCarthy	Richards	Weichel
McConnell	Riehlman	
Merrill	Rivers	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 7339, a bill to amend certain phases of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PAY CERTAIN DISABILITY COMPENSATION PAYMENTS QUARTERLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 631) to provide that compensation of veterans for service-connected disability, rated 20 percent or less disabling, shall be paid quarterly rather than monthly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO COMPLETE INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3986) to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

OPERATION OF HEALTH FACILITIES FOR INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 303) to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

TAX REFUNDS ON CIGARETTES LOST IN THE FLOODS OF 1951

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4319) to authorize tax refunds on cigarettes lost in the floods of 1951.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CITY OF CHANDLER, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1081) to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

TANKERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6353) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national-defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL MONUMENT IN BROOKLYN, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 582) to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3413) to grant oil and gas in lands on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., to individual Indians in certain cases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the oil and gas in land located within the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., allotted on or after March 3, 1927, which is now reserved to the Indians having tribal rights on such reservation by the first section of the act of March 3, 1927, relating to oil and gas in certain tribal lands within the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont. (44 Stat. 101), is hereby granted to the Indian who, on the date of enactment of this act, holds the surface rights of such land. If on such date the surface rights of such land are held by any person other than an Indian, the oil and gas therein is hereby granted to the last Indian who prior to such date held such surface rights or, if such Indian is deceased, to his heirs.

SEC. 2. No oil and gas lease which covers in whole or in part land allotted on or after March 3, 1927, is entered into pursuant to the first section of the act of March 3, 1927, and is in effect on the date of enactment of this act, shall be affected by reason of the enactment of this act, except that any rents, royalties, and other money payable under such lease after such date of enactment, which are attributable to the oil and gas granted to an Indian by the first section of this act, shall be paid to such Indian.

SEC. 3. This act shall not apply to (1) oil and gas in tribal land which, on the date of enactment of this act, is unallotted or otherwise undisposed of and (2) oil and gas in land, the surface rights of which are held on such date by a person other than an Indian, if the last Indian owner of such surface rights was the Fort Peck Tribe.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the oil and gas in land located within the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., allotted on or after March 3, 1927, which is now reserved to the Indians having tribal rights on such reservation by the first section of the act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1401), relating to oil and gas in certain tribal lands within the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., is hereby granted to the allottee of such lands, or, if such Indian is deceased, to his heirs or devisees: *Provided*, That if the allottee or his heirs or devisees, relinquished such allotment and received a lieu allotment of other lands in the said reservation or transferred title to such allotment to the Fort Peck Tribe and, in exchange therefor, received an assignment of the same or other lands in the said reservation, the oil and gas hereby granted shall be only that in the land in the lieu allotment or the exchange assignment, as the case may be.

"SEC. 2. If on or after March 3, 1927, the allottee or his heirs or devisees, relinquished an allotment made prior to March 3, 1927, and received a lieu allotment of other lands in the said reservation or transferred title to such allotment to the Fort Peck Tribe and, in exchange therefor, received an assignment of the same or other lands in the said reservation, the oil or gas in the land in such lieu allotment or such exchange assignment is hereby granted to the holder of the lieu allotment or the exchange assignment, as the case may be, unless the allottee or his heirs or devisees reserved the oil and gas in the lands transferred or relinquished.

"SEC. 3. Title to the oil and gas granted by this act shall be held in trust by the United States for the Indian owners, except where the entire interest in the oil and gas is granted to Indians to whom a fee patent for any land within the Fort Peck Indian Reservation has heretofore been issued, in which event the unrestricted fee simple title is hereby granted to the Indian owner, and except where the entire interest in the oil and gas is hereafter held for Indians to whom a fee patent for any land within said reservation has heretofore or hereafter been issued or who are determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be competent to manage their own affairs, in which event the unrestricted fee simple title shall be transferred to the Indian owner by the Secretary.

"SEC. 4. If the Secretary of the Interior determines that the entire interest in land, including land held under an exchange assignment, on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation is owned by Indians who are the grantees of oil and gas under this act and who are competent to manage their own affairs, he is authorized and directed to issue fee patents to them for such interest.

"SEC. 5. No oil and gas lease which was entered into pursuant to the first section of the act of March 3, 1927, which covers in whole or in part the lands referred to in sections 1 and 2 of this act, and which is in effect on the date of enactment of this act, shall be affected by reason of the enactment of this act, except that any royalties and other moneys payable under such lease after such date of enactment, which are attributable to the oil and gas granted to an Indian by sections 1 or 2 of this act shall be payable to such Indian, or if such Indian is deceased, to his heirs or devisees.

"SEC. 6. This act shall not apply to oil and gas in tribal land which, on the date of the enactment of this act, is otherwise undisposed of.

"SEC. 7. Any and all moneys collected by the tribes as advance rentals, bonus, and royalties of oil and gas leases after March 3, 1927, and prior to the transfer of said oil and gas rights pursuant to this act to said individual Indians may also be paid by authority of said executive board to the individual Indians to whom said oil and gas rights are transferred pursuant to this act.

"SEC. 8. The provisions of this act shall not be effective unless approved in a referendum by a majority of the members of the Fort Peck Tribe actually voting therein: *Provided*, That the total vote cast shall not be less than 30 percent of those entitled to vote. This referendum shall be conducted on not less than 60 days' notice under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior or his duly authorized representative."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to grant oil and gas in lands and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., to individual Indians in certain cases."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIRED ENLISTED AND WARRANT OFFICER PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1433) to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That enlisted men and warrant officers heretofore advanced to commissioned rank or grade on the retired list under the said act of July 24, 1941, as amended, and who were restored to their former retired enlisted or warrant officer status, as the case may be, pursuant to section 3 of the act approved June 19, 1948 (Public Law 709, 80th Congress), shall be entitled to receive enlisted or warrant officer retired pay as appropriate, from November 1, 1946, or from the date of advancement on the retired list, whichever date is the later, to the date on which they were so restored: *Provided*, That no such retired pay shall accrue to personnel mentioned in this section for periods during which such personnel received commissioned officer retired pay.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read to the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read "A bill to entitle enlisted men and warrant officers advanced to commissioned rank or grade who are restored to their former enlisted or warrant officer status pursuant to section 3 of the act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 505), to receive retired enlisted or warrant officer pay from November 1, 1946, or date of advancement, to date of restoration to enlisted or warrant officer status."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2683) to amend section 12 of the Alaska Public Works Act, approved August 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 629).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the Alaska Public Works Act, approved August 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 629), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. The authority of the administrator under this act to provide public works and to enter into agreements with applicants in connection therewith shall terminate on June 30, 1959, or on the date he obligates for such purposes the total amount authorized to be appropriated hereunder, whichever first occurs."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF HAWAIIAN ORGANIC ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2848) to amend section 89 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 89 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 89. WHARVES AND LANDINGS.—The wharves and landings constructed or controlled by the Republic of Hawaii on any seacoast, bay, roadstead, or harbor shall remain under the control of the government of the Territory of Hawaii, which shall receive and enjoy all revenue derived therefrom."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5627) to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I take this opportunity, since this bill relates to research, to call the attention of the House to the fact that in our armed services, particularly some of the branches of our armed services, there is a very unfortunate situation existing in connection with our scientists. To me, the field of science, basic and applied, is a matter of vital importance not only to the peacetime activities of our country but particularly in connection with our national defense.

One of those scientists might conceive something that would save the lives of 100,000 American boys wearing the uniform. One of them might conceive something of great benefit to our country that would be revolutionary in nature not only in connection with our domestic economy and situation but particularly in connection with our national defense.

I have a great deal of respect for our scientists. They are quiet men, most of them unassuming, but they contribute greatly. Not only have they contributed greatly in the past but their future contributions will also be of great benefit to our country.

I have ascertained that many of our scientists in the armed services are very much distressed with the conditions under which they are working, where some of the military, and I shall not mention individuals, are undertaking to dominate their activities rather than to cooperate with them, each cooperating with the other.

My purpose in rising today is not to be critical, but to call to the attention of my colleagues this situation which I have been following for the past 3 or 4 years. It is not anything new. I had taken it up with former President Truman. He made some improvements. I have discussed it on the floor of the House in the past. So my remarks have no application to any particular administration, but are solely to call to the attention of my colleagues that a very sensitive situation exists. Many of our scientists have left the service of our country, and there are many others who are going to leave the service of our country because of the conditions under which they are employed and under which they are serving. You cannot apply military rule to a scientist. Some of the military have undertaken to dictate to and to attempt to dominate them. I think that is harmful to the best interests of our country. My observations are more in the nature of a warning to my colleagues, and particularly to the military, that they ought to look into the situation and ought to try to create the harmonious

relationship between the military and the scientists in the service of our country who are working with the Department of Defense so that there will be a situation consistent with the best interests of our country. So, I repeat, this is not the time to criticize. But I am very much disturbed and alarmed at the potentialities. I hope the military will recognize that while the scientists must cooperate and they will cooperate, the military cannot dominate men of that type.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, pertinent to the observations made by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, I think it is well for me to call the attention of the House to one point at this time, which is of deep interest to the country and to the world at large regarding scientists, and that is the fact that we have men in the National Institute of Health who are invited by other countries to visit those other countries—not at the expense of the United States, but at the expense of the foreign country. Their transportation and their keep is paid for by the foreign country. All that these men are asking is that they be allowed to travel at the expense of these foreign countries, but that they be not deprived of their wages and that the time consumed in making the trip not be charged to their annual leave. They ask that they be continued on the active payroll because they are not being paid for their time while they are abroad. While they are abroad, they are simply having their expenses paid. I know of one case in particular where one man is supposed to go abroad to lead a symposium on one of the very critical diseases. I am not going to identify the man because I do not want any repercussions. His application has been pending now for 6 months, and unless action is taken very promptly, he will not be able to get reservations to go abroad and lend his experience to this symposium on this particular disease in which all of us are vitally interested. I took up this question with the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education on a general scale about a year or so ago. I was told then that, of course, such leave could be granted and that the man would not lose his pay while abroad. But, no action has been taken on this particular case. Unless some action is taken very shortly, I intend to publicize this matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with the few guarded remarks and observations that I have made, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of Public Law 472, 81st Congress, is amended to read "The total of the sums expended pursuant to this act, including all sums expended for the payment of salaries or compensation to employees on leave, shall not exceed $100,000 in any fiscal year."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCLUSION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPRESENTATIVE AS A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7541) to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 271, 63d Congress, approved March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 930; 50 U. S. C. 151a), as amended, be amended by striking out "the chairman of the Research and Development Board of the Department of Defense" and inserting in lieu thereof "one representative of the Department of Defense, from the office in charge of research and development."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO COOPERATE WITH THE STATE OF KENTUCKY TO ACQUIRE NONFEDERAL CAVE PROPERTIES WITHIN THE AUTHORIZED BOUNDARIES OF MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 79) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Kentucky to acquire non-Federal cave properties within the authorized boundaries of Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONVEY CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF TUCSON, ARIZ., AND TO ACCEPT OTHER LAND IN EXCHANGE THEREFOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1160) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Tucson, Ariz., and to accept other land in exchange therefor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Tucson, Ariz., a municipal corporation, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that tract of land situate in the county of Pima, State of Arizona, described as that portion of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 24, township 14 south of range 13 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Pima County, Ariz., more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the south line of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of said section 24, distant three hundred forty-five and nine-tenths feet westerly from the southwest corner of said northwest quarter of the northwest quarter; run thence westerly along said south line, a distance of one hundred forty-four and one-tenth feet to a point; run thence northerly and parallel with the east line of said northwest quarter of the northwest quarter, a distance of two hundred ninety and four-tenths feet to a point; run thence easterly and parallel with the south line of said northwest quarter of the northwest quarter, a distance of one hundred forty-three and fifty-five one-hundredths feet to a point; run thence southerly a distance of two hundred ninety and four-tenths feet, more or less, to the point of beginning;

and to accept in exchange therefore a conveyance in fee simple to the United States by the city of Tucson, Ariz., a municipal corporation, of the following described real property situate in Pima County, Ariz.:

The east one hundred and ninety feet of the south two hundred ninety and four-tenths feet of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 24, township 14 south of range 13 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Pima County, Ariz.

SEC. 2. The deed of the land conveyed by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the provisions of the first section of this act shall contain express conditions—

(a) that the city of Tucson shall agree, upon the receipt of the deed from the Secretary of the Interior, to demolish the existing structure on such land; and

(b) that all salvage therefrom may be removed by the Papago Council of the Papago Tribe of Indians without the council paying for the same.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEASING OF LANDS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1570) to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 50 years.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso in the first section of the act entitled "An act to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1915, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 353), is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That the Territory may, by general law, provide for leasing said land in area not to exceed one section to any one person, association, or corporation for not longer than fifty years at any one time:".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "fifty" and insert "fifty-five."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational

purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 55 years."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ADMISSION OF CITIZENS OF THAILAND AND BELGIUM TO UNITED STATES MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the resolution (S. J. Res. 34) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to permit within 1 year after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, 2 persons, citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such instruction.

SEC. 2. Except as may be otherwise determined by the Secretary of the Army, the said persons shall, as a condition to receiving instruction under the provisions of this joint resolution, agree to be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as cadets at the United States Military Academy appointed from the United States, but they shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States Army by reason of their graduation from the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to subject the said persons to the provisions of section 1320 of the Revised Statutes or to section 3 of the act of June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 304; 10 U. S. C. 1092c).

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to permit within 1 year after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, two persons, citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such legislation.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to permit within 1 year after the enactment of this joint resolution, upon designation of the President of the United States, two persons, citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium, to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such instruction.

"SEC. 3. Except as may be otherwise determined by the Secretary of the Army, in the case of persons attending the United States Military Academy, or the Secretary of the Navy, in the case of persons attending the United States Naval Academy, the said persons shall, as a condition to receiving instruction under the provisions of this joint resolution, agree to be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as cadets at the United States Military Academy or midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, appointed from the United States, but they shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States Army or the United States Navy by reason of their graduation from the United States Military Academy or the United States Naval Academy.

"SEC. 4. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to subject the said persons to the provisions of section 1320 of the Revised Statutes or to section 3 of the act of June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 304)."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: On page 2, line 20, strike the last word of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the word "instruction."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, and the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO CITY OF ST. JOSEPH, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7402) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of St. Joseph, Mich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey to the city of St. Joseph, Mich., upon payment by such city of $3,300, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to lot No. 112 in such city (being a portion of the property which was formerly known as the St. Joseph Lighthouse Reservation, Mich., and which was conditionally conveyed to such city by the Secretary of Commerce under the act of May 28, 1935), notwithstanding any conditions or limitations imposed by section 17 or section 36 of such act (49 Stat. 307, 311) or by the deed of conveyance issued thereunder.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "city," insert "for use as a parking lot."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY TO STATE OF INDIANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 232) to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Indiana, upon the terms and conditions and for the consideration set forth in section 2, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land (hereinafter referred to as Federal land) situated in Marion County, Ind., together with all fixtures and improvements thereon. Such land, which is surplus to the requirements of the United States, comprises a part of the north half of the northwest quarter of section 20, township 15 north, range 3 east, Marion County, Ind., known as Tent City, and is more particularly described as follows:

(1) Beginning at the southwest intersection of Wade Avenue with Main Street as shown on plat of Thurston Place Addition, said point being the northeast corner of the tract of land herein described, thence running south along the western right-of-way line of Main Street a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue; thence running in a westerly direction along the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue, a distance of hour hundred and fifty-five and twenty-three one-hundredths feet to a point in the east right-of-way line of a fifteen-foot alley; thence running north along said east right-of-way line of said fifteen-foot alley a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the south right-of-way line of Wade Avenue; thence along said south right-of-way line of Wade Avenue a distance of four hundred fifty-five and twenty-three one-hundredths feet to a place of beginning and containing four and seventy-eight one-hundredths acres of land more or less (tract 1);

(2) Beginning at the southeast intersection of Wade Avenue with Main Street as shown on plat of Thurston Place Addition, said point being the northwest corner of the tract of land herein described; thence running south along the eastern right-of-way line of Main Street a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue; thence running east along the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue, a distance of nine hundred twenty-five and forty-six one-hundredths feet to a point in the west right-of-way line of Holt Road, thence running north along the west right-of-way line of Holt Road a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the south right-of-way of Wade Avenue, thence running west along the south right-of-way line of Wade Avenue a distance of nine hundred twenty-five and forty-six one-hundredths feet to the place of beginning and containing nine and seventy-three one-hundredths acres of land more or less (tract 2); and

(3) All the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all streets, highways, alleys, ways, and rights-of-way which may or do adjoin or abut the said land—the land described in this section is the same land that was acquired by the United States by deed dated December 7, 1942, recorded in the land records of Marion County, Ind., in volume 1103 at page 599, and shown as tracts 1 and 2 on the military real estate map of Stout Field, numbered 1627, approved July 6, 1945, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers.

SEC. 2. The conveyance of the Federal land provided for in the first section shall be made upon the terms and conditions and for the consideration set forth as follows:

(1) In time of war or of national emergency heretofore or hereafter declared by the President or the Congress, and upon the request of the Secretary of Defense to the State of Indiana, the United States shall

have the right to the exclusive or nonexclusive use of all or any part of the Federal land, for the full period of such war or national emergency without cost to the United States. Upon the expiration of such war or national emergency the use of the Federal land shall cease in favor of the State of Indiana.

(2) In consideration of the conveyance of the Federal land, the State of Indiana shall agree not to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of all or any part of certain land or improvements thereon (hereinafter referred to as State land) comprising Stout Field, situated in sections 17, 18, 19, and 20, township 15 north, range 3 east, second principal meridian, Marion County, Ind., and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point at the center of section 17, township 15 north, range 3 east, second principal meridian, said point being the intersection of the center line of Minnesota Avenue and Holt Road; thence south along the north-south center line of section 17 and the center line of Holt Road three thousand four hundred ninety-three and fifty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point, said point being the intersection of the center line of Holt Road and Wade Street; thence in a westerly direction along the center line of Wade Street extended three thousand four hundred forty-five and eighty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point; thence in a northerly direction nine hundred thirty-two and thirteen one-hundredths feet to a point on the north line of Raymond Street extended, said point being two hundred nineteen and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet east of the east line of Denniston Street; thence in a westerly direction along the north line of Raymond Street extended two hundred nineteen and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet to a point in the east line of Denniston Street; thence north along the east line of Denniston Street one thousand one hundred sixty-five and twenty-one one-hundredths feet to a point; thence in an easterly direction along a line parallel to Lagrand Avenue eight hundred fifty-nine and thirty-one one-hundredths feet to a point on the east line of Roena Avenue; thence north along the east line of Roena Avenue one thousand four hundred ninety-three and seventy-nine one-hundredths feet to a point on the east-west center line of section 18; thence in an easterly direction along the east-west center line of sections 18 and 17, and the center of Minnesota Avenue two thousand seven hundred ninety-one and eight-tenths feet to a point of beginning; containing two hundred fifty-eight and ten one-hundredths acres, more or less; and being the same land under lease to the United States from 1942 to December 31, 1946, covered by lease contract numbered W2215-ENG-69, between the State of Indiana and the United States, executed April 7, 1942; shown as tract 4 on the military real-estate map of Stout Field, numbered 1627, approved July 6, 1945, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers.

(3) In time of war or of national emergency heretofore or hereafter declared by the President or the Congress, and upon the request of the Secretary of Defense to the State of Indiana, the United States shall have the right to the exclusive or nonexclusive use of all or any part of the State land for the full period of such war or national emergency without cost to the United States. Upon the expiration of such war or national emergency the use of the State land shall cease in favor of the State of Indiana.

(4) In the event that the State of Indiana shall at any time sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of, or shall attempt to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of, all or any part of the State or Federal land without the consent of the Secretary of Defense, all of the right, title, and interest in and to the Federal land shall revert to the United States without cost.

SEC. 3. Nothing herein contained shall prevent the State of Indiana from granting leases of said lands and rights and easements therein and thereon without the consent of the Secretary of Defense providing any such leases, rights, and easements are made subject to the right of use thereof by the United States during war or national emergency.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 9, after the word "land", insert the words "and all improvements thereon."

Page 7, line 1, after the word "land", insert the words "including any improvements thereon."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This completes the bills on the Consent Calendar today.

MEXICAN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 450 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 355, amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-three Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 19]

Battle	Dorn, S. C.	Lantaff
Bentsen	Durham	Lesinski
Bolling	Gamble	Lipscomb
Brownson	Gary	McCarthy
Buckley	Gwinn	McConnell
Byrne, Pa.	Hart	Merrill
Campbell	Hillelson	Morgan
Chatham	Holifield	Moulder
Chelf	Kearney	Osmers
Clardy	Kelley, Pa.	Patterson
Corbett	Keogh	Pillion
Coudert	Kirwan	Powell
Dawson, Ill.	Kluczynski	Price
Dingell	Krueger	Prouty
Radwan	Roosevelt	Vursell
Richards	St. George	Wainwright
Riehlman	Scrivner	Weichel
Rivers	Sheppard	Wharton
Robsion, Ky.	Short	
Robeson, Va.	Taylor	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8069. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HILLELSON (at the request of Mr. SHEEHAN), for today, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SCHENCK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL to extend his remarks in the RECORD following the legislative program and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. YORTY in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND and to include resolutions.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 8069. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernment Relations.

MEXICAN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a great many Members are not familiar with the fact that there are at present high-level negotiations going on between the Mexican Government and our Government regarding Mexican labor coming across the border. I cannot understand why this particular resolution is called up today.

At this very hour a friendly nation—Mexico—is now trying to negotiate with United States representatives the very thing that this resolution seeks to accomplish. Before the Rules Committee last week it was revealed and admitted by one of the proponents of this legislation that you might term this bill a weapon with a little weight in it in order to try and pressure Mexico in the negotiations with our country regarding some of their so-called wetback farm labor. My definition of a weapon with a little weight is what is known as a blackjack.

I wonder if the Members of this House realize that last year over 580,000 illegal immigrants were sent back across the border, and most of those illegal immigrants were caused by this so-called wetback situation.

With the exception of maybe 5 States that are interested in this cheap labor, I would like to ask the Representatives of the 42 or 43 other States what they are going to say to their people about reports of unemployment which appeared in last week's papers? On February 25 of last week the Washington papers said there were 59 critical areas of unemployment in this Nation. Why should we let down the bars now to have legislation passed that will eventually this year mean thousands of workers from across the Rio Grande border coming into this country to take over jobs that millions of unemployed Americans are entitled to? Why this resolution is up here today I do not know, because this dispatch from this morning's paper states:

The Mexican Embassy announced today that an agreement has been reached in Mexico City for provisional 6 weeks' extension of the terms under which farm workers from south of the border may accept jobs in the United States. The Embassy statement said that an understanding has been reached on almost all points under consideration on a continuing bilateral agreement.

If the agreement is signed this bill is absolutely unnecessary.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I cannot yield at present; I will later if I have time.

Let me read from a February 25 newspaper article, and this article appeared in the Washington newspapers.

These groups promised to work to facilitate an agreement by their governments. They were the Associacion Nacional de Cosecheros of Mexico and the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Grange. The National Farmers Union was represented by its president, James Patton, at the Tuesday morning conference but did not participate in later meetings.

Allan B. Kline, AFBF president, is also president of the IFAP and presided at the sessions.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the farm organizations, the labor organizations are cooperating to bring about an agreement between our Government and Mexico on this labor question. The passage of this bill may jeopardize the success of these high-level negotiations.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Not right now.

The press this morning states that our Secretary of State today is down in South America with a very delicate and difficult international task to perform. I can almost read the headlines in South America tomorrow morning. They will say that our Congress passed a resolution in order to pressure the Mexican Government to sign a contract on an agreement that concerns their nationals.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. COOLEY. I think my chairman was about to ask the gentleman whether he meant to say that the farm organizations were opposed to this resolution.

It is a fact that the farm organizations—the Grange and the Farm Bureau—submitted a very feeble and a very brief endorsement of this legislation when we were having hearings. But the gentleman is calling the attention of Members of the House to the fact that last week the big farm organizations had a 3-day meeting in Washington and everyone came out against it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. They came here and they met with the labor organizations of Mexico and came out against it.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I would like to read for the benefit of the Members of the House what Attorney General Brownell stated in an interview held at San Francisco, and this is chronicled in the New York Times of August 17, 1953. Brownell stated at that time:

In San Francisco, as in San Diego, Los Angeles and the San Joaquin Valley, Mr. Brownell said he had talked with scores of Californians intimately acquainted with the yearly "invasion" of Mexican nationals.

"It develops from the conferences," he said, "that the problem is increasing. The number of wetbacks entering the country is at an all-time high. Rackets are developing in the importation of labor. It has all the earmarks of developing into a number one law enforcement problem, and it is going to take the coordinated efforts of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials to combat this problem."

Now, I wish you would listen to this. It was only 2 years ago that the Congress knocked three-million-some-odd-thousand dollars out of an appropriation to give us sufficient protection at the border, to keep aliens from coming across the border unlawfully.

Here is what Attorney General Brownell said:

The Attorney General said that, in his opinion, congressional economies that cut the United States Border Patrol from 1,627 to about 1,100 members were penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Just 2 years ago this Congress committed that act.

The Attorney General went on to say:

For every dollar saved in that way, $20 must be spent later in American law enforcement.

Let me tell you something more. In the city of Chicago the Immigration Department is having trouble with thousands and thousands of illegal immigrants who have infiltrated into Chicago by reason of this so-called cheap labor across our border.

Let me call your attention to what Mr. McBee, who is in charge of immigration out in California, said:

One smuggler, his men captured near El Paso broke down, confessed he was part of a nationwide ring headquartered in Chicago.

If they are headquartered in Chicago, they are headquartered in Detroit, Los Angeles, Seattle, New York, and other places.

Mr. McBee went on to say:

He named names, even told authorities of a restaurant on Chicago's South Halstead Street, in the city's Skid Row, where he delivered aliens for employment in industrial plants.

These aliens that are being admitted under this program are infiltrating into every industrial area in America. With 59 critical areas of unemployment in America today, I think it is about time to call a halt to this fiasco that goes on every year with regard to these wetbacks and cheap labor from across the border.

Mr. Speaker, February 7, 1954, the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, S. T. D., archbishop of San Antonio, Tex., member of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, sent the following telegram to Chairman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of the House Agriculture Committee:

House Joint Resolution 355 is calculated further to embitter our relations with Mexico. There are more than 2 million unemployed bread winners in our country today. There are thousands of unemployed Puerto Ricans in Chicago who are American citizens. In south Texas we have tens of thousands of Mexican Americans who will gladly work in agriculture for decent wages. When the Federal Government recruits illegal aliens for employment, it posts a reward for crime against the United States. We hope that Congress will not attempt to legalize lawlessness.

Similar protests were filed by the Federal Council of Churches and other civic and welfare groups, and also by the AFL and CIO, and Labor, railway labor is also opposed to this measure.

I also wish to include with my remarks the following telegram received by me from the State chairman of the American GI Forum of Texas:

DEL RIO, TEX., *February 27, 1954.*

Honorable Representative RAY MADDEN,
Democrat, Indiana,
House Office Building:

The American GI Forum of Texas, Mexican-American Veterans, and civic organization, dedicated to the betterment of the Southwest's 3 million Spanish-speaking citizens, highly praises your sincere and truthful stand on the proposed bracero resolution.

No one knows better about the welfare of our Texas farm laborers, the majority of whom are Americans of Mexican descent, than Archbishop Lucey, who has seen their poverty and squalor caused by the unfair and illegal competition of wetbacks and braceros, who provide a vast reservoir of cheap, and I mean cheap, farm labor for the greedy farming interests who have become rich overnight through use of alien labor.

We are thousands of voters, thousands of Americans who depend upon farm wages for our daily tortillas. We cannot be heard in our Congress because we do not have the money to send delegations to present our

side. We hope you will help our people, many of whom in the thousands are unemployed.

Failure of the administration as well as Congress to adequately provide for border patrol and detention facilities is congressional and administration blessing to cheap-labor subsidy for southwestern farmers and ranchers, as well as utter disregard for Nation's security in allowing a wide-open border to exist.

Our Government should spend money in marshaling our own farm labor pool. Domestic farm labor needs employment and our retail business needs their farm dollars. It is high time Congress thought of our own workers and their welfare, and not favoring minority Southwest agricultural interests with cheap labor.

Border recruitment will not stop wetbacks. Denial of employment to wetbacks is solution. Wetback business has produced rackets of employment agencies in illegal labor.

Suggest Congress read our report, What Price Wetbacks.

CRISTOBAL ALDRETE,
State Chairman, American GI Forum of Texas.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, before you can begin a discussion, quite often it is well to have a definition of terms. We have been using the term "wetback" here rather indiscriminately. To me a wetback is a Mexican national who comes into this country illegally, one who comes across the border without proper authorization by this Government and by its Immigration Service.

This bill does not deal with wetbacks except indirectly. The bill, if passed, will certainly have a very distinct effect upon keeping wetbacks from coming into the United States. These people come over here because there is work to be had. They want the work. No matter what anybody says about the unemployment situation in the East, the fact still remains that, according to the figures of the United States Employment Service, there are not enough agricultural workers in the States of Arizona and California. Any unemployed persons in those States are certainly given the opportunity to apply for these jobs. But they do not want this particular type of work. It is stoop labor; it is the type of worker who goes into the vegetable fields and pulls weeds and thins vegetables, pulls cotton, picks cotton. We just do not have that type of person available to do the work that is required, and it has been said by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, and it is true, that without some legislation of this type there will be a lot of crops in the great West that will not be harvested.

The people from Mexico who come into those States legally under this bill are known as braceros; they are not wetbacks. They are recruited by the United States Government and the Mexican Government under the present agreement with Mexico. They are brought into this country and they are given contracts with farmers providing for them to receive the prevailing wage, providing for their living conditions, even providing for insurance for them while they are here. They are well treated. This is not slave labor. These people get the prevailing wage which is paid in the area in which they are going to work for the type of work they do.

So, I just want to make this point very clear. This is not wetbacks we are dealing with. This bill has a twofold purpose: One is to provide for this type of labor to come into the United States, which is so badly needed, and the second one is by allowing these people to come in legally, to deter them from coming in illegally. This will help the United States border patrol to do its work rather than hinder it. Under this law it will become necessary, in the event we cannot make an agreement with Mexico, for the United States to recruit this Mexican labor at the border. But what happens if this becomes law? It does not mean that these Mexican workers will come over here with no protection whatsoever. It means rather that they will be recruited at the border. They will receive the same contracts they now receive under the present existing arrangement with Mexico. They will receive the prevailing wage, and all the other benefits which they are now getting. The only difference that this makes is that if we cannot perfect an agreement with Mexico we will then be able to recruit at the border instead of recruiting inside of Mexico, and we will be able to bring these people over to do this work which has to be done, and they will be very well treated.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Is it not a fact that we have had this program in operation a number of years and it has worked satisfactorily in the States where it has operated?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes. It was in effect in World War II; that is, this agreement was in effect, not in this particular form, during World War II, and in this form since 1948, and under this agreement it has worked out very well as the gentleman from Colorado has stated, and we have had a lot of these people come into the country. They have been well treated, and actually I think that the relationship between the United States and Mexico has been improved because of this contract's existence rather than hindered by it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to compliment the gentleman on bringing out the fact that this legislation will help solve the wetback problem.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It very definitely will.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Instead of aggravating it, it seeks to eliminate it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman tell the House, if he has information, how many Mexican farm laborers have been brought into the United States annually during the last 3 years?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think in response to the question of the gentleman, Mr. Siciliano of the Labor Department stated that under this program there have been 200,000 brought in in the past year.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The difficulty in getting the number of workers is that they go back and forth across the line. But the point I wanted to bring out with that no single worker could be brought in under this program, and I ask this as a question, if there were not a certification that there is no United States labor available.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is absolutely correct. The United States Employment Service has to certify that this labor is needed in a particular area before anybody can get any Mexican braceros. If there are American laborers available to do this particular type of work, then no Mexican can be brought into that particular area.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. In addition to the provision in the basic law itself it is well to point out that the contract which is signed provides that whenever the Secretary of Labor or his duly authorized representative determines that United States workers are available to fill the job for which the worker has been contracted, this agreement may be terminated by the Secretary or his duly authorized representative. Is not that protection for the American laborers?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct. Even if the people are here under contract, if the labor situation changes so that there are American laborers available, then the Secretary may terminate the contract at any time and send the Mexican labor back.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Has the gentleman given any thought to the question of the extent to which the absence of such Mexican labor would affect the farm surpluses of the United States?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. All I can say in answer to that is that if these people are not in my particular area we are going to have a lot of crops that are not going to be harvested. If the gentleman has anything against the farmers in my area, that is one thing.

Mr. DONOVAN. Perhaps I will have to ask that question of someone a little more familiar with the situation.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have found that if I ask a silly question, I quite often get a silly answer.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. PATTEN. May I answer the question of the gentleman from New York by saying that where we have these crops that have to be harvested, it does not make any difference whether there is unemployment in some other locality.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I trust the House will reject this rule. It certainly seems to me to be a most inopportune time to consider legislation which will have the effect of antagonizing a friendly nation, particularly in view of the fact that this friendly neighbor, after we have received his people, may refuse to take them back. Unless there is a bilateral agreement, there is no assurance that any of these people, once they have gotten into the United States, no matter how, will ever go back to Mexico. This bill places a premium on the ability to cross the border surreptitiously and hide. It gives to the skilled evader an opportunity to come to the United States and remain here. This is particularly serious in the case of people who are suffering from communicable diseases, who bring narcotics with them, who are felons, and who belong to Communist organizations. All protective measures of our immigration laws go out the window. After we get the people, it may well be that the Mexican Government will say, "You have given them a job, now you keep them. They are the kind of people that we do not want back in Mexico." If a bilateral agreement, which I have supported on other occasions, is reached, then, of course, this very serious problem cannot arise. It seems to me we ought to wait until such time as it is determined whether or not the United States and Mexico can reach an agreement.

I call your attention to the language in this resolution—"after every practicable effort has been made by the United States to negotiate and reach agreement on such arrangements." What does that mean? Who passes on the question of whether or not "every practicable effort" has been made? I know that the adoption of this resolution will mean the termination of all attempts to reach an agreement and that our country will be flooded by thousands upon thousands of people who will never return to Mexico. We can certainly wait until it is determined what the outcome of these negotiations are before we act upon a matter which is as serious as this.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I had not expected to speak on the rule, but I cannot refrain from doing so because of the statements which were made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] with reference to the position of the farm organizations on this legislation. I hold in my hand a copy of the hearings on this legislation. In these hearings there appear the statements of Mr. Matt Triggs, representing the American Farm Bureau Federation, and Mr. John J. Riggle, representing the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, both of them not feebly—as stated by the gentleman from North Carolina—but strongly endorsing this legislation. Also in the hearings you will find a letter from Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, approving the legislation, and urging its passage.

In addition there are numerous telegrams, statements, and letters in the hearings from local and regional farm groups and organizations endorsing this measure. No farm organization appeared in opposition.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that it is brash and it is improvident to bring this rule up today. We say in effect to Mexico, "Treaty or no treaty, we are going to bring these wetbacks in." We just thumb our nose at Mexico. That is most rude and unpleasant. Our action in passing this bill will have improvident repercussions.

I wonder what Secretary of State Dulles is going to say to justify this kind of action when he meets with the South American and Central American delegates at Caracas in a few days.

Beyond that, I want to state that this bill ought to be called not a wetback bill but a "redback" bill. Colonel Habberton, Acting Commissioner of Immigration, said recently before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for State, Justice, and Commerce, as follows:

> It was recently discovered that approximately 100 present and past members of the Communist Party had been crossing daily into the United States in the El Paso area; also that the number of present and exmembers of the Communist Party residing immediately across the border from El Paso number about 1,500, and it has been established that there exists active liaison between the Communist Party of Mexico and the Communist Party in the United States.

Such threat to national security should at least cause us to hesitate.

Here are some other results, according to Colonel Habberton:

> Results of the mass movement of wetbacks across the border are unemployment of displaced domestic labor, depressed wage scales and living standards, and creation of serious crime, health, and sanitation problems. Complaints at these results and requests for remedial action come from all levels of population, and local governments. The aliens show a tendency to quit their former attitude of docility and to assume one of defiance, obstruction, and resistance. Farmers fear for the safety of their women and children in isolated farm homes when groups of aliens appear and demand food, where they formerly begged for it. Wetbacks are making heavy contributions to the local jails, public hospitals, and even relief rolls. Their depredations range from harvesting food crops at night for subsistence, to robbery and rape. The Los Angeles Police Department reports that their officers apprehended last year 4,503 aliens who were turned over to the Service for processing as illegal entrants, which figure does not include many wetbacks who were arrested for criminal offenses and prosecuted in the courts instead of being merely booked for this Service. One thriving farm community near Los Angeles reports 4 out of 5 of the defendants in its police court are wetbacks.

This is indeed a novel procedure. We give the green light for Mexican workers to come across, treaty or no treaty. I think Congress is being used as a catspaw for the ranching, cotton, and fruit tycoons principally from Texas and California. We close the borders and ports in the North against possibility of subversives entering but along the Mexican border we deliberately leave the gates open. And now we do not even have the restraint of a treaty with Mexico. That country will say: "Since there is no treaty, we disavow responsibility for saboteurs entering the United States. We shall not take them back. They are your responsibility." Thus these Communists remain with us.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how this jibes with President Eisenhower's labor policy and our unemployment figures and how Governor Shivers feels about this. The Governor at his ranch is a notorious employer of illegal wetbacks at starvation wages. The present determined attempt of his Republican leadership to force this bill on us is passing strange.

Mr. CELLER. Certainly in view of our unemployment, especially farm-labor unemployment, and relief demands, bringing in Mexican wetbacks, who will accept substandard wages, is, to say the least, most ill-advised. Why the Republican leadership does all this is, as you say, passing strange. The voters will remember next November. Assuredly President Eisenhower could not reconcile his desire for friendly neighbors and this attitude of thumbing our noses at Mexico. As to Governor Shivers, he must answer for himself. If he employs illegal wetbacks, I hope the voters of Texas will find out and put "finis" to his political career.

Why should we not wait and see whether an agreement can be reached with the sovereign State of Mexico before we take this most unusual step of holding a gun to Mexico's temple and saying, "Stand and deliver; you will give us what we want; we will take nothing else."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio have their share of problems. But I am not an authority on their problems and I have never taken up the time of the House to try to impose on its membership what I believe to be the solution to their problems. But several of the Members from these States are representing themselves as experts on the problems of my district, in particular, the wetback problem. This is a most difficult problem and one that I have lived with all of my life on the border. It is a problem I know must be solved.

This legislation, although certainly not perfect, is a step in the direction of cutting down the number of wetbacks illegally entering our country. If we provide a simple, fair contract to farmers and employees alike there will be no incentive for the use of illegal labor. The labor contract provides a stable, legal force which will be available only in times of local labor shortages and will be returned to Mexico when sufficient

local labor is available to take care of our harvest problems. Certainly, the farmer would be encouraged to use legal labor and would find it to his advantage to abstain from the employment of wetbacks which are subject to being picked up in the fields, and therefore, a most unreliable source of labor from his standpoint.

We have tried for many years to keep out illegal aliens by enforcement measures and have not been successful. The condition in Mexico is such that in some places we find men who are unable to support their families because of lack of employment. No enforcement official is going to be able to keep them from coming into this country where jobs are available at pay scales far above those of Mexico.

There has been much talk here of the need for a bilateral contract and in this I am in accord but for years we have had a contract which has been bilateral in name only because Mexico has virtually dictated its terms. They have taken advantage of labor shortages during peak harvest and our Government has had to accept the terms as laid out by Mexico. If we are given the authority to take unilateral action in writing a contract for the protection of those who come legally into this country seeking employment then Mexico will be more amenable to entering into a bilateral contract which is fair to both countries.

It must be stressed that this legislation provides protection for local citizens who desire to do this type of labor. No man will be imported to do this labor unless the Secretary of Labor certifies that there is a labor shortage in the area. To protect local labor from having this measure used to cut their wages it also provides that these men should not be paid less than the prevailing wage.

Mexico has gone so far as to demand that these imported laborers be paid not a prevailing wage but a minimum wage and I do not believe that imported labor should be given rights that are not as yet afforded to our own citizens.

I hope that some of the people here who seem so concerned with Mexico will show the same concern toward citizens of these United States who are trying to protect its economy.

It is my conviction that much of the opposition in Mexico to this program stems from wealthy farmers in northern Mexico who resent seeing their labor paid the relatively high wages paid in this country in comparison to those they pay in Mexico.

It is quite true that in some sections of our country and in particular some categories of work we have a labor surplus. But I can cite a last week's newspaper article from my home town of McAllen, Tex., which shows farmers in that section have placed applications for hundreds of laborers with the Texas Employment Office guaranteeing a minimum wage of 50 cents an hour and that they had been unable to fill these applications with local citizens.

Frankly, I think it is fortunate that in the times of peak harvest we do not have sufficient local labor to gather the crops for if we did, these same citizens would be unemployed throughout the rest of year. From the standpoint of local citizens it is far better that they have year around employment and that labor be imported only during the peak harvest to be certain that the crops are not allowed to rot in the fields.

I assure you that if we are successful in working out a fair contract to the farmer and employee that the combination of the stable supply of labor resulting from it to take care of our peak harvest and the expected increase in appropriations for the border patrol will result in a great deal of progress in solving our wetback problem by cutting down the incentive for the employment of illegal aliens. Legal entrants will have the full protection of our laws whereas wetbacks are subject to exploitation with no legal remedy available.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear from what has been said that if some of the Members had the time to read the hearings that were presented in support of this resolution many of the objections that have been raised would not have been raised.

A good example was the completely unfounded argument just advanced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. He said he is opposed to this resolution because thousands of Mexican nationals would be processed to work in this country and then the Mexican Government would probably not permit them to return to their homeland. If he had made an inquiry, or if he had read the hearings, he would never have made such an argument. On page 5 of the hearings Mr. Siciliano—Assistant Secretary of Labor Rocco C. Siciliano—stated:

> It is against their constitution to try to prohibit the entry or exits of their people. That is what they maintain when we ask them to try to keep their wetbacks back.

They have raised the old argument about wetbacks, when any one who is interested in the facts can read the RECORD and know that this bill has no connection whatever with the wetback problem except that it would aid the immigration officials in dealing with them. It is easy to understand why any one who is in favor of freedom of wetback movement would be opposed to this resolution. It is easy to understand why those who do not want aliens who come across the border screened so as to better prevent Communists and subversives from coming in would be opposed to this legislation. Apparently the opponents do not want any control or any processing or any screening of those who enter from Mexico. I favor such screening and such processing and I am therefore naturally in favor of this resolution.

I assume the rule will be readily adopted, and I wish to address myself briefly to the merits of the pending resolution. It is of the utmost importance that it be promptly approved by the Congress.

If the urgency of this measure is fully understood I have no doubt of its prompt approval. Therefore, I shall discuss the facts, the background, and the necessity of this legislation. I first call attention to the fact that the resolution was reported by the Agriculture Committee, after exhautsive hearings, with but two dissening votes.

It is strongly supported by the Department of State, by the Justice Department, by the Labor Department, and by the Department of Agriculture. It is endorsed by the American Farm Bureau, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Grange, and by scores of other farm and grower organizations.

I am sure the purpose of the legislation is understood. I shall briefly refer to that. Public Law 78 of the 82d Congress begins as follows:

> SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico), the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

That law then spells out the general terms and conditions under which an international labor agreement can be negotiated and carried out with Mexico.

Public Law 78 does not expire until December 31, 1955. But the migrant labor agreements last but a year at a time. The last one expired on January 1, 1954. It was extended to January 15 by mutual agreement while negotiations for a new agreement were going on. But no new agreement was made and since January 15 there has been none. Following the expiration on January 15 this Government began unilateral processing of Mexican nationals who presented themselves at our border recruitment stations. Then the question arose concerning the authorization for money to be expended in pursuance of the special recruiting procedures set forth in Public Law 78. The Comptroller General on January 18 ruled that procedures contained in Public Law 78 could be used only when an international labor agreement with Mexico was in force and effect. The border recruitment stations were then promptly closed.

The purpose of House Resolution 355 is to amend Public Law 78 so as to permit the special recruiting procedures therein set forth to be usable regardless of whether an international agreement is or is not in effect. In other words, it would permit the use of the special procedures contained in that law in carrying out unilateral processing of Mexican farm workers who present themselves, legally, at border recruitment stations in the United States.

WOULD ALLEVIATE WETBACK PROBLEM

I repeat that in debating this legislation it must be kept in mind that this is not a wetback bill, except that its passage would alleviate the wetback problem by enabling Mexican farm workers to be processed and gain a legal status and thereby enjoy much more desirable wage guaranties and working conditions than they would have as illegal wetbacks.

That arrangment would, of course, tend to deter the movement of wetbacks who cross the border and would reduce the number and enable our immigration officers to maintain better control over them. That view was expressed by the Department of Justice in its report to the Agriculture Committee. The Deputy Attorney General stated:

It is the view of the Department that enactment of such legislation is of urgent importance to the efficient administration of the immigration laws of the United States, and to the needs of a substantial part of the agricultural economy of the western and southwestern United States.

So this legislation has nothing to do with the wetback problem, as such, except that it would reduce the number of illegal entrants and better enable our immigration officials to cope with them.

NEGOTIATIONS HAMPERED BY MEXICO

Let me now give you a little of the background of our prior negotiations of labor agreements with Mexico and some of the perplexing difficulties that have arisen in the application. For 12 years we have had migrant labor agreements with Mexico whereby Mexican workers come across and work in agriculture in areas found to be suffering from labor shortages. Throughout the history of the program these imported workers have not been permitted to work in a county or an area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified that there is insufficient domestic help available and unless it is shown that diligent efforts have been made to recruit American workers elsewhere than in the immediate locality.

But for some reason or other in recent years it has become increasingly difficult to work out acceptable agreements with Mexico. During the past few years our friends in Mexico have engaged in delays, stalling tactics, bickerings over interpretations, and indulged in other tactics that have been almost intolerable at times. That fact was confirmed by Robert G. Goodwin, Director, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, in his testimony, when he referred to tactics used by Mexican negotiators during proposed labor agreements. Mr. Goodwin stated:

We feel that we have reached agreement in the past at considerable cost to our own interests. The pattern that has been followed regularly on the part of Mexican officials is a delaying tactic until we get into a position where the labor is so desperately needed here that we have to agree to whatever conditions are put forth. You can take the experience, the history of the negotiations with Mexico each time that they have been conducted in the past, and the pattern has been exactly that. The reason we do not have an agreement this time is because we have taken a firm position against that, including a firm position against delays.

But since, as Mr. Goodwin indicated, many of these actions arose at times when, without such Mexican labor, millions of dollars worth of crops would rot in the fields without the use of that only source of labor, our Government and our employers have buckled under the extreme emergencies and demands of the occasion. As is often true with appeasement, it has seemed that yielding at one time on one issue simply served to encourage more unreasonable and almost unconscionable demands to be made subsequently.

The simple fact is that our Government has yielded, appeased, and given in to the point that a showdown became virtually inevitable as to the making of agreements and good faith respect for them after they are made. Our Government is to be commended for taking this forthright and proper stand, and this Congress should without equivocation support that realistic policy.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Since when has this country become so weak that we have to turn to other nations to tell us whom we are going to send out, what aliens we are going to admit, or what aliens we are going to send out?

Mr. FISHER. Oh, yes; the gentleman is so correct about that. To listen to some of the arguments that have been made against this measure you would think we are incapable of doing our own legislating on domestic legislation—and this is a domestic issue, pure and simple. This deals with conditions under which we in this country will employ aliens from Mexico who enter this country legally, through regular ports of entry. It applies to them only after we have assumed sovereignty over them. As the able gentleman from New Mexico has so properly pointed out, we should be able to determine our own policies with regard to those we permit to come in and those we desire to send out.

Mr. Speaker, in order to fully understand the necessity for this legislation and to comprehend the problem from our Government's standpoint and the need for a showdown, it is important that we be apprised of some of the difficulties we have faced in the execution of the agreements in the past. Let me talk about that for a moment.

One development had to do with Mexico summarily closing the recruiting center at Monterrey, which was the only one within a reasonable distance of the border. Other centers were located several hundred miles deep in the interior of Mexico, very inconvenient to our people who found it necessary to go to them. Our Government protested the closing at Monterrey, but to no avail. It was closed by the unilateral action of the Mexican Government.

Now, that action by Mexico not only added to the inconvenience of American citizens but aggravated the problem of our border officials in controlling the entry of wetbacks. The reason for that is obvious. There are tens of thousands of unemployed, poverty-stricken people in northern Mexico, living in the proximity of the northern border. In order for them to come in legally they had to travel hundreds of miles into the interior of Mexico to the recruiting centers. If they went there they might or might not be accepted. So, faced with that dilemma, thousands of them, with hungry families to feed, evidently crossed the border and sought employment. It is obvious that the further into Mexico the recruiting centers are located, the more inaccessible they are to the Mexican workers in the border area, the more tempted they are to cross the border illegally. Therefore, our Government protested the closing at Monterrey, but, as I have said, to no avail.

Another development had to do with wages. Article 15 of the last migrant-labor agreement, which expired on January 15, provided:

The employer shall pay the Mexican worker not less than the prevailing wage rate paid to a domestic worker for similar work at the time the work was performed and in the manner paid within the area of employment, or at the rate prevalent in the work contract, whichever is higher. Determination of the prevailing wage rate shall be made by the Secretary of Labor.

Despite the provision in the agreement to the effect that wages paid to Mexican workers had to be the prevailing wage, determined by our Secretary of Labor, on May 8, 1953, the Mexican Government announced a scale of minimum wages for all workers contracted in the future. That was directly contrary to the international agreement, which I have quoted. Here is the wording, a pertinent part of the announcement made in a note from the Mexican Government:

In view of the foregoing and based on the statistical data and salary graphs of the wages received in the year 1952 by the Mexican contract laborers, compared to the averages of the prevailing wages in those regions where American laborers are employed for the same agricultural task, the Government of Mexico has arrived at the following conclusions. First, every request from employers who wish to engage Mexican workers must be refused when the offered salary is lower than the minimum initial rates of $2.75 for the first hand picking of 100 pounds of cotton, the minimum wage rates being proportionately adjusted for picking under different conditions as well as for other types of agricultural laborers, and, second, that as a general rule it is proper to establish for all agricultural regions which employ Mexican laborers an increase of the hourly wage fixing an initial minimum of not less than 65 cents for the States of the Southeast, of 75 cents for the Middle West, and of 60 cents for the Western States.

That quotation is from an official translation by the Foreign Office of the Mexican note. It is directly contrary to the international agreement.

Here is another one. Although the agreement contains no authorization for Mexico to fix the subsistance rate for the workers recruited on contract—that being determinable under the terms of the agreement by our Secretary of Labor—in Arkansas, western Texas, and New Mexico employers were coerced into paying a subsistance rate fixed by the Mexican consul as a condition of obtaining workers. These illegal demands had to be met or the employers were faced with great crop losses.

UNILATERAL BLACKLISTING

Another of those many developments had to do with blacklisting—unilateral blacklisting, of American employers or of areas or counties, by the Mexican Government, again directly contrary to the plain and unambiguous wording of the international agreement. Under that agreement if a complaint arose the

exact procedure was set out whereby a joint hearing would be held before any blacklisting could take place. It did not outlaw blacklisting, but simply required a hearing before it could take place. But completely ignoring that agreement, Mexico engaged in repeated unilateral actions of summarily blacklisting counties, areas, and individuals, without any sort of hearing and without any warning whatever.

Another arbitrary and unauthorized interpretation of the agreement on the part of Mexico had to do with insurance. Here is the wording of a pertinent part of article 6 of the work contract on that subject:

> No deduction shall be made from the Mexican worker's wages except as provided in this article. The employer may make the following deductions only: For insurance plans when authorized by the Mexican Government under an insurance plan covering nonoccupational injuries and diseases, when such plan has been approved by that Government.

It was developed during the hearings that for 2 years from August 1951 to June 1953 this provision was interpreted to be permissive, rather than mandatory on the part of the employer. In June 1953, just 6 months prior to the expiration of the agreement, and after a Mexican official from the Foreign Ministry had spent considerable time visiting employers and insurance companies on this side of the border, the Mexican Government suddenly announced that they construed article 6 to be mandatory and that employers were required to make the necessary deductions when authorized to do so by the Mexican Government.

The Mexican Government did not stop there. Employers were told that they must take that insurance from certain companies selected by the Mexican Government, and no others. Mr. Goodwin told the committee:

> There seems to be no logical basis for the manner in which these insurance companies were selected.

Mr. Goodwin went on to tell the committee that in some cases the rates of the approved companies were higher than those of companies not approved. Some of the unapproved companies with lower rates had been previously commended by the Mexican Ministry for Foreign Affairs for the fine service they had rendered to Mexican workers and the promptness with which they paid their claims.

Here, Mr. Speaker, was what appears to me to have been a rather highhanded solicitation of insurance for certain companies—only 2 or 3 of them—to the exclusion of all others. It was completely unilateral on the part of Mexico.

Another example can be cited of a demand made by a Mexican consul that employers in Dona Ana County, N. Mex., as a condition of extending the contracts of Mexican workers then and there employed, that they purchase and pay for life insurance for these workers. The agreement authorized no such requirement. And when the employer replied that there was no contractual obligation to pay for such life insurance, the employers were notified that they would be blacklisted because of their uncooperative attitude.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have dwelt at some length on the developments wherein the Mexican Government has, time after time, unilaterally and summarily made interpretations and demands under the migrant-labor agreements. From this I think you can readily understand what I meant when at the beginning of my statement I said a showdown with the Mexican Government became inevitable.

POINTS OF DIFFERENCE

I shall now refer to a few of the points of difference between the two governments which the negotiators could not agree upon. First, our negotiators very properly insisted that some concession be made by Mexico with respect to the location of the Mexican recruitment centers. Our representatives felt that at least some of the recruiting should be possible within a reasonable distance of the border. But Mexico made no concession.

Secondly, our Government insisted that Mexico's demand for a fixed, minimum wage could not be granted because it is unauthorized under American law. But Mexico nevertheless persisted in that demand.

Another problem was that of subsistance allowance for the Mexico workers. After the unhappy experience some of our employers had been subjected to in respect to illegal and exorbitant demands from Mexican officials under the old agreement, it was very proper and indeed imperative that a detailed, spelled-out, precise agreement on that point be inserted. But Mexico would not yield on that point.

Another difference had to do with insurance. Our Government insisted on limiting the Mexican Government to approving the coverage desired for nonoccupational insurance and the full cost paid by the worker. On this Mexico made no concession.

Still another difference had to do with worker responsibility. It is known from experience that about 15 or 20 percent of the braceros who are processed leave their jobs without cause. They are known as "skippers." This practice has resulted in considerable financial loss and inconvenience to the employers. Our negotiators very properly insisted that the employer be allowed to withhold several days of the workers' pay until he finished his contract. That would help deter the worker from violating his work agreement. But again our negotiators were rebuffed in that very reasonable suggestion.

BORDER RECRUITMENT NEEDED

After weeks and weeks of negotiations, from last October to January, not a single major concession was made by Mexico on these various points of disagreement. After January 15 our Government did a very proper thing: Processing centers were opened on this side of the border. Mexican nationals legally in this country were processed there until the program was closed down due to the Comptroller General's ruling. The passage of this resolution will enable that border recruiting to be resumed. It is hard to understand why there should be any objection to that. It has to do with a domestic problem—that of processing laborers who are legally in this country. To listen to some of the opponents of this legislation you would think these people are to be processed to work in Mexico and that we are therefore invading the jurisdiction of that country. This is an American problem. It does not deal with anything in Mexico. It does permit Mexican nationals to be processed—but only when they are legally in the United States as our guests and with our sovereignty extending over them while they are here.

CIO OPPOSES

It is true that the CIO and the AFL, or certain segments of those unions, have raised objections. But the CIO frankly announced through R. J. Thomas that it is opposed to any workers whatever coming over at this time, legally or illegally, agreement or no agreement. Apparently the CIO either does not know, or is not interested in, the fact that except for imported Mexican labor, American dinner tables would be denied thousands of tons of food.

UNILATERAL PROCESSING

It has been contended that this legislation is bad because it would permit unilateral processing—meaning processing of Mexican labor without consultation with Mexico. So what? This is our country, is it not? We have immigration laws which authorize unilateral processing of foreign labor. It is already the law without passing this measure. The Attorney General has pointed out that the general immigration laws might be invoked to meet this problem. But he says the specialized procedures contained in Public Law 78 are more desirable and their application would be much less expensive and more feasible than resort to the facets of our general immigration laws that apply to importation of farmworkers. Yes; the Attorney General has authority to process Mexican workers now, under existing immigration laws, and do so unilaterally. I have not heard that the existence of this law has disrupted international relations to any extent. Just who, Mr. Speaker, are we representing here today—the United States or Mexico?

Our Mexican friends, for whom I have great respect and admiration, are quite capable of looking after themselves. I have not heard of any Mexican congressmen objecting to the passage of laws in Mexico City which deal with domestic problems and which might not be to the liking of certain Americans. And I do not blame them a bit.

I do not recall that the United States was consulted when the Mexican Congress passed a law to expropriate property of great value owned by American oil companies a few years ago. I doubt that there was a single Mexican congressman who stood up and represented the United States on that occasion. And I do not blame him. That was Mexico's business. She acted in accord with her sovereign rights.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman or I sought employment down there in Mexico we would be employed under the Mexican law, would we not?

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And the United States would have absolutely nothing to do with terms and conditions or wages, would it?

Mr. FISHER. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And neither the gentleman nor I nor any other Member of the American Congress protested that action because we recognize that Mexico was a sovereign nation and it had the right to do as it pleased in its own territory.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

What about the bill passed by the Mexican Congress a few years ago which expropriated valuable property owned by American oil companies? That was a unilateral action. It was directed primarily at American citizens. When that drastic measure was being considered not a single Mexican Congressman arose to represent the United States, and I do not blame them one bit. Whether we agree with the wisdom and propriety of that action or not, the fact remains that it was an exercise of a right and a prerogative of a sovereign government, and I would defend them to the end in the right to exercise that right.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is about time that more people assume the responsibility of speaking for the American Government when we are dealing with domestic issues that affect our own sovereignty and our own country instead of spending so much of their time speaking here in behalf of foreign countries whose citizens, while guests in the United States, become the subject of regulation and control by laws which this American Congress seeks to enact.

Nor did any Mexican Congressman represent us when the Mexican Congress passed a law a few years ago which limits the right of American citizens to have gainful employment in Mexico. That comes under the head of Mexico's business. So far as I know, not a single Mexican Congressman represented us when a law was passed down there which prohibits a foreigner from purchasing real estate within 100 kilometers of the border, and limits and restricts the ownership of other property elsewhere in Mexico. Again, I do not blame the Mexican Congress. That was an action by a sovereign government, and even though many Americans were adversely affected, I certainly did not expect a Mexican Congressmen to represent us. The Mexican Congressmen did what you or I would have done: They looked after their own country without regard to the incidental and adverse effect the action might have on Americans.

MEXICO ACTS UNILATERALLY

But if you are going to say that it is bad to do things unilaterally, let us take a leaf from Mexico's book on that score. What about Mexico unilaterally blacklisting our citizens and our counties and areas?

What about Mexico unilaterally setting minimum wages, directly contrary to the migrant labor agreement?

What about Mexico, contrary to the agreement, unilaterally and summarily, setting a subsistance allowance for Mexican workers above the amount previously arrived at in accordance with the agreement; and which, by the way, was determined by our Government to be exorbitant and unreasonable as well as illegal?

And what about Mexico unilaterally and summarily demanding that our employers purchase certain insurance for Mexican workers, to be taken with companies named by the Mexican Government? And remember this was contrary to the wording of the international agreement.

I could go on and on, but time is short. Again I ask: Who are we representing here today—Mexico or the United States? The Mexican people are good traders. They are sharp and crafty, and from their standpoint I say "Power to them." They have been having their way, pretty well, in these agreements for years. When they have agreed to something they did not like they just unilaterally and summarily interpreted it to fit their own desires. And they have been getting by with it. Now their hand has at last been called, and here today we can sustain our own Government in having all this "monkey business" on the part of Mexico cut out.

When our Mexican friends find they must do business with us on a different basis from what they have been, you will see a little different attitude. This resolution will vastly improve the chances for a new agreement to be arrived at. It will place our negotiators in a much better position. The fact is that in regard to these workers Mexico needs us as much or even more than we need the Mexican workers. And they know it. It means more than $150 million a year of American money pumped into the economy of Mexico. And that is a lot of money anywhere, more particularly in Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, appeasement has been tried on other occasions between nations and has failed. As a general rule too much of it, whether between individuals or Nations, simply does not work very well. And we have a good example of it here.

Again, I ask what is there so wrong and evil about unilateral processing? It is our own business. We have been practicing it for years, and are doing so now, with respect to Canadian workers who come across by the thousands to work in our lumber camps of the north woods. It was practiced for decades by this Government along the Mexican border prior to a few years ago when this international agreement fad got into the picture. And it can and will work very well right now.

I am sure we all hope an acceptable international labor agreement can be negotiated with Mexico. One probably will be eventually, particularly if this resolution is enacted. But right now it is imperative that this amendment to Public Law 78 be passed. We are faced with an emergency in the Southwest. This is planting time. It is lambing time and shearing time on the ranches. It is harvesttime in many of the vegetable fields. And there is not even half enough labor available to meet the minimum requirements.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there is a very important principle involved in this simple joint resolution which is before us, or which I hope will be before us upon the adoption of the rule. This principle has very little to do with much of the subject of the debate as it has gone on in this last hour.

The principle involved is simply this: Shall we, the Government of the United States, continue to exercise jurisdiction over the entrance of foreigners, aliens, into our country? I do not think that this particular problem has ever actually been debated in the Halls of Congress before. I think it has always been taken for granted, Mr. Speaker, that the United States runs its own business with respect to who may be admitted inside our borders. A few years ago the Congress passed a bill which gave to the Republic of Mexico the courtesy of joining with us in an agreement regarding the admission of people who would perform labor in this country under certain conditions. We extended the Government of Mexico the courtesy of making an agreement with us. It was purely that and nothing more. We were not bound in any way to have done it; it was not necessary that we do that, because people are entering our country under our laws right along without any such agreement. But we did make that arrangement in the statute enacted regarding this labor program. Now the Government of Mexico appears not to be willing to recognize this courtesy and to deal with us in a manner which would seem to our people to be reasonable and mutually satisfactory. I see nothing except a good, forthright American principle in the idea of passing this joint resolution, which simply says, "Unfortunately, if we cannot have a satisfactory arrangement with you, we must withdraw that courtesy."

Mr. Speaker, this resolution before us merely asserts the right of the United States to have control over the entrance of people into our country—nothing more.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, if this bill is passed here today, we will have an agreement with Mexico satisfactory to our authorities, and we will have that agreement before this bill gets to the President for signature. If we do not have this bill passed, we can have an agreement with Mexico only if we capitulate to the ever-growing demands of Mexico. If this bill is not passed and we do not have an agreement with Mexico, then the result will be that we will take a step backward to the prewar days when the wetbacks came over without any control, without any agreement, and without any regulations, and when the Mexican laborer was exploited, and through the exploitation of the Mexican our own labor was exploited. So, this bill is not only necessary; it is imperative that we pass it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will vote for this rule and let us present to the House the arguments for the necessity of this bill. We already have a law that permits these agreements, but Mexico is coming to realize that by that law we placed ourselves in a straitjacket where they can dictate the terms and we can agree or go without. We want to get along with our good neighbors, but for months now we have been unable to come to an agreement because our authorities do not have anything to bargain with, they do not have the alternative that this bill would give them. The sooner we take them out of their straitjackets, the sooner they can negotiate effectively.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN].

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is regretted that this legislation provoked such a controversy. We have been having it almost every year since the war, call it agricultural labor, braceros, wetbacks, or whatever it is. This bill should have the support of every Member of this House. It is not a partisan bill, it is not a labor bill, but this bill is for the good of the United States, and everybody, I think, in America would support it if they understood it, except maybe a few farmers right along the border who are not concerned. They might just as well continue employing illegal Mexicans, but this is to make the employment of Mexican labor legal. We need them not only in Texas, Arizona, and California, but I would like to have the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] know that last year 27 States of the 48 employed Mexican labor, because we do not have stoop labor any more in the United States. We have to get it from some source, and of all those unemployed he referred to, you will not get one of them to pick cotton, potatoes, sugarbeets, or do the necessary menial jobs that these Mexicans are willing to do in coming over here and earning these Yankee dollars.

I hope the entire House will support this legislation despite the fact that there a few farmers on the border who would be very happy to continue without legislation. This unilateral agreement that is proposed here will enable the Labor Department to enforce certain regulations that have been in force since 1948, legalizing these Mexicans rather than letting them come over illegally.

I was surprised that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] would repeat such a ridiculous statement as that about 1,200 Communists coming across at El Paso. He knew there was nothing to that. He is too smart a man to fall for that kind of baloney. An irresponsible man made that statement while he was acting as director of a service here. I am surprised the gentleman from New York would even use it in his talk, because it is so utterly ridiculous.

I am also surprised at the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I usually think he does a marvelous job on immigration affairs. But this bill merely makes it legal so the Department of Labor can continue to operate as it has been doing in the last several years in the legal process of handling these Mexicans rather than the illegal method of letting them come across and get work without being properly processed, which in turn might promote the entry of Communists and some of the other ill things it has been suggested might happen.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may insert their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], who is unable to be here today, to insert his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the migratory farm worker remains the greatest social problem in the United States. Twice, during the 6 years I have been in Congress, the Congress has passed legislation establishing conditions under which agricultural workers might legally be imported from Mexico. The second of these acts is still in effect.

I have opposed this legislation each time that it has been presented to the House of Representatives; first, because of the inadequacies of the legislation; second, because it completely ignored the problem of the migratory worker who is a citizen of the United States; and third, because it did little or nothing to stop the flow of illegal workers crossing the border from Mexico. The legislation which we passed in the last session of Congress still has 2 years to run. What is proposed here today is a further weakening of an already inadequate piece of legislation. This legislation, and all similar legislation, should be rejected until such time as a reasonable effort is made to meet the problem of the migratory worker.

The international contracts previously agreed upon by our Government and that of Mexico have stipulated a minimum wage and included requirements regarding housing, health, unemployment, and death. No such safeguards are granted to American migratory workers. Citizens in the United States working in the same fields, or displaced by imported labor, do not have even a minimum of protection by social legislation. When I proposed last year that American citizens working in competition with imported labor on crops that are supported at 90 percent of parity or subsidized under the Sugar Act be paid at least 90 percent of the minimum wage, my proposal was rejected by the chairman of the committee handling the migratory labor bill on a point of order. It seems only fair that this provision should be written into law, so as to give at least a minimum of protection to American citizens competing in this labor market. As the system now works, the influx of both legal and illegal labor from Mexico into southern Texas sets up a chain reaction which results in the displacement of farm workers throughout the West and Southwest. For 3 or 4 months of the year these people have uncertain employment, and, in turn, themselves become migrants. The present situation, marked by disorder and neglect and, in some cases, by exploitation, verges on the scandalous.

Rather than pass this legislation, Congress should give attention to passing legislation to establish a Federal Committee for Migratory Labor as recommended by the President's Commission on Migratory Labor and should work with State legislatures, farmers associations, agriculture labor unions, and religious organizations, and other groups, preliminary to passing legislation to establish some order in the field of migratory farm labor.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, this Mexican labor problem comes before us today under circumstances much worse than ever before when we were giving consideration to legislation to amend, clarify, and approve agreements that had been reached between our Government and the Government of Mexico regarding our use and conditions under which at least limited numbers of screened and approved Mexican agriculture workers would be permitted legal and limited entry into this country during the Southwest harvesting season.

Today the problem is at its worst for the reason that no agreement has been reached between the two Governments and, of course, can result in a terrible state of exploitation and illegal entry of a million of nothing more or less than what we have termed in the past as wetbacks. No method of screening them as safe risks, no check on them for return to their homeland, and with no contract to cover their pay, their care and housing, transportation and policing, what a mess it will create for everyone except the industrialized farm owner and grower who, of course, has always sought their cheap labor. Without a contract this Mexican labor will be used to drive down labor costs in our present surplus labor market.

Like myself, I am sure many of the Members have received a copy of the very graphic and enlightening book put out last summer by the Texas State Federation of Labor on this subject and problem. I read every page of it and surely if anyone has to live with this problem day in and day out the labor movement of Texas ought to be qualified to speak with a lot of knowledge and authority on the subject.

In addition to that, I have just read over again and refreshed my memory on the facts presented in the President's Commission Reports on Problems of Migrant Workers, which I am briefly cutting down and making a part of my remarks at this time:

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION REPORTS PROBLEMS OF MIGRANT WORKERS

WASHINGTON.—For the first time an official United States Government commission has put on the record the discriminations, persecutions, and sufferings imposed on the migrant farm workers of America.

Almost everyone of these problems has been depicted and decried by the AFL National Farm Labor Union and the AFL but now they are verified and confirmed officially by President Truman's Commission on Migrant Farm Labor. Here are highlights from the Commission report:

LARGE GROWERS, UNITED STATES BLAMED

The report deals with the plight of 1 million migratory farm workers, of whom half are domestic migrants. The other half is made up of 400,000 illegal Mexican wetbacks (persons who cross the border by swimming or wading or just walking) and 100,000 Mexicans legally here under contract, and a small number of British West Indians and Puerto Ricans.

Some of the evils which the Commission says it found during its 8 months' investigation were pinned on the large industrial growers, many of whom deal with so-called contractor and crew leaders. These last-named bear no direct responsibility to the migratory workers.

The Commission, too, discovered an anomaly in the employment conditions of migratory farm workers. Alien workers, such as those who come here from Mexico, for example, are, by intergovernmental treaty, guaranteed employment, minimum wages, workmen's compensation, medical care, housing, and sanitation standards. But domestic migrants not only have no protection through collective bargaining but employers refuse to accord to them the guarantees they extend to imported alien farm workers.

It was emphasized by the Commission that the problems under study were not primarily those of the poor little farmer, but were largely confined to conditions on about 125,000 farms which amount to 2 percent of the farms of the Nation and produce crops equal to approximately 7 percent of the value of all farm products.

IMPORTS NOT NEEDED

The conclusion that it is not necessary to import aliens in large numbers during the present emergency is supported broadly by this argument:

Estimated farm output for 1951 is 3.6 percent above 1949. If this additional output were to require an equal percentage increase in man-hours then we would need about 700 million additional hours to produce the 1951 output.

These additional man-hours could be supplied by the present domestic labor force, including farm family labor, if each worker put in 6½ more days per year. And, even at that, they would be working 3 days fewer per year than in 1945. The average hired farm worker who in 1949 was getting only 90 days of farm work—23 fewer than in wartime—would be willing, if given the opportunity, to contribute this amount and more.

FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS ANNUAL EARNINGS

Comparing the hourly earnings of farm laborers and factory workers the commission reported that during 1910–14, the period designated by Congress as the base for the farm parity price system, farm wages were two-thirds of factory wages. Today they are a little more than one-third.

Actual average hourly earnings of farm workers in 1950 was 55 cents and those of factory workers $1.45. In 1910–14 the comparable figures were 14 and 21 cents.

Notwithstanding prerequisites furnished by employers such as housing and transportation, the commission finds that farm workers' annual earnings, compared with the pay of factory workers are even worse than is suggested by relative wage rates because factory employees get more work than farm employees.

Whereas average cash earnings of factory workers in 1949 were $2,600, average earnings for both migratory and nonmigratory farm workers were only slightly more than $500.

BARGAINING NEEDED

The commission said it was convinced that balanced organization and effective collective bargaining would be of great assistance not only to farm workers but that it would also contribute to more orderly management of labor. Adoption of the system would, for instance, eliminate the labor contractor and middleman and the "sweatshop conditions that are frequently associated with them," the report said.

It was recommended that the Taft-Hartley Act be amended to cover employees on farms having a specified minimum employment.

UNITED STATES RELAXES VIGILANCE

The official vigilance during World War II that provided for temporary admission of alien farm workers was abandoned in the postwar years, the report points out.

Since then, responsible Government administrative agencies have ceased putting forth efforts to preserve national immigration policy, the report continues.

The Commission, in fact, found that the importation of alien farm workers since the war had been on a larger scale than during the war.

The result is that temporary foreign laborers have come to furnish "the very competition to American labor that it is the purpose of the immigration law to prevent."

PHONY SHORTAGE CERTIFIED

The report describes what the Commission considers the inadequacies in the method of ascertaining whether a farm labor shortage exists.

The farmers, it was pointed out, meet at the beginning of the season and decide unilaterally what the prevailing wage is to be. The rate is usually low before the season begins, and so, the report finds, it is possible that insufficient domestic labor is attracted. Therefore a "labor shortage" can be said to exist "at that price."

Since foreign workers cannot be imported until the United States Employment Service certifies that a shortage exists, this apparent lack of applicants becomes the basis for the necessary certification.

To safeguard the interests of domestic farm labor and to avoid, so far as possible, discrimination that favors imported alien contract labor, the Commission proposes that "no certification of shortage of domestic labor should be made unless and until continental domestic labor has been offered the same terms and conditions of employment as are offered to foreign workers."

NO WORKER SPOKESMEN

The Farm Placement Division in the United States Employment Service, according to the Commission, is more sucessful in winning the confidence and cooperation of employers than of the migratory workers.

"This seems to be due to the fact that in practice the service places greater emphasis on its function as a recruiting agency for farm employers than it does on the equally important function of a work-finding agency for the migratory farm laborers," the Commission points out.

These practices "have convinced the Commission that the employment service conceives its functions as rather narrow and limited. Moreover its activities are marked by a certain onesidedness in favor of corralling supplies of migratory farm workers to meet growers' labor demand regardless of the effect on the workers."

The general attitude of the Farm Placement Division which impressed the Commission as "one-sided" was that although Congress, in establishing the United States Employment Service, provided for a Federal Advisory Council representing workers, employers and the public, the Farm Placement Service (a part of the Federal Employment Service) has disregarded this tripartite principle. Instead, it has organized and depended for advice on a Special Farm Labor Committee, composed wholly of farm employers and their representatives.

WETBACKS AND THEIR GREEDY EMPLOYERS A DISGRACE TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, they sneak across the Rio Grande from Mexico, aided and abetted by large farmers, ranchers, and growers associations, to work for starvation wages.

That is why they are called wetbacks.

It is easy for thousands of them to slip through the long boundary between Mexico and the United States because our border patrol is kept at skeleton strength with the connivance of agricultural employers in the United States who want to fatten themselves by exploiting cheap labor.

The tragedy and the treason of this situation is that it is being encouraged by every devious practice at a time when unemployment is mounting among our people. There is no need whatsoever for imported farm help, when there is a growing surplus of American labor.

Those who encourage this modern slavery in the Southwest wrap themselves in the American flag whenever there is a bill to liberalize immigration from Europe that would bring skilled refugees to our country. They shout about the dangers of, communism when we are trying to provide sancutary for a few more of communism's victims. But they flout every consideration of security when they smell the profits that will accrue to themselves by opening the borders to migrant Mexican workers. They ignore the warning by the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service that more than 100 Communists a day are coming in through our back door. Our whole security setup becomes a farce when the precautions we exercise along the Canadian border, and at all west coast, east coast, and gulf ports, are abandoned along the 2,000-mile Mexican border, because special interests here put selfishness above patriotism.

It is to the credit of the Mexican Government and evidence of its concern for the welfare of its own nationals that it wants to engage in joint supervision of this problem. There was such an agreement, but it expired on January 15, 1954. Mexico will not renew this pact unless it contains minimum guaranties covering wages and conditions of work.

Meanwhile, irresponsible farmers, ranchers, and growers—and there is a growing suspicion of collusion between them and the United States Government—have been recruiting wetbacks legally and illegally to reap "grapes of wrath" all over again.

The shameful conditions under which these migrant laborers live endanger the public health, undermine educational standards, lower the level of economic activity, and provoke social tensions. The wages paid them by their slave mas-

ters in the United States degrade them to an animal-like status. This is a threat to farmers and ranchers in other parts of the United States who pay legitimate wages. As these migrant wetbacks spread through the country, they are used by other exploiters to wreck our own labor standards. And the minimum-wage law becomes a travesty on economic justice.

Under these conditions, more people are apt to wonder whether the Communists or these greedy employers are doing more to sabotage the confidence of Americans in their Government.

The scope of the problem, in numbers alone, is revealed by the Government's admission that there were about 500,000 apprehensions of illegal entrants in 1952 as against 839,000 in 1953.

From these figures it is safe to assume that the number of those who were not apprehended is large. This invasion could not be successful without a conspiracy to evade the laws of the United States.

It is apparent, therefore, that we must crack down—and hard—on those Americans responsible for this deplorable condition.

The present bill would enable the Department of Labor to handle this problem in a unilateral manner, which would be an arrogant attitude, tending to break down the good-neighbor policy between the United States and her friends to the south of us who are rightfully sensitive on this point.

I do not claim that the Mexican Government is without fault on this issue.

Behind the whole question of negotiations between the two governments, and disagreement as to terms, is the much larger and more difficult problem that has never been resolved.

The bootleg traffic in wetbacks is a practice that will not be tolerated by American public opinion. It is an affront to human dignity and a menace to our labor standards.

You can never validate a continuing injustice no matter how you disguise it.

Unilateral recruitment of Mexican farm labor is un-American to begin with.

Furthermore, it is an insult to our unemployed, and to the absence of any constructive help for them.

House Joint Resolution 355 is a mask that fails to conceal the exploitation of human misery. All the rationalizing in the world cannot conceal the ugly facts.

The reputation of the United States should not be sullied by this type of legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include two telegrams in my remarks on the rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this legislation and I hope this rule is adopted. The importation of Mexican nationals for agricultural work in this country has worked out very successfully for a number of years. This type of labor is absolutely essential to the beet-sugar industry in Colorado and other States where sugar beets are raised. I understand that about 3,000 of these nationals were employed in Colorado last year to harvest our crops. While this number is small as compared to the total number imported, this labor is a very important element of our economy. Without this labor, it would be impossible to harvest certain crops.

I am, of course, very anxious to use local labor wherever possible. This resolution provides that the nationals cannot be used where local labor is available. No one has any intention of taking any work away from citizens of this country. However, it has been demonstrated year after year that this type of labor is not available in the United States.

I feel that it is essential to the economy of our Nation that this legislation be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I trust that we may proceed to the adoption of this rule and the adoption of the legislation which will be before us pursuant to the rule. My understanding is that the great Committee on Agriculture by almost a unanimous vote has brought this matter to us for our consideration on the floor of the House. Before I talk about the merits involved here, I want to say I do not know whether or not I understood correctly what the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] said. If I understood him, he was at least trying to create the impression that the great President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, was for this legislation as a result of some social visit which he made with Governor Shivers, of Texas. We have heard a few things around here lately about name calling, but I want to say I resent that sort of implication and there certainly should be no one in this Chamber who would take any stock whatsoever in such a statement. Now, let us not get all mixed up about illegal wetbacks, a name applied supposedly to people wading across the Rio Grande River. I have seen the Rio Grande River a few times, and I do not know whether you could get wet in it or not. But at any rate they walk across illegally. Here we are dealing with the question of legal admission to this country. In order that there be no question about it, and apparently much of this opposition is centered around some sort of contention that the Department of State and the Department of Labor and the Department of Justice do not want this legislation or that the administration does not want it, let me set your minds at rest about that because I can assure you that this legislation would not be here before us today if such were the case. On the contrary, this legislation is desired. It is desired because it is in the national interest and those people having primary charge of the conduct of our foreign affairs as well as the conduct of our affairs here at home favor this legislation and want it to be brought to enactment.

As some of you may have read in the papers, we have certain Monday morning meetings in the city, and as recently as this morning this matter was again discussed. So I say to you, set your minds at rest about that.

Referring again to wetbacks, this is no wetback bill. Somebody said something about stopping the illegal entries at the Mexican border. I just want to say, if some of you will follow certain leadership operations that might be exerted here, we will begin to do something about it. That is one thing that is not involved here unless it can be fairly said that by the adoption of this legislation, which will provide for the legal entry of people needed here, we will avoid, at least in some measure, the problems incident to the wetbacks coming into this country. As a matter of fact, there are about 40,000 of these Mexican workers now in the western part of the country, and if they have to leave it will create a vacuum which will persuade more wetbacks to come in here to meet the situation. Furthermore, some of the gentlemen, who have such a great solicitude for labor in this country, should consider that if these crops are not harvested, then the workers in the sheds, and so forth, will not have jobs, because they will not have anything to work on. Whatever there is in that, I hope they will consider it.

As a matter of fact, my information is that it costs the producers in this country more to hire these Mexican laborers than the prevailing local scale; but you cannot find local people to do the work.

It has otherwise been urged here that what we need is an agreement with Mexico. I concur in that. That is what we want—an agreement. We have been trying to work one out for months and months and months. I am not so certain but what the fact that this resolution has been reported and that action on it is imminent has brought us to the point where, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] pointed out in the paper, it now looks as if an agreement will be worked out. That is what we want. No one disagrees with that. But the question then arises, How best do you get the agreement? I will tell you that one way not to get an agreement is to defeat this rule and this proposed legislation, because just as surely as you do, you are not going to get any agreement, unless it is one that perhaps would ask us to do so much that we would not want to enter into it. That is not the sort of thing that should be talked about here too much, because I realize that we have to maintain friendly relations with everybody.

Do you not have confidence in the people in the executive branch of the Government, who have the primary responsibility for maintaining those relations? I think I can assure you on the best authority that if there were anything destructive or bad to come from the adoption of this resolution, the people in charge would have said so and I would not be here urging its adoption. But because that is not the situation, I am here urging its adoption.

Reference has been made to the farm organizations wanting an agreement. Of course they want an agreement.

Everybody, as I said, wants an agreement. But there again, the fundamental thing is how best are we going to get an agreement? I would hazard a little guess. Let us pass this resolution here today. I trust that some of the Members in opposition to it will be willing to proceed and debate the matter and get a vote on it so that we do not have to call the roll too many times, because we have lots of work to do, and this is one thing we are going to have to conclude because it is a part of the program and needs to be done.

If we can, let us get up to the vote and approach it on its merits and as a starter. I believe you will find these negotiations will be proceeding quite expeditiously and that very shortly we can look for an agreement that will be satisfactory to the Mexican Government and satisfactory to the Government of the United States and will help out in this critical situation which confronts us. I do not know whether any of these people will come to my State of Indiana or not, but it does not make any difference. Here is a proposition that has been urged at the hearings. We have been acting on it for years, going about the same thing, so why not proceed toward action and get on with other business before us.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the resolution.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

RECESS

At approximately 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. a demonstration and the discharge of firearms, from the southwest House Gallery (No. 11), interrupted the counting of the vote; the Speaker, pursuant to the inherent power lodged in the Presiding Officer in the case of grave emergency, after ascertaining that certain Members had been wounded and to facilitate their care, at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m. declared the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Members wounded were: Mr. BENTLEY of Michigan, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. FALLON of Maryland, Mr. JENSEN of Iowa, and Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 2, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1308. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly report on borrowing authority for the quarter ending September 30, 1953, pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1309. A letter from the Achivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1310. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Third Annual Report by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics on Operations, pursuant to Public Law 867, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1311. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend subdivision (a) of section 66, 'Unclaimed moneys' of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision (b) of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1312. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend subdivision (b) of section 14, 'Discharges, when granted,' of the Bankruptcy Act as amended and subdivision (b) of section 58, 'Notices' of the Bankruptcy Act as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1313. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report presenting a plan for a single-purpose irrigation development in the basin of the Pecan Bayou, a tributary of the Colorado River of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1314. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Tenth Annual Report of the Operation of the Fort Peck project for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 8 (c) of the Fort Peck Project Act of May 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 403); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 25, 1954, the following report was filed on February 26, 1954:

Mr. WOLCOTT: Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Report pursuant to section 5 (a) of Public Law 304 (79th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted March 1, 1954]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4481. A bill to authorize enrolled members of the Gros Ventre and Assiniboine Tribes of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., to acquire interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 7339. A bill to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 8116. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to increase the income tax exemptions allowed a taxpayer for himself, his spouse, and his dependents to $700 for the taxable year 1954 and to $800 for succeeding taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 8117. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the donation of food commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 8118. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the donation of food commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 8119. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to certain rodeos, community shows, and festivals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 8120. A bill to make it unlawful for any person having a wife and children dependent upon him to flee to another State or foreign country for the purpose of avoiding his responsibility to provide for their support and maintenance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 8121. A bill relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 8122. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 8123. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain widows and widowers of retired employees and certain widows of employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 8124. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 8125. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for certain deduc-

tions for taxpayers and dependents who are physically or mentally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 8126. A bill to incorporate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 8127. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 8128. A bill to modify the requirement for an oath in certain cases in attachment proceedings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 8129. A bill to establish a self-sustaining national pension system that will benefit retired citizens 60 years of age and over; to stabilize the economic structure of the Nation; and to induce a more equitable distribution of wealth through monetary circulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 8130. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of Arizona or on the Navaho Indian Reservation in the State of New Mexico for religious, educational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 8131. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain widows and widowers of retired employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 8132. A bill to increase the personal-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 8133. A bill to provide that certain payments to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities shall be measured by average daily membership in the schools of such agencies instead of being measured by average daily attendance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 8134. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions (including the exemptions for dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness) from $600 to $800 for 1954, and to $1,000 for 1955 and succeeding years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 8135. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 8136. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to admission taxes on intercollegiate rowing regattas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 8137. A bill to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service of postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. J. Res. 456. Joint resolution providing for the coinage of a medal in recognition of 30 years of the distinguished public service of John Edgar Hoover as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 457. Joint resolution authorizing the formulation and carrying out of a program for sending freedom messages behind the Iron Curtain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. J. Res. 458. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim retained rights in a certain tract of land to the Board of Education of Irwin County, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. J. Res. 459. Joint resolution designating the lake to be formed by the completion of the Texarkana Dam and Reservoir on Sulphur River, about 9 miles southwest from Texarkana, Tex., as Lake Texarkana; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Internal Security; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the Colorado General Assembly urging the President of the United States to defend the freedom and decency of the free world by continuing firmly to oppose admission of Red China to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to a joint resolution expressing support of the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 8138. A bill for the relief of Ruben Barrow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 8139. A bill for the relief of Stanley Fiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 8140. A bill for the relief of Domenico Giordano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 8141. A bill for the relief of Friedrich Jakobus Stech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 8142. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Sciarrino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8143. A bill for the relief of Dr. James Archibald Pabarue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 8144. A bill for the relief of Glenn J. McAllister; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 8145. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Merkouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 8146. A bill for the relief of Palmira Smarrelli (nee Lattanzio); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 8147. A bill for the relief of George W. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 8148. A bill for the relief of Dominick Cardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

534. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 39 residents of Slippery Rock, Pa., opposing the sale of liquor in Army camps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

535. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, American Lithuanian Council of Lake and La Porte Counties, East Chicago, Ind., requesting the United States to use its power and influence to help Lithuania and other Baltic States regain their freedom and sovereign rights in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

536. Also, petition of the chairman, Lithuanian Americans of the City of Racine, Racine, Wis., expressing gratitude to the United States of America for its favorable attitude toward the Lithuanian Nation in its struggle for liberty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

537. Also, petition of the president, Linden, N. J., branch, Lithuanian American Council, Linden, N. J., expressing appreciation for continued encouragement of the ultimate liberation of Lithuania from Bolshevik enslavement, and for the creation of the Kersten committee which investigated seizure and forcible Soviet annexation of Lithuania into Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

538. Also, petition of the executive secretary, Lithuanian Council of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., relative to a resolution adopted at special commemoration ceremonies marking the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

539. Also, petition of the chairman, American Lithuanians of the City of Portland, Portland, Oreg., pledging full cooperation with the present Government of the United States in its efforts to resist the forces of Communist imperialism and achieve international peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

540. Also, petition of the deputy, Board of Supervisors, County of San Diego, San Diego, Calif., opposing the adoption of Senate bill 2749, which provides for the termination of Federal supervision over trust and restricted property of Indian tribes and individual Indians in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

541. Also, petition of the clerk, County Commissioners of Allegany County, Cumberland, Md., requesting the issuance of a commemorative stamp marking the 200th anniversary of the founding of Fort Cumberland; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

542. Also, petition of the mayor of Cumberland, Md., relative to the issuance of a commemorative stamp to mark the 200th anniversary of the founding of Fort Cumberland; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Letter Mail Rates Should Not Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to reduce the current postal deficit, the Post Office Department is bent on a course of action which, if carried through, promises to boomerang.

I speak of the bills in both the House of Representatives and the Senate—H. R. 6052 and S. 2836—designed to raise first-class mail postage from 3 cents to 4 cents and air-mail postage from 6 cents to 7 cents, in the belief that additional postal revenues would thus be generated.

Such legislation is unrealistic for two major reasons:

FIRST-CLASS MAIL A PROFITMAKER

First, the Post Office Department is presently realizing a substantial profit from first-class mail and air mail at the going rates of 3 cents and 6 cents per ounce, respectively. The Post Office Department's own cost ascertainment report for 1952, the last complete year for which postal data are available, shows that first-class mail returned a net profit to the post office of $52,400,000 on first-class revenues totaling about $843 million, which represents a profit of about 6 percent.

AIR MAIL RETURNS GREATER PERCENTAGE OF PROFIT THAN FIRST-CLASS MAIL

In addition to profits resulting from first-class mail, the Post Office Department in 1952—excluding subsidy, for which the Department is no longer responsible—realized air-mail profits from the services provided by the scheduled airlines of approximately $10 million. The Department's total domestic air-mail revenues were about $120 million, so it actually made a profit of more than 8 percent on gross air-mail business.

CALIFORNIA TOP STATE IN ORIGINATING AIRMAIL

A substantial percentage of these revenues was accounted for by the State of California. Los Angeles and San Francisco alone generated domestic airmail revenues for the Post Office amounting to nearly $9 million, or more than 7 percent of total domestic airmail revenues accruing to the Post Office in 1952. Compare this figure with the year 1940, when these 2 cities returned less than $2 million to the Post Office Department in airmail revenues. Los Angeles, which ranks third among United States cities on airmail revenues, accounted for more than 4 percent of the national airmail revenue total in 1952, returning nearly $5 million to the Post Office. The importance of airmail to California is further indicated by the fact that during 1952, according to an air commerce traffic pattern study made by the CAA, more tons of airmail originated in California than in any other State in the Union—approximately 14,000 tons or about 15 percent of all airmail originating in the more than 650 cities currently on the airmail map.

As exemplified by California, there is no reason why these airmail profits for the Post Office should not continue to grow—providing, that is, that "the goose that lays the golden egg" is not killed by hiking airmail postage from 6 cents to 7 cents. Which brings me to my second major reason for opposing the proposed legislation.

HIGH POSTAL RATES REDUCE MAIL VOLUME

A sound case can be made for the conclusion that an increase in postal rates has a detrimental effect on volume—that such an increase does not raise revenue sufficiently to compensate for the higher unit costs due to decreased volume. Let us examine the record.

The beginning of scheduled domestic air transportation coincides roughly with the establishment of the first uniform airmail postage rates. Prior to February 1, 1927, airmail rates had been very complex. As a result of the Kelly Act of 2 years previous, postage rates had been established at 10 cents per ounce per contract route. On the above date, a simple blanket postage rate of 10 cents per half ounce was established between any two points in the United States. Data on revenues and expenses both before and after this rate change are incomplete; but it did result in a 15.6 percent increase in volume in the first month after the new rate was instituted.

On August 1, 1928, a new airmail rate was inaugurated. The first ounce was reduced from 10 cents to 5 cents, with all additional ounces at 10 cents. The assumption that the number if not the total weight of airmail might be increased was borne out immediately. The first month saw a 95-percent rise in the volume of airmail. The increase for the fiscal year 1929 was over 200 percent.

The first opportunity to observe the adverse effects of airmail rate increases came in 1932 when the postage rate was raised to 8 cents for the first ounce and 13 cents for each additional ounce. The results of the increase were immediate and substantial. The following fiscal year saw a 33-percent reduction in the volume of airmail. This rate increase occurred at the heighth of the depression, a fact which in part may account for the substantial increase in the airmail deficit resulting from smaller volumes. However, the period of the great depression also saw experimentation with a rate decrease. In 1935 a flat 6 cents per ounce rate was inaugurated. Volume increased 21.2 percent during the first month and the fiscal year 1935 witnessed an increase of 50.5 percent over the previous year.

The new 6-cent rate remained unchanged for almost a decade, during which period domestic airmail experienced a very healthy increase.

During the war an 8-cent rate was established, and the volume of airmail dropped severely, from 1,091,000,000 pieces in fiscal 1944 to 716 million pieces in 1946. Revenue dropped from $8,500,000 monthly in fiscal 1944 to $6,770,000 in 1945, a drop of 11.2 percent. While a portion of this reduction resulted from the decrease of military mail, a major part was clearly attributable to the high rate, because the percentage of airmail to total first-class mail dropped during this period from 5.02 to 3.68 percent.

In an effort both to promote the use of airmail and to reverse the trend in costs, a 5-cent rate was inaugurated on October 1, 1946. An immediate upsurge took place. In this 1 month some 40 percent more airmail was carried than in the previous month under the 8-cent rate. The first 9 months of 1947 saw increases over September 1946, which ranged from 42 to 53 percent. Undoubtedly the sharp increase in airmail volume which followed the inauguration of the new rate was to a large extent the result of the very considerable rate reduction effected.

In an effort to derive more revenue from airmail without disturbing this favorable trend the postage rate was increased cautiously to 6 cents an ounce on January 1, 1949. Even this modest increase resulted in a reduction in volume of the mail to which the rate applied, from 33 million pounds in 1949 to 32 million pounds in 1950. There can be no doubt but that the postage rate increase caused this reduction, because the trend of total first-class mail was in the opposite direction. While the airmail lost a million pounds, the surface first-class mail gained approximately 12 million pounds.

It is true that total airmail service, which includes airmail and air parcel post, has been increasing during the years since 1950. This overall increase results from the growth of air parcel post, which was introduced in 1949.

SIX-CENT RATE MAXIMUM AIRMAIL LIMIT

From this record it appears that Congress has already proved that the existing rate is as high as airmail postage should go. An increase to 7 cents will repeat a mistake made before with adverse consequences. It is no answer to say that in view of the general inflation the public would be willing to pay the additional 1 cent for airmail, and that for that reason no reduction would be suffered. This is disproved by the fact that even the modest increase of 1 cent in 1949 resulted in a reduction of a million pounds, to say nothing of the adverse effect the increase had on the growth of airmail service as such.

EXPEDITED FIRST-CLASS MAIL A BOON TO POST OFFICE

In addition to the profitable service which airmail is currently providing the Post Office, note should also be taken of the profit the Post Office is making by flying nonlocal first-class mail between

New York and Chicago on an experimental basis. The scheduled airlines are now well in their fifth month in providing this expedited service to the public. Postal revenues accruing to the Post Office Department amount to $2,310 a ton, of which $134.66 is paid to the airlines for services rendered. This means that the airlines receive only 5.8 percent of the postal revenues for flying the New York-Chicago mail and the remaining 94.2 percent, or $2,175.34 on each ton, is retained by the Post Office to pay ground expenses.

Regular airmail moving over this same route is sold to the public, under the existing 6-cent rate, at $4,200 per ton. The Department pays the carriers $325.80 per ton for transporting it. The remaining $3,975 per ton is retained by the Post Office Department to pay its ground handling costs, which, surely, are not greatly in excess of those incurred for the handling of surface mail.

AIRMAIL SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED BY POST OFFICE

These figures show two things. In the first place, the Post Office Department must be making a good profit out of the services of the airlines. Second, airmail is the service that should be encouraged most by the Post Office Department, because the Department receives almost twice as much to pay for its ground handling costs as it does in the case of surface mail, even though the handling of the two types of mail is very similar.

In this bill, however, the Department, far from encouraging the use of airmail, is, on the basis of the previous record of rate increases, endangering not only the continued growth of this very profitable service but even the present volume.

For these reasons, I am firm in my conviction that the increase of first-class mail from 3 cents to 4 cents an ounce and of airmail from 6 cents to 7 cents is not in the best interests of the Federal Government, or of the general public, and, therefore, should be opposed.

Guiding Principles in Atomic Energy Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the President has sent a message to the Congress recommending certain changes in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946—see House Document No. 228, 83d Congress, 2d session, February 17, 1954. These recommendations seek to accomplish several purposes: namely, a limited sharing of atomic information with friendly nations to enhance cooperation for mutual defense and peacetime applications; a redefinition of "restricted data" to facilitate security clearance of personnel and access of industry to atomic information; and authorization for private ownership of fissionable materials and atomic reactors to promote industrial development of atomic energy.

Some of the legislative changes which the President recommends are in the nature of perfecting amendments to improve present procedures or to make progress toward mutual defense objectives which are well understood and generally accepted. Regarding such changes for improvements in existing legislation, there should be no major areas of disagreement, and I believe such changes merit support by the Congress. Of course the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on which I am privileged to serve, will make a careful appraisal of these matters and report to the Congress its findings.

Other recommendations of the President, however, are directed to basic revisions in the Atomic Energy Act which introduce the new concept of private enterprise in the atomic field. I say "new concept" because to date the United States Government is by law the exclusive owner of atomic materials and facilities even though private firms are engaged as contractors or agents of the Government. This new concept opens up wide areas of disagreement and controversy.

A substantial body of opinion hold that atomic energy development based wholly on the investment of public funds—now about $12 billion in the aggregate—should remain a public enterprise and that atomic materials and works are properly to be considered a part of the public domain.

Others believe that private industry has a legitimate and useful place in this field, but that authorizing legislation now is ill-advised and premature and, if enacted, would result in freezing the strategic monopoly position of a few large corporations which possess the technical know-how and equipment to carry on atomic operations.

Finally there are those who maintain that the existing atomic energy legislation is a brake on industrial progress; that the restrictive provisions of the law are holding under leash a great potential atomic industry ready to burst forth in all its glory, investing huge sums, and pioneering new developments, if only the Congress will say the word.

There are other divisions and shades of opinion, but I believe that these broad avenues of approach indicate the legislative situation which confronts us in the atomic field. How to resolve the many problems is a complicated and difficult task. There are no easy answers.

Those who believe that atomic energy should remain exclusively a Government monopoly and those who argue for a complete redirection of emphasis in favor of private industry, both state some fundamental truths; and yet neither position is sufficient by itself, in my opinion, to qualify as public policy. That is why I am inclined toward the intermediate position.

Wider industrial participation should be encouraged, but the time is not yet ripe for fundamental changes in the basic legislation. The President seemed to take that position when he said in his message that "the act in the main is still adequate to the Nation's needs." Therefore, I wonder whether the President is fully aware that his proposal to confer private ownership rights in atomic energy is a radical departure from the concept that has guided atomic developments to date. Legislative authority for such rights would recast the whole pattern of the Nation's atomic energy program.

There are factors to be considered which transcend in importance the providing of incentives to private enterprise in atomic energy. As I have said before on several occasions, how to wring a profit from the atom is a problem much less compelling to solve than how to save our beloved country and indeed the whole world from savage and wholesale destruction.

And even when we come to the matter of permissive legislation for private enterprise, we must consider the role of labor as well as management, of consumer as well as producer, of the public as well as the private interest. All Americans have a stake in the atomic-energy program, and any benefits to be derived now or in the future must be widely shared. If the promise of atomic energy is not belied, its impact will be far-reaching, and we as legislators must consider the consequences for all groups and all sections of the country.

On the floor of this House and elsewhere I have set forth what I consider to be the implications of legislative changes in the Atomic Energy Act proposed by the Atomic Energy Commission and by industrial spokesmen—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 5, pages 5853–5863 and 7029–7031. I have introduced a joint resolution outlining what inquiries I believe the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy should make before any further legislation is adopted—House Joint Resolution 317, 83d Congress, 1st session. For text of resolution and accompanying statement see Atomic Power Development and Private Enterprise, hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 83d Congress, 1st session, pages 573–577. And finally, I have participated actively in the hearings held this past summer by our joint committee which explored at great length and in considerable detail proposals for industrial participation in the atomic field.

For the convenience of the Members, I may note that the recent hearings of our joint committee have been ably summarized by the committee staff and summaries are available at the committee office.

Our chairman, the Honorable STERLING COLE, always has been fairminded, objective, and considerate in the conduct of the committee hearings, and I take this opportunity to commend him again for his excellent leadership and statesmanlike demeanor.

The committee hearings, as I said before, were exploratory; we were not considering specific legislation. The committee was apprised informally of legislative proposals drafted in the Atomic

Energy Commission, but that draft was incomplete and objectionable in many points. Since the close of our hearings last July, the Commission under the chairmanship of Lewis Strauss, who succeeded Gordon Dean about that time, has been reworking the draft legislation. President Eisenhower's message now signifies apparently that the administration has made up its collective mind as to what changes in the Atomic Energy Act it considers desirable for the promotion of private enterprise.

The President's message is couched in very general terms. The Commission's followup proposals for amending the law will be carefully analyzed by the committee. If and when the proposed legislation reaches bill form and is introduced in the Congress, I presume our joint committee will hold further public hearings. Proposals of such far-reaching effect require a full-dress review in public.

It is too early to discuss point by point the Commission's legislative recommendations or to say what modifications will be made by the joint committee. However, I think it is timely and important to outline what I deem to be guiding principles for any new legislation that may be enacted relative to atomic-energy development and private enterprise. By these guiding principles I will measure any legislative proposals that come before us, and if the principles are violated in any substantial degree, I serve notice here and now that I will oppose the legislation down the line.

NONINTERFERENCE WITH INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC AGENCY

Some weeks ago the President addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations and kindled new hope among peoples everywhere by his proposal for cooperation with other nations in peacetime atomic pursuits. The hope is that nations working together on the atom for peace will be less inclined to work against each other for atomic war. At the Berlin conference Secretary Dulles entered into preliminary discussions with the Russian representatives concerning the President's proposals.

In a public address soon after the President's statement before the United Nations General Assembly, I said:

> We should put first things first, and the first task ahead in atomic energy legislation is to clear the path for the creation of the international atomic agency proposed by President Eisenhower.

Then I continued:

> Exactly what our commitments to the international atomic agency should be in the way of contributing uranium ores, fissionable materials, atomic facilities and devices, scientific and technical knowledge, and trained personnel, we cannot know in advance. There are matters to be worked out in the months ahead, if the atomic agency proposal is to become a reality. Whatever legislative changes are necessary to back up the commitments should not be hampered by the intrusion of proposals to legislate electrical utilities or industrial firms into the atomic energy picture.
>
> In a special sense we are on our best behavior before the world. Its hopes and prayers can be worn away quickly by corroding cynicism if we fail to make good with deeds our noble words. We must take care lest other nations see us preoccupied with seeking ways to make a profit from the atom instead of seeking ways to advance the welfare of mankind. There is a compelling urgency about concerted efforts for peace; no compelling urgency about authorizing Consolidated Edison or Monsanto Chemical to own an atomic reactor.

Later, in a message to the Congress recommending changes in the Atomic Energy Act, the President stated with regard to his proposal for international cooperation:

> Consideration of additional legislation which may be needed to implement that proposal should await the development of areas of agreement as a result of our discussion with other nations.

Thus, I say we are not warranted in pushing ahead with legislation for private enterprise in atomic energy before we know the legislative requirements for the international atomic agency. Our negotiations should not be obstructed in any way by domestic controversy over the handling of atomic business.

And if these negotiations, by some good fortune, prepare the way for effective international control of atomic weapons, the Government, in striving for peace, should not be tied down by vested private interests in atomic energy which conflict with our international commitments. Our Government could hardly put its best foot forward if it were faced with the burden of confiscating private atomic plants to meet requirements of an international control arrangement such as we have advocated in the past.

In the meantime, we can proceed, as the President recommended, with legislation to authorize the sharing with our allies of such tactical and training information as they need for mutual defense purposes. We can take steps, too, at this time to permit the wider dissemination of atomic data needed by American business and by friendly countries for industrial application.

CLEAR DECLARATION OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

If and when the Atomic Energy Act is rewritten to confer private ownership and patent rights in atomic energy, specific legislative amendments should be preceded by an explicit declaration of congressional policy stating what the Congress intends to achieve by the new legislation and what safeguards are being provided to insure that the congressional objectives will not be thwarted or dissipated by administrative interpretation.

Certainly the Congress would want to prevent monopoly, to encourage participation by small business as well as large, to insure the widest possible distribution of the benefits of atomic power and other peacetime developments, to protect collective-bargaining rights of labor in a new industry hedged in by stringent security regulations, to guarantee the priority of military requirements, and otherwise to promote the public welfare and protect the public interest.

In view of the necessarily broad areas of administrative discretion that must be left to the Atomic Energy Commission, it would be wise for the Congress not only to draft the law as carefully as possible, but to illumine its provisions with a coherent and well-rounded statement of congressional objectives.

MAINTENANCE OF CIVILIAN CONTROL

The great battle of civilian versus military control over atomic energy development was fought out 8 years ago when the McMahon Act was passed. The principle of civilian control, though bloody and bowed, emerged victorious. Despite the fact that the atomic energy program was born of urgent wartime need and its military phases have received paramount and overriding consideration in these troubled years, we have never been willing, as a matter of national policy, to let this program be an exclusive province of the military. Administrative control is vested in an independent civilian commission appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

We must be on the alert to detect and prevent any backsliding toward greater military control of atomic energy. Vigilance is called for especially in these days of the so-called new look, when atomic weapons are assuming even greater prominence in the councils of military strategy and are rapidly acquiring the status of conventional armament.

Doubtless the Department of Defense has contributed its suggestions to the legislative proposals of the Atomic Energy Commission. I dare say the military will want a greater voice in the atomic program. Proposed amendments that seem harmless on their face will have to be scrutinized very carefully to make sure that they do not carry concealed weapons to vitiate the principle of civilian control.

In this connection I wish to point out that the two most important posts in the Atomic Energy Commission's program are now occupied by former high-ranking military officers. The Chairman of the Commission, Lewis L. Strauss, achieved the rank of rear admiral for service rendered our Nation during World War II. The second most important position is the office of general manager which is occupied for the first time since passage of the McMahon Act in 1946 by a career military man, a graduate of West Point, Maj. Gen. Kenneth D. Nichols. Thus we see today a situation which would not have been feasible or acceptable on policy grounds at the conclusion of the great civilian-military legislative controversy 8 years ago. These two men possess unusual backgrounds of atomic experience, a high degree of intelligence, and administrative ability. Whether their administrative policies and legislative recommendations will preserve firm civilian control or will strengthen the military influence unduly remains to be seen.

Our duty as legislators is to maintain a clear position of civilian control. This position should be safeguarded in the law, and, in my opinion, accords with the views of the great majority of our citizens.

AN ATOMIC INDUSTRY FREE OF SUBSIDIES

Industrial spokesmen for changes in the Atomic Energy Act sound this re-

frain: Atomic power and other industrial advances in atomic energy will be brought about only by the aggressive, dynamic activity of private enterprise; progress is held back by the heavy hand of Government monopoly. It sounds good, but there is more fancy than fact in the assertion. Here is what General Eisenhower said in his message to the Congress:

> Since 1946, however, there has been great progress in nuclear science and technology. Generations of normal scientific development have been compressed into less than a decade. Each successive year has seen technological advances in atomic energy exceeding even progressive estimates. The anticipations of 1946, when Government policy was established and the Atomic Energy Act was written, have been far outdistanced.

The blunt fact is that existing atomic energy legislation—Government monopoly and all—has provided the framework for great progress in this field.

Nevertheless, industrial spokesmen argue that only private enterprise can make such progress, and they insist that the law must be changed to provide a favorable climate in which private atomic enterprise can flourish. Closer examination of the conditions demanded for a salubrious climate usually will reveal that private enterprise expects the taxpayer to offer subsidies of one kind or another to minimize the risks of private investment.

It may be a demand for rapid tax amortization, which amounts in effect to an interest-free loan by the taxpayers. It may be a demand for direct Government financing at low interest rates and lenient repayment terms. It may be a demand for a Government-guaranteed supply of fissionable materials or Government-performed technical services at favorable prices—favorable, that is, to the industry. It may be a demand for Government-guaranteed purchases of fissionable and by-product materials from private plants, again at prices favorable to the industry. In these and other ways, private enterprise undoubtedly will seek to bring about the proper climate.

It will be necessary to examine carefully the proposed legislation to determine the nature and extent of the subsidies demanded. I believe that private atomic industry should not expect to live and grow on the largess of the taxpayer. If those who say that what atomic energy needs is more private enterprise are sincere, then they should be prepared to make good on their own, to stand on their own feet and to be self-supporting. I quite agree with the statement in President Eisenhower's message that—

> It is essential that this program so proceed that this new industry will develop self-reliance and self-sufficiency.

TEN-YEAR BAN ON EXCLUSIVE PATENT PRIVILEGES

Industrial spokesmen for changes in the Atomic Energy Act argue that conventional patent privileges, now banned by the Atomic Energy Act, must be given to private enterprise as one of the necessary incentives for development. When it is pointed out that patents could become an instrument of monopoly control by a few large corporations favorably situated in the atomic energy program, they contend that the basic scientific knowledge is not patentable and that the issuance of patents on new inventions would not seriously handicap any competing firms.

Commonsense and an awareness of the history of patent monopolies combine to support the counter argument that the exercise of ordinary patent privileges is premature in this field. President Eisenhower, recognized the danger of patent monopoly when he said in his message to the Congress:

> Until industrial participation in the utilization of atomic energy acquires a broader base, considerations of fairness require some mechanism to assure that the limited number of companies, which as Government contractors now have access to the program, cannot build a patent monopoly which would exclude others desiring to enter the field. I hope that participation in the development of atomic power will have broadened sufficiently in the next 5 years to remove the need for such provisions.

The President proposed not that industrial atomic patents be banned outright, as they are in certain cases under existing legislation, but that persons or firms obtaining such patents be required to license others for a limited period to use the inventions. This procedure is known as compulsory licensing.

I believe the President's expressed hope that 5 years would be a sufficient period to broaden the base of atomic industry is unduly optimistic and unwarranted by the present state of atomic technology. It takes 3 or 4 years to build a reactor, even on the assumption that the design has been perfected. It will take at least 10 years before we can reasonably expect to see reactors of sufficient diversity in design and techniques of operation to determine the economics of the industry.

The decade ahead must be regarded as the crucial period of atomic experimentation and development. It will be a fluid period of testing and rejection, of new discoveries and rapid obsolescence. To really broaden the base of atomic industry the use of all inventions should be made readily available to all interested and qualified businesses for a period of not less than 10 years.

And when I say "made available" I mean that any business duly licensed to carry on atomic activities should automatically have access to the desired invention or discovery which is patented, upon payment of a reasonable royalty fee. There is no good reason, as I see it, why one licensed company should have the privilege and not another, or why the applicant must be subjected to burdensome justifications before the Atomic Energy Commission to gain access to any given patent when he has already met the qualifications for licensing in the atomic energy field.

Unless the licensing of patented inventions to all qualified parties is automatic, the purposes of so-called compulsory licensing may well be defeated. A clue to this possible result is provided in the testimony of Caspar Ooms, a patent attorney who was formerly United States Patent Commissioner and later Chairman of the AEC Patent Compensation Board. In his appearance before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy Mr. Ooms proposed instead of automatic licensing "that each applicant for a license must demonstrate separately that the license is necessary to effectuate the policies and purposes of the act. This restriction is maintained to make the invocation of this licensing power an exception and an infrequently used device. It is intended to guard against the fear that the inventor who is willing to devote his resources to making developments in this field would be compelled to share his contributions with his competitors and to insure that he will be required to give license only in the extreme and infrequent situation where that is necessary to accomplish the designs of this legislation."

It seems to me that Mr. Ooms has thrown out the baby with the bath. Whereas our objective should be to broaden the base of atomic industry by affording equal access to technical innovations, for a period of time at least, Mr. Ooms makes only a grudging concession to that objective and prefers that the limited and exceptional instance be the rule.

I am most deeply concerned with basic patents which might restrict use of processes or mechanical gadgetry and which would be of such major importance as to prohibit development of peacetime uses by others who are competent to bring to the mass of the people important benefits. I am not so much concerned with patents in a peripheral or secondary zone, which would not give to any inventor a major or basic control over the industry.

PREVENTION OF MONOPOLISTIC TRENDS

Ready access of licensed firms to all patents for 10 years is an essential element, as I have indicated, in preventing monopolistic exploitation of atomic enterprises by a few large firms. In addition to patent measures, other safeguards must be established to prevent the growth of monopolies to the detriment of small business and competitive business.

I doubt very much that the antitrust laws are a sufficient instrument for preventing monopoly growth in this new and untried field. The limitations of the antitrust laws in this regard were well stated in testimony before our joint committee by Andrew Biemiller, a former member of this body, speaking for the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Biemiller said:

> We believe that the Congress should not relieve the Atomic Energy Commission of its positive obligation to prevent or discourage monopoly in the field of atomic power. It is not enough to rely simply on the antitrust laws and to pass the buck to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. Although these laws have an important function in limiting the monopolistic tendencies of big business, the protracted and cumbersome procedures for determining whether the antitrust laws have been violated in a given case may not work very well in the completely new field of atomic power.
>
> The antitrust lawyers, working in an intricate maze of judicial decisions, are accustomed to thinking in terms of degrees of market control and percentages of production accounted for by established firms. In the case of atomic power, which breaks new ground and contains no precedents for

evaluating industrial controls, it would seem more appropriate for the Atomic Energy Commission to maintain its original responsibility through its licensing powers to prevent the growth of monopoly in atomic energy. No proposals should be entertained which would weaken the positive mandate in the Atomic Energy Act to strengthen free competition in private enterprise.

WIDE DISTRIBUTION OF ATOMIC POWER BENEFITS

Although the potential peacetime benefits of atomic energy are many and varied, our primary concern in this context is with atomic power. How to harness this vast new source of energy to perform the daily tasks of mankind and to further industrial progress is the problem that intrigues our scientists, engineers, businessmen, legislators, and administrators of Government.

The Atomic Energy Commission, perhaps because of its preoccupation with atomic weapons, has not shown great imagination or ingenuity in fostering the development of atomic power, except to propose that private industry take over the responsibility.

For years the Commission has been devouring enormous amounts of electricity from conventional sources to run the various atomic installations, even while the energy potential of atomic fission has been allowed to go to waste. The Commission today is the largest single consumer of electricity in the United States, accounting for possibly 4 or 5 percent of the total electrical-power demand of the Nation.

One would expect the Commission to be enterprising in figuring out ways and means of cutting down its huge power bill and working toward self-sufficiency in power requirements by utilizing atomic power. In fact, the Commission has not only been lacking in such enterprise; it has entered into agreements with private utilities in some areas to supply a large portion of its power needs for the next 25 years. And the utilities, in turn, have asked for—and received—Government guaranties of compensation in the event the AEC power demand falls off and eliminates the need for the utilities' output.

When the Atomic Energy Act was passed in 1946, the Congress contemplated the possibility that atomic power would be generated. Section 7 (d) of the act authorizes the Commission to use and sell electricity derived from the atom. But the Commission is not a power-minded agency; it does not like to think of itself as a producer and marketer of atomic power. Perhaps other agencies of the Government are better equipped for this task. In any event, the Federal Government has an important responsibility in atomic-power production and distribution.

After the investment of billions from the Public Treasury in atomic energy, and the glowing promises of its ultimate contributions to human welfare, how short of expectations would be our atomic power program if the only end results were to build up the power supply position of a few private utilities without any noticeable effect on the prices that consumers pay for electricity or the availability of power to areas and populations now denied its blessings.

The cardinal principle—though it may sound old-fashioned in the "giveaway" age, still remains, namely, that the benefits created by public investment should be widely distributed throughout the national economy.

PROTECTION OF LABOR'S RIGHTS IN ATOMIC INDUSTRY

Greater freedom of enterprise in atomic energy carries with it the commensurate obligation of insuring the like freedom to labor. Management-labor relations in this field have been handicapped by onerous security requirements. Legislative safeguards must be written to prevent the abuse of secrecy to evade collective bargaining.

IMPARTIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

If opportunities are to be opened up to private enterprise in the atomic-energy field, Government controls necessary for maintaining security, health, safety, and other basic measures should be administered in a fair and impartial manner. I deem it essential that persons or firms who may have grounds for believing fair treatment has been denied them in regard to licensing or other actions should be accorded the right of appeal to an independent review board or tribunal apart from the Atomic Energy Commission itself.

To minimize further the possibilities for arbitrary administrative action, I believe the Commission should exert the necessary controls only at strategic points in the atomic industrial process without suffocating the whole industry by bureaucratic redtape. Thus, a leasing system for fissionable materials, with title remaining in the Government, would provide an intelligent control mechanism, eliminating the need for a complicated licensing procedure for atomic production facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to outline some of the more important considerations that must guide our approach to new legislation in the atomic-energy field. Our joint committee will make an intensive study of proposed legislation and in due time report to the Congress.

The Problem of Trieste—Italy's Historical Right to the Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, at the head of the Adriatic Sea lies Trieste, a city which currently is a powder keg in Europe. Italy and Yugoslavia both make historical and geographical claims to Trieste.

The history of the Trieste problem ought to be better known by the American people. It would then be understood why Italy's claim is much more than a sentimental attachment to the city. Trieste was Italian for centuries—under the Romans, then under Venice and later as a free Italian "Commune" within the framework of Austrian feudalism. Trieste has always maintained her Italian character. The predominance of Italian people in this area has been confirmed over the years by successive censuses of the population.

Italy intervened in World War I on the side of the Allies, in large part for the purpose of unifying Trieste to Italy; this war cost Italy more than 600,000 dead. At the end of the war Italy's request for Trieste was accepted by the Allies at the London conference; by the Yugoslavs with the Rome pact; and was acknowledged by President Wilson. Then, some 25 years later, toward the end of World War II, Italy many times brought to the attention of the Allies its anxiety over Trieste. In spite of assurances to Italy by the Allies, Marshal Tito occupied the city. At the peace conference following the war, American officials proposed the line most favorable to Italy; unfortunately this line was not accepted. To please Russia the Allies found it necessary to agree as a temporary measure to a Free Territory of Trieste, by which Trieste was divided into Zones A and B to be supervised over by Italy and Yugoslavia, respectively. This arrangement has never been acceptable, either to the local population, or to the people and Governments of Italy and Yugoslavia. Numerous times Italian officials have presented proposals for a settlement of the Trieste issue. Recently Italy has proposed a plebescite in harmony with the democratic principles of the right to self-determination; but these overtures have been rejected by the Yugoslavs. It has been increasingly evident that Italy is anxious for a settlement of this issue by an agreement with Yugoslavia, but today there appears to be little chance for an immediate solution. It is to be hoped that Italy's legitimate claims in this area will be realized soon.

Mr. Speaker, Italian-Americans are vitally concerned with the actions of our Government in this matter. They have expressed themselves as favoring a speedy solution in Italy's behalf. The oldest Italian-American fraternal organization in the United States is the Columbian Federation of Italian-American Societies. Three units of this great organization are quartered in Springfield, Mass.—they are Loggia Figli del Lavoro, No. 188; Loggia No. 221, Societa' Unione e Fratellanza Italiana; Societa' Venezia Italiana, No. 229. I am proud of these societies, their members, and their accomplishments. All three recently passed resolutions calling for the return of Trieste to Italy. Under unanimous consent, I include the resolutions in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY LODGE FIGLI DEL LAVORO, NO. 188, OF THE COLUMBIAN FEDERATION OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS., ON JANUARY 8, 1954

Whereas the great majority of inhabitants of the city of Trieste are Italian; and

Whereas that our Government in April 1948 pledged publicly to use its moral force in order to revise the Italian Peace Treaty and to return the city of Trieste to Italy; and

Whereas tens of thousands of people of the Italian cities and towns of Istria, such as Fiume, Pola, Parenzo, Zara, etc., left their belongings and escaped from the dictatorship of Tito in order to live in a free and democratic country are now refugees in Trieste; and

Whereas in supporting these refugees the economic, financial, industrial, and health structure of the city of Trieste are crippling the town forever if the present situation will endure: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the members of this organization, American citizens of Italian extraction, support the policy of our Government in pledging the return of the territory of Trieste to Italy; be it

Resolved, That the pledge will be enforced with facts in future meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers, or through our delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN TATTY,
President.
AUGUSTO DAGRADI,
Secretary.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Resolution passed by Lodge Societa' Unione e Fratellanza Italiana, No. 221, of the Columbian Federation of Springfield, Mass., on January 7, 1954:

"Whereas the great majority of inhabitants of the city of Trieste are Italian; and

"Whereas that our Government in April 1948, pledged publicly to use its moral force in order to revise the Italian Peace Treaty and to return city of Trieste to Italy; and

"Whereas tens of thousands of people of the Italian cities and towns of Istria, such as Fiume, Pola, Parenzo, Lussino, Zara, etc., left their belongings and escaped from the dictatorship of Tito in order to live in a free and democratic country are now refugees in Trieste; and

"Whereas in supporting these refugees the economic, financial, industrial, and health structure of the city of Trieste are crippling the town forever if the present situation will endure: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the members of this organization, American citizens of Italian extraction, support the policy of our Government in pledging the return of the territory of Trieste to Italy: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the pledge will be enforced with facts, in future meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers, or through our delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations."

Respectfully submitted.

FRED PEZZINI,
President.
RENZO VEDANI,
Secretary.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Resolution passed by Lodge Societa' Venezia Italiana, No. 229, of the Columbian Federation of Springfield, Mass., on January 5, 1954:

"Whereas the great majority of inhabitants of the city of Trieste are Italian; and

"Whereas our Government in April 1948 pledged publicly to use its moral force in order to revise the Italian Peace Treaty and to return the city of Trieste to Italy; and

"Whereas tens of thousands of people of the Italian cities and towns of Istria, such as Fiume, Pola, Parenzo, Lussino, Zara, etc., left their belongings and escaped from the dictatorship of Tito in order to live in a free and democratic country are now refugees in Trieste; and

"Whereas in supporting these refugees the economic, financial, industrial, and health structure of the city of Trieste is crippling the town forever if the present situation will endure: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the members of this organization, American citizens of Italian extraction, support the policy of our Government in pledging the return of the territory of Trieste to Italy; be it

"*Resolved*, That the pledge will be enforced with facts, in future meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers, or through our delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations."

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH MARCHETTI,
President.
RENZO VEDANI,
Secretary.

We Should Speed Up Work on the Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, California is one of our key agricultural and industrial States. More people have moved to California since 1940 than now live in many of our Midwestern States. The heartland of California is the Central Valley, which includes a third of the total land area of the State.

The growth of industry and population in the State has greatly advanced the demands for food and electric power. To keep pace with these demands it is only natural that the people turn toward the Central Valley. Here lies one part of the State where appreciable amounts of agricultural land can be improved. Here are the principal sources of developed and undeveloped power.

Water falls in California in the wrong places at the wrong times. In the Central Valley two-thirds of the water supply originates in the Sacramento Valley, while two-thirds of the agricultural lands are located far to the south in the San Joaquin Valley. The rains fall in the winter and spring, but the land needs water in the summer long after the spring runoff from the western slopes of the Sierras has ceased. Therefore, the great Central Valley exists almost entirely by irrigation.

The irrigation water is provided by the Central Valley project, which was authorized in 1935 as a Federal undertaking in the interest of power, reclamation, flood control, navigation, and related uses.

The basic plan of the project was proposed decades before the project actually took definite form. It was originally authorized by the legislature to be constructed through the sale of $170,000,000, worth of State bonds. The authorization act was taken to a referendum by certain private utilities who spent large sums of money in almost invalidating the authorization.

I remember the campaign very well. In southern California the voters were urged by the project's opponents not to saddle themselves with a debt of $170-million to finance a northern California project. I am proud to say that I was one of a small group of southern Californian volunteers who worked hard to save the project. Incidentally, the now famous public relations team of Whitaker and Baxter managed the campaign in favor of the project and won out in spite of the much better financed campaign of the opposition. Having seen them in action, the private utilities promptly engaged their services. They went on to become the highest paid public relations firm in the Nation, when they represented the American Medical Association.

Actually, the State bonds were not used to start the project. Considerable time has elapsed, but if I remember correctly, the project encountered opposition from Secretary Ickes as head of the Public Works Administration. It was initially gotten under way by President Roosevelt through a grant for relief of unemployment. The project provided a sound and proper means for stimulating employment then. It still does today. This is one of the reasons why the proposed purchase of the project by the State has proved infeasible and should be abandoned. To continue the negotiations for the purchase may result in needless confusion and delay, while we should be speeding the project toward completion.

The Federal Bureau of Reclamation has spent over $400 million on the Central Valley project, which is now about 50 percent completed. Although all the initial features of the project have been placed in operation, a significant construction program is now under way and proposed for continuance in fiscal year 1955.

To be more specific, the minimum program which I consider justified to continue work on the Central Valley project in fiscal year 1955 will require an appropriation of $26,600,000, about $3,100,000 more than the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget. This is the amount recommended by the Water Project Authority of my State which has worked closely with the Bureau of Reclamation and other Federal agencies in behalf of the people of the valley and the State.

The largest single item in this sum is $10,000,000, which is primarily for continuing construction of the Friant-Kern and completion of the Madera distribution systems.

Other large items are $7 million for Folsom power facilities to complete the powerplant to a point that all units will begin generating in 1955, and $3 million for completion of Sly Park Dam and conduit.

A significant item is $4 million for the Sacramento Valley Canals. This is a large development item, and time is, of course, required to solve some of the complex problems arising in connection with the water contracts. I am glad to state, however, that it is expected that negotiations will advance to the point that work on these canals can be initiated in the current fiscal year and can be greatly accelerated in 1955. I fully concur in the recommendation of the Water Project Authority that expenditure of funds for the Sacramento Valley canals be contingent upon organization of public districts with adequate power to enter into contracts with the United

States for the delivery of water and for repayment of the construction costs of the works. This is only sound procedure.

And last, a number of less costly but equally important items primarily concerned with finishing work on power and irrigation systems, provision of Delta fish-protective facilities, and clearing up water rights are estimated to cost $2,600,000.

The Federal cost of the Central Valley project is estimated at approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars—a tremendous sum even in these days. But I am happy to state that close to 90 percent of this amount will be returned to the United States Treasury. In fact it is estimated that by the end of fiscal year 1955 about $100 million will have been repaid from power revenues, irrigation, and municipal water payments.

Today our people are greatly concerned about growing unemployment. There are several million persons without jobs. Many of them are getting by for a short time on meager unemployment benefits or through use of accumulated savings.

The Government of the United States has an important responsibility to prevent economic depression. That responsibility was written into law under the Truman administration through passage of the Employment Act of 1946.

It is now the responsibility of the Federal Government to use all means at its disposal to maintain our economic well-being. One of the most important means for use in the growing State of California is to speed up necessary work on the Central Valley project through the provision of adequate funds in 1955.

This is a fitting time to vigorously push the Trinity River, San Luis, and Santa Maria projects. Only a dynamic, expanding economy can provide increasing opportunities for our expanding population. Speeding up work on the Central Valley project offers one ideal method for combating unemployment through sound economic expansion.

Discriminatory Restrictions Imposed by Germany Against American Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1954

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to a recent action of the Bonn government of Germany.

While the architects and advocates of the so-called Randall Commission report seem quite concerned over having the United States lower its tariff barriers to permit extensive importation of foreign products into our country, the Bonn government of Germany recently arbitrarily acted to impose a discriminatory restriction against American coals.

As if enough harm is not being done already to injure the American coal industry, and particularly in my own State of West Virginia, through the unrestricted flood of foreign residual oil into east coast markets, now we are faced with restrictions on our own export activities. West Virginia coal mines supply the great preponderance of overseas coal exports.

This is a serious matter. What the Bonn Government of Germany has done is place a quantitative restriction on the import of American coals into Germany by refusing to issue licenses to her coal importers to purchase United States coals, except in very limited quantities. But, and I call this to your attention especially, no such restrictions have been issued against English coals coming into Germany, although fine quality American coals can, and were being laid down in Germany at a cost of from 4 to 5 United States dollars a ton under English coal.

While coal is being produced today at a rate slightly in excess of 400 million tons annually, in the war years we were geared to an output of 600 million tons, and the uninformed in our midst seem to think, should we get into a hot war again, this excess tonnage would be forthcoming much as water would from a faucet when the tap is turned from two-thirds to full. This is not the case, however, because a mine which is idled by loss of markets, exports, or otherwise, cannot be brought back into immediate capacity production. This situation is a matter of grave concern to the coal producers and miners, to the railroad and shipping companies, and certainly to the general public. Every ton which can be exported helps; every ton which is shut off hurts.

The discriminatory restrictions imposed by Germany against American coal set a dangerous precedent. If our Government acquiesces in them, other countries might be encouraged to take similar steps—and not only against coal. This arbitrary action is typical of some of the restrictions placed against America—who has liberalized her tariff regulations—by other countries.

While Europe must be helped to full recovery, this cannot be done entirely at the expense of the American economy, a vital and basic segment of which is our coal industry.

After 20 Brilliant Years in the Congress, Hon. Edward J. Hart, of New Jersey, Will Retire at the End of This Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding lawyer, Democrat, and Member of Congress has just announced that he will retire from the House of Representatives at the end of this term. It saddens us that this distinguished, brilliant, brave, and warm-hearted friend of man, that beloved fighter, the Honorable EDWART J. HART, representing the 14th District, in Hudson County, N. J., will leave us at the end of this session.

The 14th District of New Jersey is a most unusual district, Mr. Speaker. So is its Congressman. The booming, golden voice with a brain of Congressman HART will not only be missed here on the Hill, on the House floor, in committee, but on the stump as well.

Up and down the State of New Jersey, year in and year out, Congressman ED HART sparked and racked up victory after victory for the Democratic Party. When the going was toughest, and times were tightest, it was Congressman HART who smashed through the line, yard after yard, time after time, scoring gain after gain for the little man, his wife, and child—scoring gains for the triumvirate of life, the trilogy on earth, the family unit, symbolized by a man, his wife, and child.

The race each of us runs, Mr. Speaker, is at best 60, 65, 70, 75, 80, 85, 90, 95 yards down the field. Born alone, running down the field, crossing the 20-, 25-yard line, one gains a mate, a beloved wife. On the 30-, 35-, 40-yard line, the couple runs interference for the children that follow. As he peels off on the 60-, 65-, 70-, 75-yard line, Pop throws a lateral to Mom. She keeps going. The kids follow. Mom laterals. The kids score.

It seems the goals of life we set for others, they generally reach. Those we set for ourselves, we rarely reach. Setting none for himself but all for others, to laugh, and love, and lift, Congressman HART today roams in acres of diamonds, aglow with the light of pathways he has pointed out for others to follow, in health, in happiness.

One of the most glorious letters of my life, Mr. Speaker, was the one I received in November 1950 in North Korea, above the 38th parallel in Hamhung. It was from Congressman HART. He told me that it was his pleasure to join with Mrs. Sieminski from one end of Hudson County to the other to score one of the most sensational congressional elections of the day against one of the hardest fighting political machines in the United States. Sparked by that magnificent leader, the Hon. John V. Kenny, mayor of Jersey City, Congressman HART and Mrs. Sieminski smashed the Hague opposition—tore it to shreds, in that terrific, sensational November congressional election.

Congressman ED HART's letter to me in North Korea telling of my wife's victory on my behalf shows the kind of a man ED is, shows his regard for the trilogy of life—for a man, his wife and child—for Alfred, Marie and Christine, as he has shown for others all through his Godly life.

You see what it is, Mr. Speaker, to come down Hudson County, to represent it here in the Congress? It has been the gateway to the Nation—streams on streams of people have passed the Statue of Liberty, landed on our Jersey shore, hammered out their living; since 1609, when the *Half Moon* and Henryk Hudson cast anchor off our shore there

was laid down a fighting, warm-hearted, good and brave tradition for us to follow and pass on to others. That's Hudson County, Mr. Speaker; that's ED HART, Congressman, brilliant Representative of our country, Nation, State, county, city, community, friends, and fellowmen. A salute to you ED, coach, father, brother, uncle and friend.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, cited below is an editorial on the announced retirement of Congressman HART as it appeared in the February 23, 1954, issue of the Jersey Journal:

TWENTY YEARS IN CONGRESS

Now it is official. Months ago, this newspaper was first to publish the news that Representative EDWARD J. HART would retire at the end of his current term. Yesterday, in Washington, the veteran of two decades in Congress announced he will not seek another term. He will take his pension, perhaps practice law. There is a good chance that his years of experience will be put to use somewhere in the State government.

His 20 years in Congress have seen great changes in the Nation and at home. When he went to Washington for the first time, the Nation was fighting its way out of the depression and was in the first term of Franklin Roosevelt's momentous era. In the ensuing years, Congressman HART grew in seniority in the controlling Democratic delegation and played a larger and larger part in public affairs.

In the same period, fundamental changes occurred within the Democratic Party at home. His public career continued through all that without becoming enmeshed in the deep bitterness which marked the battle within the party.

For years Congressman HART has been noted as the legislator with the shortest biography in the Congressional Directory. It says simply, under the Fourteenth District caption: "EDWARD J. HART, Democrat, lawyer, Jersey City." In a volume which includes some extravagant autobiographical articles, this is a refreshing change.

It tells much more than its brief recital of facts. Its simplicity and freedom from conceit go far to explain the reasons for a long career in Congress.

J. Edgar Hoover: 30 Years As Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1954, J. Edgar Hoover will have completed 30 years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and today I am introducing in the House a joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to cause to be struck a gold medal for presentation to this distinguished American and public servant.

"It is altogether fitting and proper," to quote the words of the immortal Lincoln, that we single out and honor this fine, patriotic American, who for 30 years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has so ably devoted himself solely to the interests of the Government.

J. Edgar Hoover is a man who is not only incorruptible, of high character and integrity, but he has stayed on in this office and continued to devote himself to the public service despite tempting offers of hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly for his services in private industry.

He has served this Nation under seven Presidents, and built the FBI, from a few agents, appointed largely on a political basis, without automobiles, without authority to carry firearms, without jurisdiction over kidnaping, bank robbery, or subversive activities, and with no laboratory or fingerprint system or teletype machines, into an organization of thousands of well-trained agents, detecting and waging war on crime, corruption, and communism.

Our entire citizenry has a high admiration and respect for J. Edgar Hoover because of his devotion to the cause of America, and in introducing this resolution, and in what I may say, I feel that I am expressing the wishes of the Nation in pointing out our indebtedness to him for the distinguished public record he has achieved in organizing and firmly establishing as an agency of the executive branch of the Government the Federal Bureau of Investigation, about which there has never been a breath of scandal, as it has quietly gone about rendering efficient public service.

The FBI is universally regarded as the most efficient organization of its kind anywhere in the world and we cannot think of the FBI without thinking of J. Edgar Hoover and the able staff of assistants which he has built up and trained. He has the complete confidence of the American people, and I think the time has come, upon the completion of his 30 years of service as director, that we show our gratitude in an official manner to such an outstanding and honorable public servant.

This act of recognition will be an inspiration to the young people of America.

Improvements Needed in Civil-Service Retirement System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I favor amendments to the retirement system for Federal employees under civil service which would make two necessary improvements. H. R. 5556, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], provides full retirement benefits after 30 years of service at the age of 55.

H. R. 3936, introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], would permit all civil-service employees to retire after 35 years of service, regardless of their age, and without deduction of any kind due to age of the person retiring.

At present retirement is permitted after 30 years of service at the age of 55, but an employee who exercises this right loses 3 percent of his retirement for each year under the age of 60. This means a reduction during the years of 55 to 60, when he has the option to retire, of 15, 12, 9, 6, and 3 percent of his retirement. The reduction, particularly in the earlier years, is too steep for most of the civil servants to afford to exercise this right. These employees have made their contributions for 30 years and the Government has matched them. If it is right to plan retirement for long-service employees, they should not then be penalized by a deduction from their modest retirement checks.

Even though servicemen make no contribution to a retirement fund, they are entitled to retire after 20 or 30 years of service without deduction for any years under 60. On the other hand, employees in the civil service, from whom deductions of 6 percent of their salaries are taken, which accumulates in interest more than the contributions during the 30 years, cannot receive their retirement payments unless a substantial deduction is made if they are still under 60 years of age.

The provision for full benefits without reduction of any amounts for any of the years under 60 is not limited to pension plans for service personnel, but exists also in the systems for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, for the Public Health Service, for investigative and Foreign Service employees, and for policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia.

I am not questioning the wisdom of the provision which has been made in these systems. I think, however, that other civil servants who have put in 30 years in Government service and who have reached the age of 55 should be permitted to retire and receive the retirement pay to which they would then be entitled by length of service—amounting usually to less than half of their earnings while at work. Deductions up to 15 percent for those under 60 make such retirement impractical.

The other bill which I favor to improve the civil service retirement system, H. R. 3936, would make it possible for an employee to retire if he or she has worked in the civil service for 35 years. The age requirement after a person has served all of 35 years in the Government seems to me to be purely formal and perfunctory. Persons who have worked for the Government for at least 35 years are not young persons. It is the years of service and the contributions which have been made which are the true basis for an equitable claim to retirement. As already indicated, the retirement systems of the military services and the Public Health Service and Coast and Geodetic Survey are based on service and not age requirements, and the service requirements vary from 20 to 30 years. When they are entitled to benefits they receive full benefits, without deductions because they may not have reached a certain fixed age.

Two States have followed this example—Ohio permitting retirement at any age after 36 years of service and Colorado after 35 years of service. This principle is also commonly used in many

municipalities for policemen and firemen, with terms of required service much less than 35 years.

The average age of retirement of Government employees in fiscal 1953 was 61½ years. The overall average years of service of these employees was 23½ years. This is broken down in the following categories under which retirement is permitted by the present law:

Basis of retirement:	*Average years of Government service*
Disability	17.7
Mandatory (at 70, at least 15 years of service)	29.2
Optional, 60 to 70 years (at least 30 years of service)	36.6
Optional, 62 to 70 years (at least 15 years of service)	21.8

While we have no exact figures on the number now employed who have had 35 years of service, the sample of retirements in 1953 suggests that a comparatively small number of long-service employees would be involved.

There Was a Shooting in the House Chamber Today, Mr. Speaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this noon, when the House met, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it was my intent to discuss here the origin and the development of the grand jury, the full appreciation of which might serve to ease our tensions and give us that public calm needed for the proper maintenance of law and order.

An inflamed people can hardly be expected to enforce their laws with balanced scales. Since the Congress adjourned last July a mounting pitch of emotion has risen in the country. This, in inverse proportion to truce developments in Korea.

Last August, on active duty with the Sixth Army, at the presidio in San Francisco, under the command of Lt. Gen. Jos. M. Swing, it was my high honor to meet several POW ships as they slid up the bay. Bands played. Fire hoses sprayed. "Welcome home, boys, welcome home." Soldiers double timed down gangplanks, into the arms of weeping relations, into stalls for final processing. Chow. Then home. After Korea, peace and quiet was theirs. To what extent?

For the last 6 months of 1953, Congress was not in session. Charges flew. Here and abroad, on most all continents, accusations filled the air, man against man. England, Canada, Australia, alone, seemed unaffected.

In the first 2 months of this year, the pitch mounted. Last week, in America, it reached its crescendo.

Today, there was a shooting in the House Chamber. Five of our colleagues were felled.

The question is, will our beloved colleagues and friends pull through, again alive and alert, able in body, mind, and spirit? They must. Our deepest sympathies go to their brave and beloved families, their wives and children, their loved ones, and their constituents. Each of us feel the hurt.

What now? Close the Chamber? Deny the galleries? Secret service men at the portals? America, an armed camp? What is best for America will be done. Scalping and the tomahawk did not stop our hearty pioneers. Since 1776, eight generations of Americans have eight times shed blood for the love and glory of America, the beautiful and the free. Blood on the House floor today was in that line of march.

In 1922, Mussolini marched on Rome. Communists, gangsters, racketeers, and Socialists were blamed. Black Shirts, "Viva Duce—Viva Duce," war, desolation, and the Communist threat followed.

In the thirties, the German Reichstag was burned. A Dutch Communist was tried and executed. Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, Ribbentrop, and Von Papen rode the crest. Storm troopers "Seig Heiled," marched, fought, and died. Germany went up in flames, one-half of it Communist-ruled today.

Earlier, in Russia, Rasputin terrified the court. Then the Bolsheviks slaughtered the Czar and his family.

Fear, slaughter, conquest. Then communism. Are these the four horsemen of our century?

What horse do we ride? None. Our foot is not even in the stirrup. Thank heavens. It must never be.

I shall always remember today, Mr. Speaker. The shooting was so strange. Just before it started, I phoned Mrs. Sieminiski to say there would be a roll-call or two, to hold supper. I would call back. I took a seat in the center of the last row, on the Democratic side, just in front of the page's desk.

Then the Speaker called for a standing vote. We were on the so-called wetback bill. Those in favor of the rule rose to their feet. It seemed as though an overwhelming majority of the Members stood to be counted. Speaker MARTIN seemed to be nearly finished with his tally. I was in my seat. Then, the shooting started.

I stayed in my seat, eyes glued to the black guns in the hands of the assassins who were directly opposite me in the gallery, across the Chamber. As the shooting continued the membership took more and more cover, got down behind the benches.

In front of me, to my left—I saw Congressman ROBERTS fall. To my front right Congressman FALLON grabbed his thigh. More and more Members got down. As if hypnotized, I stayed in my seat, eyes glued to muzzles of the weapons. I looked at the ceiling, saw a hole. Then a man came through the gallery door—smashed into, grabbed, and lifted one of the shooters off his feet, up and out of the gallery. Just before that, one of the shooters ran out. Just then, a woman unfurled a flag, red and white, and seemed to shout "Viva —ico."

To my right rear, a bullet hit the wall, just between the heads of two pages. Just over my head, another bullet lodged in the wall, over the page's desk.

I went forward, Congressman ROBERTS was down, blood on his trouser leg, tourniquet on his thigh. Congressman FALLON held his thigh and left the Chamber. Moving forward, toward the well of the House, over on the right, sat Congressman DAVIS of Tennessee. He was hit in the leg, sitting upright. I moved on, forward, on the Republican side, in the well Congressman BENTLEY was on his back. His eyes open, his face ashen. He had been hit in the chest. His shirt sopped up blood like a blotter. Over him kneeled the House Chaplain, Dr. Braskamp.

Near me stood Congressman FULTON, of Pennsylvania. He was telling someone how he moved toward the door with Congressman JENSEN, of Iowa, following him. BEN got two slugs in the back and dropped.

People in the gallery seemed frozen in their seats. The membership milled about, comparing notes, who was where, and how close each was to a colleague who was hurt, or a bullet that had hit. Congressman BONNER had a close call. Sat right next to Mr. ROBERTS. Congressman BARDEN kept his eyes glued on the killers all the time. There was Congressman HERLONG—and over there was Mr. CANFIELD. Judge RUTH THOMPSON, Congresswoman from Michigan, and Mrs. CHURCH, in her seat, calm, possessed. Everyone was there. Calm. The phone booths were filled.

In came the plainclothesmen. Some cushions were removed. One was slashed open for a sample slug, which had embedded itself in the leather upholstering.

I met Russell Saville, House librarian, told him I had thanked the Almighty for a few more precious moments here on earth, not so much for myself as for a chance to try to do a little more for my wife Marie, and daughter Christine and Isabella who had only recently come through the Iron Curtain from Poland. Alone, the three of them would have had a bit of a go of it. I was thankful to God.

I phoned home. Isabella answered. She had not heard. We spoke Polish. I told her to reassure mother who had gone to fetch Christine at school.

Then John Murphy, my able and outstanding assistant called. All was well. His young son was ill. They were at the doctor's. I spoke to newsmen.

When I arrived at the office Mrs. Sieminski, Christine, and Isabella were there. We embraced. Christine was pale. Came over, sat on the arm of my chair, kissed me and said, "Daddy, I'm glad you're all right."

In the outer office, I gave a statement on the above to crack reporter, Washington representative of the Jersey Journal and the Newark Star Ledger, Tom Buchanan. Then I said good night to Miss Connie.

Our dinner was quiet. News has just come in, all colleagues are alive. Ben is gaining in strength. They will operate in the morning. Alvin is holding on.

May the lesson of this day, O Lord, grow clearer and clearer.

Sixty Days of Accumulated Annual Leave in the Federal Government Service Should Be Reinstituted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the concerted cry from many sources for relief from the so-called Thomas rider, Congress enacted Public Law 102, 83d Congress, approved July 2, 1953, for the purpose of overcoming some of the criticisms of it.

After a closer view of the new leave law, many students of civil-service reform and personnel administration came to the conclusion that for most employees in the Federal Government Public Law 102 is not a betterment of the bad situation, but that in reality the situation is probably worse, even if unintentionally so. A careful analysis reveals that the new leave law goes even further than the Thomas rider in curbing employee leave benefits. The only employees benefiting from the new law are those who had less than 30 days of accumulated leave. Under the Thomas rider they could not accumulate any more leave, but these employees now can save up to 30 days. For the great majority of Federal employees who have in excess of 30 days' leave, the new law hurts them even more than the old one.

Congress has decreed in this new law that all employees must reduce their accumulated leave to 30 days within a reasonable length of time. The new law also prevents departing employees from receiving cash payments for unused leave for any current year. They are entitled to cash payments for the amount of leave they had accumulated at the beginning of the year, but all unused leave of the current year will have to be taken as vacations before they depart from Federal service. Survivors of deceased employees are discriminated against even more, for now they are not entitled to cash payments for the unused leave of the current year left by an employee.

This is the way Congress answered the impassioned plea of many Government employees and employee unions for some relief to the inequities which had crept into our annual leave law.

It is imperative that we now reexamine the annual leave picture and make some drastic changes in the annual and sick leave law with a view to restoring to this group of loyal and devoted employees some of the rights which they have enjoyed historically in our Nation.

The privilege of receiving annual and sick leave benefits as Government employees is not a new idea; the first legislation providing sick and annual leave for Government employees was passed in 1893, over 60 years ago. Prior to 1932, however, Federal leave statutes made no provision whatsoever for accumulation, but the Economy Act of June 30, 1932, made annual leave accumulative without limit. The Annual Leave Act of March 14, 1936, preserved the right of employees to leave which they had accumulated under restrictions of the Economy Act, and authorized future accumulations in amounts up to 60 days. During World War II, Federal employees were requested by the President to limit annual leave to a period of 2 weeks a year, except in emergencies. Because of this stipulation, the accumulation limit was increased, to a total of 90 days. Since wartime, however, Congress has constantly been chipping away at this reserve by various acts.

Public Law 239, 80th Congress, returned to the 60-day accumulation limit. Section 1212 of the General Appropriations Act, 1951, required that all annual leave earned in calendar year 1950 be used or forfeited by June 30, 1951. Section 601 of the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1952, required that all annual leave earned in calendar year 1951 be used or forfeited by June 30, 1952. The basic law regulating annual and sick leave rights was rewritten in 1951, repealing section 601 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act. This act also provided a 60-day limit on accumulation—except for a 90-day limit for certain categories of overseas personnel—and protected existing accumulations, although providing for a gradual reduction of such accumulation to the 60-day level through normal use. Section 401 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1953, ordered as permanent legislation forfeiture each June 30th of all unused annual leave earned in the preceding calendar year. This was the so-called Thomas rider.

It is my honest opinion at this time that we in Congress must enact legislation as rapidly as the legislative process will allow restoring to the loyal body of Federal employees the right to accumulate annual leave to an unrestricted maximum of 60 days. In my mind, the justice of such an action would be unquestioned. Think with me for a moment if you will of the many reasons which necessitate such an action on the part of Congress in the name of fairness, equity, and even good business and personnel management practices.

First, Government workers have no financial protection against unemployment. Almost all employees in private concerns now are covered by unemployment insurance, and in addition many of them receive severance pay as well. Federal employees alone among the Nation's major groups of wage earners have absolutely no unemployment insurance or severance-pay benefits to buffer them against any possible personnel action in the future which separates them from their jobs. Under the provisions of the old laws which allowed accumulation of up to 60 days of annual leave, Federal employees were at least given an opportunity to save their leave so that they would be assured of transitional pay in the event of a sudden separation from Government service.

Second, the accumulation is imperative for effective and equitable Federal personnel management. Under the present graduated leave system, new employees earn only 13 days annual leave a year. All of this amount is not likely to be available for vacation purposes, since every absence for necessary personal business also must be charged to the employee's annual-leave account. As a result, many new employees working in locations distant from their homes, such as in California, have difficulty in returning home for vacations when they cannot accumulate enough leave to make the long trip possible and financially practical. This provision tends to hamper recruitment of needed workers in Washington and discriminates against citizens from Western States such as my own State of California. In short, the denial of leave accumulation is unfair, creates additional recruitment problems, and results in poor employee morale.

Third, leave accumulation makes possible more efficient administration. Reasonable leave accumulation allows needed flexibility in personnel utilization. Government agencies often find it necessary to ask employees to restrict or give up annual leave for given periods of time, particularly during emergencies. In this situation, if leave cannot be accumulated, administration officials are left with a poor choice of forcing employees to lose earned leave, which is obviously very unfair; or granting leave to employees when they cannot be spared, which results in loss of production, replacement cost, and additional work at overtime rates.

Last, but not least, the ban on accumulation of annual leave is not in reality an economy measure. It does not reduce the amount of annual leave earned in any 1 year. The morale of public employees has been seriously impaired by this enactment by these provisions.

I would like to point out to all the Members of Congress that the efficiency of our Government depends in the long run upon the caliber of our Federal employees. We cannot expect to recruit and retain the best qualified persons in Government service unless we treat them justly and fairly. We should assure them that we are concerned sincerely in their best interest and that we recognize the economic facts of life well enough to allow them this accumulation of leave to serve as a buffer against any eventual separation from their employment. Moreover, it is in the interest of this Government to reward faith and loyalty in service with just consideration. Such practice is in the tradition of American standards, which are as valid in day-to-day affairs as in great matters of state.

Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1954, and with the unanimous consent of the Members of the House, I inserted a questionnaire in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was my intention to give that questionnaire wide circulation in the Third District of Ohio, but because of the heavy legislative schedule and almost daily committee hearings, it was not possible to complete the necessary mechanical production details at that time. I have been amazed and highly pleased, however, that a considerable number of people from widely scattered areas of the United States read this questionnaire in the RECORD, clipped it out, answered it, and sent me some very complimentary and helpful letters of comments along with the completed questionnaires.

This has proven to me again beyond a doubt, Mr. Speaker, the very great help it is to me as a Representative in Congress to known the grass roots opinions of people.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in my former remarks on this matter, I pointed out that, "it is my constant and sincere effort, Mr. Speaker, to represent all the people in our very important Third District of Ohio to the very best of my ability" and called to the attention of the Members of the House that after the adjournment of Congress, during the past 2 years, I returned to the Third District of Ohio and initiated the holding of grass roots conferences throughout the Third Ohio District. More than three times as many people attended in 1953 than in 1952, and our personal discussions of the problems facing our Federal Government were extremely helpful to me in guiding my consideration of these questions as they are presented here in Congress. I have also maintained a District congressional office in the District and each time I can return to the District for even a day or two, during the session of Congress, when legislative sessions are not scheduled, I have a full schedule of appointments and discuss these many vital questions with people from all walks of life on a person-to-person basis. All of this, Mr. Speaker, has been very helpful to me as a Representative in Congress, because it has enabled me to keep a point of view related to the opinions and thinking of all the people of our Third District of Ohio.

In view of some recent actions here in the Congress of these United States, and various recommendations that have been included in the several messages of President Eisenhower to the Congress, it has seemed wise, Mr. Speaker, for me to make a few changes in my original questionnaire. Since it is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to now proceed with the least possible delay to give this questionnaire wide distribution in the Third District of Ohio, I am herewith submitting my revised questionnaire and respectfully request unanimous consent that I be permitted and authorized to take the necessary steps to implement the distribution of these questionnaires.

Following, Mr. Speaker, is the questionnaire I now propose to use. The results of the tabulation of these questionnaires will be of great value to me in my constant and sincere effort to represent all of the people in our very important Third District of Ohio to the best of my ability.

NEW HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., March 1954.

DEAR FRIEND: During the current session of Congress, every man, woman, and child will be affected by the legislation adopted. It is extremely helpful to me to know your thinking on the many important matters which will be considered. Therefore, I will greatly appreciate having your opinion on the following questions. Perhaps you may also want to make additional suggestions. It is my hope that you will mark and return this questionnaire to me in Washington at your earliest convenience.

This need not be signed, although we will be glad to have you do so if you feel it would be helpful. It will greatly assist us, however, in tabulating and interpreting your answers if you will state your occupation.

Your cooperation will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

PAUL F. SCHENCK,
Representative to Congress, Third District, Ohio.

Occupation: _____

1. Do you believe that we should cut taxes first and balance the budget later? Yes ☐ No ☐

2. Do you feel that the Taft-Hartley law—
A. Should be repealed? Yes ☐ No ☐
B. Should be changed giving greater rights to employers? Yes ☐ No ☐
C. Should be changed giving greater rights to workers? Yes ☐ No ☐

3. Do you favor farm-price supports? Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Should social security be broadened to include groups not now covered (farmers, professional, etc)? Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Should contributions be high enough to make the social-security program self-supporting? Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Those receiving social security are now limited to earning $75 per month in employment covered by social security. Should this $75 limitation be increased? Yes ☐ No ☐
A. If so, to what amount? $_____

7. Do you favor Senator MCCARTHY's investigation of subversive influences both in and out of Government? Yes ☐ No ☐

8. Do you favor the Un-American Activities Committee investigation? Yes ☐ No ☐

9. Do you favor investigations by congressional committees? Yes ☐ No ☐

10. Do you favor the St. Lawrence seaway if financed by revenue bonds to be retired from toll charges paid by users? Yes ☐ No ☐

11. Do you believe the United States should remain in the United Nations? Yes ☐ No ☐

12. Do you favor continued foreign economic aid? Yes ☐ No ☐

13. Do you favor continued foreign military aid? Yes ☐ No ☐

14. Do you feel that the reciprocal trade laws should be continued to assist in our foreign trade and commerce? Yes ☐ No ☐

15. Do you favor increased postal rates on:
A. First-class mail? Yes ☐ No ☐
B. Second- and third-class mail? Yes ☐ No ☐
C. Airmail? Yes ☐ No ☐

16. Do you feel it is necessary that the Post Office Department operate without a deficit? Yes ☐ No ☐

17. Do you favor increased pay rates for postal employees? Yes ☐ No ☐

18. Are you in favor of universal military training? Yes ☐ No ☐

19. Do you favor the requirement that drafted and enlisted military personnel serve in the Reserves for a specified period after discharge from active service? Yes ☐ No ☐

20. Would you favor UMT after the expiration of our present draft law? Yes ☐ No ☐

21. Do you believe that a civil-defense program is necessary? Yes ☐ No ☐

22. Do you believe that the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act should be amended to provide for more liberal admission of immigrants into the United States? Yes ☐ No ☐

23. Do you favor a constitutional amendment voiding treaties which deny or abridge any constitutional rights of American citizens? Yes ☐ No ☐

24. Do you feel that personal income taxes should be lowered by:
A. Lowering the income-tax rate? Yes ☐ No ☐
B. Increasing exemption for dependents? Yes ☐ No ☐
C. Raising exemptions for married couples? Yes ☐ No ☐

25. Would you favor exemption of the first $1,500 of retirement income from income taxes? Yes ☐ No ☐

26. Do you feel that the Eisenhower adistration is doing a good job? Yes ☐ No ☐

Name _____
Address _____
Remarks _____

Need for Increased Fire Protection on the Watersheds of Los Angeles County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, late last December the newspapers across the country blazoned the story of a forest fire in the San Gabriel Mountains, of Los Angeles County, Calif. They told how it threatened the costly observatory on Mt. Wilson.

Drought conditions had prevailed for months throughout the entire region, the foresters of Los Angeles County had joined with those of the Federal Forest Service to warn everybody against carelessness with fire. Someone failed to heed the warnings, however, and on Sunday afternoon, December 27, a fire started at about the 4,500-foot level on the slope of Monrovia Peak. A wind of cyclonic violence drove it over the crest and down into the scattered timber below.

Before Forest Service fire fighters could arrive on the scene, the burning was so fierce that the fire department of the city of Monrovia, 5 miles to the south, was called. This force was soon joined by the Arcadia department and 150 men detailed by the Forest Service. In a little more than 6 hours it had traveled 3½ miles and was described as out of control. A week passed, with 1,100 men working with big water tanks and pumpers, bulldozers, and even a helicopter, before it was under control.

During those hectic days damage estimated at more than $7 million was done to the watershed. Thirty-three residences were destroyed, 2,000 people were forced to leave their homes and belongings, and forest and vegetative growth on 15,000 acres was blotted out.

This fire caught the public interest because it threatened the world-famous observatory on Mount Wilson, and the massive 200-inch telescope. But in area burned and in dollar losses it was ex-

ceeded by another of the 10 fires that scarred the mountains and watersheds of Los Angeles County during the same year. This clearly demonstrates the fact that fire is a constant hazard in southern California, against which we must all be alert.

To top it off, the embers of the most recent fire were scarcely cold when rain came. At first it was a welcome relief from the long dry months. Then the worst fears were fulfilled. It grew from a gentle rain to a torrent. With no trees or brush, no grass, no vegetation of any kind on thousands of acres of mountainside, the water moved with increasing velocity to fill the dry beds of the canyons. In short, it turned into a gully washer.

Mud, boulders, and debris were swept down to fill the streets and cover the lawns of such towns as Sierra Madre, Duarte, and Monrovia, to depths of 4 feet or more. Houses were undermined or actually crashed in, trees and powerlines were down, cars and furniture were washed along on the crest of the flood, to be left strewn along the stream margins.

The foothill communities of Los Angeles County started in immediately to dig themselves out, and were still doing so when on January 25 and 26 a second rain on the unprotected mountainsides launched another torrent of mud and boulders. That which happened during the first storm was repeated and made worse.

The people of Los Angeles County have done much to avert such calamities. It seems, however, that all this is short of what is necessary, when some person, careless or worse, starts a fire in the drought-dried brush and tree growth which clothes those mountainsides. Then, the stage is set for a catastrophe. Lives are menaced, properties are damaged, forests which protect the storage areas of life-giving waters are ruined.

The watershed values of the brush and tree growth on those hillsides has been placed at $700 to $1,000 an acre. But when water is at a premium dollars can scarcely measure its value.

Los Angeles County, the several communities in the county, the State of California, and the Federal Government have combined their forces to fight fire wherever it occurs. The county maintains facilities for fighting fires and restoring forests which excel those of many States. The primary object of managing the 650,000 acres of chaparral and tree growth in the Angeles National Forest is to protect vegetative growth that covers the watershed.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, forest-fire protection on the Angeles National Forest cost more than 52 cents an acre. This is more than 5 times the 9 cents an acre spent for protecting all national forests. In addition, a little more than 98 cents an acre, available under the Flood Control Act of 1944, was spent for fire control on the Los Angeles River watershed portion of Angeles National Forest. Thus, over most of this national forest, fire fighting cost an average of $1.50 an acre. Yet the fires persist.

Without criticizing the expenditures for forest-fire fighting, those who have lived with the problem and studied it from day to day, have concluded that something is lacking. They believe that too little attention and too little money are being directed to the prevention of forest fires. It is as if an expensive and well-equipped ambulance were maintained at the base of a dangerous cliff, while the top of the cliff, from which victims are repeatedly falling, is without a guard or guardrail.

Supervisor William V. Mendenhall thinks that fire prevention has been neglected. He lives with the fire problem day after day, and year after year, so he sees it as few others can. Moreover, he has observed the remarkable service provided by the County of Los Angeles. Their program of prevention, which supplements the one of protection, has proved successful on similarly forested watershed lands outside the national forest. Accordingly, he proposed a long-range plan of education and improvements to keep forest fires from being started.

The plan appeals so strongly to the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County that they have backed up their conviction with a resolution. A copy has been sent to me, and I, too, am so convinced of its worth that I respectfully call it to your attention. The resolution follows:

Whereas the recent disastrous fires in the San Gabriel Mountains caused untold damage to southern California watersheds; and

Whereas destruction of watersheds will have damaging effect on properties in southern California for many years to come; and

Whereas these fires were controlled by unstinting and cooperative effort of Federal, State, county, and local agencies, including the fire departments of many counties adjacent to Los Angeles County, but, at tremendous cost; and

Whereas actual expenditures for fire fighting in the watershed areas are many times those for fire prevention; and

Whereas additional expenditures for fire prevention might well eliminate the major portion of required expenditures for the suppression of fires, as well as prevent irreparable damage to watersheds of Los Angeles County; and

Whereas present appropriations for fire prevention in the national forests of southern California are not sufficient to provide a level of service comparable to that furnished by the county of Los Angeles, either in quality, quantity, or period of coverage; and

Whereas the supervisor of the Angeles National Forest has submitted a report outlining the fiscal requirements to provide the proper level of service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors endorses the program submitted by the supervisor of the Angeles National Forest, and urges the United States Department of Agriculture, the United States Forester, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Congress, and all other responsible officials to support the program submitted, and make available the necessary appropriations to maintain an adequate level of Federal fire protection in the national forests of southern California; and be it further

Resolved, That the county of Los Angeles pledges its utmost cooperation in maintaining the highest level of fire protection so that the natural resources of this county and other southern California counties will not be jeopardized by such disastrous fires; and be it further

Resolved, That Supervisor Herbert C. Legg be authorized to take the report of the supervisor of the Angeles National Forest and copies of this resolution to Washington and discuss with the United States Forester, Members of Congress, and representatives of the State department of agriculture, and the Bureau of the Budget the problems of adequate fire protection in southern California; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the United States Senators and United States Congressmen from the southern California counties, the United States Department of Agriculture, the United States Forester, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Governor of the State of California, and the State board of forestry.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, March 1, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, whose mercy is as great as our unworthiness, forgive our feverish ways and the impatience of our attitudes as, like restless pools, so often our spirits mirror the agitation of our disturbed day. In the midst of demands which drain our strength, save us from forgetting the courtesy which shines with respect and understanding for the opinions of others. However much we may differ in viewpoint, may we never lose faith in each other's sincerity and high mindedness of purpose. Scorning all that is petty and mean, may these testing days find us growing in true greatness, the nobility of goodness.

Under the shadow of the white dome, symbol of America's destiny, we come today shocked at the murderous violence of disordered minds who imagine a false and a vain thing. We lift our prayers for those smitten at their posts of duty, especially for the legislator whose wounds are so grievous. Upon his dear ones in these hours of deep anxiety we ask Thy sustaining grace. May the dedicated skill of surgeons and the tender ministries of nurses bring him, if it be Thy will, safely through the valley of the shadow to useful years yet to be. In life and in death, unto Thee we commit our spirits: In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 1, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting

nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1160) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Tucson, Ariz., and to accept other land in exchange therefor.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 232. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind.;

H. R. 1433. An act to entitle enlisted men and warrant officers advanced to commissioned rank or grade who are restored to their former enlisted or warrant officer status pursuant to section 3 of the act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 505), to receive retired enlisted or warrant officer pay from November 1, 1946, or date of advancement, to date of restoration to enlisted or warrant officer status;

H. R. 1570. An act to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 55 years;

H. R. 2683. An act to amend section 12 of the Alaska Public Works Act, approved August 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 629);

H. R. 2848. An act to amend section 89 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended;

H. R. 3413. An act to grant oil and gas in lands and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., to individual Indians in certain cases;

H. R. 5627. An act to amend Public Law 472, 81st Congress, approved April 11, 1950, entitled "An act to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study";

H. R. 7402. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of St. Joseph, Mich.; and

H. R. 7541. An act to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6130) to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under Lanham War Housing Act, and it was signed by the Vice President.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet today, during the session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me say that, following the morning hour, we shall resume the call of the calendar, from the point where the call was suspended yesterday. We shall begin with Calendar No. 955, House bill 711, a private relief bill, and shall go through to the end of the calendar, in the case of the bills on which committee reports are available to Members of the Senate. However, under our customary practice, if a committee report is not available on a bill, I would expect the calendar committee on either side of the aisle—one or the other—to object to consideration of the bill.

When the call of the calendar has been concluded, we expect to consider the supplemental appropriation bill, which has been on the calendar for several days; we expect to take it up this afternoon.

Of course, the unfinished business is still the bill providing for statehood for Hawaii. After consultation, later in the afternoon, with the minority leader, I expect to be able to make an announcement regarding the program for tomorrow and the remainder of the week.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on an overobligation of an appropriation for the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS RELATING TO IMPROVED TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics on operations under Public Law 867, 81st Congress, relating to improved transport aircraft (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PERMANENT ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to the proposal of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, a list containing the names of natives of Mexico and adjacent islands, which are to be reexamined with a view to placing them on a joint resolution granting such aliens permanent adjustment of their status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT, RELATING TO UNCLAIMED MONEYS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subdivision (a) of section 66—Unclaimed Moneys—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision (b) of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT, RELATING TO DISCHARGES, WHEN GRANTED, AND NOTICES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, to amend subdivision (b) of section 14—Discharges, When Granted—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and subdivision (b) of section 58—Notices—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF RURAL LETTER CARRIERS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 3 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of rural letter carriers, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1934 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER FORT PECK PROJECT ACT

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on operations under the Fort Peck Project Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Joint resolution expressing support of the Tennessee Valley Authority

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Kentucky has derived, and will continue to derive, many benefits from the operation of the TVA, including a $3 million annual saving to the residents of the 25 counties in the Commonwealth of Kentucky who use electricity furnished by the TVA to local distribution system; and

"Whereas the TVA annually purchases millions of tons of Kentucky coal for use in its steam plants; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Kentucky benefits from the navigation, flood control, resource development, and recreational programs of TVA; and

"Whereas the area served by the TVA is in urgent need of additional electric power for atomic energy and national security purposes as well as domestic purposes, and for

new generating facilities to produce the needed power; and

"Whereas the funds invested in the TVA represent a sound investment because it is repaid with interest over a 40-year period; and

"Whereas the people of the area served by the TVA own 40 percent of the total investment in the TVA power system through their ownership of local distribution systems, and that investment should not be jeopardized by short-sighted budgetary treatment of the TVA; and

"Whereas the admirable reputation of the TVA for accurate forecasts of future power requirements, for honest and practical budget requests, for effective cooperation with State and local agencies, and for great achievement in fostering the progress and prosperity of a region which was once far between the economic standard of the Nation, is now being besmirched by false accusations; and

"Whereas the TVA, because of its strategic location in the region which it serves and its responsibility to the people of that region for its success, is a dramatic example of effective decentralization of public management: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky—

"That the President and the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby memorialized and urged to give their most serious consideration to the requests for appropriations which will enable the TVA to continue to serve the region with the same high degree of efficiency.

"That the President of the United States be urged in his budget message to Congress to provide adequate funds for the TVA, and that the President make it clear that the funds for power development will be repaid with interest and that the funds for other statutory programs represent a profitable investment in the Nation's future.

"That the President and the Congress of the United States be urged by the congressional delegation from Kentucky to support the TVA as an outstanding example of a unified, carefully integrated program of conservation and resource development, and

"That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to the chairmen of the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives Committees on Appropriation.

"Attest:

"J. ERVIN SANDERS,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

Resolutions adopted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at Miami, Fla., relating to appropriations for the Southeastern Power Administration, and so forth; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Central Labor Council of Portland, Oreg., and vicinity, protesting against any special exemption on income derived from dividends; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the California Federation of Women's Clubs, Los Angeles, Calif., signed by Mrs. Joseph C. Wenger, president, and Mrs. Alan W. Young, corresponding secretary, relating to the deduction of the costs of child care for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Lithuanian Americans of Racine, Wis., protesting against any recognition of the occupation of Lithuania as a legal act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of San Diego County, Calif., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 2749, providing for the termination of Federal supervision over trust and restricted property of individual and tribal Indians residing within the boundaries of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Telegrams and cablegrams in the nature of petitions from the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico, the Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, of San Juan, the Ponce Chamber of Commerce, the Bautista Council 1543, Knights of Columbus, San Juan, the National Exchange Club of Bayamon, the Parents-Teachers Association, San Juan, and the Lions Club of Ponce, all in Puerto Rico, condemning the action of certain persons in attempting to assassinate Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the County Commissioners of Allegany County, Cumberland, Md., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the issuance of a commemorative stamp to mark the 200th anniversary of the founding of Fort Cumberland on January 26, 1955; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the mayor and City Council of the City of Cumberland, Md., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp to mark the 200th anniversary of the founding of Fort Cumberland; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to the confirmation of the nomination of Earl Warren to be Chief Justice of the United States; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of San Diego County, Calif., relating to the confirmation of the nomination of Earl Warren to be Chief Justice of the United States; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the California Federation of Women's Clubs, Los Angeles, Calif., signed by Mrs. Joseph C. Wenger, president, and Mrs. Alan W. Young, corresponding secretary, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 49, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to equal rights for men and women; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Bar Association of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., relating to statehood for Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Hawaii Mission Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, Honolulu, Hawaii, favoring statehood for Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GOLDWATER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2844. A bill to amend the act of December 23, 1944, to make permanent the authorization for certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 1038).

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2244. A bill to provide for promotion by merit of employees in the postal service and to establish uniform procedures for examination and appointment of candidates for promotion to supervisory positions; with amendments (Rept. No. 1039).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 3051. A bill for the relief of Rachel Lorna Bauman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 3052. A bill to encourage a stable, prosperous and free agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. AIKEN, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 3053. A bill for the relief of Giussepina Cervi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3054. A bill for the relief of Rosita A. Jocsan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 3055. A bill for the relief of Jan R. Cwiklinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WELKER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3056. A bill for the relief of S. Sgt. Silvestre E. Castillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JAN R. CWIKLINSKI

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President in 1953, Capt. Jan R. Cwiklinski was the master of the Polish motorship *Batory*, the ship used in the escape of Gerhardt Eisler, to his position behind the Iron Curtain.

We of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, have had Captain Cwiklinski appear before the committee. He has escaped to the free world, and is the guest of the Polish-American Congress. Captain Cwiklinski is doing a great deal to help us in our fight against communism.

I introduce a bill for the relief of Capt. Jan R. Cwiklinski and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3055) for the relief of Jan R. Cwiklinski, introduced by Mr. WELKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASE IN BORROWING POWER OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2714) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2982) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 232. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind.; and

H. R. 7402. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of St. Joseph, Mich.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 1433. An act to entitle enlisted men and warrant officers advanced to commissioned rank or grade who are restored to their former enlisted or warrant officer status pursuant to section 3 of the act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 505), to receive retired enlisted or warrant officer pay from November 1, 1946, or date of advancement, to date of restoration to enlisted or warrant officer status;

H. R. 5627. An act to amend Public Law 472, 81st Congress, approved April 11, 1950, entitled "An act to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study"; and

H. R. 7541. An act to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1570. An act to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational purpose. may be leased for periods not in excess of 65 years;

H. R. 2848. An act to amend section 89 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended; and

H. R. 3413. An act to grant oil and gas in lands and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., to individual Indians in certain cases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2683. An act to amend section 12 of the Alaska Public Works Act, approved August 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 629); to the Committee on Public Works.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate today received the nominations of the following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for the terms indicated:

Mark A. May, of Connecticut, for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1956—reappointment;

Justin Miller, of California, for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1956—reappointment; and

Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1957, vice Ben Hibbs, term expired.

I wish to give notice that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CANCELLATION OF WHITE HOUSE RECEPTION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make an additional announcement to the Senate, at the request of the White House.

There had been scheduled for this evening a congressional reception, but I have been requested by the White House to advise the Senate that the reception has been canceled, because of the incident which occurred in the House of Representatives yesterday. This cancellation of the reception has already been announced in the press, but I wanted any Senators who had not seen the article in the press to be informed that the reception will not be held this evening.

THE JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Joint Economic Report is now available. It is published as House Report No. 1256. It will be sent to the office of each Senator; and to the general public it will be available from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, at 30 cents a copy.

In regard to the report, which is an analysis of the President's Economic Report, I wish to say we have had more extensive and complete hearings than at any time in the past. A real job of analysis has been done. Nevertheless, we completed the work on time—in other words, on March 1—for the first time in history, I believe. To that extent, at least, this is an historic document.

Mr. President, I hope each Senator will read the copy of the report he receives.

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF TEXAS DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it was just 118 years ago today that a small group of Texans struck a great—and dramatic—blow for freedom. Meeting at the little town of Washington-on-the-Brazos, they issued the historic document of Texas freedom—the Texas Declaration of Independence. It was a long step forward in the long struggle of mankind toward liberty.

It would be difficult to conceive of more adverse circumstances surrounding the birth of a republic. Those were dark and trying days—days that separated men from weaklings; courageous fighters from slaves. The Alamo was besieged by overwhelming forces. The defeat at San Patricio was a fresh and vivid memory. The massacre of Goliad was already in the making. If any cause appeared hopeless, it was the cause of Texas independence.

But the men assembled at Washington-on-the-Brazos were not of the breed who acknowledge doom. They were tough-minded patriots whose strength had been tempered by the hard life of the American frontier. They were staunch Americans whose love for liberty had been hardened into firm resolve by a life under despotism.

We who are Texans are proud of the heritage they left us. We will always thrill to the names of the great patriots who signed that document—Sam Houston, Jose Navarro, Bailey Hardeman, and the others who staked their lives on freedom. But it is more than just a Texas story. It is an American story—a part of the great and stirring tradition that belongs to all our people.

Texas Independence Day is a salute to men everywhere who love freedom. It is a day set aside to all those who have shouted their defiance to tyranny, and have stood firm and fought for liberty.

One hundred and eighteen years have passed since the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence. There have been many changes in the life of our country and on the face of our land.

But the spirit of liberty which fired the people of Texas on that day still lives. They lit the torch of independence. As long as it burns in our hearts and our souls, our Nation will live through all eternity.

QUORUM CALLS AND YEA-AND-NAY VOTES ON ALL TREATIES AND CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak at this time for not more than 3 minutes, on an important subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last year, on July 18, I submitted two resolutions proposing a change in the rules of the Senate, so as to require a quorum call and a yea-and-nay vote on all treaties and, likewise, on proposals for Constitutional amendments. Those resolutions were Senate Resolution 144 and Senate Resolution 145. They were referred to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

At the time, both the majority leader and the minority leader indicated their agreement with the purpose of my resolutions. The majority leader pledged that as a matter of practice he would henceforth insist upon procedures consistent with my resolutions.

Since then, we have had the historic debate on the Bricker proposal to amend the Constitution and the various compromise and supplemental proposals to the same general effect. That debate ended in the defeat of all the proposals for a constitutional amendment.

It is noteworthy, however, that the one point on which there was practically unanimous agreement was the need to insure that all treaties should be subject to yea-and-nay votes. Indeed, the fact that, in the past, a number of treaties were approved by voice vote, without yea-and-nay votes, helped to inspire the demand for an amendment to the Constitution along the lines of the Bricker proposal.

During the debate on the so-called Bricker amendment, the Senate indicated that it was ready and willing, by overwhelming majority, to make a mandatory provision for a yea-and-nay vote on treaties. The Senate was ready to write that requirement into the Constitution.

I saw no need—and now see none—to amend our Constitution to this effect. The purpose can be accomplished by a simple change in the Senate rules, as I

originally proposed. Moreover, such a change should be made speedily.

On January 11 of this year, I addressed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration a letter in which I asked for prompt consideration of my two resolutions to so amend the rules. I now ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter of January 11 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Chairman, Rules and Administration Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JENNER: Last July 18 I introduced two Senate resolutions, Senate Resolution 144 and Senate Resolution 145, proposing changes in the rules of the Senate so as to require a quorum call and a rollcall vote on (a) treaties and (b) proposals for constitutional amendments.

With all the concern that has been, and is being expressed, concerning the importance of treaties and the danger that there may be negotiated and approved treaties which are not fully in accord with the best interests of the United States, it would seem most desirable, and most urgent, that immediate action be taken on these proposals, regardless of the outcome of the consideration by the Senate of the so-called Bricker resolution.

These resolutions represent procedural changes which will insure that any constitutional amendment or any treaty will receive the consideration of a majority of the Senate and not be approved by voice vote, with only a handful of Senators on the floor as has, regrettably, been the case in some instances in recent years.

I am aware that the majority leader has, since I introduced my proposals, indicated that he would follow their intent as a matter of routine. Still, I think the country would be reassured by the formal approval of these resolutions.

I, therefore, suggest and urge that your committee give the earliest possible consideration to these proposals, with a view to taking action upon them.

Yours very sincerely,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I think it is generally agreed that just as treaties should be made subject to yea-and-nay votes, so, too, should proposals for constitutional amendments.

All of us must remember with some misgivings the fact that early last year we approved a proposal to amend our Constitution—a very dangerous amendment, in my judgment—by voice vote, with only 2 or 3 Senators on the floor. What a frightening way of conducting the vital business of the Congress, the most important business we could possibly undertake—the amendment of our Constitution.

For this reason and other reasons which are so obvious they do not need repetition, I urge again that the Senate give prompt consideration to my two resolutions and to the general proposition of changing its rules, so as to require quorum calls and yea-and-nay votes on all treaties and on all proposals to amend the Constitution.

CARL SCHURZ

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the remarks of our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] on the anniversary of independence in Texas furnish a good launching ground for recalling that today is the anniversary of the birth of a great citizen dedicated to freedom, who served in the United States Senate a long time ago.

I refer to Hon. Carl Schurz, who was in the forefront of the revolution in Germany in 1848, when he was only 18 years of age.

Four years later, at age 22, he came to the United States, and here he constantly dedicated himself to the cause of freedom.

He had an amazing mind, for he mastered a new language. He passed the bar examination for the State of Wisconsin and was admitted to the practice of law in that State. He actually practiced for a considerable period of time in the city of Milwaukee.

In 1860, having identified himself with the fortunes of the Republican Party, he became a delegate to the Republican National Convention, and in the great convention in the Wigwam in Chicago he cast his vote for Abraham Lincoln. From that day on they were inseparable friends.

He was also a delegate to the convention in 1868, and was subsequently honored by being appointed our Minister to Spain.

He served in the Civil War as a brigadier general, and then served in the United States Senate from the State of Missouri from 1869 to 1875.

He was also honored in the Cabinet of President Hayes by serving as Secretary of the Interior.

Subsequently he gave of his talents as president of the National Civil Service Reform League. He died in 1906.

I think it is useful and reassuring to recall the birth anniversary of a great character who graced this deliberative body, and who, having had the disadvantage of foreign birth, yet became one of the great American patriots of all time. So this day, in the hurly-burly of this existence, I think we can very suitably honor the memory of a great citizen who made this the country of his adoption, Carl Schurz of Missouri.

WISCONSIN DAIRYING AND ITS CRUCIAL ROLE IN THE NATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand 2 clippings—1 is from the Milwaukee Journal of February 17. It announces that Wisconsin, during 1952, was once again the Nation's leading dairy State, holding 14 of 18 first places in production of milk and milk products.

The second is an editorial from the current issue of the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer, regarding the terrifically harmful impact of the slash in parity announced by Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these two articles be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of February 17, 1954]

DAIRY OUTPUT OF STATE TOPS 1952 PRODUCTION

MADISON, WIS.—Wisconsin was the Nation's leading dairy State in 1952, holding 14 of 18 first places in production of milk and milk products, Wisconsin Dairying said Tuesday.

Wisconsin Dairying is an official publication of the Federal-State crop and livestock reporting service.

In 1952, Wisconsin plants made three-quarters or more of all malted milk powder, munster, and brick cheese produced in the country. They made at least half the limburger and whey and American cheese, and a third of the Italian and Swiss cheese, powdered whole milk, and powdered skim milk. Figures for 1952 are the latest available.

THIRTEEN AND THREE-TENTHS PERCENT OF MILK

The report, prepared before Secretary of Agriculture Benson announced dairy product support cuts February 15, brought into focus the tremendous role Wisconsin plays in national dairy production.

The State, according to the publication, also led in milk production, with more than 15 billion pounds produced in 1952, representing 13.3 percent of the country's total.

The following table shows the Wisconsin percentage of United States dairying production in 1952, rank of the State, and production:

	Percent	Rank	Production (pounds)
Malted milk powder	85.6	1	25,065,000
Munster cheese	84.4	1	9,337,000
Brick cheese	71.2	1	16,212,000
Limburger cheese	55.9	1	3,476,000
Powdered whey	49.7	1	81,691,000
American cheese	49.0	1	416,313,000
Italian cheese	40.8	1	24,817,000
Swiss cheese	40.6	1	43,865,000
Powdered whole milk	37.1	1	37,761,000
Powdered skim milk	31.3	1	277,913,000
Evaporated whole milk	22.4	1	635,074,000
Condensed skim milk (sweetened)	18.4	1	30,815,000
Butter	13.6	3	161,561,000
Condensed skim milk (unsweetened)	12.5	1	63,030,000
Condensed whole milk (sweetened)	10.3	2	10,615,000
Condensed whole milk (unsweetened)	7.7	4	16,975,000
Ice cream (gals.)	3.0	10	17,696,000

BUTTER CONTINUES TO RISE

For 1953, butter production continued its upward march, as fluid milk markets and condenseries were unable to absorb the increased output of dairy farms. The Nation's December production was over 108 million pounds, largest output for the month since 1942 and 20 percent above the November output. Usually the November to December boost is only 5 percent. The Wisconsin increase for the month was 25 percent.

December production of American cheese was 12.5 percent over the same month a year earlier, making service officials voice the opinion that Wisconsin more than held its own last year.

[From the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer]

DAIRYMEN DESERTED AGAIN

Dairymen may feel that they were dealt a low blow when the Government whacked such a big chunk off butter and cheese supports. But they shouldn't have been greatly surprised.

Washington never has worried much about milk producers. Look what has happened during the last 25 years.

Corn-hog, wheat, and cotton growers were bailed out by New Deal farm programs in the black depression years during the 1930's. Dairying had to muddle through the best it could.

Not only that, but Government programs put many outsiders into the milk business. Acres diverted from corn, cotton, and wheat went into grass and grass went into cattle.

Milk suddenly became important during the war. Incentive payments were used to coax more milk out of the butter and cheese areas. Everybody needed Midwest milk then. Wisconsin and nearby States went all out.

The flood of milk eventually started backing up. The word "surplus" reared its ugly head. So down comes Benson's hatchet and Midwest dairying is cut back to size. And once again the Midwest dairyman goes through the wringer.

Getting sick of it?

REGULATIONS GOVERNING ADMISSION TO SENATE GALLERIES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, because I believe Senators will be interested in the situation in relation to the galleries, I wish to make a brief statement.

The only change in the regulations so far as the galleries are concerned is that, for the present, at least, admission to the Senate galleries will be by card only. Visitors who have been coming into the public galleries without cards may contact the offices of Senators and request cards. I think all Senators should be advised of the situation. The requirement, it seems to me, is not an unreasonable one.

I do not suggest to any individual Senator the procedures to be followed in his own office. I merely state that in my office we are requiring each person who comes in and requests a card of admission to the galleries to fill out a guest card in his own handwriting, showing his name and address. We then indicate on the card that that person came in and requested a card of admission to the galleries.

With that exception, the normal procedure will be followed.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). The Secretary will proceed with the call of the calendar, the first order of business being No. 955, House bill 711.

Mr. GORE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cordon	Hayden
Barrett	Daniel	Hendrickson
Beall	Dirksen	Hickenlooper
Bennett	Duff	Hill
Bricker	Dworshak	Hoey
Burke	Eastland	Holland
Bush	Ellender	Humphrey
Butler, Md.	Ferguson	Hunt
Butler, Nebr.	Flanders	Ives
Byrd	Fulbright	Jackson
Carlson	George	Jenner
Case	Gillette	Johnson, Colo.
Chaves	Goldwater	Johnson, Tex.
Clements	Gore	Johnston, S. C.
Cooper	Griswold	Kefauver
Kennedy	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Kerr	McClellan	Schoeppel
Kilgore	Millikin	Smathers
Knowland	Monroney	Smith, Maine
Kuchel	Morse	Smith, N. J.
Langer	Mundt	Stennis
Lehman	Murray	Thye
Lennon	Neely	Upton
Long	Pastore	Watkins
Magnuson	Payne	Welker
Malone	Potter	Wiley
Mansfield	Purtell	Williams
Martin	Robertson	Young
Maybank	Russell	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate, attending the sessions of the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela, as a congressional adviser on the United States delegation.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Secretary will call the first bill in order on the calendar.

MRS. RUTH R. EKHOLM

The bill (H. R. 711) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth R. Ekholm was announced as first in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICE. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 711) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth R. Ekholm was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCOISE BRESNAHAN

The bill (H. R. 752) for the relief of Francoise Bresnahan was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, since this bill grants permanent residence to a person who has been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, it should be amended to protect that individual from future deportation based upon such conviction. The Immigration and Naturalization Service has recommended the following language, which was used to amend S. 1062, Calendar No. 953, an earlier bill on the calendar:

The Attorney General is hereby directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, and warrant of deportation in the case of said Francoise Bresnahan, and is further directed hereafter not to exclude or deport her from the United States by reason of any of the facts constituting ground for deportation as set forth in such outstanding order or warrant of deportation.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary whether he intended to offer such an amendment; or, if he did not intend to do so, whether he had any objection to such an amendment.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, in line 7, after the word "fee", to insert:

The Attorney General is hereby directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation and warrant of deportation in the case of said Francoise Bresnahan, and is further directed hereafter not to exclude or deport her from the United States by reason of any of the facts constituting ground for deportation as set forth in such outstanding order or warrant of deportation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BERYL WILLIAMS

The bill (H. R. 788) for the relief of Beryl Williams was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wonder if we might have an explanation of this bill, inasmuch as it involves the payment to an individual of the sum of $10,000.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this proposed legislation would pay to Beryl Williams, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $10,000 for injuries sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Navy vehicle on June 5, 1943. The Department of the Navy is of the opinion that claimant should be compensated for expenses incurred and personal injuries sustained as the result of the accident, and states that it would have no objection to the payment of $10,000 to the claimant.

Without sounding a horn or giving any other signal, a Navy vehicle struck the claimant, injuring her critically. Investigation of the facts discloses no negligence attributable to the claimant, but indicates that the accident was caused solely by the negligence of the Navy Department.

It is, therefore, unanimously recommended by the Judiciary Committee that the bill is considered favorably.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like

to ask the able chairman of the Judiciary Committee a question. In view of the fact that there are so many bills of this nature coming before the Judiciary Committee by which individuals are seeking large sums of money, would it not be better to undertake to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act so as to bring within its provisions cases such as the one which is now before the Senate? In that way the question of liability and the amount of damages could actually be proven before a jury or before a court, where there is time for procedure of that kind.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the distinguished Senator that, in my judgment, that would be very unwise. At any time the committee feels there is the least doubt as to negligence, we always resolve the doubt in favor of the Government. We have authority to refer such cases to the courts. As the Senator knows, that has been done on a great many occasions. We have been very careful not to allow claims of this character unless we feel that equity has not been done, and if there is any doubt in our minds, we let the claimant bring suit in the proper courts.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would not wish the Senator to think for a moment that I was casting any aspersions on the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Certainly not.

Mr. SMATHERS. These cases come to the Senate or to the House because the Federal Tort Claims Act bars them beyond a certain date. I think it is January 1, 1945. So I thought it might be better to amend the act, so that such cases could be handled in the Federal courts where most of them are now being handled. That was the question I wanted to ask the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I appreciate the interest the distinguished Senator from Florida has shown. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] will verify the statement that time and time again we have had that question in mind.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it the opinion of the Senator, then, that we should continue to leave the act as it is, and that any cases arising prior to the time stated should be brought to the attention of the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; in order to do equity in specific cases. I think that is the proper way to handle such matters.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee would tell the Senate what, in his judgment, such a method would cost. Would it be more costly to amend the act, or to settle such claims as we have been doing?

Mr. LANGER. I think it is much better this way. It saves a great deal of expense. Witnesses before the subcommittee are examined carefully. In a great many instances, the persons involved are very poor, and if they should bring suit in a court they would have to pay a lawyer 30 or 40 or 50 percent of the amount allowed.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure the Senator will agree that it is not a matter of cost. It is a matter of the time necessary to arrive at what is real justice, and where justice can best be done. Can it be done best at a subcommittee hearing, some of which hearings are well attended, but most of which, as we realize, are not too well attended? Senators have so many things to do that it is often difficult for them to be present at hearings. The question is whether claimants can receive more exact justice in the Federal courts, where a trial can be held, a jury selected, and the judge has plenty of time to go into all the facts. It is not a matter of snap judgment. My own feeling is that it would be better to have these claims adjudicated by the courts.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. There is much merit in what the Senator says, but courts are so overloaded now that almost inevitably great delay would ensue.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is very true, but the Senator will agree that a great deal of time is required to enable committees of Congress to hear all the cases. I agree with the chairman of the committee that we do not have sufficient time to take care of the backlog of cases which have been building up. Once a case is started in a court, I think everyone will agree that members of the Federal bench take plenty of time and go into all the facets of a particular case, so that all facts are presented.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I can assure the distinguished Senator from Florida that in this instance the committee went into the whole question very carefully, and I think justice is being done in this case.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have no doubt about that at all. But it seems to me that with so many bills providing compensation because of injuries suffered by various citizens, we are in danger of becoming a sort of jury, and of being obliged to listen to such claims, resulting in an inordinate amount of our time being taken. Frequently in our own proceedings emotion enters the question, and we are likely not to do justice.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator's mind is exploring a very important field.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have great regard for the Senator from New Jersey, and I would appreciate his associating with me in exploring the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on this question has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Florida be given 5 additional minutes to complete his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I did not know whether the Chair was starting a speech or making a point of order against me. It was my intention to say that I hope the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, fortified by the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], will give some thought to this problem, which, in the long run, if properly decided, will save a great deal of time and, I think, bring about more exact justice.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida. I think the Committee on the Judiciary could well look further into the whole matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 788) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ABRAHAM G. SAKIN

The bill (H. R. 823) for the relief of Abraham G. Sakin was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I observe that the bill is related to the Displaced Persons Act. It grants permanent residence to a man whose family came to the United States under the Displaced Persons Act. Does the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, who is chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, feel that the granting of permanent residence under these circumstances is justified; and will the Senator otherwise explain the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the bill was considered very carefully. It grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 60-year-old native and citizen of Lithuania, who last entered the United States as a visitor on August 2, 1949. The wife and two children of the beneficiary are permanent residents of the United States. They already are here, their status having been adjusted pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act. The beneficiary of the bill was unable to obtain an adjustment of his status in the same manner, inasmuch as his entry did not occur prior to April 30, 1947. Had he applied for admission to the United States before that date, he could have entered this country with his wife and two children.

Even though the beneficiary applied for admission after that date, and since his wife and two children were already in the country, the committee did not desire to break up the family simply because the husband and father could not apply before that date. Furthermore, the committee felt that a man 60 years old ought to be with his wife and two children, and should be granted the status of permanent residence in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 823) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEMETRIOUS KONSTANTNO PAPANICOLAOU

The bill (H. R. 824) for the relief of Demetrious Konstantno Papanicolaou was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. VINCENZO GUZZO

The bill (H. R. 828) for the relief of Dr. Vincenzo Guzzo was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like an explanation of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. The bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 40-year-old native and citizen of Italy, who last entered the United States as a visitor on February 14, 1950. The beneficiary is a medical doctor, and is employed as a house physician in a hospital where his services are stated to be essential and vital to the hospital.

I might add that because there has been a great shortage of doctors, the committee discussed the bill at great length. The hospital concerned desired to retain the man, saying he was a specialist in his line, and was needed in this country. The hospital wanted him to stay, if he possibly could.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Was the man a member of the Fascist Party?

Mr. LANGER. If he was, I do not remember it. My recollection is that he was not. I am satisfied he was not because, of course, an examination is always made by the Immigration and Naturalization Service to determine whether a person is or has been a member of the Fascist Party or the Communist Party, and undoubtedly, in this case, the person must have been approved before the Attorney General would have made a favorable report on the bill.

Mr. GORE. I believe the report shows that he was a member of the Fascist Party.

Mr. LANGER. I shall read a letter dated May 15, 1952, from A. Devitt Vanech, Deputy Attorney General, to Representative EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

MAY 15, 1952.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice relative to the bill (H. R. 4358) for the relief of Dr. Vincenzo GUZZO, an alien. The bill would cancel any deportation proceedings now pending against the alien, and would grant him permanent residence in the United States.

A memorandum prepared by the Immigration and Naturalization Service setting forth the facts in the case is attached.

Dr. GUZZO is chargeable to the quota of Italy, which is oversubscribed, and an immigration visa is not readily obtainable. The record, however, fails to present sufficient considerations to justify granting him a preference over others who desire to enter the United States for permanent residence but who nevertheless have remained abroad and are following the procedure prescribed by law in obtaining entry.

Accordingly, this Department is unable to recommend enactment of the measure.

Sincerely,

A. DEVITT VANECH,
Deputy Attorney General.

There is nothing in the letter to indicate that Dr. Guzzo was either a Fascist or a Communist.

Mr. GORE. But the Department does not recommend passage of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. The Department does not recommend passage of the bill. However, the committee report contains a memorandum of information from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, relative to Dr. Guzzo, which I shall read:

MEMORANDUM OF INFORMATION FROM IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE FILES RE DR. VINCENZO GUZZO, BENEFICIARY OF H. R. 4358

Dr. GUZZO is a native and citizen of Italy who was born on February 5, 1913. He last entered the United States on February 14, 1950, at New York as a temporary visitor for a period of 6 months. He was granted one extension of stay which expired on July 25, 1951. An application filed by the alien for a change of status from that of a visitor under section 3 (2) of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, to that of an exchange visitor under section 201 of the United States Information and Education Exchange Act of 1948 was denied on September 10, 1951.

The alien is a physician by occupation. He is presently employed as a house physician at the Bon Secours Hospital, Methuen, Mass., at a salary of $1,800 a year plus room and board. He is unmarried. His parents, 3 sisters, and 1 brother reside in Italy. Two brothers are now in the United States.

Dr. GUZZO stated that he belonged to a youth organization of the Fascist Party during the time he was receiving his education until his graduation from the University of Bologna. He stated that such membership was compulsory. He alleged that he was never a member of the Communist Party but that his brother Paul GUZZO was a member of that party a long time ago.

Representative THOMAS J. LANE, the author of the bill, appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and submitted the following information in support of the bill:

J. M. J. BON SECOURS HOSPITAL,
Methuen, Mass., May 22, 1953.

Mr. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANE: Dr. Vincent GUZZO has been most satisfactory and is very essential for the operation of the hospital. At the present time he is the only houseman, and it is very imperative that he remain with us.

Hoping you are able to make suitable adjustments.

Sincerely yours,
MOTHER GERMANUS, *Administrator.*

I shall read also another letter from the Bon Secours Hospital:

J. M. J. BON SECOURS HOSPITAL,
Methuen, Mass., June 2, 1953.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Regarding the position of Dr. Vincent P. GUZZO, resident physician at Bon Secours Hospital, his services are absolutely necessary and indispensable for the continued efficient operation of this institution founded 2 years ago.

Only 1 month ago our other resident left us to further his studies, leaving us with a serious vacancy we are unable to fill due to the shortage of doctors in this area of the country.

As a result, Dr. GUZZO is now serving us on a 24-hour, 7-days-per-week schedule, this being in addition to assisting in the operating room and taking care of each and every emergency case brought into our accident room.

His services to us are essential and vital to the hospital as well as to the many sick and injured patients entrusted to our care.

Consequently, we are hopeful that your efforts in his behalf will bear fruit successfuly.

Sincerely yours,
Sister M. HELEN,
(For Mother Germanus, Administrator).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 828) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WOLODYMYR HIRNIAK

The bill (H. R. 907) for the relief of Wolodymyr Hirniak was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. LOUISE BLACKSTONE

The bill (H. R. 946) for the relief of Mrs. Louise Blackstone was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is it possible, by passing the bill, that Congress will be creating a precedent which will give to unofficial records greater weight than is given to the official pay record possessed by the Department of the Army?

Mr. LANGER. The opinion of the committee is that a precedent will not be created.

The bill awards the sum of $1,481.85 to the sister of a serviceman who died while a prisoner of the Japanese. His sister, as administratrix, received payments from the Department of the Army which supposedly represented the pay and allowances due the serviceman to the date of notice of his death. However, these payments were based on the pay of a private, though the serviceman's last rate of record is sergeant.

The report of the Department of the Army states that it has been unable to discover any affirmative evidence that the serviceman had been demoted, and the Department therefore has no objection to enactment of the bill.

The committee feels that there is ample evidence to indicate that the estate of this serviceman has not received moneys to which the estate is entitled, and the committee therefore recommends favorable consideration of this bill. The estate of this decedent certainly was entitled, we felt, to his pay as a sergeant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 946) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MICHAEL DEMCHESHEN

The bill (H. R. 965) for the relief of Michael Demcheshen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. SOON TAI RYANG

The bill (H. R. 1339) for the relief of Dr. Soon Tai Ryang was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. MARCELINO J. AVECILLA AND DR. TEODORA A. FIDELINO-AVECILLA

The bill (H. R. 1358) for the relief of Dr. Marcelino J. Avecilla and Dr. Teodora A. Fidelino-Avecilla was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wonder if we might have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a husband and wife, natives and citizens of the Philippine Islands, who are 42 and 47 years of age, respectively. The beneficiaries last entered the United States as visitors in 1948, and in 1950 an order was entered directing that their status be changed to that of exchange visitors. Both beneficiaries are medical doctors and are presently serving as resident physicians in a New York hospital, where it is stated their services are extremely necessary.

Does the disinguished Senator desire to have me make a further explanation?

Mr. SMATHERS. Will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary state whether it is the policy of the Committee on the Judiciary to permit doctors or others who are trained along medical lines to come to the United States as visitors and then, notwithstanding the fact that they came only as visitors, to permit them to remain, in violation of the laws of the United States, even though there is a great need of doctors in the United States?

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my distinguished colleague that it has been the policy of the Committee on the Judiciary to to see to it that when men and women doctors of the type under consideration come to this country they are located in places where there is a shortage of doctors, in order to take care of the medical needs of such a locality. In the Midwest, such as in the Dakotas, Minnesota, and Montana, there is an extreme shortage of doctors. In certain tuberculosis hospitals in North Dakota which may accommodate five or six hundred patients, the best the authorities have been able to do is obtain the services of a doctor who is a displaced person as superintendent. The situation is acute.

Mr. SMATHERS. I agree completely with what the Senator from North Dakota has said about the need and desirability of more doctors. My question is whether or not we are establishing a policy of permitting doctors to come to the United States from countries which are not controlled by the Communists, when such visitors could go back and perform services in their own country. Are we establishing a policy of saying, "Once you get here, we will keep you here"?

Mr. LANGER. With respect to every case I know of, the Committee on the Judiciary has been in touch with local medical associations in order to find out the type of men or women the immigrants are. If the committee determines doctors are badly needed, and that their services will result in making medical services available to certain communities which otherwise would not have them, the policy has been to permit such doctors to go to those areas. In such cases bills are passed permitting such persons to remain in this country.

Mr. SMATHERS. Am I to understand that the Committee on the Judiciary is going to forget about some laws which the Committee on the Judiciary was originally responsible for having enacted, such as the immigration laws? Is the committee going to say that when doctors come from the Philippines, France, or England, or from some other country to which they could easily return, if such doctors will stay and render services in needed areas, we will forget the immigration laws, and they will not have to wait for a quota, and will not have to go through the procedure which all others must comply with? I know there is a need for doctors, but are we holding out an invitation to every medical student or doctor from foreign countries to remain in this country? In other words, are we saying, "Once you come here, we will waive our immigration laws"? I do not know that it is not a good idea; I am merely asking the Senator for a statement on the policy.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the Senator from Florida that investigation is always made as to how badly such doctors are needed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Doctors are needed in my State of Florida.

Mr. LANGER. We will be glad to obtain some doctors for the Senator from Florida, if the committee can help his State.

Mr. SMATHERS. I appreciate the candor of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I will have to get in touch with the Senator on that matter.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from North Dakota that we have recently concluded hearings on an Indian bill. The Indians in our State, as is true of the Indians in his State, have actually no medical care at all.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Indians have to travel 50, 60, or 75 miles in order to get medical assistance. We need doctors.

I will ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary if we may expect to get a doctor from somewhere in the world before too long a time.

Mr. LANGER. I shall be glad to help the Senator from Florida if I can.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, for the RECORD I think it should be said that all the cases involving doctors are subject to constant screening.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder if the able Senator from New Jersey subscribes to what the Senator from North Dakota has just said, that in fact we are going to forget the immigration laws when there is a need for obtaining a certain type of person, like a doctor from the Philippines. Such a doctor can get back to the Philippines very easily. Once persons in this category are here as visitors, on a temporary permit, they say, "Well, we are educated as medical doctors, and we are going to stay here."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. If they misbehave once, they have to leave the country.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is the Senator willing to have them remain until they misbehave for the first time?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No; I would not be in favor of applying such a rule as that.

Mr. SMATHERS. May I ask the Senator what distinguishes the two persons under consideration from other aliens?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That question has been debated for the last 10 minutes. The answer to the question is the need for physicians.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator suggest that if there is a need for physicians we should forget the immigration laws to the extent that such need may be supplied?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. If they are found to be deserving, and are properly screened.

Mr. SMATHERS. What does the Senator mean by the word "deserving"?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I mean if they are deserving of the right to have residence in this country. They do not become citizens. I am sure the Senator understands that.

Mr. SMATHERS. What right do such persons have to remain in this country contrary to laws which originated in the Committee on the Judiciary, and which laws are on the statute books today, and are applied to all other citizens of the Philippines?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Under the measure the Senate is presently considering, they would have such a right.

Mr. SMATHERS. Only because the Congress of the United States would be waiving the law on the basis of need in this particular case. Does the Senator state that is the answer to my question?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1358) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOUIS M. JACOBS

The bill (H. R. 1495) for the relief of Louis M. Jacobs was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this bill authorizes the payment of $4,971.75. There should be an explanation before the bill is passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, under the bill Louis M. Jacobs, of Buffalo, N. Y., would be paid $4,971.75 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages suffered when refrigerating piping owned by Jacobs and installed in the coliseum building in the New York State Fairgrounds was removed from the building by the United States Army in 1943.

Mr. Jacobs was the owner of an ice-making machine, and the pipe used in connection with it was installed in the aforementioned building and was used for making ice for an ice-skating rink. The building was leased from the State of New York to a corporation owned by the claimant and his brother. In 1942 the United States leased from the State of New York the fairgrounds, which included the coliseum building. Over the protest of an agent of Jacobs, the pipe was removed and stored in an open field. Negotiations were had between the Army and Jacobs for sale of the pipe, but these came to no end result. The evidence clearly shows that the Army removed the pipe and that it was improperly stored, so as to render it unfit for further use, and the damages sustained by the claimant amount to $4,971.75.

The Department of the Army believes that the claimant should be compensated in the amount of the damages sustained. The committee agrees with the conclusions reached by the Department of the Army, and therefore recommends that H. R. 1495 be considered favorably.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Would it not be better to confer jurisdiction upon an appropriate Federal court which could determine the question of liability and the extent of damages?

Mr. LANGER. The Army admitted taking the pipe, and the Army concurred in the statement of the amount of the damage. The Army took the pipe, and did not compensate the claimant. Therefore, this case clearly comes under the statute which permits the Judiciary Committee to do equity and justice.

Mr. GORE. There is no question about the right and power of the Judiciary Committee to report such a bill. Neither is there any question about the right, jurisdiction, and power of the Congress to pass such a bill. However, that is not the question I submitted.

I asked the distinguished chairman of the committee whether in his opinion it would be better and more orderly to confer jurisdiction upon an appropriate Federal court, to have it determine in a legal and orderly way the question of liability and, if liability is found, the extent of damage involved.

Mr. LANGER. No; I do not think so. I do not know of a better or quicker way to do justice for the claimant than the procedure which has been followed. When the Army takes a person's property, why should he be required to pay a lawyer $1,000 or so, in an effort to get back his property or the equivalent of it?

In this case we are doing equity, and we are doing it faster than it could otherwise be done. We are doing equity after the Army has admitted that it took the man's property, and after the Army also admits that the amount now recommended as compensation is fair.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have very high respect for both Houses of Congress; and I think both Houses, together with their committees, can, when they put their mind to it, do justice in cases similar to the one now before us.

However, I submit to the distinguished Chairman of the Judiciary Committee that this body is not a judicial one. We are not equipped to try, take testimony, take proof, determine liability, and go into the intricate details in connection therewith, from the legal point of view.

Mr. LANGER. The Judiciary Committee is so equipped. It has 7 or 8 lawyers on its staff. The entire staff gets together and goes into such matters in detail, and calls witnesses. The staff does not do its work in a haphazard fashion.

If the Senator from Tennessee will investigate, he will find, I think, that more than half the claims submitted to the Judiciary Committee have been rejected.

Let me ask the distinguished Senator from New Jersey whether he agrees with that statement.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I would say that many more than half of the claims are rejected.

Mr. LANGER. In short, Mr. President, we go into these matters in detail.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield further to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator from North Dakota inform the Senate what witnesses appeared and gave testimony regarding this claim, and how many members of the Judiciary Committee, if any, were present to hear the witnesses?

Mr. LANGER. I am informed by a member of the staff that there was no hearing on this particular bill; that the Army wrote a letter in which it said it took the pipe and owed the money, and that the claimant should be paid.

Mr. GORE. Then how did the Judiciary Committee arrive at its determination of the question of liability, other than through the very brief procedure just related by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. There is no question that the Army took the pipe. The Army says it took it, and the Army also says the pipe was spoiled because of the way it was treated by the Army. The Army has stated that the pipe was worth a certain amount of money. What other evidence is needed?

Mr. GORE. Then that makes even more pertinent my original inquiry, namely, why would it not be better to confer jurisdiction upon a court of record, to have it determine, in an orderly way, the extent of liability and the amount of damage, rather than to bring up the matter on the floor of the Senate, without having a hearing, and after only a cursory examination?

Mr. LANGER. If the distinguished Senator from Tennessee wishes to change the rule in regard to such matters—although Congress passed the act giving the Judiciary Committee jurisdiction in matters of this kind, in order to do equity—of course, that is certainly his right.

Mr. GORE. It is not my desire in any way to take from the powerful committee headed by the able Senator from North Dakota any of its power, or to deny to Congress the power it has. I raise the question of advisability and feasibility of turning the United States Congress into a court of claims.

Mr. LANGER. All I can say to my distinguished friend is that is the way the law was passed, giving this jurisdiction to the Judiciary Committee. We are acting under the law which was passed by Congress.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall not press an objection to this bill, but I think it raises a question which addresses itself to the entire Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1495) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. GISELE WALTER SIZEMORE

The bill (H. R. 1649) for the relief of Mrs. Gisele Walter Sizemore was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, I should like to have a statement from the chairman of the Judiciary Committee that the illness—tuberculosis—with which the lady was afflicted, and which automatically excluded her from admission to the United States, has been properly arrested, so that she no longer constitutes a threat to the health of the general populace of the United States. Of course, her present exclusion is under a specific provision of law.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill waives the excluding provision of existing law relating to one afflicted with tuberculosis, in behalf of the wife of a United States citizen, a veteran of our Armed Forces. It is believed that the condition is now arrested. Without the waiver provided for in the bill, the beneficiary will be unable to join her citizen husband in this country.

So, Mr. President, this case is very simple. The member of the Armed Forces was married in another country. His wife had tuberculosis, so she was not permitted to enter the United States until the disease was cured or arrested. Now she is to be permitted to enter the United States to join her husband who is a veteran of the Armed Forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1649) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY TY

The bill (H. R. 1688) for the relief of Henry Ty was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELENA SHOSTENKO

The bill (H. R. 1795) for the relief of Helena Shostenko was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MICHALINE BORZECKA

The bill (H. R. 2035) for the relief of Mrs. Michaline Borzecka was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM M. SMITH—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2387) for the relief of William M. Smith was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill would award the sum of $1,027 to William M. Smith, of Homestead, Fla., in full settlement of his claims against the United States for damages sustained by him as the result of a collision between his truck and a United States Army ambulance, which occurred at Haddonfield, N. J., on January 9, 1946.

Claimant herein was operating his truck in Haddonfield, N. J., when he was struck by an Army ambulance causing extensive damage to his truck and incurring personal injuries.

Claimant filed a claim with the War Department in the amount of $1,152 for damages sustained by him as the result of the accident of January 9, 1946. On August 1, 1946, Mr. Smith amended his claim for damages to the aggregate amount of $1,027. Before final administrative action was taken on the claim of Mr. Smith, Congress enacted the Federal Tort Claims Act, which conferred exclusive jurisdiction upon the United States district courts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of this nature arising on and after January 1, 1945, where the amount claimed exceeded the sum of $1,000, the authority of the executive department and other agencies of the Federal Government being limited to the approval of claims of this nature where the amount involved did not exceed $1,000. On August 31, 1947, claimant was advised by the War Department that there was no further action that could be taken by the Department on his claim, because the amount exceeded $1,000.

On September 24, 1952, Mr. Smith filed an amended claim with the Department of the Army in the amount of $1,000. On October 2, 1952, the Judge Advocate General of the Army denied the claim on the ground that the claim was not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act or any other statute available to the Department of the Army for the settlement of claims.

The Department of the Army recommends favorable consideration of this claim. The committee does not believe that claimant should be penalized and be denied just compensation because the statute expired while he was attempting to secure administrative relief through the Department of the Army. The committee therefore recommends favorable consideration of this bill H. R. 2387.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the claimant comes from Homestead, Fla., let me say I am very glad that there is now to be a proper distribution of wealth. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. In view of the fact that the committee does not feel that this claimant should be penalized because the statute of limitations has run against his claim, would it not be preferable simply to lift that bar and allow him to go into the Court of Claims without the hindrance of the statute of limitations, rather than confer the benefit through this bill?

Mr. LANGER. This is a claim for a little more than $1,000. The Army admits that it owes that sum. The Army recommends payment. Why should the claimant be obliged to hire a lawyer and go to the cost of pursuing a case in court? It might be on the court calendar for a year or two, as the Senator well knows. As a matter of fact, we are proposing to do equity and justice by allowing the sum of $1,027.

Mr. GORE. I can appreciate the difficulties of bringing suit for such an amount. However, I do not understand—and I wonder if the Senator can explain—the delay of 5 years in presenting this claim.

Mr. LANGER. I can go into all the details if the distinguished Senator wishes me to do so. The case is adequately explained in the record.

Mr. GORE. I dislike to impose upon the distinguished Senator the duty of explaining the bill.

Mr. LANGER. I do not mind doing it. That is what I am here for. If the Senator from Tennessee wishes to have me explain it in detail I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator performs his function as a United States Senator in a very creditable and honorable way. I should like to know why it is that the claim was delayed 5 years before it was brought to the Army?

Mr. LANGER. I read from the report of the committee:

The records of the Department of the Army disclose that on January 9, 1946, at about 7 p. m., William M. Smith was driving his 1936 Dodge truck south on Haddon Avenue in Haddonfield, N. J., approaching the intersection of said avenue with Kings Highway. He stopped in obedience to a red traffic light. When the light changed to green for traffic on Haddon Avenue, he entered the intersection and when he was about two-thirds of the way across said intersection his truck was struck by an Army ambulance, which was traveling east on Kings Highway and which had entered the intersection against the red light. Visibility at the time was impaired by a fog and a light rain, and neither driver saw the other approaching the intersection. The force of the impact of the Army ambulance against claimant's truck knocked the latter vehicle to the corner against a gasoline pump belonging to the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., of Philadelphia, tearing it down. The Army vehicle was being operated on official business at the time of the accident. As a result of this accident, the truck of Mr. Smith was extensively damaged and he sustained a fracture of his left arm, bruises and abrasions, and the gasoline pump of the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. was damaged in the amount of $71. The evidence discloses that the Army vehicle was traveling at a speed variously estimated at between 30 and 40 miles per hour at the time this accident occurred.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is it not true that the Department of the Army has already paid a $71 damage claim to the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. arising out of this negligence?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. The Senator from Tennessee asks why the claimant waited 5 years to bring the claim, and I am trying to explain the situation.

On February 25, 1946, the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. filed a claim with the War Department (now Department of the Army) in the amount of $71 for the damage caused to its gasoline pump in this accident. The claim was duly approved in the amount claimed under the provisions of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; 31 U. S. C. 223b), as amended, and was paid on March 14, 1946.

On June 21, 1946, claimant filed a claim with the War Department in the amount of $1,152, under the provisions of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; 31 U. S. C. 223b), as amended, for the damages sustained by him as the result of the accident of January 9, 1946.

In other words, he waited from January 9 until June 21.

On August 1, 1946, Mr. Smith amended his claim to a claim for damages in the aggregate amount of $1,027. The purpose of so amending his claim was to eliminate therefrom the item in the amount of $125 for damages on account of the permanent disability of the claimant's left arm, inasmuch as the act of July 3, 1943, supra, the only statute under which the claim could then be considered, made no provision for the payment of damages because of physical disability as such.

Before final action was taken on the claim of Mr. Smith, the Congress enacted the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 842; 28 U. S. C. 921), which conferred exclusive jurisdiction upon the United States district courts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of this nature arising on or after January 1, 1945, where the amount claimed exceeded the sum of $1,000, the authority of the executive departments and other agencies of the Federal Government being limited to the approval of claims of this nature where the amount involved did not exceed $1,000. On August 31, 1947, Mr. Smith was advised by the War Department that there was no further action that could be taken by the Department on his claim because the amount claimed exceeded $1,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 5 minutes. Under the rule the time has expired.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have not used my 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that only one 5-minute speech is permitted. The time having expired, is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee will state his objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GORE. Does the 5-minute limitation on the bill preclude the offering of amendments, and sufficient time to consider amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There can be another 5 minutes on an amendment.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. I offer a motion to strike out the last word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a motion is not in order in the Senate.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator cannot make a speech.

Mr. GORE. I have an amendment to offer, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment is not in order until the bill is taken up for consideration. The pending question is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

SISTERS ADELAIDE CANELAS AND MARIA ISABEL FRANCO

The bill (H. R. 2504) for the relief of Sisters Adelaide Canelas and Maria Isabel Franco was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

HAROLD TREVOR COLBOURN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to make an observation with respect to a bill which was reached during the call of the calendar yesterday. I refer to Senate bill 268, for the relief of Harold Trevor Colbourn, which, as shown on page 2408 of the RECORD, was passed over. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and its consideration was objected to yesterday by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

My information, based upon correspondence with a friend of Mr. Colbourn's, is that he is not now in this country as an exchange student under the Smith-Mundt Act, but is rather here as a private student, at his own expense, under an ordinary student visa.

I am informed that Mr. Colbourn was, at one time, the recipient of a Smith-Mundt grant, but that he left this country upon the expiration of his visa under that act, as required by law, and attempted to obtain employment in England as a teacher of American history, but was unsuccessful. His immigration difficulties at present arise from the fact that he is Australian by birth, although he has not lived in that country since he was about 3 years old.

Thus, his present difficulties do not arise by virtue of failure to comply with the provisions of the Smith-Mundt Act requiring return to country of origin, but because the Australian quota is oversubscribed.

I am fully in accord with the provision of the Smith-Mundt Act requiring the return of grantees, and do not believe this principle should be vitiated by private bills. However, I do not believe this principle should be held to bar, forever, one who has complied with it by returning to his country, and who is now in this country under some other provision of the immigration laws.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. As I understand the situation, Mr. Colbourn was in the United States as an educational exchange student, but after he had completed his studies he returned to Australia. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He returned to England. He had not been in Australia since he was 3 years old. Although still a subject of Australia, he had been living in England. That complicates the situation a little. His place of residence could be considered as England, although technically he is a subject of Australia, having been born there.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it the view of the Senator from Arkansas, who has done so much to bring about the exchange-student program, that when a student comes here from a foreign country and avails himself of our educational facilities and returns to his native country for the purpose of spreading the good word about the United States, he should then, because he likes our country so much, return here, and thereby cause us to lose the advantage of his work in his native country, after he has been educated in this country?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I say to the Senator from Florida that I regret such a situation does develop at times. It does not happen very often, of course. It seems to me that at some point we will have to draw a line. It should be remembered that I have consistently objected to other bills which would have permitted students to remain in this country. Our policy has always been that students must agree to return to their native countries. However, at the same time I feel that at some point we must say that we will not pursue a student and exclude him forever, for the rest of his life, from ever returning merely because he had taken advantage of an educational grant.

In this case the student had actually been here professionally before he obtained the grant. He was doing research work in this country. Apparently he is a very fine scholar in American history. Later he went to England.

According to a letter written by the Director of the Institute of Early American History and Culture, at Williamsburg, Va., the student attempted to obtain employment as a history teacher in England, but he was unable to obtain such employment.

The bill was introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. The student has returned to the United States and has obtained employment as a teacher at Penn State, I believe. From all considerations I cannot find any justice in pursuing him forever. He has complied with the agreement by going home. Later he returned to this country on his own.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must inform the Senator from Arkansas that his 5 minutes have expired.

SISTERS ADELAIDE CANELAS AND MARIA ISABEL FRANCO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 2504?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2504) for the relief of Sisters Adelaide Canelas and Maria Isabel Franco was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIA TERESA ORTEGA PEREZ

The bill (H. R. 2622) for the relief of Maria Teresa Ortega Perez was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

HAROLD TREVOR COLBOURN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the consideration of Calendar No. 974, H. R. 2622, I merely wish to complete my statement on the Colbourn case in order to make my position clear.

I shall continue to object to bills of the character introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] concerning students who are in the United States and have never returned to their native country.

However, at least so far as I am concerned, I believe at some point we will have to stop objecting when a student returns to his native land and later returns to the United States. I do not believe we can be justified in objecting forever.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does not the Senator from Arkansas agree that it is a rather unfortunate circumstance, when a student comes here from a foreign country and is educated here, on his return to his native country he should be unable to teach in his native country about what he has learned in the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot guarantee that he was unable to obtain a position as teacher in England because of any prejudice over there against our history. There simply was not a place open for him. They have many teachers of American history in England. This person, according to the letter I have, did not get a job as a teacher. The situation varies from time to time. As I say, not many of them come back. On the other hand, it is a great compliment that they should wish to come back, and we should not be too hard on them.

I do not believe that this particular student's value is lost to us entirely, because he has relatives in England. The same statement applies to other students, of course. Such students have relatives in their native lands, and our investment in them is not entirely lost. Obviously they have been favorably impressed by life in the United States. We should not regard the value of such a person as lost, because he has influence in many ways in his home country.

Mr. SMATHERS. It seems to me that he can serve us best, as the program can serve us best, if he returns and teaches the beneficial things he has learned in this country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree completely. If a great number of them sought to return to the United States, I certainly would favor a reconsideration of our policy. However, where it concerns only a few individuals, we should not pursue them forever. The particular circumstance I am discussing is the first one that has come to my attention, as the Senator knows, out of perhaps seven or eight thousand cases. Therefore no great abuse is involved. The facts in this case seem to be a little beyond the point where I would be justified in drawing the line. If any other Senator desires to do so, of course that is his right; but I cannot object in this case, although I know objections have been made on my account.

Mr. SMATHERS. In answer to the statement of the Senator from Arkansas I may say that I am very happy to withdraw my objection on the basis of his statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to have it understood that I am dealing only with this particular case of Mr. Colbourn. I am not withdrawing the objections I stated with respect to other cases. What I have stated today does not represent any broad change in the policy. We have not considered this kind of case before.

MARIA TERESA ORTEGA PEREZ

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 2622?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this bill grants permanent residence to a 27-year-old girl who resides in Puerto Rico. So far as the report discloses and so far as I am able to determine, there is no particular claim to equity in this case. Rather, it proposes that Congress, without unusual circumstances being involved, should grant permanent residence to this individual. I wonder whether the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary would be willing to explain why the committee feels justified in recommending approval of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill grants status of permanent residence in the United States to a 27-year-old native of Spain who resides in Puerto Rico with her parents, who are permanent residents of the United States. The beneficiary entered Puerto Rico in 1948 as a student. Her older brother is a citizen of the United States.

In a letter under date of April 21, 1952, addressed to Representative CELLER, Mr. A. Devitt Vanech, Deputy Attorney General, said:

APRIL 21, 1952.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice relative to the bill (H. R. 4501) for the relief of Maria Teresa Ortega Perez, an alien. The bill would grant Miss Perez permanent residence in the United States as of April 12, 1948.

There is attached a memorandum prepared by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of this Department setting forth the facts in the case.

The quota for Spain, to which Miss Perez is chargeable, is oversubscribed, and an immigration visa is not readily obtainable. Whether, under the circumstances in this case, the bill should be enacted presents a question of policy on which the Department of Justice prefers to make no recommendation.

Sincerely,

A. DEVITT VANECH,
Deputy Attorney General.

The memorandum reads as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF INFORMATION FROM IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE FILES RE MARIA TERESA ORTEGA PEREZ, BENEFICIARY OF H. R. 4501

Miss Perez is a native and citizen of Spain, who was born on April 10, 1926. She last arrived in the United States at the port of San Juan, P. R., via airplane from the Dominican Republic, on July 21, 1948, when she was admitted as a student until September 9, 1948. She was granted several extensions of temporary stay, the last of which expired on July 26, 1951. On August 8, 1951, a warrant for her arrest in deportation proceedings was issued charging her with being in the United States in violation of the act of May 26, 1924, in that she is a student who has remained in the United States for a longer time than permitted under that act or regulations made thereunder. Subsequently she applied for the privilege of voluntary departure in lieu of deportation, which privilege was granted her by the Assistant Commissioner for Adjudications of this Service on November 23, 1951. Miss Perez first entered the United States at San Juan, P. R., on April 12, 1948, when she was admitted for a temporary period of 3 months, but she departed from the United States on July 16, 1948. It is noted that the bill as drafted refers to the date of her first entry.

At the time of her last entry into the United States, Miss Perez was destined to Sacred Heart Academy in Santurce, P. R., where she maintained her status as a student in that academy until her graduation therefrom on June 3, 1951. The parents of Miss Perez are legal-resident aliens of the United States residing in Puerto Rico, having been admitted into this country for permanent residence during August of 1948. Her parents had lived in Puerto Rico for several years prior to 1920. They entered with first preference quota immigration visas issued on the basis of an approved visa petition submitted in their behalf by their son who is a citizen of the United States through his birth therein. Miss Perez is presently residing in the home of her parents in Santurce, P. R., and is being supported by them. Her father owns a bakery in that city. Miss Perez testified that she had lived in Spain from birth until January 1947, when she proceeded to Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic, where she remained until her first entry into Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2622) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HAROLD TREVOR COLBOURN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like very much to dispose of Calendar 951, Senate bill 268. I ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate yesterday by which Senate bill 268 was passed over, be reconsidered, and that it be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to returning to the consideration of Calendar 951, Senate bill 268?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what is the calendar number to which reference has been made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The calendar number is 951.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, was there an agreement on yesterday that the bill might be brought up today?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not so far as I know. I was trying to answer the objection made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. It is a bill introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and I assumed it was cleared with Senators on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of this bill, but I shall object to going back to other bills on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the action of the Senate in passing over Senate bill 268 is reconsidered.

Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 268) for the relief of Harold Trevor Colbourn, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Harold Trevor Colbourn shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSE M. THOMASA-SANCHEZ, ADELA DURAN CUEVAS DE THOMASA, AND JOSE MARIA THOMASA DURAN

The bill (H. R. 2623) for the relief of Jose M. Thomasa-Sanchez, Adela Duran Cuevas de Thomasa, and Jose Maria Thomasa Duran was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall

not object—I wonder if we may have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, this bill would grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to three citizens of Spain, a husband, wife, and minor, presently residing in Puerto Rico, where the husband, Thomasa-Sanchez is a physician on the staff of a municipal hospital. They entered Puerto Rico as visitors in August 1949. It is stated that the services of the male beneficiary are urgently needed at the hospital.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder if the Senator from Maryland would agree that, in view of what happened in the House of Representatives yesterday, where several Members of Congress were injured by certain citizens of Puerto Rico, it would be better for the physician to come to the United States for citizenship?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I assume that would be true.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it the opinion of the committee that this physician from Spain is needed in Puerto Rico?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2623) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ENDRE SZENDE, ZSUZSANNA SZENDE, KATALIN SZENDE (A MINOR), AND MARIA SZENDE (A MINOR)

The bill (H. R. 2774) an act for the relief of Endre Szende, Zsuzsanna Szende, Katalin Szende (a minor), and Maria Szende (a minor) was announced as next in order.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER VOTE ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Mr. LENNON. Mr. President, last Friday the senior Senator from Nevada and the junior Senator from North Carolina were absent from the Senate Chamber on official business. In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of rule XIII of the standing rules of the Senate, I now move to reconsider the vote whereby Senate Joint Resolution 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements, failed of passage.

I also move, Mr. President, in connection therewith, to reconsider the vote ordering the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

I have no desire that the motion be considered at this time, as I intend to discuss the matter with the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader at a time convenient to them and to the other Members of the Senate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from North Carolina is only filing a motion?

Mr. LENNON. I am filing a motion. The motion is being formally filed at this time.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is the motion to reconsider open to debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is preserving his right to make the motion within the proper period of time.

Mr. SMATHERS. When will the motion be given consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be brought up by a majority vote at any time.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to ask one further question. I should like to receive from the Chair advice as to whether or not the motion, having been filed, is now open for discussion by other Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion itself is not open for debate at this time, but it would be permissible for Members of the Senate to take 5 minutes' time during the call of the calendar if they wish to discuss the question.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Chair to say that there has to be a bill under consideration on the floor before a discussion can be had relative to the motion of the junior Senator from North Carolina?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order is to consider bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, and remarks can be made under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. SMATHERS. Then the ruling of the Chair is that the motion filed by the junior Senator from North Carolina is actually not open to discussion as such, but it can be discussed in relation to some other bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. If a Senator claims 5 minutes with reference to some bill on the calendar, he can devote the time to remarks on the motion.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. LENNON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the filing of the motion by the Senator from North Carolina means that until the motion is taken up and disposed of by the Senate, it is subject to being considered at any time before the adjournment of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is correct; but a motion would be required in order to take up the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, but the motion of the Senator from North Carolina is subject to being taken up at any time between now and the time the Senate finally adjourns for this session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LENNON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. A motion to take up the motion of the Senator from North Carolina would be debatable, would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is advised that that would depend on when the motion was made to consider the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not mean that it would be debatable during the morning hour, but at any time when debate otherwise would be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the motion were made during the morning hour, as the Senator from Arkansas has intimated, it would not be debatable; but if the motion were made after 2 o'clock, or after the conclusion of the morning hour, it would be debatable.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then am I to understand that the motion would be debatable, and the Senate would vote finally upon the motion to consider the motion of the Senator from North Carolina, just as it would consider any other measure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is presumably so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. After the motion of the Senator from North Carolina had been taken up, it still would be debatable on its merits, would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GORE. Would a motion to take up the motion of the Senator from North Carolina take precedence over whatever matter may be pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the Senator from North Carolina filed his motion, he was entering a privileged motion. The privilege extended merely to entering the motion; it did not displace the regular order of business.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GORE. The inquiry which I submitted to the Chair, following the Chair's reply to the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] was this: Would consideration of a motion to take up the motion to reconsider take precedence over the discussion and consideration of a bill which might then be pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If a motion to take up the motion of the Senator from North Carolina were adopted by a majority vote, it would displace whatever business the Senate was then considering.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COOPER. My inquiry may be redundant, but, as I understand the situation, a motion has been entered by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina to reconsider the vote which was taken on last Friday. At any time other than during the present call of the calendar, or other than during the morning

hour, a Senator could move that the motion of the Senator from North Carolina be taken up. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator obtained recognition, yes.

Mr. COOPER. If there should be a majority vote of the Senators present, the motion just made by the Senator from North Carolina would become the order of business, would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As of this hour, is the Senate operating in the morning hour, or is it operating under a unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is presently operating under an order, entered by unanimous consent, that the Senate consider bills on the calendar to which there is no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That was the impression of the junior Senator from New Jersey, and I simply desired to be certain about it.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I desire to address a question to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], in view of what he has just said. Did I correctly understand him to say that it is not his intention to call up his motion to reconsider, except at a time which would be agreeable to the majority and minority leaders together?

Mr. LENNON. That is my intention.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, if the junior Senator from North Carolina could not obtain complete agreement from either one side or the other, but it still occurred to him that the time was propitious to have his motion taken up, does not the Senator think he should reserve the right, at any time he, in his wisdom, after consulting with the leaders, should decide to do so, to call up the motion, rather than to tie himself to an agreement with both sides?

Mr. LENNON. I think the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Florida is well taken.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not within the province of any Senator to call up the motion at any time he sees fit to call it up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Any Senator can move to have the motion taken up.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is what I thought.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GORE. The Chair has ruled that a motion to take up a motion to reconsider, when it is in order, would, if agreed to by a majority vote, displace any bill pending before the Senate. I have one further inquiry in that connection. Debate upon the motion of the Senator from North Carolina would be in order at any time any Senator wished to take up the motion filed by the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina. Is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At any time after 2 o'clock.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That raises another question. If a motion were made now to take up the motion of the Senator from North Carolina, could the motion of the Senator from North Carolina be taken up without unanimous consent, in view of the fact that the Senate is now operating under a unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It could not, in view of the fact that the Senate is now proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement.

The Senate will now proceed, under its unanimous-consent agreement, with the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection. House bill 2774 had been called when the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] filed his motion. The bill will be stated by title.

ENDRE SZENDE, ZSUZSANNA SZENDE, KATALIN SZENDE (A MINOR), AND MARIA SZENDE (A MINOR)

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2774) for the relief of Endre Szende, Zsuzsanna Szende, Katalin Szende (a minor), and Maria Szende (a minor).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WOLDEMAR JASKOWSKY

The bill (H. R. 3749) for the relief of Woldemar Jaskowsky was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wonder if we may have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. This bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 28-year-old native of Russia and citizen of Germany, who last entered the United States as a student on September 27, 1949. The beneficiary completed his graduate work in physics at the California Institute of Technology, and is now employed as a physicist and chemist, where it is stated that his services are invaluable.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STEBBINS CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1967) for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "the," to strike out "Federal District Court of" and insert "United States District Court for."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BRACEY-WELSH CO., INC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3275) for the relief of Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 4, after the word "claim," to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. ORINDA JOSEPHINE QUIGLEY

The bill (H. R. 3832) for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. This proposed legislation would pay to Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley the sum of $10,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the payment of United States Government life insurance benefits.

Claimant's husband was an aviator on duty in the United State Air Corps. His period of active service was to have terminated by operation of law on April 2, 1940. On March 11, 1940, Lieutenant Quigley's term of service was extended from April 2, 1940, to April 2, 1941.

When Lieutenant Quigley first went on duty he did not request or apply for Government life insurance, but on April 4, 1940, which was 2 days after the commencement of his 1-year extension, he did apply for $10,000 United States Government life insurance and authorized deductions of his pay for that purpose. The application was accepted, but later on the Veterans' Administration decided that, since the application was not made within 120 days of the officer's enlistment, it should be declined.

During the year of extended duty, Lieutenant Quigley died in service in line of duty, as a result of injuries sustained by him. Thereafter, the claimant asked for payment and contended that the insurance should have been granted, because the extended active duty constituted a new term.

According to the file, suit was brought by the claimant in the Federal District Court for the Southern District of Ohio for the $10,000 claimed to be due under this policy, and there is some discussion between counsel that Mrs. Orinda Quigley should proceed by private legislation. It appears from some of the file that counsel for the United States Government, as well as counsel for the Veterans' Administration, advised counsel for the plaintiff that they would oppose a private bill for $10,000, but that if a bill were introduced seeking to pay Mrs. Quigley 50 percent of her claim, they would recommend that no opposition be entered against such a bill.

It is, of course, understood by the committee, as appears in the Veterans' Administration letter of April 23, 1953, that the representations of counsel were without authority and were not binding upon the United States Government and as such the Department rejected an offer of compromise on the part of the plaintiff.

However, the committee is of the opinion that the purpose of this type of insurance is to give to men in the service, in order that they may have no fears as to what may become of their families as a result of the hazardous occupation in which they are employed, some measure of security. In years gone by, many insurance companies would not insure service personnel because of the hazardous occupation in which they found themselves, and it was only through a plan supported by the Government of the United States that insurance could be provided. The very purpose and intent of the system was to provide insurance for service people.

While the committee recognizes that some limitation should be placed on the time in which one should apply, it is not believed that the purpose and intent of the act should be construed so harshly as to defeat the very purposes for which it was intended. The committee is firmly of the opinion that this is one of the cases which comes within that category. It is therefore recommended that the bill, H. R. 3832, be considered favorably.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland, who is an able member of the Committee on the Judiciary, would mind indicating his attitude toward the tendency, of which the pending bill is an example, of constituting, upon given days, the United States Senate into a quasi court of claims to consider such bills as this. Would it be the Senator's opinion that a more judicial manner of handling this kind of claim would be to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Committee on the Judiciary has given a great deal of thought to the question the Senator from Tennessee now raises. On the floor of the Senate yesterday I said that the Court of Claims was constituted solely for the purpose of adjudicating cases arising in contract. The measures now coming before the Senate all involve torts. They are cases that arise independently of contract; they arise through negligence.

I think it would be a mistake for the Senate to extend the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims so as to encompass claims of the character of that under discussion. I do not think jurisdiction over this type of case should be conferred on any court.

Cases of the kind now under consideration come before the Committee on the Judiciary in ever-increasing numbers. They are very burdensome to the committee. I have sat in judgment, so to speak, on a number of such cases. All the committee can do is determine what the law of the case would be if it were being tried before a court, and whether there is any legal justification for paying a claim such as in the instant one, where the application for insurance was not made in the first term of service of the officer but was made in his second term of service. The question arises whether the claimant should be denied relief because of such a technicality. The committee presently exercises its best judgment and passes claims for payment when it considers that course to be justifiable.

On the other hand, if the committee has before it claims where there is no possible liability on the part of the Government, the committee consistently denies such claims.

I have heard it said that the procedure in the Committee on the Judiciary is a hit-and-miss procedure; that some days the committee will deny a claim, and that within a week the committee will allow a claim very similar to the one which it previously denied. I agree with the Senator that that is not good procedure, and that something should be done about it. The duty of devising a different procedure is that of the Committee on the Judiciary. The committee is giving consideration to what should be done about the problem, but up to this time it has not discovered a better method than that now employed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is it not true that, regardless of the need for sound consideration which should be given to the problem, there is now no other method of dealing with such matters?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. There is no other method, and I do not know how the Congress of the United States can establish a judicial body which would deal with claims which would not be justiciable in an ordinary Federal court. That is the problem the committee now confronts.

I freely admit that on some days the committee disapproves a claim and that, perhaps within a week, will allow a claim which is almost identical with the one which it disallowed. However, I do not know of any method by which the problem can be better handled. The claims in most cases have no real legal merit. Persons could not recover on such claims in court. As regards many of the claims, the claimants could not even go into court.

The committee is adjudicating claims on which a person cannot go into court because, for instance, of a statute of limitations, or because there is no liability on the part of the Government. I assume a citizen would feel very much aggrieved if he did not have the right to bring such a claim to the attention of his Congress.

While the adjudication of such claims is burdensome for the Committee on the Judiciary—and at times they are very burdensome to me, as I handle a number of them—I can think of no better way of acting on such claims if we are to give to the American people the consideration to which I think they are entitled.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I might say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that this whole problem has given me much trouble ever since I entered upon my duties as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. I have often thought that the Senate might be able to set up a judicial hearing group to sit and hear such cases for the Senate in a strictly judicial manner. I do not know what name could be given such a court. I do not know whether it would be constitutional. However, many problems are involved when one thinks about establishing a sound legislative procedure to handle such claims other than the manner in which they are now being handled.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It would be my judgment that the Senate should not create such a court, tribunal, or legal body, because if it does, there will be a mushrooming of cases of this kind which are now being satisfactorily handled by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must advise Senators that they are limited to 5 minutes on the bill, and the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Tennessee have exhausted their time.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If the Senator from Tennessee has any further ideas on the problem, the committee certainly will be glad to consider them, because it is searching for every means available in order to do a better job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$10,000."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall take 5 minutes on the committee amendment, only in order to complete the discussion. The distinguished able

senior Senator from Maryland has said that the Court of Claims was created to handle claims arising out of contracts. There is a serious question here involved as to whether the pending claim did not indeed arise out of a contract. However, that question aside, I know of no sound reason—at least, no good reason comes readily to mind—why the Court of Claims could not have conferred upon it jurisdiction in tort cases.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I shall yield in just a moment.

The senior Senator from Maryland has said the Judiciary Committee will, one day, deny a claim, and a few days later will approve a similar bill. Perhaps that is because on one day the full membership of the committee is present; and perhaps on the next occasion very few, if any, members of the committee are present, but, rather, the proceedings may be largely handled by the staff.

Earlier today, the chairman of the committee, in discussing a calendar bill, said no hearing whatsoever was held on it. Yet the bill, granting large monetary benefits to a citizen, had been approved by the committee.

I submit that these circumstances, when taken together, do not quite support the statement of the senior Senator from Maryland that claims of this sort are now being handled in the best possible manner.

I have no concrete suggestion to make. However, having served for 2 years as a member of the minority calendar committee, I must say I can think of far better ways of handling such matters. I am willing to proceed to reach a conclusion on each individual bill and to ask questions in an effort to bring out the facts; but I submit that I can think of far better procedures.

Now I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, let me say, first of all, that the reason why I said the Court of Claims has jurisdiction primarily in cases arising in contract is that the substantial number of cases which come to us are tort cases, i. e., cases which arise independent of contract. Very few contract cases come before our committee.

The next point I should like to make is that if we are to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims, we might just as well let these cases be handled by the district courts. But there is no court in which many of these claims could be prosecuted, because many of them have no legal basis, in the legal sense, but are handled by us strictly as a matter of policy. In other words, as a matter of policy on the part of the United States Government, we see to it that the wife and family of a member of the armed services are taken care of if he dies in service. In some cases we pass a bill permitting a case to be tried in court. In other cases we have our appropriate committee hold a hearing and pass on the claim.

I know of no better way of handling these matters than the way by which we are now handling them.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator from Maryland mean to say that by the passage of this bill or other private claims bills, Congress is establishing a precedent which may operate as a policy?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No, we are not establishing a precedent. But the Judiciary Committee, according to its best judgment, felt that in this particular case the best possible thing to do—in fact, the only thing to do—was to pay this claim. The members of the committee can do only what any other human beings would do. We use our faculties to the best possible advantage, and arrive at a result.

In this case we felt the claim should be paid.

Mr. GORE. But the faculties of Members of the Senate are limited; and when we have a calendar of 100 bills or so, and when the leadership expects the members of the calendar committees to consider all those bills in a brief time, how much consideration can we give to them?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I respectfully say that the Senator from Tennessee should place more dependence upon the Judiciary Committee. That is our job. We prepare reports on these bills, prior to having the bills placed on the calendar, and made ready for Senate consideration.

In cases where we do not hold extensive hearings on a bill, we do have all the factual data before us. We talk to those in the departments downtown who know about these matters, and we obtain their approval. If the department involved disapproves, we request a hearing, and we try to obtain the necessary information.

In short, I believe that we handle these matters in the best possible way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the 5-minute rule, the time available to the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, is it not true that in connection with the case immediately before us, even if we conferred jurisdiction on the Court of Claims, it would have no legal basis for making a decision?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I tried to make that point clear. In most of these cases there is no legal basis for going to court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3832), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2567) to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493) relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 8, after the word "the", to strike out "Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments" and insert "Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, Department of the Air Force, and of the Coast Guard"; and on page 2, line 12, after the word "Navy", strike out "or the Secretary of the Air Force" and insert "the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Treasury."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO—JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 121) amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468) as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this measure?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me say that a measure similar to this was under consideration yesterday in the House of Representatives at the time when the fanatical attack was made from the gallery of the House. So final action was not taken in the House on the joint resolution pending in that body.

The object of this measure is to place our Government in a better position to negotiate with the Government of Mexico, as compared with the position our Government would otherwise be in, if we had no choice except to follow an agreement. In the absence of an agreement, this measure will free the hands of our Government, to permit it to conduct itself as it may see fit to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. COOPER. I object.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that several objections were raised on the minority side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the joint resolution will be passed over.

BILLS PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 215) to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the bill was reported from the Committee on Public Works. I do not see on the floor at this time a member of that committee.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

The bill (S. 2405) to authorize the exchange, upon terms fully protecting the public interest of the United States Public Health quarantine station at Marcus Hook, Pa., for a new quarantine station was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I make the same request in the case of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

PAYMENT FOR LOSSES TO OWNERS OF WELLS IN THE VICINITY OF COLD CREEK DAM

The bill (S. 546) to authorize payment for losses sustained by owners of wells in the vicinity of Cold Brook Dam by reason of the lowering of the level of water in such wells as a result of the construction of Cold Brook Dam was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill by its author?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, this bill is occasioned by the fact that the Corps of Engineers, under an act of Congress, constructed what is known as the Cold Brook Dam. In the construction of the dam, it was necessary to disturb the natural flow of the underground waters in the streambed below the site of the dam. As a result, there was a depletion in the water supply available to 6 or 8 persons. They appealed to the Corps of Engineers, which made an investigation, and agreed that the difficulty arose because of the construction of the dam and the work incident thereto. They hoped the water flow would be restored when the dam was completed. However, that has not occurred.

The bill was introduced with the approval of the Corps of Engineers. Under existing law, the Corps of Engineers did not have authority to take care of the damage sustained in the case of the 7 or 8 wells which are involved.

The bill was introduced more or less with the approval of the Department of the Army. I read from page 3 of the report, in the letter from the Secretary of the Army:

> However, it is obvious that some loss has been sustained by the owners of the wells and that authorization to compensate them to the extent of such loss should be provided.

So the Secretary of the Army recommended approval of the bill. The Bureau of the Budget concurred in that recommendation. It suggested an amendment to permit the Secretary of the Army to make determination of the amount of loss. The Committee on Public Works approved such an amendment. It is proposed to offer that amendment at the time the bill is considered for amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Was the property acquired by process of eminent domain, or by negotiation?

Mr. CASE. The property was not acquired. These are wells below the site of the dam, on the stream bed.

Mr. GORE. The land adjacent to the wells was not acquired?

Mr. CASE. Land was acquired where the dam was constructed, but the underground flows were interfered with by the excavation for the footings of the dam. That work disturbed and interrupted the flow of water in the alluvial soil for the property owners who lived below the dam. Property of householders below the dam was not acquired.

Mr. GORE. Does the Corps of Engineers acknowledge that such footings did in fact disturb the waterflow?

Mr. CASE. Yes; it does. The report of the Secretary of Army seems to be clear on that point. It says:

> While the construction of the dam appears to have had considerable effect on the availability of water in the alluvium below the dam which provides the source of supply to the wells, studies to determine the relationship between the construction of the dam and the depletion of the water supply in the wells are inconclusive and the time lapse since the water supply shortage developed is insufficient to determine, with any degree of certainty, whether the alluvium below the dam will return to its former capacity. However, it is obvious that some loss has been sustained by the owners of the wells and that authorization to compensate them to the extent of such loss should be provided.

That is over the signature of the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator quoted the Secretary as saying that some loss was sustained. By what process did the distinguished Senator determine the amount of loss to be $15,000?

Mr. CASE. That was developed in correspondence and in conference with the Corps of Engineers. In the case of the eight wells which are involved, the losses could probably be covered within that amount. That was the estimate of the Corps of Engineers.

The committee amendment provides that the words "determined by him to have been" shall be inserted between the word "losses" and the word "sustained." So the actual determination of the precise loss in the case of each householder will be up to the Secretary of the Army or his representatives among the personnel of the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to take 5 minutes on my own behalf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota if this case seems similar, in his opinion, to one which came to the attention of the junior Senator from Tennessee today.

Today citizens of the city of Gallatin, Tenn., called upon me. The water supply of the city of Gallatin is located on the reservoir of the Old Hickory Dam, or the reservoir to be created by the Old Hickory Dam. That reservoir will flood the water intake of the city of Gallatin, and also that of the city of Lebanon.

The Corps of Engineers has taken the position that it has no liability to compensate those two municipalities for the inundation of an expensive water intake. In the case of Lebanon, a hole of large circumference is bored down many feet through solid limestone. It is a very expensive undertaking for a comparatively small town. If the Senator can find relief for his constituents through this kind of bill, recognizing damages from corollary effects, could not the junior Senator from Tennessee, in the opinion of the Senator from South Dakota, resort to a similar procedure?

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota would suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that he introduce a bill. I am sure it will receive careful consideration by the Committee on Public Works.

I am not sure, from what the Senator has said, that I could say that the cases are identical. I understood the Senator from Tennessee to say that the Corps of Engineers did not admit liability. In this case, in the negotiations the Corps of Engineers did admit liability, but stated that it had no legal authority to make compensation. It may be that in the case the Senator from Tennessee describes there is also a similar lack of legal authority to render compensation even if liability exists. In this particular case the Corps of Engineers did not question the responsibility or the liability, so to speak, but merely stated that there was no legal authority by which it could make payment from any of its funds.

On the merits of the case, as the Senator describes it, I see considerable similarity. I suggest that the Senator introduce a bill. Certainly if the evidence shows that the city was injured, it should be entitled to receive indemnity for such injury from the Government.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the suggestion of my able friend. I assure him that if I am unable to obtain relief otherwise, I shall follow his suggestion and elicit his support by withholding objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 546.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 546?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "losses",

to insert "determined by him to have been", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, That the Secretary of the Army, through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to compensate the owners of water wells in the vicinity of Cold Brook Dam in South Dakota for losses determined by him to have been sustained by reason of the lowering of the level of water in such wells as a result, wholly or partially, of the construction and operation of Cold Brook Dam. Losses compensable under this act shall include, but not be limited to, (1) the expense of improving or replacing the affected wells so that an amount of water equal to the amount previously obtainable from the affected wells will be available to the owners; (2) the expense of maintaining an adequate supply of water pending the completion of the improvement or replacement of the affected wells; and (3) injuries to property resulting from the lack of an adequate supply of water pending the completion of the improvement or replacement of the affected wells.

SEC. 2. Claims for losses compensable under this act shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Army, through the Chief of Engineers, in such form and in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe. Any such claim shall be submitted not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this act, or not later than 2 years after the lowering of the level of water which is the basis for the claim, whichever is the later.

SEC. 3. Payment of claims for losses compensable under this act shall be made by the Secretary of the Army out of any funds available for flood control.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENT OF TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS PISCATAQUA RIVER AT PORTSMOUTH, N. H.

The bill (S. 2120) to authorize the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority to reconstruct and improve the toll bridge, and the approaches thereto, across the Piscataqua River at Portsmouth, N. H., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. UPTON. Mr. President, the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority is a public agency created by the States of New Hampshire and Maine for the construction and operation of a toll bridge over the Piscataqua River at or near Port Smith, N. H. The Piscataqua River is a navigable stream.

The Congress, by act of July 28, 1937, consented to the construction of the bridge and authorized the imposition of tolls. Section 4 of the act provides that the authority may fix and charge tolls for the use of the bridge, the cost of which shall be amortized within a period not to exceed 45 years from the date of its completion, after which time the bridge will be made free of tolls, or the rates of tolls adjusted to provide a fund not to exceed proper maintenance and operation costs. The bridge was completed on November 8, 1940, and went into operation.

It is now necessary to make certain additions and improvements to the structure and to the approaches. Senate bill 2120 would amend the authorizing act so as to provide for reconstruction and improvement of the bridge and its approaches, and the cost of such works would be deemed to be a part of the original cost of the bridge. In other words, the present expenditures are to be treated as a part of the capital represented by the structure.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is not this bill in somewhat direct violation of the General Bridge Act of 1946?

Mr. UPTON. I cannot answer the Senator's question directly. The policy of the Congress has been determined, so far as this bridge is concerned, in connection with the construction of the bridge. The imposition of tolls has been approved by Congress. The bill would merely allow the additions and improvements to be treated as a part of the cost of the structure, to be amortized with the original cost.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator from New Hampshire believe that the bill should be amended to bring it in harmony with the General Bridge Act?

Mr. UPTON. I see no reason why we should amend the original act for that purpose. The question, if there was any question, was thrashed out at the time the bill was presented. It is merely an amendment of an act passed in 1937, and is in furtherance of the purposes of that original act.

Mr. GORE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2120) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act authorizing the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Piscataqua River at or near Portsmouth, State of New Hampshire," approved July 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 535), is amended by inserting after section 4 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 4A. In addition to the powers granted by the preceding sections of this act, the authority is hereby authorized to reconstruct and to improve such bridge and its approaches and approach facilities. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge, the cost of any such reconstruction or improvement and the cost of acquiring the right of access to such approaches and approach facilities, including reasonable interest and financing costs and the financing costs and expenses incident to the refunding of the outstanding bridge revenue bonds of the authority, shall be deemed to be a part of the cost of such bridge and its approaches."

REFUNDING OF PREMIUMS PAID ON UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE CANCELED FOR FRAUD

The bill (H. R. 5773) to provide for the refund under certain conditions of money paid as premiums on United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance which is canceled for fraud was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RESOLUTIONS PLACED AT THE FOOT OF THE CALENDAR

The resolution (S. Res. 196) increasing the limit of expenditure by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) to print the proceedings in connection with the placing of the statue of Marcus Whitman in the Capitol, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be explained.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask that the concurrent resolution go to the foot of the calendar for the time being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

SUZANNE JACQUET

The bill (S. 58) for the relief of Suzanne Jacquet was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Suzanne Jacquet shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JENO CSEPLO

The bill (S. 233) for the relief of Jeno Cseplo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jeno Cseplo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DR. CHIH CHIANG TENG

The bill (S. 428) for the relief of Dr. Chih Chiang Teng was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. This bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 49-year-old native and citizen of China who last entered the United States as a visitor on April 4, 1949. The beneficiary is an eye specialist and is presently engaged in research work in the Eye Bank Laboratory in New York City, where it is stated that his work is extremely valuable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 428) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Chih Chiang Teng shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JOHAN GERHARD FABER AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 455) for the relief of Johan Gerhard Faber and others was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Johan Gerhard Faber, Dagmar Anna Faber, Hilke Faber, and Frauke Faber shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

DR. THEODORE A. BALOURDAS

The bill (S. 487) for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Balourdas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Theodore A. Balourdas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JOSEPHINE REIGL

The bill (S. 490) for the relief of Josephine Reigl was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 47-year-old native and citizen of Austria who last entered the United States as a visitor on February 2, 1949. The beneficiary resides with a family where she receives room and board in return for assisting in the care of two children. She states that her life would be in danger if she returned to Austria.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 490) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Josephine Reigl shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SISTER MARIE THERESE DE GALZAIN

The bill (S. 518) for the relief of Sister Marie Therese De Galzain was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Marie Therese De Galzain shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MR. AND MRS. IVAN S. AYLESWORTH

The bill (S. 520) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ivan S. Aylesworth was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mr. and Mrs. Ivan S. Aylesworth, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking, prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oath prescribed by section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said Mr. and Mrs. Ivan S. Aylesworth shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

ANNA URWICZ

The bill (S. 552) for the relief of Anna Urwicz was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Urwicz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JOSEF RADZIWILL

The bill (S. 795) for the relief of Josef Radziwill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Josef Radziwill shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MONA LISBET KOFOED NICOLAISEN AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 946) for the relief of Mona Lisbet Kofoed Nicolaisen and others was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mona Lisbet Kofoed Nicolaisen, Leif Martin Borglum Nicolaisen, and Ian Alan Kofoed Nicolaisen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CHUAN HUA LOWE AND HIS WIFE

The bill (S. 997) for the relief of Chuan Hua Lowe and his wife was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Chuan Hua Lowe and his wife, Sien-ung Lowe, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

HELEN KNIGHT WATERS AND ARNOLD ELZEY WATERS, JR.

The bill (S. 1517) for the relief of Helen Knight Waters and Arnold Elzey Waters, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the

Immigration Act, the minor children, Helen Knight Waters and Arnold Elzey Waters, Jr., shall be held and considered to be the natural-born, alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Arnold E. Waters, citizens of the United States.

REV. FRANCIS T. DWYER AND REV. THOMAS MORRISSEY

The bill (S. 1937) for the relief of Rev. Francis T. Dwyer and Rev. Thomas Morrissey was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rev. Francis T. Dwyer and Rev. Thomas Morrissey shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MRS. BETTY THORNTON OR JOZSEFNE TOTH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 98) for the relief of Mrs. Betty Thornton or Jozsefne Toth, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Betty Thornton or Jozsefne Toth shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SISTER CONSTANTINE (TERESIA KAKONYI)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 208) for the relief of Sister Constantine (Teresia Kakonyi), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sister Constantine (Teresia Kakonyi) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TARIK S. KAYNOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 327) for the relief of Tarik S. Kaynor, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Tarik S. Kaynor shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROSA EULER AND CHILD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 584) for the relief of Rosa Euler and her minor child, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosa Euler, the fiancée of John B. Thompson, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Rosa Euler is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said John B. Thompson and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Rosa Euler, and her minor child, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Rosa Euler, and her minor child, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Rosa Euler, and her minor child, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VIRGINIA GRANDE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 937) for the relief of Virginia Grande, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee," to strike out "and head tax," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Virginia Grande shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN SAUDAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1138) for the relief of John Saudas, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Saudas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officers to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. CACILA GOTTHARDT GANGE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1689) for the relief of Mrs. Cacila Gotthardt Gange, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "that", where it occurs the first time, to strike out "Act" and insert "Act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Cacila Gotthardt Gange may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEO A. RIBITZKI

The bill (S. 1863) for the relief of Leo A. Ribitzki and others was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wonder if we may have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a husband, wife, and minor child, natives and citizens of Germany, who last entered the United States on May

18, 1947, and November 18, 1948, respectively. The male beneficiary was a Government witness in a number of treason trials at which convictions were obtained. During the last war he was employed in Berlin as a radio announcer in a supervisory capacity.

Mr. SMATHERS. Where did he work during the last war?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. He worked as a radio announcer in Berlin, in a supervisory capacity.

Mr. SMATHERS. Was he a Fascist or Nazi, or connected with the political party in power?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The beneficiary of the bill arrived in the United States on May 16, 1947, in the first instance.

Mr. SMATHERS. What was the recommendation of the Department of Justice in connection with this bill? Can the Senator tell me what the recommendation was?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Department of Justice has screened these beneficiaries, and the beneficiaries have gone through the test of committee approval, which, as the Senator from Florida knows, is very strict in cases of this kind.

Mr. SMATHERS. Am I to understand that the bill was recommended by all the members of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Leo A. Ribitzki, Mrs. Charlotte Ribitzki, and Marion A. Ribitzki shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GERTRUDE RENA CARLSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2166) for the relief of Gertrude Rena Carlson, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, at the beginning of line 7, to insert "upon payment of the required visa fee", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gertrude Rena Carlson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIA YUTRIAGO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 474) for the relief of Maria Yutriago, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 4, after the name "Maria", to strike out "Yutriago" and insert "Intriago", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Maria Intriago shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Maria Intriago."

SISTER WALFREDA AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 687) for the relief of Sister Walfreda and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SHUI-FOOK FUNG

The bill (H. R. 749) for the relief of Shui-Fook Fung was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ZIA EDIN TAHERI AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1346) for the relief of Zia Edin Taheri and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALFONSO GATTI

The bill (H. R. 2507) for the relief of Alfonso Gatti was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE A. FERRIS

The bill (H. R. 2817) for the relief of George A. Ferris was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, this proposed legislation is to pay the sum of $110.40 to the claimant George A. Ferris, as a refund for the amount of penalties collected from him for overloading his truck while carrying a load of Army freight.

The overloading was admittedly the error of the Anniston Ordnance Depot, Anniston, Ala., in May of 1951. The evidence shows that while en route from Bynum, Ala., to Defense, Tex., with a shipment of ammunition, Mr. Ferris was fined at Greenville, Miss., and Garland, Ark., respectively, in sums aggregating $110.40, because his cargo was overweight in the amount of 6,600 pounds.

As before stated, an investigation disclosed that the overloading of this truck with ammunition was caused by a mistake on the part of the tallyman in checking the same.

It is the view of the committee that inasmuch as the error which caused the fines to be levied against the claimant was caused solely by the mistake on the part of Army personnel, this claimant should not be required to suffer loss which was not caused by any error on his part. It is, therefore, recommended that the bill be considered favorably.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator presents an appealing case, even though the amount of money involved is small. I shall not object, but I wish to inquire of the Senator if this does not, in effect, operate as a payment of a State fine by the Federal Government, a fine which a State would be without authority to levy.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct. The State would be without authority to levy a fine against the Federal Government, but it could levy it against the driver of the vehicle, personally, which it did. The committee felt that the driver of the truck should not be subjected to the penalty when he did not know he had an overload and when it was the obligation of the United States Army to tell him what his load was. He would have known that he had an overload, had not the tallyman made a mistake.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Did the Judiciary Committee consider that the driver was an agent of the Federal Government?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No; I think the driver in this case was an independent contractor or the driver of an independent contractor. He was certainly not an employee of the Federal Government.

Mr. GORE. There is no legal justification, in the opinion of the Senator from Maryland, then, for the payment of this fine by the Government, which fine was levied against the driver of the truck?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct. This is one of those cases where the equitable or moral obligation of the Government to pay a claim, in the opinion of the committee, should be met.

Mr. GORE. I congratulate the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2817) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES SABAH

The bill (H. R. 3005) for the relief of Charles Sabah was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTANTIN AND LUCIA (BERCESCU) TURCANO

The bill (H. R. 3236) for the relief of Constantin and Lucia (Bercescu) Turcano was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JALAL RASHTIAN

The bill (H. R. 3455) for the relief of Jalal Rashtian was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAROSLAV, BOZENA, YVONKA, AND JARKA ONDRICEK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2214) for the relief of Jaroslav, Bozena, Yvonka, and Jarka Ondricek which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the word "deduct", to strike out "four" and insert "the required numbers."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PROHIBITION OF REDUCTION OF RATING OF DISABILITY FOR COMPENSATION OR PENSION PURPOSES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2984) to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disabiilty or permanent total disability for compensation or pension purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the able Senator from Maryland if he will give us an explanation of this bill?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, this bill does not come from the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not know whether there is any member of the Finance Committee on the floor who has knowledge of the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. In view of the fact that there is no Senator on the floor to give us an explanation of the bill, I request unanimous consent that it be placed at the foot of the calendar, in the hope that by the time it is again reached some Senator can give us an explanation of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

ADDITIONAL TIME FOR FILING BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY OF REPORT ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The resolution (S. Res. 215) granting additional time for the filing of a preliminary report by the Committee on the Judiciary on the investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GORE. Reserving the right to object, I would not want to charge that a committee of the United States Senate had been remiss in its duties, particularly a select committee headed by my eminent and distinguished friend, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and of which my senior colleague from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is a very important member; but the fact stands, Mr. President, that this select committee was instructed to file its report by February 28, 1954. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey if such a report has been filed, and, if not, why not?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I am glad to reply to my distinguished friend from Tennessee. The report is in almost final form and will be filed before the expiration of the renewal date if the Senator will be kind enough to grant us the privilege of a renewal date.

The committee was not appointed until the last day of the last session. There were numerous things to do. The committee actually operated only 5 months. It does need a few more days in which to finish and submit to the Senate a report of which it can be proud.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator feel that, technically, he and his committee could be held in contempt of the Senate for failing to comply with the order or direction of the Senate?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. If the Senator would hold me in contempt for that, I would stand convicted.

Mr. GORE. It is not the purpose of the junior Senator from Tennessee even to suggest that the Senator from New Jersey is in contempt, but since a rather liberal license is being taken in connection with the prosecution of citizens, I wish to point out that there is a special obligation on Members of the Senate to live up to the letter of the instructions of this body.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. We are proposing to submit the report to the Senate so as to live up to the letter of the instructions of this body.

Mr. GORE. I congratulate the Senator upon his noble intentions, and I shall not object to the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 215) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That section 3 of Senate Resolution 89, 83d Congress, agreed to June 1, 1953 (authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of juvenile delinquency in the United States), as amended by Senate Resolution 190, 83d Congress, agreed to January 27, 1954, is amended by striking out "February 28, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 15, 1954."

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union was announced as next in order.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON INTERLOCKING SUBVERSION IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) to print, for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, additional copies of hearings on interlocking subversion in Government departments was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution is not in my charge. It is perfectly clear from it that we need to have additional copies of hearings which have been requested by the public generally.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am not prepared to debate the question with the Senator from Maryland. I have a few questions, however.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I shall be glad to answer them if I can.

Mr. GORE. Has the Senator any information with reference to the hearings on interlocking subversion in Government departments? To what departments do they have reference?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The subcommittee of which I am a member has been holding hearings for a period of a year or more involving the Department of State, the Treasury Department, and other departments in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the concurrent resolution concern the printing of a report or of the hearings that originated in the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It concerns a report of the hearings which originated in the Subcommittee on Internal Security.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary not to exceed 25,000 copies of parts 15, 16, 17, and subsequent parts of the hearings entitled "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments," held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 83d Congress.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1954—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PERCENTAGE OF COLONELS IN THE MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5509) to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, relating to the percentage of colonels in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

The bill (S. 2040) to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 2, after line 12, to insert:

SEC. 2. A person becoming entitled to pension or compensation administered by the Veterans' Administration, based upon active military service by reason of this act, may elect within 1 year from the effective date hereof to receive that pension or compensation in lieu of any compensation under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (39 Stat. 742), as amended (5 U. S. C. 751, and the following), to which he may be entitled on the basis of the same service. The election shall be irrevocable and shall not create entitlement to the pension or compensation for periods prior to the date the election is made.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That title I of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (ch. 449, 62 Stat. 356), as amended, is further amended by adding a new section 111 as follows:

"SEC. 111. (a) Active service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps on or after May 14, 1942, and before September 30, 1943, shall be deemed for all purposes except as limited by subsection (b) hereof to be active military service (1) in the status of a commissioned officer in the Army of the United States for the period during which a person held an appointment as an officer in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps and (2) in the status of an enlisted person of the Army of the United States for the period during which a person was enrolled as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps: *Provided*, That active military service in the armed forces is performed before or after the effective date of this act.

"(b) No back pay or allowances shall be paid by reason of subsection (a) of this section, nor shall anything contained in this section be construed as providing service credit for promotion purposes in addition to that otherwise provided by law."

SEC. 2. A person becoming entitled to pension or compensation administered by the Veterans' Administration, based upon active military service by reason of this act, may elect within 1 year from the effective date hereof to receive that pension or compensation in lieu of any compensation under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (39 Stat. 742), as amended (5 U. S. C. 751, and the following), to which he may be entitled on the basis of the same service. The election shall be irrevocable and shall not create entitlement to the pension or compensation for periods prior to the date the election is made.

Mr. DUFF. I send to the desk two amendments to the committee amendment and ask that they be stated. The amendments are merely changes of punctuation and section numbers; they do not affect the substance of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 2, at the beginning of line 13, it is proposed to strike out "SEC. 2." and insert in lieu thereof "(c)"; and in line 15, after the word "service", to strike out "by reason of this act" and insert "as defined in this section."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF].

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title I of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (ch. 449, 62 Stat. 356), as amended, is further amended by adding a new section 111 as follows:

"SEC. 111. (a) Active service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps on or after May 14, 1942, and before September 30, 1943, shall be deemed for all purposes except as limited by subsection (b) hereof to be active military service (1) in the status of a commissioned officer in the Army of the United States for the period during which a person held an appointment as an officer in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps and (2) in the status of an enlisted person of the Army of the United States for the period during which a person was enrolled as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps: *Provided*, That active military service in the armed forces is performed before or after the effective date of this act.

"(b) No back pay or allowances shall be paid by reason of subsection (a) of this section, nor shall anything contained in this section be construed as providing service credit for promotion purposes in addition to that otherwise provided by law.

"(c) A person becoming entitled to pension or compensation administered by the Veterans' Administration, based upon active military service as defined in this section, may elect within one year from the effective date hereof to receive that pension or compensation in lieu of any compensation under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (39 Stat. 742), as amended (5 U. S. C. 751, and the following), to which he may be entitled on the basis of the same service. The election shall be irrevocable and shall not create entitlement to the pension or compensation for periods prior to the date the election is made."

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MAKING APPLICATION FOR TERMINAL-LEAVE PAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 897) to extend the time for making application for terminal-leave pay under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "thereof", to strike out "June 30, 1954" and insert "June 30, 1955"; and after line 6, to insert:

SEC. 2. In view of the previous extensions granted which, together with the extension provided by this act, allow a period of over 7 years during which applications could be filed for terminal-leave pay under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, it is the declared policy of the Congress that no further extension beyond that provided by this act will be granted.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1951" wherever it appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955."

SEC. 2. In view of the previous extensions granted which, together with the extension provided by this act, allow a period of over 7 years during which applications could be filed for terminal-leave pay under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, it is the declared policy of the Congress that no further extension beyond that provided by this act will be granted.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACCEPTANCE OF WAR DECORATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (S. 2247) to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations of certain foreign nations was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Reserving the right to object, I see on the floor the able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], who is the author of the bill. I wonder if we may have him explain the bill?

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, in substance the bill is the same type of bill as was passed after World War II. It provides that any decoration given to a member of the armed services of the United States must be from a country which was associated in arms with the United States. No decoration may be given to any member of our armed services for which a member of the armed services of the country conferring the decoration is not eligible.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DUFF. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does that mean that the United States, in turn, will begin to grant similar decorations to soldiers of other countries who fought alongside our soldiers?

Mr. DUFF. No; there is no provision for reciprocity whatsoever.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it a unilateral program?

Mr. DUFF. This is purely discretionary.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the word "Navy", to strike out "and"; and in the same line, after the word "Force", to insert "and Treasury", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Treasury, members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States holding any office of profit or trust under the United States who have served, subsequent to June 26, 1950, in Korea and such of the waters or lands adjacent thereto as may be designated as combat zones or areas by the respective Secretaries are authorized, during the period of hostilities in Korea in which the United States is engaged, and for 1 year thereafter, to accept from the governments of foreign nations whose personnel are participating with or under the United Nations Command in Korea such decorations, orders, and emblems as may be tendered them, and which are conferred by such governments upon members of their own military forces. For purposes of this act the consent of the Congress required in accordance with clause 8 of section 9, article I of the Constitution is hereby granted. Any such member or former member holding any office of profit or trust under the United States is authorized to wear any decoration, order, or emblem accepted pursuant to authority contained in this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES ACT OF 1933, AND OTHER ACTS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2846) to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940 was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PURCHASE OF METAL FOR MINOR COINS

The bill (S. 2845) to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUSH. The bill would amend section 3528 of the revised statutes so as to increase from $1 million to $2 million the so-called minor coinage metal fund, which is a revolving fund used for the purchase of metals needed for the manufacture of 1-cent and 5-cent coins. The fund is not an appropriation; therefore, the proposed legislation would not involve an increase in Government expenditures.

Does the Senator from Tennessee desire a further explanation?

Mr. GORE. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 340), is hereby further amended by striking out "$1,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the consideration of the calendar with the exception of the bills passed to the foot of the calendar. The clerk will call the first of the bills which went to the foot of the calendar.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS DUE TO FLOOD AND DAMAGE TO LANDS IN LAKE OF THE WOODS

The bill (S. 215) to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I am very sorry the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the author of the bill, is not in the Chamber. The bill which was considered by the Committee on Public Works relates to a treaty between the United States and Canada. Provision was made whereby the Army was to determine certain damages which had occurred. Certain further damages are occurring, and the bill is to authorize the Army to determine the loss or damage sustained, and to report to Congress.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee which reported the bill if he is certain that the Morse formula has been observed.

Mr. MARTIN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that the so-called Morse formula does not apply in any way to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 215) which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, on page 2, line 13, after the word "datum", to strike out "and upon any flooding between elevations one thousand sixty-two and five-tenths and one thousand and sixty-four sea-level datum unaffected by winds", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to investigate, as soon as practicable, all claims filed within 6 months from the date of the enactment of this act for losses and damages caused after August 26, 1937, to inhabitants of the United States by fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods due to artificial obstructions placed in the outlets of such lake pursuant to the convention (signed at Washington on February 24, 1925) between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain providing for the regulation of the level of such lake.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, shall ascertain and determine the loss or damage if any, that may have been sustained by the respective claimants, and to report to the Congress for its consideration the amount or amounts which he finds to be equitably due such claimants, together with a statement in each case of the substantial facts upon which the conclusion is based. The amounts found to be due the respective claimants for such loss or damage may be based upon any flooding exceeding elevation 1,064 sea level datum, as provided in the convention (signed at Washington on February 24, 1925) between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain providing for the regulation of the level of such lake.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for determining the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods, Minn."

EXCHANGE OF PUBLIC HEALTH QUARANTINE STATION AT MARCUS HOOK, PA., FOR A NEW STATION

The bill (S. 2405) to authorize the exchange, upon terms fully protecting the public interest of the United States Public Health quarantine station at Marcus Hook, Pa., for a new quarantine station was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, this bill calls for an exchange of property between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Sun Oil Co. of Philadelphia.

Quarantine service to shipping, entering the Philadelphia area, is provided by the United States Public Health Service through operation of a quarantine station at Marcus Hook. The station consists of a number of buildings over 50 years old and a boat dock occupying about 25 acres. The State of Pennsylvania donated this property to the Federal Government in 1941.

Oil refinery operations around Marcus Hook have created a health and traffic problem for the quarantine station, and a project has been approved for acquiring another site in the area.

The Sun Oil Co. desires the lands occupied by the quarantine station for expansion of its operations, which are adjacent to the quarantine station location.

The bill provides that the new buildings, wharf, and road for the new quarantine station will be constructed on a suitable site in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Administrator of General Services.

The public interest is fully protected by the provisions of the bill, in that the exchange shall not be made unless the Administrator determines that the value of the property received is equal to or exceeds the market value of the property conveyed; or that the Sun Oil Co. will pay the United States an amount equal to the amount by which the market value of the property to be conveyed exceeds the value of the property received by the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2405) which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "the Secretary of the Interior and," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to the provisions of section 2 of this act, the Administrator of General Services, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is hereby authorized, on behalf of the United States, to exchange with the Sun Oil Co., upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator may determine to be in the public interest, the lands and buildings comprising the United States Public Health quarantine station at Marcus Hook, Pa., for a new quarantine station (including land and buildings, a wharf, approaches, roadways, and other improvements incidental thereto, to be constructed in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Administrator) to be provided by the Sun Oil Co. upon a suitable site in the Philadelphia port area.

SEC. 2. The exchange authorized by the first section of this act shall not be made unless the Administrator of General Services determines (1) that the value to the United States of the property to be conveyed to it is equal to or in excess of the market value of the property to be conveyed by the United States, or (2) that the United States is to receive from the Sun Oil Co., upon conveyance of the properties to be exchanged, a sum of money equal to the amount by which the market value of the property to be conveyed by the United States exceeds the value to the United States of the property to be conveyed to the United States. Any money received by the United States in connection with the exchange shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

The resolution (S. Res. 196) increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 83d Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 812, 831).

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH PLACING OF STATUE OF MARCUS WHITMAN IN CAPITOL

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) to print the proceedings in connection with the placing of the statue of Marcus Whitman in the Capitol was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there be printed with illustrations and bound, in such style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, the proceedings in Congress at the unveiling in the rotunda, together with such other matter as the joint committee may deem pertinent thereto, upon the occasion of the acceptance of the statue of Marcus Whitman, presented by the State of Washington, 5,000 copies; of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and for the use and distribution by the Senators from Washington; and the remaining 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and for the use of and the distribution by the Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer, who shall provide suitable illustrations to be bound with these proceedings.

PROHIBITION OF REDUCTION OF RATING OF TOTAL OR PERMANENT DISABILITY FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES

The bill (H. R. 2984) to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation or pension purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a short time ago I asked that the bill go over only because no one was here to explain it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I shall be glad to explain the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. House bill 2984 provides that a veteran who has either been classified or determined to be totally disabled, and who has been drawing compensation as such for a period of 20 years, or who has been declared totally and permanently disabled and whose status has been undisturbed for a period of 20 years, shall be finally presumed to be totally and permanently disabled insofar as benefits of pension, compensation, or insurance are concerned.

The bill was approved and passed unanimously by the House at the last session, and it was reported unanimously by the Committee on Finance of the Senate, with an amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. I presume the Senator would agree that the passage of the bill would not result in costing the Government very much money, in any event. Am I correct?

Mr. KERR. The statement of the Veterans' Administration was that the cost would be very slight.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 4, after the word "for," it is proposed to strike out "compensation or pension" and insert "compensation, pension, or insurance."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oklahoma take the position that even though a veteran may become well, nevertheless the Congress should lay down a policy whereby, if he has been sick or disabled for 20 years, he is to be declared by the Congress as sick or disabled for the remainder of his life?

Mr. KERR. The possibility of such a situation arising exists, but I would remind the distinguished Senator it is very, very remote, because, in the first place, the bill applies to two groups of veterans.

It applies to a veteran who, after a thorough examination, observation, and treatment, has been found, and therefore declared, to be totally and permanently disabled. Often the total and permanent disability arises from the loss of limbs or sight, or other impairment which, under the law, either presumes permanent and total disability, or, according to the standards of physicians, amounts to total and permanent disability. That is one group to which the bill applies and the Senator can understand that the possibility of such a patient becoming well after 20 years, aside from a miraculous healing, is very remote.

The other group of veterans to which the bill applies are those who were originally found to be totally disabled, and the Veterans' Administration examines them rather frequently for the first 5 years, during which time they are continuously found to be totally disabled. Thereafter such patients are examined frequently; and only when they have been so examined and found to have been totally disabled for a period of 20 years does the presumption arise.

I also wish to state to the distinguished Senator that the Veterans' Administration felt, and the committee shared their views, that a mental hazard existed in one who was actually totally disabled, was found to be totally disabled, and was aware of his condition.

The patient may have some slight improvement; but mistakes which may be made, or arbitrary rulings which may be made, in declaring the patient to be less disabled than he actually was, constitute a mental hazard. In the opinion of the Veterans' Administration, and in the opinion of the committee, such a mental hazard is a serious matter and is suffi-

cient to outweigh whatever cost might result from the passage of the bill, which would indulge this presumption in the case of those veterans who have been found, declared, and demonstrated to be totally disabled for a period of 20 years. That is the other group to which the law applies.

Mr. GORE. I do not object, under those circumstances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES ACT OF 1933, AND OTHER ACTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now consider Senate bill 2846, relating to the amendment of certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2846) to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, yesterday, when the calendar was called, I objected to consideration of Calendar 1037, S. 2846, thinking that some Senators not present on the floor might be interested in the bill.

The bill is the result of a very careful review of the Securities Acts of 1933 and 1934 by a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The bill has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. As a member of the subcommittee and of the full committee, I cannot recall any objection. Am I correct in my recollection?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. The changes are mostly of a technical nature; are they not?

Mr. BUSH. The changes are designed mainly to improve the machinery for administering the acts. Nothing is proposed which would in any way change the main purpose of the security acts, which is full disclosure in connection with the offering of securities, and the protection of the investor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will yield further to me, I wish to thank him, because what he has stated was my understanding, as a member of the subcommittee; and I think it was also the understanding of the full committee.

The bill was approved unanimously by both the subcommittee and the full committee, under the able leadership of the Senator from Connecticut. I knew of no objection to the bill, except that at one time the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] said he might reserve the right to object. However, I have had the privilege of discussing that matter with him, and I understood him to say he did not intend to object.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will yield to me, let me say that the Senator from South Carolina has correctly stated the matter. I did have some reservations about the bill, but my doubts were satisfied by the explanation which was given to me by the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I concur in what the Senator from Connecticut has stated, namely, that the bill will not change the basic law for the protection of stockholders. On the contrary, the bill will merely make certain adjustments which it is necessary to have made.

Mr. BUSH. In fact, the bill actually improves the law, does it not?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think it is necessary for me, as a member of the minority calendar committee, to ask the Senator from Connecticut to tell us what the bill will do. We have been told that it is a good bill and that it will protect investors; but will the Senator from Connecticut tell us what the bill will actually accomplish?

Mr. BUSH. I shall be glad to do so, for as long as time is available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the 5-minute rule, the Senator from Connecticut has 2 minutes still available.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Connecticut be allowed sufficient time to make the explanation, notwithstanding the 5-minute rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, the several principal features of the bill are as follows: In the first place, it contains an amendment to the act which will permit those who have securities to disseminate information regarding them during the waiting period which now is provided for—in other words, during the 20-day waiting period. Heretofore, during that length of time, there have been considerable confusion and considerable doubt regarding the rights of an underwriter in connection with the offering of securities. During that period of time, he has not been allowed to offer the securities for sale. Nevertheless, during that time he has disseminated information about the securities.

Under this amendment, he would be allowed during that time to offer the securities for sale, but not to take orders until the effective date declared by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut inform us whether he is satisfied that that provision will constitute a protection of investors?

Mr. BUSH. I am satisfied that it will. I think it will be of considerable benefit to investors, because it will remove any inhibition on the person or firm offering securities from explaining in full the securities and from circulating information about them, with an intent to sell them.

Heretofore, during that period information about such securities has been circulated in a very restricted way; and the smaller investors, particularly, frequently are shut out, so to speak, especially in the case of the more desirable issues, because they do not have access to what might be termed undercover disclosures, and so forth, which have been made.

In other words, I consider this provision an improvement, in connection with the intent of the basic law, which is full disclosure. This provision will not foreclose any liabilities in the case of misrepresentation, or anything of the sort; nor will a person be permitted to confirm an order during that period of time; he will only be able to explain the securities he offers for sale, and he will be able to offer them.

Mr. SMATHERS. I understand the Senator from Connecticut to state that because it will be possible for the information to be disseminated, such an arrangement will be an advantage to the small stock purchasers, who heretofore have not had the necessary information. Under this arrangement, they will be able to obtain information, in order to be enabled to make purchases of securities in which they are interested. Is that correct?

Mr. BUSH. Not entirely, but the bill is of that nature. In other words, it will widen the market, so to speak; it will remove from those who offer securities the present inhibition, in that it will permit them to disseminate information more widely and actually to offer the securities.

Heretofore they have been allowed to issue only the so-called "red herring" prospectuses, which contain disclaimers that the securities are actually being offered. The bill will permit greater latitude in that respect; it will remove the restrictions which have led to confusion. In fact, restrictions of this sort have accomplished no good result. The bill will make it possible for security dealers to offer securities during that period of time, but not to take orders until the effective date.

I may say there is absolutely no objection to the bill. In fact, everyone who is familiar with the industry—investors and sellers alike—regards the bill as a definite improvement.

Mr. SMATHERS. Of course, what the Senator from Connecticut has just said

does not cover all the provisions of the bill, does it?

Mr. BUSH. Oh, no.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut that a seller—and I confess I am speaking of a matter about which I have very little knowledge—will, under the bill, be able to take orders prior to the time when the 20-day period has elapsed?

Mr. BUSH. No; he will not be able to take orders during that period, but he will be able to offer the securities, with the result that during that time persons who are interested will be able to consider whether they will place an order for the securities on the effective date.

Mr. SMATHERS. I understand.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. This bill is a very complicated one, and deals with a technical subject. The bill is 19 pages long, and the report accompanying it is 29 pages long. Much of the report is not only in fine print, but also is stated in technical language.

Except for one reason, I would object to consideration of the bill during the call of the Consent Calendar. However, the fact that the ranking minority member of the committee is on the floor, would place me in a highly presumptuous position if I were to object. Therefore, I shall not object; but in my humble opinion it is questionable whether such technical proposed legislation, major in scope, should even be considered during the call of the Consent Calendar, regardless of what Senators may be present.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee will recall that previously I, myself, made a similar statement, in asking that the bill go over.

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. I had not intended to ask that the bill be taken up today, and would not have done so except for the suggestion of my very good friend, the ranking minority member and former chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and in view of the further fact that the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] has acquiesced in the request. I felt that if they wished to have the bill taken up, then, acting on their advice, I would be glad to have it considered and acted upon. But I do not wish to have my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], feel that I am taking advantage of their very active and friendly interest in this matter. If it is desired to have the bill passed over, it will be satisfactory to me to have that course followed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to make a similar statement, because so far as I know there has been no objection to the bill on the part of any stockholders or brokers or others. A long series of hearings were held on the bill. Certainly I would be the last one to try to rush through a measure, as my colleagues realize.

However, in view of the fact that the bill was on the calendar, and in view of the further fact that, following the calendar call, we shall proceed to consider the Hawaiian statehood bill and other measures which will keep us occupied for a long time, I felt that if there were no objection to the bill, it might be the part of wisdom to pass it.

On the other hand, I wish it distinctly understood that I do not advocate the passage, during the call of the Consent Calendar, of a technical bill—as my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has said, it is technical—comprising a number of pages.

Nevertheless, this bill includes the substance of what we have been going over for years and years. At the hearings this year I do not recall there was a single objector. I did not attend all the hearings this year, although in past years I have attended all of them. Therefore, I asked the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] whether there was any objection at the hearings this year. They said that no broker or stockholder opposed the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. BUSH. I certainly think it is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me at this time?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. How urgent is it that we take action today on the bill?

Mr. BUSH. I think there is a slight urgency—although, as I have said, I am not pressing for action today on the bill, and I hope the Senator from Florida fully understands that point.

The urgency—if it can properly be called such—connected with the bill is that it must go to the House of Representatives, which must hold its own hearings on it. It is a part of the general program of the President to review the existing legislation on this subject. It has not been done for 20 years. This is a part of the program which we want to get on with. We would like to dispose of this measure and get it over to the House.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I share the sentiments of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. We have a certain responsibility not to permit legislation of general import, which is technical in nature, to pass on the call of the calendar. We do not profess to be experts. We are not members of all the committees. Actually we do not know too much about the bill. It might be passed, and later Senators might say to us, "This is a bill which we naturally believed was of such tremendous importance that it never would be passed on the call of the calendar."

The only reason we ask these questions and make even temporary objection is to give any Senator who may know of an objection an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, ample hearings will be held in the House, as the Senator from Connecticut has said. Then there will be a conference. I suppose it will be sometime around May before the conference report is submitted.

Mr. SMATHERS. Even if the bill were taken up on motion, there very probably would not be a greater number of Senators present to discuss it than are present at this moment. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] all say that they see no sleepers in the bill, that the investor will be protected, and that the bill is not designed to help the fat people grow fatter.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Under those circumstances I do not see that there is any practical purpose to be served in registering further objection, so I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Banking and Currency were, on page 3, line 23, after the word "was" to strike out "made" and insert "made,"; in line 24, after the word "advertisement", strike out "letter of" and insert "letter, or"; on page 4, line 6, after the word "or", where it occurs the first time, strike out "regulations," and insert "regulations"; on page 7, line 8, after the word "stop", strike out "order," and insert "order"; in the same line, after the word "or", where it occurs the second time, strike out "prior" and insert "(prior"; in line 9, after the word "registration", strike out "statement" and insert "statement)"; in line 10, after the word "or", strike out "examination," and insert "examination"; on page 9, line 14, after the word "be", strike out "used" and insert "used,"; on page 12, line 18, after the word "obtained", insert "(if such statement is required by rules or regulations under paragraphs (1) or (2) of subsection (b) of section 306)"; in line 22, after the word "thereof", strike out "and"; on page 16, line 6, after the word "stop", strike out "order," and insert "order"; in the same line, after the word "or", where it occurs the second time, strike out "prior to qualification" and insert "(prior to qualification)", and in line 7, after the word "or", strike out "examination," and insert "examination", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO SECURITIES ACT OF 1933, AS AMENDED

SECTION 1. Paragraph (3) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The term 'sale' or 'sell' shall include every contract of sale or disposition of a security or interest in a security, for value. The term 'offer to sell', 'offer for sale', or 'offer' shall include every attempt or offer to dispose of, or solicitation of an offer to buy, a security or interest in a security, for value. The terms defined in this paragraph and the term 'offer to buy' as used in subsection (c) of section 5 shall not include preliminary negotiations or agreements between an issuer (or any person directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by an issuer, or under direct or indirect common control with an issuer) and any underwriter or among underwriters who are or are to be in pivity of contact with an issuer (or any person directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by an issuer, or under direct or indirect common control with an issuer). Any security given or delivered with, or as a bonus on account of, any purchase of securities or any other thing, shall be conclusively presumed to constitute a part of the subject of such purchase and to have been offered and sold for value. The issue or transfer of a right or privilege, when originally issued or transferred with a security,

giving the holder of such security the right to convert such security into another security of the same issuer or of another person, or giving a right to subscribe to another security of the same issuer or of another person, which right cannot be exercised until some future date, shall not be deemed to be an offer or sale of such other security; but the issue or transfer of such other security upon the exercise of such right of conversion or subscription shall be deemed a sale of such other security."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (8) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"(8) The term 'registration statement' means the statement provided for in section 6, and includes any amendment thereto and any report, document, or memorandum filed as part of such statement or incorporated therein by reference."

SEC. 3. Paragraph (10) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(10) The term 'prospectus' means any prospectus, notice, circular, advertisement, letter, or communication writen or by radio or television, which offers any security for sale or confirms the sale of any security; except that (a) a communication sent or given after the effective date of the registration statement (other than a prospectus permitted under subsection (b) of section 10) shall not be deemed a prospectus if it is proved that prior to or at the same time with such communication a written prospectus meeting the requirements of subsection (a) of section 10 at the time of such communication was sent or given to the person to whom the communication was made, and (b) a notice, circular, advertisement, letter, or communication in respect of a security shall not be deemed to be a prospectus if it states from whom a written prospectus meeting the requirements of section 10 may be obtained and, in addition, does no more than identify the security, state the price thereof, state by whom orders will be executed, and contain such other information as the Commission, by rules or regulations deemed necessary or appropriate in the public interest and for the protection of investors, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed therein, may permit."

SEC. 4. Paragraph (11) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended by inserting the words "offers or" before the word "sells."

SEC. 5. Paragraph (11) of section 3 (a) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by inserting the words "offered and" before the word "sold."

SEC. 6. Subsection (b) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by striking out "$300,000" where it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000."

SEC. 7. Section 4 (1) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The provisions of section 5 shall not apply to any of the following transactions:

"(1) Transactions by any person other than an issuer, underwriter, or dealer; transactions by an issuer not involving any public offering; or transactions by a dealer (including an underwriter no longer acting as an underwriter in respect of the security involved in such transaction), except transactions taking place prior to the expiration of 40 days after the first date upon which the security was bona fide offered to the public by the issuer or by or through an underwriter and transactions in a security as to which a registration statement has been filed taking place prior to the expiration of 40 days after the effective date of such registration statement or prior to the expiration of 40 days after the first date upon which the security was bona fide offered to the public by the issuer or by or through an underwriter after such effective date, whichever is later (excluding in the computation of such 40 days any time during which a stop order issued under section 8 is in effect as to the security), and except transactions as to securities constituting the whole or a part of an unsold allotment to or subscription by such dealer as a participant in the distribution of such securities by the issuer or by or through an underwriter."

SEC. 8. Section 5 of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Unless a registration statement is in effect as to a security, it shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly—

"(1) to make use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to sell such security through the use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise; or

"(2) to carry or cause to be carried through the mails or in interstate commerce, by any means or instruments of transportation, any such security for the purpose of sale or for delivery after sale.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly—

"(1) to make use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to carry or transmit any prospectus relating to any security with respect to which a registration statement has been filed under this title, unless such prospectus meets the requirements of section 10; or

"(2) to carry or cause to be carried through the mails or in interstate commerce any such security for the purpose of sale or for delivery after sale, unless accompanied or preceded by a prospectus that meets the requirements of subsection (a) of section 10.

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to make use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to offer to sell or offer to buy through the use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise any security, unless a registration statement has been filed as to such security, or while the registration statement is the subject of a refusal order or stop order or (prior to the effective date of the registration statement) any public proceeding or examination under section 8."

SEC. 9. Section 10 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except to the extent otherwise permitted or required pursuant to this subsection or subsections (c), (d), or (e)—

"(1) a prospectus relating to a security other than a security issued by a foreign government or political subdivision thereof, shall contain the information contained in the registration statement, but it need not include the documents referred to in paragraphs (28) to (32), inclusive, of schedule A;

"(2) a prospectus relating to a security issued by a foreign government or political subdivision thereof shall contain the information contained in the registration statement, but it need not include the documents referred to in paragraphs (13) and (14) of schedule B;

"(3) nothwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection (a) when a prospectus is used more than 9 months after the effective date of the registration statement, the information contained therein shall be as of a date not more than 16 months prior to such use, so far as such information is known to the user of such prospectus or can be furnished by such user without unreasonable effort or expense;

"(4) there may be omitted from any prospectus any of the information required under this subsection (a) which the Commission may by rules or regulations designate as not being necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

"(b) In addition to the prospectus permitted or required in subsection (a), the Commission shall by rules or regulations deemed necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors permit the use of a prospectus for the purposes of subsection (b) (1) of section 5 which omits in part or summarizes information in the prospectus specified in subsection (a). A prospectus permitted under this subsection shall, except to the extent the Commission by rules or regulations deemed necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors otherwise provides, be filed as part of the registration statement but shall not be deemed a part of such registration statement for the purposes of section 11. The Commission may at any time issue an order preventing or suspending the use of a prospectus permitted under this subsection (b), if it has reason to believe that such prospectus has not been filed (if required to be filed as part of the registration statement) or includes any untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state any material fact required to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements therein, in the light of the circumstances under which such prospectus is or is to be used, not misleading. Upon issuance of an order under this subsection, the Commission shall give notice of the issuance of such order and opportunity for hearing by personal service or the sending of confirmed telegraphic notice. The Commission shall vacate or modify the order at any time for good cause or if such prospectus has been filed or amended in accordance with such order.

"(c) Any prospectus shall contain such other information as the Commission may by rules or regulations require as being necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

"(d) In the exercise of its powers under subsections (a), (b), or (c), the Commission shall have authority to classify prospectuses according to the nature and circumstances of their use or the nature of the security, issue, issuer, or otherwise, and, by rules and regulations and subject to such terms and conditions as it shall specify therein, to prescribe as to each class the form and contents which it may find appropriate and consistent with the public interest and the protection of investors.

"(e) The statements or information required to be included in a prospectus by or under authority of subsections (a), (b), (c), or (d), when written, shall be placed in a conspicuous part of the prospectus and, except as otherwise permitted by rules or regulations, in type as large as that used generally in the body of the prospectus.

"(f) In any case where a prospectus consists of a radio or television broadcast, copies thereof shall be filed with the Commission under such rules and regulations as it shall prescribe. The Commission may by rules and regulations require the filing with it of forms and prospectuses used in connection with the offer or sale of securities registered under this title."

SEC. 10. Section 12 of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended by inserting the words "offers or" before the word "sells" in clauses (1) and (2) thereof.

SEC. 11. Section 17 (a) of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended by inserting the words "offer or" before the word "sale" in the introductory clause thereof.

SEC. 12. Section 22 (a) of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended by inserting the words "offer or" before the word "sale" in the second sentence thereof.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED

SEC. 201. Paragraph (d) of section 11 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended

by striking out the words "six months" where they appear in such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the words "thirty days."

SEC. 202. The last sentence of paragraph (d) of section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is hereby repealed.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO TRUST INDENTURE ACT OF 1939

SEC. 301. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 303 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended by deleting the words "as heretofore amended."

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 303 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The terms 'sale', 'sell', 'offer to sell', 'offer for sale', and 'offer' shall include all transactions included in such terms as provided in paragraph (3) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, except that an offer or sale of a certificate of interest or participation shall be deemed an offer or sale of the security or securities in which such certificate evidences an interest or participation if, and only if, such certificate gives the holder thereof the right to convert the same into such security or securities."

(c) Paragraph (3) of section 303 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The term 'prospectus' shall have the meaning assigned to such term in paragraph (10) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, except that in the case of securities which are not registered under the Securities Act of 1933, such term shall not include any communication (A) if it is proved that prior to or at the same time with such communication a written statement if any required by section 306 was sent or given to the persons to whom the communication was made, or (B) if such communication states from whom such statement may be obtained (if such statement is required by rules or regulations under paragraphs (1) or (2) of subsection (b) of section 306) and, in addition, does no more than identify the security, state the price thereof, state by whom orders will be executed and contain such other information as the Commission, by rules or regulations deemed necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed therein, may permit."

(d) Paragraph (4) of section 303 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended by inserting the words "offers or" before the word "sells."

SEC. 302. Subsection (b) of section 304 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended by deleting the words "as heretofore amended."

SEC. 303. Subsection (c) of section 305 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) A prospectus relating to any such security shall include to the extent the Commission may prescribe by rules and regulations as necessary and appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, as though such inclusion were required by section 10 of the Securities Act of 1933, a written statement containing the analysis set forth in the registration statement, of any indenture provisions with respect to the matters specified in paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section, together with a supplementary analysis, prepared by the Commission, of such provisions and of the effect thereof, if, in the opinion of the Commission, the inclusion of such supplementary analysis is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, and the Commission so declares by order after notice and, if demanded by the issuer, opportunity for hearing thereon. Such order shall be entered prior to the effective date of registration, except that if opportunity for hearing thereon is demanded by the issuer such order shall be entered within a reasonable time after such opportunity for hearing."

SEC. 304. Section 306 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 306. (a) In the case of any security which is not registered under the Securities Act of 1933 and to which this subsection is applicable notwithstanding the provisions of section 304, unless such security has been or is to be issued under an indenture and an application for qualification is effective as to such indenture, it shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly—

"(1) to make use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to sell such security through the use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise; or

"(2) to carry or cause to be carried through the mails or in interstate commerce, by any means or instruments of transportation, any such security for the purpose of sale or for delivery after sale.

"(b) In the case of any security which is not registered under the Securities Act of 1933, but which has been or is to be issued under an indenture as to which an application for qualification is effective, it shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly—

"(1) to make use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to carry or transmit any prospectus relating to any such security, unless such prospectus, to the extent the Commission may prescribe by rules and regulations as necessary and appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, includes or is accompanied by a written statement that contains the information specified in subsection (c) of section 305; or

"(2) to carry or to cause to be carried through the mails or in interstate commerce any such security for the purpose of sale or for delivery after sale, unless, to the extent the Commission may prescribe by rules and regulations as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, accompanied or preceded by a written statement that contains the information specified in subsection (c) of section 305.

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to make use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to offer to sell through the use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise any security which is not registered under the Securities Act of 1933 and to which this subsection is applicable notwithstanding the provisions of section 304, unless such security has been or is to be issued under an indenture and an application for qualification has been filed as to such indenture, or while the application is the subject of a refusal order or stop order or (prior to qualification) any public proceeding or examination under section 307 (c)."

SEC. 305. Section 324 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 is amended by deleting the words "issuing or selling" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "offering, selling, or issuing."

TITLE IV—AMENDMENTS TO INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940

SEC. 401. Section 2 (a) (30) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 is amended to read as follows:

"(30) 'Prospectus,' as used in section 22, means a written prospectus intended to meet the requirements of section 10 (a) of the Securities Act of 1933 and currently in use. As used elsewhere, 'prospectus' means a prospectus as defined in the Securities Act of 1933."

SEC. 402. Subsection (d) of section 24 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "The exemption provided by the third clause of section 4 (1) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, shall not apply to any transaction in a security issued by a face-amount certificate company or in a redeemable security issued by an open-end management company or unit investment trust, if any other security of the same class is currently being offered or sold by the issuer or by or through an underwriter in a distribution which is not exempted from section 5 of said act, except to such extent and subject to such terms and conditions as the Commission, having due regard for the public interest and the protection of investors, may prescribe by rules or regulations with respect to any class of persons, securities, or transactions."

SEC. 403. Section 24 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (e) as follows:

"(e) (1) A registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 relating to a security issued by a face-amount certificate company or a redeemable security issued by an open-end management company or unit investment trust may be amended after its effective date so as to increase the securities specified therein as proposed to be offered. At the time of filing such amendment there shall be paid to the Commission a fee, calculated in the manner specified in section 6 (b) of said act, with respect to the additional securities therein proposed to be offered.

"(2) The filing of such an amendment to a registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933 shall not be deemed to have taken place unless it is accompanied by a United States postal money order or a certified bank check or cash for the amount of the fee required under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(3) For the purposes of section 11 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the effective date of the latest amendment filed pursuant to this subsection or otherwise shall be deemed the effective date of the registration statement with respect to securities sold after such amendment shall have become effective. For the purposes of section 13 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, no such security shall be deemed to have been bona fide offered to the public prior to the effective date of the latest amendment filed pursuant to this subsection. Except to the extent the Commission otherwise provides by rules or regulations as appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, no prospectus relating to a security issued by a face-amount certificate company or a redeemable security issued by an open-end management company or unit investment trust which varies for the purposes of subsection (a) (3) of section 10 of the Securities Act of 1933 from the latest prospectus filed as a part of the registration statement shall be deemed to meet the requirements of said section 10 unless filed as part of an amendment to the registration statement under said act and such amendment has become effective."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM M. SMITH

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 972, House bill 2387. Earlier in the day I objected to the consideration of the bill, frankly, on the ground that I thought insufficient time had been given to obtain an answer to a question. That question has now been answered to my satisfaction. Therefore I withdraw my

objection and ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 2387?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2387) for the relief of William M. Smith was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the call of the calendar.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1954

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have today introduced a bill "to encourage a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture."

Although this bill does not embody all the recommendations for an agricultural program which the administration might desire, I have reason to believe that, as far as they go, its provisions do meet with the approval of the administration.

I am introducing this bill today in order that hearings may get under way on Thursday of this week.

It is obvious that, with the huge accumulation of excess supplies of farm commodities and the decreasing prices which the producers are receiving for certain important commodities, improvements must be made in the existing farm program, and be made without delay.

It is my expectation that by starting hearings later this week such hearings may be concluded by early April and any necessary legislation be recommended to the Congress soon thereafter.

Title I of the bill which I have introduced provides for the setting aside of approximately $2½ billion worth of wheat, upland cotton, cottonseed oil, and dairy products.

This commodity set-aside "shall be excluded from the computation of 'carryover' for the purpose of determining the price-support level for such commodity under the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and related legislation."

By this means wheat and cotton farmers can look forward to an early lifting of controls to which they seem permanently relegated by the present rigid system.

It also holds the promise of eliminating the threat of extending controls to many other crops the market for which may be undermined by acreage diverted from wheat, corn, and cotton production.

The bill provides methods by which such commodity "set aside" may be reduced as follows:

1. Transfer for foreign-aid purposes, including disaster and other relief purposes outside the United States, to the extent not inconsistent with other legislation.

2. Sale or barter (including barter for strategic materials) to develop new or expanded markets for American agricultural commodities.

3. Donation to school-lunch programs.

4. Transfer to the national stockpile established pursuant to the act of June 7, 1939, as amended (50 U. S. C. 98–98h), without reimbursement from funds appropriated for the purposes of the act.

5. Donation, sale, or other disposition for research, experimental, or educational purposes.

6. Donation, sale, or other disposition for disaster-relief purposes in the United States or to meet any national emergency declared by the President.

7. Sale for unrestricted use to meet a need for increased supplies at not less than 105 percent of the parity price in the case of agricultural commodities and a price reflecting 105 percent of the parity price of the agricultural commodity in the case of products of agricultural commodities.

The Commodity Credit Corporation would also have authority to sell any commodity covered by the commodity "set aside" for the purpose of rotating stocks or consolidating inventories in order to prevent loss from spoilage.

Title II of the bill contains several important provisions.

First, it would provide for a more rapid change in the support level for corn.

It would delete tung nuts and honey from the mandatory list of supported commodities placing these commodities as well as Irish potatoes in the same category as other commodities for which support is authorized but not mandatory.

It would require the Secretary of Agriculture to take action in regard to diverted acres which would prevent the use of such land from distressing the producers of other commodities.

It would include State penal and corrective institutions among the list of public and private agencies to which surplus commodities could be contributed.

It would also authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the cost of processing, packaging, transporting, and handling commodities to be delivered to a Federal or State agency or to shipside for use outside the United States.

Title III of the bill provides for a gradual transition of the basic commodities from the old to the modernized parity formula in steps of 5 percentage points of the old parity per year until the change has been accomplished.

This provision would begin to take effect after the 1955 crop year.

It would also provide for the use of the last 5 calendar years rather than the last 10 in determining the normal yield per acre for wheat and corn.

It would strike out of the law the provision for marketing quotas in the case of corn and leave provision for acreage allotments only for those years when controls may be necessary.

Title IV of the bill would amend the Marketing Agreements Act of 1937 so as to authorize the issuance of orders regulating the handling of honey, fruits, and vegetables for canning or freezing, but prohibits the regulation of canned or frozen fruits or vegetables.

It would also authorize marketing research projects to be paid from funds collected under marketing orders for other commodities as is now done in the case of milk.

Title V of the bill would extend for an additional 2 years, the authority for a Federal agricultural conservation program.

If at any time during this 2-year period any State enacts adequate State legislation and submits satisfactory State plans to the Secretary, the administration of such plans would be delegated to the State, as contemplated by section 7a of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936.

For those States which do not submit satisfactory plans, present provisions of the act would remain in full force and effect.

I do not claim perfection for the bill which I have introduced.

Many witnesses will be heard. There will be opposition to some of its provisions.

There will be recommendations for including provisions which are not presently in the bill.

There are those who desire to have provision for a continuance of rigid 90 percent supports without regard to supply made a mandatory part of any farm program.

I would specifically call attention at this time to the fact that the legislation I am proposing, added to that enacted in 1948 and 1949, will permanently guarantee a high level of support—even 90 percent—if farmers will do their part in keeping production in line.

I trust that the Members of this Senate will keep a fair and open mind on this subject.

A farm program must be devised which will give farmers better access to both foreign and domestic markets.

It must be one which will maintain agricultural income at a high level for the national economy is dependent to a great extent upon the purchasing power of the American farmer.

The program we devise must be in the interest of all the people and must assure farm production adequate to meet the needs of consumers industry and our export demands.

A complete farm program cannot be contained in any one piece of legislation.

It will depend not alone on legislation, but on good administration as well and particularly upon the wholehearted actions of farmers themselves.

We have a challenging issue before us. We have the ability to meet it adequately.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, at the suggestion of the majority leader, I suggest absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WORLD CONDITIONS—NEGLECT OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, almost before the echoes of the final salvos of World War II had died away, even as the thoughts and hopes of people of good will everywhere were turning to the question of peace—an enduring peace that would forever bar another return performance by the great war god Mars—a disturbing suspicion that all was not well in the world began to make itself felt. Hovering over the wartorn fields and cities of Europe and the Far East was a menacing shadow, the shadow of world communism. And that shadow has spread, has taken on a more ominous aspect until today its disturbing force is keeping the whole world in breathless, fearful suspense, while turmoil and dissension have engulfed more than one-third of the peoples of the world.

During all these postwar years our country's economy necessarily has been attuned to the rumblings of the war drums of Moscow. The hopes for peace that thrilled the world and gave a new meaning to life of people everywhere when first the Nazi legions, and later the forces of Japan laid down their arms, have not been realized. Aggression flared in Korea, calling for the expenditure without stint of American manhood and wealth. The result has been an uneasy truce. What the ultimate outcome will be hangs, like every other phase of international problems, upon the whims of the Communist leadership, centered in the Kremlin. And the avowed purpose of this leadership, publicly proclaimed on many occasions, is to seek world domination through the overthrow and destruction of this and all other free governments still outside the Soviet orbit.

In every national budget submitted and passed throughout these troubled postwar years appropriations for military defense have been paramount. The outlays for security preparations have far surpassed all normal administrative spending. And, in the face of the all-pervading Soviet threat, it would be difficult indeed to justify criticism of such a well-reasoned policy. Through debates and committee hearings in the Congress, through press and radio and by every avenue of publicity, our people have been alerted and persuaded to the necessity of adequate measures to detect and repel aggression of any nature, whenever or wherever it might strike.

Funds have been provided for the Army and the Navy, for the Air Force and Marine Corps, for the atomic and hydrogen bombs, for development of guided missiles, for research, for countless activities in connection with the training, arming, and field operations of every branch of the military.

Every branch, did I say? I should qualify that statement. For there is one great branch of the Nation's military setup to which all too little consideration has been, and is being given. It contains the stepchildren, the forgotten family in the picture. Presidents, present and past, have rightly characterized it as the fourth arm of defense. Presidential commissions have stressed its strategic importance, its vital necessity in times of national emergency. The Korean hostilities emphasized anew what has been demonstrated clearly whenever and wherever it has been necessary to maintain American fighting forces or installations beyond the borders of our own country. No conflict on foreign soil could be prosecuted successfully without a transportation system capable of delivering the essential manpower and supplies at the right spot swiftly and safely.

I refer, of course, to the American merchant marine, which, like the British Tommy Atkins of Rudyard Kipling's famous poem, is the toast of the land when it is feeding, clothing, housing, and otherwise supplying all the military and personnel needs of our fighting men throughout the world, but is something else again when the emergency has passed.

The merchant marine is the one great field in which our nation, so technically competent otherwise, refuses to learn by experience. Poorly prepared with shipping to meet the threat to national security when projected into the midst of World War I, the Nation spent—or maybe wasted would be the more correct term—more than $3 billion to build shipyards and train workmen, only to have the conflict end before delivery of any of the 2,300 ships so hastily and not always so well constructed.

In the two decades between the end of World War I and the Nazi aggression in Poland in 1939 that warned America of the necessity for preparing for World War II, few new ships were built. Those constructed during the First World War became obsolete and unable to compete with the newer foreign bottoms.

Passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, with its provisions for Government assistance to the shipping industry through what is known as construction-differential and operating subsidies, gave some impetus to private financing and operation of new ships. However, World War II again found the Nation unprepared with shipping adequate to transport either military forces or the huge supplies and armaments necessary for successful prosecution of hostilities in Europe, the Far East, the Arctic and the Tropics, in the countless areas where American fighting men or vessels were deployed.

So once again billions of dollars were expended, with unavoidable waste, to expand and equip shipyards, and to mass produce five thousand relatively slow, quickly outmoded vessels. On hand today are some 1,700 of these. They are uneconomic for normal operation today, and too slow for military needs. Like their predecessors of World War I vintage, they are growing old together—again without any program of orderly replacement.

We just do not seem to profit by the lessons of World War I or World War II. The history of those two conflicts should have been most conclusive as to the fact that, in the war as waged today, military forces cannot operate effectively without tremendous supporting transportation facilities of most modern type. And just as conclusive is our experience as to the danger of trusting to possible allies to furnish emergency shipping which they may not possess, or may need as urgently as this Nation could.

It is most unfortunate that the term "subsidy" ever came to be used in connection with shipping. Citizens, and there are millions of them, one may be sure, who do not have the opportunity to evaluate the importance of the merchant marine to national security, or to the Nation's economy, throw up their hands in horror at the suggestion of a subsidy to maintain American shipping. Even in Congress, it might appear, there is at times a disposition to dismiss even the most urgent proposals relative to American shipping on the basis of opposition to subsidies of any kind, regardless of their purpose.

While willing to provide billions of dollars for the three fighting arms of defense, they refuse to allot a tiny percentage of these amounts for the fourth arm—the shipping arm—that alone can move the men, munitions, and armaments to vital zones in amounts great enough to be effective.

One reason for such lack of consideration, it must be admitted, is that the many and diverse elements that make up the components of the shipping industry have not always been as helpful as they might have been in devising and working toward solution of industry problems. But I am happy to say that there would seem to be no such bar today to progress along cooperative, forward-looking lines.

Indeed, one of the bright aspects of what is generally a rather gloomy maritime picture is the new spirit of mutual help and assistance which has manifested itself in recent weeks on the part of the many management and labor groups in the field of shipping. Practically without exception, they have buried any differences that might exist, and have joined together in formal conferences, to attack and resolve the problems that are weighing so heavily upon them today.

It was my privilege to confer with members of this coalition a few days ago, and I was vastly impressed with the earnestness and unity of purpose that marked our discussions. That their joint action in thus attacking the questions common to them and to our Senate Subcommittee on Water Transportation will be exceedingly helpful and productive, really goes without saying. On behalf of our subcommittee I welcome such cooperation most thankfully. Not only will it advance the work of our subcommittee during this busy session, but it cannot help but be of lasting benefit to every element in the American maritime field, and thus offer added assurance to the progress and security of the entire Nation.

Voluntarily associated under the aegis of this newly formed Labor-Management Maritime Conference are the shipping associations and unions listed below. In their behalf it should be emphasized that their efforts in behalf of their common interests is another heartening instance of the spirit that has made and always

will maintain America the great Nation she is.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT MARITIME CONFERENCE

American Merchant Marine Institute, representing many leading steamship lines; Association of American Ship Owners; Pacific American Steamship Association; American Tramp Ship Owners Association, Inc.; Waterfront Employees Association; Labor-Management Maritime Committee; CIO Maritime Committee; National Maritime Union; Pacific Maritime Association; National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, CIO; American Radio Association, CIO; Sailors Union of the Pacific, AFL; Seafarers International Union; Seafarers International Union, Atlantic and Gulf District, AFL; Seafarers International Union, Great Lakes District, AFL; Canadian Seafarers International Union; Marine Firemen, Oilers, Watertenders, and Wipers, AFL; Masters, Mates, and Pilots, AFL; Brotherhood of Marine Engineers; Inlandboatmen's Union of the Pacific, AFL; Radio Officers Union; Marine Cooks and Stewards, AFL; Brotherhood of Marine Officers; District 4, United Steelworkers of America.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1031, H. R. 7996, the bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1954, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the information of the Senate, if action on the supplemental appropriation bill is completed this afternoon, it will be my intention to move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

I have spoken with the minority leader about the proposed legislation pertaining to the Commodity Credit Corporation. He has requested—and I have had a similar request from this side of the aisle—that the bill go over until Wednesday, because at least one Member on his side of the aisle had asked that the bill dealing with the Commodity Credit Corporation be taken up at that time. That bill is Calendar No. 887, S. 2714. I assume that the Senator who desired the bill to go over is expected back by tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In order that Senators may make their plans for the weekend, can the Senator from California state whether he expects to have any votes on Friday of this week?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would not expect to have any votes on the Hawaiian statehood bill on Friday. Certainly I hope no important matter such as the motion to reconsider the action taken on Senate Joint Resolution 1 will be taken up on Friday. If the bill relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation can be disposed of tomorrow, and if on the following day the Senate can dispose of Senate Joint Resolution 121, the joint resolution dealing with Mexican labor, which is on the calendar, we might even—and I shall consult further with the minority leader about it—recess on Thursday night until Monday, in order to give Senators an opportunity to catch up with work in their offices and to enable certain committees to function.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it the plan of the majority leader to have the Senate take up the joint resolution relating to Mexican labor and the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, and not to have votes on any other measures?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. In the event that the Senate finishes with the work I have outlined, I should like to be able to proceed with the debate on the unfinished business, the Hawaiian statehood bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But not with the purpose of taking any votes on it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Not with the purpose of taking any votes on Friday.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall object to taking up S. 2714, the bill to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, the Senator from Delaware has that privilege. But I have been informed that it is important that the bill be brought to the attention of the Senate for consideration. At least, as I have told the Senator from Delaware, I shall give him 1 day's notice, to permit him to be informed, and tomorrow I shall make the request to take up the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is correct in his statement; but if a motion were made to take up the bill, the motion, of course, would be debatable.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would not agree to unanimous consent to having the bill taken up tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand the Senator's position, and I thank him for his courtesy.

STUDY OF EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS OR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 217), as follows:

Whereas there has been an increasing use of the executive agreement as an instrument for conducting the foreign relations of the United States, and upon occasion, for dealing with matters which in the past have been regarded as properly falling within the scope of established treaty procedure sanctioned by the Constitution;

Whereas the recent action in the Senate on proposals for amending the Constitution to provide safeguards against possible abuses in the exercise of the treaty making power has revealed serious concern on the part of many of its Members as to the manner in which the authority to conclude executive agreements has been exercised;

Whereas a substantial lack of information exists with respect to the precise role of executive agreements in our constitutional system, the circumstances in which they have been used in the past, and the extent to which provisions of State laws and constitutions may have been affected thereby: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, in conjunction with two other Senators designated by the President of the Senate, is directed to make a full and complete study of executive agreements negotiated between the United States and foreign governments or international organizations, with particular emphasis on agreements negotiated since 1938.

SEC. 2. Such study shall include investigation into the number and nature of executive agreements affecting internal law in the United States and the authority for entering into such agreements. It shall also deal with the circumstances under which executive agreements have been used in the past and the difference between executive agreements and treaties with respect to such use.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Foreign Relations shall transmit to the Senate, not later than February 1, 1955, the results of the study and investigation of the said committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, together with such recommendations as may be found desirable.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of this resolution, the said committee or subcommittee is authorized to employ on a temporary basis until February 1, 1955, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts and consultants as it deems desirable. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the necessary expenses of the committee or subcommittee under this resolution, which shall not exceed ——, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers

approved by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, as the case may be.

Mr. FERGUSON. As indicated, I ask the Chair to refer the resolution to the appropriate committee. I am not asking for consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I stated last Friday that I believed more information was necessary on the important question of amending the Constitution as it related to treaties and executive agreements. Sponsors of the resolution believe it affords the way by which the Senate can obtain the needed information.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say to my colleague, the Senator from Michigan, that I join with him in the resolution, because I believe it offers the only method for obtaining information on which to base further action by this body looking toward the adoption of a constitutional amendment, concerning which there is so much interest, and likewise so much need for careful and thoughtful consideration. I thank the Senator for the privilege of permitting me to join with him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to associate myself with the sentiments of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I agree this is a very proper way to proceed to examine into the problem, and I am delighted to join with the Senator from Michigan in the resolution.

Is the Senator getting ready to ask the Senate to consider the supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I have in mind asking the Senate immediately to consider the appropriation bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it the purpose of the Senator's resolution to take consideration of the proposed constitutional amendment away from the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. FERGUSON. No, that is not the purpose.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator believe that the Committee on the Judiciary has not looked into the matter?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not the broad question which the sponors of the resolution believe should be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations, with the addition of two Senators to be appointed by the Vice President. The resolution deals only with a study of executive agreements and treaties. It does not deal with a study of any constitutional amendment for the solution of the problem.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I can very well understand the object of the distinguished Senator in the submission of such a resolution. I have no objection to it whatsoever. However, I wish to assure the Senator that such a resolution will not suffice and will not satisfy those who are interested in a constitutional amendment. It may be that an investigation will bring forth information which will be helpful to those on both sides of the aisle who are interested in a constitutional amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. The only purpose of the resolution is to secure information, not only for the Senate, but for the people of the country.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. The resolution provides for a report which will be due a month after the opening of the next session of Congress. I am sure that in the next session an amendment to the Constitution will be proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who were the authors of proposals which had the attention of the Senate this year.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope that a report can be made much earlier than the time indicated in the resolution, because I believe it is a matter which should receive the very careful attention of the committee and of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wish to say that it is quite understandable to me that those who voted against any constitutional amendment are now anxious to have something done which will, on its face, look as if it meant something. However, nothing will be accomplished by the proposed investigation unless it be carried on by the Committee on the Judiciary, which might report a suitable resolution. Otherwise, nothing can be accomplished by the resolution.

I have reached the firm conclusion that there is no way to distinguish between executive agreements and treaties, under any circumstances. The substitute which I offered would have subjected all executive agreements to some legislative scrutiny.

I do not know what may be offered in the next session of the Congress, but I myself would have no hesitancy in joining other Senators in a resolution which broadly incorporated the requirement that no executive agreement shall have the effect of internal law in the United States, which would be enforceable in any of the courts of the United States, unless and until two-thirds of the Senate had concurred in such agreements.

I shall be very glad to meet the States rights argument on that point. I shall be quite happy to do it. Since there is no possible distinction, what possible objection could there be to saying that all international agreements which have the effect of overriding otherwise valid laws and constitutional provisions and prior acts of Congress, passed in pursuance of the Constitution, should be sanctioned by two-thirds of the Senate?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that it may well be that had such a provision been included in the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, rather than the approach of having approval by an act of Congress, which would have meant a majority in the House and the Senate, the Senate might have approved the Senator's amendment. I say that as one who, as the Senator knows, voted for the amendment of the Senator from Georgia on the final vote, although I had some grave misgivings about opening up an alternative path by which an administration might circumvent the treatymaking powers of the Senate and use what I was fearful would be a short-cut by getting a majority vote in both Houses of Congress.

Although it is a debatable question, if the approach now suggested by the Senator from Georgia had been followed, it is possible that a two-thirds vote might have been achieved.

Mr. GEORGE. It is possible, but I doubt it. I base my conviction on the absence of any real reason on the part of those who opposed the provision for a majority vote of the two Houses.

However, I should like to say, Mr. President, that the Senate will have the opportunity of saying whether any international agreement, be it a treaty or another type of agreement, shall have the effect of internal law which will be enforceable by the courts unless and until it has been approved or concurred in by two-thirds of the Senate, as a treaty must be. I know such a provision would reach the problem, and I do not know of anything else that would.

Mr. President, we have strange ideas in the Senate. At this session the Senate has already passed on the so-called St. Lawrence Seaway bill, and that measure is now in the House of Representatives. One section of that measure provides for a canal through United States land and United States waters, and then turns over the administration and maintenance of the canal, through 47 miles of United States territory, to 2 corporations, 1 domestic and 1 foreign—one, the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation of the United States; the other, the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation of Canada.

Mr. President, what are we to do with such things? Why should we worry about analyzing and determining whether such a provision should be made by executive agreement or whether it should be made by treaty? That is probably a case in which there should have been a treaty. It is a case in which, under any rule or concept of treaty law, there should have been a treaty. Yet that measure was passed by the Senate and was sent to the House of Representatives.

If my colleagues will examine into the matter, they will find that through United States land and United States water we are to build 40-odd miles of seaway, and then are to turn over the maintenance and operation of the seaway—which undoubtedly will mean the

fixing of the tolls—to one domestic corporation and one foreign corporation.

The only way to get around these things, Mr. President, is to say broadly that every international agreement shall have no effect in this Nation and shall not be enforced by our courts unless it has been approved by two-thirds of the Senate, as in the case of a treaty—whether the agreement be a treaty or whether it not be a treaty.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to say to my friend, the Senator from Georgia—and I recall that both he and I voted against the St. Lawrence Seaway measure—that what he has just said is, of course, true. However, I wish to ask him a question. It is my understanding that there is an international agreement, in the form of a treaty made in 1909, which provides that Canada and the United States, in making any use of the St. Lawrence River or in any development of that river, must have equal rights, equal tolls, and equal benefits. Therefore, this international agreement, which was handled in the form of an act of Congress—over both the objection of the Senator from Georgia and myself—is based on the treaty of 1909, and must relate to that treaty. Is not that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes; there was such a treaty. But what we have done in the St. Lawrence Seaway Act goes far beyond anything that treaty contemplated.

Mr. President, I do not care to debate the subject. I am merely pointing out how careless we are about international agreements, and how imperative it is to say that they shall have some sanction.

I prefer to have both the Senate and the House of Representatives pass upon them, rather than to have the State Department alone pass upon them; but I am certainly content to say that they should be concurred in by two-thirds of the Senate, as in the case of a treaty. Then it will not matter whether it is an executive agreement, technically, or an executive agreement of broader scope, or whether it be in treaty form, because there will have been provision for concurrence by two-thirds of the Senate.

But I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] upon their agility.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, which has been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in explanation of the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1954, let me say that the amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is $27,917,616, an increase of $2,131,909 over the amount voted by the House of Representatives, which was $25,785,707. The bill as reported to the Senate constitutes a decrease of $25,000 from the budget estimates.

The changes made by the Senate Appropriations Committee are as follows: The committee added to the bill $600,000 for Senate inquiries and investigations. This amount is necessary if the employees of the Senate committees dealing with investigations are to be paid.

Mr. President, under the rules of the Senate, the Appropriations Committee does not fix the amounts to be spent by each committee. In effect, the Committee on Rules and Administration has charge of the measures determining the amounts of such expenditures. After the amounts are fixed by the Senate, the matter comes to the Appropriations Committee, which must recommend to the Senate that certain amounts be appropriated to pay for what the Senate has already passed upon.

The committee voted to allow the budget estimate of $8,620,500 for navigational aid stations for the Coast Guard—an increase of $1 million over the amount allowed by the House of Representatives—with the entire amount to be derived by transfer of funds from appropriations for the Air Force. From the funds appropriated last year for the Air Force, there would be transferred the amount of money required for this Coast Guard activity, namely, the navigational aid stations. This amount of money is necessary if the Corps of Engineers is to be able to take advantage of the favorable climatic conditions during the next few months, in the Arctic, where these stations are to be built.

The committee allowed an increase of $43,200 over the amount voted by the House of Representatives as travel limitations for the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—or a total of $143,200. This is not an increase in appropriations, but is merely an increase in the amount allowed for travel for study groups, most of whom serve without compensation.

The committee allowed the budget estimate of $1,831,909 for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, in other words, the Hoover Commission. Within that amount, there is established a travel limitation of $302,344. That is necessary if the Commission is to plan for and institute its programs and make its report, as required by the act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 2, to insert:

CHAPTER I

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senate

Contingent Expenses of the Senate

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, $600,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 7, to change the chapter number from "I" to "II."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department—Coast Guard—Acquisition, construction, and improvements," on page 2, line 16, after the word "improvements", to strike out "$7,620,500" and insert "$8,620,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 20, to change the chapter number from "II" to "III."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 5, to change the chapter number from "III" to "IV."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent offices—Commission on Intergovernmental Relations," on page 4, line 6, after the word "to", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$143,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government," on page 4, line 11, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$1,831,909", and in line 15, after the word "to", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$302,344."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 17, to change the chapter number from "IV" to "V."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 15, to change the chapter number from "V" to "VI."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

MILITARY AID TO PAKISTAN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to make a few observations about the recent decision of the administration to supply arms to Pakistan. I disapprove of this move, and I wish the RECORD to show very clearly my disapproval, because in the future when the results of this policy are evident to all I want it to be clear where the responsibility rests.

Last year some very general provisions concerning the possibility of aid to

Pakistan were included in the legislative history of the mutual-defense program. Later the Secretary of State, in a general statement, suggested that since the Middle East Command idea had not borne fruit, some alliance of the upper tier of countries in the Middle East might be helpful. Nothing concrete regarding the supplying of arms was ever submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations until the decision had been made.

About 10 days ago an Assistant Secretary of State met with the committee. I was present. He described what had already been agreed to. He was not asking our advice. He was telling us the decision of the administration. It is my understanding that no legislation is necessary to put this agreement into effect.

I think the decision to supply arms to Pakistan at this time is an unfortunate mistake. I want the record to show very clearly that this decision was taken over my objection.

I have the greatest respect for the people of Pakistan, as I do for the people of India. Both have had their independence for some 7 years. Both are striving to create a stable system of self-government. In my opinion, neither is Communist-dominated.

It seems to me that we should carefully avoid alienating either country. They have their mutual difficulties, which have threatened war, so we are not unaware of the tension which exists between them and therefore should have been extremely careful in our relations with both.

I cannot help but believe that this unwise and improvident decision has been at least partly promoted by some very severe criticism of Prime Minister Nehru by Members of this body. The majority leader has on several occasions criticized what he calls the neutralism of Nehru and possibly has laid the basis for a belief by Mr. Nehru that this arming of Pakistan is designed to force his hand or to punish him politically.

In addition to this aspect of the problem, it is my belief that the current hysteria and fear generated by recent attacks upon the Foreign Service and the State Department has closed the mouths of any Foreign Service officers or experts in the State Department who might agree that it is unwise to arm Pakistan and risk the alienation of India and its possible loss to communism. Their mouths are closed simply because criticism of the proposed alliance and arms program might be interpreted by some—unjustly, I believe—as being soft toward communism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks an Associated Press dispatch from New Delhi, which was published in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIA INSISTS UNITED STATES MISSION QUIT KASHMIR

NEW DELHI, March 1.—Prime Minister Nehru today spurned President Eisenhower's arms-aid offer similar to that granted neighboring Pakistan. Nehru demanded that United States observers get off the United Nations cease-fire team in Kashmir.

The Indian Parliament cheered as the Prime Minister commented bitterly on Mr. Eisenhower's letter explaining the United States decision to grant Pakistan military aid for defense purposes and offering the same treatment to India.

"In making this suggestion," Nehru declared, "the President has done less than justice to us or to himself. If we object to military aid being given to Pakistan, we would be hypocrites and unprincipled opportunists to accept it ourselves."

The deputies laughed when Nehru said: "President Eisenhower has been good enough to suggest he would give his most sympathetic consideration to any request we might wish to make for military assistance."

India and Pakistan have been disputing the future political status of Kashmir ever since the Indian subcontinent was divided between the two in 1947. Referring to the presence of American members on the U. N. cease-fire team there Nehru said:

"Since they can no longer be treated by us as neutrals in this dispute, military aid given by the United States to Pakistan is a form of intervention in the disputes between India and Pakistan. Their (the United States observers) presence there, therefore appears to us to be improper."

At the end of last year, the United States had 14 observers among about 100 from 9 countries on the cease-fire team.

Commenting on Mr. Eisenhower's assurance that the aid extended to Pakistan will not be misused, the Prime Minister said:

"I have no doubt the President is opposed to aggression. But we know from past experience that aggression takes place, and nothing is done about it. Aggression took place in Kashmir 6½ years ago, and thus far the United States has not only not condemned it, but we have been asked not to press it in the interests of peace."

He cited press reports of testimony by Walter S. Robertson, United States Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, before the House Appropriations Committee on January 26. Nehru paraphrased reports of this testimony as saying "the United States must dominate Asia for an indefinite period and pose a military threat to Communist China until it disintegrates." Nehru conceded there have been conflicting reports of exactly what Robertson said, one version being that the United States must maintain its posture of strength (not dominate) in Asia. Then the Prime Minister added:

"Whatever the wording, the meaning is the same. It is known that India's policy in regard to the (Communist) People's Government of China differs from that of the United States. Our two policies in this respect are wholly opposed to each other. But what is more important is that a responsible officer in the United States should say that it is their policy that the United States dominate Asia for an indefinite period."

The version of the Robertson testimony, released last week by Representative FREDERIC COUDERT, Jr., Republican, of New York, said the Assistant Secretary had concurred in a statement by Mr. COUDERT that "a cold war waged under the leadership of the United States" must be maintained for "an indefinite number of years." Robertson was quoted as saying he thought America must maintain the cold war until there were some indications the Communists had changed their objectives. When COUDERT asked if that meant the United States would try "to maintain for an indefinite period of years American dominance in the Far East," Robertson answered "Yes, exactly."

Nehru said there had recently been developing a more friendly approach between India and Pakistan on Kashmir but "that has all changed now."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Also I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a dispatch to the New York Times dated February 21, 1954, concerning a rally in Pakistan. The heading of the article is "Rally in Pakistan Assails United States Pact."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RALLY IN PAKISTAN ASSAILS UNITED STATES PACT—MEETING OF STUDENTS JOINED BY OPPOSITION PARTY ALSO SCORES MOSLEM LEAGUE

DACCA, PAKISTAN, February 21.—Anti-American posters and banners depicting United States soldiers grabbing Pakistan were carried today by Communists among 15,000 students in a martyrs' day parade.

The demonstration was part of a 14-hour program that began at 3 a. m. The 2-mile procession went from Dacca University to the graves of 36 undergraduates who were killed 2 years ago when the police fired on students during a riot.

The 1952 rioting broke out after former Prime Minister Khwaja Nazimuddin had rejected a student demand that Bengali, the predominant language of East Pakistan, be recognized as a state language equivalent to Urdu, which is spoken in West Pakistan.

All shops were closed today and vehicular traffic was at a standstill as heavily armed steel-helmeted police lined the route through the city of 500,000.

Plans for a curfew were canceled last night after student leaders had promised the police that the demonstration would be orderly. Fearing that a repetition of the 1952 incident would be a further setback for the Moslem League Government, officials also instructed the police not to use force regardless of provocation.

OPPOSITION USES RALLY

This placating action by the Government reflected its apprehension over the outcome of the first election to be held in this province March 8 to 12, when 20 million will go to polls to elect 309 legislators. It also was a development that offered opposition groups a readymade opportunity for increasing their popularity in advance of the elections.

At 3:30 p. m., as the students marched into the meeting ground in the center of town to hold the memorial service, they were joined by 35,000 sympathizers and the leader of the Awami League Party, one of four that comprise the united front opposing the Moslem League.

After prayers had been offered for the deceased students, Abdul Hamid Khan Hashani, president of the Awami League, spoke for more than an hour, condemning 6½ years of maladministration of the Moslem League. He drew a resounding affirmative answer when he asked the audience of 50,000 if they were ready to dismiss the leaders of the Moslem League, of which Prime Minister Mohammed Ali is president.

He also assailed the government for accepting a grant of 700,000 tons of wheat from the United States and said the people would crush the unholy alliance with the United States by refusing military aid if the united front won the elections.

At the end of the speech, which drew repeated cheers, the students waved banners, including black flags and others on which appeared pictures of the league throwing Pakistan into the lap of Uncle Sam. The caption on that poster was, "We are against American aid."

The united front platform, which has gained wide support throughout East Pakistan, calls for nationalization of the jute industry, the nation's biggest foreign exchange earner, redistribution of the land by

abolition of wealthy landowners and the gift of extensive ricefields to the people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, when the investigating committees or historians of the future are trying to ascertain why we lost the friendship of India, I want it to be perfectly clear where the responsibility should be placed.

RECESS

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 3, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 2 (legislative day of March 1), 1954:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Thomas Ramage Ethridge, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi, vice Noel H. Malone, resigned.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for the terms indicated:

Mark A. May, of Connecticut, for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1956 (reappointment).

Justin Miller, of California, for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1956 (reappointment).

Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1957, vice Ben Hibbs, term expired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, by whose mercies we have been spared and by whose powers we are sustained in our earthly pilgrimage, we are coming unto Thee with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

Gird us now with courage and with confidence in Thy loving kindness for Thou art never closer unto us than when our hearts are wrung with sorrow and our heads are bowed in tribulation.

We commend unto Thy gracious care and keeping our beloved colleagues, beseeching Thee that Thou wilt share Thine eternal wisdom with the doctors and nurses for Thou art the Great Physician who canst mediate unto them divine skill and enable them to do that which is far beyond all that we can ask or think.

Grant unto the members of the sorrowing and stricken families the consolations of Thy grace and, as they bravely carry on and faithfully and patiently keep the vigil of faith, hope, and love, may they have the blessed companionship of that friend who sticketh closer than a brother.

We thank Thee for the beautiful spirit of Thy servant, so seriously ill, who has besought us to remember in our prayer those who have harmed us. May we also emulate the example of our blessed Lord who prayed, "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do."

To Thy name, through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour, we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6130. An act to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under Lanham War Housing Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 235. An act for the relief of Rev. Armando Fuoco;

S. 267. An act for the relief of Pantelis Morfessis;

S. 662. An act for the relief of Julie Nicola Frangou;

S. 740. An act for the relief of Santa Muciaccia (Sister Maria Fridiana), Teresa Saragaglia (Sister Maria Eutropia), and Caterina Isonni (Sister Maria Giovita);

S. 747. An act for the relief of Jacek Von Henneberg;

S. 893. An act for the relief of David T. Wright;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Augusta Bleys (also known as Augustina Bleys);

S. 924. An act for the relief of Sofia B. Panagoulopoulos Kanell;

S. 929. An act for the relief of Cleopatra Stavros Milionis;

S. 945. An act for the relief of Moshe Gips;

S. 1062. An act for the relief of Eileen Joaquim Boa;

S. 1209. An act for the relief of Dr. Uheng Khoo;

S. 1265. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

S. 1594. An act for the relief of Berenice Catherine Montgomery;

S. 1691. An act to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia, and to cross Kenilworth Avenue NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 2534. An act for the relief of Dora Vida Lyew Seixas;

S. 2698. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi;

S. 2773. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756);

S. 2937. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing without meeting the requirements of section 15 (8) (b) (ii) of that act;

S. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor.

AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 453, Rept. No. 1259), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7328) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT FOR SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 454, Rept. No. 1260), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6788) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

MARCH 1, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

All in Puerto Rico shocked by the savage and unbelievable lunacy perpetrated today by persons completely unrepresentative of the decent feelings of Puerto Ricans. Please convey to the House as well as to the wounded Members the deep solidarity of the whole Puerto Rican people who condemn with all their strength this dastardly deed.

LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN,
Governor.

The SPEAKER. The Delegate from Puerto Rico [Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN] is recognized.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, on no occasion could I address this House with deeper sorrow. To add to my consternation, the name of the dear island of my birth was invoked by the reckless vandals who staged this terrible deed yesterday. To know that five of our beloved colleagues in this House have been wounded, the innocent victims of fanaticism, of fanatical terrorism, even though with the help of God their lives have been spared, has brought awe, grief, and indignation to the people of Puerto Rico.

When have the people of Puerto Rico, through their elected representatives, come before this Assembly with a request or proposal that has not been kindly received and the wishes of the people recognized and carried out? And who has given any authority, representation, or task concerning the affairs of Puerto Rico, to obscure blood-spilling individuals under the spell of diabolic inspiration, who have moved away and are no longer members of our island community, in this way to disturb the peace and mind of the great people of the United States, including the loyal citizens of the island of Puerto Rico? Why should the orderly business of Congress be interrupted by an unspeakable act, not only criminal, but stupidly and absurdly tragic? The bullets that were shot did not only sorely hurt five of our colleagues; they all hit the heart of Puerto Rico. May the Lord protect us from greater sorrows.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of the great people of Puerto Rico, I offer condolence, both collective and personal, to our fallen colleagues and their families, to the Congress and to the whole of the people of the United States. I request unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include in the RECORD the statement made yesterday by the Governor of Puerto Rico, and the resolution adopted last night by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Press reports from Washington have just been received informing that a group of persons entered the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States, then in session, and treacherously attacked its Members, wounding several distinguished Members of Congress. The assailants have been identified as members of the scant group of terrorists who call themselves the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico. The people of Puerto Rico condemn and repudiate the actions of that group of fanatical terrorists. The bonds between the United States and Puerto Rico are predicated by the will of the people of Puerto Rico and of the Congress of the United States, on a common citizenship and on mutual respect and esteem: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico on behalf of all the people of Puerto Rico:

1. To repudiate and condemn, most emphatically, the cowardly and inconceivable attempt against the life of men who represent the will of their people.

2. To declare before the world that the act which we now repudiate and condemn, far from representing any sentiment of the people of Puerto Rico, constitutes an aggression against our own people and provokes in us such anger and indignation as is difficult to express in any language.

3. To transmit to the Congress of the United States and to the distinguished Congressmen who were wounded, the sympathy and solidarity of the legislative assembly and of all the people of Puerto Rico.

By SAMUEL R. QUIÑONES,
President, Senate of Puerto Rico.

STATEMENT OF THE GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

The whole people of Puerto Rico are deeply indignant because of this savage and unbelievable lunacy which does not express even in the most remote way the peaceful and decent nature of the Puerto Rican people.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD at this point certain cablegrams and telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

MOROVIS, PUERTO RICO, *March 2, 1954.*

SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please accept our most sincere expression of regret for the most contemptible and infamous incident that occurred yesterday. This municipality of Morovis very deeply regrets and condemns this inconceivable act which in no way reflects the feelings and ideals of the people of Puerto Rico.

ANTONIO M. COLON,
Mayor.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 1, 1954.*

The Honorable JOSEPH MARTIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives:

It is with great emotion and indignation that I hear of the criminal attacks against the Members of the House. The feeling of shock that such a terroristic action has caused in your country will be fully shared in France. I form heartfelt wishes for the prompt recovery of your wounded colleagues.

Sincerely,

HENRI BONNET.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 1, 1954.*

The SPEAKER,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of my colleagues and myself I want to express to you, Mr. Speaker, our horror and indignation at what happened this afternoon at the Capitol. We feel greatly relieved and gratified that the dastardly deed did not cause the loss of life. Kindly extend to the wounded Congressmen our deepest sympathy.

WILHELM MORGENSTIERNE,
Norwegian Ambassador, Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

SAN JUAN PROVINCE, *March 1, 1954.*

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

The Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico adopted today the following concurrent resolution:

"Press reports from Washington have just been received informing that a group of persons entered the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States, then in session, and treacherously attacked its Members, wounding several distinguished Members of Congress. The assailants have been identified as members of the scant group of terrorists who call themselves the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico. The people of Puerto Rico condemn and repudiate the actions of that group of fanatical terrorists. The bonds between the United States and Puerto Rico are predicated by the will of the people of Puerto Rico and of the Congress of the United States on a common citizenship and on mutual respect and esteem: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico on behalf of all the people of Puerto Rico:*

"1. To repudiate and condemn, most emphatically, the cowardly and inconceivable attempt against the life of men who represent the will of their people.

"2. To declare before the world that the act which we now repudiate and condemn, far from representing any sentiment of the people of Puerto Rico, constitutes an aggression against our own people and provokes in us such anger and indignation as is difficult to express in any language.

"3. To transmit to the Congress of the United States and to the distinguished Congressmen who were wounded, the sympathy and solidarity of the legislative assembly and of all the people of Puerto Rico."

SAMUEL R. QUIÑONES,
President, Senate of Puerto Rico.

SAN SALVADOR, *March 2, 1954.*

HON. CAMARA DE REPRESENTANTES,
Washington, D. C.:

Asamblea Legislativa hondamente consternada lamenta grave incidente ocurido hoy punto hace votos sinceros for restablecimiento completo honorables Representates lesionados punto franternalment.

JOSE MARIE PERALTA SALAZAR,
Presidente Asamblea Legislatativa de El Salvador Centro America.

CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR POSTPONED

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the Private Calendar in order today may be postponed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MEXICAN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business of the House is the question on the adoption of House Resolution 450, providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 355, amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (54 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, because of the unusual situation, may I ask, is this a vote on the adoption of the resolution making in order consideration of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. The vote is on the rule making the legislation in order for consideration by the House.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOLEY) there were—ayes 197, noes 56.

So the resolution was agreed to.

PROVIDING FOR THE PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS AT THE UNVEILING OF THE STATUE OF DR. MARCUS WHITMAN

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up for immediate consideration House Concurrent Resolution 196.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed with illustrations and bound, in such style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, the proceedings in Congress at the unveiling in the rotunda, together with such other matter as the joint committee may deem pertinent thereto, upon the occasion of the acceptance of the statue of Marcus Whitman, presented by the State of Washington, 5,000 copies; of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and for the use and the distribution by the Senators from Washington; and the remaining 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and for the use of and the distribution by the Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer, who shall provide suitable illustrations to be bound with these proceedings.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the House concurrent resolution.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was granted permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the following statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have obtained unanimous consent to address the House today for 30 minutes. My subject will be, "I Do Not Believe the Material You Have Suggested Would Be Useful"—An Outrageous Refusal by the Secretary of the Treasury To Furnish Information of a Nonconfidential Nature to a Member of Congress.

To those who may not be able to be on the floor this afternoon because of the press of other official business, I respectfully make the request that you take time to read my remarks, believing that they will be of interest to each individual Member.

PROSECUTE THE OUTLAWS BUT DO NOT INDICT A WHOLE PEOPLE

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, having been one of the two congressional delegates to the United Nations last fall, where I handled the issue of self-government for Puerto Rico, I believe I can add some understanding to the great tragedy which struck the House yesterday.

These assassins who shot down five of our colleagues are members of the so-called Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico. This group, which has never qualified as a legitimate political party, is a notorious terrorist organization. It is the same organization which instigated the bloody 1950 riots in Puerto Rico, the assault on Government House and the attempted murder of the Governor of Puerto Rico, and which incited the murder of the chief of the Puerto Rican police in 1936. Its members attempted assassination of President Truman and killed one of his guards in the same ruthless demonstration of insanity that was repeated here yesterday.

But in fairness to the 2¼ million people of Puerto Rico, we should recognize that this terrorist band represents less than 500 members. The so-called Nationalist Party no more represents the true feelings of the people of Puerto Rico than the Communist Party represents the sentiments of the people of the United States.

Moreover, let us not confuse this band with the Independence Party, which is a small, legitimate party that seeks to achieve its political aims by democratic and constitutional methods.

Through the free expression of an overwhelming majority of its people in democratic elections, Puerto Rico has achieved a full measure of self-government under its new constitution. In Puerto Rico's association with the United States, we continue to control matters of defense and foreign relations.

When I presented the decision of the United States Government on Puerto Rican self-government before the United Nations, the General Assembly endorsed that decision. It was extremely important to our relations with the rest of the world that we should get that U. N. endorsement.

In presenting that case before the bar of world opinion, the United States delegation was aided immensely by Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico; the Honorable Ernesto Ramos-Antonini, speaker of the Puerto Rican House of Representatives; Dr. Arturo Morales-Carrion, under secretary of state; Dr. Jose Trias-Monge, secretary of justice; and other distinguished Puerto Rican-Americans. These fine men are representative of all but the lunatic fringe in a nation whose people—citizens of the United States since 1917—appreciate the mutual benefits obtained by their present Commonwealth status.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Governments of both the United States and Puerto Rico prosecute every member of this band for what they are, a band of terrorists. But I also urge that we recognize that the Puerto Rican people—with slight exceptions—are strong friends of the United States and are as shocked and dismayed at yesterday's action as we are.

REPORT ON PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Public Accounts Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee is in the process of reporting our findings on the investigation which our subcommittee undertook concerning the government of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. In view of yesterday's unfortunate occurrence, I should like to take this opportunity to advise the Congress of an excerpt from our report on Puerto Rico. I am making the statement at this time in fairness to Governor Muñoz-Marín and the other loyal American citizens of Puerto Rico.

The excerpt is as follows:

One matter discussed with the Governor was the situation regarding the Nationalist Party and the role it played in the government of Puerto Rico. The Governor stated that this extreme group of radicals represented only a very small proportion of the Puerto Rican citizens, estimated to be less than 500 in number among the more than 2 million decent liberty-loving American citizens of Puerto Rico. They agitate for complete freedom for Puerto Rico, which is exactly contrary to the wishes of the vast majority of the Puerto Rican citizens. They have not been able to elect a single member to the Puerto Rican Legislature.

There is no doubt, in my mind, that there is a direct tieup between the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico and the Communist International. The Governor is doing everything possible within the framework of constitutional procedure to suppress this group, whose actions are considered disgraceful and of great harm to the cause of Puerto Rico.

Our subcommittee was very favorably impressed by Governor Muñoz-Marín and his administration as will be indicated by our subcommittee report, which will be submitted in the very near future.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 8127, the highway-aid bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

BATTLESHIP "OLYMPIA"

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the proposal of the Department of the Navy that the famous old warship *Olympia* be scrapped, I have today introduced a bill to transfer the ownership of the *Olympia* to the State of Washington.

It is appropriate that this ship, with its glorious history, and named, as it is, after the capital of Washington State, be preserved as an historic shrine to remind future generations of the part our Navy has played in the history of our great Nation.

The *Olympia* was the flagship of Admiral Dewey at the Battle of Manila Bay. She was the ship that brought the body of the Unknown Soldier back to the United States after the First World War. She is now rusting at her berth in the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

Mr. Speaker, I am most appreciative of the predicament of the Navy. It is obviously wasteful to maintain the *Olympia*. Before any program to scrap her is inaugurated, however, the people of her namesake city and State should be given the opportunity to claim her.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to transfer the special order granted him for yesterday to today.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

IMPORT FEES ON WOOL

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, less than one-third of the wool consumed in the United States is produced by American growers.

The balance of our supply is furnished by foreign sources which can sell below the American standard of living and cost of production. Yet even so, we have wool shorn in 1951 and 1952 stacked in warehouses under our present loan-support program. The taxpayers are paying for fighting the moths and for the storage of this wool and we are loaning money on the 1953 clip of wool, with every indication that we will have to foreclose on that and pay further storage on support activities.

The Department of Agriculture has told the Tariff Commission there is a need for additional import fees to be levied under section 22 of the Agricultural Act. A Tariff Commission recommendation on the matter has gone to the President. The President now has the authority to impose these import fees, which would permit the American grown wool to be sold on the American market and for the Government to sell its inventory without loss.

Surely the President will act promptly and set an import fee sufficient to permit our support program, voted by this Congress, to work for our needed wool industry.

MEXICAN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 355) amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the House Joint Resolution 355, with Mr. KEATING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, our unfortunate colleague, Mr. ALVIN M. BENTLEY, one of the victims of yesterday's tragic event, was very much interested in this legislation. He was prepared to express that interest by addressing the House during the debate. I am going to read the remarks which he would have presented had he had the opportunity to do so. I want also to say that I am thoroughly in accord with what he has to say, and I want to emphasize that this is important to me in my district as well, as our districts border one another, and are much the same in the great State of Michigan. However, before I do that I would like to make a statement regarding the condition of my colleague, and very dear and close personal friend. I have been at the hospital a number of times. The latest report I had is that he is coming along as well as could possibly be expected. I talked to his sister some few minutes ago. The family has been out there, and they feel they are very fortunate that his life has been spared, and we pray that God will look after him and his dear wife.

This is the statement which was prepared by Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, in recent weeks I have received a great number of letters from my home district urging congressional action to insure a supply of Mexican workers to harvest the so-called stoop crops for 1954. Because of the recent expiration of our agreement with Mexico our growers face great losses of vegetable and fruit crops if they are not assured adequate hand labor. In order to emphasize the seriousness of the problem I would like to quote from some of the letters I have received.

Mr. James Graham, of route 3, Freeland, in calling attention to the need for Mexican labor, states: "This will mean a lot to our community as we grow a lot of pickles, tomatoes, snap beans, sugar beets, etc., or all work that takes stooped labor. Domestic labor is very scarce and they do not prefer this kind of work so the national labor is very essential to our locality, without this Mexican national agriculture labor it would be very difficult for us to operate."

Mr. R. C. Mayan, of Merill, Mich., states: "I know from my observation locally that were it not for the Mexican nationals labor brought into this area that our crops of sugar beets, pickles and cucumbers would definitely have suffered for the lack of this type of labor and I also know from experience that the importing of white labor from the South has not proven satisfactory."

Mr. James W. Burgess, of St. Charles, Mich., states: "We would appreciate your full support for Public Law No. 78 to make it possible in continuing migrating Mexican national workers that are required for hand labor and hoeing that we need for such crops as sugar beets, picking cucumbers, hoeing beans, and harvesting potatoes. These are the major crops in our community."

Mr. M. C. Henderson, executive secretary-treasurer of Michigan Field Crops, Inc., a nonprofit cooperative oganization serving some 30,000 Michigan farmers in matters of procuring field labor, writes that "Since before the beginning of World War II, local domestic supplies have been insufficient to harvest the many crops requiring hand labor, such as cherries, peaches, snap beans, pickles, sugar beets, onions and like products."

Mr. C. L. Brody, executive vice president of the Michigan Farm Bureau, writes:

"I am advised that available appropriations for administration of the Mexican farm labor program will be exhausted February 12, 1954. Since the expiration of the agreement with Mexico on January 15, 1954, the United States Government has instituted a unilateral program in providing for the admission and contracting of Mexican labor.

"I understand that negotiations with Mexico for a new bilateral agreement are being carried on. In the meantime, however, funds are needed to carry on the unilateral program. I understand that under the unilateral agreement several improvements in the contract with Mexican nationals have been put into effect by the Department of Labor. This is an important matter to Michigan as large numbers of Mexican workers are needed.

"Therefore, the Michigan Farm Bureau is requesting your support, first, of a supplemental appropriation to carry on after February 12, 1954, and second, your support of Senate Joint Resolution 121 and House Joint Resolution 355 to authorize the unilateral Mexican farm labor program. We are not informed as to the amount of money needed for the supplementary appropriation, but understand that the Budget Department has approved $550,000.

"We shall greatly appreciate your interest and support."

Letter after letter has emphasized again and again the need for Mexican labor to handle crops in Michigan. The growers must have early action on this matter in order to plan.

I have contacted the Labor Department with regard to the need for labor in this area and their findings confirm the need. Mr. Robert Goodwin, Director of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security, in answer to my recent inquiry, stated: "Our farm placement service does have a classification of agricultural reporting areas which are concerned only with agricultural labor data. You are correct in your assumption that there has been a shortage of seasonal farm labor in your congressional district. During 1953 we certified to a shortage of such labor in the Bay City area which includes Saginaw County and 9 other adjacent counties, and permitted the temporary importation of 760 Mexican workers under the provisions of Public Law 78 and 210 British West Indians under the provisions of Public Law 414."

The Michigan Employment Security Commission in its postseason farm-labor report for 1953 makes several statements in this regard:

"Recruitment started in the early spring. Since Michigan is a highly industrialized State and factories are humming, no appreciable number of local workers were available. It was necessary to recruit workers from other States.

"Generally local labor was not interested in working on activities necessary for production and harvest of sugar beets, pickles, and muck crops. However, vegetable, berry, and fruit harvest appealed to them.

"For some activities which did not appeal to domestic workers or in times of acute labor shortages, the importation of foreign labar was a vital factor in averting crop losses."

This report also states that the 1954 season presents the same problems with regard to securing an adequate labor supply as did 1953. Many people feel that mechanized equipment is replacing such labor but the following statement from the aforementioned report indicates how gradual this change is.

"No new mechanized equipment was introduced in 1953 to materially reduce the requirements of seasonal farm labor. Some improvements were made in the design of the sugar beet thinner and weeder as well as the harvester. Farmers have not accepted the thinner and weeder in the same manner as the harvester. About 50 percent of the beets were blocked, thinned, and weeded by hand, whereas only 10 percent were harvested by hand labor."

In closing I would like to emphasize that the type of labor the Mexican nationals provide is very indispensable to the vegetable and fruitgrowers of Michigan. I strongly urge the passage of House Joint Resolution 355 which will authorize recruitment of such labor at the border.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple bill. I think it has been represented to be a great many things which it is not. In the first place, it is not a bill involving foreign policy in any sense. It is not a wetback bill, as it has been called, except in the sense that the passage of this legislation will assist the Department of Justice and the Immigration Service in controlling the illegal influx of the wetbacks.

I do not think anyone would seriously contend that this Nation or any nation does not have the right and authority to prescribe the conditions under which those who enter it from the outside may obtain and carry out employment in this country. It is true that in the past we have operated the Mexican-labor program under an agreement with Mexico, setting up the terms of employment, and other conditions under which these Mexican laborers should work in this country.

We did that not because there was any necessity for doing it but simply as a matter of comity and as a way of bringing about a better understanding between the two countries with respect to the use of this labor.

This resolution does not in any sense affect the wetback or illegal entrant into this country. The Attorney General has requested the passage of this legislation for the reason that he believes it will help control the illegal immigration. Those who come into this country and who are placed on farms in this country under the program will all come in legally; they will come in through the regular ports of entry.

If there is a way by which these Mexicans can come in legally, I believe it is reasonable to assume, that there will be a smaller number who will try to come in illegally; and we do know that they will come in one way or another because of the great difference in the wage scales in the two countries.

We have had no cooperation from the Mexican Government in keeping out the Mexican labor because as I understand it, under the constitution of Mexico that country has no authority to prevent any Mexican citizen from leaving or entering that country—at least that is the reason they have given for their failure to prevent illegal entrants from leaving Mexico. So we have had no cooperation from that nation in our efforts to keep out the wetbacks. With a borderline of more than 2,000 miles between this country and Mexico it is impossible to keep all illegal entrants out. We believe this legislation makes it possible to set up a program whereby those who enter legally will be able to find employment at good wages. It is felt by the Attorney General, by the Department of Labor and by the Department of Agriculture that the bill will very materially assist in relieving the wetback problem and at the same time furnish American farmers with a needed labor supply.

I want to take just a moment or two to give you something of the history of this program. During the war we had a labor program which expired in 1947, and since that time we have been operating under the present program. Every year we have had much difficulty in negotiating an agreement with the Mexican Government. I am not going to detail the situation as it occurred year by year, but generally speaking the Mexican Government refused to make an agreement, or kept postponing any final decision or any action on the matter, until the peak season for the use of the labor had arrived in this country. Then under the pressure of that situation our negotiators were forced to capitulate to the Mexican demands or go without any labor whatever.

Mr. Chairman, coming down to this year, negotiations with Mexico under the present law began last October and continued up to January without any agreement being reached. Contrary to what has been said, these negotiations have never been broken off by the American Government. However they were suspended as far as any action taken was concerned for a brief period, in fact until after the hearings were begun on this legislation, at which time they were resumed, and I am happy to say that some progress has been made. I attribute that progress to the fact we have been considering this legislation.

I do not desire, of course, to criticize the great nation of Mexico or its government, but I believe that most of our trouble in connection with these negotiations has come about because of the fact that the Government of Mexico has felt we could not carry out this program without an agreement with that country. As long as they felt that that was the situation they held out for all they could get, in the way of concessions, and some very unreasonable concessions it seems to me.

More than that, in the past, the Mexican Government has chosen to apply a unilateral interpretation of the provisions of these agreements. American farmers who thought that they had a contract for Mexican laborers based upon an agreement soon found out that they did not have the contract they thought they had at all. For one thing, the Mexican Government frequently raised a question about subsistence rates which the agreement covered rather specifically. But after a contract had been made, American farmers were confronted with demands from Mexican consuls in this country that the subsistence rate be raised.

In addition to that, farmers who have undertaken to use this labor have found that the Mexican consuls were demanding that the wage be increased above the prevailing wage in the community.

Furthermore, the Mexican Government has arbitrarily assumed the authority to blacklist entire counties in the United States and to forbid their nationals from working in those counties without any reason whatsoever as far as anyone in this country was able to find out.

They have insisted upon certain insurance provisions being put into effect which were not in any way made mandatory by provisions of the agreement between the two countries.

I could go on and name other instances, which I will not take the time to do now, where the Mexican Government has insisted upon a unilateral interpretation of the contract. And because we needed this labor we have been forced to agree to those interpretations.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman, briefly.

Mr. FISHER. As a matter of fact, for the past year or probably 2 or 3 years, we have been operating virtually under a unilateral agreement with Mexico as a result of the interpretations, arbitrary and summary, that have been made on the part of Mexico with respect to these various points to which the gentleman has just referred; is that not correct?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, I think that is a very accurate and a fair statement of the matter.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HOPE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOLDEN. Is it not true that the negotiators on the part of Mexico insisted on many benefits to these Mexican nationals that were not given to our own people here in America; and that they continued to insist upon those without making any efforts to agree for many, many months, while our negotiators were trying to make a decent agreement with that country?

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for another question?

Mr HOPE. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. It is also true that as to practically every one of these points to which the gentleman has referred, pertaining to subsistence, minimum wages, blacklisting, insurance, the interpretations the Mexican Government has given to those points and the position of the Mexican Government on those points have been directly contrary to the wording of the international agreement that has been in effect; is not that correct?

Mr. HOPE. I am sure that the hearings, which were quite extensive on this measure, will bear out the statement that the gentleman has made.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Would the gentleman explain whether there is any provision in the bill to assure us that the Mexicans who come over here to do this work—and I am in sympathy with this bill—can be gotten out of this country and back to Mexico, to be sure that they do not stay here and interfere with our immigration laws? The language in the bill does not spell that out very clearly to me. From the gentleman's study of the bill, I thought he might be able to throw some light on that subject.

Mr. HOPE. This bill simply amends the act which we passed last year by saying that it shall be in effect not only when there is an agreement with Mexico, but also after efforts have been made in good faith to reach an agreement, and there has been a failure to reach an agreement. So the provisions of the bill which we passed last year govern, as far as the return of these Mexicans to Mexico is concerned, after they have completed their contracts in this country.

The provisions of the bill to which this joint resolution is an amendment provide that these people must return to Mexico as soon as they have completed their contracts in this country; that they are here illegally after that time.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield to me for one further question?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. May I ask the gentleman to give us an illustration, or give us the benefit of his knowledge, of what has transpired heretofore under the existing law? Have we had any serious trouble after bringing Mexican nationals in, as we have been doing for years, in getting a count on those who were here and then getting them to return to Mexico? Has there been any trouble with those who did not return? Was there interference with the immigration authorities so that an additional burden was thrown upon them? What is the fact in respect to that?

Mr. HOPE. No; there has been no serious trouble with the Mexicans who came in legally under this program. The gentleman knows, as we all know, that many Mexicans come in illegally. Those who come in illegally and who are not in any way affected by this bill have caused most of the trouble.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the people did not hire the wetbacks they would not come in, would they? Somebody in this country is hiring them, otherwise there would not be an inducement for them to come in here.

Mr. HOPE. That is undoubtedly true. What this bill does is permit entrants to come in legally, so that we will not have to depend on the wetbacks to harvest our crops and keep our food supply from spoiling. If we do not pass this legislation we know Mexicans will come in. They have come in every year illegally. We know they will continue to as long as there is the differential between wages in this country and Mexico that exists at the present time. Those people are coming in. There is no way to keep them out on a border 2,000 miles long. We could not keep them out absolutely unless we had the United States Army strung along that border. But we believe and the Attorney General believes we will have less trouble and fewer illegal entrants if we permit them to come in legally. That is the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman of course recognizes that the Government of Mexico has a right to undertake to protect its own nationals?

Mr. HOPE. I do not recognize they have a right to protect their own nationals which is superior to the right of this country to define the conditions under which citizens of another country may seek and obtain and carry out employment in this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish the gentleman would think that answer of his over, because I hardly think it represents the views of my friend, having served with him so many years, because we certainly are acting unilaterally in this bill. The gentleman's answer would indicate that he does not recognize the right of the Government of Mexico, although we may not agree with it, to undertake to protect its own nationals. The gentleman's answer would indicate that he denies that.

Mr. HOPE. They have a right to undertake anything they want to, but we do not have to yield to their ideas as to what conditions their nationals should work under in this country. They are here by reason of our sufferance, as far as that is concerned. We admit them here for a certain purpose. They are here by our permission while they are here. I am sure my friend does not want to say that we do not have the right as a sovereign nation to say how they shall conduct themselves while they are in this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says they are here by sufferance. We are trying to induce them to come here, are we not? A wetback would be here in violation of the law.

Mr. HOPE. They do not obtain any rights when they come in here that we do not choose to give them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman think the passage of this joint resolution would be conducive to good relationships between the United States and the Government of Mexico?

Mr. HOPE. Let me answer in this way: These negotiations have been going on since last October. I will not say they broke down in January because they never were actually broken off, but we submitted a proposal to the Mexican Government at that time. We had no reply from it. However, since the introduction of this legislation and the hearings that were held by the Committee on Agriculture, these negotiations have been resumed, and I am happy to say some progress has been made. I do not believe that indicates that there has been any disruption of our relations or any worsening of our relations during that time. As I said a while ago, as long as the Mexican Government believes that we have to operate under an agreement it is going to be pretty tough to get along with. But we do not have to operate under an agreement. We can operate unilaterally. When they are convinced of that fact, as I think they are now, I believe it will be possible for us to reach an agreement within a very short time. Of course, we want to reach an agreement. That is the purpose.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understood it was said we had to operate under a bilateral agreement.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 20]

Ayres	Carrigg	Davis, Tenn.
Baker	Celler	Dawson, Ill.
Battle	Chatham	Dingell
Bentley	Chelf	Durham
Buckley	Clardy	Ellsworth
Campbell	Coudert	Fallon

Gamble	Oakman	Sheppard
Jensen	Reed, Ill.	Taylor
Kersten, Wis.	Richards	Thomas
Krueger	Rivers	Vursell
Lantaff	Roberts	Wainwright
Morrison	Roosevelt	Weichel
Moulder, Mo.	Shafer	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. KEATING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Comittee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 355, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 387 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I have stood in the well of the House for several years now to call the attention of the Members of this body and their staffs and families to an interesting and very helpful opportunity afforded all of us. During the historic lenten season which begins on Wednesday, March 3, the various Protestant denominations cooperate in noonday services daily on Capitol Hill.

The services are held daily, Monday through Friday, from 12:10 to 12:30 in the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, 212 East Capitol Street, and the speakers are from the various Protestant denominations. Everybody will receive a most cordial welcome.

The church is located opposite the Folger Shakespeare Library and across the street from the Library of Congress and the Supreme Court. It is, therefore, in quick walking distance from the Capitol and the Senate and House Office Buildings.

In these difficult days in which we live and study national and world problems I, for one, believe most sincerely that we should learn and understand afresh the spirtual foundations of our democratic way of life. We can strengthen our country in the long run only upon these spiritual foundations of our democratic way of life.

The lenten season comes at a fitting time to reinforce and guide us all.

I would commend these services to my fellow Members for their personal attendance. I would also suggest that we make it possible for our staffs to attend.

The list of speakers for the entire 6 weeks period is as follows:

Ash Wednesday, March 3: Dr. Lawrence D. Folkemer, Church of the Reformation.

Thursday, March 4: Rev. Robert E. Lee, St. Luke's Lutheran Church.

Friday, March 5: Rev. Robert J. Plumb, St. Mark's Episcopal Church.

Monday, March 8: Dr. Hirl A. Kester, Waugh Methodist Church.

Tuesday, March 9: Mrs. Clarence T. Nelson, Augustana Lutheran Church.

Wednesday, March 10: Mrs. Nelson.

Thursday, March 11: Mrs. Nelson.

Friday, March 12: Mrs. Nelson.

Monday, March 15: Rev. James C. Fahl, Metropolitan Presbyterian Church.

Tuesday, March 16: Dr. Edward G. Latch, Metropolitan Methodist Church.

Wednesday, March 17: Dr. Latch.

Thursday, March 18: Dr. Albert P. Shirkey, Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church.

Friday, March 19: Dr. Shirkey.

Monday, March 22: Rev. Paul Diehl, Trinity Methodist Church.

Tuesday, March 23: Dr. Carl Heath Koupf, First Congregational Church.

Wednesday, March 24: Dr. Kopf.

Thursday, March 25: Dr. Kopf.

Friday, March 26: Dr. Kopf.

Monday, March 29: Rev. Paul E. Horn, Memorial Evangelical United Brethren Church.

Tuesday, March 30: Dr. Clarence W. Cranford, Calvary Baptist Church.

Wednesday, March 31: Dr. Cranford.

Thursday, April 1: Dr. Cranford.

Friday, April 2: Dr. Cranford.

Monday, April 5: Rev. Duane Ramsey, Church of the Brethren.

Tuesday, April 6: Rev. Paul R. Schearrer, Takoma Park Presebyterian Church.

Wednesday, April 7: Reverend Schearrer.

Thursday, April 8: Dr. Edward H. Pruden, First Baptist Church.

Friday, April 9: Dr. Pruden.

HOLY WEEK

Monday, April 12: Rev. Otto Reimherr, Hope Lutheran Church.

Tuesday, April 13: Dr. Carl R. Simon, Keller Memorial Lutheran Church.

Wednesday, April 14: Dr. Folkemer.

Thursday, April 15: Dr. Robert E. Van Deusen, National Lutheran Council.

Good Friday, April 16: The 3-hour service, 12 to 3 p. m.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great regret that I find myself in opposition to the members of my committee, the Committee on Agriculture, which presented this joint resolution for your consideration.

For almost 20 years now I have served on that very important committee. During that entire time I have served with my beloved colleague from Kansas, the distinguished gentleman who is now chairman of that committee, Mr. CLIFFORD HOPE. No fairer man ever lived. No greater American ever lived. During the 20 years we have served together seldom, if ever, have we had even the slightest kind of controversy.

I want you to know just what has happened with reference to this resolution. I assure you that in my consideration of it I have divorced myself from every partisan consideration. I have approached it with an impartial mind in an effort to judge it for what it was worth. In opposing this resolution I have nothing at stake except my inmost feelings and my own integrity. I accord to every other member of my committee the best of motives, although I question the wisdom of their judgment.

I bring this opposition to you to the end that you may evaluate it and may lift yourselves above the bondages of prejudices and partisan politics. I present it to you in the hope that we may reason together in the best interests of our own great country.

Just one minute about the history of the legislation. We were called into executive session on February 3 by our distinguished chairman to consider our legislative program for the current session. On that morning almost all the members of our committee were there. When we entered the room for executive session, lo and behold we found there a man by the name of Rocco Siciliano, Assistant Secretary of Labor. Our chairman asked us if we would hear the Assistant Secretary of Labor discuss a resolution which he then presented and discussed. The doors of our committee room were closed. Not another human being except the members of the committee heard Mr. Siciliano's testimony. When he had concluded his presentation, I interrogated him and one of the questions I propounded was in substance this: Is this resolution not likely to impair the friendship between the great Governments of America and the Republic of Mexico? To which he replied: "It might have very grave effect."

Now, that is in the record. I want to say here that when Mr. Siciliano concluded his statement, I pointed out to our distinguished chairman that we were in star chamber session, that no public hearings had been held, and that this was was a highly controversial bill, and that I thought that by all means we should open the doors of our committee room and have public hearings. The always reasonable chairman of our great committee immediately arranged for public hearings. So the committee room doors were opened. The public was invited to come and present their views, pro and con. They came from near and far, and we had extensive hearings. I do not believe that any member of the committee now regrets that we threw open the doors of the committee room and held public hearings.

I am frank to say, unfortunately, that the public hearings did not change many opinions of the members of that committee. Why did this man appear there on February 3? I will tell you why. He came there unannounced. No member of our committee knew he was coming except, perhaps, the chairman, and he came there because on the day before, February 2, the great Comptroller General of the United States had issued an order, the effect of which was to say to the Labor Department, "You are operating an illegal program and you must stop." So within 24 hours, this man from the Department of Labor, Mr. Siciliano, appeared before our committee and wanted us to legalize that which Lindsay Warren had said was illegal. So we had the hearings. I asked who represented agriculture on the negotiating team, and Mr. Siciliano looked at his colleagues from the Department—and I said, "Do you mean you do not know the man's name?" and they did not even know the man's name nor his title. So then I said this is an amendment to an agricultural law; where is the report from the Department of Agriculture; and they looked around and they did not even have a report. But from that day on they got a report from Agriculture, Justice, Labor, and from the Department of State. But every single one of those

communications was signed by a man in the lower echelon—not a Cabinet officer would dignify this measure by signing his name to any document approving its passage. The four departments, and I called them the "four horsemen," rode herd on our committee for 2 weeks. The chairman had said that at the end of the hearings we would go into executive session for the vote.

Go back one minute. In that star-chamber session—and it was a star-chamber session—there was an effort made to report this bill. When I pointed out the unheard-of procedure about to be followed, the man who made the motion withdrew it.

Now we have this measure here. They went straight from our committee room to the Rules Committee. The transcript of the evidence had not even been made available to the Members of this House. They demanded a rule, and even at that moment the hearings were not available.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHELLEY. Will the gentleman advise us the number of members of the committee present at the time the bill was acted upon by the committee?

Mr. COOLEY. I think I can do that with propriety, because it was disclosed to the Rules Committee. Although the distinguished chairman had announced that the vote would come immediately upon the conclusion of the hearings, although every member of the committee knew that, when the chips were down and the votes were taken, out of 16 Republicans on that committee only 6 were there. Six out of 16. I am sure all of them had a perfectly legitimate and proper excuse to be absent. But the fact is they were not there. So this bill comes out here as if it were a unanimous report from our Committee on Agriculture, when 10 Republicans did not even record their votes or express their wishes in the final vote.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman has attempted to reflect upon the attendance record of the Republican members.

Mr. COOLEY. No, no.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman does recall that it was February 12, Lincoln's birthday?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly I am not criticizing any of the members of our great committee. I realize that the vote was taken, as my chairman has said, on Lincoln's birthday, February 12. I am perfectly willing to believe that each absent member had a perfectly legitimate excuse for being absent on that day, but the fact remains that only 6 Republicans attended the meeting. I am trying to emphasize the fact that there was no urgency which could have possibly required that the voting should have taken place on Lincoln's birthday. Certainly I did not call for the vote, nor did I arrange for the meeting. I was perfectly willing at all times for the meeting to have been postponed. Actually, had the decision been left to me, I would have postponed it indefinitely pending the negotiations which had been resumed at the request of the President of our own great country. But the vote was taken. My colleagues know that I patiently waited for a quorum to arrive. When the meeting was called to order a quorum was not present, but finally 17 out of the 30 members came into the committee room and the votes were taken. Fourteen voted "aye," 2 voted "no," and there was 1 abstention. Six Republicans and 8 Democrats, making a total of 14, less than a majority of our 30-man committee, reported this very urgent administration must legislation. I still wonder why the must. The only explanation is that our Government officials thought that they must have a blackjack. You just do not compose differences with blackjacks and bowie knives or shotguns and pistols.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman contend there are more than two members of the committee at this time who are opposed to this legislation?

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, no. I am not making that contention at all. I am perfectly willing to stand here alone in my opposition to this resolution. There is one thing that I have tried to teach myself all the days of my life and that is never to permit myself to be disappointed. I was not disappointed by the vote in our committee. I shall not be disappointed by the vote which will soon be taken on the pending measure. But most of all, I shall not disappoint myself by offending my own sensibilities regarding this very important resolution.

My recollection is that the star-chamber courts were abolished in England in about 1640. I believe you will agree with me that it would have been very unfortunate if this resolution had been reported by our committee at the time that the first motion to report the resolution was made. I cannot believe that our great chairman would have permitted this resolution to have been reported under such circumstances. When he realized the import of its purpose he very readily agreed for hearings to be held. I have no right to criticize the actions of Senators, but I understand that a similar resolution was reported in a star chamber session without the benefit of the testimony of a single solitary witness at the other end of the Capitol. Our committee has never operated in secrecy, and I hope that it never shall. Regardless of the outcome, when the final vote is taken here today, I know that all of us will be happy in the glad thought that our committee room doors were thrown open and committee hearings were held.

Let us dispel all this misunderstanding about this important measure. I am very much afraid that you have been led to believe that this resolution merely extends the existing law and the programs we have had through the years. That is far from being the truth. Just a moment ago I commended the chairman of the Rules Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, LEO ALLEN, upon the splendid manner in which he presented the rule, but I am frank to say that just about all of the debate on the rule was well calculated to lead Members to believe that this is just merely an extension of the Mexican farm labor law. Now what is the truth? In 1948 Congress enacted a law, the purpose of which was to provide a program for the recruitment of Mexican farm labor. The law contemplated an agreement between the two countries, an agreement with the dignity of a treaty, but an agreement between employer and employee which would provide a degree of security for both. Under that law agreements were negotiated, contracts were made, and Mexican labor worked in the fields of America. In 1951 when I was chairman of the great Committee on Agriculture that law was rewritten and reenacted and pursuant to the amended law other agreements were negotiated and other contracts were written. Under the present administration, just last year, that law was renewed and extended through the year 1955. This was done at the request of the present administration and the law is still in full force and effect. Even the laws I have referred to met with formidable opposition when each of the bills was presented. It was never contemplated that Mexican laborers would be brought into this country to take the jobs of Americans. Mexican labor was to be brought into America only when American labor was not available, and only when the Department of Labor had certified that American workers were not ready, willing, and able to take and to perform the jobs in which labor was then needed.

When our committee was considering an extension of the Mexican farm-labor law in 1953, during the hearings, our chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], indicated that he thought that the agreements were working satisfactorily, and actually the people in the Department of Labor indicated that they, too, thought that the agreements were working well.

Now, all of a sudden, we find ourselves in the very unfortunate position of not being able to compose differences which have arisen. We were told that there were 7 or 8 points in dispute, but that not one of them had been composed. From the very beginning I insisted upon an honest effort in further negotiations to compose all the differences involved. For some reason unknown to me and I think actually unknown to you—the Republican lash is being used and we are told that this is a "must" bill, but we are not told why it is a "must' bill. Let me remind you that the law is on the books; our negotiators are negotiating; great progress has been made and a contract or agreement may soon be announced.

Now, perhaps you will think it is very audacious of me, a Democratic Congressman to communicate with the White House and with the others with whom I have communicated.

My first objection was that this resolution would disrupt our friendly relations with our great neighbor south of the border. Our people had terminated the negotiations and had come home north of the border to operate operations unilaterally. This was a great affront and an insult of the people of Mexico. So I called the White House and I asked: "What did the President say

to the Ambassador from Mexico about this resolution?" I was told that the President expressed the hope that negotiations would be resumed immediately and actually that very night in Mexico City negotiations were resumed at Mr. Eisenhower's request, and they have continued from that time up until now, and the last report came to me yesterday from the Department of Labor.

I checked also with the Mexican Ambassador.

Now, if your President and mine has caused these negotiations to be resumed why should we wave this red flag in the face of the Mexican people? Why should we insult them by saying that they cannot negotiate with their neighbors in good faith and cannot intelligently compose differences?

The negotiations have led to this point, that Mr. White, our Ambassador, has said that within a week or two they will conclude an agreement. We were told by the gentleman who flew in from California that if this bill was not reported before midnight tomorrow night and signed by the President that the wetbacks who had come into this country legally would thereafter remain here illegally. He must have known that that could have been rectified, and it was indeed. Our Government officials have authorized renewal of those employment contracts for 6 weeks.

All I have been pleading for in connection with this bill is to delay its consideration until those negotiations could be consummated and put into a written document, an agreement. But no, they have run the steamroller; and why, heaven only knows, especially when we realize that yesterday in Caracas a very serious and important conference of the American family of nations was convened. Unfortunately the hostile atmosphere was so intense that our great Secretary of State was met at the airport and taken to his hotel in a bullet-proof automobile with the heaviest guard that ever surrounded a diplomat of our country. Here he is in that hostile atmosphere. Here we are about to insult and offend Mexico. This resolution will definitely offend the Republic of Mexico.

I called the Ambassador, a little unusual for a Congressman, I suppose, to be calling a diplomat, but I did it because of my intense interest in the international aspects of this resolution. He said definitely that it will have a bad effect on our relationship, that if we pass this resolution it will hit the headlines of all the newspapers of Mexico and great antagonism will be aroused.

Why should we disturb Mr. Eisenhower's negotiations, I ask you? It is not urgent. The record shows that Mr. Siciliano stated that this resolution was brought here because this is the season of the year when the labor was needed less than at any other season of the year. That is the record. Yet we have it here.

I did not stop with the White House, I did not stop with the Mexican Ambassador; I said before the Rules Committee that it was my belief that Secretary John Foster Dulles had never known anything about this resolution. I took it upon myself to call the Secretary of State and he frankly admitted that he did not know anything about it, but he assured me he would investigate immediately. The very next morning his assistant was in my office. I discussed the matter at length with him. I told him about my opposition, about my apprehension regarding the international aspects, and he said he would go back and reappraise it. The Mexican Ambassador went down to the State Department to see Mr. Morton and to discuss it. I did not stop there. I told the Rules Committee that this resolution would destroy all the good that had been accomplished by Milton Eisenhower's trip to South America. He went there on a friendly mission, and this thing is an unfriendly act.

I called Milton Eisenhower in Pennsylvania. He was surprised and amazed, and told me he would call Secretary Dulles the next day. Secretary Dulles is a busy man—I am not blaming him. But this is an important resolution. It is not needed. We now have the law, the negotiations are being carried on, and if we can defeat this bill I venture the assertion that within 10 days a contract will be signed.

In a telephone conversation only yesterday morning I mentioned to Mr. Siciliano the desirability of postponing action in the House because negotiations were coming along so well and that it might prove embarrassing diplomatically and to our negotiator. Mr. Siciliano said, "I do not disagree with you at all." In fact, Mr. Siciliano said that Secretary Mitchell had said at the White House there might be reason for wanting to postpone it. Then Mr. Mitchell said that he would have to tell them at the White House this might be embarrassing to Mr. Dulles. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] did not tell the membership of this House what took place at the White House, but here it is.

Mr. Chairman, here it is. Why on earth should we do something to embarrass Mr. Dulles and to embarrass Ambassador White in our negotiations with a friendly country?

I could stand up here and talk for the rest of the day about this resolution and about the law. The Lord in Heaven knows I have no ax to grind, and I have no purpose that should not be your purpose; that is, to see to it that our Government deals in a friendly way with a friendly nation.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Did the gentleman read the remarks of the majority leader on yesterday or hear them, in which he said that he had just come from a conference at the White House and at that conference with the President of the United States he was told that this legislation is vitally necessary?

Mr. COOLEY. I heard it. I heard the speech of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], but I am saying that the gentleman did not tell the House that Secretary of Labor Mitchell said it might be embarrassing to Mr. Dulles.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman very well knows that the State Department has approved this legislation?

Mr. COOLEY. The State Department sent up a letter signed by an assistant, Mr. Morton, yes, but not by Mr. Dulles.

Mr. HOEVEN. Does the gentleman contend that he does not speak for the State Department?

Mr. COOLEY. I contend that he has no right to take the position he has in what he has asked of this Congress. This is not a continuation of law. He is asking this Congress to invalidate the law that has been on the books since 1948, and to come in through the back door.

Do you know what kind of diplomacy this is? It is the "slam-the-door, go-it-alone diplomatic policy"; and I mean slam the door, because they have actually slammed the door on every employment station in the interior of Mexico.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have the situation of our Secretary of State in Venezuela now, appealing for amity among the nations of North and South America. Only Sunday the President sent a letter to Dr. Charles W. Mayo, president of the American Association for the United Nations, on the occasion of the association's 3-day conference on United States responsibility for world leadership; and among other things the President said that the United States leadership "reflects no ambition for world power. It springs from no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of another nation."

Mr. COOLEY. Let me return to this proposition to show that the negotiations are almost concluded. And I pause to say that if we pass this resolution, I would not be a bit surprised if the Mexican officials got up and walked out of the conference. I said before the Rules Committee that I did not see how President Eisenhower could, with good grace, sign this resolution, approve it, knowing that the negotiations were started at his request.

Here is what Mr. Siciliano told me; and I think this was dated March 1:

> Our main difficulty now is that we are having trouble in translating the agreement on principles into writing. We have reached an agreement on wages. We are going to set the wages, but to put this agreement in writing is our present difficulty. One thing they have backed away from finally is that they wanted to set the wages. We are willing to give them the right of appeal if they think the wages are too low. Our trouble is now the language difficulty in putting the agreement in writing.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The question I want to ask, Mr. Chairman, is: Does the gentleman agree that this legislation has had the effect of probably stimulating some agreement on the part of Mexico for fear that if they do not get "on the ball" and enter into an agreement, we are going to adopt the same position that Mexico has held? Will the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. COOLEY. That is the same as saying, which everyone here knows to be true, and as the gentleman from Iowa said here yesterday, that this is a

weighted blackjack. You cannot negotiate with friends with a blackjack in your hand, or with a horse pistol in your hand, or with a bullwhip in your hand. If the gentleman thinks he is going to blackjack the Mexicans into an agreement, he is mistaken.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think that we have permitted the Mexicans to dictate to us over the years and that we have had to accept their terms in an emergency?

Mr. COOLEY. I can prove to the gentleman from the lips of Mr. HOPE, of Kansas, the chairman of the committee, who said last year that this bill and these contracts had operated successfully. You have never heard a complaint about them.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But we have not got an agreement. That is what we are asking for now.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is not asking for an agreement. He is asking for a unilateral operation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If they will not give us an agreement; yes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I should like to call attention to the fact that under the immigration and nationality code, the Attorney General of the United States has ample authority under whatever regulations he deems necessary to deal with this very situation. What disturbs me is that if a treaty is not negotiated, then the Attorney General will never get around to working out the sort of an arrangement which has proved so satisfactory in the North, between the United States and Canada. That is the important thing, as I see it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. HOPE. I should like to find out from the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], whom I regard as a great authority on immigration law, the answer to this question. It is perfectly true, of course, that the Attorney General can arrange for the admission of these aliens into this country, but he cannot give them the protection that they get under Public Law 78, unless we pass this legislation to permit the program to go into effect. That is the question we are considering today, and the only question.

Mr. WALTER. I do not agree with my distinguished friend at all. If he will look at section 101 and section 214 (a) of the Immigration Code, he will find that it is spelled out because, after all, sitting in on the preparation of this section of the bill was Mr. Fellows of Maine, who had the problem in his State of the Canadian woodsmen coming down temporarily, Senator FERGUSON of Michigan, with the same problem as it related to Windsor and Detroit, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON]. We have always felt that we pointed the way to the Attorney General of the United States, no matter who he is, to work out a decent solution of this problem.

Mr. HOPE. If the gentleman will yield for one moment, I am sure my friend from Pennsylvania is not contending that under the legislation to which he refers the Department of Labor can operate a placement program. That is the question that is involved here, whether they can operate a placement program so as to protect these people as we have been doing in the past.

Mr. COOLEY. I want to address this remark to the lawyers in this House, and I think even the laymen know it, that you cannot have a unilateral agreement. There is no such animal known to legal jurisprudence. Whoever heard of a unilateral agreement? What our officials have done in Mexico is to slam the door on the recruiting offices and to move north of the Rio Grande and to carry on in illegal fashion.

The New York Times published a statement the other day that 100 Communists a day were coming across the border as wetbacks and finding their way into the city districts of this country.

Going back to the negotiations, this is what Mr. White said about it, and this is sent to me from the Mexican Embassy. It is a translation from Excelsior, a paper published in Mexico City:

> In a statement made to the press in Monterrey, Ambassador White said that he was hopeful that an agreement on Mexican migratory workers would be reached soon.
>
> Ambassador White stated that the negotiations are being conducted between the two Governments in a spirit of great friendship and understanding.
>
> "We can emphatically state," he added, "that we have made real progress in the negotiations and that we expect soon to reach a definite agreement."

That was back on February 23. They have made much progress since then.

Mr. HOPE. That was after the committee had reported out the joint resolution?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. But it was only after my call to the White House on February 10, before the bill was reported, and after the President had no doubt called Mr. White and insisted on resumption of negotiations that progress was made. Certainly it was not the resolution that prompted the resumption of negotiations; it was directly due to the wish of the President after I had communicated with the White House.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman does not contend, then, that we offended the Mexican Government by reporting out this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. No; but you will offend them when you pass this resolution, because it will be the Congress of this great country speaking. Up to then it was only 6 Republicans and 8 Democrats in the committee, but now the Congress is about to act.

Let me go to another thing, and that is the necessity of orderly recruiting. The Mexican Government had insisted on interior recruiting because they knew if they had border recruiting all these workers would flock to the border, as they did, and they would have social problems of great magnitude. They would have thousands of people there without food and shelter, and what would happen? Mob violence would break loose.

What did happen? Here are some of the headlines:

"Mexican Pact Ends—Recruiting Labor at Border Begins Monday."

That is from El Centro, Calif. Then you have another one from the Imperial Valley Press:

"Near Riot at Border—Mexican Border Violence Erupts."

Another one:

"Unemployed Here Near Postwar Peak."

Here is another:

"Violence Shatters Border Recruiting."

The minute they put border recruiting in—and that is what our officials insisted on—this is what happened:

"Iron Curtain Border Policy Strengthened by Mexicans. Some Brave Guards in Border Jumping."

Here is one. "Thousands of Desperate Mexican Laborers Charge Against Border Gates."

They are doing that by the thousands.

"Border Shut Off for Week—Jobless Mob Seek Entry."

"Quota Filled Until Monday—Unemployment Increases 510,000 Over Last Month."

This unemployment is in our own country. Look at the mobs in this picture. Riot guns and tear gas used on these poor, hungry Mexicans who are trying to get in here to earn something by working in the fields of America.

"United States Officers Hurling Back Bracero Mob." Our officers are hurling back the Mexicans, people who want to come over here to work. There are thousands of them.

Here is another headline. "Surprise Predawn Gate Opening Admits Braceros."

"Emergency Police Forces Turn Back Worker Hordes."

Let me stop at this point to tell you that I could go on indefinitely with these headlines. Here is another one.

"Recruitment Full Steam Ahead as Mexico Lifts Iron Curtain."

"Drive Back Bracero Mob—Mexicans Trampled in Rush on Border—Orderly Recruiting Shattered as Milling Throng Makes Break." These are headlines in American papers and these pictures provide convincing evidence why Mexico does not want border recruiting.

Let me turn now to the cost of this program. Do you know what it costs—you economy-minded people? Out of 200,000 contract laborers coming into America last year, 178,000 of the 200,000 went to the landlords of five States. Mark that. The other 22,000 went into 22 other States.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman name the five States.

Mr. COOLEY. The five States are Texas, California, New Mexico, Arizona, and Arkansas. This program cost the taxpayers 2½ million dollars in 1953. In other words, you are subsidizing the big landlords of five States to the tune of 2½ million dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish the Members who were not present yesterday during the debate on the rule would read the two telegrams which I inserted in my remarks at page 2424 of yesterday's RECORD. One was from Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, who is President Eisenhower's Commissioner on Migratory Labor and the other is from the Texas chairman of the American GI Forum, Mr. Cristobal Aldrete.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope that every Member will read those messages. I came here with the 1951 bill, and frankly I had not studied this bill nor this program as carefully as I have studied the program during the last 30 days. In the last 30 days I have studied every aspect of this program and every implication of this legislation. Are we going to support a program that costs the taxpayers $2½ million to furnish labor for the landlords of five States, when, we in our own country, under our own farm program, and under the proclamation of the Secretary of Agriculture, are taking 30 million acres of fertile farm land out of production of basic agricultural commodities? Where are those workers who tilled those 30 million acres in 1953 going to find jobs? Where are they going to go to make a living? I can show you pictures right now of bread lines right here in this country. I have a picture here showing the main street of Phoenix, Ariz., where they are feeding 1,500 to 1,600 meals a day to idle people. Does that not make an impression on you? Are we going to bring Mexicans in here to take jobs of American workers who are idle and in bread lines? Let us see where this program goes. Look at how ridiculous this program is. Do you know how many Mexican laborers went to the great State of Illinois? Do you know how many of those strong-backed Mexican laborers from Mexico went to Illinois? One hundred and nine. Do you believe that the economy of a State like Illinois depends upon the strength of 109 Mexicans? In the city of Chicago, in the great State of Illinois, they are maintaining a great regional office. And in Ohio, bless your soul, they did not even get a single Mexican. There, too, they are maintaining a regional office in Cleveland. Please explain that to me, if you will? Do you know how many went to the great State of Kansas, the State of my great and beloved chairman—five. Do you mean to tell me that the economy of the State of Kansas depends upon the labor of five Mexicans? Do you know how many went to Wisconsin—eight. I know that the great State of Wisconsin can get along without the labor of eight Mexicans. Now look—there is something "rotten in Denmark"—I do not know what it is, but I think it is our duty to find out.

One hundred and nine in Illinois; Iowa got 96. Now think of the cost of taking a Mexican from the Mexican border out to Wisconsin. Do you believe that any landlord in Wisconsin or Kansas or Illinois is going to pay the fare and maintenance en route for a worker to come from, say, 500 miles south of the border to go up there to work in those States? Oh, no.

Down in the corner of this chart there is a statement which needs some explanation. "One million nine hundred and thirty-one thousand five hundred and seven meals, including box lunches"—I know you all know what box lunches are, especially you on the left side of the aisle—"box lunches were provided to Mexican agricultural workers by the United States Government, almost 2 million meals."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will the gentleman tell us who is going to pay for that?

Mr. COOLEY. The people who gave me this chart did not say until I called their attention to it and asked them. We provided in the law that you could charge each landlord $15 per head to bring the laborer up to the border. The Department has operated that program so as to make a profit. They paid for the meals out of that fund. But do you know what it costs now? They have reduced that $15 down to $6 on the average.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will you tell us why they reduced it to $6?

Mr. COOLEY. Because they found it did not cost $15.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. They were making a profit?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. Even now they have a surplus, but I am anxious to know how these 8 men got up to Wisconsin and these 5 brave Mexicans got all the way up to Kansas. What were they needed for? Do you mean to tell me you cannot find five idle farm workers in the great State of Kansas who are willing to do stoop labor?

These people come across the border in droves, by the thousands. Only 200,000 came over under contract, and I think the record is that a million came over illegally. About 800,000 of them were deported.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. I gathered from the gentleman's remarks that the first 20 minutes of his speech was in favor of the continuance of the present operation. Now the last 5 minutes of his speech, he appears to be against the entire thing.

My speech is in two parts and both parts are very vital. In the first place, I want this resolution defeated. In the second place, I want our committee to look into this program from bottom to top and to find out just how it has been operated. I want to know why 5 Mexicans from south of the border went to the great State of Kansas and why 8 Mexicans from south of the border went to Wisconsin, and further, why 96 Mexican workers went to Iowa and only 109 to Illinois. Who paid their way? Did the landlords pay the bill or did Uncle Sam pick up the check? Is our economy so weak that we must depend upon Mexican labor to provide the food and the fiber for our own people?

Until our committee has thoroughly investigated and examined this program, I am perfectly willing for the bilateral program to continue, but I definitely do not want workers from Mexico to take jobs which are wanted and needed by our own unemployed citizens.

I have talked, perhaps too long, but actually I could go on for the rest of the day and into the night. I have not yet heard one sound or logical argument why this resolution should be adopted. I know that the party whip on the left side of the aisle has been used in typical Republican fashion. Perhaps those on the left side of the aisle know why this resolution is so urgent, but, unfortunately, they have not let us in on their great secret.

The passage of this resolution will be unfortunate but the administration wants it and perhaps the administration will have it. What will become of brother Milton's friendly mission to the countries south of the border? Why is the atmosphere at Caracas so hostile? Why is the Mexican Ambassador so concerned? If the passage of this resolution is not wise and in the interest of our good neighbor policy, the decision is that of the administration now in power and the responsibility and the results are attached to those who are responsible for its passage. I know it is unwise; I know it is not right; I know that it will rise up to haunt us in the days ahead. How can it be urgent; how can it be right when our own citizens are unemployed and in bread lines? Mexico has insisted upon a continuation of the contracts made under the old agreement until a new agreement can be negotiated. The arrogance of our Government is calculated to inflame the minds of our friends south of the border. When you offend one member of a family of nations, in a degree you offend all other members of that family of nations. Is there any earthly reason why we should want to offend the people of Mexico?

The only way to cope with the wetback problem is to enforce our immigration laws. The Mexican Government is not willing to make prisoners of their own citizens any more than the American Government is willing to imprison us within the continental confines of our own territory. Mexicans, as Americans, have a right to move from their nation into any other nation in which they desire to go and in which they are accepted. We cannot depend upon Mexico to enforce our own immigration laws. This economy-minded administration has denied the Immigration and Naturalization Service $3,500,000 which that service deems necessary in the enforcement of our immigration laws. No wonder the border patrol has broken down; no wonder we are unable to enforce our immigration laws; no wonder that 100 Communists are coming across the border every day in the week and in the month as wetbacks and finding their ways into the industries of America. This administration screams about communism and yet it makes no effort to protect our southern border. Because of a limitation of funds the Naturalization and Immigration Service has found

it necessary to take men from Philadelphia, from Baltimore, and from Norfolk to reinforce the border patrol on the Mexican border. This, to be sure, is false economy. Better that we take the $2,500,000 which is being used to subsidize the landlords of 5 States and use that money to enforce our immigration laws.

We have spent billions rehabilitating the shattered economies of other countries. We have been trying to build friendships around the world. Our storehouses are bulging with vital foods and fibers and yet we are told that there is hunger and distress just south of the Rio Grande. What have we done for Mexico and for the hungry people that live within its borders? There is no real port of entry on that long border that extends for 1,600 or 1,800 miles. The Rio Grande, a narrow brook in the catalogue of rivers, is the port of entry. With our neighbors to the south shall we be arrogant or shall we be friendly? Shall we be exacting or shall we be charitable?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Could you advise the House as to the number of Mexican nationals who are now being utilized to harvest crops which are paid support prices?

Mr. COOLEY. Frankly, most of these Mexicans worked with fruits and vegetables. Many of them, however, are engaged in the picking or pulling of cotton. Cotton is about the only crop in which Mexican labor is used that is supported at 90 percent of parity. The other crops involved might be supported at a lower level.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Could the gentleman advise the House approximately how many men were used in harvesting the cotton crop?

Mr. COOLEY. I regret I cannot give the gentleman accurate information as to the number of Mexicans employed in the harvesting of our cotton crop. But in that connection I want to say that I do not believe that any Mexican can make as much as $15 a day either picking or pulling cotton in the cotton fields of America. In my State of North Carolina I think we pay more for picking cotton than is paid in any of the great cotton-growing States of the Union, and I know that no one person can make $15 a day picking cotton in North Carolina. If the landlords of the great cotton-producing areas, or if the vegetable producers, or the fruitgrowers of America are willing to pay anything like $8, $10, $12, or $15 a day for laborers I am positive that American workers by the thousands will flock to the jobs. All this talk about $15 a day for picking cotton is just a lot of bunk. In this connection, let me remind you of the fact that just about every cottongrower in America will this year reduce his acreage by 33⅓ percent. So there will not be so much cotton to pick in 1954. Why should the little cotton farmers and taxpayers of the South subsidize a program for the big industrial, mechanized cotton farms in other parts of the country to the tune of $2,500,000 a year, only to increase our cotton supply and to put it in storage as a burden on the market and on the Government? If we are "going it alone," let us go it alone for the citizens of America who are willing to work and who want to work in our own fields.

Is this the Eisenhower labor program? Frankly, I believe that it is about all of the labor legislation which will be brought to the floor of this House during this the last session of the 83d Congress. Is this the change the people wanted and voted for? Is this the good-neighbor policy of the present administration? Has any Democratic Secretary of State ridden in a bulletproof and armored car with barbed-wire entanglements and a heavy guard to protect him in a friendly country south of the Rio Grande? Certainly this resolution is not responsible for all the caution which has been provided at Caracas, but there is something mysterious in the atmosphere which we do not know about or understand. South America wants to be friendly. They want to trade with us as neighbors. They feel neglected—and maybe they have been. If our good-neighbor policy is to be a reality, we must be realistic about it.

Now, in conclusion, I repeat: There are two parts to my speech—first, this resolution should be defeated; second, this program should be reexamined and reappraised and perhaps abolished in its entirety.

Throughout the years we have in the Republic of Mexico cultivated the sweet flower of friendship. Let us not now ruthlessly pull the petals from this lovely flower which should flourish through the years to come.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to reply briefly to one or two statements made by my distinguished friend the gentleman from North Carolina which perhaps have left the wrong impression with the Committee. One of those is his statement to the effect that this matter was taken up in an executive session and was expected to be concluded in an executive session without benefit of any hearing.

In reply to my friend I want to call attention to the printed hearings—they are available to all of you—and to point out that it was not an executive session which was held the first day, the day that Mr. Siciliano was present. Every word that was spoken at that meeting was transcribed and is to be found in the hearings. The Chair during the course of the hearings made the statement to the effect that it was not an executive session, and I want to read the statement that the Chair made at that time. I am quoting:

> Let the Chair make a statement. Two or three members have asked if this is an executive session. I have told the members who asked that it is not. The press is here. If some of the members do not know that the press is here I am advising them now that there is a representative of the press present.

There was no executive session; and I will say to my distinguished friend from North Carolina that there was no intention on the part of the chairman at any time to conclude the matter at the session which was held that morning which was called first as an executive session to consider another matter. However, because of the emergency and urgency of this situation the Chair asked the committee to hear Mr. Siciliano in open session, which it did, after which the Chair asked the committee to decide what it wanted to do about the matter, whether to have a further hearing or to take some action on the matter. The committee decided to have further hearings and there were 5 days of additional hearings held on the resolution.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I want to say to my distinguished friend there was no disagreement between us with reference to the matter which the gentleman is now discussing. I certainly know that my chairman would not have permitted action to be taken on a matter of this kind in a star chamber session or in an executive session.

RECEPTION OF HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

The Committee rose informally.

At 2:14 p. m., the Speaker declared a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving the Governor of Puerto Rico, His Excellency Luis Muñoz-Marín.

At 2:21 p. m. the Speaker called the House to order and the Committee resumed its sitting.

MEXICAN AGRICULTURE WORKERS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to make a political speech here today. We are dealing with realities, but I may say very frankly that since the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina has said there are only 8 of these Mexican nationals that came to Minnesota I feel I can speak with impartiality on this subject.

In the first place, I want to employ American labor wherever it is available to work in agriculture and in other pursuits.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not think I have anything to correct. The gentleman stated there were 8 of these Mexican nationals in Minnesota. I do not know where he got his figures.

Mr. COOLEY. I meant in Wisconsin. I stand corrected.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman said Minnesota and referred to my name in particular. I have reason to believe that he knows what he is talking about sometimes, but in this case I feel that he is mistaken in what he has told the members of this committee on this important piece of legislation.

As I stated, I want American labor to do our work in the United States if it is available. There may be unemployed something like 3 million people, scattered over the United States. Back in 1949 when we recommended this legislation and put it through Congress under the leadership of the gentleman from North Carolina there were 4,300,000 unemployed in the United States, and none of them would work on the farms in the areas to do stoop labor which is required, which American citizens will not do.

We have had agreements with Mexico. I am hopeful and I am sure that we will have another agreement that will be fair and equitable to our country and Mexico and to the employers of labor, providing not only adequate compensation for the Mexican workers that come into this country but also do justice to the employers of labor and the cost of the program to the Government.

We have heard a great deal mentioned about wetbacks. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has referred to this as the wetback bill. This bill seeks to prevent wetbacks from coming into the United States. We want Mexicans to come in legally. Unless this resolution is passed, these Mexicans who want to come into the United States will come in across the Rio Grande River and they will be wetbacks. If we do not pass this resolution, if we do not enact it into law, there will not only not be an agreement, but our country will be flooded with wetbacks, who will be here illegally. Then we will have another problem, to get them out of this country. There has been reference, too, to the fact that a good many Communists come in from Mexico. I do not know if there is any truth to that; there may be some, but they come in as wetbacks, over the Rio Grande River. They do not come in through the legal channels, the legal ports of entry. This resolution seeks to prevent those wetbacks and those Communists from coming into the United States by having the selected men examined by the Immigration Service, both as to their health and as to their character, to determine whether or not they can come into the United States. If they are found to be unreliable, if it is thought that they might do injury to this country, if they are unhealthy, they are not permitted to come into this country.

We are hoping that there is going to be an agreement with Mexico, but I can assure you this: Unless this resolution is passed, there will not be any fair agreement with Mexico.

It has been said that this bill is used as a blackjack. That has come from the opposition to this legislation. For more than 20 years it has been the policy of our country, up to a year or two ago, to appease every country in the world, to do what they wanted and not what was for the best interests of our country. I think it is high time that we think of the welfare of the American people and have American policies, whether they be bilateral or unilateral.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has made an impassioned plea to you here today to defeat this legislation. He is mistaken in his opinion, and I am sorry to see it. He has referred to the proceedings of our committee in executive session, which is quite unusual for any member of our committee. He has referred to star-chamber sessions.

I have sat on this committee longer than has the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] or possibly any other man. There may have been star-chamber sessions under his chairmanship of the committee, but not to my knowledge. For him to stand here and accuse the present chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], of conducting star-chamber sessions is uncalled for. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is not warranted in making such accusations.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry; I cannot yield to the gentleman.

Let us pass this legislation. Let us improve our relations with Mexico, because we will be providing the means, the honest means, to secure a satisfactory agreement with the country to the south of us, who are our friends. They understand us best when we are a little firm on those things on which we are trying to negotiate.

We would have been much better off with the entire world had we been firm and stood for America during the past 20 years in negotiating agreements for the benefit of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has made some reference to what he believes to be the attitude of the administration, the executive branch of the Government, with respect to this measure.

Let me say again today, as I said yesterday, that this matter was discussed at the White House last week. It was discussed again Monday morning. I say unequivocally and without any reservation at all that this measure is approved by the administration. There is no difference among the executive departments of the Government with respect to it. I state that as a fact without regard to any question that may be raised about it. I had hoped it would not be necessary to be that blunt about it, but since the question has been raised, perhaps that is the best way to clarify it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I was reporting the conversation I had with the Department of Labor to the effect that Mr. Mitchell had indicated at the White House conference which the gentleman attended yesterday morning at 8:30 that this resolution might be very embarrassing to Mr. Dulles at Caracas. If he did not say that, then I was misinformed.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman that Mr. Mitchell was there. The gentleman from North Carolina has been around here long enough to know that I am not going to discuss here on the floor of the House for the RECORD the conversations that took place at the White House conference. The gentleman has been very solicitous about the administration's attitude. That is perfectly all right, but I also have a responsibility, and as I said yesterday this measure would not be here today except for the fact that those in primary charge of the conduct of our foreign affairs as well as our interests at home desire this legislation. May I say to the gentleman that Jim Mitchell, Secretary of Labor was there, but I can say also that this legislation is desired and desired at this time for enactment by the House of Representatives.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course the gentleman is entirely correct in saying the measure would not be here but for the fact that the administration wants it. I know the gentleman is reporting accurately on the conference. All I said was that there were some misgivings, at least with regard to the possibility of embarrassing Mr. Dulles, and he is my Secretary of State just as much as he is yours. I do not want to see him embarrassed. Now, whether the administration wants it or it does not want it, I want you to tell this House why you want it.

Mr. HALLECK. I pointed out the reason yesterday in my talk on the rule. I am not going to go over it again, but I said that I am supporting this legislation, and I said why I am supporting this legislation. As a matter of fact, apparently everybody on the Committee on Agriculture except the gentleman from North Carolina is out of step. It is not just a matter of the administration wanting this legislation. I would assume that this legislation was initiated here in the Congress because we have been acting upon this sort of legislation for years and years. What I am saying is that so far as the administration is concerned and so far as any embarrassing of Mr. Dulles is concerned, and so far as the conduct of our foreign affairs is concerned, it should be understood here without any question that this legislation should proceed to enactment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the former vice chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], for 4 minutes, and I regret that I cannot yield any more time to him.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman does not regret any more than I do that he cannot yield me more than 4 minutes because my distinguished former chairman, and good friend, has undoubtedly been so effective in his argument that I fear that some of our colleagues may have felt that he was speaking for the Democratic membership of the Agriculture Committee. Actually, there was no political division on this bill. More Democrats voted for it than Republicans. Only one other member of the committee joined the gentleman from North Carolina in opposition.

Ordinarily, this measure would have attracted little attention. It has become so important because it has been blown

up into something of tremendous magnitude by those who, doubtless in all good faith, have been seeing "boogers." The bill has been completely misunderstood. Unfortunately, there is little time in which to try to clear up those misunderstandings.

This bill is but an effort to continue the basic policy which we adopted several years ago. It is based upon the belief that it is sound for the United States to try to work out a program which will not only provide the United States with needed agricultural labor, but which will give to the citizens of a friendly Republic a degree of opportunity and protection which we, in the larger nation, feel we should afford to these workers. There have been a lot of tears shed at this microphone in behalf of these workers and particularly those who are wetbacks. I want to call to your attention the fundamental problem of the wetbacks, which is simply a question of economics. In the Republic of Mexico a farm laborer can ordinarily make less working all day long from sun to sun than he will make in 1 hour when he crosses that river just a few miles to the north. Those people down there are human beings just like you and me. They have families. They are good, hardworking people. They feel responsible for supporting their families, and they make a serious effort to support them. They are going to cross the border just like water is going to run downhill. Is it any wonder that these people throng to the border, seeking to cross, seeking the fabulous wages that are paid on the northern side? What would you do if you were in their situation? I think I would cross the border just as they do—legally if they can—illegally if we refuse to provide any other method. The difference will be that if we do not pass this bill and we do not have any contract program, then they come without any protection whatever. They will accept any employment offered them—at any wage and under any living conditions so long as it seems that the immigration officers won't be likely to find them.

These Mexican workers need the little protection which a contract can afford them. They need it far more than we need it, but we must insist that if there is to be a contract that it be reasonable. I feel that the Mexican Government has insisted on some very unreasonable provisions. For instance, they have refused to allow any border recruitment. They have said that all of the workers must come from the interior of Mexico. I recognize Mexico's problems. I realize that a program which recruited all the workers from the border would be unfair. On the other hand, if all the workers are recruited in the interior, the Mexican workers who live along the border are going to continue to cross, illegally, and we will have done little to relieve the wetback problem. I should think those who oppose this bill would want to join with us in correcting this situation. The answer should be a compromise with, not a surrender to, Mexico.

Let all those who claim to be interested in the welfare of these Mexican citizens, let them explain how they would take care of these Mexicans—how, without a contract, they would make sure that these workers will get wages promised them. I challenge the next speaker, if there are others who are opposed to this bill—I know of only one. But if there be any other opponent, let him explain to you not the dire plight of the Mexican wetback, which we all recognize, but just how he and the other opponents of this bill expect to improve that plight. Would he agree with the Mexican Government that the Mexican farmer who lives just south of the border should be denied the employment opportunities which are offered to the taxi driver from the city of Mexico? Would he oppose all contract workers? If so, what will he say to the American worker who wants a job? Not one single Mexican worker can come in under this bill until the United States Department of Labor has found that there are no American citizens who want the jobs. How do these opponents of this legislation propose to protect American labor?

Oh, they say those of us who support this bill want cheap labor. If we simply wanted to exploit the Mexican people, we would want to see all this orderly program destroyed. Then we could indeed mistreat those unfortunate wetbacks who would never dare to take their trouble to the officials because of fear of deportation.

We offer you an orderly method of employment under the law. Unless we give some alternative, the only other way for those people to come over is to let them come and be subject to all the exploitation of which the opponents of this bill have told you. In all sincerity I tell you that this is not a bill merely for the benefit of the employers in five States. It is a bill for the benefit of the citizens of a friendly republic. It is a bill for the benefit of the laboring people of the United States. It is a bill to protect human rights. Those of you who are interested in protecting human rights and who oppose this bill, should at least have the frankness to tell us just how you propose to see that those rights are protected. We offer you a program of Government-supervised contract labor. What do you offer? I challenge the next one who is going to get up here, not to talk about wetbacks, but to talk about how you are going to keep people from being wetbacks; how you are going to give some legal recourse to those people; how you are going to protect American workers from unfair competition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to place myself in the same position as my good friend from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. He is an older Member and has served longer on the Committee on Agriculture than have I. No better friend or no better working friend than Mr. POAGE have I had or expect to have in the Committee on Agriculture. We have worked together on subcommittees. We have worked together in the Committee of the Whole. We have cooperated on all problems that arise in the area which he represents, which is a great deal of the Southwest, as well as serious agricultural problems that sometimes affect the area that I personally represent. So I am proud to follow him on this occasion, especially when I know how much he really knows about this legislation.

As he told you—and he was very excellent in that statement that he made to the Rules Committee—when he explained that this was not a bill that has any concern whatsoever with the wetback problem; let us be sure that is plain in everybody's mind.

Then, to my friend, the ranking member on the minority side on the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I agree with him when he said our committee tries to operate in a nonpartisan way. We have.

Now, in the not too far distant future we will have legislation on this floor that will probably affect production areas of every part of this United States. I hope and I pray that that legislation will come out of our committee nonpartisan.

But let me call the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] to a little statement he made about the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

This statement was made when the ranking minority member who has spoken at length this afternoon and created a lot of smoke—he does not tell us where the fire is—the only difference is that this time, this moment, he is opposing this bill and at that time when he was my chairman he was all for supporting this legislation.

Now, I have not any way to know what sort of elements he has in his mind that have caused this change of stand shown in what he said about my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], when he was carrying the burden of chairmanship of the subcommittee dealing with this question:

I do not suppose you could find 30 better Americans than the 30 members of the House Committee on Agriculture.

That, of course, included the gentleman from North Carolina as well.

And certainly every member of our committee is not only interested in farmers and farm problems but is likewise interested in American laboring men and in the general welfare of all our people. Certainly no American landlord would prefer to give work to an alien in preference to a citizen, nor is it reasonable to believe that American employers of farm labor would be willing to incur the expense and to assume the risk incident to bringing in foreign labor if local labor were available.

Let us start this discussion by realizing the urgent need for importing Mexicans to do a job which otherwise will not be done.

Now, listen to the rest of it. He calls attention to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to say this without attempting to discuss the details of the measure before you, that I do hope you will listen as it is discussed. I again urge you to listen to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], the chairman of the subcommittee that conducted the hearings. He understands all of the problems here presented. If you will listen to him as he pre-

sents the bill I think you can vote more intelligently.

Now, just who is standing for this bill? What about the departments? I hold in my hand committee reports, and I see some of you have looked at them. But you will find that report signed by a man who served 6 years in this House, a man most of you know. The gentleman I refer to is now Assistant Secretary of State, Thruston Morton. Here is what he says:

> The Department of State strongly favors the enactment of this joint resolution. * * * It is also felt that the likelihood of achieving a satisfactory agreement with Mexico will be improved if it can be shown that the United States is capable of exercising reasonably satisfactory controls by itself.

Further he states:

> The Department of State will continue its efforts to achieve an agreement responsive to the best interests of the various affected sectors of the United States economy and of our national security, as well as those of the Mexican worker. These efforts will be appreciably assisted by passage of the legislation under consideration.

That is signed "Thruston B. Morton" and is dated February 5, 1954.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Let me finish my statement.

In addition to that I have a statement from the Attorney General. I will not read it.

Then, I also call your attention to the statement of True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture; and in addition to that the Labor Department brought before our committee their top man and supported this legislation, which every one of you may be able to discover by just taking a glance at the printed report of the hearings.

In closing let me tell you that all this legislation does is to provide a method, a manner, a means of bringing Mexican laborers into these United States and grant them the privilege to remain in this country in areas where the Secretary of Labor declares there is a deficiency and that it is impossible to secure farm labor.

It is stuff and nonsense to think that because Colorado has 3,000 of these laborers that we do not need this legislation. The answer is, We get more of the Spanish-American people from New Mexico, Arizona, and even Texas, if there is plenty of labor in that area; but if the labor tightens up in Texas, if the labor tightens up in California, Arizona, and New Mexico, we would not be able to get along without these extra folks who come into our area. So just because the State of Wisconsin or Michigan or some other State has only 5 or 10 or 15 Spanish-American people, that is no reason in the world why anyone should make the statement that we do not need them. We need them in Colorado because our people will not do this stoop labor; there is no question about that, and I am not finding fault with them because they will not do the stoop labor. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] told you, these Mexicans get much more money for an hour's labor up here than they can get in Mexico for a day's labor, so why should they not come into the United States and do this stoop labor? They save their money and they go back down to Mexico with their money and supply their families with much-needed food and other necessities that greatly improve their economic condition, and they should be protected by the Government of Mexico in doing this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I have known Spanish-American workers who have attended schools under my teaching. A finer group of boys and girls I never had. But I know the life of those folks. I know the life and the surroundings from which they come. As stated by the gentleman who was blowing a lot of hot air around that would not even smoke if you put dynamite under it, these men face a terrible condition when they come into this country to work. I said, "All right, I will accept that, but you go down into Mexico and bring me the picture back as to the conditions under which their families exist in Mexico." He said he would get it for the record, but as yet he never provided it for the record because he probably has not been closer to Mexico than the north borderline of the State of California.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDON].

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the resolution allowing the United States unilaterally to make arrangements with individual Mexican nationals for work in the United States. I do so because I feel that such an act is unwise in the absence of an agreement with the Republic of Mexico. When the measure came up in the first session of this Congress, pursuant to the bilateral agreement between the two governments, I voted for the bill. I had some misgivings as to the desirability of this method of recruitment, but I felt that a showing had been made that the labor was necessary, and that the rights of the individuals involved were protected by the agreement between our country and our neighbor to the south. Such an agreement, however, has not been negotiated for the forthcoming year. From statements made on the floor, it appears that negotiations are now going on, and there is every likelihood that some form of agreement may be reached. I feel that by passing this legislation now, we will offset these negotiations by providing machinery for unilateral action on our part and disregarding the legitimate interests of the Mexican Government.

I feel that at a time when our world relationships and particularly those in Latin America seem to be deteriorating, we should not take action which will give offense to the very proud countries in Central and South America. Moreover, I feel that in the absence of an agreement in which the Republic of Mexico has a definite interest, there may be a possibility for a deterioration of the working conditions and wages of the persons who would come across the border.

Finally, I am impressed with the reasoning of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] that we may be creating a situation in which the Republic of Mexico under international law could refuse to allow these Mexican nationals to return to that country. If the Republic of Mexico took this course, it seems to me we would not be in a position to deport these individuals after their term of service is up. Obviously, they would have been legally admitted to the United States, and therefore the grounds for deportation may not exist in the absence of the acceptance by the Republic of Mexico of these persons at the end of the contract period.

For these reasons, I am joining with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] in opposing the measure.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate on this bill. I listened to the testimony given in the hearings and I have tried to weigh this matter objectively. I can do so because we do not use any of this labor in Florida. It is my conclusion that virtually every argument that has been made against this bill is in reality a logical argument in favor of the passage of it.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Does the gentleman know how many witnesses appeared in opposition to this resolution?

Mr. HERLONG. My recollection is that there were three witnesses who appeared in opposition to the bill.

Mr. FISHER. Who did they represent? From what source does the opposition to this bill come?

Mr. HERLONG. They were, of course, the labor organizations.

Mr. FISHER. Were there any witnesses in opposition to the measure except the CIO and the AFL or certain segments of them, and somebody representing a local union out in California that is endeavoring to organize the farmers out there?

Mr. HERLONG. Not that I recall.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the gentleman if Mr. Thomas, who represented the CIO and who seemed to be spearheading the opposition to this measure before the committee, made any statement as to whether he is for or against the processing of Mexican labor to work on this side regardless of whether we are or are not in agreement with Mexico?

Mr. HERLONG. It is my recollection that he was opposed to bringing any over here, whether or not there was an agreement.

Mr. FISHER. In other words, while he made a very lengthy tirade against this proposal, he finally ended up by saying that he was opposed to the use of Mexican nationals on this side of the border, whether they came in legally or illegally, or whether there was an agreement or no agreement; is not that so?

Mr. HERLONG. That is my recollection, yes.

Mr. FISHER. On the contrary, I should like to ask the gentleman if the American Farm Bureau supported this, for the record.

Mr. HERLONG. Yes, all the farm organizations who took any position at all on it, supported it.

Mr. FISHER. Did the National Grange also endorse it?

Mr. HERLONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. FISHER. Did the National Farmers Cooperative endorse it?

Mr. HERLONG. They did.

Mr. FISHER. And did the National Cotton Council endorse it?

Mr. HERLONG. They did.

Mr. FISHER. And did not more than a score of farm organizations in California who are dependent upon this labor in order to harvest their crops also endorse it?

Mr. HERLONG. There was a whole raft of them who did.

Mr. FISHER. All the responsible people who know anything at all about this issue who appeared before the committee endorsed it?

Mr. HERLONG. That was the impression that I got.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I should like to clarify a few of the things which have been said in connection with this resolution. Of course, the impression that the Government is spending a lot of money because of this resolution is fallacious because actually the Government will be spending more money unless we do bring these Mexican laborers in legally rather than have them come in illegally; because, when they are brought in legally the employer pays the expense of returning them if they leave their work or break their contract. In fact, he posts a bond to guarantee the payment of this cost if the Government is forced to apprehend the "skip."

Another thing I think should be made specifically clear is that this Mexican labor, which is imported only for agricultural purposes, will not be brought in unless there is a certificate of necessity from the Department of Labor. There has to be a need for this labor. The certificate is issued only after all available domestic labor supplies have been exhausted.

I hate to take issue with the former chairman of my committee, a man with whom I have worked in harmony through the years that I have had the opportunity of being a member of the Committee on Agriculture; but I think that he has left some impressions here today which would confuse the average person. Again I would say that if we do not pass this resolution, we will be agreeing in principle that we are willing for the Mexican Government to dictate all of the provisions under which this labor comes into the United States. I should much prefer that we do have an agreement with Mexico, even if it is the same agreement that we have had in the past. But if we cannot get such an agreement, then I think that it is reasonable to adopt this resolution. On the other hand, I say that the failure to pass this resolution, or the defeat of this resolution, will not stop wetbacks coming into the United States. I think that the failure to pass this resolution will even increase the number of wetbacks who come into the United States and will create a greater expense, and at the same time will prevent the employer of legal Mexican labor from securing the labor which he needs.

In my area of the country we have some unemployment at this time; but I can assure this House that when the cotton chopping season comes, we are not going to have any unemployment. We are going to need some additional labor in order to cultivate and harvest that crop.

I have no desire whatsoever to do anything which would in my opinion reduce the opportunity for employment of any American citizen. Actually, while the Mexican labor does not receive wages in excess of those paid to domestic labor, the employer, through the payment of transportation costs, insurance, bond, and fringe benefits which are required under the contract, is forced to pay more for the labor performed by Mexicans than that performed by American citizens, and for that reason most employers—farmers—do not use Mexican labor except in emergencies and when local labor is not available and when other domestic labor cannot be provided by the United States Employment Service. I feel that this issue has been confused more than necessary because of some of the statements which were made by our former chairman. I think the gentleman from Colorado hit the nail on the head when he said that we should follow the advice of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who is possibly as well acquainted with the situation as any other person.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman know that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] was in gross error when he said to this House that this joint resolution was a mere continuation of the policy that has been in operation since 1948?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not going to argue that point with the gentleman. I will say this, however, that if you defeat this resolution here today I think you are going to contribute to the entrance of more wetbacks and you are going to make it more difficult to reach the agreement on which the people from our Nation and the friendly nation of Mexico are now working. I think we all want to see that agreement consummated, and I think that the introduction and reporting of this resolution have had a salutary effect. I think that possibly the agreement will be consummated largely because of this resolution and not in spite of it as has been suggested by some of the opponents.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be repetitious. This is a sound piece of legislation. It is being asked for by the administration. It has the approval of the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, and the Attorney General of the United States. It is a constructive piece of legislation.

It has been very well pointed out that this legislation is necessary to meet the stoop labor situation in the United States. It presents an orderly way of handling the wetback problem, as has been emphasized time and time again. We can either have the problem of the wetbacks continuously or we can try to do something about it. These wetbacks have been coming across the Rio Grande and into this country without much restriction. They have been creating a real problem. Under the terms of the resolution now before us, these Mexicans will come into the United States in accordance with the law. I am sure that is what the American people want done.

I am not particularly concerned because only some 96 of these Mexican laborers were employed in the State of Iowa. That is completely beside the point. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I see it as my duty to legislate for agriculture in the 48 States of the Union.

We are confronted with a very practical problem. I think you well know that the labor involved here relates to the so-called stoop labor, getting down on the ground and pulling vegetables out of the ground and pulling weeds out of the ground, and doing this stoop labor is the kind of work which the ordinary American laboring man simply refuses to do.

I certainly am in favor of using American labor in every instance where it can be done. When we get to the point where we cannot recruit from the labor pool in this country the men that are needed to harvest the perishable crops then it is our duty to find ways and means to get these crops harvested.

As for me, I do not want food of any kind to go to waste. I think it is highly essential that our vegetable and fruit crops be harvested when they are ready to be harvested. Unless vegetables and fruits are harvested within a certain set time they may rot on the ground.

Now a word about the negotiations with Mexico. I am in favor of continuing the agreements with the Republic of Mexico. The negotiations of the past weeks and months have been rather one-sided affairs. We could not come to agreement with the Mexican authorities because they were arbitrary in their demands. They were insisting, among other things, that they had the right to fix the minimum wage rates in the United States, well knowing that there was no minimum wage for agricultural workers in the United States.

I think the members of the committee should also know that the Mexican Government was insisting that the insurance policies covering the Mexican workers be channeled through one particular insurance company. There is ample reason why the American negotiators were not willing to meet such unreasonable demands.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. We who are affected in our area appreciate the attitude of the gentleman. We want to do everything we can to be fair with Mexico and to be friendly with Mexico, but we should not go so far as to become paralyzed on an occasion like this for fear of offending our sister republic of Mexico.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am very happy to have the gentleman's comment. In fact, the gentleman took the words out of my mouth. I cannot quite see why Members of the Congress of the United States should be so unduly concerned about the welfare of the people of foreign countries, and not be as fully concerned about the welfare of our own people.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? What was that word—"mulish"? Did the gentleman say mulish Members of Congress?

Mr. HOEVEN. I did not make such a statement. I said unduly concerned, nothing else. There was a stalemate in the negotiations with the Republic of Mexico up to the very time the Committee on Agriculture started hearings on the resolution now being considered. When we got busy the Mexican Government got busy and now they are ready to negotiate some more. The passage of this resolution will help the negotiations rather than harm them.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to observe that my distinguished friend from Iowa made a grave mistake when he said that the State of Iowa received 97 workers. Actually, Iowa received 96. I am just wondering if the gentleman is willing to support a program that costs the American taxpayers $2½ million a year in order to get 96 workers in the State of Iowa to save the agricultural economy of the great State of Iowa.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How many did the State of Michigan get?

Mr. COOLEY. Two thousand five hundred and sixty-eight.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How many?

Mr. COOLEY. Two thousand five hundred and sixty-eight.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, we have hundreds of them.

Mr. HOEVEN. How many did the State of North Carolina get?

Mr. COOLEY. The State of North Carolina did not get nor did the State of North Carolina need or want a single one.

Reference has been made to the endorsement of this resolution by the leading farm organizations of America. Yes, it is a fact. The American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange sent to our committee very brief and feeble endorsements. Frankly, I doubt if those who prepared and presented the endorsements really understood the purpose of the resolution. Be that as it may, the fact remains that according to press reports these great organizations and other great farm organizations later held a two-day meeting here in the city of Washington and finally concluded that "farm leaders hold Golden Rule is vital." Here is a quotation from the Washington Post dated February 25, 1954:

> On the wetback issue, three United States farm organizations and the Mexican farm organization represented at the conference unanimously agreed that the question should be handled through an international agreement.
>
> These groups promised to work to facilitate an agreement by their governments. They were the Asociacion Nacional de Cosecheros of Mexico and the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Grange. The National Farmers Union was represented by its president, James Patton, at the Tuesday morning conference but did not participate in later meetings.
>
> Allan B. Kline, AFBF president, is also president of the IFAP and presided at the sessions.

Even though the record discloses the feeble endorsements that I have referred to, the press report clearly indicates that the leaders of these great organizations, when they really understood the proposition, decided that Mexican labor should be recruited as contemplated by the law which has been on the books since 1948 and as it was revised or amended in 1951. So it is plain to see that not only are all of the labor organizations of America opposed to this resolution but likewise all of the great farm organizations of America are also opposed to this slam-the-door, go-it-alone program. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we may be realistic about this very important matter and appreciate fully the delicate diplomatic implications involved.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I do not come to the well of this House today to qualify as a witness speaking to the question as to whether these workers are needed. I am perfectly willing to take the word of my colleagues who represent those districts where these workers are used. I was impressed at the beginning of the hearings on this particular resolution with the fact that we had reams and reams of testimony previously taken, coming from essentially the same sources that a repetition of it came from when we opened the doors to them again. So I would like to address my remarks for an instant or two to the reasons for the opposition that has appeared on the floor of this House to this legislation. It seems to be an uncontroverted fact that these Mexicans are needed; that they are coming. Therefore, if they are here they are going to work. I want them to work legally.

When we began the hearings on this legislation the ranking Democrat on this committee, whom you have heard at some length this afternoon, insisted that he thought a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture was much better qualified to negotiate an agreement between this Government and the Government of Mexico than were the representatives of the executive department. He insisted that he felt that the chairman of our great committee should send a subcommittee to Mexico City in order to negotiate this agreement. The chairman of the committee, very wisely in my opinion, felt that the Members of the Congress had no business in Mexico City attempting to usurp the prerogatives of the executive department, regardless of how long it had been since certain Members had been on an extended tour. In confirmation of that particular position, I was astounded later on in the hearings by having the ranking Democrat on our committee insist that representatives of the Department of Labor tell the committee in open public hearings exactly the points on which this sovereign Government would yield. Finally, I was glad to see that this committee, in direct divergence from action taken by some committees in this Congress in recent years, decided that for once representatives of this Government should have their hands upheld.

Many crocodile tears have been shed in the well of this House over some supposed unilateral action that might come from this Government if this resolution is adopted. The testimony makes abundantly clear that there have been hundreds and hundreds of instances where the agents of Mexico have employed unilateral actions, even in spite of contracts that existed.

Now, if you want to help solve the wetback problem, if you want to help keep wetbacks out of this country, you vote to adopt this resolution. The reason for the opposition that came from the well of the House was very obvious to me, because it came at the instance of two labor organizations. The reason for their opposition was obvious, it being based on the fact that they could not demand organizational dues from those Mexican workers, because if they did it would violate the contract under which the Mexicans work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, we have had a very interesting and constructive debate this afternoon on this bill.

Mr. POAGE, of Texas, and Mr. HILL, of Colorado, made especially eloquent and interesting speeches.

It is hard for me to understand why there should be so much misunderstanding on this proposal to bring into the United States Mexican nationals to help harvest the fabulous crops of California and other Western States, especially those which rely on irrigation.

The ones who profit most from this operation, I think, are the Mexican workers. By that I mean they profit most financially when it is considered how much they are paid in Mexico and what they are paid by the ranchers who hire them in California. But we also profit greatly by this operation because it enables California ranchers to harvest the fabulous crops which we grow in our State. What I wish our eastern friends could understand is that if we do not get the laborers to help us harvest these crops that the prices to the consumer will be increased because of a scarce crop.

For instance, now, in my area asparagus is ready to be harvested. Six hundred workers are required right now to help harvest this crop and 600 more will be required in several weeks. This applies to all other crops such as celery, potatoes, onions, cherries, and so forth.

There have been so many excellent speeches showing the need for this bill that there is nothing I can add. The Committee on Agriculture of the House was practically unanimous that this measure should be passed at once. Its recommendations have always been sound and its recommendation in this instance is no exception.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, we have only one other speaker on this side.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

I am somewhat surprised by the speech which has just been made by my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER]. His speech prompts me to say that for 4 long years I was chairman of the great Committee on Agriculture. In each term of Congress this House made available to our committee the sum of $50,000, and this House without a dissenting vote passed the resolution which authorized our committee to meet at any time, whether Congress was in session or not, and at any place inside or outside of the United States. If that resolution did not take in the entire world I do not know how the entire world could have been taken in. Yet during that entire time, for 4 years while I was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I did not go to Mexico at the expense of the taxpayers of America. During the time that I was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I sent subcommittees to Mexico; I sent subcommittees to many parts of our own great country, and at least one subcommittee to Europe. At my direction, and pursuant to the resolution I have just mentioned, I requested and required the members of our committee to use Government facilities on a nonreimbursable basis and on a space-available basis—the ships and planes and other facilities owned and operated by our Government, and, as a result of all of this, my recollection is we turned back into the Treasury of the United States during the first 2 years more than $28,000 of the $50,000 which this House had made available to our committee. In the next 2 years we did just about the same thing, and, my recollection is, we turned back more than one-half the money which you had appropriated for us. Mr. Chairman, my recollection is further to the effect that I did not travel with any of the subcommittees to any place inside or outside of the United States except on one occasion I did meet one of the subcommittees investigating the terminal markets in the city of New Orleans and perhaps on one other occasion I met with members of our committee in the city of Memphis.

Mr. Chairman, had I really wanted to travel even to the far-distant parts of the world, for 4 long years I could have gone at the expense of the taxpayers, but this, Mr. Chairman, I did not do. The record of expenditures is over yonder in the House Office Building and certainly those records are open for the scrutiny and inspection of the gentleman from Georgia. I shall be glad to put the expenditures of our committee up against the expenditures of any other committee of this Congress. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am certainly surprised at the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia.

Why is not the gentleman from Georgia willing to meet the issue here presented forthright and head on and argue the merits of the proposition here presented? The answer to that question is obvious. He has no argument.

During the time that I was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and when that committee had the authority and the money I have just referred to, and at a time when the officias of our Government were negotiating an agreement with the Government of Mexico, two Members of Congress, Senator ALLEN JOSEPH ELLENDER, of Louisiana, a member of the Senate Committee on Agricuture and Forestry, and my distinguished and beloved colleague W. R. POAGE, of Texas, a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, actually went to Mexico as advisers to our team of negotiators. During the hearings on this joint resolution, and after being thoroughly convinced that we had no team of negotiators in Mexico, and after I had been further convinced that no real effort had been made to compose differences and to reach an agreement, I merely suggested, in our committee room, that it might be a good idea for some members, perhaps one or two from each of the committees, that is, of the Senate and the House, to go to Mexico and to supplement the feeble efforts of those who had been charged with the great responsibility of negotiating a new agreement. At the time I made the suggestion I know that the chairman of our committee, the very distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] had no authority to send a member of our committee outside of our country, nor did he have money available to him to defray the expenses incident to such a mission. If you will examine the transcript you will see that at the very time I made the suggestion I said I had never been into the interior of Mexico and I had no desire to go there now. I made the suggestion only to emphasize the fact that I believe that reasonable men could compose the differences.

I stated before the Rules Committee that I thought that any five members of that great committee could take charge of the negotiations and could come to an agreement. I am more than ever convinced that the officials of our Government laid down an ultimatum and then came home. In effect, they said, you will do it our way or you will not do it at all.

If you will examine the record you will not find even the names of the negotiators. I challenge anyone even now to give me the name of any official of our Government who has even spoken to an official of the Government of Mexico, except perhaps to the Ambassador from Mexico, who is residing right here in the city of Washington. The whole problem was turned over to our Ambassador to Mexico, Mr. White. When the negotiations broke down and were terminated, officials of our Government sought to establish an illegal program which was finally declared illegal by the great Comptroller General on February 2 in the good year of our Lord 1954.

Prompted by the hope of President Eisenhower, and, no doubt, at his request, negotiations were resumed on the night of February 10. The negotiations are now in progress and fortunately great progress has been made. Everything now indicates that within the next few days all controversies will be composed and an agreement will be reached. Why should we interfere with those negotiators by passing this resolution which very well might be considered as an insult to the officials of the Government of Mexico?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, it is rather unfortunate, I think, that personalities have been permitted to enter into this discussion, because what we have here at stake is a very important problem; it is important to the economy of great sections of our country.

I am supporting this resolution and I do so wholeheartedly. I have supported similar legislation in the past.

The question has been raised here as to whether or not the American Farm Bureau is in support of this legislation. I wish to read from a letter which was addressed to our chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], February 19 of this year concerning House Joint Resolution 355. This is the pertinent paragraph:

> The American Farm Bureau very strongly supports the enactment of House Joint Resolution 355. As you know we recommended early consideration of the matter by your committee. We testified in favor of the bill. We have urged the House Rules Committee to expedite the granting of a rule. We have urged the Senate Agriculture Committee to expedite their consideration of a similar Senate resolution. We have recommended to the Senate majority leader that the Senate resolution be cleared for early action by the Senate.

I think that should in very conclusive fashion set to rest any question that might have arisen in your mind with regard to this particular matter.

Just briefly in conclusion I may say this, that in my State and also in Michigan because it is a seasonal proposition, many of these Mexicans, both citizens of the State of Texas as well as Mexican nationals do come up for seasonal work. They come into Indiana for a short season, go on up to Michigan, then they come back again for the harvest season. Primarily they come into Indiana for the tomato harvest season and in this respect they are invaluable; in fact, if we are to get this great tomato harvest in the pack it is absolutely essential that we do have them. They are dependable, and I would like to say here and now that we in Indiana have had none but the finest contacts and dealings with these people. They have represented in my opinion an excellent type of citizenship, and we are proud to have them there. We are very happy also to tell you that many of those same families

have been coming to our community for several years. We see those who started coming to Indiana many years ago have improved their economic status to where they are able to maintain themselves at a higher standard of living and some are people of very substantial means. So I think it is important to remember that in this problem the people who are participating, whether they are citizens of Texas or Mexican nationals, are and have been profiting by this opportunity. Certainly I know that we in Indiana have been delighted to have them. They have come to my home county and they have rendered a very valuable service.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Let me point out to the gentleman that you did not get a single one of them in Indiana. How can the gentleman receive them so cordially when the record shows that Indiana did not get a single one?

Mr. HARVEY. I do not know where the gentleman got his statistics, but I live in Indiana and I know they come there.

Mr. COOLEY. This is from the Labor Department.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 501 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949," approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, is further amended by striking out the parenthetical clause "(pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico or after every practicable effort has been made by the United States to negotiate and reach agreement on such arrangements)."

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on this bill as one who is familiar with it from personal experience because on rare occasions when no other source of labor is available I have hired Mexican nationals on my ranch in California.

I would like to point out some of the facts regarding the unusual situation which prevails in my native State of California. In the first place, as you probably know, our State raises 212 commercial crops. To be commercial a crop must be in interstate or foreign commerce and it must bring $1 million into the State of California; otherwise it is not classified as commercial.

Our State of California produces 8 percent of the agricultural wealth of the United States and uses 7 percent of the agricultural labor. In the last 4 years, the most recent 4 years, we have produced $2 billion in new agricultural wealth, yet in the last 100 years our gold industry in the State of California has produced less than $1 billion in new wealth.

In our State we plant and harvest a crop every month of the year. We raise crops on land at elevations of 5,000 feet on down to 250 feet below sea level. We raise them in temperatures that vary from 120 degrees to freezing in any month of the year.

I point out these facts to show that California has a different situation. Mechanization is not possible in our State as it is in others.

Mr. Chairman, I would like now to come down to a very basic point which has been involved in this debate today. That is the question, Is there a shortage of agricultural labor? With in excess of 3 million unemployed how can there be a labor shortage? I admit to you very frankly that in our State of California there is unemployment, but I point out that those who are currently unemployed are not qualified to perform agricultural labor nor do they have the desire to engage in it.

Agricultural labor, believe it or not, is skilled labor. For example, may I point out the operation involved in the thinning of sugar beets which is currently going on at this very moment on my ranch in California. I am paying $16 an acre for thinning sugar beets. A good experienced sugar-beet thinner can thin an acre in 10 hours. His salary is, therefore, $1.60 an hour. We plant sugar beets on hills or beds which are 40 inches apart and we plant two rows to each hill or bed. That means that there are 26,162 running feet row in each acre. We try to leave 160 beets every 100 feet when we are performing this thinning operation. That means that this man, this skilled laborer I am going to call him, must strike the ground with his short-handled hoe 15,697 times to earn that $16 or $1.60 an hour. If he thins the acre in 10 hours, that means he hits the ground with that hoe 1,570 times each hour or 27 strokes per minute, or once every 2.2 seconds.

Visualize this beet thinner. He cannot get down on his knees because he is progressing forward at a rate of 12 to 14 feet a minute. He is standing in a stooped position, reaching to the ground, chopping every 2.2 seconds. And he must be very careful to hit the ground as close to that beet seedling as he possibly can, so that the many beet seedlings which are intertwined will be exposed. And while he is doing that with his right hand, his left index finger and thumb are working with the deftness of a surgeon, going in to untwine those intertwined beets, removing the weak ones and leaving only the strong ones and leaving only one single beet every 8 inches.

I point out that operation to you, Mr. Chairman, to show you that this is not just ordinary labor; it is skilled labor.

There is unemployment in California. Go to the unemployment insurance lines and you will see it. But go to those lines and ask those men if they will accept a job thinning beets, hitting that ground 1,570 times per hour for $16 an acre, and they will tell you, "We won't do it." And furthermore, if you try them you will find that they cannot do it.

I maintain that the persons in the unemployment insurance lines or the people who are unemployed in California and the other States are not agricultural laborers. They are not qualified to do this work. They do not have the desire to do it.

As I explained in a debate on this subject last year, we prefer to hire local labor because local laborers are more experienced and because the incidental costs of local labor are not as high as for Mexican nationals.

Let me quote from a letter which I received from one of my growers in California, a heavy producer of broccoli:

> They call the Mexican national program slavery. In some areas of the Nation this might be true, but why penalize California and Arizona? We must pay these nationals the going rate of pay for such labor as we pay the locals. Then we must furnish camp facilities, power, water, heat, kitchen, cooks, transportation, medical treatment, transportation to and from the border, association fees, and countless other expenses. Our cost for this program brings the hourly rate to $1.19 per hour per man. We can hire locals, if available, for 95 cents to $1 per hour and furnish none of the above. Obviously, it would be sound business to hire locals, but there's one catch—there are none, or very few, who are willing to work in the fields. Those who used to work in canneries have gone to industrial employment; those who used to work the fields have gone to the canneries and industry. You have no one to replace the field worker except the "wineos." For 3 years now we have had standing orders for 60 men per year from the farm labor office, and in the whole 3 years they have been unable to furnish us 60 men total.

I quote from another letter received from a large producer of strawberries. He says:

> Domestic labor here has never been successful because the majority of available domestic workers are not accustomed and have no desire for the type of stoop labor that is necessary for strawberry harvest.

Another large producer of strawberries says:

> While it is true that there may be local unemployment, none of our local people will do stoop labor. In hundreds of cases people are sent out from employment offices with cards, requesting us to sign their cards showing no jobs, in order that they may go back on unemployment relief. Whether we sign the card or not, in 75 percent of the instances they will not attempt the work. Those that will try, generally will last only a day or two.

Here in another letter is the case of a farmer in my district who wanted to hire local labor, so he went to the local farm-labor office:

> We needed men to pick broccoli, and we were sent 60 men from the Department of Farm Labor; 2 men worked 2 hours, another 4 hours, the others refused to work at all.

Another letter comes from an association which hires Mexican nationals in my district. They said they went to the State of California Farm Placement Service and they attempted to replace our Mexican nationals with domestic workers. The result was that in 2 weeks' time they sent out 23 domestic unemployed to 1 of their growers. One of the 23 worked 4 days, the others worked

from 2 hours to less than a day. Yet that operation needed 40 men.

I point out that the legitimate farm laborer who sincerely desires work will always have that work in the particular section of California which I happen to represent. I can show you hundreds of men who devote their lives to rendering this type of service and who have a better standard of living than the average factory worker in the big city. But unfortunately not enough of these men exist, and we still lose our crops.

One more important point, and that is that the industrial workers who are in the packing sheds in the plants where these crops are packaged and processed will lose their jobs unless the field workers are available to harvest the crops of the raw material which these people put into packages.

I contend that if you deny us an adequate source of farm labor to harvest our highly perishable specialty crops you will be denying industrial workers in the packing sheds their right to earn a living.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt as to the probable outcome of this joint resolution, but I should like to place myself on record as stating that it is a poor resolution for this body to pass.

It seems rather strange to me, listening to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER], that he could not get qualified Americans at $1.60 an hour. There must be a rather strange situation existing when they cannot get Americans at $1.60 an hour.

My friend admittedly has an interest, and he had a perfect right as a Member of this body to express his thoughts, but he clearly showed he had an interest. He is speaking for one segment, the big producers. On the other hand, I have something here from a qualified person who is certainly disinterested, but whose concern is not only with the bodies of men, women, and children, the families of the workers, but also with the souls of the workers and their families. I read a telegram that I have here dated February 26, 1954, addressed to me. It is as follows:

> Will you please express my earnest hope to your colleagues in the House of Representatives that as many of them as possible be present Monday to vote against House Joint Resolution 355. As I have written to President Eisenhower and Chairman CLIFFORD HOPE of the House Agricultural Committee, I feel strongly the proposed unilateral amendment to Public Law 78 will accentuate the wetback problem rather than cure it, will enlarge the injustice to Mexican workers crossing the border rather than lessening it, and will cause further injustice to our domestic workers: at the same time mistreatment of individual human beings would thus be increased. Enactment of this legislation at the behest of powerful interests in five States will gravely endanger our relations with Mexico and all Latin American Republics. Our good-neighbor policy is clearly at stake in this issue.

That telegram is signed by Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of the archdiocese of San Antonio in Texas.

The other day President Eisenhower made a statement and among other things he said that the United States leadership, and I quote, "reflects no ambition for world power. It springs from no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of other nations."

Yet, here we are, powerful America, the most powerful nation in the world passing a bill today that will be an affront to our neighbor to the south. Should we do it? Is it for our best interest to do it? We see the situation in Korea. We know it is fraught with danger. We see the situation in Indochina. We see the situation existing in the Near East and in the Middle East. We see the world confronted with danger. We see the dangerous situation existing internally in Italy and in France. Now by this legislation we are going out of our way to affront our neighbor to the south, and when you affront any Central or South American country, you affront all nations in South America. So far as I am concerned, I hope this bill will not pass. I am doubtful, however. I feel quite certain it will pass, but it should not pass. In any event, I hope the Government of Mexico, and the press of Mexico, and the people of Mexico will not hold its passage and its affront to them against all Americans. To me it is one of the strangest situations to see great America at this time with the Secretary of State in Venezuela at a meeting, at a conference of South American and North American nations calling for unity and amity, as I say, to me it is one of the strangest situations to see the House of Representatives of America considering and passing this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not any sound or logical argument has been presented on the floor of the House as to why this resolution should be adopted. An effort has been made to lead the Members of the House to believe that this is but a mere continuation of a program which has been in operation since 1948. It is a repudiation of that policy. It is a go-it-alone policy. There is no need for this foreign labor in this country at this time. I want to ask the gentleman if he will sum up the arguments in favor of this resolution. We are told the administration wants it, but we are not told why it wants it.

Mr. McCORMACK. All I can say to the gentleman is that the passage of this bill at this time is fraught with danger. The only construction that can be placed upon it by the people of Mexico is that we are putting a club over their head. We are trying to overcome that impression—a hangover from the past. The South American countries have a feeling that we have been acting the part of the big brother with a big club in our hand. It is going to take many generations to overcome that feeling. This bill is not conducive to better relationships with our neighbor to the south, but is conducive to increasing tensions, all to the disadvantage of both countries. I repeat, if this bill passes the House, I hope the officials of the Government of Mexico and the members of Mexico and the people of Mexico will realize that there were some among us in this body who fought the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I live on the border of Mexico in west Texas and represent 500 miles of Mexican border. I have heard all of this discussion, and I cannot understand why the Members should work up so much heat over a very simple matter. But, in my opinion, and I have many things to base that on, it all stems from the heads of the CIO. They have been trying for the last several years to deny any Mexican labor coming into this country because, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] said yesterday, they are not dues-paying members. So they are against their entry.

That does not adversely affect the laboring men in this country in any way. This country needs these Mexican laborers. As has been pointed out by several speakers, we have no stoop laborers. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] says $1.60 would appeal to a lot of men out of work. That may be true, but they are not skilled in that type of work. If it was not a skilled job, that $1.60 an hour might appeal to them.

We have been getting more and more difficult situations into this agreement to try to keep on friendly relations with Mexico. There are no more interested people than those in Texas who are interested in that friendly policy. There is no man in this House who has more friends in Mexico than have I, or who have spent more time in Mexico than have I. I do not believe the Mexican officials are as much concerned about this, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has pointed out. As a matter of fact, I heard a few days ago the President of Mexico felt that he could straighten this thing out in a few minutes. But I went to Mexico 2 or 3 years ago, very much concerned about the way this thing was going on. We were getting increased hardships injected into this Mexican labor agreement, so that the farmers cannot employ Mexicans at all. We have almost reached that point now. I went down to Mexico and found that there was one of the head men of the CIO down there telling our Labor Department what to put into the agreement between the United States and Mexico. I saw him there every day for about 3 days. So it is not just guesswork with me. I know the CIO is trying to run this thing. The laboring people are not adversely affected, but they are benefited, because if we can grow crops and harvest them, if we can keep those crops from spoiling and get them into commercial channels, the members of labor get cheaper vegetables and products than if they are not allowed to be harvested.

I have heard a great deal about the cost of this program from the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. He said a lot about $2-million cost. It is true. I understand they have been spending a considerable sum in processing and examining nationals coming

through in the regular manner. At the same time, it is relieving the border-patrol men and the immigration agents from doing a lot of work that they would otherwise have to do. So the Government in the long run would probably be spending that same $2 million in enforcement officers in other places, instead of in the Labor Department.

I do not think the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] should be so concerned about $2 million being spent in some 20 States in the Union when our Government is spending a considerable sum in the Carolinas in subsidizing tobacco. We have to have a little Government support on this, that is true. You might keep that in mind.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Since the gentleman is from the border country, as am I, the two of us know the Mexican people and admire them. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a sort of insult to the Mexican Government and the Mexican people to suggest that they would consider it an affront for the United States Congress to take it on ourselves to legislate on an issue that is domestic, in that it deals with foreign labor in this country legally, that are being processed and given very favorable working contracts.

Does not the gentleman think that Mexico is not the type of nation or the type of people who would resent our doing what we have a right to do under our sovereignty as a nation?

Mr. REGAN. The gentleman is correct. They are reasonable, sensible people; and I want to say again that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] and I both have many friends among the Mexican people. We are not going to offend them through this legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

WHY UNNECESSARILY OFFEND MEXICO?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in what may now be said it is my sincere hope that no Member of the House will construe what is about to be said as an attempt to solicit, I would not say "get", solicit the favor of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] by agreeing with one of the views he just expressed.

This bill is an apparently harmless one. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] said that Michigan had 2,500 Mexican workers. We have onions, carrots, cabbages, cauliflower, tomatoes, worlds of crops; we have square miles of muck land where you cannot get an American, much less an Irishman, to get down on his knees and pull weeds, thin plants; they just will not do it. And, of course, the members of the CIO, and there is a fine delegation down here from the CIO, and the UE from Whirlpool Corp. are in opposition to this bill. I can understand why when these people come in from Mexico and they cannot be forced into a union to pay initiation fees and dues, why the CIO does not want them here; that is not hard to figure out. Neither can I understand why when the CIO or UE men do not want the work, will not do the job which the Mexicans want and will do, they should object, unless it be on the ground just suggested. Certainly the union men want cheaper vegetables, farm produce, for their families.

But there is something else about the bill, in view of our foreign policy, that is not logical. What does the legislation do? As one reads it, it appears to be harmless, does it not? Apparently; but what it says in amending this law is that if the Secretary of Labor cannot agree with the Mexican Government, then he, the Secretary, can go ahead and recruit workers from Mexico anyway, regardless of what Mexico thinks. That is being bigger and stronger than Mexico. We will just deal with her individual citizens as we please, regardless of what the Mexican Government says or does. In short Mexico, though friendly, can like it or lump it.

We have spent billions upon billions of dollars, we have had at least a million men in the armed services to buy friendship. One of the objectives for the spending of billions, getting into two wars was to retain the friendship of other nations by helping them fight communism and the Communists. We have been at it for 20 long years, trying, we were told, to build up friendship. Now we come along with this bill, and we say to Mexico: "You either agree or the Secretary of Labor will do five things." And whether you like it makes no difference. "This is it; you take it and like it." Is that the way to treat a friendly nation? Would we do that to Britain? What are the things we authorize the Secretary to do? I sent over to get the statute law. It lists five things that the Secretary of Labor can do without paying any attention to what the Mexican Government wants. Here is the statutory authorization:

The Secretary is given authority:

(1) To recruit such workers (including any such workers who have resided in the United States for the preceding 5 years, or who are temporarily in the United States under legal entry);

(2) To establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United States for the purpose of receiving and housing such workers while arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the continental United States;

(3) To provide transportation for such workers from recruitment centers outside the continental United States to such reception centers and transportation from such reception centers to such recruitment centers after termination of employment;

(4) To provide such workers with such subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses (not exceeding $150 burial expenses in any one case) as may be or become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (3) and while such workers are at reception centers.

Somebody said that the Mexican Government wanted a minimum wage. Well, we have it in this country. Is there any reason why they should not have a minimum wage? And their people who come up here, should they not receive a minimum wage? Then the same gentleman, my very dear friend from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] said they had less than a hundred in Iowa—said that the Mexicans were trying to channel the insurance—I suppose health and welfare—into some particular company. Well, bless your dear heart, that is what the labor racketeers do in this country. When I wanted to stop it a committee of the House said: "Get out of that one; we do not want you monkeying around there."

Permit me to repeat: Just what can the Secretary do? He is authorized to recruit such workers.

That is all there in section 1. To recruit such workers. That is solicit Mexicans to leave their homes, their country and do the work we will not do.

What else does he do? "Establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United States for the purpose of receiving and housing."

That is to say, he can go across the Mexican border, send his agents across to coax workers into signing employment contracts, put up a barracks, housing facilities, he can pay the transportation of the Mexicans from their homes to wherever this center is, he can feed those Mexicans and take care of them, give them medical services while they are there, yes, he can bury them, too, if it does not cost more than $150. All of that the Secretary of Labor can do without the consent of the Mexican authorities. He can tell the representatives of this friendly nation to "go peddle their papers. We will deal with their people as we wish."

I do not know what is coming over the folks here who talk about States rights. Why, do you not in this resolution want to retain the bargaining power in the Congress? You want to give the Secretary of Labor the authority and let him go down and establish these recruiting centers to coax the Mexicans to come over here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the only point I care to make is we need these workers in Michigan. We need between 3,000 and 3,500 of them this coming year. We need them in the canning and processing factories as well as on the farms. We want them in Michigan.

But certainly our folks do not want the Secretary of Agriculture in opposition to the policies which we have supported and which has cost us so much in dollars, in lives, and suffering in trying to get the good will of the other nations to act arbitrarily and without the approval of the Government of this friendly nation in inducing its people to come here just because they will work for less than others. We do not want the Secretary of Agriculture to go down there close to the line or perhaps in Mexico and do things

to which the Mexican government objects. Do we want the Secretary to coax these people away from their homeland by giving them more money, more money than they can make at home, to come across the border and defy the Mexican Government to prescribe rules, regulations, or laws under which their own people may operate? We can do all that need be done easy enough by negotiation. Are we being Christians—friendly when instead of appointing members of a joint Commission to do the job we give the Secretary power to tell Mexico you do this or we, because we have the power, will do it anyway. We do not need to use strong-arm methods, we do not need to tell them we are going to do it anyway, we do not need to say we are going to get your men and women to come over here whether you want us to or not, and you have nothing to say or do about their wages or living conditions.

Think it over. I do not want to oppose the Farm Bureau. I try to go along with their program, but I do not believe in delegating authority to an executive to deal with a friendly nation when that nation does not want to deal with him. Maybe I will have to vote "present." If I do, it will be the second time I have done that since I have been here. I am not laboring under any delusions about what is going to happen here. The bill will be passed by a comfortable margin. If it does, and I vote "no," then once more I am not going along with my leadership and the Eisenhower administration. I would like to go along sometime on something with them. I wish they would send up more of the sound, sensible ideas which, even though they are old, made us what we are.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear in the beginning that I am not speaking for California, Arizona or for a lot of these other places. I am speaking for the eighth congressional district of Louisiana. And I am not talking about what somebody told me or about something that I read in a book. I am going to talk to you about what I, GEORGE LONG, know about this situation.

We come here and we talk about overproduction. We have too much butter, we have too much wheat, we have too much corn, we have too much of everything; yet you want to bring more people into this country to create more surplus for the Government to buy. That is the whole story. You want to bring in more labor, Mexican labor, and I do not care where they come from.

In my part of the country we have reduced the need for cotton pickers by half, by the use of the cotton picking machines. I raise cotton. I am a cotton farmer. I know something about these Mexican laborers, and I am going to tell you about them, too. We further reduced the need for cotton pickers by reducing the number of acres by 33⅓ percent.

Now we have on our hands, along with much of the rest of the United States, unemployment. The people I am talking about do not raise crops. They do not own a foot of land. The only place they have is the home that they live in. They work on the farms by the hour or by the day. They are recruited by people who come to town and take them off to the farm and work them for that day. These people, many of them, are today out of work because much cotton land is not being cultivated. They will not be needed to pick the cotton.

This Mexican laborer business has been bothering my part of the country a long time. We can recruit all the labor we need, and we can help Texas if they want it, right out of Louisiana where these people live.

Let us see what there is about these Mexican laborers. They are brought into our State in cattle trucks, standing up; there is not even room to sit down. They cannot speak a word of English, but they have a man with them who can. And he sells them, he trades them to these big farmers.

You talk about the CIO wanting this bill or the American Federation of Labor wanting this bill. I will tell you who wants this bill. The big cotton farmer in Louisiana wants these Mexican laborers, because he can hire them for a pittance as against the laborers who live there. And he is doing it. There is no question about his doing it. Do not be deceived about who is doing this. Some of the Members have been a little caustic here. Do you know what this is? This is for the big farmers in California, in Louisiana, and in the rest of this country. They are the people who want the bill. This is the payoff to the big farmers and the big cattle raisers for having financed the Republican campaign. I am speaking for the poor fellow who does not have a dime and who cannot speak for himself and who wants an opportunity to go out and earn a living for a bunch of little old kids. In many of those huts there are living 2 and 3 families who are begging for a chance to earn an honest living. Do not deny them that chance.

If Texas wants this, if California wants it, let them have it. But do not force it on the State of Louisiana where we have men on relief rolls today begging for work.

Announcement by President Eisenhower that this country will resume negotiations with Mexico toward an agreement on importation of farm labor from that country falls far short of the action required to solve the wetback problem. In 1951, before he entered the White House, Mr. Eisenhower called the wetback situation a moral disgrace. Since he became President, traffic in this contraband labor has increased to a current rate of 1 million a year. At the same time a dangerous relaxation in the standards formerly protecting such workers has taken place.

Pressure for increased immigration of Mexican farmworkers comes from the big ranchers and corporate farms of California and the Southwest. These interests gave the Republican ticket heavy political and financial support in their campaign. In response to their claims that an emergency exists, the Department of Labor is now, with doubtful legality, recruiting farmworkers for them at the border.

There is no justification for legislation, already approved by the Agriculture Committees of both Houses of Congress, authorizing the Department of Labor to contract for seasonal farmworkers from Mexico. Unemployment in the United States is increasing rapidly, with more than 3½ million now idle. The situation in Louisiana at this time is deplorable. There are thousands of unemployed men—farmers and laborers—forced off the farms as a result of the reduction in cotton acreage. The landlords are not in position to keep them because cotton is the money crop, and they do not have enough land. Many farms which supported from 75 to 100 families now have 25 or less.

For the past several years, the laborers on cotton farms have found it increasingly difficult to obtain employment. Now that the cotton acreage has been reduced, many thousands of people who have no other vocation are out of work. In the main, these people are well trained in farming but untrained in any other line.

Alien Mexican labor is a problem for other reasons. Use and sale of narcotics increase as do crimes of violence. Illegitimate births, attributable to alien fathers, are common.

I suggest that we make the wetbacks drybacks and leave them in Mexico where they cannot compete with our farm laborers. All the farm labor needed this year can be recruited in Louisiana and other Southern States, I am sure; and I trust we will not be foolish enough to think that we are doing anyone a favor when we bring more labor into this country, thereby forcing the minimum wage down instead of up and reducing our standard of living to the point that we will again have in this country unfed and unclothed men and women—all brought on by the fact that we were not wise enough to see in time and avoid the indiscriminate admission of Mexican labor into this country. We already have laws by which Mexican labor can be brought into this country; and there is no need, year after year, to meet here and fight out this problem of making legal that which is otherwise illegal.

It seems to me that we ought to wake up and, instead of crying high taxes, put into practice measures calculated to remove the burden from the taxpayers. I earnestly hope that the Members of this Congress will take stock, do some figuring for themselves, and not be stampeded by a group of big farmers who employ large numbers of laborers each year and want

to hire them just as cheaply as they can. They seem to be not at all concerned with the misery that will result, such as sickness from overcrowding and even death to children who are undernourished. We all know the weak go first; and when adults cannot find employment to support their families, then malnutrition follows. This is a serious situation and, rather than patch together the old pact for importing workers, Congress should look to the rights of American citizens who have been treated with a good deal less consideration than their foreign cousins. If we continue to admit Mexicans, we will certainly live to see the day that we will regret it. The Congress of the United States can and should be held responsible for the condition that is bound to come if this bill is passed.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about this legislation. Let us at the start clear up one thing. Statements were made by several of the speakers supporting the legislation which might lead people to believe that this is the same legislation, that it has the same thought behind it, that has been on this floor in previous years. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Let us review for just a brief moment the history of this legislation. Before I review it briefly, may I say that in that review I hope to justify the position taken by the labor movements of this country, about which some critical or unfounded remarks were made today.

During the years of World War II there was found to be a great shortage of labor qualified and willing and available for agricultural work. Nobody denied it. It was well recognized. The labor movements of the United States cooperated in setting up a program that would open the borders of this country to Mexican labor that was available because their citizens were not being used in as great numbers as ours were on the battlefield.

At the cessation of the war that program was terminated or reduced. In 1948 it was proposed that a new program be worked out which would supply labor to a recognized shortage in the farm and agricultural areas of this country. The labor movement recognized the need. The labor movement came back to Washington and sat down in conferences. At that time as the President of the California State Federation of Labor I took part in those conferences and urged the working out of a program which would bring Mexican labor into the United States under properly negotiated contracts to help solve the labor shortage in the agricultural field.

That program as enacted into law by the Congress provided for a contract or a treaty between this country and the Mexican Government. A contract takes two parties, it takes a meeting of the minds, and it must be bilateral. There may be some unilateral points of execution, but the contract must be bilateral between two separate and distinct people. That is what we had, and it expired on January 15 of this year.

Since then what has happened? This country went on its own, carrying out its own policy to bring these people in. The Comptroller General of the United States advised the Secretary of Labor and the administrative agencies that they were expending the funds appropriated by this Congress to be used for the purpose of carrying out such agreement as was arrived at between our two countries, the United States and Mexico, under the previous law passed, they were expending the funds illegally and unlawfully, and they must cease and desist.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman point out at that place in his remarks the fact that the law under which these agreements have been executed is still on the books and still in operation? It was continued at the request of the present administration, and goes through 1955. It was only the contracts that have expired, and they have been extended for 6 weeks pending the outcome of these negotitions.

Mr. SHELLEY. What the gentleman has said is absolutely correct. The law is still on the books. The contract agreement has expired, and the contract agreement in the past several days has been extended for 6 weeks pending the outcome of the resumed negotiations that are now going on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how many there are who desire to speak on the joint resolution at this time. I think we ought to close up the general debate.

Mr. COOLEY. I think there are about 4 or 5 on this side, maybe 6.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 16 gentlemen standing.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to object to additional time and I shall not object as far as the gentleman from California is concerned, but I think I shall be compelled to object to additional time on the part of any other Member, in view of the fact that there are still a large number who desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, when the contract expired on January 15, large numbers of workers rushed to the Mexican border, at least in my State, and I assume there were similar occurrences in and along the border in other States. You saw the pictures of such occurrences as shown by Mr. COOLEY earlier in this debate. I have on the committee desk on this side of the aisle notarized affidavits from people who witnessed the situation where the employees of the Department of Immigration of the United States, Department of Employment, and of the border patrol who had rounded up not only Mexicans who had originally come in legally, but those who had come in illegally, brought them to the border and told them, "There is no longer any contract. We will take you to the border. You put your foot over and then jump back and you will then be a legal entrant under the way we are now operating." I have any number of affidavits from people who saw that operation. That is not denied. That is what will prevail if you adopt this kind of legislation. What will we do with these people after they are here if the Mexican Government at some subsequent date refuses to take them back? You are passing legislation which is creating a terrific social impact upon the conditions of American workers. In this resolution you are passing legislation which can have the most dire effect on our diplomatic situation in Central and South America where the Communist agents have been operating for some time in Guatemala and in Mexico, and who several years ago were in strong power in Chile, who have been using the argument that the United States is an imperialistic country which will simply operate for its own benefit, to exploit the citizens of neighboring states. At this particular time with the Inter-American Conference going on in Caracas, Venezuela, we certainly should not approach this matter hastily. We have spent some years developing and carrying out a good neighbor policy in our relationships with our southern neighbors. Are we going to let the avaricious desire of some few factory farmers destroy that relationship? That is exactly what we will be doing in passing this legislation.

Further, there is no provision for proper screening as to the health hazards or as to the criminal background or narcotic addiction or peddling, and the Justice Department and the Health Department many times made comment on that situation. In some of the communities in my State, the local authorities are now complaining of the number of Mexicans, both legally admitted and illegally admitted who have come in and have become problems, social problems, and health problems for those communities.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot have an understanding as to the termination of debate on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the joint resolution and amendments thereto close at 4:30 p. m.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object. I think only 3 or 4 Members have spoken since general debate on the joint resolution was concluded. Only 3 or 4 Members have spoken under the 5-minute rule. You can see from the number of Members standing the great interest in this legislation. It seems to me it would be very unwise to shorten the debate in any such fashion. I shall be forced to object to any such request because when we were engaged in general debate, I know that many Members wanted time and we only had an hour on this side. Unfortunately, I consumed more time than I had anticipated. I am sure the Members are sincere in wanting to present their views on this matter. I hope the gentleman will not press for a limitation

of time at this moment, but let us go on for a little while.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, there has been a considerable amount of debate under the 5-minute rule. We had ample debate during the 2 hours that was allowed for the discussion of this measure. I believe the Committee is ready to vote in the near future.

I move that all debate on the bill, and amendments thereto, close at 4:30.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOLEY) there were—ayes 103, noes 31.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], is recognized.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to point out two things that I believe are apparent from the debate that has taken place today. One is that whereas these negotiations had been stalemated for some time before this legislation was considered by the committee and before a rule was granted, since that time we are making some progress. If we pass this legislation we will make some more progress. There has been nothing come up that I know of that has indicated that what we have done in any way has offended the Mexican Government or the Mexican people.

Second, with the exception of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], every Member who has opposed this legislation also opposed the initial legislation to permit bringing Mexican labor into this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 355. I do so somewhat reluctantly because I have farmer friends in my district who feel that this legislation is necessary to a proper solution of their labor problems. I do not question their sincerity. I do question their estimate of the availability of domestic farm labor in this country. In the light of undisputed reports of growing unemployment in all categories of labor including farm labor I would be abdicating fair judgment if I found any necessity for enactment of this bill; moreover I would be deserting all reasonable concepts of humanitarianism and legislative objectivity if I failed to oppose it. I apologize to my friends for our difference of opinion.

I would preface further remarks on the substance of the situation by qualifying myself as somewhat of an expert on the subject of agricultural labor. I represent a great three-county agricultural area. Therein we grow almost every variety of crop which contributes to our national food and fiber requirements and some of these crops are almost exclusively grown in my district. I am familiar with the recent history of labor supply and demand with respect to the production and harvesting of these groups. Truck, tree fruit, and vine crops require a lot of hand labor. The production and harvesting of cotton requires a great deal of hand labor. In the early thirties depression and drought in the great Southwest displaced a great many of the good people in the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and New Mexico. These people came to California seeking jobs and until the outset of World War II constituted almost the sole source of the labor necessary for such crops. In the course of time many of these fine people settled on the land and have become successful entrepreneurs in our economy but there are many of them who have never ceased doing farm labor and they have continued to supply a good portion of our farm-labor requirement. This requirement has declined by reason of mechanization and this fact plus the fact that emigres to our cities are available for peak agricultural employment has resulted in the establishment of a most stable relationship between employment demand and supply met largely out of the labor pool created by the influx of people I have mentioned. These are the people who lose jobs to imported laborers in time of job shortages.

The timing of this legislation is extremely bad. It can be justified only on the basis of labor shortage. In my opinion this shortage does not presently exist in my area of California; moreover, I question the validity of a conclusion of shortage in any other area because like growers in other areas some of my growers insist they have a labor shortage in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary. I voted for 1953 legislation continuing the treaty arrangement. In my opinion that is the only proper method to handle a real labor shortage.

We have heard a great deal of talk about wetbacks, so-called by reason of illegal entrance into this country. This bill is speciously described as a solution to the wetback problem. I certainly reject this argument. I would hate to conclude that a great country like the United States could only close its borders to illegal entrants by the device of offering jobs to foreigners, jobs which are needed by our own people. Those who hold such an opinion have small faith in our institutions. If there is any truth in this conclusion we are, indeed in trouble because the Justice Department recently reported that over 100 past and present Communists cross the border daily in this horde of legal and illegal Mexican laborers.

In truth the only real justification for this bill is a purported shortage of domestic agricultural labor. Let us examine this justification.

I have before me a story from the Fresno Bee of February 17, 1954. The head reads "Work Program Is Ordered for Farm Jobless." The article states that the welfare director for Kings County, my home county, stated:

> We have the greatest agricultural relief load since the depression. In the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys many agricultural workers will be reemployed by spring but the outlook is not so good.

Further:

> Rible was of the opinion work production will reduce the crime rate and if there is a bona fide need a family man will be glad to work.

A February 16 story in the Bakersfield Californian is headed "Fresno To Ask More Agents To Rout Wetbacks," Sidney Cruff, the chairman of the Fresno County board of supervisors, is quoted as saying:

> There is no doubt that every wetback at work in the county is keeping a citizen out of a job.

A story in the Fresno Bee of February 17 reports that the county has formally appealed to the Immigration and Naturalization Service for a more vigorous program of deporting Mexican aliens to relieve the agricultural unemployment situation in that county. A letter addressed by the county board of supervisors to that Federal agency reads in part:

> The demand upon our county welfare department for general relief to employable but unemployed citizen agricultural workers is rising out of proportion to normal expectations. At the same time a rapid increase in thefts, burglaries, and robberies may be traced to these destitute and needy people.

The Fresno Bee, one of the outstanding newspapers in the United States has twice editorialized on the necessity of reducing the number of alien Mexican laborers in order that American citizens might have jobs.

Gentlemen this is the situation in my part of the country with respect to the presence or absence of local farm-labor supply, and I venture to say that there are as many big operators shedding crocodile tears about the absence of local labor here as exist in any part of the 5 States which principally seek this legislation.

If local people are unemployed by lack of jobs it makes no difference whether available jobs are being filled by aliens legally in the United States or illegally in the United States. In either event the local citizen is just as unemployed, just as broke, just as hungry, just as susceptible to an economic urge to rob or steal.

Only the most urgent and demonstrable necessity would dictate the importation of a foreign-labor force consisting almost solely of male persons unaccompanied by families. Aside from the question of displacement of local labor such a labor force carries with it social problems of overwhelming importance.

Until the advent of a large foreign Mexican labor force in California the rural areas of California had no problem of narcotic use and sale. Today each edition of the local papers carries news of arrests for narcotic addiction or sale. In an overwhelming number of cases the person arrested has a name of Mexican ethnic origin. He is either an alien or a domestic corrupted by association with aliens. I understand that Mexico is now the prime source of heroin used in this country and it would be unrealistic to assume that day laborers crossing the border would not be used as agents or carriers. Crimes of violence are various and frequent in those areas which have a large foreign-labor population.

Prostitution and illegitimacy are other common occurrences. These conditions are typical of communities with a displaced male labor force without women

or any real roots in the community. It is to the credit of the Catholic Church that it has always recognized this problem through the vehicle of the Rural Life Conference, so ably headed in California by Monsignor O'Dwyer.

Gentlemen, in expressing the foregoing conclusions I make no inference of basic inferiority with respect to any ethnic group. I am merely expressing a prejudice in favor of American citizens over alien residents in this country under the peculiar conditions of agricultural employment. We have, in the San Joaquin Valley, a local population of Mexican origin of recent or distant character. These persons are citizens. They participate in community affairs. They have families. They are among our best citizens and contribute a large number of persons to our farm-labor supply. They need your protection.

I urge you to defeat this disgraceful legislation which is unjustified and is a direct affront to a friendly government.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] is recognized.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNTER and Mr. PHILLIPS yielded their time to Mr. WILSON of California.)

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am perhaps as near being a wetback as any Member here, for I was born on the Mexican border and have lived my life on the Mexican border. I know the problem very well.

This legislation is a sincere attempt to eliminate the wetback menace. I think the bill should be known as the wetback control bill. It is the result of a visit to the border by the Attorney General last summer. He was very much concerned about the number of arrests of wetbacks in our State last year. He came down to the border to see what the problem was. As a result he saw that some changes were needed in existing agreements, and he and the Department of Labor have been attempting to get those changes put into the agreement with Mexico. Mexico has not yet agreed to go along with us, and so they have not signed the new agreement, but I am confident that if we pass this legislation and if Mexico sees that we are sincere in wanting to make some minor changes in the agreement we can eliminate the very serious wetback menace that confronts us. I hope you will support this legislation.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill now before us. It serves two major purposes. First, it helps to provide for the orderly recruitment of supplemental agricultural labor from Mexico. Second, it makes possible more effective administration of the immigration laws. In other words, it will help solve the wetback problem.

In order to gain a clear and accurate picture of the present farm labor situation in California and the need for supplemental workers from Mexico in the immediate future, I asked for a report from the Department of Employment of the State of California. I received such a report dated February 18, 1954, signed by Edward F. Hayes, chief of the farm placement service of said department, and I quote from his report:

Southern California is in the early stages of harvesting nearly 100,000 acres of lemons and navel oranges. Current employment in these 2 citrus crops totals 8,700 workers, and the rising labor demand is expected to reach 12,000 by mid-March, if weather and crop maturity follow present indications. The 8,700 workers currently picking citrus include about 6,000 contract Mexican nationals. These harvests will be at a peak some time between late March and the first of May, when the peak labor requirement may total 13,000 workers.

At the present time there are 16,750 Mexican nationals under contract to California employers, with 14,000 of these men, here under original contracts, subject to return to Mexico, under present regulations, on or before February 26, 1954. It will be impossible to replace these workers with domestic farm workers. Our offices have been conducting urgent recruitment among unemployed domestic workers, trying to replace these Mexicans but without success.

Furthermore, California faces the spring peak of planting and thinning operations, and early vegetable harvests calling for additional workers in most parts of the State. In addition to continuing or rising labor needs in Imperial Valley vegetables and southern California citrus crops, the next major need requiring large numbers of supplemental workers will be possibly 2,000 for the harvest of some 65,000 acres of asparagus in the San Joaquin-Sacramento delta area, starting about March 1 and normally requiring a peak total of about 9,000 workers between April and June.

To give you some idea of the significance of the labor needs cited, in relation to the State total farm-labor picture, total employment on farms at mid-February was about 398,000, with current shortages of 1,100. Approximately 97,000 of the total were engaged in major seasonal operations, including about 50,000 in the harvests, and pruning of orchards and vineyards; more than 30,000 in vegetables, and about 17,000 in field crops—principally cotton picking.

Although California has an estimated 200,000 unemployed workers at the present time, these are primarily nonagricultural workers, including seasonal employees of canneries, other processing plants, lumbering, and construction industries, as well as workers unemployed by industrial layoffs. Agricultural employment is being offered to these people but with very few acceptances, and the turnover of those who have accepted available farm jobs has been very high.

We hope this information conveys the urgency of California's need for immediate decision and action to maintain and augment our supply of supplemental Mexican workers.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, if I have any additional time I would just like to say there are over a thousand farmers in my district who are interested in this legislation. We hear about the big contract farmers which are supposed to be the only ones supporting this legislation. Most of my farmers run small citrus groves and small truck farms; they are not the large contract farmers, yet they do use a few of these contract laborers and they are very much interested in this legislation. So it is not a bill that benefits the big farmers, it benefits a great many of the small farmers who are producing our truck crops. I urge adoption of this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted Mr. RHODES of Arizona was given to Mr. HOSMER.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, some difficulties have been pointed out here by certain of the objectors to this bill that it might cause some slight to the Mexican Government and cause some difficulty with our international relations in that regard. It has also been pointed out by some of the opponents of the bill the fear that it might permit the illegal importation of narcotics into this country from the Republic of Mexico. I truly believe these fears are not justified. However, if they do exist, and these opponents are sincere, and if it may likewise be sincere among the people of Mexico and the Government of Mexico, there is a measure now pending before the Judiciary Committee of this House to establish a joint United States-Mexico Commission to handle the problem of wetbacks and narcotics that can be passed by this House as a supplement to the measure now before us, which would set at rest any of those fears that have been expressed on those two counts.

I sincerely hope that such measure will be passed by the House before this session is ended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted Mr. THOMPSON of Texas was given to Mr. MAHON.)

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman from Texas, my friend, CLARK THOMPSON, for yielding me the brief time allotted to him. His support of this legislation is well known, and his interest in the cause of agriculture and labor is, likewise, well known. Mr. Chairman, one of the Members has previously referred to his personal acquaintance with this subject. I, too, can talk about the agricultural labor situation from firsthand knowledge. I think I represent the heaviest cotton-producing district in the United States. Much of that cotton is harvested by Mexican nationals.

The Mexican national law has done a great deal to raise the standards of the agricultural worker in the Southwest. It has brought about better housing facilities, better sleeping and living conditions, better utilities for the workers; it has raised the standards of the agricultural worker and it has done a great deal for the cause of labor. I yield to no one in my support of the working people of this country—organized or unorganized. I would not be willing to support a measure that would discriminate against the rights and privileges of our own American laborers. I would not be willing to see foreign labor imported as a device for lowering the employment opportunities, the living conditions, or the wages of American working people. I well realize that this program must be administered with great care in order that we fully safeguard the rights of our own people.

Someone said on the floor that these people work for a mere pittance. The truth is that the Mexican national worker by reason of the contract is paid the prevailing wage. The truth is that during the peak of the cotton-harvesting season in my congressional district, the Mexican

national who comes there makes more money per hour, per day, and per week than many of the school teachers in my district, than many of the clerks in the stores for a comparable period. They make from $5 to $10 and more, probably $15 or $20 per day in the peak of the season helping harvest the cotton crop.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted Mr. MADDEN was given to Mr. McCARTHY.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, ever since I have been a Member of the Congress this farm labor bill has been presented to the Congress as the solution to the wetback problem. The statistics in regard to the number of wetbacks who have been caught and returned show clearly that every time we pass a new bill the wetback problem becomes worse instead of better. Before we had any legal program from ten to twelve thousand illegals were coming into the country each year. Since the passage of the first so-called legalizing act of 1943 the number of illegal entries has increased, until last year the number apprehended was approximately 875,000.

If we are going to pass this bill, let us not act upon it as a means of controlling the wetback problem, because it simply will not accomplish that purpose. What the Committee on Agriculture should do, instead of weakening the present act, is to give some study to the recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor as reported in 1951.

I should like to ask the members of the committee whether they have given any consideration to those recommendations; whether they have tried to do anything about the migratory farm labor problem in the United States; whether they have proposed anything that would improve the wages or the working conditions or the standard of living of these people.

As a matter of fact, the only improvement that has come has been the result of the insistence of the Mexican Government that we in the United States set up certain standards with regard to wages and working conditions for Mexican nationals who come into this country. The only standard we have is one that is related to what the Mexican Government has insisted that we set up for her nationals, and the committee now is asking us to weaken those standards. I think this legislation should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN].

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, twice, on yesterday and today, I have heard remarks about irresponsible statements of somebody from one of the bureaus here, made in an effort to get a higher appropriation, and saying that there were hundreds of Communists coming across at El Paso under the guise of being braceros. That is not true. I defy them to prove it. I know it is not true.

Further I resent the fact that these hardworking Mexicans, who come over here to try to make a few honest dollars, are accused of being Communists, because they are not that type of people. They are pretty good, decent, fair, hard-working Mexicans who are doing work over here that our overrich people will not do.

One more thing. This bill, in my opinion, is to determine whether or not the Congress of the United States or the CIO is calling the turn on what we shall do in the United States. I hope this will be supported in a substantial way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in one minute one cannot cover very much ground on this subject. But the study on migratory labor of the United States Government is available to all the Members of the House. If they will study that one book, they will see what this is all about. I quote from page 79:

> The United States Department of Agriculture figures on wages for farm labor in Texas in 1950 were 54 cents an hour; in New Mexico 54 cents an hour; in Arizona 64 cents an hour; and in California 88 cents an hour.

I might say that in the Imperial Valley in California farm-labor wages were about half what they were at the time up in the San Joaquin Valley, which is about 200 miles north. The farther away you get from the Mexican-California border the higher the farm wage gets. This proves the depressing effect of wetback or contract labor from Mexico.

This bill will give a cloak of "legalism" to labor exploitation by the corporate farm owners of the West.

It will have a bad effect on our international relations with Mexico and other Latin American countries.

I regret that time has been denied the opponents to effectively use the many arguments available against this bill. I shall vote against the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

(By unanimous consent Mr. FISHER yielded the time allotted to him to Mr. GATHINGS.)

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, there has been quite a lot of discussion in this debate about the need for these Mexicans in the United States. I want to read a few sentences from a letter addressed to me from the Ventura County Citrus Growers Committee under date of February 24, 1954:

> Our association made a request for 500 British West Indian workers, and we were told by the California Department of Employment that we would first have to take all the domestic referrals that they could send us. The appeal went forth during the third week of January by press, radio, and the department of employment job bulletin boards. Referrals were accepted from California, Arizona, and Nevada. On February 22 something over 2,600 referrals had been made to Ventura County. Over 1,100 of them actually reported to the packinghouses inquiring about the jobs; 565 to 575 agreed to accept employment; 305 actually reported on the job; and as of February 22 105 were working.
>
> These people were both families and single men. We had houses for them to rent—2 to 4 bedrooms for $10 and $15 per month. We paid the deposits for electricity and gas, and 65 percent of the families used our houses, drew food in advance, and as soon as work was available left without paying for food, deposits, or rent. We have a barrack type camp for single men; and, at last accounting on night of February 20, over four hundred men had gone through camp with 67 left and $3,818 board and room bills left unpaid.
>
> I might say that lemon picking is on a piece-rate basis and the average earnings for all pickers in our county last year was 97.4 cents for lemons and $1.02 per hour for oranges. The average moneys earned applies to imported Mexican nationals, displaced persons, and American domestic workers, since all types and all classes of workers are paid on exactly the same rate and in many crews the workers are commingled. I would like to say also that our domestic crews are better than the other groups and earn a higher average.
>
> Hoping that this information answers your request, I remain
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> BRUCE H. MILLS,
> *President.*
> WILLIAM H. TOLBERT,
> *Manager.*

That is out of 2,600 that had been referred.

I have a telegram here from the San Antonio Employment Association under date of February 23, 1954:

> In re inquiry, quote figures of referrals by California Department of Employment, January 15 to present: 350 referred, 294 showed up, 275 had work in agriculture, 250 began work, 30 now working, average length of stay 2 days, records on 34 men show 15 left owing, total 69.

Here is another telegram, from the Southern California Farmers Association to me:

> Following figures referrals California Department Employment to this labor association for citrus harvest January 15 to February 1: Referrals, 204; still working 5.

There is a distinct need for recruiting these workers from Mexico if farming operations are to be maintained and food and fiber crops cultivated and harvested. For the lack of workers when they are needed will mean higher prices for the consumer. Perishable commodities will deteriorate or spoil completely if they are not harvested when they are ready for harvest.

This resolution will provide a unilateral procedure to recruit needed Mexican workers when an agreement between the two Governments cannot be agreed upon. Unilateral action is not new to the Mexican officials. The hearings reveal that the Mexican representatives have blacklisted communities and counties on flimsy and unwarranted charges. The farmers residing in those communities or counties were denied workers until such time as a hearing was held and the facts revealed. I quote below a letter of an eminent Arkansas attorney received by me last week regarding the ridiculous charges used by Mexican officials to blacklist a whole county:

> HALE & FOGLEMAN,
> *Marion, Ark., February 18, 1954.*
>
> Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
> *Member of Congress,*
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR TOOK: I am a day late getting you the information requested in your telephone call of yesterday, but had no secretary when court adjourned and was unable to locate my files.
>
> The people in this territory found in dealing with the Mexican Government, with

reference to seasonal use of Mexican nationals, that many false claims were made and a great many unnecessary complaints were registered. In a hearing before the Mexican consul and the representatives of the United States Department of Labor last September, it was revealed that false claims were registered with reference to housing, subsistence, pay scale and the contracts in general.

To fully set this out, the representatives of Mexico made claims that housing was inadequate, although proper inspection and approval had been had; that bedding was improper, although it met the contract's specifications; that dishes were not clean, although it was the duty of the workmen to do their own dishwashing, etc.; complaint was made because certain Mexican nationals had been placed under arrest when, in fact, they had departed from the place of employment and were later expelled from the country.

Complaints were raised about filth in the quarters when the filthy conditions themselves were shown to have been a result of bad housekeeping by those using the premises.

We likewise were faced with complaints that the farmers did not pay the established prices, although the price was established at a time later than the period for which claim was made. This was a direct result of the investigation and price determination made in August of 1952 which was retroactive until June. Adjustments were promptly made, but great complaint was registered by the representatives of the Mexican Government.

Claims were likewise made by the consulate that local laborers were being paid more than their nationals. It developed that they were unable to prove a single instance of such improper action.

Of course, we do not insist that there were not errors or instances when some minor complaints might not have been proper. However, this was principally due to language difficulty and a difference in opinion as to the interpretation of the contract. It was found that a great majority of the claims were without foundation and that much trouble was caused by unnecessary meddling by the Mexican officials then in charge of the local office. We trust that this will be of some assistance to you.

Very truly yours,

JAMES C. HALE.

This legislation is needed. It is needed now. If approved it would uphold the hand of our Government officials in their negotiations. It would uphold the hand of the American farmer who asks a better work agreement, an agreement that will prevent the blacklisting of an entire county without fully complying with the international agreement which requires joint action of the two governments and not the action of one government alone.

Our officials are asking that the worker himself should have some responsibilities to perform and that the farmer could withhold wages to reimburse him in case the worker jumped his contract and absconded. I trust the resolution will be agreed to.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the Congress is seldom called upon to consider a more complicated social and economic problem than that presented in the pending resolution. I shall support it because I believe the existing supply of farm labor will prove insufficient in certain seasons and at the same time it will provide opportunities for residents of Mexico who are eager for this employment.

While I appreciate the desire of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] to avoid tension in our relations with the Republic of Mexico I am confident that the passage of the resolution will not have the effect of disturbing the relationship. Progress in working out a mutually satisfactory agreement must be made.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct attention to related problems which I trust will soon receive our attention. I refer to the absence of a coordinated Federal program for the welfare of all migrants, our native workers as well as those who come for a period from outside our borders. There is an appalling need for improved health, educational and welfare facilities for this group, particularly the children.

Now I realize that primarily the responsibility for this service belongs to local agencies and that private rather than governmental programs are required. I do not contend for Federal usurpation of these functions, but only that we cannot afford to enter the field of labor recruitment to the extent of this resolution without accepting the accompanying responsibility for providing, through all appropriate agencies, for the well-being of those affected by it.

This is an appealing human problem and it will continue to cry out for solution until we act.

I do not condemn the employers. They are harrassed by cost problems, and they are busy with a multitude of seasonal tasks. Still our best hope is in the imagination and stimulated interest which they may display in this matter. Once aroused to its urgency they will exert leadership.

The soundness of a federally coordinated program in behalf of these uprooted multitudes cannot be questioned. I respectfully urge the great Committee on Agriculture to take time out to survey the needs.

There is abundant material on the subject. The President's Commission on Migratory Labor which completed its exhaustive studies on March 26, 1926, submitted comprehensive reports on various phases of the problem and outlined effective remedies. Still little has been done by Federal authority. For example, there is virtually a complete vacuum in Federal housing legislation for the migrant and seasonal workers.

State school facilities are often strained to provide minimum services and these efforts are poorly coordinated.

In the case of health, the fact that migrants by the nature of their occupation cannot meet residence requirements, imposed by law or regulation, combines with their poverty to deny them care. In addition, as pointed out by the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, local governments are financially unable to pay the major share of health costs for this group. This factor, combined with the interstate nature of the problems involved, make it necessary, according to the Commission, for the Federal Government to share responsibility with the States in developing a health program for migrants.

In view of the growing trend toward mechanization of agriculture and the increased risks to farm workers, the Commission also recommended that the Departments of Labor and Agriculture, in cooperation with State agencies, institute a safety program and that the Department of Labor take the initiative in assisting administrators of State labor laws to solve problems of applying workmen's compensation to migratory farm workers. At the present time, only one State, Ohio, makes coverage of agricultural workers in their workmen's compensation laws compulsory. The Legislative Reference Service advises me that five other States—Arizona, Minnesota, New York, Oklahoma, and Wyoming—make coverage compulsory for certain mechanical or power operations on farms.

There are two Federal laws regulating child labor in agriculture: The Sugar Beet Act of 1937 and the Fair Labor Standards Act. However, according to the investigation of the Commission on Migratory Labor, enforcement of both statutes is in general not strict, although it varies from State to State. The Commission also found that, while eradication of child labor is primarily a State responsibility, few States have adequate child-labor laws applicable to agriculture, and still fewer States have adequately enforced the child-labor laws in existence.

Closely related to the problem of child labor in agriculture is the lack of educational opportunity among migrant children to which I have alluded. The Commission on Migratory Labor concluded that because of the conflict between the nonlocal character of migratory people and the essential local character of the public school system, it is necessary for the Federal Government to give supplementary educational aid to the States with the provision that Federal activities should not compete with or displace locally provided services.

The President's Commission recognizes the outstanding work done in the field of developing migrant-labor facilities by the States of New Jersey, New York, California, Wisconsin, Texas, and Colorado. But again, Mr. Chairman, the Commission points out that the Federal Government has resorted to emergency provisions. No continuity has been provided.

The Commission wisely cautions against a new bureau or agency to serve these requirements. Some of the recommendations follow:

We recommend that—

(1) There be established a Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor, to be appointed by and responsible to the President.

(2) The committee be composed of 3 public members and 1 member from each of the following agencies: Department of Agriculture, Department of Labor, Department of State, Immigration and Naturalization Service, and Federal Security Agency.

(3) The public members be appointed by the President. One public member should serve full time as chairman and the other two on a part-time basis. The Government representatives should be appointed by the President on the nomination of the heads of the respective agencies. The committee should have authority, within the limits of

its appropriation, to establish such advisory committees as it deems necessary.

(4) The Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor have the authority and responsibility, with adequate staff and funds to assist, coordinate, and stimulate the various agencies of the Government in their activities and policies relating to migratory farm labor, including such investigations and publications as will contribute to an understanding of migratory farm labor problems, and to recommend to the President, from time to time, such changes in administration and legislation as may be required to facilitate improvements in the policies of the Government relating to migratory farm labor. The committee should undertake such specific responsibilities as are assigned to it in the recommendations set forth in this report and as may be assigned to it by the President.

In general, however, the committee should have no administrative or operating responsibilities; these should remain within the respective established agencies and departments.

(5) Similar agencies be established in the various States. The responsibilities and the activities of the Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor and those of the agencies established in the States should be complementary and not competitive. The State agencies should be encouraged to carry forward those programs in behalf of migratory farm workers which, by their nature, fall within the responsibility of individual States. The Federal committee will have major concern with interstate, national, and international activities. But at all times there should be close consultation between the Federal and State agencies and a two-way flow of information, suggestions, and effective cooperation.

I call attention to the above recommendations because I believe we will continue to be plagued by these problems unless we set in motion at the Federal level remedial procedures to reduce in severity the evils associated with these conditions. There is no basic conflict between our interest and Mexico's, between the employer and those seeking to sell their labor, between the Southwest and the other regions of our country. It is indeed a national problem and it must be met.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

(Mr. MILLER of Kansas and Mr. METCALF asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. BAILEY.)

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, when this initial legislation was approved in 1951 I opposed it on the ground that there was written into the legislation a provision exempting these Mexican immigrant workers from the payment of income taxes and exempting them from participation and inclusion under the Social Security Act.

I was interested in what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] said about Mexican workers making more than school teachers. If that is true, they ought to be paying income taxes.

Mexico has abrogated the provisions of the agreement. This resolution here would provide for negotiating directly by the farm people at the border with the Mexican laborers themselves.

Under the agreement we have with Mexico these workers were guaranteed a minimum wage, they were guaranteed certain hospital services, they were guaranteed unemployment compensation. All of that will be set aside under this new agreement because we are going to deal directly with them, and you will negotiate with them at whatever you want to pay on the border.

With more than 45,000 unemployed people in the State of West Virginia, I would be remiss in my duty if I voted for a piece of legislation to bring in probably two or three hundred thousand additional workers to work on the farms of this country.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Is there any reason to believe that the Mexican Government can set their minimum wages and labor standards better, more fairly, and to greater advantages for these workers than our own Government can?

Mr. BAILEY. That was part of the agreement that was abrogated.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. This would provide for it. If we do not provide for it, we will not have anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, with the full understanding and intent that this shall be a part of the legislative history of this bill, I want to clearly state that approval of this joint resolution does not approve the contract the Labor Department has proposed to give to the Mexican workers. Certainly I want it understood that this House is not writing legislative history approving the wording of any contract but is simply authorizing the negotiation of a contract with Mexican workers. I feel that there are provisions in the proposed contract which are not in keeping with the general law of the United States. I would not want this debate to close until it is made abundantly clear for the purpose of the RECORD that the enactment of this measure does not in any way constitute an approval of article 17 of that contract. It was never the intent of the committee or the Congress that the Secretary of Labor should attempt by contract or otherwise to regulate the dealings between the worker and the employer, except as is provided in section 503 of the act to see that foreign workers cannot be employed as long as domestic workers are available and to see that the employment of foreign workers will not adversely affect wages and working conditions of domestic workers, similarly employed. Other than this, it has always been the intent of this legislation that both the worker and the employer should be left free in their dealings with one another.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude by saying I believe this resolution is of very great importance. It transcends local considerations. My first objection to it was based on the international implications which I believed and still believe are involved. I know, as the majority leader has said, that this measure is wanted and desired by the administration. I wish to conclude by saying that it is my fondest hope that this resolution will not result in the impairment of our friendship with our good neighbor "South of the Border."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. KEATING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 355) amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico, pursuant to House Resolution 450, he reported the joint resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. SHELLEY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHELLEY moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 355 to the House Committee on Agriculture.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 156, nays 250, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—156

Abernethy	Carnahan	Forand
Addonizio	Carrigg	Frazier
Andrews	Chudoff	Friedel
Angell	Condon	Fulton
Bailey	Cooley	Garmatz
Baker	Corbett	George
Barrett	Crosser	Gordon
Battle	Curtis, Mass.	Granahan
Becker	Davis, Ga.	Green
Bennett, Fla.	Deane	Gross
Bennett, Mich.	Delaney	Hagen, Calif.
Bishop	Dingell	Haley
Blatnik	Dodd	Hand
Boggs	Dollinger	Hart
Boland	Donohue	Hays, Ohio
Bolling	Donovan	Heller
Bonin	Dorn, N. Y.	Hoffman, Mich.
Bowler	Doyle	Holifield
Boykin	Eberharter	Holtzman
Bray	Elliott	Howell
Brooks, La.	Evins	Jarman
Buchanan	Feighan	Javits
Burdick	Fenton	Johnson, Wis.
Byrd	Fine	Karsten, Mo.
Byrne, Pa.	Fino	Kean
Canfield	Fogarty	Kearns

Keating	Moulder	Saylor
Kee	Multer	Scott
Kelley, Pa.	O'Brien, Ill.	Secrest
Kelly, N. Y.	O'Brien, Mich.	Seely-Brown
Keogh	O'Brien, N. Y.	Selden
King, Calif.	O'Hara, Ill.	Sheehan
Kirwan	O'Konski	Shelley
Klein	O'Neill	Sieminski
Kluczynski	Osmers	Spence
Lane	Ostertag	Staggers
Lanham	Patterson	Sullivan
Lesinski	Pelly	Tollefson
Long	Perkins	Van Zandt
McCarthy	Pfost	Vorys
McCormack	Philbin	Wainwright
Machrowicz	Polk	Walter
Mack, Ill.	Powell	Watts
Mack, Wash.	Price	Whitten
Madden	Priest	Wier
Magnuson	Rabaut	Williams, N. J.
Marshall	Radwan	Wilson, Ind.
Metcalf	Rains	Winstead
Miller, Calif.	Rhodes, Pa.	Withrow
Mollohan	Rodino	Yates
Morano	Rogers, Colo.	Yorty
Morgan	Rooney	Zablocki

NAYS—250

Abbitt	Forrester	Mason
Adair	Fountain	Matthews
Albert	Frelinghuysen	Meader
Alexander	Gamble	Merrill
Allen, Calif.	Gary	Merrow
Allen, Ill.	Gathings	Miller, Kans.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gavin	Miller, Md.
	Gentry	Miller, Nebr.
Andresen, August H.	Golden	Miller, N. Y.
	Goodwin	Mills
Arends	Graham	Morrison
Ashmore	Grant	Moss
Aspinall	Gregory	Mumma
Auchincloss	Gubser	Murray
Ayres	Gwinn	Natcher
Barden	Hagen, Minn.	Neal
Bates	Hale	Nelson
Beamer	Halleck	Nicholson
Belcher	Harden	Norblad
Bender	Hardy	Norrell
Bentsen	Harris	Oakman
Berry	Harrison, Nebr.	O'Hara, Minn.
Betts	Harrison, Va.	Passman
Bolton, Frances P.	Harrison, Wyo.	Patman
	Harvey	Patten
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hays, Ark.	Phillips
	Hébert	Pilcher
Bonner	Herlong	Pillion
Bosch	Heselton	Poage
Bow	Hess	Poff
Bramblett	Hiestand	Preston
Brooks, Tex.	Hill	Prouty
Brown, Ga.	Hillelson	Ray
Brown, Ohio	Hillings	Rayburn
Brownson	Hinshaw	Reams
Budge	Hoeven	Reed, Ill.
Burleson	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
Busbey	Holmes	Rees, Kans.
Bush	Holt	Regan
Byrnes, Wis.	Hope	Rhodes, Ariz.
Camp	Horan	Richlman
Cannon	Hosmer	Riley
Carlyle	Hruska	Robeson, Va.
Cederberg	Hunter	Robsion, Ky.
Chenoweth	Hyde	Rogers, Fla.
Chiperfield	Ikard	Rogers, Mass.
Church	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Clevenger	James	Sadlak
Cole, Mo.	Jenkins	St. George
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Calif.	Schenck
Colmer	Jonas, Ill.	Scherer
Coon	Jonas, N. C.	Scrivner
Cooper	Jones, Ala.	Scudder
Cotton	Jones, Mo.	Shafer
Coudert	Jones, N. C.	Short
Cretella	Judd	Shuford
Crumpacker	Kersten, Wis.	Sikes
Cunningham	Kilburn	Simpson, Ill.
Curtis, Mo.	Kilday	Small
Curtis, Nebr.	King, Pa.	Smith, Kans.
Dague	Knox	Smith, Miss.
Davis, Wis.	Laird	Smith, Va.
Dawson, Utah	Landrum	Smith, Wis.
Dempsey	LeCompte	Springer
Derounian	Lipscomb	Stauffer
Devereux	Lovre	Steed
D'Ewart	Lucas	Stringfellow
Dies	Lyle	Sutton
Dolliver	McConnell	Taber
Dondero	McCulloch	Talle
Dorn, S. C.	McDonough	Teague
Dowdy	McGregor	Thomas
Edmondson	McIntire	Thompson, La.
Ellsworth	McMillan	Thompson, Mich.
Engle	McVey	
Fernandez	Mahon	Thompson, Tex.
Fisher	Mailliard	Thornberry
Ford	Martin, Iowa	Trimble
Tuck	Westland	Willis
Utt	Wharton	Wilson, Calif.
Van Pelt	Wheeler	Wilson, Tex.
Velde	Wickersham	Wolcott
Vinson	Widnall	Wolverton
Wampler	Wigglesworth	Young
Warburton	Williams, N. Y.	Younger

NOT VOTING—28

Bentley	Durham	Roberts
Broyhill	Fallon	Roosevelt
Buckley	Jensen	Sheppard
Campbell	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Celler	Krueger	Taylor
Chatham	Lantaff	Vursell
Chelf	Latham	Weichel
Clardy	Reece, Tenn.	Williams, Miss.
Davis, Tenn.	Richards	
Dawson, Ill.	Rivers	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Bentley against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Williams of Mississippi against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Latham against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Mr. Durham for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Chelf against.

Mr. Dawson of Illinois for, with Mr. Krueger against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Jensen with Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. Clardy with Mr. Campbell.

Mr. Weichel with Mr. Lantaff.

Mr. Vursell with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Richards.

Mr. Broyhill with Mr. Fallon.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title, H. R. 7996, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for this bill which creates a new way of recruiting foreigners to work in the United States at a time of increasing unemployment here. The present law at least requires agreement with Mexico. This bill eliminates this limitation. I would not like to see organized Government recruiting of Americans by Canada, or Mexico, for any purpose, just across our borders. I am concerned to see that this policy of bringing in Mexicans and others to do American stoop-labor which was originally a war emergency measure, is becoming a fixed part of our economy, and in this bill is being broadened. Under our present system the Government spends money to bring in foreigners to help raise crops like cotton, then buys the cotton, and then pays unemployment insurance to American workers. It is said that Americans are unwilling to do this work. If we spent money organizing and recruiting and transporting Americans I believe we could get the numbers to raise the crops we really need. Instead, we seem to have drifted into a situation where certain segments of our agriculture are developing vested rights in foreign labor. I admit the problem is complex, but I do not believe we help to solve it by extending this recruiting system, regardless of the consent of a neighboring friendly country, at this time.

EXTENSION OF MAJOR EXCISE TAXES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which extends those excise rates which would otherwise be subject to automatic reduction on April 1. This extension has been requested by the President. The major excises affected are those on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, gasoline, and automobiles. The extension contained in my bill will retain about $1.1 billion revenue from these sources.

My bill also reduces a number of excise rates on a selective basis. The present law contains a variety of rates ranging up to 25 percent in some cases. There is no rhyme or reason in such a discriminatory system of rates. I believe that no article or service should be subjected to an ad valorem excise tax in excess of 10 percent unless imposed as a penalty. For that reason, the bill which I am introducing reduces to 10 percent all nonpenalty ad valorem excises which are presently above that level. The bill leaves untouched any rates below 10 percent.

This is the effect of the major excise cuts contained in the bill:

First. The tax on luggage, including ladies' handbags, is cut in half, from 20 to 10 percent.

Second. The tax on furs, one of the Nation's depressed industries, is cut in half, from 20 to 10 percent.

Third. The tax on jewelry, also a depressed industry, is cut in half, from 20 to 10 percent.

Fourth. The tax on toilet articles is cut in half, from 20 to 10 percent.

Fifth. The tax on admissions, including movie admissions, is cut in half, from 20 to 10 percent.

Sixth. The tax on electric-light bulbs is cut in half, from 20 to 10 percent.

Seventh. The tax on photographic equipment is cut in half, from 20 to 10 percent.

Eighth. The tax on mechanical pens, pencils, and lighters is cut from 15 to 10 percent.

Ninth. The tax on long-distance telephone calls is cut from 25 to 10 percent.

Tenth. The tax on local telephone calls and telegrams is cut from 15 to 10 percent.

Eleventh. The tax on sporting goods is cut from 15 to 10 percent.

The above excise cuts will relieve the Nation's consumers of close to $1 billion a year in excise taxes. This will give needed stimulation immediately to consumer-purchasing power. It will give immediate stimulation to the Nation's business and to employment. Furthermore, the rate changes will provide a more equitable tax system, by leveling down those rates which are now excessively high and discriminatory.

I prepared this excise bill several months ago. However, I have delayed introduction of the bill until today because premature announcement of excise cuts can have an adverse effect upon business conditions. It is very easy to encourage a buyers' strike on the part of consumers. Now that the bill has been introduced, I think it is essential that Congress act with speed and decision on this vital legislation.

PROGRAM FOR SENDING FREEDOM MESSAGES BEHIND IRON CURTAIN

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, after World War II the United States took almost sole responsibility in providing relief and rehabilitation to the millions of victims of the most tragic war of all time. We have always stood as a symbol of hope to the destitute and the oppressed. Today, because of subsequent developments in Eastern Europe, a large number of these people are in a geographic and political isolation unprecedented in history for its effectiveness. Not only have these people been cut off from all contact with the Western World, of which they are traditionally a part, but they have been subjected to a steady barrage of lies from the Kremlin's master propagandists in an attempt to destroy the last vestiges of democratic tradition. We must let these people know once again that the bonds which unite freedom-loving men all over the world transcend all boundaries and obstacles. If we do not, we shall completely lose these enslaved millions to the forces of communism. Our task is to give them new courage to resist the brain washing that they have undergone for so long, and to alleviate their physical suffering, no matter in how small a measure.

My honored colleague, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, introduced a joint resolution in the Senate, February 23—Senate Joint Resolution 131—calling for the appropriation of $2 million to be used to send balloons carrying freedom messages and small packets of freedom food to the satellite countries.

Several years ago the columnist, Drew Pearson, and Harold E. Stassen, now Director of FOA, carried out a similar campaign. This program actually succeeded in sending 11 million balloon-borne messages beyond the Iron Curtain. There can be no doubt that these words of freedom from the West did considerable damage to the Communist regimes in these countries. A program, such as the one proposed by Senator DOUGLAS, would be of tremendous value in corroding the Iron Curtain and thus, in a very effective way, would break through the barrier that the Communists have set up between their satellites and the free world.

Because it is a means of reaching individuals in the most direct way possible, its value as a weapon in the cold war should not be overlooked. Furthermore, it would be virtually impossible for the Communists to put a complete stop to such a campaign.

Our distribution of food to the starving people of East Berlin, although restricted in its application by the barriers thrown up by the Soviet occupying forces, shows how effective such a campaign can be against communism.

Only by constantly keeping the truth alive can we hope to destroy the danger of the Moscow fabricated lies which is one of the greatest threats to the free world. Only by proving to the people of the Iron Curtain countries that we have not forgotten them can we expect to retain them as our friends. Only by helping them can we keep alive their hope for eventual liberation. A program contributing a campaign of truth with the tangible evidence of our friendship which would be provided by small food packages should make a significant contribution to these ends. I therefore am pleased to join myself with this cause and to introduce in this Chamber a joint resolution authorizing the formulation and carrying out of a program for sending freedom messages behind the Iron Curtain.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE OFFSHORE PROCUREMENT PROGRAM

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I desire during this time that has been granted me to express my very grave concern about a subject that is being sadly glossed over from day to day here in the Congress and I refer to the continuing increase in the ranks of the unemployed.

As Shakespeare said in Hamlet, "To be or not to be, that is the question." When is this administration going to take off its rose-colored glasses and face up to the facts of just what is taking place in our economy from day to day?

My district in Minnesota has had an alarming growth of the unemployed beginning back last September when over 1,200 employees were thrown out of work by one of our largest manufacturing plants engaged in farm machinery and tractors. This has been followed by many more cutbacks in lesser plants as well as a general slowdown in the construction industry.

Now the Government itself has instituted the worst layoff of all and has issued orders to its large ordnance plants in the Twin City area to remove, by June 1, around 6,000 to 7,000 employees from gainful employment. That applies only to the Minneapolis-St. Paul area and because that order has been decreed for all their shell plants around the Nation, I am sure that many more Members of the House are likewise feeling the impact of unemployment. This layoff also will affect employment in several of the feeder plants that have contracts with the ordnance plant.

As of today, I am in receipt of communications from hundreds of these employees or former employees whose chief reaction surely appears to be a justified complaint because they know only too well that in 1952 the Congress appropriated a little over $1 billion for the offshore procurement program in order that military contracts could be made to have the production and manufacture of war material, supplies, shells, explosives, and so forth, all made in countries in Europe, Asia, and Africa by the workers of those countries and with our tax money, much of which comes from taxes paid by the workers now being thrown out of employment.

Do they have a complaint or do they not? You ask them. Their communications are the answer and as for myself, I am concerned and have prepared this statement as to my findings on the subject as well as my position in support of their reaction.

With regard to money and taxes that are voted by the Congress for the foreign production of shells and all other necessary military hardware, such as all ammunition, explosives, guns, and so forth, this seems to be one of the questions that bothers and concerns the workers being laid off at the ordnance plants the most.

Here is what I know and likewise have learned after a very thorough checkup and investigation of my own.

Almost $1 billion was voted a year ago for the offshore procurement contracts to our friendly allies. These funds are voted as appropriations to the mutual defense assistance program of foreign military aid and are in the main administered under the direction of Harold Stassen, Foreign Operations Administration.

Offshore procurement is the purchase by the United States Armed Forces of military supplies and equipment from sources in Europe, the Near East, and north Africa. Such equipment and supplies may be used as part of the United States military aid program to NATO

and non-NATO countries such as Yugoslavia.

Ammunition and explosives took the largest part of these contracts that were turned over by Mr. Stassen. Next came contracts for aircraft and equipment, contracts for ships, and contracts for vehicles—other than transport—likewise, contracts for electronic equipment.

Involved were some 350 prime contractors of 15 nations, producing hundreds of items from complete aircraft and tanks to .30-caliber ammunition. After getting these contracts and money from Mr. Stassen, the Army placed the bulk of the contracts, both in number and total, of 141.

This offshore procurement is part of overall procurement under the mutual defense assistance program and was started in the fiscal year 1952 with a total of funds obligated to the program of just over $600 million. The purposes of this plan, so they then said and still say, were to, first, increase Europe's long-run industrial self-sufficiency; second, to broaden Europe's industrial mobilization base, putting the producer nearer the consumer for strategic, political, and economic reasons; third, to help meet military needs more effectively.

In addition, it has also been said by the proponents that there were a lot of lesser principles, too, such as manpower utilization, supplementing United States production. It now not only supplements; it supplants. That is the one that hurts our American workers today. Also, to increase European productivity and helping in an important way to relieve the European dollar shortage.

Now, that is a very brief outline of my knowledge and what I have learned of the offshore procurement program up to now. However, may I say this program is coming back to haunt the military production workers of our own country because the shooting war is in a stage of truce and therefore the need for military production has been, and is continuing to be, cut back, resulting in many of the military ordnance production plants laying off thousands of our own workers all over this Nation and adding them to an already fast-growing army of unemployed.

That being true, what do we do now to curb this threat of serious unemployment? My first step in that direction was to call on two officers of the Ordnance Department of the Army. Their only answer to me with regard to these cutbacks to a single shift at both the Twin City Ordnance and Donovan plants was that they had received these instructions or orders from higher up in the Pentagon and had no other choice than to follow orders like the good soldiers they are. At the same time they advised me that all their ordnance plants making various types of caliber shells were all being advised of these orders and were being required to make the same layoffs.

My next effort was a call to Mr. Nash, Chief of the Foreign Production and Procurement Division. I found Mr. Nash to be not only very courteous but cooperative, and likewise sympathetic to the plight of these thousands that were being tossed out of employment.

He informed me that his agency and the military Chiefs of Staff are concerned with the unemployment situation as well as the fact that these layoff orders have had to be issued and because of the growing seriousness of our whole national economy. Mr. Nash advised me that no contracts have been let by his agency since June 30, 1953, for offshore procurement, including all ammunition, and that he has been holding up $22 million worth of contracts that should have been approved because he feels the White House and the military will have to take some decisive and remedial action soon.

To all those employees of the Twin City Ordnance who have lost their employment or have received their notice of dismissal and written to me, I can only say I have and shall continue to use my efforts to correct this evil with which our American workers are now confronted. If President Eisenhower and his administration do not realize what is taking place throughout the length and breadth of this Nation and take steps to check this increasing trend of unemployment, then of course I shall, as one of the 435 Members of the House, have only one alternative and that is to oppose and vote against any and all funds for these agencies that are dealing out our jobs all over the world, except of course to our own American workers.

This I can and shall have to do when the appropriation bills come before the House in the near future.

MISSOURI DROUGHT EMERGENCY PROGRAM

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am quoting for the consideration of the House the portion of the address of Gov. Phil M. Donnelly to the 67th General Assembly of Missouri, extra session, which deals with the Missouri drought emergency program:

On October 19, 128 days ago, this general assembly met in extraordinary session to deal at that time with the public calamity which had befallen the State of Missouri as a result of the most prolonged and devastating drought in the history of our State. The people of Missouri have a right to be proud of this general assembly for the speed and unanimity of action which it took at that time to meet the public calamity. In that extraordinary session, this general assembly authorized the establishment of a program for bringing into and distributing within the State hay and roughage for the feeding of livestock by the citizens of Missouri. To carry out such a program, the general assembly appropriated $6,500,000 out of the general revenue fund, and also appropriated any grants received from the Federal Government for such program, with the proviso that the amount of such Federal grants should be deducted from the appropriation of State funds.

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by that legislation to establish such a program, on October 26, 1953, I promulgated an executive order establishing the Missouri drought emergency program and providing rules and regulations for the operation thereof. Within just 8 days after the convening of the general assembly, the program was established and under way, with vitally needed hay moving into the State.

The success of the program has thus far exceeded our best hopes and expectations. Its success can be attributed to the manifold efforts of thousands of Missouri citizens who have worked long and diligently to make this program succeed. The gratitude of Missouri must be extended to the more than 800 authorized dealers, who handled and financed the purchase and distribution of hay and roughage under this program, to the county extension agents who cooperated in helping to administer it, and to the railroad industry which not only reduced its rates, but, in addition, cooperated splendidly in the movement of such tremendous quantities of hay. We were fortunate because unusually large quantities of surplus hay were available in other States and our gratitude goes out to our friends and neighbors in other States who were willing to sell the hay at a reasonable price. Without the cooperative efforts of all these people, and many others, this program could not have succeeded as it has to date.

The success of the program up to this time is vividly demonstrated by the fact that on February 15, 1954, a total of 571,246 tons of hay had been moved into the State, at a total cost for transportation of $6,430,849.08, which has been or is in the process of being paid. When the program was authorized by the general assembly, it was estimated that 500,000 tons of hay and roughage was the maximum amount which could be purchased and physically moved into the State. It was anticipated that $6½ million would be required to pay transportation costs on this tonnage. Therefore, we may well be proud of two results, first, that we have been able to move more hay into Missouri than it was thought physically possible, and, second, that the cost of transporting such hay into Missouri is less than we anticipated.

This immense movement of hay into Missouri is hard to visualize. Under this program, 39,401 railroad cars of hay, and 1,027 truck loads of hay have been moved into the State. A total of 80,896 farmers in our 114 counties have been issued certificates to obtain desperately needed hay.

This program has been beneficial to all citizens, for agriculture is our basic industry. Hundreds of thousands of cattle which would have been sacrificed upon glutted markets are, as a result of this program, still upon Missouri farms. Every Missourian would have felt the effects in some measure had our livestock industry been severely crippled by the awful drought. Thousands of farm families who faced financial ruin have been saved. The adverse economic effects to business of every kind in the State have, in a large degree, been alleviated.

Unfortunately, however, the prolonged and devastating drought has not yet been broken. Many farmers still do not have sufficient quantities of hay and roughage to carry their livestock through until grass is available this spring. Many farmers, due to their financial condition, have only been able to buy hay in small quantities.

The State department of agriculture made a survey of all authorized dealers to determine the extent to which available appropriated funds would complete the program. That survey indicated that the available funds of $6½ million would not be adequate to bring into the State the hay and roughage needed to carry livestock through until spring.

Fully realizing that no funds in excess of $6½ million could be expected to carry on this program without action by this general assembly, the State commissioner or agriculture, with my approval, notified all authorized dealers handling hay that the

State would not approve claims for reimbursement until further notice.

Thereupon, I wired the appointed leaders of both parties of both houses of this general assembly to obtain their opinion on legislation to make available the Federal funds which had been granted to Missouri, or may in the future be granted, as an addition to the State appropriation of $6,500,000. The overwhelming majority of the replies which I received stated they favored such legislation. Relying on this assurance and realizing the urgent need of hay supplies by our farmers, I ordered the program resumed and continued.

I am sure that the primary objective of all of us is the success of this program. This objective transcends all partisan political considerations. Unless this program is continued until spring, much of the benefit thus far achieved may well be lost.

It now appears, following a survey of all authorized dealers and county extension agents, that in order to successfully complete the program, every effort should be made to move an additional 225,000 tons of hay into the State before spring. Based upon average transportation costs in effect at this time, the transportation costs on this tonnage of hay will amount to approximately $3,600,000.

I recommend, therefore, that House bill 2, enacted by the 67th general assembly, 1953 extra session, approved October 23, 1953, be amended so that Federal grants which have been received or may yet be received by the State may be expended for this program in addition to the amounts appropriated out of the general revenue fund of the State.

I recommend that House bill 2 be further amended to increase the amount appropriated out of the general revenues fund of the State from $6,500,000 to $8,500,000.

If these amendments are enacted, an additional $3,604,000 will be made available to continue and carry out the Missouri drought emergency program. Of this amount, $1,604,000 will be Federal funds received or to be received and $2 million will be additional State funds.

Any funds remaining unexpended upon the termination of this program will be returned to the State treasury.

A full and complete audit of the operations of this entire program cannot, of course, be made until it has been finally concluded and terminated. However, a preliminary or summary audit has been made by the State auditor of the operations of the program from its inception to January 31, 1954, which is available to the general assembly. At the conclusion of the program, a complete audit will be made, and it also will be available to the general assembly.

I am pleased to report that this program has been efficiently and economically administered by the State department of agriculture. Therefore, no additional administrative appropriation is required. However, due to the fact that the work of concluding, terminating, and auditing the program will necessarily extend beyond June 30, 1954, I recommend that House bill 2 be amended to authorize the expenditure until December 31, 1954, of funds already appropriated for administrative expense.

Mr. Speaker, I have been impressed with the manner in which the State of Missouri under a Democrat governor and senate and Republican lower house has moved forward in conjunction with various citizens organizations to meet this great disaster to our State.

Essentially, tragedies of this sort must remain the problems of the State and local governments and their citizenry. To treat them otherwise would be to weaken the moral fiber of our people. However, the Federal Government should be ready to be of ancillary assistance when these tragedies reach great proportions as they sometimes do and as is the case presently in Missouri.

I believe that the Federal Government has been of great ancillary assistance to the State of Missouri and its people in meeting this tragedy. There have been instances where the State authorities and the Federal authorities were in disagreement. In one particular instance I backed up the State authorities although I thought the Federal decision was the better, solely because I felt that the State should have the right of decision and the Federal Government should remain in the ancillary role.

I take the trouble to set this forth on the floor of the House because since the drought hit Missouri certain Democrat Members in the United States Congress from Missouri have been going from one end of the State to the other crying out that the Federal Government was not meeting its obligations, completely ignoring what the Governor of the State might have had to say on the subject of what help was needed by the State from the Federal Government.

In other words, the attempt seemed to be to persuade the citizens of Missouri that the Federal Government was the first place to look for help and not the State government. The attempt disregarded the position of the Governor of the State and other State officials.

Now I ask for an end to this partisanship. Governor Donnelly has well stated it:

> I am sure that the primary objective of all of us is the success of this program. This objective transcends all partisan political considerations.

I have assured Governor Donnelly that I stand ready and willing to be of any assistance I can as a Member of the Federal legislative body to supplement the State program where he feels it needs supplementing and it is proper for the Federal Government to do so.

I believe the proper procedure for all representatives from Missouri in the Congress, both the House and the Senate, is to work with the State program under the leadership of the Governor and the State officials in an ancillary manner and not to go around promoting programs which may or may not fit with the State program.

If there are Members of the Congress from Missouri who disagree with this procedure, then I say indeed we have a fair political issue. It is the issue of the relationship of the Federal Government to the State government, not the issue, as they might like to have it, of who is concerned about solving the plight of Missouri farmers who have been afflicted by this terrible drought. Let us resolve this issue and if it is one of States' rights let us see which side of the fence my Democrat colleagues are sitting on. They cannot sit on both sides any longer.

NEW ENGLAND TO BE BYPASSED AGAIN?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, during all the debate on the St. Lawrence Seaway, I have heard no arguments put forward to prove that it will help New England.

The omission is eloquent.

The stark fact is that the Northeastern States will be further isolated from the Union by Federal action if this legislation is passed.

We hear lofty statements imploring us to be guided by the national interest on this and other issues and I sincerely wish this could be so. Behind this smoke screen, however, sectional interests are working feverishly to gain advantages for certain regions.

Perhaps we could overlook this, if the claims of each region, in turn, were given consideration, and help in the true national interest. We have subsidized the farmers for a long time. We have used Federal funds to develop the South and the West. I do not propose to criticize these programs, if due consideration and assistance is finally given to the economic problems of New England.

But when neglect of our just claims is compounded by legislation that, in helping others, will harm our region, then we must protest and vigorously.

The administration, deaf to our appeals for cooperation in effecting the economic rebirth of our mill cities that are losing their factories to the Southern States, is manifesting a lively interest in supporting the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

Our seaports and railroads are having a difficult enough time as it is, without being choked off by a project which will divert imports and exports to an inland seaway that is largely under the control of a neighboring nation.

We resent being taxed to put ourselves out of business.

We shall fight against any further move to squeeze our hard-pressed economy.

An inland seaway offers no alternate routes, in case of a traffic tieup, or if it is immobilized by an enemy attack. It is useless for 5 months of the year when it is icebound. It is intended to accelerate the shipment of Canadian wheat and ores, and would only be of secondary help to special interests in the United States.

It is estimated that 30 percent of Boston's foreign trade would be lost to the seaway. If legitimate business is drained off during 7 months of the year, we cannot expect eastern railroads and seaports to remain efficient on a standby basis, and be ready to serve the needs of the United States in any emergency that might arise.

Speaking of the national interest, what about our national defense, if the facilities that we depended upon in the past, are weakened by diversion of traffic to the seaway?

As the Boston Post observed in its editorial of January 22, 1954:

> The big argument for the seaway, and the biggest switch in votes, was in relation to the development of the Labrador-Quebec

iron deposits when the Mesabi Range deposits began to thin out.

The man who had most to do with the planning and investment in the development of the Labrador-Quebec iron deposits is George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, but formerly top executive of the Hanna Co., of Ohio, which has an enormous investment in the Labrador ore field.

At this point I suggest that help for the New England economy merits priority over a project intended to improve a major transport facility in a foreign land.

To make the expense of it appear inconsequential, they say it would only cost us $105 million. A few years back, however, when costs were lower, Congress was told that the initial outlay would be $800 million, with the probability that extras would raise it much higher.

In the new look that has become fashionable in Washington, which they would like us to slavishly copy, it is considered old fashioned to mention domestic or sectional problems, but it is the height of style to buy any foreign design, no matter how expensive or harmful it may be to us.

If the Federal Government cannot afford to spend 1 cent to help the labor-surplus areas of New England to effect an economic transition, how can it, with any logic or consistency, advocate the eventual spending of billions on a Canadian project that Canada will build anyway?

The answer to that calls for the defeat of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and special orders heretofore entered.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. When does the gentleman expect to go to conference on this bill?

Mr. TABER. Tomorrow morning.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, PHILLIPS, CLEVENGER, CANNON, and THOMAS.

INCREASING THE BORROWING POWER OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 459, Rept. 1264) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7339) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all those who spoke on House Joint Resolution 355 today may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in announcing the program for this week I stated that if additional rules were granted we would try to dispose of them this week. Rules have been filed on H. R. 7328, dealing with research facilities of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, from the Armed Services Committee; H. R. 6788, soil conservation and watershed projects; H. R. 7339, to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

We propose tomorrow to call the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments appropriation bill. My impression about it is that we can conclude that bill tomorrow evening. Some Members have some commitments for Thursday, which I know about and which we will do our best to protect.

The Kersten resolution, which is an extension of the committee operations investigating the situation back of the Iron Curtain in the Baltic countries will come up and be disposed of on Thursday.

As I say, my information is that these particular matters are not controversial, so I hope we can dispose of them on Thursday and Friday.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Some Members are interested in what order these resolutions will be taken up. Some Members are very much interested in the so-called Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman would prefer, I would be very happy to arrange as of now that the Commodity Credit Corporation bill be taken up on Friday, rather than on Thursday, and dispose of these other matters on Thursday.

Mr. RAYBURN. If something controversial comes up on Thursday, would you put the vote over until Friday, to accommodate the delegation from Virginia?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. I will undertake to do that.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole and include therewith extraneous matter; and that my remarks follow the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF TEXAS

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that this is March 2, a great day in the history of the great State of Texas. It was on March 2, 1836, that Texas patriots threw off the yoke of despotism and declared its independence, and became a member of the family of the nations of the world.

That declaration was made secure at the Alamo, at Goliad, and at San Jacinto in subsequent weeks where gallantry, sacrifice, and courage were displayed on those occasions in fashion seldom equaled in all the history of mankind. Devotion to principle was paramount in the minds of those patriots. Texans today, joined, I am sure, by their fellow Americans, in all humility, pay tribute to the memory of these great and good men.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission that the special order he had for today be postponed to Thursday.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes, to revise and extend my

remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a certain reluctance to discuss a somewhat delicate subject. In the first place, as our Chaplain said at the opening of the session today, "Our hearts are wrung with sorrow" at the tragic episode which occurred here yesterday. Under present circumstances it is not easy to proceed with other business. Perhaps we should be thankful that more people were not injured by that violent and fanatical attack. We grieve, however, for all those who were injured, and especially for my close friend, ALVIN BENTLEY, of Michigan. I am sure all the Members of this body earnestly wish him a speedy recovery.

As a junior member of this body it perhaps is not entirely appropriate that I call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to a serious situation. It is, however because this situation is serious, and because it needs the urgent and intensive consideration of every member of this body that I have decided to discuss the matter.

I refer to the necessity of setting up promptly more adequate rules of procedure for our investigating committees. The Nation's attention during the past week has been called all too vividly to serious defects in congressional procedures. In my opinion immediate and serious self-examination of the methods by which our investigating committees operate is in order. It is likewise timely to consider promptly how effective our basic investigating committee organization has been.

Unless we here in Congress can promptly and effectively handle the problems with which we have been dramatically presented, the prestige and respect of the legislative branch itself may be damaged. For effective representative government, it is essential that the people maintain their respect for, and faith in, their governmental institutions, particularly their Congress. For that reason it is time to look into the methods of operation of our investigating committees.

The distinguished majority leader in the other body, Senator KNOWLAND, of California, has recently proposed that the Senate policy committee make a full study of the rules of their investigating committees. As we know, the subcommittee of our own Rules Committee, under the leadership of my able colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], is already studying bills providing for a fair code of rules and procedures for the protection of witnesses. It is my hope that every Member of this body will take a real interest in proposals which may be forthcoming from this committee.

I should like to mention briefly a few of the events last week which made headlines in every newspaper in this country, and which precipitated the present situation. I refer of course to the arbitrary treatment given a fine Army officer before an investigating committee. For the record, I should like to state that this officer, Brig. Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker, is commanding general at Camp Kilmer, which is located in the district which I represent in Congress. As a further item of information, the Secretary of the Army, Robert T. Stevens, who promptly criticized the humiliating treatment accorded General Zwicker, is a constituent of mine.

I feel so strongly about this affair, however, not because of these facts. Involved is the prestige of the great party to which I belong. Furthermore, as I have said already, the prestige and good name of Congress are affected when investigating committees abuse their power. Prompt action is needed to correct this situation.

And now I should like again to mention briefly the treatment which General Zwicker received from a one-man congressional investigating committee. First of all, I should like to make my own position clear. I believe the treatment accorded General Zwicker was unjustifiable. I feel he personally is owed an apology. It appears inexcusable that a man in uniform should be publicly pilloried, especially by a congressional committee, for obeying orders issued by his superior. The quarrel, if any, involves the officer's superior—in this case Secretary of the Army Stevens.

I feel sure that nobody in either body of Congress questions the right of investigating committees to have sufficient authority to make needed inquiries, and their right to exercise this authority. The right of Congress to investigate is not in issue. Their methods, however, definitely are in issue.

Our form of government is one of checks and balances. The legislative branch should not interfere unduly with the exercise of power by the executive branch. General Zwicker was simply carrying out orders in refusing to answer certain questions. Secretary of the Army Stevens made it plain that he would answer instead. There was no excuse here for the abuse to which General Zwicker was subjected.

Self-restraint and self-discipline by the Members of Congress, individually and collectively, normally will prevent unjustifiable forays such as last week's episode. The executive branch is as interested as are we in rooting subversives out of official positions. Secretary of the Army Stevens has repeatedly made this clear. The chairman of the Republican National Committee, Leonard Hall, pointed out at a press conference only today that he did not think anyone would say that generals in our Army are not fighting communism. Secretary Stevens has indicated unequivocally that he will cooperate fully with congressional committees. Quite naturally, however, he is very much opposed to browbeating and unnecessary abuse of military personnel, even by congressional committees.

This recent abuse of the authority and legitimate exercise of power by congressional committees emphasizes the urgent need for us to put our own house in order. It should be a first order of business. We may then proceed to the consideration of other urgent legislative business.

But, it may be argued, the investigating committees of the House are not subject to this criticism. I should like now to mention briefly our own Committee on Un-American Activities. Last Thursday its respected chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE], discussed the rules of this committee. At the conclusion of his remarks, $275,000 was voted to continue actively the work of this committee for another year.

The achievements of this committee should be commended, and I joined in voting for further appropriations. There is, however, no room for members of this body to be complacent about our investigating committees' procedures, at least if past experience is any guide. There have been incidents of ill-advised action, made possible by inadequate procedures.

In conclusion, I should like to mention briefly a joint resolution which I introduced nearly 2 months ago, on the opening day of this session. It is House Joint Resolution 328. It provides for a Joint Committee on Internal Security, which would have exclusive jurisdiction over all matters involving subversive and un-American activities.

In my opinion such a committee would enable us to operate more efficiently and economically, without the duplication of effort and the competition for witnesses such as now occurs. My colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I understand, yesterday introduced a similar resolution proposing a joint committee. At this point I should like to include Mr. JAVITS' article, "For a Joint Committee on Internal Security," which appeared in the New York Times of February 28. It describes admirably some of the problems which we face today, and discusses one way in which improvements can be made in our congressional machinery.

FOR A JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBVERSION

(By Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS)

Congressional investigations aimed at finding Communists, subversives, and loyalty risks in and out of government have aroused one of the most heated controversies ever heard in this country. So great a stir have they made that there is even argument within the party in power over whether communism at home, instead of the numerous other domestic and foreign problems facing the Nation, is to be the chief issue of this year's congressional elections.

The question is not whether there is a need to investigate communism and subversion; the question, rather, is of the methods employed. These methods greatly trouble millions of Americans who are sensible of our historic traditions of jurisprudence and who are concerned at the growing threat they pose to our civil liberties.

Some of these investigations have taken on the nature of prosecution of witnesses or persons mentioned by witnesses, resulting in subsequent loss of livelihood, reputation, and social standing. Some have compromised the conduct of the Nation's foreign policy. Some have undermined the morale of employees in our own Government and have struck at discipline in the Army.

Lately we have had the grave situation of a top administration officer, Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens, taking issue with Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY over the conduct of an investigation by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which brought a charge from the Secretary that the Senator's methods in investigating

Army security resulted in unwarranted abuse of our loyal officers.

Such results involve major questions of over-all national policy—not alone the finding of Communists and subversives. They certainly go beyond the authority generally vested in the individual investigating committee. They involve the responsibility of Congress as a whole.

It is noteworthy, too, that additional laws to be sought by the administration would enlarge the area of investigative activity. These include laws of the Federal use of wiretapping in espionage cases, to compel testimony by a grant of immunity from prosecution even where the privilege against self-incrimination is pleaded, and for loss of citizenship in case of conviction under the Smith Act for advocating or conspiring to advocate overthrow of the Government by force.

It is clear that a reform of congressional investigating committee methods is badly needed and that we must seek ways more in keeping with traditional concepts of justice to reach our objectives. At the same time we must not lose sight of the objectives or of the dangers which created them. We have had many evidences of the fact that even our country is not immune from the sinister Communist effort to overthrow free government by unconstitutional means and to fasten upon us and the rest of the world the yoke of Communist slavery.

It should be stressed that the problem, therefore, is not whether there is a danger to be dealt with; the problem is how this should be done with the greatest effectiveness and security in keeping with our Nation's foreign and domestic policy, and yet with justice to the individual in compliance with constitutional safeguards. Two new methods have been suggested and are under consideration.

One is that we should follow the practice of the Royal Commission which is in effect in Great Britain and Canada for similar investigations. The most prominent example of the commission's work was the sensational Gouzenko case in Canada in 1946 which brought about the conviction of the atomic scientists, Allan Nunn May and Klaus Fuchs and others engaged in espionage for Soviet Russia. This did much to arouse our authorities to the dangers of subversive activities in this country.

The other suggestion is to entrust these investigations to a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives. This would certainly be a great improvement over the present procedure of individual investigating committees of each House. In my opinion it would attain the desired results, and, for reasons having to do with our form of government which will be discussed later. I prefer it to an American counterpart of the Royal Commission. Consideration of the idea is especially pertinent now, since investigations already carried on have dealt pretty thoroughly with the history of attempted subversion and Communist infiltration and have shown that the chances of successful attempts are being greatly lessened.

Under this plan a joint committee of 12 or 14 members would be established, with equal representation from each House. A chairman and a vice chairman would be chosen by the members, without regard to the seniority rule followed by the present investigating committees. The chairmanship would alternate, with each Congress, between Senate and House. This fact, together with the broad base such a joint committee would have, gives assurance that the head of the committee would be one to whom responsibilities could safely be entrusted.

The resolution establishing the joint committee would also set up rules of fair procedure for its operations and to safeguard individuals. The committee would be financed by appropriations from each of the Houses, which have funds available from the legislative budget for this purpose. It would be given the power of subpenas by each House and would otherwise operate as if it were a committee of either House.

Such is the gist of the idea. But why, it may be asked, would this be superior to the current investigating procedure by separate committees? How would it avoid the present excesses? The answer to these questions provides several good reasons why the plan should be adopted.

First, a joint committee would eliminate the duplication of effort as between the committees functioning separately in the House and the Senate as they now do. Even more important, it would eliminate the competition between the various committees to get the headlines by making sensational charges, of which we have seen some regrettable examples—as in the investigation of the Fort Monmouth Signal Corps Research Center or the competitive effort to get jurisdiction for investigation, as in the Harry Dexter White case.

Competition of this kind is certainly not conducive to the dignity and prestige of the Congress, which is at stake in the actions of investigating committees. Indeed, this is one of the fundamental reasons for a change to joint committee responsibility in this field.

Second, a joint committee would have the benefit of the prestige which is traditionally and especially associated with this type of body and could proceed with greater substance and orderliness in this highly sensitive area of investigation. The added prestige involves an intangible, psychological factor of considerable importance; the eyes of the Congress watch the operations of a joint committee more closely than that of a separate committee.

One of the outstanding examples of the prestige enjoyed by a joint committee is the responsibility vested in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has conducted in the utmost secrecy investigations of great moment to the security of this country and of the free world. This group, which is charged with as great a responsibility as Congress has ever given to any committee, could well be a model for the handling of subversion.

Thus, the joint committee, unshackled by the rule of seniority which now prevails as to the special or legislative committees of each House, would function under rules of fair procedure. These rules would correct some glaring deficiencies shown by the present methods of investigating communism and subversion and should give assurance that, regardless of personalities, excesses will be avoided. They would:

Provide for a clear statement of the legislative objective sought in the investigation.

Call for executive hearings to establish witnesses' credibility and to screen the evidence before the holding of public sessions which are likely to result in charges against individuals.

Insure the right of a witness, or of one adversely mentioned by a witness, to make a reasonable statement in his own defense and the right to a reasonable cross-examination and presentation of testimony to rebut testimony adversely affecting his reputation.

Require that no individual member of the committee, including a chairman or an employee, release for publication reports or charges or material from a committee file except that which is substantiated and is authorized for release by a majority of the whole committee.

Require that broadcasting or televising of the examination of witnesses whose reputation is at stake, or those whom they call in defense, be permitted only with the consent of the witness.

This reform of rules of procedures, which already has the support of leading bar associations, including those of New York, Boston, and the District of Coumbia, and of a great section of the public, is under active study in Congress. Even the present committees investigating Communism and subversion see the justice in the demand for rules in view of the jeopardy to individuals in such investigations and, indeed, have formulated some rules themselves. But the rules are either inadequate or, being self-promulgated, are not given that enforcement in letter and spirit which a mandate of the whole Congress is more likely to produce.

The idea for a joint committee to investigate subversion and Communism is now the subject of measures pending in Congress. It is considered favorably by a number of Members of both Houses, including at least one member of the Un-American Activities Committee, and the whole question of rules of fair procedures is now under consideration by a subcommittee of the House Rules Committee whose chairman is Representative HUGH SCOTT, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

The value of the joint committee as an institution has been recognized since the first Congress in 1789. There are a number of joint committees of great importance now in existence, among them the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which is charged with considering the President's annual assessment of the economic condition of the country, and the Joint Committees on Internal Revenue Taxation, Defense Production, Immigration and Nationality, and on Printing.

George B. Galloway of the Library of Congress, an outstanding authority on American Government, says of them: "Joint committees have been used at intervals from the earliest days of the Republic, mainly for ceremonial and routine administrative purposes and for conduct of investigations." He notes that they flourished during the Civil War and reconstruction period when they were formed to investigate the conduct of the war and other matters of great importance at that time. He points out that the joint committee is also a valuable instrument of legislative surveillance and statutory amendment in experimental and controversial fields where economic stability and national security are at stake. This is certainly applicable to the investigation of subversion and communism.

Such investigations are not new. They date back to 1919. A famous committee of the 1930's was the McCormack-Dickstein committee, which was organized to study communism and fascism here. The Un-American Activities Committee is, of course, well known and had its origin in a change of the rules of the House of Representatives in 1938. But what touched off the spate of postwar investigations of subversion in the United States was undoubtedly the previously referred-to Gouzenko case. This case illustrates some of the differences in the handling of investigations by a royal commission and by our separate committees.

As many remember, Igor Gouzenko, a code clerk in the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa, broke away from communism in September 1945 and submitted to the Canadian Government documents which he had taken from the files of the Soviet Embassy showing beyond question an enormous espionage plan carried on in Canada by the U. S. S. R. A Royal commission appointed to investigate the whole situation. It consisted of two justices of the Supreme Court of Canada.

The commission set in secret for 5 months, it had the power of subpena, and it was required to inquire into and report upon which public officials and other persons in position of trust had given away secret information to foreign agents, and the circumstances surrounding the acts. In a manner not untypical of Canadian and British justice, the commission made reasonable accommodations to rules of procedure without by so doing impairing its activity.

Representation of witnesses by counsel, for instance, was generally allowed but was considered discretionary. Although the members of the commission had doubts as to the right of any witness to claim immunity under the Canada Evidence Act on the grounds of self-incrimination (in view of the special terms under which they were proceeding), they nevertheless imposed no penalty for refusal to testify. They conducted executive hearings but made no statement with respect to those hearings, and imposed for all participants, even their own counsel, an oath of secrecy. The work of the Royal commission was extraordinarily effective in breaking up the spy ring and in bringing punishment to the major conspirators. Yet the civil liberties of individuals were preserved.

There are many analogies between the operations of this Royal commission and the proposed operations of a joint committee of Congress to investigate subversion in the United States. The joint committee technique has proved effective in investigations to exercise legislative oversight on the executive departments, to gather material for new legislation and to determine how existing legislation is being enforced.

The joint committee holds promise of a more effective way of accomplishing Congress' part in rooting out subversives while at the same time protecting the rights and civil liberties of the individual. It also promises greater congressional responsibility where questions involving overall foreign policy or national security, freedom of higher learning and freedom of religion are involved. It would require no new law; it could be established by resolution of both Houses of Congress. In addition to its own work, it could refer particular investigations to a standing or a special committee of either House or could recommend the establishment of a commission for the purpose and specify the conditions and rules of procedure to guide such assigned investigations, which would be under its general supervision.

President Eisenhower is reported to favor some permanent system for finding out and dealing with domestic Communists. It is possible, of course, to pass a law establishing a commission to handle all such problems. But in our country, unlike in Canada or the United Kingdom, commissions are usually temporary bodies for the purpose of making a specific report, like the (Hoover) Commission on Government Reorganization and the (Randall) Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, or proposing some plan or program, or they are administrative in nature.

It is true that there are congressional Members on the Hoover and Randall Commissions, and this suggests a possible formula for adopting the "royal commission" idea. But Congress is properly concerned about its power of legislative oversight and will not, I believe, be satisfied merely with representation on a commission engaged in this investigative field. Nor would such a commission in practice supplant congressional committees. It would seem, therefore, that if we wish to profit from our own experience and that of our Canadian neighbors in this field—and if we wish to correct present investigative excesses—the path to choose would lead to the establishment of a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to investigate subversion and communism.

Mr. Speaker, I realize, of course, that a Joint Committee on Internal Security is not the only answer to this situation. Perhaps a code of fair play will be enough to eliminate most of our difficulties. My colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], has recently introduced such a bill, and my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] introduced a similar bill some 6 years ago.

This situation is serious, as I have said, because the dignity, prestige, and effectiveness of the Congress itself are at stake. Each one of us has a basic responsibility here. More is involved than adequate rules of conduct, or even adequate machinery to enable us here in Congress to do a better job. This problem affects the reasonable and proper relationship between the legislative and executive branches of our Government. It is a problem which cannot be solved by inertia, but rather by prompt action.

UNITED STATES NEEDS AN ADEQUATE MERCHANT MARINE IN PEACE AS WELL AS IN WAR

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I am addressing myself today to the proposition that the United States needs and should have, in peace as in time of war, an adequate merchant fleet. Not only is it in the interests of national defense but it would bolster our economy by furnishing employment on ships, on the docks, in shipbuilding and repair, in ship supply and related activities. In the final analysis the Government would save millions of dollars despite the fact of subsidy requirements.

It seems incredible to me that this can still remain a matter for debate.

As a matter of fact, even the enemies of an adequate merchant fleet shy away from their own side of the argument.

They say that a merchant fleet is needed only in time of war, and that in times of peace we can forget about it.

One of the great tragedies of history is that its lessons are never learned. And the costliest lesson—costly in terms of American lives lost, American wealth destroyed, American grand strategy delayed, and wars prolonged—derives directly from the fact that we have not heeded the lesson of the great need of an adequate merchant fleet in times of peace as well as in times of war.

There are, even today, those in important and influential quarters who have yet to learn that a reasonably powerful American merchant marine is more than our first line of defense.

It is our advance line of action.

It is our guardian against the enemy before any other guardian.

It is our high seas protection against the enemy on the economic front long before our first line of military defense is called into play.

Great merchant fleets have been the making of mighty empires just as the lack of them, or their neglect, has been the undoing of whole civilizations.

History has established that fact, and repeated the proofs again and again, since the days of the ancient Phoenicians. Neglect of their merchant marine meant the loss of their prestige to ancient Greece.

The story of the great merchant fleets down through the ages is the story of the great maritime nations—the story of prosperity, the story of enlightenment, the story of leadership and prestige.

In Spain as in England the peak of their glory coincides with the greatness of their merchant marine.

But those whose thinking runs against the evidence of history tell us today that we do not need an adequate merchant fleet, and in the event of war we can rely upon foreign merchant marines.

And I say we can depend as much on foreign merchant fleets in time of war as we can depend on foreign navies in time of war.

No nation as proud and as able as we are, with our enormous frontage on the sea, should ever permit itself to say that it will depend on foreign merchant fleets for its defense.

Such a policy is an insult to American pride and American self-reliance.

World War I was infinitely more costly because we failed at the time to have an adequate merchant fleet in being.

For the second time in a single generation history beat the facts of the indispensability of an adequate American merchant marine into our reluctant minds with frightful consequences in World War II.

Yet there are those of us in Congress who have to stand up and beg for a strong merchant fleet as if it were a form of boondoggling, or pork-barrel legislation.

The historians say our lack of a merchant fleet of any consequence was an encouragement to our enemies to make war upon us in both World Wars.

A strong merchant fleet is a lifeline for the people of the United States.

Today I want to present to you not speculative, but proved data.

For example there is no gainsaying the fact that we cannot have an adequate merchant fleet in time of war unless we have one—now—in time of peace.

To wait for the emergency to come upon us before we act against it is to build ourselves up to a state of desperation.

That is what we have been doing. Only the next time there is grave doubt that we can get away with it.

The past has proved that we need ships not only as a means of conveying supplies to our fighting men and to our allies and of bringing back materials from them, but as a means of forestalling perhaps the greatest of all wartime rackets.

For the absence of a sufficient merchant fleet makes us the world's outstanding sucker nation in time of war and the victim of the costliest of all rackets founded on the desperate national need for shipping.

We came within inches—so to speak—of losing Word War I because we did not have the merchant marine the situation called for.

And then the prices we were practically blackmailed into paying for the use of foreign ships—when we could get them—to carry our desperately needed war supplies, reveals the stupidity of leaving ourselves open to this form of extortion.

The United States so neglected its merchant marine just before World War

I that our ships were carrying only 9 percent of our export and import trade. When the war finally broke and while we were still a neutral nation we were in the extremely perilous position of having no ships even for our basic needs. That made us a set-up, clay-pigeon style, for a whole variety of calamities: The nations of the world would not let us use their ships. Our country's foreign trade was paralyzed because goods and materials piled up on our docks. For instance in August 1913 we exported some 257,172 bales of cotton, but in August 1914, only a year later, this dropped to 21,219 bales. And because we did not have the ships in which to make the deliveries the price of cotton dropped from $62.50 a bale in July 1914 to $36.25 in December of the same year.

American businessmen caught in this dilemma faced bankruptcy.

And then the great wartime racket began.

British and neutral shipowners seized upon our high seas misery and gouged American business for all the traffic would bear—that is, those who were good enough to send any ships to our shores at all. For we were in the position at that time to be grateful even to those who were gouging us into near ruin.

Consider what happened:

Even before our traffic became heavy with munitions shipping rates went up 700 percent.

Then, when the war got going full blast shipping rates skyrocketed to 2,000 percent—a common occurrence. For general cargo the average rate jumped 1,117 percent. If there is any doubt about my figures, I refer you to the final report of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 81st Congress, 2d session. This is called the Merchant Marine Study and Investigation, and was prepared by its Subcommittee on Merchant Marine Matters. The figures I have been quoting will be found on page 85.

Let us look more closely at the arithmetic:

The normal price for chartering a ship before World War I was $1 a ton. Within 2 months after hostilities broke this $1 price jumped to $13.88 a ton if the destination was outside the war zone, and for destinations inside the war zone the prices went up to $20 and $21 a ton.

But of course you could buy the ships.

If you wanted to be stung that way the sales price was suddenly jumped from the $60 a ton before the war to $300 a ton when the war broke.

One voyage was enough—in many instances—to pay completely for a ship, so great had become the profits.

It is a misrepresentation of the facts to say, as some do, that American ships under foreign flags may or may not be available for our use. Most American-owned ships had been registered under foreign flag before World War I. But these ships were not made available to the United States when the war broke and Congress jumped into the breach, under the impetus of President Wilson, to remedy this situation. In August 1914 it passed a law enabling Americans to register their foreign-flag ships under the American flag. To this law was added another one covering these ships with insurance.

The two laws made more shipping available to the United States.

With this history in front of them those who would discourage the American merchant marine still say the solution to the problem is foreign flags for American-owned ships.

The American flag by July 1, 1915, flew over 523,000 tons of shipping which had thus been transferred to it, and by 1917 this increased to a total of 650,000 tons.

When World War I ended the United States had a merchant fleet of 2,547 ships, or some 14,705,281 deadweight tons.

The cost of that fleet, the acquisition of which was imperative for the Nation's survival, is an appalling statistic that should silence the critics of an adequate merchant marine forever.

The ships that were procured by direct acquisition cost the United States $3,042,000,000.

The Government itself constructed 2,316 of them at a cost—at wartime prices—of $2,951,807,000.

The rest of these ships, 231 of them, were acquired by seizure of enemy property, transfer from other Government departments, or purchase at a net cost of $126,194.

Let me give you a breakdown of that superpriced wartime merchant fleet:

Cargo	1,866
Tankers	159
Passenger	63
Transports	23
Colliers	19
Tugs, barges, and other miscellany	417
Total	2,547

The enormity of the mistake of not maintaining a peacetime fleet sufficient to our needs in foreign trade during war, distressed the wartime President Wilson who made it a point to speak out to the Nation in his third annual message to Congress in May 1915. He said:

> It is high time we repaired our mistake and resumed our commercial independence on the seas. For it is a question of independence. If other nations go to war or seek to hamper each other's commerce, our merchants it seems are at their mercy, to do with as they please. We must use their ships, and use them as they determine. We have not ships enough of our own. We cannot handle our own commerce on the seas. Our independence is provincial and is only on land and within our own borders.

Out of the study and the agitation that followed World War I the 66th Congress probed the problems and the possible function in peace and in war of an American Merchant Marine. The Merchant Marine Act of 1920 emerged from an examination of the woe that had been inflicted upon the American people by a shortsighted philosophy imperiling American safety. This act was the answer of the time to the idea that we could rely upon foreign flag ships and that we did not need to maintain a merchant fleet of our own.

But suppose we let the Congress of the United States speak for itself in the language of the preamble of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. This preamble says:

> That it is necessary for the national defense and for the proper growth of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine of the best equipped and most suitable types of vessels sufficient to carry the greater portion of its commerce and serve as a naval or military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, ultimately to be owned and operated privately by citizens of the United States and it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to do whatever may be necessary to develop and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine, and insofar as may not be inconsistent with the express provisions of this act, the United States Shipping Board, shall in the disposition of vessels and shipping property as hereinafter provided, in the making of rules and regulations, and in the administration of the shipping laws keep always in view this purpose and object as the primary end to be obtained.

What the Congress said in 1920 it repeated even more strongly and in greater detail and emphasis in 1936. This preamble put it this way:

> It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne and a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine.

But all this did not down the arguments of those who saw little point in a strong merchant fleet and who—in spite of everything—kept insisting that other nations, allied with us, had all the merchant fleets we needed, and that we could safely depend upon them.

But with the outbreak of World War II it was shown that even the Commission had underestimated the need for an American merchant fleet.

And again the country in most respects repeated the agony of World War I.

Our allies could not afford to furnish us their shipping.

The United States in the midst of war, with its enormous energies needed critically for the production of airplanes, munitions, and other war materiel, found itself confronted with the additional emergency need of a basic fleet of 5,000 ships to fill the shipping wants of our own forces and the Allied forces fighting the Axis.

But on September 1, 1939, the United States merchant fleet had only 1,379 seaworthy ships grossing 1,000 tons and over.

What had happened may very well be called the great miscalculation.

For in November 1937, the United States Maritime Commission proclaimed

that all our country needed in time of war would be 1,200 ships. This great miscalculation was predicated upon the old die-hard fallacy that the United States could safely rely on the merchant fleets of foreign nations.

It was a costly and a dreadful miscalculation.

They were wrong—and proved to be wrong—by no less than 6,234 ships.

This was one of the great mistakes of World War II.

The geography of World War II made the great miscalculation particularly onerous, for whole oceans separated us from the combat areas.

Our not having an adequate merchant marine meant that the enemy had won one of the great battles of World War II without spending a nickel or losing a single soldier.

What it cost us in lives and in treasure is incalculable.

The Axis knew the situation and exploited it.

The very inadequacy of our merchant fleet suggested the possibility to them of total victory in this phase of the war. With so little to destroy perhaps they could destroy it all.

Now what was the shipping situation the world over when World War II broke in 1939:

Well, the oceangoing merchant shipping for the world totaled some 80 million deadweight tons.

Of this 27 million were controlled by Britain and France.

The neutral shipping was mostly available to the Allies.

The German blockade was immediate with the outbreak of war. The Axis sank 16 million deadweight tons in the 27 months before we even got into the war.

And in that same 27 months all the ships that could be turned out by both the United States and the United Kingdom came to no more than 5 million deadweight tons.

This, I may add, represented practically the only new merchant shipping which the Allies could not put their hands upon.

The German submarine attack on our shipping was both spectacular and devastating. We had about 11,600,000 deadweight tons under the American flag. This included ocean passenger, dry cargo, and tanker vessels. German submarines appeared like hornets in the western Atlantic, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Caribbean. Americans standing on our eastern shores could see our submarine-struck vessels sinking off the coastline. The year of our blackest losses was 1942. That year the German submarines, sent 3,609,000 deadweight tons of American ships to the bottom of the seas. During the course of the whole war our total losses were about 6,764,000 deadweight tons. The losses for the whole period of the war to all the Allies in ships controlled or available to them was over 36 million deadweight tons. There were 733 American merchant ships of over 1,000 gross tons in these total losses by the Allies and hundreds of other American ships of lighter tonnage. What this means is that the American loss was more than half the tonnage of our whole merchant marine before the war.

You may be interested in a breakdown of the figures showing the allied merchant shipping losses. Let me, therefore, quote them, for they give you a compact and, at the same time, a complete overall picture. Here they are:

[Deadweight tons]

	Nontanker	Tanker	Total
September 1939–December 1941	13,700,000	2,600,000	16,300,000
Year 1942	8,957,000	3,070,000	12,027,000
Year 1943	4,342,000	977,000	5,319,000
Year 1944	1,804,000	293,000	2,097,000
January–August 1945	679,000	160,000	839,000
Total	29,482,000	7,100,000	36,582,000

There were several months through 1941 and a part of 1942 when the losses of Allied shipping outbalanced all the ships that could be constructed both in the United Kingdom and the United States by more than 500,000 deadweight tons.

But luckily our shipbuilding industry had become activated in the period before we became involved in the war. This was doubly fortunate because American shipbuilding had been allowed to lag during the early thirties. Had this paralyzation of the thirties continued, the effect would have compounded the shipping distress of the war, for the challenge to our shipmasters to meet the war emergency proved overwhelming. The shipbuilding capacities of Norway, the Low Countries, and France were lost to us when the German armies overran those countries. Then came the period of shipbuilding desperation. The British put in orders to American shipyards for 60 freighters in 1940. The Maritime Commission ordered 200 more cargo carriers in 1941. The American shipbuilding program widened toward the end of 1941 to build some 1,200 ships, totaling about 14 million deadweight tons.

It was at about this time that the Liberty ship was designed in the expectation that its simplified design would hasten the delivery of British orders.

The Liberty ship, however, was obsolete before the design for it had hardly been finished.

Between 1941 and 1945 American shipyards turned out a total of 5,280 oceangoing ships. They aggregated more than 54 million deadweight tons.

I have here a yearly breakdown, and I quote from my tabulations some of the more interesting figures. For instance:

Year	Number of ships	Deadweight tons
1941	105	1,165,200
1942	740	7,918,000
1943	1,719	18,561,400
1944	1,623	15,982,200
1945	1,093	10,597,300
Total	5,280	54,224,100

For those who may be interested in the breakdown of the types of ships, and the tonnage, I have here these estimates. They show that:

	Number of ships	Deadweight tons
Standard cargo	475	4,604,400
Liberty ships	2,708	29,182,400
Victory ships	414	4,491,700
Tankers	678	10,934,200
Military troop ships	245	1,243,700
Other military types	266	1,791,700
Miscellaneous	494	1,886,000
Total	5,280	54,224,100

Now it will be interesting to see how the argument stands up which the so-called experts advanced that we could depend on foreign nations for our merchant fleet in time of war.

Let us see what they contributed in the way of ships while the German submarines and the Japanese were playing havoc with allied shipping on the high seas:

Well, the British Empire shipyards during the war delivered less than 11 million deadweight tons.

All of our allies together furnished us with about 715,000 gross tons of ships.

Against that we delivered to them 5,500,000 gross tons.

The costs were exorbitant in both life and treasure and the desperation was extreme but the United States Merchant Marine delivered the material to the men at the front and to our fighting allies.

Between December 7, 1941, and the surrender of Japan the total cargo lift from the United States outward bound was: 268,252,000 long tons.

Of this, 203,522,000 represented dry cargo and 64,730,000 constituted petroleum and other liquid freight. This meant the delivery at an average of 8,500 tons of cargo every hour of every day and every night during the last year of the war.

It was American ships also that carried overseas the bulk of the 7,129,907 Army personnel and the 141,537 civilians between December 7, 1941, and November 30, 1945.

This was an achievement in the face of the experts and the theorists who argued for a small and inadequate merchant fleet.

It was an achievement which made it possible for us to carry the burden of the shipping load of the free world.

But the shortsightedness that compelled the extra and over-extra effort that went into our sudden and desperate shipbuilding project ate up a vast portion of our war energy and our war construction materials in the hour of crisis.

Our capacity to build made possible our capacity to deliver.

Another effect was to frustrate the awful gouging which made us the No. 1 sucker nation, in maritime matters in World War I.

The general cargo rates in World War II increased 70 percent. In World War I they had gone up 1,117 percent.

What makes the difference even more remarkable is that the costs of operating ships in World War II were far greater than they had been in World War I.

Now, I want to focus your attention on a single piece of oceangoing arithmetic

to show what it would mean to the United States if it had its own ships to transport its troops, instead of buying up passenger space for our fighting men on the ships of our allies.

The British *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth* were two ships among others on which our troops were rushed to Europe and on which they afterward came home. In the interests of economy, maximum results, and the effort to meet the emergency, anywhere from 10,000 to 15,000 American troops were jammed on each of these great liners for every voyage across the ocean. But a price had to be paid—for every soldier on board ship.

Our British ally charged the Government of the United States at the rate of £20 per soldier. This came to about $1 million gross for a one-way trip. In the course of the war the *Queen Elizabeth* carried 364,178 American troops from the United States to Europe and 104,368 from Europe to the United States. The *Queen Mary* transported 353,939 to Europe and 155,716 back—all United States troops. Thus the two *Queens* transported a total of 978,201 American troops.

Now my point is that at the rates I have just quoted from the records, it would not have been long before the United States could have paid the construction subsidy for an American passenger liner.

Let us put it in figures:

The direct construction subsidy for the new and magnificent United States passenger liner, the steamship *United States*, is $18 million.

The features on the ship, especially installed for her quick conversion to a troop carrier in the event of war, cost the Government of the United States $32 million.

It is clear, it seems to me, that this is an excellent investment.

For here is an American-flag passenger ship which can transport 14,000 troops 10,000 miles at the world record speed of more than 35 knots without refueling.

It is a ship which is always in our control. It can do a bigger job better. And we will not be paying our money to another country for the use of its ships to carry our troops, subject to their conditions.

The American merchant marine for its work in World War II deserves the highest tribute. The man best qualified to give it was Fleet Adm. Ernest King, then in charge of United States naval operations, during the period in question. He wrote Admiral Land on November 2, 1945, like this:

> During the past 3½ years, the Navy has been dependent upon the merchant marine to supply our farflung fleet and bases. Without this support, the Navy could not have accomplished its mission. Consequently, it is fitting that the merchant marine share in our success as it shared in our trials.
>
> The merchant marine is a strong bulwark of national defense in peace and war, and a buttress to sound national economy. A large merchant marine is not only an important national resource; it is, in being, an integral part of our country's armed might during time of crisis. During World War II this precept has been proven.
>
> As the merchant marine returns to its peacetime pursuits, I take pleasure in expressing the Navy's heartfelt thanks to you and through you to the officers and men of the merchant marine for their magnificent support during World War II. All hands can feel a pride of accomplishment in a job well done.
>
> We wish the merchant marine every success during the years ahead and sincerely hope that it remains strong and continues as a vital and integral part of our national economy and defense.

But even the history of facts, the very living example of contemporaneous events, plus the carefully expressed convictions of Admiral King, failed to persuade those who continued to argue that our merchant marine needed no modernization and that its neglect was of no concern to our country. The admiral says our merchant fleet should remain strong and that it is necessary to our national economy and our defense. I repeat the definitive line from the admiral's letter to his colleague that a large merchant marine "is not only an important national resource; it is, in being, an integral part of our country's armed might during the time of crisis." No one can say it more plainly, more bluntly, or more authoritatively than that.

It seems hard to believe that there are those even now who insist that our merchant marine should be scrapped by neglect to help close the dollar gap between the United States and other powers. And again, up comes the wearisome, defeated, fallacious, and, I believe, dangerous argument, that we can depend in wartime on foreign merchant fleets and American-owned ships under foreign flag. They are saying this in spite of the evidence that during the comparatively limited war in Korea our allies were in no position to furnish the ships for the needed tasks of that emergency.

The record, as far as I have it almost up to the end of the armistice, shows that it was our merchant ships which delivered 80 percent of the cargoes to Korea.

Only modernization and efficient maintenance can bring our merchant fleet to a status to meet an all-out war. And it is our merchant fleet alone which we can depend upon in the event of so great an emergency.

There is no question today but that in the next war we will be required to build all their ships for our allies. For there is no change in the basic situation that prevailed in both world wars. We went into them without one fundamental requirement for our economic and military defense—a merchant fleet. We paid a frightful price. In the face of this twice demonstrated mistake are we now deliberately to go through it again for the third time?

Rear Adm. R. E. Wilson stated the position of the Department of Defense on June 16, 1953, before the Special Subcommittee on Maritime Subsidies. This written statement again expresses the need and the importance of enlarging and modernizing our United States merchant fleet and shipbuilding facilities. He, too, would place maximum reliance on United States flag shipping and not on foreign ships, or American ships under foreign flags.

Now I would like to present a correct picture of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. To begin with, the act did away with the undesirable, indirect ship operating subsidy. This indirect subsidy used to be camouflaged as a form of compensation for carrying mail. The act was more forthright. It simply created a subsidy for the construction of ships in United States shipyards and for the operation of certain American ships in the regular berth services. It was what it said it was. What needs to be pointed out is that the operating subsidy does not guarantee profits to a shipping company. The subsidy establishes parity between the builders and operators of United States ships and their foreign competitors who operate their ships in countries with a very low standard of living.

Along with not guaranteeing a profit I think I ought to emphasize the recapture section in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to correct another false impression. The recapture section provides that one-half of all profits in excess of capital used in the business over a 10-year period are recaptured up to the amount of the subsidy paid. There is no other Government subsidy program in which such a provision appears.

Now what effect has this subsidy section actually had in recapturing subsidies?

Well, 4 out of the 12 recipient companies who got subsidies during the first 10 years of the law's operation returned to the Government all of the operating subsidy money that had been advanced to them. The other eight companies returned a substantial portion of the subsidy. The total paid out in operating subsidies for the first 10 years ending December 31, 1948, was $88 million. Of this $88 million, the Government recaptured $52,500,000. The companies retained $35,515,800. Subsidies were suspended during the war years from April 1942 to December 1946. So that the Government's cost of operating subsidy was about $6 million a year.

That is a $6 million a year subsidy for a merchant marine.

Contrast that with the subsidies provided by the Government during the same 10 years to other industries:

The dairy industry got a Government subsidy of $1,205,645,000.

The sugar industry got a Government subsidy of $524,195,000.

A Government subsidy of $132,694,000 went for potatoes.

A Government subsidy of $67,635,000 went for cheddar cheese.

All agriculture subsidies together came to $2,104,192,000.

Agriculture got additional help through the tariff which the Government imposed by charging and collecting $2,700,741,000 during the 10-year period.

Figures like that make the $35,515,800 in operating subsidies paid to the American merchant marine seem puny indeed.

Nor is what I have just said to be interpreted as a criticism of farm subsidies.

I am merely presenting the audit so that the importance of a merchant-marine parity can be appreciated.

Today the fact is clear that the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 demands an adequate merchant marine to carry a substantial portion of our domestic and foreign trade and to serve for our country's defense, and that, as of now, the Government has failed to provide a sufficient subsidy to carry out the mandate of the Congress.

That is the story.

The figures are dramatic and compelling because our World War I shipbuilding program cost $2,951,807,000. These ships would have cost about $840 million had they been built before the war. But the difference in cost was not all the consequences of the mistake of neglect. The ships built during the war proved inefficient. And not only were they not available when they were needed, but many of them never saw war service at all.

To put it another way it has been estimated that a fleet of, say, 8 million deadweight tons, sufficient for World War I, would, prior to the war, have cost at the most $500 million. This means that a sound maritime policy would have given us a saving of $2,500,000,000 in ship construction, exclusive of all other advantages. All of which adds up to this:

The desperate, almost hysterical shipbuilding energies could have been used in other areas of the war effort.

There would have been no rate-gouging at our expense.

The men and the supplies would have reached their destinations on time as the military required them.

The war would have been shortened.

Lives would have been saved.

During the first decade of the 1936 act the operating differential per year was about $30,000 per ship. That means that we could have run a fleet of 1,000 competent ships for 20 years prior to World War I and been ahead $2 billion if we were to include the possible savings in the cost of construction. And that construction cost is certainly a valid item and a realistic one.

How about the story for World War II?

Well, the United States built 54,224,100 deadweight tons of merchant shipping during this war, costing $14,204,000,000.

With a cost of only $4 billion, a 40-million-deadweight-ton fleet could have been built having the same cargo capacity, had the construction been done before war broke out.

That would have meant a saving of $10,204,000,000.

Given that amount we could have had 2,000 modern ships at the outbreak of the war, and still have saved $8 or $9 billion to say nothing of critical materials, time, and life.

On a saving like that under present-day high operating differentials we could keep a fleet of 2,000 vessels trafficking on the high seas for more than a quarter of a century.

Now that I am approaching the end of my talk let me make it clear that those of us who favor an adequate American merchant marine do not hold that we can at all times support an active peacetime merchant fleet, backed up by ships in reserve, in a quantity to meet our needs and the needs of our allies in time of war. In the light of our World War II experience it has been figured out that the United States will need at least 6,000 modern ships for an all-out world war III.

Now the question is how large should our merchant fleet be? The best judgment is that it should be large enough—composed of modern ships—to be able to carry at least 50 percent of our export and import trade. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in its preamble said that our merchant marine must be—I quote—"sufficient to carry a substantial portion of our foreign trade." That was its greatest error, the term "substantial portion." When we say "sufficient to carry at least 50 percent of our export and import trade" we give meaning to our language. But "substantial" can mean as many things as there are points of view.

It is our contention that Congress intended our merchant marine to carry at least 50 percent of our incoming and outgoing trade. But it is not to be assumed from this that on some trade routes we should not carry less than 50 percent, or more on other trade routes. For confirmation on what I have just said I point to the congressional mandates that American ships should carry at least 50 percent of the cargoes provided under our foreign economic and military aid program. You will find the 50 percent provision in these programs:

First. Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, and the ECA Amendments, 1949, Public Law 47, 81st Congress.

Second. Korean Aid Act, Public Law 447, 81st Congress.

Third. Yugoslavia Emergency Relief Assistance Act of 1950, Public Law 897, 81st Congress.

Fourth. India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951, Public Law 48, 82d Congress.

Fifth. Mutual Defense Assistance Act, Public Law 329, 81st Congress.

Sixth. Mutual Security Act of 1951, Public Law 165, 82d Congress.

Seventh. Pakistan wheat bill, public law 77, 83d Congress.

The 73d Congress in Public Resolution 17, declared that all cargoes financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or by any other agency of Government, should be transported in American ships when these are available at reasonable prices. But this was cut down to 50 percent by Government agencies in consultation with shipping interests. A desirable effect of this administrative practice has been to provide a weapon against discriminatory shipping practices pursued to our disadvantage by other maritime nations.

An American merchant fleet capable of carrying at least 50 percent of our foreign trade is the most reasonable figure because it represents a workable nucleus for expansion in the event of another all-out war. The 50-percent estimate is based on a fluctuating volume of foreign trade in a period of national emergency. We know that as the national emergency rises the sea traffic rises proportionately to meet the mounting movement of supplies and troops. Then as this traffic mounts we should increase our merchant fleet. Such a result is possible if our ships now are called on to carry at least 50 percent of our export and import trade.

But what is the figure now?

American-flag ships in January of 1953 carried only 25.8 percent of our foreign trade. It is my understanding that the average figure is about 30 percent.

That means we have cut the needed program in half.

We are repeating, after all the agony, the same mistake we made in World War I and World War II.

Our merchant marine is being subjected to neglect by the same purblind thinking that cost us untold lives and billions in dollars in World Wars I and II.

Twice we have been a voice crying in the wilderness.

There may not be an opportunity for a third time—for the third time our Nation may not survive the ordeal.

Our program is clear, it is definite, it has historical proof and statistical evidence.

Let us, united, make sure that we have an adequate merchant marine, in peacetime as well as in time of war.

"I DO NOT BELIEVE THE MATERIAL YOU HAVE SUGGESTED WOULD BE USEFUL"—AN OUTRAGEOUS REFUSAL BY THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO FURNISH INFORMATION OF A NONCONFIDENTIAL NATURE TO A MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of Congress since January 1937. In the intervening 17 years, I had always found the executive agencies of the Government conscious of the fact that Members of Congress were entitled to certain types of information without question. I am speaking, of course, of technical information which they are capable of developing and which in no way involves anything of a secret or confidential nature. I had never had the experience of having an executive department, or an official of any agency, refuse to provide me with certain information because he thought the material I requested would not be useful. In other words, that he did not think the conclusions which might be drawn from such information would be useful—not to me or to the Congress—but to the agency itself.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is always a first time for everything. I was told by the head of one of the Government departments that he would not provide me with some technical information for the reason that he did not believe the material I have asked for would be useful.

There is no question of the ability of his agency to provide this information. He just did not think I should have it.

The gentleman who took this position is the Secretary of the Treasury. And what he said, in effect, was this—I am, of course, paraphrasing: "There has been given to the House Ways and Means Committee certain projections on estimated revenue losses over the next 3 years resulting from a change the Treasury has recommended in methods of computing depreciation allowances for tax purposes. When you ask me to use exactly the same premises and project this information over a 10-year period rather than just 3 years, you are asking for information I do not think is very good information to have kicking around Congress. It might be misunderstood. Therefore, I do not think it would be useful to give it to you. Therefore, go soak your head—I am not going to give this information to you."

Mr. Humphrey used somewhat more polite language than that. He did not tell me to go soak my head. He did not come right out and say he would not like to see information of this kind in the hands of the Congress. He did not say flatly he would not give it to me.

Here is what he did say:

> We believe that any long-term statistical projections based upon any assumed rate of capital investment would be unrealistic. Therefore, I do not believe the material you have suggested would be useful.

And, of course, I did not get the information.

Mr. Speaker, I rise here on the House floor to bring this matter to the attention of the Congress not out of any sense of personal pique over the Secretary's rudeness. I think he has been impertinent, offensive, obnoxious in this matter. He has been deliberately insolent and insulting. And I resent it.

I resent it, Mr. Speaker, not for myself—because I have seen other instances on the part of this Secretary of the Treasury which reflects arrogance toward individuals with whom he disagrees. But I deeply resent, and cannot so readily pass over, the insult here to the Congress itself—to the institution we Members cherish and do our best to serve.

The Secretary of the Treasury certainly has the right to disagree with any Member of Congress, or, for that matter, with every Member of Congress, over any legislative proposal he chooses. He can argue with us in the Ways and Means Committee on any tax matter, and he can tell us we are wrong when he thinks we are wrong. That is his right and, in fact, his duty. None of us on the Ways and Means Committee has ever objected to any Secretary of the Treasury telling us in the most forceful language at his command that a certain proposed change in the tax laws or in any other law is good or bad for the country. He can not only disagree with us; as a presidential appointee, he can go out and campaign against us and we have no objection to that.

But when this Secretary of the Treasury or any Secretary of the Treasury attempts to tell us on the Ways and Means Committee that he will not give us technical information which he possesses—information which merely carries forward projections and estimates he has already volunteered to the committee—because in his opinion it would not serve a useful purpose for us to have that material, then I say he has overstepped the bounds of decency and propriety, he has told the Congress to do no independent thinking on its own but to take his estimates and his suggestions and proposals as the final say—as a sacred ukase which brooks no doubt or independent investigation.

Let me explain, Mr. Speaker, why I am so exercised about this incident. For many long and weary weeks, as you know and as the Members know, the Ways and Means Committee has been going over the whole complex and complicated structure of our internal revenue code to write an entirely new tax law—the first real thoroughgoing revision in the tax laws in many, many years. It is exhausting work.

Any taxpayer whoever struggled with a Form 1040 or a corporate tax form as March 15 approached knows that the subject is infernally intricate. Tax lawyers devote their lives to learning the ins-and-outs of the tax laws, to understand them. The Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation have both put to work over a period of several years their best technical brains on the subject to draft the proposals submitted before our committee. And now these proposals are before us for decision.

On every decision we make, millions if not billions of dollars are involved—not just for the Government but for businesses and for individuals. The future of a plant or industry in your district may rest on an innocuous-sounding phrase inserted in this bill. It could perhaps kill that plant or industry, wreck it. Or it could bring millions of additional profits to General Motors or the Hanna Coal Co. or any other large undertaking.

We on the committee are mortals, subject to human error. But I should like to make clear that every member of that committee is conscientiously trying to do a fair and honest job in writing this legislative monster, which is what a tax bill inevitably has to be.

When that bill comes here on the House floor we want to know what is in it and be able to explain it to your satisfaction. We do not want to have jokers slipped into it without our knowledge. We do not want to be misled into an extravagant handout of the taxpayer's dollar or of the Nation's revenues to this or that particular group of individuals or to this or that particular group of businesses.

The bill as it now stands is a big-business bill which provides many new means under which corporations and stockholders in corporations can ease their tax responsibilities at the expense of the rest of the citizens of this Nation. So far, there is practically nothing in this bill which eases the tax of the wage earner or the small-business man. It is a rich man's, an investor's tax bill.

The members of the committee who have supported some of these provisions to which I and other minority members object, and who have opposed the kind of tax relief we on the Democratic side have proposed for the little fellow—for the wage earner, for the general public, for the great mass of people who pay the taxes we spend for defense and other purposes—the Members on the majority side, I repeat, have put these provisions into the bill because they believe they are good for the country. They believe in the trickle-down theory of economic prosperity—make business happy, give it all kinds of tax incentives to expand, make common stocks more attractive to investors, and prosperity will be assured. That is their belief. They believe in it sincerely. We on the Democratic side are just as sincere and honest in believing that if the great mass of the people have money to spend on the things they want and need, business will provide those needs and make such profits as will guarantee an expanding economy and a prosperous economy.

Those two divergent views, Mr. Speaker, probably go further to explain the philosophic differences of the two major political parties in the United States today than any other set of premises. The issue of slavery once provided this contrast. Then, later, it was tariffs. In 1932 it was the role of the Federal Government in moving against misery and suffering and starvation. Later, with some exceptions on both sides, it was the issue of foreign policy—in the historic debates before Pearl Harbor. Today it is this question of how to assure prosperity—how to restore it first, for it temporarily seems to have fled from us, and then how to maintain it and expand it.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that in arguing out these issues in a straightforward, honest, and sincere fashion, we are upholding the greatest traditions of American democracy. We are doing our duty as Members of Congress or as officials of Government. In our deliberations, we are, if you will excuse an overworked phrase now almost synonomous with a popular television program, only after the facts. We can disagree over what the facts portend, but we feel we should and must have all the facts available to us, no matter what they show.

In the case of this one technical matter involving depreciation, I have been disturbed that the proposal supported by a majority of the committee will mean an extravagant handout of tax revenues to a few big corporations—to them it could be worth many millions of dollars a year. That may or may not mean it is bad for the country. We can have separate views on that.

But the Secretary of the Treasury has seen fit to tell us what it will mean, according to certain estimates and projections he has made covering the first 3 years of its application. He told us it would mean a reduction in revenue for the third year of $1,550,000,000.

In writing to the Secretary about this matter, I did not accuse him of any wrongdoing. I did not make any insinuations about him—his patriotism or his friendships or his golf score. I made no effort to argue the merits of this depreciation change.

I asked only for a further projection of his own estimates—for 10 years instead of for 3. I asked him to disregard

any incentive factor, and to use exactly the same assumptions in the 10-year projection as he had in the 3-year projection in regard to levels of business activity, levels of business investment, and levels of tax rates.

And that was all.

I noted that it was particularly important for me to have the answer by February 25, and I am pleased to say that in writing his answer by February 26 he got it to me only a day after I had considered it important to receive the information requested in my letter of February 20.

I subsequently found that there was no reason for him to spend 6 days preparing his answer, for it gave me none of the facts I requested.

His letter—unanimous-consent request—is in sharp contrast with the one I sent him. Instead of giving me the objective factual information I requested, he gave me a page of arguments as to why the Treasury proposal on depreciation was a good thing, why it would not cost the Government any money at all in the long run—a highly debatable point—and why and how it would encourage capital expansion and bring more risk capital into play in the economy.

I did not ask him for any of that information—he had already told us that several times, like a school teacher in the elementary grades dinning the multiplication table into the dense skulls of reluctant pupils.

But he would not give the extended projections I requested, because he had decided they would not be useful.

A proper answer, it seems to me, would be to give me the extended projections I had requested, while at the same time disputing their reliability. If I attempted to use them in any improper way, he could have objected. If I had drawn conclusions from them with which he disagreed, he could have disputed them. If I had sought to use the projections without acknowledging the Secretary's doubts as to their validity, he could have demanded on behalf of fair play that the doubts be cited and he could have cited them himself.

In short, he and the Treasury and the administration have various protections against any improper or unfair use of the Treasury's figures to oppose the Treasury's point of view.

But he did not choose to rest on these protections. He has insulted me as an individual and as a Member by deciding in his superior wisdom it would not be a safe thing for me to have this information and therefore he has refused to provide it.

I say in all candor, Mr. Speaker, that this is a new approach by an executive agency to the proper sphere of Congress. I say it is an insult to the entire House and to the entire Congress. I say it is scandalous misuse of executive power and a warning to the Congress to defend its prerogatives before new and deeper encroachments are undertaken by this arrogant official, newly arrived from big business, who administers the Treasury Department of the United States.

Whether the information I requested is useful or not, I insist it must be forthcoming. I insist upon it in behalf of the rights of all Members to courteous treatment and factual accounting from the executive departments.

I have therefore renewed my request to the Secretary of the Treasury to provide the information.

FEBRUARY 26, 1954.

The Honorable GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have your letter of February 26 in response to my request of the 20th for certain information.

I am frankly astonished by your failure to provide the information I requested on the grounds that you "do not believe the material (I) have suggested would be useful." I can only conclude that you have not read my letter of February 20 with sufficient care.

If you do so, you will note that I made a specific request for specific information. I did not ask for your opinion as to whether or not this information would be useful, although had you complied with my request I would have been most happy to have your opinion and would have given it careful consideration.

Although my letter specifically requested you not to take into account any so-called incentive factor—that is, increased investment arising out of this new depreciation method—I was surprised that the bulk of your response dealt with what you believe will be the increase in business investment resulting from incentives of this new depreciation method.

Economists know that, important as it may be, this incentive factor is so vague and nebulous that it cannot be accurately calculated. That is why the first 3 year's projections made by your Department and by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation were careful to exclude that factor. That is also why I am again requesting that you not take this factor into account and that you not use this vague concept as an excuse for failing to continue the projections already begun by your Department and the joint committee staff.

Inasmuch as your Department and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation have made these computations for the first 3 years, there is no reason why similar computations cannot be made for succeeding years, using the same assumptions as to level of economic activity and levels of investment and taxation. It is not for you to judge whether these computations would be useful to me or not. One of the duties of your Department is to furnish information requested by the Congress and Congress will decide whether or not the information is useful. If your staff is unable to make these computations, I suggest they contact the staff of the joint committee which made the 3-year projection.

As you know, the Revenue Act of 1954 will soon be finally acted upon by the Committee on Ways and Means and will shortly thereafter be considered by the House of Representatives. I feel that the information I am requesting is essential to my own deliberations on this bill, and I must insist that you furnish this information to me by noon on Wednesday, March 3. If you do not intend to furnish the information by that time I should like to have word from you to that effect by noon on Monday, March 1.

In my 18 years in Congress your response to my request represents the first time a Secretary of the Treasury has failed to furnish to a Member of Congress who is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means information concerning a pending tax measure.

I note that you oppose an increase in the personal exemptions—which will benefit the average taxpayer—because of the revenue loss involved. I cannot reconcile this with your failure to furnish a Member of Congress with information on the revenue loss from a provision whose benefits will go to the corporations of the country, on the ground that the information would not be useful.

I am at a loss to understand why you should not disclose the revenue effects of such provision, unless you fear that to do so would disclose the true nature of this tax bill—one which ignores the average taxpayer and gives enormous benefits to corporations and high-income taxpayers.

Knowing your regard for the fiscal stability of the Nation, I am sure that you will not decline again to furnish to a Member of Congress, especially one who is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, information which is crucial to the future of our Nation's economy.

Sincerely,

HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, February 26, 1954.

Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. EBERHARTER: I have your letter of February 20 requesting estimates of the effects on the revenue of double-rate declining-balance depreciation for the fiscal years 1957 to 1964, under certain stated assumptions.

As you know, the change in the tax treatment of depreciation will simply change the timing of depreciation deductions, and not the total deductions. Over the entire period of use of a machine or building, its total cost will be written off under any system of depreciation accounting. With any given amount of investment, there would be no net change in total revenue, except insofar as tax rates may change.

Looking at a single item, revenues would be lower in the early years than under the present system. But a point is reached, depending on the life of the asset, after which revenues will be higher than at present. Any increase in deductions during the early years will, of course, be offset by decreased deductions in later years.

My own experience and the advice of numerous groups convince me that faster depreciation in the early years of use will very substantially increase total investment over what it would be under straight-line depreciation. This will occur because the opportunity for an earlier recovery of capital will encourage people to take the risks which exist in any capital investment. The change will also increase investment by making possible shorter term financing which is especially important for small and growing companies.

Because of the combination of the two factors noted above, we believe that any long term statistical projections based upon any assumed rate of capital investment would be unrealistic. Therefore, I do not believe the material you have suggested would be useful. We feel sure that the net effect of the change in depreciation accounting will be to increase revenues, as well as employment and national income, because of the stimulation to investment.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

FEBRUARY 20, 1954.

The Honorable GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I note that you have projected the net revenue reduction resulting from the double-rate declining-balance depreciation provisions adopted by the House Ways and Means Committee for the first 3 years of its operation, giving a

total reduction in revenues for the third year of $1,550,000,000.

I assume that there will continue to be a net revenue reduction from this provision (as compared with the revenues that would result from continuing the present straight-line methods) for some years to come.

I am writing to request you to project these estimated net revenue reductions for an additional 7 years (making a total of 10 years from the date on which this declining balance method will take effect). In projecting these please use the same assumptions as to (a) level of economic activity, (b) level of business investment, and (c) tax rates that were used in arriving at the 3-year projection already completed and do not take into account any incentive factor.

It is quite important that I have this information by Thursday, February 25.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely,

HERMAN P. EBERHARTER.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I noticed in the newspapers of Monday that Secretary Humphrey participated in a television program on Sunday, which he had a perfect right to do, and that when he was asked about the proposal of the Democratic members on the Ways and Means Committee, which motion was offered in the committee to increase personal exemptions from $600 to $700 per person, he termed it as "political propaganda." Did the gentleman see that in the newspaper?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am sorry, I did not see it, but I am not surprised to hear that was his reaction to a proposal made by the Democrats.

Mr. McCORMACK. You can disagree with the judgment of a person, but when you go beyond that you are entering dangerous territory when you impugn the motives of an entire political party.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I doubt whether any Secretary of the Treasury has ever attributed to proposals made by the other side purely political motives.

Mr. McCORMACK. I served on the Ways and Means Committee for 10 years myself before being elected majority leader, and I agree with the gentleman. I have no recollection that any such characterization, which goes to the motives not only of members but representatives of a political party on a committee, particularly the great Committee on Ways and Means. I think the Secretary has a lot to learn. He should be very careful in making statements that impugn the motives of an individual member, but he should be particularly careful when he impugns the motives of all members of the Democratic Party, as he did in this case in connection with the Ways and Means Committee, when he characterized a proposal, sincerely offered, as "political propaganda."

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think it would be well to see the results that occur in the House if we have an opportunity to have a vote of the membership on the question of whether an increase in exemptions is purely political or whether the membership decides it is proper relief. I would say in my judgment the majority of the people of this country would say that they certainly favor an exemption increase. We have come to a pretty pass, Mr. Speaker, when the Secretary of the Treasury, on whom all Members of Congress would like to rely as responsible, who feel that he has an important position and should be respected for his judgment, and perhaps consider them very much in the light of the position he holds as having special opportunities to render valuable advice. But when he characterizes a political party of the opposition, the Democratic Party, with being entirely advocates of something for purely a political nature, when it comes to taxes, I think he is showing a disdain that ill behooves a man holding such a position as he holds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include some correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL PROSPERITY AND DEFENSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the present administration took office in January of 1953, I made a speech in my district in which I touched upon some of the basic and grave problems facing the country and the new Government. At that time I stated in effect that the new President elected by a substantial majority of the American people was entitled to an opportunity to work out his program and that in that process every American regardless of party should strive to cooperate in order to solve some of the great issues before us.

What I deem to be far more pertinent at present, however, was that I then expressed the hope and also urged at that time that, notwithstanding any other factors, the leaders of the new administration would pursue forward-looking policies with respect to the national economy, the full-time employment of our people and the security and well-being of workers, farmers, small-business men, and others who make up our great composite American body politic.

I especially expressed the hope that the new administration and its leadership would not pursue any policy which would have the effect of unloosing recessionary forces in the economy, thus causing diminished business activity, unemployment, and concern about our future stability. That was early in 1953.

I do not desire at this time to enlarge upon the policies which have since been followed by the administration because in general they are well known to the Members of this body and to the people. Contrary to my expectations and hopes, recessionary policies have been pursued with economic and social consequences which are now very apparent and which have been felt in many communities throughout the land in the form of reduced business activity and unemployment.

In a short period of time, haphazard and ill-considered attacks have been made upon many great pending problems. The armed services have been indiscriminately slashed and that is a matter which is giving greatest concern to those of us who have been working to maintain a strong defense and powerful striking power in our Armed Forces, as well as to the general public and our allies.

Undoubtedly this move has also given our potential enemies to believe that we are indulging ourselves in a somewhat luxurious complacency about the general, very dangerous, unsettled world picture.

On the domestic front, poorly conceived, restrictive monetary policies have been adopted, the farm-price-support program has been radically manipulated, thus suddenly diminishing the purchasing power of a very large segment of our people, indiscriminate layoffs of Government workers have been effected, resulting in many individual cases of injustice to long-time faithful employees and also adding to the generally recessionary influences of other policies. Hasty, unsound economies and cuts have been made in the budget. I do not have the exact figures, but many billions of dollars will have been cut across the board from the national budget for the ensuing fiscal year.

In the light of these developments it is not difficult to understand why the delicate psychological balance of public sentiment and confidence which so vitally influences the American economy and which frequently marks out the boundaries between prosperity and recession, has been considerably disturbed. Nor it is difficult to realize why so many business concerns, individuals, and families at every level comprising the purchasing power which makes the economy click have commenced to restrict their purchasing, or cut down their business activity, to accord with their view of possible future adverse economic trends. One who calmly surveys these conditions cannot but have genuine concern. Obviously the lifting of so many billions of dollars in terms of Government expenditure from the economy in such a short period of time of itself would be bound to have very significant repercussions, not only in the psychology, but in the actual business and working lives of our citizens. That is surely an economic fact of which we can all take note.

While all these things are happening the commodity markets are upset and the security market is reflecting the idea, apparently widely held by investors and marketing experts, that these conditions may be moving the Nation in time toward greater inflation. That is one of the paradoxes in the situation.

I am most sympathetic concerning the problems confronting the administration which are of such great moment to all of us, and no one is more anxious than I am to cooperate in working them out on a sound realistic basis. But we cannot afford to let these matters drift any longer. Some affirmative action must be

taken and taken promptly. The national leadership must find ways and means of restoring the confidence of businessmen and the general public. The administration and the Congress must be prepared to inaugurate now policies which will not only stop, but counteract, the recessionary forces presently operating in the economy which are looming more and more day by day as a real danger to the national prosperity, to economic stability, and moving toward a weakening of our productive strength and national morale, so important and vital to us at this time of crisis to meet the manifestations and threats of world communism.

I do not favor haphazard policies in government at any time, and I am not suggesting unsound remedies based solely on Federal spending or novel, untried, economic experiments. I should like to see these very important questions tackled at once both by the administration and the Congress and carefully surveyed and studied and a definite program adopted which can secure widest possible support in the Congress and among the people, which will move toward the essential ends of halting recession and again assuring prosperous business conditions and the employment of all our citizens.

Some of these proposed remedial measures undoubtedly lie in the monetary field and should be tackled immediately by financial experts and appropriate committees of our Congress under the leadership of the very able specialists in financial matters who are Members of our respective bodies. Other measures clearly lie in the tax field where it certainly should be possible for the Congress in view of current conditions to lower the taxes, direct and indirect, including excise and nuisance taxes, upon various classes of the American people, and particularly our workers and members of the rank and file, and thereby stimulate some renewed purchasing power.

I believe also that the Congress should give early consideration to the extremely complex agricultural price-support system with a view to ameliorating the depressed conditions which are beginning to appear among many of our farmers. At the same time we should give our attention also to the general extension, rather than the limitation, of the resources and instrumentalities of this great economy of ours so as to make it what it should be—not a contracting economy, but a vital, dynamic, expanding economy predicated upon the fullest possible development of our national resources, human and material, and by all means under every circumstance the full-time employment of our citizens.

Included also in these considerations should be the immediate activation, if it appears necessary, of the huge program of public works and public development which we have been assured by administration leaders has been blueprinted and is ready to be put into operation. We should have in mind that it will take considerable time to implement and make this program really effective.

And most important of all in my opinion, in the interest and the safety and security of the Nation and without boondoggling, waste, or inefficiency, the Congress should promptly move to restore most of the cuts that have been indiscriminately made in national defense so that disbalances between the various services will be eliminated, and so that we may have an appropriately balanced, soundly devised, adequately established armed services truly sufficient to meet any and every contingency that may arise. The national security comes first. It should never be risked for ill-timed economy.

We must never permit men who, despite great ability, have extremely limited experience in dealing with the special technical and generalized problems of world policy in relation to national defense, and who have had little or no practice in handling delicate public questions and problems, to dictate a course of action for this Congress which may save tax dollars for the corporate and privileged classes of the Nation, but which in the end may leave this country inadequately prepared for possible aggression, inadequately equipped to cope with attacks upon our security, and inadequately implemented to deliver smashing and devastating blows against a sudden adversary.

I urge the administration leaders and our own committees to take immediate action to cope with these great problems because if the current situation is permitted to drift further we may land on the shoals of sudden economic lassitude which could not only gravely imperil our economy but might very well invite assaults upon the national security as well.

LEGISLATIVE TASKS AHEAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a high honor and privilege to represent the people of the 19th Congressional District in the great State of California. Their confidence in me is shown by the fact that they elected me to this congressional office in 1942 and have kept me here ever since.

While my political views are well known and frankly stated, I have tried always to serve the people in a fair manner and to avoid a narrow, partisan approach. I believe the voters of my district respect and appreciate that concept of congressional service, because Democrats and Republicans alike have nominated me for office.

It is my purpose now to present a report to the people of the 19th Congressional District of California outlining major legislative tasks ahead, as I see them.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The social security system created under the administration of Franklin Roosevelt and now in existence for almost 20 years, must be expanded and improved. Our citizens are entitled to assurance that they will have a secure and steady income in retirement and old age.

Various perfecting amendments to the Social Security Act are needed to bring more persons under the benefits of the act, to increase the amount of the benefits received by individuals, to allow retired persons to do useful work and earn some money without being penalized in regard to social security payments, to enlarge the amount of base earnings that can be credited for such payments, to allow the computation of benefits on a fairer basis by excluding periods of abnormally low earnings, and to protect the benefit rights of those who become disabled.

Improvements in the social security system along these lines have been recommended by the President and will receive my full support. However, I am greatly disturbed by the fact that some members of the President's own party in the Congress are challenging the basic worth of the social security system. They want to tamper with the trust fund—over $19 billion—that has been built up over the years by the individual contributions of workers and employers. They are advocating drastic changes in the system which would destroy the equities our people now have in the system and which would, in my judgment, result in a lowering of benefits to all.

I shall fight any moves to weaken or destroy social security in America. It is my hope that Members of Congress, regardless of party, will come together in a spirit of good will and vote the necessary improvements in the social security law. I regard this legislative action as a must.

MORE JOBS

Today our people are greatly concerned about growing unemployment and the difficulties faced by small business. Several million persons who want jobs are without jobs. Many of them are getting by for a short time on meager unemployment compensation benefits.

The Government of the United States has an important responsibility to prevent economic depression. That responsibility was written into law under the Truman administration, when the Employment Act of 1946 was passed. As a Member of Congress I supported that legislation.

The Federal Government has many opportunities and can use many resources to fight off depression, provided its leaders are willing to take bold and decisive action. If the administration fails to act, I shall support legislation in the Congress directing the administration to take whatever steps are necessary to maintain high levels of employment. Steady jobs and good wages are the foundation of national prosperity.

TAX RELIEF

Because jobs are getting scarcer, workers as a whole are earning less money and buying less at the stores. To keep our economy healthy and growing, purchasing power must be maintained. I will support every legitimate action toward this end.

One of the important steps we can take to strengthen buying power is to increase the exemption allowed to individuals on their income taxes. The average family of modest income, if permitted to deduct several hundred dollars above the present exemption from its

income tax, will have that much more money for the essentials of family living. Those dollars injected into the bloodstream of the economy will have a powerful stimulating effect on business.

Too much attention is being directed to tax relief for big corporations and wealthy individuals and not enough to tax relief for the American family of modest income. I believe the wage-earning taxpayer deserves a break and the economy certainly needs it. I will vote for legislation to increase the exemption on income taxes for individuals.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL CARE

Good health is basic to the happiness and productivity of our people. There is growing recognition in this country that health protection and good medical care should be brought within the reach of everyone. Certainly some means must be found to cope with the staggering costs of serious and prolonged illness.

The Federal Government is helping to improve the health of American citizens by financial contributions and technical assistance to States for the construction of hospitals, for maternal and child health services, for vocational rehabilitation, for research in industrial hygiene and other public health fields. Federal research programs are being conducted in cancer, heart diseases, mental illness, and other serious afflictions of humanity. Medical facilities are available to veterans and to members of the armed services.

I believe that the Government has a responsibility to make sure that no citizen is deprived of happiness and long life because he cannot afford adequate medical care. I believe this responsibility can be discharged without regimenting doctors and without limiting the freedom of individuals to choose their own doctors.

None of us wants medicine to be socialized, but all of us want the opportunity to get proper medical attention when we need it, and to be able to pay our doctor bills. President Eisenhower himself has recognized these needs in a special message to the Congress. I shall support all legislative measures, including increased income-tax deductions for medical expenses, to ease the burden of medical costs and to afford our people the health protection and medical care they need and deserve.

HOUSING

Good homes for all American families are tied in with other measures to insure a prosperous economy and the happiness and well-being of our people. Housing construction at a sustained rate provides jobs in many industries and the foundation for steady economic growth. Together with slum clearance and community development it also means that American children will grow up in better family and neighborhood surroundings and become better citizens.

The Congress will be called upon to review existing housing legislation and to provide more incentives to industry to build and finance homes. I shall support all constructive housing measures that will encourage home building and will enable families to purchase homes on more liberal credit terms.

Furthermore, I shall support a program of public housing for those families who do not have the means of buying or renting decent homes. Opportunities to obtain such housing should be afforded all low-income families, whatever their nationality, religious, or racial background.

I believe the Government must take the initiative, too, in promoting slum clearance and reconstruction of blighted areas that are breeding places of crime and disease in our cities.

ATOMIC ENERGY FOR PEACE

As a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, I have watched the development of atomic energy in this country almost from the beginning. We have made our country's defenses strong to resist aggression, but we have also prayed and worked for peace. In the hearts of all of us there is a longing for a world at peace and for putting atomic energy to work to serve the welfare of mankind rather than its destruction.

Upon the initiative of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the United States has embarked on a program of producing electric power from the atom. Already we have launched an atomic-powered submarine. Possibilities of atomic-driven locomotives and airplanes are being examined. Many exciting discoveries in medicine, agriculture, and industry are being made with the help of atomic devices.

Shortly the Congress will be called upon to review existing atomic energy legislation in order to determine what changes are needed to promote peacetime uses of atomic energy, including cooperative work with other nations. I shall support constructive measures toward these ends. I shall oppose moves which are afoot in some quarters to give monopolistic controls over peacetime atomic energy to a few large corporations. The American people are the owners of atomic plants and processes and should receive the full benefits of atomic energy development for peace.

IMPROVED IMMIGRATION LAW

Several years of experience with the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1950 [McCarran Act] have shown that the act contains many inequities and imposes unnecessary hardships on families. The harsh effects of the McCarran Act are evident in my district, which contains many Spanish-speaking families or individuals who emigrated from Mexico.

Many families have been broken up, and wives and children forced on public relief after the family breadwinner, who lived here for many years, was forced to return to Mexico because of some technical interpretation of the law.

In common fairness and decency, we owe it to our own citizens and to honest and industrious people who wish to come here from other countries, to change the McCarran Act. We must eliminate those provisions which result in discriminatory treatment against any group or nationality and which impose unnecessary and cruel hardships.

ELIMINATING WASTE AND EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT

I believe that the Government has a positive duty and obligation to perform for the people those services which are essential to the general welfare. As Abraham Lincoln so aptly put it, "The legitimate object of government is to do for the people what needs to be done but which they cannot, by individual effort, do at all or do so well for themselves." At the same time, I have no patience with those who are responsible for waste and mismanagement and excessive red-tape in Government.

Throughout my entire career in the Congress, I have served on the House Committee on Government Operations, which is the watchdog committee over the activities of the executive branch. Our committee has exposed many situations of wasteful expenditures, and has been instrumental in saving the taxpayers many millions, even billions, of dollars.

Recently the Speaker of the House designated me to serve on the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, popularly known as the Hoover Commission. This Commission is investigating, and will recommend to the Congress, improved methods of Government operation.

I shall support every sound proposal for streamlining the Federal Government and for making it more efficient and more economical. I shall oppose any proposals which seek to eliminate essential services or which favor monopolistic exploitation of the public domain or the natural resources owned by all the people.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, there are other important legislative tasks which I expect to discuss with the people of my district from time to time. I wish to say now that I am greatly concerned over the mean and petty spirit of partisanship that seems to inspire so many Government leaders and officeholders. They seek to instill doubt and fear and disunity among our people instead of working for constructive programs that will make our country healthy and strong and prosperous.

From talks with people in my district and from letters they write me, I believe it is fair to say that very few are taken in by political demagogery. They expect their elected representatives to take a reasoned approach to Government and to work constructively for the good of all. I have tried to be faithful to that concept of congressional service.

CONTROL OF THE NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RAILROAD CO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the people of New England are very much

concerned with the persons who control the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. This road is probably the main economic lifeblood of New England. The future of New England depends greatly upon the right type of leadership in control of this company; leadership which has the public interest uppermost in their minds as well as the stockholders.

Operating control of the New Haven Railroad which, under local management, has been making giant strides toward economic recovery, threatens once again to pass into the hands of outsiders.

That would be most harmful to the people of New England.

The present New Haven management, under Frederic C. Dumaine, Jr., has halted a half-century of deficit operations. It is giving the public what it wants—a well-run system of rail transportation.

This welcome change in the character of the New Haven Road has been paying off.

For nearly 50 years the New Haven has been milked and mugged by financial interests having no regard whatever for its service territory nor for the people who live there.

From the time of the Mellon debacle, it has been the victim of a long succession of absentee landlords, bankers' agents, Wall Street holding companies, and court-appointed trustees.

They had a universal remedy for whatever ailed the system. It was to amputate the service and throw away the substance.

What can we expect if the present able management is thrown out and a group of financial manipulators is installed in its place?

It is most alarming to learn from the Interstate Commerce Commission that the Patrick B. McGinnis group, now seeking to wrest the New Haven from the Dumaines, was scathingly criticized by the ICC for the working over it gave the finances of the Norfolk Southern Railway.

Every New Englander, Congressmen and all, should read the devastating report of an ICC investigation, recently published as Docket No. 30980, into the honesty, economy, and efficiency of Norfolk Southern Railway management.

This report is loaded with exposures of questionable practices by the McGinnis management, some in outright defiance of Commission orders, including habitual misuse of company funds for the private transactions of its officers.

The report abounds in descriptions of waste and huge expense accounts. It tells of the organization of curious satellite corporations by company officers and of fringe transactions they made with themselves, as representatives of both.

This duality of interest appears in many phases of the Norfolk Southern investigation but ICC found no trace of objection on the part of the railway's directors, some of whom would now performs the same function on the New Haven.

Only because Norfolk Southern is now in different hands, which have eliminated all objectional practices, did the respondents escape being more seriously dealt with. At it was, a fine was imposed on the railroad following a plea of nolo contendere.

Here, indeed, is a capsule of what may very well befall the New Haven Railroad if McGinnis succeeds in his proxy fight against Dumaine. Heavily backed by Canadian capital, this group is interested chiefly in getting larger immediate financial returns, not necessarily in restoring public confidence in the railroad and the kind of service that will guarantee its own and New England's prosperity.

If the threatened upset of New Haven management takes place, New England's hopes for industrial recovery will receive a body blow.

With control vested in a group whose largest stockholder interest lies north of the border, we shall run a bad second to the plans of any outside banking combine or group.

In such event, because the change will profoundly affect the public interest, which Congress and our Government are sworn to protect, it will become the duty of those of us who represent the New England area to take all necessary steps to investigate this situation from top to bottom.

I will gladly cooperate with any of my colleagues in taking such action as may be necessary to protect in this case the best interest of New England.

The Canadian interest should stop, look, and listen before they take any action which would be contrary to the best interest of New England and for the best interest of the New Haven Railroad. In connection with this, they should give full consideration to public opinion in New England which, based on the fine leadership of Frederic C. Dumaine, Jr., is practically solidly behind him.

Frederic C. Dumaine, Jr., a product of New England, succeeded his father as president of the New Haven in 1951.

Under Frederic C. Dumaine, Jr.'s progressive management, the locomotive power on the New Haven is now entirely electric or diesel.

Many—1,325—units of new equipment have been placed in operation and additional units—284—of necessary equipment have been authorized.

Construction of new warehouse facilities in New York and Boston have been completed which will produce additional freight traffic.

Surplus real estate and old equipment, no longer of use to the road, have been sold.

Other investments, such as station improvements, parking areas, improved roadbeds, and new rail, have been made for the purpose of providing more efficient and economical transportation.

Under his guidance the New Haven has taken an active part in the construction of the new South Boston Market terminal. This terminal attracts additional freight to New England, facilitates the movement of meat products from the supplier to the wholesaler with ultimate distribution to the retailer in an efficient and economic manner. It represented farseeing and courageous leadership. It brings great benefits to the New Haven railroad and at the same time solves the great problem confronting the city of Boston.

Frederic C. Dumaine, Jr., is a throwback to those hardy men who dared, and who decades and even generations ago built New England as a great industrial area.

New England needs the leadership of Frederic C. Dumaine, Jr. We need more men of his type.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of committees under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Messrs. BENTLEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), JENSEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), ROBERTS (at the request of Mr. RAINS), DAVIS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), FALLON (at the request of Mr. GARMATZ), indefinitely, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FINO.

Mr. YOUNGER.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. HELLER in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. RABAUT.

Mr. WILSON of California.

Mr. MULTER in two instances.

Mr. PHILBIN in two instances and to include additional matter.

Mr. DOLLINGER and to include additional matter.

Mrs. HARDEN.

Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. ROONEY to revise and extend the remarks he makes on the State Department appropriation bill tomorrow and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken

from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 235. An act for the relief of Rev. Armando Fuoco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 267. An act for the relief of Pantelis Morfessis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 662. An act for the relief of Julie Nicola Frangou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 740. An act for the relief of Santa Muciaccia (Sister Maria Fridiana), Teresa Saragaglia (Sister Maria Eutropia), and Caterina Isonni (Sister Maria Giovita); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 747. An act for the relief of Jacek Von Henneberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 893. An act for the relief of David T. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 915. An act for the relief of Augusta Bleys (also known as Augustina Bleys); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 924. An act for the relief of Sofia B. Panagoulopoulos Kaneli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 929. An act for the relief of Cleopatra Stavros Millonis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 945. An act for the relief of Moshe Gips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1062. An act for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1209. An act for the relief of Dr. Uheng Khoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1265. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1594. An act for the relief of Berenice Catherine Montgomery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1691. An act to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia, and to cross Kenilworth Avenue NE., in said District, with, certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2534. An act for the relief of Dora Vida Lyew Seixas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2698. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2773. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2937. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing without meeting the requirements of section 15 (8) (b) (ii) of that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6130. An act to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under Lanham War Housing Act.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1160. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Tucson, Ariz., and to accept other land in exchange therefor.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 1, 1954:

H. R. 8069. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

On March 2, 1954:

H. R. 6130. An act to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under Lanham War Housing Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 3, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1315. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 in the amount of $34,541 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 340); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1316. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to repeal section 3 of the act entitled 'An act to adjust the salaries of rural letter carriers, and for other purposes,'" approved June 25, 1934; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 453. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7328. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; without amendment (Rept. No. 1259). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 454. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6788. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1260). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SCHENCK: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 195. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of proceedings at the unveiling of the statue of Dr. Marcus Whitman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1261). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1067. A bill to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make and publish rules for procedure on review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8045. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land located in Windsor Locks, Conn., to the State of Connecticut; without amendment (Rept. No. 1263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 459. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7339, a bill to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1264). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 8149. A bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to the States for surveying the need for diagnostic or treatment centers, for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, for rehabilitation facilities, and for nursing homes, and to provide assistance in the construction of such facilities through grants to public and nonprofit agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8150. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 8151. A bill to expand and extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8152. A bill to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 8153. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the National Encampment of the Sons of Union Veterans to be held in Duluth, Minn., August 8 to August 13, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 8154. A bill to provide for construction of bulletproof, shatterproof glass

screens in the spectator's galleries of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 8155. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1955, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 8156. A bill to provide for entertainment allowance to the chaplain at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 8157. A bill to authorize additional credits in the accounts of certain employees in the civil-service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 8158. A bill to continue authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8159. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing without meeting the requirements of section 15 (8) (b) (ii) of that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 8160. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HARDEN:

H. R. 8161. A bill to provide for a system of turning, starting, and stopping signals for the operation of motor vehicles, and a system of highway signs, to be uniform throughout the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8162. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of postmasters for fixtures and equipment in use at the time of discontinuance of such post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 8163. A bill to provide that equipment for use in post offices shall be furnished by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 8164. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to exempt certain marketing regulations, when issued after the beginning of the marketing season of the commodity concerned, from certain formal requirements of notice and publication; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8165. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, so as to authorize a full and fair hearing of claims when demanded by the applicant; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 8166. A bill to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 8167. A bill to clarify the religious exemption under the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 8168. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize disposal of surplus farm products to Federal, State, and local hospitals and penal and correctional institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 8169. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children through the eighth grade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 8170. A bill to require inside latches on the doors of household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 8171. A bill to provide for the restoration of the U. S. S. *Olympia* and for her disposition to the State of Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 8172. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 8173. A bill to provide that the carrying of a deadly weapon on or about the person in the presence of either House of Congress, or any committee thereof, shall be a felony, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 8174. A bill to promote the agriculture of the United States by acquiring and diffusing useful information regarding agriculture in foreign countries and the marketing of American agricultural commodities, and the products thereof, outside of the United States; to authorize the creation of an Agricultural Foreign Service in the Department of Agriculture; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 8175. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to reduce the "absorption" requirement from 3 percent to 2 percent for small school districts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 8176. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of all persons for damages arising out of the lowering of the water table in the vicinity of Cold Brook Dam, S. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 8177. A bill providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 8178. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the donation of food commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 8179. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 8180. A bill to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers, sailors, and airmen of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 8181. A bill to extend the time within which persons may file for certain compensation benefits under laws administered by the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. J. Res. 460. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 9 as Leif Erickson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. Con. Res. 203. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to conduct an investigation and study of the steps which can be taken to promote the safety of Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. Res. 455. Resolution providing for a referendum on the question of independence for Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. Res. 456. Resolution providing for payment of certain hospital, medical, and nursing expenses; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 457. Resolution providing for investigation of appropriate security measures for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 453. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate the possibility of providing adequate protection for Members of the House, legislative employees, and the visiting public during sessions of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H. R. 8182. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Schober Frugia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 8183. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Ida Geissler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 8184. A bill authorizing and requesting the President to award the Legion of Merit posthumously to Maj. William V. Holohan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 8185. A bill for the relief of Olga I. Papadopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 8186. A bill for the relief of Esther Silvera Escobedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 8187. A bill for the relief of Cecil Edgar Deonarine, Mrs. Gloria Deonarine (nee Ramjattansingh), and Jessel J. Deonarine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 8188. A bill for the relief of B. F. Reames, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 8189. A bill for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Pay of Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the recent statement of the Postmaster General when he said that "the correction of inequities will result in better work performance and greater efficiency." However, I do not believe that he will correct pay inequities by following the recommendations proposed in the report of Fry and Associates, nor, will he get "better work performance and greater efficiency" as a result of the adoption of such a plan.

The new 20 grade pay proposal does not answer nor solve the problem confronting the rank and file postal workers. Under the proposed reclassification scheme and pay increase plan, postal employees will receive an average increase of $200 per year but the great majority of clerks and carriers will average only from $10 to $100 a year. This, to me, represents a token pay raise—and a shameful gesture toward a faithful and devoted group of civil service employees.

This report, in making specific comparisons between postal employees and other non-Federal workers, says that the average weekly earnings of regular clerks and letter carriers are better than the average weekly earnings of large city policemen, firemen, and teachers. The fallacy of such an argument is found in the fact that these city employees are also underpaid and rightfully entitled to substantial pay increases. We also know that these city employees, as well as the Federal postal workers, have been attempting to catch up with the rapid rise in the cost of living.

I believe, and I am sure the Members of Congress agree, that every employee, be he in private industry or Government service should be paid adequate compensation—a salary that will retain his purchasing power parity with his pay check of 1939.

The Postmaster General's proposal fails to meet the dire needs of these postal employees. It offers them no relief from their economic plight. It is unrealistic—inadequate and unfair. It is a shameful attempt under the guise of a pay raise.

These Federal servants are entitled to fair and just treatment at the hands of Congress—it is our duty to see that they get a decent pay raise. We can only attain an efficient and effective postal system through a dedicated and loyal group of postal workers who are treated and paid fairly. That is a solemn responsibility none of us can bypass nor shirk. Let us not fail them in this hour of great need. Let us correct the pay inequities and thereby get "better work performance and greater efficiency."

House Resolution 355

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained by several considerations to vote against this measure.

First, it will without a doubt gravely disturb and imperil the present cordial and amicable relations with our neighbors to the South of the great Republic of Mexico. The passage of the measure at this time will be a direct, official affront to a friendly power of the Western Hemisphere which may well bring unfavorable consequences not only in Mexico but other Central and South American Governments.

The measure would thus inject a jarring and divisive element into our good-neighbor policy and lessen the good will and cooperative spirit so necessary to the development of a proper hemispheric unity to check the conspiracies, infiltrations, and possible aggressions of the Marxist plot against human freedom.

Secondly, there is something besides dollars and cents and material gain and profit involved in this question. Our great farming industry is entitled to every legal assistance in cultivating and harvesting its crops and products. And I would be among the first in wanting this Congress to create the proper climate and conditions which will best promote and encourage the prompt, efficient conduct of this important business.

But that is only one of the considerations facing us here. Before property rights, before business profits, before material gains, this Congress must be concerned with the human rights and needs of the many human beings whose lives, health, and well-being can well be involved in the question of migratory, so-called wetback farm labor. We have a duty, a sacred duty, to protect those of the laboring classes entering this country and unable adequately to protect themselves against the grave injustices of exploitation, underpayment, undernourishment, substandard health and living conditions, and other unwholesome, undesirable, antisocial effects that almost always accompany the padrone-peonage system of indenture which throughout history has been so demoralizing, degrading, and harmful to the human race in its struggle for decent standards of living.

We can recall that in history the same arguments that are advanced today in behalf of this resolution were similarly employed to justify the slave traffic with its debasement of human and spiritual values—a traffic which denied the essential dignity of man and condemned him to be sold and bartered in the market places of exploitation as a common chattel.

Thirdly, the measure will be disruptive of our own American labor supply and conditions, as well as our immigration, tax, and social-security laws. I would not oppose the adoption and implementation of any reasonable arrangement that can be arrived at by and between our Government and the great Government of Mexico. This arrangement should not be unilateral, but bilateral, and mutually and reciprocally expressed and agreed upon as establishing decent terms and conditions and insuring the maintenance of satisfactory and adequate standards.

This Congress should never repudiate the doctrine already written into our laws and already accepted in principle and morality by the American people that the labor of human beings is not a commodity. We must go further and reaffirm the fact that men and women under our Constitution are not mere chattels to be brought and sold but human beings possessed of immortal souls, endowed by the Creator as well as by the laws of this great Nation with inalienable rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—rights of the dignity and worth and freedom of the human personality, rights which guarantee his property and contractual privileges and which differentiate him from the slave.

I will oppose this measure.

California Artichokes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, three adjoining counties in California produce 95 percent of all the artichokes grown in the United States. My colleague from California, Mr. GUBSER, represents two of those counties—Monterey and Santa Cruz—while I have the honor of representing the other—San Mateo. These counties bordering on the Pacific Ocean alone possess the correct soil and climatic condition to produce this fine vegetable.

Here on the east coast we find so many who have never tasted artichokes and those who have eaten them classify them as a luxury. Out our way they are a common, delectable vegetable with unusual iron content. They retail in our section for about 15 cents a piece for the large size while here in Washington its current price is 35 cents. The farmer receives about 12 cents apiece for his choice product.

To land this select vegetable on the east coast in the best edible condition we must use air freight and this ought to be possible so that the retail price here would be within the financial reach of most of our people.

We have received several crates of artichokes via United Airlines freight from Half Moon Bay and Santa Cruz, Calif., and they will be served free in the House restaurant today noon. You are all invited to enjoy this fine vegetable with the compliments of the Half Moon Bay Growers Association and the Santa Cruz Artichoke and Sprout Growers Association.

Sixty-third Anniversary of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body occasionally indulge a colleague when he feels impelled to call their attention to some matter that is of importance to his own legislative district. I hope today the House will bear with me in such an instance. This is an anniversary, and I believe will be celebrated in a most appropriate way, in Bremerton and Kitsap County in the First District of the State of Washington.

Sixty-three years ago this very day Congress authorized the establishment of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton. On this birthday, so to speak, I rise to pay tribute to this naval installation. In so doing I ask leave briefly to recite a few historical incidents in the life of this important defense establishment, which later events have proved to be such a wise creation of Congress.

The interest of the United States Government, and particularly of the United States Navy, in the Bremerton area was manifested early in the history of the Oregon Territory. In 1841 Lt. Charles Wilkes, United States Navy, entered Puget Sound in command of a squadron of American vessels to explore, chart, and gather scientific data for the United States Government. At that time the city of Seattle had not been founded, and the whole of what is now Kitsap County was a forest wilderness inhabited by often hostile Indians.

The next 50 years saw the foundations laid by hardy pioneers for the vibrant and expanding Puget Sound area. The next official Government mission to Puget Sound was the Mahan Commission, sent by the Navy Department in 1888 to locate a drydock somewhere on Puget Sound. The lighthouse tender *Manzanita* carried the Commission whose findings were, unfortunately, delayed in receiving attention. President Harrison, however, shortly after taking office sent the Platt Commission to Puget Sound for the same purpose. The findings of the Mahan Commission were confirmed and Sinclair Inlet, between the present cities of Port Orchard and Bremerton, was selected as the most practicable site for a Government drydock on the sound.

An act of March 2, 1891, authorized the Secretary of the Navy to build a drydock at Bremerton and Port Orchard, Wash., and appropriated the sum of $10,000 for that purpose. Thus the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard was born. In April 1891, Lt. A. B. Wyckoff, United States Navy, came to Puget Sound prepared to purchase land for a United States drydock and to carry out the instructions of Congress, and on September 16, 1891, he took official command of the newly purchased Puget Sound Navy Yard.

Today, therefore, is the 63d anniversary of this farseeing action of that Congress. Those who voted in favor of that humble appropriation would, I venture, today be amazed at the outstanding record of the drydock on Puget Sound since 1891.

The history of the navy yard is intimately connected with the history of Kitsap County. In 1893 Congress again appropriated money for the continuation of the construction of the original drydock, which was not completed until 1896. The country was then passing through the great panic of 1893–96, which struck hard at this new wilderness country. Because the construction of the drydock was considered the end of Government activity in Kitsap County, many of the new community's citizens joined the Alaska goldrush.

Then, in 1898, came the Spanish-American War. The famous old battleship *Oregon* was in the Puget Sound yard at the time, and Government attention focused on the need to protect the yard. The Government bought land in the surrounding area for an Army installation and the present Manchester Oil Depot. Orders came for the *Oregon* to report to the fleet in Cuba, and that historic run around Cape Horn to join the fleet helped call attention to the need of the Panama Canal. The Nation was thrilled by the exploits of the *Oregon* when she avoided the Spanish Fleet and arrived at her destination safely. The Bremerton drydock could well be proud of its part in this great chapter of United States naval history.

The next chapter in the unfolding story of the Puget Sound yard was the period of expansion between the Spanish-American War and World War I. During the first great war the navy yard did yeoman duty. Its payroll was 6,500 in 1918. During the war it had built 25 subchasers, 7 seagoing tugs, 2 minesweepers, 2 ammunition ships, and 1,700 small boats. The U. S. S. *Louisville* was built and commissioned in 1930 at the yard.

When World War II came the Department of the Navy realized Bremerton's potential fully. Activities were at fever pitch. Five of the 8 ships damaged on the "day of infamy"—December 7, 1941—were restored at the yard at a cost of $33 million. During the 44 months of the war the yard fitted, overhauled, or repaired the astounding total of 344 destroyers. Fifty other ships were built or fitted out during this period, which saw the navy yard payroll climb to 34,000 employees.

Since the war, the Puget Sound yard has continued to maintain its key position in the defense of this country. In 1949 the aircraft carrier *Essex* came to Bremerton for overhaul and modernization, and at least six other carriers have since been modernized there, now officially called the United States naval shipyard.

I said at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I believed this anniversary would be celebrated appropriately in Bremerton. By this I refer to the fact that this week, if not this very day, the yard that has established such a proud record, the lead yard in canted-deck design, the public yard which is tops in the Nation, accepts another work challenge in the arrival of the U. S. S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt*. This is the first Midway class carrier to come under the program of modernization.

In a one-industry community this new assignment is an important event to every man, woman, and child. Conscious as we of Kitsap County are of our past history, even more we are concerned with our present responsibility as one of the great navy yards of the United States.

The Members of the House will appreciate what an honor and pleasure it is for me to represent in Congress the community of which the Bremerton Navy Yard is the principal industry.

This afternoon I congratulate and commend those persons, past and present, who have established in this navy yard a unique and splendid record for workmanship, meeting time schedules and last, but not least, efficiency and economy. No public yard surpasses the achievements of Bremerton's skilled workers and supervisors. No group is more determined to maintain their prestige and reputation.

We who legislate in Congress must gain satisfaction that here is an example of effective employment of defense appropriations. On this account I mention this anniversary which, of course, to me personally is an occasion of special pride and satisfaction.

Labor Market Situation in Los Angeles County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, since my remarks here Monday on the employment situation in Los Angeles County, I have received additional data which I am pleased to pass along, namely, that during January 1954 employment in all Los Angeles metropolitan manufacturing industries totaled 636,500 wage and salary workers. This was 3,800 above a year ago, represented the highest January total since World War II, and was 7,100 above the previous month.

I hope this information may help clear the tears from the eyes of some of our solemn, tormented, dispirited, and brooding gloom-shrouded prognosticators of doom.

Postal Employees Are Entitled to Adequate Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement I have submitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, concerning salary increases for postal employees. I trust that we shall soon have the opportunity to vote on this necessary legislation. My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, I urge that you give favorable consideration to the legislation now before you which provides for a pay raise for postal employees.

You are apprised of their sad plight, I know. It is a fact that they cannot exist on their present salaries, that they cannot meet ordinary living expenses. Living costs have reached a new high. Since the postal workers were given their last pay raise, there have been increases in rents, food, and other necessary commodities, and in medical and dental care.

Many hundreds of letters have been sent me indicating the struggle our postal workers and their families are enduring in an effort to make ends meet. The postal workers are forced to seek extra work, outside of their postal jobs, to try to earn a few dollars in order to supplement their income. Wives who can manage to do so must also seek employment in order to help balance the family budget. They have been forced to borrow on their insurance, to go into debt in order to meet family emergencies. Their lives are filled with sacrifices, deprivations, stress, insecurity, and worries.

Postal workers should not have to seek such outside employment—when they have done their day's work for the post office, they should have the reward of a few hours' leisure. Their wives should not be overburdened and made to seek outside work when they have a full-time job in caring for the home and children.

We find that postal workers and their dependents have suffered a tremendous drop in their standard of living. At the same time, productivity of post-office employees has greatly increased. It is only fair that they should benefit as a result of their industry and their interest in giving their best efforts to the postal service.

Another important point to be considered is that years ago, the postal service was considered to be a desirable working career. Today, conditions have so changed that a man who wishes to provide his family and himself with a decent standard of living cannot afford to enter the postal service. Furthermore, many valued and trained postal employees are leaving the service for jobs in private industry because they are forced to seek more pay. The postal service, so necessary and important to every person in the United States, is losing large numbers of trained workers and is suffering as a result. Unless adequate pay is offered its employees it will be unable to attract desirable and faithful workers and hold them.

The postal worker needs help now. He is entitled to a living wage for the services he performs. To insure his efficiency and well-being he must be given the assistance he deserves.

It is our duty to provide adequate pay for our postal workers. The very least we should give him is an $800 per year wage increase—anything less would be woefully inadequate and unacceptable. I urge the committee to approve the $800 increase as provided in H. R. 2344.

I trust this committee will give Members of Congress the opportunity to vote for the long overdue pay raise without further delay.

City of Chicago Has a Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of this week, March 4, the city of Chicago will be 117 years old. I am sure that our colleagues from other cities and other States will join with the Chicago delegation in sending happy birthday greetings.

In 117 years we have come a long way. On March 4, 1837, when the Illinois Legislature at Vandalia granted Chicago a charter as a city, the population was 4,170. There were 450 buildings, such as they were, including 12 hotels, 10 taverns, and 5 churches. When it rained the streets became mud puddles and wagons sunk deep in the goo.

In August of 1833 Chicago had been incorporated as a town under the government of a board of nine trustees. Under the charter of March 4, 1837, she became a real city, the village board of trustees giving place to a mayor and 10 aldermen.

William B. Ogden, a lawyer from New York, was elected the first mayor. Some of the aldermen thought it unfair the mayor should be paid an annual salary of $500 while there was no provision for aldermanic salaries. One of the duties of the mayor was to serve as fire warden with the responsibility of keeping idle and suspicious persons from the scene of fires. Aldermen also had their work cut out for them, one of their duties being the jailing of rogues, vagabonds, and stragglers. The city quickly adopted a motto, "Urbs in Horto," a city set in a garden.

The district which I represent in this body is all within the present city of Chicago. It includes the great University of Chicago, the Kenwood and Hyde Park sections, the South Shore Country Club, and the beautiful drive along the south shore of Lake Michigan. It includes the Woodlawn, Windsor Park, the Avalon Park, and the Chatham Fields districts. It is a district of beautiful homes, of fine hotels, imposing apartment buildings, and of churches and synagogues. In 1837 when Chicago received her charter as a city the southern limits were at 22d Street, which was more than 2 miles north of where the present Second District begins.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Chicago has come far in 117 years. All America well may rejoice with us on this natal anniversary because the growth of Chicago in size, prestige, moral and cultural strength has made a contribution of incalculable magnitude to the march of destiny of the United States of America.

Tax Exemption Should Be Raised to $800

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the House Ways and Means Committee has completed a revision of our tax laws, which will shortly be brought before Congress for consideration. We have been told that certain inequities have been removed and that substantial rate reductions have been made in the tax laws.

It was to be hoped that the individual taxpayers, particularly the low-income taxpayers, would be granted a fair share of these reductions. Unfortunately, this is not the case. The reductions proposed in the revised tax laws will benefit primarily big business, but not the wage earner, nor the individual taxpayer of low income. A few minor relief provisions for individuals are contained in the new tax proposals, such as allowances for baby-sitting and a larger allowance for medical deductions, which will benefit the average taxpayer about $6 per year.

The administration's tax proposals, however, would grant considerable tax relief to business in the sum of $1.8 billion, and a tax saving of $1.2 billion to stockholders on their dividend receipts. Thus a very small percentage of our population, perhaps no more than 1 or 2 percent, would benefit to the tune of $3 billion annually.

Aside from the fact that this is gross discrimination and unjust to millions of low-income families, it is also dangerous at a time when unemployment has become a serious factor and the threat of a depression is staring us in the face. In a recent letter addressed to President Eisenhower, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS, stated that a reduction in taxes granted to the upper-income groups and business corporations would probably stimulate savings on their part, but it would not expand production or help increase employment. Senator DOUGLAS said:

To prevent the recession from deepening into a depression, it is, therefore, far better to stimulate consumption than it is savings. The idea of giving tax relief only to business and investors as a stabilizing force is simply the old trickle down theory, or what is good for business is good for the country. Such policies, followed in the twenties, ended up with the greatest depression this Nation ever had.

Mr. Speaker, it is a simple fact that if people will have the money to buy the goods and services they need, business will have the markets, production will increase and people will have jobs. Evidently, the administration's tax planners in Congress fail to understand this simple fact, for if they did they would not show favoritism toward the upper income strata and ignore the low-income taxpayers.

It is for these reasons that the Democrats in Congress are sponsoring a bill to raise income tax exemptions from

$600 to $700. This is the very least that should be done for the lower income taxpayers, but actually it is not enough. I should like to see that exemption increased to $800 for each taxpayer and each dependent this year, and to $1,000 next year. For the average worker it would mean about $3 more each week in his pay envelope this year, and about twice that amount next year. This is the kind of tax revision our country needs today.

Mr. Speaker, ever since I came to Congress I have been a strong advocate of tax reduction. Last July, shortly before the 1953 session of Congress was adjourned, I stated on the floor of the House:

> There has been much talk of reducing taxes and balancing the national budget. Despite their promises to do both, the Republicans have not been able to keep their promises. * * * It has always been my view that we should grant tax exemptions to the low-income groups and place the greater burden of taxation on the higher-income groups and big business.

Mr. Speaker, in line with these views I was always opposed to a general sales tax because I felt that the low-income people would be hit the hardest. I supported repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on theater admissions, furs, cosmetics, liquor, leather goods and other articles. I favored continuation of the excess profits tax on the big corporations. I also introduced several tax-relief bills, including a bill to provide for a deduction up to $1,000 for the education of a dependent child, and a bill granting a special deduction in income taxes to working mothers who must provide care for their children.

The House Ways and Means Committee in its revision of our tax laws chose to ignore the low-income groups and refused to grant tax relief where the need is the greatest. It is up to us to act immediately in behalf of these people.

Israel Returns Shipwrecked Lebanese Sailors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a Lebanese vessel capsized on January 20, 1954, near the Israel coast at Caesarea. Three of its crew of four succeeded in reaching the shore. Israel immediately notified the Lebanese authorities and returned the three sailors the following day.

This is in sharp contrast to the illegal detention of three Israel citizens imprisoned by the Iraq authorities after the plane in which they were traveling from Cyprus to Iran had made a forced landing in Baghdad last January. The British plane was released to its owner. The Israel citizens are still in prison, though charged with no crime.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an excellent article by Mr. J. Hugh Bolton, president of the Whitin Machine Works, Whitinsville, Mass., which recently appeared in the Whitin Review.

Mr. Bolton has admirably outlined the impact of the reciprocal trade agreements upon many of our industries. There can be no doubt that in operation these agreements are raising havoc with many American industries and this deplorable situation is greatly augmented by the recessionary trends that are presently appearing in many parts of our economy.

Beyond a doubt, a large number of our industries are finding it increasingly more difficult to operate at a profit because of cutthroat competition from the flood of cheaply produced foreign goods coming into the American market. This is the situation that I have found compelling reasons to protest on previous occasions. Frankly, if we cannot find some way to put an end to this cutthroat competition from abroad, many American industries and American men and women will be the victims of this most unsound and unwise policy.

Moreover, if certain of the affected industries are forced out of business there will, undoubtedly, be very grave effects upon our productive system in the event of war and that is also a very disturbing factor.

The slogan in some places has been "Trade not aid" but, actually, under the existing program, many foreign nations are getting both trade and aid. It is both our export and domestic markets that are feeling very serious consequences under the operation of these laws. I am very fearful that, unless both the Congress and executive branch of the Government can find some way to bring about an adjustment of the trade treaties and, thus, prevent the heavy influx of cheap foreign goods, there will inevitably be a more extensive business recession in many parts of the country and with consequent unemployment of our faithful workers.

I think we all want to be realistic and helpful in our international relations and desire to embrace a well-thought-out program of sincere international cooperation. But that should not entail, and must not result, in further damage to our own industrial structure and further reduction in the employment of our own American citizens. Our very generous aid, combined with the trade treaties, may be producing employment in foreign nations, but they are producing business stagnation and unemployment here, and that we should not tolerate.

For this economy to try to compete with foreign nations, which are dumping cheap goods into our own Nation, while they effect blocked exchange, export subsidies, and high-tariff barriers for their own industries, will ultimately mean that we will lose markets, not only at home, but abroad, and suffer severe economic repercussions destructive to our prosperity and full-time employment.

Mr. Bolton's article is a challenging, thoughtful warning to the administration and the Congress to take immediate stock of the unhappy results of the reciprocal trade agreements and act to revise and change them before they inflict greater and perhaps irreparable damage upon many basic American industries.

His article follows:

> The attitude of our State Department in connection with reciprocal trade agreements has bothered me for a long time. Now, of course, the hue and cry is for "trade, not aid," in order to accomplish which, our tariff barriers should be removed so that those countries who have been receiving dollar aid would be able to ship their goods and services to this country with no tariff restrictions. This, believe it or not, is referred to in a great many quarters as free trade. Nothing at all is ever said about these same countries removing their tariff and licensing restrictions against Amercan products, nor is it even suggested that easy convertibility of their currency to dollars might be put into effect.
>
> I am utterly opposed to the State Department's attitude because of the possible terrific impact on American industry and, hence, the possibility of very materially decreased employment and decreased living standards in our country.
>
> Two years ago a great many major industries in America would have disagreed with me. Even now the automobile industry and certain others have formed the Coleman committee to fight for the elimination of tariffs. I am very pleased to have learned quite recently that large segments of other major industries in this country are now awakening to the fact that if this policy is pursued further, or even continued in the status quo, there is grave danger to American industry. I am happy to see this situation develop because, if there is enough pressure brought to bear by sufficient number of informed individuals, I am sure that something can and will be done about it.
>
> Even the advocates of no tariff admit that certain industries would be very badly hurt. These industries, therefore, are considered expendable and all sorts of schemes are being cooked up whereby the Government will subsidize the workers who lose their jobs until such time as other work can be found for them. The way things are shaping up at the moment this could represent a pretty fair sized number of workers now gainfully employed.
>
> Nothing is said about the inherent danger in the event of war that might result from industries so eliminated. If we depend too much upon outside sources for certain of our raw materials, heavy machinery and even textiles, it would easily be seen that we could find ourselves in dire straits if these sources were cut off.
>
> The United States cannot afford to lose any of its industries. I admit that it is essential that we have a prosperous Europe, including Great Britain, but I am very strongly of the opinion that it would be suicide, both for ourselves and Europe, to build them up at the expense of American industry and enterprise.
>
> Some of the things that have been happening simply make your blood run cold. For example, this country gives outright grants in dollars to foreign governments in order to help them build up their industrial

potential. These same foreign governments would like to buy American machinery with their dollar grants but the United States State Department representatives deny them that privilege and insist that they purchase their needed heavy equipment from other foreign countries. That, of course, directly affects our own export markets.

Another thing we have been faced with is the fact that almost without exception European governments subsidize exports in one way or another. That also makes for exceedingly difficult competition. In spite of that, we have been willing to take our chances as long as our domestic market was not attacked with low-priced subsidized machinery. Now that that is being done, and is likely to be done on an even vaster scale, the time really has come when we have to fight.

Col. Phyllis D. S. Gray and Col. Irene Galloway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, the new Director of Women in the Air Force is Col. Phyllis D. S. Gray. Colonel Gray served formerly as the WAF Staff Director in Europe.

Women in the armed services have performed a great service for their country. The many skills and occupations which they have filled have released many men for more urgent missions. Today, the women in the Army, Navy, and Air Force are recognized as an integral part of the Military Establishment. These women in effect represent the women of our Nation in the armed services; through them the American homes are receiving word of life in the armed services from other than the masculine viewpoint.

To direct these activities and to successfully administer a program with such responsibility is a grave undertaking. The WAF Director is charged on the one hand with efficient participation in the Air Force program and on the other with capable and understanding solicitude for the members of these military women groups.

During the 82d Congress various subcommittees traveled abroad and brought back the reports on the fine work performance of these women in our armed services. Colonel Gray in the Air Force and WAC Colonel Irene Galloway of the Army were highly commended in their duties at that time.

The true evaluation of a job well done is not generally by record review but by judging the effects in the field. It is not ascertained by questioning the top level in authority. It is more easily ascertained by evaluating the effect of the top level policy as applied in the field. The leaders of these women groups have had the experience in the field in implementing policy and, based on their experience and training, will, without doubt, be capable of evolving a policy for their service which will maintain the high standards presently enjoyed by the women in the Army and Navy and Air Force.

Promotion from within the organization is the greatest builder of morale. The nominations of Colonels Gray and Galloway, I am sure, will be a source of inspiration to the women in the ranks. The women Directors will, I am certain, carry in mind always the lessons that they learned on their way to the top.

I know that the membership of the House wishes Colonels Gray and Galloway well in their new undertakings.

Salary Increases for Postal and Classified Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a recent comparison of living standards of various groups of American employees clearly show that classified civil service and postal workers were "low men on the totem pole" financially.

The comparative chart, appearing in a national magazine, showed that Federal workers in these categories had less purchasing power, when wage rates and taxes were adjusted, than in 1939. Surely it is not the intent of the Federal Government to keep its own employees in such an unfavorable comparative position.

Federal service suffers when wage rates are kept appreciably below those of outside employment. High turnover of workers, because of low pay, results in an increased cost of training new workers, morale problems, and inefficient service to the public. The Eisenhower administration is demanding more efficiency of its Federal workers in an admirable attempt to reduce the total cost of Government. It will get more efficiency with more realistic pay scales.

Federal employment is declining rather than increasing, as over the past two decades. With the decline in total numbers of Federal employees, we are going to need a better trained and better motivated hard corps of classified civil service and postal workers to carry out the demands of new management.

The best means of getting full efficiency from the vast corps of Federal workers is through a pay raise that will bring them more in line with similar outside employment. While it is true that adjustments need to be made on some sort of a sliding scale to provide adequate compensation for increased responsibilities, within the service, it seems to me that we need a substantial minimum pay raise for all classified and postal employees to help compensate for the basic cost of living increases that have plagued them since the last pay adjustment was made several years ago.

I have found many postal and classified Federal workers in serious financial trouble. A great number of them have wives and children working to help make ends meet. They have no one to turn to but Congress, which holds the purse strings on their very existence. I urge you to give serious consideration to a substantial pay increase immediately.

Postal Pay Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service urging postal pay increases:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to appear before the committee on behalf of our loyal postal employees who I believe to be most deserving of a substantial increase in compensation.

The postal employees in my district in Los Angeles County, Calif., have consistently felt the pressure of increased living costs and it is indeed difficult for them to provide their families with the bare necessities of living. As you all know, it is necessary for many of such employees to seek outside employment in order to properly care for their wives and children. From the letters I have received from my constituents, and to my own personal knowledge, there are numerous hardship cases ahong our postal employees due to the present inadequate wage scale. Of course this means that the lower bracket employees are feeling the pressure the hardest.

The testimony before the committee for several years past has established the fact that it would require between a 20 and 25 percent salary increase to bring the postal employees income up to a rate paralleling the increased cost of living.

There are many bills pending before the committee proposing various increases for postal employees. I have always supported reasonable and just benefits for the employees of our postal service, and I am again most anxious to see them treated justly, and I hope that the committee in its wisdom will decide on an adequate increase which will enable these employees to meet their necessary obligations and save something for the future.

We all know that the Post Office Department is continuously losing employees to private industry where they secure wages more in line with the increased cost of living. The turnover in this service has reached a startling proportion due entirely, in my opinion, to the inadequacy and unattractiveness of the compensation in the postal service, and the working conditions. The process of constantly training new employees certainly does not increase the efficiency of the postal service, in which we have all taken such just pride throughout the years.

In spite of the hardships experienced by these loyal postal employees, that have certainly not been eased by the recent orders of the Postal Department in curtailing deliveries to one a day and in making our letter carriers virtual door-to-door bill passers, they place their faith in the Congress which I trust will not let them down.

In my judgment, a pay raise is long overdue for our deserving postal employees and I trust the committee will promptly and favorably report a substantial increase in their compensation.

It is my understanding that this committee is also to consider other Federal employee pay-raise proposals at a later date. In my opinion, favorable consideration should most certainly also be given to their requests, for I feel our Government's service generally has suffered greatly due to the inadequacy and unattractiveness of Federal pay scales.

House Resolution 438, To Expand Investigation of Communist Domination, Should Be Unanimously Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] for introducing House Resolution 438, which, I understand, is scheduled for action in the near future.

This resolution, to expand the scope of the present committee, would authorize, first, a full and complete investigation of the seizure and forced incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the treatment of these Baltic peoples during and following that seizure and incorporation; and, second, to investigate and report the subversion and destruction of free institutions and human liberties in all other areas under Communist control and domination, including the treatment of the people in such areas.

Unfortunately, there appear to be a great many people, including responsible heads of States, who seem not to understand the terrible implications of the Communist threat to freedom and to liberty. Unfortunately, there appear to be a great many who do not really believe that the Communist methods embrace persecution, terrorization, and cruel tyranny to attain their objectives.

It is indeed axiomatic that the truth encourages and preserves freedom and liberty. For those who are still in ignorance and in darkness in our time, and for those who will come after us and face new problems concerning freedom and further threats to liberty, the true historical record of what actually happened in these suffering nations must be written. The facts must be completely set down. They must be verified, so that the case against communism will be overwhelmingly convincing.

On various ceremonial days of the year, meaning so much to the peoples of Lithuania, Poland, Latvia, Estonia, and all the others that are suffering the sharp heel of Communist barbarism, we make dutiful pledges to help. Up to this time, I am sorry to say, there has been little sign of any concrete supporting action.

I believe firmly that this resolution is the first realistic step in carrying out our promises. Communist propaganda has enslaved people with lies and deceit. We must help to liberate them with truth, but first we must have the determination and the facilities to get the facts from those who have suffered from the cruelties of communism so that the power of world opinion and cooperative action will guarantee its defeat.

The searchlight of careful and probing investigation, under the wide scope of this resolution, will reveal the truth of Communist crimes to the Christian world and, God willing, advance the day of liberation for millions of persecuted, suffering people. I earnestly hope this resolution will be unanimously approved at the appropriate time.

Veterans and the Interest Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under present law, veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict are entitled to the benefits of the Government loan-guaranty program. This program provides that the Government shall guarantee loans made by private lenders to veterans for the purchase of a home. The guaranty may be for 60 percent of the loan, up to a maximum of $7,500. On loans other than home loans the Veterans' Administration guarantees the lender against loss up to 50 percent of the loan, with a maximum guaranty of $4,000 on real estate and $2,000 on non-real estate. Lenders are now permitted to charge a maximum interest rate of 4½ percent on guaranteed loans.

In addition to these guaranteed loans, direct Federal loans are available to veterans who live in the smaller towns and rural areas where loans from private investors are not available. These loans are also subject to a maximum of 4½ percent interest.

The original acts providing for veterans' loans—namely, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952—permitted a maximum interest rate of 4 percent to be charged on guaranteed and direct loans. It is my view that the 4½-percent rate allowable now should be reduced by legislation to a maximum of 4 percent.

By reducing the interest rate to 4 percent we would return to veterans the opportunity to obtain mortgage financing on liberal terms and at low interest costs. Low-cost financing was the original purpose of the acts providing for these loans to veterans; however, since May 1953 the veteran has been required to pay a 4½-percent interest rate.

The Veterans' Administrator was granted discretion by Public Law 901, 80th Congress, to increase the interest rate on guaranteed loans to a maximum of 4½ percent, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, if the loan market demanded it. By Public Law 101, 83d Congress, approved on July 1, 1953, the Administrator was granted authority to raise the interest rate on direct loans to a maximum of 4½ percent.

This additional one-half percent means approximately $640 additional cost on a $10,000 loan for 20 years and about $1,070 additional on a 30-year loan. Similarly, on a $20,000 loan the veteran must pay approximately $1,320 additional on a 20-year loan and about $2,140 additional on a 30-year loan. This means that tens of thousands of veterans' families, who can ill afford to do so, must find ways and means to bear the additional cost of home ownership over a period of 2 or 3 decades. The hardship on these veterans and their families is quite clear. The extra one-half percent may mean in many instances the difference between buying a decent home or remaining in a filthy dilapidated hovel to raise one's family.

There will be some, however, who will say that at 4 percent adequate funds would not be forthcoming from lenders. They will claim that this situation was the principal factor responsible for the increase of the rate to 4½ percent in May 1953. However, these dissenters perhaps fail to realize that the conditions of the money market have changed since that time. Prior to May 1953 mortgage financing was not forthcoming from lenders because competing investments were yielding more attractive interest rates. Since that time there has been a close coordination between the Treasury debt management policy and an easier credit policy of the Federal Reserve System.

As a result interest rates have declined and mortgage credit has become more available. The February issue of Economic Indicators, prepared by the Council of Economic Advisers, shows a decline in interest rates from June 1953 to February 9, 1954, in corporate high-grade bonds from 3.40 to 2.94, and in United States long-term bonds from 3.09 for old series and 3.29 for new series to 2.59 for the old series and 2.86 for the new series. There has been a decline also in short-term prime commercial paper and a drastic decline in 3-month Treasury bills—the latter reaching a rate of less than 1 percent which is the lowest level in 4½ years.

Another reason for advocating a reduction in the interest rate is that a return of 4 percent to lenders of veterans' loans should be sufficient in view of the reduced risk to the lender. On this point the American Veterans' Committee in its recommendations before a congressional committee for the improvement of the veterans' home loan guaranty program had this to say:

Coming to the question of the interest rate, we think that 4 percent is a very high rate inasmuch as the element of risk is removed by the Government guaranty of the mortgage. * * * This is, of course, where the real cost of the house appears. We think all efforts to increase the interest rate above 4 percent must be resisted and that no statutory authority must be granted further. (U. S. Congress; House Select Com-

mittee To Investigate Education, Training, and Loan Guaranty Programs Under GI Bill, Veterans' Loan Guaranty Program, Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1952, p. 149. (82d Cong. 2d sess., H. Rept. No. 2501).)

Statistics show that since 1944, when the loan guaranty program was begun, the Veterans' Administration had guaranteed by the end of 1953 nearly 3,200,000 loans for homes having a value in excess of $21,500,000,000, of which the Veterans' Administration guaranteed more than $11,500,000,000—New York Times, January 3, 1954, page 58. Of these loans less than 0.6 of 1 percent have resulted in payment of the guaranty through default. In view of this record of safety, surely the veterans are justified in claiming that 4 percent interest is a sufficiently liberal price to pay for a loan where the risk of default is so small and where the Federal Government guarantees the mortgage.

Finally, a very important and very timely reason for reducing the interest rate to 4 percent is that of offsetting the present economic recession. Many economists and others point out that we are in a recessionary period and they are suggesting methods of preventing a full depression. One of the most effective ways suggested thus far to prevent a depression is to encourage or to create the incentive to invest and consume. Lowering the interest rate on loans could prove to be a potent force in encouraging many veterans to invest in housing, whereas at the higher interest rates such investments may be discouraged.

Any increase in the borrowing by veterans could make idle funds held by lending institutions available to builders so that they in turn could buy more materials and, thereby, create more consumer income and employment. Furthermore, reduction of the interest rate to 4 percent would leave in the hands of the veterans more money for consumption. Additional purchasing power in a period of recession, especially among the low and middle income groups, would certainly prove to be a stimulant to the Nation's economy.

In summary then, the reduction to 4 percent of the present 4½ percent interest rate that may be charged on Government guaranteed and direct Federal loans to veterans is strongly urged for the following three major reasons: First, it would return to the veteran the opportunity for low-cost mortgage financing in accordance with the purpose of the loan guaranty program; second, the rate of return to the lenders should be sufficient in view of the fact that the risk to the lender is virtually eliminated; and, third, it could be an important instrument in offsetting the economic recession at this time.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I am today introducing a bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to reduce from 4½ percent to 4 percent the maximum interest rate on home loans made, guaranteed, or insured under that act. My bill relates to home loans only, that is, loans for repairing, altering, improving, constructing, or purchasing homes. It provides that the VA Administrator must set the interest rate on home loans guaranteed or insured under the act at no higher than 4 percent. Section 2 of my bill makes a corresponding change in the interest rate for direct home loans made by the Veterans' Administration.

The text of my bill is as follows:

A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to reduce from 4½ percent to 4 percent, the maximum interest rate on home loans made, guaranteed, or insured under that act

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso of section 500 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended by striking out "not in excess of 4½ percent per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof "not in excess of 4 percent per annum in the case of any loan guaranteed under section 501, or any loan guaranteed under section 502 the proceeds of which are to be used for repairing, altering, constructing, or improving any farmhouse, and not in excess of 4½ percent per annum in the case of other loans."

SEC. 2. Section 512 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended by striking out "4½ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "4 percent."

Increased Pay for Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, these days we are hearing a great deal about salary increases, and I should like at this time to present to our colleagues my views with respect to pending legislation providing additional compensation for postal and Federal workers.

We all know what has happened to our cost of living and that it has been steadily rising for the past year. Employees of the postal service, and for that matter, all Government employees, are finding it impossible to meet this rising cost of living with their inadequate salaries.

I will not quote figures, for I am sure that is not necessary. I am also sure you are all familiar with the changing condition of our economy since July 1, 1951, when Government employees received their last pay increase.

I should, however, like to call your attention to the fact that employees are going into debt to maintain their families. To buy the necessities, food, clothing, provide medical care, and shelter, many employees have found it necessary to take a second job to supplement their Government salaries. In some families, the wives have had to seek employment.

I urge that this Congress enact legislation now to grant its loyal and efficient civil servants a substantial pay increase. I feel that it is the minimum obligation of this Congress. We neglect that obligation if we do not give these workers sufficient compensation with which to maintain a decent standard of living.

A Better and Broader Social-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on April 5 I appeared before the House Committee on Ways and Means to speak certain of my thoughts on how to broaden and improve the effect of the old-age and survivors' insurance program, as proposed in H. R. 7199, better known in everyday parlance as a bill to amend the Social Security Act.

At that time I told the committee that for some while all of us, legislator and laborer, window washer and white-collar worker, have been aware that a change for the better is needed. This is certainly so if the benefits received by our senior citizens today and in the years to come under the program are to fall more closely in line with the realities of our present-day economic structure, and to reflect our concern for the requirements of ordinary day-to-day living.

I reminded the committee members that on January 13 of this year I had joined together with a number of my Democratic colleagues in endorsing what was conceived to be the minimum social insurance program which would meet the needs of the American people. It included the following seven recommendations:

First. The more than 10 million persons who are now without basic retirement and survivors' protection should be included in the social security insurance program.

Second. The Federal Government should continue to contribute to the States for old-age assistance payments to those persons outside the insurance system.

Third. The present $75 limitation on monthly earnings should be increased to $100.

Fourth. Benefits should be payable to workers who become permanently and totally disabled, with waiver of premiums.

Fifth. The monthly benefit payments should be increased because of higher living costs.

Sixth. The present base of $3,600 on which contributions are collected and benefits are paid should be increased to at least $4,800.

Seventh. We favor retaining the 2 percent contribution which went into effect January 1, 1954.

I feel that the bill H. R. 7199, under consideration by the committee, meets some of the recommendations made in our January 13 memorandum. On some other counts, it falls short.

Before considering particular aspects of this proposed legislation it is well to refresh our memories as to the nature and ultimate purpose of social-security legislation. The old-age and survivors insurance plan is intended to provide

minimum protection against the economic hazards caused by wage loss resulting from retirement or death during retirement. Benefits in individual cases may greatly exceed actual contributions or may not equal the amounts paid in. This protection is unlike that provided by private annuity insurance which pays automatically upon the attainment of a specified age. Accordingly, the costs of social insurance protection are considerably lower than any other comparable plan.

Under H. R. 7199, if an individual's earnings for a full year of 12 months are not more than $1,000, no deductions from benefits are made because of such earnings. The bill should, in my considered judgment, be increased to a $1,200 maximum, computed on a yearly basis to provide the greatest effective flexibility.

The upshot of this is that an individual could, without losing benefits under the act, earn what he wished during any period of a given year, no matter how short the period, nor how large the amount, so long as his total earnings for that year did not exceed the $1,200 maximum.

As one of those who, since its beginning has consistently supported social-security legislation, has studied its worthwhileness, and has supported vigorously any proposed extension of coverage and improvements in benefits to meet shifting economic conditions, I feel the above suggested provision a necessary one, and have urged its inclusion in the bill under consideration.

H. R. 7199, as propounded, also amends the Internal Revenue Code to conform the provisions of the code to the change in earnings base from $3,600 to $4,200. What this means is that, for purposes of determining future benefits under the act, only the first $4,200 of an individual's salary will be taken into consideration as a basis for premium deductions and benefits.

My idea of it is that the maximum figure should be raised to $4,800.

Under today's inflated economy and sky-rocketing prices, the social-security dollar will not do the job it was originally meant to do; it does not afford the minimum protection which it was originally meant to provide. To meet this increased cost of living we must raise the maximum earnings base, in line of course, with the soundest fiscal policy and in keeping with the self-supporting character of the program.

Actually, to do this on the basis of comparative figures of 17 years ago, at the inception year of this program, we could well raise the earnings base several thousand dollars above its present level.

Those who have in the past resisted this increase in the earnings base would be well advised, in the light of patent economic and cost of living considerations, to adopt a more realistic view toward its enactment on behalf of old-age insurance recipients.

It must be remembered that the duty of the employee to provide his honest day's work, steadily, through a lifetime of toil, and ever to look toward his own retirement security, is no less an exacting and binding one than the obligation of employer and Government, acting together, to help provide a decent, honorable standard of living for that employee. This, not only while he works, but for so long as he lives, and to provide for his widow and children.

Millions of Americans have a stake, direct and personal, in the social-security system. Yet, as we know, it is meant merely to augment, not to substitute for pensions, private savings, and insurance protection. It was meant, as has often been said, to provide a foundation upon which these forms of protection can be soundly built.

We also realize that in affairs of state and of personal life we must be just before being generous. But what greater justice can there be than a generosity toward our old folk and their families and loved ones which a liberal, intelligent and actuarially sound social-security program will provide.

Let us set out to buttress that foundation. Let us take care that in this Nation, upon which a kindly providence has lavished the richest treasures of the earth, none will lack adequate old-age protection or fail for want of assistance in the declining years of life.

California Artichokes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1954

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from California [Mr. YOUNGER] in calling the attention of this House and, indeed, the Nation, to the California artichoke. While this noble vegetable is usually called the true or French artichoke, to distinguish it from lesser varieties, we can safely call it the California artichoke in view of the fact that 90 percent or more of the acreage producing it on the North American Continent is located in California. Of this, the counties of Santa Cruz and San Mateo, respectively, represented by myself and by my colleague, Mr. YOUNGER, provide the lion's share.

It is remarkable that this table delicacy is still virtually unknown on the dinner tables of the eastern seaboard and the vast Midwest of our country when references to artichokes are ample in English literature as far back as the early 16th century, and artichokes themselves were table fare in England ever since Henry the Eighth introduced them from the Continent.

Mr. Speaker, with the kind cooperation of our growers' associations, and the efficient service of United Airlines, all comers will be able to sample artichokes at the House restaurant tomorrow. California is proud to thus demonstrate one of its outstanding agricultural products.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, March 1, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Master of mankind: Turning away from distracting contentions which hedge our daily way, and from all which is of the earth earthy, we would for this moment of vision look up to the sky above and see plainly Thy pillar of cloud and of fire ever leading us on. In the midst of the timely we would begin the day with a consciousness of the timeless. We would hush all other voices now but the one voice in the silence reminding us that the eternal God is our refuge and that underneath are the everlasting arms.

Make us vividly aware of how inconsequential our individual lives are, except as they become channels for Thy purpose and Thy will. To this end, empty our spirits of all ill will that corrodes and corrupts. Make us rich in the treasures of faith and love that thieves cannot steal nor rust decay. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 2, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 355) amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. CLEVENGER, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. THOMAS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 196) providing for the printing of proceedings at the unveiling of the statue of

Dr. Marcus Whitman, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed with illustrations and bound, in such style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, the proceedings in Congress at the unveiling in the rotunda, together with such other matter as the joint committee may deem pertinent thereto, upon the occasion of the acceptance of the statue of Marcus Whitman, presented by the State of Washington, 5,000 copies; of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and for the use and the distribution by the Senators from Washington; and the remaining 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and for the use of and the distribution by the Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer, who shall provide suitable illustrations to be bound with these proceedings.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1160) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Tucson, Ariz., and to accept other land in exchange therefor, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I was designated last week by the Vice President as 1 of the 2 congressional advisers to attend the conference at Caracas, Venezuela. I did not go then, but I expect to leave tomorrow. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the sessions of the Senate during my attendance on that conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CASE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations may be permitted to meet this afternoon. I have discussed the matter with the minority leader, and I have been informed that the minority members of the subcommittee are agreeable to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AUDIT REPORT ON VETERANS' CANTEEN SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Veterans' Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Frank Ramos-Ramos from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on January 15, 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reason for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate telegrams and cablegrams in the nature of petitions from Felipe N. Torres, member of the Assembly of the State of New York, Ted Vidal, of San Juan, the Republican Party of Puerto Rico, San Juan, the Railroad Workers Union of Puerto Rico, San Juan, the Most Sovereign Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Puerto Rico, the Chamber of Commerce of San Juan, the chairman of the Puerto Rican Housing Authority, San Juan, the acting postmaster of San Juan, the board of commissioners, and the administrative board of San Juan, the city manager of San Juan, and the board of directors, Club Deportivo of Ponce, all in Puerto Rico, condemning the action of certain persons in attempting to assassinate Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Putnam County Citizens for TVA, Cookeville, and resolutions of the commissioners of the city of Cookeville, and the Quarterly Court of Putnam County, all in the State of Tennessee, endorsing the TVA, and recommending to the President and Congress that TVA appropriations be made available to carry out planned expansion of this great program. Both of these items merit the consideration of all thinking Americans.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOKEVILLE, TENN., *January 26, 1954.*

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: Enclosed please find copies of resolutions adopted by the commissioners of the city of Cookeville and by the Quarterly Court of Putnam County, and forwarded to the President concerning TVA. It was the expressed desire of these groups that the resolutions be also sent to our very able Senators and Congressmen in order that you might know that we are completely with you in your efforts on behalf of TVA and that we desire to be of some help if possible.

We realize that you and your Tennessee colleagues are fighting a hard and difficult battle and are leaving no stones unturned in your fight for this worthy cause.

I am also happy to advise you that the following civic and service organizations of Putnam County have adopted similar resolutions that have been forwarded to the President: Business and Professional Women's Club; Cookeville Lions Club; Veterans of Foreign Wars, Cookeville Post No. 6296; American Legion Post No. 46, Cookeville, Tenn.; Disabled American Veterans, Silver Star Chapter No. 11.

Other organizations are following suit.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD L. MITCHELL,
Organizing Chairman, Putnam County Citizens for TVA.
WESLEY P. FLATT, JR.,
Cochairman.

Whereas the economic life of Cookeville, Putnam County, and the upper Cumberland area of Tennessee is dependent upon the TVA and will grow or decline as TVA grows or declines; and

Whereas the TVA has been of incalculable benefit to all the citizens of this area in furnishing to them that which private power could or would not furnish, hydroelectric power at a reasonable rate; and

Whereas the TVA benefits not only the South but the entire Nation as a result of the rise of the standard of living in this area which greatly increases the purchasing power as a result of its contribution to the national defense and as a result of its influence as a yardstick which has forced the lowering of power rates over the whole Nation; and

Whereas the Tennessee Valley area is faced with a power shortage in the years ahead unless new plant capacity is added to the

TVA power system in that the national defense is calling upon the TVA for more and more power and as a result of the natural economic growth of the area; and

Whereas important National Government leaders have expressed dislike or outright hostility toward the TVA idea and as a result current appropriations, if not the whole TVA, are in danger: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the commissioners of the city of Cookeville, Tenn., go on record as endorsing the TVA and recommending to the President of the United States that TVA appropriations requests be honored as the honest, practical, and necessary requests that 20 years of experience has proved them to be, and that the House and Senate Appropriations Committees be asked to recommend, and the House and Senate make available, adequate funds for the TVA to carry out planned expansion; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to the President of the United States.

DERO BROWN,
J. L. MCCAWLY,
J. E. OWEN.

Whereas the economic life of Cookeville, Putnam County, and the upper Cumberland area of Tennessee is dependent upon the TVA and will grow or decline as TVA grows or declines; and

Whereas the TVA has been of incalculable benefit to all the citizens of this area in furnishing to them that which private power could or would not furnish—hydroelectric power at a reasonable rate; and

Whereas the TVA benefits not only the South but the entire Nation as a result of the rise of the standard of living in this area which greatly increases the purchasing power, as a result of its contribution to the national defense, and as a result of its influence as a yardstick which has forced the lowering of power rates over the whole Nation; and

Whereas the Tennessee Valley area is faced with a power shortage in the years ahead unless new plant capacity is added to the TVA power system in that the national defense is calling upon the TVA for more and more power and as a result of the natural economic growth of the area; and

Whereas important National Government leaders have expressed dislike or outright hostility toward the TVA idea and as a result current appropriations, if not the whole TVA, are in danger: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Quarterly Court of Putnam County, Tenn., go on record as endorsing the TVA and recommending to the President of the United States that TVA appropriations requests be honored as the honest, practical, and necessary requests that 20 years of experience has proved them to be and that the House and Senate Appropriations Committees be asked to recommend, and the House and Senate make available, adequate funds for the TVA to carry out planned expansion; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to the President of the United States.

Entered on minutes of county court, and the original was certified to and forwarded to the President.

TREATYMAKING POWER—TELEGRAM FROM CONFERENCE ON UNITED STATES RESPONSIBILITY FOR WORLD LEADERSHIP, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive a telegram which I know many of my other colleagues have also received, as adopted by the Washington Conference on United States Responsibility for World Leadership.

The telegram reiterates the view of a vast number of American citizens represented through 90 national organizations who stand unequivocally for continued constructive American foreign policy, and who stand for the preservation of the treatymaking power of the Constitution.

I present the telegram and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 3, 1954.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In view of possible reconsideration of proposed amendment to the Constitution relating to treaties and executive agreements, we wish to transmit to you immediately one of the resolutions passed today by the Washington Conference on United States Responsibility for World Leadership. This resolution was unanimously adopted by the delegates at this conference voting as individuals but appointed by some 90 national organizations. The full text of the resolution follows:

"We acclaim President Eisenhower for his leadership and the 32 Senators for their wisdom and courage in opposing the proposals for a constitutional amendment concerning treaties and executive agreements. The effort to limit the treatymaking power of the President and the Senate and the constitutional responsibilities of the President to conduct our foreign relations, is the beginning of an attempt to limit our participation in world affairs including the United Nations.

"The growing opposition to these proposals has evidenced the realization by the American people of their international responsibilities upon which their national security depends. The need for informing the people concerning this issue does not stop with the bare defeat of these proposals. There must be greater awareness of the fact that such constitutional amendments would make it uncertain whether the United States would be able to honor the obligations which it undertakes by treaties and executive agreements.

"We reaffirm our opposition to all such proposals for a constitutional amendment and we strongly urge a continuation of the process of informing the people concerning the grave dangers to our national security and international leadership that are involved."

PHILIP SCHIFF,
Chairman, Conference Resolutions Committee.
CLARK M. EICHELBERGER,
Chairman, continuing Action Committee of the Conference on United States Responsibility for World Leadership.

PUBLIC USE OF NATIONAL FORESTS—LETTER FROM MILWAUKEE COUNTY (WIS.) CONSERVATION ALLIANCE, INC.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I had previously pointed out on the Senate floor the importance of legislation to set aside 10 percent of the money received annually from the national forests for the purpose of facilitating public use thereof, and particularly to improve and maintain wildlife habitat.

This morning I was pleased to receive a brief message from the Milwaukee County Conservation Alliance renewing its recommendation for passage of Senate bill 1173. I earnestly hope that the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will report the measure favorably.

I present the letter and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, followed by a list of the constituent organizations of the alliance, and that thereafter it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, together with a list of constituent organizations, as follows:

MILWAUKEE COUNTY
CONSERVATION ALLIANCE, INC.,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 28, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: By action of the delegates of the Milwaukee County Conservation Alliance, we urgently request you to do what you can to help the passage of bill S. 1173 during this session of Congress.

This bill in substance sets up an appropriation to maintain and improve the fish and wildlife habitat and recreational facilities of the publicly owned national forests.

Yours respectfully,

WAYNE M. KASTNER,
President, Milwaukee County Conservation Alliance.

Officers: Wayne Kastner, president, 4524 North Bartlett Avenue; Earl W. May, vice president, 605 North 23d Street; Henry O. Stenzel, treasurer, 919 North Broadway; Webster H. Stone, secretary, 1633 South 82d Street; David Behling, sergeant at arms.

Board of directors: Arthur Molstad, Larry Whiffen, Owen Gromme, John McElrone, Elsa A. Schmidt, Ray Bassett, Roman H. Papka, William Hoffman.

Member organizations: Badger Bell Sportsmen's Club; Badger Fisherman's League; Blatz Rod and Gun Club; Brewery Workers Union Sportsmen's Club, Inc.; Business and Professional Woman's Club; Cutler-Hammer Rod and Gun Club; Daniel Boone Hunters' League; Heil Sportsmen's Club; German Short-Haired Pointers Club; Idlewild Field and Stream Club; Kiwanis Club, Milwaukee; Kiwanis Club, North Milwaukee; Kiwanis Club, West Allis; Milwaukee Audubon Society; Milwaukee Beagle Club; Milwaukee Metropolitan Sportsmen's Club; Milwaukee Casting Club; Milwaukee District Garden Club; Milwaukee Gun Club; Milwaukee Sporting Goods Dealers Association; Nature Club of Milwaukee; Pabst Sportsmen's League; Rex Rod and Gun Club; Society of American Foresters; Sportsman's Rod and Gun Club; Sportsmen's Club, Northwest Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Square D Fishing Club; Union Rod and Gun Club; Wisconsin Bow Hunter's Association; Wisconsin Duck Hunter's Association, Inc.; Wisconsin Fisherman and Hunter's League; Wisconsin Go-Hiking Club.

OCCUPATION OF LITHUANIA—RESOLUTION OF LITHUANIAN AMERICANS, RACINE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from a group of Lithuanian Americans in Racine, Wis., a resolution which was adopted on the occasion of the 36th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania.

I know that my colleagues share my hope that this splendid nation will re-

gain her sovereignty and her birthright. Never will we as a people recognize the unspeakable Soviet despoiling of Lithuania and never will we be silent against the mass horror which Soviet Russia has perpetrated on helpless peoples in the Baltic States, in Poland, in the Balkans, and elsewhere.

I present the resolution and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RACINE, WIS., *February 21, 1954.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Resolution unanimously adopted at the mass meeting of Lithuanian Americans of the city of Racine, Wis., held under the auspices of the local branch of the Lithuanian American Council, Inc., on the 21st day of February 1954, to commemorate the 36th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas the Republic of Lithuania fell as a victim of imperialistic aggression of Soviet Russia on June 15, 1940; and

"Whereas the incorporation of Lithuania into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was completed by ways and means directed from the Kremlin; and

"Whereas the Lithuanian people were and are the subjects of a continuous policy of terror, murder, and mass deportations; and

"Whereas wherever Communists rule no respect for individual human rights exists; and

"Whereas the Communists' drive for the world's conquest creates a great danger for the free nations; and

"Whereas the principles of liberty, justice, and respect for individual human rights, on which the foundation of the United States of America is based, are still alive in our hearts; and

"Whereas for these purposes so many great Americans gave up their lives: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this meeting appeals to the Government of the United States and the Members of Congress never to recognize the occupation of Lithuania as a legal act; and further be it

"*Resolved*, That the true facts about the enslavement of Lithuania and other countries should be brought up before the General Assembly of the United Nations; and further be it

"*Resolved*, That all the possible action should be taken to stop the crime of genocide on all the countries behind the Iron Curtain; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That no treaties or agreements should be made in favor of the Communist bloc until freedom for the occupied countries is restored; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we urge immediate ratification of the Genocide Convention and stepped-up investigation of Communist activities inland and abroad; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That this meeting express its gratitude to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States of America for their favorable attitude toward the Lithuanian nation in its struggle for liberty; and for its creation of a congressional committee to investigate the seizure of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union and for their expanded political and strategical efforts to stop Communist aggression in any place of the world."

MARTIN KASPARAITIS,
Chairman.
STANLEY P. BUDRYS,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 5337. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1041).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2548. A bill to facilitate the administration of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent thereon; and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1042).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution to validate conveyance of a 40-acre tract in Okaloosa County, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1040).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 3, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1160) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Tucson, Ariz., and to accept other land in exchange therefor.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY TO INVESTIGATE THE IMPORTATION OF WHEAT CLASSIFIED AS UNFIT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I report an original resolution extending the authority of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to investigate the importation of wheat classified as unfit for human consumption, and I submit a report (No. 1043) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 218) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 127, 83d Congress, agreed to July 10, 1953 (providing for an investigation with respect to the importation of wheat classified as unfit for human consumption and other matters relating to agricultural programs and price levels), is hereby continued until January 31, 1955.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3057. A bill for the relief of the Lacchi Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 3058. A bill for the relief of certain nationals of Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER (by request):

S. 3059. A bill to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3060. A bill for the relief of Cosmos Papadopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 3061. A bill for the relief of Myong Suk Kim; and

S. 3062. A bill for the relief of the American Surety Co. of New York and certain other surety companies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 3063. A bill for the relief of Lamberto Angelino Petri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3064. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary Beaton Denninger, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 3065. A bill for the relief of Ernest Ludwig Bamford and Mrs. Nadine Bamford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 3066. A bill to amend section 108 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAYBANK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 3067. A bill to require that international agreements other than treaties, hereafter entered into by the United States, be transmitted to the Senate within 30 days after the execution thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FERGUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION ACT

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, by request I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that a statement in justification of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3059) to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. BRICKER is as follows:

STATEMENT OF JUSTIFICATION

Under contract from the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, pursuant to Senate Resolution 332 (82d Cong.), the Wolf Management Engineering Co. made an investigation and study of the organization and operations of the Interstate Commerce Commission and rendered its report to the committee in December 1952. The Wolf Co.'s report recommended several far-reaching changes in the Commission's organization and operations, including the appointment of a Managing Director to take over the supervision of administrative operations, a reduction in the number of bureaus, and increased emphasis

on personnel, budgetary, and management programs. Soon after the release of the report the Commission accepted in principle the recommendations contained therein. Expressions of approval have also been made in both Houses of Congress. A Managing Director was appointed by the Commission and is now proceeding with the reorganization with the full support of the Commission.

In discussing implementation of the recommendations, the Wolf Co. report states as follows (pp. 13–14):

"All the changes in organizational structure, the realinement of administrative activities and of budgetary controls, the delegation of administrative and quasi-judicial responsibilities and authorities, the appointment of a Managing Director, transportation consultants, technical review committees, and additional employees, as recommended by us, appear to be within the present powers and authority of the Commission under the Interstate Commerce Act, except the consolidation of the Bureaus of Safety and Locomotive Inspection."

Section 3 of the Locomotive Inspection Act provides "that there shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Director of Locomotive Inspection and two Assistant Directors of Locomotive Inspection."

We believe that, for reasons of economy and efficiency, the Bureaus of Safety and Locomotive Inspection should be consolidated into one bureau. The logic of this consolidation is supported by the fact that both Bureaus, even now, are administratively supervised by the same Commissioner.

We recommend, therefore, that steps be taken to revise the Locomotive Inspection Act to permit such a consolidation.

The following quotation from the report (pp. 22–23) is a discussion of the proposed consolidated Bureau of Safety Inspection:

"5. BUREAU OF SAFETY INSPECTION

"We propose that the present Bureau of Locomotive Inspection, the Bureau of Safety, the present Section of Safety of the Motor Carrier Bureau, and the Section for Explosives under the Bureau of Service be consolidated.

"For the purposes of administrative efficiency, the technical and executive functions related to inspection of equipment, formulation of safety rules, and safety practices for the various types of carriers should be under one central administrative authority. The specialized technical specifications for safety rules and the applications of such rules do not, in our opinion, require separate administrative bureaus. For economy and uniform policies, we propose one administrative bureau which consolidates all functions with respect to regulatory and administrative authorities dealing with safety matters.

"We recommend no change in the respective technical functions consolidated, except as safety programs may be improved from time to time. The specialized technical staffs, however, need to be continued because the training and technical requirements of safety practices are, of necessity, different for each type of carrier; hence, the sections would be organized by types of carriers.

"Although the present Bureau of Locomotive Inspection and the Bureau of Safety are supervised by one Commissioner, section 3 of the Locomotive Inspection Act specifically provides for the appointment of a director of locomotive inspection and two assistants. No doubt, this congressional act was not intended to create unnecessary expense and duplication of administrative services with respect to the enforcement of this particular statute, but currently it does so. We propose that the Bureau of Locomotive Inspection be operated as a separate bureau until this act can be revised to permit consolidation and bring provisions relating to locomotive inspection up to date.

"The advantages of consolidating the technical and administrative services dealing with equipment inspection and safety practices for rail and highway transportation outweigh the historical reasons for their separation.

"The proposed Bureau of Safety Inspection would exercise functional supervision over all safety inspectors in the field."

The draft of bill submitted herewith would amend the Locomotive Inspection Act so as to make possible a consolidation of bureaus along the lines set out in the Wolf Co. report.

At the present time, inspectors from the Bureau of Locomotive Inspection, operating under the Locomotive Inspection Act, visit railroad yards and engine houses to inspect locomotives and tenders, including their appurtenances such as brakes, signal devices, and safety appliances. At the same time, inspectors from the Bureau of Safety may visit the same yards and inspect the safety appliances and brakes of train cars and locomotives. Duplicated inspection of locomotives, sometimes on the same day, by Bureau of Locomotive Inspection and Bureau of Safety inspectors have naturally brought objections from the railroads.

Field inspectors of the Bureaus of Safety, Service, and Locomotive Inspection make observations of the safety matters under their particular jurisdiction, but do not ordinarily take cognizance of, nor attempt to correct, dangerous practices or violations coming under the jurisdiction of another bureau.

To the extent consistent with the nature of the duties and the qualifications of the employees, the Commission should be free to utilize its personnel, in the interest of efficiency, to perform all duties for which they are qualified, and not be restricted to using employees for only one type or phase of work. Where a function requires any particular training, experience, or facility, only those employees possessing the necessary attributes should, of course, be assigned to perform such a function.

It is expected that many desirable advantages and specific savings would result from amending the Locomotive Inspection Act so as: (a) to permit the consolidation of the Bureau of Locomotive Inspection with the Bureau of Safety and possibly the Bureau of Service, (b) to remove present cumbersome restrictions as to geographical divisions or districts, and (c) to allow greater flexibility in the assignment of employees to duties for which they are qualified.

1. Much better use of travel funds could be obtained by sending 1 inspector instead of 2 or 3 when it is necessary to inspect out-of-town yards. Present travel allotments for each bureau permit travel by inspectors for only about one-half of their working days. More effective use of travel funds would permit the same number of inspections with fewer employees or a greater number of inspections with the staff presently available.

2. By expanding the functions assigned to an individual inspector, each inspection could be made more all-inclusive of safety matters and thus be more effective. Loss of time and inconvenience to the rail carriers could be reduced and confined to the necessary minimum.

3. Present investigation of accidents by inspectors of 2 and sometimes 3 bureaus could be eliminated by assigning 1 qualified inspector to make a comprehensive investigation, thus securing adequate coverage with fewer field employees.

4. Consolidation would make possible efficiency and economy with respect to stenographic and clerical service, space, and general administration. Duplication of functions by the separate bureaus could be eliminated and more uniformity in regard to reports of accidents and violations, compilation of statistics, etc., would be possible.

5. The substitution of 1 bureau for 2 or 3 would be a step toward a more manageable organization and such a consolidation would place all operating activities relating to railroad safety under 1 head, permitting the development of an improved railroad-safety program and a better balance of railroad-safety activities.

If the Locomotive Inspection Act were amended as here suggested, it may become possible, through greater utilization of available personnel, to perform all of the safety functions with which the Commission is charged, some of which have recently been necessarily neglected or curtailed by budgetary limitations.

The Commission believes that there need be no fear that unqualified supervisory personnel would be appointed if the choice is left to the Commission. The Commission has consistently tried to appoint only the best qualified persons as bureau directors and section chiefs. Certainly the Commission would not deviate from this policy with respect to anything so important as its safety functions.

In summary, the attached draft of bill would make changes necessary to carry out the pertinent recommendations of the Wolf Co. report, which congressional committees have strongly advised the Commission to follow, and would make possible increased efficiency and economy, in accord with the policy of the present administration.

REDUCTION IN PARITY SUPPORT LEVEL OF MILK, BUTTERFAT, AND DAIRY PRODUCTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL, AND LETTER

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on February 26 I asked and received unanimous consent of the Senate to add the names of 22 cosponsors to my bill, S. 2962, which would limit to 5 percent in any marketing year the reduction in the parity support level of milk, butterfat, and dairy products.

Subsequently the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] asked to join as a cosponsor and I now have received a request from the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE] to be included in the list of cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that these additional names be added as cosponsors to S. 2962.

This brings to a total of 25 Members of the Senate who join in introducing S. 2962.

In view of the strong support thus indicated and the many requests which have been received for copies of the bill, I now ask unanimous consent that a reprinting of S. 2962 be made with the names of all the cosponsors listed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a letter dated February 18, 1954, from E. M. Norton, executive director, National Milk Producers Federation, to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., February 18, 1954.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You undoubtedly are aware that bills to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 have been introduced in the

House and Senate. Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Republican, of Minnesota, put in H. R. 7895, and Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Republican, of Minnesota, introduced S. 2962. These identical bills would limit to 5 percent in any marketing year the reduction in the parity support level of milk, butterfat, and their products. We earnestly ask that you consider this amendment and request your support thereof.

In making this request, we are mindful of the announced positions of President Eisenhower that a limit be placed upon declines in the support levels for the six basic crops, if and when the present 90 percent mandatory level ends and the flexible provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 become operative upon these crops.

We agree with the President, and assume that you do also, when he recommends that support-level declines be limited to 5 percent in order to provide an orderly transition period and safeguard agriculture from too violent drops in farm income.

We believe that you already have indicated a desire to prevent undue "economic" hardship" from resulting to any segment of agriculture as a consequence of rigid enforcement of the existing law. You made such a statement and took that position in urging Congress to increase this year's cotton acreage by 3,500,000 acres above the level of 17,940,000 acres, which you had been compelled to set under the law requiring you to establish acreage allotments and marketing quotas on that commodity.

We appreciate that you faced the same mandatory requirement of law when you lowered the dairy support levels from the 90 percent of last year to 75 percent for the coming marketing year. You acted, as you explained in your announcement, in compliance with that section of the law that requires you to "set the support level at a point which will produce an adequate supply of milk for the Nation's needs."

We assume that in setting the 75-percent level—the minimum allowed by law—you complied with the other sections of the law, which require you to consider rate of production, stocks on hand, and their probable disappearance. We are not questioning your conclusions, but we respectfully call your attention to the probable consequences to the more than 4 million farmers who derive all or part of their cash income from the sale of dairy products.

If in the coming marketing year, as in the past year, the support level should establish the selling price for these farmers, they will suffer an income loss of approximately $600 million. In addition, there will be a decline in the value of their capital assets because of this drop in earning power. This might approach the capital asset loss they suffered in 1953 in the value of their cows and heifers, 2 years old and over. This amounted to $1,200,000,000, according to Department figures. If the loss should be only a fractional percent as great, say one-third, they would suffer a total loss of at least a billion dollars in 1954—an amount equaling 25 percent of their 1953 income.

We believe that you will agree that such a loss constitutes an economic hardship, and one that you will not permit to happen to the dairymen any more than you would permit it to happen to the Nation's cotton farmers. Such a decline in the purchasing power of dairy farmers in Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, and the New England States—where dairying is the major source of farm income—would border on the disastrous. It would certainly be depressing and could have serious economic reactions in the hundreds of small towns and cities in the rural areas of those States.

While a certain amount of price flexibility may be desirable in the dairy field, we hope that you will agree that a decline of 15 percent in the parity support levels at this time, with present surplus problems as yet unsolved, would work an economic hardship too great to be permitted by you or the administration.

Sincerely,

E. M. NORTON,
Executive Director.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2962) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat. He has just made that request of me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION PLACED ON CALENDAR

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 355) amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DUNCAN WILMER DAUGHERTY, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a further hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 12, 1954, beginning at 9:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Duncan Wilmer Daugherty, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF W. WILSON WHITE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a further hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 12, 1954, beginning at 9:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of W. Wilson White, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF N. WELCH MORRISETTE, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, EASTERN DISTRICT OF SOUH CAROLINA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a further hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 12, 1954, beginning at 9:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of N. Welch Morrisette, Jr., to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DON N. LARAMORE, TO BE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 12, 1954, at 9:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Don N. Laramore, of Indiana, to be judge of the United States court of claims, vice Evan Howell, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS AND UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 12, 1954, beginning at 9:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Robert Tieken, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, vice Otto Kerner, Jr., resigned.

Archie M. Meyer, of Arizona, to be United States marshal for the district of Arizona, vice Benjamin J. McKinney, retired.

Theodore F. Stevens, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No.

4, district of Alaska, vice Everett W. Hepp, resigned.

Charles Peyton McKnight, Jr., of Texas, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas, vice Stanford C. Stiles, whose term expired February 28, 1954.

William Raab, of Nebraska, to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska, vice Frank Golden, resigned.

Hobart Kelliston McDowell, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Texas, vice James R. Wright, resigned.

Thomas Ramage Ethridge, of Mississippi to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi, vice Noel H. Malone, resigned.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF MEMBERS OF WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 12, 1954, at 9:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon nominations for members of the War Claims Commission. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The nominees are as follows:

Raymond T. Armbruster, of New York.
Whitney Gillilland, of Iowa.
Mrs. Pearl Carter Pace, of Kentucky.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG:

Results of a poll taken by him in the State of North Dakota with reference to policies of the Eisenhower administration.

WRIGHT PATMAN, REPRESENTATIVE FROM TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a Member of the Texas delegation in the House of Representatives is today observing the silver anniversary of the beginning of his service in the Congress.

Twenty-five years ago the people of the First District of Texas sent a young man named WRIGHT PATMAN to represent them in the House of Representatives. They have been sending him back ever since. Those of us who know him understand why. His service to his district, his State, and his Nation is outstanding.

His efforts in advancing the cause of good government are constant and effective. His devotion to the interests of the people generally is widely recognized.

I wish to pay high tribute to WRIGHT PATMAN, my good friend and a great public servant, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the beginning of his service in the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution on this subject, approved by the chairman of the Texas congressional delegation and by the Membership of the Texas State Society of Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas WRIGHT PATMAN is now observing his 25th year as a Member of the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas those 25 years have been devoted to serving his fellowman and advancing the cause of good government; and

Whereas WRIGHT PATMAN has worked assiduously to increase the popular understanding of government and has taken pains to answer thoughtfully and accurately the many questions citizens and students have asked him through the years; and

Whereas the most important and basic questions asked of him have now been compiled in a book entitled "Our American Government and the Answers to a Thousand and One Questions"; and

Whereas this book has been praised by statesmen and scholars as an important contribution to our never-ending work of creating an informed and alert citizenry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the chairman of the Texas congressional delegation and the members of the Texas State Society of Washington, D. C., congratulate WRIGHT PATMAN for his 25 years of constructive service to his fellowman in the Congress of the United States and that we commend him for his good work; and be it further

Resolved, That we designate March 3 as WRIGHT PATMAN day to be observed with the appropriate ceremonies by all of us and by like-minded citizens everywhere.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am delighted to join with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Texas State Society of Washington, D. C., in paying tribute to my friend, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texarkana, on this 25th anniversary of the beginning of his service in the Congress of the United States.

It has been my pleasure and my privilege to know Representative PATMAN since I came to the United States Senate in 1934. He was at that time already a veteran Congressman, having some 6 years of service behind him. I early recognized the high quality of his leadership, and was attracted by his vigorous personality.

I have worked with Representative PATMAN through the years, and he and I have sponsored important legislation together. Through these close contacts I have come to know WRIGHT PATMAN, to appreciate him as a serious and profound student of economics, and to respect him as a great, unselfish, and public-spirited American.

In his public service, WRIGHT PATMAN has been ever mindful of the needs and the problems of the common people of this great country of ours, and he has been in the forefront of every legislative battle to advance the common good.

The qualities I appreciate most about WRIGHT PATMAN are his unflagging zeal and his persistent effort to create an informed public opinion in this country. In his own words, "It is impossible to have a democratic society unless the people are fully educated and informed on the issues."

This axiom Representative PATMAN has taken as a guide of conduct, and for 25 years he has worked assiduously to inform his constituents and the American public about our Government.

As a teacher, scholar, and statesman, Representative PATMAN deserves the highest measure of praise and commendation.

I am happy to add my voice to that of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas in paying tribute to this great and good man, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas.

May he continue to serve his people as faithfully and well during his next 25 years in the Congress as he has served them for the past quarter of a century.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to add a word of commendation, in line with the sentiments already expressed, regarding the fine service rendered during the past quarter of a century by WRIGHT PATMAN, a Member of the House of Representatives from Texas. He has filled his position magnificently. He has always had the interests of the people at heart. I am delighted to hear the tributes which are being paid to him today.

JOHN O'DONNELL, EDITOR EMERITUS OF THE OIL CITY (PA.) DERRICK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, America this week mourns the passing of a great Pennsylvanian, John O'Donnell, dean of our Commonwealth's newspapermen, and editor emeritus of the Oil City Derrick, at Oil City, Pa.

Mr. O'Donnell, whom I knew well, and who was one of my close personal friends over the years, died at his home last Sunday night. His death closed one of the most brilliant and colorful careers known to the newspaper profession in our State.

Throughout the United States he was looked upon by members of his profession as one of the foremost editors representing the field of journalism in both metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas.

His battles against encroachment upon freedom of the press made memorable history. His editorials were clear, concise, and brilliant. But through all his years as an editor, to the day of his death at the age of 83, he never lost his keen reporter's instinct. He excelled in developing news and in bringing to light the hidden facts.

Pennsylvania and America have suffered a great loss in his death. But the great good which he did, as a fearless and enterprising journalist, will live on in the hearts and minds of his fellow citizens.

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak at this time for not more than 5 minutes, on a matter which I believe to be of first importance, and about which I read in the press yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I read with amazement Mr. Walter Lippmann's column which appeared in The New York Herald Tribune yesterday, March 2, entitled, "A Booby Trap for Geneva." I must take strong exception to Mr. Lippmann's conclusions, which seem to be: First, that the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and his friends in the Senate are attempting to deprive Secretary Dulles of his "negotiable position" at the Geneva Conference; and second, that the American position on the admission of Communist China to the United Nations should be "relative and conditional."

Mr. President, I need not, nor do I purport to speak for the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], but I am happy to number myself as one of his friends, especially on this vital issue; and I believe that Mr. Lippmann's conclusions are completely unsupportable. If Mr. Lippmann would visit the Far East, as I have on three different occasions during the past 5 years, he could never, in my judgment, have arrived at what appear to be his erroneous and startling conclusions.

Nothing could be more fallacious than the allegation that the Senate, or a number of Senators, are trying to take away from the Secretary of State a position which he would like to maintain during the negotiations at Geneva. I can assure the Senate, Mr. Lippmann, and the public at large that Mr. Dulles, the Secretary of State, has no intention or desire to hold forth the admission of Communist China to the United Nations as an inducement to gain concessions from the Soviet Union or Red China. This I state categorically. This being so, none of us in the Senate can be taking away from the Secretary of State that which he does not have or does not want.

The Secretary of State himself insisted at Berlin on the inclusion of a paragraph which appears in the communique of the Four Powers after the Berlin Conference, which makes his position absolutely clear. That paragraph reads as follows:

> It is understood that neither invitation to nor holding of the above-mentioned conference shall be deemed to imply diplomatic recognition in any case where it has not already been accorded.

Mr. President, the conclusion of Mr. Lippmann that the United States at this time should have a "relative and conditional" position on the admission of Communist China to the United Nations is equally unsound. The freedom of all Asia depends on the ultimate freedom and independence of China. The importance of China's freedom from external controls has been axiomatic in American foreign policy since early in the 19th century, and was typified by the open-door policy, the Stimson doctrine of nonrecognition, and Secretary Hull's reiteration of the latter principle in the midthirties. There could be no worse time to abandon this historic policy than the present. Mr. President, the recognition of Communist China, or acquiescence to its admission to the United Nations under present conditions would be a reversal of our historic policy, for no one can doubt that the masters of the Kremlin today are ruling Peking, as well as Moscow.

It is true that Mr. Lippmann, at this time, is not advocating the admission of Communist China to the United Nations, but he does argue that the United States should regard that matter as a negotiable issue. This reveals how little he understands the problems of Asia, for, at least with the peoples of the Far East, negotiation on this subject, or the admission that this issue was negotiable would lose us almost as much as actual admission itself. Face, Mr. President, remains of incalculable importance in the Far East. Let me add without fear of successful contradiction that the recognition of Communist China and its admission to the United Nations at this time, or under present conditions, would cause the loss to the free world of all of Asia.

I have a high regard for the penetrating intellect and vast erudition of Mr. Lippmann. With regard to his column on March 2, however, I feel that he has fallen prey to his own rationalization. The days of conducting diplomatic negotiations as one would play a chess match, sacrificing a pawn early in the game for the chance at a rook on some later move, or tempting a bishop to sally forth enticed by a knight, are gone. Formosa in the world today cannot be considered a pawn, nor can membership in the United Nations—or even the prospect of it—be bandied about as a lure to entrap Moscow or its satellites.

Mr. President, a free and independent China uncontrolled by any outside power is the key to a free Asia, and this must be the foundation of our policy in the Far East. I am not advocating that this be brought about by war, but it will be brought about by inevitability, if the free nations of the world stand behind this declaration of principle and support it by their continuous thinking—yes, and their prayers—as well as their continuous action. And let me add that a free Asia, entirely outside the Iron Curtain, is the key to a free world and the key to ultimate and lasting world peace.

Mr. President, I am confident that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, do not share Mr. Lippmann's views on the art of diplomacy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire column by Mr. Lippmann be inserted in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BOOBY TRAP FOR GENEVA

(By Walter Lippmann)

The Geneva conference which is to meet at the end of April and is to deal with Korea and Indochina, is not an event which we can look forward to with much pleasure. We are entangled in a war where, though we lack the power to decide the issue, we stand a good chance of making ourselves everybody's scapegoat.

This was already a possible outcome when Mr. Dulles was in Berlin. But after his return to Washington, the Senators, led by Mr. KNOWLAND, have made it very nearly unavoidable.

Nobody knows, I believe, what are the real terms on which Moscow, Peiping, and the Vietminh would agree to an armistice. But there is every presumption that admission to the U. N. is part, but by no means the whole, of their irreducible terms. Now the more nearly absolute and unconditional is our refusal ever to agree to their coming into the U. N., the easier it is for them to offer terms that are more attractive to Europe and to Asia than they would, in fact, be willing to agree to. For they take no risk of having their bluff called. Senator KNOWLAND and his friends have for all practical purposes given them a written guaranty that the United States will not call such a bluff.

It is astonishing that politicians on Capitol Hill should be so unaware of the boobytrap which they have been rigging up for American diplomacy to fall into. Yet, how often have they seen a Member of Congress take a position on some measure which he does not wish to have prevail—once he has made sure that the bill will fail in the final rollcall or be vetoed by the President?

They have seen this happen again and again. A guaranty that the bill will not pass liberates the Congressman who is playing politics from the risk of having to make good on his vote, and of having to face the practical consequences of passing the bill.

Now this is what the absolutists in the Senate have done for the Geneva conference. They have gone as far as it is possible to go in giving a guaranty to the Communist powers that they need not show their hand, that since they cannot negotiate and will not have to negotiate, they can promise the moon, and count on the Senate to protect them from having to deliver it.

With this almost ironclad guaranty against any of the risks of diplomacy and negotiation, they have a standing invitation to make a demonstration to the French, to the rest of Europe, to the uncommitted peoples of Asia. They can maneuver themselves into the position where they are able to say: You see, the Americans do not want peace. * * * But for the American refusal to concede what almost all of you have already conceded, or are willing to concede, there would be peace in Indochina. * * * And the last shooting war would be coming to an end.

How is this boobytrap to be avoided? By allowing Secretary Dulles the diplomatic freedom to force the other side to show its hand, its real terms for a negotiated armistice. He cannot do that if the Senate insists upon an absolute and unconditional refusal to admit Red China to the U. N. He can force the Communist powers to show their hand, to disclose their real terms, only if the American position on Red China in the U. N. is relative and conditional.

For if there are no conditions under which we will ever agree to the Red Chinese being admitted to the U. N., then how can Secretary Dulles compel them to disclose their real conditions for peace in Indochina? It is quite plain that Secretary Dulles agreed to the Geneva conference because he knew that an attempt to negotiate an armistice was necessary. In agreeing it was plainly his intention to make the Communist powers show at Geneva what their real terms are by drawing them into a negotiation instead of an exchange of propagandist broadsides.

In order to do this he had to have a negotiable position himself. That is what the Senators are doing their best to take away from him. If they have their way, the United States will appear at Geneva unwilling to fight in Indochina and unable to negotiate.

It is very difficult to imagine the terms of an armistice in Indochina which would satisfy the honor and vital interests of the main belligerents and of their principal

allies. But no one who knows the facts of life can doubt that the attempt must be made, and it would be the utmost folly for this country to make itself, in a frenzy of blind feeling, the self-appointed scapegoat of a predetermined failure.

THE TREATYMAKING POWER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a very illuminating comment which comes from the House of Representatives in regard to the treatymaking power.

As reported in the Washington Post this morning, Representative JOHN M. VORYS announced that, if a constitutional amendment relating to treaties or other international agreements reaches the House, he will support changes giving the House an equal voice with the Senate in treaty ratification.

The Post quotes Mr. VORYS as believing all treaties should be approved by a majority vote of both Houses and as saying:

> If the House is good enough to pass on laws, it is good enough to pass on treaties affecting internal laws.

Mr. President, during the recent debate in the Senate on treatymaking, some of us warned that the various proposals would have the inevitable effect of weakening the Senate's voice and prerogatives. Mr. VORYS' comment of yesterday confirms this warning and further indicates that the House may not be satisfied with an indirect assault on the Senate's powers, but will insist on outright repeal of the two-thirds rule.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the House has already expressed itself on this score. On May 9, 1945, by the emphatic vote of 288 to 88, the House passed a proposed constitutional amendment providing for ratification of treaties by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress. The amendment, of course, was promptly buried in the Senate which was not then seized with the suicidal compulsions it now suffers.

I suspect that the knowledge that the Senate would not agree to limiting its treaty powers has been the principal factor deterring the House from taking additional action along the lines of its 1945 vote. But this deterrent will be removed if the Senate itself sends a treatymaking amendment to the House.

Mr. President, it is becoming clearer every day that all of the constitutional amendments proposed thus far would detract from the Senate's historic powers. And that is to say also from the States' historic powers, because it is only in the Senate that all States meet as equals. I cannot support such a movement, and I do not believe the Senate and the States will support it, either, when its implications are fully understood.

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE BENSON

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, there was published in the March 1954 issue of Fortune magazine, an article entitled "Mr. Benson's Flexible Flyer," written by Duncan Norton-Taylor. Without making further remarks on the matter at this time, I may say that, in view of the agricultural discussions which are now in progress, I think this is a very pertinent, thoughtful article, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. BENSON'S FLEXIBLE FLYER

(By Duncan Norton-Taylor)

EZRA TAFT BENSON is a carefully brushed, quietly attired man who gazes on the Washington battleground with large, liquid eyes, wearing a shy smile, an almost apologetic manner, and either a Boy Scout pin or a 4-H Club pin in his buttonhole. He is anxious to be liked and takes great pains not to give any personal offense. But to some people there is no one in the Cabinet so offensive as Mr. Benson.

When Mr. Benson was about to make his first appearance this year before the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, Senator CLINTON ANDERSON predicted that he would get a sympathetic reception from Chairman GEORGE AIKEN. "But," ANDERSON said sadly, "he'll look a long time before he sees another friendly face—mine." The Senator was exaggerating a little. But peering into an array of cold senatorial faces from the Dakotas, Minnesota, the Carolinas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Mr. Benson saw enough hostility to the position he expounds to send an ordinary man running for cover, or at least groping for some kind of compromise.

Mr. Benson, however, is not a compromising man when it comes to principle. His mild manner can be easily misinterpreted; what he has, apparently, is an inner serenity that rests on a calm sense of duty in all things.

It will be recalled that he rejected a $40,000 job with one of the major farm cooperatives to return to Salt Lake City and become 1 of the 12 governing apostles of the Mormon Church on a $6,000-a-year living allowance, and that he was serving in that position when the job of running the Department of Agriculture was thrust upon him. Having accepted the secretaryship, he stated forthwith that he thought a subsidized farm economy demoralized the people and that price supports should be used only as insurance against disaster. This idea comes from a basic Mormon tenet, that the Lord helps those who help themselves. The tenet is not universally popular. Knowledgeable observers predicted that Benson would have to reconstruct his thinking or Ike would have to ask him to resign.

The Secretary did not reconstruct his thinking and he has not been asked to resign. When he and his aides sat down to write the President's farm message, he had to make some compromises but he proceeded to put together a program for getting agriculture back to the idea of self-help through flexible price supports. And on that program, which was the work of many hands but chiefly reflected his own philosophy, Ezra Benson has stood against opposition as substantial and various as any Eisenhower Cabinet member is likely to encounter in this session of Congress.

The opposition cuts across the political map. It includes not only those stony-faced members of the Senate committee but an even larger and flintier majority on the Agriculture Committee in the House, whose chairman, CLIFFORD HOPE, is a thoroughly loyal administration man on every matter but this one. HOPE comes from Kansas, which grows more wheat than any other State and has more wheat under Government loan than any other State. Congressman HOPE notes unhappily that some people are calling flexible supports sliding supports, and he can think of no implication more politically devastating in the farm areas. "Things don't slide up," he points out gloomily.

It was HOPE'S committee that toured the country last autumn, trying to get opinions on farm legislation at the grassroots.[1] It was later charged by some of the Members that the hearings were stacked in favor of ardent advocates of high support, that the energetic and radical Farmers Union saw to it that well-rehearsed rural orators were on hand to monopolize the seats and the time allotted. At Des Moines a small brigade of witnesses arrayed themselves in the committee hearing room wearing cards that read "I like full parity Ike"; a crack at the rather indefinite promises Mr. Eisenhower made to the farmers in his Kasson, Minn., campaign speech of 1952. Frequently the meetings were used for soapbox denunciations of Republicans in general and Benson in particular. "Mr. HOPE ruled that the committee should ask no questions," one of the members reported. "We sat there like dummies all day listening to propaganda to a great extent."

Stacked or not, the proceedings seemed to convince most of the Republican committee members that flexible supports were political poison.

ARE YOU GOING TO IGNORE PRINCIPLE?

With the congressional elections coming up in November, with the present House barely Republican and the Senate only technically Republican, the Benson program obviously puts Republicans on the spot. The report of a private conversation between two Republican Congressmen points up their dilemma. Congressman A, whose district is mostly an industrial one, asked Congressman B if he thought it was sound for the Government to go on buying surplus farm stocks at high, rigid supports. Congressman B, who is from a farm district, said "No"; but he would have to go on voting for it anyhow. "Are you going to ignore principle entirely?" Congressman A demanded righteously. Said Congressman B, "Would you rather see me vote as you are going to vote and have a Democrat take my place who would go along with even higher supports?" Congressman A had to concede that he wouldn't want that.

The Republican dilemma, naturally, is one the Democrats are anxious to enhance, and they have thrown themselves enthusiastically into the anti-Benson clamor. This does not mean that all Democrats believe in their hearts in rigid supports, but that is the way a great many of them will vote. A notable exception is New Mexico's Senator ANDERSON, who was Secretary of Agriculture under Truman from 1945 to 1948. He does not believe in rigid supports and will vote against them.

Southern Democrats stand firm against flexible supports and so, finally, do the consecrated Fair Dealers and economic planners who correctly see the Benson program as a complete contradiction of their ideology and the reversal of a trend that was proceeding steadily and successfully for some 20 years before Ezra came along. From his law office in Denver, ex-Secretary Charles Brannan in shocked tones denounced the Benson recommendations as indefensible. Farmers, of course, can scare the wits out of politicians, but the process works both ways; politicians often find it profitable to scare the wits out of farmers. They can then pose as the indispensable men in the impending crisis.

Benson's program is not likely to survive as written; very few political proposals as far-reaching and controversial as this one ever do. But—and here is a fact generally overlooked in all the racket around him—the Secretary occupies a very favorable tactical

[1] Almost a score of members, filled with responsibility, made a side trip last January to Cuba to study the sugar situation. Some took their wives. The Cuban Government paid the bill.

position. And for reasons that will be pointed out, Mr. Benson, in the end, may win his main proposal.

PRICES FLEX, HOPE WINCES

To begin with, Mr. Benson is not proposing that farmers be left completely at the mercy of the law of supply and demand. Government support, as now, would be chiefly provided through loans on surplus commodities—loans that are in effect a standing offer to purchase. But instead of fixed 90-percent supports, the prices the Government would promise to pay for certain commodities would drop 1 percentage point every time there was a 2-point increase in supply.

The support prices would flex between a floor of 75 percent of parity and a ceiling of 90 percent of parity. The parity formula, involving price indexes, taxes, interest, and, lately, the cost of labor, is awesomely complicated. Mr. Benson proposes to make it a little more straightforward, but it would remain essentially an attempt to preserve some previous, and supposedly just, relationship between prices the farmer gets for his commodities and what he has to pay for the things he buys.

In shifting from rigid to flexible supports, the administration would be returning to a program that was originally applauded on all sides, had the backing of Harry Truman and even of Charles Brannan, and moreover became the very basis of the statute under which Congress presumably intended that the farm economy should operate. The law of the land is the Agricultural Act of 1949, which is a combination of the Hope-Aiken Act, passed by the Republican 80th Congress (HOPE now winces at the mention of his name in this connection), and the Anderson Act, passed by the Democratic 81st Congress.

The Anderson Act called for rigid supports on basic commodities but only until the end of 1950. Flexibility, although at a slightly higher floor than that provided by Hope-Aiken, was the foundation of the legislation. The Senate approved it by almost 7 to 1, the House by 5 to 1. It is clear that flexible supports were defensible then, both economically and politically.

Congress continued to think of rigid supports, meanwhile, as just a temporary expedient. Mandatory fixed supports at 90 percent of parity for the basic commodities (corn, cotton, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts) had been part of the Stabilization Act of 1942. They were designed to cushion the farmer's transition from a high wartime demand for food to the more normal requirements of peace, and they were to expire 2 years after war had ceased.

ALWAYS AN EMERGENCY

Instead, Congress kept extending them, and for one seemingly pressing reason or another extended them finally to the end of this year, which will be exactly 8 years after Mr. Truman officially proclaimed that the war had ceased.

The explanation was always that another emergency had come along, which is the argument that is being made at present. What the emergency is depends on where you sit.

Farm Congressmen maintain that the 1954 emergency is the squeeze the farmer is undergoing between declining income and costs that persist in staying up. Net farm income declined from a record high of $16.7 billion in 1947 (when the parity ratio was 115 percent) to $12.5 billion last year (when it was 92 percent).

Mr. Benson sees the immediate emergency as a $5-billion pile of surplus commodities that, if it grows much taller, will topple over and bury the farmer himself. Senator AIKEN, who sees things in the same light, makes the estimate that the surpluses, which have been costing the taxpayers almost $500,000 a day for storage alone, will soon be so big that storage will cost $1 million a day.

HOW BENSON CAN WIN

What is the Secretary's political advantage?

In the first place, before the fight is over, he should turn up with a lot of support that hasn't yet made itself apparent. Congressmen elected by the Nation's nonfarming consumers do represent 85 percent of the population. Various urban Congressmen, after they have mulled over the costs of the present program, may take a second look, and some of them may be constrained to vote the interests of their constituencies. Mr. Benson also hopes that before the issue comes to a vote some rural Congressmen may discover that they have misread the thinking of their farm constituencies.

There are grounds for such hopes. The majority of the country's cattlemen, for instance, are against rigid supports and so are hog raisers and poultrymen who have to pay high prices for grain but whose own products are not supported.

Furthermore, the Secretary has the public support of the influential Farm Bureau Federation (which tried to help out Mr. Benson by suggesting variable as a more palatable word than flexible).

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, of which Benson himself was once the executive secretary, has not taken a position on the Benson program, because of the widely checkered nature of its membership. But on principle the co-ops stand just about where Benson does; they also believe in self-help.

The Secretary has considerable intellectual support among conservative agricultural economists in the land-grant colleges. The chairman of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, which Eisenhower set up last year to study the farm program, is Dean William Myers, of the New York State Agricultural College at Cornell, who hoes a pretty straight conservative row.

These economists control no votes but do influence thinking among farm-belt editors. Benson is counting on a certain amount of education in the next few months to swing more opinion his way.

But most important, the Secretary has the stubborn support of Mr. Eisenhower, who in this fight, even more than in any other impending legislative battle, may be the decisive force.

This is where Mr. Benson's tactical advantage comes in. In order to keep high rigid supports, proponents must extend them again by legislation or pass another law to take the place of the 1949 act. This puts the high-support faction at a disadvantage since whatever they legislate, Mr. Eisenhower can veto it; whether two-thirds of either Chamber would dare to vote to override Dwight Eisenhower is a question that has not yet been put to the test. It is doubtful that many Republicans are yet prepared to make such a personal challenge.

If, as is more than likely, a vote on farm legislation does not occur until the last days of the session, Mr. Eisenhower could kill a rigid-support bill with a pocket veto. The administration would then be left with the 1949 act, which actually is enough like what Benson is now proposing to suit the administration well enough. And on the main point, the substitution of flexible for rigid supports, Mr. Benson would have won.

CHRONIC AND ACUTE

In two decades of trial and error, Government programs designed primarily to stabilize farm prices have cost the United States $7.5 billion net. The farm problem is both chronic and, at the moment, acute. Mr. Benson intends to deal with both aspects, but to deal first with the acute one: the accumulation of certain surpluses that the country apparently can't eat up, use up, sell—or even give away—without upsetting the markets.

As of early November 1953 CCC loans on farm commodities had reached these levels:

Wheat—$2.5 billion on 854 million bushels.

Corn—$852 million on 530 million bushels.

Cotton—$1.3 billion on 6 million bales.

Dairy products—$381 million on 1 billion pounds (including 250 million pounds of butter, which may soon reach 300 million).

Fat and oils—$224 million on one billion pounds.

Tobacco—$223 million on 528 million pounds.

CCC had to put out more than twice as much in loans during 1953 as it did in 1952. It will soon come close to its statutory limit of $6.75 billion. In order to meet commitments through 1954, the limit will have to be lifted to $8.5 billion.

YOU CAN'T STOP IT

There is a great deal to be said for some Federal support of agriculture. Assistant Secretary of Agriculture John H. Davis[1] explains:

"In industry you can gage what you are going to produce and hit it on the nose. In agriculture you may miss the goal by 30 percent because of the weather; in a single area you may miss it by as much as 100 percent. For that reason we have to plan too much in order to have enough.

"In industry when the market won't take the supply, you cut the supply down. The slack is reflected in terms of unemployment. If industry is in a nonprofitable position, it can slow up production and get back automatically, without Government aid, to a profit position for all firms except the most inefficient.

"In agriculture that doesn't happen. Production is a biological process and the cycle, with a few exceptions, is a year. You can't turn the production off and on at will; it starts and you can't stop it."

This is precisely what has happened. During World War II farm production was expanded 40 percent beyond its normal prewar production; it was stretched out again during the Korean war. But in the postwar years, foreign agriculture has been reviving, while high supports have been pricing United States products, particularly wheat, out of the world market. United States farm exports dropped from $4 billion in 1952 to $2.8 billion last year.

A LOT LESS WORK

The case for Government support, however, is not a case for rigid support. One result of the rigid and discriminatory supports is that farmers are producing too much of the wrong things. Mr. Benson estimates that they are producing only 2 or 3 percent in excess of what the country can consume or export, but their production is out of whack.

For example, in the spring of 1953, when unsupported hog prices were down while supported corn prices stayed up, farmers cut their production of hogs. They found it more profitable to feed their corn to CCC. Besides, as one farmer observed: "It's a lot less work." So at a time when CCC already had some 290 million bushels of corn in inventory, farmers deposited an additional 235 million bushels on the Government. Pork products became scarce and high priced, even while bins were bursting with unused corn paid for by the taxpayers.[2]

---

[1] Davis will shortly leave the department to direct a research program, at Harvard, into methods by which business can help agriculture toward acquiring stability without Government support.

[2] Mr. Benson's program gives corn special treatment. Instead of changing at the rate of one percentage point to every 2 percent change in supply, corn supports would change at the rate of 1 to 1, the theory being that this will decrease corn prices faster and inspire farmers to turn more corn into hogs.

Rigid supports cannot even be counted on to hold up the prices they are supposed to support. There is not enough storage space to get all the excess production into bins so that it can qualify for loans. The farmer, particularly the small, hard-pressed farmer, will frequently sell on the open market rather than wait and go through all the rigamarole of applying for loans. Even with the support price at 90, the 1952–53 wheat crop sold at an average of 84 percent.

Moreover, high rigid supports have encouraged farmers in other than traditional wheat-growing areas to plant wheat in fields that should have lain fallow, on land where they had formerly grown vegetables, or pastured cattle, thus multiplying overproduction.

In brief, rigid supports instead of solving the problem have made the farmer's situation worse.

Mr. Benson knows that he can't change things overnight. As poor as is the case for rigid supports, he does not believe that substantial protection for the farmer can be abruptly withdrawn.

To Divine help bestowed upon those who help themselves, Ezra Benson would add a fair degree of governmental assistance, hopeful that such assistance finally could be limited to times of real distress.

TO SOFTEN THE SHOCK

The administration program has a number of devices for letting the farmer down gently.

A changeover to new parity, which is one of the important secondary features of the program, would be carefully cushioned. New parity is figured on the basis of the farmer's average purchasing power over the immediately preceding 10 years; old parity is figured on average purchasing power from 1910 to 1914. Under the present program support prices are based on either new or old parity, whichever is higher. Old parity almost always is. Parity for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts is now on the 1910–14 basis—although to produce 100 bushels of wheat 40 years ago, for example, took around 100 man-hours; today, takes only around 26 man-hours.

New parity would not be made universal until 1956, and irrespective of what the parity level turned out to be, support prices would never be lowered more than five points in a year.

TWO BILLION FIVE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS UP THE SLEEVE?

Furthermore, $2.5 billion of CCC stocks would be frozen. This idea has been the focus of much discussion and has been treated with considerable skepticism as nothing but a gigantic piece of legerdemain—a slipping of $2.5 billion of CCC stocks up the Agriculture Department's sleeve. The State Department stands ready to block any effort to dump it in foreign markets. Well, what would happen to the $2.5 billion worth of commodities? This is a question that will continue to embarrass the Agriculture Department. It has been suggested that some of the surplus might be used as payment for foreign labor on overseas military bases. A little of it might be used for foreign relief or doled out at home. But the chances are most of it would just sit in bins for a long time to come while everyone studiously looked the other way.

In any case, freezing it would remove that amount of surplus from total supply, and total supply is the main factor in computing flexible support prices. Thus, support prices would hold at somewhat higher levels than if the $2.5 billion of supply still had to be taken into account.

The fact of the matter is, Department spokesmen have estimated that under the Benson program support prices in 1955 would continue to hold at around 90 percent. It would be 1956 before the effect of the program was felt, and even then support prices would not go much below 85 percent.

THE DIVERTED ACRES

The Benson program has its economic weaknesses. Acreage allotments and marketing quotas will have to be continued for some time on wheat and cotton, and acreage allotments will undoubtedly have to be clamped down on corn.

Plantings of those crops may be cut by some 25 million acres. But the program includes no specific plan for dealing with those acres, many of which, Mr. Benson admits, may be diverted to such crops as soybeans, potatoes, rice, oats, grain sorghums, flaxseed, vegetables. The program undertakes to give some support also to those crops, which may result in merely shifting some of the Government's burden. On this point Mr. Benson takes a wait-and-see attitude.

The program has its philosophic inconsistencies. Tobacco would continue to enjoy 90 percent support, mainly because it has not cost the Government much—not because of anything intrinsically right about 90 percent support for tobacco.

Wool would be supported by out-and-out Government subsidy. The administration wool plan has been called the Brannan plan in sheep's clothing. Actually, the idea was part of farm legislation years before Mr. Brannan gave birth to his brain child.

American woolgrowers are up against foreign competition that, despite United States tariffs running as high as 27 percent, is able to sell annually some 700 million pounds of wool in the United States.

The Government feels that it should maintain the domestic industry at a rate of 360 million pounds a year—as a national defense measure, the argument goes. Sheep growers have convinced the Government they would all vanish from the farm scene without subsidies that hold their prices at 90 percent of parity.

ACID AND EMOTIONAL

Such were the criticisms from friendly sources. Partisan criticism was acid and emotional.

One criticism was that declining prices, instead of cutting production, would have the opposite effect, that farmers would increase their production in a frantic effort to keep ahead.

Department of Agriculture spokesmen deny the validity of the argument, which they say presupposes the farmers will act "irrationally." It is the incentives of rising prices and guaranteed support that cause the farmer to increase production, as witness the 18 years from 1935 to 1953.

From sources that still look without fear on expanding Government power came the old argument that only stricter controls of planting and marketing would do the trick.

But they failed to point out how absolute controls can be applied. The present surpluses, for example, would not be so critical if Brannan had clamped on corn and wheat allotments, as he was directed to by the law, in the presidential-election year of 1952. And Mr. Brannan should not be singled out for special remark. One of the first acts of the somewhat Republican 83d Congress was to pass a bill increasing the allowable cotton acreage from 17,900,000 to 21,300,000. This was not because the United States needs more cotton, but because the old base period from which the allotments were being calculated did not give enough weight to the recent expansion of California and Arizona cotton growing. There no doubt was justice in California's and Arizona's complaint; there was also plenty of political pressure behind it.

The final emotional argument was that farmers should not have to go through an economic readjustment while organized labor enjoys protected wages and industry enjoys markets protected by tariffs. But the fact is that labor does not enjoy anything approaching full protection for wages; for example, it is estimated that 30,000 people were laid off last autumn because of cutbacks in farm-implement plants. For some the layoffs were more than temporary. At best (or worst) tariffs afford only some protection to some segments of United States industry. It has been estimated that competitive goods manufactured abroad, which would come in if tariff barriers were lifted, would actually amount to less than 1 percent of the total goods now produced by United States manufacturers.

The Randall Commission, by the way, made one observation as relevant to the farm problem as to the foreign-trade problem: "In a free economy, some displacement of workers and some injury to institutions is unavoidable. It may come about through technological change, alterations, new taxes, or many other causes. * * * It has never been seriously proposed that the burden of all such injury arising in a free economy should be assumed by the Government."

STRONG BEGINNING

Obviously, the Benson program is not the last word on "the farm problem."

But it is a strong start. It represents a year of the most exhaustive study (according to the Department) ever given to the farm problem. It is consistent with the philosophy, as expressed by Mr. Eisenhower, of being liberal in dealing with people and conservative in economic affairs. And if it isn't the last word, Mr. Benson believes it is a position to stand on for a long time to come. "It is flexible enough," he says, "to meet any situation which we can foresee at present."

Though few individual items in the Benson package can be called completely new, the plan as a whole does open a new phase in a struggle that has been waged along the farm front for some 30 years.

The conservative position has not always been realistic, which is one reason it has lost every round of the fight so far.

In the twenties, when farmers were sinking helplessly into a depression created by the post-World War I collapse of markets, a Republican Congress thrice turned down the McNary-Haugen bill, which introduced the principle of "ratio-price" (now known as parity) and would have had the Government buy domestic farm surpluses and sell them abroad. Finally, the Republican Congress did pass McNary-Haugen twice, and twice it was vetoed by Calvin Coolidge. McNary-Haugen may have been all wrong. But a Republican Congress and Republican administration never produced anything else to meet the crisis.

The Hoover administration's answer to the farmers' mounting distress was to set up the Federal Farm Board. The Board tried to shore up a collapsing economy by underwriting farm cooperatives, improving marketing methods, and finally by buying 257 million bushels of wheat. The Board held onto the wheat until it lost its nerve, and announced that it was going to unload. Wheat that had been selling around 52 cents a bushel plummeted to 36 cents.

By 1933 some nervier men were in the saddle. Some of the nerviest became entrenched in the Department of Agriculture. In the Department, then under Secretary Henry Wallace, was the Communist Ware group, whose members included Alger Hiss, serving as assistant to the general counsel of the AAA. There were others who, if they were not Communists, shared Marxism's antipathy for the profit system.

Actually much of the New Deal farm legislation would be considered practically reactionary today (for example, the 1938 law, which based a flexible-support program on 52 percent to 75 percent of parity)—but it was the New Deal that started the process of solving all farm problems by increasing Government handouts and expanding Government controls. Senator McCarthy, who has come out now for farm-price supports up to

110 percent, should feel a little uneasy at finding himself in this ideological tradition.

The Fair Deal carried the process to a point where proponents of any degree of flexibility in price supports were attacked as betrayers of the farmer. A guiding spirit in that drive to the left was Brannan, who is now serving as a lawyer to the Farmers Union, whose president, Jim Patton, once expressed himself as quite convinced that capitalism is a losing idea.

It is a measure of the distance agriculture history has traveled that the Benson program—moderate, cautious as it is—is being attacked now from both the right and the left as too drastic a readjustment.

A STRUGGLE TO WIN

The long years of Agriculture's domination by radical thinkers now multiply Ezra Benson's difficulties. It is probably true that the great bulk of Agriculture Department employees are nonpolitical civil-service workers; it is also true that Benson is closely surrounded by men who have worked under quite different policies from his. Virtually every important job below the top 4 or 5 is occupied by a Democratic holdover. In 1952 some 150 Department employees were ardent enough Democrats to plunk down $100 apiece for Jackson Day dinners. At the last count, made by one of the lonely Republicans in the Agriculture Department, the 150 were still at work under Mr. Benson. All but a few of the Department's 69,000 employees in Washington and in the network of fieldmen that stretches across the country are holdovers from Democratic administrations, protected by civil service, veterans' preference, and sometimes just by Ezra Benson's faith in men. Mr. Benson thinks of himself as being in a quandary, and regards the quandary with an air of sadness; he has avowed a determination to do something about it. Until he does, his efforts will be undercut and inhibited. He himself will be the victim of frequent, quiet betrayals.

Mr. Benson is trying to reverse history—a bold move any way it is look at, and bound to bring out all the dexterity of which the opposition is capable. The attacks will be made through covert action in Washington and in the field, and by overt action or stultifying compromises devised by Congressmen.

The mere effort to turn the agricultural economy around and start it in another direction represents an immense undertaking. It took courage to initiate the move, and it will take courage on the part of Benson and his boss to see it through. At this point they appear to be two very determined men.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Burke	Carlson
Barrett	Bush	Case
Beall	Butler, Md.	Clements
Bennett	Butler, Nebr.	Cooper
Bricker	Byrd	Cordon
Daniel	Jenner	Mundt
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Eastland	Johnston, S. C	Pastore
Ellender	Kefauver	Payne
Ferguson	Kennedy	Potter
Flanders	Kerr	Purtell
Frear	Kilgore	Robertson
Fulbright	Knowland	Russell
George	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Gillette	Langer	Schoeppel
Goldwater	Lehman	Smathers
Gore	Lennon	Smith, Maine
Griswold	Long	Smith, N. J.
Hayden	Magnuson	Stennis
Hendrickson	Malone	Thye
Hickenlooper	Mansfield	Upton
Hill	Martin	Watkins
Hoey	Maybank	Welker
Holland	McCarthy	Wiley
Humphrey	McClellan	Williams
Hunt	Millikin	Young
Ives	Monroney	
Jackson	Morse	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is absent on official business, and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate, attending the sessions of the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela, as a congressional adviser on the United States delegation.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION BORROWING AUTHORITY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to the announcement I made in the Senate yesterday after consultation with the minority leader, I now ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2714, which is a bill to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2714) to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, in line 10, to strike out "Sec. 3. This act shall be effective July 1, 1954."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to provide $1¾ billion additional borrowing authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Approximately a month ago Congress authorized a restoration of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount of $681,769,703. I was advised a short time ago by Mr. Beach, Director of the Budget Division of the Commodity Credit Corporation, that as of February 19, 1954, the Corporation is estimated to have had $452.2 million of its borrowing authority still available. That was 2 weeks ago. It is probably safe to say it has approximately $200 million or possibly $250 million of borrowing authority left as of today, which will probably carry it through the next 2 or 3 weeks.

The additional borrowing authority provided by the bill should take care of our price-support programs for the 1954 crops, assuming some increase in yields and no sharp drop in general economic conditions. Sharply increased yields, increased plantings of nonallotment price-supported crops, or a sharp decline in business activity, could make additional funds, above those provided by the bill, necessary for 1954 price-support operations. The rate at which cotton and corn loans are being made has slackened somewhat. The Corporation is receiving as a result of price supports a large volume of dairy products, and it is expected that the purchases will increase during the weeks ahead.

If, by the end of the fiscal year, it should appear that more money is required, the representatives of the Corporation have stated they will come before the Congress and advise us so as to make sure they will not run out of funds during the fall harvest season.

I think that tells the story, Mr. President. The Corporation needs the money. It has sufficient funds to enable it to proceed for probably a couple of weeks. It is believed that the amount provided in the bill will enable the Corporation to meet the demands upon it through the 1954 crop year.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Without this increase in borrowing authority, would it be possible to accomplish the purposes of the program?

Mr. AIKEN. It is doubtful whether the present program could be accomplished. Commodities which are already on hand, including those which the President proposes to set aside, have been already acquired and paid for. Most of the Corporation's funds have already been tied up in these commodities.

Mr. CASE. They have; but would it be possible to continue the program of loans through the Commodity Credit Corporation without this increase in borrowing power?

Mr. AIKEN. No; because the commodities involved in the set-aside proposal are already paid for, and the set-aside would not of itself provide any additional funds. The money would be tied up in the future without much prospect of having it available.

Mr. CASE. Then, if a Senator wishes to support the so-called set-aside proposal and to continue the price-support

program through loans, it would be important to support the particular proposed legislation which is now pending, would it not?

Mr. AIKEN. It would be very important to take that position.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the set-aside proposal to which the Senator has referred is carried out, would it not be necessary for Congress to appropriate money so as to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the cost of the commodities that may be set aside.

Mr. AIKEN. The commodities which would be set aside are pretty well tied up for quite a while in the foreseeable future. There would be very little chance of getting any money out of the commodities which are proposed to be set aside, with the possible exception of dairy products.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator realizes, of course, that unless we appropriate additional money for the set-aside program, it might hamper the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying the support program now provided for under the present law. The Corporation has to have this money in order to be able to support prices of certain commodities under the present law.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. If any of these commodities are set aside, in order to carry out the new program it will be necessary to appropriate more money for it.

Mr. AIKEN. It is believed that the money provided for in this bill is adequate to carry through this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is for the loan program. The pending bill is strictly to carry out the support program now provided by law.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. If two and a half billion dollars worth of commodities are set aside and taken out of the picture, we shall not realize much from them for perhaps 3 or 4 years. It is entirely possible that that amount will have to be restored to the Corporation for future price support operations. The authorization contained in the bill is believed to be adequate to take care of the needs for this year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to the fact that it is my understanding the action in reporting the bill was unanimous on the part of all Senators who are members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Regardless of differences of opinion with respect to price supports, differences of opinion as to the reduction in parity support level of dairy products in which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is interested, and differences of opinion on other matters, all Senators, if my recollection serves me correctly, felt that here was something that had to be done if the Commodity Credit Corporation was to be assured of its ability to carry through with the existing price-support program during the current year. Am I not correct in my understanding?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Florida is correct. There were no votes in opposition to reporting the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, it is proposed to strike out section 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I call up amendment designated 3-2-54-A, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In line 3, it is proposed to insert "(a)" after the word "That", and between lines 5 and 6 to insert the following:

(b) (1) The first section of such act is amended by striking out the following: ", or insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower,".

(2) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Such capital impairment shall be restored with appropriated funds as provided herein rather than through the cancellation of notes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] appear as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The purpose of the amendment is in line with the debate on the floor of the Senate several weeks ago in connection with the cancellation of notes to offset a $700 million deficit of the Commodity Credit Coorporation.

This amendment would have no effect at all with respect to the amount of money provided by the bill, nor would it represent any savings to the taxpayer. The amendment merely provides for a simplification of the bookkeeping system of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The first section of the amendment would require the Treasury Department, each year when it made an appraisal of the department's inventories, to appraise those inventories on the basis of actual cost. In other words, the loss would not be written off until after the loss had actually been sustained. That will provide a more accurate picture of what the Corporation was doing and show the exact cost of the program broken down by commodities.

The second section provides that the capital impairment recommended by the Treasury Department would then be written off by direct appropriations, rather than by the present indirect method of note cancellations. Again, I am frank to say that this would represent no savings to the taxpayers, nor would it save time. It is merely a long overdue simplification of the bookkeeping system. It would also obviate many arguments as to the actual cost of this program to the taxpayers. It would require everything to be set out in the open, and to be aboveboard, so that every commodity would stand on its own footing.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment would in no manner save time, either, would it, because the Commodity Credit Corporation authorities must appear before committees of the Congress and show what the chargeoff or the impairment of capital is, would they not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In either case, it would be necessary for the Commodity Credit Corporation to present to Congress figures showing what the losses were.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. It would neither save any time nor require any additional time. It would simply mean that that which was done by the Corporation would be more readily understandable by the American people and by Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Following the action of Congress in restoring the impaired capital, in the amount, roughly, of $680 million, officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation discussed the situation not only among themselves, but with other agencies of the Government, and have considered recommending that the law be amended to provide only for restoration of realized losses, as the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware would provide.

The Corporation would not, under such a proposal, ask for reimbursement until it has equalized its position with the Treasury. In other words, the Commodity Credit Corporation would not ask for restoration of losses until losses actually have been incurred. As I understand it, the Corporation would not ask for restoration of estimated losses.

However, the Department is quite concerned about whether the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware would be retroactive in nature and would require them to repay to the Treasury money which has already been restored to them, for estimated losses on inventories and which has been largely spent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that there is nothing in the amendment of a retroactive nature, and the amendment is not so intended.

As the Senator from Vermont knows, I opposed the last note cancellation bill which was before the Senate, but I be-

lieve that to make the amendment apply retroactively would entail much unnecessary work. It would be almost mathematically impossible to go back and make proper calculations. I would be well satisfied to have the amendment incorporated in the bill, so that from this time forward the business of the Commodity Credit Corporation would be done in a manner which would be more readily understandable to all concerned.

There is nothing of a retroactive nature in the amendment, and nothing of that nature is intended.

Mr. AIKEN. With regard to the desire of the Senator from Delaware to have impairment restored through appropriated funds, rather than through the cancellation of notes, I have always favored direct appropriations. Appropriations should be made out in the open where everybody can see them. I do not favor the cancellation of notes.

I have no authority, on behalf of the committee, to accept the amendments offered by the Senator from Delaware. Personally, I have no objection to them. With the understanding that the provisions are not retroactive, I am satisfied that the Department would have no objection to the amendments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is my understanding, after conferring with officials of the Department, that they were concerned with the possibility of a retroactive feature. I agree with the officials in that view, but there are no retroactive provisions. The amendments would go into effect if and when the bill were passed.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Department recognizes, just as much as do the Members of the Senate, and as has always been the position of the Senator from Vermont, that it would be better to make payments in the form of direct appropriations, which are made openly and above board.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure my good friend, the Senator from Vermont, will recall that when we had a conference sometime ago in the Committee on Appropriations pertaining to a replenishment of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation, we took the position that only such losses as were actually sustained should be charged off. I favor the amendment suggested and I hope it will be adopted. Several days ago I stated that I did not think it was appropriate for the Commodity Credit Corporation to charge off anticipated losses, but only actual losses. This amendment will accomplish that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say to the Senator from Louisiana that after the conference to which he referred, the officials of the Department of Agriculture and other departments of the Government agreed to proceed on a realized-loss basis in asking for the restoration of capital from now on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have no further amendment to offer to the bill, and I am not going to oppose the bill because regardless of what we think about the merits or demerits of the 90 percent support program, we must nevertheless recognize that such a program is on the statute books, that it is the law and that therefore Congress is obligated to provide funds in order that the law may be properly administered.

There is, however, another phase of this question which I wish to discuss, and I should like to get some assurance from the chairman of the committee and others in order that we may correct the situation. I refer to the manner in which the poultry industry on the Del-Mar-Va peninsula has been injured by decisions of the United States Government.

For several months poultry prices have been at a low level for farmers throughout the United States. Back in December 1953, a meeting was held at Selbyville, Del., which was attended by the Senators from Maryland, my colleague, the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Representative from that area in Maryland, and the Representative from the State of Delaware.

At that time broilers on the Del-Mar-Va peninsula were selling at a loss to the farmers of from 6 to 8 cents a pound. Prices had declined from an average of from 28 to 30 cents a pound in September to a low level in December of from 14 to 18 cents a pound.

It was recognized by all concerned that there had been an overexpansion of production, and that to that extent the farmers themselves were responsible for the correction. It was pointed out, however, at the meeting that while the national average of overproduction had been 15 percent, the overproduction in the Del-Mar-Va area had been less than 7 percent. Therefore, we were at a loss to understand why prices in the Del-Mar-Va area had suffered more than double the decline indicated by the national average. At that time prices on the Del-Mar-Va peninsula were 4½ cents a pound below the national average.

The farmers requested that a study be made in order to obtain the answers to certain questions. One of the questions was why prices in the Del-Mar-Va area had declined to a level much lower than prices throughout the country.

That question was prominent in the minds of all in view of the fact that overproduction on the peninsula was much less than the expansion throughout the country.

Failure of consumer prices to reflect the lower farm prices was also discussed.

The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was already planning the appointment of a subcommittee to study the question of the spread between prices received by the farmers in general and prices paid by the consumer. We hope later to make a report on this question.

We have heard much about the spread in prices of agricultural commodities, not only of poultry but of all other agricultural commodities. Recently the Department of Agriculture issued a report in which it outlined the reasons for the wide spread in beef prices. There have been many such reports, but still the question kept recurring. There seems to be a failure on the part of many to understand the reasons for the wide spread between the price the consumer pays and what the farmer receives.

In checking the problem confronting the broiler growers it was soon established that the United States Government itself, either intentionally or otherwise, had been a contributing factor to the extreme decline in poultry prices during the last 4 months of 1953. I have already discussed this with officials of the Department of Agriculture and the Quartermaster Corps. I think it should be brought to the attention of Congress.

In the last 6 months of 1953 there were three decisions made by the Government agencies each of which adversely affected the broiler market. One of these decisions resulted in the practical demoralization of the market in the Del-Mar-Va area.

All of us remember the low price of beef back in the middle of 1953, at which time the Secretary of Agriculture inaugurated a beef-buying program to help relieve demoralized prices of cattle. At that time I discussed with the Secretary of Agriculture the possibility that if the program were extended too far, it could result in an adverse effect upon the prices of competitive meats. To a certain extent we find that action to be responsible for the condition with which we are now confronted.

It should be noted that those who raise broilers constitute the only group of farmers in the United States who have not asked for or received one dime in subsidies from the United States Government. They have not asked previously, nor do they ask now, to be included in the price support program, but they do insist that the United States Government does not have a right to administer a support program in another phase of the industry and thereby demoralize poultry prices. After buying this beef the Government distributed the product free of charge for school-lunch programs, hospitals, welfare agencies, and other such organizations. Such agencies used to buy poultry products. Today instead they are using beef which is being distributed cost free and transportation free by the United States Government.

This was a contributing factor in adversely affecting poultry prices at the farm and was so recognized by the Department of Agriculture at the time the program was started.

However, there was another phase to the problem involving an action by the Government which was even more important than the one I have just mentioned. The Government is using the Quartermaster Corps of the Armed Forces as an instrument of the price-support program.

The Armed Forces were given instructions to cut the purchase of poultry by 25 percent and substitute beef on the

menu of our men in uniform. This decision was made for the sole purpose of supporting the beef market with little care as to the possible ill effect it would inevitably have on poultry prices.

It was admitted that the decision was made for the sole purpose of helping beef producers, although it was also admitted that in carrying out such a program they recognized that it would have an adverse effect on the price of other meats. It was stated that if poultry prices got low enough, poultry producers would start squealing, and they would then grease their wheel. I think such a statement is an absurd one to be made by any public official.

Mr. President, when this matter was called to our attention—namely, that the Army had reduced by more than 25 percent its purchases of poultry, as compared with those in the preceding 4 months of 1952—again we recognize that that still did not explain why the price of poultry on the Del-Mar-Va peninsula had declined below the national average. The action of the Department of Agriculture in distributing free beef and the action of the Army in curtailing its poultry purchases by 25 percent should have had the same effect throughout the Nation, including the Del-Mar-Va peninsula. So we still did not have the answer as to why prices in the Eastern Shore of Maryland and in the State of Delaware had declined 3 or 4 cents below the national average. Therefore, we continued to check.

We found, much to our surprise, that in carrying out its reduction in purchases, the United States Army had centered the reduction 100 percent in the Del-Mar-Va peninsula, and had practically eliminated all purchases in that area. This action was done notwithstanding the fact that the Del-Mar-Va area represents the largest broiler producing area in the United States and prices in that area were lower than in any other area in the United States.

The entire cutback in Army buying was centered in the Del-Mar-Va area.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Can the Senator from Delaware tell me what proportion of the entire production of broilers and fryers originates in Maryland?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Eastern Shore of Maryland and the State of Delaware produce approximately 25 percent of all broilers produced in the United States.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Can the Senator from Delaware tell us the percentage of broilers purchased by the Army, through the New York, Richmond, and Columbia quartermaster centers in 1953 from the Delaware and Maryland area?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was such an insignificant proportion that I cannot figure it, but the Del-Mar-Va area produces about 3 million broilers a week, whereas in all of 1953 the Army purchased less than 30,000 broilers, or less than 90,000 pounds. They used, however, around 80 million pounds of poultry during 1953.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not true that the Army did not purchase any in the State of Maryland during that period?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true. The State of Maryland did not receive a single order, and only 90,000 pounds were purchased in Delaware.

The Army has blocked out this area, which represents 25 percent of the entire poultry production of the Nation. It is the same area which supplied practically all the poultry used by the Army during World War II, because at that time the Army blocked off our entire producing area, and took 100 percent of its poultry output. As a result, we lost all our civilian markets. However, we are not complaining about that. The Government needed the poultry, and we were glad to provide it. Nevertheless, it is true that we lost all our civilian markets. As the Armed Forces took 100 percent of the poultry output of the Eastern Shore of Maryland and the State of Delaware, the result was that the surrounding areas were able to take over our former customers.

With this background we feel that, at least, we are entitled to our proportionate part of the Army's purchases.

On the other hand, when the Quartermaster Corps of the Army is used as an instrument of the price-support program—and that has been acknowledged to be a fact—and when the Army cuts back by 25 percent its purchases of a product as important as poultry, and then makes all the reduction in the two States of Delaware and Maryland, I think an explanation is called for. Obviously, Mr. President, if such rigging of a market were done by a group of private purchasers, they would be put in jail. And yet we have here a clear-cut case where two Government agencies admit having conspired to rig the market of these commodities.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Quartermaster Corps did that without consulting anyone in the poultry industry in Delaware or Maryland and I believe the Senator said that after doing it, the Quartermaster Corps said that when it began to hurt, it was satisfied the injured parties would complain about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct; the Army said it was subjected to such tremendous pressure that it had to help the beef producers; and therefore it felt it had to cut back the purchases of poultry. So evidently the Army is inviting a little bit of squeaking and a little bit of pressure. If that it what it is inviting, I am certain it will find such squeaks and pressure occurring, because, so far I am concerned, it will find difficulty in obtaining appropriations to finance these unjust if not illegal decisions.

Mr. President, this is a case which should be looked into by the Department of Justice, because the United States Government has no right to take the tax dollars of the people of the States of Maryland and Delaware and then use those dollars to put the farmers of those States out of business.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. FREAR. I understood the senior Senator from Delaware to say that during World War II the Army took all the poultry or all the broilers produced in the Eastern Shore of Maryland and in the State of Delaware, for consumption by those who served in the armed services. Is that true?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true.

Mr. FREAR. Did the Army or the purchasing agent for the Army pay a premium price for that poultry, to indemnify in a small degree the poultry producers of that area for losing their civilian markets?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; the poultry was purchased at the national average price. I may say that the price at which the poultry was purchased was satisfactory and resulted in a profit, insofar as the farmers were concerned, although there was much complaint about the arbitrary manner in which that operation was conducted—and much could be said about it. The farmers in that area felt that if the Army needed the poultry, they were willing to let the Army have it. At the same time, because of that situation, and in view of the fact that as a result those farmers lost their civilian markets, a good argument could be made on the proposition that they now should receive some consideration. At least they are entitled to their share of the Government business.

We will not sit idly by and have the United States Army completely block off the most important poultry-producing area of the Nation by refusing to make any poultry purchases whatever in that area.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will my colleague yield further to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FREAR. My colleague correctly stated that the Army did this in an arbitrary manner. I subscribe entirely to his statement. I think the poultry farmers of our area are receiving at this time treatment similar to that they received during the war, in that the purchasing agency of the Armed Forces is acting very arbitrarily in placing purchase orders for poultry in areas other than the one about which we are speaking, namely, the Eastern Shore of Maryland and the State of Delaware.

The producers in that area have had very little benefit from the civilian markets during most of the last 18 months, as a matter of fact; is not that true?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It is an established doctrine that the power to tax is the power to destroy. It now would seem that the power to purchase is the power to destroy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There can be no question of that, and that is recognized by the procurement officials of the Army.

Mr. President, to emphasize the absurdity of this situation, let me point out that a large Army camp is located within half a mile of where my colleague from Delaware lives, Dover, Del. The Army is actually transporting poultry there for a distance of 600 or 800 miles, and is paying the transportation charges in order to feed the men in that Army camp—a camp which is located in the very heart of the greatest broiler-producing area in the United States. And the Army is paying for the poultry it sends there at a greater price than the price at which the poultry could be purchased in that very area. That is ridiculous.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does not the Senator from Delaware know that other agencies of the Government are purchasing materials offshore, at an equal or greater price than that at which the same materials could be purchased in the United States? Yet in this instance, by using the poultry produced in the area, the Army could avoid paying the freight charges they are required to pay in the case of the broilers and fryers sent from a distance. Is not that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

I took up this question with the Army, and I said there could be only two possible reasons, so far as I knew, why it was bypassing that area. One would be the quality of our poultry. They said that was not true. Of course, I would have argued with them if they had said otherwise, because as one from that area, we know it is as good as that produced anywhere. Nevertheless, they admitted that that was not the reason. The next question then must be the question of price. Immediately they jumped at that and said, "Yes; your price in that area is a little higher. We could buy them cheaper elsewhere. As one who advocates economy, we know you want us to buy them where they can be bought the cheapest." I would not argue that point. I asked for the figures, and found that the prices being paid in other areas were not lower but higher than the prices in the Del-Mar-Va area.

So they were acting contrary to the argument which they made with respect to buying poultry products at the lowest price. Therefore, it is established that it is not the quality nor is it the price that influenced their decision. Thus far they have been unable to think of any other excuse. The Government has no right to demoralize any farming industry. Such a course would not be tolerated by other States for 1 minute in connection with the support program. For example, if Government officials were to say, "We will support the price of wheat, but we will leave North Dakota or Minnesota out, and buy no wheat in that area," or if they were to say, "We will leave out Michigan or Minnesota in buying milk," or "We will leave out the State of Maine when we buy potatoes," I do not think any of those States, or any other State in the Union, would stand for it; and we in the Del-Mar-Va area do not intend to stand for it in this instance.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not true that during the entire year of 1953 the three great purchasing agencies of the Army in this area did not buy a pound of broilers or roasters on the eastern shore of Maryland?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. There are many plants on the eastern shore of Maryland. Last year they produced 176 million pounds of poultry, for which new markets had to be found. The State of Delaware produced 202 million pounds.

When the Government decided arbitrarily to cut back the buying of poultry in order to help the price of beef, the entire cutback was made in those States. I think that is wrong. The Government had no right to cutback the buying of poultry in order to help the price of meat. I do not believe that it was ever intended that the United States Army should serve as a support program for agricultural commodities. The sooner the Army officials get that through their heads the better it will be. If such a policy continues, eventually we shall find the Army buying tanks in order to keep a certain plant operating, whether tanks are needed or not. We shall find them buying other products without regard to their need, but solely on the basis of make-work policies.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does not the Senator find, in talking with representatives of the various agencies, that just such a psychology is creeping into their thinking?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it may be; and if it is, it is time to have it corrected. I should like to hear an expression from the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as to whether or not he thinks we are "off base" in filing our protest against the action which has been taken.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry feels that when it comes to protecting the rights of Delaware and Maryland poultry raisers, the Senators from those States are in a class by themselves.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Apparently we have done a very poor job up to this point in protecting ourselves.

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is always concerned over any inequity in the prices which farmers receive, and in the spread of prices between the producer and the ultimate consumer. That is the reason why the committee authorized the appointment of a subcommittee to follow up the actions which might affect farm prices generally, or prices in a particular area. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. I believe they constitute a very effective subcommittee. I think it can almost be taken for granted that the full committee will support the subcommittee in its findings, because I believe its findings will be findings of fact.

I know that on frequent occasions the Senator from Delaware has mentioned the names of persons on the floor of the Senate; but I have never known him to make any charge against any person on the floor of the Senate which was not later substantiated. I have never known him to name a person on the floor of the Senate who was not later found to be negligent in some respect.

Our committee does not have much money with which to operate. A year ago we had $15,000, and spent $10,000 of it. To my dismay, I found that the time for spending the other $5,000 expired on January 31. We have submitted a resolution, which I presume will go to the Committee on Rules and Administration, asking that we be permitted to use the other $5,000 during the remainder of the year. I believe we can make it go a long way.

So far as the Senator from Delaware is concerned, I feel that we should support him in correcting inequities, whether such inequities are committed by individuals or by an agency of Government, if they result in harmful effects upon the farm economy in general.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Vermont. Let me repeat what I said in the beginning. I am not making this protest by way of an objection to the bill which is now being considered. However, it is appropriate to discuss the subject while we are talking about increasing the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation. While it is true that the Commodity Credit Corporation is not directly responsible for what the Army buys, yet both agencies admit that the overall plan to reduce purchases of one agricultural commodity at the expense of another was worked out in a joint conference between the two agencies. So far as the American farmer is concerned, he is not in the least bit interested in whether X agency or Y agency is the agency which bankrupts him. It is the United States Government which is responsible, and the farmer wants the situation corrected regardless of whether one agency or the other is responsible. We do not want any buckpassing.

I close by expressing the hope that both agencies will recognize the impropriety of that which they have done, and take immediate steps to correct the situation. If they do not do so, I shall continue this effort in perhaps a more aggressive manner than I am now proceeding. I cannot sit by as a representative from that area and see Government purchasing agencies deliberately bring about wholesale bankruptcies in the farming area of that section of the country.

The county in which I live rates as the third largest agricultural county east of the Rocky Mountains in terms of production. When we speak of agricultural production, it is often supposed that reference is made only to the Midwest.

For the benefit of those who look upon our area as more or less an industrial area, let me repeat that Sussex County, Del., in which I live outranks every county in the so-called farm belt in the Midwest and every county in the South. Furthermore it is time that the administration recognizes that our farmers are just as important to the economy of this Nation as are the farmers in the so-called agriculture belt.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator thinks it would be worthwhile to place in the RECORD at this point figures showing the total number of pounds of fryers and broilers sold from farms in this area and the total purchases made by the three purchasing agencies of the Army?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it would be appropriate, and I think it might be well to have such figures incorporated into the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a breakdown of the production capacity of each of the major broiler-producing areas.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Georgia	315, 339, 000
2. Arkansas	203, 356, 000
3. Delaware	202, 092, 000
4. Maryland	176, 595, 000
5. Texas	170, 783, 000
6. California	158, 661, 000
7. Virginia (Shenandoah Valley)	156, 990, 000
8. North Carolina	121, 425, 000
9. Indiana	107, 757, 000
10. Maine	87, 582, 000
Total pounds sold from farms (latest figures officially available above) for the year 1952	2, 695, 358, 000

Mr. WILLIAMS. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report of purchases for 1953 which I received under date of February 24, 1954, signed by K. L. Hastings, Major General, United States Army, the Quartermaster General. In this report he confirms that the States of Delaware and Maryland have been ignored 100 percent during the past 12 months. The bad effects of this action accumulated during the year and finally were climaxed by the disastrous break in the last couple of months.

This report covers only three procurement centers, at Richmond, Va.; Columbia, S. C.; and New York, N. Y. They are the three centers which do the buying so far as the eastern seaboard is concerned. Other procurement centers do the buying for other areas of the country.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 24, 1954.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Pursuant to your request of January 27, 1954, there are attached tabulations by States of monthly purchases of poultry made by the New York, Richmond, and Columbia Quartermaster Market Centers during calendar year 1953. Prices given are the average of the prices paid by each market center to vendors in the respective States in the months listed and include transportation costs.

This office is glad to have been able to be of assistance to you in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

K. L. HASTINGS,
Major General, USA,
The Quartermaster General.

New York quartermaster market center, fryers and roasters, ready to cook, domestic consumption

PURCHASES IN NEW JERSEY

1953	Number of pounds	Average price per pound
January	44, 200	$0. 5781
February	8, 400	.5784
March	26, 700	.5326
April	18, 080	.5301
May	21, 510	.5054
June	13, 680	.5127
July	22, 680	.5433
August	12, 370	.5376
September	32, 740	.5178
October	4, 710	.5524
November	2, 050	.5529
December	6, 350	.4826

PURCHASES IN PENNSYLVANIA

January	57, 864	$0. 5027
February	38, 282	.5203
March	20, 740	.5364
April	21, 370	.5219
May	9, 335	.5168
June	283, 470	.4744
July	102, 070	.5094
August	15, 600	.5271
September	112, 050	.4654
October	15, 450	.5028
November	103, 400	.4673
December	69, 960	.4325

PURCHASES IN NEW YORK

January	60, 650	$0. 4895
February	820	.5478
March	640	.5614
April	616	.5308
May	2, 000	.5297
June	6, 300	.5001
July	5, 000	.4928
August	600	.5875
September	None	None
October	400	.5500
November	39, 200	.4525
December	14, 000	.4223

PURCHASES IN MAINE

January	None	None
February	None	None
March	None	None
April	8, 560	$0. 4801
May	30, 000	.4973
June	30, 000	.5100
July	None	None
August	None	None
September	None	None
October	None	None
November	None	None
December	90, 000	.4972

Richmond quartermaster market center, fryers and roasters, ready to cook, domestic consumption

PURCHASES IN PENNSYLVANIA

1953	Number of pounds	Average price per pound
January	0	0
February	87, 300	$0. 4053
March	53, 000	.4600
April	71, 100	.4742
May	98, 000	.4671
June	59, 967	.4295

Richmond quartermaster market center, fryers and roasters, ready to cook, domestic consumption—Continued

1953	Number of pounds	Average price per pound
July	63, 500	$0. 5418
August	92, 500	.4953
September	30, 500	.4804
October	46, 000	.5052
November	82, 300	.5097
December	75, 400	.4185

PURCHASES IN VIRGINIA

January	179, 560	$0. 4939
February	268, 950	.4792
March	270, 000	.4727
April	114, 300	.4651
May	55, 500	.4590
June	175, 000	.4623
July	25, 000	.5095
August	13, 500	.5135
September	62, 000	.4883
October	248, 300	.4588
November	100, 775	.4687
December	380, 900	.4136

PURCHASES IN DELAWARE

January	None	None
February	None	None
March	None	None
April	None	None
May	None	None
June	17, 300	$0. 4531
July	23, 000	.5344
August	6, 500	.4998
September	None	None
October	None	None
November	30, 900	.4551
December	None	None

Columbia quartermaster market center, fryers and roasters, ready to cook, domestic consumption

PURCHASES IN NORTH CAROLINA

1953	Number of pounds	Average price per pound
January	53, 300	$0. 5346
February	204, 860	.4661
March	142, 405	.4807
April	154, 820	.4680
May	277, 120	.4615
June	333, 900	.4676
July	189, 110	.5072
August	552, 775	.4793
September	493, 260	.4671
October	261, 500	.4664
November	246, 000	.4662
December	379, 800	.4134

PURCHASES IN GEORGIA

January	402, 000	$0. 5323
February	303, 180	.4658
March	157, 000	.4652
April	181, 500	.4700
May	230, 700	.4552
June	260, 612	.4835
July	346, 100	.5028
August	107, 100	.4813
September	115, 620	.4725
October	165, 630	.4730
November	219, 040	.4497
December	245, 470	.4198

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is unquestionably true that all the cutback was made in our Delmarva area. I think the United States Government has the responsibility to offset that cutback in the months to follow, not only by reinstating purchases where they belong, but by giving to our area extra orders until such time as the balance is reestablished.

I have likewise discussed the subject with the majority leader, and I understand that he, too, will support our contention that the discrimination against

our area, the States of Maryland and Delaware, was never intended by Congress when it appropriated funds for the United States Army.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware that I did raise some objections to the possibility of an amendment to the bill on that point. The Senator from Delaware agreed that it would not be the correct procedure to offer such an amendment in order to meet the problem. I say to him at this time that there has been inequity in the handling of the situation which, at least on its face, and also from the facts which the Senator from Delaware has presented—and I have no doubt that they are accurate facts, because I have always found him to be accurate in his presentations, both on the floor of the Senate and privately—and that I would certainly undertake to determine why such inequity was permitted to exist, and to do everything possible to try to remedy it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, with the assurances which we have had of cooperation on the part of the leaders in the Senate in urging correction of this unfair situation, I shall not object to the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2714) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2984) to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation or pension purposes which have been in effect for 20 or more years.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of Sister Walfreda (Anna Nelles), and Sister Amaltrudis (Gertrude Schneider);

H. R. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth R. Ekholm;

H. R. 749. An act for the relief of Shul-Fook Fung;

H. R. 788. An act for the relief of Beryl Williams;

H. R. 823. An act for the relief of Abraham G. Sakin;

H. R. 824. An act for the relief of Demetrious Konstantno Papanicolaou;

H. R. 828. An act for the relief of Dr. Vincenzo Guzzo;

H. R. 907. An act for the relief of Wolodymyr Hirniak;

H. R. 946. An act for the relief of Mrs. Louise Blackstone;

H. R. 965. An act for the relief of Michael Demcheshen;

H. R. 1339. An act for the relief of Dr. Soon Tai Ryang;

H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Zia Edin Taheri and Frances Hakimzadeh Taheri;

H. R. 1358. An act for the relief of Dr. Marcelino J. Avecilla and Dr. Teodora A. Fidelino-Avecilla;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Louis M. Jacobs;

H. R. 1649. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisela Walter Sizemore;

H. R. 1688. An act for the relief of Henry Ty;

H. R. 1795. An act for the relief of Helena Shostenko;

H. R. 2035. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michaline Borzecka;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of William M. Smith;

H. R. 2504. An act for the relief of Sisters Adelaide Canelas and Maria Isabel Franco;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of Alfonso Gatti;

H. R. 2622. An act for the relief of Maria Teresa Ortega Perez;

H. R. 2623. An act for the relief of Jose M. Thomasa-Sanchez, Adela Duran Cuevas de Thomasa, and Jose Maria Thomasa Duran;

H. R. 2774. An act for the relief of Endre Szende, Zsuzsanna Szende, Katalin Szende (a minor), and Maria Szende (a minor);

H. R. 2817. An act for the relief of George A. Ferris;

H. R. 3005. An act for the relief of Charles Sabah;

H. R. 3236. An act for the relief of Constantin and Lucia (Bercescu) Turcano;

H. R. 3455. An act for the relief of Jalal Rashtian;

H. R. 3749. An act for the relief of Woldemar Jaskowsky; and

H. R. 5773. An act to provide for the refund, under certain conditions, of money paid as premiums on United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance which is canceled for fraud.

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 355.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 355) to amend the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468) as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated. The amendment is identical with the text of Senate Joint Resolution 121, Calendar No. 983, to supply agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend the joint resolution so as to read:

Resolved, etc., That section 501 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended is further amended by striking out the parenthetical clause "(pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico or after every practicable effort has been made by the United States to negotiate and reach agreement on such arrangements)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the reason for introducing the joint resolution is that the mutual agreement between the United States and Mexico expired on January 15, 1954, and the two governments have been unable to get together on certain points since that time. The United States Government undertook unilateral recruitment of farm labor which had legally entered the United States. That had been going on, I think, for approximately a month, and it was found that legislation would be necessary to enable it to continue. So the proposed legislation has been introduced, which in effect, authorizes the proper United States agency to recruit Mexican farm labor in the event that the United States Government is unable to reach an agreement with the Mexican Government.

As I understand, Mr. President, the two Governments have now virtually reached an agreement for the coming year and are simply trying to work out the proper language at this time. It may require another week or two to do that. However, our Labor Department feels that if this proposed legislation were enacted it would be a safeguard for the future in the event the law is continued and the two Governments are unable to reach an agreement. It is believed that it will also help in working out any new agreement.

I wish to say again that the two governments are in virtual agreement at this time. If they reach a satisfactory agreement, unilateral action will not be necessary, and the situation will be as it was last year. Of course, in the event the two Governments are unable to reach a satisfactory agreement, and there is no provision for unilateral screening of the migrant labor from south of the border, we shall simply have labor contractors going into the field, and there is a feeling that the screening will not be as thorough as it would be if the Federal Government had a part in the program.

I understand the Mexican Government is now showing a real willingness to reach an agreement, and, in all probability, the program will be worked out between the two Governments within the next 10 days.

The Department of Labor feels that the amendment to the law should be enacted so that in the event another impasse is reached, the recruitment of

Mexican labor will not be turned over to private contractors and we will not be running the risk of getting more undesirable migrant labor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I understand it, this joint resolution would permit the admission of certain migrant workers through unilateral action of the United States Government in the event a satisfactory agreement cannot be reached with the Mexican Government, as has been the case in previous years.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry what would be the qualifications required; what would be the standards in regard to the admission of migrant workers from Mexico?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the qualifications would be such as would be established by our own Department of Labor. Whether they would be higher than those which are provided under a mutual agreement with Mexico, I cannot say. To me the significant thing is that these laborers will cross the border, anyway, looking for work, and it is probably better to have them screened by the United States Labor Department than it is to let them scatter and seek work wherever they can find it, because probably a greater measure of security is afforded by having our own agency screen them. We hope and believe it will not be necessary to do that, but, apparently, the Mexican Government was not ready to renew the agreement at the time the old one expired on January 15, and something had to be done. It seemed more orderly for the United States Government to undertake to do it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Do I correctly understand that an undisclosed number of migrant workers would be screened according to the requirements of our immigration laws today, covering the legal admission of migrant labor?

Mr. AIKEN. It is my understanding that under the Immigration Act migrants can be admitted temporarily for farm labor. The Labor Department would not be expected to accept those who entered the country illegally.

I wish the Senator from New York to understand that I am not an expert on immigration at all.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to establish the fact that satisfactory requirements concerning qualifications will be provided by the proposed amendment, in admitting a large number of Mexican workers into this country. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator can inform me further on that question.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall have to say it is my impression that the qualifications and standards would be as high, and probably higher, if the immigrants were screened by the Department of Labor as they would be if there were no screening at all. There is some protection involved which we would not have if the laborers came across the border and contacted labor contractors here and there, seeking jobs for themselves.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I assure the distinguished Senator from New York that my latest information is that probably it will not be necessary at all to engage in unilateral contracting for this labor, because it appears that the two Governments are very close to full agreement at this time.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

I believe the proposal made in the amendment is extremely dangerous and most surprising. In recent months we have heard of the great need for screening immigrants to the United States, notably from Europe.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. My attention has just been called to the fact that the conditions of entry are to be specified by the Attorney General.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

Very rigid standards and requirements have been established under the McCarran-Walter Act, covering immigration to the United States. As Senators know, I have been critical of many provisions of that act, which I think are unduly harsh, inhumane, unworkable, and contrary to the best interests of the United States in our relations with other countries. But, at most, those immigrants are entering the United States legally, after screening.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the chairman of the committee, will listen to my statement about this matter.

During the present calendar year, approximately 100,000 immigrants, carefully screened, will come into the United States. I think that in many cases, as I have said, they will be hypercritically screened. We seek to exclude anyone who has the slightest taint of any subversive organization, either by association or by connection. That is as it should be. I have no objection to that. But in addition we are excluding many persons, both men and women, having great skills in science, engineering, medicine, the arts, literature, and in other fields, for other reasons that go far beyond the necessities of national security.

At the same time, we are closing our eyes to the fact that today approximately 1,500,000 immigrants are coming into the United States illegally. All that it is necessary for these people to do is to walk across the Rio Grande, which separates Mexico from the United States. They are called wetbacks, but they do not even have to wet their backs. At most seasons of the year, they do not have to swim the Rio Grande; they can walk across it with no more effort than I would use in walking from here to the rostrum. They are admitted into the United States, not legally, but completely illegally. Because we close our eyes to the situation, these 1,500,000 persons who come into the country are completely and absolutely uncontrolled. They enter under no standards or qualifications whatsoever. We are not willing, even, to provide the Immigration and Naturalization Service with adequate funds with which to police the border between the United States and Mexico and between the United States and Canada.

Why do the immigrants come into the United States? Because it has been represented that some of our farming interests require their help. We are making a fight against subversives, and we must continue to make a fight against them and against communism; but I pray that we shall be, at least, reasonably consistent.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service, in a statement issued less than 3 weeks ago, said that every day more than 100 subversives were coming across the Mexican border into the United States as wetbacks. Think of it, Mr. President, 100 a day. We are making no effort to stem that tide.

Certainly there is no reason in the world for Russia or her satellite countries to try to send subversive spies, saboteurs, and traitors into the United States through legal ports of entry, when all that it is necessary for them to do is to place such persons on the border between the United States and Mexico and to say, "Go to it, boys. No one will make any attempt to stop you."

Mr. President, 1½ million persons of the wetback type will come into the United States this year. Of that number more than 100 subversives will enter the United States every day.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I am very much concerned when the Senator says that more than 100 subversives will come into the United States each day.

Mr. LEHMAN. That statement was made by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator mean that officials in the Immigration and Naturalization Service have made the statement that 100 subversives will come over the border every day?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is the statement.

Mr. THYE. That is a serious charge. I simply wished to get some facts in connection with the number and as to where such figures have come from.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think I can inform the Senator. I shall be glad to place the quotation in the record. The statement was made, I believe, before the House Committee on Appropriations, at the time consideration was being given to the appropriation for the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not think the Senator from New York means to imply that because of the measure before the Senate today, or as a result of regulations under the joint agreement which has existed, so-called subversives are coming into the United States. As I understand, the testimony was relative to the Immigration and Naturalization Service having a sufficient number of border guards to check the influx of people from Mexico. It seems to me that there would be a better check on them by either legislation of the type which is here proposed or by international agreement, than there would be if the joint

resolution under consideration or the international agreement should not become effective.

The other problem would exist in any event, and would be broader in scope than the agricultural labor problem.

Mr. LEHMAN. The distinguished majority leader is quite right. The influx of subversives would continue to occur. The influx of wetbacks is not the result of the legal agreement we have made with Mexico, and will not be the result of the amendment, if it is agreed to. But the fact still remains that, according to the records which have been submitted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, approximately 1,500,000 wetbacks are coming into the United States illegally every year. Of that number, it has been reported by the Immigration and Naturalization Service to the House Committee on Appropriations that 100 subversives are coming into the United States daily. I shall be very glad, indeed, to place that reference in the RECORD.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. There would be illegal entries into the United States whether the pending legislation were enacted or not. There is only one way to find a final answer to the illegal entry question, and that is either to construct a heavy fence at the border which could not in any manner be crossed, or to put a sufficient force of guards close enough to each other so that they could supervise every foot of the border between the United States and Mexico.

The main question confronting the Senate is whether the pending amendment to the law should be acted on or not. I have been close enough to the question and to the Department of Labor to learn that all other attempts to deal with the problem up until the last few days have met with failure.

If we cannot continue to recruit manpower from Mexico in the manner followed in previous years, there is only one way to get protection. That would be to have at the border officials who would seek to obtain workers from Mexico. We know that labor is needed in the California area, where some perishable crops are now being harvested. There is a crying need for labor for that purpose. We know that such labor will be needed in some areas of the South.

A reading of the report discloses that Secretary of Labor Mitchell has approved the proposed legislation. I think the situation at the border will be controlled in a more legal manner by the enactment of the legislation than if there is no legislation.

We know that the wetbacks will still be coming into the United States and that there will be no governmental intervention or supervision as they enter our borders. They will simply come across the border in the best way they are able to, and they will infiltrate into various States in the best way they can, and some of them will be employed. If the joint resolution as amended shall be enacted, officials of our Government will receive them at the border, there will be some supervision over them, and we will continue to have knowledge of where these men are going. If such persons enter the United States in an illegal manner, we will have no knowledge of where they are going, or by whom they will be employed.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Minnesota. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, of course in my opinion, what is being done with respect to the wetbacks is a vicious practice, contrary to the best interests of this country, and more severely contrary to its interests today than in the past 2 or 3 years.

I agree that the wetback scourge will probably continue until Congress appropriates sufficient moneys to stop it; and what is more important, until appropriate legislation is enacted to stop it.

I would remind the Senator from Minnesota that last year together with the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] I offered an amendment which in my opinion would have shut off the greatest part of this vicious influx, which is a completely uncontrolled and unscreened influx of illegal immigrants. We proposed an amendment which would have made it a misdemeanor, punishable by law, for anyone knowingly—and I emphasize the word "knowingly," because it is important—to give employment to a man who had been found to be an illegal immigrant. I believe the enactment of such an amendment would have gone far toward solving this problem because those who are exploiting the wetbacks—and as a matter of fact, who are going to exploit some of the men who will enter the United States under this amendment to the law—would have hesitated a long time to give employment to people whom they knew to be illegally in this country. Such an enactment is the way to solve the problem. I hope that sometime the Congress will wake up and enact that kind of legislation.

Mr. DANIEL. As I understood the Senator from New York a few moments ago, he made a very serious charge as to the number of subversives who were coming across the border from Mexico, and I believe he stated the number to be a hundred every day. Did I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is what I said, and I believe I am correct.

Mr. DANIEL. Are the figures given by the Senator supposed to be the number of those who have come across the border?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; it is the number coming across the border at the present time.

Mr. DANIEL. One hundred subversives a day?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is my recollection, and I believe I can prove it to be a statement of a responsible official of our Government.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator realize that he is making a serious charge against the republic to the south, the Republic of Mexico?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, I do not think so. I think it is a charge against the manner in which our immigration laws are being enforced.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from New York really believe that a hundred subversives a day are crossing the border and coming into this country without being stopped either by Mexican or United States officials?

Mr. LEHMAN. What is the United States doing? It is doing nothing The figure I have given is no more surprising than the figure of 125,000 wetbacks who are coming into this country illegally each month, or about a million and a half a year. That is the surprising figure. Yet what are we doing about it?

Mr. DANIEL. I am not in a position to challenge the Senator's figures as to the number of subversives who have been crossing the Rio Grande, but I seriously doubt the accuracy of the figures. The charge is serious, and one I am surprised to hear the Senator from New York bandying about on the floor of the Senate. I cannot believe that 100 subversives a day are coming from Mexico into the United States, and I should like to have evidence to substantiate that charge. The Senator from New York has asked for evidence to substantiate certain charges made of late, and so have I. I think charges of this kind should be fully substantiated by evidence before they are made on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. If the Senator from Texas will wait a few minutes, I will be able to give him the proper reference. Before I do that, I should like to say that the Senator from New York has quoted what he believes to be accurate figures, which have been submitted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service to the Appropriations Committee of the House, to the effect that 100 subversives come into this country each day. Five hundred subversives may be coming in each day so far as the United States Government knows, because there is no screening, and no attempt is made to ascertain who the immigrants are, what they are, what they have done, or what they will do. The immigration is completely uncontrolled, and I believe uncontrollable.

Mr. DANIEL. If that be true, then the Senator must admit that there is no way for the immigration authorities to set a figure of 100 subversives a day. If there is no control or check, it is just a figure which somebody has estimated, and which is being repeated by the Senator on the floor of the Senate. This is contrary to the attitude which the Senator has taken regarding other figures recently released concerning other alleged subversives.

Mr. President, in my opinion it is a serious charge the Senator from New York makes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am not in the habit of making unsupported charges. I believe the statement I have made is a correct one. I am quite certain that within a very short time—within a matter of half an hour or 1 hour, when I can get the records—I shall

be able to place them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and thus, I hope, satisfy the Senator from Texas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does not the Senator from New York recall that during the time when I was chairman of the labor-management subcommittee, for 2 years, we conducted extensive hearings on the entire subject of Mexican laborers entering the United States, particularly the wetback situation? We held hearings for a period of 8 months, during which time we obtained some of the best testimony which I think could be obtained. It came from leading churchmen, immigration authorities, and various other responsible citizens and citizen groups throughout the Nation.

Does not it appear rather peculiar to the Senator from New York that a Congress which imposes the strictest form of security rules upon even a Supreme Court Justice—demanding an FBI report upon the Chief Justice of the United States—nevertheless keeps open the entire border along the Rio Grande, with little or no immigration control?

Mr. President, whether the Senate knows it or not, the Communist international movement, the so-called Cominform, is today waging in Mexico one of its most effective and strongest programs of infiltration. If Senators do not know that, they had better bone up on their homework, because it is a matter of record.

It is strange that even an exchange student under the Fulbright program must undergo all sorts of tests and examinations, including even a Wassermann test, before he is permitted to enter the United States, whereas cheap agricultural labor from Mexico is permitted to enter the United States with little or no restriction but solely because of the statement and argument that it is desirable to have cheap agricultural labor available.

Mr. President, the fact is that three gates to the United States are closed; I refer to the gate to Canada, on the north, and the gate on the west coast, and the gate on the east coast. However, many, many persons are entering the United States from the south, from Mexico, even though we know that Guatemala is a nest of Communist activity, and the Mexican Government at this very time is engaged in almost a death struggle to keep out of Communist control. Nevertheless, in the face of that situation, we leave our southern gate wide open. In that respect we have almost completely abandoned immigration control.

I am shocked beyond words that the Congress, which investigates practically eveyone from a baby sitter to a kindergarten teacher, does not impose stringent controls in the case of immigration at the Mexican border.

I say that in connection with this matter, the burden of proof does not rest upon the Senator from New York. The truth is that there is a failure to maintain adequate border control and adequate immigration-control measures along the Mexican border. Certainly no one can justify the failure to provide for adequate immigration control along that border. In that respect the burden of proof does not rest on the Senator from New York or anyone else who does not believe the Mexican border should be left open and virtually uncontrolled as it is.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. DANIEL. Let me ask the Senator from New York to yield to me, in order that I may ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for that purpose, if I may have unanimous consent to do so, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DANIEL. Does not the Senator from Minnesota believe that before definite figures are stated to the Senate with reference to the number of subversives who are entering the United States from Mexico, some evidence to support such statements should be obtained?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand there was considerable evidence at the hearings.

I may say that if there is a tendency to become rather general in the statement of figures in the case of security risks, the pattern for that has been set by the administration.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I am surprised to hear the Senator from New York, in referring to the number of subversives who are said to be entering the country from Mexico, employ figures which he does not support. I am very much surprised to see any Senator who in the past has objected so much to the bandying about of various figures in regard to subversives in the United States, and who has criticized certain Members of the Senate because of their use of such figures in regard to subversives, now charge on this floor that 100 subversives a day are entering the United States from Mexico, across the Mexican border. I am surprised to hear the Senator from New York make such a statement, because I do not believe he has evidence to support such a figure.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Texas is jumping at conclusions. I am quite certain I shall be able to show the accuracy of my statement in regard to 100.

Let me say that I hold in my hand a statement which goes much further than that: I refer to an article which appeared on February 7 in the New York Times. In the article, no limit is given in regard to the number of subversives who may be entering the United States. I read from the article, as follows:

> The Immigration and Naturalization Service has told Congress that a mass invasion of illegal aliens is beyond control. It said that the way was open for almost any number of foreign agents, including Communists, to enter this country undetected, in a situation which was worse than ever before.

In that statement by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, no limit is given. The indication is that any number—not only 100 a day, but perhaps 500 or 1,000 a day—may be entering the United States. No limit is stated.

Although I am quite certain that I shall be able to show the Senator from Texas that I was accurate when I used the figure 100, actually I believe the number may be much greater than 100.

Mr. DANIEL. I shall await with interest any evidence the Senator from New York may produce to show that the United States is in danger of having 100 subversives a day cross its southern border. I happen to live on the southern border, and I do not believe that is the truth of the situation.

The Senator from New York has made it clear that he is quoting someone else. However, is it correct to state that the Senator from New York does not at this time have evidence to support the statement he has made?

Mr. LEHMAN. I said I will furnish it as soon as I can obtain it from my office.

I have also read from an article which quotes representatives of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I have not quoted an irresponsible agency or an irresponsible official. On the contrary, I have read from an article quoting the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which has the responsibility of handling all matters pertaining to immigration. The article states, in part:

> The way was open for almost any number of foreign agents, including Communists, to enter this country undetected, in a situation that was worse than ever before. The testimony before the House Appropriations Committee was made public today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at this time to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator from New York would not wish to find himself placed in a position of arguing arithmetic. Certainly the burden of proof rests upon the Senator from Texas, to prove to the Senate that it is fair and equitable to prevent the entry of Norwegians, Danes, Finns, French, British, Belgians, and Canadians, and yet to leave entirely open our southern border.

Will the Senator from Texas testify in the Senate that there is not a Communist in Mexico? Will he testify before the Senate that there is not a growing Communist movement in Mexico? Will he say to the Senate that that movement is not affecting labor in Mexico? Will he tell the Senate that there is not an actual and growing Communist threat in Guatemala?

How can we impose security measures upon all other people and all other countries, and yet in the name of wetback labor—20-cents-an-hour or 30-cents-an-hour agricultural labor—permit our southern border to be wide open to Mexican invasion, and against the will of the Mexican Government.

We do not need to debate this issue on the basis of communism. We have sent our Secretary of State to Caracas, to breathe good will. The President has

sent his distinguished brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, to South America to breathe good will. Yet the Congress of the United States, in utter disregard of the wishes of the Mexican Government—the Government of a free and sovereign state, a sister republic in the Western Hemisphere, and a partner in the Rio pact—completely flouts the will of the Mexican Government, and is willing to authorize the entry of Mexican contract labor, despite the desire of the Mexican Government to negotiate a fair and equitable agreement. I say that the burden of proof rests upon those who want this kind of cheap labor.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not accept the task assigned by the Senator from Minnesota. The burden of proof is not upon the junior Senator from Texas to defend any of the things to which the Senator from Minnesota has referred. I have not come upon this floor to ask that the Mexican border be left open. I believe in the enforcement of our immigration laws along the Mexican border in the same way they are enforced along every other border. I want those who cross the border to be screened so that no subversives will enter this country.

The only thing I arose to point out was that I thought it strange to hear the Senator from New York charge that 100 subversives a day are coming across the border into the United States. If they are, I want it stopped: I want the kind of security on the Mexican border that we have on every other border, whatever funds are necessary to maintain such security.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator think we have it?

Mr. DANIEL. But by the same token, I do not wish to see Mexico and other countries to the south libeled by the statement that 100 subversives a day are pouring in over that border, when I do not believe the Senator from New York has any evidence which would substantiate such a charge.

Certainly the Communist movement is growing in Mexico. The Communist movement is growing in Hawaii. The Communist movement is growing in Puerto Rico, and in other places. It seems that those who are doing the shooting come from Puerto Rico by way of New York City. But, Mr. President, we want security on every border. My point is that before we make such charges against our neighbors to the south we ought to have some evidence to substantiate them. I rose to say that I am surprised that the Senator from New York should ever make such a charge without having readily at hand the evidence to support it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Texas that the Senator from New York is careful in the charges which he makes. He has been critical of figures which have been given on this floor. He will continue to be critical. But when the Senator from Texas says that the charges of the Senator from New York are unsubstantiated, he is not stating the situation accurately. I believe I shall be able fully to substantiate them.

Mr. DANIEL rose.

Mr. LEHMAN. Just a moment.

I have read a quotation from the testimony given by a representative of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which reads as follows:

> The way was open for almost any number of foreign agents, including Communists, to enter the country undetected in a situation that was worse than ever before.

Mr. SMATHERS rose.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator in a moment.

I point out that we are doing nothing whatsoever to stop the influx of these people, including many Communists. There is no question that many of them are Communists. I believe I shall be able to substantiate my reference to the number of 100 a day. The number may be considerably greater than 100 a day.

We are doing nothing to stop them. Why? Because a few of the States want cheap farm labor. They are closing their eyes to all the dangers and iniquities. They are trying to import cheap labor, and trying to force the wetbacks who are in this country illegally to accept any kind of pay the farmer, in his kindness, is willing to give them. He has a hold over them, because he can say to them—and he does say to them—"If you do not accept the pay I give you, I will report you to the immigration authorities and you will be shipped back to Mexico."

The result is that they work for any pay the farmers consent to give them. They are willing to do so, and they do so, in spite of the fact that they are competing with decent American labor not only in the States which are benefited most directly, but also in other States of the Union, including Minnesota and New York. They are adding to our unemployment problem.

We know that these men work their way up north. They compete with American labor in North Carolina, Virginia, New York, and, I have no doubt, Montana, Wyoming, Minnesota, and Michigan.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. They will accept any pay their employer is willing to give them, because of the hold which the employer has over them, and his threat to report them to the authorities and have them returned to Mexico.

The pending proposal is very different from previous proposals. We propose to take action unilaterally. We do not seek the assistance or cooperation of Mexico. We have established in conjunction with Mexico no standards by which these people, if they do not observe the laws of this country or the regulations of the various States, may be returned to Mexico and be accepted by Mexico. We propose to act unilaterally, in the face of opposition by the Mexican Government, a friendly Government. We are saying to Mexico, "Whether you like it or not, we are going to allow these people to come into the United States. We will allow as many to come in as we think we need, without any standards and without any qualifications whatsoever."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from New York is acquainted with Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey, archbishop of San Antonio, Tex., a distinguished churchman, a gentleman whom I have the privilege of knowing as a friend. He came before us to testify with reference to this problem. I believe his statement would be of interest to the Senate. Archbishop Lucey certainly can be considered to be interested in the spiritual, physical, and ideological well-being of the people. Archbishop Lucey sent the following telegram to Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, on February 7, 1954:

> House Joint Resolution 355 is calculated further to embitter our relations with Mexico. There are more than 2 million unemployed breadwinners in our country today.

This telegram was dated February 7. Since that time the number of unemployed has considerably increased.

> There are thousands of unemployed Puerto Ricans in Chicago who are American citizens.

This is the archbishop of San Antonio, Tex., speaking.

> In south Texas we have tens of thousands of Mexican-Americans who will gladly work in agriculture for decent wages. When the Federal Government recruits illegal aliens—

I emphasize the words "illegal aliens." That is what we are talking about. We are talking about recruiting illegal aliens.

> When the Federal Government recruits illegal aliens for employment it posts a reward for crime against the United States. We hope that Congress will not attempt to legalize lawlessness.

The archbishop also sent a letter to the President of the United States outlining his views.

I think the important point is not whether 100 Communists come across the border every day. With respect to almost every bill which has come before Congress for consideration during the past 5 years, the question has been asked by someone, "What is it going to do to communism?" Whether we are trying to make fresh water out of salt water, or trying to do something else, someone always raises the issue as to how Stalin or Malenkov will feel about it.

I do not think that is the issue. The issue is this: Are we to recruit Mexican labor, citizens of Mexico, in violation of, in disagreement with, and in opposition to the Mexican Government?

I am not saying that we should not have recruitment of Mexican labor. I am simply saying that the Government of Mexico, which is our neighbor, is unwilling to agree to the terms which the American Government has proposed for the agreement. I ask Senators how they would feel if the Government of Canada, unable to come to an agreement with the United States as to the recruitment of American labor for a project in Canada, were literally to bypass the wishes of the American Government and put a premium upon illegal entry into Canada of American labor to fulfill the needs of a Canadian project.

This is not the way to build goodwill. When a similar bill was passed on a previous occasion we had an agreement with Mexico. The junior Senator from Minnesota voted for that bill. I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when that bill was processed. I say, Mr. President, it is one thing to have an agreement with the Republic of Mexico. On the other hand, the pending joint resolution does not provide for an agreement. It says, in effect, "If you can get an agreement, well and good; if not, go ahead on your own."

I say that is a way to lose friends and make enemies. It places a premium upon illegal entry into the United States. The Attorney General of the State of California had something to say about it. He made it quite clear. I refer to Mr. Edmund G. Brown, the Attorney General of the State of California. He said:

> It is up to the Government to police the border more effectively not only for the safety of California but for the entire Nation. When immigration laws are being violated continuously, as they are now, it spells trouble and more trouble.
>
> The comparatively easy influx that wetbacks now have also indicates that the door also is open for potential saboteurs and fifth columnists. Representatives of unfriendly nations can use the same methods of infiltration.

I have just quoted from a statement of the highest law official of the State of California. I quote now from Assistant United States Attorney General Rankin:

> This border is also an easy avenue of entry into our country for almost any number of Communists or foreign agents from Mexico, Guatemala, Dutch Guiana, and, entry into Mexico being as easy as it is, from any country in the world. The seriousness of this situation is self-evident. Until this border is brought under control our internal security will remain in jeopardy.

That is what one of the highest officials in the Federal Government has had to say about the situation.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California may do so, without jeopardizing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota to what bill the attorney general of California was referring in the testimony alluded to by the Senator?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He was referring to no particular bill; he was referring to the border situation to which the pending joint resolution applies.

Mr. KUCHEL. At the outset in order that my position may be perfectly clear, let me say that so far as policing the United States border is concerned, and particularly the border between the southern part of the United States and Mexico, I am for policing the border and against entry of any illegal labor into the United States regardless of its source.

I ask the Senator from Minnesota this question: It is true that the joint resolution eliminates the requirement of a treaty before legal processes are employed, but how can the Senator use the statement of the attorney general of California as an argument against the joint resolution? I agree with the attorney general of California. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota. I do not want illegal labor forces to come into the United States. However, does the Senator from Minnesota at this time contend that the enactment of the pending joint resolution would permit aliens to enter this country illegally?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would not only permit them to do so, but it would put a premium on their entry.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Minnesota why he objects to a screening of the wetbacks who come into the United States, so that subversives may be kept out? That is the Senator's argument, it seems to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We do not object to that.

Mr. AIKEN. Why does the Senator take that position?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that he knows better than that.

Mr. AIKEN. I am referring to the Senator's own argument.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The junior Senator from Minnesota has stated on the floor of the Senate again and again that he is in favor of providing adequate funds for an adequate border control. Congress has not provided such funds. That is the problem we confront. The pending joint resolution is in violation of our good-neighbor policy. It has but one purpose, namely bringing into the United States cheap labor. That is its purpose, Mr. President, make no mistake about it.

There is sufficient labor available in the United States if the farmers interested are willing to pay an adequate wage. The purpose of the joint resolution is to permit the recruitment of winter labor. There is testimony on the books to the effect that unemployment exists in some of the areas involved. I say that if we are going to recruit Mexican labor, we should do it on the basis of an agreement with the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. First I should like to reply to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. AIKEN]. I share the surprise and possibly the resentment of the Senator from Minnesota when he answered the Senator from Vermont that he was misquoting what the Senator from Minnesota and I had said with regard to the screening of the Mexican labor. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry tried to give the impression that we were opposed to screening. The chairman will recall that before I commenced my remarks I specifically asked him what standards would be invoked prior to the admission of this large number of Mexicans into our country, based on unilateral action by this country. The distinguished Senator from Vermont, for whom I have very great regard, as he knows, replied that he did not know what the standards were, but he assumed that the standards would be prescribed by the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I should first like to finish my remarks, and then I shall be very glad to yield. In view of the fact that the Attorney General has certainly not done anything of any moment or of any value in stemming the great flood of illegal immigrants, I certainly would not feel that the standards he would apply in the face of the nonacquiescence of our friendly neighbor to the south, Mexico, would be of any great value or great moment or great effect.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am not concerned with any difference of opinion which may prevail between the Attorney General and the Senator from New York, but I do say that the standards of entry to be invoked would be those prescribed by the Attorney General of the United States. One purpose of the joint resolution is to provide that the wetbacks coming into this country—perhaps I should say farm labor instead of wetbacks—shall be screened, in order to make certain that the hundreds of subversives, to which the Senator from New York has referred, do not become residents of the United States. That is the least we should do. I do not believe that either the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] or the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] wants in any way to permit the entry into the United States of people who ought not to be admitted. I may ask that if the Mexican Government does not want Mexicans to come into our country, why does it let them come in so freely?

I believe that everything which has been said by the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota is an argument in favor of the proposed legislation. I say, let us have some kind of order. If we do not have an actual agreement with the Government of Mexico, which I believe we will have, let us at least have some sort of official order maintained in the recruitment of the farm labor which comes into the United States over the Mexican border.

I believe, too, that if Mexican farm laborers are recruited through a United States agency, the chances of such laborers getting more adequate wages are much better than if they were to come here illegally and forced to work for whatever they could get, under the threat of being sent back to Mexico.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that unless we can enter into a satisfactory agreement with the Republic of Mexico, assuring cooperation on the part of both countries, for the purpose of protecting the interests and security of the two countries, I would be very glad to have the border between Mexico and the United States closed to this kind of immigration. I would favor it, Mr. President.

Of course, there will not be any suggestion of that kind, but if that were done there would not be coming into this coun-

try great numbers of cheap laborers to compete with American laborers, and thus to beat down the prevailing wages which are paid to our own workers.

I would be in favor of closing the borders to them. But that is not going to be done. I know it will not be done, because I am aware that farmers in many States want to recruit Mexican labor, regardless of the quality of the labor and regardless of the standards which have been established.

I may say to the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] that if there had been sincerity in the argument that what some of the farming interests wanted was merely to get good labor to work the crops, and that this country was being swamped with illegal immigrants, they would have voted for the amendment which was proposed by the senior Senator from Illinois and myself, making it a misdemeanor, subject to punishment, for anyone to employ a man or a woman who was known to be illegally in this country. That would have taken care of the problem, but we did not receive any support for that amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from New York, of course, realizes that the only statement of his which I have challenged is that 100 subversives a day are crossing the Mexican border into the United States. I should like to ask the Senator if he knows how long that has been going on.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know.

Mr. DANIEL. If for a month, there would be 3,000 subversives, and if for a year, there would be 36,000.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, but I have made no statement, and I do not think the Immigration Service made any statement, as to how many days, weeks, or months it has been going on. The statement to which I referred was that there were coming into this country 100 subversives a day.

Mr. DANIEL. How long has that been going on?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have told the Senator that I do not know. There was no statement made as to that, nor did I make any statement with regard to the length of time. It may be a week, a month, or a year. Certainly, if a million and a half immigrants come into this country every year without screening laws, there is opportunity for a great many subversives to enter our borders.

Mr. DANIEL. If there are no screening laws, how is it possible to estimate that there are a hundred subversives coming into the United States each day? Probably it is merely a guess, and the Senator has no more evidence to substantiate his charges than other persons have had evidence to substantiate charges criticized by the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article by Gladwin Hill, which appeared in the New York Times of September 15, 1953.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WETBACK TRAFFIC AGAIN SETS RECORD—ONE HUNDRED AND FIVE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-NINE PERSONS INTERCEPTED IN AUGUST—FARMERS BALK AT NEW FEDERAL DRIVE

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, September 15.—The illegal immigration of Mexican wetback workers into the United States over the Nation's southwestern border has reached a record rate of more than 100,000 persons a month.

At the same time, efforts by southwestern farmers and Members of Congress to get the Department of Justice to soft-pedal its new campaign against the influx also have hit an unprecedented pitch.

The administration's expressed desire to minimize the illicit traffic involving evils from slave wages to the spreading of diseases, has clashed head on with the partial reliance of some segments of southwestern agriculture upon cheap Mexican labor, which has been increasing ever since World War II.

A result of this clash has been a rising chorus of complaint from farm quarters over the last fortnight. The farmers complain that an intensified campaign against wetbacks—so-called because many swim or wade the Rio Grande—will jeopardize crops such at cotton, lettuce, and melons.

The protests have culminated in the revival of proposals that the wetback traffic be indirectly legalized to some degree. Some of the proposals, which were dormant for several years, have the support of at least some sections of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Nation's largest farmer organization.

TOPPED JULY BY 4,000

In August border-patrol officers of the Justice Department's Immigration and Naturalization Service, deployed above the 1,600-mile international boundary between Brownsville, Tex., and San Diego, Calif., caught 105,529 illegal aliens, almost all Mexicans. This was the biggest month's round-up on record, topping by more than 4,000 the previous high, in July. It was also more than the total caught in the entire year of 1946.

This brought the total number of apprehensions this year to 697,044, a 67 percent increase over 1952.

Immigration officers say their apprehensions vary directly with the total amount of wetback traffic and acknowledge that for every one caught, one or more probably get in undetected. Most of them return seasonally to Mexico, but thousands settled down illegally in the United States.

During the World War II manpower shortage, arrangements were made with Mexico for the legal importation of farm workers under seasonal contracts. This has continued annually since the war at a rate of more than 200,000 workers a year.

The contracts guarantee them the prevailing wage in the district where they are employed. The prevailing wage, in the determination of which the farmers have an important hand, tends to be as low as the employers can make it. At present, for southern California's rich Imperial Valley, for instance, it is 79 cents an hour.

Wetbacks, as fugitives from justice, have to work even more cheaply, for whatever they can get.

CONTRACT LEGALITIES PROTESTED

These factors have tended to keep farm wages down to levels unattractive to domestic labor. This in turn tends to perpetuate the reported shortages of farm labor that spur the border traffic. There are many farmers who do not use wetbacks. Others insist they cannot distinguish them from citizen Mexican-Americans or that they need them because the formalities of procuring legal Mexican contract labor are too complex or protracted.

There are currently about 4,000 contract workers in the Imperial Valley alone, and the importation of 5,000 more within a few weeks is contemplated. In addition, the valley has a sizable number of the 100,000 wetbacks estimated to be in California.

An intensified drive against wetbacks as outlined by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, JR., last month unquestionably would embarrass many farmers, at least economically.

In the face of this threat, they are urging two courses of action. One is to legalize temporarily the illegal aliens found working on farms. This is a practice that was frequently indulged in for several years after the war. But it was denounced by the Presidential Commission of Migratory Labor in 1951 as an important contributing factor to the wetback traffic.

The other proposal is that the legal contract system be supplemented by what is generally described as "a simple crossing card system" under which aliens would receive identity cards at the border and be shuttled among farmers needing labor, without many of the present contractual guaranties, such as assurances of minimum periods of employment and specified conditions of board and lodging.

These proposals are the essence of a 16-point program just endorsed by the Imperial County branch of the American Farm Bureau Federation. B. A. Harrigan, the county agriculture director and secretary of the Farmers' Association, said the program had been formulated at a special conference called by the federation at Dallas, Tex., on September 1 and 2 to consider problems raised by Attorney General Brownell's announcement.

Mr. Harrigan said the program presumably would be recommended to the administration by the federation.

Among Members of Congress who have expressed themselves in favor of such a program in the last few days are Representatives CLARK FISHER, Democrat, of Texas, and JAMES B. UTT, ROBERT WILSON, and JOHN PHILLIPS, all Republicans, of California. Mr. PHILLIPS already has asked Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON to intercede with the Department of Justice in the matter.

A group of women's organizations in El Paso, Tex., also has urged the crossing-card plan as a means of assuring a supply of domestic servants.

GRAVE PROBLEMS DEPICTED

SAN FRANCISCO, September 18.—The wetback problem was pictured today by Edmund G. Brown, California attorney general, as one that embodies "all the ills and evils of an illegal underground operation."

"'What appears to be an economic problem of getting stoop labor to handle the year-round harvests,' he told the San Francisco Bar Association, "has grown into a grave social problem, involving murder, prostitution, robbery, and a gigantic illegal narcotic infiltration."

To try to cope with what he said was "a threat to our society," he called for "more personnel to effect more control, lighter legislation, and swift justice."

He charged that wetbacks were brought in by agricultural labor contractors "who collect on both sides of the border."

"The charge for smuggling a wetback into the United States is $100 to $125 a head, while ranchers on the American side pay the contractor $25 a head for the labor," Mr. Brown asserted.

He said afterward that the difficulty lay in proving knowledge on the part of the farmer that the wetbacks were in this country illegally and added that prosecution could "easily overwhelm our courts."

"There is also an element of condoning this thing," he declared. "Our farmers need the labor to such an extent that in many places they could not otherwise harvest their crops."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article which appeared in the New York Times of February 7, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BORDER INVASION DECLARED A PERIL—OFFICIALS SAY ILLEGAL ENTRIES ARE OUT OF CONTROL AND MAY INCLUDE FOREIGN AGENTS

WASHINGTON, February 7.—The Immigration and Naturalization Service has told Congress that a mass invasion of illegal aliens was beyond control.

It said that the way was open for "almost any number" of foreign agents, including Communists, to enter the country undetected in a situation that was worse than ever before. The testimony before the House Appropriations Committee was made public today.

The service's budget has been cut by $3,250,000 from that of this fiscal year and the Attorney General, Herbert Brownell Jr., testified that he was not sure it would help to increase the number of men in the border patrol. The service is a unit of his department.

He told the committee at closed-door hearings that it might be necessary to set up on the Mexican border, where illegal crossings have soared to a record level, "some mechanized equipment, perhaps a two-way communication system with watchtowers and things of that sort."

WARNING OF SOME RISKS

Benjamin G. Habberton, acting commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, testified that the proposed budget cut, calling for a reduction of 640 employees, involves some risks in connection with admission of dangerous and undesirable aliens, although no members of the border patrol would be eliminated.

He asserted that the Service was already swamped and that the relatively small force of officers could not cope with the hordes of illegal aliens flooding the Southwest.

He said that men were transferred from port jobs at Baltimore, Norfolk, and Philadelphia to help out on the Mexican border. These transfers were made, he added, after the Service had been implored by citizens' associations, chambers of commerce, and local peace officers to help halt robbery, rape and pillage ascribed to wetbacks.

"This mass invasion of illegal aliens has reached proportions which are beyond control of the limited force provided to deal with it," he declared in a prepared statement filed with the committee.

The term "wetback" is applied to illegal Mexican entrants because many swim or wade the Rio Grande.

Border-jumping from Canada is also on the upswing, Mr. Habberton said, pointing out that more than 770,000 Europeans have been admitted to Canada since World War II under security screening that he termed "practically nonexistent."

SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS

"A progressively increasing number of illegal entries into the United States across the Mexican and Canadian borders cannot be other than a threat to the security of the United States," he asserted.

"In the midst of a situation where the small border patrol force is being overrun by hordes of illegal aliens an easy avenue of entry into the country is provided for almost any number of Communists or foreign agents from Mexico, Guatemala and Dutch Guiana and, entry into Mexico being as easy as it is, from any country in the entire world."

The border patrol, with a personnel of 1,129, patrolled 11 million miles last year and arrested 839,149 as illegally entered aliens, an increase of about 58 percent over the previous year.

"The situation continues to worsen," Mr. Habberton said.

Mr. Brownell testified that the "wetback" problem was the worst ever. He voiced hope that it could be relieved by negotiation of a new farm-labor contract with Mexico. This should be tried, he added, "before we go ahead and indiscriminately increase the number of the border patrol."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think it can be said that two problems confront us. We have before us a resolution which was reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator from Vermont points out that Congress extended the authority 2 years ago, I believe. We have had considerable argument regarding it. This problem is not unrelated to the overall problem of illegal entry of Mexican labor into the United States, which is commonly known as the wetback problem. They are tied in together, and, because they are tied in together, the Mexican Government insists on having something to say about its own nationals. It insists that if citizens are to be recruited from the Republic of Mexico to work in the United States of America, the Mexican Government ought to have something to say about the standards under which its own citizens shall enter and work in the United States. We insist upon certain standards for our own people. We insist upon good working conditions for American citizens in foreign nations, and the Mexican Government is insisting upon the same consideration for its own nationals in our country.

Mr. President, there were no hearings on this resolution. There was no way to explore what could be done or should be done.

This resolution is not based upon the mutual acceptance of an agreement or understanding between the two sovereign States involved. There has to be a demonstrated need as to the entrance of contract labor from Mexico over and above what the available domestic supply of labor in the United States can provide. I notice that the representatives of 40 State labor departments—not AFL or CIO, but representatives of the Governors of 40 of the 48 States of this great and glorious Republic and representatives of organized labor in 40 of the 48 States—joined in a common resolution in the 20th Annual Conference on Labor Legislation with respect to the very situation which we are discussing. They have something to say about the problem. They adopted a resolution with reference to the wetback problem and contract labor.

The States whose representatives were not present include Arizona, Kentucky, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, Oregon, and Utah. I happen to know there are a few persons in my own State who would like to have a great deal of Mexican labor. I do not suppose my position will be popular with them.

The present administration talks about building good will and the good-neighbor policy, and the President sends his own beloved brother to make a good-will tour at a time when our Secretary of State is in Venezuela in order to build up good will, but what do we do?

I have before me a New York Times editorial of January 24, 1954, entitled "Mexico Resents United States Hiring Policy—North-of-the-Border Signing of Migrants Held Unfair—National Pride a Factor."

I also have before me an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of January 20, 1954, with regard to the unilateral action of our Government.

Also an article which appeared in the New York Times of January 17, 1954, entitled "Mexico Shuts Off Migrant Entries—Acts as Pact for Farmwork in United States Ends, but Washington Is Skeptical of Effect."

I have another editorial from the New York Times of January 13, 1954, headed, "Wetback Influx Hits New Height—One Million Twenty-four Thousand Arrested in 1953, Reflecting a Total Traffic of About 2 Million."

Also, Mr. President, an article which appeared in the New York Times of January 12, 1954, headed, "United States-Mexico Talks on Labor Bogged—Agricultural Hiring Pact Expires Friday—Two Sides Split on New Terms."

Another article appearing in the New York Times of November 22, 1953, headed "Wetback Influx Near the Record—October Figure Second Highest in History—Crime Follows the Illegal Immigrants."

And so on, down the line.

All I can say, Mr. President, is that the best this resolution will provide is an opportunity for the United States Government, operating unilaterally, to contract for the labor of nationals of another sovereign state to do work in the United States of America. It will do nothing to correct the wetback problem, which is a continuing one. I do not think the two are identical, but they are related.

Mr. President, the official report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service for January 1954, has this to say regarding the question of the number of Mexicans entering this country. It is like the old argument as to how many angels could depend from the point of a needle. Here is the report, Mr. President:

In July we made reports to the Attorney General of this alarmingly worsening situation, and told him of the many reports we were receiving of the misery, disease, crime, and many other evils attendant upon this illegal influx. Mr. Brownell frankly stated that these reports seemed so incredible that he would have to go and see for himself. In August he made his factfinding tour. He covered the State of California from the border to San Francisco. He talked with upwards of a hundred people who were concerned for one reason or another with this situation. Among them were State officials, including mayors, judges, district attorneys, county supervisors, chiefs of police, and sheriffs—also county welfare directors, county and Federal health officers, representatives of farm organizations as well as

individual farmers, State employment authorities, representatives of labor, and the clergy. He also conferred with representatives of civic organizations, and last, but not least, with the officers of the Border Patrol. He saw Mexicans who had been arrested by Border Patrol officers being brought in by the hundreds. He flew in a Marine Corps helicopter and saw them actually being arrested in fields, on the highways, and along the railroads. He went to the border near Tijuana and saw them actually streaming across on foot.

Those are some of the things Mr. Brownell saw.

If the Attorney General is to establish standards under the proposal now being considered, what is he doing about the situation at present, a situation which is growing worse every day? All I can ask is, Is this the proper way to meet the problem?

We had an agreement with Mexico for many years, or at least since 1951, which I believe was the date of the last agreement we negotiated, and which I think was a reasonably good agreement. We should have the same type of agreement again.

I do not want to deny anyone the right to work, but I say this is unbelievable action by our Government. I think we ought to wait to see what arrangements can be made with Mexico in terms of an agreement. If that cannot be done, we should not undertake to handle the problem in a manner which will cost us plenty of good will in the years to come.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have the floor. I yielded to the Senator from Minnesota to permit him to make a statement. I have agreed to yield next to the Senator from Florida, who desires to leave the floor in order to attend a meeting. After that, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York be permitted to retain the floor, while yielding to me, to enable me to make a short statement now, since I have been called from the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the real, compelling reason for action in the present situation is the shortage of persons in the United States who are willing to perform what is called stoop labor. In my section, we do not have any of the Mexican workers. To the contrary, to meet the same type of labor shortage, we enter into contractual relationships with the colonial government of the Bahamas and a similar government in Jamaica to bring in stoop labor. At one time there was such an arrangement with the colonial government of British Honduras, but that agreement is no longer in force.

In Florida we do not proceed under the type of legislation now being considered and we do not wish to proceed under it. We are perfectly willing to proceed under the legislation which has been on the books for many years, and which requires, as does the measure now before the Senate, a certificate of shortage of American labor to perform the work, and also requires supervision by the Department of Justice and the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the terms and conditions applicable to those who are brought into the United States.

I may add, by way of parenthesis, that the colonial government of the Bahamas and the government at Kingston, Jamaica, are very zealous in the protection of their labor. We have found them perfectly able to deal across the table with any of our employers or other individuals in connection with the protection of their citizens.

The laborers whom we employ—and when I say "we," I mean not only the vegetable and fruit growers of Florida, but similar employers all the way up to the Connecticut Valley, as I understand—are laborers who are entitled to receive, and who do receive, the same rate of pay as American workers. They are required to receive the same rate of pay under the agreements by which they are brought into the United States as is paid to domestic laborers performing the same type of work.

We wish there were an abundance of domestic laborers to perform that type of work. At one time when I was serving as chief executive of my State, and it was then quite difficult to get offshore labor, I wrote personal letters to the governors of all States extending from Florida north to Maryland and as far west as Missouri, and south as far as Arkansas and Louisiana, to invite their help, through their State employment agencies, in obtaining domestic laborers who would come into Florida. But even having done that, it was necessary to procure labor from offshore sources.

I have gone into the subject at length because the people of my State—and I think it is true of the people in States all the way to the Canadian border on the eastern side of the country—do not wish to have any question about their ability to proceed under the prior existing law, which has been very satisfactory, both to employers and to offshore employees in that area.

As I recall, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is now chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has always made it clear that the people of New England desire to be allowed to continue the use of the old law in connection with the importation of labor from Canada. I believe that is true in the far Northwest also.

But, Mr. President, we have realized that the same shortage of stoop labor exists in the Southwest. We realize that the traditional source from which that labor has been supplied is our friendly associate and ally, the Republic of Mexico.

So far as I am concerned, I would much prefer to have the importation of Mexican labor under an agreement between our country and the Republic of Mexico, and I feel certain that that sentiment prevails on the part of every Senator from the area which is most affected. The amendment now proposed accentuates the use of such an agreement, but provides that in the absence of such an agreement the laborers shall not all be treated as illegal wetbacks, who can be misused, and abused by unprincipled employers—and, of course, there are some such—by giving them much less pay than they should receive, and much poorer living conditions than they should have.

It was the judgment, therefore, of many members of the committee, who do not have any direct stake in the matter, that the amendment now under consideration is greatly preferable to leaving the matter completely unregulated and completely without any mandatory supervision on the part of the Government of the United States in insisting upon the payment of fair wages, the giving of adequate medical protection, and the providing of suitable housing and fair burial arrangements, and things of that kind, such as are still provided for in the law.

So with some reluctance, because I again say that I would much rather have had an agreement with Mexico, I feel that the Senate, and Congress, must recognize the fact that unless this amendment is agreed to, there will be no regulation whatsoever, because there is no way of keeping these people, who desire employment and who desire to earn dollars for themselves and their families, from coming across a border which, I believe, is 1,800 or 2,000 miles long. They just pour across. It is much better, I say with great respect to Senators who feel otherwise, to have our own agents and the agency of the United States Government acting to keep conditions of entrance as tolerable as possible and as sound as possible from the standpoint of terms of employment, housing, and the like, than to have such labor completely unregulated and unprotected and to have a much larger percentage of these persons abused, as I believe they would be if there were no regulation whatsoever.

I appreciate the opportunity which has been accorded to me to make this statement. I hope the distinguished Senator from New York will understand that here is not a matter of bringing in outside persons when there is an adequate supply of our own labor, because the governors of the affected States, just as I did at one time, have frequently been called upon to try to help bring in labor from elsewhere in our Nation. Naturally, it would be preferable to use the labor in our own country, but we have not been able to do so, because so many of our citizens are no longer willing to perform stoop labor. It seems to me that, subject to discussion, as it should be, the amendment affords an arrangement which is decidedly preferable to having the whole field unregulated in any way, since we know it is completely beyond the power of the Mexican Government to keep its nationals, who want employment and want to be paid in dollars, from coming across our long southern border.

I thank the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question on this issue. Does the Senator remember that some 3 years ago an act was passed in an attempt to obtain an

agreement with the Republic of Mexico with reference to the selfsame labor we are now discussing? Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I do.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator also remember that, following the passage of the act, the House cut out the necessary appropriation, or enough of it so that the act could not be properly implemented, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service was unable to carry out the provisions of the act, although the employers and everyone else concerned desired to have the law enforced? Those concerned desired to bring laborers into the country legally, because the Mexican Government did not want wetbacks coming into the United States. The Government wanted to admit Mexicans who could come into this country legally and return legally. Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. LEHMAN. I remember it very well. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from West Virginia also recalls that at that time he and a number of other Senators of like mind tried to provide an appropriation in an amount sufficient to make it possible to really stop the influx of wetbacks, but the attempt was defeated on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to thank the Senator for recalling that, because I well remember it. I also remember that as a result of the lack of appropriations we could not even ship back to Mexico the wetbacks who were within our borders. There were many wetbacks here, and the Mexican Government naturally became disgusted. As a result we are confronted with the present situation, which is most deplorable. I think the pending measure affects the State of New York. I know it affects the States of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and West Virginia, and, in fact, every State in which there is a canning industry. The selfsame wetbacks who come across the border and work for a while on the ranches and farms finally find their way into the canning factories of my State and other States of the Middle West, without having been examined by the Public Health Service, and without our knowing the condition of their health, or anything of that kind. After the canning season trucks take the laborers back to the border. The Mexican laborers can much of the food which is consumed by the people of the United States, and there is reason why steps should be taken to protect the safety and sanitation of such food.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his remarks.

Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] has raised some question with regard to my integrity or my good faith in quoting figures which he doubted I could sustain. I was somewhat concerned, because, as is so often the case when one sees figures which have made an impression on his mind, I could not lay my hand on those figures immediately. Fortunately I have been able to obtain the record sustaining the statement which I made.

I do not wish to put any ideas into the mind of the Senator from Texas, but I am hopeful that after I read the statement the Senator will express at least some regret for his somewhat unkind remarks about the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to correct the record. If I said anything unkind or which would imply that I questioned the honesty and the integrity of the Senator from New York, I certainly did not mean to. I questioned the accuracy of anyone's figures indicating that a hundred subversives a day are coming across the Mexican border into the United States. I question the accuracy of the figures because I do not believe that any kind of investigation has been made of those crossing the border which would substantiate the statement that that many subversives were crossing the border. I think it is an absurd statement, whoever made it, or whomever the Senator is quoting as having made it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad the Senator from Texas did not reflect on the integrity or good faith of the Senator from New York.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator for allowing me to make the statement.

Mr. LEHMAN. But, after all, a Member of the Congress, in arguing a case or an issue in which he is deeply interested, can only quote from responsible sources, which, if not contradicted, would certainly justify a belief in the accuracy of those sources.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Senator from Texas that I am about to quote from the hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives of the 83d Congress, 2d session.

The Senator will recall that I made the statement that approximately 100 subversives or Communists were coming into this country each day. I quote from the hearings and from the testimony of Col. Benjamin G. Habberton, the Acting Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The whole record of the hearings is at the disposal of the Senate, of course, but I shall not ask that it be put into the RECORD at this point. I shall simply quote language which bears out what I have said. I remind the Senator that I am quoting the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. DANIEL. May I ask the Senator for the date of the hearings, please?

Mr. LEHMAN. The date is December 10, 1953.

THREAT TO INTERNAL SECURITY

A harvest of dangerous byproducts from the seemingly harmless invasion by illegal aliens is now in the making. Who can say that Communists and subversives do not cross the Rio Grande? As reported elsewhere in these justifications it was recently discovered that approximately 100 present and past members of the Communist Party had been crossing daily into the United States in the El Paso area.

Mr. President, that is only in one area, and I assume, therefore, that the total number of subversives who came across the border would be very much in excess of 100, which was the number I previously had given.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. May I ask if the Senator has read the part preceding and following the matter he has just quoted in order to ascertain whether or not the witness was referring to those who crossed back and forth on the same day? I understood the Senator from New York to allege that 100 subversives a day are now coming into the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have read the very clear language of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization. The distinguished Senator may place on such statement any interpretation he wishes. I am not going into the question of semantics. I have read his exact statement. I think it is very clear and conclusive. I have no desire to preclude the Senator from Texas from coming to any conclusion or taking any position which he wishes to maintain; but, so far as I am concerned, I believe I have fully answered what I again characterize as the somewhat unkind comments of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from New York, and I think the Senate will realize that what the Senator from Texas was trying to say was that he challenged the Senator's statement, or the statement of anyone else, that 100 subversives a day are coming into the United States across the Mexican border. I challenged that statement because it left the impression with me that it was being charged that this is now occurring and that it has been going on for a long time, and is still going on. I do not think the statement which the Commissioner made relating to the El Paso area is any evidence that this influx of subversives is continuing from day to day, or that a hundred new subversives cross the border each day. I rose to make that point.

I assured the Senator from New York that the people of my State are divided on this proposed legislation. I have not decided as to which way I shall vote on the joint resolution.

I wish to say to the Senator from New York that we are not winning friends and not following a good-neighbor policy when we make loose charges against our neighbor to the south that 100 subversives a day are crossing the border, leaving the impression that that many Communists or Communist sympathizers are daily coming into the United States from Mexico.

I appreciate having the Senator from New York quote the figures, and I see on what he based his estimate, and I understand the person he was quoting. However, I still say I do not believe the figures are accurate, especially if they are interpreted as meaning that 100 subversives now cross our southern border every day and enter the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have quoted with complete accuracy, word for word, the testimony of the Acting Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

I have no intention of engaging further in an interpretation of the exact statement which was made; but I may suggest to the distinguished Senator from Texas that if he has any doubt about the accuracy of the statement, then, instead of addressing his questions

to me, he should write to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which, I have no doubt, will be very glad to give such explanation as may be necessary or desirable under the circumstances.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to read a letter which Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, addressed to the President of the United States:

JANUARY 11, 1954.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Grave damage both to the standards of American workers and to relations between this country and Mexico is being done by the shockingly inadequate way in which the United States Government is handling the ever-growing flood of illegal entrants from Mexico and the programs for bringing in foreign contract labor for use on farms.

Since the present agreement with Mexico has been extended only until January 15, and since you will be making recommendations for legislation and appropriations in the near future, we urge that you give leadership in overcoming the truly scandalous conditions that exist.

The Director of the Bureau of Employment Security of the United States Department of Labor has informed us that if by January 15 "a satisfactory agreement is not reached with Mexico, it is our plan to join with the Departments of State and Justice in recommending a proposal for continuing a similar program on a unilateral basis." Such unilateral action would precipitate a most unfortunate situation by exposing Mexicans to exploitation without any protection from their own Government and by straining our relations with Mexico. Instead of such a drastic step, a constructive, cooperative program should be developed after adequate consideration of the workers' viewpoint.

As the agreement has operated, the Mexican contract workers have too often been utilized for work which would have been performed by United States residents if the wages and other conditions of employment and living had been adequate. Organized growers in areas along the border, and indeed in many States farther north, prefer to use Mexican contract nationals as against free American workers because the former can be obtained more cheaply and can be removed from the area whenever desired.

While theoretically the contract workers are to receive prevailing rates, in practice the actual or expected presence of thousands of Mexican workers depresses wage rates and adversely affects American wage earners and family farmers. During the past year hundreds of union members in the packing sheds of California have lost their jobs because lettuce packing was carried on at substandard rates by Mexican contract workers, contrary to the intent of Congress.

Mexican workers have repeatedly found that the growers have not provided the expected incomes or living conditions and they have not been permitted to organize effectively to enforce contract terms and protest gross abuses. As a result, thousands have skipped their contracts and gone to industrial areas, swelling the ranks of the several million illegal entrants estimated to come here each year.

The abuses to which the illegal entrants are subject are even greater, since any effort to insist on decent conditions may well result in deportation without payment of wages due. The depressing effect on American job opportunities and wages is very severe in certain areas, and cities as well as rural areas are confronted with serious health problems from the miserable, unsupervised conditions under which these wetbacks live.

Our friendly relations with Mexico are threatened by these growing evils through the natural resentments aroused among workers of both nations.

The difficult and complex problems resulting from Mexican migration require a vigorous, comprehensive program for constructive solution. In regard to contract workers, basic improvements are required in the agreement and in administrative procedures.

At a conference held in December between representatives of the Mexican and United States unions it was agreed that full participation of the unions in the negotiation would be requested so that the needs of the working people could be properly dealt with. Proposed changes in the agreement were also adopted, including strict enforcement, extension of the principles of Mexican labor legislation where there does not exist better legislation in the United States, full protection of collective-bargaining rights of Mexican workers, and participation of the unions of both countries in the formulation of individual work contracts.

We therefore strongly urge that union representatives be fully consulted, either through participation in formal negotiations or through close collaboration, if some other method of handling legal migration of Mexican workers is developed.

We are also deeply interested in other essential steps, such as adequate appropriations and powers to enable the Immigration and Naturalization Service to halt would-be illegal entrants; adequate appropriations for the United States Department of Labor to improve the recruitment of United States citizens for farm jobs; penalizing employers who knowingly hire wetbacks through immediately disallowing their wages as expenses for income-tax purposes and through new legislation; and drastic revision of the present slack procedures for certifying that foreign workers are needed and for determining their wages and conditions.

I am sure that if you have time to familiarize yourself with existing abuses you will be shocked and insist on remedies, many of which are possible through executive action.

Sincerely yours,

_____,
President, American Federation of Labor.

Mr. President, I also wish to read from an article which appeared in the New York Times of August 18, 1953:

EISENHOWER BACKS WETBACKS DRIVE—BROWNELL PRESENTS AT DENVER HIS UNITED STATES-STATE PLAN TO HALT ILLEGAL INFLUX OF MEXICANS

(By Anthony Leviero)

DENVER, August 17.—Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., won President Eisenhower's approval today of a three-way approach to a solution of the problem of illegal labor—wetbacks—from Mexico.

Having made a personal survey in California, Mr. Brownell likened the situation to the prohibition era because of the many opportunities it offers for exploitation by racketeers and other lawless elements.

After his talk with the President, Mr. Brownell declined to discuss detailed proposals, saying he wished to avoid half-baked ideas pending a study of a mountain of facts. He did outline, however, this three-way approach that had been decided upon:

1. At the diplomatic level, the administration will begin conversations with the Ambassador from Mexico in Washington with a view of developing a mutual approach to a solution from both sides of the Rio Grande border.

2. The Department of Justice will organize a group to determine how Federal laws may be made tougher to help control the tide of thousands who are swarming over the border into Texas, California, and elsewhere.

3. State district attorneys will study similar changes in State laws. At this local level organizations such as State federations of labor, farmers' cooperatives, and local enforcement agencies will cooperate.

Attorney General Brownell said the President had authorized him to go ahead with the proposals made for Federal action.

Mr. President, I desire to point out as forcefully as I can that certainly no mutual approach has been developed between Mexico and the United States by diplomatic conversations.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will yield on the point in regard to mutual approach, let me say the negotiations between the United States and Mexico have been going on for months—long before the agreement which was in existence expired. They have also been going on ever since. So there has been a mutual approach, although there has been no mutual agreement.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, what I meant is that a successful agreement has not been reached. Let me repeat that the article which appeared in the New York Times of August 18 states, in part:

After his talk with the President, Mr. Brownell declined to discuss detailed proposals, saying he wished to avoid half-baked ideas, pending the study of a mountain of facts. He did outline, however, this three-way approach that had been decided upon:

1. At the diplomatic level, the administration will begin conversations with the Ambassador from Mexico in Washington with a view of developing a mutual approach to a solution from both sides of the Rio Grande border.

I have no doubt that those conversations have occurred, but certainly no mutual understanding has been reached.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me say that I believe both Governments are now very closely at work. As evidence of that, I point out that the Mexican Government has agreed that farm laborers who were in the United States as of February 26, the date when they were supposed to be returned to Mexico, may remain in the United States for—I forget how long a time; it seems to me it is to be about 6 weeks—pending completion of the agreement between the two countries.

My only interest in this measure is that in the event of a collapse of the negotiations, there should be some semblance of order in the recruiting of such farm labor as might be hired in the United States. Of course, the entire law terminates on December 31 of next year. In view of the opposition and the difficulties involved, it is my impression that the law may not be renewed.

Mr. LEHMAN. In a moment I shall refer to that matter.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. But I think a bilateral agreement is by far the best arrangement, and I think it is possible to work it out with our neighbor to the south.

Mr. LEHMAN. In a few minutes I shall refer to that subject. Of course, it is perfectly evident that no agreement has been reached thus far with the Mexican Government.

Mr. AIKEN. My information of about 3 hours ago—I had not realized that this matter would be under discussion at

this time, although I did read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning—is that the Mexicans are now showing real evidence of a desire to reach an agreement, and progress is now being made. Agreement on the principles has already been reached, and an effort is now being made to draft appropriate language.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Vermont for that information. In a moment, I shall refer to it, too.

The second condition which the President suggested was:

> 2. The Department of Justice will organize a group to determine how Federal laws may be made tougher to help control the tide of thousands who are swarming over the border into Texas, California, and elsewhere.

I have certainly seen no efforts made in that direction.

The third suggestion made by the President was:

> State district attorneys will study similar changes in State laws. At this local level organizations such as State federations of labor, farmers' cooperatives, and local enforcement agencies will cooperate.

I have seen no successful efforts made in that direction.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has stated that we are on the verge of making an agreement with the Mexican Government on this subject. Certainly, if any arrangement between this country and Mexico, or this country and any of our other neighbors, is to be successful it must be on a bilateral or multilateral basis, not on a unilateral basis. I understood the Senator from Vermont to say that we are on the verge of making such an agreement.

Mr. AIKEN. That is entirely correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. If that be the case, why should we pass the joint resolution now? I probably would vote against any such measure. I do not wish to give the wrong impression. I believe that the entire wetback situation is so serious that it must receive the definite attention of the Congress and of the country. But why should we be rushed into the passage of the pending joint resolution today, when there are certainly very serious objections to it?

I think one of the objections may well be that the Mexican Government may have the feeling that their people who come to this country have been exploited. I believe that in many cases they have been. At the same time, our American workers have been injured because of the exploitation of Mexican workers. But why, when we are apparently on the verge of an agreement with Mexico, should we be rushed into taking unilateral action on this important subject? It is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. About the 1st of January I thought we were to have a mutual agreement before the 15th of January, but it did not materialize. It now appears that we are on the verge of a mutual agreement with our sister republic, but that, too, may not materialize. If it does not, it seems to me that there should be some order in the handling of Mexicans who legally cross the Rio Grande seeking employment in the United States. If they go to an agency of the United States Department of Labor, they are more likely to be employed in places where they will receive better pay and better treatment, and enjoy better conditions all around. That is my opinion. If we are to have no provision for recruiting and screening those people on the United States side of the border, in the event a mutual agreement is not concluded, then I feel that conditions will probably be more chaotic than they are now.

I am sure the Senator from New York knows that during past years I have worked with him in an effort to control the wetback situation, which, incidentally, is not confined to the Rio Grande region. We find illegal immigrants coming into this country at other points as well. The question is whether we wish to allow a certain number to come across the border—the number which the Department of Labor says is needed in this country. They cannot come unless the need is found. Shall we allow them to come across the border and then screen them and see that they get to places where there are certain standards of employment and wages, or shall we allow them to come over in droves, shifting for themselves, many of them, undoubtedly, having to work for inadequate wages?

Mr. LEHMAN. Can the Senator from Vermont inform me where such standards of wages and employment would exist if they were not subject to agreement between the Mexican Government and our Government?

Mr. AIKEN. There would be such standards of employment as might be established by the United States Department of Labor. I do not believe the Department of Labor would recruit laborers to work under substandard working conditions. At least it would not do so knowingly.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Vermont that I think there can be no question in the mind of any fair-minded person that these people have been exploited for many years, so far as wages are concerned. Has the Department of Labor successfully intervened to prevent that?

Mr. AIKEN. At times during the past 40 years the Senator from Vermont has felt that he was being exploited. However, no one has been able to stop that completely, either. I do not see how we can stop one human being from exploiting another. However, I believe that when these laborers are certified by the United States Department of Labor things will be a little easier all around.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can plainly see that our discussions on this subject have finally got down to the fine points of the joint resolution, for which we are all grateful. I think it is desirable that 1 or 2 clear-cut observations be made in connection with the joint resolution.

We are talking about an agreement when, in fact, no agreement is involved. The joint resolution contemplates unilateral action on the part of the United States to recruit Mexican labor on the American side of the border, in contrast to the past situation of recruitment of Mexican labor on the Mexican side of the border under a bilateral agreement between Mexico and the United States.

Representative COOLEY, the distinguished Representative from North Carolina, entered the debate very vigorously in the House of Representatives yesterday. The RECORD will reveal that he made some very pertinent observations. I think Mr. COOLEY stated the issue very clearly. The point which he made with great effectiveness was that there was no need of haste with respect to this particular joint resolution; that the pending agreement between Mexico and the United States was in its final stages; and that the passage of the joint resolution might completely upset the bargaining and negotiations which have been in progress on this subject.

I should like to read what Mr. COOLEY had to say. I read from page 2491 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 2:

> I called the Ambassador—

Speaking, of course, of the Mexican Ambassador—

> I called the Ambassador—a little unusual for a Congressman, I suppose, to be calling a diplomat, but I did it because of my intense interest in the international aspects of this resolution. He said definitely that it will have a bad effect on our relationship, that if we pass this resolution it will hit the headlines of all the newspapers of Mexico and great antagonism will be aroused.
>
> Why should we disturb Mr. Eisenhower's negotiations, I ask you? It is not urgent. The record shows that Mr. Siciliano stated that this resolution was brought here because this is the season of the year when the labor was needed less than at any other season of the year. That is the record. Yet we have it here.
>
> I did not stop with the White House, I did not stop with the Mexican Ambassador; I said before the Rules Committee that it was my belief that Secretary John Foster Dulles had never known anything about this resolution. I took it upon myself to call the Secretary of State and he frankly admitted that he did not know anything about it, but he assured me he would investigate immediately. The very next morning his assistant was in my office. I discussed the matter at length with him. I told him about my opposition, about my apprehension regarding the international aspects, and he said he would go back and reappraise it. The Mexican Ambassador went down to the State Department to see Mr. Morton and to discuss it.

As we know, Mr. Morton is the Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. COOLEY continued:

> I did not stop there. I told the Rules Committee that this resolution would destroy all the good that had been accomplished by Milton Eisenhower's trip to South America. He went there on a friendly mission, and this thing is an unfriendly act.
>
> I called Milton Eisenhower in Pennsylvania. He was surprised and amazed, and told me he would call Secretary Dulles the next day. Secretary Dulles is a busy man—I am not blaming him. But this is an important resolution.
>
> It is not needed. We now have the law, the negotiations are being carried on, and if we can defeat this bill I venture the assertion that within 10 days a contract will be signed.

In a telephone conversation only yesterday morning I mentioned to Mr. Siciliano the desirability of postponing action in the House because negotiations were coming along so well and that it might prove embarrassing diplomatically and to our negotiator. Mr. Siciliano said, "I do not disagree with you at all." In fact, Mr. Siciliano said that Secretary Mitchell had said at the White House there might be reason for wanting to postpone it. Then Mr. Mitchell said that he would have to tell them at the White House this might be embarrassing to Mr. Dulles. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] did not tell the membership of this House what took place at the White House, but here it is.

Then Mr. COOLEY had this to say:

Mr. COOLEY. I want to address this remark to the lawyers in this House, and I think even the laymen know it, that you cannot have a unilateral agreement. There is no such animal known to legal jurisprudence. Whoever heard of a unilateral agreement? What our officials have done in Mexico is to slam the door on the recruiting offices and to move north of the Rio Grande and to carry on in illegal fashion.

The New York Times published a statement the other day that 100 Communists a day were coming across the border as wetbacks and finding their way into the city districts of this country.

Going back to the negotiations, this is what Mr. White—

He is our Ambassador to Mexico—

said about it, and this is sent to me from the Mexican Embassy. It is a translation from Excelsior, a paper published in Mexico City:

"In a statement made to the press in Monterrey, Ambassador White said that he was hopeful that an agreement on Mexican migratory workers would be reached soon.

"Ambassador White stated that the negotiations are being conducted between the two Governments in a spirit of great friendship and understanding.

"'We can emphatically state,' he added, 'that we have made real progress in the negotiations and that we expect soon to reach a definite agreement'."

Mr. President, I think the issue is rather simple. We are asked to follow a rather unusual procedure. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], 3 years ago, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, brought before the Senate a bill incorporating an agreement between Mexico and the United States. That agreement was ratified by Congress. Recruitment processes went on under that agreement in a normal, reasonable, and fair manner. There were differences of opinion as to whether we should have such an agreement, but it was agreed to by Congress, and the junior Senator from Minnesota voted for it. The junior Senator from Minnesota was a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at the time and he voted for the joint resolution in committee.

Now, however, the situation is entirely different, and there are involved factors which are of importance to our country. At the very hour, Mr. President—and I repeat what I said earlier, because it needs to be repeated—at the very hour our Secretary of State is in Caracas, Venezuela, trying to prove to our Latin American brothers that we are a friendly power and that we and they must bind ourselves together in closer cooperation and in closer unity, at a time when we are trying to build a very cordial and wholesome relationship with the Republic of Mexico, and at a time when our Government finds itself in disagreement with Mexico over the recruitment of Mexican labor, what do we do, Mr. President? We go far beyond what our executive branch is trying to do. We bypass the Secretary of State, our Ambassador to Mexico, the Mexican Ambassador, and the Department of Labor, and we bring to the Halls of Congress the pending joint resolution, and we say that we will authorize the recruitment of labor whether Mexico likes it or not.

Of course, there is a saving clause in the joint resolution which says that if an agreement is reached, very well; but if no agreement is reached, we will go on with the recruitment.

I say the action proposed today is premature.

I believe the joint resolution should be referred to the proper committee. There is no real haste for its passage. I believe we should await a final solution of the problem by the responsible diplomatic officials. If they cannot resolve the problem through agreement, and if we cannot reach a bilateral agreement with the Republic of Mexico, we can take up the subject again before the appropriate committee.

I believe that Representative COOLEY made the argument which needed to be made on this subject.

I am not denying the fact that stoop labor is hard to find. I listened with interest to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] outline the method by which, under an agreement with the Bahama Islands and Jamaica, as I recall, farmers in Florida are able to get that kind of labor, under an agreement which they have been able to work out.

We have had a working agreement with the Republic of Mexico. The wetback problem is one of law enforcement; it is a problem of border patrol, a problem of appropriation, and of proper control over a boundary which is approximately 2,000 miles in length.

The question before us today revolves around the point of whether we will charge ahead regardless of international repercussions, and do as we please, literally defying the Government of Mexico, by telling it that we are setting up recruiting establishments on the other side of the border to entice workers to cross the border, in spite of the fact that the Mexican Government has said to its workers: "You shall not leave the country to take those jobs."

Mr. President, this is an unprecedented position for Congress to find itself in. At a time when we are asking other people to keep their agreements, and at a time when we ask that other nations be responsible for their actions, we cannot afford to take a position of irresponsibility.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be happy to yield, provided I do not lose the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Has the Senator from Minnesota undertaken to determine the position of the State Department with regard to the pending joint resolution?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that the joint resolution came before us so fast that some of us have not had much time to study it, and I have had to read it on the run, so to speak, but I gather from what we have been able to find by way of evidence and from what Representative COOLEY has said—and I have read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the House proceedings what the Representative said—that Secretary of State Dulles did not even know about it when he was called with respect to it, at the time the Rules Committee of the House was considering the joint resolution, with respect to whether or not it should be put on the House Calendar. I wish to read to my distinguished friend what I quoted a few minutes ago. I read from what Representative COOLEY said yesterday on the floor of the House. He is speaking about his many visits with responsible officials of our Government. He said:

I did not stop with the White House, I did not stop with the Mexican Ambassador; I said before the Rules Committee that it was my belief that Secretary John Foster Dulles had never known anything about this resolution. I took it upon myself to call the Secretary of State and he frankly admitted that he did not know anything about it, but he assured me he would investigate immediately. The very next morning his assistant was in my office. I discussed the matter at length with him. I told him about my opposition, about my apprehension regarding the international aspects, and he said he would go back and reappraise it. The Mexican Ambassador went down to the State Department to see Mr. Morton and to discuss it. I did not stop there. I told the Rules Committee that this resolution would destroy all the good that had been accomplished by Milton Eisenhower's trip to South America. He went there on a friendly mission, and this thing is an unfriendly act.

I called Milton Eisenhower in Pennsylvania. He was surprised and amazed, and told me he would call Secretary Dulles the next day.

Whether the State Department, within the last week or 10 days, has come to a different opinion, I do not know, but at the time the question of whether the joint resolution should be placed on the House Calendar was under consideration, the State Department had no information about it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield, with the understanding that the Senator from New York does not lose the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say, first of all, that Mr. Dulles has obviously had some additional problems to consider during the past few weeks, and might not have been informed on this partciular piece of legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thoroughly agree.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I say that the joint resolution comes to the Senate, as it went to the House, with the approval of the administration, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Labor, and

that the procedure we are following has the approval of the State Department.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield, with the same understanding?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Regardless of what Representative COOLEY undoubtedly in good faith told the House yesterday, the United States Employment Service told me about 3 hours ago that this proposed legislation is needed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am talking about the desirability of an agreement between the two Republics and about the method which is employed. There are those who say that plenty of labor is available in the United States, in view of the unemployment which now exists. We have had testimony and letters on this subject in other years. I read a moment ago a telegram from the archbishop of San Antonio, one of the distinguished churchmen of southwestern United States, who vigorously protested the action proposed to be taken. I also quoted from a letter from the archbishop to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, before I declare my intention with reference to a legislative procedure I wish to point out that the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. Siciliano, who has been conducting some of the negotiations, had this to say on March 1:

> Our main difficulty now is that we are having trouble in translating the agreement on principles into writing. We have reached an agreement on wages. We are going to set the wages, but to put this agreement in writing is our present difficulty. One thing they have backed away from finally is that they wanted to set the wages. We are willing to give them the right of appeal if they think the wages are too low. Our trouble is now the language difficulty in putting the agreement in writing.

Representative COOLEY pointed out that if this agreement is arrived at we will be back in the situation to which the senior Senator from Louisiana referred, with an agreement between the two Republics which will come up for further consideration. At the present time, that is not the situation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now serve notice that it is my intention at the appropriate time, when the debate is concluded—I do not wish to shut off any debate—to move to refer the resolution to committee. I make that declaration of intention because I do not believe we are proceeding in a manner which is in the best interest of the international relations of our country, in the best interest of cordial relations between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, or in the best interest of reasonable and fair recruitment of foreign labor for purposes of employment in the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the debate has about run out, and since the distinguished Senator from Minnesota said he is ready to make a motion to refer House Joint Resolution 355, as amended, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum. First, I wish to say for the information of the Senate that I had hoped we would dispose of this measure today and proceed with the Hawaiian statehood bill tomorrow and begin the debate on that measure. I expect to consult with the minority leader further, but if we can work things out satisfactorily, I hope we may be able to recess tomorrow night until Monday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that House Joint Resolution 355, as amended, be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to refer House Joint Resolution 355, as amended, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as one of the sponsors of the joint resolution reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which is identical with the joint resolution passed by the House of Representatives, I wish to defend the measure.

There is no agreement with the Government of Canada with respect to the importation of agricultural laborers to be employed seasonally on the farms of Maine, when Canadian laborers go there to dig potatoes. It has not been necessary to have such an agreement.

Neither would it have been necessary to have an agreement with the Government of Mexico, except that the Mexican Government, some years ago, changed its policy and decided that citizens of Mexico who lived along the border, and who had been accustomed to enter the United States, just as Canadians do, with a crossing card, after examination by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and a bond given for their return within a given period of time, should no longer be allowed to enter the United States. That was the old arrangement between the United States and Mexico, and it worked entirely satisfactorily.

But the Mexican Government, in its wisdom, decided that the Mexicans residing along the border had acquired an agricultural education, so to speak, by having worked on American farms, and had learned many of our methods of agriculture and that, therefore, they should not be allowed to continue to return to the United States. It was decided that the recruitment of Mexican laborers for work in the United States should be done a thousand miles south of the Mexican border, where other citizens of Mexico would be selected and allowed to enter the United States and to learn our methods of agriculture.

Under the changed circumstances, it was necessary to negotiate an agreement with Mexico, and under the agreement the recruitment has been made at a great distance from the border.

The agreement which was made—and it was the only way by which the United States could procure farm labor from Mexico during the war—provided that anyone who came to the United States to work on a farm should receive the prevailing rate of wages in the United States. But, first, under the prior method of recruitment it was necessary to have a certification that there was no American labor available to do the work. The certification had to be made in advance by the Department of Labor for any kind of recruitment at the international border. But when it was established that for crops to be harvested in the United States there was a shortage of agricultural labor in this country, under those circumstances a sufficient number of persons to aid in the work during the harvesting season were admitted into the United States, but they were required to be returned to Mexico when their services were no longer needed, at the end of a limited period of time.

The labor agreement with Mexico expired at the end of last year. There was no reason why it should have expired. It should have been renegotiated and continued into this year, as it had been in prior years.

But Mexico imposed now conditions upon the use of Mexican labor in the United States. Mexico insisted that it should determine what wages Mexican workers were to obtain in the United States. The rule which had been applied—and it was a sound rule—was that the rate of compensation should be the prevailing rate in the area where the person worked. That is how the existing disagreement arose.

In my opinion, the prospect for a new agreement has become greatly improved. Why? Because the Mexican Government had notice that the House Committee on Rules had adopted a rule that the measure now before the Senate would be considered by the House of Representatives. When the Mexican Government learned that Congress proposed to act as it had acted before making any agreement, and as it had a perfect right to act, that Government then began to modify its demands, and the two Governments now are getting together. The United States Government has a perfect right to say who may come into the United States, how long he can stay, and under what conditions. We have insisted on that right for many years.

If this joint resolution is passed, if Mexico is ready to make an agreement, and if nothing remains to be done but to write the agreement, then the second provision of the joint resolution will never go into effect; there will be no necessity for it. The language is perfectly clear. The law now provides that arrangements for the importation of labor shall be "(pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico)." It is proposed to strike out that language from the existing law and to insert, in lieu thereof, "(pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico or after every practicable effort has

been made by the United States to negotiate and reach agreement on such arrangements)."

That is the only change which is proposed to be made in existing law. It is simply common sense that those who are negotiating for the United States should be given some bargaining power. Without such bargaining power, what would happen? It could mean that there would be no agreement. Agricultural labor is needed on this side of the border. The Mexican knows that if he comes into the United States to work, he can get a job, so he becomes a wetback. The enactment of the joint resolution will prevent large numbers of wetbacks from coming into the United States.

Sufficient money has not been appropriated by Congress properly to enforce the immigration laws along the border to prevent wetbacks from entering this country. That is why they have poured into the country and have drifted even up to States in the North, as has been repeatedly said on this floor.

I wish to remind Senators opposing the resolution that on the floor of the Senate and in committee I have been as strong an advocate for the enforcement of the immigration laws as has been any other Senator. I have insisted that more money should be appropriated from year to year to the Department of Labor and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, so that they could have adequate personnel to regulate properly the ingress and egress of Mexican labor. I have thoroughly agreed and urged at all times that the United States Government should do everything it possibly can to enforce the law to prevent wetbacks from entering this country. A failure to pass this joint resolution and a failure to reach an agreement with the Government of Mexico will mean more and more wetbacks. If Senators favor having more wetbacks, then let them defeat the joint resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to make a short rejoinder to the remarks of the Senator from Arizona. No Senator has been more determined in his efforts to obtain adequate appropriations for the proper enforcement of the immigration laws than has the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I am deeply indebted to him. I recognize the merit of his argument about the importance of regularized, standardized procedures of recruitment. Certainly I am not adverse to them. I wish to make that point clear. My feeling is based primarily on the manner in which we are now approaching and moving into this labor-recruitment program.

Mr. VORYS, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Relations, made a very pertinent statement yesterday in the House of Representatives following the vote, under the caption "Explanation of Vote." I should like to read it for the benefit of my colleagues. I am sure they have studied the RECORD of yesterday, but there are times when we glance at it rather quickly.

Mr. VORYS said:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for this bill which creates a new way of recruiting foreigners to work in the United States at a time of increasing unemployment here. The present law at least requires agreement with Mexico. This bill eliminates this limitation. I would not like to see organized Government recruiting of Americans by Canada or Mexico for any purpose just across our borders. I am concerned to see that this policy of bringing in Mexicans and others to do American stoop-labor which was originally a war emergency measure is becoming a fixed part of our economy, and in this bill is being broadened. Under our present system, the Government spends money to bring in foreigners to help raise crops like cotton, then buys the cotton, and then pays unemployment insurance to American workers. It is said that Americans are unwilling to do this work. If we spent money organizing and recruiting and transporting Americans, I believe we could get the numbers to raise the crops we really need. Instead, we seem to have drifted into a situation where certain segments of our agriculture are developing vested rights in foreign labor. I admit the problem is complex, but I do not believe we help to solve it by extending this recruiting system, regardless of the consent of a neighboring friendly country, at this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Minnesota will admit, will he not, that the Member of the House whom he has quoted failed to explain that no Mexican labor can be imported, under any agreement with Mexico, unless there is a certification by the Department of Labor that American labor cannot be found to do the work?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. Again I am not arguing about the details of the agreement. I wish to assure the Senator from Arizona of that. Some 2 or 3 years ago this question was argued on the floor of the Senate, with some of us holding different views. I am sure that if it were not for the pressing conditions in terms of the need of workers in some of the crop areas of the State which the Senator in part represents—and I sympathize with the problem of the farmers there—he would feel, as I feel, that the best way to approach this question is by an agreement with the Mexican Government.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not think that is the best method of approach. I doubt if the Member of the House quoted by the Senator from Minnesota realized that we got along very, very well for many years and obtained the agricultural labor that was needed in the regular way, without any agreement with Mexico. The only reason why there is an agreement is the insistence of the Mexican Government, in the exercise of its paternal care, that the recruitment take place somewhere else than at the border. To accomplish that objective, the Mexican Government insisted on not allowing Mexican workers who were to come into this country to be recruited at the border, as had been customary in the past. When laborers went to the border seeking to obtain employment in the United States, there had to be a certificate from the Department of Labor that there was employment available to them. Then there had to be somebody, usually one who represented an agricultural organization, who would put up a bond for the laborer, which would require his return to Mexico within a certain period of time. It was also agreed that the wage which he would be paid would be the prevailing wage. All those arrangements were handled expeditiously and without difficulty until Mexico insisted that there be an arrangement of this kind. Canada has not insisted on such a provision; we get along very well with Canada, and Canadians cross the border to help American farmers with their crops at harvest time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What the Senator has said is true so far as wages are concerned. There was a different situation during the war years. The Mexican Government made no protest during the war years, but it has protested now. It has insisted that it be treated as a sovereign state. It has made it clear that it does not like it when we establish recruitment centers at the border which entice Mexican laborers to come into our country against the will of the Mexican Government. They have made their opposition clear.

If the Canadian Government established a recruitment center at the border across from one of the Northern States, and our Government stated we did not want American citizens to go to Canada because we had not been able to come to an agreement with Canada as to the standards which would prevail for their labor, our Government would be very angry with the Canadian Government for defying our will and wish. We have before us a tense international situation which will be aggravated.

I further say that if the United States Government in some areas spent as much time trying to recruit American nationals, Mexican-Americans, and others who are without work, as it does in trying to recruit Mexican laborers, we should be meeting much of the employment problem. That is another issue within itself.

One of the reasons why Mexican labor is imported is that Mexican labor can be hired at a rate which is lower than the wages established for American labor.

The Senator may say, in reply, that the prevailing wage is paid to Mexican laborers, but the prevailing wage is a very difficult thing to ascertain. We held hearings on how the prevailing wage was arrived at, and learned that the prevailing wage is what the growers are accustomed to pay. It is not the minimum wage of 75 cents an hour. We discovered that the prevailing wage would run as low as 55 cents and 60 cents an hour. No American can live on such a wage rate, and no American should be required to do so.

What we are really confronted with is an unorthodox procedure. We have established relationships with Mexico. We are asking our Government to complete an agreement. There is no evidence that it will be completed.

I am proud of the Mexican Government. At long last it is standing up for its people. We have become too accustomed to using Mexico for our own purposes. We have exploited her oil resources, and now we are attempting to exploit her people. Thank God that the

Republic of Mexico at long last has said, "Mexicans are going to be treated like human beings, and Mexico is going to be treated like a sovereign government."

I say three cheers for Mexico. I am glad the Mexican Government is asserting itself in connection with this unusual practice of trying to recruit Mexican workers in defiance of the law and will of Mexico.

Now I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I merely wished to make a very brief comment. The Senator from Minnesota seems to approve of the arbitrary action taken by the Mexican Government which limits its nationals in their ability to come to the United States. The Senator from Minnesota states that we would resent action taken by Canada to recruit American workers. I should like to know what American worker would allow his Government to tell him whether he could go to Canada in order to get a job. The comparison shows the difference between the kind of free Government we have and the kind of paternal Government Mexico has, when that Government has the power to tell its nationals whether or not they can go to the United States to find employment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should not have become engaged in this argument, because I am now speaking to the most distinguished statesman in the Senate and one of my dearest friends, and one of the ablest men who has ever come to this body. As the Senator knows—and he knows more than he is saying now—what the Mexican Government is trying to do is to give its own nationals a better deal. He knows that the Mexican Government in the agreement of 1951 compelled our Government to provide better standards for labor, transportation, and so forth, and for a bond to be provided which would assure the return of the worker to Mexico. The Mexican Government wants to have its workers recruited from all over Mexico. The Mexican Government does not want workers recruited only from the border. One of the reasons why Mexico wanted recruitment in Mexico to be below the Mexican border was to enable workers from the southern provinces of Mexico to go to the United States as laborers, and not have mass migration of their people crowding at the gates of the border, as is now occurring.

Mr. President, in this instance if the need for agricultural labor is so great that we should shunt aside the wishes of a friendly republic, then the situation is indeed critical. Either there is unemployment in the United States or there is not unemployment in the United States. I have heard some of my colleagues say that unemployment to the extent of 3,200,000 persons exists in the United States. Certainly there is unemployment in the Southwest—in the States of Arizona, New Mexico, and California. When American citizens are unemployed, it does not seem to me to be wise to begin importing workers from outside the continental limits of our Nation, in order to permit such workers to take jobs in the United States.

Mr. President, what is the issue? American workers seek 75 cents an hour or $1 an hour, whereas the Mexican workers will labor for 50 or 60 cents an hour. We do not help meet the needs of our own people if we permit the entry of Mexican workers who are willing to labor at such low wages.

It seems to me that we should first consider the employment situation among the people of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I sponsored the original Mexican labor law when it was considered in the Senate several years ago. I am sure that many Members of the Senate voted for that measure in the hope that it would assist in stamping out the wetback evil. I have no doubt that under the present law we would be well on the way in attaining that goal, if only the Government of Mexico had cooperated. We were rendered little or no assistance by Mexico. The burden remained on our shoulders. Because of the lack of cooperation on the part of Mexico we find that at this time more wetbacks than ever before have entered the United States.

It is my understanding that under Mexican law, Mexico can prefer charges against all wetbacks that are captured in our country and returned to our neighbor to the south. We have captured and returned hundreds of thousands of wetbacks and no effort was made to punish them as provided by the laws of Mexico. It was my understanding that when the last agreement was made between us and Mexico that the Mexicans would place more men on the border to patrol it, also that severe penalties would be imposed by Mexico on those wetbacks captured and returned by us, but none of that came to pass.

Under the present law, it is of course necessary that an agreement be entered into between our Government and the Mexican Government which would permit Mexicans who entered our country legally to work here for a fixed period of time. I know, of my own knowledge, that for the past 7 or 8 months every effort has been made by our Government to obtain an agreement with Mexico, but all to no avail. Mexico is demanding certain stipulations in the agreement that are not acceptable and should not be accepted by our Government.

The purpose of the amendment as I understand it, is to permit the consummation of agreements with Mexican laborers, without the consent of the Mexican Government. That I believe is wrong. It will create bad feelings between us and Mexico. It would make the Labor Department of our Government an employment agency charged with the obligation of contracting with Mexican nationals to work in our fields. It is my belief that the law should be repealed, if it does not accomplish its purpose. It may be that if such a course were pursued the Mexican Government could be made to see the light and it could be prevailed upon to be more cooperative in our efforts to stamp out the wetback menace. So far as I am concerned, I am opposed to the pending joint resolution. I voted against reporting the companion Senate joint resolution to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that House Joint Resolution 355, as amended, be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, again I ask for the yeas and nays on this question, and I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to refer House Joint Resolution 355, as amended, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LEHMAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate, attending the sessions of the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela, as a congressional adviser on the United States delegation.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If present

and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—59

Aiken	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Griswold	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Payne
Bennett	Hendrickson	Potter
Bush	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Russell
Byrd	Hunt	Saltonstall
Carlson	Ives	Schoeppel
Case	Jenner	Smathers
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Knowland	Stennis
Dirksen	Kuchel	Thye
Duff	Langer	Upton
Dworshak	Lennon	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Wiley
Ferguson	Martin	Williams
Flanders	McCarthy	Young
George	McClellan	

NAYS—22

Burke	Jackson	Mansfield
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Maybank
Ellender	Kefauver	Monroney
Frear	Kennedy	Murray
Fulbright	Kilgore	Neely
Gore	Lehman	Pastore
Hill	Long	
Humphrey	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson	Douglas	McCarran
Bricker	Gillette	Morse
Bridges	Green	Sparkman
Capehart	Hennings	Symington
Chavez	Kerr	Welker

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 355) was passed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 121 is indefinitely postponed.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, after Senators have made routine insertions in the RECORD I shall move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow. There will be no further voting this evening.

LOANS TO PUBLIC AGENCIES—AMENDMENT TO SECTION 108 OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION ACT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, last year, at the time the Senate was debating the liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the establishment of a Small Business Administration, several of us were concerned about that legislation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in effect Federal aid to small business has certainly been liquidated by not making loans in sufficient number.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, at the time of the debate several of us were concerned about the fact that no Government agency was designated in the proposed legislation to make public agency loans. During the course of the debate, the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who had been chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, brought up the question, along with the junior Senator from Florida and several other Senators. The result of the colloquy which ensued was that the then chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], agreed to an amendment which provided that $25 million would be allocated to the Small Business Administration, and that the Small Business Administration would have the right to make community loans. It was pointed out and demonstrated that there were many communities which had no place to go in order to borrow money to build public waterworks, sewerage systems, and projects of that nature.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Members on the other side of the aisle agreed thoroughly with the amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct. The amendment was agreed to. It went to conference, and the conference committee changed the amendment which had been agreed to. The conference bill contained what is known as section 108, which provided that an agency of the Government would be authorized to have $25 million, which agency could make public works loans to various communities That was in the conference report, and it is now the law of the land.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was passed last July.

Mr. SMATHERS. It was in July, I believe.

Mr. MAYBANK. But the President has never designated any agency to make public-agency loans. Of course, the Bureau of the Budget has done nothing about asking for an appropriation for the program. Small-business assistance has dwindled until today there is practically no small-business Federal aid. The people of America know that. The Senator from Florida is speaking the truth.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. There is no doubt about the fact that today there is no place where municipalities can go to borrow money for waterworks, sewerage systems, and projects of that nature.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is there any place for small business to go?

Mr. SMATHERS. So far as I know, the Small Business Administration has been activated in name only.

The President of the United States was, in effect, directed by the Congress, insofar as it is possible for Congress to direct the President, to designate an agency. Since that time persons have come from my State representing certain cities which want to obtain loans, in one instance, to construct a sewerage system, and in another instance, to construct a wharf. They cannot borrow the necessary funds at any of the private lending agencies, and contaminated water is of necessity being consumed in some localities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am happy to hear the junior Senator from Florida bring this issue to the attention of the Senate, and, I trust, through this medium, to the attention of the President, because it was clearly understood at the time the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] offered his amendment that it was vitally important that the particular function of assisting municipalities to construct improved waterworks and other such facilities be maintained as an active function of the Government.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 108 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, and that the bill be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3066) to amend section 108 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was received, read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 108 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act (62 Stat. 262) is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out from subsection (a) thereof the words "the President, through such officer or agency of the Government (other than the Reconstruction Finance Corporation) as he may designate" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Housing and Home Finance Administrator."

(b) Strike out all of subsection (b) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) For the purposes of this section, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to obtain from a revolving fund hereby established in the Treasury of the United States not to exceed a total of $50 million outstanding at any one time. For this purpose there is hereby appropriated to said revolving fund in the Treasury the amount of $50 million. Advances from the revolving fund shall be made to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator upon his request. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, at the close of each fiscal year, interest on the amount of advances outstanding, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding interest-bearing marketable public-debt obligations of the United States of comparable maturities. As

the Housing and Home Finance Administrator repays principal sums advanced from the revolving fund pursuant to this section, such repayments shall be made to the revolving fund."

(c) Strike out from subsection (c) thereof the words "officer or agency designated by the President" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Housing and Home Finance Administrator."

(d) Strike out from subsection (d) thereof the figures "1955" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "1957."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill which I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

At the time this body was debating the bill which has become the RFC Liquidation Act, it wisely amended it to provide authority for the Federal Government to make loans to public agencies, such as States, counties, and municipalities. These loans could be made to finance public projects when the borrower could not obtain the money elsewhere on reasonable terms.

This power had been vested in the RFC for many years. Not one criticism was ever heard of this part of the RFC program. Overall it made profit for the Federal Government, while it financed the construction of many worthy civic projects.

When the bill liquidating the RFC went to conference between the two Houses of the Congress, the substance of the Senate amendment authorizing a loan program for public agencies was kept in the bill.

However, the conferees decided to leave it to the President to designate some agency other than the RFC to administer the program, since the liquidation of that agency made it necessary to transfer to other agencies several of the programs being handled by RFC.

The RFC Liquidation Act became law on July 30, 1953. More than 8 months have passed since that date. However, during that long period, no agency has been designated to handle the public agency loan program. Neither has any appropriation been requested from the Congress to establish the $25 million revolving fund authorized for this program.

I have heard only two excuses given for not putting into effect the public agency program authorized by the Congress.

First, it was stated there were funds available for these loans from private sources. I have only one comment on that reason. If funds are available from private sources on reasonable terms, then under the terms of the law as passed, not a single dollar can be loaned by the Federal Government. By its terms, the act provides only for those public bodies that cannot obtain financing for public projects from private sources on reasonable terms. Since September 28, 1953, the date when RFC authority to make such loans ended, States, counties, cities, and towns have had no Federal agency to which they can turn for financial aid in building needed civic projects. This works particularly against the smaller communities whose projects are just as vital to residents as those in the larger cities. Yet these smaller communities cannot tap the national securities markets with their local bond issues. They are not well enough known in the national market. Moreover, the expense attached to a national offering of securities is greatly out of proportion to the smaller loans needed by these communities.

The second reason I have heard for not placing the public agency loan program in effect is that the Federal Government needs its funds for use in other programs. This, in effect, is a statement that the legislation passed by the Congress is to be set aside by the executive department without the formality of a veto.

Wholly apart from this, one of the accepted methods of helping to revive economic activity is through the construction of useful public works. Here is a program that proposes to accomplish this by loans, not grants, of Federal funds. It is no giveaway program.

Moreover, it places the initiative in the States, where it belongs. It assures them of some financial aid from the Federal Government for worthwhile projects. It is a use of Federal funds, through the lending of Federal credit, to help prevent a serious economic decline. This is far better and much less costly than to pour out millions of taxpayers' funds in Federal grants once a depression has occurred.

The past history of this public agency loan program under the RFC was a financial success from the standpoint of the Federal Government.

In my opinion it is a proper and wise use of the Federal credit at the present time.

I have therefore introduced this bill to name the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to handle this program which the Congress authorized 8 months ago. HHFA presently has personnel equipped to handle this type of program in its Community Facilities group. They administer a loan program to public agencies for waterworks, sewer systems, and similar public projects in critical defense housing areas. They handle school construction loans for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They conduct the loan program authorized to provide dormitories for colleges. They should be able to embark immediately upon this program.

In order to provide the funds needed to get the program under way, my bill appropriates $50 million to a revolving fund in the Treasury. If additional amounts prove to be necessary, they can be provided later by the Congress. However, the $50 million will be enough to get the public agency loan program into operation.

Apart from naming the agency to administer the statutory provisions through June 30, 1957, and providing the funds needed, this bill makes no change of substance in the public agency loan program authorized by the Congress last July. It merely provides the means for placing this program in operation.

I urge the Congress to give early attention to this measure.

Mr. MAYBANK. Small business has been sold down the river, Mr. President, and I do not intend to see that process continued in the case of public agency loans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was trying to say to the junior Senator from Florida that the matter to which he is directing our attention is of vital importance to municipalities throughout the country. I am sure the Senator is aware that an association known as the American Municipal Association is anxious to have action. Only a few days ago I received a letter asking whether or not there was any agency of Government to which application could be made for the kind of assistance we have been discussing. I believe it was in relation to health facilities.

I could only say in reply that we authorized such an agency; we put into the law a provision to that effect, but it is in cold storage. Nothing has been done about it.

I hope this debate will stir the administration into action. All it takes is the designation of an agency; and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has already told us what agency should be designated.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I spoke most respectfully of the President, but he has not taken any action to put this public-agency program into effect. In my own State in areas in the Savannah Valley project of the Atomic Energy Commission certain towns do not have proper water or sewerage facilities. So I have asked that the Housing and Home Finance Agency be designated as the agency to administer this public-agency-loan program. I speak most respectfully, because no one appreciates the President of the United States more than I do, be he Republican or Democrat. Something should be done about the situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from South Carolina has indicated what is our desire and he has been more than cooperative by mentioning a possible agency, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which seems to be the appropriate one.

I commend to the Senate the remarks of the junior Senator from Florida and those of the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from Minnesota.

I might say that last year he was the Senator who actually started the discussion of the matter, which eventually resulted in the offering of an amendment by the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], which was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. I might add that the present chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], favored it and the amendment was taken to conference. It was determined that, rather than name any agency specifically in the statute, the matter would be left to the President. I have the utmost respect for the President, but I am sorry some action has not been taken in the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. SMATHERS. What disturbs me is that if Congress should pass the bill which has been introduced by the Senator from South Carolina and which has been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and if, as has been the case under section 108, the Budget Bureau does not request any funds, there will not be any funds, which is the case at present. What is to be done if the President of the United States does not act?

Mr. MAYBANK. First, as I am familiar with the situation, I can say to my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Florida, that there are a great many municipalities that cannot get legal banking loans, which previously

could have been obtained from the RFC when it was in existence.

Second, my bill provides for a $50-million appropriation. I doubt that the Committee on Appropriations would oppose an appropriation of $25 million or $50 million for the political subdivisions of the United States on a loan basis to carry out this public agency loan program.

Mr. SMATHERS. As I understand, the Budget Bureau did not request the $25 million because they said, first, there was no agency designated by the President, and, second, they knew of no requests for such loans. But all Senators know of many such requests.

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill I have introduced provides for an appropriation of $50 million. I do not know whether the bill will be passed or not. I have no criticism to make of the administration. Do not misunderstand me. The distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], on the other side of the aisle, and the other members of the committee were unanimous in the view that the President should designate an agency. With the many duties resting upon him, the President probably has not had an opportunity to consider the question.

All my bill does is to designate the Housing and Home Finance Agency as the agency to handle a $50-million fund for loans to public agencies.

If the Senator from Florida wishes to know the truth, it is that the Bureau of the Budget has said there was no need to have any money on hand for poor municipalities; they could borrow from the banks. But if the banks do not lend the money, I say to the distinguished acting majority leader, there is a vital need for a source of Federal aid. Am I not correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. The inaction of the Bureau of the Budget has been in line with the hesitancy of the Treasury Department to increase Federal spending. The Bureau has said there is no need of any municipality borrowing money from any Federal agency under this program, but that the local banks should lend the money. Am I not correct in my understanding?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is what was said.

Mr. MAYBANK. In small towns in Oklahoma, Florida, Minnesota, South Carolina, and other States, there are many local financial institutions and banks whose capital is not sufficient to enable them to make such loans, and sometimes the State laws prohibit the lending of large sums of money. If I am wrong about that, I hope the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma will correct me, because he knows of the situation in Oklahoma, and he can well express it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield, so that I may reply to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from South Carolina is absolutely correct. I am trying to assist the small communities along this line.

I should like to ask the distinguished former Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency if any study is now being made in the committee with respect to the necessity for a revival of the lending functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation?

Mr. MAYBANK. I should say that I personally know of no study on that specific point, although the committee is checking on the liquidation program of the RFC. But I did not favor the abolition of the RFC, as the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma well knows. I think a great mistake was made when the RFC was abolished. Of course, there was some corruption in the RFC, as there is in other agencies. I regretted it. When I appointed the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] as chairman of a subcommittee to investigate, there were many disclosures about gifts and of a mink coat and of other kinds of corruption. Of course, such things happen. Unfortunately and sadly, corruption exists in a great many agencies. But from the time of the chairmanship of Jesse Jones and throughout the years, the overall good done by the RFC far outweighed the corruption, and the agency more than paid for itself.

The Democratic Party was smart enough to see to it that the guilty parties were brought to justice. If I am not mistaken, all those in the RFC who were substantially involved in corruption were indicted.

As Senators know the Merle Young case was brought up on the floor of the Senate, and I well know about what happened because I saw him in his appearances in court.

If there is anyone who was connected with the RFC who should have been sent to jail but has not been sent to jail, I hope that he will be. But those sad occurrences did not make it necessary to do away with the RFC.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

I wish to urge that there be a continuation of the study of municipal loans by the Committee on Banking and Currency, because I am being informed continually by municipalities and other governmental subdivisions, such as boards of education and small-school administrations, that their situation in regard to finances for needed construction is critical, and that efforts which are being made to reduce unemployment before it becomes too severe are finding absolutely no encouragement when attempts are made to obtain the necessary loans in the money markets of the East.

Certainly the record of the RFC, considering all the Senator from South Carolina has said about it, shows that the open window as a last resort for the financing of necessary, needed public works was the outstanding performance of that agency. No other agency has been instituted in the Federal Government which will again permit municipalities to float the loans which they later will be able to repay. I hope some attention will be paid to making available adequate financing on the part of the Government, when it cannot be had in the commercial market.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his statement.

Mr. President, I am disturbed by the fact that the President, in a recent press conference, seemed concerned about the rising unemployment and the possibility that the Nation might be entering upon some sort of economic recession. It appears to me that one of the better ways to meet the rising unemployment and to head off or to stave off what appears to be the hand of depression would be to make active such an agency as has already been provided for by act of Congress so as to enable municipalities to come to Washington to borrow money with which to undertake the most necessitous projects which municipal governments are required to construct, namely, to supply pure water to the citizens of communities and to provide other important public works and facilities. Obviously, there would be a great impact in that particular field.

Secondly, I wonder if the President understands the sentiment of Congress, as he so clearly did last year when the question was being debated, and the bill was unanimously passed by the Senate, and I presume was passed by a large majority in the House of Representatives. Despite the expression by Congress, the Budget Director refused to act, and he is still refusing to act. I wonder what other recourse Congress has.

Of course, we can say that we will proceed in any event to make appropriations even though no agency has been named to handle the program. But that is not the orderly procedure. As I understand, the President has stated on many occasions his belief that Congress should determine the policy, certainly with respect to domestic legislation.

Congress has determined the policy in this particular instance. Yet the President of the United States, or his administration, has not acted. It may be that the President as an individual does not know anything about it. I do not know; but certainly the persons who are guiding him, who advise him on matters of policy, who call such matters to his attention, and who are aware of the wishes of Congress in connection with this particular project, are not going to continue to ignore Congress.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I was distressed to hear the statement made on the floor that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey has taken the position that there is no need to have any agency to make loans to various communities which desire to construct public utilities and facilities.

Mr. MAYBANK. If I used the name of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, in that connection, I was mistaken. I meant to say the Bureau of the Budget refused to make a recommendation, because it said such action was not necessary. The Director of the Budget, Mr. Dodge, may have stated this to the Secretary of the Treasury. I did not mean to make a misstatement.

Mr. LONG. I am delighted to have that correction, because I desire only the facts.

I was rather surprised to learn that the position taken by the Bureau of the Budget, or by the responsible officials of it, was that there was no need to make loans to small municipalities in order that they might construct necessary utilities. There have been many appointments made from States other than Louisiana during the Republican administration. I have not heard that any resident of Louisiana has received an important appointment to an administrative position.

Perhaps because there is no one from Louisiana in the Bureau of the Budget officials of the Bureau do not know what the situation is in Louisiana. I wish to inform the Director of the Budget what the conditions are in my State. If he wishes to learn of small communities which need loans, I suggest that he go to Colfax, La., a municipality which attempted to establish a gas-distribution system. The law permits them to pay as high as 5 percent interest on borrowed money and prohibits them from paying more than 5 percent on their revenue bonds. In what position do the people of that community find themselves? The new administration took over, pushed the interest rate to a high figure, and now the people cannot borrow money in order to install a gas-distribution system.

Mr. SMATHERS. If the President designated an agency to make such loans, and the agency stated it would make a loan at about 4½ percent or 4¾ percent interest, would that not have a tendency to force bankers to lower their interest rates, and make it possible for municipalities to borrow more money at lower interest rates?

Mr. LONG. The Senator is absolutely correct. When there was an institution to which the municipalities could go to seek relief, they were able to obtain loans at less than 5 percent interest. They were able to obtain loans at about 3½ percent. Now municipalities have to pay 5½ or 5¾ percent interest in order to borrow money to construct such projects as gas-distribution systems.

The high-interest-rate policy of the Republican administration has made it necessary for such municipalities to pay higher interest rates, and the President has not designated an agency which could make loans to such municipalities.

I have mentioned the town of Colfax. That is only one. Boyce, La., is another. The authorities of that town had authorization to put in a natural-gas distribution system. They have been trying for more than a year to have such a system installed. They are unable to borrow money, because the President will not designate an agency to lend the money to the municipality. The lending syndicates have not seen fit to lend them money. We will be happy to take Mr. Dodge to Louisiana and show him a dozen municipalities which desire to construct sewage-disposal systems but they are unable to do it because it is impossible for them to borrow the necessary money.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his comments. The experience which the municipalities are having in Louisiana is similar to that of municipalities in practically every State of the Union.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Inasmuch as the Bureau of the Budget takes the position that there is no need for such loans, I should like to have the Bureau know that the mayors of 20 small cities in Louisiana sometime ago asked the Senators from Louisiana to attend a meeting with them. The whole purpose of the meeting, which was attended by the mayors of those 20 small cities, was to urge us to find some way in which they could borrow money in order to install sewage-disposal plants. There may not be a need in some areas of the country for such loans, but there is such a need in Louisiana. I have discussed the question with the mayors of many small cities.

Mr. SMATHERS. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana.

Last week the mayor and the city manager of a small but delightful town, Fort Pierce, Fla., came to Washington. They wished to borrow money in order to build a wharf which would permit boats to dock at their city. If they are unable to construct such a wharf, the city will lose a great refrigeration storehouse which it built. They have been to New York and Atlanta, Ga., in an effort to borrow money. They applied to other financial centers of the United States, but they have not been able to obtain a loan. They came to Washington and said, "Surely there must be some public agency where we can borrow money at a reasonable rate of interest, so that we can do the things which must be done in order to keep the city going."

I had the same experience which the Senator from Louisiana had. We got in touch with the Bureau of the Budget, and were informed that nothing could be done to afford relief because the President had not designated an agency. Furthermore, the Bureau of the Budget had not asked for any appropriation, on the false ground that there was no need for it.

Members of this body have demonstrated that there is a great need for such financial assistance. It would seem to me that the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is the head of the Republican Policy Committee, should see to it that such a need is met. As stated earlier by the Senator from South Carolina, former chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, when the amendment to the law was adopted, it was not a partisan amendment; it was a nonpartisan amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no criticism of my friends on the other side of the aisle. After discussion, they voted for the amendment unanimously.

Mr. SMATHERS. It is their party, their President, and their administration. It seems to me the administration should not leave the party in the lurch after the party has supported a measure such as the one under discussion, which is good for the whole country. I think the administrative branch of the Republican Party should follow through.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I have read some statements to the effect that the President feels that if the unemployment situation becomes very much worse some dire measures may have to be taken in order to ward off a depression. I understand one of the measures proposed is the rich man's tax relief bill now in the House of Representatives. That bill would result in 70 percent of the tax relief going to 1 percent of the people.

If anyone really desires to create additional employment, one way would be to make it possible for people to borrow money, as they previously have been able to do, in order to improve communities and smaller cities all over the United States. I can assure the Senator that the ability to borrow money would mean hundreds of additional jobs in Louisiana in small communities which desire to construct sewage disposal plants, gas distribution lines, and projects of that kind.

Mr. SMATHERS. The able Senator from Louisiana is eminently correct in the statement which he has made.

Mr. President, I do not propose to prolong the discussion. In summing up, I may say I hope the result of this discussion will be that some Senator on the Republican side of the aisle will call the Bureau of the Budget and advise them of the necessity for asking for an appropriation, which I am sure the Congress will be glad to grant, in the amount of $25 million. The necessary law is already on the statute books. This action should be taken. If it is not, legislation of the kind suggested by the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] ought to be enacted.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is not my intention to introduce proposed legislation which would lead to long debate. All I desire is to have the law passed last year put into effect, and have the Congress appropriate $25 million, an authorization for which has been unanimously agreed to on both sides of the aisle, and that the President name the agency to administer the public loan agency program.

Mr. SMATHERS. I hope this discussion will act as an inducement for the President to do so.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SUBMISSION OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS TO THE SENATE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, at this time I wish to introduce a bill on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and myself. The bill relates to the publication of international agreements, and submitting them

to the Senate, where they may be referred to the appropriate committee by the Vice President. The law already provides that they shall be published within a year. We believe that law should be amended.

At the present time the United Nations Charter provides that copies of international agreements shall be furnished to the United Nations. Section 1 of article 102 of the United Nations Charter provides that—

Every treaty and every international agreement entered into by any member of the United Nations after the present Charter comes into force shall as soon as possible be registered with the Secretariat and published by it.

Section 2 of article 102 provides that—

No party to any such treaty or international agreement which has not been registered in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article may invoke that treaty or agreement before any organ of the United Nations.

The bill (S. 3067) to require that international agreements other than treaties, hereafter entered into by the United States, be transmitted to the Senate within 30 days after the execution thereof, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RECESS

Mr. FERGUSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 4, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Eternal God, whose treasury of goodness is inexhaustible, we thank Thee for this day called Ash Wednesday, ushering in the blessed lenten season which reminds us that the soul of all culture is the culture of the soul.

Grant that in these perilous times, when tragic experience and evil tidings cause us to be pensive and smite us with fear, we may cultivate those spiritual resources and capacities which will make us adequate to face difficulties bravely and carry heavy responsibilities calmly.

We pray that Thou wilt continue to manifest Thy presence and healing power to those who are near and dear unto us and whose companionship and counsel we so greatly need as we aspire and struggle to achieve for all mankind the blessings of the more abundant life.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord whose guiding and sustaining grace is always available and within reach of us all. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of Sister Walfreda (Anna Nelles), and Sister Amaltrudis (Gertrude Schneider);

H. R. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth R. Ekholm;

H. R. 749. An act for the relief of Shui-Fook Fung;

H. R. 788. An act for the relief of Beryl Williams;

H. R. 823. An act for the relief of Abraham G. Sakin;

H. R. 824. An act for the relief of Demetrious Konstantno Papanicolaou;

H. R. 828. An act for the relief of Dr. Vincenzo Guzzo;

H. R. 907. An act for the relief of Wolodymyr Hirniak;

H. R. 946. An act for the relief of Mrs. Louise Blackstone;

H. R. 965. An act for the relief of Michael Demcheshen;

H. R. 1339. An act for the relief of Dr. Soon Tai Ryang;

H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Zia Edin Taheri and Frances Hakimzadeh Taheri;

H. R. 1358. An act for the relief of Dr. Marcelino J. Avecilla and Dr. Teodora A. Fidelino-Avecilla;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Louis M. Jacobs;

H. R. 1649. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisela Walter Sizemore;

H. R. 1688. An act for the relief of Henry Ty;

H. R. 1795. An act for the relief of Helena Shostenko;

H. R. 2035. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michaline Borzecka;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of William M. Smith;

H. R. 2504. An act for the relief of Sisters Adelaide Canelas and Maria Isabel Franco;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of Alfonso Gatti;

H. R. 2622. An act for the relief of Maria Teresa Ortega Perez;

H. R. 2623. An act for the relief of Jose M. Thomasa-Sanchez, Adela Duran Cuevas de Thomasa, and Jose Maria Thomasa Duran;

H. R. 2774. An act for the relief of Endre Szende, Zsuzsanna Szende, Katalin Szende (a minor), and Maria Szende (a minor);

H. R. 2817. An act for the relief of George A. Ferris;

H. R. 3005. An act for the relief of Charles Sabah;

H. R. 3236. An act for the relief of Constantin and Lucia (Bercescu) Turcano;

H. R. 3455. An act for the relief of Jalal Rashtian;

H. R. 3749. An act for the relief of Woldemar Jaskowsky; and

H. R. 5773. An act to provide for the refund, under certain conditions, of money paid as premiums on United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance which is canceled for fraud.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 752. An act for the relief of Francoise Bresnahan;

H. R. 1967. An act for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co.;

H. R. 2214. An act for the relief of Jeroslav, Bozena, Yvonka, and Jarka Ondricek;

H. R. 2567. An act to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers;

H. R. 2984. An act to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation or pension purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc.;

H. R. 3832. An act for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley; and

H. R. 7996. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 58. An act for the relief of Suzanne Jacquet;

S. 98. An act for the relief of (Mrs.) Betty Thornton or Jozsefne Toth;

S. 208. An act for the relief of Sister Constantine (Teresia Kakonyi);

S. 215. An act to provide for determining the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations of the water level of the Lake of the Woods, Minn.;

S. 233. An act for the relief of Jeno Cseplo;

S. 268. An act for the relief of Harold Trevor Colbourn;

S. 327. An act for the relief of Tarik S. Kaynor;

S. 428. An act for the relief of Dr. Chih Chiang Teng;

S. 455. An act for the relief of Johan Faber, Dagmar Anna Faber, Hilke Faber, and Frauke Faber;

S. 474. An act for the relief of Maria Intriago;

S. 487. An act for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Balourdas;

S. 490. An act for the relief of Josephine Reigl;

S. 518. An act for the relief of Sister Marie Therese De Galzain;

S. 520. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ivan S. Aylesworth;

S. 546. An act to authorize payment for losses sustained by owners of wells in the vicinity of Cold Brook Dam by reason of the lowering of the level of water in such wells as a result of the construction of Cold Brook Dam;

S. 552. An act for the relief of Anna Urwicz;

S. 584. An act for the relief of Rosa Euler and her minor child;

S. 795. An act for the relief of Josef Radziwill;

S. 897. An act to extend the time for making application for terminal-leave pay under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 937. An act for the relief of Virginia Grande;

S. 946. An act for the relief of Mona Lisbet Kofoed Nicolaisen, Leif Martin Borglum Nicolaisen, and Ian Alan Kofoed Nicolaisen;

S. 997. An act for the relief of Chuan Hua Lowe and his wife;

S. 1138. An act for the relief of John Soudas;

S. 1156. An act for the relief of Dr. Jagannath P. Chawla;

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Helen Knight Waters and Arnold Elzey Waters, Jr.;

S. 1689. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cacila Gotthardt Gange;

S. 1863. An act for the relief of Leo A. Ribitzki, Mrs. Charlotte Ribitzki, and Marion A. Ribitzki;

S. 1937. An act for the relief of Rev. Francis T. Dwyer and Rev. Thomas Morrissey;

S. 2040. An act to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions;

S. 2120. An act to authorize the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority to reconstruct and improve the toll bridge, and the approaches thereto, across the Piscataqua River at Portsmouth, N. H.;

S. 2166. An act for the relief of Gertrude Rena Carlson;

S. 2247. An act to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations of certain foreign nations;

S. 2405. An act to authorize the exchange, upon terms fully protecting the public interest, of the United States public health quarantine station at Marcus Hook, Pa., for a new quarantine station;

S. 2845. An act to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States;

S. 2846. An act to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940;

S. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution to print the proceedings in connection with the placing of the statue of Marcus Whitman in the Capitol; and

S. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of hearings on interlocking subversion in Government departments.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks relating to Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, who today winds up 25 years of service in the House, and that other Members may extend their remarks also at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 25th anniversary of the services of WRIGHT PATMAN in this House.

During these years he has been a diligent, able, and wise statesman. No man has labored more hours in valuable service to his district nor his country than WRIGHT PATMAN.

He is a gentleman as well as a statesman. All of Texas joins his district in pride of having him as a citizen of our great State.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am so happy to join with my colleagues in congratulating our distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] on the anniversary day of his 25th year as a Member of Congress. WRIGHT PATMAN has represented his people, his State, and his Nation with ability and distinction. The people of his district are justified in reposing the confidence that they have in him, and in reposing their confidence in him in the future. In addition to representing his people with ability and distinction and credit, he also represents them in an honorable and trustworthy manner.

The outlook of life by WRIGHT PATMAN, possessing an understanding mind and exercising it in relation to his fellowmen, is an inspiration to and an example for all others to follow. His devotion to his duty and to the cause of the people has earned for him an outstanding position in the Congress and the deserving praise and commendation of his colleagues. Throughout the years that WRIGHT PATMAN and I have served together in this body, I have seen him always fighting for progressive measures—for measures that will strengthen our country, not only internally, but against any external danger. He has always voted for measures to preserve and strengthen the family life of our country. His vision has never dimmed. Today, after 25 years of service in this body, he is looking forward to the years that lie ahead just the same as he has during the past 25 years. WRIGHT PATMAN is truly a great son of Texas; a great legislator, but over and above that, a great American. I am glad to join with my colleagues in the tributes they have paid today to this great man.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in paying tribute to my distinguished colleague, WRIGHT PATMAN, as he attains the quarter-century mark in service to his people as their Representative in the Halls of Congress. And by "his people" I refer to far more than his constituents in the great First District of Texas; I refer even to more than the citizens of the Lone Star State. All the inhabitants of the United States have been his people and faithfully indeed has he served them all.

As a new Member from Texas, I am personally indebted to WRIGHT PATMAN for the counsel and assistance that he has always given so willingly and generously to all those with less experience in the parliamentary problems and procedures of this Capitol. It has been a great benefit to all of us to be able to look for advice to a man of such wisdom, integrity, and friendliness.

WRIGHT PATMAN has filled many places of trust and honor—as a soldier, as a State legislator, as a district attorney, and, since 1928, as a Member of Congress. Few persons, I am sure, can look back on such a magnificent career with so few regrets.

And yet, we speak of a man who is still youthful and vigorous with quite probably his greatest years of service still ahead. It is especially gratifying to be able to voice our esteem and appreciation when the friend we honor is right beside us to continue to show us the way.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, who has completed a quarter of a century of service in this House. During these years he has been a stanch advocate of everything that is constructive and beneficial to the interests of the American people. He is an able and valiant public servant in the finest sense of the term. During the years that I have come to know him, I have always found him to be an indefatigable worker. He is a gentleman and a scholar, always fair in his judgment, temperate in his views, and a man of sterling character.

On this occasion I want to extend to him my sincerest wishes for continued good health and for many more fruitful years of public service in behalf of our country. I hope and trust he will be here with us for a long time so that we may benefit of his rich experience and his wise counsel in the days ahead.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Texas delegation in Congress I wish to join in the tributes that are today being paid to our distinguished colleague, WRIGHT PATMAN. At our delegation luncheon today, attended by his colleagues and more than a score of his friends from the press, radio, and television, he was honored for his contribution to good government during 25 years of service in this House. Aside from the recognition gained from his membership here, he was also commended for his authorship of a book, Our American Government, to be released by the publisher, Bantam Books, of New York, on tomorrow. No one is better qualified to write on this subject than WRIGHT PATMAN. The Texas State Society and the Texas delegation have joined in presenting Mr. PATMAN with an appropriate scroll testifying to these worthy accomplishments. So on this auspicious occasion we congratulate our able colleague and extend to him, Mrs. Patman, and their family best wishes for the future.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to add my tribute to those of WRIGHT PATMAN's friends and colleagues. We have served together on the Banking and Currency Committee for many years. He is a man of great capacity with a broad knowledge and a deep understanding of government and the problems incident to it. Through the years by his indefatigable energy and his industry and his alert mind he has made a great contribution to his country in his support of progressive and constructive legislation. He has always advocated those measures which would benefit the people. He has done much to assist small business upon which the very future of our country's stability and its way of life depend. He has served his people with a devotion and a conscientious persistence which entitle him to their gratitude and affection. One of his outstanding qualities is an infinite capacity for work which someone has said is genius. The people of his district while he serves them have a watchman on the tower to protect their liberties and guard their rights. We hope his service here may long continue, and we wish him health and happiness.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it affords me great pleasure to have this opportunity of expressing my high regard and my warm affection for the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN. Association with him on the Banking and Currency Committee is both an educational treat and a heartwarming experience in friendship. I have been singularly fortunate during my service in the Congress to have been in the circle of his radiant personality on the committee, of which he is a distinguished senior member. The fame of WRIGHT PATMAN is known from coast to coast. His is one of the great and beloved names known to all of our people. I know it has enhanced my standing with my constituents in the Second District of Illinois to be associated with the distinguished gentleman from Texas as a member of the same committee. His industry and his scholarship have never ceased to amaze me. One of the country's out-

standing authorities on money, his learning is by no means confined to that one subject. It can be safely said that no Member of either body is better informed on more matters of government or more questions of legislative interest. The Nation is the stronger and richer because of the new Congressman that came from Texas to take the oath of office in this Chamber on March 3, 1929. When the gentleman from Texas first came here the economic storms were gathering. Before the year 1929 had run its course the storm burst with unprecedented fury. In the years that followed, when under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman the country was carried from the despair and hopelessnes of the depression, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN was one of the strong men leading the country back to prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we are very fortunate that at this time when again there are threatening clouds that we have in the Congress of the United States a statesman of the caliber, the experience, and the ideals of the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, the completion of whose 25 years in Congress we celebrate today.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay honor to my dear friend and colleague, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, who has completed 25 years of service to his Nation as a Member of the House of Representatives. He has my hearty congratulations.

WRIGHT PATMAN has ably and wisely represented his people; the country has benefited by his guidance and wisdom during its most perilous days.

Before coming to Congress, he had an illustrious career as a State legislator and as district attorney. His outstanding talents and fine character won for him his place in the Congress of the United States, where he has served with high honor.

As I serve on the House Banking and Currency Committee with WRIGHT PATMAN, I have had an opportunity to come to know him well, and to know that he has the respect and affection of all who work with him. His ability, astuteness, and counsel have been of great value in committee and in the House.

He has my best wishes for many more years of happiness, good health, and success. The people of the First District of Texas are fortunate in having him as their Representative—and we are fortunate in having him among us.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill H. R. 8127.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow, Thursday, to call the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONCESSIONS IN THE NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point six resolutions which were adopted by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on March 2 relative to certain concessions in the parks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD six resolutions which were adopted by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House on March 2, 1954. These resolutions find no objection to the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior on proposed concession awards by the National Park Service.

The act of July 31, 1953—Public Law 172, 83d Congress—provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees. Recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior concerning six proposed contracts or extensions of contracts have been referred to date by the Speaker to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for review.

Meeting in open session on March 2, 1954, the committee was apprised of no reason to disapprove the Secretary's recommendations thereon and the following resolutions were therefore adopted:

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated February 5, 1954, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. E. G. Wellman which will, when approved by the regional director, region 2, National Park Service, authorize him to operate a saddle-horse concession within Glacier National Park, Mont., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 2d day of March 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated February 16, 1954, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Kings Mountain Little Theatre, Inc., which will, when approved by the regional director, region 1, National Park Service, authorize it to present its historical drama commemorating the battle of Kings Mountain and the incidental sale of refreshments in Kings Mountain National Military Park, S. C., for a period of 6 months from April 1, 1954.

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 2d day of March, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTARIVES.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated February 8, 1954, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Lee Roy and Alice Wiles, which will, when approved by the regional director, region 2, National Park Service, authorize them to offer rowboats and outboard motors for hire at Lake McDonald in Glacier National Park, Mont., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum

present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it had no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 2d day of March 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated February 8, 1954, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a letter to Mr. Erwin H. Flother which will, when approved by the regional director, region 3, National Park Service, renew for 1 year from January 1, 1954, concession permit No. I–4np–94 under which Mr. Flother is authorized to provide accommodations, services, and facilities for the public at Willow Beach in Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev.; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 2d day of March, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated February 8, 1954, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. R. E. Baygent, doing business as Baygent Coaches, which will, when approved by the regional director, region 3, National Park Service, authorize Mr. Baygent to provide passenger motorbus transportation to Big Bend National Park, Tex., from outside points, for a period of 3 years from January 1, 1953; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 2d day of March, 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated December 18, 1953, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to John C. Turner, and Louise M. Turner, his wife, which will, when approved by the regional director, region 2, National Park Service, authorize Mr. and Mrs. Turner to operate the Triangle X Guest Ranch in Grand Teton National Park, Wyo., for a period of 10 years from January 1, 1954; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 2d day of March 1954.

RATING OF TOTAL DISABILITY OR PERMANENT TOTAL DISABILITY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2984) to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation or pension purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 4, strike out "compensation or pension" and insert "compensation, pension, or insurance."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years."

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this bill would prohibit the reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more continuous years.

The bill was reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs during the first session and at that time covered only compensation or pension cases. I conferred with the Members most interested in this bill, and I am advised that the amendments of the Senate are entirely acceptable to them and to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as a whole. It will not add any additional cost to the taxpayer and may save some administrative expense. I, therefore, renew my motion that the House concur in the amendments of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 22]

Barrett	Gamble	Patten
Bentley	Green	Pillion
Buckley	Hart	Powell
Campbell	Holifield	Rivers
Celler	Jensen	Roberts
Chatham	Jones, Ala.	Roosevelt
Chelf	Kearney	Shafer
Chudoff	Kearns	Shelley
Clardy	King, Calif.	Short
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Sutton
Dawson, Ill.	Lantaff	Taylor
Durham	Miller, N. Y.	Weichel
Fallon	Morgan	Williams, N. J.
Fulton	Moulder	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 385 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. TABER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 8149.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have permission to sit during the general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Printing may have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1955

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2½ hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and myself.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether he intends to have a quorum on the floor at all times?

Mr. CLEVENGER. We would be hopeful there would be a quorum here all the time, but that is something beyond my control.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8067, with Mr. JOHNSON of California in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the total of the appropriations carried in this bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the United States Information Agency is $1,146,988,000. The amount recommended in the bill is $178,094,601 below the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. The reductions in the budget estimates total $166,932,960. The committee does not claim savings of the entire amount of the reduction below the budget estimates since a couple of the reductions, are to a certain extent deferrals and will possibly require additional funds later on. The action of the committee in making the deferrals should result in savings to the taxpayer, even though the exact amount cannot be determined at this time.

It is to be remembered that this committee last year reduced the budget estimates submitted to it for items in this bill approximately $400 million. In practically every instance, those reductions were sustained by the House and enacted into law.

The budget requests submitted to us by the President for the various items in this bill were reduced $11 million below the current year's appropriation, which is a rather unique situation since requests for increases had been pretty much the rule for several years past. Notwithstanding last year's reductions, and the decreased requests, the committee has recommended additional reductions which are set forth in its report.

The committee has included language in various items which will require the purchase from the United States Treasury of approximately $25 million of the foreign credit owed to or owned by the United States, with funds included in this bill.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A total of $108,410,000 is included in the bill for the Department of State. This is a reduction of $7,781,960 in the budget estimates and is $14,133,676 below the amount appropriated for the present fiscal year.

Large reductions were made in this Department last year. Only two increases over the present year's appropriations have been recommended. One is in the item "Acquisition of buildings abroad," for which $2,750,000 is recommended. No funds were appropriated last year in this bill, since they had over $10 million unobligated at the end of the fiscal year. The only other increase is in operation and maintenance of the International Boundary and Water Commission, where an increase of $100,000 has been granted for operating the Falcon Dam, which has been finished recently. It should be pointed out in that connection that the item for "Construction" has been decreased by $6,300,000.

The largest item in the Department of State section is "Salaries and expenses." There is included in the bill $62,500,000 for this item, a reduction of $1,200,000 in the budget estimate and $3,100,000 below the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. When the comparative transfers, reduction-in-force costs, and other nonrecurring items are taken into consideration, the amount recommended for fiscal year 1955 is approximately $393,000 less than the amount available for the present fiscal year.

In connection with the Department of State, I should like to read from the statement to the committee of the Under Secretary for Administration:

> On January 31, 1953, the Department employed a total of 42,734 persons. Of this total, 16,750 were engaged in functions which were later transferred to the Foreign Operations Administration and United States Information Agency. The remaining 25,984 assigned to regular State Department functions were reduced to 20,508 by October 31, 1953. By December 31, 1953, there were less than 20,000 people in the State Department. This reduction of 5,476 employees was accomplished by a reduction-in-force program and by not filling jobs which became vacant.

I should also like to point out that the committee has recommended the continuation in the bill of the following language which was approved by this House on July 21 last by a vote of 379 to 0:

> It is the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as a representative of China.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The total amount recommended in the bill for the Department of Justice is $176,542,000, a reduction of $1,190,000 in the budget estimates and $2,338,000 below the amount appropriated for the present fiscal year.

For all items in legal activities and general administration there is a net decrease of $1,180,000 below the current year's appropriation and $700,000 below the budget estimates.

The committee has allowed the full amount of the budget estimate, $78,282,000, for the FBI. This will allow them to maintain their present staff and obtain the necessary additional technical equipment.

Likewise, the budget estimate, $39 million, for the Immigration and Naturalization Service has been approved.

For the Federal prison system, the committee has recommended a total of $28,860,000, an increase of $810,000 over the current year's appropriation but a decrease of $490,000 in the budget estimate. This increase is due largely to increased number of prisoners, and for special repairs and improvements.

The committee recommends an authorization of $3 million, the amount of the budget estimate, for the general administrative expenses of the Office of Alien Property, which is payable out of funds vested in the Attorney General. Although the amount recommended is $500,000 above the authorization for the current fiscal year, it is $800,000 below the authorization for 1953. The committee has recommended this increase with the expectation that this office will proceed to get the job done within a reasonable length of time.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The budget estimates for the Department of Commerce, including salaries and expenses and payments to air carriers, of the Civil Aeronautics Board total $930,997,000. The appropriations for these activities for fiscal year 1954 total $940,241,925. The amount recommended in this bill is $786,222,000, a reduction of $144,775,000 in the budget estimates and $154,019,925 below the appropriations for the current fiscal year.

When testifying before the committee, the Secretary of Commerce stated:

So far as personnel is concerned, the positions in fiscal 1953 were 43,686. We cut them down to 35,952 in 1954, and the projected request for 1955 is 32,694. Therefore, so far as positions are concerned, we are down about 25 percent.

The action recommended by the committee will further reduce the number of positions.

For the office of the Secretary the committee has allowed approximately the same amount as for the current year.

A total of $6,200,000 is included for the Bureau of the Census. The request for $3,500,000 for a sample census of agriculture and $650,000 for special surveys of manufacturers and other businesses were not approved.

The total recommended for the Civil Aeronautics Administration is $103,750,000. This represents a reduction of $35,035,000 below the appropriation for the current fiscal year. The largest item in the CAA is for salaries and expenses, for which $96,450,000 has been requested. Since this request is $8,550,000 below the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year, no further reductions have been recommended.

The bill includes the budget estimate, $3,777,000, for salaries and expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board. This is the same amount as available for the current fiscal year.

The subcommittee had before it this year for the first time the item payment to air carriers, which is, in effect, air subsidy.

Formal separation of the service and subsidy components of airmail pay was effected by Reorganization Plan No. 10, which became law August 1, 1953. Under that plan, effective October 1, 1953, the Postmaster General is responsible for payment of service-mail pay at rates established by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Board is responsible for payment, out of appropriations made for these purposes, of the subsidy element. The subsidy payment is, therefore, now a part of this bill.

It is estimated by the Board that $80,252,000 will accrue to the subsidy carriers during the fiscal year 1955. The comparable figure for the present fiscal year is $80,655,000. These funds were previously carried in the Post Office Department Appropriation Act. The budget request for 1955, however, is $73,000,000, since the proposed appropriation language places this account on an actual expenditure basis and the Board estimated actual payments to carriers during the fiscal year 1955 at that amount. However, actual payments by the Board from October 1, 1953, through December 31, 1953, totaled $12,643,055, according to information given the committee by the Board.

Since the completion of the hearings by this committee the Supreme Court in unanimous decisions reversed certain methods used by the Civil Aeronautics Board in the computation of subsidies.

The decisions appear on pages 694 through 698 of the Commerce Department hearings.

These decisions, in effect, require that excess earnings from domestic operations of an international carrier be offset against the international subsidy rate.

In view of the far-reaching nature of the Supreme Court decision, the committee recommended only $23 million for this item at the time the bill was marked.

On Monday the subcommittee had before it the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board in order to obtain the latest information available on the subject of air subsidy. The committee was advised that payments by the CAB are presently averaging about $6 million per month. The Civil Aeronautics Board estimate that they will have a carryover on June 30 next of between $7 and $8 million.

It is not the committee's purpose to harm either the local or overseas airlines. On the other hand, the committee wants to know what it is appropriating for and how much is required. Based on the information obtained yesterday from the CAB chairman, the committee will present an amendment to increase the $23 million figure to $40 million which, together with the estimated carryover will provide payments for air subsidies to March 1. Prior to that time, the committee will hear additional testimony from the CAB as to the exact effect of the Supreme Court's decisions.

The committee hopes that the necessary review of all subsidy claims effected by this decision will be made as expeditiously as possible and that it will result in a substantial saving to the American taxpayer.

The budget requests for Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Patent Office were allowed. For Business and Defense Services Administration, for the Office of Business Economics, and for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Foreign Commerce, and National Bureau of Standards, the committee has allowed approximately the same amounts as available during the present fiscal year, but has cut out the increases requested. For export control, the committee has allowed $3,600,000, the budget estimate.

For maritime activities the bill includes the sum of $71,360,000. Of this amount, $55,000,000 is for operating-differential subsidies, $13,500,000 for salaries and expenses, $2,200,000 for maritime training, and $660,000 for State marine schools. The amount allowed for maritime training will allow cadet midshipmen training at Kings Point to continue at approximately the same level as the present year.

One-half billion dollars is included in the bill for Federal-aid highways. This is an increase of $25 million over the amount appropriated to date for the present fiscal year and is $55 million below the budget estimate. In the event additional funds are needed they will have to be supplied since these payments actually constitute the liquidation of prior contract authority. The budget estimate for forest highways, Inter-American Highway, and Rama Road have been granted. The budget estimate for the Weather Bureau was also granted.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

The bill includes $75,814,000 for this agency, a reduction of $13,186,000 in the budget estimate. While the amount allowed for fiscal year 1955 appears to be $7,603,000 below the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year, it is actually an increase of $570,058 over the comparable figure for the current year when the nonrecurring items totaling $8,173,058 are deducted.

The committee has allowed the full amount of the budget estimate for the item, "Radio broadcasting." No other specific increases were granted, and some decreases were specified as set out in the report.

CORPORATIONS

Finally, for corporations, the committee has authorized $850,000 for the Federal Prison Industries and $14,000 for the Inland Waterways Corporation.

I feel that the subcommittee has done a good job with the bill. Every item is not the way everyone would like to have it, but all in all it is a pretty good bill.

If there are any questions, I shall be glad to try and answer them.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I should like to ask the gentleman a question or two about this proposition of Federal aid to airports. I notice in this little compilation in the committee's report there are certain figures. In this item that I have in mind there is no appropriation made, but there are very significant references which read like this: "Authorization to use $1.5 million of prior balances for administration, and authorization to use $750,000 of prior balances for administration." I should like to ask the gentleman does he know what kind of shape those balances are in? What can anybody do to open them up, or can they be opened up, or are they sanctified?

Mr. CLEVENGER. There were no budget requests, as the gentleman knows, a year ago, for new starts. There was some $22 million for the liquidation of prior contracts. Such amounts as mentioned here are probably fragments of the liquidation of those contracts. So far there has been no request made of the committee for funds for new starts.

Mr. JENKINS. There is nothing in this bill with reference to new starts on airports?

Mr. CLEVENGER. There was no request made by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. JENKINS. As a matter of information, because of the gentleman's long experience with these matters, what would be his advice as to what an ordinary Congressman could do with reference to finding out what, if anything, is going to be done with these balances that the Administration still holds?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I would contact the Department of Commerce, the Secretary for Transportation, and present my request to him.

Mr. JENKINS. Let me see. The Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Transportation.

Mr. CLEVENGER. The Assistant Secretary or Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. That falls within his jurisdiction. Mr. Murray is that gentleman.

Mr. JENKINS. He would be the man, then, who properly could furnish information with reference to those balances?

Mr. CLEVENGER. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD I wish to say that the Committee on Appropriations of the House or some other agency should take some steps to advance the program of constructing new airports. If it is not the duty of the Appropriations Committee it should be the duty of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I have already referred to the figures shown at the bottom of the 27th page of the committee report. There appears to be two funds which are dormant or inactive. One of these funds amounts to $1,500,000 and the other amounts to $750,000.

The city of Portsmouth, Ohio, which is located close to the gigantic atomic energy plant and which is in a section that is showing phenomenal growth has for months been making an effort to have an airport located in that section. There can be no doubt that this proposed airport is badly needed. The proof of this assertion is that there is no airport within 100 miles of this place. There is another reason why this airport should be constructed. Here it is: Several months ago the city of Portsmouth acting under the belief that they would get Federal aid for the construction of this airport voted bonds in the sum of $400,000. These bonds have been sold and they are now drawing interest and the $400,000 is in the bank. These people have a moral right as well as a financial right to expect some agency of the Government to come forward with a program that will do what should be done. The Government should immediately authorize the use of some of this large fund for the construction of this airport and Portsmouth will match the Government funds and southern Ohio will have an airport which it deserves.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to ask the gentleman about this cut in the United States Information Agency. Just exactly what does the subcommittee expect that that cut is going to be taken out of? What function does the subcommittee expect is going to be curtailed?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I would say that that is just a denial of the increase requested.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the gentleman to note page 370 of the hearings and tell us whether the denials are generally speaking stated on that page. They seem to total a little bit more than the reduction, but those are marked additions in the presentation by the Agency itself.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will kindly yield to me, is not the correct answer to the gentleman from New York to turn to pages 18, 19, and 20 of the committee report on this bill, and there will be found in detail the action of the committee with regard to the various items for the United States Information Agency.

Mr. CLEVENGER. That is true. The gentleman from New York has the report.

Mr. JAVITS. I checked that, and I cannot figure that to total $13 million.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. With regard to the $40 million that was set up for the Civil Aeronautics Board to be paid for these services it was not the intention of the committee that this should be stretched over the whole fiscal year?

Mr. CLEVENGER. As I said in my remarks, that would carry the full operations until past March 1 next year, when they ought to have the surveys made in compliance with the Supreme Court decision.

Mr. BELCHER. It will not require the cutting down of the payments at all?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Not at all, not if they are legal.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. I was interested in the comments of the gentleman from Ohio concerning the payment to air carriers, as carried on page 30 of the bill, and I note particularly the reference made to the Supreme Court decision which influenced the committee's decision in recommending in the bill $23 million. Did I understand the gentleman to say he expected to offer an amendment to increase that amount at this time to $40 million?

Mr. CLEVENGER. That will be done when the committee offers its committee amendment when the bill is read for amendment.

Mr. DEANE. In line 3, page 30, there appeared the language "for payments to air carriers," and there is no breakdown as to sums payable to international, local, and domestic services. I wonder if that is going to be left entirely with the Civil Aeronautics Board, or does the committee expect CAB to recognize formulas previously established with particular reference to domestic and local service operators?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I would not say they would be interfered with, because the Supreme Court decision does not apply to the average domestic carrier, so the whole matter will be in the hands of the Civil Aeronautics Board to conduct from now until March 1 in accordance with the law. They will have to determine by an audit just how much they owe some of these carriers. We hope the last 4 months of the year we can make some savings.

Mr. DEANE. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say, then, that the present services of the local and domestic lines will be protected?

Mr. CLEVENGER. They are not affected in any way.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the 3-months' operation of the Civil Aeronautics Board has resulted in a net reduction in the overall cost of this setup of $8,500,000?

Mr. CLEVENGER. At least; that is a carryover, but I think they are about a month behind in their budget.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. In view of the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], may I say with regard to the airline subsidies of $80 million a year, certainly there is a difference in the coming year, the difference is $400,000 in an item of $80 millions.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. How much has the gentleman appropriated or rather how much has the committee appropriated for Central Intelligence work?

Mr. CLEVENGER. That is an incidental item with which we have nothing at all to do.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. You appropriate for Central Intelligence in this bill, do you not?

Mr. CLEVENGER. No, we do not.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. A number of us are concerned about the program of subsidies for the local service airlines.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I can assure the gentleman that they are not affected at all.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio whether it is clearly understood, and whether it is not the intent of the committee to go ahead and see that the $23 million is used for the domestic airlines?

Mr. CLEVENGER. No, we are giving them $40 million under this committee amendment to continue their operations for approximately 1 year from today.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It will run up to about March of next year?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Yes, past that time.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There is no intention of cutting it off at that time, is there?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I have assured the committee repeatedly it is not the intention. I have assured the committee that there is not that intention, and we hope that the Civil Aeronautics Board will have their surveys completed in accordance with the Supreme Court decision so that we may save the public some money in the last 4 months of the year.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is not the intention to try to force out of business companies that have operated efficiently like the North American Airlines?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I have assured the committee it is not my intention to hurt anyone.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I understand from the statement that the gentleman made a moment ago that on Monday of this week you did have a conference with the Civil Aeronautics Authority concerning how they expected to carry out the Supreme Court decision, is that correct?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Yes, we talked to the chairman of CAB about it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. You and I know that they have complete charge of the subsidy program as it is set forth in this bill; that is true, is it not?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Certainly, but neither of us has control over the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, but the point we are trying to get at is that the Civil Aeronautics Board did not have an opportunity to finish a complete survey of their needs or the money that they would need in connection with this program, but because of that you were willing then to increase it to $40 million and expect them to carry out their duties and responsibilities imposed upder the law.

Mr. CLEVENGER. And they have a calendar year to do it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Was there any discussion in the meeting with the CAB as to the time and method by which payments would be made to these domestic airlines?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I think that is probably a leading question, but it would be done the same as it is done under the present practice, and we are giving them a year. It will be done in accordance with their past procedures. We are giving them a year to adjust themselves and also we will take a look at this before the end of the current fiscal year.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I may state to the gentleman there is some apprehension by those operating the domestic airlines that the amounts that are available to them would not be readily ascertained by the Board.

Mr. CLEVENGER. They are not affected in the slightest for 12 calendar months.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to thank the gentleman for assuring us that the local airlines will not be affected in this act, because if they were they would have to curtail their services, which would greatly affect the smaller communities. I am pleased to be assured that that will not happen.

Mr. CLEVENGER. We are quite aware of that. We have no desire to hurt any of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has consumed 32 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it was on Thursday last that the great House Committee on Appropriations reported the pending bill to the House. As I recall, at that time I referred to Republican budget balancing and pointed out that the mountain of alleged Republican economy had labored and brought forth not an elephant but a mouse. I shall now proceed to prove this to you.

The amount of the budget estimates, that is, the amount that President Eisenhower asked of the Congress—and this is President Eisenhower's bill, and everything in it is President Eisenhower's—was $1,313,920,960. As the printed committee report stands before us at the moment, the committee has allowed $1,146,988,000. The difference between these two amounts would be an alleged savings of $166,932,960; but, in capital letters, but this is no real saving, because three items in this bill which total $135 million, and which this Congress is going to appropriate just as sure as the Lord made little apples, have to be deducted from the $166,932,960. The savings is now down to less than 2½ percent, or $31,932,960 out of budget requests which total $1,313,920,960.

Now, let us look at the $135 million which I mention and which this committee deducts as a saving, but which certainly contains not a plugged nickel of economy.

The first of the 3 items which make up the $135 million is $50 million for payments to air carriers, Civil Aeronautics Board, simon-pure subsidy money. On Thursday last the full Committee on Appropriations met, and without objection cut the subsidy request of $73 million by $50 million. Subsequently, on Monday the subcommittee was called to a strange meeting that afternoon. It was a very fortunate meeting in one way, but unfortunate in another. It was fortunate in that the meeting was called for 2 o'clock, and 7 of us were fortunate enough to be confined in the committee room in the center of the Capitol at the time 5 of our respected colleagues were shot in the Chamber. It was unfortunate for the taxpayers, however, because the committee, over the objection of the gentleman from New York, who now has the floor, agreed to raise the subsidy money from $23 million, by $17 million, to $40 million. This unexpected action would give to the Civil Aeronautics Board almost $48 million to hand out in the fashion shown in the printed hearings on the Department of Commerce budget.

Let us see how they hand out the taxpayers' money. When they come up here asking for $80 million for subsidies, do you think they examine the books of the corporations they are pouring this money into? Nonsense. Just take a look at page 637 of the printed hearings and you will find that no complete audit of Pan American has been performed covering the period subsequent to December 31, 1950. You will find by reading the same page that although Pan American has subsidiaries and affiliates and investments that the Civil Aeronautics Board never audits these. No real audit is made as to whether or not the International Hotels Corp., which Pan American wholly owns, is making or losing money; as a matter of fact, they are so expertly uninformed down in the Civil Aeronautics Board that they told us at the hearing that International Hotels Corp. was owned only to the extent of 20 percent by Pan American. You will now find in a later part of the record that they admit that it is 100-percent owned by Pan American. So much for the subsidy matter at the moment; I will come back to it.

I do not want to take your attention from the alleged savings which I mentioned, $135 million. The next alleged saving, $30 million, is for operating differential subsidies for the Maritime Administration. You know and I know, and it was admitted by my distinguished friend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], that this is merely a deferment of payment of this money. This $30 million is finally going to be appropriated. The third item, which makes up the $135 milion, is for the Bureau of Public Roads Federal aid to highway program. It amounts to $55 million and you and I know it is going to be appropriated and paid out of the United States Treasury. The Appropriations Committee is merely going to sign the check when it is presented to the Congress for payment.

Why it was only Monday last that the Committee on Public Works of this House reported out an administration bill which would allow $875 million instead of $575 million for each of the next 2 years, 1955 and 1956 fiscal years, for the Federal aid-highway program. I am not against doing this. I believe in spending more of the gasoline and oil and other automobile and truck taxes which when collected come to about $2 billion a year. I think more of these taxes should be put back in building public roads. I am not against doing so, but I am pointing out that the alleged saving of $135 million is just a lot of nonsense. The amount actually cut in this bill is only $31,932,960 out of a bill carrying $1,313,000,000; or a cut of less than 2½ percent. I thought that we were really going to do something for the taxpayer this year.

We should have had the cooperation of all our friends on the majority side in looking through the items in this bill, but the hearings were merely perfunctory. The witnesses were asked to insert this and that and other things in the printed record. Practically the only questions asked, upon which savings might be predicated, were asked by other members of the committee.

Let us revert again to this savings figure of $31,932,960. Right now that saving is completely washed out for the reason that there are supplemental appropriation requests now pending, which have been sent up here in a House document which is on file with the Clerk, for the Bureau of Public Roads in the amount of $65 million and for the Maritime Administration in the amount of $29,500,000; or $94,500,000 in two supplemental requests to offset the savings of $31,932,960.

Let us see how the committee operated on this bill. I can find 20 items in this bill, which total $295,834,000, which is almost three-tenths of a billion dollars, which have not even been touched. I do not say that there are not some of these items which should not be touched. But the fact is that three-tenths of a

billion dollars is carried in this bill for these 20 different items without the saving of the cost of a 5-gallon can of gasoline or a dozen Eberhard Faber pencils, or a ream of paper.

Imagine! This is a new method of approach for an appropriations committee. Let me give you these 20 items.

In the State Department, Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, $1 million; not touched.

State Department: International contingencies, $1 million; not a dime cut from that.

In the Department of Justice—and let me say that I agree with this action and also with regard to the action on the next three items—Antitrust Division, was not cut. They were allowed $3,100,000, which was the amount they asked. I am for some real results from this division.

The item for the FBI $78,282,000, was not cut. I am for that.

For the Immigration and Naturalization Service $39 million. That has not been cut.

With regard to the Office of Alien Property, the amount requested, $3 million, was allowed.

For the Civil Aeronautics Administration, in the Department of Commerce, salaries and expenses $96,450,000. They could not save a ream of paper or a light of glass out of a $100 million item such as this. They could not save a few telephone calls. This is a new way of looking at appropriations; that is, a new way to me, because I learned the hard way. When I first sat on an appropriations committee handling the Department of the Interior bill, the chairman used to know where all the typewriters, automobiles, and the live bodies were. But under this system of appropriating, nobody knows where anything is.

Establishment of air-navigation facilities, $5 million. They could not cut a dime out of that?

Technical development and evaluation in the CAA, $700,000. They could not cut a nickel from that?

Civil Aeronautics Board—and I agreed with this action—salaries and expenses $3,777,000. I agreed with it because I hope they are going to go to work on this subsidy matter with a view of saving some money for the American taxpayer.

Coast and Geodetic Survey $10,200,000. They could not save a boathook there.

Bureau of Foreign Commerce, export control, $3,600,000.

Maritime training, $2,200,000. I am for these last two items, after careful study.

State marine schools, $660,000.

Patent Office, $11 million.

Bureau of Public Roads, forest highways, $10 million.

The Inter-American Highway and Rama Road; construction of laboratories, National Bureau of Standards—all allowed the amount requested, exactly the amount they requested, without a change of a 10-cent piece.

For the Weather Bureau—perhaps we will have better Eisenhower weather now—the full amount, $24,750,000.

Now, these are 20 items out of a total of 54 items in the bill on which the committee has not saved a 5-cent piece.

The most glaring example of the Eisenhower giveaway program which has come to my attention has been a proposal with reference to two airports. You will find this in the hearings on the Department of Commerce. It concerns two airports which have just been completed at Federal expense at Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska. The only airport owned by the Federal Government is the Washington National Airport right over here in Virginia. That airport through CAA has come to this subcommittee for its appropriations over these many years. The committee has taken an interest in it and that airport is practically a paying proposition. With that kind of an operation in mind, and because they were justified on the basis of national defense, the committee in the last few years appropriated, oh, about $11 million to build these two airports at Fairbanks and Anchorage, Alaska. According to figures which CAA gave us this year, these two airports should have revenues in fiscal 1955 of approximately $800,000. What do you suppose they propose to do with these two airports now that the taxpayer is going to get $800,000 a year gross revenue, now that we have paid every nickel for their construction? They propose to give them away either to the Territory of Alaska or to the municipaliities of Fairbanks and Anchorage. I wonder what some of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle think about spending ten or eleven million dollars of their taxpayers' money to build these airports, which now belong to all the taxpayers of the Nation, and then turn them over to a territory or two municipalities which could never carry them.

Included in this bill is the money to run the Office of the Secretary of Commerce, and as near as I can gather, the amount requested for the Office of the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sinclair Weeks, reaches an all-time high. They may try to tell you that there are functions now carried on in that office that were carried on by someone else, but you cannot get away from Mr. Weeks' testimony, which I refer to at page 33 of the hearings on the Department of Commerce:

> Very frankly, we want more money because we are spending less money almost than we were 25 years ago on the business activities of the Department. I am very anxious to build up that phase of the operation.

And what business activities are those? Well, let us turn to pages 536, 537, and 538 of the hearings, which I shall insert in the RECORD at this point:

INTEREST OF "AMERICAN BUSINESS COMMUNITY" IN INCREASED SERVICES

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Secretary, the American business community to which you refer, and which you say wants these additional services from you, which you propose to give them at the general taxpayers' expense by increasing an appropriation for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, from $1,511,900 to $2,800,000, includes the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Foreign Trade Council and the United States Chamber of Commerce, does it not?

Mr. SAMUEL W. ANDERSON. You mean as organizations?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. SAMUEL W. ANDERSON. Yes. They call on us for some information. They and their members.

Mr. ROONEY. You said that as soon as you took up your duties you immediately organized or called meetings of three advisory committees.

Mr. SAMUEL W. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. One representing exporters, one representing the importers, and the third representing major national business organizations, such as the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Foreign Trade Council, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and so forth.

Mr. SAMUEL W. ANDERSON. That is right.

Mr. ROONEY. What assurance would the committee have if we were to go along with such a request—and I merely am assuming such a thing at the moment—to increase this activity to the extent that you ask, which would bring it to a higher level than it has been since Hoover's administration, as you said a while ago, that we would not have the same thing happen again that happened in 1929? We have been doing pretty well for 20 years with much reduced expenditures in this line, and according to your own charts business is increasing. You have all these people working today, and now you want to further build up the top, the American corporation. I wonder if you would address yourself to that, Mr. Secretary.

COMPETITION INCREASING

Mr. SAMUEL W. ANDERSON. Yes. The situation, as Mr. Smith pointed out previously, is different and difficult as it faces us in the next 18 months, I am sure. It is far more competitive than at any time since the war. The importance of our foreign trade both ways is of course undisputed in terms of the effect on the American business community. It represents in many industries a profit or loss, as far as exports are concerned.

Now, if we are to maintain our share of the world's business, and if that world business as a whole is going to grow, as we all hope it will, I think that the business community has a perfectly legitimate right to ask from its Government effective and efficient assistance in the way of information and help. We are not giving them that now.

NEED FOR BALANCING BUDGET

Mr. ROONEY. This is the very business community that is always talking about balancing the budget. I am sure that they would not want the amount of limitation on the national debt increased.

These are the very people who, day after day, are shouting with regard to high taxes, and yet, according to this presentation, if I understand it correctly, you propose to perform for that very community an act which would cost the general taxpayers almost 50 percent more than it has been costing them in the past 20 years.

BUSINESS NEEDS STATED IN QUESTIONNAIRE REPLIES

Mr. SAMUEL W. ANDERSON. That is correct.

For whom do they want additional money in the Department of Commerce? For whom do they want to double the appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, salaries, and expenses, from $1.5 million to $2.8 million? For the National Association of Manufacturers, for the United States Chamber of Commerce, and for the International Foreign Trade Council. These organizations must confuse even their lobbyists. On the one hand they come up before the tax committees and they want taxes cut. Over here they are in another committee wanting the appropriations cut, but here is one who wants the appropriation doubled.

To get back to the matter of airline subsidies, I am not opposed to some subsidies for our airlines. I fully realize that our carriers cannot compete with the British and the Dutch and the French and other foreign airlines without some subsidy. I fully realize this. But at the same time I think that the Civil Aeronautics Board should have some commonsense system of arriving at the amount of subsidies they give to these airlines.

The airlines' trade paper, American Aviation Daily, has stated that airline revenues are at an all-time high, their receipts and profits greater than ever. They have continually been boasting of their successes, not only in their trade paper but in press releases. Yet at the same time up and up and up goes the taxpayers' subsidy money. I can remember how appalled this committee was a few years ago before it had jurisdiction of this item, when subsidies amounted to $40 million. But up and up and up they go, and we are now up to $80 million.

How do you think they examine the airlines' books in order to determine subsidies? To quote from the Supreme Court decision of a couple of weeks ago in the Delta case, in fixing the subsidy for the past period the Board, meaning the Civil Aeronautics Board, refused to offset against the carriers' need for foreign operations the excess earnings on its domestic flights. Imagine. Let them keep all the profits on their domestic flights, and we have to subsidize them on their international flights.

Here is Pan American with four divisions. Do you think the Civil Aeronautics Board over these years has looked at that in the interest of the taxpayers? Do you think they examined Pan American's books on a system basis? Oh, no, they examine them on a division basis. They compute one division without regard to whether or not there has been profit or loss on one or more of the other three divisions.

I am quite amazed today to find the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] holding in his hand an amendment which is going to add $17 million of the taxpayers' money to this bill. I always thought we were in agreement with regard to this matter and that our thoughts coincided. But, no, some one is worried that the subsidy checks will not go out on the first of the month. My, my, my, how times have changed—how times have changed, when we find 20 items in the bill without even a look at them, amounting to three-tenths of a billion dollars.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Relative to the matter that the gentleman is discussing, is it not a fact that one outfit in this country, the Flying Tigers, have made a formal offer to fly this mail without any subsidy?

Mr. ROONEY. I believe so. CAB had an offer from a nonscheduled airline to fly the mail between continental United States and Alaska for one dollar a year, the same kind of offer the Flying Tigers made. But do you think they could get the business away from the big airlines which are scheduled to carry it? Oh no.

Mr. ENGLE. Has the committee given that matter any consideration?

Mr. ROONEY. I have been receiving a flood of telegrams in the last couple of days. There is not a small airline in this country that is not tickled to death at the action of the committee in cutting this request by $50 million.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I would like to ask the gentleman three questions, if I may. I notice that the North American Airlines have been operating without any subsidy and they have low fares and have made good profits. All this has been done without a subsidy.

Mr. ROONEY. There is another example of the mentality of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Who conceived the air-coach service in this country? It was North American Airlines, a small outfit. I believe they are from the State of California. They were the ones who originated it, and the Civil Aeronautics Board has been doing everything possible to put them out of business while the big airlines have adopted it and continued in the coach business.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Would not the gentleman's committee look with disfavor on the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Board has used up 50 percent of its enforcement money trying to put North American out of business? Would not your committee look with disfavor upon that?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know all the facts in the case with regard to North American Airlines, but I will say to the gentleman that every activity of the Civil Aeronautics Board is designed to keep the big ones in and put the small companies out of business.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. This $23 million really should be for the subsidy of the domestic airlines for this service, should it not?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know. Perhaps they should be allowed their subsidy, but I do not have any confidence in the way these subsidies are arrived at.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will it not be necessary for this committee to come back for a supplemental appropriation in March of next year?

Mr. ROONEY. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], has invited them to come back in March and so has the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who presided at the meeting on Monday when they added $17 million to the bill after the full committee had approved it with only $23 million in it for this purpose.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In view of the fact that our friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] said that there was no intention to harm these carriers, is it not difficult in your opinion for these carriers to get deficit financing from the banks on these short-term extensions of, say, 8 months at a time?

Mr. ROONEY. It might.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he said that the hearings were not too thorough. I notice that is not the case with respect to the United States Information Agency.

Mr. ROONEY. Who asked the questions on the subject of the United States Information Agency?

Mr. JAVITS. I am just coming to that point, if the gentleman from New York will forgive me. I notice there they had several days of hearings and it takes up almost half of the total record. Would the gentleman say, regardless of who asked the questions—and I assume the gentleman means to imply that he asked most of them—I have not tried to evaluate that in the record, were not those thorough hearings?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not believe that the Information Agency was before us for more than what—4 days, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CLEVENGER. About that.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the gentleman consider that a thorough hearing?

Mr. ROONEY. We used to give them 3 or 4 weeks to explain things. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I did not hear what he said.

Mr. JAVITS. I asked the gentleman if he thought that was a thorough hearing. I think he has answered the question.

Mr. ROONEY. I thought that it should be gone into further with a view of saving some money and cutting out some of the silly things that they continue to do. For instance, they had in this bill a request for $204,000, the only effect of which would be to tell the American public how good they are—press releases and all kinds of releases to tell the public how good they are when that $204,000 should be directed toward the Iron Curtain in an attempt to pierce it.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the gentleman tell me whether he feels he takes the same attitude with respect to this agency now as he did before when the Democratic administration was in power, indeed, even last year?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not think my viewpoint with regard to this agency has changed too much in the years. I think they are just as capable now, or incapable, whichever the gentleman prefers to use.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. With reference to the question raised by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] in regard to the local service airlines, I understand the bill as originally written contained $23 million for payment to all classes of carriers, including the internationals. Later on that was raised to something like $40 million.

Mr. ROONEY. It is going to be raised by the gentleman from Ohio and the majority members of the committee.

Mr. ENGLE. What I am trying to get at is this. That applies to all lines of

carriers. If the money is inadequate, what is to prevent the big international carriers from getting it all, to the detriment of the small carriers?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] assured the House that this money will be checked out. He says, "We are not going to hurt any of them." They will get their check.

Mr. ENGLE. Is there any assurance in this legislation that the big fellows will get their hands on all the money and these little fellows will be left out in the cold?

Mr. ROONEY. Since I am for the little fellow I would hate to see that. I have never been able to understand the CAB. I can remember the time when airlines had a series of fires in the tail of their Constellations, due to defective smoke-detector devices. The CAB and the CAA grounded those planes for a period of about 2 weeks. Do you know that CAB a few years ago came before this committee and attempted to justify the payment of subsidy moneys to reimburse these airlines for every bit of money they claimed they lost as a result of the planes being defective and grounded?

Mr. ENGLE. We have to write it into the law. Is there anything in here that will keep my little Southwest Air Line in California, which gives local service to the people, from being crowded out by the big fellows?

Mr. ROONEY. I would be glad to help the gentleman, if there was some way to do it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understand the gentleman, he is favorable to the provisions of law which require a carrier, certificated for service to serve the general public. If that service requires a subsidy from the Government you are in favor of the subsidy as the law provides, provided it can be shown the subsidy is justified?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes. And I would want it to be shown that if there were any other outfit competent and agreeable to carrying the mail, and willing to do so for less money, that those people refused it. They have a fair record for safety. As a matter of fact, the company mentioned by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] a while ago has an unusual safety record; the North American Co.

Mr. ENGLE. The North American Co. has a perfect record.

Mr. HARRIS. But the gentleman realizes there are some circumstances and conditions where certain carriers are required to furnish services that will not economically support such services.

Mr. ROONEY. I think all circumstances should be taken into consideration, but no one can understand the operations of CAB.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understand from the report, the $23 million, which will be amended to make it $40 million, is a lump sum appropriated to the Board for payment of subsidies, whether domestic or international.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, when we are talking about subsidies, I know the gentleman understands that we are not talking about carrying the mail. We are talking about gift checks every month.

Mr. HARRIS. In order for this carrier to comply with the certification of his air-line service to the public.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure it will be a good one. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I will try to make it such.

Mr. ROONEY. I observed the distinguished gentleman figuring it out for the last 15 minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. How long has the gentleman been on the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. ROONEY. I think almost 10 years.

Mr. GAVIN. Permit me to observe that I am gratified to see the gentleman become so economy minded.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman. I deeply appreciate those remarks coming from him.

Mr. GAVIN. The facts are that you say there is changed thinking, and that is quite evident; there is changed thinking on your part.

Mr. ROONEY. There has been no change on my part.

Mr. GAVIN. If the gentleman——

Mr. ROONEY. I have the floor. I will say to the gentleman that there has been no change in my thinking.

Mr. GAVIN. Yes; you have, if you will permit me.

Mr. ROONEY. No. I referred to the matter of subsidies. If that is not what he is getting at, then failure to cut the budget requests.

Mr. GAVIN. No.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman will recall that the gentleman from New York when he was chairman never came in here with 20 items——

Mr. GAVIN. Is the gentleman going to make a speech or did he yield to me for a question?

Mr. ROONEY. Is that your question? I yielded for a question but did not hear any.

Mr. GAVIN. I am just leading up to it. Does the gentleman feel the cuts were not drastic enough? If the gentleman will think back a little, he has been on the Appropriations Committee 10 years and when the Republican administration took over there was about $35 billion or $40 billion national debt.

Mr. ROONEY. But the Democratic Party did not tell the American people falsehoods. We did not get into office by telling the people we were going to balance the budget and then bring in a bill such as this for a billion three with a cut of less than 2½ percent. We did not do that; we did not travel under false colors.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman let me answer that?

Mr. ROONEY. No; I yielded to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. GAVIN. We are just trying to catch up with the enormous stockpile of appropriations that were authorized, but no money set aside to pay for.

Now the question, Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman has a question that he can put inside of 15 seconds I shall be glad to yield to him.

Mr. GAVIN. The question: Will the gentleman take 5 minutes to tell me why we have a $275 billion debt at the present time? The gentleman is talking about cuts now, which is most pleasing to hear.

Mr. ROONEY. Is that the question?

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman tell us? Yes, why?

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman cannot be serious in asking that question because it would not take any 5 minutes to answer that. He heard of World War II.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Can the gentleman tell us why the CAA is here asking for more money and at the same time closing down airports and curtailing service out through the Middle West, and holding hearing on the subject of closing communication stations in Iowa?

Mr. ROONEY. I will say this to the gentleman——

Mr. LECOMPTE. That would be utterly ridiculous, would it not?

Mr. ROONEY. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that the airport development program, Federal aid to airports, has been cut out of this bill. There is no request this year.

But the real answer to this would be that this is a matter for President Eisenhower. He has discontinued it. He has asked nothing this year for Federal aid to the airports of the country, but he has asked for practically the same $80 million as subsidies for the big airlines.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I am taking about communication stations as well as airports; I am talking about the fact that the CAA is curtailing service out through the Middle West, and perhaps authorizing airlines to cut out certain stops. Why should they ask for more money when this is proposed?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman has his own answer.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania might be interested to know that when we entered the World War we had a national debt of between 39 and 40 billions of dollars. The rest of the national debt was incurred to save America that you and I might be sitting here in this Chamber and that men and women might be free under the law.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman from New York permit me to reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. ROONEY. Perhaps the gentleman from Ohio does understand that?

Mr. GAVIN. Pardon me, make it Pennsylvania, I am from the great State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROONEY. Very well, Pennsylvania; but the gentleman seems to want to monopolize the time. We have another distinguished gentleman over here to whom I would prefer to yield at this

moment and I will be glad to come back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I just want to reply to the gentleman from Massachusets [Mr. McCORMACK], if I may be permitted to at this time.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Did the gentleman's committee feel, after the hearings, that there was a full and complete understanding as to how the subsidies were fixed?

Mr. ROONEY. How could you ever arrive at a proper subsidy, when it is computed for a big airline on a division basis? And that is the way it has been done all these years. That is how the $80 million figure for 1955 was arrived at. I pointed out a while ago, that instead of examining the whole company, and all its subsidiaries, affiliates, and investments, to see whether it is really making or losing money, CAB split it up and audited it by divisions. We have big airlines which own hotels, which own foreign airlines, which are involved in many businesses aside from the actual flying of their planes. Nevertheless, the profit or loss with regard to these other activities has never been taken into consideration by the CAB except perhaps in one isolated case that I heard about.

Mr. YOUNGER. Was there any evidence given as to the various rates that the CAB fixed for carrying freight and carrying mail?

Mr. ROONEY. What about them, may I ask?

Mr. YOUNGER. I have in mind, for instance, this: I understand that a rate has been fixed by the CAB to carry livestock and that that rate is less than the rate for carrying the mail.

Mr. ROONEY. I know that international airlines carry passengers at rates less than for a bag of mail.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. BENTSEN. For the purpose of clarification, may I ask, Was it the intent of the committee in their recommendation that the $23 million appropriated would not in any way curtail service by local airlines?

Mr. ROONEY. I think the committee chairman should answer that.

Mr. BENTSEN. May I ask that that question be directed to the chairman of the committee?

Mr. ROONEY. I should prefer that that be done on his time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. In response to the question by the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER], I was going to say that the average mail rate fixed by the Board for the airlines is 45 cents domestic.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, and 85 cents international, without the subsidy.

Mr. HARRIS. Overseas, yes.

Mr. ROONEY. Here is CAB's comparison between a passenger and a bag of mail, a 215-pound bag of mail, from New York to Paris. I am referring to page 617 of the Department of Commerce hearings:

(The following was submitted later by CAB:)

On the basis of the estimated subsidy and service mail pay set forth for fiscal year 1953 in appendix C of the September 1953 separation report, the mail pay applicable to a 215-pound shipment of mail from New York to Paris (215 pounds is the average weight of a passenger and his free baggage allowance for international services) is as follows:

	TWA	PAA
Service mail pay at 85 cents per ton-mile	$309.00	$309.00
Subsidy (average for entire Atlantic Division)	351.78	586.63
Total mail pay	660.78	895.63
Passenger fare-1-way first-class ticket	415.00	415.00

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. I am gratified at the position taken by my very good, distinguished, and able friend from New York. He has at long last become economy minded. Like my good friend, Bob Rich, he is now asking, "Where are you going to get the money?" It was interesting to hear him talk about balancing the budget. Is not that something? After 20 years that side is now responding to need for a balanced budget and now are asking the question why the budget is not balanced. I would like to tell my friend the reason why it is not balanced. When we took over, the previous administration left us to handle an authorized but unexpended approximate $100 billion worth of appropriations, for planes and tanks and jeeps and guns and other equipment.

This accumulated stockpile of authorized but unexpended appropriations of $100 billion were built up over several years from 1951 on. No money was set aside each year for these authorizations, and now the planes and the jets and the tanks and guns are coming off the line and have to be paid for. These appropriations were made by the previous administration; however the present administration is charged with responsibility to pay for them. Certainly the gentleman knows it is difficult to balance the budget with this inherited stockpile of accumulated unexpended appropriations of approximately $100 billion. So, it is not the 1954–1955 budget, but what was appropriated and unexpended previously that throws the budget out of balance and will continue to throw it out of balance for the next few years. Now, do not expect us to perform miracles. If you had set the money aside in the years you authorized these appropriations there would be no difficulty in balancing the budget today.

Now you are concerned about balancing the budget. Why do you not tell the American people about the stockpile of unauthorized, unexpended appropriations of $100 billion that you handed to this administration to pay and at the same time balance the budget? You are asking this administration, the Eisenhower administration, who are conscientiously and sincerely trying to balance the budget, to do it. We can never balance the budget until we clean up what you authorized and unexpended but did not set aside in the budget of those respective years to pay for. Now when these materials are coming off the lines the Eisenhower administration has to see they are paid for. So I am glad to see your great interest in balancing the budget after 20 years. It is about time you start to look at balancing the budget and retiring our national indebtedness of $275 thousand million that the American people by the sweat of their brows must earn the money to pay the taxes to pay this debt if it is ever paid. If we reduced the debt three billion a year it would take 100 years to pay it off.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I certainly have nothing to add to the observations and report of my good friend from Ohio, the genial and distinguished chairman of this committee. He has stated as clearly and succinctly as humanly possible the substance of this bill, and in so doing summarized the report.

So, if I may, I shall confine myself to a few observations excited by the remarks of my distinguished friend from New York who lives on the wrong side of the East River.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. Not at this time. Does the gentleman live on the wrong side of the East River, too?

Mr. KEOGH. I want to have the gentleman know that he has been living in the city of New York too long to know which is the right and the wrong side of the East River.

Mr. COUDERT. I will tell the gentleman from New York, or Brooklyn, a secret. My mother was born in Brooklyn, and in a weak-minded moment she married a gentleman from Manhattan. That is how I got across the river.

Mr. KEOGH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COUDERT. Yes.

Mr. KEOGH. We promise to keep your secret.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, as my friend from Pennsylvania just pointed out, times have certainly changed, to use the words of my friend from New York, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. Times have changed, states he, and nobody could have been more impressed with that than the Members of this House on my side of the aisle who have fought for economy all during the years. During those long years when the distinguished gentleman from New York, my colleague, was chairman of this subcommittee, he never made such a speech as he did today. I congratulate him. Evidently the Supreme Court is not the only institution that "listens to election returns," in the words of Mr. Dooley.

The gentleman made something of 20 items that this committee in its wisdom did not reduce below the estimates sub-

mitted by the administration agencies. Now, that is a very interesting point and I think it is worth examining. Let us begin with a general statement.

The Truman 1954 budget request for the agencies covered by this bill, was reduced by $400 million, so that the 1954 expenditures for these agencies will be $400 million less than requested by the last administration, during which the gentleman was chairman of this committee. The bill submitted today by this subcommittee calls for something less than the current year's bill. So much for the general principle of whether this bill represents economy or extravagance á la Truman-Roosevelt.

Now, as to the particular 20 items to which the gentleman referred, every single one of them was greatly reduced by the administrative agencies in their estimates made last year and the year before, so that when they came to this committee the reductions had been very largely accomplished, savings had been made, great reductions in expenditures and manpower had been achieved, and there was very little left for this committee to do—a condition which to the gentleman from New York and his Democratic friends must indeed be a shocking surprise, because it never happened in all the 20 years of Democratic Presidents.

Let me recapitulate. The 20 items in which no reductions were made, and of which the gentleman from New York speaks so much, take up $295 million in the present bill. That amount of $295 million is $24 million less than the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. In other words, the new administration agencies requested $24 million less than they received for those agencies in the current fiscal year. In other words, the administration was carrying out the campaign pledges of the Republican candidate for President and his colleagues when they promised to give this country for the first time in 20 years a businesslike, economical administration of the great agencies of government. But more than that, the amount requested for these 20 unchanged items was $41 million less than the amount appropriated for fiscal 1953, which was a full Truman year and a year in which the gentleman from New York was chairman of this committee.

I wonder why he did not make the speech he made today the year before last when the budget for 1953 was under consideration. As to the items themselves, I wonder which ones he would reduce. Would he reduce the FBI? Would he reduce the Antitrust Division? Would he reduce the fund allowed for the Immigration and Naturalization Service? Would he reduce the salaries and expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, maritime training, emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service, and international contingencies? Of course he would not. That was a fine speech. I congratulate him on it, and I hope that in future years he will continue to make that speech.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield for one short interpolation at this time?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman will agree that in the years that he served on the committee—I do not recall that the gentleman was on the committee when I was chairman.

Mr. COUDERT. No, I was not. I have just gone on it.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] ought to be able to verify this, that when the gentleman from New York was chairman of this committee he never came into this Chamber with a bill which cut the President's budget estimates by less than 2½ percent. The State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill was usually the second most drastically cut bill that came on the floor of this House for debate during the time the gentleman from New York was chairman.

Mr. COUDERT. The fact still remains when that appeared in the bill in 1953, it was $41 million more for these 20 items than it is in the present bill about which the gentleman complains.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have the distinct recollection that on the 1953 budget, the House took $53 million off the information program on the floor of the House after we went into this.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, but now the request for funds for the United States Information Agency has gone up. I say to the gentleman from Ohio, look at the amount now reported to the Committee of the Whole. The gentleman will recall an occasion when the present minority reported a bill with a cut of about $90 million in supplemental funds for this agency.

Mr. COUDERT. Let me make the further point, and then I will yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, [Mr. JUDD] that the fundamental difference between this administration and the situation which confronts us today, and the situation which existed a year ago, is that we now have a Bureau of the Budget that is really interested in economy, and which is really attempting to reduce expenditures. That had not been the case for 20 long years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us speak of the matter of subsidy. We begin with the premise that this committee faces the subsidy problem for the first time. Heretofore, it has been held a Post Office operation, the problems confronting the Post Office subcommittee, and not this one. So we are new at it. Therefore, we know very little about it. But I think the House may be assured before we make any full appropriation for these items, we are going to know a great deal more about them. I do not know whether the attacks made by the gentleman from New York on a subsidy payment heretofore, and the methods of payment, are justified or not. I do not know whether there has been incompetence or dishonesty or what have you, but I am dead sure of one thing—that he is speaking of years during which the Civil Aeronautics Board was under Democratic control and operated by Truman and Roosevelt appointees. So, if there has been any monkey business anywhere at all, it would be entirely the responsibility of the Democratic side of Washington.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. Certainly.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Eisenhower is giving $80,655,000 of the taxpayers' money for this hand-out program in the present year. The facts show that. This figure is the highest in history, never before the present year was $80,655,000 paid in subsidy to the airlines.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I know that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], whom I hold in high esteem, wants to have the record straight. I am confused, and perhaps the gentleman can clear this matter up because we are supposed to consider appropriation bills in a nonpartisan way. But from January 3, 1953, to January 3, 1954, the present administration spent all the revenue accruing to the Government and increased the public debt by $9 billion, the largest increase in the public debt in any one peacetime year in the history of our Nation. Would the gentleman explain how the present administration increased that public debt so tremendously in 1 year?

Mr. COUDERT. I think the gentleman knows the answer to that as well as I do.

Mr. PASSMAN. No, I do not know and that is why I am asking the gentleman to explain.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman knows perfectly well that that is the result of the profligate, extravagant, and reckless commitments made by the prior administration.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. When the present administration took over, the previous one had left us with a charge account of about $81 billion. They had bought stuff or ordered it, and we certainly had to pick up the checks and pay for it. So those expenditures could not be reduced no matter how much we cut appropriations for the future.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. Those so-called charge accounts were carried over every year for 20 years during the time that the Democrats were in control, and we never had any such increase in the public debt during peacetime.

Mr. JUDD. Huge orders were placed after the opening of the Korean war. It takes time to get the materials produced. The bills began to come in last year in large quantities. You would not want us to refuse to pay those bills, would you?

Mr. PASSMAN. The Democrats reduced the debt by $3 billion during Mr. Truman's 7 years in office. You are trying to charge back many appropriations against the Truman administration.

Mr. COUDERT. I do not yield further, Mr. Chairman. The debt has not been paid, and I do not think the gentleman meant what he said. We all understand that the debt has gone up in astronomical amounts.

Mr. PASSMAN. I meant what I said. The present administration increased the public debt by $9 billion plus all the revenues that the Government received during your year in control.

Mr. COUDERT. Certainly, the public debt was increased and that was inevitable as the consequence of what the prior administration left us. They left us a burden that we could not avoid. I do not mind telling you that I am dissatisfied with the reductions. I would have reduced more, if I could have. I would have reduced the expenditures a great deal more. I would go a step further.

I would now, if I had my way, have Congress enact legislation that would limit expenditures to revenues in the future.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman tell the House about the testimony of Mr. Chandler, administrative head of the United States courts, to the effect that the number of bankruptcies has reached an all-time high since 1942. He heard the testimony.

Mr. COUDERT. I am not going to yield any further. That is a little irrelevant. I will not yield further.

Now, we still have this question of subsidies, about which there has been a great deal of talk, some of it confusing and misleading. The fact of the matter is there is a law on the books that defines the determination of subsidies for airlines. There is the further fact that without subsidies there would not be any airlines in international operations. So there is no use kidding ourselves about the possibility of eliminating subsidies for airlines at this time.

There is no Member on this floor who is more opposed to subsidy payments, in principle, than I. It is a very unfortunate situation when a subsidy is required. It leads to abuses. It constantly increases, and everything humanly possible should be done to avoid and limit it. But the fact remains there are circumstances under which subsidies are needed. If you eliminate subsidies today, you would probably close down two great American foreign airlines—Pan-American and TWA. You would probably close down a lot of other operations in addition.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that we have more airlines operating subsidy free, and we are having more and more each year, with less and less subsidies? For instance, the Big Four and the Big Five domestic lines are subsidy free.

Mr. COUDERT. That is entirely correct. The fact of the matter is that the great domestic carriers are out of the subsidy class.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COUDERT. They are receiving now solely airmail service subsidies, just like the railroads. The great subsidy payments today go to the foreign carriers, Pan American, TWA, and 1 or 2 others. By way of enlightenment—because it was enlightenment to me when I discovered the figures, and I think it may be to the Members of the House—the subsidy plays a large part in the operation of these lines.

Let me give you a few figures, to illustrate how important the subsidy is, and why we cannot just arbitrarily cut it off, however hard we might try to eliminate the unjustifiable, illegal, or otherwise improper payments.

Take TWA, which operates a great European line which runs as far as Rangoon. Its nonairmail revenue in the last fiscal year was about $48 million. Its subsidy was $4,400,000. Its profit was $400,000. Without the subsidy it would have run a net deficit of $4 million. In other words, it simply could not operate.

The great Pan American System runs four divisions, Pacific, Latin American, Atlantic, and Alaska. The percentage of subsidy payments to its total revenues in those four divisions, respectively, is 19 percent, 9 percent, 13 percent, and 17 percent. The plain fact of the matter is that without subsidies there could be no operation. This committee recognizes that. It also recognizes that a very careful and close scrutiny must be made of the payments made, and the basis of such payments, to the end that the intention of Congress may be carried out faithfully and accurately and no money wasted or improperly paid.

There is another thing that is important, and it bears upon the decision of this committee to allow $40 million in order that payments for all lines may continue, at least until the 1st of March, unaltered. That is being done because first, under the Supreme Court decision, it is going to be necessary for the CAB to reestimate some of the subsidy payments. It will take them some time to reestimate and resubmit a supplemental budget request on that.

Then, I think with respect to the two big foreign carriers there is pending a rate case which will finally determine the permanent rate for all these operations, since 1946. So all of the payments made since 1946 are in process of review with a view to determining what shall be the permanent rate for Pan American, TVA, and others. When that decision is determined we will then know whether we are entitled to reimbursement for overpayments, or required to increase payments.

In the event that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is right and that there have been overpayments, then those overpayments will be recaptured. That has happened in this very year; TWA gets no subsidy in certain of its operations because of reimbursement on account of overpayments in prior years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand the gentleman now as saying that in the ensuing fiscal year there will be a subsidy of $80 million?

Mr. COUDERT. We do not know; that is the request. We are granting $40 million so they will have 6 months to find out the exact amount.

Mr. GROSS. Let us take the $40 million figure; is that construed to be an airmail subsidy or a direct subsidy?

Mr. COUDERT. That is a subsidy as opposed to the airmail service charge. That is an entirely different item. This is a pure subsidy.

Mr. GROSS. Do you appropriate for the airmail subsidy?

Mr. COUDERT. No; that comes under the Post Office Subcommittee.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman stressed the great importance of these subsidies for the larger international airlines? He did not speak much about the local domestic airlines in which I am greatly interested. In the allocation of these subsidy payments can the gentleman assure us that the subsidy payments that are being made to local or smaller airlines will not be cut to such an extent that their services will be curtailed in anyway? They also are entitled to our every consideration.

Mr. COUDERT. All I can tell the gentleman is that the CAB Chairman was asked that question. We considered that in determining the amount that we would recommend for the period until March. The amount is predicated upon the assumption that the CAB will continue to pay all those presently receiving subsidies on the same basis as they are presently being paid, local and foreign as well.

Mr. GAVIN. I am glad to hear the gentleman make that statement because I think we should be just as much concerned with the smaller local domestic airlines serving our own backyards as we are with those in the international field.

Mr. COUDERT. We have been so concerned with our own backyard, let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that as a result of the subsidies that have been paid through the years we have succeeded in building up a number of great airlines in the United States which have outlived and outgrown the subsidies. They are not getting any subsidies now because they do not need them. We are hopeful that these others will ultimately achieve the same status.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the gentleman share the same point of view expressed by the chairman of the full committee that if after a review of operations by March of next year it is found necessary for them to have additional funds for these subsidy payments that the committee will come back to the Congress for it?

Mr. COUDERT. I can say only to the gentleman that the function of this committee is to see that the law is properly carried out. If the legislative committee sponsors a bill and there is a law on the books our sole function is to determine whether or not the agency here

is properly carrying its duty under the law. I assume they will come in with a supplemental request, after they have reexamined the position; and then it will be up to us, with our investigators and others, to determine whether they have done a proper job.

Mr. HARRIS. But you do have a right, if a need is shown, if additional funds are necessary, to make the appropriation?

Mr. COUDERT. That is up to the CAB. I do not believe we have any authority on our own motion to increase an amount by simply saying that this or that operator does not have enough.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. As I understand it, if the amendment which I understand is to be offered increasing the amount to $40 million for subsidy payments is adopted, and there is a carryover of approximately $8 million—is that correct?

Mr. COUDERT. I believe so.

Mr. PRIEST. Making a total of about $48 million; then, as I understand it—and I want the gentleman's statement in the RECORD on this particular question—that is expected to take care of the payments up to March 1, 1955?

Mr. COUDERT. At current rates; yes. So that nobody will be reduced and there will be no reduction in this bill. This is merely a postponement of action on the total budget request for the item.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I have been looking at this $80 million airline budget and the $85 million Maritime budget. Of course, the $85 million for the Maritime operation does not begin to tell the amount of Government subsidy that goes to the merchant marine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS. The purpose of our merchant-marine subsidy, as I understand it, is to maintain a fleet in being—an auxiliary fleet for M-day. What is the purpose of our airline subsidy? Did the gentleman's committee have any testimony that would indicate that ultimately our airlines will be able to support themselves on these expensive international lines, or are we going to subsidize them forever, while the British subsidize the BOAC and the Dutch the KLM? Did the gentleman have an opportunity to go into that matter?

Mr. COUDERT. Personally I am in no position to express an opinion on that. I think it will depend on circumstances. Certainly one would hope that at some point we will be able to get off the hook in the matter of subsidies.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. BOW. Is it not true that as of today 98 percent of the mail is being carried without subsidies, by the airlines in this country?

Mr. COUDERT. Yes, in the United States.

Mr. BOW. That is in answer to the question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], to the extent that they have developed to the point where 98 percent of the domestic carriers are operating without subsidies.

Mr. VORYS. I was thinking about the international lines particularly.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I should like to reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] by saying that while we have a merchant marine for the purpose of being ready on M-day with a merchant fleet, we have a fleet of aircraft for such things as the Korean airlift or the Berlin airlift or any other airlift that may come along. We are required to have the facilities for an airlift just the same as we are required to have a merchant marine. And it is meantime economical to have that fleet of aircraft engaged in commerce at little if any cost to the Government.

Mr. VORYS. Is that in the law?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require. It is pertinent at this point to give due notice to the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] and our former distinguished Member from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, now a Member of the other body, are entitled to a great deal of credit and the thanks of the American public for finally getting this matter of airline subsidies, previously paid, under the guise of airmail pay, up on the table for the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate and for the American public to look at and consider. It has not been until now that an Appropriations Committee has really had a chance to look at these subsidies. They were always called airmail subsidy payments.

No attempt was ever made to differentiate between what the airlines were allowed for carrying the mail and what they were allowed as subsidy. If the Members of the House will look at page 595 of the commerce hearings with regard to domestic air carriers and page 600 with regard to international, overseas, and territorial air carriers, they will find some information that might open their eyes now that this matter of subsidies has been put up on the table for inspection.

For example, with regard to Piedmont, domestic operations, $86,000 for carrying the mail in 1955 and $1,549,000 outright subsidy on top of that. With regard to Mohawk Airlines, $46,000 for carrying the mail in 1955 and almost $1 million as outright subsidy gift of the taxpayers of the United States. With regard to the well-named Bonanza Airline, $43,000 for carrying the mail and $902,000 as an outright subsidy. With regard to the international, overseas, and territorial air carriers, let me call your attention to Alaska Airlines, $122,000 for carrying the mail and $1,174,000 as outright subsidy. Pan-American-Alaska, $247,000 for carrying the mail and on top of that $1,322,000 as an outright subsidy. With regard to Delta Airlines—and that is an airline in one of the cases in which the Civil Aeronautics Board was reversed unanimously by the United States Supreme Court and told that they must consider all the operations of these companies in order to arrive at a subsidy payment—$61,000 for carrying the mail, and CAB has to give them almost three-quarters of a million dollars on top of that as an outright subsidy.

I do hope that the Members of the House will look at these figures and forget about the telegrams and letters from these very influential airlines before they vote on the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] to increase the subsidy business by $17 million of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to call the attention of the House to the fact that the item relating to Federal aid for airports has been completely eliminated from this bill. The reason I am calling this to the attention of the committee is the fact that in the district that I have the honor to represent, Scioto County, Ohio, some 2 or 3 years ago passed a bond issue which was authorized by a substantial vote of the people of that county. They sold bonds to the amount of $400,000, and they have in the bank the money from the sale of those bonds which were issued and sold with the thought that they would be able to secure Federal aid for an airport in this country. This was done some 2 or 3 years ago.

Might I point out also that in this region, very close to the location of this proposed airport, one of the largest atomic energy gaseous diffusion plants in the United States is now under construction. The Government is spending well over a billion dollars on this atomic-energy plant. I was advised several months ago by the former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Gordon Dean, that a suitable airfield was very necessary for the use of the Government and for the use of the various activities in connection with this atomic-energy plant.

Last year when this question came before the House we were told that the Secretary of Commerce was going to conduct an investigation of this entire question of Federal aid for airports.

At this time I call your attention to the title of the report. It is "The National Airport Program, Report of the Airport Panel of the Transportation Council of the Department of Commerce on the Growth of the United States Airport System." This is Senate Document No. 95. I would like to read just a few excerpts from this report. Remember, this is a Government panel appointed last year to investigate this problem.

The report states in part:

> Based on its findings, the panel is convinced that civil airports are public facilities of vital importance to the commerce and security of local communities and of the Nation as a whole. The panel is convinced

also that the ability of the airplane to serve the general public varies in direct proportion to the number and functional adequacy of airports strategically located in the United States and its possessions.

The studies undertaken by the panel have revealed that States, municipalities, and other local political units alone are unable to carry the capital investment burden involved in providing an adequate system of national airports. Therefore, it is the unanimous opinion of the panel that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to give financial assistance to local governments in developing airports which are in the national interest.

The report points out further that many organizations have recommended that Federal funds be authorized for Federal aid for airports.

The panel's findings indicate that today, as in 1946, growth is inherent in the structure of United States civil air traffic. It thus appears to the panel that Federal aid in developing a system of civil airports to keep pace with the requirements of an ever-growing aviation industry continues to be in the national interest.

They point out that the United States Chamber of Commerce made the following statement in their policy report in May 1953:

The national interest in the provision of an adequate nationwide airport system justifies reasonable Federal aid for this purpose. The Federal Airport Act of 1946 is the basis for such participation.

The United States Conference of Mayors in their report entitled "The Need for an Expanded National Airport Program," published in 1953, made the following statement:

In recognition of the national responsibility, it is essential that Congress appropriate the necessary funds to revitalize the national airport plan in terms of the Nation's current airport requirements. The intent of the Federal Airport Act, as foreshadowed by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, will thus be on the way to realization.

They point out many other agencies like the United States Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association and other groups, advocate that we should appropriate Federal funds for airports.

I would at this time like to direct a question to the committee as to what will be the attitude of the committee concerning this report. I wonder if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] could tell me what will be the attitude of his committee with reference to the recommendations of the Department of Commerce report on Federal aid to airports.

Mr. CLEVENGER. As I replied to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], it is not a case of the committee denying anything. There was no budget for new airports. We have removed nothing from the bill. There would have to be a request and a budgeted amount sent up to the committee for consideration. What the committee's attitude would be I would not know. It would depend on the merits of the situation, and each man would have his own opinion. I could not give the gentleman the opinion of the committee regarding that.

Mr. POLK. I am glad to tell the gentleman I am not criticizing him. I realize full well there was no request in the budget for this particular item.

Mr. CLEVENGER. There was no money requested in last year's budget for new starts. There was $22 million for liquidation of our contracts, and we were in hopes that out of that amount of money your airport might have been taken care of. But, it is out of our hands. The CAB would be the one to determine which one shall have priority.

Mr. POLK. The gentleman knows well that there are many, many instances throughout the country where municipalities and other government agencies have sold bonds and have the money ready to match any Federal appropriation that might be made for this purpose, so I hope those Members who are interested in this program will get a copy of Senate Document No. 95. It is a very well written and well documented report of some 67 pages. It was filed on February 3 of this year. It is strictly up to date, and it shows the need for Federal aid for airports. I hope those who are interested in this problem will get the report and read it, and that we may be able to bring about a situation whereby this very worthwhile program may be continued.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLK. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to take this opportunity to thank my very distinguished and able friend, whom I greatly admire, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] for giving me an opportunity to take 2 minutes of his time.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the learned gentleman from Pennsylvania addressing the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GAVIN. I was addressing the gentleman from New York to thank my very good and able friend whom I greatly admire for giving me an opportunity to take 2 minutes of his time.

Mr. ROONEY. I assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I took no umbrage at his failure to yield to me during the time that I had yielded to him. We have been friends and colleagues too long for that.

Mr. GAVIN. I appreciate and value greatly the gentleman's friendship. I just want to say to the gentleman that the gentleman was so very generous, that I did not think he would want to usurp the time that he gave to me and take it from me after he had given it to me.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I did not expect any miracles from him.

Mr. GAVIN. And I want to say to the gentleman from New York that the feeling is mutual.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 23]

Barrett	Brownson	Canfield
Battle	Buckley	Celler
Bentley	Campbell	Chatham
Chelf	Hoffman, Ill.	Rivers
Chudoff	Holifield	Roberts
Clardy	Jensen	Roosevelt
Cooley	Kearney	Shafer
Davis, Tenn.	Kelly, N. Y.	Sutton
Dawson, Ill.	Krueger	Taylor
Fallon	Lantaff	Wainwright
Fulton	Morgan	Weichel
Green	Moulder	Wilson, Tex.
Harris	Patten	
Hart	Powell	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 8067, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 392 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the report of the committee correctly, there is a reduction of more than a million dollars in the appropriation for maritime training. I think anyone who watched at close range the life-and-death struggle during World War II is aware of the vital importance to our country of an efficient and adequate merchant marine. Is not the effect of this cut going to be the closing down of the only facilities we have today for training deckhands and engineering-room people in our merchant marine? Is not the effect going to be to leave us with only one school and that is to train merchant-marine officers?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from Oklahoma is correct. The maritime-training schools which provide upgrading refresher and specialist courses for seamen at Alameda, Calif., and Sheepshead Bay, N. Y., have already been closed, although funds were appropriated for them in the current fiscal year. There is no money requested by the Eisenhower administration in this budget for these vitally important training schools, and I very much regret the administration's action.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I agree with the gentleman's statement, and I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to clear up what may be confusing in the minds of the American people—not necessarily in the minds of the membership of this body. I have heard claims by my friends on the left about the great reductions they are making in expenditures. They blame the Democrats for everything bad that has happened, and for all the expenditures and increases in the public debt in the past few years. What actually are the facts? I wish the Members would listen carefully to this. From January 3, 1953, to January 3, 1954, the 1 year that the Republicans have been in control of the

Congress and all Government Departments and operations, not only did they spend all the revenue collected by the Government, but they increased the public debt by $9 billion. That is the largest increase made in the public debt in peacetime in the history of our Nation. I do not want to be partisan about this, but I am tired of hearing the Democrats being blamed for all Federal expenditures made. They are going to tell you it is as a result of due bills that have been carried over from the prior administration. Let me point out where these overdrafts come from. Let us take the foreign-aid bill. At the beginning of the present fiscal year the present administration had in excess of $14 billion to the credit of the foreign-aid appropriations. My friends on the left supported this unbelievable sum. Now you can only charge the Democrats with appropriating $8 billion of this amount, and with Republican help. That amount had been obligated, but you had a $2 billion unobligated balance, and instead of letting that die they said they wanted the $2 billion. They charged that to the Democrats, and they asked us for an additional $4 billion, thus giving the present administration $14 billion for foreign aid during its first fiscal year in office. When the accounting Treasury figures are balanced daily, and that is the case with the daily statement, and you find the revenues exceed the expenditures, then you have a credit. If the expenditures exceed the revenues, then you have a deficit. I repeat, the Republican administration has spent all the revenues collected during the period I mentioned and at the same time increased the public debt by $9 billion.

So do not attempt to prove the due bills caused the increase because under the 7 years that Mr. Truman served as President the record will show that he reduced the public debt by $3 billion.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman realize that the Truman budget estimates for that year were reduced by the insignificant sum of $12 billion, and that if the Truman estimates had been appropriated the increase in the public debt for the period would have been not $9 billion but it would have been $21 billion.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say that the Congress never approves a President's budget intact. I think the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] reduced President Truman's budget 1 year by approximately $10 billion. The Senate may have reinstated a part of this reduction. What the Congress appropriates is something else. I want you to explain the increase in the public debt of $9 billion, plus all the revenues collected in your first year in control, and if you get into a lengthy discussion I shall ask for more time to have it explained. But in fact I do not expect you to be able to defend your position, so this should close the discussion.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I thought it might be interesting to some of my friends upon my right to realize that between January 21 and June 30 last year, the Eisenhower administration, helped by the Republican Congress, reduced expenditures that were estimated by Mr. Truman by over $5 billion for the fiscal year 1953. That is the reason the deficit was not $15 billion instead of $9 billion.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Let us keep this on an annual basis. I was very fair when I used an entire year to show that you had increased the public debt by $9 billion, plus all the revenues collected, whereas you are using only a few months period.

This discussion was brought on by the needling from your side, Mr. Chairman, that the Democrats are responsible for all the financial woes of our Government, which is not the case.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the necessity for economy in Government as well as the fact that it is the duty of each of us to do everything possible to bring about economies. But let us not think that we can accomplish this objective by merely cutting appropriations. On the contrary, there are a number of activities of Government for which the provision of adequate appropriations today can bring about major economies in the future. So I urge that the reductions we make may all be considered with foresight to determine whether or not they are real lasting economies in terms of the future prosperity and security of the Nation.

I am convinced that the appropriations we make for the Department of State and the Foreign Service should be most seriously considered in this light. Just as bipartisanship is important to America's Foreign Policy, equally important is a bipartisan and statesmanlike consideration of the funds we provide to make that policy work.

A year ago we reduced the funds for the State Department and the Foreign Service by some 20 percent. It occurred to me at the time that you do not win battles by decimating your own troops—or by "blood-letting" and I look upon our Foreign Service as being our first line of defense short of a shooting war.

Direct observation and close personal study of Foreign Service posts has given me ample opportunity to assess our capabilities in diplomatic and consular activities. I am pleased to report to you that I have been favorably impressed with the high caliber of the men and women in our Foreign Service. They were able, considerate and sincere people—representative Americans—as conscientious and hardworking as any group you would find in any part of the United States. This could hardly be called an unusual finding because, of course, these men and women are representative of every part of the United States.

I have another conviction—I do not believe there is at this time overstaffing of our Foreign Service posts. I've seen many of these missions personally, and the State Department's share of personnel is small compared with the representatives of the other United States agencies, and small indeed compared with the responsibility they carry. For example, for all activities of this Government, there were 160,000 United States employees overseas as of December 31, 1953, and of this number, 55,000 employees are located in United States Territories abroad. Less than 10 percent—1 out of 10—of these are employees of the Department of State.

Let me go one step further and compare the Foreign Service's responsibilities today with those of 10 years ago.

At that time we had no diplomatic missions in almost one-half of the countries of the world in which we must be represented today. Both in Europe and Asia, large sections of territory were under Axis occupation. There were also many areas which had not received their independence until the late 40's but in which we are represented today.

In the Far East, for example, we had only four posts. These four missions employed 45 Americans largely for handling our relations with the National Government of China. Last year, however, reflecting the increased importance attached to the Far East, the Eisenhower administration asked for a total staff of 450 Americans and 749 local employees in that area. We have diplomatic missions today in Japan, Korea, Formosa, the Philippines, Indonesia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Malaya, Thailand, and Burma—all countries where we had no representatives until after the war.

In other parts of the world, new diplomatic missions opened within the past 10 years include India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Jordan, Israel, and Libya.

Quite aside from the increased number of missions operating overseas today, is the increase in our responsibilities as the leader of the free world. I am not going to discuss the importance of NATO, or the European Defense Community, or the critical situation in Indochina. We know our responsibilities in these areas and we know the cost to ourselves and this Nation if we do not face up to them. Let us get closer to home—let us think about South and Central America, right here in our own hemisphere. We see Guatemala orienting itself more and more with the Communists. We see anti-Americanism getting stronger and stronger right in our own backyard. Yet, unfortunately, we have been continually cutting back on our American representation in this vital area—in effect, making it easier for the Commies to move in, making it harder for our own people to fight back.

At the same time we have been cutting back in another critical corner—training. Funds for operating the Foreign Service Institute and providing for other academic area and language training are getting shorter and shorter.

I was astounded to learn during our hearings that in the entire foreign service, we have but 141 officers who have received special area and language training. In several languages we do not

have a single trained expert—such as Czech, Polish, and certain Indian dialects. We seem to be working on the thesis that it is not necessary to teach our people how to handle themselves in the diplomatic clinches—they will just pick it up as they go along. Eventually we shall have to face up to the need for expert training for the Foreign Service.

To take another example, world travel at the end of World War II was at a low ebb. Passports issued to American citizens traveling abroad amounted to only 137,609 at that time as compared with the approximately 400,000 that will be issued this fiscal year. During the same period there were only 101,784 visas issued annually for entry of aliens into the United States as compared with about 485,000 in 1953.

All of these responsibilities call for much greater time and effort on the part of the State Department and the Foreign Service. And yet, instead of recognizing the vast expansion in responsibilities to perform these vital tasks, we are prone to obscure these factors with generalized charges of waste, duplication of functions, and excessive staffs and appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a matter that we can take lightly or casually gloss over. To sacrifice our Foreign Service capacity either as to quality or quantity in the name of economy is foolhardy. It plays into the very hands of those whom we oppose in the so-called cold war. It weakens us, it weakens our allies, and it weakens our alliances. It makes the ultimate cost of our world leadership and our national defense many times more expensive to every American citizen. However costly we may find peacetime budgets, they are infinitesimal compared to the costs of war. The people in the United States Foreign Service man the front lines in America's effort to find a way to lasting peace. They do a bigger and a more important job than many of us realize.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. To get back to this bill, I asked for this time to submit a question to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], chairman of the subcommittee, relating to the subsidy appropriations for the airlines. As I understand the situation, the bill as written calls for $23 million. An amendment will be offered to increase that to $40 million and there is eight million carryover. But the CAB came in and asked for $73 million, which means that the total amount appropriated will be $25 million short of what the CAB has actually requested for this particular item.

We have 14 small local carriers. The question I want to ask the gentleman is this: If the money runs out, what assurance is there in this legislation that the 14 little local-service domestic carriers will not be crowded off the end of the limb by the 4 big major international carriers? In other words, how are they going to be protected if the money runs out?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I can only say to the gentleman that the Chairman of the CAB has agreed that the $40 million would run them for a full calendar year from now, during which time they expect to complete their duties levied upon them by the decision of the Supreme Court, to bring to us a documented budget.

They can operate without any let or hindrance, either foreign or domestic, all of your domestic lines for the next calendar year without any more money. Certainly some of us will be around to hear what they have to say when they come up for the balance of the fiscal year.

Mr. ENGLE. It is correct to state, then, is it, Mr. Chairman, that it is not the intention of the committee to cut out whatever justified subsidy there is for these small domestic service operators?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I have said it and resaid it, and in my initial statement on the floor I made that so everlastingly plain.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. BOW. I would like to say to the gentleman that the CAB in their presentation to the committee estimated the expenditure to take care of all subsidies or every line would be $6 million a month.

I understand the chairman intends to offer an amendment to the bill making it $40 million and making available the carryover of $8 million, a total of $48 million on a 8-month operation on the new bill; so there is plenty of money to take care of all the lines.

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad to have that information and thank the gentlemen very much.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Department of State not otherwise provided for, including the cost of transporting to and from a place of storage and the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an employee of the Foreign Service who is assigned to a post at which he is unable to use his furniture and effects, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe; expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801–1158), not otherwise provided for; expenses of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the act of July 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 287o, 287q, 287r); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding outside the continental United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of uniforms; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than the others; rental of tie lines and teletype equipment; employment of aliens, by contract, for services abroad; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for passports; establishment, maintenance, and operation of passport and despatch agencies; ice and drinking water for use abroad; excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; loss by exchange; radio communications; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and similar services abroad; relief, protection, and burial of American seamen and alien seamen from United States vessels in foreign countries and in the United States Territories and possessions; expenses incurred in acknowledging services of officers and crews of foreign vessels and aircraft in rescuing American seamen, airmen, or citizens from shipwreck or other catastrophe abroad; rent and expenses of maintaining in Egypt, Morocco, and Muscat, institutions for American convicts and persons declared insane by any consular court, and care and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane; expenses, as authorized by law (18 U. S. C. 3192), of bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons charged with crime; and procurement by contract or otherwise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1) translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical information, (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids, (4) maintenance, improvement, and repair of diplomatic and consular properties in foreign countries, including minor construction on Government-owned properties, (5) fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased property abroad, and (6) rental or lease, for periods not exceeding 10 years, of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for the use of the Foreign Service, for which payments may be made in advance; $62,500,000, of which not less than $8 million shall, if possible, be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That pursuant to section 201 (c) of the act of June 30, 1949 (40 U. S. C. 481 (c)), passenger motor vehicles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be exchanged or sold and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be available without fiscal-year limitation for replacement of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not exceed $3,000 in the case of the chief of mission automobile at each diplomatic mission (except that 5 such vehicles may be purchased at not to exceed $3,600 each) and $1,400 in the case of all other such vehicles except station wagons.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: Page 4, line 8, strike out "$62,500,000" and insert "$61,933,000."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, being the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee on appropriations for agriculture and having served as chairman of that group, I can realize some of the problems that all of the members of each subcommittee have.

In offering this amendment to this particular appropriation I hope I can

have your attention as to what moves me to do it. This amendment strikes out the sum of $567,000 which is appropriated for 46 agricultural attachés in different points throughout the world. Under the law the Department of Agriculture was authorized many years ago to assimilate and disseminate information in connection with trade conditions in foreign countries and things of that sort.

May I point out the history of this service.

Sections 511, 512, and 514, title 5, United States Code, approved in 1862, authorize the Department of Agriculture to collect and disseminate useful agricultural information. Under this authority the Department maintained two or three officers abroad prior to 1930. In June 1930—Forty-sixth United States Statutes at Large, page 497—Congress established the Foreign Agricultural Service of the United States and authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint agricultural attachés, assistant agricultural attachés, agricultural commissioners, or other officers, and directed the Department of State to regularly and officially attach such officers to the embassies of the United States. The direction of these officers was in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Effective July 1, 1939, the agricultural attachés operating under the act of June 1930—Forty-sixth United States Statutes at Large, page 497—were transferred by President Roosevelt's Reorganization Plan No. 2 to the Department of State. They become a part of the Foreign Service of the United States as then constituted and operated. In 1946 the Congress passed the Foreign Service Act of 1946—Sixtieth United States Statutes at Large, page 999, title 22, United States Code, section 801. This act—section 1131 (56), title 7, United States Code, sections 541–545—repealed the act of June 1930 with respect to the foreign operations of the Department of Agriculture. Employees of the Department of Agriculture going abroad or working abroad on special detail, had no connection whatsoever with the Foreign Service of the United States or the embassies abroad. They did continue to operate under title 5, United States Code, sections 511, 512, 514, which is the basic authority for the Department of Agriculture.

On June 5, 1951, the President issued Executive Order 10249, which gives the Department of State complete authority to transmit or not to transmit the requests of the Department of Agriculture for information to the agricultural attachés stationed abroad. The present authority for the present operations of the Department of Agriculture in the field of foreign agriculture is found in title 5 of the United States Code, sections 511, 512, 514, and the item for this purpose, exclusive of agricultural attachés in the annual appropriation acts for the Department of Agriculture.

My amendment strikes out the appropriation for these agricultural attachés in the State Department appropriation bill. If you cut it out here, I feel that by appropriating for this group in the Agriculture appropriation bill we at least will have the opportunity—those of us who work in detail on all of your agricultural problems will have the opportunity—to have detailed reports from these folks on whom we are so dependent today for trying to relieve an agricultural situation that is becoming intolerable for the farmers in our own country.

I want to tell you why. From 1942 through 1952 the farmers of America were asked by the Government to increase production tremendously year after year. During that period a number of export restrictions were written by the Government, prohibiting the export of agricultural production of the United States to foreign lands at any price, even though the foreign price was much higher than farmers could get on the domestic market.

Under the price support program, it is contemplated that American agricultural production shall move in world trade channels at competitive prices. Under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, we provide that 30 percent of the import duties shall be set aside for use to make up the difference between the world price and our domestic support price so our farm commodities can go through private channels into world trade on a competitive basis.

Under the law setting up the Commodity Credit Corporation and the support program under it, we have made loans and bought in excess of $6 billion worth of farm commodities. And notwithstanding the fact that the law contemplates and authorizes the sale of those commodities on foreign markets at competitive prices, they are not being offered on a truly competitive basis, but they are being held off world markets. These commodities are bottled up in your country by reason of a Government policy saying that we will not offer them on a competitive basis, but will let the farmers of other countries have the available market.

The testimony before our committee shows that about $1½ billion of these commodities have been offered at prevailing prices. "Prevailing prices" means that we determine what the world price is and we offer our commodities at that price, and we do not reduce that announced price to compete.

A 2-percent discount offered by any competitor we have serves to take our commodities out of the market. The effect of that governmental policy is this huge investment in American agricultural commodities. And those who are against the present farm program are using this buildup of commodities on hand which are being held off the world market as a part of the Government program in an effort to strike at your farm price support program.

I should like to point out that whether you believe in flexible supports, or firm price supports, as I do, with controls on the quantity, or whatever you may believe in, it is absolutely essential that the production of American farms have its rightful place in the world markets. And you have got to offer such commodities at competitive prices. This is a must. This is more important than what happens to supplies now on hand. The United States has been referred to in Foreign Agricultural News as being a residual exporter; that is we are following a policy that says that we will stay out of the foreign markets, we will not offer our farm products on a competitive basis, that we will wait and see how much somebody else wants to sell, and if foreign countries do not have enough to supply world demand, to that extent we will loosen the strings and let our farm production go into export to fill the balance of world needs.

In connection with our agricultural welfare, agricultural attachés are in foreign lands for the purpose of gathering information on such countries, their possible need for our farm commodities, to disseminate such information. Yet whether our request even goes to them is determined by the State Department; whether their reports come back to our Department of Agriculture is also up to the State Department.

We appropriated last year $200 million under section 550 of the foreign-aid bill to be used in the purchase of surplus agricultural products of the United States. I have had importers in other countries, and various businessmen say that the reason we have been able to use less than half, or only $94 million, of that is because in these foreign countries the attitude of the State Department is: "Let some other country have the market and we will keep the American commodities off." Many times, I am told, foreign countries have been discouraged by our State Department, off the record and in an unofficial way, and prevented from even requesting the American commodity, though such country is the beneficiary of millions of dollars of our aid.

What am I doing here? I am not changing the law, though I would like to. We cannot do that here, because this is an appropriation bill. Agricultural attachés will continue to be subject to the State Department. But I am saying, let us pay them through the agricultural bill and then at least they will come before us to justify their appropriation and can then tell us the story of what the developments are. We who live with this problem, the Department dependent on this service, will have a better chance to get maximum service. We must have relief.

May I point out to you the flexible-price-support system goes into effect automatically by operation of law January 1, 1955. May I point out to you that farm commodities on hand, largely because held off world markets, are sufficient in the case of wheat, cotton, corn, and many others to automatically force price supports on basic commodities from 90 to 75 percent and on others to the minimum. We must offer such commodities for sale at competitive prices.

May I remind you the national income has averaged about seven times the farm income for any 5-year period in our history. As a nation, we cannot afford to follow present policies of limiting American production to domestic markets. That would wreck our farmers and thereby the Nation.

Behind this effort on my part is this: The State Department does not have any authority under the law to prohibit us

offering farm commodities on world markets at competitive prices. The Commerce Department does not have any such right under the law, but due to their influence in determining Government policy today we have a Government policy which keeps American farm commodities off the world market at competitive prices. That is tragic. We cannot long live under it on a prosperous basis, neither the consumer nor the farmer. At least, let us make this one step in an effort to have those who are charged with looking after this very substantial interest at this time report to the committee that deals with all these many problems and see if we can get at the whole problem and get some relief.

Let me repeat again, in addition to the $45 billion of foreign aid, we have in addition thereto helped foreign nations by following a governmental policy of holding off the world market American agricultural products and giving the markets to producers in other lands, supposedly to rehabilitate and restore them, yet in many foreign areas farmers are prospering far beyond other segments of people in such country. We have given them much more foreign aid than the American people realize. And in the doing of it we have jeopardized our farm programs, the welfare of our farmers. Today those farm programs are under attack from all sides. I am afraid that some of our good friends in their effort to build up public resentment at the surplus in the domestic market, of commodities in our own country, which we are holding as part of a governmental policy, in an effort to have their views accepted for flexible support prices, in effect are building up public sentiment against any farm program, which was not the intention of some. I believe the adoption of the amendment I offer is a step in the right direction. I know we must have relief.

I am asking you to strike out the fund for this undertaking in this bill. I am convinced that my own subcommittee will provide those funds and then, in doing that, these agricultural attachés will justify their activities and report to those of us who have wrestled so hard with the problems concerning agriculture, and thereby concerning the welfare of the whole country.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during this last year I was in every country in Western Europe on the very matter that the gentleman is talking about. This problem is considerably complicated; I will admit that. In talking with our State Department representatives and the agricultural attachés in these various countries—and I am trying to approach this in a reasonable manner and not in any way partisan—I did find this, that since the end of World War II there has been an attempt on the part of the State Department to guide the agricultural trade of Europe between European countries. Their explanation for that is that it prevents us from having to make up a deficit here in trade which we have been doing through the foreign-aid program.

Now, up to this last year we have never been faced with the surplus problem that we have at the present time; in other words, through the foreign-aid drawing accounts—and that is what foreign aid has been—through the drawing accounts these countries have been buying our grain and our agricultural produce, so there has been no great surplus problem here in the United States. During the last year and a half we have cut off a great deal of the economic aid to Europe. That is, we have cut off these drawing accounts by which they buy corn, cotton, soybeans, apples, fruit, and all the rest of the agricultural products of this country.

Now we are faced today with having to find a market for those instead of allowing these countries to have a drawing account. It is a difficult problem, I will admit, but I do believe that the State Department is going to have to now readjust its thinking entirely in view of the economic situation in this country where you do have a serious surplus agriculture problem. They are going to have to get out of the frame of mind that they are not going to allow our agricultural produce to enter into the markets in Europe. Now, that is the whole fundamental readjustment of thinking which the State Department is going to have to make.

I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from what I saw in Europe, that I do not know how you are going to get at this problem except through such an amendment. I talked to every single embassy in Europe, and I got their thinking, and not a one of them said, "We are not going to do what you want to do," but I am pretty sure that their psychological approach is that they are not going to do anything about allowing our surplus produce to go into those markets until there is pressure exerted from this Congress to do so. It may be that this amendment may be a solution to it. At least, I do not think the State Department is going to police itself down there on this problem, because it is all wrapped up in the problem of diplomatic negotiations between countries. They are working out the problem over in Europe on that basis and they are not very much concerned about what the local problem is here in the United States.

This may be a shock to you but, as one economic adviser said to me in confidence, and I am not going to repeat the name of that person, "I think the thing America should do is cut its agricultural market back to a point where it is consuming its own product." I believe that is about the psychological approach of these people in the State Department. I am not trying to be critical of them but I believe I am telling you the truth as I found it to be this summer as I was there on this one problem. May I say that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] was there. We met in Europe and compared notes. He was there on this agricultural program himself. I covered a little broader aspect than that.

May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi at this point if he has in mind retaining these agricultural attachés in the State Department as they are now?

Mr. WHITTEN. Insofar as my amendment is concerned, that definitely would leave them there. Any change would be a legislative matter. I would not be completely honest if I did not tell the gentleman I have some personal views as to what the law should be, but that is a legal matter that would go before the legislative committee. Involved here only is the one thing at least effecting this much of a cure. This is not slanted one way or another to control what happens. Whatever happens in the other regard, I think this is completely sound. I thank the gentleman for what he has said.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask another question: The gentleman does not intend, either now or in the future insofar as he himself or his subcommittee is concerned, to transfer these attachés to the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. WHITTEN. We have no such intent, neither do we have the authority. There are individual members on the committee who would urge the legislative committee of the Congress to change the law. This is no effort along that line for such an amendment would be subject to a point of order. Individually and personally we have wrestled with this problem so long that many of us think we must have several things done if we are to get relief, but pending whatever is done by the Congress I think this is absolutely essential.

May I ask the gentleman one question now, and may I say that I have the highest regard for him and his opinion and for the other members of the subcommittee. I work closely with many of them. At the present time the State Department's attitude, which the gentleman has so aptly described, of bottling up in the United States the agricultural production of the United States, apparently is the controlling voice in our present policy. Whatever the reasons for that and however sound they may be judged by the State Department, the executive department, or what have you, does not the gentleman agree that these commodities being so held up as a part of our foreign policy should not be charged up to the American farmer and used to break the price support system we have in this country?

Mr. SPRINGER. I agree with the gentleman on that point.

There is just this one thing further I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi. The gentleman does not contemplate now by the use of these funds in his department, where I am inclined to think they should be, to pressure the State Department into dumping on these western countries of Europe? That would create a serious situation. I am cognizant of the whole thing involved in the State Department problem, but at the same time I am interested in my own area, which is largely agricultural, and where this problem is a serious one.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think we have through this untenable policy of bottling these commodities up in our country built up such a reserve that it would be most shortsighted to try to dump all these commodities. We have built them up to where we are going to have to

move them back into world markets in a well regulated manner, but certainly we cannot sell anything until we offer it for sale. Now we are not even offering it for sale, for unless we offer at truly competitive prices, we have not really offered to sell.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee and myself, let me say that we, on my side at least, listened with a great deal of interest to the observation of the gentleman from Mississippi. I am sure no one is more familiar with the farm problem than he is, and no one is a greater decentralizer and a greater believer in local autonomy than he is, coming as he does from the great State of Mississippi. So far as the farm problem is concerned, it seems to me that is not the problem before this committee. It seems to me that the sources of payment of these attachés is not going to affect the fundamentals of this one bit. He is dealing with major problems of American economic and foreign policy which will have to be determined here on the ground, by the top men in Washington.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have asked the gentleman to yield this early so that he may have the benefit of this point being raised. The situation that exists, from the point of view of those who have worked with our problem, I mean the jurisdiction of our committee, is such that if we cannot get some relief through this source, we, of necessity, will be forced to set up trade commissions in foreign countries in line with the objective stated by the Agriculture Department, which in turn would be a duplication of these services. I say that not as a threat. I cannot speak for the committee nor for the Congress, but in my own judgment that is the only solution I see to get out of this situation, and that would be to duplicate these people so that we could get the job done.

Mr. COUDERT. Let me say in answer to that, I think the gentleman has furnished a sufficient answer, or rather sufficient repudiation of his own amendment. Until those commissions are established and the law is changed so as to provide for such commissions, there is no possible excuse for the adoption of the gentleman's amendment. What in effect it would do would be to fragmentize even further the foreign policy management of the United States. Of course, what he is really trying to do by this amendment is to fragmentize and decentralize even further the conduct of the foreign policy of the United States because there are under the State Department budget, under the control of the Secretary of State, 200 odd attachés American and local for agriculture, 600 for the Department of Commerce, 100 for the Department of Labor, and 60—all these in round figures—for the Department of the Interior. If we adopt this amendment for part of the attachés, the Department of Agriculture, why not for Interior, why not for Labor, why not for Commerce, why not set up a half dozen separate State Departments conducting the economic foreign policy of the United States? It seems to me that question answers itself and pretty adequately disposes of the gentleman's amendment. I certainly hope it is not adopted.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota who is chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations what his view is on this amendment, and whether he feels that his committee could take care of these attachés if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will say this. I do not agree entirely with your premise, but, after all, as I understand it, the Department of Defense does pay, does it not, for military, air, and naval attachés abroad?

Mr. COUDERT. Yes; I suppose it does.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. So there you have a precedent for what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] wants to do. But here is what I question very severely about the amendment. As I understand our Parliamentarian, if this is stricken out, it is very questionable as to whether or not we can put it in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, and whether or not a point of order would lie against it. I agree entirely with what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is aiming at, but I would not want to be a party here today to striking out the money for the agricultural attachés from this bill, and later on not being able to get it restored into my bill for an agriculture appropriation because of a point of order probably being made against it. We do know that legislation is pending before the legislative Committee on Agriculture to achieve this transfer. So, very reluctantly, I cannot go along with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] on the amendment.

Mr. COUDERT. There is another point, and then I will yield to my colleague from New York [Mr. ROONEY], because I think we will all be interested to hear what he has to say.

We are operating today under a reorganization plan of 1939. Prior to that time these attachés were paid by agriculture, as well as the attachés in commerce. Then, as the result of experience, Congress adopted a reorganization plan, and those attachés were brought in under the broad umbrella of the State Department and have carried on since 1939, the closest cooperation being maintained between the department that they represent and the State Department.

Now I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I am in thorough agreement with what the gentleman from New York has said. I find myself in agreement with all the majority members of the committee on the pending amendment, and believe it should be rejected. The consequence of its adoption would be to create another State Department in the Department of Agriculture. Why then should we not have a State Department for the commercial attachés who come out of the Commerce Department, the attachés who come out of the Interior Department, and the attachés who come out of the Labor Department? We would then have 5 or 6 State Departments in each of our foreign missions abroad. If the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi were adopted, it might mean that we will have no agricultural attachés at all. I am going to vote against the pending amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. It is worse than trying to set up another separate State Department. The amendment, as explained by the gentleman, would have the direction of our foreign policy in a subcommittee on appropriations, because, as he says, he wants them to report, not to the Secretary of Agriculture but to report to him. It seems to me that this is not only an attempt at left-handed legislation on an appropriation bill, but it is an attempt of a subcommittee on appropriations to direct the foreign policy of the United States. If we were to do anything like that we certainly should take it up through legislative channels, rather than by striking an appropriation out of an appropriation bill.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. As previously pointed out, our military and naval attachés are paid out of the Defense Department, so certainly there is a precedent. The gentleman from New York stated a few moments ago that our agricultural attachés were satisfactory prior to 1939. As a matter of fact, before then they reported to the Department of Agriculture, and we got along pretty well. But arguments were made in favor of consolidation, and the Department of Agriculture was put into this wedding, which turned out to be very unsatisfactory as far as the farming interests in this country are concerned. I feel the farm interests will be better off if the agricultural attachés were responsible directly to the Department of Agriculture. I feel there is a great deal of merit in the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. Whether or not it will stand up on technical grounds, I do not know, but he does point to the fact that we are not being served, as far as our American farm problems are concerned, by the State Department at the present time.

Mr. COUDERT. Does not the gentleman think that the proper forum for discussion and determination of this matter is a legislative committee and not a subcommittee on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HUNTER. This is a very good time to bring it up.

Mr. COUDERT. But not to decide it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman would admit that all that is involved here is the elimination of an appropriation. If it is put in the Agriculture appropriation bill, the reports coming to our committee will be through the Secretary of Agriculture. We will not be in position to change the law; we will be in position to give the reports on these people who are there for the purpose of representing the agricultural interests through the State Department and see whether they are worth the cost.

We cannot change the law, but all that is involved here is whether these people there in the State Department—they will continue in the State Department—whether they shall be paid through our subcommittee where we can tell whether we are getting any results or not. Of course the answer to getting relief through legislation is that we have not been able to get such relief in the 10 years relief has been sought.

The State Department's representation, singly of our foreign policy, concerning agriculture, completely ignores the welfare of American agriculture. It actually hurts our cause.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COUDERT was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. COUDERT. Let me say to my friend from Mississippi that I am sure he would recognize that the agricultural interests are part of the greater interests of all the people of the United States, and agriculture and economic policy are part of the foreign policy and foreign problems of the United States. Speaking for myself as an individual—I am not speaking for the members of the committee on this, I do not know how they feel—but I personally feel very strongly that we should not fragmentize the State Department but should rather bring all of the elements of foreign policy together under one broad roof. That is why I personally would be opposed to creating any further autonomous agencies dealing with foreign policy such as the gentleman seems to contemplate.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the gentleman from New York makes an excellent statement for his case. However, may I say this: Some years ago the Foreign Agriculture Service—and I stand corrected by those who were here before me—was under the Department of Agriculture. It has since been removed from the Department of Agriculture where it properly belongs and moved over to the State Department so that actually those who are interested in agriculture no longer have anything to say about the Foreign Agriculture Service because this policy is all being dictated by the State Department and they are using that as a diplomatic arm but not necessarily using it in the best interest of agriculture, which it is supposed to serve.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman mean that the overall interest of the United States as represented by the State Department should be subordinated exclusively to the interests of agriculture? That is what the gentleman seems to say.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am not but I do believe that the Department of Agriculture should have control over those who are speaking for agriculture as far as the United States is concerned.

Mr. COUDERT. I trust that the amendment will fail.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on the pro forma amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet. The gentleman has already had 10 minutes time on this amendment. I must object.

Mr. WHITTEN. I suggest that the objection comes too late, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the gentleman from Ohio on his feet?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I certainly was.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is sorry but the Chair did not see the gentleman. The gentleman from Mississippi has already been recognized.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I realize you run the risk of a little displeasure on the part of your colleagues when you speak twice in as close order as I am today; but this problem in my own mind is so serious that I am willing to risk a little displeasure on the part of some few colleagues.

You have seen here this afternoon in the attitude of some of my colleagues an indication of the problem that we have when we try to get the welfare of American agriculture considered in the formulation of the State Department or foreign policy. Why, we cannot be heard.

All this amendment does is to strike out pay for agricultural attachés in this bill. We expect to provide for their pay in the agricultural appropriation bill.

If this money is stricken out and the money put into the agriculture bill, the money will go to the State Department to disburse to these people, but the Department of Agriculture will come in and justify the request for pay and report on what they are doing and what results come from it. As a result you will have a chance to determine whether this is a good investment or not. In addition these people, many of them good representatives of this Government and men well versed in their field. Others reportedly are not quite so good, because of primary interest in eventually getting into the State Department. I think our trouble is largely in the system. If you will follow my suggestion, we will have an opportunity to find out where the problem is.

I do believe, win, lose, or draw, on the amendment, that I have pointed out something that no one in the Government is pointing out to the American people, in the press; that is, that practically none of these American farm commodities in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation that are pointed out and deplored, which are being held in our country as a weight on the domestic market, are being held off the world market, as a matter of your national policy. In the doing of that, our Government reflects the views of the State Department and apparently of many of my good colleagues on this floor who have advocated and gotten through the Congress $45 billion in foreign aid through the years; and in addition thereto have been parties to a governmental policy which says that American agricultural production will be held off the world market at competitive prices. In addition to the $45 billion in foreign aid, we hold back and are only a residual exporter. We let the other countries of the world have, for their farmers, markets for their farm products.

Again, there may be reasons for such a foreign policy. There may be reasons for such a governmental policy. But whatever they are, they do not reflect the individual interest of agriculture. And if they should predominate in our general policy, it follows that you have got no right to charge up these farm commodities to American agriculture.

All that is involved is an amendment to strike out funds to pay folks representing the agricultural interests but reporting to, and under the control of, others. If cut out, we expect to add the funds to the agricultural appropriation bill and thereby we will not change the law, but we will have reports and justification for their very existence to the group which has to wrestle with this farm program. And it is a real wrestling match, to try to solve a problem when you are hemmed up in your own country and hold off foreign markets on a competitive basis all our agricultural production and give world markets to other people in the world.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I certainly have supported the foreign-aid program every year it has been up. In addition, I think I have backed up the Eisenhower foreign policy on about every occasion it has been put to a test in this body.

But I want to say that the State Department is going to have to reconstruct its thinking about what we are going to do in behalf of, or on the subject of, the agricultural surplus in this country. Whether this amendment carries today or not, it is a fundamental thing that this House is going to be faced with and is going to have to solve within this next year, if it does not want to see these surpluses get higher and higher. I think this discussion has started our thinking and I hope at the other end of the avenue, in the State Department, there are going to be people thinking about this problem. I hope in their thinking the State Department is going to give agriculture its due share of consideration.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that I thank the gentleman for his very fair way of looking at a subject and the real contribution he has made in presenting this subject to the Members.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, if we adopt this amendment it is going to create control by a different set of people dealing with a lot of foreign countries, and we will be worse off than we are now when we have representatives from Mutual Security and the State Department monkeying around with our relations. We have no authority, as I understand the law, for the agricultural subcommittee in its bill to provide for any such thing. To my mind it would be a great mistake for us, who represent agricultural districts, as I do, to knock out the only representation that is available to agriculture in foreign countries. If that representation is not proper and effective it should be corrected. But to go ahead and knock this out and have no representation for agriculture, frankly, does not appeal to me.

I feel that we should and must reject this amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to a factual situation. We used to have agricultural attachés. They were under the direction and responsibility of the Department of Agriculture. They were taken into the State Department, in the Foreign Reorganization Act of a few years ago, and ceased to be agricultural attachés except in name. They went into the Foreign Service line, and their interests were directed to a job as counselor or something like that. The fact remains that we, from the agricultural areas, like the gentleman from New York and myself, have this serious problem that we do not now have the agricultural attachés we think we have. The gentleman from New York is correct; there must be enabling legislation, but that legislation has been introduced, and in all probability some step has to be taken, I would say to the gentleman from New York, some day to pry this function loose from the Department of State which has changed the agricultural attaché service we used to have.

Mr. TABER. Well, now, frankly, I would have to say that I found in Rome and in Paris, when I was there in 1947, men who had a very good grasp of what the agricultural condition was in those places, and I found the same situation in the agricultural picture in the United States Government occupation group in Germany.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that this is one of the things that the Hoover Commission reviewed with great care? Suggestions were made that we go back to the idea of having a Department of Agriculture attaché and a Department of Commerce attaché and a Department of Labor attaché, and they came to the conclusion that in a foreign country the United States must speak with one voice, and that while we have these experts who are selected in consultation with the various departments and who report to those departments, that the United States cannot have 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 different agencies representing it in a foreign land. Therefore, this is a bipartisan decision settled over a period of years, by the Hoover Commission and prior to that and since then. It seems to me that this would interfere with the foreign agricultural policy of the United States, and I agree that our policy is as the gentleman has suggested, but to attempt to discuss or decide that by striking out the only representation that agriculture has is a very foolish way to go about it.

Mr. TABER. I think that is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish the situation were as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio has so ably described it. That is not what the situation is. This is a discussion which would take a great deal more time than 5 minutes. The fact of the matter is that these men, instead of being specialists for commerce or specialists for agriculture, which we intended them to be, have become Foreign Service officers in a line of promotion in the Foreign Service, and their eyes are fixed upon a different job, and not on the job of becoming specialists in any commodity line.

Mr. Chairman, the only objection I can think to the suggestion of the gentleman from Mississippi is an argument that we should not put every bit of effort and every bit of intelligence into the disposal of our own products in other markets of the world.

I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is correct that legislation is needed, and I hope the Committee on Agriculture will set hearings immediately on legislation already introduced to solve this problem. It has troubled agriculture for more than a dozen years. In the meantime, I support the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi was kind enough to discuss this amendment with me before he offered it. While I am entirely in sympathy with the objective he has in mind with respect to getting these agricultural attaches in a position where they will be of greater benefit to American agriculture, I believe we are going at the matter in the wrong way by attempting to adopt this amendment. It seems to me we may find ourselves in a position where if we adopt the amendment we will take the item out of this bill and then be unable to put it in some other bill. I doubt if it would be in order in some other bill, and we really will not have accomplished anything.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman has a high regard for the gentleman from Mississippi, as do I, but does not the gentleman think this is a matter for consideration by the proper legislative committee rather than upon an appropriation bill?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, I agree wholeheartedly with what the gentleman has said. I do have a most high regard for the gentleman from Mississippi and the thought and study he has given this matter. He has introduced a bill which has been referred to the legislative committee on agriculture and I have introduced the same bill; in fact several Members of the House have introduced a bill which will have the effect of putting these attachés under the Department of Agriculture and in a position where I think they can do the job they are expected to do. I hope we can pass some legislation along that line. That is the way to go at the matter. This is not the way to do it. I can assure those of you in the House who are interested in doing something about this situation that the Committee on Agriculture is going to give it consideration at an early date. I think you will have an opportunity—I hope you will, anyway—to vote on this proposition in the House during this session.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that the bill which has been introduced was authored by the gentleman from Kansas. I appreciate his reference to me. What I did was drop in the hopper a copy of the gentleman's bill, with his approval. I think, too, that it is something that is needed.

I would like to use some of the gentleman's time at this point again to say that involved here is the case of which department will appropriate and pay for a service, the one for whom the service is to be rendered or the one by whom they are assigned. I think the expenditure of salary should be made by those who have the job of saying whether or not the service is worth the money. Unless these folks are put in the right place, where we can tell whether their services are worth their pay or not, we will of necessity be required to duplicate the service and appropriate money for which we do have the authority to put a duplicate set of folks over there to represent us on the very serious problems which face us. So I am not changing the law here. I am changing the group for whom the justification is made for their place in the sun and the pay we make to them.

Mr. HOPE. My disagreement with the gentleman from Mississippi is not on what he is trying to do but the method by which he is undertaking to do it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I find myself also in the embarrassing position of being with my friend from Mississippi in principle, but this actually will not achieve the thing we want to do. We want the Secretary of Agriculture to pay our attachés and have the power of the purse, and through that to direct it. What will happen if this amendment carries is that we will then try to get it in our agricultural bill. Then after it passes the House we will

have to transfer it back to the State Department, so they will still pay the attachés.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

For representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131), $450,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 5, line 4, strike out "$450,000" and insert "$400,000."

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, have we not passed that section? I think the gentleman's amendment comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. No; we have not passed that. The gentleman from Kansas was on his feet seeking recognition, and he was recognized by the Chair. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment. The committee has in some years past seen fit to reduce the amount of this so-called representation until now the request is for $500,000. The committee did see fit to make it $450,000 and all I am asking is to save $50,000 of this amount. Since the amendment provides an extremely moderate reduction of $50,000, I trust that it will be adopted. $50,000 is worth saving and more important we should not appropriate funds from the Federal Treasury for this purposes. I feel that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] should go along with this amendment leaving $400,000 which I think is too much but will at least put the expenditure more nearly back where it was before when we took this matter up last year, in line with the amount approved last year.

Mr. ROONEY. Is this the item which the distinguished gentleman from Kansas sometimes refers to as the booze bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, no; I am referring to it by its dignified name that appears in the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. This is an item which the distinguished gentleman and I have discussed over the years. Suppose we are going to buy our Ambassador up at the United Nations a $12 luncheon, Would the gentleman from Kansas object to including a dry martini or an old-fashioned, would he?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have never heard of drinking an old-fashioned that did any good, have you? I have seen the use of it do a lot of harm.

Mr. ROONEY. They tell me that on a very cold night it does some good.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman for whom I have such high regard and I could debate that thing the rest of the afternoon. I think we could reach the conclusion that an old-fashioned such as he talks about never did accomplish any real good on behalf of the United States. On this I am expressing my opinion.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from Kansas knows the great affection I have for him. I now seriously say to the gentleman from Kansas that the committee was in unanimous agreement on this item. There has already been a substantial cut because this item at one time ran up to over $675,000.

Mr. BOW. Eight hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; $800,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I hope that the committee will see fit to reduce the item further.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman that his kindly persistence over the years has resulted in quite some economy. But I do feel sure in speaking for all the members of the committee that the committee operated on this item about as much as it should. For that reason it will be with great reluctance that I vote against the gentleman's proposed amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The committee did reduce the original request by $50,000. We could cut out $50,000 more and make it an even $400,000, which is a lot of money for this purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from New York would give us a few more details on that $12 luncheon for Ambassador Lodge in New York. This is the first I have heard about it, and I would like to hear more about it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE], who is on his feet.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, if I correctly understand the gentleman from New York, he advocates a policy of fearing God and keeping the martinis dry.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I hope the committee will accept this comparatively modest reduction. Let us save a part of an extremely extravagant item of expenditure. I trust my amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to enable the Commission to settle certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments as authorized by the act of March 10, 1950, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1621–1627), including expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purpose of this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles for field use only; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and employment of aliens; $130,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, while we are on the State Department, there are a few observations I wish to make in relation to the possibility of Red China being admitted into the United Nations, and to express my vigorous opposition to any such thing happening.

Secretary Dulles recently returned from a very important conference in Berlin, and upon his return most vocal and vigorous criticism of the Secretary came from certain prominent members of the Republican Party. We Democrats refrained from offering any criticism because we realized the difficulty of his mission, and the fact that while he brought nothing affirmative forth from the conference, under the circumstances, having in mind that particular conference, he probably did the best he could. However, the fact cannot be overlooked, despite the reservation of no recognition of Red China being involved at the coming Geneva conference, that admitting Red China as one of the participants in the coming conference is a step forward for that regime. It places our country in a defensive position, in a position where we have to do the explaining. It is well known the countries still possessing some degree of friendship for us have stated that they favor the admission of Red China into the United Nations. It is rather interesting to note a report of Foreign Secretary Eden of Great Britain, made in the House of Commons, in a speech made recently in that body, the only claim he made was that "modest gains" were obtained for Great Britain, France, and the United States. Apparently the "modest gains" are the fact that Molotov, acting for the Soviet Union, did not drive any wedge between France and the United States. The real answer to that important question, in my opinion, will rise prominently and be more fully determined at the coming Geneva Conference. That is the one I am watching. That is when the Soviet Union will make its greatest drive in this respect. I certainly hope that they will not be successful, because the friendship between the United States and France goes back to Revolutionary days. It has never been disturbed to any marked degree, and should continue. Of course, if the Government of France should ratify the European Defense Treaty before the conference takes place, it will strengthen the position of Great Britain, France, and the United States at the coming conference, but if France does not ratify the treaty, great care will have to be employed by Secretary Dulles and the representatives of our country and the representatives of Great Britain and France to prevent a weakening of the alliance that now exists among the three big free nations of the world.

For many months I have been concerned about this avenue I see being established and builded upon from time to time towards the admission of Red China into the United Nations. I am fearful that if that vote were to take place that there may be more than two-thirds of the General Assembly that would vote to admit Red China. I hope I am wrong, but I think that the votes may be there. I see the buildup and I see the danger. But the nation members of the United Nations should realize the people of America are overwhelmingly in opposition to such admission. The great majority of Americans without regard to our political affiliations are vigorously opposed to that. If that happens I then see in the future, recognition by our country of Red China. I am not saying it is going to happen, but my purpose today is to call attention to

the possibility. The real test in keeping France and the United States and Great Britain in close alliance to one another will take place at Geneva; it did not take place at Berlin.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. May I suggest that the gentleman was not accurate in that part of his remarks where he said that for the first time the Chinese Communists were to be admitted as participants in such a conference at Geneva. Because that is not the fact. They will be participating in this conference in Geneva in exactly the same way that they were at Panmunjon for over a year. Geneva is merely a resumption of Panmunjon under conditions less favorable to the Communist side.

The only way you can settle a war is to discuss the issues with those who are waging the war. But that does not constitute recognition.

Is it not more accurate to say, sir, that they are coming to Geneva accused before the bar of public opinion and condemned by the United Nations as aggressors, rather than have an implication go out from the former distinguished majority leader of the House that Geneva represents a step forward for the Communist regime in that they will then be considered as participants, as if they were not that before.

I do not think they have gained anything except as people may think they have gained; and I do not think we ought to take any chance of giving any impression here that they will be in any stronger position at Geneva and therefore more likely to be admitted to the United Nations than was previously the case.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope my friend from Minnesota is correct that they have not gained anything.

I will accept the gentleman's observations, because they fairly represent my state of mind. What I was saying was that Red China hopes and the Soviet Union thinks, and the Communist satellite nations think that they have made great advancement toward the ultimate admission of Red China into the United Nations.

From the overall angle I think the gentleman's statement is a sound position and one that at this time I subscribe to. I hope it will be adhered to at Geneva.

Mr. JUDD. Let me agree with the gentleman that we must be on our guard. The Communists are resourceful and they will use every single artifice and device in their kit to try to trip us up. But when the President and the Secretary of State are adamantly opposed to admission, and Congress is unanimously opposed to it, and the people are overwhelmingly opposed to it, I think we can assure our allies that it is not going to happen.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has made an observation that I thoroughly subscribe to. But I make this one exception: Sometimes circumstances and conditions determine. One may not have the intent to do a certain thing, but circumstances and conditions arise where a certain result is produced.

I say that the forthcoming Conference at Geneva is the one to be watched; that is the one where friendship between France and the United States in particular and also Great Britain must be adhered to, and that is the Conference where Molotov and the Soviet representatives will try to drive a wedge between France and the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How can the gentleman accept the statement a moment ago of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and still leave in the RECORD his statement that he is afraid that the United Nations would, if tested, vote Communist China into membership?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman asks a very pertinent question. My acceptance of the gentleman's observation was with respect to what we, in America, feel and think. My statement was what I thought might happen as a result of changing circumstances. Furthermore, the question of admission of Red China is one that comes before the General Assembly of the United Nations and requires a two-thirds vote. I am fearful that they may have the two-thirds vote.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. However, we can exercise a double veto if necessary. The Soviet Union on 3 occasions exercised a double veto against the admission of 3 different nations into the United Nations, when the General Assembly had overwhelmingly, in those cases, voted to admit them. If the Soviet Union can exercise a double veto then, if necessary, the United States of America can exercise a double veto. I am sure my friend from Iowa will agree with that.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has said, and the gentleman accepted his statement, that Communist China stood condemned by the United Nations.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. You cannot have your cake and eat it, too.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Minnesota's expression was as to the state of mind in America, that we are opposed to the admission of Communist China.

Mr. JUDD. It is more than that. The United Nations General Assembly voted overwhelmingly to condemn Communist China as an aggressor.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure that my friend from Minnesota recognizes that circumstances and conditions might bring about certain results?

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend from Minnesota entertains the thought that ultimately, perhaps not so far in the future, an attempt will be made to admit Red China into the United Nations.

Mr. JUDD. That is the reason I opposed starting the conversations in Korea 2½ years ago under the circumstances then prevailing, because I was afraid that one step would lead to a second, and then to a third, and one day we would have to go along in appeasement or else have a disruption of the whole grand coalition that we have been building up at such cost, in the free world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The real test in holding together the solidarity of the United States, France, and Great Britain will be at Geneva.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. And therefore I am sure the gentleman agrees with me in commending the subcommittee for putting in this bill language which the Congress has passed, in substance, twice before, to tell the world that those who may be playing with the idea that on the one hand they can have the full confidence and support of the United States and on the other hand can embrace the Communist aggressors, with their hands dripping with the blood of American and United Nations soldiers are making a grave mistake. In this bill we shall say once more officially that "it is the sense of Congress that the Communist Chinese government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China." We are saying that to the Kremlin, but more, we are saying that to some of our allies and those still on the fence who have got to play ball with us as we have proved that we want to play ball with them, for a free world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. And will the gentleman from Minnesota not agree with me that if France should ratify the European Defense Community pact before the meeting at Geneva, that we will go there with stronger hands?

Mr. JUDD. Enormously stronger hands.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I want to commend the very distinguished minority whip. I think he has made a very fine and statesmanlike address here this

afternoon, one that transcends party lines, in that he has alerted this Congress to something that may very well happen.

We have made mistakes in the past. We have gotten started on some things that we have not been able always to finish. It is always well to remember that England went into World War II to preserve and to keep the integrity of Poland. And look where Poland is today.

I am very grateful, personally, to the minority whip for having brought this question to the floor and having alerted the Congress to it. We must not permit Red China to be admitted into the United Nations. If we do we will be lost.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the remarks of the gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that I have here in my hand the confidential print. Title I, Department of State Appropriations, 1955, which is usually referred to as the subcommittee print. In this subcommittee print at page 64 President Eisenhower's Bureau of the Budget and the Department of State proposed that the following language be stricken from the bill in the coming fiscal year, to wit, 1955:

SEC. 111. It is the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

I am glad to say that the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations were in unanimous agreement in turning down the request of the President's Bureau of the Budget for the deletion of this language, and instead wrote into the pending bill at page 16:

SEC. 110. It is the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman agree that the State Department appearing before the committee expressed the view that the reason the Bureau of the Budget had requested deletion was the fact that having been passed by the Congress previously it was permanent and existing legislation?

Mr. ROONEY. I believe they did contend that, but I disagreed with their recommendation then and I disagree with it now. The American people, through their representatives here in this Chamber, cannot make it too clear that at every opportunity we must vigorously adhere to the policy that Red China must not be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

Mr. BOW. I agreed definitely with the gentleman in voting for this provision.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman certainly did, and I commend the gentleman and every member of the committee for their unanimous stand with regard to it.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think it should also be pointed out that within a few days ago two top men of the State Department appeared before a congressional committee to point out that fifteen or more million innocent people have been liquidated since the Reds took over in China. I think the fact that this information is brought out at this time indicates the position of the State Department to be definitely opposed to the admission of Red China.

Mr. ROONEY. I do hope they sincerely are. I say to the gentleman that every Member of this body hopes that Secretary of State Dulles and the State Department are going to stick to their guns in regard to this particular matter. And I also hope that all the talk about Secretary Dulles' Berlin Conference being a forerunner to admission of Red China into the United Nations is untrue and that the people of the State Department mean what they say. So there shall be no misunderstanding as to what we have to say. We have inserted section 110 in the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested, in view of the fact that it is desirable to finish this bill tonight, that we consider the balance of the bill as read and open to amendment. Would the gentleman from Ohio make that request?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I want to protect the gentlewoman from Missouri, who has an amendment. I know the Chair will see that she is recognized.

Mr. TABER. I am sure the Chair will see that everyone who desires is recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.)

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against the bill?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman. On page 49, lines 11 to 14, I make a point of order against that language.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman explain his point of order?

Mr. ROONEY. This would make available into another fiscal year funds appropriated in the current year. There is no authority in law for this.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks this is legislation on an appropriation bill. Therefore, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in title IV, page 45, lines 11 and 12, "Without regard to the civil-service and classification laws," on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, this is the exact language of the authorizing statute, Title 22, United States Code, section 1471.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If there is a statute authorizing this, I fail to understand why you would attempt to write such law into an appropriation bill. It seems quite unusual.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I think we found that under the Smith-Mundt Act there is a provision that this is proper language if carried in an appropriation bill. The Smith-Mundt Act provides for it. That is the legislative authority for it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair like to hear the paragraph authorizing this?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. TABER. This is from United States Code, section 1471:

In carrying out the purpose of this chapter, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him—* * * (5) to employ, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, when such employment is provided for by the appropriation act, (i) persons on a temporary basis, and (ii) aliens within the United States, but such employment of aliens shall be limited to services related to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available (62 Stat. 12).

This provision is entirely subject to the authority that was provided in the act.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, if he maintains that we already have such authority written into the law, then it should not be necessary to have it in the appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. But the authority is given to us when such employment is provided for by the appropriation act, and we have to refer to just those things that we are authorized to do in order to accomplish the purpose.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I still think if there is permanent law on the statute book which provides expenditure of funds without consideration for the civil-service laws, rules and regulations, if there is law on the statute books that authorizes expenditure of funds for the purposes set forth in this section of the bill, it should not be necessary to rewrite it in an appropriation bill. I still feel it is not necessary to write it in this bill, if authorized under permanent law.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I believe the distinguished gentleman from Kansas and I are in agreement with regard to what he is trying to do under the point of order he has raised. However, I reluctantly admit that I think the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations [Mr. TABER] is correct in the position that he has taken, and that is that this language is not subject to a point of order. I would suggest that an amendment be offered to strike out this language which has been objected to, as I understand, by the American Legion in a letter to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. If the gentleman will do that, I am sure many of us will go along with him in his attempt to do the right thing with regard to our veterans and civil-service employees.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Might I point out that the point of order raised by the gentleman from Kansas against that language would reach that objective, would it not? However, if the Chair overrules the point of order, it is expected such amendment will be offered.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to a distinguished member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. GROSS. Under the law cited by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, there were limitations but there are no limitations here.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There is no limitation. The only limitation here would be the amount of money to be expended under the provision of this section of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. The duties of such employees would be exempt?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

The Chair has listened to the reading of the statute by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and followed it in the United States Code, and finds that what the gentleman has read is correct. The Chair is also of the opinion that the statute requires a repetition in the particular appropriation act where they wish to apply it. That is exactly what has been done here, and for that reason the Chair overrules the point of order.

Are there any further points of order?

Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVENGER: On page 30, line 8, strike out "$23,000,000" and insert "$40,000,000."

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, we have discussed this at length in the present bill and several times before, I think. There is nothing new to add. This is a fund for the operation of this board for a period up to March next year when we can take it up again.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the situation is simply this. The committee unanimously one day, I believe it was a couple of weeks ago, agreed upon the amount of $23 million for these subsidy moneys. We were in unanimous agreement.

Now these subsidy moneys have nothing to do with the cost of carrying the mail insofar as cost to the taxpayer is concerned. Payments for mail pay are in the Treasury-Post Office bill. These are purely subsidy moneys for the airlines. The subcommittee reported the $23 million figure to the full committee which met on last Thursday. Not a word of objection was made with regard to this, although there was considerable discussion in the full committee. The full committee approved the subcommittee action and reported the bill to the House with the $23 million figure. Lo and behold, a very unusual situation arose. Another meeting was called on Monday afternoon at 2 o'clock, 4 days later. I inquired what the purpose of the meeting was when I got there and was informed it was to get some additional facts on subsidies. Actually what happened at that meeting was a vote by all the majority members to add $17 million to this subsidy bill, with the result that they would have the $23 million the committee had already allowed, plus the $17 million that they added to the bill that afternoon, plus about $8 million, which is the estimated carryover at the end of this fiscal year. In other words, the majority now wants to give the airlines $48 million in subsidy money, mostly for the big airlines. And strangely, the full committee has never met to consider or vote upon this increase of $17 million.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the committee give any consideration to this $17 million? Did they discuss that?

Mr. ROONEY. No. The subcommittee on last Monday afternoon, during the time of the unfortunate incident in the House, agreed—and when I say "the committee agreed," I mean the Republican members of the committee agreed to offer an amendment on the floor, such as is now being offered, to add $17 million to the bill for these subsidies.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why?

Mr. ROONEY. Perhaps they are afraid that the big airlines will not get their subsidy checks on time. That is about the situation, as far as I can see it. They are worried that this flow of $6 million in subsidy a month to the airlines, which have not been examined for years—and the affiliates and subsidiaries have never been really examined—might be delayed. They want to keep these checks going.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman just stated that the present rate of payment to all airlines taken together is $6 million a month. If $23 million, plus $8 million, which makes $31 million, is the amount appropriated in this bill out of $80 million requested for the full fiscal year——

Mr. ROONEY. The amount of the budget estimate was $73 million.

Mr. COUDERT. All right; $73 million. Is it not a fact that the $31 million will run out at the end of the month of November, and the airlines which need subsidies, legitimately and properly, will be without funds and will fold up because there will be no Congress in session and no opportunity to consider any supplemental bill? Is that not the fact?

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the gentleman feel that delay and full examination might save some money for the taxpayers?

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman knows this is not a matter of saving. This is a matter of postponement or temporarily carrying on until determination is made of the relative merits.

Mr. ROONEY. I see the gentleman probably agrees with what I said at the outset this afternoon when I mentioned $135 million of alleged savings not being savings at all.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen will proceed in order.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman said the committee met. Is the gentleman speaking of the full committee or the subcommittee?

Mr. ROONEY. I am speaking of the subcommittee, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. There were seven members present, and at that time and against my stated objection the majority members decided to give them $17 million more for these subsidies. I take the position that we might well delay this at this time. Some subsidy will have to be paid, but let us look it over first.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the House is in danger of being misled on this matter. We are not talking about saving money at this time. There is not any question of saving directly involved in this amendment, which provides only about one-half of the total sum requested. CAB came in and requested $73 million of new money as its estimates of funds required to pay all the subsidies for the entire fiscal year with the $8 million carryover. The day we met to mark up the bill the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], came in with a copy of a Supreme Court decision with which the other members of the committee were not then familiar. It had been handed down not more than 4 or 5 days before the markup.

Under that decision it appeared obvious that CAB would be required to reestimate on a different basis some of the many subsidized lines' requirements. The committee was in no position at that time, nor was, I suppose, the CAB to determine which lines would have to be reestimated; and, of course, no one

could anticipate what the result of such re-estimation would be either by way of increasing or decreasing the amount. We all hoped that savings would be the result. So the committee did the only thing it could do: It took arbitrary action, and the arbitrary action it took was to strike out all of the foreign line subsidy payments, because the Supreme Court decision dealt only with lines that had foreign operations as well as domestic.

That left $23 million, without a dime for the American foreign carriers, with a carryover from the current year of $8 million, or a total of $31 million. This would only carry the whole subsidy operation through October at present rate of subsidy payments.

Then the attention of the committee was called by the CAB to this obvious fact, that it would mean closing down completely the subsidies of many lines that would not be affected by the decision; so the obvious thing for the committee to do was to sit down with the CAB and say: "Well, what is the story? How much do you need of the requested $73 million total to carry you along on the present temporary basis until you are able first to reappraise, reestimate requirements under the new Supreme Court decision, to complete determination of the pending rate cases involving all of the foreign airlines and some others, I think, since 1946, so that you will be in a position to come to us again with a supplementary request putting all of these lines on a permanent basis, and giving us an opportunity to examine and scrutinize with the greatest care all of the items?"

The answer was that it would take $40 million. So the matter of savings is not the issue at this time, Mr. Chairman; it is a matter of postponing final determination because of reasons beyond our control. We are giving half of what they request in order that there may be a reappraisal, in order that the CAB and the committee itself may have time to determine final figures whatever they may be.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. Certainly I will yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say that I have never heard the gentleman plead so earnestly for $17 million of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. COUDERT. I think the gentleman's remark is unfair. He knows it is unfair, but if it amuses him, why, that is all right with me.

The fact of the matter is that this $17 million is certainly going to be paid anyway; no matter what we do we can hardly expect to reduce the subsidies below $40 million for next year, without disastrous results to American airlines, domestic and foreign. After all, $40 million is only half of the estimated requirements for 1955.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Regardless of what may be determined the full committee put $23 million in this bill for the domestic carriers, the domestic feeder carriers; and it was so considered, I presume.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman means, of course, that the full committee approved the form in which it came from the subcommittee; precisely.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Approved $23 million for the domestic carriers and it should not be considered now that that sum was only a part of the domestic carriers.

Mr. COUDERT. Let me make another observation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] who is smiling there across the room, about that $17 million. How about the $1 billion-odd that was spent for subsidies under Democratic administrations during part of which time the gentleman was chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman should know that together with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], for years I have been interested in this very subject and that this is the first time we have ever had these subsidies before our subcommittee. I have been an advocate for separation of airmail pay from subsidy money for years. Further, these outright subsidies reached an all-time high this year under Mr. Eisenhower.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is, that these payments of subsidy are not something that the Committee on Appropriations is to decide. They are in the law as an obligation upon the Congress to pay. They are in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and have been there ever since that act was passed, as all the gentlemen on my committee certainly know, and as all the Members of the House should know, including the members of the Appropriations Committee.

The Civil Aeronautics Board is obligated to pay the amounts necessary to make up the difference between the cost of operation under economic and efficient management and their requirements.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HINSHAW was given permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, under the aegis of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of which I have the honor to be a member, the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 was passed. It was passed for the purpose of encouraging civil aviation in the United States. If we are to have an airlift that is worth a dime, we either have to buy the planes and hold them in the Military Establishment, staff them and all of that sort of thing, and keep them ready for an airlift to Korea or to Berlin or to any other place that the world situation may demand—but that is a very uneconomical thing. We have determined to have such planes available and in commerce, to have required number of planes engaged in commerce, at the service of the people of the United States in the meantime, which is a very economical means of maintaining an airlift. I can think of no better means. It is parallel exactly to that of the merchant fleet. Now, we have provided that if the airlines require support in order to get along—and such are principally the small airlines, those in the hinterland, if you please—then we have authorized and directed the Civil Aeronautics Board, in line with Reorganization Plan No. 10, to pay that amount of money that is necessary to sustain them, directly to the airlines.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do I understand that we either adopt this amendment or they can go to the Court of Claims and get it anyway?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is the use of sending them to the Court of Claims, then?

Mr. HINSHAW. There is no use at all. It is, furthermore, a very bad thing to the airlines because it stops them from obtaining financing, selling their bonds, and so forth, with which to buy the equipment which is so necessary to the airlift of the United States. If they are going to buy the equipment and put up the dollars, that is wonderful, but if Congress has to buy the equipment and put up the dollars, that is not good, is it? The system we have established under the Civil Aeronautics Act is the most economical way to organize and maintain an airlift in the United States, and we have taken that position.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Does the gentleman not think it would be to the advantage financially of these airlines to permit the matter to go to the Court of Claims because, after all, they would be entitled to interest at 6 percent?

Mr. HINSHAW. That might be, but in the meantime they would not have money enough to operate.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. It would take more than 6 percent to pay the lawyers.

Mr. HINSHAW. Oh, yes. The gentleman from California correctly calls attention to the fact that the lawyer's fee would indeed be more than 6 percent. That would be most uneconomical from either the Government or the airline viewpoint.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, the reservation of 5 minutes to the committee is not in order, and I make that point of order.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment

and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that in the Post Office appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1955 reported by our Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee and subsequently passed by the House, H. R. 7893, $60,223,000 was included for service airmail payments. That is a payment to the airlines for the services they render in transporting the mail. This sum therefore takes care of all payments determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board to represent compensation for actual flying of the mails.

Referring to page 29 of the hearings of our Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee it might be noted that the Postmaster General believes that the $60 million of service airmail pay still contains some subsidy.

The Postmaster General intends getting the remaining subsidies as quickly as possible out of his budget. Meanwhile, some of the subsidies have already been separated and made part of the Civil Aeronautics Board appropriation instead of the Post Office appropriation and it is up to the House to determine the size of these subsidies.

As I have already noted the $60 million in service airmail pay has been voted by the House and these service airmail rates were figured on a generous basis by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

In addition to that $60 million, you have in this bill the sum of $23 million, plus $7 million left over which is reappropriated, making a total of $30 million. That makes an overall total of payments and subsidies to the airlines for this year of $90 million.

With regard to the granting of subsidies over and above the service air mail pay, the Supreme Court in two decisions by 9 to 0 votes on February 1, 1954, overruled the Civil Aeronautics Board in favor of the Postmaster General in the cases of Summerfield against CAB where the Postmaster General had protested against the granting of excessive air mail subsidies.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the Postmaster General has already filed briefs in other cases similar to the two test cases decided by the Supreme Court which are mentioned on page 14 of the committee report, and that the amounts of money involved in these cases approximate $35 million.

For example, Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand the brief filed by the Postmaster General July 3, 1953, in CAB Docket No. 1706, being the Trans-Atlantic Mail Rate case, in which the Postmaster General protests that excess earnings of $5,015,000 in Pan American's Pacific and Alaska divisions should be used to offset the proposed subsidies in Pan American's Atlantic division. The Postmaster General's protest is well documented in a 14-page legal brief with three statistical exhibits.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to note that the Postmaster General has several other briefs outstanding, which involve, in summary the following amounts of money:

Delta (already decided by Supreme Court)	$654,000
Western (already decided by Supreme Court)	350,000
Pan American-Atlantic (Postmaster General's brief of July 3, 1953, in CAB Docket No. 1706)	5,015,000
TWA-International (Postmaster General's brief of July 3, 1953, in CAB Docket No. 1706)	12,158,000
United (Hawaii) (Post office rebuttal exhibit No. 1 in CAB Docket No. 2913)	15,857,000
Braniff (Post Office brief of Oct. 27, 1953, in CAB Docket No. 5142)	1,000,000
Total	35,034,000

The arguments of the Postmaster General in these cases I have just cited seem to be substantially the same as those which were supported by the Supreme Court in the cases cited on page 14 of House Report No. 1242.

It is quite possible also, Mr. Chairman, that, encouraged by the unanimity of the Supreme Court's decisions in opposition to CAB, the Postmaster General or other intervenors may file protests in other cases.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me to be ill-advised at this time for this House to appropriate subsidies in excess of the $30,000,000 originally recommended by the committee.

It seems to me that before we increase those amounts we should at least wait until some of this litigation is over which is now pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question. I want to see if we are agreed on this particular problem. The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] asked the question here about an hour ago, if there were sufficient funds in this bill to take care of all of the small feeder lines. The answer, as I understood it, was "yes." Is that right, may I ask the gentleman from New York?

Mr. COUDERT. That is the understanding of the committee and the assurance of the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, that $40 million would carry them on the present basis of operation until the 1st of March.

Mr. SPRINGER. When was this supplemental $17 million decided on?

Mr. COUDERT. I think it was Monday.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understood in talking with one member of the Civil Aeronautics Board over this last weekend that you were short about $3,500,000 for these small feeder airlines. It should be a figure of about $26 million or $26 million-plus instead of $23 million as set out in the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. COUDERT. That I do not know. All I know is that the $40 million figure the Civil Aeronautics Board Chairman and his associates declared would carry through the subsidized lines on the present basis until March.

Mr. SPRINGER. This does not include any overseas, then?

Mr. COUDERT. It includes all the lines, overseas, domestic, and local. It maintains the status quo.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The fact remains from that action of the committee that the $40 million will provide the necessary subsidy until March 1, 1955. Anything after that it is estimated will have to be provided for following March 1.

Mr. COUDERT. That is correct.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in 1952 the CAB permitted two large carriers to suspend international service from the city of Philadelphia, thus depriving the Nation's third largest population area of such service. Substantially, the reason given was to the effect that continuation of the special service to Philadelphia would require approximately $40,000 in subsidy, and on this ground it suspended the international service from Philadelphia.

Actually this explanation of this matter is beside the point. The fact is that the certificated carriers found that it was a nuisance to fly to Philadelphia to pick up passengers. Rather than inconvenience these carriers, the public service to Philadelphia has been curtailed. I am not one who seeks to encourage greater subsidies. An agency which, under the statutes, has been handing out hundreds of millions of dollars should not permit the deprivation of the Nation's third largest city of needed international service at the slight cost of $40,000.

The convenience of the carriers certainly should not be permitted to weigh more heavily than the public convenience and necessity.

Lack of adequate air service is not unique to Philadelphia. I understand that such cities as Dallas are up in arms over the fact that they cannot get the kind of service which they would like. My city of Philadelphia rightly feels that concern for public convenience and necessity of its air passengers should be maintained as national policy superior to the mere convenience of the airline carriers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I realize that in 2½ minutes it is utterly impossible to state a case in connection with this amendment. But I would like to present this thought. As I understand it, this amendment, if adopted, would carry at the same rate as the current fiscal year until March 1, 1955. I do not say this in criticism of the subcommittee, but I do feel very strongly that this matter ought to be clearly identified as a subsidy, which should be justified before

the subcommittee, the full committee, and the Congress, and that the full facts should be brought out as soon as possible. It started with the President's reorganization plan in June, which became effective, as I understand it, in October. I do not know of any reason why, when we are now taking the first legislative step, when the bill has to pass the other body and go to conference, why our subcommittee cannot insist on the CAB coming here with a much better record than they did present. I compliment the members of the committee for the exhaustive hearings that they held on this whole puzzling and difficult problem of subsidies. But I do not believe we would be wise this afternoon in taking an additional figure of $17 million. That is still a great deal of money. I do not believe we would be wise in saying to the CAB or to the airlines you do not have to do anything to reduce the cost of the subsidies. There is evidence in the hearings that over half a million dollars was saved since the plan went into operation. It is worth while to try to save, it seems to me, a million or $2 million or whatever the amount may be. There is a great deal of talk about these subsidies, and until the CAB understands that the committee means business I do not believe that they are going to bother to change the situation much or to exert themselves greatly. I am not referring to the members of the Board necessarily. But my experience with some of the staff during the consideration of basic legislation in this field does not give me much confidence that they entertain any enthusiasm for doing the work that must be done if a true and effective separation is to be brought about.

I want now to deal in the following extension with another phase of the problem of effective separation of service-mail pay and subsidies.

I know that there are some who do not approve of any interference with the subsidy program. But I believe that a great majority of the House does approve of the President's efforts through Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1953 to this end.

When he submitted his message with the plan on June 1, 1953, he said, "At the same time, the immediate transfer of subsidy payment under this reorganization plan should not preclude the consideration by the Congress of legislation to effect refinements and modifications in the basic law in this field. One such change, for example, would be an amendment of the Civil Aeronautics Act to provide specifically that compensatory rates for mail transportation should be based upon the cost of rendering mail service, plus a fair return. I understand that the Civil Aeronautics Board has been following this general policy in those cases where it has established compensatory mail rates. The reorganization plan will not affect its right to continue applying such a policy in the future. However, I believe it would be appropriate to establish the cost principle as a matter of definite legislative policy."

I am concerned that support of this amendment may well be interpreted as opposition to effective separation and that those who are led to support of the committee amendment by the belief that it is a step in a direction of effective separation may be confronted with sharp criticism before we have another chance to reexamine the facts should the committee amendment prevail.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported favorably basic legislation in this field in the 81st Congress. A quotation from the committee report, which is pertinent to the problem before us, follows:

THE COST STANDARD

(Committee report of 81st Cong.)

This bill accomplishes the separation of subsidy from mail pay by amending subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 406 of the Civil Aeronautics Act so that subsections (a) and (b) deal solely with the fixing of fair and reasonable rates for the transportation of mail, and subsection (c) deals solely with subsidy for essential aircraft operation. Paragraph (2) of the amended subsection (a) provides that the fair and reasonable rates "* * * shall not exceed the necessary cost to the air carrier, under honest, economical, and efficient mangement, or the mail transportation services actually rendered or such services to be rendered * * * plus a fair and reasonable return."

The committee feels that this provision is called for by reason of the present ratemaking provision of the Civil Aeronautics Act under which compensation for the transportation of mail, and subsidy for the development of a sound air transportation system, have been lumped over a period of 12 years. The committee deems this provision necessary to inaure as completely as the present state of the science of accounting will permit the clear separation of the subsidy element from mail pay. Unless this is done, and done well, there is serious danger that, no matter how clearly we state that we want the subsidy element separated, it will still remain in substantial part in the compensation for the transportation of mail. This provision is fair and just to the carriers and the Government alike. Section 405 (g) of the Civil Aeronautics Act imposes a duty upon carriers certificated for the carriage of mail to carry mail tendered them by the Postmaster General. It also requires the Postmaster General to tender mail "to the extent required by the postal service." Thus, there are obligations on both sides. Considering the fact that public utilities are entitled only to a fair and reasonable return on their investments devoted to the public service, there is no occasion for air carriers to object if they receive no more than their costs, plus a fair and reasonable return, for transporting mail, and, on the other hand, the Government cannot reasonably object to making payment in that amount for the service it receives.

A portion of the minority's report, submitted July 2, 1952, is also pertinent and follows:

This cost standard, which is totally absent from the bill reported by the majority, is essential to protect the Post Office and the taxpayers from continuing to be overcharged by the airlines for carriage of the mail.

Subsequent to the committee report of the 81st Congress, the former Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, former President Hoover, wrote that "The most practical and accurate way to separate these two types of payments is to base the determination of the mail pay upon what it costs the carriers to furnish mail carriage services to the post office. * * * That type of standard will make it possible for the taxpayers and the Congress to have accurate information. In order for the reform to be effective, it is not equitable to exempt any mail carriers, foreign or domestic. The reform should apply equally to all."

Former President Hoover's subsequent letter reaffirms the sound principle of the committee report of 1950.

President Truman has twice more indicated his conviction that mail pay should mean compensation for the "cost" of carrying airmail and this same standard has been specifically endorsed at the committee hearings in the 82d Congress by the Budget Bureau, Post Office Department, and Civil Aeronautics Board.

We urge that without the cost standard there would be no definite dividing line between what constitutes mail pay, on the one hand, and what constitutes subsidy, on the other hand. Such a dividing line is essential to separation.

Related to this important legislative proposal and directly connected with the establishment of a sound cost standard is the problem of standards for allocating receipts and expenditures. In that connection, I want to cite other excerpts from the two reports to which I have referred:

STANDARDS FOR ALLOCATING RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES

(Committee report of 81st Cong.)

Closely related to the problem of the cost standard discussed above is the amendment to existing law, made by section 3 of the bill, which directs the Civil Aeronautics Board, on or before July 1, 1951, to prescribe standards by which air carriers, in keeping their accounts, records, and memoranda, shall allocate receipts and expenditures among four classes of service (passenger, freight, express, and mail). In fact, the provisions which relate to the cost standard (par. (2) of the amended sec. 406 (a)) expressly provide that the cost of the mail transportation services rendered by an air carrier is to be computed in accordance with the standards so prescribed by the Board.

It is, of course, impossible to arrive at the cost of one service rendered by an air carrier, such as its mail service, without arriving at the cost of the other services it renders. Furthermore, while it is true that the final determination of the cost to any carrier of rendering mail services will have to be made in the proceeding for the fixing of the mail rate for such carrier, the making of such determination will be greatly facilitated if the carrier or carriers concerned in the proceeding have been keeping their accounts, records, and memoranda in accordance with the general principles of cost allocation which, as required by paragraph (2) of the amended section 406 (a), will be used in the proceeding. Nor is the value of requiring adherence to these general principles limited to the field of air-mail pay. It will be helpful, for example, in determining the economic soundness of a particular service, in determining the amount of subsidy needed to maintain a particular service, and for ascertaining the rates which should be charged to the public for any nonmail transportation service.

[From the minority report of July 2, 1952]

If the cost of mail services rendered is accepted as the proper standard for mail pay in the future, as it is by the great preponderance of opinion in the executive branch, among other congressional committees, and among the public, then it is essential to provide a means of getting at the cost figures.

The Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Regulatory Commission stated:

"The mail rates should no longer include any need for subsidy element, but should be based on the service rendered. They

should reflect a fair allocation of costs between mail, passenger, and freight services."

H. R. 508 requires such allocation of costs to be made by the airlines under standards prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Board, as the House committee bill of the 81st Congress did. The only subsequent change has been in deference to the request of the Civil Aeronautics Board not to be confined to the four specified categories of airline traffic, viz, passengers and baggage, freight, express, and mail, as previously specified in H. R. 9184.

Therefore, H. R. 508 simply requires that the airlines should allocate costs "among the air transportation services rendered by them." Thus it is left to the discretion of the Civil Aeronautics Board how many categories there should be.

This change, which was in the direction of compromise or concession, has been known as the Brown amendment, offered December 7, 1950. In telegrams of December 11, 1950, to the gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. HESELTON], Dr. Robert L. Johnson, the chairman of the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, stated:

"In the message to Congressman CLARENCE BROWN we have defined what we believe to be the three essentials which any effective measure must contain and have pointed out that the proposed changes so far as they safely may in the direction of compromise without weakening or negating the aims of the bill as a whole. Mr. BROWN's recommendation on cost allocation represents absolute bare minimum, and we recommend keeping this provision as strong as possible." (House committee hearings, 82d Cong., pp. 397–398.)

I believe it is clear now that both the CAB and the Appropriations Subcommittee have been handicapped seriously in arriving at any judgment as to the soundness of recommendations as to proper subsidies by the lack of any legislative sanction of a cost standard and of standards for allocating receipts and expenditures. Further, I believe there is every probability that this was true as to the efforts of the Post Office Department and the subcommittee dealing with the Post Office appropriations bill insofar as service pay was concerned. I am confident that if the members of those two committees believe their efforts in this field would be strengthened by such legislation it would be a matter of great interest to the members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has jurisdiction in this field.

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. COUDERT was granted to Mr. Bow.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am anxious to hear the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], who I am sure will put up quite a justification for this $17 million.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield his time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be granted to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] for 6 minutes to close debate.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from New York in yielding his time. I shall not take all the time I have. I simply want to try to make it crystal clear what this committee has done in the increase of $17 million. I heard the gentleman from New York speak many times of his great concern for small business and small groups. The purpose of this $17 million increase is to protect small business and small airlines and keep them from going into bankruptcy. I think that is very clear. Ninety-eight percent of the mail is being carried domestically now without any subsidy in this country. So we are getting away from subsidies with the domestic airlines. Ninety-eight percent is subsidy free. It is the small feeder lines that would be affected if we did not have sufficient money to take care of them. What is the formula? The formula is this: We are spending $6 million a month in subsidies every day to take care of all lines. That $6 million for 8 months is $48 million; with a carryover of $8 million, and the $40 million provided in this bill, that will take the airlines until March, and nobody is going to be hurt. The reason this happens is the fact that after we had considered the CAB request in the subcommittee the Supreme Court came out with a decision which reversed an order of the CAB and held that they had not been properly determining the payments to some of the international lines. That made our subcommittee feel that we should take an additional look to determine whether these subsidies are right or wrong. If we remain where we are with $23 million, I say to the committee you would have closed airlines in this country. Their financing would be cut off and you would have chaos.

Now what is the situation? We have a reserve fleet for the military of this country today, built up by reason of the airline subsidy, to the value of approximately $350 million, that is available to us on almost instant notice if we need them. Three days after the invasion of South Korea, the certificated scheduled airlines provided forty 4-engine airplanes to meet the Communist threat.

During the first 4 months of the Korean airlift, the certificated scheduled airlines made 586 crossings, or 5 a day, between the United States and Tokyo with personnel, munitions, bazookas, serums, plasma, and other vital supplies and materiel.

During the Korean war, the certificated scheduled airlines flew across the Pacific to Korea at the rate of more than 22,189,000 ton-miles a month.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it not true that if the $23 million is left in the bill as the committee first reported it, these lines would not be affected for a period of 3 months?

Mr. BOW. That is right.

Mr. HESELTON. It was my thought that in that 3 months we might have a clarification of this situation.

Mr. BOW. My worry about that is the fact that Congress may not be here and may not be in a position to bring the money to take care of these people. We can do it now and we will not have bankruptcy.

Mr. HESELTON. Does not the gentleman think we will be here until July anyway?

Mr. BOW. I am afraid we will be here longer than that, but we ought to be safe and protect these airlines.

I urge the Committee to adopt this committee amendment and keep our great air fleet going.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that the committee action provides $40 million, plus any carryover, which is seven or eight million, and is it not a fact that that is in one lump sum to take care of any subsidy requirements for all airlines, whether domestic or overseas?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Then there is no division as to the use of this fund, as between domestic and international carriers?

Mr. BOW. There is no division in this bill, and in the bill that is now before us, with the $23 million there is no division. It is just the same. So we take care of them, $6 million every month, payment to both international carriers and domestic trunklines. I think, Mr. Chairman, the committee would be interested in the fact that airlines do pay their way. Here are facts.

In 1952, the certificated scheduled airlines paid their way. They paid more than twice as much into the Federal Treasury as they received.

The certificated scheduled airlines created postage revenues for the Post Office Department of $152,634,211.

The certificated scheduled airlines accounted for transportation-excise taxes of $97,425,891.

The certificated scheduled airlines paid Federal income taxes of $69,731,274.

The certificated scheduled airlines paid Federal gas and oil taxes of $12,699,219.

The certificated scheduled airlines paid miscellaneous excise taxes of $1,638,648.

The certificated scheduled airlines were responsible for a total Federal revenue of $334,129,249.

The airlines received from the Federal Government $115,215,000, mail payments, of which $44,656,000 was for services rendered and $70,559,000 was subsidy. Certificated airlines' share of maintaining and operating Federal Airways System in 1952, $11,500,000. Total, $126,715,000.

On balance, net to the Federal Government in 1952, $207,414,249.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has expired.

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 86, noes 40.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to announce that the Committee will rise after I have finished this statement and further consideration of this measure will go over until tomorrow. Under an arrangement previously entered into, it is understood there will be no record vote tomorrow; that we will conclude the reading of the bill for amendment and the amendment stage tomorrow. If there are no requests for a record vote, then we can conclude action on the bill, but should a situation develop that requires a record vote that will go over until Friday.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I should say to the gentleman from Indiana, the distinguished majority leader, that I intend to ask for a separate vote and a rollcall on the subsidy amendment just adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HALLECK. That would indicate that there may be a record vote. The gentleman, I assume, would have no objection to that vote going over until Friday.

Mr. ROONEY. I would have no such objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Further than that, Mr. Chairman, following the conclusion of the pending appropriation bill we will call up the Kersten resolution; then, if we have time, we will take up the bill from the Committee on the Armed Services and one from the Committee on Agriculture and proceed with it as far as we can get with the idea of completing them on Friday, if necessary, and also acting Friday on additional capital for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE COMPETITIVE BIDDING RULE UNDER THE PUBLIC UTILITY HOLDING COMPANY ACT

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Securities and Exchange Commission, under the leadership of its new Chairman, Ralph H. Demmler, has proposed a change in the competitive bidding rule, which, if adopted, would undermine a very significant reform in the financial and securities markets that has taken many, many years of hard work and effort to achieve.

The Commission has proposed to modify its competitive bidding rule U-50 under the Public Utility Holding Act, so as to provide an exception from the requirement of competitive bidding with respect to security issues of utility subsidiaries of holding companies where such issues are expressly authorized by the regulatory commission of the State in which the issuer is incorporated and does business.

If the proposed rule is finally adopted, this country will have taken a long step backward in the direction of the loose financial and ethical practices which prevailed in the business and financial community during the roaring 1920's. These sharp practices undermined the integrity of our capital markets, destroyed investor confidence, and led business and industry to the brink of national disaster.

Incredible as this proposal may seem, it becomes more difficult to understand when we are advised by Chairman Demmler that there has been no request from anyone for a change in the rule. He stated publicly on February 18:

> I want to state on behalf of myself and my fellow Commissioners that the proposal was developed wholly within the Commission and in consultation with its staff without any suggestion from anyone outside the Commission and without the prior knowledge of anyone outside the Commission.

If the giant utilities and financial institutions who have been subject to this rule since 1941 and are directly affected by it have not complained about it, why propose a change? Is this another payoff by the Eisenhower administration to super big business?

The fact of the matter is that this rule has been functioning very well indeed. Year after year, until the new administration took over, the Securities and Exchange Commission had reported to the Congress that the competitive bidding rule was very effective in maintaining competition in the marketing of securities and enabling the public utilities to obtain capital at a minimum cost, with a resulting saving to consumers. Here is what the 18th annual report of the Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, had to say:

> The experience gained in the 11 years of administration of rule U-50 has adequately demonstrated its workability and effectiveness in maintaining competitive conditions in the marketing of securities and in achieving minimum costs in the procurement of capital. However, the Commission has always recognized that flexibility of application was essential and in a number of cases, where unusual circumstances were present, it has granted exemptions by order from the competitive bidding requirements of the rule. During the period of existence of the rule, 201 issues of securities of registered holding companies and their subsidiaries with aggregate proceeds of $1.5 billion have been exempted in this manner. Such sales, of course, do not include the automatic exemptions afforded by the rule.

However, in the 19th annual report, the first to be issued under Republican Chairman Demmler, this significant statement is strangely absent. Why? Have conditions changed so abruptly within the last year that this statement is no longer true? Or was this paragraph omitted in anticipation of this new move to abolish competitive bidding for a significant part of the public utility industry?

According to one estimate presented to the Commission, the effect of the proposed amendment to rule U-50 would be to eliminate effective competitive bidding requirement upon half of the debt financing now subject to the rule. In fiscal year 1953, the volume of debt financing subject to the rule was $394 million. In addition, some $205 million of stock was sold under competitive bidding. No less than 124 utility subsidiaries of holding companies may be affected by this proposal. It is clear, therefore, that the proposed change in the rule could have the effect of changing radically the existing practices in utility financing.

Why was it necessary to have competitive bidding in public utility regulation? In order to answer this question, we have to go back a little in history to the era of preregulation. Congressional investigation in the early 1930's disclosed that public utility holding companies and their subsidiaries were subject to serious and widespread abuses which were not in the public interest, in the interests of investors and consumers. Among these abuses was the almost universal practice of selling utility securities to an underwriting syndicate at a price determined by private negotiation between the issuer and the principal underwriter. It was an established policy of investment bankers not to compete among themselves for security business of any issuer which had a continuing investment banking relationship with a particular firm. This development of traditional banker relationships with which other bankers were reluctant to interfere led to the suppression of competition in the underwriting of utility securities. Similarly, with few exceptions, the issuer made no attempt to seek competitive bids or to shop around for better terms than those offered by its customary banker. Also, there were transactions involving subsidiary public utilities wherein there was an absence of arm's length bargaining, in addition to a lack of free and independent competition.

The Congress recognized that these and other evils, which I shall not go into, must be eradicated for the public welfare, as well as the welfare of investors and consumers. And because of the interstate character of these giant utility systems and the intricate corporate relationships between the parent holding company and the subsidiaries, the Congress concluded that the evils and abuses which were found to exist were completely outside the power of the individual States to handle. Accordingly, the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 was enacted providing for the Federal regulation of public utilities.

Under section 12 (d) of this act, the Securities and Exchange Commission is required to assure the maintenance of competitive conditions in connection with the issuance and sale of securities by registered holding companies and their subsidiaries. The Commission is also required, under sections 6 and 7, to pass upon the reasonableness of fees, commissions and other remuneration paid in connection with the sale of such securities. These are protective features in the act to provide protection to security holders and consumers.

After considerable experimentation, the Commission concluded that there was no procedure short of competitive bidding in the issuance and sale of securities that gave promise of achieving arm's length bargaining, determining the reasonableness of spreads, fairness of price, and obtaining disinterested advice in financial matters to the utility companies concerned. To accomplish these objectives, the Commission adopted Rule U-50 on April 7, 1941.

The Commission has acknowledged in several annual reports to the Congress that this rule has been very effective. I have quoted from the 18th annual report to this effect. I should also like to quote from a speech delivered by Commissioner Richard B. McEntire, one of the ablest men ever to have served on the Securities and Exchange Commission. Speaking before the Industrial College of the Armed Forces on March 8, 1951, Mr. McEntire stated in part:

We believe that minimum costs (in the sale of securities) can best be obtained through full competition between security buyers in the best American tradition. * * * The direct negotiation between an issuer and either the investment banker or the institutional investor does not afford this result. We are convinced that sale of securities through competitive bidding is the best answer. The merits of this procedure are also recognized by the Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Power Commission, and 15 State regulatory agencies.

* * * It (competive bidding) has achieved a lowering in the cost of security flotations and through diversification of underwriting management has done much to eliminate the detrimental influence of preferential relationships between particular investment banking houses and public utility companies.

I should also like to quote a statement on competitive bidding made by the able former Chairman of the Commission, Donald C. Cook. This statement appears in the testimony he gave before the Securities and Exchange Commission Subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee, of which I had the honor of serving as chairman in the 82d Congress. Here is what Mr. Cook said:

COMPETITIVE BIDDING

(Excerpt from testimony of Hon. Donald C. Cook, former Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, before the SEC Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, January 11, 1952)

Public utility companies owe a duty to the public to obtain their capital at the lowest cost consistent with a sound financial structure. Since the industry requires a large investment in plant and equipment, the cost of capital is an important element of expense and therefore of utility rates. One of the evils found by Congress to exist in the industry was the absence of arm's length bargaining in the sale of securities and utility assets. This situation arose in large measure from the existence of traditional banker relationships between certain large investment bankers and particular holding-company systems, which gave these bankers virtual monopoly over the financing of the system companies, permitting the charging of exorbitant underwriting fees. The Commission is required by section 12 (d) of the act to assure the maintenance of competitive conditions in the sales of securities or utility assets.

After experimenting with various methods for meeting this congressional directive, with limited success, the Commission in 1941 adopted the competitive bidding rule. This step was taken only after extensive conferences with representatives of both the utility and security industry and after the consideration of numerous alternative proposals. The rule requires, with certain exceptions, that securities sold by registered holding companies or their subsidiaries be pursuant to public invitation of sealed bids. Since its adoption there has been active competition among investment bankers, both in the formation of groups to bid on new issues (usually without relationship to past affiliations) and in the tendering of bids. The insistence upon competition in the sale of securities follows the traditional American pattern of the antitrust laws which aim at preserving fair and open competition. The rule has fostered free enterprise and competition in a field which has long been characterized by concentration in a few firms. Over $6 billion of securities of various classes have been sold pursuant to the competitive bidding rule in the past 10 years.

The Commission, however, has not insisted upon adherence to the rule where special circumstances, either of the issuer or of the market, have made it apparent that a negotiated transaction would be more advantageous and where there was assurance that competitive conditions could be maintained. Almost $1,500,000,000 of securities have been sold in transactions exempted from the rule.

The competitive bidding rule is primarily responsible for the noticeable decrease in the cost of flotation over the past decade. Its effect extends beyond the limited number of companies subject to the Commission's jurisdiction, for the prices obtained and the underwriting spread paid by these companies set the standard for all security issuances whether or not subject to the rule. The competitive bidding technique for utility securities is now widely accepted: it is regularly required by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and by 15 State regulatory commissions. It has been employed, moreover, by a number of utility companies under no regulatory compulsion to do so.

Mr. Speaker, these statements contain nothing but praise for the competitive bidding rule.

Advocates of the proposed change in the rule—chiefly investment bankers and utility executives—will say: "We are not trying to destroy competitive bidding. We merely want to turn this matter over to the State regulatory commissions. It is a matter of States rights. There has been entirely too much interference by the Federal Government in local affairs. The State commissions are most familiar with local conditions and the needs of the utilities registered in and serving the State. We want to restore to management the exercise of judgment and responsibility in corporate affairs."

Oh how these giant utilities and big bankers love the iron hand of State regulation.

The fact of the matter is that mere authorization or approval of a security issue by a State regulatory commission is not a substitute for competitive bidding. Only 15 States require competitive bidding. We know that most State commissions are overworked and undermanned. They do not have the broad experience and information for dealing with security matters as the Securities and Exchange Commission possesses. State commissions are not able to withstand the terrific pressures of these giant utilities and banking interests. Only the Federal Government is capable of standing up to them.

Mr. Speaker, let us not cave in to these pressures at this crucial time. Let us not permit the Securities and Exchange Commission to fell with one swoop a key reform of the Roosevelt administration, a reform which both friend and foe will admit has worked exceedingly well in eradicating one of the great evils that beset utility financing before the era of Federal public utility regulation.

DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM FOR VETERANS' HOUSING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] introduced his bill, H. R. 8152, as follows:

H. R. 8152

A bill to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By striking out "June 30, 1954" from clause (C) of section 512 (b) and inserting "June 30, 1055" in lieu thereof.

(2) By striking out "June 30, 1954" from the first sentence of section 513 (a) and inserting "June 30, 1955" in lieu thereof.

(3) By striking out "June 30, 1955" from the third sentence of section 513 (c) and inserting "June 30, 1056" in lieu thereof.

(4) By striking out "June 30, 1954" from the first sentence of section 513 (d) and inserting "June 30, 1955" in lieu thereof.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to authorize not to exceed $100 million additional for the revolving fund for the purpose of making direct home and farmhouse loans to veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, and to extend the authority for operations to June 30, 1955. The present authority expires June 30, 1954. The maximum amount of any loan is unchanged from the previous limit of $10,000.

The original authorization extended from July 19, 1950, to June 30, 1951, and empowered the Administrator to make direct loans up to $150 million—Public Law 475, 81st Congress, approved April 20, 1950. After expiring, at the

end of June 30, 1951, the authority was renewed on September 1, 1951, on a revolving fund basis, limited to $150 million outstanding as of any one time, and extended to June 30, 1953—Public Law 139, 82d Congress. The revolving fund included the unreserved portion of the original $150 million fund allocation, plus the increment from loan repayments, and the proceeds of sales of direct loans to private investors. The revolving fund was augmented in April 1952 by an additional allocation of up to $125 million, to be made available by the Secretary of the Treasury in quarterly installments of $25 million, less the proceeds of direct-loan sales in the preceding quarter—Public Law 325, 82d Congress. Under provisions of Public Law 101, 83d Congress, approved July 1, 1953, the program was continued for 1 year, to June 30, 1954, with up to $100 million added to the revolving fund, to be made available in quarterly installments, and the maximum interest rate on direct loans was raised to conform to the rate on guaranteed loans.

As stated, Public Law 325 of the 82d Congress granted $125 million for use in making such loans, but the $125 million was to be limited to $25 million for each quarter remaining for the life of the program. This bill maintains the same sort of allocation which was carried forward by Public Law 101 of the 83d Congress. In accordance with previous provisions, the sum of $25 million will be decreased by such amount as is received by the Veterans' Administration in the previous quarter from the sale of direct loans. In other words, to the extent that the Veterans' Administration is successful in selling previously made mortgages to private lending institutions in each quarter, the requirements for the funds authorized by this law will be proportionately reduced as to the succeeding quarter. Thus, if sufficient sales were effected in each quarter the additional funds would not be required.

It is important to note, however, that the amount of such sales has been negligible in proportion to the amount of lending done by the Veterans' Administration. As of January 31, 1954, 1,709 loans with a principal amount of $10,890,400, had been sold—less than 4 percent of all direct loans made to date.

Administrative application of the program, which it is assumed will be continued, generally is limited to the designated nonmetropolitan areas of the country, and thus the loans are generally confined to the smaller towns and rural and semirural areas.

It is important to stress that the Veterans' Administration is empowered to make a direct loan only after it is determined that private capital is not available to finance the loan. In practice, under existing law, whenever an eligible veteran makes an application for a direct loan and is found to be basically qualified, he must show that he is unable to obtain a 4½ percent loan from private lending sources in the area. It is only after private sources have proved unavailable that the Veterans' Administration makes the loan in a designated area.

From the beginning of the direct-loan program in July of 1950 to January 31, 1954, a total of 78,269 formal applications for direct loans have been received, of which 27,472 had been withdrawn or denied, 43,198 had resulted in closed and fully disbursed loans, and 7,599 were in process. From the inception of the program, a total of $376,231,400 had become available in the revolving fund for making direct loans. This sum was derived from the following sources:

Original congressional authorization	$150,000,000
Subsequent Treasury advances (8 quarterly advances)	190,867,100
Proceeds of direct-loan sales	10,890,400
Other principal repayments	24,473,900
Total	376,231,400

By the end of January 1954, the total amount of direct loans disbursed was $299,676,000. An additional $53,596,900 had been committed for loans in process, leaving $22,958,500 in uncommitted funds available for making additional direct loans. Between February 1, 1954, and June 30, 1954, it is estimated that about $29,500,000 will become available for making direct loans; $25 million for Treasury advances, and the proceeds from direct-loan sales; $4,500,000 from principal repayments. This sum added to the $22,958,500 in uncommitted funds available for making loans at the end of January 1954, totals about $52,460,000, enough to provide about 7,500 additional loans during the final 5 months of the presently authorized direct-loan program. As of January 31, 1954, there were about 32,000 veterans with loan applications or requests on file, which funds had not been reserved, and in the 57 Veterans' Administration regional offices which have areas designated as eligible for direct loans, as compared with 26,100 at the end of January a year ago.

As of the end of January 1954, a total of 2,289 direct loans had been terminated; 519 by repayment in full; 1,709 by sale; 29 by foreclosure; 32 by voluntary conveyance of title to property. As of the end of January 1954, there were 1,475 direct loans in default, of which 163 were 4 or more installments in default, or four-tenths of 1 percent of the 40,909 direct loans outstanding on that date. Direct-loan sales during recent months have been almost negligible. However, some gradual acceleration is anticipated in the sales of loans made by the Veterans' Administration after July 1, 1953, at the new 4½-percent-interest rate.

The committee is of the opinion that this program is working extremely well, that the default rate of four-tenths of 1 percent is unusually low, and that the entire program is administered in a very conservative manner. So long as these direct loans are made only after private lending sources are shown to be unavailable to make the loans, the committee believes the Government is fully warranted in providing and authorizing such a program.

BAA! BAA! BRANNAN SHEEP ADOPTED BY BENSON—MATTERS OF INTEREST, ILLEGAL, AND OTHERWISE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, let us gather round as the shades of night, I mean shades of campaign knights, fall fast.

The echoes that we hear resounding through the country are not of the campaign oratory. They are the more recent vintage of campaign promises crashing against the mountain of nonperformance.

Remember how a very distinguished candidate, on September 6, 1952, at Kasson, Minn., said, "We can and will find a sound way to do the job without indulging in the moral bankruptcy of the Brannan plan"? More recently we heard this same Brannan plan described by the same person, now our distinguished President, as follows: It "will assure equitable returns to growers and encourage efficient production and marketing. It should require a minimum of governmental interference with both producers and processors, entail a minimum of cost to taxpayers and consumers; and align itself compatibly with overall farm and international trade policies," following which message to the Congress came a press conference on January 11, 1954, with the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, in which Mr. Benson said:

> We think this will cost no more money, probably less money, be much simpler to operate, and will permit our own wool to move into consumption and not into Government storage at very heavy expense for storage and some depreciation and loss.

To be more specific, on that same occasion Mr. Benson also said:

> It is recommended that (1) prices of domestically produced wool be permitted to seek their level in the market, competing with other fibers and with imported wool (and) (2) direct payments be made to domestic producers sufficient when added to the average market price for the season, to raise the average return per pound to 90 percent of parity.

Well, it now looks as though we are going places. Wool is a nonperishable. It does not turn rancid. It can be stored indefinitely. If that principle is good for such a commodity as wool, how much better it must be for the dairy products, and particularly for butter. Butter cannot be stored indefinitely. It is perishable. It will turn rancid. If not used within a reasonable time it must be dumped. The same consumers' tax money, which puts the wool in storage, puts the butter in storage. Shortly now they are going to get the same benefit with reference to butter and other dairy products as Secretary Benson indicates they will get from wool?

Well, Mr. Consumer, I regret to tell you that there must be some kind of a difference. I cannot find the distinction. You are going to continue to pay for the dairy products with your tax money, and continue to pay for them again at higher

prices. The Department of Agriculture will continue its studies and continue its clinics, and continue to get advice from the farmers and the processers, and continue to pat all of them on the back with a "you have got a good plan," and continue to sit by supinely and do nothing about it.

No, I am wrong. The Department will continue to buy more commodities and more warehouse space, and fill the latter with the former while continuing to orate that it will deal "realistically" with the matter and "not just store it away in warehouses where with each tick of the clock the damage of spoilage grows, the cost of storage mounts, and the depressing effect on markets increases." Beautiful words. Let us compare them with practice.

Shortly before the voters decreed a change of administration we had on hand some 11 million pounds of butter. Today the Government has in storage close to 280 million pounds of butter.

It was not so long ago the Committee on Banking and Currency was told by the farmers of the country that the more they produced the lower the prices to the consumer.

Someone has rewritten the law of supply and demand.

While butter was selling at 80 cents a pound to the consumer, Secretary Benson managed to have the Commodity Credit Corporation acquire about 140 million pounds of butter. With the price falling until it dropped to 75 cents a pound and less to the consumer, they have now managed to accumulate close to 280 million pounds. And while all of this is happening we are told that butter has been priced out of the market.

Confronted with that kind of a situation I should think that the Secretary of Agriculture would be ashamed to come before the committee and ask for more money with which to carry on that kind of a practice. Nevertheless, he has done so. Last week he asked that the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation be increased to $8½ billion from $6,750,000,000. An increase of one and three-fourths billion dollars. The bill to accomplish that increase, as introduced, carried an effective date of July 1, 1954. At the request of the Secretary of Agriculture the bill has been amended so that the increase will become effective immediately upon enactment of the bill.

The cotton and tobacco programs which are operated by the Commodity Credit Corporation have been managed successfully with a profit to the Government. Please, will someone tell us what is wrong with the rest of the price-support program.

There is no doubt that if this program is to be continued they need the money immediately. In fact, they needed it last year.

Let me show you how Secretary Benson obtained for this Government corporation over $1 billion and note particularly how expensive it was to the taxpayers of our country to get the money in a manner which I now very deliberately state was accomplished in violation of law.

Existing law, Title 15, United States Code, section 713a–714, as amended, provides the Commodity Credit Corporation may acquire the funds with which it operates by obligations issued in such manner and sold at such prices as may be prescribed by the Commodity Credit Corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such obligations shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed both as to interest and principal by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. The obligations I am about to refer to are designated as certificates of interest. They were not issued with the formal approval of the Treasury Department, obtained in advance. They purport to be obligations of the Corporation and do not purport to be fully and unconditionally guaranteed by the United States, and have no such legend on the face thereof.

Secretary Humphrey must nevertheless, assume his share of responsibility for these transactions because the Treasury Department approved this procedure.

What was the result costwise of the issuance of such certificates?

On October 14, 1953, certificates of interest in the amount of $360 million were issued at the interest rate of 2½ percent. On December 7, 1953, such certificates of interest in the amount of $450 million were issued at an interest rate of 2¼ percent, and on January 15, 1954, another $350 million worth were issued at 2⅛ percent. Total issuance: $1,160,000,000.

They are all payable on demand. At that time commercial call money, that is commercial loans payable on demand, was paying 2 percent interest.

At the same time Treasury 91-day notes, short-term money, were carrying 1½ percent interest and less.

Taking the 1½ percent Treasury short-term rate, we find that $9,187,500 of taxpayers' money was given to the bankers to float these illegal certificates of interest.

But that is not the only cost to the taxpayer. The Federal Reserve member banks that were holding Treasury bills paying a lower rate of interest turned them in to the Government and bought instead the higher interest certificates of interest. If that money instead of being borrowed by the Commodity Credit Corporation on certificates of interest from the private bankers had been borrowed from the United States Treasury, which in turn had borrowed the money on short-term Treasury notes, the taxpayers would have saved an additional $97½ million in interest. The total cost to taxpayers on account of that illegal transaction is a minimum of $106,687,500, all taken out of taxpayers' pockets and poured into the pockets of the Nation's bankers.

Economy in government. Baa! Baa!

The Wall Street Journal, certainly not pro-Democratic in its thinking, certainly not anti-Republican in its policies, on February 17, 1954, said:

> The butter mess has become a national scandal.

I suggest the entire business is a mess and a national scandal that needs our immediate attention.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I will be happy to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My question is this: What remedy would the gentleman suggest for the situation in which we find ourselves?

Mr. MULTER. With specific reference to all of these products?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let us take butter.

Mr. MULTER. If the plan now put into effect by Secretary Benson is good for wool, the same plan should be used as to all of these commodities that we are buying and storing and give the consumer the advantage of buying them on the market.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman means to put them on the market?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, if you put them on the market—for instance, we will take butter; we will confine it to that; we will put this butter on the market—then does it not follow that the market price will be reduced, too?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, it will.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then will not the Government have to pay the difference between the market price and the parity price, and will that not increase all the time?

Mr. MULTER. The Government will not have to pay the difference. The Government has already paid the bill. In other words, you and I and every taxpayer have already paid for the $280 million worth in storage and paid for it at top prices, as high as 90 cents, which, at the wholesale price, runs as high as 60. Now, after awhile it is going to turn rancid. Now, instead of dumping it, let us put it on the market like wool and let the market seek its level.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman; we have already paid that subsidy. We will say it amounts to 30 cents a pound. We have paid that. But, you put that butter on the market, after it is consumed does not the market price of butter drop, and the Government being obligated to keep up the parity, do we not lose so much more all the time?

Mr. MULTER. If you continue this price-support program, yes, on the new crop of butter, on the new crop of dairy products, and we will have to pay it again. But, we have to make up our minds as to whether that is the only way to keep our farmers in business. If it is, we have to pay that subsidy and use that tax money, but do not let us pay it twice. Pay it to him in order to have a decent standard of living, and again pay it as the market price. Certainly, we do not want another potato scandal.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with you we should not let that stuff spoil. I think it is outrageous. But what would the gentleman advocate with reference to future payments of subsidies? Would the gentleman say we should quit as of today or tomorrow, or when?

Mr. MULTER. No, I am not ready to quit as of today or tomorrow. I think the program must be carried on for a little while yet, but whether or not we can carry it on after 2 or 3 or 5 or 6 years, I do not know the answer. If the answer to the program now is the Brannan plan for wool, I would say let us have the Brannan plan for foodstuffs. It is more important there than in the nonperishable field.

We were told only last week by Secretary Benson that they must have one and three-quarters billions more now for this program. We are now told by Secretary Benson that next year he may have to come back and ask for $2.5 billions more. How much further can we go with this kind of program?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman want me to answer?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In my judgment, I cannot name the month or the year, but I am firmly of the conviction that if we go on long enough it will ruin us. But my point is this: Am I correct in assuming that the gentleman would go back eventually to the law of supply and demand and do away with subsidies?

Mr. MULTER. I think at this stage we cannot go back.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not now, but eventually.

Mr. MULTER. Eventually I think we must find our way back.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman or his party will tell us when to do that, we will have the answer.

Mr. MULTER. I think we can be on the road if we will follow the same plan—I do not care whether they call it the Brannan plan or the Benson plan—if we follow the same plan with reference to all these stored commodities and products we are following on wool now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman mean treat perishable and nonperishable the same?

Mr. MULTER. If we follow that same program now I think eventually we can get back on a footing where we will again get back to the so-called law of supply and demand and free enterprise and free markets.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield once more, and I do not want to obstruct, I think the gentleman fails to recognize that there is a basic difference between, for example, cotton and butter. You cannot keep the butter.

Mr. MULTER. Of course there is a difference, but let us not overlook this: The cotton program and the tobacco program have operated very successfully and with a profit to the Government. Why can it not operate profitably as to each of the other commodities we are storing?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It could if we would continue to have inflation and prices going up all the time as they have on cotton.

Mr. MULTER. There must be some other way out. I hope the Congress can find it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We have been spending so much money abroad and at home, and we have had ever-increasing inflation, so of course the price of cotton has gone up.

Mr. MULTER. Part of that has been influenced by the Treasury and the Secretary of Agriculture combining to borrow money at 2½ percent when they could have been borrowing it at 1½ percent. There was $1,160,000,000 borrowed for this very program in October, November, and December of 1953. It was done at a time when the Treasury was borrowing the same kind of money on 91-day notes at less than 1½ percent. Instead of continuing to do it that way they went out and had the bankers turn back their 91-day Treasury notes that they were paying 1½ percent and less and take certificates of interest from the Commodity Credit Corporation paying 2½ percent. It cost them $106,000,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman, certainly, that if the Government could borrow the money at a cheaper rate it should have done it, but what I want to ask the gentleman now is this: Did not the whole situation of which the gentleman complains originate in the years gone by with the Democratic Party?

Mr. MULTER. It originated in the years gone by when the Democratic Party was in control of the Congress and the farm bloc convinced us on both sides that that was the program we ought to have and this was the way to do it. The whole program needs revision now. I said to Secretary Benson last week when he was before us, "You had better come up with a good program, because you cannot treat it in the way you are treating it, study, study, more talk. Everybody has a good plan but nobody does anything about it."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We are to the point where your party originated it and put it into effect, and now you want an answer as to how to get out of it.

Mr. MULTER. I have tried to give you an answer. We tried to correct it, but at that time President Eisenhower said that to adopt the Brannan plan was to go into moral bankruptcy. I do not care whether it is moral bankruptcy or immoral bankruptcy, we do not want to go into any kind of bankruptcy. Now Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture says this is a good plan. I say if it is good as to one it is good as to all. Let us try it.

NORTH AMERICAN AIRLINES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] may exend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the outstanding thing about the national economy in the last few years has been the skyrocketing of all costs to the consumer.

The outstanding thing about air transportation has been the availability of good, rapid, safe air travel at an ever-diminishing figure.

The remarkable fact is that this beneficial trend is something which can be attributed not to the farsighted policies of the Civil Aeronautics Board, nor to the leadership of the air transportation industry, but to the innovation of the air-coach, a concept which was first introduced by World War II veterans who are the management of a California based enterprise, the North American Airlines group.

Here we see a situation where the public required more service than was available; also a situation in which a great mass of the public required rapid transportation, but never thought of flying because of the high cost of air travel, which was regarded as a luxury, reserved for the wealthiest people in the upper brackets, or for people traveling on expense accounts or Government travel orders. Less than 5 percent of interurban traffic moved by air.

North American came into the picture, began flying transcontinentally for less than $100, began offering fares for 3.3 cents per mile, as against the first-class fare of 6 cents per mile. The idea of air-coach was adopted, reluctantly at first, by the certificated carriers. Today we find that over 30 percent of United States air travel is by coach. We also find that North American, without the Board's blessing, and completely without any subsidy or mail pay, is the fifth largest carrier of coach passengers in the domestic air picture.

Yet today, while applying for certification on three routes, North American is now in the process of defending itself against a revocation proceeding, instituted by the Board on the grounds that it has flown too frequently, too regularly, and that it has maintained improper corporate relationships between the carriers which constitute the North American group.

The penalty for success, we must assume, is death, if you happen to be a company that sincerely believes that the function of an air carrier is to offer a reliable, low-cost service to the best of your ability.

This is no fly-by-night company. Last year North American did $10 million gross business. And, I must emphasize, that instead of taking money from the Treasury in the form of subsidy and mail pay, it paid its transportation and corporate taxes in excess of $2 million.

Its 6 DC-4's and its DC-3's are owned outright, purchased from the profits from the air-coach operation. Evidently the Bank of America must have confidence in the future of low-cost air transportation because this important bank has underwritten to the extent of $2½ million the purchase by North American of 2 Douglas DC-6B's, which will be put into air-coach service at the end of this year—providing, of course, the company is not regulated out of business by the Board. The bank has no assurance other than the reputation of the company—there is no guaranty from the Government that it will be in business, but rather an implied threat hangs over North American. This loan proves that a large financial institution believes in the future of air transporta-

tion and the North American way of servicing this market.

In the matter of safety, their crews have met exactly the same safety standards as those of any certificated carrier and their safety record is perfect.

I submit that a company with this record is entitled to be heard on its positive contribution to air transportation, rather than be driven to the ground because it is charged with failure to comply with a host of arbitrary regulations which were constructed deliberately as a screen to keep any new enterprise out of the sky. But the record of this company is obviously embarrassing to those carriers, the certificated industry, which received over half a billion dollars in subsidy and swollen mail pay in the first 6 years after the war.

In aviation as in the electrical utility field or in any other highly protected economic area, a yardstick is always necessary, some accurate gage of what the price really should be in a free market. North American Airlines has fulfilled this role and by the fact that it has operated without any artificial cushion it has been able to give us an accurate picture of what costs really should be. One may fairly say that North American's major sin has been that it has not only cut costs and operated without handouts from the Treasury and the Post Office Department, but that it has made a fair profit.

This company is willing to comply with all the requirements fulfilled by any other carrier. The fact that it has volunteered an excellent service is what has got it in the technical trouble that it now finds itself. North American has indicated in its applications for certificates that it will stop at the nonprofitable communities as well as the points where the air market is concentrated.

North American Airlines has been the continual object of a campaign to put it out of business. The campaign has been waged by the CAB but it has been inspired by those carriers who feel either unwilling or unable to face the competition of new ideas and new techniques in air transportation. If the CAB had spent as much of its money in fighting for low-cost air transportation as it has spent in its "total war" to put nonsubsidized enterprise out of business, we would certainly have more low-cost air transportation develop at a more rapid rate.

Also, there never could be any cry for subsidies if the Board had compelled the aviation industry to lower its costs and increase its volume to the point where it would have been profitable years ago. In conclusion, I should like to suggest:

First. That the budget of the Civil Aeronautics Board be scrutinized to discover if the Board is spending public money to wage a ruthless campaign against free enterprise in aviation.

Second. An investigation to determine the exact relationships between Board members and representatives of various certificated carriers.

Third. That notice be served on the Board that its suspension or elimination of any carrier for reasons other than safety must cease until there is a complete examination of the right of entry into air transportation.

Fourth. A full inquiry by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to determine the extent to which the Board has perverted the original Civil Aeronautics Act, or failed to properly administer all the provisions of the act.

We have heard a good deal about servile agencies, agencies that were the puppets, the messenger boys, and the pliant tools of special interests in the industry, but there exists no example which provides a more classic and consistent record of industry domination than the Civil Aeronautics Board.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H. R. 8126, a bill to grant a congressional charter to the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped.

This federation, now in its 14th year of service to the handicapped, has performed very important and valuable work in the development and application of programs for our 38 million physically and mentally handicapped citizens, and among its incorporators will be noted many distinguished leaders of industry, business, labor, veterans, medicine and surgery, education, and public service.

Many of us here have voted for measures brought to the attention of the Congress by the federation, including a House investigation on aid to the physically handicapped, which brought to light more facts bearing upon this important problem than ever before known and National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, which has been the sparkplug of employment of some 3 million handicapped, who have earned more than $3 billion in salaries or wages, and have paid taxes approximately $750 million.

These and other programs developed by the federation have been practical, needed, and unquestionably in the public interest. I am sure that Members on both sides of the aisle have become acquainted with the varied problems and needs of our millions of handicapped, largely through the efforts of Paul A. Strachan, founder and president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, who is, himself, 90 percent physically disabled, and Miss Mildred Scott, secretary-treasurer, who is also severely handicapped. Paul Strachan and Miss Scott have for years given fearlessly and tirelessly of their time and efforts in helping and benefiting the handicapped of our country from a legislative, as well as a personal angle.

Experts testifying before the House Labor Subcommittee To Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped, in 1944–46, estimated that there were, then, a total of 38 million blind, partially sighted, deaf, hard of hearing, amputees, arthritics, cardiacs, cerebral palsied, diabetics, epileptics, victims of muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, poliomyelitis, rheumatism, tuberculosis, and other cripplers, as well as those having congenital defects and deformities.

For 14 years, the program of the Amercan Federation of the Physically Handicapped has developed and expanded, solely with the view to presenting the most practical and practicable means of effectuating a national program, beneficial to all handicapped people.

Shunning the charity approach, and dealing with this great economic problem in a commonsense way, AFPH has proven, beyond doubt, that what it has projected, has benefited not only the handicapped, but the whole Nation. On the point of employment of handicapped alone, programs initiated and carried into effect by AFPH have been the means of placing, in suitable employment, 3 million citizens.

Today, AFPH is militantly campaigning for a broad, overall program, which includes:

First. Promotion of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, enacted by Congress, AFPH's request, and setting aside the first full week of October, each year, as a period in which to arouse public interest in and support for employment of handicapped.

Second. AFPH national conferences on placement of severely handicapped: Digging deep into research and applied science, to ascertain the work potentials of the approximate 7 to 9 million handicapped, estimated to be from 60 to 100 percent physically disabled, and by pooling the knowledge and experience of eminent physicians, educators, Government counseling and placement officers, representatives of industry, business, labor, veterans, women's clubs, farm organizations, civic and fraternal associations, and others at interest, actually prove that, for example, those severely handicapped by arthritis, amputations, blindness, deafness, epilepsy, cardiac troubles, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, poliomyelitis, osteomyelitis, congenital defects and deformities, and results of other crippling diseases or injuries, are, with suitable training, in many instances, fully capable of pulling their own load, and earning their own way.

Third. AFPH Institute for Human Engineering: To be located in Florida, where the benefits of warm sun, balmy airs, and salt water will be available to the handicapped, and to be the one place in all the world wherein handicapped people may be medically treated; vocationally guided and counseled; educated and trained, and, through a scientific placement clinic, be enabled to be placed in employment where their particular handicap is not a factor.

Fourth. Public affairs to include (a) collegiate programs, (b) civic programs, (c) cooperation with outside organizations, (d) cooperation with medical groups, (e) cooperation with labor, (f) cooperation with industry, (g) legislation, (h) public education.

Fifth. Organization to include (a) expansion of AFPH membership; (b) establishment of AFPH field offices, so that handicapped may receive better personal counseling and assistance; (c) full development of educational, economic, and social benefits under lodge leadership.

Sixth. Valor: To continually improve the official organ by presentation of articles on rehabilitation and employment therein, to be written by eminent specialists, and to expand through Valor various services to the members and other handicapped.

The foregoing is unquestionably the most thorough and effective program for handicapped that it is possible to devise. Not only will it further AFPH's contention that no program for handicapped can possibly succeed unless and until it is made a regular part of labor-management relations but through varied media and followups brings about close coordination of all activities in the handicapped field—and develops to high degree full cooperation with all Government and private agencies and individuals at interest.

AFPH, therefore, is operating in the public interest, and is fully deserving of public support.

I hope there will be early and favorable action upon this bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TUCK (at the request of Mr. ROBERSON of Virginia) and to include an editorial.

Mr. WOLVERTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. CLEVENGER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SAYLOR in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MORGAN (at the request of Mr. ROONEY), for today and tomorrow, on account of illness in family.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 58. An act for the relief of Suzanne Jacquet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 95. An act for the relief of (Mrs.) Betty Thornton or Josefne Toth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 208. An act for the relief of Sister Constantine (Teresia Kakonyi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 215. An act to provide for determining the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations of the water level of the Lake of the Woods, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 233. An act for the relief of Jeno Caeplo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 268. An act for the relief of Harold Trevor Colbourn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 327. An act for the relief of Tarik S. Kaynor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 428. An act for the relief of Dr. Chih Chiang Teng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 455. An act for the relief of Johan Faber, Dagmar Anna Faber, Hilke Faber, and Frauke Faber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 474. An act for the relief of Maria Intriago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 487. An act for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Balourdas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 490. An act for the relief of Josephine Reigl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 518. An act for the relief of Sister Marie Therese De Galzain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 520. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ivan S. Aylesworth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 546. An act to authorize payment for losses sustained by owners of wells in the vicinity of Cold Brook Dam by reason of the lowering of the level of water in such wells as a result of the construction of Cold Brook Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 552. An act for the relief of Anna Urwicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 584. An act for the relief of Rosa Euler and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 795. An act for the relief of Josef Radziwill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 897. An act to extend the time for making application for terminal-leave pay under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 937. An act for the relief of Virginia Grande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 946. An act for the relief of Mona Lisbet Kofoed Nicolaisen, Leif Martin Borglum Nicolaisen, and Ian Alan Kofoed Nicolaisen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 997. An act for the relief of Chuan Hua Lowe and his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1138. An act for the relief of John Soudas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1156. An act for the relief of Dr. Jagannath P. Chawla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Helen Knight Waters an ! Arnold Elzey Waters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1689. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cacila Gotthardt Gange; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1863. An act for the relief of Leo A. Ribitzki, Mrs. Charlotte Ribitzki, and Marion A. Ribitzki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1937. An act for the relief of Rev. Francis T. Dwyer and Rev. Thomas Morrissey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2040. An act to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2120. An act to authorize the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority to reconstruct and improve the toll bridge, and the approaches thereto, across the Piscataqua River at Portsmouth, N. H.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2166. An act for the relief of Gertrude Rena Carlson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2247. An act to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations of certain foreign nations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2405. An act to authorize the exchange, upon terms fully protecting the public interest, of the United States Public Health quarantine station at Marcus Hook, Pa., for a new quarantine station; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2845. An act to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2846. An act to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of hearings on Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of Sister Walfreda (Anna Nelles), and Sister Amaltrudis (Gertrude Schneider);

H. R. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth R. Ekholm;

H. R. 749. An act for the relief of Shui-Fook Fung;

H. R. 788. An act for the relief of Baryl Williams;

H. R. 823. An act for the relief of Abraham G. Sakin;

H. R. 824. An act for the relief of Demetrious Konstantno Papanicolaou;

H. R. 828. An act for the relief of Dr. Vincenzo Guzzo;

H. R. 907. An act for the relief of Wolodymyr Hirniak;

H. R. 946. An act for the relief of Mrs. Louise Blackstone;

H. R. 965. An act for the relief of Michael Demcheshen;

H. R. 1339. An act for the relief of Dr. Soon Tai Ryang;

H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Zia Edin Taberi and Frances Hakimzadeh Taberi;

H. R. 1358. An act for the relief of Dr. Marcelino J. Avecilla and Dr. Teodora A. Fidelino-Avecilla;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Louis M. Jacobs;

H. R. 1649. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisela Walter Sizemore;

H. R. 1688. An act for the relief of Henry Ty;

H. R. 1795. An act for the relief of Helena Shostenko;

H. R. 2035. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michaline Borzecka;

H. R. 2367. An act for the relief of William M. Smith;

H. R. 2504. An act for the relief of Sisters Adelaide Canelas and Maria Isabel Franco;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of Alfonso Gatti;

H. R. 2622. An act for the relief of Maria Teresa Ortega Perez;

H. R. 2623. An act for the relief of Jose M. Thomasa-Sancher, Adela Duran Cuevas de Thomasa, and Jose Maria Thomasa Duran;

H. R. 2774. An act for the relief of Endre Szende, Zsuzsanna Szende, Katalin Szende (a minor), and Maria Szende (a minor);

H. R. 2817. An act for the relief of George A. Ferris;

H. R. 3005. An act for the relief of Charles Sabah;

H. R. 3236. An act for the relief of Constantin and Lucia (Bercescu) Turcano;

H. R. 3455. An act for the relief of Jalal Rashtian;

H. R. 3749. An act for the relief of Woldemar Jaskowsky; and

H. R. 5773. An act to provide for the refund, under certain conditions, of money paid as premiums on United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance which is canceled for fraud.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 4, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1317. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the Court's opinion re: *Goshen Veneer Company* v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 17865, pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and pursuant to House Resolution 814; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1318. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1319. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C., 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1320. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1321. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Frank Ramos-Ramos, A-2459952 (T-1496978) and requesting that the case be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1322. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 28, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Selkirk Shores State Park, N. Y., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 343); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

1323. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 4, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers, Tex. This interim report is submitted under the authority for a review of reports on the Guadalupe River, Tex., to determine the advisability of improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, water power, irrigation, and related purposes, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 8, 1938, and March 29, 1945, respectively. It is also in partial response to the River and Harbor Act approved on June 20, 1938, which authorized a preliminary examination and survey of San Antonio River, Tex. (H. Doc. No. 344); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with five illustrations.

1324. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 26, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Erie Harbor, Pa., with a view to determining if it is advisable to widen the 25-foot approach channel in the interest of navigation at the present time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on March 15, 1949. (H. Doc. No. 345); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1325. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 14, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the shore of Galveston Bay from April Fool Point to Kemah in Galveston County, Tex., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 346); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with four illustrations.

1326. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 21, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of Crooked Slough Harbor, Winona, Minn. This interim report is submitted under the authority for a review of reports on the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., with a view to providing additional harbors for commercial and fishing vessels, and for recreational craft, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on April 22, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 347); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1327. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Veterans' Canteen Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the act of August 7, 1946 (38 U. S. C. 13f) (H. Doc. No. 342); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TABER: Committee of conference. H. R. 7996. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1265). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1005. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fort Union National Monument, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 8152. A bill to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8149. A bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to the States for surveying the need for diagnostic or treatment centers, for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, for rehabilitation facilities, and for nursing homes, and to provide assistance in the construction of such facilities through grants to public and nonprofit agencies, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 8190. A bill to affirm the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, familiarly called antitrust laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; and to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8191. A bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price-Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to small and independent business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 8192. A bill to establish a Commission to prepare a plan for the removal of temporary Government buildings in the District of Columbia, for the accommodation in other buildings of the personnel employed in such temporary buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 8193. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 8194. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 8195. A bill to require the United States Coast Guard to make inspections and certifications of vessels carrying passengers for hire; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 8196. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require licensees to investigate persons and organizations on whose behalf contributions are solicited on radio and television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRINGFELLOW:

H. R. 8197. A bill to provide for the development of a sound and profitable domestic wool industry under our national policy of

expanding world trade; to encourage increased domestic production of wool for our national security; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 8198. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 8199. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to ministers and members of religious orders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8200. A bill to terminate the war-tax rate on admissions to theaters, and to provide that no tax on admissions shall apply in the case of admissions to theaters where the cost of admission is less than 60 cents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8201. A bill to terminate the war-tax rate on admissions to public parks, and to provide that no tax on admissions shall apply in the case of admissions to public parks where the cost of admission is less than 60 cents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 8202. A bill to amend paragraph (3) of section 2 (a) of the Public Utility Act of 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 8203. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act, so as to repeal the $75 limitation upon the amount of outside income which may be received in any month by a person receiving benefits under title II of such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8204. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 35th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 8205. A bill to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to Virginia Electric & Power Co. of a perpetual easement of right-of-way for electric transmission line purposes across lands of the Richmond National Battlefield Park, Va., such easement to be granted in exchange for, and in consideration of, the donation for park purposes of approximately 6 acres of land adjoining the park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 8206. A bill to outlaw the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico within the continental limits of the United States by making it a crime to be a member thereof within the continental limits of the United States, to provide for the forfeiture of the citizenship of persons convicted of being members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 8207. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide that certain church robes and vestments shall be exempt from duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 8208. A bill to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a special milk and beef consumption expansion program; to assist in maintaining parity prices and incomes to farmers by providing expanded outlets for beef and dairy products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 8209. A bill to amend subdivision (a) and to repeal subdivision (b) of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, relating to unclaimed moneys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8210. A bill to amend subdivision (b) of section 14 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, relating to discharges, and subdivision (b) of section 58 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, relating to notices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 8211. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 8212. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anne P. Perceval; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 8213. A bill for the relief of Fred Libby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 8214. A bill for the relief of Ramnarase Panday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 8215. A bill for the relief of Regina Berg Vomberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 8216. A bill for the relief of Sister Anna Scrinzi, Sister Giuliana Paladini, Sister Iolanda Mazzocchi, and Sister Giuseppina Zanchetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 8217. A bill for the relief of Philon Pavayotis Pappasoteriou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 8218. A bill for the relief of Arcangelo Guastaferro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8219. A bill for the relief of Jean Henri Buchet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

543. By Mr. SHEEHAN: Petition of the Lithuanian Council of Chicago, relative to commemoration ceremonies marking 36th Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day, held February 14, 1954, at Ashland Auditorium in Chicago; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

544. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of the Junior Women's Club of Altoona, Pa., urging mandatory Federal action to protect the public health and welfare of the citizens of the United States through the restoration and revitalization of the specific authority via the Federal Food Drug and Cosmetics Act enforcing governmental inspections at manufacturing and factory levels throughout the aforementioned industries and business enterprises situated in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

545. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Kings County Council, JWVA, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the extension of all benefits enjoyed by veterans of World War II, under existing legislation, to all veterans of the Korean struggle who were members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Roaches Run Bridge Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H. R. 8096 to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct a bridge over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Roaches Run. This is the location for a bridge to serve the central area recommended by the National Capital Planning Commission and strongly supported by the Department of the Interior, which has jurisdiction over most of the land required for both District and Virginia approaches.

My principal reason for proposing this legislation is to provide an opportunity for Congress to consider the merits of the Planning Commission's proposal. Otherwise, I am told, testimony would have been limited to another location, advocated by the District Commissioners but vigorously opposed by the Department of the Interior and the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, as well as by the Planning Commission and others. I do not believe we should prevent these representatives of important public interests from presenting constructive views on matters about which they feel so keenly and have inherent responsibilities.

I am informed that the E Street bridge location proposed by the District Commissioners does violence to all well accepted concepts for the protection and enhancement of the western terminus of our world-famed Mall. It would project a commercial type steel girder bridge across Roosevelt Island and in many other respects be out of harmony with the standards set for that area by the Lincoln Memorial, the Arlington Memorial Bridge, and the flanking parkways along the river.

The Roaches Run site, on the other hand, accords with well considered plans of the National Capital Planning Commission published in 1950. That agency was set up more than a quarter of a century ago to give us advice particularly on the long-range needs of the national capital. It is composed of key public officials and eminent citizens qualified in city planning matters. Its present chairman, Harland Bartholomew, was appointed by President Eisenhower last

August. He is one of the Nation's leading city planners and has been a consultant on the Washington plan for more than 25 years. I believe we should give the Commission's plan full consideration and weigh carefully the broad issues involved in the decision on a new bridge location.

Results of Poll Taken in North Dakota Regarding Policies of the Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 3, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the results of a poll which I have taken in North Dakota.

The returns, 4,247, from my questionnaire are, in many respects, surprising and most interesting and helpful. They represent a pretty fair cross section of North Dakota thinking. Admittedly, it is not fully representative of labor thinking as no labor list was available. Every third name was selected from the Minot—railroad division point—telephone directory to help overcome this discrepancy. The most outstanding thing in the results is the sharp cleavage in the opinions between farmers and nonfarmers with respect to both President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson. This is almost entirely because of the farm price support issue. Secretary Benson is not without a great many ardent supporters in North Dakota. An overwhelming majority, however, are bitterly opposed to his policies. This sharp difference in opinion may well have ominous forebodings for candidates facing election this year. The adverse opinion expressed by farmers on President Eisenhower in this poll is borne out by a recent poll conducted by several South Dakota newspapers and the opinions expressed by Members of Congress from Minnesota.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Do you believe the foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration is an improvement over the Truman administration? Yes, 2,581; no, 1,206.

2. Do you believe the social-security program should be broadened and liberalized? Yes, 3,123; no, 730.

3. Do you favor including farmers under social security? Yes, 2,908; no, 969.

4. Do you favor further tax reduction this year even if, after diligent efforts, the budget cannot be balanced until 1956 or later? Yes, 1,095; no, 2,910.

5. Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which expires June 12, 1954, the President acting on the advice of the Tariff Commission, can raise or lower tariffs. Do you believe this authority should be extended as requested by the President? Yes, 2,152; no, 1,446.

6. Do you favor immediate statehood for Hawaii? Yes, 2,726; no, 809.

7. Do you favor immediate statehood for Alaska? Yes, 2,931; no, 807.

8. How would you appraise the Eisenhower administration's first year in office? (a) Good, 1,345; (b) fair, 1,756; (c) poor, 1,181.

9. Did you vote for President Eisenhower in 1952? Total: Yes, 2,630; no, 1,396. Farmers: Yes, 1,478; no, 1,035; nonfarmers: Yes, 1,152; no, 361.

10. Would you vote for his reelection today? Total: Yes, 1,825; no, 1,978. Farmers: Yes, 837; no, 1,436; nonfarmers: Yes, 988; no, 542.

11. What do you think of the McCarthy investigations (including methods and results)? (a) Good, 1,205; (b) fair, 1,139; (c) poor, 1,510.

12. If you were a resident of Wisconsin would you vote for his reelection? Farmers: Yes, 1,006; no, 1,173; nonfarmer: yes, 747; no, 647. Total: Yes, 1,753; no, 1,820.

13. What do you think of Secretary of Agriculture Benson's policies and actions during his first year in office? (a) Good, 845; (b) fair, 751; (c) poor, 2,434.

14. Do you favor his retention as Secretary of Agriculture: Total: Yes, 1,311; no, 2,786. Farmers: Yes, 474; no, 2,077. Nonfarmers: Yes, 837; no, 709.

15. Which type of price support program do you favor for basic farm commodities? (a) Flexible supports (75 to 90 percent) total: 830. (b) Retention of 90 percent, total: 3,151. Farmers, 270; nonfarmers, 560. Farmers, 2,198; nonfarmers, 953.

16. Do you believe the so-called two-price system of farm price supports has merit and should be given further study and consideration? Total: Yes, 1,751; no, 1,815. Farmers: Yes, 979; no, 1,351. Nonfarmers: Yes, 772; no, 464.

17. What, in your opinion, is the most important issue facing Congress and the Nation today? (1) Farm prices, 1,154; (2) world peace, 1,109; (3) national economy, 535; (4) communism, 345.

Federal Aid to Highway Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I hope the membership will carefully analyze the charts that show the difference of money authorized for highways under the existing law and that which is recommended in the new highway bill H. R. 8127, which will soon be before Congress for our consideration:

Approximate apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds pursuant to H. R. 7340, the existing law

State	Federal-aid				Interstate system ($25,000,000)	Grand total ($575,000,000)
	Primary ($247,500,000)	Secondary ($165,000,000)	Urban ($137,500,000)	Subtotal ($550,000,000)		
Alabama	$5,135,000	$3,984,000	$1,745,000	$10,864,000	$524,000	$11,388,000
Arizona	3,624,000	2,468,000	518,000	6,610,000	370,000	6,980,000
Arkansas	4,026,000	3,224,000	745,000	7,995,000	411,000	8,406,000
California	11,177,000	5,757,000	11,837,000	28,771,000	1,141,000	29,912,000
Colorado	4,387,000	2,930,000	1,107,000	8,424,000	448,000	8,872,000
Connecticut	1,542,000	794,000	2,579,000	4,915,000	158,000	5,073,000
Delaware	1,191,000	794,000	273,000	2,258,000	120,000	2,378,000
Florida	3,865,000	2,525,000	2,388,000	8,778,000	395,000	9,173,000
Georgia	6,040,000	4,610,000	1,941,000	12,591,000	617,000	13,208,000
Idaho	3,011,000	2,117,000	256,000	5,384,000	307,000	5,691,000
Illinois	9,370,000	5,103,000	9,313,000	23,786,000	957,000	24,743,000
Indiana	5,773,000	3,979,000	3,186,000	12,938,000	589,000	13,527,000
Iowa	5,914,000	4,325,000	1,581,000	11,820,000	604,000	12,424,000
Kansas	5,945,000	4,160,000	1,252,000	11,357,000	607,000	11,964,000
Kentucky	4,469,000	3,711,000	1,383,000	9,563,000	456,000	10,019,000
Louisiana	3,755,000	2,720,000	1,952,000	8,427,000	383,000	8,810,000
Maine	2,051,000	1,467,000	557,000	4,075,000	209,000	4,284,000
Maryland	2,128,000	1,300,000	2,280,000	5,689,000	217,000	5,906,000
Massachusetts	3,062,000	1,129,000	5,543,000	9,734,000	313,000	10,047,000
Michigan	7,565,000	4,617,000	6,198,000	18,380,000	772,000	19,152,000
Minnesota	6,405,000	4,517,000	2,168,000	13,090,000	654,000	13,744,000
Mississippi	4,341,000	3,616,000	737,000	8,694,000	443,000	9,137,000
Missouri	7,006,000	4,740,000	3,279,000	15,025,000	715,000	15,740,000
Montana	4,923,000	3,385,000	314,000	8,622,000	503,000	9,125,000
Nebraska	4,724,000	3,350,000	781,000	8,855,000	482,000	9,337,000
Nevada	3,150,000	2,105,000	101,000	5,356,000	322,000	5,678,000
New Hampshire	1,191,000	794,000	386,000	2,371,000	120,000	2,491,000
New Jersey	3,152,000	1,064,000	5,829,000	10,045,000	322,000	10,367,000
New Mexico	3,981,000	2,734,000	437,000	7,152,000	406,000	7,558,000
New York	11,422,000	4,575,000	17,799,000	33,796,000	1,166,000	34,962,000
North Carolina	5,995,000	5,126,000	4,711,000	12,832,000	612,000	13,444,000
North Dakota	3,548,000	2,575,000	225,000	6,348,000	362,000	6,710,000
Ohio	8,460,000	5,149,000	7,706,000	21,321,000	864,000	22,185,000
Oklahoma	5,217,000	3,734,000	1,455,000	10,406,000	533,000	10,939,000
Oregon	4,178,000	2,919,000	1,068,000	8,165,000	427,000	8,592,000
Pennsylvania	9,548,000	5,682,000	10,081,000	25,311,000	975,000	26,286,000
Rhode Island	1,191,000	794,000	952,000	2,937,000	120,000	3,057,000
South Carolina	3,284,000	2,717,000	916,000	6,917,000	335,000	7,252,000
South Dakota	3,797,000	2,712,000	259,000	6,768,000	388,000	7,156,000
Tennessee	5,183,000	4,049,000	1,926,000	11,158,000	529,000	11,687,000
Texas	15,736,000	10,535,000	6,380,000	32,651,000	1,606,000	34,257,000
Utah	2,795,000	1,848,000	564,000	5,207,000	285,000	5,492,000
Vermont	1,191,000	794,000	207,000	2,192,000	120,000	2,312,000
Virginia	4,625,000	3,593,000	2,077,000	10,295,000	472,000	10,767,000
Washington	4,033,000	2,694,000	2,009,000	8,736,000	412,000	9,148,000
West Virginia	2,651,000	2,307,000	867,000	5,825,000	271,000	6,096,000
Wisconsin	5,780,000	4,031,000	2,608,000	12,419,000	590,000	13,009,000
Wyoming	3,033,000	2,055,000	145,000	5,233,000	310,000	5,543,000
Hawaii	1,191,000	794,000	448,000	2,433,000	----------	2,433,000
District of Columbia	1,191,000	794,000	1,150,000	3,135,000	120,000	3,255,000
Puerto Rico	1,260,000	1,317,000	1,145,000	3,722,000	----------	3,722,000

The bill is the result of extensive hearings last summer and again this year. H. R. 8127 is H. R. 7818, as amended, by the Committee on Public Works.

Approximate apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds pursuant to H. R. 8127, by McGregor, of Ohio

State	Federal aid				Interstate			Total ($800,000,000)
	Primary ($270,000,000)	Secondary ($180,000,000)	Urban ($150,000,000)	Subtotal ($600,000,000)	Population [1] ($100,000,000)	Sec. 21 [2] ($100,000,000)	Subtotal ($200,000,000)	
Alabama	$5,761,000	$4,465,000	$1,938,000	$12,164,000	$1,876,000	$2,155,000	$4,031,000	$16,195,000
Arizona	4,038,000	2,750,000	575,000	7,363,000	735,000	1,507,000	2,242,000	9,605,000
Arkansas	4,495,000	3,597,000	827,000	8,919,000	1,170,000	1,680,000	2,850,000	11,769,000
California	12,393,000	6,381,000	13,148,000	31,922,000	6,487,000	4,652,000	11,139,000	43,061,000
Colorado	4,858,000	3,245,000	1,229,000	9,332,000	812,000	1,814,000	2,626,000	11,958,000
Connecticut	1,751,000	882,000	2,864,000	5,497,000	1,230,000	658,000	1,888,000	7,385,000
Delaware	1,323,000	882,000	303,000	2,508,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,733,000
Florida	4,386,000	2,867,000	2,652,000	9,905,000	1,698,000	1,643,000	3,341,000	13,246,000
Georgia	6,682,000	5,103,000	2,156,000	13,941,000	2,111,000	2,499,000	4,610,000	18,551,000
Idaho	3,328,000	2,341,000	285,000	5,954,000	735,000	1,242,000	1,977,000	7,931,000
Illinois	10,401,000	5,664,000	10,344,000	26,409,000	5,339,000	3,901,000	9,240,000	35,649,000
Indiana	6,409,000	4,418,000	3,538,000	14,365,000	2,411,000	2,399,000	4,810,000	19,175,000
Iowa	6,520,000	4,772,000	1,756,000	13,048,000	1,606,000	2,436,000	4,042,000	17,090,000
Kansas	6,552,000	4,587,000	1,390,000	12,529,000	1,168,000	2,446,000	3,614,000	16,143,000
Kentucky	4,977,000	4,131,000	1,536,000	10,644,000	1,804,000	1,863,000	3,667,000	14,311,000
Louisiana	4,207,000	3,045,000	2,168,000	9,420,000	1,644,000	1,576,000	3,220,000	12,640,000
Maine	2,265,000	1,621,000	618,000	4,504,000	735,000	847,000	1,582,000	6,086,000
Maryland	2,374,000	1,451,000	2,510,000	6,335,000	1,436,000	892,000	2,328,000	8,663,000
Massachusetts	3,429,000	1,273,000	6,156,000	10,858,000	2,874,000	1,293,000	4,167,000	15,025,000
Michigan	8,379,000	5,113,000	6,884,000	20,376,000	3,904,000	3,141,000	7,045,000	27,421,000
Minnesota	7,002,000	4,943,000	2,408,000	14,353,000	1,828,000	2,617,000	4,445,000	18,798,000
Mississippi	4,826,000	4,021,000	819,000	9,666,000	1,335,000	1,804,000	3,139,000	12,805,000
Missouri	7,870,000	5,325,000	3,643,000	16,838,000	2,423,000	2,943,000	5,366,000	22,204,000
Montana	5,423,000	3,730,000	348,000	9,501,000	735,000	2,023,000	2,758,000	12,259,000
Nebraska	5,264,000	3,733,000	868,000	9,865,000	812,000	1,965,000	2,777,000	12,642,000
Nevada	3,486,000	2,330,000	113,000	5,929,000	735,000	1,300,000	2,035,000	7,964,000
New Hampshire	1,323,000	882,000	438,000	2,643,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,868,000
New Jersey	3,491,000	1,175,000	6,475,000	11,141,000	2,963,000	1,316,000	4,279,000	15,420,000
New Mexico	4,389,000	3,015,000	485,000	7,889,000	735,000	1,638,000	2,373,000	10,262,000
New York	12,691,000	5,085,000	19,770,000	37,546,000	9,087,000	4,775,000	13,862,000	51,408,000
North Carolina	6,690,000	5,715,000	1,901,000	14,306,000	2,489,000	2,504,000	4,993,000	19,299,000
North Dakota	3,917,000	2,844,000	250,000	7,011,000	735,000	1,461,000	2,196,000	9,207,000
Ohio	9,415,000	5,727,000	8,559,000	23,701,000	4,869,000	3,531,000	8,400,000	32,101,000
Oklahoma	5,778,000	4,137,000	1,616,000	11,531,000	1,369,000	2,159,000	3,528,000	15,059,000
Oregon	4,616,000	3,226,000	1,186,000	9,028,000	932,000	1,725,000	2,657,000	11,685,000
Pennsylvania	10,597,000	6,306,000	11,197,000	28,100,000	6,433,000	3,980,000	10,413,000	38,513,000
Rhode Island	1,323,000	882,000	1,057,000	3,262,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	4,487,000
South Carolina	3,635,000	3,010,000	1,017,000	7,662,000	1,297,000	1,361,000	2,658,000	10,320,000
South Dakota	4,217,000	3,012,000	287,000	7,516,000	735,000	1,573,000	2,308,000	9,824,000
Tennessee	5,851,000	4,560,000	2,139,000	12,550,000	2,017,000	2,189,000	4,206,000	16,756,000
Texas	17,513,000	11,727,000	7,086,000	36,326,000	4,725,000	6,548,000	11,273,000	47,599,000
Utah	3,104,000	2,053,000	627,000	5,784,000	735,000	1,159,000	1,894,000	7,678,000
Vermont	1,323,000	882,000	230,000	2,435,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,660,000
Virginia	5,128,000	3,986,000	2,306,000	11,420,000	2,034,000	1,920,000	3,954,000	15,374,000
Washington	4,463,000	2,982,000	2,232,000	9,677,000	1,458,000	1,670,000	3,128,000	12,805,000
West Virginia	2,944,000	2,563,000	963,000	6,470,000	1,229,000	1,103,000	2,332,000	8,802,000
Wisconsin	6,378,000	4,450,000	2,896,000	13,724,000	2,105,000	2,386,000	4,491,000	18,215,000
Wyoming	3,367,000	2,282,000	161,000	5,810,000	735,000	1,256,000	1,991,000	7,801,000
Hawaii	1,323,000	882,000	497,000	2,702,000				2,702,000
District of Columbia	1,323,000	882,000	1,278,000	3,483,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	4,708,000
Puerto Rico	1,402,000	1,465,000	1,271,000	4,138,000				4,138,000

[1] Apportioned according to total population with minimum of ¾ of 1 percent.
[2] Apportioned according to sec. 21 of Federal Highway Act—⅓ area, ⅓ total population, and ⅓ post-road mileage, with minimum of ½ of 1 percent.

A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $600 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) $270 million for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) $180 million for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

(c) $150 million for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas.

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this act: *Provided further*, That in the case of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of the respective States applicable to projects in this category approved by him: *Provided further*, That not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to each State under subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section may be transferred from the apportionment under one subparagraph to the apportionment under either of the other subparagraphs: *Provided further*, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more than 25 percent: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $200 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the following manner: one-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-Aid primary system: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project on the national system of interstate highways pro-

vided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 60 percent of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 40 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1954; and the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1955.

(b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects under this section.

(c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the authorization in section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is hereby canceled; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of $22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds available for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for vehicular parking areas: *Provided further*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

(b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 5. Any unappropriated balance of the sums heretofore authorized to be appropriated by sections 5 and 6 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 158), for the Rama Road in Nicaragua and the Inter-American Highway, respectively, for the fiscal years 1953 and 1954, shall continue to be authorized to be appropriated for such purposes for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956.

SEC. 6. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 158), not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 7. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 8. All acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect on its passage.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed to make a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties in interest relative to the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from highway improvements authorized under this act. Among other things, such a study shall include a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end that a full and informative report may be made to the President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States not later than February 1, 1955.

SEC. 10. The term "highway," as defined in section 2 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented, shall be deemed to include "tunnels."

SEC. 11. The Secretary of Commerce may approve as a part of the Federal-aid secondary system, extensions through urban areas, connecting points on that system, provided that Federal participation in projects on such extensions shall be limited to urban funds.

SEC. 12. For the purpose of expediting the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico in general conformity with the provisions of the Federal Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and with the recommended plan set forth in the joint report submitted to the Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior pursuant to the act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 262, 81st Cong.), there is hereby authorized to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce from general administrative funds not to exceed $250,000; the amount expended under this section shall be apportioned among the 10 States bordering the Mississippi River in proportion to the amount allocated by these respective States for the improvement and extension of existing sections of this highway project as approved by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with other public agencies concerned therewith.

SEC. 13. This act may be cited as the "Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954."

Attention, New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I recently wrote to all Members of the House from New England to suggest that they make known their views on tariff matters in advance of trade policy discussions by Congress. My inquiry was prompted by hearings of the Tariff Commission on duties to protect the American watch industry, but we who represent other sections of the country are equally concerned with tariffs applicable to leather goods, textiles, fish, lumber, bicycles, and other products of New England.

Last year when an attempt was made to enact legislation placing a quota limit on residual oil imports, New Englanders opposed such legislation on the ground that foreign residual oil can be purchased cheaper than coal on the east coast. The plight of the coal industry and miners adversely affected by excessive imports of residual oil was completely ignored.

I asked my colleagues from New England if representatives of coal-producing districts would be justified in opposing tariffs on watches, leather goods, fish, textiles, and other commodities produced in New England for the same selfish reason that a freer flow of these goods from other countries would result in lower prices to our people.

In reply, some of the Members of this legislative body have admitted that there is no reason for the disparity, and they have promised to give the matter their close consideration. I would be less than frank to neglect to mention that some Members have thus far failed to commit themselves on the question which I submitted for their views, but I trust that their silence is indication that they are cognizant of the inequity of our tariff laws and that they are giving thorough study to the problem.

Still other Members from New England, while expressing sympathy with our position, told me that they could not vote to restrict imports of residual oil because it would increase costs of heating fuel for their constituents. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be farther from the truth, and the gentlemen with whom I talked were astonished to learn that residual oil cannot—because of its specific gravity—be used in home heating. International oil companies have created the illusion through flagrant distortions of fact that this fuel could be used by

householders and that any check on the quantity coming from foreign refineries would cause home-heating prices to rise. On the contrary, the tendency has been for the prices of home-heating oils, gasoline, and kerosene to rise with the decrease in residual oil prices—the reason being that importing companies can manipulate the prices of high-grade products upward in order to absorb any revenue drop that comes with price cutting on residual.

Residual oil is what remains after the better products have been taken from the crude. It may be likened to the fishmeal that remains after the New England fishing industry has removed the filets and oils from the day's catch. Fishmeal is not the principally desired product of that industry, and its price can be dropped to a point of for-free if there is sufficient gross from the other products.

Residual oil is used primarily by electric power utilities and industrial plants. Fuel makes up only about 20 percent of the total cost in the determination of electricity rates, the bulk of the costs being attributable to capital investment, operation, and distribution. In industrial plants, the ratio of fuel costs is appreciably smaller. Thus the consumer does not realize much of a savings, if any, through slightly reduced fuel costs for the utility or manufacturer. This factor should be entirely academic, however, since there is no more justification for buying foreign products at the expense of America's industries and workers than there is for our admitting foreign goods destructive to the Down East industries.

New Englanders cannot in conscience demand protection for their industries and refuse the same consideration to those of other sections of the country. They cannot look upon the existing double standard for United States trade policies as crafty Yankee trading. At least, they cannot do so and at the same time adhere to the philosophy of equality and justice for all, and I am confident that our colleagues who represent the good people of New England will concur when they broaden their perspective to include the imports problem in its entirety.

Savage and Unbelievable Lunacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1954

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, the infiltration of the United States by Communists for sinister purposes has been going on for many years. This movement was accelerated under a plan sponsored by Mayor LaGuardia and former Congressman Marcantonio when thousands of Puerto Ricans were shuttled from the islands to New York City and immediately placed on the voting lists and relief rolls.

As far back as 1943 it was obvious that a conspiracy existed between these lawless elements when the Communist Party in the United States affirmed that—

> We pledge our full support to the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico and to the complete unification of all the people of Puerto Rico and their various parties around the supreme task of achieving full nationhood.
>
> We will fulfill our pledge by rallying the people and, particularly, the labor movement of our country to Puerto Rican independence as a necessary precondition to correct relations with all Latin America and, as an acid test of the Atlantic Charter, Puerto Rico must and will be free.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation was shocked on Monday afternoon when, without warning of any sort, international gangsters fired from the gallery upon the House of Representatives of the United States while its membership was solemnly deliberating the Nation's business, resulting in the wounding of five distinguished and highly respected Members of Congress. Such an occurrence is unprecedented in our national history. I deprecate the circumstances which have made such an occurrence possible and look with disdain upon those responsible for the establishment of the policy to which I have referred.

Firm and resolute hands should sternly deal with these maniacs and felons, and the cesspools of crime and corruption from which they come should be drained and dried.

Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1954, the Danville Register, of Danville, Va., published an editorial on this subject.

The Register was established in February 1847. It represents the finest and best in the tradition of our American press. It has weathered the adverse storms of more than 100 years. In April 1865 the last meeting that President Jefferson Davis, of the Confederate States of America, held with his full Cabinet was in the city of Danville. The Register covered and reported this event. This newspaper throughout its long existence has fearlessly and courageously printed the truth and the news as it was—be it good or bad. As a consequence of the pursuit of this and other sound policies, as well as by good management, it has thrived and enjoys in an unusually high degree the confidence, the esteem, and good will of the people in the section of Virginia which I have the honor to represent. The late Hon. Rorer A. James, who was at the time of his death on August 6, 1921, chairman of the Democratic Committee for the Commonwealth of Virginia and a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Fifth Congressional District, owned and controlled and published this newspaper. His granddaughter, Stuart James Grant, continues the publication. I am sure that the membership of this body would be interested in knowing that she is also a great granddaughter of that fearless and colorful Confederate cavalryman, Gen. J. E. B. Stuart. The editor of the Danville Register, W. Marion Saunders, is a brilliant journalist and represents the high standards of excellence for which the Danville Register is noted.

In accordance with the unanimous consent given me, I include this editorial as a part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

SAVAGE AND UNBELIEVABLE LUNACY

The Nation and half the world, including Puerto Rico, was given a shocked sense of outrage yesterday by the fanatic revolutionaries who opened fire upon the House of Representatives as a means of focusing attention upon the affiliation of their island homeland with these United States.

No more savage or senseless move could have been conceived than that executed by the little group of followers of Don Pedro Campos, the bitter and crazed leader of the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party—a splinter group with no standing and only a very small following in the island. Campos is in jail for leading a riot in 1950 in which 30 Puerto Ricans were killed. His riot, intended as a spark to revolution, actually was as futile and senseless as the action of his followers in Washington yesterday afternoon. It did not spark anything except mass murder because the people of Puerto Rico, far from wanting separation from the United States, have looked to this country—and not in vain—for help; for citizenship under a free government of their own choosing.

Governor Luis Muñoz-Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico, is the first governor of the island to be chosen by free and popular election. Against Marín, the Nationalists under Campos have not been able to build up any sizable following. It is this failure, together with the changes occurring in the island—all bringing the people closer to the United States—since 1948, which caused Campos to give up hope of ever gaining control by peaceful means and set him preaching revolution.

The ridiculousness of the note found in the purse of Lolita Lebron, the woman leader of the shooting from the House gallery, is exploded by fact. She, like Campos, whom she referred to as the apostle of independence, charged that the United States is "betraying the sacred principles of mankind in their continuous subjugation of my country, violating their rights to a free nation and a free people in their barbarous torture of our apostle of independence, Don Pedro Albizu Campos."

What are the facts?

Columbus discovered Puerto Rico, which the natives called Boriquen, on November 19, 1493, and 16 years later, in 1509, Ponce de Leon conquered the island for Spain. The island remained under Spanish control, a rigid control it was, for 389 years. The Cuban War for Independence, which turned into the Spanish-American War, saw Puerto Rico ceded to the United States by terms of the Treaty of Paris, signed December 10, 1898.

What has been the course of United States administration of this ceded territory during the 55 years since the Treaty of Paris?

The island was governed by a governor-general and treated very much like the Philippines, Hawaii, and Alaska. In 1917 the Organic Act of Puerto Rico was enacted. This act, with amendments, granted Puerto Ricans American citizenship and unrestricted suffrage. President Truman (himself a target for Campos' fanatics) signed in 1947 an act giving Puerto Rico the right to choose its own chief executive by popular vote. In 1950 an act of Congress, affirmed by a special election in Puerto Rico on June 4, 1951, permitted Puerto Rico to draft and pass its own constitution. The island people modeled their own government after that of the United States and delegates elected by the people approved their new constitution, 88 to 3. When submitted to the people on March 3, 1952, Puerto Ricans voted approval 373,418 to 82,473. On the

following July 3, President Truman signed a congressional resolution approving the new constitution and elevating Puerto Rico to the status of a free Commonwealth affiliated with the United States.

Puerto Ricans have all the benefits of United States citizenship and few of its responsibilities. They are as free as any people could be and still cling to an affiliation. And the great majority of Puerto Ricans do cling tenaciously to that affiliation. They do not want to follow the course of the Philippines and sever the link to go it alone.

Puerto Ricans, including those who did the shooting, came to the United States mainland and immediately went on the voting lists and the public assistance lists of New York City. They have done so by the hundred thousands since Fiorello LaGuardia and Vito Marcantonio inaugurated the plan to help relieve the densely overpopulated island by a shuttle-service of air transport to New York where they became political pawns of the LaGuardia-Marcantonio political machine and later of the Tammany-Junior Roosevelt-Lehman-Wagner forces.

It would be a critical mistake for us to hold that the revolutionary fanatics are typical of the Puerto Rican people. The shooting was put in proper perspective, we think, by the message issued immediately by Governor Marín yesterday. He said: "The whole people of Puerto Rico are deeply indignant because of this savage and unbelievable lunacy which does not express in the remotest way the peaceful and decent nature of the people of Puerto Rico."

So let's not hold Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans responsible. The people to be held responsible are those in custody and awaiting trial and the Nationalists, who are potential killers, both in Puerto Rico and in the United States.

Already the shooting has led to control of persons who shall enter the congressional galleries. In the future, Speaker MARTIN said, only persons with cards issued by a Member of the Congress will be given gallery privileges, and each Congressman will be responsible for the people he admits. This is a sane and proper procedure.

H. R. 8149, Introduced by Chairman of Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a Substitute for H. R. 7341—The New Bill Incorporates Amendments Made by Committee to H. R. 7341

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has authorized and directed me to report favorably without amendment, H. R. 8149, a bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to the States for surveying the need for diagnostic or treatment centers, for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, for rehabilitation facilities, and for nursing homes, and to provide assistance in the construction of such facilities through grants to public and nonprofit agencies, and for other purposes.

This bill takes the place of H. R. 7341, which I had the privilege to introduce on January 18 following the delivery of President Eisenhower's special health message to the Congress.

The bill carries out one phase of President Eisenhower's health program. It provides for the expansion of the program which is provided for under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. The expansion provided for in H. R. 8149 adopts the same principles which have proven so successful in the case of hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act. It would assist the States in constructing diagnostic or treatment centers, hospitals for chronic diseases, nursing homes, and rehabilitation facilities.

I want to stress that our committee was unanimous in reporting H. R. 8149. This unanimity is in line with the earlier history of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, which received bipartisan support when the program was first initiated in 1946 and again in 1949 and 1952, when the duration of the program was extended through fiscal year 1957.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has gone over carefully the original program, and it firmly believes that the expansion of the program called for in H. R. 8149 will greatly benefit the American people by providing the types of facilities which are clearly needed in providing health services to our people.

Charity Begins at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I see the United States Department of Agriculture has not given up on its idea of disposing surplus products to countries behind the Iron Curtain, at knock-down, give-away prices. I do not think the people of America, who, in reality, foot the bill in taxes for these subsidized products, are going to take too kindly to this proposition.

In the first place we have hundreds upon hundreds of families in America where the breadwinner is unemployed. Certainly they should have consideration in any program of disposal of surplusage by our Government. Again there are thousands upon thousands of marginally employed workers today in our country, people who are only gainfully employed several days a week. They should be given consideration also.

When the needs of our Nation have been well and amply provided for, that is time to look elsewhere for the distribution of those surplus products.

Of course, the proposal of the Agriculture disposal program to Russia's satellites only serves to focus attention on the whole proposition of trade with the Soviet-dominated world. Britain, as we know, is rushing into Russia's arms with indecent abandon in the effort to promote East-West trade. The British Government accompanies all such proposals with the ready explanation that it means to stop short of trading in strategic materials. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that this stumps me. I don't know how you can draw the line and say what is strategic and what is not. It seems to me that anything that sustains the Soviet regime, that enables it to keep in power, to increase its hold on captive states, anything that does this, is essentially strategic.

Because others appear ready and eager to trade principles for profits is no reason why Uncle Sam should abandon the moral basis upon which this Nation opposes and contests the tenets of atheistic communism.

There is much being proposed, Mr. Speaker, in the name of international trade these days that needs to be scrutinized. In this connection I would like to draw the attention of this body to the following communication from Mr. Thomas Kennedy, vice president of the United Mine Workers of America, to Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of the board of the Studebaker Corp., at South Bend, Ind., in which we gain some valuable insights into several aspects of modern international trade:

FEBRUARY 18, 1954.

Mr. PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
Chairman of the Board, Studebaker Corp., South Bend, Ind.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I have just read your article entitled "Suicide by Tariff" in the February 23 issue of Look magazine.

The first paragraph of your article is as follows:

"As we sat in my hotel room in Berlin, a German economist said: 'You Americans baffle me. You praise free enterprise. You know how much the American consumer gains when manufacturers really compete at making better products for lower prices. Yet you put up tariff walls against import goods that Americans need and want. The result is that Americans are obliged to buy domestic goods when they could get the same things better and cheaper from overseas. Does your idea of competition stop at the border?'" And then you say, "I could not deny his logic."

If you had considered all the facts, I think you could have easily denied the above. I was in Western Germany recently and found that American coal can be placed in Hamburg in successful competition with the Ruhr Valley coal, but it is impossible to do because the Federal Government of Western Germany refuses to grant an import license for such imports.

A recent Associated Press story from Luxembourg stated that Belgium had initiated a trade agreement with Russia involving purchase of 60,000 tons of Russian anthracite. In this connection it may be pertinent to ask if Belgium is using American dollars to cover this trade agreement, and why Welsh anthracite could not be purchased from Great Britain or from the United States as cheap as it could be bought from Russia.

It may also be fair to ask if subsidies are part of the international trade-relations program, or apply to any European nation, such as Russia and other countries, where nationalization of industries is in effect. Moreover, the various countries participating in the Marshall plan have been and are still buying Polish coal—which is really Russian coal. Have they used American dollars to purchase this coal?

Based on the foregoing facts and with some little knowledge of international trade, particularly as it relates to coal, it is my judgment that free trade or lower tariffs is a one-way street and the only country moving along this street is the United States of America. For instance, England refused to join the Schuman plan because it might damage its export trade and adversely affect wage scales in England; various South American countries have instituted import licenses and quota systems against American goods and commodities, and waste residual oil from Venezuela is indiscriminately dumped on our eastern seaboard in violation of every concept of reasonable competition with both liquid and solid fuels produced in this country.

In commenting on the Randall Commission report, which you refer to and evidently approve, I would say that the dissenting opinions of various members of that Commission make out a better case than the majority report which favors the Randall policy and dovetails with your views. It is quite difficult to make adequate comment on your article in a brief letter, but I think it is reasonable to make the observation that you should refrain from writing additional stories on tariffs unless you give consideration to all available facts related to this involved subject.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS KENNEDY,
Vice President.

Every fairminded person will agree, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Kennedy presents a well-reasoned, soundly set-forth case. I am particularly struck by Mr. Kennedy's question as to whether our own American dollars are being used as economic tools against us in this game of international trade. In like manner, I am impressed by his stress on the dumping of residual fuel oil on our eastern seaboard and its detrimental effect upon the coal industry of this country.

It would be well for all of us to bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that if this body approves the St. Lawrence seaway and it becomes a reality, then the flow of this residual fuel oil into the United States will be greatly increased and the harm it is doing to the coal and domestic oil industry will be gravely aggravated. We might also ponder well the probable additional effects of the seaway on other industries as the dumping of foreign goods is accelerated. Who knows how many products of Soviet slave labor will eventually find their way through the seaway doors to destroy the base of American industrial production and thus help promote the economic collapse which the top Soviet strategists await as the hour to launch their most aggressive assault. I commend these considerations to my colleagues as worthy of their best thought.

Low Tariffs Create a Menace to Employment and Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for the past 20 years tariffs have been reduced in a reckless and irresponsible manner and their serious implications have not been apprised by our people due to the prosperity created by war. There can be no denial that low tariffs have been creating a growing menace to employment and capital.

For several years, I have urged the responsible officials of the Federal Government to take corrective steps to remedy the great inroads made by foreign competition on our industries. I have repeated, in many instances, that our labor and industry should not be made "guinea pigs" for so-called internationalists and their policies of free trade.

The present Trade Agreements Act should be allowed to expire in June 1954 and Congress should resume its constitutional responsibility to regulate commerce, adjust tariff rates, and provide import restrictions in accordance with the principles of fair competition.

I vehemently disagree with the recommendations of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy in the further decrease of tariffs. It should be the authority of Congress to review our trade policies with vigor and concern, study the serious ramifications of legislation in order to protect our domestic producers from foreign competition, and adjust our trade policies in complete fairness.

As import pressure mounts from all sources, we will hear of other industries which have been affected. Already the coal industry has been unfairly afflicted by the imports of cheap foreign residual oil; the labor and management of the glass industry have been caused great alarm by cheap foreign imports; and the same situation exists in many other private enterprises. I highly recommend that all industries of our great Nation take this issue to heart—it is a serious matter and should not be ignored.

I have received thousands of communications from employees of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., located in Ford City, part of my congressional district, which I have the honor to represent. While it is impossible to elaborate all the views expressed, I feel the following resolution adopted by the elected officials of Armstrong County confirms the existing problems in the glass industry and I include the same as part of my remarks:

Whereas it has come to our attention that a further reduction in the United States import duties on plate glass and window glass has been recommended by the Randall Commission; and

Whereas there is a great spread in wages between foreign glass workers and those of this country, which spread amounts to something close to $2 per hour or more; and

Whereas almost all of the principal trading nations of the world have a higher percentage of duty on total imports than does the United States, a typical example being England, which at the present time collects duties amounting to approximately 25 percent of the value of their imports per year, while this country is collecting about 5 percent; and

Whereas raw material costs for glass making are more than twice as much in this country as they are abroad; and

Whereas the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. is one of the country's largest producers of window glass and plate glass and 2 of its 4 plate-glass plants are located at Ford City, which is situated in the central part of Armstrong County; and

Whereas further decreases in the duties imposed on importations of plate glass and window glass would materially affect this country's plate- and window-glass industry and the Ford City plant of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. would be involved; and

Whereas unemployment in the glass industry, which is by far the county's largest industrial operation, would affect many workers directly and all of the business and professional men as well as the tax income of the county: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, and it is hereby resolved, That we, the elected officials of Armstrong County, go on record as being unanimously opposed to such a reduction in import duties and request that you actively oppose any further reduction in the import duties on plate and window glass such as have been proposed by the Randall Commission.

J. Frank Graff, President Judge; Robert E. Ashe, District Attorney; Ross B. McIlwain, Wm. H. Claypoole, Walter H. Miller, County Commissioners; Herbert G. Gates, Prothonotary; Robert H. Powers, Register and Recorder; Ray DeLancey, Treasurer; Thomas C. Hutchison, Sheriff; E. Clinton Stitt, Controller; C. N. Hanner, Superintendent of Schools.

Problems Affecting the Welfare of Metal-Trade Workers in the Various East Coast Naval Shipyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 3, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, a matter of some importance has been called to my attention by a representative of the East Coast Metal Trades District Council. It is a situation that should be corrected, in justice to both enlisted men in the Navy and civilian workers in the naval shipyards.

The East Coast Metal Trades District Council is an organization of over 100 affiliated AFL local unions in the various east coast naval shipyards. The executive board of the council has been in session for the past several days considering problems affecting their members. It has been agreed that perhaps their most important single problem is concerned with the practice of assigning work normally done by civilians to Navy service personnel. That the problem is vital to the civilian workers in the naval shipyards is easily shown. For example, during the past month at the Norfolk shipyard job orders involving over 17,000 man-days of work were canceled and the work assigned to service personnel. The East Coast Metal Trades District Council has the names of the ships and the number of the job orders which were canceled and will make them available to any interested party. When it is considered that most of the work done by the crews of naval ships undergoing repair or overhaul at naval shipyards is assigned to them immediately upon arrival of the ships, and therefore never

appear on job orders, it becomes evident that the total amount of work done by the ships' force during the past month at Norfolk which could have been done better and cheaper by civilian workers is at the very least 3 to 4 times the 17,000 man-days listed above which are a matter of record.

Of course, this condition is not confined to the Norfolk Shipyard. Representatives from each of the East Coast Naval Shipyards attended the meeting of the Executive Board of the Council and it was agreed that this is a problem common to all naval shipyards. When you consider the amount of work done by Navy repair ships and tenders in addition to the work done by ship's personnel in shipyards it is clear that well over 50 percent of the repair and overhaul work on Navy vessels is done by service personnel.

The Metal Trades Council maintains that all this work could be done better and cheaper by civilian workers. The expense involved in training and maintaining a serviceman under present conditions makes him one of the most expensive workers in the country. This is not to be considered in any way as a criticism of Navy personnel. Their primary function is to operate the fleet and to train for maximum effectiveness in the event of war. The past record of the Navy proves that they do a magnificent job. However, to take these men who are trained to operate the Navy ships and attempt to make them fully qualified shipyard craftsmen is an inefficient utilization of manpower which causes extra expense, improper work, and unnecessary accidents.

If I were to attempt at this time to fully document the statement that the use of servicemen doing civilian work results in extra expense, improper work, and unnecessary accidents it would require hours of time. What I would like to do is to outline typical examples of the type of incidents which result from this practice.

For example, take the matter of additional expense. In addition to the items of maintenance, clothes, hospitalization, training, pensions, and so forth, which must be considered in computing the final cost of such work we would have to consider such typical jobs handled by servicemen as the following: On the U. S. S. *Coral Sea* at Norfolk—job order 16–127–4812—the crew fabricated 24 sections of 3½- and 4-inch bilge drainage pipe, approximately 170 feet. The job was not done properly and had to be renewed by the pipe shop. Since the shipyard had not done the work originally they were not aware that the job was faulty. An order to the shipyard to do the job was not issued until 7 days prior to the completion date. This late planning caused by the ship's force attempting the work resulted in overtime work to complete the work on time. Just the cost of the material ruined on this job was $253.20—170 feet of pipe at 84 cents per foot plus 48 flanges at $2.30 each.

At Charlestown, S. C., a job order—08–236–1601—was issued January 22, 1954, which instructed the ship's force to repair interior watertight doors. The doors were disassembled by the ship's force and the parts were cleaned and thrown in a large box. The parts were not tagged or identified in any way and at the present time are lying jumbled in the box. It will require many extra days work to sort out these parts, identify and reorder damaged parts, and reassemble the doors. The shipyard's civilian workers will almost certainly be called on to do the job at the last minute.

On the *LST 664* at Norfolk the servicemen undertook a routine job of cleaning fresh-water tanks which had been coated with zinc dust. As a result of neglecting safety precautions 18 of the men were sent to the dispensary to be checked for lung trouble.

The unsafe practices resulting from assigning inexperienced servicemen to ship repair work is further proven by the following excerpts from the safety bulletins put out at the Boston naval shipyard recently. The first quotation is from the January 25, 1954, bulletin. It reads as follows:

> Recently Joseph J. Maschella, plumber, was burned by hot steam when a wood plug driven into the end of a steam condensate line blew out, permitting steam to escape into the forward engineroom of the E–PCE(R)–850 on pier No. 7. The plug had been installed by the crew about a week before and blew out when steam was turned into the line.

The second item is taken from the issue of the same bulletin dated February 8, 1954, and reads as follows:

> Last week several members of the crew aboard the U. S. S. *Roberts* started to remove a bleeder valve from a 3-inch steamline in the No. 1 engine in the No. 1 fireroom. When the valve flange was unbolted the residual pressure in the line forced the joint open and a blast of steam burned the machinist mates performing the work.

As far as the overall operations of the Navy are concerned the three jobs listed above are minor. However, these cases can be multiplied by hundreds in each of the naval shipyards. An impartial study conducted by a congressional committee would reveal that the general conditions outlined above exist.

Actually the problem has actually gone further. The Navy is now using enlisted men, it seems, whenever and wherever it is possible to replace civilian workers. On the U. S. S. *Wacamaw* in Boston a job estimated at 65 man-days issued to the laborers to clean a number of tanks was canceled when the ship decided to have prisoners on board do the work instead. Further, in the past week a busload of prisoners from the First Naval District have been brought into the Boston shipyard daily and put to work on various ships, including the U. S. S. *Manuel*, the U. S. S. *Mullany*, and the U. S. S. *Baltimore*, doing work which has been assigned to civilians in the past.

At Norfolk shipyard recently members of the Metal Trades Union noted job order No. 62–025–5002 issued to repair 6,000 type A drawer stowage which had been made three-eighths of an inch too short. Upon questioning they were told that the drawers had been made in a Federal penitentiary.

At Portsmouth, N. H., the prisoners run a print shop which prints 10,000 copies of the monthly shipyard paper in addition to many of the standard forms used in the shipyard.

We are familiar with the viewpoint that argues that since the funds available for shipyard work is limited the curtailment of servicemen doing civilian work would not result in any additional work for the shipyard. This view ignores the basic cause of the situation outlined. At the time budget allocations are made to cover the cost of operating the fleet and the shipyards to service the fleet, the Navy estimates its manpower requirements for both servicemen and civilian workers. It is at that time that manpower ceilings are fixed, after which the Department is bound by its own ruling. It is also at that time that the weight of the labor force represented by the enlisted personnel makes itself felt, and that these misassignments of work are conceived.

It is the position of the Metal Trades Union that the Department estimates should be based on the principle that civilian workers should be employed wherever possible to free military personnel for primarily military duties. If this principle is followed we will not run into the situation where funds available for the shipyards are exhausted while servicemen are available in large numbers to do work which can be done better, safer, and cheaper by civilians.

It is not intended that these remarks shall be considered as a reflection on the enlisted men, but to show that it is neither fair nor just to put enlisted men at tasks not part of military duty and for which civilian tasks they have not been trained. The duties of enlisted men and civilian workers are separate and distinct and should be so considered so that to each will be assigned duties within their respective positions. To do this will be beneficial to both enlisted men and civilian workers.

Income-Tax Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as the deadline approaches for filing 1953 income-tax returns the taxpayers of my district and the Nation are increasingly conscious of the tax burden they have borne year after year. I welcome the current numerous proposals to increase income-tax exemptions for the taxpaper and his family. I have long advocated this method as the proper and realistic approach to reducing taxes.

I am convinced that H. R. 7204, which I introduced on January 14, is the most practical solution in respect to individual relief, as well as the effect on the general economy. I remind you that the provisions of my bill include a $1,500 exemption for each taxpayer, plus a $1,000 exemption for each dependent.

While it is true that H. R. 7204 provides higher exemptions than the amounts generally being recommended by other Members of the House and Senate, I believe that such relief is long overdue the American taxpayer. President Eisenhower stated last month that he would consider a cut in taxes as a medium of stimulating increased buying if business conditions seem to warrant such a step in the coming month. Inasmuch as the Chief Executive recognizes the tax reduction would energize the national economy, it is my conviction that Congress should act immediately to utilize this bona fide business tonic that is a traditional part of the diet of a healthy nation.

For all too long the American wage-earner and his family have been burdened with unjustifiably high taxes that were used to nuture a Federal bureaucracy that exceeded all proportions of necessity and sanity. These tax dollars were also used to finance economic programs in all parts of the world. Now that the bureaucracy is being trimmed to proper size and lands far away are gradually being weaned from the pumps that have siphoned dollars from the United States Treasury for many years, the time has come for the taxpayers in my district and the Nation to be shown some consideration.

I do not arbitrarily say that my bill is the positive answer to the acknowledged need for tax reductions, but I submit that it is incumbent upon this Congress to study closely the provisions of H. R. 7204 and their ramifications before assuming that such a rise would be too acute at the present time.

I call to your attention the fact that while the revenue loss resulting from enactment of this measure is purported to be between 2 and 3 billion dollars, the consequent increase in the take-home pay of millions of Americans would so invigorate the Nation's economy that the projected loss would be quickly neutralized. Moreover, the American wage earner would once again feel that "of the people, by the people, and for the people" is taking precedence over the phrase "from the people" which has become a truism in years past.

Report on Southeast Asia and the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, last fall four members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs—Hon. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, Illinois; Hon. E. ROSS ADAIR, Indiana; Hon. CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin; and myself as chairman—flew more than 30,000 miles in the Far East and southeast Asia. We visited 14 countries and dependencies to make a firsthand assessment of American policies, programs, and problems.

We took every opportunity to meet and talk with our officials, local officials, and private citizens, both Americans and local. It was a hard trip, but, I believe, a fruitful one.

Since our return, we have been engaged in writing a report of our findings. That report has now been prepared and submitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. In it we have studiously tried to be objective and candid. We have no desire to be sensational. Nor do we believe that any constructive purpose will be served by dealing in rosy generalities.

It is our belief that the Members of the House may find the report helpful in formulating their judgments on the complexities of the Asian scene, and I am including the conclusions herewith. We hope that in addition many Members will find time to read the more detailed observations on each country, or at least the recommendations we make at the end of each country study.

CONCLUSIONS ON SOUTHEAST ASIA AND PACIFIC

The study mission returned from its Asian trip firmly convinced that a free Asia is vital to the security of the free world and, therefore, to the security of the United States. The Communist danger cannot be overestimated. Delay and indecision operate to the advantage of the Communists.

COMMUNIST STRATEGY AND TACTICS IN THE FAR EAST

As in other areas of the world, the Communists in the Far East have shifted their tactics to exploit the weaknesses of their opponents at the same time that they remain rigidly loyal to their objective of bringing this area within the Communist orbit. The study mission had its own views on this matter confirmed in the course of a conversation with one of the highest British officials in Asia. He observed to the rtudy mission that the Communists are embarking upon the third round in their drive to capture this area. The first round immediately after World War II involved a period of respectability in which they promoted united fronts and sought to take power through coalition governments. Beginning about 1948 they felt strong enough to embark upon the second round which consisted of armed uprisings and attempts to seize by force the Governments of this area, as exemplified in Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, Indochina, Korea, and the Huks in the Philippines. They failed in part because they revealed their real plans and alienated much of the local population.

It is evident now that the third round has begun—a shift back to conciliation and a peace offensive as their principal tactical weapons rather than reliance upon armed uprisings and physical violence. Their failure to win by violence alone, plus involvement in the Korean war, has caused them to revert, not only in Asia but around the world, to their former tactics of respectability in a united front. The danger is that now this technique may find a more ready response among war-weary people. Timed to coincide with talks, settlements, truce, and conferences, it may more easily enable the Communists to gain by peace what they have not been able to win by war and violence.

The daily preoccupation of governments and peoples with their immediate tasks, together with the constant variation in Communist techniques of attack, has obscured the larger Communist strategy that is unfolding in Asia. The Communists already control China. From that deep and rich base they can move north to strike ultimately at Japan. Korea was a step in that direction. The cessation of Korean hostilities represents no abandonment of their plans. They are also advancing south to secure the rich resources of south Asia. Should they succeed in this continental pincer movement, the manpower of China, plus the industrial capacity of north Asia, plus the agricultural and raw material resources of south Asia, would create a most formidable power element roving against the free world.

Asian leaders with whom the study mission spoke left no doubt that they now understand the nature and dangers of Communist aggression and the menace posed by Communist China. They are confident they could cope with their local Communists were it not for outside aid in the form of funds, propaganda, and even sabotage from Communist China. But living as they do under the long shadow of this menace, they have to exercise caution and restraint. They are not encouraged to do otherwise in the absence of a clear and firm policy by the United States and the free world. So long as this uncertainty and the resulting irresolution exist, Asian leaders cannot be expected to stand up against Communist China. And the longer it takes the United States and the free world to fix their policy and set their course of action, the more difficult it becomes to convince the Asian peoples of the sincerity and steadfastness of purpose of the free world.

The immediate threat to Asia is from mainland China, the Asian puppet of the Soviets. By virtue of its location, size, and manpower, Communist China intrudes itself into every phase of Asian issues. It is to this grim reality that our policy and actions must be directed. Some leaders believe the threat is so serious that they advocate vigorous preparation for an attempt to destroy the Communist regime by military action even though they recognize the terrible cost and the possibility of unleashing other problems almost as great as those that now exist. Others who do not go so far agree that we cannot wait for the slow process of time to effect changes in the character of Chinese communism. In the dynamic atmosphere of the present world such a policy is tantamount to abandonment. Neither is it reasonable to expect the Chinese people to rise up against a ruthless police state regime that controls a heavy military establishment.

The most feasible course open to us is to carry on a constant and simultaneous combination of pressures from within and without in order to intensify the internal problems of the Chinese Communist regime and to give encouragement to those outside. Our tactics must be as numerous, varied, and flexible as those of the Communists. Such a campaign requires imagination in its conception and ingenuity in its execution. Like a military operation, the cold war involves harassment, withdrawals, and feints, as well as forward thrusts. The mobility necessary to carry out this policy will require cooperation among our allies abroad and understanding by those of us at home who may easily mistake a diversionary move as a sign of appeasement.

RECOGNITION AND ADMISSION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

At the same time, the United States must steadfastly refuse to recognize the Communist regime in China and must resist its admission to the United Nations.

The study mission was unable to discover any benefit that recognition could bring to us or to any other nation in the free world. This is not a matter of speculation. What benefits have been gained by any of the countries that have recognized Communist China?

There are solid grounds for opposing Communist China's admission to the United Nations and other international organizations:

1. Legally, such admission would make a mockery of the U. N. Charter itself, which restricts admission to "peace-loving" nations. Communist China cannot qualify for admission until it proves it has changed its character and objectives by supporting the U. N. against aggression, instead of supporting aggression against the U. N. It cannot change its character and objectives until it ceases to be Communist. And the more the world accepts it the less reason there is for it to shed its communism.

2. Politically, admission to the U. N. would be a smashing victory for world communism and a smashing defeat for the forces of freedom. It would give the Communist dictatorship in China legitimacy and respectability, enormously increase its prestige, influence, and power. It would give Communists control of Chinese embassies and consulates in scores of countries, including some which have never recognized the Soviet Union. Every consulate would become a center of Communist espionage, sabotage, and propaganda. This would be especially disastrous in southeast Asia, where the free peoples are already fighting a life-and-death struggle to halt Communist advances and subversion.

3. Morally, it would be an equally devastating defeat for the free world. Admission would not be mere acceptance of a powerful band of gangsters on the basis of expediency or so-called realism; rather, it would be abandonment of 450 million people to Communist enslavement. It would be regarded by all as an attempt to buy peace for ourselves by sacrificing our own moral principles and other peoples' freedom. If anyone imagines the peoples of Asia will resist a Communist China which the Western World embraces, he is deceiving no one but himself. History proves that there is no peace in appeasement.

If we are to defeat the avowed purpose of armed communism to conquer the world, the first step is to prevent its gaining any more victories—territorial, military, economic, diplomatic. Free Asia will crumble once it believes the Communists are winning. Recognition by the United States or admission to the United Nations would mean to Asia, as it should mean to us, that the Communists have already won.

PACIFIC PACT

The study mission noted a gradual recognition by many of the governments that collective security offered the best hope for survival. Much of this changing perception stems from the collective action taken in Korea. The United States has mutual security pacts with the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and Korea. The study mission believes these are significant elements in the defense of the region. The question is whether conditions are favorable for broadening these bilateral arrangements into a regional pact. In this connection the study mission offers these observations:

1. The initiative for such a pact must come from the Asian nations themselves. But such initiative is not likely to come unless these nations feel confident that the United States will view it with favor and will support it.

2. Relations between Japan and the other free nations, notably Korea and Australia, have not yet reached a degree of cordiality sufficient to favor broadening the present bilateral agreements.

3. Any such pact is meaningless without the inclusion of Nationalist China. Yet to include Nationalist China must take into account the legitimate aspiration of the National Government of China to return to the mainland. It must also take into account the desire of the Republic of Korea to unite all of Korea into a single nation.

In line with previous expressions by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the study mission believes that a Pacific pact is a desirable objective toward which United States policy should be directed.

ASIAN NATIONALISM

Time is rapidly running out in Asia when constructive policies and measures can be undertaken. However much we may believe we are winning psychological battles, the Communists are gaining control of more territory and more people. Ignorance or apathy on our part is almost as useful a weapon for the Communists as is their own guile.

The study mission has returned from this area with a deep conviction that the free world must deal intelligently, decisively, and rapidly with a complex situation. The peoples in Asia want to develop self-government in a peaceful and neighborly world. Nationalism is the lingua franca of Asia. The Communists have long recognized this. Let they use it only to destroy the newly won independence of these peoples. If the programs of the free world are to succeed, the first requisite is that we use Asian nationalism in fact as the Communists do in name. Outside assistance, including American aid, must be presented and managed in a way which will make unmistakably clear that its purpose is to strengthen, not undermine, their national independence. In that approach we in the free world have not been too successful.

The moment is quickly approaching when the rising tide of communism could engulf Asia. This is not the time for panicky action any more than it is for wishful thinking. Neither will exorcise the threat to Asia. The first step is to recognize the danger, then plot our policy and resolutely follow it. Such a course requires that the executive branch reveal to the people the unpleasant facts, restrained only by considerations of security. The study mission is following its own advice by speaking out with as much candor as it can on this subject. To do otherwise would defeat the very purpose for which the trip was made.

ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

There is a popular assumption that appropriations of money are the solution for our problems. Money is a measure of our interest, not a yardstick of our success. If money alone could do the job, our problems in Asia would long since have disappeared. Its conversion into constructive programs and action is the real test.

Since 1945 the United States has given more than $6 billion in economic and technical assistance to countries in this area. About $5 billion has been for various kinds of emergency relief, most of it immediately after the war. Since 1950 more than $1 billion has been, or is being, spent for programs of economic and technical assistance.

The "impact" phase of economic assistance is nearing its conclusion in most countries. In view of the limited funds and the chronic difficulty in securing suitable personnel, emphasis should be on technical assistance projects and not commodity programs, except where the military situation may require some commodity support. The projects ought to be only those that build upon the basic strength of the country rather than spreading the funds over an array of projects, however useful, that must be started from scratch. The study mission believes that concentration on fewer and more significant projects will better serve both the immediate and the long-range needs of the countries and, at the same time, offer a more convincing demonstration of the benefits to be derived from technical assistance.

Technical assistance is by its very concept a personalized program. The fact that it has not yet proved possible to recruit and to retain dequate numbers of first-rate personnel is one of the strongest arguments in favor of its sharper, and more limited focus.

Historically, Asian governments have seldom been benevolent governments. The Communists have capitalized on the popular hostility toward government by working with the people. It cannot be denied that in many cases they have gained support among the populace by appearing to serve its interests. In contrast, the United States, not operating a fifth column, has of necessity worked with governments, and thus has been the recipient of some of the odium, suspicion, and lack of understanding that prevail.

The technical assistance program is reaching a point in experience where it is necessary to reexamine many of the assumptions on which it was initiated and to reappraise results in terms other than economic. Too little attention has been given to the effect of economic and technical assistance on the political and social life of the recipient country. The consequences of the aid program in these fields may be more significant than in the economic field. For example, the program was billed as a "grassroots" approach. Yet our missions must operate through the established government agencies. In the underdeveloped countries the gap between the grassroots and the governments has always been wide. Is the effect of our aid widening the gap? If it is, what are the implications? The study mission saw some projects that were poorly conceived and badly executed, but it also saw evidence that some basic projects were bringing to peoples not only immediate improvements but were gaining respect and appreciation for the United States.

The study mission suggests that each of the geographical subcommittees of the Committee on Foreign Affairs give more attention to a study of our economic and technical assistance programs in this broader context.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

The nations of Southeast Asia and the Pacific are either under attack or stand in imminent danger of attack. All of them are victims of Communist subversion. They have no alternative but to divert their limited resources to the support of a military establishment. This is their only hope for survival. Their continuance outside the Communist orbit is as important for our national security as it is essential for theirs. The study mission recognizes the necessity for continued military assistance in proportion to the urgency of the need and the capacity to use it effectively.

In the one area engaged in open conflict at the moment, Indochina, the study mission believes it imperative that the maximum use be made of Vietnamese forces. Their effectiveness is contingent upon the training that they receive. No less important is the building up of their conviction that they are fighting for their own national salvation. Thus far these have been slow. The study mission believes that American and French authorities should vigorously explore means by

which their military training, political consciousness, and morale building can be accelerated. The splendid showing made by South Korean troops is indicative of what can be accomplished by well-trained troops fighting in defense of their own country.

POLITICAL EVOLUTION

The Asian nations have left their authoritarian past and are groping to find an acceptable political alternative. Without exception they have borrowed liberally from the vocabulary of western democracies. But the new governments have not yet been able to give to these words the same content that they have in the Western World. It is doubtful if they ever will—certainly not in the foreseeable future. Democratic practice as we understand it requires a high sense of public responsibility and the acceptance of rules and values different from those that are the heritage of the Asian nations. In most of those countries parties are little more than cliques clustered around a few leaders, who, however worthy their motives, have had no experience in relating policies to popular support. Nor have they had to think through the complexities of the basic issues that confront their countries. The prevailing tensions and pressures do not provide the occasion for reflective thought and convincing argument. Expediency is the more acceptable method by which to gain and hold power.

Political parties and organizations have not yet established firm roots among the populace. For this reason it is open to debate to what extent the leaders speak for the people whom they profess to represent. Many of them are western oriented—lawyers, civil servants, and members of a small urban elite—who are not too well informed about their own country however articulate and influential they may be.

The absence of private capital imposes upon the governments the obligation of supplying capital, thus encouraging the growth of a heavy bureaucracy that will become more firmly entrenched as the economy develops. There is the ever-present danger that this group will manipulate the machinery of government according to its own predilections and stifle, not necessarily by design as much as by force of circumstances, the local initiative and expressions that we in the West regard as part of the democratic process.

To the illiterate masses the operation of democratic machinery represents confusion. In the democratic process opposition performs a valuable service. In the Orient the idea of a loyal opposition is neither understood nor respected. It has no constructive function. To be in the opposition is generally regarded not as evidence of political courage but as evidence of weakness. Against the unfamiliar pattern of democracy, the Communists provide an alternative which is more intelligible to Asians. It is not the ideology of communism that is attractive to them. It is the discipline, organization, program, and action that are more in accord with their tradition. The danger is that the confusion attendant upon the development of the parliamentary system will offer an unfavorable contrast to the rigidity and apparent efficiency of communism.

For this reason, the study mission was particularly pleased with the conduct of the Philippine elections. It is the best illustration of the orderly transfer of power in that part of the world. It is not to be expected, however, that the other nations will soon emulate the Philippine experience. The Asian nations must work out their own political pattern in the light of their own background and experience. The western concept of democracy will be modified by local innovations, adaptations, and circumstances. Part of our responsibility will be an understanding of this diversity rather than its castigation, and a willingness to work with it toward the solution of common problems.

SUMMARY

The study mission believes that the United States must recognize frankly that it is the security—even the survival—of the free world that is threatened in Asia. We do not believe, in the light of our information and analysis, that a third world war is the most immediate danger in that part of the world. The first stage in the Communist program is always to try to subvert the weak and divide the strong. Therefore, it is the unending series of local actions in Asia, including violence and subversion, and the constant attempts to sow dissension among our allies in Europe and elsewhere, to which American policies must be directed with intelligence, vigor, and determination if we are to prevent the gradual chipping away of the free world.

Tariff Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, not content with the severe damage suffered by manifold economic groups in this country as a result of insidious trade policies that scorn America's welfare and security, the theorists are now proposing measures that would further extend harm and distress throughout many of the districts which you and I represent.

My congressional district is one of the principal victims of inequitable competition from the deluge of foreign residual oil that has invaded domestic coal's legitimate markets. Now this same congressional district is involved in another unfair struggle for economic subsistence that requires the immediate attention of Congress. Our plate- and window-glass manufacturers and their employees who last year lost approximately 2,150,000 man-hours of work as a result of markets lost to imports are the new victims of this treacherous trade policy. That figure, which represents hardship for many American workers and their families, should in itself be sufficient to stimulate corrective action on the part of responsible officials in our Government. Unfortunately, however, nothing whatsoever has thus far been done to alleviate the situation; on the contrary, the Randall Commission would widen the devastation by a further reduction of tariffs.

I ask you, the Members of this Congress, how long must our people endure this sort of treatment? No one will deny that the American glass industry has been one of the most important contributors to industrial progress and to better living for all of us. It has made our lives healthier, safer, and brighter. It is my privilege to be personally acquainted with many hundreds of persons connected with the glass industry in my district. They are loyal Americans who, like their fellow citizens, have been called upon year after year for sacrifices that other nationals would, by tradition, consider far beyond the call of duty. They traveled to the hot deserts of Africa, to the mountains of Asia and the broad beaches of the Pacific, across the explosive terrain from Omaha Beach to Berlin and through all of Italy, and in airplanes and fighting ships traversing the universe in the campaign that our fellow men might be free.

For the past decade our people have shared ponderous burdens in order that those human beings for whom we fought—and many whom we fought against—might enjoy economic standards never before attained. Our people have made these sacrifices without complaint, but our voices rise in justifiable wrath when we are unnecessarily deprived of our right to provide the necessities of life for ourselves and our families. We reject any philosophy that would subject our people to the ranks of the unemployed in order that selfish internationalists might prosper. We refuse to be made starving guinea pigs for the experimentations of sanctimonious doctrinaires.

Mr. Speaker, until our Government moves toward a sensible trade policy, the crescendo of demands from neglected American citizens will increase in intensity. If this Nation is to reject any depreciation of our living standards, our industries must be protected from cheap foreign competition. Glass manufacturing abroad is so similar to that of this country that the wage differential is almost entirely responsible for the discrepancy in production costs, so obviously European manufacturers can undersell American companies.

Belgian glassworkers earn from 38 to 51 cents per hour, as compared with an average of $2.43 paid by the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. plants in my district. The pattern is the same when comparisons are made with other countries, and it is also applicable in the case of transportation workers who are responsible for getting the glass to market. The product is shipped across the Atlantic in vessels whose crews earn only a fraction of the wages paid to American railroad employees; consequently glass can be shipped from Europe to our east coast cities at rates that are actually lower than rail freight charges from our Ford City plant to the same United States destinations.

Under these circumstances, are American management and labor asking too much in requesting an increase in the inadequate tariff rates now in effect? Are they unpatriotic in rising in protest against the philosophy of the Randall report and any other recommendation that would move this country still closer to the shoals of economic disaster and place it at the mercy of foreign trade winds? The people back home are awaiting a reply from Washington.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, March 1, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, whose glory is in all the world and whose grace is the breath of our very lives: We thank Thee for this day freighted with promise and wealthy with opportunity if we but seize it. Save us from missing its nobler calls by our prepossession with lesser and meaner concerns, so that when evening tints the sky "It might have been" will not be our sad lament. Give us the purpose and the patience to fill sunny hours with labor knowing that, after our brief and fitful day, the night cometh, when our work is done. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 4, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MALONE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 3, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 153. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert;

S. 303. An act for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr;

S. 502. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand; and

S. 827. An act for the relief of Matthew J. Berckman.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor; and

H. R. 2567. An act to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1967. An act for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co.; and

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2984) to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. POTTER, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for salaries and expenses, Forest Service (subappropriation fighting forest fires), for the fiscal year 1954 had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF BUREAU OF MINES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Bureau of Mines, Coal Mine Inspection Branch, and Health and Safety Division, Department of the Interior, for the period January 1 through December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

A letter from the Secretary, Railroad Retirement Board, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CENSUSES OF MANUFACTURERS, MINERAL INDUSTRIES, AND OTHER BUSINESSES

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 19, 1948, to provide for censuses of manufacturers, mineral industries, and other businesses, relating to the year 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF STATISTICS OF COTTON

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cotton" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT, RELATING TO REQUIREMENT FOR FINAL PHYSICAL EXAMINATION IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate telegrams, cablegrams, and a letter in the nature of petitions from the Council of School Supervision and Administration of Ceiba; the Local Board Teachers Association of Ceiba; the Local Board Teachers Association of Aspiedras; local union No. 849, Sugar Industry of Camuy; the board of directors of the National Farm Loan Association of Puerto Rico of San Juan; the Rotary Club of Ponce; the Puerto Rico State Association of Letter Carriers of San Juan; the Secretary of Education, San Juan; the Puerto Rico Council of Boy Scouts of America, San Juan; the supervisory council, Puerto Rico Teachers Association, San Juan; and J. Acosta Henriquez, Rio Piedras, all in Puerto Rico, condemning the action of certain persons in attempting to assassinate Members of the House of Representatives, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MAINTENANCE OF BOSTON ARMY BASE FACILITIES—RESOLUTION OF DIRECTORS, NEW ENGLAND CHAPTER, NATIONAL DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the directors of the New England chapter, National Defense Transportation Association, with relation to the repair and maintenance of the waterfront terminal section of the Boston Army base. This subject is of great importance to those of us who reside in Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF NEW ENGLAND CHAPTER, NATIONAL DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION, ADOPTED, BOSTON, MASS., THE 9TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 1954

Whereas the National Defense Transportation Association has as its aims and objectives: To assist in effecting transportation preparedness for war. To make studies and reports upon special subjects and problems pertaining to all phases of transportation as they may affect requirements during an emergency. To bring to the attention of the people of our country the necessity for transportation preparedness and to stress the importance of transportation as a major factor in bringing an emergency to a successful conclusion; and

Whereas the National Defense Transportation Association, which membership consists of recognized experts in the field of transportation and allied industry, subscribes to said aims and objectives; and

Whereas the New England chapter, National Defense Transportation Association, has been advised of the proposal of the Department of the Army, that the section of the Boston Army Base known as the "waterfront terminal section" be leased, sold and/or declared excess to the Department of Army needs; and

Whereas Boston Army Base is the only terminal in New England with the necessary supporting facilities vital to the requirements of the military in times of national emergency; and

Whereas other pier facilities in Boston and/or New England are not sufficient in number or adequate in type; and

Whereas it is the further understanding of the New England chapter, National Defense Transportation Association, that the Department of the Army proposal is necessitated by the failure to allocate funds in the budget for needed repairs and rehabilitation; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the directors of the New England chapter, National Defense Transportation Association, that the waterfront terminal section of the Boston Army Base is a necessary facility in preparedness for periods of emergency; and

Whereas it is the considered opinion of the directors of the New England chapter, National Defense Transportation Association, as assembled, that the proposal to lease, sell, or declare excess is contrary to the best interest of national defense and preparedness; and

Whereas it is the considered opinion of the New England chapter, National Defense Transportation Association directors, as assembled, that it is the purpose of their organization to express themselves in such matters: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the directors of the New England chapter, National Defense Transportation Association, meeting at Boston, Mass., this 9th day of February 1954, advise the Defense Department, and the Armed Forces Committees of the Congress and the Senate of the United States, and all New England Members of the Congress and the Senate of the United States, that the proposed action of the Department of the Army to lease, sell, or declare excess the waterfront terminal section of the Boston Army Base is contrary to the interest of national defense and preparedness; therefore, be it further

Resolved, That the Department of the Army, the Armed Forces Committees, all Members of the New England delegation to the Congress and the Senate of the United States, be requested to recommend the allocation of funds for the maintenance and rehabilitation of the waterfront terminal facilities of the Boston Army Base.

PRICE SUPPORTS ON DAIRY PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF WASTEDO FARMERS UNION LOCAL 488, GOODHUE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Wastedo Farmers Union Local, No. 488, Goodhue, Minn., concerning reduced price supports on dairy products, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY ABOUT 135 MEMBERS OF THE WASTEDO FARMERS UNION LOCAL, NO. 488, AT MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 15, 1954, IN THE LEON TOWNSHIP HALL, GOODHUE COUNTY, MINN.

Resolved, That we are alarmed at the drastic action taken by Secretary Ezra Benson in reducing price supports on dairy products to 75 percent of parity.

That this action will not only destroy farmers' buying power but will in turn injure the economic structure of all business in agricultural areas.

That our congressional representatives should at this session of Congress take legislative action to annul such unfair drastic administrative action taken by the United States Department of Agriculture.

That the lowering of price supports on soybeans, flax, and dairy products in addition to acreage cuts already provided for will mean that farmers are headed for a severe economic depression in 1954.

ARTHUR E. HAGGSTROM,
Secretary, Wastedo Farmers Union Local No. 488.

CONGRESSIONAL AND JUDICIAL SALARIES—RESOLUTION OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT BAR ASSOCIATION OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the 11th Judicial District Bar Association of Minnesota, on February 15, in favor of increasing congressional and judicial salaries, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT BAR ASSOCIATION OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Resolved, That the 11th Judicial District Bar Association of the State of Minnesota hereby approves United States Senate bill No. 1663 introduced by Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of the United States Court, and United States attorneys, and urges the Honorable EDWARD J. THYE, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK to lend their support to the passage of said legislation.

Adopted and approved by the 11th Judicial District Bar Association of the State of Minnesota February 15, 1954.

DIRECT PRODUCTION PAYMENTS FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF ROCK CREEK BOOSTERS CLUB, ROCK CREEK, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Rock Creek Boosters Club, Rock Creek, Minn., at its meeting on February 9, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred. The resolution expresses approval of the principle of direct production payments for dairy products.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the February meeting of the Rock Creek Boosters Club held at the C. Edwin Peterson farm home on February 9, 1954:

"Whereas the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has declared he will seek a reduction from 90 to 75 percent of parity on dairy products; and

"Whereas the dairy farmers of the northwest are greatly disturbed by the act of the Secretary of Agriculture in singling out the dairy farmer for such drastic cut in his income; and

"Whereas the farmer's cost of operating his farm is at its highest peak, as to tractors, farm machinery, repairs, gas labor, taxes, etc.; and

"Whereas the present method of handling by the Government the purchasing and storing of dairy products are not feasible nor economical: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we favor the principle of direct production payments for dairy products, thereby consuming all the dairy products at its market place; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and Congressmen, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C."

JOHN E. JOHNSON,
President, Rock Creek, Minn.
Mrs. ERVIN NELSON,
Secretary, Pine City, Minn.

After the meeting adjourned the following members signed the resolution and are on file with the secretary:

John E. Johnson, Rock Creek, Minn.; Gunnard Shoberg, Rush City, Minn.; Clifford Shoberg, Rush City, Minn.; Ernest Olson, Rush City, Minn.; Gust Christenson, Rush City, Minn.; Elmer Johnson, Rush City, Minn.; C. Edwin Peterson, Pine City, Minn.; Harold E. Peterson, Pine City, Minn.; Ervin L. Nelson, Pine City, Minn.; Louis Baum, Pine City, Minn.; Mrs. Alice Nelson, Pine City, Minn.; Mrs. Harold Peterson, Pine City, Minn.; Mrs. C. E. Peterson, Pine City, Minn.; Mrs. Freda Johnson, Rock Creek, Minn.; Mrs. Hannah Johnson, Rush City, Minn.; Mrs. Edith Christenson, Rush City, Minn.; Mrs. Mabel Shoberg, Rush City, Minn.; Mrs. Margaret Olson, Rush City, Minn.; Mrs. Viola Baum, Pine City, Minn.

EMPLOYMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION AGENTS — RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, DULUTH, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Duluth, Minn., Chamber of Commerce, on February 23, proposing the employment of Agricultural Extension Agents in the Forestry Division of the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Duluth Chamber of Commerce, through its agricultural council and its forestry committee, is cognizant of the vast amount of privately owned land in northeastern Minnesota which is suitable for forestry purposes, such as production of pulp, fence posts, veneer, and saw logs, which would supplement other regular farm income; and

Whereas those owning such lands are in need of technical assistance to aid them in planning a well managed, long-range forestry program; and

Whereas such special assistance has been made available in Itasca County by the employment of an extension agent in forestry, demonstrating, beyond all doubt, the value of such technical assistance in forestry to private land owners.

Therefore the Duluth Chamber of Commerce, through its agricultural council and forestry committee, resolves that the Congress of the United States give very serious consideration to the matter of shifting existing funds within the Department of Agriculture which would permit employment of agricultural extension agents in forestry; that these agents in forestry be located in the agricultural extension offices of the several counties in northeastern Minnesota, working and cooperating with the agricultural extension agent and other cooperating agencies to develop a long-range forestry management program which would benefit not only the private land owner who has land suitable for growth of trees, but would benefit society in general by making greater and wiser use of our natural resources; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Congressmen and Senators in Washington, and that a copy be sent to the Director of Extension at University Farm, St. Paul, Minn.

RESOLUTIONS OF ROSEAU COUNTY (MINN.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by the Roseau County Farmers Union, favoring a price support of 100 percent on farm commodities, and opposing the selling out of Government projects to private power companies, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROSEAU COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
Roseau, Minn., February 18, 1954.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At our last Farmers Union County Board meeting we passed these two resolutions:

"The Roseau County Farmers Union Board, representing 800 farm families, goes on record favoring a price support of 100 percent or full parity on all farm commodities"

"The Roseau County Farmers Union Board goes on record opposing the selling of our Niagara Falls or any other Government project to any private power company for generating purposes."

Sincerely,

MRS. TILFORD WICKLANDER,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF OKLEE FARMERS UNION, LOCAL 157, OKLEE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by the Oklee Farmers Union Local, No. 157, Oklee, Minn., on February 12, favoring a price support of 100 percent of parity on farm products, and extending the REA program, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLEE, MINN., *February 18, 1954.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: When we, the members of the Oklee Farmers Union Local, No. 157, Red Lake County, in a meeting assembled on Friday, February 12, 1954, the following resolutions were passed representing our 144 members:

"RESOLUTION 1

"A resolution was passed asking a support price of 100 percent of parity on all farm products including perishables with marketing quotas or production controls if necessary.

"Therefore we urge you to vote and strongly support this legislation when it comes up in Congress."

"RESOLUTION 2

"We favor extension of the REA program and further development of dam sites and hydroelectric power by the Federal Government. Cooperatives and municipalities to have first preference of such power. We are opposed to the proposed plan where cooperatives would be required to estimate their power needs for 20 years in advance. It would be impossible to estimate the needs for even a short time in advance due to the rapid increase of power needs."

Therefore we urge you to strongly support the extension of the REA and to strongly oppose and vote against the new power policy on the proposed plan requiring 20 years advancement estimates of power needs when it comes up in Congress.

OKLEE FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
MRS. ALFRED SYRTVEIT,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION OF PINE ROCK GRANGE 775, PINE CITY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by Pine Rock Grange, No. 775, Pine City, Minn., on February 17, demanding 90 percent of parity for dairy farmers, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PINE CITY, MINN., *February 18, 1954.*

Hon. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY:

The Pine Rock Grange, No. 775, at their meeting on February 17, passed a resolution demanding 90 percent parity for the dairy farmers and instructed me to send you a copy of same.

PINE ROCK GRANGE, No. 775.
JOE KARAS, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTIONS OF GOOD HOPE LOCAL, MINNESOTA FARMERS UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Farmers Union, Good Hope local, on February 17, to extend the present price-support program, and concerning the imports of oats, barley, rye, and wheat, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the 95 family members of the Minnesota Farmers Union, Good Hope local, Pennington County, Minn., at local meeting held at B. F. Bieswenger home February 17, 1954, offer the following resolutions:

"RESOLUTION 1

"1. We urge that our Congressmen and Senators extend the present price-support program until its committees can develop a program that will give the farmers 100 percent of parity, which will be fair to producers and consumers alike.

"2. We urge that Congress take account of the Secretary of Agriculture setting the price of dairy products at 75 percent of parity and have them moved up to present levels which expire March 31, 1954.

"3. We are agreed that food occupies a position in the present international situation, where it is properly classified as a defense weapon.

"We urge, therefore, that congressional policies be written which will specify the upper and lower limits of the reserves of food and fibers and other agricultural products which are necessary to be maintained in the national interest, but that such reserves should be surrounded by safeguards which will effectively insulate them. Farmers should not be forced to assume the cost and other burdens of such reserves, when they are created in the national interest."

"RESOLUTION 2

"1. We urge our Congressmen and Senators deal promptly with the imports of oats, barley, rye, and wheat, when these imports of grains endanger the interests of the farmers and the Government.

"2. These imports are a direct abuse of price-support program.

"We urge once more that Congress take appropriate and prompt action to halt the imports of farm commodities that prevent attainment of the goal of parity prices."

JOE JOHNSON,
President.
Mrs. C. H. BEISWENGER,
Secretary.

EXCISE TAX ON TELEPHONE SERVICE—RESOLUTION OF BRAHAM FARMERS MUTUAL TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION, BRAHAM, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Braham Farmers Mutual Telephone Association, Braham, Minn., at their annual meeting, urging the elimination of the 15-percent Federal excise tax on telephone service, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANCHFIELD, MINN., *February 23, 1954.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the annual meeting of the Braham Farmers Mutual Telephone Association the resolution written below was decided on in committee. The chairman, Mr.

Charles A. Pearson, reported to the directors and delegates in regular session. This director organization represents 11 rural telephone companies around the Braham, Minn., area.

On motion seconded, and carried L. L. Schaeffer, secretary, was ordered to spread on records said motion; and to send a copy to each Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Hon. EDWARD THYE, and Hon. ROY WIER.

"Whereas there is now imposed a Federal excise tax of 15 percent of telephone service which imposes a severe and, we think, an unjust burden and additional cost on all telephone users, local as well as long distance. This tax steps up to 25 percent on calls over 24 cents charge. Since this tax as it is now applied has a crippling effect on small independent companies, it should receive the consideration of the tax-making bodies: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we the directors of the Braham Farmers Mutual Telephone Association, in annual meeting assembled, and representing 210 rural telephone stations, do hereby respectfully urge the elimination or reduction of these discriminatory taxes."

Respectfully submitted.

L. L. SCHAEFFER,
Secretary, Braham Farmers Mutual Telephone Association, Braham, Minn.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2911. A bill to provide for the development of a sound and profitable domestic wool industry under our national policy of expanding world trade, to encourage increased domestic production of wool for our national security, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1044).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 3068. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, relative to the process of selection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3069. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. FERGUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 3070. A bill to govern the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water; and

S. 3071. A bill to amend the act authorizing agricultural entries under the nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such act to 320 acres; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 3072. A bill for the relief of Spirodon Karousatos; and

S. 3073. A bill for the relief of Julius Rutigliano (Giulio Rutigliano); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3074. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to authorize the disposal of certain Federal surplus property to State and local units of the United States Civil Defense Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DEVELOPMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAYS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which I believe will provide adequate funds from the Federal Government for the development of the Nation's highways. I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement in connection with the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

The bill (S. 3069) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there is no substantial disagreement about the need for much swifter and broader action in the development and maintenance of our national highway system. The need is great, and bold action is required. This bill authorizes bold action.

The bill provides a total of $2,208,000,000 for each of the 2 fiscal years, 1956 and 1957, for the Federal share of our highway program.

On the principal Federal-aid systems, where funds are matched by State and local agencies, this bill proposes $2,175,000,000 against authorizations in the 1952 act of $575 million for each year.

A large increase is proposed in funds available for the national system of interstate highways, from $25 million to $900 million. Large increases are also proposed for the Federal primary, secondary, and primary highways in urban area systems.

The bill I have introduced would also authorize the sum of $100 million for defense highways, including circumferential highways around a city or intracity radial routes. I believe this is an important authorization in the bill because it will make funds available for development of necessary civil defense highways. These highways, necessary also in the everyday development of our cities, would also play a vital role in military and civil defense should such a need ever arise. They too, would be invaluable as evacuation routes, and, also, as means of bringing support and assistance to areas affected in case of a bombing attack. I believe this Nation will be much better off if we construct evacuation highways for civil defense which can also be used every day rather than build bomb shelters that we hope will never be used.

In addition to these features, which I believe mark a positive, constructive and adequate approach to our highway problem, this bill contains highly desirable new legislative features.

First. The funds authorized in the bill would be apportioned among the States on the basis of a modified formula. One-half of the funds would be apportioned on the basis of existing law and one-half on the basis of the proportionate number of motor vehicle registrations in each State. I believe this is a sounder approach because our highway problem exists where the cars and trucks are and this bill would attack the problem directly.

Second. The entire amount for the farm-to-market roads of the Federal secondary system would be made available for disbursement to the States on a certification that the plans meet the requirements of the individual State. This would give States the opportunity to use their own initiative and resourcefulness to get maximum mileage in the secondary system. It would answer the criticism of some that greater mileage would be possible except for the standard required by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Third. Authority would be provided for the President to advance allocations made under this bill by 1 year if he finds that such a speedup would be desirable as a means of increasing employment.

Fourth. In order to assure that adequate consideration is given to the civil-defense aspects of highways, the bill directs that Federal highway officials consult periodically with the Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

Fifth. The bill provides a new and broadened section authorizing research activities on the part of the Bureau of Public Roads. I have felt for some time that research in highway planning and construction has not kept pace with the development of modern motor vehicles and believe this new authority will be beneficial in that respect.

Sixth. Because existing Federal legislation in the field on highways is contained in numerous different acts running back for many years, this bill directs the Federal highway officials to transmit to Congress a draft of consolidated and codified Federal highway legislation which I hope will eliminate some of the difficulty and confusion which now exists.

The sums which would be authorized in this bill are based on two separate and unrelated sets of facts:

First. The deficiencies in the federally supported highway systems is estimated by the President in his economic report to be $35 billion. This bill contemplates a 15-year program of restoration of our national highways, at the rate of about $2.2 billion per year. This bill is adequate to eliminate the existing backlog of highway needs within a reasonable period.

Second. This bill will authorize a sum approximately equal to the amount of revenue collected by the Federal Government from various highway-use taxes, including gasoline, oil, and various excise taxes on vehicles, tires, and accessories.

I hope an early public hearing will be held on the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at the conclusion of my remarks a comparative table of the au-

thorizations under the current act and those proposed by my bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison in authorizations in Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 and proposed authorization in Ferguson bill

Item or category	1952 act, Public Law 413, 82d Cong. for 1954–55 fiscal years	Ferguson bill, 1956–57 fiscal years
Federal-aid system:		
Primary system	$247,500,000	$425,000,000
Secondary system	165,000,000	350,000,000
Primary system in urban areas	137,500,000	350,000,000
Interstate system	25,000,000	900,000,000
Defense highways, including circumferential highways		100,000,000
Total, Federal-aid system	575,000,000	2,125,000,000
Federal roads:		
Forest highways	22,500,000	22,500,000
Forest-development roads and trails	22,500,000	22,500,000
Park roads and trails	10,000,000	10,000,000
Parkways	10,000,000	10,000,000
Indian roads and trails	10,000,000	10,000,000
Public lands roads	2,500,000	
Total, Federal roads	77,500,000	75,000,000
Total, each fiscal year	652,500,000	2,200,000,000
Total, for both years	1,305,000,000	4,400,000,000
Special authorizations:		
Inter-American Highway	16,000,000	16,000,000
Other	65,500,000	
Total, special authorizations	81,500,000	16,000,000
Grand total	1,386,500,000	4,416,000,000

SUBMISSION OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS TO THE SENATE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I did not want to take the time of the Senate last night in connection with Senate bill 3067 which I introduced at that time for myself and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], but I would like to briefly call it to the attention of the Senate at this time.

The bill would require the State Department to transmit to the Senate within 30 days the text of any executive agreement or other international agreement to which the United States is a party. The bill also provides that the President of the Senate shall refer the agreement to the appropriate committee of the Senate, or the appropriate joint committee.

At the present time, the State Department is required by section 102 of the United Nations Charter to send the text of these international agreements to the U. N., but there is no requirement that they advise the United States Senate.

I believe this is completely unreasonable, so the Senator from California and I have introduced corrective legislation.

We would be pleased to have other interested Senators join us in sponsoring this proposed legislation.

JOHN SAUDAS—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on the Consent Calendar, last Tuesday, the Senate passed and sent to the House Senate bill 1138, for the relief of John Saudas. I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which that bill was passed, and I have been advised by the Parliamentarian that it will be necessary that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate. There are certain features of the bill which I should like to consider further. I have discussed the matter with the majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to reconsider the vote will be entered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I move that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware requesting the House to return to the Senate, Senate bill 1138.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as acting majority leader, I wish to commend the Senator from Delaware for the action which he has just taken. This is another example of the able manner in which the Senator from Delaware performs his senatorial duties. The motion involves a very serious matter, and as a result thereof the Senate will be required carefully to review proposed legislation passed this week on the Consent Calendar. I am very proud that the Senator from Delaware invites our attention to the seriousness of some of our actions, particularly when they appear to be ill considered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Statement prepared by him on the anniversary of Hungarian Independence Day.

Statement prepared by him on the anniversary of the Soviet nomination of Rumania.

DECLARATION OF UNITED STATES SOVEREIGNTY OVER AREAS OF THE ANTARCTIC CONTINENT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, recently I have noted the interest being taken by the press and radio in my resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 127, declaring United States sovereignty over certain areas of the huge Antarctic Continent. This resolution is a companion measure to House Joint Resolution 353, introduced in this Congress and in prior Congresses by Representative TOLLEFSON, of Washington. In section 1 of the joint resolution, specific meridians, 90° to 150° west longitude, are given as boundaries of an area which American citizens have explored and which has not yet been claimed by any other country. Under section 2 of the joint resolution, all other American explored lands are included, and the President is requested to take necessary steps leading toward negotiation for the recognition of our claims in the areas which have been explored by Americans, but which today lie within the formal paper claims of other nations. I mention these two main sections of the joint resolution because in some press accounts the distinction between them has not always been clearly understood.

In taking action on a measure of this kind, the Congress will not in any way encroach upon the conduct of foreign affairs, which is rightly in the hands of the executive branch of our Government; but especially in regard to the tract not claimed by any other nation, the Congress quite properly has an opportunity to pass upon the declaration of our sovereignty. I hope the Foreign Relations Committee will soon find an opportunity to consider the joint resolution.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a portion of a newscast by David Wills over the National Broadcasting Co. network on February 16, 1954, on the program Three Star Extra, originating in Washington, D. C. I believe the commentator is to be commended for his research work in connection with claims of the United States as to parts of the Antarctic Continent.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bills have been introduced in Senate and House to declare American sovereignty over parts of the Antarctic Continent, specifically the area between the 90th and 150th meridians of longitude. This incidentally, is the worst stretch of coast on that whole frigid continent. No one has ever landed upon it from the sea, and no other country claims it.

Up to now the American official position has been that while we do not claim any land in Antarctica, we reserve the right to make any claims we wish and meanwhile we don't recognize the claims of any other country.

The Argentinians, the Chileans, and the English keep up a running quarrel over that part of Antarctica opposite South America, tear each others' huts down, sail a cruiser by to show strength, but never get too rough.

The Norwegians, English, Australians, New Zealanders, and the French have mutually recognized each others' claims, some of them rather tenuous; only one New Zealander has ever even seen the place.

The Russians thought they had a brave right since 1820 when an explorer named a cape Alexander the First Land, but it turned out to be only an island.

While no one lives in Antarctica, 10,000 men visit it yearly for whaling, and a land mass twice the size of the United States must have abundant minerals. The ice

caps make them unworkable right now, but who knows what technological progress and atomic power may make possible in the future. A couple of centuries ago when the beaten French had to choose between ceding a couple of Caribbean islands or Canada to the English, they kept the then rich islands and surrendered the unwanted colds of Canada—now a fabulously wealthy nation.

The wealth of Antarctica may some day be opened up, and America will want her share, earned by many brave and successful explorations.

SURPLUS FOODS FOR NEEDY AMERICANS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, on February 3, I addressed identical letters to the Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare, urging swift action to establish a system whereby surplus foods in Government stocks can be more readily distributed to needy American citizens, particularly unemployed persons and elderly people receiving inadequate pensions and insurance, and requesting that the Departments assign staff experts to cooperate with me in drafting proposed legislation.

As of today, I have received replies from the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Agriculture. The Department of Labor has offered to detail a staff man to work with me in the preparation of proposed legislation, but the Department of Agriculture has reported that "its studies and discussions have not progressed to the point where specific legislation can be formulated." The Department of Welfare has not yet replied to my letter dated 1 month ago.

A great many individuals from all parts of the country have written me about this proposal. I have also received a large number of thoughtful comments and suggestions from leaders of organizations concerned with this problem.

As matters of interest to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the following communications relating to this food disposal plan be printed in the RECORD at this point:

From the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, the Iowa Food Distributors Association, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, the Cooperative League of the USA, the National Association of Retail Grocers, and the Iowa CIO Council.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1954.

Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of February 3, concerning the possibility of using surplus food stocks to improve the diets of groups within this country with limited amounts of money to spend for food.

We appreciate and share your concern over the size of Government-held inventories and the need to find constructive uses for such surpluses without dislocating normal trade channels. Moreover, we are in complete agreement with the principle expressed in your letter that maximum use of such foods should be made in meeting the need of some of our citizens for improved diets before wide-scale dispositions are made for foreign relief purposes.

Many persons in this country are now benefiting from our donations of surplus foods. During this fiscal year, we now estimate that at least $170 million worth of surplus foods will be distributed to over 9 million children in school-lunch programs and 1 million inmates of charitable institutions.

This use of surplus foods is being accomplished under our program of direct distribution, for which both the Federal Government and the States share responsibility. This Department arranges for and underwrites the costs incident to such donations up to the time such foods are delivered in carload lots to the States. The States are responsible for all subsequent costs of handling and delivery to eligible groups. Through the extensive use of existing storage and transportation facilities, States have developed quite effective delivery systems, with a minimum of out-of-pocket costs.

Needy families also are eligible to receive surplus foods under our present program of direct distribution. However, until recently, there has been but limited demand for such distribution; donations to needy families have been made only in certain areas in a few States and to Indian families on reservations. Recently, there has been a marked increase in interest in, and requests for, distribution on a family basis. In this connection, we want to point out that the Department has held that needy families are not necessarily limited to those receiving general assistance or welfare grants such as old-age assistance. Rather, as far as surplus commodities are concerned, needy families are those certified by State or local officials to be in need of additional food.

In response to these requests for family distribution, such donations are being accomplished as rapidly as States are able to arrange for the certification of applicant groups as needy and for the local handling and distribution of the commodities. We want to point out, in this connection, that the majority of States would be required to make considerable realinements in their delivery organizations (now based upon relatively infrequent deliveries to relatively large-volume users) in order to accomplish any wide-scale family distribution. Nonetheless, substantial progress is being made. Our latest report indicates that States are now providing surplus foods to 283,000 needy persons and that this number will shortly be increased by at least an additional 130,000 persons. Dairy products—butter, cheese, and dry milk—are making up a substantial portion of this distribution, since the Commodity Credit Corporation holds no stocks of dried eggs and canned beef, purchases were limited to the quantities that could be used by existing outlets at the time the purchase was made.

We recognize there are certain limitations of this method of using surplus foods to improve family dietary levels. Therefore, we are now studying the advantages and disadvantages of alternative or additional methods of accomplishing such an objective. We have been discussing various approaches with Senator AIKEN and other members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and with the House Committee on Agriculture. However, these studies and discussions have not progressed to the point where specific legislation can be formulated.

If you should wish more detailed information on the current status of our program of direct distribution, particularly in relation to donations to needy families, we will be happy to supply it.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, February 16, 1954.

The Honorable GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 3 and your telegram of February 13. This reply was delayed pending my return this morning from California.

I have been advised by the Secretary of Agriculture that his Department has already devoted a great deal of time and effort to this vital problem in cooperation with the Senate Committee on Agriculture under the chairmanship of Senator AIKEN and that these deliberations have and will explore many possible solutions to the problem including the one you propose. I understand that the Labor Department will be called upon shortly to participate fully in these undertakings.

However, this Department is ready to cooperate with you in every possible way and I have asked Mr. George Tobias, program specialist attached to my office, to contact you and determine how best the Labor Department can be of service.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor.

IOWA FOOD DISTRIBUTORS ASSOCIATION,
Des Moines, Iowa, February 10, 1954.

Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senator from Iowa,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Thank you very much for your letter of February 5, and especially so for sending a copy of your letter to Secretary of Agriculture Benson, in which you suggest a procedure that will be helpful in proper utilization of the tremendous supply of foods purchased under the price-maintenance program.

Certainly the need for some action in this matter is imperative and your suggestions are both practical and timely.

You recall, of course, the so-called food-stamp program which was in operation, beginning in 1939, and continuing until the need for disposal of surpluses ended during the war period. The previous plan proved satisfactory in most respects and by adoption of a program substantially similar the plan could be made effective promptly. It is most desirable that the products now in storage or to be bought hereafter be furnished to those most in need of additional food, and certainly it is proper and praiseworthy to avoid the loss of these valuable foods.

You may not recall the circumstances but the record will show that this office was the first to suggest the adoption of the food-stamp plan, and our members and I personally worked very closely with Mr. Milo Perkins, director of the previous program, throughout the entire period that the plan was in operation. Des Moines was one of the first cities in which the plan was tried and this office was very active in assuring the proper and successful operation of the program in this trade area and in obtaining its expansion throughout our State.

This background of experience is mentioned only as a basis for our assurance that we are ready and anxious to cooperate with you and with the Federal Government in the establishment and operation of a program such as the one you suggest, or in providing any assistance that we can render in the operation of any other practical plan to meet the present situation.

Thanking you very much for your assistance and with best personal regards, I am,

Yours most sincerely,

RALPH E. KITTINGER,
Secretary.

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1954.
Senator GUY M. GILLETTE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have read with great interest the copy of your letter to Secretary Benson of Agriculture, Secretary Hobby of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Secretary Mitchell of Labor.

I would say that your proposal seems to me to be in accordance with the American way of thinking. Your statement that you believe that charity should begin at home is, indeed, apropos to the situation today when we are giving millions to other nations when we have hundreds of thousands living on a very meager income, thus unable to have proper nourishment.

Have not had an opportunity to speak to Mrs. Ahlgren, President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, regarding her personal attitude to this, since she is out of the city. But I find that the General Federation of Women's Clubs has resolutions which, I am sure, would cover the subject sufficiently to allow us to support you in your effort to have the surplus foods distributed among our own people who need it. We have one resolution under the caption "food surpluses" which states that the General Federation of Women's Clubs "expresses its strong support of continued efforts to reach an effective method for the constructive use of United States agricultural surpluses." While in this particular resolution the General Federation had in mind overseas underdeveloped countries, we also have a resolution for "protection of consumer interests" which says that "a permanent joint standing committee of the House and Senate be formed whose purpose shall be to inquire into all matters affecting the health, welfare, and protection of the consumer and to recommend appropriate legislation."

Therefore, it is my opinion as legislative research director for the General Federation of Women's Clubs that this organization can and will support the principle set out in any legislation which will use our surpluses for the needy people in our own country—as I believe the above quoted resolutions give us that much latitude.

I personally am extremely interested in your suggestion of food stamps and I have many, many times spoken from the platform urging that some feasible plan be worked out whereby surpluses, if need be, be given to the needy rather than have the taxpayers pay storage.

You can count on the General Federation of Women's Clubs working for any principle which is set up for this purpose.

Sincerely,

SALLY BUTLER,
Director, Legislative Research.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON AGRICULTURAL LIFE AND LABOR,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1954.
Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Thank you for sending us a copy of your release about the proposed food-stamp bill.

There is a great deal of interest in this bill among our member organizations and I shall include some of your letter in the next issue of our bulletin.

I enclose a copy of our last issue.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH B. HERRING,
Executive Secretary.

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Cleveland, Ohio, February 9, 1954.
Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Your letter of February 5, 1954, and copies of the press release and your letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, requesting assignment of experts to assist in drafting a suitable plan to distribute dairy, meat, and other perishable food surpluses to persons dependent on old-age and other unemployment benefits, is appreciated.

The suggestion that Government-held food surpluses be distributed to needy Americans is, indeed, timely and a reasonable way such surpluses should be used as long as there is urgent need for them in this country.

There are many thousands of workers who have been unemployed for such an extended period that they have already exhausted benefits due them under the unemployment-compensation laws of the several States and under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Such unemployed workers are in a worse condition than those receiving old-age, retirement, or unemployment benefits. The proposal to distribute Government-held surpluses to needy persons should include unemployed workers whose unemployment benefits have been exhausted.

I trust the Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor, and Welfare, will quickly respond to your request by making available the necessary experts to formulate the plans needed to draft the required legislation.

The food stamp, or any other feasible plan, should be developed without undue delay. There is immediate need for distribution of the surplus foods to those receiving inadequate old-age or retirement benefits and to the unemployed workers. Such distribution will release storage space for the oncoming crops.

I compliment you on your aggressive action in promoting this worthy cause.

Sincerely yours,

W. P. KENNEDY,
President.

UNITED STATES WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1954.
Senator GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Thanks very much for sending us documents relating to your suggestions and actions with respect to some form of food-stamp plan or other plan for the disposal to needy citizens of the Government's huge stock of certain surplus foods.

Proper disposal of these foods is most desirable but constitutes a very difficult problem. We are glad to note your activity in this connection.

In view of the fact our official board has taken no stand on any specific plans for accomplishing the desired objective, we are not in position to offer you any definite suggestions except by way of inquiry and comment as follows:

1. Is it intended that the retail store would carry a separate stock of Government surplus foods for which the proposed stamps would be exchanged?

(a) This, of course, would impose extra management and handling to keep such stocks separated from the normal supply.

(b) How would the purchase of these Government surplus foods affect the movement of similar foods held in the grocer's regular stock? For instance, a pound of butter purchased through the stamp plan might very well result in 1 pound less of butter purchased from regular stock which, of course, would not create the added movement desired. Such being the case, the dairy farmer would not benefit, the Government would have 1 more pound of butter moved into surplus for each pound moved out, and the merchants all along the normal line of distribution would have that much drop in volume.

2. Assuming that these Government-owned surpluses would be made available to grocery stores throughout the Nation, how would these stores obtain possession of such foods?

(a) Would the Government set up commissaries throughout the country for distributing these foods to the retailers? Or—

(b) Would the established wholesalers be expected to stock and deliver these surplus foods?

3. What provision would be made for paying the cost of necessary distribution? Would the retailer and distributor be permitted to charge their normal overhead expense or would they be expected to handle these surplus foods at cost, adding the expense load onto their other sales?

We would like for you to keep our association on your mailing list for further information on this movement, and for further consideration as developments may warrant.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD O. SMITH, Jr.,
Executive Vice President.

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1954.
Senator GUY M. GILLETTE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Thank you very much for sending us a copy of your letter to the Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor, and Welfare. Certainly speedy action should be taken to make effective use of our surplus food stocks.

We are wholeheartedly in support of your proposal to use substantial parts of these foodstuffs for our own needy citizens. This, of course, should be an immediate and prior consideration of any disposition of the surplus.

Because there will be about $6 billion worth of commodities in the surplus pile by June, several of us have felt that up to $1 billion worth of these foodstuffs should be used for overseas relief. CARE, in which we have a very important role and in which you have a very great interest I know, is proposing to the Congress that a substantial part of this should be distributed by voluntary agencies, including CARE. We are taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of the CARE proposal and hope you will give it your earnest consideration.

Cooperatively yours,

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE,
WALLACE J. CAMPBELL.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETAIL GROCERS,
Chicago, Ill., February 17, 1954.
Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Your letter of February 5, asking for comments on a communication you addressed to the Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor, and Welfare, urging immediate action to dispose of surplus food stocks, was forwarded to me by our Washington office—because I am president of the association and a resident of your home State of Iowa.

At the outset, let me tell you that we join wholeheartedly in your concern about the vast stocks of food being purchased and stored by the Federal Government. The sight of the Government buying and storing mountains of edible and nutritious foods is one that is the proper subject of concern by everyone.

As representatives of independent retail grocers, we view this problem from the point of view of consumers. And there is a growing dissatisfaction with the present system which permits the accumulation of these surpluses without any adequate means for disposing of them.

Independent retail grocers are opposed to allowing this food to go to waste. However, neither can we allow the disposal of this food to threaten the stability of either agriculture or the food distribution industry.

We note you have not suggested any set plan or method, but instead ask that the matter be studied and carefully considered. The National Association of Retail Grocers is more than anxious to see this done and will consider it a privilege to join with you and other Government officials in working out some plan to prevent waste of this food, and not at the same time upset normal distribution channels.

We believe, and feel sure you will agree, that formulating a food-stamp plan or any other plan must be worked out carefully. As you so rightly stated, these surpluses hang like a Damocles sword over our market. This being so, we urge that the utmost caution be exerted so that the desired result can be accomplished economically, efficiently, and without a disturbing effect.

Very truly yours,

V. L. BROWNER,
President.

DES MOINES, IOWA, *March 1, 1954.*

Senator GUY GILLETTE,
Senate Office Building:

Iowa CIO council supports you in your plan to distribute surplus perishable foods to needy unemployed; many thousands of our members in Iowa industrial cities now in real need as unemployment benefits expire. Your plan can be of great benefit to farmers as well as needy factory workers.

KEN EVERHART,
Secretary, Iowa CIO.

BRICKER AMENDMENT VOTES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was extremely interested to read in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune a very clear summary of the various votes on the Bricker amendment, as written by the distinguished syndicated columnist, chief of the Tribune's Washington bureau, Mr. Roscoe Drummond.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Drummond's article be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HAPPENED ON THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Senator BRICKER is undoubtedly right in suggesting that the issues behind the defeated Bricker amendment have not been settled for all time.

Senator BRICKER himself said that he intends to renew his effort to alter the treaty-making powers of the Federal Government. Mr. BRICKER may or may not change his mind. In any event, it is important that the public not misread the one-vote defeat which the Senate finally gave to the last, watered-down version of the Bricker-Knowland-George resolutions.

On the surface it might appear that the Bricker amendment was lost by so hair-breadth a margin as to suggest that it retains strong support in Congress.

The exact opposite is the reality. Whether you are a supporter or an opponent of the Bricker amendment, you will want to have this fact clear.

The factual position is as follows:

1. The core, the central substance of the Bricker amendment, as it was advanced at the beginning of this session, was that a treaty should become effective as internal law in the United States "only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of the treaty." This was the controversial "which" clause. It was so substantially opposed by the majority of Senators and so obviously headed for defeat that Senator BRICKER never brought it to a vote.

2. Then, on February 17, the Senate rejected what many thought was an unclear adaptation of the "which" clause, rewriting the Constitution to say that no treaty shall be effective unless it is "in pursuance of the Constitution." The vote was 44 to 43, or 15 short of the required two-thirds.

3. Next came the vote on Senator BRICKER's amendment to the Knowland resolution, the effect of which was to require legislation by Congress before any treaty or executive agreement could be effective as internal law—unless a two-thirds vote of the Senate specifically ruled otherwise. This amendment lost by a vote of 50 to 42, or 20 votes short of the required two-thirds.

Thus ended all efforts to dilute the authority of the President and the powers of the Senate to negotiate and ratify treaties. The effect of these votes was to show:

That, at all times and on all tests, there was a majority judgment in the Senate against any effort to alter the treatymaking procedures of the Constitution.

That, at all times and on all tests, there was never even a majority vote (and from 15 to 20 short of the needed two-thirds) against any constitutional change in treaty-making procedure.

The final one-vote defeat of the George resolution, from which the principal provisions of the Bricker amendment had been omitted, dealt only with an uncertain generality about no treaties violating the Constitution, and with a provision that executive agreements (as distinct from treaties) would become effective as internal law only after legislation had been passed by Congress.

The essence of this record is that the heart of the Bricker amendment was defeated by substantial votes before the George resolution was put to a test and that the one-vote defeat of the George resolution dealt primarily with the residual nontreaty phases of the earlier proposals.

Most observers agree that there is a theoretical potential danger that two-thirds of the Senate could ratify an ill-considered, improper treaty or that the President could approve a similarly unwise executive agreement that could become internal law.

But the difference between the latter version of the Bricker-George resolution and present law is only this:

Under the proposed changes no such treaty or executive agreement could become effective as internal law without one or both Houses approving in advance.

Under the Constitution, unchanged, any such treaty or executive agreement can be instantly removed as internal law by an act of Congress even after it is ratified. It has been done more than once.

If the issue is to be further pressed, those who disapprove any major change in the Constitution—and the Senate votes indicate that they are the majority—will reasonably feel that the advocates should be able to demonstrate a clear and present concrete danger, not merely a theoretical, potential danger that the Senate is not doing its duty.

INCREASE PERSONAL EXEMPTION AND EXEMPTION FOR DEPENDENTS UNDER INCOME-TAX LAW

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on February 19, last, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], for himself, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], introduced Senate bill 2983, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the personal exemption and the exemption for dependents to $800 for the 1954 taxable year and to $1,000 for succeeding taxable years; to the Committee on Finance.

This bill would increase the personal exemptions and the exemptions for dependents from $600, the present amount of allowable deductions, to $800 for the taxable year 1954. Beginning next year those deductions would be increased to $1,000. Mr. President, I wish to announce my support of that measure.

At the time of introducing that bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia said, among other things:

Whatever we do for corporations and whatever we do for the big business organizations may have an indirect effect on our economy, but what we do in this field, by leaving more take-home pay in the pockets of the workers, will increase the purchasing power, and will stimulate productivity in the United States. If we are courageous enough to take this forward-looking step, before our economy falls on its face, we can be of great service to the American people.

Mr. President, I am sure my announced support of this measure is no surprise to my colleagues in the Senate. Nor will it come as a surprise to the people of my State of Arkansas, whom I have the honor to represent in this distinguished body. I have long advocated this method as the proper way to begin reducing taxes. As early as May 28, 1947, when a tax bill was before the Senate, and at which time these exemptions were only $500, I offered an amendment to increase personal exemptions to $750.

In urging the adoption of that amendment, Mr. President, I said on the floor of the Senate:

I have said over and over again that I think that is the point where tax relief ought to begin, namely, with people in the low-income brackets, the low-wage earners, the people who are having a struggle to provide the actual necessities of life. * * * Many a man is struggling today to live on a comparatively decent standard. * * * It is obvious that we should start reducing taxes by helping those at the bottom of the ladder who have the hardest struggle.

Notwithstanding my efforts, on a roll-call the amendment was rejected by a vote of 44 to 27.

Again, on July 14 of the same year, feeling so strongly the propriety and necessity for increasing income tax exemptions, but realizing I could not get them increased to $750 as I had originally proposed, I offered an amendment to raise exemptions to $600, the amount they are at present. In addressing the Senate at that time, I said:

There is no use arguing the amendment. Senators know they are either for it or do not favor it. I know it will be said it would increase the loss of revenue to result from enactment of the bill. Certainly it would. That is what we are doing, proposing to lose revenues, and if we are to lose revenues, and keep on losing them, I want to lose some to the advantage and for relief to wage earners and small-salaried folks who are trying to make a living, who are having a hard struggle to meet the high cost of living. I should like to remove some of them from the Federal tax rolls. They are the ones who need tax relief most. Their

tax burden is much greater than any whom this bill is designed to benefit.

The Senate turned down that proposal, but by a vote of only 47 to 43.

Later, on December 12, 1947, I again took the floor in a special session of the Senate to urge the Republican majority of the 80th Congress to acknowledge their responsibility for the enactment of proper tax legislation by providing relief to low-income groups. In that address I said:

Those are the people, Mr. President, who are really suffering from high taxes. If our Government can stand any loss of revenue—if now is the time to make reduction in income taxes—let us start by including in any tax-reduction bill that we enact, relief for those people who need it most, by raising personal exemptions sufficiently to take them off the tax rolls.

Continuing, I said:

I hope, Mr. President, that in the next session of the Congress we will enact legislation to raise personal exemptions in order to remove many citizens from the tax rolls and help others in the low-income brackets who greatly need tax relief.

The issue raised by my amendments in 1947, although they were not adopted, helped to pave the way for the raising of personal exemptions to $600 in the bill that was enacted the following year.

While trying to get personal exemptions increased in 1947, I also sponsored an amendment to remove the flagrant Federal income-tax discrimination that then existed against husbands and wives in Arkansas. Husbands and wives in 12 community-property States paid much less Federal income tax on the same amount of income than husbands and wives of Arkansas were required to pay. Three of those States—Oklahoma, Texas, and Louisiana—border on Arkansas. Thus, citizens of Arkansas were being unjustly penalized and discriminated against.

The first amendment I offered to remove that discrimination was defeated by a vote of 51 to 29. Later in the same session I offered the amendment again, and it was defeated by a vote of 52 to 40; but, it was not defeated until promises were given by the leadership of both the majority and the minority that the amendment I was sponsoring would be incorporated in the next tax bill, which came up the following year. That promise was kept, and in 1948 the principle of putting husbands and wives of all States of the Union on the same basis with respect to Federal income taxes was passed.

I may say that up to now it has resulted in the elimination of a discrimination which would have amounted to approximately $40 million to the husbands and wives of Arkansas, as compared with the 3 States on its borders.

Mr. President, a general tax-revision bill is presently being developed and processed in the House of Representatives. It has not yet been reported by the Ways and Means Committee, but I think we can anticipate that a tax-revision bill will be passed by the House and sent to the Senate at this session of Congress. If that prospect materializes, then the distinguished Senator from Georgia will have the opportunity to present his bill as an amendment to the tax bill that comes over from the House.

I understand that the Secretary of the Treasury, and the administration opposes raising personal exemptions. The Ways and Means Committee of the House has already rejected the proposal. If the House does not incorporate this provision in the bill it passes and sends to us, then we must make the fight in the Senate and adopt the George amendment.

I say this, Mr. President, because the reductions now indicated by the House Ways and Means Committee are wholly inadequate to give proper tax relief under present economic conditions. They ignore and disregard giving relief where the need is the greatest. That relief can be provided only by the increasing of personal exemptions.

It appears that the revisions now proposed by the House Ways and Means Committee and by this administration would benefit big business and individual taxpayers in the upper-income brackets.

Apparently the philosophy behind this administration's tax-revision program is based upon the so-called "trickle-down" theory—the argument being that tax cuts for big business would stimulate investments and production, resulting in more jobs and more payrolls. This "trickle-down" theory, Mr. President, is not the proper approach for relieving the tax burden where the present greatest distress exists.

The cost of living is today at the highest level in the history of our country. It has risen approximately 12 percent since 1947. If I was right in the position I took then—and I was—in urging that personal exemptions be raised to $750, we are more than justified in insisting now that they be raised to $800.

Instead of providing tax relief, Mr. President, that will "trickle down" to the small-income groups, I want to give them some direct relief by raising their personal exemptions and thus permit them to retain more of their wages to meet their own personal expenses and the cost of living. In other words, Mr. President, by raising personal-income exemptions we can create tax relief and benefits that will "trickle up" and bolster our economy by placing more purchasing power in the hands of the consumer. That is to say, if those in lower-income groups are given an increase in personal exemptions they will be able to spend those additional funds, taxes they are now required to pay, for those essentials and necessities of life of which they and their families are now being deprived.

That money spent by them would, of course, find its way into the possession of those in the higher income categories. It always does. Money spent in the normal course of trade by our small-income earners goes for food, clothing, and those basic essentials that make for a higher standard of living. Such expenditures ultimately go back into industry, thereby enabling it to expand, to create more jobs, and to increase production and payrolls.

It is said that the increasing of personal exemptions to $800 as proposed by the Senator from Georgia will cause a loss of revenues of approximately $4 billion. While I doubt that the net loss would be that much, nevertheless, such a program is necessary in the threatening situation if we are to use tax relief for the bolstering of our economy. I am for a sound economy, but I submit that no economy is sound when, by the imposition of a Federal income tax on his meager earnings, the low wage earner is deprived of those essentials that are needed and necessary to provide for him and his family a minimum standard of living.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support, as I have in the past, the proposal to raise personal exemptions as a means of providing tax relief to those in the greatest distress, and who are suffering most under the present income tax burden.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORDON obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield in order that I may address a question to the majority leader with reference to the course of the debate upon which we are about to enter?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there are some of us who are in the position of supporting the efforts for statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska. The first question to be voted on, as I understand, is the motion which has been made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to attach the Alaska bill to the Hawaii bill. I should like very much to have each of these matters considered on its own merits, and, at the same time, I would not like to have the Alaskan proposal acted upon without full consideration by the Senate. So my question is this: Is it the purpose and determination of the distinguished majority leader, in the event of the passage by the Senate of the Hawaii statehood bill by itself, to take up at an early date thereafter the Alaska statehood bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that it is the purpose of the majority leader to recommend to the Senate that the Alaska statehood bill be called up subsequent to the Hawaii statehood bill, and I personally hope and expect that will be during the month of March. I do not want to

say to the Senator that the Alaska statehood bill will immediately follow the passage of the Hawaii statehood bill, because there are some matters which have a time expiration, including certain tax bills, and so forth, which we shall have to consider. But I can give full assurance to the Senator from Florida that there will be no effort or purpose on the part of the majority leader to prevent the Alaska statehood bill from coming up as early as may be possible after the Hawaii statehood bill is disposed of, so that the Senate may have a full opportunity to debate and vote on the Alaska statehood bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will yield further, is the Senate to understand that not only the majority leader, but also the Republican policy committee has made that decision?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should say to the Senator that I have been authorized by the Republican policy committee to make the statement on the floor that the bill providing for statehood for Alaska will be scheduled at an early date, but in the discretion of the majority leader with reference to fitting it into the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and its chairman, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] have given me the honor of presenting to the Senate, Senate bill 49, a bill to enable the populous and prosperous American Territory of Hawaii to become a State of the United States. The committee worked at length on the bill, which I introduced on my own behalf and that of 15 other Senators from both sides of the aisle, and has amended and improved the measure substantially over the form in which it was introduced.

The admission of a new State into the Union of States is always a historic occasion. It is an epoch-making event, both for the people of the area admitted to full partnership in the Union and also for the country itself. The growth of our Republic has been accompanied by a corresponding growth in our prosperity and economic strength, and in many ways the successive admission of States has symbolized our rise to power and riches as a Nation.

On March 4, 1791—just 163 years ago today, to the day—the United States of America was a little band of 13 States hugging the eastern seaboard of the Atlantic. On that historic date the State of Vermont was "received and admitted into the Union as a new and entire member there of," in the words of the admission statute. Authority for this action of the first Congress is found in article IV, section 3, of the Constitution, which provides in simple, straightforward language:

> New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union.

The last time this authority was exercised was by the 62d Congress on February 14, 1912, when the State of Arizona was admitted into the full sisterhood. What a splendid record of achievement and attainment has marked that span of 121 years between the admission of Vermont in 1791 and that of Arizona in 1912.

PATTERN FOR STATEHOOD

During those 121 years the authority conferred by the quoted section of the Constitution has been exercised by this body on 30 different occasions by providing for the admission of the 35 States which have been becoming a part of the Union on "free and equal footing" with the Original Thirteen.

The pattern for the admission of new States, generally speaking, was established in the famed Northwest Ordinance by the Continental Congress in 1787. The Northwest Ordinance was the statute for the government of the vast area west of the Allegheny Mountains and north of the Ohio River. From this Territory the five States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan were created.

Under this pattern, the Territory was first of all incorporated into the Union. That is, the Constitution of the United States was extended to it, and the area thereby legally and politically became a part of the Union. As soon as a part of the area had sufficient population to support statehood—the original requirement was but 60,000—and the inhabitants gave evidence of their desire for statehood, an enabling act was passed by Congress, which prescribed a procedure for the organization of a State government and certain standards for and conditions of statehood. When these steps had been taken and the requirements met, States were admitted into the Union on a free and equal basis with the Thirteen Original States.

ACTION WITHOUT ENABLING ACT

A slight variation in the above pattern has occurred in certain instances when the people of a Territory have gone ahead on their own initiative and held a constitutional convention, drafted a constitution, and submitted it to the people without waiting for the Federal Congress to authorize them to do so. The constitution would then be submitted to the Congress, and if approved, the State would be admitted by the enactment of an Admission Act by Congress. Such was the case in my own State of Oregon. Six other States also entered the Union through this procedure by taking the initiative themselves, namely, Arkansas, California, Florida, Idaho, Maine, and Wyoming.

I mention this variation of the pattern because Hawaii has followed the precedent of those States and has held its constitutional convention and drafted its own proposed State constitution. While the proposed State constitution of Hawaii is not before us at this time, it is printed in the committee's report on S. 49, and I wish to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to it. It gives us a preview, so to speak, of the kind of State we would be admitting.

However, regardless of whether the people of a Territory waited for the passage of an enabling act by the Congress or acted on their own initiative, the end result, namely, statehood, has been the same for each of the incorporated Territories except Hawaii and Alaska. The greatness of our Union and the strength of each of the 35 subsequently admitted States today is manifest proof of the success of the policy with respect to incorporated Territories which the Continental Congress established 167 years ago.

In no instance has statehood failed. With the admission of each of the 35 States, the people in the established States have benefited as well as have the people of the new State.

There have been two historic methods for the admission of States. The first and most often used is that touched upon above; namely, in our westward march as a Nation, we first settled an area; then established local governments by a Federal statute known as an organic act, which also extended the Constitution of the United States to the area, thereby incorporating it into the Union, in the words of the Supreme Court; and finally, after a suitable period of "pupilage"—to use again the term employed by the Supreme Court in such cases—we brought the Territory into the partnership of a State of the United States.

HAWAII AN INDEPENDENT REPUBLIC

The other method is that which was employed by the 28th Congress in 1845, in admitting the free and independent Republic of Texas into the Union as a State. California also has some claim to having been an independent republic prior to her admission by the 31st Congress in 1850, but her independence was not recognized by other nations as was that of Texas.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Hawaii, like Texas, was a free and independent republic when in 1898 it became incorporated into the Union. The Newlands resolution for the annexation of Hawaii, which I shall discuss in more detail subsequently, specifically cited that the people of Hawaii have made manifest their consent. About a half century previously, in 1854, President Franklin Pierce had authorized negotiations for a treaty under which Hawaii would have been admitted as a State after the manner of Texas. This fact is cited by the Supreme Court of the United States in case of *Downes* v. *Bidwell* (182 U. S. 305).

As I have pointed out, the Constitution of the United States does not itself set forth any standards for the admission of new States. However, a study of the history and the circumstances surrounding the admission of the 35 States admitted since the formation of the Union shows that the requirements for statehood for an incorporated Territory, such as Hawaii, have been the following three simple but historically effective ones:

First. The Territory has a sufficiently large population, with sufficient economic development to enable it to support the costs of statehood and to bear the burdens of full participation in the Union;

Second. The population is imbued with, and wholeheartedly in support of, democracy and the American form of government; and

Third. The people of the Territory desire statehood.

For confirmation of my analysis, I refer the Members of the Senate to the recitals in the enabling acts and acts of admission for the several States.

Each of the Territories which has been incorporated in the manner heretofore described has become a State except two: Hawaii and Alaska.

Hawaii fully meets each and every one of the historic tests of statehood. In fact, it is not too much to say that no Territory better qualified in every respect has ever been a candidate for statehood.

The first of the historic tests of the readiness of a Territory for statehood is population. According to the 1950 census, which is the latest official count, and one by which the Congress is bound in all apportionment matters—the representation in the other body of Congress likewise is controlled by it—the population of Hawaii is 499,794. Only one Territory, namely, Oklahoma, had a population as large at the time of admission into the Union as a State. This half-million population is greater than that of any one of four of our present States today. Each of the States of Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, and Nevada has less population today than does the Territory of Hawaii.

ABILITY TO SUPPORT STATEHOOD

I shall have more to say about population in a few moments, but first I wish to outline briefly how Hawaii fulfills all the other historic tests of statehood. A second qualification is ability to support statehood. Here, beyond question, are facts about which there can be no dispute. Hawaii is the richest Territory, from the standpoint of economic development, ever to enter the Union. In the fiscal year 1953 Hawaii paid more than $136 million in Federal taxes, a sum greater than that which was paid by any one of 9 of the present States, namely, Nevada, New Hampshire, Montana, Vermont, Idaho, South Dakota, North Dakota, Wyoming, and New Mexico.

As to Hawaii's economics, again I shall have more to say in a few minutes, but first I wish to touch upon a third factor, namely, Hawaii's Americanism. Implicit in the admission of States has been the requirement that the population must be thoroughly American, American in outlook, in spirit, and in fact. Here again Hawaii meets the test, and comes through with flying colors.

A full 84 percent of the half-million population, or some 423,174, according to the 1950 census, are native-born American citizens. A substantial proportion of the 16 percent listed as aliens are in that category only because prior to the Walter-McCarran Act of 1952 they were ineligible for citizenship under our laws except through service in the Armed Forces. Since the passage of that act, hundreds have been naturalized, and thousands more are eagerly awaiting naturalization.

ALIEN GROUP DECLINING

When I made the first of my official inspection trips to Hawaii on behalf of the committee, in 1948, the average age of the surviving original Japanese immigrants was 68 years. Their number is, of course, steadily declining, both through natural causes and because of the fact that such immigrants can now become citizens through the 1952 Naturalization Act.

More significant for the future of the new State of Hawaii, however, is the fact that 99.2 percent of all the school children in the Territory are native-born Americans. The 1950 census studies show that the national average of children in school who are between 14 and 17 years of age is 83.7 percent, while in Hawaii the figure is 91.2 percent.

The Hawaiian Islands are less than 24 hours travel time from Washington. Churches, fraternities, veterans' and other organizations, business groups, and banking systems are closely linked with their counterparts on the mainland. Hawaii has, of course, been within the American judicial, customs, and internal-revenue systems for a half-century.

As to support of the American form of government, the people of the Islands have lived under a constitutional form of government for more than a century, the first Hawaiian constitution having been written in 1840. It was modeled along the lines of our own Constitution. In 1893 the people of Hawaii threw off even the form of monarchy, and established a representative republic under the presidency of Sanford B. Dole, a son of New England parents.

FULFILLMENT OF DUTIES OF CITIZENSHIP

Since they gave up their independence for annexation to the United States, they have exercised the rights of their limited citizenship vigorously. In the 1952 election, 87.6 percent of the registered voters in the Territory voted. The national average was only 62.5 percent, and in some States the percentage of eligible voters fulfilling their responsibilites was as low as 24.2 percent.

AMERICANISM

The Americanism of any particular group or segment of our population is a difficult matter to gage and measure accurately. It is so much a matter of spirit and point of view, that definite standards and rules for testing it are difficult to lay down.

However, I submit there is one objective standard that is hardly open to dispute. That is the willingness to fight and die for one's country. Hawaii's heroic war record on the battlefields of Europe and more recently on the battlefields of Korea is well known to the Members of this body, but I desire to briefly mention a few of the outstanding aspects of this record.

HEROISM OF HAWAIIAN SOLDIERS

In World War II, for example, the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442d Combat Team from Hawaii, composed of so-called Japanese-Americans—Americans of Japanese ancestry, that is—together formed what has been described by Gen. Mark Clark, under whom they served, as the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States. Its battle honors include 7 Presidential Citations, 3,600 Purple Heart Medals with 500 Oak Leaf Clusters, 15 Soldier's Medals, 17 Legion of Merit Medals, 342 Silver Star Medals, 1 Distinguished Service Medal, and 1 Congressional Medal of Honor.

In the recent Korean conflict, a substantial percentage of soldiers from Hawaii, representative of the varied racial background of the people of Hawaii, were on duty in Japan with the 24th and 25th Divisions when the Communist invasion occurred. These divisions were the first committed to combat in Korea, and the 24th was soon strengthened by the 5th Regimental Combat Team from Hawaii.

The percentage of Hawaii's battle casualties in Korea was three times that of the States on the mainland. With respect to the high rate of Hawaii's casualties in Korea, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, then Chief of Staff, wrote Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate from Hawaii, as follows:

> The relatively high casualty rate suffered by Hawaii soldiers can be attributed to the large proportion of Hawaii soldiers in the 24th Infantry Division, which includes the 5th Regimental Combat Team, and the 25th Division. At the time of its deployment to the Far East Command, almost 50 percent were Hawaii-born soldiers. I doubt that any other unit of the Regular Army can be associated with a particular geographical area as closely as the 5th Regimental Combat Team is associated with Hawaii. There were also substantial percentages of Hawaii soldiers in the 24th and 25th Divisions which were already in Japan and which were, of course, the first committed in Korea. All enlisted personnel of these units, when the conflict started, were volunteers. The heavy fighting that they have encountered and the regrettably high casualty rates sustained are, of course, well known throughout the United States.

In connection with Hawaii's war record, it should be noted that J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has reported that there is not a single instance on record of a case of sabotage by an Hawaiian citizen during the entire war. That fact must be given weight when one considers the question of loyalty to the United States Government.

DESIRE OF PEOPLE OF HAWAII

To round out the fact that Hawaii meets each and every one of the historic tests of readiness for statehood, I shall mention briefly the desire of the people of Hawaii for statehood. To anyone who has had the opportunity to visit Hawaii, as I did during the recent recess of the Senate, or as has more recently, even, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] who now occupies the chair, or our Vice President, it is almost incredible that this point would need debate or even discussion. However, one or two of the witnesses who appeared before the committee charged that a great many of the people of Hawaii were secretly opposed to statehood, but were afraid to say so publicly. Those making that charge were a little vague about just what those in opposition were afraid of, since no one was able to cite a single instance or specific example of any harm that had come to anyone or to any property because of opposition. Nevertheless, since the charge has been made, and probably will be made again,

and no doubt during the debate on this measure, I shall cite the following facts for the record.

In 1940 a Territory-wide plebiscite was held on the question, "Do you favor statehood for Hawaii?"

The vote was 67 percent yes and 33 percent no. I may point out, parenthetically, that apparently a good many citizens of Hawaii had the courage of their convictions on that occasion, at least.

In 1949—and I think this matter is of particular importance and pertinency—the Territorial legislature provided for the election of delegates to a constitutional convention, for the drafting of a proposed State constitution, and for the submission of the constitution so drafted to the people of Hawaii, for their adoption or rejection. In 1950, the constitution drafted by the elected delegates was submitted in a general election. All that anyone who at that time was opposed to statehood had to do was to vote against approval. Mr. President, again I emphasize that in that election the ballots were secret. There the most timorous might have his view registered on this occasion, also, with safety to himself and his family. So there could have been no possible fear of retaliation.

The vote was more than 3 to 1 approving the proposed State constitution for the State of Hawaii.

It is submitted, Mr. President, that this is a very effective plebiscite and that the people of Hawaii expressed themselves most impressively as desiring statehood. I can conceive of none more effective.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY THOUSAND SIGNED STATEHOOD PETITION

Again, within the past few days we have had a still further indication of how the people of Hawaii feel about statehood. Last Friday the elected Delegate from Hawaii and the Governor of Hawaii presented to the Vice President of the United States a statehood roll of honor signed by almost 120,000 citizens of Hawaii exercising their constitutional right of petition. This gigantic roll—it comprises a half-ton of newsprint—is a simply worded petition for immediate statehood for Hawaii. Some 120,000 citizens took the time and the trouble—most often they had to wait in line, sometimes for a long time—to go to a central place and sign this petition.

In view of all these facts, Mr. President, as well as the long history of the statehood movement which I shall touch upon in a moment, I fail to understand how anyone could suggest either that the people of Hawaii, overwhelmingly and wholeheartedly, do not desire statehood, or could think of offering them some other status, such as that of a Commonwealth.

Mr. President, this would seem to be a logical point for me to trace briefly for the Senate the history of the statehood movement in Hawaii. Beginning with the first elected Territorial legislature under the American flag in 1903, only 3 years after enactment of the Organic Act, the people of Hawaii have petitioned some 20 times for the fulfillment to them of the historic destiny of all other incorporated Territories. On nearly 50 different occasions since 1930 bills have been introduced in successive Congresses to provide statehood for Hawaii. In the past 19 years there have been 13 separate hearings on statehood for Hawaii by various congressional committees. Five of these 13 hearings have been held in the Territory of Hawaii itself.

HUGE RECORD COMPILED

On my desk in front of me is a stack of these hearings, beginning with that conducted by the Committee on Territories of the House of Representatives in the 74th Congress.

In all, this printed record comprises some 5,100 pages of testimony and exhibits. Other hundreds of pages of evidence have been incorporated by reference or are in the committee files, not printed in the hearings. More than 700 witnesses have been heard, both in the Territory and in Washington.

The most recent of this long and impressive series was that conducted by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the 83d Congress in 1953 and 1954. The record of the Senate committee in the 83d Congress is in 3 separate volumes comprising some 652 pages.

After hearings by the House committee in the 83d Congress on March 10, 1953, just a little short of a year ago, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 3575 by a vote of 274 to 138. This is the third time that the House has passed an Enabling Act for Hawaii, although it has never before been the order of business in the Senate. It would be well, indeed, Mr. President, if every piece of major legislation presented to the Congress for legislative action had had the thorough study that has been given to statehood for Hawaii. It is not too much to say that almost everything that can be said about the subject has been said.

Each and every aspect of the situation has been debated pro and con in the hearings and in the executive sessions. It is an impressive record, Mr. President. I ask that a summary of the hearings and investigations set forth in my report on S. 49, Report No. 886, 83d Congress, pages 80 to 84, inclusive, appear in the RECORD at this point for convenient reference.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS OF STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII, 1935–54

I. THE 1935 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

The first hearings on statehood were conducted in Hawaii in 1935 by a committee of the House.

The committee held hearings for 12 days and heard 105 witnesses, 90 of whom favored statehood, and collected 343 pages of testimony. (Hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Territories on H. R. 3034, 74th Cong., 1st sess.) At that time the committee reported to Congress that it found the Territory of Hawaii to be a modern unit of the American commonwealth, with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type. (Hearings on H. R. 3034, 74th Cong., 1st sess., p. 329.)

By the close margin of 3 to 2 the bill failed to be reported favorably to the full committee, since the majority felt that further study was necessary. (See summary, hearings on H. R. 3034, pp. 301–304.)

II. THE 1937 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

In 1937, the joint committee appointed to visit Hawaii held public hearings for 17 days and visited industrial, social, educational, and military establishments on the 5 major islands. Residents on all islands visited were publicly urged to appear and express their views. The committee heard 66 witnesses, 47 of whom favored statehood, and collected nearly 700 pages of testimony. (Hearings before the Joint Committee on Hawaii, 75th Cong., 2d sess.)

In its report (S. Doc. No. 151, 75th Cong., 3d sess.), the committee said, "Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted for Territories." (S. Doc. No. 151, p. 94.)

The committee recommended that a statehood plebiscite be held to ascertain the wishes of the people, and that further study be made due to the disturbed condition of international affairs (S. Doc. No. 151, p. 95).

The Territorial legislature authorized a plebiscite to be held in 1940. By a majority of more than 2 to 1, the people of Hawaii voted in favor of statehood.

During the war years Hawaii held its statehood aspirations in abeyance.

III. THE 1946 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

In 1946, a third congressional investigation was held in Hawaii.

The committee publicly invited the people to appear before them to present their views on statehood and upon any other matter relating to the welfare of the Territory.

The group held hearings for 12 days on the 5 major islands, and heard 107 witnesses, 91 of whom favored statehood. Recorded were 908 pages of testimony, including 35 written statements and exhibits relating to social, economic, and political life. (Hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Territories, House of Representatives, 79th Cong., 2d sess.)

The subcommittee submitted a unanimous report (H. Rept. No. 1620, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) in which it recommended that "since:

"1. The people of the Territory of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question not only their loyalty and patriotism but also their desire to assume the responsibilities of statehood; and since

"2. The policy of the United States Government is one of self-determination: that peoples be allowed to choose freely their form of political status; and since

"3. Hawaii's strategic location in the Pacific plays so large a part in our country's international position in this area; and since

"4. The Congress of the United States has through a series of acts and committee reports indicated to the people of the Territory that Hawaii would be admitted into the Union when qualified; and since

"5. The Territory of Hawaii now meets the necessary requirements for statehood:

"It is the recommendation of this subcommittee that the Committee on Territories give immediate consideration to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood."

IV. THE 1947 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

The House Committee on Public Lands met in Washington, D. C., in March 1947, to consider H. R. 49, and 11 other bills granting statehood to Hawaii.

The committee held hearings for 13 days and heard 35 witnesses, all of whom favored immediate statehood. Opposition to the bill consisted of three communications, one of which was printed in the record. The committee collected 310 pages of testimony. (Hearings before the Committee on Public Lands, House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 49.)

Several Federal departments were requested by the committee to submit reports on Hawaii's statehood bill. The administration endorsed the bill, and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy offered no objection to the enactment of H. R. 49.

Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, testifying as a private citizen, stated, "From a military and naval standpoint, I can see no objection to these islands achieving statehood."

Maj. Gen. Charles D. Herron, United States Army (retired) former commander of the Hawaiian Department, testified that the people of Hawaii have long since shown themselves to be wise and fully worthy of full citizenship.

Many Members of the 80th Congress testified or presented statements for the record supporting the bill.

Whereas the 1946 hearings in Hawaii stressed the readiness of the people of the islands to meet the responsibilities of statehood, the testimony submitted in Washington in 1947 related largely to national aspects, such as national defense, trade relations, and foreign affairs. Hawaii's position at the crossroads of the Pacific was viewed as a reason for statehood.

For the second time in 2 years a committee of Congress unanimously recommended statehood.

The 1947 committee report (H. Rept. No. 194, 80th Cong., 1st sess.), drew particular attention to the following:

"The strategic location in the mid-Pacific of Hawaii's modern community of a half million loyal American citizens, with its modern facilities for transportation, communication, and defense, is of immeasurable value to the Nation;

"The granting of statehood to Hawaii at this time will be an actual demonstration of the purposes of the United States in granting self-determination to the peoples of the world;

"The joint committee of the Seventy-fifth Congress appointed in 1937, after thorough investigation in the islands, found that Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted of Territories; and

"The subcommittee appointed in the 79th Congress unanimously recommended that immediate consideration for legislation looking to the admission of Hawaii to statehood be undertaken."

The findings and conclusions of the 1947 congressional hearings on the question of statehood for Hawaii were based on its own investigation and the investigations of two previous congressional committees.

In June 1947, an Hawaii statehood bill passed the House by a vote of 196 to 133; Congress adjourned before further action was taken.

V. THE 1948 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

During 1948 three separate investigations on the subject of statehood for Hawaii were held:

1. In January the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs, Hon. GUY CORDON, of Oregon, went to Hawaii at the direction of the full committee in connection with H. R. 49, the Hawaiian statehood bill before the 80th Congress.

Public hearings on statehood were held for 16 days on the major islands. Of the 231 witnesses testifying, 215 favored statehood and 16 opposed it. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Committee on Public Lands, 80th Cong., 2d sess.)

Special study was given to the Territory's judicial system, the degree to which the racial "melting pot" works, the economic stability of the Territory, and the extent of the menace of communism and bloc voting.

The report held that—

(1) The courts of the Territory are functioning satisfactorily.

(2) Democracy has creditably proved itself in Hawaii.

(3) The financial condition of the Territory appears sound.

(4) Though the extent of Communist success in Hawaii is not definitely known, the total number of Communists being fewer than 100, ample protection against the infiltration of Communist doctrines in the formation of a State constitution exist, since approval must be given both by the electorate of Hawaii and by the President of the United States.

(COMMITTEE NOTE.—By committee amendment to the present bill, this function of safeguarding the State constitution rests with the Congress, in accordance with the principles of the Federal Constitution.)

(5) Election records of Hawaii for 48 years do not support the contention of bloc voting, and there is little chance that the pattern of political behavior will undergo any drastic changes under State government.

The chairman recommended that the bill be favorably reported to the Senate with a recommendation for immediate action.

It was later decided by the Senate committee to hold further hearings in Washington, D. C., to determine national interest.

2. On April 15, the Senate subcommittee met in Washington, heard 8 witnesses, none in opposition, and collected 53 pages of testimony.

On May 8, the committee decided to take no action on its subcommittee's favorable report on statehood, and authorized the chairman to arrange a trip to Hawaii for committee members wishing to study the matter on the ground.

3. From November 1 to 12, the chairman of the committee, Senator HUGH BUTLER, conducted in Hawaii an investigation of Communist activities in the Territory. In all, 77 confidential interviews were made a matter of record, and more than 100 other witnesses interviewed.

A report of the investigation was made in June 1949; in summary, the report recommended:

(1) That statehood for Hawaii be deferred indefinitely, until communism in the Territory may be brought under effective control;

(2) That the Territorial government of Hawaii be encouraged to take positive steps within the scope of its authority to suppress unlawful communistic activities;

(3) That the executive branch of the Federal Government, through the Department of Justice, take immediate steps to prosecute lawless communism in the Territory, and to protect from force and violence those who honestly seek to support and strengthen orderly constitutional government;

(4) That Congress take cognizance of the very serious economic problems which confront Hawaii as a result of the activities of the Communist-dominated ILWU and immediately enact remedial legislation.

VI. THE 1949 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

On March 3 and 8, the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Possessions of the House Public Lands Committee held hearings in Washington, with the voluminous record already amassed before it. Five witnesses testified, none in opposition, though two communications in opposition to the legislation were received and made part of the record.

The Committee on Public Lands on March 10, in reporting favorably on the bill, as amended, and recommending that it pass, concluded, in part, as follows:

1. The Territory is not only self-supporting, but pays more Federal income tax than any 1 of 12 States.

2. Had Hawaii been a State, it hardly would have been subjected to the indignities which befell it in World War II.

3. There is no area under United States jurisdiction where a greater complexity of races live so harmoniously.

4. Both major political parties in the United States included a recommendation of statehood for Hawaii in their party platforms of 1948.

5. Statehood for Hawaii would increase immeasurably the prestige of America throughout the Orient.

The committee recognized that the extent of Communist influence and activity in the Territory had been the objective of intense inquiry, but was of the opinion that the people of the Territory are alert to the problem and would be better able to cope with it as a State than as a Territory.

VII. THE 1950 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

Though the seventh investigation by Congress of statehood for Hawaii was not held until May 1950, two activities of Congress preceded the Senate hearings.

1. In January, a House Public Lands Committee, Special Committee on Pacific Territories and Island Possessions, after an extended trip throughout the Pacific Ocean area, including Hawaii, returned to Washington and strongly urged that Congress act favorably on the Hawaii statehood legislation. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was officially represented by its chief clerk, Mills Astin, on this inspection trip and inquiry.

2. The House of Representatives voted on March 7 by 262 to 110 to admit Hawaii to statehood.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held hearings in Washington the early part of May, heard 60 witnesses, none in opposition, though several communications in opposition to statehood were inserted in the record. Subsequently, the committee met in executive session over a period of 2 weeks to consider the evidence and make necessary amendments to the bill.

VIII. THE 1951 SENATE COMMITTEE REPORT

On May 8, 1951, 9 members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported favorably on S. 49, in one of the most emphatically worded reports in the long history of the Hawaii statehood legislation.

The majority group passed the bill without further hearings, stating that the record of testimony built up around the question of Hawaiian statehood was more complete than in the case of any other Territory prior to admission.

The committee found that Hawaii, unequivocally, had met every test applied to 29 other Territorial applications for admittance into the Union.

"It is a paradox," the report stated, "that the United States should still permit so vital a part of itself to remain in the inferior status of a Territory when that part fulfills each and every one of the historic qualifications for statehood, and is eager to assume the burdens and responsibilities of full equality, as well as enjoy its privileges." And:

"It is submitted that if the ultimate test of loyalty and patriotism is the willingness to fight and die for one's country, then Hawaii has nobly met this test also." And:

"The devotion to American ideals of the sons of Hawaii has been irrefutably written in the pages of world history on the battlefields of Europe, and, more recently, in Korea." And in conclusion:

"Therefore, conscious of their responsibility as Members of the Senate of the 82d Congress to the Senate and to the Nation, the majority of the committee recommends that the Senate continue the pattern under which America has grown great and approve this legislation to admit the prosperous, populous, and thoroughly American Territory of Hawaii to statehood."

IX. THE 1953 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

A subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 1st session, met on February 23, 24, 26, and 27 to continue its investigation into the fitness of Hawaii to assume the obligations and responsibilities of statehood.

Nineteen witnesses were heard or made oral depositions. One was in opposition, the remainder favorable to Hawaii's admission as a State. Among the latter was the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, who gave it as his opinion that Hawaii was fully qualified for statehood and that our American principles of constitutional self-government call for speedy and favorable action on H. R. 49.

The Navy Department, by letter, signed by the Judge Advocate General recommended enactment of the bill.

On March 3, the committee submitted its report, recommending passage by the House. The report held that admission of Hawaii is in the national interest; noncontiguity is no bar to statehood; that economic and cultural progress in Hawaii has been marked; and that the economy of the Territory was sufficient to maintain stable government.

On March 10, for the third time in the history of the Hawaii statehood campaign, the House of Representatives passed the bill to enable Hawaii to become a State. The vote was 274 to 138.

On March 6, a subcommitee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, convened to hear testimony on S. 49, introduced by Mr. CORDON and 15 other Senators; and S. 51, introduced by Mr. MURRAY and 14 other Democratic Senators. The committee heard three witnesses, among them the former attorney general of Hawaii, who testified in connection with land matters in Hawaii.

A new and full-dress investigation was started before the full committee on June 29 and continued up to July 11. Twenty-five witnesses appeared in person while scores of exhibits and statements were introduced into the record. The resultant report, of 652 pages, again comprises in up-to-date form an incisive insight into the political, economic, cultural, racial, labor, and administrative standards in the Territory.

X. THE 1954 CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

When the 2d session of the 83d Congress convened in January, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee met on January 7–8, for the purpose of hearing former Gov. Ingram M. Stainback of Hawaii testify.

His appearance was followed by a series of executive sessions of the committee. On January 27, with a full committee represented, the Hawaii statehood bill was reported favorably by a vote of 12 to 3.

Mr. CORDON. This brief outline of the history of the statehood movement in Hawaii brings me logically to the point of saying a few words about the colorful and dramatic history of Hawaii itself. As nearly as can be determined, the islands were settled more than a thousand years ago by those most daring of primitive seafarers, the Polynesians, who crossed the mighty Pacific from the Far East in sailing canoes. So far as they were concerned, they were coming from the West. They were coming from the Asiatic side of the Pacific, most anthropologists believe, although there is some difference of opinion on the matter.

EARLY NEW ENGLAND INFLUENCE

The form of government these daring seafarers developed was that of a kingdom—an absolute, even though benign, monarchy. European discovery was by the British seaman, Capt. James Cook, who came upon them in 1778 and named them the Sandwich Islands, in honor of one of his patrons, the Earl of Sandwich.

A group of Christian missionaries arrived from New England in 1820 and converted the approximately 142,050 inhabitants to Christianity from their outworn paganism. The New Englanders established a permanent colony, reduced the native Hawaiian tongue, which was only a spoken tongue, to writing and began the process of Americanizing Hawaii, an enterprise in which they were eminently successful. Under the influence of the Americans, in 1840 the kingdom adopted its first written constitution. This constitution was modeled along American democratic lines, as I mentioned earlier. Treaties of friendship and trade were signed with the United States in 1850 and 1876, the latter of which led to the fortification of Pearl Harbor.

Meanwhile, the Yankee influence in the commerce and culture of the islands had become predominant. Whalers came in increasing numbers; a New England firm started a plantation on the island of Kauai and laid the foundations of Hawaii's future sugar industry. The majority of ships calling at Hawaiian ports flew the American flag.

Inspired and led by American settlers and traders, the Hawaiians deposed Queen Liliuokalani in 1893 and set up the provisional government with Sanford B. Dole, the son of New England parents, at its head. The Republic was established a year later with Dole as president.

HAWAII "INCORPORATED" INTO THE UNITED STATES

In June of 1897, representatives of the Republic of Hawaii and of the United States signed a treaty, the preamble of which recited that the United States and its citizens had acquired a preponderant share of the industry and trade of the Hawaiian Islands and referred to the "express desire of the Government of the Republic of Hawaii that these islands should be incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof." This treaty was ratified by the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii, but the 2d session of the 55th Congress adjourned without taking the required action. The following year, in 1898, Joint Resolution 55, sponsored by Senator Newlands, of Nevada, was adopted and approved on July 7. This statute recited the fact that the people of Hawaii had signified their consent and proceeded to annex the islands to the United States.

ANALOGY TO TEXAS

Thus, the people of Hawaii became a part of the United States by their voluntary act. In this way, Hawaii's position is analogous to that of Texas and California.

The Newlands resolution provided for a commission to visit the Hawaiian Islands, study the situation there, and report back to the Congress with recommendations for legislation for the government of the islands. Based on the report of the Newlands commission, basic legislation was enacted as the Organic Act of Hawaii on April 30, 1900.

Mr. President, we now come to the meat in the coconut, in a manner of speaking. American citizenship was granted to the citizens of Hawaii, and the United States Constitution was declared to "have the same force and effect within the said Territory as elsewhere in the United States."

ALL OTHER INCORPORATED TERRITORIES ADMITTED

Thus, in the language of the Supreme Court of the United States, Hawaii acquired the status of an incorporated Territory, became an integral part of the United States and, as such, became destined for admission as a State after a period of pupilage. As I have stated, Hawaii and Alaska are the sole remaining incorporated Territories that have not yet attained the destiny that has been the unvarying rule with all other incorporated Territories.

Statehood for Hawaii is the one step possible in our historic tradition. To refuse statehood would be to break the historic mold under which we have grown great. Far from establishing a precedent in admitting Hawaii, as some opponents charge, we would, on the contrary, be establishing a precedent if we refused to admit Hawaii, or attempted to set up some other political status for her, contrary to the unequivocally expressed wishes of the nearly one-half million American citizens who are residents of Hawaii.

GOVERNMENT BY CONSENT

We of the United States have prided ourselves, and justly, on our great tradition of government by the consent of the governed. That doctrine is one of our great ideological ramparts against alien philosophies, particularly communism.

The pending bill, S. 49, affords a clear-cut opportunity for the Senate to show not only to the people of the mainland and of Hawaii but to all the world that we still practice what we have long preached and practiced, namely, that we still believe in what President Abraham Lincoln so historically described as "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

HUMPHREY VERSUS HUMPHREY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to another subject. I do so in all good humor, and I hope I can do it in good taste.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield for that purpose?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest to my good friend from Maryland that at the conclusion of my remarks he could suggest the absence of a quorum, unless the Senator insists on doing so now.

Mr. BEALL. If the Senator from Minnesota intends to speak for some time I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not intend to speak for a very long time, I will say to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. Very well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the subject to which I address myself is entitled Humphrey versus Humphrey. I believe I should be able to speak with some authoritative information on the

subject in view of the fact that my family name is involved.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. Is it or is it not a fact that the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury are cousins?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I may say that I am about to direct my remarks to that subject. However, I can say early in the proceedings that, so far as I have been able to understand, there is no relationship either biologically or politically.

Mr. President, like most men in public life, I must admit I take a second look when I see my name in the newspaper headlines.

Lately, however, I must admit I have been a bit bewitched, bothered, and bewildered by some headlines about Humphrey.

I am not too happy about picking up my daily paper and reading "Humphrey Raises Interest Rates," "Humphrey Against Tax Reduction," and "Humphrey Finds No Urgency in Action to Stop Recession."

And I am sure the public must often be confused when it further reads other headlines in smaller print, to be sure, saying "HUMPHREY Protests Boosts in Interest Rates," "HUMPHREY Favors Tax Reduction," and "HUMPHREY Urges Action to Halt Recession."

I am sure it is increasingly necessary to make one thing clear: There is no relationship between Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey.

Secretary Humphrey is an extremely able gentleman and a fine man. I know that he is held in the highest esteem by the President and his associates. He is a man of great business experience, of good character and fine reputation. I am sure anyone would be proud to have him as a friend. He is doing an extremely effective job—in supporting the policies and economic views to which he subscribes. Most assuredly I respect his right to hold those views and to state them on any occasion. In fact, I admire the manner in which he advances them.

But they are not my views. So it is understandable that HUBERT HUMPHREY often disagrees with George Humphrey—and vice versa.

For that reason, this situation of Humphrey versus Humphrey in the news columns is becoming more and more confusing.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator from Minnesota has said it is becoming increasingly necessary to point out the difference and the distinction between the two honorable Messrs. Humphrey. I wonder if he would elaborate on why it becomes increasingly necessary. Might it be that November is approaching nearer and nearer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that if he will do with me as Shakespeare said in his great play, Julius Caesar—"Lend me thine ears"—he will soon find out why I feel it is increasingly necessary to make this statement. It is being made in the best of good humor, and, if it is humanly possible for me to do so, in the best of good taste.

Knowing my views, my Minnesota constituents were understandably rather astounded last year over headlines saying, "Humphrey Raises Interest Rates."

I am sure Secretary Humphrey's friends must have been equally surprised when they saw stories about the same time saying, "HUMPHREY Protests Boost in Interest Rates."

And I must admit that everybody will be a bit bewildered, if the press interprets these remarks as "HUMPHREY Raps Humphrey."

The situation is becoming worse instead of better. The increase in interest rates was bad enough—but now it is taxes and the recession.

My position on tax reduction should be evident. I have introduced proposed legislation calling for raising individual exemptions from $600 to $800 so as to spread the benefit of lower taxes where it is needed most—among the lower and middle income groups—and thereby to stimulate purchasing power. I have expressed pleasure at similar action by my good friend the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Then I was greatly encouraged recently by a similar position taken by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] whom I regard as the foremost authority on tax and fiscal matters in the Senate. I have been endeavoring to send word to my friends at home that as a result of his significant support, the outlook is now encouraging for tax relief.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a clipping from the Washington Post of March 1, last Monday, headed "Humphrey Opposes Income Tax Relief." Whether it is sheer coincidence or whether it is a designed plot, I say this kind of headline seems to find its way back home to the Minnesota press.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMPHREY OPPOSED INCOME-TAX RELIEF

(By Rex Chaney)

Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey said yesterday that barring a drastic change in the economy he would recommend that President Eisenhower veto any bill to raise individual income-tax exemptions.

He made the statement as Representative JERE COOPER, of Tennessee, top Democrat on the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee, served notice Democrats will wage an all-out fight on the House floor to raise the exemptions from $600 to $700.

Humphrey said on Man of the Week, a CBS television program, that the proposed hike would cost the Government $2.5 billion a year in revenues and present circumstances do not call for more deficit spending.

COOPER charged in a statement that the administration's tax revision bill, which the House committee finished drafting last week, is loaded in favor of larger businesses and wealthy taxpayers.

He said it would give individual taxpayers a mere pittance of relief and demanded that tax relief be given to the public generally rather than to selected taxpayers.

Humphrey called such talk political propaganda. He said two-thirds of the tax relief called for in the administration's bill would go to individual taxpayers. The rest, he said, would go to business to create new jobs for living as defense spending for killing goes down.

COOPER was joined by Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, who backed a proposal by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, to raise the present $600 exemption to $800 this year and $1,000 in 1955. SMATHERS said the George plan would help meet the threat of a recession. Humphrey called GEORGE'S proposal a battleax program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may the RECORD show—and may the public know—that it is not this HUMPHREY, the one who is now speaking, who had anything to do with that story.

Recently I have been pushing for immediate, positive action to combat the signs of a recession or downward adjustment in our economy. I have urged expanding our school-construction, hospital-construction, home-building, and road-building programs to absorb some of our unemployed—maintain our Nation's purchasing power.

Yet I pick up the paper from my home State, the Duluth News Tribune, and read, "Humphrey Finds No Urgency in Action To Stop Recession." Again, I ask, may the RECORD show, please, that it is not this HUMPHREY.

It is getting so bad that I am receiving mail protesting the actions of the other Humphrey. I cannot help but wonder if he is receiving mail objecting to my views.

Even the White House staff gets confused and has called this HUMPHREY regarding an appointment for the other Humphrey.

No wonder, Mr. President, that sometimes one's constituents may be confused.

For the RECORD let me say once more: This HUMPHREY is for tax reduction; this HUMPHREY is for action now to stop the recession.

This HUMPHREY is for tax reduction where it is needed most, and where it will do most to stimulate America's purchasing power—tax reduction for the broad base of the American people.

If one reads otherwise, the reference is to the other Humphrey.

I do not mean to suggest the other Humphrey should stay out of the headlines, but I do not like the kind of headlines he gets.

This HUMPHREY has to run for office and go forth and face the people; the other Humphrey does not. I cannot help but wonder: Can this be the Republican Party's new secret weapon to try and unseat this HUMPHREY next fall? [Laughter.]

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. I was wondering if we might call this the open season on Humphreys. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would hope that it would be a season for kindness to all Humphreys. If the Secretary of the Treasury has an opportunity to read these remarks, he will know they were

made in good spirit, as is exemplified in the RECORD. The Secretary of the Treasury was kind enough on one occasion to come to my office, and we had a little chance to talk about this mixup. He is a man with a good sense of humor and a man of fine character, and I wish him well, but I certainly disapprove of his point of view.

I desire now, Mr. President, to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

REDUCTION IN PRICE SUPPORTS OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since we are in a rather informal session today, with apparently no votes before us, I should like to say that 2 weeks ago we were extolling the virtues of Abraham Lincoln, and I understand that tomorrow the Democrats are going to extoll the virtues of Jackson and Jefferson. We have two heroes to extol.

Today I should like to talk about some of the weaknesses of the Secretary of Agriculture. I am not going to extol virtues.

Mr. President, I wish to renew and continue my protest in behalf of America's dairy industry, against the drastic price reduction threatened by the action of Secretary of Agriculture Benson on April 1. Time is marching on. That deadline is nearing. More and more evidence is accumulating that the Secretary's decision was a mistake, a very serious mistake.

In view of the determined struggle the Secretary of Agriculture is making to rally support behind his efforts to reduce all farm price supports, there is ample reason to believe that this drastic blow proposed for the dairy industry was a part of a deliberate strategy to divide farm unity in this country, and to try to pit one segment of agriculture against another. There is reason to believe it was an attempt to turn feed consumers against feed producers, and to bring to bear pressures of the dairy industry to help force down the level of supports for basic commodities.

However, Mr. President, I am willing to be more charitable and accept the move as merely a mistake on Secretary Benson's part; a mistake in judgment.

It has been contended by spokesmen for the Department of Agriculture and spokesmen rising to Secretary Benson's defense on this floor that the Secretary had no other course to take and that he was compelled to lower price supports to 75 percent by his interpretation of the existing law.

Mr. President, I have before me an article from the Minneapolis Star of February 25 reporting on an address delivered by one of Secretary Benson's assistants at Moorhead, Minn. I call attention to the fact that it is headed "Law Forced Benson's Dairy Cut, Farmers Told." I ask unanimous consent to have the article appear at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW FORCED BENSON'S DAIRY CUT, FARMERS TOLD

MOORHEAD, MINN.—Agriculture Secretary Benson has cut the dairy price-support level to 75 percent of parity "because he is a law-abiding man," farmers were told here Wednesday.

The law required Benson to make the cut, Theodore S. Gold, assistant to the Under Secretary of Agriculture, said when he spoke at the Greater Moorhead Days celebration.

"A year ago Secretary Benson strained—and maybe cracked—the law a little in setting supports for dairy products at 90 percent," said Gold.

"He did so because representatives of the dairy industry said 1 more year at the 90-percent level was all they needed to work out a solution to the big surpluses on hand," he said.

This year, Gold said, that surplus is still on hand, and the range of price supports must be based on the supply.

Farmers' Day Chairman Stanley H. Mickelson asked the predominately farm audience of some 1,600 for a show of hands for and against the rigid price-support plan.

Sentiment was overwhelmingly in favor of the high, rigid price-support program.

In his address Gold declared that farm incomes last year were lower than at any time since 1940, in terms of purchasing power, in spite of a $6 billion price-support program investment.

He explained that the conclusion to be gained from this is that price supports have not effectively protected farm income.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if that is the position of Secretary Benson, then I have a few questions to ask.

If the Secretary feels he was compelled by law to take such action, was it done against his best judgment as to the best interest of agriculture?

If the Secretary feels he was compelled by law to take such action, and did it only regretfully, does he agree that it constitutes too severe a blow to America's agricultural economy, and, too, an unfair and discriminatory blow to America's dairy industry?

If the Secretary feels he was compelled by law to take such action would he have preferred to have been able to continue effective price protection for the dairy industry through a less drastic reduction, or none at all?

If we are to accept the arguments of the supporters of Secretary Benson's position, I think we need answers to those questions. If the Secretary's answer is "No" to those questions, Mr. President, I think it becomes obvious that the argument about his being compelled to take such action is all nonsense. If his answer is "No" to the questions I have asked, it becomes apparent that the Secretary wanted to cut the support price, law or no law, and did so to the maximum extent the law would permit. If that is his position, he and his supporters should say so openly, and not peek out from behind the alibi of saying he only did what the law required him to do.

If the Secretary's answer is "Yes" to those questions, however, if Secretary Benson felt the law compelled him to take action he did not want to take, he should have fulfilled his responsibility to American agriculture by recommending that Congress change that law.

Instead, the administration indicated it was satisfied with the existing law, and recommended that it be retained intact, as far as dairy products are concerned.

I can only conclude, from such evidence, that this administration wanted all along to bring about a substantial reduction in dairy prices—without giving proper consideration to the economic consequences.

But all of this, of course, is prologue; it is now past. There is very little that can be done about the past.

Yet it is not too late to avoid such a drastic blow to the dairy industry. It is not too late for the administration to reconsider, in view of the alarm that has spread throughout the dairy industry.

I appeal to Secretary Benson and the administration to grant that reconsideration, and give further thought to the unfairness of discriminating against the dairy industry, further thought to the basic nature of dairying to our farm economy, and further thought to the effects of such a sudden decline in farm purchasing power upon our entire economy.

If Secretary Benson is really concerned about our dairy farmers, and only pulling the rug out from under them because, as he says, he feels the law compels him to do so, we are offering him a good opportunity to prove it—now.

Pending before the Senate is a bill introduced by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] calling for 90 percent support for dairy products. Pending before this body also is my own price support bill including similar provisions for the dairy industry. Also pending before this body is a more recent measure to limit reduction of dairy support to 5 percent per year, cosponsored by some 25 Senators.

If the present law is all that stands in Secretary Benson's way, I invite him to make known his support for any of these constructive efforts to prevent discrimination against the dairy industry.

The National Milk Producers Federation has written Secretary Benson asking his support for the measure on which widespread bipartisan support has been united as at least a temporary "stopgap." I refer to S. 2962, which I am pleased to co-sponsor with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], together with other cosponsors who have joined with us.

On behalf of the dairy industry of Minnesota—yes, of the Nation—I publicly join in that request from the milk producers, and urge Secretary Benson to make known at once his willingness to accept and support this modification of his original order so that action can be expedited by the Congress.

Let me quote briefly from the letter to Secretary Benson from the National Milk Producers Federation:

> We respectfully call your attention to the probable consequences to the more than 4 million farmers who derive all or part of their cash income from the sale of dairy products.
>
> If in the coming marketing year, as in the past year, the support level should establish the selling price for these farmers, they will suffer an income loss of approximately $600 million. In addition, there will be a decline in the value of their capital assets

because of this drop in earning power. This might approach the capital asset loss they suffered in 1953 in the value of their cows and heifers, 2 years old and over. This amounted to $1,200,000,000, according to Department figures. If the loss should be only a fractional percent as great, say one-third, they would suffer a total loss of at least a billion dollars in 1954—an amount equaling 25 percent of their 1953 income.

We believe that you will agree that such a loss constitutes an "economic hardship," and one that you will not permit to happen to the dairymen any more than you would permit it to happen to the Nation's cotton farmers. Such a decline in the purchasing power of dairy farmers in Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, and the New England States—where dairying is the major source of farm income—would border on disastrous. It would certainly be depressing, and could have serious economic reactions in the hundreds of small towns and cities in the rural areas of those States.

Mr. President, I await with interest the reply of Secretary Benson. If he continues to persist to forge this great economic blow, and refuses to accept S. 2962 as a proper safeguard for our dairy industry, it should be obvious that any talk about his acting only because the law compelled him to do so is just a political alibi.

Mr. President, Minnesota has a tremendous stake in the outcome of this dairy crisis. I am standing on the floor of the Senate, fighting for the economic life of my State. I do not intend to quit the fight until some remedy is provided. I do not intend to see thousands of our finest people depressed by action on the part of the Government.

It is not only for our dairy farmers that I am repeatedly calling for corrective action on this floor. Instead, it is for the sake of our entire economy, including the Main Street merchants, who depend on farm income and farm purchasing power.

Minnesota annually produces some 251,389,000 pounds of butter, 45,587,000 pounds of American cheese, and 160,474,000 pounds of nonfat dry milk.

The Midwest is the real victim of this drastic drop in dairy price supports, because it lacks the fluid-milk outlets for its dairy production available on the eastern seaboard.

I make note of the fact that the milk-marketing orders prevent us from shipping our goods into many of the milk markets. So long as the milk-marketing orders are in effect, dairy farmers are denied the opportunity to compete.

Thirty percent of all the butter purchased by the Department of Agriculture nationally is handled through the Minneapolis office of the Commodity Stabilization Service. Sixty-five percent of all the cheese purchases made nationally by the Department of Agriculture are handled through the same office, and 63 percent of all the national purchases of nonfat dry-milk solids.

In those 3 categories, 96, 99.5, and 99.9 percent, respectively, of those commodities handled by the Minneapolis office of the Department originate in either Minnesota or neighboring Wisconsin.

This is not a political argument. I have said a number of times that what we are talking about is bread and butter. We are talking about economics. We are talking about money in the bank. We are talking about mortgages which will have to be paid. Are we to suffer the consequences?

I repeat what I have mentioned before, that Secretary Benson's order is conservatively estimated to cost Minnesota a loss of $2,500,000 each month in farm income—immediate cash income.

But that will merely be the start. A chain reaction will hurt our entire farm economy.

Already extension specialists are advising dairymen that they will have to be more efficient, and get rid of more cull dairy cattle.

That will mean lower prices of canners and cutters, and other livestock prices may also move downward.

We have already suffered a terrible liquidation because of the drop in cattle prices. In areas suitable for corn and soybeans, some farmers may produce hogs instead of milk. That will tend to roll back hog prices, since the number of hogs will be increased. In areas where there are no other alternatives—and there are many such areas in my State—dairy farmers will try to step up their production, in order to make up for the loss in income. Minnesota has thousands of acres of cutover area, stump land, where the lumber barons took the trees and left the stumps. Our farmers, over generations of hard work, have tried to clean up that land and put it into dairy farms, and in that way step up their production to make up for the loss in income. That is their only alternative.

So far as I can see, nothing will be solved, and new problems will be created.

Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dairy Chain Reaction," published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Wednesday, February 24, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAIRY CHAIN REACTION

If Congress permits dairy price supports to be cut from 90 to 75 percent of parity on April 1 as scheduled, the chain reaction will influence many things besides the price of milk, butter and cheese.

From the standpoint of the consumer, most of the anticipated change will be to the good. From the standpoint of dairy farmers, processors and distributors, the cut will mean a sharp drop in income and a time of painful readjustment. It is up to Congress to weigh these effects before deciding whether to approve or modify Secretary Benson's order.

Dr. E. Fred Koller, an agricultural economist at the University of Minnesota, has thrown interesting light on how the parity cut may have such diverse results as lowering livestock prices, increasing the consumption of baked goods, and adding to the Iron Range labor pool.

He suggests, for example, that some dairy farmers in northern sections of Minnesota and Wisconsin will be forced out of dairy farming. As a result, some young farmers will have to take up other work and may gravitate to the expanding taconite industry.

Dr. Koller also notes that Dakota wheat and beef farmers will quit buying cull dairy cattle because such animals will no longer make a profit for them when dairy prices drop.

This will tend to lower prices of canners and cutters, and other livestock prices may move downward also. In areas suitable for corn and soybeans, some farmers may produce hogs instead of milk. That would tend to roll back hog prices as the number of animals increased.

As for the baked goods, Dr. Koller sees two possible effects. Housewives, he says, may bake fewer pies and cakes and serve more ice cream. On the other hand, commercial baked goods may become cheaper, and better, because bakers will use more dry milk at lower prices.

Another big factor in this matter is the problem of what to do about dairy surpluses. Secretary Benson is reported to be on the verge of announcing a plan for disposal of these vast stores of butter and other products.

The Department of Agriculture has been bombarded with a variety of proposals, ranging from bargain sales to a modification of the old food-stamp plan. Whatever plan is finally approved must again be assessed carefully in the light of its possible effect on our dairy production and marketing system.

Lower food prices would be welcome. But consumers will do well to think also about the effect on the dairy industry—and, in the long run, on themselves as well—of this sharp drop in supports. They might also consider whether it is fair to single out dairymen for such drastic treatment.

Legislation embodying gradual change to lower dairy price supports—by 5-percent steps—is now before Congress. Such an approach would make the necessary cutback just as effective—and a lot less painful—than an abrupt drop from 90 to 75 percent of parity.

The administration has called for a gradual transition to a system of lower supports for the basic farm crops. This philosophy should apply to dairying as well as to other segments of agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the afternoon newspaper published by the same news publishing company, in one of its earlier editorials, supported the position of the Secretary of Agriculture; but I am happy to state that the light of day has seeped through the shadows, the fuzziness, and the cloudiness of that early thinking. Now the morning newspaper points out not only what this policy means to the dairy farmer but also its chain reaction to our economy.

I repeat, Mr. President, that I will not stand idly by and see an order of the Government literally put thousands of people in my State on their economic backs. There is a way to apply a remedy, and that way is now pending before the committees of the Congress, and we are asking for priority action.

Businessmen as well as farmers are deeply concerned about the trends in our farm policy, particularly since this drastic dairy action.

I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD at this point a letter from the Baudette Civic and Commerce Association expressing the unanimous view of their organization in regard to the dairy situation and farm legislation generally.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAUDETTE CIVIC AND
COMMERCE ASSOCIATION,
Baudette, Minn., February 27, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Baudette (Minn.) Civic and Commerce Association at a

regular meeting on February 23, 1954 unanimously went on record as favoring at least 90 percent of parity prices for agricultural products.

This group took this action because we realize that farmers prosperity will result in prosperity for the rest of the Nation.

We deplore the recent action of the Secretary of Agriculture in drastically cutting the support price of butter from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity.

BAUDETTE CIVIC AND COMMERCE ASSOCIATION,
EDWARD EIDE, *Vice President.*
ELMER HAMRE, *Secretary.*

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Minnesota speaks eloquently about the chain reaction. Does he in his speech intend to discuss where the dairy farmers buy the feed for their cattle?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I do. Just before the Senator from South Carolina came on the floor, I was mentioning that this phase of the problem was tied in with the overall agricultural situation. To be sure, if the prices which the dairy farmer receives are low, the only thing he can do is seek to buy the basic commodities which he uses for feed at low prices. The price of every product becomes depressed as a result.

Mr. MAYBANK. I heard the Senator speak of a chain reaction. I am sorry I was not here when the Senator began his remarks. I am interested in the question of the feed dairy farmers must buy, not only in the State of Minnesota, but in all other States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has made a fine contribution. I thank him for it.

I am sure that when civic and commerce associations arrive at such views as those contained in the letter I have just presented for the RECORD, they are doing so not out of sheer sympathy for themselves, but they are doing it for unselfish reasons.

Mr. President, I further ask consent to have published in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Triumph-Monterey Progress, one of Minnesota's fine weekly newspapers, published by Gordon and Phyllis Spielman. The editorial is entitled "Butter Hits the Skids," and warns of the effect on our economy of Secretary Benson's proposal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUTTER HITS THE SKIDS

Agriculture Secretary Benson has been playing off the consumer against the farmer in his latest move to impoverish the Midwest farmers, a move which has shocked both advocates of fixed price supports and those who favor a sliding scale.

Benson poses as friend of the consumer when he waxes indignantly about stored butter and surpluses and tumbles down butter supports to the lowest level allowed by law. He prefers to forget that the two largest classes of consumers are the farmers and the laboring people. The consumers' problem is not that farm prices are too high, but that income is too low. And Benson proposes to solve that problem by cutting income further.

The loss to farmers in income in Minnesota alone will be some $35 million annually. This loss of income, means loss of buying power which will be reflected in less manufactured goods sold, and an increase in industrial unemployment, which, of course, means still less consumer income. It is this vicious cycle that breeds depression.

The administration refuses to listen to its own Republican Congressmen and Senators from the Midwest farm belt who are unanimous in opposing the sharp lowering of supports. In fact there is not a single midwestern Member of Congress of either party who supports Benson or the administration's farm policy.

Nor has there been a single Midwest farm organization, whether it believes in rigid or sliding supports, which backs the Benson butter fiasco. Benson must go, before all of us, whether on the farm or Main Street, go broke.

This great butter surplus Benson is acting so drastically about, is actually less than a 5-percent overproduction. The huge Government support program that Benson finds so burdensome on dairy products takes up only 8.4 percent of the CCC's investment. Yet dairy products make up some 14.6 percent of all farm income.

We think that the farmers must act and act now. When we are in a depression it will be too late.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD an article from the February 18, 1954, issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press, headed "United States Dairy Prop Cut Called Broken Pledge," describing the reaction of Mr. A. J. Smaby, general manager of Midland Cooperatives, Inc.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DAIRY PROP CUT CALLED BROKEN PLEDGE

A. J. Smaby, general manager of Midland Cooperatives, Inc., said Wednesday the Government broke its pledge to agriculture for orderly adjustment in the dairy program by lowering dairy price support.

The 8-cent-per-pound reduction in butter price supports will become effective April 1.

Smaby said: "The shock of the great reduction in dairy support prices will disrupt dairying in this region for many months. If supports must be lowered so drastically, dairymen should have been given adequate notice. * * *

"Cooperatives are easing some of the squeeze on net farm income. Few local cooperatives, however, can make up in cash refunds this year the loss their members will suffer from lower dairy incomes."

Midland is made up of 682 local cooperatives owned by about 285,000 farm families.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The article describes the reaction of Mr. A. J. Smaby, who was recently appointed by the President as a Director of the Federal Land Bank. I make note of the fact that Mr. Smaby, who is one of our most respected citizens, states: "The shock of the great reduction in dairy support prices will disrupt dairying in this region for many months." He points out that by lowering the dairy price supports, the Government broke its pledge to agriculture for an orderly adjustment in the dairy program.

Mr. President, I also ask consent to have published in the body of the RECORD a resolution wired to President Eisenhower by Chippewa Local of the Swift County Farmers Union, urging him to undo the damage Secretary Benson has done to the dairy industry.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following resolution in the form of a wire to President Eisenhower was unanimously passed at the last meeting of the Chippewa local of the Swift County Farmers Union, held at district 71, on February 17:

"Secretary Benson's recent action reducing butterfat supports means disaster for the dairy industry. We urge you to undo the damage by again setting dairy supports at 90 percent of parity until a new farm program is passed around your campaign promise of full parity for American agriculture.

"JAMES HARLOW,
"*Secretary.*

"BENSON, MINN."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say that the people of my State voted overwhelmingly, or at least in substantial majority, for President Eisenhower. The people of my State have high regard and true affection for the President. If my voice could reach the White House this afternoon I would ask the President not to let those people down. I would ask him not to permit one of his agents, one of his department heads, to disavow a pledge which the President made to the people of my State and to the people of the Nation. Surely, the President knows what his Secretary of Agriculture is doing. The President has concurred, apparently, in what the Secretary has done. I ask him to redeem this broken promise. I am not making this request in a tone of partisanship, but in the name of mercy and justice.

After all, the President voluntarily made a promise to the people of Minnesota on September 6, 1952. Before God and the people, he promised support of not less than 90 percent, and a more limited program for perishable commodities. No Minnesotan wrote that speech. No farmer asked him to make it. He said what I have quoted. It was a golden promise, and I say the promise must be kept. If the Secretary of Agriculture cannot keep it, I ask the President to call the Secretary in and find out who is President in this country. Ours is not a Government by committee. The President of the United States has the responsibility for his administration.

Mr. President, I have another clipping from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of February 21, entitled "Dairymen Do Not Take Kindly to Support Cut." Let me read and extract from it:

Experts seem to agree on one thing: the lowering of prices won't get rid of the butter surplus. There'll still be too much of a spread between the prices of oleomargarine and butter.

This article further points out that some of our dairymen will have to turn to already depressed livestock, others will turn to hogs. It also emphasizes that in some areas the only answer will be feeding heavier or increasing cow herds—increasing milk output, rather than decreasing it.

I ask consent that this article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAIRYMEN DON'T TAKE KINDLY TO SUPPORT CUT

How is the dairy industry taking the jolt of lowered price prospects for butter and other products?

The industry doesn't like it.

Dairymen say they're entitled to an opportunity for an orderly retreat from high production and it cannot be done overnight without assistance from the same people who brought the plea for more milk during wartime.

Most farmers had figured supports would be reduced, but gradually and not to the legal limit all at once.

Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, had hinted broadly that he'd reduce dairy support prices so the move was not unexpected.

Experts seem to agree on one thing—the lowering of prices won't get rid of the butter surplus. There'll still be too much of a spread between prices of oleomargarine and butter.

Even with the drop, butter will be in the 60–70 cents a pound range retail, while in Minnesota, even with heavy taxes, most oleo is about 20 cents lower.

How will farmers meet the price adjustment?

E. Fred Koller, professor of agricultural economics at University of Minnesota, came up with some definite ideas last week:

In southern and southwestern Minnesota, farmers may get discouraged and turn to crops or livestock. Many believe beef cattle prices have reached the bottom and may start feeding more cattle.

Hogs hit a high of $28 a hundredweight at South St. Paul last week and this may encourage some to go heavier into hogs.

In northern Minnesota, however, farmers don't have alternative crops.

Here, Koller figures, farmers may step up production in order to maintain income with lowered prices. That could mean feeding heavier or increasing cow herds.

In all areas, the watchword will be efficiency. A cow that produces less than 6,000 pounds of milk and 200 pounds of butterfat in a year isn't earning her keep.

Some experts say there are enough of these "boarders" to solve the butter surplus problem. Sending low producing cows to market could reduce milk production between 6 and 8 million pounds almost overnight.

Among efficiency measures will be cutting of feed costs by raising more low cost but highly nutritious grasses and legumes, use of fertilizers on pastures, cutting labor by labor-saving devices and, if planning a new barn, considering pole type or pen type barns that cost less.

But even with efficient operations, Minnesota will be hard hit. Much of the milk production goes into butter. The State is the No. 1 butter-producing State in the Nation and last year churned some 290 million pounds.

Butter, however, comes from surplus milk. The area is too far away from the big milk consuming areas of the East and South. Transportation is a problem.

And many markets for fluid milk and cream have been lost to midwest producers because of artificial barriers erected by many milksheds in the form of so-called sanitary regulations.

"Get your milk inspected by our city inspectors on the farm or don't ship to us" is one of the favorites.

One of the brightest pictures in the dairy industry is increased use of milk powder. With greater attempts at merchandising, United States consumption has risen from 2 million to 100 million pounds in the past 5 years.

Coincident with release of new price-support announcement, the department of agriculture forecast milk production for 1954–55 crop year at 122 billion pounds, an increase of nearly 2 billion pounds over 1953–54.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there are in the world no better experts on the subject of dairy products than the people of Minnesota and those of the neighboring State of Wisconsin. The experts who have studied the question find no solution to the present problem in the action of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt how Minnesota feels about this issue. It is a very disturbing situation that must be corrected, for the sake of our entire economy.

All my efforts in that direction have been in a constructive and bipartisan spirit, because when dairymen go broke it doesn't make any difference whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

When the mortgage falls due and the money is not there to pay it, the dairy farmer may go to his Republican banker and show him a card which says he is a member of the Republican Party, but that is not going to pay the mortgage, and is not going to relieve the dairy farmer of his responsibility.

He can go to the Democratic central committeeman who may be the head of a lending association, and even though the farmer is a member of the Democratic Party, when the mortgage is due the lender wants the money. So we are not talking about Republicans or Democrats; we are talking about one simple thing—farm income.

Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a letter to me from Ross B. Clark, secretary-manager of the Mid-South Milk Producers Association, commending me for my efforts in behalf of the dairy industry, and adding their protest against Secretary Benson's action.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 27, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have just read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 24, 1954, your comments on the floor of the Senate in regard to price supports on dairy products. The dairymen in the mid-south area have the same sentiments as you expressed from the dairymen of your State, Minnesota. We have contacted our honorable Senators EASTLAND and STENNIS, of Mississippi, and Senators GORE and KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, expressing the same viewpoints that you so ably presented to the Senate.

While our market is comparatively small, a reduction in dairy support prices to 75 percent of parity would mean from 55 to 60 thousand dollars less income a month to our producers.

Our market had been a deficit market for many years, and immediately after World War II, we encouraged 650 new producers to borrow money to buy cows; build grade A dairy barns; improve pasture lands; buy additional farm machinery to help supply our bottled milk market with an adequate supply of milk. Many of our 650 new producers were young GI's just returning from the war. Unless the support price of dairy commodities is raised from 75 to 85 percent of parity many of our dairymen and young GI's will lose their farms and herds.

We feel that a rollback in prices in an orderly manner is justified, but such drastic actions by our Secretary of Agriculture could force our country into another major depression such as we had in the early Thirties.

We want you and our Senators to know that the dairymen all over the country appreciate your continued fight for a solid agricultural economy.

Respectfully yours,
MID-SOUTH MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
ROSS B. CLARK,
Secretary-Manager.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there is much more that could be said on this dairy issue, and much more that I will say, unless some action is quickly taken to reduce the effect of Secretary Benson's disastrous blow. I repeat my promise to keep this issue before the Senate until there is taken some favorable action which is reasonable and fair, and which will provide effective safeguards and protection for America's economically important dairy industry.

COST OF AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President some time ago Secretary of Agriculture Benson submitted a table to the Senate Agriculture Committee in which he listed the realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function, for the fiscal years 1932–53. That table and another dealing exclusively with the price support program I submitted some time ago to the Senate. I have no doubt that the table was submitted primarily to show the cost to the Government of the United States of the price support programs, but, interestingly enough, it included the cost of other programs which are completely unrelated to the price support program.

For example, the Secretary inserted as a part of the table a section showing that the REA program cost the Government $99.8 million from its inception. Why did the Secretary of Agriculture consider it necessary to insert figures showing losses in the case of a program such as that of the REA, which is completely unrelated to the program of price supports? Was he trying to confuse the issue? Was he trying to give the REA a black eye? Or was he playing into the hands of those who are trying to destroy the REA program, which has meant so much to the farmers of the United States.

When one compares the Secretary's figures with the official figures of the REA, as contained in its Administrator's report to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953, there is a total difference of $145.3 million. The Secretary's table shows the REA program operated at a loss to the Government of $99.8 million, whereas the REA report shows a profit of $45.5 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator

from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for clarifying this matter, because at this time I have in my office a number of letters from persons in the business area of my State, asking me which set of figures is correct. As I understand, the annual report of the REA shows a substantial profit.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Whereas the report of the Secretary of Agriculture to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry shows a loss.

Mr. ELLENDER. I propose to explain the matter thoroughly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to thank the Senator from Louisiana, because the figures have been as goobledygooked and as mixed up as some other figures which have been submitted to us of late.

Mr. ELLENDER. Think of it, Mr. President—there is a difference of $145.3 million between the figures supplied by the Department and the figures supplied by an agency within that Department. Apparently the Department of Agriculture figured its estimate on a realized-cost basis, whereas the REA figured theirs on an accrued income and expense basis. The official statement of the Secretary states that "records for these programs are maintained and reports are made on the accrued basis, pursuant to regulations governing business-type Government operations." Therefore, if the Government regulations require the agency to report its operations on an accrued basis, why did the Secretary attempt to report them on a realized cost basis?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield again?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Louisiana is pointing to a discrepancy in figures within the Department of Agriculture. Does he realize that at the time we discussed the Commodity Credit Corporation and the liquidation of some of the loans which had been made by it—subjects which were recently discussed in the Senate—the Secretary of the Treasury valued the stores of butter the Government had on hand at approximately 38 cents a pound?

Mr. ELLENDER. I find it strange, I may say, that this table should have been presented to our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As I stated on the floor of the Senate during January, the table was most misleading. In my humble judgment, that was done in an effort to blacken the support program. As I indicated then, the table indicated a loss, from the agricultural programs, of $16 billion, when, as a matter of fact, the losses sustained by the Government on the basic commodities for a period of 20 years amounted to less than $21 million, and in the case of all commodities—whether basic or nonbasic—the loss was a little more than $1 billion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of that amount, is it not true that the potato losses were the most significant?

Mr. ELLENDER. The potato losses accounted for $448 million, as I recall the figures.

I may say that those tables have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29, 1954, at pages 1000, 1001, and 1002.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As a Senator who comes from a State with a population which is from 40 to 45 percent rural and from 55 to 60 percent urban, I wish to say that I am becoming sick, tired, and disgusted that a department of our Government should submit figures which it knows to be misleading, and which it has designed and compiled for the sole purpose of discrediting a program which functions well and to perfect which the Senator from Louisiana has dedicated years of service.

Mr. President, let no mistake be made about this matter: If the figures can be distorted, so as thereby to jeopardize the realization of truth by the American public, these programs will be "washed out" or ended, and the Nation will suffer.

The people of my State have been told again and again, through almost every means of propaganda, that the losses from the farm programs have amounted to more than $16 billion. I believe that on the floor of the Senate we should, week after week, repudiate that misrepresentation and also the misrepresenters—those who have done the dirty deed.

Mr. President, what an outrageous performance on the part of an agency of Government that is. The Secretary of Agriculture is supposed to represent agriculture, just as the Secretary of Labor is supposed to represent labor and management. What the Secretary of Agriculture has done in this case is fantastic.

I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for bringing out the facts in connection with this matter. It is time for righteous indignation. One thing we should expect from the Government is simple honesty in arithmetic.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on several occasions I have tried to make the facts plain to the Senate, and it is my purpose to continue to do so in the future, because I believe it to be wrong for the Secretary of Agriculture to blacken the present agricultural program, in the hope that he can have his own program adopted. I do not mind a fair fight, but at least the American people should be told the truth about the various programs.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe my colleague will find it very significant to study the results of a poll taken by the very able junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. In yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he placed the results of a poll he had taken among a group of North Dakotans. I notice the poll showed that among the farmers who responded, 1,478 said they had voted for President Eisenhower, and 1,035 said they had not. When asked how they would vote if an election were held today, by almost 2 to 1 they indicated they would not vote for President Eisenhower again.

Why did they say they would not vote for him again? The reason is not specifically stated in connection with the poll, but when we come to the answer to the 14th question we find significant figures. That question was, "Do you favor Secretary Benson's being retained as Secretary of Agriculture?"

Among the farmers the vote was 474 "yes" and 2,077 "no." That means that, whereas a majority of the farmers had voted for President Eisenhower, a large majority of them do not feel that they could vote for him at the present time, because, in the proportion of approximately 5 to 1, they do not approve the actions of his Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me at this time to permit me to make an observation in regard to another poll?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield if it is understood that in doing so, I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that within the last week or 10 days the Chamber of Commerce at Moorhead, Minn., one of our very fine, larger cities, and a neighboring city to Fargo, N. Dak., sponsored what is called the Greater Moorhead Days. They selected 2 days of the week for Farmers' Days. On one day they invited me to speak in the auditorium of Concordia College to the farmers there assembled. There was a packed house of more than 3,000. I would say that, conservatively estimated, 3,500 farm people were present.

Three days later an assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, a man by the name of Mr. Gold, went there, to speak in behalf of the administration's program. Of course, on that occasion he had the rebuttal, he spoke after I had spoken. Having heard what I had had to say, he had the advantage of all the briefing. After he finished speaking, an informal poll was taken; at the conclusion of the two meetings, the farmers present were asked by the presiding officer, who was the chairman of the Farmers' Days:

All those in favor of flexible price supports, the Benson program, please stand.

Mr. President, I must say, that, out of courtesy, some of the fine, friendly, charitable, kindly people in that part of the State of Minnesota stood.

Then they were asked the question:

All those in favor of 90 percent price supports, the so-called rigid price supports, please stand.

Mr. President, the number of those who stood at that time was so great that they reminded one of a forest; they stood en masse. Yet I wish to say that within the political picture these folk are traditionally Republicans. However, let me say they know how to keep books. They also know what it means to pay the bills. Right now there is no shadow of a doubt. If any Senator has any doubt about it, I suggest that he

take a few days off and go home. In Washington, on the banks of the Potomac, we become easily confused over agricultural problems. But let any Senator who has any doubt in his mind make a visit back home with the folks. They will help him considerably. The voice of the people is second only to the voice of the Lord.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to continue the statement explaining the discrepancy. I repeat what I have just read, so as to preserve continuity:

The official statement of the Secretary recites:

> Records for these programs are maintained and reports are made on the accrued basis pursuant to regulations governing business-type Government operations.

Therefore, if the Government regulations require the agency to report its operations on an accrued basis, why did the Secretary attempt to report them on a realized cost basis? Since the regulations stipulate that they are to be reported on an accrual basis, what is the Secretary trying to do? Is he trying to enter into an academic discussion of accounting in disregard of the wishes of the Congress; wishes that, as we shall see, are expressed in the law of the land? Surely the Secretary is not so naive as to believe that the enemies of the rural electrification program will not seize upon his figures and spread over the land the statement that the REA program has cost the American people almost a hundred million dollars. Surely it could not have been his intention to harm this fine program, a program that is bringing electricity to over 4 million farm families and rural establishments.

The report of the REA Administrator for fiscal year 1953, submitted to the Congress on January 22, 1954, states that the net income from lending operations cumulative to June 30, 1953, was $45,543,819. This is quite a difference from the net loss of $99.8 million listed in the Secretary of Agriculture's report. Why is there such a great discrepancy between these two sets of figures? In the Secretary's report he lists interest income as $150.9 million to June 30, 1953, while in the REA report they list interest income as almost $234 million. What accounts for this difference of $83.1 million? The REA Act wisely provides that the rural-electric systems are given a 5-year deferment period on the payment of interest and principal. This deferment is necessary in order to give these systems sufficient time to build up their loads so that they will have revenue enough to repay their loans. This was the decision of the Congress, and I, for one, believe it was a wise decision.

Up to December 30, 1953, this deferred interest amounted to $86,634,911.45. I noted that the difference between the REA figures for interest income and the Secretary of Agriculture's figures is approximately $83 million. This difference is accounted for by the deferment of interest for the 5-year period. But when the rural electric systems defer the payment of this interest, they accrue it with the understanding that they will pay it when it comes due at the end of the deferment period. They are doing this in good faith, in the faith that they have to meet their obligations to the Federal Government. They are doing it in accord with law as enacted by the Congress. I for one know their honor is good and the obligation will be discharged in due time. Let us look at the record. Through calendar year 1953 the rural electric system had repaid $163,300,000 in interest and $305,200,000 in principal, of which $62,500,000 were payments in advance of the date they were due. This was a gain in advance payments of $10 million for the calendar year 1953. This total amount of advanced payments is now credited to more than 700 borrowers and is about equal to the total amount due in interest and principal from all borrowers during 1953. With such a fine record of financial achievement, how could anyone list this deferred interest as a cost to the Government? There should be no question in anybody's mind regarding the intent and ability of the farmers' rural electric systems to repay this money to the Government as it becomes due.

The REA Administrator, Ancher Nelsen, announced in a press release on February 4 that delinquent electric loan payments to REA were the lowest in 9 years. Only $343,352 was overdue more than 30 days at the beginning of 1954. This is very small when we consider that the amount loaned is almost $2 billion. This was only one-twelfth of 1 percent of the total amount due. Does this fine record of financial achievement give any cause to the Secretary of Agriculture to list the deferred interest as a cost to the Government? It seems to me that when one does this, he is playing into the hands of those who desire to destroy this great rural electrification program.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson in his table lists the interest expense to the Government as $250.7 million while the REA Administrator in his official report to the Congress as only $185.9 million. There happens to be a slight difference here of $64.8 million. REA bases its statement of interest expense on the provisions of the REA act while the Secretary of Agriculture bases his interest cost on the computed interest rate on all Federal and federally guaranteed securities as of June 30 each year—in other words, disregarding the law. When REA was first established, its interest rate was 3 percent (during the period from 1935 to 1936). Then upon passage of the REA act in 1936 the act stated that the interest rate should be equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States on its obligations having a maturity of 10 or more years.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table designated table 1, showing interest rates paid by REA borrowers and methods by which they were determined, by fiscal year.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Interest rates paid by REA borrowers and methods by which they were determined, by fiscal years, 1936–53*

Fiscal year	Rate of interest paid by REA borrowers [1]	Average rate of interest payable by United States on obligations issued yearly having a maturity of 10 years or more [2]	Computed interest rate on marketable Federal securities [3]	Method of determining rate of interest paid by REA borrowers
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	
1936	3.0	2.77		Administrative determination under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act.
1937	2.77	2.88		Statutory rate prescribed by section 4–5, Rural Electrification Act of 1936—a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States on its obligations having a maturity of 10 or more years issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued.[4]
1938	2.88	2.73		
1939	2.73	2.69	2.525	
1940	2.69	2.46	2.492	
1941	2.46	2.48	2.413	
1942	2.48	2.57	2.225	
1943	2.57	2.67	1.822	
1944	2.67	2.49	1.725	
1945 through Sept. 20, 1944	2.49		1.718	
1945 from Sept. 21, 1944	2.0		1.718	Statutory rate prescribed by sec. 502, Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944—a fixed 2-percent rate.
1946	2.0		1.773	
1947	2.0		1.871	
1948	2.0		1.942	
1949	2.0		2.001	
1950	2.0		1.958	
1951	2.0		1.981	
1952	2.0		2.051	
1953	2.0		2.207	

[1] 2.49 percent rate was effective through Sept. 20, 1944; 2 percent thereafter.

[2] This was the figure that determined the REA interest rate during the 1937–44 period. Note that the rate in this column for each year became the REA interest rate the following year.

[3] This is the computed annual average cost to the Government on all marketable Federal securities, and is often regarded as representing the cost of money to the Government. Since July 1, 1947, the amount in this column has been the basis of the interest rate charged REA by the Treasury for the money it makes available to borrowers. A comparable rate is not readily available for fiscal years earlier than 1939.

[4] The rate of interest payable on amounts placed under note during fiscal year 1940, for example, was equal to the average rate of interest payable on bonds with maturities of 10 years or more issued in fiscal 1939. If no such bonds had been issued in 1939, the 1938 issues would have been used. Such average rates were computed by the Treasury Department.

Mr. ELLENDER. Table I lists the interest rates paid by the systems during that period. I ask unanimous consent that the table may be inserted as part of my remarks. Then in 1944 the Pace Act was passed which reduced the REA interest rate to a fixed 2 percent. During all this period except for 1952 and

1953 you will note from the table the interest rate on REA loans was higher than the computed interest rate on marketable Federal securities. This rate on marketable Federal securities is considered the cost of money to the Government and has been the basis of the interest rate charged REA by the Treasury for the money it makes available to its borrowers. Because the rate paid by the borrowers for most of this period was higher than the rate paid by REA, you have a net income of $45.5 million on interest as listed in the REA Administrator's report for fiscal year 1953.

What the Secretary of Agriculture has done is to average the amount of REA loans outstanding at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year and then multiply this by the computed interest rate on all Federal and federally guaranteed securities as of June 30 each year. This means of computing the cost of money to the Treasury has no basis in either the REA Act as explained above or in fact. By doing this he is burdening the cooperatives with the cost of all Federal and federally guaranteed securities. This includes such things as the Panama Canal bonds, conversion bonds, postal-savings bonds, tax and savings notes, investment series bonds, depository bonds, Armed Forces leave bonds, adjusted-service bonds, Treasury bonds, and so forth. The interest rates on these issues from June 30, 1936, to June 30, 1953, as shown in table II, have varied from thirty-eight one hundreds of 1 percent to 3 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*Computed interest rate on public debt, by security classes, selected dates, 1936–53*

Date	Total public debt	Marketable issues					Nonmarketable issues				Special issues
		Total [1]	Bills	Certificates	Notes	Treasury bonds	Total	Savings bonds [2]	Tax and savings notes	Other [3]	
June 30, 1936	2.559	(4)	(4)	----------	(4)	(4)	(4)	2.900	----------	3.000	(4)
June 30, 1937	2.582	(4)	(4)	----------	(4)	(4)	(4)	2.900	----------	3.000	(4)
June 30, 1938	2.589	(4)	(4)	----------	(4)	(4)	(4)	2.900	----------	3.000	(4)
June 30, 1939	2.609	2.525	0.010	----------	1.448	2.964	2.913	2.900	----------	3.000	3.091
June 30, 1940	2.583	2.492	.038	----------	1.256	2.908	2.908	2.900	----------	3.000	3.026
June 30, 1941	2.518	2.413	.089	----------	1.075	2.787	2.865	2.858	----------	3.000	2.904
June 30, 1942	2.295	2.225	.300	0.564	1.092	2.680	2.277	2.787	0.506	2.743	2.681
June 30, 1943	1.979	1.822	.380	.875	1.105	2.494	2.330	2.782	1.040	2.495	2.408
June 30, 1944	1.929	1.725	.381	.875	1.281	2.379	2.417	2.788	1.080	2.314	2.405
June 30, 1945	1.936	1.718	.381	.875	1.204	2.314	2.473	2.789	1.076	2.000	2.436
June 30, 1946	1.996	1.773	.381	.875	1.289	2.307	2.567	2.777	1.070	2.000	2.448
June 30, 1947	2.107	1.871	0.382	0.875	1.448	2.307	2.593	2.765	1.070	2.423	2.510
June 30, 1948	2.182	1.942	1.014	1.042	1.204	2.309	2.623	2.759	1.070	2.414	2.588
June 30, 1949	2.256	2.001	1.176	1.225	1.375	2.313	2.629	2.751	1.290	2.393	2.596
June 30, 1950	2.200	1.958	1.187	1.163	1.344	2.322	2.569	2.748	1.383	2.407	2.589
June 30, 1951	2.270	1.981	1.569	1.875	1.399	2.327	2.623	2.742	1.567	2.717	2.606
June 30, 1952	2.329	2.051	1.711	1.875	1.560	2.317	2.659	2.745	1.785	2.714	2.675
June 30, 1953	2.438	2.207	2.254	2.319	1.784	2.342	2.720	2.760	2.231	2.714	2.746
Sept. 30, 1953	2.456	2.242	2.067	[5] 2.476	1.852	2.380	2.723	2.764	2.347	2.714	2.751

[1] Total includes the following issues not shown separately: postal savings bonds, Panama Canal bonds and conversion bonds. This column contains the interest figures generally referred to as "the cost of money to the Government," i. e., the average rate of interest on marketable securities.
[2] Computed on the basis of the rate to maturity applied against the amount outstanding.
[3] Includes investment series bonds, depositary bonds, Armed Forces leave bonds, and adjusted service bonds.
[4] Not available.
[5] Interest rate on regular certificates was 2.476 percent on total of $20.5 billion. In July Treasury began issuing a special tax anticipation certificate at 2.5 percent, with a total outstanding Sept. 30, 1953, of $5.9 billion. Treasury does not supply a computed average of the 2 types of certificates. The slightly lower (0.024 percent) rate is used here because about ⅘ of the certificates are at that rate.

Source: U. S. Treasury, Annual Report and Bulletin.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask the Secretary why burden the rural electric cooperatives with the interest expense of all these varying types of Government securities? This certainly is not the rate that REA had to pay the Treasury for the moneys which is advanced to the rural electric systems. This accounts for the difference of $64.8 million between the Secretary of Agriculture's figures and the official figures of the REA. Why does the Secretary of Agriculture insist on burdening the farmers' rural electric systems with this additional $64.8 million? I insist that he would only do this if he did not have the best interests of the rural electric systems at heart.

The 1,022 REA borrowers at the end of calendar year 1953 were serving 4,031,000 connected consumers on 1,295,000 miles of line. Over 91 percent of the Nation's farms are now receiving central station electric service as compared with only 10.9 percent on December 31, 1934. This is an achievement we are all proud of.

All of us are proud of the record of the farmers' rural electric systems and we want to make the record clear that we object to this juggling of figures by the Secretary of Agriculture. This manipulation is contrary to the wishes of the Congress, as expressed in the REA Act, as amended, and also is contrary to the faith that we in the Congress have in the ability of the rural electric systems to meet all their obligations to the Government. It also disregards a record of achievement that all of us in the Congress are proud of.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I shall speak today briefly on the extent of the Communist control of the economic and political life of Hawaii. Later in this debate I expect to speak at some length and in great detail in opposition to this resolution. Today, my remarks will be directed largely at occurrences in the past few months since the investigation last summer which show the extent of Communist domination of this Territory which is now knocking at the door of the American Congress demanding admission into this Union of sovereign States. This is a very dangerous matter, Mr. President, and in my judgment is fraught with grave peril to the United States.

Not one valid reason has been given why this Territory should be admitted to statehood. Not one valid proof has been given, Mr. President, that the admission of Hawaii would benefit the people of the United States. I submit all the facts point the other way. At the outset, let me state that the investigation of the ILWU by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate shows beyond any peradventure of doubt that this union is Communist controlled; that Communists control the economic life of Hawaii; that Communist control has penetrated the Government of Hawaii and that the international Communist conspiracy today exerts great influence in the county governments in the Territory and in the territorial legislature. The issue is not how many Communists are there in Hawaii. That is beside the point. The real issue is: Do they control the Territory? The issue is the extent of their power and control. The question is what is their strength rather than what are their numbers. I submit that their power is dangerous, that this power is so dangerous Hawaii should not be admitted to statehood.

I submit, Mr. President, that the admission of Hawaii to statehood would place on the floor of the Senate of the United States two Senators who, if not Communists, would be subject to influence from Moscow and that the government of the new state would be influenced by the international Communist conspiracy just as Communists today yield great power in the Territorial government of Hawaii.

There are several yardsticks to be used in evaluating the real power of communism in Hawaii. First: The extent of the control of the economic life of the community and the ability through Communist controlled unions to halt the wheels of the economic life at the whim of the party and its masters in the Kremlin. Second: The extent of the infiltration in the government through (a) elected or appointed government officials, and (b) government employees in general who belong to organizations under Communist control. Third: The percentage of the population who belong to unions under complete control of the Communist Party. Fourth: The funds spent by the Communist press, including all publications under party control, and Communist controlled unions. Fifth: The fear of the community to fight back and the ability of the Communist Party to make life intolerable for former Com-

munists who desert the ranks of the party and openly help to expose its sinister and subversive activities; and, further the fear of reprisal and the ability of the party to impose reprisals upon others who cooperate with the Government of the United States in the effort of the Government of the United States to break up the Communist conspiracy in the islands, and to convict the leaders who have participated therein.

Let me say at that point, Mr. President, the record shows that the witnesses who testified for the Government in the Smith Act trial of Communist leaders in the Islands are unable to obtain employment today and that their families are suffering, because of the power of the Communist Party in Hawaii, which says they shall not be employed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Mississippi is familiar with the fact, is he not, that the jury was not afraid to find the Communist leaders guilty, that the trial judge was not afraid to sentence them to terms in the penitentiary, and that the Governor and leading Republicans and leading Democrats were not afraid to testify against them at the trial?

Mr. EASTLAND. Speaking of leading Democrats, the mayor of the city of Honolulu, which contains about half the population of the islands, testified as a defense witness, and many other leading citizens testified as defense witnesses.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. The Senator from Louisiana asked me a question, and I shall attempt to answer it. One of the business firms employed in a supervisory capacity one of the criminals who was convicted in the Smith Act trial. That same firm employed one of the Government witnesses who testified against the defendants. The facts disclose that after the trial the business firm promoted the convicted Communist and gave him a raise in salary, and discharged the man who had the courage to testify against the convicted traitors. Such incidents as this show the power of communism in the islands.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. There is another factor involved. In Hawaii a shortwave radio at times picks up Radio Moscow broadcasts, and rebroadcasts those anti-American lies and propoganda over the islands. That shows the tremendous power of the Communist Party in the islands.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is familiar with the outcome of the trial in question, I believe. The outcome was that the Communist leaders were convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary.

Mr. EASTLAND. I understand that to be the fact. I also understand that the economic life of the islands is controlled and dominated by Communists through union control. I believe the facts will show that from 2,000 to 3,000 of the territorial employees of the Government in Hawaii are members of a Communist-dominated union.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator has stated and reiterated his view that the economic life of the Hawaiian Islands is controlled by Communists through the domination by Communists of union labor forces.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. Of course, that is a conclusion, as the Senator readily recognizes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly, it is a conclusion, but I think I shall make known the facts to sustain it.

Mr. CORDON. I assumed that the Senator would bring out facts which would show the actual exercise of control.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall not discuss in detail that phase of the subject today. I shall discuss it later, and if the Senator will refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last year he will find the speech I made and also a speech by the then junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], citing the control of the economic life of the Territory of Hawaii by Communist leadership.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is familiar, is he not, with the fact—and it is a fact—that the most recent strike of the so-called longshoremen's group in 1949–50, tied up transportation to and from the islands, without any question? The Senator is also familiar with the fact that while the strike was in progress and while every effort Communist leaders could exert to tie up and throttle the commerce of the islands was made, the Legislature of Hawaii was called into special session and passed legislation which provided complete authority for the Territorial Government to take over and operate all longshore and wharfage operations in the Territory?

Mr. EASTLAND. The answer to that question is that the labor organization did tie up the economy of the islands. It is a fact on which we rely to show Communist control of the economic life of the islands.

Mr. CORDON. But legislation was passed by a legislature elected in Hawaii, and it was signed by the Governor, went into effect, and was used for the purpose for which it was passed. Is that not true?

Mr. EASTLAND. I know there are some persons in Hawaii who make that claim but the facts are that the strike almost destroyed Hawaii and demonstrated Communist control of the economy of Hawaii. For months the people could not obtain an adequate food supply.

Mr. CORDON. Would the Senator say it was destructive of the economy of Hawaii when the highest legislative body in the Territory took steps to place in the hands of the courts adequate authority to control the situation?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has made his point, but, as I have said, the same thing is happening over and over again. The strike did bring the economy of Hawaii to its knees.

Mr. CORDON. But not on its back.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will tell the Senator something else for his information. Another strike in Hawaii is threatened for this month. There is a union which not only controls all the longshoremen, but controls the pineapple workers, the sugarcane workers, and even the taxi drivers, and it is affiliated with another Communist union, the Public Workers Union, which controls hospital employees, having from 2,000 to 3,000 members among the employees of the county and Territorial governments. To say that an all-out strike of those organizations could not bring the economy of Hawaii to its knees is not correct.

Mr. CORDON. Has it?

Mr. EASTLAND. It did.

Mr. CORDON. Was it not completely met by adequate legislation enacted by the legislature of the Territory?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; it was not completely met. It caused great suffering in Hawaii.

Mr. President, when we apply these standards of measure to the Communist apparatus in Hawaii, we find a situation so shocking that the facts stagger the imagination.

Mr. President, I shall apply these tests from sworn testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee, and largely from newspaper articles and advertisements, which reveal occurrences in the life of the islands.

The Communist Party controls the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union, dominated largely by Harry Bridges and headed in Hawaii by one Jack W. Hall, convicted last summer under the Smith Act. The ILWU has recently demonstrated its ability to bring economic paralysis to the islands. There is no place in the continental United States where the Communist Party can, at any moment of its own choosing, bring the economic life of the community to a halt. From this measure of strength, Communist power in Hawaii is many, many times greater than in the continental United States. I shall speak upon this aspect of the question in detail at a later time during the debate.

Suffice it to say, Mr. President, that the economic life of Hawaii has been brought to a complete halt on several occasions by the Communist-controlled ILWU.

The political parties in Hawaii are approximately evenly divided. The Democratic Party is largely a captive party which is controlled and dominated by Communists. However, the Communist conspiracy has infiltrated the Territorial government of the islands through both political parties. An intense drive is now in progress to consolidate the Communist hold upon the Democratic Party through the control of the ILWU and the Public Workers Union.

Mr. President, at the present time a delegation of citizens of the Territory are en route to Washington to lobby with the American Congress in the interest

of Hawaiian statehood. One of the members and one of the lobbyists is one John A. Burns, chairman of the Territorial Democratic Central Committee.

Only last week the Honolulu Star-Bulletin carried the following headline: "Fasi Challenges Burns, Akau To Denounce ILWU Reds."

The newspaper story appearing in the paper owned by the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii, Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, states:

> Frank F. Fasi, Democratic National Committeeman for Hawaii, has set off another crackling dispute in his party by challenging two of its top leaders to denounce "the Communist leadership of the ILWU once and for all."

The story in the Star-Bulletin states further that Mr. Fasi asserted that Mr. Burns refused to testify against Jack W. Hall, territorial director of the ILWU, who was convicted last year in the Smith Act trials of conspiring to advocate and teach the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Fasi said:

> I challenge you again, Mr. Burns, to deny even today that you are working hand in glove with agents of the Communist ILWU leadership to control the territorial conventions.

Mr. President, the John A. Burns mentioned by National Committeeman Frank F. Fasi, is the chairman of the Territorial Central Committee. Mr. Burns is one of those being sent to Washington by the Hawaii Statehood Commission, at government expense to lobby for statehood. This is the type man, Mr. President, who is being sent to Washington to influence the Senate of the United States to pass this bill. Does it not show the power of communism in high places in Hawaii?

I submit, that if the chairman of the Territorial Democratic Central Committee is "working hand in glove with agents of the Communist ILWU leadership to control the coming territorial conventions," the Communist menace in Hawaii is greater today than ever before. The man who has made this statement, the man who says that John A. Burns is working hand in glove with agents of the Communists, is the highly respected national committeeman of the Democratic Party, who has been an outstanding and consistent opponent of communism in the islands.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Do I correctly understand the Senator's argument to be that Communists control the Democratic Party in Hawaii, and that to support his argument the Senator calls as his witness a Democratic national committeeman, who is challenging other Democrats?

Mr. EASTLAND. I call him as one of the witnesses. I do not see how the Senator from Louisiana could for one moment imagine that I was resting my case on that one incident.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is not contending that the Democratic national committeeman is a Communist or is Communist controlled, is he?

Mr. EASTLAND. Did the Senator from Louisiana hear what I said?

Mr. LONG. I take it from the Senator's speech——

Mr. EASTLAND. I said that Mr. Fasi was highly respected and has been an outstanding, consistent opponent of communism. I am sorry if I did not make myself clear to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator imply that the Democratic Party is controlled by the Communist Party?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is controlled by Communists.

Mr. LONG. And also that the Democratic national committeeman is a Communist or is controlled by the Communist Party?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Democratic Party is controlled by the Communists. It is an agent of the Communist Party. It is a fact I hate to admit; yet it is correct. The Democratic Party is controlled by the ILWU, which is dominated by Communists.

Mr. LONG. I completely disagree with the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know the Senator disagrees with me.

Two years ago Judge Metzger was the Democratic nominee for Delegate in opposition to Delegate FARRINGTON. Judge Metzger was controlled by the ILWU. He is the man who went to New York just a year ago and received an award from the Communist-front National Lawyers Guild, and also made an inflammatory speech there. He came within 10,000 votes of defeating FARRINGTON.

Mr. LONG. I simply cannot follow the argument of the Senator from Mississippi that the Democratic Party is controlled by Communists, when the same Democratic Party has named as its national committeeman one who, the Senator from Mississippi says, is a strong anti-Communist.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly, he is; but he does not control the Democratic Party. The control of the Democratic Party in Hawaii rests in the hands of Jack Hall and the ILWU.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I addressed the Democratic Party of Hawaii last year, and while I was in the islands I made every effort to investigate the strength of the Communists there. So far as I could determine, the control of the Democratic Party was not in the hands of Communists. I did not meet Jack Hall. I did have the pleasure of meeting the Democratic district attorney who had prosecuted Mr. Hall, and I had the pleasure of meeting the Democratic judge who had presided at the trial at which Hall was found guilty, and who sentenced Hall to the penitentiary.

Unfortunately, I did not have occasion to judge what kind of man Hall is. Perhaps I should say fortunately I did not have the opportunity to meet him, because he was not among the Democrats whom I had occasion to meet and address.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, the Senator would not associate with characters like Jack Hall; but the fact remains that at the trial of Hall, the most powerful Democrat in the islands, the Honorable John Wilson, mayor of the city of Honolulu, was a defense witness.

Judge Metzger was a defense witness. Other leaders of the Democratic Party, persons who actually exercise power, were defense witnesses.

If the Senator from Louisiana wishes to be enlightened about whether the Democratic Party is Communist-controlled, then, if I am not mistaken, he can check the reports of his own committee, which has made that statement.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator from Mississippi know that other Democrats have made the mistake of testifying in behalf of Communists? There have been members of the President's Cabinet and former Supreme Court Justices who have, on occasion, been character witnesses on behalf of persons who were accused of being Communists.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LONG. But that did not mean the Democratic Party was Communist-controlled.

Mr. EASTLAND. I think those occurrences were a national disgrace. Certainly I do not think they afford any justification for a Democratic leader accepting an award from a Communist-controlled organization.

Mr. LONG. Certainly, I would not take that to mean that the Democratic Party was Communist-controlled.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is a circumstance. I do not think there can be any dispute that the Democratic Party in Hawaii is Communist-controlled. I believe the reports of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have so stated.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Mississippi knows, does he not, that the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Representative VELDE, has given considerable study to the subject, and is strongly in favor of Statehood for Hawaii? He does not believe that the Communist danger in Hawaii is any greater than it is in many parts of the United States mainland.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator say that that is Mr. VELDE's opinion?

Mr. LONG. That is his opinion.

Mr. EASTLAND. Or is it the Senator's understanding of Mr. VELDE's opinion?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator's understanding of another individual's opinion is not probative evidence.

Mr. LONG. I had the pleasure of reading his statement. I also had the pleasure of reading the statement of

Representative FRANCIS WALTER, a very able man, who serves on the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. EASTLAND. Before the debate is over, I think it will be shown beyond any peradventure of doubt that, beginning with a former Communist, who is now employed by the Government of the United States and who lives in Hawaii, and who organized the party there, down to date the Communists have controlled the economic life of Hawaii, and have had tremendous influence in its political affairs.

I have before me a Communist newspaper which shows that on one of the islands every member of the Territorial Legislature was advertising in the Communist newspaper and later was thanking that organization for its support in his election. I may say that they were Democrats.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know there have been unions in this country which have had Communist leaders, many of whom have lost their influence in the unions? There is a union in New York which is seeking to retain control over its membership. The leadership of that union is regarded as being either Communist or Communist-inspired. Is the Senator aware of that fact?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. The Senator says such unions in this country have lost their influence. Perhaps they have, but the Communist unions which run Hawaii have not lost their influence.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not true that the last general strike in Hawaii occurred 5 years ago, in 1949?

Mr. EASTLAND. In my statement I shall develop the facts concerning that strike; but I do not think the fact that it occurred 5 years ago means anything.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not true that when we were at war with the Communists in Korea, and all our supplies had to be shipped through Hawaii, there was not a single act of sabotage performed there?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, those supplies passed through one of the greatest bases we have, during which time intelligence officers of the Army and Navy were stationed there.

I wish to ask the Senator this question: Did the Navy permit the ILWU longshoremen to handle Navy cargo?

Mr. BENNETT. I do not know the answer to that question.

Mr. EASTLAND. We shall have some information on that point. I am not certain of the answer, either; but I have been informed by a former Communist Party member that they did handle such cargo. I intend to put his testimony into the RECORD in a few moments.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator aware of the fact that in our fight against communism in Korea one of the units which was engaged in combat to a great extent was the Hawaiian National Guard, that those troops were among the first sent to Korea, and that they fought valiantly for this country against communism?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly, I am aware of that.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator further aware that the rate of casualties which they sustained was approximately three times as great as those of the average unit which served against the Communists on the Korean front?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly, I am aware of that. The Senator has not heard me say that all the people in Hawaii are Communists. I stated that Communists controlled the unions, and, through control of the unions, controlled the economic life of the islands, and, through control and domination of the union vote, had enormous control over the political affairs of the islands. That cannot be disputed, because it is a fact. Neither can the statement be disputed that the candidate whom the Communists backed, Judge Metzger, who received a Lawyers' Guild award, came within 10,000 votes of winning the election over Delegate FARRINGTON.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CORDON. Does not that fact completely dispute the Senator's own conclusion that the Communist-dominated unions have control of Hawaii, when their own candidate was defeated by 10,000 votes?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; it does not. The Communist-controlled unions control the city of Honolulu, which is the most powerful area in the islands. They control great numbers of the members of the Territorial legislature. As I am going to show, they control members of the board of supervisors in the islands, and that from two to three thousand public employees of the Territorial and county governments in the islands are Communists.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Does the Senator know that the constitution which has been voted upon by the people of Hawaii contains a proviso that no Communist may hold office of any kind?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry the distinguished Senator brought that subject up. He is the man who convinced me that the pending bill should not pass because of Communist power in the Hawaiian Islands. I read the report of the distinguished Senator.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for a short remark on that particular subject?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield, not for a remark, but for a question.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I merely wish to advise the Senator that I myself have a very short address to make concerning the Communist situation in Hawaii; but I cannot make it until the Senator completes his remarks.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator may make his address when I have finished, but the fact remains that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska convinced me that communism was too powerful in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the Senator know that of the 63 who were elected to the constitutional convention, only 1 admitted former membership in the Communist Party, and 1 refused to answer, and neither one was seated?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is not the number of Communists that counts. The number is entirely beside the point. It is a question of control. Before the debate is over, I shall show that membership in the Communist Party in Hawaii has been deliberately kept low in order to dilute the control to the few people who now run the islands.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the Senator desire to have me understand that, having refused to seat the two ex-Communists, a Communist-controlled convention proceeded then to write a constitution?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have never stated that a Communist-controlled convention proceeded to write the constitution. The Senator sets up his own strawman, knocks him over, and draws his own conclusion from alleged facts which he has stated. I have never said the constitutional convention was communistic. I have taken this thesis: The economic life of the islands is controlled by Communists. Communists exert tremendous influence over the political affairs of the islands. I am going to demonstrate that as a fact, and not as a conclusion.

I should like to exhibit to the Senator a Communist newspaper. Here it is. [Exhibiting.] The Senator has been a very prominent and very distinguished businessman. Here are four issues of the official Communist newspaper of Honolulu, taken at random, which are presented to show their power. In one issue there are paid advertisements by 562 business firms.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of giving us the date of that newspaper?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall put the newspapers in the RECORD in my own time, and at the place at which I think they belong in my remarks.

In the same issue to which I referred there were paid advertisements by 810 individuals. In other words, there were 1,102 people who paid for advertisements in that newspaper.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator advise me whether the name of the newspaper is the Honolulu Daily Worker, if there is such a publication? What is the name of the publication?

Mr. EASTLAND. The name of the publication is the Honolulu Record. I am going to place these newspapers in the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is that an official organ of the Communist Party?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is the organ of the Communist Party in Hawaii. Its editor is Mr. Koji Aruyoshi, who, I understand, is one of the men who was convicted under the Smith Act.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What are the dates of the newspapers?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have stated to the Senator that, in my own time, I shall place them in the RECORD, together with the dates.

I continue to read from the story in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin referring to Mr. Frank F. Fasi. The story concludes as follows:

> He [Mr. Fasi] said thousands of independent voters are waiting anxiously for a responsible Democratic Party.

Mr. President, I am reading from the statement made by the Democratic national committeeman for Hawaii. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] says the Communists do not influence that man. Let me read further from the article about Mr. Frank Fasi. As I was saying the article concludes with the statement:

> He [Mr. Fasi] said thousands of independent voters are waiting anxiously for a responsible Democratic Party. They don't want to go along year after year with a big-business Republican Party, but they have no alternative when a vacuum exists on the Democratic side. They can't bring themselves to work in a party for any candidate where one must bow down and kowtow to Communist ILWU leadership.

Mr. President, that statement was made last week by the Democratic national committeeman for Hawaii.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me at this point?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator from Mississippi know that when opposing candidates run against one another for office, they are often inclined to make very strong and perhaps overstated charges against their opposition?

For instance, does not the Senator from Mississippi know that a couple of years ago, in Louisiana, during a gubernatorial campaign, District Attorney Perez made such charges against Representative HALE BOGGS, a Member of the United States House of Representatives, but later in the campaign a letter of apology was written by the candidate on whose behalf Mr. Perez made such charges?

Does not my colleague know that Frank Fasi was a candidate for mayor of Honolulu, and is going to run again for that office?

Mr. EASTLAND. However, Mr. President, we cannot lightly brush aside the charge, which was made by that Democratic national committeeman, that in Hawaii candidates on the Democratic ticket must kowtow and bow down to the ILWU leadership. I will not remain silent when such charges are made.

The Senator from Louisiana has referred to a situation existing in Louisiana, but I do not think that situation throws any light on the matter to which I have been referring.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator from Mississippi know that Frank Fasi ran last year as a candidate for mayor of Honolulu, and expects to run again for that office?

Mr. EASTLAND. The quotation I just read relates, not to the mayor of Honolulu, but to a man named Burns, who has been sent to Washington in an effort to lobby and to try to influence the votes of the Members of the United States Congress; and he has been told to disavow any connection with communism, because if a connection of that sort were known it would hurt his case.

Mr. LONG. I assume that the Senator from Mississippi does not know that Mr. Burns and Mr. Fasi see things the same way, so far as local politics is concerned.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know how the Senator from Louisiana can make that statement.

Mr. LONG. I know who ran for election as mayor of Honolulu.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, I know that; and I know that the present mayor of Honolulu is a Democrat, and is the most powerful man in the islands, next to Jack Hall; but he has been a witness for and a stooge of the Communists. He had in his office an administrative assistant who is dead now; but there can be no doubt in my mind about what that man's connections were.

Mr. President, thus ends this significant story in an issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin only last week.

Another story which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of Thursday, February 25, throws further light on the evergrowing and sinister Communist menace. The story is headed "UPW Official Here Is Listed as Communist." The story states that there are three full-time, paid officials of the United Public Workers in Hawaii, and identifies them as Henry Epstein, Stephen Murin, and Max Roffman. It states that—

> Epstein and Murin have been previously identified as Communists by the Territorial commission on subversive activities.

The article then proceeds to designate Max Roffman as having been an active Communist Party member on the mainland before he went to Hawaii.

Recently the Honolulu Star-Bulletin published a series of articles on the Communist-dominated United Public Workers in organizing government employees in the Territory. According to the data published in December of 1953, the progress of this Communist union in recruiting government workers is truly terrifying. At the lowest estimate this subversive organization has not less than 3,000 government employees in the Territory or Hawaii on its membership rolls, and has recruited a majority of the firemen in the Territory. The Communist union bosses have already brought all of the sugar workers, taxi drivers, pineapple workers, and the waterfront workers under their control, and now the octopus is extending its tentacles into the ranks of government employees. How can one say that communism has not penetrated the Territorial government, when several thousands employees of the government deliberately join a Red union? Could anyone have confidence in such a State, if Hawaii were admitted to this Union?

The government workers are joining this identified Communist organization, which, unfortunately, is working closely with Harry Bridges' ILWU, and are simply following the example of the important elected officials in the Territory. In testimony last week before the Senate Judiciary Committee, copies of the Communist weekly Honolulu Record were introduced in evidence by a witness who is now a Federal Government employee in the islands. Mr. President, let me say that the facts I am recounting are taken from sworn testimony which I shall place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

In looking over that Communist sheet, which had 60 pages in its anniversary issue of August 6, 1953, I find on page 49, advertisements paid for by 10 top officials of the county government of Kauai. The headline begins: "Greetings to the Honolulu Record on Its Fifth Anniversary." The advertisement is signed by A. C. Baptiste, Jr., chairman and executive officer, county of Kauai. There are, on the same page, paid display advertisements of greetings to the weekly voice of treason in Hawaii, and they were inserted and paid for by the county attorney of Kauai County, Mr. Toshio Kabutan, and four members of the County Board of Supervisors—Matsuki Arashiro, Chris Watase, Raymond Souza, and Tom Okura.

I understand there are six members of the county board of supervisors in that county. Four of the six have brazenly advertised their support of this Communist publication. How can anyone say, Mr. President, that Communist influence in the islands is nil, when county officeholders advertise in a Communist newspaper?

There are four other items from representatives in the Territorial legislature from the county of Kauai. They are Toshiharu Yama, Toshio Serizawa, William Fernandes, and Manuel Henriques, all four of whom are members of the Territorial legislature from the county of Kauai, and all four are proud to aline themselves with Communist traitors.

To describe this, Mr. President, as a serious situation is to make the understatement of the year. It is high time that the Governor of Hawaii, the Honorable Samuel Wilder King, took steps to remove these pro-Communists from their high positions, and if he needs the backing of the Congress of the United States in doing so, he should let this be known.

Mr. President, at this point let me say that I have before me an advertisement, which I shall place in the RECORD, from the county treasurer of Honolulu City and County. The advertisement was placed in that Communist newspaper, and in the advertisement the Honolulu treasurer thanks the newspaper for its support in his successful campaign for election.

Another issue of the Honolulu Record, organ of the Communists in Hawaii, dated December 24, 1953, contains a display ad by Eddie Tam, chairman and executive officer of the county of Maui.

Mr. President, we see 2 of the 4 heads of the county governments in

Hawaii openly lined up with Harry Bridges, Jack W. Hall, and other agents of world communism. We see them appealing for Communist support. We see them soliciting Communist aid. What reasonable man can say they will not be influenced by communism? Something should be done about this situation and without delay.

Mr. President, to show the power of the Communist Party in Hawaii one has but to read the Communist Honolulu Record. I hold in my hand the issue of this newspaper for Thursday, August 7, 1952. On this date a total of 329 business firms were advertising in this newspaper. There were greetings from 54 local labor unions; there were 7 classified advertisements; there were 8 advertisements from candidates for public office and public officeholders in the islands. On December 25, 1952, 197 business firms were advertising in this newspaper. There were 59 local labor unions, 6 classified local advertisements, and, in addition, there were 7 advertisements of greetings from public officials and candidates for public office. One year later, on Thursday, August 6, 1953, a total of 562 business firms were advertising in this newspaper. There were paid greetings from 100 local labor unions. In addition, there were 10 advertisements from candidates for public office and public officeholders in the Territory. On Thursday, December 24, 1953, a total of 239 business firms were advertising in this Communist newspaper. There were paid greetings from 53 local labor unions and 4 classified advertisements.

These four editions of this Communist newspaper were picked at random. They prove conclusively the terrific influence of communism when more than 500 business firms find it necessary to advertise in the Communist newspaper. More than 500 business firms find it necessary to advertise in the Communist newspaper, when the total population of the islands is only about 467,000. Where in the continental United States would one find such Communist power?

I submit, Mr. President, that the Communist publication in Hawaii contains more advertisements from business than one would find in Communist newspapers in Iron Curtain countries.

Some supporters of Hawaiian statehood say that communism was once strong in the Hawaiian Islands but that it has weakened, and they give that as their reason for changing their position on Hawaiian statehood. I hold in my hand the January 15, 1954, copy of a newspaper published in Honolulu named Spot Light. This is an anti-Communist newspaper which, I understand, was created by some of the best people in the islands to fight the growing menace and power of communism in the Territory. I read the headline in its lead article: "Is Communism on the Wane in Hawaii? An Inventory Says 'No'."

Let me read excerpts, Mr. President: The expression "communism is on the wane in Hawaii" is the wishful thinking of some residents, especially those who believe the best way to combat communism is to ignore it, and then it will quietly fade away. A candid, down-to-earth inventory of the situation disproves such wishful thinking. A first-of-the-year inventory of the known Communists and their activities indicates that all of them are still with us and all of them are at liberty to pursue their Red activities.

FREE PRESS

And, even though convicted of conspiracy under the Smith Act, Koji Ariyoshi, editor, and Jack Kimoto, employee, still continue to edit, publish, and distribute the weekly Communist newspaper, the Honolulu Record.

That Red tabloid issued a 24-page Christmas edition containing paid ads by 292 business firms or organizations, plus 810 individuals, or a total of 1,102 paid advertisements.

This show of Communist strength in Hawaii is all the proof necessary to dispel the wishful-thinking idea that "Communism is on the wane in Hawaii."

This newspaper was created and is supported by some of the best people in the islands, to oppose the power and menace of communism.

I continue to quote from the newspaper, Spot Light:

RADIO MOSCOW

The chief spokesman for communism and against Americanism, Robert W. McElrath, is growing even bolder in his presentation of Communist propaganda.

On Monday evening, January 4, he presented, on transcription made by means of direct shortwave, a program broadcast in English from Radio Moscow.

What would happen in the United States, Mr. President, if Communist propaganda, and anti-American lies direct from Radio Moscow were broadcast over the United States? All these links in the chain show the stranglehold which communism has in Hawaii. They show that Hawaii does not merit statehood. They show Communist influence upon life in the islands.

Another prominent man in Hawaii is Delbert E. Metzger, one of the members of the Hawaiian Statehood Commission and Democratic nominee for Delegate from Hawaii in the last election. He is the man who was given an award by the Communist-front National Lawyers' Guild, the same man who came within a hair's breadth of defeating Delegate FARRINGTON for the office of Delegate from the Territory. In the election he was defeated by the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, but by a margin of only some 10,000 votes.

Delbert E. Metzger was one of the major witnesses for the Communist leader, Jack W. Hall, in the recent Smith Act trial where Hall and his co-conspirators were convicted and sentenced to a Federal penitentiary. Only 1 year ago, in February 1953, Delbert E. Metzger went to New York City to speak before and receive an award from the notorious Communist-front Lawyers' Guild.

It is interesting to read the speech of this member of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, as it appeared in the Daily Worker.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if he does not feel that that fact shows that perhaps there are some people within the continental limits of the United States who are affiliated with the Communist Party, if they bring such a man here to decorate him in a gathering of that kind, an event which apparently was publicized in the local continental papers.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly; but the Communists do not have much power here. The power of the Communists in Hawaii is a thousand times stronger than it is in the continental United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. The Senator knows, I believe, that that is not the appraisal of the FBI, that it is not the appraisal of the Un-American Activities Committee, and that it is not the appraisal of the Attorney General.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I do not know any such thing. The FBI has made a statement on the number of Communists in the islands.

Mr. LONG. I assume the Senator from Mississippi is familiar with the statement made by Representative WALTER, to the effect that the Un-American Activities Committee of the House had the FBI records available to it when it investigated communism in Hawaii.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know that such information, which comes from the FBI, is not supposed to be used in debate. I know something about the subject myself. I care not what a Representative or a Senator may do. I take very great issue with such a conclusion. I tell the Senator from Louisiana that before our subcommittee there appeared a great many former intelligence officers of the Army and of the Navy, as well as of other agencies. So far as any information from the Attorney General's office is concerned, that is political.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Attorney General of the United States does have access to the information in the FBI files, and he has sent us a letter stating his appraisal of the Communist situation.

Mr. EASTLAND. The best information on that subject would be found in the files. I am not going to discuss the FBI files, or what is in them. I believe I know as much about that subject as does Representative WALTER or the Senator from Louisiana. I will not discuss that type of information.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has just as much right to state his conclusions from what he is able to obtain from FBI information as has any other person.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will not discuss it. It would be a breach of faith to do so. I will not go into that subject. If the Senator from Louisiana desires to ask me a question on any phase except that one, I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi whether he does not feel that he or any one else, who has had the benefit of seeing information and of reviewing information which the FBI had made available, would have the right to state his overall thinking with regard to a given subject matter

after he had apprised himself of the information contained in the FBI files.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly; but the Attorney General did not have the benefit of the testimony of high ranking Communists who organized the party in Hawaii. I refer to a man who is now employed by the United States Government. He is a man in whose veracity the present Attorney General has confidence, because he has used him in trials as a witness against other Communists. He was trained in the Lenin Institute in Moscow, and was formerly the Communist director in the Nevada-California-Hawaii district. He organized the district, and he now lives in Hawaii. What better proof could anyone want? He is now employed by the Government of the United States, and his integrity and veracity are sanctioned by the Government of the United States, because it uses him as a witness. He has testified for the present administration and for the previous Democratic administration.

Apparently believing that association with Communist activities is as popular in New York City as in Honolulu, Delbert E. Metzger, a member of the statehood commission, insisted that he be one of those sent to Washington at public expense to lobby for statehood. Although Metzger is kept on the statehood commission in Hawaii, his associates on the commission felt that his activities in support of the Communists would make him an ineffective lobbyist in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. President, Metzger is a member of the statehood commission. He is a high-ranking Democrat, one of the most powerful politicians in the islands, and a former judge—and he was too chummy with the Communists when he was judge—but the commission would not send him to Washington because of his Communist connections.

The Honolulu Advertiser on February 24, 1954, last week, carried a headline saying, "Tavers Says Judge Would Harm Bill—Commission Votes 4 to 2 Against Approval of Metzger Trip Even if Private Funds Used." Those are headlines. The story states:

Former Federal Judge Delbert E. Metzger asked the Hawaii statehood commission, of which he is a member, yesterday whether it thinks he is an acceptable advocate for statehood in Washington and the answer came back "No."

I should like to read from an editorial which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser of Thursday, February 25, 1954. It refers to a member of the statehood commission, one of the men who is directing the fight for Hawaiian statehood. I read from the editorial:

UNPLEASANT BUT THE RIGHT ACTION

The Hawaii statehood commissioners acted with courage and, within the possible limits of the situation, with compassion when they put off former Judge Delbert E. Metzger's bid to go to Washington to work for statehood. They performed an unpleasant duty in a high and forthright manner.

It was like a surgical operation in which the patient is only partially anesthetized, and in which the surgeons find the cutting equally as painful as the patient. It is, after all, no pleasure to tell a man bluntly that he just won't do.

* * * * *

Unfortunately, the telling would not have have been necessary had the judge not insisted on being told. It was obvious in advance what the answer would be.

Commission Chairman C. Nils Tavers handled a delicate situation in an exemplary manner. He was gentlemanly, impersonal, and restrained in conducting what amounted to a self-sought trial of Judge Metzger's suitability as a statehood spokesman.

Democratic Commissioner Katsuro Miho showed not only personal strength but great humanity in his attempt to dissuade the judge from the course in which he was persisting. And Mr. Miho helped again to prove that statehood is not a partisan affair.

* * * * *

Judge Metzger insisted that he had been given no good reason for opposition to a journey to Washington. It was he, not the rest of the commission, who injected his own controversial conduct into the discussion. The commissioners kept the argument to the single point—

Note this, Mr. President—

that in view of intense feeling against the judge in some Senate quarters it would be better for him not to go.

That was certainly keeping it to a single point, because there is no feeling against the judge himself, but against his connections.

As the judge remarked, there was indeed a concerted effort to keep the matter from coming to a head. Since he forced the issue, however, the commissioners acted in the only way possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed in the body of the RECORD the editorial from which I have read. It appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser of February 25, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the supporters of statehood for Hawaii why Delbert E. Metzger is acceptable as a member of the commission in Hawaii but is not acceptable as one of their spokesmen in Washington, D. C.? Could it be that the sponsors of statehood for Hawaii are afraid that we might ask some embarrassing questions of Delbert E. Metzger?

Are they afraid we would ask Delbert E. Metzger why he testified in defense of one of the most notorious Communists in the world in the Smith Act trial and why he accepted an award from an identified Communist front, the Lawyers' Guild?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I ask the Senator to permit me to finish this paragraph. Then I shall be happy to yield.

Are they afraid that we might ask Delbert E. Metzger whether he did not receive the active backing of the Honolulu Record, weekly organ of the Communist Party, of Communist leader Jack W. Hall, and of all the Red leaders in Hawaii in the last election campaign, both in the primary and in the final elections?

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he is aware of the fact that the Hawaii Statehood Commission sent several witnesses to Washington at the expense of the commission, who were not in favor of statehood for Hawaii?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I know that.

Mayor John H. Wilson, of Honolulu, was also a defense witness for Communist leader Jack Hall. Jack Hall is one of the biggest Communists in the Western World. What would we think in this country if the mayor of our largest and most important city should testify in defense of a notorious Communist "big shot"? Or, Mr. President, what would we think if the mayor of that city were a defense witness in behalf of notorious Communists in this country?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Do we not have a record on the mainland of persons far above the position of mayor appearing as character witnesses and giving reputation testimony——

Mr. EASTLAND. That was a national disgrace, and, knowing the sterling character and ability of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, I thought he would be the last man to raise such a point as justification for the conduct of Mayor Wilson.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator realize that if he had kept still until I completed my question he would have received the answer, that here on the mainland the same kind of people head the Communist Party as head it in Hawaii?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mayor Wilson has been elected over and over again. He is old and has spent a great deal of his time in the hospital. I think the records of the Senator's committee show—I know the records of the Internal Security Committee show—that a notorious Communist ran the city government for him while he was in the hospital.

Mr. CORDON. I have somewhat the same information which the Senator from Mississippi has. The old gentleman, Wilson, who is mayor of Honolulu, is in his mid-eighties and has lived all his life in Hawaii. He is a big-hearted, friendly, but ignorant man who, throughout the years, has made many friendships in the Honolulu area. Many people support him because of his lovable personal characteristics.

On the other hand, I know of many who recognize that the Communists have used the old gentleman. He has apparently been duped into having as an administrative assistant a man who is strongly suspected, at least, of Communist leanings.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator says is exactly correct, except his explanation in justification of Mr. Wilson's conduct.

Mr. Wilson is a tool of the Communists but I think he is a very able politician. He knew that to remain in office he had to kowtow and be influenced by the Communist leadership in the islands. That has worked successfully, because the Communists have kept him in office.

Mr. President, during the past month the Communist leaders in Hawaii who control the ILWU have been considering the advisability of using their power to bring about another complete paralysis of island economy. The Territory of Hawaii lies at the complete mercy of the Communist bosses who control 30,000 members of the ILWU and the United Public Workers Union. Former members of the Communist Party who have broken with the party and have rendered valuable service to our Government through testimony in the Smith Act trial find themselves unemployed today as the employers in Hawaii are afraid to give jobs to those who are targets for the hatred and vengeance of the Communist Party.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to ask whether the Senator from Mississippi has the names of the persons involved so that a check for accuracy may be made.

Mr. EASTLAND. The testimony on which the statement is based is going into the RECORD.

Mr. CORDON. But the Senator does not have the names?

Mr. EASTLAND. They are in the record. I do not know whether I have them.

One of the leading contractors in Hawaii prior to the Smith Act trial employed not only one of the defendants in the proceedings, the secretary of the Communist Party of Hawaii, but also one of the major Government witnesses. I understand that this employer continued the salary of the secretary of the Communist Party of Hawaii throughout the many months of the trial and after the trial gave him an increase in pay and today is employing him as a construction superintendent.

That is sworn testimony coming from the one who organized the Communist Party in Hawaii. It shows tremendous Communist power when members of the party who broke with it and testified for their Government against treason were denied the right to make a living because of the strength of the Communists in Hawaii.

In contrast, the witness for the Government who had been employed by this firm was told that his services were no longer needed and he is still unemployed, though a highly qualified and capable man.

That shows the Communists' power. Here is a major employer having two men working for him, one of whom is secretary of the Communist Party who was indicted under the Smith Act, and during the trial, when he was not working, his employer continued to pay him. After the trial, he gave him an increase in salary.

Here is another man, who worked for the same employer, who had the courage to testify for the United States and to bring to light a Communist conspiracy against the safety of the United States. He was discharged.

Can anyone say that does not show terrific Communist power in Hawaii? This is certainly an alarming condition when an anti-Communist employer is forced to fire a worker who testifies for his country against a Communist charged with conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of the United States by force and violence.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CORDON. Can the Senator from Mississippi refer me to the pages in the testimony, or elsewhere, so that I may at least have an opportunity to determine the facts upon which an inquiry should be made?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly. As I have told the Senator, I do not have the page numbers, but the information is in the testimony.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the testimony of Paul Crouch, given in executive session before a work team of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, dated February 26, 1954, volume 301; and also testimony by the same witness before the same subcommittee on March 1, 1954, contained in volume 302.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibits 2 and 3.)

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CORDON. Certainly. The Senator from Oregon will never transgress intentionally.

Am I to understand that the Senator from Mississippi does not have the names of any of the persons involved in the matter he has been discussing, and whose actions, if they took place, he has been condemning?

Mr. EASTLAND. Probably they are in the record. As I told the distinguished Senator from Oregon, my information is based on the sworn testimony of the man who organized the Communist Party in Hawaii, and who now is a trusted employee of the United States Government in the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Did not the Senator state at the beginning of this particular portion of his address that some witness had said he understood these things to be facts?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, I did not. The Senator from Mississippi said, "I understand these things to be facts."

Mr. CORDON. Then, the Senator from Mississippi has not verified the facts for himself, has he?

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, certainly, yes, from the sworn testimony of the man who organized the Communist Party in Hawaii, and who now is a trusted employee of the Government, a man whom the Senator's administration vouches for with respect to his truthfulness and veracity, because he was put on the witness stand as a Government witness.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is not the Senator making an argument predicated merely on generalized statements and opinion, when he does not even know the names of the persons involved in the matter he has been discussing?

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, no; all the Senator from Oregon has to do, if he has an open mind, is to read the testimony.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon will be glad to do so, but he would like to know how carefully the Senator from Mississippi has read it.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have read it very carefully. What I have said is based on sworn testimony and also on newspaper articles which were published currently in the press, and which I have listed. I have the newspapers here.

Mr. CORDON. With respect to the testimony, I assume it would appear to be factual to the extent that either we can get evidence that it is true or it is not true. That is the point.

Mr. EASTLAND. The whole point is that the condition should be investigated in Hawaii by a senatorial committee which could obtain the facts. That is the whole point. There has been no investigation made in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. CORDON. Is not the Senator from Mississippi aware of the fact that an established office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation staffed by trained agents is located in Hawaii, and also that the Security and Intelligence Service of the Armed Forces are on duty throughout the area?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator from Mississippi say that these agencies are not aware of the situation and are not capable of making such investigations if additional ones are indicated?

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator refer to an investigation of communism, to determine whether Hawaii should be admitted to statehood? No such question would ever confront them.

Mr. CORDON. Why not let them investigate communism and reach their conclusions? Then we would have an expert, professional inquiry into what is going on in Hawaii with respect to Communist activity and its power.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the course the Senator suggests should be followed, why hold committee hearings on the question at all? We would not have anything at all to do with the question. Then, let us simply abolish the McCarthy Committee and the Internal Security Subcommittee, and do exactly what the Senator from Oregon indicates he would want us to do.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator from Mississippi agree with me that there are a great number of questions with respect to statehood for Hawaii in addition to communistic activity there

which a congressional committee ought to consider before it recommends passage of a statehood bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, certainly. I think the Senator's committee has done very fine work.

Mr. CORDON. I am appreciative of the Senator's compliment.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the hearings to which I have just referred contain sworn testimony which I think is very material. I think that before the bill is passed, a committee of Congress should go to Hawaii and conduct an investigation.

Mr. CORDON. Was all the testimony in both volumes of the transcript the Senator from Mississippi has put into the RECORD given by the same individual?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. So if I read the volumes from cover to cover, I am bound to come upon the testimony which the Senator from Mississippi has been discussing? Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. If I understood the Senator from Mississippi correctly, he just made a remark to the effect that no investigation of communism ever had been made in Hawaii.

In 1948, when I held the same view which the Senator from Mississippi now holds on the question of statehood for Hawaii, I advocated an investigation. It was the 80th Congress and I was then chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. An investigation was made in the islands. I had Secret Service operatives working there for 6 months before I, my staff members, and committee members went there officially.

Mr. EASTLAND. What did the Senator from Nebraska find? What was the Senator's recommendation?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I will furnish the Senator from Mississippi with a list of the many things which were found; but in 1948 there were named several members of the Communist Party, who recently were indicted, tried, and convicted by a jury of Hawaiian citizens.

Mr. EASTLAND. What did the Senator find as a result of his visit, and what was his recommendation as to whether Hawaii should be admitted to statehood?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I caused my report to be reprinted in this year's hearings on statehood. I told the Senator from Mississippi a while ago that as soon as I can obtain the floor I shall make a statement as to the results of my 1952 investigation on behalf of the committee on the Communist situation in Hawaii. I spent a considerable period of time in an intensive personal inquiry on all of the islands.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator decline to state what he found on the 1948 visit?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. It is in this year's hearings, as I stated. I found that in 1948 communism, at least according to my impression, was a threat to Hawaii. There was a longshoreman's strike which lasted for 6 or 8 months, and which had serious effects on the economy of Hawaii at that time. The situation was very serious.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct. I agree with him that the situation was serious.

I have before me a newspaper published by some of the best people in Hawaii who oppose statehood. They found in January of this year that the influence of communism had not waned.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I shall answer that point a little later with a statement this year from the Attorney General of the United States, among other things.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator. I shall be glad to hear what he has to say.

The Governor of Hawaii, Hon. Samuel Wilder King, the Honorable Joseph R. Farrington, Democratic National Committeeman Frank F. Fasi, Justice Stainback, and others are making a brave fight against the ever-growing Communist menace in the islands. Unfortunately, some of them try to whitewash the picture and let personal ambition guide them in their desire for statehood at all costs. They should admit the facts, the undisputable and documented facts, and instead of asking for statehood at this time, they should be asking this Congress and the administrative agencies of the Federal Government for immediate aid in dealing with the Communist menace in the islands.

Mr. President, the finances available to the Communists in Hawaii can best be understood by a population percentage comparison with the situation on the mainland. The population of Hawaii is 467,000 people, but for easy calculation let us consider the islands as having a half million people and the mainland 150 million. The Communist newspaper in Hawaii operates on a budget of $40,000 a year. If the Communist press on the mainland received equal support, the Daily Worker would have a budget of $12 million a year.

The total income of Communist controlled organizations in Hawaii—most of it being through the ILWU—is about $600,000 a year. If Communist-controlled organizations on the mainland had an income in the same proportion according to population, the total income of such groups would be $180 million a year. The number of people who belong to organizations controlled by the Communists in Hawaii is about 30,000. The same returns on the mainland would mean 9 million people belonged to Communist-controlled unions and other organizations. The actual number in the Continental United States is about 1 million. Therefore, according to this particular yardstick, Communist strength in Hawaii is nine times as great as on the mainland. This is without taking into consideration the far greater degree of Communist control over unions in Hawaii than on the mainland. The Hawaiian labor movement is definitely controlled by Communists. The union members are disciplined. They support candidates selected by the Communist leaders. All the power of their numbers is used to promote the ends of the Communist leadership. These leaders are controlled from Moscow, and they in turn control thousands of Hawaiians who do their bidding.

But Communist influence in Hawaii is many more than nine times greater than is Communist influence on the mainland. This is true because Communism is very, very powerful in the political life of the islands. The question, Mr. President, as I said in the beginning, is not the actual number of Communists. The question is Communist control, and there can be no doubt that the Communists control the economic life of Hawaii, and very closely influence its political affairs. This political control is growing, and I submit that if Hawaii were admitted to statehood, she would be a cancer in the body politic of the United States.

It is a theory of the American Government that our 48 States are sovereign States. If Hawaii were added as a 49th State, she could not be a sovereign State because of the vast influence and control which Moscow would exert upon her elected representatives through Communist control of the labor movement in the islands. We would have an American State which, in my judgment, would be influenced by a foreign power.

I submit, Mr. President, that Hawaii is not ready for statehood. Her economic and political fabric is tinctured with Red. Her admission would weaken and not strengthen the United States. We can have no assurance that she would have a republican form of government, as guaranteed in the Constitution. We can have no assurance that she would master her own destiny and walk in unison with her sister States. It is my judgment, that great influence, if not control, would rest behind the walls of the Kremlin in Moscow.

The admission of Hawaii into the Union would give her Senators and her Representatives in Congress, under Communist influence, a power over our domestic affairs. Her admission would give communism power and influence over the foreign policy of the United States. Her admission would weaken our beloved country, and, therefore, this bill must at all costs be defeated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, an article which appeared in IMUA Spot Light, of January 15, 1954, published in Honolulu, Hawaii. The title of the article is "Is Communism on the Wane in Hawaii? An Inventory Says 'No.'"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Communism in Hawaii," written by Paul

Crouch, Founder Federation of Former Communists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I stated that I would place in the RECORD several copies of the Honlulu Record. The editions of the paper consist of 40 or 50 pages, and I shall not put the entire paper in the RECORD, but I shall make them available to the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] or to any other Senator who desires to see them.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Honolulu Advertiser of February 25, 1954]

UNPLEASANT BUT THE RIGHT ACTION

The Hawaii statehood commissioners acted with courage and, within the possible limits of the situation, with compassion when they put off former Judge Delbert E. Metzger's bid to go to Washington to work for statehood. They performed an unpleasant duty in a high and forthright manner.

It was like a surgical operation in which the patient is only partially anesthetized, and in which the surgeons find the cutting equally as painful as the patient. It is, after all, no pleasure to tell a man bluntly that he just won't do.

Unfortunately, the telling would not have been necessary had the judge not insisted on being told. It was obvious in advance what the answer would be.

Commission Chairman C. Nils Tavares handled a delicate situation in an exemplary manner. He was gentlemanly, impersonal, and restrained in conducting what amounted to a self-sought trial of Judge Metzger's suitability as a statehood spokesman.

Democratic Commissioner Katsuro Miho showed not only personal strength but great humanity in his attempt to dissuade the judge from the course in which he was persisting. And Mr. Miho helped again to prove that statehood is not a partisan affair.

Judge Metzger insisted that he had been given no good reason for opposition to a journey to Washington. It was he, not the rest of the commission, who injected his own controversial conduct into the discussion. The commissioners kept the argument to the single point that in view of intense feeling against the judge in some Senate quarters it would be better for him not to go.

As the judge remarked, there was indeed a concerted effort to keep the matter from coming to a head. Since he forced the issue, however, the commissioners acted in the only way possible.

EXHIBIT 2

UNITED STATES SENATE, SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS, OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, WASHINGTON, D. C., FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1954

The subcommittee met at 2 p. m., pursuant to call, in room 411, Senate Office Building, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND presiding.

Present: Senator EASTLAND.

Senator EASTLAND. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate of the United States will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. CROUCH. I do.

TESTIMONY OF PAUL CROUCH, 1565 ST. LOUIS DRIVE, HONOLULU, HAWAII

Senator EASTLAND. Please give your name and residence.

Mr. CROUCH. My name is Paul Crouch; my residence is 1565 St. Louis Drive, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Senator EASTLAND. How long have you been in Hawaii?

Mr. CROUCH. I have been in Hawaii since December 24, 1953. Prior to that I was in Hawaii in the fall of 1952, and I served a year in the Army in Hawaii in 1924 and 1925.

Senator EASTLAND. By whom are you now employed?

Mr. CROUCH. I am now employed by the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, and have been so employed for 2½ years.

Senator EASTLAND. In what cases have you testified for the United States Government under both the Eisenhower and Truman administrations?

Mr. CROUCH. I was a witness for the Government in the perjury trials ending in conviction of Harry Bridges and William Remington. I was an expert witness in the case of Dr. Joseph Weinberg in Washington. I have been a witness in four Smith Act trials—Baltimore, Honolulu, Seattle, and St. Louis. I have appeared in 19 proceedings of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Senator EASTLAND. Who organized the Communist Party in Hawaii?

Mr. CROUCH. Set up the first Communist organization in Hawaii in the United States Army in 1925 and was closely connected with supervision of the organization of the Communist movement there from 1928 until I left the Communist Party in 1942.

Senator EASTLAND. I can tell from your answers that you have been a member of the Communist Party. Please state how long you have been a member of the Communist Party and what official positions you held within the Communist Party.

Mr. CROUCH. I was a member of the Communist Party from 1925 until the spring of 1942. The major positions I held were head of the national department of the Communist Party for infiltration of the Armed Forces; representative of the Communist Party to the executive committee of the Communist Internationale in Moscow, or, rather, as one of the representatives to the Communist Internationale; honorary regimental commander of the Red army; member of various commissions of the Communist Internationale; State or district organizer of the Communist Party in the United States in Virginia, Utah, North and South Carolina, and Tennessee; editor of the New South, the official Communist organ for the Southern States; member of the district bureau of the Communist Party for California, Nevada, and the Hawaiian Islands; a member of the Negro Trade Union, agricultural and anti-imperialist commissions of the central committee of the Communist Party of the United States; national educational director of the Young Communist League, youth section of the Communist Party; editor of the Young Worker, official Communist youth paper; member of the editorial staff of the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party; candidate for Congress in New York on the Communist ticket; Communist candidate for governor of New York; Communist nominee for United States Senate from Tennessee; and various other positions, such as head of the control commission for the Communist Party in Alabama, Mississippi, and Georgia; and a member of the steering committee that set up the Southern Conference for Human Welfare in 1938.

Senator EASTLAND. Mr. Crouch, you have heretofore testified before this committee about setting up the Communist Party in Hawaii, and the facts on communism, its control of the economic and political life of the islands. I would ask you, Is it your judgment if Hawaii were admitted to statehood that the Communist Party would be able to influence the governor of the new State, the Congressmen which would represent the new State, and the lower House of the American Congress, and the two United States Senators from Hawaii?

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, Senator. The Communist Party would be one of the major factors in any State government as it is today in the Territorial government. I would like to give some illustrations of the political power of the Communist Party to substantiate this statement on my part.

There are in Hawaii four counties: Honolulu County, covering the island of Kalawao; the county of Maui, which includes some smaller islands; the county of Kauai; and the county of Hawaii, or the Big Island, as it is generally known.

Outside of Honolulu County there are three counties in the Territory. The heads of these county governments are known as chairman and executive officers. In two of these counties, Kauai and Maui, the chairmen of the counties have publicly advertised to the world in substance that they are disloyal to America and loyal to the Soviet Union by publishing paid advertisements in the Communist weekly paper, the Honolulu Record.

I have before me the Honolulu Record of December 25, 1952, and I am looking at page 5 of that issue. On that issue you see an ad reading, "To all a Merry Christmas and thanks for electing me your county attorney, Toshio, Kabutan, Hanapepe, from Kauai."

Senator EASTLAND. That appeared in the Honolulu Record, which is the official Communist publication for the Territory?

Mr. CROUCH. That is correct. Later I will give you considerable data on that.

Senator EASTLAND. I want this in here. The editor of that paper has been convicted under the Smith Act.

Mr. CROUCH. He has. Coji Ariyoshi. He was convicted last year.

Also on the same page is a display ad reading, "My sincerest thanks and the season's greetings to all," signed Anthony C. Baptiste, Jr., chairman and executive officer, county of Kauai, and below it——

Senator EASTLAND. Is his father a territorial senator?

Mr. CROUCH. I do not recall.

Below it are a number of individual greetings, including one by the name of Morimoto. This Morimoto is one of the three Communist Party leaders on the Island of Kauai, and has been a publicly identified Communist since 1947. When I visited the island of Kauai a few weeks ago, during the early part of February, I found that Morimoto, the well-known top Communist leader, was serving on a grand jury in the territorial courts.

I have been informed by a former judge in Honolulu that it is impossible on the island of Kauai to be elected to any position without first receiving the support of the Communist controlled ILWU. I have just received information from Hawaii that a leader of the Democratic Party in the islands has stated that the Democratic Party's next candidate for mayor of Honolulu must be a man who is approved by the ILWU and supported by it. This ILWU in Hawaii is nothing more nor less than a rubber stamp for the Communist Party.

The Democratic Party at the moment in Hawaii is split wide open between the Truman Democrats who are loyal Americans and those who are agents of the Communist Party. The extent to which the Communist Party is now infiltrating every walk of life is shown by the fact that one of the top leaders of the Communist Party, one of their main leaders at the present moment, is Jean King, wife of James King, nephew of the Governor of Hawaii.

The Governor of Hawaii is a true and loyal American and will have nothing to do with his nephew and his nephew's wife. But this illustrates the far-reaching tentacles of the Communist octopus which has penetrated every field of life in Hawaii today.

Senator EASTLAND. Is King, the nephew of the Governor, a Communist?

Mr. CROUCH. He is known to have received orders from the Communist Party and to have transmitted orders from the Communist Party. He is employed on the law firm of Simons & Boursiag, the firm which represents the ILWU. His name has appeared in paid greetings in the Communist weekly, the Honolulu Record.

Senator EASTLAND. Proceed.

Mr. CROUCH. The Communist Party's influence in Hawaii in the present Territorial legislature is reflected in the extremely low appropriations made for the Territorial Un-American Activities Committee which, I believe, is only about $17,500 a year, an appropriation so low that it makes it impossible for the Territorial committee to publish its findings in printed form or to conduct public and effective hearings.

The support, the open support and encouragement given by the mayor of Honolulu to the subversive, Communist-controlled Public Workers Union also reflects the political danger of Communist infiltration of both the present Territorial Government and any State government that might be set up

The Public Workers Union is headed by a Communist named Henry Epstein.

Senator EASTLAND. Is it affiliated with the ILWU?

Mr. CROUCH. And it works closely with the ILWU, operating out of the same headquarters. Henry Epstein appears on radio programs paid for by the ILWU.

Senator EASTLAND. How do you know Henry Epstein is a Communist?

Mr. CROUCH. Henry Epstein has been known to me as a Communist over a period of many years through material I have handled in connection with my work for various Government agencies from the time I was on the staff of the California Un-American Activities Committee in 1950. He has never made any denial under oath of his membership in the Communist Party.

He has never denied he has belonged and was transferred from Chicago to Hawaii when he went to Hawaii.

The Public Workers Union, which has the closest alliance with the ILWU, has organized the majority of the firemen in various municipalities of the Territory. All observers in Hawaii agree that not less than 3,000 Territorial, county, and municipal employees at the present time belong to the Communist-controlled Public Workers Union.

I mentioned earlier the name of the county executive officer of Kauai County. I am now looking at page 17 of the Communist weekly, the Honolulu Record of Thursday, December 24, 1953. That is about 2 months ago. There is before me a large display ad on this page reading, "Holiday greetings from one and to one and all from friendly Eddie Tam, chairman and executive officer, county of Maui."

Mr. Tam, the head of the county government of Maui, knows that the Honolulu Record has been identified and proven to be the Communist organ by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and by the Territorial Un-American Activities Committee.

Senator EASTLAND. You can read that paper and tell it is a Communist paper. What was the job that this man held?

Mr. CROUCH. This man holds at the present time the position as chairman and the executive officer of the county of Maui, and is the head of one of the four county governments in the Territory of Hawaii.

Senator EASTLAND. What are his duties?

Mr. CROUCH. His duties are to preside over the law enforcement, to supervise the functioning of the various government departments of the Territory and the county of Maui, to supervise government expenditures in that county embracing the islands of Maui and Molokai; and by his position he is one of the most important government officials in the Territory of Hawaii and certainly would be one of those likely to be elected to the United States Senate or to the House of Representatives if Hawaii becomes a State, or to be elected as one of the highest officials in a State as he now holds one of the highest positions in the Territorial setup in Hawaii.

The increasing political power of the Communist Party in Hawaii is well illustrated by the increase in paid advertising in its weekly paper.

Senator EASTLAND. So what we have here is public officials of the Territory who are advertising in the Communist paper, is that correct?

Mr. CROUCH. That is right. I have the issue of August 7, 1953, which contains 32 pages, of which about 90 percent is paid advertising.

I also have before me the issue of August 6, 1953—that is, last summer—an issue published about 2 months after the conviction of its editor in the Smith Act trial. It has 60 pages with about 90 percent of paid advertising by many hundreds of business firms in all the islands of the Territory and thousands of individuals.

I would like to call the attention of the committee here to the fact that I have found that many of these paid ads were obtained by paid officials of the International Longshoremen's Union who, while on the payroll of the union, went from house to house among the business firms soliciting their ads for the Communist paper and then transmitted these funds through the union apparatus, so-called, to be turned over to the Communist Party.

The ILWU obtains approximately $600,000 a year in checkoff dues of about 27,000 members, and a large percentage of this is used to promote the cause of revolution and subversion. They finance from dues collected from the workers of Hawaii a daily radio program in English, a daily radio program in the Filipino language, a weekly program in the Japanese language—all filled with Communist propaganda. And at least three-fourths of the $40,000 a year budget of the Honolulu Record can be traced to the ILWU.

It is obvious that where a large part of the businessmen of Hawaii find it necessary to contribute money to advance treason that the political power of the Communists is literally terrific. If a subcommittee of the United States Senate could go to Hawaii and hold a thorough hearing on the spot and hear the real facts about the situation, our Nation would be astounded and dumbfounded. I might say that in my opinion the situation in Hawaii as I have seen it is so serious to our national security that such an on-the-spot investigation is most urgent.

Senator EASTLAND. Why would this country be astounded? Why would the people be astounded?

Mr. CROUCH. People of this country would be astounded to find that one of the two major parties in Hawaii is infiltrated to such a degree, to learn that the heads of half of the county governments in Hawaii are associated with the Communists that witnesses do not dare testify for the Federal Government because they know they would be blacklisted as other witnesses have already been.

Senator EASTLAND. What do you mean by blacklisted?

Mr. CROUCH. I mean men like Ichiro Isuka and Jack Kawano, born in the islands, men who have worked as longshoremen all of their lives until they came out against the Communist Party. Today they cannot find employment in their trades and are living under conditions that would shock the American people if they were publicized.

Also, Robert Kempa, one of the Government's major witnesses in the Smith Act trial, was employed by the Nicholas Construction Co., a large contracting firm in Hawaii which also employed Dwight James Freeman, one of the convicted Communist leaders who is secretary of the Communist Party of Hawaii. Nicholas paid Freeman's wages while he was on the witness stand, and after he was convicted gave him a raise. Today Freeman is working as a construction superintendent.

Senator EASTLAND. That is, while his case is on appeal?

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, and while he is out on bail. Kempa was also employed by the Nicholas Construction Co. before his testimony at the trial. When he testified, the Nicholas Construction Co. told him his services were no longer needed. He is today unemployed in Hawaii. I do not know of any business firm that has the courage to defy the Communist leaders by giving decent jobs to Isuka, to Kawano, or to Kempa. This fact prevents many other potential witnesses from testifying for the various agencies of our Federal Government because they know that to come out against the Communist Party would be to face the danger of starvation for their wives and children.

If a hearing were held in Hawaii where the full facts were brought out, our country would realize that unless something is done quickly to correct the situation there, a major war would likely result in the loss of Hawaii to the Communist enemy.

I might say here that one of the leading officials of the Communist Party who broke with it at a relatively recent date was informed before he left the party by Dwight James Freeman, secretary of the Communist Party of Hawaii, that the Communists have sufficient power in the islands to physically seize the islands by force at any time they wished to do so and that such action will, of course, depend on the international situation. They would be foolish to seize the islands prematurely. The party must wait until the time comes.

This former official of the Communist Party also informed me that to his knowledge and belief the actual membership of the Communist Party is only from 50 to 75, but these people consist of the hardboiled core of leaders that all security risks have been dropped and that Jack Hall could, if he wished, sign up 500 new members of the Communist Party any day in the islands. His estimate accords with all the information that I have received that the Communist Party restricts its actual nominal membership to a small hard core and that hundreds are daily working under its directives.

Senator EASTLAND. Do you have anything else to add?

Mr. CROUCH. One matter I would like to call to the attention of this committee is the situation on the waterfront in the——

Senator EASTLAND. Those copies of the Honolulu Record will be made a part of the record.

Mr. CROUCH. One matter I would like to call to the serious attention of this committee is the situation on the waterfront in the handling of naval and military cargo. Last summer after the conviction of the defendants in the Smith Act trial several naval ships were being loaded at Honolulu with cargo for our boys fighting in Korea. By direction of the Communist leadership the members of the ILWU walked off their jobs for several days and deserted their work in loading this essential war material.

The Navy took steps to have the ships loaded and thereafter hired civil-service personnel numbering, I believe, about 300. These today continue to handle all naval cargo. The result of this in ILWU ranks has been tremendous and there has been bitter criticism of the Communist leaders for their action in causing them to lose their work from the Navy. However, the Army has not followed a similar policy. The Army continues to have its cargo handled in Hawaii by longshoremen who belong to the ILWU.

If the Army had followed the example of the Navy and refused to have any member of an organization controlled by the Communist Party touch its cargo, the results would have been so tremendous that I believe the Communist apparatus on the waterfront would have been shattered, or at least would have been severely damaged.

I have learned through authoritative, confidential sources that Harry Bridges and the officials of a private company employing ILWU members to handle Army cargo and which formerly handled naval cargo have planned concerted action to have the civil-service work of the Navy discontinued and to return this work to the ILWU. Such a capitulation on the part of the Navy would be a terrific victory for the Communists in Hawaii.

I think the Senate should look into this situation; that the Navy should be directed to continue its handling of the work through the Civil Service and the Army should be asked to follow the excellent example of the Navy. If this is done, the Communist power on the waterfront will be dealt a very severe blow.

It is my opinion that the critical situation in Hawaii calls for strong legislative action by the United States Congress. I think that Congress should consider what legislative steps are necessary to prevent officials of unions from diverting funds obtained by checkoff of dues to the Communist Party and papers of the Communist Party, as is done in Hawaii, and to look into the entire question of Communist representation through the Labor Relations Board.

If Hawaii is to become a State, legislative action would be imperative on immigration matters, particularly in view of the fact that at the present time admission to Hawaii does not provide admission to the United States. The copies of the Honolulu Record which I am giving this committee to be a part of the record contain the names of thousands of people who have advertised their disloyalty to America and their hatred of our Government by paid greetings in the paper. A large part of these self-advertised subversives are aliens.

Senator EASTLAND. Do you know how many people have advertised?

Mr. CROUCH. I have not counted them, but they are in the thousands. The staff of the committee can count the exact number. If Hawaii becomes a State, these aliens who have advertised to the world their disloyalty through the columns of the Honolulu Record would be eligible to come to the United States and to any part of the mainland at will. At the present time they cannot do so.

Every alien in Hawaii who wishes to come to the mainland must pass through inspection by the Immigration Service and meet the same qualifications that he would if he were coming from Europe or some other foreign country. So to throw down the barriers and permit all these people freedom to come to the mainland and travel throughout the country would be a serious danger, and legislative steps should be considered in that connection.

Also, there are many boats, fishing boats, in Hawaii that travel throughout the Pacific, and smuggling of aliens into Hawaii would be very easy. This is no problem at the present time because they cannot come to Hawaii, from Hawaii to the mainland without examination by the Immigration Service, and they would be caught with little difficulty. However, if Hawaii becomes a State, this inspection between Hawaii and the mainland would no longer exist. Anyone who might land on the various isolated islands of Hawaii, Maui, Molokai, Kalawao, or Lanai could take a plane from those local islands to Honolulu and from there to the mainland. This could easily make the smuggling of aliens from Asiatic countries to the United States a most profitable business.

Senator EASTLAND. It would also facilitate smuggling of Communist agents into this country.

Mr. CROUCH. It would greatly facilitate the smuggling of espionage and Communist agents and trained saboteurs from the Soviet Union. To prevent this it would be necessary for our Government to establish a large border patrol station on all of the islands in Hawaii and equipped with hydroplanes to make such inspection effective.

If Hawaii is to become a State, this question should receive the very serious consideration of the United States Congress if our Nation is not to be flooded with espionage agents, saboteurs, and criminals who could never enter our country through legitimate channels.

Senator EASTLAND. I have in my hand the Washington Evening Star printed in Washington, D. C., dated Friday, February 26, 1954. I see here a statement, "Paul Crouch, former Communist Party member, is expected to resume his testimony when the trial continues." Have you been testifying in St. Louis?

Mr. CROUCH. I have testified during the past 4 days in the Smith Act trial in St. Louis, completing cross examination yesterday.

Senator EASTLAND. The statement says, "Crouch under cross examination yesterday testified he may have erred on some dates in his testimony about meeting three of the Communists on trial here." Then it quotes you, "I am not the all-wise guy that Stalin claimed to be." Did you make that statement?

Mr. CROUCH. I did not make that statement. It is completely and wholly incorrect. I certainly regret such a statement published under a heading of the Associated Press. If not corrected by the Associated Press after investigation of the transcript, it will certainly be of tremendous value to the Communist Party in future hearings where I will appear. I made no statement that could conceivably be interpreted as saying I had made any error on the question of dates or other testimony.

Senator EASTLAND. Then you were not wrong in dates you gave on cross examination?

Mr. CROUCH. No.

Senator EASTLAND. Do you have anything else?

Mr. CROUCH. No, sir.

(Whereupon, at 3:15 p. m., the hearing closed.)

EXHIBIT 3

UNITED STATES SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS, OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, WASHINGTON, D. C., MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1954

The subcommittee met at 2 p. m., in room 411, Senate Office Building, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, presiding.

Present: Senator EASTLAND.

Senator EASTLAND. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Crouch, do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate, will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. CROUCH. I do.

Senator EASTLAND. Mr. Crouch, you testified in executive session of the committee last Friday and we did not finish that testimony. Now will you please go into it and give us any other facts that you might know about the Communist penetration in the Territory of Hawaii?

TESTIMONY OF PAUL CROUCH, 1565 SAINT LOUIS DRIVE, HONOLULU, HAWAII

Mr. CROUCH. Senator, I refer to advertisements placed in the Honolulu Record by some officials in the government.

Senator EASTLAND. That is the Government of Honolulu?

Mr. CROUCH. That is the Territorial and county governments.

Senator EASTLAND. Now, those officials are paid by the United States Government, are they not?

Mr. CROUCH. The members of the Territorial legislature draw their salaries from the Government of the United States. Other officials are paid from funds obtained by public taxation in the Territory.

Now, on page 49 of the Communist weekly Honolulu Record, August 6, 1953, there are found on 1 page alone 10 display paid advertisements by public officials. They include, first of all, A. C. Batiste, Jr., the chairman and executive officer of the county of Kauai who I mentioned previously.

Senator EASTLAND. What are his duties as chairman and executive officer?

Mr. CROUCH. His duties are to preside over the meetings of the county supervisors, see that all the county officials perform their duties, to attend to the general administrative work of the county, to prepare budgets, and in general to do the work required of the head of a county government.

Senator EASTLAND. How many counties are there in the Territory?

Mr. CROUCH. There are four counties in Hawaii. First, Honolulu, which has a city-county form of government and includes the island of Oahu. There is the county of Hawaii, known as the big island, with headquarters at Hilo. There is the county of Maui, also including the island of Molakai, and 1 or 2 other minor islands, and the county of Kauai, which also includes the islands of Nihau, the island of Kauai, which is most completely influenced and dominated by the Communist Party as big paid advertisements by responsible officials on one page of the Honolulu Record clearly show.

To continue, Senator, there was also an ad by county attorney and by 4 of the 6 members of the board of supervisors. There are 6 supervisors. There are 4 of the 6 supervisors that have paid advertisements in

this well-known, well-identified Communist paper.

And last, but not by any means least, are the ads of all of the 4 representatives from that county in the Territorial legislature.

That county is represented by 4 representatives in the Territorial legislature and all of the 4 have demonstrated either their loyalty to communism or the extent to which they are willing to be unscrupulous politicians and capitulate to Communist pressure and appear as Communist, whether they are, or not.

Now, these 4 representatives are not paid by taxes in Hawaii. They all draw their salaries from the Government of the United States in Washington, D. C.

Now, here is something I would particularly like to call to the attention of the Senate. These men are giving money to one of the best identified Communist papers that is published. This paper has been identified by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and by the Territorial Committee on Un-American Activities as the voice of the Communist Party of Hawaii.

These 10 public officials through these ads not only contributed moral support but financial support as well.

Under the laws that have been passed by the United States Congress an alien in Hawaii who contributes money to the Communist Party through its press would automatically make himself liable to deportation and yet these aliens if brought before the Immigration Service under deportation warrants, they are in a position to point out that they are only doing the same things against our Government that 10 public officials in their country are doing.

This certainly is prejudicial to the security efforts of our Federal agencies in Hawaii.

Another matter I would like to call attention to is the increasingly sharp battle between the loyal Americans and Communist agents for control of the Democratic Party in Hawaii. This is best illustrated by a story which appeared in the Honolulu Star Bulletin last week, which is headed "Fasi challenges Burns, Akau, To Denounce ILWU Reds."

Now, to understand this story, it is necessary to remember that Frank F. Fasi is a Democratic national committeeman from Hawaii. He is a man of unquestioned loyalty and integrity and for years has been making an outstanding fight in Hawaii to save his party, the Democratic Party, from Communist infiltration and control.

The chairman of the Territorial Democratic Central Committee is Mr. John A. Burns, who is shortly coming to Washington, D. C., as one of the Territorial spokesmen on the statehood issue.

Mr. Burns is coming to Washington at public expense, so it is important to keep in mind the personalities, Mr. Fasi, the outstanding fighter against communism, and Democratic national committeeman and the fact that he is talking about the chairman of the Territorial Democratic Central Committee.

The story states, and I quote from the Honolulu Star Bulletin, owned by Delegate Farrington of Hawaii:

"Frank F. Fasi, Democratic National Committeeman for Hawaii, has set off another crackling dispute in his party, challenging two of his top leaders to denounce the Communist leadership of the ILWU once and for all."

He singled out John A. Burns, chairman of the Territorial Democratic Central Committee and Jack Akau, Jr., chairman of the party's Oahu County Committee and prime target in his attack on a radio broadcast last night.

Mr. Fasi asserted Mr. Burns refused to testify against Jack W. Hall, Territorial director of the ILWU, who was convicted last year in the Smith Act trials of conspiring to advocate and teach the overthrow of the Government by violence.

I might say here to make the record clear that this quote is from Democratic National Committeeman Mr. Frank F. Fasi regarding Mr. John A. Burns, chairman of the Territorial Democratic Central Committee.

"I challenge you again, Mr. Burns, to deny that even today you are working hand in glove with agents of the Communist ILWU leadership to control the coming Territorial convention," Fasi said.

Skipping some paragraphs of the story, it continues in reference to Fasi, and I am reading from the Star Bulletin:

"He said thousands of individual voters are waiting anxiously for a responsible Democratic Party.

"They don't want to go along year after year with a big business, the 'punkin' party, but they have no alternative when a vacuum exists on the Democratic side. They can't bring themselves to work in a party where any candidate must bow down and kow-tow to Communist ILWU leadership," he said.

Now, Senator, we have here a statement by a responsible man like Mr. Frank F. Fasi that the Territorial chairman of the party to which he himself belongs is working hand in glove with the agents of the ILWU leadership to control the coming Territorial convention.

I think this is evidence that the threat of Communist political control in the Territory is grave indeed.

Now, these views are not my own. These are views expressed by a man like Mr. Frank F. Fasi who really knows the picture in Hawaii and had it not been for Mr. Fasi's fight against communism, I might say that the situation would be even more grave than it is there today.

Turning to another matter, I would like to state for the record some information obtained from Mr. Robert Kempa, who broke with the Communist Party in July of 1952. Mr. Kempa was one of the top leaders of the Communist Party in the islands and was in the newly organized, the newly reorganized underground apparatus. Mr. Kempa tells me that when he left the Communist Party the members were all in units of three and were directed to meet only in moving automobiles.

This illustrates the extent to which the party is underground and the virtual impossibility of obtaining accurate data because of this underground structure.

Mr. Kempa estimates the membership of the Communist Party at the time he left, in the summer of 1952, as between 50 and 75, where he states that those who were dropped for security reasons continue to work under the party and are just as loyal to the Communist Party now as they were when they had formal membership.

He also advised me that without question Jack W. Hall could go out any day he wished and sign up 500 new members for the Communist Party in the Territory.

Mr. Kempa also advised me that Dwight James Freeman, secretary of the Communist Party of Hawaii, and one of those convicted in the Smith Act, told Kempa, that is prior to Kempa's break with the party in 1952, that the Communist Party in Hawaii has the physical strength and power to seize physically the Hawaiian Islands any time the international situation might make it desirable to do so.

Freeman, the head of the Communist Party, went on to say that the actual carrying out of such action actually would depend upon the international situation; it would be foolish indeed to try to seize the island when the United States Army and Navy could immediately retake them, but that the party would wait for the proper moment in the international situation before taking such revolutionary action.

In analyzing the situation in Hawaii one must consider the close relationship with events there, with the situation there, and developments in Asia.

For example, if the Philippines should fall under Communist rule, the pressure on the Filipino residents of the island would be very great. The Filipinos are subjected to Communist influence to a greater degree than any other nationality in the islands.

Most of them do not speak English and they get their information largely through a daily Filipino-language program and through Communist Filipino leaders in their unions.

I would like to make clear for the record that the formal dues-paying membership of the Communist Party, which is organized on an underground basis, is no index to Communist strength, because the people attached to these small units are the generals of the army. They do not need a large party so far as formal and official membership is concerned, and the Communist leaders are particularly careful to keep the number of formal members among the aliens as low as possible to protect them from deportation.

I am of the opinion that the Senate committee should make a thorough study of Communist methods of organization, with a view to possibly some changes to make our present immigration and naturalization laws fully applicable to the conditions in Hawaii.

The Communist Party in Hawaii, in effect, operates on a different structural basis from the mainland. There are at least 2,000 or 3,000 people who without question regard themselves as Communists, and one can count at least that many names by looking through paid individual greeting ads in the issues of the Honolulu Record, which I have given as part of my testimony.

I have not counted names, but I think there must be at least 3,000 individuals who paid money to advertise their support of communism in the Communist weekly paper in Hawaii.

I certainly agree with the opinion of Mr. Kempa that Jack Hall could, if he wished, sign up 500 new members of the party in 1 day.

Several other former leaders of the Communist Party have told me the same thing as Mr. Kempa on that point.

Senator, there is another matter in connection with Communist activities in Hawaii to which I should like to call attention. That is the diversion by union leaders of union money to the Communist Party.

We have laws on our statute books regarding embezzlement, but in Hawaii we have actually wholesale embezzlement of union money obtained through checkoff for the use of the Communist Party.

The ILWU contributes huge sums in paid greeting ads in the Communist weekly, Honolulu Record. The ILWU has its official paper, the Dispatcher, printed on the press of the Communist weekly paper in the islands and pays a very substantial amount for each issue.

The budget of the Honolulu Record is $40,000 a year, and at least $30,000 of this is contributed or raised directly or indirectly through the ILWU.

It is my opinion that this Senate committee and Federal agencies should investigate the actual embezzlement of union money and its diversion to the revolutionary purposes of the Communist Party in Hawaii.

The total income of the Communist-controlled organizations in Hawaii is between $500,000 and $600,000 per year, of which between $150,000 and $200,000 are sent to the mainland to be used under the direction of Harry Bridges.

To get some idea of the strength of communism in Hawaii, we should compare the funds and membership of Communist-controlled organizations with the mainland on a per capita basis.

The population of Hawaii is 470,000, but, for comparison purposes, we might call it

half a million and the mainland United States 150 million. The budget of the Honolulu Record is $40,000 a year. If the Communist press had as much per capita support in the United States, the Daily Worker would have a budget of $12 million a year. The Communist-controlled organizations in Hawaii, mostly ILWU, have an income of around $600,000 per year.

If the Communist-controlled organizations on the mainland had similar income, they would have $180 million a year to use for Communist activities.

There are about 30,000 members of organizations completely controlled by the Communist Party in Hawaii.

A similar issue on the mainland would mean 9 million people in the United States under the control of the Communist Party.

(Thereupon, at 3 p. m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.)

EXHIBIT 4

[From the IMUA Spotlight of January 15, 1954]

IS COMMUNISM ON THE WANE IN HAWAII?—AN INVENTORY SAYS "NO"

The expression "Communism is on the wane in Hawaii" is the wishful thinking of some residents, especially those who believe the best way to combat communism is to ignore it, and then it will quietly fade away. A candid, down-to-earth inventory of the situation disproves such wishful thinking.

A first of the year inventory of the known Communists and their activities indicates that all of them are still with us and all of them are at liberty to pursue their Red activities.

THE HAWAII SEVEN

The Hawaii seven are the best known of the identified Communists. First indicted under the Smith Act in August 1951, they were finally brought to trial on November 5, 1952.

Following a trial of almost 9 months (longest trial in Hawaii's legal history) they were found guilty on all counts, by the unanimous verdict of a jury of 12 men. The guilty verdict was rendered on June 19 of last year, and now, 6 months later, all 7 are still at liberty on bail set at $15,000 each.

NO JAIL FOR HALL

Jack Hall, ILWU regional director, has not as yet spent 1 minute in jail. He faces, with the others, a 5-year prison term, for being convicted of conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence.

Due to the rich coffers of the ILWU defense fund, thousands of dollars collected from the rank and file union members, bail for Hall was posted immediately, thus permitting him to remain at large. He has also been permitted to make a trip to the mainland, ostensibly on union business.

VERDICT APPEALED

As was expected, and as has occurred in all Smith Act cases, the verdict of the jury has been appealed, to the ninth circuit court in San Francisco. The date for final filing of the appeal by the defense was originally set for November 17.

This was first postponed, at the request of the defense, to December 17 and then a second delay was granted to January 17, 1954. As this article is written (Jan. 10) what action, if any, will occur on this twice-delayed appeal case is unknown.

In any event, it is not expected that the Hawaii seven will actually be put in prison for many months. Even if the ninth circuit court denies the appeal, the defense will no doubt resort to the final appeal to the Supreme Court in Washington.

COMMUNISTS AT LARGE

In other words, as 1954 gets underway, at least the whereabouts of seven identified Communists is known. They are at liberty in Honolulu, devoting their time as usual to the promotion and advancement of communism in every way possible.

Charles K. Fujimoto is still functioning as the full-time secretary of the Communist Party of Hawaii. His wife, Eileen, is still at work in the ILWU offices. John E. Reinecke is often seen, with his usual large armful of books and papers, in the vicinity of Bouslog and Symonds law offices, doing "research" as always.

FREE PRESS

And, even though convicted of conspiracy under the Smith Act, Koji Ariyoshi, editor, and Jack Kimoto, employee, still continue to edit, publish and distribute the weekly Communist newspaper, the Honolulu Record.

That Red tabloid issued a 24-page Christmas edition, containing paid ads by 292 business firms or organizations, plus 810 individuals, or a total of 1,102 paid advertisements.

This show of Communist strength in Hawaii is all the proof necessary to dispel the wishful-thinking idea that "communism is on the wane in Hawaii."

RADIO MOSCOW

The chief spokesman for communism and against Americanism, Robert W. McElrath, is growing even bolder in his presentation of Communist propaganda.

On Monday evening, January 4, he presented, on transcription made by means of direct shortwave, a program broadcast in English from Radio Moscow.

BRAZEN COMMUNISM

Such broadcasts by the "little Red schoolboy" offer the most positive proof that communism is not on the wane in Hawaii.

In the meantime, McElrath continues with his nightly propaganda, aimed at creating dissension among races and social, political, religious and economic groups within our community; and always devising tricky and sneaky ways and means of casting disrespect on all properly constituted authority, including our laws, our courts and judges; disrespect for all American institutions.

THE VOTELESS CRITIC

Robert W. McElrath, in spite of his many years of residence in the Territory, has never even bothered to register or to vote in Hawaii. He, who received part of his training at the Communist school in San Francisco, and is therefore known as the "little Red schoolboy," is also properly called the "voteless critic of America."

All other identified Communists; all such Communist fronts as the Civil Rights Congress; all fellow-travelers, stooges, and sympathizers are, to the best available knowledge, still functioning in their usual traitorious manner, working for, aiding and abetting the cause of communism.

HENRY B. EPSTEIN

This identified Communist (he has never officially denied it) is the top leader of the United Public Workers union, a group of some 2,000 members, mostly Government or hospital workers.

One of Epstein's top assistants is another well identified Communist, Steve Murin.

LEARN MORE IN 1954

It is the sincere hope of IMUA that the good, loyal people of Hawaii will make and keep one New Year's resolution, and that is to learn more about communism; how it works; who its leaders are; its ultimate aims and purposes.

Remember—all that is necessary for the triumph of evil—the triumph of communism—is that good men do nothing.

Won't you resolve not to be among the ranks of "good men" who do nothing, during 1954?

EXHIBIT 5

COMMUNISM IN HAWAII

(By Paul Crouch, founder, Federation of Former Communists)

Hawaii is indeed a land of superlatives. It has the best climate in the world, one of the lowest—if not the lowest—of death rates to be found, music and dances that are justly famous, and varied scenic attractions that make the islands a tourist paradise. But Hawaii today has one superlative feature that is anything but desirable. Hawaii has the most powerful Communist apparatus to be found under the American flag. Communism is a malignant cancer, quietly but rapidly destroying the foundations of Hawaii's economic and political life.

"How strong is communism in Hawaii?" Experts have given rather contradictory answers to this question, yet all were based on facts. In many cases the facts were but small fragments of the entire picture, and from them a false and dangerous sense of security was obtained. One must have accurate yardsticks to measure Communist strength and an understanding of what makes communism a truly dangerous force. The least important of all factors is the number of formal and dues paying members of the Communist Party, especially if the party is in control of trade unions and other organizations through which its decisions can be carried out. In a formal organizational sense the party has been stripped down to a hard core of perhaps no more than 50 leaders. They belong to cells of 3 members each and hold "meetings" in moving automobiles. The maximum formal membership of the Communist Party in Hawaii at any one time was about two hundred. Only about 25 former Communists have given real evidence of a break with communism by public testimony and open opposition to it. Most of those who have been "dropped" from formal membership for security reasons remain under Communist discipline and without hesitation or question carry out directives from the party leadership.

Here are far more basic yardsticks for estimating the real power of communism in Hawaii. First, the extent of control of the economic life of the community and the ability, through Communist controlled unions, to halt the wheels of economic life at the whim of the party and its masters in the Kremlin. Second, the extent of infiltration in the Government through (a) elected or appointed Government officials; and (b) Government employees in general who belong to organizations under Communist control. Third, the percent of the population who belong to unions under complete control of the Communist Party. Fourth, funds spent for the Communist press (including all publications under party control) and Communist controlled unions. Fifth, fear of the community to fight back and ability of the Communist Party to make life intolerable for former Communists who desert the ranks of the party and openly help to expose its sinister and subversive activities. When we apply these standards of measure to the Communist apparatus in Hawaii we find a situation so shocking that the facts stagger the imagination.

The Communist Party controls the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, controlled nationally by Harry Bridges and headed in Hawaii by Jack W. Hall, convicted last summer under the Smith Act. The ILWU has repeatedly demonstrated its ability to bring economic paralysis to the islands. There is no place on the mainland where the Communist Party can at any moment of its own choosing bring the economic life of the community to a halt. From

this measure of strength, Communist power in Hawaii may be a thousand times what it is on the mainland.

The extent of Communist influence in the Territorial Government and the four counties of the Territory has been a subject of sharp dispute, because most undercover Communist Party members and fellow travelers can be expected to deny the fact and try to conceal the evidence. But there are documentary facts beyond question. The main publication of the Communists in Hawaii is the Honolulu Record. For several years it has been officially identified as a Communist publication by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and Hawaii's own Territorial Committee on Un-American Activities. The Record's editor, Koji Ariyoshi, is one of the Communist Party leaders convicted under the Smith Act during the early summer of 1953. About 2 months after the conviction of its editor, the weekly Honolulu Record published its fifth anniversary issue on August 6, 1953. Page 49 of this issue contains ten display paid advertisements that are without precedent in documentation of the power of the Red termites in the Territory.

To understand the full significance of the ten paid advertisements we must keep in mind the fact that there are only four counties in the Territory of Hawaii, and Kauai is one of them. The county of Kauai includes the islands of Kauai and Niihau.

The first of these advertisements in the Communist weekly begins: "Greetings to the Honolulu Record on its fifth anniversary" and ends: "A. C. Baptiste, Jr., Chairman and Executive Officer, County of Kauai." A second advertisement reads: "Aloha. County Attorney Toshio Kabutan, Hanapepe, Kauai." This County Attorney Toshio Kabutan, called a former Communist, Ichiro Izuka, a stool pigeon because he testified for the United State Government, thereby rendering invaluable service to Hawaii and our country by exposing the Red conspiracy. Four of the advertisements are from County Supervisors Matsuki Arashiro, Chris Watase, Raymond Souza and Tom Okura. There are six members of the county board of supervisors in Kauai County; 4 of the 6, by paid advertising in a Communist weekly, openly placed themselves in the camp of the enemies of our country, civilization and freedom.

The remaining four advertisements from Government officials on page 49 of the August 6, 1953, issue of the Communist Honolulu Record, are from four Representatives in the Territorial legislature. They are advertisements by Representatives Manuel Henriques, William Fernandes, Toshio Serizawa, and Toshiharu Yama. Mainland readers may ask how many representatives there are from the county of Kauai in the Territorial legislature. There are only four—and every one of them through the Communist weekly advertised the fact that he is either part of the Red conspiracy or is such an unprincipled politician that he will betray his country and give both money and moral support to its enemies in exchange for the Communist support essential for election to any position in the county of Kauai.

One of the leaders of the Communist Party on the island of Kauai is Y. Morimoto. He has been repeatedly identified since 1947. On a visit to Kauai early in February I found this Communist leader to be serving on a grand jury at that time.

I will agree with those who say that Kauai is the hotbed of communism in the Territory and that in none of the other three counties is the political power of the Communists so complete and unchallenged. But the picture in the other counties is bad enough.

On page 17 of the Honolulu Record of December 24, 1953 (published less than 3 months ago), there is a paid display advertisement reading: "Holiday greetings to one and all from friendly Eddie Tam, chairman and executive officer, county of Maui."

The highest official in the three counties other than the city-county government of Honolulu is the chairman and executive officer. We see the official heads of half of Hawaii's four counties openly and defiantly taking their place in the ranks of Harry Bridges, Jack W. Hall, Dwight James Freeman, and other Communists who are plotting to destroy our country. If the official heads of half of the counties in Florida, California, New York, or any other State were to display their loyalty to the Kremlin through paid advertisements of greetings in the Daily Worker it would create national consternation. The governor of the State would take immediate steps to remove such officials. Governor Samuel Wilder King, actually a militant anti-Communist, has as yet taken no steps to remove Eddie Tam, head of the county of Maui, A. C. Baptiste, Jr., head of the county government of Kauai, and the four county supervisors who joined Baptiste in open and paid support of the Communist weekly.

Turning to lower levels of Territorial, county, and municipal employees, we find that at the lowest estimate, about 3,000 belong to the Communist-controlled Public Workers Union. The three top officials of this union are Henry Epstein, Stephen Murin, and Max Roffman. The Honolulu Star-Bulletin of February 25, 1954, stated that Epstein and Murin had been identified as Communists by Hawaii's Commission on Subversive Activities, and the Star-Bulletin then published evidence of Roffman's membership in the Communist Party on the mainland before he came to Hawaii. This red union has organized the majority of employees of fire departments throughout Hawaii, as well as many other strategic departments in Territorial, county, and municipal governments. The Red-controlled Public Workers Union works closely with the ILWU and uses radio time paid for by the Bridges-Hall union. The Public Workers Union has received open support and encouragement from many government officials.

It is well known that Delbert E. Metzger, Democratic nominee for Delegate to Congress, who was defeated in the last election by a margin of only about 10,000 votes, was a major defense witness for Jack W. Hall in the Smith Act trial. In February 1953 he went to New York to accept an award from the notorious Communist-front National Lawyers Guild. Mayor John H. Wilson, of Honolulu, also was a defense witness for the Communist leader, Jack W. Hall.

At the present time National Committeeman Frank F. Fasi is making a real effort to free the Democratic Party from the Communists seeking to capture it. He is meeting with terrific resistance from the Red forces and the outcome cannot be predicted at this time. Other true Democratic leaders like Justice Stainback are fighting bravely against the rising tide of communism, together with Republicans like Governor King and Delegate Farrington.

The finances available to the Communists in Hawaii can best be understood by a population percentage comparison with the situation on the mainland. The population of Hawaii is about 470,000, but for easy calculation let us consider the islands as having half a million people and the mainland 150 million. The Communist newspaper in Hawaii operates on a budget of $40,000 per year. If the Communist press on the mainland received equal support the Daily Worker would have a budget of $12 million per year.

The total income of Communist-controlled organizations in Hawaii, most of it being through the ILWU, is about $600,000 per year. If Communist-controlled organizations on the mainland had an income in the same proportion according to population, the total income of such groups would be $180 million. Yes, $180 million. As a matter of fact, the Communist ILWU sends from $150,000 to $200,000 per year to the mainland for use under the supervision of Harry Bridges.

The number of people who belong to organizations controlled by the Communists in Hawaii is about 30,000. The same ratio on the mainland would mean 9 million people belonging to Communist-controlled unions and other organizations. The actual number probably is about 1 million—so from this yardstick Communist strength in Hawaii is about 9 times as great as the mainland average. This is without taking into consideration the far greater degree of control over unions in Hawaii than on the mainland.

Last but not least is the power of the Communists to take vengeance on those who desert their ranks and cooperate with our country in exposing subversive forces. The study of the economic suffering endured by former Communists is in itself a dramatic and shocking story. I have yet to find an industrialist or employer in Hawaii with the courage to provide decent employment for ex-Communist leaders who were key witnesses for the Federal Government. They are afraid of the power of the Communist bosses of the ILWU and Public Workers Union. The fact that employers in Hawaii are afraid to provide jobs for these former Communists who have done so much to save Hawaii and our country is, in my opinion, the most striking evidence of the extent of Red power in Hawaii.

Hawaii has another superlative quality. It is one of the most vital spots in America's national defense. The Soviet Government knows this and since 1928 the world Communist movement has devoted intensive efforts to building a base in Hawaii. With communism continuing to make new gains in Asia, Hawaii is as much an outpost of our defense as it was in the last war. It is time for our Nation to wake up to the real facts and quickly do something about the situation in the islands.

Hawaii—land of superlatives—is likely to play an important role in coming events that will shape the course of history for centuries to come. The fate of humanity and civilization may well depend on the present struggle between two philosophies and ways of life in this mid-Pacific island paradise.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its work today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be empowered to sign duly enrolled bills or resolutions during the recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted

into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to read a telegram which I have just received. It is addressed to me and reads as follows:

Both political parties strongly urge passage of Hawaii statehood bill on its own merits. Earnestly request bill not be encumbered by any extraneous questions. Friends of both Hawaii and Alaska convinced that if Hawaii enters Union of States Alaska cannot be far behind. Combining Hawaii and Alaska in one bill may be fatal to both. All Hawaii awaits decision with hopeful anxiety.

SAMUEL P. KING,
Chairman, Republican Party of Hawaii.
JOHN A. BURNS,
Chairman, Democratic Party of Hawaii.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the splendid address of the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. He apparently based most of his argument on statements which were made by one man who appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on January 7 and 9, 1954, when the bill was under consideration by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am chairmen. The chairman of the committee addressed a letter to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, asking for as much of a detailed report as it was possible to give us at that time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question? Then I shall not again interrupt him.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator said I was resting on the testimony of one witness. As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, I merely prefaced my remarks at that time with the testimony to which the Senator refers. That testimony was limited to occurrences in the islands since the conclusion of the investigation last summer, which would be from August up to date. It could not have been the testimony of one witness, when we relied on the average daily happenings throughout the islands.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. The hearings which the Senator has had inserted were of recent date.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct. Two were in 1952. The point was to compare August, 1952, and December 25, 1952, to the same dates of last year.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I desired to have the RECORD show that the committee which handled the proposed legislation did the best it could—at least, it thought it did—to survey the Communist situation in the islands of Hawaii. After making a direct inquiry of the Director of the FBI, we had a very polite letter from him, in reply, explaining that because the FBI operates under the Department of Justice, he would have to submit our letter to the Attorney General for reply, if any reply was to be obtained.

The committee received a reply under date of January 13, and that letter appears on page 37 of the report. I think the letter is as factual as anything can possibly be with reference to the Communist situation in the islands of Hawaii.

I shall not take time to read the entire letter, but shall read only the closing paragraph:

The fact that it has been necessary to prosecute the leaders of the Communist conspiracy in Hawaii is, in my opinion, no more of an indication of the strength of the party in that area than the convictions of the Communist leaders in New York, Pittsburgh, Seattle, and Los Angeles are indications of party control and dominance in those areas.

HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
Attorney General.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1954.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your letters of January 7 and January 9, 1954, to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation concerning communism in Hawaii. In his reply the Director explained the reasons that precluded him from a reply. Some of these considerations also apply to the Department, but I am glad to oblige you with as broad a response as circumstances permit.

The facts known to me concerning communism in Hawaii do not indicate any reason to believe that communism is a greater menace in Hawaii at the present time than it was in 1950. As a matter of fact, the known members of the Communist Party in Hawaii appear to be fewer in number at present than they were in 1950. Undoubtedly the recent conviction of the leaders of the Communist conspiracy in Hawaii has contributed to this decline in Communist Party membership. I believe it inevitable that this conviction will have a weakening effect on the strength of communism in Hawaii.

I do not mean to suggest, however, that the seriousness of the Communist menace in Hawii can be measured by these facts alone. These convictions have a relation to the convictions of Communist leaders in other parts of the United States. All of these cases serve to reveal the widespread nature of the Communist conspiracy with the fact that Communist activities are related in all parts of the country and the trials contributed to a public understanding of the undermining tactics of communism which the President recently described as akin to treason.

The fact that it has been necessary to prosecute the leaders of the Communist conspiracy in Hawaii is, in my opinion, no more of an indication of the strength of the party in that area than the convictions of the Communist leaders in New York, Pittsburgh, Seattle, and Los Angeles are indications of party control and dominance in those areas.

Sincerely,

HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
Attorney General.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, before making my brief remarks, which will be mostly on the subject which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has just covered, I wish to pay a compliment to the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who conducted the hearings and who opened the debate with a statement before the Senate this morning. He has done fine work and has labored diligently, as have members from both sides of the Senate who served on the subcommittee.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that, as the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have taken an active part, for a number of years, in consideration of the Hawaii statehood question, I should like to make a statement in connection with the pending measure, and set forth my present views on this subject.

I am strongly in favor of statehood for Hawaii at this time. I intend to support the pending bill, and I very much hope it will pass by an overwhelming majority.

I do not intend to analyze all the details of this issue. I should like to address myself particularly to one objection to statehood for Hawaii that has been raised, namely, the issue of communism.

I am convinced that today the people of Hawaii are alert to the problem of communism and are fully able to cope with the Communist danger.

Some Members of the Senate may recall that in 1948, I was the first Member of Congress to expose the extent of Communist influence in Hawaii. At that time I visited the Territory, and made a thorough study of the situation; and I filed a report which outlined the extent of Communist power in Hawaii and named the leaders. On the basis of those conditions, I opposed statehood for Hawaii until strong action could be taken to break the strength of communism there.

Since that time I have followed closely the struggle in Hawaii against communism. As late as 1951, I felt obliged to oppose statehood because of the Communist question. The following year I visited the Islands again, for an on-the-spot study of the question.

In view of my past opposition to statehood, it is a real pleasure for me to be able to say now that in my opinion during the intervening years the people of Hawaii have brought the Communist menace under control.

I still believe firmly that my opposition to Hawaiian statehood in former years was correct. But since then, the people of Hawaii have taken vigorous action to clean out un-American influence. If they had not done so, I assure the Senate that I would still be just as much opposed to statehood as before.

During the course of this debate, I am sure the Senate will hear charges that there are still a few known or suspected Communists in positions of influence, or that there is still too great a degree of tolerance by certain elements in Hawaii toward communism. During our hearings there were two or three witnesses who still insisted that communism was a threat in Hawaii. I am sure their words will be seized upon by the opposition to this bill, and quoted and requoted, as justification for postponing action one more time on this matter.

Certainly a few Communists are still at large in Hawaii. No one denies that. Against that is the determination of the people of Hawaii, growing steadily

stronger and stronger, to destroy communism and destroy Communist influence wherever it shows itself and whenever opportunity arises.

Of that fact, we have had many proofs in recent years. Several times, the forces of communism have raised a challenge to the people of Hawaii. Each time, that challenge has been repulsed. Each time, the forces of freedom have grown stronger, while the forces of communism have grown weaker. I wish to mention a few of those incidents.

The year after my visit to the Islands in 1948, at which time I first exposed the Communist menace, the Communist high command inflicted upon the Territory its greatest economic disaster in recent history, in the form of a six months' strike by the Communist-led International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. The Territory of Hawaii is, of course, entirely dependent upon sea transportation for its food supply and its other necessities—in fact, for its very existence. The effect of that strike was to cut the economic life-line of Hawaii with the continental United States.

The impact of the strike was equivalent to the effect which a general strike would have on any of our mainland cities. In effect, it represented a clear-cut Communist challenge to organized civilized life and to civil government itself.

The people of Hawii refused to knuckle under to that challenge. Upon the urging of the then governor, the territorial legislature enacted emergency legislation authorizing the territorial government to seize the docks and carry on stevedoring operations until the strike was settled. The Communist leadership in Hawaii, of course, fought this rather drastic proposal, using as a smokescreen all the conventional arguments regarding the rights of labor and so forth. Such arguments undoubtedly would have had an appeal if that strike had been merely a weapon in a conventional labor conflict. But the people of Hawaii and the legislature of Hawaii could recognize a Communist threat when they saw one. The legislature voted the proposed legislation by an overwhelming majority. The strike was settled.

Incidentally, during this debate we may hear argument to the effect that we must control Hawaii from Washington because the people of Hawaii cannot cope with communism by themselves. In the case of that strike, Hawaii pleaded to Washington for help in stopping the strike, but received no help. So the Hawaiians themselves stopped the strike.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Nebraska knows, of course, does he not, that it would be completely beyond the power of the United States Government to conduct a trial in a Federal court in Hawaii and there have a citizen of Hawaii convicted on a charge of disloyalty, unless the jury, picked in Hawaii, saw fit to convict him?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Nebraska also knows, does he not, that the jury which tried and convicted certain Communists of violating the Smith Act was composed of Hawaiian citizens, and it was a judge of the Territory of Hawaii who sentenced them?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, after that refusal by the Federal Government to help Hawaii in her grave crisis, it is no longer convincing to argue that we can control communism in Hawaii better than the Hawaiians can.

A year later, communism posed another challenge to the people of Hawaii, and again it was beaten back decisively. Preparatory to statehood, a proposed state constitution was drafted, for submission to the people of Hawaii for ratification in November of 1950. Keenly alive to the Communist problem, the Hawaiian constitutional convention had inserted in that constitution the most stringent possible anti-Communist oath. As a result, the Communist leadership in Hawaii, including the leadership of the ILWU, campaigned bitterly against the popular ratification of that constitution.

Thus, the opposition to ratification was made up of several classes of people—those opposed to statehood, as such; those opposed to various particular provisions of the constitution, and the Communist leadership, and all those whom it could lead or mislead.

The result? The people of Hawaii ratified the proposed constitution by an overwhelming majority—about 3 to 1.

Nineteen hundred and fifty brought yet another test of the loyalty and determination of the people of Hawaii—this time a test that had to be faced on the battlefield. When the Korean war broke out, the sons of Hawaii fought, as they have always fought, for the United States and also for the United Nations, for human dignity, and freedom. They compiled an impressive record on the battlefield. On a per-capita basis, Hawaii contributed more than her share of young men in that effort, and young men of Hawaii contributed more than their share of the blood that was spilled. The figures on casualties, and also on decorations are given in the hearings. Hawaii had more than her share of both.

Mr. President, a few weeks ago this Nation had the unpleasant experience of realizing that there were a few—fortunately a very few—of our young men taken prisoner in Korea who, when offered a choice between communism and Americanism, chose communism. Those 21 young men came from homes and communities scattered all over our Nation—not every State; there were only 21 of them—but every part of the continental United States, north, east, south, and west. I do not mean to cast any reflection on the homes or the communities from which those young men came. I do not know the particular circumstances in each case. I do wish to point out that young men from Hawaii were in our armies, some of them were captured, too, but not a single one of them chose communism over Americanism.

I mention one more test of the strength of communism in Hawaii. That test came last year, when the United States Government took to court a prosecution of seven leading Communists under the Smith Act. The case had to be presented, of course, before a local jury, drawn from every occupation and racial group in the Territory. Something has been made of the fact that Hawaii has a rather high proportion of citizens of oriental ancestry. All those racial groups were represented on the jury which tried that case.

Throughout that case skilled defense attorneys did everything possible to awaken racial prejudice, to create class hatred, to distort and confuse the issues. Every possible kind of red herring was drawn into the case by the defense. Time-serving politicians were induced to lend their names as character witnesses to the disreputable cause of the defense.

Yet that jury of diverse racial origins promptly proved that it recognized the Communist menace very clearly. The lawyers took 7½ months to present the case, but the jury took only 1 ballot to decide unanimously for conviction in all 7 cases.

Mr. President, what else is Hawaii supposed to do, to prove that it is anti-Communist? Shall we postpone statehood until the last lone Communist has been run out of the Territory? If Hawaiians have not yet done enough about the Communist question, what further action should they take to convince us of their determination? What further assurance of their loyalty can we think up, to demand of them? Shall we defer statehood year after year, until all hope and all faith in the hearts of the people of Hawaii are gone?

I know it will be said that such-and-such a person is a suspected Communist, that there is a party-line newspaper in Hawaii, that the largest union is Communist led. Mr. President, there are Communist-led unions in continental United States. There are Communist Party publications in continental United States, freely published and freely circulated. There are still leading Communists at large on the continent, some of them in positions of influence, perhaps some of them still in official positions, for all I know. Just a few weeks ago a major in the Army, a "fifth amendment" Communist, received an honorable discharge—why, I do not know.

We heard testimony from several witnesses about the Communist danger in Hawaii. One of them, former Governor Stainback, said he thought the Communist danger was growing. But he gave no evidence to support that opinion. He gave us no new facts of any kind about the Communist problem. He did not even tell us how he had arrived at that opinion. He simply gave us his

opinion. I admire Governor Stainback very much for the fine, statesmanlike service he rendered the people of Hawaii when he was their Democratic-appointed Governor.

I yield to no other Member of this body in my opposition to communism. Furthermore, I lay credit to having first exposed the Communist danger in Hawaii. Today, I am convinced that the people of Hawaii have the Communist problem under control.

I hope the Senate will agree with my judgment in this matter. If there is such a thing as earning the right to statehood, the people of Hawaii have earned that right. Statehood for Hawaii would strengthen our Nation, as well as do justice to a loyal group of American citizens. No one contends that everything about Hawaii is absolutely perfect. Few things are perfect in this world. Some of our existing States are not perfect. Certainly Hawaii is at least as well qualified for statehood as any of the 35 States admitted since the adoption of our Constitution. Statehood for Hawaii has been more thoroughly studied and investigated than any of the previous cases. Hawaii has had to pass more rigorous tests for admission than any of the existing States. In simple justice, we ought not to deny statehood any longer.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 355) amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1954—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

This matter has been discussed between the majority leader and the minority leader, and there is no objection to the consideration of the report at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1265)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,120,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,431,909"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

THE COST OF THE PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, approximately 6 weeks ago the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and submitted a chart showing the realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, for the fiscal years 1932 to 1953.

The chart showed the total cost of those program to be between $16 billion and $17 billion.

Mr. Benson was promptly charged by his political enemies with trying to make it appear that the support-price program had cost $16 billion.

Nothing could have been further from the truth than such charges made against the Secretary of Agriculture. Nevertheless, Mr. President, inasmuch as the figures were not broken down in detail, I asked the Secretary of Agriculture to have prepared, at the earliest possible moment, charts breaking down his figures in detail and showing what it had cost to support each commodity during the past 22 years; grouping the various basic and other commodities together and showing what each group had cost; and breaking down the cost of the Rural Electrification Administration over the life of that agency.

The Secretary of Agriculture has furnished me with such charts, and I ask unanimous consent to have them inserted in the RECORD.

The first chart shows the realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, for the fiscal years 1932 to 1953. Attached to it is a statement showing the relationship of realized costs to statements of accrued income and expenses for noncorporate lending programs. It shows how different figures can be arrived at in estimating the cost of the rural electrification program, which, incidentally, has not been large.

Another chart is an appendix to the table Realized Cost of Agricultural and Related Programs, by Function or Purpose, Fiscal Years 1932 to 1953. It shows the distribution of realized cost by commodities, where possible, of programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income.

It shows the amounts which have been spent, so far as it was possible to determine them, on every agricultural commodity, from almonds to wool.

The total cost of the support program has been a little more than $9 billion.

There has been deducted from that amount approximately $2 billion, which was collected in processing taxes, which, after all, was a cost on the consumer just the same.

The third chart is an appendix to the table Realized Cost of Agricultural and Related Programs, by Function or Purpose, Fiscal Years 1932 to 1953.

These charts altogether cannot possibly show all the costs of a program, because there is no way of including in them the billions of dollars which were charged off to the armed services and the foreign-aid programs in the years immediately following the war.

There is no possible way of showing the profits which were gained because of the fact that Congress raised the support prices of the commodities from the 52 percent, which prevailed in 1942, to the 90 percent, which was legislated by an act of Congress.

Nevertheless the cost is less than $500 million a year. In my opinion it has been a good investment.

I believe that the political enemies of the Secretary of Agriculture are extremely unfair, and display a great lack of statesmanship, in questioning his integrity. We know that anyone who questions the integrity of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, is talking merely for political purposes, and nothing else.

I believe the charts will at least counteract some of the vicious charges which have been made against the integrity of an honest man.

I believe the charts answer the critics and the political enemies of Secretary Benson. The charts are as accurate as an agency headed by an honest man can make them.

There being no objection, the charts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, fiscal years 1932–53

[The basis for the costs reflected in this table is as follows: (1) For activities financed from appropriated funds, the expenditures less receipts arising from the activities so financed; (2) for noncorporate loan funds, the losses on loans and the net interest cost or income; (3) for Commodity Credit Corporation and Federal Crop Insurance Corporation corporate funds, the net gains or losses from operations and the interest cost to Treasury on Government-subscribed capital; and (4) for corporations of the Farm Credit System, the interest cost to Treasury on Government-subscribed capital and payments made by Treasury on account of reductions in interest rates on mortgages less dividends and franchise taxes paid to Treasury. Interest cost to Treasury on noncorporate loan funds and on Government-subscribed capital of corporations has been computed on the basis of the average rate on the public debt paid by Treasury in each of these years.]

[Millions of dollars]

	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943
Program primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income:												
Commodity Credit Corporation:												
Program operations:												
Price support programs					8.7	5.3	0.4	4.6	7.4	34.0	[1] 69.1	[1] 49.9
Supply, foreign purchase, commodity export, and other CCC activities											[1] .1	2.0
Administrative and other general costs			[1] 0.6	[1] 0.9	11.7	3.9	2.1	[1] 3.0	8.7	2.2	[1] 9.6	12.1
International Wheat Agreement [2]												
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities [3]					32.2	35.2	35.2	211.6	143.9	226.1	196.3	112.0
Sugar Act							[1] 27.4	[1] 6.5	[1] 25.2	[1] 30.0	[1] 32.7	[1] .6
Federal crop insurance								4.4	7.7	9.8	14.8	14.6
Acreage allotment payments under the agricultural conservation program						313.6	217.4	350.7	380.2	326.7	332.5	218.1
Other, including Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, parity payments, and other adjustment and surplus removal programs	297.8	75.1	[1] 48.2	179.6	417.3	84.9	[1] .5	28.0	224.1	197.2	202.7	203.7
Total	297.8	75.1	[1] 48.8	178.7	469.9	442.9	227.2	589.8	746.8	766.0	634.8	512.0
Programs primarily for conservation of resources:												
Agricultural conservation program (exclusive of acreage allotment payments)					.5	55.1	88.8	119.8	202.0	132.7	136.6	212.0
Soil Conservation Service programs [4]	.2	.2	.1	.2	3.5	21.0	24.2	25.7	30.9	23.0	23.4	23.4
Forest Service programs [5]	19.6	12.2	6.8	8.3	9.5	14.2	17.9	21.4	24.3	18.9	17.8	18.5
Flood prevention program							.3	1.4	2.3	2.9	1.5	.4
Total	19.8	12.4	6.9	8.5	13.5	90.3	131.2	168.3	259.5	177.5	179.3	254.3
Credit and related programs for electrification and telephone facilities, and farm purchase, maintenance, operation, and housing:												
Lending programs:												
Rural Electrification Administration						.2	.7	1.3		2.5	1.0	[1] 1.9
Farmers' Home Administration	13.7	13.2	13.7	14.5	9.5	14.5	12.2	17.7	11.4	9.3	7.1	[1] .3
Farm Credit System	5.4	6.5	22.3	33.5	49.9	55.2	60.0	61.1	58.5	51.5	50.9	48.1
Grants and other expenses, including salaries and expenses related to the above lending programs	4.9	6.6	9.1	12.7	77.3	157.7	110.8	72.5	72.9	69.8	67.3	51.3
Total	24.0	26.3	45.1	60.7	136.7	227.6	183.7	152.6	142.8	133.1	126.3	97.2
Research and education:												
Research	20.6	18.1	15.3	15.6	18.4	20.9	22.6	25.7	30.2	31.2	31.6	30.9
Extension Service, including payments to States	10.1	9.9	9.4	9.3	17.4	17.0	17.9	18.5	19.2	19.2	19.5	19.5
Total	30.7	28.0	24.7	24.9	35.8	37.9	40.5	44.2	49.4	50.4	51.1	50.4
Other, chiefly school lunch, marketing services, control and regulatory activities:												
School lunch program [6]												1.0
Other	23.9	22.2	18.0	37.1	41.5	34.7	35.6	33.7	32.8	30.9	31.1	31.0
Total	23.9	22.2	18.0	37.1	41.5	34.7	35.6	33.7	32.8	30.9	31.1	32.0
Programs primarily for wartime, defense, and other special needs											5.3	14.1
Total, above items	396.2	164.0	45.9	309.9	697.4	833.4	618.2	988.6	1,231.3	1,157.9	1,027.9	960.0
Wartime consumer subsidies on agricultural commodities:												
Paid by Commodity Credit Corporation											8.3	145.5
Paid by Reconstruction Finance Corporation											.9	23.4
Total											9.2	168.9
Other special activities not a part of the agricultural programs of the Department:												
Special activities conducted by the Department under transferred funds as a service for other agencies (chiefly for purchase of commodities for lend-lease, UNRRA, Mutual Security and other foreign aid programs)	2.1	3.1	32.1	161.8	72.3	64.0	26.1	30.0	20.6	20.9	698.4	2,031.2
Government procurement of agricultural commodities for foreign-aid programs other than through the Department of Agriculture												
Total	2.1	3.1	32.1	161.8	72.3	64.0	26.1	30.0	20.6	20.9	698.4	2,031.2

	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	Total
Programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income:											
Commodity Credit Corporation:											
Program operations:											
Price support programs	[1] 5.9	29.4	[1] 30.1	71.9	125.4	254.7	249.2	345.6	67.4	61.1	1,110.1
Supply, foreign purchase, commodity export, and other CCC activities	[1] 12.4	5.8	[1] 35.9	[1] 242.7	[1] 38.4	[1] 4.7	[1] 2.7	1.6	1.3	6.4	[1] 319.8
Administrative and other general costs	10.4	26.1	33.2	12.9	[1] 6.5	15.9	48.1	42.0	34.6	55.3	299.6
International Wheat Agreement [2]							75.6	180.4	171.3	130.8	558.1
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities [3]	63.4	24.9	19.2	78.4	51.2	75.6	96.6	46.0	37.5	82.3	1,567.6
Sugar Act	[1] 21.3	[1] 32.9	[1] 5.2	[1] 7.4	[1] 13.1	[1] 23.3	[1] 14.5	[1] 14.8	[1] 21.8	[1] 19.4	[1] 296.1
Federal crop insurance	18.1	2.9	21.5	36.9	[1] 1.8	[1].4	9.6	4.6	8.7	6.4	157.8
Acreage allotment payments under the agricultural conservation program	109.1		22.5								2,354.8

See footnotes at end of table.

Realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, fiscal years 1932–53—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	Total
Programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income—Continued											
Other, including Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, parity payments, and other adjustment and surplus removal programs	155.7	[1] 6.1	[1] 1.5	[1] 2.2	----------	10.9	25.0	18.9	7.2	7.7	2,078.3
Total	402.1	50.1	23.7	[1] 51.2	116.8	328.7	486.9	624.3	306.2	330.6	7,510.4
Programs primarily for conservation of resources:											
Agricultural conservation program (exclusive of acreage allotment payments)	226.6	278.9	275.3	329.2	230.6	167.6	237.2	275.5	262.0	270.3	3,500.7
Soil Conservation Service programs [4]	25.1	28.2	34.6	43.1	41.3	47.9	52.8	52.1	56.0	59.6	616.5
Forest Service programs [5]	18.3	21.0	28.0	36.4	37.7	33.8	33.5	9.8	7.6	6.2	421.7
Flood prevention program	.1	.1	.6	2.6	3.8	5.9	6.7	7.5	7.8	6.3	50.2
Total	270.1	328.2	338.5	411.3	313.4	255.2	330.2	344.9	333.4	342.4	4,589.1
Credit and related programs for electrification and telephone facilities, and farm purchase, maintenance, operation, and housing:											
Lending programs:											
Rural Electrification Administration	[1] 4.4	[1] 1.9	[1] .9	2.5	6.5	9.7	14.4	20.2	23.2	26.7	99.8
Farmers' Home Administration	[1] 9.8	[1] 7.6	[1] 2.6	[1] 4.9	[1] 4.6	[1] 4.8	[1] 3.2	[1] 5.4	[1] 5.3	[1] 5.1	83.2
Farm Credit System	43.2	18.1	9.4	7.3	7.0	[1][7] 62.3	[1] 11.2	[1] 8.0	[1] 7.8	[1] 2.6	506.0
Grants and other expenses, including salaries and expenses related to the above lending programs	30.8	36.0	37.6	42.5	26.4	29.0	33.8	35.4	37.1	36.8	1,067.3
Total	68.8	44.6	43.5	47.4	35.3	[1] 18.4	33.8	42.2	47.2	55.8	1,756.3
Research and education:											
Research	28.2	29.7	31.6	37.1	42.4	52.6	56.8	55.2	54.8	55.2	724.7
Extension Service, including payments to States	19.5	19.4	23.9	27.4	37.2	31.1	32.1	32.3	32.6	32.6	465.0
Total	47.7	49.1	55.5	64.5	69.6	83.7	88.9	87.5	87.4	87.8	1,189.7
Other, chiefly school lunch, marketing services, control and regulatory activities:											
School lunch program [6]	33.7	45.4	56.6	77.5	68.4	75.0	83.2	82.8	83.6	82.8	690.0
Other	35.8	36.3	40.3	48.5	40.5	48.1	52.8	55.2	53.9	57.4	841.3
Total	69.5	81.7	96.9	126.0	108.9	123.1	136.0	138.0	137.5	140.2	1,531.3
Programs primarily for wartime, defense, and other special needs	73.8	84.7	31.1	31.3	41.3	45.9	31.5	1.6	8.2	5.4	344.2
Total, above items	932.0	608.4	589.2	629.3	685.3	818.2	1,107.3	1,238.5	919.9	962.2	16,921.0
Wartime consumer subsidies on agricultural commodities:											
Paid by Commodity Credit Corporation	390.1	741.7	845.1	[1] 22.4	[1] 4.0	[1] 2.2	.1	.3	[1] .3	[1] .1	2,102.1
Paid by Reconstruction Finance Corporation	570.4	626.3	924.8	[1] 3.0	.1	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	2,142.9
Total	960.5	1,368.0	1,769.9	[1] 25.4	[1] 3.9	[1] 2.2	.1	.3	[1] .3	[1] .1	4,245.0
Other special activities not a part of the agricultural programs of the Department:											
Special activities conducted by the Department under transferred funds as a service for other agencies (chiefly for purchase of commodities for lend-lease, UNRRA, Mutual Security and other foreign-aid programs)	2,139.9	1,382.1	1,610.8	579.1	744.6	1,018.4	611.4	447.6	331.8	118.7	12,147.0
Government procurement of agricultural commodities for foreign-aid programs other than through the Department of Agriculture	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	1,425.9	1,236.3	741.8	312.4	351.3	4,067.7
Total	2,139.9	1,382.1	1,610.8	579.1	744.6	2,444.3	1,847.7	1,189.4	644.2	470.0	16,214.7

[1] Excess of credits—deduct.

[2] The expenditures under this program are for payment of the difference between the price specified in the International Wheat Agreement and the domestic market price of wheat. The program is essentially international in nature, and is included in this classification with the kinds of items to which it most nearly relates.

[3] Exclusive of cash payments for school-lunch programs.

[4] The amounts shown include the purchase of 9,643,738 acres of submarginal land at a total cost of approximately $60,061,000.

[5] The amounts shown include the purchase of 14,450,711 acres of land at a total cost of approximately $68,532,000.

[6] Includes costs under the National School Lunch Act and sec. 32 funds used for cash payments for school-lunch programs.

[7] Includes $9.3 million representing the cumulative net loss of capital subscribed to the regional Agricultural Credit Corporations which were liquidated in 1949.

RELATIONSHIP OF REALIZED COSTS TO STATEMENTS OF ACCRUED INCOME AND EXPENSES FOR NONCORPORATE LENDING PROGRAMS

The financial aspects of the noncorporate lending programs of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farmers' Home Administration, which are reported on this statement on a realized cost basis, are also susceptible of being reported on an accrued income and expense basis. Records for these programs are maintained and reports are made on the accrued basis pursuant to regulations covering business-type Government operations. To illustrate the differences involved in these two concepts the following tabulation, using the REA as an example, shows the results, from the beginning of the REA programs through the fiscal year 1953, on the accrual basis compared with the realized costs reflected in this statement.

Lending operations of REA from inception to June 30, 1953

[Millions of dollars]

	Accrued income and expense basis	Net realized cost basis
Interest income	234.0	150.9
Expense:		
Interest expense	165.9	250.7
Provision for possible losses on loans	2.5	----------
Net income	45.5	----------
Net expense	----------	99.8

The principal differences in the two bases are as follows:

(1) Interest income: The accrual basis includes interest earned but not collected. A substantial part of the difference is due to the inclusion on the accrual basis of interest deferred under the law during the first 5 years of a loan but properly accounted for as accrued interest earned although it is not due or payable. The realized cost basis includes actual collections of interest.

(2) Interest expense: The accrual basis includes only the interest actually charged to REA on funds borrowed from RFC (in the earlier years) and from the Treasury, under borrowing authorizations provided by Congress. The realized cost basis includes as interest expense the amount resulting from applying to the average total of loans outstanding in each year the average interest rate paid by the Government for the funds it borrowed in that year.

(3) Provision for possible losses on loans: The accrual basis includes projected or anticipated losses based on the best estimate that could be made at the end of the fiscal year 1953. The realized cost basis, which takes into account only those costs that have actually come about, does not include any anticipated losses on loans.

Appendix to table of "Realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, fiscal years 1932–53"—Distribution of realized cost by commodities, where possible, of programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income [1]

[Millions of dollars]

	Total	Commodity Credit Corporation				International Wheat Agreement	Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	Sugar Act	Federal crop insurance	Acreage allotment payments under the Agricultural Conservation Program	Agricultural production programs (principally acreage allotments and marketing quotas) [2]	Parity payments	Retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates	Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and related acts	Removal of surplus cattle and dairy products [3]	Agricultural Marketing Act Revolving Fund, and payments to stabilization corporations for losses incurred [4]	Other
		Price support programs	Supply, foreign purchase, commodity export, and other CCC activities	Administrative and other general costs	Total												
Almonds	1.7						1.7										
Apples	81.5						81.5										
Apricots	1.3						1.3										
Barley	10.1	10.1			10.1												
Beans	60.6	35.0			35.0		25.1		0.3								
Beef	1.5						1.5									0.2	
Beets	1.0						1.0										
Blackberries	.1						.1										
Butter	158.8	48.7			48.7		110.1										
Cabbage	5.1						5.1										
Carrots	1.3						1.3										
Castor beans	.2	.2			.2												
Cattle and dairy products	76.6														76.6		
Cauliflower	.1						.1										
Celery	.5						.5										
Cheese	28.7	25.0			25.0		3.7										
Cherries	2.2						2.2										
Citrus	[5] .1								[5] .1								
Citrus (juice and salad)	.1						.1										
Coffee	.6						.6										
Corn, cornmeal, and corn-hog program:																	
Corn	869.6	70.9			70.9		.9		.4	441.0	8.9	347.5					
Cornmeal	17.5						17.5										
Corn-hog program:																	
Program expenses	488.7													488.7			
Miscellaneous receipts	[5] .6													[5] .6			
Processing taxes (net)	[5] 261.4													[5] 261.4			
Total, corn-hog	226.7													226.7			
Total, corn	1,113.8	70.9			70.9		18.4		.4	441.0	8.9	347.5		226.7			
Cotton:																	
CCC price support program:																	
Upland cotton	[5] 268.2	[5] 268.2			[5] 268.2												
Puerto Rican cotton	.1	.1			.1												
Cotton export differential	41.4	41.4			41.4												
Cotton-rubber barter	[5] 11.1	[5] 11.1			[5] 11.1												
Total, CCC price-support program	[5] 237.8	[5] 237.8			[5] 237.8												
Other cotton programs:																	
Program expenses	2,059.4		[5] 12.5		12.5		[7] 348.9		67.8	771.2	21.1	279.7	1.3	416.7		140.2	
Miscellaneous receipts	[5] 9.5										[5] 7.7			[5] 1.8			
Processing taxes (net)	[5] 247.2													[5] 47.2			
Total, cotton	1,564.9	[5] 237.8	12.5		[5] 225.3		348.9		67.8	771.2	13.4	279.7	1.3	167.7		140.2	
Cottonseed and products	[5] 13.6	[5] 15.3			[5] 15.3		1.7										
Cranberries	1.2						1.2										
Dairy products	.5																
Dates	.4						.4									.5	
Eggs	331.6	189.7			189.7		141.9										
Figs	2.6						2.6										
Filberts	.6						.6										
Fish	1.2						1.2										
Flax	21.8	.4			.4		.2		[5] 3.3	24.5							
Flaxseed and linseed oil	72.0	66.2			66.2		5.8										
Fruits and vegetables	[5] .6																
Fruits, dried	14.9	14.9			14.9											5.6	
General depleting crops	627.5									[5] 627.5							
Grain	83.0		[5] 12.0		12.0											71.0	
Grain sorghums	41.4	35.4			35.4		6.0										
Grapes	.5						.5										
Grapefruit (fruit and juice)	27.8	1.7			1.7		26.1										
Hay	8.0		[10] 8.0		8.0												
Hemp and hemp fiber	21.6	21.5			21.5												
Hides (miscellaneous receipts)	[5] 13.0																[5] 13.0
Hominy grits	3.5						3.5										
Honey	12.2	.9			.9		11.3									(11)	
Hops	1.7	1.0			1.0		.7										
Lard	19.3						19.3										
Lemons (fruit and juice)	.4						.4										
Livestock	.1															.1	
Meat, miscellaneous	.2						.2										
Milk	51.1						51.1										
Milk, dried	62.8	62.8			62.8												
Multiple crops	5.0								[12] 5.0								
Naval stores	1.4	1.4															
Nuts	.3															.3	
Oats	1.4	1.4			1.4												
Oats, rolled	3.4						3.4										
Olive oil	.4	(11)			(11)		.4										

See footnotes at end of table.

Appendix to table of "Realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, fiscal years 1932–53"—Distribution of realized cost by commodities, where possible, of programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income [1]—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

	Total	Commodity Credit Corporation				International Wheat Agreement	Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	Sugar Act	Federal crop insurance	Acreage allotment payments under the Agricultural Conservation Program	Agricultural production programs (principally acreage allotments and marketing quotas) [2]	Parity payments	Retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates	Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and related acts	Removal of surplus cattle and dairy products [3]	Agricultural Marketing Act Revolving Fund, and payments to stabilization corporations for losses incurred [4]	Other
		Price support programs	Supply, foreign purchase, commodity export, and other CCC activities	Administrative and other general costs	Total												
Onions	2.9						2.9										
Oranges (fruit and juice)	51.6						51.6										
Peaches	10.0						10.0										
Peanut butter	1.7						1.7										
Peanuts:																	
Program expenses	142.9	92.6			92.6		26.8			6.2	13.6			3.7			
Miscellaneous receipts	[5] 1.3										[5] 1.3						
Processing taxes (net)	[5] 3.7													[5] 3.7			
Total, peanuts	137.9	92.6			92.6		26.8			6.2	12.3						
Pears	11.9						11.9										
Peas (canned, dried and fresh)	3.2	.9			.9		2.3										
Pecans	3.8	(11)			(11)		3.8										
Pineapples	.1						.1										
Plums	.6						.6										
Pork	66.0						66.0										
Pork and beans	2.1						2.1										
Potatoes	635.8	478.1			478.1		[6] 131.6			26.1							
Potatoes, sweet	4.0	.1			.1		3.9										
Poultry	.3																
Prunes	36.6						36.6									.3	
Raisins	33.1						33.1										
Rice:																	
Program expenses	35.4	1.5			1.5		6.6			11.7	.4	5.6		9.6	[7]		
Processing taxes (net)	.5													.5			
Total, rice	35.9	1.5			1.5		6.6			11.7	.4	5.6		10.1			
Rye:																	
Program expenses	.4	.2			.2									.2			
Processing taxes (net)	.2													[5] .2			
Total, rye	.2	.2			.2												
Seeds:																	
Program expenses	5.6	4.9			4.9											.7	
Miscellaneous receipts	[5] 5.4													[5] 5.4			
Total, seeds	.2	4.9			4.9									[5] 5.4		.7	
Shortening, vegetable	.1						.1										
Soup	.0						.9										
Soybeans	[5] 4.4	[5] 4.4			[5] 4.4												
Spinach	.3						.3										
Squash	.1						.1										
Sugar:																	
Sugar Act program:																	
Sugar payments	819.9							819.9									
Sugar taxes	[5] 1,135.2							[5] 1,135.2									
Net total, Sugar Act	[5] 315.3							[5] 315.3									
Other sugar programs, including sugar beets:																	
Program expenses	111.2	16.5			16.5		.1			3.6				91.0			
Processing taxes (net)	[5] 76.2													[5] 76.2			
Total, other sugar	35.0	16.5			16.5		.1			3.6				14.8			
Total, sugar	[5] 280.3	16.5			16.5		.1	[5] 315.3		3.6				14.8			
Sirup	.4						.4										
Tangerines	1.1						1.1										
Tobacco:																	
Program expenses	186.4	[5] 1.6			[5] 1.6		18.1		[5] 3.0	85.0	19.8	6.1		62.0			
Miscellaneous receipts	[5] 23.3										[5] 21.2			[5] 2.1			
Processing taxes (net)	[5] 68.5													[5] 68.5			
Total, tobacco	94.6	[5] 1.6			[5] 1.6		18.1		[5] 3.0	85.0	[5] 1.4	6.1		[5] 8.6			
Tomatoes	3.8						3.8										
Tung oil	.1	.1			.1												
Turkeys	33.4	(11)			(11)		33.4										
Vegetables	42.7	(11)			(11)		[12] 35.9			6.8							
Walnuts	13.8						13.8										

See footnotes at end of table.

Appendix to table of "Realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, fiscal years 1932–53"—Distribution of realized cost by commodities, where possible, of programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income [1]—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

	Total	Commodity Credit Corporation				International Wheat Agreement	Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	Sugar Act	Federal crop insurance	Acreage allotment payments under the Agricultural Conservation Program	Agricultural production programs (principally acreage allotments and marketing quotas) [2]	Parity payments	Retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates	Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and related acts	Removal of surplus cattle and dairy products [3]	Agricultural Marketing Act Revolving Fund, and payments to stabilization corporations for losses incurred [4]	Other
		Price support programs	Supply, foreign purchase, commodity export, and other CCC activities	Administrative and other general costs	Total												
Wheat, wheat cereal, and wheat flour:																	
Wheat:																	
Program expenses	1,870.4	95.1	[5] 1.2	.....	96.3	546.5	21.7	.....	1.8	351.2	22.0	328.2	.....	354.6	.....	148.1	.....
Miscellaneous receipts	[5] 15.4	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	[5] 15.4	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Processing taxes (net)	[5] 244.9	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	[5] 244.9	.....	.....	.....
Total, wheat	1,610.1	95.1	1.2	.....	96.3	546.5	21.7	.....	1.8	351.2	6.6	328.2	.....	109.7	.....	148.1	.....
Wheat cereal	4.5	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4.5	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wheat flour	107.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	107.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, wheat and wheat products	1,721.6	95.1	1.2	.....	96.3	546.5	133.2	.....	1.8	351.2	6.6	328.2	.....	109.7	.....	148.1	.....
Wool	104.6	92.2	.....	.....	92.2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	12.4	.....
Total, all commodities	7,279.8	1,110.1	33.8	.....	1,143.9	546.5	[14] 1,514.4	[5] 315.3	68.9	2,354.8	40.2	967.1	1.3	515.0	76.6	379.4	[5] 13.0
Interest cost:																	
Interest payments	272.5	.....	.....	261.7	261.7	10.8	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Imputed interest cost [15]	71.5	.....	.....	31.9	31.9	.....	.....	.....	13.7	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	25.9	.....
Interest income	[5] 174.0	.....	.....	[5] 149.3	[5] 149.3	.....	.....	.....	[5] .7	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	[5] 24.0	.....
Other costs not allocable to specific commodities [16]	63.4	.....	[5] [17] 353.6	155.3	[5] 198.3	.8	53.2	19.2	75.9	([17])	[18] 6.8	49.5	.1	56.2	.....	.....	.....
Receipts not allocable by commodities	[5] 2.8	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	[5] 6.1	.....	.....	[5] [20] 2.7
Realized cost	7,510.4	1,110.1	[5] 319.8	299.6	1,089.9	558.1	[21] 1,567.6	[5] 296.1	157.8	2,354.8	47.0	1,016.6	1.4	571.1	76.6	381.3	[5] 15.7
RECAPITULATION																	
Commodity totals:																	
Program expense (before deduction of miscellaneous receipts and taxes)	9,385.1	1,110.1	33.8	.....	1,143.9	546.5	1,514.4	819.9	68.9	2,354.8	85.8	967.1	1.3	1,426.5	76.6	379.4	.....
Miscellaneous receipts	[5] 68.5	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	[5] 45.6	.....	.....	[5] 9.9	.....	.....	[5] 13.0
Sugar taxes	[5] 1,135.2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	[5] 1,135.2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Processing taxes (net)	[5] 901.6	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	[5] 901.6	.....	.....	.....
Total, commodities	7,279.8	1,110.1	33.8	.....	1,143.9	546.5	1,514.4	[5] 315.3	68.9	2,354.8	40.2	967.1	1.3	515.0	76.6	379.4	[5] 13.0
Other amounts not allocable by commodities	230.6	.....	[5] 353.6	299.6	[5] 54.0	11.6	53.2	19.2	88.9	.....	6.8	49.5	.1	56.1	.....	1.9	[5] 2.7
Realized cost	7,510.4	1,110.1	[5] 319.8	299.6	1,089.9	558.1	1,567.6	[5] 296.1	157.8	2,354.8	47.0	1,016.6	1.4	571.1	76.6	381.3	[5] 15.7

[1] The distribution by commodities is necessarily estimated in most instances since accounting records were not required to be maintained on an individual commodity basis.

[2] The amounts indicated hereunder are principally for salaries and expenses for fiscal years 1947 to 1953 in connection with acreage allotments and marketing quotas on the commodities shown. Prior to 1947, such work was handled as a part of the agricultural conservation program, and administrative expenses for this work were not maintained separately from administrative expenses of the agricultural conservation program. Accordingly, amounts for acreage allotments and marketing quotas for 1946 and prior years are not included in this statement.

[3] Program conducted under the Jones-Connally Act.

[4] Represents principally losses incurred on loans made from the revolving fund by the Federal Farm Board to stabilize the prices of wheat and cotton. A large portion of such losses resulted from donations authorized by Congress to the American Red Cross, without reimbursement to the fund, of wheat and cotton acquired in stabilization operations.

[5] Represents income or minus expenditures.

[6] Represents cost of commodity export program on cotton and wheat exclusive of export differential on cotton owned or pooled by CCC.

[7] Includes $163.2 million for cotton-price adjustment.

[8] Breakdown by commodity is not available. In general, row crops were considered to be soil-depleting if grain or forage was removed from the land. In addition, small grain crops harvested for grain or hay fell into this category.

[9] Represents cost of the storage facilities program which applies primarily to the cost of providing local and emergency storage for corn and wheat in the earlier years of the Corporation's program.

[10] Represents net loss on sales of hay for feeding in drought emergency areas in 1953.

[11] Less than $50,000.

[12] This item applies to a type of insurance which covers several crops on the farm and on which indemnities are paid only for crop deficiencies based upon the total value of the insured crops.

[13] Includes $25.6 million and $4.9 million applicable to potatoes and vegetables, respectively, in incentive payments under the 1943 agricultural conservation program.

[14] Includes $163.2 million cost applicable to the cotton-price-adjustment programs and $30.5 million in incentive payments under the 1943 ACP program. An item of $12.1 million of program cost, which cannot be allocated to individual commodities, is included in "Other costs not allocable to specific commodities" below.

[15] Interest computed for each year on the basis of the average rate on the public debt paid by Treasury in that year.

[16] Consists of administrative expenses and other general costs or income not distributable by specific commodities.

[17] Includes charged-off accounts and notes receivable of $1.8 million and the net realized gain on the supply and foreign purchase programs which are identifiable by broad commodity groupings as follows:

	Millions
Supply:	
Cotton and linters	[5] $1.9
Grains and seeds	[5] 76.0
Oils (bulk)	[5] .9
Tobacco	[5] 4.8
General commodities purchase	[5] 185.8
Processed and packaged commodities	[5] 39.1
Other	3.4
Total	[5] 305.1
Foreign purchase:	
Cotton	[5] 5.9
Fats and oils	[5] 38.9
Foodstuffs	[5] 5.7
Other	.2
Total	[5] 50.3

These programs were separate from the major activity of the Corporation and were undertaken as a means of supplying the requirements of Government agencies, foreign governments and relief and rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements. The gain of $185.8 million reflected under general commodities purchase resulted from the establishment of sales prices at a level which would prevent losses to the Corporation on the supplying of commodities and products thereof to meet the requirements of the United States armed services, lend-lease participants, foreign governments, relief agencies, etc., during World War II.

[18] No administrative or other general costs are included for these acreage allotment payments. The program was conducted as a part of the agricultural conservation program and records of administrative and other nonpayment costs were not maintained separately for acreage allotment payments as distinguished from payments for conservation practices.

[19] Represents activities to assure production of crops in short supply and assistance to farmers in obtaining equipment and materials necessary to achieve the production required by the Korean mobilization.

[20] Represents receipts from liquidation of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation.

[21] Exclusive of cash payments for school-lunch programs.

NOTE.—Details may not add to totals shown due to rounding.
February 1954.

Appendix to table of "Realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, fiscal years 1932–53"—Summary of realized cost of agricultural programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income, showing distribution of cost by commodity groups [1]

[Millions of dollars]

	Total	Commodity Credit Corporation				International Wheat Agreement	Removal of surplus agricultural commodities [2]	Sugar Act	Federal crop insurance	Acreage allotment payments under the Agricultural Conservation Program	Agricultural production programs (principally acreage allotments and marketing quotas) [3]	Parity payments	Retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates	Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and related acts	Removal of surplus cattle and dairy products [4]	Agricultural Marketing Act Revolving Fund, and payments to stabilization corporations for losses incurred [5]	Other
		Price support programs	Supply, foreign purchase, commodity export, and other CCC activities	Administrative and other general costs	Total												
BASIC COMMODITIES																	
Corn (including cornmeal and AAA corn-hog program):																	
Program expense	1,375.8	70.9			70.9		18.4		.4	441.0	8.9	347.9		488.7			
Miscellaneous receipts	[6] .6													[6] .6			
Processing taxes (net)	[6] 261.4													[6] 261.4			
Total, corn	1,113.8	70.9			70.9		18.4		.4	441.0	8.9	347.5		226.7			
Cotton:																	
CCC price support:																	
Upland cotton	[6] 268.2	[6] 268.2			[6] 268.2												
Puerto Rican cotton	.1	.1			.1												
Cotton export differential	41.4	41.4			41.4												
Cotton-rubber barter	[6] 11.1	[6] 11.1			[6] 11.1												
Total, CCC price support	[6] 237.8	[6] 237.8			[6] 237.8												
Other cotton programs:																	
Program expense	2,059.4		[7] 12.5		12.5		[8] 348.9		67.8	771.2	21.1	279.7	1.3	416.7		140.2	
Miscellaneous receipts	[6] 9.5										[6] 7.7			[6] 1.8			
Processing taxes (net)	[6] 247.2													[6] 247.2			
Total, cotton	1,564.9	[6] 237.8	12.5		[6] 225.3		348.9		67.8	771.2	13.4	279.7	1.3	167.7		140.2	
Peanuts:																	
Program expense	142.9	92.6			92.6		26.8			6.2	13.6			3.7			
Miscellaneous receipt	[6] 1.3										[6] 1.3						
Processing taxes (net)	[6] 3.7													[6] 3.7			
Total, peanuts	137.9	92.6			92.6		26.8			6.2	12.3						
Rice:																	
Program expense	35.4	1.5			1.5		6.6			11.7	.4	5.6		9.6			
Processing taxes (net)	.5													.5			
Total, rice	35.9	1.5			1.5		6.6			11.7	.4	5.6		10.1			
Tobacco:																	
Program expense	186.4	[6] 1.6			[6] 1.6		18.1		[6] 3.0	85.0	19.8	6.1		62.0			
Miscellaneous receipts	[6] 23.3										[6] 21.2			[6] 2.1			
Processing taxes (net)	[6] 68.5													[6] 68.5			
Total, tobacco	94.6	[6] 1.6			[6] 1.6		18.1		[6] 3.0	85.0	[6] 1.4	6.1		[6] 8.6			
Wheat (including wheat cereal and wheat flour):																	
Program expense	1,981.9	95.1	[7] 1.2		96.3	546.5	133.2		1.8	351.2	22.0	328.2		354.6		148.1	
Miscellaneous receipts	[6] 15.4										[6] 15.4						
Processing taxes (net)	[6] 244.9													[6] 244.9			
Total, wheat	1,721.6	95.1	1.2		96.3	546.5	133.2		1.8	351.2	6.6	328.2		109.7		148.1	
Total, basic	4,668.7	20.7	13.7		34.4	546.5	552.0		67.0	1,666.3	40.2	967.1	1.3	505.6		288.3	
DESIGNATED NONBASIC COMMODITIES																	
Butter	158.8	48.7			48.7		110.1										
Cheese	28.7	25.0			25.0		3.7										
Milk	113.9	62.8			62.8		51.1										
Potatoes	635.8	478.1			478.1		131.6			26.1							
Wool	104.6	92.2			92.2											12.4	
Other	12.8	1.0			1.0		11.3									.5	
Total, designated nonbasic	1,054.6	707.8			707.8		307.8			26.1						12.9	
OTHER NONBASIC COMMODITIES																	
Eggs	331.6	189.7			189.7		141.9										
Flaxseed and linseed oil	72.0	66.2			66.2		5.8										
Sugar:																	
Sugar act program:																	
Sugar payments	819.9							819.9									
Sugar taxes	[6] 1,135.2							[6] 1,135.2									
Net total, sugar act	[6] 315.3							[6] 315.3									
Other sugar programs	11.2	16.5			16.5		.1			3.6				91.0			
Processing taxes (net)	[6] 76.2													[6] 76.2			
Total, sugar	[6] 280.3	16.5			16.5		.1	[6] 315.3		3.6				14.8			

Footnotes at end of table.

Appendix to table of "Realized cost of agricultural and related programs, by function or purpose, fiscal years 1932–53"—Summary of realized cost of agricultural programs primarily for stabilization of prices and farm income, showing distribution of cost by commodity groups [1]—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

	Total	Commodity Credit Corporation				International Wheat Agreement	Removal of surplus agricultural commodities [2]	Sugar Act	Federal crop insurance	Acreage allotment payments under the Agricultural Conservation Program	Agricultural production programs (principally acreage allotments and marketing quotas) [3]	Parity payments	Retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates	Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and related acts	Removal of surplus cattle and dairy products [4]	Agricultural Marketing Act Revolving Fund, and payments to stabilization corporations for losses incurred [5]	Other
		Price support programs	Supply, foreign purchase, commodity export, and other CCC activities	Administrative and other general costs	Total												
OTHER NONBASIC COMMODITIES—con.																	
Other:																	
Program expense	1,452.0	109.4	20.0	-------	129.4	-------	506.9	-------	1.9	658.8	-------	-------	-------	.2	76.6	78.2	-------
Miscellaneous receipts	[6] 18.4	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	[6] 5.4	-------	-------	[6] 13.0
Processing taxes (net)	[6] .2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	[6] .2	-------	-------	-------
Total, other	1,433.4	109.4	20.0	-------	129.4	-------	506.9	-------	1.9	658.8	-------	-------	-------	[6] 5.4	76.6	78.2	[6] 13.0
Total, other nonbasic	1,556.7	381.8	20.0	-------	401.8	-------	654.7	[6] 315.3	1.9	662.4	-------	-------	-------	9.4	76.6	78.2	[6] 13.0
Total, all commodities	7,279.8	1,110.1	33.8	-------	1,143.9	546.5	[6] 1,514.4	[6] 315.3	68.9	2,354.8	40.2	967.1	1.3	515.0	76.6	379.4	[6] 13.0
Interest cost:																	
Interest payments	272.5	-------	-------	261.7	261.7	10.8	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Imputed interest cost [10]	71.5	-------	-------	31.9	31.9	-------	-------	-------	13.7	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	25.9	-------
Interest income	[6] 174.0	-------	-------	[6] 149.3	[6] 149.3	-------	-------	-------	[6] .7	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	[6] 24.0	-------
Other costs not allocable to specific commodities [11]	63.4	-------	[6] [12] 353.6	155.3	[6] 198.3	.8	53.2	19.2	75.9	[13]	[14] 6.8	49.5	.1	56.2	-------	-------	-------
Receipts not allocable by commodities	[6] 2.8	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	[6] .1	-------	-------	[6] [15] 2.7
Realized cost	7,510.4	1,110.1	[6] 319.8	299.6	1,089.9	558.1	1,567.6	[6] 296.1	157.8	2,354.8	47.0	1,016.6	1.4	571.1	76.6	381.3	[6] 15.7
RECAPITULATION																	
Commodity totals:																	
Program expense (before deduction of miscellaneous receipts and taxes)	9,385.1	1,110.1	33.8	-------	1,143.9	546.5	1,514.4	819.9	68.9	2,354.8	85.8	967.1	1.3	1,426.5	76.6	379.4	-------
Miscellaneous receipts	[6] 68.5	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	[6] 45.6	-------	-------	[6] 9.9	-------	-------	[6] 13.0
Sugar taxes	[6] 1,135.2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	[6] 1,135.2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Processing taxes (net)	[6] 901.6	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	[6] 901.6	-------	-------	-------
Total, commodities	7,279.8	1,110.1	33.8	-------	1,143.9	546.5	1,514.4	[6] 315.3	68.9	2,354.8	40.2	967.1	1.3	515.0	76.6	379.4	[6] 13.0
Other amounts not allocable by commodities	230.6	-------	[6] 353.6	299.6	[6] 54.0	11.6	53.2	19.2	88.9	-------	6.8	49.5	.1	56.1	-------	1.9	[6] 2.7
Realized cost	7,510.4	1,110.1	[6] 319.8	299.6	1,089.9	558.1	1,567.6	[6] 296.1	157.8	2,354.8	47.0	1,016.6	1.4	571.1	76.6	381.3	[6] 15.7

[1] The distribution by commodities is necessarily estimated in most instances since accounting records were not required to be maintained on an individual commodity basis.

[2] Exclusive of cash payments for school-lunch programs.

[3] The amounts indicated hereunder are principally for salaries and expenses for fiscal years 1947 to 1953 in connection with acreage allotments and marketing quotas on the commodities shown. Prior to 1947, such work was handled as a part of the agricultural conservation program, and administrative expenses for this work were not maintained separately from administrative expenses of the agriculturalconservation program. Accordingly, amounts for acreage allotments and marketing quotas for 1946 and prior years are not included in this statement.

[4] Program conducted under the Jones-Connally Act.

[5] Represents principally losses incurred on loans made from the revolving fund by the Federal Farm Board to stabilize the prices of wheat and cotton. A large portion of such losses resulted from donations authorized by Congress to the American Red Cross, without reimbursement to the fund, of wheat and cotton acquired in stabilization operations.

[6] Represents income or minus expenditures.

[7] Represents cost of commodity-export on program cotton and wheat exclusive of export differential on cotton owned or pooled by CCC.

[8] Includes $163.2 million for cotton price adjustment.

[9] Includes $163.2 million cost applicable to the cotton price adjustment programs and $30.5 million in incentive payments under the 1943 ACP program. An item of $12.1 million of program cost, which cannot be allocated to individual commodities, is included in "Other costs not allocable to specific commodities" below.

[10] Interest computed for each year on the basis of the average rate on the public debt paid by Treasury in that year.

[11] Consists of administrative expenses and other general costs or income not distributable by specific commodities.

[12] Includes charged-off accounts and notes receivable of $1.8 million and the net realized gain on the supply and foreign-purchase programs which are identifiable by broad commodity groupings as follows:

	Millions
Supply:	
Cotton and linters	[6] $1.9
Grains and seeds	[6] 76.0
Oils (bulk)	[6] .9
Tobacco	[6] 4.8
General commodities purchase	[6] 185.8
Processed and packaged commodities	[6] 39.1
Other	3.4
Total	[6] 305.1
Foreign purchase:	
Cotton	[6] 5.9
Fats and oils	[6] 38.9
Foodstuffs	[6] 5.7
Other	.2
Total	[6] 50.3

These programs were separate from the major activity of the Corporation and were undertaken as a means of supplying the requirements of Government agencies, foreign governments, and relief and rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements. The gain of $185.8 million under general commodities purchase resulted from the establishment of sales prices at a level which would prevent losses to the Corporation on the supplying of commodities and products thereof to meet the requirements of the United States armed services, lend-lease participants, foreign governments, relief agencies, etc., during World War II.

[13] No administrative or other general costs are included for these acreage-allotment payments. The program was conducted as a part of the agricultural-conservation program and records of administrative and other nonpayment costs were not maintained separately for acreage-allotment payments as distinguished from payments for conservation practices.

[14] Represents activities to assure production of crops in short supply and assistance to farmers in obtaining equipment and materials necessary to achieve the production required by the Korean mobilization.

[15] Represents receipts from liquidation of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation.

NOTE.—Details may not add to totals shown due to rounding.
February 1954.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN CHINA AND SIBERIA

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, on January 25 I made a statement regarding American servicemen, variously estimated as between 700 and 944, who are being held in slave-labor camps in China and Siberia in direct violation of the Korean truce agreement, which pledged that all prisoners would be returned.

In the interest of continuity, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD certain recent correspondence on this matter which I have received from the Department of State and the Department of Defense.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1954.

Hon. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: The Secretary of Defense has directed that I reply to your letter of February 2, requesting information on the 944 servicemen reported as being held as prisoners of war in Korea. In this connection, your remarks on the floor of the Senate, as reported in the January 25 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, have been read with great interest.

It is confirmed that there were 944 of our men concerning whom reports were received which indicated that the Communists possessed knowledge about their fate. Information concerning them originated, among other sources, from prisoner-of-war interrogations, statements of repatriated personnel, Communist radio broadcasts and news reports, and personal letters.

An initial demand for an accounting for these men was presented to the Military Armistice Commission on September 9. The Communist reply of September 21 was regarded by the United Nations Command as totally unsatisfactory and unacceptable; and subsequently, on September 25, November 23, December 10, and January 18, further demands were made. The Communist responses have been uniformly unacceptable.

In many cases, the reported information concerning the men was scanty and inconclusive. It has never been believed, or intended to be implied, that all 944 men were living. The demands presented to the Military Armistice Commission were not for a return of 944 men, but for an accounting for them—to include, of course, the return of all who might still be living.

It must be recognized that there is a diminishing basis for optimism concerning the fate of many of the men. In some cases, conclusive evidence has been obtained which has justified formal findings of death. In other cases, after the expiration of 12 months in a missing-in-action status, presumptive findings of death have been made as provided for in the Missing Persons Act. Other similar findings must be expected. This does not mean, however, that efforts will be slackened to obtain an accounting for these men. Our Government, through the Military Armistice Commission, will continue its negotiations to obtain information which would clarify the status of all the men; and will continue to investigate all sources of information and explore all feasible courses of action.

One course of action which may have occurred to some persons as a possible alternative to the slow and often frustrating attempts to obtain an accounting for these men should be the employment of force. Aside from the doubtful efficacy of such a course of action, however, it would be altogether inconsistent with the international agreements which brought an end to the shooting war in Korea and which we fervently hope will eventually provide the basis for a durable peace in that land.

As can be seen, the above statement of facts is at variance with the account printed in the December 18 edition of the U. S. News & World Report.

We fully appreciate your interest in this important matter, and assure you that the problem has our continuing, serious attention.

Sincerely yours,

WADE M. FLEISCHER,
Colonel, USAF, Acting Director, Office of Legislative Liaison.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 19, 1954.

The Honorable JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: In the absence of Ambassador Dean, I am replying to your letter of February 2, acknowledged by telephone on February 10, concerning reports that American servicemen are being held in slave labor camps in China and Siberia.

To date, on the basis of information available to the Department of State, such reports cannot be verified. However, this matter will continue to receive our most careful attention.

We are, of course, very much concerned about the problem of the American personnel who have been listed as missing in action during the Korean war and about whom there is evidence that they had at one time been in Communist custody. It will continue to be the purpose of the United Nations Command and the United States Government to obtain the return of all United Nations personnel who may still be alive and in Communist custody, and to obtain information concerning other personnel still unaccounted for. I am enclosing a statement outlining the efforts which have been made in this regard.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

EFFORTS TO SECURE THE RETURN OF AMERICAN PERSONNEL WHO MIGHT STILL BE IN COMMUNIST CUSTODY

The Korean Armistice Agreement provided for the return within 60 days from the effective date of the Armistice of all prisoners of war who desire repatriation. The United Nations Command has made every effort to make sure that all United Nations Command prisoners in Communist custody who wish repatriation are returned.

The United Nations Command has collected information from every known source to make sure that all prisoners were accounted for. It has gathered information from letters written home by prisoners, and by questioning former prisoners, by monitoring Communist radio broadcasts and by examining the actual circumstances of the disappearance of United Nations Command personnel from United Nations Command control.

The careful screening of this information has produced evidence that there might be some United Nations Command personnel in Communist custody who were not returned during the prisoner of war exchange, nor turned over to the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission nor otherwise accounted for by the Communists. While the United Nations Command has not had evidence that can be considered definite proof of the death or survival of the personnel not accounted for, there has been reason to believe that the Communists could furnish further information about these personnel.

A list of approximately 3,400 United Nations personnel carried as missing in action was presented by the United Nations Command to the Communist representatives on the Military Armistice Commission on September 9, 1953 with a demand that the Communists account for them. This list included the names of 944 Americans.

The United Nations Command demanded that the Communists account for all 944 men and that they return all who might still be living. It has not been believed, nor has the United Nations Command ever implied, that all 944 men were living. In many cases the information available about personnel not accounted for has been scanty and inconclusive.

On September 21, 1953, the Communists replied to the United Nations Command demand for an accounting of the missing personnel. They said that many of the men whose names were on the list had never been captured by their forces. They claimed knowledge of approximately 900 United Nations personnel (including only 112 Americans), all of whom the Communists claimed were either deceased, escaped or released at the front.

On September 24 the United Nations Command in a letter to the Communists said that it considered their reply wholly unacceptable. The United Nations Command letter pointed out that by signing the Armistice Agreement the Communists had undertaken a solemn obligation to repatriate or to hand over to the custody of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission all of the captured persons held by them at the time of the Armistice. In addition it was pointed out that this obligation is binding upon them and applies to all United Nations personnel held in custody.

On November 21 the United Nations Command again protested in the Military Armistice Commission to the Communists that they had still failed to give a satisfactory reply concerning the list of United Nations Command personnel unaccounted for and pointed out that additional evidence provided by three Republic of Korea prisoners of war who had escaped from the Communists corroborated the United Nations Command statements that the Communists were withholding prisoners of war. At that time the United Nations Command demanded that the Communists "hand over to the custody of the Custodian Forces of India all those prisoners that your side still retains."

On December 7, the United Nations representative to the Military Armistice Commission requested the Communist side to agree to an impartial investigation of the evidence given by the three defectors. The Communists rejected this proposal.

On January 18 and January 26, 1954, the United Nations Representative to the Military Armistice Commission again requested the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission to investigate the charge that the Communists were withholding prisoners of war.

In the meantime, further information regarding the fate of those missing in action has been obtained from United Nations Command personnel returned by the Communists. This information has in many cases justified formal findings of death.

It has been suggested that some of our men are being held by the Communists because they are technically qualified specialists. It is doubtful that any of our men are being held for this reason. Examination of the list of those still unaccounted for shows that most of them are enlisted personnel without special technical qualifications.

Although it must be recognized that there is a diminishing basis for optimism concerning the fate of many of these men, it will continue to be the purpose of the United Nations Command and the United States Government to obtain the return of all

United Nations personnel who may still be alive and in Communist custody, and to obtain information concerning other personnel still unaccounted for. All feasible measures are being taken to accomplish this objective and we will continue to investigate every source of information that is available.

PUBLIC SERVICES DIVISION,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 10, 1954.*

PENALTY ON TOBACCO GROWN OVER ALLOTMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on March 1, I introduced for myself and on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], S. 3050, dealing with the imposition of a penalty on tobacco that is grown over the allotment.

I have received a telegram from Marion Fowler, of the Lake City (S. C.) Tobacco Market, which was addressed to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. It has a bearing upon the bill which has been introduced, and is an expression of views of the tobacco growers in the Lake City area.

I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAKE CITY, S. C., *March 1, 1954.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate:

Re tel, have contacted number of growers over State belt as well as various interested parties you suggested contacting, and in every case introducing and passage of such bill as Senator CLEMENTS has in mind was favorable. Practice of excessive overplanting tobacco beyond allotment tends to undermine present program and has caused much dissatisfaction in many communities as those farmers living up to allowed acreage requirements feel it unfair other growers plant more than allotment. Increase in penalty rate would certainly help to reduce overplanting and some growers contacted suggested a penalty rate even greater than 50 percent. Without divulging names or details of matter your wire I contacted tobacconists on each market as well as growers over wide area. Will continue survey and give you further report by letter. Feel sure, and your contacts here agree, such a bill is proper step to correct situation overplanting. If desirous further information or details don't hesitate to call me collect. Kind regards to all of you.

MARION FOWLER,
Lake City Tobacco Market.

THE NEVADA REPUBLICAN CONVENTION AND THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Republican Party of Nevada is proud of the accomplishments of this administration.

At the State convention of the Republican Party, held in Las Vegas, Nev., February 5–6, delegates applauded changes made under the leadership of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and adopted resolutions commending the national administration.

The junior Senator from Nevada had the great privilege and pleasure of attending this convention, participating in its deliberations, and obtaining at firsthand the views and counsel of the delegates.

These delegates, as are all Nevadans, are fine Americans. They represent the major segments of the Nation's economic life—agriculture, labor, mining and mineral, and chemical-resource development, transportation, education, and important national-defense industries. They are a splendid cross section of America, vitally concerned in America's prosperity and destiny rather than that of distant foreign lands. They are concerned about American living standards, American production, and American investment and development.

The people of Nevada believe that the working men and investors of the United States should be protected against the slave and low-cost labor of Europe, Africa, and Asia.

Where the national administration has affected changes from the warped and misguided policies of the previous administrations the people of Nevada, or at least a very substantial majority of the Nation's sixth largest State, are proud and happy.

Nevada's electorate, it may be recalled, affected a change also in the last presidential election, casting more than 60 percent of the popular vote for President Eisenhower, after they had voted in five previous elections for the Democratic nominee.

CHANGES FROM NEW DEAL COMMENDED

The people of Nevada voted for a change and the Republican State committee, at its recent convention, noted and commended 11 changes that have been accomplished in the first year of President Eisenhower's administration by resolutions unanimously adopted.

By equally unanimous resolutions the Republican State convention called for further changes, all from New Deal policies to Republican policies, and they did this with full expectation that a Republican national administration will bring about these changes.

Foremost among changes from Democrat to Republican policies was, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, that relating to foreign trade.

Mr. President, the resolution on that subject reads:

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to domestic industry;

Whereas article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect * * * duties, imposts and excises" (tariffs or import fees) and "to regulate foreign commerce"; and

Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce, through the adjustment of duties, imposts and excises, through its agent the Tariff Commission and allow the Trade Agreements Act—the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act—which transferred such responsibility to the President, to expire in June of 1954.

Mr. President, the sentiment expressed in this fine resolution is the sentiment not only of Nevada Republicans but of citizens and official bodies generally in the West, and I am sure, in many other parts of the Nation.

CALIFORNIA RESOLUTION

Less than a year ago the Legislature of the State of California, by joint resolution expressed similar sentiments. The resolution entitled "Joint resolution concerning the restoration to Congress of the fixing of tariffs" reads as follows:

Whereas it is essential to the protection of the American standard of living and the American way of life that products of foreign countries be admitted to this country only on a basis which will not endanger the living standards of the American workingman and the American farmer and will not threaten serious economic injury to any domestic industry; and

Whereas promotion of world trade by the Government of the United States should adhere to this principle so that the economic status of the American people may be maintained and not reduced to that in the depressed areas of the world where work is performed behind the sweatshops curtain; and

Whereas, while recent imports of live cattle and frozen and cannec beef from Mexico, Canada, New Zealand, and other areas have dramatically highlighted the problem with respect to one industry, yet it is a problem affecting all the branches of agriculture, industry, and commercial production; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States abandoned its traditional function of fixing tariffs on foreign commerce entering the United States under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 to the executive department of the Government, which has carried out policies inconsistent with the welfare of American agriculture, industry, and commerce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California most respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to return to its traditional method of fixing tariffs based on principles of protection of American agriculture, industry, and commerce, and the standards of living for all American citizens created thereby; and be it further

Resolved, That until Congress so acts, the executive department of the Government exercises its powers to fixing tariffs only in accordance with the traditional principles of American policy as set forth in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, that is a resolution adopted by the legislature of the great State of California early in this administration, but to date not acted on by the administration.

The junior Senator from Nevada is happy that his party, the Republican Party, and its organization in Nevada, concur so warmly with the resolution adopted by the California Legislature,

and have renewed the appeal to the administration expressed in the earlier California resolution.

California and Nevada are neighbors, and, I may say, good neighbors. Our 2 States have the longest contiguous border of any 2 States in the Nation. We see eye to eye on many of the pressing problems that confront the West as well as other sections of the country, and we see eye to eye on policies looking toward restoring foreign trade to a basis of fair and reasonable competition with American workers and investors.

Mr. President, the Legislature of California petitions the Congress of the United States to return to its traditional method of fixing tariffs based on principles of protection of American agriculture, industry, and commerce.

OUTLAW DISASTROUS TRADE AGREEMENTS

It wants the iniquitous Trade Agreements Act of 1934 which has done so much harm to the Nation and particularly to the West expunged from the statute books.

Mr. President, the Republican Party in Nevada, representing as it does fine Americans in all walks of life, wants the New Deal proforeign trade-away act of 1934 to die on June 12 of this year, its expiration date.

Republicans in Nevada want restored the constitutional responsibility of Congress to regulate foreign trade, the American policy and the historic policy, the traditional Republican policy on foreign trade.

With a Republican administration in power, Mr. President, this change to the American way is far overdue.

Other changes from the system inaugurated by the Democratic Party are also long overdue, and the delegates to the Nevada State Republican Convention dealt with them, too.

They declared by unanimous resolution, for example, "that the policies of the Government of the United States have for a period of years prior to 1953 discriminated against the mining industry of the State of Nevada."

That, of course, is very true. It is true today and doubtless will be true so long as the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 remains in effect and a foreign-minded State Department in administering this act favors foreign mining, mine production, and mine development, to the injury and destruction of the American mining industry.

In addition to asking that the disastrous and destructive Trade Agreements Act of 1934 die on its scheduled execution date, the Nevada Republican Convention called on the Government of the United States to lend its sincere attention to aid the mining industry of Nevada and the Western States.

UNITED STATES MINING DISCRIMINATED AGAINST

In a further resolution the Nevada State Republican Convention urged an expanded stockpiling program giving full preference to domestic producers.

Mr. President, for 20 years it has been the official policy of the Government to discriminate against the American mining industry and to treat it as expendable in deals with foreign nations.

Foreign mines and mineral development and foreign metal production have been encouraged. Domestic mining and metals production have been and are being discouraged, and some industries and enterprises have been destroyed.

State Department diplomats, with no knowledge of minerals or mining, have for 20 years put the American mining industry on a disparity with foreign producers, with other segments of America's economy, and with respect to purchases for our strategic stockpile.

They have disregarded or evaded the Buy American Act and superseded it with their own never legalized policy of "buy foreign."

To cite one example, it has been only since last December that these proforeign statesmen have stopped encouraging the payment of 36½ cents a pound for Chilean copper—6½ cents above the world price and more than America's copper industry was receiving for American copper, produced by Americans in American copper mines.

Nevada Republicans do not appreciate queer deals like that, and they expect a Republican administration to eliminate the proforeign mining and metals policy of the New Deal and substitute for it the time-honored Republican policy of "buy American."

Nevada Republicans are concerned also about the proforeign policies in the case of lead and zinc.

Mr. President, in a recent statement to the press I called attention to the fact that zinc production in Nevada last year slumped 62 percent, or to only 5,900 tons of metal in our once thriving zinc industry.

While this drop in Nevada production was occurring, zinc imports from foreign mines doubled to 230,000 tons.

MINERS VICTIMS OF FOREIGN DUMPING

The junior Senator from Nevada stated then, and he repeats now, that we have conclusive evidence that the greater part of the imports of zinc during 1953 came from stocks which had been accumulated in foreign countries during the period when price ceilings had been fixed as a result of our defense program.

The lead and zinc industry in Nevada and throughout the United States is, in fact, the victim of foreign dumping.

The Legislature of the State of Idaho, at its last session, held during this administration, adopted Senate Joint Memorial No. 7, protesting foreign dumping and policies destructive to the American mining industry. The resolution, addressed to the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and others, reads as follows:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, in legislative session, duly and regularly assembled, most respectfully present the following preamble and resolution, to wit:

"Whereas the base mining industry of the United States has suffered serious curtailment, and is threatened with further curtailment, through dumping of lead and zinc from low-wage foreign countries creating an unemployment situation for a large number of the American metal miners; and

"Whereas the domestic lead and zinc miner has suffered from the effects of currency devaluation and the monopolistic practices of foreign governments in the purchase and sale of metals; and

"Whereas Idaho as well as many other sections of the United States, is in a large measure dependent upon the new wealth created by the mining and processing of these metals for the maintenance of its economy and for the purchasing of commodities needed by Idaho but not produced in Idaho; and

"Whereas unemployment and loss of production caused by dumping from low-wage countries is depriving local, county, and State governments of much needed tax income; and

"Whereas the American taxpayer has been called upon to finance the expansion of foreign production of metals and minerals in competition with home production to the detriment of the development of reserves vitally needed in this country for national security; and

"Whereas propaganda from Washington during recent years has endeavored, without foundation, to place this country in a have-not class, to the end that tariffs on basic commodities, including metals, should be abandoned: Now, therefore, be it jointly

"*Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the 32d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (the Governor of the State of Idaho concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to approve legislation for the stabilizing of the market for metals at prices consistent with the prevailing domestic economic level through the enactment of constructive legislation providing for a sliding scale stabilization import tax. This legislation will promote the development of our natural resources and protect our domestic economy in the interest of national security; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho, be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson; Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; Howard I. Young, Deputy Administrator, Defense Materials Procurement Agency; J. D. Small, Chairman, Munitions Board; Hon. Henry C. Dworshak, United States Senate; Hon. Herman Welker, United States Senate; Hon. Hamer H. Budge and Hon. Gracie Pfost, United States House of Representatives; Hon. Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States; Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Speaker of the House; Hon. George W. Malone, chairman, Senate Mines Committee, and Hon. A. L. Miller, chairman of House Internal and Insular Affairs Committee."

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 21st day of February 1953.

EDSON H. DEAL,
President of the Senate.

HAVE-NOT PROPAGANDA DENOUNCED

Mr. President, I would be remiss if I did not include the splendid resolution adopted during this administration by the legislature of my own State of Nevada, which properly denounces the persistent propaganda from Washington that ours is a have-not nation, and which calls on the administration to promote and protect the natural resources of America.

The resolution, in which I concur completely, reads as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 12

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of domestic mines

Whereas the base metal mining industry of the United States has suffered serious curtailment, and is threatened with further

curtailment, through dumping of lead and zinc from low-wage foreign countries; and

Whereas the domestic lead and zinc miner has suffered from the effects of currency devaluation and the monopolistic practices of foreign governments in the purchase and sale of metals; and

Whereas Nevada, as well as many other sections of the United States, is in a large measure dependent upon the new wealth created by the mining and processing of these metals for the maintenance of its economy and for the purchasing of commodities needed by Nevada but not produced in Nevada; and

Whereas unemployment and loss of production caused by dumping from low-wage countries is depriving local, county, and State governments of much-needed tax income; and

Whereas the American taxpayer has been called upon to finance the expansion of foreign production of metals and minerals in competition with home production to the detriment of the development of reserves vitally needed in this country for national security; and

Whereas propaganda from Washington during recent years has endeavored, without foundation, to place this country in a have-not class, to the end that tariffs on basic commodities, including metals, should be abandoned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to approve legislation for the stabilizing of the market for metals at prices consistent with the prevailing domestic economic level through the enactment of constructive legislation providing for a sliding scale stabilization import tax. This legislation will promote the development of our natural resources and protect our domestic economy in the interest of national security; be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to each member of the Nevada congressional delegation, to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

OPPOSE TRADE ACT EXTENSION

Mr. President, I also wish to include in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the following resolution proposed during this administration by the Advisory Mining Board of the State of Nevada:

Whereas the mining industry in Nevada has in the past, and is now suffering because of low prices on their minerals which has been brought about by the importation of minerals produced in foreign countries, who have low wages and standards of living; and

Whereas there is now an active campaign sponsored by certain foreign countries and American citizens who consume these minerals, under the slogan "trade, not aid" to convince Congress that we should continue to give foreign aid in the form of free trade rather than direct aid even though our mines close; and

Whereas the means of accomplishing this is through a continuation of so-called reciprocal trade agreements, which past experience has shown to be the cause of unemployment in the mining industry; and

Whereas the political party in power in Nevada has pledged itself to protect American labor and industry from unfair foreign competition by establishing the principle of flexible import fees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are opposed to any extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and ask that Congress again assume the responsibility of protecting the American workman and investor against unfair competition from abroad. We do favor the establishment in this country of a market for goods of foreign nations on the basis of fair and reasonable competition which will protect workers and investors against foreign low wages and low standards of living, and maintain a healthy domestic mining industry. Equalization of the difference between wages and standards of living here and abroad can best be accomplished by the adoption, by Congress, of the flexible import free principle; be it further

Resolved, That the above resolution is a recommendation to Gov. Charles H. Russell, of Nevada, and we ask that he forward a copy of this resolution to Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Senator PATRICK MCCARRAN, and Congressman CLIFTON YOUNG.

CHARLES H. RUSSELL,
Governor.

ROY A. HARDY,
Chairman, Advisory Mining Board.

LOUIS D. CORDON,
Secretary, Nevada Mining Association.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada brings these resolutions to the attention of the Senate with the full hope and expectation that the administration will, during this session of the Congress, give favorable consideration to them.

During the 1952 presidential campaign, it will be recalled, great emphasis was placed on encouragement of American enterprise and cooperation between Federal and State Governments and the Federal Government and other political units.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Nevada understood the campaign, one of the aims was to return to responsible government. I should like to point out that in 1934 the Congress of the United States transferred to the Executive its constitutional duty to regulate foreign trade and to adjust excises and fees on imports. In practice such power often has turned out to be in the hands of the Secretary of State.

I wish to call attention also to the fact that the problem is not solely a Western State problem; it is a problem of the textile industry in the New England States, where the present presiding officer of the Senate [Mr. PURTELL] lives, and it is a problem of the Southern and Middle States.

I recall that Governor Kennon, of Louisiana, testified before the Subcommittee on Minerals, Metals, and Fuels, which conducted hearings under Senate Resolution 143 to determine the availability of critical materials to the United States in time of war, and also to investigate into the Nation's expanding economy and security.

Governor Kennon said in part that he believed we should of course import whatever was necessary; but he said, regarding the subject of importing petroleum from the Middle East, an area from which it has been established by the committee that no oil could be imported during world war No. 4, or whatever number it may be accorded in history, that we must have available to us in the Western Hemisphere, and primarily in the United States and adjacent countries, sufficient fuel to enable us to fight in time of war and to live in time of peace.

Governor Kennon said that we pay the present high taxes and high wages to support a great market, the greatest market the world has ever seen; and then companies and individuals operating in foreign countries, where low wages and low taxes are in effect, send their products into our country and take a part of the American market. He said it was obvious to everyone that if all the materials we needed were suddenly imported and manufactured into finished products, our economy would fall tomorrow; but by having imported materials come into our country a little at a time, something would be paid into the United States Treasury which would in whole or in part make up the difference between wages and taxes in effect in foreign countries where such companies operate, and those in effect in this country.

Governor Kennon finally said he did not believe a quota system would be proper, or that subsidies should be paid. We would have to call whatever was imposed a duty, as the Constitution refers to it, or a tariff, as it is customarily called now. Such a charge should be levied in order to make up the difference between the wages and taxes in effect in this country and those in effect in countries where our chief competition is located. In my opinion, his statement covered the subject in the best way anyone has handled it before the committee.

The professions on the part of Republican candidates gave hope and encouragement to the electorate, and contributed in no small degree, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, to the happy results of the election.

There were no pledges, to my knowledge, of cooperation with individuals who embrace the philosophies of free trade and one economic world, or of adherence to their global theories, in marked disparity with the expressed wishes of legislative bodies of the various States.

As I stated before, the emphasis was all on closer working relationships with State and other governmental bodies in the interest of relaxing centralized controls and the encouragement of free enterprise.

Today, as under the New Deal and the Fair Deal, the State Department exercises life-or-death control over American industries and resource development through concessions to foreign nations and foreign-trade manipulations.

In no instance, within the knowledge of the junior Senator from Nevada, has the State Department, since the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, ever officially weighed or acted favorably upon a resolution adopted by the legislature of a State pertaining to protection of American commodities against sweatshop foreign competition.

If the State Department, in its queer dealings and negotiations at Annecy, France; Torquay, England; Geneva, Switzerland, or other far-off places where it makes its trade agreements, has ever favored an American industry over a foreign industry wishing to invade or capture the American market, it has escaped my notice. Certainly there has been no such instance in connection with the mining industry, and I have followed that very closely.

It is the belief of the junior Senator from Nevada that the administration will honor its campaign assurances of closer Federal-State relationships and cooperation between the Federal Government and other governmental units. When it does this, the legislative enactments of the sovereign States will have greater weight, and I trust greater weight than the advice and counsels of self-interest freetraders or the fanatical advocates of one economic world.

Dumping policies, encouraged by these global theorists, will be halted and our domestic industries, so vital to our security, will revive.

RESOURCE INDUSTRIES VICTIMS OF DUMPING

The mining industry of the United States as a whole, the wool industry, the oil industry, the coal industry, and scores of other industries are today victims of foreign dumpings encouraged by the proforeign Trade Agreements Act of 1934.

The Republican Party in Nevada and, I am sure, the overwhelming majority of the people of Nevada and of other western States want this act, which has done and is doing irreparable harm to workingmen and investors, to expire.

They want the Republican Party to be Republican.

Mr. President, the Republican Party has performed and is performing like a Republican Party in many fields. Eleven of these fields are listed in resolution No. 1, adopted at the Republican State convention held early this month in Las Vegas, Nev. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 1—COMMENDATION OF NATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Whereas the national administration under the leadership of President Dwight D. Eisenhower has accomplished among other things, the following: (a) The truce in Korea; (b) the elimination of many poor security risks in Government; (c) the reverse of the trend toward limitless expansion of Government; (d) the reduction of taxes wherever possible; (e) the determined policy of dealing with foreign powers and the secession of the policy of containment of the former Democratic administration; (f) the return of responsibility and authority to State and local governments; (g) the removal of price and wage controls, allowing for a competitive system of private enterprise; (h) adjustment in the social-security laws to the benefit of people generally; (i) a general reduction of foreign monetary aid; (j) enactment of a beneficial and practical agricultural program leading to the encouragement of self-reliance of the industry; (k) speedy action in the administration of the drought relief program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national Republican administration be commended for its accomplishments and for its firm dedication in its new course of action providing for the prosperity and well-being of the American people.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, equal commendation will be given, I am sure, when the Republican administration and the Republican Congress, in which I am proud to serve, adopt the Republican policy of fair treatment to all industries in the United States, their workingmen and investors, halts the bartering away of our wealth and resources, to the advantage of foreign nations, and returns to what I call the American system.

BRICKER AMENDMENT URGED

The Republican Party of Nevada met in a State convention which was called for the purpose of the protection of America and Americans, not only with relation to industry and trade, but also with respect to our constitutional rights. The Republican delegates at Las Vegas adopted unanimously the following resolution:

BRICKER AMENDMENT

Whereas a question has arisen that a law enacted in conformance with the treaty-making powers of the United States Government could violate the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas in order to protect the people of the United States from the loss of their constitutional rights, Senator JOHN W. BRICKER and 62 of his colleagues in the United States Senate have introduced a proposed constitutional amendment restricting treaties and executive agreements from violating the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States adopt proper legislation incorporating the intent and purpose of the Bricker amendment.

Mr. President, I think the delegates to that convention will be happy to know that although the Bricker amendment lost by one vote in the Senate of the United States, a motion has now been made to recall it to the floor of the Senate.

NEVADA RESOLUTIONS

The Republican State convention held this month at Las Vegas adopted resolutions which the junior Senator from Nevada is sure deserve the attention of this body and the administration.

I ask unanimous consent to have these resolutions incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLD STANDARD

Whereas the operators of gold-producing mines within the State of Nevada have been adversely affected for a number of years by the policy of the Government of the United States setting a ceiling on the price of gold; and

Whereas the monetary system of the United States is not now backed by gold: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Government of the United States restore the gold standard, and remove restrictions on the purchase, sale, or ownership of gold, and provide for full interchangeability of gold and the dollar at a fixed ratio.

COMMENDATION OF NEVADA STATE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

Whereas the State of Nevada, under the leadership of Gov. Charles Russell, has grown and prospered; and

Whereas the financially sound program being followed has resulted in the accumulation of the largest surplus in our State treasury in all of our State's history; and

Whereas the people of Nevada are enjoying leadership committed to the best interests of the State of Nevada in its entirety, and not to the special benefit of the few: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention commend heartily the present Republican administration of the State of Nevada.

REMOVE GOVERNMENT FROM PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Whereas the Government of the United States has, until the election of the present Republican administration, followed a program of engaging in several phases of business and industry to the detriment of State and Federal tax structures and leading toward socialistic practices: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government remove itself from those pursuits which are the province of private enterprise.

FOUR-LANE HIGHWAY OVER DONNER SUMMIT

Whereas it is to the best interests and safety of the people of the United States that United States Highway 40, over Donner Summit, be widened to four lanes; and

Whereas the widening of said highway would materially aid the economy of the State of Nevada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That proper legislation be enacted to ultimately provide a four-lane highway on United States Highway 40 through the critical Donner Summit area.

THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Whereas the American Indian has long been denied his rightful privileges in keeping with his American citizenship; and

Whereas the United States Indian Bureau employs more people than the group it seeks to administer; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Indian be placed on a plane of responsibility, with privileges in keeping with his American citizenship, and that the powers of the United States Indian Bureau be reduced until said Bureau is completely abolished.

REPRESENTATIVE YOUNG PRAISED—COMMENDATION OF NEVADA'S REPUBLICAN REPRESENTATION IN WASHINGTON

Whereas Senator GEORGE W. MALONE and Congressman CLIFTON YOUNG have demonstrated their unswerving devotion to the best interests of our Nation and the State of Nevada by vigorously fighting for their beliefs and by constant attention to detail, have exemplified the finest Republican tradition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention go on record as commending our outstanding Representatives now serving our State.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the commendation of my colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable CLIFTON YOUNG, is most deserved. He has, as the resolution states, given devoted service both to the State of Nevada and to the Nation.

Of course, I am grateful for the kind references to me in the resolution, and I shall always seek to merit them.

The junior Senator from Nevada will always fight vigorously for his beliefs, which are, he might add, uncompromisingly Republican. He will work for Republican principles, confident that Republican principles are, as they have been throughout the 100 years of Republican history, in the best interests of the people, the 48 sovereign States, and our sovereign Nation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had

agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2326) to amend the Act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

SUBVERSIVES CROSSING THE MEXICAN BORDER

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] made the charge that approximately 100 subversives were daily crossing the Mexican border into the United States; and in support of this he cited a statement given before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, which did appear to say that at one time 100 members or former members of the Communist Party had daily crossed the border at El Paso, Tex.

Mr. President, I have been informed by the Commissioner of Immigration that the Senator from New York has not correctly interpreted the statement, and that no subversives are now crossing the Mexican border into the United States, within their knowledge. The Commissioner is preparing a statement which will clear up any incorrect impression left by the testimony cited yesterday by the Senator from New York.

On Monday, I shall present to the Senate the letter and statement from the Commissioner of Immigration; but, Mr. President, I am glad to say at this time that I have been assured that it will be clear that the statement made yesterday by the Senator from New York—namely, that 100 subversives are now coming, each day, into this country, from Mexico—is incorrect.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, March 8, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4 (legislative day of March 1), 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

J. Ernest Wilkins, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor, vice Spencer Miller, Jr.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Ray H. Schoonover, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal for the western district of Wisconsin, vice John M. Comeford, resigned.

UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Robert F. A. Studds to be Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for a term of 4 years, effective May 12, 1954.

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned captain

Walter H. Bainbridge
Carl I. Aslakson
Paul A. Smith

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Karl S. Day

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John D. Macklin
Bertrand T. Fay

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the beneficent and supreme ruler of the universe and the guiding intelligence in the life of men and nations, we rejoice that here in our beloved country Thou hast ordained and established sovereignty by the free will of the people.

Grant that our citizens may always have a lofty conception of the Presidency, rendering unto him who occupies this exalted position that respect, reverence, honor, and encouragement to which his sacred office entitles him.

May all the Members of the Congress, who are joined with the President in the exercise of government, rule in the fear of God and be given that favor and influence with the people they represent, which come from doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with the Lord.

Wilt Thou hear and answer our petitions as we daily pray for our fellow Members who are absent from this Chamber by reason of illness and who need Thy healing ministry.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 355. Joint resolution amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2714. An act to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Public Works Committee may meet this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION IS BECOMING SERIOUS

Mr HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, if anyone still entertains any doubts that we are in the throes of a serious economic situation, I invite him to visit my congressional district. As I go through the district, as I talk to the people, as I observe the increasing rolls of the unemployed, I cannot help but feel uneasy about the future.

Former President Herbert Hoover, who considers himself an expert on economic depressions, recently assured the Nation it can have high confidence that it is not headed into another great depression such as the one of the early 1930's. He referred to the present situation as only a passing dip. When such assurances come from the man whose very name is associated with the "Hoover depression," and whose words still have that familiar ring of prosperity is just around the corner, then it is high time for us to consider this situation a little more seriously.

Mr. Speaker, about a month ago—on February 4, 1954—I called to the attention of this House the unemployment situation in my congressional district. I cited facts and figures about layoffs in the Brooklyn Navy Yard in my district. I told of the closing down of the Naval Clothing Factory and the transfer of the Naval Supply Facilities from Brooklyn to a depot elsewhere. I stressed how the unemployment situation resulting therefrom is having a serious economic strain on the economy of our community. In my appeal for "prompt and forceful action" by the administration, I said:

While the administration is still sitting back taking no measures to deal with this snowballing unemployment situation, the problem is assuming serious dimensions in our local communities. In my district, the effects of the situation are becoming more noticeable with each passing day. Not only is the growing unemployment affecting the workers and their families directly involved, but also those who live in constant fear of an approaching layoff, and it is also having a telling effect on the storekeeper, the small-business man, and the manufacturer whose

volume of business is shrinking. In short, the whole community suffers because of this most infectious disease.

Mr. Speaker, I ask again: What is the administration doing about these people? Does it have any plans to cope with the situation? What steps is it taking to prevent a breakdown of our economic foundations? I am still waiting for a reply to these questions.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that those of us who call attention to this situation and warn of the coming dangers are derided and scorned. "They are trying to talk the country into a depression," charged one administration spokesman. "Folks who are out of jobs these days and who think business is not good are just a bunch of eggheads," said another. This is the way the administration is fighting the current economic recession.

But while they talk of eggheads and dips and seasonal readjustment, unemployment keeps growing and the number of claimants for unemployment compensation increases every week. According to information just released by the United States Department of Labor, more persons claimed unemployment compensation benefit in mid-February of this year than at any time since February 1950. By the middle of February 1954 unemployment insurance claims totaled 2,179,000, or about double the figure of a year ago at this time. The total of such claims for the week ending February 13 was greater by 58,500 over the preceding week, according to the Labor Department.

I am citing these official figures on unemployment compensation because these figures cannot be questioned. Unfortunately, where it concerns statistics dealing with unemployment there are many who question the veracity of these figures given out periodically by the Government. It is claimed that the unemployment statistics are either inaccurate or are several months behind. Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, recently observed on the Senate floor:

> There is no question about the fact that unemployment has increased to a serious degree. In fact, if we had accurate figures, which I am satisfied we do not have—because the administration cannot even agree on the base which it should use for measuring unemployment—I think they would show the number of unemployed persons in the United States today to be nearer 4 million than 3 million.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot sit back and simply wait, as has been suggested, for an upturn in the spring or summer. What if the upturn never materializes? What if the situation gets out of hand by then? This course is as dangerous as it is unrealistic.

We cannot turn our heads away from the facts and hope that somehow the annoying unemployment problem will miraculously disappear, when headlines across the Nation continue to paint a grim picture of mounting joblessness in New York, Masssachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Oregon, Washington, California, and other States. It indicates a clear and steady drift toward economic depression.

Now is the time to come forward with an effective Government program to deal with this problem before the drift swells into a deluge and inundates the entire Nation. Such program should include steps to strengthen the unemployment-insurance system, broaden the social-security system, increase the minimum wage, extend tax reduction to the low-income people and the great mass of consumers instead of big business, undertake a huge housing program designed for low- and middle-income families, as well as a large-scale program of public works, new schools, good roads, and similar projects from which the people would benefit.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of a program that was initiated by men of vision and faith two decades ago under the inspiring leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It helped then, it will help now. Let us learn from past experience.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day fixed for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ALBERT VINCENT, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6033) for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Albert Vincent, Sr., route 1, box 337, St. Martinville, La., the sum of $336, in full settlement of all claims of said Albert Vincent, Sr., against the United States for regular subsistence pay for the period September 26, 1949, through January 17, 1950, in the adult academic education program through the Iberia Parish School Board in Louisiana: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILHELM ENGELBERT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 153) for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wilhelm Engelbert shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FELIX S. SCHORR AND WIFE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 303) for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third third, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER PENOVIC ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1432) for the relief of Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, and Nikola Maljkovic.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MICHELE PACCIONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 666) for the relief of Michele Paccione.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Michele Paccione, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Dominic J. Savino, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIM MI HAE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 858) for the relief of Kim Mi Hae.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Kim Mi Hae, the Korean fiance of Walter C. Brown, a citizen of the United States and a veteran of World War II presently serving in the United States Air Force, and that the said Kim Mi Hae shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Kim Mi Hae is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Walter C. Brown, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kim Mi Hae, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be

deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C. title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kim Mi Hae, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Kim Mi Hae as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax:

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kim Mi Hae, the fiance of Walter C. Brown, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Kim Mi Hae is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Walter C. Brown and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kim Mi Hae, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kim Mi Hae, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Kim Mi Hae as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER A. PIROGOV

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1100) for the relief of Peter A. Pirogov.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter A. Pirogov shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. In the administration of that act, the said Peter A. Pirogov shall not be regarded as having been at any time prior to the enactment of this act a person within the provisions of section 212 (a) (28) (c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163).

SEC. 2. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 6, strike out the words "the date of the enactment of this act" and substitute in lieu thereof "February 4, 1949."

On line 10, strike out "(c)" and substitute in lieu thereof "(C)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sincerely pleased that the House has seen fit to grant its unanimous consent to the passage of H. R. 1100, a private bill which I introduced, at the request of a representative of one of the executive agencies of our Government, for the relief of Peter A. Pirogov.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall the newspaper headlines of October 20, 1948, which informed us that 2 Soviet officers had fled to American controlled Austria, landing their twin-engine Soviet bomber at a United States Army base near Linz, Austria, on October 9, 1948. This was the first instance where Soviet airmen had had the courage to flee the oppression of their native land to seek freedom elsewhere. The two airmen credited the Voice of America broadcasts as the final inspiration in their determination to escape Russian despotism.

Mr. Pirogov stated at a press interview held at the time of his escape that his personal ideas and ideology were not in agreement with the Communist ideology. He said:

I feel that the Government should answer the needs and desires of the people. * * * I feel that the Soviet Union does not meet the needs and desires of the people.

Mr. Pirogov told the press that he was desirous of obtaining asylum in this country because he believed in freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom to work and to live.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pirogov has been in this country since February 4, 1949. Since that time, he has given valuable assistance to various agencies of our Government. Since his arrival here he has met and married a very charming young lady, who like himself is a Russian refugee. Approximately a year and a half ago she presented him with twin daughters, born in our land of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pirogov's statements to the press upon his escape speak for themselves. His conduct since coming to this country has been exemplary. This augurs well for the future. I am confident that he will continue to be an asset to our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the membership of the House joins with me in extending to Mr. Pirogov and his family a continued happy and successful life in these United States.

PRAMOVIL VACLAV MALY AND JARMILA MALY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3145) for the relief of Pramovil Vaclav Maly and Jarmila Maly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the aliens Pramovil Vaclav Maly and Jarmila Maly shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011, 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1953).

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "and head taxes."

On page 1, line 4, strike out "Pramovil" and substitute the name "Pravomil."

On pages 1 and 2, beginning on page 1, line 11, after the words "to deduct two numbers", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following: "from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Pravomil Vaclav Maly and Jarmila Maly."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETRA FUMIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3836) for the relief of Petra Fumia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Petra Fumia, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Angelo Ruta, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MADELEINE ALICE AQUARONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7559) for the relief of Mrs. Madeleine Alice Aquarone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and nationality laws, section 352 (a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. 1484 (a) (2)) shall not apply to Mrs. Madeleine Alice Aquarone, a citizen of the United States, for such time as the employment of her husband, Stanislas Aquarone, by the International Court of Justice at The Hauge, The Netherlands, is the reason for her continued residence abroad: *Provided*, That Mrs. Aquarone begins to reside permanently in the United States prior to the expiration of 1 year after the termination of such employment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATTHEW J. BERCKMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 827) for the relief of Matthew J. Berckman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Matthew J. Berckman, of Jersey City, N. J., the sum of $16,119.76, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for furnishing information which led to the discovery, and forfeiture to the United States, of gold bullion, valued at $171,197.60, about to be shipped unlawfully out of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES T. DOUDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2634) for the relief of Charles T. Douds.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles T. Douds, Englewood, N. J., the sum of $12,229.66. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Charles T. Douds against the United States for losses in compensation he sustained, and expenses he incurred, as the result of his removal and separation without pay from his position as regional director, region 2, National Labor Relations Board, effective February 20, 1945. On February 27, 1947, he was restored to his position, after the United States Civil Service Commission, upon appeal from the Board's removal action, had concluded that the evidence on record did not justify his removal and recommended his restoration. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the sum and insert "$10,777.06."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE JAPHET

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2636) for the relief of George Japhet.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George Japhet, of New York, N. Y., the sum of $1,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said George Japhet against the United States for reimbursement of collateral furnished upon a surety bond of the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland to the United States given upon the admission of Gabriella Japhet to the United States for medical treatment, which bond was subsequently forfeited: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARTIN G. SCOTT AND HANNA VON GUSMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2666) for the relief of Martin G. Scott and Hanna von Gusmann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Martin G. Scott the sum of $354.50; and to Hanna von Gusmann the sum of $776. Such sums are designated in full satisfaction of such employees' claims against the United States for compensation for reasonable and necessary personal property lost while in the course of their duties as a result of war and conditions resulting from war, which claims have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendations of a Treasury Claim Board: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT F. SUCZEK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4699) for the relief of Robert F. Suczek.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Robert F. Suczek, of 3301 Betty Lane, Lafayette, Calif., be, and he is hereby, relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $333.20. Such sum represents overpayment in subsistence allowance made to said Robert F. Suczek, through an error on the part of the Veterans' Administration.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. RICHARD ORME FLINN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4735) for the relief of Lt. Col. Richard Orme Flinn, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to relieve Lt. Col. Richard Orme Flinn, Jr., Chaplain Corps, United States Army Reserve, serial No. O-260011, of all liability to refund the sum of $5,440.80. Such sum represents overpayment of increased rental and subsistence allowances on the account of a dependent child (his ward, Thomas Jack Wheeler) for the period of March 26, 1942, through February 18, 1946.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COL. HENRY M. DENNING ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4996) for the relief of Col. Henry M. Denning, and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That relief is hereby granted the various disbursing officers of the United States or claimants hereinafter mentioned in amounts shown herein, said amounts representing amounts of erroneous payments made by said disbursing officers of public funds for which said officers are accountable or amounts due said claimants as listed in and under the circumstances described in identical letters of the Secretary of the Army to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

SEC. 2. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of the following officers and employees of the Army of the United States the amounts set opposite their names: Col. Henry M. Denning, Finance Corps (now retired), $133.77; Col. C. K. McAlister, Finance Corps, $39.79; Col. Frank Richards, Finance Corps (now retired), $34.69; Col. H. R. Cole, Corps of Engineers, $18.72, the said amounts representing erroneous payments of public funds for which these persons are accountable, resulting from minor errors in determining amounts of pay and allowances due former members of the Civilian Conservation Corps, former officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Army or contractors from whom collection of the overpayments cannot be effected, and which amounts have been disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maj. Paul M. Birkeland, Artillery, $500; 1st Lt. Maurice A. Berg, Air Force, $108; 2d Lt. Charles Nuckols, Jr., class A agent officer for Lt. Col. Julius S. Eberstein, Finance Corp., $48.75; 1st Lt. Austin E. Pritchard, Air Force, $121; 1st Lt. Irwin D. Bingham, Air Force, $330; 1st Lt. Charles P. Schwep, Signal Corps, $276; 1st Lt. Henry Fontenot, Ordnance Corps, $100; Capt. B. D. Grossman, Finance Corps, $50; 1st Lt. Harold B. Cockrell, Infantry, class A

agent officer for Maj. W. F. Menegus, Finance Corps, $436; W. O. (jg.) Gregory W. Corken, class B agent officer for Maj. E. A. Ganschow, Finance Corps, $30.26; Capt. Francis S. Chasm, Infantry, $181.36; in full satisfaction of the claim of each such claimant against the United States for a like amount.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the PG Publishing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., $218.40; Cleveland Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio, $206.38; the Indianapolis Star, Indianapolis, Ind., $260.04; the Dispatch Printing Co., Columbus, Ohio, $188.16; the Cincinnati Enquirer, Cincinnati, Ohio, $321.30; Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., $60.90; the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times Co., Louisville, Ky., $78.75; the Madison Courier, Madison, Ind, $4.50; the Marion Star, Marion, Ohio, $11.76; the Toledo Blade Co., Toledo, Ohio, $50.40; the Columbus Dispatch, Columbus, Ohio, $47.88; the Tribune Co., Chicago, Ill., $138.60; Tribune-Star Publishing Co., Inc., Terre Haute, Ind., $15.12; the New York Sun, Inc., New York, $99.63; the LaPorte Printing Co., LaPorte, Ind., $24.32; the Chicago Daily News, Inc., Chicago, Ill., $69.30; the News-Journal Co., Wilmington, Del., $16.80; the Philadelphia Record Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $63; Indianapolis News Publishing Co., Indianapolis, Ind., $52.48; the New York Times Co., New York, $138.60; Richwood Publishing Co., Richwood, W. Va., $8; Elkins Inter-Mountain Co., Inc., Elkins, W. Va., $8.82; West Virginia Newspaper Publishing Co., Morgantown, W. Va., $16.80; the Athenaeum, Morgantown, W. Va., $6.60; Clarksburg Publishing Co., Clarksburg, W. Va., $12.50; Grant County Press, Petersburg, W. Va., $9.98; Mineral Daily News-Tribune, Kayser, W. Va., $12.60; Advocate Messenger Co., Danville, Ky., $2.40; New York Journal American, New York, N. Y., $45.40; the Newspaper Advertising Service, Madison, Wis., $25.20; the Journal Co., Milwaukee, Wis., $46.20; the Shopper's Guide, J. Schilling and J. Holton, publishers, Baraboo, Wis., $4.95; the Sauk County News, Prairie DuSac, Wis., $5; and the Albert Hand Co., Cape May, N. J., $16.30, which amounts are due the several publishing companies mentioned above for advertising ordered and published for and in the interest of the United States without the prior approval of the Secretary of War as required by Revised Statutes 3828 (44 U. S. C. 324): *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the township of Montgomery, Harlingen, N. J., $199.31, and the township of Hillsborough, Neshanic, N. J., $136.44, which amounts are due to the townships mentioned above for cost and legal fees incurred in the enactment of local ordinances which were enacted at the behest of the military authorities at the Belle Mead Army Service Forces Depot, Somerville, N. J., for reasons of military security: *Provided*, That no persons shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments.

SEC. 6. That any amounts refunded by any disbursing officers or his heirs in connection with any item of indebtedness in accounts cleared herein and/or any amount otherwise due any disbursing officer or his heirs which was set off against any item of indebtedness in the accounts which are cleared herein, shall be refunded to said disbursing officer or his heirs: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts authorized herein to be credited in the accounts of the disbursing officer shall be charged against any individual other than the various payees.

SEC. 7. That in all cases where disbursing officers' accounts are cleared or relieved under the authority of this or any other act, such clearance or relief shall be considered and construed as precluding the recovery of any interest charged from said disbursing officer arising from any items so cleared or relieved, whether such interest charges are in connection with judicial proceedings or otherwise.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY C. BUSH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5765) for the relief of Henry C. Bush and other Foreign Service officers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States the sum designated in full satisfaction of such officer's or employee's claim against the United States for compensation for reasonable and necessary personal property lost while in the course of his duties as a result of war and conditions resulting from war:

Henry C. Bush, $6,000; Anna Charlton, $2,656.50; Thomas J. Cory, $85; Edna B. Crilley, $204.50; Robert B. Dreessen, $631; Hubert F. Ferrell, $1,000; Helene E. Fischer, $1,000; Christine M. Hardy, $462.50; Clive E. Knowlson, $851; Edwin W. Martin, $2,506.15; Donald B. McCue, $1,300.98; Evelyn B. Mitchell, $222.50; Josef L. Norris, $141.50; Vincoe M. Paxton, $1,010.50; Bertrand L. Pinsonnault, $73.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, after "$73" insert a colon and the following: "George H. Earle, III, $12,830: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JAMES FRANCIS NICHOLSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6020) for the relief of the estate of James Francis Nicholson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of James Francis Nicholson, the sum of $2,274, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the amount of the check No. 12,331,785, dated May 10, 1951, which was made payable to James Francis Nicholson on account of war claim due but which, because of his absence from home, was not received by him before his death and was returned to the Treasury for cancellation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL OF RICHLAND COUNTY, S. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6477) for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C., the sum of $18,322.92. Such sum represents reimbursement for the reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by such hospital in providing care and treatment during the period beginning September 18, 1942, and ending October 18, 1952, to one Halsford V. Sharpe, a former prisoner of the United States who is permanently and totally disabled as a result of an injury sustained by him in the course of his arrest on March 7, 1942, by agents of the Alcohol Tax Unit, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury, and who was placed in such hospital by such agents on such date. The United States, through the Department of Justice, paid all expenses for such care and treatment for the period beginning March 7, 1942, and ending September 17, 1942, during which period the said Halsford V. Sharpe was in the custody of a United States marshal but, on the latter date, the said Halsford V. Sharpe was discharged from such custody and the United States disclaimed further liability in law to pay such expenses.

(b) After reference of the matter to the United States Court of Claims by House Resolution 404, 82d Congress, agreed to on October 4, 1951, such court in the congressional reference case styled Columbia Hospital of Richland County against the United States (Congressional No. 17872, decided July 13, 1953) determined (1) that there was a moral obligation on the part of the United States to compensate the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C., for the reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by such hospital in the care and treatment of the said Halsford V. Sharpe, (2) that the sum of $18,322.92 is the amount of such expenses for the period beginning September 18, 1942, and ending October 18, 1952, and (3) that the United States should compensate such hospital for all such expenses occurring after the end of such period or, in lieu thereof, should arrange the transfer of the said Halsford V. Sharpe to a Federal institution properly equipped to care for him on a permanent basis.

(c) In accordance with such determination of the court, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are authorized and directed to make such arrangements as may be necessary and appropriate (1) to effect the transfer of the said Halsford V. Sharpe, on the earliest practicable date, from the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C., to any hospital under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service, Department of Health,

Education, and Welfare, which is properly equipped to receive and care for the said Halsford V. Sharpe, and (2) to provide care and treatment on a permanent basis for the said Halsford V. Sharpe in such hospital under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service. The Secretary of the Treasury is further authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C., a sum equal to the amount which shall be certified by such hospital to the United States Court of Claims, and shall be approved and certified by such court to the Secretary of the Treasury, as being the amount of the reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by such hospital in providing for the care and treatment of the said Halsford V. Sharpe during the period beginning October 19, 1952, and ending on the day immediately prior to the date of the transfer of the said Halsford V. Sharpe to the hospital under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service as provided for in this subsection.

(d) The payments to the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C., of the sums referred to in subsections (a) and (c) and the transfer of the said Halsford V. Sharpe to a hospital under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service for care and treatment therein on a permanent basis as provided for in subsection (c) shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the care and treatment of the said Halsford V. Sharpe.

(e) No part of either of the sums appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim or portion thereof settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIVIO BRIANESCO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6594) for the relief of Livio Brianesco.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Livio Brianesco, Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of $59.12. Such sum represents the amount of the judgment and costs for which the said Livio Brianesco was held liable on June 1, 1953, in a civil action in the municipal court of Cleveland, as the result of an accident which occurred on West 77th Street, between Madison and Franklin Avenues, in Cleveland on January 29, 1953, and which involved a United States mail truck being driven by the said Livio Brianesco, a letter carrier in the United States Post Office, Cleveland, Ohio. Such sum shall be paid only on condition that the said Livio Brianesco shall use such sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay such judgment and costs in full: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAURA SMITH MERRITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7407) for the relief of Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt, Camden, Ala., the sum of $402.63. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of transportation expenses incurred by the said Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt in traveling from Frankfurt, Germany, to Washington, D. C., on October 18 and 19, 1950: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$402.63" and insert: "$306.08."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT E. LEIBBRAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5772) for the relief of Robert E. Leibbrand.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Robert E. Leibbrand, Seattle, Wash., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $960. Such sum represents the amount of the class E allotment payments which were erroneously made to Rose Leibbrand, the sister of the said Robert E. Leibbrand, during the period beginning November 1, 1942, and ending October 31, 1945, after the said Robert E. Leibbrand had discontinued such allotment. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Page 1, line 3, after "Leibbrand" insert "and Rose Leibbrand"; and in the same line strike out the word "is" and insert in lieu thereof "are."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Amend the title so as to read: "For the relief of Robert E. Leibbrand and Rose Leibbrand."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MRS. MARGARETH WEIGAND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 502) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President, or the officer or agency designated by him pursuant to the provisions of section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act (U. S. C., title 50, App. sec. 32), shall transfer and deliver to the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand the amount payable to her under the Social Security Act as a result of the death of her late son, Kurt F. Weigand, which amount was, in accordance with the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, vested in or transferred to the Attorney General by vesting order No. 17973.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE L. F. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1325) for the relief of George L. F. Allen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the two provisos of paragraph 1 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) setting time limits for the initiation and termination of education or training under such part VIII shall not apply to George L. F. Allen, of McAllen, Tex., if he initiates his education or training under such part VIII within 120 days after the date of enactment of this act. Upon the said George L. F. Allen so initiating his education or training under such part VIII, he shall be held and considered to have been eligible for education or training under such part beginning October 17, 1951, the date on which he actually commenced his education or training. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall reimburse the said George L. F. Allen for tuition, subsistence allowances, and other expenses related to his education or training which would have been paid him under paragraphs 5 (a) and 6 (a) of such part VIII if he had been eligible on and after October 17, 1951, and shall make the appropriate deduction of time from the period of eligibility of the said George L. F. Allen.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUERTO RICAN INDIGNATION

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there came to my desk this morning a letter from an old friend in my home town. For himself and the other Puerto Ricans living in our county he spoke out in horrified indignation

over the action of the unfortunate fanatics who endangered the lives of people whom he regarded as friends of mankind. I assured my friend that we here in this great body do not in any degree blame this unfortunate affair on the good people of his native land. It is my privilege to place in the RECORD my friend's letter and my reply:

THE JOURNEYMEN
BARBERS, HAIRDRESSERS,
COSMETOLOGISTS AND PROPRIETORS
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF AMERICA,
LOCAL NO. 100,
Galveston, Tex., March 3, 1954.

Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CLARK: We are deeply hurt in view of the present headlines; and we, the Puerto Ricans residing in Galveston County, Tex., wish to express to you and your fine colleagues our sincere regrets. We also wish to extend our best wishes for the speedy recovery of those five great Americans who were seriously injured during the foulest attempt made on the lives of the people like you, who are devoting the best years of their lives for the best interests of people all over the world. It is beyond our comprehension how any person or persons could carry out such a foul attempt.

We unanimously recommend that new legislation be passed, providing that whereas any person or persons, making an attempt on the lives of any Member or Members of the Senate or the House of Representatives while in execution of their duties, upon conviction of said offense, shall be sentenced to death. Any other punishment would be inadequate.

We shall be more than glad to cooperate with any agency of the United States Government, at any time, in exposing any Puerto Rican Nationalist or any Communist.

Looking forward to seeing you on your next visit to our great city, I remain, as ever,

Your loyal friend,

JOE
J. E. CASALS.

MARCH 4, 1954.

Mr. J. E. CASALS,
Galveston, Tex.:

I am deeply touched by your fine letter of March 3. Please assure all of the Puerto Ricans in our home county that my colleagues and I understand and appreciate their complete loyalty to our mutual country. I am placing your letter in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CLARK W. THOMPSON,
Member of Congress.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 24]

Abbitt	Chatham	Fulton
Barrett	Chelf	Gamble
Bentley	Chudoff	Gary
Bolton, Oliver P.	Clardy	Granahan
Brownson	Davis, Tenn.	Green
Buckley	Dawson, Ill.	Hardy
Campbell	Dingell	Harrison, Va.
Carnahan	Elliott	Hart
Celler	Fallon	Holifield
	Forrester	Javits
Jensen	Pillion	Stringfellow
Kearns	Powell	Sutton
Krueger	Reed, Ill.	Taylor
Lanham	Rivers	Tuck
Lantaff	Roberts	Yorsell
Miller, N. Y.	Roosevelt	Warburton
Morgan	Shelley	Weichel
Morrison	Sieminski	Winstead
Moulder, Mo.	Smith, Va.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-nine Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

FRANKLIN JIM

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1883) for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment:

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor" and insert "Franklin Jim, a."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEBBINS CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1967) for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "Federal District Court of" and insert "United States District Court for."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRACEY-WELSH CO., INC.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3275) for the relief of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after "claim", insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2567) to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments" and insert "Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, Department of the Air Force, and of the Coast Guard."

Page 2 line 10, strike out "or the Secretary of the Air Force" and insert "the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Treasury."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1955

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8067, with Mr. JOHNSON of California in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COON:

Page 39, line 24, strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$15,000,000."

Page 40, line 1, strike out "$1,600,000" and insert "$6,600,000."

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, the $10 million recommended in this bill for the

forest-highway program next year would be used chiefly to pay for contracts already let, with little or no money to spend for new construction. The effect of this would be to practically stop the program.

The $10 million figure in the present bill represents a cut of 33 percent from the $15 million originally requested by the Bureau of Public Roads. This amount was reduced in the office of the Secretary of Commerce.

I believe we should spend at least the amount of the Bureau of Public Roads request this year, so I am proposing in my amendment an increase of $5 million.

In fiscal 1953, $20 million was authorized by the United States Congress for forest highways. In fiscal 1954, $22.5 million was authorized, and in fiscal 1955, the authorization is $22.5 million. This is a total of $65 million authorized, while the amount actually appropriated so far totals only $11.6 million. The amount authorized but unappropriated is $43.4 million.

Eighty-seven percent of the national forests are located in 11 western States. Timber production from these forests is important to the economy of these States, and forest highways are important to timber production, as well as being necessary links in the State highway systems.

I want to point out that the Federal forests are one of the agencies of the Federal Government which pays it own way. Last year revenues from the forests came to $75 million. Of this, approximately $18 million went back to the counties in lieu of taxes, and another $7.5 million was spent on access roads leading into the main roads. This leaves a balance of about $50 milion which went back to the United States Treasury to be spent for other things, such as foreign aid, while forest highways did not even receive the amount authorized for them.

In the case of my own State, Oregon, I understand the Government received $15.6 millions in timber revenues in 1953, while returning only about $2.7 millions in forest highway funds.

It is well known that the Federal Government owns better than 53 percent of the land in the 11 western States—Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. This ownership puts the Government in the position of landlord. If this "landlord" is to continue taking revenues from our area, then he must invest the amount required to keep the revenue coming, and he should do his part to pay for the facilities he shares with other users. The forest highway program must be continued if these two purposes are to be served.

I understand that in the 4 western States, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, there are about 5 billion feet of timber which has been infected with insects. If we have adequate roads, we can salvage that timber. If we do not have the roads soon this infected timber will die and rot. Every dollar spent in the near future on a Federal forest road or trail will return dollars in salvaged timber that would otherwise be wasted.

President Eisenhower said in his state of the Union message that it will be necessary to continue the 2-cent gasoline tax if we are to have the expanded highway program necessary to get a safe and adequate highway system. I cannot see much logic in taxing on the one hand to build roads, and on the other hand spending for other purposes the money our forest roads bring in.

Good forest highways, making possible more timber production at lower cost, will mean greater economic stability for the communities of the West, higher employment, and more prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read some of the questions and answers with reference to this matter found on page 295 of the hearings:

Mr. COON. You say the estimate of $10 million will be required primarily to liquidate contracts incurred in prior years. Then how much will there be available this year for additional contracts?

In answer to that question Mr. Curtiss said:

Substantially none for new contracts in 1955.

Then I asked the question:

But there will be no new contracts let?

He said:

Not during 1955 under this appropriation.

Then I asked him further:

Then actually what you are doing is completely stopping this program; is that right?

Mr. Curtiss said:

That is approximately it.

Mr. PRESTON said:

You had a little difficulty getting it out.

I believe it would be unfair to our western States, retarding to the development of our timber resources, false economy in the long run, and contrary to the spirit of the President's highway program to appropriate less than the $15 million requested by the Bureau of Public Roads for forest highways next year.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the Public Works Committee 2 years ago brought forth a highway authorization bill it proposed that $575 million be expended for general highway construction. The money was to be divided between primary, secondary, and urban roads. That money it proposed should be divided one-third on the basis of population, one-third on the basis of area, and one-third on the basis of miles of road.

Included in this bill was a provision that $22,500,000 should be authorized for the construction of Federal forest highways. This $22,500,000 was authorized and was to be an integral part of the primary highway system of the Nation. This $22,500,000 was to be divided among the States with this forest land on the basis of 50–50, the States paying the cost of the construction of these highways. This $22,500,000 was in a way sort of an in lieu payment, in place of the taxes the States lost by the Federal Government's owning so much forest land.

The Forest Service has jurisdiction over 160 million acres of forest land that is owned by the Federal Government. This 160 million acres of forest land constitutes an area approximately as large as the entire State of Texas.

The Public Works Committee, in 1950, asked for $22,500,000 for forest highways and the Appropriations Committee later approved $22,500,000. In 1951 the Appropriations Committee reduced the amount to $20 million. This committee reduced it the next year to $18 million, last year to $15 million, and this year to $10 million.

We think at least $15 million should be spent on the Federal primary forest highways this year on a 50–50 matching-fund basis. We think we ought to have at least $15 million for that purpose.

Forest highways are the roads that go from city to city to serve the general traveling public. A forest highway is a primary highway, not secondary, not urban, but a primary highway. The Federal Government contributes some millions, and the State matches those funds.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Are these forest highways financed in the same way as the Federal-aid highways?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Federal Government supplies 50 percent of the money and the States match the 50 percent to build the highways. That is my understanding.

Mr. COUDERT. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I think the gentleman may be in error on that. That is why I raised the issue. I have before me the statement of the Director of the Highways Bureau in which he says:

I feel that the forest highways program could be prosecuted more expeditiously if financed in the same way as Federal-aid highways. I plan to explore this matter thoroughly with Commissioner du Pont and the Bureau of the Budget.

It seems to me that if there is in process a program that may lead to a different method of financing these roads, it might be wise to leave this budget estimate alone and not add to it at this time.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman may be right in that statement.

These highways serve the primary road system. In addition these roads enable loggers who buy Government timber to get it out more easily. This places these loggers in competition with other timber buyers, with the result that the Federal Government secures a higher price for its timber. Also, these highways provide firefighting facilities which facilitate getting men and equipment to the scene of a fire. These highways, also make it easier for the Federal Government to log diseased timber or timber damaged by fire.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. In addition, when we do not have funds adequate to build the proper roads inside the forest, when you come to a poor piece of road it closes the

circuit all the way because of that poor piece.

Mr. MACK of Washington. It affects 160 million acres of Government forest land situated in 45 of the 48 States of the Union.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. It is my understanding that these roads will help to salvage some $25 million worth of blown timber in the gentleman's own area.

Mr. MACK of Washington. We had a forest fire in 1951 in the district of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] that destroyed half a billion feet of timber. The timber damaged by this fire was valued at $5 million. Today, because of that forest fire, it is worth only $2 million. Not a stick of that $2 million worth of damaged timber could have been salvaged except for the Federal forest highways being built in that area.

Mr. HORAN. The reason these are not matching funds is that they are payment in lieu of taxes to the States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington may be permitted to continue for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I intend to support this amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington. The question I would like to ask is, Are we not impeding the sustained-yield program in our national forests because of the lack of roads to get into the forest areas? Is that not correct?

Mr. MACK of Washington. We are impeding the primary highway construction of the Nation. We are retarding the salvaging of timber damaged as the result of fires and bug infestation. We are limiting the opportunities of the Forest Service to get into those areas with men and equipment to fight fires. We are hampering the Federal Government in its logging of diseased or bug-infested timber.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman referred to the appropriations in the past of $22,500,000. Would he mind repeating those figures and bringing them down to the present appropriation?

Mr. MACK of Washington. In 1950 the appropriation for the forest Federal highways was $22,500,000. In 1951 that was reduced to $19 million. Last year it was reduced to $15 million. This year it is being reduced by the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations to $10 million. In other words, the program is being gradually done away with, although it is a self-supporting program by reason of the savings made by salvaging of the timber.

Mr. GAVIN. I think this restoration of $5 million by the amendment offered by the gentleman should be accepted by the House. It is very important.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I just want to correct the last statement. This is the action of the Secretary of Commerce. The committee did nothing with it. This is a budget recommendation.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I recognize that the Budget Bureau has recommended only $10 million for this year. I understand that the Forest Service asked for $15 million.

Mr. CLEVENGER. It was not the action of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MACK of Washington. No; the committee is carrying out the instructions of the Budget Director. That is correct.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. SCUDDER. Is it not a fact that the curtailment of the expenditures on our forest highways is curtailing the harvesting of overripe timber and getting it to the mills and from the mills into the markets? The thing that we have been working for, as you well know, is to develop more forest highways because with better highways the Federal Government will receive more stumpage fees for timber which they own and, therefore, it will come back into another pocket of the Federal Government. I believe that for every dollar that we spend for these highways the Federal Government will get back $5.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is absolutely correct. If you build forest highways into the timber, it increases the competition among bidders for that timber. The Government, as a result, receives a higher price for its timber; also, the building of these roads facilitates the removal from the forest of overripe timber which otherwise would rot and go to waste.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. I congratulate the gentleman from Washington on the remarks that he is making concerning this amendment. I want to go on record as supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon, the Honorable SAM COON. I appreciate very much hearing the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] in support of this amendment. I am happy to see the interest of the State of Pennsylania corresponding with the interest of the Far West in this particular matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who gets the money for the salvaged timber?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Federal Government gets the money because the Federal Government owns the timber.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. MUMMA. I do not want to strike a discordant note exactly, but there is an alternative proposition to getting these roads built. Is it not a matter of fact or a matter of record that when they let logging contracts they include a proviso—I do not know whether it is done in every case, but it has been done and it is being done.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is talking about roads and trails.

Mr. MUMMA. No. I am talking about roads. There is a big difference.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Federal forest highway is built to serve the traveling public from town to town.

Mr. MUMMA. I understand, but there can be two interpretations, and one group is talking about roads to get logs out. All these logs are not along the primary highways.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I would say to the gentleman the Federal forest highway, although it is built to serve communities, it does go through the forests. Because of this the loggers build their stub roads to those Federal forest highways. The building of these Federal forest highways on a primary system makes it easier for the logger to get into the timber, and thereby increases the number of bidders for the timber. This results in the Government getting a higher price for its timber.

Mr. MUMMA. That could not be true in all cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] has again expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am rising in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON]. My district, which comprises over one-third of the total area of California runs from the Oregon line to and including Death Valley, Calif.; 700 miles down the Sierra Nevada Mountains. That district has more national forests than any other district in the country. It comprises all or part of 11 national forests. There are at least six major highways crossing the Sierra Nevada Mountains, bringing traffic from the East to the West and from the West to the East. Large sections of all of those major highways pass through as much as 50 or 100 miles of national-forest lands. How in the world are the people of my State going to get back and forth across those Sierra Nevada Mountains unless they get some help from the Federal Government in building these national-forest highways which are on the primary system.

A good illustration is Highway No. 40, which is the main road running from Reno, Nev., across Donner Summit into the Sacramento Valley, and from there into San Francisco Bay area. That road is clogged up a great part of the time both in summer and worse in winter because it has never been adequately improved. The Bureau of Public Roads has not had the money under current appropriations to get it done. The amount recommended in this bill is simply the termination of that program. Ten million dollars is just enough to take care of the contracts that are already

under consideration and let, and just a little more. The Bureau of Public Roads asked for $15 million, which is exactly the amount of money it had last year for this purpose, inadequate certainly, but at least the same as we had last year. The Bureau of the Budget, I understand, cut them back $5 million. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON] has offered an amendment which would put into this bill an additional $5 million, making the amount equal to the amount of money requested by the Bureau of Public Roads, and the same amount granted in the appropriation last year for this same purpose. I hope that the Committee will see fit to restore these funds, for all the reasons that have been mentioned.

In my State we had practically a civil war over on the coast area, in the district represented by the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER], when load limitations for trucks went on those State highways, and they were forced to pull off their trucks. That is where these roads get into trouble with the lumber industry. They will simply not hold up under that traffic. The load limitations force the lumber trucks off the roads.

With the Federal Government in my State owning 46 percent of the total land area of California, and over 70 percent of my district—in some counties over 90 percent in my district in Federal ownership—it seems to me we are not asking very much of the Federal Government when we ask that they step up as a property owner and help to build some of these roads through the national forest areas.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Is it not true there are large stands of timber in these forest holdings which are not accessible because of the lack of roads to reach them?

Mr. ENGLE. Not only that, but they are not accessible because after the logging companies, from their private roads, get on the main stem, they find inadequate road conditions, load limits on the bridges, and that sort of thing.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Is it not true also that good forest cutting practice requires that a lot of timber that cannot now be reached ought to be cut before it spoils?

Mr. ENGLE. We are losing 2 billion feet of timber a year to what I call the Insect Logging Co., that is the timber in our national forests that is eaten up by bugs, and falls due to being overripe. It is a waste of good national resources.

But whatever may be done about that we have a right to point out that the Federal Government as a proprietor, as the owner of 70 percent of the land in the Sierra Nevada region should step up and put up just a little amount of money, and this is a pittance, to build these main roads through the national forest areas.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we in Oregon are vitally interested in this problem. Over 52 percent of the lands of Oregon belong to the Federal Government, and some 14 percent of the moneys that come in on these roads from the Federal Treasury goes for these highways running through the Oregon forests.

There are three types of forest land that are benefited in this appropriation: One is the forest timber that has been knocked down by wind and that sort of thing; second is the forest timber that has been stricken with infestation; the third is that injured by fire. These three categories of timber have great value if harvested immediately, but unless they are gotten out in a short time after these troubles take place they are lost.

It is true that these roads about which we are talking here are not the access roads that go back into the deep forests, but they are the trunkline roads that go through the forests which must be used to market this timber.

Last year we allowed $15 million, for these roads, this year practically nothing. It is true there is $10 million appropriated in this bill for this purpose, but it is only to meet outstanding commitments and obligations; as I understand absolutely, not $1 for new construction. It seems to me it is penny-wise and pound foolish for the Federal Government which owns these lands—a big investment of the Federal Government alone—not to provide a minimum appropriation for this purpose to preserve and market our timber.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Just one question: Is this request within the amount allowed by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. ANGELL. No; the Bureau of the Budget recommended only $10 million.

Mr. RABAUT. So this is above the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. ANGELL. The Forestry Service recommended $15 million. That was the amount allowed last year.

I hope this Committee will restore the $5 million in order not to help the people of Oregon but to help the Federal Government itself which owns this great investment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. At times I do not always agree with my friends from the great Northwest, but this is one time that I certainly agree with them in this amendment offered here today. I merely want to observe that I cannot at times understand the thinking of the House. We spend hundreds of millions of dollars all over the world and the membership votes it through with but little or no debate. However, when it comes to our own backyard, I mean the development of our great national forests for the welfare of the people of America, we certainly scrutinize all details. Now, here is a $5 million item which would be a contribution to the development of these great forest areas. I sincerely hope that the Members of the House will approach this matter today with the thought that here is something that concerns their own backyard. This amendment should be adopted overwhelmingly.

Mr. ANGELL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution; he is absolutely right.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. My time has about expired.

(On request of Mr. DEMPSEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ANGELL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico, who is very familiar with all of these problems.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am very happy to support the amendment providing $5 million additional. The committee, of which the gentleman from Oregon is a member, the Public Works Committee, had this matter under consideration and went into every phase of it. I think he is more familiar with the situation than most Members of the House. A great many people feel that a pine tree when it grows up just stands there until somebody cuts it down, that it does not deteriorate. A tree matures or gets ripe just like fruit gets ripe or wheat gets ripe and unless you harvest it at that time you are going to lose the tree. It is not an economy move to take $5 million in a proposition of this kind. Our Public Works Committee recommended $22,500,000. We did the same thing 2 years ago, but at that time the appropriations committee cut it to $15 million. Now they have cut it to $10 million and I assume next year they will cut it to $5 million; at the same time the people of the United States wonder what is happening to our national resources. We are just not protecting them.

It is a cold, hard fact that curtailment of this appropriation is costing the people of the United States many times what has been cut out of the amount originally authorized. Conservative estimates are that the annual loss to the Government in unharvested timber—which has deteriorated and become worthless—is far in excess of $20 million. Many times that amount is lost to the ravages of forest fires because lack of proper access roads hamper the firefighters. Added to that is the incalculable loss due to destruction of watersheds in the national forests, particularly in the semiarid States where water is their veritable lifeblood.

No, this constant whittling down of forest highways appropriations is the farthest thing imaginable from sound economy.

Mr. ANGELL. Under this bill we are not getting a dime this year for these roads except to take care of the commitments heretofore incurred, not one single penny for future construction of

roads in this great forest area. Last year $15 million were appropriated for these roads. The Public Works Committee with jurisdiction over roads, of which I am a member, authorized $22,500,000. I most strongly urge that the motion of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON], be adopted to increase this item $5 million, which is the amount appropriated last fiscal year which will provide only $5 million for new construction.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon. Much as I like him, much as I would like to contribute to his happiness and to the happiness of his constituents, despite the fact that the eloquence of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] brought tears to my eyes about the plight of those unhappy people struggling across the Sierra Nevada Mountains, despite all of those considerations, the rest of us on this side of the Committee are opposed to this amendment. We are opposed to it for the simple reason that we believe in sustaining the administration's very sound position in seeking to keep down expenditures and to minimize to the greatest extent possible additions to the national debt. If we increase this $10 million allowed by the Bureau of the Budget by an additional $5 million, we will simply be contributing an additional $5 million to the deficit for 1955. We will be increasing the debt and to that extent adding to inflation. After the stirring speech of the ranking member of the minority here yesterday, my colleague from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who struggled so hard to save the taxpayers $17 million, I would expect the minority members of the Committee likewise to oppose this amendment, they now having become exponents of economy and sound fiscal policy.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. When the House, as it does, approves the proposal to build the St. Lawrence Seaway and obligates the Government to the extent of $106 million, will that not exceed the debt limit and put us into deficit financing.

Mr. COUDERT. I am not aware that the St. Lawrence Seaway is in this bill. Whatever we do with the St. Lawrence Seaway, the fact will still remain an additional $5 million added to this bill over and above the Bureau of the Budget figures will increase the deficit for 1955 by just that amount. I trust that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will stand with us on this and that the committee may be united in its opposition to this amendment, not that we do not like forests. Of course, we could spend fifty or one hundred million dollars, and I wish we had a billion dollars to spend on them.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I must say that the argument of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON], was quite compelling. The gentleman from New York knows what went on in committee with regard to this. The gentleman from New York, the present speaker, offered to increase the amount by a half million dollars. It was refused by the gentleman from Oregon. That is the way the record stands.

Mr. COUDERT. I think the committee would settle for a half million dollars because we like the gentleman from Oregon so much. But I do not believe he would settle for that.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I just want to observe that if the gentleman from California brought tears to the gentleman from New York, he is doing very well.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I was informed yesterday by the chairman of the Roads Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], that we are spending scores of millions of dollars in Europe for the construction of highways under those gift programs. Does not the gentleman from New York believe that it would be better to spend $5 million upon American highways in the United States rather than scores of millions of dollars in this giveaway foreign-aid program for roads in foreign countries?

Mr. COUDERT. I think that is a very good question, and I would like to answer it.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Washington that he is entirely right. Unhappily, under our present appropriating process, there is no connection between the two, and the right hand knoweth not what the left hand doeth. If we vote $5 million here today, next week and next month we will vote for roads all over the world. Therefore, I say, Mr. Chairman, if we really want to relate like things to like and if we really want to establish a sound fiscal system for the Government of the United States, then for heaven's sake let us persuade the Committee on Rules to report out my H. R. 2 that ties expenditures to taxation and receipts and puts the House in a position of having to determine in fact whether it is going to give highways to Washington and other States that need them or whether it is going to spend money to build roads in Yucatan or Iran or anywhere else. Without that your question would always be relevant but meaningless in practice.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take but a minute or two to make some comments with regard to the budget-balancing abracadabra which is happening here on the other side of the aisle. It is really quite amazing and amusing. In this morning's paper a headline reads "House Slashes Subsidy Funds for Airlines." Why, I was under the impression, Mr. Chairman, and I was here all day yesterday, that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle added $17 million to this bill for airline subsidies. That is not a slash in my book. That is a plain plush addition of $17 million of the taxpayers' money.

Now they are confronted with a real problem. It all emanates from the geniality of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON], and there are very few of the members of the majority side who care to vote against the $5 million amendment of the genial and distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I simply want to observe, as all Members of the House observe, that, persuasive as the gentleman from New York may be, whichever side he happens to take for the moment, he did not succeed in fooling the House yesterday and evidently did not succeed in fooling the gentlemen of the press. My compliments to them.

Mr. ROONEY. Surely the gentleman from New York does not mean to imply that I fooled him and the subcommittee and the full 50-member Committee on Appropriations when all, including the gentleman from New York, were unanimous in arriving at the figure of $23 million for the airline subsidy money, a cut of $50 million. I wonder what later happened to change their minds about it and caused them to come on the floor without ever bringing the subject before the full committee and have the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] offer an amendment to his own bill to add $17 million of the taxpayers' money. Now, if the gentlemen could figure some way of taking five of those $17 million in airline subsidies and giving them to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON] and his associates for their forest highways, I might be agreeable to go along.

Mr. COUDERT. Will the gentleman support my bill H. R. 2, which will tie expenditures to revenues and compel the House to make a choice?

Mr. ROONEY. No; I do not agree with the gentleman from New York in regard to H. R. 2, and I daresay that not too many of his colleagues on his side of the aisle agree with the provisions of H. R. 2, either. After all, if it was the right thing to do—and I understand that this is a Republican House, and that is the party of the gentleman, and the gentleman's party is in control of the committees of the House—why do they not report out the gentleman's bill, H. R. 2, and let us take a look at it?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is really gratifying to see how economy-minded my very good friend from New York, whom I greatly admire, has become in the last several weeks. It is really a creditable performance on economy he is turning in.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the learned gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I think the fact that he has been so closely associated with the

gentleman from New York that it is contagious, and they are both becoming economy minded, in this particular instance.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. May I remind the gentleman that my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and I are divided by a river, and it is a very sharp division—the East River in New York.

Mr. GAVIN. I assume from what the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] stated and from what the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] stated that there may be a river between them in their respective districts, but they are both agreed on opposition to this proposed amendment, and that is what I am concerned about.

Let us examine this Forest Service situation and our national forests. It is really interesting. I might say it is the only branch of the Federal Government that I know of that is turning in a profit. They actually took in about $12 million more last year than they expended.

In the discussion we had the other day on the legislation relative to exchange of land in the national forests, as to why they have not increased their activities on sustained-yield programs in the national forests, it was evident that they could not increase their programs because of lack of roads in the forests.

If one branch of the Government can show a profit of $12 million, it certainly is an outstanding performance. It would be creditable if other branches of the Government could emulate that performance. If they can show a greater result by allocating an additional $5 million to this program, I think this amendment should be adopted.

In my honest opinion, it is a wise investment of the American taxpayers' dollars. My record has been well known on economy ever since I have been here. But this is one program where I do not feel that economy is wise, nor is the cut justified. I do not think the appropriation should be cut back from $22,500,000 in a couple of years to $10 million. This is a drastic cut. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars all over the world; however, when it comes to our own backyard, our own people, our great national forests that are operated profitably and used by hundreds of thousands of people for recreation and other purposes, cuts are made that make forest programs ineffective.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman understand that President Eisenhower does not want this $5 million added to the bill, that his Bureau of the Budget and his Secretary of Commerce submitted a request in the amount of $10 million, and that that is all they say they want and can use for forest highways?

Mr. GAVIN. We are in disagreement. That is why we are debating it today. In the final analysis, we are the ones that are going to determine whether the Bureau of the Budget is going to reach conclusions on this program or whether the duly elected representatives of the people are going to reach those conclusions as to what these programs should be.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. Is it not a fact that no matter what we appropriate and no matter how much we appropriate, if the Bureau of the Budget does not authorize the agency to spend the funds, they will not be spent, and therefore even if we give them 15 or 20 or 50 million dollars, if the Bureau of the Budget says $10 million is all they need this year, that is all that is going to be spent?

Mr. GAVIN. If we appropriate the money to them and then the Bureau of the Budget does not permit them to use it, it is up to us again to take the matter up with the Bureau of the Budget to ascertain reason why. We will get into that later, but I assume from what the gentleman is saying that you are going to vote for the amendment, is that correct?

Mr. COUDERT. No, I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SULLIVAN: On page 24, line 3, change the period to a comma and insert "of which $10,000 shall be used to renew the compilation of statistics on stocks of coffee on hand."

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, providing for a very modest sum in the appropriation for the Census Bureau to be earmarked for the compilation of statistics, is intended to give to the American Government and to the American people the true facts on the stocks of coffee on hand in the United States. We know that the coffee crop in Brazil was damaged badly last year. We know that there will be, if present rates of consumption of coffee continue, some degree of shortage in the United States. We can expect that coffee prices will continue to go up under those circumstances.

However, we have every right to expect that coffee prices will not go up in anticipation of shortages. That is what happened late last year and earlier this year. From the best information I can obtain, there have been no shortages of coffee in the United States. Over a period of years we have imported more coffee than we have consumed. Yet the price has been shooting up in the grocery stores and every week we are told that another 5-cent-a-pound increase is imminent.

What are the facts about coffee supply—about stocks of coffee on hand? Frankly, we just do not seem to know, at least not accurately. Apparently the only way we can find out, through our investigating committees, is by the subpena process. That is ridiculous when we are dealing with a commodity so generally used in the American household—so much enjoyed by the American public.

The Census Bureau did keep statistics on the volume of coffee stocks during the war and for a short period in the late 1940's. It does not keep them at this time. My amendment, earmarking $10,000 of the appropriation for the Bureau of the Census, would enable the Bureau to renew the compilation of statistics on stocks of coffee on hand. If we are going to prevent speculative price increases resulting from hoarding on the part of some big operators or manipulation, we have got to know how much coffee there is in the United States. The Census Bureau can determine that for us if we give it the funds it needs for this simple operation. If as a result of having this information we can save the housewife an unnecessary increase of as little as 1 cent a pound in the price of coffee, then we are saving the amount of this appropriation many hundreds of times over in the cost of living for the American consumer and in the cost of Government, too, and without asking for any additional money. We must remember that coffee makes up all by itself 1 percent of the Consumers' Price Index. Therefore, it is no minor item in the cost of living formula. And we all know how wages and many other costs are tied to the Consumer Price Index.

If we had had this information—the accurate information—on stocks of coffee on hand last November, I can tell you honestly, Mr. Chairman, that the American housewives would not have been victimized as they were by the tremendous increase in coffee prices on a speculative basis in anticipation of shortages due some time this year. We would have known that there was more coffee in the United States than we were consuming. We would have known that there was no excuse for the price increases which took place. As it was, we did not know what the true facts were, and committees of the House and Senate are still trying to find out, and the more they look into the matter the more they find that speculation was at the heart of the tremendous price increases of the last 5 months.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that any Member who is really concerned about the price of such an important item in the consumers' price index, who is concerned about letters he is receiving from housewives in his district about coffee prices, support this amendment as an effective means of getting the facts on the record, so that we are protected in the future against unnecessary increases in the price of coffee. Think of it, Mr. Chairman, for only $10,000 we should be able to know, and not have to guess about the volume of coffee stocks on hand in the United States, and we can know then whether any increase in coffee prices is justified by supply factors, or merely by greed. The people are demanding that we do something about coffee prices, and here is an effective means of taking realistic action. I hope the committee will see fit to accept the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. If I correctly understand the gentlewoman's amendment, it would not add 1 nickel to the bill; is that correct?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The gentleman is correct. I am not asking for additional money to be appropriated.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentlewoman's amendment merely allocates $10,000 of the total in this bill for the Bureau of the Census to go into this matter of coffee, which is a subject of very much concern to the American housewife today.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. I commend the distinguished and very able gentlewoman from Missouri for offering this amendment, and I assure her that we shall support it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I wanted to inquire of the lady whether or not it would be possible for the Bureau to use this money for this purpose without the amendment which she has offered?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The authority was vested in the Administrator away back in the 80th Congress, Public Law 671, but they kept those records only during wartime. When I called them about it earlier this year they said that because of lack of money they could not continue to keep them.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The point I am making is this. Could they not, without this amendment, use the money already allocated to them for this purpose, without having it earmarked specifically for this purpose?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The answer is that the appropriation last year was not large enough to continue these records so they did not compile the statistics. If it were indicated to them that we want those figures, that it is the intention of the Congress to have those figures, then they will use the fund to provide them out of their general appropriation.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I thank the lady for the explanation.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

May I say that the committee on this side has no objection to this amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the amendment is entirely satisfactry to the minority members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUSBEY: On page 47, line 16, strike out "$75,814,000" and insert "$55,814,000."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, this seems to be the day for adopting amendments on an appropriation bill, and I hope that my amendment will not be the first to be defeated. It should be passed for these reasons:

First of all, it is a step toward economy. It is a very—shall I say in the words of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in referring to some cuts—modest cut? It cuts only $20 million out of the fund for the United States information program. It is a modest cut, because I was afraid the membership of the House would not go along with me if I offered an amendment to cut the fund by a considerable amount—which should be done. For that reason, I offered an amendment for just a very, very modest cut.

Why should this agency be cut? Frankly, notwithstanding the fact that the Appropriations Committee, in the 1954 appropriation bill, gave the agency almost blanket authority to discharge any employee, this agency has done less than any agency in Government to get rid of the old Barrett-Acheson-Truman holdovers, who are in key positions—all the policymaking positions. A new director, Mr. Theodore Streibert of New York, was appointed after Mr. Johnson resigned. As far as I know, Mr. Streibert is a very honorable gentleman. He has had a very distinguished career in the field of radio and television with the Mutual Broadcasting System; but I challenge anyone to show me one single qualification Mr. Streibert possesses for handling an ideological program such as the Voice of America.

The personnel down there is the same old personnel, and they are still running the show. This I will prove later.

On two occasions—in 1952 and 1953—I took the floor of the House to expose one of the leading Communists of the United States, Mr. Bertram Wolfe, who had been the chief of the ideological section of the Voice of America in New York for 4½ years. First of all, I have his Form 57, which is his application for a position in the Voice of America; and I called to the attention of Mr. Streibert, and also to Mr. Philip Young, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the fact that Wolfe had falsified his application for employment in the Government. Before my time runs out, let me say that I hope every Member of this House will read my extension of remarks on this matter. Because it would take me some 40 minutes to explain this entire picture, I intend to extend my remarks. You will find that my remarks expose this whole matter of Bertram Wolfe.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. It is always a pleasure to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman knows that this man is no longer on the payroll?

Mr. BUSBEY. I know he is no longer on the payroll. I have tried to get Mr. Streibert to fire Wolfe ever since he has been in office. My reasons will be found in my extension of remarks. Last week, just before this appropriation bill was reported, Wolfe was permitted to resign. Mr. Streibert should have fired him. I do not think the man would be off the payroll even at this date, if Mr. Streibert had not known that I was going to bring this matter before the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Has the gentleman any assurances he will not be put back?

Mr. BUSBEY. No, and that is what irks me considerably. Hundreds and hundreds of such employees have been permitted to resign when they should have been fired. Now, Mr. Wolfe told them he disavowed communism in 1929, but my remarks will show that he was an active Communist up until at least 1941.

There is one more thing I desire to bring out. When some former Communist, such as Elizabeth Bentley, Louis Budenz, Ben Gitlow, and others, have broken from the Communist Party, they have come forward and given the agencies of Government and the committees of Congress the benefit of the knowledge and information they gained during their many years of work inside the Communist Party. I defy anyone to show me where they have had one iota of help from Bertram Wolfe.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. Chairman, the present organizational structure of the United States Information Agency is essentially a product of the key figures and planners of the program under the Democratic administration. Thus, it becomes an instrument for vindicating the Barrett-created empire and protecting the positions and promotions of the key holdovers from the Barrett era.

In a sense, the new director, Theodore Streibert, was forced by the shortage of time to adopt this creation of the holdovers. The interval between his appointment to the directorship in August, and the announcement of the new organization in October and November 1953, did not permit more than cursory analysis of the entire organization.

The shortage of time figured also in the reduction in force of personnel between August and December 31, 1953. Streibert had a mandate to clear out key holdovers from the misguided Barrett regime. Yet, in the final analysis, it was the key holdovers who set up the reduction-in-force program, and recommended the release of certain personnel under the mandate of Public Law 207. Streibert was completely dependent on the holdovers for advice in the reduction in force, which had been underway when he took over, and which was greatly accelerated from the day he took office.

Under those circumstances, it is only natural that the holdovers should protect their own interests.

Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the International Press Service of USIA. Not one of the top leaders of IPS was affected by the reduction-in-force. Some 80 or 90 employees were cut off the IPS roster of 441 employees. Yet none of the top leaders, or any of the Grade 14 and 15 employees, were dropped nor declassified between August and December 1953.

Even though the IPS roster had been cut to nearly the level of November 1950,

it retained nearly twice as many Grade 14 and 15 employees as had been on the rolls before the wild organizational and expansion spree got under way under Barrett in 1950.

Out of the total of 19 grade 14's and 15's, 14 were ex-OWI personnel. One of the Grade 15's had been the Special Assistant to Barrett and ex-Senator Benton in the OWI and post-OWI days. The top man in the International Press Service was an acknowledged life-long Democrat, appointed to his position during the confused transitionary period of the ill-fated Robert Johnson regime.

Most of the grade 14 and 15 personnell were either without Civil Service permanent status, or else were recently promoted during the dying days of the Democratic administration. Four of the seven Grade 15's were promoted between September 1952 and February 1953. Nine of the 14 Grade 14's were promoted during this same period.

Three of the grade 15's could have been released under Public Law 207. At least five of the grade 14's could have been dropped by the same law. The remainder could have been reduced to lesser grades commensurate with their abilities, either through reorganization or a combination of reorganization and reduction of the grade 15 and 14 positions. This was not done, however, and the result has been a general debasement of grade 15 and 14 duties and responsibilities in a greatly compressed organization.

Grade 15's and 14's are performing duties once performed by personnel from one to two grades lower, under the standards prevailing in 1950. Some, like the newly appointed Chief of the Far Eastern Branch, have had no previous experience in the specialized fields which they head.

Thus the present organizational structure has been predicated for the most part on the perpetuation of personalities and their promotions. It retains as much as possible of the numerous management and policy empires which grew up like Topsy during the Barrett period of over-expansion and over-grading. This is true on an Agency-wide basis, as well as on the various media and service levels.

What this amounts to, in substance, is that it now costs much more to operate a program which today is less in some respects than the level of 1950. This is particularly true in the case of the International Press Service.

The various components of the International Press Service have been known by many different names since October of 1950, but the fact remains that the products have changed little if any. Yet the output as a whole has declined.

That the production level of the Internation Press Service has declined is not surprising. October of 1950 represented a key month in the determination of field demand and domestic servicing functions. It was a peak month in the Korean war. The demands from the field, in terms of quantity, represented the capacity of foreign press and publication outlets to absorb materials from International Press Service. Anything beyond the peak level of October was excess, a glut on the USIS distribution points overseas, which piled up unseen and unused in warehouses until Congressional investigating teams unearthed the surpluses in 1951–52.

Under pressure of the congressional investigations, the information program was reorganized in 1951–52 to give greater emphasis on regional requirements and demand. The reorganization, however, merely compounded the error. It was built on the greatly overstaffed and overgraded organization which had been built up subsequent to November 1950 to turn out voluminous quantities of state-side-created anti-Communist propaganda materials. The empire builders of the Barrett regime simply pyramided an even greater top-heavy organizational structure on top of the grossly overstaffed domestic servicing functions. Each media and servicing function acquired even greater autonomy, with all of the separate management and policy facilities that go with such autonomy.

Close overall operational control declined as media autonomy increased. No strong central office nor personality controlled the field program. Radio, press and publications, and management functions were competing with each other for their share of the time and funds of the overseas program. The USIS field post office in Washington, which should have played the dominant role in establishing the field requirements and coordinating the output, was relegated to the sidelines in the struggle of the radio, press, and management functions for power. Even the Director and Deputy Director of the Agency lost control of the operations of the contending forces. This was borne out time and again in congressional inquiries of the Agency heads.

This lack of control by the Agency heads was attributable, in great measure, to the caliber of the Agency heads, but underlying their own difficulties was an organizational deficiency which was not of their own creation. Dr. Compton, the successor of Barrett, inherited an organizational structure which was designed by his predecessor and was put into operation by leaders recruited under the Barrett regime.

Mr. Streibert inherited the same organization, with the modifications engineered by the same Barrett holdovers during Dr. Johnson's short tenure.

Key personnel, who fully expected to be axed after the inauguration, stayed on to become influential advisers to Johnson. In their possession was the blacklist of personnel whom Barrett has frequently termed "malcontents," and other derogatory labels were applied to persons who had dared to question the policies of his regime. Some of the names of these employees undoubtedly cropped up in a 207 letter when the holdovers could find no way to dismiss them through regular procedures. Some minor employees with good records and civil service status, who had voted the Republican ticket, were cast adrift under the cloud of the 207 letter. They were speeded on their way by New Deal incompetents who had been the most vociferous anti-Republicans.

Those persons who were excluded from the 207 law were sidetracked from reduction-in-force processes through manipulation of the reduction-in-force lists.

In summary, the reorganization has bolstered the status of the hard core of the holdovers, and placed a few Streibert appointees at the top. Whether these few top appointees can prevail against the consolidated position of the holdovers in the face of blanket approval of the program from the White House is extremely doubtful. At this late date they enter the program as defenders. This is reflected in Streibert's statements, and is personified so well in the case of the newly appointed Chief of the International Press Service, Harlan Logan.

Logan took office on January 1, 1954. The reorganization had been completed a month or two earlier, and the justifications of the program and its budget for presentation to Congress in February were well along toward completion. He will be defending an operation and leadership which is little changed from what it was prior to the Presidential election of 1952.

What is the answer to all of this?

Either complete abolishment of the program and a new start, or else a far-reaching efficiency and management study by persons who are influenced by the need, instead of perpetuation of the past.

Whatever the method, the pending transfer of the Voice of America from New York to Washington provides the ideal setting for a thorough revamping of the program. Here is the opportunity to consolidate the numerous overlapping management and policy functions of the several media and services.

The reorganization should center on dividing the Agency into three distinct functions; namely, operations, policy, and management.

Under operations would be placed the complete control of the media servicing the field operations. Media servicing would be made subordinate to field operations.

Policy would be comprised of a small and select staff to advise the Agency Director and the Field Operations Chief.

Management would pull together all of the administrative support functions—budget, personnel, finance, and contract functions—and establish them as a supporting facility for operations, but answerable to the Director of the Agency.

The principal objective of this management, or analyzation division would be to relieve the Field Director of as much policy and administrative responsibilities as possible and to free him for direct day-to-day implementation and control of the informational policies. At his fingertips would be the media services for employment as he saw fit through USIS posts and radio broadcasting facilities. He would be relieved of the purely technical aspects of radio facilities and the mechanics of media transmission in order to concentrate on editorial content and interpretation of policy.

This same separation of editorial and psychological operations from purely management functions would also be

reflected in the individual media functions. Only skeleton administrative staffs would remain in the media services after consolidation in the central management office.

To provide greater attention to the editorial aspects of media and to enable appropriate emphasis and coordination, the media would be divided into fast media and slow media. Under fast media would be radio programing, press, and possibly pictorial functions.

The publications, motion pictures, and general visuals functions which comprise long-range implementation of informational and educational themes would be placed under slow media.

This is a general breakdown of the proposed reorganization of USIA. The detail, of which there would be considerable, would be met with a great deal of resistance because it would effect extensive budget and personnel cuts. But from it would come program coordination which has never been achieved in all of the previous reorganizations.

Mr. Chairman, the United States Information Agency was estabished during the past year for the express purpose of combatting international communism and to give to the countries of the world a true picture of the United States and its aims, insofar as its aims affect our world position. The Director of the USIA has proposed a budget for the next year of approximately $89 milion. Such diverse subjects as press services, motion-picture services, operation of information centers, maintenance of overseas missions, radio broadcasting, and overhead are provided for in this budget. If this amount of money, or even 10 times this amount of money, gave promise of stopping or slowing down the processes of international communism, the Members of this body would grant the funds without further debate. But the truth is that our information programs overseas are still giving little, if any, positive evidence of accomplishing the basic mission.

In the justification for this budget, the following sentence appears:

> Over two-thirds of the United States Information Service budget for fiscal 1955 will be expended to confound communism in Eastern Germany and to prevent its entrenchment in the hearts and habits of the enslaved population.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the fantastic number of refugees pouring into Western Germany from the East—not only from Eastern Germany, but from the other satellite countries—is clear evidence that communism has failed to find a place in the "hearts and habits of the enslaved population." Let us look into this budget in some detail.

A very great amount of money—some $6½ million—has been earmarked for the operation of packaging centers and program services in Cairo, Manila, Munich, in Washington, and elsewhere. Of this amount, $71,000 is provided for Washington—the lowest amount of any of the centers—and yet, it is Washington which is responsible for doing the job.

A qualified committee, headed by Mr. C. D. Jackson, recommended months ago that radio broadcasts to the Soviet Union should be limited to straight news and explanatory commentaries. Despite this, the Voice of America continues to insist upon program content other than news and commentary, to the detriment of our political aims. While much is made, in the justification for this budget, of the Radio RIAS in Berlin, and particularly of the role of that broadcasting station in maintaining a climate of defiance to the Soviet masters in East Germany; the Americans in charge of the broadcasting station did not hesitate to hire 3 recent employees of the Communist Party just prior to the uprising of last June. Indeed, one man, Eberhardt Schultze, had been a high official of the German Communist Party who spent much of the Hitler period in Moscow. In charge of the so-called East German programs, which are supposed to defeat the effects of Communist propaganda in that country, the man selected for the job was Heinz Frenzel, who, until a year ago, was chief of the district press office of the East German Communist Party in the State of Thuringia. Another commentator selected for a key position in the American broadcasting station in Berlin, Martin Kohl, is also reported to be a former member of the East German Communist Party.

As further evidence of the reluctance of the USIA to divorce itself from personnel presently or recently associated with the International Communist conspiracy, I would like to call your attention to the following:

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no single piece of proposed legislation which would have more far-reaching benefits to the Nation than the President's recommendation that a citizen of the United States, who is convicted in the courts of hereafter conspiring to advocate the overthrow of this Government by force or violence, be treated as having, by such act, renounced his allegiance to the United States and forfeited his United States citizenship.

The very future of our Nation and Government, and the legislative processes which are manifested in this Congress of the United States depend on curbing the doctrine of overthrow of the constitutional government of the United States by minority through armed revolt. Current history has been filled with too many instances of successful capture of governments by minority armed revolt for us to treat the phrase lightly, as was once the custom.

The groundwork for successful armed revolt is laid by just such infiltrations as have been uncovered and highlighted many times in less than a decade. Armed ovethrow of the Government and abolishment of every vestige of the Constitution, including the very political-parliamentary system of which the Democratic and Republican Parties are a part, is the aim of Communists, Left-Wing Revolutionary Socialists, and a whole host of liberals, some of whom dwell in the not-too-well-defined realm of internationalism.

Let us not confuse honest social progressiveness, and international cooperation, with the type of liberalism and internationalism which would destroy the very foundations of our constitutional government. The latter philosophy abandons the very religious, political, and social traditions on which the Constitution was founded.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly endorse the President's appeal for the legal weapons to combat the alien philosophy of overthrow of the Government by violence. I might even suggest that the proposed new legislation include some appropriate clause applicable to Government officials who knowingly shelter and defend employees who do, or have admittedly, advocated the overthrow of the United States by armed violence.

Perhaps with some such clause it might be possible to remove from office, or deny future positions of trust to, persons in the United States Information program responsible for the employment of Bertram D. Wolfe, Chief of the Ideological Advisory Staff of the Voice of America.

Bertram Wolfe, from 1919 to at least 1941, advocated, and was affiliated with at least a half dozen revolutionary Socialist and Communist organizations, including the official Communist Party, which advocated overthrow and destruction of the constitutional government by armed violence.

On July 5, 1952, and August 3, 1953, here in this Chamber, I have called attention to Bertram Wolfe's long Communist record and anti-American philosophy, and suggested that a man with his background must certainly have falsified his application for employment with the Voice of America in 1950–51.

Shortly after the adjournment of Congress last August, I confirmed my suspicion that Mr. Wolfe lied in his answer to the question in his Civil Service Commission job application, which reads: "Do you advocate or have you ever advocated, or are you now or have you ever been a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence?"

Bertram Wolfe boldly admitted that he did advocate just such a philosophy of armed violence, but only until 1929.

Now the truth is that Bertram Wolfe was the leading American teacher of the Marxist-Leninist theory of overthrow of the constitutional Government by violence from 1919 to at least 1941—first, with the Revolutionary Socialists in 1919, then with the American and Mexican Communist Parties from 1919 to 1929, and then with the Jay Lovestone Communist "splinter" organizations from 1929 to 1941. This is documented by Wolfe himself in his many writings and reports on his activities in the Lovestone official publications.

The post-1929 period, which Wolfe excluded from the view of his employers and the Civil Service Commission is his 12-year association with the following Lovestoneite Communist organizations:

Communist Party of the U. S. A., majority group, 1929 to 1932.

Communist Party of the U. S. A., opposition, 1932 to 1937.

Independent Communist Labor League of America, 1937 to 1938.

Independent Labor League of America, 1938 to 1941.

These are the semiunderground Communist organizations which Wolfe excluded from his civil-service application in 1950, and from a Civil Service Review Board in 1952. Under pressure caused by my recent revelations, and questioning by officials of USIA, Wolfe finally acknowledged for the first time, on August 25, 1953, that he retained his basic sympathy for communism until 1939, when his thinking finally underwent a change.

I will prove later in a review of Wolfe's writings and affiliations with the Lovestoneite Communists that even this belated admission of Communist sympathies after 1929 is a gross misrepresentation of his post-1929 activities, but first let us consider for a moment why Wolfe falsely stated to the Civil Service Commission that his advocacy of violent armed overthrow of the United States Government ended in 1929.

For nearly a decade Wolfe had capitalized on the legend that he had resigned from the Communist Party in 1929 and renounced Communism thereafter. As America went through successive stages of anti-Hitlerism and anti-Stalinism, Wolfe's writings on the latter subject developed an additional legend, that he was strongly anti-Communist.

Actually Wolfe did not resign from the Communist Party nor renounce communism in 1929. He and the rest of the Lovestoneites were expelled from their party positions and membership because of their zealous communism and ultra-Marxist-Leninist line of revolutionary international socialism-communism.

From 1929 to 1941, Wolfe and the Lovestoneites fought an international conflict with the Kremlin for control of Communism, and for immediate armed overthrow, not only of the American Government, but of all other governments founded on the principle of the constitutional-parliamentary system. The Lovestoneites wanted immediate destruction of all vestiges of national patriotism and the establishment of socialist federation governed by the philosophy of Karl Marx.

If there be among us any who have any doubts as to what would happen to our religious, political, and labor institutions, as well as countless other American traditions, I refer them to the manifesto of the left-wing revolutionary Socialists, which Wolfe, as a council member of that group, helped draft in 1919. This was the organization which collaborated with Lenin in 1919 to create the Communist International and the first American Communist Party. The story of the left-wing Socialists, their manifesto, and its offspring, the Communist Party, is presented in detail in the pamphlet Organized Communism in the United States, published in 1953 by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The record of Wolfe's key role in the revolutionary Socialist-Communist organizations, as well as documented evidence of Wolfe's 1929-to-1941 leadership in the Lovestone Communists, was brought to the attention of Mr. Theodore Streibert, Director of the International Information Agency, parent organization of the Voice of America.

Mr. Streibert's response, I am sorry to report, has been to turn heaven and earth to condone Wolfe's falsification of his civil-service application form, and to defend him as a loyal American engaged in a fight against international communism.

Mr. Chairman, what manner of reasoning have our Government leaders adopted, which pictures a man as a loyal American who, for at least 22 years, and right up to the time he was 45 years old, advocated and engaged in an international conspiracy to overthrow and destroy the very foundations of our Government?

This line of reasoning Mr. Streibert has followed in his defense of Wolfe, is a reflection, I think, of an information program which, for the past several years, has emphasized anticommunism without a clear realization of the fundamental alien Marxist philosophies which gave birth to communism. I think, too, that Mr. Streibert's reaction highlights the lack of understanding of, or lack of conviction in, the distinctive and revered features of the American system.

Even allowing for a possible renunciation of communism, which certainly is not evident in Bertram Wolfe's case, I cannot reconcile the appointment of such an admitted enemy of our American traditions to the key ideological policy post in the Voice of America.

To defend Wolfe's falsifications and to retain this alien philosopher in a position in which he has influenced the press, radio, and publication output of America's information and public relations, is beyond belief.

Perhaps a few persons in top positions in Government fear embarrassment over disclosure of their ignorance and negligence in employing Bertram Wolfe. But, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to destroy the Communist menace and weed out the persons who seek to overthrow and destroy the Government by armed violence, then we must start with persons, like Wolfe, who formulated the doctrine and put it into practice.

President Eisenhower came into the White House with a mandate from the people to clean up the mess in Washington. Certainly no man is more above reproach nor more sincere in his intention to preserve American heritages and to give us and the world a positive program based on those heritages.

Bertram Wolfe is the very symbol of the deep-rooted philosophies and personalities which the President inherited and which have defied his first year's efforts to unravel. Even men like Streibert, whom Eisenhower entrusted to the cleanup task, have succumbed to the insidious influence of the holdovers. Streibert failed to use the mandate given him by Congress in August to weed out Wolfe or the inestimable number of confederates and sympathizers in the agency.

From my study of the Wolfe case, I am convinced that there are countless numbers of disciples of Wolfe and the Lovestone Communists in Government today. They have not been touched by the many programs directed toward eradication of official Communist Party members from Government. In fact, the very emphasis on anti-Stalinism and anti-"totalitarian" communism has provided the very avenue for their infiltration of Government, and non-Government organizations, by these Lovestone Communists. These original Communists—the Lovestoneites—were fighting Stalin and his diversion from the most radical International Revolutionary Socialist-Communist doctrine long before America's awakening to the menace of Stalin Russia.

But the Lovestoneites have been fighting Stalin and Stalin Russia as a political adversary in the world of communism, and not as an ally in the American ideological struggle against the overthrow and destruction of the Judeo-Greco-Christian society's traditions.

Allow me now, Mr. Chairman, to highlight the philosophy and activities of the Lovestone Communists up to the time of their disbandment in 1941. It is a factual study assembled from writings of the Lovestoneites and contemporary works on international socialism-communism. Every thoughtful American, no matter what his religious or political or labor affiliation may be, should acquaint himself with the activities of this group; for it was from this group that bolshevism and communism were spawned, and it is this group which played a key role in the formation of foreign policies, which have neither defeated communism as a political-military-economic organization, nor obstructed the spread of communism-revolutionary socialism as an ideology.

Returning once again to a breakdown of the many millions of dollars requested by the United States Information Agency, I direct your attention to the fact that, despite recommendations by the President's own Committee of Inquiry, and by the Senate Subcommittee on Overseas Information Programs to the contrary, it is proposed that we spend $970,000 in the next year for the maintenance of a newspaper in West Germany called the Neuezeitung. All experts who have surveyed the situation in Germany are agreed that this is a useless expenditure, in view of the existence of German anti-Communist newspapers which are finding their way behind the Iron Curtain. In short, we are proposing here to continue, and compound, an error of the past, namely, the continuation of the most extensive and most expensive information program in the world in Germany, where communism has never gained a foothold in the more than a century since Marx proposed his revolutionary theories in that country.

The personnel requirements are estimated at approximately 900 Americans and more than 5,000 indigenous personnel in Europe. On a world-wide basis, USIA presently has 255 posts located in 85 countries. I submit that the wise course of action, at this time, is to reduce the size of USIA substantially, thus giving authority to its director to rid himself of ineffectives, and to prove the ability of the agency to meet and defeat international communism in those areas where the agency now operates. Once they have demonstrated their ability, it would be possible for the Congress gradually to increase the amount of money

available to USIA, but only on a basis of proven performance. Such performance is not now satisfactory, and has not been in the past.

USIA, instead of implementing United States policy, is apparently setting itself up as another diplomatic service. On the record—and it is a record which they have submitted to this Congress in justification for the present budget request—USIA is becoming another State Department. They have asked for diplomatic passports. They are unable to reduce personnel requirements below 11,500 persons. No cognizance has been taken of the existence of other information services sponsored by private funds, such as Radio Free Europe, Radio Free Asia. No notice whatever is taken of the anti-Communist services of the other free governments, such as the British Empire, operating in the same areas. In Manila, for example—certainly the very heart of the free world in Asia, and with a magnificent record of the Philippines' fight against communism—we are presently operating a $400,000 printing plant. We are asked to provide $2½ million for a production center in Paris—primarily to produce films which could be produced cheaper and better right here—which would provide handouts for news centers which have their own news-gathering facilities and are staffed by enormous numbers of Americans who compound a situation of confusion that is already chaotic.

We have increased, in this budget, the amounts of money for other motion-picture productions to a total of nearly $7 million. This, despite the availability of pro-American motion pictures, without cost to the Government, from private industry and from the motion-picture industry itself.

In the past 5 years, the American taxpayer has paid out one-half billion dollars for global-information programs and, in those 5 years, communism has won the battle on all propaganda fronts. USIA operates information centers throughout the world, which receive daily handouts prepared in the United States at one of the production centers which, if used at all, would be questionable, but which, by their disuse and misuse, are downright extravagance.

As another example, take the matter of travel in Germany. It is difficult to see how the 173 Americans, assigned to Public Affairs of the High Commissioner's office, could expend an estimated $239,952 for travel. It is equally difficult to understand how 5 Americans and 669 Germans are required for the Neuezeitung newspaper, while only 1 American and 7 Germans are provided for the publication of what is supposed to be our principal cultural publication (the magazine Der Monat); not even why 13 Americans and 622 Germans are required for the operation of radio programs in Germany. In its continued justification for this enormous budget, USIA claims, "especially in the film, pamphlet, and library fields, are aimed at the refugee camps in West Germany, breeding places for malcontents and socially and economically unstable elements." I am glad to see this, because it was reported by congressional committees a year ago that, in these refugee camps, no effort was being made by the United States Government to indoctrinate and orientate refugees. However, I question whether United States personnel and money can do a better job among these refugees than the vigorous West Germans themselves, who have integrated the one-half million refugees in their economy in the past year. This seems to me to be the most effective anti-Communist propaganda effort.

Mr. Chairman, I could take the rest of my time here today to invite the attention of my colleagues in the House to case after case in the proposed budget even more glaring than those which I have cited today. It should not be necessary for me to do this, and it would not be necessary had this budget been carefully examined by the director of USIA himself. I feel sure that had he done so and not accepted the estimates of the Truman-Acheson appointed subordinates in his office, he himself, would have arrived at a figure at least 30 percent under that which he proposed. I say again that if the caliber of personnel in USIA were commensurate with the amount of funds for which they asked, and if the work of USIA reflected true value for each tax dollar so carelessly allocated, no Member of the Congress would fail to give his wholehearted support to such requests. The fact that we do not have an effective overseas program is demonstrated by the success of the Soviet international propaganda effort in the Far East, in Italy, and in the satellite countries of western Europe. It is not enough merely to irritate the Communist conspiracy in our approach to the program of international information; it is not enough to devote millions of dollars to this effort. What is needed is a program and a policy directly implementing United States policies, and loyal to the present administration and its aims and purposes abroad. In the International Press Service—a key agency with many high-ranking and high-salaried employees—12 of the 14 branch chiefs and assistants are nonveteran holdovers of the old Office of War Information. It should be self-evident that examples like these are of themselves enough to make us pause in approving this budget. There are presently 973 employees in the Voice of America in New York City. It must be assumed that most of these fall into the category which I have just described. How can we possibly expect these people without experience in information media—other than the OWI—to carry out the present policy of this Government? How can we expect these people, reared in an era of boondoggling and give-away foreign-aid programs to prepare a budget aimed at the effective reduction of costs? Last, but most important, how can we expect these people, with their left-wing slant (and left-wing appointed), effectively to oppose international communism? The answer is self-evident, and it lies in a here-and-now reduction of taxpayers' dollars to a point where those people who line up on March 15th to pay for this international effort have some assurance that their dollars are indeed to protect and further the interests of the United States.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. Chairman, sometimes I think we are unable to see the forest for the trees.

We are in a cold war, a new type of war, but it is no less venomous, no less deadly, than a shooting war. We have been in that cold war for 7 years and there is nothing to indicate we are approaching the end.

In this war, propaganda has been one of the principal weapons used. It is one of the principal weapons available. I do not have to tell any Member of this House that the Communists have used propaganda to great advantage. They have used it with such telling effect that a great many of the so-called neutral peoples of the world today do not know whether we are right or whether the Reds are right.

You can never have a better commentary on the effectiveness of propaganda than that. We know who is right but our propaganda has not convinced others. Now it is proposed that we, to all effects and purposes, abandon our propaganda efforts, close down shop, and abandon any effective efforts to tell our story to the world. That is what this amendment would do.

Look around a little; make some inquiry; try to find out just what has been done by the information services before you take such a foolish step. You will find when you do that the information services are among our main defenses today. They are America's counterweapons to the Red propaganda that has been used with such telling effect during these past 7 years that we have been engaged in a cold war.

Of course, we do not agree with all the things the information services have done. They have done some foolish things. But I do not believe in shooting a horse just because he stumbles once or twice. We still can get a lot of work out of that horse. We still need him. We need the information services. We need them on a much bigger scale than they can operate under this bill that is before us now.

The facts are that the Reds are spending many dollars for every dollar that we spend in propaganda, yet ours has been very effective. The information services are doing a lot of good. I have seen their work; I have seen some of the effects of it.

Last fall, I was privileged to participate in an inspection trip of several different Government installations in Western Europe as a member of the Appropriations Committee. In the course of this trip, I observed a number of the operations of the United States Information Agency and the effect on these operations of the deep cuts made last summer in the appropriations for the overseas information program.

There is no question these contractions worked serious hardship on some of the Agency's operations. For example, the reduction in funds caused the elimination of some essential personnel, forcing the Agency to adopt an un-

economic level of operations in some phases of its work.

Therefore, from my own observations, I would say that the increased funds being requested by the President are necessary if the Agency is to operate at a minimum reasonable level of operations. In no sense can this be labeled a request for an expanded program.

Critics will ask, of course, can we appropriate the funds requested with the confidence that they will be spent effectively? From personal observation, again, I would say, yes, emphatically.

I have found it interesting, for example, to observe the contrast between the effectiveness of American and Soviet information activities in Austria. In Vienna, the Soviets have a very elaborate information center on which they spend an estimated $25 million annually. This is many times the amount the United States has to spend on its center in Vienna. Yet, by actual count, the Reds have an average of 400 visitors to their information center daily, in contrast to our average of 3,000.

And on visits to both these centers, I was amazed at the enthusiastic quest for information at the American center, contrasted with the indifference of groups who wander in and out of the Soviet center.

Another operation which impressed me was the Voice of America's radio center at Munich, Germany. This center originates programs and also relays VOA short-wave broadcasts coming from the United States. It has a key role in that part of our whole broadcasting effort aimed at the captive peoples behind the iron curtain.

The Munich center is a good example of the important recent trend in our world-wide radio operations toward locally broadcast programs. In these radio operations, we are relying less and less on long-distance short-wave broadcasts which are relatively difficult to receive. Instead, we are placing more and more programs on local stations or networks abroad or broadcasting or relaying programs from stations of our own located close to the potential audience. In this way, we are able to reach many more people than by short-wave transmission alone.

The operations of the Munich center were recently strengthened by the addition of a powerful new million-watt transmitter, one of three placed in operation around the world by VOA last summer. These transmitters are the most powerful in the world. They help greatly to overcome Soviet jamming, and reach audiences that formerly were out of range.

The new Munich transmitter, interestingly enough, is on the same wavelength as the most powerful Soviet station in Moscow. Its operation has driven the output of this Soviet station back to about 200 miles from Moscow. As a result, if the Russians try to jam our incoming signal, they only succeed in jamming their own broadcasts in the area as well.

I was also very much impressed by the local broadcasting we are doing in Austria over the Red-White-Red network. The programs of this network are popular in Austria. It also helps meet the daily need for information of captive peoples behind the curtain.

Having observed our broadcasting operations at Munich and in Austria, I was particularly interested in an item which appeared recently in the press regarding the effectiveness of our broadcasts to some of the Iron Curtain countries.

An independent study has just been completed of the reactions of 110 young refugees to western radio programs. In this study, it was found that the most popular western station was the Voice of America. Second, was the British Broadcasting Corp., and, third, Radio Free Europe. These young refugees, interviewed over a year period, comprised 13 nationalities and had escaped from 8 different countries.

Thus, my confidence in our overseas information program derives partially from these recent personal observations of several of its operations.

I would not venture to suggest, however, that you support the President's request merely on the basis of these observations, for there have been important changes in the whole information program in the past several months which you must also take into account.

You will recall that the deep cuts made in the 1954 appropriation for this program were justified largely on the grounds that the program was badly in need of a thorough shakeup.

The past 6 months have brought such a shakeup. Substantial changes have been made in both the organization and methods of administration of the program:

All nonmilitary overseas information programs have now been consolidated in the new United States Information Agency.

The new Agency has been given a new mission and concept of operation by the President upon the advice of the National Security Council. This new mission stresses the interests and goals we share with other peoples. In carrying out this mission, emphasis is placed on objective, factual news reporting. Both the new mission and the emphasis on factual reporting have received considerable acclaim in the editorial pages of the American press.

Better coordination of our information programs with the other policies and actions of our Government has been achieved through the establishment of the Operations Coordinating Board—a unit of the National Security Council.

In its operations, the information program is now concentrating on fewer objectives in each country abroad. By this means, better use is being made of the resources available to the program.

A number of steps have been taken to achieve the decentralization of overseas operations called for by the Congress and other groups over the past several years.

The Director has also reported that the authority granted him by the Congress in the current fiscal year to remove incompetent employees in some categories has been used to improve the overall efficiency of the Agency. Likewise, according to the Director, all persons deemed security risks have been removed.

Several new executives—many of them from private industry—have been brought into the top staff of the Agency.

Increased emphasis has been placed one bringing the skills and resources of private groups into our whole overseas information effort.

This is an impressive list of changes. These changes have gone a long way toward meeting the major criticisms which have been made against the program.

In this connection, I would like to commend to your attention the recent comments of two important groups which have been critical of the program in the past—the Hickenlooper committee and the United States Advisory Commission on Information, made up of a number of distinguished private citizens.

Appraising the first 6 months' operations of the new United States Information Agency, the Hickenlooper committee said this in its final report, dated February 1954:

> There has been improvement in the operation of the information program during the past 6 months. * * * Many shortcomings remain and there is, as there always will be, room for improvement. It does appear, however, that a solid foundation for further progress has been laid. Many new policies have been initiated during the past 6 months and these should bear fruit as they take firmer hold and permeate the entire organization.

In a report also publisher this month, covering the same period of operations, the United States Advisory Commission on Information said this:

> In our judgment the new agency is off to a good start. * * * While it is altogether too early to judge the results of its work, yet its efforts reflect an honest and intelligent effort to comply with the wishes of the new administration and of the 83d Congress for a bold, new type of program. For this effort we feel it deserves, for the time being at least, the sympathetic support of the executive and legislative branches of our Government, private industry, and the general public.

Considering these facts, I feel that even those who have been most severely critical of this program in the past can support with confidence the comparatively modest increase being requested by the President.

Certainly the amount being requested is not too great considering the magnitude of the problems we face overseas.

There is little question that these overseas information programs are essential to our national security. We cannot possibly do without them so long as Communist imperialism stalks the earth and continues to menace peace and freedom everywhere.

The menace from Communist propaganda is fully as great as from their armies.

The Communist imperialists have used propaganda as a tool of conquest with telling effect.

And they have succeeded in convincing millions of people in many parts of the world that we, the Americans, are bent on imperialist aggression.

Therefore, it is not enough in the world today for us merely to do the right thing. We must also convince others we are doing right—convince them that our actions help them achieve their legitimate goals and that we do not threaten them in any way.

And we must accomplish this difficult job of persuasion in the face of a Soviet propaganda machine which presses on relentlessly and tirelessly — sowing hatred, suspicion, and distrust—seeking to tear down everything we have sought to build, seeking to twist the face of a friend so it appears as the face of an aggressor.

This Soviet propaganda machine has enormous proportions. There is no way of getting an accurate estimate of how much the Soviet and its satellites spend on external propaganda. However, the most recent estimates are that on both internal and external propaganda the Soviet Union spent $1,160,000,000 on direct propaganda activities in 1953. Communist China budgeted an even larger amount for propaganda in 1953—$1,400,000,000. Certainly, it is obvious that on activities comparable to those conducted by the United States Information Agency the Communist nations are spending many times the $89 million requested in the President's budget. I, for one, feel that compared with what these amounts must be, the funds requested by the President for the program of the United States Information Agency appear relatively insignificant.

Yet, if the cause of freedom is to triumph, we must succeed in thwarting the aims of this enormous Communist propaganda machine. Let us not overlook the fact that it is possible to lose the war against communism—even if not another shot is fired, not another bomb dropped, not another human being sacrificed in the agony of battle.

In summary, then, I have cited four major reasons why I believe that the Members of this distinguished body should support the comparatively modest increase in funds for the overseas information program requested by the President:

First. Considering the heavy cuts in the 1954 appropriation for the information program, the President's request in effect is not for a true increase, but merely for the restoration of a minimum reasonable level of appropriations.

Second. From my own personal observations of certain USIA operations, I am convinced that the overseas information program by and large is an effective operation meriting the support of this Congress.

Third. Important changes have been made in the program during the past several months which have met nearly all of the criticisms made in the past. Therefore, I believe that even those who have been most critical of the program in the past can now support the President's request with confidence.

Fourth. The global problems we face, and the enormous propaganda machine of the Communists, demand from us an adequate overseas information effort.

Therefore, we must demonstrate that we can face the facts. If we are to win the struggle being waged today for the minds of men, we must be sure we provide the tools they need to those who fight our battles. We are getting results. We must have these results. It would be a serious mistake to make the cut that is proposed here.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I agree with the gentleman that it is a very important branch of our psychological warfare, but the personnel that has been held over from the prior administration is still there. It is not effective any more. I think the thing to be done is to cut the whole agency by 75 percent of personnel and build it up with the right kind of personnel and give them twice as much money.

Mr. SIKES. Is the gentleman aggrieved simply because his party has not been able to fire everybody acquired from the previous administration? Is that the gentleman's only quarrel with the program?

Mr. BUSBEY. No. It is the caliber of personnel acquired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the pending proposed action of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], would not only be foolish, but dangerous; dangerous at a time when international tensions are what they are, when we are spending as much as we are for arms and defense against communism all over the world, and at a time when the Soviet Union is spending sums far in excess of this for their vicious untruthful propaganda activities. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is not a member of this subcommittee. Consequently, he did not attend the hearings and listen to the agency's justifications. We know of his record as a hunter of known Communists. He mentioned one here on the floor who Mr. TABER says is no longer connected with the agency.

No Member of this House has been more vigorous in his efforts to have Communists and people who are real security risks summarily thrown out of the Government than the present speaker, the gentleman from New York.

Adoption of the pending amendment would utterly devastate this vitally important program. I have been, I think, as critical of the operation of this program over the years as any Member of the House. Members will recall that one time this agency presented to the subcommittee a supplemental request for $97.5 million, and the committee unanimously, and the House agreed with us, cut $90 million out of that request. At that time I was the chairman.

I want the best information agency we can get. I do not believe in their going into frills and activities which are not directed against communism and the Iron Curtain. I do not believe that they should spend a couple of hundred thousand dollars of the taxpayers' money to tell the American public how good they are. That was proposed in this budget, but the committee unanimously cut it out. Why, they are busy down there day after day getting out press releases, telling about this new person added to the agency and the transfer of this other one. We could save many dollars in stencils and mimeograph paper by discontinuing such nonsense. The time and effort to compose these releases should be directed toward piercing the Iron Curtain. But because I disagree with this activity is no reason to utterly cripple a vital program.

The committee has already taken substantial action in regard to this agency's request when they cut some $13 million from the amount of the budget estimate. To now reduce the amount further by $20 million, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] proposes, would be utterly dangerous and unwarranted. I trust the pending amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois; one of the few times that I think I have ever opposed an amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. We generally are in accord.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say now that I am not familiar with the particular case that the gentleman from Illinois has discussed. However, I am seriously concerned with the cut that he has suggested.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has said, I have been one of the severe critics of the United States Information Agency and in the past have taken the floor to support substantial cuts, to remove what we felt were unnecessary activities in this agency. But to further cut this program at this time would be taking away from this administration the opportunity to have a proper information service throughout the world.

I wish each Member of the House could have heard the presentation made to our committee by the new Director of the United States Information Service, Mr. Streibert. I am sure that everyone here would have been impressed, as were the members of our committee, that here we had a man to head up this organization qualified to do it from experience in the past in private industry. Mr. Streibert was before the committee for 4 days. Here is a man, the head of a new agency, who was able to come in and present himself practically all the testimony before our committee. He has shown himself well advised as to what was going on.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield for a question.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am not disputing the fact that Mr. Streibert is a radio man from the mechanical standpoint, but will the gentleman enlighten the Members as to what qualifications or experience he has had in dealing with the subject of communism? The only reason for spending all this money is to stop and contain communism.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Streibert has had experience in the radio field, the information field, and in administration. You can get any number of people who are investigators of communism, you can get writers who can write, but in

this agency in the past the trouble has been that we have had people who were not familiar with administration, how to run an agency, who were not familiar with the operation of large radio operations. The gentleman has seen the waste, and so have I.

The President himself has taken an interest in the United States Information Service by his reorganization plan. We have gone under the President's request with the bill we have brought to you. We think we have taken out some matters that should not have been in, of which the gentleman from New York spoke, such as propagandizing in this country. If we are going in this cold war to meet the Communist threat to the world, we cannot cut this program any further than it has been cut. I will say to the House as I did a year ago, when this agency begins to supply the kind of information service I know the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] wants and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and the Members of this House, I for one will vote to increase these appropriations as they make their proof.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman on his fine statement and to express my agreement with it and my opposition to this amendment. I happen to have known Mr. Streibert for a good many years. He is a gentleman of the highest character, great ability, and broad experience. If anybody can carry this agency to a successful conclusion he is the man.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I thoroughly agree with what has been said here in opposition to the pending amendment by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]. I believe Mr. Streibert is a highly intelligent, capable gentleman trying to do a good job. I disagree with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] with regard to him. I do not know how many times the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has met him, but he appeared before this committee for 4 or 5 full days, from early in the morning until late in the evening, and every member of the committee had a chance to observe the sort of gentleman he is.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I refer the attention of the gentleman to page 385 of the hearings where the gentleman himself [Mr. BOW] stated:

> So that I may be sure I am right on this, the office which Mr. Washburn fills is new to the Service; Mr. Dickey is new, Mr. Witherow, Mr. Smith, Mr. Logan, Mr. Cook, and Mr. Berding, are all new?

Is the gentleman bringing out the fact that the new top executives in this agency are all new people and are not continuations of old personnel?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will read my extension of remarks in the RECORD about the replacement of personnel, and then he will be convinced that less of the old personnel have been replaced in this agency than in any other agency of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amount which the committee is allowing for this particular type of work. I think our efforts to get behind the Iron Curtain are excellent, and while they are getting results, I think we ought to support these efforts and support them very enthusiastically. There is one part of the program, however, which does not meet my approval. I think it is wrong. I have taken this matter up with the State Department. Thus far, I have gotten rather meager results. I refer to the arrangements which we have in many instances to permit foreign legations in the United States to propagandize our people in return for which we hope to get a peep at what is going on behind the Iron Curtain. I think that this arrangement to let these people use our facilities for communism is all wrong. For instance, up until last December, I believe it was, we allowed the Rumanian Legation to publicize what was called the Rumanian News, a propaganda magazine, in the United States. These people had the right under a reciprocal arrangement to release as many copies of this publication and as often as they wanted to, as I understand it, throughout the United States to propagandize our people. It was pure and simple communistic propaganda given to our people for the purpose of converting them to the cause of communism. I am glad to say that the Department of State, when this matter was called to its attention, acted quickly and stopped this publication. I understood then that the Rumanian News was the last publication of that sort which was being permitted to be circulated in the United States. I rather breathed a sigh of relief and thought, "Well, this thing is all over." The other day, however, Mr. Chairman, I was given a copy of a booklet that is called the New Hungary.

New Hungary is a publication printed by the Legation here in Washington from the Iron Curtain country of Hungary. It is spread throughout the United States by use of our mail. It is being mailed out to my district in Louisiana. It is being mailed out to your districts. It is being mailed largely to libraries and organizations. I think that it is a reprehensible situation that allows these Iron Curtain countries to publicize their Communist propaganda and to use our United States mails, to carry at less than cost this propaganda. Therefore, we are subsidizing the distribution of this publication and permitting it to be sent to our people to read so that they may be converted, if they are so deluded and misguided and benighted as to become Communists. Then, Mr. Chairman, we set up three great committees in the Congress of the United States. Do I have to name them? Everybody knows the names of these three great committees. We have a committee in the House of Representatives. I am proud of the fact that I voted to organize that committee originally when it was created. We have these committees set up here for the purpose of running down those people who believe in communism. We have, on the other hand, an arrangement under which we agree to carry Iron Curtain communistic propaganda publications printed and edited by the legations here in Washington and send it throughout the country for the express objective of creating communism in our land. I do not think anybody can exactly harmonize that situation. You cannot say in one breath that we want to locate these people who fight our Government, and we want to turn the searchlight of publicity on them, and that we want to put them into jail and yet at the same time we subsidize the carrying of their publications throughout the United States of America.

I am against this arrangement just as violently as a man can be against communism. I think it should be stopped, and I so told the State Department, and I have letters in my office defending this program, from the State Department—not from the leftover members in the State Department, but the Assistant Secretary of State who is there at this hour, functioning, defending that type of practice.

I do not think any Member of the House of Representatives is going to defend that type of practice of permitting those people to communize the people of the United States by using our mails as a subsidy for their propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has expired.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will not take the entire 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that while I agree with what I think is the major sentiment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], namely, that the VOA program should be hard hitting and anti-Communist, I regret to say that I disagree with the gentleman's amendment to cut the appropriation. I think the program is becoming more anti-Communist, and getting away from the neutral position in which it has been. Undoubtedly, there is room for improvement. But the top men of the VOA are

good and dedicated men, and they mean to formulate a program to oppose the vicious lies of the Communists. If we are going to oppose the Communist line, we must have an effective anti-Communist line. Some people disdain the term "anti-Communist." But communism is essentially evil. One cannot disdain being "antievil."

I have had the privilege of associating myself with the gentleman from Illinois in hearings before our special committee to investigate the Soviet seizure of the Baltics and he and others have brought out some hard-hitting anti-Communist facts. These hearings have been used over the Voice of America, and at least 14 times Red radios from Moscow and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain have hit back at us, indicating that we are drawing some blood. The Voice of America has cooperated with us very well, having beamed our hearing each day. The proof that the VOA has been effective with our hearings is the vicious Communist counterattack.

One further thing I would like to point out is some of the printed type of Soviet propaganda that we must hit at. I have in my hand a Soviet textbook for schoolchildren printed in Moscow to be used in the captive nations, to educate the children of the captive nations. Here is a little pamphlet to the same effect. This textbook is designed to educate the children in the captive nations along the Communist line. This literature is spread into the captive nations by the millions and we must counteract it with literature of the free world. Otherwise, the new generation growing up in the captive nations will be fanatical Communists anxious to fight the West.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I wish to assure the gentleman from Wisconsin I do not want to destroy anything in the information program that is doing a good job. I want to strengthen that. I just want to get rid of the other part of the program that is not doing as good a job as some people around the country think they are doing. If they are given a little cut we might get rid of some of those people and be able to hire some people who are better qualified to make the program more effective. I am not against the program.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I am happy to have the gentleman's statement that he is not against the program.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. It seems that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] wants to strengthen the activity by cutting it to the extent of $20 million. It reminds me of the way President Eisenhower strengthened the Air Force; he took $5 billion away from them.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman from New York, I would rather have no program than a bad program or a neutral program. I think we should have a hard-hitting, anti-Communist program. I think we are moving in that direction, and the faster we do it the better.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman agree that the agency which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] was talking about a few minutes ago, when he was referring to the State Department USIS, now is separated from that agency, and is not the one he was referring to?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I so understood. I did not think it referred to the Voice of America in any respect whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, as one Member I must vigorously protest the sharp cut made in the appropriation for the United States Information Agency, over $13 million under the budget estimate. At a time when it is estimated that the Communists are spending the equivalent of $1,500,000,000 in this very field and when we are locked in a mortal struggle with them in Europe, Asia, and the Americas it seems inconceivable that we would not go all out in our own education and information program. All the arguments which have heretofore been made against this agency have now been answered. It has a directive from no less than the National Security Council, it is magnificently staffed, it has trimmed its employees by one-third, its scripts and presentation are hard hitting, factual and direct. Now that the agency has been reorganized and consolidated, answering all the complaints of before, we must back it in a full program. This is an essential third of the fight against communism, the other two parts being military and economic. To say that the amount granted is the same as last year is not an answer because last year the program was in reorganization and was still being held down as a changeover from the previous administration and in view of a major move from New York to Washington and other factors. I recognize the situation before the House and shall do all I can to get this amount materially increased in the other body and in conference.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question in my mind but what the Voice of America today is a very much better instrument than it was a year ago, 2 years ago, or 3 years ago. I think, however, that we still overestimate its value. I was talking to a refugee from behind the Iron Curtain just a short time ago, and I asked him about the effectiveness of the Voice of America behind the Iron Curtain. He said: "You know, those of us who do listen to it cannot help but get smiles on our faces when we hear the Americans talk about how bad communism is, because we have it, we live under it, we know how dastardly it is, we are slaves of it; and it is rather ironical to have a country like America tell us how bad it is." Still I feel that the Voice of America should carry on, but I think that it will be ineffective and it will fail in its purpose if we do not implement what we hope to carry out by the Voice of America.

What we intend to do by the Voice of America is to discourage those people behind the Iron Curtain from accepting the doctrine of communism, to run away from communism, desert if they possibly can; and they are not deserting necessarily because they listen to the Voice of America but because they despise communism; and they are deserting by the hundreds every day. The point I am making is that when they carry out our suggestion and desert communism and come over to our side there is no provision or security for them. I would like to give you the story of three young men who were fliers, crack fliers, expert fliers in their respective countries dominated by the Communists. They came over to the United States of America at our suggestion hoping that they could join the United States Air Force and help fight godless communism throughout the world. When they came over to America they were interrogated for hours and weeks and months, and when the various agencies of our Government got all the information from them they could they were cast out into the street. In other words they could not become members of the United States Air Force or any air force for that matter to fight for their homeland.

I think there are two agencies of our Government that should work hand in hand: No. 1, the Voice of America should be continued, but we should implement the Voice of America and do something and carry through when these people follow our suggestion and desert. I would like to say in that respect that when we passed the mutual security bill some time ago, I think it was about 3 years ago, this Congress in its wisdom provided $100 million which is already appropriated, to take care of these people who desert from behind the Iron Curtain and give them an opportunity to do something respectable, to fight back for their homelands.

Much to my regret, not one dime of that $100 million that this Congress in its wisdom and far in advance of those in charge of our security has been spent. This Congress provided $100 million to take care of those people who came from behind the Iron Curtain, but not a dollar of that money has been used for that purpose.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this spending of $78 million or $79 million for the Voice of America asking these people to desert and come over to our side—and they are doing it in droves—will do no good unless we also get these people in charge of our security and our defense to use the $100 million that this Congress in its wisdom provided to take care of those people so that they could take jobs, be responsible, and have jobs of responsibility, and, most of all, be given

the opportunity to fight back for their homeland. This thing is going to boomerang because we are getting so many refugees now that they are beginning to ask questions. I might mention the Czech flier who escaped some months ago. He is now in the United States of America. After he has given all the information to the various agencies of our Government that he possibly could he has been refused entry into the United States Air Force and is now simply cast upon the streets, looking for a place to hang his hat. There are thousands of refugees in the same hopeless predicament. Those boys are going to begin to ask questions. They are going to begin to say: "Well, did we do the right thing? Over there we were fliers, we were lieutenants, and even if we were slaves, at least we had jobs, whereas here in the United States of America, where we hoped that we may get some opportunity to fight back for our homeland, that opportunity is denied us."

I say to you that unless we make provision for those people who escape as the result of our propaganda we should cut out the propaganda because, in my judgment, it is not right to ask people to expose themselves and then deny them an opportunity to fight for their homeland.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who know the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] realize that he is just as heartily in favor of this program as anyone can be. All he is trying to do is to call to the attention of the House and to some of those who have been trying to carry it on is to suggest that we get more competent individuals to handle it. That when an individual has been shown to be a Red or perhaps if he is just pink, he be removed from the service so a better, more competent man may take over.

In the last few days we have seen plenty in the papers about a statement which came from the President, suggesting that while he as much as anyone would fight communism as vigorously as anyone no matter where it cropped up, he wanted witnesses in congressional hearings treated courteously. We had a statement from a Member of the other body, whose home is in Wisconsin, in reference to how we should go about exposing communism and Communists. He insists that he treats witnesses fairly, though he may have made a mistake a few days ago. Of course, while some of us think that the gentleman from Wisconsin may have been a little hasty in expressing his opinion the other day—we all know the bitter opposition to his actions, since he is doing a worthwhile job which no one else seemed as capable of doing—we know the Army was absolutely wrong in following the course which it did with reference to the individual the gentleman from Wisconsin was talking about. The President so states.

To show that the Army like some of the rest of us can be off on the wrong foot, let me call your attention to this little book. And what happened to it. Here it is. It is John Roy Carlson's Under Cover. Now that was put out in 1943 and it names and charges 41 Members of the House as well as 20 Members of the Senate with subversive activities. There were 4 Members of the House from Michigan named in the group.

What does it do? What was its purpose? Well, it just tries to tell the people of the country that there were subversives among Members of the House, naming them. It was a deliberate lying attempt to destroy politically, to liquidate, if you please, conservative Members of Congress. Let me give you a sample of the logic of John Roy Carlson.

Let me quote from page 200 about one Member of the House. He said there were four from Michigan. Here is an example. This is what he wrote about Mr. DONDERO, the gentleman from Detroit. If there ever was a man in the House who was and is after Communists all the time it is and was the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. No more able, patriotic Member ever came to Congress. What did Carlson and his gang have against him? Why did they cite him as subversive? Referring to a certain published article here is what Carlson—and that is but one of the several aliases he used—Carlson wrote:

> And one by Congressman GEORGE A. DONDERO, is titled "United States Never Was a Democracy."

Most people know it is not—we know that it is a representative republic.

What do you know about that? The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] said that this was a republican form of government, as did Benjamin Franklin, yet he is cited by this author as being subversive and his accurate description of our form of government is the proof. What nonsense.

Who put it out? Who gave circulation to this book with its vile, evil, false charges? This is what I am getting at and this is the point I am trying to make. The Army bought copies of the book with its false charges and gave copies to men in the service.

I wrote The Adjutant General on September 14, 1943, and I asked him how many of these books were purchased by the Army with tax dollars and sent out by the Army and whether there was any truth to the report made by a nationally known commentator that 5,000 had been purchased and distributed to forces overseas. He said there was not any truth to that.

But here is what he also wrote me:

> This is in further reply to your letter of September 14, 1943, inquiring as to the accuracy of the allegation that the Army has purchased 5,000 copies of the book, Under Cover, for distribution to our soldiers.
>
> Reports from the field just now available to me reveal that, in response to requests emanating from among some 5,500,000 soldiers, a total of 363 copies of this book has been purchased for post libraries from appropriated and nonappropriated funds, and that 107 additional copies are on order.

That was a total of 470 copies of this lying book carrying false charges of a lack of loyalty of 61 Members of Congress that the Army as early as 1943 was buying and making available to the servicemen—false charges which it was thought might make the fighting men think they were not being supported by the folks at home.

Why did the Army do it? The Army did not do it. It was the act of some—to be charitable—nitwit who wanted to stir up trouble.

Let me read you what Judge Barnes said in Chicago when the house that published Under Cover was sued for libel:

> The charges in the book—in the first place, the book is over 500 pages of twaddle—just twaddle, with a few outrageous charges—wholly unfounded charges, of which any citizen—any loyal citizen may very properly complain.
>
> And they charge—I think they charge plaintiff—this book charges the plaintiff with being disloyal, being a Nazi agent, being an enemy of the United States, and being anti-Semitic. And I didn't hear any evidence of the truth of those charges. It wasn't attempted to show that he was a Nazi agent. It wasn't attempted to show that he was an enemy of the country. It was attempted to show that he was anti-Semitic. I didn't see any evidence of that fact.
>
> I think that book was written by a wholly irresponsible person who was willing to say anything for money. I wouldn't believe him on oath, now or at any time hereafter.
>
> I think that book was published by a publisher who was willing to publish anything for money. That is what I think about it. I don't think they made any adequate investigation of the author of that book. If they had they would not publish it unless they cared more for the almighty dollar than they care for human decency. That is the way I feel about it.

And, John Roy Carlson last week was lecturing in Detroit still going around peddling his poison. My point is that we better hunt Communists and communism wherever we find them, even though they may be in the Republican Party. Certainly no executive department—should be a "city of refuge" for either—The President so says and our Wisconsin friend intends—if I understand him—intends to hunt them out—maybe he was a little rough the other day, but, would our leftwing Communists complain so long as they do not want the job, unless of course they prefer they remain hidden.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(The Clerk again read the amendment.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: At page 52, after line 19, add the following new section:
>
> "SEC. 604. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any officer or employee of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs

of the Department of State who, for the purposes of the act of August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U. S. C. 118i), shall not be included within the construction of the term 'officer' or 'employee'."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill; that it changes existing law and requires new and additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I cite volume VII, Cannon's Precedents, section 1663 and section 1670:

1. Denial of use of an appropriation for payment of salaries of employees of the Department of Agriculture who forecast the price of agricultural products was construed as a proper limitation and in order on an appropriation bill.

The Chairman at that time, March 2, 1928, Allen T. Treadway, of Massachusetts, relied on prior decisions of Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. Graham, of Illinois, in 1924, and Mr. Longworth, of Ohio, in 1923, and held such a limitation proper and not subject to point of order.

2. An amendment forbidding payment of salary authorized by law from any part of an appropriation to a designated individual was held to be a limitation and in order on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. TABER. I do, Mr. Chairman.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, refers to the so-called Hatch Act, section 118i, of title V of the Code. It reads as follows:

For the purposes of this section the term "officer" or "employee" shall not be construed to include (1) the President and Vice President of the United States; (2) persons whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the Office of the President (3) heads and assistant heads of executive departments; (4) officers who are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the nationwide administration of Federal laws. The provisions of the second sentence of this subsection shall not apply to the employees of the Alaska Railroad.

This provision in effect brings about the prohibition of payments to these employees who are not determined to be officers or employees within the provisions of this paragraph of section 118. It requires a determination on the part of some officer before the thing can be effective. For that reason, it requires additional duties to be performed by some officer before it can be effective. Therefore, it is subject to the rule that it requires additional duties, and it is an attempt on the part of the amendment to change and enlarge the provisions of that section.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard further?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in House Report No. 1365, 82d Congress, relative to H. R. 5678, the McCarran-Walter bill, it is stated on page 36:

The Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, section 104, creates a new organizational setup within the Department of State to administer the issuance of passports and visas. There will be a responsible authority in the Department of State of rank and power corresponding to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover—

and the Central Intelligence Agency—

Mr. Dulles—

all of whom are to collaborate in the interests of national security.

Is it the contention of anybody here that we would want, for instance, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover going around the country making political speeches?

The CHAIRMAN. That is just an observation. It does not go to the point of order.

Mr. RABAUT. I know; but I have raised the point of order, Mr. Chairman, and I would like a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

This amendment in brief provides that no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any officer or employee of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs who shall not be included within the construction of the term "officer" or "employee."

It appears to the Chair that the contention of those who make the point of order is answered by this provision in Hinds' Precedents, volume IV, section 3954:

A provision that no part of an appropriation for pay of retired Army officers should go to one receiving pay for services as a civil employee was held to be a limitation.

Likewise we have a similar expression in Cannon's Precedents, volume VII, section 1651, which contains the provision that no part of an appropriation shall be allotted to a beneficiary failing to comply with certain requirements. That provision was held in order as a proper limitation on an appropriation bill. With those two precedents the Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order, and the Chair so rules.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment to make clear the intent of Congress when it established the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs through the passage of H. R. 5678, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, Public Law 414. There is nothing punitive about this amendment. It in no way refers to prior political activities of the individuals concerned. The State Department has vacillated in its reasoning, but steadily held the conclusion that the Director of the Bureau is not subject to the prohibition against political activity contained in the Hatch Act. The Civil Service Commission has at least informally indicated to the contrary. Such confusion about the nature of this important office should be cleared up. House Report 1365 of the 82d Congress on the bill H. R. 5678 described this authority in the Department of State as having rank and power corresponding to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency. I am sure no Member of the House would deem it proper for FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, or the CIA Director, Allen Dulles, to go charging about the country making political speeches in the manner of Mr. McLeod. My amendment makes it perfectly clear that Congress intended these two officials to be in the same category in this respect. Politics is not and should not be the province of these officers to whom we have entrusted the guardianship of the national security. For this reason I present my amendment and hope the House will support it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. May I ask if the gentleman made a speech similar to this when the former administrator of the ECA, Mr. Averell Harriman, went about the country making violently partisan political speeches?

Mr. RABAUT. Perhaps it was the prerogative of the gentleman from Minnesota to make a speech at that time.

Mr. JUDD. I would just like to know whether the gentleman from Michigan was as disturbed then about improper political activity by these officers, as he is now?

Mr. RABAUT. I said that I am not making a political football out of this. I will ask the gentleman, does he think it would be a proper thing if J. Edgar Hoover went running around the country making political speeches?

Mr. JUDD. No, I am talking about Averell Harriman.

Mr. RABAUT. That is not the point that I am making here.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. I think the gentleman might point out that Mr. McLeod and Mr. Averell Harriman did not hold similar positions.

Mr. JUDD. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. PRICE. There is no comparison in the positions.

Mr. JUDD. The position of Averell Harriman is a far more important position and he is sent around the world as the representative of the United States, and yet he made, for example, at Houston, Tex., a violently partisan attack.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. McLeod was a security officer in the Department of State. He was in charge of personnel. I think it would not be fitting in his job to participate in partisan politics.

Mr. JUDD. Do you think it was fitting that Mr. Harriman should do what he did?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would say to the gentleman your amendment does not limit the boy wonder from Minnesota from going around making speeches, the present ECA administrator who is making partisan speeches. He has the same job. This is an entirely different situation.

Mr. RABAUT. My amendment deals with security officers of the United States, and I do not think there is any-

body in the House of Representatives who ought to be opposed to it.

At this time I should like to read the Hatch Act provision—Title 5, United States Code, section 118i:

> For the purposes of this section the term "officer" or "employee" shall not be construed to include (1) the President and Vice President of the United States; (2) persons whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the office of the President; (3) heads and assistant heads of executive departments; (4) officers who are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the nationwide administration of Federal laws.

This is a clear case. I hope the House will not ascribe a political purpose to this, but look at it from the angle from which it deserves to be looked at, and vote for the amendment.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I do not think it need take very long to state the position of the committee on this amendment. I am pretty sure that every Member of the House understands the character of this amendment, the purpose of this amendment and what is back of it. It is nothing more nor less than another attempt, purely partisan attempt, by the gentlemen on the other side to discredit the State Department, presently under a Republican President and a Republican Secretary of State. There is nothing else to it than that.

Last year these gentlemen attacked and knocked out of a bill, this bill, a provision that they themselves had incorporated for the benefit of Democratic Secretaries of State, to-wit: the power to fire. As soon as we get a Republican President and a Republican Secretary of State, we get the ripper tactics to knock out the very provision that was put in for the benefit of Democratic Secretaries; but it is too good for a Republican Secretary.

Now we have this very curious situation here where there is a ruling as to a relatively minor official of the State Department by the responsible heads—presumably the Secretary himself—that this individual is not subject to the limitations of the Hatch Act. So here comes one of our Members, a Democratic Member, and seeks to reverse, by the action of this House, the administrative determination of that Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, are we going to undertake to manage the State Department, and on our side of the aisle are we going to permit the Democratic minority to manage the State Department while we are sitting in majority on this side? Oh, no, Mr. Chairman. This amendment must be knocked out. It is purely partisan. There is no purpose in it except to injure and discredit the State Department. There is no merit to it. It should be voted down.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is completely misinterpreting the intent of this amendment. I am sure you will agree with that from his opening statement, where he said that this is an attempt on the part of the Democrats to discredit the State Department under the present administration. All of the attempted discrediting of the State Department that I have noticed lately has not come from the Democrats. According to the press those people who made Dulles break down and tears come to his eyes during his report on the Berlin Conference were not Democrats. Now about the gentleman from Minnesota comparing this situation to Mr. Averell Harriman—and let me state right here that I am not a great admirer of Mr. Harriman, but the circumstances are not comparable, because Mr. Harriman was holding the position that Mr. Stassen now holds and I do not think there is anyone on this side of the House who wants to gag Mr. Stassen. He is in a position of Cabinet rank and he has a perfect right, as I see it, to go around making any kind of political speech he wants and to defend himself against attacks which are made against him not by Democrats, if you please, but by people who are supposed to be of the same political party that he is.

But the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is aimed at doing what needs to be done, I do not care whether it is a Republican administration or a Democratic administration, security officers should be kept from engaging in politics, and I think it especially needs to be done, since it has been proved conclusively that some of them did not tell the truth, will not tell the truth, and do not know the truth when they see it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it would have been much better if the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] had confined himself to the amendment and not extended his remarks to the full extent that he did. I am going to talk on the broader implications involved in the gentleman's remarks rather than discuss the amendment itself.

I happen to occupy a position of leadership in the Democratic Party. For 10 out of the last 13 years I was the majority leader of this House, and now I am the Democratic whip. I have attended many important conferences during the past year. I have seen no Democrat who criticized or embarrassed Secretary Dulles or President Eisenhower. We have discussed merits but never engaged in personalities.

I was present at the meeting that took place when Secretary Dulles returned from his hard ordeal in Berlin. I could visualize what he had gone through by asking myself: "JOHN MCCORMACK, suppose you were Secretary of State; what would have been your thoughts? What would have been the ordeal you went through, knowing the situation of the world as it is today?"

There were no Democrats who criticized Secretary Dulles, I am informing the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]—and I am not attributing his remarks to any other one of my Republican friends, I want that distinctly understood—this is the time to withhold many words. There is the courage of action, but there is also the courage of silence. Sometimes it takes a lot of courage to be silent, and this is the time when we should stop, look, and listen, and ponder long before we make intemperate attacks upon either of the great political parties as such.

I have not seen any Democrat make any critical statement about Secretary Dulles in relation to the Berlin conference. I made a few guarded remarks yesterday, but no criticism. I felt that under the circumstances he did the best he could, not what he wanted to do, but under the circumstances he did the best he could so far as the Berlin conference is concerned; that he was faced with a probable blowup unless he agreed to the Geneva conference. I could see that. He had the situation in Indochina confronting him as well as other countries; and also the division of public opinion in other countries friendly to us, in some of which the Communist forces are very strong. I could see all of that. I did not necessarily have to agree with the Secretary to refrain from criticizing him and making his job more onerous.

So when the statement is made, and I assume it does not represent the Republican view, that the Democrats are trying to injure the State Department because of the offering of this amendment by the gentleman from Michigan, that statement is completely inconsistent with the facts.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. If the gentleman is so well satisfied with the Secretary of State——

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say that, did I? Do not put into my mouth words I did not say.

Mr. COUDERT. Well, I was merely attempting to construe what the gentleman meant.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say I was satisfied with him. Do not put into my mouth words. The gentleman is raising another question he did not raise previously because the gentleman is trying to raise the question whether or not I am satisfied. I am not talking on the question of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. I specifically say I am not dissatisfied yet.

Mr. COUDERT. If the gentleman is not dissatisfied with the conduct of foreign affairs by the Secretary of State——

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say that. I said I am not dissatisfied yet with the Secretary of State. The gentleman says "conduct of foreign affairs." Do not put into my mouth words I did not say. My friend from New York is very adroit, and the gentleman from Massachusetts may be lacking in mental ability, but the gentleman from Massachusetts is capable of understanding some things the gentleman from New York says; furthermore to a slight extent the gentleman from Massachusetts can penetrate his mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, but we have been at this a considerable time and there are three other matters we want to dispose of. I am going to make a suggestion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I am not going to object.

Mr. McCORMACK. I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman, because I have said all I intended to say and I think a prolongation of it would not be for the best interests of the situation because the gentleman from New York is trying to be, kindly and friendly to say the least, provocative.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. TABER. Is it an amendment to the pending amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, no. It is another amendment.

Mr. TABER. I only asked unanimous consent with reference to this particular amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object in order to make a statement, and I am certainly not going to object, I note at the desk there are 3 amendments. It occurred to me that after we have disposed of the pending amendment we could have a limitation of 30 minutes, which will give 5 minutes to a side on each of the amendments, then we can dispose of this matter.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I want 5 minutes to ask certain questions in reference to the interpretation of some language in the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Then it would have to be 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder just exactly what will be in the minds of the Members as they approach this vote. This is a proposed limitation on an appropriation bill which would prevent the payment of salary to the holder of a certain position who is legally in office.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not think that is true.

Mr. TABER. I am sorry if the gentleman thinks so. I think he ought to read it.

Mr. RABAUT. The amendment simply says that he comes under the Hatch Act.

Mr. TABER. Well, if that is it, the point of order should have been sustained.

Mr. RABAUT. It was not sustained, and it is so.

Mr. TABER. If it is so, the gentleman is now admitting that his amendment is entirely out of order.

Mr. RABAUT. No; I am not admitting my amendment is entirely out of order.

Mr. TABER. Well, I do not see any other possible construction.

Mr. RABAUT. The only thing it does is stop him from making speeches. It lets him hold his position as a security officer.

Mr. TABER. Now, let me tell you what this does. This stops the payment of any wage or salary of any officer or employee of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs who, for the purpose of this act, shall not be included within the construction of the term "officer" or "employee." I do not know what else you call it. Anyway, by this kind of an amendment, if it prevails, you stop the payment of the salary out of this appropriation. Such an amendment, if it changed the Hatch Act, would be out of order, and it would not be proper. The officer who is legally installed could go to the Court of Claims and collect his salary. That is how good this amendment is. I do not believe that the House of Representatives wants to indulge in that kind of legislation. I hope that this amendment will be defeated. I believe also that the Secretary of State, having given a particular construction as to what the meaning of the language was as to this Department, should be sustained by the House.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. As a matter of fact, the amendment does not mean anything because if the Secretary of State again decided that this man was in a position that did not come under the Hatch Act, he could continue to work and draw his pay just the same.

Mr. TABER. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CLEVENGER and Mr. RABAUT.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 61, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this bill and all amendments thereto be limited to 35 minutes, that 5 minutes be allowed to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], and that 5-minute statements be allowed, 1 for and 1 against, on amendments that may be offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to address several questions to the chairman or other members of the subcommittee regarding certain things in the committee report. On page 19 of the report, in the long paragraph on the lower half of the page, there are 6 or 7 committee recommendations which appear to be intended as limitations, as I read them.

For example, down in the middle of the paragraph it is stated:

> For the Office of Private Cooperation the committee recommends the same amount as was actually expended in fiscal year 1953, which was $99,727.

Actually, the Office of Private Cooperation will have used by the end of the current 1954 fiscal year approximately $182,000, and requested $250,000 for 1955.

This office of the United States Information Agency carries on, I think, one of its most useful functions. It has been able, as Mr. Streibert explained on page 571 of the hearings, to get over 800 foundations, organizations, groups, and businesses to cooperate in telling our story abroad.

It seems to me that if the subcommittee wants to cut it down, it ought to write the limitation into the bill itself, and say that not more than $99,000 shall be used for this particular office. Then we who believe the amount should be increased could offer an amendment to change that limitation. I do not know why the committee report carries a recommendation that only the amount used in 1953 be allowed, and not the amount used in 1954, which was almost doubled because the office had improved and properly expanded its activities and gotten a remarkable response from private agencies to do the job of telling America's story abroad. They can do it without the stigma and handicap of being Government propaganda.

What I would like to find out is, What is the force, legal and otherwise, of this irregular way of legislating? Are these recommendations binding upon the Administrator of this agency? Would there be reprisals against him by the subcommittee if he did not follow them because he felt that in order to carry out the main purposes of the agency, he had to deviate from the recommendations? Does the Administrator have his hands tied within his own agency by recommendations in a committee report?

Mr. CLEVENGER. It is a committee recommendation and the committee would expect weight to be given to its recommendations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I cannot understand the distinguished chairman of the committee making a remark like that here

on the floor of the House after the committee was in full agreement on this. The language of the report is directive, not a recommendation. There was no objection to the action of the committee by anyone with regard to this. If I recall correctly, this is the matter in which they sought a very substantial increase in funds in order to have people traveling all over the country.

Mr. JUDD. I still would like to know: Is it your judgment then that this recommendation of the subcommittee is binding on the Administrator of the agency, and that he cannot exceed this figure?

Mr. ROONEY. It most certainly is.

Mr. JUDD. Then suppose the will of the House is not in accord with the will of the subcommittee and the House would like to change that recommendation? How can one offer an amendment to a committee report? You see the House is prevented by this subcommittee procedure from working its own will. If the limitations were in the bill itself, one could offer an amendment to change the figures on this item and others like "a total of $40,000 is recommended for the Office of the General Counsel." Actually, we would save money by having all contracts reviewed by legal counsel. Many had mistakes that could have been prevented thereby. Why not let the Administrator correct this weakness by enlarging his legal staff budget to about $70,000, as requested?

But the recommendation is in a committee report and I am helpless to do anything about it. If it is binding, it ought to be in the law and if it is not in the law, then it ought not to be considered binding, and that ought to be understood here and now.

Mr. CLEVENGER. May I point out to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] that in a representative government it is inherent that some of these powers would be delegated, and we do the best we can when we go into the committee room to find out what they are doing with the money and how judiciously they are spending it. That is one of the prices we have to pay for a representative government.

Mr. JUDD. I do not think that quite answers my question. I cannot see why, if the committee was in complete agreement on this and felt that there ought to be this limitation, you did not write it in the text of the bill. There are other such limitations in the bill.

Mr. CLEVENGER. We try to leave a little "give and take" in a bill, and not make it too restrictive.

Mr. JUDD. This ought to be spelled out definitely one way or the other because it does not seem to me that these committee reports ought to be considered binding, and yet we are unable to amend them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAGEN of California: On page 21, line 13, after "General", strike out "$39,000,000" and insert "$39,697,000."

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am sure you are all familiar with the problem of wetbacks after the discussion we had the other day. One aspect of the wetback, so-called illegal Mexican problem, is the question of the proper appropriation for the border patrol and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. If we really are trying to solve the problem of illegal entrants, we have to provide the Service with sufficient money to be able to police the border and to pick up the illegal entrants once they get into this country. I am not on the Committee on Appropriations and, therefore, I am not too familiar with the budget, but I am hitting an aspect of the appropriation which is wholly clear. I read the committee report and I closely read the hearings on this particular subject. At page 183 of the report relating to the Justice Department, I find this statement by an officer of the Service, Mr. Habberton:

A cutback of $697,000 is scheduled in items covering alien travel, contractual detention, hospitalization, and food for aliens. If the ratio between deportations overseas and those to adjacent countries remains about the same in 1955 as in the fiscal year 1953, this cutback should have no material detrimental effect upon activity looking to deportations to countries other than Mexico. However, it does mean that funds will not be available for airlift, trainlift, or buslift of Mexican aliens. Also, depending upon developments, the Service may be financially unable to accept custody of all aliens picked up by local law-enforcement officers in the lower California and Texas areas.

The fact is that the Service is grossly understaffed in this matter of enforcement of our immigration laws as they concern Mexican aliens.

I have in my hand a clipping from the Fresno Bee of February 24, which is as follows:

WETBACK ISSUE IN FRESNO COUNTY STIRS DISPUTE

FRESNO.—Fresno County supervisors angrily rejected a statement by the Immigration Service that it can make no additional efforts to drive out invading swarms of wetbacks.

And the county board resolved to appeal to its Congressmen for stronger control at the Nation's southern border so that Mexican nationals will be halted from coming in, rather than be rounded up after making good their entry.

Board Chairman Sidney Cruff had demanded of the Immigration and Naturalization Service that it send additional agents to clear out wetbacks because the Mexicans are replacing domestic farm labor and causing employment and relief burdens.

SITUATIONS ARE SIMILAR

Bruce G. Barber, head of the Service's San Francisco district, replied in a letter:

"We are continually receiving reports of situations similar to that existing in Fresno County, not only from law-enforcement agencies, welfare departments, and other public officials, but from individuals from many areas of the San Francisco district."

Barber said his office, which patrols all California counties north of Kern, as well as the States of Utah and Nevada, had asked its Washington, D. C., headquarters for additional help, but none could be supplied because of budget limitations.

The district director also said that no more border patrolmen could be dispatched to the Fresno area because that would work hardships on other parts of northern California.

LIMITED JAIL FACILITIES

Barber said the Service's operations in the Fresno area were hampered by limited jail facilities, making it necessary to deport aliens by buses the same day they were arrested.

Cruff and other supervisors declared that if the border control were tightened, fewer officers would be needed in interior California.

And Cruff asserted Barber's remarks about the Fresno jail were completely false. Cruff claimed the local immigration officer, Leonard Adams, says the jail facilities do not hinder alien roundups.

The supervisors voted unanimously to raise the charge of the Government for housing Federal prisoners, such as wetbacks, from the present $1.10 a day to a new rate of $1.50 a day.

In reply to that the local head of the service said they just did not have the agents. The local law-enforcement agencies have to do a good part of this job of policing this problem of illegals crossing the border. They make the arrests, and they make temporary detentions, and unless you provide the wherewithal for reimbursing the local agencies for boarding these people, they are not going to do it. I say to my Republican colleagues your reported concern with the wetback problem in discussing House Joint Resolution 355 will be revealed as sheer hypocrisy if you fail to vote for my amendment.

In one of my counties they had to build an extension on the jail to hold these alien Mexicans. If sufficient funds are not forthcoming to reimburse the local agencies of government for their part in this program, you are going to have the country overrun with illegal Mexican workers. It is not just a problem of putting the local people out of employment. We have never, until the advent of alien Mexican labor, in my part of the country, had a rural narcotic problem. Yet today you can pick up any paper, any day, and read of numerous arrests for the sale or use of narcotics. I understand that Mexico is the prime source of heroin in this country. It would be ridiculous to assume that these illegal Mexicans are not carrying the narcotics, and that we need to enforce our immigration and naturalization laws with respect to them.

Not only that, they bring a whole train of moral and criminal problems with them. Our jails are crowded with the results of their activities. All I am asking is the restoration to this budget of $697,000, which will permit the counties to continue their participation in this program of rounding up and deporting these illegal entrants. Without this $697,000 addition, the policing of wetbacks will be severely handicapped. To my Republican colleagues who have a wetback problem which they recognize I say you cannot, in good conscience, fail to give your local people the monetary assistance reflected in my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday before the vote on the $17 million Clevenger amendment the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] advised the House that the payments of subsidy moneys to the airlines are not something that the Committee on Appropriations is to decide. He said they are "in the law as an obligation upon the Congress to pay."

In this regard, I call the Members' attention to the following extract from opinion May 13, 1953, by James P. Radigan, Jr., Chief, American Law Division, Library of Congress:

Under the proposed reorganization plan, would the Civil Aeronautics Board have authority to obligate the funds for subsidies without action directly by Congress?

If by "without action directly by Congress" you mean without previous authorization and appropriation, the answer is no. Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution provides: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law." This clause is a restriction upon the disbursing authority of the executive department, and means simply that no money can be paid out of the Treasury unless it has been appropriated by an act of Congress. (*Cincinnati Soap Co.* v. *United States* ((1937) 301 U. S. 308).) No officer, however high, not even the President, is empowered to pay debts of the United States generally, when presented to them. (*Reeside* v. *Walker* ((1950) 11 How. 272).) There is, however, under the present law (which would be true under the proposed reorganization plan) no method of controlling the amount allocated for individual subsidies except to the extent that the totals must not exceed appropriations. Under the present law, the cost of air mail transportation service and the amount of subsidies are consolidated and the rate of compensation is fixed by the Civil Aeronautics Board which the Postmaster General is obligated to pay from the appropriations for air mail transportation services. Under the proposed reorganization plan it would appear necessary to limit payments from the appropriation for air mail transportation services payable by the Postmaster General to the amount fixed by the Civil Aeronautics Board as the rate of compensation for these services. The payment of subsidies under the proposed reorganization plan would be made by the Civil Aeronautics Board from appropriations made therefor. It is not possible under the Constitution for any public officer or department to obligate the United States to pay any moneys whatsoever except pursuant to statutory authorization.

It is for Congress, proceeding under the Constitution, to say what amount may be drawn from the Treasury in pursuance of an appropriation, and if an officer, upon his own responsibility, and without the authority of Congress, assumes to bind the Government, by express or implied, contract, to pay a sum in excess of that limited by Congress for the purposes of such a contract, the contract is nullity, so far as the Government is concerned, and no legal obligation arises upon its part to meet its provision. (*Hooe* v. *United States* ((1910) 218 U. S. 322).)

From a practical point of view no air mail carrier or other air carrier would have a claim, other than moral, against the United States for any promised subsidies which had not been specifically authorized by statute and which had not been specifically allocated from funds previously appropriated. Congress has power to recognize moral obligations. (*Marion & Rye Valley Railroad Co.* v. *United States* ((1926) 270 U. S. 280).)

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to call attention in this regard to the following memorandum addressed to Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, under date May 19, 1953:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
AMERICAN LAW DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1953.

To: Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY.
(Attention: Mr. Marvin.)

Subject: Power of the Civil Aeronautics Board to obligate the United States for subsidy payments under the proposed reorganization plan and under S. 1360 of the 83d Congress.

Assuming, arguendo, that the proposed reorganization plan is valid, then the power of the Board to obligate the United States for subsidy payments would emanate from section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 998; U. S. C. 49: 486). The pertinent part of this section, with respect to subsidies as distinguished from compensation for airmail transportation service after the effectuation of the division of the function under the proposed reorganization plan, would be: "and, [the need] together with all other revenue of the air carrier, to enable such air carrier under honest, economical, and efficient management, to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense." The authority thus granted by section 406 (b) to consider the foregoing factor in the fixing of airmail transportation compensation is a rather nebulous basis upon which to predicate a reorganization plan under which an obligatory contract for the payment of subsidies may be made.

But even if it were sufficient authority to support obligatory contracts for the payment of subsidies, such contracts would be subject to the limitations of Revised Statutes 3678 (U. S. C. 31: 665), the first subsection of which reads: "No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available therein; nor shall any such officer or employee involve the Government in any contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law." If sections 483, 486, and 493 of title 39 of the United States Code, which generally authorize the Postmaster General to contract for carrying the mails, yield to this provision, as originally enacted, limiting expenditures so that appropriation is necessary for the employment of extra carriers, etc. (39 Op. Atty. Gen. 157), may it be logically contended that the general and indefinite terms of section 486 (b), pertaining to the consideration of the need for subsidies, would be outside the purview of such section? It is the settled and recognized policy of Congress to keep all of the Departments of the Government, in the matter of incurring obligations for expenditures, within the appropriations annually made for conducting its affairs. *Sutton* v. *U. S.* ((1921) 256 U. S. 575).

The contracts likewise would be subject to the provisions of the act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 764; U. S. C. 31: 627) which provides: "No act of Congress hereafter passed shall be construed to make an appropriation out of the Treasury of the United States, or to authorize the execution of a contract involving the payment of money in excess of appropriations made by law, unless such act shall in specific terms declare an appropriation to be made or that a contract may be executed." As those dealing with the Government must be held to have notice of these limitations upon authority (see *Sutton* v. *U. S., supra*), any contention that the grants or subsidies are not within the ambit of the limitations of this section is very tenuous.

If the power of the Postmaster General "to establish post offices" does not authorize him to bind the United States by a lease for a post-office building, there being no appropriation therefor (*Chase* v. *U. S.* (1894) (155 U. S. 489)), a fortiori the Civil Aeronautics Board may not bind the United States by a contract for the grant of subsidies in excess of appropriations. If, as stated in 6 Op. Atty. Gen. 28, one appropriation does not necessarily involve the undertaking of the Congress to make further appropriations, and does not of itself empower the President to engage the Government beyond the specified sum, it is impossible to support the allegation that the Civil Aeronautics Board may bind the Government to pay grants of subsidies made by it in excess of appropriations. The general public system for the appropriation and disbursement of public moneys is permanent, and unless charges are within the objects for which an appropriation is made they cannot be applied to that appropriation (28 Op. Atty. Gen. 634).

The foregoing observations, with references to limitations on the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to obligate the United States for subsidy payments beyond the amount appropriated and available, would likewise be applicable to the Board if S. 1360 were passed. There would be, however, the additional specific restriction of the bill found on page 5, lines 2–6, which reads: "Payments under this subsection [subsidies for essential aircraft operation] shall be made by the Board out of sums appropriated to the Board for such purpose, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection." This wording of S. 1360 also has the additional advantage over the proposed reorganization plan in that it grants a clear authorization for appropriations for subsidies as such, which is not found in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, supra, the foundation for the payment of subsidies under the proposed reorganization plan.

Continuing, Mr. Chairman, the following telegram represents the feelings of most of the taxpayers' organizations in the State of New York:

ALBANY, N. Y., *March 4, 1954.*

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House Office Building:

As representative taxpayers, New York, we strongly oppose Clevenger amendment now pending before House to perpetuate Civil Aeronautics Board subsidies at present rate for total $48 million for next 8 months. Since House already appropriated $60 million for service air mail pay, what purpose do subsidies serve? Largest recipients have been getting subsidies from taxpayers' money for 16 years. When do we wean them?

GARTH A. SHOEMAKER,
President, Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, Inc.

In fairness to Pan American World Airways System which was referred to many times in the course of the hearings held by the subcommittee on the appropriation requests of the Civil Aeronautics Board, I am including without comment a letter and attached memoran-

dum received from that company. They read as follows:

PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: During the recent hearings of the Appropriations Subcommittee concerned with Commerce Department appropriations, you asked several questions of the Civil Aeronautics Board as they affected Pan American World Airways.

In the interest of clarifying any misunderstandings which may still exist, we take the liberty of making available to you the attached memorandum.

Sincerely,

ROGER B. DOULENS.

COMMENTS RELATING TO HEARINGS ON COMMERCE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS FOR YEAR 1955 BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 83D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Pages 608–610: "Reason for increased subsidy in spite of increased net revenues of international airlines."

Mr. ROONEY points out that in the year 1953 revenues for international carriers increased over 1952 and net operating income increased to $24,250,000 in 1953 as compared to $8,633,000 in 1952 and raises a question as to why subsidies increased in the fiscal year 1953 as opposed to the year 1952 by some $5 million. The following items account for this increase.

1. On January 1, 1953, the Latin American division of Pan American Airways was placed on a prospective mail rate as opposed to past period mail rates. Under this change in status the return on investment in the last half of fiscal year 1953 was increased from 7 to 10 percent. On a full-year basis such a change would amount to approximately $2,200,000 based on the Latin American division's investment for this period of approximately $35 million. The Board's staff in preparing the estimates for the fiscal year 1953 must have assumed that the Latin American division's rate would be effective for the full year and made provision for $13 million of total mail pay for the fiscal year as opposed to $10 million for fiscal year 1952—$3 million.

2. Although the two carriers, Northwest and Pan American operating in the trans-Pacific area were on final rates in the years 1952 and 1953, the level of operations for the Korean airlift was reduced as compared to the year 1952 and the profits in reduction in mail pay from the airlift operation were correspondingly reduced, thus increasing the mail pay requirements of the two American trans-Pacific carriers by some $821,000.

3. In the fiscal year 1953 the appropriations for mail pay required for States-Alaska operations were increased over 1952 by approximately $1,450,000. This increase is applied to all three carriers—Pan American, Alaska Airlines, and Pacific-Northern—reflects the cost of subsidization of competition over this route as contemplated in the Board's orders authorizing Alaska Airlines and Pacific-Northern to operate over this route. This competition was authorized not on the basis of need for additional service but for national defense purposes—$1,443,000.

4. The provision for mail pay for intra-Alaska operations which might be characterized as regional or local services reflects an increase in requirements in the fiscal year 1953 over fiscal 1952 of $1,215,000. In these operations there was little or no expansion in traffic volume which could be available to offset increasing costs due to inflation in labor, materials, and cost of aircraft.

5. The comparative figures to which Mr. ROONEY referred relating to international airlines, as appearing in the American Aviation Daily of December 24, 1953, cover only operations of the trunkline carriers and stub-end operations of domestic carriers. None of the States-Alaska (except Pan American's operations), intra-Alaska, or Hawaiian operations were included in the figures to which he referred.

6. Of the total trunk carriers (11 airline operations which are ratemaking entities) included in the CAB statement of subsidy and mail pay for the year 1952, page 597 of the hearing records, 7 in the fiscal year 1952 were operating on temporary rates and were in review periods and the provision for return on investment would be at a 7-percent level rather than a 10-percent level.

7. We have estimated that the investments for these trunkline carriers and the stub-end domestic operations totaled approximately $200 million in the year 1953 and that the $24,250,000 of operating profits in the year 1953 would represent a return on investment after taxes of approximately 5.8 percent, which is substantially below what might be considered a reasonable return. If we assume an investment in the year 1952 of $180 million, the $8,633,000 considered as operating profit referred to by Mr. ROONEY would represent a return after taxes of approximately 2.3 percent.

Page 615: "Comparison of passenger fare and mail pay on New York-Paris route."

1. The first-class passenger fare to Paris is $394.60 which stated in terms of fare per passenger ton-mile is $1.01. This compares with the compensatory rate per ton-mile for United States mail pay which is received by Pan American on the Atlantic of 85 cents. The passenger weight is computed at 215 pounds per passenger. The sack of mail at the same weight, or 215 pounds, would pay $330.77 as fare, as compared with the passenger fare of $394.60. Mr. Kennedy in his article indicates the sack of mail pays $1,578. This figure is determined by dividing the total amount of mail pay for subsidy received by the total number of United States mail ton-miles, which is patently incorrect. On October 1, 1953, through Executive Order No. 10 a separation was made between mail pay and subsidy. The subsidy element which the airline receives is not mail pay but is a subsidy to the entire airline operation and is comparable to the subsidy which a shipping line receives as an operating subsidy. Even though in the past mail pay included a subsidy amount, the subsidy should not be interpreted as being applicable only to mail but to the entire operation. Services which are operated under certificates authorized by the Civil Aeronautics Board are to carry out the objectives of the Civil Aeronautics Act which include the encouragement and development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service and the national defense. On many routes of a national-interest character the Board in authorizing services was fully cognizant of the fact that service mail pay could never support the operation of these routes and the subsidy element of mail pay was provided in order to carry out the objectives of the Civil Aeronautics Act including commerce.

Page 628: "Difficulty of collating divisional awards."

The divisional breakdown of Pan American's financial reports creates no problem in reconciling reported divisional figures with figures published in the annual reports. The reports to the Board are basically the same figures which are used to prepare published reports. There may be some slight change in the classifications in published figures. However, there are no changes in basic figures.

Page 630: "Computed basis of certain distributed costs."

Realisticness of allocated figures.

Page 630: "Allocation of invested capital."

Taxes.

Page 632: "Interdivisional transactions."

Page 633: "Possibility of arbitrary shifts of expenses."

All of the questions raised in connection with the above subjects have to do with the question of whether because of the divisional breakdown of Pan American's reports and divisional breakdown of areas for ratemaking purposes, there is a possibility that Pan American can obtain through duplication of expenses more mail pay than it should receive. Mr. Roth has pointed out the safeguards which the CAB uses to insure that there are no duplications between divisions. He also points out the advantages which the divisional reports make available to the CAB staff in providing economic yardsticks and comparisons in various areas of the world with competitive United States flag services. If the entire Pan American operation were to be thrown into a single ratemaking entity, there would be no basis for comparing results with other American-flag carriers.

Under the recent Supreme Court decision in which excessive profits in one division of a company may be used to offset deficiencies in mail pay in other divisions, the problem inherent in ratemaking by divisions, i. e., the possibility of shifting of expenses and revenues, etc., between divisions, becomes moot, since it is impossible to earn amounts in excess of a reasonable rate of return if the offset theory is applied. This philosophy applies so long as any division of Pan American is open from the standpoint of subsidy rate. In the Atlantic the Pan American and TWA mail rates are open from 1946 to the end of 1952, and under the Court's ruling, any excessive earnings of any division are available to offset mail-pay needs in the Atlantic.

With regard to possibility of arbitrary shift of expenses between divisions, which was suggested by Mr. ROONEY, a review of the record in Pan American's Atlantic Rate case should convince him on this score. The CAB, after careful investigation, has not challenged any of the allocations made by Pan American of either revenues or expenses. On the other hand, it has challenged TWA's allocations between its domestic and international operations to the extent of some $3,330,000. (See Bureau Counsel's exhibit No. 259 in the Atlantic rate case.)

Pages 634–635: "Airline subsidiaries."

This section of the hearing record raises the question of whether expenses of Pan American may be increased because of relationships with affiliated companies. The CAB has reviewed Pan American's transactions with affiliated and associated companies in the Latin American Rate case covering the period 1948 through 1951 and in the Atlantic case covering the period 1946 through 1952, has found the exchange of expenses and revenues to be entirely appropriate, no adjustments having been made for improper charges. In a previous Latin American Rate case covering the years 1944 and 1945 the Civil Aeronautics Board did make some substantial disallowances in expense charges received by Pan American for the use of joint facilities of Panair do Brasil. However, even in this case the charges made were in accordance with a joint facility contract which was dictated by the Civil Aeronautics Board itself. This is the only case in which actual disallowances were made on the basis of improper intercompany charges.

The fact of the matter is that in most cases Pan American through its relationship

with its affiliated companies obtains a definite expense advantage. There are a few examples which follow:

1. In the year 1952 of the $705,000 of expenses incurred by Pan American's system purchasing office, over $450,000 was defrayed by commissions charged to affiliated and associated companies for services rendered for their account.

2. The system shipping department costs were $109,000. This entire amount was defrayed by commissions earned on shipping for affiliated and associated companies and a profit was realized of approximately $9,000.

3. Pan American maintains a United States sales office organization with some 25 offices throughout the United States and acts as general agent for many of its affiliated and associated companies. On all sales made for these companies Pan American receives a commission of 10 percent on sales. In the year 1952 these commissions amounted to approximately $730,000.

4. In many instances the affiliated companies provided joint facilities to Pan American at a much less cost than if Pan American itself were to provide the facilities now supplied by the affiliates. In many instances insofar as communications companies are concerned and investments therein, these facilities are not only facilities for Pan American but are facilities available for all carriers located in the areas including not only other American-flag carriers but foreign flag carriers.

5. The affiliated and associated companies have created a market for the sale of Pan American's obsolete aircraft. These sales in the past have been fully reviewed and approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The prices at which the sales were made were as high as would have been realized if sales had been made to others in the open market. Substantial profits realized from such sales have been used to reduce Pan American's mail-pay requirements.

6. With regard to the question of miscellaneous income from investments and the allocation of such income between divisions, it should be pointed out that under the 1945 Atlantic Division Rate case and several other cases under consideration at that time, the CAB decided that profits from investments in other carriers and from operations of Government contracts would not be considered in the determination of mail pay, and in the past Pan American has considered such income as nondivisional. These investments in airlines and applicable to Government contracts have been eliminated in determining the investment base for carriers. In recent rate cases, however, the CAB has changed its position and now contends that any excess earnings on these investments should be offset against mail-pay subsidy requirements. For the future, no matter whether a system rate or a divisional rate is fixed for Pan American's operations, it would be necessary for the CAB to carefully analyze both earnings and investments in these activities to determine whether or not excess earnings are available to offset mail-pay requirements. In the presently pending Atlantic Rate proceeding this entire problem has been exhaustively reviewed by the CAB staff, and the final result of the staff's investigation will only be known at the conclusion of this case.

7. With regard to investments listed by Pan American having to do with country clubs, these are the purchase of country-club stock required in connection with memberships in these clubs and are not an indication that Pan American is operating country clubs.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. In the opinion of the committee, at least those on this side of the aisle, and I hope we are joined by those on the other side, $39 million is ample for the functions to be performed by this agency. Let me call the attention of the Members to page 9 of the report which deals with this matter. The total amount is $39 million, which is the amount requested by the agency, and approved by the budget. The committee did not reduce this amount 1 cent. It is the full budget estimate, in other words. An examination of the decreases proposed to be made by the agency as the result of the decrease in the amount in the preceding year showed that there would be some decrease in the total number of the border patrol. However, the committee has disposed of that in the report by requiring that the reduction from the preceding year be made in administration and not in the border patrol, because the reduction from the preceding year amounts only to one-half of 1 percent so that by reducing their administrative costs one-half of 1 percent the agency will be able to continue the maintenance of the border patrol which is 18 more than the average number of employees in the fiscal year 1953.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if we are going to try to keep expenditures down and limit budget deficits and the national debt we have got to go along with the Budget Bureau and the administration in these matters.

I hope the House will vote down the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Since the gentleman solicited my idea with regard to the pending amendment I must say to him that I intend to support the amendment. I deplore the fact that President Eisenhower and Attorney General Brownell in their budget request cut $3,250,000 from the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I am willing to give many millions of dollars in excess of the amount of this budget estimate to close our borders against wetbacks, Communists, narcotic smugglers, and all these other people who are walking across the border at will every day.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested. I thought we were seeing a new model of the gentleman from New York when he made his opening speech on this bill. I thought he had become a great economizer but it now appears that he wants to be a great economizer on one item and is for spending on every other item.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I say to the gentleman that with regard to this particular matter I am not here in the form of a new model. I have been for properly policing the borders and interested in the Mexican wetback problem for years. The gentleman well knows that I am for saving money where money can be saved. There are many items in this bill in which I agree with the action of the majority members of the committee in cutting funds; but I am not entirely in accord with them on their bill and I am not against every provision in the bill. I reserve the right to express myself with reference to each particular item. This is one in which I disagree. And here is what the American Legion said to our committee on this subject:

WITNESS: CLARENCE H. OLSON, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. CLEVENGER. You may proceed, Mr. Olson.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I would like to read this statement if I may. It is a short statement.

The American Legion is proud of its record in the field of Americanism for more than a third of a century. I am personally privileged in having the opportunity to come before your committee for the second time in support of adequate funds for the Justice Department so that the Immigration and Naturalization Service may be given the tools with which it can discharge its responsibilities under the law.

The American Legion is grateful to your committee for permitting us to discuss this matter with you at this time.

When I testified before your committee last year (p. 238 of the hearings before your committee) I told you that the information leading up to the development of my testimony came from within our organization and not from an agency of the Federal Government. I wish to reiterate that statement in connection with the testimony I offer here today.

It is interesting to look back a year, to page 226 of the hearings on the Department of Justice, and to note there was some conflict between the assurances of the Attorney General that funds were adequate, and our apprehension that additional funds would be needed to properly carry out the program laid down for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. It is also interesting to note that scarcely 7 weeks after the beginning of the 1954 fiscal year the Attorney General, following a personal inspection of the United States-Mexican border, according to the Washington Post of August 19, 1953, was much concerned over the increase in the number of people illegally crossing over from Mexico into the United States. According to the Washington Post the Attorney General said the problem was still in an "incipient" stage.

Of course, we realize that you gentlemen of the Congress have to rely on the facts as they are given to you by responsible authorities in Government and that your actions are guided by them. We are not critical of this committee for having failed to appropriate the funds but we do criticize the Attorney General's office for having failed to ask you for the amount necessary to appreciably strengthen the Immigration Service's weak position along our Southwest border.

More recently, the magazine section of the New York Times of January 31, 1954, had a very interesting article on the wetback situation entitled, "Two Every Minute Across the Border," which was written by Mr. Gladwin Hill, of the Los Angeles-New York Times Bureau. I do not include the article because of its volume but wish to quote from it for the purpose of emphasizing several points that will follow:

"Most wetbacks have to pause at least briefly in the valley to work and get a little money before pushing northward. One objective of the patrol is to nail them before they can get social-security cards. The law does not deny cards even to illegal aliens and, once in hand, they become quasi-passports.

"The cat-and-mouse game would be comic if it were not for its evil ramifications. Because of their numbers, the wetbacks make a mockery of border supervision, transforming the line into a gateway through which foreigners of any sort can infiltrate. The wetbacks bring all kinds of contraband with

them, from drugs and parrots to venereal disease. Their direct social cost in Imperial County alone, counting everything from jailing to hospitalization for tuberculosis, has been reckoned at several hundred thousand dollars a year."

* * * * *

We are not here as fiscal or immigration experts. We will not say how much money is needed for the job—that is up to the Attorney General—but it strikes us as being peculiar that 1955 fund requests are even less than 1954 (p. 818, Federal Budget). We ask ourselves, What has happened to the concern of the Attorney General as expressed last August? Or, what new plan has been devised to more than offset the money and personnel decreases? Surely, the Attorney General would not be satisfield with a continuance of the rather ineffective job being done by his Department along the Mexican border.

In closing we point to the following extract from a joint release by State, Justice, and Labor dated January 15, 1954:

"The border patrol has therefore been instructed to redouble its efforts to prevent the illegal entry of Mexican aliens and their employment."

In great emergency such as war, conflagration, or flood, men can and are expected to redouble their efforts for a short span but cannot be expected to meet such tests for a year at a time. Reserves and more personnel are the answers to such demands. To provide that, the Department must have the funds or weaken the line at other points.

We have attached a copy of St. Louis national convention resolution No. 396 which is my Legion authority to appear today. If you are interested in resolutions pertaining to social security, narcotics, and other matters mentioned herein, I will be glad to provide them.

"1953 NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, ST. LOUIS, MO., AUGUST 31 TO SEPTEMBER 3, 1953

"Resolution No. 396.

"Committee: Americanism.

"Subject: To prevent illegal entrance at the Mexican border.

"Whereas the safety, security, and welfare of the Nation is the primary objective of the American Legion, which objective is impossible of attainment without enforcement of the immigration laws; and

"Whereas aliens are entering the United States illegally from Mexico in a mass migration that has reached proportions out of control of the presently constituted authorities; and

"Whereas the border States are being overrun with this invasion of aliens, which is encroaching upon the interior States in ever-increasing numbers, in defiance of the laws of the United States and in numbers which cannot be computed but may be estimated by the fact that over 400,000 such aliens were apprehended in southern California alone during the 12 months ending July 1, 1953, and

"Whereas this army of invading aliens is bringing with it poverty, disease, and crime, is loading our relief rolls, filling our public hospitals, crowding our jails with aliens having no claim to our bounty, and is displacing domestic labor, depressing wage scales and living standards, raising serious police and health problems, and creating widespread distress and unhappiness in the homes of our people by these results; and

"Whereas the breach in our defenses which is opened by the illegal entry of this horde of aliens affords a means of unregulated and uncontrolled entry into our country of unlimited numbers of hostile aliens bent upon our subversion and destruction: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Legion in national convention assembled at St. Louis, Mo., August 31 to September 3, 1953, call upon the President to use means at his command or to request the Congress to authorize measures to deal with this unprecedented menace to our Government, welfare and prosperity."

Mr. OLSON. I am prepared to answer questions, sir.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Thank you for your statement, Mr. Olson.

ANALYSIS OF WETBACK PROBLEM

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to commend you and the national legislative commission of the American Legion for taking this interest in the wetback problem which to me has been a very serious one over a number of years now. When I was chairman of this committee this committee reported a bill which would have put several hundred more border patrolmen on the Mexican border. I hope the present Attorney General will do something about it. Mr. Brownell presently deplores the situation but has no suggestion to rectify it at the moment, or at the time of his testimony, not a word as to what to do about it. Instead of doing something about it he reduces the amount of appropriations which he requests here for the Immigration and Naturalization Service by three and a quarter millions.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I might say, also, there was under consideration extension of this contract labor agreement between the United States and Mexico. I do not know whether it resulted in renegotiation or not, that is, where they brought them over under contract. The wetback was just surplusage of labor. Do you know whether we have renewed that agreement or whether it is terminated?

Mr. OLSON. According to the reference I made here to the joint release by the State, Justice, and Labor Departments on January 15, they were looking forward to the possibility of such an agreement. Something now seems to have erupted between Mexico and the United States.

Mr. CLEVENGER. It expired?

Mr. OLSON. That is correct, as I understand it, and there has been some difficulty in their attempt to renegotiate an agreement something like they had before.

Of course, in our opinion that may not be the answer. It may help the situation. We believe that the only way, if we are going to try to prevent these people from coming over, is to stop them at the source or at the line. I realize, too, that it would be difficult to have a skirmish line extended from California to Brownsville, Tex. We have to apprehend those who slip by the so-called screen.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I might say to you it is a concern of mine that we stop ship jumping and border crossing at any point and not just from Mexico.

Mr. OLSON. We have concentrated on this thing alone because of the text of the resolution. We appreciate that you have the same situation in the coastal States of this country. You have probably a bad situation in Florida. I think along the Canadian border it may not be as bad because of the stricter application of their own laws. We are not talking only of this Mexican border but that seems to be the sore point in the whole situation.

Mr. CLEVENGER. There is a big flow of marijuana from Mexico but other narcotics come from other countries in greater quantities.

Mr. OLSON. People who want to plant their saboteurs and subversives here naturally would look to that area. I would if I were trying to infiltrate people into this country.

Mr. ROONEY. Are you familiar with a report gotten out a couple of months ago entitled "What Price Wetbacks" which contains many photographs depicting this deplorable problem?

Mr. OLSON. No, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. It was published by the American GI Forum in southeastern Texas in cooperation with the Texas State Federation of Labor. I commend it to you for your reading.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you very much.

USE OF CHEAP LABOR ALONG BORDER

Mr. ROONEY. This is an economic problem, and the farmers along the Texas border will not pay the American minimum wage required by law to hire Americans. They hire these wetbacks at coolie wages, as little as $2 for a 10-hour day, with the result that our immigration laws are flouted. The immigration inspector along that border is treated with contempt by every farmer who uses wetback labor, and most of them do, including many placed very high in the State of Texas.

Mr. OLSON. I am not positive, but either the magazine article of the New York Times to which I referred or the joint release by the three departments touches on that. It suggests that possibly this cheap labor does take away jobs from our own people.

Mr. ROONEY. Not only that, this illegal labor takes away approximately, if I remember the figure, $30 million a year. The money paid as coolie wages is not spent in the United States on our side of the border. It is sent to Mexico and constitutes the third largest source of income to Mexico, exceeded only by tourism and the mining industry. The outfit that does the biggest business along the border is the United States post office where the wetbacks buy money orders to send their wages back into Mexico. So that it harms the small-business man, the drugstore, the restaurant, and other such small businesses. All the money goes to the other side of the border. I commend that for your reading.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you very much. I believe Mr. Bow, acting chairman last year, indicated that the Appropriations Committee sort of frowned on these luxurious airplane rides to return these people back to Mexico who were apprehended and they were going to try to work out other plans for returning of these jumpers. I suppose that would permit them to use it elsewhere. We of the Legion, it may seem funny to you that we are interested in a proposition of this kind, but there are those——

Mr. ROONEY. You should be interested.

Mr. OLSON. But there are those other factors that come into it.

Mr. ROONEY. I say that as one who sometimes disagrees with the Legion.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. COUDERT. Let me remind the membership again that this bill will provide 18 more members of the border patrol than they had in 1953.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. This approach is still a further continuation of unilateral dealing with this problem from one side of the border, and it is not a problem that can be dealt with from one side of the border only; it is necessary to have active cooperation of the Mexican Government to handle both the wetback problem and the narcotics problem. The only way to do it is to use the method we used in combating the foot-and-mouth disease, a joint Mexican-American commission. The flow of narcotics across the border can only be controlled through some such joint action. There is legislation which will come before the House to provide some such method of taking care of the entire problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired; all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAGEN of California) there were—ayes 25, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 45, in lines 11 and 12, strike out the words "without regard to the civil-service and classification laws."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this is the same language to which I directed a point of order on yesterday but was overruled by the Chair. I do not want to in anywise injure this proposed legislation; however, I want to protect two situations. One is the civil service. I want to make sure neither is violated. The other is veterans' preference.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House suggested that there is a law already on the statute books that does provide for the employment of certain individuals who can speak foreign languages that is so helpful in carrying out the purpose of this particular section of the bill. Then it appears there should not be the necessity of inserting this language in the bill. As I stated, I do not want in any way to injure the legislation, but I do have a letter from the American Legion legislative representatives stating that in the Mutual Security Act of 1953 there was similar language but somehow, in some way, that language was abused.

I also call attention to the fact that there is no explanation in your report with regard to the use of this money excepting, we are told, it is used to carry out this particular section of the bill.

Now, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee 3 or 4 questions. What limitation is intended under the exception granted by the language of this bill? Just to what do you limit it?

Mr. TABER. The language here would permit only persons on a temporary basis, who received total compensation not to exceed $120,000, to be employed without regard to the civil-service laws.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Whom does the gentleman have in mind? What persons does he have in mind?

Mr. TABER. The temporary employment of people, that is all. This law is effective in here and continues effective only if it is carried from year to year in an appropriation act. That is the way the language of the authorizing act read.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman have a limit on the number of aliens? If not, there should be a limit.

Mr. TABER. Not on the number of aliens; no. They have to have aliens in connection with this program, they have to have people who can translate the broadcasts that we want to put out and deliver. We cannot get Americans who are qualified to do this sort of thing in the number that is required. They have to go over there sometimes and get somebody to come in here. Under the civil-service laws they would not be allowed to employ them if we did not have this authority. I think all of these things are minor; on the other hand, they are very important to the successful operation of the program.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman think that the language of this bill will in anywise include employees within the United States; those employed in the information agencies generally?

Mr. TABER. Not where regularly employed. It cannot permit people who are regularly employed on a fixed salary except aliens who have to be employed for the purpose of translation or broadcasting.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The thing in which I am particularly interested at this time is that we do not use this language in any way in violation of the Veterans' Preference Act, for one thing.

Mr. TABER. It could not be used in that way, because you would not find aliens who are veterans who would be entitled to any preference.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would not want to see it used in violation of the civil-service law unless there is an emergency where it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. TABER. It is nothing but temporary employment of somebody whom they want to do some particular job.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the statements that have been made by the members of this committee and the assurance I have received that there will be no violations of the civil-service act, rules, and regulations, and in further consideration that the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 will not be bypassed or violated, I shall not press for the adoption of my amendment. I am enclosing herewith as a part of my statement a letter I have received from Mr. Miles B. Kennedy, director of the American Legion, wherein he expresses the interest of the American Legion in this section of the bill:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD H. REES,
House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REES: Referring to H. R. 8067, same being a bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, my attention has been directed to the language appearing on page 45, lines 11, 12, and 13, under title IV, United States Information Agency. The American Legion objects to the same.

The Mutual Security Act of 1953 (Public Law 118, 83d Cong., H. R. 5710, sec. 706 (a)) contained somewhat similar language and the agency immediately construed the act to release them from any adherence to veteran's preference; the Civil Service Commission concurred with their construction and refused to accept any appeals from veterans who were separated under authority of this section. There was a time limitation upon the authority to so reduce personnel and without Civil Service Commission assistance it was impossible for the Legion or the veteran to ascertain if the agency even acted within the time allowed, or if the veteran came within the 10-percent figure which was also included in the act as a maximum number to be so reduced.

It is felt that if the wording of H. R. 8067, as mentioned, is not changed or stricken, it will result in a similar situation with reference to veterans' preference in appointment, and also any rights veterans may have under the reemployment phase of veterans' preference. This type of legislation not only on its face results in a partial abolition of veterans' preference, but allows the possibility of a wholesale disregard behind closed doors so to speak, and if not objected to here, the idea will tend to spread among the opponents of veterans' preference.

The American Legion would appreciate it very much if you will make it a point to look into the purpose of the language appearing in H. R. 8067, page 45, lines 11, 12, and 13, with a view to having same stricken or deleted when this measure is before the House today, Tuesday, March 2, thereby forestalling any attempt to bypass the provisions of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as amended.

Thanking you for your courtesy and cooperation in this connection, I am

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first, in reference to what the gentleman from Kansas said as to the violation of the civil-service law, I can assure him that there is no desire to violate the civil-service law. I should like to bring to the attention of the committee the justification for this language which was submitted to our committee by the information agency as the reason why this is necessary.

Language is rooted in Public Law 402, the Smith-Mundt law, which requires appropriation language to set authority for employment of persons on a temporary basis and aliens for the special needs of the Agency.

The unusual skills required by the United States Information Agency are not contained within regular staffing patterns.

For example, the Agency needs persons who can review motion-picture films which use rare languages; persons who can adapt press and publications output to the needs of a foreign area by preparation of suitable cartoons or pamphlets; or who can provide translation services in languages not available from within on a regular staffing pattern basis; or who can provide narration services for radio in foreign languages.

Most of these specialties are not of a sufficiently continuing nature to justify full-time employment of a continuing nature. Many of the specialists with the requisite qualifications do not meet civil-service standards, are not interested in applying for civil-service examinations simply for temporary employment, or are not available for temporary employment at civil-service rates.

The employment of aliens, to which this provision also pertains, is absolutely essential to the continued output of the radio broadcasting program: there are at present 123 resident aliens performing this work in New York; without these employees, 18 languages, many of them beamed to areas behind the Iron Curtain, would have to be dropped.

I submit to the gentleman that those are the justifications submitted to our committee for the writing of this language.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If you only had the language in the act you prefer, why repeat it in an appropriation bill?

Mr. BOW. Because the Smith-Mundt Act definitely provides, I will say to the gentleman from Kansas, that this language be incorporated in an appropriation bill. Now, we strangely have this basic language saying that in order to enforce it it must be contained in the appropriation bill. If we do not put it in ths bill, it would not be applicable. It is a rather strange feature, I admit, but we must put it in this bill in order to have it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The second question: Do I understand it is the belief of this committee that the persons employed under this section are necessary employees who cannot come under or who do not pass examinations under Civil Service in order to fit those particular jobs; that you cannot recruit them from Civil Service?

Mr. BOW. I think that is true, sir.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And in no wise would this section affect the Veterans' Preference Act?

Mr. BOW. Not speaking for the committee, but speaking for this particular member, I think that is true.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, what is the status of these people? Are they contract workers?

Mr. BOW. Part of them are contract workers.

Mr. GROSS. This Government as of this date has 427,000 alien contract workers scattered all over the world. How many more are we going to load on the taxpayers?

Mr. BOW. I cannot answer the gentleman's question on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 25, strike out lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to strike from the bill section 207, on page 25, which provides:

None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of the suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, by the United States of America against Fallbrook Public Utility District, a public service corporation of the State of California, and others.

I think the best way to argue for the adoption of this amendment is to quote the questions asked of and the answers given by the present Attorney General of the United States. At page 7 of the Department of Justice hearings we find this:

Mr. ROONEY. With regard to your request that the language concerning the Fallbrook Water District matter be deleted from the bill, what is your reason for asking that?

Mr. BROWNELL. Basically it is this: That the whole suit involves Camp Pendleton, which is one of the largest military installations on the west coast, a Marine installation. The Government bought that property not knowing what their water rights were. If the water is taken away an investment of over $100 million would be lost. I say the way to find out what the water rights of the Government are is to do it in court, and the effect of the rider is to prevent the Department of Justice from defending the Federal Government in court and really would mean a default.

Mr. ROONEY. The rider is not in the best interests of all of the people of the United States by any means, is it?

Mr. BROWNELL. I think not.

Mr. ROONEY. And should not have been inserted in the bill?

Mr. BROWNELL. That is right.

This rider was inserted in the bill last year on a close rollcall vote.

Continuing:

Mr. ROONEY. As a lawyer, that would be your opinion?

Mr. BROWNELL. That is it exactly.

Mr. ROONEY. I am glad to see my position has been vindicated after all this time.

The Marine Corps, incidentally, is not in favor of such a rider being contained in this bill?

Mr. BROWNELL. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. In other words, its lawyers agree with you in regard to this?

Mr. BROWNELL. That is correct.

At page 230 of the same printed hearings on the Department of Justice appropriation we find this:

Mr. CLEVENGER. The committee will come to order.

This testimony which we will hear now is a completion of the statement which was partly covered by the testimony of the Attorney General, and we will ask you, Mr. Rankin, for your statement at this time in regard to the Fallbrook Public Utility District matter which is contained in section 207 of the committee print of the bill.

After another remark or two by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], Assistant Attorney General Rankin replied:

Mr. RANKIN. We appear before this committee asking that Congress eliminate that language from the new appropriation act.

We think it is not proper and that it does not leave the Department of Justice free to defend the United States in its legal rights; that it is not in accordance with the American tradition of permitting the trial of legal issues by the courts and a proper determination of those questions in the courts. We feel that this case, in the best interest, not only of the United States, but all of the litigants, should be tried so that the courts can determine the rights of the United States with regard to water at Camp Pendleton, and also the rights of all the other parties to the litigation. It is very important to the private parties to this litigation, in making their plans about the development of their various properties, as well as it is important to the United States in making plans concerning Camp Pendleton, that they know what their legal rights are to the use of water, the priorities concerning that use, and their relative positions regarding it. Before there can be any proper development of the whole area on any permanent basis, the interested parties must know what those rights are and what reliance they can place upon them.

That is substantially the position which was taken here on the floor of the House a year ago in opposition to this rider. I think it is unconscionable for the Congress to usurp the power of the courts on a matter such as this. This controversy should be left to the courts, and the rights of all the taxpayers of the United States of America, not merely the litigants in the Fallbrook case, should be fairly and equitably determined. I trust the House will, in its wisdom, adopt the proposed amendment which would strike this rider from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, with complete confidence that the amendment will be defeated, as it has been defeated in previous sessions or, when the section was not written into the bill, it was written there by the Congress. It is manifestly impossible in 5 minutes to discuss a technical matter so complex as this. The United States bought for the Marine Corps what was known as the Santa Margarita Ranch, which had concluded a trial, lasting years, with the Vail Ranch to decide the water rights between those two great ranches in southern California. Camp Pendleton was established there. The lawsuit over water rights was not started at the instigation of the Marine Corps or of the Navy, so we have been told, but at the instigation of an employee of a former Attorney General. It was the intention of the Attorney General to file papers upon approximately 12,000 residents in the watershed in this area to settle a case involving underground water, surface water and the accumulation of water. The case involving individual rights has gone to trial. It is on appeal. A stipulation has been arrived at by which all of those 12,000 people will not be subjected to separate demands upon them to prove their water rights. If we can maintain the status quo and support a bill in the Interior Committee to build a small dam to accumulate further water, this can be settled. At no time has the Marine Corps been denied water. It is understood that the entire amount of water, irrespective of all demands, will be available to the Marine Corps, if it is needed for military purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude hastily to recognize my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], who has been there himself to investigate this situation.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have been there and have investigated this, and I quite agree with everything that the gentleman from California has said as to the need for this particular bill. I am sure the Committee on this side is opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder whether or not, in view of the position taken by the gentleman from California and the testimony of the Attorney General, he thinks that the present Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, is incompetent or inept?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think neither. I think a predecessor of Mr. Brownell had a young man in the Attorney General's Office who came out to California and

attempted to establish what he designated as the "paramount right" of the United States to all water and to bypass State water laws for the first time in the history of California water litigation, and if that were asserted and maintained, every State in the United States would have an interest in this suit as well as the State of California.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] in whose district the property lies.

Mr. UTT. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. I just want to say to the Members of this Committee that the suit has been divided. The suit on the Santa Margarita Water Co. has already been tried. It is now in the Supreme Court of the United States in the Ninth Circuit Court and there are 22 assignments of error. It is improper to continue the suit in the district court until those matters have been disposed of, because there have been 22 assignments of error based on the fact that the court did not follow the California water law. They made a decision which flies in the face of our concept of basic California water law, and the suit should not go on. The rights of the Government are not prejudiced because of the fact that they are maintained intact so long as the suit exists, and the riparian rights are in order. There is no shortage of water so far as military use is concerned. There is simply a shortage of water for the tax-free land of tenants and the Santa Margarita ranch.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I chairmaned the subcommittee that held the hearings, both here in Washington and in California, on the Fallbrook matter.

Here are the facts: The Justice Department started a lawsuit against 12,000 small farmers, lot owners, and business people in the Fallbrook area. Because of the hardship of that lawsuit on thousands of little people, we tried to get the Justice Department to hold off the serving of summons until we could work out a settlement here in the Congress. We did work out legislation which passed this House without even a rollcall. That bill is pending in the Senate. But the Justice Department would not hold up its legal proceedings to let Congress settle the matter, or listen to Congress. The Justice Department was going to proceed, break the small landowners with the cost of this lawsuit, force them to the wall, and confront everybody with a fait accompli. These thousands of small landowners could not afford to fight for justice—the cost would force them to throw in the sponge. That situation called for action by the political agency of our Government—the Congress, and we took action to achieve justice by other means—legislation.

How do we prevent a great agency of this Government from using its financial and other resources arbitrarily to crush the common citizen? The way to do it is cut off their money. That is exactly what we have done, and that is the effect of the provision the amendment seeks to strike out of the bill. The provision simply holds the legal case in status quo until the pending bill is acted on by the Senate, one way or the other. If you believe the Congress has the right and the good sense to do justice between the people of Fallbrook and the Federal agencies involved at Camp Pendleton, then vote this amendment down.

This is a situation in which the legal remedy is not adequate. The rights involved, except those of the local people, are rights of the Federal Government, and the property of the Federal Government. The Congress—not the Federal courts—is primarily responsible to the people of this country for the rights and property of this Government. We have the right, and the responsibility, to arrogate to ourselves decisions relating to those rights and that property, where we think the circumstances warrant—and remove the matter from the strict legalisms of the courts. We have chosen to do that previously in this particular case. We should continue the prohibition against this lawsuit in the confidence that we will make the right decision here in respect to the rights and property of the Federal Government in the Fallbrook case.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 17, noes, 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Clevenger amendment with regard to payments to air carriers.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the other amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVENGER: On page 30, line 80, strike out "$23,000,000" and insert "$40,000,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 104, noes 28.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with an agreement made with the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my point of order at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the vote be postponed until tomorrow?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the gentleman from New York was seeking to withdraw the point of no quorum. If we agree to that I shall then ask unanimous consent that the vote go over until tomorrow.

Mr. ROONEY. And couple with the request that the first order of business tomorrow shall be the rollcall on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot make any agreement as to the rollcall tomorrow; the House will determine that tomorrow.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Can we submit the consent request now that the rollcall be had tomorrow?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Might I at this point assure the gentleman from New York that on our side we will see to it under the circumstances that the roll is called tomorrow if that is what he wants.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman very much; that is exactly what I want.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. ROONEY. If that is the proper thing to do.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to know if the gentleman withdraws it or not.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on the measure before us go over until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN HOSPITAL, MEDICAL, AND NURSING EXPENSES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resoution 456.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House such amounts as may be necessary to defray hospital, medical, and nursing expenses in the treatment of injuries incurred in the House of Representatives by its Members during the session of the House on March 1, 1954.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I am not going to, will the gentleman from Indiana explain the resolution?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced by our colleague from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG], a very close friend of one of our colleagues who was injured the other day.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for payment out of the contingent fund of the House of the necessary medical and hospital expenses for our five colleagues who were so tragically wounded on the House floor the other day. They were here on duty in the House of Representatives. It seems to me and to everyone with whom I have discussed this matter it is only fair and right that the hospital and medical expenses which they are incurring in the treatment of their wounds be borne out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a rising vote.

The question was taken, the Members rising.

The SPEAKER. One hundred and ninety-four have voted in the affirmative, none in the negative.

So the resolution was agreed to unanimously, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCISE TAXES

Mr. REED of New York, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 8224) to reduce excise taxes and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1307), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not see the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] presently on the floor, but I am sure he would want to ask unanimous consent that the minority views be filed also, and I submit that in the form of a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who made remarks in the Committee of the Whole today be given the privilege of revising and extending their remarks and including extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1265)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,120,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,431,909"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN TABER,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $600,000 for contingent expenses of the Senate, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Changes chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Authorizes the transfer of $8,120,500 to the Coast Guard appropriation for acquisition, construction, and improvements instead of $7,620,500 as proposed by the House and $8,620,500 as proposed by the Senate. In allowing this amount it is the desire of the conferees that the Secretary of Defense shall, prior to the transfer of any of these funds, certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate the necessity of such proposed transfer.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5: Change chapter numbers as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Increases the travel limitation of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to $143,200 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $1,431,909 for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government instead of $300,000 as proposed by the House and $1,831,909 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees in approving this amount eliminated $400,000 included in the budget presentation for task forces which may have to be created. The Commission is in the process of organizing budget requirements for all task force work and will know better after plans are more definite whether an additional amount will be required.

Amendment No. 8: Increases the travel limitation for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government to $302,344 as proposed by the Senate instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10: Change chapter numbers as proposed by the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the House made some brave retrenchments in this bill and cut the estimates something like $2,200,000. Out of the $27,942,616 requested the House sent only $25,785,707 to the Senate.

But the conference report now under consideration here carries $27,517,616, reducing the saving to a little over $400,000 instead of the $2,200,000 favored by the House.

At this rate it will be a long road to a balanced budget and a reduction in the national debt.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEXICAN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 355) amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 3, strike out all after "the" down to and including "1461–1468)" in line 5, and insert "Agricultural Act of 1949."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution amending title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE SEIZURE AND FORCED INCORPORATION OF LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 438 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the second paragraph of House Resolution 346 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of (1) the seizure and forced 'incorporation' of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the treatment of the said Baltic peoples during and following said seizure and 'incorporation'; and (2) the subversion and destruction of free institutions and human liberties in all other areas controlled, directly or indirectly, by world communism, including the treatment of the peoples in such areas."

SEC. 2. The fourth paragraph of such resolution is hereby amended by inserting the words "or outside" immediately after the word "within."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out line 12 and lines 1 and 2 on page 2 and insert:

"SEC. 2. The fourth paragraph of such resolution is hereby amended by inserting immediately after the word 'within' the following: ', and after March 1, 1954, outside,'."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment as to which I understand there is no opposition.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCOTT: Page 2, after line 5, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. The first paragraph of such resolution is hereby amended by striking out 'seven' and inserting in lieu thereof 'nine'."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], and yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a continuation of a House resolution that was approved in the last session of this House and to some extent an extension of that resolution by providing for the expansion of the consideration by the committee of the forced incorporation by the Soviet Union of other states than the Baltic States mentioned in the original resolution. The resolution also extends the right of the committee to make certain necessary investigations outside as well as within the United States.

The resolution has the unqualified and very vigorous approval of the State Department in a memorandum which I understand came to the attention of the Secretary of State himself and was drafted by the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Smith, and which will be introduced more at length by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN], in the consideration of the bill.

The tragic manner in which the Baltic people were duped out of their freedom was the Kremlin's first successful big bluff. It should have been called at Yalta, at Teheran, or at Potsdam. The fact that they got away with it only led to the perfection of a pattern of aggression which has been steadily and carefully expanded. In Czechoslovakia, Poland, and other Iron Curtain nations, the pattern has remained the same. Only political expediency has altered its implementation.

The three Baltic nations which had been under the Czar for more than a century, yet, had maintained their languages, their culture, and their customs. But most important of all, they maintained their innate love of liberty. In 1918 when the Russian Army collapsed, the Bolsheviks revolted in Russia and the German Army weakened and the three nations proclaimed their freedom. Almost immediately, they were besieged by the Bolsheviks. They defended their lands so successfully that the Russians finally sought peace. Each of the three nations eventually entered into nonaggression pacts with the Kremlin and, in 1921, they became members of the League of Nations.

The intent of the Soviet regime in Russia to seize the Baltic nations was demonstrated in 1918. But the strength to enforce the seizure was not mustered until 21 years later. It only came about through the Stalin-Hitler friendship pact in 1939.

Exiled diplomats and government officials of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have testified that during the period when Molotov and Von Ribbentrop were negotiating the Germany-Soviet friendship pact, Stalin summoned representatives of the three Baltic governments to the Kremlin and ordered them to draw up mutual-assistance agreements which would permit the Red army, navy and air force to occupy strategic ports, airfields and areas. The Balts were unwilling to sign away their territorial integrity—which the Kremlin had always guaranteed; but when the Hitler-Stalin pact was followed by Germany's invasion of Poland 10 days later, they reluctantly permitted Stalin to assume the role of protector of the Baltics.

They now know that the Stalin-Hitler agreement included the payment of $7,500,000 in gold to Hitler for the Soviets' sphere of influence in the Baltics. They know, too, that in that pact of August 23, 1939 Hitler turned over the Baltic nations and a part of Poland to Stalin.

But the Kremlin was wary of Hitler and fearful of the unrest in the Baltic nations. Litvinoff — translated means the man from Lithuania—and Molotov repeatedly pronounced the Kremlin's intention to respect the sovereignty as well as the territorial integrity of the Baltic nations.

Stalin cunningly waited until June 14, 1940 before he made his master move. That was the day the victorious German army marched into Paris. That was the day when, with Hitler and all Germany looking south, Stalin issued an ultimatum to the Baltic nations. He demanded new governments in the three nations—governments friendly to the Kremlin and willing to guarantee free passage of Soviet troops. Without waiting for a reply, Red troops moved into Lithuania. The next day they occupied Latvia; a day later, Estonia.

This was Vishinsky's first big job. He directed the seizure of the three nations from Riga, capital of Latvia. His associates, Dekanozov in Lithuania and Zhdanov in Estonia eventually received the award that goes to those in the Politburo who achieve too much power. Of the three, only Vishinsky is still alive.

With the heads of the three governments jailed or exiled, and Red puppets in their places—always the leaders of the Soviet Friendship Societies—it only remained for the Kremlin to order phoney elections of Parliaments whose first order of business was to beg Russia to incorporate their nations into the Soviet Union. With machine guns strategically placed at these sessions, the elected members had to vote for incorporation or personally learn why Stalin chose to call himself the man of steel.

The fact that Hitler turned on Stalin and invaded the Baltics a year later does not alter the Kremlin's claim that the nations were incorporated into the Soviet Union. Former Secretary of State Cordell Hull expressed his concern about the Baltic nations and states that he spoke to President Roosevelt about it.

The President promised to talk to Stalin about the liberty of the 6 million subjugated people but there is no evidence on the record that he ever did.

So far as the world is concerned, the Iron Curtain rang down on the Baltic nations on the day that Paris fell to the Nazis. The Soviet pattern of aggression and the succeeding years of mass arrests, deportation, and murder cannot help but be recorded as one of the great horrors of history.

I have talked with people who saw freight cars filled with children who had been forcibly separated from their parents—dead from suffocation; with legal experts who attest that they were there when nearly 2,000 bodies were dug out of stench-laden earth; with former Government officials who have lists of

names, charges, and destination of deportation for over 200,000 people.

The Soviets made one mistake in the Baltic nations. When they fled before the Nazi armies in 1941, they left behind them enough documents to hang Stalin, Malenkov, Molotov, Vishinsky, Beria, and the entire Politburo in any court anywhere in the world.

Today, everyone and everything is sovietized from the Czech border eastward to the Pacific. The Kremlin has almost a billion people under its control. But among that billion they have the greatest fifth column this world has ever seen. Millions still remember the promise of liberty and freedom that came at the end of World War I, and the more nebulous promises of the Atlantic Charter of World War II. The hope of freedom still exists, even under the Kremlin's cruel domination. Revolt and unrest still prevail behind the Iron Curtain and those with courage continue to escape to the free world.

I believe that our American heritage demands that we do everything in our power to keep alive the spark of freedom behind the Iron Curtain. By every available means of communication, and that includes the Voice of America, we should tell the captive peoples to keep up their hope.

The Kremlin's house of cards will fall.

The extraordinary effectiveness of this committee's work is mentioned in Babson's Washington Forecast, which offers confidential advice on governmental matters, in its issue of February 1, 1954. The Babson Forecast calls this deadly documentation:

Much of the credit for the administration's new look at communism must go to the House "Baltic" Committee, headed by clear-thinking Congressman CHARLES J. KERSTEN of Wisconsin.

The committee's documentation of Soviet murder and treachery in Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania got widespread press coverage throughout the world.

It constituted the first formidable step in regaining the world propaganda initiative for the West.

We have learned that, this week, the committee will request a new appropriation of $175,000 to expand its documented indictment to include the rape of Rumania, Poland, and Czechoslovakia.

It is our prediction that this first request for investigative funds by a special House committee in the current session of Congress will be promptly granted.

And Representative KERSTEN will soon propose exploitation of another facet in America's new realism toward world communism.

With reference to the history of the Baltic States prior to their forced incorporation into the U. S. S. R., here is what happened between 1918 and 1940 in the Baltic area.

All three Baltic States emerged as independent sovereign republics as a result of the post World War I political settlement in that region. Originally they were part of the Russian Empire and in 1918, by the decision of their popular representative bodies, proclaimed independence. The Soviet Government—1918–19—attempted then to establish Communist rule in the Baltic countries by force of arms. This attempt, however, failed because of the weakness of the Communist rule in the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic, and because of strong armed resistance on the part of the Baltic peoples. The Soviet Government therefore postponed their incorporation to a more favorable occasion and concluded peace treaties with Lithuania on July 12, 1920; Latvia on August 11, 1920; and with Estonia on February 2 of the same year. Subsequently, or even prior to that, the Baltic States were recognized by all European governments and admitted to the League of Nations on September 22, 1921.

Their position, vis-à-vis their eastern neighbor, was strengthened still more by nonaggression pacts concluded between Lithuania and the U. S. S. R. on September 28, 1926—the validity of which was extended until December 31, 1945; between Latvia and the U. S. S. R. on February 2, 1932; and between Estonia and the U. S. S. R. on May 4, 1932.

By these bilateral treaties, the Soviet Union undertook to respect, in all circumstances, the sovereignty, as well as integrity, and the territorial inviolability of the Baltic countries.

Many official pronouncements of Soviet statesmen—Litvinov, Molotov, and so forth—can be quoted to the effect that the Soviet Union professed its firm adherence to the spirit as well as the letter of those agreements.

With the upset political equilibrium in Europe, caused by German aggression and the friendship and neutrality—Stalin-Hitler—pact of August 23, 1939, the Soviet Government had its hands free to resume its communistic expansion in the Baltic area, abandoned in 1920. The incorporation of the Baltic States was accomplished in stages, the first being the conclusion of mutual-assistance treaties between the U. S. S. R. and Estonia on September 28, 1939; Latvia on October 5, 1939; and Lithuania on October 10, 1939. By virtue of these treaties, Soviet military bases were established on their territories. The presence of these Red army detachments was later used to exert pressure on the Baltic Governments. In June 1940 the Soviet Government took further steps in its carefully planned piecemeal incorporation design. It confronted the three Baltic States with ultimative requests for establishment of new governments "capable and willing to warrant the honest execution of the mutual-assistance pacts" and "free passage of Soviet troops in sufficient numbers to guarantee the realization of the mutual assistance pact."

The next step was to stage new elections in order to elect a Parliament willing to ask for incorporation into the U. S. S. R. The candidates were named, and the whole operation was supervised by Dekanozov in Kaunas, Vishinsky in Riga, and Zhdanov in Tallinn. The new elected Diets adopted at their first session resolutions obliging the Soviet Governments of the respective Baltic Republics to apply to the Soviet Union for inclusion in the U. S. S. R. On August 3, 1940, the Supreme Council of the U. S. S. R. acceded to Lithuania's request. On August 6 Latvia was accepted, and on August 7, Estonia.

The occupation, seizure, and incorporation of the 3 Baltic nations violated every agreement previously entered into by the U. S. S. R. and the 3 countries.

Soviet occupation of the 3 countries continued until July 1941. During this time more than 200,000 people were deported, killed, or disappeared. Then, in July, Hitler attacked Russia, occupied the Baltic area, and held it until 1944, when the Red armies again returned, and they completed the annexation and incorporation that was started in 1940.

The House Baltic Committee on February 9, 1954, released the following statement, with which I am in full accord:

The Baltic committee, which I truly believe to have proven itself bipartisan throughout hearings in Washington, New York, Detroit and Chicago has seriously, and successfully, endeavored to document what happens to a nation—in this case three nations—when the Soviets move in.

The Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia were the first to suffer from Communist aggression. In all three countries there were only six million people—but we found, in addition to the exiles who had lost their land, their homes and their families that there were many great Americans deeply concerned with the fundamental freedom of people.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was our first witness. His historic statement on the principles for which our Government stands at the international conference table has—as I stated on the floor yesterday—produced notable and outstanding success at the current Berlin conference.

Our committee must finish its documentation of the illegal seizure of the Baltic nations. Many important witnesses are unable to come to the United States. It might be necessary for our small group to go to them.

But even more important is the very basic fact, brought out by testimony before our committee, that the seizure of the Baltic nations and their incorporation into the Soviet Union was but the first in a well-planned series of aggression which has now brought nearly a billion people under the domination of the small clique in the Kremlin.

The same pattern of merciless, inhumane treatment that was used in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in 1940 and 1941 was later used in Poland, in Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and in the other captive nations.

A map, for example, placed before our committee as evidence and attested to by former President Herbert Hoover and General Rastikis, chief of staff of the Lithuanian Army, conclusively proved that the Nazi-Soviet Friendship Pact of 1939 sold out not only the Baltic nations but gave half of Poland to Stalin. This means that Soviet aggression in the Baltics and in Poland went hand in hand—even though Hitler never dreamed that after his death Stalin would steal Poland through phony elections first perfected in the Baltics.

We have conclusively proven, by testimony, films, and documents that Soviet Ambassador to the United States, Andrei Vishinsky, was the mastermind who subjugated the Baltic States. We ask permission to show the role he played in the ruin of Rumania.

We ask, too, that we be given the opportunity to document the maneuvers of Premier Georgi Malenkov in reestablishing the Cominform in Poland in 1947 which resulted in the bondage the Polish people now endure.

Think of it: In 7 years the most modest estimate of Poles deported from their homeland is well over a million.

Our committee hopes that, through being granted the privilege of more latitude in our investigation, we can, before this session of Congress closes, bring before you conclusive proof of a great international conspiracy through which the many are enslaved by the few. Our investigations thus far show that the story is the same, the pattern is the same, only the magnitude of the crime changes as we go from the Baltics to the Ukraine, to Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland—a pattern first imposed on the Russian people themselves.

We ask for time. We ask for funds to fully expose it.

I should report to you that the Baltic Committee is probably the only one established by the House in recent years to win 14 attacks in 3 weeks by the big guns of the Moscow propaganda machine. We even have a new name. Pravda, Radio Moscow, and the entire Communist press have called us KERSTEN'S traveling circus.

But from behind the Iron Curtain—through Stockholm, Sweden, comes word that brings assurance that this investigation is worthwhile. It may give you some measure of the concern our hearings have caused in the Kremlin.

"After Pravda, the entire press of Soviet Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania reprinted the attack (on KERSTEN'S traveling circus) and those Balts who cannot hear the Kersten Commission in Baltic broadcasts could read in their daily papers that the Soviet crimes against their countries are being inquired into and that their case is not entirely forgotten in the democratic West."

We cannot forget the Poles, the Czechs, the Slovaks, the Hungarians, Rumanians, Albanians, Russians, or Ukrainians and others under Soviet domination any more than we can afford to forget the Balts. For who among us cannot proudly boast of ties with Europe through blood or friendship?

The day is not far off when we will have a free world of free nations and free people. And I believe that our committee should conclude its work in such form and in such manner that the red mark which the Reds have made on human history will become a matter of record that will live forever and plague the criminals responsible for it.

Through this amendment, we can achieve two objectives: We can show the Communist conspiracy for what it is. We can keep the faith, the hope, and the spirit of captive millions alive. And, through thousands of tomorrows, we can help to show those who follow us what it means to lose freedom and how it can be lost through a carefully planned and well-executed conspiracy.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to read the communication from the State Department to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred, as I think it sums up the situation as to the advisability of extending the scope of this inquiry. This communication is signed by Under Secretary of State Walter B. Smith, but I understand reliably that the language was formulated by Mr. Dulles while he was in Berlin. It is dated February 8, 1954, and reads as follows:

Memorandum for the Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN, House of Representatives.

The following are the Department's views regarding the work of the House Baltic Committee and your proposal to broaden the scope of the committee's inquiry, as set forth in the draft resolution enclosed with your letter of January 17, 1954, to Secretary Dulles:

1. The Department considers that the work of the House committee has been wisely planned and effectively conducted. It is apparent that the hearings held to date have made a valuable contribution to United States objectives in disseminating impressive evidence of Soviet disrespect for the rights and sovereignty of small nations.

2. The Department believes that it will be beneficial to broaden the scope of the committee's work to provide for inquiry into similar cases where communism has extended its domination over free peoples. Careful, well-documented investigation of such cases would be valuable (a) to assure the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain that they are not forgotten and that the United States does not endorse their captivity; and (b) to educate public opinion in the free world regarding Communist techniques in seizing power and the terrible realities of life under Communist rule.

This amendment expands the scope of the inquiry of House Resolution 346 originally authorizing and directing the House Select Committee to investigate the seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviets and the treatment of their peoples. Our committee is in the process of documenting and exposing the Communist seizure of the Baltic nations. We have completed a substantial part of our work with regard to the Baltics and contemplate some further Baltic hearings.

The amendment expands the inquiry so as to show the Communist subversion and destruction of freedom in countries such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and other areas where the ugly and inhuman Communist way of life has made itself known.

The United States has not acquiesced in the Communist enslavement of the peoples of the captive nations. Among the first of the captive nations to be enslaved by Communist aggression were the defenseless Baltic nations.

The same blueprint of Communist enslavement was imposed upon the brave people of Poland, Hungary, Rumania, the Czech and Slovak people; the peoples of Bulgaria and Albania; it was the same pattern of enslavement earlier applied by the Communists to the Ukrainian nation and to the other nations of the Soviet Union, including the first imposition upon the people of Russian, or Bolshevik terror by the small but ruthless band headed by Lenin.

I believe the work of the Baltic committee is making an important contribution to the security of the United States, particularly by keeping alive and strengthening the bond between the people of America and the peoples enslaved by communism behind the Iron Curtain.

The success of the committee thus far has been due to the fine work of the committee members and of our hard-working staff.

At this point I would like to pay a tribute to the outstanding work of one of our committee members, the Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY, of Michigan, who was shot down on the floor of this House Monday afternoon.

In behalf of every member of our committee and staff, we want to pay a special tribute to him and let him know that we need him back with our committee at the earliest opportunity his health will permit. Mr. BENTLEY'S examination of witnesses at our hearings, particularly those in Detroit, in bringing out from witnesses the story of their actual experiences of the inhuman practices of the Communist NKVD, is an example in point. These firsthand stories of Communist cruelty practiced upon enslaved peoples were beamed over the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe and have caused violent and hysterical Soviet reaction. The experience and background of the gentleman from Michigan admirably qualify him to unmask Soviet occupation, having for 2 years been attached to the American Embassy in Hungary under Communist occupation during the trials of Cardinal Mindszenty and thereafter.

Likewise the other members of our committee have made very valuable contributions to the effectiveness of our work. Mr. BUSBEY, of Illinois, and Mr. BONIN, of Pennsylvania, have, by their intelligent questioning of witnesses who experienced life under the Communists, brought out the horrors of Communist occupation.

Mr. MADDEN, of Indiana, chairman of the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee, and Mr. MACHROWICZ, of Michigan, likewise on that committee, who have the exceptional background of experience in the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, have likewise brought out, for the benefit of the American people and of the world, the inhuman practices of the Communists in the Baltic nations.

Mr. DODD, of Connecticut, whose experience in the Nuremberg trials, admirably qualify him, and likewise have given him a deep understanding of the Communist conspiracy. He, too, has helped pierce the curtain of deception hiding NKVD atrocities.

I would like to call attention to some of the statements made at the time when Mr. Dulles wrote this letter on behalf of our committee in Berlin and many of the other statements made in Mr. Molotov's presence for the benefit of the people in Europe. At that time he, on two different occasions, specifically referred to the Communist rape of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to the great embarrassment of Mr. Molotov.

A reading of Mr. Dulles' statement made at the Berlin Conference shows clearly that he understood Soviet duplicity and hit hard at the history of their bloody rule over people everywhere the Communists have come to power.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that by bringing out the facts as to the actuality and realities of the treatment of people once they fall slave to the Communists as told by the lips of those who at firsthand have experienced it is one of the most

effective ways that we can get a hard-hitting information program. But, further and more important than that, it shows that we have a real bond of sympathy with these captive nations—the peoples of Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, the Ukraine, the Russian people, the other peoples of the Soviet Union. That is what we must keep alive. We must keep these allies on the other side of the Iron Curtain. That is the chief motive of this committee to show our understanding for these suffering peoples and to show the realities of the Communist way of life.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I congratulate the committee for the splendid work they have been doing which I followed with great satisfaction. I learned that the propaganda organs from Moscow have criticised severely not only you, as chairman, but the entire committee for exposing the Communist crimes committed in the Baltic States. It appears to me that your committee has hit the Kremlin where it hurts the most. Does the gentleman not think that is correct?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio who, I know, knows a great deal about the Communist conspiracy that at least on 14 different occasions since we started our hearings, Radio Moscow and the Communist radio have been screaming. I think they have been hurt and I think we can hurt them far more with this type of truth.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Further, I understand that the Voice of America has been carrying beyond the Iron Curtain particularly into the Baltic States the testimony which you have elicited from those witnesses, including verbatim testimony of many of the eyewitnesses, and that there is clear and concise evidence that the Voice of America got this story across to the people of the Baltic nations.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Both the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe recorded all of our hearings, I believe, and beamed them across, and the fact that we had such a violent response shows that these programs carried across the Iron Curtain.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Of course, in the cold war, we are fighting for the minds and loyalties of men, and I want to quote from a statement by one of the foremost and distinguished geopoliticians in the United States, Father Walsh, of Georgetown University, of Washington, D. C., who said:

> The hotter we make the logistics of the cold war, the colder we make the probabilities of a hot war.

I agree with that statement, and I wonder if the gentleman likewise agrees with it?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I am in complete agreement with that, because it is my understanding of that statement of Father Edmund Walsh of Georgetown that the more sympathy and union we can create between ourselves and the enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain, the more impossible we make it for the Communists to mold them into an aggressive force against us.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. I congratulate the gentleman on the vigorous and determined fashion in which he has undertaken his duties as chairman of this committee. I am in complete sympathy with what he is doing with his committee in this work. However, as I read the resolution, it seems to be quite all-embracive, and I wonder if the gentleman would give us a little more concrete information as to the method he intends to follow. I notice that it will take in the bamboo curtain, for instance.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think we will have to use a little common sense with regard to that. I think a majority of our witnesses would come from the countries of Eastern Europe, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and so forth. There might be a few from other areas, but the Department of State and the committee members thought it wise not to put down exact areas, because it might thereby create an obligation. But without any question, the countries of Eastern Europe will afford most of the witnesses that can be effective in such further hearings.

Mr. SADLAK. I was particularly interested to know whether the gentleman planned to go into Rumania and Hungary.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Oh, yes. Rumania and Hungary would be included in the countries of Eastern Europe.

Mr. SADLAK. Then, of course, the bamboo curtain takes in China, which was not so long ago in completely friendly hands. Does the gentleman plan to take in that phase now?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. At this point I would say our first approach would be where the witnesses are most numerous and available.

Mr. SADLAK. And the same pattern or design is approved there?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That is true.

EXPOSE WHOLE RECORD OF RED SLAVERY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman and the members of his committee for bringing this very important matter to the attention of the House.

The Russian people were the first victims.

They are in the middle of a prison that has been growing larger with every communist conquest. They have been given up for lost. No one thinks of these, the first living victims of the Reds, or pleads their case with facts or figures, or offers any hope that the liberties stolen from them will ever be restored.

By ignoring their plight, our counter-offensive against communism is failing to strike at the heart of the problem.

The whole record of communist terror and subversion must be probed to its very beginnings and revealed to all the world as the first step in rolling back this conspiracy against mankind—to the very first crime, which was committed against the Russian people, until we enlist their support by documenting the fraud and force that enslaved them, our job will only be half done.

With this in mind, we should give unanimous approval to House Resolution 438, introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN]. It would authorize a committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of, first, the seizure and forced incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the treatment of said Baltic peoples during and following said seizure and incorporation; and, second, the subversion and destruction of free institutions and human liberties in all other areas controlled, directly or indirectly, by world communism, including the treatment of the peoples in such areas.

Section 2: The fourth paragraph of such resolution—House Resolution 346—"is hereby amended by inserting the words 'or outside' immediately after the word 'within'."

These two little words are important. we must know how the Communist conspiracy takes root underground and how it spreads. Obviously, we cannot take our committee past the Red army and the Red secret police, to secure evidence within the dungeons of Lubianka prison, or within the remote and forbidding slave camps in Siberia.

Therefore we must get our evidence outside from reliable and fortunate witnesses, who have escaped from the terror.

The investigation must be conducted as close to the Iron Curtain as possible, to contact refugees from the captive countries, and also Russians who have fled to freedom with the stories of Now It Can Be Told.

I believe that such a forthright investigation would pile up a tremendous moral indictment of communism; it would also provide the free world with accurate and moving testimony that could be radioed back into the dark world of communism, bringing hope that the emancipating truth is known and is actively working for the day of liberation.

The facts must be marshaled completely. They must be verified, so that the case against communism will be overwhelming.

On a number of days during the year, on occasions that mean so much to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, and other nations that are groaning under the heel of Communist brutality, we offer vague promises of help.

Up to this moment there has been no sign of any supporting action.

I believe that this resolution is the first realistic step and in the right direction. Communist propaganda has enslaved people with lies. We must help to liberate them with truth, but first we must have the courage and the decision to get at the facts that will expose the deceits

and cruelties of communism from those who have suffered from it so that the power of world opinion will start it on the road to oblivion.

The searchlight of investigation, under the wide scope of House Resolution 438, will help to uncover all the dark crimes of communism so that they will have no place to hide, even within Russia itself.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution expanding the Baltic committee was passed out of the Rules Committee without any opposition. I simply wish to remind the Members of the House that I believe one of the most effective ways of combating and curtailing the spread of communism is the work that this committee is doing. During December we held hearings in Washington, New York, Detroit, and Chicago, and we listened to the testimony of a great number of witnesses, collected a great many exhibits which were admitted into the testimony, and those facts were not only published in the newspapers generally throughout this country but Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America carried the proceedings behind the Iron Curtain.

As chairman of the Katyn committee in the last session of Congress I can testify, to the outstanding effectiveness the work of a committee engaged in this type of investigation can accomplish. In London and Frankfurt, Germany, we held 6 days of hearings in each locality. Every day we had between 70 or 80 newspaper reporters, radio commentators, and newspapers throughout all Western Europe carrying the testimony and proceedings. Not only that, but the testimony and facts that were revealed, exposing communism in its true light, were carried behind the Iron Curtain. The newspaper Pravda, and the Warsaw newspapers and others including radio behind the Iron Curtain were making daily malicious attacks upon our committee, which was the best evidence that we were highly effective.

Congressman MACHROWICZ and I spoke at the opening of a convention of newspaper journalists in Berlin on Friday of the week when we held hearings at Frankfurt, Germany. Over 500 delegates were in attendance. Most of these delegates were journalists who had escaped from behind the Iron Curtain. A number of them were members of the underground from various captive countries.

We talked to a number of these journalists and they stated that for the first time since the war the Katyn committee had brought out facts and information revealing the true criminal and barbarous mind which is possessed by the Kremlin rulers. These facts were sent not only to the free countries but to all captive nations behind the Iron Curtain. The Communist propaganda machine was placed on the defensive for the first time by reason of the revelations recorded by the Katyn committee.

I wish to read an excerpt from a newspaper article. It testifies more than anything else to the great work which this committee is accomplishing and will accomplish. You have all read about John Hvasta. He was the ex-GI who was a prisoner for almost 4 years behind the Iron Curtain. He said, and I quote:

"People in Czechoslovakia don't get much of a thrill out of their buildings, especially government buildings," he added. "In fact, they don't get any thrill out of their government. But here you do. At least I do, and I think most people do. We may cuss out our Government, but we appreciate it just the same.

"The word 'American' is a passport in Czechoslovakia," he said, explaining to me how he was able to travel 200 miles from his prison in Leopoldov to the American Embassy in Prague. "I never would have been taken in by Czech families along the way had I not been an American."

Hvasta was greatly interested in the freedom balloons which this writer helped to launch from the German border into Czechoslovakia 3 years ago, carrying messages of hope and friendship.

"I heard about the balloons though I didn't see any," he said. "What the people there need is exactly this kind of encouragement. All the people behind the Iron Curtain are strong for America, but they have to be reminded that we have not forgotten them. We have far more friends than we realize, but we don't take advantage of that fact."

The work of the Baltic committee will reassure the freedom-loving people behind the Iron Curtain that the free world has not forgotten them.

This means that the work of this committee through the testimony to be revealed by witnesses some of whom were leaders in their Communist captive nations before World War II will give millions renewed life and courage to continue the struggle against communistic slavery. I know that every Member of this House deplores the unfortunate wounding of a member of this committee by the Puerto Rican terrorist last Monday afternoon. ALVIN BENTLEY devoted a great service to the Baltic committee and we all hope that his recovery is rapid so he can resume his duties as a member of our committee. Of course, the same sentiments are held by all of us toward the other Members who were shot by these fanatics.

I want to commend the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman KERSTEN, for the outstanding work that has been done so far, and I do hope that this resolution will be unanimously adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the gentleman have any further requests for time on his side?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution extending the life and the scope of the Kersten committee should be passed by this House.

As a member of this committee since the date of its organization, I have had an excellent opportunity to observe and to evaluate its work.

When assigned to this committee I believed that a great opportunity to render service to the cause of freedom and liberty awaited us as members of the committee and likewise awaited all of us as Members of this Congress. That belief has been confirmed.

I saw in the establishment of this committee the first real opportunity to investigate the destruction of the free Baltic nations, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by the Soviet Union.

I knew that such a committee could not undo any of the dreadful things that had happened. I knew that we could not rewrite history; that we could not bring back life to those who were murdered by the Communists of the Soviet Union. I knew that we could not free from the worst type of slavery and bondage those who are in the Soviet prison camps and jails. I knew that we could not restore liberty and decency and freedom to the hapless inhabitants of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia who live from day to day under the heel of the occupying Soviet tyrant.

I never expected that this committee could achieve by itself the end result of our foreign policy and the ultimate objective of free and decent peoples all over the world.

I did believe then, and I believe now, that this Congress through this Kersten committee could ascertain the facts concerning the destruction of these free countries. I knew that we could write a record of what happened based on the testimony of living persons and on the availability of truthful documents and honest records.

Mr. Speaker, that has been partially accomplished and the record that has been written so far is a chapter of history that the world must never forget. This record must be completed.

It is important that this history be written now because many of those living who can tell us what happened are growing older. Soon they will not be available. Besides, the documentary material must be recorded and preserved under a proper authority.

Unfortunately there are still people in the world who do not believe that the Communist conspiracy murders, plunders and terrorizes free people wherever and whenever it gets an opportunity to do so.

There are still responsible heads of state who appear not to understand the implications of the Communist threat to freedom and to liberty. People like Nehru of India, still do not understand. Some people in our own land do not understand.

For those who are still in ignorance and in darkness in our own time, and for those who will come after us and face new problems concerning freedom and new threats to liberty, the record of what happened in these places must be set down.

By the extension of the life of this committee this mission can be fulfilled.

That is the first purpose of this resolution.

By widening the scope of this committee to include those other countries which have been dragged behind the Iron Curtain we can extend and make more complete this record. There are great numbers of individuals who are available to tell us what happened in Poland, in Hungary, in Czechoslovakia, and in the Balkan countries. From

their lips and from the records the history of this dark time can be preserved. Not only will we have made a great contribution toward the documentation of this black period, but as well, and at the same time, we can accomplish two other great objectives by the conducting of this investigation through a committee of representatives of a free people.

First, we will sustain hope in the hearts of those who are now in Soviet thralldom; we will give them faith because they will know we have not forgotten them.

Secondly, we will serve notice to the world that the struggle goes on, that the people of America will never retreat from this battle for liberty and that we will never give up the struggle for peace and for freedom under law.

Before closing, let me observe that this committee, among its other accomplishments, occupies a standout position for the manner in which it has conducted its affairs.

The chairman of this committee, Congressman CHARLES KERSTEN, of Wisconsin, has been a model of fairness, of moderation, and of industrious application to the work assigned. At a time when congressional investigations are a matter of grave concern across this land, Congressman KERSTEN and the members of this committee have demonstrated that a congressional committee can investigate Communists and communism judiciously, temperately, and honestly.

For all of these reasons and for many more which the limitations of time do not permit me to relate on the floor of this House, I earnestly ask that this resolution be passed by this House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take any more time than is necessary on this matter but I do want to add my words of commendation to our distinguished chairman of the Baltic committee for the splendid work he has done thus far. As a minority member of the committee I think I can attest to the fact and I can attest also to the fact that already very much has been accomplished at a relatively low cost to us if we talk in the matter of finances.

Just this afternoon we spent a lot of time debating how much we should spend on the Voice of America and our United States Information Service abroad. We appropriated $75 million for that purpose, and very wisely, in my opinion.

With a relatively small sum of money, because the work of this committee has taken very little money, we can accomplish so much at such low cost and I am sure, therefore, there will be no dispute about the passage of this resolution.

The purpose of the work of this committee is twofold. First of all, we are conducting a psychological warfare. We are letting the people behind the Iron Curtain know that we have not forgotten them, that we still do intend to work until the days of their enslavement are ended. Secondly, we are accomplishing something that sometimes we forget about, and that is, in order to properly face this Communist problem which we have before us we must understand it. We cannot understand it unless we study it properly. We cannot study it properly unless we see what they have done in the past and unless we accumulate all of the evidence that is available.

This committee has done a splendid job in that respect, and I am sure it will continue to do so if it is permitted to proceed under the terms of this resolution, which I heartily support and trust will be passed by the House unanimously.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I compliment and congratulate the able gentleman of Wisconsin and the distinguished committee for bringing this significant resolution to the floor of the House. It will, of course, have my wholehearted support.

Full investigation of the calloused, merciless, godless persecution of millions of unfortunate democratic-minded peoples has been too long delayed.

This inquiry which covers broad scope may well be the entering wedge which will in time open up and foreshadow the liberation of these sorely afflicted nations. It will give new heart and new courage to the oppressed and persecuted.

It will also serve to inform the free world as well as peoples behind the Iron Curtain of the enormity, barbarity, cruelty, and savagery which have characterized the Soviet program of infiltrating, consolidating, and incorporating these freedom-loving peoples into the ideological, military, territorial, and political orbit of world communism.

The investigation will reveal to the world the unconscionable excesses of the Communists, not only those destructive of liberty and violative of humanity, but in the broader sense, those which have so diabolically stifled the national sovereignty, political independence, and social justice of the oppressed nations.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BONIN].

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Baltic committee to investigate the illegal seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Communist overlords of Moscow, I rise to support the House Resolution 438. The Baltic committee saw and heard witnesses who portrayed the most dastardly acts of barbarism to the helpless people of these proud nations. Our committee established a new precedent of recreating, for the future benefit of free people, the method in which ruthless dictators deprive millions of people of their freedom, liberty, and independence. It was clearly shown that Andrei Vishinsky, the Soviet representative to the United Nations, wilfully and maliciously participated in the rape of Latvia and was responsible for the massacre, murder and imprisonment of thousands upon thousands of freedom-loving people.

Our hearings established the fact that the word of Communist dictators cannot be believed. In the case of the three Baltic nations, the dictators of Russia entered into solemn compacts, treaties and agreements and, within a short span of 20 years and at the outbreak of the Second World War, the Government of the Soviet Union, on various pretexts and unfounded allegations, violated all the treaties signed by them and proceeded with the occupation of these indefensible countries. On May 29, 1940, Lithuania was presented with a menacing note from Moscow charging the Lithuanians with letting their foreign agents kidnap and torture two Red army soldiers in order to force them to disclose military secrets. The Lithuanian Government officials sought to clarify this incident which actually had been inspired by Moscow agents. Sixteen days later, the proud nation of Lithuania was handed an ultimatum from Moscow demanding the immediate formation of a new government acceptable to the Communist dictators and also for the admission of new troops to occupy all of the important centers of that nation. Substantial Red army contingents had already been placed at strategic points in pursuance to the Mutual Aid Pact between the Soviets and Lithuania. Being unable to resist these demands, the Lithuanian Government capitulated on June 15. The occupation of all Lithuania by the Red troops began immediately.

Then, to add insult to injury, the Soviet News Agency, Tass, informed the world that the Baltic nations had conducted a military alliance against the Soviet Union, to justify their ruthless action against the freedom, independence, and sovereignty of these helpless nations. We heard the same identical charges preferred against Estonia and Latvia and with the same type of hypocrisy—in accordance with the plan of deceit, lies, and hypocrisy which is ever present in the dealings of the Russian Commissars. Red troops occupied all three of these little nations. This is demonstrative proof that no solemn agreement entered with the Communists can be relied upon by any nation of the free world.

The most recent demonstration of their subterfuge occurred in Berlin and, as a result of the Russian conduct at the Berlin conference, Secretary Dulles was able to use the information supplied by our Baltic hearings to prove the Communist leaders had no intention of abiding by the rules of honesty and decency.

The resolution under consideration at the present time, expands the activities of the committee in order to prove to the world that the same identical pattern was used by the Russians to take over Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Our committee, under this resolution, will establish that these governments came under the domination of Communist influence as a result of the use of lies, chicanery, murder, and other means by the Russians.

I earnestly urge the Members of the House to unanimously adopt this resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to declare my full support of House Resolution 346, as amended by House Resolution 438. The resolution, as amended, sets up a select congressional committee to conduct a complete investigation of the incorporation and seizure of the Baltic nations—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—by the U. S. S. R., as well as the Kremlin's subversion and destruction of free institutions and liberties in other countries such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and other captive nations now compelled by Communist tyranny to remain behind the Iron Curtain.

It is clear that the seizure, merciless and inhuman domination of these countries is part of a well-defined pattern of Soviet Communist imperialism, which has brought nearly a billion people under the domination of the Kremlin clique. There are some 15 millions in forced labor camps in Soviet Russia. Since 1939 a total of 264,200 square miles has been brought under direct Soviet imperialistic and Communist control. The validity of the Soviet claim to the countries and territories in these areas rests principally upon sheer force and brutality.

The U. S. S. R. occupied Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia in June 1940 and these countries were annexed by Soviet decree in August of that year. In the meantime, the flower of Polish leadership and thousands upon thousands of other freedom-loving Poles have been deported to arctic Russia and to Siberia. Many others have been executed without trial. Polish industry and mining are under the control of the Soviet Union. The Polish people are compelled to do without basic needs while the Kremlin reaps the Polish harvest. The formerly free Polish farmer, miner, and worker has now been forced to become in effect a Soviet serf, chained to the slave farm collectives, mines, and factories.

This resolution, as amended, recognizes that savage crimes against humanity have been committed in Poland, in the Baltic States and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain, and that natural justice demands that there be presented to the world the evidence of the crimes, the identity of the criminals and the manner in which the crimes were committed. It is important to know how the criminals were able to subjugate these peoples and the methods and individuals who were used in the diabolic process. We must have a public record of Soviet crimes for the whole world to see and to this end we must collect all of the information in one place under official auspices.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is entirely fitting and appropriate that this inquiry should be made by a select committee of the United States Congress, which is the very backbone of our free and democratic form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Polish-American Congress, Inc., Illinois division, in support of the resolution, as amended:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
ILLINOIS DIVISION,
Chicago, Ill., February 27, 1954.

The Honorable THOMAS S. GORDON,
Representative in Congress, Illinois Eighth District, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GORDON: It is our understanding that House Resolution 438 comes up for a vote in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, March 2. We would be extremely grateful to you for any support you can give toward adoption of this all-important resolution.

We have given this resolution careful study and sincerely believe the best interest of the United States can be served if the present Baltic committee's investigation is extended to include a study of Soviet Russia's bizarre and illegal seizure of Poland and her neighbors.

Our files are replete with reports of inhuman treatment and persecution of the Poles by their present Communist rulers. These Soviet-dominated rulers seized Poland and the other countries covered by the proposed resolution through the most outrageous act of treachery ever recorded by history.

Extension of the Baltic committee's investigation can be the best answer to those in our country who still cling to their belief that Russia can be trusted to keep her agreements. It will likewise best serve to support President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles in their bold determination to contain Soviet expansion.

As Americans, we are deeply concerned that the United States have as many supporters in Europe as possible. So long as the Soviets realize America has not abandoned her traditional position of freedom and justice for all mankind, they will not dare start a third war. Exposure of all the facts leading to the enslavement of our traditional allies—including Poland—by the Soviets is undoubtedly the most forceful way we can demonstrate to those poor victims of Communist aggression that this country has not forgotten them.

It is for these reasons that we earnestly hope you will add your support to this vital resolution, House Resolution 438.

We would be greatly honored to learn your own observations on this subject.

Respectfully yours,
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
President.
(For the Board).

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is not generally recognized in this Congress that California is the third ranking State in the United States in wool production. California's many attributes and the myriad of crops grown there have tended to overshadow the importance of wool. Yet, wool production is an important segment of the economy of the State, particularly the San Joaquin Valley, of which the district which I am privileged to represent is an integral part. As a matter of fact, the major portion of California's wool production is in my district.

I mention these points, Mr. Speaker, as a preliminary to calling the attention of this body to H. R. 7775, on which hearings began today before the Committee on Agriculture. This bill embodies the Administration's recommended wool-support program and is vitally needed to spur domestic production of this product, whose critical and essential character for military needs has been recognized by both the administration and Congress. The Congress has set by statute a production goal of 360 million pounds of shorn wool per year in the United States. This figure has not been attained under the present program in the face of import competition. In fact, the number of sheep in California and in the Nation have declined during the past year until we have 800,000 fewer breeding ewes in the Nation today than we had 12 months ago.

Those of us in the House who represent wool-producing areas are hopeful that the wool program can be enacted into law as soon as possible and without being hampered by amendments affecting other commodities.

To complete the task of attaining adequate domestic wool production one other action is required. Before the President of the United States is a recommendation of the Tariff Commission affecting wool imports which was arrived at after 8 months study. Although I am not acquainted with detailed findings of the Commission, the facts presented at hearings several months make it selfevident that additional fees on imported wool not only are desirable but absolutely essential. Due to the great amount of wool which is imported annually the present price support program for wool never has been able to operate as was intended by Congress.

Domestic wool is continuing to accumulate in Government inventory. The wool program thus far has cost the Commodity Credit Corporation $90 million. This does not include any possible losses which may accrue on the nearly 100 million pounds of wool now in Government storage, nor on the 35 million pounds now under appraisal from the new clip, much of which is likely to be foreclosed upon by the Government. The cost of storage on wool now in Federal inventory is $100,000 a month. The establishment of a higher import fee to enable the sale of that wool into the domestic market without loss to the Government, in my judgment, would be an important economy measure on behalf of all taxpayers of the United States.

Taking these facts into consideration, officials of the Department of Agriculture as well as representatives of the wool industry urged the Tariff Commission to fix a higher import than that now existing. My best advice is that an increase of 12 cents per clean pound is required to protect both the Government support program and the industry up to the support level. This move is considered necessary to provide for an orderly transition into the new program, if and when the Congress approves it. I have therefore urged such decisive action upon the President. This is not to say that I am an advocate of the high tariff in all instances. As a member of the minority party in Congress, I subscribe

to the theory of free trade in most instances. However, this case is one in which I believe increased import controls are dictated.

I might underscore the effect of the plight of the wool industry on our economy by pointing out that county assessors in California have begun setting lower valuations on sheep for tax purposes because of the low income of the sheep industry. Upon this valuation of sheep and the land on which they graze rests a portion of our tax revenue for school districts and other districts and county governmental functions.

There is another factor as far as California is concerned. In my district thousands of acres are going out of cotton production through the imposition of quotas on the 1954 crop. Action to bring the income from wool more nearly into balance with the production of other agricultural commodities can do much to alleviate the loss of revenue created by the required diversion of these acres to other agricultural production. This will ease, to some degree, the ill effects upon the San Joaquin Valley's economy which will result from the imposition of the cotton acreage quotas.

To my mind there is no question of the clear-cut need for adoption by the Congress of the bill embodying the new wool program and executive action increasing the import fee on foreign wool.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Kersten committee is deserving of high praise for their work in exposing the manner in which the world Communist conspiracy works.

The committee has exposed the utter worthlessness of any agreement or treaty with the Moscovite conspiracy.

The whole history of Moscow indicates that they use any agreement or treaty with another power as a means of further extending their empire.

What they actually do is to use a legal instrument, so recognized by the standards of civilized man, to commit illegal acts which lead to the downfall of independent nations and their incorporation into the empire of Moscow.

I laud the committee for the wonderful job it did in pointing out the manner in which the madmen of the Kremlin forced the Baltic States to enter into nonaggression pacts with them and the manner in which these pacts were used to destroy the sovereign independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Another major contribution of the committee was the manner in which they identified one Andrei Vishinsky as the mastermind behind the subversion of the sovereign independent State of Latvia.

The committee proved beyond any doubt the criminal activities of Vishinsky in bringing about the forced annexation of Latvia into the empire of Moscow.

I am happy to note that the committee did not hesitate to point out that this is the same Andrei Vishinsky who heads the Russian delegation in the U. N.

I am only sorry that Vishinsky did not accept the invitation of the committee to appear before it and face the irrefutable evidence compiled by the committee against him.

In any case, Vishinsky has been properly branded as one of the outstanding international criminals of our day.

In my opinion the methods of inquiry developed by the House Baltic Committee should be extended to inquire into the illegal annexation of all the nations now enslaved by Moscow. This is a very large undertaking, but one in which, I am sure, the committee will have the same kind of success they have had in investigating the annexation of the Baltic States. Such an investigation will make it clear to all the people held captive within the Communist empire that the Government of the United States has not deserted them and that the inevitable day of the triumph of human freedom over slavery is not too far off.

In my considered judgment the Congress could strike a real blow for peace and freedom by authorizing the House Baltic committee to extend its investigation into all the nations enslaved by the international Communist conspiracy.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as I rise to support the Kersten resolution, House Resolution 438, the words of John Hvasta, Hillside, N. J., youth, who recently escaped from behind the Iron Curtain, seem to ring in my ears. It is part of his testimony that the name "American" served as sort of a passport in his house-to-house and town-to-town journeys and concealment, all leading to his final penetration of the curtain and his return to his loved ones at home. According to John Hvasta, America has more friends behind the Iron Curtain than is generally realized. These subject peoples hunger for news from the land of the free and the home of the brave, and their courageous underground movements are sustained by events such as are now taking place on the floor of this House.

Dr. Gustave Kosik, chairman, and John C. Sciranka, secretary and editor, American Friends of Slovak Freedom, Passaic, N. J., in my district, urge speedy enactment of the Kersten resolution, and so does Mary M. Kizis, director of the Lithuanian Information Center, of New York, speaking for many Americans of Lithuanian extraction among the people I am privileged to represent.

Peoples now reduced to slavery know that ultimately the truth will make them free, and this resolution provides some of the mechanics for getting the truth.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 453 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7328) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], and yield myself 1 minute.

This is a resolution to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

Does the gentleman from Mississippi have any requests for time?

Mr. COLMER. I have no request for time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 7328) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill H. R. 7328, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that has been reported out unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services. It is a bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

This legislation would authorize additional construction, and purchase and installation on additional equipment, at the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory at Hampton, Va., which is a high-speed,

hydrodynamic facility, costing $1,220,000; alterations to two small supersonic tunnels at the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, Moffett Field, Calif., at a cost of $349,000 and alterations to an existing supersonic tunnel, air drier for propulsion systems laboratory, air heater for altitude test chambers, and rocket engine research facility at the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio, at a cost of $3,431,000.

Any of these approximate costs that I have enumerated are authorized to be varied upwards 5 percent to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all the work so enumerated shall not exceed $5,000,000.

This legislation is requested by the Defense Department, following a thorough study and endorsement by the Budget Bureau. I might say also that it is in keeping with the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics program of the past several years to keep its construction legislation consistent with the military construction authorizations.

I do not desire to burden the House with any lengthy remarks in support of this legislation, but I believe that in view of developments there is certain pertinent information that should be given this afternoon.

About 2 weeks ago, our Nation was startled to see reproduced on the front pages of our daily press and in the principal news magazines, photographs of two advanced design, long-range bombers in quantity use in Russia. To me this is clear evidence that any Nation, unfriendly, as well as friendly, can build military aircraft and missiles of increasing capabilities.

Here in the United States, the agency which carries the heavy responsibility for providing the major portion of new basic aeronautical information, from which can come the design of tomorrow's airplanes and missiles, is the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. We hear very little about the work of the NACA, as it is known, because this agency is modest almost to the point of being bashful. At this time, however, I believe it is important to recognize how vital is the work this agency is doing.

Last year, almost on the eve of the 50th anniversary of the first powered flight in the world, by the Wright brothers, two aeronautical events took place which, to say the least, forecast in sober terms the shape of things to come. The first was a series of successful first flights by the North American F–100, America's first production fighter, capable of supersonic speed in level flights. The second was a flight by Maj. Charles E. Yeager, USAF, in a Bell X–1–A on December 12, 1953, during which he reached the the phenomenal speed of 2½ times the speed of sound—1,600 miles per hour.

These achievements climaxed the little publicized but deadly earnest effort which began during the closing days of World War II, an effort in which the NACA played a vital part along with the military services of our aircraft industry.

The goal ahead was flight at supersonic speeds, flight faster than sound. At the time that the scientists of NACA applied themselves extensively to the program, the top speed of our military aircraft was less than 500 miles per hour. In less than a decade, the speed of production type tactical military airplanes has been virtually doubled and in special research airplanes such as Major Yeager was flying, the speed has been more than tripled.

That, I submit, is real progress.

But unfortunately America cannot rest on its aeronautical laurels. We know that halfway around the world there are other scientists applying themselves to the problems with at least equal vigor. We know also that such effort, by those unfriendly scientists, is being supported 100 percent by a government which respects only superior force.

It is an equally sobering fact that the scientific problems associated with supersonic flight today are increasing in number, complexity, and expense. Many of these important problems, to be solved as completely and as quickly as the national interest demands, require the use of research tools.

The NACA, it can be said, is constantly modernizing the research equipment it now has. However, new equipment is also needed from time to time. The proposed legislation before us is designed to provide for these alterations as I enumerated at the beginning.

To sum up, both the potential of our atomic weapons and our defense against such weapons depend in major part on superior aircraft and missiles. By virtue of an immense effort, this country now holds a position of leadership in many areas of aeronautical science.

But no complacency is justified in view of the high scientific and technical capabilities disclosed by the Soviet, whose progress incudes that in nuclear weapons. It cannot for one moment be assumed the Soviets will not likewise make advances in aeronautical science which we know to be possible.

I feel certain H. R. 7328 will receive prompt and wholehearted support of all Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have not had a chance to read the report very carefully, but can the gentleman tell me this: There cannot possibly be any funds in this bill for the Truman Airport at Grandview, Mo.?

Mr. SHAFER. Not in this legislation.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not call for a large expenditure of funds but it is an extremely important bill. Those of us who are charged with the responsibility, as this Congress is, of protecting and defending the United States of America, know that we must have air power. We know that especially in this phase of national defense scientific exploration is extremely important.

We are blazing a trail in aviation, and without proper experimentation and scientific support, we cannot hope to lead the world in air power and air developments. This bill is a distinctly forward step in the progress of air power throughout the United States and in our national defense. As America moves steadily forward into the supersonic era, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the task of America's aircraft industry to create the designs which will meet the operational and performance requirements of the military services is a gigantic one.

Actually, air power in the United States is composed of three indispensable elements: The military services which determine the requirements for new aircraft, and make use of them; the aircraft industry, which designs and constructs the new aircraft; and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—better known as the NACA—which provides much of the foundation knowledge about aerodynamics, hydrodynamics, jet propulsion, and all the other complex subjects for use by the aircraft designers.

That is what the NACA exists for, to supply as the fruit of its scientific laboratory research in aeronautics, the new knowledge which will enable design of aircraft and missiles of superior performance.

Actually, the NACA research programs have both the long-range, all-inclusive objective of acquiring the new scientific knowledge essential to assure American leadership in aeronautics, and the immediate objective of solving, as quickly as possible, the most pressing problems, thereby assuring the success of America's current supersonic aircraft construction program.

During its 39 years' existence and especially since World War II, the President and Congress have recognized the tremendous responsibilities of the NACA and have supported this Federal agency in its intensive program of fundamental scientific studies in the several fields of aeronautical science. Today the NACA operates 3 research centers, 1 at Langley Field, Va., another at Moffett Field, Calif., and the third at Cleveland, Ohio. Here are nearly 7,000 scientists and necessary supporting personnel. Much of the work they are doing is on an around-the-clock basis.

Consider for a moment, gentlemen, the kind of performance that we are demanding from our new fighters and bombers. In addition to being able to fly at supersonic speeds, they must have the necessary range to enable accomplishment of their fighter or bomber missions.

They must, of course, be maneuverable. Their qualities of stability and control must be sufficiently manageable to permit satisfactory operation by their pilots. By their design and construction, these new aircraft must be capable of avoiding, or at least withstanding, the manifold problems of flutter, buffeting, and aerodynamic heating—problems which become more and more serious and complex as speeds increase.

To give but a single example, it has been publicly stated that the power required to operate the refrigeration equipment for one of our newest high-speed aircraft is greater than the output of the most powerful of our World War II aircraft engines—think on that a moment, gentlemen.

This is so, of course, because of the heat barrier which looms ahead. Actually, in the field of guided missiles, the heat barrier is a very real thing, right now. Missiles are being flown at speeds four times that of sound, and faster. When a missile maintains such speed, 2,500 miles an hour or more, the temperature of its outer surface or skin, can rise to 900 degrees or more Fahrenheit, a temperature beyond that where aluminum can hold its strength.

There are other aeronautical problems of equal urgency and importance. Take, for instance, what happens in the transonic speed range. Here the flight of the airplane is subject to two entirely different sets of aerodynamic laws, one of them pertaining to speeds lower than that of sound, the other pertaining to speeds faster than sound. The degree to which one or the other of these sets of aerodynamic laws is paramount, or is influenced by the other, is constantly changing.

We have, due to the inventiveness of NACA scientists, within the past few years been able to construct new wind tunnels which were useful in the study of flight problems in this transonic speed range. But even so, we have been unable to develop the mathematical means for predicting accurately aerodynamic behavior in the transonic speed range, and as a consequence, have been forced to depend on building up the necessary experimental data for each new design. We have yet to learn the extent to which detailed information about one specific design can be applied successfully to other designs.

One of the greatest difficulties in providing such vitally needed information has been the development of the research tools with which to provide it. H. R. 7328, the bill before you, is to provide authorization for the NACA's 1955 construction program, to enable acquisition of some of the new, sharper research tools which are needed for the solution of today's urgent aeronautical problems.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to further take up the time of the committee this afternoon to go into the details of the bill. I am merely going to say that it is extremely important to our national defense. There is no opposition to it on either side. Certainly everybody I know here on this side is very strongly in favor of the quick enactment of the provisions of this bill this afternoon.

In addition, we have a man on this side of the aisle, the gentleman from North Carolina, who has spent a long time working on this type of legislation, supporting the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Mr. DURHAM, of North Carolina. In my judgment, he is an expert, if there is an expert in Congress in the field of that type of legislation supporting the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. So, Mr. Chairman, I conclude my remarks at this time and yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] for his statement that I qualify as an expert on these matters. I do not believe I am an expert in this field, but I do feel the House is entitled to an explanation of why we bring this legislation here in this form. This agency has been operating since 1914. It operated for many, many years under a few words in an appropriation bill authorizing the NACA agency. Over this period of time, it did most of its work in a small way without having too great expenses. So at the end of the war, the committee felt that this agency should be brought under the control of the House. We wrote the first Civil Aeronautics NACA bill authorizing this agency by an act of the Congress. We put them on a yearly basis for authorization for their appropriation, which I feel is the thing to do because in a field of scientific instruments which changes so fast to authorize a tremendous sum of money for a long period of time was not thought to be wise by your committee because the change in these scientific instruments is almost continuous. That is the primary reason why this bill is here today. We set up this basic, fundamental agency which, in my opinion, is the heart of the Air Force of this country. Our Air Force could not function today without the tools and the scientific analysis made of these tremendous speeds and temperatures and other things involved in the field of aerodynamics today.

This agency of our Government is today performing one of the most important positions in our ever increasing airpower. Around it we have built what today is the strongest airpower force in the world. This agency work is conducted by a group of scientific men under the direction of Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, a man who has contributed most of his life to the development of what we call the military plan in the basic law.

This gentleman is the very heart of our airpower both domestic and military. Today's planes have justified our confidence in this agency. It has performed in a manner that should make every American proud of what has been accomplished. I trust no one will object to this bill, as it is necessary.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, pursuant to subsection (b) of section 1 of Public Law 672, approved August 8, 1950 (50 U. S. C. 151b), the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to undertake additional construction, and to purchase and install additional equipment at the following locations:

Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Hampton, Va.: High-speed hydrodynamic facility, $1,220,000.

Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, Moffett Field, Calif.: Alterations to two small supersonic tunnels, $349,000.

Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio: Alterations to an existing supersonic tunnel, air dryer for propulsion systems laboratory, air heater for altitude test chambers, and rocket engine research facility, $3,431,000.

SEC. 2. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in section 1 of this act may, in the discretion of the Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, be varied upwards 10 percent and, with the concurrence of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, by such further amounts as may be necessary to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work so enumerated shall not exceed $5 million.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $5 million to accomplish the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 11, after the word "upwards", strike out "10 percent and, with the concurrence of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, by such further amounts as may be necessary" and insert "5 percent."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7328) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, pursuant to House Resolution 453, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONNEL STRENGTHS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 2326, an act to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Line 7, strike out "1958" and insert "1957."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the engrossed bill (S. 1138) entitled "An act for the relief of John Soudas."

DO WHAT IS BEST FOR THE COUNTRY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, each day we are beseeched by mail and by visits from various organizations urging us to do something special for them. They may want an increase in certain benefits they may be receiving or a reduction in the taxes they may be obliged to pay. Not infrequently their concern is not what may be for the benefit of anyone but themselves. They say they want economy, but they want the other fellow to take the cut. They say they want a balanced budget, but they are the only ones entitled to a tax reduction.

This is not the attitude of the great majority of American people. I should like to read to the House a letter I received from a constituent of mine who lives in the small community of Wellington, Ill. I do not know him. Nor is it particularly important for our thought here whether you entirely agree with his views. The important thing about this letter is the refreshing, encouraging attitude it expresses. He wants only that which he believes is in the best interests of the country, and obviously, he is willing to make whatever personal sacrifices that may be necessary.

I read this letter because it is so typically and so truly American:

DEAR MR. ARENDS: From what I read in the newspapers, it seems to me that the House of Representatives should follow the lead of the Senate and support the plan for the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Having only 1 dependent, my income tax was $114 this year. An increase in exemptions for those in the lower income brackets would seemingly benefit me. But I don't think so. We not only need to balance the budget but what about starting to reduce the national debt?

Business conditions are not bad, they are normal. In normal times there are always some unemployed and a few farmers or other businessmen going broke because of poor management.

Let's reduce or eliminate (where practical) the subsidies for we farmers, airlines, business, transportation, etc.

Sincerely,

LOUIS A. ZIEBART.

MORE SMOKES FOR VETERANS

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the opportunity given me to acquaint the House with a development affecting our veterans which I feel will be applauded generally.

For a long, long time it has been possible to give tax-free cigarettes to veterans in Federal hospitals. Strangely enough this could not be done in the case of servicemen or veterans who chanced to be hospitalized in State institutions. So we have had a condition of inequality and discrimination that has been really cruel.

However, that has now all been changed.

We are now assured of more smokes for veterans.

In a letter that has just come to me from Deputy Commissioner O. Gordon Delk of the Internal Revenue Bureau, I am advised that that Bureau has set up regulations respecting tax-free cigarettes that cut through the discrimination I have mentioned. Under the new regulation, veterans' organizations and other groups can now distribute tax-free cigarettes also to veterans in State hospitals. This will be a tremendous encouragement to them. It will widen greatly their opportunity to be of service, to be of comfort. Veterans' organizations have been doing an outstanding work, a very humane sort of work during the years, and the gifts of cigarettes, although it is only a little thing, has meant a great deal to our veterans and has very markedly helped their morale. Especially is this little action of service appreciated in mental hospitals where there is a loneliness which is all too pervading and which is mitigated by the visits of groups with their gifts of cigarettes.

As a practical proposition, it will mean that we can now give 2 packs of cigarettes where only 1 was given before.

I want to commend the administration for its sympathetic interest in our veterans and its fine action in their behalf. It is a very happy and also a proper decision. It emphasizes that in its view, also, it should make no difference in determining the question of whether a cigarette ought to be tax free, whether the veteran lies in a Federal bed or in a State bed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include copies of correspondence between the Internal Revenue Bureau and myself on this subject. The Bureau's letter, especially, will be of very large interest not only to veterans, but to veterans' organizations and other volunteer groups who visit our hospitalized veterans and who have been following the custom of giving gifts of cigarettes.

(The material referred to is as follows:)

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 25, 1954.

HON. FRANK J. BECKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKER: Representatives of the Internal Revenue Service have just concluded several conferences with representatives of the Veterans' Administration, in a joint effort to work out administratively, in accordance with the request contained in your letter of November 30, 1953, some satisfactory arrangement by which tax-free cigarettes would be made available for gratuitous distribution to present and former members of the military and naval forces of the United States confined in other than Federal hospitals.

These conferences developed the fact that under existing procedures tax-free cigarettes are now distributed free of charge to present or former members of our Armed Forces who are patients in Federal hospitals or in other hospitals where such persons receive medical care pursuant to contract with the Veterans' Administration. Therefore, the efforts of the conferees were confined to the matter or working out an arrangement which would make tax-free cigarettes available for distribution to present or former members of the Armed Forces of our country hospitalized in hospitals operated by the several States and the District of Columbia. I am happy to advise that as a result of the sympathetic understanding of the problem and a mutual desire on the part of the Internal Revenue Service and the Veterans' Administration to cooperate in alleviating the situation of which you complain, agreement has been reached on an administrative arrangement under which tax-free cigarettes could be furnished to such present and former servicemen.

Briefly, this arrangement would provide that the officers in charge of such hospitals will act as representatives of the Veterans Administration in the purchase, storage and distribution of the tax-free cigarettes and that the purchase, storage and distribution of the tax-free cigarettes by such representatives will be accomplished under the necessary supervision and control of the Veterans' Administration. The arrangement also contemplates that any organization of war veterans which is granted recognition (by or pursuant to the provisions of section 200, Public Law 844, 74th Cong, 38 U. S. C. sec. 101) in the presentation of claims under the statutes administered by the Veterans' Administration, or any local post or chapter of any such recognized organization, may donate cigarettes for this purpose by turning over to the head of such a hospital the funds with which to purchase the tax-free cigarettes.

In order to aid in carrying this arrangement into effect, the Internal Revenue Service proposes to amend such of its applicable regulations as may be necessary to permit the sale of tax-free cigarettes for the purpose described above.

Very truly yours,

O. GORDON DELK,
Acting Commissioner.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. November 30, 1953.

MR. T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: It is good to know that this administration is willing and anxious to give painstaking and cooperative consideration to the setting up of methods, without the need of statutory legislation,

for the distribution of tax-free cigarettes to veterans in other than Federal hospitals.

This matter has had your consideration and also that of the Treasury Department for some time and I hope the studies that have been made, both from the practical and the legal angles, will thoroughly satisfy the Internal Revenue Bureau that a method can be agreed upon which will do the two things we are aiming at: from my viewpoint, to help widen and broaden the efforts of our veterans organizations to enhance the benefits they are accomplishing through the distribution of cigarettes to hospitalized servicemen and former servicemen and, at the same time, from your viewpoint, to set up such safeguards in the distribution of these tax-free cigarettes as will properly protect the integrity of our Internal Revenue system.

On the latter point, specifically, I want to acknowledge your kindness in your letter to me of April 30 to volunteer the comment that you appreciated my interest in safeguarding the revenue by inclusion in legislation I had introduced of provisions specifying particular safeguards under which cigarettes might be bought tax-free for distribution to our veterans.

I have cooperated with veterans organizations in this particular work for many, many years. I am confident, without any reservations, that I reflect their ideas completely when I state that it would be a wonderful, a grand action by this administration to accomplish the distribution of tax-free cigarettes to hospitals, other than Federal, but which also house our former servicemen and veterans. The veterans organizations have been doing an outstanding work, a very human sort of work during the years, and the gratuity of free cigarettes, although it is only a little thing, has helped tremendously in building up desirable morale among our hospitalized veterans. You would see this especially—most sharply—in the mental hospitals, where, entirely too much, there is a loneliness which is all too pervading and which the visits by members of local posts and chapters of our veterans organizations helps much to dispel and mitigate, and when such visits are accompanied by the distribution of cigarettes and other little gratuities.

There is no question of moment involved here touching dollars and cents. Your bureau is already on record as not being at all minded to finally judge this matter from the revenue viewpoint. The agreement that we must reach is how we may best accomplish the desires of the veterans organizations and at the same time meet your policy needs insofar as the protection of the revenue goes.

Here is my suggestion, predicated on this main and fundamental idea: that the serviceman or the former serviceman is to be served. Therefore, it should make no difference whether this veteran lies in a Federal bed or in a State bed, or whether his hospitalization is paid for by the Federal Government or by a State.

It seems to me it is a cruel discrimination which can distinguish between a Federally hospitalized and a State hospitalized veteran, whether the latter is under contract with the Veterans' Administration or not. In the average contract hospital case it seems to me that it would be logical and eminently proper to have the director of such a hospital act for and on behalf of the Veterans' Administration and/or the Internal Revenue Bureau so far as the ordering, receipt, and distribution of tax-free cigarettes is concerned. The test should not be the type of hospital or who runs it; it ought to be the veteran who is in that hospital, and if that veteran served in the Army, Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, or in any branch thereof, that should be enough. The present law permitting tax-free cigarette distribution to veterans in Federal hospitals I do not believe was intended to be exclusive in character, and that the real objective in that provision was to reach the hospitalized veteran.

Taking Kings Park Hospital on Long Island as an illustration: This is a State institution, a mental hospital. There are veterans hospitalized there on a Veterans' Administration contract basis. There are also State cases there, presumably. A few miles away is the Northport Hospital of the Veterans' Administration. In the latter our veterans organizations can arrange for the distribution as gifts of tax-free cigarettes. At Kings Park they may not. And here is a service that under the present scheme of things is denied the man who happens to be lodged at Kings Park. As I said before, it is a cruel discrimination. It would be an easy thing, as I see it, to make the director of the Kings Park Hospital the agent of the Veterans' Administration for the distribution of tax-free cigarettes to the veterans of that hospital.

I should, of course, be most happy to meet with you at any time or times to help gain a solution of this matter and thus to help very materially and substantially the service by your veterans organizations to those unhappy people, the Nation's veterans, who chance to be hospitalized.

I can only reemphasize that I know every veterans organization and all of our people generally would applaud an administrative decision by this administration along the lines of my submission to the end that the fine and the humanitarian work they are now doing may be broadened and expanded.

Yours respectfully,

FRANK J. BECKER.

REDUCTION OF EXCISE TAXES

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, the proposed cut in the excise tax contained in H. R. 8224 on many of the necessities of life will undoubtedly provide one of the best stimulants to business of any proposal to come before this House.

As taxpayers, we are now handing over $1 billion of our money each year, paying as high as 25 percent in excise taxes just for the privilege of buying everyday necessary articles of clothing or services which we need.

By reducing the excise tax to 10 percent, we are freeing major segments of our economy from a yoke that has in some instances almost throttled businesses to death. Some of the current unemployment undoubtedly can be traced to this source.

The purchasing power of every American family will be increased measurably by this reduction in excise taxes. Business will be stimulated, and in turn provide additional revenue for the Government. Now is the time to remove a major portion of this annoying, discriminatory system of taxation.

DEFENSE AND HUMAN VALUES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a rather pathetic inconsistency on the part of those who now spread hysteria and terrorism among the American people about the horrible dangers of atomic air attack, yet who just a few months ago were moving so expeditiously to cut down and cripple our air arm to the tune of over $5 billion.

There has been a great deal of false propaganda, loose thinking, and misconception concerning the atomic and hydrogen bombs. You are familiar with some of the speeches and statements which would in effect spread fear and terror among our people. Such utterances, whether so intended or not, tend in the direction of appeasement and confusion.

Regardless of the admittedly destructive power of these new weapons, our political leadership has essential and greatest responsibility toward the American people. First, to set up appropriate defenses and countermeasures and, secondly, to do and say nothing that would arouse irrational fear and apprehension among the people, thirdly, to draw the shades of secrecy from the basic facts of the atom without disclosing strictly security information.

It is believed by experts that a high percentage of attacking planes could get through. General Vandenberg set the figure some time ago at about 70 percent. However, the extensive radar screens and new techniques we have developed are now believed to warrant a much lower estimate of attacking planes that could get through. Instead of prating about these dangers, it should be the duty of the Congress to do something about them, to implement the right kind of defense as speedily as possible and without regard to the cost.

It would be fatuous and the height of folly for this Nation to reduce or keep down the cost of national defense just to serve the purposes and fatten the tax pocketbooks of members of the "big business" axis and its satellites. Yet that seems to be perhaps the pervading spirit to date—a disregard for human values; the accentuation of greedy, selfish policies to preserve material wealth. Of course, such policies will never secure the long-time approval of the American people; indeed, they forfeit majority support.

I have been in vigorous support of every measure to build a strong defense, particularly a strong Air Force. I believe in a balanced defense, not one that would be weighted against the Army or the Navy because I believe them both to be of paramount importance, but one that will give the Nation a rounded defensive military system and also a most powerful Air Arm that would enable us on a world-wide basis, if necessary, to launch devastating retaliatory attacks upon any nation or group of nations evil enough to challenge our security and the cause of human freedom.

Congress must stand for the kind of dynamic military institutions which the

Nation needs in these troubled, unsettled times.

If we start measuring and limiting our military system by our tax pocketbooks, we should keep it in mind that the time may well come when the national security will be gravely imperiled.

I am continuing my efforts as a member of the House Armed Services Committee to accelerate the program designed to protect the Nation against attack, as well as that necessary to retaliate against attack. Both are of paramount essentiality. Both must be implemented with every possible speed. Both must be shaped in such ways as to retain balanced, well-rounded and where necessary, integrated Armed Forces capable of defending the country and also capable of seeking out and destroying the enemy whenever an attack is made upon our shores or cities.

More than ever we need now to emphasize human values before material values in our national life and in the setting up of necessary defenses.

I do not believe for a moment that any loyal American would intentionally wish at this time to weaken or impair our armed strength and thus make the Nation more vulnerable to attack.

The point I am making is that apparently some people in public life today are willing to curtail military appropriations very materially, notwithstanding the present very dubious prospects of world order. I believe such a course, motivated in large measure by material values and the quest for diminished taxes, is a serious risk, so I believe, to the security of the country.

Let us not only zealously preserve our spiritual ideals which are the very source of our strength, but let us also protect our human values—the well-being of the individual as well as the safety, security, and prosperity of all our people. The national defense must be our constant and most intensive concern. It should not be jeopardized by materialistic and selfish aims.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the other special orders.

FARM PRICE PARITY AND PROSPERITY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called the attention of this House to the fact that the whole prosperity of this Nation was dependent on the prosperity of our farmers; that we could not have a lasting, prosperous economy unless we had a prosperous agriculture; that if we allowed farm prices to sink to 75 percent of parity, or below, that we would inevitably have disastrous depression and unemployment sweeping all sections of the country; whereas, on the other hand, we had never known a period when the average of farm prices was as high as 100 percent of parity that all of our people were not prosperous.

In view of this fact it seems to me clear that we should maintain as far as we can the price of our basic agricultural commodities at at least 90 percent of parity and not let them drop down to the disastrous level advocated by some which would break not only the farmers but all of our people.

We have been told that we ought to have flexibility in any program. I do not know why. We are told by some highly placed agricultural authorities that we need flexibility in our farm price-support program. The great girders that support our bridges are not supposed to be flexible; the foundations of our homes are not supposed to be flexible. I do not know why supports on agricultural commodities are desired to be flexible. I want these supports to be firm when the weight of our economy falls on them. I don't want them to flex when they should hold firm. We are told we need sliding supports. Why? Do we want price supports to slide out from under the farmer every time he needs them?

I think it would be well to observe that if there is any need for flexibility in a price-support program we have all we need in the present program. We do not have the "high" "rigid" supports that some people have talked about. We have never had a rigid support, one that does not change. The supports on all of our basic agricultural products do change. They change regularly. They are tied to parity. Parity is tied to the cost of the things farmers buy. We are supporting those basic commodities at only 90 percent of parity; that is, only 90 percent of a fair price. When the general economy of our Nation goes up, employment increases, wages go up, farmers' costs go up, and parity goes up. The dollars and cents level of support of those commodities, of course, then increases. On the other hand, when the temper of our economy slows down, when people become unemployed, when wages drop, when prices are lower, then parity drops, and the 90 percent of parity at which we support farm prices is in dollars a lesser figure than it would be if conditions were better. So we have today in our present program the only type of flexibility that I want or that I believe the American people need.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman is making a very scholarly address. I have followed the gentleman's record in the Congress since he first became a Member. He has always been sincere and devoted to the cause of agriculture of the United States. In reaching the point you have in your address, do you not feel that we do have a flexible support as now set up for the basic commodities, such as cotton? While it is a support of 90 percent of parity, it is flexible?

Mr. POAGE. It is, indeed. Every time the price level goes up that support goes up in dollars, but when the price level goes down and the farmer can buy at a lower level, his support also goes down in dollars.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Like, for instance, the price of automobiles, of General Motors, Chrysler or any automobile company. The price may go up and it may come down.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. So, likewise, the support at 90 percent on the basic commodities is also flexible?

Mr. POAGE. That is right. It is flexible now and it is tied to the general economy of the Nation, it is tied to the prices that the farmer has to pay; but there are those who are telling us that these supports should not be tied to what the farmer has to pay, on the contrary they want supports tied to the amount of commodities produced, to make the whole support program ineffective when it is needed, and leave it at an effective level only when it is not needed. To me the proposal of a sliding scale simply means slide out from under you every time we need any support.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman tell the House what he proposes in the way of a farm program? As the gentleman knows, we have to do something about it.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. ARENDS. Has the gentleman some ready recommendation besides 90 percent support prices to meet the situation?

Mr. POAGE. First, I do recommend a continuation of 90 percent of parity supports on storable basic commodities. Of course, the 90 percent support price alone is inadequate. I think the gentleman will agree with that. You have to have a good many things to go with that support price. We need especially disposal programs. As I have visualized it for a good many years, there are at least two outstanding prerequisites which must exist before the farmers can properly call upon the Government to give them the 90 percent support now available to storable basics. First, the product that they ask to be supported must of necessity be storable, else there is no opportunity for the Government to carry it over from year to year in order to work out the problem without undue loss.

In the second place, it seems to me that the farmers themselves must be willing to carry a portion of the burden. We have recognized that in the case of the six basic commodities by providing that at any time the farmers themselves refuse to approve marketing quotas and acreage allotments, that the support shall only be 50 percent of parity instead of 90 percent of parity; in other words, we say that "over the long pull, Mr. Farmer, you must, working together, bring your production in line with the demand, else the Government will not help you over the short pull to make the adjustment."

Now, it is much more difficult for farmers to make adjustments than it is for a manufacturing plant. It takes a longer period of time because it takes

a cycle of at least 12 months to carry out a farm operation, and consequently you cannot make the changes so rapidly. That is why it seems to me eminently sound that the Government should help tide farmers over during that period of change, and that is all we ask. That is exactly what happens on the support of these basic commodities, the storables. In the days of old Joseph, away back in Pharaoh's time in Egypt, they took their products during the period of flush production and put them in the granaries and held them there until the time when need came. The Government can do that with these commodities today.

Now there are those who say that will not work. But it has worked. Our great crop in my section of the country is cotton, and we can carry cotton for many, many years after it is picked and stored, and the United States Government, through the cooperation of our farmers who have repeatedly voted to limit their production and who have never rejected controls, has right now a net profit of $267 million through the process of supporting the cotton crop. Not only did we aid the cotton farmers of America, but we put $267 million into the Public Treasury. Now that is not a bad deal for the United States Government.

There are other crops where we do not have the storability that we have in those six major crops, particularly the dairy commodities and fresh meats, and I recognize you cannot apply to those perishable commodities the same kind of treatment that you can apply to the basic storable commodities, both because you cannot store them and because you cannot control the production of them like you can control the production of these basic commodities.

Unquestionably the producers of those commodities are entitled to every consideration we can consistently give them.

So it would seem to me that we must emphasize the disposition, the sale, of larger quantities of those commodities, and while I have been reluctant to follow the philosophy of subsidy, I listened this morning to the distinguished Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, our former colleague, Hon. Ross Rizley, who came before the Committee on Agriculture and pleaded for a subsidy on wool. And, I do not know that there is any better way of handling it. I do not know that we can offer anything better than what has been suggested, and that is to pay a subsidy on wool. Maybe we must rely on subsidies and on purchase programs for these perishable commodities. Maybe we must use indirect supports.

Mr. ARENDS. We face a little different situation with corn than you do with cotton. As I understand, when the acreage reduction in both cotton and wheat first came in here and we increased the acreage reduction, you did not want to abide by the acreage reduction, and you increased it on cotton and wheat. In the commercial corn area, particularly in my section of Illinois, they reduced the corn acreage from 20.8 to 27 percent, and the normal farmer who has been trying to conserve his soil finds himself in a predicament. Now that we are trying to solve the problem, what are we going to do with the corn allotment?

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Illinois is very much better versed on corn than I am, but I would be inclined to go along with him if he feels that this 27-percent reduction is too much to take in 1 year. I would be inclined to agree with him and go along with whatever figure he felt was a reasonable proposal, just as he went along with us on the cotton proposition when we felt that 33⅓ percent was too great and cut the reduction down to about 22 percent, because we felt 33⅓ percent was more than the cotton farmer should take in 1 year. We suggested that it would be better to spread it over 2 years instead of 1. I do not know whether the amount that is being proposed now for corn is too great. If it is too great, I recognize that you can store corn, and you can carry it for a period of several years, and that it is not essential that you take all the necessary cut in 1 year. I think that is one of the beauties of the Government's giving assistance in these programs. The Government can carry these commodities over a longer period of time than any one individual farmer can carry them. That should enable us to make the needed cut by such degrees as will enable us to step down, as I tried to suggest once, in 2 steps rather than 1, and maybe not break a leg in doing it.

It is quite possible that the gentleman from Illinois may want to suggest that we take the reduction in corn acreage in more than one step. Ultimately we will have to come down just as much in both cotton and corn. I think we must recognize that. We have no illusions as to cotton. We know we are ultimately going to have to come down. We started to come all the way in 1 step, but we are now proposing to do it in 2. But we do believe that the farmers must express their good faith by being willing to bring production down to the level that the people will consume, because if we keep producing more than the people will consume we certainly cannot expect the Government forever to take it off our hands. But I do think we should take the cut in such steps as will not destroy the patient as we do it.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, how many American citizens must be out of work before this administration will do anything to relieve unemployment? How long must our people be out of work before this administration will take action? From past experience, it appears that neither question is of any concern when a greedy administration comes into power, yet it is inconceivable that anyone with a scintilla of respect for his fellow human beings would endorse or even passively accept the conditions responsible for their distress—regardless of political considerations involved.

Whereas Members of Congress have been reminded time and again of the need to protect the domestic coal industry and other American industries from the ravages of cheap foreign products unloaded in this country, it is probable that top administration officials have not been properly advised of the damage that is being inflicted by excessive imports. Otherwise those officials could hardly recommend a continuance of the policies responsible for the unemployment and poverty that have become prevalent in my district and in many other districts of this once-prosperous Nation.

Last July 23 the House had an opportunity to correct unfair foreign trade policies through passage of a bill to place a quota limitation on residual oil and to make other necessary changes in the Nation's trade program. But at the last minute the majority leader rushed up Pennsylvania Avenue with word that the bill should not be passed. Unlike Paul Revere, who warned his countrymen of an impending invasion by foreign forces, this messenger was armed with orders to continue the policies of confining American business within an economic stockade in order that international interests might continue to profit without restriction. The excuse for this directive was that a commission to study the trade problem had been established, and that it appeared more politic to force Americans to endure their suffering rather than to disturb the marketing tactics of international profiteers. "I do not intend any criticism at all of those who have spoken here today, who have industries in their districts that are under severe hardships," the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana, said to the House on that fateful day last year. Then he proceeded to issue the mandate for rejection of the bill to safeguard American industry and labor. Here is the way he explained the administration's anomalous position to his colleagues:

He—

The President—

wants this bill defeated, because it defeats the purposes, it defeats what we are trying to do in this other operation.

So I say that we ought to stand by the administration; not just because it is a matter of standing by the administration, but because it is the proper thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, it is now a full 7 months later, the commission studying foreign trade has made its report, and the administration is still standing by despite the fact that economic conditions in my district and in scores of other districts in the United States are getting progressively worse. Foreign residual oil is causing more and more unemployment in the coal and railroad industries, and the distress has spread to countless other businesses. In the glass industry there has been a steady decline as a result of the influx of foreign products made by

laborers whose wages would be entirely unacceptable in this country.

The disastrous effects of the deluge of residual oil on the economy of this country were described in full last year by such prominent industry and labor representatives as Tom Pickett, former Member of Congress and now executive vice president of the National Coal Association; Thomas Kennedy, former Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the vice president of United Mine Workers of America; Harry See, national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; and W. D. Johnson, vice president and national legislative representative, Order of Railway Conductors.

As for the impact of foreign products on the handmade-glass industry of this country, let me point out that the Morgantown Chamber of Commerce last month submitted a statement to the United States Tariff Commission showing that the industry in our area has been badly hurt in the past several years and that there is an imminent prospect of further layoffs. Our workers are highly skilled artisans who have spent many years learning their trade, and many of them are third-generation glassworkers who know no other trade.

In view of this testimony, is the administration willing to continue the prevailing trade policies, or can we finally expect action that will enable our industries to prosper once more and restore to our citizens the rights to those jobs from which they have been disfranchised by cheap foreign labor?

As Representative of a district that has been unjustifiably imposed upon by insane foreign-trade practices, I implore you to give ear to the prayers of our own people regardless of whether the remedy conflicts with the contents of any messages that may be carried up Pennsylvania Avenue in behalf of a political philosophy.

EXCISE TAXES ON AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's action by the House Ways and Means Committee on excise taxes is, to say the very least, disappointing to me and to the millions of people in America who are vitally concerned with the welfare of the automobile industry.

In his announcement when he introduced the bill, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], said the excise tax cuts provided by the bill would "give needed stimulation immediately to consumer purchasing power." It would, he said, "give immediate stimulation to the Nation's business."

In all sincerity, let us take a look at the facts of the present economic situation. Is there any segment of American business more in need of stimulation than the automotive industry? This House is aware, I am sure, that many thousands of workers in Detroit and other automotive production centers have been laid off because new car inventories are rapidly piling up and because a number of other factors point to declines in automobile sales this year.

This industry right now needs the shot in the arm that a reduction in excise tax rates can give it. Instead of a shot in the arm it has been given a stab in the back by this excise tax bill, because, in addition to denying the industry any relief, the bill establishes as permanent law 10-percent excise taxes on passenger cars, 8-percent taxes on trucks, buses and automotive parts. There is no expiration date in the bill for these excises, an action which is without precedent in my memory as to excise-tax legislation. This bill means the permanent saddling of this great industry with a crippling tax burden.

Henry Ford everlastingly proved that if you can get the price of automobiles low enough you can sell them and sell them in such quantities that the automobile industry will rank as the foremost manufacturing enterprise in the Nation. Because he mass-produced low-priced automobiles the industry has passed far beyond the luxury class. It now turns out a product that is a vital necessity in our way of life—a necessity in more ways than I have time to recite. The job of 1 out of every 7 workers in America today is in some way related to the automobile. The automobile has necessitated our good roads—it was the progenitor of the petroleum industry—it provides a means of intercourse and communication between our peoples that is convenient and inexpensive. I could go on, but I would only be belaboring the obvious. The importance of the automobile is the common knowledge of everyone.

Why then the discrimination in this bill against the automobile industry—an industry that draws raw materials and manufactured products from every part of the Nation? Ladies' handbags, fancy furs, costume jewelry, shaving lotion and eau de cologne, movie tickets, flash bulbs, and fountain pens are getting preferential treatment at the expense of an industry that is a vital part of our national economy. I am not arguing against relief for these other products. On the merits of each case, they may all be entitled to relief. But I cannot see the justice or the logic of such relief when the automobile industry is made to carry the burden of avoiding further budget deficits.

During the last great war, the executives of the automobile industry and the highly skilled, energetic and productive workers who manned the automobile factories earned for Detroit the title of the "Hub of the Arsenal of Democracy."

Does it seem just, by any stretch of the imagination, that, after this splendid record in time of war and of service to the peacetime economy of the Nation, the automobile industry should be permanently burdened with the load of these taxes?

What pains me most is the absence of a termination date in this bill. It would appear that the committee has decided, as a matter of policy, that excise taxes shall be a permanent source of revenue and that the automobile industry, because of the great volume of its business, will have to carry the load in avoiding budget deficits.

This legislation is grossly unjust. It is discriminatory. It is economically unsound. I hope the injustice of the provision will impress itself upon the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MCGREGOR and to include certain charts, the result of a questionnaire recently sent out by him.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLTZMAN in two instances.

Mr. DIES and to include a speech on outlawing the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. BUSBEY the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania on a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL).

Mr. WESTLAND.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SEELY-BROWN (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) for March 5, on account of illness in the family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2984. An act to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years; and

H. R. 7996. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of Sister Walfreda (Anna Nelles) and Sister Amaltrudis (Gertrude Schneider);

H. R. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth R. Ekholm;

H. R. 749. An act for the relief of Shui-Fook Fung;

H. R. 788. An act for the relief of Beryl Williams;

H. R. 823. An act for the relief of Abraham G. Sakin;

H. R. 824. An act for the relief of Demetrious Konstantno Papanicolaou;

H. R. 828. An act for the relief of Dr. Vincenzo Guzzo;

H. R. 907. An act for the relief of Wolodymyr Hirniak;

H. R. 946. An act for the relief of Mrs. Louise Blackstone;

H. R. 965. An act for the relief of Michael Demcheshen;

H. R. 1339. An act for the relief of Dr. Soon Tai Ryang;

H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Zia Edin Taheri and Frances Hakimzadeh Taheri;

H. R. 1358. An act for the relief of Dr. Marcelino J. Avecilla and Dr. Teodora A. Fidelino-Avecilla;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Louis M. Jacobs;

H. R. 1649. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisela Walter Sizemore;

H. R. 1688. An act for the relief of Henry Ty;

H. R. 1795. An act for the relief of Helena Shostenko;

H. R. 2035. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michaline Borzecka;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of William M. Smith;

H. R. 2504. An act for the relief of Sisters Adelaide Canelas and Maria Isabel Franco;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of Alfonso Gatti;

H. R. 2622. An act for the relief of Maria Teresa Ortega Peres;

H. R. 2623. An act for the relief of Jose M. Thomasa-Sanchez, Adela Duran Cuevas de Thomasa, and Jose Maria Thomasa Duran;

H. R. 2774. An act for the relief of Endre Szende, Zsuzsanna Szende, Katalin Szende (a minor), and Maria Szende (a minor);

H. R. 2817. An act for the relief of George A. Ferris;

H. R. 3005. An act for the relief of Charles Sabah;

H. R. 3236. An act for the relief of Constantin and Lucia (Bercescu) Turcano;

H. R. 3455. An act for the relief of Jalal Rashtian;

H. R. 3749. An act for the relief of Woldemar Jaskowsky; and

H. R. 5773. An act to provide for the refund, under certain conditions, of money paid as premiums on United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance which is canceled for fraud.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 5, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1328. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1955 involving a decrease in the amount of $23,900,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 348); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1329. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1330. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, of the exchange stabilization fund created by section 10 (b) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended, pursuant to section 10 (a) of the act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1331. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Bureau of Mines for the calendar year January 1, 1953, through December 31, 1953, pursuant to sections 102 (a) and 212 (c) of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 692; Public Law 552, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1332. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cotton' "; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1333. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948, to provide for censuses of manufactures, mineral industries, and other businesses," relating to the year 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE of Missouri: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 573. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2098. A bill to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods; with amendment (Rept. No. 1304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7057. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to transfer, exchange, and dispose of land in the Eden project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8092. A bill to facilitate the entry of Philippine traders; without amendment (Rept. No. 1306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8224. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8127. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 54. An act for the relief of Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra; without amendment (Rept. No. 1269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 316. An act for the relief of Vera Lazaros and Cristo Lazaros; without amendment (Rept. No. 1270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 551. An act for the relief of Mamertas Cvirka and Mrs. Petronele Cvirka; without amendment (Rept. No. 1271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 850. An act for the relief of Alice Power and Ruby Power; without amendment (Rept. No. 1272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 931. An act for the relief of Vilhjalmur Thorlaksson Bjarnar; without amendment (Rept. No. 1273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1038. An act for the relief of Sliva Galjevscek; without amendment (Rept. No. 1274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1137. An act for the relief of Utako Kanita; without amendment (Rept. No. 1275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1440. An act for the relief of Paolo Danesi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1652. An act for the relief of Robert A. Tyrrell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2073. An act for the relief of Esther Wagner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 683. A bill for the relief of George P. Symrniotis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 970. A bill for the relief of George Economos; with amendment (Rept. No. 1280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1755. A bill for the relief of Theresa Mire Piantoni; with amendment (Rept. No. 1281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1784. A bill for the relief of Rito Solla; with amendment (Rept. No. 1282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2385. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Fruscione; without amendment (Rept. No. 1283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2404. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2406. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3349. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Burdo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3876. A bill for the relief of Martha Schnauffer; with amendment (Rept. No. 1287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4135. A bill for the relief of George Telegdy and Julia Peyer Telegdy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4864. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Noel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5090. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Magdalene Zarnovski Austin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 214. An act for the relief of Geraldine B. Mathews; with amendment (Rept. No. 1291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2791. A bill for the relief of Esther E. Ellicott; with amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3109. A bill for the relief of Theodore W. Carlson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3672. A bill for the relief of Clyde M. Litton; with amendment (Rept. No. 1294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3751. A bill for the relief of Alexandria S. Balasko; with amendment (Rept. No. 1295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3756. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 1296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3970. A bill for the relief of Bernhard F. Elmers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4475. A bill for the relief of Curtis W. McPhail; with amendment (Rept. No. 1298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4713. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Milward; with amendment (Rept. No. 1299). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5436. A bill for the relief of David Hanan; with amendment (Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5460. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Chancy C. Newsom; with amendment (Rept. No. 1301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4532. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ann Elizabeth Caulk; with amendment (Rept. No. 1302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 8220. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 20 of the United States Code, entitled "Education"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8221. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food and Drugs"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. R. 8222. A bill to amend various statutes and certain titles of the United States Code, for the purpose of correcting obsolete references, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 8223. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 23 of the United States Code, entitled "Highways"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8224. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 8225. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 8226. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 8227. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8228. A bill to provide adequate diets for the unemployed and their families in distress areas of unemployment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8229. A bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to the States for surveying the need for diagnostic or treatment centers, for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, for rehabilitation facilities, and for nursing homes, and to provide assistance in the construction of such facilities through grants to public and nonprofit agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 8230. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children through the 12th grade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 8231. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8232. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 8233. A bill to promote the agriculture of the United States by acquiring and diffusing useful information regarding agriculture in foreign countries and the marketing of American agricultural commodities, and the products thereof, outside of the United States; to authorize the creation of an Agricultural Foreign Service in the Department of Agriculture; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 8234. A bill to incorporate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. R. 8235. A bill to appropriate money for the construction of the Calumet-Sag Channel, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 8236. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to provide that feed grains acquired through price-support operations shall be sold to dairy farmers at prices equivalent to 75 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 8237. A bill to limit the term "waterproof" when applied to cloth or fabric; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 8238. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to permit individual motor carriers to file suits to enjoin operations being conducted in violation of such part; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. REED of New York:

H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the report thereon; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 8239. A bill for the relief of Fung Ping Wah (also known as Reginald Ping Wah Fung) and his wife, Fung Wai-Yin Li (also known as Doris Fung); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 8240. A bill for the relief of Fa Hsiang Wu and George Kuosing Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN (by request):

H. R. 8241. A bill for the relief of Letterio (Leo) G. Curro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8242. A bill for the relief of Max Moskowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 8243. A bill for the relief of Ida Kaganowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 8244. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Nell Woolgar Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8245. A bill for the relief of Juan Ysais-Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 8246. A bill for the relief of Concepcion Galloñn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Testifies Before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in Support of H. R. 7397

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the testimony of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, given today before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of H. R. 7397, is very important. Mrs. Hobby explained to the committee that the bill is designed to simplify and improve the several grant-in-aid programs which are now administered pursuant to the provisions of the Public Health Service Act. She pointed out that there are 14 major grant-in-aid programs administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Of these 14, 6 are for the support of State and local health services. The provisions of H. R. 7397 apply only to this latter group.

The bill would replace the present separate authorizations for categorical public health grants for venereal disease control, tuberculosis control, general health and heart disease control—including the separate programs for mental health and cancer control—with an authorization for the following three types of grants:

First. Grants to assist States generally in meeting the costs of their public health services.

Second. Grants to assist States in initiating extensions of, and improvements in, their public health services.

Third. Grants to assist in meeting the costs of projects directed toward the solution of public health problems of regional or national significance.

The amount of Federal funds to be available for each of the above three types of grants would be specified in annual appropriation acts.

GENERAL GRANTS

The formula for determining each State's allotment for the first type of grant would be the same as that used in the hospital survey and construction—Hill-Burton—provisions of the Public Health Service Act— which take into account both the relative populations of the States and their relative fiscal resources as measured by State per capita incomes. There would, however, be a minimum allotment of $55,000. From its allotment, each State would receive payments equal to a percentage of the cost of public health services under its approved State plan, the percentage varying inversely with the State's relative per capita income between a maximum of 66⅔ and a minimum of 33⅓ percent. This contrasts with present law under which the amount of the allotment and the Federal share of the cost are determined by regulations and differ from program to program.

EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

The formula for determining each State's allotment for extension and improvement purposes would be based on relative State populations with a minimum allotment of $25,000. From its allotment, a State could receive, over a 6-year period, varying proportions of the cost of approved projects—included in its approved State plan—for extension and improvement of its public health services—75 percent of the cost for the first 2 years, 50 percent for the next 2, and 25 percent for the last 2.

SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS

These grants would be made on a project basis to States and to public and nonprofit agencies or organizations. They would be available for paying part of the cost of combating unusually severe public health problems in specific geographical areas, and of carrying out special projects which hold unique promise of contributing to the solution of public health problems common to all or several States, and projects directed at meeting public health problems of special national significance or concern.

STATE PLANS

Payments from allotments for the first type of grant—for support of public health services—would be conditioned upon submission of a plan by the State health authority—and mental health authority in connection with mental health—which meets requirements prescribed in regulations of the Surgeon General.

As under existing law, regulations would be issued by the Surgeon General, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and only after consultation with and, insofar as practicable, the concurrence of the State health—or mental health—authorities.

ADMINISTRATION

The grants would continue, as under existing law, to be administered through the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TRANSITION PROVISIONS

In order to provide States an opportunity to adjust their finances to the new allotment formulas, provision would be made to limit to 10 percent any decrease in allotments which any State would receive in any 1 year by virtue of the formula change.

Mrs. Hobby testified that when she first examined the present grant structure, it became apparent that the number, variation, and complexity of existing authorizations and regulations were obstacles to effective administration, particularly State and local administration. Further, it appeared that the pattern and structure of these grants did not provide the flexibility needed to meet the problems of the several States in the best possible way. She stated further that last year she reviewed the history and operation of all these programs and came to the conclusion that there is a real need for clarification, greater flexibility, and more local determination in connection with adminstering the program. Consequently, legislation was developed designed to accomplish these objectives.

These amendments to the Public Health Service Act would not become effective until July 1, 1955.

Postal Salary Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein a copy of the statement I made recently before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in behalf of the salary increase for postal employees.

I am most hopeful that the Members of this House will see fit to support the Withrow bill so that the salaries of our postal employees can be adjusted upward to meet increased living costs.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE RELATIVE TO THE POSTAL PAY INCREASE, MARCH, 1, 1954

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank you and the members of the committee for giving me an opportunity to speak to you about a matter which is of grave concern to us all—the proposed increase in pay for postal employees.

Several times before on the House floor I have urged my colleagues to act, and to act quickly, on a raise in pay for this group of Federal employees which has served us so well and so faithfully over the years. Although the cost of living has continued its upward spiral our postal employees have had no increase in pay since 1951. They are hard pressed to provide even the barest essentials for their families. Many employees have been forced to take on additional work, and in many instances the wives of postal employees have had to go to work in an effort to relieve the financial hardships caused by inadequate salaries.

Our Post Office Department is one of the largest businesses in the world. It was inaugurated as a service to the people of the country, and only through the diligent efforts and the unfailing teamwork within the postal organization has it been possible to overcome the many complex problems which arise, and to ensure the type of mail service we have come to expect.

Economy in Government operations seems to be the watchword here in Washington today. That is a good thing. However, economy means more than an actual saving of

money per se. It means wise and careful management, and the utilization of funds to the best advantage. As I have said previously, the Post Office Department was set up with the intention of providing a necessary service to the people, and because it does not pay its own way, I cannot see why employees must wait for postal rate increases before they can expect increases in their own salaries. Other Government departments and agencies are not self-sustaining, and if our Government can subsidize the farmers, airlines, steamship companies, and even foreign countries, then in my opinion we can and should extend a helping hand to the postal workers.

I most respectfully urge the members of this committee to report out a bill which will provide for an adequate increase in salaries for that group.

Dorchester Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago last month the Army transport *Dorchester* went down in icy waters off the coast of Newfoundland. In that dark night of terror many men died bravely, and others, no less brave, survived. And if not all were brave in that sudden hell of fire and ice and darkness, when the torpedo struck the engineroom, and boilers burst and lights went out, and the ship listed with its mortal wound, what man can blame them? Honor is due to all who died for us that night, suddenly or through long agony, bravely, or in a scrambling terror. But honor is doubly due to those 4 men, the chaplains, Washington, Poling, Fox, and Goode—1 priest, 2 ministers, 1 rabbi—who stood firm in the midst of panic, aided the captain and other officers in restoring order, and went down together, praying as one to that one God whom we all own as Lord, Creator, and Father.

As long as America lives those four men will stand together, in the white light of history, at the ship's rail, forgetful of self, calling down the mercy of God upon the endangered, the dying, and the dead. They will so stand in our children's history books, teaching them in one vivid mental picture what is finest in the tradition of America—selfless courage in the face of danger, devotion to God, service to fellow man. Catholic priest, Protestant ministers, and Jewish rabbi, they represent that more than tolerance by which we, of all faiths and races, are one in the spirit of America.

If 1 of these 4 men was first in proposing that they remain with the ship—we do not know which man that was. One gave his lifebelt to a soldier—we do not know which man that was. That is as it should be. These four are equal in bravery, equal in honor, before the remembering world.

But I, for my own reasons, wish to say a few words of Father John P. Washington. He was, like me, born to a Catholic family. When John Washington was a year-old baby, or thereabouts, in Newark, I was born in the same city. Like many of my friends, he went to Seton Hall College—now Seton Hall University—in South Orange, and then to Immaculate Conception Seminary in Darlington, being ordained in 1935 as a priest of the diocese of Newark, and then serving parishes in Elizabeth, Orange, and Arlington. Many of my hearers, from Arlington and Kearny particularly, probably remember Father John Washington, who arrived at St. Stephen's Church in Arlington to be one of Father Murphy's assistants, just in time to take part in the ceremony of laying the cornerstone of the splendid new church, and stayed there until he entered the Army as a chaplain. Those of us who were fortunate enough to know him have a proud memory to cherish and hand down to our descendants.

I take pleasure in the thought that the name of Washington, already so glorious in the history of America, was held on high this time by one whose father and mother had come to America as immigrants from Ireland. I take a personal interest in the achievements of second-generation Americans, and I particularly like the kind of immigrant family in which the children are brought up, as the young Washingtons were, in thoroughly American style, yet with a care to preserve, along with the religion brought from the old country, legends, and traditions that help to make life beautiful and happy. Young John Washington was taught to love the land and history of Ireland, as well as the land and history of America, to remember the Battle of the Boyne as well as the Battle of Fort Ticonderoga. We here, his friends and neighbors, know that his name is now enshrined in a phrase, one of the watchwords of our liberty, as deathless as "In the name of the great Jehovah and the Continental Congress." That watchword is a simple list of four names: Washington, Poling, Fox, and Goode.

Results of McGregor Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the results of a questionnaire I sent to the citizens in the 17th Ohio District. I am proud to represent this district in the Congress of the United States. The questions were concerned with major national and international problems facing Congress today.

I regret I could not send a questionnaire to each of my constituents in the district, but I believe the replies I have received are the opinions of a cross-section of those I represent.

Questions sheets were sent to almost every occupational group: Republican and Democratic committeemen and women, laborers, attorneys, housewives, public office holders and Government employees, salesmen, retired men and women, ministers, college and high-school students, and their instructors. Also included are those working in business and industry, newspaper, radio, and professional positions.

Blanks were mailed to individuals and reproductions of the questionnaire were published in nearly all of the 20 daily and weekly newspapers in my district.

A large percent of the completed forms contained comments on the questions which proves to me that the average citizen is interested in the vital issues now before this legislative body and is anxious to express his views on them. I am very pleased so many took the time to write and attach letters and notes to the questionnaire enlarging upon their answers.

The population in my district is composed of about half rural and half urban residents. Nearly all of the labor and farm organizations are represented as well as large and small business. There are also two colleges and two universities.

It is not often that a Congressman can obtain a true picture of such an evenly divided district, but through the questionnaire method, I feel I have gained the majority opinion of those I represent.

The questionnaire and the results are as follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE IN AN ENDEAVOR TO LEARN THE VIEWS OF THE FOLKS BACK HOME

	Yes	No
	Per-cent	Per-cent
1. Should the present farm program (90 percent parity and price supports) be continued?	46	54
2. Should we have controls on the production of farm products?	38	62
3. Do you favor continuation of—		
(a) technical assistance to Europe	76	24
(b) economic aid to Europe	35	65
4. Do you favor continuation of—		
(a) technical assistance to Asia	72	28
(b) economic aid to Asia	42	58
5. Do you advocate the admittance of Red China into the U. N., although the refusal of which might lead to the renewal of the Korean war?	19	81
6. Do you favor the extension of social security coverage to 10.5 million additional persons, including doctors, dentists, ministers, farmers, and others who are self-employed, although this might possibly mean an increase in the rate paid by both the employer and the employee?	51	49
7. Do you advocate the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway at this time, regardless of the lack of a written agreement with Canada relative to construction and operation?	68	32
8. Do you favor allowing the 18-year-olds to vote?	70	30
9. Do you favor the methods of Senator McCARTHY in his endeavors to disclose the actions of the Communists in this country?	59	41
10. Do you favor the continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House?	90	10

Signature _____
Street _____
City and State _____
Occupation _____

Please fill out and return this questionnaire to J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Member of Congress, 1434 New House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

Percentage distribution of replies to questionnaire

Question 1. Should the present farm program (90 percent parity and price supports) be continued?

	Yes	No
	Per-cent	*Per-cent*
Total replies	46	54
Attorneys	33	67
Business, industry, and salesmen	21	79
Farmers	35	65
Farm groups	18	82
Housewives	17	83
Labor	32	68
Ministers	38	62
Newspaper and radio	50	50
Occupation not given and organizations	35	65
Professionals	21	79
Public officeholders and Federal employees	20	80
Retired	29	71
Teachers	42½	57½
Students	62½	37½

Question 2. Should we have controls on the production of farm products?

	Yes	No
	Per-cent	*Per-cent*
Total replies	38	62
Attorneys	49	51
Business, industry, and salesmen	28	72
Farmers	26	74
Farm groups	9	91
Housewives	17	83
Labor	26	74
Ministers	50	50
Newspaper and radio	50	50
Occupation not given and organizations	35	65
Professionals	29	71
Public officeholders and Federal employees	33	67
Retired	34	66
Teachers	45	55
Students	46	54

Question 3. Do you favor continuation of—
(a) Technical assistance to Europe?

	Yes	No
	Per-cent	*Per-cent*
Total replies	76	24
Attorneys	76	24
Business, industry, and salesmen	78	22
Farmers	70	30
Farm groups	83	17
Housewives	66	34
Labor	63	37
Ministers	92	8
Newspaper and radio	100	0
Occupation not given and organizations	24	76
Professionals	83	17
Public officeholders and Federal employees	73	27
Retired	82	18
Teachers	95	5
Students	79	21

(b) Economic aid to Europe?

	Yes	No
	Per-cent	*Per-cent*
Total replies	35	65
Attorneys	33	67
Business, industry, and salesmen	26	74
Farmers	32	68
Farm groups	9	91
Housewives	29	71
Labor	23	77
Ministers	67	33
Newspaper and radio	29	71
Occupation not given and organizations	16	84
Professionals	24	76
Public officeholders and Federal employees	33	67
Retired	42	58
Teachers	59	41
Students	41	59

Question 4. Do you favor continuation of—
(a) Technical assistance to Asia?

	Yes	No
	Per-cent	*Per-cent*
Total replies	72	28
Attorneys	80	20
Business, industry, and salesmen	78	22
Farmers	76	24
Farm groups	81	19
Housewives	67	33
Labor	65	35
Ministers	93	7
Newspaper and radio	86	14
Occupation not given and organizations	21	79
Professionals	83	17
Public officeholders and Federal employees	71	29
Retired	78	22
Teachers	93	7
Students	71	29

(b) Economic aid to Asia?

	Yes	No
	Per-cent	*Per-cent*
Total replies	42	58
Attorneys	43	57
Business, industry, and salesmen	39	61
Farmers	38	62
Farm groups	11	89
Housewives	36	64
Labor	25	75
Ministers	73	27
Newspaper and radio	57	43
Occupation not given and organizations	43	57
Professionals	41	59
Public officeholders and Federal employees	49	51
Retired	56	44
Teachers	74	26
Students	43	57

Question 5. Do you advocate the admittance of Red China into the U. N., although the refusal of which might lead to the renewal of the Korean war?

	Yes	No
	Per-cent	*Per-cent*
Total replies	19	81
Attorneys	18	82
Business, industry, and salesmen	11	89
Farmers	11	89
Farm groups	0	100
Housewives	9	91
Labor	3	97
Ministers	22	78
Newspaper and radio	29	71
Occupation not given and organizations	11	89
Professionals	9	91
Public officeholders and Federal employees	14	86
Retired	4	96
Teachers	19	81
Students	27	73

Question 6. Do you favor the extension of social security coverage to 10.5 million additional persons, including doctors, dentists, ministers, farmers and others who are self-employed, although this might possibly mean an increase in the rate paid by both the employer and the employee?

	Yes	No
	Per-cent	*Per-cent*
Total replies	51	49
Attorneys	50	50
Business, industry, and salesmen	49	51
Farmers	34	66
Farm groups	18	82
Housewives	43	57
Labor	53	47
Ministers	68	32
Newspaper and radio	29	71
Occupation not given and organizations	25	75
Professionals	37	63
Public officeholders and Federal employees	65	35
Retired	75	25
Teachers	59	41
Students	57	43

Question 7. Do you advocate the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway at this time, regardless of the lack of a written agreement with Canada relative to construction and operation?

	Yes	No
	Per-cent	*Per-cent*
Total replies	68	32
Attorneys	46	54
Business, industry, and salesmen	62	38
Farmers	46	54
Farm groups	28	72
Housewives	50	50
Labor	36	64
Ministers	62	38
Newspaper and radio	57	43
Occupation not given and organizations	70	30
Professionals	55	45
Public officeholders and Federal employees	67	33
Retired	62	38
Teachers	73	27
Students	79	21

Question 8. Do you favor allowing the 18-year-olds to vote?

	Yes	No
	Per-cent	*Per-cent*
Total replies	70	30
Attorneys	51	49
Business, industry, and salesmen	54	46
Farmers	49	51
Farm groups	73	27
Housewives	61	39
Labor	56	44
Ministers	56	44
Newspaper and radio	29	71
Occupation not given and organizations	70	30
Professionals	52	48
Public officeholders and Federal employees	43	57
Retired	57	43
Teachers	72½	27½
Students	81	19

Question 9. Do you favor the methods of Senator McCarthy in his endeavors to disclose the actions of the Communists in this country?

	Yes	No
	Per-cent	*Per-cent*
Total replies	59	41
Attorneys	41	59
Business, industry, and salesmen	72	28
Farmers	75	25
Farm groups	90	10
Housewives	78	22
Labor	83	17
Ministers	37	63
Newspaper and radio	86	14
Occupation not given and organizations	76	24
Professionals	74	26
Public officeholders and Federal employees	71	29
Retired	68	32
Teachers	56	44
Students	48	52

Question 10. Do you favor the continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House?

	Yes	No
	Per-cent	*Per-cent*
Total replies	90	10
Attorneys	88	12
Business, industry, and salesmen	92	8
Farmers	90	10
Farm groups	99	1
Housewives	95	5
Labor	92	8
Ministers	80	20
Newspaper and radio	100	0
Occupation not given and organizations	93	7
Professionals	96	4
Public officeholders and Federal employees	95	5
Retired	93	7
Teachers	82	18
Students	87	13

Is the Massive Retaliation Policy a Dangerous Gamble, Playing Into the Hands of the Kremlin Extremists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, although it has received very little public discussion, a strong undercurrent of deep concern is now evident among Members of Congress of both parties over the policy of massive retaliation enunciated earlier this year by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

The so-called New Look in our military and defense strategy as outlined by the Secretary calls for primary dependence upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our own choosing in case of any renewed outbreak of aggression.

Considering the far-reaching shift in American policy which this pronouncement appeared to indicate, it is unfortunate that there has been so little discussion of it by responsible military as well as diplomatic officials of the administration or any clear-cut definition of just what the policy is supposed to mean.

I have withheld comment on this matter up to now in the hopes that some such clear-cut definition might be forthcoming. I think now that the time has come when the Eisenhower administration should either clarify or withdraw this policy pronouncement before it sets off the very disaster it is intended to prevent—that is, a global atomic war of total obliteration.

I believe this policy strengthens the power of both the Russian military extremists itching to expand the Soviet empire by force and the Communist political theorists in Russia who believe unquestioningly in the Marx-Lenin teachings based on European conditions of a half century or more ago when wars were considered fairly normal and not very destructive affairs.

As the Dulles policy—which presumably also is the Eisenhower policy—now stands, it is a threat to make a worldwide atomic war out of any new Korea, to drop atomic bombs on Peiping if the Chinese Communists invade Indochina, or to atomize Moscow if Russia were to march against Iran or any other neighbor.

This may or may not be what the Secretary meant to imply, but that's what everyone takes it to mean. Presumably the Russians take it to mean that, too. If so, it could be a dangerous gamble—perhaps an almost suicidal dare, playing right into the hands of the crazy men of the Kremlin.

The leaders of Russian communism have always pretended—and some of them like Malenkov may even believe—that the West wants to attack them and wipe them out. That line has been sold to the Russian people for 37 years.

It has been their excuse, if not their reason, for blocking every attempt to reach a real peace. Even during the height of World War II when we were pouring billions in lend-lease aid into Russia, they often treated us more like potential enemies than as allies. Though our allies, they never acted as our friends and never reciprocated our efforts to be friends, for they maintained an official suspicion that such a friendship was ideologically impossible. You must remember that they had been Hitler's allies, too, for a while.

Since World War II they have painted us in the same colors in which they painted the Nazis. And they have waged an intensive and unrelentingly savage hate campaign against us among their own people.

The question is how seriously do they take their own propaganda. Do they really believe it? If so, is it possible that they might seize on the Dulles pronouncement as their signal to rain atomic bombs on us at the first sign of any localized aggression anywhere in the world. Would they or would they not be likely to do that in the belief they were acting in self-defense?

Those are some of the question this "new look" raises—vital questions which deserve thoughtful and well-considered answers from the administration.

For myself, I believe the policy of this country should be one of continuing to organize the strength of the whole free world to stop aggression, but not to go out inviting global atomic war over minor-league skirmishes or border incidents, not to stand on a vague and unclear policy which seems to convey to the suspicious denizens of the Kremlin that we are as trigger happy as they are. And by all means we should certainly take no stand which might invite an atomic Pearl Harbor in our own cities the minute pro- and anti-Communist regimes in some far corner of the earth start a local war against each other.

Justice for the Dairy Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, title 7, United States Code, section 1427. This proposed amendment provides that feed grains acquired through price-support operations shall be offered for sale to dairy farmers at prices equivalent to 75 percent of parity. Processors and other persons in the normal channel of trade would, under the proposed amendment, be allowed to purchase feed grains on this same basis for resale in processed form or otherwise to dairy farmers at prices which will properly reflect the price at which such grains were purchased from the corporation.

The reason for the introduction of this bill is very simple—justice. As we all know, under present law and regulation, dairy products will be supported at 75 percent of parity beginning April 1, 1954. Also under law, feed grains which are the raw product of these dairy products will be supported at 90 percent of parity at least until January 1, 1955. Certainly the injustice of this situation is obvious to anyone. In order to remain in business, the dairy farmer must purchase feed grains for his cows. Because of the price-support program, he is presently paying an artificially high price for these grains. Without the relief afforded by this amendment, beginning April 1, 1954, the dairy farmer will be squeezed between two irresistible forces—high price supports for feed grains on the one hand, low price supports for dairy products on the other.

A great many of the dairy farmers in my district would prefer no price supports at all on either dairy products or feed grains. They are independent people and want only an opportunity to run their own show with the least possible interference from the Federal Government. They have demonstrated their sincerity as to this by suggesting and proposing a "self-help plan," whereby Federal supports will be eliminated entirely and the dairy farmers themselves will handle their own surplus and production problems.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge and plead that the Congress take early and positive action on the bill which I have introduced today so that justice may be done and the dairy farmer who, in the aggregate is one of the most important segments of the economy of this country, will not, of necessity be faced with economic disaster beginning April 1, 1954.

Statement by Hon. Homer Ferguson, of Michigan, on the Anniversary of Soviet Domination of Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the anniversary of the Soviet domination of Rumania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HOMER FERGUSON, OF MICHIGAN, ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOVIET DOMINATION OF RUMANIA

Saturday, March 6, 1954, marks the ninth anniversary of the Communist seizure of the Government of Rumania and I wish to call attention to this mournful anniversary because it contains a lesson which has not yet been learned by many people throughout the world.

The lesson to be learned from the Communist seizure of Rumania is that communism and Communist leaders cannot be trusted.

Rumania, of course, was occupied by Russian forces toward the end of 1944 and the Communists immediately began to exercise every conceivable pressure to secure their complete control, aided by the few Communist Rumanians and the firepower of the Red army.

The Rumanian Government was unable to resist the powerful Soviet demands indefinitely in the face of the military power of the Communists. On March 6, after Russian troops had occupied the principal Government office buildings, the Communist government was formed without the participation of the two strongest Rumanian parties.

As well as studying the lesson of these events, we must also use this occasion to pay tribute to the Rumanian people who have been ruthlessly exploited for the benefit of the Soviet Union and yet have not lost their love for freedom or their determination to regain it.

Aaniversary of Hungarian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the anniversary of Hungarian Independence Day, which will be observed on March 14.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HOMER FERGUSON, OF MICHIGAN, ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

It is a real pleasure for me to join in saluting those brave Hungarians who stepped forward with great courage to free their homeland from the bondage of Hapsburg rule in the 1848 war for Hungarian independence.

Louis Kossuth won his place in history in the forefront of the great fighters for freedom and independence during that unfortunately brief period of Hungarian independence in 1848 and 1849. That great patriot ranks with George Washington as a fighter for liberty.

This anniversary of Hungarian independence recalls the continuing love of the Hungarian people for liberty and freedom and brings to mind great leaders like St. Stephen, who united Hungary; Col. Michael DeKowatz, Hungarian patriot who fought for America's freedom during our Revolutionary War; and contemporaries like Cardinal Mindszenty.

Unfortunately, the precious independence won by Louis Kossuth and his followers was short-lived as the forces of Austria and Russia combined to crush the Hungarian nation and reimpose the Hapsburg domination.

The basic foundation of the free Hungary of Louis Kossuth—the 10 points—are well worth keeping in mind during this period when the godless forces of communism impose their will on the people of Hungary. Those 10 points included religious liberty, responsible government, equality before law, right of public meeting, and other rights we believe to be essential to the dignity of the individual.

It is fitting and necessary that we observe this anniversary here in America and elsewhere in the free world since I am certain that people in Hungary will not be able to observe it.

I join my fellow Americans of Hungarian descent in praying and working for the restoration of freedom in the Hungarian homeland.

We Must Outlaw the Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN DIES
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, during the existence of the Dies committee from 1938 to 1945, we investigated and exposed approximately 500 Fascist, Nazi, and Communist organizations, with a claimed total membership in the United States of 10 million persons, and as a result most of these organizations went out of existence before the termination of our committee on January 3, 1945. We exposed several hundred Fascist, Nazi, and Communist magazines, periodicals, and publications, with the result that they were unable to survive the disclosure of their treasonable purposes. We exposed a dozen international labor unions affiliated with the CIO which were controlled by Communists. Ten years later the CIO confirmed our findings and expelled these unions from their organization.

Our committee revealed the names and occupations of several thousand employees and officials with subversive records working for our Government, and gradually and belatedly they were weeded out of the Government service by discharge or forced resignations. Included in this list, which we submitted in 1941, were the names of Alger Hiss, Donald Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Harold Glasser, and George Shaw Wheeler. The work of our committee was an important factor in the conviction of Fritz Kuhn, styled feuhrer of the German-American Bund; Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party, and William Weiner, party treasurer; Nicholas Dozenberg; William Dudley Pelley, leader of the Silver Shirts of America; officials of Bookniga, Soviet propaganda agency; the expulsion of Arno Rissi and Mrs. Leslie Fry, and the prosecution of many other disloyal persons. Many bills of a corrective nature passed the House as a result of the testimony produced by our committee. Before World War II our committee exposed the Japanese fifth column in the United States and furnished to our Government a map showing in great detail the fleet positions and battle formations of the United States Navy around Pearl Harbor. As a result of our hearings and findings, bills were passed under which many Communist leaders have been sent to the penitentiary.

One of our chief recommendations to outlaw the Communist conspiracy, which may be found in the committee's report filed with Congress on January 3, 1941, has not yet been enacted into law. In connection with this recommendation, our committee said in its report:

As long as these organizations have a legal status in the United States, it will be difficult for any agency of the Government to deal with them.

Our committee also found that from 1919 to 1924 the Communist conspiracy was outlawed in this country by wartime legislation, and that during this period the Communist movement in the United States "remained comparatively stationary and innocuous."

Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1954, I introduced H. R. 7894, which declares that the Communist Party of the United States and its various components of affiliated, subsidiary, and frontal organizations and all other organizations, no matter under what name, whose object or purpose is to overthrow the Government of the United States or the government of any State, Territory, District, or possession thereof, or of any political subdivision therein, by force and violence, are declared illegal and not entitled to any of the rights, privileges, and immunities attendant upon legal bodies created under the jurisdiction of the laws of the United States or any political subdivision thereof; and that membership in any such organization is a Federal offense punishable by a fine not exceeding $10,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 10 years, or both, provided that the member had knowledge of the revolutionary object or purpose of such organization. If this legislation is enacted, it will deprive the Communists of their greatest asset, which is the legal apparatus and window dressing for the planning and perpetration of treason and the deception of gullible and unthinking people.

The evidence produced before our committee showed beyond any doubt that communism is a foreign conspiracy masked as a political party, and that Communists in the United States are the un-uniformed soldiers of the Kremlin stationed on American soil. The evidence was established that the Communist Party and its components of affiliated, subsidiary, and frontal organizations is an agency for the planning and perpetration of misdemeanors and high crimes. These crimes and misdemeanors belong in a special class. Behind the Communist violations of our statutes there is a special motive which requires a special kind of understanding. The Communist criminal is not an ordinary criminal even when he is committing ordinary crimes. The extraordinary thing about a Communist crime is that it rests upon an elaborate philosophy which is summed up in the doctrine that the end justifies the means. The Communist end is a beautifully depicted utopia. Only after the new recruit has become wedded to the Communist utopia is he initiated into the criminal means by which the Communist Party proposes to attain its utopia. Even according to its professed tactics, the Communist Party and its affiliated organizations is an agency for the planning and perpetration of misdemeanors and high

crimes. Lenin, himself, made this perfectly clear when he said:

> Revolutionaries who are unable to combine illegal forms of struggle with every form of legal struggle are very poor revolutionaries.

What I have said explains why Earl Browder was convicted for obtaining a United States passport through fraud. It explains why William Weiner was convicted for fraudulently representing himself as an American citizen. It explains why Nicholas Dozenberg was convicted for perjury in obtaining an American passport. It explains why Dr. Valentine Burtan, Communist agent for Stalin's counterfeiting ring, served a sentence in the Federal prison in Lewisburg, Pa. It explains why the Communist Party practiced fraud on a large scale in obtaining signatures for its election petitions. It explains why Communists defied our laws to recruit 4,000 American boys to send them to fight for Stalin in Spain. All of these men and thousands of others who have not yet been apprehended and convicted committed their crimes in the service of the Communist Party. The Communist Party has put itself on record again and again with respect to its intentions of disloyalty to the American Government, and with respect to its actual loyalty to the Soviet Union.

To Communists treason is a virtue. No Communist who ever appeared before our committee would ever say that in the event of war between the United States and Soviet Russia he would support the United States. Furthermore, the Communist conspiracy preaches and practices the overthrow of non-Communist governments by force and violence. They do not believe in the democratic processes of free elections and parliamentary procedure to achieve their ends.

In view of these facts which have been proven before the Congress and the courts of the United States, is there any possible justification for the continued recognition of the Communist conspiracy as legal in the United States? Are we not placed in an impossibly inconsistent position when we seek to combat communistic activities in the United States and at the same time recognize Communist organizations as legal bodies? The Communist organizations remain just as legal in America today as they have been since the expiration of the wartime acts in 1924.

The time has come to end this farce by the passage of my bill.

H. R. 3842

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 1, the world was shocked by the terrorist shooting of five Members of the House of Representatives.

The incident has naturally brought about a series of resolutions calling for tighter security regulations for visitors to the gallery. These resolutions include provisions for the installation of bullet-proof glass protection, photoelectric cells, and many other gimmicks.

Of course, no prudent person will summarily reject any of the measures offered, if they add to the safety of the Members. But the Lugers which shot at and wounded our Members on Monday might not have been available if my bill, H. R. 3842, became law. This bill would direct the Secretary of Defense to search the belongings of members of the Armed Forces and their families returning to the United States, and to seize any so-called souvenir weapons.

Since dropping the bill into the hopper on March 10, 1953, two tragic accidents occurred in my own little community, and thousands of crimes have been committed with these weapons.

Mr. Speaker, it seems logical to me that in order to prevent, or at least to minimize, the likelihood of these incidents, a good beginning is to prohibit the importation of these guns.

Independence of Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1954

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, many are the strands which have gone into the making of our civilization. We and our immediate predecessors have borrowed to a greater or lesser extent, from ancient civilizations of the Near East, from ancient Greece and from Rome, and from early Christianity. But many of us firmly believe that some of the best elements in our heritage and some of the most cherished of our ideas and ideals, particularly many of our modern ideas of freedom, liberty, and independence, have their roots in ancient Greece. Greeks of those distant days formulated and developed those sublime ideas, embodied them in ethical and legal precepts, and passed them on to posterity. That, one might say, is the legacy of Greece to us.

Those wise and learned Greeks, however were not able to maintain their independence. For centuries their country was conquered and ruled by foreign overlords and for many centuries they suffered under alien tyranny. Yet during all that time they remained true to their ancient traditions, cherishing the ideal of their national independence. Finally, in 1821 when the oppressive rule of their Turkish overlords had become almost unbearable they revolted against their oppressors and clamored for freedom, liberty and national political independence. We are very happy that their feats of bravery brought them independence, and today in celebrating the 133d anniversary of the beginning of that revolt and the Greek declaration of independence, we heartily hope that Greece will continue to live in peace and enjoy its hard-won freedom.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 5, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, we are again coming unto Thee constrained by a love that will not let us go and compelled by longings which Thou alone canst satisfy.

Grant that on this day of world prayer our spiritual life, which is so often eclipsed by moods of doubt and fear, may be enriched and strengthened with a greater faith and hope in Thee.

We penitently confess that we are frequently more concerned with knowing the truth about mere material things than we are in knowing the truth about Thee and ourselves.

May we give ourselves unreservedly and completely to the guidance of Thy divine spirit as we carry on.

Hear us as, in our helplessness, we daily pray for our colleagues who are so desperately in need of that healing ministry which is more blessed than anything that the wisest and most skillful can give.

In Christ's name we humbly pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

FEDERAL AID ROAD ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 460, Rept. No. 1309), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as

ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING HOSPITAL SURVEY AND CONSTRUCTION PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 461, Rept. No. 1310), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8149) to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to the States for surveying the need for diagnostic or treatment centers, for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, for rehabilitation facilities, and for nursing homes, and to provide assistance in the construction of such facilities through grants to public and nonprofit agencies, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

LIMITATION OF NUMBER OF OFFICERS IN CERTAIN COMMISSIONED GRADES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 462, Rept. No. 1311), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7103) to establish limitations on the numbers of officers who may serve in various commissioned grades in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, and all points of order against such bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INTERLOCKING SUBVERSION IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 66.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary not to exceed 25,000 copies of parts 15, 16, 17, and subsequent parts of the hearings entitled "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments," held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 83d Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 204.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed a total of 20,000 copies of the bill entitled "Internal Revenue Code of 1954" for the use of the following: House document room, 13,000 copies; Senate document room, 500 copies; House Committee on Ways and Means, 6,450 copies; Senate Committee on Finance, 50 copies; and that there be printed a total of 20,000 copies of the report thereon submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means for the use of the following: House document room 13,000 copies; Senate document room, 1,700 copies; House Committee on Ways and Means, 5,000 copies; Senate Committee on Finance, 300 copies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PART II, NATIONAL HIGHWAY STUDY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 403.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works 1,000 additional copies of Part II of the National Highway Study held during the 83d Congress, 1st session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements. With unemployment over the 3-million mark, the time to argue over whether it is a recession or adjustment is passed. There is no sense in waiting until the April reports on February unemployment. The time to act is now.

Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district, which comprises Westmoreland County of Pennsylvania, we know a program of public works is long overdue. Our mining industry is way off; rubber factories, electrical plants, and other installations in our heavily industrialized county are not operating anywhere near the rate of a year or two ago; and the people are tired of waiting for prosperity around the corner and need jobs now. Some of the people are actually so destitute, especially in the more isolated mining areas, that I have been trying to get them surplus Government-owned food in order to alleviate malnutrition and hunger. They would rather go to work. So let us make sure they have work opportunities.

The bill I have introduced would establish a joint Federal-State and Federal-local public-works program, modeled along the lines of the PWA program of some years back, and carrying out the objectives of the Full Employment Act. It would authorize Federal grants of up to $3 billion for useful public works, with the States and municipalities providing 55 percent of the cost of these projects.

The PWA Administrator would consult with a council of economic advisers to make sure that proposed projects carried out the objectives of the Full Employment Act. The bill would not provide for aid to projects which are already eligible for other types of Federal assistance.

In other words, we now have a variety of Federal-aid programs not in existence at the time of PWA; the Federal-aid highway program has been vastly expanded since then and also the flood-control program; and we now have Federal aid to airports, hospitals, housing projects, and so on. If those programs are to be expanded—and I think they should be—it can be done under present authorizations merely by increasing appropriations for these purposes. My purpose is to open the way for States and localities to improve facilities not

presently eligible for Federal assistance, particularly schools, and also including sewage systems, filtration plants, city halls, courthouses, recreation centers, firehouses, police stations, local flood-control projects not eligible for Federal flood-control funds, and similar construction activities.

COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the public hearings of the Banking and Currency Committee I have raised a question which I think at this time should be submitted to the scholarship of the House and of the Nation.

I use the word "scholarship" advisedly, as numbered among the Members of this body are lawyers and jurists of highest distinction and students in every field of intellectual inquiry. Furthermore, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is widely read by men and women on the faculties of our universities and on the bench in the courts of the land. I trust that we shall hear from many of them.

With all respect for the able personnel of the State Department, and the enviable professional standing of the Secretary of State himself, I think that the question I have raised should pass through the scrutiny of the scholarship I have mentioned.

The measure before the committee is the administration's housing bill. It provides that it shall be effective in the "States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, including the District of Columbia."

I raised the question of the applicability of the language of this definition to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The witness then on the stand, and speaking with the authority of the Housing Administration, replied to my question by saying: First, that the definition had been submitted to and had been approved by the State Department; second, that it was held to be a definition inclusive of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and, third, that a similar definition is incorporated in other legislative proposals and enactments.

But Puerto Rico is not a State. It is not a Territory. It is not a possession. That is the plain fact. Here is the historic background:

On July 3, 1950, in the second session of the 81st Congress we adopted a compact with the people of Puerto Rico to become operative upon its approval by the people of Puerto Rico. On June 4, 1951, the people of Puerto Rico at a referendum overwhelmingly approved the act and from September 17, 1951, to February 6, 1952, worked assiduously and successfully in the formation of a constitution for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

On March 3, 1952, the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico by a vote of 374,649 to 82,923, and on July 3, 1952, Public Law 447 of the 82d Congress became effective. This Public Law 447 approved the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Since that date the status of Puerto Rico has been that of a commonwealth. To say that it is anything else is to voice something that is not true. It is an entirely new relationship in our American Union.

The learned and universally esteemed Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Dr. A. FERNÓS-ISERN, believes that definitions such as that in the housing bill should read "States, Territories, and possessions, including the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico." Otherwise he is fearful that much legal confusion may eventuate. I understand that in the one instance that has arisen since July 3, 1952, a court in Boston held that Puerto Rico was not a Territory or a possession, but did possess the attributes germane to a State. Other courts well may see no similarity in a State structure and that of a commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, the plain fact is that now for the first time we have a commonwealth as part of our Union. In future it is possible we will have other commonwealths. I am inclined to think the better type definition, designed to cover the situation of the present and not of the past, would be "States, Territories, commonwealth, and possessions, including the District of Columbia."

In any event it would seem to be the course of prudence for the State Department to leave the decision to the scholarship of the Congress. I am bringing it up now so that Members may have ample time for its consideration before the bill reaches the floor of the House.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1955

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], on which a separate vote was demanded. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVENGER: On page 30, line 80, strike out "$23,000,000" and insert "$40,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 88, noes 24.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 265, nays 105, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—265

Abernethy	Frazier	Oakman
Adair	Frelinghuysen	O'Brien, Mich.
Albert	Fulton	O'Brien, N. Y.
Allen, Calif.	Gathings	O'Hara, Minn.
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Osmers
Andresen,	George	Ostertag
H. Carl	Golden	Passman
Andresen,	Goodwin	Patman
August H.	Graham	Patterson
Andrews	Grant	Pelly
Angell	Gubser	Pfost
Arends	Hale	Phillips
Aspinall	Haley	Pilcher
Auchincloss	Halleck	Poff
Baker	Hand	Preston
Bates	Harden	Priest
Beamer	Harris	Prouty
Becker	Harrison, Nebr.	Radwan
Beicher	Harrison, Wyo.	Ray
Bennett, Fla.	Harvey	Rayburn
Bennett, Mich.	Hays, Ark.	Reams
Bentsen	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Berry	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Betts	Hiestand	Regan
Bishop	Hill	Rhodes, Ariz.
Blatnik	Hillelson	Richards
Boggs	Hillings	Riehlman
Bolling	Hinshaw	Robsion, Ky.
Bolton	Hoeven	Rogers, Colo.
Frances P.	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Mass.
Bolton,	Holmes	Rogers, Tex.
Oliver P.	Holt	Sadlak
Bonin	Hope	St. George
Bosch	Horan	Saylor
Bow	Hosmer	Schenck
Boykin	Howell	Scherer
Bramblett	Hruska	Scott
Bray	Hunter	Scrivner
Brooks, La.	Hyde	Scudder
Brooks, Tex.	Ikard	Secrest
Brown, Ga.	Jarman	Selden
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins	Shafer
Brownson	Johnson, Calif.	Sheehan
Broyhill	Jonas, Ill.	Shelley
Burdick	Jones, Ala.	Sheppard
Burleson	Jones, Mo.	Short
Busbey	Kersten, Wis.	Simpson, Ill.
Bush	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Byrd	Kilday	Small
Cannon	King, Calif.	Smith, Kans.
Carnahan	Landrum	Smith, Miss.
Carrigg	Latham	Springer
Cederberg	LeCompte	Staggers
Chenoweth	Lipscomb	Stauffer
Chiperfield	Long	Taber
Church	Lovre	Talle
Clevenger	Lucas	Teague
Cole, Mo.	Lyle	Thomas
Cole, N. Y.	McCarthy	Thompson, La.
Condon	McConnell	Thompson,
Cooley	McCormack	Mich.
Coon	McCulloch	Thompson, Tex.
Cooper	McDonough	Thornberry
Corbett	McGregor	Tollefson
Cotton	McIntire	Trimble
Crumpacker	McVey	Utt
Cunningham	Mack, Ill.	Van Pelt
Curtis, Mass.	Mack, Wash.	Van Zandt
Curtis, Mo.	Magnuson	Vinson
Curtis, Nebr.	Mahon	Vorys
Dague	Mailliard	Vursell
Davis, Ga.	Martin, Iowa	Wainwright
Deane	Mason	Walter
Dempsey	Matthews	Warburton
Derounian	Meader	Westland
Devereux	Merrill	Wharton
D'Ewart	Merrow	Wheeler
Dies	Metcalf	Whitten
Dolliver	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Dondero	Miller, Kans.	Wigglesworth
Donovan	Miller, Md.	Williams, Miss.
Durham	Miller, Nebr.	Williams, N. Y.
Edmondson	Mills	Willis
Ellsworth	Moss	Wilson, Calif.
Engle	Moulder	Wilson, Ind.
Evins	Natcher	Wolcott
Fenton	Neal	Wolverton
Fernandez	Nelson	Yorty
Fisher	Nicholson	Young
Ford	Norrell	Younger

NAYS—105

Abbitt	Gordon	O'Hara, Ill.
Addonizio	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Alexander	Gregory	O'Konski
Ashmore	Gross	O'Neill
Barden	Hagen, Calif.	Perkins
Barrett	Hardy	Philbin
Boland	Harrison, Va.	Poage
Bonner	Hays, Ohio	Polk
Buchanan	Heller	Powell
Budge	Heselton	Price
Byrne, Pa.	Holtzman	Rabaut
Byrnes, Wis.	Jackson	Rees, Kans.
Canfield	Javits	Rhodes, Pa.
Carlyle	Johnson, Wis.	Robeson, Va.
Colmer	Jonas, N. C.	Rodino
Cretella	Jones, N. C.	Rogers, Fla.
Crosser	Karsten, Mo.	Rooney
Davis, Wis.	Kean	Roosevelt
Dawson, Utah	Keating	Shuford
Delaney	Kee	Sikes
Dodd	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Va.
Dollinger	Kelly, N. Y.	Smith, Wis.
Donohue	Kirwan	Spence
Dorn, N. Y.	Kluczynski	Steed
Dowdy	Laird	Sullivan
Doyle	Lane	Tuck
Eberharter	Lesinski	Velde
Feighan	McMillan	Watts
Fogarty	Machrowicz	Widnall
Forand	Madden	Wier
Fountain	Marshall	Wilson, Tex.
Friedel	Morgan	Winstead
Garmatz	Multer	Withrow
Gary	Murray	Yates
Gentry	Norblad	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—64

Ayres	Fino	Miller, N. Y.
Bailey	Forrester	Mollohan
Battle	Gamble	Morano
Bender	Green	Morrison
Bentley	Gwinn	Mumma
Bowler	Hagen, Minn.	Patten
Buckley	Hart	Pillion
Camp	Herlong	Rains
Campbell	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Holifield	Riley
Chatham	James	Rivers
Chelf	Jensen	Roberts
Chudoff	Judd	Seely-Brown
Clardy	Kearney	Siemenski
Coudert	Kearns	Stringfellow
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Sutton
Dawson, Ill.	King, Pa.	Taylor
Dingell	Klein	Wampler
Dorn, S. C.	Knox	Weichel
Elliott	Krueger	Williams, N. J.
Fallon	Lanham	
Fine	Lantaff	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Camp for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Forrester for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Mollohan for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Morano for, with Mr. Fine against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Bowler against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Chudoff against.

Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Green against.

Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Mumma for, with Mr. Campbell against.

Mr. James for, with Mr. Lantaff against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Siemiński against.

Mr. Elliott for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kearney with Mr. Battle.

Mr. King of Pennsylvania with Mr. Riley.

Mr. Hagen of Minnesota with Mr. Chelf.

Mr. Gamble with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Miller of New York with Mr. Sutton.

Mr. Stringfellow with Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

Mr. Seely-Brown with Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Bentley with Mr. Fallon.

Mr. Reed of Illinois with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Jensen with Mr. Dorn of South Carolina.

Mr. Shafer with Mr. Lanham.

Mr. HALE changed his vote from "nay" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN SOUDAS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request from the Senate:

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the engrossed bill (S. 1138) entitled "An act for the relief of John Soudas."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the Senate will be complied with.

There was no objection.

INCREASING THE BORROWING AUTHORITY OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 459 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7339) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of House bill 7339, a bill to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It would give the Commodity Credit Corporation authority to borrow up to $8,500,000,000, which is an increase of $1¾ billion over its present authority.

This is an open rule providing for 2 hours' general debate, the time to be controlled equally by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the ranking minority member thereof.

I am advised that this bill was reported unanimously by the committee. The committee adopted an amendment making the provisions of the bill effective immediately. This action was based upon the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture, who testified that this legislation is needed at this time in order that the Corporation may continue its operations between now and July 1.

I will not go into further details in this brief statement. I am for this legislation and I hope the rule will be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out, there being many more Members on the floor at the present time than there may be later on, that it is my intention, and I understand the intention of other Members, to discuss this resolution in terms of the whole farm price policy, in terms of the administration program on that policy, and the opposition to it. This authorization of money provided by this bill is intended to implement the present 90 percent fixed farm price support policy.

We had this up the other day in connection with a resolution to cancel certain notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation. But this is the payoff on that proposition and would increase authority of the CCC by $1¾ billion in addition to what its authority now is in this very field. I thought it would be proper at this time to advise the membership that the whole farm price policy is going to be under debate.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7339) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7339, with Mr. CANFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill simply implements the farm support program which is set forth in other legislation. At the present time the Commodity Credit Corporation, taking into consideration the moneys which we made available to it lately by writing off some of their obligations, have left about $350 million of borrowing authority. The bill provides for an increase in borrowing authority from the present $6.75 billion to $8.5 billion. I believe we can assume that as of now this will be sufficient authority to carry them into the next year. We will not know, of course, with any degree of accuracy, whether it is going to be sufficient until we have some better estimates than we have now on the new

crops which will come in later in the summer and in the fall.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is merely to effectuate the farm program as it is now on the statute books. The bill has passed the other body. I might add that because the Commodity Credit Corporation is running out of money, as I said down to about $350 million of authority at the present time, it was found advisable to suggest as a committee amendment that section 3 of the bill be stricken. This provided that this authority would not be available until July 1 of this year. The demands upon the Corporation have exceeded estimates since the bill was introduced on January 18. This is all pretty well covered in the appropriation bill which was before us in February under which we canceled some of this indebtedness which we had, under our mandate, compelled the CCC to use in respect to the International Wheat Agreement and of the hoof-and-mouth disease program as well as estimated losses under its price support operations.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

DEFEAT MONOPOLY'S OPPOSITION TO COMPULSORY COMPETITION BY LENDERS ON PUBLIC UTILITY SECURITIES

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, recently the special interests have been striving desperately to do away with the regulation adopted by the Securities and Exchange Commission to compel competitive bidding among those desiring to furnish money on the security of stocks and bonds of public utility companies and their subsidiaries. It is reported also that the present Securities and Exchange Commission is planning to limit the competitive bidding rule, which was adopted pursuant to requirements of the Public Utility Holding Company Act, and to narrow the scope of Rule U–50 to such extent as will make it almost useless, and therefore would release public utility companies almost entirely from the requirements of Rule U–50. This apparently harmless proposal strikes at the very foundation of the Commission's regulation requiring competitive bidding. It would greatly harm the many millions of consumers in this Nation. It would also do gross injustice to the many owners of public utility securities by forcing such security owners to pay unreasonably high charges for the services of especially favored banks or other lenders of money on the stocks and bonds of public utility companies.

Mr. Chairman, if there be any present who would minimize the danger just mentioned, let me quote in part Burns' advice to a young friend, when he said:

> But Och! mankind are unco weak
> An' little to be trusted;
> If Self the wavering balance shake
> It's rarely right adjusted!

I remember well when, early in 1941, the Securities and Exchange Commission was considering the adoption of a regulation to enforce competitive bidding among lenders of money on public-utility securities. By invitation of the Commission I spoke in favor of the adoption of a regulation compelling competitive bidding among those seeking to loan money on securities of public-utility companies. I was pleased to learn later that the Commission had adopted rule U-50 providing for compulsory competitive bidding.

The rule adopted by the Commission requiring competitive bidding has been in force for 13 years. It has helped to lessen the cost of securing capital by public-utility companies, and assisted in establishing and continuing conditions favorable to competitive bidding in financing operations in general. Why, then, should the Commission even seriously consider, much less strive to disturb this very desirable situation?

Mr. Chairman, competition is clearly necessary in the democratic system of free enterprise. Because competition is essential for the development of individual initiative and the system of free enterprise, and in order to make as sure as possible, the development and continuation of such competitive conditions in industry and commerce, Congress passed the Sherman antitrust law, the Clayton antitrust law, and the Federal Trade Commission law. These measures were passed in order to prohibit the making of harmful and unjust arrangements for the purpose of preventing free and open buying and the selling of commodities or property of any kind. The laws just mentioned aimed also, of course, to provide for the continuance and improvement of conditions necessary for free and fair competition.

In view of the facts just mentioned, it is then proper to ask those who claim to favor the free-enterprise system, those alleged champions of fair dealing, why any one should be allowed to interfere with competitive bidding in the sale of public utility securities?

The especially favored bankers and other lenders who are eager to abolish the competitive bidding rule, continually prattle about free enterprise and chirp about individual initiative. If, however, they can succeed in having wiped off the books, the regulation which provides for compulsory bidding, it would not be at all possible for individual initiative or free enterprise to continue. If we allow utility officials to go back to the evil system of the good old days when they made deals, in private, and confidentially, with especially privileged lenders, it is clear that other lenders of capital, not in the charmed circle of favored banks, would have no opportunity to lend money to public utilities, at a lower charge and on terms which, also in other respects, would be fairer, from the standpoint of the consumers, who must buy electricity, gas, or other commodities furnished by public utility companies. Without competition, public utility companies are forced to pay for loans, unreasonably high charges to especially favored lenders. In addition however to the advantage of competition to the consumers, it would be much fairer to the owners of public utility securities to compel competitive bidding by lenders in connection with their offers to furnish capital. Without such proper supervision and regulation, however, and according to the old, discredited, indefensible custom, such utility companies are compelled to pay for such loans, the excessive charges made by favored bankers.

Uncontrolled by any proper official regulation as to charges for furnishing such capital, great money lenders in the charmed circle are then allowed to maneuver for the privilege of financing public utilities. Free from governmental control, it is easy to see that such especially favored financiers are then able to demand and collect from public-utility companies, charges altogether out of reason for their alleged service. Moreover, even a worse evil is the fact that in order to secure the money necessary to pay to especially privileged lenders, their unjust, unreasonable, and unwarranted charges for furnishing capital to the utility companies, the public-utility companies are forced to mulct the public, consisting of you and me and every other consumer in this Nation.

Public-utility companies require large amounts of capital to provide their necessary plant and equipment. The cost, to utility companies, of securing such capital is, therefore, a substantial and very important part of their expense, an expense which must finally be paid with money, collected from the consuming public, by utility companies, who naturally charge unreasonably high prices for their gas, electric current, or for other utility product, derived from the natural resources provided by the Creator. The only way, to be sure that needed capital will be secured by utility companies at the lowest possible cost, is to provide, by law, that competition, by banks and other lenders, for the right to furnish such capital, to public-utility companies, must be altogether free from coercion by lending institutions.

The public welfare, the protection of consumers and also the rights of owners of public-utility securities, all demand that the requirement that competitive bidding, in the sale of utility securities, should continue in full force and effect. Moreover, the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 clearly stated that the agency of the Government which was authorized and directed to administer said act was the Securities and Exchange Commission. That was an order by the highest lawmaking authority of the United States.

In that act just mentioned, Congress condemned the shocking evils, connected with financing arrangements by utility companies, due to the lack of free, uncontrolled, and uncoerced dealing.

In the light of what has been said, the Commission, according to every standard of duty, should wholeheartedly uphold the act. The lack of opportunity for the utility companies to secure capital at reasonable cost, results in great injury to consumers, to owners of public utility securities, and to the general public. Congress, therefore, as already stated, ordered that these evils be thoroughly uprooted and ended forever.

Nevertheless one of the largest institutions, engaged in the business of fi-

nancing public-utility companies, bluntly states in public print:

> We do not believe in compulsory competitive bidding for corporate securities.

Mr. Chairman, we know that for many years the evil of monopoly has been condemned almost unanimously by public opinion. We have noted also the efforts of Congress for generations to plan antitrust and antimonopoly laws to protect the general public and to assure the people as fully as possible, of freedom from unfair and evil practices in the buying and selling of commodities. It is, therefore, unbelievable, yes, astounding, that in one of the most important markets of all, namely, the money market, there should be a sinister power which can flout public opinion, and sneer at efforts to assure true freedom in bargaining for the purchase of credit.

The situation is explained, to some extent, by the old saying that "power grows on what it feeds on." Those, therefore, who succeed in being especially favored in matters of business, yes, such presumptuous persons, always become more arrogant as their power, resulting from their special privileges, increases. It is regrettable, however, that, with the continued growth of such power, there is also, on the part of the power's victims, the people, a tendency to regard as futile any effort to outlaw or resist such unwarranted use of power. Referring to such feeling of futility on the part of many and, to their timidity about supporting a just cause, James Russell Lowell expressed the true idea forcibly and effectively in the lines, which I quote as follows:

> They are slaves who fear to speak
> For the fallen and the weak,
> They are slaves who will not choose
> Hatred, scoffing, and abuse,
> Rather than in silence shrink
> From the Truth they need but think.
> They are slaves who dare not be
> In the right with two or three.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 7339 provides for an increase of $1,750,000,000 in the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation is perhaps the most important of all the agencies of the United States Government in maintaining the economic health of the Nation, and, of course, particularly of the farmers. It is the financial organization through which are carried out the loans and purchases providing price supports for farmers. It has had a fine record of achievement, before World War II, during the war, and since.

At the present the Corporation has a borrowing power of $6,750,000,000. This means that we, the Congress, have placed a limit of $6¾ billion on the amount the Corporation may owe the United States Treasury or banks at any one time. The limit applies to the sum of actual borrowings and obligations on the part of the Corporation to reimburse banks for CCC loans such banks make with their own funds as lending agencies of the Corporation.

Although we placed this limit on the Corporation's financial resources we, the Congress, have by laws which we have passed directed the Corporation to carry out price-support operations for farmers. We have said that the Corporation shall carry out these operations because we recognize clearly the key importance of a sound and prosperous farm economy to the prosperity of the Nation as a whole. We have recognized the magnificent production job that farmers did for the free world during and after the late war. We have insisted that farmers' incomes be protected during the period of production adjustment that must inevitably follow the high levels attained to meet war and immediate postwar needs.

May I point out that firm contracts were given for industrial production at cost plus a profit to meet the needs of the Nation during World War II and in the emergency since. Not only that, but huge grants were made to get industry to expand. More than $29 billion in quick tax amortization were granted. We have built up and now have on hand $129 million worth of military material, but this is not on the domestic market. At the end of World War II industry was granted about $16 billion for reconversion to keep industrial labor employed.

With a few minor exceptions, there were no grants nor quick tax amortization made to farmers. Nor were firm contracts given for increased agricultural production, and 90 percent of the comparative purchasing power the farmer had in 1909–14 through loans was the usual maximum. Much of such production was held in this country by export restrictions when large profits could have been had from sale on the world markets. With the end of World War II no such payments were made to farmers as were made to industry for reconversion costs.

Mr. Chairman, when the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before our committee he presented a table showing that the cost—not of the program under discussion today but of the entire agricultural program—from 1932 to 1953 was many billion dollars.

But what did he include in that figure? Was the table confined to the price-support program? No, Mr. Chairman. The table included much other material. The evidence he submitted included costs of the program for soil conservation, and conservation of natural resources—work which includes flood control and things of that character. He charged all these costs to agriculture, although the subject before our committee dealt solely with price-support programs.

The truth of the matter is that over a span of 20 years from October 17, 1933, to December 31, 1953, the losses suffered in connection with the price-support program for basic commodities—cotton, corn, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—were only about $63 million. By supporting cotton the Government experienced a profit of $268 million. Tobacco netted a profit of about $1,600,000. Relatively small losses, considering the size of the programs, were experienced on corn and wheat.

The large losses experienced by the Commodity Credit Corporation in its price-support program have been experienced on supporting the nonbasic commodities. As of December 31, 1953, the loss on nonbasic commodities was approximately $1,100,000,000. Almost half a billion dollars was lost in supporting Irish potatoes. This is a program on which I always had a great deal of reservation.

As you know, this program was terminated several years ago. The price supports on eggs cost the Government almost $200 million. Eggs are no longer being purchased. During the war as an emergency wartime program the Commodity Credit Corporation undertook to stimulate production of flax in order to assure this country of an adequate supply of linseed oil. The cost of this program amounted to approximately $75 million. I believe that the results of the flax program justified this expenditure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to address my remarks to some of my urban colleagues who have been critical of the price-support program. For the past 3 years the American farmer has experienced a steady decline in income. In 1953 net farm income was about 7.5 percent below that of 1952. The welfare of the American economy is directly related to the prosperity of the American farmer. Throughout our history economic downturns in our economy have first appeared upon the farm. Once again I feel we may be retracing this tragic pattern. Industrial production as measured by the Federal Reserve Board index declined from 137 in July 1953 to 125 in January 1954. At the present time, unemployment is about 3,500,000. Much of this business decline and unemployment is centered in industries which must depend on the farmers for a substantial percentage of their market. In light of these facts, I believe that it would be exceedingly shortsighted for members from city districts to vote to end mandatory price supports. I feel that the Secretary of Agriculture's stand against mandatory price supports is exceedingly unwise. I am very happy, therefore, that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has taken a firm stand against the abandonment of mandatory price supports.

I should like to close my remarks by quoting from the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

> Whatever the merits of flexible supports and modern parity may or may not be as a long-run program it is questionable whether their contribution at this time will act to sustain farm income in the months immediately ahead when the threat to our economic stability is so generally recognized. On the contrary, it seems more likely that the proposed shift to modernized parity at this particular time would be an unnecessary disrupting factor.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the hearings on this bill to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I directed certain questions to the Secretary of Agriculture which in the light of the debate today are I think significant and at this point I submit the following questions directed to Mr. Benson and his replies:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. DEANE.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I want to express to the Secretary my appreciation for his willingness to come back. I am mindful of the terrific pressure all of us operate under these days, and I wonder if because of that pressure we have poor legislation, we simply don't have time to reason together on what is right. Mr. Secretary, what is the need for price support, if there isn't a surplus?

Secretary BENSON. I didn't get the last phrase.

Mr. DEANE. I say, what is the need for price support, unless we do have a surplus?

Secretary BENSON. I appreciate, very much, Mr. DEANE, your kind remarks. I would like to say that the President, sensing the importance of the legislation that is being considered here this morning, granted me permission to leave the Cabinet meeting, after the most pressing matters had been disposed of. I am sorry I couldn't be here earlier.

It is my personal feeling, Mr. DEANE, that the agricultural industry has been geared up to an industrial economy, and operates on a much different basis than it did a generation or so ago, is influenced much more by market fluctuations in prices, up and down movements, and the operation is more hazardous than it was at another time, possibly.

Therefore, price supports can be used and used effectively to give some protection, by placing floors under farm prices to prevent undue fluctuations. Particularly is that true in the case of commodities that are storable, where they can be carried over from one year to the next, to level out the up and down swings.

Mr. DEANE. In other words, I gain, from your answer, that there is a need for, and there must be price supports?

Secretary BENSON. Well, I don't know that there must be, but it seems to me that they have a place, particularly in the storable commodities and to a lesser extent, possibly, in some of the semiperishable commodities, providing there is some flexibility and some discretion in their use.

Mr. DEANE. I have heard many definitions of parity. Would you agree on this definition: "That parity is a standard for measuring prices of farm products, in relation to prices paid by farmers for things they buy?"

Secretary BENSON. I think that is a very good definition, Mr. DEANE.

Mr. DEANE. What is the present drop in prices to the farmer, covering the things he is having to buy?

Secretary BENSON. Do you mean the index of the things he uses in production?

Mr. DEANE. Yes.

Secretary BENSON. I don't know that I could give you the exact figure. Perhaps Mr. Morse can give it to you. He has been dealing with some of these figures more recently.

Mr. MORSE. Following Korea——

Mr. DEANE. Let's take wheat, for example. Let's take the machinery, fertilizer, and various elements that go into the things that the farmer must purchase to produce wheat. What is the variation in price now, as compared with months ago?

Mr. MORSE. These costs of farmers——

Mr. DEANE. I am thinking now of a wheat farmer.

Mr. MORSE. Well, that would apply to wheat farmers. The costs tend to remain up after a period of inflation.

Mr. DEANE. Do you have figures that you could give?

Mr. MORSE. The effective measurement is in this parity ratio, which, following Korea, started down, from 113 in February 1951—100 presumably being in balance. Last January, a year ago, when Secretary Benson came into office, it had reached 94. The decline during the previous year had been 10 points. It went on down from 94 to 90 in November. It has since recovered 2 points, so that it stands now, as compared with a year ago, down 2 points in the year, against a 10-point decline the previous year.

That is the overall measurement of the position of the farmer, and what has happened to him in these recent years.

Mr. DEANE. That will apply to the wheat farmer, the cotton farmer, and the dairy farmer?

Mr. MORSE. It will apply broadly to farmers, because they are all purchasers of fertilizer, machinery, gas, oil, insecticides, chemicals, and all the things that enter into farming.

(The following data was submitted by Mr. DEANE, at p. 91.)

[1910–14=100]

Period	Prices paid for items used in: Living	Prices paid for items used in: Production	Parity index (prices paid, interest, taxes, and wage rates)	Prices received by farmers	Parity ratio [1]
1939 monthly average	120	121	123	95	77
1942 monthly average	149	148	152	159	105
1944 monthly average	175	173	182	[2] 197	108
1946 monthly average	202	191	208	[2] 236	113
1948 monthly average	251	250	260	287	110
1949 monthly average	243	238	251	250	100
1950 monthly average	246	246	256	258	101
June 15	243	247	255	249	98
1951 monthly average	268	273	282	302	107
1952 monthly average	271	274	287	288	100
1953 monthly average	270	283	279	258	92
1952—Dec. 15	269	264	281	268	95
1953—Jan. 15	268	265	284	268	94
Feb. 15	266	261	281	264	94
Mar. 15	269	261	282	264	94
Apr. 15	269	257	280	259	92
May 15	270	257	280	263	94
June 15	271	248	277	257	93
July 15	271	250	279	260	93
Aug. 15	273	249	279	255	91
Sept. 15	270	247	277	257	93
Oct. 15	270	246	276	249	90
Nov. 15	270	248	277	249	90
Dec. 15	270	250	278	254	91
1954—Jan. 15	271	254	282	259	92

[1] Ratio of index of prices received by farmers to parity index.

[2] Includes wartime subsidy payments paid on beef cattle, sheep, lambs, milk, and butterfat between October 1943 and June 1946.

Source: Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DEANE. What is the average annual income of a farmer?

Mr. MORSE. Could we supply that and have it right, sir?

"The total income per farm operator in 1953 was $2,212."

Mr. DEANE. I notice, Mr. Secretary, in a speech you made in New York Monday night, that you say it represented about 5 percent of the national income.

Secretary BENSON. Yes, in round figures, I think that is the figure I used. The farm population represents in round figures about 15 percent of the population, but the percentage of the national income which is coming to farmers from farming is around 5 percent.

Mr. DEANE. How does that compare, do you think, with what he deserves?

Secretary BENSON. Well, I don't think it is enough, certainly.

Mr. DEANE. And if there hadn't been price support, do you think that percentage figure would be up or down?

Secretary BENSON. Well, that would require considerable analysis with respect to various commodities. You see, we have 90 percent supports on some of the basic commodities now, but that doesn't necessarily mean that the farmer will get that.

As an example, corn is being supported at 90 percent, but the average price to the farmer at the present time is only 79 percent of parity, and I think that one of the charts that was attached to the statement yesterday indicated that over the 20-year period, the prices of unsupported commodities had averaged about along the same line with the supported commodities, if not a little higher.

But there are times, certainly, when supports can be used effectively to prevent market declines, by the Government providing a floor, and by the storing of commodities. However, that cannot go on indefinitely if great surpluses accumulate. Eventually, the price level will go down regardless of what the support level is, and we are facing that situation now in the case of wheat. We are scouring the country to try to get enough storage space for wheat, and I don't know what we will do next year if we should get better than normal yields.

Of course, we never know what the yields will be. We can't predict those. But it looks as though we will have a carryover of something over 800 million bushels, which is enough for a year's supply without any production next year. So you reach a point, if supports are maintained at a rigid, high level, when the inducement of those supports brings in new land, stimulates heavy production, and you may reach the point when eventually the program will collapse of its own weight, unless something is done to move the crops into consumption.

Mr. DEANE. I am coming to that in a moment. Before you came in Mr. BROWN was directing a question, or brought out the fact that he was concerned about the word "loss" being used so frequently in connection with the price-support program. It has given me a great deal of concern. I see the word "losses" appearing a number of times in your statement, and I certainly want to recognize the fact, if it is a loss, but I fear we are creating in the minds of the nonfarm group the feeling that the farmer has become the ward of the Government.

You don't think he has, do you?

Secretary BENSON. Well, no; of course I don't.

Mr. DEANE. You don't.

Secretary BENSON. I don't want him to become the ward of the Government, either.

Mr. DEANE. The figures given us would indicate that if the price-support program reflects a loss for the years 1933–53 its total for all commodities for 20 years is $1,226 million. I wonder if the nonfarm group realizes the fact, and I wonder if you use this figure occasionally; that since the end of World War II, industry was granted approximately $16 billion for reconversion from war to peace to keep industrial labor employed. Keep in mind this $16 billion for industry and labor, and $1 billion for this 20-year period, for the farmers. We need to remind all our people of the millions and millions of dollars that were involved in firm contracts for industrial production on a cost-plus basis. What I am saying is not intended to array one group against the other.

Secretary BENSON. I understand that.

Mr. DEANE. We need to impress upon the minds of the thinking public, through the press, that the farmer has not become a ward of the Government when you consider these enormous millions and billions of dollars paid to industry.

I carry it a step further: Within recent years, $29 billion has been given to industry in the form of quick tax amortization. Something was said a moment ago, I believe

by Mr. Morse, that quick amortizations have been given to encourage the construction of storage facilities. I don't know whether the farmer figures in that amortization program for a storage bin.

Secretary BENSON. Yes, sir; he does.

Mr. DEANE. If he does, I am glad to know that. And also, in the President's state of the Union message, he had something like this to say, that a proposal or suggestion that business firms would be permitted to depreciate their capital expenditures, at a notably faster rate than has been previously allowed, without special Government permission.

Taking an additional step, when you think about the so-called loss under the farm price-support program, I fear that we are forgetting the facts as to what we have honestly done for business.

Mr. Secretary, in your statement, on page 8, you say: "We recognize the need for Federal aid to agriculture on a very broad scale when it becomes necessary."

I wonder if you would mind elaborating, Mr. Secretary, on what you mean by "on a very broad scale"?

Secretary BENSON. May I say, first, Mr. DEANE, that several times, in public addresses, I have referred to the fact that agriculture is certainly not the only segment of our economy that has received subsidy or other assistance from the Federal Government, and I have pointed out some of these other groups.

I think there is justification for the Government going quite a long way during an emergency period, particularly, to induce the type of industrial production, or the type of farm production which is needed to meet a great emergency, and, of course, that was the reason why the high rigid price supports were established. That was the principle argument used.

But there is often a tendency to continue emergency measures after the emergency ends and, of course, our agriculture has become great and efficient not because of subsidies, but because the farmer has had a maximum of freedom to use the facilities at hand in keeping with his very best judgment and in keeping with good farm-management practices.

Now, there have been many things—when I say "broadly" I include much of the work, practically all of the work, that is being done, for example, by the United States Department of Agriculture, and by the land-grant colleges, through the experiment stations and the extension services, and what is being done in the field of conservation, REA, and the various other agencies. This matter of price support is only a part of the overall program for agriculture.

Sometimes I think it is emphasized beyond its importance, relative importance, at least, to the farmer.

Mr. DEANE. Right along that line, on page 1126 of the President's budget, among the so-called aids, I notice "Aids to air navigation" totaling $80 million.

Ship-operating subsidies, $91 million.

Navigation aids to Coast Guard, $138 million.

International aids, economic and technical, $946 million.

Then I notice, in 1953, current aids and special services, on the bottom of page 1121 of the budget, agriculture, $305 million, business, $934 million.

Now, for the new fiscal year there is going to be perhaps a drop in aids to business by some $300 million in view of the economy moves and the transfers of Post Office obligations to other agencies. But still, agriculture, taking into consideration these things that you have mentioned, is still far under what the business economy is receiving in the form of aids.

Now, I move to this question, and I certainly feel, Mr. Secretary, that you will not feel that I am being partisan, because I really am not. What was the date on which you entered into the purchasing of butter at 90 percent of parity?

Secretary BENSON. The decision, which I made—if that is what you are referring to—as Secretary of Agriculture, was for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1953. That year expires at the end of next month.

Mr. DEANE. Do you have a figure on just what that has amounted to up to the present time?

Secretary BENSON. The total expenditures?

Mr. DEANE. Yes, sir.

Secretary BENSON. We have it here.

Mr. BEACH. The figure on butter, total purchases from April 1, 1953, through February 17 of this year, was 200,060,000 pounds, roughly.

Mr. DEANE. How long can you store that butter safely, without deterioration?

Secretary BENSON. I am not sure that we can answer that accurately because we haven't had very much experience in the storage of butter in Government hands. However, we are trying to watch it very closely, and the best judgments that we can get from those who have had some experience in the trade would indicate that we could probably store it, with a reasonable safety for a period of 1½ to 2 years, under ideal storage conditions.

Mr. DEANE. Well, how much of this butter have you sold on the international market, at competitive world prices?

Secretary BENSON. I don't think there has been any sold on the world market at competitive prices.

Mr. DEANE. I realize that my good friend here from Brooklyn, and his constituents, might have something to say about the fact if you moved into the world market at competitive world prices, at a figure somewhat lower than what his constituents or even mine might pay, but don't you think that that is something that you should seriously think about?

Secretary BENSON. As a matter of fact, it is something we have seriously thought about, Mr. DEANE.

Mr. DEANE. What do you contemplate?

Secretary BENSON. I don't know that we are ready to announce any plan for disposal. We are working on several possible angles. But, of course, we are very anxious to get more of these dairy products moved into consumption here, in many areas where there is a need for greater consumption of these protective foods—dairy products. We think that there is not a great opportunity to move a lot of butter in competition with other countries. Normally we don't export butter. We do export some dried milk, and of course, we hope that we can expand the markets in that field, but normally very little butter moves into export.

Mr. DEANE. In other words, it is your feeling that you wouldn't be able to move any appreciable amount of this butter in the international world market at competitive prices?

Secretary BENSON. Of course, we don't know exactly how much we could move. We might be able to move some. Of course, the fact remains that what has happened, actually, is that butter has been priced out of the domestic market. The dairymen recognize that. They have been rather slow to recognize it, some of them, but I think they generally recognize it now, that it has been priced out of the market in competition with other spreads. As a result butter consumption, domestically, has declined markedly, while competing spreads consumption has increased over the same period.

Mr. DEANE. Let's move to cotton. What was the purpose of the Export-Import Bank?

Secretary BENSON. Well, you probably are in a better position to answer that than I am. I understood it was to help facilitate the financing of foreign trade.

Mr. DEANE. And that policy, or the facilities of the Export-Import Bank, is no longer being fully used.

Secretary BENSON. No longer exists?

Mr. DEANE. That is right. Has it been abolished?

Secretary BENSON. No; I don't think it has been abolished. It still continues. As a matter of fact, we have been working with the bank, as you may know, to provide, for instance, of cotton in foreign ports. We have urged and recommended that.

Mr. DEANE. Well, let's take cotton on the international world competitive price basis. Have you moved any of the cotton onto the world market at competitive prices?

Secretary BENSON. I can't give you the quantity, but we have moved some, and we are moving some right along. I am sure of that. And of course, we hope that we will be able to move more.

As I pointed out yesterday, I think, we did lose part of our world market when we placed a restriction on cotton to the point where we actually placed an embargo on exports.

Mr. DEANE. I know that in the previous administration, and perhaps in this one—and I don't want to array one administration or agency against the other—but I wonder if our State Department, past and present, if they are showing the cooperation that they should in encouraging the Department of Agriculture to get into this competitive world market for our surpluses?

Secretary BENSON. That is a matter of opinion, I presume. We feel that the cooperation is pretty good, and is improving, as we are working with these other agencies, and they come to understand more completely the seriousness of our surplus situation today. I think they have come to recognize that we have got to move part of this into export markets.

Mr. DEANE. This certainly is a program you should seriously consider; especially when the current budget on international aids, economical and technical, is $946 millions.

Secretary BENSON. Could I comment on that point, first?

Mr. DEANE. Yes.

Secretary BENSON. I have a figure here now that coarse cotton continues as the Nation's most important farm export. In December of this year, the sales of cotton abroad were $68 million, which indicates that there is quite a lot of it moving in foreign export.

Mr. DEANE. Well, I wonder if that is the reason that the price-support program on cotton shows a decided profit?

Mr. BEACH. The profit on cotton, through December 31, was approximately $268 million as shown on the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. DEANE. I am glad to have that figure, Mr. Secretary. If we were as aggressive with the other crops as we have been for cotton, perhaps our surplus problem might be different.

Secretary BENSON. Certainly the cotton industry has been very aggressive in promoting its production abroad, and I am sure many of the other producers have also. I am not sure. It is very difficult to measure. But that profit which you refer to was largely due to an increase in price level. It just happened that the Commodity Credit Corporation had huge stocks when the inflationary war period came, and as a result of that, there were some profits realized.

It might have been otherwise, and it may be otherwise today unless we move a lot more of it into consumption than is being done now.

Mr. DEANE. I wonder if Mr. Beach can tell us about section 32 funds. I understand that this section provides for the use of 30 percent of import duties to move farm products in world trade. How many dollars have been used in the last 2 years for that purpose, Mr. Beach?

Mr. BEACH. How many dollars have been used in the last 2 years?

Mr. DEANE. That is right.

Mr. BEACH. I don't have the actual figures here, but my recollection is that in the current fiscal year, and in the most recent fiscal year, a total of something over $200 million of section 32 funds were used for all purposes.

Secretary BENSON. I might add, Mr. DEANE, that we are using some of those funds now to finance these trade missions that are going into Asia and Europe, and South American countries, to help promote the expansion and the opening up of markets for our surplus farm commodities.

Mr. DEANE. I have this final question, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly have been trying to keep my questions directed to the bill, but I don't see how we can keep from getting somewhat into the flexible price-support program.

Now, if Congress does nothing, so far as legislation is concerned, we will get flexible price support on January 1, 1955, will we not?

Secretary BENSON. Yes, sir; my understanding of the 1948–49 acts, which were passed by overwhelming majorities of both parties, is that they would become operative.

Mr. DEANE. That being true, under the 1948–49 acts, new parity on all crops will be 75 percent.

Secretary BENSON. No; I don't think that is a fair conclusion at all. In the first place, the President has wisely provided setting aside $2½ billion worth of these surpluses, to be fed out over a period of years, and they would not figure in the calculations which would determine the price-support level. So it is conceivable that the price-support level, after those setasides, may be near what they are now, and in some cases even higher than now.

I pointed out that in the case of wheat the support level is 90, but the realized price is only 82 percent.

Mr. DEANE. So far as present agriculture legislation, and what you would recommend is concerned, Mr. Secretary, what is the basic difference?

Secretary BENSON. Well, the basic difference is that the 1948–49 legislation would become operative, which was passed, as I indicated, and was looked upon as longtime legislation for peacetime use. That would become operative. The new program would provide for this setaside which I have mentioned, $2½ billion.

It would also provide for placing all the commodities on an equal basis as to the use of a modernized parity. It would provide for a transition from the old to the modernized parity, in the case of the 4 basic commodities, still using the old parity, in which there could not be more than 5 percentage point changes in any 1 year. But as to the price level itself, the support level, that would be gaged by a formula which is written in the 1948–49 legislation.

Mr. DEANE. I recall the President's farm message. Had you thought, Mr. Secretary, about using dairy products on the same basis as he recommended for wool?

Secretary BENSON. No; I can't say that we have, because we feel that the legislation which provides for discretionary support levels in dairy products over the years will give the protection and provide the help which the dairy industry will need, and I think it will be found to be quite workable.

Mr. MORSE. May I speak to that question, sir? There are two basic differences that need to be recognized between dairy products and wool. Wool is, first of all, considered a strategic material. Congress has so expressed itself. And, secondly, it is an item where we import over two-thirds of our requirements. Whereas we are producing a great deficit, so far as our domestic requirements are concerned, of wool, we are producing more than we are consuming of dairy products. There are two major differences.

Mr. DEANE. You don't think it would be worthwhile to experiment? Because I would assume that even wool might be worth experimentation.

Mr. MORSE. I would not consider it such. I can assure you that all of these were thoroughly explored in this very extensive process that we went through, in examining what was best for agriculture, in the way of a farm program.

Mr. DEANE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the farming industry is fraught with hazard. The farmer assumes the risks of a gambler. When he sows he does not know what he will reap nor the character of his product. In order to keep him on the farm, to keep him engaged in the great industry of feeding our people, we must do what we can to stabilize that industry. There is no way that I know that he can be given assurance that he will get a reasonable price for the products which he produces, except by the support of prices. The great means by which that has been accomplished through the years has been the Commodity Credit Corporation. It has given the farmer assurance that he will not obtain less than a designated price for his crops. That is not an agency that should be criticized by the people of the cities. The city is the market of the farmer, and if you drive the farmer off the farm, he not only ceases to produce the food you need in the cities, but he leaves the farm and goes to the city to try to get the jobs that the city people have. We must have a balanced economy in this country, whereby we will all be successful, or none of us will be successful.

This controversy that has risen between the city people and the farmers has no merit to it. If you give the farmer a starvation price he will not produce, and he will come into competition with the very people who are trying to take this support way from him. I hope that will not be done. I hope you will continue to give him the support and protection he needs. Support is a strong word. I do not know just what "flexible support" is. I know when you raise your hand and you say you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, it has a meaning. But if you say, "I will give flexible support," I do not know just what you would mean. I would say the farmer wants assurance of his price. I am no expert on flexible support, but support means rigidity and not flexibility. I want to see the farmer have the assurance that he will get a specified price that he can rely on, that he will know what it will be before he plants his crop, in order that you may give him peace of mind and assurance that he can continue to support himself and his family.

I am heartily in favor of this measure; I am heartily in favor of the objectives sought by the creation of Commodity Credit Corporation. I am, however, going to offer an amendment to compel the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell its obligations to the Treasury of the United States. Only in that way can the Secretary of the Treasury successfully maintain the management of our debt and control the interest rates. But that amendment will provide only for the purchase of the obligations they need, for the cash they need, by the Treasury of the United States, and will not have any effect upon the certificates they issue to the banks which are engaged in making Commodity Credit Corporation loans. It will prevent only their going to the big banks which have not participated in the programs and offering their securities to them rather than to the Treasury as they have recently done. I know there was a reason for the Commodity Credit Corporation to ask the banks to form a pool to purchase a billion one hundred million of their debentures and issue certificates of interest against the same, because we were just at the debt limit. If they had gone to the Treasury the Treasury by the issuance of their notes would have increased the debt probably beyond the limit. But it is bad policy to do what was done. All the top officials of the Comptroller General's Office said it was bad policy and that the Commodity Credit Corporation ought to finance its obligations in the Treasury of the United States.

This amendment will not affect a single program; it will not tie their hands in any way; it will not impair the usefulness or the activities of country banks. Those banks which are now engaged in the program who are now lending to farmers on the credit of a Commodity Credit Corporation loan will continue to do as they have been doing uncontrolled by this language.

I ask the committee to vote for that amendment when it is offered. It will put the Commodity Credit Corporation on a sounder financial basis. It will make its expenses less and its income more. It will permit it to obtain its money at a lesser rate of interest. It will have an effect upon the interest rates generally throughout the United States and will reduce Government expenses.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am interested in the gentleman's amendment. Does the gentleman propose to recommend that we also increase the debt limit so that the Treasury can finance these securities?

Mr. SPENCE. I voted to increase the debt limit; so my vote would be quite as important as my recommendation on that matter. But no one in a position to know, no one who has handled these matters thinks that it is sound policy to go to the banks of the country to finance an institution that is owned and controlled by the Government of the United States and whose obligations are guaranteed both as to principal and interest by the United States Government.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is that not what they have been doing over a long period of years?

Mr. SPENCE. No. I am not attempting to curtail the activities of those banks that are engaged in the program. They are lending money to the farmer

on the guarantee of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from going into the money market and borrowing money from the big banks who have no interest in or no association with the Commodity Credit Corporation and the farm program. They cannot have these banks finance them unless they give them an interest rate higher than the going rate. That has been shown recently. And when they do give to the banks a higher interest rate on their obligations, then the going interest rate of Treasury obligations rises with it. Interest is a very sensitive mechanism.

This amendment will not impair the usefulness or lessen the services that the Commodity Credit Corporation can render. It will save them money and put them on a sound financial basis in accordance with the opinion of the Comptroller General and all the officials of his office. They have all said that that was the sound, the safe, and the right way to proceed. We do not want corporations that are entirely governmental corporations going to private enterprise to finance themselves when they could be financed by the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. The effort to depict this piece of legislation as something we have to do because it represents empowering a Government agency to meet its commitments is an understandable one, but I do not think it quite gives us the story or shows us the alternatives, for this is the old question of the hen and the egg.

If any of us believe, and apparently a good many of us do, that the farm price policy of the country has to be changed, and we vote the amount asked here, we are taking the first step to make it possible to continue exactly the present farm price policy because this whole bill is premised on the fact that the 1954 crop will be paid for with price supports at present rates—and that includes butter.

We are told: Well, wait, gentlemen, until the farm price policy comes up. I assure you when that comes up we are likely to be told: What are you fellows talking about? You have taken the step; you have made the decision; you have decided you are going to give the CCC authority to take care of these crops at 90 percent of parity, so we are rearguing something we have already decided.

I think it is only fair to take time by the forelock and to seek to recommit this measure now, because it represents the first step in a series of steps which will continue the present high fixed farm price parity policy.

Some well-meaning people have said that some effort is being made to pit the city against the country in this debate. I do not think that is right; I do not think it depicts the situation at all, for this reason: If the countrypeople were doing superbly well with this program, then one could say an effort is being made to pit the countrypeople against the city people or vice versa. But despite all of the eloquent arguments which are made on the floor about looking after the farmer, the farmer is doing relatively badly under this program. His income this year is down about 13 percent; that is, both net and gross. His export markets have dried up to a material extent, and perhaps the most significant indication of what is happening to the farmer is that in the 5 months ending December 31, 1953, $2.5 billion of these price supports were used in only 5 months, and that is 3 times the rate of use of these funds of the years 1948 and 1949.

Now, these surpluses are piling up and up and up, and why? Because the farmer is being insulated almost completely—many other segments of the country are insulated in part; it is all a quantitative question—but the farmer is being insulated practically completely from the supply and demand factors of the open market. Now, that is destroying not the city dweller, but it is threatening to destroy the farmer. It is for the very reason that people like myself believe that a flourishing agriculture requires the change of this program. We know that the arguments of people who represent farm areas are necessarily directly affected by that fact, and we have therefore repeatedly raised this question; we may be wrong, but we have repeatedly raised this question about maintaining this program at this level and asked these facts. So, I think it is our duty to raise and argue them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, what is the gentleman's farm program?

Mr. JAVITS. All right, I am going to give it to the gentleman. I explained it once before in the preceding debate upon this very question, and I would like to do it again.

As I see the farm program, it involves the following three parts. You cannot speak of adopting the President's program in part, that is, just adopting the flexible farm price parity plan proposed. You have to consider adopting the President's policy in whole. That is the only way you can make progress with the program.

First, it includes the effort to improve and liberalize foreign trade and the open markets.

Second, it includes an effort to dispose of farm surpluses as an element in the foreign policy of the United States. This is very essential, because many free peoples are trying to get on an industrial basis but in the meantime have a food deficit, and our food surplus can be used materially to help in that situation.

Third, to put a concrete base under the farmer in the economic field through the improvement of the social-security system, improvement in unemployment insurance, and help in the housing and health situations. All that helps the ability of all our people to buy food. Therefore, on the basis of the whole administration program to put into effect a flexible price support farm policy which will, for the first time in recent years, adjust the farmer to some extent to the supply and demand position of the open market.

That is my program and my farm price policy. I think it is sound and just. That is why I am for recommital of this bill. This will enable the committee in charge to recompute what is needed only on the basis of the administration's recommended flexible farm price parity support program.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this very simple matter of merely extending the authorization from $6.75 billion to $8.5 billion does present much more serious problems than just increasing the amount of the authorization by $1.75 billion. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has just indicated, it does bring before you the entire problem. I doubt whether we will have time today to discuss the whole program. There are, as indicated by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], very serious matters of maladministration of the program which have been brought to your attention and which he will try to remedy by an amendment which he will offer.

Mr. Chairman, I want to spend a few moments first in talking about the program itself. As a Member representative of city areas who has supported the farm program not only vocally but with every vote he has ever cast on the subject, I think I have a right to call to your attention that the program is not working out with fairness to all concerned. It is not working out fairly to the farmer and it is certainly working most unfairly to the city man.

Let me quote to you very briefly from the testimony given to our committee by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, in support of this bill:

> The current situation calls for a new evaluation of the farm problem. We recognize the need for Federal aid to agriculture on a very broad scale when it becomes necessary. But the cost of the program is reaching such proportions that we must insist upon value received for these expenditures—upon getting the dollars into the pockets of farmers who need them.

I suggest an amendment to that statement by adding these words after his words " 'upon getting the dollars into the pockets of the farmers who need them' and upon getting the dollars into the pockets of all of our taxpayers who are entitled to them."

We from the city are willing to pay our share of the taxes to support this farm program but we are not willing to pay twice for the same commodity. That is what we are being asked to do under this farm program which Mr. Benson tells you needs re-evaluation.

Secretary Benson has adopted the Brannan plan as applied to wool. He tells you it is a good plan and should be adopted with reference to wool. In doing so, the city man says "Good luck to you; it is a good program," because under that program Mr. Benson tells us, and the city men go along with you and tell you, too, that then we will pay for the wool only once, then the wool will

go out into the market, the price will find its level in accordance with the law of supply and demand, and the city consumer and the farm consumer will not pay for it a second time in the high price.

When it comes to the dairy products and all the other products we are told there is a difference. Neither the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, nor anyone else can point out the distinction. For instance, in butter, he tells us butter is priced out of the market, and that is why it is not being sold. It is being stored in the warehouses instead. He fails to account to us for the increase in butter in storage to double what it was a year ago. When it was selling on the retail market at 80 cents we stored 140 million pounds. When it is selling at 75 cents we store 280 million pounds.

The National Milk Producers Federation which I understand is a respectable organization and represents the milk producers' view, came forward with a plan and indicated to Mr. Benson what he should do with these dairy products, support the price to the farmer so he will get his fair share and get parity and be able to maintain a decent living standard. After doing that, let it go out into the market and your price then will drop to 40 cents a pound, and we city folk will buy your butter and we will not have to pay for it twice, as we are now required to do.

Let me pass on to another subject very briefly. Spring is coming. Summer cottages will probably be preferred to mink coats. So let me point out that last year the Congress cut the research program for milk by some $30,000, which was to be used to find out what we could do with these dairy products and how you could help the farmer and the city folks too, the Secretary recommended it and the Congress struck out the $30,000 for research in milk. Subsequently Secretary Benson used $2,000 from the animal research appropriation to fix up a Government-owned country cottage for his own use. Well, I am glad that mink coats have now given way to country cottages.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the Secretary used $2,000 out of the research program to fix up a cottage?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir; $2,018 out of the animal research funds.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman had better investigate a little further before he makes that kind of statement.

Mr. MULTER. That comes within the jurisdiction of your committee. Suppose your committee looks into it and asks him to explain it when he comes before your committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We will give you a chance to come before our committee if you would like to do so to prove it.

Mr. MULTER. I have made the charge. I will give your committee the information, and I suggest that you ask the Secretary to explain it when he comes before your committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman's ideas are quite farfetched.

Mr. MULTER. They may be farfetched, but ask Secretary Benson, and if it is wrong and he tells you that is wrong, I will apologize on this floor to him.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Did the gentleman ask him when he was before your committee?

Mr. MULTER. I did not have the information at that time or I certainly would have asked him the question. And if you will let me know when you intend to propound the question to him before your committee, I will be glad to appear there and apologize there to him if he can satisfactorily explain the item.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us pass to another item. This is not an item involving $2,018. This is a matter involving $1,160,000 of funds which Secretary Benson borrowed to run this program. Under existing law, we authorized $6,750,000,000 and from time to time we have given additional moneys to the program by canceling their indebtedness. That was legally done because the Congress decided that was the way to do it, and they did it. Do not think that this program is going to stop at $8,500,000,000, if you pass this bill today. Secretary Benson has already warned us, as has President Eisenhower in his farm message, that he is going to ask that the commodities now stored to the extent of $2,500,000,000 be set aside and be taken out of the $8,500,000,000 so that you will still have $8,500,000,000 to use in addition to the $2,500,000,000 of the commodities that are now stored. So this is an $11 billion program. But let us talk about how he is operating the program as of now. At the present time the law specifically provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall borrow no money except with the formal approval of the Department of the Treasury, obtained in advance upon such terms and conditions as approved by the Department of the Treasury, and all such obligations shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed both as to interest and principal by the United States, and such a legend shall be endorsed upon every such obligation. In October, November of 1953 and January 1954, this program borrowed $1,160,000,000 and the Secretary of the Treasury assumed his part of the blame for this fiscal procedure because he was consulted about it and the record shows that he acquiesced in it, although he gave no formal approval in advance as required by law. The money was borrowed by the CCC issuing certificates of interest without any Government guaranty and without any legend to that effect on their face, and they were issued as follows: $360 million on October 14, 1953, at 2½ percent interest; $450 million on December 7, 1953, at 2¼ percent interest; $350 million more on January 15, 1954, at 2½ percent interest—total borrowing $1,160,000,000. Do not let anybody try to kid you and tell you that these certificates of interest are not borrowings or are not loans to the Commodity Credit Corporation because if you will look in the report on this bill in the other body and if you will look in the report of our committee of the House of Representatives on this bill you will find that that $1,160,000,000 is listed as borrowings by the Commodity Credit Corporation for this very purpose—for running this program.

At the time the Secretary of the Treasury approved, and the Secretary of Agriculture was borrowing this $1,160,000,000—and these are demand obligations. They carry a maturity date, but they provide that they are payable on demand, and any time anybody wants the money, he goes to the Commodity Credit Corporation and demands his money and gets it, with full interest. So these demand obligations, issued at these high rates of interest, were issued at the very time that the Secretary of the Treasury was borrowing short-term money at 1½ percent and less; call money, commercial call money, demand money for commercial loans, without any Government guaranties, without any Government corporate guaranties were at this time paying only 2 percent. The cost to our United States Government and to our taxpayers for this $1,160,000,000 is in excess of $106 million.

At the time that these certificates of interest were issued to borrow this money, the very bankers who bought the certificates, turned back to the United States Treasury treasury notes that were paying 1½ percent and less interest, and took instead these 2¼ percent and 2½ percent certificates which provided the money with which to carry on this program.

I am not saying and I do not intimate or infer that we should not carry on the program. Let us meet that issue when the program comes before us. The law is that this program shall be financed through the United States Treasury. But let us not soak the taxpayer more interest than he should pay. When you can borrow at 1½ percent and less, there is no excuse for borrowing at 2½ percent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In spite of the criticism which the gentleman has offered, this bill was unanimously reported by his committee, was it not?

Mr. MULTER. It was unanimously reported by the committee, after the committee had rejected the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] to correct the situation that I am talking about. He will offer his amendment here again. The gentlemen on our committee do not want to stymie the program, but they want to correct its administration. They want to see to it that the program is carried out in accordance with the law. If the law is wrong, let us change it. If you want this Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture to borrow money at high rates, if you want more inflation, if you want a greater cost to the farmer and a higher cost to the taxpayer, then let us stop talking about economy and write

into the law permission to do these things. The law now prohibits it. The Secretaries of Agriculture and Treasury have gone outside the law and violated the law.

The amendment that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] will offer will seek to keep him within the law. If the gentleman doubts what I say on the subject, I refer him to all the debates on this question through the years since we brought this program into being.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman know of any other Government operations being carried on in this respect? In other words, the people who buy these loan certificates certainly are relying upon the Federal Government to make them good when that becomes necessary, yet the amount of the loans is not carried as part of the debt of the country. Is that the situation?

Mr. MULTER. That is precisely the situation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. So this is a sort of a hoax being perpetrated upon the people of the country, because this does not show as an obligation of the United States Government. If they carry on financial operations in that way, we cannot rely upon the budget figures on the question as to whether or not it is necessary to increase the limit of the debt. That follows, too, does it not?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, it does.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the record should show, too, that this 2½ percent interest rate, the rate on the first issue of certificates, was determined in July?

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. McCARTHY. And the certificates were not issued until October?

Mr. MULTER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. In that period of time, according to the testimony of the Commodity Credit Corporation, when the rate of 2½ percent was set in July, Treasury 9-to-12-month obligations carried on interest rate of about 2.4 percent.

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Treasury and the Commodity Credit met in July and determined on a rate of 2½ percent. At that time the rate on Treasury 9- to 12-month obligations was about 2.4 percent. In October when the certificates of interest were issued at 2.5 percent the rate on Treasury 9- to 12-month obligations had dropped to about 1.7 percent.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman is right, but at the same time we must not overlook the fact that these were demand obligations, and demand obligations always carry a lower rate of interest than short-term notes or long-term notes, or bonds, or obligations.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. When we asked why the interest rate on the certificates of interest had not been lowered at the time they were issued in October we received no satisfactory answer.

Mr. MULTER. Again the gentleman is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, there are two points with reference to this legislation which I would like to discuss briefly. I realize that it might be said that they are not directly involved in this legislation before us, and I recognize that the Committee on Banking and Currency has no jurisdiction over the existing farm program or whatever it may become.

In the first place, I would like to inquire of the chairman whether or not the justifications presented to the committee were based on the existing farm program rather than on any possible changed program such as has been recommended by the President.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I am in position to say that it is predicated upon the present farm program; it would have to be predicated upon the present farm program because the new farm program has not been legislated upon.

Mr. HESELTON. I recognize that. I simply want to comment that I think we have an obligation in this Congress to address ourselves to the President's recommendations in the very near future.

In the second place, I am worried—and I know others in and out of Congress are and have been worried—about the situation insofar as wholesome food commodities are concerned.

Evidence was presented in the other body as to the amount of deterioration and spoilage that had taken place, and it runs into very large figures.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] introduced a bill Monday which would at least make an effort to improve the situation, and he courteously informed me of that fact. I introduced a somewhat modified version of it. His bill is H. R. 8117; my bill is H. R. 8178. We are interested in providing means of getting the wholesome food that is in storage, for which we are paying millions of dollars of storage—and the amount of this food runs into the millions of pounds—into the hands of people who could use it, and who would use it, if it were brought to them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to call to the attention of the House that the gentleman from Massachusetts now addressing the House was very helpful in joining me a few years ago in pushing through legislation which had much to do at least for a short period with getting surplus foods into the hands of welfare boards and old-age recipients. The gentleman from Massachusetts and I at this time are interested in extending that same principle which was so successful some years ago.

Mr. HESELTON. Again I want to say that this is not any criticism of the Committee on Banking and Currency, for they have no jurisdiction over this phase of it; but I insist that you and I and everyone in either body of this Congress have a great moral responsibility not to let this food be destroyed or spoil, especially while people are hungry and cannot afford to buy the food. So we are not interfering with the normal trade channels in any way whatsoever. We are just presenting this as a solution to prevent the spoilage and other waste and loss of this food. We feel that the proposal we have presented at least makes a stride in the right direction.

I am not sure that any of us would be justified necessarily in opposing this bill that is proposed this afternoon, but I am inclined to think that in view of the amount of credit that is available still—and I may say that I have some real hope the Committee on Agriculture is going to give a hearing on these various proposals fairly soon—that we might put the horse before the cart by recommitting this bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency temporarily for further study and to see what developments may appear in the near future.

We may find some degree of order out of the whole picture and begin to eliminate the terrific cost to the taxpayers and also relieve hunger wherever hunger exists. I think every Member of this body feels keenly that if we have an opportunity to pass on that type of a bill which will relieve the Treasury and the taxpayers, on the one hand, and will assist in taking care of people who are hungry and cannot afford to buy these foods, then we will be taking most constructive and humane action.

While there are a great many groups and individuals who are becoming more and more concerned every day as to what may happen to the gigantic supplies of food commodities held in storage by the Commodity Credit Corporation, I want to mention one group particularly. It is the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc. The following are the member agencies:

Adventist Relief Agency of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

American Baptist Relief.

American Bureau for Medical Aid to China, Inc.

American Committee for Émigré Scholars, Writers and Artists, Inc.

American Committee of OSE, Inc.

American Federation of International Institutes, Inc.

American Friends Service Committee, Inc.

American Friends of Russian Freedom, Inc.

American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc.

American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Inc.

American Middle East Relief, Inc.

American National Committee To Aid Homeless Armenians—ANCHA.

American ORT Federation, Inc.

American Relief for Poland, Inc.

Boys' Towns of Italy, Inc.

Brethren Service Commission.

Church World Service, Inc., National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A.

Congregational Christian Service Committee, Inc.

Cooperative for American Remittances to Everywhere—CARE.

Foster Parents' Plan for War Children, Inc.

General Council of the Assemblies of God, Foreign Service Committee.

Girl Scouts of the United States of America, Inc.

Hands Across the Sea Annual Scholarship Award, Inc.

Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society, Inc.

International Rescue Committee, Inc.

International Social Service, Inc.

Iran Foundation, Inc.

Lutheran Service to Immigrants of the National Lutheran Council.

Lutheran World Relief, Inc.

Mennonite Central Committee, Inc.

National Council of Jewish Women, Inc.

Near East Foundation.

Russian Children's Welfare Society, Inc.

Salvation Army.

Selfhelp of Émigrés From Central Europe, Inc.

Tolstoy Foundation, Inc.

Unitarian Service Committee, Inc.

United Friends of the Needy and Displaced People of Yugoslavia, Inc.

United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc.

United Seamen's Service, Inc.

United Service for New Americans, Inc.

United Ukrainian American Relief Committee, Inc.

War Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Inc.

World University Service.

Young Women's Christian Association, Inc.—world emergency fund.

Certainly these representatives of millions of fine Americans should be encouraged to continue their humanitarian work.

It is my personal conviction that legislation in this field should extend to fellow Americans who could use this food, but who are not able to purchase it.

Charges are made that while this increasingly difficult problem of constantly increasing food surpluses is recognized by practically everybody, no practical suggestion has been offered which would be of assistance. I urge most sincerely that our Committee on Agriculture give the earliest possible consideration to H. R. 8117 and H. R. 8178 as practical suggestions.

I want to include here the latest information I have found as to the quantities of certain of these food surpluses.

As of December 31, 1953, the Commodity Credit Corporation had on hand 448,239,917 bushels of wheat, 361,511,364 bushels of corn, 285,084,033 pounds of butter, 269,130,366 pounds of cheese, 465,540,630 pounds of dried milk, 3,094,883 pounds of honey, 1,751,173 bushels of oats, and 202,825 gallons of olive oil.

The total carrying charges on storing those commodities from June 30, 1953, was $99,314,333.84. That was at the rate of $539,751.81 a day. I think we must assume that these charges have continued and undoubtedly are close to or beyond $103 million.

Of course, some of these charges will prove to be sound, especially in the carryover of wheat, corn, and oats. But it is equally clear that a very large portion is now uneconomical. Certainly, if used in paying transportation costs in clearing out these warehouses, thereby ending the continued drain on the CCC funds, this would be a useful result. By also ending the continuing threat of spoilage we would have another good result. And by providing means of placing food in the hands of those who need it but cannot buy it, we would have brought about the best result of all.

I hope our colleagues will consider these bills carefully in the light of all known facts. I am confident that if this is done, the proposals will receive overwhelming, if not unanimous, approval. But every day lost in obtaining action means a loss to the taxpayers in unnecessary carrying charges of many thousands of dollars a day. And the possibility of spoilage certainly increases daily.

The challenge of loss by deterioration and shrinkage has been one which has concerned me for years. I was not able to secure any satisfactory information as to its extent, although we all recall the reaction of the American people when good, wholesome potatoes were destroyed in large quantities.

I am including here data from the CCC as to this. I recall that over a period of some years I was advised that I could not have this information because the CCC books were not set up to provide that. Of course, they should have been so set up. But the CCC is to be commended for instituting this kind of book entries, and I am confident that it will help the CCC and Congress in taking action to prevent the scandal of unnecessary spoilage. However, I must add that I consider a loss of this kind amounting to over $5 million in 5 months to call for prompt action to prevent its continuation.

The report follows:

Commodity Stabilization Service, Commodity Credit Corporation—Losses resulting from sales of deteriorated commodities and inventory losses due to shrinkage and spoilage, fiscal year 1954 through Nov. 30, 1953

Commodity	Unit	Deteriorated				Shrinkage and spoilage		Total loss
		Quantity	Cost	Proceeds	Loss	Quantity	Loss (cost)	
Corn	Bushels	8,477,654	$15,526,022.82	$11,193,329.80	$4,332,693.02	343,947	$608,404.77	$4,941,097.79
Rice, rough	Hundredweight					33	190.04	190.04
Wheat	Bushels	284,935	519,879.15	450,040.27	69,838.88	18,623	84,973.60	154,812.48
Wool	Pounds					146,592		
Barley	Bushels	286	356.66	248.85	107.81	1,534	1,920.46	2,028.27
Beans, dry edible	Hundredweight	596	5,520.91	426.65	5,103.26	2,996	26,005.44	31,108.70
Cottonseed oil, refined	Pounds					3,702	683.16	683.16
Cotton linters	do	5,162	995.64	264.71	240.93	[1] 300	[1] 26.98	213.95
Flaxseed	Bushels					10,323	40,496.77	40,496.77
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	[1] 822	[1] 1,994.43	[1] 3,182.07	1,187.64		.26	1,187.90
Oats	Bushels	31,323	27,358.04	20,376.61	6,981.43	1,549	1,208.71	8,190.14
Alfalfa (hay and pasture)	Pounds					2	.56	.56
Clover (hay and pasture)	do					451	132.77	132.77
Grasses (hay and pasture)	do					12	2.40	2.40
Vetches (winter cover crop)	do					19,754	2,091.67	2,091.67
Soybeans	Bushels	22,440	60,745.76	53,045.05	7,700.71	1	4.38	7,705.09
Corn (emergency feed program)	do					555	819.36	819.36
Total			16,138,403.55	11,714,549.87	4,423,853.68		766,907.37	5,190,761.05

[1] Adjustment of prior fiscal year transaction.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the hearings on this bill in developing the story of dairy products and their place in the farm program. It seems as though in the newspapers and articles that have appeared critical of the farm program that dairy products have been the leading item mentioned.

I was interested in bringing out just exactly what the ratio was of dairy products in proportion to the rest of the program and I find that of all the money involved in the loan obligations, dairy products, which include butter, nonfat dried milk solids, cheese, and so forth, take up just exactly 6 percent of the total fund involved. As a matter of fact, from the figures furnished to us we find that at the present time they have a net book value, commodity inventories and under contracts to purchase, the sum of $75 million worth of butter. That is a lot of money and, of course, butter is a perishable commodity, but at the same time we have net loans outstanding on other products that run over a billion dollars on a single product, for instance.

There has been a good deal of criticism, and I think perhaps it is justified, of the Secretary's action in reducing the parity price on butter to 75 percent and

leaving items that the dairy people have to buy to produce their product at 90 percent of parity. I undertook to question the Secretary a little about that. I asked him what the biggest item in a dairy ration would be. He replied, "I presume the biggest item would be protein concentrates." I said that that might be true in cost, but in bulk? I will not read you all of this, but finally he gets down to agreeing that probably the biggest item would be corn.

I asked him how he could justify holding corn at 90 percent of parity when they cut dairy products, which depend upon corn to be produced, to 75 percent. I asked him to come in with a program for that, which he says they will do in the future. I am not very optimistic about that.

I merely make this statement, Mr. Chairman, to put this thing in its true perspective and to point out to you that out of the $6½ billion that are tied up now in this farm program, only 6 percent of that amount is in dairy products which has been the whipping boy of all the criticisms in the newspapers about this program.

As to the immediate urgency of this matter, I think there is some doubt. There has been a good deal of contradiction of testimony about this. Secretary Benson appeared before the Senate Agricultural Committee on January 18 and he said:

> We could conceivably reach our borrowing limitation before the end of this fiscal year, possibly as early as March or April.

That is what he said over there in January. Under Secretary Morse appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations just exactly 1 week later, and he said then that the Department of Agriculture knew that the CCC borrowing authority was nearly exhausted on January 22, and he asked for the cancellation of the outstanding Treasury notes. I think it is fair to ask—and I have always supported the farm program—I have a great deal of agriculture in my district—but before they come back in again I think it is fair to ask that they try to estimate and know a little bit from 1 week to the next what the requirements are going to be, because when you have the Secretary saying one thing and the Under Secretary saying another within the space of 1 week, you begin to wonder, well, do they need this $1.5 billion or do they not? Of course, the way they are going at the borrowing, they say that the $1.5 billion is not part of the national debt, but, as I see it, these certificates of interest are part of the obligation of the Federal Government, and whether you do some fancy bookkeeping or whether you do not, it is still another $1.5 billion that the Federal Government is obligated for in the long run. This is important, I think.

We asked the Secretary when he was before the Committee on Banking and Currency if he anticipated that he might have to come back for additional funds over and above this $1.75 billion that he is asking for today, and he said he could not predict accurately what the crop season would be; how much rainfall we would have, and so forth. I certainly concur that he cannot, but he said, "It is very possible that I will have to come back and ask for more." Now, if we are going to go on this way, with $1.75 billion every time he says he needs it, where are we going to end?

Mr. Chairman, those are some of the things that this Congress is going to have to deal with if it is going to write a farm program. If it is going to let the present farm program stand, then, I think, we ought to be trying to get some figures as to how much it is going to cost. We ought to be getting some facts about all segments of agriculture and see if they are going to be treated equally, or whether you are going to peg part of them at 75 percent and another part at 90 percent, and if so, what is your justification for it. I do not believe the people who are engaged in agriculture are going to be very happy until they get some better answers than they have now. I think this again ties right in with an article that appeared in the press either yesterday or the day before which showed that the net farm income in the last year had gone down even further out of proportion to the income of the rest of the population than it has been. When you cut the farmer's income in this country it has been a historical fact and it is a historical fact and it always will be one that you cut his purchasing power, and when you cut his purchasing power you not only hurt the farmer, but you hurt the people in the cities who manufacture the articles that he buys, and you start a spiral of unemployment. All these things tie in with this. All this we are trying to do today is nothing but a stopgap program; it is not trying to get at the root of the problem on the farm that we were promised a year ago.

I asked the Secretary if he had any concrete suggestions, and he said, "We have been doing a lot of thinking about it." I asked him specifically if he had any suggestions for getting this butter out to the people who could use it so that it would not spoil. He said, "There has been a lot of thinking on that subject." I said to the Secretary, "Mr. Secretary, sometimes I think there has been too much thinking and not enough action."

I say again, that some program had better be devised to get this butter on the market, because if you do not and you let it spoil, the people of this country will have paid for it twice, once in taxes when they bought it; and, too, they have been paying for it right along in the high price of butter.

My district is partly agricultural and partly urban. I believe the people in the urban area are willing to pay for the butter once. I believe they are willing to go along. But I do not think they are willing to pay for it twice. As a farmer, I certainly am not willing to ask them to pay for it twice.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, first may I say that I regret that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has seen fit to call up the item of the Front Royal Cottage. If he had taken the time to refer to the hearings before my subcommittee this past month he would have found in those hearings on page 117 a full explanation of this $1,610 item which, after all, was utilized in repairing property of the Federal Government which was falling into disrepair. It certainly was not in any way by any wild stretch of the imagination used to benefit Mr. Benson. He and his family were guests in the cottages for only 9 nights during the year and Mr. Benson paid the going rate of rent for those 9 nights.

I refer the House again to pages 117 and 118 of volume I of the hearings before my subcommittee this year in regard to this particular point.

One other item: We hear these gentlemen from the cities belabor agriculture and the farmer as to what it has cost in relation to the price-support program. I wish they would give the full picture when they talk about that. In the first place, if they would turn to page 123 of the hearings to which I referred, they would find that the net realized loss to the taxpayers of America as of November 30, 1953, just last November 30, over the stretch of a 20-year period, in relation to the price support program, according to the Department of Agriculture is $1,194,800,000; in other words, less than $60 million a year since the inception of the price-support program.

On the other hand, on the following page, if the gentlemen will study the record, they will find that $2,102,000,000 was paid out by the Commodity Credit Corporation during World War II for strictly consumer subsidies and, in addition, there was paid out by the Defense Supplies Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation an additional sum of $2,143,000,000, totaling in those two items alone $4,250,000,000—for what purpose? For nothing but bringing to the consumer food at a cheaper price than otherwise he would have been able to secure it for. Did the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] object at the time to those consumer subsidies which, according to the record in these hearings before me, amounted to at least 2½ times the total cost of the price-support program to date?

Let us be fair. I estimate personally, based upon evidence before us, and including the $609 million made available just the other week in impairment of Commodity Credit Corporation capital, that our price-support program may be claimed to date as costing the taxpayers of America $1,800,000,000 at the most, $90 million a year for 20 years. It has resulted in bringing to the United States of America a strong prosperous agriculture. It is an expenditure which has resulted in bringing to the economy of the United States of America untold billions of dollars—thousands of millions of dollars of additional revenue. This price support expenditure has given hundreds of thousands of young veterans of World War II and Korea an opportunity to get started in agriculture. So when you representatives from the consumer districts say anything about this price-support program, please remember too that we are apt to question you about the

gift by the taxpayers to the consumers during the war period of, and I quote again, "$4,300,000,000" or 2½ times the amount expended and justly chargeable to the price-support program over the 20-year period.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. STAGGERS. I think most of us are in agreement with the farm program, but I would like to ask a question about the statement about this $1,610. I understood the gentleman from New York to say that two thousand and some odd dollars had been taken from animal-research funds to repair this cabin. Whether that is true, I do not know. Is it true? Can the gentleman inform me on that?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Let me quote from the record. This cottage was taken over, as you folks know, from the Remount Service, Department of the Army, in 1948. The Department of Agriculture found that it needed repairs. If you will look at page 118 in the record of the hearings, you will find these sums charged for repairs. One thousand, six hundred and ten dollars of which labor, sanding floors, screens, glass, fence wire, miscellaneous hardware, water heater, connections and so forth were included.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would like to know if the gentleman can tell me whether the funds came out of the animal research money to repair a cabin.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The Bureau of Animal Industry, I might say, seeing the need for repairing this cottage to a certain extent, allocated these particular funds for special repairs to the cottage. This was from a reserve established for contingencies in connection with animal husbandry research.

Mr. STAGGERS. I do not think they have the authority to do that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As far as I understand, for the preservation of Federal properties, certainly they were within their rights.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUNTER. Of course, we must realize that all of the maintenance and upkeep of the buildings and facilities that are there come within the research program. It is only natural that if we have a building on these premises, it would be maintained and kept up out of research funds just like barns or any other farm building.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Why certainly.

Permit me to conclude by saying that I do not agree with Mr. Ezra Benson on his sliding scale price support theory, but I do want to treat him fairly on matters of this nature just as you and I and all of us would like to be treated.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the Democrats from the urban centers of the North have supported the farm price-support program because they believe there is a fellowship and a mutuality of interest between the workers in the cities and the farmers in the agricultural regions. We have gone along with the farm program, even though there were times when we needed help in meeting our urban problems, problems that are very close to us, and our friends from the agricultural districts did not show the same degree of understanding of our problems that we have tried to give to their problems.

As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I voted for this bill because I did not want to do anything to hurry on a depression. Frankly I am afraid of the economic weather. Already we in the cities are feeling the let-down in agricultural buying power. Furthermore, the bill is not writing any new policies. It is merely meeting the honest obligations incurred under existing law. Existing law may be right or it may be wrong; that is not the question presented today. Under existing law obligations were contracted and there was no way of estimating their volume with any fair degree of certainty. If this bill is not passed, then the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot meet its honest obligations. What then is the moral obligation upon me as a Member of Congress?

When we had what is now Public Law 295 before us we had another situation. Public Law 295 gave three-quarters of a billion dollars to the Commodity Credit Corporation not by appropriation but by subterfuge. I think that was the dishonest way of legislating. The Commodity Credit Corporation owed the United States Treasury this money. Public Law 295 ordered the Treasury to give CCC a receipt in full. That to my mind is exactly the same as though I had gone into a national bank and borrowed $5,000 and later the directors of the bank got together and told the note teller to tear up my note and forget about it.

This bill, however, is conceived along the path of honor. CCC needs the money because the demands imposed by existing law have made the demand. It is a matter of increasing the debt authorization or defaulting.

My support of this measure under the prevailing circumstances does not mean that I am excusing the combined obstinacy and stupidity that has marked our agricultural program under the present administration. I am going alone only because the honor of our Government is involved and it is not a case of who got us and so quickly after the historic change in the present sorry mess.

But, Mr. Chairman, in our districts in the cities they are beginning to ask questions. I want to know how to answer them. There is interest in the Second District of Illinois in this butter that is being stored. We have many thousands of people in the city of Chicago, and in my district, who could use that butter. I am thinking especially of the older men and women living on disgracefully low allowances. Why does not the Secretary of Agriculture give his time, and may I in humility and reverence say, Mr. Chairman, his prayers, to finding some way of getting that butter out of storage. The Secretary of Agriculture is paying $14 million a month in storage fees. Why does he not move heaven and earth to get that butter to poor and needy people? It is ridiculous to say that to distribute it among people who could not purchase because of lack of money would disturb the market.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday when I thought this bill might reach the floor of the House, I telephoned the Department of Agriculture to ascertain the quantity of butter in storage. I was told that there were on hand in storage 283,699,485 pounds of butter.

There are now on old-age assistance 2,591,016 men and women. On social security there are 5,981,420, including widows and orphans.

Mr. Chairman, the common sense procedure is to save ourselves a good share of that $14 million monthly storage bill by distributing a little butter among some millions of our fellow citizens who never even get near the sight of butter.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, in this whole program there is one thing that I think is being lost sight of which disturbs me a great deal.

We have on hand a product, for instance, about 700 million bushels of corn, which is approximately a billion dollars' worth of corn.

However, when you come to analyze that it is exactly a 3 months' supply of our national domestic needs. I do not believe the United States is in the same position it was before World War II. You are simply going to have to have a supply on hand, in view of our position in the world today. I do not think we can go back to that point we were in before the war, where we had no surpluses of any kind. I think the question to be determined by the Department of Agriculture, and I do not seem to be able to get any answer to this, if you are going to have a storage program for the possibility of an outbreak of another war, what is that supply going to be? How many bushels is it going to be?

I think the second pertinent question is, "Is there any correlation between the stockpiling of agricultural products for a critical period of time and the national defense?" You have a strategic stockpile of minerals, metals, and many other things, but as far as I know, there is no program worked out to tell us how much we should have on hand for critical times.

Sometime ago the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. HOPE] raised this question with me when I took up the question of corn with him. He said, "I do not think a 90-day supply of corn is too much to have on hand." If we should have an outbreak of war, a 90-day supply would be infinitesimally small. I think somewhere along the line the administration and the Secretary of Agriculture must say what our supply should be in these various agricultural products.

There is a third pertinent point I want to make, and I think I discussed it the other day on the floor of the House, but I want to reiterate it. This last summer when I was in Europe every country I visited had a trade mission, and the trade mission in those countries had a purpose. The purpose was to sell the

product of that country in the world market. The thing that surprised me was that all over Europe there was not a single American that I could find in any embassy that was working to get rid of any surpluses we had in this country, or, as far as I could find out, was very much interested in it at all. We have nothing resembling a trade mission in our entire Government setup.

I do believe that it is important that the Department of Agriculture or these various departments, whatever department it is, that they be interested in this problem of surplus and how we are going to make up our program for getting rid of our surpluses in regular trade channels abroad.

I would like, if I may, to ask the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Michigan, if he has any knowledge of any correlation of the agricultural surplus storage program with our strategic stockpiles?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know that I can answer the gentleman specifically, but I have in mind that the Commodity Credit Corporation acts as the purchasing agent in some particulars for the Defense Department. Much of the surplus which the Commodity Credit Corporation is holding in addition to its loan program, that is, after they have taken the percentage they need to hold, they sell to the armed services as much of the surplus as they can.

Mr. SPRINGER. Has the Secretary of Agriculture in any of his appearances before the committee ever indicated what he felt our surplus should be, the normal surplus that we would expect to have from year to year for purposes of national defense?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; that varies from year to year as the defense needs vary. Militarily, of course, it varies in accordance with their full needs, because there is nothing static with respect to personnel in the Defense Department, Army, Marine, Air Force, Navy; there is no way they could possibly tell about that; it varies according to the number of personnel.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman. May I submit the same question to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], a member of the Agriculture Committee?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman will recall that the President urged that a stockpile be set up out of the surplus, certain basic surpluses in the ownership of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I am sure the President has that very thing in mind which the gentleman has mentioned. The gentleman knows that the corn crop depends on the weather. You may have a dry season this year where you will not get any corn crop; so there are a number of variable factors that enter into it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 11 minutes.

HARD MONEY, HIGH INTEREST

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, again involved here, so far as I am concerned, is a question of interest rates. I am in favor of this bill, but I do not believe that we should encourage the Commodity Credit Corporation to borrow the money directly and not go through the Treasury as the traditional policy has been.

Here is the difficulty in it, as I see it: If the Treasury borrows the money directly—it has been suggested we want to do it with private enterprise, well, that is private enterprise, the Treasury borrows the money directly on competitive bids, and the Treasury lets the Commodity Credit Corporation have money to finance its operations.

We know that the Treasury can borrow the money much cheaper than Commodity Credit can borrow it. Here is the result: If you let the Commodity Credit Corporation borrow it, not only does the Commodity Credit Corporation have to pay from 1½ to 2 percent more which is charged up to the farmer—which is charged up to the farmer—having to pay that much more to the Commodity Credit Corporation; but in addition to that the Commodity Credit Corporation paper is in competition with the Treasury. At the same time the Commodity Credit Corporation is trying to get short-term money the Treasury is trying to get short-term money. That causes competition and causes not only the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay more but also it causes the Treasury to pay more. Now, that is not a guess. I can cite you the actual information that happened last year. I can show you that not only did the Commodity Credit Corporation have to pay millions of dollars more that way, but the Treasury itself, having the competition of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation asking for money at the same time the Treasury did, had to pay higher interest rates which last year amounted to $97 million that the Treasury had to pay in excess because of the competition between the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Treasury. You can rely on that. Get your hearings if there is any doubt in the mind of any Member of this House about what I have said about this competition between Government agencies at the same time running the interest rate up on both at the same time. Just get a copy of the hearings and you will see it in the hearings that we have.

I want to seriously urge you, the Members of this House, to consider the devastating effect that higher interest rates have on our entire economy. If interest rates are increased, it means that all across the board it costs more to operate this entire Government. Not only will this person with limited income here at the end of the month, having only so much to spend for himself and his family, have less to spend, less for what he is buying in the way of food, clothing, comforts and necessities, and possibly a few luxuries of life, but he will be compelled to buy less and less because he will have to pay more and more for services caused by higher interest.

Let me show you how that works. When you increase the interest rate just a little, that increases the cost of servicing the national debt, that increases the income taxes. You have to pay higher income taxes because of that. It increases the cost of the State governments, the city governments, the school districts, and political subdivisions. They have to pay more interest. Therefore, you have to pay more taxes. And not only that, when your utilities are refinanced, and they all refinance or get new financing, they have to pay more interest on their obligations. So you will have higher prices for electricity, for gas, for water, for telephones, for transportation—freight and passenger—because interest rates have gone up clear across the board. Whenever you translate that down to the little fellow, who has a limited income here at the end of the month, he is having to spend more and more on account of this high interest; therefore he has less and less to buy in commerce, business, and industry.

So which is best, leave it in the hands of this little fellow who is really the savior of our country—his purchasing power is—or divert it into the hands of those who will not buy an extra pair of shoes or an extra hat or an extra automobile because they already have everything in the world they need or want?

It is in the interest of the country to keep these interest rates lower so that the little man can use that money to buy the things that he needs and that he puts into the blood stream of business, commerce, and industry which make the wheels of our economy continue to go around and our country to expand and continue to be prosperous. That is what we want to do by keeping the interest rates low and not have competition between Government agencies that cause higher interest rates.

If you pass this bill in its present form, Mr. Chairman, there is the Commodity Credit Corporation borrowing its money directly, ignoring the Treasury.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was set up to use the Treasury to get its money. You cannot say that you are going around private enterprise because the Treasury must get that money from private enterprise, but if you get it through the Treasury, then the Treasury and the Commodity Credit Corporation are not in competition at the same time, and one will not cause the other to have to pay more for their short-term money.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge you, my friends, to consider that point. It is a dangerous precedent we are starting here. If you vote for this bill like it is, you are endorsing the principle of putting the agencies of our Government one under the other in competition with each other, thereby forcing not only the one that wants funds at a particular time to pay a higher rate of interest, but you are forcing the other to pay a high interest rate. I repeat, if you get a copy of the printed hearings, the testimony before this committee, you will find that that devastating policy I am telling you about, which cannot be disputed, not only caused the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay millions of dollars extra last year, but it caused the Government at the same time, getting money in competition with the Commodity Credit

Corporation, to pay an increase equal to $97 million a year. Now, that was last year and only for last year. What will it be the next year or for 15, 20, 25, or 40 years from now? That is not the right kind of a policy; it is not a business-like policy. If you vote for this bill like it is without the Spence amendment or any amendment that will restrict this interest rate and keep it in that traditional groove as set up by this Congress years ago, you will set one of the worst precedents in this bill that you ever set.

So, I ask you to vote for the Spence amendment.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am certainly no agricultural expert, so I look for light on this subject where I can find it. I find an enlightening table on pages 41 to 44 of these hearings that is news to me and entirely different from information we have had earlier in the day as to the cost of our farm programs. This table is entitled "Realized Cost of Agricultural and Related Programs, by Function or Purpose, Fiscal Years 1932–53." At the beginning it says:

For activities financed from appropriated funds, the expenditures less receipts arising from the activities so financed.

The total is not $1 billion but $37,380,700,000.

Here are the items in this total:

For stabilization of prices and farm income	$7,510,400,000
Conservation programs	4,589,100,000
Credit and related programs	1,756,300,000
Research and education	1,189,700,000
School lunch, marketing services, etc	1,531,900,000
Wartime defense and special	344,200,000
Total of above items	16,921,000,000
Consumer subsidies	4,245,000,000
Agricultural commodities for foreign-aid programs	16,214,700,000
Grand total	37,380,700,000

Mr. Chairman, I never dreamed that the farmers of this country, whom I always thought were a self-reliant group, had been subsidized and helped to any such extent. They received over thirty-one billions during and since World War II. Postwar foreign aid alone purchased $8,530,100,000 of agricultural commodities. What impresses me is that with the dropping out of this foreign-aid bonanza—and as far as American agriculture is concerned, it has been a bonanza for them—they are making no plans to market their own crops and sell them in the market and live off the proceeds. All I seem to hear from the agricultural experts in Congress are new schemes to have the Government subsidize the farmers, or pleas to continue the costly wartime programs. About 40 million acres, about 10 percent of the total American acreage, raise crops for export. The produce from that acreage goes into export and accounts for about 8 percent of the farmer's income. The big crops, the basic crops, are all export crops. Wool and sugar are problems because they are on a net import basis, in that we use more than we raise; but these other basic crops are crops where the top money, the controlling income, has to come from exports. One-third of our wheat, 40 percent of our cotton and rice, one-fourth of our tobacco and soy beans have been exported until now, while through price supports we have priced ourselves out of the world market when people are hungry.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman count this $16 billion for foreign aid in food as a bonanza for the American farmers, or was it a policy that the gentleman advocated?

Mr. VORYS. It was part of a foreign-aid policy that I advocated.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Should it then be charged up to American agriculture?

Mr. VORYS. As I say, it was a foreign-aid plan, a relief plan, a recovery plan abroad, but as far as the American farmer was concerned it was a chance to have the Government buy those crops and not have to find a commercial market for them. Some of you remember the time when I attempted to use surplus crops we already owned to meet the Marshall plan needs and save appropriating new money for the food supplies needed in these foreign-aid programs. It was my farmer friends who struck that provision from the bill here on the floor.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman does not mean to imply, does he, that industry did not benefit very greatly from the foreign-aid program?

Mr. VORYS. Yes; to put it that way, these foreign-aid programs, the purpose of which was to aid other countries for our own security, benefited various industries that participated in the programs, as well as agriculture.

However, this is what concerns me. We are all anxious to cut down foreign aid giveaway programs, but the record here shows as we act today to authorize more money to buy farm crops that the farmers and their representatives are not devising any plan that does not depend as it has for the last 21 years upon vast Federal subsidies.

All I would like to say is, instead of talking about Benson and the Agriculture Department, I hope the agricultural experts within our own ranks here in Congress on the various committees involved, will figure out ways to sell our surplus at home and abroad and not have to give it away, or let it rot. Then I hope they will figure out ways to get farmers out of the dole class for the future. We have basic protective laws for labor, industry, and commerce, and therefore need similar basic protection for agriculture, but the system that cost us 37 billion for farmers far exceeds anything we do for other groups, and in spite of it, farm income is sliding. I hope our farm experts right here in Congress will show us a solution that does not involve perpetual Federal spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is amended by striking out "$6,750,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,500,000,000."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Strike out lines 3, 4, and 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 4 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is amended by striking out '$6,750,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$8,500,000,000', and by adding at the end of the section the following new sentence: 'Hereafter, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not issue or sell any of its obligations to any person other than the Secretary of the Treasury; however, this sentence shall not apply to certificates issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation to banks making Commodity Credit Corporation loans'."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in kindness and not in malice. I do not suppose anybody here is more heartily in favor of the continuation of the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation than I am. I have seen it lift the tobacco growers of my section from poverty to a condition of competence and stability and to a decent standard of living. I am heartily in favor of doing everything I can to stimulate its activities in the future. I think it has been generally agreed that the Government agencies owned and controlled by the Government whose obligations both as to principal and interest are guaranteed by the Government should be financed in the Treasury. This has been said many, many times by those in authority. It is a policy which has been approved generally, and it has been approved especially with reference to this Corporation.

During 1948, when bills to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation were being considered by the Congress, the Comptroller General of the United States and high officials of the General Accounting Office proposed to have this principle written into the Corporation's charter. The views of Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General at the time, were expressed to the Congress as follows:

We believe, from the standpoint of public policy, that the United States Treasury should, in general, be the source of funds utilized in conducting the Government's business. If all financing required by the agencies of the Government is not obtained from the Treasury, the control of the Secretary of the Treasury over the public debt and interest rates is impaired; more important is the reduction in the extent to which the Secretary of the Treasury may be held accountable for the management of the public debt, and the obscuring of the overall indebtedness and interest costs of the Government. We believe that this was recognized by the Congress when section 303 (a) of the Government Corporation Control Act was enacted. That section and, in the case of Commodity Credit Corporation, section 4 of the act of March 8, 1938, provide the Secretary of the Treasury with certain instruments of control over the public debt and the interest rates, but do not specifically prohibit the Corporation from obtaining

funds through the sale of its obligations to the public or by borrowing from private banks. Since the enactment of the legislation referred to, the Corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, has borrowed general-purpose funds from private banks at low interest rates. Presumably the United States Treasury is in a position of equal advantage with the Corporation in its ability to obtain low interest rates.

The view was elaborated upon by Mr. Frank H. Weitzel, Assistant to the Comptroller General, in his testimony:

The General Accounting Office feels that public-debt operations should be centralized within the Treasury Department and it will bring about a better overall coordination of the Government borrowings generally to have them handled in that manner.

And by Mr. James Blakemore, a top-level General Accounting Office official:

We feel that, generally speaking, the borrowing of the United States Government should be centralized in the Treasury of the United States.

It may be true that as to any particular loan, 1 element of the Government, 1 agency, can borrow at less than that 1 percent.

We feel, overall, the advantage of that short-term money should be utilized to the extent the Government's interest is best served by that utilization through the Treasury, rather than through a host of Government corporations and agencies.

It would be foolish, it seems to me, for Government agencies, when the Treasury has the money and when it is absolutely established that the going interest rate of the Treasury is less than the interest rate of the commercial institutions, to go to the private institutions to finance essentially governmental functions. I do not think anybody can make an argument in favor of that. This amendment provides that the obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be sold directly to the Treasury, but it exempts the certificates issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation to banks making Commodity Credit Corporation loans. In other words, the banks that are now engaged in making Commodity Credit Corporation loans and servicing loans are exempted from the provision of this amendment. Its only effect is to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from going to the great centers of finance and marketing its obligations instead of going to the Treasury. Is there any objection to that? I thought when I offered this amendment, it would stabilize and strengthen the Commodity Credit Corporation. I can assure you it was offered in kindness and in a spirit of helpfulness. What is the effect of going outside the Treasury? In order to make these obligations appeal to the financial institutions, the interest rate is raised. Interest is a very sensitive mechanism. When the interest rate is raised on these obligations, the interest rate on the bills and notes of the Treasury is raised. It has always happened that way. This will not only cost the Commodity Credit Corporation vast sums of money, but it will also entail a vast expense upon the Government to finance its general governmental operations.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Just by way of clarifying what the gentleman intends by this amendment, what obligations has the gentleman in mind? I notice he exempts the certificates of interest and then provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot sell its obligations to other than the Treasury. What obligations does the gentleman have in mind—the bonds, the notes, and so forth?

Mr. SPENCE. The bonds, the notes, and the obligations that will give them the necessary cash to operate their ordinary functions.

Mr. WOLCOTT. What are they in addition to the bonds or debentures that they sell to the Treasury anyway to get their working capital? What obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation has the gentleman in mind? He does not have in mind the certificates of interest, because he exempts them. He surely cannot have in mind the obligations which they sell directly to the Treasury, anyway. What obligations does the gentleman have in mind?

Mr. SPENCE. They could without this amendment, sell obligations outside of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. What would prevent them now from selling any obligations, the obligations they now sell to the Treasury, to private enterprise? They could do it. I have been informed by people connected with the Commodity Credit Corporation that, while I do not claim they are for this amendment, it would do exactly what I want it to do.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Is the intention of the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] that it stop the present practice engaged in by the Secretary of Agriculture in October, December, and January, of selling certificates of interest? The point is that they shall not be prohibited from issuing certificates to banks making loans to borrowers; is that so?

Mr. SPENCE. That is so.

Mr. MULTER. But the purpose of the amendment is to stop the sale of certificates of interest to bankers?

Mr. SPENCE. This would have prevented that pool that was created to purchase $1,100,000,000 of certificates, of obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, by banks who were not interested in the program, who had not participated in it, who were merely moneylenders, who had no interest at all in the activity or the program of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. MULTER. This will not in any way interfere with banks lending to farmers in connection with the Commodity Credit program and will not in any way interfere with the Commodity Credit Corporation taking back those loans made by the banks to the farmers?

Mr. SPENCE. That was the purpose I had in view. I have discussed this with some of the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I do not say that they said they were for it, but I wanted to know if it would do what I want it to do, and they said it would.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let us assume that in village X a bank makes a crop loan and that bank sells that loan to a larger bank, a correspondent bank. Is the gentleman assured that that correspondent bank is not prohibited from taking that loan, under the gentleman's amendment, to the point where we will stymie the crop loans which are made to local banks? Approximately a billion dollars have been loaned on cotton alone, and I know that the gentleman does not want to interfere in any way with his tobacco program. There must have been hundreds of millions of dollars of those loans within the periphery of his own district.

I do not think the gentleman wants this amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. I am satisfied it would not affect that. I think it would put this on a sound financial basis that would make the operations less expensive—of less cost to the Government. I only want to put this on a sound financial basis. These notes are sent by the banks to the Commodity Credit Corporation. They issue their certificates to the banks all over the country, and these little banks would operate just as they operate now, under this amendment.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am somewhat intrigued by the gentleman's proposal. All of us, of course, want to be sure that we are on safe ground. After all, the CCC is the very heart of our farm program.

Mr. SPENCE. That is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And we would not want to do anything, particularly on the spur of the moment, so far as I am concerned. Of course, I am sure the gentleman has studied the amendment. But we would not want to do anything that might impair the program.

Will the gentleman tell the members of the committee whether or not his amendment purports to return to a system which was followed by the Commodity Credit Corporation for a long period of time, and until a recent date; and whether or not, further, it attempts to set aside some method that has recently been instituted or is something new?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

(On request of Mr. ABERNETHY and by unanimous consent, Mr. SPENCE was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. SPENCE. I think the original purpose for the creation of the Commodity Credit Corporation was to compel them to do just what I want them to do now.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But have they ever done it in the history of the Corporation?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not know that they have ever done it, but so far as I am concerned, to do anything to injure the Commodity Credit Corporation would be one of the most certain ways to cut my political throat that I know of.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am sure of the gentleman's interest.

Mr. SPENCE. I do not want to injure the Commodity Credit Corporation, because it has done so much for my people and for the people of the United States, and I am sure it does not in any way impair any of its programs or functions.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I know for a fact the gentleman is interested in the program of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I am absolutely satisfied that he sincerely means to protect it and certainly would not do anything to harm it. But I am a little bit concerned about the adoption of this amendment now, for it is going to change entirely the way the Corporation has heretofore operated—unless it comes with the majority support of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. SPENCE. It makes it conform to what the Comptroller General said he thought was essential; and he made a fine argument in favor of it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Did he say that recently?

Mr. SPENCE. He said that 2 years ago, I think.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Did he testify before the committee?

Mr. SPENCE. He did not testify before the Banking and Currency committee.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman in his feeling that the interest rates paid by the Government should not be higher on certificates or on borrowings by the Commodity Credit Corporation from private banks than they would be if we went through the Treasury. There are several ways to reach that in this bill and I hope that they will be used. However, I would like to say that according to all the testimony that was given before the Appropriations Committee a few weeks ago when we canceled notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation, had this amendment been the law during the past fall for a part of the time you would have had no price-support program. We have a fixed debt ceiling. There are two things that would restrict the capacity of the Commodity Credit Corporation to meet the obligations imposed on it by law to support prices on certain basic commodities; one is the limit of the borrowing capacity of the corporation itself; the other is the overall debt ceiling imposed upon the Treasury by law if that were the only source of funds.

If the Commodity Credit Corporation borrows its money from private sources, as it has been doing in the last year, those notes are not counted as a part of the national debt. On the other hand, if the Corporation has to get its money from the Treasury Department, then it is a part of the national debt. So there were two difficulties facing the Commodity Credit Corporation: One was that the borrowing authority of the Corporation was about exhausted; the other was that the debt ceiling had almost been reached and we could not risk outstanding certificates in private banks being presented to the Treasury for payment. The debt ceiling would have prevented payment. We were close to the edge, and we came within 1 week of having to send out orders all over the United States for everybody to stop putting out anything in the way of price supports. So while I want to correct the ill that seems to be confronting us of paying exorbitant or too high interest rates, I should hate to do it in this way by saying the Corporation has to borrow its money from the Treasury, for should they ever reach the ceiling of the debt limit your price-support program would end.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. TALLE. I do not intend to take the time of the gentleman except to make a supplementary comment suggested by previous discussion on this matter and to point out to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] that the manner of raising money employed by the Commodity Credit Corporation in recent months is an old practice.

If the gentleman and other Members will turn to page 104 and elsewhere in the hearings on this bill, the testimony will confirm that this is an old practice. This method of financing has been used repeatedly in the past. There is nothing startling or spectacular or unusual about it. It was simply employing a practice which the Commodity Credit Corporation had used for many years.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am familiar with the fact that for many years they have financed cotton loans through this course. I do not know what the reason is, why the distinction between cotton and some of the other commodities; all I am saying is that if you curtail or prevent the Corporation from financing its operations in private fields, should you reach the debt ceiling, then your farm program is out of the window until you can get relief from the debt ceiling. I say when we canceled those notes a few weeks ago we were up to two ceilings: one, the ceiling of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the other the debt ceiling. Either ceiling will catch you if you get up to it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman has well stated that had not this provision been available last fall, the price-support program would have collapsed at that time.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. I repeat, I am not in favor of paying higher interest rates to private sources for money that you could obtain from the Treasury at a less rate, but you do not have to reach that problem in this way.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. If we could get rid of some of these stocks and surpluses that we have, we would not have to have this bill before us; would we?

Mr. WHITTEN. As has been said, I am glad you asked that question. On Wednesday of this week I pointed out here on the floor that the policy of the Government is to hold all American agricultural commodities off the world markets at competitive prices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

(At the request of Mr. WHITTEN, and by unanimous consent, he was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, it is the fixed policy of the Government now that commodities in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not be offered on world markets at competitive prices, that we will hold within our country these commodities and let the farmers in the countries of the world have all the market there is; then if there is any left over, we will release ours to the point of making up the difference. That is the situation today. It was confirmed repeatedly in the debate on Wednesday.

I would like to call attention to the fact that I have introduced today a bill which provides that the price support program levels in effect in January 1954, shall continue on every commodity so long as the commodity is not offered on the world markets at competitive prices.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the gentleman clear up this point. As I understood him, he said the price-support operation would come to a halt if this legislation had been in effect last fall.

Mr. WHITTEN. According to all the information given us as to how close to the debt ceiling we were, that is true.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the point I think should be emphasized. If the debt ceiling had been raised, as it probably should have been, and as the House proposed to do, then this action would not have been necessary?

Mr. WHITTEN. Quite naturally, if the ceiling had been higher we would not be as close to the ceiling. That naturally follows. But I am saying that when you deprive the Corporation of the authority to meet its obligations to carry out the price-support system, you leave them absolutely dependent then upon what can be done under the debt ceiling. We all know, however you may feel about raising the debt ceiling, that for a period of time we had been awfully close to it. The fact of the matter is the situation was serious, much more so, than you who do not have to deal with the testimony realized, and a whole lot more close to a really tragic situation than I think the country appreciated a few weeks ago.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was interested in the gentleman's statement as to the effect of this amendment. Do I understand that unless his bill goes through the farm program will fail, will be forced to come to an end?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am saying that the Commodity Credit Corporation is a Government agency. It is set up with a certain borrowing authority. It is charged with the responsibility and duty of supporting farm commodities at a certain price. To do that they must have money.

There are two sources of money: One is directly from the Treasury and the other from private sources by the sale of certificates. I am saying that if the borrowing authority of the Corporation is completely used up, then it has no authority to support the program further. I am saying that if there is no source of money, either because of the ceiling or lack of funds, they cannot carry out their functions.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And the gentleman advocates the sale of these surpluses now on the foreign market?

Mr. WHITTEN. I say it is unconscionable and unfair and completely unrealistic to have a Government policy that says American farm production shall be bottled up in this country and not even offered on the world market at competitive prices. We have been following that policy and we are following it now, and all this buildup follows from a governmental program that keeps it tied up and does not even offer it on the world market at competitive prices. That is something that the public does not realize.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, agreeing with that, as I can, the gentleman contends that we should continue to permit the Congress to borrow money to pay these subsidies?

Mr. WHITTEN. I say if the Government is going to penalize the American farmers by bottling their production up in this country, that it then has an obligation to at least assure the farm folks of some reasonable income. There would be much less cost if we let the commodities move in world trade.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Agreeing with that, Mr Chairman, I understand the gentleman to advocate the sale of these surpluses abroad.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. Now let me ask the other one. Then that being true, the gentleman contends further that we should continue to pay the subsidies here and, if so, how long?

Mr. WHITTEN. I think as long as by law we have protected the income of those in organized labor, as long as we have minimum wage laws, as long as we have protective tariffs, as long as we have bargaining power of labor unions, as long as we have laws touching just about everything in the world, that there is an obligation on this Congress to give the American farmers some reasonable chance at a fair income by providing for them their fair share of the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, in view of what the gentleman has just said, it inevitably follows that we have to continue to pay farm subsidies indefinitely, does it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. Unless the gentleman can give us an assurance that these other things are going to be changed. I say that American agriculture is entitled to equality in law, and unless you are going to change these other things, it follows we must treat agriculture like the rest if we are going to continue in the years ahead to have the high standard of living we now have. We should be thankful to have plenty of food.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KILBURN. Is the gentleman for or against this amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. I believe this amendment would be most unwise and would threaten the farm program as it is now presented.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I am wondering whether the gentleman agrees with this, so long as this Government is paying only $1 out of $40 out of all the subsidies paid, whether the rest of the country has any objection to paying the farmers that $1.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not believe that they have any objection to giving somewhat equal treatment to all the rest. But I do not call this a subsidy. Perhaps it comes from having worked with it, but from my judgment those who take the raw materials out of the ground should have enough income to buy the things they need and afford them a reasonable profit out of their investment. We must see that they can take care of the soil. We provide laws touching practically everything in this complex society, and as long as we have that, we have to strike a balance, and the first place to set that is to provide a reasonable program for those who deal with the original raw material, because they are charged with the responsibility of maintaining the food supply of the Nation through the conservation and preservation of the soil of our country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, what I am again trying to have someone tell me is what we are going to do about the situation we are in and which is the result of the farm program of the last two administrations. I understand all right how we got into it and I can appreciate the force of the argument of the gentleman who just preceded me when he says we have had protection to the manufacturer through the tariff, we have had this, that, and the other subsidy or payment all along the line, and his argument, as I get it, is that we should continue to pay subsidies to the farmers because others have profited through Federal payments of one type or another.

All right, then, why not benefit payments to everyone? In my section of the country, where we have farmers who grow wheat and corn, who produce hogs, cattle, and have dairy products, we have as well a large number who have fruit, berries, and vegetables. They grow and they have on the market several million dollars' worth of cherries, plums, peaches, black raspberries, pears, and so on every year. I would like to have the gentleman tell me why we should not have a subsidy on these things, too.

Mr. WHITTEN. When we refer to paying subsidies, that is one thing. The whole farm program is geared up to permit the farmers at the beginning of the year to try to cut the pattern to the cloth, so that they can set out marketing and production goals in line with the expected demand. If we had not dumped this wartime production on our price-support system you would not be paying out any subsidies, because the farmers would have had the opportunity to limit their production to the market.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. But who ever heard of anyone limiting himself in the production of anything which gave him a substantial profit? The trouble with the gentleman's argument is that he knows that the war has ended and we now have not only a surplus of many things but an increased productivity, not only of farm produce, but of some items of merchandise. He certainly would not have us get into another war so that we could use this surplus for the purpose for which it was originally created. He would not do that. No one would do that.

In my community, for example, one young farmer I know bought three tractors and a combine. He rented three farms and commenced to grow more wheat. Naturally he wanted that $2.21 a bushel. He has not paid for all his machinery. He does not see any good reason why he should be cut off from what we call the subsidy. At the same time, he said to me when I talked to him, "The policy is not sound, because these surpluses are piling up and up and up, and after awhile we will have so much of so many things we will not have room to store them, even with the Government building storage facilities which are costing millions every month. Soon we will all be broke."

So what I want to know is when, how soon, we can begin to taper this thing off so we can get out of it. That is what I am concerned about.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There are three definite proposals before this Congress today in the form of legislation. One—introduced by myself—is to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to take its surplus perishable commodities and put them into the hands of needy people in America who can consume them.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman means give them to people who need them?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is right; right here in America.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is one; and if we do that, the amount of the subsidy goes up, does it not? The

overall purchases drop, the price goes down, and every time it does the amount the Government must pay increases, does it not?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The taxpayer will naturally have to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the gift of those particular perishables to the consumers, the needy people in America.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right; and if you give them away to local people who otherwise would buy on the open market, the market price drops and the Government has to make up the difference between the actual market price and the parity figure.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That has nothing to do with the market price, because the support price will still be beneath the commodities. I am talking about the surplus perishables already owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Second, we propose not to add to the storables by forcing the taking out of production of perhaps 30 million acres of land through what is known as the diverted acres program, which I have had a part in proposing to the Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Allocation of acreage? And pay the landowner for the acres he does not own?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We are going to take those acres out of production entirely and place them into a bank of fertility. There is no use to produce cotton, corn, and wheat we do not need.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have that one; go ahead.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The third is to encourage as far as possible shipments abroad of our surplus through an enlarged foreign agricultural program.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Which would again increase the amount of the subsidy which would be paid to the producers, because with the surpluses out of the country and off the market, again the gap between the local market price and the parity figure increases and the Government payment goes up.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not think the word "subsidy" is a fair designation because, as I stated previously, the consumers in America have received 2½ times the subsidy in the last 12 years that the farmers in America have received over a 20-year period in the price-support program.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then the justification for the subsidy seems to be based upon the argument that because consumers have received Federal payments in 2½ years which totaled more than the farmers have received in 20 years, subsidies should be continued until the farmers' payments match those benefits received by consumers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this matter. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, that is a wonderful compliment. What does the gentleman from New York want me to talk about?

Mr. DONOVAN. I got the notion that you ran away from the question of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the gentleman that I ran away from a question from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], will the gentleman repeat his question?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I had finished, and, I believe, put my point across.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Minnesota does not wish to ask a question, I yield back the balance of my time. We all know the policy to be unsound; that if continued indefinitely it will ruin us. All I wish to know is how we can honorably get out of it with the least cost to the taxpayer and without unduly hurting the farmer, the producer.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment. I desire to propound a question to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. Mr. Chairman, is it true that there was no evidence at all submitted at the hearing on this amendment?

Mr. WOLCOTT. There was no evidence submitted. It was discussed in executive session.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Then, no evidence was submitted at the hearings?

Mr. WOLCOTT. None that I recall.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Is it true that this amendment was voted down by a large vote, and then immediately afterwards a similar amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] was voted down by a vote of 16 to 5.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. No one in this Chamber can tell what effect this amendment may have on this program, is that not correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Absolutely.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. This amendment is dangerous. Mr. Chairman, this program is working well. It has satisfied the farmers and the local institutions making the loans. Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to agree with the gentleman, as I expresed earlier, but I asked him to yield so that I might refer to the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan, if the gentleman will permit me to do so. May I point out to the House that in the period from 1942 to 1952, the farmers of the United States were requested to expand their production in the interest of prosecuting the war and meeting the problems thereof tremendously. During a large portion of that time, the Government itself issued export restrictions prohibiting the export of American farm commodities in world channels at any price. I want to point out also that since the war is over, and as of now the Government policy is that American agricultural production shall not be offered on the world market at competitive prices, but that those markets shall be left alone for foreign producers. Under those conditions, it makes it necessary to do many things in this country that would not be necessary, if that Government policy was not in effect at the moment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. What the distinguished gentleman from Georgia has said is true. The amendment that was offered by me was voted down, but it was not this amendment. This amendment has been changed very materially since then. It is not the amendment which I have now offered, which was voted down in committee.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It is the same principle.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that there is a substantial difference in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky and this amendment, and the reason that many Members voted against it in committee was because it would foreclose the Commodity Credit Corporation from making local loans to carry cotton and wheat and making other commodity loans, and this amendment is so prepared that they will be able to continue to do that and will only have effect where the certificates are offered nationally? This amendment has been prepared to meet the objections which were raised.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I do not think it does. I trust the Members who voted against the amendment then will vote against it today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the Committee of the Whole has just been informed that the amendment now under discussion was not even mentioned in the Committee on Banking and Currency deliberations on this bill and since it has been argued by the proponents that this amendment is an entirely different amendment from anything that was offered or discussed by the Committee on Banking and Currency, certainly an amendment which is so clouded and so confused and so uncertain as to its effects should be voted down.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Is it not a fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] all questioned the Secretary of Agriculture and his aids who were present before our committee, on this very subject of interest and the illegality of what they did?

Mr. McCARTHY. I would say that practically the only controversy in the committee that was germane to this particular bill did relate to this very question. Most of the other questioning had to do with Secretary Benson's farm price support program and was unrelated.

The decision to finance the Commodity Credit Corporation by this device, at least as far as we could discover from the questioning, came from the Treasury Department rather than from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I have a letter dated February 4—before this request came up. My office called the Department of the Treasury and asked what had been done in order to stay under the present debt limit. The answer from W. Randolph Burgess includes this statement:

> Thus far the Treasury has been able to operate under the present debt limit. This was accomplished by using a number of expedients.

And then he goes on to list them. As the second expedient, he lists this:

> No. 2, by making arrangements with the Commodity Credit Corporation to procure wider participation by banks in the financing of price support loans.

In other words, this program was undertaken, I am satisfied, under the urging of the Department of the Treasury. The consequences of it have been disadvantageous to the Commodity Credit Corporation, which was required under this procedure to pay from three-quarters to 1 percent more interest on these certificates than the Treasury was paying on similar obligations at the same time. In July this 2½ percent interest rate was set; the certificates were not issued until October, November, and February. Between July and the date of issuance of these certificates, the rate on 9- to 12-month Government notes fell from about 2.4 down to 1.7 in October. Yet no change was made in the interest rates which were offered on these certificates of interest in October when they were issued.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is trying to establish an orderly procedure which will protect the Commodity Credit Corporation, the farmers, and also protect the taxpayers. I can see no good reason why the Members of the House should not support his amendment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, you know, the more I listen to the debates on agricultural legislation the more confused I become. It seems this amendment is confusion compounded on confusion. Nobody seems to know much about what it is all about. But what I am interested in is what my friend from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is interested in: How long are these subsidy payments going to be continued?

As I remember, the subsidy program started back in the New Deal days of 1935 and 1936, when we had the dust bowl storms, droughts, and floods, and some help had to be given to the farmers. I think there was justification for the action taken by the Congress at that time in trying to afford relief to the farmers in these devastated areas who needed help. That was all right. After that situation cleared up the argument for continuation of subsidy payments was that in 1938, 1939, and 1940 these subsidy programs were necessary for an incentive to the agricultural interests of the Nation to produce the foodstuffs to meet the needs and demands of a war and subsidies were continued throughout World War II and the Korean war. That was a pretty good reason to continue subsidy programs, too.

In the meantime, the Republicans—and I hold no brief for either side, Republicans or Democrats, you have all had your nose in the trough and you like it: Kansas has wheat; Iowa has corn; Wisconsin and Minnesota have butter, eggs, and cheese; in Nebraska it is wool; in California it is citrus fruits and cotton; in Texas, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana it is cotton; in Georgia it is peanuts, tobacco, and cotton; in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia, it is tobacco; so all are in together and it is a very fine coalition. But the fallacy is that you are getting something for nothing; the facts are the only way Uncle Sam gets money is to impose taxes on the American people. So in reality it is ridiculous to think you are getting something for nothing. You want high prices to the farmer and low prices to the consumer, but you forget to argue that the taxpayer has got to foot the bill; so nobody is getting anything for nothing. We are all paying the bill—farmers, consumers, and everybody. Now how long are you going on with these programs? I just wonder if we are going to be a little realistic in our thinking.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GAVIN. Not at this time.

We recall the potato fiasco a few years ago. The American people finally got so incensed and frustrated over the potato situation that you finally let it go back to the operation of the law of supply and demand—a free flow of trade—and you have not heard anything about potatoes since. Now it is butter, and you have priced butter out of the market. The Government, through farm programs and subsidies, bought up millions and millions of pounds or tons of butter and put it in warehouses, caves, and storage places to deteriorate, rot, and waste, to take the butter out of the market and hold up the price structure, and take it away from the consumer, because he could not compete with the Government. That does not make sense to me. I am getting rather fed up with the whole program. I think it is about time you gentlemen thought of the average American. Good sound commonsense should prevail. Certainly a continuation of this kind of program just does not make sense. But the minute Secretary of Agriculture Benson talks about flexibility in agricultural programs and a program in an effort to solve these problems, he is attacked vigorously, viciously, and energetically from all parts of the country. I ask you: Do you want to wreck the economy of the country and the farmer along with it?

How long can the economy of this country stand this kind of program? I just hope the Members of Congress will reason and say these programs do not make commonsense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Like my good friend from Michigan, I, too, wonder how long we are going on with this kind of a program; how long the economy of the country can stand up. You are going to carry on, I am telling you here today, until such time as the American people are going to rebel and rise up and say, "Now, listen, Mr. Congressman, let us get back to commonsense." And I am getting letters from farmers in my district who are fed up with these programs. They realize these subsidies cannot go on forever. I had one today. He said:

> I am a farmer and have studied Mr. Benson's program. I believe it is worth much to the taxpayers of this country. I think farming should be self-sustaining.

So the time has come when we are talking about increasing the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation, now getting many billions of dollars. It should be given a good looking over. Yesterday we had considerable debate over a little constructive project where $5 million was involved; the opposition was forceful.

When in the name of commonsense are we going to reason these programs out, not from a standpoint of political expediency but as good Americans interested in the future welfare of our country? We know these subsidy programs do not make sense and it is time for us to fully realize we must go back to programs that mean the building and welfare and well-being of the American people and the American taxpayer.

I trust you will all think, not from the standpoint of what it means to me or how politically wise it is but from the standpoint, Is it for the good and welfare of the American people and this great country of ours that has been so generous to all of us over a long period of years? I sincerely hope we are coming back to that kind of reasoning.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment my good friend from Pennsylvania on the very statesmanlike approach he takes to this matter. As a matter of fact, I inserted in the RECORD today an editorial which complimented him on his very statesmanlike approach

to the forestry situation the other day. I really believe he has the best interests of the United States and all the people at heart, especially those in his own district. I think that his speech will read real well if he has it printed and if he sends it back to his district. I hope he will send a few of the remarks I will make along with it.

I am serious about this. I agree with many of the criticisms that he made. The agricultural program is bogging down. The Secretary of Agriculture has no remedy in sight. He keeps talking about a great new program he is going to come up with, but he is still thinking about it. Now, the only catch to this is that he, the Secretary, happens to be of the same political party as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I am glad the gentleman made the statements he did because nobody could say that they are political. I would hesitate to say those things because if I said them the Republicans would say: "You are just playing politics." But we all know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would not play politics with a member of his own political party. So he has to be sincere about this.

He made a good speech. There was a lot of validity to it. The gentleman made a lot of telling points. He had a lot of criticisms that the Secretary has not answered. But there was just one thing lacking. The gentleman does not have a program, either. If he did I did not hear it mentioned.

Now, the agricultural population is an important segment of our country. The income of those people is vital to the economy of the country. It is nice to criticize, and I tried to be very careful the other day when I was questioning the Secretary. In critical questions I asked, I pointed out to him that I knew it was easy to criticize and difficult to come up with a solution, that I had some suggestions to make, too. But this is a program that both Democrats and Republicans have been fooling around with. The gentleman said it is a coalition, but you know it is a funny thing, with all the smart people there have been in Congress before I came, and a lot of them since I came, nobody has come up with a perfect answer yet.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I cannot yield for a speech.

Mr. GAVIN. The point I am trying to make is this: For 20 years, we will say, the previous administration has handled the affairs of our agricultural program. Now, I think this—and I am sincere about it—I think Secretary Benson is a conscientious, hard-working agriculturalist who is trying to do a job.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I cannot yield any more.

Mr. GAVIN. Just give him a chance; that is all I am asking. Let us give him a chance, and then in a year from now, if he does not come up with something, we can approach it in a different manner. We have not tried yet what he recommends, but let us do that and see how it works; and then next year come back, if it does not work, and then you can work him over. But he has not been in long enough.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is all I can yield for. I am glad the gentleman made that statement, because it is in my remarks, and I am going to see that it stays in. We have given him a year, and now you want him to have another year. We will give him another year, and I will make a little prediction that he will not have any more program then than he has now; and then I will hold you to your promise that we can work him over, because if he does not come up with a sound program he will be worked over. I will sure work him over. I believe in being charitable, and I believe in giving him time. But, you know, I read a piece in the paper the other day about some fellow making a speech about 20 years of treason. Then he attacked the administration the next day, and one of the Republican papers said, "He is not mad at anybody; he is just looking for material for a speech to be called 21 years of treason." Now, the Secretary of Agriculture, or, to be perfectly fair, some of his political adherents, talked long and loud about what they would do for the farmer if they could only get in power. The question occurs to me, What year are they going to start doing these things for the farmer?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think attention has already been called to the futility of this language and the doubts expressed whether it even does what the gentleman from Kentucky intends by it, because as some of us interpret the language, while this limitation would not apply to certificates issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation to banks making Commodity Credit Corporation loans, it does apply to a method which has been used by the Commodity Credit Corporation in getting its money to effectuate the contracts over the years. It just so happens that these small banks that make these loans service these loans, they advise with the farmers, and they make it possible to make the loan locally, instead of a farmer out in the back country having to come miles into the city. Recognizing that certain States are remote from the money markets, the participants in this program in those States would find it necessary to go hundreds of miles, perhaps, to the money markets, were it not for the fact that these loans made by small banks to these farmers can be pooled and the certificates sold to their correspondent banks.

The interpretation I personally put upon the language the gentleman from Kentucky has offered in his amendment is that although it would exempt the certificate issued to the original bank, the small country bank, it would prohibit the practice of pooling these certificates, which is the key, the hard core of this program at the present time.

This has been going on for years. I call your attention to the fact that as far back as 1943, down to and including 1952, they were operating directly through the banks under this program in a volume exceeding $1 billion. They even borrowed from the public as far back as 1938. At the present time they have other certificates amounting to $1,160,000,000. I am informed that about $675 million of this total is in cotton certificates and that $210 million of the loans pooled are tobacco producer loans. I am sure the gentleman from Kentucky does not want to do anything which would prohibit his tobacco farmers from participating in this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPENCE) there were—ayes 48, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 1, line 5, immediately following the figure "$8,500,000,000" (and before the quotation marks which follow such figure) insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the Corporation shall not issue any obligations (other than to the Secretary of the Treasury) at a rate of interest in excess of 25 percent of the rate of interest (or comparable cost) paid by the Treasury of the United States on the most recently issued obligations of the United States of comparable maturity, except that the provisions of this proviso shall not apply to lending agency agreements applicable to loans under a commodity loan program."

A CHANGE FROM THE TRADITIONAL POLICY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the Members of the House want to go as far as this bill goes, if they would only understand it. I know they have not had the time to study it. Some of the members of our committee evidently have not because the hearings are full of valuable information, which I am sure has not been given consideration by all Members. This is a big change from the traditional policy. I am going to try to show you how it is a change, if I can. Heretofore, the farmers who were getting Commodity Credit loans on their tobacco or their cotton or anything else went to their local banks and got these loans. That was all right. This amendment will not change it. It will preserve that traditional policy. They will still be able to do that. But when they do that, they will not be in competition with the Treasury in getting money. They get this money locally. If you do it, as this bill provides, it will be a mandate from the Congress to increase the interest rates on the farmer, and take just that much more purchasing power away from him, and make him spend that money paying interest instead of buying something that is necessary for himself and his family. Putting it simply that is exactly what it amounts to. Under the traditional policy, the Commodity Credit Corporation gets the

money from the Treasury. Where does the Treasury get it? It borrows it from the banks and other investors. If you want to call it that, it is the private enterprise system at work. But when the Treasury gets it from private-enterprise system, the Treasury lets the Commodity Credit Corporation have it. In that way, it saves the farmers a great deal of interest because the Treasury can borrow money cheaper than the Commodity Credit can. It saves the farmers a lot of interest. Furthermore, it saves another thing. It would save the Commodity Credit from going into the market and asking for a bid on money at the same time the Treasury is going into the same market and asking for a bid on money. That causes the Commodity Credit Corporation to have to pay more money in the form of interest. That causes its competitor—its competitor, imagine that—are you going to vote to set up competition between two Government agencies—the competitor in this case will be the Treasury to have to pay more interest which is charged to the taxpayers. The Treasury will have to pay more money in the form of interest because it is in competition with Commodity Credit. That is not just a guess. Call a page and have him bring you a copy of the printed hearings before our committee. Turn to page 29 and then to page 30, and you will find that last year the Commodity Credit in adopting that policy for the first time in history that it has ever been adopted—the first time—cost the farmers of this country $9 million more. Then it cost the Federal Government in borrowing on short-term securities, being in competition at the same time with the Commodity Credit Corporation—it cost Uncle Sam $97 million more. That is not for just 1 year, but it is for 10 years or 15 years or 20 years—it is from here on because those debts are refunded on longer obligations, as you know. For us to vote for this bill, without this amendment, is just voting to endorse not only the hardest kind of hard money possible, but the highest kind of high interest policy. A vote for this bill without this amendment is a vote to place two Government agencies in competition with each other in their efforts to get funds from the investing public.

I am inserting herewith excerpts from the hearings on this bill before the Banking and Currency Committee, pages 29 and 30:

Mr. PATMAN. Now, this has resulted in the Treasury having to raise its rate, and the figures I am putting in the record will show something that the gentleman from Kentucky indicated a while ago, that not only did you pay more money than you should have paid on these certificates by over $9 million a year, because you went through the banks instead of the Treasury, but it caused the Government to have to pay more and more on 90-day bills, which cost the Government $97,500,000 for the first year of interest.

I am putting this statement in the record.

(The statement referred to by Mr. PATMAN is as follows:)

"CERTIFICATES OF INTEREST IN CCC LOANS

"Secretary of Agriculture Benson announced on September 23, 1953, to the American Bankers Association the outlines of a plan to allow banks to participate in a pooling of loans made by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the course of supporting prices of certain basic crops.

"The purpose, he said, was 'to achieve a greater investment of funds by private banks with a view to reducing the Commodity Credit Corporation's use of Treasury funds to a minimum' (American Banker, September 23, 1953).

"Some details were announced by Benson on October 14, 1953, when bankers were invited to buy certificates of interest in the first three pools. On the basis of transactions in more than $1 billion worth of CCC loans, here's how the system works:

"As in the past, the CCC makes price support loans to farmers, either directly or by using local banks as fiscal agents. As the amount of outstanding loans increases, CCC goes to the United States Treasury Department and borrows enough money to meet its obligations to farmers. The Treasury lends the money out of funds on hand or goes into the market to raise it by its own borrowing. Congress has placed a limit on CCC's authority to borrow from the Treasury which currently stands at $6.75 billion, but would raise to $8.5 billion in President Eisenhower's recommendations of January 11, 1954. This process has been going on for many years.

"However, the Treasury was turned down last summer by Congress on its request for an increase in its own authority to borrow money, or increase the congressional ceiling on the public debt. As the Treasury got closer and closer to the ceiling, methods were devised for avoiding a rupture of the ceiling, including the new plan for certificates of interest in price support loans.

"The CCC placed outstanding price support loans in a pool and sold certificates of interest in the pool to bankers, using the cash thus collected from bankers for making subsequent price support loans to farmers and thus avoiding a trip to the Treasury to borrow. Partly because of this release, the Treasury has avoided piercing the ceiling to date, for the certificates of interest are not considered part of the public debt.

"NOTE.—This arrangement between the CCC and private banks is not to be confused with a program which has been operated for several years whereby the local banks which handle price support loans as fiscal agents for the CCC elect to hold the loan (and service it) in return for a payment of interest from the CCC. The new system is in addition to that one.

"Secretary Benson has set up three pools for banker participation by purchase of certificates of interest, as follows:

Date	Target amount	Interest rate	Oversubscription
		Percent	
Oct. 14, 1953	$360,000,000	2½	$1,790,304,000
Dec. 7, 1953	450,000,000	2¼	754,304,000
Jan. 15, 1954	350,000,000	2⅛	1,511,529,000
Total	1,160,000,000		4,056,137,000

"This is actually Government (CCC) borrowing from banks on short-term or call conditions. The very first announcement, on October 14, stated: 'Certificates will mature on August 2, 1954, but will be purchased by the CCC prior to maturity upon demand.'

"However, the rate of interest paid by the CCC is considerably higher than the going rate on Treasury short-term borrowings and commercial call money. The CCC is paying 2¼ and 2½ percent, while the Treasury could have borrowed 91-day (short-term) money for 1½ percent or less. (Commercial call money was about 2 percent at the time.)

"The difference between the two rates represents added cost to the taxpayers. Assuming a Treasury rate of 1½ percent, here is the approximate additional cost of each pool transaction:

Date	Target amount	Interest rate	Additional cost
		Percent	
Oct. 14, 1953	$360,000,000	2½	$3,600,000
Dec. 7, 1953	450,000,000	2¼	3,400,000
Jan. 15, 1954	350,000,000	2⅛	2,187,500
Total			9,187,500

"That this operation has cost the Government considerably more money is confirmed by the fact that the issues were very heavily oversubscribed, in spite of the interest rate having been reduced on each successive issue by the CCC.

"It should also be noted that these interest rates are higher than the 2-percent rate which the Treasury charged the CCC for the last money it borrowed from the Treasury ($5 million on October 1, 1953, for a 9-month note). These added costs will be charged in some way to the farm price-support program.

"In addition, the operation caused an indirect increase of nearly $100 million in the cost of Treasury financing. Because bankers were so attracted to the certificates of interest at the high rates, they stayed away from the regular Treasury issues of short-term bills, forcing the Treasury to raise the rates on those issues.

"In the 2-week period ending October 14 (the date of the first CCC offer of $360 million certificates) weekly reporting Federal Reserve member banks reduced their holdings of Treasury bills by $304 million. The December 1953 Monthly Review of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York states: 'The possibility that the CCC would soon offer another large amount of certificates of interest tended to depress the bill market. Average yields on the third and fourth issues of Treasury bills during the month, the issues dated November 19 and 27, were 1.433 percent, respectively.'

"Average annual interest rates on new issues of Treasury 91-day bills which had reached a low of 1.220 percent on October 29 climbed to 1.687 percent on the bills dated December 17. This represents an increase of almost one-half of 1 percent per annum in interest. The Treasury borrows $1.5 billion every week through bill sales. An increase of one-half of 1 percent paid in refinancing the total of Treasury bills outstanding for 1 year would cost $97.5 million.

"Thus, the total cost to the Government, and hence to the taxpayers, is—

"Cost of higher interest paid on CCC pools	$9,197,500
Annual cost of higher interest forced on Treasury	97,500,000
Total additional cost	106,697,500

"In addition, it should be noted that the Administration raised interest rates on CCC price-support loans to farmers last March from 3½ to 4 percent, and gave to the banks who act as CCC fiscal agents all the benefit of the raise.

"A serious matter of public policy is involved. There is great doubt that Congress or farm groups ever intended the CCC to engage in its own financing, such as it is doing by the certificates of interest, and there are equally great doubts that it is advisable, aside from its extra cost to taxpayers."

When they ask for bids for money the investors run from one to the other, and there will be a race, going up on the Commodity Credit Corporation; going up on the Federal Government. I do not think this House wants to vote to

put two agencies of this Government in competition with each other in obtaining funds in the open market, where the interest rates will be increased on one and then increased on the other. Gentlemen, I submit to you this bill needs this safeguard. It will not prohibit the Commodity Credit Corporation from borrowing money if it wants to in the open market.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PATMAN was granted 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. PATMAN. Under this amendment they can still—I am yielding there—I am going further than I like to go, but this amendment is generous. This says the Commodity Credit Corporation can still go into the open market and borrow money, but it cannot pay over 25 percent more in interest. Are you going to vote to let them pay more than 25 percent in the open market, more than they can get the same money from the Treasury, when the Treasury gets it from the open market? If you vote against this amendment you vote to allow the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay 200 percent more, and it will, than it would have to pay to the United States Treasury.

This amendment is liberal. It permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to operate in the open market and pay not more than 25 percent more than they would have to pay to the United States Treasury. So I ask you in all fairness to consider this amendment and vote for it, because it is a necessary part of this important bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the subject matter of this amendment is almost identical with the one just acted upon, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that, in my opinion, in this subsidy program—and I am inserting in the RECORD four articles recently appearing in the Pittsburgh Press—that big farmers, not the little farmers, are the ones reaping the greatest benefit. I am all out to help the small farmer at any time he needs help, but when the big commercial farmer is producing for the Government rather than the American consumer, "I'm agin it." The question is, Do these programs help the average American farmer or the big commercial farmers, the great wheat and corn growers, and others who get subsidies of thousands of dollars? Who are we helping? The newspaper articles I have inserted indicate who is getting the subsidies.

As far as my State, which was referred to, I might say up in Jefferson County in my district, a mine has just closed. It has been in operation for years. Four to six hundred men have been thrown out of work. The miners have made their last trip in and there is no possible chance for immediate employment. It will become a distress area, but they do not come down here to the Department of the Interior crying the blues and it is questionable what help they would get if they did. They are entitled to consideration and help as much as anyone else. Why not subsidize coal? It is just as important as anything else. But every time an agricultural program comes up for consideration you are in here all together, a coalition, putting it through. I am proud of my State and my district. My State of 10 million sent 1,400,000 men and women into World War II. We produced 30 to 35 percent of all the war materials. We do have difficulties, particularly in the coal industry, where we have real problems. If any Member from a farm State had an area where 400 to 600 farmers were suddenly flattened out, they would be given, I am sure, consideration and they would be entitled to it, so there are other branches of our economic life that might be considered for subsidy programs such as coal if these programs are going to be continued.

[From the Pittsburgh Press of February 9, 1954]

ONE CHECK PAYS $183,510—UNITED STATES WHEAT SUBSIDIES GIVE BIGGEST BENEFITS TO WEALTHY GROWERS—EFFICIENT FARMERS WOULD STILL PROFIT UNDER CHANGES SUPPORTED BY PRESIDENT

(By George Thiem)

(George Thiem, who heads the Springfield, Ill., bureau of the Chicago Daily News, is a nationally known authority on agriculture. A farm owner himself, Mr. Thiem was a writer for farm journals before joining the Chicago Daily News staff 13 years ago. Thiem's vigorous reporting about newspaper editors on Illinois State payrolls won a Pulitzer award for the newspaper in 1949. This is the first of three articles.)

CHICAGO, February 9.—Big western wheat growers are collecting important money—one got a quarter of a million dollars—on a single crop under the 90-percent-parity-price loan program.

They have been selling wheat that cost 80 cents or less a bushel to raise to the Government—the highest bidder—for $2.14 a bushel.

The wheat-subsidy program, from which wealthy growers get the most benefit, has cost the taxpayers $95,127,450 in losses during the 20 years ended June 30, 1953.

The figures are taken from the operations report of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of June 30, 1953, issued by the Department of Agriculture.

POTENTIAL LOSSES

Potential losses on the 1953 crop, of which 431 million bushels were under price supports December 15, are expected to push in-the-red figures well over $125 millions.

President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson are pleading with Congress to return to the flexible price-support program to avoid piling up more tax-eating surpluses.

The leading farm organizations, sensing a public demand to cut farm subsidies and balance the Federal budget, are supporting the administration.

They are opposed by politicians in Congress, many from the big wheat States, who are attempting to continue a wartime measure—high price supports—adopted to stimulate production when our allies were crying for food.

In the wheat country east of Denver, Colo., the 10 top 1952 crop wheat loans for Adams and Arapahoe Counties varied from $261,091.14 down to $28,379.12, the Chicago News survey revealed.

RECORDS QUOTED

The figures taken from the records in the local agricultural stabilization and conservation offices in these two counties appear in the following table:

Producer	Bushels under loan	Amount of loan
Monoghan Farms Co	122,578.00	$261,091.14
Jeff Drohan	25,112.72	50,529.60
J. A. Shoebrook	22,068.00	47,323.25
Box Elder Farms Co	22,015.87	44,378.63
Alfred and James Linnebur	19,578.00	41,927.09
Schmidt Bros	18,037.00	38,599.18
Moffitt Bros	16,576.45	33,484.12
J. E. Wickham & Sons	14,821.00	31,919.33
Halverson Bros	15,069.57	30,289.84
Melvin Anderson	14,049.07	28,379.12

All of the loans were written off when the owners delivered the grain to the Government.

Had the price gone up above the loan figure, the growers would have sold the wheat and paid off the loan, pocketing the profit.

TAXPAYERS TAKE LOSS

When the price fails to rise or goes down, as usually happens, the taxpayers take the loss. The Government is left with the wheat to dispose of as best it can.

Under the program changes currently being advocated by President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson, wheatgrowers would still get a $1.78-per-bushel loan (75 percent of parity) under surplus conditions.

Such a loan would still enable the producer to make a handsome profit on efficient farms.

Losses to the taxpayers, however, would be cut sharply if not eliminated. To get the loan, the grower would have to observe his acreage allotment.

ESTIMATE OF PRICES

Grain market experts estimate that without a Government loan, current wheat prices would average $1.60 to $1.75 a bushel.

In years of short crops, desirable grades would possibly rise to parity ($2.45 a bushel) or higher just as hog prices currently—without Government intervention—are selling well above parity.

In the Pacific Northwest, the Government wheat loan is a bonanza for producers of the club wheat common to that area.

The January report from Washington revealed that Washington, Oregon, and Idaho doubled the volume of 1953 wheat put under Government seal compared to 1952.

BIG BENEFITS

Top Benson County, Wash., producers (on the south-central border) drew up to $183,000 in wheat loans on the 1952 crop. The biggest check for $183,510.36 went to Horrigan Farms, Prosser, Wash., on a delivery of 82,490 bushels.

McWhorter & McWhorter, of the same county, drew checks totaling $93,599.72 on 43,205 bushels placed under seal.

In Whitman County, near Spokane, L. C. Staley drew a Government check for $121,953.09 on his 1952 crop of 57,850 bushels.

Floyd F. Fields did almost as well—$101,723.77 for the 50,783 bushels he put in a Government-approved warehouse.

Another big loan was that to Edgar W. Smith & Sons, $89,529.60 on a volume of 42,592 bushels.

[From the Pittsburgh Press of February 10, 1954]

LITTLE GUY GETS ATTENTION, BUT BIG WHEAT GROWERS LAP UP MILLIONS—ONE TEXAS FARMER DREW $64,320 CHECK; SURPLUSES REVEAL PROGRAM OVEREXTENDED

(By George Thiem)

(Second of a series)

CHICAGO, February 10.—The halls of Congress ring with the plight of the little farmer, but big growers are lapping up millions of the taxpayers' money in wheat subsidies.

In Texas, normally a big wheat State, 10 growers in Sherman County, located in the wheat-growing Panhandle, averaged nearly $30,000 on their 1952 crop despite the drought.

One grower, R. C. Buckles, of Stratford, Tex., drew a $64,320 Government check on 32,000 bushels. He later delivered the wheat to the Commodity Credit Corporation to become part of the 1,760-million-bushel supply of which about half is surplus.

Here is a list of these big loans:

Grower	Bushels under loan	Amount of loan
R. C. Buckles	32,000	$64,320.00
B. L. Smith	15,351	30,396.31
Kenneth Borth	15,501	31,158.36
Paul Auddell	11,485	23,059.19
Leroy Judd	12,540	28,609.43
Frank Judd	12,540	28,576.77
Haile Brothers	11,586	23,288.86
M. Dortch	10,315	20,734.15
Do	10,315	20,733.81
W. N. Price	11,396	23,133.88

(When wheat prices rise beyond the Government loan figure, the growers can sell the wheat, pay off the loan, and pocket the profit. But when the price fails to rise, or goes down, as often happens, the taxpayers take the loss. The Government is left to get rid of the wheat as best it can.)

The wheat program was started in 1933 as a depression emergency program, with the Government paying low, flexible price supports.

During World War II the program was stiffened.

The Government began to pay supports at the rate of 90 percent of parity in order to stimulate production to aid our Allies.

The wheat program has been continued long after the need for it ceased to exist, ever-mounting surpluses reveal.

NINETY-MILLION-DOLLAR LOSSES

In the 6 years ended June 30, 1953, wheat program losses of the CCC totaled nearly $90 million. An additional $25 million may be lost on 1953 crop wheat of which the Government is holding the bag on 431 million bushels.

For the 20-year period since the program began, losses on wheat alone totaled $95,127,450.

During this period, price support losses—on all crops and commodities—totaled $1,110,136,889.

Figuring the Government loss at 50 cents a bushel on the huge wheat surpluses it now holds, the Sherman County growers in the accompanying list were subsidized to the extent of $5,000 to $16,000 per farm on their 1952 crop.

In Dallam County, Tex., the top loan went to J. E. Crabtree of Conlen.

His Government wheat check totaled $40,200. Mr. Crabtree and L. J. Schmidt, of Dalhart, who drew $35,314.44 on 17,311 bushels, delivered the wheat to the Commodity Credit Corporation in satisfaction of the loan.

Twenty other big wheat growers in Dallam and Hartley Counties drew checks varying from $15,000 to $32,526 on their 1952 wheat fields.

DROUGHT CUT LOANS

If West Texas had received timely rains in 1952 needed to produce a bumper crop, the yields and Government loans would have been much greater.

Are 90 percent parity price loans necessary for Great Plains wheat growers to make a profit?

Prof. George Montgomery, head of the department of economics and sociology at Kansas State College, Manhattan, says "no."

In a recent study of wheat growing in dry southwestern Kansas where the summer-fallow system (one crop in 2 years on the same field) is practiced, Mr. Montgomery calculated production costs at less than 80 cents a bushel.

Similar studies in eastern Kansas, southern Indiana and southern Michigan revealed a range of wheat yield costs of from $1.50 to $1.75 a bushel.

Based on his studies of wheat costs, Mr. Montgomery observed:

"The system of price supports which has been established for wheat has not resulted in output being obtained from the lowest cost producers. * * *

"The level of price supports (90 percent parity) prevailing at present, is well above the level necessary to call forth a volume of wheat production to meet adequately the domestic need for human food."

[From the Pittsburgh Press of February 11, 1954]

"SUITCASE FARMERS" REAP PROFITS—SUBSIDY PROGRAM SPURS WHEAT GROWING IN HIGH-COST AREAS—NEW INDUSTRY OF RAISING GRAIN FOR UNITED STATES FORCING $200 MILLION LOSS ON TAXPAYERS

(By George Thiem)

(Last of a series)

CHICAGO, February 11.—The war-born Government wheat subsidy has stimulated wheat growing in high-cost areas all over America.

This has increased the demand for price-support protection.

Because the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) is the highest bidder, a record 431 million bushels of 1953 crop wheat had been put under loan on purchase agreement by December 15, 1953.

The loan period ended January 31, 1954, and the final figures are not yet available.

The taxpayers are facing a potential loss of $200 million and more on this wheat on which the Government is pledged to take delivery April 30.

PLANTING EXPANDED

Only a severe 1954 drought and resulting low yield can save the Government from a loss that would exceed the accumulated deficits of the previous 20 years.

Under the stimulus of high-price supports, bread grain planting has expanded from its natural low-cost habitat in the Great Plains and Pacific Northwest States, into the rich Corn Belt of the Middle West.

Growing wheat to sell to the Government is a new industry in some parts of the East. Even the South is getting into the act.

You have the example of a 1,500-acre New Jersey dairy farm south of New York City growing 1,000 acres of wheat for the Government.

Because wheat can be grown with minimum labor, acreage jumped in Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio in 1953, according to figures released by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Administration.

Where these States put only 9.3 million bushels of wheat under loan in 1952, they applied for and got the guaranteed price on 46.7 million bushels on the 1953 crop.

Of course, wheat under loan is not the best comparison of acreage. Higher open market prices in 1952 had made the loan less advantageous to producers.

Actual acreage in the three States was reported by the Government as 5,634,000 in 1952 and 6,135,000 in 1953, an increase of 501,000 acres.

MIDWEST CUT SHARPLY

The Midwest States were cut sharply in the 1954 acreage reduction program because of their recent expansion.

Practically all of this 1953 wheat crop pledged to the Government, it is expected, will be delivered to the CCC this spring to satisfy the loans and purchase contracts.

All this means that taxpayers' money is being used to promote competition in wheat-growing on $400 to $500 an acre land. It can be raised more efficiently on the $25 to $50 an acre soil of Kansas, eastern Colorado, western Oklahoma, Texas, the Dakotas, Montana, Washington, Idaho, and Oregon.

Thus the dryland States, where wheat is one of the few crops that can be grown successfully, are faced with hundreds of thousands of new competitors piling up more surpluses.

These stockpiles of wheat bear down on domestic and world price at a time when normal production has returned to such war-torn areas as France, Italy, Germany, Russia, and Eastern Europe.

President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson are currently asking Congress to take another look at the wheat picture.

They are not demanding an end of price supports. They chose the moderate course of recommending a return to the flexible-loan program of 1949.

This would allow surpluses to find more normal outlets in world trade and for livestock feed.

COMMONSENSE

The President and Secretary are attempting to restore what they and thousands of thoughtful wheat growers regard as a commonsense price-support program.

Instead of the current national average support price of $2.21 a bushel (90 percent of parity), in time of huge surpluses, as at present, the support price would be dropped to about $1.70, or 75 percent of parity.

The Chicago Daily News survey disclosed that wealthy wheat growers in the West are getting the big money out of wheat subsidies.

Many of these dryland producers are called suitcase farmers because of their habit of staying on the land only long enough to put in the fall crop, planted usually in October in the Southwest.

Many then leave to spend the winter in California or Florida, returning in late May and June to hire big combine harvesters to bring in the golden grains.

The facts revealed that the bulk of Middle West and eastern wheat growers are little farmers who derive most of their income from other sources.

They would not be hurt economically by a flexible price-support program.

H. Earl Propst, New Jersey stabilization and conservation administrator at New Brunswick, said many potato growers in that State turned to wheat growing after Congress voted to end potato subsidies.

He reported: "The majority of our wheat growers are now equipped to handle wheat production," indicating recent purchase of drills and combine harvesters.

[From the Pittsburgh Press of February 12, 1954]

IT'S TAXPAYERS' MONEY—SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIVE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIVE DOLLARS COLLECTED BY WHEAT GROWER IN ONE SUBSIDY CHECK—OTHER KANSAS FARMERS ON GRAVY TRAIN NET PAYMENTS FROM $200,000 TO $20,000

(By George Thiem)

CHICAGO, February 12.—Big Kansas wheat growers had a front seat on the gravy train

carrying Federal 90 percent parity price-support loans on the 1952 crop.

One got a Government check for nearly three-quarters of a million dollars, a Chicago Daily News investigation disclosed.

The biggest beneficiary yet uncovered is Garvey Farms of Greeley and Thomas Counties in the extreme western part of the State.

In Greeley County, Garvey Farms got four loans totaling $89,949.94 on 37,668 bushels of warehoused wheat. In Thomas County, the loan of $615,755.23 on 260,486 bushels brought the total to $705,705.17, an estimated $150,000 of which will come out of the taxpayers' pockets.

The estimated cost to the taxpayers is based on the current export wheat subsidy of 52 to 53 cents a bushel.

CURB ON SELLING

According to expert grain sources at Kansas City, the Government isn't permitted to sell wheat domestically below the loan price plus 5 percent.

However, it is authorized to subsidize exports. To meet world competition, exporters are taking Government subsidies, thus working off surpluses into foreign channels and strengthening the home market.

Informed sources feel that United States market prices would fall around 50 cents a bushel if free trade were restored.

Wheat at Kansas City this week was selling (for No. 1 hard) at $2.35 a bushel, or 15 cents under the Government loan price.

At country points in extreme western Kansas, the loan price of $2.13 to $2.14 on farm-stored wheat reflects the differential due to freight and handling charges.

Numerous western Kansas wheatgrowers fattened on subsidy loans varying from $200,000 down to $20,000, the Chicago Daily News survey disclosed.

NINETY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS LOST

These subsidies figured in the 20-year loss of $95,127,450 on wheat supports since 1933.

Nearly $90 million of this came in the 6 years prior to June 30, 1953, when Congress and the administration failed to allow the flexible-loan program with its more reasonable price supports to go into effect.

To what extent the big wheatgrowers fattening at the public trough pressured Congress into continuing high price supports in the face of a slackening world demand is still to be revealed.

Next to Garvey Farms, the fattest Government wheat check in Greeley County went to Coupland Bros. The payment was $201,598.85 on a delivery of 94,466 bushels.

Another grower who hit the jackpot was C. Wilbert White, of Goodland, Sherman County, whose take was $142,354.28 on 65,556 bushels.

Mr. White delivered the 1952 crop wheat to the Government in cancellation of the loan. The Government still has the wheat.

It is not permitted to sell it on the home market because the free market price is below the loan price. To sell it abroad, it pays a subsidy of 52 to 53 cents a bushel.

Duane Schneider, of Tribune, Kans., sold his 30,068 bushels of wheat to the Government for $75,186.02, delivering the bread grain at the end of the loan period to cancel the contract.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] is recognized.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, last summer the President of the United States asked the Congress to act upon the statutory debt limit. I supported the President as did many other Members of this body to increase the statutory debt limit. The other body did not see fit to act upon that particular measure, so we find that we have had some things happen in the matter of trying to carry on the financing of our Government.

I have asked repeatedly how much the failure to act upon raising the statutory debt limit has cost the taxpayers of this country. If there is any Member of this body who can give me that information I certainly will appreciate it. I have not been able to find out in dollars and cents how much that has cost or will cost.

I do have a letter in my hand from the Secretary of the Treasury talking about this matter. The financing of the Commodity Credit Corporation paper. I am going to cite a few figures from that letter:

In October 25 CCC certificates of interest sold at 2½ percent interest.

On December 17 CCC certificates of interest sold at 2¼ percent interest.

On February 2 CCC certificates of interest sold at 2⅛ percent interest.

Every one of these loans was greatly oversubscribed, up to 8 and 10 times the amount that was offered.

On October 28, CCC borrowed $360 million.

On December 17, CCC borrowed $450 million.

On February 2, CCC borrowed $350 million.

I do think that it is particularly interesting to note the closing line of h's letter to me:

The increase in the cost of this financing is due to the limitation of Treasury borrowing under the existing debt limit.

If you figure this at one-quarter percent increase in interest which is the lowest amount that could be considered, I am sure it is costing the taxpayer $2,900,000 yearly. That is no small sum. This should not be charged to the farmers of the United States. It is not their responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARTHY yielded his time to Mr. MULTER.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, may I take half a minute to refer to the challenge that was made during the course of general debate when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] challenged the statement of the gentleman from New York now addressing you that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, had spent $2,018 of animal research funds for rehabilitating a cottage which he personally used for himself and his family. I think he then left the floor, or at least I did not observe the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] on the floor, when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] read from the hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture and sustained the charge I made quoting Mr. Secretary Benson as admitting that he used that amount of money out of the animal research fund.

Now may I go on to the matter before us. Let us not get this issue confused. You in the farm bloc on both sides of the aisle, if you reject this amendment as you rejected the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], are going to be voting as has already been indicated to you, to increase the cost of this program to the farmer, to the consumer, to all the taxpayers. This manner of operation of borrowing by the Commodity Credit Corporation is illegal, it is unlawful, it is contrary to existing law and it has been frowned upon by the General Accounting Office, by the Budget Director and by the former Secretary of the Treasury. The only excuse for it can be that you want to exceed the debt limit. Now, if you want to exceed the debt limit, and you had to do it last year, let us increase the debt limit. Let us not try to go through the back door and saddle on the taxpayers and the farmers and the consumers what has already amounted to in excess of $106 million in the floating of over a billion dollars worth of certificates. Those are not the certificates that the Commodity Credit Corporation issues to the banks that make the loans to the farmers. These certificates that the Secretary of Agriculture is now selling illegally are being sold to the big bankers who are not in this program, who are not lending money to the farmers; but they are giving the Secretary of Agriculture through the Commodity Credit Corporation the proceeds of the certificates of interest which he in turn gives to the little banker who is lending the money to the little farmer. If that is what you want to do, then vote down the amendment. I am sure you do not want to be charged with selling out the farmer to the moneychangers. That is what you would do if you reject this amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I would like to know what the gentleman means by the statement that the Secretary is selling these obligations illegally?

Mr. MULTER. The law provides he may borrow money for the Commodity Credit Corporation only through the Treasury, only through the United States Treasury. Instead of doing that he is bypassing the United States Treasury with Mr. Humphrey's approval and issuing certificates to the bankers for their money which he then uses to run this program instead of getting his money through the Secretary of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York better check up on his facts before he charges that the Secretary of Agriculture is doing an illegal act because if that is so there is ample precedent for it running away back to 1934. We would have to assume

that every Secretary of Agriculture has been violating the law since that time.

To get down to the point here, this amendment, as I understand it, is nearly identical in its purpose to the one that the House just voted down. In a similar manner it would in practice limit the local banks from participating in these loans. Where would a local farmer go for service on these loans? Where should he go other than to his local small town bank for service on these loans?

Now, do not be misled by the 25 percent. It is 25 percent of the rate of interest paid by the Treasurer of the United States on the most recent obligations of the United States of comparable maturity. The issue that would comply with that criteria are the 2⅝ due August 15, 1954. So you have to take 25 percent of 2⅝. Can you imagine any bank with that limitation, on that small margin which constitutes an almost infinitesimal return on its investment, being able to participate in this program?

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated overwhelmingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Patman amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MULTER) there were—ayes 73, noes 109.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 4 (1) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (62 Stat. 1070), as amended, is amended by striking out "$6,750,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,500,000,000."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a good many of the Members who are here now were not here when I discussed this question in general debate. It is my intention, if a motion to recommit is not offered on the other side, to offer a motion to recommit this bill for further consideration. My reason is this. I would like to restate it briefly by way of summation of what I said before in general debate.

This bill is designed essentially to sustain the present 90-percent fixed price-support farm program. It gives no consideration to the new program recommended by the administration. It does not even give consideration to the revision in the program already ordered by the Secretary of Agriculture in respect of butter. Hence it seems to me to be directly tied to the existing farm-price policy and it is my conviction that this is the basis for this vote.

It is impossible, however, to oppose the bill in toto because there is some money that will be needed under any farm-price-support program and therefore the logical thing is to have the vote upon a motion to recommit.

The statement was made a moment ago that this farm-price policy has cost the country only $1 billion. I am sorry, but I cannot agree with that statement, and I say that for this reason: The Commodity Credit Corporation credits at the full amount of what it paid for commodities all repayments to it by other Government agencies. I think everybody here knows that very large transactions have taken place under the European recovery and other programs, with the Commodity Credit Corporation in that way without regard to market or actual prices.

A Department of Agriculture estimate I have seen quoted puts the cost of agricultural and related programs 1932–53 at over $16 billion to which can be added over $4 billion for wartime consumer subsidies or a total of over $20 billion.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am quoting from figures given by the Department of Agriculture itself on page 123 of the hearings.

Mr. JAVITS. The figures I have seen are quoted from figures given by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. But Mr. King's figures, as the gentleman knows, include the cost of all agricultural programs over the last 20 years.

Mr. JAVITS. I was coming to the fundamental point which is this: We have about $6,150,000,000 of these commodities in store. As I read the debate in the other body by people who are in the farm group, they themselves estimated that if we realized 50 percent on what we have in store of butter, cheese, and dried milk solids something like a quarter of a billion dollars worth, we would be doing well.

This issue cannot be argued upon the basis of how much it did or did not cost. If it is just, then whatever it has cost is worth it. The only thing I say, and I am not arguing about the city against the country, is that this whole situation is going against the farmer, with an investment estimated now to go up $8.5 billion for price-supported agricultural commodities which is 25 percent of the value of all the farm commodities marketed in this country in 1952. Just think of it, 25 percent the Government is expected to acquire and hold.

This whole program is economically unsound. It is a snare and a delusion both for the consumer and the farmer. It has to be revised. To revise it, you have to start somewhere, and this bill is the place to start it, because if you do not start it here you will be told in a month or so from now when it comes to voting on the farm price-support program itself, "Don't worry about it now, you have already decided it. You have provided the money, so why not continue the same high-fixed farm price-support program again?"

The issue is not alone the $8.5 billion for price supports. With all due respect to these gentlemen and the internal mechanics of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the issue is, Do you or do you not want the commitment for fixed 90 percent of parity farm price supports?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say it is anticipated there will be at least a 50-percent loss in this program now?

Mr. JAVITS. I did not say quite that. What I said was that in reading the debates in the other body, the estimates made by Members from farm areas on the milk products stocks held by CCC, there were estimates there that the loss in such commodities held would be 50 percent or more.

Mr. ARENDS. I wondered where the estimate came from. I did not know about it.

Mr. JAVITS. It may very well be that some of the Members of the other body were thinking of specific commodities. For example, I have heard specifically the 50-percent figure in respect to butter. Hence I was not stating it authoritatively; I was only pointing out that there would be a substantial loss on the commodities held by CCC; nothing else.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I believe the gentleman stated that if this is justice then this bill should pass as a matter of justice.

Mr. JAVITS. I made that amply clear. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Does the gentleman think that 90 percent of parity or equality is less than justice?

Mr. JAVITS. I have made my point clear. I do not think it is just either to the farmer or the consumer because it is not working for the farmer as witness the figures, and the consumer is paying twice—in higher food prices and in Federal taxes.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate this afternoon, particularly the point that seems to be the greatest question in the minds of those of consumer districts. They wonder just where this program is going, why we are in the predicament we are in, and if there is any hopeful future for it.

Whether you are in sympathy with the program or not, we must start from where we are. We got into this predicament because the prior Secretary of Agriculture—and I am not challenging his judgment; he might have been proved to be right—thought we were going to get into an all-out war in 1950 after the outbreak of war in Korea. He urged all-out production, particularly of basic commodities such as wheat and cotton.

What we have today is the result of the urgency of production. It is an unnatural surplus, not a normal accumulation. The wheatgrowers and the cottongrowers, and they are the two commodities of the basics that are experiencing the greatest trouble right now, have voluntarily started cutting back production so that they can bring their production in line with the consumption demands. Take wheat, for example. Because of the demands for the war and the postwar programs we increased our production of wheat until we are now producing about 1 billion to 1.1 billion bushels of wheat per year. We have an actual cash market for about half of that here at home, and about 300 million bushels abroad, which means we have around 200 to 300 million bushels capacity production after the cash market has gone. So what we are doing is saying to the farmer you must decide whether you will cut back your acreage and get your production in line with the demand as of now or have the support program virtually eliminated. So I think that is an effective answer without prejudice to those who are wondering what is going to be the outcome of these farm programs. Obviously, too, the farmers are operating on an annual basis, and they cannot change their production and cut back production as quickly as in many of our industrial assembly lines. But the goal will be achieved, and I think it should be looked forward to on that basis. The legislation which we are now considering should be regarded on just that basis, too.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Indiana has attempted to indicate to us something of what we can expect in the way of a Republican farm program. I hope some of the members of the Department of Agriculture will also try to clarify what they are recommending. In the hearings on this bill the Secretary of Agriculture appeared and said, in effect, that this high price-support program, this 90 percent, really does not mean anything. He said:

> Do you know that there is 90 percent support on corn, but corn is actually bringing in 79 percent of parity in the market?

A little later Under Secretary Morse appeared, and he said:

> I will give you a dramatic example of what happens when you have high fixed price supports.

He said pork is selling at 120 percent of parity. So I said to him:

> You know that the Secretary said corn was selling for 79 percent of parity. How low do you wish to bring the price of corn in relation to parity in order to bring the price of pork down to 100 percent of parity?

It seemed to me that that was a fair question, since the Secretary had said that 90 percent does not mean 90 percent because corn was selling at only 79 percent of parity, and the Under Secretary said that pork was selling at 120 percent of parity because the price support of corn is too high. If there is any good Republican who can understand the remarks of another Republican on farm policy, I would like an interpretation of this answer. Here is my question:

> How low do you estimate you are going to have to reduce the price of corn to bring pork down to 100 percent of parity, which seems to be your objective?

And here is what Mr. Morse answered:

> The inducement is in the direction when the farmer has the choice of storage for Government support prices.

I will read that again, on page 92 of the hearings. The question is:

> How low are you going to have to reduce the price of corn to bring pork down to 100 percent of parity?

And the answer:

> The inducement is in the direction when the farmer has the choice of storage for Government support prices.

Then we went on a little further; and this is what he said, talking of this new program. He said:

> The response that you would get would be that you would bring both corn and hogs nearer to the 100-percent level.

I said:

> Do you mean that if we had a program which was flexible that the cost of corn would rise, and that would have the effect of lowering the price of pork?

Mr. Morse said:

> The long-run effect would be—

I said:

> This is a new economic theory to me, but I hope you can make it work.

Then I asked him:

> How long a run would this take?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman is just giving graphic proof why the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] wants to give them another year; is he not?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will say to the gentleman I think the Republicans should want to have the Secretary stay another year. I do not know whether it would be good for the country or good for the farmers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we may return to section 1 for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On line 3, after the word "that", insert "(a)"; and immediately following line 5, insert the following new subsection:
>
> "(b) (1) The first section of such act is amended by striking out the following: ', or insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower.'
>
> "(2) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Such capital impairment shall be restored with appropriated funds as provided herein rather than through the cancellation of notes'."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. May I ask the gentleman—this is a surprise to me. I did not know anything like that was contemplated and, therefore, I did not object.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If there is any objection to it, we will not put it in.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know what it is. I know it is something I did not have any knowledge of. If the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] says he knew about it, that is all right.

Mr. SPENCE. I see no objection to it.

Mr. PATMAN. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized on the amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If there is going to be any objection to it, I think I should make a statement about it in support of the amendment.

I may say this amendment will bring this bill in harmony with the action of the Senate. In fact, unless the bill is amended in other respects, it will be identical with the Senate bill, so that we will not have to go to conference on it.

The Corporation is to be reimbursed for the capital impairment resulting from net realized losses, only the reimbursement is to be accomplished by appropriation rather than note cancellation. That is about all there is to it.

In my extension of remarks I will place in the RECORD a statement more in detail as to what the amendment provides. It is as follows:

The first part of the amendment changes existing law with respect to the appraisal of the assets of the Corporation by providing that the appraisal be based on the cost of the assets to the Corporation rather than on the basis of lower cost or the average market price of the assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal. The effect of this amendment is that the Corporation would be reimbursed for capital impairment on the basis of net realized losses sustained as reflected on the books of the Corporation as of the close of the fiscal year. In addition, under this amendment the Corporation would make payments to the Treasury in those cases where the books of the Corporation at the close of the fiscal year reflect net realized gains.

Therefore, under this amendment the Secretary of the Treasury would determine the impairment of the Corporation's capital as of June 30, 1954, and each year thereafter on the basis of net realized gains and losses as shown in the Corporation's accounts. These accounts are subject to subsequent annual audit by the General Accounting Office under the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945, and any adjustments resulting from such audits would be included in the Corporation's accounts and financial statements in the following year. This should avoid any duplication of work

between the Treasury and General Accounting Office.

As stated by the sponsor of the amendment during the debate in the Senate, it is clearly understood that the provisions of the amendment requiring consideration of net realized losses only in restoring capital impairment should not be retroactive. This is important because the note cancellation approved on February 12, 1954—Public Law 295, 83d Congress—included $550,151,848 of the capital impairment of the Corporation as of June 30, 1953, of which $435,868,786.75 represented estimated losses not yet realized as of June 30, 1953.

Under this amendment, if the net realized loss sustained by CCC during the fiscal year 1954 amounts to less than $435,868,786.75 there would be no impairment of the capital as of June 30, 1954, and, therefore, no appropriation would be required. This amendment does not contemplate that any part of the $435,868,786.75 would be repaid to the Treasury but would be used to offset any net realized losses of the Corporation in 1954 and future years. If the net realized loss sustained by the Corporation during fiscal year 1954 should exceed the $435,868,786.75, then an appropriation would be required in the amount of such excess. This procedure would provide an orderly transition to the amended basis for restoration of capital impairment of the Corporation.

The second part of the amendment merely provides that reimbursement for capital impairment shall be accomplished by appropriation rather than by note cancellation.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express satisfaction with the action of the other body in voting this amendment. If my colleagues will refer to pages 96 to 101 of the public hearings they will find my colloquy with the Honorable True D. Morse on the morality of legislative action authorizing the payment of debt by the questionable means of cancellation. I had ventured the opinion that it was not a moral thing to do, and although Mr. Morse did not agree with my concepts, and in his prepared reply to my contention questioned my statement of facts and my conclusions, I feel that the action of the other body has vindicated my position.

The Secretary of Agriculture, by the way, was not present when Mr. Morse and I engaged in conversation. I had hoped to have an opportunity to direct some questions to him on the matter of morality in legislation. Unfortunately the Secretary could not remain—understand I am not criticizing him—because of my lack of seniority it would have been a long time before I should have had an opportunity to address questions to the Secretary of Agriculture, he being a busy man, a Member of the Cabinet, and I, being in a very humble position, and the district which I represent being in the city of Chicago, presumably holding no interest for the Secretary of Agriculture. Hence I directed my questions in the area of morality in legislation to the Assistant Secretary.

I am very happy to have the proof furnished by this amendment already passed by the other body and now to be accepted by this body that my concept of what constitutes morality and immorality in legislation is the accepted concept of my colleagues.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. This act shall be effective July 1, 1954.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out section 3.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

PROGRAM, MARCH 8 TO MARCH 20

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time in order to announce the program for next week.

In view of the lateness of the hour we do not expect to call up the watershed bill we had thought might be disposed of today.

It will be my purpose to adjourn over until Monday after we have disposed of the pending bill.

Monday, March 8, we expect to call up H. R. 8127, the highway aid bill. If that can be completed without a record vote it will be completed on Monday. If there is to be a record vote we will endeavor to postpone that vote until Tuesday.

Tuesday: We want to call up H. R. 8149, the hospital survey and construction bill. It is possible we will find it advisable to come in early on Tuesday in order to complete action on the bill that day. I might say that we hope to complete the highway aid bill on Monday and the hospital survey and construction bill on Tuesday.

Wednesday: We shall call up H. R. 8224, dealing with the extension of certain excise taxes and the reduction of certain other excise taxes. The rule grants 4 hours of debate on the bill. It is a closed rule about which I would not anticipate any controversy. So we expect to conclude action on that bill Wednesday.

Thursday we hope to call up H. R. 7103, the Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954.

House Joint Resolution 461 which provides for certain appropriations dealing with the administration of the measure we passed having to do with Mexican farm labor;

H. R. 6788, the watershed bill. Possibly I should suggest that the watershed bill might be disposed of ahead of these others, although I think it might be well to understand, generally, that unless there is a specific reference to a particular date that a matter will be called, I do not want it understood that we are bound by the particular sequence in which the bills might be announced on the floor of the House.

Further than that and without undertaking to make definite commitments at this time but rather to give the membership the best possible advance information that I can, it looks to me now as if for the week beginning March 15 we will have on the floor probably on the 15th and 16th the civil-functions appropriation bill. We hope to follow that on Wednesday with general debate on the tax-reduction bill from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Wednesday happens to be St. Patrick's birthday and is a day of considerable importance to a number of the Members who want to make speeches here and there. I am quite certain that this arrangement for the opening of general debate on the tax-revision bill on that day will accommodate the Members who do have those commitments.

We would hope to conclude that bill on Thursday the 18th.

As to what other program there might be I do not know at the moment. It seems a reasonable prospect that this will be the program for the next 2 weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CANFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7339) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation, pursuant to House Resolution 459, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MULTER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MULTER moves to recommit H. R. 7339 to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 1, line 5, immediately following the figure "8,500,000,000" (and before the quotation marks which follow such figure) insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the Corporation shall not issue any obligations (other than to the Secretary of the Treasury) at a rate of interest in excess of 25 percent of the rate of interest (or comparable cost) paid by the Treasury of the United States on the most recently issued obligations of the United States of comparable maturity, except that the provisions of this proviso shall not apply to lending agency agreements applicable to loans under a commodity loan program."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MULTER) there were—ayes 58, noes 180.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO INCREASE THE BORROWING POWER OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2714) to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 4 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is amended by striking out "$6,750,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,500,000,000."

(b) (1) The first section of such act is amended by striking out the following: ", or insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower."

(2) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Such capital impairment shall be restored with appropriated funds as provided herein rather than through the cancellation of notes."

SEC. 2. Section 4 (1) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (62 Stat. 1070), as amended, is amended by striking out "$6,750,000,000", and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,500,000,000."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The proceedings whereby a similar House bill (H. R. 7339) was passed were vacated.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FISCAL YEAR 1954

Mr. ELLSWORTH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 464, Rept. No. 1319), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 461, making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

TO REDUCE EXCISE TAXES

Mr. ELLSWORTH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 465, Rept. No. 1320), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8224) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 466.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 1,045 additional copies of Senate Document No. 52, 83d Congress, 1st session, entitled "Our American Government—What Is It?—How Does It Function?" for the use of Representative LESTER R. JOHNSON, of Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does that refer to the Wright-Patman article?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRESSMAN JONES TELLS HOW HE WAS MISREPRESENTED BY STATE PRESIDENT OF LETTER CARRIERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for the first time during the more than 5 years that I have served as a Member of this body, I have this week experienced a reprehensible action brought about by the State president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, who apparently has been deliberately and maliciously misrepresenting to members of that organization residing in the 10th Missouri District my position on the proposed postal employees pay increase bill, based upon an interview which took place in my office some weeks ago.

Apparently this character is of the opinion that by deliberately circulating a falsehood and by giving impetus to the big lie he can arouse the members of his organization who reside in my district to put the pressure on this Representative to cause me to capitulate to the demands of the union which he represents.

I was fair in explaining my position to the State president, and while I did not agree that I would go down the line and support any measure that his group demanded, and explained that it was my policy to refrain from endorsing any specific bill until after it had been considered and reported by the legislative committee to which it is referred, I did state that I would look favorably upon any proposed reasonable increase in the pay of postal employees that could be justified.

In view of the time and the courteous hearing that I gave to this delegation which did not include any representative from my district, I was surprised, amazed, and even shocked to receive in yesterday's mail a letter from Mr. Charles R. Ross, secretary of the Southeast Missouri District Association of the National Association of Letter Carriers, a letter stating that Mr. Ernest Holtz, of Sedalia, president of that association, has informed him that—

> You said you were against the 5-day workweek for the postal employees; that we were being overpaid now and that you were against any increase in pay for postal employees at this time.

For the purpose of making my position clear, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD the letter of Mr. Ross, and also my reply to Mr. Ross' letter, directed to President Holtz, in which I

review the statements made to Mr. Holtz and clarify my position in this matter.

The letter from Mr. Charles R. Ross, under date of March 2 and written from Farmington, Mo., on stationery of the Southeast Missouri District Association, National Association of Letter Carriers, reads as follows:

Hon. PAUL C. JONES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE REPRESENTATIVE JONES: Mr. Ernest Holtz, of Sedalia, president of the Missouri National Association of Letter Carriers, informed us thus:

"You said you were against the 5-day workweek for the postal employees.

"That we were being overpaid now and that you were against any increase in pay for postal employees at this time."

We, as constituents of the 10th District desire to know the truth about this interview with Mr. Holtz, of Sedalia, and Mr. Levisay, of Paris, who was also interviewed.

May we have your true position in this matter?

Respectfully,
CHARLES R. ROSS, *Secretary.*
FARMINGTON, MO.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Ross must have suspicioned that Mr. Holtz was not telling the truth and had not correctly reported his interview with me, for you will note he says they "desire to know the truth," and in the last sentence asks if they may not have my "true position" in this matter.

Immediately upon receiving the letter from Mr. Ross, I wrote the following letter to Mr. Ernest Holtz, and have sent copies thereof to Mr. Ross and to other officials and representatives of the National Association of Letter Carriers residing in my district, and, furthermore, expect to see every member of that association, as well as other postal employees in the 10th Missouri District, have an opportunity of reading both Mr. Ross' letter and also my letter to Mr. Holtz, a copy of which follows:

MARCH 4, 1954.

Mr. ERNEST HOLTZ,
President, Missouri National Association of Letter Carriers,
Sedalia, Mo.

DEAR MR. HOLTZ: If, as indicated in a letter under date of March 2, 1954, from Mr. Charles R. Ross, secretary of the Southeast Missouri District Association, you have stated to anyone that I said that postal employees were being overpaid, you are guilty of circulating a falsehood, and furthermore you will recall that I stated that while I would not commit myself to any bill which had not been reported from a committee, I would give every sympathetic consideration to any reasonable increase which could be justified.

I did say that I thought there was merit in trying to work out a pay schedule based upon a cost-of-living scale; that what might be fair salary in a small town or village would be entirely inadequate in a large city like St. Louis, Kansas City, Detroit, or New York. I thought I made myself clear to you that I felt it was desirable to attempt to keep all Government pay schedules on a par with the wages in the community where the services were being performed, realizing of course that this has not and is not now being done.

I did say, and I repeat, that I have never been sold on a 5-day workweek for anyone, and I did not single out postal employees when I made this statement; in fact, you may remember that I said I was old fashioned and still believed in the Bible which says that 6 days shall we labor and on the seventh shall we rest.

From the letter which I have from Mr. Ross, it appears that you have deliberately and maliciously misrepresented my position, apparently because I would not agree entirely with your position and would not commit myself to supporting a bill which your organization had endorsed but which had not been heard by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

While I am always happy to hear from any of my constituents and to have the benefit of their views and suggestions and to listen when they feel that they have been mistreated and seek my assistance which I am always glad to give, I want them to know that their cause is not being helped by men of your type who apparently have the idea that they can bring pressure upon and browbeat Representatives into seeing things their way.

Assuring you that I intend to see that every member of your association is acquainted with the reprehensible but unsuccessful effort which you have made in trying to discredit my position in this matter, I am

Yours truly,
PAUL C. JONES,
Member of Congress.

EXCISE TAXES

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the day is likely to come under a Republican administration when we can wipe out all of the excise taxes which have retarded American business and annoyed American taxpayers for so long. It is possible now to cut most of these taxes from 20 and even 25 percent to 10 percent without bankrupting the Government.

You will be able to make a long-distance telephone call without paying a quarter in taxes for every dollar it costs; take an airplane trip without shelling out from $10 to $50 in taxes; buy a pen or pencil, send a telegram, and even buy your son a baseball mitt for 50 percent less tax than you are paying now.

Just think, 20 cents is added to every dollar you now spend to buy your wife a ring or necklace. A $300 fur coat is now taxed $60, that will be reduced to $30; if you buy a camera to take vacation pictures 20 cents is added to every dollar you spend just for taxes.

The same applies to electric light bulbs, a handbag for your wife, or a suitcase for the kids going away to school. Add it all up and the 50-percent reduction proposed in the new tax bill represents a major saving to the average family.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SHOWING OF THE MOVIE, THE LONG CANE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Higley, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration and Admiral Boone, the Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, have asked me to tell the Members of the House that on Monday at 3:30 at the Departmental Auditorium, Constitution Avenue between 13th and 14th Streets, there will be a showing of the movie called The Long Cane. It is very moving and beautifully played. It is a movie which portrays the training of a blinded veteran named McCabe. Many of you have seen him here at the doors of the Congress when he has come down about legislation, always for other people, never for himself. He is a thoroughly fine young man. He took the training for the blind and now goes about by himself. It is a wonderful portrayal of the courage and patience a blinded man must have to take that training and learn to become self-sufficient and go about through crowded thoroughfares by himself with a long cane, from which the movie gets its name.

A Veterans' Administration official told me that Gen. Melvin Maas, a former Member and a marine, who was blinded as a result of the war, learned to become entirely self-sufficient and to get about and do almost everything that a person can who has his eyesight more quickly than any other person they ever had at this Hines Training Center for the Blind.

The following is a letter from Admiral Boone:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 19, 1954.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs told me that he has invited you to attend an advance showing of the picture, The Long Cane, which has just been produced by the Veterans' Administration.

I am so earnestly convinced of the importance of this picture, and of your interest in it that I want to second his invitation.

The picture takes its name from a recently developed long metal cane which because of its light weight has greatly added to the efficiency of blind people going about on their own.

The therapy portrayed is that given newly blinded veterans at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Hines, Ill. This hospital, as

you know, has been set up as a blind center to serve all the Armed Forces as well as the Veterans' Administration. In charge of the blind center is a man who is a blinded veteran himself. All the roles of blind people in the film are played by blinded veterans.

While the picture emphasizes both the psychological and physiological importance of the long cane in the rehabilitation of the blind, this is incidental to the methods used in training the war blinded to take up useful and important places in society.

Because of your keen interest in the handicapped, I believe you will want to see this picture.

J. T. BOONE,
Vice Admiral (M. C.) United States Navy Retired, Chief Medical Director.

RUMANIA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, 9 years will have elapsed tomorrow the 6th of March, since the Communist seizure, through fraud and violence, of Romania. A country of nearly 20 million inhabitants of Latin descent, occupying a strategic position in the path of Muscovite imperialistic expansion. Romania had been in the past the object of numerous invasions from the east. It was for European defense and security that the Treaty of Paris in 1856 recognized Romanian territory as the outpost blocking one of the main arteries of invasions from the east leading into the heart of Europe. It was European equilibrium, soundly conceived, in the middle of the last century, which motivated the western powers to entrust Romania the guardianship of the mouth of the Danube, a key position for the protection of Europe.

Therefore, it is understandable that one of the first moves of the Russian Communists in their imperialistic plan was to insure, through the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of August 23, 1939, the annexation of the Rumanian province of Bessarabia, including the strategic mouth of the Danube.

Two weeks after the Yalta declaration, the Communists, through a military and political fiat, brutally destroyed Romanian independence. This action was obviously motivated by the larger aggressive plan for the conquest of the whole of Europe. The Communists first tried to bring to power their indigenous agents through their standard techniques of intimidation, pressure, compromise, open and mass support of the Communists, progressive infiltration and other devious means. Immediately after Romania put her army at the disposal of the Allies, the Russians, then an ally of the United States and the United Kingdom, proceeded to subvert the legal government and to bring the people of Romania under the forced control of a handful of Romanian quislings. The Romanian Army—which the London Times noted at that time as being the fourth largest combat force on the allied side—was almost in its entirety on the front, thus leaving the country at the mercy of Russian political and military pressure. The Romanian Communist Party, according to the statement of its leader, Ana Pauker, had less than 1,000 members. The Communist occupation forces openly intervened in building up a controlling Communist apparatus. They openly supported the Communist Party, attacking and threatening the democratic parties, providing all necessary facilities and support to Communist activities and curbing those of the other parties. Moscow's radio and press were spearheading this campaign which moved rapidly from intimidation to terror. In spite of all this ruthless pressure, the resistance to Communist domination was so great that the standard techniques of "invisible" seizure proved inadequate.

Toward the end of February 1945 the Russian-led Communist gangs, confronted by this failure, attempted to take outright control of the government by a coup d'etat. Large groups of Communist-organized demonstrators and Communist Party shock-troops were massed in the center of Bucharest on the 24th of February. An attempt to assassinate the Prime Minister, Gen. Niculae Radescu, was unsuccessful, as was the attempt to create anarchy and the forceful takeover of key strategic positions. That same evening the Prime Minister, in a speech to the country, denounced the Communist attempt to overthrow the government.

This resounding defeat of Moscow's advance agents forced the Kremlin to take overt action. The chief engineer of the illegal seizure of Latvia in 1940, Andrei Vishinsky, was rushed to Bucharest. He delivered a final ultimatum to King Michael, demanding the immediate ousting of General Radescu and his government. In the meantime, the Russian troops had disarmed the garrison of the Romanian capital and had taken control of the civil police.

The Honorable James Byrnes has recorded in his book, Speaking Frankly, some of the most striking aspects of these events. Vishinsky's interview with the King, with his slamming of the door and the 2-hour-and-5-minute ultimatum are vividly recalled by our former Secretary of State. The Muscovite envoy imposed a Communist-controlled government under Groza, attacked the democratic parties in a public speech and after giving his blessing to the puppet regime he created, Vishinsky returned to his vulture's perch in the Kremlin.

It may appear strange that immediately after Yalta where the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics agreed to take joint action in any decision affecting the liberated countries, such a flagrant disregard of that solemn declaration could have taken place. There was established in Romania at that time an Allied Control Commission, but that was merely a facade. All decisions were taken by the Muscovites without consultation with their American and British colleagues. There were also established Allied political missions, equally helpless.

When Vishinsky delivered his ultimatum to the King, the latter asked these missions for political or moral backing, which was not forthcoming.

This enslavement of Romania on the 6th of March 1945 has continued to this day with ever increasing suffering and terror for her people. Ruthless economic exploitation through the so-called joint companies, which in fact are Russian economic monopolies, has bled the country dry. Romania, which was the most important granary in Europe, is now starving. Communist political terror and the planned destruction of the backbone of the nation were instrumental in the liquidation of the nation's leaders and a large number of Romania's patriotic youth. The independent peasants are being progressively eliminated, or forced into the Kilkoses, through enforced deliveries to the State and administrative oppression. Mass deportations and forced labor camps add to the process of destruction.

Unfortunately we have recognized this Communist regime of terror and ruthless exploitation in Romania, as we did elsewhere in Eastern Europe. Some efforts were made on our part at the Moscow conference of December 1945, with a view to holding free elections, which the Russians agreed to, but which in fact, in November 1946, turned into the usual farce of Communist-rigged elections. The declaration by the Department of State of November 26, 1946, regarding these elections states:

> At the Crimea conference in 1945 the Governments of the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom agreed jointly to assist the people of liberated Europe with a view to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of those people. Subsequently, pursuant to agreement reached at Moscow in December 1945 between the same powers, representatives of the three Governments met in Rumania and obtained assurances from the Rumanian Government that the latter would hold free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal and secret ballot.
>
> The Rumanian Government held elections on November 19, 1946. The Department of State has now received extensive reports concerning the conduct of those elections, and the information contained therein makes it abundantly clear that, as a result of manipulations of the electoral registers, the procedures followed in conducting the balloting and the counting of votes, as well as by intimidation through terrorism of large democratic elements of the electorate, the franchise was on that occasion effectively denied to important sections of the population. Consequently, the United States Government cannot regard those elections as a compliance by the Rumanian Government with the assurances it gave the United States, United Kingdom, and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Governments in implementation of the Moscow decision.

In spite of this clear identification of the Groza government as not representing the will of the Romanian people, the United States Government signed a peace treaty with it in 1947. It may be noted that the essential provisions of that treaty—which in itself was an incredible concession—were not fulfilled. There is no longer the slightest doubt that the Communist government in Romania is an organ of the Kremlin and is maintained in power by the pressure of Russian military occupation.

The recent Berlin Conference has clearly demonstrated the Kremlin's determination not to withdraw their troops from the strategic positions they now hold. They are attempting to organize the captive nations—among which Rumania is in a key position—as military bases for aggressive, expansionist purposes.

What is our answer to this threat?

It is a fact that the Rumanian people are our sincere friends as are the other captive people. They are bound to us by a community of interests and ideals and by the history of man's heroic struggle for freedom and personal dignity. In freedom they have been our natural allies. Enslaved and terrorized as they are, reports from Rumania remind us that this deep-rooted friendship is still alive. Unfortunately we have not yet designed a dynamic policy to preserve, encourage, and strengthen this historic friendship. This is the time when we should take action to reaffirm the basic American support for principles of freedom, honor, and justice. We should make it abundantly clear that nothing which transpired at the Berlin Conference confirms the slavery of Rumania or the other captive nations. We must give more public emphasis to our demands for the restored independence of the captive nations than Moscow is giving to its demands for recognition of Communist China.

This sad ninth anniversay of Rumania's seizure by the Russian Communists should cause us to take stock of our policy toward the enslaved nations within the Communist empire. We must ask ourselves what improvements we have made in our efforts to sustain the minds and retain the loyalties of the enslaved people. Have we made it crystal clear to them and to their masters in the Kremlin that we shall not rest until they are free, and their nations established as independent, sovereign powers? Our own self-interest demands that we pursue this policy with all the vigor and ingenuity at our command. History is certain to commend us for taking such a determined course just as it is certain to condemn us if we fail to do so.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to compliment the gentleman for bringing this important matter to the floor of the House and ask him if he does not agree with me that in our State of Ohio as well as throughout the Nation some of our very finest citizens are those of Rumanian descent, who have been naturalized; and the Rumanians that we encounter in our area are fine American citizens and very much interested in the matter which the gentleman has brought to the attention of the House.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I heartily agree with the gentleman from Ohio. It gives me pleasure to state that my first knowledge about Rumania and Rumanians in the United States came from my father, lately deceased, who was a close friend of Rumanians in the United States for over 50 years. I can well recall his feelings about the Rumanian people who emigrated to the United States and settled in Cleveland, Ohio. He was warm in his praise of the way in which the Rumanian newcomers adjusted in the United States, and their devotion to the principles of freedom, individual liberty, and justice which all Americans cherish. He knew the Rumanians in the United States well, just as they knew him. In my own experience I have learned how well the warm words of praise my father had for the Rumanian people in the United States characterized their devotion to everything that is essentially American. I have had the opportunity to be personally associated with Rumanian-Americans, both in business endeavors and socially, and have always found them to be firm advocates and loyal supporters of the United States. This very long experience permits me to say with authority, that I completely concur with the gentleman from Ohio.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. REAMS.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. PATMAN, the remarks he will make in Committee today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALBERT, the remarks he will make on H. R. 6788 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. SHELLEY).

Mr. O'NEILL.

Mr. SHAFER.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KNOX (at the request of Mr. CEDERBERG) indefinitely, on account of official business.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for Friday, March 5, 1954, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of Franklin Jim;

H. R. 1967. An act for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co.;

H. R. 2326. An act to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces;

H. R. 2567. An act to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc.; and

H. J. Res. 355. Joint resolution amending title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 153. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert;

S. 303. An act for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr;

S. 502. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand; and

S. 827. An act for the relief of Matthew J. Berckman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of Franklin Jim;

H. R. 1967. An act for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co.;

H. R. 2326. An act to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces;

H. R. 2567. An act to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers;

H. R. 2984. An act to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc.;

H. R. 7996. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 355. Joint resolution amending title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, March 8, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1334. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the 40th Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, pursuant to the requirements of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 460. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 8127, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1309). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 461. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 8149, a bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to the States for surveying the need for diagnostic or treatment centers, for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, for rehabilitation facilities, and for nursing homes, and to provide assistance in the construction of such facilities through grants to public and nonprofit agencies, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1310). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 462. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7103, a bill to establish limitations on the numbers of officers who may serve in various commissioned grades in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1311). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUSBEY: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 461. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 63. Concurrent resolution requesting churches and synagogues to give special prayers on Easter Sunday for those denied freedom to worship behind the Iron Curtain; without amendment (Rept. No. 1318). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 464. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 461. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1319). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 465. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 8224, a bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1320). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4099. A bill for the relief of Lee Siu Shee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5961. A bill for the relief of Marianne Schuster Dawes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6647. A bill for the relief of Yoko Kagawa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6754. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hooey Shee Eng; without amendment (Rept. No. 1315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7452. A bill for the relief of Therese Boehner Soisson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 8247. A bill to provide for the restoration and maintenance of the U. S. S. *Constitution* and to authorize the disposition of the U. S. S. *Constellation*, U. S. S. *Hartford*, U. S. S. *Olympia*, and U. S. S. *Oregon*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 8248. A bill to expand and extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8249. A bill to remove the requirement of automatic periodic reduction of the education and training allowances of veterans pursuing on-the-job training or institutional on-farm training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 8250. A bill to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8251. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 8252. A bill for the relief of the city of Fort Smith, Ark.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 8253. A bill to continue existing price supports under present conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 8254. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Mary, mother of Christ; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 8255. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Los Angeles in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 8256. A bill to continue existing price supports under present conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 8257. A bill to provide adequate diets for the unemployed and their families in distress areas of unemployment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 8258. A bill to provide adequate diets for the unemployed and their families in distress areas of unemployment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr BUSBEY:

H. J. Res. 461. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 462. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 205. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to make a study of the organization and operation of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Res. 463. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses to Mrs. Marial Beck, sister of Ursula M. Leipold, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 467. Resolution providing additional funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 346, as amended by House Resolution 438; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. Res. 468. Resolution providing additional funds for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations, incurred by certain regular subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Second Legislature of Guam, relative to establishing in Guam an Office of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territories; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 8259. A bill for the relief of Benito Vargas Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 8260. A bill for the relief of Hugo Edward Kullberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8261. A bill for the relief of Fay Jeannette Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 8262. A bill for the relief of the Reverend Philip Bartocetti, S. O. S. B.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 8263. A bill for the relief of J. R. Holt and Victor Webb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 8264. A bill for the relief of Paul Compagnino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 8265. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Thalhammer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 8266. A bill for the relief of Elmo Johanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

546. By Mr. REAMS: Petitions from Our Lady of Perpetual Help Academy, Tampa, Fla.; St. Patrick's Altar Guild, Youngstown, Ohio; and the Daughters of the Eucharist, Youngstown, Ohio, to request that a Mother's Day postage stamp honoring Mary, the mother of Christ and the world's greatest mother, be issued for the Marian year; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

547. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. A. O. Johnson, Mount Vernon, Mo., and other residents of Lawrence County, protesting all liquor advertising in newspapers, magazines, billboards, and over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

548. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution by the Wisconsin Retail Lumbermen's Association in convention assembled, that our United States Senators and Representatives be, and they hereby are, urged to support such measures and take such steps as will restore the security of the farmer and to maintain a sound agricultural economy for the benefit of all. As the farmer goes, so goes the Nation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

549. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Bar Association of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., relative to adopting a resolution endorsing immediate statehood for Hawaii and requesting the Congress of the United States to grant the same; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A True Understanding of Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRAZIER REAMS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1954

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, today is the 165th anniversary of the convening of the first session of the First Congress of the United States. By the standard of the measure of lives of human beings that is a long time. It has been a record filled with much of which we are justifiably proud. It has in it a minimum of the sordid, selfish, and base.

We have witnessed this week a great example of maturity by the Members of Congress. Early on the first legislative day of the week, the House was subjected to a lethal attack of gunfire unknown heretofore in the history of the Congress. In other years of the Congress of our country this might have been a signal for revenge against the people of Puerto Rico and disciplinary action against their government.

It was not so here. On the next day when our colleague, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, came to the well of the House to express regret and condolence for himself and the people of his homeland, the membership spontaneously arose as an expression of understanding and good will toward him and the good people of Puerto Rico. It was evidence that the membership of the House did not believe that these irrational and fanatical individuals who attempted to murder indiscriminately the Representatives and Delegates of the Congress were expressing the will of the government of the people of Puerto Rico.

A little later in the day the distinguished Governor of Puerto Rico, Hon. Muñoz-Marín, appeared at the Capitol and by invitation came to the floor of the House. Even before a reception line could be formed by the Speaker, the membership crowded forward to accept his words of regret and sympathy, and to assure him of their understanding that this outrage against the peace and dignity of Congress and the constituents whom they represent was not the will of the government or the vast majority of the people of the Commonwealth which he represents.

The most perfect expression, however, of understanding and maturity and genuine good will came when our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. BENTLEY] from his hospital bed asked the Chaplain of the House to pray for those persons who had so recently placed him on the very threshold of death. This spirit of understanding was further reflected when the wives of our five hospitalized colleagues had lunch with the gracious wife of the Governor of Puerto Rico on the day after their husbands had been so seriously wounded.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am proud indeed to be a citizen of such a country and a Member of a deliberative body which has Members with that kind of maturity, understanding, and genuine belief in the principles of true justice. These acts have shown to the world that our understanding of justice is the punishment of the guilty in fact, not a guilt arrived at by association, nationality, language, religion, race, color, or political subdivision. There could be no better example of a true understanding of Brotherhood Week than this.

On this the 165th anniversary of the first session of the First Congress of the United States this House of Representatives has been tested anew and I believe it has shown itself worthy of its responsibilities and great traditions.

One Hundred and Fourth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1954

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to take this occasion to pay tribute to the memory of one whom I consider among the greatest statesmen of recent times.

Sunday, March 7, is the 104th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk.

As the founder of the Czechoslovak Republic Thomas Masaryk established into fixed reality the spirit of freedom so long a tradition among his people. He carved into the foundation of that nation the ideals of democracy and independence that guided it through its difficult early days of statehood.

As the father of the Czechoslovak Republic, his memory is venerated not only by the oppressed people of Europe, but by the entire free world. The idea to which he dedicated his life, and his endeavors in behalf of freedom serve as a beacon of hope for the millions behind the Iron Curtain who yearn for liberty and for deliverance from tyranny.

But the memory of Thomas Masaryk cannot be claimed for the people of Europe alone. For like his close friend and American colleague of that period, our own President Woodrow Wilson, Thomas Masaryk dreamed and worked for universal brotherhood and charity among men and advocated tirelessly the ideals of international cooperation. While both Thomas Masaryk and Woodrow Wilson were devoted patriots of their native countries, they shared a deep-rooted understanding that there was no contradiction between devotion to country and a dedication to the ideals of international cooperation and of mutual striving for solutions to world problems. They both knew and understood that no country could live in peace, freedom, and security while aggression, tyranny, and dictatorship existed any place in the world.

In paying tribute to Thomas Masaryk we pay homage to a man who guided himself by those very principles of freedom and human dignity which have made our own country so great. So long as those principles of freedom and democracy thrive in any part of this universe, the oppressed peoples of the world can continue to hope that some day these ideas shall once again prevail in their country.

Join the IGHUGS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1954

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a petition signed by 17 residents of the city of Anderson, Ind.:

We, the undersigned taxpayers, property owners and residents in the city of Anderson,

Ind., do hereby request that you, as our representative, take immediate action to defeat all appropriations authorizing any wasteful or unnecessary Government spending.

We are aware that the shocking size of today's taxes is 32 cents out of every dollar that we earn; so, therefore we desire to be a part of the IGHUGS (I'm gonna howl 'bout unnecessary Government spending) and thereby try to help to deflate the enormous tax load.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to tell that worthy group that I have voted against every unnecessary Government expenditure that has come or that has been brought to my attention. For example, my votes on appropriation bills presented to the House of Representatives in 1953 during the first session of the 83d Congress would have provided cuts of approximately $7 billion more than actually were made. Even so, the cut that was made amounted to more than $13 billion reduction from the recommendations of President Truman.

It is only by a reduction of Government spending that an eventual cut in taxes can be made.

H. R. 438

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to cast my vote for House bill 438, extending the life and scope of the committee to investigate the seizure by the Soviet Union of the Baltic nations: Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

This committee extends the work of the Katyn committee. Hearings held by the latter committee in London and in Frankfurt, Germany, have demonstrated the capabilities of such investigation, first, by the attacks upon it staged by Pravda and the Warsaw newspapers, as well as the radio behind the Iron Curtain; and second, testimony of spectators, many of whom were journalists who had escaped from Iron Curtain countries, and who stated that for the first time since the war the Katyn committee had brought out facts and information revealing the barbarous minds of the rulers of the Kremlin. These revelations placed the Communist propaganda machine on the defensive for the first time.

The Baltic committee held hearings during December in Washington, New York, Detroit, and Chicago, and received testimony of witnesses, collected many exhibits which were admitted into the testimony. The facts brought out were published in newspapers throughout the country and carried behind the Iron Curtain by broadcasts of Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America.

The work of the Baltic committee will reassure the freedom-loving people behind the Iron Curtain that we of the free world have not forgotten them. Testimony revealed by the witnesses who testified in December, some of whom were leaders in the Communist captive nation before World War II, indicated that the continued activity of this committee will give millions renewed courage to continue their struggle against communism. There are great numbers of individuals who can tell us what happened in Poland, in Hungary, in Czechoslovakia, and in the Balkans. Only from their lips can the history of this dark time be documented.

This resolution, as amended, recognizes that savage crimes against humanity have been committed in Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, and the Baltic States. It is clear that the seizure and inhuman domination of these countries is part of a well-defined pattern of Soviet imperialism which has brought nearly a billion people under the domination of the Kremlin.

So long as the Soviets realize that America has not abandoned her traditional position of freedom and justice for all mankind, and hope is kept alive in the hearts of freedom-loving people now under Soviet domination, the seeds of Soviet disintegration shall continue to germinate and the threat of a third world war will be averted.

In voting for the resolution continuing and expanding the work of the committee, I was not unmindful of the herculean service in this field rendered by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], who sparkplugged the investigation as chairman in the 82d Congress and is the ranking minority member of the present committee.

H. R. 7339

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a measure to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

It would increase that power from $6¾ billion now in effect to $8½ billion.

At present the amount of uncommitted borrowing authority of the agency is, I understand, in the neighborhood of $500 million.

The rise in borrowing power has been justified before the committee apparently to its satisfaction on the ground that it is necessary to finance CCC investments in 1953 and prior year crops and to support the price of the 1954 crop.

I am not satisfied with the operations of the price-support program. It is true that we have in past years financed major crops like corn, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts and designated nonbasic commodities like wool, mohair, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat, and other commodities.

To my mind there have been serious abuses attending these operations which have wasted foodstuffs and unreasonably held up the prices of basic commodities and consumer foodstuffs. The fact seems incontrovertible to me that existing surpluses accumulated under this general program present a very perplexing problem. How to handle these surpluses is indeed an enigma and I have not heard yet of a real sound practical solution. It strikes me that there should be at least one governing principle applied in dealing with this problem and that is that none of the stored food stuffs should be wasted.

It is bad enough to waste the taxpayers' money in buying food and letting it deteriorate and rot. But it is a willful waste and a great social crime not to find a way to use all this food to alleviate human need.

The policy of spending public money to force up commodities prices to high levels thus placing a great burden on the American consumers, and then letting the supported foodstuffs rot before selling them in the competitive market appears to me to have every earmark of economic dementia.

I would respectfully adjure the committee to find some practicable, sensible way at earliest possible date of dealing effectively with the problem of disposal of agricultural surpluses.

The House should act upon this question. It is urgent. Unless solved soon, it will further discredit and could possibly wreck the entire agricultural program.

There is a definite interdependency between the prosperity of our farmers and the prosperity of American business and the full-time employment of our industrial workers. During my service here, I have always recognized what seems to me to be a demonstrable economic fact. But I have never contemplated in my support of this view that the operations of CCC in the price-support field would ever lead us into a situation where valuable foodstuffs would be allowed to go to waste and to rot and where huge surpluses of food and fiber would be piled up in the storehouses of the Nation with the Government agencies concerned, and the Congress apparently unmoved to the urgent need for remedial and corrective action.

Another pertinent aspect of this bill relates to current interest rates. Of course, it is vital that the monetary and financial departments of the Government should, when necessary, exercise certain effective controls over inflation or deflation. Such controls wisely and skillfully administered by trained economists, monetary and banking specialists can unquestionably be helpful in preserving or reestablishing financial and economic equilibrium in the economy.

At a time, however, when money is more plentiful than it has been for several years, I am of the opinion that the raising of interest rates is a very questionable policy. This step was evidently taken to further the so-called hard dollar, but it has had just the opposite effect and worse. It not only did not bring lower general prices which are about at the highest level in history, but it has been followed by a wave of business contraction and serious unemployment in some areas.

I urge the immediate overhaul of the entire price-support program (a) in the interest of the farmer, (b) the consumer, and, (c) the Treasury. Congress should tackle this job at once. It is vitally necessary.

Armenian Struggle Against Russian Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1954

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I wish to salute at this time the gallant people of Armenia, who on February 18, 1921, overthrew Communist rule forcibly imposed on them on December 2, 1920, and for 6 months rid their country of Soviet domination.

The Armenians lost their independence many centuries ago. Their historic homeland was overrun and conquered by Asiatic hordes long before Columbus discovered America. During all that time they have been subjected to one oppressor after another. Many of them have been forced to leave their homeland, and all have had to struggle hard to make their livelihood. Yet in the midst of endless vicissitudes and sufferings they had not forsaken the idea of their national independence. They have, throughout their long subjugation under foreign rule, worked most persistently to regain it. Their most recent history may be characterized as mass deportation and wholesale massacres. During World War I more than 600,000 Armenians met their death in cold-blooded massacres, while another 600,000 are said to have died of starvation.

At the end of that world conflict, the survivors of that holocaust staked out a part of their ancient land at the very foot of their Mount Ararat, and proclaimed their national independence. For a brief time it seemed that at last a great historic wrong had been redressed and the long-cherished dream of suffering Armenians had come true. But revolutionary events subsequent to World War I worked to the detriment of the newly born and weak Armenian Republic. Russian communism and aggressive Turkish nationalism would not tolerate small independent states in the Caucasus. And the hope-inspiring West, including the United States, did not show sufficient concern in Armenian affairs to intervene effectively. At the end of 2 years, when the Armenian Republic was attacked by both the Turks and the Russian Communists, it was overrun by the forces of both invaders. Then, late in December of 1920, Russians succeeded in bringing most of Caucasian Armenia into the Soviet Union. Soon Armenians were to learn the brute nature of Soviet rule: intolerable oppression and endless misery.

Then the people of Armenia, inspired and led by fearless leaders, staged an uprising against their Communist overlords. In this attempt they successfully overthrew the Communist regime forcibly imposed upon them, and on February 18, 1921—the anniversary we commemorate today—they once more asserted their national independence. This, however, proved to be a revival of short duration. In the course of the next 2 months the Russian Communists gathered strength, renewed their attack against Armenia, and in April Armenia was once more engulfed in the massive and bloody Communist tide.

Since then the Soviet Union rules over Armenia with an iron hand. Its oppressive and deadly yoke weighs heavily upon all Armenians there. During all that time ruthless Communists have done their utmost to eradicate the spirit of independence and freedom among the Armenians. But they have not succeeded in that task. The Armenians, though subjected to inhuman treatment by their ruthless overlords, have not relinquished their claim and their right to freedom and independence. On this day, in commemorating the anniversary of their successful revolt against Soviet rule, we pay our tribute to the memory of those who gave their lives for a noble cause and express our admiration of those who still steadfastly cling to the ideals held in common by all freemen.

Blessing in Grim Disguise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1954

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, as one who saw friends and colleagues shot down on the floor of Congress by the gunfire of the Puerto Rican fanatics, besides being one of many who narrowly escaped the barrage of bullets, I naturally was deeply shocked by this appalling occurrence.

Yet terrible as the happening was as an act of violence against the hundreds of persons assembled in the hall and galleries of the House of Representatives, this was actually the lesser part of the crime.

Far more heinous was the fact that this was an invasion and desecration of the very temple of free and representative government by the agents of organized violence, hate, and terrorism. Moreover, the murderous gunfire came at the moment the House was conducting a vote on a pending measure—as if the intent was deliberately to profane the most central and sacred rite of self-government.

There is abundant and increasing evidence of direct ties between the small band of Puerto Rican revolutionaries and the worldwide Communist conspiracy. Even more obvious is the deadly parallel between this murderous assault on the Congress and the known methods and goals of the Communists in America and elsewhere.

Certainly Members of Congress—and, it is hoped, the American people as well—now have a clearer understanding of all that is involved in the phrase "advocacy of the overthrow of the Government by force and violence."

Perhaps there will also be a clearer understanding that the essence of the Communist movement is not the meetings of Marxist discussion groups; the winning of converts to an abstract theoretical ideology; the infiltration of American institutions by adherents to Communist doctrines or an exaggerated spy scare. The essence of the Communist conspiracy and the full flowering of its teaching of hatred is the terrorist tactics which invaded the Halls of Congress last week, and the ultimate goal is seizure of the complete power of government by whatever means are necessary.

It may be too much to hope that the American people will also have a new understanding and appreciation of what Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY and the other militant foes of communism in Congress and the Government are fighting. But this should be one byproduct of that murderous assault on Congress.

There should be a realization that the relentless effort to destroy MCCARTHY, the constant leftwing attempt to drive a wedge between MCCARTHY and President Eisenhower, and the ceaseless pressure to goad MCCARTHY into intemperate actions which can be made the basis of discrediting him, plays directly into the hands and serves the cause of those who seek the overthrow of this Government by force and violence.

The fact that honest and sincere citizens are taken in by this long-standing campaign to destroy anyone who dares to fight communism makes the situation all the more tragic and pitiful. The time is short in which all loyal Americans may close ranks in support of all who are working, at the price of arduous toil and personal peril, to safeguard the Nation from enemies foreign and domestic.

The guns which blazed in the Halls of Congress the other day spoke a graphic warning of what evil conspirators have in mind for America. If that warning is recognized and heeded it can prove a blessing in grim and terrible disguise.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, March 1, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Warren E. Mace, associate rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Almighty God, the God of this Nation and of all men, we render to Thee our praise for the many blessings bestowed upon our country both in former days and in these times. May we, especially through our leaders, show our gratitude by seeking to know Thy will both for ourselves and for the whole family of nations. Enable us to fulfill it. Be with this body in its deliberations, we humbly beseech Thee, and may we all have a vision of a more perfect society in which there may be peace and unity at home, and mutual regard and respect amongst the nations in our generation. Hear this our prayer, we humbly beseech Thee, O God, our creator and preserver. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ROBERT W. UPTON, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. UPTON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 4, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 6, 1954, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, returned to the Senate in compliance with its request the bill (S. 1138) for the relief of John Soudas.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2714) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of hearings on Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 666. An act for the relief of Michele Paccione;

H. R. 858. An act for the relief of Kim Mi Hae;

H. R. 1100. An act for the relief of Peter A. Pirogov;

H. R. 1325. An act for the relief of George L. F. Allen;

H. R. 2634. An act for the relief of Charles T. Douds;

H. R. 2636. An act for the relief of George Japhet;

H. R. 2666. An act for the relief of Martin G. Scott and Hanna von Gusmann;

H. R. 3145. An act for the relief of Pravomil Vaclav Maly and Jarmila Maly;

H. R. 3836. An act for the relief of Petra Fumia;

H. R. 4699. An act for the relief of Robert F. Suczek;

H. R. 4735. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Richard Orme Flinn, Jr.;

H. R. 4996. An act for the relief of Col. Henry M. Denning, and others;

H. R. 5765. An act for the relief of Henry C. Bush and other Foreign Service officers;

H. R. 5772. An act for the relief of Robert E. Leibbrand and Rose Leibbrand;

H. R. 6020. An act for the relief of the estate of James Francis Nicholson;

H. R. 6033. An act for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.;

H. R. 6477. An act for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.;

H. R. 6594. An act for the relief of Livio Brianesco;

H. R. 7328. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research;

H. R. 7407. An act for the relief of Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt;

H. R. 7559. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madeleine Alice Aquarone; and

H. R. 8067. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 204) providing for the printing of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the report thereon:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed a total of 20,000 copies of the bill entitled "Internal Revenue Code of 1954" for the use of the following: House document room, 13,000 copies; Senate document room, 500 copies; House Committee on Ways and Means, 6,450 copies; Senate Committee on Finance, 50 copies; and that there be printed a total of 20,000 copies of the report thereon submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means for the use of the following: House document room, 13,000 copies; Senate document room, 1,700 copies; House Committee on Ways and Means, 5,000 copies; Senate Committee on Finance, 300 copies.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING RECESS

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 5, 1954,

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on March 5, 1954, he signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 153. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert;

S. 303. An act for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr;

S. 502. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand;

S. 827. An act for the relief of Matthew J. Berckman;

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of Franklin Jim;

H. R. 1967. An act for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co.;

H. R. 2326. An act to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces;

H. R. 2567. An act to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc.; and

H. J. Res. 355. Joint resolution amending title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 337)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the report on the Mutual Security Program covering operations during the 6-month period, June 30, 1953, to December 31, 1953, in furtherance of the purpose of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended.

In this report is factual evidence of valuable progress being made through mutual efforts toward the vital goal of

increased security for this Nation and all the free world.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 8, 1954.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Exchange Stabilization Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS, FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TRANSMISSION AND DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY GENERATED AT FALCON DAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated by Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Fees and expenses of witnesses," for the fiscal year 1954, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons," for the fiscal year 1954, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Support of United States prisoners," for the fiscal year 1954, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Farm Credit Administration for "Administrative expenses" for the fiscal year 1954, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriaiton for the administrative expenses authorization for the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the fiscal year 1954, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of administrative expense authorization of greater proportion than was originally estimated (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Guam Legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution 129

"Resolution relative to establishing in Guam an Office of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territories

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas it has been proposed that the Office of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territories be moved from Honolulu, T. H., to a location more closely associated with the trust territories; and

"Whereas the Territory of Guam is centrally located within the jurisdiction of the High Commissioner; and

"Whereas facilities are already maintained by the trust territories in Guam, and such facilities are susceptible to such expansion as might be necessary to accommodate the offices of the High Commissioner: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the High Commissioner of the Trust Territories be hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to provide for the establishment of future headquarters for the High Commissioner of the Trust Territories to be established in the Territory of Guam; and be it further

"Resolved, That the executive secretary be and he is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the High Commissioner of the Trust Territories, and to the Governor of Guam."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Anacostia Home & School Association, Washington, D. C., signed by Jessie L. Williams, corresponding secretary, endorsing the District of Columbia public works program; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, New York, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for personal exemptions of $1,200 in lieu of the present $600 for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at Miami, Fla., relating to the Federal accelerated tax amortization program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Telegrams, cablegrams, and letters in the nature of petitions from the Aceitunal Parent-Teachers Association, Camuy, the Teachers of BO Cienaga, Camuy, Parent-Teachers Association, Camuy, Ceferino Cordero Parent-Teachers Association, Camuy, the Anasco Rural Teachers, Anasco, the Elementary Urban School Lunchroom Employees, Camuy, the Anasco Teachers Association, Anasco, the Oddfellow Lodge Luz y Progreso, San Juan, the senior members, Civil Air Patrol, Anasco Squadron, the Teachers of Lopez Sicardo, Rio Piedras, the Local Federal Postal Employees, Ceiba, Teachers of Montana Second Unit, Aguadilla, the Teachers of Eladiovega School, Aguadilla, the Personnel Extension Service, University of Puerto Rico, San Juan, the Rotary Club of Anasco, the Faculty, Salto Arriba Second Unit, Utuado, the Daguao Teaching Staff, Nabuabo, the Parents and Teachers Association of the Elementary School of Naguabo, the Naguabo Secondary School Teachers, Naguabo, the Secondary School Teachers of Naranjito, the Asambiea Municipal of Mayaguez, and the chairman and commissioners of the Puerto Rico Industrial Commission, Department of Labor, San Juan, and students of Elementary Urban School, of Camuy, all in Puerto Rico, condemning the action of certain persons in attempting to assassinate Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Resolution 16

"Resolution paying tribute to the Honorable Fred W. Kaess, Federal district attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, southern division, and his associates, William G. Hundley, William O'Donnell, and Birney McCristy, and the ever-vigilant Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the splendid work done in the conviction of six top Communists

"Whereas Fred W. Kaess, William G. Hundley, and Birney McCristy spent many months in preparation for the trial of six top Communists who were charged with conspiracy to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government; and

"Whereas the ever vigilant Federal Bureau of Investigation has spent many tireless hours in securing, evaluating, and correlating evidence to be used at said trial; and

"Whereas the above named able attorneys spent many weeks, almost 4 months, having the full burden and responsibility of presenting the case to the jury; and

"Whereas because of the splendid ability and the outstanding work of said men, working closely with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, said parties brought about a conviction of said six top Communists after a prolonged and difficult conspiracy trial: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Michigan Senate does hereby pay tribute to the splendid ability and the outstanding work of the following persons, Fred W. Kaess, William G. Hundley, and Birney McCristy, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in securing the conviction of said parties; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Federal Bureau of Investigation be commended for its able assistance in securing the conviction of said Communists; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Herbert Brownell, Attorney General of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable HOMER FERGUSON and the Honorable CHARLES POTTER, United States Senators from Michigan; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution also be sent to the Honorable Frank A. Picard, the able jurist before whom said case was tried, and to J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, at Washington, D. C.; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution also be sent to the Honorable Fred W. Kaess, Federal district attorney, and his able assistants.

"Adopted by the senate February 22, 1954.

"FRED I. CHASE,
"Secretary of the Senate."

EMPLOYMENT AT BLACK HILLS ORDNANCE DEPOT — LETTER FROM LODGE 1549, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, IGLOO, S. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from Local Lodge 1549, American Federation of Government Employees, Igloo, S. Dak., relating to the employment situation at the Black Hills Ordnance Depot of the Army, at Igloo.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES,
Igloo, S. Dak., February 26, 1954.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: We, of the Lodge No. 1549, AFGE, of Igloo, S. Dak., are appealing for help on this depot which appears to be fast becoming a disaster area.

People came here with the promise they would have a job. They are now being put on a reduction in force and no place to go and no money to support their families. Jobs are scarce in this area and throughout the whole State of South Dakota. Not one provision of compensation is provided on a United States Government job for those who are laid off out here.

Our members are thoroughly disgusted with this deplorable situation. Children have to suffer for the thoughtlessness of Government practices. They are being taken from school when parents lose their jobs. This deprives them of what is an American privilege—schooling.

Cost of living has gone up tremendously. It is much higher out here than east of us, but wages are not going up accordingly. It is understood wages have now gone up in the States farther east of us.

This depot needs your help desperately.

Yours sincerely,

ALVIN D. VILHAUER,
President No. 1549.

INDEPENDENCE OF ESTONIA—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Juhan Vasar, president, the Estonian National Committee in the United States, of New York, N. Y., transmitting a resolution adopted by Estonians and friends of Estonia assembled at a meeting in New York, N. Y., on the 36th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Estonia. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ESTONIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE IN THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N. Y., March 4, 1954.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: On behalf of Estonians in this country, I take the liberty to bring to your attention the attached resolution.

At the same time I would like to express our hope that you will continue to support our cause, which is aimed at the liberation of Estonia from Soviet tyranny.

Very truly yours,

JUHAN VASAR, *President.*

Estonians and friends of Estonia assembled today at a concert meeting in New York, commemorating the 36th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Republic of Estonia, have resolved—

To express their gratitude to the Government of the United States for its firm policy of nonrecognition of the absorption of Estonia and the other Baltic nations into the Soviet Union and for its support in their fight for freedom and restoration of their independence.

To extend this expression of gratitude also to the Members of the Congress of the United States, supporting the cause of Estonia and the other Baltic nations, and in particular to the members of the Baltic Committee of the House of Representatives.

To call attention to the plight of Estonians in their home country and to the urgency of their earliest liberation.

Daily, people in Estonia and other Baltic countries continue to be arrested and deported, subjected to mental and physical torture; religious, spiritual, and material values are continuously being tramped on; youth is being corrupted and indoctrinated. If Kremlin's genocidal designs are not to succeed, immediate help is needed.

It is the plea and conviction of those assembled at this commemorative meeting that the great United States, great in power, and great in principles will do its best to accelerate the liberation of the unlucky Estonians and other East European peoples from the unbearable Soviet yoke.

TAXATION OF INTEREST ON CERTAIN TYPES OF MUNICIPAL BOND ISSUES—LETTER AND RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from R. S. Niles, city auditor of the city of Grand Forks, N. Dak., transmitting a resolution adopted by the City Council of Grand Forks, relating to the proposed tax on the interest on certain types of municipal bond issues. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.,
February 2, 1954.

The Honorable Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed herewith find certified copy of a resolution which was adopted by the City Council of the City of Grand Forks, N. Dak., at its regular meeting held on February 1, 1954. Any consideration or help that you may be able to give in calling this matter to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,

R. S. NILES,
City Auditor.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., ON FEBRUARY 1, 1954

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Grand Forks, N. Dak., That the unprecedented action of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in approving, without public hearing or opportunity for municipalities to express their views, the proposal to make the interest on certain types of municipal bond issues subject to Federal income tax, should be reconsidered, and that a full opportunity should be given for all municipalities and their representatives to be heard upon this question which involves the entire future of municipal financing.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and to the Members of the congressional delegation from North Dakota.

A true copy.

R. S. NILES,
City Auditor of the City of Grand Forks, N. Dak.

CROP FAILURE AND LACK OF FARM INCOME

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Norman W. Cross, manager of the Slope Electric Cooperative, Inc., of New England, N. Dak., enclosing a letter from Mr. and Mrs. Jake Fiedler, of New England, N. Dak. I ask that the two letters be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLOPE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
New England, N. Dak., January 26, 1954.

Senator WILLIAM J. LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: The attached letter was received a few days ago and was brought up at a recent board of directors meeting. The board was very interested in it and hoped that it would not indicate a beginning of a trend.

They also thought that you would be interested in it and might be able to use it as evidence that the farmers of this State are not as prosperous as a lot of people seem to believe.

Yours truly,

NORMAN W. CROSS,
Manager.

JANUARY 16, 1954.

SLOPE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
New England, N. Dak.

DEAR SIR: We have disconnected our hot-water heater—also the refrigerator; hence, the change is our bill for this month. Due to the crop failure and no farm income, we cannot pay the usual $16 to $20 per month bill.

This is by no means a reflection on the REA co-op. Nothing has done more to raise the standard of living for the average farm family, and we deeply appreciate the prompt and courteous service given us the past 5 years that we have received electricity.

We are hoping for the best in the future. Thanking you very kindly, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. JAKE FIEDLER.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—STATEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the secretary-treasurer of the International Long-

shoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, and a statement of policy adopted unanimously at the last quarterly meeting of the international executive board of that union.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION,
San Francisco, Calif., March 1, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The attached resolution adopted unanimously at the last quarterly meeting of the international executive board of this union is sent to you at the direction of the board.

The board felt most strongly that in view of the present economic situation, the cost of living, and the difficulties the average American has to make ends meet, that the proposed 100-percent wage increase for Congressmen is uncalled for. Added to this is the failure on the part of Congress to lift the minimum wage which is presently only 75 cents an hour.

Irrespective of your particular position on a proposed pay raise for Members of Congress we feel sure you will find the statement of interest.

Sincerely,

LOUIS GOLDBLATT,
Secretary-Treasurer.

STATEMENT OF POLICY TO KEEP CONGRESSMEN FROM BREADLINES

More and more Americans are facing real economic problems today.

Unemployment is growing. Minimum wages fixed by Congress are still at 75 cents an hour. Social security is miserably inadequate. Taxes are the highest in history, and are now the greatest single item taken from a worker's pay.

The Congressmen sitting in Washington are in a position to do something about some of these things. But instead they are maintaining the high taxes, beginning to say those who are alarmed at growing unemployment are helping communism, ignoring minimum wage increases, and increasing the workers' payments toward social security. At the same time, by putting more handcuffs on the trade unions, they are further restricting the ability of the workers' own organizations to help their own members economically.

After all this, some Congressmen and Senators have the outright hypocrisy to complain about how tough it is for them to make ends meet on $1,000 a month plus tax-free expenses.

Claiming that they're underpaid because all they get is $12,500 a year plus $2,500 in expenses, legislation is now pending which would double the Congressman's base pay to $25,000 a year—a 100-percent increase. Congressmen now earn more than over 96 percent of American families.

The members of this union should know that Congressmen and Senators get free haircuts, shaves, and shines, in private barbershops right in the Capitol Building. They're free to the free-loaders, but they're paid for by our taxes.

The Senate and House restaurants serve the best food in Washington and at the cheapest prices. But every time a Congressman pays 75 cents for a $2 luncheon, we pick up the tab for the other buck and a quarter.

When any Congressman or member of his family is ill or needs hospitalization he is treated by the finest specialists in the most elaborate hospitals in America—the Army and Navy Medical Centers. For this service he pays a nominal fee. Although they're all members of a fancy, prepaid, preventative medicine program—for themselves of course—these same politicians vote against such medical care for the American people on the ground that it's socialized medicine. And now they're talking about investigating union welfare programs and funds—allegedly in our own interest, of course.

And so it goes. Free office space, free clerical and secretarial help—telephones, telegraph, and mail. Free trips to and from Washington.

They voted off rent controls all over the country, and kept them on in Washington, D. C., where they live.

Their junkets all over the world—at Government expense, of course—have become the laughing stock of the foreign newspapers who report on the latest flying visit by one Congressman or another.

Of course, there are certain trade union leaders who see nothing wrong with the tax policies and the high-income thinking of the Congressmen. These are such men as Dave Beck, labor's first millionaire, or George Meany, who makes $45,000 a year, or Dave McDonald, who takes home as much and more than these money-grubbing politicians.

In view of the poverty stricken condition of the Congressmen and Senators we feel that something should be done for them. To alleviate their plight, the ILWU proposes a program of giveaway to each Congressman—all he and his family can consume from the Government's stockpiles of surplus foods. This would include grain, milk, dried eggs, cheese, peanuts, butter, and potatoes. This would help the Government's dilemma of what to do with these surplus foods.

With these foodbaskets, plus their present $15,000 a year, plus their expenses, plus the wives, family members, sweethearts they place on their payroll as secretaries, etc., they should be able to struggle through the next year without a wage increase of $250 a week.

We further announce that our hearts bleed for these needy cases, and their poverty-stricken plight, and fervently hope many of them will be rescued from their tragic situation by the votes of the people in the next elections.

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain resolutions unanimously adopted by the 12th annual meeting of members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on January 14, 1954, at Miami, Fla. They were sent to me in a letter from Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1954.

To All Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives:

We are enclosing herewith for your information and consideration resolutions Nos. 21, 25, 26, 27, 29, 14, and 22, which were unanimously adopted by the 12th annual meeting of members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on January 14, 1954, at Miami, Fla. Over 5,000 members attended this meeting.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
Executive Manager.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING OF MEMBERS, MIAMI, FLA., JANUARY 14, 1954

RESOLUTION 21

Be it resolved, That funds be made available to the Southeastern Power Administration for construction of transmission lines from Clark Hill Dam to serve preferred customers, and if that is not done, that the proposal of the Georgia Electric Membership Corp. (statewide association) to purchase the entire output of the Georgia side of Clark Hill Dam for distribution to preference customers and commercial power companies in the area to assure greatest benefits to all, be approved by the Department of the Interior, as opposed to the bus-bar sale of the power to the Georgia Power Co., with almost the entire benefit going to that company; and be it further

Resolved, That if a policy of sale at the bus bar is followed by the United States Government in the distribution of electric power generated at Federal hydro projects, the Rural Electrification Administration make available funds for construction of transmission lines by rural electric cooperatives, so that power generated at Federal hydro projects can be made available to preference agencies as directed by the United States Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

RESOLUTION 25

Whereas the pressure continues in intensity against the appropriation of funds for the construction of generating plants and transmission lines; and

Whereas it is felt by the delegates to this annual meeting that the right to construct said generating plants and transmission lines is the lifeblood of the rural-electrification program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Members of Congress to do everything within their power to defend the right and opportunity of REA cooperatives and power districts to construct and operate generating plants and transmission lines to serve themselves; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to authorize adequate loan funds for this purpose.

RESOLUTION 26

Be it resolved, That this NRECA 12th annual meeting reaffirm its endorsement of the statement of Federal power policy as adopted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on February 1, 1951 (copy attached).

RESOLUTION 27

Whereas research and publications of the Federal Power Commission demonstrate the feasibility of developing electric energy from windpower, and FPC has recommended that Congress authorize further development work and the construction of a demonstration plant; and

Whereas such a development would assist materially in increasing the amounts of power available to the rural systems from Government hydroelectric installations, especially in areas where the low-water season coincides with a high-wind season; and

Whereas Senator MURRAY has introduced a bill, designated S. 160, providing for further development work and the construction of a demonstration plant: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to enact S. 160 and appropriate the funds necessary to carry out the provisions thereof.

RESOLUTION 29

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority has been so vitally constructive in providing low-cost electric power and energy to the farmers, home owners, defense industries, other industries, municipalities, and mills in the Tennessee Valley, and improved the general standard of living for farm and home

owners through furnishing power to the rural-electric cooperatives, and to the establishment of industries in its area; and

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority has made vast contributions to national defense, including the provision far ahead of schedule of the tremendous needs for power of the atomic-energy program, furnishing this power at rates so low as to save all the taxpayers of the United States millions of dollars; and

Whereas the TVA program is self-liquidating, repaying capital invested by the people of the United States over a 40-year period and will still belong to all the American people after the people of the Tennessee Valley have paid for it; and

Whereas TVA's wholesale rate yardstick has reduced the rates at which all rural electric systems must buy power, thus exercising a restraining influence that diminishes only with the distance from TVA territory: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend to the Congress the great economic advancements and contributions to the development of the Southeast made by the TVA, and request that continued appropriations be made to supplement, advance, and continue this great development of our national resources.

RESOLUTION 14

Whereas for years and to the present, many private power companies have flooded America with advertising propaganda palpably designed to prejudice public opinion against the Nation's power-development program and the rural electric cooperatives as well; and

Whereas this maze of propaganda is paid for by the electric consumers of the country in their electric rate schedules, including our own members, and under the present law the cost of such advertising is deductible as business expenses for tax purposes; and

Whereas forcing electric consumers to pay for the cost of spreading propaganda is inimicable to their own interests and repugnant to our whole system of democracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully urge our Senators and Congressmen to enact appropriate legislation amending the internal revenue laws to prohibit the deduction of advertising costs from income before taxes where such advertising is designed for purposes other than legitimate promotion of the sales and services of the companies involved.

RESOLUTION 22

Whereas NRECA has, at its 10th and 11th annual meetings requested the Congress to enact legislation for the development of power on the St. Lawrence River in accordance with the established policy of NRECA relating to public power development as set forth in the statement of Federal power policy, adopted by NRECA February 1, 1951; and

Whereas the Congress has failed to enact such legislation and the Federal Power Commission has granted a license to the Power Authority of the State of New York to develop and market St. Lawrence hydropower, without protection to the consumer through application of the provisions of the preference clause of the Flood Control Act of 1944; and

Whereas legislation is now pending in the Congress to permit the development at Niagara of hydropower by five private companies, with no protection afforded the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we do hereby request the Congress to enact positive legislation for the protection of the public in accordance with the established power policy of NRECA in the development of hydropower at the St. Lawrence and Niagara power sites.

PARITY FOR FARM PRODUCTS—LETTER FROM FARMERS UNION LOCAL 103, BLACKDUCK, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from Mr. Engberg, chairman of Farmers Union Local 103, Blackduck, Minn., in favor of 90 to 100 percent of parity, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLACKDUCK, MINN., *March 1, 1954.*

To Hon. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: The Cormant Quiring Farmers Union Local 103 wish to thank you for the fine support you have given to American agriculture, also to inform you that we have gone on record as in favor of 100 percent or not less than 90 percent of parity on all farm products and more adequate loans to REA and RTA and power dams.

Thanking you very much.

Yours truly,

STANLEY ENGBERG,
Chairman, Local 103.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., on February 26, concerning the Natural Gas Act, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ENDORSING H. R. 7624-S. 2971, PENDING IN CONGRESS, RELATING TO AN AMENDMENT OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT

Whereas the city of Minneapolis is confronted with the need of protecting the interests of its natural gas rate payers in a number of requests for advances in natural gas rates under the Natural Gas Act; and

Whereas the Natural Gas Act is designed for the regulation of such rates; and

Whereas H. R. 7624–S. 2971 will facilitate and improve that regulation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That the City Council of the City of Minneapolis endorses the said proposed amendment; be it further

Resolved, That the city council requests the Representatives from Minnesota in the Congress of the United States to exert every effort to secure passage of legislation similar to H. R. 7624-S. 2971; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Representatives from Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

Passed February 26, 1954.

W. GLEN WALLACE,
President of the Council.

Approved March 1, 1954.

ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor.

Attest:

ARLENE R. FINKLE,
City Clerk.

WRIGHT PATMAN, REPRESENTATIVE FROM TEXAS—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL REHABILITATION COMMISSION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I consider it a privilege and an honor to bring to the attention of the Senate a resolution adopted on March 4, 1954, by the National Rehabilitation Commission of the American Legion.

The resolution pays its respects to the splendid services the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of the First Congressional District of Texas, has performed as a supporter of veterans' rights and privileges and as a man in public life constantly committed to the public interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Wright Patman Day will be observed March 3, 1954, in Washington, D. C., in honor of Representative WRIGHT PATMAN of the First Congressional District of Texas; and

Whereas this tribute is being tendered in recognition of his 25 years of continuous distinguished service as a United States Congressman; and

Whereas Representative PATMAN has been a stanch supporter of veterans' rights and privileges; and

Whereas he has served honorably during both World Wars and has been a member of long standing and good faith in the American Legion; and

Whereas Representative PATMAN has always been a faithful servant of all the American people; and

Whereas the American Legion's National Rehabilitation Commission is now in annual conference in Washington, D. C.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion does give full recognition and commendation to the outstanding works and services of this distinguished Congressman from Texas; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be entered into the official minutes of this conference, and that a copy of this resolution be presented to the Honorable Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN.

PRICE SUPPORTS—PETITIONS, LETTERS, AND NEWSPAPER ADVERTISEMENTS OF MINNESOTA BUSINESSMEN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, businessmen of Minnesota's many fine rural communities are showing more and more concern about falling farm purchasing power. They want the Congress to know they stand shoulder to shoulder with our farm people, their customers, in insisting upon effective farm price supports, and opposing a downward sliding scale of lower level supports.

Through petitions, newspaper advertisements, and individual letters, they are adding the voice of small business to the voice of the farmer from the great agricultural State of Minnesota.

Many of these petitions and newspaper advertisements have already been called to the attention of the Congress, but more arrive in every mail. As a typical example, I hold in my hand a full-page advertisement from the Lake Park Journal of February 25 asking parity for the farmer, and declaring in part:

The welfare of our rural centers and our agricultural communities go hand in hand. We are interdependent. We will not long remain thriving and healthy if half the

community is prosperous, and the other half is suffering a slump.

It further says that, and I quote:

We realize that any program to deliberately lower farm prices and farm income would be dangerous to our rural communities, and we urge that any such proposals be vigorously opposed.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement appear in full at this point in the body of the RECORD, along with the names of the 30 leading merchants signing it.

There being no objection, the statement and the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARITY FOR THE FARMER

The welfare of our rural centers and our agricultural communities go hand in hand. We are interdependent. We will not long remain thriving and healthy if half the community is prosperous and the other half is suffering a slump.

For this reason we view as serious the continuing farm price slump of the past year and prediction from Federal Reserve Bank authorities that farmers may suffer another 10 percent cut in cash income in 1954.

All of us should work together with farmers to maintain an agricultural program which will enable our family system to continue to function and which will keep our food productive capacity strong.

We believe that it is important for all people to understand that a strong farm price support system which will assure us plentiful food at fair prices is in the best long run interest of all of us, farmers, businessmen and townspeople alike.

We realize that any program to deliberately lower farm prices and farm income would be dangerous to our rural communities and we urge that any such proposals be vigorously opposed.

We therefore recommend that Congress maintain a strong farm support program with a price floor at or near full parity on all major farm production.

Al Grierson, Grierson Chevrolet Co.; Fay Hamilton, Grocery Store; Bob Palmer, Lake Park Hotel; Tory Olsen, Fashion Cleaners; Kenneth Cregan, Cregan's Bar; Dan Halliday, Lake Park Liquor Store; Gordon Martinson, Martinson Cafe; Florence Ellertson, Beauty Shop; M. A. Rogness, State Bank of Lake Park; Bob & Irv's, Standard Station; Art Friese, Friese Implement; Harry Fuglie, Creamery Oil Department; Vigen & Sons, Hardware Store; M. O. Hviding, Independent Oil Co.; S. W. Winjum, Hardware Store; A. J. Haugen, Lake Park Produce; Sanford Lunder, Garage and Car Sales; Jordahl's Store, Grocery Store; Albert Palin, Recreation Parlor; Lake Park Cooperative Creamery; Harry Wiecks, Barber Shop; Stanley Olson, Flo-Mor Cafe; Thorvald Tweed, Tweed's Cafe; E. P. Schulstad, Standard Oil Agent; R. C. Bakken, Big 5 Gas Agent; Winberg & Knutson Garage; Aldric Johnson, Plumber; Elmer Hoeschen, D. H. I. A.; C. B. Knudson, Wilcox Lumber Co.; R. F. Bergeson, Insurance Agent; Elmer Rogness, Lake Park Hardware; Ed Struble.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from Edwin Odegard, chairman of the Milaca Chamber of Commerce legislative committee, informing me of that civic body's protest against the sudden reduction of support prices on dairy products.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILACA, MINN., *March 4, 1954.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senator,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.:

The Chamber of Commerce of Milaca, Minn., has by resolution directed its legislative committee to advise you that the economic welfare of this community is largely dependent upon the prosperity of the dairy industry and protest the sudden reduction of support prices on butter from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent of parity.

EDWIN ODEGARD,
Chairman, the Milaca Chamber of Commerce Legislative Committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from Harry Wermager, of the Waubun Implement Co. at Waubun, Minn., has come another petition signed by 20 leading businessmen of Waubun, calling upon me to oppose the administration's farm policy. I ask consent for it to appear in the body of the RECORD at this point, together with the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the petition, together with the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned businessmen of Waubun, Minn., a community highly dependent upon the basic industry, farming, feel that the farm policy of the present administration is extremely dangerous to our Nation as well as absolutely unfair to the farmer.

Since no man can live without the products of the soil, the tillers of that soil, our farmers, must be treated fairly in order that our Nation may grow stronger and, by its strength, ultimately bring peace to the world.

We feel that the farmers are not asking too much when they ask for fair treatment. Everyone knows that there are many, many minor industries that are absolutely unable to stand on their own feet, but, because of the extremely valuable nature of their services, cannot be allowed to fold, and so are supported by Government subsidies, direct or indirect.

Then, why, when the basic industry, farming, is, so to speak, weak in the knees, should the supports be removed or drastically reduced? Is it to hasten the collapse of the small farm, and the small-business man—the very backbones of the Nation? Perhaps that is not the intention. But that will be the result.

Therefore, we urge your opposition to the administration's farm policy.

Harry Wermager, farm implements; Waubun Market, locker plant and groceries; Norris Peterson, Peterson's beer; T. O. Colgrove, timber products; Orval Fagre, carpenter; Waubun Creamery, creamery; L. J. Avander, garage; Joe Huich, Waubun feed mill; John Carrwinn, lumber company; H. B. Gundens, merchant; E. P. Roering, cafe; Harold Kemper, dray line; Tony Voit, Ray Carlson, repair shop; Pat Chrorey, roadbuilding; Don Donald, hardware; Victor Guatesfson, liquor store; Jack D. Neises, merchant; H. H. Patnode, barber; William Carriveau, manager, factory; John Brehm, trucking; Ben Bement, bulk service station; Earl Herby, manager, grain elevator; A. W. Severine, agent, Soo Line; Dehmar Fleisher, Standard Service; George Malakowsky, shoe shop; Karl Haddeland, Waubun woodwork shop; W. C. Roering, cafe and dance hall; Farmers State Bank.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have 5 similar petitions from Appleton, Benson, Holloway, Danvers, and Clontarf in Minnesota, signed by a total of 215 businessmen in every line of endeavor. Rather than repeat the petition and list all the names, I ask consent that the body of the petition be printed at this point in the RECORD, with the notation that it was signed by 215 nonfarm people recognizing everybody's stake in a sound farm program.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 1, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: We, the undersigned, ask you in all sincerity to vote and fight for farm-support prices of not less than 90 to 100 percent of parity, figured under the old parity formula for all farm products.

We are strictly opposed to any sliding scale and to the use of the new parity formula, as our place of business will suffer tremendously if the sliding scale is forced upon the American farmer. We strongly urge that the Senate and House of the Congress of the United States will not let Secretary of Agriculture Benson's 75-percent parity on dairy products go into effect, but rather reinstate them at not less than 90 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask the RECORD also show that a similar petition has been sent me by Harry Arnold, of Holloway, Minn., signed by 77 farm people of Holloway, Murdock, Benson, Danvers, Willmar, Hancock, Kerkhoven, and Appleton.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 53. A bill for the relief of Lewis Roland Edwards (Rept. No. 1045);

S. 496. A bill for the relief of Dr. Samson Sol Flores and his wife, the former Cecilia T. Tolentino (Rept. No. 1046);

S. 509. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law (Rept. No. 1047);

S. 587. A bill for the relief of Carlos Fortich, Jr. (Rept. No. 1048);

S. 1352. A bill for the relief of Siegfried Rosensweig (Rept. No. 1049); and

H. R. 2747. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday (Rept. No. 1050).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 203. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Linnea Colcord (Rept. No. 1051);

S. 246. A bill for the relief of Gerrit Been (Rept. No. 1052);

S. 347. A bill for the relief of George Taipale (Rept. No. 1053);

S. 431. A bill for the relief of Joseph Di Pasquale (Rept. No. 1054);

S. 483. A bill for the relief of Miss Elvira Bortolin (Rept. No. 1055);

S. 614. A bill for the relief of Eero and Tina and Karina Waskinen (Rept. No. 1056);

S. 670. A bill for the relief of John Doyle Mociair (Rept. No. 1057); and

S. 2070. A bill for the relief of the estate of Givens Christian (Rept. No. 1058).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 769. A bill for the relief of Maria E. Laedel (Rept. No. 1059).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on March 5, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 153. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert;

S. 303. An act for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr;

S. 502. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand; and

S. 827. An act for the relief of Matthew J. Berckman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 3075. A bill to prohibit interstate common-carrier pipelines from transporting commodities in which such carriers have any interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. GILLETTE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3076. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of Meadow School District No. 29, Upham, N. Dak., for loss of revenue resulting from the acquisition of certain lands within such school district by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3077. A bill for the relief of Gisela Hofmeier; and

S. 3078. A bill for the relief of Marianne Eder and Curt George Eder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 3079. A bill to provide for improving the Nation's health standards through the issuance of dairy diet dividend certificates to individuals receiving certain welfare or other payments; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3080. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act relating to mining claims located on land with respect to which a permit or lease has been issued, or an application or offer for permit or lease has been made, under the mineral leasing laws, or known to be valuable for minerals subject to disposition under the mineral leasing laws, and for other purposes," approved August 12, 1953; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 3081. A bill to amend section 1089 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia so as to dispense with the necessity for a garnishee to answer a writ of attachment under oath; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3082. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe (Joseph) Barberis; and

S. 3083. A bill for the relief of Luigi (Louis) Rossano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3084. A bill for the relief of Elsa Lederer; and

S. 3085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Stryk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant representation in the House of Representatives and in the Electoral college to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Internal Security; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROHIBITION OF INTERSTATE COMMON-CARRIER PIPELINES FROM TRANSPORTING COMMODITIES IN WHICH THEY HAVE ANY INTEREST

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which has as its purpose the lowering of the cost to consumers of petroleum fuels transported by oil pipelines.

If this bill is enacted, the people of my State of Iowa alone will be saved annually a sum of at least $18 million on the cost of their gasoline, tractor fuel, kerosene, and fuel oil. Other similarly situated States would benefit proportionately. A legislative error of nearly 50 years' standing would be finally corrected.

The bill prohibits interstate common-carrier pipelines from transporting commodities in which such carriers have any interest. It would effectively place the common-carrier pipelines under the same regulations as those which now govern the railroads, under the so-called commodities clause of the Hepburn Act.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, which was created by Congress in 1887, did not become a vitalized and vigorous agency until after passage of the Hepburn Act in 1906. That act, in its commodities clause, prohibits any railroad from transporting in interstate commerce any commodity, other than timber, which was mined or produced by itself or under its authority, or which it may own in whole or in part, or in which it may have any direct interest.

As passed by the Senate, the original version of the Hepburn bill gave to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to regulate the transportation of oil by pipeline, in the same manner, as the Commission has power to regulate the railroads. If the bill had been finally enacted in that form, there would be no need for the legislation that I now propose. In the conference committee on the bill at that time, however, the commodities clause was amended, so as to make it applicable only to railroads, excluding oil pipelines. As a result, pipelines are common carriers in all respects except that they are not governed by a clause prohibiting them from carrying their own products. Being exempt from this prohibition, the pipelines are operated more or less as plant facilities of their shipper-owners.

The bill I am introducing today is no new proposal. It is almost identical with S. 2181, 1st session, 76th Congress, which was introduced by the late Senator from Idaho, Mr. Borah, with my cosponsorship on April 17, 1939. That bill died in the files of the Committee on the Judiciary, but I resurrect it today in the belief that it provides one way to reduce the cost of living to millions of our people, and particularly the cost of operating motor-driven equipment on our farms.

Crossing my State of Iowa, are several major oil pipelines which have stations where gasoline, kerosene, and fuel oil are taken off, for sale in the State. These are so-called common-carrier pipelines. The cost of shipping petroleum products by pipeline is only about half as much as the cost of shipping them by rail. Yet, because the commodities clause of the Hepburn Act does not apply to oil pipelines, the big oil companies which own these pipelines are able to charge to consumers, for their products, prices which do not reflect the cheaper mode of transportation. Our citizens in Iowa receive no benefit from the cheaper pipeline method of shipping petroleum products. Our farmers, our automobile operators, and our homeowners who heat with oil are still charged the rail freight rate, although the products move into the State through pipelines at a cost to the shipper of substantially one-half the rail freight rate.

The farm industry is by far the greatest consumer of gasoline and other petroleum products of any industry in the country. Farmers face the highest operating costs in history. They and all other motor-vehicle owners are entitled to the fair treatment afforded by this bill.

The following figures show the total number of automotive units on farms in the country as a whole and in the State of Iowa:

	Automobiles	Trucks	Tractors	Total
All United States farms	4,350,000	2,410,000	4,170,000	10,930,000
Iowa farms	236,000	70,000	306,000	575,000

The above figures have graciously been furnished me by the research department of Capper Publications, of Topeka, Kans. They are one indication of the enormous market for petroleum products on the Nation's farms, and they suggest how important a part of the cost of farm operation lies in gas and oil for farm machinery.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3075) to prohibit interstate common-carrier pipelines from transporting commodities in which such carriers have any interest, introduced by Mr. GILLETTE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

NATIONAL DAIRY DIET DIVIDEND ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "National Dairy Diet Dividend Act."

The aim of this measure is twofold:

First. To improve the Nation's health standards; and

Second. To use America's dairy abundance to aid underprivileged families.

Mr. President, for the past year I have insisted repeatedly that the soundest answer to our dairy problem was stimulating outlets for milk and butter—not just cutting prices to the farmer.

Last August 1 I presented to the Senate a comprehensive study showing the diet deficiencies of millions of Americans in health-giving dairy products and proposed adoption of a plan to put dairy products within reach of our aged people, dependent children, blind, and others on public assistance.

I have now placed that proposal in legislative form for the consideration of the Congress. It is a health and welfare measure, not a farm relief measure. Yet, in view of the current dairy crisis in this country, the twofold benefits of stimulating consumption of dairy products at this time appears obvious.

The act I propose calls for issuance of dairy diet dividend certificates to individuals eligible for public-assistance benefits. The certificates would enable them to buy at discount prices the minimum monthly amount of dairy products required to satisfy nutritional needs of a proper diet.

Under provisions of this act—

First. Eligibility would be determined by already established standards for public assistance, including recipients of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, aid to permanently and totally disabled, Federal old-age and survivors insurance, unemployment compensation, or public-assistance rolls of any State or subdivision.

Second. Dairy diet dividend certificates would be cashed through normal retail channels of trade.

Third. Existing Federal, State, and county welfare departments would be used to carry out the program, making unnecessary any new bureaucratic machinery.

Fourth. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to transfer surplus-disposal funds to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to aid in financing the program to stimulate consumption of dairy products among underprivileged groups.

Fifth. Redemption value of certificates would be based on relationship between average public-assistance income and the Nation's average per capita income, for the minimum monthly amount of fluid milk necessary to satisfy average individual nutritional needs.

Sixth. While the formula for determining value of certificates is based on milk requirements, they would be acceptable at face value for the purchase of butter, cheese, buttermilk, cream, evaporated milk, condensed milk, and dried milk, as well as fluid milk.

The benefits of this act would extend to some 12 million people now existing on incomes too meager to permit proper diets.

If the limited assistance proposed only enabled the recipients to get an extra quart of milk and a half-pound of butter per week, it would mean a new outlet for 624 million quarts of milk and 312 million pounds of butter a year, more than wiping out any so-called dairy surplus, and making it unnecessary for heavy Government purchases and storage of such commodities.

This is a constructive, humanitarian measure. Instead of giving away dairy products outright, my bill would raise the purchasing power of our less fortunate citizens for the minimum essentials of a correct diet of dairy products to an equality with the average per capita income in this country, through certificates covering part of the cost of such products

Secretary of Agriculture Benson says there would be no surplus if the American people consumed the amount of milk and butter they should have in their diets.

Why not make it possible for those needing these products most to have them? That is what my Dairy Diet Dividend Act proposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3079) to provide for improving the Nation's health standards through the issuance of dairy diet dividend certificates to individuals receiving certain welfare or other payments, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REDUCTION OF EXCISE TAXES—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 8224) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON HARBOR FACILITIES AT ANACORTES, WASH. (S. DOC. NO. 102)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Public Works, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated June 26, 1953, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on the Anacortes Harbor in the State of Washington with a view of making improvements in the harbor facilities, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 666. An act for the relief of Michele Paccione;

H. R. 858. An act for the relief of Kim Mi Hae;

H. R. 1100. An act for the relief of Peter A. Pirogov;

H. R. 1325. An act for the relief of George L. F. Allen;

H. R. 2634. An act for the relief of Charles T. Douds;

H. R. 2636. An act for the relief of George Japhet;

H. R. 2666. An act for the relief of Martin G. Scott and Hanna von Gusmann;

H. R. 3145. An act for the relief of Pravomil Vaclav Maly and Jarmila Maly;

H. R. 3836. An act for the relief of Petra Fumia;

H. R. 4699. An act for the relief of Robert F. Suczek;

H. R. 4735. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Richard Orme Flinn, Jr.;

H. R. 4996. An act for the relief of Col. Henry M. Denning, and others;

H. R. 5765. An act for the relief of Henry C. Bush and other Foreign Service officers;

H. R. 5772. An act for the relief of Robert E. Leibbrand and Rose Leibbrand;

H. R. 6020. An act for the relief of the estate of James Francis Nicholson;

H. R. 6033. An act for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.;

H. R. 6477. An act for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.;

H. R. 6594. An act for the relief of Livio Brianesco;

H. R. 7407. An act for the relief of Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt; and

H. R. 7559. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madeleine Alice Aquarone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7328. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8067. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 204) providing for the printing of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the report thereon was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

NOTICE OF CHANGE OF DATE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 133, MAKING ANTITRUST LAWS APPLICABLE TO PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the public hearing scheduled

for Thursday, March 11, 1954, at 9:30 a. m., on Senate Joint Resolution 133, a resolution to make the antitrust laws applicable to professional baseball clubs affiliated with the alcoholic beverage industry, has been rescheduled for Thursday, March 18, 1954, at 9:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building.

The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Madison B. Graves, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada; and

Cedric E. Stewart, of Nevada, to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada.

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Fred Elledge, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Arnold R. Baar, of Illinois, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States, vice Samuel B. Hill, retired.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Letter dated February 16, 1954, written by him to the President of the United States, on the subject of an increase in personal income-tax exemptions.

Statement prepared by him relative to ninth anniversary of Communist seizure of Romania.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Study by Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress relating to acts of Congress providing benefits for Korean war veterans.

NEW YORK CITY POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, within the last few days I had an opportunity to read a very interesting article which appeared in the New York Times for Sunday, February 28, 1954, describing a lack of efficiency within the New York postal service. In view of the fact that this article bears upon the pneumatic-tube service for rapid delivery in New York, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY POSTAL SERVICE 50 PERCENT EFFICIENT—FOUR-DAY LOCAL DELIVERY NOT UNUSUAL

(By Richard T. Baker)

Letters posted at random hours and in random places around the metropolitan area, for local delivery, stand only a 50–50 chance of being delivered the following morning. Oftener they will not be delivered until the second morning, and week-ends and holidays can so upset even the 2-day schedule that deliveries 3 or 4 days later are not unusual.

Overnight delivery, which is the goal of local postal service, is what you hope for when you mail a letter. Half the time it will go through, and you couldn't ask for better service.

The other half of the time, however, when play tickets, vehicle license tags, insurance notices, checks, and other vital necessities often seem to be involved, anything can happen.

For the last 3 weeks the New York Times has been criss-crossing the metropolitan area with test mailings to study the quality of the city's postal service.

How long do ordinary letters take to be delivered? Are deliveries in certain areas speedier than in others? When and where and how should a letter be posted to ensure fastest delivery? If the service is slow, what is being done and what can be done to improve it?

These were among the questions that the test sought to answer concerning the largest post office in the world, one that handles a tenth of the Nation's total postal business.

From the study certain facts stand out:

Of the entire test mailing slightly less than 50 percent received overnight delivery, slightly more were delivered in 2 days or more. Letters were posted at all hours of the day and night and in all parts of the area.

Distance inside the metropolitan area made little difference insofar as speed of delivery was concerned. Letters mailed from the Bronx to Staten Island received overnight delivery. Letters mailed across the width of Central Park took 2 days to reach their destination. One which struck a week-end was 4 days on its way.

Special delivery inside the metropolitan area might as well be forgotten. Ordinary letters posted at the same time reached addressees faster.

Time of mailing, while a significant factor inside the post office in relieving peak loads and the 6 to 9 p. m. climax of the postal day, made little difference to the customer. Letters mailed early in the day were received at the same time as letters posted at the peak hour.

ZONE NUMBER ADDS NO SPEED

Similarly, addressing with the use of the postal zone number is a boon to the post office, but in the test showed no results for the user of the mails. Three sets of letters were sent from outside the city to New York addresses. One set used the postal zone number, one did not use the zone number, and the other used an improper zone number. All the letters arrived without exception in the same length of time.

Service was better in certain areas of the city than in others. Business zones, like midtown and the Wall Street area, where 2 and 3 deliveries a day are the rule, showed the promptest mail handling. Residential zones, where one-a-day deliveries prevail, suffered.

A test of first-class and third-class commercial mailings revealed that first class, the queen of the services, received little in the way of preferential handling. Both first-class and third-class letters were delivered in the same mail.

Inadequate service is in part due to antiquated postal organization in the New York area. Brooklyn has a single post office and one postmaster. Queens has four independent post offices. Manhattan and the Bronx have one post office with four dispatching stations, dozens of carrier stations and many more collecting and business offices Around this core are the hundreds of individual suburban post offices.

As population has grown and moved, the post-office structure has merely been adjusted. No basic organizational changes, no major abandonments or consolidation have come to keep pace with the growth of the city and its suburbs.

Postal service within the single metropolitan unity is, therefore, made more difficult rather than helped by the structure of the organization upon which the service depends.

Following are some of the specific findings of the test of mail service in the New York area:

A number of letters, mailed simultaneously from a single box in the Bronx, addressed to scattered points around the city, reflected the general average for local delivery. A few more than half of them took 2 days for delivery. A few less than half arrived the following morning.

One of them, directed to a residential address in a remote area of Staten Island, was delivered the next morning. Another, directed just across the Harlem River to an Upper Manhattan address, took 2 days for delivery. Another, to the lower tip of Manhattan, took 2 days. Another, to a New Jersey suburb, arrived promptly the next morning. Another, to a closer Westchester suburb, took 2 days.

"We don't try to explain it," a postal official said. "We work to keep the mails moving just as fast as possible. But the time comes when a sorter has to stop sorting and make a bundle for dispatching. At that moment 2 identical pieces of mail may be separated, and the difference will show up when the 2 letters are delivered."

Service was conspicuously bad in areas east of Central Park. In fact, for a man to get a billet doux eastward across the park from Central Park West to Fifth Avenue, he might far better walk. Ordinary mail took 2 days, and 1 missive was 4 days on the way.

The reverse was not true, westward across the park, mail took only a day for delivery.

If you live on a residential street in a predominantly business neighborhood or, conversely, yours is a business address in a predominantly residential area, your postal service is apt to suffer. Letters addressed to a residence in one of Manhattan's busiest postal zones were frequently a day late in delivery, a lapse attributed to the fact that in such a zone residential mail was receiving secondary consideration.

Mail went easily overnight from the Bronx to Queens. But, returning from Queens to the Bronx, it took 2 days for delivery.

While postal officials contend that same-day deliveries are not unusual, the test mailings developed not one instance in which a letter was posted, however early, and delivered the same day.

Letters moving north on the East Side showed a tendency to run into snags. Two-day deliveries were more common than with letters moving south.

Mail from Brooklyn to Queens was delivered in 1 day. Mail from Queens to Brooklyn, 2 days.

Normal overnight delivery prevailed across the East River from downtown Manhattan points to Brooklyn.

Mail the length of the city, from the Battery to Riverdale, was more often 2 days in passage than 1. Generally, it took 2 days

to move letters between the Bronx and Brooklyn.

With only 1 exception, letters exchanged inside Queens took 2 days for delivery. The exception was an exchange of letters between two persons across the street from each other. They were delivered overnight in both directions.

An airmail letter from New York to Paris was delivered in 43 elapsed hours. A New York-bound letter from Paris took 60 elapsed hours for delivery.

LONDON, BROOKLYN MAILS ALIKE

Airmail from London was delivered in a Bergen County suburb in 3 days, the same length of time that is customarily taken in delivering an ordinary letter from Brooklyn to the same suburban address. An airmail letter from Hong Kong took only a day longer.

Deteriorated postal service has been complained about by big business users of the mails, by chambers of commerce and by ordinary citizens. A year ago the then Acting Postmaster, Harold Riegelman, admitted that 24-hour delays were not unusual in the city.

Some steps have been taken to improve service and some progress has been made. Within the last year window hours in post offices have been lengthened, and night collection hours in many areas of the city have been extended by as much as 2½ hours.

Local post office officials report that complaints fell off noticeably when the later collection hours went into effect.

Officials are convinced that greater efficiency can be achieved through better systems for sorting the mail and conveying it, and research is under way to improve these systems. Mechanical sorters are still hoped for. Personnel practices are being revised and incentive systems organized for workers. All these, officials hope, will bring better service.

They point out that much depends upon the user of the mails for the kind of service he gets. They urge care in addressing, use of zone numbers and early mailing.

"Don't expect overnight delivery if you mail your letter in a box that is closed for the night," they say.

While tests made by the Times showed no appreciable results from early mailings and use of zone numbers, the post office was quick to point out that if everyone posted late and without proper addresses the results could be chaotic.

Experiments in pre-sorting the mail by users are under way in 52 business buildings of the city today, and postal officials are convinced that the experiments are speeding delivery.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF THOMAS G. MASARYK—RESOLUTIONS OF LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF NEW YORK STATE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on yesterday, March 7, our fellow citizens of Czechoslovak descent commemorated the birthday of the great world leader, Thomas G. Masaryk. I feel privileged indeed to be able to join in the observance of his birthday and to express my admiration for the spirit of freedom he symbolized. As long as we remember what men like Masaryk lived for, so long will hope and confidence for the future be part of our lives. We know that in time Czechoslovakia will again be a free nation, rid of Communist domination. There can be no better time than this day for all of us to join in expressing our faith in the future.

Mr. President, the New York Lithuanian-American Council has transmitted to me a copy of resolutions adopted by Lithuanian-American residents of New York State on the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolutions printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN
INFORMATION CENTER,
New York, N. Y., March 1, 1954.

We, loyal Lithuanian Americans and residents of New York State, assembled at Webster Hall, in New York City, this 14th day of February 1954, and gathered to celebrate the 36th anniversary of the restoration of the independent Lithuanian State and having duly noted that—

Whereas during the course of World War II, the Soviet Union in a conspiracy with Nazi Germany invaded Lithuania in violation of all treaties and international commitments binding Soviet Russia, and imposed a Russian Communist regime; and

Whereas the Soviet occupation of Lithuania transformed a once most prosperous and progressive country into a slave state; depleted the native population and exploited the resources of the country for the sole benefit of Russia; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has never recognized the fruits of the Nazi-Soviet conspiracy and aggression and continues to recognize Lithuania as a sovereign state and entitled to a restoration of its untrammeled freedom and membership in the community of sovereign nations; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States created the House Select Baltic Committee to investigate the forced seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviet Union and their present situation under a hostile Soviet occupation; and

Whereas the division of Europe, one-half free and one-half slave makes impossible the establishment of a lasting peace based on justice and poses a constant Soviet threat to the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we appeal to the President and Congress of the United States to stand firm in the leadership of the free world and to reject any proposal of expediency which would prejudice the rights and vital interests of the captive nations; and be it further

Resolved, That we thank the Government of the United States for its vigorous policy of liberation and reviving the hopes of freedom in the hearts of the people of Lithuania and the other Baltic States and elsewhere; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the Senate of the United States to ratify the Genocide Convention; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Government of the United States to promote in the United Nations and in international conferences a dynamic policy tending to alleviate the situation of subjugated peoples in Lithuania and in other captive countries, pending the restoration of their independence, and to call upon the United Nations to investigate genocide in Lithuania and in other captive nations; be it finally

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, Members of Congress, and the Governor of the State of New York.

VYTAUTAS ABRAITIS,
President, New York Lithuanian American Council.
ALBERT OSLAPAS, *Secretary.*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk is a fitting occasion to pay tribute to a man who was a living symbol of the democratic way of life. His great contribution to the creation of Czechoslovakia as President of the Republic will long be remembered, not only by his people, but by the friends of freedom and democracy everywhere. In the turmoil and trouble that beset central Europe between the wars, Thomas Masaryk helped create and lead a government in which peace and stability reigned, a shining example of liberal philosophy and democratic government.

Masaryk's great work was shattered in 1938 as the rest of the world stood idly by. After its recreation in 1945 it was again destroyed in 1948. Today the proconsuls of the Kremlin, the brutal doctrines of Leninism, falsifications of history, and Stalinist pseudoscience have replaced freedom of thought and the teaching of truth. Yet we know that the people of Czechoslovakia will hold fast to the traditions of Thomas and Jan Masaryk. They will remain adherents of the democratic way of life during the period of the Soviet occupation just as they remained adherents of the democratic way of life during the period of the Nazi occupation. The spirit will remain steadfast until freedom and democracy reign once again in Prague and Bratislava.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, today marks the 104th anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest and bravest statesmen of our time: Thomas G. Masaryk, father of Czechoslovak freedom and founder in 1918 of the democratic government of Czechoslovakia.

Through almost inconceivable difficulties and delicate negotiations before and following World War I, Thomas Masaryk steered his people to freedom and set up a model government based upon the great principles of civil rights. America was his home during his years of exile and struggle for freedom. Woodrow Wilson was his confidant and his friend. His courage, his patriotism, and his devotion to democratic principles won him the friendship of this continent, and ultimately the admiration of the world. His son carried on the great tradition of the father.

Though Czechoslovakia today toils under the lash of a Communist dictatorship, and is the slave of Soviet Russia, hope is not lost and patriotism is not dead. The very memory of the great deeds of Thomas Masaryk is a flame that one day will consume Czechoslovakia's Communist torturers. So long as the memory of Masaryk is alive and his great deeds remembered, the Communist dictatorship is sapped and undermined until eventually it will fall and Czechoslovakia will again be free.

I should like to repeat here what I said 4 years ago regarding the Communists' mad efforts to expunge the memory of Thomas Masaryk:

> Is is any wonder that they would try to erase the memory of his life and labors? His very name threatens them. His very name is a summation of all that resists them. So long as a mere spark of his memory is kept alive, it can leap to flame and yet consume them.

Somewhere in Czechoslovakia, unknown to the oppressors, there are other Thomas Masaryks, young men seized

with his fire and ideals, who someday will rise and strike off the tyranny, reasserting the freedom and humanity that their great statesman taught to his people.

EFFECT OF TREATIES ON RIGHTS OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in the March 10, 1954, issue of the Saturday Evening Post there appeared an editorial entitled "People Want Guaranties Against Any Future Yalta."

The writer of the editorial made reference to the debate and action recently taken in the Senate on the Bricker amendment and the amendments thereto. One matter referred to in the editorial is of telling importance, Mr. President, and in that connection I now read from it:

Getting a formal treaty through the United States Senate is a tough assignment, and the Bricker debate has undoubtedly so aroused that body that in the future the Senate may be expected to go over every proposed treaty with a fine-tooth comb. To be sure, the NATO status of forces treaty, under which American soldiers serving abroad may be tried in foreign courts, did get by, but the sentence of a GI to 5 years in a French jug for stealing an automobile while plastered is already producing a bad reaction to that treaty. The boy's relatives are suing on the ground that the agreement with France deprives him of rights which he was supposed to enjoy under the Constitution.

Mr. President, this matter points to some of the feelings that some of us had with reference to that treaty. I wish to say that the senior Senator from Kansas did not vote for that treaty. I am glad that such a great publication as the Saturday Evening Post is pointing to the importance of having the Senate scrutinize all treaties, and the need for some improvement, as recently argued in this body.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEOPLE WANT GUARANTIES AGAINST ANY FUTURE YALTA

That great historic debate on the Bricker amendment never really got going for at least two reasons: (1), the country has run out of great constitutional debaters, and (2) it became apparent to all that the real loophole through which treaty law could upset our constitutional balance is not so much in the machinery for making treaties as in the right of the President to make executive agreements without consulting Congress at all.

Getting a formal treaty through the United States Senate is a tough assignment, and the Bricker debate has undoubtedly so aroused that body that in the future the Senate may be expected to go over every proposed treaty with a fine-tooth comb. To be sure, the NATO status of forces treaty, under which American soldiers serving abroad may be tried in foreign courts, did get by, but the sentence of a GI to 5 years in a French jug for stealing an automobile while plastered is already producing a bad reaction to that treaty. The boy's relatives are suing on the ground that the agreement with France deprived him of rights which he was supposed to enjoy under the Constitution.

Fear of hostile congressional reaction has in the past accounted for the rapidly accelerating use of executive agreements to accomplish the purposes usually effected by treaties. The dubious deals at Yalta and Potsdam were made by means of executive agreements. The Eisenhower administration used this device in its agreement with Spain, which was not submitted to the Senate, although it contains items which may well affect the rights or even the security of Americans for a long time. The reasons why the Spanish matter was handled in this way are easy to understand, but there are dangers in the method. The Bricker amendment called for "regulation" of executive agreements, and Senator George's substitute emphasized review of executive agreements rather than treaties.

The Bricker amendment was attacked as an effort to deprive the President of a "free hand" in negotiations with other countries. The executive agreement, rather than the treaty power, already gives him a hand so free that the head of any other nontotalitarian state might well envy him. Sir Winston Churchill, on his return from the United States last year, found out what happens to a British Prime Minister who is even suspected of making agreements with another country before consulting Parliament. Rumors that he had agreed while in Washington in January, 1953, to something which might extend the Korean war and about which Parliament had not been informed, gave the Prime Minister a bad time.

Up to now, few have expressed concern with this phase of the vexing question: How to keep foreign policy in the hands of the people and at the same time leave it sufficiently flexible to meet the quickly shifting gusts of an atomic age. The nearest thing to a workable idea that we have seen came from Mr. David Lawrence in United States News and World Report. Mr. Lawrence thinks that Congress must somehow acquire the right to question the Secretary of State frequently, either in open or secret session, so that any agreements needed with other countries or with the United Nations would have the knowledge and consent of Congress.

This is an approach to the English parliamentary system which is not fully adaptable to the Federal system of the United States, but surely there must be some means of bridging the gap between the Executive and Congress on this vital matter. The main objective, however, is to vaccinate against the possibility that some future irresponsible President might actually assume, through an agreement with foreigners, powers which he could not claim under our Constitution. That this is no merely fancied danger is suggested by a remark by former Ambassador Philip C. Jessup in respect to a case in which the Supreme Court ruled that an executive agreement could supersede the fifth amendment. Wrote Mr. Jessup: "The decision may well mark one of the most far-reaching inroads upon the protection which it was supposed the fifth amendment accorded to private property."

LIFE AND CUSTOMS IN EARLY PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, frequently I am asked for reliable works on early Pennsylvania life and customs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a newspaper article of recent date entitled, "References to Pennsylvania Life and Customs," compiled by Dr. Charles M. Steese.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFERENCES TO PENNSYLVANIA LIFE AND CUSTOMS

(Compiled by Dr. Charles M. Steese)

The compiler was recently paid the compliment of being requested by the public library of a midwestern city to prepare a short but select list of publications pertaining to early Pennsylvania life and customs. The list was to be used by those of the library's patrons doing research or writing papers on this subject. After compiling and mailing the list the thought occurred to me that it might be of some use as well to our readers here at home.

The books listed are all very interesting reading material, and if not available at the local library can be procured from the State library in Harrisburg.

The Pennsylvania Dutch, by Frederick Klees.

The Scotch-Irish in Colonial Pennsylvania, by W. F. Dunaway.

The Story of the Mennonites, by Charles Henry Smith.

The Old Order of Amish, by Calvin G. Bachman.

Memorials of the Huguenots, by Rev. Ammon Stapleton.

History of the German Baptist Brethren, by Dr. Martin G. Brumbaugh.

Two Hundred Years of Germans in Pennsylvania, by Walter E. Baum.

Old Time Notes of Pennsylvania, by Alexander K. McClure.

The Making of Pennsylvania, by Sidney George Fisher.

Pennsylvania Agriculture and Country Life, by S. W. Fletcher.

Home Life in Colonial Days, by Alice Morse Earle.

The German and Swiss Settlements of Colonial Pennsylvania, by L. O. Kuhns.

White Servitude in Pennsylvania, by C. A. Herrick.

Rafting Days in Pennsylvania, by J. Herbert Walker.

Pennsylvania Mountain Stories, by Col. Henry W. Shoemaker.

Pennsylvania the Keystone, by Samuel W. Pennypacker.

Folk Art of Rural Pennsylvania, by Francis Lichten.

The Bible in Iron, by Henry C. Mercer.

Pennsylvania German Literature, also Pennsylvania Dutch Stuff, by E. F. Robacker.

The Red Hills, The Blue Hills, The Dutch Country, and The Plenty of Pennsylvania, all by Dr. Cornelius Weygand.

Conrad Weiser, also The Muhlenbergs in Pennsylvania, by Dr. Paul A. W. Wallace.

Of course there have been a great many more fine books published covering Pennsylvania life and custom. The foregoing list contains only those with which the compiler is familiar. They will all be found valuable in preparing club papers or in school work.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY PANAYOTIS KANELLOPOULOS, MINISTER OF DEFENSE OF GREECE

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, it is a privilege for me to have the opportunity to introduce to the Senate at this time Mr. Panayotis Kanellopoulos, Minister of Defense of Greece.

During the occupation of Greece by the Germans Mr. Kanellopoulos was a professor at the University of Athens. He served for a time as Prime Minister of that country. He is one of the intellectual and political leaders of the nation.

He is in the United States at this time for a tour of several weeks. He is visit-

ing the Department of Defense as the personal guest of Secretary Wilson.

Mr. Kanellopoulos is now serving as one of the leaders in the Greek Government, and is Minister of Defense at this time. He has been a member of Parliament for 10 years. He was a friend of mine during the year I served in Greece.

I am very happy to have the privilege of introducing to the Senate at this time Mr. Panayotis Kanellopoulos, Minister of Defense of Greece. [Applause.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair takes pleasure in welcoming the distinguished visitor to the floor of the Senate.

ALLEGED SUBVERSIVES FROM MEXICO

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on March 3, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] repeatedly told the Senate that 100 subversives are daily coming across the Mexican border into the United States. I quote one of the Senator's statements, as found on page 2556 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

> The Immigration and Naturalization Service, in a statement issued less than 3 weeks ago, said that every day more than 100 subversives were coming across the Mexican border into the United States as wetbacks. Think of it, Mr. President, 100 a day. We are making no effort to stem that tide.

Mr. President, I challenged this statement as a serious and questionable allegation against our neighbor, the Republic of Mexico, and its people, as well as against the officials of the United States of America. I demanded that in all fairness to Mexico and the officials of our own country, the Senator from New York give us what evidence he had in support of the charges.

The only evidence cited by the Senator from New York was a statement alleged to have been made last year in the testimony of Col. Benjamin G. Habberton, Deputy Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. I have taken up this matter with Mr. Habberton, and have been assured by him that the statement attributed to him was not correctly interpreted by the Senator from New York. In fact, I have from Deputy Commissioner Habberton a letter on this subject, as follows:

> UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
> *Washington, D. C., March 4, 1954.*
>
> Hon. PRICE DANIEL,
> *United States Senate,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> MY DEAR SENATOR DANIEL: You have called to the attention of this Service the fact that it was stated on the floor of the Senate yesterday, in connection with the consideration of the joint resolution relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico, that 100 subversives are coming into the United States from Mexico each day. You advise that it was reported that this statement was based upon a statement of this Service made before the House Committee on Appropriations in connection with the appropriation for this Service.
>
> The statement of the Service referred to was as follows: "It was recently discovered that approximately 100 present and past members of the Communist Party had been crossing daily into the United States in the El Paso area." This statement was contained in this Service's budget justification submitted last December and became a part of the record of the hearing before the House Committee when a member of that committee requested that several pages of these justifications be inserted into the RECORD. The statement was not part of my testimony.
>
> As you undoubtedly know, there are a large number of persons on the Mexican border who cross back and forth into and out of the United States. The Service is continually conducting investigations to determine whether any of these might possibly be inadmissible to the United States and, of course, we are particularly concerned from the subversive standpoint. Some months ago, as a result of information received, we identified a number of individuals as members or former members of the Communist Party of Mexico and of this number we found that some 100 were among those who had been so crossing. Their entry into the United States was, of course, immediately stopped. Continuing investigations undoubtedly will reveal additional such persons and, of course, they likewise will be prevented from entering.
>
> As indicated, the situation described is one which had existed until discovered and corrected a number of months ago.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> BENJAMIN G. HABBERTON,
> *Deputy Commissioner.*

Mr. President, from the letter it is obvious that the Senator from New York was incorrect in saying that each day 100 subversives are now crossing the border from Mexico into the United States. In fact, even as to past conditions, this figure was never used by the Immigration and Naturalization Service as indicating a daily influx of 100 additional subversives crossing this border. Actually the figure was used to show that many months ago it was discovered that a total of 100 past or present members of the Communist Party of Mexico were among the thousands who crossed the border back and forth during the day at El Paso. Only the Rio Grande River and a bridge separate El Paso, a city of over 130,000 people, and the Mexican city of Juarez, with more than 48,000 population. Literally thousands of Americans and Mexicans cross this bridge back and forth each day, most of them in a perfectly legal manner, on the same order that Americans cross the Canadian border at Detroit, Buffalo, and other border cities. Some months ago the Immigration Service found that about 100 members or former members of the Communist Party of Mexico were among the thousands living across the border who had been crossing back and forth at El Paso. Only the same 100 were involved, not an influx of a new 100 every day.

The important thing is that several months ago these 100 Mexican citizens were denied further crossings into the United States. Their entry was immediately stopped. It has not occurred in recent months, and it is not now occurring.

Attorney General Brownell, after a personal visit to the Rio Grande border, recently reported that there was no danger of the entry of subversives from Mexico. As late as February 19, Attorney General Brownell made it clear that he did not agree with the interpretation being placed on earlier statements of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I refer to a newspaper interview appearing on page 1 of the El Paso Times of February 19, 1954, and I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> BROWNELL DENIES KNOWLEDGE OF REDS CROSSING BORDER
>
> (By Sarah McClendon)
>
> WASHINGTON.—Attorney General Brownell was asked at a press conference here Thursday if he could coordinate recent statements by the Acting Commissioner of Immigration about the number of Communists crossing the border at Juarez with his own and other immigration officials recent statements to the effect that there was no such danger on the Mexican border.
>
> Brownell appeared surprised. He had not known of any such happenings. First he said he could only be responsible for his own statement. However, the Immigration Service comes under Brownell as Attorney General and head of the Justice Department.
>
> Then Brownell appeared doubtful that Acting Commissioner of Immigration Benjamin G. Habberton on December 10 could have so testified before the House Appropriations subcommittee about Communists presenting a daily threat on the Mexican border when appearing for more annual appropriations for the Immigration Service and Border Patrol. Brownell, however, was told that Habberton's statement appeared in the printed record of the hearings released by the committee and taken down as Habberton testified behind closed doors. These hearings were later made public.
>
> "This is the first I had heard of any influx there at that time," Brownell replied.
>
> Brownell was reminded that early last fall after he returned from an inspection tour of the California border he had said that there was no evidence that aliens entering illegally included Communists.
>
> Brownell was also told that several high-ranking immigration officials, including Ray Farrel, Chief of Investigations Division, Harlon B. Cater, Chief of the Border Patrol, and others had said about December 1 that Communists along the Mexican border presented no threat, that cases of Communists there had been so few as to require no special program of enforcement, no additional training, and only routine security examinations, because Mexicans were not Communists.
>
> "How can you coordinate these statements with that of Mr. Habberton when seeking additional appropriations?" Brownell was asked.
>
> He shook his head.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I have gone to this trouble to ascertain the true facts in this matter, because I felt that charges of 100 subversives now entering this country daily, from Mexico, were too serious to go unanswered. I am glad to know that they are incorrect, and that no subversives are now entering the United States from Mexico, according to the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in view of the statement made today by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], in which he questioned certain figures which I gave on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief reply.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. When I spoke a few days ago I gave figures as to the number of subversives, reported by responsible authority, who had entered this country from Mexico illegally. Those figures appear in the printed record of hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on December 10. They are in the justification given by the Acting Commissioner of Immigration in the presentation of his request for funds. They appear on pages 194 and 195 of the printed record of the hearings.

I quote once more what was stated in the justification of the request for an appropriation at the hearing, in which the Acting Commissioner was the principal witness:

A harvest of dangerous byproducts from the seemingly harmless invasion by illegal aliens is now in the making. Who can say that Communists and subversives do not cross the Rio Grande? As reported elsewhere in these justifications it was recently discovered that approximately 100 present and past members of the Communist Party had been crossing daily into the United States in the El Paso area; also that the number of present and ex-members of the Communist Party residing immediately across the border from El Paso number about 1,500, and it has been established that there exists active liaison between the Communist Party of Mexico and the Communist Party in the United States.

That was on December 10. The record of the hearings was not made public immediately, but on February 10 the New York Times carried an article from which I quote in part:

REDS SLIP INTO UNITED STATES, CONGRESS WARNED—IMMIGRATION SERVICE SAYS 100 PRESENT, EX-MEMBERS SNEAK IN DAILY FROM MEXICO

WASHINGTON, February 9.—The Immigration and Naturalization Service has told Congress that it "recently discovered that approximately 100 present and past members of the Communist Party" have been illegally entering the United States daily from Mexico.

The increasing illegal entries from Mexica, coupled with a similar situation along the Canadian border, "cannot be other than a threat to the security of the United States," the Service told a House Appropriations subcommittee in secret testimony December 10.

The subcommittee made public the Service's statement, which was presented in support of a requested appropriation of $39 million in the administration's 1954–55 budget. This figure is $3,250,000 less than the $42 million appropriated for the current year.

It has been established that there exists active liaison between the Communist Party of Mexico and the Communist Party in the United States, the Service declared.

Communists and former Communists have been entering the United States in the El Paso, Tex., area, the Service said. It declared that present and ex-members of the party residing immediately across the border from El Paso number about 1,500.

EASY AVENUE OF ENTRY

The Service did not explain in its statement how it knew the number of Communists and former Communists who were entering the United States.

"In the midst of a situation where the small border patrol force is being overrun by hordes of illegal aliens," the Service continued, "an easy avenue of entry is provided for almost any number of Communists or foreign agents from Mexico, Guatemala, from Dutch Guiana, and, entry into Mexico being as easy as it is, from any country in the entire world."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. I ask unanimous consent to make a further statement. I believe I may do so under the order of personal privilege.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks matter contained in the record of the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, appearing in the first, second, and third paragraphs on page 194, and in the first paragraph on page 195.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURRENT YEAR PROBLEMS

MASS INVASION BY ILLEGAL ALIENS

The most difficult problem facing the border patrol during the current fiscal year is the necessity for handling appalling numbers of apprehensions. The relatively small force of officers cannot give sufficient attention to the problems of organized smuggling, apprehension of dangerous aliens, and prevention of illegal entry when officers are promptly enmeshed in the many problems associated with the arrest and transportation of thousands of illegal aliens every time they go upon the highways or crossing places. This mass invasion of illegal aliens has reached proportions which are beyond control of the limited force provided to deal with it.

DEVELOPMENT OF BELLIGERENT CHARACTERISTICS AMONG WETBACKS

Results of the mass movement of wetbacks across the border are unemployment of displaced domestic labor, depressed wage scales and living standards, and creation of serious crime, health, and sanitation problems. Complaints at these results and request for remedial action come from all levels of population and local governments. The aliens show a tendency to quit their former attitude of docility and to assume one of defiance, obstruction, and resistance. Farmers fear for the safety of their women and children in isolated farm homes when groups of aliens appear and demand food, where they formerly begged for it. Wetbacks are making heavy contributions to the local jails, public hospitals, and even relief rolls. Their depredations range from harvesting food crops at night for subsistence to robbery and rape. The Los Angeles police department reports that their officers apprehended last year 4,503 aliens who were turned over to the Service for processing as illegal entrants, which figure does not include many wetbacks who were arrested for criminal offenses and prosecuted in the courts instead of being merely booked for this Service. One thriving farm community near Los Angeles reports 4 out of 5 of the defendants in its police court are wetbacks.

THREAT TO INTERNAL SECURITY

A harvest of dangerous byproducts from the seemingly harmless invasion by illegal aliens is now in the making. Who can say that Communists and subversives do not cross the Rio Grande? As reported elsewhere in these justifications, it was recently discovered that approximately 100 present and past members of the Communist Party had been crossing daily into the United States in the El Paso area; also that the number of present and ex-members of the Communist Party residing immediately across the border from El Paso number about 1,500, and it has been established that there exists active liaison between the Communist Party of Mexico and the Communist Party in the United States.

FALSE CLAIMS TO CITIZENSHIP

The wetback invasion began during World War II years. At that time the problem was concerned almost wholly with farmworkers. The average citizen believes or pretends that the wetback comes and goes as does the ocean tide and the harvest moon. Conducive to this concept is the wetback of the Guanajuato-hat and huaracha-sandal class who labors in the open fields. The chronic user of wetback labor would shrink the problem to just this type of alien. However, the not-so-elementary phase of the problem concerns large numbers of aliens working as United States citizens. This alien arrives with and in the same manner as the before-described type, excepting those that may obtain false certificates before leaving Mexico. Arriving in ignorance, many learn that birth certificates can be had through the swearing of dishonest witnesses. Or they secure a copy of a United States citizen's baptismal certificate through whatever church. False identity is strengthened with social-security cards, draft cards, and, in some instances, poll-tax receipts. Even the dead are involved. Illegal aliens take the identity of deceased persons to claim United States citizenship and show the appropriate documents. The Guanajuato straw hat and huaracha sandal are discarded after a sojourn in the border area and the fraudulent citizen is ready to move north into some unsuspecting community where he may join a labor union and take a place as a voter. Under these circumstances, the price of United States citizenship is indeed cheap. Furthermore, there are untold thousands of aliens who first came to this country as wetbacks and were subsequently apprehended and returned several times by the border patrol. In the meantime, these aliens have learned to secure false papers, adopt American mannerisms and clothing, and are now enjoying the benefits of citizenship. They have complete freedom of movement, and indications are that many also exercise the right of the United States citizen at the polls on election day. This problem, while serious enough now, will become more serious as time passes and will create an ever-increasing number of false claims to citizenship.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Acting Commissioner further stated at the same hearing:

Late in the fiscal year the Service was implored by citizens' associations, chambers of commerce, and local peace officers to use all possible resources toward controlling the hordes of illegal aliens flooding the Southwest. Reports of robbery, rape, and pillage by wetbacks in that area provided ample testimony to the fact that the situation was, and remains, serious indeed. In the light of the extreme urgency of the situation on the Mexican border, border-patrol units assigned to seaport work in the Baltimore, Norfolk, and Philadelphia areas, were withdrawn for the purpose of strengthening the force on the southern border. Similar action had been taken earlier in the year as to the border-patrol unit formerly in the New York area. These units had been assigned at seaports initially for the purpose of searching suspect ships and maintaining surveillance of such ships while in port. To the extent that manpower permits, a limited amount of

this work is now being performed by the investigative forces at the seaport areas mentioned.

CURRENT PROBLEMS IN BORDER PATROL

The problems facing the border patrol are tremendous. Pages 78 to 83 of the justifications point up those most pressing. Briefly, they are:

(1) A volume of illegal entries—flagrant violations of the laws of the United States—far beyond the capabilities of the limited force.

(3) Increasing belligerence on the part of wetbacks.

(3) The threat of entries across our borders of Communists or foreign agents.

(4) False claims to citizenship growing out of the ease with which illegal entry can be effected.

(5) An increase in organized smuggling.

It has been authoritatively stated as a conservative estimate that about one and a half million wetbacks come into this country illegally each year just by walking across the Rio Grande. No effective effort is made to stop the influx of illegal immigrants, which numbers from 10 to 15 times as many as the relatively small number of immigrants who come into this country legally from other parts of the world each year.

No effort has been made effectively to strike at the root of this evil. Appropriations have been reduced. Last year the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I submitted an amendment which would have made it unlawful and punishable by law for anyone in this country to employ any person who was known to him to be an illegal immigrant. We got nowhere. The amendment was disregarded and as a matter of fact the appropriations for the Border Patrol was actually reduced.

In our effort to stop a few scientists, artists, musicians, authors, and decent workmen from coming to this country we are closing our eyes to the fact that every year at least one and a half million persons come into this country illegally from Mexico. We have little control over them. They compete with our workers. As a result wages paid to American workmen frequently are drastically reduced. The illegal immigrants take jobs away from our workers in many parts of the Nation. They comprise a heavy burden economically, socially and morally on many communities. They are a threat to the security and the safety of the localities in which they live. Yet nothing is being done about it. And in the meantime we allow our officials abroad to refuse on arbitrary grounds, which cannot be appealed, emigration visas to decent hard-working honest applicants who desire to be reunited with their families and who would make valuable citizens of the United States.

A few days ago we passed a bill. There was no hurry about it. Yet we were rushed into it against the opposition of some of us. I understand that an agreement has been reached, or is about to be reached, with the Mexican Government concerning the workers legally to be admitted into this country under supervision of the friendly Mexican Government. What we did the other day unilaterally was a slap at Mexico, a slap at a friendly nation which has always cooperated with us and with which I hope we will always continue to cooperate.

The figures and explanations which the Senator from Texas has given in an effort to refute the arguments which I have made and the figures I have submitted do not refute but instead completely confirm what I stated last week on the floor of the Senate and which I vehemently repeat today.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. DANIEL addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to raise a question on several points which have been brought to the attention of the Senate by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

I refer, first, to some correspondence which I had with the Department of Justice on this subject. On the 15th of June, 1953, I addressed a letter to Attorney General Brownell, the text of which is found at page 1304 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 4, 1954. In the letter I called the attention of the Attorney General to the large volume of illegal entries into our country, and the many harmful effects of such entries, and I asked for his comments on the dangers to our national security through the entry of enemy agents under cover of the heavy illicit traffic over our southern border.

I did not receive a reply from the Department of Justice until November 20, 1953. The reply was contained in a letter signed by J. Lee Rankin, Assistant Attorney General. In the reply, which will be found at page 1304 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 4, 1954, Mr. Rankin stated:

> Since January 1, 1953, the border patrol of the Immigration Service has apprehended over 880,000 Mexican aliens illegally within the United States.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska will state it.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Is the Senate still transacting routine business under the usual morning hour agreement?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like to know why 1 or 2 Senators are able to occupy so much time when other Members of the Senate have come to the floor to take only a few minutes in order to request insertions in the RECORD, or to present other routine business. I should think that speeches would be booked for delivery at a time after the regular morning hour has been concluded.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it will take me only a few minutes to complete what I have to say. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] obtained unanimous consent to speak on this issue. If the Senator from Nebraska wishes to be technical about it, we on this side of the aisle could also withhold unanimous consent in the future for an extension of time in similar situations. But I hope we may not be constrained to do this.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I would object to giving unanimous consent for any remarks exceeding the usual 2-minute limit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. If the Senator from New York and the Senator from Illinois wish to occupy all the time during the morning hour, they can do so, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I merely ask that I be given no more than 2 minutes to complete my statement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. How much time does the Senator from Illinois desire to take?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not my intention to occupy all the time of the morning hour. If there is objection raised on the other side of the aisle, we shall abide by the objection.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how long does the Senator from Illinois desire to take?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Perhaps 2 or 2½ minutes in all.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Assistant Attornew General in his letter of November 20 to me stated:

> Since January 1, 1953, the border patrol of the Immigration Service has apprehended over 880,000 Mexican aliens illegally within the United States.

He reported that the 880,000 had been apprehended and deported since the first of the year, but he also stated that in his judgment there were 3 more illegal entrants for every 1 deported. He concludes his letter as follows:

> I regret that I am unable to report any exact figures, but the Immigration Service conservatively estimates that for each apprehension, three Mexican aliens cross the border and either return undetected or infiltrate into our northern industrial areas. This means that during 1954 over 4,000,000 persons will have entered the United States illegally from Mexico. The great majority are "braceros," who seek only seasonal employment, but it is apparent that this border is also an easy avenue of entry into our country for almost any number of Communists or foreign agents from Mexico——

I call particular attention to this portion of the letter—

> is also an easy avenue of entry into our country for almost any number of Communists or foreign agents from Mexico, Guatemala, Dutch Guiana, and, entry into Mexico being as easy as it is, from any country in the world. The seriousness of this situation is self-evident; until this border is brought under control our internal security program will remain in jeopardy.

Does not that statement of the Assistant Attorney General bear out what the Senator from New York has stated about the grave dangers to national security in this situation?

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his contribution. His remarks and the quotation he has read strongly support everything I have said. I was quite conservative in stating my figures. I referred to a million and a half illegal immigrants from Mexico. Judging by what the Senator from Illinois has quoted from the Justice Department there were probably three and one-half to four million illegal entrants instead of a million and a half.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the only figures of the Senator from New York I challenged were those with reference to subversives crossing the border at this time at El Paso. He said, "We are making no effort to stem that tide."

I was not referring to aliens illegally entering; I was referring to his charge that subversives are today entering at the rate of 100 a day, and that, in the Senator's words, "we are not making any effort to stem that tide." That statement is not correct.

I have read the letter from the Immigration Service, in which it is stated that such illegal entry has been stopped, and that it was stopped several months ago. I believe it is a very serious charge to make against our officials to say that they are doing nothing to stop this illegal immigration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the Senator from Texas be extended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DANIEL. I merely desired to complete my statement. The evidence which I have introduced this morning shows that our officials have been very diligent. The officials to whom the Senator from New York has referred have stated that they stopped the illegal immigration as soon as they found out about it. It has not occurred for months, and it is not occurring today.

Therefore, I believe the Senator from New York must admit that his charge, that each day 100 subversives are entering the United States at El Paso, and that we are making no effort to stem the tide, is incorrect.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Texas knows that the Senator from New York was quoting from a statement made by the Acting Commissioner of Immigration in support of his request for appropriations. That statement was included in the record of the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee of December 10, from which I have read. That statement has never been denied by anyone in the Immigration Service.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the Senator from New York referring to his statement, "We are making no effort to stem that tide"? Are those the words of the Senator from New York or of the Commissioner of Immigration?

Mr. LEHMAN. I said no adequate steps have been taken.

Mr. DANIEL. I beg the Senator's pardon. I am quoting from his own statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Senator from New York stated on the floor of the Senate:

> We are making no effort to stem that tide.

I asked him whether those are his words or the words of the Commissioner of Immigration.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York read a statement which had been submitted by the acting Commissioner of Immigration on December 10, before a committee of the House of Representatives, in which the Acting Commissioner of Immigration stated that approximately 100 subversives—I cannot quote the exact words, because I do not have them in my hand——

Mr. DANIEL. Had been crossing the Mexican border.

Mr. LEHMAN. Had been crossing the border. It is a very serious charge to make, and I made it. I believe that the statement made by me is borne out by the facts. Whether they are today crossing, I do not know. I said that I could not tell for how many days the statement would hold good. I did make the statement, and no one has ever denied it. The Acting Commissioner of Immigration has not denied it, and I have not heard that he is willing to refute his own statement.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from New York concede that the official states it has now been stopped?

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the discussion which has recently taken place between the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] on the so-called wetback question, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very carefully written, conservative article entitled "Problem Dimensions of Wetbacks," published recently in the Christian Science Monitor and wisely reprinted in national advertisements as a public service by the International Latex Corp.

Although the article really understates the issue, nevertheless, it is an excellent, brief summary of the problem, and it concludes by saying:

> Neither nation nor region can afford entrenchment of a major industry upon outlaw, near-peon labor. Neither can long tolerate the social poisons, the erosion of public morality, and the political hazards inherent in permitting such a system to persist.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEM DIMENSIONS OF WETBACKS

Headline I: "Brownell Plans United States-State Drive on Wetback Problem."

Headline II: "Ranchers Ask Easing of Drive Against Illegal Immigration."

These two headlines bring into focus one of the most serious and baffling problems the American people have faced in many a decade.

What are its dimensions?

The physical dimensions: It is estimated that over 1 million Mexican laborers slip over the Rio Grande or other borders every year in search of jobs. This is in addition to the 180,000 legal entrants who come in under treaty agreement with Mexico.

The economic dimensions: Since these wetbacks are legally fugitives from justice, they are completely at the mercy of a wage level beaten down by competition between their employers and by a competition of desperation between themselves. This could settle an economy on the regions affected based upon peonage rather than upon free labor. Ranchers and processors who use this depressed labor can produce at profits fabulously above those of their competitors in other regions. And labor which must be sold at any price gradually and surely undercuts the wage levels of the free worker.

The social dimensions: Many of the wetbacks go back to Mexico. But many come in again and others with them. The presence of so large a body of usually penniless, unskilled, relatively primitive people, comparable in their status to the masterless men of the Middle Ages, brings with it problems of crime, delinquency, neglected children, and disease. One Texas sociologist estimates the wetback invasion may have set back America's assimilation of its legitimate Spanish-speaking population by two centuries.

The international dimensions: Americans tend to identify all Mexico with the primitive, ignorant wetback; Mexicans tend to judge Americans by their treatment of these helpless Mexican nationals.

The political dimensions: Hundreds of thousands of the wetbacks escape the meager enforcement of the law and remain. Every community and region which has invited and then exploited cheap labor has come to regret its expediency sooner or later.

The moral dimensions: The gradual, tacit acceptance as normal of a traffic in "outlaws," the overwhelming local pressures upon officials to turn their backs or do their duty as the state of the labor market dictates lets loose a corrosive force no nation dare ignore.

What is the remedy? The wetbacks are obvious results of two national economies at vastly different levels living side by side along a thinly guarded border. The poor on one side flow toward the oft-magnified pay on the other as inevitably as water flows over a dam. On the one hand are the tangible, immediate justifications in the situation of ranchers with crops ready to harvest needing a quick, ample, and temporary labor supply and waiting laborers with standards of living which make even such employment attractive; on the other, the intangible but far greater evils which follow from meeting these needs with a species of anarchy.

It is probably more useful at this moment to underline the reasons why answers must be found than attempt to blueprint solutions: Neither nation nor region can afford entrenchment of a major industry upon outlaw, near-peon labor. Neither can long tolerate the social poisons, the erosion of public morality, and the political hazards inherent in permitting such a system to persist.

ECONOMIES IN FEDERAL BUDGET—RECOMMENDATIONS BY SENATOR BYRD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD recommendations I am making for economies in the Federal budget.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS BY SENATOR BYRD

We have piled up the Federal debt with deficits in 20 of the last 23 years, and President Eisenhower's first budget proposes to increase the debt still more with another deficit of $2.9 billion.

The longer the administration goes without making good on the President's cardinal campaign promise to balance the budget, the more difficult it will be. It could be done in the fiscal year beginning July 1 with additional expenditure reductions amounting to less than 5 percent of the $65.6 billion expenditure total in the President's budget.

Suggested reductions in the budget expenditure estimates are summarized as follows:

1. Foreign assistance expenditures	$650,000,000
(a) Military	350,000,000
(b) Economic	300,000,000
2. Military expenditures	1,100,000,000
3. Domestic-civilian expenditures	800,000,000
4. Civilian employment expenditures	500,000,000
Total	3,050,000,000

SUGGESTED EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

With respect to foreign assistance the suggested reductions would cut aggregate expenditures in the coming year little more than 15 percent under the estimate for the current year. They would leave military assistance expenditures at approximately 93 percent of the current all-time high spending level.

Most of the suggested reductions in military expenditures would merely hold items, where increases are proposed in the budget, to this year's level. Notable exceptions are Army procurement and Air Force procurement where, in each case, increases would be provided even after these reductions.

The suggested expenditure reductions in the domestic-civilian category would fall into two parts. They would eliminate items requiring new program legislation and subsequent budget messages; and in certain Government corporations and so-called business-type programs expenditures would be held to a figure within their own receipts.

Further reductions in civilian employment, at a saving of $500 million a year, would still leave nearly a quarter of a million more employees than were on the payroll at the outbreak of the Korean war.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Proposals in the President's budget for next fiscal year, beginning July 1, may be summarized as follows:

[In billions]

Total appropriations and other expenditure authorizations	$143.2
(a) In balances remaining in old appropriations and other spending authority to be carried over	86.9
(b) In new appropriations and other spending authority recommended for enactment in the current session of Congress	56.3
Total expenditures	$65.6
(a) From balances in old appropriations and other spending authority carried over	31.0
(b) From new appropriations and other spending authority recommended for enactment in the current session of Congress	34.6
Total receipts	62.6
Deficit	2.9

(It is the difference between expenditures (not appropriations) and receipts in a fiscal year that determines whether the budget is balanced, or whether there is a deficit or surplus.)

In view of all the circumstances, including the tremendous balances in previously enacted appropriations and other expenditure authorizations which have been allowed to accumulate and remain available for expenditure, it is a relatively tight budget. But, with provisions for no critical emergencies, it still takes us further in debt.

EXPENDITURES—APPROPRIATIONS

It should be noted that the reductions suggested here are in terms of next year's expenditures. Reduction in actual expenditures during the year must be accomplished if the deficit is to be reduced.

Reduction in new appropriations before Congress is equally essential, but in instances where appropriations are for more than 1 year it is possible that the effect of appropriation reduction alone on the deficit in the coming year may be only partial or none at all. Of the $56.3 billion in new appropriations now before Congress, more than 35 percent would be for expenditure in some fiscal year after June 30, 1955.

By the same token, reduction in new appropriations does not curtail expenditures from balances in previously enacted appropriations. Nearly 50 percent of next year's expenditures will be out of old appropriations and authorizations.

Foreign aid appropriations and expenditures

Foreign aid is an example of areas where difficulty is encountered in efforts to cut expenditures in the coming year by reducing new appropriations.

Foreign aid, under the mutual security programs, as proposed in the President's budget, follows:

[In billions]

Foreign aid	Availability of funds			Expenditures		Total
	In old appropriations and authority	In new appropriations and authority	Total	From old appropriations and authority	From new appropriations and authority	
Economic:						
Mutual security economic and technical cooperation	$1.2	$0.9	$2.1	$0.8	$0.3	$1.1
Surplus agricultural commodity disposal	----------	.3	.3	----------	(1.3)	(1.3)
Total, economic	1.2	1.2	2.4	.8	.3	1.1
Military	8.2	2.5	10.7	3.6	.7	4.3
Total, foreign aid	9.4	3.7	13.1	4.4	1.0	5.4

1 This money would be used by the Government agency handling the program to buy surplus commodities from Commodity Credit Corporation. Actually, it would be an expenditure by one Government agency and a receipt for another. The net effect on the budgetary deficit for the coming year would be zero. The cost of the products to the Commodity Credit Corporation was reflected in its expenditures in the year of original purchase.

Figures in the preceding table show that only $1 out of every $5.40 of mutual security foreign aid next year would be from new appropriations.

For obvious reasons suggestions in this statement for reductions in the deficit next year are in terms of expenditures.

SUGGESTED FOREIGN-AID EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

Since World War II, actual expenditures for all foreign aid have totaled $47.6 billion, an average of $5.3 billion a year. The administration has recommended expenditure of $5.4 billion in mutual security foreign aid next year.

Expenditures for all foreign economic aid since World War II have cost American taxpayers $33.7 billion. This year it is estimated that all economic aid expenditures will total $1.6 billion. For the coming year the administration proposes mutual security economic aid expenditures totaling $1.1 billion. Of this total for next year $0.8 billion would be spent from appropriations previously enacted and $0.3 billion would be from new appropriations. The expenditure reduction suggested here for mutual security economic aid would eliminate all expenditures out of new money. This would not impair any spending commitments already made. Expenditures would total more than half of this year's level. The deficit would be reduced by $0.3 billion.

Expenditures for all foreign military aid since World War II have cost American taxpayers $13.9 billion. This year it is estimated that military-aid expenditures will total $4.2 billion. For the coming year the administration proposed military aid expenditures totaling $4.3 billion. Of this total $3.6 billion would be spent from appropriations previously enacted, and $0.7 billion from new appropriations. The expenditure reduction suggested here would cut expenditures from new appropriations 50 percent. This would not impair any spending commitments already made. It would merely taper down spending out of new money. It would reduce military aid expenditures only about 7 percent under the estimate for this year. The deficit would be reduced by $350 million.

Under these expenditure suggestions total mutual security foreign aid would still cost approximately $4½ billion, but the deficit would be reduced by $650 million.

SUGGESTED MILITARY EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

Army

Reductions in Army expenditures suggested here, totaling $657 million, follow:

One hundred million dollars in expenditures for Army maintenance and operations. The budget proposes an increase of $100 million in this item over the current year. With reduction in the size of the Army as proposed for next year, it would seem that maintenance and operations costs should not exceed those of this year.

One million dollars in construction expenditures for Reserve components. This could be accomplished without reduction in prior commitments.

Nine million dollars in expenditures for the Reserve Officers Training Corps. This would allow for the current year's level.

Ten million dollars in expenditures for the National Guard. With this reduction out of new money, there would still be an increase of 10 percent in total expenditures over the current year.

Five hundred million dollars in expenditures for Army procurement and production. With this reduction expenditures would still amount to 10 percent more than the estimate for the current year.

Five million dollars reduction in expenditures for acquisition of real property by the Army, and $50 million in expenditures for construction. This would leave nearly $200 million for expenditure during the year.

In summary, it would seem that these reductions would conform with the administration's policy of moderate retrenchment in the Department of the Army.

Navy

Reductions in Navy expenditures suggested here, totaling $64 million, follow:

Twenty million dollars in expenditures for naval aircraft and facilities. This would allow for expenditures at the current year's level.

Twenty million dollars in expenditures for ships and facilities. This would allow "maintenance of the active fleet" at the current year's level.

Two million dollars in expenditures for naval ordnance and facilities. This would allow for expenditures out of new money at the level of the current year, and all that is requested out of prior-year appropriations.

Five million dollars in expenditures for Navy civil engineering. This would allow for expenditures out of new money at virtually the current year's level and all requested out of prior-year appropriations.

Five million dollars in military construction expenditures for naval reserve components. This would allow for expenditures at the current year's level.

Five million dollars in expenditures for naval research, $1 million out of new money and $4 million out of appropriations previously enacted. This would still leave $55 million for naval research expenditure.

Seven million dollars in expenditures for Navy servicewide operations. This would allow for expenditures out of new appropriations at the current year's level and provide all expenditures requested out of appropriations previously made.

In summary, these reductions would appear to conform with the administration's policy for no expansion in the Navy.

Air Force

Reductions in Air Force expenditures suggested here, totaling $292 million, follow:

One hundred and twelve million nine hundred thousand dollars in Air Force expenditures for maintenance and operations. By reducing expenditures for rents and utilities $5.6 million and other contractual services $107.3 million, this reduction would allow expenditures at the current year's level.

One hundred and twenty-nine million dollars in expenditures for acquisition of real property and construction. This would allow expenditures at the current year's level.

Fifty million dollars in expenditures for major Air Force procurement other than aircraft. This would allow a quarter-of-a-billion-dollar increase over the current year's level.

In summary, these reductions would save nearly $300 million in expenditures without impairment of the administration's policy with respect to the Air Force.

Military public works

It is further suggested that the military public works expenditure item of $100 million, proposed for later transmission, be reduced by $50 million. In this connection, military agencies should require greater use of native labor on contract projects overseas. Such a requirement would reduce not only labor costs but also travel costs and overseas emoluments.

SUGGESTED DOMESTIC-CIVILIAN EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

The budget contemplates numerous new expenditure items requiring new program legislation, along with others requiring additional budgetary recommendations. The expenditure reductions suggested here would eliminate strictly domestic-civilian items in this category totaling $170 million for the coming fiscal year. Items to be eliminated would include:

$10.8 million in expenditures for Army civil functions;

$3 million in expenditures for Housing and Home Finance Agency advance planning;

$129 million in expenditures for seven Department of Health, Education, and Welfare programs;

$5.4 million in expenditures for Reclamation Bureau construction and rehabilitation projects; and

$21.8 million in expenditures for unemployment compensation grants to States.

In addition, United States Information Agency expenditures should be held to the current year's level, at a saving of $8.7 million. As an example of nonessential expenditures which could be eliminated without impairing the program, the USIA recently telegraphed requests to newspapers around the country for copies of their papers to be exhibited at some future date in England.

Government corporations and so-called business-type agencies for years have been a pipeline from the Federal Treasury to their select clientele. They are into American taxpayers for an amount which, by the nature of their ramified operations and records, is impossible of determination.

With the Federal debt at its statutory limit and reductions in tax revenue, the time has come when these agencies should operate like business-type operations, stop bleeding the Treasury and the taxpayers, and live within their income.

For example, under the President's budget proposals, in the coming year, the net new-money cost to American taxpayers of the six so-called business-type programs listed below would be $0.4 billion. If they were made to live on 75 percent of their income during the coming year, the Federal deficit would be reduced by more than a half-billion dollars.

This would require merely writing expenditure limitations into appropriation bills, the figures to be based on a percentage of their estimated receipts.

In most of these programs large amounts are due and collectable, and in the current condition of the Federal Treasury there is no reason why they should not live on or within their own annual income instead of using more tax money and increasing the debt, except in extreme emergencies.

The six examples of so-called business-type programs in which a half-billion dollars could be saved follow:

Programs and agencies	Estimated expenditures		Estimated receipts, fiscal year 1955	Estimated effect on the budget, 1955	Expenditures, 75 percent of 1955 receipts	Budget savings
	Fiscal year 1954	Fiscal year 1955				
Expansion of defense production (This direct loan and grant program was established to stimulate expansion of war plants for the Korean war. That war is over. A policy of moderate military retrenchment has been adopted. There is no need for continuation of this program at virtually the wartime level)	$561, 607, 671	$546, 048, 448	$238, 422, 919	$307, 625, 529	$168, 817, 119	$377, 231, 329
Reconstruction Finance Corporation production programs (Disposal of these rubber, tin, and fiber plants is under consideration. It is estimated that they will take in more than they spend next year. This is a simple proposal that they spend still less)	348, 950, 759	270, 032, 000	334, 698, 000	−64, 666, 000	251, 023, 500	19, 008, 500
Small Business Administration (This agency is a hangover from the abolished RFC. 75 percent of its estimated income should meet its necessary disaster requirements with some left over)	12, 971, 594	31, 235, 586	6, 178, 981	25, 056, 605	4, 634, 236	26, 601, 350
Housing loans under the Veterans' Administration (This program of direct housing loans for veterans is in addition to the guaranteed veterans loan programs. Limitation on expenditures under it would not affect the guaranteed loan program available to veterans)	108, 515, 307	83, 745, 000	40, 045, 000	43, 700, 000	30, 033, 750	53, 711, 250
Slum clearance and urban redevelopment under Housing and Home Finance Agency (This program has been going on for years in one form or another. There is no new reason why expenditures next year should be 50 percent higher than this year and 300 percent over last year's level)	68, 326, 309	97, 244, 360	49, 654, 500	47, 589, 860	37, 240, 875	60, 003, 485
Educational institutions housing loans under Housing and Home Finance Agency (In the present condition of the Federal Treasury there is no justification for financing construction for State universities and privately endowed institutions beyond absolute minimum commitments)	36, 853, 825	62, 053, 500	4, 343, 500	57, 709, 000	3, 257, 625	58, 794, 875
Total	1, 137, 234, 465	1, 090, 357, 894	673, 342, 900	417, 014, 994	495, 007, 105	595, 350, 789

SUGGESTED CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

When the Korean war started civilian employment by executive agencies of the Federal Government totaled 1,968,400. During the war the number of employees increased to a peak of 2,601,800 in July 1952. The budget estimates the number of employees in the coming fiscal year, beginning July 1, will average 2,353,200.

Despite the reduction of 248,600 from the Korean war peak, Federal civilian employment next year will still average 384,800 above the pre-Korean war level. The budget estimates the payroll in the coming year at an annual rate of approximately $9.7 billion, as compared with $6.8 billion in fiscal year 1950. It is approximately the same as it was in the Korean war peak year of 1952.

If the Federal payroll were reduced by 150,000 employees, it would still be nearly a quarter of a million above the pre-Korean war level. Such a reduction in Federal civilian employment would reduce the deficit next year by at least $500 million.

Additional savings could be made if agencies operating overseas would use foreign nationals living at the scene of the activity, where they can be used more economically. In the coming year there will be between 75,000 and 100,000 American citizens on Federal payrolls working overseas. For those who have families it costs the Federal Treasury, in addition to their salaries, approximately $9,000 to transport the employees, their families, household effects, etc., overseas and back. Experience in the past few years has indicated foreign nationals can be used effectively in many of these jobs at less pay and with no additional transportation costs.

Additional personal service

In addition to the regular employment of 2,353,200 next year, the military agencies will use the service of approximately 400,000 foreign nationals in their overseas activities. Some of these are paid by the German Government for their work in connection with the American occupation forces. But the majority are paid from funds appropriated out of the American Treasury for purposes not designated as personal service. In January this year 175,000 in Japan were employed under labor contracts between the military services and the Japanese Government.

As of January this year these employees, outside the payroll budget, were reported to be as follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Germany	117,992	97,206	1,920	18,866
Japan	174,901	115,226	18,374	41,301
Korea	105,893	96,574	----	9,319
Lybia	199	----	----	199
Ryukyus	14,683	11,083	----	3,600
Saudi Arabia	395	----	----	395
Total	414,063	320,089	20,294	73,680

These suggested reductions are made after careful study of the budget, which was found to be tightened up considerably, and greatly improved by comparison with budgets of the past. Among the improvements were:

1. Presentation for the first time of gross expenditure figures. Previously only the net figures were given for Government corporations and so-called business-type activities. Net figures are perfectly proper, but the gross figures present a more accurate picture of the full scope of their operations.

2. Treatment of railroad retirement receipts and expenditures as trust fund transactions, as they should be, outside the budget.

3. Provision for more complete budgetary control over the use of foreign currencies, particularly by the military departments.

4. Development of a compilation and analysis of expenditures for research and development.

5. Presentation for the first time in the Budget Document of summary data on funds still available for expenditure in old appropriations.

It is to be hoped that this data may be expanded in future budgets to show in the same form unexpended balances in old appropriations remaining available for expenditure in each appropriation account. This would give Congress a clearer picture of new appropriation requirements on an itemized basis.

Another worthwhile improvement in future budget documents would be the complete elimination of all reference to the so-called cash budget, whether it is called "payments to and receipts from the public" or something else. In the Budget Document this merely confuses people. If it is necessary, the President's Economic Report would be a better place for it. The budget should be confined to a literal presentation of expenditures to be met by receipts from taxes and other general revenue, or by borrowing.

TAXES AND CONTINGENCIES

The administration is to be commended on both tightening up and improving its budget presentations. But still more is required. It is still loose in many respects, particularly in the contingencies which are treated with budgetary optimism.

As presented by the administration the budget is $2.9 billion out of balance. This is an optimistic deficit estimate because it is based on the following contingencies:

(1) That revenue next year, even after the automatic tax reductions, will be within $2 billion of last year's peak;

(2) that the additional Korean war excise and corporation taxes will be continued;

(3) that postal rates will be increased;

(4) that there will be no Federal pay raises such as the administration is now considering; and

(5) that the annual Federal contribution to the Civil Service Retirement Fund for actuarial soundness will be evaded.

It is possible that unless expenditures are reduced under the administration's budget estimates the deficit will be doubled.

If the full resources of the Government are used in the name of recession, the deficit as estimated in the budget might easily be trebled, for the Government has no resources except your credit and mine.

Meanwhile, there is great agitation for still further tax reduction. If this should occur the deficit-debt situation would be even worse, unless there are commensurate expenditure reductions. It does not make sense to borrow money which must be paid back, after paying interest for generations, to finance temporary tax reduction.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, after consultation with the minority leader, I desire to make a statement for the information of the Senate. It is hoped that after the morning hour has been completed, the Senate may resume the consideration of the bill to provide statehood for Hawaii by taking up the committee amendments and having them acted on today, so that the bill will be in the form as recommended by the committee.

I have had an inquiry from the minority whip, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], as to whether it might then be possible to recess until tomorrow before taking up the Anderson amendment. I stated that that would be agreeable, provided we could first take up a number of other bills, which I had already mentioned to the minority leader. I felt we would have sufficient work to do to occupy the Senate for the remainder of the afternoon.

The additional bills are Calendar 1045, S. 2548; Calendar 1043, H. R. 5337; Calendar 1046, Senate Resolution 218; and Calendar 1047, S. 2911.

It was my hope that after the Senate had completed its work on the committee amendments to the Hawaiian statehood bill, it would then proceed to the consideration of the four measures I have stated, although not necessarily in the order I have listed them. After that has been done and Senators have had an opportunity to make additional speeches and to request further insertions in the RECORD, if there are any further requests, we would then be prepared to recess until tomorrow, when I hope the Senate will be in a position to move ahead with the debate on the Anderson amendment to the Hawaiian statehood bill.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF DOMESTIC WOOL INDUSTRY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield, so that I may ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], chairman of the Commitee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it the opinion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that Calendar 1047, S. 2911, the so-called wool bill, is a measure which ought to be taken up on such short notice?

Mr. AIKEN. This bill was reported on March 4 by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It should be acted upon very soon if it is to apply to the 1954 clip of wool. Both the manufacturers and the wool growers have been urging early action on the bill, and the President referred to it recently in a statement, in which he denied to the wool producers of the United States an additional 10-percent increase in the tariff on wool. In his statement he referred to the bill, S. 2911, and suggested that the wool producers obtain their relief through this proposed legislation rather than through an increase in the tariff.

Mr. CLEMENTS. As the chairman of the committee knows, I am not opposed to the measure.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand.

Mr. CLEMENTS. In my opinion, it is a measure as to the consideration of which longer notice should be given than that given a few minutes ago by the majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. For that reason, I thought the chairman of the committee might suggest that the bill be taken up tomorrow or on another day during the week.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not the majority leader and, therefore, do not have the responsibility to suggest the program.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I believe the chairman of the committee will agree that this bill is considerably more far-reaching than are the other agricultural bills which have been mentioned by the majority leader.

Mr. AIKEN. It is a very important bill and will have a decided long-range effect on the production of wool in the United States and probably indirectly on the national security.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Furthermore, there are some members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who, I think, would like to be present at the time the bill is considered, and they will not be able to be present during today.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not know that the bill would be considered this afternoon. In the hearings, as the Senator from Kentucky may recall, the principal objection was made by the Wool Growers' Association of Idaho, which insisted that the best way in which to deal with the situation would be by an increase in the tariff, so that foreign wool could not come into the United States and compete with domestic wool. No other State associations agreed with the Idaho Wool Growers' Association in this matter.

The President since that time has indicated that he is not inclined to raise the tariff on wool. Both the manufacturers who use wool and the producers of wool have, within the last day or two, urged early action on the bill. I do not know that that means this afternoon, but I do know the woolen manufacturers of the Eastern States are anxious to know what is going to happen, and the producers of all the States, particularly of the Western States, want to know

where they stand. The number of sheep in the United States decreased by about 3 million in the last year.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I can assure the Senator from Vermont that the sheepgrowers of Kentucky are interested in having the consideration of the bill expedited. I desire to commend the chairman of the committee for the improvement which has been made in the bill following the hearings on it, but I believe, and I am confident the chairman of the committee shares my belief, that the bill is of such importance that probably it should not be taken up on such short notice.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL-GAS ACT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the eminent majority leader yield in order that I may address a question to him?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Some time ago the distinguished majority leader stated that he intended to have considered Calendar No. 821, H. R. 5976, an act to amend section 1 of the Natural-Gas Act. I wonder if the distinguished majority leader would be willing to inform Members of the Senate when it is intended to consider that bill, in order that we may have notice adequately in advance to allow us sufficient time to prepare for debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that we are trying to conform to the normal legislative process in the Senate. I had hoped the Senate could vote on some aspects of the Hawaiian statehood bill this week. The majority leader is trying to accommodate Senators on both sides of the aisle, who, for varying reasons, all of which are perfectly valid, desire that attention be given to bills which were carried over from last Thursday until today. That is true in the Air Force Academy bill. I am perfectly willing, because of the suggestion which has been made, to defer the consideration of the wool bill until tomorrow.

It is hoped that cooperation may be obtained from both sides of the aisle so that during any lapses in the debate on the unfinished business, the Hawaiian statehood bill, we may be able to consider, out of order, some of the bills which are being reported by committees, at least those on which no minority views are filed, and to which, so far as I know, there is no major visible opposition.

I did state last week, with regard to Calendar No. 821, H. R. 5976, to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act, that I desired Senators to be on notice that at the earliest opportunity the bill might be considered and voted by the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What the Senator from Illinois is seeking is assurance from the eminent majority leader that the bill will not be suddenly brought up for action without advance notice of at least some days being served as to when it is the intention of the majority leader to have the bill considered; in other words, that it will not be suddenly sprung upon the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the Senator knows that the majority leader is not in the habit of suddenly springing proposed legislation on the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There was no implication in my statement of an invidious intent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I remind the distinguished Senator that the bill was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on July 30, 1953.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that if the eminent leader goes into the question of the legislative history of the bill, I think he will find that it was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without any hearings, on the very day it passed the House. Therefore, since no hearings were held in committee, I believe the bill deserves thorough discussion on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. All the Senator from California is suggesting to the Senator from Illinois is that the bill was reported in July of last year. I understand various State regulatory bodies have been very much concerned with the bill, and generally are in support of it. The majority leader did give notice that it was a bill he hoped to have considered at an early date. I hope the Senator will take this discussion as notice that it will be considered at an early time, and that he will prepare his remarks on it. I can assure the Senator that there will be at least a day's notice in advance of its consideration. In the meantime, the Senator can be gathering his material together in order to prepare remarks on it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A notice of 1 day will be satisfactory.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

INVESTIGATION OF IMPORTATIONS OF WHEAT CLASSIFIED AS UNFIT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it the majority leader's understanding that Calendar No. 1046, Senate Resolution 218, extending the authority of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to investigate the importation of wheat classified as unfit for human consumption, will be referred to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the rule, I think so.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know whether the resolution should be referred to the Rules Committee or not. It may be recalled that last summer the Senate appropriated for the use of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the sum of $15,000 to use in its work in particular reference to the investigation of the possible fraudulent use of imported Canadian wheat and the investigation of other aspects affecting farm programs. The committee spent about $10,000 of that amount of money last year, a part of it on the wheat-investigation program, and a part of it by a subcommittee which was studying the application of the drought-relief program, and probably $4,000 or $5,000 was spent in holding three hearings in the Rocky Mountain region in connection with S. 2548.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. There is no disposition on the part of the Senator from Kentucky to delay the committee. But, in order to meet the Hayden formula, it seems to me that Senate Resolution 218 should of necessity be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. AIKEN. That is all right. I have no objection to that course being taken. Strange to say, of the $15,000 appropriated, the committee had left over the sum of $4,000 or $5,000 which it had not spent. Inasmuch as we anticipate lengthy hearings in the next few months, the committee would like to have that $4,000 or $5,000 made available to it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. As a member of the committee of which the Senator is chairman, I am in whole-hearted agreement with that suggestion.

Mr. AIKEN. I know the Senator from Kentucky is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that Senate Resolution 218, Calendar No. 1046, be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. CORDON obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for the purpose of permitting me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I now ask that the bill be read for amendment, and that the amendments proposed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be first considered, ad seriatim.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 1, after line 2, where it first occurs, to insert a new heading "Title I"; in line 2, at the beginning of the line, to insert "SECTION 1."; and in

the same line, after the word "the", to strike out "inhabitants of all that part" and insert "citizens."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, in line 3, after the word "States", to insert "who are bona fide residents of that part of the United States"; in line 4, after the name "Hawaii", to strike out "as at present described,"; on page 2, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "aforesaid," and insert "'State of Hawaii'"; and in line 2, after the word "Union", to strike out "and that the said State of Hawaii shall consist of all the territory, now included in the said Territory of Hawaii."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 4, to insert:

The State of Hawaii shall consist of all the islands, together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters, now included in the Territory of Hawaii, except the atoll known as Palmyra Island, together with its appurtenant reefs, and territorial waters, but said State shall not be deemed to include the Midway Islands, Johnston Island, Sand Island (offshore from Johnston Island), or Kingman Reef, together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon if it is his interpretation and if he understands it also to be the interpretation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that by means of this bill, we shall take into the United States the Territory of Hawaii, with the boundaries it has established, namely, the boundaries which now exist, except for the specific exceptions mentioned in this amendment, namely, "Palmyra Island, together with its appurtenant reefs and territorial waters"; the Midway Islands; Johnston Island; Sand Island; and the others which are specifically mentioned as not being included.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct in his assumption. That is the committee's purpose.

Mr. DANIEL. As the Senator knows, the main point I am driving at is whether or not it is the interpretation of the Senator from Oregon, and if he understands it to be the interpretation of the committee, that whatever the territorial waters of the Hawaiian Islands happen to be, they will be taken into the United States as they now exist.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. For example, as the Senator well knows, in the earlier history of the Hawaiian Islands the King—and subsequently the Territory—claimed certain waters between the main islands as territorial waters, even though they are farther than 3 miles from shore. Do I correctly understand that such claim of a wider territorial limit than 3 miles from shore between the main islands is preserved, or whatever rights already exist are preserved by this proposed legislation?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Texas is correct. He will recall that there is a question as to the continuity of that particular claim; but Hawaii would be admitted into the Union as a State, with whatever rights attached by virtue of the organization of the Hawaiian Islands as a Territory, and whatever description the islands had as a republic, except as to the islands, sand spits, and territorial waters expressly excluded by the amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. For example, if the Territory had established under international law an area of territorial waters between the main islands more than 3 miles in width, such area would be taken into the United States by this bill.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, after line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 20, after the word "election," to strike out "and" and insert "of delegates, the"; on page 3, after line 2, to strike out:

In order that the constitutional convention so elected and organized may have an opportunity to consider whether any changes in the constitution and State government so formed are needed by reason of the enactment of this act, the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, within 20 days after the approval of this act, may, and upon petition by at least one-fifth of the delegates to said convention shall, issue a proclamation directing said convention to reconvene on the day designated by such proclamation, which day shall be not later than 10 days after the issuance of such proclamation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 4, line 1, after the word "First.", to strike out "That perfect freedom of religious worship shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship." and insert "That no law shall be enacted respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for the redress of grievances."; on page 5, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "original"; in line 14, after the word "impaired", insert "by any such amendment or law"; in line 20 after the word "the", to strike out "original"; in line 24, after the word "from", to strike out "Hawaiian home lands shall be available to said State for use in accordance with the terms of said act" and insert "the available lands", as defined by said act, shall be used only in carrying out the provisions of said act."; on page 7, line 7, after the word "States", to strike out "shall retain title to all the public lands and other public property in Hawaii title to which is in the United States (except as hereafter provided) for a period of 5 years after the enactment of this act. Such land and public property shall continue to be administered in accordance with the laws applicable thereto immediately prior to the admission of said State until otherwise provided by the Congress: *Provided*, That immediately after the enactment of this act an investigation and report shall be made by a joint committee composed of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives upon the subject of the public lands and other public property in Hawaii and the terms and provisions of the cession and transfer thereof by the Republic of Hawaii, and the Congress shall thereafter make a final determination and disposition of the remaining public lands and other public property. In the event the Congress has made no other disposition thereof within said 5-year period, then title to all the public lands and other public property undisposed of shall thereupon vest in the State of Hawaii absolutely" and insert "hereby grants to the State of Hawaii, effective upon the date of its admission into the Union, the absolute title to all the public lands and other public property in Hawaii title to which is in the United States immediately prior to the admission of such State into the Union, except as otherwise provided in this act: *Provided however*,"; on page 8, line 12, after the word "States", to strike out "or the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof"; in line 16, after the word "States", to strike out "or the State of Hawaii or, subject to the constitution and laws of said State, such political subdivision, as the case may be,"; in line 20, after the word "be", to strike out the colon and "*Provided further*, That the provisions of section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 511), which authorize the President to restore to their previous status lands set aside for the use of the United States, shall not terminate upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union but shall continue in effect until the end of said 5-year period"; and insert "As used in this subsection, the term 'public lands and other public property' means, and is limited to, the lands and other properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750) or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or other properties so ceded."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 7, to strike out "(c) The State of Hawaii, upon the admission to the Union, shall be entitled to select, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue patents to said State for 180,000 acres of public lands, as that term is defined in section 73 (a) of the Hawaiian Organic Act (42 Stat. 116, 48 U. S. C., sec. 663), within the boundaries of said State. The selection of such lands by the State of Hawaii shall be made and completed within 5 years from the admission of said State into the Union. The lands so selected" and insert "The lands hereby granted"; at the beginning of line 21, to reletter the subsection from "(d)" to "(c)"; in the same line, after the word "lands" to strike out "patented" and insert "granted"; on page 10, line 15, after the

word "lands" to strike out "patented" and insert "granted"; in line 18, to reletter the subsection from "(c)" to "(d)"; at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "(f)" and insert:

(e) The Submerged Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 31, 83d Cong., 1st sess.; 67 Stat. 29) shall be applicable to the State of Hawaii, and the said State shall have the same rights as do existing States thereunder.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 3, after "SEC. 4.", to strike out "Section 1 of the" and insert "The"; in line 17, after the numbers "1949", to strike out "is hereby ratified, and the election for which provision is made in said joint resolution of the Territorial Legislature shall be, and is hereby, recognized as the election authorized to be held for the purpose of ratifying or rejecting the constitution and State government formed by said convention" and insert "and of any new constitution framed by such convention in consequence of a rejection of the proposed constitution by the people, is hereby ratified; and the election held on November 7, 1950, pursuant to section 1 of said joint resolution, at which election the people of the Territory of Hawaii ratified the proposed constitution by a majority of the votes cast shall be, and hereby is, recognized as constituting due ratification of said constitution by the people of Hawaii."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 4, to strike out:

If said constitutional convention is reconvened pursuant to section 2 of this act, and said convention shall determine that changes in the constitution and State government formed by it are needed by reason of the enactment of this act, the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, within 30 days after the final adjournment of said convention so reconvened, shall issue a proclamation for an election to be held on a day designated by said proclamation, at which election said constitution, as so changed by the convention, shall be resubmitted to the people of said Territory for ratification, by a majority of the legal votes cast. The day designated for the holding of said election shall be not earlier than 60 nor later than 90 days after the issuance of said proclamation. At such election the qualified voters of said Territory shall vote directly for or against said constitution. Persons possessing the qualifications entitling them to vote for delegate under section 2 of the act of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii approved May 20, 1949 (Act 334, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949) shall be entitled to vote on the ratitification or rejection of said constitution, under such rules or regulations as said convention may have prescribed, not in conflict with this act. The returns of said election shall be made by the election officers direct to the secretary of said Territory who, with the clerks of the several counties, shall constitute a canvassing board and they, or any three of them, shall meet at the city of Honolulu, not later than the third Monday after said election, and shall canvass the same.

The said canvassing board shall forthwith certify the result of said election to the Governor of said Territory, together with a statement of the votes cast upon the question of ratification or rejection of said constitution. If a majority of the legal votes cast at said election shall reject the constitution, the Governor of said Territory shall, by proclamation, order the constitutional convention to reassamble at a date not later than 20 days after the receipt by said Governor of the documents showing the rejection of the constitution by the people, and thereafter a new constitution may be formed and the same proceedings shall be taken in regard thereto in like manner as if said constitution were being originally prepared for submission and submitted to the people: *Provided*, That not more than two elections shall be held under the authority of this paragraph and the preceding paragraph.

When said constitution shall have been duly ratified by the people of said Territory, as aforesaid, a certified copy of the same shall be submitted by the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, through the President of the United States to the Congress for approval, together with a statement of the votes cast thereon. If the Congress approves said constitution, it shall be the duty of the President to certify such approval to the Governor of said Territory. Within 30 days after the receipt of said notification from the President, the Governor shall issue his proclamation for the election, as hereinafter provided, of officers for all elective offices provided for by the constitution and laws of said State, except officers continued in office.

And insert:

A certified copy of said constitution shall be submitted by the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii to the President of the United States. Thereupon the President of the United States shall forthwith submit said constitution to the Congress for its consideration. Should the Congress by a majority vote approve said constitution, it shall be the duty of the President, on or after June 5, and not later than July 4, 1954, to certify such approval to the Governor of the said Territory. Thereupon the Governor, on or after July 5, and not later than August 3, 1954, shall issue his proclamation for the election, as hereinafter provided, of officers for all elective offices provided for.

On page 15, line 2, after the word "shall", to insert "immediately"; in line 9, after the world "if", to strike out "said constitution were being originally prepared for submission and submitted to the people" and insert "the proposed constitution had been rejected by the people and as if the new constitution were being originally submitted to the President for approval by the Congress"; in line 18, after the word "provided", to strike out "an election, or primary and general elections, as may be required by said constitution; shall be held at the time or times named in the proclamation of the Governor of said Territory provided for in the preceding section. Said election shall take place not earlier than sixty days nor later than ninety days after said proclamation by the Governor of said Territory ordering the same, or if a primary election is to be held, then the primary election shall take place not earlier than sixty days nor later than ninety days after said proclamation by the Governor of said Territory, and the general election shall take place within forty days after the primary election" and insert "a primary election shall be held on October 2, 1954, and a general election on November 2, 1954, and said primary and general election dates shall be duly named in the proclamation of the Governor of said Territory provided for in the preceding section"; on page 16, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "election or"; at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "election or"; in line 16, after the word "prescribe.", to strike out "When said election of said officers above provided for shall be held and the returns thereof made and certified as hereinbefore provided, the Governor of the said Territory shall certify the result of said election as certified as herein provided, to the President of the United States, who thereupon shall immediately issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election so ascertained, and, upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States, the proposed State of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the other States"; on page 17, after line 2, to insert:

At the general election to be held on November 2, 1954, there shall also be submitted to the electors qualified to vote in said election, for adoption or rejection, the following proposition: "The boundaries of the State of Hawaii shall be as prescribed in the act of Congress providing for the admission of this State into the Union, and all claims of this State to any areas of land or sea outside the boundaries so prescribed are hereby irrevocably relinquished to the United States." In the event the foregoing proposition is adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast, section 1 of article XIII of the proposed constitution of the State of Hawaii, as ratified by the people at the election held on November 7, 1950, and any definition of the boundaries of the State of Hawaii in any new constitution adopted pursuant to this act, shall be deemed amended so as to contain the language of the second paragraph of section 1 of this act, in lieu of any other language. In the event the foregoing proposition is not adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast, the provisions of this act shall thereupon cease to be effective. The Governor of said Territory is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to insure the submission of said proposition at the general election on November 2, 1954, and a statement of the votes cast on said proposition shall be included in the returns of said election.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 4, to insert:

When the general election provided for in this section shall have been held and the returns thereof made and certified as hereinbefore provided, the Governor of said Territory shall certify the results of said election, as so ascertained, to the President of the United States. Thereupon the President, if he finds that the proposition with respect to boundaries set forth in this section has been duly adopted by the people of Hawaii as hereinbefore provided, shall immediately issue his proclamation announcing the results of said election as so ascertained. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States, the proposed State of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the other States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "and secretary"; after line 22, to strike out:

SEC. 7. That the sum of $200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for defraying the expenses of the elections provided for in this act and the expenses of the convention and for the payment of compensation to the

delegates to said convention. The delegates shall receive for their services, in addition to mileage at the rate of 20 cents a mile each way, the sum of $1,000 each, payable in four equal installments on and after the 1st, 20th, 40th, and 60th days of the convention, excluding Sundays and holidays. The disbursements of the money so appropriated shall be made by the Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii. The Territorial legislature is hereby authorized to appropriate such sum as it may deem advisable for the payment of additional compensation to said delegates and for defraying their expenses and for such other purposes as it may deem necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 17, to change the section number from "8" to "7"; on page 21, line 15, to change the section number from "9" to "8"; in line 22, to change the section number from "10" to "9"; on page 22, line 12, to change the section number from "11" to "10"; in line 18, after the word "constitution", to strike out "to be thus formed" and insert "of said State"; on page 23, line 18, after the word "such", to strike out "offenses"; and insert "offenses."; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "The admission of said State shall effect no change in the substantive or criminal law governing such causes of action and criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed;"; on page 24, line 4, to change the section number from "12" to "11"; in line 18, after the word "all", to insert "orders"; on page 25, line 3, change the section number from "13" to "12"; in line 16, after the word "renumbering", to strike out "paragraph" and insert "paragraphs"; in the same line, after "(6)" to insert "and (7)"; in line 17, at the beginning of the line, strike out "paragrraph" and insert "paragraphs"; in the same line, after "(5)" insert "and (6) respectvely"; on page 27, line 7, to change the section number from "14" to "13"; in line 17, to change the section number from "15" to "14"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "(a); on page 28, after line 10, to insert:

(b) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, authority is reserved in the United States, subject to the proviso hereinafter set forth, for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as, immediately prior to the admission of said State, are owned by the United States and held for military, naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard purposes, whether such lands were acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii and set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States, or were acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided*: (i) That the State of Hawaii shall always have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the said tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts or parcels of land; (ii) that the reservation of authority in the United States for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation over the lands aforesaid shall not operate to prevent such lands from being a part of the State of Hawaii, or to prevent the said State from exercising over or upon such lands, concurrently with the United States, any jurisdiction whatsoever which it would have in the absence of such reservation of authority and which is consistent with the laws hereafter enacted by the Congress pursuant to such reservation of authority; and (iii) that such power of exclusive legislation shall vest and remain in the United States only so long as the particular tract or parcel of land involved is owned by the United States and used for military, naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 21, to change the section number from "16" to "15"; in line 22, after "38 Stat." to strike out "252" and insert "251"; on page 30, line 12, to change the section number from "17" to "16"; at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "ports" and insert "any port"; in line 17, after the word "possessions", to insert "or as conferring on the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over transportation by water between any such ports", and in line 20, to change the section number from "18" to "17".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SECTION 1. That the citizens of the United States who are bona fide residents of that part of the United States now constituting the Territory of Hawaii, are hereby authorized to form for themselves a constitution and State Government, with the name "State of Hawaii," which State, when so formed, shall be admitted into the Union, all as hereinafter provided.

The State of Hawaii shall consist of all the islands, together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters, now included in the Territory of Hawaii, except the atoll known as Palmyra Island, together with its appurtenant reefs and territorial waters, but said State shall not be deemed to include the Midway Islands, Johnston Island, Sand Island (offshore from Johnston Island), or Kingman Reef, together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters.

SEC. 2. Sections 2 and 3 of the act of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii entitled "An Act to provide for a constitutional convention, the adoption of a State constitution, and the forwarding of the same to the Congress of the United States, and appropriating money therefor," approved May 20, 1949 (act 334, session laws of Hawaii, 1949), which sections provide for the election of delegates, the organization of a constitutional convention and the forming of a constitution and State Government for the proposed State of Hawaii, are hereby ratified, and the convention for which provision is made in said act of the Territorial legislature shall be, and is hereby, recognized as the body authorized to form a constitution and State Government for said proposed State.

The constitution shall be republican in form, shall make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color, shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and shall provide that no person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the State of Hawaii or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office of trust or profit under the State constitution. Said constitution shall provide:

First. That no law shall be enacted respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for the redress of grievances.

Second. That provisions shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools which shall be open to all children of said State and free from sectarian control.

Third. That the debts and liabilities of said Territory of Hawaii shall be assumed and paid by said State and all debts owed to said Territory of Hawaii shall be collected by said State.

Fourth. That the State and its people cede to the United States, and disclaim title to, the property in the Territory of Hawaii set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union as more particularly provided in the next section of this act.

Fifth. That, as a compact with the United States relating to the management and disposition of the Hawaiian homelands, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is adopted as a law of said State, subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the United States, and in no other manner: *Provided*, That (1) sections 202, 213, 219, 220, 222, 224, and 225 and other provisions relating to administration, and paragraph (2) of section 204, sections 206 and 212, and other provisions relating to the powers and duties of officers other than those charged with the administration of said act, may be amended in the constitution, or in the manner required for ordinary State legislation, but the Hawaiian home-loan fund, the Hawaiian home-operating fund, and the Hawaiian home-development fund shall not be reduced or impaired by any such amendment or law, and the encumbrances authorized to be placed on Hawaiian homelands by officers other than those charged with the administration of said act shall not be increased, except with the consent of the United States; (2) that any amendment to increase the benefits to lessees of Hawaiian homelands may be made in the constitution, or in the manner required for ordinary State legislation, but the qualifications of lessees shall not be changed except with the consent of the United States; and (3) that all proceeds and income from the "available lands," as defined by said act, shall be used only in carrying out the provisions of said act.

Sixth. That the lands and other property belonging to citizens of the United States residing without said State shall never be taxed at a higher rate than the lands and other property belonging to residents thereof.

Seventh. That said State and its people do agree and declare that no taxes shall be imposed by said State upon any lands or property now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States; and that all provisions of this act reserving rights or powers to the United States, as well as those prescribing the terms or conditions of the grants of lands or other property herein made to the said State, are consented to fully by said State and its people.

SEC. 3. (a) The State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, shall retain all the lands and other public property title to which is in the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, except as herein provided, and all such lands and other property shall remain and be the absolute property of the State of Hawaii

and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, subject to the constitution and laws of said State: *Provided, however,* That as to any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall be and become vested with absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be.

(b) The United States hereby grants to the State of Hawaii, effective upon the date of its admission into the Union, the absolute title to all the public lands and other public property in Hawaii title to which is in the United States immediately prior to the admission of such State into the Union, except as otherwise provided in this act: *Provided, however,* That as to any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall retain absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be. As used in this subsection, the term "public lands and other public property" means, and is limited to, the lands and other properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750) or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or other properties so ceded.

The lands hereby granted shall be in lieu of any and all grants provided for new States by provisions of law other than this act, and such grants shall not extend to the State of Hawaii.

(c) The lands granted to the State of Hawaii pursuant to the preceding subsection, together with the proceeds thereof and the income therefrom, shall be held by said State as a public trust for the support of the public schools and other public educational institutions, for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians, as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, for the development of farm and home ownership on as widespread a basis as possible, for the making of public improvements, and for the provision of lands for public use. Such lands, proceeds, and income shall be managed and disposed of for one or more of the foregoing purposes in such manner as the constitution and laws of said State may provide, and their use for any other object shall consitute a breach of trust for which suit may be brought by the United States. The schools and other educational institutions supported, in whole or in part, out of such public trust shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State; and no part of the proceeds or income from the lands patented granted under the preceding subsection shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university.

(d) Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union all laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property hereinabove vested in the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions, or the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto, are hereby repealed.

(e) The Submerged Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 31, 83d Cong., 1st sess.; 67 Stat. 29) shall be applicable to the State of Hawaii, and the said State shall have the same rights as do existing States thereunder.

SEC. 4. The joint resolution of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii entitled "Joint resolution providing for the submission to the people of the Territory of Hawaii of the constitution framed by the convention held pursuant to act 334 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1949 and in the event of failure of ratification, the framing and submission of a new constitution, and making appropriations therefor," approved October 12, 1950 (Joint Resolution 1, Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1950), which section provides for the submission to the people of the Territory of Hawaii, for ratification or rejection, of the proposed constitution framed by the constitutional convention held pursuant to sections 2 and 3 of the Act of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii approved May 20, 1949 (Act 334, Sesssion Laws of Hawaii, 1949), and of any new constitution framed by such convention in consequence of a rejection of the proposed constitution by the people, is hereby ratified; and the election held on November 7, 1950, pursuant to section 1 of said joint resolution, at which election the people of the Territory of Hawaii ratified the proposed constitution by a majority of the votes cast shall be, and hereby is, recognized as constituting due ratification of said constitution by the people of Hawaii.

A certified copy of said constitution shall be submitted by the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii to the President of the United States. Thereupon the President of the United States shall forthwith submit said constitution to the Congress for its consideration. Should the Congress by a majority vote approve said constitution, it shall be the duty of the President, on or after June 5, and not later than July 4, 1954, to certify such approval to the Governor of the said Territory. Thereupon the Governor, on or after July 5, and not later than August 3, 1954, shall issue his proclamation for the election, as hereinafter provided, of officers for all elective offices provided for by the constitution and laws of said State, but the officers so to be elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives in Congress. Until and unless otherwise required by the constitution or laws of said State, said Representatives shall be elected at large.

If the Congress shall disapprove said constitution, such disapproval shall immediately be certified by the President to the Governor of said Territory, with the objections to the proposed constitution; the Governor thereupon by proclamation shall order the constitutional convention to reassemble at a date not later than 20 days after receipt of such notification and thereafter a new constitution may be formed and the same proceedings shall be taken in regard thereto in like manner as if the proposed constitution had been rejected by the people and as if the new constitution were being originally submitted to the President for approval by the Congress: *Provided,* That not more than one election shall be held under the authority of this paragraph.

SEC. 5. In case the Congress approves the constitution duly ratified by the people of said Territory, all as hereinbefore provided, a primary election shall be held on October 2, 1954, and a general election on November 2, 1954, and said primary and general election dates shall be duly named in the proclamation of the Governor of said Territory provided for in the preceding section. At such elections the officers required to be elected as provided in section 4, shall be chosen by the people. Such elections shall be held, and the qualifications of voters thereat shall be, as prescribed by said constitution and the laws of said State for the election of members of the State legislature. The returns thereof shall be made and certified in such manner as the constitution and laws of said State may prescribe.

At the general election to be held on November 2, 1954, there shall also be submitted to the electors qualified to vote in said election, for adoption or rejection, the following proposition: "The boundaries of the State of Hawaii shall be as prescribed in the act of Congress providing for the admission of this State into the Union, and all claims of this State to any areas of land or sea outside the boundaries so prescribed are hereby irrevocably relinquished to the United States." In the event the foregoing proposition is adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast, section 1 of article XIII of the proposed constitution of the State of Hawaii, as ratified by the people at the election held on November 7, 1950, and any definition of the boundaries of the State of Hawaii in any new constitution adopted pursuant to this act, shall be deemed amended so as to contain the language of the second paragraph of section 1 of this act, in lieu of any other language. In the event the foregoing proposition is not adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast, the provisions of this act shall thereupon cease to be effective. The Governor of said Territory is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to insure the submission of said proposition at the general election on November 2, 1954, and a statement of the votes cast on said proposition shall be included in the returns of said election.

When the general election provided for in this section shall have been held and the returns thereof made and certified as hereinbefore provided, the Governor of said Territory shall certify the results of said election, as so ascertained, to the President of the United States. Thereupon the President, if he finds that the proposition with respect to boundaries set forth in this section has been duly adopted by the people of Hawaii as hereinbefore provided, shall immediately issue his proclamation announcing the results of said election as so ascertained. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States, the proposed State of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the other States.

Until the said State is so admitted into the Union, the persons holding legislative, executive, and judicial offices in or under or by authority of the government of said Territory, and the Delegate in Congress thereof, shall continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the officers elected at said election, and qualified under the provisions of the constitution and laws of said State, shall proceed to exercise all the functions pertaining to their offices in or under or by authority of the government of said State, and officers not required to be elected at said initial election shall be selected or continued in office as provided by the constitution and laws of said State. The Governor of said State shall certify the election of the Senators and Representatives in the manner required by law, and the said Senators and Representatives shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 6. The State of Hawaii upon its admission into the Union shall be entitled to two Representatives until the taking effect of the next reapportionment, and such Representatives shall be in addition to the membership of the House of Representatives as now prescribed by law: *Provided,* That such temporary increase in the membership of the House of Representatives shall not affect the basis of apportionment established by the act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat.

761; 2 U. S. C., sec. 2a), for the 83d Congress and each Congress thereafter.

SEC. 7. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii established by and existing under title 28 of the United States Code shall thenceforth be a court of the United States with judicial power derived from article III, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the terms of office of the district judges for the District of Hawaii then in office shall terminate upon the effective date of this section and the President, pursuant to sections 133 and 134 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this act, shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two district judges for the said district who shall hold office during good behavior;

(b) the last paragraph of section 133 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed; and

(c) subsection (a) of section 134 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The district judges, except in Puerto Rico, shall hold office during good behavior. The district judge in Puerto Rico shall hold office for the term of 8 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified."

SEC. 8. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the House the second paragraph of section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "including the district courts of the United States for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "including the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,".

SEC. 9. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the last paragraph of section 501 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed;

(b) the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii, where the term shall be 6 years";

(c) the first sentence of subsection (c) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii where the term shall be 6 years"; and

(d) subsection (d) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

SEC. 10. No action, case, proceeding, or matter pending in any court of the Territory of Hawaii, or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall abate by reason of the admission of said State into the Union, but the same shall be transferred to and proceeded with in such appropriate State courts as shall be established under the constitution of said State, or shall continue in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, as the nature of the case may require. And no indictment, action, or proceedings shall abate by reason of any change in the courts, but shall be proceeded with in the State or United States courts according to the laws thereof, respectively. And the appropriate State courts shall be the successors of the courts of the Territory as to all cases arising within the limits embraced within the jurisdiction of such courts, respectively, with full power to proceed with the same, and award mesne or final process therein, and all the files, records, indictments, and proceedings relating to any such cases shall be transferred to such appropriate State courts and the same shall be proceeded with therein in due course of law.

All civil causes of action and all criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no suit, action, or prosecution shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said State courts had been established prior to the accrual of such causes of action or the commission of such offenses. The admission of said State shall effect no change in the substantive or criminal law governing such causes of action and criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

SEC. 11. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of final decisions of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii in any case finally decided prior to admission of said State into the Union, whether or not an appeal therefrom shall have been perfected prior to such admission, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided prior to admission of said State into the Union, and any mandate issued subsequent to the admission of said State shall be to the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or a court of the State, as may be appropriate. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of all orders, judgments, and decrees of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii and of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii as successor to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, in any case pending at the time of admission of said State into the Union, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided in any case arising subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union.

SEC. 12. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) title 28, United States Code, section 1252, is amended by striking out "Hawaii" from the clause relating to courts of record;

(b) title 28, United States Code, section 1293, is amended by striking out the words "First and Ninth Circuits" and by inserting in lieu thereof "First Circuit," and by striking out the words "supreme courts of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, respectively" and inserting in lieu thereof "supreme court of Puerto Rico";

(c) title 28, United States Code, section 1294, is amended by striking out paragraph (5) thereof and by renumbering paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (5) and (6) respectively;

(d) the first paragraph of section 373 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "United States District Courts for the districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico," and insertion in lieu thereof the words "United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,"; and by striking out the words "and any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii": *Provided,* That the amendments made by this subsection shall not affect the rights of any judge or justice who may have retired before the effective date of this subsection: *And provided further,* That service as a judge of the District Court for the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or as a justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii shall be included in computing under section 371, 372, or 373 of title 28, United States Code, the aggregate years of judicial service of any person who is in commission as a district judge for the District of Hawaii on the date of enactment of this act;

(e) section 92 of the act of April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 159), as amended, and the act of May 29, 1928 (ch. 904, 45 Stat. 997), are repealed;

(f) section 86 of the act approved April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 158), as amended, is repealed;

(g) section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico"; and

(h) section 3772 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico."

SEC. 13. All Territorial laws in force in the Territory of Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union shall continue in force in the State of Hawaii, except as modified or changed by this act or by the constitution of the State, and shall be subject to repeal or amendment by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, except as hereinbefore provided with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended; and the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States.

SEC. 14. (a) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the area which may then or thereafter be included in Hawaii National Park, saving, however, to the State of Hawaii the same rights as are reserved to the Territory of Hawaii by section 1 of the act of April 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 227), and saving, further, to persons then or thereafter residing within such area the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside. Upon the admission of said State all references to the Territory of Hawaii in said act or in other laws relating to Hawaii National Park shall be deemed to refer to the State of Hawaii. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect the ownership and control by the United States of any lands or other property within Hawaii National Park which may now belong to, or which may hereafter be acquired by, the United States.

(b) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, authority is reserved in the United States, subject to the proviso hereinafter set forth, for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as, immediately prior to the admission of said State, are owned by the United States and held for military, naval, air force, or coast guard purposes, whether such lands were acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii and set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States, or were acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided,* (i) That the State of Hawaii shall always have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the said tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts or parcels of land; (ii) that the reservation of authority in the United States for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the

power of exclusive legislation over the lands aforesaid shall not operate to prevent such lands from being a part of the State of Hawaii, or to prevent the said State from exercising over or upon such lands, concurrently with the United States, any jurisdiction whatsoever which it would have in the absence of such reservation of authority and which is consistent with the laws hereafter enacted by the Congress pursuant to such reservation of authority; and (iii) that such power of exclusive legislation shall vest and remain in the United States only so long as the particular tract or parcel of land involved is owned by the United States and used for military, naval, air force, or coast guard purposes.

SEC. 15. The first paragraph of section 2 of the Federal Reserve Act (38 Stat. 251) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: "When any State is hereafter admitted to the Union the Federal Reserve districts shall be readjusted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in such manner as to include such State. Every national bank in any State shall, upon commencing business or within 90 days after admission into the Union of the State in which it is located, become a member bank of the Federal Reserve System by subscribing and paying for stock in the Federal Reserve bank of its district in accordance with the provisions of this act and shall thereupon be an insured bank under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and failure to do so shall subject such bank to the penalty provided by the sixth paragraph of this section."

SEC. 16. Nothing contained in this or any other act shall be construed as depriving the Federal Maritime Board of the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore conferred on it over common carriers engaged in transportation by water between any port in the State of Hawaii and other ports in the United States, its Territories, or possessions, or as conferring on the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over transportation by water between any such ports.

SEC. 17. All act or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act, whether passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress are hereby repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I have received from the Honorable Samuel Wilder King, Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, a letter dealing very fully with the Communist problem in Hawaii. It is my hope that every Member of the Senate will read the letter carefully, because it gives a most complete and concise picture of the actual problem. Governor King admits frankly that there still are some known Communists in Hawaii, but he points out the energetic steps which have been taken by the people of Hawaii to bring the Communist threat under control.

For example, he points out that the popularly elected Legislature of Hawaii established a Hawaiian Subversive Activities Commission, with investigatory powers. This is a step which has been taken by very few of the 48 States. The legislature has created a territorial loyalty board, to pass on the personal history and background of all territorial employees. The legislature also took the extraordinary step of calling in the United States House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate the problem, and the people of Hawaii have cooperated fully with the findings of that committee.

All these steps show how fully alert the people of Hawaii are to this problem. It is a record of vigorous action, a record as good or better than that of the existing States. I believe it proves conclusively that the problem of communism is being dealt with as effectively in Hawaii as anywhere else in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter from Governor King printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Honolulu, March 4, 1954.

Senator HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: I have only now had an opportunity to read the official text of former Gov. Ingram M. Stainback's recent testimony regarding statehood for Hawaii. Although the hearings have been closed, his statements on the influence of communism in Hawaii should not go unchallenged.

Mr. Stainback stated that the Communist movement has increased in Hawaii since 1950 and that the granting of statehood to Hawaii would therefore endanger the national security.

We are in fact a militantly loyal community and have supported every patriotic call beyond the quotas assigned or expected of us, whether in dollars or in manpower.

The charge that a community of this character would tolerate Communist domination shows a lack of faith in the power of our American democracy and is utterly groundless.

The people of Hawaii have lived in close association with all branches of the armed services of the United States for a long period of time. In the case of the Navy this association goes back to the early days of the Kingdom of Hawaii, over 100 years ago.

There are over 50,000 veterans in Hawaii, comprising about 1 in 6 of our entire adult population, male and female. There is hardly a family in the entire Territory that has not had a father, brother, or son in our country's armed service, and hundreds of families have lost near relatives in World War II and in the Korean conflict.

Our veterans' organizations, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and others, are active and influential in civic and public affairs.

Our ROTC units are popular with our youth, and always filled to the limits allowed. Our National Guard and Air National Guard with over 5,500 men enrolled have been officially recognized as among the outstanding units of the Nation.

It is worthy of note that, although there was a large number of men from Hawaii in the forces that fought in Korea and a disproportionately large number of casualties and prisoners among them, no man from Hawaii was among the 21 who turned their backs on the United States to adopt communism at Panmunjom just a few weeks ago.

If I thought for a moment that there was any merit in Mr. Stainback's personal opinion, I would not be an advocate of statehood for Hawaii, nor would the thousands of other patriotic Americans who have been working hard and long to achieve this goal.

Mr. Stainback served as Governor of Hawaii from 1942 to 1951. He himself acknowledged that he was unaware of a Communist movement in Hawaii until so apprised by Gen. John E. Hull in 1947. Prior thereto he had unwittingly advanced Communists in public office and thereafter he vigorously opposed Communists and communism.

It does not appear from his testimony what steps he took, if any, to keep informed about the Communist movement after he ceased to be Governor. The facts elicited from him all relate to periods prior to the time he appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in 1950 to state that Hawaii should then be granted immediate statehood and that communism was no bar to this achievement. His present change of heart is not explained by anything that has happened since 1950 with relation to the Communist movement in Hawaii.

The focus of Communist activities in Hawaii is the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, with headquarters in San Francisco. We have learned that the effective leaders of this union are Communists or Communist sympathizers, beginning with its head, Harry Bridges, of California, and his appointed regional director in Hawaii, John Wayne Hall, originally of Wisconsin. After many years of effort, the United States Government has not yet succeeded in restraining the activities of Bridges, and Hall is still free to represent his union in collective bargaining under Federal law, despite his conviction of a violation of the Smith Act in 1953. The ILWU is still strong on the west coast, where it was first formed, although its Communist domination has been exposed and although it was expelled from the CIO as a Communist-dominated union in 1951.

On the other hand, the overwhelming majority of the members of the ILWU are loyal to the United States, and there are identified Communist or Communist sympathizers in Hawaii not openly connected with the ILWU. We must also bear in mind that the ILWU is a labor union which has qualified under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. Not all of its activities can be dismissed as solely of significance in the Communist movement, and we should not fall into the error of opposing a worthy objective because some Communist has expressed approval of it. The Communist technique of endorsing worthy causes which are likely to be achieved and popular candidates who are likely to be elected is now familiar to everyone.

The usual argument advanced against statehood from the fact of the existence of the ILWU in our midst is that this union controls or can control the economic and political life of Hawaii and would or could therefore turn Hawaii into a Communist-dominated State. The waterfront strike of 1949 and its aftermath, which is generally pointed to as evidence of this argument, in fact proves just the opposite.

On May 1, 1949, the ILWU stevedores went on strike after the long attempt at collective bargaining had failed to result in a contract between the ILWU and local stevedoring companies as to wages and conditions of employment on the waterfront in Hawaii. The commercial ports of Hawaii were effectively sealed. Dependent as we are on seaborne commerce for our existence, the people of Hawaii faced a very serious situation and ultimately there was a very substantial loss to the entire community. Many small businesses were forced into liquidation. Feelings ran high. The strike lasted until October 25, 1949, when the parties directly involved finally reached an agreement with the help of the Federal Conciliation Service of the United States Department of Labor.

Mr. Stainback was Governor at the time. He acted with dispatch in appointing a factfinding committee. The recommendations of the factfinding committee were accepted by the employers and rejected by the union. Thereafter public opinion steadily increased against the union. The final settlement was practically on the basis recommended by the factfinding committee.

As the strike continued, an effort was made to invoke the injunctive procedures of the

Taft-Hartley Act. President Truman did not believe that the situation in Hawaii was encompassed by this act.

An attempt was made to enact special legislation of a national character to meet this problem. Hearings were held before the United States Senate Committee on Labor, but no appropriate legislation could be agreed upon.

In July of 1949, at the request of the holdover committee of our local legislature, Mr. Stainback called a special session of the Hawaiian Legislature. The legislature first urged the employers and the union to reach an agreement. When this failed, the legislature passed a series of acts designed to place the Territorial government in the stevedoring business and to prevent future prolonged waterfront tieups. These acts were vigorously opposed by the ILWU leadership. The employers involved also objected to what they called government interference. Yet in the Senate there was only 1 dissenting vote on 1 of these acts out of 15 members (9 Republicans, 6 Democrats), and in the House there were from 1 to 6 dissenting votes out of 30 members (20 Republicans, 10 Democrats).

These laws were put into effect immediately and resulted in substantial relief to the public.

After this special session it was predicted by some that those legislators who had voted for these acts would be defeated by the ILWU at the next election. The results of the 1950 and 1952 elections did not bear out this prediction. All of those who had taken the lead in the passage of the acts mentioned, both Republicans and Democrats and on all islands were reelected and have since been again reelected.

Earlier in 1950 many of these same legislators and others who had taken a lead in opposing the ILWU position in the stevedoring strike were elected to the State Constitutional Convention. ILWU-supported candidates who sought election to this convention were mostly unsuccessful. Only two ILWU officials were elected. One refused to testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities which held hearings in Hawaii during the session of the constitutional convention. He was expelled by the convention for this refusal, the other ILWU official being on the committee that unanimously recommended his expulsion.

At the 1950 general elections the constitution framed by this convention was ratified by the people by a vote of more than 3 to 1, although the ILWU opposed the ratification.

The attention given to the ILWU must not blind us to the fact that we also have a strong American Federation of Labor organization in Hawaii which claims 12,000 to 15,000 members and which is vigorously anti-Communist. There are also several independent unions, one of which was formed by a group who left the ILWU because of the ILWU leadership's Communist bent.

The people of Hawaii have done as much as if not more than any other community to expose and combat communism.

In 1941 the Territorial legislature enacted a law requiring a loyalty oath of all Government officers and employees. This law was amended to conform to decisions by the United States Supreme Court as to the permissible scope and effect of such laws and is a permanent part of our statutory law today.

With regard to Government employees, the case of John E. Reinecke in 1948 highlighted the desirability for a loyalty program. Reinecke was a teacher in the public-school system in Hawaii. Upon information being made available that he was a Communist, he was formally charged with a failure to possess the ideals of democracy as required of teachers by Territorial law, and dismissed for that reason after an extended hearing before the Territorial Commissioners of Public Instruction. The present attorney general of Hawaii was chairman of that commission during those hearings.

Because of the difficulty in obtaining usable information from Federal sources, the legislature in 1949 established the Hawaiian Subversive Activities Commission with investigatory powers. This commission has filed two reports on communism in Hawaii, one in 1951 and the latest in 1953, making available for public use all available information on the subject.

The commission is continuously investigating all forms of subversive activity and has been instrumental in advising cognizant authorities of the planned entry of known Communists or Communist sympathizers from the mainland.

On October 4, 1949, the legislature formally petitioned the House Committee on Un-American Activities to hold hearings in Hawaii. This was done in April of 1950, at which time an excellent job of exposing Communist personalities was accomplished. Of the witnesses subpenaed by the committee, 39 refused to testify. One was at the time a delegate to the constitutional convention and, as previously stated, he was expelled from the convention for his refusal. Another delegate to this convention testified as a friendly witness that he had been a member of the Communist Party, but had severed his connection with the Communist Party when he learned that it was not simply a labor party, but was an organization inimical to the United States. After his testimony he voluntarily resigned from the convention to save his fellow delegates embarrassment.

The convention adopted as a proposed part of the constitution for the State of Hawaii, ratified by the people later that year, a provision that reads:

"No person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the government of this State or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment."

Such a provision is unique in the United States.

In 1951 the legislature created a Territorial Loyalty Board with authority to prescribe a personal history statement of all Government officers and employees and to hear cases involving the loyalty of any such persons. To date the Board has not had a single case requiring a loyalty hearing.

In June of 1953, 7 persons including John Wayne Hall were convicted by a Hawaiian jury of violating the Smith Act. All defendants are now out on bail pending the disposition of appeals.

Aside from legislative, judicial and executive action, there have been numerous spontaneous expressions of disapproval of Communism by the people of Hawaii. In 1949 the Hawaii Residents' Association (popularly known as IMUA) was formed to educate the public to the Communist menace, expose Communist personalities, and teach Americanism. This voluntary eleemosynary association has grown in strength over the years. It is now well financed, has a large membership, publishes a weekly newspaper, and produces a radio program which is put on nightly except for weekends.

The Hawaii Bar Association adopted a resolution along the lines proposed by the American Bar Association declaring that membership in the Communist Party was inconsistent with the duties and responsibilities of a licensed attorney and ground for expulsion from the association. The Supreme Court of Hawaii requires an affidavit of all applicants for admission to the bar of Hawaii, relating to the loyalty of the applicants. Failure to satisfy the supreme court in this regard is grounds for denial of admission or for disbarment thereafter.

In 1950 at the local Democratic Party convention, a few of the "reluctant 39" appeared on the floor as precinct delegates. A considerable number of the delegates to the convention was incensed at the appearance of these people and staged a "walkout" which precipitated a strong drive to purge these individuals from the Democratic Party. In the 1952 local Democratic Party convention, the anti-Communists controlled the convention. The responsible leaders of our local Democratic Party have continued since then to guard against the infiltration of the Democratic Party leadership and have succeeded in preventing any further inroads into their ranks. The local Democratic Party even has a loyalty program of its own for this purpose.

The best estimate of the Communist movement in Hawaii is that it reached the peak of its strength in 1946–47 and has subsequently continuously lost ground until today it is not an effective force in the community. The exposure of the meaning of communism and the identification of Communist personalities have had their effect in Hawaii as in the rest of the United States in bringing this alien philosophy and its exponents into disfavor.

Like most good Americans, the people of Hawaii are perhaps a little ahead of their officials in a proper appreciation of the Communist menace.

The future of our country if not of the whole world belongs to the optimists and not to the pessimists. Every past dire prediction questioning future developments in Hawaii has in the event proven to have been false. The fear of Communist influence as an excuse for delaying statehood for Hawaii is not supported by the facts, and is widely interpreted as only a rationalization for some other grounds of opposition.

There is no doubt in my mind that Hawaii as a State would continue to live up to the highest tradition of patriotism and loyalty to the United States and firm opposition to communism.

Mr. Oren E. Long, a Democrat, who succeeded Mr. Stainback as Governor of Hawaii and who was my immediate predecessor in this office, has read this letter and authorized me to say that it is in general agreement with the testimony which he gave before your committee in April of 1953.

With highest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

SAMUEL WILDER KING,
Governor of Hawaii.

PROVISION FOR ORDERLY USE, IMPROVEMENT, AND DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL FORESTS AND OTHER LANDS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1045, Senate bill 2548.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2548) to facilitate the administration of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent thereon; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Mansfield
Barrett	Goldwater	Martin
Beall	Gore	Maybank
Bennett	Griswold	McClellan
Bricker	Hayden	Millikin
Burke	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bush	Hill	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Payne
Capehart	Hunt	Potter
Carlson	Ives	Purtell
Case	Jackson	Robertson
Chaves	Jenner	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kerr	Sparkman
Douglas	Kilgore	Stennis
Duff	Knowland	Symington
Dworshak	Kuchel	Thye
Ellender	Langer	Upton
Ferguson	Lehman	Watkins
Frear	Lennon	Williams
Fulbright	Long	Young
George	Malone	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate, attending the sessions of the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela, as a congressional adviser on the United States delegation.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate, attending the sessions of the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela, as a congressional adviser on the United States delegation.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have discussed the situation with the minority leader, and, because of some appointments of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and after consultation with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1043, House bill 5337, providing for the establishment of an Air Force Academy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to make an inquiry of the majority leader. How long does the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services contemplate the consideration of the bill will take? I ask the question for the reason that some of the Members on this side of the aisle are especially interested in the subject. I want to go along with the majority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senators to whom the minority leader refers have not come into the Chamber before the Senator from Massachusetts has completed his statement, and if there are no other remarks on the bill, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum so that a vote will not be taken until those Senators arrive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5337) to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5337) to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 1, after line 9, to strike out:

SEC. 3 (a) The Academy shall be located at such place within the United States as the Secretary of the Air Force shall determine. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to establish a commission, and to appoint the members thereof, to advise him in connection with the selection of a permanent location for the academy.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force shall determine the location of the academy within the United States in the following manner:

(1) The Secretary of the Air Force shall establish immediately a commission, and appoint five members thereof, to advise him in connection with the selection of a permanent location for the academy. The commission shall make its report to the Secretary as soon as practicable, and in no event later than 45 days from the date of its establishment.

(2) The Secretary shall accept the unanimous decision for a permanent location by such commission. In the event such recommendation is not unanimous, the commission by a majority vote shall submit to the Secretary three sites from which the Secretary shall select one as the permanent location. Within 15 days after the selection, the Secretary shall submit a written report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, setting forth the reasons for his selection.

On page 4, line 1, after "SEC. 5." to strike out "(a)"; after line 12, to strike out:

(b) To permit an orderly increase in the number of Air Force cadets during the period ending not more than 6 years after the entrance of the initial class at the Academy, the Secretary of the Air Force may limit the number to be appointed during that period by providing for a competitive examination to be held annually in each State, each Territory, and Puerto Rico among those persons nominated to the Academy by Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. During the above prescribed period, the number of vacancies allocated to each State, each Territory, and Puerto Rico, shall be proportional to the representation in Congress from that State or Territory or Puerto Rico. Appointments from each State, each Territory, and Puerto Rico shall be made from among qualified candidates in the order of merit established by the examinations. During the same period the vacancies allocated to other sources shall be filled from among qualified candidates in each category in order of merit established by similar competitive examinations and shall not exceed 15 per centum of the total number of appointments authorized.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 6. To permit an orderly increase in the number of Air Force cadets during the period ending not more than 4 years after the entrance of the initial class at the Academy, the Secretary of the Air Force may limit the number to be appointed each year during that period in the following manner:

(a) A competitive examination shall be held annually among those persons nominated to the Academy by Senators and Representatives, and the number of vacancies allocated to each State shall be proportional to the representation in Congress from that State. Appointments from each State shall be made from among qualified candidates nominated from that State in the order of merit established by the examinations.

(b) Vacancies allocated to other sources shall be filled from among qualified candidates in each category in order of merit established by similar competitive examinations and shall not exceed 15 per centum of the total number of appointment authorized.

On page 6, line 3, after "SEC." to strike out "6" and insert "7"; after line 7, to insert:

SEC. 8. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each cadet at the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy and each midshipman at the United States Naval Academy shall, prior to his graduation from such Academy, be afforded an opportunity to state a preference for appointment as a commissioned officer of the United States Army, the United States Navy, the United States Air Force, or the United States Marine Corps, upon his graduation, and, with the consent of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over the Armed Force in which he prefers appointment, shall, upon his graduation, be accepted for appointment therein, except that not more than 12½ percent of the members of any graduating class of any such Academy shall be appointed as commissioned officer in Armed Forces other than the one administering such Academy. For the purpose of the foregoing limitation, graduates of the United States Naval Academy appointed as commissioned officers in the United States Marine Corps shall not be considered as having been commissioned in Armed Forces other than the United States Navy.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall by regulation provide for the equitable and fair distribution of appointments made pursuant to this section in the event that more than 12½ percent of a graduating class of any

academy referred to herein expresses a preference to be so appointed.

(c) The provisions of this section shall take effect (1) in the year in which the first class of the United States Air Force Academy graduates, or (2) upon the rescission of the present agreement under which graduates of the United States Military and Naval Academies may volunteer for appointment in the United States Air Force, whichever is earlier.

On page 7, after line 14, to strike out:

SEC. 7. There is authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended when so specified in the appropriation act concerned, not to exceed $26 million for the purpose of this act. Of this amount not to exceed $1 million may be utilized for the purpose of section 4 of this act.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $126 million to carry out the provisions of this act, of which not to exceed $26 million shall be appropriated for any period beginning prior to January 1, 1955. Of the amount so appropriated for any such period, not exceeding $1 million may be utilized for the purpose of section 4 of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, there is before the Senate, House bill 5337, providing for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy. The bill is substantially in the same form as it passed the House, with the exception of a number of amendments which the committee felt would strengthen the bill.

The bill received careful consideration by the Committee on Armed Services. The committee realized, on the one hand, that in authorizing a third military academy this bill would be historic legislation. In 1802 Congress enacted legislation establishing the United States Military Academy at West Point, and in 1845 Congress passed legislation establishing the Naval Academy at Annapolis. Now, it is proposed to establish an Air Force Academy. The need for such an academy has been thoroughly examined, since this institution will cost a considerable amount of money.

The committee was convinced that the Air Force Academy must be established for the basic reason that none of the military services are receiving a sufficient number of Academy-trained regular air officers. At the present time the Military and Naval Academies share their output under an agreement which permits up to 25 percent of each graduating class to volunteer for commissions in the Air Force.

The Army has an annual requirement of 650 Academy graduates.

I might interpolate to say that the armed services prefer to have 50 percent of their officers come from the Military and Naval Academies and 50 percent from the ROTC of the various universities. So when I say the Army has an annual requirement of 650 Academy graduates, it means there are approximately 1,300 new Regular Army lieutenants each year.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In line with what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has just said, is it not also true that the Air Force feels the need of offering to young men who wish to enter the Air Force an opportunity for career training, so as to create for the Air Force the same traditions and the same career psychology which exist at West Point for the Army and at Annapolis for the Navy?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator from South Dakota says is absolutely correct. I shall touch on that in a moment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Does the bill provide that the students who will be admitted to the Air Force Academy will come only from the Naval Academy or the Military Academy as advance or graduate students?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Oh, no.

Mr. THYE. Will they be selected by Members of Congress in the same manner as candidates for the Naval Academy and the Military Academy are now selected?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct, after the first 4 years. I shall cover that in my statement, if the Senator will permit me to continue.

Mr. THYE. I thought I detected, from the Senator's statement, a difference in the procedure of selecting candidates for the Air Force Academy. That was what prompted me to make the inquiry.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No. I am sorry if the Senator received that impression. The procedure will be exactly the same, after the first 4 years, when the Academy personnel is built up.

The Army has an annual requirement of 650 Academy graduates, but because of the sharing arrangement is receiving only about 400; the Navy requires about 800, but is receiving only 600 annually; the Air Force needs about 600 Academy graduates annually, but is receiving from the two military academies only 350 a year. Unless the output of Academy-trained officers is enlarged, the officer personnel structure of the services will be increasingly weakened in the years to come.

The Department of Defense urged a separate Air Force Academy rather than an expansion of existing Academy facilities because of the following reasons:

First. In terms of expense, the cost of building a separate Air Force Academy would be no greater than expanding the existing facilities at Annapolis and West Point.

Second. Each service should have the opportunity for developing in each cadet at the beginning of his military education a tradition and esprit for the service in which he expects to serve; and

Third. Each service has requirements for special training which necessitate separate Academies.

In addition to the committee hearings there is before each Senator, Senate Report No. 1041, which explains in detail the provisions of H. R. 5337, as amended. I shall now summarize the basic features of the bill.

First, as to the permanent site, the bill provides for both a permanent and a temporary site for the Air Force Academy. The temporary site, as I shall explain later, will be at some existing Air Force base, to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, and will be used for only about 2 years, until construction of the permanent site will permit the Academy to transfer to the permanent location.

With respect to the permanent site, the committee amended section 3 (a) of the bill in order to clarify the role of the Commission which the Secretary of the Air Force is required to appoint in connection with advising him on the permanent location of the Academy. As amended, the bill provides that the permanent site shall be located in the United States and shall be determined in the following manner:

The Secretary of the Air Force must appoint a five-member commission to advise him on the permanent location of the Academy. The commission is required to make its report in no later than 45 days after the date of its establishment. If the recommendation of the Commission is unanimous, the Secretary must accept it. If the Commission does not make a unanimous recommendation, the bill provides that the Commission by majority vote shall submit 3 sites to the Secretary, and that the Secretary shall select 1 of the 3 as the permanent site. Within 15 days after the Secretary selects 1 of the 3 recommended sites of the Commission, he is required to submit a written report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives setting forth the reasons for his selection. No report is required in the event of a unanimous recommendation by the Commission.

After the permanent site has been determined, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to acquire the necessary land from other Government agencies without cost and with the consent of those agencies. The Secretary is also authorized to purchase the necessary land or receive it by donation. It is also important to point out that the Secretary would not be required to consult with the Congress prior to the selection of the permanent site, since section 3 (b) (2) permits the Secretary to acquire the necessary land without coming into prior agreement with the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services, as required under existing law where the cost is estimated to be in excess of $25,000.

The bill also contains the necessary planning and construction authority.

Second, the temporary site.

In order to permit the Academy to begin operating as soon as possible, section 4 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to erect at some existing Air Force base, as a temporary site, the necessary temporary buildings and facilities.

It should be noted that section 9 of the bill limits the amount of money which can be spent at the temporary site to $1 million.

In other words, only $1 million can be spent on any present site to make it into a temporary Academy site.

The Air Force plans to enter the first class at the temporary site in June 1955, if this bill is passed and the necessary appropriations are made.

In order to provide for the basic provisions of law which will govern the Academy, section 5 of the bill provides that all appropriate provisions of law which now pertain to the United States Military Academy will apply to the Air Force Academy except where those laws are inconsistent with this bill itself. The Air Force intends to comply substantially with all the existing Academy laws except for the provisions relating to organizational and professorial titles, and except for certain provisions which are archaic and are no longer followed by the Military Academy.

Section 6 of the bill provides an explicit exception to the present West Point laws by providing that for not more than 4 years after the entrance of the initial Air Force Academy class, a different system of appointments may prevail from that now existing at the Military Academy. This section, in effect, allots not less than 85 percent of the Air Force cadet vacancies to the 48 States based upon the proportional representation in Congress of each State. The vacancies would be filled as a result of competitive examinations held for the candidates of each State. Only candidates from a particular State will compete for the vacancies allotted to that State. The bill places no limit on the number of nominations for the examinations which each Member of Congress can make. With respect to the Military Academy, however, Members of Congress by custom do not nominate at any one time for each vacancy more than 1 principal and 3 alternates. The Air Force is hopeful that each Member of Congress will make at least 4, but no more than 10, nominations for each Air Academy vacancy. Section 6 was amended in order to clarify the intent of the section, and amounts to a technical amendment.

Next I shall discuss the right of a percentage of the graduates of all academies to volunteer for another military service. I may say that this is new. It is a recommendation on the part of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and has been before the committee for a number of years. As one member of the committee, and as its present chairman, I heartily agree with what the amendment proposes to do. The amendment has previously been agreed to in principle by the Senate, but has not been accepted by the House.

Section 8, an amendment, relates to the right of a percentage of the graduates of all academies to volunteer for another military service. At the present time an agreement exists between the military departments which permits up to 25 percent of the graduates of the Military and Naval Academies to volunteer to be commissioned in the Air Force. Testimony before the committee indicated that this arrangement is expected to continue until the year of the first graduating class of the Air Force Academy.

Section 8 would go into effect the year of the first graduating class of the Air Force Academy, or whenever the existing agreement is rescinded, whichever is earlier. This amendment provides that graduates of all the academies will be permitted to state a preference of the four military services—Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps—in which they desire to be commissioned, and with the consent of the Secretary of the service in which the graduate desires to be commissioned, a number up to 12½ percent of each graduating class will be commissioned in military departments other than the one administering the particular academy.

This section also contains language which excludes the Naval Academy graduates who volunteer for a commission in the Marine Corps from being counted as a part of the 12½ percent. The committee felt that transfers between the Naval Academy and the Marine Corps were in effect internal transfers. Both the Navy and the Marine Corps are under the Secretary of the Navy, and there has been a long and close association between these two organizations. Except for the period between 1890 and 1901, the Naval Academy since 1881 has permitted a limited portion of its graduates to volunteer and be commissioned in the Marine Corps.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

The authorization for appropriations is contained in section 9 of the bill. As amended, section 9 provides for authorization not to exceed $126 million, of which not to exceed $26 million shall be appropriated for any period beginning prior to January 1, 1955. Of the amount appropriated, not more than $1 million may be utilized for the purpose of establishing a temporary site.

Mr. President, I might say that the top limit of the original appropriation requested was $146 million, and the committee voted to make the top limit $126 million instead of $146 million without serious objection on the part of the Air Force, the theory being that, for the plans, and the purpose of land, equipment, and buildings, the ultimate cost would be no more than $126 million, rather than $146 million.

The committee had two aims in amending this section, first, to establish a total authorization for the Academy in order that Congress would fix in some degree a ceiling on the ultimate cost of the Air Force Academy; and, second, to authorize an immediate appropriation which would enable construction on the Academy to begin as soon as possible.

The Air Force should adapt its construction plans so as not to exceed the $126 million authorization. If the Air Force finds that the Academy cannot be constructed within the authorization, it can request and seek to justify an additional authorization at a later date. It should be emphasized at the same time that the authorization is intended to be a ceiling and not a floor. The total authorization need not be appropriated if at a later date it is found that a lesser amount is sufficient for the Academy construction.

The Air Force schedule calls for completion of the Academy in 5 years after the commencement of construction.

Mr. President, that is a brief explanation of the bill as amended by the committee. I hope it will be passed by the Senate.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. Referring to the first page of the report, subdivision (2) of section 3, about halfway down in the particular paragraph, reads as follows:

> Within 15 days after the selection, the Secretary shall submit a written report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, setting forth the reasons for his selection.

Is there to be read into that language the idea that the Secretary is not to make his selections known until he has advised the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to my colleague on the committee that that is not my understanding. The theory is that the Air Force Secretary shall choose five members of a commission to advise him with reference to the site. If those five agree unanimously, the Secretary must follow their unanimous choice. If they cannot agree unanimously, they shall, by majority vote, select the top three sites. The Secretary must then decide on one of those three sites, then give to the two Armed Services Committees of Congress his reasons for selecting it. That is to say, he will have to justify his selection of one of the three sites.

I assume it was thought that if the committees felt he was wrong in his selection, they could take some action about it; but the Secretary's report would be for our information.

Mr. HUNT. We do not anticipate that the Secretary will go wrong in making the selection, although, as the distinguished chairman knows, I have opposed giving to the Secretary the authority to make the selection. Basically, I think it would be a mistake to give him such authority. I did not quite understand what useful purpose would be served by having the Secretary come to the committees of Congress after he had announced the selection, and tell them about it. However, the explanation of the Senator seems quite ample to justify the provision.

Mr. President, I have one or two more questions. On page 9 of the report, under section 6, the following language appears:

> This section, as amended, provides for a special system for appointments for not more than 4 years after the entrance of the initial Academy class.

It would, then, be 5 years before recommendations would be started to be made by the Congress, would it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; I would not say that statement is strictly correct. The committee changed the time from 6 to 4 years, as my colleague will remember, and for the first 4 years, in order to build up the Academy, a proportion-

ate number will be appointed from each State to each class in the Academy. It will take 4 years to get the full complement of appointments. Those men will be taken from the top of the list. In other words, if the Senator from Wyoming submits 10 names and the Representative from Wyoming submits 10, and 4 of the 10 names submitted by the Senator from Wyoming received the top grade, those 4 men will be chosen from Wyoming. I am assuming that the number would be 4. It may be 2, or any other number. Then after the first 4 years, the same principle which applies to appointments to the Naval and Military Academies at the present time would be followed. If the Senator from Wyoming had one vacancy to fill, he would submit one principal and three alternates.

Mr. HUNT. I appreciate the explanation of the chairman of the committee, but I believe I have to disagree with his statement that the time will be 4 years. From the wording of the report, I am constrained to think it will be 5 years. I shall read the wording:

> This section, as amended, provides for a special system for appointments for not more than 4 years after the entrance of the initial Academy class.

It would seem to me it would be 5 years before appointments would be made by Members of Congress.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The fifth class will be recommended in the ordinary way, if I have not made it clear.

Mr. HUNT. That would mean the time would be 5 years. That was my point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. HUNT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota. Then I should like to ask another question.

Mr. THYE. Did I understand correctly that a Member of the House could make recommendations and a Senator could submit recommendations, and that of the number of recommendations submitted, whether 4, 10, or 16, only four could be selected; and of those four applicants, selections could be made of four which were solely recommended by either the Senator or the Member of the House? Did I correctly understand the explanation made by the chairman of the committee?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let us take the case of Minnesota——

Mr. THYE. Let us take Massachusetts, so that I may not be involved in the discussion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well. Massachusetts has 14 Representatives and 2 Senators. In the first year Massachusetts would receive eight appointments. In the second year Massachusetts would receive eight appointments.

Mr. THYE. The question I am asking is whether of the 8 appointments, all of them could be made upon the recommendations of 1 Senator. The Senator could recommend a sufficient number of applicants so that all eight appointments could be selected upon his recommendations?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct, provided those 8 applicants were the top 8 of those who took the examination.

Mr. THYE. In other words, the Academy will give an examination, and the Academy will grade the examination? Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. The Academy will give the examination, and the examination papers will be graded; and the top men from Massachusetts—to use Massachusetts as an example—will receive appointments.

Mr. THYE. All the top men from Massachusetts may have been nominated by the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Or, let us say, by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, Representative McCORMACK.

Mr. THYE. It matters not as to that; but I understand that all the Representatives from a State and the 2 Senators from a State will be able to submit nominations, and then the Academy will conduct its own examination, and will select, in accordance with its own examination rating, the 4 men who will serve, from that State, in a particular class. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There will be eight from Massachusetts. The number from Minnesota will be a little different.

Mr. THYE. Minnesota would not have as many, because Minnesota has a lesser number of Members of Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Nevertheless, Massachusetts is to be allowed eight; is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. THYE. Of the 8, all could be appointed on the recommendation of 1 Member of Congress—either 1 Representative or 1 Senator; is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. However, such a procedure is not followed in the case of appointments to the Military Academy, at West Point, or to the Naval Academy, at Annapolis; is it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; neither will that system be followed in the case of the Air Force Academy, after the fifth year.

Mr. THYE. I cannot quite understand why this method is proposed to be followed in making the first selections from civilian student applicants.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The purpose is to build up the Academy. In the first year there will be only 1 class; in the second year, 2 classes; in the third year 3 classes; in the fourth year, 4 classes. In that way the Academy will be built up in what we believe to be the fairest way; the best possible men will be obtained, and there will be a proper geographical distribution or balance. For those reasons, this method has been proposed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I still must say that I believe the purpose could have been achieved in a more equitable manner, by making certain that the appointees would come from nominations by a number of Members of Congress, rather than possibly by only one Member of Congress—for instance, a Member representing the State of Massachusetts. That is my impression in regard to this phase of the matter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I myself asked the same question. I became convinced that the beginning should be made in the best possible way, so as to obtain the best possible men.

The Senator from Minnesota has inquired about an extreme case. It is not likely that the men nominated by any one Member of Congress would be the top men in grade and would be the ones to be appointed from any particular State. That is my opinion. The case cited by my colleague from Minnesota is, of course, an extreme one.

The method proposed has been suggested for the purpose of obtaining the best-qualified men, and at the same time to be fair from a geographical point of view, and also to be fair in accordance with the representation of the States in Congress.

Mr. THYE. The point of fairness from a geographical basis disturbs me, because the selection proposed is to be made specifically on the basis of qualification, as provided in an examination. I can very readily understand that a well-qualified man would be chosen if any one of the first four in the examination—either the principal or the first three alternates—were to be the one finally appointed. However, all four of them might be rejected.

Therefore, it seems to me there would be greater opportunity for a fair geographical representation if the selections were to be made from the men proposed or nominated by the Members of Congress.

If such a system were followed, I fully appreciate that in the case of any of the first four classes, the men nominated to attend the Academy from a State would be much greater in number than the ones who could actually be appointed.

However, I say there is danger that all the appointees from Massachusetts might come from the city of Boston, for the simple reason that in the case of the appointees from Massachusetts, the 10 highest in the examination would be taken. If the 10 highest were from Boston, and if all 10 had been nominated by one Massachusetts Member of Congress, then the other Members of Congress representing the State of Massachusetts would not have nominated any man who would attend the Academy during that period of time.

So, Mr. President, in considering the manner of selection, that question occurs to me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator from Minnesota suggests is a possibility, of course. However, both the Senate committee and the House committee were faced with the problem of obtaining the fairest method of making the original selections, in order to get the Academy started. We felt that if Minnesota, Wyoming, Colorado, and Massachusetts each were allowed its proportionate share, in proportion to its representation in Congress, then the method of selection throughout the Nation, on a geographical basis, would be fair.

Within each of the States, the effort would be made to obtain the best qualified men. That determination would be arrived at on the basis of tests.

In order to be fair and to carry out an arrangement upon which Congress has properly insisted for a great many years, we propose to return, after the first 4 years, to the method of having nominations made by individual Representatives and Senators.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, once more I should like to invite the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee to section 6, which reads in part as follows:

(a) A competitive examination shall be held annually among those persons nominated to the Academy by Senators and Representatives, and the number of vacancies allotted to each State shall be proportional to the representation in Congress from that State.

Let me say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that we know that at present the examinations for admission to the existing Academies are held at post offices. For instance, we know that a boy from any part of a State has an opportunity to appear at his post office and take an examination for appointment either to West Point or to Annapolis.

Does the distinguished chairman of the committee think that in the bill we have spelled out sufficiently the method of giving the examinations? As I read the committee amendment on page 5, as proposed, the Air Force would be able to select in my State, let us say, the one city of Cheyenne, located in almost the southeastern corner of the State; and some Wyoming boys would have to travel 400 or 500 miles in order to reach that city. Or perhaps the examination for the entire area might be held in Denver. Such an arrangement would prevent many young men from taking the examination.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me call attention to the statement appearing at the bottom of page 10 of the report:

Examining facilities: The Air Force plans to establish approximately 32 examining stations in existing Air Force installations for the purpose of examining young men who have been nominated to take the examination. These sites, according to the Air Force, were carefully selected in order to make them geographically accessible to the greatest number of potential candidates.

Mr. HUNT. But that might preclude all cities in Wyoming except Cheyenne, which is located in the southeastern corner of the State; and, as a result, some Wyoming boys would have to travel 500 miles to get there.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say somewhat facetiously that if they travel with the same agility the Senator from Wyoming travels, they would have no trouble.

Mr. HUNT. Without leaving this particular item entirely, let me say that I hope at the further meetings of our committee we shall discuss this particular point, because I believe that perhaps the Armed Services Committee should make some suggestion to the Air Force with reference to where the examinations should be held.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a member of the committee, and its present chairman, I shall be very happy to do that at any time the Senator from Wyoming suggests.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, now let me call attention to page 10 of the report, on which reference is made to the method of selection. I note that Mississippi is mentioned. Mississippi has a population of 2,178,914. I note that Mississippi is to be allocated 1.5 percent.

Further along in the same paragraph the statement is made that—

Each State will receive its correct percentage share.

My rapid arithmetic may be in error, but I am of the opinion——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I may interrupt, let me say that Mississippi will receive 4 appointments, or 1.5 percent of the 255 vacancies.

Mr. HUNT. But Mississippi has a population of 2,178,914, whereas my State of Wyoming has a population of 300,000. I wonder whether the distinguished chairman of the committee would object to an amendment to the effect that no State shall be deprived of at least one appointment each year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I refer the Senator to the chart on page 41 of the hearings, which I shall be glad to show him if he does not have a copy before him. It is my understanding that every State will receive a certain number of appointments each year. Wyoming will get 1 the first year and 2 the second year. Nevada will get 1 the first year and 2 the second year. On the other hand, New York will get 21 the first year and 24 the second year. No State will be left out entirely.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the chairman. That clears up the point.

I should like to make one reference to the method upon which we have decided for selecting the men to enter the Academy. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the committee gave a great deal of thought to the very best possible method of obtaining the best boys for the Air Force. We came to the conclusion that an examination, other than a written examination such as the boys we now appoint take, would be the best method of selection. Although in some instances the boy to receive the appointment might not be the one whom we would recommend, nevertheless, the result would be better qualified young men in the Academy. That was our thought in selecting the method which we chose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the committee yield for several questions?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Massachusetts has yielded the floor. He will be glad to try to answer any questions.

Mr. HOLLAND. The first question is this: Is there any geographic limitation or regulation with reference to the appointment of the Commission of five members?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is not.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the committee have any assurance from the Secretary as to what geographic method, if any, he proposes to follow in naming the Commission members?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Secretary of the Air Force gave us the names of two members of the Commission whom he had already asked to serve. They are in the record. I shall be glad to furnish them to the Senator as they were given to the committee. Beyond that, as chairman of the committee, I asked the Secretary not to furnish any additional names unless members of the committee requested him to do so. He has appointed 4 members, and 1 other person is ready to be appointed if the bill becomes law.

Mr. HOLLAND. The chairman refers, I presume, to General Spaatz and General Harmon?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator from Florida to understand that the membership of the Commission will come entirely from the commissioned personnel of the Air Force?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I distinctly do not so understand.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is the understanding of the distinguished chairman with reference to the distribution of the Commission members as between commissioned officers of the Air Force and civilians?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer that question, because no member of the committee wanted the Air Force Secretary, Mr. Talbot, to tell us whom he intended to appoint. We felt that it would be better for him to appoint the best qualified men. We did not want to know who they were, because we felt that if we knew there might be an argument as to whether they were the best men or not. It is his responsibility to choose them. He should choose men whom he believes to be the best possible men to help him.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Massachusetts will further yield, I am sure he is aware of the fact that the rumor has been widespread that the selection of the site upon which the academy is to be located has already been made. That rumor has been highly discouraging in some areas of the Nation, in connection with the making of applications, the drafting of brochures, and the submission of claims of those particular areas for consideration. I think the Congress and the general public are entitled to some assurance other than that which has been given, to the effect that there has been no choice, no tentative choice, and no closing of the door to any community in the Nation which feels that it is well qualified to serve as the host community for the Air Force Academy. Every such community should have an opportunity to make its case, with every chance to be heard fairly, and with every chance which is offered to every other community in the Nation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to my colleague from Florida that an hour and a half ago I telephoned the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Talbott. I talked with him personally. I told him that I had heard the rumor to which the Senator refers, and that I wanted him to give me a specific and categorical answer. He

said emphatically that no decision had been made, that he had not made up his mind on any site, and that every site stood the same chance. Let me correct that statement. He did not say exactly that. He said that no site had been selected in any manner, shape, or form. He was very emphatic.

Mr. HOLLAND. I presume the Senators from Florida are in no different situation from that of Senators from other States, in that there are communities within many States which are anxious to be considered. I think the long and satisfactory experience of the Air Force and the Navy air arm in our State indicates that at least there are very great flying advantages in our State which should be considered. The Senators from Florida have received communications not only from the State chamber of commerce but from 10 or 12 cities and areas in our State to the effect that it is understood that the selection has already been made, or has been made tentatively, so as to preclude full and fair consideration of applications from our State. Are we assured by the distinguished Senator, as chairman of his committee, based upon information received by him within the past hour and a half, as he has just stated, that there is no basis of fact whatever behind these rumors, and that each community in the Nation which has a claim to offer will have full and fair opportunity to be heard and have its claim considered?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That was the specific assurance given to me by the Secretary of the Air Force over the telephone an hour and a half ago.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me in order that I may further answer the question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to receive an answer from the distinguished Senator from Wyoming to any of my questions.

Mr. HUNT. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that when Secretary Talbott was asked that question in committee he stated that to a certain extent the area had been narrowed down to seven sites. However, later he stated that 300 sites were under study, and he assured us that every one of them would receive very careful study and consideration.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his helpful remarks.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have one further question to ask. It is addressed to one of the details in the bill which I think is bound to create great confusion instead of giving great assistance in the selection of students for the first 4 years. Am I correct in my understanding that there will be no limit whatsoever upon the number of names submitted by each Senator and each Member of the House during those 4 years?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is no legal limit, but it is hoped that no Senator or Representative will submit less than 4 names or more than 10. As I have stated, there is no legal limit.

Mr. HOLLAND. What was the purpose of the distinguished committee in making that provision, which seems to me to be calculated to subserve political objectives by encouraging each Senator or Representative to simply send in his complete list of applicants, without in any sense doing the thing which I think is reasonable, that is, choosing from among them the ones who, from his observation and close knowledge of the situation in his State, would be considered best qualified for appointment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I can only express my feeling on this subject. My own feeling is that what we want to do is to get the best possible men with whom to start the Air Force Academy. If the Air Force officers are willing to give the examinations in number, and if the boys are willing to go to the places where examinations are to be held, we should give everyone who wishes to take the chance the opportunity to get into the Air Force Academy. We should have the best possible men with whom to start the academy. We must realize that the physical examinations, mental examinations, and other examinations which enter into the selection of a flying officer are extremely stringent. I cannot give the Senator the exact proportion of boys who take such examinations who can be expected to pass, but the figure is very low. I think I can perhaps give the Senator an approximate idea.

Studies made by the Air Force indicate that only about 50 out of each 1,000 of the young male population of the United States at large could be expected to pass all of the examinations necessary to qualify as an Air Force cadet.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sensible, of course, to the value of trying to select only the very best applicants possible. However, is there any difference in the objective in filling places in the Naval Academy and in the Military Academy from that followed in the case of the proposed Air Force Academy?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Florida asks me a very embarrassing question. I am confident he will agree with me that every Senator always chooses the best possible candidates from his State.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator from Florida tries to follow that rule, and he believes his friend from Massachusetts does follow it. Furthermore, the Senator from Florida believes that both the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Florida have been of assistance to those two great Academies; and the law applicable to those two Academies contemplates just that.

The Senator from Florida happens to be a former member of the Air Force, as the Senator from Massachusetts knows, and he feels that he would like to render just as much help and in the same measure to those who will establish the Air Academy as he attempts to do in selecting applicants whom he believes to be best equipped to meet the requirements, which are heavy, of the Military Academy and the Naval Academy.

The Senator from Florida does not understand the open invitation to send over all the names. The Senator from Florida had 70 applicants last year from his State. He does not believe that he would be rendering much service to any Academy to merely send over a long list of names.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; he can cut down the list to 10, which would help the Air Force to that extent.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yet the Senator from Massachusetts proposes to have written into the law a provision which lets every person within the State know that there is no limitation at all to the number of names which each Senator and each Representative can submit. Is that not correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. What happens with reference to the other two service Academies is that every citizen of a State and every citizen of the Nation knows that there is a limitation, and that each Senator and each Representative can submit for each vacancy an original appointment, and a first, second, and third alternate, if they feel that many young men are well qualified for a particular vacancy. The Senator knows that to be correct, does he not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. However, I would say to my friend that recently, when I tried to fill a vacancy in the Naval Academy, and endeavored to find what I considered to be qualified men who had made marks above 70, I could not supply all the alternate places.

Mr. HOLLAND. I regret to hear that the Senator from Massachusetts was faced with that dilemma. We in Florida have not been faced with such a dilemma. We always have so many young men who make marks above 70 that it becomes a real duty and responsibility on our part to try to choose the young men who are best qualified from the many who apply and make a mark of 70 or better.

Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], is necessarily absent today on public business of very vital importance to our State and, I think, to the Nation.

In the informal division of duties between the two Senators from Florida, which is made as the occasion requires, this particular subject was given largely to the attention of the junior Senator from Florida, who had prepared an able address on the subject. I regret that he is not here, and I am sure he also regrets that he is not here. I wish I could bring to the Senate all of the information he has incorporated in his able address. The very least I can do is to ask unanimous consent to insert the address of my junior colleague at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of the debate on the pending measure.

There being no objection, the statement of Mr. SMATHERS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

The bill before the Senate today, H. R. 5337, 83d Congress, as amended, is a vital step in the preparedness program of this Nation.

Winston Churchill has said, "for good or ill, air mastery is the supreme expression of military power."

This profound observation is more true today than ever before for today airpower is vital to our military strength. It has

been said that airpower is, indeed, the key to our national survival.

The former Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, once defined airpower as both a shield and a sword. As a shield, he said, it represents the most important single deterrent to an attack upon our country. As a sword, he saw airpower as a dagger poised to strike a swift counterblow at the vitals of any enemy so foolish as to launch an attack upon us.

We are all aware of the terrible impact of airpower in time of war. In World War II, the strategic campaign of the Allied air forces made a substantial contribution to our victory over the Axis. Japan surrendered without the necessity for a single Allied soldier's setting foot on her mainland home soil in the act of invasion, the first time in the history of warfare that a major power had so capitulated. Airpower, cooperating with our sea and landpower, made this possible and, in so doing, saved countless American lives which might have been lost had an invasion of the Japanese homeland been necessary.

Few will disagree that at the beginning of this second 50 years of powered flight airpower has become an indispensable segment of the hard core of any nation's strategic concept—the Soviets as well as our own.

Many persons view airpower in terms of numbers of aircraft, bases, and in terms of productive capacity. Too many of us are prone to stress the machine at the expense of the man.

Airpower is manpower as well as machine power. But a special kind of manpower is required. This manpower must be able to furnish leadership in the highly specialized skills which are fundamental to the existence of airpower.

The thoroughly trained air officer in this modern air age is as important to the concept of airpower as the aircraft which fly at transsonic speeds and where distance is measured in terms of hours rather than miles.

To date we have not faced this fact squarely. We have depended on patriotic motivation and chance to draw qualified men into the United States Air Force, to be trained for leadership.

During World War II the Air Force, then the Air Corps, expanded almost overnight from a small force of only 2,000 officers to the world's greatest air armada of approximately 400,000 officers. At that time young men of this country eagerly volunteered for the wild blue yonder. It is to be noted that these same battle-trained veterans, both Regular and Reserve, who constitute the backbone of our present Air Force, are not getting any younger. Unfortunately, the glamour of flying no longer has the same appeal to American youth that it did a decade ago. This creates a serious problem for the Air Force and the Nation. Recently, so few of our youth have volunteered for flight training it has been necessary for the Air Force to accept young men as flying cadets who possess only a high-school education. Since pilots from this source constitute one of the largest procurement sources, the Air Force has found it necessary to offer them regular commissions in ever-increasing numbers. While these are fine young men, for obvious reasons it would be far more desirable if the men who constitute the backbone of the Air Force—the Regular service—possess broader educational backgrounds.

To alleviate this serious deficiency it is imperative that we establish an Air Force Academy which will attract, train, and motivate outstanding young men for a lifetime of service as career officers in the Air Force.

West Point and Annapolis are so much a part of our Army and Navy that we would not consider being without them. These two academies, over the years, have amortized their investment many times over in leaders furnished to those services. The same should be true for the Air Force, for it has the same need for professional leadership as do the older services.

The great technological advances which have been made during the past few decades have brought about a degree of specialization heretofore unknown in the United States. Our educators recognizing this have patterned the academic courses at our leading universities to follow this trend, with the result that certain engineering schools now specialize in textile engineering, others in electrical engineering, others in petroleum engineering, etc. Schools in the other fields of education have likewise specialized in given fields.

The same degree of specialization is also to be found in our present-day Armed Forces with their ever-increasing complex weapons systems. The day is past when an officer can be expected to fill any position in the service. It is, therefore, no less essential that our officers be afforded the same degree of specialized training as are civilian counterparts.

This specialization is readily apparent when we consider that in World War II a crew of a B–17, of which we trained thousands in our great State of Florida, consisted of 10 officers and men. Today the crew of our new jet superbomber, the B–47, based at our great Air Force base, MacDill Field, in Tampa, Fla., consists solely of three officers, all being supertechnicians in their jobs. The need for these superspecialists is readily apparent when you realize that this crew of three fly a plane which is far larger, more costly, many times faster, and operate equipment far more complex than did their B–17 counterparts who outnumbered them 3 to 1.

I firmly believe that the need for an Air Force Academy where outstanding air-minded young men will be molded into Air Force specialists was never more apparent than now.

I have heard the question asked as to why, in the spirit of unification, should we not have one academy for all three services, or why should not the present academies be Armed Forces academies rather than academies for the separate services. As I see it, the reason for this separation is fundamental.

The Army, Navy, including the Marine Corps, and Air Force have distinctive and specialized missions to perform within the Department of Defense. It is by the very nature of these special missions that our future officers must be specialists within their chosen field. Therefore, the amalgamation of the service academies would serve to give the future officers a broad staff concept of the Department of Defense as a whole, but would not train them to be specialists within a given field. There is only so much that a young man can learn at a civilian academic institution in a 4-year period. The same is true for our service academies. In this age of technological warfare it takes 4 years of intensive training to train a young man to be a specialist in the art of land, naval, or aerial warfare and, therefore, there simply is not the time to make him a specialist in all phases of the Armed Forces.

It must be remembered that upon graduation from one of the service academies these young men do not walk into high-level interservice staff jobs, but instead become platoon leaders, copilots, or are given similar type jobs that are assigned to brand-new second lieutenants or ensigns. It is only after years in the field working from the bottom up that these officers will possess sufficient seniority to be assigned to positions where they will deal with the other services on an interservice basis. At this point in an officer's career he is afforded the opportunity to go to one of the service command and staff schools with officers from all three services, where he will be indoctrinated with the latest concepts of interservice relationships.

The service Academies are more than just academic institutions. By their very nature, they are national monuments dedicated to serve the public and as such are under the public's constant surveillance. While I feel strongly on the question of the economic operation of our Federal Government, I believe in this instance it would be false economy if the Air Force Academy were built of second-rate construction. We should see to it that an Air Force Academy is constructed which will be a credit to this great Nation. I feel that the authorization of $126 million contained in H. R. 5337, as amended, affords sufficient funds in this regard. Either we want an Air Force Academy or we do not. If we want it, let us see to it that we get the best and that it is constructed in the most economical manner.

On January 26, 1953, I introduced S. 647, 83d Congress, a bill to establish the United States Air Academy within the State of Florida.

In seeking to have Florida selected as the site for this Academy I felt that with the utmost sincerity I am offering to the United States of America the finest location within our boundaries.

In doing so I mean to cast no reflection upon any of the other 47 States, all of which have their distinctive characteristics and each of which, in some field or another, excels all of their other sister States. For instance, Florida will gracefully yield to California in the superior excellence of its great phenomena—the California giant redwood forests; Floridians would be the first to assert that it has no mountains to rival those of the great and magnificent Rockies of the Western States. Florida does not even claim to rival Vermont for her maple sirup nor Boston in the home State of the distinguished chairman of the Senate's Armed Services Committee for her baked beans.

But Florida is singularly blessed with the finest climate in the Nation and for the most consistent year-around weather which lends itself to regular, continual uninterrupted flying and flight instruction.

That Florida was so high on the lists of States for aviation activity during World War II, and that she is second among the States (and second only to a State several times larger in area) in the postwar military activities program, is no accident, or boondoggle. Florida achieved that high degree of continuous service because Florida has the most to offer.

Florida has the best weather in the Nation, but she also offers many other things—vast available land areas which are flat, or nonmountainous; an eager hospitality of all Florida's people as well as the State and local governments; an attractive year-around recreational program which contributes so much to morale.

Florida is close to the oil supplies; Florida raises and would have immediately at hand a year-round and widely diversified food supply; Florida offers all facilities including economical housing at a price few other States can match. In the training program, the peninsula offers the advantages of flight training either over land or water, or both.

Florida is anxious to be the host State to the Air Academy and I trust will be given genuine, earnest, and sincere consideration.

This is a vital asset to our national security. This is no issue in which should be involved any political "wheeling and dealing."

Inasmuch as section 3a of H. R. 5337 provides for the Secretary of the Air Force to determine the location of the Academy from a site or sites within the United States selected by a five-member Commission to be appointed by him, I hope that due consideration will be given by the Secretary of the Air Force and by this Commission to the State of Florida.

In conclusion, I think every effort should be made to get this bill and the necessary appropriations through the Congress this session in order that the Air Force may start construction of the Air Force Academy without further delay.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to address a question or two to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. There are a number of communities in my State which, I assume, are not contained in the list of 300 communities I heard mentioned in the debate. Can the chairman inform the Senate, particularly the Senator from Utah, as to the possibilities existing from this point on by which additional communities may have their requests considered?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed that the Air Force will issue a circular showing how application may be made.

Mr. BENNETT. Will such a circular be specific, with reference to information contained in it, showing how a community may determine pretty well in advance whether it can meet the basic requirements?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I can answer the Senator only by saying we hope so. The best thing for my colleague from Utah to do would be to apprise the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force of his interest and ask that some of the circulars be sent to him.

If the circulars do not contain all the information he desires he can get additional information. If he will come to the Committee on Armed Services we will try to help him get all the information he may desire.

Mr. BENNETT. There is one other question I should like to ask the distinguished chairman. It deals with the time pattern. Did I correctly understand the distinguished chairman to say that if the bill is passed and the Commission is appointed, from that point on there will be only 45 days in which the Commission can act?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. As has been pointed out, a survey was made in the past. Approximately 300 sites are already on record, and a great deal of work has already been done for the Commission to consider when it is appointed. The Air Force is very anxious to get the academy started. That is why the 45-day limit was inserted.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, does the chairman of the committee advise his colleague from Utah that the representatives of the communities in Utah should get busy at once, without awaiting the appointment of the Commission?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My advice is that they get busy at once, even before the bill is enacted. The House has already passed the bill and, while undoubtedly conferees will be appointed, I believe the bill will be enacted very shortly.

Mr. BENNETT. I was assuming that specifications would be issued. Apparently that is not contemplated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If my colleague from Utah will get in touch with Mr. Braswell of the Committee on Armed Services, he will receive every service the committee can render.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Am I to understand from the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that the studies made by a commission which was appointed some years ago to consider the location of an air academy will be available to the new Commission when it is appointed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. CARLSON. On that basis, will it be necessary for the various cities—and there are many in the State of Kansas, as well as in other States, which are interested—to submit additional information, or should they request that the earlier information, already available, be used by the new Commission?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer that question authoritatively, but it seems to me it would be wise for such communities to look over their material and to submit up-to-date information. Of course the requirements have changed quite a good deal in the intervening time.

Mr. CARLSON. As the distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] will agree, Kansas is the geographical center of the Nation, and has very fine flying weather and excellent terrain for aircraft. We have more good flying days a year than almost any other State in the Union. Moreover, our State has pioneered in the field of aviation.

For that reason I hope the Commission will give some thought to the location of the Academy in the State of Kansas. I might also mention the fact that Glenn Martin is a Kansas product; that Cessna is a Kansas product; that Walter Beech is a Kansas product. We had an aircraft factory in the State of Kansas in 1908, 5 years after the Wright brothers started flying. Therefore, I hope the Commission will give some consideration to the State of Kansas.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I apprehend that the principal concern at this time is with respect to the location of the Academy. I believe I can assuage all concern and dissipate all rumors and resolve all questions if my friend from Massachusetts will agree to amend the bill by striking out the section creating a commission and providing, instead, that the new Air Academy shall be located in the State of Illinois, which is now the center of population of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Illinois is making a statement, not asking a question.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I am tempted to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, following the remarks of my good friend from Kansas, if he realizes that Kansas is not the center of the United States. I would also remind him of the fact that Glenn Martin established his factory in Nebraska instead of in Kansas, and that Charles Lindbergh received his first training in Lincoln, Nebr.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am more concerned with the advisability of creating an Air Force Academy than I am with its location or the manner of filling vacancies. How does the creation of an Air Force Academy fit in with the spirit of unification of the three services?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It fits in with the policy of getting the best militarily trained youngsters and giving them an opportunity to learn about the services and learn to become good officers. A good officer has to be intellectually trained in the humanities and be well trained in subjects relating to his particular branch of the service.

The Senator from Tennessee will recognize that a very fine amendment has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], formerly chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, to the effect that 12½ percent of students can move from one service to another. The theory of the amendment is to permit a man trained in the Air Force Academy to become a good naval officer, or for a naval officer to become a good Air Force officer. The idea is to integrate them to that extent.

Mr. GORE. I am aware of the amendment, and I agree with the sentiment and purpose behind it, because I have felt for a long while that one of the divisive forces in our National Defense Establishment, one of the principal causes of interservice rivalry, is the antagonistic spirit developed in the academies. I wonder if it would not be more in the spirit of unification to consolidate the two academies we have rather than to create a third one?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am confident my colleague from Tennessee has served on some of the committees appointed to visit the several academies. If he has not, I may say that if he will study the curriculum of the Naval Academy, as I have, and ask questions regarding it, as I have attempted to do, he will see that much of the training has to be in special subjects. If we combined all the subjects in one school, a man designated to serve in the Navy would not have the necessary basic training of a good naval officer, with all the knowledge of seamanship, gunnery, radar, and all the other subjects a good naval officer has to have, including higher mathematics and technical engineering skills which are necessary. An Air Force officer, in addition to his technical training, has to have a knowledge of English history, Greek history, and all the other branches of learning that go to make up an educated man. He must also specialize. When we say that 12½ percent can be transferred from one Academy to another——

Mr. GORE. It seems to me the Senator has made a rather persuasive argument against the establishment of a separate academy. True, these young men, whether they serve in the Air Force, the

Navy, or the Army, need to be trained in geometry, in English, in history, and many other subjects; but we do not need to have three separate academies in order to provide that kind of training. Of course, specialized training is needed for service in all branches, but it would seem to me to be far more practical to place these young men together so that they may acquire the spirit of national defense and a proper idea of the unification of the services, and then let them go into the fields of special training which their aptitudes may indicate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Again, I can only reply by saying that, in addition to training in the humanities and in the other subjects which any educated man receive there are different technical subjects pertinent to each branch of the service which must be mastered. I invite attention to the fact that the young men in the Naval Academy must study the drafting of plans for ships, where to place the engines, the amount of power required, the size of propellers, and things of that technical nature. An Air Force student must learn about the shape of airplane wings, how a ship is propelled through the air with the least amount of resistance——

Mr. GORE. Under the terms of the bill, 12½ percent of the men who are trained to build a ship and how to navigate through difficult waters, may be going into the Air Force.

Why would it not be better to have one national defense academy in which these young men would receive their training in the humanities, and, during the course of their studies, their aptitude and their desires could be ascertained? Then, instead of training young men who want to go into the Air Force how to operate a submarine and how to draft the plans and specifications for ships, a better result would be brought about by concentrating on aerodynamic specifics.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When the Senator asks that question he goes to the whole basic foundation of the educational system of the military. If it is desired to change the whole system and have preliminary general studies and then an advanced school in each of the three services, before a man can become an officer, that is one thing. What is done now is to give them special training in the various subjects for which they are qualified, so as to make them officers in the various services.

Mr. GORE. Under the terms of the pending bill, 37½ percent of them can change to services for which they have not been qualified or trained.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to my friend from Tennessee that I should be delighted at some time to argue the question with him, if he is going to argue against an Air Force Academy for that reason. I shall be delighted to debate the question with him and shall try to get more information so as to be more convincing.

Mr. GORE. That would be an academic debate indeed, after the bill is passed. The time to discuss it is now.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. We now have 2 Academies, and, if the idea of the Senator from Tennessee were adopted it would mean building up additional facilities in 1 place and then establishing advanced schools in another place. It is a very fundamental question. I think the system which the President and the present Secretary of Defense favor is a better system. There will be 3 football games instead of 2 football games. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. That is the strongest argument I have heard in favor of the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have given considerable thought to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I was a member of the board of visitors to the Naval Academy. The Naval Academy is limited in the extent to which it can expand. I would say that we should take into consideration the hazard of something happening to the Academy from a national standpoint.

Therefore, I would be heartily in favor of establishing the Air Force Academy somewhere else in the Nation, geographically speaking, than either at West Point or at Annapolis.

Second, I think the flying aspects must be taken into consideration in connection with the location of the Air Force Academy. We could not hope to have at Annapolis or West Point the facilities which are necessary to accommodate an Air Force Academy, so I certainly would be opposed to expanding or increasing the size of the Academies either at West Point or at Annapolis.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida, who has been seeking recognition.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall defer to the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], who has been called from the floor, so that he may propound a question.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Florida.

I came into the Chamber late, and did not hear the discussion on the question of the location of the Academy. The two Senators from Texas not having been on the floor, I merely wish to be certain that no location has as yet been decided upon. I did not hear completely the assurances of the Senator from Massachusetts, but I desire to be certain that I understood him correctly to say that the Secretary of the Air Force had told the Committee on Armed Services that no decision had as yet been made as to the location, or that no locations had been decided against. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct. I may say to the Senator from Texas that within the past 2 hours I have talked personally with Secretary Talbott, who gave me every assurance that there had been no selection of and no decision as to a site.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I wish to agree with the position taken by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in his colloquy with my friend, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. But there is one ground supporting the creation of an Air Force Academy which I think is completely and fundamentally important in the debate, and which I have not heard mentioned, namely, that young men, chosen and trained as they are now, to be pilots—and that seems to be the main thing people think about—do not necessarily have any familiarity at all with military law, military procedure, military administration, military discipline, or anything that constitutes the special understanding of the problems of the military operation.

I think the establishment of an academy for the Air Force is more necessary to afford a constant flow of officers who have such basic information and basic doctrine than for any other purpose.

It has been my feeling, throughout the years since the Air Force was established as a separate functioning body, that the greatest weakness of the Air Force has been in its administrative performance. I know that view is shared by many members of the Armed Services Committee and by many other Senators, and it seems to me that we would be making a great mistake if we thought of the matter in terms of mere development of pilots and other specialists, because the Air Force has now become our largest arm. It handles our most expensive equipment and facilities, and it must be able to function more efficiently from the administrative point of view, it seems to me, than has been the case up to this time.

I wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services if he would be agreeable to the adoption of an amendment which would occur on page 5, line 22, and would follow immediately paragraph (a) of section 6, the amendment to be in these words:

> Each Senator and each Representative may submit not more than 10 nominations each year.

This would get away from the fact that under the system proposed in the bill the public would be advised that Senators and Representatives had no function at all that was selective, which probably would result in literally thousands of nominations being sent in by Members of Congress each year, many of them being of young men who, it was believed by Senators and Representatives, could not make good.

It seems to me that the inclusion of such a provision, which would be much more generous than the provisions with reference to the naval and military academies, would be of real assistance to the Air Force, and would enable each Member of Congress to face up to and to accept some part of the responsibility, which is heavy, in supplying good applicants, and in helping to eliminate those who, for one reason or another, were not so well qualified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection. However, it has been pointed out to me that perhaps the Senator from

Florida would accomplish his objective more clearly if he would submit his amendment as follows:

On page 5, line 15, strike out down to and including the word "the", on line 18, and to insert "each Senator and Representative shall nominate not to exceed 10 persons, who shall be eligible to take a competitive examination which shall be held annually. The number of vacancies allocated to each State shall be proportional with the representation in Congress from that State."

If the distinguished Senator from Florida wishes to propose that amendment, I shall be glad to take it to conference. I think it helps rather than hurts the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to accept the substitute suggestion. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that it is a better statement of the objective I have in view, and I appreciate the willingness of the chairman to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). Does the Senator ask unanimous consent for the adoption of the amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. At the place in the bill where I had suggested the amendment, unanimous consent would not have been required, whereas the rewording of the amendment, which the Senator from Massachusetts has suggested, and which I think improves the carrying out of the objective sought, would require unanimous consent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe that is the proper way to word the amendment. If there is objection by any Senator, it can be worded in another way.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment, as reworded by the chairman of the committee, may be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 15, it is proposed to strike out down to and including the word "the" in line 18, and to insert, in lieu thereof, the following:

Each Senator and Representative shall nominate not to exceed 10 persons, who shall be eligible to take a competitive examination, which shall be held annually. The

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

THE AIR ACADEMY—CANDIDATES FOR TRAINING

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Do I understand correctly that there is proposed a difference in the manner of recommending students for the proposed Air Force training school than applies now to the Naval Academy and to the Military Academy?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For the first 4 years there would be a different method than now applies to the present academies, until the new school was built up. After the fourth year, or in the fifth year, the method would be the same as is used in the making of nominations to West Point and Annapolis.

Mr. MALONE. Then each Senator and each Representative would propose two candidates. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No. For the first 3 years, in order to build up the school——

Mr. MALONE. I am talking about the procedure following the first 4 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. After the first 4 years the procedure will be the same as it is now for the Military and the Naval Academies, namely, 2 principals and 3 alternates to each principal, as I understand.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator from Massachusetts explain exactly how many of the 10 candidates to be recommended for examination will be accepted?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Before the Senator from Nevada came into the Chamber, I had explained that for the first 4 years each State will receive a proportion based on its proportional representation in Congress, including Senators and Representatives. For instance, in Nevada, the Senator's home State, there are 2 Senators and 1 Representative. So in the first year of the operation of the Air Force Academy, Nevada would be permitted to appoint 1 person; in the second year, 2 persons. They would be the top persons on the list. In other words, if the Senator from Nevada and his colleague in the Senate and the Representative from Nevada all submitted 10 names, or whatever number they submitted, the person from the three groups who ranked first in the examinations would be the one to receive the appointment.

Mr. MALONE. Under the existing system, an examination may or may not be held, and the top ranking person may or may not be appointed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. But in the procedure stated by the Senator from Massachusetts the top man only could be appointed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For the first 4 years.

Mr. MALONE. Regardless of other qualifications any candidate might have?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For the first 4 years.

Mr. MALONE. So the Senators and the Representative from Nevada would be permitted to appoint one person in the first year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; there would be one person appointed from the entire State.

Mr. MALONE. That is what I said. The three Members of Congress from Nevada would appoint only one person in the first year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct; there would be one person appointed from the State of Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Why is there to be a difference in the beginning from what is proposed after the Academy is underway, so to speak?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Because there will be only 300 students in the first year. Ultimately there will be 4 classes in the school, but it will be necessary to build up the school. So in the first year only the members of the first class will be appointed; in the second year there will be two classes; and the school will build up to an enrollment of 600; in the third year the enrollment will be 900; and in the fourth year it will be 1,200.

Mr. MALONE. After the leveling off in the fifth year will it be the policy to permit each Senator and Representative to appoint two candidates in the same manner as is done in the case of the present Academies?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding. The same law would be followed as now exists with relation to West Point.

Mr. MALONE. How about Annapolis?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I spoke as I did because the law establishing the Air Force Academy will be based on the law pertaining to the Military Academy at West Point rather than the Naval Academy at Annapolis. That is why I so qualified my remarks.

Mr. MALONE. How many will be appointed the first year?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The first year 300 will be appointed. The allocations for appointments on the recommendations or Senators, Representatives, and other sources will total 624. There are 531 Senators and Representatives, and their recommendations will be followed in making 85 percent of the appointments to the Academy, or a total of 255 for the first year.

Mr. MALONE. There will be 255 appointments on recommendations of Senators and Representatives?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MALONE. There is only one Representative from the State of Nevada. May I ask the distinguished Senator how many appointments will be allocated to Massachusetts?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Massachusetts has 16 Senators and Representatives. Massachusetts will have 8 appointees the first year and 8 appointees the second year. Oregon, for example, has a representation of 6 in the Congress. The first year it will have 3 appointments to the academy, and 3 appointments the second year.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire the number of appointments Minnesota would be entitled to under the same formula.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are 11 Members of Congress from Minnesota, and it will get 5 appointments to the academy the first year and 6 the second year.

Mr. MALONE. The ones who are appointed, I presume, will be selected by Senators and Representatives. Why is the selection of the candidate on a different basis from the present selection to West Point and the Naval Academy? I understand that it is based solely upon the examination grades.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct, and that subject was discussed by the committee. The method arrived at was believed to be the fairest by which the academy could be started with the best qualified men. We agreed that the boy who passes with the highest grade does not necessarily make the best

officer; but the committee believed that the method provided was the best that could be devised to get the results desired.

Mr. MALONE. Would there not be some merit in having a candidate admitted whose selection was agreed upon by Senators and Representatives from among those who passed the examination in the same manner as candidates are now chosen?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would be very difficult to carry out such an arrangement. Let us take as an example the State of New York, which has 43 Representatives and 2 Senators. To get those Members of Congress to agree on 21 candidates would be very difficult.

Mr. MALONE. If they could not agree, the same qualification would apply as that now provided; but if they all did agree on who should be the candidate or candidates, as the case may be, would that not be a better arrangement than encouraging 10 or more times the number than could ever hope to be appointed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There might be some difficulty in selecting men under such an arrangement. It was desired to get the academy started in the best possible way. The House has passed the bill. It was the feeling of the Committee on Armed Services, after some discussion of the point which the Senator has raised, that the method arrived at was the best that could be adopted to get the academy started reasonably soon.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield, so that I might ask a question along the line he is discussing?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee that I can visualize an occurrence which would probably happen every year in my State, where my colleague, and the Member of the House and I would submit the same name, under some conditions. I am wondering whether, as an administrative matter, the distinguished chairman will give some thought to discussing the question in future meetings of the committee, with the thought in mind that the Air Corps would submit the names to the three Members of Congress from my State, let us say, so that they could clear the matter with each other, and if there were duplications one of us could eliminate one name, and an effort could be made to give an opportunity to another boy in the State.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would have no objection to such an arrangement. It is an administrative matter. I know that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and I have in more than one instance followed the practice the Senator suggests.

Mr. HUNT. Such a procedure is necessary, because year before last in my State the same boy was appointed to both West Point and the Naval Academy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We had the same difficulty in Massachusetts, and we overcame the problem by clearing it between us beforehand.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator read the portion of the bill which refers to the period of the 4 first years?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On page 5 of the bill, section 6 states:

> To permit an orderly increase in the number of Air Force cadets during the period ending not more than 4 years after the entrance of the initial class at the Academy, the Secretary of the Air Force may limit the number to be appointed each year during that period.

That refers to the first 4 years. After that time the provisions of law governing the United States Military Academy apply.

Section 5, on the top of page 4 of the bill, reads:

> All appropriate provisions of law, not inconsistent with the purposes of this act, which pertain to the United States Military Academy shall, by the authority of this section, also pertain to the United States Air Force Academy.

Mr. MALONE. Will the membership in the Air Force Academy ultimately be approximately equal to the membership in the Naval Academy and West Point Military Academy?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer to the Senator's question is "Yes."

Mr. MALONE. After 4 years each Senator and each Representative will appoint 1 principal and 3 alternates?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. One principal and three alternates each year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous request that the amendment of the committee may be amended as proposed by the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be amended as suggested.

The amendment was, in the amendment of the committee, on page 5, line 15, to strike out "(a) A competitive examination shall be held annually among those persons nominated to the Academy by Senators and Representatives, and the" and insert "(a) Each Senator and Representative shall nominate not to exceed 10 persons, who shall be eligible to take a competitive examination which shall be held annually. The."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts to accept a modification, that in the case of agreement between the 2 Senators and the Representative or Representatives on the appointees they could appoint a principal, or 2 principals, as the case may be, with the usual alternates, so that there need not be 20 or 30 candidates, whatever the number may be, who would be encouraged and be subjected to almost sure disappointment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand the point the Senator is making. The difficulty is to put such an arrangement in appropriate language. It would have to be limited according to the size of the State?

Mr. MALONE. I do not think there would have to be any such limitation. If an agreement were arrived at, such a procedure could be followed. In Massachusetts, for instance, if 16 or 6 candidates were agreed upon, the candidates and alternates could be named. If they were not agreed upon, the procedure provided by the bill could be followed. I am speaking of a modification which would permit States to follow such an arrangement where agreement was had to prevent building up the hopes of so many students when so few can be accepted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The difficulty would be in applying the law to a larger State such as New York, for instance, which is the largest State in the Union in point of membership in Congress, with 21 appointees the first year and 24 the second year. If a distinction were made between such a large State and a small State, I think it would lead to unfairness. Where is the line to be drawn? Suppose all Members of Congress from Nevada agreed. Nevada has 2 Senators and 1 Representative. It would mean they would agree on 1 man, whereas there might be 10 candidates who wanted to take the examination. We will say that in Massachusetts there was not any agreement. That would force 100 young men to take the examination.

Mr. MALONE. Then only in case of an agreement would there be any difference. If there were no agreement, the law as now proposed would govern, would it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course, ultimately they would have to take the examinations, anyway.

Mr. MALONE. Yes; but if my suggested amendment were adopted, 4 young men would be designated in case of an agreement—a principal, a first alternate, a second alternate, and a third alternate—instead of building up the hopes of 30 young men when only 1 could be appointed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No, that would not be the case, because as the system now works, one man would be chosen from Nevada, but no alternates would be chosen from Nevada. That one man would be the one who would be qualified under the written examination, although he would also have to qualify under the physical and mental examinations.

Mr. MALONE. That is true, under the committee's proposal. But under my proposed amendment, if the Members of Congress from that State agreed on one principal and on a first alternate and a second alternate and a third alternate, then—although only one of them would finally be appointed—only 4, instead of 30 or 40, would take the examinations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, I have not had the benefit of attending the various meetings of the Armed Services Committee, but I understand that the proposed system to which the Senator from Massachusetts has been referring has been worked out by the committee.

Although I do not agree about all the mechanics of the proposed system, nevertheless it is obvious that it is very important to have the Air Force Academy in operation. So I am perfectly willing to have the bill as reported by the committee passed, perhaps as modified by the

amendment—which I believe to be an excellent one—proposed by the Senator from Florida.

I think the question of the arrangements to be made after the first year should be given very careful attention by the committee, after there has been opportunity to see how the system works.

At this time I am not inclined to be favorably disposed toward the proposed amendment of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], because I do not think there should be two methods of selection. It may be that the matter should be studied further, and that in subsequent legislation, particularly after the first year or two—and let me say that of course I realize the difficulty of getting the Academy started—and perhaps before the fifth year, consideration should be given to having the standards for the Air Force Academy based on the West Point and Annapolis standards.

So I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will not agree to a further modification, by means of the change proposed by the Senator from Nevada, which might result in a differentiation because of the difference in size of the various States, and might make it difficult to determine where the line would be drawn. In fact, I think there would be a great many complications under the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield to me, let me say that I have no idea of drawing a line or of making a differentiation on the basis of the difference in size of the various States.

My amendment would simply make it possible for all the Members of Congress from 1 State to get together and decide upon a principal and 3 alternates for each appointment to be made. For instance, in the case of a large State, its 2 Senators and say 40 Representatives could reach such an agreement, and the matter could be handled in that way—then there would only be the number of principals nominated that were to be appointed, together with their alternates, instead of 420 appointees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Suppose there were to be 30 nominations from Nevada—10 nominations by each of the 2 Senators from Nevada and 10 nominations by the Representative from Nevada. As I understand, those 30 young men would then be given the examination by the Air Force Academy; and from the 30, only 1 or 2 would be appointed from Nevada. In other words, either the top man or the two top men in the examination would be appointed.

Under the theory of the Senator from Nevada, could the 2 Senators and the 1 Representative from Nevada agree upon the appointment of the 30th man in the examination—the 30th in standing, based on the list resulting from the examination—rather than upon the top man in the list?

Mr. MALONE. No. My point is that if 30 nominations are made, all 30 will be encouraged to hope they will be able to enter the Academy, whereas, of course, only 1 will actually be able to attend the Academy.

Therefore, my proposal is that, instead, there be nominated 1 principal and 3 alternates. That could be done if all the Members of Congress from a given State were to agree upon such a principal and three alternates. Of course, that might not be done in some cases. However, if by means of such an agreement, only a principal and 3 alternates were actually nominated, then the hopes of only 4 young men from that particular State would be built up.

Of course, Mr. President, all of us know that many young men who hope to attend the various service academies come to Washington, D. C., from various parts of the States, and here attend special schools, in an effort to be able to pass the entrance examinations, which are difficult. Why build up the hopes of 30 young men from a given State, instead of only a reasonable number? That is why I propose that the Members of Congress from the various States reach such agreements.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only reason I can see is to have the broadest possible field of selection, so as to encourage young men from Nevada and other States of the Union to take the examinations.

Mr. MALONE. Of course, Mr. President, all of us have had the experience of encouraging young men to take the examinations as alternates then having no appointment for them. The purpose of my proposed amendment is to hold such disappointments to a minimum.

When they take such an examination and go through the necessary special study the ensuing disappointment is very severe—and often the parents have expended additional money for special courses which they can ill afford to expend.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the 2 Senators and 1 Representative from Nevada were to agree upon, and were to submit, only the name of Tom Smith, let us say, then Tom Smith would be the only person from Nevada to take the examination. The Members of Congress from Nevada could make such an agreement and thus could carry out the objective of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I do not understand that the amendment specifically provides for such a procedure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say that could be done. Of course, the senior Senator from Nevada could make 10 nominations, and the junior Senator from Nevada could make 10 nominations, and the Representative from Nevada could make 10 nominations—or a total of 30. However, suppose all 3 of those Members of Congress agreed that Tom Smith would be the 1 to be nominated. Then Tom Smith would be the only one to take the examination.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The senior Senator from Massachusetts has served in the Congress for a longer period of time than has the junior Senator from Nevada, so he realizes fully that each Member of Congress would insist upon making all the nominations he was entitled to make. Thus, in order to avoid disappointing 26 of the 30 young men nominated, in the case of a State having 2 Senators and 1 Representative, 1 student together with 3 alternates could be appointed from that State, then only 3 would be disappointed instead of 26.

The existing arrangement does not specifically provide that those Members of Congress can get together and agree upon only 4 nominations—a principal and 3 alternates—with only 1 of the 4 finally to be appointed, instead of only 1 out of a possible 30 nominations.

However, I withdraw the suggested amendment at the request of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course, as I have said, it is our responsibility to check constantly on the operation of the system decided upon. We shall do so next year, of course.

So I hope the Senator from Nevada will not insist upon his amendment, because the system proposed by it would be difficult to follow fairly.

The arrangement we propose has been examined very carefully. In substantially the same form, it has been approved by the House of Representatives, and it is generally agreed that this method is the best one.

So I hope the Senator from Nevada will permit his amendment to go over until next year.

Mr. MALONE. Let me say I do not agree with the senior Senator from Massachusetts that this subject will be again discussed upon this floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement.

In view of the physical condition of the plant at Annapolis—the inadequacy of the plant, with its existing buildings and facilities—and in view of the increased emphasis in the Navy on aerodynamics, and in view of the number of airplanes in the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force, it would seem the better part of wisdom for Congress to consider the establishment of a new Defense Academy, one in which all air training can be consolidated, looking toward the eventual establishment of one unified Defense Academy, in which the young men, the future officers of the National Defense Establishment, can be trained.

Mr. President, the United States Army also is placing greater emphasis upon air operations.

Therefore, let me say that a Senator who votes against the passage of the pending bill—and I shall vote against its passage—will not, in my opinion, minimize the importance of air training. Quite to the contrary, I think the establishment of one United States Defense Academy would be the proper way to place greater emphasis on air training as well as the great need for unification.

There is in the bill an amendment providing for interchangeability. That seems to me to be an argument against the establishment of a third academy, rather than in favor of it. Under the interchangeability provision a young man might be appointed, for example, to enter the Naval Academy. He would learn how to operate a submarine or how

to design a ship. Then he could transfer to the Air Force, or vice versa, to the extent of 12½ percent from each of the three academies. Where is the economy in such a system? Wherein lies the wisdom?

Young men are appointed to the academies largely by Members of Congress. A young man applies for entrance into one or the other of the service Academies. Members of Congress do not give aptitude tests in deciding to whom to award appointments to the Naval Academy or to West Point, or—in the event of the passage of the pending bill—to the Air Force Academy. Often an applicant will apply for nomination to either Academy. Under this system no evaluation is made as to the aptitudes of the young man for training in service in a specific field, or of his desire, in many respects.

If we had an opportunity to enlarge and expand the United States Naval Academy or the United States Military Academy, I think $140 million could better be spent in the enlargement and consolidation, or replacement, of the present facilities. It would be even better if Congress would give consideration to the broader scope, not merely to giving the Air Force an Academy, partly because the other services have Academies, but to the needs of unification of both training and service. We are in an age in which aero-dynamics, hydrogen weapons, and atomic weapons will some day force unification. This bill flies in the teeth of unification. We hear many speeches about unification, but there is little action pointing toward unification.

Therefore, I believe the pending proposal goes contrary to the direction in which we should proceed in this modern age, and, therefore, is basically unwise, I shall cast my vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PROVISION FOR ORDERLY USE, IMPROVEMENT, AND DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL FORESTS AND OTHER LANDS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now resume the consideration of Calendar 1045, Senate bill 2548. I have previously consulted the minority leader regarding the bill. It was temporarily laid aside in order to give priority to consideration of the Air Force Academy bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2548) to facilitate the administration of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent thereon; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the bill is designed to provide a legal framework for administration of national forest lands and certain Bankhead-Jones Act lands to the end that such lands may be protected and improved and the economic, recreational and other benefits accruing to the general public and to the various segments thereof may be safeguarded and regulated pursuant to rule of law.

The bill was introduced last August 1. Hearings were held in the range States of the West in September. The bill has been approved by the Forest Service. The Forest Service has been very helpful in drafting the provisions of the bill and reconciling some differences of opinion between interested parties; indeed, it has been generally helpful. We have also received considerable help from officials of wildlife and conservation organizations.

In January we held a final hearing in Washington. After the final hearing the bill was turned over to a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who gave consideration to all the proposed amendments and submitted to the full committee a bill which, as amended, we believe to be an excellent bill and one which will result in improvement of the forest administration. The bill would write into congressional policy a great many things which for a long time have been Forest Service policy.

The first section of the bill makes it applicable to national forest lands and lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. The committee amendments would extend it to lands in all States, rather than the 14 States named in the bill as introduced, and would exclude Bankhead-Jones Act lands administered by the Secretary of the Interior or any other agency other than the Department of Agriculture. These changes supplement the committee amendment to section 6 of the bill extending the appeal provisions to all types of occupancy and use, rather than restricting it to grazing which would be of importance primarily in the 14 named States.

As originally introduced—although it was inadvertent on my part—certain provisions of the bill applied only to those who use forest lands for grazing purposes. That situation has been corrected, so that its provisions are now made applicable to all users of forest lands.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I ask what bill is under consideration?

Mr. AIKEN. Senate bill 2548, Calendar 1045.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is that the bill with respect to which the majority leader asked unanimous consent for consideration at this time? I did not so understand.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, earlier in the day I made a unanimous-consent request for consideration of the bill, which request was agreed to. At that time the majority leader and minority leader were both present. However, the bill was temporarily laid aside in order to afford opportunity for the consideration of the Air Force Academy bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, it was the pending business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. The request to make it the pending business had been agreed to. It was laid aside to give priority to consideration of the Air Force Academy bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was not present at the time; hence my inquiry.

May I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], if the bill was reported unanimously?

Mr. AIKEN. There were no disapproving votes in the committee. I will not say that it was reported unanimously, because I doubt that all 15 members of the committee were present. It is my recollection that 12 or 13 members of the committee were present, and the vote was unanimous.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] was just called from the Chamber. He had intended to state, and he has asked that I state in his absence, that all minority members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry approved the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not know how far the Senate wishes me to go in explaining the provisions of the bill. If there is no demand for a detailed explanation——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield, I should like to say to my distinguished friend from Montana that the committee did report the bill unanimously. When the bill came before the committee for consideration there was only one question raised, and it was raised by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. References to that situation will be found at page 4 of the committee report. His question related to court procedure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee another question, if I may.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the bill have the approval of the Forest Service?

Mr. AIKEN. The bill has the approval of the Forest Service. The Forest Service was very helpful in writing the bill itself, and even more helpful in

reconciling some differences of opinion among the various groups that use the national forest lands. We believe we have met all the major objections and have reconciled all the major differences of opinion. I assume that there are still some slight differences of opinion, but I would not consider them material. If there is no demand for my going through the bill section by section, Mr. President, I ask leave to have the report of the committee printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1041) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2548) to facilitate the administration of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent thereon; and for other purposes, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with amendments.

GENERAL PURPOSE

The bill is designed to provide a legal framework for administration of national forest lands and certain Bankhead-Jones Act lands to the end that such lands may be protected and improved and the economic, recreational, and other benefits accruing to the general public and to the various segments thereof may be safeguarded and regulated pursuant to rule of law. To accomplish this end the bill provides for the encouragement of range improvement by grazing permittees, compensation for such improvements lost through Government action or transfer of the permit, regulations governing base property standards and transfer of grazing permits, procedures for review of departmental decisions affecting any use of lands covered by the bill, and multiple-use advisory boards.

LANDS COVERED BY THE BILL

The first section of the bill makes it applicable to national forest lands and lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. The committee amendments would extend it to lands in all States, rather than the 14 States named in the bill as introduced, and would exclude Bankhead-Jones Act lands administered by the Secretary of the Interior or any other agency other than the Department of Agriculture. These changes supplement the committee amendment to section 6 of the bill extending the appeal provisions to all types of occupancy and use rather than restricting it to grazing which would be of importance primarily in the 14 named States.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

Section 2 provides for encouraging range improvement by grazing permittees.

Subsection (a) provides for assuring the permittee that he will receive the benefits of the increased grazing capacity resulting from improvements made by him.

Subsection (b) provides for compensating a permittee for loss of a range improvement caused by the Federal Government.

Subsection (c) provides for payment by a subsequent permittee to his predecessor of the value of improvements constructed by such predecessor.

Subsection (d) provides for amortizing the value of any range improvement (based on its replacement cost) over its normal life, not to exceed 20 years. Compensation to which a permittee would be entitled under subsection (b) or (c) could not exceed this amortized value. After the normal life of the improvement had expired it would be deemed of no value for compensation purposes, even though it might have considerable actual value. This would prevent permittees from acquiring continuing interests in improvements on the public range.

The committee amendments to section 2 would add subsection (d), just discussed, and make it clear that noxious plant control would be included in improvements covered by it, that permittees' estates would be entitled to compensation in the event of their decease or disability, that permittees abandoning their permits would not be entitled to compensation for loss or on transfer, that the Government would not be required to pay compensation if its action was necessitated by injury to the lands, and that losses caused by Federal agencies other than the Department of Agriculture would be compensated out of appropriations for such agencies.

TRANSFER OF GRAZING PERMITS

Section 3 provides for regulations governing transfers of grazing privileges. In the past the Department has frequently delayed grazing cuts until the permit is being transferred and made the cut at the time. Under section 3 cuts based solely on the fact that the permit is being transferred are prohibited. Cuts may be made whenever conditions warrant, but the transfer of the permit should form no part of the basis.

BASE PROPERTY STANDARDS

Section 4 provides for maintenance of base property standard (land, water, and improvements required to qualify for a grazing permit) consistent with local practices. Thus in some localities livestock operations may be customarily undertaken with a much larger percentage of rented or permitted lands (whether private, State, forest, or Taylor Grazing Act lands) than is customary in other localities.

GRAZING FEE STUDY

Section 5 of the bill, as introduced, provided for a comprehensive economic study for the purpose of determining suitable grazing fees. This section is a survival from earlier versions of similar bills which would have been applicable to lands administered under the Taylor Grazing Act by the Bureau of Land Management as well as national forest and Bankhead-Jones Act lands, and its original purpose was to provide for a joint study which might result in uniformity of fees. Your committee feels that such a joint study is very desirable and recommends to the Appropriations Committees and to the Congress that funds for such a study be provided. The Department now has authority to participate in such a study and authorizing legislation is not required. A study conducted by the Secretary of Agriculture, however, alone, and relating only to lands covered by the bill, as required by section 5 would not contribute to a uniform fee system, and your committee therefore recommends that section 5 be stricken from the bill.

INFORMAL APPEAL PROCEDURE

Section 6 provides informal appeals, up to the Secretary, from any departmental decision respecting use of lands covered by the bill. Upon request, appeals to the Secretary would be referred to a three-man board consisting of a Department employee (not from the Forest Service) designated by the Secretary, a second member designated by the appellant, and a third member representing the general public and selected by the other two. The committee amendments to this section would (1) extend it to cover all uses of the lands, instead of only grazing uses; (2) strike out the reference to the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service and agencies not involved in the review since departmental reorganization has placed all of the lands covered by the bill, including the Bankhead-Jones Act lands, under the Forest Service; (3) provide that the third member of the board shall represent the general public; and (4) provide for appointment of the third member by the appropriate district court if the first two members are unable to agree upon a third.

FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL

Section 7 provides for a formal review de novo, at which a record is made, for anyone dissatisfied with the result of the informal review under section 6.

COURT APPEAL

Section 8 provides a further appeal to the United States district court. The committee amendment would give this jurisdiction to the district court, rather than the court of appeals, so that appellants would not be required to travel so far from their homes to conduct their appeals.

SCOPE OF COURT APPEAL

Section 9 provides that the review by the district court shall be based upon the record made in the formal review provided by section 7. When your committee was considering this provision it was strongly contended by Senator WELKER that the court review should be upon a trial de novo; that the court should not be bound by the facts produced at the Secretary's hearing, but should have full authority to decide the matter on the basis of the facts presented to it; and that the court's jurisdiction should extend to appeals from cuts in grazing privileges made for the protection of the range or to bring about a change in use of the range. Appeals from protection or changed use cuts are now expressly excluded from the formal and court review provisions of the bill by section 11, which preserves the Secretary's discretion in making cuts for those purposes. While the committee realizes that protection and changed use cuts are a major problem in administration of the lands covered by the bill and are likely to have serious economic effects on permittees who sustain them, the majority of the committee felt that the bill represents a delicate balance of conflicting interests in this respect, and that the change proposed by Senator WELKER would upset this balance, evoke the opposition of other forest users, and quite possibly result in defeat of the bill.

The amendment to this section recommended by your committee would require payment of court costs by losing appellants, and would permit the court to require bond to assure payment of such costs.

STAY OF DECISION

Section 10 provides that the formal and court reviews provided by the bill would operate to stay the decision appealed from only if the Secretary or the court should so order.

PROTECTION AND CHANGED USE CUTS

Section 11 makes the review procedures provided by the bill exclusive, preserves the Secretary's discretion to make protection or changed use cuts, and excludes decisions on such cuts from the formal and court review procedures provided by the bill. The committee amendments would preserve whatever legal remedy a permittee may now have with respect to such cuts for which formal remedies are not provided by the bill, and preserves the Secretary's freedom of action to deal summarily with trespass or other unauthorized use of the lands covered by the bill.

MULTIPLE-USE ADVISORY COUNCILS

Your committee recommends insertion of a new section preceding section 12 of the bill to provide for multiple-use advisory councils. These councils would not supersede the Granger-Thye Act boards in any way, but would advise the Secretary solely on questions involved in the multiple use of lands covered by the bill. Such councils

might be established on local, regional, and national bases. They would not be entitled to any compensation, expenses or per diem.

CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

Section 12 is a statement of the congressional policy that all resources and uses of the lands covered by the bill be safeguarded and given full consideration.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE

Your committee recommends that the title be amended to reflect the changes made in the bill, which broaden and extend it to cover all uses of the lands to which it applies.

A copy of the Department's report on the bill, showing how it would change existing procedure is set out below:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, August 3, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: Reference is made to your request of August 3 for a report on S. 2548, a bill "to facilitate the administration of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent thereon; and for other purposes." This bill is identical to H. R. 6787, by Congressman Hope.

The objective of S. 2548 is to clarify and specify the procedures to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in administering the grazing resources of the national forests and the title III Bankhead-Jones lands in the 14 Western States.

The bill deals with construction of range improvements by permittees; transfer of grazing privileges; base property standards; an economic study to help develop a method of determining grazing fees; boards of appeal with respect to grazing uses; formal hearings and appeals to the courts. The bill also spells out certain exceptions to its provisions, and recognizes the importance of all resources and uses of these lands.

Following is a summary of the specific provisions of the bill and a comparison of wherein these provisions differ from existing law.

SECTION 1—COVERAGE OF THE BILL

The bill would apply to the national forests and title II Bankhead-Jones lands in the 14 Western States.

SECTION 2—IMPROVEMENTS

The Secretary is authorized to promote and encourage construction of range improvements by grazing permittees. As an incentive to permittees to undertake such action at their own expense, the Secretary is authorized to agree with permittees on the terms under which resulting increased grazing capacity will be made available to them.

Recent changes in administrative practice now assure permittees the benefits of increased grazing capacity resulting from their own investments.

The Secretary is directed to provide for compensation to permittees for the loss of improvements constructed by them with the approval of the Secretary, where the loss is caused by Government action and not by the unlawful act of the permittee. No permit shall be issued to a new permittee to use improvements constructed by a prior permittee, unless the latter has been compensated, either by the Government or by the new permittee.

The Secretary has authority under existing law to compensate permittees for loss of improvements. This proposal directs him to provide such compensation. Issuance of permit to a new permittee where the prior permittee has not been compensated for improvements by either the Government or the new permittee is not now prohibited.

SECTION 3—TRANSFERS OF GRAZING PRIVILIGES

The Secretary shall specify the terms and conditions under which transfers of grazing privileges may be made. No reduction in grazing permits may be made at time of transfer solely on account of the transfer.

Under present regulations the Secretary or his representative specifies the terms and conditions under which the preference may be transferred. Present administrative instructions prohibit reductions at time of transfer solely because of the transfer. A proposed new administrative policy, now under consideration, would provide that protection reductions would be made as and when needed without relation to any transfer of grazing privileges.

SECTION 4—BASE PROPERTY

The Secretary is directed to maintain base property standards considering land, water, or ranch or range improvements based upon customary practice of the locality and to require these standards as a qualification for a grazing privilege.

The requirements in section 4 do not differ from present practice.

SECTION 5—ECONOMIC STUDY

The Secretary is directed to make a comprehensive economic study to obtain information needed to establish a method of determining grazing fees. The Secretary is instructed to consider all relevant facts and circumstances. The Secretary is to submit his recommendations to the Agriculture Committees of both Houses within 2 years, and pending this submission existing methods of determining grazing fees shall remain in effect.

The provision directing the Secretary to make a study and submit his recommendations to Congress is new.

SECTION 6—BOARD OF APPEALS

The Secretary is directed to prescribe by regulation a procedure whereby actions of departmental officers may, upon appeal, be reviewed. In the event of an appeal from decisions of the Chiefs of the Forest Service or Soil Conservation Service, the Secretary shall, if requested by the appellant, refer the case to an advisory board of appeals. The board shall consist of an employee of the Department appointed by the Secretary but not a resident of the State in which the dispute arose; the second member is to be selected by the appellant; and the third member is to be selected by the other two but shall not be an employee of the Federal or any State Governments or directly connected with the livestock industry, nor a resident of the State in which the dispute arose.

Present administrative procedure provides for a five-man advisory board appointed by the Secretary from members of the Department (but not the Forest Service) to consider appeals from decisions of the Chief of the Forest Service.

Present procedure also provides for appeal of administrative decisions to progressively higher levels within the Forest Service. A dissatisfied grazing permittee can appeal to the immediate superior of the officer making the decision all the way from ranger to the Chief Forester. Or he may, if he desires, have his case heard by the local grazing advisory board, which then advises the forest supervisor.

SECTIONS 7, 8, 9, AND 10—FORMAL HEARINGS AND APPEALS TO THE COURTS

These sections provide in detail the procedure to be followed where any person who is aggrieved by any order of the Secretary made pursuant to section 6 may request a formal hearing. The request for the hearing must contain such information and allegations as the Secretary prescribes. The hearing shall be held in the State in which the dispute arose. The appellant may appeal to the circuit court of appeals from the decision of the Secretary based upon such formal hearing. The proper circuit court is that within whose jurisdiction the formal hearing was held. The court is limited in its review to the record made before the Secretary, and must determine that the Secretary's actions were arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law before remanding or taking any action contrary to the decision of the Secretary. The request for formal hearing or the petition to the court would not operate to suspend the application of the decision unless so ordered by either the Secretary or the court.

Present law does not authorize formal hearings or statutory appeals to the courts. However, courts will grant relief from arbitrary or capricious actions of public officers.

SECTION 11—EXCEPTIONS TO THE BILL

This section specifically limits the review of decisions of the Secretary with respect to grazing to the manner prescribed in the act. It states that nothing in the act would restrict the authority of the Secretary to limit or discontinue the grazing use of any lands in order to prevent injury to such lands from grazing, or to change the use of any lands, and provides that the formal hearings and appeals procedures of sections 7, 8, and 9 shall not apply to protection adjustments and changes of use.

SECTION 12—RECOGNITION OF OTHER USES

This section states a congressional policy that the Secretary shall give consideration to all resources and uses, including grazing, watershed conservation, timber production, recreation, mining, and wildlife.

The Department has considered carefully the probable effects of S. 2548. It feels that the provisions of the bill would benefit the holders of grazing privileges. It also feels that the bill would not hamper the administration of the national forests or Bankhead-Jones lands; that it would not interfere with the management and protection of the range resource; and that it would give due recognition to the multiple-use objectives of the national forests and importance of all resources and uses on the public lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

The Department recommends enactment of S. 2548.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The committee amendments were severally stated and respectively agreed to, as follows:

The amendments of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry were, on page 1, line 4, after the word "administered", to insert "by the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary)"; in line 6, after the word "act", to strike out "in the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary)"; in line 4, after the word "reseeding", to insert "and noxious plant control"; in line 18, after the word "holders", to insert "or their estates"; in line 22, after the word "action", strike out "and is not caused by" and insert "not occasioned either by abandonment or"; in line 23, after the word "holders"

insert "or by fire, flood, drought, or other disaster which causes injury to the lands or improvements covered by the permit: *Provided*, That in the event such loss is the result of the action of a Federal agency other than the Department of Agriculture or because the Federal lands are needed for or transferred or assigned to another governmental agency for administration such compensation shall be paid by such other agency"; on page 3, line 8, after the word "permittee", insert "or his estate"; in line 11, after the word "permittee", insert "or his estate"; in line 13, after the word "Secretary", insert a semicolon and "but no prior permittee who shall have abandoned his permit shall be required to be compensated"; after line 15, insert:

(d) The value of any improvement as determined under subsection (b) or (c) shall not exceed its replacement cost, less a percentage thereof commensurate with the expired portion of its normal life. The normal life of any improvement shall be determined under rules and regulations of the Secretary and shall not exceed 20 years.

On page 4, after line 9, to strike out:

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized and directed to conduct a comprehensive economic study for the purpose of obtaining information necessary to establish a method of determining grazing fees on the lands described in section 1 which will take into consideration all relevant facts and circumstances. Within 2 years after the date of enactment of this act the Secretary shall submit in writing to the Committee on Agriculure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate his recommendations as a result of such study. Pending the completion and submission of such study by the Secretary together with his recommendations, existing methods of determining grazing fees and the presently established basis therefor shall remain in effect.

In line 24, to change the section number from "6" to "5"; at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "grazing on" and insert "any occupancy and use of"; on page 5, at the beginning of line 3, strike out "grazing uses" and insert "such occupancy and use"; in line 9, after the word "Service", strike out "or the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service"; in line 10, after the word "to", strike out "grazing uses" and insert "such occupancy and use"; in line 15, after the word "Department", strike out "not involved in the review" and insert "except the Forest Service"; in line 18, after the word, "members", insert "to represent the general public"; in line 21, after the word "the", strike out "livestock industry" and insert "interest or interests concerned. Should the first two members fail for more than 30 days after their appointment to agree upon a third member, such third member representing the general public shall be appointed by the United States district court for any district in which any of the lands with respect to which the matter in dispute arose are located"; on page 6, line 16, after the word "section", strike out "7" and insert "6"; in line 18, to change the section number from "7" to "6"; in line 19, after the word "section", strike out "6" and insert "5"; in line 21, after the word "section", strike out "6" and insert "5"; on page 7, line 6, after the word "section", strike out "6" and insert "5"; in line 12, after the word "section", strike out "6" and insert "5"; in line 15, after the word "section", strike out "9" and insert "8"; on page 8, line 14, change the section number from "8" to "7"; in the same line, after the word "States", strike out "Court of Appeals" and insert "District Court"; in line 16, after the word "section", strike out "7" and insert "6"; in line 17, after the word "section", strike out "7" and insert "6"; on page 9, line 3, after the word "section", strike out "7" and insert "6"; at the beginning of line 8, change the section number from "9" to "8"; in the same line, after the word "section", strike out "8" and insert "7"; in line 13, after the word "section", strike out "7" and insert "6"; in line 18, after the word "requires.", insert "If the court affirms the decision reviewed, the petitioner shall be required to pay the costs of such review as determined by the court. The court may require bond or other assurance from the petitioner to assure payment of such costs."; at the beginning of line 23, change the section number from "10" to "9"; in line 24, after the word "to", strike out "section 7 or section 8" and insert "section 6 or section 7"; on page 10, line 4, change the section number from "11" to "10"; in line 5, after the word "to", strike out "grazing uses on" and insert "the occupancy and use of"; in line 6, after "section 1", insert "(except those relating to the authority described in the next sentence)"; in line 10, after the word "the", strike out "grazing use on" and insert "occupancy and use of"; in line 12, after the word "lands", strike out "from grazing"; in line 13, after the word "from", strike out "grazing" and insert "one use"; in line 14, after the word "under", strike out "sections 7, 8, 9" and insert "sections 6, 7, or 8"; in line 17, after the word "section.", insert "Nor shall anything in this act be construed to prevent or restrict any appropriate action with respect to any unauthorized use or occupancy of any such lands, nor to authorize the review under sections 5, 6, 7, or 8 of this act of any such action or decision with respect thereto."; and after line 21, insert:

SEC. 11. In order to obtain the views and recommendations of the various users of the lands described in section 1 and their resources on questions of policy involved in the multiple use of such lands, the Secretary may establish multiple use advisory councils: *Provided, however*, That such councils shall not supersede or perform any of the functions of the advisory boards established under section 18 of the act of April 24, 1950 (16 U. S. C. 580k). Such councils may be established for any unit of such lands, for groups of such units, and for all such lands. In appointing the members of such councils, the Secretary shall give consideration to the recommendations made by the officers of organizations representing the principal interests concerned with the use and administration of such lands, including, but not limited to, grazing, mining, recreation, timber production, watershed conservation, wildlife, and the general public. Such councils may submit recommendations on their own initiative or in response to requests by the Secretary with respect to any question of policy affecting the multiple use of such lands.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall apply to the national forests and lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary is authorized to promote and encourage the construction and maintenance of fences, range water facilities, the undertaking of range reseeding and noxious plant control projects, and other such improvements, upon the Federal lands concerned to the maximum practicable extent by the holders of grazing privileges. As an incentive to make such improvements, the Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with the holders of grazing privileges providing for the construction and maintenance of such improvements and the terms under which the increased grazing capacity resulting from so much of such improvements as are undertaken at the expense of such holders will be made available to such holders.

(b) To further promote and encourage the construction and maintenance of such range improvements the Secretary shall provide by rules and regulations for compensation to such privilege holders or their estates for the loss of the value of such improvements, where such improvements shall have been authorized by the proper governmental agency and where such loss is caused by subsequent governmental action not occasioned either by abandonment or unlawful acts of the privilege holders or by fire, flood, drought, or other disaster which causes injury to the lands or improvements covered by the permit: *Provided*, That in the event such loss is the result of the action of a Federal agency other than the Department of Agriculture or because the Federal lands are needed for or transferred or assigned to another governmental agency for administration such compensation shall be paid by such other agency.

(c) No permit shall be issued which shall entitle a permittee to the use of improvements constructed and owned by a prior permittee until either such prior permittee or his estate has received compensation from the Government in accordance with the provisions of section 2 (b) or the applicant has paid to the prior permittee or his estate the reasonable value of such improvements to be determined under rules and regulations of the Secretary; but no prior permittee who shall have abandoned his permit shall be required to be compensated.

(d) The value of any improvement as determined under subsection (b) or (c) shall not exceed its replacement cost, less a percentage thereof commensurate with the expired portion of its normal life. The normal life of any improvement shall be determined under rules and regulations of the Secretary and shall not exceed 20 years.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall provide by rules and regulations for the terms and conditions under which transfers of grazing privileges may be made. The Secretary, at the time of transfer, shall not make any reduction in the number of permitted livestock solely on the basis that the permit is being transferred.

SEC. 4. Based upon the customary practices of the grazing privilege holders of each locality concerned, the Secretary shall maintain standards as to the kind and extent of lands, waters or ranch or range improvements or any combination thereof, commonly known as base properties, required as a qualification for grazing privileges on the lands to which this act applies.

SEC. 5. (a) Regulations of the Secretary applicable to any occupancy and use of lands described in the first section shall include provisions whereby any action or decision of an officer of the Department with respect to such occupancy and use may, upon request of any person aggrieved by the action or decision, be reviewed. Unless a request for

review is made in accordance with the provisions of such regulations, the action or decision shall be final.

(b) Reviews by the Secretary of decisions of the Chief of the Forest Service with respect to such occupancy and use shall, upon written request to the Secretary, be referred by him to a board consisting of three members. One member of the board shall be an employee of the Department of Agriculture, to be designated by the Secretary from any agency of the Department, except the Forest Service. The second member shall be designated by the person requesting the review. The third member of the board shall be selected by the other two members to represent the general public, but such third member shall not be either an employee of the Federal or any State Government or directly connected with the interest or interests concerned. Should the first two members fail for more than 30 days after their appointment to agree upon a third member, such third member representing the general public shall be appointed by the United States district court for any district in which any of the lands with respect to which the matter in dispute arose are located. Neither the first nor third member shall be a resident of the State in which the lands with respect to which the matter in dispute arose are located. The members of the board shall receive such per diem and actual expenses as may be determined by the Secretary. Hearings shall be held in the State in which the lands with respect to which the matter in dispute arose are located. The board shall consider the case on its merits and furnish its advice and recommendation to the Secretary.

(c) Upon the completion of the review, the Secretary shall render a decision which shall affirm, modify, or reverse the action or decision under review. The decision of the Secretary shall be final unless an appeal therefrom pursuant to section 6 is taken within 60 days from the day on which the decision is announced.

SEC. 6. (a) Any person who is aggrieved by a decision of the Secretary under section 5 may appeal to the Secretary for a review de novo of the action or decision of the officer reviewed under section 5, or of such action or decision as modified or reversed by the decision of the Secretary under such section, by filing a petition therefor within 60 days from the day on which the decision of the Secretary under such section is announced. The petition for appeal shall be in such form and contain such information and allegations as the Secretary, by regulations, shall prescribe. Upon the filing of a petition within the time prescribed in this subsection, the Secretary shall, in accordance with the petition, review de novo the action or decision of the officer reviewed under section 5, or such action or decision as modified or reversed by the Secretary under such section. A formal hearing shall be held, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, in the State in which the lands with respect to which the matter in dispute arose are located. The Secretary shall render a decision affirming, modifying, or reversing the action or decision reviewed under section 5, or such action or decision as modified or reversed by the Secretary under such section. The decision of the Secretary under this section shall, except as provided in section 8, be final.

(b) For the purpose of any hearing provided for in this section, the Secretary or his designated representative is authorized to, and at the request of the appellant shall, take the deposition of any person, and by subpena require any person to appear and testify, or to appear and produce documents, or both, at any named place, before the Secretary or his designated representative, or before the person taking the deposition. The Secretary or his designated representative is also authorized to administer oaths or affirmations to such witnesses. Any deposition may be taken before any person designated by the Secretary or his designated representative and having power to administer oaths.

(c) Witnesses subpenaed under this section shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witnesses in the district courts.

(d) In the case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena served upon, any person, the district court in which such person resides, transacts business, or is found shall upon application by the Secretary, have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony, or to appear and produce documents or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

SEC. 7. The United States district court within whose jurisdiction the formal hearing required by section 6 (a) was held is vested with jurisdiction to review any decision made under the provisions of section 6 (a) provided a petition for that purpose is filed within 60 days from the date of the entry of such decision. Service of process in any such proceedings may be had upon the Secretary by delivering to him a copy of the petition. Within the time prescribed by, and in accordance with the requirements of, rules promulgated by the court, unless the proceeding has been terminated on a motion to dismiss the petition, the Secretary shall file in the office of the clerk the record on review, duly certified, consisting of the pleadings, evidence, and proceedings before the Secretary under section 6, or such portions thereof as such rules shall require to be included in such record, or such portions thereof as the petitioner and the Secretary, with the approval of the court, shall agree upon in writing.

SEC. 8. Petitions filed pursuant to section 7 of this act, unless determined on a motion to dismiss the petition, shall be heard by the court upon the record of the pleadings, evidence adduced, and proceedings before the Secretary. If the court determines that the decision of the Secretary under section 6 is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, it shall remand such proceedings to the Secretary with directions either (a) to make such decision as the court shall determine to be in accordance with law, or (b) to take such further proceedings as in its opinion the law requires. If the court affirms the decision reviewed, the petitioner shall be required to pay the costs of such review as determined by the court. The court may require bond or other assurance from the petitioner to assure payment of such costs.

SEC. 9. The pendency of proceedings instituted pursuant to section 6 or section 7 of this act shall not, unless specifically ordered by the Secretary or the court as the case may be, operate to stay or suspend the application of the decision involved.

SEC. 10. Decisions and rulings by the Secretary with respect to the occupancy and use of the lands described in section 1 (except those relating to the authority described in the next sentence) shall not be reviewed in any manner except as herein provided. Nothing in this act shall be construed to restrict the authority of the Secretary in his discretion to limit or discontinue the occupancy and use of any such lands for the purpose of preventing injury to such lands or to change the use of any such lands from one use to any other authorized use, nor to authorize the review under section 6, 7 or 8 of this act of any action or decision with respect to the powers reserved to the Secretary in this section. Nor shall anything in this act be construed to prevent or restrict any appropriate action with respect to any unauthorized use or occupancy of any such lands, nor to authorize the review under section 5, 6, 7, or 8 of this act of any such action or decision with respect thereto.

SEC. 11. In order to obtain the views and recommendations of the various users of the lands described in section 1 and their resources on questions of policy involved in the multiple use of such lands, the Secretary may establish multiple use advisory councils: *Provided however*, That such councils shall not supersede or perform any of the functions of the advisory boards established under section 18 of the act of April 24, 1950 (16 U. S. C. 580k). Such councils may be established for any unit of such lands, for groups of such units, and for all such lands. In appointing the members of such councils, the Secretary shall give consideration to the recommendations made by the officers of organizations representing the principal interests concerned with the use and administration of such lands, including, but not limited to, grazing, mining, recreation, timber production, watershed conservation, wildlife, and the general public. Such councils may submit recommendations on their own initiative or in response to requests by the Secretary with respect to any question of policy affecting the multiple use of such lands.

SEC. 12. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of this act, shall give full consideration to the safeguarding of all resources and uses made of these lands, including grazing, mining, recreation, timber production, watershed conservation, and wildlife.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee for the splendid work they have done on the bill. I did not raise any objection to the amendment on page 3, but I believe that the language in line 19, on page 3, reading, "The normal life of any improvement shall be determined under rules and regulations of the Secretary and shall not exceed 20 years," does not properly reflect the true condition of depreciation. So I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether, if this subject should be in disagreement between the Senate and the House, the Senator from Vermont will endeavor to work out language which will correctly reflect the depreciated value of the improvements.

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad to say to the Senator from Wyoming that the committee did endeavor to fix a limitation of time during which the cost of any expenditure for improvement might be amortized. It is particularly true in the case of a dam, for instance, that the life of the improvement might be more than 20 years. On the other hand, the Forest Service advised me that it was unlikely any dam of that kind would be involved.

The Forest Service stated it would be very helpful if a limitation of time were provided by the bill. Certain persons interested in wildlife suggested 10 years. Certain stockmen suggested the elimination of any ceiling, and letting the time extend to perhaps 30 or 50 years. The committee felt that 20 years represented a fair length of time during which improvements might be amortized.

There is no intent on the part of the committee to perpetrate an injustice on

anyone. The House may get more information on that point than the Senate was able to obtain. I am sure the Members of the House will advise us if they believe the 20-year period is not correct.

Mr. BARRETT. There is one further point about which I should like to inquire. It refers to drift fences that might be built under the terms of the bill. Assuming that a fence, after about 10 years or so, needed extensive repairs, it might well be that to put the fence in good repair would cost half again its original cost. In the Senator's opinion, would that extend the life of the term of the contract for depreciation purposes?

Mr. AIKEN. It is my opinion that if the fence had lost its value and then by agreement with the Forest Service the permittee built another fence, it might constitute a new contract. However, the Forest Service can now make such arrangements. We are merely trying to write into law and make congressional policy what is now Forest Service policy.

In the hearings we found general satisfaction with the administration of the lands by the Forest Service. No one may go ahead and make improvements on his land without full agreement of the Forest Service in the first place, and included in such agreement would be the length of time during which he might be required to amortize the cost of the improvement.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator. I take it, then, it is the intention of the committee that discretion shall be left with the Forest Service to make supplemental agreements as time goes on, and by doing so they could extend the depreciation period.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think that is a matter to be determined through an agreement with the Forest Service and the permittee. They have been getting along very nicely in most cases. When land has been removed from grazing use to be used for watershed protection or other purposes, the permittee, naturally, has not felt very happy about it. Nevertheless, he has in almost every instance accepted the decision of the Forest Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not desire to delay the passage of the bill. I regret that I have not had an opportunity to study it, though. The fault is mine, and I did not know it was coming up today. So I should like to ask a question about it. As I understand from what I have heard regarding the bill, it provides only for improvements which private users may make on Forest Service land. Is that correct? Or does it go beyond that and give an equity in the land?

Mr. AIKEN. No. It gives no equity in the land to the permittee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It regulates improvements made on Forest Service lands?

Mr. AIKEN. The improvements are made, in the first place, with the approval of the Forest Service.

The Forest Service asked us to include the eradication of noxious plants as one part of the work which the permittee might do. While the Forest Service itself does some work of that kind, the permittee may discover 4 or 5 acres of land covered with Canadian thistles, or some other weeds, and he might want to eradicate them without further delay. With the approval of the Forest Service he could do that work and be credited with the improvement. It would not give him any interest in the land itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He would have no equity at all in the land, and could not sell his permit to run stock on the range.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the permittee had made improvements under agreement with the Forest Service and then, for some reason, the Forest Service decided to use the land for some other purpose, the permittee would be entitled to recover on the undepreciated part of his improvement, would he not?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I will say to my distinguished friend from Colorado that the general purpose of the bill was primarily to provide an incentive for users of grazing areas in the national forests to make improvements which would aid a permittee in managing the range; for instance, to construct drift fences to keep cattle off surrounding areas of the range at certain times of the year, or to improve the springs or water facilities, which might not involve the expenditure of a great deal of money. A man would hesitate before spending very much money to remove brush which is spreading across the grazing area, thereby destroying its use for grazing.

If a rancher wanted to eradicate the brush, either by burning or by some other method, and then to reseed it to grass, and if he went to that expense, he would be certain he would have a right to use the land over a period of 20 years. But let us suppose he passed away, and his widow and children could not carry on, and would have to give up the land. Unless some such provision as this were written into the law, there would be a question as to who would compensate the widow for the expense to which the husband had gone in improving the range. If the improvement of the range is not done by the user, the Forest Service would have to do it, and that, of course, becomes more expensive. Possibly the work would not be done for a long time.

That thought, in part, was behind the language of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then the Senator agrees with me when he says that if the permittee goes to the land and makes improvements he will be guaranteed the use of the land for a period of 20 years.

Mr. THYE. No. I was referring to the maximum value that goes into the improvement. The permittee has no lien or equity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The permittee, then, cannot do anything more with the land, under the bill, than he can at the present time?

Mr. THYE. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and I were delegated by the committee to study the bill and report our findings to the full committee. We suggested most of the amendments recommended by the committee so as to bring the bill more in keeping with what was intended to be accomplished. As has already been stated we sought to write into law much of what was now being done by the Department of Agriculture through rule and regulations. The main purpose of the bill is to encourage range improvements by grazing permittees. They are assured of receiving the benefits of increased grazing capacity resulting from improvements made by themselves. The permittees are protected against loss of their improvements, less depreciation, should the Government take over the lands leased for its own use. They are also allowed to receive payment by subsequent permittees for such improvements as they may undertake. In order to prevent permittees from acquiring continuing interests in improvements on the public range they are permitted to amortize the value of the improvement over a period of 20 years, after the expiration of which period the improvements would have no value for compensation purposes. The bill in no way gives to the permittees a vested right in the public lands.

Mr. THYE. As the Senator from Vermont pointed out, if any fencing or anything else in the nature of improvement is placed on the land, the permittee will have 20 years within which to charge off the cost of the improvement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If he continues to use the land. But if he should die, as the Senator from Minnesota has suggested, and his estate should be liquidated, under this bill, his right to run stock on the reserve could not be sold.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course not, if he should die.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But suppose he should live and wanted to go out of the business.

Mr. AIKEN. He could transfer the right. But it would have to be done with the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think I have the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is the nature of the improvement a man can put on land in order to enable him to retain his rights?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In the past, persons using Forest Service land have been permitted to build fences. I have run livestock on Forest Reserve land. A number of fences were built, and even a pasture in which to keep cattle. That is an old custom. It was done under the supervision of the Forest Service.

But I know there has been an effort made by livestock men to gain an equity or a property right in a permit to run cattle on the Forest Reserve, and I wondered if this bill would provide for that in a modified way.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. I can assure the Senator it does not. It does not give them any vested right at all in the land itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If a rancher builds a fence and then next year, for one reason or another is unable to use it, he ought to have some way of being reimbursed, if the construction had been done with the consent of the Forest Service.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the purpose of the bill, I may say to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill provides for a broadening out, by permitting the development of water holes, for example?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And to fight obnoxious weeds?

Mr. AIKEN. In certain areas of the range country, it was desired to undertake some reseeding, while in other areas reseeding would not be effective. That would be determined by the Forest Service. The rancher can do nothing that is not authorized by the Forest Service, under the contract with the Forest Service; but the bill will provide assurance that if he develops the range under agreement with the Forest Service, and then he should be killed a week later, his widow will not lose everything.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think those are fine objectives. I am glad they are being put in the statute. However, I am surprised that any legislation is needed, because the Forest Service has the authority to do all these things, and it has done all of them, except perhaps to conduct the fight against obnoxious weeds; and it has done that to some extent.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I may say to the Senator from Colorado that in his State we met with the ranchers, and also met with the representatives of the Forest Service and with the Secretary of Agriculture. We spent a very informative and profitable day in the range area, in the Senator's own State. We even looked for the Senator, and regretted that he could not have been with us at the time we visited his State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I regret that I was not able to be present. Colorado has 12 very large forest reserves, and this bill is a matter of great importance to Colorado. I also knew that a great many of the ranchers were trying to establish an equity which they could sell on the market or which they would be authorized to use, and which they would be assured they could use over a long period of time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have received objections from persons in Michigan who are interested in conservation, so I wish to ask this question: Is there any prescriptive right possible under the bill? After occupying the land for a period of years, is it possible for one to acquire any prescriptive rights to title, or clear rights to compensation, less depreciation?

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill gives no permittee the right to acquire any of the real estate. What the bill is intended to accomplish is provided in section 2, subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) and, I believe, subsection (a) spells out the main purpose of the measure and that is "to give assurance to a permittee that he will receive the benefits of the increased grazing capacity resulting from improvements made by him."

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, if the permittee seeded the range——

Mr. ELLENDER. He would be protected.

Mr. FERGUSON. He has some rights. Suppose the Forest Service desired to cancel his rights. Could it cancel them and compensate the rancher for his improvements?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, should the Government decide to use the land compensation would then be made to the permittee, less any depreciation.

Let us assume that a fence has been built on the public domain through an agreement between a permittee and the Forest Service, and the fence has been used for 3 years. Let us assume further that the rate of depreciation agreed upon was 10 percent a year. That would be 30 percent of the cost.

If the Federal Government desired to take over the lands under lease for its own use, then it would be obligated, under the bill, simply to compensate the person who built the fence for 70 percent of its cost.

Mr. FERGUSON. Suppose the fence were built, but was of no value; that the permittee had made a mistake such as many persons sometimes make, and even the rancher and the Department of Agriculture came to the conclusion that instead of its being of benefit, it was a detriment to the range.

Would the Government still be required to pay 70 percent of the cost?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. If a permittee should fail to obtain any benefit on the property because of a mistake on his part and he abandons any improvements made by him it would be his loss. In other words, if he should fail in his venture he could not make the Government pay for his improvements.

Mr. AIKEN. A permittee could not install any improvements without the approval of the Forest Service.

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, he must first get the approval of the Forest Service?

Mr. AIKEN. He must first enter into an agreement with the Forest Service.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Forest Service would determine whether the proposed improvement would or would not be a benefit?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. The Forest Service at all times can reduce the number of stock to be grazed on a certain area.

Mr. FERGUSON. A permittee would not be entitled to compensation if it were decided that he should run 50 head of stock instead of 100 head?

Mr. AIKEN. The Forest Service has a right to make such a determination.

Mr. FERGUSON. And a permittee would not get compensation if he were required to make a reduction in the number?

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the bill make very clear that no vested right can be gained by a permittee?

Mr. ELLENDER. It does.

Mr. AIKEN. It is absolutely clear, and it is the firm intention of the committee, that no one shall acquire any vested rights in any of the property.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As the Senator from Vermont knows, the original legislation was sought by the ranchers. Perhaps the father or the grandfather of this bill was a bill which provided that a rancher might be able to secure a vested right in forest land. Then he could improve it and operate it just as thought it were his own. He could sell it to anyone he wished, or he could use it as long as he wished.

However, that has been abandoned, and all that is being done is to formalize the type of improvements a permittee can place on the land, and the Forest Service can reduce the size of his herds or permit increases in them, just as it can now.

Mr. AIKEN. Just as it can do now; yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is a great deal of competition, as the Senator knows.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. From the hearings held in Colorado and in other Western States, it appears there is considerable competition for the right to run cattle on the forest lands. That privilege is much sought after. I assume the Forest Service will be in complete control of the lands, as it has been heretofore.

Mr. AIKEN. I cannot too strongly state that to be the fact. The Forest Service will be in complete control of regulating the number of cattle to be run on the land, and will be deprived of no rights and no functions whatever by the proposed legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have one more question, and then I shall not interrupt further.

Does the proposed legislation meet with the complete approval of the Forest Service?

Mr. AIKEN. Absolutely, it does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Did any witnesses who were opposed to the bill appear before the committee?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. There were several who opposed the original provisions of the bill. I think most of the objections have been reconciled.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. By amendments?

Mr. AIKEN. The committee had a great deal of assistance from persons representing the conservation and wildlife interests. I wish particularly to mention Hugh Woodward, of Albuquerque, and a Mr. Smart, from, I think, Salt Lake City. There were others whose names I cannot recall now. All of them were very helpful, indeed, in pointing out provisions of the bill which could be improved.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I may say to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Colorado, that we studied range improvement in Colorado. The whole intent of the bill is to try to help the Forest Service and those in charge of public grazing to obtain better management of the grazing area, and to allow the building of drift fences and to keep cattle on the lower ranges at certain times of the year, and then on the higher ranges as the season progresses.

The entire purpose of the bill is to have the user given the incentive to make improvements, because he can make improvements cheaper than the Government can, for the reason that the user may have his crew available at certain times of the year and be able to build or repair fences, whereas for the Forest Service to do so would require the use of a whole detachment of men, trucks, and other facilities of that nature.

The entire thought was to improve the method of handling the grazing area of the range, and I think an excellent bill has been produced to do exactly that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It would appear that this will be good legislation, and I thank the members of the committee for giving me the information which they have. I regret that I had not carefully studied the bill previously.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee or the chairman of the full committee a few questions relative to the proposed legislation. First, why was section 5 of the bill deleted? This section called for a comprehensive economic study for the purpose of obtaining information necessary to establish a method for determining grazing fees on the lands described in section 1, which would take into consideration all relevant facts and circumstances. It provided that within 2 years the Secretary of Agriculture would make a report.

Mr. AIKEN. Section 5 was originally an offspring of a conservation bill which was referred to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the House, and provided for a study of the public lands, with a view to fixing proper rates for grazing purposes.

But the bill now under consideration refers only to forest lands. Lower rates by far are charged for lands under the Interior Department. Both the Forest Service and the Department of Interior have full authority to make such a study, if they have the money with which to do it. It is presumed it will cost about $200,000, as I recall the estimate.

In our report we are recommending to the Committee on Appropriations that they make the money available for a comprehensive survey not only of forest lands but of the lands under the Interior Department as well. We felt that to make a survey only of the Forest Service lands, which at the present time represent approximately three times the grazing fees per animal unit that the Interior Department lands do, would of itself not prove anything at all. So we are recommending to the Committee on Appropriations that it provide funds for a survey of all the public lands where grazing is permitted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So, in effect, the intent behind the recommendation of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will be the same as in the deleted section 5, to wit, that grazing fees will be raised if the study proves an increase to be necessary?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. We felt section 5 itself would not go very far in that it would apply only to certain lands which are particularly well administered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The assurance of the chairman of the committee is good enough for me.

Mr. AIKEN. So we recommend that this study be made of the Bureau of Land Management lands, as well as national forest and Bankhead-Jones lands.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is a strong recommendation, I assume?

Mr. AIKEN. It is as strong as we could make it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask one more question. Why have the activities of the multiple-use advisory councils been reduced from considering all questions relative to Forest Service lands to a limited number of such questions?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think they have been. There has been no legislative authority for the use of multiple-use advisory councils up to this time. The Department of Agriculture has used them, but they have been strictly informal, and so we are giving them statutory being.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will they be consulted on all matters affecting the use of Forest Service lands?

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator wish me to read section 11, which pertains to his question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Section 11, on page 10 of the bill, reads:

> In order to obtain the views and recommendations of the various users of the lands described in section 1—

They are the Forest Service and the Bankhead-Jones lands.

> SEC. 11. In order to obtain the views and recommendations of the various users of the lands described in section 1 and their resources on questions of policy involved in the multiple use of such lands, the Secretary may establish multiple use advisory councils: *Provided, however*, That such councils shall not supersede or perform any of the functions of the advisory boards established under section 18 of the act of April 24, 1950.

That is the Thye-Granger Act.

> Such councils may be established for any unit of such lands, for groups of such units, and for all such lands. In appointing the members of such councils, the Secretary shall give consideration to the recommendations made by the officers of organizations representing the principal interests concerned with the use and administration of such lands, including, but not limited to, grazing, mining, recreation, timber production, watershed conservation, wildlife, and the general public. Such councils may submit recommendations on their own initiative or in response to requests by the Secretary with respect to any question of policy affecting the multiple use of such lands.

That provision gives the multiple use councils official recognition for the first time. They have been used up to now, but only on an informal basis.

Some persons thought provision should be made for per diem fees and expenses; but it seemed to the committee that to do so would simply invite an opening of the gates. Every Member of the Senate knows what such an invitation would mean. It is possible that on a regional or a national basis the Secretary might desire the advice of a multiple use council. It is my understanding that if such provision were made, members of the council could be put on a consulting basis, and transportation and other expenses could be paid. We felt that in each community people interested in recreation, wildlife, grazing, forestry, and so forth, would be willing to contribute their services, just as they do now on an informal basis. The bill does not go so far as some persons would like to go, and I think it goes a little further than some would like to go. To the committee as a whole, however, what is provided seems like a very good step.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Vermont that, in my opinion, it would be advisable to set up the multiple use councils, which were just mentioned, on a local basis rather than a regional basis, because many times consulting fees run up to a high figure. I should like to see a continuation of the practice which is in effect at the present time. While I realize the bill will give statutory legality to the councils, nevertheless, discretion rests in the Secretary of Agriculture, as I read the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. The bill takes nothing away from those who would like to employ multiple use councils.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the committee did not try to do away with the use of the multiple use councils; we tried to dignify the councils by naming them in the law, in the event a controversy arose and there was a need for a council to give consideration to any problem. We dignified the council by having it provided for in the law, but we hoped the use of the councils would be on the same basis on which they have been employed in the past. I do not believe the committee has

deprived the councils of any function; we have made the councils more dignified by referring to them in the law.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am pleased to note that the chairman of the subcommittee which handled the legislation can give the Senate that assurance. What I have in mind is that I hope the Secretary will not take the word "may" too literally, but that he will consult with the advisory councils so that all interests in the forest lands can be given proper consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment. If no further amendment is to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2548) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to facilitate the administration of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; and for other purposes."

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending bill is the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

THE GRAIN-STORAGE PROBLEM

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] discussed the grain-storage problem at some length last week. His remarks were included in the RECORD of February 25.

The fact that there are large surpluses of some grains and other farm commodities is, of course, more important at the moment than the question of how they happened to be acquired. Nevertheless, I think it should be pointed out that this administration inherited no small part of these surpluses. They were built up even further during 1953 as a result of decisions made by the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, in 1952. In fairness to Secretary Benson, it should be made very clear that he had no voice in the decision to permit unlimited planting of the 1953 crops of wheat and cotton.

It was Mr. Brannan who determined that there should be no acreage controls. Shortly before leaving office he actually called upon farmers to increase their 1953 acreage of corn.

As soon as he possibly could do so under the law, Secretary Benson moved to prevent further pileups of these three major crops. The surpluses we have on hand are not of his making.

At the same time this administration has gone forward during the last year with the most comprehensive program ever devised to encourage expansion of the Nation's grain-storage facilities. It already has set in motion—well in advance of the marketing of the 1954 crops—an enlarged plan to meet this year's storage needs.

This administration is solving the storage problem with a six-point program which includes:

First. A guaranteed-occupancy plan, with the Commodity Credit Corporation contracting to reimburse commercial and cooperative warehouse operators in the event that actual usage of newly constructed storage facilities falls below specified levels. Net applications accepted to date indicate that more than 200 million bushels of new space will be added under this program.

Second. Direct loans to farmers for construction of bins and cribs. This resulted in the construction of 30 million bushels of storage space on farms during 1953. A companion program made loans available to farmers for the purchase of ventilators, fans, and other drying equipment.

Third. A rapid tax amortization plan, approved by Congress in 1953, permitting farmers and commercial warehousemen to charge off the construction cost of new facilities over a 5-year period.

Fourth. An increase of 96 million bushels in the Commodity Credit Corporation's ownership of storage facilities during 1953.

Fifth. An emergency storage plan under which 305 ships of the reserve fleet are being used to store 68 million bushels of grain.

Sixth. Emergency loans on wheat stored on the ground and in temporary structures at harvest time, as well as special loans on rust-damaged wheat.

This six-point program has made it possible to meet the storage problem thus far.

The guaranteed occupancy plan, together with the individual loans to farmers and the rapid tax amortization, give farmers, co-ops, and commercial warehouse operators the greatest incentives ever offered to increase grain storage facilities. Emphasis has been placed primarily upon encouraging the expansion of storage by farmers and commercial handlers of grain, rather than by the Government itself.

On February 25, the very day when the Senator from Iowa was expressing criticism, Mr. Benson had issued a warning about the possible storage squeeze this year. The Secretary called for cooperation by farmers and all others in getting ready to meet it, and he reviewed the many aids available.

Again—on last Friday, March 5—Secretary Benson announced additional storage program steps for this year. He has called a special meeting at Omaha, Nebr., for March 18. At this meeting, the whole grain storage situation will be reviewed with farmers and others from all grain-producing areas, and plans will be made for further aggressive and coordinated attacks on the whole storage problem. I hope to attend this meeting.

The farmers and storage men of the country know that the present administration is doing an outstanding job of helping to assure the storage which will protect 1954 crops and make the established price supports work as fully as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the grain storage statements issued on February 25 and March 5 by the Secretary of Agriculture be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY BENSON WARNS ABOUT STORAGE AND URGES FARMERS TO PLAN EARLY

WASHINGTON, February 24, 1954.—Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today warned of the danger of serious storage problems this year and urged farmers to make plans now to help assure adequate storage facilities.

"Continued big production, encouraged by high price supports, has built up tremendous supplies of major commodities," Secretary Benson pointed out. "Storage facilities had to be stretched to the limit, and supplemented in many cases, in order to handle 1953 crops.

"With normal weather this spring and summer, the storage problem can be even more acute in 1954. The carryover of old supplies—before this year's harvests—will be at all-time record levels for the two leading grain crops. The wheat carryover is now expected to be above 800 million bushels, as compared with 562 million bushels last year. The corn carryover is expected to be around 900 million bushels, as compared with 769 million in 1953.

"The size of this year's crop will, of course, be a determining factor, but it is obvious that the storage situation can be very serious—especially in areas of heaviest concentration of supplies.

"The effectiveness of price-support programs for storage commodities depends very directly on the availability of adequate storage. The regular price-support loans cannot be extended to farmers unless their commodities are housed in satisfactory storage—either on the farm or in commercial facilities.

"The Department of Agriculture did everything possible to assist the expansion of both farm and commercial storage facilities in 1953. It will continue this vigorous help this year. The final responsibility, however, rests with farmers themselves. They should anticipate their requirements and make plans immediately to see that adequate storage space is available when they need it. We will help in every practicable way."

The Secretary called attention to the following specific types of assistance which the Federal Government is making available to farmers to help them expand storage facilities on their own farms, in addition to special steps to increase commercial space:

Farm storage-facility loans: Commodity Credit Corporation loans for financing new storage construction are available to farmers through local banks or direct from the local county agricultural stabilization and conservation committee. These loans, which can run up to 80 percent of the cost of the new storage facilities in most States, can be paid off over a 4-year period. The loans, at 4 percent interest, are available until June 30, 1954, and are intended to supplement local credit services when for any reason normal lending-agency credit is not available. Last year around 30 million bushels of farm-storage capacity was added under this program.

Storage-equipment loans: Commodity Credit Corporation loans are also available

to farmers for financing the purchase of drying equipment for the conditioning of storable crops. The drying equipment includes mobile mechanical dryers, air circulators, ventilators, tunnels, and fans. The loans, which are available until June 30, 1954, through the same local sources as the storage loans, can be used to meet up to 75 percent of the delivered and assembled cost of the equipment. They are payable in three annual installments, or earlier, at the option of the borrower. The interest rate is 4 percent a year. The loans are intended to assist farmers who need this additional financial help in getting and maintaining their crops in the proper storage conditions required for CCC commodity loans.

Income-tax amortization deductions: Public Law 287, 83d Congress, section 206, signed by the President August 15, 1953, provides an amortization deduction for grain-storage facilities. Under this provision the Federal income-tax payer may elect to amortize over a period of 60 months the depreciable cost of grain-storage facilities constructed after December 31, 1952. The amortization provision also applies to alteration or remodeling of a grain-storage structure that increases the capacity of the structure for grain storage. Eligible storage facilities include any corncrib, grain bin, or grain elevator, or any similar structure suitable primarily for the storage of grain, or any public grain warehouse permanently equipped for receiving, elevating, conditioning, and loading out grain. No application for the deduction is required: The decision by the taxpayer to take the deduction can be announced simply by a statement to that effect in his Federal income-tax return for the taxable year in which the storage structure is completed.

In addition, the following programs and special aids are available to encourage increases in elevator and warehouse space for use by farmers and others as needed:

Guaranteed occupancy of new warehouse storage: Under this program, the CCC contracts to make payments to warehousemen in the event that occupancy of approved new storage construction falls below specified levels over a period of 5 or 6 years, depending on the plan the warehouseman elects. The program is designed to encourage new construction by responsible commercial firms in areas where additional storage facilities are needed. As of February 13, 1954 applications totaling more than 293 million bushels of new storage capacity had been tentatively approved by the Department. Cancellations and withdrawals by applicants of previously accepted applications totaled approximately 85 million bushels, leaving a net total of acceptances of more than 208 million bushels. The new construction will be principally available for farmers' use, with CCC stocks to be used largely as needed to maintain the guaranteed levels of occupancy.

Income-tax amortization deductions: The Federal income tax deductions for amortization over a period of 60 months of the depreciable cost of new grain storage facilities applies to commercial and cooperative storage elevators and warehouses as well as to farm storage structures.

Expanded CCC bin sites: During the past year the CCC has awarded contracts for the purchase of 16,520 grain storage structures—with a total capacity of approximately 96,211,600 bushels—for erection at CCC bin-sites in Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. This brings CCC bin-site storage capacity, which is used when adequate commercial storage is not available, to a total of approximately 640 million bushels. By storing a large part of its own holdings of corn at these Corn Belt bin-sites, CCC removes this quantity of grain from competition for available farm and commercial storage in these areas.

Emergency ship grain storage: During the past year the CCC made arrangements with the United States Maritime Administration for the emergency storage of grain in 125 ships of the Maritime Administration's Reserve Fleet. These ships—75 at Jones Point, N. Y., and 50 on the James River—have provided storage for approximately 28 million bushels of wheat. Preparations have been completed for the use of an additional 180 ships this year, consisting of 130 ships in the Pacific Northwest and 50 additional ships on the James River. These additions will provide CCC with new emergency ship storage for approximately 40 million bushels of grain, thus opening up an equal quantity of commercial storage for use by farmers and other commercial users.

SECRETARY BENSON ANNOUNCES NEW STORAGE AIDS; CALLS CONFERENCE AT OMAHA MARCH 18

WASHINGTON, March 5, 1954.—Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today announced additional action in the United States Department of Agriculture's broad program to help assure adequate grain storage facilities to handle the big supplies expected this year, and to make it possible for farmers to take full advantage of the established price support programs:

1. A special reseaIing program will encourage farmers to hold 1953-crop loan and purchase agreement stocks of seven commodities on the farm for another year, instead of turning them over to the Commodity Credit Corporation this summer. The seven commodities are: Corn, wheat, oats, barley, grain sorghums, rye, and flaxseed.

2. Farm storage facility and equipment loan programs, under which farmers can borrow a large part of the cost of building or buying additional storage space and drying equipment, will be continued for another year.

3. A national grain storage conference will be held at Omaha, Nebr., on Thursday, March 18, to review the whole storage situation and make further plans for a coordinated and aggressive attack upon storage-shortage problems in all areas.

"With average weather, 1954 production—added to all-time record carryovers of former crops—can mean the most serious storage problems we have ever faced," Secretary Benson said in commenting on today's announcement. "We met the situation last year by stretching facilities to the limit and offering many special aids to increase available storage. We are determined to do everything possible again this year to see that the big supplies can be handled and that farmers will be in position to use the price-support loan and purchase agreement programs fully. By starting emergency measures early in the season, we are confident that, with full cooperation, the storage problems can be met satisfactorily."

Department of Agriculture officials point out that the extent of the storage problems ahead will be determined largely by the size of 1954 production. On the basis of average expectancy, however, they think the total supply of grains and oil seeds after harvest this year may be from 300 to 500 million bushels greater than a year ago. In terms of storage needs, some of this anticipated increase in total supplies can be offset by increases in storage capacity already scheduled.

Storage shortages in some areas of concentrated supply may be more severe than the overall national situation, and relatively serious problems can be expected in all heavy grain producing regions if yields are normal. Other special problems will center around the big volume of 1953-crop price support loan and purchase agreement stocks which CCC will probably have to take over at the end of the program year.

Referring to the seriousness of the storage situation, James A. McConnell, Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Service, said, "Never before in history has this Nation or any other nation been faced with the problem of handling, storing, and keeping in good usable condition such a vast amount of grain. It will require the utmost teamwork on the part of farmers, the grain trade, and the Department of Agriculture. The very heart of the price-support program is storage. Storage on the farm, storage in the country, and terminal storage—all must be brought into play. The more storage farmers provide, the better chance the individual farmer has of getting full benefits."

Under a reseaIing program which was available last year for loan stocks of three 1952 crops—corn, wheat, and oats—a considerable quantity of grain was held on the farm. The new and broadened program covers four additional crops. Farmers who reseal 1953 stocks this year will earn storage payments in line with 1954 Uniform Grain Storage Agreement rates.

The Department of Agriculture will urge farmers to use the new re-seal program, holding the grain themselves for another year and helping to solve mutual storage problems. It is expected that the quantity of grain re-sealed will be far greater than a year ago. Details of the new re-seal program, and the States where it will apply for the different commodities, will be announced in the near future.

The farm storage facility loans, which are being extended for another year beyond June 30, offer farmers up to 80 percent of the cost of new storage facilities in most States. The loans, which carry 4-percent interest, can be paid off over a 4-year period. A net increase of about 30 million bushels of on-farm storage capacity was financed under these loans in 1953.

The storage equipment loans, also extended for another year beyond June 30, offer up to 75 percent of the delivered and assembled cost of ventilators, fans, and other drying equipment needed to keep stored crops in proper condition. They also carry 4-percent interest, and can be paid off in three annual installments.

The grain-storage conference at Omaha will be attended by administrative officials of the Department of Agriculture and by representatives from grain-producing States. These will include representatives of the extension services of State agricultural colleges, State agricultural stabilization and conservation committees, State departments of agriculture and markets, farm and commodity organizations, and warehouse, feed manufacture, storage supply, and related business and cooperative services.

Facts on the probable storage situation, for different crops and in different regions, will be presented at the conference. Plans will also be made for cooperative efforts, on a State-by-State basis, to do everything necessary to meet the expected storage problems.

In addition to the new storage action announced today, a broad program of other aids and services is in effect. These include:

A "guaranteed occupancy" program to encourage construction of new warehouse and elevator facilities, under which the current net of application acceptances calls for an increase of about 200 million bushels of capacity.

Special income tax features (similar to those authorized for defense plant amortization) under which the cost of new farm or commercial storage facilities can be amortized over a period of 5 years.

Emergency ship storage, for use in holding Commodity Credit Corporation grain stocks in order to relieve regular storage facilities. A total of 305 ships from the Reserve fleet, on both the east and west coasts, can house about 68 million bushels of grain.

CCC bins which are used to store Government-owned grain when commercial facilities are not available, thus freeing storage space for the new crops. CCC owns such bins with a total capacity of about 640 million bushels, of which 96 million bushels were added in 1953.

Decisions on whether it will be necessary to acquire more CCC bin capacity, to meet emergency needs this year, will be made later as the situation develops.

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATING SUBSIDIES UNDER THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936, AS AMENDED

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, in view of the almost complete—and, to my mind, thoroughly tragic—lack of understanding of the purposes of, and the vital need for, the American Merchant Marine, I desire to call to the attention of both Congress and the general public a few facts and opinions, gleaned from an official Government report which has just come to hand.

This report, styled "Analysis of Construction and Operating Subsidies Under Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as Amended," was submitted by the Ocean Shipping Panel of the Transportation Council for the Department of Commerce. The panel is composed of top executives of leading American shipping lines. Based on a study by the panel, the report in question was submitted at the request of the Under Secretary of Commerce in charge of transportation, Robert B. Murray, Jr.

Laid down at the very outset of the report, as a basic premise, is a conclusion to the effect that—

> There is a general agreement that we need an adequate and balanced American merchant marine. The authorities appear unanimous, and assign two compelling reasons: (a) The national defense requirements and (b) the economic advantages.

Heading the authorities on these points is listed President Eisenhower. In a statement issued on October 3, 1952, the President declared:

> In 1944, from London, I said, "When final victory is ours, there is no organization that will share its credit more deservedly than the American merchant marine." We were caught flatfooted in both world wars because we relied too much upon foreign owned and operated shipping to carry our cargoes abroad and to bring critically needed supplies to this country. America's industrial prosperity and military security both demand that we maintain a privately operated merchant marine adequate in size and of modern design to insure that our lines of supply for either peace or war will be safe. I consider the merchant marine to be our fourth arm of defense and vital to the stability and expansion of our foreign trade.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues Senators to note carefully the President's undisguised warning against dependence upon foreign shipping in time of emergency. This dangerous doctrine, advanced under the former administration, is readvocated in the report recently made to the President by the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy. In the report, generally known as the Randall Commission report, "availability of foreign vessels" and "the importance to the balance of payments of foreign maritime nations of their dollar earnings from shipping services" are reasons urged for consideration in the determination of the active merchant fleet requirements of the United States.

Against this recommendation are the findings of the Department of Commerce with respect to our experience in World War II and in Korea, as reported by the former Secretary of Commerce to the President on November 1, 1952.

The Secretary's report declared:

> World War II and Korea dispel any doubts which might have existed prior to that time as to this country's reliance upon our merchant marine in assuring its national security. Ships are as much materials of war as guns and airplanes, and no world power can depend entirely upon foreign nations to supply it with the sinews of war. It is elementary that our military plans still are governed largely by the availability of shipping.

Mr. President, in this connection it might well be noted that our country paid more than $100,000,000 to Great Britain for temporary use of the passenger ships *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth* to transport United States troops across the Atlantic in World War II. Under the type of long-range programing which all who are interested in the merchant marine believe is necessary to assure national security, the Government could assure itself, at this cost, of two ultramodern troop ships of the *United States* class for immediate use in time of emergency. Further, without such long-range programing of passenger and cargo-ship construction, there can be no assurance that an adequate number of vessels of either type will be available and ready at hand if and when the need for them should arise again.

A vital point made in the Commerce Department's recent ocean shipping panel report that merits the thoughtful attention of Senators and citizenry alike has to do with cost—and results—of war-built ship construction as against an orderly year-to-year replacement program based upon well-considered passenger, dry cargo and tanker needs.

Noting that the Shipping Act of 1916 was designed chiefly to meet the shipping needs of World War I, the report states:

> As time did not permit a rebuilding of privately-owned merchant marine the act authorized the Government to buy, build, and operate an American-flag merchant fleet. We paid heavily for the prior neglect of shipping, the cost to the Government for shipbuilding during 1916–20 being almost $2½ billion.

Here let me remind my colleagues that the Commerce Department report of November 1, 1952, on the Merchant Marine and the Federal Tax Policy, adds the crushing commentary that the World War I shipbuilding program, the cost of which it placed at more than $3 billion produced 2,300 ships, but none of them were actually delivered until after the Armistice.

Immediately pertinent to the foregoing is the statement by the former Secretary of Commerce, in the above-mentioned November 1, 1952, report, concerning what he termed the shipping impasse before this country's entrance into World War I.

> The ships of foreign nations, carrying about 90 percent of the American foreign trade, were withdrawn from normal operations—

According to this report—

> and the American economy was cut off from foreign raw materials and American export trade was left high and dry.

Is there any assurance that we shall not be left high and dry again in future emergencies, if, despite the warning of our President and of high military leaders who have testified before our Senate subcommittee as to the utter necessity of an adequate Merchant Marine to supplement the American Navy, we delude ourselves into again placing such dependence upon possible allies?

We have seen, then, that shipbuilding costs in World War I were either 2½ billions or more than 3 billions depending upon which set of figures we prefer, and the results, as least so far as the war itself is concerned, were nil. Not a single ship was delivered until after the Armistice.

Turning now to World War II, what do we find? The Commerce Department Report of November 1952 puts it this way:

> As a result (of the costly shipbuilding program during World War I) the United States in the early 1920's had a sizable merchant fleet available. The result of the failure to maintain this fleet with new and modern replacements, as well as our inability to rely on foreign shipping for our national security, is clearly evidenced by the gigantic shipbuilding program which we were forced to undertake in World War II. In spite of the creation of an international pool of shipping then, it was still necessary for the United States to undertake that tremendous and unprecedented ship construction program without which World War II could not have been won.

During the 3-year period, 1942 through 1944, the Secretary placed total expenditures for cargo ships at 7 percent of all munitions spending, or $10.5 billion. In this connection, the report made this point clear:

> The importance of shipping to this country in time of war was thus again demonstrated * * * At the beginning of World War II, this country had some ships and shipyards. Had it not, there is grave doubt whether completely new ships and shipyards could have been built and operated in time. We can stockpile ships but we can't stockpile skills and industrial organization.

As a result of total expenditures of more than $12 billion for shipbuilding during World War II, the American merchant marine at the beginning of 1953 was declared by the ocean shipping panel to be the largest in the Nation's history.

But there are several unfavorable aspects of the situation which the panel emphasizes in its report.

The danger of block obsolescence is one of these problems. The present tonnage, the panel reminds us, is about 83 percent war built, and thus will become obsolescent in a block in the period from 1962 to 1966. This applies principally to the dry cargo ships, which are

90 percent warbuilt. Of the total of 13 million tons of shipping on hand last year only 9 percent is postwar, and thus relatively modern.

Going more into detail on this point, the panel report says that—

About 75 percent of the Government's standby fleet, which represents the second line of national defense, is commercially obsolete. Composed as it is, predominantly of Liberty ships, it will have only limited utility for national defense purposes a few years hence.

Concerning subsidies, the report makes one statement which should be borne in mind by every Member of Congress and every citizen. It is simply this:

The operating-differential subsidy under the provisions of the 1936 act is the only subsidy paid by the Government that is subject to recapture by the Government.

In this connection, and particularly because the controversy over the amount of construction-differential subsidy paid for the building of the steamship *United States* may have left some of our people under a false impression, it is well to quote a few figures from the panel's analysis.

For the 14 years ending December 1, 1951, the net construction-differential subsidies paid on American ship construction was $88 million plus, or an average of $6,300,000 per annum.

Net operating-differential payments, for the same 14-year period, were $147 million. Exclusive of the 1943–46 period during which subsidy payments were suspended, the net annual cost to the Government for operating-differential payments was $14.7 million.

This net total of some $21 million annual payments in behalf of a strong merchant marine compares with average annual subsidy payments to all industry of almost $1 billion yearly. This is for an industry whose operations in the field of foreign commerce have assisted perhaps more than any other single industry in achieving that "extra" measure of business activity which has been so largely responsible for raising the American standard of living so far beyond the world level of living.

That yearly net total of payments to keep alive an industry that is alike indispensable in peace and war compares most favorably with the $20 million of foreign aid paid to Germany and Japan annually during the last 3 years to help revive their merchant marines—which, incidentally, have increased by leaps and bounds during this period while the American merchant marine has declined.

Why should our merchant marine suffer a decline, some will ask, while German and Japanese shipping booms? The answer goes to the heart of the problems of American shipping in competition with that of the rest of the world.

According to figures presented in the report of the Commerce Department ocean-shipping panel, monthly wages of an American-flag vessel during 1952 totaled $24,500, against $4,100 under Japanese registry, and $5,100 under German registry.

This is only one phase of ship operation showing such divergence in costs. Crew subsistence, stores, supplies and equipment, maintenance and repair work, and marine insurance costs likewise are vastly higher in American ship operations because of higher living standards here, tighter safety regulations, and other factors.

Unfortunately, the report of the ocean-shipping panel to the Transportion Council for the Department of Commerce will necessarily have limited distribution. For this reason and because, also, there seems to be so little general interest concerning the American merchant marine I am afraid the findings, conclusions, and recommendations therein will not normally receive the serious attention and thought they deserve. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the conclusions and recommendations contained in the "Analysis of Construction and Operating Subsidies Under Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as Amended, Submitted by the Ocean Shipping Panel to the Transportation Council for the Department of Commerce."

There being no objection, the conclusions and recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCLUSIONS

(A) A strong and modern merchant marine is essential to the foreign commerce and the national defense of the United States.

(B) Large economic advantages flow from the existence of such merchant marine.

(C) Such marine cannot be maintained without some form of equalization of the high American costs and low foreign costs of shipbuilding and ship operation.

(D) The parity principles of the 1936 act are sound and have worked well in practice.

(E) Under its provisions and those of the Merchant Ship Sales Act, 1946, this Nation has attained the best and most modern merchant marine in its history.

(F) The administration of the act is improving, but requires further improvement, particularly as to prompt payments of operating differentials and consistency of policy.

(G) The costs of ship subsidies have been modest, and have been justified by the war services rendered and peacetime benefits produced.

(H) The American merchant marine is facing keener competition from foreign-flag ships.

(I) Foreign discriminations against American-flag ships are being felt.

(J) The competition from MSTS ships is a serious threat to the American merchant marine.

(K) A large part of the American merchant marine will become obsolete en bloc in 1962–66. The problem of ship replacement is great, particularly in view of increased costs.

(L) The Government's reserve fleet is fast becoming obsolete, and many of the deficiencies in our present military needs may be overcome by upgrading the present reserve fleet.

(M) American shipyards face a slack period between 1955 and 1962.

(N) The controversies and uncertainties as to allowance of construction differential subsidy operate as an impediment to shipbuilding programs.

(O) A realistic program of trade-ins is required to achieve the following objectives: (1) An immediate stimulus to shipbuilding; (2) an advance replacement of vessels, particularly those subject to block obsolescence; and (3) an upgrading of the Government's reserve fleet.

(P) A fleet of dry-cargo bulk carriers is a necessary part of the American merchant marine.

(Q) A consistent Government policy toward its merchant marine is essential.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I. The 1936 act

The 1936 act should be steadfastly supported as the foundation of American maritime policy.

II. Military requirements and the reserve fleet

The Department of Defense has estimated that the total civilian and military requirements for merchant-type shipping in the event of the outbreak of war will exceed the available capacity of the American merchant marine by the following numbers of ships: (1) 165 cargo vessels (in addition to the Mariners) having characteristics of the present-day C–2's and C–3's, but faster and having improved cargo handling gear and other special features; (2) 6 passenger vessels having design characteristics of the P–2; and (3) 43 large tankers, equivalent to the T–5 class.

In making this projection the Department of Defense has also stated that:

"The number and type of vessels in the active national defense fleet which can be gainfully employed in the conduct of normal peacetime commerce appears to be a matter which is controlled by the national economy and foreign commerce."

This recognizes that Government aid to shipping must be limited to the number of ships that can be commercially operated at a profit. To go beyond that limit would ignore the law of diminishing returns and result in an excessive expenditure of public funds.

The military objective fixed by the Department of Defense is far in excess of the commercial requirements of the merchant marine. To avoid uneconomical and wasteful dissipation of the resources of the United States, we believe that this military objective must be compromised in a realistic and practical manner. National-defense requirements provide a temptation to operate as large a number of vessels as possible under the American flag. However, in our national planning ordinary commercial needs must be integrated into the national-defense requirements in the most economical manner consistent with the national safety. We believe that this integration will be best effectuated at the least cost to the American taxpayer by having (A) a first-class active commercial fleet under private ownership, and (B) a high-quality reserve fleet maintained by the Government.

Maintenance of approximately 500 C-type and Victory vessels as a reserve fleet in ready status at widely dispersed anchorages would do much to overcome any military deficiency. Adoption of such a plan would permit ready activation of the reserve fleet in times of dire emergency. To achieve this, thought should be given to such appropriate modification of title V of the 1936 act as would encourage shipowners to accelerate trade-ins of their existing vessels without incurring the economic disability now inherent in such trade-ins. We believe that the national benefits of such a program should be recognized and that the problem should be met in an open and realistic manner.

To induce such advance replacement of vessels and to permit up-grading of the reserve fleet, a program of trade-ins should be authorized, whereby the remaining years of life of the present vessel may be exchanged without extra cost against a similar period of life of a replacement vessel of comparable commercial utility. In the event the replacement ship has greater commercial utility, the allowance should be reduced proportionately.

In addition, it will be necessary to set aside, by legislation or otherwise, the recent decision of the Comptroller General to the effect that section 510 (d) of the 1936 act should be interpreted so as to deduct from the trade-in allowance granted for an obsolete vessel an amount equal to the charter hire on such traded-in vessel during the period of construction of a replacement vessel. Continuation of this penalty provision will discourage the trade-in of the existing fleet.

III. Tax deferment

To facilitate ship replacements, accumulations of earnings and profits in reserve funds should be encouraged, by means of tax-deferment and other inducements.

IV. Technological advances

In view of the rapid advances in the field of gas turbines, atomic propulsion, and attendant ship design, a vigorous program of research should be conducted by the Maritime Administration, in cooperation with the Defense Department and shipbuilding and ship operating industries, to assure American leadership in ship design and propulsion.

V. Foreign discriminations

The State Department and all other Government agencies should be instructed to intercede to prevent discriminations by foreign nations against American-flag vessels.

VI. Construction differentials

(A) Construction differentials should be allowed, based on the difference between the cost of a vessel built to American specifications in American yards and the cost of building a foreign-flag vessel of comparable commercial utility to foreign-flag specifications in a foreign yard.

(B) Construction differential rates should be determined and published periodically, as a basis for adoption by the shipowner for contract purposes.

(C) The Maritime Administration's computation of a construction differential should not be subject to review after the contract has been executed.

VII. MSTS competition

The Government should not compete with private industry. MSTS should be prohibited from carrying cargoes or passengers, for the carriage of which privately-owned American-flag vessels are available.

VIII. Subsidy payments

Payments of accrued operating-differential subsidies should be brought up to date, and unpaid amounts due contractors should be available for offset against ship mortgages and other indebtedness of the contractor to the Government.

IX. Bulk carriers

Aid should be extended on suitable terms and conditions to the building and maintenance of a nucleus fleet of new-type dry-cargo bulk carriers as may be required to assure the carriage of a substantial portion of the cargoes normally carried by tramp vessels and the importation of strategic raw materials in time of emergency. The Defense Department should be authorized to take long-term charters on such tonnage. Also, careful and sympathetic investigation should be given to the possibilities of commercial employment of such tonnage and the basis upon which Government aid may be extended thereto. Any subsidy aid to tramp ships should be extended strictly in accordance with the underlying principles of the 1936 act, including all of the conditions and restrictions to which contracting liners are now subject. In addition, suitable safeguards should be included to prevent undermining of the trades of the contracting liner-operators. No obsolete type of bulk carrier, as defined by the 1936 act, should be eligible for subsidy, unless the applicant simultaneously signs a contract to build forthwith a modern replacement vessel of approved design.

X. Special amortization

In recognition of the cyclical nature of shipping earnings, optional or elective amortization of vessel costs should be allowed for Federal tax purposes.

XI. Present reserve fleet

The present, largely obsolete reserve fleet should be evaluated in the light of future military demands. In addition to upgrading the ready reserve fleet through gradual acquisition of existing C-type and Victory-type ships, it appears necessary to provide for defense purposes a limited number of vessels as a secondary reserve in the laid-up fleet.

In conclusion, it should be noted that certain comments on the report have been filed separately by two panel members, and a minority report by a third member.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY AND CODE OF FAIR PLAY FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in introducing today, with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], a joint resolution to establish by law a Joint Committee on Internal Security and a Code of Fair Play for its investigations, I am influenced by several principles.

I may say that originally it had been the intention of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] to introduce a joint resolution on this subject, and I had agreed to join with him and possibly other Senators in the introduction of such a joint resolution. I have been in conversation with the junior Senator from New Jersey over the weekend, and I believe I am correct in saying that he is in sympathy with the purposes of the joint resolution which we are introducing today, but feels, because of his membership on the Republican policy committtee, which is presumably still considering the subject, that he should not himself formally join us at this time in the introduction of the joint resolution.

Mr. President, these are the principles which I believe to be proper and immediate, and which, to my mind, dictate early action in this field.

First. I desire to introduce into our legislative inquiries that same sense of justice and responsibility which is the foundation of our civil rights, and which guides our courts.

Second. I believe this action is necessary to restore the prestige of the Congress, to save it from falling into disrepute, and to strengthen public support for the proper investigative functions of the Congress.

Third. I believe we will improve our prestige abroad by passage of this legislation.

Fourth. I believe we can save a lot of money, and better employ the limited manpower resources of the Congress by consolidating the investigations of dangers to our security into one strong, legally constituted committee. And I believe we can better justify these investigations before history, by giving the single committee the best manpower from each Chamber and a firm legal basis upon which to proceed.

INVESTIGATIONS NEED FAIR PROCEDURES AND CLARIFIED RESPONSIBILITY

We cannot proceed further with committees competing for headlines and sensations, with chairmen contesting with officials of the executive departments, and with the legislative and executive at loggerheads over the best methods and proper spheres of investigations. President Eisenhower was absolutely right when he called for specific rules to guide congressional investigations. I have long felt that we should do this in order to give a fair trial to those brought before what are in effect legislative courts of public opinion, and I so expressed myself on the floor of the Senate last year. I believe also that we must do so in order to protect our own reputations and that of the National Legislature itself.

I devoutly believe that we must temper our investigations—and indeed all our actions—with justice, compassion, and mercy. I do not advocate that we should be soft; not in the least. But we must develop a sense of Christian charity and mercy in our investigations, and apply the principles of fair play and due process that are the guidelines of American legal justice, if we are going to enlist the fullest support and cooperation of all people. I believe that the present resolution would bring these qualities into our internal-security investigations, without in the least weakening the investigative power. Indeed, they would strengthen that very power by enlisting a wider public support.

SAFEGUARDS FOR PERSONAL REPUTATION ARE ESSENTIAL

The joint resolution which I am introducing largely follows the lines of the excellent bill recently introduced in the House by Representative FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey, a young Representative who is becoming widely known for his fine sense of civic concern and responsibility. Its procedural requirements are very similar to those in bills previously introduced in the Senate by my former colleague, Scott W. Lucas, and by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and other Senators. I think the basic principles which should be followed have been fairly well established by this time, both from an observation of what is wrong with present procedures and from the concrete proposals which have been advanced. At their heart is the doctrine that the accused should have an adequate and speedy right to defend his most precious possession, namely, his reputation. It is as simple as that.

Painfully over the centuries we have built up the attributes of a fair trial in our criminal and civil courts when men's lives and property are involved. But we have not done so where men's reputations are involved. Yet every one of us, I think, cherishes his reputation more than he cherishes his property or his life. Men should at least have the right adequately to defend that reputation when it is attacked.

MAJORITY POLICY COMMITTEE PLAN IS INADEQUATE

I have noted with great concern that the Republican policy committee apparently does not propose to take positive and binding action on the President's recommendations. Nor do they apparently propose to act upon the various bills previously introduced to improve the investigating procedures generally. Instead of acting resolutely, the Republican policy committee, as I understand it from press reports, proposes to make suggestions to committee chairmen for revised rules of conduct. This, I submit, is not enough. The permissive suggestions by the policy committee would amount to an expression of a pious hope that committees will reform themselves, and no more. A reform of this type could be reversed by the next chairman, or the present chairman at his merest wish.

This does not even touch the problem.

It is not what the President had in mind, I am sure. He asked for effective measures. I am sorely disappointed that the Republican majority apparently does not intend to meet this issue squarely and head on. It is not a sufficient acceptance of the responsibility we all have as Members of Congress for the reform of our procedures, and does not show a proper regard for preservation of our precious civil rights.

It is true that the congressional committees cannot jail a man on their own motion; they must go through legal procedures of a grand-jury presentment and trial in court before a man may be deprived of his liberty for perjury or contempt.

But there are those of us who feel that the destruction of a person's reputation, reflections upon his honesty and his patriotism, questions as to his love of country—all unsupported by any evidence other than circumstantial, and that often of the most flimsy sort—is even more devastating than a jail sentence.

It was not lightly that Shakespeare wrote the lines:

> But he that filches from me my good name
> Robs me of that which not enriches him,
> And makes me poor indeed.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION, LIBERALISM, FREE INQUIRY, AND CHRISTIAN CHARITY ARE NOT DISLOYALTY

We need a reawakening in America to the real purpose and intent of our Constitution and our Bill of Rights. The legislation we have proposed today would help to lead the way, I believe, in that reawakening.

For the love of our own country, and for our own salvation, we must realize before it is too late that—

We can have differences without being disloyal.

We can be soldiers, or sailors, or marines without "coddling" Communists.

We can be liberal without being Communist or subversive.

We can believe in progress without being a danger to free institutions.

We can grant to others the right to be either conformist or nonconformist, to be inquiring and venturesome, to be intellectually provocative, without endangering national security.

We can demonstrate understanding, humanity, compassion, and Christian charity toward others; we can respect our Bill of Rights without being soft or weak toward one ideology or another.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Can one still do those things without being investigated?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should hope so. Certainly, one should be able to do those things.

We can and we do have but one ideology, and that is one which supports a free government within the framework of the Constitution of the United States.

It is with this ideology in mind that I have submitted the instant legislation. If we are not to have a due regard to our constitutional and Christian principles, then we have lost the battle before it is joined. Division, suspicion, unfairness, will destroy us.

WISE COUNSEL OF CHIEF JUSTICE HUGHES

Fifteen years ago, on March 4, 1939, our great Chief Justice of the United States, Charles Evans Hughes, on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the first meeting of the Congress, said some things that I think we need to remember today. May I quote him:

> We work in successful cooperation by being true, each department to its own function, and all to the spirit which pervades our institutions—exalting the processes of reason, seeking through the very limitations of power the promotion of the wise use of power, and finding the ultimate security of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and the promise of continued stability and a rational progress, in the good sense of the American people.

Mr. President, those words are historic. How great a man was Charles Evans Hughes. What wisdom he displayed and what understanding of government. Let us here and now live up to his concept and his words, and let us be faithful "each department to its own function."

SUMMARY OF PROCEDURAL PROVISIONS

Without going into all of its details, that is exactly what our joint resolution in its field proposes. I summarize herewith its major procedural provisions:

First. Hearings would be held only if voted by a majority of the committee, and a clear advance statement of the subject of hearings would be required.

Second. Witnesses would have the right of counsel and his advice in public hearings, and, unless a majority of the committee voted otherwise, in private hearings also.

Third. Witnesses would be permitted to file supplementary material following examination, or make brief oral statements confined to the matters upon which they were questioned.

Fourth. All sessions would be reported stenographically, and the record made available for inspection by witness or counsel, and furnished to the witness on request at his expense.

Fifth. Only a majority of the committee would be permitted to authorize the release of statements or documents.

Sixth. A majority of the committee would be required to order executive hearings, and at least two members would be required to be present.

Seventh. Committee testimony would be released only in full text except in such cases as might compromise national security.

Eighth. No committee reports could be issued unless submitted in advance to the committee members and adopted at a committee meeting.

Ninth. Advance notice would be required to be given to persons about whom it is proposed to present derogatory information at a public hearing, and insofar as practicable such material shall be presented first in executive session to permit the committee to test its reliability and probative value.

Tenth. Persons who believe they were defamed or their reputations damaged by committee testimony made public would be permitted to file a sworn statement refuting such testimony, to appear personally and testify, to obtain witnesses in their behalf if allowed by the committee majority, and to secure the appearance of and cross-examine adverse witnesses unless the majority should decide otherwise.

Eleventh. Witnesses would also be permitted to submit cross-examination questions in writing to the chairman of the committee to be put to other witnesses who have given damaging testimony.

Twelfth. A novel provision of the bill requires that a witness who gives testimony reflecting adversely on the character and reputation of another in an open hearing shall "be required to disclose his sources of information, unless to do so would endanger the national security." This clause would compel witnesses to identify their sources of information regarding other persons.

If these reforms and the proposal for one Joint Committee on Internal Security are adopted—and I sincerely hope they will be—and soon—Congress' stature and our prestige abroad will be greatly increased.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to establish a joint committee on internal security.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 137) to establish a joint committee on internal security, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the bill is similar to House Joint Resolution 328, proposed in the House by Representative FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN's article on this measure from the Reporter, of March 16, 1954, and the full text of the joint resolution which I have just introduced.

There being no objection, the joint resolution and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GOP CONGRESSMAN'S VIEWS ON SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

(By Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.)

As a freshman Representative, I have been impressed by the important role played by congressional committees. When they function well, as most of them do, they contribute greatly to the passage of important legislation. I have also been surprised at the relatively small degree of partisanship displayed in most of these bodies. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have seen little evidence that either Republicans or Democrats are thinking of veterans' problems in an exclusively political way.

Even more surprising to me is the small degree of political fireworks on the House Education and Labor Committee. Although individual members have sharply differing opinions, all witnesses are given a full and fair hearing. Each of us has realized that the basic question—the adequacy of present labor-management relations legislation—needs to be considered objectively. So far, at least, partisanship has been minimized. Unfortunately the general objectivity and balance that characterize most of our committees do not carry over to the competing committees in the field of subversive activities.

Competition for publicity among investigating committees is a serious fault, as witness the extraordinary spectacle of the subpenaing contest between Senator WILLIAM JENNER'S Internal Security Subcommittee and Representative HAROLD H. VELDE'S Un-American Activities Committee following the now-famous Chicago Executives Club speech of Attorney General Herbert Brownell last November 6. Another fault is the failure on the part of some committees to afford adequate protection to witnesses. As a result, some persons oppose all congressional investigating committees. They feel these committees do more harm than good, and that Congress should restrict its investigation to the gathering of information needed in the preparation of legislation. I do not hold this view. When properly employed, the investigatory function is an extremely valuable one.

The La Follette Senate Civil Liberties Committee of 1936 did not confine itself to preparing legislation. By its investigations and exposure of substandard working and living conditions it laid the groundwork for the social reforms which followed during the next decade or so. The Truman investigating committee during the Second World War earned general commendation for exposure of inefficiencies in our military procurement program. The Johnson Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, which carried on this type of investigation during the Korean war, did another fine job. So did the King subcommittee, which investigated tax frauds, and the Fulbright subcommittee, which looked into the operations of the RFC.

Such investigating committees can serve two valuable functions:

They can help Congress to carry out its role of overseeing the work of the executive departments. This function is an essential part of our system of checks and balances. It has become increasingly important with the growth of bureaucracy and the insulation of many governmental decisions from public opinion.

They can help Congress to perform what Woodrow Wilson called the informing function; that is, they can help educate the people and aid them in securing the facts they need to perform as intelligent and responsible citizens.

Investigating committees in the field of subversive activities need not be excepted from the above generalizations. In the field of internal security, as in others, Congress can do a useful and constructive job in overseeing the work of the executive branch. The primary responsibility for investigating subversion and for reassuring the public rests with the Justice Department and the FBI. The role of the legislative branch should be of a general supervisory character, with congressional investigating committees serving as watchdogs to check on the performance of the executive branch. Certainly there primary function should not be to develop ammunition to be used for political purposes.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE

How then should Congress deal with the problems presented by the various competing committees in investigating subversive activities?

The problem can best be handled, it seems to me, by the establishment of a single Joint Committee on Internal Security, which would have exclusive jurisdiction in this field. On the opening day of this session of Congress I introduced Joint Resolution 328, providing for such a joint committee.

A number of considerations led me to make this proposal. As I have stated, congressional investigating committees have a highly important role to play. They must be employed, however, in an intelligent, fair, and impartial manner. What is needed is a means of curtailing such publicity competitions among the committees as the Jenner-Velde affair. It is also important that investigation of subversives be put on an objective nonpartisan level so as to insure full public support. A joint committee seems uniquely appropriate.

Another advantage of a joint committee is that it provides for a chairmanship alternating between House and Senate Members. This provision, which could well apply to all joint committees, is especially important in the field of subversive activities. It would tend to reduce the possibility of any one person developing a vested interest in investigating subversives. It might encourage the committee to work as a unit rather than as a mere tool of a particular chairman.

The question of efficiency is also involved. Under the present system, with at least three committees going off in different directions, it is obvious that the energy and resources of Congress are dissipated. From the standpoint of efficient legislative-executive relations, furthermore, the joint committee would facilitate closer cooperation. The Justice Department and the FBI would have to deal with only one committee.

The resolution I have introduced contains also a number of fair-play provisions. These would afford witnesses protections similar to those they would receive in a court of law. The problem of developing such a code of procedures, I realize, is not necessarily tied up with the proposal for a joint committee. Other resolutions dealing exclusively with the question of investigating-committee procedures have been introduced. This problem of the rights of witnesses, nonetheless, is one that arises most frequently in connection with investigations of alleged subversion. While considering the question of establishing a single committee in this field, therefore, Congress should have the opportunity to pass upon the question of the rights of witnesses. In that way Congress can establish basic committee procedures. The question of adequate protection for witnesses is so fundamental that it should not simply be left to the committee itself.

EVEN THE DEMOCRATS

Another important motivation behind my proposal is a desire to take the question of communism out of the political arena. This is a field where, in the national interest, there is great need for reducing partisanship. If there is a continuing threat that Communists will penetrate into policymaking positions, both parties are equally interested. If adequate security precautions are being taken, both parties want the public to know it. A single committee can handle these problems more thoroughly and effectively than the three-ring bedlam now in effect.

By its very nature the topic of internal subversion arouses fundamental fears and emotions. Nothing would divide a nation or stir its most violent emotions more than a continuing political war based upon charges that a political party has betrayed the national security. Moreover, these same emotions, if not properly tempered and channeled, could even serve as a real threat to stable representative government.

In the final analysis, representative government is based upon the citizen's trust in the essential good will and integrity of his fellow citizens. Party government works because we have faith that members of both parties will generally strive for what they conceive to be the best interests of the Nation. We abide by the rules of the game. These prescribe that we provide basic support to the party that wins the election and permit that party to govern.

Underlying the disagreements over specific issues and the natural competition between parties has ever been a fundamental respect for the patriotism of the opposition.

If Communists in Government is permitted to continue as a major issue between our political parties, I believe that this fundamental of our political system can become seriously corroded. National unity cannot be maintained when the loyalty of a great political party is constantly being impugned. If you increase people's fears, you eventually sap their strength.

The problem of how best to handle the questions of internal security, like those of foreign policy and military security, should be dealt with on a nonpartisan basis. This is so not only because of the character of the general subject matter but also because charges against individuals are involved—charges similar to those coming before the courts. Naturally, I recognize that party responsibility makes complete agreement between the parties unlikely. The problem of subversion, however, could be handled more effectively if conducted on less of a partisan basis. A single joint committee, with competent personnel and sufficient prestige, would help bring this about.

FOREIGN-AFFAIRS ASPECTS

The divisive effects of communism as a political issue are not only domestic in character. They carry over into our international relations, particularly into our relations with our allies. The nations of Europe, many of which have long histories as great powers, have a natural reluctance to accept the United States as undisputed leader of the western coalition. We should understand this, and win their confidence by demonstrating our capacity for leadership. Maintaining an effective coalition against Soviet aggression would be ticklish enough even if the United States were able to present a perfect picture of maturity and unity in its domestic affairs. When we appear to be seriously dividing our Nation with intemperate charges, it becomes even more difficult to maintain the respect and faith of our allies. Sharp disunity at home could discourage the unity we need abroad.

I realize that many veteran legislators will view my proposal for a Joint Committee on Internal Security as impractical. Because it would require an alteration of our present committee structure, it inevitably runs into certain powerful vested interests. Certainly the present odds are against the resolution's getting out of the Rules Committee this session.

On the other hand, the problem my proposal seeks to remedy is one of more than ordinary importance. It is a problem that

has far-reaching domestic and international implications. Perhaps public opinion will before long force leaders of both parties to take positive steps toward reforming present procedures.

This question of handling adequately the problem of internal security is only one of a number of related problems which require a degree of maturity and stability not demanded even a few decades ago.

Certainly such problems cannot be solved by any gimmick—not a joint committee, a code of fair play, or anything else that simple. The final solution will depend upon what kind of public attitude American citizens finally develop on these questions. In the interim, however, I do believe that the types of machinery and procedures we employ are important. They can serve as a brake upon violent emotions. They can help us direct those emotions into more constructive channels. Such proposals can serve also as a rallying point for those seeking to educate the public concerning the necessity of maintaining its equilibrium and sense of proportion. In that way we can help protect our most important possessions—representative government and our rights and freedoms as American citizens.

Whereas subversive and other un-American activities present an increasingly dangerous threat to the security and welfare of the United States; and

Whereas at present this threat arises principally from a world Communist conspiracy which is of such a complex nature and present in so many guises that to cope with it demands a unified and coordinated effort on the part of the two Houses of the Congress; and

Whereas the jurisdiction of no single standing committee of the Congress is sufficiently comprehensive to deal with the varied shifting tactics of the world Communist conspiracy and other subversive and un-American activities; and

Whereas in the past the duplication of effort and overlapping responsibilities in investigating the problems coming within the scope of this resolution have resulted in an uneconomic utilization of the resources of the Congress; and

Whereas certain agencies of the executive branch of the Government dealing with problems involving our internal security have found it difficult to coordinate the work of the executive branch with that of the Congress; and

Whereas it is the intent of Congress in dealing with the problem of subversive and other un-American activities to make certain that the traditional rights and liberties of our citizens are fully protected: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That (a) there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Internal Security. As used in this joint resolution, the term "joint committee" means the Joint Committee on Internal Security, and the term "committee" means the joint committee or any of its subcommittees.

(b) The joint committee shall be composed of 12 members, as follows:

(1) Six members who are members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, no more than three of whom are members of the same political party, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and

(2) Six members who are members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, no more than three of whom are members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(c) Any vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. During each odd-numbered Congress, the chairman shall be a Member of the Senate, and during each even-numbered Congress, the chairman shall be a Member of the House of Representatives.

(e) Seven members of the joint committee shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 2. The members of the joint committee shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the joint committee other than expenses in connection with meetings of the joint committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

SEC. 3. (a) The joint committee is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable.

(b) The joint committee is authorized to reimburse the members of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the joint committee other than expenses in connection with meetings of the joint committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives may assign members of the staff of such committees to serve on the staff of the joint committee, without additional compensation, except for the reimbursement of expenses incurred by such staff members as prescribed in this subsection.

(c) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the joint committee or by any member of the joint committee duly authorized by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Clerk of the House of Representatives out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the Senate in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have exclusive jurisdiction (so far as the Congress is concerned) to make investigations of all subversive and un-American activities, and all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to such activities shall be referred to the joint committee.

(b) The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses, and matters which are referred to the joint committee or are otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

(c) For the purposes of this joint resolution, the committee is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the joint committee or of any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member but no subpena shall be issued except with the approval of a majority of the joint committee. Any member of the committee may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the committee.

(d) For the purposes of this section, the term "United States" includes the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone.

SEC. 5. (a) The committee shall be governed by the rules set forth in the following subsections of this section.

(b) Committee meetings, other than regular meetings authorized by section 133 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 837), shall be called only upon a minimum of 24 hours' written notice to the office of each committee member.

(c) Committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) shall be held only upon the majority vote of the committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present, and when executive hearings are held at least two members of the committee shall be present.

(d) A resolution or motion scheduling hearings shall state clearly and concisely the subject thereof which may be amended in the same manner prescribed in subsection (c) for the scheduling of hearings.

(e) Any witness before the committee at a public hearing and, unless the committee by a majority vote determines otherwise, any witness before the committee at a private hearing shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel, who shall be permitted to advise the witness while on the witness stand of his rights.

(f) Every witness shall have an opportunity, at the conclusion of the examination by the committee, to supplement the testimony which he has given, by making a brief written or oral statement, which shall be made part of the record; but such testimony shall be confined to matters with respect to which he has previously been examined.

(g) An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of each witness before the committee, whether in public or in executive session. In either case, the record of his testimony shall be made available for inspection by the witness or his counsel; and if given in public session he shall be furnished with a copy thereof at his expense if he so requests, and if given in executive session he shall be furnished with a copy thereof at his expense in case his testimony is subsequently used or referred to in a public session.

(h) No statements shall be released and no documents shall be published by the committee without the approval of a majority of such committee.

(i) No committee report shall be issued unless a draft of such report is submitted to the office of each committee member 24 hours in advance of the meeting at which it is to be considered and is adopted at a meeting at which a majority is actually present.

(j) When testimony given the committee is released, the full text of the testimony shall be released, except where considerations of national security otherwise require.

(k) Insofar as practicable, any person whose activities are the subject of investigation by the committee, or about whom derogatory information is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of the committee, shall be fully advised by the committee as to the matters into which the committee proposes to inquire and the derogatory material which is proposed to be presented. Insofar as practicable, all material reflecting adversely on the character or reputation of any individual which is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of the committee shall be first reviewed in executive session to determine its reliability and probative value and shall not be presented at a public hearing except pursuant to majority vote of the committee.

(l) Any person who is specifically identified by name in public hearing before the committee or in private hearings when the testimony has been made public, and who believes that testimony or other evidence given in such hearing or comment made by any member of the committee or its counsel tends to defame him or otherwise adversely affect his reputation, shall be afforded the following privileges:

(1) To file with the committtee a sworn statement, of reasonable length, concerning such testimony, evidence, or comment, which shall be made a part of the record of such hearings.

(2) To appear personally before the committee and testify in his own behalf.

(3) Unless the committee by a majority vote shall determine otherwise, to have the committee secure the appearance of witnesses whose testimony adversely affected him, and to cross-examine such witnesses, either personally or by counsel; but such cross-examination shall be limited to 1 hour as to any 1 witness unless the committee votes to lengthen the period.

(4) In the discretion of the committee, by a majority vote, to have the committee call a reasonable number of witnesses in his behalf. The extent to which this privilege may be availed of shall be left to the discretion of the committee.

(m) In the discretion of the chairman of the commitee, a witness may question another witness who comments adversely upon his testimony. Where such questioning is allowed, it shall be conducted by means of written questions handed to the chairman and stated by him.

(n) Any witness who gives testimony before the committee in an open hearing which reflects adversely on the character or reputation of another person shall be required to disclose his sources of information, unless to do so would endanger the national security.

SEC. 6. (a) Paragraph 1 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out the following:

"(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members."

(b) Paragraph 17 of rule XI (relating to the powers and duties of the Committee on Un-American Activities) is hereby repealed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have listened with interest and approbation to the principles enunciated by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. The principles he has stated and proclaimed are rooted in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence and in the respect for the dignity and the rights of man which we have cherished since King John was forced to sign the Magna Charta.

I rose to inquire of the Senator if he does not think the same principles which he would apply to congressional investigations should apply with equal force to the procedure with reference to the loyalty program now established in the executive branch.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it generally would, but there is one point as to which I have never been able to make up my mind, namely, the question as to whether the source of a charge or of derogatory information must always be made known to the accused in a loyalty investigation.

It is well known that the FBI has undercover men, and it is probably true that to reveal their identity in loyalty hearings might well identify them and make further investigation more difficult. So that when we are dealing with elimination by the executive of possibly subversive persons within the executive branch of the Government, I have a suspended judgment as to that procedural feature. But in the case of a congressional hearing which does not involve, at least directly, the question of tenure in governmental service but does involve great danger perhaps, to one's reputation it seems to me that the source of the charge should be identified.

Mr. GORE. I do not believe that in the ordinary case the FBI makes a charge.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. There have recently come to my attention the details of a rather tragic case which I shall not discuss on the floor of the Senate. I shall be glad privately to tell the Senator of it. But a very great wrong was done an innocent person. The FBI furnished certain information, not charges.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. The FBI does not prefer charges; it furnishes information.

Mr. GORE. Yet, no information is given as to the source of the derogatory statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I fear that is often true.

Mr. GORE. I am not entirely clear as to what I think should be done. When one cannot reach a conclusion satisfactory to himself, he is in a poor position to convince other persons. But the procedure we have is far from satisfactory. It may be that we must pay a price to preserve the principle that a human being can face his accuser. I, for one, am willing to pay a high price to preserve that right.

I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but, having had the tragic incidents of a case recently brought to my mind, it appeared to me that the fine principles laid down by the distinguished Senator from Illinois could apply in loyalty and security procedures in the executive branch as well as to investigations by congressional committees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is certainly true that the major portion of them could be so applied. I am not trying today to propose a formula for security investigations, but I am proposing that we begin on our own thinking in Congress. I believe this is very essential, because from the time of King John onward, as the Senator from Tennessee has remarked, the abuses of the courts led men who loved liberty to propose successive safeguards, which have been purchased with great sacrifice, effort, and bloodshed.

We know that English liberties were menaced under King Charles I by star-chamber proceedings by which men were tried and condemned in their absence, without being permitted to face their accusers or to produce testimony in their own defense.

It was the proper resentment against the abuses of the star-chamber proceedings under Bishop Laud which led, in large part, to the revolt of the British people and the creation of the commonwealth under Cromwell.

At great price have we purchased the protection of men's lives, liberties, and property in courts of law, by providing that a judge shall not, at the same time, be the prosecuting attorney; that men shall have the right to testify in their own behalf, but that they shall not be compelled to testify; that they shall have the right to produce witnesses; that they shall have the right to counsel; that they shall have the right of cross-examination; that evidence must meet certain standards of probative value to be admissible; and so forth.

These rights have crystallized over the centuries, not aimlessly, but by great effort. For instance, a reading of the Journal of the Trial of William Penn, under King Charles II, will disclose how the courts at that time abused justice.

We have won these freedoms, and the Founding Fathers, in the Bill of Rights, intended to preserve them. We have largely established them in the courts of law.

But what has happened has been that our investigative bodies have become largely informal courts of public opinion. They do not sentence people; they do not take property away from them. But the testimony which is given and the reports which are issued may take from them something far more precious than their property or their lives, namely, their reputation. But we have not been able to create adequate safeguards within the legislative investigative bodies.

I can speak with some feeling on the subject, as probably the Senator from Tennessee can also, because I once was a Member of a Senate investigating committee, and I remember the struggles which went on in my breast between my duty in the sense of being a prosecutor, my desire to get to the bottom of an issue, and at the same time, my concern that we grant a fair hearing to those who were being adversely reflected upon.

So I appreciate the dangers and complexities of protecting ourselves from the possible tendency to abuse our powers by means of a standard code which would hold us in line.

Mr. GORE. The Senator's eloquent statement recalls the equally eloquent statement made by our distinguished President, Mr. Eisenhower, last year, to the B'nai B'rith. Perhaps the Senator will recall the statement of the President, in which he spoke most eloquently of the right of an American citizen to face his accuser. I applauded that speech. I applaud the speech now being made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. But how does that apply to the hapless 2,200 persons, some of whom have been charged, and some of whom have had their names blackened, without any knowledge that they were even being investigated? How does the Senator lay the preachment beside the practice?

Mr. DOUGLAS. All I can say is that we cannot reform the entire world at once. If we clean up our own procedures, we shall have taken a mighty step

forward. At present, I should say that in many cases there are probably more safeguards in hearings before loyalty boards, than there are in hearings before congressional committees. If hearings before congressional committees were placed on a higher standard than hearings before loyalty boards, possibly that might be an inducement for the executive department also to move forward.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator that we should start at home. Those who live in glass houses should not cast stones. But one wrong does not justify another. Thousands of persons are being wrongfully accused and wrongfully convicted, without having the privilege of disproving their guilt, without having an opportunity to establish their innocence, without knowing who is accusing them or of what they are being accused.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee is quite correct, and, unfortunately, this tendency has become more marked in the past 14 months. But let us move ahead in Congress to change and improve those procedures which we can most directly affect.

RECESS

Mr. WILLIAMS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 9, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 8 (legislative day of March 1), 1954:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Joseph E. Hines, of South Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina, vice John C. Williams, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Maynard C. Hutchinson, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., to fill an existing vacancy.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Gen. John Kenneth Cannon, 3A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander-in-chief, United States Naval Forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean.

Vice Adm. Thomas S. Combs, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Rear Adm. Edmund T. Wooldridge, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, at whose word of command all life was created and light first sprang out of darkness, we thank Thee for the gift of this new day.

We humbly beseech Thee that our hearts may be filled with a sense of Thy goodness and our minds illumined with that divine wisdom which will make us equal to all our tasks and responsibilities.

We penitently confess that our vision is dim, our faith is feeble and we are tempted to despair as we look and labor for a better world wherein dwelleth righteousness.

Grant that Thy peace, which passeth all understanding, may dispel those doubts and fears which so frequently haunt us and hold us in captivity.

We pray that Thou wilt give health of body and peace of soul to our stricken colleagues. Bless the doctors and nurses with faith and skill as they minister tenderly unto all who are in suffering and pain.

Hear us in the name of the great Physician. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 5, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 1, 1954:

H. R. 8069. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

On March 6, 1954:

H. R. 7996. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

THE INSIDE STORY OF DEAN MANION'S DISMISSAL

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Dean Manion's outspoken support of the Bricker amendment was the official excuse or subterfuge for his dismissal. It was not the basic reason. The basic reason for Manion's dismissal was the fact that he took his job too seriously; he proposed to do a thorough job of halting the Federal Government's invasion of State, local, and private functions in the fields of taxation, power, health, housing, education, business, industry, and agriculture, and of returning some of these functions to the States and local governments where they belong under our Constitution.

Dean Manion had laid the groundwork for a thorough job of unscrambling the concentration of powers in Washington that had taken place during the 20-year New Deal regime. He planned to present such a convincing and powerful report that the Congress would feel impelled to pass the necessary legislation to implement the report.

Dean Manion was fired not because he spent too little time on the work of the Commission—as Governor Thornton of Colorado suggested—but rather because he was determined to go further than the administration wanted to go.

Mr. Speaker, Dean Manion is one of the greatest authorities in the Nation on our Federal Constitution. He is perhaps the greatest defender of the Constitution in the United States today. He was fired because of his effectiveness, his thoroughness, because the administration did not want to go as far as Dean Manion proposed to go in the work of decentralization.

PRELIMINARY REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE ON HEALTH INQUIRY

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am filing today, on behalf of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a preliminary report growing out of our health inquiry which summarizes important facts about health and disease today.

Last October after the adjournment of the Congress, this committee, in the discharge of its legislative responsibilities in the field of health, initiated a broad inquiry, the first phase of which was a study of our present-day knowledge of the causes, prevention, and control of some of the major diseases of today. We were concerned specifically with finding out just what has been accomplished, what the problems are, what the immediate future holds, and what additional steps might be taken by way of research, or other measures, to hasten relief from these dreadful diseases, mitigate human suffering, and curtail the losses which disease inflicts on our national economy.

Some 95 distinguished physicians, scientists, and laymen participated in the series of panel discussions which we conducted last fall. This report summarizes the testimony received and recommendations made by these outstanding persons in the fields of heart disease, cancer, arthritis, rheumatism, poliomyelitis, tuberculosis, blindness, hearing defects,

epilepsy, cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, and mental illness.

While the health inquiry continued through the fall and into this Congress, and will result in further reports to the Congress, it has seemed to the committee that the testimony concerning these major diseases has been so significant and comprehensive that it warrants being drawn together in this preliminary report so that all may have the benefit of this knowledge. The report contains the statements and opinions of qualified persons on subjects which are close to the heart of the people and timely for the consideration now being given to our public health.

I commend the reading of the report to every Member of the Congress.

PROTECTION OF CONGRESSMEN

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a number of letters and telegrams from various people of Louisiana dealing with the matter of bulletproof glass placed in the House and Senate Chambers for the protection of the Members of Congress. I had not paid too much attention to it until I received a letter from the Honorable James A. Noe. Mr. Noe is a very influential citizen of Louisiana, and a former governor. He is the owner of two radio stations and the largest television station in the State of Louisiana. I thought this letter was of enough interest to place in the RECORD in order that you may read it and give it some consideration.

The letter is as follows:

THE JAMES A. NOE STATIONS,
Monroe, La., March 3, 1954.

Congressman GEORGE S. LONG,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I heard someone say over the radio that nothing could be done to protect you Congressmen and Senators from some fanatic or crank that wanted to get up in the gallery and shoot you. I do not agree with that. I have sat in the gallery of the Senate many times and I am sure the people who come to Washington and come to the gallery of the House and Senate would not object if there was a 10-foot, bullet-proof glass put around the entire gallery of the House and Senate and, if this had been done, this awful thing could not have happened that happened, and I am writing each member of the delegation from Louisiana to see if this can be done because this awful thing might happen again and be worse the next time.

Hoping to see you soon, I am,
Most sincerely yours,
JAMES A. NOE.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the acts of violence committed in the House last Monday by four fanatics have created a great deal of discussion as to what lies behind that criminal activity. In the first flush of excitement the press identified them as Puerto Rican Nationalists. Shortly thereafter it was revealed that two of the terrorists were involved in the international Communist conspiracy and that the Communist Party was lurking in the background of this criminal activity.

But the question is still unanswered as to what is the real purpose behind the shooting.

It has been obvious for some time that the Kremlin agents operating in Latin America have been using the cover of nationalism for their nefarious activities. A careful study of Kremlin strategy will show conclusively that its agents are associated with and taking advantage of the driving force of nationalism in every part of the free world wherever it becomes active. I wish to emphasize that this strategy is applied only to the free world. The other phase of the Kremlin strategy, which applies to the empire of captive nations over which it ruthlessly rules, is to kill off every vestige of nationalism. This appears to any reasonable person as a contradiction and more particularly a dual policy. That is precisely what it is.

The new internationalism conceived by Lenin and activiated by Stalin remains as the basic doctrine and practice of the international Communist conspiracy. This new internationalism calls for the absolute destruction of all sovereign nation states and their replacement by Communist dictatorships which will be completely controlled by Moscow. This new internationalism has for its objective a world based on one economy, one language, one culture, one tradition, one ruling elite class. It also calls for one ruler—a czar of czars—who will be enthroned on the traditional seat of the czars in Moscow. The superior people of this envisioned empire will be the Muscovites—the proclaimed elite of the new world order.

This is no idle dream, nor it is a classroom theory. It is being put to practice with relentless fury in every one of the non-Russian nations controlled by Moscow. In every respect it is genocide on a scale never before known to man.

Entire nations have been destroyed for opposing it—such as the Crimean Tatars and the Kalmucks. But despite the fury of the Kremlin to destroy nationalism within its slave empire—nationalism still remains its greatest enemy and unrelenting adversary. The spirit of the national patriot is something the mad men of the Kremlin cannot destroy.

In the free world the Kremlin agents associate themselves with and seek to control the natural, healthy aspirations of nationalism. Their objective is to ride to power on the legitimate aspirations of national patriotism. But they also create a false nationalism in areas and countries where it does not exist. They organize, finance, and direct small groups of lunatics and fanatics in order to create turmoil and confusion in the free world.

Puerto Rico is just such a case. There is really no nationalist party or movement in Puerto Rico. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House made an investigation of the so-called nationalist movement in Puerto Rico in 1951 and here is what, in summary, they found.

First. An effort was made to organize a nationalist party in Puerto Rico in the early thirties but it never gained more than 1,000 adherents.

Second. Its leading candidate for senator-at-large was only able to get 2 percent of the vote in the 1932 insular elections.

Third. The defeated candidate then organized an underground army known as the liberating army of the republic. This has a familiar ring, because Moscow has been organizing liberating armies underground for many years. The purpose of course is to liberate free people into Communist slavery.

Fourth. The propaganda line of the phony nationalist party has for years been playing up "Yankee imperialism." We know that in recent years Moscow and all its agents have been spreading false propaganda charges on "Yankee imperialism." The only imperialists left in the world are the Muscovites so they exercise their guilty conscience by making the charge against us.

Fifth. The entire record of the so-called nationalist party in Puerto Rico is one of violence, murder, and underground subversion. The tactics used are identical with those taught in the advanced institute of violence in Moscow.

Sixth. The record and performance of the so-called nationalist party in Puerto Rico is directly interwoven with that of the Communist conspiracy in the United States. The Daily Worker and the Sunday Worker—both mouthpieces of the Kremlin—have long been loud in the praise of these so-called nationalists.

This record all adds up to but one conclusion. We should stop calling the would-be assassins of last Monday nationalists and recognize them for what they really are. They are agents of the world Communist conspiracy. Whether they are witting or unwitting agents is secondary. We should also recognize that the mad men of the Kremlin continue to stoop to the use of lunatics to carry out their black operations. What the Kremlin really hopes to do is to discredit healthy nationalism because it fears that the leaders of the free world will eventually come to support and associate themselves with the forces of healthy nationalism now at work within the Moscow-controlled prison of nations, it is clear that the Kremlin will stop at nothing in order to prevent this from happening.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 337)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the report on the Mutual Security Program covering operations during the 6-month period, June 30, 1953, to December 31, 1953, in furtherance of the purpose of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended.

In this report is factual evidence of valuable progress being made through mutual efforts toward the vital goal of increased security for this Nation and all the free world.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 8, 1954.*

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 460 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] and yield myself such time as I may consume, and I further ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 460 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 8127, the so-called public roads bill, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR]. This is an open rule, and it provides for 2 hours of general debate.

This bill is the usual public roads measure which is brought into the Congress every 2 years, except it is an enlarged bill. It goes further, perhaps, than any other measure of this type that we have considered for a great many years. The authorization for public roads for this year, for instance, if my memory serves me correctly, is $550 or $575 millions. This measure carries an authorization for public roads purposes of $875 million per year for the 2 years beginning in 1955.

The McGregor bill, the measure before you, is the product of some 13 weeks of subcommittee hearings by the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the House Committee on Public Works. It carries authorization for the appropriation of $270 million for the primary highway system, that is, the Federal aid to be matched by State funds, which is an increase of $32,500,000 over the provisions in the present law.

The bill carries an authorization of $180 million a year in appropriations for Federal aid for the secondary system, for the farm-to-market roads for the Nation, an increase of some $15 million above the present authorization. Incidentally, and rather importantly, too, I might say, this measure provides that in the future the State highway departments shall have the control and final authority over the specifications for farm-to-market roads included in the secondary highway system rather than the Public Roads Administration of the Federal Government, as in the past.

This bill provides also for an interstate highway system of $200 million, or $175 million more than provided in the present law. This interstate system, by the way, is requested by the military authorities of the Nation and will be of great benefit to all States. Incidentally, the matching arrangement on the interstate system is a little different from the ordinary matching system in the Federal-aid-to-highways proposals in the past. Usually the matching has been on a 50–50 basis. However, this bill provides that on interstate systems under the $200 million appropriation authorized, the matching should be on the basis of 60 percent Federal funds and 40 percent State funds. This is done, as I understand it, for the purpose of helping the lower income States in the West which have such large areas and such long road systems that must be constructed, if we are to have a national highway system worthy of the name.

The bill would authorize an appropriation of $875 million out of an estimated income from gasoline taxes of some $906 million. This would leave approximately $31 million to be used for emergency purposes. I think I should point out very clearly, if I may, that the $200 million fund authorized for construction of an interstate highway system is predicated upon the Congress continuing the one-half-cent gasoline tax, which was put on as part of the Korean war emergency effort. I have been requested to point out, as it was pointed out to us in the Committee on Rules, that the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives appreciates fully that it has no authority or jurisdiction of any kind over questions as to whether or not this one-half-cent gasoline tax is to be extended. That is a matter over which only the Committee on Ways and Means has original jurisdiction. That great Committee on Ways and Means will, of course, give consideration to the question as to whether the one-half-cent gasoline tax is to be extended or is to be permitted to die. So, the Committee on Public Works has so drawn this bill that in case the Committee on Ways and Means, or the Congress itself decides not to extend the one-half-cent gasoline tax, the emergency tax which is now in existence, the interstate system and the money authorized therefor will be eliminated and will not be put into effect. Am I correct in that statement, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman please repeat that statement. I am very much interested in that part of the bill to which the gentleman from Ohio is now addressing himself concerning the gasoline-tax provision. Did the gentleman say that is going to be stricken from the bill?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, I did not say it would be stricken from the bill. I tried to point out that the Committee on Public Works in appearing before the Committee on Rules made it very clear that the $200 million fund for the construction of the interstate-highway system to be allocated to the States on a 60-40 percent basis was dependent upon whether the one-half-cent gasoline tax now in effect and due to expire is extended by the Congress. They made it very clear also that the Committee on Public Works did not assume, or did not attempt, to take any jurisdiction whatsoever over any tax legislation, and that this question of whether the one-half-cent gasoline tax is to be extended or permitted to expire rests entirely with the Committee on Ways and Means, and then following any action of the Committee on Ways and Means, any action that the Congress itself may take. However, as I understand it, this legislation is so drawn that if for any reason the Committee on Ways and Means or the Congress itself decides not to extend the one-half-cent emergency-gasoline tax, then this section of the bill will not apply. In other words, the funds will not be appropriated or authorized under the $200 million interstate system plan which was set up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman any views as to the effect of this particular provision on the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think it has been made pretty clear in the hearings and so forth and so on, of the committee, and in the statements made by the committee, and those statements which I understand will be made later on in debate, so that the Committee on Appropriations will understand clearly.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to press the matter further with my friend because, of course, he is speaking on and presenting the rule. I was interested in that particular provision because it seems to me to be a most unusual one.

I have no recollection of any similar provision being included in any other bill for this.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In other words, if I may express my understanding of the situation to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] the Public Works Committee, being pressed by many States and by many Members of Congress for some action on this interstate system, finally agreed that they would include the authorization in the bill subject, of course, to later action by the Ways and Means Committee and the House itself. In other words, they did not feel that they should authorize a greater amount of money than would be available under the present law, if it is continued.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. This linking up of the Federal tax on gasoline and the road program is setting quite a precedent, and in view of the fact that the Manion Commission has gone thoroughly into the subject of Federal aid for roads and will have a comprehensive report upon the same, it is doubtful whether the Congress should preview this matter and disregard entirely what the Manion Commission may report and may recommend, by taking this action at this time. I feel that we are establishing a precedent that is a doubtful one. I feel that the Congress should wait at least until they get the report and the recommendations of the Manion Commission on Federal aid for roads.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] knows, when we levied this half-cent tax on gasoline, it was meant to go into the general revenue, and there was no intention that the proceeds of that tax or the continuation of that tax, which we voted the other day, should be specifically applied to roads. I agree that it would be a very bad thing to have in the law.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that the bill does not specifically tie the two together.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. That may be true, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] has just stated. But I venture to say that 90 out of every 100 people who drive up to a station for gasoline, consciously or perhaps unconsciously, think or understand that the 2 cents a gallon he has to pay for the gas that he buys is in some way connected with the roads of this country and he thinks that that money is being expended for that purpose.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan. That is exactly the statement I was going to make. There is a strong feeling—and I am one who feels that way—that if we are to levy gasoline taxes on a Federal basis, or for that matter on a State basis, the funds derived from such special gasoline taxes ought to go where the American people think they are going and where they want them to go, on the highways of the Nation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I have had a number of people talk to me about this language and what it might mean as some sort of a perpetual Federal tax, as against a State tax. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] properly referred, of course, to the Commission's work on intergovernmental relations and what might be forthcoming. Let me say that, as far as I am concerned—and I think it is the attitude of the committee—this does not build anything in perpetuity. If in the future it is determined that the Federal Government should get out of the field of gasoline taxation and turn it back to the States, there is nothing here to prevent that being done. That is a matter for continuing study. But what is here sought to be done—and I am for it, and I think generally speaking the Members of the House will be for it—is to see to it that when this becomes effective the money that the people pay in the form of gasoline taxes shall be applied to the building of roads. That is a battle that has gone on in the States before. It went on in my State. It is still going on there. Of course, there are many other taxes, excise taxes, for instance, on automobiles and on lubricating oil and on tires that are not covered here.

Those taxes go into the general revenue to cover the general operations of the Government. But here we are dealing with a specific thing, which is the gasoline tax; and, as the gentleman from Ohio so well points out, it is a tax that the people believe is being expended in the construction of roads and that is where they want it expended.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much. I would like to point out, if I may, that the American motorist is the highest taxed individual in the world. He is being taxed in every direction for every purpose. All that the Committee on Public Works is endeavoring to do in this legislation, as I understand it, is to set up a system of distribution of Federal funds for highway aid purposes somewhat realistic to the amount of money that is being collected from the American people in the form of gas taxes, although by no means the full amount of the gasoline taxes. If that were to be done it would require new legislation. But the people who pay the tax are certainly very much interested, and that is the sort of logic that the committee is following out wisely and well. They have done everything within their power to make certain that they will not intrude upon the rights and privileges of either the Ways and Means Committee or the Members of the House and Senate themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There have been some observations made by the chairman of the committee and also by the distinguished majority leader that would make the record appear that the 2 cents is going to be used in connection with roadbuilding. That, of course, is not so.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is correct. The money is paid into the general revenue funds as gasoline taxes, and this comes out of the general revenue funds.

Mr. McCORMACK. And if the committee were to bring out a bill providing that gasoline taxes would be used only for roads that would be a different proposition. I would agree to that.

Mr. MASON. So would I.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure we would both agree on that, but the money included in this bill comes out of the general revenue funds.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gasoline tax is paid into the general funds of the Treasury.

I think the gentleman would go a step further and say that if Congress decided that for highway purposes we were to appropriate twice or three times as much out of the general revenue funds as the gasoline taxes we would have a perfect right to do it under the present law and setup. But what the Committee on Public Works is attempting to do here, as I say, is to make a somewhat realistic allocation of highway funds for Federal-aid purposes on the basis of what is being collected in gasoline taxes and going into the revenue fund.

Mr. McCORMACK. We want the record to show that this bill does not provide that the gasoline taxes imposed, or the revenue derived from them shall be used in connection with road building.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have tried to point that out to the best of my ability. Perhaps I am not sufficiently intelligent to make it clear.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Ohio is very intelligent. I simply wanted the record to show in view of the statement made by the majority leader——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I believe it does.

Mr. McCORMACK. That this applies to the half-cent tax.

What I do not like about it—I am not saying I am opposed to it—but what I do not like about it is that this is conditional legislation and it seems to me it might fall within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee to consider.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would suggest that we go ahead and adopt this rule and reserve our questions for a discussion of the merits of the bill later.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 26]

Abbitt	Fogarty	Moulder
Ayres	Forrester	Multer
Barrett	Gamble	O'Brien, N. Y.
Battle	Garmatz	O'Neill
Bender	Gary	Osmers
Bentley	Granahan	Patman, Tex.
Boland	Green	Patterson
Bosch	Gwinn	Philbin
Brownson	Hand	Phillips
Buckley	Hart	Powell
Byrne, Pa.	Heller	Radwan
Camp	Herlong	Rains
Canfield	Hillings	Rayburn
Celler	Holifield	Reams
Chelf	Holtzman	Reece, Tenn.
Chudoff	Hunter	Rivers
Clardy	Javits	Roberts
Cotton	Jensen	Rodino
Coudert	Kearney	Rogers, Fla.
Davis, Tenn.	King, Pa.	Roosevelt
Dawson, Ill.	Klein	Small
Dodd	Knox	Sutton
Donovan	Krueger	Taylor
Dorn, S. C.	Lantaff	Weichel
Edmondson	Latham	Wickersham
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Widnall
Engle	Miller, N. Y.	Williams, N. J.
Fallon	Morgan	Wilson, Calif.
Fine	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Fino	Moss	Yates

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 337 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have permission to sit during general debate for the balance of the week on H. R. 7839.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make this statement, that so far as I can speak for the Ways and Means Committee, I do not consider that this is any impingement upon the rights of our committee. I am very much in favor of this proposal as presented in this bill.

I think it is essential, and I think the bill is very well drawn. All that the Ways and Means Committee is doing under the excise tax is simply to extend the gasoline tax as requested by the President.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means; I thank him very much for his statement.

I would like to say again that perhaps the greatest need of this Nation basically today is for better roads. Almost all of us recognize that the highway system has deteriorated greatly throughout the Nation during the war years. The number of automobiles on the highways today is much larger than it was just a few short years ago.

Perhaps there may be some need for expanded employment in this country in the days ahead; no one knows at the present moment, but I do know that many States are taking action now to try to build better and more highways. My own State just last fall by a vote of the people authorized a bond issue of some $500 million to be expended in the State on State highways and county roads in addition to the $80 million a year that is spent on a regular basis. So it is necessary if we are to have good highways in this country that we continue this Federal-aid program, either that or turn the tax money back to the States.

I think the Committee on Public Works has done well in preparing this legislation. It is comprehensive legislation. Perhaps none of it is exactly the way each and every one of us would like to have it, but it is a good well-rounded bill, and it does return to the local communities and to the States for highway purposes most of the money that the people of the United States put into the general revenue fund through gasoline taxes.

I am hopeful that this rule will be adopted promptly and that we may turn to the consideration of this measure on its merits in 2 hours of general debate under an open rule. You will have an opportunity to offer any amendment you wish. I am hopeful that the rule will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in taking the floor now is not to go over too much what occurred in our committee but I just want to point out to the membership of this House what this bill proposes.

The able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who just preceded me compared this bill to the last highway-aid bill, and told you that in the existing bill we have $575 million appropriated for the use of highways. That is true, but I will say to my friend from Ohio that Indian roads and forest roads previously have been financed from money coming from other sources.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not going on last year's bill; I am telling what is in this bill, $550 million to $575 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is not the fact because it also includes Indian roads and forest roads. The comparison is not equitable.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Perhaps the comparison is wrong; I do not know. But I do know that the highway bill as reported by the Public Works Committee last year carried $550 million to $575 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Five hundred and seventy-five million dollars exclusive of forest roads and Indian roads.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will permit, Public Law No. 413 of the 82d Congress provided $247,500,000 for the primary system.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. One hundred and sixty-five million dollars for the secondary system.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. One hundred and thirty-seven million five hundred thousand dollars for primary and urban; and the interstate system $25 million which if my arithmetic is correct adds up to $575 million. Now, if I have been given incorrect information, I am very sorry, but that is from the public law that was passed by the last session.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am proud of the gentleman for being a great mathematician because he is 100 percent right, but in the bill before us he adds elements that are not in that bill, so it is not a fair comparison.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We do have in this bill some items that were not in the other bills; however, this bill does carry a total of $875 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In that bill, and the figures the gentleman has just read do not include forest roads and Indian roads.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right. We did not have as much in that bill as we do in this one.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You had as much for forest roads and Indian roads. But we will not confuse that. The comparison is just not equitable because you cannot compare all the elements in the two propositions.

The bill that we are considering has several elements that I disapprove. We have now three categories in the allocation of funds. The first is interstate. Interstate roads are nothing else but the cream of the primary roads that the Defense Department, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the highway departments of the respective States selected as being defense roads. We made them interstate roads because of the comprehensive system we need here in the United States for defense purposes.

The interstate, the primary, and the secondary funds have always been apportioned to the States on a formula predicated upon population, area, and miles of road. The urban are on a different basis, on population alone, and you can see why that should be. It affects the cities.

Now, we have changed the formula. This bill that is before you today splits the $200 million for interstate roads notwithstanding they are defense roads, notwithstanding they were approved by the Defense Department, in fact, recommended by that Department, and puts half of the $200 million on a strictly population basis.

What does that do to the defense highways? Well, the great State of Texas has 2,500 miles of defense roads and on this population-basis apportionment they lose in the 2 years $3,600,000.

There are 19 States affected here and they are all affected in the same way—they all are victims of discrimination. The State of Alabama loses $279,000; Arizona, $772,000; Arkansas, $510,000; Colorado, $1,002,000; Georgia, $388,000; Idaho, $507,000; Iowa, $830,000; Kansas, $1,278,000; Kentucky, $59,000; Maine, $112,000; Minnesota, $789,000; Mississippi, $469,000; Missouri, $520,000; Montana, $1,288,000; Nebraska, $1,153,000; Nevada, $565,000; New Mexico, $903,000; North Carolina, $15,000; North Dakota, $726,000; Oklahoma, $790,000; Oregon, $793,000; South Carolina, $64,000; South Dakota, $838,000; Tennessee, $172,000; Texas, $1,823,000; all annually. Then there is Utah, $424,000; Washington, $212,000; Wisconsin, $281,000; Wyoming, $521,000. In the 2 years this bill covers, fiscal 1956 and 1957, all of the States I have enumerated will lose double the amounts I have just stated.

The States that I have just given you are charged with the responsibility of the care of 64 percent—about two-thirds—of the defense roads. Those with about one-third of the interstate mileage get more than all the States to which I have just called your attention. In other words, the States with one-third of that mileage are given almost 50 percent more of the Federal funds than are the States with twice as much mileage.

Now, I am not going to talk too long on this subject. We fought in the committee up and down, and the majority of my committee felt that they would split it two ways and let it go at that.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. My distinguished colleague said that the majority of the committee split it two ways. My distinguished friend from New Mexico was the only one who objected to splitting it two ways.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have not denied that; that is just what I am bragging about, if you will let me do it, because there is a principle involved here. You have changed the formula that has been in existence a great many years. Now we find that a gentleman in another part of this Capitol, in another branch of the Congress, wants to change the apportionment made to farm-to-market roads and put it on the basis of the number of automobiles owned by the respective States. We are getting away from a comprehensive system of highways and going back to something that I dislike because, after all, if in defense areas radar or something of that kind was needed, and it cost a billion dollars, I would vote for it. You do not need it in sparsely settled areas, but in sparsely settled areas is where you have your defense projects. They need roads there. I have in my State a project that is over 90 miles long and 30 miles wide. They condemned much of that land owned by ranchers because it was needed by the Federal Government, and I was happy the Government obtained it.

Now, there are several things about this bill I want to call to your attention. I promised the chairman of my committee, who introduced the bill, I would be for retaining 2-cent gasoline and diesel fuel tax. I am for it, but I believe the money should go to the construction of highways in the United States. I have been advised, not directly but indirectly, by the President of the United States through his speeches, that that is what he wants done. The majority floor leader of this honorable body is a great person. The press this morning quotes him as saying this money should be expended for roads. But, when does this bill we are now considering take effect? A year from next July, and in the meantime if we retain this extra half cent on gasoline, it earns from April to next July $500 million. Where is that going? Is it going on roads? We should be fair. I tried to get in my committee consideration for a bill introduced a year ago last January providing for $200 million additional for interstate highways last year and this. Now, I tried to get $200 million more for last year and this year for this interstate system because those roads are in deplorable condition and need immediate work. There was no argument against my bill except balancing the budget. We had hearings last year, a terrific number of them, to find out what the situation was. We found that the situation was that everybody needed more and better roads. People were constantly being killed on the highways, even some murdered. Thirty-eight thousand three hundred people were killed last year, far over 300 more than the year before, and it will be more this year. That will continue until we do our job and get this money for the highways that we need.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Are there any toll roads in the gentleman's State?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Not one. We could use more money. If this bill is not going to take effect until a year from next July, then we should get something in the meantime, or else use the $500 million that we are going to tax the people in the meantime, take it and put it where it is going to construct more and better roads.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I want to compliment the gentleman in directing the attention of the House to the disproportionate distribution of this money as it deals with the western territory, as he has previously outlined. What I would like to know is, What would be the correct answer, in the opinion of the gentleman? Should we retain it on the basis of population, area, and road miles?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Defense roads should be absolutely placed on the basis of population, area, and total miles in your State. That formula has been in effect for years and years.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Was there any other formula suggested to the committee of which the gentleman is a member as to the manner in which this should be apportioned other than 50–50 on the basis of population and on the primary fund roads?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will say this, that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads and the gentleman from New Mexico had worked very closely together until this thing came up.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY].

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the authorization for highway purposes proposed in this bill (H. R. 8127) is not adequate. Years of neglect, much of it caused by war and defense expenditures, have left our roads dilapidated, dangerous, and inadequate from many standpoints. Further delay in attacking the problem in a bold, effective way cannot be justified. For a nation on wheels, a highly industrialized nation, to longer tolerate our highway deficiencies is inexcusable.

This Nation should be criss-crossed with broad, safe, smooth, modern highways. Even now, to bring our highways up to reasonable standards will require years of vigorous effort. Obviously further delay means drifting toward avoidable highway dangers and possible defense calamity.

Our civil defense authorities are now beginning to feel that their previous program of "duck and cover" is being made untenable by the increasing destructive power of nuclear weapons. Can anyone here imagine what would happen if our large city populations had to be quickly moved to the country? The chaos, congestion, and confusion would be a sorry and sad testimonial to our failure to build adequate highways. We would pay in lives then for our failure to spend dollars now.

We are presently reducing the size of our Army and planning to keep it, insofar as possible, here in the States, as a strategic reserve. We hope to somewhat offset the size of our Army by emphasis on mobility. This necessary mobility would be closer to actuality if we had modern highways. For instance, out in California, one inadequate trans-Sierra highway would prove a most hazardous bottleneck to movements in or out of central California, including the crowded and highly strategic bay region. Added to this overall lack of good highways must be added the inadequacy of military access roads. This was called to my attention last year by the Department of Defense.

We are in a period of increasing unemployment. There is talk of trying to reverse the trend by construction of public works. No public works could be more sensible or useful than highways to get America out of the traffic jam.

The great Hearst newspapers, in an article of March 6, written by Mr. John A. O'Brien, have estimated that this proposed program is $1,900,000,000 short of our minimum requirement to merely start on a 10-year highway plan. Mr. O'Brien quoted President Eisenhower, where on several occasions he indicated cognizance of the need for a greately expanded highway program. I should like

to include Mr. O'Brien's ably written article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of March 7, 1954]

ROAD BILLS FAIL TO MEET CRISIS OUTLINED BY IKE—?'EASURES FALL $1,900,000,000 SHORT OF NATION'S NEEDS

(By John H. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON, March 6.—A review of the statements of President Eisenhower on highways not only demonstrates his understanding of the Nation's congestion crisis, it also demonstrates the inadequacy of the Federal-aid highway bill supported by his administration.

The President's first statement concerning highways was printed in the Hearst newspapers of October 26, 1952, when he was a candidate for the office to which the American public elected him by a landslide vote.

The statement was a lengthy one, and in it the President showed a keen awareness of the obsolescence of our streets and roads; the congestion around cities, and, in his words, the "appalling problem of waste, death, and danger."

MILITARY VIEWS

He looked at the problem, too, with the eyes of a military man.

"More than at any time in history, modern roads are necessary to defense and traffic is an interstate problem of concern to the Federal Government."

In stating his own solution to the problem, the President spoke in general terms. He said:

"By intelligent leadership and wise planning, an integrated program can be devised within the ability of the people to pay the cost."

TAX REQUEST

A year after he took office, the President on January 7, 1954, referred to highways in his state of the Union message.

He asked that the Federal gasoline tax be kept at 2 cents "so that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the interstate highway system."

The tax was to be reduced automatically to 1½ cents next April 1. Congress has demonstrated its undoubted intent to retain the full tax.

Shortly thereafter, a bill written by Representative MCGREGOR, Republican, of Ohio, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Roads, was introduced calling for the annual authorization of $875 million in Federal aid to highways.

The author of the bill said it had administration support, and this has never been questioned.

At a White House press conference a few days later, the President was asked what he thought should be the amount of Federal aid.

An aide handed him a slip of paper, and the President replied that it ought to be $800 million. It developed in subsequent discussion that the aide had written $825 million on the slip of paper, but that the President had cut it down by $25 million to be on the conservative side.

It thus became apparent that the administration favored a bill authorizing somewhere between $800 million and $875 million, with the larger figure actually incorporated in an administration bill.

On January 28, the President submitted to Congress the Economic Report of the President, a 225-page book.

On page 104, under a subhead reading "Need for Public Works," the President wrote:

"The largest current requirement for predominantly State and local facilities is streets and roads."

CITES NEEDS

"It has been estimated that an annual expenditure of $3½ billion would be required for 10 years to eliminate the existing backlog for federally aided systems and another one to two billion dollars for other roads and streets.

"In the meantime, many roads now adequate would need to be improved as traffic increases, or rebuilt because of normal wear, adding over $1,500,000,000 of construction annually, while maintenance costs would average another $1,700,000,000.

"Thus, the total annual expenditure required to provide an adequate road system within a decade is apparently over $8 billion, which compares with a current outlay of about $5 billion."

To meet the needs of the Federal-aid road system alone, as the President wrote, requires the annual expenditure for 10 years of $3,500,000,000.

BILLS LAG

The administration bill calls for the spending of $875 million, and with matching funds required from each State would bring the total to something like $1,600,000,000.

The need: $3,500,000,000.

The solution: $1,600,000,000.

The gap between need and solution: $1,900,000,000.

Thus the gap is larger than the solution.

Since all of the foregoing information comes from administration sources, it bears out the conclusion reached in the first paragraph:

That the statements demonstrate the President's awareness of the scope of the problem and the inadequacy of the administration's solution.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to point out a section of the bill which I think is surplusage under the present situation. I think on the whole the bill is a very good bill. Of course, I am for it. However, there is a provision written into this bill, on page 5, line 11, that reads as follows:

That the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1954; and the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1955.

I think I understand the reasoning behind that and the reasons for that provision's being in the bill. At the time this bill was written and adopted by the very splendid Committee on Public Works, the bill continuing that excess tax of half a cent and bringing it up to 2 cents had not been voted out by the Committee on Ways and Means. Since that time that tax has been voted out—that is, a continuation of that tax of half a cent, which gives the 2-cent tax that is mentioned here. It will be passed by this body on Wednesday.

You might argue, What difference does it make then? It makes this difference: For the first time in the history of all this Federal-aid road legislation, as I understand it, such a restriction has been placed upon these allocations.

Let us bear in mind there is nothing partisan about this. This is not partisan legislation. This is a matter that has been supported uniformly by both the Democratic and the Republican Parties when they were in power. I do not think there is anything sinister or partisan about this provision under discussion, but I am apprehensive—and others who have given thought to this matter are apprehensive—of the precedent set here when we put that in the bill. Once you write that into this bill, do not forget that it is going to continue in there from now on and will become permanent legislation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure we all recognize the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi has always been fair and his honesty and integrity cannot be questioned. We are trying to do that in this legislation. We are trying to say to the traveling public in all honesty that we are going to give them the approximate amount of money that they pay in for gasoline taxes and diesel fuel. Certainly there is nothing in this legislation that makes it permanent. But we are pointing out to the other body that we want to be in a position where we can say to the States in which we have contractual obligations that we are going to live up to them as long as we have the 2 cents gasoline tax revenue. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me on that.

Mr. COLMER. Now will the gentleman from Ohio answer a question for me? If the gentleman had been assured in the premises that the one-half cent excise tax would be continued, then I would take it he would not have written this provision into the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. We might have had that assurance in this body, but I will say that sometimes the other body does things that we do not do here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. What assurance is there, assuming that this bill becomes law that the Committee on Appropriations will appropriate the one-half cent that this relates to? There is no guarantee of that?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am certain that the minority whip is familiar with the rules of the House relative to authorizations which might be considered appropriations as far as roads are concerned. The Committee on Appropriations is practically bound to appropriate money called for in road authorizations because of the contractual obligations made with the various States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman stating that our Government is bound by the provisions of these bills and that the Committee on Appropriations should appropriate funds which have not been authorized?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am glad to be corrected. I will say that we are morally bound because of the contractual obligations that exist with the States.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will agree when the gentleman says we are morally bound. But that is a different matter than being legally bound because if what the gentleman says is correct, then we are making an appropriation which the standing committee has no power to make.

Mr. McGREGOR. I might say to my distinguished friend, there is nothing in this bill relative to appropriations that is not in the basic Highway Act of 1944, and the gentleman from Massachusetts was here at that time and helped pass that bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. The basic act of 1944 provides for authorizations.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill we are now considering makes an authorization dependent upon the existence of a tax, is that not correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. We are just being honest and saying you cannot have the cake and eat it too; if you want good roads, you must pay for them.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not impugning the honesty of my friends or of the committee. The language is very plain. I am not even saying that I am going to vote against it, but I have certain doubts about the advisability of it.

Mr. McGREGOR. May I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is so worried over this additional one-half cent tax that is going to be renewed, I hope, on Wednesday. If he wants to make a motion to strike out that one-half cent tax on Wednesday on a recommitment motion, that is his privilege. Then we can definitely decide whether we want good roads or bad roads.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is deeply indebted to his friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for advising him as to something he can do, which the gentleman from Massachusetts is thoroughly acquainted with and knows that he can do. But let us confine ourselves to this bill. According to what the gentleman said this amounts to an appropriation, or has the effect of an appropriation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Not any more, as my distinguished friend knows, than any other authorization bill relating to roads coming from the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. McCORMACK. My dear friend fails to differentiate. This is entirely different from an ordinary authorization, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very obvious here that under the present situation we do not need this provision in the bill. My good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, falls back on that old relief measure, that we are going to leave this to the other body to attend to. I think sometimes we ought to do a little legislating on our own over here.

Let us go back to the merits of this proposal for just a moment. It is not going to make any practical difference if this tax is continued and if this language stays in, except for the danger of the precedent that you set for the future. Once you tie it in here with this, you are going to have it continue in the bills that follow. If that is what you are going to do, and you collect 2 cents for the Federal Government, which amounts to more than these allocations, why not put it all on a Federal-aid basis, if you are going to match it dollar for dollar and that is your purpose? But again I would be opposed to that for the simple reason that I do not want this highway legislation tied down with this kind of restriction. Your administrative problems would be enormous.

For instance, take your fishing fleets, your agricultural tractors, and other farm implements, where they do not pay the tax. You would have an enormous administrative problem there in making these deductions. The Federal Government would have to go in and figure out the various deductions for these fishing fleets and agricultural implements, where the tax was not required.

I was in hopes—I do not have too much now—that my distinguished friend might see his way clear to eliminating this section. I am not so sure, if somebody else does not do it, in the consideration of the bill, that I shall not be constrained to offer an amendment to delete it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my remarks to the provisions of the bill which provide $200 million of Federal matching funds for the interstate highway system.

There are a few basic facts about this system which should be recalled:

Its designation as interstate indicates that this is the system with which the Federal Government should be primarily concerned.

If another war should come, which, of course, we all pray will not happen, these are the highways which the Department of Defense says must do the job. Today they are the roads which are carrying the load. These 40,000 miles of interstate highways comprise only 1 percent of the entire road mileage in the United States yet they carry 20 percent of all the traffic.

The evidence adduced by the committee is conclusive that this system today is totally inadequate to do the job because of this high volume and heavy traffic load. This is particularly true in the highly populated areas. It is on these interstate roads in the congested sections that the movement of traffic has been reduced to a snail's pace. It is here where the highways have deteriorated—where they are too narrow and outmoded. These are the highways that were built at the beginning of the automobile era. They now need rebuilding and replacement. It is here where the great losses are incurred—in cargo delays, in driver time loss, in added gasoline and oil consumption, in wear and tear on motor vehicles and the motoring public's nervous system.

These are some of the reasons why the McGregor bill provides for the first time a substantial sum for the interstate system. It is my personal opinion that an even greater amount of the total should be allocated to this system.

The American Association of State Highway Officials who are responsible for the roads in your State and, who on a whole know more about the road problem than any other persons in the country, have made an exhaustive study and survey with reference to the interstate system and have reached the conclusions as I have outlined them. Their study goes further and recommends what must be done to improve the interstate system. They point out that the improvement of the interstate system must be a uniform improvement throughout the entire country. It must be a uniform improvement if it is to be effective, particularly in the time of emergency. In other words, this interstate chain of roads is no stronger or effective than its weakest section.

These State highway officials have determined the approximate cost of bringing these roads up to the standard needed to meet the commercial and defense requirements of the Nation.

One of their significant findings is the fact that the cost of doing this job in the 8 most populated States is 51½ percent of the total, while the cost of all of the remaining 40 States represents 48½ percent of the total cost. Their findings further point out that in the first 8 States we find 71,500,000 of our people as against 79,200,000 in the remaining 40 States.

Then again these 8 States account for 25,700,000 motor-vehicle registrations against 27,500,000 in the remaining 40 States.

With these cogent facts before them, the State highway officials in convention assembled voted to recommend to the Congress that the money allocated for the interstate system be distributed on a population basis. The significant thing about this recommendation is the fact that 46 highway departments voted specifically for the population formula and only 2 against.

It should be further noted that each State had one vote irrespective of its size, population, or the amount contributed to the Federal Government in gasoline taxes.

It seems to me that with these facts no fair-minded person can come to a different conclusion than have our State highway officials, especially when it is known that in many instances the cost per mile of constructing these interstate highways in the industrial areas is seven times the cost in rural areas.

The McGregor bill before us provides that only one-half of the two hundred million be distributed under the population formula; that the remaining one hundred million be distributed under the old formula.

It is obvious from what I have said that if the interstate system is to be improved uniformly and the job property done all of the two hundred million should be distributed under the population formula as the State highway officials recommend. Yet there are some who selfishly insist that we should ignore the population formula completely and distribute this entire two hundred million on the old basis. If we do this those States where the cost of improvement is 51½

percent, get only 34⅒ percent of the funds while those States where the cost is only 48½ percent get 67⅒ of the money.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for making a very excellent statement. It is quite evident that as a member of this great committee he has paid close attention to the testimony before the committee and made a great study of it and he is, better than that and more than that, expressing so well and for the education of all of us the solutions to the problems that confronted the committee.

Mr. SCHERER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8127, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill presented to the House today is the result not of brief hearings on the part of the Committee on Public Works or its subcommittee on roads but is the result of long and extended hearings that lasted more than 3 months last year and many days this year. We think it is a good bill. There may be some provisions in it that some Members of the House and some members of the committee are not entirely satisfied with.

But, upon the whole this is a good bill and provides more money for highways than any highway-aid bill ever presented to Congress.

I think the great problem before the American people today is not how to build the best automobiles in the world, because we are doing that, but the great problem which presents itself to us in the House today is to find some means of providing adequate facilities on which to operate them. The Bureau of Public Roads informs us that we now have 55 million registered motor vehicles in our country, 1 for every 3 people in the United States. More than that, we are adding to that number about 3 million new cars annually. The industry provides about 6 million new cars every year, while 3 million cars leave the roads each year because of time and travel; in other words, they become old, obsolete, and worn out. In the next 2 years we will have 60 million cars traveling the highways of this country. More than that, we are told that we aggregate about one-half trillion miles of travel every year. The people who own automobiles use their cars more than they did 10 years ago. They travel more miles; they go longer distances; they use the car more often, and we are burning up about 40 billion gallons of gasoline annually. I know of no people on the face of the earth who are more dependent upon their motor transportation facilities for their daily needs or when the ownership of motor vehicles have become such an important factor in the lives and welfare of the people, as here in the United States. So, I refer once more to the problem that faces this Congress and the public officials of this country, namely, to provide adequate facilities to operate the enormous number of cars that travel the highways of our land.

There has been some criticism found with one or two of the provisions. This bill provides $225 million more in matching money than the previous bill which was passed by this Congress two years ago. It has been the policy of the Congress to pass a road bill every 2 years. This bill provides for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. The money for the fiscal years 1954–55 has already been provided for and has been allocated to the States. Some argument has been presented that this bill ought to be set up a year sooner. I heard it discussed in the well of the House. I doubt very much, if you did that, whether the States could match it in time to take advantage of it; in other words, we have a road policy in this land that started back in 1916, a Federal-State highway system. Upon the whole that system has worked admirably for more than 35 years. Why should we change it? Why should we change it when it is time-tested and found not wanting? I think it would be a great mistake. Even the suggestion that the Federal Bureau of Roads be abolished and the Federal Government withdraw from collecting taxes on gasoline suggested by the governors' conference I think would be a tragic mistake, because you would have no coordinating agency to integrate this vast system of highways that has been built up since 1916. Why, more than 300 years ago it was discovered that "the easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place was one of the three things necessary to make a nation great and strong." Good roads manifested itself to the people of this world even 2,000 years ago. The Romans believed in good roads and they built a road that has lasted more than 2,000 years. The Greeks believed in good roads, and 300 years ago an English authority came forth and said that the easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place is one of the three essentials which make a nation great and strong. That is the subject we are dealing with today on the floor of this House, the subject of transportation.

I am not going into the question of the technical points of the bill, because, may I say to the House, in justice to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], that he has devoted much time, thought, and energy to the question of good roads. It was from his subcommittee that the bill was presented to the full committee and adopted by us unanimously.

The opposition presented here about this half-cent gas tax I think is a tempest in a teapot. Perhaps the language is unusual, but if the tax bill which will come to this floor next Wednesday had been passed before this bill came to the floor you would have heard no discussion about it and there would have been no necessity for putting the language in the bill. I am satisfied that the half-cent gas tax should be continued, and I believe it will be continued.

I am not going to take any more time at this point.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works yield me a moment in order that I may confess that there are certain provisions in this bill I do not understand? Knowing how careful and capable the gentleman is in delving into these subjects in his committee, I should like him to explain, in order that I may vote intelligently on the provisions of this bill, first, what is meant by the Federal-aid primary highway system. Is that within the States alone?

Mr. DONDERO. I trust the gentleman will defer his question because I have tried to avoid discussing such questions, leaving them to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads [Mr. MCGREGOR], which committee practically prepared this bill.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I am willing to wait if the gentleman will give me time to ask that question later.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I will first state to the committee that I am appearing as a substitute today. The absence of our distinguished colleague from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], ranking member of the Roads Subcommittee, was caused by the tragic incident that happened here last Monday. There were two members of our committee who received injury then, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]. I am happy to report to the committee today that both Mr. FALLON and Mr. DAVIS of this committee have been able to return home and their conditions have been reported as satisfactory.

In spite of the combined efforts of the local governments, the State governments, and the Federal Government, we have not been able to settle the tremendous and urgent road problem existing in this country today. You will recall that we have 3 million miles of roads in our country. It is estimated that to put all our roads in repair and bring them up to present-day standards it would require an appropriation of from

$35 to $40 billions. The number of vehicles has increased far in excess of the building program that has been carried on throughout the country.

The principal section is section 1, dealing with the traditional recognized highway program, the primary, urban, secondary, or so-called farm-to-market roads. This amount of $550 million provided under existing law has been increased to $600 million. There has been some change in the administration of the secondary-road program. It establishes the elimination of the rigid requirements that heretofore have been required of local governments in the construction of secondary roads to meet certain criteria and certain standards and certain specifications. The provision of that part of the bill is somewhat distasteful to me. However, there still remains the right of the Secretary of Commerce to veto any standards or specifications that do not meet requirements. There has been a contention throughout the land that we need to relax those high standards which have been imposed heretofore and give the local governments more opportunity to have their say as to what type and what character of roads they should construct. I have always been of the opinion that we have a firm obligation to see that the Federal Government's tax dollars are being wisely invested, and, even though there might have been some complaints, it has served a most useful purpose.

In section 1 we also find a 25-percent interchange of funds that has been made retroactive to the act of 1952.

The most controversial section of the bill is section 2, dealing with the interstate system. The last act we passed in 1952 provided for $25 million to be spent on the principal or main arterial highways throughout the country known as the defense highways. That road system found its life in the act of 1944. It places a limitation of 40,000 miles of roads in the interstate system. So far we have had designated 37,000 miles of the interstate system. It carries the heavy load of the traffic index figures. We are increasing the former amount to $175 million to be made available in the fiscal year 1956–57 for the construction of the interstate system. Heretofore the interstate system has been on a 50–50 matching program, 50 percent being furnished by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the local and State governments. We have increased Federal participation to 60–40 percent. We have changed the formula of $100 million from the traditional matching basis that we have used in the past to a population basis. The other $100 million is to follow the same matching formula that we have had in the primary and other road systems. This represents a compromise between the urban voices and that of the rural States.

In my own State we would be most happy to have the traditional formula written, based upon the three ingredients that have been recognized historically in the writing of the roads bill. Unfortunately, we did not have sufficient strength, we did not have the urge nor the facilities to write into this bill everything that would be suitable to my people or suitable to all the people in the other States. So we agreed that one-half of the total amount would be based on a population formula and the other $100 million would be based upon the formula we have used in the past.

There is a great deal of contention about the continuation of the one-half cent gasoline tax. I assure you this is no effort on the part of the Committee on Public Works to trespass upon the sovereignty and the authority of the Committee on Ways and Means. But with an increase of $175 million it was necessary to have some agreement and some voice of concert that we would have available in 1956 and 1957 sufficient moneys to pay for the increases made in the bill.

There is a great deal of uneasiness about this proposal. You will recall that in the discussion with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] the very question was raised as to whether or not the normal relationship existing between an authorization and an appropriation would prevail in making funds available for the construction of roads. The Committee on Appropriations has recognized that this authorization gives rise to a moral obigation that when the contracts are made between the Bureau of Public Roads and a State highway department, they could then proceed with the planning and the expenditures of local funds in obtaining rights-of-way, a condition precedent to carrying out its contractual relations.

This bill recognizes, as we have in the past, that within 2 years the State highway departments of the various States would have credits of moneys that were not used in a single year. So I do not conceive nor do I believe that this provision in the bill is as serious as the objectors find it to be.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I wanted to inquire of the gentleman whether or not he knew of any precedent in previous legislation for adopting the 60–40 matching fund basis rather than the 50–50 basis. It is the first time it has come to my attention.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The 60–40 formula is based upon several reasons, the principal one being the tremendous cost of building the interstate system. In the State of Rhode Island for example, it is estimated that on the interstate system the cost would be in excess of $2 million a mile. To take care of 4- and 6-lane highways such as these, it is necessary that we have huge and large expenditures to construct that type of road.

Second, the ability of the State to match these funds has been most difficult for a number of States. As an inducement to the States to carry on the construction of an interstate system it was necessary, in the opinion of the committee, to provide an increase in Federal participation.

I, for one, along with several other members of the committee, would like to have seen the formula changed to 75–25. Our views, however, did not prevail, and that too was a compromise figure.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman know whether or not we have in the past adopted such a matching basis? My only experience has been with a 50–50 basis. I am wondering if the gentleman has additional information on that.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I do not recall in a single instance when the matching ratio has been that high on the four principal categories of roads.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I have been somewhat concerned about the provision in the bill for the diversion of 25 percent from one purpose to another. Is it the intention of the committee that funds appropriated for urban roads might be diverted to rural roads or that funds appropriated for rural roads might be diverted to the building of city streets?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Not in excess of 25 percent; and that 25 percent provision was written in, in order that there should be some versatility of effort on the part of State highway departments to meet their State's needs. It is hard to anticipate this far in advance the particular needs of an individual State.

Mr. EVINS. I do not remember that flexibility in such legislation before. Funds have been appropriated for a particular purpose and they have been used for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes; they have the 25 percent formula in existing law.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I want to say in reply to the distinguished gentleman from New York that the act of 1941 carried a different formula than the 50–50 matching provision.

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to take advantage of this opportunity to extend my thanks and appreciation to the gentleman from Alabama for the distinguished service and assistance he has given us on this bill and legislation.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 27 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, and the author of the bill before us.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my respects not only to the Subcommittee on Roads but also to the full Committee on Public Works. They have worked hard and diligently. This is a bill that came out of our committee by a unanimous vote. There was no politics; we considered all of the areas which it is our privilege to represent; and, as so ably stated by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, this is a compromise measure. There are many things in the bill that, possibly, if I were writing it for the 17th Congressional District of Ohio or for the State of Ohio, I would have changed to coincide with the Ohio viewpoint; but all of us in representing our respective

districts and States recognized this as a national matter and thus agreed on a compromise bill which we all accepted. I want to say to the members of the committee that I certainly appreciate the splendid cooperation they have given me.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to read a statement which was presented to me by one of our colleagues on the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]; and I also ask, Mr. Chairman, that after this statement our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Roads, be granted permission to insert his remarks ahead of those of the gentleman from Ohio. Both of these gentlemen are confined to the hospital for reason known to all of us.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. This is a statement of the gentleman from Tennessee:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Public Works, I rise to support House Resolution 8127. This measure is necessary and should be enacted into law to provide Federal-aid authorizations for orderly continuation of the highway construction program for an additional 2-year period. The amounts authorized by this bill will become available to the States during the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, on a matching basis.

The Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works conducted a complete study of the highway problem, as well as the needs for a new construction and numerous other factors all relating to highways. As a result of the factual material furnished to the committee by Federal department representatives, State highway officials, road builders, automobile associations, truckers, the motorist, and many persons in private industry as well as others, we were convinced that the highway problem was one which demanded top priority.

We were informed that $800 million was the minimum annual Federal-aid authorization which would be required to accomplish most urgently needed construction work and that such a program would have to be kept in effect for at least 20 years to keep pace with the problems.

I believe the committee in reporting favorably on H. R. 8127 is attempting to be realistic, consistent with the economy of the Nation, and is meeting head on the challenge which the highway problem presents.

In authorizing $800 million for Federal aid to highways for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, we have increased the amount authorized in the 1952 act by $225 million per fiscal year.

I believe the provision in section 1 of the bill, which permits up to 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for primary, secondary, and urban systems, respectively, to be transferred from one system to either of the others, is a progressive measure and allows greater latitude in administering the funds which will accomplish better results on a more satisfactory basis. This same observation may be made with respect to the second proviso in section 1, for that will also assure more perfect cooperation between the States and the Bureau of Public Roads with respect to secondary roads, and should prove mutually advantageous.

The committee should be commended for the constructive action which it has taken in this bill with respect to two vital and somewhat controversial measures. In section 9, it has directed the Secretary of Commerce to make a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties in interest relative to the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from authorized highway improvements. Among other things, such a study is to include a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end that a full and informative report may be made to the President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States not later than February 1, 1955.

In section 12 the committee has given recognition to the need for a great highway to traverse the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf and has authorized the expenditure of $250,000 from general administrative funds to expedite the planning and coordination of this Great River Road.

The purposes and objectives of this legislation are reasonable and urgently required. These authorizations are needed not only as part of the national defense program but also the national highway safety program.

I earnestly and sincerely support this bill and respectfully urge its passage.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege and a pleasure for me to incorporate in the RECORD at this point the statement of the Honorable CLIFFORD DAVIS, a member of our subcommittee and the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time in history, the bill before you, H. R. 8127 authorizes appropriations for Federal-aid highways and for highway work in the national forests, national parks and parkways, and Indian reservations in the approximate amount of the Federal road user tax on motor fuels. The total of $875 million authorizations carried in the bill compares with the approximately $905 million collected by the Federal Government on gasoline and diesel fuel in the fiscal year 1953.

There are several important features in the bill which I shall describe more in detail in a moment. These are:

First. Provision for a greatly enlarged authorization for the improvement of the national system of interstate highways.

Second. Provision for the transfer of funds between different categories to provide a flexibility necessary to meet highway needs which vary from State to State.

Third. The transfer to the State highway departments of much greater authority to handle the local problems involved in the farm-to-market road program.

The bill provides for carrying forward the time-proven pattern of cooperation between the Federal Government operating through the Bureau of Public Roads and the several States operating through their respective State highway departments with a few changes which experience has indicated are desirable.

The bill would authorize $600 million for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, divided among the three categories of projects established initially in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, as follows:

Two hundred and seventy million dollars, or 45 percent, for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

One hundred and eighty million dollars, or 30 percent, for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

One hundred and fifty million dollars, or 25 percent, for projects on the Federal-aid primary system in urban areas.

An additional $200 million annually is authorized for improvements on the interstate system. This system, which was set up through cooperative effort of the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads under the direction of Congress, is limited to 40,000 miles. It represents the most important highways in the primary system. It is important not only to our peacetime economy but is vital to our national defense, consisting as it does of highways of the greatest strategic importance. The rural portions of this system, although comprising only slightly more than 1 percent of all the highways in the country, carry 20 percent or more of all the rural traffic. It has been well said that this system, together with other important mileage, is an integral part of our industrial assembly line. It provides an indispensable service.

The approximate amounts which each State would receive from the $800 million authorized are shown in the table which I submit for the RECORD:

Approximate apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds pursuant to H. R. 8127

State	Federal-aid				Interstate			Total ($600,000,000)
	Primary ($270,000,000)	Secondary ($180,000,000)	Urban ($150,000,000)	Subtotal ($600,000,000)	Population [1] ($100,000,000)	Sec. 21 [2] ($100,000,000)	Subtotal ($200,000,000)	
Alabama	$5,761,000	$4,465,000	$1,938,000	$12,164,000	$1,876,000	$2,155,000	$4,031,000	$16,195,000
Arizona	4,038,000	2,750,000	575,000	7,363,000	735,000	1,507,000	2,242,000	9,605,000
Arkansas	4,495,000	3,597,000	827,000	8,919,000	1,170,000	1,680,000	2,850,000	11,769,000
California	12,393,000	6,381,000	13,148,000	31,922,000	6,487,000	4,652,000	11,139,000	43,061,000
Colorado	4,858,000	3,245,000	1,229,000	9,332,000	812,000	1,814,000	2,626,000	11,958,000
Connecticut	1,751,000	882,000	2,864,000	5,497,000	1,230,000	658,000	1,888,000	7,385,000
Delaware	1,323,000	882,000	303,000	2,508,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,733,000
Florida	4,386,000	2,867,000	2,652,000	9,905,000	1,698,000	1,643,000	3,341,000	13,246,000
Georgia	6,682,000	5,103,000	2,156,000	13,941,000	2,111,000	2,499,000	4,610,000	18,551,000

[1] Apportioned according to total population with minimum of ¾ of 1 percent.
[2] Apportioned according to sec. 21 of Federal Highway Act—⅓ area, ⅓ total population, and ⅓ post road mileage, with minimum of ½ of 1 percent.

Approximate apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds pursuant to H. R. 8127—Continued

State	Federal-aid				Interstate			Total ($800,000,000)
	Primary ($270,000,000)	Secondary ($180,000,000)	Urban ($150,000,000)	Subtotal ($600,000,000)	Population ($100,000,000)	Sec. 21 ($100,000,000)	Subtotal ($200,000,000)	
Idaho	$3,328,000	$2,341,000	$285,000	$5,954,000	$735,000	$1,242,000	$1,977,000	$7,931,000
Illinois	10,401,000	5,664,000	10,344,000	26,409,000	5,339,000	3,901,000	9,240,000	35,649,000
Indiana	6,409,000	4,418,000	3,538,000	14,365,000	2,411,000	2,399,000	4,810,000	19,175,000
Iowa	6,520,000	4,772,000	1,756,000	13,048,000	1,606,000	2,436,000	4,042,000	17,090,000
Kansas	6,552,000	4,587,000	1,390,000	12,529,000	1,168,000	2,446,000	3,614,000	16,143,000
Kentucky	4,977,000	4,131,000	1,536,000	10,644,000	1,804,000	1,863,000	3,667,000	14,311,000
Louisiana	4,207,000	3,045,000	2,168,000	9,420,000	1,644,000	1,576,000	3,220,000	12,640,000
Maine	2,265,000	1,621,000	618,000	4,504,000	735,000	847,000	1,582,000	6,086,000
Maryland	2,374,000	1,451,000	2,510,000	6,335,000	1,436,000	892,000	2,328,000	8,663,000
Massachusetts	3,429,000	1,273,000	6,156,000	10,858,000	2,874,000	1,293,000	4,167,000	15,025,000
Michigan	8,379,000	5,113,000	6,884,000	20,376,000	3,904,000	3,141,000	7,045,000	27,421,000
Minnesota	7,002,000	4,943,000	2,408,000	14,353,000	1,828,000	2,617,000	4,445,000	18,798,000
Mississippi	4,826,000	4,021,000	819,000	9,666,000	1,335,000	1,804,000	3,139,000	12,805,000
Missouri	7,870,000	5,325,000	3,643,000	16,838,000	2,423,000	2,943,000	5,366,000	22,204,000
Montana	5,423,000	3,730,000	348,000	9,501,000	735,000	2,023,000	2,758,000	12,259,000
Nebraska	5,264,000	3,733,000	868,000	9,865,000	812,000	1,965,000	2,777,000	12,642,000
Nevada	3,486,000	2,330,000	113,000	5,929,000	735,000	1,300,000	2,035,000	7,964,000
New Hampshire	1,323,000	882,000	438,000	2,643,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,868,000
New Jersey	3,491,000	1,175,000	6,475,000	11,141,000	2,963,000	1,316,000	4,279,000	15,420,000
New Mexico	4,389,000	3,015,000	485,000	7,889,000	735,000	1,638,000	2,373,000	10,262,000
New York	12,691,000	5,085,000	19,770,000	37,546,000	9,087,000	4,775,000	13,862,000	51,408,000
North Carolina	6,699,000	5,715,000	1,901,000	14,306,000	2,489,000	2,594,000	4,993,000	19,299,000
North Dakota	3,917,000	2,844,000	250,000	7,011,000	735,000	1,461,000	2,196,000	9,207,000
Ohio	9,415,000	5,727,000	8,559,000	23,701,000	4,869,000	3,531,000	8,400,000	32,101,000
Oklahoma	5,778,000	4,137,000	1,616,000	11,531,000	1,369,000	2,159,000	3,528,000	15,059,000
Oregon	4,616,000	3,226,000	1,186,000	9,028,000	932,000	1,725,000	2,657,000	11,685,000
Pennsylvania	10,597,000	6,306,000	11,197,000	28,100,000	6,433,000	3,980,000	10,413,000	38,513,000
Rhode Island	1,323,000	882,000	1,057,000	3,262,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	4,487,000
South Carolina	3,635,000	3,010,000	1,017,000	7,662,000	1,297,000	1,361,000	2,658,000	10,320,000
South Dakota	4,217,000	3,012,000	287,000	7,516,000	735,000	1,573,000	2,308,000	9,824,000
Tennessee	5,851,000	4,560,000	2,139,000	12,550,000	2,017,000	2,189,000	4,206,000	16,756,000
Texas	17,513,000	11,727,000	7,086,000	36,326,000	4,725,000	6,548,000	11,273,000	47,599,000
Utah	3,104,000	2,053,000	627,000	5,784,000	735,000	1,159,000	1,894,000	7,678,000
Vermont	1,323,000	882,000	230,000	2,435,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,660,000
Virginia	5,128,000	3,986,000	2,306,000	11,420,000	2,034,000	1,920,000	3,954,000	15,374,000
Washington	4,463,000	2,982,000	2,232,000	9,677,000	1,458,000	1,670,000	3,128,000	12,805,000
West Virginia	2,944,000	2,563,000	963,000	6,470,000	1,229,000	1,103,000	2,332,000	8,802,000
Wisconsin	6,378,000	4,450,000	2,896,000	13,724,000	2,105,000	2,386,000	4,491,000	18,215,000
Wyoming	3,367,000	2,282,000	161,000	5,810,000	735,000	1,256,000	1,991,000	7,801,000
Hawaii	1,323,000	882,000	497,000	2,702,000				2,702,000
District of Columbia	1,323,000	882,000	1,278,000	3,483,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	4,708,000
Puerto Rico	1,402,000	1,465,000	1,271,000	4,138,000				4,138,000

No one can dispute the urgent need for modernizing our highway system. Testimony submitted to the committee by the State highway officials indicated that the estimated cost of eliminating the deficiencies on the approved Federal-aid systems of 673,000 miles amounted to approximately $35 billion. This estimate is larger than similar estimates made in prior years. The increase in the estimated cost of modernizing this mileage shows that under our present rate of expenditure we have been losing ground. This has happened in spite of an expenditure of $3,600,000,000 on the Federal-aid systems in the past few years.

A look at the increase in automobile registrations will help to explain this situation. Ten years ago, in 1944, 30,479,000 motor vehicles were registered. The number of motor vehicles using our highways has steadily increased at such an unprecedented rate that in the year just closed more than 55 million motor vehicles were in service. This is an increase in a 10-year period of 80 percent.

These statistics, however, do not tell the full story. Many owners of automobiles are using them more and more each year for both recreation and daily activities. We are truly a nation on wheels. Over night our whole population could be moved from one place to another with less than an average of three persons per car—that is, it could if we had the highways to accommodate our motor vehicles.

Now a word of explanation as to the new features in the bill which experience has indicated are desirable. The $600 million authorized for work on the three categories of projects—primary, secondary, and urban, which might be referred to as the regular Federal-aid highway program—is apportioned in the same manner among the States as provided in the 1944 act. To provide greater flexibility in the use of these funds to meet varying conditions encountered in different States, there is provision in the bill that would permit the transfer between these 3 classes of projects to the extent of not more than 25 percent when such transfer is requested by a State highway department and approved by the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest.

Such a provision has been recommended by the State highway officials several times in the past in connection with consideration of previous legislation, and the committee is now convinced that such a provision is necessary to provide the flexibility necessary for a State highway department to make the most beneficial use of Federal funds apportioned to it in meeting its particular highway needs.

Another provision would give to the State highway departments much geater authority in handling their secondary road program. Following the apportionment of the secondary funds to the States and the programing of projects, the State highway departments would carry on the secondary program without the necessity of referring the plans to the Bureau of Public Roads for approval and without detail inspection by engineers of the Bureau of Public Roads as is required by the present law. Payment of the Federal share of the cost of secondary projects would be made on certification by the State highway department that the plans, design, and construction of such projects were in accord with the standards and procedures applicable to such projects which had previously been approved and following a final inspection by the Bureau engineers to see that the work had been performed.

This provision is intended to place back in the States the handling of the local problems involved in the building of farm-to-market roads and would relieve the Bureau of Public Roads of many administrative and engineering responsibilities imposed by present law. It is my belief that this provision will provide a pattern of cooperation between the State highway departments and counties, or other local units, comparable to that which has been built up through the years and which would continue between the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments on the primary and urban systems. This desirable transfer of authority to the State highway departments will in no way affect the requirement that the States or counties maintain the projects after construction. This maintenance requirement will insure the protection of the Federal interest in these projects and the public of continuing satisfactory highway service through proper maintenance.

The committee gave the most serious consideration to the apportionment formula for the $200 million authorized for the interstate system. The State highway officials association had repeatedly recommended that these funds be apportioned on the basis of population rather than the formula for primary roads which gives equal weight to the three factors of population, area, and

mileage of post roads. To provide a larger apportionment to States with sparse population, a floor of three-fourths of 1 percent was recommended as a part of the population formula. The reason for apportioning these funds on a population basis, which was stressed before the committee, was that it would permit reasonably uniform progress in removing the deficiencies from the interstate system in all of the States. After extended consideration, the committee decided to provide that one-half the funds authorized for the interstate system be apportioned on the traditional primary formula and one-half on population with a floor of three-fourths of 1 percent. This is a good compromise because testimony before the committee indicated that the cost of removing the deficiencies on the interstate system are about equally divided between urban and rural areas and one-half the interstate funds would be apportioned under the bill on a formula similar to that covering the apportionment of urban funds and the remaining half in the same manner as primary funds.

Another departure from current practice is a provision which would make the Federal share of the cost of improving the interstate system 60 percent and the States' share 40 percent, with the sliding scale applying in the public land States. Strong support was presented to the committee for increasing the Federal share above the traditional 50-50 matching ratio because of the vital importance of this system to the Nation as a whole. The State Highway Officials Association and the American Automobile Association each recommended that the Federal share be increased to 75 percent. Other witnesses appearing before the committee thought that the regular 50-50 matching should be continued. Recognizing the great importance of the interstate system and the importance of expediting its modernization and that a larger Federal share would serve as an inducement to proceed more rapidly with the costly improvements on the interstate system, the committee included the 60-40 matching provision.

The apportionment and availability of the interstate funds is conditioned on the continuation of the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax. A reduction of one-half cent in this tax would reduce the income from this source by an amount in excess of the $200,000,000 being provided for the interstate system. To make this program self-supporting from the motor fuel tax revenue it is necessary that this tax be retained at 2 cents per gallon.

The bill also provides for continuation of present programs of highway work in Federal reservations for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 as follows:

Forest highways	$22,500,000
Forest development roads and trails	22,500,000
National park roads	10,000,000
Parkways	10,000,000
Indian reservation roads	10,000,000
Total	75,000,000

Because of the great lag between appropriations and authorizations for forest highways, the bill proposes to cancel the authorization of $22,500,000 authorized for the fiscal year 1955. Such a cancellation will still leave nearly $21 million authorized but not appropriated. There is precedent for such cancellation action since a similar situation of lagging appropriations existed when the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948 was under consideration and the authorization for 1948 was canceled.

No new authorization is contained in H. R. 8127 for continuing work on the Inter-American Highway and the so-called Rama Road in Nicaragua. However, on recommendation of the Department of State the unappropriated balances of the funds heretofore authorized to be appropriated for such purposes are continued for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956. This will provide for continuing this work at an acceptable rate.

A number of witnesses appeared before the committee urging that the cost of adjusting public utilities in connection with the construction of Federal-aid projects be made reimbursable from Federal funds regardless of current State laws and franchise provisions. The committee recognizes that assumption of the costs involved in making adjustments necessitated by highway projects imposes a serious burden on many utilities, particularly the smaller ones. The committee concluded, however, that before recommending such a step it should have the benefit of a factual study including a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types and so has directed the Secretary of Commerce to make such a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties and interests relative to the problems posed by the necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities resulting from Federal-aid highway improvements.

Under present legislation there is no specific provision for the improvement of extensions of the secondary system in urban areas. To correct this situation section 11 provides for Federal participation in the improvement of such extensions with urban funds. This is a very desirable provision. In my opinion it might be well also to permit the improvement of such extensions with primary funds.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to use not to exceed $250,000 from General Administrative funds for the purpose of expediting the planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road which would traverse the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. Such Mississippi Valley Parkway has been proposed in accordance with the plan recommended in the joint report submitted to Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior. The committee feels that such authorization would provide an incentive to the 10 States bordering the Mississippi toward the developing of such parkway in line with established Federal-aid procedures. During recent years the committee has had before it numerous bills to provide Federal authorizations and assistance toward this project.

In concluding my description of the bill I wish to reemphasize that for the first time in history, through the enactment of H. R. 8127, we will be making available for highway work approximately the amount of the Federal tax on motor fuels.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I want to ask the question that I propounded of the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee as to the meaning or significance of the words "private highway" system. Does that include the roads within each respective State?

Mr. McGREGOR. I may say that the gentleman's inference is correct. The primary highway system is a network of principal highways comprising the Federal-aid primary-highway systems in the States. Since World War II, 45 percent of each year's authorization has gone to this particular system.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Is the percentage allocated this year on a par or is it the same as the pattern we have followed every year previously?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct. The bill makes no change whatsoever in the primary, urban, and secondary systems; 45 percent goes to the primary, 30 percent goes to the secondary, and 25 percent to the urban.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. It is noted here that $150 million is for projects on Federal-aid and primary highways in urban areas and $200 million is set aside for interstate roads concerning urban areas. Why is not the $200 million tied in with the $150 million?

Mr. McGREGOR. I might say that under the interstate system we have 40,000 miles, and that 40,000 miles comprises primarily urban and, I expect, a little secondary. But the 40,000 miles is the main routes of arterial travel from one section of the country to the other, and that is really under the category of a military road. We have allocated $200 million for the interstate system. We have changed the formula on that. Instead of a 50–50 matching clause, which is applicable to the primary, secondary, and urban on the interstate system, we call it 60–40, which is 60 percent put up by the Federal Government and 40 percent put up by the States. We do that to add a little incentive for the States to hurry the so-called interstate system, because it is a part of our defense program. This defense program is quite mobile, and I feel that the interstate system is more of a Federal responsibility than it is a State responsibility.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I thank the distinguished gentleman of the subcommittee for the information he gave me. Then the sum total of these figures would be $800 million?

Mr. McGREGOR. The matching money is $800 million. The actual total of the bill proper is $875 million. The $75 million represents forest highways, parks, and so forth.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. All of this is to be allocated to the improvement and construction of new roads; am I correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct. If I may interrupt the gentleman, this $875 million is the highest amount of money ever allocated or authorized by the Federal Government for roads. The actual return from the 2-cent fuel gas tax this year is approximately $906 million. We are authorizing $875 million of this amount. We are leaving approximately $30 million as a cushion fund for an emergency that might arise.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I just want to add to what I have heretofore stated, that I am sure the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is familiar with the statement the President of the United States made recently before the National Safety Council. He described the maiming and the slaughter of thousands of individuals killed on the highways, and the loss of property. My only regret, Mr. Chairman, is that the figure just mentioned is not four times as big as that which this bill calls for. I think it is one of the most worthy, one of the most outstanding, one of the most necessary causes to which we can contribute our funds that has ever been conjured up since I have been in this House.

Mr. McGREGOR. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, because I know of his intense interest in this problem. I might say that on page 2615 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you will find the apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds as it compares with existing law as to each of the segments of the highway program.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. One of the subjects discussed on the floor during the consideration of the rule on this bill was the question of linkage between the tax on gasoline and the amount appropriated. Now, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he is an advocate of linkage between the proceeds of the gas tax and the appropriations.

Mr. McGREGOR. I might say to my distinguished friend from Iowa that there is really no linkage in this particular bill. We are saying to the people, "If you want good highways, you give us the money that you have been paying in, the 2-cent gas tax, and we will assure you by the passage of this legislation that we will put approximately the same amount of money on roads." Now, being absolutely honest and sincere, we are saying "you can either have good roads or you can vote out the one-half cent liquid fuel tax and not have them." We have no jurisdiction over the continuation of the half-cent tax, and I was highly pleased when the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Congressman REED, made the statement that we were not interfering with operation of his committee. It is imperative that the 2-cent gas tax be continued and not be permitted to expire for the revenue therefrom will bring in approximately $910 million. With this fund available, we can assure you that you will have $875 million spent on roads. We are not linking it. The revenue from gas and diesel oil all goes into the general fund of the Treasury. Ninety percent of the American people believe that the gas taxes which they pay are all going into roads.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is it fair to say to people who inquire of me that this is not a linkage bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. I would say to my friend from Iowa, in my opinion, it is not entirely a linkage bill. If it were a direct linkage bill we would be interfering with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, or at least that question could be raised. There has been a great debate here on whether or not we should continue the one-half cent tax. You will have an opportunity to vote on that Wednesday—for it is part of the tax bill.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is in connection with the tax bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is right. It is in the tax bill, I am told. If they want to argue whether or not we should continue the tax bill, that is the time to debate it. We are saying here, if you do continue the tax, we will give approximately that amount of money to the road program. If you do not continue it, we cannot, because we just have so much money. This one-half cent represents approximately $225 million. We cannot enter into contractual obligations with the various States and then have that $225 million taken from us.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I may say to the gentleman that as a member of the Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations this subject of Federal aid to highways has been one of the subjects which is under current consideration.

Mr. McGREGOR. I recognize the gentleman is a member of that Commission and doing a splendid job.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The Commission is presently having under consideration a special report with reference to Federal aid for highways. That was in the background of my thinking in asking these questions.

Mr. McGREGOR. Please remember that this is not permanent legislation. The Congress can change its mind. But one thing we are doing, we are saying to the other body that when this piece of legislation goes over there they cannot do what some of us think they want to do, which is to take out the half-cent tax and still have good roads.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman should also point out that that half cent brings in about $225 million a year. If that half cent is not continued, it means the income from that gas tax is that much less. In this bill we are increasing the amount to the States $225 million. It makes a spread of $450 million.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman's figures are correct.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. NELSON. Do I correctly understand that the gentleman from Ohio means to say that the Committee on Public Works confines itself in making appropriations for public roads solely to the revenue received from the gas tax?

Mr. McGREGOR. Indeed not. We are not changing the existing tax law. If we were, we would say that it would be earmarked specifically for interstate roads. In no place in this legislation are we saying that we are earmarking any funds. It all goes into the General Treasury. But we are saying that we cannot give you good roads and then allow you to take one-half cent of the gasoline tax away from us.

Mr. NELSON. The gentleman's committee has made an appropriation of some $200 million for interstate highways. I understand from the address of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], when he spoke on the rule, that the committee considers it a primary responsibility of the Federal Government to develop the interstate highway system.

Mr. McGREGOR. We do consider the interstate system more of a Federal responsibility because of its military value and its possible expensive and rigid specifications?

Mr. NELSON. Yet, in this bill you appropriate $600 million for intrastate highways without any limitation, but you place an express limitation on interstate highways that the money shall not be apportioned or spent unless the gas tax continues at 2 cents.

Mr. McGREGOR. We have not changed the formula in the primary, secondary, or urban systems.

Mr. NELSON. I am talking about your limitation upon interstate highways. You have an express limitation that the money shall not be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce unless the gas tax continues at 2 cents.

Mr. McGREGOR. Again I say to my friend, we are just saying truthfully, if we do not have the money, we cannot build the roads.

Mr. NELSON. I have gathered from the debate, and I have listened to it very carefully, the primary purpose of the linkage between the $200 million and the 2-cent gas tax is to get the excise tax through the other body; is that correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. I would not think so. The other body can do as they please with the excise-tax bill. If my friend wants to take off the one-half cent, he will have that privilege next Wednesday by making such a motion.

Mr. NELSON. Your friend has no desire to take off the one-half-cent tax, but he does oppose the linkage of the one-half-cent gasoline tax to the development of the interstate highways.

Mr. McGREGOR. Would my friend then want us to be in the position of entering into a contract or an obligation with a State thinking that we were going to get approximately $910 million of revenue, and then the other body deciding that we were only going to get approximately $700 million? We would then be faced with the problem of canceling our obligations.

Mr. NELSON. No; the gentleman is objecting to the linkage of the tax in connection with the development of our highways. I think the development of our highways is the responsibility of the

Federal Government, regardless of the income from the gasoline taxes.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think it is the responsibility of the States and the Federal Government, but I also think it is our responsibility to be honest and fair with the road users and see to it that the money they are paying for gas tax goes on the roads.

Mr. NELSON. Does not the gentleman consider that this limitation on the expenditure of $200 million is in effect an announcement that your committee does not consider that the Government has any responsibility for interstate highways unless and only as long as it collects the gasoline tax?

Mr. McGREGOR. No; the gentleman is entirely wrong. I am certain that the gentleman has not read the hearings. We had weeks and weeks of hearings on this. Certainly, we tried to be fair and not infringe upon the Committee on Ways and Means, as the chairman so stated a few moments ago.

Mr. NELSON. I have no doubt about that at all.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from Maine, in his colloquy with my colleague who is addressing us from the well of the House, has said numerous times that your committee has made appropriations for highway purposes. Now, to keep the record straight, is it not true that what your committee has done is to authorize this expenditure, but it has made no appropriations? I just would like to have the record straight on that.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct. We cannot initiate an appropriation bill, we can only authorize. As you readily recall, the Committee on Appropriations took out $55 million of our authorization bill for 1954.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman on the fine statement he is making, and to commend him also for the provision in the bill with respect to forest highways. I note the bill provides for an authorization of $22½ million for forest highways. As the gentleman knows, we are extremely interested in that subject. I assume that we can count on the gentleman's support when that authorization bill or rather appropriation bill comes up.

Mr. McGREGOR. Certainly, and I recognize the gentleman's interest in forest highways as well as in the rest of the highway program, he has discussed the problem with me many times.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think the gentleman from Ohio has done a very fine job in presenting this bill. I congratulate him and I congratulate the members of his committee for the excellent work that they have done. However, I do have a few questions. If I understood the gentleman correctly, the bill which we are now considering does not change previous law going back to, let us say, 1948, 1947, or 1946 except that you have increased the amounts. But the allocation or the formula remains the same.

Mr. McGREGOR. Yes, with the exception of the interstate system, which we put on a 60–40 basis.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes. But, as I understood the gentleman, no money has ever been earmarked in the Federal Treasury for the use of the highways, and this bill does not earmark any money; is that not correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Then, under this bill a certain amount is authorized, which is larger than any other previous bill in history or in recent years, and once we pass this bill and that money is authorized, it will be the obligation of the Federal Government whether the Federal gas tax is reduced or not; is that not correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct, except on the interstate system.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Therefore, there would be no direct relationship between this bill and the retaining of the present 2-cent per-gallon tax?

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not think that is true.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And that is the wording of this bill as of now, is it not?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I say one more word? Then, in the event that the Congress should see fit to reduce the Federal gasoline tax from 2 cents to 1½ cents a gallon sometime in the future, the next bill that comes from this committee would have to take that into consideration; but in no way would it affect the legislation now pending before us.

Mr. McGREGOR. The question then would be for the Congress to decide upon the amount of money it would authorize.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. At some future date.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is right.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It would be the obligation of the Congress to find the money for this purpose, even if it had to go into the Federal Treasury and take money out that had been acquired from the highway user under some other tax, such as the tax on tires or tubes, or new automobiles, or automobile parts; am I correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. I think the language is very clear on that.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Referring to section 9, am I to infer from reading that section, that there is support in the committee for a policy of permitting the use of these Federal funds in the relocating and reconstruction of public utilities?

Mr. McGREGOR. I think the gentleman is right in the assumption that there is support in the committee, because many members of the committee feel that there is a problem relating to utilities. Some of the members wanted to earmark 4 percent or 5 percent of the fund for that specific purpose, but we decided that a study should be made first to determine various States rights.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If I may ask one other question, at the present time none of these Federal funds may be used for such relocation or reconstruction or to assume any part of the cost of operating a public utility; is that right?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct—except condemnation on private property.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McGREGOR. I should like to call attention of the membership to the secondary-road problem. We have heard that the governors and various other State officials want more control. On page 3 you will find a clause which gives to the State highway departments the right to draw plans and specifications and construct secondary roads to meet the needs in a particular area. There we are doing away with the practice of having to adhere to rigid Federal specifications, which are more costly than the type of road in certain areas requires.

There was reference a few moments ago that upon recommendation, the States may take the initiative, and permit a transfer from one fund to the other, of 25 percent. That is made flexible so that if the States have more money in the primary fund than they need and are short in the urban fund, they can transfer from primary to urban; or vice versa, the exception being the interstate system.

I should like to say a word on the matter of the population basis. You have heard arguments here this afternoon to the effect that the formula for the interstate roads should be on a basis of population alone. You have heard arguments to the effect that it should be based on the old formula alone. We had $200 million. Along with other members of the committee I agreed that in order to be fair we should divide the $200 million; take $100 million, or 50 percent, to be spent on the basis of population, and the other $100 million distributed according to the old formula, that is, one-third, one-third, and one-third.

That was the compromise, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that this Committee stays with that compromise. There are arguments that could be made on both sides.

I wish we had money enough to give every rural Representative all the money that he wanted and to give every urban Representative all the money that he wanted. But we do not have it. So this is a compromise, and I hope the Committee will go along with it.

This is not a perfect bill. There are some things in it that some of us do not like. But we have spent weeks and weeks on this proposed legislation, and I hope the Committee will join with every member of our committee in endeavoring to keep the bill intact, as it is written, and then send it over the other body for consideration.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS].

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman, in discussing H. R. 8127, the Federal Aid Road Act for the fiscal years of 1956 and 1957, I am sure that every member of the committee shares with me a feeling of gratification that we are authorizing the appropriation and spending of Federal money on projects to improve our own country. Good roads have contributed much to the expansion and growth of this country. They have added much to the health, happiness, and welfare of our people and have made possible to a large extent our economic expansion and the great wealth of material things that we all enjoy.

The great trouble has been and now is that we have not and are not even in this bill expending as much as we should and certainly not enough to have and enjoy a system of roads such as we all want and should have.

Money spent on the improvement, education, and welfare of our own people never seems to be enough to accomplish our objectives and our needs. Yet every dollar that we spend in these fields is returned to us and to future generations many times over. While H. R. 8127 authorizes more money to be spent on our Federal-aid roads than has ever been authorized before, and while being a step in the right direction, it by no means meets the need. It has been accurately estimated that as of November 1953, 63.8 percent of our roads on the Federal-aid system are now below safe standards for such roads and that expenditures of about thirty-five billions would have to be made to bring them up to the standard of safety that is needed. This same report or estimate shows that we are not even keeping even with our road-building program—that 2 years ago it would have required thirty-two billions to put our roads in good condition, whereas today it would take at least thirty-five billions. We are falling behind in spite of the large sums we are spending on our highways.

H. R. 8127 authorizes the spending of $800 million in each of the years of 1956 and 1957 on our primary, secondary, urban, and interstate systems of roads as against the sum of $575 million for fiscal years 1954 and 1955.

While our committee recognized that this is not as much money as could be beneficially spent, the majority of the committee felt that under all the circumstances with which our country is faced today that it was about as much as we could afford to spend.

The committee held extensive hearings in the spring of 1953 on national highway problems and gained much information that has been a real help in framing this piece of legislation. We held adequate hearings immediately prior to the introduction of H. R. 8127 as a clean bill. In our hearings we quickly discovered that all categories of our roads needed more money. More money was needed on the primary system, on the secondary system, and on the urban system. This bill provides more money on all of those systems on a percentage division among the States. That is basic law and has worked very well for a number of years.

It was almost the unanimous opinion of all witnesses that appeared before us and the opinion of the committee that the greatest need was for a rapid development of the Federal system of interstate roads. This system of over 38,000 miles comprises the main arterial highways of our country. They were selected by the highway departments of the various States. They are the main defense roads of our country. They carry the bulk of our interstate traffic. While representing only about 1 percent of our roads, 20 percent of our travel and traffic is over them. These roads run through both the rural and urban sections of our country and are parts of our primary and urban systems. The committee authorized $200 billion for this system for each of the years covered by this legislation. We further provided that on this system of roads, which in reality is a primary obligation of the Federal Government, that the Federal Government should provide 60 percent of the cost of construction and reconstruction of same and that the States should provide 40 percent, making allowances in addition to those States that have large public landholdings within their borders. By this change in matching formula I feel that these things will be accomplished; mainly, first, it will accelerate the building of this system of roads; second, it will allow the construction, particularly in large cities, of many costly improvements that have long been delayed due to their high construction cost; third, it will help many States who are or will be hard pressed to match Federal funds on road construction.

The committee adopted a new formula for the distribution of the interstate funds among the several States. Many members of the committee wanted the sum distributed on the old formula—one-third on population, one-third on area, one-third on miles of rural and star-route roads. Many others wanted the funds provided solely on a population basis. Neither group got exactly what it wanted, but a large majority on the committee finally determined that the fair and proper thing to do was to distribute the funds on a divided basis—that is, one-half or $100 million should be divided among the States on the old formula, and the remaining one-half, or $100 million, should be divided on a population basis with the provision that out of the fund divided on a population basis no State should receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of that fund. While this was not satisfactory to all members of the committee, I for one who come from a State that would be benefited by the entire sum being divided on the old formula feel that on the evidence before our committee and all other things considered that the action of the committee and the terms of the bill as it is before you was, and are, fair.

The committee made several other changes in the present highway law that were thought to be beneficial and needed in the legislation.

First. The bill provides that as to the funds for the primary, secondary, and urban systems that upon the request of the highway department of a respective State and with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce 25 percent of any of these funds could be transferred to any one or more of the other funds, but at the same time limiting the amount that any such fund could be increased to 25 percent.

Second. The bill further provides that this same arrangement shall apply to any funds heretofore authorized. This change in the law will be very beneficial in that it recognizes that different States have different problems, that in some States more money may be needed on a particular system, whereas in other States the reverse may be true. At least, it allows each State to evaluate its own problems and shift some of the funds so as to better meet those problems.

Third. A further change effected by the bill deals with the construction of secondary roads. Under present law the construction of secondary roads on the Federal-aid system are all required to fit or be up to more or less a rigid standard with little leeway for deviation therefrom. This legislation somewhat relaxes that rigid standard and provides that the highway departments of the different States may submit overall plans for design and construction of such roads subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce; and when such plans have been approved, the Secretary may discharge his responsibility as to individual projects in a State by receiving a certification from the highway department of that State that the plans for the project conform to the standards approved for that State. This change recognizes the need for different types and kinds of construction on secondary roads in the different States and recognizes differences in different parts of the same State. It vests more authority and latitude in the various highway departments in dealing with problems in their States.

With the exception of the changes above noted, H. R. 8127 generally conforms to former highway bills except that a continuation of the 2-cent gas tax is made necessary by the language of the bill if the $200 million provided for the interstate system is to be made available to the States and further provides for a study by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the State highway departments and other interested parties of the problems posed by the relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services for highway improvement.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATTS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I first want to compliment my distinguished colleague on the excellent statement he is now making. What are the requirements in connection with the secondary road system; I mean does the State road commissioner have more latitude under this authorization bill than in the previous bill?

Mr. WATTS. I may say to the gentleman that under existing law the Federal Bureau of Public Roads adopted pretty much a rigid standard and required that all States construct their secondary roads in accordance with that

standard. We have attempted in this legislation to relax this standard so that now all the highway department has to do is go before the Bureau of Public Roads and present a standard that fits that State—that will work good in that State—and if the Bureau of Public Roads feels that standard is adequate it will approve the overall plans for that State. The Secretary of Commerce or the Bureau of Public Roads may then discharge its obligation so far as the secondary roads are concerned by receiving from the highway departments of the various States a certification that the plans and specifications on the individual projects conform to the overall plans and specifications that have been heretofore approved for that State by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. PERKINS. Let us assume that we are back home in Kentucky for just a few moments. In the area that I represent in eastern Kentucky it is impractical in many instances to obtain a 60-foot right-of-way due to the narrowness of valleys.

Under the present law, as I understand, you cannot get matching funds from the Federal Government unless you obtain that 60-foot right-of-way. Now, let us assume that we have acquired a right-of-way up some narrow valley of only 30 feet. Would it be possible to receive matching funds for the 30-foot right-of-way for the purpose of constructing an 18-foot roadbed from the Federal Government?

Mr. WATTS. I cannot tell the gentleman that the Federal Bureau of Roads or the Department of Commerce would approve a plan along that line, but I will say that the language as written in this bill makes it possible for the approval of a road of that kind, whereas the old language did not.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, this proposal to amend the Federal Aid Road Act by revising the formula for the allocation of Federal funds and giving the States more responsibility for the proper expenditure of these funds is of primary importance to the country at this time.

The current economic conditions have reduced the amount of State funds available for matching purposes and at the same time caused widespread unemployment. This authorization for an appropriation approximately equal to the receipts from the Federal gasoline tax is fully justified as this tax comes from the same source as that of the major portion of the State highway funds. The practice of diverting a portion of the proceeds from the Federal gasoline tax to uses other than highway construction must be stopped. The increased construction costs make it more than necessary that every possible source of funds for the construction of an adequate national highway system be fully utilized.

Modern highways must be built to sustain the heavy traffic of interstate trucking with secondary roads adequate to carry this heavy traffic to every section of the country. This interstate traffic is one of the major items that has increased the cost of building a good State system of highways. This increased cost is definitely a proper charge against the Federal Government. It is impossible to make an exact breakdown of the cost to be charged to the Federal program, but this ratio of 60–40 is more reasonable in the light of current conditions than is the old ratio of 50–50. In fact, I would gladly go along with the ratio originally proposed in this bill of 3 to 1.

The liberalization, as I understand, of the requirements for secondary roads in particular is also a progressive step. The long history of Federal-State cooperation in highway building clearly indicates that the Federal Government need not be so strict as to sometimes appear unreasonable in order to assure that the State highway departments will make proper use of these funds. There will always be some need of Federal standards but that does not mean that the Federal highway engineers be required to follow in detail every action taken by the State highway departments.

The delegation of responsibility to the State highway departments, which are fully responsible to the people for their actions, will do much to expedite both the Federal and State highway programs. The current rise of unemployment makes it more urgent that our road-building program be expanded at the earliest possible date.

I know that all the Members in this body are concerned about our inadequate highway system. The lack of both water and highway transportation has retarded industrial development in the area that I represent in eastern Kentucky.

I deeply regret that the committee has seen fit to postpone the effective date of this authorization bill until July of 1955. I am hopeful that more consideration will be given to our secondary-road system. In many rural areas school children are now forced to walk several miles to school, and at times, wade the creek.

I have always doubted the wisdom in denying matching funds to certain rural areas because local governments are not able to comply with rigid standards and specifications of the Federal Government. In many instances it is now impractical to meet the Federal requirement of a 60-foot right-of-way for the construction of rural roads due to the narrowness of the valleys.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, it is rather confusing to me to be told that we are going to spend all this money collected by way of gasoline tax. I am going to vote for a continuation of 2 cents Federal gasoline tax, but it is disturbing to me to know that as of April 1 of this year there is not one cent of money you are talking about appropriating today in this bill that any of the States will get before a year from next July. That is when it becomes effective. We are now spending for Federal-aid roads a total of $575 million a year. We are collecting, or have collected last year, more than $900 million, and the increase is at the rate of between 5 and 7 percent annually. So, from April 1954 to July 1955 there will be collected by the Federal Treasury approximately $500 million more than will be used on the highway system. By the time that this $800 million Federal aid will be used in fiscal years 1956–57 the take by the Federal Treasury from the taxpayers of this country will be running about $1.1 billion a year at least.

I tried to get a bill through that would amend the Federal-aid highway law now in effect by adding $200 million a year for the interstate roads. We are told by every speaker that they are defense roads, so selected by the Defense Department, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the highway departments of the respective States.

You would think by the allocation of some of these funds on a population basis that the amount of roads in the respective States had nothing to do with it. The 29 States that are going to take a beating on this bill on this population basis have 23,342 miles out of the 37,000 miles in this interstate system, and there are 13,616 miles in what is known as the area of population. That is the situation. I am getting rather tired of talking so much about this bill.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I want to ask the gentleman two questions, and he has touched on both of them. Under the Federal excise tax of 2 cents a gallon, is all of that income from gasoline confined to highway construction or does the Federal Government use any part of it for any other service?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The funds are commingled with the general fund and we get whatever the roads committee recommends and is approved by the House, when the bill is signed by the President. We are using about $575 million out of more than $900 million that was collected last year.

Mr. WIER. The gasoline tax is diverted to other expenditures?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is and always has been, and it is going to be under this bill.

Mr. WIER. That is what I understand.

The next question I want to ask the gentleman from New Mexico is this: In the gentleman's first presentation under the rule he used the figure that the State of Minnesota would lose approximately $800,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Seven hundred and eighty-nine thousand dollars a year.

Mr. WIER. I have heard this new formula used quite often here. Will the gentleman explain why it is that Minnesota loses $800,000-odd as the result of this new formula?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Under the old formula, which was based on population, area, and miles of road, out of $100 million the State of Minnesota received

$2,617,000. Under the population formula you will receive $1,828,000. That is where you lose.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Under the existing law, the State of Minnesota gets $13,744,000, and under the bill that is before us for consideration the State of Minnesota gets $18,798,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. May I say to the chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee that the gentleman did not ask me how much they would be entitled to with these additional funds, he asked what they were going to lose because of the change in formula.

Mr. WIER. If the gentleman will yield, that is a different picture. I was assuming that the State of Minnesota, under this new formula of population, would have been $800,000 shorter than they would have been under the old formula or the present formula.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is the gentleman referring to the present formula of one-third, one-third, and one-third?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is the present formula.

Mr. WIER. Yes; I am referring to the difference between what we will get under the new formula and what we would get under the old formula.

Mr. McGREGOR. I hope the gentleman will recognize and give consideration to what he is getting under the new bill regardless of the taxes and what he would be getting under the old law. It is approximately $5 million.

Mr. WIER. I do recognize that the State of Minnesota will get considerably more.

Mr. DEMPSEY. So will every other State.

Mr. WIER. I think that is due to the fact that more money is being appropriated.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, under the old formula, we had four categories. We have the urban, the secondary, the primary, and the interstate systems. The primary system apportionment was on a three-way basis of population, area, and mileage. The interstate system was on that basis. The secondary system was on that basis, and is now, but the urban system was not. That was recognized as a population proposition, and is on a population basis. I pleaded with the committee, both with the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee, to put in any amount that they wanted for the urban system if the cities were hard hit and needed more money, and told them that I would support that. But here we have just put in a new system, a new category in 1952 that they have been trying to get in since 1944. It was never possible because of the fear of what would happen, and it has happened. Right now, in the other body, one of the Members has gone further than this, and in his bill he wants to put the secondary road system on a population basis predicated upon the number of cars licensed in the respective States. Have you ever heard of such a thing as that? Farm-to-market roads, if you please, put on the basis of the number of cars owned in the respective States. I am perfectly amazed that anybody from the State of Michigan would support such a theory or philosophy, because, after all, we look to the State of Michigan to give us or sell us more cars. We are getting the best cars in the world, and we certainly are using them as much as we can. But I am afraid that, notwithstanding Henry Ford and some of the other people who have put America on wheels, that with the unjust taxes we are now collecting and have been collecting we are going to take a lot of our people off wheels.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman explain why the Secretary of Commerce is given discretionary power over the distribution of the funds?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because that, too, was discussed at very great length. I was happy to find that the respective highway departments in the States could have some say as to what they should put in the secondary roads. I think a standard should be set up so that proper roads will be constructed. But the language in this bill is improper. It says he may do such and such in connection with this responsibility. It does not say he will do so. He could tell the State of West Virginia, "You can go ahead." Then he could tell the State of Iowa, "No; you cannot go ahead." There is nothing in this bill which makes it mandatory upon the Secretary of Commerce to give each State the same treatment. If he says "No," that is no, and you cannot do it; but if he says "Yes," then you can do it. I have never seen legislation of that kind brought up on the floor of this House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately, I did not hear all of the gentleman's remarks. Does the gentleman say that this bill gives discretionary power to the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; let me read that part of the bill to you.

Mr. GROSS. That road aid was to be apportioned on the basis of cars owned?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No, no; that is not stated in this bill. The question asked me by the gentleman from West Virginia had to do with the Secretary of Commerce permitting different States to have money on the secondary road system and giving some States more liberal treatment than others. In other words, they can provide what they want and he may approve it. But I want to read to you the language in this bill. It states:

> The Secretary of Commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified statement by the State highway departments setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of the respective States applicable to projects in this category approved by him.

He may do it. I think it should have said that he shall do it. Then we would be somewhere.

I will tell the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] another thing. We have been talking about who is getting this money. I will tell the gentleman how much he is going to lose in his State. Eight hundred and thirty thousand dollars in what the State of Iowa is going to lose.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the able gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Could the gentleman give the figures on North Carolina?

Mr. DEMPSEY. North Carolina loses $15,000 a year.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Does California gain or lose under this formula?

Mr. DEMPSEY. California loses in number of tourists but it gains in dollars. The State of California gets approximately $1,800,000 more; it may be more than that. But every State north of California or every State around California—Oregon, Washington, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Idaho—gets less. I think California would prefer to have good roads coming into the State, because they represent the big source for tourists in America. That is, California is the largest area for tourists in America. Florida comes next. Despite the great citrus fruit crop in California, the greatest dollar crop is the tourists who come to California. That is the great cash crop in California.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the gentleman yield further for a comment?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman is eminently correct. We want good roads leading into California.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman is not going to get them on this basis.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. How does Arizona come out on this basis?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Not very well. Arizona loses $1,544,000. I had a letter on this from your representative in the other body.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure the gentleman wants to get the figures right for the record. On the basis in the bill, California would get $9,255,000, and on a basis of population it would get $12,974,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have the figures right here. California would gain about $1,835,000 each year. But every State

around California would lose. I think the State of California is more concerned about the roads leading into it, which would bring the tourists into California, because California itself has done a very good job with its roads, perhaps the best of any State in the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. This is not a question of what a State loses under this formula, is it?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; it is a question of what the national defense loses. These are national defense roads.

Mr. SCHERER. Is it not a fact that the figures that I quoted in my remarks on the rule are correct; namely, that the improvement in the 8 States will cost 51½ percent of the total and that if the money is divided as you say it should be, they will get only 32.4 percent, while the States——

Mr. DEMPSEY. I heard the gentleman's speech and did not interrupt him when he made it, notwithstanding I thought his philosophy was somewhat wrong. But that is the gentleman's opinion to which he has a right.

Mr. SCHERER. Will the gentleman permit me to finish my statement? Is it not a fact that all the State highway officials agree with my philosophy, including the officials of the gentleman's own State?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; they did not. They voted against it.

Mr. SCHERER. In the gentleman's State?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; and also in the State of Arizona. Both of those States voted against it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to correct the record. Our distinguished friend from New Mexico has left an erroneous impression, I am sure quite unintentionally, but just let us get down to the facts: California under the basic section 21 specifications that the gentleman from New Mexico is advocating, would get $9,255,000; and under population would get $12,974,000.

Texas under basic 21 would get $13,030,000; and under population $9,450,000.

Illinois under basic 21 would get $7,763,000; and under population $10,677,000.

Ohio under basic 21 would get $7,026,000; and under population $9,738,000, in round figures.

Michigan under basic 21 would get $6,250,000; under population $7,809,000.

Pennsylvania under basic No. 21, advocated by the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, would get $7,920,000; under population, $12,866,000.

New York under the recommendation of the gentleman from New Mexico would get $9,501,000; and under population, $18,174,000.

New Jersey under basic No. 21 would get $2,618,000; and on a population basis would get $5,926,000.

I repeat that we attempted to make a compromise between the rural and the city areas.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The State of New Jersey which the gentleman just mentioned has 192 miles of the interstate system. The State of New York has 1,034 miles.

As I remember, the State of Pennsylvania has 1,300 miles.

The State of Texas has 2,700 miles not put on her by the State of Texas but put on her by the Defense Department for defense roads and you cut them down.

Mr. McGREGOR. That was O. K.'d by the Highway Department of Texas.

Mr. DEMPSEY. But it was not O. K.'d by the people of Texas.

Mr. McGREGOR. The highway department O. K.'d it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That may be.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, just before coming to the floor of the House I obtained from the National Safety Council a report on the number of automobile accidents which occurred in the United States in calendar year 1953.

The National Safety Council places the number of automobile accidents for 1953 at 9,500,000. In these accidents, the National Safety Council says, there were 1,350,000 people injured and 33,300 killed. In addition to that the National Safety Council says that the property losses and the expenses incurred through medical and hospital services as a result of these accidents totalled $3,950,000,000.

This great number of deaths according to Mr. James Cope, vice president of the Chrysler Corp., who testified before the Public Works Committee as a representative of the Automobile Manufacturers' Association, were to a great extent preventable. He stated that the Nation's best traffic authorities estimated that 2 in every 5 traffic deaths automatically would have been avoided if present highway deficiencies did not exist.

Thus, according to the Nation's best traffic experts, the lives of about 13,000 traffic victims would have been saved had the Nation, last year, possessed adequate highways. The main justfication for proving the increased highways building sums which this bill would authorize is that the additional money will provide safer highways to save lives, to lessen the number of persons being injured, and to decrease the economic and financial losses which occur as the result of unnecessary accidents that result from the inadequacies of our present highways.

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, urged that the present 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gasoline tax be kept in effect after April 1, 1954, when it is due to expire. In return for keeping the 2-cent a-gallon Federal tax in effect, the President promised an expanded highway program.

This bill provides for that expanded-highway program. It fulfills the President's promise.

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union speech in January said:

> To protect the vital interest of every citizen in a safe and adequate highway system, the Federal Government is continuing its central role in the Federal-aid highway program. So that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the interstate highway system, we must continue the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon. This will require cancellation of the one-half-cent decrease which otherwise will become effective April 1, and will maintain revenues so that an expanded highway program can be undertaken.

During the past 2 years, the Federal Government, under existing legislation, provided the States with $575 million a year in Federal matching funds. This bill increases the amount of these matching funds to $800 million, or in short, increases them by $225 million.

In addition to this $800 million there is $75 million in this bill for other types of highways, forest highways, parkways, and so forth. The total amount of money in this bill for highways is $875 million.

During the past year, the Federal Government collected $906 million from its 2-cent-a-gallon tax on liquid fuels, gasoline and diesel oil. The new bill, therefore, gives back to the States for highway purposes nearly all of the money derived from the Federal 2-cent gasoline tax. This, in my opinion, is sound policy. Federal gasoline taxes should not be diverted to other purposes than road building.

Gasoline taxes are paid by a special class of our citizens—the American motorists. These taxes are paid by the motorist largely in proportion to the number of miles he drives and therefore, in essence are based on the extent to which a motorist uses the highways. What the motorist pays in gasoline taxes should be used by both the Federal Government and the States to building more, better, and safer highways.

These gasoline-tax revenues should not be diverted to foreign aid or to any other purposes.

MUST PAY FOR ROADS

All of the evidence submitted before our Public Works Committee, which sponsors this bill, indicated that American highways are wearing out much faster than old ones have been repaired or replaced or new ones built. This evidence was to the effect that $35 billion will be required to place our American highways in A–1 condition.

Whether money is spent to build these needed highways or not taxpayers will pay for them just the same.

If the highways the Nation desperately needs are built, the motorists must pay for them in taxes. If the highways are not built the motorist will pay for them just the same in increased wear and tear on his car and tires, in costlier repair

bills, in higher medical and hospital expenses and in higher automobile insurance rates.

In the long run the motorists will be better off paying a 2-cent gasoline tax provided that the revenue derived from this tax is expended on more, better and safer highways.

In the long run it is cheaper to build good highways now than not to build them.

INCREASE IN CARS

In the past 20 years, the number of motor vehicles, automobiles, buses and trucks, using our American highways have more than doubled.

In 1931, there were only 25.8 million motor vehicles licensed in this country. By 1952, this number had doubled and stood at 53.3 million.

Between 1931 and 1952, the number of motor buses licensed and using American highways increased fivefold, from 42,000 to 240,000.

The number of motor trucks using our highways in 1931 was 3.5 million. In 1952 there were 9.2 million, nearly 3 times as many as in 1931.

The number of pleasure automobiles licensed in the United States increased from 22.3 million in 1931 to 43.8 million in 1952.

The number of motor vehicles using the highways is still increasing and will continue to increase.

The population of the Nation which in 1900 was less than 75 million by 1950 had doubled and stood at more than 150 million. There is every reason to believe that, barring a war of extermination, that our Nation's population will double again in the last half of the century and stand at about 300 million by 2000 A. D.

If the population doubles, the number of motor vehicles in use, it may be expected, also will double. The Nation, probably, will have 100 million instead of the present 53 million motor vehicles on its highways within 50 years. Our highway problem is not finished. It is just beginning.

In building more, better, and safer highways we build not alone for the present but also for the future.

HOW PACIFIC COAST FARES

My constituents will be interested in knowing how the three Pacific Coast States of Oregon, Washington, and California will benefit from this bill.

I have obtained from Commissioner F. V. du Pont, of the Federal Bureau of Roads, how much each of these three States will share in the increased funds in this bill.

Washington during each of the past 2 years has received $9,148,000 a year in Federal highway matching funds. Under this bill, Washington State will be allocated, Commissioner du Pont informs me, $12,805,000 a year for each of the next 2 years. This will be an increase of $3,657,000 a year for Washington State for each of the next 2 years.

Oregon during the past 2 years has received $8,502,000 a year in Federal highway matching funds. Under this bill, Oregon will be allocated $11,685,000 a year for each of the next 2 years. This will be an increase for Oregon of $3,183,000 a year over the amount now being received.

California during the past 2 years has been receiving $29,912,000 a year in Federal highway matching funds. Under this bill, California will be allocated $43,061,000 a year during each of the next 2 years. This will be an increase of $13,049,000 a year for California.

Altogether, the 3 Pacific coast States will receive about $20 million a year or $40 million during the next 2 years more than these 3 States received in Federal matching funds during the past 2 years.

Under this bill, most of this Federal money must be matched on a 50–50 basis by the States. This means that during the next 2 years there will be $80 million more spent on the highways of these 3 States than in the past 2 years. This additional $80 million, on top of the millions already being expended, will do wonders toward improving the highways of the Pacific coast by making them wider, better, and safer.

TO HELP MANY INDUSTRIES

The bill carries a total of $300 million more in Federal matching funds for the 48 States and Territories than any previous highway bill.

Most of these Federal funds must be matched by the States on a 50–50 basis. This means that the additional $300 million of Federal money will stimulate a $600 million increase in the Nation's highway building program during each of the next 2 years—will increase that highway building program by more than a billion dollars during the next 2 years.

Such an increase in the highway building program means the creation of jobs for tens of thousands of additional construction workers.

Also, this vast expansion of the national highway program means the creation of an enormous increased demand for cement, asphalt, steel, lumber, plywood, and all of those other materials that go into highway and bridge construction. This will bring into being tens of thousands of additional jobs for those who work to produce building and construction materials.

The railroads, truck and other transportation companies, also, will benefit through the increased freight this expanded road program will generate.

While the bill is not perfect in every detail, it is the best highway bill ever presented to Congress. I am proud to have, as a member of the House Public Works Committee, participated in writing it. I hope it will have the support of all Members of the House.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is on the whole a very good highway bill, one that has the bipartisan endorsement of the Committee on Public Works, one that will go a long ways toward meeting the highway problems that we have in this country of ours. The main complaint I have against the bill is that the sum authorized is still entirely inadequate to meet the highway needs of the Nation on a year-to-year basis. I do not believe that we should ever allow ourselves to get into a position in regard to Federal appropriations for highways of saying: We will only appropriate so much money as we get in the way of a Federal gasoline tax.

With respect to that idea, it is well to call the attention of the Members of the House who have listened to the debate as to how distribution of the interstate highway system money will be applied, because we have had a serious effort made in the past few years to do away entirely with the Federal gasoline tax and to do away entirely with the Federal system of highway aid. I would like to call the attention of those of us who represent some of the so-called poor States that if that system is done away with we will be left out in the cold entirely. I think the compromise that has been worked out in regard to the interstate system in this bill is reasonable and equitable.

I call your attention to the fact that the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] comes from a State that would benefit greatly if the interstate funds were allocated purely on the basis of population. I happen to come from a State that would benefit if the allocation was purely on the basis of the old formula. I believe, however, that in the compromise that has been worked out, where equal attention is given to both of these factors, we have reached a solution that is best for all of us concerned. If those of us from the so-called poorer States, from the large and sparsely settled States, succeeded in writing into the law a provision that ignores the needs of the highly populated States, we are liable to wake up 2 years from now and find that we get no Federal highway aid.

As has been pointed out on the floor here before, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is studying this problem now. Under the former Chairman of that Commission, I think it is very likely that we would have come through with a recommendation to do away with the Federal aid to highways system. I hope the Commission will not come through with that recommendation. If it does not, the reason will be in good part due to the fine work done by the Subcommittee on Highways of our committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR]. A very thorough study of this entire problem was made at great length last year, with hearings that took more than 13 weeks. It was the considered opinion of most of those who testified at that time that the Federal-aid system should be continued.

I fully realize the problems of these urban areas; that these highly populated areas must be fully considered and some attempt be made to resolve these problems in this legislation as is proposed in the portion of the bill that gives distribution of these funds in half of the interstate system on the basis of population. I think it is a fair and reasonable proposition as presented to us today, and I hope that the House will go along with this attempt that the committee has made to arrive at a meeting of the minds in the committee that will,

so far as is possible for it to do so, meet the needs of the entire country. We are not legislating here today to solve the highway problem of Mississippi, Ohio, or any other individual State. We are attempting to help and work out a national highway system that will, insofar as possible, meet the basic needs of this country.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, the bill you have before you today is the work of several months of investigation by the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works. I believe they have given to you a comprehensive, well-rounded piece of legislation for your consideration.

There are a few matters that have not been touched upon during the course of the discussion, and I would like to give you a few figures that seem rather important to me. While this bill is not one of linkage, nor do we by this bill endeavor to appropriate all moneys that are collected in the form of gas tax, there is a relationship, because most of us feel that the ordinary motorist, when he drives up to a gas station to purchase gasoline, does that with a feeling that the tax that he is paying is being used for the construction and maintenance of highways throughout our entire country.

In 1952 there was collected in gas tax $866,221,000. The highway users contributed $800,755,000. The nonusers of the highways paid in gas tax that year $65,466,000. We had complaints come to us from the airplane companies that they were paying a gas tax and, therefore, their portion of the tax should not be used for highways. The same type of complaint came from farmers, who said that the gas tax on tractors and other implements used on the farm should not be used for highways. We also had similar complaints from the motorboat owners.

I made some research and I found that this coming year we expect to collect about $910 million. It is estimated that 91 percent of the tax will be paid by the highway users, in other words $878,100,000 of the money to be paid in through this tax will be paid by the highway users. The amount set forth in this bill is quite a coincidence in that we are asking in the bill for $875 million, so there is a spread of only a little over $3 million in favor of the general fund left from the taxes paid by the users of the highways. It seems to me that should satisfy everyone when it comes to an equal distribution of the taxes paid.

I feel that another very important factor in this bill is that we have turned over to the various States the responsibility of constructing, maintaining, and writing the specifications for secondary roads. It was pointed out that the administrative cost of the Federal Bureau of Roads would be reduced by 50 percent if the secondary roads were handled entirely and directly by the State departments of highways. I think that is a very good argument in favor of this bill.

Another thing that you from the rural areas will be interested in is that this bill provides that the Federal Government may use urban money for the construction of secondary highways through the small municipalities. You are aware that the urban moneys go only to cities of 5,000 and more, so the smaller cities are left without any funds to assist them in building the trunklines through their small municipalities. This bill will assist them. The Highway Commission may appropriate urban moneys for the construction of highways through the small cities.

I feel that this is a very fine, well worked out bill, and urge your support of it in toto.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, we face two national crises—rising unemployment, which, if not checked, will bring us into a major depression; and a woefully inadequate highway system.

I maintain these two crises in the same breath, because a solution for one is a solution for both. Members of this body who drive to and from Washington, no matter in what direction they leave the Capital, must be painfully aware of the poor condition of our highways.

The one good stretch of highway—the 18 miles of the Shirley Highway in Virginia—is rapidly becoming a death trap. Scarcely a week goes by that we do not pick up our morning newspaper and read of a serious accident.

When I drive to my home in East St. Louis, I travel over roads that are battered from the pounding of traffic. For long stretches they are narrow, and I am forced to crawl behind trucks or risk my life trying to pass. Quaint little Frederick bogs me down with congested streets; Cumberland slows me with interminable stop signs; Wheeling brings me almost to a crawl with steep hills, sharp turns, and a bridge more than 100 years old; the route takes me through the heavily congested areas of Columbus and Indianapolis.

My route takes me over an important artery, an artery over which flows the lifeblood of our economy; a route over which important military traffic must pass in time of war or national emergency. To me, the delays and the bumps mean only an inconvenience, and a month off the life of my car. As I experience these delays, however, I ask myself what they mean to the logistic snowball of military support. How many hours or days delay in a vital air strike results from 5 minutes loss by a truckload of electronic gear in Cumberland or Wheeling or Columbus?

Mr. Chairman, we in the Congress can take a long step toward solving the highway crisis. We may do it without deficit financing. All we need do is to recognize that an adequate interstate highway system is a Federal responsibility. Within a period of no more than 10 years we can build our interstate highway system up to par. We can do it without going into debt. The financing of such a program can be achieved by devoting all the money collected from gasoline and other taxes on highway users to the highway program.

That would provide about a billion and a half dollars a year to be spent on the highway system. States could continue to do the actual work, under Bureau of Public Roads supervision, But the States would not be required to match the funds. This would free state and ordinary Federal-aid funds for work on our rural highways and on streets over which interstate traffic rarely passes.

Now how would this meet the unemployment crisis? In the first place, it would provide jobs. The program would not be boondoggling, for we would be building to increase the national wealth and to increase the national security.

In the second place, unless our highways are made adequate the market for new automobiles will continue to shrink. More and more people will come to realize that it is folly to endanger an investment of two thousand dollars, or more, on narrow, winding, rough highways. When fewer cars and trucks are built, less steel is consumed. When less steel is consumed, less coal is burned. That is something very close to me and the people living in the district I have the honor to represent.

Finally, I cannot stress too much the importance of adequate highways to our national defense. The Eisenhower administration is wedded to the military strategy of fast and massive retaliation. The effectiveness of such a strategy depends upon speed all along the line, not just in a fast carrier or a jet bomber. In a time of mobilization, every truck on our highways will be making a contribution to power we exert on the enemy. All the money we appropriate for jet aircraft, fast ships, and speedy tanks will be of no avail if these weapons are shackled by a horse and buggy highway system.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, service on a committee of this House is more like service on a jury than anything I know. Those of you who have served on juries know that you will sit day after day and hear testimony and then hear the court give the instructions on the law, and then you will go out and all 12 of you will have a different idea as to what the verdict ought to be. Then you have to give and take. You do not surrender your convictions if it comes to that. You hang the jury.

There are 29 of us on this Committee on Public Works, and I presume that if we had had our way there would have been 29 different bills. I happen to represent a State that is rather thinly populated, and we are not entirely satisfied with the provisions of this bill. I think the division of the fund on the interstate highway system under this bill would get more votes and would be more equitable to the thinly populated and poorer States if the formula was 75/25. There are other features of the bill which I would change. I am not particularly strong for the idea of linkage because if we have the highway system, say, linked to the gasoline tax, and then a future Congress does away with the gasoline tax, we would be thrown into utter confusion with reference to our program. The interstate system is set

up on a formula different from the general road funds which obtained through the years since I have been here and before. I have had quite a few phone calls, and some telegrams, and some letters expressing concern over the fact that this bill takes away or disturbs the old formula of the primary, secondary, and urban roads. I think that comes about by reason of the fact that here for the second time we have the interstate or so-called defense roads system mentioned. Indirectly, this defense roads system or the interstate system will help us because it will take from the primary system, for instance, in the State of Arkansas, although I do not remember the mileage, but Highway No. 70 goes through our State, and Highway No. 67 from Little Rock and northeast through our State—as I say, I do not recall the mileage but whatever the mileage is, it is subtracted from the primary system which has heretofore declared in our State, and we will have that much more to put on the primary, secondary system, and the urban system. Another thing that disturbs me too is the formula. That is not new in this bill. It has been in other bills. We are losing population in the State of Arkansas, and it is largely because our road systems, our secondary or farm-to-market or rural routes and postal route roads are poor and people are just not going to live on those gravel roads when they can move to better roads. Then there is the so-called transfer in this bill as in the previous bill. We have a switch of 25 percent allowed. The highway department of the State of Arkansas, for instance, can take 25 percent of the funds allocated for secondary roads and use it on primary roads. But, by the same token, it can take 25 percent from the primary roads and use it on the secondary roads. The pressure gets pretty heavy on the highway department of the State. Personally, I would like to have that nailed down especially with reference to the secondary road system. Because if we can get those roads, and if they can be traveled over and get these people out of the mud, then our gas tax receipts will increase because the people will travel more. I can cite one instance in the district that I represent where the average travel on the highway was 75 vehicles per day, but it was paved and then the travel on that highway increased to about 300 vehicles per day. Of course, with the incidental increase in the gasoline tax money that was used.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman explain just how the State road department in my State or your State would take those funds that we are allocating for primary roads and use them on urban roads? Would the gentleman be a little more definite as to just how that could happen?

Mr. TRIMBLE. The highway department of the State, as I understand this legislation—and this was in legislation prior to this, and is not new in this particular bill—could, let us say, in the State of West Virginia have $3 million for a primary system, and then, if the highway department decides they need more funds on the secondary system, they could take 25 percent, or $750,000, and set it over on the secondary system, or vice versa.

Mr. BAILEY. They could also take funds for secondary roads and use them for access roads to municipalities in the urban centers?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I am not sure about that. I would not want to be bound by a statement to that effect. I think they can shift 25 percent of any of these funds to any other fund. That is my understanding of the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of this subcommittee that has been making a study of this road problem the past 2 years. I want to commend the membership of this committee. As you listened to the debate today, you noticed some difference of opinion. Different areas are affected in different ways by this bill. It is a compromise bill between the various groups from the different types of States that we have in the United States, with the overall idea in mind that we are trying to pass legislation here which will do the greatest good to the greatest number of people.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support H. R. 8127, because in my judgment, it is the most realistic highway contruction bill ever considered by Congress. This bill was prepared after exhaustive hearings held many days last year in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, in which witnesses from all segments of our economy were heard. In addition, extensive hearings have been held this year before our Subcommittee on Roads, and the House Public Works Committee took final action on this bill after complete discussion.

There are many things in this bill that can be considered of a controversial nature. Each segment, however, of our people who are interested in highway construction, have something in this bill that commends itself to them. This bill raises the regular funds for highway construction $100 million. In addition to that, $200 million was established in comparatively new funds to be used on our strategic military network.

Altogether, this bill provides for additional construction of highways in our country amounting to over $1 billion for the 2-year period fiscal 1956 and 1957. This is only a step in the right direction. It will not nearly meet the Nation's highway needs. I hope this expanded program will meet with such success that the people of the various States will ask Congress to increase the amount to be used on highway construction many millions of dollars per year in the near future.

We have been spending billions of dollars for foreign aid, and other billions for our military strength. It seems to me it is time that we are starting to partly meet our highway construction problems in the United States. This bill is a forward step in that direction.

Federal apportionment of funds State of Kansas would receive under new national Federal-aid-to-highways bill:

Primary	$6,552,000
Secondary	4,587,000
Urban	1,390,000
Subtotal	12,529,000
Interstate population formula	1,168,000
Old formula under sec. 21	2,446,000
Subtotal	3,614,000
Overall approximate total	16,143,000
1955 total	12,035,698
Increase per year	4,107,302

Federal apportionment which Kansas is receiving under the 1952 law for fiscal 1954 and fiscal 1955:

1954

Primary	$5,950,738
Secondary	4,165,742
Urban	1,261,297
Interstate	605,853
Total	11,898,630

1955

Primary	$5,975,744
Secondary	4,183,753
Urban	1,267,798
Interstate	608,403
Total	12,035,698

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I should like to ask the gentleman a question; I should like to say beforehand, parenthetically, that I would not be so emboldened as to put my own individual judgment up against the judgment of the committee which has given so much thought and attention to this problem; not only to this one bill but to this problem over a period of years.

I want also to say that I have been in touch with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], who has always been attentive and interested and thoughtful and very nice about listening to suggestions. My concern with these public-works road bills now is that we have a tendency, in my judgment, to lose sight of the primary need for defense highways; and I get that idea from traveling through the country.

If we were to have world war III now I tremble to think about how we would move the traffic engendered by such a war over our highways, because they go through these urban centers, which are the first ones which would be knocked out, and they go through every town and village, and make no appreciable effort to bypass them. How to get military traffic through at a high rate of speed is the great question, and that is the thing that I see in the tendency, not of the committee so much, but the tendency of the citizens, the people, to overlook the need for defense highways.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my remarks to section 2

(a), on page 5, this controversial proviso beginning in line 10. Despite what the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] says of this bill and has to say about there being no connection or no linkage there, a lot of people back in my State seem to think that there is.

I have before me here—and I would like to include in the RECORD—a statement by the public-relations officer of the Standard Oil Co. located in my State protesting it.

I have another from one of the officers of the State Contractors' Association protesting it.

I am wondering if the gentleman will again explain to the members of the Committee why there is not a connection there. They seem to think so and my mind is not clear that there is not. So I ask the gentleman to explain it.

Mr. McGREGOR. We simply say to the people that we cannot give you additional miles of better roads unless we have the money with which to do it. Now if we are talking about continuing the half-cent gas tax, that bill will be in here on Wednesday and everyone will have an opportunity to vote "yes" or "no" on the continuation of the gas tax. This can be changed overnight; there is nothing permanent about this legislation whatsoever.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. J. M. Douds says:

> We are definitely opposed to the provision linking the gasoline tax and the Federal-aid highway program because of the traditional responsibility of the Federal Government to construct and maintain interstate post and military roads.

It has been the tradition of the Government to do that. Why use the gasoline tax to do it? That is the question all will ask.

Mr. McGREGOR. If you ask the average man on the street what the gasoline tax was used for he would say it was used for highways.

Mr. BAILEY. Under the circumstances I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the pending measure to amend the Federal Aid Road Act and to authorize increased appropriations for the construction of highways is an important measure and certainly represents a forward-looking and progressive piece of legislation.

The building of better highways and improved secondary road systems for the Nation is a nonpartisan issue. We all are for, or should be for, better roads and improved highways. The new bill represents an extension of the Federal Aid Highways Act of years past and provides for carrying forward the basic highway pattern of Federal Government and State cooperation on a matching funds basis—a 50–50 basis with some exceptions.

The bill would authorize the appropriation of $600 million for each of the fiscal years of 1956 and 1957 and to be made available to the States and expended as follows:

Two hundred and seventy millions of dollars for projects on Federal aid primary highway systems.

One hundred and eighty millions of dollars for Federal-aid projects on secondary road systems.

One hundred and fifty millions of dollars for projects on Federal-aid highway systems in urban areas.

Under this authorization, the State of Tennessee will receive $5,851,000 in Federal aid funds for primary road construction; $4,560,000 for Federal aid for secondary road construction; and $2,139,000 for Federal aid for urban road construction—a total of $12,550,000 in Federal aid for highway and rural road construction and development in the State of Tennessee—and a total of $16,756,000 with the additional population increase basis.

This represents a substantial increase over funds provided in recent years and marks a progressive step forward. It is an indication of the fact that an increased highway construction program is needed and should be stimulated inasmuch as there has been a period of some laxity in road construction during the war years and postwar years.

Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat concerned about the provisions contained in the bill with respect to the transfer of funds from rural to urban road purposes and vice versa. The bill would permit not exceeding 25 percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated to the States, in any one year, to be transferred from the apportionment under one system to either of the others.

Many of us are greatly concerned about the construction of rural roads and it is to be hoped there will not be any substantial diversion or transfer of funds herein appropriated for rural road development to urban projects. It is noted that such transfer of funds can only be effected when requested and certified to by State highway departments of the various States and being in the public interest, and when approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

The apportionment is the same as before—on a 50–50 basis except in the case of the authorization of $200 million for interstate highway construction in which case a new formula is adopted with the Federal Government making a contribution of 60 percent as compared with 40 percent from the States. This is to stimulate an increased interstate highway construction program.

This is a progressive measure, a constructive measure and represents an extension of progressive legislation which has been in effect for a number of years.

I wish to commend members of the committee for recommending this legislation and I urge its adoption.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL], a member of the committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, insofar as linkage is concerned, it does not seem to me it makes a great deal of difference how you look at this matter. In West Virginia we have a gasoline tax which goes entirely to the support and maintenance of the highway system. We may be in this particular bill adopting the principle of linkage, yet it is temporary and it does not necessarily mean that it is a precedent.

I do not believe, after getting extensive information in the hearings extending over many weeks, that we could possibly present to you a bill that would satisfy everybody; however, there is something about this bill which I think needs to be commended and that is this: In all these years that we have been neglecting our highways, we have been building more and more automobiles and creating more and more traffic. We have diverted funds which we really should have used for highway purposes. We have diverted those funds to other purposes.

Regardless of the criticism you may have of this particular bill, it does one thing, it at least makes a start toward the Federal Government's assumption of its duty to improve the Federal highways. If the money comes from the gasoline tax, if it comes from the general fund or from whatever source, we must recognize it is a start in the right direction and certainly there is not anything in this country that needs the support of Federal funds as much as the highway system of the Nation. I think this is a good bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. As author of the pending bill, I want to pay my respects to the splendid work that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL] has done in behalf of good legislation. He has made many excellent contributions to problems studied by our committee.

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to point out that I believe this committee has taken the wrong approach when it attempts to change the formula whereby you take the money authorized in this legislation and change it to the formula as set forth on page 4 of this bill. I say that for the reason that all of us know that heretofore the formula used has been satisfactory and also, may I say, that this authorization where it changes that formula will be a disadvantage to the thing that you desire to accomplish. The thing that you desire to accomplish, as I understand it, is national defense highways.

In my State as an example, there has only been authorized 661 miles of roads for national defense highways, but under this apportionment we stand to lose over a million dollars. I know it has been said around here that if you would take a look at the figures compiled on page 20 of the report it will be found that the State of Colorado pursuant to old apportionment received $8,484,000, and that on page 18 in pursuance to the appointment as set forth therein the State of Colorado would get $11,958,000,

an increase of approximately $4 million. The thing that they have overlooked is that as they compiled the figures set forth on page 20 of the report they only used $575 million as the appropriation.

In this bill we have $800 million, and as the result, if we had had the same proportion—and it will apply to 29 other States—then we would have received in excess of almost $13 million. Now, I can readily understand how many members of the Highway Engineers, meeting in a convention, were told that if you would follow this formula, then you would get $3 or $4 million for your respective States, but the thing that they did not tell them was that of the increased amount, and if they had followed the old formula, they would have received all the way from $1 million to $2 to $5 million more under the old formula.

Mr. Chairman, it is therefore going to be my privilege when this bill is presented under the 5-minute rule to offer an amendment to strike that portion of the bill which deals with population only. I want to point out that if you are going to have this for a national-defense highway system, it is as essential to have that defense highway through sparsely settled sections of the United States as it is to have it in the thickly populated sections of the United States.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Under the formula on the interstate system of 60–40, the State of Colorado will get 65.16 percent of the Federal appropriation; in other words, you are getting 5.16 percent more than the average State will receive.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, that is correct. This increase to Colorado is due to the fact the public lands formula has been employed. I have always supported the public land in the Highway Act, which the gentleman from Alabama well knows.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee or the author of the bill a question in regard to this interstate highway fund. In California we have one road that has given us a great deal of grief. It is Highway U. S. 40 which runs from San Francisco through Sacramento, over the Sierra Nevada Mountains at the Donner Pass and into Reno. It is an interstate highway. During the wintertime it is plugged up with snow and a great deal of the time is impassable. In the last session of the legislature the State legislature voted $20 million to improve that highway, provided that the Federal Government would put up an additional $20 million as a matching fund. Five of us Members of the House have introduced bills to authorize that particular contribution by the Federal Government, which would be additional and extra to the annual Federal aid allotment. Those measures are pending before your committee at this time, and we are seeking the support of the Defense Department for those bills, because this is a defense highway which, when blocked, cuts off the defense establishments east of the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

The question I want to ask the gentleman is this: Since $200 million has been put into this bill, would it be possible to take California's portion of that $200 million and use it in connection with the $20 million now set aside and earmarked by the State of California for the improvement of Highway 40?

Mr. McGREGOR. It would be, if it were so recommended by the California State Highway Department and concurred in by the Bureau of Public Roads They could probably take that amount before it is allocated anywhere else, because it would probably have preferential treatment because of its military value.

Mr. ENGLE. The State of California has already indicated the preferential treatment it wants to give this highway. As I understand, if the State of California, its road official, can convince the Bureau of Public Roads that this allocation which goes to California out of that $200 million should be used on Highway 40, it can be used for that purpose.

Mr. McGREGOR. If they can prove it to the Public Roads Administration, it can be taken as part of the California share under this new legislation; we are stressing the $200 million interstate because of military value.

Mr. ENGLE. And because that is a primary defense highway?

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the gentleman, and I compliment the committee on the excellent work it has done on this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) $270,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) $180,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

(c) $150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas.

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this act: *Provided further*, That in the case of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of the respective States applicable to projects in this category approved by him: *Provided further*, That not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to each State under subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section may be transferred from the apportionment under one subparagraph to the apportionment under either of the other subparagraphs: *Provided further*, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more than 25 percent: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $200 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the following manner: one-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project on the national system of interstate highways provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 60 percent of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 40 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1954; and the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, unless a Fed-

eral excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1955.

(b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects under this section.

(c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the authorization in section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is hereby canceled; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of $22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds available for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for vehicular parking areas: *Provided further*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

(b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 5. Any unappropriated balance of the sums heretofore authorized to be appropriated by sections 5 and 6 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 158), for the Rama Road in Nicaragua and the Inter-American Highway, respectively, for the fiscal years 1953 and 1954, shall continue to be authorized to be appropriated for such purposes for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956.

SEC. 6. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 158), not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 7. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 8. All acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect on its passage.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed to make a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties in interest relative to the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from highway improvements authorized under this act. Among other things, such a study shall include a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end that a full and informative report may be made to the President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States not later than February 1, 1955.

SEC. 10. The term "highway," as defined in section 2 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented, shall be deemed to include "tunnels."

SEC. 11. The Secretary of Commerce may approve as a part of the Federal-aid secondary system, extensions through urban areas, connecting points on that system, provided that Federal participation in projects on such extensions shall be limited to urban funds.

SEC. 12. For the purpose of expediting the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico in general conformity with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and with the recommended plan set forth in the joint report submitted to the Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior pursuant to the act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 262, 81st Cong.), there is hereby authorized to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce from general administrative funds not to exceed $250,000; the amount expended under this section shall be apportioned among the 10 States bordering the Mississippi River in proportion to the amount allocated by these respective States for the improvement and extension of existing sections of this highway project as approved by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with other public agencies concerned therewith.

SEC. 13. This act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954."

Mr. DONDERO (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman have any idea how much time we will have for debate before we are shut off?

Mr. DONDERO. There is no disposition on the part of the chairman to shut off debate.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I know there is no such disposition on the part of the gentleman, but I want to know if we can have some time, because there are some things that should be discussed on this bill.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McGREGOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly will not object, I wonder if in the opinion of the members of the committee on that side we might finish the legislation tonight, and set a time of not later than 6 o'clock, we will say, for closing debate.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Of course, there is no disposition on this side of the aisle that I know of to extend debate on the bill. I see no reason why we cannot conclude it tonight. I suggest that we proceed and see how we come out, and then consider closing debate.

Mr. McGREGOR. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the immediate request will of course be granted, and certainly, as the chairman has pointed out, there is no disposition to shut off debate. However, in scheduling the program for the week, it was my understanding after consultation generally that we could conclude the matter today. I am very sure that we can. I have checked at the desk and there are three amendments there. That does not necessarily mean that there are not other amendments that will be offered, because Members may have amendments that are not at the desk. If Members do have amendments, if they would send them to the desk we could tell better how we could proceed in order to grant plenty of time for the discussion of the amendments that may be offered.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEMPSEY:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$700,000,000."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "$270,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$315,000,000."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "$180,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$210,000,000."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$175,000,000."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. In view of the fact that it is proposed to continue the gasoline tax at 2 cents, we will build up an additional fund of about $500 million from the 1st of February of this year until the 1st of July of next year.

There is nothing in this bill we have before us which provides for spending any money before the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. The amount of money in addition that I am asking is $100 million to be given to these categories that have not been treated very generously in this bill. They are the primary system, the secondary system, and the urban system. The primary system would get an additional $45 million, on the same ratio as they would under the formula now. The secondary system would get $30 million and the urban system would get $25 million. That is the formula that has been in effect for a great many years. Everybody who speaks about highways is concerned about the accidents we have been having and the lack of funds we need to do the job that has to be done. If we want to be sincere about this thing, I do not believe we should continue for another year and 3 months with not one additional dime for highways in view of the increase in accidents. We should provide something additional for 1956–57. That is all there is to this amendment. It affects every segment of this Nation. It affects all people. It provides the same formula that we have been working on for a great many years. I think the money is available and I do not see any excuse not to adopt this amendment.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, is it the purpose of the gentleman to take that $100 million from the $200 million provided in section 2?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It has nothing to do with that at all. This is just an additional $100 million. This amendment has nothing to do with that.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, you are seeking to set this up one year?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No, I am asking to set up an additional $100 million for each of the fiscal years 1956–57. And I hope we may get some of that back before that time.

Mr. DONDERO. That means that you want to increase the bill by $100 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right. It may be that we will get the authority to use some of it earlier, but the bill we are considering now, notwithstanding what the President said about the highway accidents, what he said about these killings on the highways, and what he said about using this gasoline tax for construction, does not provide sufficient money to do the job, in my opinion. The funds authorized by this amendment will at least help out and help in the categories that have not been given anything in a great many years. You set up $50 million for many, many years for that category.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. STEED. Do I understand the main purpose you have here in asking for this $100 million increase is due to the fact that for the next year or slightly more than 1 year you are going to continue to collect the 2-cent gasoline tax?

Mr. DEMPSEY. For 1 year and 3 months.

Mr. STEED. And that money will be spent on building roads?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right. I am asking for $100 million additional for 15 months, and I think we should use some of it.

Mr. STEED. If your amendment is adopted, then in these 2 following years you are going to have a total of $200 million additional?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. It is my understanding the gentleman is talking about the 3 categories where the States match funds on a 50–50 basis?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes, that is right.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am certain the gentleman has listened to the testimony. There were a number of States wondering whether they would be able to match the funds that we have established here in this bill to say nothing of matching any additional funds.

Mr. DEMPSEY. May I point out to the chairman that if there are any States that cannot match it, they are not required to match the funds. But, if they can match the funds—and I am sure they would if they were given the opportunity—we are giving them another year to do so. Certainly, they will be able to match the funds. The gentleman is trying to predict what the States will do. The Bureau of Public Roads told you that they have not failed yet.

Mr. McGREGOR. But you do have on record the fact that there are other States that cannot match the amount that we have in the bill now before us. The gentleman knows, if he is making assurances, as he suggested, that we have no assurance as to what the gasoline-tax income for the coming year is going to be. As of now, it is $906 million without any increase. I would ask the gentleman in all sincerity, because I know he believes in a balanced budget, where are we going to get this extra $100 million?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will tell the gentleman where we can get this extra $100 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DEMPSEY was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. I got my figures primarily from the chairman, who stated to the Rules Committee that we had $100 million or more last year. He also stated that it was increasing at the rate of about 5 percent per year. So there would be $45 million more in 1 year, or $56 million in 15 months.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will yield to my chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman understands that we are stepping up this bill now over $225 million above what it was at any previous time. We did that for the purpose of practically absorbing all of the gasoline tax. We are within $31 million of it now. If the gentleman's amendment prevails, we would go a way beyond that.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman has put in $70 million that he knows is not going to be appropriated. They are not matching funds with the Federal Government. They have to do with Indian roads, and with parks, and such things as that, which really do not come before the committee. They do not represent a matching proposition. They are in the same category as in 1952.

Mr. DONDERO. But the money comes out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The money comes out of the Federal Treasury, certainly. But you are delaying this action for a year or 15 months. That is what you are doing, if you do not appropriate this money until 1956 or 1957. With all of this gasoline tax money coming in, under your own figures it will be close to $500 million and we will not be doing anything about building roads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The question of the amount of money provided for roads in this bill has been considered thoroughly by the members of the committee. That was done before we reported it to the House. No one suggested that we should increase the amount of the bill. If the gentleman's amendment were adopted, we would be authorizing more money than is coming into the Federal Treasury from the gasoline tax, if you want to link the question of the gasoline tax with the question of road funds.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. At no time did my distinguished friend from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] bring this amendment before the committee. This bill came out of the committee by a unanimous vote. We all recognize that it is not as much as we want, but it is a compromise and my good friend voted for it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for just a word?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I did everything in my power to get the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee to approve more money for urban roads, did I not? The gentleman said that there was no way to do it except by changing the formula. I tried to prevail upon the gentleman to change the formula for the interstate roads, but in what the gentleman has done he has hurt the other category, the primary system of highways. I did every thing in my power to get additional money for these roads, because the amount of money was inadequate. I asked the chairman of the committee if we would have a chance to get some additional money for 1955 and he said, "No." If we can for 1955, we should; if not, for 1956 or 1957; just so the money is available.

Mr. DONDERO. Money is provided in this bill for 1956 and 1957. The question of money for 1954 and 1955 has already been disposed of and the money allocated to the States. The amendment would increase the total another $100 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In January 1953, when we convened I introduced a bill providing for $200 million for interstate roads. The gentleman put in a bill for $250 million. I went along with him. I did not want my bill, I wanted his. But he did not do anything about it, and he is not doing anything about it now, except what is in this bill.

Mr. DONDERO. That may be true, but we have done this, we have added to the bill before the House now $225 million more than any previous bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Certainly.

Mr. DONDERO. I think we have gone a long way in increasing the amount of the authorization.

Mr. DEMPSEY. We have done that because of the terrific increase in the gasoline tax we are collecting.

Mr. DONDERO. But this bill takes nearly all the gasoline tax; we are within $31 million of it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman's figures are in error.

Mr. DONDERO. I doubt it very much.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Those are not the figures the gentleman has been using.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the House vote down this amendment, because if it is approved we would be providing far in excess of what the present program for roads contains.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. SCUDDER. I just want to make an observation: There is about $100 million involved in the difference between the highway users' gasoline tax and other forms of tax paid in under this legislation. Now if we do get to a point where they are charging us with linkage, then I think that we would have plenty of opportunity for our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol to bring in an amendment to strike that part out. I think we are on dangerous ground in endeavoring to absorb all this money that comes in from both the users' tax and nonusers' tax.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. We are appropriating money for the years 1956 and 1957. Is it not true that by that time we will have about $1,200,000,000 in the tax?

Mr. DONDERO. At the rate of increase of 5 percent a year.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Then the fact of the matter is that we would be using up only about $900 million out of $1,200,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. That may be true.

I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DEMPSEY) there were—ayes 17, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: Page 9, line 15, strike out all of section 9 on pages 9 and 10 and insert a new section to be known as section 9 and to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. No part of any appropriation authorized by this act shall be used to defray any part of the cost of relocating, reconstructing, or improving any public utility service."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment not because I have any desire to change anything that is being done under the present law, but I am fearful of the effect of section 9.

I was rather amazed when the author of this bill told me upon interrogation that there was support in that committee advocating a policy of using a part of the tax money to reimburse or to help pay a part of the cost of construction or relocation or reconstruction or improvement of public utilities. I think that in this bill unless we take out section 9, you are beginning to establish a policy of paying a part of the expenses which should be borne by the public utilities and which no one ever dreamed would come out of the pockets of the payers of gasoline taxes to help relocate gas lines, electric lines, telephone lines, and what have you. Already the various States are giving free rights-of-way to these utilities, permitting them to tear up along the sides of the highways, the shoulders, if you please, interrupting traffic and causing great inconvenience to the traveling public. We are already doing that.

Here someone is proposing through this study to do something else, and I think we might as well face the situation. We all realize that under this administration no one will deny it is anything but favorable to the public utilities. The Secretary of Commerce could very well next time bring in a report and a recommendation that we allocate a certain percentage of these funds to pay the public utilities for a part of the work which they should do themselves. I say that already we are giving the utilities enough when we grant them the privilege of using the right-of-way and when we subject ourselves to the inconvenience caused thereby.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I think my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. Under existing law the utilities that are occupying their own rights-of-way can be reimbursed 50 percent under Federal aid. The gentleman's amendment will fix it so that no money whatever can be paid to the utilities.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No. If they are occupying their own rights-of-way, yes, but practically all of this right-of-way is along State highways. It is not owned by the utility. They pay nothing for the use of it, they pay no rental or lease, they get it absolutely free, and I am not in favor of taking gasoline tax money to reimburse utilities for doing something they should be doing themselves.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the view of the majority of this committee, but the gentleman's amendment would change existing law.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No. Under the present law they cannot use these funds for that because the State Highway Department does not include it as a part of the cost of construction. They make no application for Federal funds for that purpose. They are not paying it now and I do not want them to pay it in the future.

Mr. GEORGE. It is considered part of the highway in our State if they are occupying their own right-of-way and is to be charged against construction. If they are on a public right-of-way or on a highway that is an entirely different matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman does not want to use part of this money to pay a public utility for moving a gas line or a cable line or anything like that, does he?

Mr. GEORGE. Not according to the telegrams I have been getting and according to the hearings. I conducted the hearings on this problem and they did not think I was on that side.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman is on my side and if that is the case I know he will support my amendment.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. Chairman, we want to be fair with all segments of our economy, whether it is the labor group, the farm group, the utility group or whoever it might be. The committee had under discussion for many days, a proposal that 5 percent of the money authorized under this legislation be used for the relocation of utilities, both private and public. We did have a lot of evidence that there was a possible problem relative to utility relocations. Even those who do not believe in the utility program recognized that. We were informed that some of the small utility groups were made completely bankrupt by the relocation of highway systems. We decided that rather than make it a mandatory provision of 5 percent we would authorize a study in conjunction with the State highway departments and the Secretary of Commerce and other parties in interest. To me this is nothing more than fair.

Next year you can vote on it, whether you think it is right or whether you think it is wrong, but certainly these people are entitled to their term in court. May I say to my distinguished friend that many of the States are using State moneys for doing this very thing? I concur in the statement of my colleague from Kansas, that should this amendment prevail we would have to have some corrective amendments relative to State laws.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who wrote the bill whether this provision would cover the case of an interstate pipeline company, for instance, transporting petroleum up here to Washington, or natural gas.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think it would, sir. They would come under the study, because we endeavored to make it broad. You will note "State highway departments and other parties in interest," so that they can report back to the Congress, I think it is, in February 1955.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman will admit, though, that the Secretary of Commerce already has the authority to make this study, without directing it, and without providing an opening wedge for coming in for this percentage that you say a member of the committee already endorses.

Mr. McGREGOR. It is very much in question whether the Secretary of Commerce has authority. He might be going beyond his line of authority to make that investigation and have the right and privilege of calling in other interested parties. I am taking the position that I think they are entitled to a study being made.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. This study would include, would it not, also the small utility districts that are entirely membership propositions; nonprofit? For example, a small water district organization may be adjacent to a large city but not a part of the city water system.

Mr. McGREGOR. I want to say to my distinguished colleague, and I do appreciate his interest, those are the very ones that caused some of the members of our committee to agree even to a study.

Mr. PRIEST. I fully agree with the gentleman, and I hope that the amendment will be rejected and the study be made, because I feel in that particular field there is certainly a case for a very real study to be made as it might affect the small utility districts.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, after some real authorities have spoken on this subject, like the chairman of the subcommittee, I hate to add any remarks here, but I rise in opposition to the amendment and would like to explain the situation with which my home town community is faced. My home town, the growing city of Jacksonville, Fla., owns many of the things which ordinarily are owned by private industry. Jacksonville owns its own public utilities and was faced very recently with a situation which shows up the inequity of the present legislation, because when a Federal highway was built through the center of the city of Jacksonville they paid the railroads for the small disturbance they made for them, but they entirely overlooked the municipal public utilities whose damages ran into millions of dollars. Now, so I am advised, the city of Jacksonville, if they had been placing this Federal highway, would not have placed it where it was placed. As a matter of fact, the State authority and the Federal authorities got together on a location which suited them just fine but it did not suit the city of Jacksonville at all, because this particular location cost the city a great deal of money in requiring the relocation of its utilities. If this location had been moved just a block to the right or to the left, it would not have cost nearly that much money. Should the Federal and the State governments be allowed to come into a city like Jacksonville and tell its public utility that it has to pay out $2 million for improving this road which this city would have preferred to be located elsewhere? That does not seem to me to be a proper and just procedure.

The approach to this problem which we of the Jacksonville area are advocating is embodied in H. R. 7897 which I introduced recently in the House. The first section of H. R. 7897 redefines "construction" as used in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to include "relocation and readjustment of utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of the highway." Section 2 of my bill would put nonrailway utilities on an equal basis with railroad facilities, with the same limitation as to Federal funds which may be used for readjusting and relocating nonrailway utility facilities. Section 5 (b) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 provides a formula where railroads reimburse the United States for a small amount when it has been established that the railroad has received a net benefit from the project. However, there can be no net benefit to nonrailway utility facilities, so this proposed draft leaves the present provisions of law applicable to railway facilities exactly as they are, and adds the new provisos applicable alone to nonrailway utility facilities.

Section 2 of my bill makes the bill applicable only to Federal funds heretofore or hereafter apportioned to the States. This excludes any application of the proposed statute to Federal funds already expended.

Interest in this problem is shown by this committee including section 9 of the bill now before the House.

I believe the committee's study of this problem over the last 3 years and the study now underway by the committee give sufficient foundation for concrete action along the lines of H. R. 7897.

The problem in Jacksonville arising out of the construction of the Jacksonville Expressway is an illustration of the need for this legislation. The expressway is part of the Federal-aid system and as such has been recognized as a project built to defend our country and to facilitate interstate commerce. City officials tell me that the project was well underway before they were advised that these facilities would have to be moved, and that the city would have to bear the expense of relocation. This is an expense of one and a half to two million dollars. This thrusts upon the city the necessity of raising this money either by taxes or by increased utility rates. Both alternatives present complicated and difficult problems.

Briefly, there are several reasons why these expenses should be considered a part of the construction. First, the cost of alterations to railroads is already recognized as a legitimate part of the highway construction costs. There is no logical or ethical reason why such discrimination between railroad and nonrailroad utilities should be allowed to continue.

Second, the law as it now stands creates an inequity because in some States this Federal benefit is available and in others it is not. Whatever a State wants to do with its own highway system should be left up to the State involved, but a Federal benefit should not be withheld from a local utility on the basis of a State's highway policies.

Third, to allow the present condition to continue places a double burden on residents of the localities involved by requiring Federal taxation for support of the Federal highway system and also requiring increased local taxes or utility rates to pay for the Federal function of moving the utilities for the Federal highway.

At this point I include the provisions of H. R. 7897:

H. R. 7897

A bill to amend the laws relating to the construction of Federal-aid highways to provide for equality of treatment of railroads and other public utilities with respect to the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of such highways by defining the term "construction" to include relocation and readjustment of utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of such highways and by prescribing the extent to which Federal funds may be used for the relocation and readjustment of such utility facilities

Be it enacted, etc., That the definition of the term "construction" contained in the first section of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The term 'construction' means the supervising, inspecting, actual building, and all expenses incidental to the construction or reconstruction of a highway, including locating, surveying, and mapping, costs of rights-of-way, relocation and readjustment of utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of the highway, and elimination of hazards of railway-grade crossings."

SEC. 2. Section 5 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *Provided further*, That the entire cost of relocation and readjustment of nonrailway utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of any highway with funds made available under the foregoing provisions of this act also may be paid from Federal funds, except that not more than 50 percent of the right-of-way and property damage costs, paid from public funds, on any such project, may be paid from Federal funds: *Provided further*, That not more than

10 percent of the sums apportioned to any State under the terms of this act for each fiscal year shall be used for the relocation and readjustment of such nonrailway utility facilities, to be expended in accordance with the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, and the provisions of this section."

SEC. 3. The foregoing provisions of this act shall be applicable with respect to all Federal funds heretofore or hereafter apportioned to each State for Federal-aid highway projects.

At this point I include a statement by Mayor Haydon Burns, of Jacksonville, in which he was joined by William Madison, city attorney for Jacksonville, both very able city officials:

THE EVER-EXPANDING PROGRAM OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION MAKES REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS OF READJUSTING UTILITY FACILITIES IMPERATIVE

A serious problem confronts utilities, with the exception of the railroads, whether they be public or private, in connection with the readjustment of their facilities attendant upon the construction and improvement of highways and railroad grade crossings where related to the improvement of the system of Federal-aid roads. The acceleration of public road construction under the Federal-aid highway program to meet the needs of interstate commerce and the national defense has made the problem one of urgent moment. These roads, containing double lanes, overpasses, underpasses, and cloverleafs require greater widths for rights-of-way and the extensive readjustment of utility facilities to accommodate them has imposed a cost burden that greatly overshadows that necessary to meet local road requirements. Such an imposition on nonrailroad utilities of relocation costs necessarily incurred under the Federal-aid program is unfair, burdensome, and inequitable to the users of utility services who, in the long run, will be forced to bear these costs.

FEDERAL FUNDS ARE AUTHORIZED FOR PAYMENT TO THE RAILROADS OF READJUSTMENT COSTS BUT ARE DENIED, UNDER THE GENERAL PRACTICE, TO ALL OTHER UTILITIES

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838; U. S. Code Cong. Service, 1944, p. 840) makes no specific provision for payment from Federal funds of any portion of the expense of relocating or readjusting the facilities of utilities which are located within highway rights-of-way and which must necessarily move to accommodate Federal-aid highway projects.

On the other hand, the Federal Aid Highway Act authorizes payment from Federal funds of costs in relocating facilities of railroads which are located within the highway right-of-way and which are included in Federal-aid grade crossing projects. The regulations of the Bureau of Roads relieve the railroads of making any contribution toward the elimination of railway-highway grade crossings in connection with Federal-aid projects, even where applicable State laws impose a duty on the railroads to bear a substantial part of the cost of eliminating such hazards at grade crossings.

Furthermore, the Bureau of Public Roads has consistently refused reimbursement to nonrailroad utilities except where State authorities determine that nonrailroad utilities are relieved of this obligation under State laws.

This ruling of the Bureau of Public Roads has prevailed even where the relocation of non-railroad-utility facilities was necessitated because of railway grade crossing elimination projects.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE THROUGH CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITY TO RELIEVE THE INEQUITABLE BURDEN PRESENTLY IMPOSED ON NONRAILROAD UTILITIES?

At the first session of the present Congress, the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Public Works Committee held extensive hearings under the authority of a resolution authorizing it to make a comprehensive study and review of the highway problem. On July 8, 1953, upon invitation of this subcommittee numerous representatives and spokesmen for public and privately owned utilities and cooperatives appeared before the subcommittee urging the enactment of legislation which would relieve utility users of the inequitable burden attendant upon relocation costs. Heading the list of those who appeared before the subcommittee was the representative of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners which is an organization composed of Federal and State bodies which regulate utility activities and operations.

Among those appearing before the Subcommittee on Roads on this occasion were the representatives of the following organizations:

National Association of Railroad & Utilities Commissioners.
Bell System Telephone Companies.
National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.
American Transit Association.
United States Independent Telephone Association.
American Water Works Association.
Western Union Telegraph Co.
Tennessee Valley Public Power Association.
American Public Power Association.
Kansas City Power & Electric Co.
City of Nashville Public Works Department.
Michigan Consolidated Gas Co.
American Gas Association (Syracuse Suburban Gas Co., Inc.).
Consolidated Gas, Electric Light & Power Co. of Baltimore.
National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.
Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.
Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.
Dayton Power & Light Co.
Marietta Electric Co.
Ohio Edison Co.
Toledo Edison Co.
Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co.

There is now pending before the Public Works Committee of the Senate a bill introduced by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado (S. 1108), the purpose of which is to authorize reimbursement to nonrailroad utilities, of relocation costs incurred in connection with Federal-aid highway projects. This measure is similar to bills introduced in the 82d Congress by Senator McKellar and Representative DAVIS, both of Tennessee. No action was taken on S. 1108 by the committee during the 1st session of the 83d Congress.

ARGUMENTS ADVANCED BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS BY REPRESENTATIVES OF AFFECTED UTILITY GROUPS

I

The added costs and expenses made necessary by the relocation of utility facilities to accommodate Federal-aid highway projects constitutes a burden which must, in the final analysis, be borne by the subscriber, since the expense of furnishing utility services can only be realized through rates charged to and collected from subscribers of utility services.

The former Commissioner of Public Roads, Hon. Thomas H. MacDonald, in supporting the law authorizing reimbursement from Federal funds to railroads, stated, in testimony before the House Public Works Committee in 1944: "If funds were contributed by the railroads they would have to come from their earnings; that is, they would have to be gathered from the public." (Hearings before Committee on Roads, House of Representatives, 78th Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 2426, vol. 2, p. 968.)

It is strongly urged that the same reasoning applies with equal force to users of nonrailroad utility services.

II

Utilities use the highway rights-of-way through grants of franchise rights by State and local governments. These grants were not made just to favor the utilities but that the public welfare might be enhanced through the development and extension of utility services throughout the several States. The use of the highways for utility purposes is a proper public purpose and function and is in the public interest.

Utility development would be retarded greatly and rates would be prohibitive for many citizens if utilities were forced to acquire private rights-of-way for a function essentially public in nature.

III

The use of Federal funds for Federal-aid highway purposes is primarily justified on the theory that these highways are constructed in the interest of national defense and interstate commerce for the general welfare. Taxes levied on the general public provide the funds thus expended. The nonrailroad utility subscriber, as a member of the general public pays his fair share of all Federal taxes, but must also pay, through rates charged for services, all costs and expenses incurred for the relocation of the utilities facilities. Thus the nonrailroad utility user makes a double contribution to the cost of Federal-aid highway construction—once in taxes and again in rates. He is thereby doubly taxed. Such a discrimination between classes of taxpayers is completely unjustified and discriminatory.

IV

The relocation of nonrailroad utility facilities is necessitated only because of the construction or reconstruction of a Federal-aid highway or railroad grade crossing in order to meet needs of the general traveling public. Utility subscribers receive no greater benefits from Federal-aid highway construction than any other user of the highway; no improvement in service results. Hence, relocation costs should be treated as a part of construction costs of the highway just as any other cost. For many years Congress has given recognition to this principle in connection with the relocating of railroad facilities. A different treatment for nonrailroad utilities is wholly unjustified.

V

There can be no argument against reimbursement of railroads for relocation costs in connection with Federal-aid highway projects. But thus relieving one utility, the railroads, of a burden left to be borne by other utilities is beyond defense on any sound basis. This unfair and inequitable discrimination is compounded when we consider that the railroad facilities create a hazard to the traveling public, but the facilities of other utilities are quite harmless from the standpoint of public safety.

It has been said that railroads should be reimbursed because their facilities are situated within private rights-of-way. If this were uniformly true the railroads would not need the benefit of Federal legislation since their rights would be protected under the eminent domain laws. Actually, whether the railroad facilities are on public or private right-of-way at the site of the highway-railway grade crossing is immaterial. The point is that virtually all States impose on railroads an obligation to bear all or a substantial part of the cost of relocating their facilities at railroad-grade crossings irrespective of whether the railroad is

on public or private right-of-way. The theory of these statutes is that the railroad creates the hazard to the public required to be eliminated, which justifies the imposition of these special burdens on them. Yet, the Federal-Aid Highway Act expressly relieves the railroads of that liability and provides reimbursement to the railroads for any relocation costs incurred by them in connection with Federal-aid projects. These circumstances further illustrate the justification for authorizing reimbursement to nonrailroad utilities of the relocation costs incurred by them in connection with Federal-aid projects.

VI

As a result of the expansion of the Federal-aid highway system, the problem of relocation cost is becoming serious to nonrailroad utilities. Roads geared to the needs of the national defense and interstate commerce replace local and State roads. The new and elaborate highways require greatly widened rights-of-way. The extensive relocation of utility lines, required by these superhighways, imposes on subscribers to utility services a substantial cost far in excess of that required to accommodate roads of a character suitable for local needs only.

VII

In recent years many States have passed statutes providing for the construction of freeways or turnpikes. These freeways or turnpikes are similar in size and character to Federal-aid highways. The State legislatures which have enacted such legislation have recognized that public utilities should be fully reimbursed for relocation costs made necessary by the construction of such freeways or turnpikes. The following States have acted in such a manner: Florida (1953), Georgia (1952), Kansas (1950), Kentucky (1953), Michigan (1953), New Jersey (1948), New York (1946), North Carolina (1951), Ohio (1949), Oklahoma (1953), Texas (1953), and Virginia (1952).

Hence, it may be observed that recognition is being accorded to the changing character of modern roadways as they affect the use and placement of utility facilities.

So many inquiries have been made by members of congressional committees, and properly so, regarding the costs involved in relocating nonrailroad utility facilities that for the purpose of developing information on the subject the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners suggested that a study be made to determine such costs. Twelve representative States were selected and certain information was obtained by committees composed of representatives from the various utilities both publicly and privately owned.

The study encompassed all Federal-aid highway projects completed in a recent 12-month period as well as the cost borne by each utility as a result of relocating facilities to accommodate each Federal-aid project excluding any cost resulting from improvement or betterment of the particular facilities.

This study reveals that the cost to all nonrailroad utilities of relocating facilities to accommodate Federal-aid highway projects was 2.34 percent of the total cost of such projects. While these costs pose serious problems for individual utilities, and their subscribers, they constitute a very small part, indeed, of the total cost of constructing Federal-aid highways.

Some suggestion was made during the course of the hearings in July before the Subcommittee on Roads that the exercise of greater care by highway authorities in the selection of routes would reduce the expense of relocation of nonrailway utility facilities below the figure mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Nothing could encourage such a result to a greater extent than the enactment of legislation authorizing reimbursement to the nonrailroad utilities of their relocation costs.

It has been contended that this cost added to the annual cost of the Federal-aid program would reduce the miles of roads which could be constructed. This argument overlooks every equitable principle involved in the matter. With equal force and justification it could be argued that private property owners should not be compensated from Federal funds because this likewise would reduce the funds which would otherwise be available for highway construction purposes. It is difficult to comprehend how such an argument could justify the unfair burden presently imposed on the subscribers of nonrailroad utility services who are forced to make a double contribution toward the cost of construction of Federal-aid highways, whereas they receive no benefits in excess of those received by the members of the public who only contributed once.

I would like to conclude by saying I certainly hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] will be defeated, because this study is very greatly needed. I personally feel that much more than this should be done. I think the testimony before the committee shows that public utilities certainly need assistance at this time.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SCUDDER. Complaint was made before the committee that the engineers had put in a subterranean bypass where they might have relocated it somewhere else and put in an overpass. The plan of putting in the subterranean bypass disturbed all the utilities and caused a great amount of expense to the utility owners. If such a bill were passed it might result in the engineers being a little more careful how many utility lines they disturbed.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 4, line 18, after "following manner", strike out the remainder of line 18 and all down to and including the word "system" in line 24 and insert the following: "In the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is merely to reinstate what I consider a successful operation under the apportionment of money under the present law. It is conceded that this change in apportionment is based one-half upon the population of the State and the other half upon the amount of roads in the respective States. My amendment, instead of taking one-half on the population and one-half on roads, would make it conform to the present law, where you take into consideration the three separate factors, the area, the roads, and the population.

I believe the Committee should consider that, this being a national defense highway, and that is what I understand the object and purpose of it is, a road in a sparsely settled part of the country is as essential as in other sections of the country. The best way I can illustrate it is that when the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred in 1941, when the roads were not able to carry much of the military equipment, the railroads out my way were loaded day after day and day after day with a full right-of-way of military equipment going to the west coast.

If the object and purpose of this legislation, and that is what they told me in the Committee here a moment ago, is to provide national defense highways, then why cannot we make it on a formula that will assure us that we will have an adequate highway defense system?

May I point out to this Committee that in my State of Colorado, where you have the Continental Divide from Wyoming down to New Mexico, you have a large range of mountains. We have 661 miles in the State of Colorado. If you are going to have a national defense highway, you are going to have to have some money to take care of those mountains and those problems.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The purpose of the gentleman's amendment would be to take the $200 million interstate which we provide additionally in this bill and have it come under the existing formula as it stands now under the old law?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is right.

Mr. DONDERO. One-third, one-third, and one-third?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is right, because I think that the experience of this legislation since it was first enacted has proven that to be equitable and fair.

Mr. DONDERO. That would in no way recognize the populated sections of the country like the large cities where 40 percent of the traffic originates.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Except that you have changed the formula here where the Federal Government contributes 60 percent of the funds without the 50–50 basis, as I understand it, and now it is a 60–40 proposition. You have made available, as I believe you pointed out a moment ago in this bill, approximately $250 million more than at any other particular time to help take care of that situation. Now if you found the necessity of getting additional funds, as we are in this legislation, why do you want to change the formula which everybody has felt is satisfactory? That is the purpose of my amendment, and I feel it would supply a sufficient sum to the populated areas.

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, this matter was discussed at great length in committee, and I admit it comes to the floor as a matter of compromise. We divided the money—$100 million for the interstate system and $100 million to the urban centers.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I compliment the gentleman. I know he has made a tremendous study of this problem and has come up with the formula that we have in this bill. I merely want to point out that with the wide spaces and with the tremendous amount of work you have to go through in building these roads through the mountains, if you are going to have any particular east-west national defense highways, then let us make adequate provisions for them. I think this amendment does so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHERER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 4, line 18, strike out all the language beginning with the word "following" down to and including the word "system" in line 24 and insert "ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percentum of the sum authorized to be apportioned each year under this subsection."

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment provides that the $200 million allocated for the interstate system be distributed on a population basis. I am going to repeat some of the things I said during the debate on the rule. The American Association of State Highway Officials, as I said before, recognizes that one of the most serious road problems in this country is the deplorable condition of the interstate system, which although it represents only 1 percent of the total road mileage in this country carries 20 percent of the traffic. These highway officials and the Department of Defense found that this system must be improved at once if it is to meet the future emergency needs and the present day commercial requirements of this country. They made an exhaustive study to determine how this system could best be improved. They came to the conclusion that the interstate system must be improved uniformly throughout the country. You cannot improve it in Colorado and in New Jersey and let it deteriorate in New Mexico. It must be a uniform improvement. It is not a question of miles or area. It is a matter of costs. The State highway officials of this country, who know more about highway problem than anyone else, proceeded to make a study on this basis. They determined the total cost necessary to bring this system up to the standards required to meet the defense needs of this country and also the commercial needs. They went further in this study and found out that the cost of doing this job in eight of the most populated States, is 51½ percent of the total cost, while the cost in the remaining 40 States is only 48½ percent of the total.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] forgets that you must take into consideration costs; that in the industrial areas or the highly populated States the average cost per mile of construction of these interstate highways is 7½ times the cost in the rural areas. As I said before the highway officials of 46 States, each State having 1 vote, recommend to this Congress that we distribute all of this money for the interstate system on a population basis.

You have to consider that there is an additional $600 million distributed on the old formula under which the so-called rural States get the break. They get a tremendous break on the distribution of the $600 million otherwise provided for in this bill.

Lastly, if we do what the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] wants, we are going to have this result. The States where it costs 51½ percent of the total cost to do this job are going to get only 32.4 percent of the $200 milion. The States where the cost is only 48½ percent of the total cost are going to get 67.6 percent of the $200 million. If we are going to do this job properly, as the State highway officials recommend and as the Defense Department says, you have got to distribute the $200 million on a population basis.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendments.

Mr. Chairman, you can see what this committee has been going through for several months. I want to say in all sincerity that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] made an excellent statement in behalf of the rural areas. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] made an excellent statement in behalf of the urban areas. If we had enough money to give them both what they want, I am sure the chairman would have more friends. But this bill, after weeks of discussion, came out, as I have said, a compromise right down the middle; that is, $200 million is authorized, $100 million of it being distributed on the basis of population, as desired by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], and $100 million distributed on the formula of one-third, one-third, and one-third, as suggested by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

I do not know of any fairer way to do it, and I hope that this committee will agree with the committee that has submitted this proposal that it is a fair distribution, because we recognize the needs of both and we cannot give either one of them all the money that they might wish.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished floor leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the chairman and all the members of the committee for the magnificent job they have done in bringing this bill before us. I think it is highly desirable from the standpoint of the interests of the country.

As to these amendments, what the gentleman has said is obviously correct. There are differences of opinion; but the committee, in my view, has done a good job of trying to work out a fair median balance. I agree with the gentleman that both of these amendments should be voted down.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the distinguished floor leader. I might say that the district of the gentleman from Ohio would probably get more money if we were to base the distribution on population, but I am trying to be fair. We are distributing it one-half on the basis of population and one-half on the basis of the old formula—a compromise recognizing the needs and problems of both rural as well as urban areas.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not a matter of fact that it was thoroughly discussed, that those gentlemen from the populous States could have taken the selfish point of view and insisted upon the full $200 million being distributed on a basis of population? But in order to compromise the matter in committee and bring the bill to the floor we yielded in our view.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think the gentleman's statement is equally applicable to the members of the committee from rural districts. They, too, could have been selfish and asked for the $200 million on the basis of area, but we agreed on 50 percent and that is what this legislation provides.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I want to call to the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee and also of the full committee that a number of us from the smaller States supported the amendment in the subcommittee and in the full committee. We are united in opposing both amendments presented here and hope the committee bill will be voted up.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Will the gentleman tell me whether his committee took any testimony bearing upon the question of grade-crossing elimination?

Mr. McGREGOR. No. We discussed grade-crossing eliminations as far as railroads and toll roads were concerned, but we made no change in the existing law relative to grade-crossing eliminations.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. That is the 1952 act provides that State highway commissions may in their discretion use some of these funds for this purpose, as I understand.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. And this bill does not change that in any way.

Mr. McGREGOR. We did not change it in any way; and I think that the committee will agree with me.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. OAKMAN. I agree with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR]. I would like very much to see the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio

[Mr. SCHERER] carried, for in my district we are building a hundred miles of the interstate system at a cost of $8 million a mile, over a total cost of $800 million. Out in the open country that is equivalent to 4,000 miles of road. So from the standpoint of equity I should have to go along with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], but realizing that good legislation is usually a matter of compromise I lend my voice to that of the chairman, hoping now that both of these amendments will be defeated, and that the committee bill will be approved.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman very much.

I want to reiterate my hope that the substitute amendment offered by my friend from Ohio be defeated, as well as the amendment offered by my friend from Colorado so that we may go down the line and be equitable in the distribution of the funds authorized in this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Page 5, line 10, change the colon to a period and strike out all that follows through line 20.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I reluctantly approved the extension of the 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gasoline-tax rate enacted in 1951. I did this only because I was convinced that there was no other recourse. The extreme revenue needs of the Federal Government made it impossible to carry out the scheduled reduction in this tax.

However, I certainly cannot condone the clause in this bill, which would connect the Federal gasoline tax with the grants for the interstate-highway system.

The Federal gasoline tax is a general-revenue tax, imposed upon all uses of gasoline. It never has been in any way connected with highways or with the use of the highways.

A 1-cent-per-gallon tax was imposed in 1932 as a 1-year temporary emergency measure to balance the budget. It has been extended, reenacted, and increased for other general-revenue emergency purposes. In 1940 the tax was increased to 1½ cents a gallon to raise revenue for the national-defense buildup. In 1951 the rate went up to 2 cents as part of the series of tax increases prompted by the Korean war. The Ways and Means Committee has recommended that this 2-cent increase be continued to meet the present unavoidable revenue needs of the Federal Government.

It may be, and I am sure we all hope it will be, possible to reduce this tax as general revenue needs abate. But certainly I do not think it would be either proper or wise for us to nail this tax into the Federal highway-aid program. This is my last year on the Committee on Ways and Means. It is the prerogative of the Ways and Means Committee to recommend tax rates to Congress. I do not see how the committee can continue to exercise that prerogative if other committees attempt to link certain taxes with certain programs and specify the rates.

Regardless of what the situation of the country might be or the desires of Congress, some people might contend that we would be bound by the terms of this bill to retain the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon at least until September 30, 1955, and that the alternative would be to strip the Federal-aid program of grants for the vital interstate highway system.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal tax on gasoline is not a highway tax either in intent or in effect. Gasoline is not strictly a fuel for highway vehicles. It is used in aviation, in motorboats, in industry, in tractors and other farm machinery.

Take the situation in my State, for example. According to figures of the United States Bureau of Public Roads, nearly 220 million gallons of gasoline were consumed in Iowa for nonhighway purposes during 1952. That means the Federal gasoline tax costs the people of my State more than $4 million a year on motor fuel that is not consumed on the highways at all. Furthermore, the Bureau reports that nearly a hundred and ninety-nine million of these gasoline gallons were consumed by farmers in agricultural machinery and equipment used off the highways.

The figures will vary but the facts will be the same for any State that has aviation, boating, factories, or farms.

If we break with precedent and tradition by linking the Federal gasoline tax with any part of Federal highway aid, we will be ignoring the true nature and uses of gasoline. We will be creating a precedent that could bring increasing demands upon us to link other taxes with other Federal programs until at last Congress is deprived of all initiative in the establishment of tax rates.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the full implications of this provision in the bill be seriously weighed. It serves no useful purpose and carries a potential for enduring harm. That is why I believe this amendment to strike that clause out of the bill merits our wholehearted approval.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman, of course, is speaking for the deletion of this provision having to do with the 2-cent gasoline tax. The gentleman is a very important member of the Ways and Means Committee. He is familiar with the fact that the Ways and Means Committee has reported legislation which will be considered on the floor this week providing under a closed rule for continuation of that half-cent excise tax. That was the sole reason, as I understand it, why this provision was written into the pending bill in the beginning.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(At the request of Mr. PRIEST, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. COLMER. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that we have every reason to assume, the condition of the Treasury being what it is and the desire of the administration and others to balance the budget, that the other body will also continue that tax when it gets over there?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I expect it to be continued in this present bill.

Mr. COLMER. What we are doing here is setting a precedent, nailing this thing down, linking up the tax with Federal aid to roads?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct. As I have stated here, much of the gasoline is used on the farm and off the highways. There is no logic in tying that tax to the road. I might add that I fought against the automotive tax increase in 1951 also, and that yields almost as much money or practically the same amount of money as the gasoline tax. I do not know how this committee happened to single out the gasoline tax to tie down for a specific use. I take it it would be just as logical to include the other taxes that are connected with the use of highways. I have always fought against all such earmarking very strongly.

Mr. COLMER. Is there any question in the distinguished gentleman's mind that once this gets into this bill and becomes a part of the legislation but what it will remain there for the rest of the time as permanent legislation?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes, and it will be used as leverage against future action by the Committee on Ways and Means or subject that committee to the charge that they are exercising jurisdiction over road building policies if they lower the tax rate on gasoline hereafter.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman in the serious question he raised about this. I would like to ask: Does the language there serve any good purpose? Without it, you will still have the same road program, and without it the House will still get an opportunity to act affirmatively on the gasoline tax in the other bill, is that not correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct, absolutely. The adoption of this amendment will not cut down the authorization at all. It only cuts out the provision tying it to a specific excise tax, which provision does not serve any good purpose.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I notice my distinguished friend was commenting relative to the other body. We hate to lose him, but we hope he goes to the Senate. But, let me call his attention to this fact. He

does not know and neither does the present speaker know what they are going to do in the other body. My distinguished friend stated that he was always opposed to this half-cent additional tax. I might ask him, is this his way of trying to do away with the half-cent tax?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. No, this is one of the ways that we might avoid unfair pressure on the Committee on Ways and Means if that committee gives further consideration to a change in the gasoline tax.

Mr. McGREGOR. Had the committee not voted out the bill, I am sure that is true, but that bill was voted out, so all we are doing now is saying "Give us the revenue and we will give you the roads." I would like to ask the gentleman if we do away with this half-cent tax, where are we going to get the money for those roads?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the gentleman will agree that this is an authorization bill. Now, when you come along with an appropriation for these funds for highway purposes, are you certain that a conditional authorization is going to be sufficient to secure the appropriation? As you well know, a point of order can be made against an appropriation that is not authorized by law. Now you are raising the question about a conditional authorization for an appropriation. The purpose here is to carry on the Federal-State highway program. When you impose a condition of this type, you are establishing a new precedent that might serve to cause difficulty in the future.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will say that we possibly are establishing a precedent, because we are going to assure the highway users that we are going to spend the money that they pay as a tax on gasoline on roads. That is a precedent.

Mr. COOPER. Why not bring in a bill to that effect? Why jeopardize your Federal-aid highway program by having a questionable provision of this type included in an authorization bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means made the statement awhile ago in which he took exactly the opposite view of the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree upon a limitation of time on this amendment and all other amendments to the bill. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto terminate in 10 minutes.

Mr. WITHROW. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I shall object, if the gentleman will recall I asked him for time during general debate and I was allocated 3 minutes, and finally I could not use that. I want 5 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock, which will allow 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the general debate I tried to find out whether or not there was linkage in this bill between this authorization bill and the tax on gasoline. I was assured there was none. If there is not linkage with the gas tax, there certainly is a very well prepared system of cross-reference. This debate well illustrates what happens when you tie in an authorization bill with a particular tax. What we have been debating here today is not so much the need for this Federal aid to highways as where the money is coming from. Thus provisions of the bill have been tied in time after time with the gas tax. It is a function of the Committee on Public Works to authorize needed highway aid. It is up to the Appropriations Committee to find the money.

Once you say that all of the tax from a given source shall be used for highways, it immediately follows that then only the tax from that source will be used for highways. The result is immediately that you cannot meet the needs. The result in this case would be that you could use the gas tax only for highways, and then you would either have to increase the gas tax or let the highways be neglected or, if the gas tax is repealed, cut out Federal aid entirely.

This linkage should not be written into law. If you write it into law in this bill, you will be writing it into law for the first time and setting a definite precedent.

The Federal gas tax is not a tax based on user. This linkage means that in the highway program those from the most populous sections will pay through the gas tax to build highways in the less populous States. Perhaps people would prefer to pay it through the income tax. It would undoubtedly be more equitable. They do not doubt that these highways should be built, but this is a basic question which should not be discussed on a bill like this. We have listened all day to a discussion about interstate highways and the primary duty of the Federal Government to contribute to the cost of construction of such interstate highways. We have been told that the Federal Government has a duty to build these interstate highways, and that we are in crying need of building them, but then the provision this amendment would strike says the Federal Government cannot and will not discharge that duty unless it continues to receive income from the 2-cent gas tax. There could be no more effective argument against linking our Federal-aid program to a particular tax. The principle of linking the gas tax with aid for roads is entirely wrong. It should not be considered in this bill.

The bill is a fine bill otherwise. I compliment the chairman of the committee on it and the chairman of the subcommittee, who have worked very hard to bring this bill out. It is a very excellent job. But let us not set a precedent which may adversely affect our highway program by putting this linkage provision into the bill.

The only reason given for this provision that I have heard is that it will force the other body to vote for extension of the 2-cent gas tax. This result it will not accomplish. But it goes further. It is a direct blow aimed at our many State Governors, who have advocated that the Federal Government get out of the gas-tax field. By this linkage you say to them in effect, "Give up your ideas or you will lose 200 million a year for interstate highways."

The Federal gas tax was never designed to be used only for roads. It should not be so restricted. Nor should the responsibility of the Federal Government for highways be limited to the extent of the revenue that is received from a gas tax, if any.

The gentleman from Ohio asked what the Senate will do with the excise tax. I say the first thing the Senate will do is take this provision out of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. It is not necessary for me to recapitulate the arguments these gentlemen have used. They seem to me completely sound.

The use of gasoline is not confined to highways. It would be perfectly logical to say that the proceeds of the gasoline tax should be used for the construction of airports since airplanes use gas. It would be perfectly logical to say that the proceeds of the gasoline tax should be used for harbor improvements, because harbor improvements are utilized by vessels, and vessels nowadays are fueled predominantly by gasoline.

Further, I think it is a thoroughly pernicious precedent to have an attempt made to have one committee of the Congress coerce another committee of the Congress in this way.

I think we ought to vote on highway legislation in a highway bill and on excise tax legislation in a tax bill, appropriately reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Would it not be just as logical for the gentleman and me and other members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which tomorrow will bring before the House a bill authorizing some appropriations for the hospital construction act, to require that certain revenues from certain excise taxes be used for that purpose insofar as establishing a precedent is concerned?

Mr. HALE. Of course, the whole idea of earmarking, sometimes called dedication, seems to me completely false. Or to take another example, you might say that the automobile excise tax should be used entirely on highways. No proposition of that kind has been made. I have not myself seen the bill, which will be here on Wednesday from the Committee on Ways and Means. Neither I

nor anybody else knows what the House will do on that measure, still less what will be done on the measure in the other Chamber or by the Chief Executive.

I append certain telegrams recently received on this legislation:

AUGUSTA, MAINE, *March 6, 1954.*

Hon. ROBERT HALE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building:

Maine State Grange has repeatedly urged withdrawal of Federal Government from field of gasoline taxation. New Federal Aid Highway Act making portion of Federal aid dependent on continuance of tax at 2-cent level contrary to policy of both National and Maine State Grange. Urge your strong opposition to portion of H. R. 8127 linking Federal aid with motor-fuel tax.

MAYNARD C. DOLOFF,
Master, Maine State Grange.

AUGUSTA, MAINE, *March 8, 1954.*

Representative ROBERT HALE,
House Office Building:

We urge you to oppose highway-aid legislation which would tie appropriations to Federal gasoline tax revenue. Federal gasoline tax should be eliminated and left to States and Federal aid to highways should be continued because of national defense, mail delivery, interstate commerce, and general welfare. These are not responsibilities of highway uses alone but of all the people. Farmers can see no reason to pay Federal tax on gasoline used in farming operations.

MAINE FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION,
C. WILDER SMITH, *President, Cutler, Maine.*

PORTLAND, MAINE, *March 5, 1954.*

Hon. ROBERT HALE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly request your consideration of our views on H. R. 8127, proposed Federal Aid Highway Act. Section 2A, page 4, printed bill calls for earmarked funds for national system of interstate highways which we have long advocated and hope you will support. Section 2A, page 5, calls for 60 percent matching share for same funds. We urge that this be increased to 75 percent. Same section and page makes earmarked interstate authorization available only if present 2-cent Federal gas tax continued. This involves linkage and is highly undesirable. It would also make Federal-highway aid legislation contingent on tax legislation handled by different congressional committee and would adversely affect urban highway planning. May we have your views.

Thanks.

MAINE AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION.
ARLYN E. BARNARD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. I believe that if we do not adopt the amendment we will be doing that which every Congress since 1932 scrupulously avoided doing. In 1932 the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means on double taxation had this to say. This was in December of 1932:

When the gasoline tax was first discussed in the House of Representatives, it was felt by many that this field of taxation was fully occupied by the States and should be left to them. The House did not include this tax in the revenue bill as transmitted to the Senate. The Senate, however, in the light of later figures as to deficit and as to the probable tax yield, was obliged to amend the bill by including a tax upon gasoline, and that was accepted by the House.

Then, the following year, during the hearings on the Federal gasoline tax, when it was being considered by the House Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable Robert J. Doughton, who was then chairman of the committee, had this to say. This was in 1933. I quote:

This was an emergency tax measure. I am sure the Congress was reluctant to propose a tax on gasoline, but in order to balance the budget, the Congress felt it was necessary temporarily to impose a tax of 1 cent a gallon on gasoline over the objection of the House. It was passed in the Senate, and we concurred in it because they said the whole structure of government would perish if the budget was not balanced, and we were, too, anxious to balance it, and, consequently, in the rush of the close of the session of Congress and to balance the budget, we imposed the gasoline tax.

Despite the good intention of the Congress that imposed this temporary tax on gasoline, it was not permitted to expire on schedule. In 1933, the new Congress extended the tax, again on a temporary basis only, and increased its rate to 1½ cents per gallon as part of the National Industrial Recovery Act. Again, there was no pretense that this was a road tax; it was a general revenue tax. The additional one-half cent tax was permitted to expire on December 31, 1933, so the rate reverted to 1 cent per gallon. From then until July 1940, the tax was reimposed again and again at that rate, in order to meet the emergency requirements of a continuing depression.

In 1940 the tax was once more increased to 1½ cents a gallon. The Nation was recovering from the depression; but we now faced the necessity of building our military strength. The tax increase was for this avowed purpose. This tax money was needed for general-fund purposes, and there was no allegation that it was for the purpose of highway aid.

From 1940 until 1951 the tax continued at the 1½-cent rate. The fact that normal highway construction halted completely during the war years and regular Federal highway aid was suspended, serves to emphasize that the Federal gasoline tax had no connection with Federal highway aid.

In November 1951 the Federal gasoline tax was boosted to its present rate of 2 cents per gallon. Here again, the tax increase was not alleged to be for highway aid, but rather as a part of a schedule of general tax increases to raise revenue for the stepped-up defense program occasioned by the Korean war.

The history of the Federal gasoline tax speaks for itself. It shows beyond any possible question that this is and has always been a straight out general revenue tax, imposed and increased to meet general governmental emergencies. This is further emphasized by the fact that the tax applies not only to highway use of gasoline but to all gasoline, including that used in industry and agriculture.

It is a distortion of history to claim that there has ever been the slightest connection between Federal taxation of gasoline and Federal highway aid to the States. It is not only erroneous but even dangerous to suggest that the Federal gasoline tax be linked with future Federal highway aid to the States. The linkage theory upsets the very principle of Federal highway aid and jeopardizes its continuance on a sound basis.

One warning to this effect comes from the Honorable Wilburn Cartwright, who was chairman of the House Roads Committee from 1934 to 1943 and who, along with Senator CARL HAYDEN, was coauthor of a succession of Federal highway aid acts. In 1940, Representative Cartwright made a statement that offers food for reflection to all who espouse Federal gasoline tax linkage. He said:

The participation of the Federal Government in the improvement of highways in coperation with the States, using general Treasury funds therefor, is amply justified on the grounds of * * * national defense, post roads, and interstate commerce. When the first Federal Aid Road Act was passed in 1916, neither the States nor the Federal Government had levied any special taxes, commonly known as road-user taxes, such as the taxes on gasoline, lubricating oils, and motor vehicles.

I think it is important that these broader reasons for justifying Federal participation in highway construction be not even tacitly abandoned by road advocates by putting too much emphasis on the relationship between road authorizations and road-user tax revenues. There might come a time when these taxes would not be levied, but that would not, in my opinion, remove the justification for further Federal participation in road improvements.

It will be noted that Representative Cartwright mentioned Federal taxes on lubricating oil and motor vehicles, as well as the tax on gasoline. As a matter of fact, there is a whole series of Federal excises on automobiles, trucks and buses, parts and accessories, tires and tubes—which produce over a billion dollars a year in revenue over and above the $935 million yielded by the Federal gasoline and diesel fuel taxes.

Like the Federal gasoline tax, these automotive excises have no connection whatever with the Federal aid highway program. Like the Federal gasoline tax, they are emergency general excises which have been raised and lowered from time to time without any reference whatever to highway aid grants.

The nature of all these taxes underlines the lack of logic in singling out the Federal tax on gasoline as a highway tax. This fuel is used in farm tractors, boats, stationary engines and aircraft, as well as in vehicles using the highways. The Federal tax is paid on nonhighway use as well as highway use.

The linkage theory logically means that the gasoline tax would become a highway use tax—it means that nonhighway use of gasoline should be exempt from the tax. In the interests of justice, the Federal Government would be obligated to refund the tax on all gasoline used for nonhighway purposes, such as in industry and agriculture. Besides reducing receipts from

the tax, this would add enormously to collection costs. It would require the creation of another Federal bureau to process the enormous volume of refund applications.

Consumers who use gasoline on farms and in factories would be burdened with the complex report filing essential to running a tax refund system.

But this would be only one problem of many brought on by tax linkage. With a stepped-up program of Federal highway aid, linked to Federal gasoline tax receipts, it is easy to foresee endless bickering over Federal-aid allocation formulas.

The densely populated, heavily traveled States would demand Federal grants equal to the gasoline tax money collected within their borders. The States with large areas and sparse populations would continue to expect larger-than-average grants because the original purpose of Federal highway aid was to help them most of all. And this would be only the beginning of the problem. Political subdivisions within each State would be making their demands, too.

A linkage of Federal excise taxes with Federal aid for highways will place Congress in the position of a glorified road commission which will be required to act as referee between the repeated and continuous demands of the several States as well as the political subdivisions within each of the States. Linkage, which on the surface appears to be an easy way out, would create many more problems than it solves. In fact, it would be the beginning of a succession of problems where the referee will never make a decision to the liking of the participants, and the decision will be reappealed and reargued every 2 years. Linkage is not the solution to the problem; rather, it will be the beginning of a multitude of new problems.

If this linkage theory is ever accepted, it will establish a precedent for a rash of other proposals to link other Federal taxes with specific beneficiaries for each tax collected by the Government. Congress has enough problems without borrowing more of them by adopting the linkage theory.

These facts support only one conclusion: Federal gasoline tax linkage is not a program or principle. It is a gigantic fallacy—unfounded in fact and unworkable in practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I am going to try to get away from the subject of the particular tax involved because I feel the danger here is the precedent which is being set of trying to tie one particular tax in with any particular purpose. In fact, I question whether it is constitutional to do such a thing. This is just a method of getting around a very basic constitutional provision which as I read it says that taxes may be raised for general revenue purposes. I submit that if you tie it to this, you are going to tie it to other things as we go along, and we are going to disrupt our whole system of taxation completely.

I should like to make one other suggestion to the Committee on Public Works. Although they might think they were putting pressure on the Committee on Ways and Means, it will work in the opposite way because this is, in effect, turning over to the Committee on Ways and Means the power of saying whether or not you are going to have your highway program. Let us not tie in any more taxes with specific programs to give to the Ways and Means Committee additional power. We already have unemployment insurance and social security because this procedure was followed. As a member of that committee I do not believe we want to get into the business of providing roads and of making decisions in this field. I suggest that this amendment be approved and that in the future we do not attempt to tie any particular tax in with a particular program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me if we do not adopt the committee proposal we are going to do one of two things. We are going to turn down this expanded highway program or else we are going to create a larger deficit in the Federal budget. It resolves itself into something just as simple as that, as far as I am concerned.

During the past several years we have had a diversion of the use tax which in most States they think is to be used on their State and national highway system. It has amounted to between $400 and $500 million a year for the last several years. If we, as Members of Congress, had been doing our duty over a period of years, we would have seen to it that that money went back on the highways because the figures show that we have killed more people on our highways in the last 20 years than were killed in our wars. It means that we are not staying on top of our job. I hope the committee will stay with the Committee on Public Works in this proposal, and perhaps we can work out something better 2 years from now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

(Mr. MCCORMACK, by unanimous consent, yielded his time to Mr. HAYS of Arkansas.)

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to take any time at all but, as a minority member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I have been impressed with the fact that students of this problem, who are primarily interested in the point of view of the States, are universally opposed to the principle of linkage of the gasoline tax and Federal authorizations. The chairman of the subcommittee has done an excellent job with this bill, and I am for it, and I would not say anything derogatory of the bill as a whole. But I think we could improve this legislation, and I trust that the chairman of the subcommittee will not feel that those of us who offer criticism on this point fail to appreciate the splendid work that has been done by the Public Works Commission. It would set a thoroughly bad precedent if we should adopt the idea of linkage, which could spread to other types of legislation.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the logic of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is irrefutable, and that we will be perfecting this legislation to eliminate the principle of linkage and stick strictly to a Federal-aid program extending to all phases of highway legislation. For that reason I shall support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have not given a great deal of attention to the merits of this particular amendment. I would like to say just a few words as to the overall meaning of this bill.

It has been testified here today that we lose on our highways annually 33,300 people and that the financial loss is $3,950,000,000, owing to the inadequacy of our highways. It was also testified, I think by our colleague from the State of Washington, that two-fifths of this loss, both in human life and in property, is due to the inadequacy of our highway system.

Breaking these figures down to date it is something like this: Our financial loss is $3,950,000,000 per year due altogether to this inadequacy. In 2 years—and we are making this appropriation for 2 years—it is double that, or $7,950,000,000. These are losses we are dealing with, losses due to inadequacy that this House admittedly is responsible for. Let us think of it, Mr. Chairman. That means that every day, this day in which are living here and discussing this bill 36 people are being killed on our highways on account of things that we have failed to do; that is two-fifths of the entire number. One hundred and more were killed yesterday and today and will be killed tomorrow.

I have heard the argument put forth that there is not enough road equipment in existence to make use of a larger appropriation. I submit that that problem will shortly be solved once an appropriation shall be made. How long, Mr. Chairman, do you suppose it would be if Congress were to double the appropriation proposed in this bill until the manufacturers of road-building equipment would call back on the job the thousands of men recently dismissed from employment? How long would it be until additional facilities for manufacture would be under construction? There is no avenue of increasing business actively and consequent employment equal to this opportunity in existence, because it will result in the immediate saving of human life and property.

I favor the passage of this bill, but I regret that no member of the committee has seen fit to introduce an amendment to double or treble the amount of money to be appropriated. I am convinced the American people would heartily approve such a measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, if this bill had come to the floor next Wednesday and the bill from the Committee on Ways and Means had been on

the floor today, it is quite possible that all the debate and argument we have listened to would not have been heard at all.

As I stated earlier in the day, the half-cent a gallon gasoline tax yields $225 million a year. If that be not reenacted it means that the income instead of being $906 million a year would be about $700 million. Then if this bill be enacted at $875 million we would far exceed all of the income from the gas tax.

We are saying to the people of this country by this provision—call it linkage if you will—we want to give you good roads; we want to take the money that you paid for using the roads and spend it on the highways—I mean the gas tax that you pay for the gasoline you buy, we want to take it and spend it on the roads. You cannot spend it if you do not pay it; you cannot spend it if this bill is not passed, to continue the two-cent a gallon tax. The one question that is involved, and that is the old controversy, namely, if you want roads then provide the money to pay for them. If you do not link the half-cent gas tax but still enact this bill you have a spread of $450 million throwing the budget out of balance more than ever before because the income from such tax would be $225 million less while the bill provides $225 million more for roads.

What is wrong with this language? What harm does it do? Should the tax bill be passed as recommended, the language sought to be stricken out would be meaningless. We accomplished what we seek to do—morally to indicate that the money which comes from the gas tax shall be used for the building of roads; but we must have the tax continued if we are to have better highway facilities.

For the reasons stated—I will not take more time, Mr. Chairman—I ask that the amendment be voted down and call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN of Iowa) there were—ayes 70, noes 70.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DONDERO and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 80, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 460, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk, in engrossing the bill H. R. 8127, be authorized to capitalize the word "commerce" on page 3, line 5, to correct a typographical error.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, there are no special orders granted for tomorrow after the conclusion of the day's business. I trust that we can, if possible, avoid any special orders because we, on our side, desire to have a conference after the bill is disposed of tomorrow.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. VAN PELT asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXCISE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the automobile today is as necessary to the average workingman as his dinner pail. On Wednesday of this week the House will have before it H. R. 8224, the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954. This brings up a measure which in one of its elements contains a gross inequity. This inequity will have a direct material bearing on 1 out of every 7 productive workers in this Nation. This is the number of workers it is said receive their paycheck directly or indirectly from the automotive industry. I believe that, when this inequity is clearly pointed up to the committee, the only course of action would be for the Ways and Means Committee, through its chairman, to offer or accept an amendment to rectify the injustice.

I am speaking of the continuation of the 10-percent excise-tax rate on passenger cars and the 8-percent excise tax on trucks, buses, trailers, parts and accessories. As it is generally known, by law the excise tax on passenger cars was to have been automatically reduced from 10 percent to 7 percent and on trucks, buses, trailers, parts and accessories from 8 percent to 5 percent on April 1. These 3 percentage points were added to the excise tax on these commodities in 1951. It was clearly recognized by the Congress at that time that these were excessive, temporary rates that in all equity should be reduced when this country was no longer on an extreme emergency basis.

Not only does this bill continue this exorbitant tax but it performs the additional injustice of not establishing a definite cutoff date when such increases will be eliminated.

It has been said that the existence of a termination date on an excise tax in an act of Congress only invites a buyers' strike. An example has been cited to the effect that automobile dealers today have organized to stop accepting deliveries from manufacturers simply because the tax was scheduled to go down April 1. Mr. Speaker, I contend that the simple solution to this phase of a buyers' strike can be accomplished by including in the bill a provision for an automatic refund to the dealers of stocks on hand as of the effective date of the reduction in tax. This has been the case historically upon the termination or reduction of excise taxes.

The question logically follows then, Would there not be a public buyers' strike as opposed to a dealers' buyer strike? The Ways and Means Committee in its report has clearly stated that it is its intention to take another look at the rates on these items next year. Surely the existence of this intention would have as serious an effect on the buying public as the existence of a termination date in the act itself.

In the first session of the 83d Congress, I introduced a bill calling for the complete elimination of excise taxes on the items under discussion—H. R. 3186. I still believe that such action

is prudent and proper. Automotive excise taxes are unfair to millions of workers, particularly to the lower-income group who comprise more than 75 percent of the passenger-car owners. They are discriminatory against makers and owners. This is true because the tax is so highly selective and departs from the normal concept of uniformity of treatment. Excise taxes represent a threat to demand and employment. The automobile in our economy is clearly not a luxury but has been proven definitely to be a necessity. The universal high rate of use testifies to this point. As of mid-1953 there was 1 passenger car for every 4 persons in this country or 1 car for every 1.1 families.

Clearly a strong case can be made for the elimination of excise taxes on automotive items, but I am not politically naive enough to think that this action is practicable to the extent of full accomplishment or realization at the moment. Rather, I will content myself with the argument that the inequity and injustice contained in this bill should be corrected here and now. Surely the arguments for repeal speak eloquently for such correction.

Actually, this represents an inequity heaped on injustice since this same bill provides for a drastic reduction in the excise tax on luxury items. At the same time, an exorbitant rate is continued, not reduced, on automotive items, which are clearly not luxury items. Historically, excise taxes were imposed on automotive items in periods when their purchase was being discouraged because of shortage of materials. Surely, no such argument can be made today and it should be abundantly clear that an incentive rather than a detriment should be given to this vital industry.

We have heard much of an endeavor to obtain a uniform excise or manufacturer's tax on all items produced. The reduction of all excise taxes to a common level, namely, 10 percent, contained in this bill begins to look like a move in the direction of a standard excise tax. Can it be that this is the basic reason for the refusal to accept a termination date on these 3 percentage points on automotive items? If so, surely this is not the proper solution to this problem. Such a tax must be measured in the light of all the circumstances and in totality, and then only with due deliberation.

It is, therefore, my contention that the Committee should adopt an amendment to this bill, H. R. 8224, which would provide for the automatic reduction not later than April 1, 1955, of the tax on passenger cars from 10 percent to 7 percent, and on trucks, buses, trailers, parts, and accessories, from 8 percent to 5 percent. In addition, this amendment should provide that stocks of such items in the hands of dealers on said date will be the subject of a tax refund.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of the Mississippi River Parkway legislation, I am happy to know that the Committee on Public Works has included an authorization of $250,000 in the bill before us today to assist the States in expediting the planning of the Great River Road.

This great riverside highway following the Mississippi River from its source to the sea will not only welcome travelers seeking history and scenery but it will link Minnesota and the Gulf of Mexico with a defenseway through the heart of our continent. With agriculture and industry thriving along the river, there is a steadily growing need for such a midcontinent thoroughfare.

The splendid record of Federal-State cooperation which has marked all of the planning by the 10 great States bordering the Mississippi River is one unequaled in my experience in the Congress. By following present State highways, we will have an economical thoroughfare that will benefit both the States and the Federal Government. It will raise these highways to modern standards for interstate travel that will serve both national commerce and national defense. It will be at once a farm-to-market road, a scenic and historic parkway, and a modern trunk thoroughfare linking the 35 million people of the river States. As the Mississippi River has always served the heartland of the North American Continent, so too, will the great river road serve our agriculture and our commerce.

The Mississippi River Parkway Planning Commission deserves to be commended for its constant spirit of cooperation and the single-mindedness with which it has worked to make this remarkable project possible. It includes 10 members appointed by each of the 10 governors of the States bordering the Mississippi and it has given us a plan worthy of our support.

The people of the river States have long wanted a scenic interstate highway that will open the Mississippi Valley to the thousands of tourists each year who want to see America first.

In Minnesota, as in other States, the tourist trade is a rapidly expanding industry and an interesting and safe highway along the river will surely be one of America's great attractions. The river and the valley are rich in history and in a variety of scenery unequaled in our country.

At the same time it will help our State to modernize the highway system that is the midcontinent artery of our transportation system. It will connect the rich and varied agricultural areas and rural towns with the centers of industry into which their raw materials flow.

The recreation potential of the Mississippi Valley is almost unlimited and a safe modern highway will open new possibilities in every State.

In my own congressional district, the highway will offer travelers easy access to the historical and scenic cities and towns and farmlands along the river. Following is a brief summary of some of the sights to be seen in our district:

Aitkin: In this vicinity the Mississippi River runs through land which was once the floor of Lake Aitkin, a large and ancient body of water formed behind the terminal moraine of the Keewatin ice sheet. The sandy plain of the old lake is now a prosperous farming area devoted largely to dairy products, turkeys, and small fruits.

West of Aitkin the present roads run through a pleasant country of mixed farm and forest. In the spring this region is noted for the vivid coloring of the wildflowers which grow in roadside meadows and swamps.

Crosby, Ironton: In the vicinity of these towns is the Cuyuna Iron Range. Parkway travelers would be able to visit some of the mines, including the immense open-pit manganiferous ore mine which lies near the Mississippi River north of Crosby. The river here runs broad and deep between sandy banks. Dense second-growth forests, edged with brilliant wildflowers, grow to the very brink of the low banks.

Brainerd: This town is the gateway to an extensive recreation area. When the glaciers retreated from this region, great outwash streams deposited sand and gravel around and on top of huge blocks of ice. When the ice melted, pits were left in the terrain which filled with water and became lakes. North of Brainerd a series of these pit lakes—Gull Lakes, Long Lake, Whitefish Lakes, and others—forms the setting for some of Minnesota's best-known resorts. East and south of Brainerd is Mille Lacs Lake, another resort center. When the French first entered the upper Mississippi area toward the end of the 17th century they found many important Sioux towns on the shores of this lake. Both De Luth and Hennepin visited the principal Sioux village of Izatys. The lodges of present-day Indians are seen in numbers along the highways around the lake.

In the Brainerd vicinity and for many miles to the south modern highways paralleling the Mississippi to the east traverse a broad, sandy plain, marked by occasional groups of dunes. This Anoka sand plain, as it is known to geologists, was formed by wash from the Mississippi River as it pushed westward against the retreating Grantsburg sublobe of glacial ice.

Crow Wing River: A short distance below Brainerd the Mississippi is joined by its first large tributary, the clear and beautiful Crow Wing, which drains a large area of forest, farm, and lake. Near its mouth one branch of the Red River trail, over which the squeaking oxcarts made their annual journeys between Canada and the Twin Cities, crossed the Mississippi. Fur-trading posts and the vanished frontier town of Old Crow Wing were situated near the confluence of the two streams.

Fort Gaines site: On the west bank of the Mississippi, about midway between

the Crow Wing and Little Falls, stands the weathered ruin of an old brick powder magazine, all that remains to mark the site of Fort Gaines—later called Fort Ripley—a military post occupied between 1849 and 1878.

Camp Ripley: An active military reservation where Minnesota's National Guard receives its field training.

Little Falls: A modern dam largely obscures the rapids in the Mississippi, once well-known landmarks to explorers and French voyageurs. A short distance northeast of the city is Hole-in-the-Day's Bluff, named for an Ojibway chief said to have been slain by his own people and buried on the summit.

Charles A. Lindbergh State Memorial Park: This tract of 110 acres on the west bank of the Mississippi was dedicated by the State of Minnesota to the memory of Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh, who was associated with pioneer liberal movements in the State, and who was prominent in the Non-Partisan League and the Farm-Labor Party. The clapboard-covered cottage in which he lived for many years and which was the boyhood home of his famous son, the "Flying Colonel," is preserved as a museum. The park contains one of the finest remaining stands of virgin white pine and affords facilities for picnicking and hiking.

Pike's Fort site: Here on the sandy bluff overlooking the river, Lt. Zebulon M. Pike built a stockade for his exploring party during the winter of 1805–06.

South of Little Falls existing roads, sometimes unpaved, enable the traveler to follow quite closely along the west bank of the Mississippi as far as Minneapolis. Occasionally the tops of the sandy bluffs afford striking views of the blue river and the terraces—frequently wooded—which characterize the opposite bank. Although largely farmland, the country presents a diversified scene. In the spring the wildflower displays are outstanding. Occasional factories, dams, and crossings of tributary streams serve to give a pleasant variety to the landscape. Sites of early trading posts and missions are reminders of the days when the upper Mississippi was a wild frontier.

Sartell: A large pulp and paper mill is located directly on the riverbank here and probably would be open for inspection by parkway travelers.

St. Cloud: This prosperous city is the center of a famous quarrying region. The fine-grained granite found here has been used in the construction of some of the most impressive public and private buildings throughout the Nation. A pioneer log cabin built by Balthasarr Rosenberger about 1855 is preserved in Riverside Park.

Oliver H. Kelley house: On the east bank of the Mississippi about 3 miles south of Elk River is the former farm and home of Oliver Hudson Kelley, founder of the National Grange of the Order of Patrons of Husbandry. Now owned and maintained by the Grange, this property would enable parkway travelers to visualize the development of a typical Minnesota homestead into a prosperous present-day farm. Here is the outstanding site in the Nation for telling the story of the movement for farmer organization.

THE MASK HAS BECOME THE MAN

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago, in its February 1941 issue, Reader's Digest carried a story entitled "A Visit to Berchtesgaden."

The story opens at the peak of Hitler's victories in World War II. It tells of Joshua's visit to Hitler at Berchtesgaden and of Hitler's visit, through time, with Joshua to the famed trumpet and the crumbling walls of Jericho, 40 centuries ago.

The moral of the story appears to be that as you fight something, unless you are exceedingly careful, you are apt to absorb the spirit of what you fight, setting in train acts like those you sought to avoid.

Appalled at the slaughter and the misery he had seen at Jericho, Hitler tried to return to Berchtesgaden untainted. But it was too late. "The mask has become the man," said Joshua, "you cannot doff it."

Under unanimous consent, the article is cited below. I trust that it will be of some interest to the Congress in its current deliberations, especially in these days when so many people feel drained of strength and achievement and of purpose:

A VISIT TO BERCHTESGADEN

(By Hillel Bernstein)

(This seems to me the story of the year. To read it is a personal experience, and upon publication the story will become a national and international experience. It is more than literature. It is the contemporary mind coming to a great conclusion about one of the great contemporary problems. (Carl Van Doren.))

(HISTORICAL NOTE.—The World War of 1914–18 gave birth to the legend of the Unknown Soldier. After the World War which began in 1939 the despairing, mystical times brought forth a new legend, that of the Resurrected Soldier. He was expected hourly to return from the grave and liberate the enslaved peoples from the yoke of the Nazi conquerors.)

When Hitler felt the need for brooding mystically over some problem of state, he usually repaired to his mountain residence at Berchtesgaden, high above the Bavarian countryside. In such a mood he sat one evening in the private projection room of his mountain retreat, viewing again—for the hundredth time—the motion-picture record of his military triumphs.

He sat alone there, savoring with relish the striking power of his army and air force. The performance was ever a bracing tonic to the Führer. Having willed all these campaigns he also felt that he had achieved all this destruction personally. It was as if he, Hitler, has smashed Warsaw with a drive of his right first, and had destroyed a square mile of buildings in the center of Amsterdam with a vigorous kick of his left boot. He drank it in greedily with his eyes.

No previous military leader in history had enjoyed the delights of being able to view his campaigns again whenever he pleased. Hitler reflected that Napoleon, or Caesar, or Alexander, would have envied him this precious advantage. Great as they were, they could not bring back the sights of their stirring, smashing triumphs. They could not re-create, as he could, the scenes of power, victory, and glory.

Suddenly he felt a chill, and had a creepy feeling that he was not alone. He peered anxiously through the dark of the room. At the back there stood what seemed to be the figure of a huge man. Hitler's first instinct was to ring for his guards. But somehow his hand—the hand that had smashed Warsaw—was powerless to function.

"Who's there?" he said.

"I am a soldier," replied a low voice.

Hitler knew that this was no flesh-and-blood intruder. He was nervous and he played for time.

"Who let you in?" he demanded.

"I come from the past. No one let me in."

"Do not imagine that I am alone," Hitler cried. "The power of my invincible Reichswehr is about me. I am not unprotected."

"Yet now you are alone," the voice answered.

"What do you want?" Hitler's voice was thin and piping.

"For the present," came the answer, "I am looking at your battles."

"You said you were a soldier. What is your rank?"

"I am a commander."

Hitler became ingratiating. "A commander. Then you can study my battles with the eye of an expert. No doubt you can compare them with your own campaigns."

"My battles were different," said the other, curtly. A sense of superiority was evident in his manner but Hitler chose to ignore it.

"Naturally," he said. "All battles are different. A different general, a different kind of battle. And what were your battles like?"

"In most of them," said the stranger, "I spared no living thing."

Hitler's military vanity was piqued. "Do not try to talk to me in superior tones," he cried. "What scale were your campaigns on? Mine are on a world scale. Suppose I do leave a building standing here or there, or a few miserable enemies alive. Think of the immensity of my work. Military experts agree that there has been nothing like my wars in history. I have succeeded more than any other man—more than Napoleon, or Caesar, or Alexander. Who, then, are you?"

The other's voice indicated a cold fury; he, too, evidently had his military vanity. "You are going to see my battles," he said.

It was said ominously, and Hitler grew wary, remembering that he was facing an unknown danger. He said, in softer tones, "How can I see your battles? They are over and done with."

"No," was the answer. "They are still going on. I have fought them over again a thousand times. I will take you into the fighting, from the very beginning of my first campaign."

"I don't know what you mean," Hitler said, "and I cannot waste more time. I have many things to do."

The voice was freezingly contemptuous. "You are coming with me."

For the first time Hitler became clearly aware of the face. It was like nothing that he had known before: large, strong, hard-featured, expressionless, unearthly. But the eyes—the eyes. They were somehow like windows which widened out so that a world could be seen through them, a world of dooms and agonies.

Hitler felt drained of strength, achievement, fame, everything. Now the stranger's voice, as he spoke again, was inexorable. "Come with me," he said.

Hitler had a sudden feeling that he was in movement, and he struggled with all his might. But it was useless. In a moment he was out of Germany and out of his element.

They traveled on the wings of the past. They sped past the Napoleonic wars and the French Revolution, past the Thirty Years' War, past the Renaissance, and they did not even stop for the Middle Ages and the struggle between the emperors and the popes.

"Where are you taking me?" Hitler asked.

"Patience," said his fellow traveler. "I visited with you in modern times. You will visit with me in ancient times."

The Roman Empire went by like a flash, and the campaigns of Alexander the Great were just a flicker on the way. "That was Greek civilization just then," said the stranger, with a backward gesture. And then at last, "We have arrived."

Hitler found himself set down in rugged country, among warriors—hard, fierce, determined-looking men—many thousands of them gathered in an encampment. He watched his companion instantly take charge, as if he had not been away. He noted, too, from the moment of arrival, that there was a change in his companion. He looked smaller now, and without that terrifying atmosphere of doom which had characterized him at Berchtesgaden. He was more of a man and less of a shade. Although Hitler was in his power, the Führer did not fear his captor as much as he had a little while ago in the 20th century. Set in his own environment, the man was no more terrible than Hitler in his.

Immediately after his arrival there was an inspection of forces. Hitler went down the ranks with his companion, surveying the faces and military bearing of the soldiers. "Excellent fighting men," he said. "They remind me of some of my good sergeants in the Reichswehr." He spoke directly to one man, saying, "I should like to have had you for my good Reichswehr."

The man seemed to take no notice of this pretty speech, and Hitler said angrily to his companion, "Do you approve of your common soldiers behaving rudely to a visiting commander?"

"Forty centuries separate you from these men," was the reply. "They cannot see or hear you. You are not even dust in anyone's eye."

"Did you take me out of the 20th century in order to insult me?" Hitler complained. "I want to go back to the Reich, where I am in everyone's eye."

"You will go back soon," said the leader. "Meanwhile, there are battles to be viewed."

The inspection was followed by a council of war. The warriors, under the leadership of Hitler's companion, planned to invade new lands, slay all the inhabitants, and take their lands for themselves and their posterity. Hitler, the invisible one, listened to the plan of action.

"All, then, is in readiness," said the leader.

"Wait," said Hitler. "As a commander I criticize your preparations as crude and amateurish. Your plan is incomplete."

"Speak on," said Hitler's companion.

Hitler said: "Where is your propaganda machine? Where are your grievances? Why haven't you proved first that your nationals over there are being persecuted? That the other side is plotting to attack you? Where are your frontier incidents? Your atrocities? You haven't even shown the foresight to colonize some people over there first, to be killed in atrocities at the right moment. What a bungled campaign."

"None of that is necessary," said the leader. "We do not have to justify ourselves. It is the Lord who has told us to take those lands."

"That's good about the Lord," Hitler admitted. "That's always good. God is with me, too."

Then he bethought himself of another piece of excellent counsel. "You've forgotten one very important move," he said. "You ought to prove first of all that your enemies are dominated by the Jews. By the Jewish warmongers, who have instigated them to fight against you. If you do that, you will always be a hero, no matter what else you do."

His companion smiled. "That won't be necessary, either," he said. "For, you see, we are the Jews."

Hitler gasped. He looked wildly about, at those fierce, hard faces, at those warriors whose strength and soldierlike qualities he had admired. "But it's impossible," he cried. "Jews. But it can't be. And you yourself?"

"All of us."

"You're joking. I know what Jews are, and they're not fighters," he screamed. "Bankers, merchants, lawyers, doctors, tradesmen, journalists." He spat out his contempt. "Warmongers. They get others to do their fighting."

"These are the Jewish soldiers," said his companion, "and they will do their own fighting. Forty thousand of them are gathered here, and not an enemy will escape the edge of their swords."

Hitler was suddenly in panic. Forty thousand fighting Jews, and he alone among them, without a single army of 2 million to defend him. And the leader knew who he was. Already Hitler writhed in anticipation of being torn to pieces.

"You forget that they cannot see or hear you," said the leader, reading his thoughts.

Yet Hitler was sick. He sat down on a rock, and said feebly, "What is this place?"

"You are in the first chapter of the Book of Joshua of the Old Testament."

"In the Bible," groaned Hitler. "And you?"

"Joshua."

"The Bible. I had to listen to sermons from that when I was a boy. There was one about Joshua, the miracle soldier. Are you he who blew down the walls of Jericho?"

"You will see them blown down," said Joshua.

Then Hitler made a fighting effort to liberate himself from his environment. He stood up and shrieked: "No! No! I won't stay here in the Bible. I hate that book. I've got a book—my own book, Mein Kampf—and I want to go back to it. I want to go back to my German Reich and my German people."

His voice rose to a scream which he hoped would pierce the centuries, reach Berlin, arouse the Gestapo. "Help! Help! Germans to the rescue. I've been kidnaped by the Jews."

"They can't see or hear you in Berlin either," said Joshua. "There is no Berlin. It is still a marsh."

Hitler was forced to resign himself for the time being to the role of invisible spectator. The one satisfaction he enjoyed, as he looked at the fighting Jews, was his knowledge that in his day their descendants would constitute a minority that he could persecute and terrorize. At times he indulged in secret bravado. "Yah!" he jeered. "You capitalistic, bolshevistic, democratic, pacifistic, warmongering, trading, scribbling, pill-rolling, lawyering, banking Jews—yah!—you men of peace and good will, I despise you, I persecute you, I make you fear me. You tremble at the thought of me. I am the scourge." But no one heard him.

After a night of preparation and prayer, the army started on its campaign of invasion. The destination was Jericho and the first objective was the crossing of the river Jordan. To achieve the crossing swiftly and successfully, Joshua said that a miracle was in order, a miracle which would divide the waters. "Miracle," scoffed Hitler. "My army engineers create a miracle by spanning the river with pontoon bridges or rubber boats."

Hitler crossed the Jordan with Joshua as the waters divided. He was present at the siege of Jericho and he saw the walls come tumbling down at the final blast of the trumpets. It reminded him that he had blown down the bastion of Prague with a radio speech and the accompanying Nazi "Sieg Heil." "My voice, too," he said, "is the trumpet of destiny."

The walls came down, and Hitler watched the soldiers swarm over the debris and into the city with their swords flashing. It was slaughter and annihilation in the name of the Lord, who had instructed Joshua to spare no living thing.

Hitler had often dreamed of the annihilation of a foe to the last man. He had never seen his dream realized so completely as at Jericho. It sickened him.

Joshua, observing him, said, "It takes a strong stomach to do the Lord's work."

"What are you trying to insinuate?" said Hitler, touchily. "I never felt better in my life."

"You look woefully sick," said Joshua. "But you would be far sicker if you had to direct this slaughter over and over again a thousand times, as I have had to do."

The campaigns continued. Hitler watched the burning of Ai, and he saw the King of Ai hanged on a tree until eventide. For the first time he noticed a peculiar change in Joshua. The Jewish commander was indomitable, fiery, relentless; but there were moments in the midst of it all when he looked sad and weary and inconceivably old. Hitler happened to catch Joshua in his tent in one of those moments; the sight startled him.

"Go away," said Joshua, in a tired, weak voice.

"Where shall I go?" said Hitler. "You must take me back to my Reich."

"I can't do that until my campaigns are over," said Joshua.

"Then why did you bring me here in the first place?"

"Military pride," said Joshua. "I always feel that way at the beginning. But as the campaigns go on my spirit staggers under the burden. There is that within me which wants to cry out against the slaughter. But the words stop in my throat, and I cannot. I am powerless to change the course of the battle. And I feel every wound, every plunge of the sword, every slaying. It is the mass slaying of Joshua which I undergo. And it is Joshua who directs his own thousandfold slaying."

"I am not weak," said Hitler. "I do not sigh and falter at the sight of bloodshed."

"You have battles, too, which you will want to change later," said Joshua. "You, too, will be powerless."

"I will not want to change anything," said Hitler.

He was delighted to have caught Joshua in such a revealing moment; it made him feel superior and contemptuous. But if he believed this would continue as a permanent condition, he was disappointed. Joshua was again militant, again merciless. He marched against the coalition of the five kings, met their forces at Gibeon and slaughtered them. The 5 kings were hanged on 5 trees. At Azekah, Hitler saw the fleeing hordes of the enemy bombed with great stones from Heaven. There was another miracle that day, and this time Hitler was really impressed. It was getting towards evening and Joshua needed more daylight in order to complete the victory. He commanded the sun to stand still at Gibeon and the moon to remain in the valley of Ajalon.

The invasion and occupation of other lands continued, and Hitler watched the destruction of the Canaanites, the Amorites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites.

One part of the Jewish leader looked young and implacable, commanded the army and drove the soldiers on to triumph. The other part, aged, weary, sad, looked heavily on at the destruction. "The slaughter avails nothing," this second Joshua said. "The miracles avail nothing. They have to be paid for in misery."

Joshua had conquered completely and the children of Israel were in possession of the Promised Land. There was a great gathering of joy. All the victorious warriors were assembled to honor the man who had led them to victory. When Joshua appeared, the din was terrific.

Hitler, standing nearby, was assailed with nostalgia. This was the kind of applause he usually got in Germany, and it went to

his head like a powerful stimulant. It took fortitude not to respond.

Little by little, however, the faces faded out, the scene blurred; only the mass effect of a great celebration remained.

Joshua was addressing his soldiers. "With the help of the Lord," he was saying, "we have conquered. Now the children of Israel have the Promised Land. Let us worship the Lord and observe His Commandments, and we shall always enjoy the fruits of these victories—we and our children and our children's children."

There was another burst of applause, and this time Hitler, no longer aware of time and place, responded to it as automatically as if the applause came from a Nazi cheering section directed by Herr Goebbels. He bounded to the front of the platform, acknowledged the shouts of the warriors, and began to speak, pouring out his pentup emotions. "My German Soldier Comrades," he began. "This is a great hour in our history. The Lord has been with us, and we have conquered. The Lord told me to lead the Germans out of the wilderness of despair and the Versailles Diktat. The Lord told me to take the lands of the Czechs, the Poles, the Dutch, the Norwegians, the Danes, the Belgians, the French, the English, the Russians, the Americans. All these lands, He said, should be German lands, and those whom we do not annihilate should be our serfs—hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Germans.

"Now we have conquered, and now the world is ours. Now our German Reich embraces and dominates the earth, and we shall be the master race for the next 1,000 years. We Germans are the chosen people, chosen by God. The world must recognize that we are the chosen people and it must submit to our decisions and our government, for this universe is ours."

He went on and on, in a paroxysm of joy, and his body quivered as if he were experiencing the ecstasy of divine communication. But suddenly Joshua was at his side and leading him away.

"They did not hear a word, and cannot," said Joshua. "But I heard, and it is sufficient. And now, home to your Reich."

Again there was the sudden sense of motion. Just as speedily as they had traveled toward the times of Joshua, they now moved toward the times of Hitler. Almost immediately they were once more in the motion-picture projection room at Berchtesgaden. The film of Hitler's triumphs was still on the screen, and the scene as they entered showed a gathering of 200,000 Nazis shouting "Seig Heil."

"It is not true," said Hitler, "that no one heard me when I made that speech. Eighty-five million Germans heard me."

"So much the worse for them," said Joshua.

He was again a huge, formidable shape in the darkness, but Hitler no longer felt as disturbed as he had been at the beginning. "Eighty-five million triumphant, victorious people," cried Hitler, ecstatically, "The German master race. The rulers of the world."

"So be it," said Joshua. "You have declared yourselves a chosen people, and it is done. The Germans of your day are taking the place of the Jews of my day, and the Germans of a future day will take the place of the Jews of your day. It relieves us of a burden that has scarred us and borne us down, and which in adversity has made us the targets and scapegoats of all mankind. From now on you can have all the triumphs of a chosen people, and afterward, upon your downfall, you can have their persecutions, too. My Jews may rest at last. And I may rest."

"Whatever are you saying?" said Hitler. "Persecutions? Taking the place of Jews? What devilish nonsense is this?"

"You have been imitating the Jews of my time," said Joshua, and his voice ranged through the world with more volume than all the choruses of "Sieg Heil." "You have desired to be a chosen people, and now you have become one—self-chosen. I have been waiting 4,000 years for this day, waiting to be relieved of the painful punishment of fighting my battles over. And during that time I have seen the descendants of my Jews suffering the revenge of a world that remembered them once as chosen. But now, in the world's eyes, there is a new chosen people, a self-proclaimed one. Let them suffer when their time comes, while my people enjoy the delights of oblivion. My people have earned their rest."

Hitler looked into those window-eyes, and what he saw there affrighted him. Harassed Germans were there, weak and furtive, driven from pillar to post, with men lashing at them with whips while the mob jeered and showed its fangs of hatred. He sobbed and wept for the sight. Then he frantically fought off the illusion.

"No," he shrieked. "It is not so. We have not been imitating the Jews. We want to be nothing like them. Our destiny is a German destiny. Siegfried, not Joshua. We shall never know defeat and dispersion."

"You have seen what we were," said Joshua. "You may see what you will become."

Hitler put his hands over his eyes.

"It is not for nothing," said Joshua, "that in every plan of conquest you strove to identify your foes with the Jews; to make them Jews, no matter what they were in reality. Not for nothing have you fashioned the Jew into your world enemy. Deep down, deep in the spirit, an urge drove you. An urge to supplant the Jews. Not as they are today but in their ancient role."

"Outrageous and ridiculous," cried Hitler, full of hysteria. "I used the Jews as a propaganda weapon, yes—but with contempt. I made them my enemy, yes. I identified them with our foes, so that I could achieve what I wanted without opposition, because no one would dream of opposing me on behalf of the Jews. But what has that to do with imitation?"

"The mask has become the man," said Joshua. "You cannot doff it."

Hitler looked through those eyes again, and was appalled.

Joshua said, "When Moses placed his hand upon me and God instructed me, we were the chosen people. Thus imbued, I led my people in conquest of the Promised Land. No man in my lifetime could withstand me, no man and no people. We believed ourselves a chosen people, and while we were victorious we gloried in it. After me there came others, who strove to temper what I had done, whose aim was justice and mercy, the blessed leaven of tolerance and understanding, and then the brotherhood of man rather than the exclusive brotherhood of one tribe of men. But we have not been allowed to forget that we were once a chosen people. Defeated, dispersed, persecuted, we have paid bitterly and long after our time. We have done enough penance. We desired to forget that we were ever a military people; we cultivated all the ways of peace; we forgot the practice of arms. But our path was not made lighter.

"Now, at last, you have come, you and the Germans, and you hunger and strive to be chosen. So be it. For centuries my people have tried to escape the burden of memory of their role, but they had to wait for your coming. As for me, I have made my journey and my long penance is over.

"And now, O Wandering German to be, I leave you."

"Wait, wait," cried Hitler, hurrying to the door as if Joshua had left by that medium. "Let us talk this over. I——"

But he was 40 centuries too late.

INCREASED SECURITY FOR THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL AND THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a joint resolution just introduced by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one week ago the membership of the House was subjected to the tragic shooting from the gallery by fanatical Puerto Ricans who made the trip down from New York in order to murder Members of Congress. It did not make any difference to them whether they were located in the House or in the Senate. Their purpose was to inflict mortal injury upon Members of Congress.

I am tremendously pleased the Members that were injured by the fusillade of bullets which were fired by these terrorists are going to completely recover and will soon again be here with us in this honorable association. Also, I am thankful to God more of the membership were not injured and that none of those who were shot were mortally wounded.

During this week that has passed, I have given tremendous thought to the problem emphasized by this tragic occurrence. By way of conclusion to these thoughts, I have filed today a joint resolution having as its purpose the protection of the Congress of the United States, as well as the United States Capitol and its grounds. It is my view that the recommendations I have suggested in this joint resolution, if adopted by the Congress, would prove to be very effective in accomplishing the desired security for Members of Congress and for the United States Capitol.

It is to be noted that in this resolution of mine, I have made the requirement that no person shall be permitted to enter the Capitol Building unless that person has answered in the negative as to whether or not he is a Communist or a member of the Communist Party.

House Joint Resolution 464

Joint resolution to provide increase security for the United States Capitol and for the Congress

Resolved, etc., That a Board to be known as the Capitol Security Board is hereby created. The Capitol Security Board shall be composed of the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 3 Members of the Senate of the United States to be appointed by the Vice President, 3 Members of the House of Representatives of the United States to be appointed by the Speaker, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the House, and the Architect of the Capitol. The Capitol Security Board shall be responsible for the complete security of the United States Capitol Building and grounds, and the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) That an office to be known as the Security Office of the Capitol is hereby created. The Security Office of the Capitol shall be headed by a Security Officer of the Capitol who shall be appointed by, and shall

perform his duties under the supervision of, the Capitol Security Board. There shall be in such office a Deputy Security Officer of the Capitol, two Assistant Security Officers of the Capitol, and such other assistants and employees as may be necessary to enable the Security Officer of the Capitol to carry out his duties under this Act.

(b) The Security Officer of the Capitol, the Deputy Security Officer of the Capitol, and Assistant Security Officers of the Capitol shall be trained in the arts and sciences of security operations.

(c) The Capitol police shall be subject to the authority and control of the Security Officer of the Capitol.

(1) The Capitol police shall be trained in the arts and sciences of police duties and operations.

(2) The Capitol police shall be increased in organization and personnel to adequately care for increased responsibilities.

SEC. 3. (a) The Security Officer of the Capitol shall have the responsibility of controlling the admission of persons to the Capitol Building, to the end that no person shall be admitted to such building who might commit therein any act of violence.

(b) In order to accomplish the objective set forth in the preceding subsection, the Security Officer of the Capitol shall issue regulations providing, among other things, that no person shall be admitted to the Capitol Building unless—

(1) he has a pass duly issued to him by a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, or one of their authorized representatives,

(2) he is an employee of the legislative branch who has been issued a pass by the Security Office of the Capitol,

(3) he is a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner,

(4) he has been summoned to appear before a committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, or before a joint committee of the Congress, or

(5) he has been given such examination, and has furnished such information as the Security Officer thall require.

SEC. 4. No person shall be issued a pass by the Security Officer of the Capitol as provided in clause (2) of section 3 (b) of this Act, or admitted after examination as provided in clause (5) of section 3 (d) of this Act, until he has been asked whether he is or has ever been a member of the Communist Party of the United States of America, and has answered in the negative, except that this section shall not apply to persons summoned to appear before a committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, or a joint committee of the Congress.

SEC. 5. The Security Officer of the Capitol, the Deputy and Assistant Security Officers shall receive compensation in accord with the prevailing schedule for Federal Government employees. Employees of the Capitol Security Office shall be subject to the rules and regulations adopted by the Capitol Security Board.

SEC. 6. The Capitol Police Board is hereby abolished.

THE MEXICAN LABOR BILL

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House, to revise and extend my remarks and include a news article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today the Mexican farm labor bill was being considered in the House. A week ago tomorrow the final vote was taken. The following day, on Wednesday, March 3, the bill passed the Senate and on the following day, Thursday, March 4, the bill was again considered in the House and an amendment by the Senate was agreed to and the bill was sent on to the President for his signature. I understand that the bill is now on the President's desk.

At the time the resolution was first presented to the House Committee on Agriculture I objected to its consideration for many reasons. The first and most important reason was that I believed that such a resolution would be incompatible with the good-neighbor policy of our Government and I was convinced that the passage of the resolution would have far-reaching international implications. I further thought that the resolution was calculated to embarrass the officials of our own Government. I did not believe at that time that an effort in good faith had been made to compose the differences between the two governments regarding the international agreement which is definitely contemplated by existing law. These were but a few of my objections to House Joint Resolution 355. At the time I interposed my first objection and insisted upon delaying indefinitely the consideration of the measure I took the position that negotiations should be resumed in the hope than an agreement satisfactory to both governments might soon be reached.

After I had insisted upon open public hearings and after I had communicated with officials of our own Government and with the Mexican Ambassador to Washington and with the White House and was advised that the President of the United States had expressed the hope that negotiations might be resumed immediately, negotiations were resumed in Mexico City that very night. From that time forward great progress has been made. I am now advised that all matters and things in controversy have been composed and that only the drafting of the details of the provisions of the contract remain to be worked out. I understand that the language difficulties will soon be resolved and finally agreed upon. I asked for only a few weeks and at last for only a week or two in which I thought that an agreement might be reached. I stated before the Rules Committee that I did not believe that the President could very gracefully sign and approve House Joint Resolution 355 especially in view of the fact that he had caused negotiations to be resumed on the night of February 10, 1954. The President is at the present time apparently experiencing some difficulties in determining whether or not be should approve the measure.

I take the floor at this time, Mr. Speaker, to express the hope that the President will not sign and approve House Joint Resolution 355 which is generally known as the Mexican farm-labor bill. If he will withhold signing for perhaps a few more hours an agreement will probably be reached and it will not then be necessary for him to sign or to approve the measure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I sincerely hope that the President will hold up the signing of the bill, and if the agreement is entered into that he will not sign it. As a matter of fact, I hope he will not sign the bill because, like the gentleman from North Carolina, I opposed it because of the serious and unfortunate results that might develop as a result of the passage of the bill, so far as it would affect our friendly relations with our neighbors to the south. And particularly in the light of the information which is now available. I hope that the course will be one which will be consistent with strengthening the friendship between the United States and Mexico rather than the creation of tension between the two countries which is unnecessary.

Mr. COOLEY. I appreciate the observations of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts and agree entirely with the sentiment he has expressed.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a news article which I understand appeared in the San Diego Union on Saturday morning, March 6. The byline is by Frank Macomber and the date line is Washington, March 5.

ENTIRE WETBACK PICTURE SNAFUED AGAIN

(By Frank Macomber)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—United States negotiators at Mexico City have agreed to toss border recruiting of Mexican farm workers out of a new international program in exchange for other concessions from the Mexican Government, California Congressmen were told today by the State Department.

An international commission meanwhile will be created to study the question of whether border recruiting should be made a provision of an international agreement, Department officials told the Congressmen.

A new international agreement is due to be signed perhaps as early as Monday. The Department's admission that its negotiators had given way on the controversial border recruiting issue came as a shock to Congressmen who have fought for weeks to put through the House and Senate a bill legalizing United States border recruiting of Mexican farm workers without Mexico's participation.

Its primary aim was to give United States negotiators, headed by American Ambassador Francis White, a strong hand in insisting on border recruiting for farmers close to the international boundary in San Diego and Imperial Counties of southern California and in a half-dozen Texas border farming areas.

The border recruiting bill only reached the President's desk today, after a stormy trip through the House and Senate.

Representatives JOHN PHILLIPS, BOB WILSON, and JAMES B. UTT, Republican of California, first got wind of a report that the United States was about to sign a pact with Mexico without a border recruiting provision.

They went into a huddle with Vice President NIXON and Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican of California. The State Department and the White House were called and the report was confirmed.

Then Speaker JOSEPH MARTIN, Republican of Massachusetts, and Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican of Indiana, House majority leader, were brought into the huddle. The GOP congressional leaders were asked to take up the border recruiting issue Monday with the President at their regular weekly legislative huddle.

KNOWLAND said it would be the first order of business at the White House Monday.

The California Congressmen want the President to order the United States to hold up agreement on the new international farm labor agreement until some border recruiting provision is inserted.

State Department officials explained to the legislators they gave way on this issue, sidetracking it to a proposed international

study commission, as a trade for Mexican concessions.

But UTT, WILSON, and PHILLIPS charged the United State negotiators gave away the most important provision from the viewpoint of the United States farmer close to the border, in exchange for concession on far less vital provisions.

The Congressmen said they understood, too, that United States negotiators agreed to an informal understanding there would be no further United States operated border recruiting program during the life of the new international agreement.

UTT, WILSON, and PHILLIPS told the congressional leaders they should insist on at least 20 percent border recruiting—that is, of 200,000 Mexican farm laborers brought into this country each year, at least 40,000 should be recruited from the border area and the rest from the interior.

UTT, WILSON, and PHILLIPS, who spent all afternoon conferring with congressional leader on the new complication in an already complicated Mexican farm labor picture, charged that the State Department's concession on the border recruiting issue makes Congress look foolish.

"We have been fighting for weeks to get this border recruiting bill through the House and Senate, to give our negotiators backing in Mexico City," UTT recalled. "Now that the bill is about to become law and can be used as a valuable weapon in the negotiations, the State Department gives way on the one issue we have insisted upon—some border recruiting for southern California and Texas farmers."

UTT, WILSON, and PHILLIPS warned that the border recruiting program was sold to Congress on the claim that it would be the best possible way to combat the penetration of Mexican wetbacks into this country. In the last few weeks, they pointed out, since border recruiting was in effect, immigration border patrolmen have raided 110 border area farms and picked up only 10 wetbacks. Before border recruiting the raiding of 110 farms usually netted about 1,000 wetbacks, they pointed out.

The proposed United States-Mexican Commission to study border recruiting and other issues still in dispute will be a part of the new agreement as it presently is drafted, State Department officials told the Congressmen.

Rocco Siciliano, in testimony before a House Appropriations Subcommittee Wednesday but made public today, said the United States and Mexico likely will be ready to sign a new farm labor agreement by Monday.

Testimony taken at the hastily called Wednesday hearing was released as the House Appropriations Committee approved a special bill providing $478,000 to finance the Mexican farm labor program until June 30, end of the present fiscal year.

Chairman FRED BUSBEY (Republican of Illinois) of the Appropriations Subcommittee which held hearings on the Labor Department's request for the funds, emphasized the money may be spent either on a United States border recruiting setup, without Mexico's participation, or for an international program with Mexico.

State Department officials said United States negotiators are near agreement with Mexico on an international farm labor pact but said there was no assurance negotiations have been concluded and await only the signatures of both nations.

"There often is much give and take in the editing and interpretation of a final draft of an international agreement, and it would be premature to say final agreement has been reached," an official State Department spokesman said.

Labor Department officials have credited the border recruiting issue with being a potent weapon which helped to bring United States-Mexican negotiations close to agreement on a new international program.

Siciliano said Mexico now has agreed that the United States Labor Secretary will determine the prevailing wage rates on which pay of Mexican farmworkers will be based. This was a serious point of dispute which held up agreement for weeks.

Mexico also has recognized worker responsibility and the need for United States employers to withhold some wages as assurance Mexican employees won't leave the job before their contract ends, Siciliano said.

The United States has compromised with Mexico on establishment of subsistence rates for Mexican workers, insisting that the United States Labor Secretary set this amount but allowing Mexico to investigate if it believes the rate is incorrect, the Assistant Secretary added.

Negotiators have agreed, he testified, to the Joint Commission, possibly to be comprised of two members from each Government, to investigate such still disputed issues as—

1. Whether border recruiting stations for farmworkers shall be set up just inside the Mexican side of the border or on the American side, as under the unilateral recruiting setup.

2. A United States farmers' proposal that the minimum contract time be reduced from 6 to 4 weeks, making it easier for border-area growers to hire contract Mexican labor. They have complained that 6 weeks is too long a contract period.

Siciliano said the Commission also might investigate the so-called Mexican wetback traffic along the border, to determine its causes. But he did not elaborate.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VAN PELT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Republican Party. This significant event, which changed the history of this Nation, took place in Ripon, Wis., which is in the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

For a brief moment, Mr. Speaker, permit me to conjure up a picture of the scene that occurred the evening of March 20, 1854. It was a cold, bleak night, and the word had just reached the Midwest of the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill by the United States Senate. This was the call to arms for a determined band of antislavery Whig, Democrats, and Free Soilers. They had been discussing the issue for months, and had decided to form a new political party if steps were taken to extend slavery into the Territories of the West.

Maj. Alan E. Bovay, of Ripon, had suggested the name of Republican for this new party. It was at his call that the small group assembled in the candlelit white schoolhouse and, huddled around a brightly flaming wood fire, launched the new party which, in 1860, elected the immortal Lincoln to the Presidency.

The white schoolhouse still stands at Ripon, the symbol of a mighty political force in this Nation. The citizens of that community are preparing to observe the birth of the party with a great centennial celebration starting on March 20. Hon. Leonard Hall, chairman of the National Republican Committee, will be the speaker on that occasion. It is hoped that President Eisenhower will pull the switch lighting a new freedom flame at the spot where the party was born 100 years ago. Later in the year Vice President RICHARD NIXON will visit Ripon.

I have been asked by Mr. William A. Royce, Jr., cochairman of the celebration committee, to extend an invitation to the Members of the Congress to join in this pilgrimage. Complete particulars regarding the program will be available in my office.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks and include at this point a documented statement on the origin of the Republican Party. This authentic version was prepared by the late James H. Davidson, who served in this Congress from 1897 to 1913. The statement follows:

ORIGIN OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The Republican Party of the United States originated, both as to organization and name in the town of Ripon, this county. "One of the earliest, if not the earliest, of the movements," says Henry Wilson, "that contemplated definite action and the formation of a new party, was made in Ripon, Fond du Lac County, Wis., in the early months of 1854. In consequence of a very thorough canvass, conference and general comparison of views, inaugurated by A. E. Bovay (Alan E. Bovay), a prominent member of the Whig Party, among the Whigs, Free Soilers, and Democrats of that township, a call was issued * * * for a public meeting to consider the grave issues which were assuming an aspect of such alarming importance. The meeting was held on the last (day) of February, in the Congregational Church. It was largely attended by persons of both sexes from the town and surrounding country. It was a meeting solely for the discussion of principles and comparison of views. * * * The burden and drift of the speeches were the hopeless subserviency of the national parties to the behests of the slaveholders, the necessity of abandoning them, and the proposed policy of constructing a party from the materials thus set at liberty, with such as could be persuaded to leave the Democratic Party for a similar purpose. A resolution was adopted that, if the Nebraska bill, then pending, should pass, they would "throw old party organizations to the winds, and organize a new party on the sole issue of the nonextension of slavery."

"A second meeting was held," continues Mr. Wilson, "on the 20th of March, for the purpose of organization and for the adoption of such preliminary measures as the inauguration of the new party required. By formal vote, the town committees of the Whig and Free Soil Parties were dissolved, and a committee of 5, consisting of 3 Whigs, 1 Free Soiler, and 1 Democrat, was chosen. 'The work done on that evening,' says Mr. Bovay, 'was fully accepted by the Whig and Free Soil Parties of all this section immediately, and very soon—that is to say, in a few months—by these parties throughout the entire State.' A State convention was held in July, by which the organization of the party was perfected for the State, a majority of the delegation was secured for the next Congress; and a Free Soiler, Charles Durkee, was elected to the Senate of the United States. At the meeting of the 20th of March, Mr. Bovay, though stating his belief that the party should and probably would take the name of 'Republican,' advised against such a christening at that time, and by that small local body of men. He, however, wrote to the editor of the New York Tribune, suggesting the name, giving his reasons therefor, and requesting him, if

his views corresponded with his own, to call the attention of his readers to it in the columns of his paper. Thus early did the men of that frontier town inaugurate a movement which was destined to sweep and control the Nation, and which did sweep the country, and change entirely the policy of the Government."

Careful investigations in the city of Ripon more than confirm the opinion of the late Vice President of the United States—Mr. Wilson. Facts have been brought from original sources—from living witnesses—from documentary evidence—all bearing upon this interesting and important movement, and all prove beyond question that Alan E. Bovay first suggested the formation and name of the political party of the United States known as the Republican Party; that several of his neighbors whose names are hereafter given powerfully aided him in its first organization in Ripon—cordially cooperating with him in the inauguration of the new party.

Says Major Bovay:

"I had been a Whig, but the Whig Party was then dead. Its defunct condition was not generally realized, but it was dead nevertheless. It had been routed horse, foot, and artillery in the fall of 1852. That battle was its Waterloo." No party could outlive such a terrible slaughter of its innocents as that was.

"True, up to the spring of 1854, it still held on to its organization. But it was a mere shell; a skeleton army, nothing more.

"The leaders could not marshal their troops; could not anywhere bring their forces into line; in short, the party was dead, though not dissolved. Moreover, the country no longer took any interest in the old Whig issues. The slavery question dominated everything else. Nobody talked or thought any longer about protection to American industry. It was slavery in the States, slavery in the Territories, the fugitive slave law, and the refrain was ever slavery, and nothing else. There was one great, overshadowing, proslavery party—the Democratic; there must also be one great antislavery party to antagonize it. The logic of history demanded it. Such a party had become inevitable. The Whig Party was not this party, and could not be. It had outstayed its time and its usefulness; it was an anachronism. It had become an obstruction, an impediment, a nuisance. But how to get the organization out of the way—that was a rather formidable question. It stood there a great, useless, lifeless thing, awaiting some possible political earthquake, which would be violent enough to shake it to pieces. And the earthquake came.

"The triumph of slavery had been so complete in the slaughter of 1852, that its cohorts thought themselves strong enough to do anything, so they laid their hands on the oldest and most sacred of the compromises. The shock was tremendous. Instantly the whole North was in a flame of indignation and rage. The hour had struck. This was the tempest that was to sweep from our sight not only the Whig organization, but also all those little fragments of parties, Free Soil and the like, that had grown out of the slavery agitation in years that were past. The time had come for all liberty-loving Whigs to dismantle their house. As for me, I did not propose to wait for the passage of the Nebraska bill. It was foreordained to pass; then why wait? I felt 'in my bones,' as old Candace said, that the righteous rage of the time ought to be turned to some permanent account, and not permitted to effervesce in useless foam. I set to work in the most systematic way that I could contrive, to dissolve the Whig Party and to organize the Republican Party right here, fully convinced that others would do the like elsewhere, and, that in a few months we should have a great, irresistible northern party, organized on the single issue of the nonextension of slavery.

"This is the point at which the late Vice President takes notice of our movement. His history is very brief, but substantially correct. Jehdiah Bowen was my chief helper; a merchant of high standing, a man of intelligence, position, and influence, his assistance was of the utmost importance. One part of the work was specially difficult. All the peope, except the most hardened Democrats, responded to my appeals with the utmost avidity, up to a certain limit. They said, 'Oh, yes; oh, yes, we are with you in denouncing this thing. It is a great outrage; it is a swindle; we will protest; we will resolve; we will sign all the remonstrances you can think of.'

"But—and just here came the pinch—a good many of the old Whigs begged hard for the Whig Party. 'Spare the party; spare the party. Let all the outside elements come to us; our party is good enough; we will fight the democracy on this ground; we will triumph.' The good souls; they had to be told squarely that the 'Whig Party must go;' that the very heart and core of our movement was that to which they could not agree. To let the Whig Party stay was to insure permanent power to the Democratic Party. To retreat from the formation of a new party was to surrender to the slave power. They came to the meetings, and were respectfully heard, but the large majority had made up their minds. The hour was late, the candles burned low; it was a cold, windy night at the vernal equinox. In the end, all but 2 or 3 gave in, and we formed our organization.

"I remember every word and act, as if the time was but yesterday. The election of that first Republican committee—A. E. Bovay, Jehdiah Bowen, Amos Loper, Jacob Woodruff, and Abraham Thomas—was a solemn act. Every man present fully believed that he was helping to make a permanent piece of history. And he was. Yes; that point ought to be clearly understood. This was no blind, unconscious movement, of which the human family make so many. We did not build better than we knew, as some have supposed; we built precisely as we knew; and there stands the edifice. Look at it. It will bear examination. It was no fragmentary movement. It contemplated the combination of all shades of antislavery sentiment in the country in one grand organization to resist the encroachments of slavery, under the name 'Republican.'

"The name was as well settled in my mind as the organization, and I took what seemed to me the most effectual course to secure its general adoption. Republican; the common weal; an old and cherished name in our own political history, and the name which is owned, as theirs, by all liberal men and liberal organizations throughout the world. The adoption of this name was as much inevitable as was the nomination of Abraham Lincoln in 1860. In both of these cases, a wise choice meant success, and an unwise one meant defeat; no more, no less. That I was advocating this name for the great party which I saw looming in the near future above the horizon, as far back as the autumn of 1852, there is abundant evidence.

"Were Horace Greeley living, I could readily convince anyone that I was contemplating this identical state of things in the political world, name, organization and all, as early even as May 1852; but, as Mr. Greeley's testimony is not now attainable, and I have but one living witness to this latter fact (which witness I do not choose to call), I must rest upon the autumn of 1852.

"And perhaps the autumn will do as well as the spring. That gives Ripon a precedence of nearly 2 years (or, to be exact, 19 months) in the matter of the name; for it was not until June 1854, that the name 'Republican' was adopted formally, and that was by the State convention of Michigan.

"I take pleasure in referring to one of our oldest and most prominent citizens, Judge E. L. Runals, who took no part in the movement, but was cognizant of it all. This is his testimony:

"RIPON, *December 16, 1879.*

"To Maj. A. E. BOVAY, *Ripon, Wis.*

"DEAR SIR: I remember well a conversation I had with you in the fall of 1852, not more than 2 or 3 weeks, I should think, after the election of Franklin Pierce to Presidency, in relation to the political affairs of the country. You, in substance, said that the Whig party, to which you belonged, could not survive such an overwhelming defeat as it had just suffered; that it could never rally again; that it would have to abandon its organization and its name; that the country had ceased to care for the old Whig issues; that slavery had become the all-absorbing question; that on some phase of this question a new party would probably soon be formed at the North, which would combine the Whigs, Free-Soilers, and all the outside elements against the Democracy, which was the great pillar and support of slavery; that the selection of a name would be an object of the first importance to this new party; and that, in your opinion, it should be called the "Republican" party. You also gave your reasons at considerable length for so thinking;

"You said that as this was the name by which the party of Jefferson had been called from its foundation up to Jackson's time, it would possess a charm, by reason of these old associations, for all Americans, and that it would be attractive to men of foreign birth by reason of its general use amongst the liberals of Europe—and much more to the same effect. Having known you in politics as a Whig, I was rather surprised at these predictions as coming from you, and it is probably owing to this fact that they made so firm an impression on my mind.

"Yours very truly,

"E. L. RUNALS."

On the 25th day of January 1854, Jeremiah Rowen, then (as now) a citizen of Ripon—a Democrat with Free-Soil proclivities—caused to be published in the Ripon Herald, a Democratic paper, the following communication:

"MR. EDITOR: Nothing indicates more clearly the truth of these words of Jefferson's—"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty"—than the course pursued in Congress by the committee to which was referred the call from Nebraska for a Territorial Government.

"It is well known that the Territory is intended to be bounded on the south, at farthest, by the old Missouri Compromise line of 30° and 30′ north latitude. It is a portion of that vast territory ceded to the United States by its treaty with France, by which the present State of Louisiana was secured to us. It is a portion of that territory which, by the act known as the Missouri Compromise, was to be forever free from the introduction of slavery or involuntary servitude, except in punishment of crimes.

"Mark, then, the appropriateness of Jefferson's maxim, when we find that Senator Douglas, as head of the above-mentioned committee, reported a bill for a Territorial Government, in which is a clause prospectively annulling that clause of the Missouri Compromise Act, mentioned above, relating to slavery in that Territory. Douglas' bill provides that should any portion of the Territory, upon application to Congress for admission into the Union as a State (have permitted involuntary servitude, it) shall not be rejected by reason of the establishment of slavery therein, by virtue of its constitution.

"One might think from the wailings and threats of the Southern press and politicians, and the echoes by their servile friends at the North, that peace was all that they demand for their peculiar institution; but it is not so; not satisfied with the triumph obtained over the North by the passage of the most odious law that encumbers the

statute books of any Christian nation, they now demand that they shall not only enjoy in peace their favorite slavery at home, and its further security under the fugitive slave law, but that the whole country shall submit to the extension of slavery into territory, which, by right and solemn compact, has been consecrated to liberty.

"What do our great men do in view of this demand? Do they not indignantly frown upon such barefaced impudence? Surely one might expect to learn, that at least the Representatives of States free from the incubus of slavery would protest against so glaring a wrong to our honor and to humanity. But what do we see? One of the highest in our national councils—the chief leader of the 'Young Democracy'—one who aspires to the chief magistracy of this great Nation, bending, cringing, licking the dust at the very feet of this Moloch—groveling in the mire before it, to gather the withered laurels cast away from the Nation's brow by reason of this insatiate monster. Is there no shame left, that a man pretending to represent a free State should thus so degrade his constituents and humanity itself? 'Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad.' It cannot be otherwise than that these men, pandering to the worst sins of a people to obtain an ephemeral fame, are deluded by their own depravity to their own ruin; God forbid that it be the Nation. Can it be supposed, that the cry of 'down with agitation and agitators,' will avail in the face of so gross an offense as is here offered to a people awakening to the inconsistencies and oppression of slavery?

"So long as Senator Douglas, or any other man, shall defend what, by compact and right, pertains to the slave States, as such, we would not refuse to him his just meed of honor; but when he stoops so low as to bend the knee of slavery and to discard the approbation of freemen, let no lover of his country's honor fail to point the finger of scorn at him, and indignantly blot his name from the list of our country's friends."

This communication was published over the signature "X" but Mr. Bowen was not at all disposed to deny its paternity, notwithstanding his affiliation with the Democratic Party; he was not adverse to being classed among anti-Nebraska Democrats. The editor of the Ripon Herald in his issue of February 1, in commenting upon Bowen's article, said: "We inserted in our last a communication over the signature "X" upon the subject of Senator Douglas' Nebraska bill, passing severe strictures upon the Senate (Senator) and his bill. We should then have said that we were not prepared to indorse the grounds taken by "X". For ourselves, we will say that we measure much of our political creed by the doctrine of State rights.

"A few days (perhaps a week) after the appearance of the article containing some strictures upon the course of Senator Douglas, in the Ripon Herald of January 25, 1854, I was called upon by A. E. Bovay, who requested an interview, if I could spare the time, to talk over the subject of that article and what ought to be done in furtherance of its purposes.

"As Mr. Bovay had widely differed with me on some of the political questions that had been under discussion during the 3 years of our acquaintance, he expressed some surprise and gratification at the publication of the sentiment contained in the article by me, and yet, as I thought then, not without some doubt as to my earnestness. However, he soon became convinced on that point. We talked for some time upon the probabilities of the future, in view of the excitement caused by the advocacy by Senator Douglas of the Kansas and Nebraska Act, for there seemed to be no adequate power to oppose his measure successfully, the Whig Party being as much divided in Congress as the Democrats. We argued that the only hope of defeating the extension of slavery, lay in the outspoken sentiment of the people, irrespective of existing parties. Then came the proposition of Mr. Bovay, to endeavor to crystalize public feeling by calling a meeting to discuss the question of organizing a new party. I hesitated; my faith was not strong that we could effect the object. I represented the sparseness of our population; we were in a small rural village, remote even from the county seat, and upon no great line of travel; could we make ourselves heard by the public at large? To this, Mr. Bovay replied, that there would be no question about it. The conclusion was that we should try it. Then followed the question of method of proceeding and the name by which to call the party—which Mr. Bovay suggested. Some estimates were attempted to be made as to what would be the relative proportion of the two parties who would give in their adherence to the new party. We agreed in the main, as to the classes of men that we had hopes of. We went to the house of Amos Loper, living some 3 miles north of the village, laid the matter before him in all its bearings, Mr. Bovay taking the lead in the conversation. Mr. Loper was not long in making up his mind, and we agreed to make a call for a meeting, to be held at the Congregational Church, on the last day of February.

"I cannot recall the exact language used by either of us. The subject occupied all our thoughts. We looked upon the movement as of considerable importance in a personal point of view, touching our relations with the citizens; for, to make a move and fail, would probably bring obloquy, and I was not prepared financially to court such a state of things; but, concluding that we were in the line of duty, it was undertaken in a hopeful and cheerful spirit. We were afterward astonished at the progress made, and watched with intense interest the spread of the movement through all the Northern States."

The call spoken of by Mr. Bowen was drawn up and printed in the Ripon Herald on the 29th of February.

The moderator of the meeting was William Dunham; W. N. Martin was secretary. The burden and drift of the speeches were, as Mr. Wilson truthfully says, "the hopeless subserviency of the national parties to the behests of the slaveholders, the necessity of abandoning them, and the proposed policy of constructing a party from the materials thus set at liberty."

The following preamble and resolutions were freely discussed and unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the Senate of the United States is entertaining, and from present indications is likely to pass, bills organizing governments for the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, in which is embodied a clause repealing the Missouri Compromise Act, and so admit into these Territories the slave system with all its evils; and, whereas, we deem that compact irrepealable as to the Constitution itself: Therefore

"Resolved, That of all outrages hitherto perpetrated or attempted upon the North and freedom by the slaveholders and their natural allies, not one compares in bold and impudent aduacity, treachery, and meanness with this, the Nebraska bill, as to the sum of all its other villanies it adds the repudiation of a solemn compact held as sacred as the Constitution itself for the period of 34 years;

"Resolved, That the Northern man who can aid and abet in commission of so stupendous a crime, is none too good to become an accomplice in renewing the African slave trade, the service which, doubtless, will next be required of him by his Southern masters, should the Nebraska treason succeed;

"Resolved, That the attempt to overthrow the Missouri Compromise, whether successful or not, admonishes the North to adopt the maxim for all time to come, 'No more compromise with slavery';

"Resolved, That the passage of this bill (if pass it should) will be the call to arms of a great northern party, such an one as the country has not hitherto seen, composed of Whigs, Democrats, and Free-Soilers; every man with a heart in him united under the single banner cry of 'Repeal! Repeal!'

"Resolved, That the small but compact phalanx of true men, who oppose the mad scheme upon the broadest principle of humanity, as well as their unflinching efforts to uphold public faith, deserve not only our applause, but our profound esteem;

"Resolved, That the heroic attitude of General Houston, amidst a host of degenerate men in the United States Senate, is worthy of honor and applause."

Then and there was born the Republican Party of the United States; the time was the evening of the last day of February 1854; the place, the frame Congregational Church, which is still standing in the city of Ripon.

On the 18th of March the following call was printed in the Ripon Herald:

"THE NEBRASKA BILL

"A bill expressly intended to extend and strengthen the institution of slavery has passed the Senate by a very large majority, many northern Senators voting for it, and many more sitting in their seats and not voting at all. It is evidently destined to pass the House and become a law unless its progress is arrested by the general uprising of the North against it.

"Therefore we, the undersigned, believing this community to be nearly or quite unanimous in opposition to the nefarious scheme, would call a public meeting of citizens of all parties to be held at the schoolhouse in Ripon on Monday evening, March 20, at 6:30 o'clock, to resolve, to petition, and to organize against it.

"J. BOWEN,
"A. LOPER,
"T. L. REYNOLDS,
"A. E. BOVAY,
"(And 50 others)."

The 54 citizens—Whigs, Democrats, and Free-Soilers—who signed the call, understood perfectly that, in so doing, they were pledging themselves to join the new party. It will be remembered that Mr. Wilson says of the meeting which followed, that "by formal vote, the town committees of the Whig and Free-Soil Parties were dissolved, and a committee of 5, consisting of 3 Whigs, 1 Free-Soiler, and 1 Democrat, was chosen." A. E. Bovay, J. Bowen, Amos Loper, Abram Thomas, and Jacon Woodruff constituted the committee. Then and there the Republican Party of the United States was christened, and these men were its godfathers. "The actors in this remote little eddy of politics," afterward wrote Mr. Bovay, "thought at the time that they were making a bit of history by that solitary tallow candle, in the little while schoolhouse on the prairie; and whether ever recognized and published or not, they think so still."

TAXPAYER, BEWARE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, when the President talked late last year and early in January about the kind of legislative program he was going to send up here for enactment, he said it was going to be dynamic and progressive.

I do not intend at this time to take up the entire program in any detail but I would like to address my remarks for a

few minutes to one extremely important part of it—the tax bill.

The revenue revision bill of 1954, which will shortly come before the House after many, many weeks of exhausting and frustrating study in the Ways and Means Committee, is certainly not progressive in any sense of the word. Nor is it dynamic. Rather, I would term it, dynamite.

The bill itself is big enough to choke an elephant. But it will be mighty palatable to those millionaires who have been most active over the years in supporting the GOP elephant. They will get back their assistance many times over if this bill becomes law in its present form.

But the average taxpayer will get nothing. In fact, he will get worse than nothing—he will find in this bill the seeds of higher tax obligations for him in the future.

His Federal taxes will ultimately have to go up if this bill passes. His State taxes will go up. His local taxes will go up. He is going to take a beating. And so I say, Mr. Speaker, "Taxpayer, beware." This bill is a fiscal killer.

I have told the House on many occasions—so many that I have become self-conscious about boring any among us who may have such closed minds they do not want the facts or the truth—about the booby traps and pitfalls and gimmicks and loopholes written into this bill, provisions intended to benefit big business and the wealthy at the expense of the rest of the citizens of the United States.

Today I want to call attention once again to the provision dealing with the falsely named, completely misleading subject of "double taxation of dividends," but I am directing my remarks not to the patent unfairness of this provision as it benefits stockholders to the disadvantage of everyone else, but rather to its broad range implications to the whole economy.

The bill, as Members know, sets up a special category of income—dividends from common stocks—which is to be treated under the tax laws as if it had divine origin—as if anyone who receives income from stocks is so much better than workingmen or other taxpayers that they should get special handouts in the form of special tax deductions and exemptions. As this provision originally stood in the bill, with the support of the majority members of the committee, it would have allowed an investor receiving $12,000 in dividends a year to get off with a Federal income tax of $10 whereas the man who earned the same amount of money by working would pay $1,836. Think of that.

The disparity here was so glaring, so preposterously unfair, and so indefensible that eventually the committee majority reconsidered and toned it down a bit and now the stockholder will not do quite as well as that, but he will still do very well, thank you, in comparison with those who earn their incomes or receive it through means other than possession of common stocks paying dividends.

Now, instead of having 5 or 10 or 15 percent—by the third year—of his dividend income deducted from the amount of the tax he owes—the most outlandish idea I ever heard of for a handout to the wealthy—he will now have 5 or 10 percent of the tax on that dividend income deducted from his tax bill. It is still a tremendous handout, a tremendous tax immunity bath for the well-to-do.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I do not today want to bore any of the Members who might look on this largess with unconcern. I have spoken often of the unfairness of this provision and I think I have made that point if it can be made at all. But let us look at the implications of this thing from another standpoint—let us look at it in cold-blooded fiscal or banker's terms rather than in terms of fairness or unfairness or right or wrong. Let us examine what it would do to the investment market—and I am sure every Member is interested in that.

This provision is intended to make common stocks more attractive to investors. If it had been written on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange or in the office of the board of governors of the exchange, it could not have been better timed or better written to promote the present drive of the stockbrockers to get more people to buy common stocks, even on the installment plan, $40 a month.

I have no objection to the stockbrokers trying to get more customers. At present, only about 4 out of 100 persons are owners of stocks. At present, only about 1 family out of 10 owns stocks. At present, only 1 out of 16 adults owns stocks. The more people who buy and sell stocks, the more commissions the brokers make, and that is their livelihood, and I have no objection to them making a living or promoting their business.

But this provision is intended to encourage stockbuying and stockholding by making common stocks more attractive from an income tax standpoint than other types of securities.

As stocks become more attractive, bonds usually lose out. So the interest rates on bonds must rise in order better to compete with stocks for investors' money. What happens when bond interest rates go up?

Borough and township, city and county, and State and Federal costs go up, because the officials of these public agencies must bid higher and higher for investors' dollars in order to compete with common stocks. That is perfectly normal.

What we are doing in this tax bill, however, is taking sides in the battle, deliberately extending tax advantages to common stocks which will react adversely to the bond market and force higher interest rates on municipal bonds, on State bonds, on Federal bonds—and do not forget we have got a $275 billion debt to fund—and on mortgages, railroad equipment bonds, corporation bonds, and every other type of security which competes with common stocks for investment funds.

Who pays the higher interest rates? In the last analysis the taxpayer—and at every level of Government.

Shades of the late but lamented hard-money policy—the monumental blunder of the Treasury last year which had much to do with today's economic dislocations. Now we are going back once again to the hard-money, high-interest policy, only this time we are going it through the medium of a tax bill to give common stocks an unnecessary, completely gratuitous, extra and special promotional gimmick, one, which I said earlier, could not have been more sweet and lovely to the stockbrokers in the Exchange if they had written it themselves in Wall Street.

In this time of worldwide military danger from communism, of huge and almost incomprehensible military expenditures for our safety and survival, of a $275 billion national debt which apparently is going to get bigger before it gets smaller—if it does get any smaller under this administration—and of burdensome direct and indirect taxes at every level of Government on the wage earner and the small-business man, what is there about common stocks which deserves such special largess right now?

Are they depressed? They are not. They are today reaching record levels, perhaps partly in anticipation of the handout momentarily expected from Congress. Are common stocks a poor investment? Obviously not—they have been exceptionally good investments for many years.

I have in my hand a pamphlet issued by one of the Wall Street brokers showing that over the years since the war, common stocks have returned in dividends anywhere from 6 to nearly 8 percent a year on market values. What other investment has done as well year after year? Not savings banks or savings and loan associations, not bonds.

Mark you, Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to earnings—I am referring to dividends. Earnings on common stocks have run anywhere from 11 to 16 percent on stockholder investment through the postwar years. And of this, the corporations' boards have seen fit to return to the stockholders in dividends about half or less of the earnings, plowing the rest back into expansion and improvements which have the effect of strengthening the stockholders' equity and investment. So it is hard to see how stockholders have been suffering in any way from this mislabeled phony, this alleged discrimination euphemistically called double taxation.

For 11 years in a row, aggregate cash dividend payments by listed common stocks topped the total for the preceding 12-month period. So let us have no tears for the poor stockholder; let us look before we leap to the "rescue" of this group of stockholders from a continued fate of 6 and 7 and 8 percent a year on investment in the form of dividends alone, not counting the appreciation in the value of their stockholdings which usually gets taxed at the capital gains rate anyhow.

Let us beware of reinstituting a hard-money policy without realizing what we are doing. Let us not doom the cities of this country to an even more severe jolt on bond funding costs—thus causing an increase in real estate and other local tax rates. Let us not force even higher rates on Government bonds and securities to thus raise our debt costs and hence our tax requirements.

Shall we permit this stock gimmick to go though? Taxpayer, beware.

GATTAS E. MALOOF

Mr. RAY asked and was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Gattas E. Maloof, no adverse report having been made thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HUNTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include certain articles.

Mr. BONIN.

Mr. DEMPSEY.

Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK).

Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. D'EWART.

Mr. SPRINGER and to include an editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida to revise and extend his remarks in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas to revise and extend his remarks in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to the enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2714. An act to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 9, 1954, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1335. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the 33d Annual Report of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1336. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1337. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of a bill entitled, "A bill to limit the operation of sections 281 and 283 of title 18, United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U. S. C. 99) with respect to counsel in a certain case"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8193. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 1323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. Ninth intermediate report on investigation of racketeering in the Detroit area (Rept. No. 1324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2348. An act to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of red-cedar shingles"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6563. A bill for the relief of Zdzislaw (Jerzy) Jazwinski; with amendment (Rept. No. 1321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 455. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 8267. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 8268. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 8269. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 8270. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 8271. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 8272. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 8273. A bill to authorize the disposal of public lands in the Fort Stanton Marine Hospital Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 8274. A bill to provide for research into cancer and heart disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8275. A bill to postpone tobacco and cigarette tax reductions 2 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 8276. A bill to encourage a stable, prosperous and productive dairy program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 8277. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 8278. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 8279. A bill to reclassify dictaphones in the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 8280. A bill for the relief of the Military Department of the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 463. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that no citizen of the United States shall have the right to vote unless such citizen has reached the age of 21; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution providing increased security for the United States Capitol and for the Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress to continue Federal grants to State relief programs for the aged to preserve the Federal social security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to increasing Federal aid allocations for the highways of the Nation; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to retaining the present formula in allocating Federal-aid funds to the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8281. A bill for the relief of the estate of William B. Rice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 8282. A bill for the relief of Max Kozlowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 8283. A bill for the relief of Vesma and Gustav Fridenvalds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 8284. A bill for the relief of Fong Bick Sem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 8285. A bill for the relief of Richard Kieve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 8286. A bill to provide for the relief of Milton Beatty and others by providing for determination and settlement of certain claims of former owners of lands and improvements purchased by the United States in connection with the Canyon Ferry Reservoir project, Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 8287. A bill for the relief of Lew F. Bryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

550. By Mr. MASON: Petition of 1,309 civilian employees of the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, Crane, Ind., asking Congress to enact H. R. 6539, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

551. By the SPEAKER: Petition of James F. Evans, director of State parks, State of New York, Albany, N. Y., relative to cooperative beach erosion control study of Selkirk Shores State Park, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

552. Also, petition of Mary F. Parkinson and others, Dunlap, Ill., urging revision of the present 15 and 25 percent rates on Federal excise tax on telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

553. Also, petition of the deputy clerk, Board of Supervisors, County of Erie, Buffalo, N. Y., relative to enactment of necessary legislation so that all individual persons be allowed an exemption of $1,200 instead of the $600 now allowed for tax exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

554. Also, petition of the president, M. I. S. Veterans, Honolulu, T. H., urging the immediate admission of the Territory of Hawaii as a State in the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Increase in Personal Income-Tax Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of a letter dated February 19, 1954, addressed by me to the President of the United States, urging a $200 increase in personal income-tax exemptions, in order to increase the buying power and the consumption of goods, as a deterrent to a further decline in business.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1954,

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The purpose of this letter is to urge you to reconsider your tax proposals in the light of later clarifications in the economic picture. I believe, after careful reflection, that you will agree with me that increasing personal exemptions for income-tax purposes to $800, and drastic reductions in taxes on consumer goods (excise tax) would be far more just and stabilizing than the current administration proposals which are primarily aimed to stimulate savings through tax reductions to corporations and to the upper income groups.

I hope that, by now, you realize that my attempts during the past 3 months to alert the country on the need to be on guard against depression neither mark me as a prophet of doom and gloom, nor represent any desire to talk the country into a depression. Perhaps it is true that my party would get more votes this fall if the country were to go into a depression. But, it seems obvious that if our motives were selfish and political, the course I would have followed would have been to remain silent and let it happen. I would rather the Democratic Party remain out of power perpetually than to return to power in the wake of the mass misery of a great depression.

So far as my being a prophet is concerned, I have not predicted a depression. But I have, as emphatically as I could, tried to keep our Nation on its toes and ready to act to stop a worsening of the economic picture.

A look at the present economic situation indicates, in my judgment, that the time for action is here. At least we should take some initial effective steps to counteract the downward trend.

The Census Bureau now estimates that there were 3.1 million unemployed in January, or 750,000 more than they had estimated a few weeks before. There is no doubt, therefore, that unemployment has increased markedly in the last few months. In addition the Census figures for January estimated that there were 275,000 "temporarily laid off" who were counted as having a job although they drew no pay and would not have been permitted by their employer to work had they showed up at their former jobs. Employers have also put large numbers on part time in order to spread the work and reduce the payments which they would otherwise have to make to the State unemployment compensation funds. During the month of January the Census estimates that there were 1.9 millions of workers outside of agriculture who actually worked less than 15 hours a week, 1.7 millions from 15 to 21 hours and 1.6 millions from 22 to 29 hours. In all, therefore, 5.2 million workers, or 10 percent of those employed in nonagricultural occupations, worked less than 30 hours a week. Some of this lost time was caused by absenteeism, sickness and voluntary absentation from work, but a large proportion was undoubtedly involuntary and caused by the employer putting the workers on part time.

The ratio of farm prices received to prices paid by farmers is hovering at its lowest point in 12 years. Steel production has dropped to only 75 percent of capacity compared with 99 percent a year ago, and is 21 percent below last year in physical volume. Freight car loadings are down 10 percent. Mail order sales are over 13 percent below last year and retail sales have fallen off somewhat. Business failures have risen by almost 50 percent.

While I believe we are in a very definite recession, I still do not predict a depression. We have erected many safety nets during the past 20 years to prevent the bottom from dropping out of the national economy. We have farm price supports, minimum wages, unemployment compensation, collective bargaining, social security, assistance to the needy aged, blind, and dependent children, insured savings deposits, and housing programs, to mention a few of these safeguards. But while they may very well cushion the heaviest impact of a depression such as the one which began 25 years ago, that is about as far as they can go. They, by themselves, will not stop the economy from getting into a tight situation.

Thus, I am urging you, as an immediate step, to alter your tax proposals. I know that you are subjected to tremendous pressures to grant the vast majority of tax relief to business, investors, and those in the upper income brackets generally. But what is needed as a stabilizing force in the economy is a tax policy to stimulate purchasing power. Increased purchasing power will mean more consumption, sales, services, production, and employment. In short, it will mean more business activity which will do much to reverse the downward trend.

I know it has been argued that stimulants to business and investors are what is needed to keep the economy up. It is argued that by giving such incentives, business will expand production and hence increase employment. But, under such a premise, who will buy the goods? Only adequate monetary purchasing power broadly distributed can do this.

A reduction in taxes to the upper income groups and to corporations would probably stimulate savings. In normal times, savings are converted into investments and give each worker more capital with which to work. This in turn leads to increased productivity and to higher real wages.

But in times such as these while savings may flow into banks, they do not flow out to the same degree in the form of actual investments since businesses are afraid to borrow and banks are afraid to lend. With the large supply of idle industrial equipment on hand, business in general does not want to borrow to add to it. The savings therefore tend to be in large part sterilized and do not expand production and employment as they would in normal times.

To prevent the recession from deepening into a depression, it is, therefore, far better to stimulate consumption than it is savings.

The idea of giving tax relief only to business and investors as a stabilizing force is simply the old "trickle down" theory, or "what's good for business is good for the country." Such policies, followed in the twenties, ended up with the greatest depression this Nation ever had. What is necessary is a "trickle up" theory, or "what's good for the country is good for business." If people have money to buy, business will have markets and persons will have jobs.

The present administration tax proposals, when in full effect, give investors and business 12 times as much relief as individuals. Individuals would get only $250 million in the form of such items as babysitter allowances and an increase in allowable medical deductions. Recipients of dividends would get $1.2 billion and businesses would get $1.8 billion, for a total of nearly $3 billion.

Yet saying that individuals would get only one-twelfth of the relief given to investors and business is vastly to understate the disparity. Let us analyze this further.

The average individual would get $6 in tax relief ($250 million divided by 39 million tax returns showing taxable income), while the average dividend recipient would ultimately get $200 ($1.2 billion divided by 6 million

stockholders), or 33 times as much. The discrimination is still understated, since less than 4 percent of the taxpayers receiving dividends (those with income over $10,000) get more than three-fourths of all taxable dividends (see table I of Treasury Release No. H-266, October 8, 1953). If we consider families rather than tax returns, we find that less than 1 percent of the American families own 80 percent of all publicly held stocks.

This seems unfair, and I believe it is. Yet the cause I am pleading is based not only on justice but on the economic needs of the Nation. For tax relief to individuals means increased purchases and business activity.

Let us consider a family of 4—husband, wife, and 2 children. Increasing personal income tax exemptions by $200 would give total extra personal exemptions of $800. At the lowest tax rate of 20 percent, this would mean tax savings of $160 a year, enough to buy a major appliance, or any one of several dozen of goods and services on the market. It would mean an increase of about 8 cents an hour in take-home pay.

Lower taxes on consumer goods, meanwhile, would leave more money for the purchase of other items and hence greater purchasing power.

Therefore, I sincerely hope that you will see fit to advocate immediate increases of $200 in personal exemptions on individual income taxes and selective decreases in the excise taxes.

When I advocated such measures while representatives of your administration were before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, they seemed to have little sympathy for them. I have hitherto advocated such policies in radio and television discussions, and in talks before and with businessmen of my own State of Illinois. I found in most cases that there was a wide public appreciation of their merit.

I should like also to call your attention to a reasoned, powerful statement made in the Senate today by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance and its former chairman. Senator GEORGE recognizes, and ably stated the case, that the situation calls for tax relief for the millions of individual taxpayers, and an expansion of purchasing power. He advocated, as have I, an immediate increase of at least $200 in the personal income exemption. His competence as a tax authority commands the most serious consideration of his views.

If you adopt these suggestions, I believe Congress will enact them. There may be some opposition in the ranks of your own party, but we Democrats, I believe, will provide the force you need to enact such tax revisions, just as we have helped to provide the necessary support for the main lines of your foreign policies.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Ninth Anniversary of Communist Seizure of Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared deploring the Communist seizure of Rumania, and urging that the United States refuse to recognize the satellite government of Rumania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

Last Saturday, March 6, marked the ninth anniversary of the Communist aggressive seizure of the Government of Rumania. Since then, nearly 20 million human beings have toiled and starved under Communist slavery.

Persecution, economic pillage, confiscation of property, suppression of civil and religious liberties, the destruction of the independent worker and agriculturalist have been rampant ever since.

This was not accomplished without the most strenuous measures. The acts of terrorism and brigandage were in themselves insufficient to quell the revolts of the Rumanian people. The Soviets then moved in their armed forces, and forcibly disarmed the patriot garrison in Bucharest, holding the city hostage.

While the effective seizure was not consummated until March 6, it was on February 27, 1945, that the Communists sent their star persecutor, Andrei Vishinsky, who now is their representative on the United Nations Security Council, to deliver their ultimatum. Vishinsky informed the King that he had only a few hours to decide, or the Russians would resort to armed suppression. The legal government was ousted, under threats of force, and Moscow's agents took over.

From then on the pattern is familiar: rigged elections on November 19, 1946, and the consequent welding of the once free nation into the Communist orbit. Since then our Department of State has repeatedly protested the tyranny and suppression of the Communist puppet government of Rumania, but this has not sufficed.

I am convinced that time will erase this perfidy, and that Rumania will again stand as a free nation. I have hitherto offered a resolution for the withdrawal of diplomatic recognition from the satellite Communist puppet governments, and for condemnation of Soviet Russia's enslavement of free peoples. It is my hope that we can get action on this resolution, and demonstrate to the world again our conviction that these governments are a forcible travesty upon the sentiments and faith of the peoples of these countries.

Acts of Congress Benefiting Korean War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a study for me on the acts of Congress which provide benefits to veterans of the Korean conflict. I ask unanimous consent that this study be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTS OF CONGRESS PROVIDING BENEFITS TO VETERANS WITH SERVICE DURING THE KOREAN CONFLICT OR SUBSEQUENT TO JUNE 27, 1950

Miscellaneous benefits: Persons who served in active service in the Armed Forces of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as the President or Congress shall determine, shall be entitled to compensation, pension, medical, hospital, and domiciliary care, and burial benefits as are provided by law for World War II veterans and their dependents. (Joint resolution of May 11, 1951, Public Law 28, 82d Cong., 65 Stat. 40.)

Automobiles: The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is directed to pay $1,600 on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance for veterans who served on or after June 27, 1950, and who suffered service-connected disability through loss of feet or hands or impairment of eyesight. Application for such vehicle must be made by October 20, 1954, or within 3 years after discharge or release if discharge or release occurs after October 20, 1954. (Act of October 20, 1951, Public Law 187, 82d Cong., 65 Stat. 574.)

Education and training: The Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act extends educational and training benefits to veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who served during any period from June 27, 1950, and the end of the emergency declared by the President or the Congress. Programs are required to be initiated within 2 years of release from active service or by August 20, 1954, whichever is later, and entitlements hereunder shall terminate 7 years from discharge or release. The veteran shall be entitled to benefits for a period equal to 1½ times the duration of his active service, but not in excess of 36 months for service since June 27, 1950, nor 48 months if he is entitled to benefits for previous service.

An allowance to meet, in part, the expense of his subsistence, tuition, supplies, etc., is to be paid to each veteran pursuing a program of education hereunder, which allowance shall vary in relation to the time spent on education, the type he is pursuing, and the number of dependents he has.

Payments to educational institutions shall be at the rate of the established charges of the institutions for tuition and fees required of nonveterans.

All courses taken by veterans must be approved by the State approving agencies in accordance with the provisions of this act. Part VI of the act sets up certain standards for courses offered by training establishments and institutional on-farm training. The State approving agency shall approve courses accredited by responsible accrediting agencies; and shall also approve nonaccredited courses for veterans training under this act if they comply with certain stated requirements. (Act of July 16, 1952, Public Law 550, 82d Cong., 66 Stat. 663–82.)

Employment: Benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 relating to Federal employment are extended to persons who have served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States during the period between April 28, 1952 and July 2, 1955. (Act of July 14, 1952, Public Law 536, 82d Cong., 66 Stat. 626–27.)

Employment: Veterans who served in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 30, 1950, shall be entitled to the same civil-service benefits as are accorded to World War II veterans who lost opportunity for probational appointment because of induction into the Armed Forces. Persons who voluntarily continue in military service beyond the 4 years required shall not be entitled to the benefits of this act. (Act of July 16, 1953, Public Law 121, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 173–74.)

Housing: Persons who served in the Armed Forces at any time on or after June 27, 1950, and before a date to be determined by the President, shall be accorded the same preferences in the purchase and occupancy of publicly owned war and low-rent housing, and of FHA-aided cooperative housing as are accorded veterans of World War II. (Act of October 26, 1951, Public Law 214, 82d Cong., 65 Stat. 647–48.)

Housing: The provision granting preferences to veterans under title V of the Lan-

ham Act (housing for distressed families of servicemen and veterans with families) is amended so as to include persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict. (Act of June 30, 1953, Public Law 98, sec. 1, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 132, sec. 1.)

Insurance: The Servicemen's Indemnity and Insurance Act of April 25, 1951, provides automatic insurance coverage for persons in active service on and after June 27, 1950. (Act of April 25, 1951, Public Law 23, 82d Cong., 65 Stat. 33–38.)

Loans: Title III of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 extends, to veterans with service in the Armed Forces of the United States at any time on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as the President or Congress shall determine, the benefits provided under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 relating to loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property. Application for such loans shall be made within 10 years after the termination date of the Korean conflict as fixed by the President or Congress. (Act of July 16, 1952, Public Law 550, 82d Cong., 66 Stat. 682–684.)

Loans: Preferences in applications for benefits under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Housing Act of 1949 are extended to veterans who served in the Armed Forces of the United States between June 27, 1950, and such date as is determined by the President or Congress. (Act of June 30, 1953, Public Law 98, secs. 2, 3, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 132–133, secs. 2, 3.)

Mailing privileges: The transmission of first-class mail free of postage is permitted until June 30, 1955, for members of the Armed Forces who "as a result of service in Korea," are hospitalized outside the continental limits of the United States. (Act of March 23, 1953, Public Law 9, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 7, ch. 9.)

Missing Persons Act: Provision is made for extension, until July 1, 1955, of provisions of the Missing Persons Act and incorporation of certain changes made by Public Law 450, 82d Congress, so as to cover the Korean situation. (Act of April 4, 1953, Public Law 16, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 20–21, as amended January 30, 1954, by Public Law 291, 83d Cong., 68 Stat. 7.)

Mustering-out pay: With certain enumerated exceptions, members of the Armed Forces who were engaged in active service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date determined by the President or Congress, shall be eligible to receive mustering-out pay. (Act of July 16, 1952, Public Law 550, title V, 82d Cong., 66 Stat. 688, title V.)

Naturalization privileges: Any person not a citizen of the United States who has been lawfully admitted for permanent residence or been in the United States at least 1 year before entering the Armed Forces, and who actively served with the Armed Forces for not less than 90 days on or after June 24, 1950, and not later than July 1, 1955, may, regardless of age, be naturalized without full compliance with the naturalization laws, such as period of residence, payment of fees, etc. Such naturalization proceedings may take place before any representative of the service designated by the Attorney General, provided the petitioner while serving is not within the jurisdiction of a court. (Act of June 30, 1953, Public Law 86, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 108–110.)

Service flag and lapel button: The act of October 17, 1942, authorizing approval of a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button for World War II veterans is amended to include veterans with service during any period of "hostilities in which the Armed Forces of the United States may be engaged." (Act of May 27, 1953, Public Law 36, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 35.)

Unemployment compensation: Title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 provides for compensation at the rate of $26 per week for any weeks of unemployment (not in excess of twenty-six) which may occur 90 days after July 16, 1952, for any veteran with service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by the President or Congress.

No compensation shall be paid hereunder for any week commencing more than 5 years after such date as determined by the President or Congress.

Veterans eligible to receive mustering-out payments are not eligible for unemployment compensation for prescribed periods of 30, 60, or 90 days after discharge depending on amount of mustering-out pay. (Act of July 16, 1952, Public Law 550, 82d Cong., 66 Stat. 684–688.)

Vocational rehabilitation: Benefits provided under Public Law 16, 78th Congress are extended to veterans with service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date thereafter as is determined by the President or Congress, who are in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of a disability incurred in combat, extra-hazardous service, or when the United States was at war. (Act of December 28, 1950, Public Law 894, 81st Cong., 64 Stat. 1121.)

Vocational rehabilitation: The benefits under the act of December 28, 1950, above, which were limited to injuries incurred in combat, etc., are extended hereunder to veterans of the Korean campaign on the same basis as veterans of World War II. (Act of October 11, 1951, Public Law 170, 82d Cong., 65 Stat. 404.)

The United States Has Lost a Great American With the Death of Will H. Hays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I know that the House will regret today's news of the death of Will H. Hays.

The story of Will Hays is the story of America. Here is an example of the Middle West small-town boy who on his ability only rose from precinct committeeman to be the chairman of the Republican National Committee and later Postmaster General. I grew up in Sullivan, Ind., where Will Hays was born, came to stature, and died. My father and Will Hays started out as precinct committeemen together. When he was chairman of the Sullivan County Central Committee my father was secretary.

I have known him from a small boy. Will Hays was the kindly and gracious gentleman for whom no favor was too much to do for any friend.

He was not only the statesman, but one continually interested in the welfare of his community, his State, and his country. He was a God-fearing man—a deacon and moderator of the Presbyterian Church. During all of his time in Washington he always managed to come back to Sullivan and to his church to take holy communion.

Even when he was in Washington and later in the movie industry he always retained his friendly interest in Indiana and the early loves of his boyhood.

The high morality which he had learned as a boy he carried with him into the movie industry where he was principally responsible for the cleaning up of the movie industry and bringing it greater respectability in the eyes of the public. In this job his ability and his integrity stood him well for he was never known to weaken on the matter of principle even when he was opposed by large segments of the industry. After his retirement he came back to Sullivan and retained his interest in his friends and the practice of law, which was his first love.

I am sure that Will Hays will be missed, not only by his friends in this body and in Washington, but the many people whom he befriended throughout the United States. The loss of this kind of a man is always felt because he was thoroughly an American.

Mr. Speaker, I am attaching herewith for the RECORD, the editorial from today's Washington Daily News on the death of the Will H. Hays, which tells a great deal about the high respect in which this man was held:

WILL H. HAYS

High-powered persuasiveness sums up best the qualities which carried Will Hays from a small-town Indiana boyhood to the czardom of a $2 billion industry—American movies.

Mr. Hays died yesterday at his Sullivan, Ind., home at the age of 74, ending a prodigious career that included politics, publicity, the profession of law, and policeman of Hollywood's screen morals.

It is a tribute to this grassroots American with a Presbyterian-elder outlook that no Federal regulation or supervision of the motion-picture industry has ever been found necessary. The system of voluntary censorship that the famed "Hays Office" introduced has been sufficiently effective.

Mr. Hays was once described, literally, as "the cat's whiskers of the movie industry" in that the film producers relied on him to guide them through tight places and around dangerous corners the way a cat relies on its whiskers for approximately the same purposes.

He held the job for 21 years. Against moralists who thought he was sometimes too liberal and against liberals who thought he was too moral, Will Hays needed only to turn on his persuasive personality to calm them. He won the respect of industry heads, the critics, and the mass of movie fans who to this day want a movie kiss no longer than the limit once decreed by the Hays office. America owes him an unpayable debt to the influence of decency and good taste he bequeathed to an industry which has such incalculable effect on our manners and morals.

Setting the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, a situation exists which I believe is in need of clarification for the benefit of the Members of this body.

On March 2, 1954, at pages 2506, et seq., of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my colleague, Mr. HAGEN, who represents the 14th District of California, which adjoins the 12th District, represented by me, cited certain statements by the Fresno

County Board of Supervisors in support of his opposition to House Joint Resolution 355, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from Mexico. Later, on March 4, at pages 2701, et seq., of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. HAGEN, in commenting on that part of the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill which provides funds for the administration of the Mexican agricultural worker program, again relied upon certain statements of the Fresno County Board of Supervisors in support of his opposition to the program.

In view of the fact that Fresno County is within my district and not Mr. HAGEN'S, I believe it would be well to call to the attention of the Members the position of the Fresno County Board of Supervisors with respect to House Joint Resolution 355 as they conveyed it to me.

In a telegram dated March 2, 1954, the board of supervisors of Fresno County advised me as follows:

> Understand some Members of Congress are under misapprehension that we feel no supplemental supply of Mexican labor is necessary in this area to properly care for and harvest crops from time to time. This is not true but we are unalterably opposed to influx of illegal Mexican nationals or so-called wetbacks. We definitely feel that a simplified and workable plan, with proper controls, is absolutely necessary and will go a long way in solving wetback problem.

I voted for House Joint Resolution 355 because, as I stated in my remarks on page 2507 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 2, I believe it will serve two major purposes. First, it helps to provide for the orderly recruitment of supplemental agricultural labor from Mexico. Second, it makes possible more effective administration of the immigration laws. In other words, it will help solve the wetback problem.

Imports of Residual Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. BONIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is the only State in the Union which can produce in substantial quantity that practical mineral known as anthracite coal. This product has been the stabilizing factor in the economy of our anthracite coal fields. For the past several years, the production of hard coal has declined from a yearly 60 million tons to approximately 30 million tons. The decrease in production of anthracite coal caused the trustees of the United Mine Workers of America Welfare Fund to reduce the monthly benefits from $100 to $50. This is a severe blow to the men who risked their lives at this hazardous occupation during the war years. The steady decline in production of hard coal has caused a severe unemployment situation in my congressional district. Why?

One of the basic reasons for the loss of production has been the importation of residual fuel oil into the eastern part of our Nation. In 1953, 134 million barrels of residual fuel oil came into this country. This was more than we imported in 1952. I have been told that 130 million barrels were imported in 1952 and the same number of barrels in 1951. This cheap product from foreign shores has caused the drop in tonnage at our mines and fewer work days for the miners.

Recently, the Randall Commission made its report to the President about our foreign trade. The Commission, in my opinion, has ignored the problem of the anthracite coal industry. I studied that report and nowhere do I find a suggestion or recommendation to protect our local industries against the dumping of foreign products on our markets.

I was happy to read the minority report which condemned the majority report for failing to give some protection to the smaller industries of our Nation. I realize that we must export products to other countries to maintain favorable trade balance with other countries. However, I am opposed to the dumping of foreign products on our shores to the detriment of our American industries. There is no duty or obligation on the part of the people of the United States to accept the surplus products of the world to the detriment of our own economic welfare. That is the theory and philosophy of the majority members of the Randall Commission. I want no part of that doctrine.

The Randall Commission would import 168 million barrels of residual fuel oil and cause a loss of an additional 30 millions of tons of hard coal. They suggest a loss of $300 million to the mining companies: a loss of $160 million in wages; $180 million loss to railroad; $88 million loss to railroad employees, plus the indirect losses to Federal, State and local governments in taxes. The Commission would bankrupt the coal companies, the railroad companies and put the employees of each of these on the relief rolls.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress who supported the Simpson bill last year are determined to protect our local industries. We shall cut off the free flow of residual fuel oil into this Nation just as effectively as the German submarines did in World War II. When that happens, and that day is not to far distant, the mines will produce again and the miners will work as they did before.

Federal-Aid Highway Bill Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that my colleagues in the House will, before they vote on the bill, give it the most careful consideration possible, particularly section 2, which apportions the $200 million per year authorized for expediting construction and improvement of the Nation's system of interstate highways. I suggest that you make a searching examination of the provisions in that section which, in my opinion, are so discriminatory against 29 of the 48 States of the Union that the Members from those 29 States will be fully justified in refusing to accept them.

The majority members of the Subcommittee on Roads, of which I am the only member from a Rocky Mountain State, originally proposed to depart from the long-established and approved Federal-aid formula in apportionment of the entire $200 million and apportion this money solely on the basis of population. Never before has such a radical departure from the established formula been proposed, not even for the apportionment of the $25 million in interstate-highway funds authorized for each year in the 1952 legislation, the first money ever authorized for this Federal-aid category.

When the annual authorization was increased to $200 million in the bill soon to come before this honorable body for consideration, the amount had grown to such alluring proportions as to appeal to the cupidity of the more populous States. The result was that allocation of these Federal funds solely on population basis was written into the original bill. That proposal, of course, was entirely unacceptable to me, because it disregarded the area and the interstate highway mileage of two-thirds of our States. It was, in fact, so apparent an attempt to grab more than an equitable and fair share of these Federal funds for the populous States, regardless of their area or highway mileage, that I was forced to oppose it strenuously. As a result, the bill now provides that one-half of the $200 million annual authorization for interstate highways shall be apportioned on the regular Federal-aid formula and the other half on the basis of population. It is my contention that the entire $200 million should be allocated in accordance with the regular formula.

The 29 States which are the victims of discrimination under the present provisions of the bill have 23,542 miles of interstate highways as compared to 13,616 miles in the 19 more populous States. The 29 States, having 63.4 percent of the total interstate system mileage, are allocated $40,687,000 of interstate-highway funds, while the 19 States are to receive $57,313,000. In other words, the States with about two-thirds of the highways being improved under this program would receive two-fifths less than half of the Federal-aid funds. So that my colleagues from those 29 States may know just what this discrimination is costing them in Federal-aid matching funds annually I am giving them the list herewith:

Alabama, $279,000; Arizona, $772,000; Arkansas, $510,000; Colorado, $1,002,000; Georgia, $388,000; Idaho, $507,000; Iowa, $830,000; Kansas, $1,278,000; Kentucky, $59,000; Maine, $112,000; Minnesota, $789,000; Mississippi, $469,000; Missouri, $520,000; Montana, $1,288,000; Nebraska, $1,153,000; Nevada, $565,000; New Mexico, $903,000; North Carolina, $15,000; North Dakota, $726,000; Oklahoma, $790,000; Oregon, $793,000; South Carolina, $64,000; South Dakota, $838,000; Tennessee, $172,000; Texas, $1,823,-

000; Utah, $424,000; Washington, $212,000; Wisconsin, $281,000; and Wyoming, $521,000.

If the original plan to apportion the entire $200 million on population basis had remained in the bill, the annual loss to those States would be double the amount indicated. That, I repeat, makes this proposal wrong. There is no justification for supporting a proposal which is wrong in any degree when we are fully aware that it is wrong. I would point out that we are not building new roads with this interstate highway money. We are improving our principal highways, all of which have been built under the established Federal-aid formula. The Congress authorized them to be financed that way. That was, in substance, our agreement with the States. We should not violate it.

The subcommittee majority offered as justification for their action the fact that only two States voted against the endorsement of population-basis allocation by the American Association of State Highway Officials at that organization's convention in Pittsburgh a few months ago. Those two States, for your information, were Arizona and New Mexico. Why the highway officials representing the other States, which would suffer considerable loss of funds under this proposal, did not voice opposition to it at this convention is difficult to understand. The best information available to me indicates that many of them believed the allocation for which they voted approval was based upon population and area. At least, that is their claim now. The highway mileage in the various States was not included as a factor in reaching this decision, yet that has been an accepted part of the Federal-aid apportionment formula for many years. Up to now I have been given no reasonable justification for the abandonment of a formula that has been long recognized as fair and equitable and productive of the best results in the Nation's development of its highways.

This interstate highway system, comprising about 38,000 miles, was set up by the Congress in 1944 because the roads included in it were the most heavily traveled of all of our traffic arteries. This determination was reached also for the reason that the Department of Defense had designated those roads as requiring immediate improvement and proper maintenance as a defense network. They are deemed the most necessary to an adequate defense production program. They are virtually essential to proper evacuation of our civilian population in event of an extreme emergency. They were during World War II and are today 15 to 20 years behind the rest of the Nation's economic progress. In brief, they constitute the most dangerous and critical bottleneck to our economy and our defense. The interstate system, which is only 1 percent of our Nation's highway mileage, carries 20 percent of our entire highway travel.

In 1953, according to the National Safety Council, 38,300 American lives were lost on our highways. Far more than the proportionate percentage of those people were killed on the interstate highways and by far the greater proportionate ratio were killed in less populous States. As an example, I cite the fact that in New Mexico the 1953 highway-traffic death toll was 56 per 100,000 population. In populous congested New York State it was 13. More than 50 percent of those killed on New Mexico highways were from other States and the big percentage of those nonresidents lost their lives on the 1,012 miles of interstate highways in New Mexico. That, to my mind, should be convincing proof that the improvement of the interstate system is not of purely local benefit. We must regard it, on the other hand, as a program designed for the protection and the benefit of our entire population.

For the Congress to apportion any part of these interstate funds on a population basis is not in accord with the best interests of all of our people. Such an apportionment would be shortsighted. I believe the Members from the more populous States will recognize that when they consider how dependent their States are upon income derived from the thousands of visitors who come to them over the Nation's highways each year. If those heavily traveled highways are inadequate, if they are filled with such death-dealing hazards as narrow bridges, sharp curves, and substandard traffic lanes they deter thousands of tourists from making trips. This reduction in travel, the records will show, costs such States as Florida, California, and others millions of dollars in income. Their economies are injured to a considerable degree.

On the other hand the allocation of these interstate highway funds on a purely population basis does not benefit them materially. Under the apportionment set up by the bill California would receive $1,835,000 more per year than if the regular Federal formula were applied. Florida would receive a trifling $55,000 more. Michigan, the Nation's top motor-vehicle producer, would receive only $763,000 additional per year. I wonder if the Michigan delegation has considered how hard a cutback in motorcar travel, due to inadequate and dangerous highways in the other States, would hit Michigan's pocketbook. That State in 1951—the last year for which accurate data are available—had 7 million out-of-State visitors who spent $560 million. Its annual motorcar production is high in the billions every year. To pass a bill which will reduce that income even 5 percent would hit Michigan's economy hard.

Sound business judgment will tell the representatives of those States that the proposal for apportionment of interstate highway funds as contained in this bill is not actually in their best interest. If the highways in such large less-populated States as New Mexico, Texas, Colorado, Oklahoma, Arizona, and many others are underdeveloped and dangerous, the tourist traffic to the other States will be greatly reduced. They will sacrifice a huge potential income for the comparatively few dollars of additional Federal-aid money they would derive under the terms of this bill. Those funds fairly apportioned on the basis of the regular Federal-aid formula will do them a much greater service by encouraging highway travel from which those populous States derive by far the greatest benefit. Every transcontinental tourist has to cross the Mountain States. Is it good judgment to take $11 million from a highway-improvement program in those States?

I trust that you will go beyond the printed language of this bill and consider its implications. Should we pass this measure as written it will establish a precedent of legislative discrimination, something that we must always seek to guard against most carefully. The only proper place in this Federal-aid highway legislation for apportionment of Federal funds upon a population basis is in the urban category. There population should be the determining factor just as it has been in the past. If more money for urban highways is justified—and I am inclined to believe that it may be—then it should be included in the urban category. To rob vast segments of the interstate highway system of necessary funds will defeat the original intent of the Congress and hamper the defense program of our Nation.

Need for Passport Office for Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that again Los Angeles is being treated as a frontier town.

Los Angeles needs and has needed for some time a passport office to meet the demands of this city with its phenomenal growth.

Los Angeles is the third largest metropolitan area in North America. We have the finest international airport in the country and the greatest man-made harbor with the finest terminals in the world. And yet—Los Angeles must conduct its passport business via an outmoded system through a Federal court clerk who must send the applications to Washington, D. C., or to San Francisco in emergency cases.

Los Angeles, a city of over 2 million population, is the third largest city in the United States handling foreign passports, with applications filed last year totaling 17,913 and involving the collection of $179,000 in fees. And yet, San Francisco, with half the population and handling far less traffic than this city, boasts an official passport office.

In 1929 Los Angeles County boasted a record passport traffic of 5,404, for a $54,000 return to the Federal Government. Today, with passport traffic more than tripled, and tourist and commercial trade growing by leaps and bounds, Los Angeles is still without an official passport office.

Los Angeles should have an issuing office on the strength of current statistics showing it to be the third largest producer in passport applications. Last month, the Los Angeles Federal court clerk received 1,701 applications for pass-

ports, as compared to a record total of 883 in 1930.

A typical day in local passport activities was reported on February 3 of this year, when 89 applications were received, of which 74 of them were sent to Washington, D. C., and 15 to San Francisco for emergency treatment. This is an entirely unnecessary restraint on world travel emanating from Los Angeles and the surrounding area. The establishment of a passport office in Los Angeles is a necessity to all types of travel, and would be in keeping with the growth of this area and its international airport and excellent harbor.

Thomas Masaryk and Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, two sister Slavic peoples, the Czechs and the Slovaks, have lived in Central Europe for at least 1,500 years. The geographic position of the country, at the historic crossroads between East and West, is the key to the long and often tragic history of the Czechoslovaks. We know that early in their history the country flourished, and the zenith of its greatness and glory was reached in the 14th century. From then on, however, the history of Czechoslovaks has been very uneven. During most of that time their country has been dominated by foreign powers, governed by alien rulers and they have suffered endless injustices and iniquities. Alien overlords have done everything in their power to extinguish all traces of Czechoslovak national life, but these agents of tyranny could not eradicate the Czechoslovak national spirit of independence and freedom.

Toward the end of World War I when the days of oppressive monarchies were numbered in that part of the world, the Czechoslovaks were fortunate in having as their spokesman and leader the great philosopher-statesman, Thomas Masaryk. It was through his relentless efforts that the Czechoslovak National Council secured recognition from the Allies, later proclaimed Czechoslovak independence, and then laid the foundations of the new state. For more than two decades Masaryk and his devoted disciple, Eduard Benes, guided the destiny of Czechoslovakia. During its early years the young Republic came through its teething troubles more quickly and successfully than any other state in central and southeastern Europe, and * * * a few years later earned for itself the title of model democracy. Trade flourished and the country's economy was stabilized; the economic well being of the people was promoted; social and educational reforms were undertaken on a large scale; and there was a remarkable revival of the national culture. All these things were accomplished according to the wishes and humanitarian beliefs of its founding father, who by this time had become an elder statesman of Europe. And in 1935, when he laid aside the burden of the presidency and passed the duties of his office on to his able disciple, Eduard Benes, Czechoslovakia was well along the road of progress and prosperity.

Late in the thirties, however, the aggressive designs of Nazi Germany singled out Czechoslovakia as one of its first victims, and some 6 months before the start of World War II, the Czechoslovak state was destroyed, the country was once more dismembered, and Nazi overlords in Prague ruled the country. For more than 5 years, from March 1939 to early May of 1945, Czechoslovaks suffered under Nazi tyrrany; and for their courageous resistance against their ruthless oppressors they paid abundantly with their lives.

On May 9, 1945, when their country was liberated, Czechoslovaks once more started their task of nation building. But this time, faced with difficult political and diplomatic problems, that task seemed almost forbidding. The Nazi danger was gone, but that of communism came closer. As a matter of fact, the Communist danger literally stalked poor Czechoslovaks soon after their liberation from the Nazi tyranny. Whenever they manifested their natural desire to establish close ties with the democratic West, they received indications of Moscow's displeasure. Whenever they made known their preference for the democratic way of life they were accused of bourgeois mentality. And in mid-1947 when they were disposed to accept Marshall plan aid, they were restrained and reprimanded by Moscow. That was the first open and unmistakable warning to them that they were not masters of their own destiny. Finally, in February of 1948, with the encouragement and underhanded support of Moscow, Czechoslovak Communists took over the government of the country.

Since then the history of the country may be described as the rapid replacement of a successful democracy by a Communist satellite in the Soviet pattern. All industries are nationalized and farms are collectivized. The country's economy is geared to that of the Soviet Union. The Communist regime maintains itself by its dreaded but efficient secret police. All traces of freedom are eliminated, and all contact with the free world is forbidden. The secret police control the public and private affairs of every citizen. Today the country is virtually a slave of the Soviet Union. It is, however, heartening that despite all these almost unbelievable restrictions and rigidity in Czechoslovak life, in spite of this reign of terror, thousands of anti-Communists succeed in finding their way to freedom by escaping to the West. And within Czechoslovakia there is unending resistance to the Communist regime. By means of such organized underground movements, brave and patriotic Czechoslovaks are not only risking their lives to regain their own freedoms, but are also carrying on the fight of democracy against tyranny in that European outpost. Let us all hope that soon their country will be liberated from Communist tyranny and all Czechoslovaks once more enjoy the blessings of freedom and national independence.

Increase Consumption of United States Agricultural Commodities in Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, a measure that I believe will be most helpful in distributing for consumption a large part of the food and fiber that is now in storage in this country.

The fact that we have not been able to find means of consuming or distributing for consumption the plentiful harvests of our farms and ranches is a perplexing problem. I sometimes think that we let our concern about this problem obscure the fact that we should be truly grateful for the abundance we have enjoyed in recent years. The real problem is to find better means of getting our farm produce to the people, both at home and abroad, who need and can use it. This bill endeavors to help with the distribution of our produce in other nations around the globe.

The purpose of the act, stated in section 2, is to promote "the stability of American agriculture and the national welfare by stimulating and facilitating the expansion of foreign trade in agricultural commodities produced in the United States."

This objective would be accomplished by both private and Government sales of agricultural commodities over and above what is considered to be the normal quantities exported, and by measures to expand a continuous market demand abroad for our agricutural commodities.

It is proposed to accomplish these ends by loans through the Export-Import Bank, and to permit payment in the currency of the borrower nation.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to designate the quantities and kinds of surplus agricultural commodities which may be offered, to reimburse the Export-Import Bank, and to direct the CCC to sell to domestic exporters for export such surplus commodities as may be shipped abroad.

The President is authorized to use foreign currencies acquired under this act to develop new markets and to purchase materials needed for our own strategic materials stockpiles. The facilities of the Foreign Operations Administration would be available to carry out this work.

It is my belief that this legislation can be of material help in creating international trade and good will, in distributing the great abundance of agricultural products now available in America, thus serving the interests not only of the farmers and ranchers of this country but of the Nation generally. I trust that it will be considered in this light.